IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

* * *

JASON JONES,

CASE NO. 63136

Electronically Filed Sep 04 2013 08:44 a.m. Tracie K. Lindeman Clerk of Supreme Court

Appellant,

VS.

THE STATE OF NEVADA,

Respondent.

APPELLANT'S APPENDIX

VOLUME 4

Direct Appeal From A Judgment of Conviction Eighth Judicial District Court The Honorable Valerie Adair, District Court Judge District Court No. C285488

David M. Schieck Special Public Defender JoNell Thomas Deputy Special Public Defender 330 S. Third Street, 8th Floor Las Vegas, NV 89155 Steven Wolfson District Attorney 200 Lewis Ave., 3rd Floor Las Vegas NV 89155

Catherine Cortez-Masto Nevada Attorney General 100 N. Carson Street Carson City, NV 89701

Attorneys for Appellant

Attorneys for Respondent

INDEX

<u>Volume</u>	Document Name/File Date	Page No.
15	AMENDED JURY LIST (1/29/13)	1544
10	BENCH WARRANT RETURN (1/25/13)	1020-23
15	CRIMINAL COURT MINUTES (UNFILED)	1599-1616
1	DEFENDANT'S MOTION IN LIMINE TO ADMIT EVIDENCE OF AND CONTENTS OF RECORDED 911 REPORT (12/18/12)	60-69
8	DEFENDANT'S PROPOSED JURY INSTRUCTIONS (1/23/13)	780-796
10	EX PARTE APPLICATION FOR ORDER REQUIRING MATERIAL WITNESS TO POST BAIL (1/24/13)	1014-18
2	EXHIBIT A IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANT'S MOTION IN LIMINE TO ADMIT EVIDENCE OF AND CONTENT OF RECORDED 911 REPORT (1/2/13)	
1	INFORMATION (11/14/12)	1-3
15	INSTRUCTIONS TO THE JURY (1/2913)	1506-37
15	JUDGMENT OF CONVICTION (JURY TRIAL) (4/29/13)	1595-96
8	JURY LIST (1/23/13)	779
1	MOTION FOR DISCOVERY SPECIFICALLY DISCLOSURE OF ALL PHYSICAL EVIDENCE COLLECTED IN THE INVESTIGATION OF THIS CASE AND/OR THIS DEFENDANT AND OF ALL FORENSIC TESTING CONDUCTED THEREON (12/18/12)	53-59

<u>Volume</u>	Document Name/File Date	Page No.
2	MOTION TO DISMISS COUNSEL (1/10/13)	168-170
15	NOTICE OF APPEAL (5/3/13)	1597-98
2	NOTICE OF DEFENDANT'S WITNESSES (1/11/13)	203-204
1	NOTICE OF WITNESSES AND/OR EXPERT WITNESSES (12/5/12)	13-32
1	ORDER [TO ISSUE WRIT] (12/26/12)	70-71
15	ORDER DENYING DEFENDANT'S PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS (1/29/13)	1504-05
1	PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS OR, IN THE ALTERNATIVE, MOTION TO REMAND FOR ADMISSION OF EVIDENCE OF OTHER ACTS/ DEFENSES (12/17/12)	39-52
1	REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING 11/27/12 (4/16/13)	4-12
1	REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING 12/11/12 (4/16/13)	33-38
2	REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING 1/3/13 (4/16/13)	164-167
2	REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING 1/10/13 (4/16/13)	171-182
3	REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING 1/17/13 (4/16/13)	212-217
3	REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING 1/18/13 (4/16/13)	218-222

<u>Volume</u>	Document Name/File Date	Page No.
3	REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING 1/22/13 JURY TRIAL DAY 1 PGS 1-91 (4/15/13)	223-313
4	REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING 1/22/13 JURY TRIAL DAY 1 PGS 92-191 (4/15/13)	314-413
5	REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING 1/22/13 JURY TRIAL DAY 1 PGS 192-293 (4/15/13)	414-515
6	REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING 1/23/13 JURY TRIAL DAY 2 PGS 1-134 (4/15/13)	516-649
7	REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING 1/23/13 JURY TRIAL DAY 2 PGS 135-263 (4/15/13)	650-778
8	REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING 1/24/13 JURY TRIAL DAY 3 PGS 1-60 (4/15/13)	806-65
9	REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING 1/24/13 JURY TRIAL DAY 3 PGS 61-126 (4/15/13)	866-931
10	REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING 1/24/13 JURY TRIAL DAY 3 PGS 127-208 (4/15/13)	932-1013
11	REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING 1/25/13 JURY TRIAL DAY 4 PGS 1-132 (4/15/13)	1024-1155
12	REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING 1/25/13 JURY TRIAL DAY 4 PGS 133-271 (4/15/13)	1156-1294
13	REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING 1/28/13 JURY TRIAL DAY 5 PGS 1-112 (4/15/13)	1295-1406
14	REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING 1/28/13 JURY TRIAL DAY 5 PGS 113-209 (4/15/13)	1407-1503

<u>Volume</u>	Document Name/File Date	Page No.
15	REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING 1/29/13 JURY TRIAL VERDICT (4/16/13)	1538-42
15	REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING 4/4/13 SENTENCING (4/16/13)	1582-94
1	RETURN TO WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS (12/26/12)	72-110
2	SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL NOTICE OF WITNESSES AND/OR EXPERT WITNESSES (1/14/13)	205-211
15	SENTENCING MEMORANDUM (3/27/13)	1545-1581
2	STATE'S OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANT'S MOTION FOR DISCOVERY (12/26/12)	113-118
2	STATE'S OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANT'S MOTION IN LIMINE TO ADMIT EVIDENCE AND CONTENTS OR RECORDED 911 REPORT (12/26/12)	119-140
2	SUPPLEMENTAL NOTICE OF WITNESSES AND/OR EXPERT WITNESSES (1/11/13)	183-202
15	VERDICT (1/29/13)	1543
10	WARRANT OF ARREST (1/24/13)	1019
2	WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS (12/28/12)	111-112
8	WRITTEN OBJECTIONS TO STATE'S PROPOSED JURY INSTRUCTIONS (1/24/13)	797-805

1	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 204: Yes.
2	MR. PANDELIS: Did I pronounce that correctly,
3	Uriarte?
4	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 204: Yes.
5	MR. PANDELIS: You indicated you own a firearm.
6	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 204: Yes.
7	MR. PANDELIS: And I'd ask you the same questions I
8	just asked Mr. Buzzard. How many firearms do you own?
9	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 204: Two.
10	MR. PANDELIS: And are do you go out and use them
11	at the range often or
12	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 204: Yeah, like
13	[Unintelligible.]
14	MR. PANDELIS: Okay. So it's a hobby of yours?
15	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 204: Right.
16	MR. PANDELIS: And like Mr. Buzzard, do you
17	understand that different types of firearms operate and
18	function in different ways?
19	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 204: Yeah, pretty much. Yeah.
20	MR. PANDELIS: Okay. So every gun every gun isn't
21	the same?
22	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 204: Right.
23	MR. PANDELIS: Okay. And the next hand, Mr. Luttner.
24	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 211: Yes.
25	MR. PANDELIS: Badge No. 211.

1	
2	

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 211: Yes. My father used to own a gun shop years ago. Well, he passed away in '85, and so I know quite a bit about firearms. But I use to own some myself. It's been since the '80s since I even owned one. So I don't keep any around and I no longer own them, but I've used them for, you know, shooting practice and stuff at the range.

MR. PANDELIS: Based on that, well, the previous, the earlier contact you had, or the contact earlier in your life that you've had with firearms, would you agree with these other two gentlemen that different types of firearms operate in different ways?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 211: Oh, yes, absolutely.

MR. PANDELIS: All right. And not all guns are the same?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 211: Right.

MR. PANDELIS: And actually, there was one more hand in the front row. Ms. Allen, correct?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 202: Yes.

MR. PANDELIS: Badge No. 202?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 202: Yes. I own a firearm, but it's not in my possession.

MR. PANDELIS: Like these other -- do you use it often, or is it something that you just own but don't really think about?

1	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 202: It's in Cedar City with
2	my daughter and son-in-law.
3	MR. PANDELIS: Okay. Are you as familiar as these
4	other two gentlemen sound with firearms
5	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 202: Yes.
6	MR. PANDELIS: Mr. Uriarte and Mr. Buzzard?
7	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 202: Mm-hmm.
. 8	MR. PANDELIS: And like them, do you understand that
9	different types of firearms operate and function in different
10	manners?
11	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 202: Yes.
12	MR. PANDELIS: And I believe that was it for the
13	bottom row, correct? Top row, I saw some hands. All right.
14	I'm going to start over with Mr. Martinez, Badge No. 220.
15	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 220: Yeah. Well, they've
16	shown me how to use them since I was like 10 or 11. So I grew
17	up using firearms, so now I [inaudible].
18	MR. PANDELIS: Who's they?
19	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 220: My uncles, family
20	members.
21	MR. PANDELIS: And they showed you how to use
22	different types, or just shotguns?
23	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 220: No. Different types.
24	MR. PANDELIS: So you understand handguns operate in
25	a different manner than shotguns?

1	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 220: Of course.
2	MR. PANDELIS: Okay. And the next hand I believe I
3	saw was Mr. Langworthy.
4	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 225: Yes.
5	MR. PANDELIS: Badge No. 225?
6	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 225: Yes.
7	MR. PANDELIS: You own firearms as well?
8	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 225: Yes, sir.
9	MR. PANDELIS: Anything to add other than what you've
10	heard these other individuals say?
11	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 225: No.
12	MR. PANDELIS: Okay. And any other hands, top row?
13	Has anybody here seen or dealt with a person who's
14	been under the influence of drugs or alcohol? Throughout the
15	morning we've heard of people who have had family members
16	who've had drug issues or alcohol issues. But has someone
17	here been close to a person with those types of issues? Ms.
18	Green.
19	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 265: As I said before, my
20	daughter was very involved with drugs.
21	MR. PANDELIS: And it sounds like and if I I
22	apologize if I don't remember this correctly, but she's making
23	some strides in the right direction?

four years she's been clean and sober.

24

25

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 265: Oh, yeah. In the past

MR. PANDELIS: Okay. You're going to hear from some of the witnesses in this case, and some of them may be struggling with issues similar to your daughter, drugs or alcohol in the past.

Now, with your daughter, when she was struggling with these issues, did you discount everything about her just because of these issues? Like you didn't listen to anything she said or value her opinions, or did you just discount everything about her, or did you still listen to her and value her opinion at times?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 265: It wasn't a matter of valuing her opinion. It was a matter of getting her help.

MR. PANDELIS: Okay. But would you agree with me that -- I mean, your daughter, even though she was struggling with these issues, she could still -- she still had eyes and could see things, correct?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 265: Mm-hmm.

MR. PANDELIS: Your daughter, she still had ears, she could hear things?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 265: Mm-hmm.

MR. PANDELIS: And that's a yes?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 265: Yes.

MR. PANDELIS: And she still had a mouth, she could still talk to you?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 265: Yes.

1	MR. PANDELIS: Now, when she would talk to you, would
2	you discount everything she said, or would you still listen to
3	her sometimes? Again, my question is: Would you discount
4	everything she said simply because she had these issues?
5	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 265: No, I didn't discount
6	everything she said, but a lot of the things she said were out
7	of proportion because of the drugs.
8	MR. PANDELIS: But you would okay.
9	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 265: I just spent a couple of
10	years really suffering trying to get her help.
11	MR. PANDELIS: But she was still able to communicate
12	with you is what I'm getting at.
13	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 265: Yeah. Oh, yes.
14	MR. PANDELIS: And Mr. Martinez, I saw your hand go
15	up as well.
16	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 220: Yeah. My [inaudible].
17	MR. PANDELIS: And Badge No. 220.
18	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 220: But they've sobered up
19	for awhile now and [inaudible].
20	MR. PANDELIS: Okay. Do you still have contact with
21	these people?
22	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 220: Yeah. They're my
23	parents.
24	MR. PANDELIS: Oh. Okay. I didn't hear. I'm sorry.

I didn't hear you. I heard you say --

1	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 220: I kind of mumbled it.
- 2	
	MR. PANDELIS: Okay. But your parents. Growing up,
3	I mean, obviously they were your parents, you still spoke to
4	them, you still listened to them, correct?
5	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 220: Of course.
6	MR. PANDELIS: Even though they were struggling those
7	issues, you didn't discount everything else about them, did
8	you?
9	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 220: No.
10	MR. PANDELIS: Okay. Anybody else? Ms. Allen.
11	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 202: Both my brothers died of
12	massive heart attacks at young ages, 46 and 49, alcohol
13	related, cirrhosis of the liver.
14	MR. PANDELIS: And what when you're brothers were
15	dealing with these issues, what was your relationship with
16	them like?
17	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 202: My older brother was
18	living in Oakland. He was the policeman. He went through a
19	lot of depression during that time, and he even threatened the
20	mayor of that town, Oakland, California.
21	MR. PANDELIS: And then you had another brother as
22	well?
23	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 202: I had a younger brother,
24	yes.

MR. PANDELIS: He dealt with those same issues?

1	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 202: Yes.
2	MR. PANDELIS: While they were dealing with these
3	issues, what was your relationship with them like?
4	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 202: Understanding, learning.
5	Learning from their mistakes.
6	MR. PANDELIS: So you understood that they were going
7	through some struggles?
8	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 202: Oh, yes.
9	MR. PANDELIS: Were you still able to have
10	conversations with them?
11	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 202: Yes.
12	MR. PANDELIS: And like I asked some of the other
13	individuals in the jury box, they had eyes, they could still
14	see things?
15	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 202: Mm-hmm.
16	MR. PANDELIS: Could they tell you about things that
17	they saw?
18	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 202: You mean under a drunken
L9	state?
20	MR. PANDELIS: Well, I mean to a lesser extent
21	certainly, but still whether or not they're drunk I mean, they
22	could still see things. Whether or not they can communicate
23	to you what they see is a whole other story. But do you
24	understand what I'm saying?
25	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 202: Not really.

1	MR. PANDELIS: They had assuming that they weren't
2	in that drunken state, I mean, they could still see things,
3	correct?
4	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 202: Yes.
5	MR. PANDELIS: But even if they were and they're not
6	in a complete drunken state, if they're telling you a story,
7	how do you assess their credibility when they're telling you a
8	story?
9	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 202: Well
10	MR. PANDELIS: They're telling you about something
11	they saw when they're in a drunken state; how would you assess
12	their credibility?
13	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 202: I grew up as a good
14	listener. I just listened.
15	MR. PANDELIS: So would you listen to
16	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 202: If they asked for advice,
17	I would give them advice, which wasn't often.
18	MR. PANDELIS: When you're assessing whether or not
19	what they're telling you is credible, you said you'd listen.
20	Would you listen for the small details to see if it made sense
21	to you?
22	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 202: Yes.

details to see if it made sense with other things that you

know, if what they're telling you conforms --

23

24

25

MR. PANDELIS: And would you listen for those small

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 202: I tried.

MR. PANDELIS: -- to reality as you know it?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 202: Yeah, I tried.

MR. PANDELIS: And if you heard from witnesses like I described in this case who dealt with those same issues, would you do that as well? Would you use your common sense to decide whether or not it makes sense, what they're telling you?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 202: Absolutely. I would -- MR. PANDELIS: And use your common --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 202: I would try to understand with common sense.

MR. PANDELIS: And use your common sense to see if what they're telling you, even if they're dealing with those issues, conforms or matches with what else you know to be true?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 202: Right.

MR. PANDELIS: Okay. Is there anybody else who disagrees with what Ms. Allen is saying? Anybody who disagrees? Okay. Mr. Langworthy, not that you disagree, but I saw you raising your hand and you had something you wanted to --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 225: Yeah. My father was an alcoholic. He used pharmaceuticals to help with his back. He had back surgeries often and, you know, he was just quite

_

impaired, and so to deal with that had to, you know, take a lot of drugs and alcohol to try to keep sane, I guess, you know, and deal with that pain.

MR. PANDELIS: Like we talked about with some of the other ladies and gentlemen up here, has two eyes, two ears, a mouth, can communicate, see and hear things, but because of his condition sometimes might not be able to communicate as effectively with you as he would if he wasn't suffering from those problems, correct?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 225: True.

MR. PANDELIS: That said, do you agree with what Ms. Allen said, that when you're assessing what your father's telling you as credible, you listen to the details, see if it makes sense to you, see if it conforms or matches with reality as you know it?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 225: Correct.

MR. PANDELIS: All right. And the other — some of the witnesses in this case that are called to the stand to testify and you hear that in the past they have dealt with issues like that, would you do the same thing, just apply your common sense to what they're telling you?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 225: Yes, sir.

MR. PANDELIS: Thank you. Any other hands that have something to add on that question?

All righty. Anybody here a fan of shows on TV like

1	CSI, Law & Order? You don't have to be embarrassed to		
2	admit it. Ms. Green, I saw your hand. What shows do you		
3	watch?		
4	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 265: I watch Law & Order, just		
5	about all of them.		
6	MR. PANDELIS: Anybody else?		
7	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 265: There's so many of them.		
8	MR. PANDELIS: Mr. Martinez, you like thòse shows as		
9	well?		
10	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 220: Yes, yes. Bones.		
11	MR. PANDELIS: Bones, that's another one?		
12	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 220: Yeah.		
13	MR. PANDELIS: I'll confess. I don't watch them, so		
14	I am not familiar with Bones. Ms. Bernhardy, you had your		
15	hand raised?		
16	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 221: CIS and Bones.		
17	MR. PANDELIS: Anyone else? Mr. Uriarte.		
18	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 204: Yes. CIS.		
19	MR. PANDELIS: Same shows?		
20	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 204: Same shows.		
21	MR. PANDELIS: And I believe, Mr. Luttner, you had		
22	your hand raised?		
23	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 211: CSI once in awhile with		
24	family.		
25	MR. PANDELIS: What is it you like about these shows?		

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 211: Just the realism, the drama.

MR. PANDELIS: What do you mean by realism?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 211: Well, the way they act,
what happens and how they arrive at the conclusions, you know.

MR. PANDELIS: Now, when you use the word "realism,"

I want to ask you, do you understand that reality is actually
quite a bit different than what you see on those television
shows?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 211: Yeah. I know it's a show, but you always got to keep that in your mind.

MR. PANDELIS: Is there anybody up here who disagrees and thinks that those shows are just accurate portrayals of real life?

THE COURT: They've figured out already it's not. I think it would have been canceled.

MR. PANDELIS: Everyone agrees that a lot of the things they see on those shows aren't realistic, aren't even possible a lot of times, but it's just good entertainment?

Okay. And when you watch those things, it's just you're watching them solely for entertainment and not — you don't think it's an accurate portrayal of what a crime scene investigator does for example? Okay.

And again, just to follow up, you're going to hear from some crime scene analysts in this case, people who are

real life CNI — CSIs. And for one, they're not going to look like movie stars. But furthermore, their job, when you — they come in here and you hear them testify, their job's not going to seem nearly as exciting as what you see on TV.

Are you going to hold that against these witnesses, that their job just doesn't measure up to what you see on TV, anybody? All right. Seeing no hands.

Judge Adair asked each of you what you do for a living. And I apologize, I don't remember offhand what each of you answered. But do any of you have jobs wherein on a regular basis you're resolving conflicts between coworkers or dealing with customers? Mr. Pryor, Badge No. 240, you have a job. What did you do again?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 240: I manage a group of people. I manage a pretty large staff, so they've got conflicts sometimes with one another or with clients.

MR. PANDELIS: When you have two employees that are going at each other, how do you address that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 240: You know, typically it's — I mean, initially it's just separating them and getting the conflict resolved immediately as far as that. But then it's working with the human resources department to figure out what the appropriate steps of action are depending on what happened.

MR. PANDELIS: When you have to deal with it, I mean,

1	have there been occasions when you have to deal with it
2	directly rather than sending it off to human resources?
3	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 240: Yeah.
4	MR. PANDELIS: Okay. And when you're dealing with
5	two employees who are going at each other, will you listen to
6	what each one of them has to say?
7	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 240: Yeah.
8,	MR. PANDELIS: Okay. And after you listen to what
9	each one of them has to say, what do you do to resolve the
10	strife that they're having?
11	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 240: Well, luckily I tend to
12	know my employees well enough and know the situations well
13	enough that they are facing that it typically becomes pretty
14	clear what happened.
15	MR. PANDELIS: Just by listening to
16	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 240: Yeah.
17	MR. PANDELIS: what each of them has to say?
18	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 240: Yeah.
19	MR. PANDELIS: And would it be fair to say that once
20	you listen to what each one of them has to say, you use your
. 21	knowledge as an upper level employee of the company as well as
22	your common sense in deciding who's right and who's wrong?
23	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 240: Yeah.
24	MR. PANDELIS: What comes to mind, Mr. Pryor, when
25	I I just used the word "common sense." What comes to mind

when I use that term?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 240: I don't know. It — common sense, I think some were born with it, some people aren't. But I think a lot of it just comes from experience and being able to determine what's right, what's wrong, and be able to read between the lines a little bit of what's been said and give a listen to what's going on.

MR. PANDELIS: Now, based on that definition, if you're selected as a juror in this case, can you use your common sense in listening to the evidence and then later deliberating in this case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 240: Yeah.

MR. PANDELIS: Thank you.

Anybody else have a job in which they resolve conflicts, whether it be between employees or customers? And Mr. Langworthy, you raised your hand.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 225: Yeah. Working at MGM, we are constantly around the customers and, you know, if they seem like they're frustrated or upset, we try to calm them and be courteous, kind, and try to offer them something that would help them be appeared.

And if we can't resolve the conflict, then we get supervisors, managers and security involved. But most of the time when we speak to them gently and kind and courteous that, you know, most of the conflicts are resolved.

1	
2	
3	
4	l
5	
6	

.. 8

MR. PANDELIS: So a little bit different than Mr. Pryor's situation where he's dealing with people internally. Where he's just trying to figure out who in his organization is right, you're dealing with customers, and we hear the old saying that the customer is always right, and generally MGM is just trying to make their customers happy, correct?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 225: Yes, sir.

MR. PANDELIS: And that's the approach you take in resolving a conflict?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 225: Yeah. We try to figure out what their problem is, you know, and if it's on our part, you know, we try to tell them, hey, I'm sorry and, you know, how can we make it up to you. You know, if it's something that they're not pleased with like maybe their hotel room or whatever, then we get other people involved.

MR. PANDELIS: Even though it's a different type of situation than Mr. Pryor, would you agree with Mr. Pryor that common sense goes a long way in resolving those conflicts?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 225: Yes, sir.

MR. PANDELIS: All right. Anybody else? Ms. Allen, I believe.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 202: Yes. For 11 to 12 years I was line captain at the Folies Bergere, the Tropicana Hotel, and I had to keep the show straight. That meant people in

their places, and sometimes they didn't take constructive criticism. I would have to go [inaudible] watch the show. I was also a dancer, and it was -- I wasn't in a popularity contest, let's say, because I was a line captain.

MR. PANDELIS: So sometimes you had to tell people that you worked with that they just weren't seeing things the right way?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 202: They weren't doing their job.

MR. PANDELIS: And a lot of times after, like we heard, using your common sense and talking to them, were you able to make them see the light?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 202: Yes, along with a superior.

MR. PANDELIS: Okay. Now, at the conclusion of this trial, if you're selected as a juror, after the State presents all the evidence, Judge Adair is going to instruct you on the law. And is there anybody — and the law is the law. You're not here to decide whether or not a law makes sense or the wisdom behind the law.

But is there anybody here that would have a problem following the law as given to you by Judge Adair even if you disagreed with the law? And I see no hands. So everyone's answering no?

Can anyone here think of a reason why a person might

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

20

19

22

21

23 24

25

be hesitant or reluctant or just not want to talk to the police? Anybody?

And Mr. Buzzard, Badge No. 198, I saw you just kind of smiling on that one. Can you think of some reasons why somebody might, if the police are near your home investigating a crime, not you necessarily, but can you -- if the police are outside a home investigating a crime, can you think of why a person might not want to talk to the police?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 198: They're inches away from being in jail themselves.

MR. PANDELIS: Any other reasons?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 198: Just nervous.

MR. PANDELIS: So some people can be nervous.

Anybody else? Mr., is it Chapin?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 261: Mm-hmm.

MR. PANDELIS: All right. Mr. Chapin, Badge No. 261, you had another reason?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 261: Yeah. The stigma of being a snitch or a rat.

What do you mean by that, sir? MR. PANDELIS: PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 261: It's in some cultures it's kind of looked down upon to be a rat or a snitch, or to call the police when there's a problem in your neighborhood, or in your gang or in your group of friends or whatever it is, so.

MR. PANDELIS: If you see something, you just kind of turn a blind eye and keep it to yourself, is that what you're saying?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 261: That's not what I do, but some people do.

MR. PANDELIS: But your answer is that's one reason you can think of why people might be hesitant to talk to police, even though it doesn't necessarily make sense to you?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 261: Correct.

MR. PANDELIS: Anybody else that has any other reasons?

One moment, Your Honor.

(Pause in proceedings)

MR. PANDELIS: We'll pass for cause.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

Defense, you may question the panel.

MR. CANO: Thank you, Your Honor.

Good afternoon. This is the only opportunity that the defense and the State has to speak directly to you. As you heard earlier from the judge, if you see us in the hallways or in the elevators, walking around, our ethics doesn't allow us to talk to you. And the reason why we have this opportunity here is to try to have an open free discussion. That's what voir dire is about.

There's no wrong answers that you can give here.

What we're asking for is your personal opinions and thoughts, because what we're looking for here is 12 fair people to listen to the evidence in this case. Would everybody agree with me that that's what we want here?

(Prospective jurors respond affirmatively.)

MR. CANO: Yes?

(Prospective jurors respond affirmatively.)

MR. CANO: Okay. So that being said, there are no wrong answers. Okay. So if I ask the question, just please volunteer and let me know what your thoughts are behind them and I'll try not to pick on you. If you feel like I'm picking on you, I apologize ahead of time, but I'm not. Okay.

By a show of hands, how many of you guys walked in, when you walked in and you got that jury notice selection, said, oh, my God, there goes the State prosecuting another innocent person? No hands are being shown.

Okay. Why did you not think that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 225: You're not guilty until you're proven guilty.

MR. CANO: But you didn't think initially, when you received that jury notice, you didn't think — and I'm speaking — for the record, oh, I'm sorry, to Mr. Langworthy, correct?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 225: Yes, sir.

MR. CANO: Okay. Juror No. 225. But when you

1	r
2	t
3	
4	
5	
6	c
7	
8	j
9	
10	c
11	g
12	i
13	

15

16

17

18

19

20

. 21

22

23

24

25

received that jury notice, it didn't initially come off the top of your head that this person may be innocent, correct?

What was your initial thought?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 225: My initial thought?

MR. CANO: Other than I don't want to go to jury duty, or I don't want to have jury service.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 225: Just losing money at my job. That's the only thought.

MR. CANO: Okay. Well, I want to talk about this concept of this presumption of innocence. We said you're not guilty until you've been proven guilty. Why is that so important, do you think?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 225: Well, everybody has a life and unless you have facts, you know, you can't judge, you know. Like the Bible says, you cannot judge a matter unless you have two or more witnesses. And so based on the Bible, I believe the way we go about it in America, you're innocent until you're proven guilty, and we need to have more witnesses or more evidence to show that you're guilty.

MR. CANO: Does everybody agree with that? Is that a yes? I see everybody nodding, so does everybody agree with that?

(Prospective jurors respond affirmatively.)

MR. CANO: So then as you look over to the table and you see Jason over there sitting down there, right now, if you

1	had to go back to the jury room and vote, what would your		
2	guys' vote be? Anybody?		
3	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 198: We don't have one.		
4	MR. CANO: You don't have one. And that was		
5	Mr. Buzzard?		
6	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 198: Buzzard, yeah.		
7	MR. CANO: Buzzard. Mr. Buzzard, Number 198, for the		
8	record. You don't have a vote?		
9	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 198: I don't have any I		
10	don't have any clue what's going on, so I can't vote either		
11	way.		
12	MR. CANO: Would everybody agree with that?		
13	(Prospective jurors respond affirmatively.)		
14	MR. CANO: Okay. Well, not to pick on you, but		
15	there's been no evidence presented to you, correct?		
16	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 198: Correct.		
17	MR. CANO: So if there's been no evidence presented		
18	to you, has the State proven his guilt beyond a reasonable		
19	doubt?		
20	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 198: No.		
21	MR. CANO: So what should your vote be then right		
22	now?		
23	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 198: Well, I would abstain.		
24	MR. CANO: Okay. Well, can you see the point that		
25	I'm trying to make though?		

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 198: I see --

MR. CANO: Without any evidence presented in front of you right now, if you had to go deliberate and vote, you should return a verdict of not quilty.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 198: I see your point.

MR. CANO: Because the State has the burden of proof in this case. That's one of the fundamental tenets that we have in the criminal justice system, that someone is presumed innocent until proven guilty beyond a reasonable doubt. Would you agree with that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 198: I see your point, yeah.

MR. CANO: So would everybody change their vote now and not abstain? Is that a yes or is that a no?

(No audible response.)

MR. CANO: Well, I mean, that's why we're having the discussion, I think, a little bit right now, to try to get people that are fair and open minded and to understand the burden of proof and understand the presumption of innocence. I think that's very important at the outset, that as Mr. Jones is sitting over there, nothing has been presented against him. He's innocent as anyone else were.

If you were switching places with him, wouldn't you want jurors to be open minded and to have that presumption prior to listening to the evidence?

(Inaudible response.)

. 8

KARR REPORTING, INC.

MR. CANO: Okay. That seems fair, doesn't it? PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. UNKNOWN: Mm-hmm.

MR. CANO: Okay. Now, along those lines as well, there's a burden of proof. I mentioned that a little bit briefly. But the State has the burden of proof, of proving every material element beyond a reasonable doubt. Okay. That burden rests solely with the State. That's Mr. Pandelis and Ms. Christensen here.

If they haven't met that burden of proof, I mean, you're required by law, you have to return a verdict of not guilty. Is everybody comfortable with that? Can everybody raise their hand if they're comfortable with that, so I know who is and who isn't. Okay. Everybody raised their hand, for the record.

So that being said, since they have the burden of proof, that means there's no obligation by the defense to prove anything. Does that make sense? The State has to prove it. The defense doesn't have to prove him innocent, so to speak. Does that make sense?

(Affirmative responses.)

MR. CANO: So if they presented their whole entire case and they sat down, they thought that they had enough evidence, but as the defense we felt that they didn't show enough evidence and we didn't present anything, didn't ask any questions, didn't present anything, you know, they just didn't

1.3

prove their case though, would you guys be comfortable returning a verdict of not guilty if they haven't met that burden of proof beyond a reasonable doubt? Is that yes?

(Affirmative responses.)

MR. CANO: Okay. Now, there are a couple things that may come up, and we're trying to find — like I said, we're trying to find fair jurors here. So if there's any prejudices or biases, I mean, that's what we're trying to fetter out here, to make sure that we get the 12 fairest people that we can to listen to the evidence in this case.

And that doesn't mean that, you know, if you don't agree with any of the points that I'm making or any of the things that I'm saying, that doesn't mean that you can't be a good juror, maybe just not the proper juror for this case. So that being said, one of the fears that the defense may have here in this case is that obviously this is a murder case. It's a very serious case.

There will be some testimony regarding the deceased and the manner of how he died, and you may hear from his family and the loss that they have had in this case. The defense fears that that may emotionally impact you to the point where it can color you from looking at the evidence. Can everyone understand what I'm trying to say there?

(Affirmative responses.)

MR. CANO: How do you think that you would be able to

Z4

deal with like pictures they may show of the deceased person?

I don't know who's familiar with that. Because you're not accustomed to that, that can have a very traumatic effect on a person. Does anybody think that being exposed to that may affect them in being able to sit in this case?

Is everybody okay with that? Well, I mean, maybe not okay with that, but is everybody willing to accept, you know, their duty as a juror and listen to all the evidence, I guess, is a better way to say that. Is that a yes?

(Affirmative responses.)

MR. CANO: Okay. And if you feel that you're being emotionally overwhelmed perhaps by some of the images that you may see in this case, would you let the Court know? I thought I could do this case but, you know, I really can't. I can't be fair, because once I saw these pictures I stopped listening. Would you be willing to let the Court know that this case wouldn't be proper for you? Is that a yes?

(Affirmative responses.)

MR. CANO: Now, I know that there were some gun owners here, correct?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. UNKNOWN: Yeah.

MR. CANO: So we do know that there are some people that are okay with the use of guns. Is there anybody on the other side of the spectrum that just can't stand guns, that because someone may possess a gun or own a gun or have used a

negative?

MR. CANO: And it could be either positive or

1	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 220: Yeah, either way		
2	depending on how they're feeling.		
3	MR. CANO: Depending on how they're feeling?		
4	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 220: Yes.		
5	MR. CANO: Okay. Would you agree with me that not		
6	only did it affect them emotionally, it sometimes could affect		
7	their perceptions?		
8	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 220: Of course. [inaudible].		
9	MR. CANO: I'm sorry?		
10	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 220: Perception of reality.		
11	They think they can do something they can't.		
12	THE COURT RECORDER: I'm sorry. I'm not picking		
13	you up, sir.		
14	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 220: Oh. Their perception of		
15	reality, they think they can do something they can't.		
16	MR. CANO: Okay. Or do they think that they saw		
17	something they didn't?		
18	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 220: Yeah, sometimes.		
19	MR. CANO: Or did something that they didn't do?		
20	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 220: That they didn't do		
21	[inaudible].		
22	MR. CANO: And was that your experience with them		
23	growing up, I mean, that the alcohol impacted them to that		
24	point, where they'd drink to that point where it would impact		
25	them?		

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

22

23

24

25

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 220: No. They only drunk to the point where they would like speed on the street or something, but never to the point where they were hallucinating or something like that.

MR. CANO: Okay. I want to speak with Ms. Green regarding that. You said you had some issues with your daughter growing up. Would you agree with Mr. Martinez and his characterization that drugs can affect someone's perceptions?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 265: Definitely.

MR. CANO: Okay. And have you had that experience with your daughter?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 265: Yes.

MR. CANO: Okay. So despite the fact that she might have eyes and ears and can speak to you about things, when she is under the influence of drugs, that doesn't necessarily mean what she's reporting to you is accurate; would that be a fair statement?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 265: Yes. Yes.

MR. CANO: Would it affect her demeanor as well?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 265: Yes.

MR. CANO: Both positively and negatively?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 265: Mm-hmm.

MR. CANO: Okay. And was that your experience with her the entire time that she was using drugs?

·8

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 265: No. There were times that were worse than others depending on, you know, how much she had or how long she'd been taking them for at that period. Some days were really bad and other days were just a little bit out of control.

MR. CANO: Would you consider her to be like an addict or a chronic user?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 265: There was a time there that I felt she was kind of like an addict, yes.

MR. CANO: And when she was — unfortunately, when she was going through that period of time in her life, would it be fair to say that she was not perhaps the most responsible person?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 265: Definitely, yes.

MR. CANO: And maybe a person that you wouldn't have a lot of credibility with?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 265: Yeah, there were times that she didn't have much credibility.

MR. CANO: Right. And I hate to relive this. I'm sorry to ask you these questions.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 265: Mm-hmm.

MR. CANO: Would it be fair to say that sometimes when a person has these type of addictive personalities or this chronic behavior, the most important thing for them is probably to get that high or to use those drugs?

22.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 265: Yes.

MR. CANO: Okay. And would it be fair to say that sometimes they'll do anything in order to achieve that goal?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 265: Yes, and she did.

MR. CANO: Okay. Sometimes --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 265: She did things that she wouldn't normally have done had she not been on drugs.

MR. CANO: Not the normal character you were used to her being, correct?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 265: Right.

MR. CANO: So when someone is under the influence, it does affect them in many different levels, you'd agree with that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 265: Yes. Yeah, she stole from me and she sold every possession that she had that was worth any money, her jewelry, her television set, anything she could get her hands on.

MR. CANO: I'm sorry that you went through that, but thank you for your honesty.

Ms. Allen, you said that your brothers had some issues with alcohol as well.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 202: Yes.

MR. CANO: Would you agree with Ms. Green a little bit in the sense that when they were under the influence of alcohol, that that would change their behaviors?

1	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 202: Yes.
2	MR. CANO: Yes?
3	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 202: Most definitely.
4	MR. CANO: Most definitely. I think you had even
5	mentioned that one of your brothers had threatened the mayor.
6	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 202: Yes.
7	MR. CANO: Was that while he was under the influence?
8	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 202: Yes.
9	MR. CANO: Yes. So sometimes, like we said, it
10	affects people positively and negatively. I guess that would
11	be a negative, kind of a violent effect that alcohol would
12	have on him?
13	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 202: Right, to a point.
14	MR. CANO: Not that I'm saying that it happened every
15	time, but at least that one
16	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 202: To the point where he had
17	to be put into a mental institution.
18	MR. CANO: So alcohol and drug uses can have a very
19	serious impact on a person's life; would everybody agree with
20	that?
21	(Affirmative responses.)
22	MR. CANO: Okay. So when evaluating someone's
23	credibility and they're an admitted drug user or alcohol user
24	to a chronic stage, would you all take that into consideration
25	in judging the credibility, that their perceptions can be

1 affected? Yes?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 202: Yes.

MR. CANO: That would be important information for you to know when evaluating if this person is credible or not credible; would you agree with that?

(Affirmative responses.)

MR. CANO: Yes?

There were some questions asked regarding if anyone is familiar with law enforcement agencies. I know Ms. Allen's brother, I think, was a police officer in Oakland, or high up in the ranks, I believe, in Oakland.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 202: Yes.

MR. CANO: Now, would anybody hold the word of a police officer to, I guess, a higher level of credibility compared to say someone who is an admitted chronic alcoholic? And it's okay if you say yes. I mean —

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 202: Possibly.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. UNKNOWN: Say that again.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. UNKNOWN: Yeah.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. UNKNOWN: Possibly, yes.

MR. CANO: My question was: Would you hold the word of a police officer higher over the word of a chronic alcoholic?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 198: In the grounds of common sense, it's possible.

1,4

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 221: It's possible. I couldn't say yes or no on that.

MR. CANO: Okay. And I got it -- I just want to make sure I got a good record here, so I'm going to go through this one at a time. That was Ms. Bernhardy, correct? You said that it was possible?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 221: Well, I mean, I just think it's tough to make a decision like that without hearing the police officer and an alcoholic [inaudible].

Unfortunately, plenty of functioning alcoholics in this world that run businesses, doctors, attorneys. So I just -- I think it's hard to say yes or no.

MR. CANO: Okay. Would you hold their credibility a little bit higher solely because of the fact that they're police officers?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 221: I don't know. I think it would depend on that person and what they were saying and the incident.

MR. CANO: And as a defense -- from the defense perspective, you can understand -- I appreciate your honesty, but I can also be a little -- it kind of gives me a little pause if you would hold the word of a police officer that of another witness.

And I give you extremes, but the reason why I ask that is that if a police officer were to come up here and

1	testify and you'd take their word over anyone else's, that
2	wouldn't necessarily be fair, would it?
3	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 221: No, but I didn't say
4	that. I said
5	MR. CANO: I know you didn't say that.
6	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 221: it would depend.
7	MR. CANO: It would depend
8	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 221: It would depend, yes.
9	MR. CANO: on what they said in conjunction with
10	other evidence?
11	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 221: Yes.
12	MR. CANO: So that being said then, you would take
13	their word or their testimony into account along with the
14	testimony of any other witnesses?
15	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 221: Yes.
16	MR. CANO: Depend despite the fact that that
17	person may have some issues?
18	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 221: I would have to listen to
19	both and make a judgment. I would say that I'm not going to
20	hold a police officer there's also been police officers
.21	that are crooked. So not every police officer is an honest
22	John, Joe, whatever.
23	MR. CANO: Okay.
24	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 221: So I know that.
25	MR. CANO: Well, thank you. Not everybody feels that

way, so I do appreciate that.

Would everybody agree with what Ms. Bernhardy said?

(Affirmative responses.)

MR. CANO: That you got to kind of take a police officer's word in account along with anyone else, and kind of evaluate what the evidence is presenting?

(Affirmative responses.)

MR. CANO: Okay. Because as in any profession, you know, there's good and bad police officers, lawyers, you know. In any profession there can be good and bad.

Now, because the State has the burden of proof in this case of proving beyond a reasonable doubt, we have no burden, my client can choose to take the stand or not take the stand. Is everyone comfortable with that concept? Have you heard of that before?

(Affirmative responses.)

MR. CANO: Yes?

(Affirmative responses.)

MR. CANO: Okay. Does anybody here have any hesitation or like would — if my client chose not to take the stand, would hesitate or have some pause, or take that into consideration in evaluating this case because he chose not to take the stand? Does anybody have a problem with that?

Is everybody okay with that, that he chose not to take the stand? Yes?

1 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 202: It's his choice. 2 MR. CANO: It is his choice. Right. He can't be 3 forced to take the stand. It's his right if he chooses not to 4 take the stand, and that shouldn't be held against him. 5 everybody agree with that? 6 (Affirmative responses.) 7 Okay. Can anybody think of any reasons MR. CANO: . 8 why someone would not want to get up on that stand to testify 9 if you were accused of a crime? 10 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 265: Be nervous. 11 MR. CANO: That's a very good point. 12 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 265: Just be nervous. 13 MR. CANO: Someone may not be use to speaking in 14 public. 15 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 265: Mm-hmm. 16 MR. CANO: So they may get nervous. Those nerves 17 from just not being able to speak in public may come across as 18 something different. Would that be correct? 19 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 265: Right. 20 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 221: He could implicate 21 himself not intentionally. 22 MR. CANO: Okay. So there are other reasons then perhaps that that person did it as to whether they didn't take 23 24 the stand; would everybody agree with that? 25 (Affirmative responses.)

MR. CANO: There could be other reasons why they chose not to testify?

(Affirmative responses.)

MR. CANO: And all of you are comfortable with the fact that if my client chooses not to testify, you won't hold that against him? And there will be some instructions from the Court as well regarding that. But all of you are comfortable with that concept, yes?

(Affirmative responses.)

MR. CANO: The Court's indulgence. Sorry.

There's some questions regarding like CSI. Basically essentially what that is, is forensic science. You may hear from some witnesses that testify regarding that count. Does everybody believe that forensic science is accurate? Does everybody agree with that statement?

Yes, no. I hear some mixed reactions here. Mr. Langworthy.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 225: Yes.

MR. CANO: I think you didn't agree with that statement.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 225: I don't think every system is perfect, so neither do I think that that could be perfect as well, you know. There might be something that's flawed, maybe overlooked or under-looked. You know, so I don't think every particular thing's —

1	MR. CANO: Okay. That's a fair assumption of a an
2	evaluation of that area. Does anybody agree with
3	Mr. Longworthy [phonetic]?
4	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 225: Langworthy.
5	MR. CANO: Langworthy. My apologies, sir.
6	Who would agree with him? Mr. Martinez,
7	Ms. Bernhardy, you would?
8	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 221: Mm-hmm.
9	MR. CANO: I think Mr. Luttner, as well. Anyone
10	else?
11	Okay. Everybody else think that it is fairly
12	accurate and right on, dead on the money?
13	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 198: I'm not going to say dead
14	on the money, but I mean, they've learned to correlate
15	information and see trends and
16	MR. CANO: Would it be a fair statement to say that
17	forensic science attempts to be accurate?
18	(Affirmative responses.)
19	MR. CANO: But there can be some mistakes in that?
20	(Affirmative responses.)
21	MR. CANO: For the most part? Okay. Fair enough.
22	Mr. Zercher.
23	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 208: Yes, sir.
24	MR. CANO: You're sitting in a little bit different
25	position than probably some of the other jurors in the fact

1	that you've had some contact with the criminal justice system,
2	correct?
3	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 208: Right.
4	MR. CANO: And anybody that has some experience with
5	that how do you view the system?
6	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 208: Think it just, you know,
7	like anything else, it's not perfect, but it is what it is.
8	MR. CANO: Okay. So it's not perfect in what way?
9	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 208: I'm sure mistakes are
10	made. Everybody's human in the system, some mistakes made
11	somewhere.
12	MR. CANO: Okay. Do you think that you were treated
13	fairly as you went through the criminal justice system?
14	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 208: Yes, I do.
15	MR. CANO: When you were initially charged with
16	whatever allegations there were at the time, did you think
17	that the police officers involved in the investigation treated
18	you fairly or properly?
19	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 208: Yes.
20	MR. CANO: Yes. And past that point, when the case
21	was passed on to district attorneys to prosecute the case and
22	you had to go out and hire your own defense attorney, do you
23	think that the district attorneys treated the case fairly?
24	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 208: Yes.
25	MR. CANO: Now, do you think that you the

favorable results you got were based upon the fact that you had good defense counsel?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 208: Possibly, maybe.

MR. CANO: Okay. What about the court, when you had to deal with the court. I know you still have some pending matters, but do you think you were being treated fairly by the courts, the system?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 208: Everything that I've experienced, it's a possibility that I would have. I mean, I was treated fairly by everybody else. You know, but who knows. Maybe there's one exception, you never know. But everybody was fair with me.

MR. CANO: Okay. And do you think that you were the exception, or do you think that you were the rule?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 208: I just think it is what it is. You asked me if I was treated fairly, I was treated fairly.

MR. CANO: Okay. This is kind of a hard question to ask, but I would appreciate your honesty on this.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 208: All right.

MR. CANO: Do you think the fact that you're a white male had an impact on how you were treated in this case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 208: Absolutely not.

MR. CANO: No? Do you think that someone who's African-American may have a different perspective from the

criminal justice system than you do?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 208: Possibly.

MR. CANO: Does anybody believe that the criminal justice system may be unfair to an African-American male?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 261: Yes.

MR. CANO: Yes. I got a yes from Mr. Chapin. What do you mean by that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 261: The system of unfairness has existed for a lot longer than we've been alive. It's kind of ingrained everywhere, the police system, the court system, everywhere. It's not gone, but even though it's a lot less than it used to be.

MR. CANO: What's not gone, the prejudices?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 261: Prejudice, bias, it's all still there. Not necessarily in this case, not necessarily in every case, but it still exists somewhere.

MR. CANO: Okay. I wouldn't disagree with that statement. That makes some sense. If for some reason you're seated as a juror in this case and you felt that maybe some other jurors were demonstrating some of this prejudice or some of this bias, would you make the Court cognizant of that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 261: Yes.

MR. CANO: Okay. That wouldn't be fair, would it, to make a judgment on someone solely based upon their race or their appearance?

1	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 261: No.
2	MR. CANO: Does everybody agree with that?
3	(Affirmative responses.)
4	MR. CANO: But can you all understand why my client
5	may be hesitant considering the racial makeup of the jury that
6	we have in front of you? Is that a yes?
7	(Affirmative responses.)
8	MR. CANO: But do all of you, if you see any kind of
9	prejudices being exhibited by the way that people are speaking
10	about the case or the way they're speaking about Mr. Jones,
11	would you make the Court aware of that
12	(Affirmative responses.)
13	MR. CANO: that a juror's acting improperly?
14	Thank you.
15	The Court's indulgence.
16	(Pause in proceedings)
17	MR. CANO: Could we approach?
L8	THE COURT: Sure.
L9	(Off-record bench conference.)
20	MR. CANO: I'll pass the panel, Your Honor.
21	THE COURT: All right. Is everyone on the panel okay
22	going a little bit longer without a break, everyone on the
23	panel?
24	Okay. For those of you in the audience, just if you
25	need to take a break, just communicate with the bailiff.

Ladies and gentlemen, you've been questioned thus far relating to your service as jurors during what's called the guilt phase of the trial. During the guilt phase, as you've heard us talk, the State has the burden of proof. They have the burden to prove, you know, that the crime that they've charged was committed and that the defendant is the person who committed the crime. And in that phase of the case they present evidence related to that, and then the jury goes in the back and deliberates.

In a case of murder, it's a little bit different than all other types of criminal cases, because in all other types of criminal cases, if an accused is convicted of a crime, it becomes the duty of the Court to pronounce sentence. In this kind of a case, if you or whomever is selected to serve on the jury finds the defendant guilty of murder in the first degree, then we move into what's called the penalty phase. And unlike in all other types of cases, it becomes the duty of the jury to pronounce sentence.

Now, in this type of a case, if in fact the defendant is convicted of murder in the first degree and we move to a penalty phase, the jury will have the opportunity to determine which penalty is appropriate among three potential penalties.

Those potential penalties are life without the possibility of parole, life with the possibility of parole with the parole eligibility beginning after 20 years has been

served, and a term of years of 20 years at the bottom and a maximum of 50 years, so a period of 20 to 50 years, parole eligibility beginning after 20 years has been served.

The attorneys would now like to ask you some questions relating to that phase of the trial. We might never get there, but they have to consider the possibility that we may get there. Although that's, you know, in no way a certainty, and so they may ask you questions that does not of course reflect a belief on the part of the attorneys that they think we'll ever get to a penalty phase.

But this is the only opportunity that the lawyers have to question you, the prospective jurors, so they do need to address whatever questions they have regarding the penalty portion of this trial, if we ever get there, at this time.

And Mr. Cano, does the defense wish to go first?
MR. CANO: Sure, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Since the State started off first last time, we'll let the defense go first, and then the State will be able to ask you some questions as well.

MR. CANO: Actually, Mr. Pike will go.

THE COURT: Oh, all right. Mr. Pike.

MR. PIKE: Thank you.

Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen of the jury.

I'm Randy Pike. I along with Mr. Cano am going to be acting as Jason's attorney in this.

Now, the Court has outlined that if you serve on this jury and if you return a verdict of first degree murder, that you then are going to be a sentencing body. You are going to consider evidence that would be presented concerning who Jason is, his history, and impact on the family of the deceased, and the evidence that's appropriate to try and make that decision.

Coming into this jury selection process, I imagine that most of you didn't know that you were buying into being a sentencing jury and this may turn into not just a guilt trial, but then a penalty phase to follow that.

Is there anybody on the jury panel that believes as a result of closely held and well-held personal or religious convictions that they cannot sit in sentencing as opposed to not sitting on — and not making a decision as to guilt or innocence? I see no hands.

So everybody here feels that they can make a decision, if a verdict is returned as to first, amongst those three decisions? And again, if I — if you don't understand my questions, raise your hand. Because we want to make sure that the jury understands what we're asking and that we are communicating.

In fact, during the trial, you'll actually find out that every time a witness finishes testifying, you'll be able, if you feel that you have additional questions, the jury members can write a question and provide it to the judge. And

the judge, if appropriate, will ask that witness the question. So you have a right to be actively involved in this case.

Now, the judge outlined three specific sentences. In the State of Nevada we have a truth in sentencing law. Life without the possibility of parole means exactly that. Is there anybody here that believes if a sentence of life without the possibility means anything other than the person that is sentenced to that will spend every day of the rest of their life in prison until they die?

Okay. If everybody understands that and understands that penalty, would you raise your hand. Indicates everybody agrees to that.

Similarly, as the judge indicated, life, a life sentence in the State of Nevada with the possibility of parole does not entitle somebody to parole. Do you — does anybody here believe that somebody that is given life with the possibility of parole will automatically at some day be paroled? Okay. Everybody believes that. And tell me if you do. Okay. Sir, that — you're Mr. Uriarte?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 204: Yes.

MR. PIKE: Okay. You believe if somebody is given the possibility of parole that they will be paroled; is that correct?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 204: Yes.

MR. PIKE: Okay. If the judge instructs you that

that is not the law, or if we bring on a witness to testify that that is not the law, or you're instructed on that, would that change your mind?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 204: Yes.

MR. PIKE: And that somebody can apply to be paroled only after they have served 20 years. That's 20, 365-day years, and only after 20 years have elapsed, then they can make an application to be paroled. And if the — as the judge has instructed you, that is the law. Does anybody believe anything different about that in the State of Nevada?

And similarly, the 20 to 50 means that 20 consecutive years must be served before somebody can apply for parole, and it would only expire after the 50 years have elapsed.

Okay. Has anybody here ever visited a prison? Okay. Go ahead, raise your hand.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 225: Back when we were little [unintelligible], right before they had the Scared Straight program, we were allowed to go as a field trip to like a prison farm, where you got to see the inmates and you got to eat some of their food and stuff like that.

MR. PIKE: Was that here in Nevada?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 225: Yeah.

MR. PIKE: Okay. And how long ago was that?

THE COURT: I did that.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 225: A long, long time ago.

.21

MR. PIKE: A long, long time ago. Have you ever been up to max prison? Have you ever been up to something besides a farm or a camp? They don't let children in those facilities. Does anybody here watch — well, you said Scared Straight. Does anybody watch Locked Up, or any of the prison shows that show what it's actually like in different prisons around the United States?

(Negative responses.)

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 225: I've seen that show.

MR. PIKE: You've seen that. Again, that's Mr. Langworthy. Is there anybody here that doesn't believe that being locked up into prison with a life sentence is a scary thing? Nobody believes that.

Now, I said all that to ask you this: Understanding the possible severity of this, and understanding that there would be a separate hearing in relation to that if you returned a verdict of first degree murder, is there anybody here that feels that they cannot sit in judgment as to a sentence in this case?

And if you — if your gut just says I don't want to raise my hand but I don't want to do it, now is the time to say I just can't do it. Sir, would you state your badge number. And this is Mr. Pacheco?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 251: Pacheco, yeah. It's Badge 14-0251. I just feel overwhelming and it's my first

experience here, so, you know, I'm not sure if — there's so many things that I can question. You know, I can understand you clearly, you know, I know how to express myself, but that's my impression right now.

MR. PIKE: And you feel that this is — and not just putting words in your mouth. Lawyers tend to do that. You're probably noticing it a lot, but if I'm understanding what you're saying, you want to make sure you understand each and every word and the import of each and every word in order to make this decision, this tough decision?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 251: Absolutely, yeah.

MR. PIKE: So you feel that you — because so much is on the line, you feel hesitant here. You wouldn't feel real comfortable sitting on this jury?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 251: No.

MR. PIKE: Okay.

THE COURT: Is that because English isn't your first language?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 251: Yes. That English is to understand and, you know, like -- you know, like all this kind of overwhelming.

THE COURT: It's an overwhelming responsibility in the whole process.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 251: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. Now, as Mr. Pike said, if you have

questions or something's done that you don't — this goes obviously for everyone, you don't understand, you can write that down and then, you know, the witness can be asked the question, or if it's, you know, something else, if we can answer it, we'll try to do that.

So go on, Mr. Pike.

MR. PIKE: Okay. Thank you.

Ms. Allen, did you have a --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 202: Yes.

MR. PIKE: -- feeling about that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 202: I suffer from anxiety and panic disorder, and I'm feeling real anxious at this point.

Not because of a lack of understanding, but it's because I do understand.

MR. PIKE: And that anxiety --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 202: It's really --

THE COURT: Now, let me ask you this: You felt okay with participating and potentially being a juror for the guilt phase, but is it the idea that you then might have to participate in a penalty phase that's causing you anxiety?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 202: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. And just can you tell us, you know, why that is?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 202: Well, that would only come after 20 years, right?

MR. PIKE: That's correct.

2

THE COURT: Well, is it because --

3

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 202: Would he serve 20 years

4

and then be up for parole?

I'm hearing from you?

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Right. That's the sentence. But is it a -- I quess my question to you is, you feel more anxiety with the possibility of having to make a determination of the sentence than you would just participating in the guilt phase, where your role is to determine whether the State has proven

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 202: No. I quess I'm not expressing myself. I think in 20 years a whole person can change.

the defendant's quilt beyond a reasonable doubt; is that what

THE COURT: Well, here's the thing. The legislature has set what the potential penalties are. So those are the only penalties that can be considered, because that has been set by the legislature as what the potential penalties. the --

> PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 202: The three?

THE COURT: -- role of the jury -- right -- isn't to say, well, we think that the legislature got it right or wrong, or to consider whether or not somebody should make parole in 20 years. Those are all determinations made by other bodies.

The only determination, if we get to a penalty phase, that the jury makes is that there will be additional evidence presented, other things to consider, and then the jury says, well, between these three penalties that the legislature has set, this is the one that we think is appropriate.

And of course, that's done collectively. You all go back, you deliberate, you discuss again and collectively determine what the appropriate punishment should be, but you only are given three things that have been enacted by the legislature as the potential punishments.

In other — just so you understand, in other cases that are not first degree murder cases, in other cases the potential penalty also is set by the legislature, but in those cases it's the role of the Court to determine what the punishment should be from the range of punishment that is set by the legislature.

In all cases the legislature says this is the punishment that you can choose from, and then, you know, typically it's the role of the Court. But in a case where it's a first degree murder, then it becomes the duty of the jury, and that's the only type of case, in this state anyway, where the jury has that function and the function is taken away from the Court and given to the jury.

Hopefully that clarifies maybe a little better what the role is.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 202: Okay.

THE COURT: And again, you know, as Mr. Cano, I think, said, there is no wrong — right or wrong answer. Don't — you know, basically when you're talking about your feelings, you know, there can be no right or wrong answer. The only wrong answer is a dishonest answer. And so, you know, just please speak freely.

You know, this isn't a math test where you come out with the correct number and everything else is wrong. We just want you all to share as honestly as you can what your feelings are. And of course, you know, we understand that, you know, this is a very serious matter and it's a big responsibility to serve on a jury, any jury, but especially, you know, a jury in a matter such as this.

So go on, Mr. Pike.

MR. PIKE: So in making a decision amongst those three, if you were to come back with first degree, you want to know about possibility of rehabilitation or ability to change or any possibility of redemption; that's what would be important to you?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 202: Yes.

MR. PIKE: Okay. Is there anybody here believes that certainty of punishment is an aspect of punishment that would have to be discussed? Did we answer those questions when the Court told you what the possible penalties were?

Is there anyone amongst you that at this point in time, besides Mr. Pacheco, that feels that for any reason that at this point in time you would not feel comfortable serving on this jury?

Okay. There being no hands raised, Your Honor, I'll submit it.

Thank you very much, ladies and gentlemen, for your patience and time.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Pike.

The State may follow up.

MS. CHRISTENSEN: Thank you, Your Honor.

Ladies and gentlemen, was anybody surprised when the judge told you that for killing someone, for murdering someone you might spend life in prison, or you might spend life in prison with the possibility of parole after 20 years? Was that a shock to anybody when they heard those as the possible sentences?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 202: Not those two.

MS. CHRISTENSEN: Ms. Allen, not those two? What was the one that was shocking to you?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 202: That we would --- we would be as a jury to ---

MS. CHRISTENSEN: So when you came in here, you knew you were going to hear a trial, but maybe not that you were going to possibly do a sentencing as well?

.21

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 202: Right.

MS. CHRISTENSEN: It's clear that that's made you uncomfortable.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 202: Absolutely.

MS. CHRISTENSEN: Yeah. I've noticed your demeanor changed. That's something that's not sitting well with you.

Is there anybody else up here right now who, besides the people who have already said so, that that same reaction took place inside of you when you heard about the possibility of a sentencing part of this trial?

Okay. One thing that both sides need to know from each one of the jurors in this case is that they could consider all three potential sentences in some kind of situation, in some kind of murder. And obviously it's very hard for you to know right now because you don't know the facts of the murder, you don't know this man's history, you don't know the victim. So it's hard to say that.

But is there anyone who's absolutely closed off and could not consider one of those potential sentences? So everyone here could — Ms. Allen.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 202: The last one.

MS. CHRISTENSEN: Which one was the last one?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 202: Well, that we would be the body of people who would sentence him.

MS. CHRISTENSEN: Okay. I'm asking about the three

potential sentences that he could face in this case. Life in prison without the possibility of parole; is there anybody in this box right now that could not consider that as a potential sentence in a case of first degree murder? Anyone up here think, no, I just couldn't sign on that no matter what the facts were? Okay. Nobody.

Anybody similarly for the bottom part, the lowest sentence that you could receive for first degree murder in this state, 50 years with parole eligibility at 20 years, anyone think on the opposite end, you know what, no way, you kill someone, that's just not enough?

Okay. So everybody up here could consider all three of those sentences; is that correct?

Okay. And you kind of heard a little bit from Mr. Pike about some of the things you may be considering in a sentencing hearing. You would hear how it's affected the family of the victim. Is there anything about that and the nature of hearing that, that doesn't sit well with you?

And there would be things presented about all kinds of different things about the people involved in this at the sentencing hearing. Can you keep an open mind as to all those things and consider everything that you hear and give it the weight that you deem appropriate in determining the sentence that you think is appropriate in this case? Anybody that can't do that?

.8

he's guilty. If there is something in your ear saying, wow,
this is a life — possibility for life sentence, you can't
consider that.

You have to just consider the facts that we present
and hold us to our burden beyond a reasonable doubt, determine

is this conversation that we just had about sentencing, you

can't consider the sentence when you're determining whether

whether we've met that. Is there anybody here who thinks that they could not put aside the thought of the possible sentence in this case in the first phase of the trial, the guilt phase? Everybody would be able to do that?

Another thing that the judge is going to instruct you

Okay. A little — I'm getting the sense a little bit that people are in shell shock a little bit. That might just be because we're here a little bit late, because I've heard a couple other people say that. Is there anybody else who's in this box right now who is feeling extremely uncomfortable about the role as jurors, as Ms. Allen has described that she is?

Okay. We don't know exactly how long it would last, the trial would last. Typically the sentencing hearing is shorter than the main portion of the trial. Is there anything about that, the fact that we don't present as much evidence at the sentencing hearing that would make you think it wasn't — that we don't believe this is serious in any way? Okay. I

1 don't see anybody saying yes. 2 Thank you for your time. I appreciate it. 3 THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Ms. Christensen. 4 Both sides pass for cause? 5 MS. CHRISTENSEN: Yes. 6 MR. CANO: Actually, Your Honor, we have a --7 THE COURT: So you need to approach? 8 MR. CANO: Yes. 9 (Off-record bench conference.) 10 State, exercise your first challenge. THE COURT: 11 MS. CHRISTENSEN: Your Honor, the State would like to 12 thank and excuse Number 265, Ms. Green. 13 THE COURT: Ms. Green, thank you very much for being 14 here and your willingness to serve as a juror. 15 excused at this time. You are free to leave. You need to go 16 back downstairs and check out -- check in with jury services. 17 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 265: Okay. Thank you. 18 THE COURT: All right. Thank you, and if you have 19 any questions, the bailiff will be at the rear door. 20 And the clerk will call the name of the next 21 prospective juror. 22 THE CLERK: Rafael Reynoso, Badge No. 277. 23 THE COURT: Good afternoon, Mr. Reynoso. We talked 24 to you a little bit before about what you do for a living and 25 all of that, and you just need to make sure you can drop your

1	daughter off in the morning. Have you ever been a juror
2	before?
3	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: No, ma'am.
4	THE COURT: Okay. Have you or anyone close to you
5	ever been arrested, charged or accused of a crime?
6	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: My wife's cousin.
7	THE COURT: Okay. What crime is that?
8	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: He was trafficking drugs.
9	THE COURT: Okay. Was that here in Clark County?
10	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: It was in California.
11	THE COURT: In California. Are you close with this
12	cousin?
13	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: Yes.
14	THE COURT: Okay. And how long ago was his contact
15	or was his problem?
16	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: Three years.
17	THE COURT: Three years. Do you know if your cousin,
18	or your wife's cousin went to trial?
19	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: He did.
20	THE COURT: And what was the outcome of that trial?
21	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: He was guilty.
22	THE COURT: Okay. Did you or your wife attend any
23	court proceedings or anything like that?
24	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: No, ma'am.
25	THE COURT: Have you talked to this cousin and gotten

1	his impressions about the whole event so to speak, his contact
2	with law enforcement, or what happened in the court proceeding
3	or anything like that?
4	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: Very vaguely.
5	THE COURT: Okay. Have you, as a result of any talks
6	you may have had either with him or other family, formed any
7	opinions as to how he was treated in the system?
8	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: No, ma'am.
9	THE COURT: Was this do you know, was it like
10	California Highway Patrol that arrested him, or was it
11	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: It was federal.
12	THE COURT: It was a federal. Okay. And I don't
13	mean to pry, but did he get probation, or did he go to
14	prison or
15	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: He went to prison.
16	THE COURT: He went to prison. Okay. And so that
17	would be a federal prison obviously, in California.
18	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: Yes, ma'am.
19	THE COURT: Was it in California?
20	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: Yes, ma'am.
21	THE COURT: Have you ever visited him in prison?
22	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: No.
23	THE COURT: Okay. Do you know if your wife's ever
24	visited him in prison?
25	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: No.

1	THE COURT: No. Okay. Have you ever been the victim
2	of a crime?
3	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: No, ma'am.
4	THE COURT: Anyone close to you ever been the victim
5	of a serious crime?
6	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: No, ma'am.
7	THE COURT: Any friends or family in law enforcement?
8	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: My brother-in-law.
9	THE COURT: And this is your wife's brother?
10	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: No. It's my sister's
11	husband.
12	THE COURT: Sister's husband. Okay. And where is
13	your brother-in-law in law enforcement?
14	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: In Dallas-Fort Worth.
L5	THE COURT: Okay. What does he do there?
L6	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: He's a homicide
L7	detective.
18	THE COURT: Okay. And that would be what, the
.9	Dallas-Fort Worth Police Department?
20	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: Yes, ma'am.
21	THE COURT: Does he talk to you about his work or
22	cases or anything like that very much?
23	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: You know what. He was
24	actually on Another 48 [sic] The First 48 show.
25	THE COURT: Oh, The First 48 hours or whatever?

.21

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: Yes, ma'am.

THE COURT: Okay. And I'm assuming you watched it?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: Yes.

THE COURT: Now, you've heard us all talking with the other prospective jurors about the fact that the State has the burden of proving the defendant's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt, and that the defense doesn't have to do anything. They don't have to call any witnesses. The defendant doesn't have to testify. Are you comfortable with that concept?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: Yes.

THE COURT: Now, if you're selected to serve as a juror, and you sit and listen to all of the evidence and you and the other jurors go back in the jury room and you discuss it and you feel like you know what, the State just didn't prove the defendant's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt, there were pieces missing or whatever, would you have any problem with raising your hand in the back and voting not guilty?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: [No audible response.]

THE COURT: Do you have any problems talking to your brother—in—law and saying you know what, I sat on a jury in a murder case and I voted not guilty?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: No.

THE COURT: Any -- no problems at the family barbecue or anything like that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: No.

1	
2	а
3	g
4	h
5	р
6	
7	
8	1
9	j
10	w
11	m
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	C.
19	0:
20	
21	S
22	

24

25

THE COURT: And you heard us talking a little bit ago about the penalty phase in the trial, and the fact that if it gets to that and if there is a penalty phase, that the jury has to consider three potential penalties. Would you have any problem considering all three penalties?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: No.

THE COURT: Did any of us ask, either me or the lawyers ask any question of any of the other prospective jurors that you thought, well, I'd have to raise my hand and I would have to say yes, that pertains to me or to a family member or anything like that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: No.

THE COURT: Any familiarity with guns?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: No.

THE COURT: Do you have guns? No?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: I don't care for them.

THE COURT: Okay. What about anyone that you're close with that's had any issues with drug abuse or alcoholism or anything like that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: I mean, everybody knows somebody that has issues with drugs and alcohol.

THE COURT: Anyone close, like a member of your immediate family, anything like that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: No.

THE COURT: Is there anything at all, anything in

.8

your background or your family background that would impact your ability to be a completely fair and impartial juror in this case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: Just my relationship with my brother-in-law. That's it.

THE COURT: All right. And do you feel -- I mean, do you feel any leaning toward the law enforcement, towards the DA's side of this because of your brother-in-law?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: Every situation's different.

THE COURT: Okay. Now, if you were seated over there with Mr. Pike and Mr. Cano and their client, would you be comfortable having somebody like yourself as a juror in this case? I mean, as they sit there, can they feel comfortable that you'll give them a fair — a fair shake and not be biased against them as we start out in any way?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: Yeah, I mean...

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

State, you may follow up.

MS. CHRISTENSEN: Thank you.

Is there any reason that if we were sitting at our table that we would think you would be biased in any way against our case just simply because that we're DAs or law enforcement is involved or anything like that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: No.

1	MS. CHRISTENSEN: Okay. Now, your cousin, or your
2	wife's cousin who had the trafficking case, you said you knew
3	him. Was he actually doing the crime?
4	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: He got convicted.
5	MS. CHRISTENSEN: Did you have actual knowledge
6	of it, like did you know he was dealing drugs?
7	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: [No audible response.]
8	MS. CHRISTENSEN: Okay. Did you think it was fair
9	that that happened to him?
10	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: Yeah.
11	MS. CHRISTENSEN: So you think that he must have been
12	doing it because the jury found him guilty of it, and so
13	that's the extent of your knowledge of it?
14	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: Yeah. I mean, from the
15	specifics of the story, I mean, they caught him with it, so.
16	MS. CHRISTENSEN: Oh, okay. So there wasn't anything
17	that you thought about that, that was unfair in any way?
18	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: No.
19	MS. CHRISTENSEN: Other than that, have you ever had
20	contact with law enforcement?
21	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: Just my brother-in-law.
22	MS. CHRISTENSEN: Okay. What about like you
23	yourself, driving down the street, pulled over for a traffic
24	ticket?
25	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: No.

1	MS. CHRISTENSEN: You've never been pulled over for
2	speeding?
3	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: Yeah, when I was in
4	school a long time ago.
5	MS. CHRISTENSEN: Okay.
6	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: It was actually on my
7	motorcycle, but
8	MS. CHRISTENSEN: On your motorcycle?
9	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: Yeah.
10	MS. CHRISTENSEN: And was there anything about that,
11	that, you know, you had a bad taste in your mouth about police
12	officers?
13	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: Just possibly that
14	they're abrasive.
15	MS. CHRISTENSEN: Okay. When they first contacted
16	you they were abrasive?
17	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: Yeah, profiling.
18	MS. CHRISTENSEN: Okay. That's what you felt was
19	happening?
20	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: Mm-hmm.
21	MS. CHRISTENSEN: If you have different officers come
22	on the stand and testify, detectives who are investigating
23	this case, can you judge them independently of those
24	circumstances where you maybe had some abrasive police
25	officers?

1	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: I don't know who they
2	are, so I don't know.
3	MS. CHRISTENSEN: That's kind of my point. You don't
4	know them.
5	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: Right.
6	MS. CHRISTENSEN: So will you be able to judge them
7	completely independently and not just think, you know, because
8	of the previous experience with the police officer, these guys
9	are all alike?
10	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: I would I'd be fine
11	with it.
12	MS. CHRISTENSEN: So you'd be able to be fair to them
13	and judge —
14	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: Sure.
15	MS. CHRISTENSEN: them based on their testimony?
16	PROSPECTIVE JUROR No. 277: Yes.
17	MS. CHRISTENSEN: Okay. You said that your
18	brother-in-law was actually on The First 48.
L9	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: Mm-hmm.
20	MS. CHRISTENSEN: And before that had you watched
21	that show?
22	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: Mm-hmm.
23	MS. CHRISTENSEN: Okay.
24	THE COURT: You have to answer yes or no for the
25	record.

1	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: Oh, yes. Sorry.
2	MS. CHRISTENSEN: And do you have some interest in
3	some of those shows, crime scene shows or law related shows?
4	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: No.
5	MS. CHRISTENSEN: Okay. But The First 48 you had
6	watched
7	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: Yeah. I have a vested
8	interest. I mean, that's a family member getting paid for
9	what they do. Extra money, so.
10	MS. CHRISTENSEN: Now, I'm not actually familiar with
11	The First 48. I assume it means first 48 hours. Was the
12	entire show about him, or just one episode?
13	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: I can't honestly tell
14	you. Several episodes.
15	MS. CHRISTENSEN: Oh, okay. So you watched several
16	episodes of it to see
17	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: Yes.
18	MS. CHRISTENSEN: what he did? Okay.
19	And did you talk to him about the case afterwards or
20	anything like that?
21	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: No. He wasn't
22	allowed to.
23	MS. CHRISTENSEN: Not allowed to talk about it.
24	Okay. So you actually haven't had discussions with him
25	about it?

_	
1	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: No.
2	MS. CHRISTENSEN: Okay. You said when you were asked
3	about if you own any firearms, you said you don't I don't
4	remember the exact words.
5	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: I don't care for them.
6	MS. CHRISTENSEN: Don't care for them
7	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: No.
8	MS. CHRISTENSEN: is what you said.
9	And what does that stem from?
10	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: One of my friends killed
11	himself when I was growing up.
12	MS. CHRISTENSEN: Sorry to hear that. And since then
13	it's just you stay away from them
14	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: Yeah.
15	MS. CHRISTENSEN: stay away from guns?
16	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: Mm-hmm.
17	MS. CHRISTENSEN: Okay. So you don't have any
18	familiarity specifically with guns before that?
19	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: I don't.
20	MS. CHRISTENSEN: When you got your jury summons in
. 21	the mail, what was your first reaction?
22	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: Damn.
23	THE COURT: Was that like damn, I'm happy?
24	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: Well, no. No, it's
25	because of my work and what I do.

1.5

MS. CHRISTENSEN: Oh, okay.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: And how many people rely on me.

MS. CHRISTENSEN: Now, believe it or not, I've asked people that question before and they've said that they were excited to come in to serve their duty, their jury duty. And a lot of people who have your same opinion later, after they serve on a jury, are very happy that they did it, because it is a good experience for most people.

When you had that reaction, it was simply because you have a lot of things that you need to take care of in your life, right?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: Yeah.

MS. CHRISTENSEN: Okay. Are those things that are going to be on your mind the entire time, to make it so that you can't even pay attention in here, or do you think that you're — I don't know what the word is, but smart enough, good enough to be able to pay attention if you're — you know, against your desires? If you're on this jury, would you be able to pay attention that's due the witnesses and keep track of the information?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: I can honestly say probably 50/50.

MS. CHRISTENSEN: Do you mean it's a 50/50 chance, or you're going to only understand 50 percent of it?

1	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: No. Understand 100
2	percent, but I mean, you always have the back of your mind
3	your responsibilities, so.
4	MS. CHRISTENSEN: Yes. We understand that. But you
5	will pay attention to understand everything that's presented
6	to you
7	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: Sure.
. 8	MS. CHRISTENSEN: witnesses? Okay.
9	Did you listen to and I know it's been a long
10	time, but did you listen to all of the questions that were
11	asked of the previous jurors?
12	PROSPECTIVE JUROR No. 277: Mm-hmm. Yes, ma'am.
13	MS. CHRISTENSEN: Okay. Was there anything that got
14	you really interested that you were more so than other
15	parts of it that you were interested in listening about?
16	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: Just interesting
17	listening to everybody's perspectives, where they come from
18	and what kind of issues they have.
19	MS. CHRISTENSEN: Just the different things that
20	people face?
21	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: Mm-hmm.
22	MS. CHRISTENSEN: And so you understand everybody
23	comes from a different place, different backgrounds?
24	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: Yeah. Mm-hmm.
25	MS. CHRISTENSEN: Did you hear one of the potential
ı	

to discuss anything relating to the case or do anything else

1	relating to the case. Please again, remember where you're
2	seated, and follow the marshal through the double doors.
3	(Court recessed at 3:44 p.m. until 3:58 p.m.)
4	(In the presence of the prospective jury panel.)
5,	THE COURT: Court is now back in session, and the
6	defense may question Mr. Reynoso.
7	MR. CANO: Good afternoon, Mr. Reynoso. You've heard
8	some of the questions that we said earlier. I guess you were
9	paying attention to some of the answers. Is there anything
10	that was asked previously that kind of comes to your mind,
11	anything, hey, I wish I could answer that question?
12	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: No.
13	MR. CANO: You're comfortable with holding the State
14	to their burden of proof?
15	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: Yes.
16	MR. CANO: And if they're not able to meet their
17	burden of proof, what would your verdict be?
18	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: Innocence. Not guilty.
19	MR. CANO: Not guilty. Okay. If you had to vote
20	right now, what would your verdict be?
21	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: Not guilty. [Inaudible.]
22	MR. CANO: All right. Now, one of the main concerns
23	that I have with you is obviously your brother-in-law is a
24	detective in Dallas-Fort Worth?
25	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: Mm-hmm. Yes, sir.

1	MR. CANO: And is it a homicide detective?
2	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: He first started off as
3	patrol, and then moved his way up the ranks through ICE and
4	then obviously homicide.
5	MR. CANO: And are you close with your
6	brother-in-law?
7	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: I am.
8	MR. CANO: How often would you speak with him?
9	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: Once a month.
10	MR. CANO: And obviously when he got the opportunity
11	to highlight one of his cases on a national TV show, you must
12	have been proud of him.
13	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: Yeah. The whole family
14	was.
15	MR. CANO: The whole family.
16	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: My sister called
17	everybody.
18	MR. CANO: I can imagine. Is that her little brother
19	or older brother?
20	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: Whose?
21	MR. CANO: Is that her little brother or older
22	brother?
23	THE COURT: It's her husband.
24	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: That's her husband.
25	MR. CANO: I'm sorry. Your sister's husband. I

got it.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: It's okay.

MR. CANO: So your sister was very happy about her husband obviously. Now, that kind of a connection with the police force, can you understand from the defense perspective why we'd be hesitant to have you on the jury?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: Sure.

MR. CANO: Because it would appear just from the surface of this, you know, if you're going to lean any direction as opposed to being neutral and right in the middle, you may lean towards, you know, the side of law enforcement. Would that be a fair statement?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: Sure

MR. CANO: And now, some of the officers that are going to be testifying here obviously are going to be homicide detectives. This is a homicide case.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: Yes.

MR. CANO: And some of the fears that we're going to have is that, well, you kind of know what the process is.

You've actually seen your brother-in-law go through it in the show. You share — has he ever spoken to you about other cases that he may have done?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: In the past, but nothing current.

MR. CANO: So you're a little bit familiar with what

	II	
1		h
2		С
3		p
4		S
5		С
6		а
7		У
8		а
9		
10		У
11		е
12		
13		
14		
15		d
16		
17		
18		d
19		

.21

22

23

24

25

homicide detectives have to go through in trying to close a case so to speak. So that obviously if we've gotten to this point of the system, of the game, of the criminal justice system, you know, that you are going to take into consideration all the [inaudible] of the homicide detectives and hold that, I think give that a little bit more weight than you would other witnesses in this case. Is that a fair assumption from the defense's side?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: Not necessarily. I mean, you would have to -- I'm a firm believer you have to give everybody due process.

MR. CANO: Okay.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: Right.

MR. CANO: All right. So then you believe that detectives can make mistakes?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: We all make mistakes.

MR. CANO: The question was: Do you believe detectives can make mistakes?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: Sure, maybe.

MR. CANO: Okay. Do you think cases where detectives are not as thorough or have made mistakes to get to the point where we're actually sitting here in trial?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: Maybe.

MR. CANO: Maybe? You were a little bit more hesitant on that one. Why is that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: Just from what you see in the news, I guess.

MR. CANO: So you think that if we've gotten to this stage of the criminal justice system, that a detective's case is very strong and that's pretty much, you know, that should be the outcome of the case; is that what you're saying?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: No.

MR. CANO: What are you saying?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: Every case is different. But, you know, you never know how many people are involved with it, so. If you're going to put your — you're going to put your opinion on one person or pass judgment on one person, on what they say —

Everybody's going to have their due process on what their opinions were and obviously based on their profession what they think of what took place, and they're going to paint you a pretty big picture of what took place, and you have to take that all in and make the right judgment call.

MR. CANO: Okay. And so just because they have this certain picture in their minds of what they think happened, that doesn't necessarily make it so, does it?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: No.

MR. CANO: Okay. And you're comfortable in this case here, if the detectives aren't able to paint that picture to your satisfaction, and they aren't -- and the State's not able

1	to prove their case beyond a reasonable doubt, you're
2	comfortable telling those detectives, these district attorneys
3	you didn't do it?
4	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: True.
5	MR. CANO: You know, something may have happened, but
6	not enough to find this man guilty, so I have to give the vote
7	of not guilty, are you comfortable with that?
. 8	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: Yes.
9	MR. CANO: Okay. And are you do you feel like
10	it's going to if you did vote that way, that it would
11	impact how you had to explain yourself to your brother-in-law?
12	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: No.
13	MR. CANO: No?
14	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: No.
15	MR. CANO: Do you think he would understand?
16	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: Absolutely.
17	MR. CANO: All right. Do you consider yourself a
18	fair and open minded person?
19	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: Yes.
20	MR. CANO: Okay. Could you be fair to Mr. Jones in
21	this case?
22	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: Sure.
23	MR. CANO: Okay. As he sits there, do you see him
24	cloaked with like his veil of innocence?
25	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: I don't know him from

KARR REPORTING, INC. 171

1 you, so I don't -- I can't make that determination on him. 2 MR. CANO: Well, I'm not being charged with anything. PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: I know you're not. 3 MR. CANO: He is unfortunately. Unfortunately, he's 4 5 being charged with something. I mean, the allegations are 6 against him. PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: 7 8 But the way our system works is he's MR. CANO: 9 presumed innocent. 10 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: Correct. 11 MR. CANO: Are you comfortable with the fact that 12 he's presumed innocent? 13 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: 14 MR. CANO: Can you hold on to that presumption all 15 the way out through this case, all the way out through all the 16 evidence, until the judge gives you the instructions at the 17 end of the trial phase to determine whether or not, you know, 18 to make your decision on whether or not you think that the 19 State's met their burden of proof? 20 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: Yes. 21 MR. CANO: Okay. A couple questions on the penalty

phase, if we get to that phase. Are you comfortable with the punishments that are -- well, comfortable's not the right word.

22

23

24

25

Are you able to take into consideration all the three

different punishments --

_

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: Yes.

MR. CANO: — that are being offered in this case?

Okay. What would be important for you to know in order to make a determination as to which is the appropriate punishment?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: That's a pretty open-ended question.

MR. CANO: It is?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: Make sure that the truth was — valid points were made and that the evidence was subjective, and it's either yes or a no.

MR. CANO: Okay. Well, maybe explain a little bit about the second phase, if we get to that phase. And we only get to that phase if he's found guilty of first degree murder. Okay. Two phases here. After the first phase, the trial phase, the same jury gets to make the determination as to what the proper punishment is.

So the State will obviously present evidence regarding how the death of Mr. Corona impacted this family, things of that nature. We present evidence on behalf of Mr. Jones regarding his background, how he grew up, things of that nature for you to take into consideration. Then it's up to each individual juror to make a decision as to what they think is proper punishment.

You all come to a decision together, but each individual person makes the decision as to what they think is proper.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: Right.

MR. CANO: One person may think life without is proper, another person may think 20 to 50 is proper, and both are very valid. Okay. But you get to make that decision yourself based upon whatever evidence is presented to you at that penalty phase. Are you comfortable with that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: Yes.

MR. CANO: Are you able to make that kind of decision?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: Yes.

MR. CANO: That being said, what is it that you'd want to know about Mr. Jones's background in order to make that decision? When you're making the decision do I send this guy away for life forever or do I give him a chance at parole after 20 years, that's a very important decision. The other decision you made prior to that was also very important. I mean, there would be some information that you'd want to —

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: Well, with the case that's going to be presented, obviously there's going to be evidence.

MR. CANO: But the background of him doesn't necessarily get presented to you in the trial phase. You

1	understand they're two different phases?
2	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: I understand.
3	MR. CANO: Would you want to know as much about
4	Mr. Jones as you could, or does that not matter to you at all?
5	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: It doesn't matter to me.
6	MR. CANO: It doesn't matter to you?
7	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: No.
8	MR. CANO: What is more important? The deceased and
9	how his background, is that more important to you?
10	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: No. Just the truth of
11	what happened.
12	MR. CANO: Well, by that point you would have made
13	your decision as to what you believe the truth is of what
14	happened is, and you would have convicted Mr. Jones. So
15	you've already made that determination.
16	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: Right.
17	MR. CANO: Is there any additional information that
18	you would need in order to make the decisions for punishment?
19	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 277: [No audible response.]
20	MR. CANO: [Inaudible.]
21	THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
22	The defense may exercise their first challenge.
23	MR. CANO: We'd thank and excuse Juror No. 198, Your
24	Honor.
25	THE COURT: All right. That is

1.	MR. CANO: Mr. Buzzard.
2	THE COURT: I'm sorry?
3	MR. CANO: Mr. Buzzard.
4	THE COURT: Mr. Buzzard, thank you very much for
5	being here and your willingness to serve as a juror. Sir, you
6	are excused at this time. And if you'd just go check out back
7	through jury services.
8	And the clerk will call up the next prospective
9	juror.
10	THE CLERK: Gerald Gage, Badge No. 282.
11	THE COURT: Mr. Gage, if you'd have that empty chair
12	there in the bottom corner, please. Good afternoon, Mr. Gage.
13	What do you do for a living, sir?
14	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 282: I'm retired.
15	THE COURT: From what type of work?
16	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 282: Construction.
17	THE COURT: All right. Was that here in Clark
18	County?
19	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 282: Yes.
20	THE COURT: All right. And what did you do in
21	construction?
22	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 282: Project manager,
23	estimator.
24	THE COURT: And are you married?
25	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 282: No.

1	THE COURT: Any children?
2 .	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 282: Two.
3	THE COURT: Grown and
4	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 282: Oh, yeah.
5	THE COURT: Okay. Have you ever been a juror before?
6	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 282: No.
7	THE COURT: Anyone close to you ever been arrested,
8	charged, accused of a crime, anything like that?
9	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 282: None that I'm aware of.
10	THE COURT: Have you ever been the victim of a crime?
11	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 282: Yes.
12	THE COURT: Tell me about that.
13	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 282: '05.
14	THE COURT: Okay.
15	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 282: I was kidnapped at
16	gunpoint, and the kidnappers shot and killed my owner of the
17	company that I was working for.
18	THE COURT: Okay. Was this a kidnap robbery
19	situation?
20	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 282: Kidnap murder.
21	THE COURT: Okay. And were you at the like an office
22	location or something like that?
23	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 282: Mm-hmm.
24	THE COURT: You have to say it. I'm sorry.
25	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 282: Oh, yes. I'm sorry.

22

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 282:

23

THE COURT: Okay. Do you know if there were ever any suspects, meaning did they think it was somebody who knew your

24 25

boss, or strangers?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 282: None that I was aware of.
THE COURT: Okay. Did you form any opinions as to
how the matter was handled by the Henderson Police Department?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 282: No. They handled it
quite well.
THE COURT: Anything about your experiences in
connection with that, that would impact your ability to be
fair and impartial and keep an open mind in this case?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 282: I was here, I'm thinking
in '10, 2010, and it was a similar kind of a case. And I kind
of put everything behind me, but that just was happening now,
and I had to end up going to a doctor. Now I'm taking
medication because of stress and anxiety, et cetera, et
cetera, so.
THE COURT: Now, the other case that you came for
in 2010, you weren't selected as a juror, you just went
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 282: I was yeah. I think I
was up here in this room, in this courtroom.
THE COURT: And then what happened? Because you said
you hadn't been a juror before.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 282: I was immediately
dismissed.
THE COURT: Okay. Were you dismissed because you
were having anxiety, or were you just

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 282: The judge asked me if I

1	could be impartial and I said I didn't think I could be,
2	because
3	THE COURT: Oh, it was me?
4	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 282: Yes.
5	THE COURT: Oh, okay.
6	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 282: I know. You said, Maybe
7	you should do a real estate trial next time.
8	THE COURT: And did they send you to a real estate
9	trial?
10	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 282: No. They brought me back
11	here.
12	THE COURT: Like Groundhog Day or something.
13	Okay. So as you sit here, it's kind of that you're
14	going through the same thing?
15	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 282: Mm-hmm.
16	THE COURT: Are you feeling now the anxiety?
17	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 282: My heart's going
18	about 150 miles an hour right now.
19	THE COURT: Okay. May I see counsel at the bench.
20	(Off-record bench conference.)
21	THE COURT: All right. What we're going to do,
22	Mr. Gage, is we're going to excuse you from this proceeding.
23	You are eligible now to serve either on a civil case, real
24	estate, construction, what have you, or on another type of a
25	criminal case involving, you know, forgery

1	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 282: Outstanding.
2	THE COURT: or bad checks or something of that
3	nature.
4	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 282: I would be happy to
5	serve.
6	THE COURT: All right. And go ahead and go back down
7	through jury service. If there's something available for
8	today, they'll send you there today.
9	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 282: Okay.
10	THE COURT: If not, again, there are other types of
11	trials that you certainly can serve on.
12	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 282: Thank you.
13	THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
14	The clerk will please call up the next prospective
15	juror.
16	THE CLERK: Terrance Donigan, Badge No. 284.
17	THE COURT: Mr. Donigan, if you'd have that empty
L8	chair there in the bottom corner, please. Good afternoon,
L9	Mr. Donigan. What do you do for a living, sir?
20	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 284: I'm retired. Plumber.
21	THE COURT: From what type of work?
22	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 284: Plumbing.
23	THE COURT: Okay. Was that here in Clark County?
24	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 284: New York.
25	THE COURT: All right. Did you have your own

1	business, or did you work for some
2	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 284: No. I worked for a local
3	union.
4	THE COURT: Okay. And then are you married?
5	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 284: Yes, I am.
6	THE COURT: What does your wife do?
7	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 284: Stay at home.
8	THE COURT: Okay. Any children?
9	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 284: Two.
10	THE COURT: Grown children? Okay.
11	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 284: Grown.
12	THE COURT: How long have you lived here in Clark
13	County?
14	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 284: I couldn't hear that.
15	THE COURT: How long have you lived here in Clark
16	County?
17	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 284: Seven years.
18	THE COURT: Okay. Are you having trouble, a little
19	bit hard of hearing?
20	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 284: Yeah, a little bit.
21	THE COURT: Okay. Have you had trouble hearing
22	what's been going on today?
23	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 284: No.
24	THE COURT: Okay. We have earphones and I'm told
25	they work very well. So if you have trouble hearing, we can

give you the earphones. Okay.

Have you ever been a juror before?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 284: No.

THE COURT: You or anyone close to you ever been arrested, charged or accused of a crime?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 284: No.

THE COURT: Have you ever been the victim of a crime?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 284: No.

THE COURT: Has anyone close to you ever been the victim of a serious crime?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 284: No.

THE COURT: Any friends or family in law enforcement?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 284: No.

THE COURT: Okay. You've heard us talking about the fact that the State has the burden of proving the defendant's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt, and if the State fails to meet their burden, the defendant is entitled to a verdict of not guilty, and that the accused in a criminal case doesn't have to present any evidence or anything like that. Are you comfortable with those concepts?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 284: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. You also heard us discussing with the other prospective jurors the fact that if the jury in this case convicts the defendant of murder in the first degree, then it becomes the duty of the jury to pronounce sentence and

1	choose between choose among, I should say, three possible
2	sentences.
3	Would you is there anything about that, that
4	causes you any concern or pause, or do you feel like you would
5	be able to if it got there, to fulfill that role as well?
6	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 284: No. I'm fine with that.
7	THE COURT: Okay. You're fine with that.
8	Is there anything that we should know about you or
9	your family background in making the determination as to
10	whether or not you would be a good juror in this case?
11	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 284: No, not really.
12	THE COURT: Do you feel like you would be a good
13	juror?
14	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 284: I feel like I would, yes.
15	THE COURT: And why is that, sir?
16	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 284: Well, I'm retired for one
17	thing. I got a lot of time.
18	THE COURT: All right. State, you may follow up with
19	this prospective juror.
20	MS. CHRISTENSEN: Thank you, Your Honor.
21	Mr. Donigan, you stated that you were able to hear
22	the questioning before. Was there any questions that were
23	asked of other jurors, potential jurors before that you would
24	have had a strong opinion one way or the other about?

This is my first

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 284: No.

25

1	time here, you know, and everything's coming in, you know. I
2	think it's fine the way it's going.
3	MS. CHRISTENSEN: Okay. Do you have any opinions one
4	way or the other about police officers, law enforcement in
5	general?
6	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 284: No.
7	MS. CHRISTENSEN: No. Okay. Are you a gun owner?
. 8	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 284: I am.
9	MS. CHRISTENSEN: How many?
10	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 284: Four.
11	MS. CHRISTENSEN: What kinds?
12	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 284: Two are collectibles and
13	two are target shooters.
14	MS. CHRISTENSEN: And are those revolvers or
15	semi-automatics?
16	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 284: Semi-automatic and two
17	revolvers.
18	MS. CHRISTENSEN: So you go shooting with those
19	sometimes?
20	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 284: Yes.
21	MS. CHRISTENSEN: When was the last time you went
22	shooting?
23	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 284: Just before Christmas.
24	MS. CHRISTENSEN: Now, you said you're from New York?
25	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 284: Yes.

1	MS. CHRISTENSEN: And where in New York?
2	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 284: Syracuse, New York,
3	upstate.
4	MS. CHRISTENSEN: And you never were a victim of a
5	crime there?
6	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 284: No.
7	MS. CHRISTENSEN: Did you retire to Las Vegas?
8	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 284: I did. I retired in New
9	York, and then I come down to Las Vegas and I got a job at
10	City Center.
11	MS. CHRISTENSEN: Okay.
12	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 284: And then the recession
13	hit and I retired again.
14	MS. CHRISTENSEN: Okay. And your wife came as well,
15	but she didn't work out here?
L6	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 284: No. She's never worked
L7	here, no.
L8	MS. CHRISTENSEN: What did you do at City Center?
L9	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 284: Plumbing and heating.
20	MS. CHRISTENSEN: Okay. And what year did you move
21	here?
22	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 284: '05.
23	MS. CHRISTENSEN: What brought you to Las Vegas?
24	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 284: The work.
25	MS. CHRISTENSEN: Oh. That was

1	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 284: See, you could retire in
2	New York and you could still work at a different state as long
3	as you're out of your
4	MS. CHRISTENSEN: So you had to leave New York to be
5	able to work and still
6	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 284: That's right.
7	THE COURT: That was to get your union pension and
8	still be a union
9	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 284: That's correct. You
10	got it.
11	THE COURT: plumber, pipe fitter?
12	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 284: That's right.
13	THE COURT: Okay.
14	MS. CHRISTENSEN: Double-dipping.
15	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 284: Double-dipping.
16	MS. CHRISTENSEN: And so in 2005, it was work that
17	brought you out here?
18	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 284: That's right.
19	MS. CHRISTENSEN: And had you visited Las Vegas or
20	had any ties to Las Vegas before that?
21	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 284: I have. I lived in
22	Carlsbad before and we used to come out on vacation, maybe
23	twice when we lived there.
24	MS. CHRISTENSEN: Okay. Is there anything that you
25	think either side needs to know about you that would make you

anything but fair and impartial as a juror?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 284: Not that I know of, unless somebody knows something I don't.

MS. CHRISTENSEN: Well, who are those people? Give me their names so I can call them.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 284: I don't know.

MS. CHRISTENSEN: Okay. Thank you. I'll pass for cause.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

Defense may question Mr. Donigan.

MR. PIKE: Mr. Donigan, good afternoon.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 284: Good afternoon.

MR. PIKE: It's a little bit odd, when you're picking a jury to make a decision on guilt or innocence on a case, to talk about penalty. It's kind of like putting a cart before the horse. But and by asking these questions, we're not conceding that the State can prove its case beyond a reasonable doubt. We're not conceding that we're ever going to reach that part.

But because of the peculiar laws of the State of Nevada, we have to ask those questions to see if you can fit in potentially those two parts. And so the fact that we've been asking questions about punish — possible punishments, do you feel that that in any way has been sort of a concession, or do you feel like we've abandoned the fact that the State is

not going to prove its case beyond a reasonable doubt?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 284: Not really.

MR. PIKE: Okay. Not really. I want to make sure that you understand that clearly, because we have not conceded any of those things. We just have to make sure that the possible juror can fit both parts. Okay. So in — is there anything, any health issues or anything that would stop you from being a juror, or have any concerns in the back of your mind so you couldn't pay close attention to the witnesses in this case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 284: No.

MR. PIKE: You've probably had to deal with a lot of different people, having worked one entire career and starting a new one in another state. Do you — would you consider yourself a pretty good judge of if somebody is lying to you or if they're telling you the truth?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 284: Pretty much, yeah, you can tell.

MR. PIKE: Okay. And you understand the evidence that's going to be presented in this case is either done directly by the testimony from the witnesses that will answer questions, and that you individually have to make a decision of whether they're telling the truth or whether they're confused and are incapable of telling the truth, or if they're lying. Do you feel like you're a good judge of character and

you could do that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 284: Yes.

MR. PIKE: And you'll only consider the actual evidence that you consider to be credible coming from this, this witness stand?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 284: Yes

MR. PIKE: And if you found yourself in deliberations where you felt that you were right and some of the other members of the jury had a different opinion, but you felt strongly about that you were right, would you be able to stand firm on your convictions, whether it's for guilt or for innocence?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 284: I would, yes.

MR. PIKE: Okay. I imagine you probably had to stand up against some pretty tough characters working your career.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 284: Some of them.

MR. PIKE: Okay. And will you devote your full attention to this case and be fair to the State and fair to — to Jason?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 284: Yes.

MR. PIKE: Thank you very much, sir.

THE COURT: Pass for cause?

MR. PIKE: We'll pass for cause.

THE COURT: All right. I believe we're on State's

KARR REPORTING, INC.

1	second.
2	MS. CHRISTENSEN: Your Honor, the State would like to
3	thank and excuse Number 208, Mr. Zercher.
4	THE COURT: Sir, thank you for being here and your
5	willingness to serve as a juror. You are excused at this
6	time. You need to go back to jury services.
7	And the clerk will call the next prospective juror.
8	THE CLERK: Brenda Pelayo, Badge No. 290.
9	MR. PIKE: May we approach the bench, Your Honor?
10	THE COURT: Sure.
11	Ma'am, have a seat there in the front.
12	(Off-record bench conference.)
13	THE COURT: Good afternoon, Ms. Pelayo. What do you
14	do for a living?
15	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 290: Bank of America, customer
16	service.
17	THE COURT: All right. Are you married?
18	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 290: Married, but separated.
19	THE COURT: And what does your husband do?
20	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 290: I haven't spoke to him in
21	a few years. We're separated.
22	THE COURT: Okay. But you're not divorced, just
23	legally separated?
24	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 290: Not yet. Mm-hmm.
25	THE COURT: Okay. And any children?
61	

KARR REPORTING, INC. 191

0413