IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA Electronically Filed

DALE EDWARD FLANAGAN,

Feb 19 2014 08:30 a.m.
Tracie K. Lindeman
Clerk of Supreme Court

Appellant,

VS.

THE STATE OF NEVADA,

Respondent.

Docket No. 63703

Appeal from the Denial of a Post-Conviction Petition District Court, Clark County The Honorable Michelle Leavitt, District Judge District Court No. 85-C069269-1

APPELLANT'S APPENDIX Volume 2

CAL J. POTTER III, ESQ. Nevada Bar No. 001988 POTTER LAW OFFICES 1125 Shadow Lane Las Vegas, Nevada 89102 Telephone (702) 385-1954 MICHAEL LAURENCE California Bar No. 121854 303 Second Street, Suite 400 South San Francisco, California 94107 Telephone: (415) 348-3800

Attorneys for Appellant Dale Edward Flanagan

Flanagan v. State, Nevada Supreme Court Case No. 63703 Index to Appellant's Appendix

Contents	Page
Volume 1: Guilt Trial (1985)	
Testimony of Angela Saldana, Reporter's Transcript of Preliminary Hearing Held on February 11, 1985	1
Testimony of Angela Saldana, Reporter's Transcript of Evidentiary Hearing Held on September 24, 1985	45
Reporter's Transcript of Jury Trial Held on September 26, 1985	105
Volume 2: Guilt Trial (1985)	
Opening Statements, Reporter's Transcript of Jury Trial Held on September 30, 1985	220
Testimony of Angela Saldana, Reporter's Transcript of Jury Trial Held on October 2, 1985	239
Testimony of Angela Saldana, Reporter's Transcript of Jury Trial Held on October 3, 1985	307
Prosecution Closing Arguments, Reporter's Transcript of Jury Trial Held on October 10, 1985	356
Volume 3: First Penalty Retrial (1989) and Second Penalty Retrial (1995)	
Testimony of Angela Saldana, Reporter's Transcript of Jury Trial Held on July 12, 1989	459
Motion for Disclosure to Information Regarding State Witness' Expectations of Benefits of Testimony, filed May 26, 1995	479
Answer in Opposition to Defendant Flanagan's Motion to Disclose Information re: State Witness' Expectations of Benefits of Testimony, filed June 5, 1995	487
Prosecution Opening Statement, Reporter's Transcript of Jury Trial Held on June 16, 1995	490
Testimony of Angela Saldana, Reporter's Transcript of Jury Trial Held on June 20, 1995	509
Prosecution Closing Arguments, Reporter's Transcript of Jury Trial Held on June 22, 1995	545
Judgment of Conviction, filed July 11, 1995	569

Contents	Page
Volume 4: First State Habeas Corpus Proceedings	
Supplemental Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus, filed November 30, 1999	573
State's Response to Defendant's Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus (Post-Conviction), filed March 29, 2000	707
Volume 5: First State Habeas Corpus Proceedings	
Petitioner's Reply in Support of Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus, filed May 17, 2000	753
Petitioner's Motion for Discovery, filed May 17, 2000	802
Petitioner's Motion for Evidentiary Hearing, filed May 17, 2000	841
Declaration of Angela Saldana Ficklin, Exhibits in Support of Petitioner's Supplemental Petition, Reply to State's Response to Supplemental Petition, and Petitioner's Motion for Evidentiary Hearing, filed May 18, 2000	859
Volume 6: First State Habeas Corpus Proceedings	
Declaration of John Lucas III, Exhibits in Support of Petitioner's Supplemental Petition, Reply to State's Response to Supplemental Petition, and Petitioner's Motion for Evidentiary Hearing, filed May 18, 2000	863
Declaration of Robert Peoples, Exhibits in Support of Petitioner's Supplemental Petition, Reply to State's Response to Supplemental Petition, and Petitioner's Motion for Evidentiary Hearing, filed May 18, 2000	871
Declaration of Debora L. Samples Smith, Exhibits in Support of Petitioner's Supplemental Petition, Reply to State's Response to Supplemental Petition, and Petitioner's Motion for Evidentiary Hearing, filed May 18, 2000	875
Declaration of Michelle Grey Thayer, Exhibits in Support of Petitioner's Supplemental Petition, Reply to State's Response to Supplemental Petition, and Petitioner's Motion for Evidentiary Hearing, filed May 18, 2000	878
Declaration of Wayne Eric Alan Wittig, Exhibits in Support of Petitioner's Supplemental Petition, Reply to State's Response to Supplemental Petition, and Petitioner's Motion for Evidentiary Hearing, filed May 18, 2000	882
Motions Hearing, Reporter's Transcript of Habeas Corpus Proceedings, August 16, 2000	897
Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Order, filed August 9, 2002	938
Order of Affirmance, <i>Flanagan v. State</i> , Nevada Supreme Court Case No. 40232, filed February 22, 2008	972

Contents	Page
Volume 7: Second State Habeas Corpus Proceedings	
Petition For Writ of Habeas Corpus (Post-Conviction), filed September 28, 2012	994
Volume 8: Second State Habeas Corpus Proceedings	
Exhibits in Support of Petition For Writ of Habeas Corpus (Post-Conviction), filed September 28, 2012	
Volume 9: Second State Habeas Corpus Proceedings	
•	44.50
Exhibits in Support of Petition For Writ of Habeas Corpus (Post-Conviction), filed September 28, 2012 (continued)	1158
State's Response and Motion to Dismiss Petition, filed January 16, 2013	1290
Opposition to Motion to Dismiss, filed March 26, 2013	1374
State's Reply to Opposition, filed April 18, 2013	1407
Reporter's Transcript of Proceedings Held on June 6, 2013	1412
Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Order, filed June 28, 2013	1432

-FILED IN O

LORETTA BOWMAN, CLERK C069269 CASE NO. 1 DEPARTMENT FOURTEEN 2 3 IN THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA 4 IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF CLARK 5 6 THE STATE OF NEVADA, 7 REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT PLAINTIFF, 8 OF 9 vs. OPENING STATEMENTS DALE EDWARD FLANAGAN, RANDOLPH 10 MOORE AKA SMITH, JOHNNY RAY LUCKETT AND ROY MCDOWELL, 11 DEFENDANTS. 12 13 BEFORE THE HONORABLE DONALD M. MOSLEY, DISTRICT JUDGE 1.4 MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 30, 1985 15 16 APPEARANCES: 17 MELVYN T. HARMON, ESQUIRE FOR THE STATE: 18 DANIEL M. SEATON, ESQUIRE DEPUTIES DISTRICT ATTORNEY 19 FOR DEFENDANT FLANAGAN: RANDALL PIKE, ESQUIRE 20 MURRAY POSIN, ESQUIRE FOR DEFENDANT MOORE: 21 WILLIAM H. SMITH, ESQUIRE FOR DEFENDANT LUCKETT: 22 FOR DEFENDANT MCDOWELL: ROBERT J. HANDFUSS, ESQUIRE 23

Reported by: Sharon J. Thielman, Official Court Reporter

24

1	LAS VEGAS, NEVADA, MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 30, 1985
2	
3	THE COURT: GOOD MORNING, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN.
4	IS COUNSEL PREPARED TO BEGIN THEIR OPENING STATEMENTS?
5	MR. HARMON: YES, YOUR HONOR.
6	THE COURT: PROCEED, PLEASE.
7	MR. HARMON: JUDGE MOSLEY, COUNSEL, LADIES AND
8	GENTLEMEN. I WOULD LIKE TO BEGIN BY TALKING ABOUT A FEW
9	RELATIONSHIPS IN THE CASE. DALE FLANAGAN WAS THE GRANDSON OF
10	COLLEEN AND CARL GORDON. THE GRANDPARENTS LIVED IN A LARGE
11	HOUSE AT 5851 WASHBURN ROAD.
12	HE LIVED ON THE SAME PROPERTY IN A TRAILER JUST
13	WEST OF THE HOUSE. THE SCENE IN THIS CASE CAN BEST BE
14	DESCRIBED AS A PEACEFUL, RURAL, SOMEWHAT ISOLATED LOCATION
15	NORTH OF TONOPAH HIGHWAY JUST EAST OF JONES BOULEVARD.
16	WASHBURN ROAD IS BETWEEN LONE MOUNTAIN ROAD ON THE
17	SOUTH AND ANN ROAD ON THE NORTH.
8 1	DEFENDANT RANDY MOORE LIVED AT 337 NORTH 13TH
L 9	STREET IN LAS VEGAS, NEVADA. HE WAS THE BEST AND MOST TRUSTED
20	FRIEND OF DEFENDANT DALE FLANAGAN. THEY CONSIDERED THEMSELVES
21	TO BE BROTHERS.
22	DEFENDANTS MOORE AND FLANAGAN WERE ALSO FRIENDS
23	AND ASSOCIATES OF CODEFENDANTS JOHNNY RAY LUCKETT, ROY
24	MCDOWELL AND TWO OTHER CO-CONSPIRATORS, MICHAEL WALSH AND
25	THOMAS AKERS. ALL OF THESE YOUNG MEN LIVEN IN LAS VEGAS,

1 NEVADA. MENTALITY. THESE YOUNG MEN LOOKED AND, FOR THE 2 MOST PART, PROBABLY ACTED LIKE ORDINARY LATE ADOLESCENT, 3 APPLE PIE AMERICAN BOYS WHO LOVED BASEBALL, BUDWEISER BEER, 4 5 BOULDER BEACH, ROCK MUSIC AND CHASING CHICKS. UNFORTUNATELY, THERE WAS A DARKER, DEVIANT SIDE TO 6 THE PERSONALITIES OF THESE YOUNG MEN. THE CONTRAST BETWEEN 7 HIS HUMBLE LITTLE 20 FEET BY 8 FEET TRAILER AND THE ELEGANT 8 TWO-STORY HOUSE OF HIS GRANDPARENTS MUST HAVE BEEN ETCHED INTO 9 10 THE CONSCIOUSNESS OF DALE FLANAGAN. HE HAD NO CAR, AT LEAST NO CAR WHICH WAS 11 OPERATIONAL, IN NOVEMBER, 1984. HE HAD A JOB, BUT HE EARNED 12 FAR LESS THAN WAS NECESSARY TO PROVIDE HIM WITH THE LIFE STYLE 13 HE COVETED. HIS GRANDPARENTS WERE OFTEN UPSET AT HIM. THERE 14 15 WERE ARGUMENTS AND RESTRICTIONS IMPOSED. PERHAPS THEY WERE A NATURAL OUTGROWTH OF THE 16 GENERATION GAP. HE WAS 19, THEY WERE 58 AND 57, RESPECTIVELY. 17 BUT THE FACT IS THAT DALE FLANAGAN FELT MISUNDERSTOOD AND 18 19 STIFLED. HIS GRANDPARENTS DIDN'T UNDERSTAND HIM. 20 21 DIDN'T UNDERSTAND HIS FRIENDS, AND THEY DISLIKED HIS FRIENDS. 22 GRADUALLY, THE EVIDENCE WILL ESTABLISH, AN ANIMOSITY, A

23

24

25

IN DALE FLANAGAN.

3

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN, THE EVIDENCE WILL THEN SHOW

FEELING OF ILL WILL TOWARDS HIS GRANDPARENTS BEGAN TO FESTER

1 THAT AT SOME POINT A VERY SINISTER THOUGHT WAS BORN. FIRST. IT WAS PROBABLY JUST THE GERM OF AN IDEA. BUT IT WAS A NOTION 2 WHICH, WITH EACH REOCCURRENCE, GREW LARGER, UNTIL IT PERVADED 3 4 THE THOUGHTS OF DALE FLANAGAN AND BECAME A CONSUMING 5 OBSESSION. 6 DALE FLANAGAN BEGAN TO THINK THE UNTHINKABLE. SOME POINT HE DECIDED TO GET RID OF HIS GRANDPARENTS. 7 8 HIS MOTIVE. HIS EXPECTATION THAT HE WAS NAMED IN THEIR WILL AND HIS BELIEF THAT WITH THEM GONE, HE WILL COLLECT 9 10 ON INSURANCE PROCEEDS. HE WOULDN'T DO IT ALONE. HE WANTED, NEEDED 11 12 MORAL -- WELL, I WOULD CHARACTERIZE IT AS IMMORAL SUPPORT, 13 ALLIES. 14 HE NEEDED WHEELS, A CAR TO GET TO AND FROM THE 15 SCENE OF THE INTENDED CRIMES AND A GUARANTEE OF SUCCESS, WHICH 16 CAME FROM STRENGTH IN NUMBERS. 17 HIS PLAN, HIS DECISION IS SHOCKING. WHAT COMES IS EVEN MORE OF A SHOCK, AS THE EVIDENCE WILL UNFOLD IN THIS 18 19 CASE, IS THAT HIS BEST FRIEND, RANDY MOORE, AND HIS FRIENDS 20 AND ASSOCIATES, JOHNNY RAY LUCKETT, ROY MCDOWELL, MICHAEL WALSH AND THOMAS AKERS, WERE WILLING TO HELP HIM IN THE 21 22 COMMISSION OF TWO MURDERS. 23 SOMEWHERE PRIOR TO NOVEMBER THE 5TH AND 6TH, 1984, 24 IT WAS DETERMINED THAT TWO HUMAN BEINGS WERE DESTINED TO DIE. 25 SIX YOUNG MEN, FOUR OF WHOM ARE SEATED IN THIS COURTROOM AS

DEFENDANTS, ENTERED INTO A PACT TO KILL. 1 2 THE FATEFUL NIGHT IS NOVEMBER THE 5TH, 1984. ON THAT NIGHT, THE WORST NIGHTMARES OF CARL AND COLLEEN GORDON 3 WERE GOING TO BE REALIZED. 4 5 THE CONSPIRATORS MET AT 337 NORTH 13TH STREET, THE 6 RESIDENCE OF DEFENDANT RANDY MOORE. 7 THE EVIDENCE WILL SHOW THAT THE PARTIES HAD 8 DECIDED BEFOREHAND TO USE THREE WEAPONS. IN FACT, THE 9 EVIDENCE WILL SUGGEST THAT ONE GUN WAS BROUGHT TO THE 10 APARTMENT THAT NIGHT BY DEFENDANT ROY MCDOWELL. IT WILL BE 11 DESCRIBED AS A .22 CALIBER, SIX-SHOT REVOLVER. 12 THE EVIDENCE WILL FURTHER SUGGEST THAT HIS ROLE 13 WAS TO SERVE BOTH AS A LOOKOUT, AND AFTER ENTRY HAD BEEN 14 GAINED INTO THE RESIDENCE, TO DO SOME RANSACKING SO IT WOULD 15 APPEAR THAT THE CRIME WAS NOT INTENDED TO BE MURDER; BUT, 16 RATHER, THE MOTIVATION WAS BURGLARY. 17 IT WAS DETERMINED THAT THOMAS AKERS WOULD BE THE 18 PERSON WHO WOULD DRIVE A VEHICLE TO AND FROM THE SCENE. HE 19 WAS THE OWNER OF A 1971 CHEVROLET EL CAMINO, YELLOW, NEVADA 20 LICENSE NUMBER 382 ALF. 21 HE WAS TO REMAIN ON THE OUTSIDE, AND WAS TO GO TO MR. FLANAGAN'S TRAILER TO PICK UP SOME TAPES. 22 23 IT IS MIND BOGGLING TO THINK THAT THESE YOUNG MEN, 24 WHO CONTEMPLATE MURDER ON THE ONE HAND, WERE STILL CONCERNED

ALSO ABOUT HAVING ROCK MUSIC TO LISTEN TO LATER THAT MORNING.

1	DEFENDANT WALSH WAS TO BREAK THE WINDOW, WHICH WAS
2	TO BE TO THE WEST OF THE RESIDENCE, WHICH WOULD GIVE THEM
3	ACCESS TO THE LIVING ROOM OF THE HOUSE. HE WAS TO USE A PIECE
4	OF BROOMSTICK, WHICH HAD BEEN WRAPPED WITH ELECTRICAL TAPE.
5	HE, ALSO, WAS TO SERVE IN THE CAPACITY AS A
6	LOOKOUT. AND THE SHOOTERS WERE MR. FLANAGAN, MR. LUCKETT AND
.7	MR. MOORE.
8.	DALE FLANAGAN HAD DETERMINED THAT HE WOULD SHOOT
9	HIS GRANDMOTHER. NOW, THE EVIDENCE WILL SHOW THAT WHILE CARL
10	GORDON WAS THE STEP-GRANDFATHER OF DALE FLANAGAN, COLLEEN WAS
11	HIS NATURAL GRANDMOTHER.
12	IT WAS DETERMINED THAT MR. FLANAGAN WOULD USE THE
13	REVOLVER, THE SIX-SHOOTER, TO SHOOT HIS GRANDMOTHER.
14	MR. MOORE WAS TO USE A .22 CALIBER, SEMIAUTOMATIC
15	LONG RIFLE. IT HAD A MAGAZINE CAPACITY OF 15.
16	MR. LUCKETT WAS TO USE A .22 CALIBER, SINGLE SHOT
17	BOLT ACTION SAWED-OFF RIFLE WITH A BARREL, WHICH WAS LATER
18	MEASURED HAVING BEEN SAWED-OFF AT 13 AND 5/8 INCHES.
19	THESE YOUNG MEN, THESE MEN WHO HAD EMBARKED UPON
20	THE CONSPIRACY TO COMMIT MURDER, LEFT THE APARTMENT OF RANDY
21	MOORE SOMETIME AFTER ELEVEN O'CLOCK P.M. ON NOVEMBER THE 5TH,
22	1984.
23	THEY LEFT WITH THOMAS AKERS AT THE WHEEL, IN HIS EL
24	CAMINO. AKERS, LUCKETT AND FLANAGAN WERE IN THE FRONT SEAT.
25	THE OTHER THREE WERE IN THE BACK SEAT.

1	THEY DROVE OUT TO JONES BOULEVARD, TURNED ON JONES
2	AND DROVE ON PAST THE INTERSECTION OF WASHBURN ROAD, PAST
3	WHERE THE PAVEMENT ENDS, ABOUT A MILE BEYOND WHERE MOORE
4	TEST-FIRED HIS .22 CALIBER, SEMIAUTOMATIC RIFLE AND FOUND THAT
5	IT WAS OPERATIONAL.
6	THEY, THEN, PROCEEDED BACK TO THE SCENE. THOMAS
7	AKERS PARKED THE VEHICLE, AND HE WALKED THE SHORT DISTANCE,
8	THEN, TO THE TRAILER. HE WILL DESCRIBE AS HE LEFT TO GO
9	TOWARDS THE TRAILER, THAT THE OTHER FIVE WERE HEADED IN THE
10	DIRECTION OF THE HOUSE, 5851 WASHBURN ROAD.
11	HE WILL SAY IN SUBSTANCE, WHEN HE GOT INSIDE THE
12	TRAILER, "I HEARD A WINDOW BREAK, TWO GUNSHOTS, A WOMAN
13	SCREAM, A MAN YELL AND ABOUT FIVE OR SIX MORE GUNSHOTS."
14	HE WILL TELL YOU THAT HIS MENTALITY AT THAT POINT
15	WAS ONE OF PANIC. HE DECIDED TO LEAVE, AND THAT WAS WITH OR
16	WITHOUT THE OTHERS.
17	HE HURRIED TO HIS CAR, TRIED TO START IT AND IT
18	WOULDN'T START. AT ABOUT THIS TIME, HE HEARD A NOISE A SHORT
19 ,	DISTANCE AWAY. HE HAD BECOME PARANOID. HE LOOKED OVER AND IT
20	WAS JOHN LUCKETT, ONE OF THE DEFENDANTS WHO IS IN THE
21	COURTROOM, WHO HAD IN HIS POSSESSION THE SAWED-OFF RIFLE.
22	MR. LUCKETT SEEMED FRIGHTENED. HE HAD BEEN HIDING
23	BEHIND SOME TUMBLEWEEDS CLOSE TO THE ROAD, CLOSE TO THE
24	VEHICLE.

THE TWO OF THEM, THEN, COLLABORATED IN TRYING TO

GET THE CAR STARTED. AKERS LIFTED THE HOOD. HE STARTED TO 1 HAMMER ON THE BATTERY CABLES. AND EVENTUALLY, WITH LUCKETT 2 3 BEHIND THE WHEEL TRYING TO START THE VEHICLE, IT STARTED. AT THIS POINT, THE OTHER FOUR CAME RUNNING OUT FROM THE AREA OF THE FRONT OF THE HOUSE. THEY ALL GOT IN, IN 5 THE SAME SPOTS THEY WERE IN WHEN THEY CAME TO THE SCENE. 6 7 AKERS WAS TOLD TO DRIVE THE CAR A SHORT DISTANCE WITHOUT 8 LIGHTS. HE DID SO. 9 THEY WENT A LITTLE FURTHER. HE WAS TOLD TO STOP. 10 ALL OF THE MEN GOT OUTSIDE OF THE VEHICLE. CERTAIN SHELL 11 CARTRIDGES WERE DISPOSED OF. A SMALL HOLE WAS DUG BEHIND A 12 MOUND, WHICH WAS CLOSE TO THE ROAD WHERE ORIGINALLY THE 13 CONSPIRATORS WERE GOING TO HIDE THE THREE GUNS. 14 THEY, THEN, CHANGED THEIR MINDS AND DROVE BACK TO 337 NORTH 13TH STREET. A WITNESS, JOHN LUCAS, WHO HAD 15 16 REMAINED AT THE RESIDENCE OF MR. MOORE, WILL EXPLAIN THAT HE WAS AWAKENED FROM HIS SLEEP BY A KNOCK ON THE DOOR AT, 17 18 PERHAPS, 1:00 OR 1:30 A.M. 19 THIS BEING THE MORNING NOW OF NOVEMBER THE 6TH 20 1984. HE WENT TO THE DOOR, AND ALL SIX OF THE CONSPIRATORS 21 CAME IN. 22 AKERS WILL DESCRIBE THE MEN THEN AS GATHERING IN 23 THE DINING ROOM-KITCHEN AREA SEATED RATHER CLOSELY TOGETHER 24 TALKING AT A QUICK PACE. THEY WERE EXCITED, A LOT OF

25

ADRENAL IN PUMPING.

1	AND IT WAS EXPLAINED AT THAT POINT THAT FLANAGAN,
2	IN FACT, HAD SHOT HIS GRANDMOTHER AND KILLED HER; THAT MOORE
3	HAD SHOT THE GRANDFATHER AS HE CAME DOWN THE STAIRS; AND THAT,
4	AT LEAST ONE OTHER SHOT WAS FIRED EITHER BY JOHNNY RAY LUCKETT
5	OR MICHAEL WALSH.
6	THE EVIDENCE WAS PRODUCED. A PURSE OR A WALLET
7	CONTAINED PHOTOGRAPHS OF ONE OR BOTH OF THE VICTIMS. THERE
8	WAS IDENTIFICATION THAT WAS BURNED, THE PHOTOGRAPHS AND THE
9	IDENTIFICATION, IN AN ASHTRAY IN THE KITCHEN OF THE RESIDENCE.
10	THE FOLLOWING AFTERNOON AT ABOUT 4:05 P.M., A
11	FORMER GIRLFRIEND OF DALE FLANAGAN CAME TO THE PROPERTY AT
12	5851 WASHBURN ROAD. THE TESTIMONY WILL BE THAT IT WAS AT
13	ABOUT FOUR O'CLOCK P.M. SHE CAME BACK TO PICK UP CERTAIN
14	CLOTHES AND BELONGINGS OF HERS, WHICH WERE IN THE TRAILER
15	WHERE SHE HAD STAYED FOR A SHORT PERIOD OF TIME WITH DEFENDANT
16	FLANAGAN.
17	SHE DIDN'T HAVE A KEY TO GET IN, SO SHE WENT TO
18	THE BIG HOUSE. AS SHE APPROACHED THE HOUSE, SHE OBSERVED THAT
19	SOMETHING WAS DRASTICALLY AMISS. THE FRONT DOOR WAS OPEN.
20	SHE WENT FAR ENOUGH INSIDE TO SEE THAT SOMETHING HORRIBLE HAD
21	OCCURRED.
22	SHE WENT IMMEDIATELY TO THE NEAREST CONVENIENCE
23	STORE TO CONTACT THE POLICE DEPARTMENT.

FRIEND, JOHN DELEON, AND ADVISED HIM THAT CRIMES HAD OCCURRED

ONCE SHE ARRIVED AT THAT LOCATION, SHE SAW A

24

1	AT 5851 WASHBURN. HE RETURNED WITH HER AND HER FRIEND, TERESA
2	HUDSON.
3	AND AT THIS POINT, MR. DELEON WENT ON INTO THE
4	HOUSE. AND HE OBSERVED THAT BOTH CARL AND COLLEEN GORDON HAD
5	BEEN SHOT TO DEATH.
6	THE POLICE WERE SUMMONED. THE MEDICAL EXAMINER
7	AND REPRESENTATIVES OF THE CORONER'S OFFICE RESPONDED TO THE
8	SCENE. DETECTIVES, REPRESENTATIVES OF THE CRIME LAB TOOK
9	PHOTOGRAPHS. THEY WILL PROVIDE A GRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF THE
10	APPEARANCE OF THE SCENE IN THIS CASE.
11	ON NOVEMBER THE 7TH 1984, DR. GILES SHELDON GREEN,
12	THE CHIEF MEDICAL EXAMINER IN CLARK COUNTY, PERFORMED AUTOPSY
13	EXAMINATIONS UPON COLLEEN AND CARL GORDON.
14	THE EVIDENCE WILL SHOW THAT MRS. GORDON HAD BEEN
15	SHOT THREE TIMES. THERE WERE TWO GUNSHOT WOUNDS, BOTH OF
16	WHICH COULD HAVE BEEN FATAL, TO THE RIGHT SIDE OF HER HEAD.
17	ONE SHOT OF ENTRY HAD GONE IN, IN THE RIGHT
18	TEMPORAL AREA, PERHAPS TWO INCHES ABOVE THE EAR AND TWO AND A
19	HALF INCHES TO THE FRONT OF THE EAR.
20	ANOTHER SHOT HAD ENTERED IN THIS AREA,
21	APPROXIMATELY FIVE INCHES ABOVE HER RIGHT EAR AND, PERHAPS, A
22	QUARTER-INCH BEHIND THE EAR.
23	ANOTHER GUNSHOT OF ENTRY PENETRATED THE LEFT EAR.
24	THAT HAD GONE DOWN THROUGH THE SKIN IN THE LEFT SHOULDER AND
25	EXITED.

1	MR. GORDON HAD BEEN SHOT SEVEN TIMES. THE
2	EVIDENCE WILL SHOW THAT THERE WERE TWO GUNSHOT WOUNDS OF ENTRY
3	TO THE CHEST.
4	THE FIRST WOUND, AND THE TESTIMONY WILL BE THAT
5	THIS WAS CERTAINLY THE FATAL WOUND, ENTERED RIGHT HERE IN THE
6	MIDLINE AREA ABOUT ONE-HALF INCH BELOW THE SUPER-STERNAL
7	NOTCH.
8	THERE WILL BE TESTIMONY THAT THERE WAS A GUNSHOT
9	WOUND OF ENTRY TO THE LEFT LOWER CHEST. IT WAS ABOUT 11
10	INCHES BELOW THIS AREA AND FOUR AND A HALF INCHES LEFT OF THE
11	MIDLINE. IT ENTERED JUST BELOW THE LEFT RIB CAGE.
12	THERE WAS A GUNSHOT WOUND OF ENTRY TO THE ABDOMEN.
13	IT WAS TWO INCHES TO THE LEFT OF THE NAVEL.
14	THERE WERE TWO GUNSHOTS WOUNDS OF ENTRY TO THE
15	RIGHT ARM. ONE OF THESE GUNSHOTS ENTERED THREE AND A HALF
16	INCHES BELOW THE RIGHT SHOULDER IN ABOUT THIS LOCATION.
17	ANOTHER WOUND OF ENTRY, EIGHT INCHES BELOW THE RIGHT SHOULDER.
18	AND THERE WERE TWO GRAZING WOUNDS IN THE BACK.
19	ONE WAS FOUR AND A HALF INCHES BELOW THE BASE OF THE SKULL AND
20	FOUR AND A HALF INCHES LEFT OF THE MIDLINE AREA.
21	THERE WERE MULTIPLE FRAGMENTS FROM THAT BULLET,
22	WHICH IMPACTED THE SKIN BEHIND THE LEFT EAR OF CARL GORDON.
23	AND NINE INCHES BELOW THE BASE OF THE SKULL, A TRANSVERSE
24	GRAZING WOUND ACROSS THE MID BACK.
25	THE EVIDENCE WILL SHOW THAT A NUMBER OF THESE

BULLETS FRAGMENTED UPON ENTRY. SO THAT, WHEN THE BULLETS CRASHED INTO THE BRAIN OF MRS. GORDON, YOU CAN IMAGINE THE DAMAGE. AND YOU CAN ALSO IMAGINE WHAT HAPPENED WHEN THE BULLETS PENETRATED THE CHEST AND ABDOMINAL AREA OF CARL GORDON. THE CAUSE OF DEATH, QUITE SIMPLY, IN THE CASE OF б COLLEEN, TWO GUNSHOT WOUNDS OF THE HEAD; AND TO CARL GORDON, ONE GUNSHOT WOUND WHICH STRUCK THE UPPER MIDLINE OF THE CHEST, IT FRAGMENTED AND COMPLETELY DISRUPTED THE AORTA.

A FATAL MISTAKE WAS MADE BY THE CONSPIRATORS
IN THIS CASE. AS THEY HAD PLANNED, ENTRY WAS MADE INTO A
WINDOW, WHICH SITS JUST A FEW FEET ABOVE THE GROUND ON THE
WEST SIDE OF THE HOUSE. TO GET INTO THE HOUSE, THE SCREEN
FIRST HAD TO BE CUT AND THE WINDOW BROKEN.

THE SCREEN WAS CUT. EVIDENTLY, A KNIFE WAS USED. THAT KNIFE BELONGED TO DALE FLANAGAN.

UNFORTUNATELY FOR THE CONSPIRATORS, THE KNIFE WAS LEFT RIGHT CLOSE TO THE POINT OF ENTRY ON THE GROUND NEAR AN OLEANDER BUSH. AND THE FIRST THING, AT LEAST ONE OF THE FIRST THINGS, THE INVESTIGATING OFFICERS FOUND WAS THE KNIFE.

THERE WILL BE TESTIMONY THAT ABOUT A WEEK AFTER THE OFFENSE, SHORTLY AFTER DETECTIVE BURT LEVOS OF THE POLICE DEPARTMENT HAD RESPONDED TO THE SCENE FOR PERHAPS THE SECOND OR THIRD OR FOURTH TIME, HE HAD MADE CONTACT WITH DEFENDANT DALE FLANAGAN. FLANAGAN WAS ADVISED THAT THE KNIFE WAS FOUND

AT THIS LOCATION.

AND MR. FLANAGAN HAD A CONVERSATION WITH HIS CURRENT GIRLFRIEND ANGELA SALDANA. THE CONVERSATION, IN SUBSTANCE, WAS SOMETHING HAS BEEN FOUND AT THE SCENE WHICH WASN'T SUPPOSED TO BE THERE. MR. FLANAGAN, THEN, WENT ON TO SAY TO MISS SALDANA THAT SOMEHOW HIS KNIFE HAD BEEN FOUND AT THE CRIME SCENE.

ABOUT TWO WEEKS AFTER THE OFFENSES AND PERHAPS A WEEK AFTER THIS INITIAL CONVERSATION, THERE WAS ANOTHER CONVERSATION BETWEEN FLANAGAN AND SALDANA. AND ON THIS OCCASION, MR. FLANAGAN RATHER PROUDLY DISPLAYED A KNIFE.

HE SAID, "I FOUND MY KNIFE." AND HER RESPONSE WAS, "THIS ONE LOOKS NEW." MR. FLANAGAN SAID, "YES, BUT NO ONE KNOWS THAT, AND NOW THE COPS DON'T HAVE ANYTHING ON ME."

TWO TO FOUR DAYS AFTER THE CRIMES, AT 2851 SOUTH DECATUR IN A CONVERSATION WITH ANOTHER FRIEND, MICHELLE GRAY, DEFENDANT FLANAGAN HAD SAID HIS KNIFE HAD SOMEHOW BEEN LEFT AT THE CRIME SCENE. AT THIS TIME, A SOLICITATION REQUEST WAS MADE; IF ANYONE ASKS, TO SAY THAT HE HAD BEEN CARRYING HIS KNIFE ALL ALONG.

THE POLICE PURSUED THEIR INVESTIGATION. IT LED THEM, EVENTUALLY, TO CUTLERY WORLD, A BUSINESS AT THE MEADOWS MALL, AND TO A POTENTIAL WITNESS, YVONNE KACZMAREK.

MISS KACZMAREK SEARCHED THE RECORDS AND DISCOVERED THAT HER BUSINESS, IN FACT, CARRIED THE PARTICULAR KNIFE FOUND

1	AT THE POINT OF ENTRY. THAT DURING OCTOBER OF 1984, THREE
2	SUCH KNIVES HAD BEEN SOLD, ONLY THREE. IT WASN'T EXACTLY A
3	BEST SELLING ITEM.
4	SHE WAS TOLD IF ANYONE MADE AN EFFORT TO PURCHASE
5	ANY MORE KNIVES LIKE THIS, TO LET THEM KNOW.
6	IN FACT, THAT HAPPENED. ON OR ABOUT NOVEMBER THE
7	16TH, 1984, A PERSON IDENTIFIED AS DALE FLANAGAN AND AT LEAST
8	ONE OF HIS OTHER FRIENDS OR ASSOCIATES CAME INTO CUTLERY
9	WORLD, AND AN IDENTICAL KNIFE WAS PURCHASED.
10	LADIES AND GENTLEMEN, THERE WILL BE FURTHER
11	EVIDENCE THAT AFTER DECIDING NOT TO BURY THE KNIVES, THAT A
12	DECISION WAS MADE TO DISPOSE OF THEM IN THE AREA OF LAKE MEAD.
13	A SHORT TIME AFTER THE CRIMES HAD OCCURRED,
14	ANOTHER FRIEND, IN FACT, HE WILL PROVE TO BE A STATE'S WITNESS
15	IN THIS CASE, BUT A FRIEND AT THE TIME OF THE DEFENDANTS,
16	JOHN LUCAS, WAS CONTACTED AT HIS RESIDENCE AT 1500 CULLEY, LAS
17	VEGAS, NEVADA.
18	DEFENDANTS MOORE AND LUCKETT WERE PRESENT AND THE
19	GIRLFRIEND, CONNIE LEAVITT, OF DEFENDANT MOORE. WHILE LEAVITT
20	AND LUCKETT STAYED IN THE CAR, MR. MOORE AND MR. LUCAS HAD A
21	SHORT CONVERSATION.
22	AND DEFENDANT MOORE TOLD LUCAS THAT THEY WERE
23	GOING UP TO THE CLIFFS AREA. AND THEY WERE GOING TO THROW THE
24	THREE GUNS OVER THE CLIFFS.
25	MR. LUCAS, THEREAFTER, REPORTED THAT CONVERSATION

TO THE POLICE DEPARTMENT. HE TOOK THE POLICE TO THE AREA AT 1 2 LAKE MEAD. HE KNOWS THE CLIFFS AREA. 3 AND DIVERS WERE SENT DOWN ON TWO OCCASIONS. THE SECOND OCCASION, DECEMBER THE 27TH, 1984, TWO GUNS, IN 4 5 FACT, WERE RECOVERED FROM THE WATERS OF LAKE MEAD. THE LOCATION WILL BE DESCRIBED AS THE UPPER GYPSUM б 7 WASH AT LAKE MEAD, A PERIMETER AREA ABOUT ONE AND A QUARTER 8 MILES DOWN THE 2.2 MILE ROAD OFF OF NORTH SHORE ROAD. 9 PARK SERVICE REPRESENTATIVE BUD INMAN WILL TESTIFY 10 THAT A SAVAGE ARM MODEL, .22 CALIBER, SEMIAUTOMATIC WITH THE 11 SERIAL NUMBER MISSING WITH A 24-INCH BARREL AND THE SAME MAKE 12 OF SINGLE SHOT BOLT ACTION, .22 CALIBER RIFLE, BEARING A 13 SERIAL NUMBER WHICH WAS CRUDELY SAWED-OFF, WERE RECOVERED FROM 14 LAKE MEAD. 15 THESE WEAPONS WERE TURNED OVER TO THE FIREARMS EXPERT OF THE LAS VEGAS METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT. HE IS 16 17 RICHARD GOOD. HE TEST-FIRED THOSE GUNS AND DISCOVERED THAT. 18 ALTHOUGH THEY WERE A LITTLE WORSE FOR THE WEAR BECAUSE OF THE 19 PERIOD OF TIME THEY WERE IN THE WATER, THAT THEY WERE STILL 20 FUNCTIONAL. 21 HE TOOK THE TEST-FIRED BULLETS AND COMPARED THOSE 22 WITH BULLETS RECOVERED FROM THE SCENE. THE EVIDENCE WILL 23 REFLECT THAT BULLETS WERE RECOVERED FROM BOTH OF THE VICTIMS

FURTHERMORE, THAT THERE WERE BULLETS AT THE SCENE

IN THIS CASE, ALTHOUGH THEY WERE BADLY DISTORTED.

24

WHICH HAD BEEN SPENT, THAT IS, FIRED IN THE LIVING ROOM AREA. 1 2 THERE WAS A BULLET BETWEEN THE MALE VICTIM'S LEGS. WHEN 3 BEDDING AND SHEETS WERE REMOVED FROM THE BED WHERE MRS. GORDON WAS LYING, TWO MORE BULLETS WERE SHAKEN OUT OF THE BEDDING. 4 5 THE EVIDENCE WILL SHOW THAT MR. GORDON HAD BEEN DISCOVERED LYING ON THE FLOOR ON HIS STOMACH IN THE DOORWAY 6 7 BETWEEN MRS. GORDON'S BEDROOM AND THE LIVING ROOM, AND THAT 8 SHE WAS ON HER BACK IN HER BED IN THE LIVING ROOM -- IN THE 9 BEDROOM, EXCUSE ME. 10 THERE WILL, FURTHERMORE, BE EVIDENCE THAT A NUMBER 11 OF CARTRIDGE CASES WERE RECOVERED. WITH RESPECT TO THE 12 BULLETS, MR. GOOD COULD ONLY SAY THAT THE RIFLES BORE THE SAME CLASS CHARACTERISTICS AS AT LEAST TWO OF THE BULLETS 13 14 RECOVERED. BUT BECAUSE OF THE POOR CONDITION OF THE BULLETS, HE COULD NOT MAKE A POSITIVE IDENTIFICATION. 15 16 REGARDING THE CARTRIDGE CASES, HE WAS ABLE TO SAY 17 THAT THE TEST-FIRED CARTRIDGE CASE FROM THE SEMIAUTOMATIC 18 WHICH WAS RECOVERED FROM THE LAKE WAS A POSITIVE MATCH TO ALL FIVE CARTRIDGE CASES RECOVERED AT THE SCENE OF THESE CRIMES. 19 20 I WILL POINT OUT THAT THERE WAS A CARTRIDGE CASE 21 ON THE LIVING ROOM FLOOR NEAR CARL GORDON'S RIGHT FOOT. 22 WAS A CARTRIDGE CASE ON THE LIVING ROOM FLOOR NEAR THE BROKEN 23 WINDOW. 24 THERE WAS A CARTRIDGE CASE IN THE WINDOWSILL

INSIDE THE BROKEN WINDOW AT THE POINT OF ENTRY. THERE WAS A

1 CARTRIDGE CASE ON THE GROUND OUTSIDE THE WEST SIDE OF THE 2 RESIDENCE NEAR THE POINT OF ENTRY. 3 AND A FIFTH CARTRIDGE CASE BETWEEN THE BROKEN WINDOW FRAME AND THE FRAME OF THE SCREEN. AND ALL THOSE WERE 4 5 MATCHED TO THE .22 CALIBER SEMIAUTOMATIC WHICH WAS RECOVERED 6 FROM LAKE MEAD. 7 LADIES AND GENTLEMEN, THERE ALSO WILL BE TESTIMONY 8 FROM ONE OF THE ACCOMPLICES. THOMAS AKERS WILL BE A STATE'S 9 WITNESS. HE WILL EXPLAIN TO YOU WHAT PLANNING OCCURRED 10 BEFOREHAND, WHAT HAPPENED AT THE SCENE, AND THE EVENTS WHICH 11 OCCURRED IMMEDIATELY AFTER THE COMMISSION OF THESE CRIMES. 12 HIS TESTIMONY WILL BE CORROBORATED BY JOHN LUCAS, 13 ANOTHER FRIEND AND ASSOCIATE OF THE CONSPIRATORS. AND THERE 14 WILL BE VARIOUS CO-CONSPIRATOR DECLARATIONS. 15 THERE WILL, ALSO, BE TESTIMONY FROM A NUMBER OF FORMER GIRLFRIENDS OF DEFENDANTS IN THIS CASE. ONE OF THESE 16 17 IS MISS SALDANA, WHOM I HAVE ALREADY MENTIONED. 18 SHE WILL TESTIFY THAT ON OR ABOUT DECEMBER THE 5TH, 1984 AT THE TRAILER ON THE GORDON'S PROPERTY WHERE DALE 19 20 FLANAGAN HAD BEEN LIVING, SHE GOT INTO AN ARGUMENT WITH MR. 21 FLANAGAN. THEY WERE ARGUING ABOUT A FORMER BOYFRIEND OF HERS. HE MADE A COMMENT, IN SUBSTANCE, HE WAS TIRED OF 22

RUNNING. AND THEN, IN SO MANY WORDS SAID, "HOW DO YOU LIKE

THIS, I DID IT, I KILLED MY GRANDPARENTS," AND WENT AHEAD AND

DISCUSSED FURTHER MATTERS CONCERNING THE COMMISSION OF THESE

23

24

1 CRIMES.

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN, I WISH I COULD TELL YOU THAT
THIS SORDID TALE OF TEENAGE CONSPIRACY TO COMMIT VIOLENT
MURDERS WAS A FANTASY. DUTY REQUIRES, AS THE PROSECUTOR, THAT
I TELL YOU IT IS A FACT.

ARRESTS WERE MADE OF THE VARIOUS DEFENDANTS IN
THIS CASE BEGINNING ON DECEMBER THE 9TH, 1984. MR. FLANAGAN
WAS ARRESTED AT HIS TRAILER ON THE PROPERTY WEST OF THE HOUSE.

JOHNNY RAY LUCKETT WAS ARRESTED ON DECEMBER THE 20TH, 1984 AT HIS RESIDENCE IN LAS VEGAS, NEVADA. MCDOWELL AND AKERS, ON THE SAME DATE, DECEMBER 20TH, 1984 IN LAS VEGAS, NEVADA.

A CO-CONSPIRATOR, WALSH, WAS ARRESTED ON JANUARY 22ND, 1985 AT ABOUT NOON ON U.S. 93, 8 8/10 MILES INTO MOJAVE COUNTY, ARIZONA. HE APPEARED TO BE EATING LUNCH BY THE SIDE OF THE ROAD. METROPOLITAN HOMICIDE DETECTIVES WENT TO KINGMAN TO, IN FACT, RETURN HIM TO LAS VEGAS, NEVADA.

AND DEFENDANT MOORE, ON JANUARY THE 23RD, 1985 AT ABOUT EIGHT O'CLOCK IN THE MORNING, WAS ARRESTED IN MEXICO AT THE ALFONSO COTA RANCH OUTSIDE OF TECATE, MEXICO BY MEXICAN JUDICIAL OFFICERS. HE WAS TAKEN TO THE BORDER, SURRENDERED AT THAT POINT TO REPRESENTATIVES OF THE SAN DIEGO SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT.

THEY, IN TURN, TURNED MR. MOORE OVER TO THE CUSTODY OF LAS VEGAS HOMICIDE DETECTIVES, WHO BROUGHT HIM

_	The state of the s
2	LADIES AND GENTLEMEN, THE EVIDENCE WILL SHOW
3	BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT IN THIS CASE THAT ON NOVEMBER THE
4	5TH OR 6TH, 1984, DALE FLANAGAN SHOT AND MURDERED HIS
5	GRANDMOTHER, THAT RANDY MOORE SHOT AND MURDERED CARL GORDON,
6	AND THAT BOTH OF THESE DEFENDANTS WERE AIDED BY THEIR
7	CODEFENDANTS, MR. MCDOWELL AND MR. LUCKETT, IN THE COMMISSION
8	OF THESE CRIMES. THANK YOU.
9	THE COURT: THANK YOU, MR. HARMON. ARE THERE
10	DEFENSE COUNSEL THAT WISH TO MAKE AN OPENING STATEMENT AT THIS
11	TIME?
12	MR. PIKE: YES, YOUR HONOR.
13	THE COURT: WHAT IS YOUR PLEASURE?
14	MR. HANDFUSS: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR. COUNSEL.
L5	LADIES AND GENTLEMEN OF THE JURY, MY NAME IS
L6	ROBERT HANDFUSS. I AM A DEFENSE COUNSEL, AND I REPRESENT MR.
17	MCDOWELL. I AM HERE TO MAKE SURE THAT MR. MCDOWELL HAS HIS
L 8	RIGHTS PROTECTED, JUST LIKE ANYBODY WHO WOULD BE SITTING AT
L 9	THAT TABLE HAS THEIR RIGHT TO HAVE THEIR RIGHTS PROTECTED.
20	YOU HAVE HEARD WHAT EVIDENCE THE STATE SAYS THAT
21	THEY ARE GOING TO PUT ON FOR YOU. I THINK IT IS VERY
22	IMPORTANT, ALSO, NOT JUST TO LISTEN TO WHAT EVIDENCE THEY PUT
23	ON, BUT TO LISTEN TO WHAT EVIDENCE THEY DO NOT BRING BEFORE
) <u> </u>	VOTI .

THE STATE CHARACTERIZED THIS AS BASICALLY THE

ORIGINAL

FILT

	112
1	CASE NO. C069269
2	DEPARTMENT FOURTEEN
3	Bylinde Want
4	IN THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA
5	IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF CLARK
6	
7	THE STATE OF NEVADA,
8	PLAINTIFF, REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT
9	VS. OF
10	DALE EDWARD FLANAGAN, RANDOLPH) JURY TRIAL, MOORE AKA SMITH, JOHNNY RAY
11	LUCKETT AND ROY MCDOWELL,
12	DEFENDANTS.
13	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
14	BEFORE THE HONORABLE DONALD M. MOSLEY, DISTRICT JUDGE
15	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
16	
17	APPEARANCES:
18	FOR THE STATE: MELVYN T. HARMON, ESQUIRE
19	DANIEL M. SEATON, ESQUIRE DEPUTIES DISTRICT ATTORNEY
20	
21	FOR DEFENDANT PLANAGAN: RANDALL PIKE, ESQUIRE
22	FOR DEFENDANT MOORE: MURRAY POSIN, ESQUIRE
23	FOR DEFENDANT LUCKETT: WILLIAM H. SMITH, ESQUIRE
24	FOR DEFENDANT MCDOWELL: ROBERT J. HANDFUSS, ESQUIRE
25	Reported by: Sharon J. Thielman, Official Court Reporter

1	MR. PIKE: YOUR HONOR, I HAVE NOTHING FURTHER AT
2	THIS TIME. HOWEVER, I WOULD ASK THAT MRS. EVANS REMAIN UNDER
3	SUBPOENA TO COME BACK AT A LATER PORTION WHEN THERE MAY BE
4	REQUIRED FULLER DEVELOPMENT OF SOME TESTIMONY.
5	THE COURT: MISS EVANS, ARE YOU STILL AT THE
6	MCDONALD'S?
7	THE WITNESS: YES.
8	THE COURT: YOU CAN BE REACHED THERE, THEN?
9	THE WITNESS: YES. I AM GOING ON VACATION THE END
10	OF THIS WEEK, THOUGH.
11	THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. MR. PIKE, IF YOU WOULD
12	CONTEMPLATE HAVING TO CALL MISS EVANS, YOU MIGHT ARRANGE OR
13	CALL HER SOMETIME OUTSIDE OF COURT AND ARRANGE SOMETHING. GET
14	SOME IDEA OF HER SCHEDULE.
15	MR. PIKE: I WILL.
16	THE COURT: THANK YOU, MISS EVANS. YOU ARE
17	EXCUSED. I ASK YOU NOT TO DISCUSS YOUR TESTIMONY WITH THOSE
18	OUTSIDE.
19	THE WITNESS: OKAY.
20	THE COURT: THE STATE'S NEXT WITNESS.
21	MR. SEATON: ANGELA SALDANA.
22	
23	ANGELA SALDANA
24	WAS CALLED AS A WITNESS ON BEHALF OF THE STATE AND, HAVING
25	BEEN FIRST DULY SWORN, TESTIFIED AS FOLLOWS:
ne ne	835

1	DIRECT EXAMINATION		
2	BY MR. SEATO	ON:	
3	Q	WOULD YOU PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME AND SPELL IT FOR	
4	THE RECORD?		
5	A	ANGELA SALDANA, S-A-L-D-A-N-A.	
6	Q	HOW OLD ARE YOU, MISS SALDANA?	
7	λ	20 YEARS OLD.	
8	Q	IS IT MISS?	
9	, A	MISS.	
10	Q	DO YOU KNOW THE INDIVIDUALS WHO ARE ON TRIAL HERE?	
11	A	YES, I DO.	
12	Q	FOR THE RECORD, WOULD YOU, STARTING TO MY RIGHT,	
13	WOULD YOU PO	DINT TO THEM AND NAME EACH INDIVIDUAL?	
14	A	RANDY MOORE, DALE FLANAGAN, ROY MCDOWELL, JOHN RAY	
15	LUCKETT.	•	
16		MR. SEATON: MAY THE RECORD REFLECT THAT THE	
17	WITNESS HAS	IDENTIFIED THE FOUR NAMED DEFENDANTS, YOUR HONOR?	
18		THE COURT: YOU ARE FAMILIAR WITH THEIR	
19	ATTORNEYS?		
20		THE WITNESS: YES, I AM.	
21		THE COURT: YOU ARE NAMING THE FOUR INDIVIDUALS	
22	EXCLUSIVE O	F THEIR ATTORNEYS; IS THAT CORRECT?	
23		THE WITNESS: YES.	
24		THE COURT: THE RECORD WILL SO REFLECT.	
25	BY MR. SEATON:		

1	Q	YOU POINTED TO EACH ONE OF THEM AS YOU NAMED THEM;
2	IS THAT COP	RRECT?
3	A	YES, I DID.
4	Q	MISS SALDANA, WHERE WERE YOU RESIDING ON NOVEMBER
5	THE 5TH, 19	984?
6	A	AT MY AUNT AND UNCLE'S HOUSE.
7	. Ω	IS THAT HERE IN LAS VEGAS, NEVADA?
8	A	YES, IT IS.
9	Q	AND HOW ABOUT NOVEMBER THE 6TH, 1984, WHERE DID
LO	YOU RESIDE	THEN?
11	λ	ON WASHBURN ROAD.
12	Q	DO YOU RECALL THE ADDRESS AT WASHBURN ROAD?
13	A	NO.
14	Q	WITH WHOM DID YOU RESIDE AT WASHBURN ROAD?
15	A	WITH DALE FLANAGAN.
16	Q	AND WAS IT IN A HOUSE OR A TRAILER?
17	A	TRAILER.
L 8	Q	IS THAT TRAILER LOCATED NEAR A HOUSE?
19	A	YES. IT'S ON THE SAME PROPERTY.
20	Q	AND IS THAT HOUSE OF DALE FLANAGAN'S GRANDPARENTS,
21	CARL AND C	OLLEEN GORDON?
22 ,	A	YES, IT IS.
23	Q	AND YOU BEGAN LIVING THERE ON NOVEMBER THE 6TH,
24	1984?	
25	A	YES.
		837

1	Q AT WHOSE REQUEST DID YOU MOVE TO THE TRAILER ON
2	THAT PROPERTY?
3	A DALE'S REQUEST.
4	Q HAD HE BEEN ASKING YOU TO MOVE THERE?
5	A YES.
6	Q AND ON THAT DATE, YOU FINALLY MOVED THERE?
7	A YES.
8	Q MISS SALDANA, SOMETIMES WE HAVE A HARD TIME
9	HEARING YOU. IF YOU COULD PULL THE MIKE CLOSER TO YOU OR,
10	PERHAPS, SCOOT YOUR CHAIR IN A LITTLE BIT CLOSER AND REMEMBER
11	NOT TO TALK TOO QUICKLY FOR US. THANKS.
12	ON NOVEMBER THE 6TH, 1984, DID YOU HAVE A
13	RELATIONSHIP WITH DALE FLANAGAN?
14	A YES, I DID.
15	Q WOULD YOU DESCRIBE IT TO US?
16	A IT WAS BOYFRIEND AND GIRLFRIEND.
17	Q WHILE YOU WERE LIVING THERE AT THE TRAILER,
18	SOMETIME IN MID NOVEMBER, DID A DETECTIVE BY THE NAME OF BURT
19	LEVOS COME TO THE TRAILER?
20	A YES, HE DID.
21	Q YOU KNOW DETECTIVE BURT LEVOS NOW?
22	A YES.
23	Q WHEN HE CAME TO THE TRAILER, AND CAN YOU TELL US AS
24	BEST YOU CAN, BETTER THAN MY MID NOVEMBER, WHEN THE DATE WAS?
25	A IT WAS APPROXIMATELY A WEEK AFTER I HAD MOVED IN,

1	AFTER THE 6TH.
2	Q SO THAT MIGHT HAVE BEEN THE 13TH OR SO?
3	A YES. I AM PRETTY SURE.
4	Q YOU WERE PAMILIAR, WERE YOU NOT, WITH THE FACT
5	THAT DALE'S GRANDPARENTS, CARL AND COLLEEN GORDON, HAD MET
6	THEIR DEATHS ON NOVEMBER THE 5TH?
7	A YES.
8	Q WHEN DETECTIVE LEVOS CAME TO THE TRAILER ON
9	NOVEMBER THE 13TH OR SO, DID HE COME BY HIMSELF?
10	A NO. HE CAME WITH ANOTHER FELLOW.
11	Q ANOTHER DETECTIVE?
12	A YES.
13	Q AND WHO WAS AT THE TRAILER WHEN THEY CAME?
14	A JUST DALE AND I.
15	Q AND DID THE FOUR OF YOU TALK TOGETHER?
16	A NO.
17	Q HOW DID IT HAPPEN?
18	A WE WERE ON HIS GRANDPARENTS' PROPERTY ON THE OTHER
19	SIDE OF THE FENCE.
20	Q YOU AND DALE WERE?
21	A YES. AND I WAS ASKED TO GO TO THE TRAILER.
22	Q WHO ASKED YOU TO GO TO THE TRAILER?
23	A DALE.
24	Q DID YOU GO TO THE TRAILER?
25	A YES, I DID.
	83 9
	037

1			
1	(٥	DID DALE REMAIN WITH DETECTIVE LEVOS AND THE OTHER
2	MAN?		A
3	į	λ	YES.
4	•	Ω	AND FOR HOW LONG A PERIOD OF TIME DID HE
5	REMAIN 1	WITH	THEM?
6		λ	APPROXIMATELY, 10, 15 MINUTES.
7		Q	DID THEY HAVE A DISCUSSION?
8		λ	YES, THEY DID.
9		Q	WERE YOU ABLE TO HEAR IT?
10		A	NO, I WASN'T.
11		Q	DID THERE COME A TIME AFTER THAT DISCUSSION WHEN
12	DALE CA	ME B	ACK TO THE TRAILER?
13		λ	EXCUSE ME?
14		Q	DID DALE COME BACK TO THE TRAILER LATER ON?
15		λ	YES, HE DID.
16		Q	AND HOW WOULD YOU DESCRIBE HIS ATTITUDE, HIS
17	DEMEANO	R WH	EN HE CAME INTO THE TRAILER?
18		A	HE WAS A LITTLE UPSET.
19		Q	DID HE SAY ANYTHING TO YOU AT THAT TIME?
20		A	HE SAID THAT THEY HAD FOUND SOMETHING OF HIS THAT
21	WASN'T	SUPP	OSED TO BE THERE AND
22		Q	GO RIGHT AHEAD.
23		A	AND I SAID, "WHICE WAS WHAT?" AND HE SAID, "MY
24	KNIFE.	•	•
25		Q	DID HE SAY WHERE THE DETECTIVES HAD TOLD HIM THEY
			840

1	HAD FOUND HIS KNIFE?
2	A BY THE WINDOW, BY THE BROKEN WINDOW.
3	Q THE BROKEN WINDOW ON THE HOUSE?
4	A YES.
5	Q DID YOU KNOW WHERE THAT BROKEN WINDOW WAS?
6	A YES, IT WAS ON THE RIGHT OF THE HOUSE.
7	Q WAS THAT THE WINDOW NEAR HIS GRANDMOTHER'S
8	BEDROOM?
9	A YES.
10	Q DID YOU KNOW THE KNIFE THAT HE WAS TALKING ABOUT?
11	A YES, I DID.
12	Q HAD YOU SEEN IT BEFORE?
13	A YES.
14	Q WHERE HAD YOU SEEN THAT KNIFE BEFORE?
15	A ON DALE'S PERSON.
16	Q HOW DID HE CARRY IT?
17	A HE HAD CARRIED IT IN THE SHEATH ON HIS BELT OR IN
18	HIS POCKET.
19	Q LET ME SHOW YOU WHAT HAS BEEN MARKED STATE'S
20	EXHIBIT 91-A, AND ASK YOU IF YOU HAVE EVER SEEN THIS
21	PARTICULAR EXHIBIT BEFORE?
22	A YES.
23	Q AND WHAT IS THIS PARTICULAR EXHIBIT?
24	A THIS IS THE FIRST KNIFE THAT DALE HAD DESCRIBED TO
25	ME AND I HAD SEEN.
	841

1	Q YOU MENTIONED THE FIRST KNIFE. NOW, LET ME
2	UNDERSTAND. IS THIS THE KNIFE THAT YOU HAD SEEN DALE CARRYING
3	BEFORE IN THE SHEATH?
4	A YES.
5	Q AND WHEN YOU SAY CARRYING BEFORE, DO YOU MEAN
6	CARRYING BEFORE THE DEATHS OF HIS GRANDPARENTS?
7	A YES.
8	Q DID THERE COME A TIME WHEN HE SHOWED YOU ANOTHER
9	KNIFE?
10	A YES, THERE WAS.
11	Q WHEN WAS THAT?
12	A I'D HAVE TO SAY APPROXIMATELY TWO WEEKS AFTER THE
13	POLICE OFFICERS OR THE DETECTIVES HAD TAKEN THE KNIFE.
14	Q IS IT FAIR TO SAY THAT WOULD BE SOMETIME NEAR THE
15	END OF NOVEMBER?
16	A YES.
17	Q AND UNDER WHAT CIRCUMSTANCES? WHERE WERE YOU WHEN
18	YOU SAW THE OTHER KNIFE?
19	A IN THE TRAILER.
20	Q AND WAS ANYONE ELSE THERE BESIDES DALE AND
21	YOURSELF?
22	A NO.
23	Q AND HOW DID HE SHOW YOU THE OTHER KNIFE?
24	A WELL, HE HAD IT IN HIS HAND IN FRONT OF HIM, AND I
25	WAS SITTING ACROSS THE TABLE. AND HE SAID, "LOOK, I FOUND MY

		'
1	KNIFE."	
2		AND I SAID, "NO, THAT'S NOT YOUR KNIFE. THAT ONE
3	LOOKS NEW."	
4		AND HE SAID, "YES, BUT NO ONE ELSE WILL KNOW THAT.
5	AND NOW, TH	E COPS DON'T HAVE ANYTHING ON ME."
6	Q	DID HE SAY ANYTHING ELSE AT THAT TIME ABOUT THE
7	KNIFE?	
8	A	NO.
9	Q	DID THERE COME A TIME A WEEK OR SO LATER THAT YOU
.0	HAD A CONVE	RSATION WITH DALE FLANAGAN REGARDING THE DEATHS OF
11	HIS GRANDPA	RENTS?
12	Α	YES.
L3	Q	CAN YOU TELL US, AS BEST YOU CAN, THE APPROXIMATE
l 4	DATE OF THE	AT CONVERSATION?
15	A	THE 5TH OF DECEMBER.
16	Q	THAT WOULD BE THE 5TH OF DECEMBER, 1984?
17	A	YES.
18	Q	AND WHERE WERE YOU WHEN THAT CONVERSATION TOOK
19	PLACE?	
20	A	IN THE TRAILER.
21	Q	WAS ANYONE ELSE THERE PRESENT?
22	A	NO.
23	Q	TELL US, IF YOU WILL, HOW THE CONVERSATION BEGAN?
24	A	WE WERE ARGUING PREVIOUSLY ABOUT AN OLD BOYFRIEND
25	OF MINE.	AND HE HAD STATED THAT HE DIDN'T CARE WHAT I DID
		843

1	ANYMORE, WHERE I WENT.
2	Q WHO STATED HE DIDN'T CARE?
3	A DALE FLANAGAN.
4	Q DALE STATED THAT HE DIDN'T CARE WHAT YOU DID
5	ANYMORE?
6	A YES.
7 .	Q OR WHERE YOU WENT?
8	A YES.
9	Q AND WHAT ELSE DID HE SAY?
LO	A THAT HE WAS TIRED OF RUNNING, AND HE WAS JUST
l1	HE WAS JUST TIRED, TIRED OF IT ALL.
12	Q DID HE SAY ANYTHING ELSE?
13	A LATER ON, HE WENT INTO THE DESCRIPTION OF WHAT
14	HAPPENED. HE SAID, "HOW DO YOU LIKE THIS, I DID IT. I
15	KILLED MY GRANDPARENTS."
16	Q DID HE JUST COME OUT AND SAY THAT?
17	A YEP.
18	Q "HOW DO YOU LIKE THIS, I DID IT, I KILLED MY
19	GRANDPARENTS*?
20	A YES.
21	MR. PIKE: YOUR HONOR, BEFORE MR. SEATON GOES
22	FURTHER, FOR THE REASONS PREVIOUSLY ANNOUNCED IN PRIOR
23	HEARINGS, I WOULD ASK THAT THE COURT NOTE ANY CONTINUING
24	OBJECTION BASED UPON THE BASIS OF THE POLICE AGENT ISSUE THAT
25	WAS RAISED.

1	THE COURT: VERY WELL, SO NOTED. PROCEED.
2	MR. SEATON: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.
3	BY MR. SEATON:
4	Q DID HE SAY WHEN HE HAD KILLED HIS GRANDPARENTS?
5	A HE STATED THAT HE DID IT EARLY IN THE MORNING,
6	LIKE AFTER MIDNIGHT OF THE 6TH, 5TH OR 6TH. I THINK IT WAS
7	THE 6TH.
8	Q AFTER MIDNIGHT OF THE 6TH, 5TH ON THE 6TH?
9	A YES.
LO	Q DID HE TELL YOU WHERE HE HAD BEEN ON THE EVENING
11	OF THE 5TH PRIOR TO THE KILLING OF HIS GRANDPARENTS?
12	A YES. HE STATED HE WAS AT RANDY MOORE'S APARTMENT.
13	Q THAT IS AT 337 NORTH 13TH?
14	A I THINK SO.
15	Q HAVE YOU BEEN THERE?
16	A YES.
17	Q DID HE SAY WHEN HE WAS AT RANDY MOORE'S APARTMENT
18	ON THE NIGHT BEFORE WHO ELSE WAS PRESENT AT THAT ADDRESS?
19	A HE STATED THAT JOHN RAY LUCKETT, TOM AKERS, ROY
20	MCDOWELL, MIKE WALSH, AND THEN, DIDN'T RANDY MOORE AND
21	HIMSELF.
22	Q IF I COULD MAKE SURE I UNDERSTAND. HE INDICATED
23	TO YOU THAT JOHN RAY LUCKETT, TOM AKERS, ROY MCDOWELL, MIKE
24	WALSH, AND RANDY MOORE
25	A YES.

1	Q	WERE PRESENT:
2	λ	YES.
3	Q	DID HE MENTION AN INDIVIDUAL BY THE NAME OF JOHN
4	LUCAS?	
5	λ	NO.
6	Q	DID HE TELL YOU ANYTHING ABOUT THE DISCUSSIONS
7	THAT HE AND	ANY OF THOSE OTHER INDIVIDUALS THAT YOU HAVE NAMED
8	HAD THE NIG	ET BEFORE?
9	А	YES. HE STATED THAT THEY HAD PLANNED TO MAKE IT
10	LOOK LIKE A	ROBBERY.
11	Q	DID HE SAY HOW THEY PLANNED TO MAKE IT LOOK LIKE A
12	ROBBERY?	
13	A	HE STATED THAT ONLY THAT JOHN RAY AND RANDY MOORE
14	WERE TO CAR	RY GUNS AND HIMSELF; ALSO, THAT THEY WERE GOING TO
15	BREAK IN TH	E WINDOW, INSTEAD OF GOING IN THE FRONT DOOR.
16	Q	DID HE TELL YOU WHAT THE REASON FOR KILLING HIS
17	GRANDPARENT	S WAS?
18	A	FOR THE WILL AND THE INSURANCE MONEY.
19	Q	DID HE THINK THAT THERE WAS A WILL?
20	λ	YES.
21	Q	AND DID HE TELL YOU WHO WAS NAMED IN THE WILL AS
22	BENEFI CLARY	77
23	λ	HE SAID THAT IT WAS RUMORED TO HIM THAT IT WAS
24	EITHER ALL	OF HIS OR HALF HIS AND HALF HIS UNCLE'S.
25	Q	DID HE TELL YOU HOW MUCH MONEY WAS INVOLVED IN THE
	1	946

2	A I THINK HE SAID TWO HUNDRED THOUSAND, I AM NOT
3	SURE.
4	Q WAS THAT THE WILL OR THE INSURANCE POLICY?
5	A THE INSURANCE. THE WILL, I HAVE NO IDEA WHAT WAS
6	IN IT.
7	Q DID HE SAY ANYTHING ABOUT THE HOUSE INSOFAR AS AN
8	INHERITANCE WAS CONCERNED?
9	A YES. HE SAID THE HOUSE WOULD HAVE BEEN HIS.
10	Q DID HE SAY ANYTHING ELSE WOULD HAVE BEEN HIS?
11	A NOT AS FAR AS DEFINITE GOES, NO. HE WASN'T SURE
12	ABOUT ANYTHING ELSE, JUST KNEW THAT THE HOUSE WOULD BE.
13	Q IS IT YOUR TESTIMONY THAT DALE FLANAGAN TOLD YOU
14	THAT THE PURPOSE FOR KILLING THE GRANDPARENTS WAS BECAUSE HE
15	WAS NAMED AS A BENEFICIARY IN THE WILL AND ON THE TWO HUNDRED
16	THOUSAND DOLLAR INSURANCE POLICY AND TO GET THE HOUSE?
17	MR. PIKE: OBJECTION, LEADING.
18	THE COURT: SUSTAINED.
19	BY MR. SEATON:
20	Q DID HE INDICATE TO YOU WHETHER OR NOT HE AND ANY
21	OTHER PEOPLE LEFT RANDY MOORE'S APARTMENT THE NIGHT OF THE
22	5TH?
23	MR. SMITH: YOUR HONOR, AT THIS POINT, I WOULD
24	RENEW AN OBJECTION PREVIOUSLY STATED, DENIAL OF SIXTH
25	AMENDMENT RIGHT, TO CONFRONT THE WITNESSES AGAINST US.
	847

WILL?

1	AND, ALSO, IT IS NOT I SUBMIT AGAIN IT HAS NOT
2	BEEN DEMONSTRATED THIS CONVERSATION WAS IN ANY WAY IN
3	FURTHERANCE OF THE CONSPIRACY.
4	MR. SEATON: QUITE TO THE CONTRARY, YOUR HONOR.
5	THIS COURT HAS ALREADY RULED THAT IT WAS IN FURTHERANCE.
6	THE COURT: ALL RIGHT.
7	MR. SMITH: MAY WE APPROACE THE BENCH?
8	THE COURT: YOU MAY.
9	(DISCUSSION AT THE BENCH WHICH WAS
10	NOT REPORTED.)
11	THE COURT: LADIES AND GENTLEMEN OF THE JURY, I AM
12	GOING TO ASK THAT YOU STEP OUTSIDE FOR A FEW MOMENTS WHILE WE
13	IRON A LITTLE MATTER OUT HERE.
14	(THE ADMONITION WAS READ.)
15	THE COURT: I AND COUNSEL REMAIN IN COURT. AND WE
16	WILL NOT BREAK BEFORE WE CALL YOU BACK, SO PLEASE STAY IN THE
17	IMMEDIATE AREA. YOU MAY EXIT THE COURTROOM AT THIS TIME.
18	(JURY EXITS THE COURTROOM.)
19	THE COURT: FOR THE RECORD, THE JURY HAS EXITED
20	THE COURTROOM. MR. SMITH, YOU HAVE AN OBJECTION?
21	MR. SMITH: CAN WE EXCUSE THE WITNESS, PLEASE?
22	THE COURT: YES. THERE IS SOME ARGUMENT, MAYBE
23	SOME QUESTIONING OF THE WITNESS.
24	MR. SMITH: WELL, I CAN GO AHEAD AND MAKE MY
25	ARGUMENT, IF THE COURT PLEASE.
	S .

MY OBJECTION IS BASICALLY THIS. THE STATE'S, I UNDERSTAND FROM THE EVIDENTIARY HEARING, ORIGINAL POSITION AS FAR AS WHY THE STATEMENTS THAT DALE FLANAGAN MADE OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF ANY OTHER DEFENDANTS TO MISS SALDANA SHOULD BE ADMITTED WERE BECAUSE HE WANTED TO INTIMIDATE HER AND BASICALLY SOLICIT HER SUPPORT IN THE STORY ABOUT THE KNIFE. AND SHE HAS TESTIFIED ABOUT BOTH OF THOSE TWO PRIOR CONVERSATIONS.

WE HAVE NOW MOVED ONTO A THIRD CONVERSATION, WHICH
THE WITNESS TESTIFIED SIMPLY CAME UP AS A RESULT OF A
BOYFRIEND-GIRLFRIEND DISCUSSION. AND THEN, DALE SAID, "HOW DO
YOU LIKE IT, I KILLED MY GRANDPARENTS."

AND THEN, WE ARE MOVING ONTO A POINT WHERE I EXPECT THE STATE IS GOING TO SOLICIT FROM THE WITNESS WHAT HE TOLD HER THE OTHER PEOPLE DID DURING THE EVENING IN QUESTION.

I THINK THE COURT'S ALREADY MADE IT CLEAR THAT THE STATE CANNOT SOLICIT MERE RECITATIONS OF FACTUAL EVENTS, WHICH ONE CODEFENDANT TOLD ANOTHER PERSON OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE OTHER DEFENDANTS WHICH IS SIMPLY THAT, A RECITATION OF FACTS. I THINK YOU CAN BREAK THIS CONVERSATION DOWN INTO ITS COMPONENTS.

AND I CAN SEE HOW THE STATE CAN LET IN THE FIRST PART. BUT IF THEY ARE MERELY SAYING, "WELL, THIS IS WHAT HAPPENED," AND IT GOES ON TO SAY WHAT HE THINKS OCCURRED, I DON'T THINK THAT PORTION OF THE CONVERSATION IS IN

FURTHERANCE. 1 THERE IS A SECOND OBJECTION TO THAT. IT WAS ALSO 2 DEVELOPED ON CROSS-EXAMINATION AT THE EVIDENTIARY HEARING THAT 3 . APPARENTLY DALE HAD NO PERSONAL KNOWLEDGE OF WHAT THE OTHER DEFENDANTS DID, PARTICULARLY, WHO THE OTHER PEOPLE THAT WERE 5 SHOOTING THE GUN WERE. 6 AND I AM SPECIFICALLY CONCERNED ABOUT THIS, 7 BECAUSE I EXPECT THAT SHE WILL SAY IF PERMITTED THAT SHE WAS 8 TOLD BY DALE THAT JOHN LUCKETT FIRED THE WEAPON. AND THERE IS 9 NO BASIS FOR ANY EVIDENCE BEFORE THIS COURT THAT HE EVER SAW 10 THAT, AND WE MUST ASSUME THAT IS WHAT HE WAS TOLD. 11 I THINK THE COURT SHOULD TAKE, ESPECIALLY, INTO 12 ACCOUNT IN THIS INSTANCE THE CONFRONTATION PROBLEMS WHICH ARE, 13 AND IT IS A VERY IMPORTANT PROBLEM, WHICH DUTTON VERSUS EVANS 14 AND OTHER CASES I STATED TO THE COURT HAVE FOCUSED ON, IS 15 WHETHER OR NOT THE WITNESS TESTIFIES FROM PERSONAL KNOWLEDGE. 16 SO I THINK WE BREAK IT DOWN RIGHT THERE, AND I 17 THINK THAT IT'S EXTREMELY PREJUDICIAL. AND, IN FACT, IT DOES 18 DENY MR. LUCKETT THE RIGHT TO CONFRONT DALE FLANAGAN AS TO THE 19 BASIS OF HIS TESTIMONY. 20 THE COURT: IS THERE ANYTHING ELSE FROM DEFENSE 21 22 COUNSEL? MR. PIKE: NOTHING. 23 MR. HANDFUSS: I WOULD JOIN WITE MR. SMITE, YOUR

850

24 25

HONOR.

MR. POSIN: YES, YOUR HONOR, PLEASE. I BELIEVE 1 THE EVIDENTIARY HEARING WAS ESTABLISHED UNDER THE BEST OF 2 CIRCUMSTANCES; THAT, IF WE ACCEPT THE TESTIMONY THAT MR. 3 FLANAGAN ENTERED THE BEDROOM, HE HAD NO WAY OF KNOWING PERSONALLY WHAT MAY HAVE HAPPENED IN ANY OTHER PART OF THE 5 HOUSE DURING ANY OTHER PART OF THE SHOOTING. THE COURT: BEFORE WE HAVE RESPONSE FROM THE 7 STATE, I WOULD LIKE TO ASK MISS SALDANA, WHO IS STILL UNDER 8 9 OATH. YOU INDICATED THAT DALE SAID TO YOU SOMETHING TO 10 THE EFFECT THAT, "HOW DO YOU LIKE THIS, I KILLED MY 11 GRANDPARENTS"; IS THAT CORRECT? 12 THE WITNESS: YES. 13 THE COURT: WAS IT IMMEDIATELY THEREAFTER OR 14 SOMETIME THEREAFTER THAT HE WENT INTO HOW THIS OCCURRED AND 15 WEO WAS INVOLVED? 16 THE WITNESS: IMMEDIATELY. 17 THE COURT: ORAY. THE STATE. 18 MR. SEATON: MAY I ASK HER ONE QUESTION, TOO? 19 BY MR. SEATON: 20 MISS SALDANA, IN THE EARLIER HEARING, YOU HAD 21 INDICATED THAT, AND I AM NOT GOING TO BE PRECISE BUT YOU WILL 22 UNDERSTAND MY MEANING, YOU INDICATED THAT YOU THOUGHT THAT 23 DALE HAD THE DISCUSSION WITH YOU ABOUT THE KNIFE SO AS TO 24

851

25

SOLICIT YOUR SUPPORT.

1	A YES.
2	Q AND THAT YOU WOULD BACK HIM UP IF THE POLICE EVER
3	CAME TO YOU?
4	A THAT'S WHAT HE WAS ASSUMING, YES.
5	MR. PIKE: OBJECTION. THAT IS AN ASSUMPTION.
6	THE COURT: THE QUESTION WAS, WAS THAT YOUR
7	FEELING?
8	THE WITNESS: YES.
9	THE COURT: WAS THAT YOUR FEELING?
10	THE WITNESS: YES.
11	MR. SEATON: JUST SO WE HAVE ESTABLISHED THAT.
12	NOW, IF I MIGHT ARGUE YOUR HONOR.
13	FIRST OF ALL, I AM GOING TO ECHO SENTIMENTS I
14	HEARD A MINUTE AGO THAT I, TOO, AM A LITTLE INSULTED WE ARE
15	DOING THIS RIGHT NOW. WE HAVE TRIAL TACTICS, AND THERE ARE
16	MOTIONS IN LIMINE THAT HAVE PURPOSES BEHIND THEM.
17	WE CAME DOWN HERE, WE ARGUED THIS THING OUT
18	FULLY. TRUE, MR. HARMON IN HIS LISTING SAID HOW DO YOU LIKE
19	THIS, I DID IT, I KILLED MY GRANDPARENTS, ET CETERA.
20	OBVIOUSLY, WE WERE REFERRING TO THE ENTIRETY OF THAT
21	CONVERSATION. THAT CONVERSATION IS THE MOST IMPORTANT THING
22	PROM AN EVIDENTIARY POINT OF VIEW TO THE STATE.
23	WE CAME DOWN HERE. WE ARGUED ALL OF THIS. THE
24	COURT GAVE US A RULING THAT THE THINGS CONTAINED IN PARAGRAPH
25	14 WERE TO BE ADMISSIBLE. AND THE COURT SAID IT WAS BASED ON
	852

THE FACT THAT EARLIER MISS SALDANA HAD SAID THAT THE KNIFE

CONVERSATION WAS SAID TO HER TO INTIMIDATE HER AND FURTHER TO

SOLICIT HER HELP.

AND HERE WE ARE IN THE MIDST OF TRIAL INTERRUPTING THE WHOLE PROCEEDINGS, DOING THIS WHOLE THING ALL OVER AGAIN.

NOW, I AM BOTHERED BY THAT.

NOW, THAT OFF OF MY CHEST, LET ME SUGGEST -- LET ME GO TO MR. SMITH'S SECOND OBJECTION, WHICH NO ONE HAS EVER REALLY ADDRESSED OR ACKNOWLEDGED IN THIS CASE, YET. AND IT'S ALWAYS BOTHERED ME EVERY TIME I HEARD IT, AND THAT IS THE FACT THAT A CO-CONSPIRATOR STATEMENT IS GIVEN WHEN HE DOESN'T HAVE PERSONAL KNOWLEDGE.

HE DIDN'T SEE THE THINGS. DALE WAS IN THE BEDROOM. AND HE HAS SIMPLY BEEN TOLD BY OTHERS WHAT TOM AKERS DID, WHAT ROY MCDOWELL DID, WHAT WALSH AND MOORE DID.

THAT DOESN'T MATTER. IT ABSOLUTELY DOESN'T MATTER. THERE ARE CO-CONSPIRATOR STATEMENTS. HIS CO-CONSPIRATORS TOLD HIM AND MADE HIM KNOWLEDGEABLE, AND HE IS REPEATING THOSE.

AND IF THEY ARE CO-CONSPIRATOR STATEMENTS, THOSE OTHER CO-CONSPIRATORS HAVE TO BEAR THE WEIGHT AND THE BRUNT OF WHATEVER IT IS HE IS REPEATING. THAT IS AN OBJECTION THAT HAS ABSOLUTELY NO STANDING AT THIS PARTICULAR JUNCTURE.

NOW, THE REAL OBJECTION THAT WE ARE OVERHAULING AGAIN IS WHETHER OR NOT THESE WERE SAID IN FURTHERANCE OF THE

CONSPIRACY. THIS COURT VERY CAREFULLY AND CONCISELY AND, I

THINK, CORRECTLY RULED THAT WITH REGARD TO THE KNIFE

CONVERSATION, AND MISS SALDANA HAS REPEATED IT FOR US HERE

TODAY, THAT NOT ONLY THE INTIMIDATION FACTOR, I THINK THAT IS

THE LEAST OF THE TWO ARGUMENTS, BUT THE FACTOR THAT HIS

STATEMENTS WERE MADE TO HER WITH THE HOPE AND THE EXPECTATION

THAT SHE WOULD BACK HIM UP, HE WAS DRAWING HER INTO THE WEB

INSOFAR AS HE COULD.

SO THAT, IF THE POLICE EVER CAME TO HER AND SAID, "WHAT DO YOU KNOW ABOUT THIS?" SHE WOULD KNOW ABOUT IT AND SHE WOULD KNOW THE RIGHT THINGS TO DISPUTE AND THE RIGHT THINGS TO ADMIT IF SHE WERE TO BE STILL ON HIS SIDE.

AND, YOU KNOW, THE NOOSE WAS DRAWING TIGHTER
AROUND THIS GUY'S NECK. IN MID NOVEMBER, THE POLICE CAME AND
ASKED HIM ABOUT THE KNIFE. AND DALE SENT HER AWAY PROBABLY
BECAUSE SHE DIDN'T KNOW ANYTHING ABOUT THE KNIFE, AND HE
DIDN'T WANT HER TO SLIP AND SAY ANYTHING WRONG.

AND HE COMES BACK IN. HE TELLS HER WHAT GOES ON.

TWO WEEKS AFTER THAT, HE COMES WITH THE EXCUSE THAT

BUTTRESSES THAT WHAT SHE BELIEVED ALL ALONG. HE IS SETTING

HER UP FOR AN ALIBI FOR THIS KNIFE.

AND NOW, ONE WEEK LATER, THE NOOSE, IF ANYTHING,
IS GETTING TIGHTER HERE, HE IS GIVING HER MORE INFORMATION.
IS THIS THE EASIEST INFERENCE WE CAN MAKE ACCORDING TO THE KIND
OF INFERENCES THAT WERE MADE IN GOLDSMITH?

IS THIS THE EASIEST INFERENCE WE CAN MAKE THAT HE REALLY IS BANKING ON HER NOW, AND HE IS GOING TO LAY THE WHOLE THING OUT TO HER SO THAT SHE KNOWS THE STORY? I MEAN, OBVIOUSLY, SHE KNEW THE STORY IN THE FIRST PLACE, BECAUSE HE IS TELLING HER ABOUT THE KNIFE, AND NOW THE COPS WON'T HAVE ANYTHING ON HIM. THAT IS TWO WEEKS EARLIER.

SO I SUGGEST TO THE COURT THAT NOT ONLY SHOULD WE NOT BE REARGUING THIS, BUT IF WE ARE, THERE IS THE BEST KIND OF EVIDENCE SHOWING THAT THIS WAS IN FURTHERANCE, AND THE FACT THAT THESE OTHER CODEFENDANTS DON'T LIKE THE FACT THAT DALE IS TELLING HER THESE THINGS AND THE JURY IS NOW GOING TO HEAR THEM IS JUST TOO BAD. BECAUSE IT IS IN THE FURTHERANCE OF A CONSPIRACY, AND IT IS A STATEMENT MADE BY A CO-CONSPIRATOR.

THE COURT: THANK YOU. MR. SMITH.

MR. SMITH: YOUR HONOR, THE STATE PERSISTENTLY HAS FAILED TO ADDRESS THE FACT THAT THERE ARE SIXTH AMENDMENT CONCERNS WHICH ARE BROADER AND, PERHAPS, MORE IMPORTANT THAN SIMPLY WHETHER OR NOT THIS IS, IN FACT, A CO-CONSPIRATOR STATEMENT WHICH WE DON'T CONCEDE.

THE FACT OF THE MATTER IS THAT THE SIXTH AMENDMENT REQUIRES THAT IF SOMEBODY ELSE'S OUT OF COURT TESTIMONY THAT WE CAN'T CONFRONT IS GOING TO BE USED AGAINST US, THEN AT LEAST THAT TESTIMONY MUST STEM FROM SOME PERSONAL BASIS OF KNOWLEDGE.

AND THE STATE CAN'T POINT TO ANYTHING TO INDICATE

HOW IN THE WORLD DALE FLANAGAN CAN SAY, BASED ON HIS OWN
PERSONAL KNOWLEDGE, THAT MY CLIENT SHOT A WEAPON. AND THAT IS
A CRITICAL SIXTH AMENDMENT CONCERN, THIS EVIDENCE. I CAN'T
THINK OF EVIDENCE WHICH COULD BE MORE PREJUDICIAL UNDER THE
CIRCUMSTANCES.

AND IRRESPECTIVE OF HOW YOU FEEL ABOUT THE CO-CONSPIRATOR EXCEPTION TO THE HEARSAY RULE, THERE ARE SERIOUS SIXTH AMENDMENT CONCERNS, WHICH HAVE NOT EVEN BEEN ATTEMPTED TO BE ADDRESSED BY THE STATE.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, MR. SMITH. THANK YOU.

MR. HANDFUSS: YOUR HONOR, I WOULD JOIN IN WITH MR. SMITH. BOTH MR. SMITH AND MYSELF RAISED THIS SIXTH AMENDMENT RIGHT OF CONFRONTATION. LOSS OF RIGHT OF CONFRONTATION AT THE EVIDENTIARY HEARING WOULD RELY ON MR. SMITH.

JUST TO CLEAR THE AIR AS TO WHAT MR. SEATON SAID,
HE WAS INSULTED THIS SHOULD GO ON AT THIS POINT IN TIME,
AND A LOT OF ASKED AND ANSWERED QUESTIONS BY THE STATE.

I WOULD POINT OUT TO THE COURT AND I WOULD MAKE IT VERY CLEAR THAT MY POSITION IS, AS PROBABLY AS EVERY OTHER DEFENSE COUNSEL IS HERE, THAT THEY HAVE DEFENDANTS HERE WHO ARE ON TRIAL FOR MURDER AND WHO MAY VERY WELL GET THE DEATH PENALTY IF THE JURY THINKS THAT IS PROPER.

NOW, AS THE COURT IS AWARE, AS DEFENSE COUNSEL IN A CASE LIKE THIS, WE ARE ENTITLED WIDE LATITUDE IN CROSS-EXAMINATION, ESPECIALLY, IN A CASE LIKE THIS WHERE WE

HAVE INCONSISTENT DEFENSES.

WHEN MR. SMITH'S DEFENSE HAPPENS TO PREJUDICE MY CLIENT BY EVIDENCE THAT NORMALLY WOULD NOT BE BROUGHT OUT AND THE STATE HAS AGREED NOT TO BRING OUT, I THINK THAT ALL DEFENSE COUNSEL SHOULD BE ALLOWED WIDE LATITUDE.

AND WHETHER OR NOT MR. SEATON IS INSULTED, OR WHETHER OR NOT MR. HARMON SAYS IN FRONT OF THE JURY THAT DEFENSE COUNSEL SHOULD KNOW BETTER NOT TO USE THE WORD IMPEACEMENT IS IMPROPER. AND WHETHER ANYBODY IS INSULTED OR NOT IS IRRELEVANT.

AND I APOLOGIZE FOR TAKING UP THE COURT'S TIME ON THIS. IT IS VERY IMPORTANT TO INFORM THE COURT SPECIFICALLY AS TO MY POSITION, HOW I AM SUPPOSED TO DEFEND MR. MCDOWELL IN THIS CASE.

THE COURT: MR. HANDFUSS, I AM NOT SURE IF YOU ARE ADDRESSING THE OBJECTION MR. SMITH FIRST VOICED, OR DO YOU HAVE OTHER AXES TO GRIND HERE.

BUT AS FAR AS ASKED AND ANSWERED AND THAT
OBJECTION, I WOULD GIVE YOU INDICATION AT THIS TIME THAT YOU
MAY COVER AREAS THAT, ALTHOUGH THEY HAVE BEEN COVERED BY OTHER
COUNSEL, WOULD SEEM TO BE IMPORTANT TO YOU.

AS I RECALL MY SUSTAINING MR. HARMON'S OBJECTIONS
AS TO ASKED AND ANSWERED, YOU HAD ASKED THE QUESTIONS
REGARDING THE AREA ON YOUR ORIGINAL DIRECT OR ORIGINAL CROSS,
AND THEN ON RECROSS. YOU SOUGHT TO REPEAT, AND THAT WAS MY

BASIS FOR SUSTAINING THE OBJECTION. 1 BUT ASIDE FROM THAT, YOU WOULD HAVE THE LATITUDE 2 THAT YOU SPEAK OF. 3 MR. HANDFUSS: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR. I SAID THAT WITH ALL DUE RESPECT. 5 THE COURT: MR. SMITH, CONCERNING YOUR MATTERS AND 6 COUNSEL THAT JOINED YOU --7 MR. PIKE: I JOIN, ALSO. 8 MR. POSIN: YES, YOUR HONOR. 9 THE COURT: ALL COUNSEL, VERY GOOD. CONCERNING 10 THE SIXTE AMENDMENT RIGHT THAT YOU ALLUDE TO, COUNSEL, I 11 SUBSCRIBED FRANKLY TO MR. SEATON'S UNDERSTANDING OF WHAT IS 12 REQUIRED IN A CO-CONSPIRATOR STATEMENT AND THE FACT IT NEED 13 NOT BE BASED ON DIRECT PERSONAL KNOWLEDGE. 14 MR. SMITH: I HAVE NO QUARREL WITH THAT POSITION 15 AS FAR AS THAT EXCEPTION IS CONCERNED, YOUR HONOR. 16 THE COURT: CONCERNING YOUR ARGUMENT OF 17 CONFRONTATION, I WOULD SUGGEST NOT TO MINIMIZE THE IMPORTANCE 18 OF CERTAINLY THE SIXTH AMENDMENT RIGHT. BUT YOUR OBJECTION, I 19 THINK, GOES TO CREDIBILITY MORE THAN ADMISSIBILITY. 20 NOW, I UNDERSTAND YOUR POSITION. CERTAINLY, YOU 21 ARE GOING TO ARGUE THAT THERE WERE MANY STATEMENTS MADE 22 HERE WITHOUT DIRECT KNOWLEDGE, THAT IT WAS A CONTINUAL PASSING 23 ON OF INFORMATION. AND IT PROBABLY GREW AS IT WAS PASSED. 24

858

BUT THAT, IN NO WAY, IN MY JUDGMENT, SHOULD

PRECLUDE THE STATE FROM ALLOWING THIS INFORMATION TO COME OUT UNDER THESE CIRCUMSTANCES.

NOW, CONCERNING MISS SALDANA'S DISCUSSION WITH MR.
FLANAGAN, SET OUT IN PARAGRAPH 14 OF THE DOCUMENT THAT THE
STATE PROPOUNDED FOR OUR MUTUAL BENEFIT, IT IS TRUE THAT WE
DID NOT GO INTO THIS DISCUSSION AT LENGTH AT THE EVIDENTIARY
HEARING.

AND I DON'T THINK THERE IS A BASIS FOR ANYBODY
BEING UPSET OR WHATEVER THE WORDS WERE USED. WE JUST DIDN'T
GO INTO THIS. AND WE LEFT A VOID IN OUR DETERMINATION, AND
THAT IS WHY WE ARE HAVING THIS, TO STOP AND RECANT AND GO
BACK.

THE WORD ET CETERA OR THE ABBREVIATION WAS

UTILIZED, AND THAT WOULD COVER A MULTITUDE OF THINGS,

THEORETICALLY. BUT I DID DETERMINE THAT THAT CONVERSATION,

CONCERNING MR. FLANAGAN'S REVELATION THAT, "HOW DO YOU LIKE

THIS, I KILLED MY GRANDPARENTS," WAS ADMISSIBLE IN FURTHERANCE

OF A CONSPIRACY ON THREE BASES.

ONE, IT WAS, IN A SENSE, AN ATTEMPT TO ELICIT
ASSISTANCE FROM MISS SALDANA. SECONDLY, TO INTIMIDATE HER TO
SOME EXTENT. AND, THIRD, TO EXPLAIN TO HER HOW SERIOUS HIS
INVOLVEMENT WAS AND IN HOPES THAT SHE WOULD STOP HER SOMEWHAT
CASUAL DISCUSSIONS WITH THE POLICE WHEN THEY COME TO
INTERVIEW, WHICH SHE HAD REASON TO BELIEVE WAS OCCURRING.
ANY ONE OF THOSE, I THINK, WOULD BE SUFFICIENT.

BUT WHEN TAKEN COLLECTIVELY, THERE IS NO DOUBT THIS WAS MADE

IN FURTHERANCE OF THE CONSPIRACY. IT WOULD BE ADMISSIBLE

UNDER THAT AUSPICES.

 NOW, I DON'T KNOW HOW FAR. I, FRANKLY, DON'T KNOW WHAT ALL WAS DISCUSSED. I AM GOING TO ASSUME IT WAS PRETTY MUCH WHAT WE HAVE HEARD PREVIOUS WITH SOME OF THE OTHER WITNESSES. IF WE SHOULD BE SURPRISED TO THAT EXTENT, THEN WE MIGHT WANT TO DISCUSS IT FURTHER WITH COUNSEL.

BUT AT THIS TIME, I AM GOING TO OVERRULE THE OBJECTION.

MR. POSIN: MIGHT I BE HEARD WITH REGARD TO THAT?

THE COURT INDICATED IT WAS A QUESTION OF

CREDIBILITY WITH REGARD TO THIS WITNESS'S TESTIMONY. AND I

HAVE NO PROBLEM WITH HER CREDIBILITY.

IN OTHER WORDS, I AM SURE SHE WILL TESTIFY AND RELATE AS BEST SHE CAN OR AS ACCURATELY AS SHE CAN WHAT SHE UNDERSTANDS THE TESTIMONY ACCURATELY OF THE STATEMENTS THAT WERE MADE BY DALE FLANAGAN.

THE QUESTION ISN'T SO MUCH CREDIBILITY AS THE RELIABILITY OF THE STATEMENTS, AND IT IS THAT TO WHICH WE ARE ADDRESSING THIS OBJECTION. THAT IS WHY THE SIXTH AMENDMENT CONCERN WITH CONFRONTATION IS SO CRITICAL AND IMPORTANT.

AND I WOULD LIKE THE RECORD TO REFLECT THAT FURTHER ARGUMENT, IF YOUR HONOR PLEASE, WITH REGARD TO THE COURT'S RULING.

THE COURT: THAT IS FINE, MR. POSIN. I THINK I 1 DIDN'T MAKE MYSELF CLEAR TO YOU IN THAT EXTENT. WHEN I WAS 2 REFERRING TO CREDIBILITY, I MEANT THE STATEMENT MADE BY MR. 3 PLANAGAN TO HER WITHOUT DIRECT KNOWLEDGE, WHICH WOULD SEEM TO BE THE ARGUMENT OF COUNSEL. 5 THEREIN LIES THE LACK OF CREDIBILITY, POSSIBLY. AND IT IS SOMETHING THAT WOULD BE, I AM SURE, CAPITALIZED ON 7 AT THE PROPER TIME. 8 MR. BAILIFF. 9 (JURY ENTERS THE COURTROOM.) 10 THE COURT: WILL COUNSEL STIPULATE THAT ALL 11 MEMBERS OF THE JURY ARE PRESENT AND PROPERLY SEATED? 12 MR. POSIN: SO STIPULATED. 13 THE COURT: PROCEED, PLEASE. 14 MR. SEATON: MISS COURT REPORTER, WOULD YOU FIND 15 THE PLACE WHERE WE WERE BEFORE WE BROKE JUST A FEW MINUTES 16 AGO? 17 THE COURT: THERE WAS AN OBJECTION ABOUT THAT TIME 18 BY MR. PIKE INDICATING THAT IT WAS -- SHOULD NOT BE HER 19 PREROGATIVE TO DETERMINE WHAT HE WAS ASSUMING. I ASKED HER 20 FURTHER, "WAS THIS YOUR UNDERSTANDING AS TO WHAT HE ASSUMED"? 21 THE WITNESS: YES. 22 THE COURT: AND HER ANSWER WAS YES. 23 MR. PIKE: YOUR HONOR, DOES THAT MEAN MY OBJECTION 24 WAS OVERRULED? I ASK FOR SPECIFIC RULING ON MY OBJECTION. 25

ì	
1	THE COURT: WELL, WITH THAT CLARIFICATION, YES.
2	BY MR. SEATON:
3	Q DID DALE FLANAGAN TELL YOU WHETHER OR NOT HE AND
4	THE OTHERS LEFT RANDY MOORE'S APARTMENT ON NOVEMBER THE 5TH?
5	A YES.
6	Q AND DID HE SAY WHO LEFT THE APARTMENT WITH HIM?
7	A HE STATED THAT ALL OF THEM, ALL SIX OF THEM.
8	Q DID HE JUST SAY IT THAT WAY, OR DID HE NAME THEM?
9	A HE JUST SAID, "ALL OF US." THAT'S IT.
LO	Q AND DID HE SAY WHERE THEY WENT?
11	A HE STATED THAT THEY WENT DIRECTLY TO HIS
12	GRANDPARENTS' HOUSE.
13	Q DID HE TELL YOU HOW THEY GOT THERE?
14	A BY THOMAS AKERS' CAR.
15	Q DID HE SAY WHO WAS DRIVING THAT CAR?
16	A THOMAS.
17	Q DID HE INDICATE TO YOU WHERE EVERYONE ELSE WAS
18	SEATED IN THE CAR?
19	A NO, HE DIDN'T.
20	Q DID HE INDICATE TO YOU, DID HE SAY ANYTHING TO YOU
21	ABOUT GUNS?
22	A NOT ON THE DRIVE. BUT HE STATED THAT RANDY MOORE,
23	JOHN LUCKETT, AND HIMSELF, DALE FLANAGAN, HAD WEAPONS.
24	Q DID HE SAY WHAT KIND OF A WEAPON RANDY MOORE HAD?
25	A A RIFLE OF SOME SORT.

1	Q DO YOU KNOW ITS CALIBER?
2	A NO, I DON'T.
3	Q DID HE SAY WHAT KIND OF A WEAPON THAT JOHNNY RAY
4	LUCKETT HAD?
5	A A RIFLE, ALSO.
6	Q DID HE SAY WHAT CALIBER IT WAS?
7	A NO.
8	Q DID HE TELL YOU WHAT SORT OF A GUN HE, DALE
9	PLANAGAN, HAD?
.0	A HE STATED THAT HE HAD A HANDGUN.
1	Q DID HE TELL YOU ITS CALIBER?
12	A NO, HE DIDN'T.
13	Q DID HE TELL YOU WHERE TOM AKERS WENT AFTER THEY
L4	ARRIVED AT THE GRANDPARENTS' HOUSE?
15	A THEY WENT TO DALE'S TRAILER.
16	THE COURT: I AM GOING TO INTERRUPT JUST A MOMENT.
L7	MISS SALDANA, WHEN YOU ARE ASKED A QUESTION DID HE
18	TELL YOU THIS, I WANT YOU TO RESPOND IF HE DID TELL YOU THAT.
19	BUT DO NOT JUST RELATE WHAT YOU MAY THINK YOU KNOW AT THIS
20	POINT. IS THAT PAIR ENOUGH?
21	THE WITNESS: OKAY, OKAY.
22	BY MR. SEATON:
23	Q DID DALE PLANAGAN TELL YOU WHERE THE OTHER FIVE
24	PEOPLE WENT?
25	A YES.
	863

ı	
1	Q AND WHERE DID HE TELL YOU THEY WENT?
2	A HE STATED THEY WENT TO THE HOUSE, TO HIS
3	GRANDPARENTS' HOUSE.
4	Q DID HE TELL YOU WHAT PART OF THE HOUSE THEY WENT
5	TO?
6	A YES.
7	Q AND WHERE IN THE HOUSE DID THEY GO TO?
8	A THEY WENT ON THE OUTSIDE TO THE RIGHT SIDE WINDOW,
9	WHICH IS NEXT TO HIS GRANDMOTHER'S BEDROOM.
10	Q IS THAT THE SAME BROKEN WINDOW THAT YOU HAD
11	REPERRED TO EARLIER IN YOUR TESTIMONY?
12	A YES.
13	Q DID HE TELL YOU WHAT HAPPENED TO THAT WINDOW?
14	A YES.
15	Q WHAT DID HE SAY HAPPENED TO THE WINDOW?
16	A HE STATED THAT HE GAVE RANDY MOORE A KNIFE TO CUT
17	OPEN THE SCREEN. IT WASN'T WORKING WELL. HE THREW IT DOWN.
18	SO DALE, HIMSELF, HAD BROKEN OPEN THE WINDOW AND HAD GOTTEN
19	IN.
20	Q DID HE SAY DID DALE TELL YOU HOW HE BROKE THE
21	WINDOW HIMSELP?
22	A DALE HAD TOLD ME WITH A STICK.
23	Q DID DALE TELL YOU WHAT HE DID AFTER HE BROKE THE
24	WINDOW?
25	A YES.

1	Q AND WHAT DID HE DO? WHAT DID HE TELL YOU HE DID?
2	A HE STATED THAT HE WENT INTO THE BEDROOM OF HIS
3 -	GRANDMOTHER'S, AND SHE WOKE UP SCREAMING. AND HE WRESTLED HER
4	TO THE BED, PUT HIS HAND OVER HER MOUTH, AND SHOT HER.
5	BUT HE STATED HE SHOT HER ONCE. HE STATED TO ME
6	HE SHOT HER ONCE.
7	Q DALE FLANAGAN TOLD YOU THAT HE WRESTLED HIS
8	GRANDMOTHER TO THE BED, COVERED HER MOUTH WITH HIS HAND?
9	A YES.
10	Q AND SHOT HER ONCE?
11	A YES.
12	Q WITH THE PISTOL THAT HE HAD?
13	A YES.
14	Q DID DALE, IN THIS CONVERSATION, TELL YOU WHAT
15	HAPPENED TO THE GRANDFATHER ON NOVEMBER THE 5TH?
16	A YES.
17	Q WHAT DID HE TELL YOU?
18	A HE DIDN'T STATE WHETHER OR NOT THE OTHER BOYS HAD
19	GOTTEN INTO THE HOUSE. BUT HE DID STATE WHILE HE WAS
20	WRESTLING HIS GRANDMOTHER TO THE BED AND ALL THAT, THAT HIS
21	GRANDFATHER WAS COMING DOWN THE STAIRS YELLING, AND THAT
22	JOHNNY RAY AND RANDY MOORE HAD SHOT HIM.
23	Q DID HE SAY HOW MANY TIMES JOHNNY RAY AND RANDY
24	MOORE SHOT THE GRANDFATHER?
25	A YES.

2	A APPROXIMATELY, SEVEN OR EIGHT TIMES.
3	Q DID HE DISTINGUISH BETWEEN THE NUMBERS OF SHOTS
4	FIRED BETWEEN RANDY MOORE AND JOHNNY RAY LUCKETT?
5	A NO, HE DIDN'T.
6	Q DID HE TELL YOU WHETHER OR NOT HE HAD SHOT HIS
7	GRANDMOTHER BEFORE OR AFTER HE HEARD THE GRANDFATHER COMING
8	DOWN THE STAIRS SCREAMING?
9	A ASK THAT ONE MORE TIME, PLEASE.
10	Q LET ME ASK IT A LITTLE DIFFERENTLY. PERHAPS, IT
11	WILL HELP. DID HE TELL YOU THE SEQUENCE OF EVENTS?
12	LET ME GO A LITTLE FURTHER. YOU INDICATED THAT HE
13	SHOT HIS GRANDMOTHER AND THAT HE HEARD HIS GRANDFATHER COMING
14	DOWN THE STEPS SCREAMING. DID HE INDICATE TO YOU THE ORDER IN
15	WHICH THOSE EVENTS OCCURRED?
16	A HIS GRANDMOTHER WAS FIRST. HE HAD SHOT HIS
17	GRANDMOTHER FIRST.
18	Q AND THEN, HE HEARD HIS GRANDFATHER COMING DOWN THE
19	STAIRS SCREAMING?
20	A YES.
21	Q AND IS IT THEN THAT RANDY MOORE AND JOHNNY RAY
22	LUCKETT SHOT THE GRANDFATHER SEVEN OR EIGHT TIMES?
23	A YES.
24	Q DID HE TELL YOU WHETHER OR NOT ANY OF THE OTHERS,
25	THAT IS, PEOPLE OTHER THAN HIMSELF, WENT INTO THE HOUSE?
	866

1	λ	I THINK I RECALL HIM SAYING THAT MIKE WALSH HAD
2	WENT INTO T	HE HOUSE, BUT HE DIDN'T SAY THAT THE OTHERS WENT.
3	Q	HE DIDN'T SAY ONE WAY OR ANOTHER?
4	A	RIGHT. HE DIDN'T SAY IF THE OTHER BOYS HAD WENT.
5	BUT I THINK	I REMEMBER HIM STATING THAT MIKE WALSH HAD BEEN IN
6	THE HOUSE.	
7	Q	DID HE TELL YOU WHETHER OR NOT ANYTHING WAS TAKEN
8	FROM THE HO	USE?
9	λ	YES.
10	Q	WHAT DID HE SAY ABOUT THAT?
11	λ	HE SAID THAT HE HAD TAKEN HIS GRANDMOTHER'S PURSE
12	FROM THE FR	CONT LIVING ROOM CLOSET.
13	Q	YOU SAID THAT HE SAID HE HAD TAKEN HIS
14	GRANDMOTHER	'S PURSE FROM THE CLOSET. DO YOU MEAN THAT DALE,
15	HIMSELF, HA	AD TAKEN THE PURSE?
16	A	YES.
17	Q	AND HE SAID THAT TO YOU?
18	λ	YES.
19	Q	DID HE TELL YOU ABOUT LEAVING THE HOUSE?
20	λ	YES.
21	Q	DID HE SAY HOW THEY LEFT THE HOUSE?
22	λ	HE SAID THAT HE GRABBED THE PURSE, AND THEY WENT
23	OUT, ALL -	- WELL, HE SAID HIMSELF. AND THEY HAD GOTTEN INTO
24	THE CAR.	•
25		HE DIDN'T SAY WHETHER THE BOYS HAD WENT IN THE

1	HOUSE OR THROUGH THE HOUSE OR ANYTHING. HE JUST SAID THAT
2	THEY GOT IN THE CAR AND DROVE AWAY.
3	Q DID HE SAY ANYTHING ABOUT STARTING THE CAR, HAVING
4.	TROUBLE STARTING THE CAR?
5	A NO. THAT WAS THOMAS'S THING.
6	Q DID HE TELL YOU WHERE DID HE TELL YOU IF
7	EVERYONE GOT INTO THE CAR?
8	A YES. HE SAID EVERYONE. HE SAID, "ALL OF US."
9	FROM WHAT I REMEMBER, HE SAID, "ALL OF US."
10	Q AND DID HE TELL YOU WHERE ALL OF THEM WENT AFTER
11	THEY GOT INTO THE AUTOMOBILE?
12	A DALE, HIMSELF, STATED THAT THEY WENT DIRECTLY TO
13	RANDY MOORE'S HOUSE.
14	Q AND WHEN THEY GOT TO RANDY MOORE'S HOUSE, DID DALE
15	TELL YOU ANYTHING ABOUT THE PURSE THAT WAS TAKEN?
16	A NO. HE DIDN'T SAY WHAT HE HAD DONE WITH IT.
17	Q DID HE SAY WHAT THEY DID WITH THE RIFLES AND THE
18	PISTOL?
19	A NO.
20	Q DID HE TELL YOU ANYTHING ABOUT ANY THREATS HAVING
21	BEEN MADE?
22	A I DON'T UNDERSTAND.
23	Q DID HE TELL YOU WHETHER OR NOT ANY OF THE SIX
24	INDIVIDUALS THREATENED ANYBODY ELSE, ANY OF THE OTHER SIX
25	INDIVIDUALS?

1	A DALE HADN'T STATED ANYTHING TO ME HIMSELF.
2	Q HE JUST DIDN'T TELL YOU ANYTHING ABOUT THAT?
3	A HUH-UH.
4	Q OKAY. MISS SALDANA, YOU HAD MENTIONED EARLIER IN
5	YOUR TESTIMONY THAT DALE THOUGHT THAT THERE WAS A WILL IN
6	WHICH HE WAS THE NAMED BENEFICIARY?
7	A YES.
8	Q DID YOU EVER HAVE AN OPPORTUNITY TO LOOK FOR THAT
9	WILL?
10	A YES.
11	Q WHERE DID YOU LOOK FOR THE WILL?
12	A IN THE HOUSE, IN THE R.V., IN THE GARAGE, IN THE
13	CARS.
14	Q HOW OFTEN DID YOU DO THAT?
15	A WE DID IT EVERY DAY FOR ABOUT A WEEK.
16	Q WHEN YOU SAY THAT WE LOOKED FOR THE WILL, DO YOU
17	MEAN DALE FLANAGAN AND YOURSELF?
18	A YES. DALE FLANAGAN, MYSELF, HIS SISTER, HIS
19	MOTHER, HIS AUNT, AND HIS MOTHER'S BOYFRIEND, AND ANOTHER
20	GENTLEMAN WHO I DON'T KNOW.
21	Q DID YOU EVER FIND THE WILL?
22	A NO, WE DIDN'T.
23	MR. SEATON: THAT CONCLUDES DIRECT EXAMINATION.
24	THE COURT: CROSS-EXAMINATION?
25	MR. SMITH: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.
	869

2	BY MR. SMITH:
3	Q MISS SALDANA, WHEN WAS THIS THIRD CONVERSATION YOU
4	HAD WITH DALE, DO YOU REMEMBER SPECIFICALLY WHEN IT WAS,
5	SOMETIME IN DECEMBER?
6	A WEICH CONVERSATION?
7	Q THE THIRD CONVERSATION, THE ONE IN THE TRAILER
8	WHERE HE SAID, "HOW DO YOU LIKE THIS?"
9	A THE DAY AFTER MY BIRTHDAY, THE 5TH.
10	Q THE 5TH OF DECEMBER?
11	A YES.
12	Q THAT WAS A MONTH AFTER THE KILLINGS OCCURRED?
13	A YES.
14	Q WHEN HE TOLD YOU WHAT HE DID, WAS IT YOUR
15	UNDERSTANDING THAT RIGHT AFTER THE WINDOW WAS BROKEN THAT DALE
16	WENT INTO HIS GRANDMOTHER'S ROOM?
17	A YES.
18	Q AND YOU ARE FAMILIAR WITH THE LAYOUT OF THE HOUSE

ON WASHBURN ROAD?

Q

YES.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

1

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

870

SEE THE GRANDFATHER COMING DOWN THE STEPS, IS ONE?

THE RESIDENCE AFTER HE SHOT HIS GRANDMOTHER?

NO. BUT YOU CAN SEE THE WINDOW.

IF A PERSON IS IN THE BEDROOM, ONE IS NOT ABLE TO

RIGHT. NOW, DID HE STATE WHAT ELSE HE DID INSIDE

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

	•	
	A	DALE STATED THAT HE GOT THE PURSE, THAT HE STATED
THAT I	E HAD	SHOT HIS GRANDMOTHER, HE CAME OUT, AND HIS
GRANDI	fath er,	, I THINK, AT THAT TIME WAS ALREADY DOWN ON THE
BOTTO	OF T	HE STAIRS.
	Q ,	SO BY THE TIME HE CAME OUT OF THE BEDROOM, THE
Grandi	fath er	HAD ALREADY BEEN SHOT AND WAS LYING DOWN?
	λ	YES.

Q WHAT DID HE DO IN THE HOUSE AFTER THAT, BASED ON WHAT HE TOLD YOU?

A HE HAD WENT TO THE LIVING ROOM CLOSET AND TAKEN OUT A PURSE.

- Q AND DID HE SAY WHAT HE DID WITH THE PURSE?
- A NO.
- Q AND WHAT DID HE SAY THAT MIKE WALSH DID WHILE MIKE WALSH WAS IN THE HOUSE?

A I THINK HE STATED THAT MIKE HAD JUST MUFFED UP THE LIVING ROOM A TINY BIT TO MAKE IT LOOK LIKE IT WAS A ROBBERY.

- Q WHAT DID HE SAY RANDY DID WHILE RANDY WAS IN THE HOUSE?
 - A HE DIDN'T SAY THAT RANDY WAS IN THE HOUSE.
 - Q HE NEVER SAID RANDY WENT INSIDE THE HOUSE?
 - A NO.
 - Q WHAT DID HE SAY ABOUT ROY MCDOWELL?
- A HE DIDN'T, HE DIDN'T. HE JUST SAID THAT HE WAS THERE. HE DIDN'T SAY HE DID ANYTHING.

1	Q HE DIDN'T SAY HE DID ANITHING!
2	A NO.
3	Q DID HE SAY JOHN LUCKETT WENT IN THE HOUSE?
4	A NO.
5	Q THE ONLY STATEMENT THAT YOU RECALL HIM MAKING ON
6	THE 5TH OF DECEMBER IS THAT, APPARENTLY, JOHN FIRED ONE OR
7	MORE SHOTS, JOHN LUCKETT?
8	A YES.
9	Q NOW, DID HE TELL YOU, "GEE, ANGIE, I SAW JOHN FIRE
10	A SHOT. " HE DIDN'T SAY THAT, DID HE?
11	A NO.
12	Q AND BASED ON WHAT HE TOLD YOU, YOU HAVE NO WAY OF
13	KNOWING IF WHAT HE SAID HE SAW JOHN LUCKETT DO WAS SOMETHING
14	HE OBSERVED, OR SOMETHING HE WAS TOLD, OR SOMETHING HE MADE
15	UP?
16	A I HAVE NO WAY OF KNOWING.
17	Q JUST, SIMPLY, THAT STATEMENT WAS MADE?
18	A HE HAD SAID THAT JOHN RAY AND RANDY MOORE WERE
19	THROWING SHOTS.
20	Q DURING YOUR RELATIONSHIP WITH DALE, DID HE TELL
21	YOU ABOUT HIS CLOSE FEELINGS FOR MIKE WALSH?
22	A I DON'T REMEMBER. THIS HAS BEEN A WHILE.
23	Q I KNOW IT HAS. YOU ARE AWARE HE WAS CLOSE WITH
24	MIKE?
25	A I WAS MORE AWARE HE WAS CLOSE WITH RANDY THAN
	672

_	
1	MIKE.
2	Q WERE YOU AWARE RANDY WAS VERY CLOSE WITH MIKE?
3	A NO.
4	Q DID HE TELL YOU ABOUT THE FACT THAT THERE WAS A
5	PLAN TO PROTECT MIKE FROM WHAT HAD HAPPENED?
6	A WHO IS HE?
7	Q DALE, THE PERSON WE ARE TALKING ABOUT, DALE?
8	A A PLAN TO PROTECT MIKE?
9	Q NO.
.0	A HE DIDN'T STATE THAT.
11	Q DID HE TELL YOU ABOUT WHAT THE PLAN WAS THAT WAS
12	MADE AT RANDY'S APARTMENT BEFORE THEY CAME TO THE RESIDENCE?
13	A YES.
L 4	Q DID HE TELL WHAT PEOPLE WERE SUPPOSED TO DO?
15	A YES. HE STATED THAT WELL, HE DIDN'T STATE
16	WHICH PEOPLE. HE JUST STATED THEY WERE GOING TO MAKE IT LOOK
17	LIKE A ROBBERY, AND THAT RANDY MOORE AND JOHNNY RAY LUCKETT
18	WERE SUPPOSED TO HAVE WEAPONS.
19	MR. POSIN: SUPPOSED TO HAVE? UNDERSTANDING THAT
20	TESTIMONY OF THE WITNESS IS COMING OUT GARBLED.
21	THE COURT: WOULD YOU REPEAT THAT SLOWLY, A LITTLE
22	LOUDER?
23	THE WITNESS: HE STATED THAT RANDY AND JOHNNY RAY
24	LUCKETT, RANDY MOORE AND JOHNNY RAY LUCKETT WERE SUPPOSED TO
25	HAVE WEAPONS AND HIMSELF, DALE, AND THAT'S IT.

i	
1	BY MR. SMITH:
2	Q THAT IS WHAT WAS SUPPOSED TO HAVE OCCURRED?
3	A THAT IS WHAT I WAS TOLD. THAT IS ALL I CAN SAY.
4	Q WELL, WHAT I AM TRYING TO GET AT, AND I THINK YOU
5	ARE GETTING AT YOURSELF, HE TOLD YOU THAT THERE WAS A PLAN
6	WHEN THEY LEFT THE RESIDENCE ABOUT WHAT PEOPLE WERE SUPPOSED
7	TO DO, RIGHT?
8	A YES.
9	NOW, IN THINKING BACK ON THIS CONVERSATION, WHICH
10	OCCURRED ABOUT TEN MONTHS AGO, CAN YOU SPECIFICALLY RECALL
11	WHAT HE SAID ACTUALLY OCCURRED AS OPPOSED TO WHAT HE SAID WAS
12	SUPPOSED TO HAVE OCCURRED? CAN YOU REMEMBER THIS CONVERSATION
13	JUST CRYSTAL CLEAR AS YOU SIT THERE?
14	A YES.
15	Q YOU SEEM A LITTLE UNCERTAIN ABOUT THAT. DO YOU
16	SIT THERE AND YOU CAN JUST REMEMBER THE WORDS VERBATIM?
17	A NOT WORD FOR WORD. BUT I DO REMEMBER HOW I FELT
18	AND WHAT HE WAS SAYING.
19	Q THE CONVERSATION YOU HAD WITH HIM ABOUT THESE
20	EVENTS LASTED ABOUT 45 MINUTES TO AN HOUR, DIDN'T THEY?
21	A YES.
22	Q HAVE YOU TOLD US EVERYTHING YOU CAN REMEMBER THAT

Q THAT IS WHAT WAS SUPPOSED TO HAVE OCCURRED?
A THAT IS WHAT I WAS TOLD. THAT IS ALL I CAN SAY.
Q WELL, WHAT I AM TRYING TO GET AT, AND I THINK YOU
TTING AT YOURSELP, HE TOLD YOU THAT THERE WAS A PLAN
HEY LEFT THE RESIDENCE ABOUT WHAT PEOPLE WERE SUPPOSED
RIGHT?
A YES.
NOW, IN THINKING BACK ON THIS CONVERSATION, WHICH
ED ABOUT TEN MONTES AGO, CAN YOU SPECIFICALLY RECALL
E SAID ACTUALLY OCCURRED AS OPPOSED TO WHAT HE SAID WAS
ED TO HAVE OCCURRED? CAN YOU REMEMBER THIS CONVERSATION
RYSTAL CLEAR AS YOU SIT THERE?
A YES.
Q YOU SEEM A LITTLE UNCERTAIN ABOUT THAT. DO YOU
ERE AND YOU CAN JUST REMEMBER THE WORDS VERBATIM?
A NOT WORD FOR WORD. BUT I DO REMEMBER HOW I FELT
AT HE WAS SAYING.
Q THE CONVERSATION YOU HAD WITH HIM ABOUT THESE
LASTED ABOUT 45 MINUTES TO AN HOUR, DIDN'T THEY?

EVERYTHING THAT HE SAID, YES. I MEAN, THERE HAS BEEN MORE.

I HAVE ANSWERED YOUR QUESTIONS AS FAR AS

HE TOLD YOU DURING THAT 45 MINUTES TO AN HOUR?

1	BUT IT WASN'T ANYTHING THAT I LEFT OUT ON MY STATEMENT. I
2	ANSWERED YOUR QUESTIONS.
3.	Q IN TRUTH I KNOW YOU HAVE ANSWERED MY QUESTION.
4	ANSWER THIS ONE.
5	IN TRUTH AND IN PACT, YOU WERE TOLD A LOT MORE BY
6	DALE ON THE 5TH OF DECEMBER OF LAST YEAR ABOUT WHAT HAPPENED
7	THAN YOU HAVE TOLD US HERE IN COURT, RIGHT, BECAUSE OF THE
8	LENGTH OF THE CONVERSATION?
9	A I WOULDN'T GO SO FAR AS A LOT MORE. THERE WAS A
10	LOT OF REPEATING. I WAS VERY NERVOUS. I HAD TO SIT THERE AND
11	LISTEN, AND IT WAS A LOT OF REPEATING.
12	Q YOU MAINLY SAT THERE AND LISTENED WHILE HE DID
13	MOST OF THE TALKING, ABOUT OVER 45 MINUTES OR AN HOUR?
14	A WHAT AM I GOING TO SAY TO HIM, WHY DID YOU?
15	Q I AM NOT CRITICIZING.
16	A WHY ARE YOU ASKING ME THESE QUESTIONS?
17	Q I DON'T WANT YOU TO GET UPSET.
18	A I CAN'T HELP IT. YOU UPSET ME.
19	Q AM I DOING SOMETHING YOU DON'T LIKE?
20	A I THINK YOU ARE TRYING TO CONFUSE ME, AND YOU ARE
21	DOING VERY WELL.
22	Q ARE YOU GOOD AND CONFUSED? WOULD THAT BE A GOOD
23	WAY TO FORGET?
24	A NOT GOOD AND CONFUSED, NOT YET.
25	Q LET'S THINK BACK. BECAUSE THIS IS REAL IMPORTANT,

2	WHAT DID HE TELL YOU ABOUT WHAT HAPPENED OR WHAT
3	WAS SUPPOSED TO HAVE HAPPENED THAT YOU DIDN'T PUT IN YOUR
4	STATEMENT THE FIRST TIME YOU WENT TO THE POLICE?
5	A ONLY THAT I HAD ASKED HIM AFTER HE HAD TOLD ME "HOW
6	DO YOU LIKE THIS, I DID IT, I KILLED MY GRANDPARENTS, " I SAID,
7	"WHY?" HE STATED, "FOR THE WILL."
8	HE DIDN'T GET ALONG WITH HIS GRANDPARENTS. HE
9	DIDN'T LIKE THEM THAT MUCH, ESPECIALLY, HIS GRANDMOTHER. AND
10	THEN, HE WENT INTO DESCRIPTION OF WHAT HAD HAPPENED. AND HE
11 .	WAS TAKING HIS TIME.
12	Q AND THAT IS A DESCRIPTION ABOUT WHAT HAPPENED AND
13	WHAT'S SUPPOSED TO HAVE HAPPENED. IT TOOK ABOUT 30 MINUTES,
14	DIDN'T IT, YOU WOULD HAVE TO SAY AT LEAST THAT LONG?
15	A AT LEAST, AT THE LEAST.
16	Q AT THE LEAST?
17	A AT THE LEAST.
18	Q AND IT IS YOUR TESTIMONY YOU CAN'T REMEMBER HIM
19	TELLING YOU ANYTHING ABOUT WHAT ROY MCDOWELL DID?
20	A HE DIDN'T. THAT IS WHAT I HAVE BEEN TRYING TO
21	TELL YOU.
22	Q HE DIDN'T TELL YOU WHAT MIKE WALSH DID OTHER THAN
23	A LITTLE HE MADE IT LOOK LIKE A MURDER?
24	A THAT'S IT.
25	Q THE ONLY THING HE TOLD YOU ABOUT JOHN LUCKETT
	876

BECAUSE PEOPLE'S LIVES ARE ON TRIAL.

1	IS THAT ONE THING THAT YOU REMEMBER TODAY, THAT'S ALL?
2	A THAT'S IT.
3	Q HOW MUCH HAVE YOU BEEN PAID FOR YOUR TESTIMONY IN
4	THIS CASE?
5	A WHAT DO YOU MEAN?
6	Q EXACTLY WHAT I SAID.
7	A PAID BY UNDER WHAT INTENTIONS?
8	Q SECRET WITNESS FUND.
9	A THE AMOUNT SECRET WITNESS PAYS FOR THE FIRST TIME,
10	I HAVEN'T BEEN PAID YET. AND I HAD NO INTENTION, I HAD NO
11	IDEA.
12	Q JUST ANSWER MY QUESTION.
13	MR. SEATON: I THINK SHE IS TRYING TO ANSWER HIS
14	QUESTION.
15	THE COURT: WELL, I THINK SHE MIGHT BE A LITTLE
16	CONFUSED ABOUT IT.
17	THE WITNESS: TWO THOUSAND, ARE YOU HAPPY?
18	THE COURT: JUST A MINUTE, MA'AM.
19	THE WITNESS: I AM REALLY UPSET.
20	THE COURT: JUST RELAX. I THINK YOU CAUGHT HER
21	UNAWARE, COUNSEL. YOU MIGHT HAVE INDICATED SECRET WITNESS,
22	AND THEN PROCEEDING AHEAD.
23	BY MR. SMITE:
24	Q YOU EXPECT TO BE PAID \$2,000?
25	A YES.

1	Q	HAVE YOU BEEN PAID ANY PORTION OF THAT?
2	. λ	NO.
3	Q	DO YOU KNOW WHY YOU HAVEN'T BEEN PAID YET?
4	λ	BECAUSE I HAVEN'T FINISHED TESTIFYING YET, THAT'S
5	WHY.	
6	Q	DID YOU COORDINATE YOUR EFFORTS TO RECEIVE MONEY
7	PROM SECRET	WITNESS WITE A JOHN LUCAS?
8	A	COULD YOU REPHRASE THAT IN VERY SIMPLE ENGLISH,
9	PLEASE?	
10		THE COURT: GO AHEAD. REPHRASE IT, COUNSEL.
11	BY MR. SMIT	B:
12	Q	DID YOU COORDINATE YOUR GOING TO SECRET WITNESS IN
13	ORDER TO GE	T PAID FOR TESTIFYING WITE JOHN LUCAS?
14	λ	I STILL DON'T I MEAN
15		THE COURT: COORDINATION.
16		THE WITNESS: YOU MEAN NOW, BEFORE?
17	BY MR. SMIT	H:
18	Q	AT ANY TIME?
19	A	I HAD NO IDEA ABOUT SECRET WITNESS WHEN I WENT TO
20	MAKE MY STA	TEMENT.
21	Q	WHEN DID YOU LEARN YOU WOULD BE ELIGIBLE FOR
22	PAYMENT OF	\$2,000 FOR TESTIMONY IN THIS CASE?
23	A	AFTER THE STATEMENT WAS MADE.
24	Q	AND HAVE YOU HAD A CHANCE TO TALK WITH JOHN LUCAS
25	ABOUT RECEI	TVING MONEY FROM SECRET WITNESS?
		878

- 1	
2	Q DO YOU KNOW JOHN LUCAS?
3	A YES. I KNOW WHO HE IS. I DON'T KNOW HIM WELL.
4	Q HE IS A FRIEND OF YOURS, IS HE NOT?
5	A NO.
6	Q YOU HAVE DISCUSSED THIS CASE WITH HIM SINCE THE
7	5TH OF NOVEMBER, HAVE YOU NOT?
8	A I HAVE NOT KEPT IN CONTACT. THIS IS THE ONLY
9	PLACE THAT I HAVE EVER SEEN ANYBODY. THIS IS IT.
10	Q HAVE YOU TALKED WITH JOHN LUCAS ABOUT GETTING
11	MONEY FROM SECRET WITNESS SINCE THE 5TH OF NOVEMBER OF LAST
12	YEAR, YES OR NO? IT IS A VERY SIMPLE QUESTION.
13	A TO MY KNOWLEDGE, NO. I HAVEN'T TALKED WITH JOHN
14	LUCAS THAT MUCH. I ASKED HIM WHAT HAS HAPPENED IN HERE,
15	THAT'S IT.
16	Q HAS HE TOLD YOU WHAT HE HAS SAID IN HERE?
17	A NO. ONLY SAID WHAT WAS GOING TO HAPPEN AND WHO
18	WAS NEXT, THAT WAS IT. HIS ASSUMPTION OF THE TRIAL, OF
19	COURT.
20	Q DID HE TELL YOU WHAT HE HAD TESTIFIED TO?
21	A NO.
22	Q DO YOU KNOW WHAT HE'S TESTIFIED TO?
23	A I GUESS.
24	Q HAVE YOU READ ANY OF THE STATEMENTS WHICH HE'S
25	MADE IN COURT, HAVE YOU HAD AN OPPORTUNITY TO READ THEM?

- 1	
1	A NO.
2	Q THE WITNESS'S STATEMENTS AND THE TRANSCRIPTS OF
3	THE TESTIMONY?
4	A NO. ONLY MINE, THAT'S IT.
5	Q TEANK YOU.
6	MR. SMITH: YOUR HONOR, I DON'T HAVE ANY FURTHER
7	QUESTIONS.
8	THE COURT: THANK YOU, MR. SMITH. COUNSEL?
9	MR. HANDFUSS: YOUR HONOR, I AM WONDERING, MY
10	CROSS-EXAMINATION MIGHT BE SOMEWHAT LENGTHY, SEEING THE HOUR.
11	IF ANYBODY ELSE HAS SHORTER, PERHAPS WE COULD TAKE OUR BREAK
12	FOR THIS AFTERNOON.
13	THE COURT: WE HAVE HAD OUR BREAK FOR THIS
14	AFTERNOON.
15	MR. HANDFUSS: WHAT I MEANT IS IT IS CLOSE TO FIVE
16	BUT I WILL START IF THE COURT WISHES.
17	THE COURT: IF THERE IS ANOTHER DEFENSE COUNSEL
18	CARE TO GO UNDER THE AUSPICES OF WHAT COUNSEL HAS SAID, BUT,
19	IF NOT, WE CAN RESUME TOMORROW. PROCEED.
20	
21	CROSS-EXAMINATION
22	BY MR. HANDFUSS:
23	Q MISS SALDANA, THAT IS HOW YOU PRONOUNCE IT; IS
24	THAT CORRECT?
25	A YES.
	880

1	Q	YOU STATED YOU WERE CONFUSED HERE; IS THAT RIGHT?
2	λ	JUST A LITTLE BIT.
3	Q	YOU TESTIFIED AT A PRELIMINARY HEARING IN THIS
4	MATTER?	
5	λ	YES.
6	Q	YOU TESTIFIED AGAIN IN THIS MATTER IN AN
7	EVIDENTIARY	HEARING?
8	λ	YES.
9	Q	DO YOU RECALL EVER SAYING IN THOSE TWO HEARINGS
10	THAT YOU WERE CONFUSED?	
11	λ	NO.
12	Q	MISS SALDANA, I AM GOING TO ASK YOU ABOUT TOM
13	AKERS. AFT	ER THESE EVENTS TOOK PLACE, DID YOU EVER TALK TO
14	TOM AKERS?	
15	λ	WEICH EVENTS?
16	Q	THE DEATHS.
17	A	YES.
18	Q	YOU TALK TO HIM IN PERSON OR BY PHONE?
19	A	BOTH.
20		THE COURT: SPEAK UP.
21		THE WITNESS: BOTH.
22	BY MR. HAN	DFUSS:
23	Q	WHEN DID YOU TALK TO HIM BY PHONE?
24	A	AFTER HE HAD BEEN ARRESTED ON CHRISTMAS DAY.
25	Q	DID YOU CALL HIM OR DID HE CALL YOU?
		881

1	A HE CALLED ME.	
2	Q AND DO YOU KNOW WHY HE CALLED YOU?	
3	A HE THOUGHT THAT WE WERE BOYFRIEND AND GIRLFRIEND.	
4	THAT IS MY UNDERSTANDING.	
5	Q HE CALLED YOU TO TELL YOU YOU WERE GIRLFRIEND AND	
6	BOYFRIEND?	
7	A MERRY CHRISTMAS GREETINGS, JUST GREETINGS.	
8	Q HE CALLED YOU MERRY CHRISTMAS, JUST GREETINGS; IS	
9	THAT RIGHT?	
10	A YES.	
11	Q DIDN'T HE ASK YOU TO MARRY YOU?	
12	A HE HAD ASKED ME PREVIOUSLY AND I TOLD HIM WE WOULD	
13	TALK ABOUT IT. HE ASKED ME AGAIN ON THE PHONE, BUT HE DIDN'T	
14	SAY, "WILL YOU MARRY ME?"	
15	HE SAID, "DO YOU REMEMBER WHAT WE TALKED ABOUT	
16	BEFORE?" I SAID, "YES."	
17	Q HE DIDN'T ASK YOU ON THE PHONE THAT DATE YOU ARE	
18	TALKING ABOUT, HE DID NOT ASK YOU TO MARRY HIM; IS THAT RIGHT?	
19	A HE WAS ASKING, BUT HE SAID, "DO YOU REMEMBER WHAT	
20	WE TALKED ABOUT? IS IT YES OR NO?"	
21	Q MISS SALDANA, DID HE ASK YOU TO MARRY YOU ON THAT	
22	PHONE CALL?	
23	A YES.	
24	Q NOW YOU ARE CONFUSING ME. EXCUSE ME.	
25	MR. SEATON: YOUR HONOR, PERHAPS IF COUNSEL COULD	
	882	

CONTROL HIS VOICE A LITTLE MORE, THAT WITNESSES AND HIMSELF 1 WOULDN'T GET CONFUSED. WE DON'T NEED THEATRICS HERE. 2 MR. HANDFUSS: I HAVEN'T YELLED. IT WAS A 3 NONRESPONSIVE ANSWER SEVERAL TIMES. THE QUESTION IS VERY CLEAR. DID HE ASK YOU TO MARRY YOU. 5 THE COURT: ASK YOU TO MARRY YOU IS WHAT YOU SAID. 6 THAT IS WHAT YOU REPEATED. IP YOU THINK ABOUT IT, IT DOESN'T 7 MAKE SENSE. 8 MR. HANDFUSS: DID YOU ASK HIM TO MARRY HIM. 9 THE COURT: IN ANY CASE, I THINK THE QUESTION 10 MIGHT HAVE BEEN BETTER PHRASED. MY UNDERSTANDING OF THE 11 WITNESS'S ANSWER IS NOT PER SE, NOT IN THOSE WORDS BUT, YES. 12 MR. HANDFUSS: PIRST, SHE SAID -- PIRST, SHE SAID 13 NO, HE JUST REFERRED BACK TO ANOTHER PHONE CALL. SHE FINALLY 14 SAID YES, HE DID BUT I AM GOING ON. I AM NOT ASKING THAT 15 16 OUESTION AGAIN. THE COURT: OKAY. 17 BY MR. HANDFUSS: 18 MISS SALDANA, WHEN DID YOU MOVE IN WITH MR. 19 Q 20 FLANAGAN? ON THE 6TH. 21 A THE 6TH OF WHAT? 22 Q NOVEMBER. '85. 23 A 1985? 24 Q *84, EXCUSE ME. 25

1	Q	DID YOU EVER HAVE A CONVERSATION WITH AN OFFICER
2	RAY BERNI?	
3	A	YES.
4	Q	CONCERNING THIS MATTER?
5	A	YES.
6	Q	AND WHEN DID THAT CONVERSATION TAKE PLACE?
7	A	APPROXIMATELY A WEEK, MAYBE A LITTLE LESS AFTER HE
8	HAD BOUGHT	THE SECOND KNIFE. AFTER DALE HAD BOUGHT THE SECOND
9	KNIFE.	
0	Q	WAS THIS CONVERSATION PRIOR TO YOUR PHONE CALL
11	WITH TOM AR	ERS OR AFTER YOUR PHONE CALL WITH TOM AKERS?
12	A	PRIOR.
L 3	Q	AND HOW CLOSE TO NOVEMBER 5TH WHEN YOU FIRST MOVED
L 4	IN WITE MR.	FLANAGAN, DID YOU HAVE THIS CONVERSATION WITH
15	OFFICER BEF	NI?
16	A	YOU MEAN, NOVEMBER 6TH?
17	Q	I AM SORRY, NOVEMBER 6TH.
18	A	AFTER, LET'S SEE. IN THE MIDDLE OF THE THIRD WEEK
19	OF NOVEMBER	. .
20		MR. POSIN: IF YOUR HONOR, PLEASE.
21		THE COURT: THE MIDDLE OF THE THIRD WEEK IN
22	NOVEMBER.	PLEASE SPEAK UP. ALL RIGHT. PROCEED.
23	BY MR. HANI	DFUSS:
24	Q	APPROXIMATELY TWO WEEKS AFTER YOU MOVED IN?
25	λ	A LITTLE MORE, YEAR, JUST.

1	Q	NOW, YOU TESTIFIED THAT YOU ALSO SEARCHED FOR A
2	WILL, THE G	ORDONS' WILL; DO YOU RECALL TEAT?
3.	λ	YES.
4	Q	DO YOU REMEMBER WHEN YOU STARTED SEARCHING FOR THE
5	GORDONS' WI	LL?
6	λ	IT WAS ALSO THE THIRD WEEK OF NOVEMBER.
7	Q	DID YOU SEARCH FOR THE WILL BEFORE OR AFTER YOU
8	SPOKE TO OF	FICER BERNI?
9	A	YES. WE HAD STARTED THE DAY BEFORE I HAD SPOKE TO
10	OFFICER BER	NI.
11	Q	YOU SEARCHED FOR THE WILL PRIOR TO THE TIME YOU
12	CALLED OFFI	CER BERNI?
13	A	JUST THE DAY BEFORE.
14	Q	AND YOU DIDN'T FIND THE WILL; IS THAT CORRECT?
15	A	NO.
16	Q	DID YOU CALL OFFICER BERNI OR DID HE CALL YOU?
17	λ	I CALLED HIM.
18	Q	CAN YOU TELL ME WHY YOU CALLED HIM?
19	λ	BECAUSE I NEEDED ASSISTANCE IN WHAT TO DO.
20	Q	WHAT DID YOU TELL HIM?
21	λ	I TOLD HIM THAT WHAT DALE HAD TOLD ME ABOUT HIS
22	SECOND KNIE	FE.
23	. Ω	AND WHAT DID HE SAY TO YOU?
24	λ	PUT THE KNIFE BACK.
25	Ω	HE TOLD YOU TO PUT THE KNIFE BACK?
	1	

1	A	YES.
2	Q	DID HE TELL YOU THAT HE WOULD DO ANYTHING AT THAT
3	TIME?	
4	A	NO. ONLY THAT IF I NEEDED HELP TO CALL.
5	Q	YOU TOLD OFFICER BERNI BASICALLY THE SAME THINGS
6	YOU TOLD TH	E JURY HERE IN COURT TODAY?
7	λ	YES.
8	Q	WHO IS OFFICER BERNI?
9	А	HE IS A PREVIOUS BOYFRIEND.
LO	Q	WHAT I MEAN BY THAT, IS HE A POLICE OFFICER?
11	A	YES, HE IS.
12	Q	HE WORKS FOR THE METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT?
13	A	YES, HE DOES.
14	Q	HE WORKED FOR THE METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT
15	AT THAT TIM	E?
16	A	YES, HE DID.
17	Q	YOU TOLD OFFICER BERNI WHAT YOU TOLD THE JURY.
18	THESE THING	S THAT YOU SAY MR. FLANAGAN TOLD YOU, YOU TOLD
19	OFFICER BEF	NI THOSE THINGS?
20	A	ONLY ABOUT THE KNIFE.
21	Q	ONLY ABOUT THE KNIFE?
22	A	AND THE WILL. THAT'S IT.
23	Q	AND THE WILL AND OFFICER BERNI TOLD YOU TO PUT THE
24	KNIFE BACK	?
25	A	YES.

	*	
1	Q	SHOULD YOU NEED ANY HELP, YOU SHOULD GIVE HIM A
2	CALL?	
3	A	YES.
4	Q	DID YOU EVER TALK TO BEECHER AVANTS?
5	A	YES.
6	Q	HOW DID YOU COME TO TALK TO MR. AVANTS?
7	A	I THINK I SPOKE WITH BEECHER AFTER DALE HAD TOLD
8	ME WHAT HE	HAD DONE.
9	Q	PRIOR OR
10	λ	I WAS LIVING WITH MY AUNT WHEN I HAD SPOKE TO
11	BEECHER.	
12	Q	THIS IS AFTER THE PHONE CALL WITH OFFICER BERNI?
13	A	YES, AFTER THE MEETING.
14	Q	DID MR. AVANTS CALL YOU OR DID YOU CALL HIM?
15	A	I CALLED HIM.
16	Q	HOW DID YOU COME TO TALK TO MR. AVANTS? WHY DID
17	YOU CALL B	EECHER AVANTS?
18	A	I WAS SUGGESTED TO BY MY AUNT AND UNCLE.
19	Q	THEY SPECIFICALLY SUGGESTED MR. AVANTS?
20	A	YES.
21	Q	DO YOU KNOW WHO MR. AVANTS IS?
22	A	HE HAS BEEN A FRIEND OF THE FAMILY SO HE WORKS
23	HERE.	
24	Q	WHAT I MEAN BY THAT IS DO YOU KNOW WHAT HE DOES
25	FOR A LIVI	NG?
		887

1	A	NOT ANYMORE.
2	Q	DO YOU KNOW WHAT HE DID FOR A LIVING AT THAT TIME?
3	λ	HE WAS AT THE TIME THAT I PIRST MET HIM, HE WAS
4	RUNNING FOR	SHERIPF.
5.	Q	WAS HE WORKING FOR THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S OFFICE
6	OR THE SHER	IFF'S DEPARTMENT OR THE METROPOLITAN POLICE
7	DEPARTMENT?	•
8	A	I DON'T KNOW.
9	Q	AND WHAT DID MR. AVANTS TELL YOU?
10	A	JUST THE ONLY THING HE SUGGESTED TO ME WAS TO GO
11	AND TALK TO	BOB HILLIARD AND
12		THE COURT: GO TALK TO WHO?
13		THE WITNESS: BOB HILLIARD.
14	BY MR. HAND	FUSS:
15	Q	WHO IS BOB HILLIARD? WHAT I MEAN BY THAT, WHAT
16	DOES MR. HI	LLIARD DO?
17	A	SERGEANT AT METRO.
18	Q	THE METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT?
19	A	YES.
20	Q	DID YOU CALL MR. HILLIARD OR MR. HILLIARD CALL
21	AOA.	
22	A	WE CALLED MR. HILLIARD.
23	Q	WHEN YOU SAY WE, WHO ARE YOU REFERRING TO?
24	A	RAY BERNI AND I.
25	Q	AND YOU TOLD MR. HILLIARD EVERYTHING YOU TOLD
•		
	1	000

1	OFFICER BERNI AND MR. AVANTS?
2	A YES.
3	Q ALL THESE ADMISSIONS THAT YOU TOLD THE JURY THAT
4	MR. FLANAGAN THAT YOU SAY MR. FLANAGAN TOLD YOU?
5	A YES. I GAVE A FULL STATEMENT BECAUSE I HAD ALL
6	THE INFORMATION AND THEN HE SUGGESTED TO GO DOWN
7	Q FULL STATEMENT?
8	MR. SEATON: COUNSEL, I WOULD LIKE TO INTERPOSE AN
9	OBJECTION FOR CLARIFICATION PURPOSES. I THINK THE INFERENCE
10	IS TRYING TO BE DRAWN AND TRYING TO BE DRAWN BEFORE
11	MR. PIKE: I WOULD OBJECT TO MR. SEATON
12	INTERPOSING HIMSELF INTO THE TRIAL TO MAKE AN EXPLANATION.
13	MR. SEATON: I AM DOING NO SUCE THING. I RESENT
14	HIS INTERRUPTING ME. WHEN I FINISH MY OBJECTION, LET HIM SAY
15	WHAT HE HAS TO SAY.
16	THE COURT: THAT IS OF CONCERN. IN INTERPOSING
17	YOUR OBJECTION, YOU ARE GOING TO MAKE ARGUMENT.
18	MR. SEATON: OF COURSE I AM AND I AM GOING TO
19	REPEAT TESTIMONY THAT HAS BEEN SAID. I WILL SAY NOTHING THAT
20	IS NOT WITHIN THIS RECORD.
21	MR. HANDFUSS: YOUR HONOR, EXCUSE ME. MAY I ASK
22	THAT MR. SEATON POLLOW THE SAME PROCEDURE THAT THE DEFENSE
23	COUNSEL HAVE FOLLOWED AND MAKE THE RECORD TO THE COURT
24	REPORTER AT THE APPROPRIATE TIME.
A E	MR CRAMON. I WILL NOT. I WILL MAKE MY ORJECTION

1 RIGHT NOW.

3.

THE COURT: IN ANY CASE, IF YOU ARE GOING TO RELATE TO TESTIMONY THAT HAS BEEN ALREADY SET OUT, THERE IS NO DAMAGE TO BE DONE.

MR. SEATON: SHE SAID IT MOMENTS AGO.

THE COURT: GO AHEAD.

MR. SEATON: IT IS JUST FOR CLARIFICATION I WANT TO DO THIS. MISS SALDANA SAID A LITTLE WHILE AGO IN RESPONSE TO A QUESTION BY MR. HANDFUSS THAT THE THINGS SHE TOLD OFFICER BERNI, THE ONLY THINGS SHE TOLD HIM WAS ABOUT THE KNIFE AND ABOUT THE WILL.

AND NOW HE IS ASKING HER AGAIN ABOUT THE -- AND I PORGET THE WORD THAT HE USED -- THE OTHER THINGS THAT DALE HAD TOLD HER AND THAT IS NOT THE CASE.

SHE NEVER TOLD BERNI OR AVANTS, AS I UNDERSTAND IT, ANY OF THE ADMISSIONS THAT DALE FLANAGAN HAD TOLD HER AND I WANT THAT CRYSTAL CLEAR AND NOT HAVE THE QUESTION RAISED BY INNUENDO THAT PERHAPS SHE DID.

MR. HANDFUSS: YOUR HONOR, I WOULD AGREE THAT SHE SAID THAT SHE DID NOT TELL RAY BERNI EVERYTHING. ONLY TOLD HIM ABOUT THE KNIFE.

SHE DID STATE SHE TOLD BEECHER AVANTS EVERYTHING SHE TOLD MR. BERNI ABOUT THE KNIFE. SHE TOLD BEECHER AVANTS EVERYTHING THAT SHE HAS TOLD THE JURY HERE TODAY.

AND THEY REFERRED HER TO MR. HILLIARD, THIRD

1	PERSON WHO SHE SAID SHE MADE A STATEMENT TO.
2	I AM NOT SAYING SHE TOLD EVERYTHING TO MR. BERNI.
3	SHE STATED UPON MY CROSS-EXAMINATION SHE DID NOT. IT WAS ONLY
4	ABOUT THE KNIFE.
5	MR. HARMON: AND THE WILL.
6	MR. SEATON: MAYBE HE COULD CLARIFY IT.
7	THE COURT: CONCERNING WHAT WAS SAID TO BEECHER
8	AVANTS, YOU MIGHT ASK A QUESTION TO CLARIFY THAT. THIS LATTER
9	INDIVIDUAL HILLIARD SHE JUST INDICATED SHE GAVE A COMPLETE
10	STATEMENT BECAUSE SHE HAD THE INFORMATION AT THAT TIME. I
11	RECALL HER SAYING THAT. ASK THE QUESTION.
12	BY MR. HANDFUSS:
13	Q DID YOU TELL MR. AVANTS BASICALLY EVERYTHING YOU
14	TOLD THE JURY HERE IN COURT TODAY?
15	A YES.
16	Q THIS IS OTHER THAN THE KNIFE AND THE WILL?
17	A YES.
18	Q AND THEN HE REFERRED YOU TO MR. HILLIARD; IS THAT
19	CORRECT?
20	A YES.
21	Q AND I DON'T RECALL, DID YOU SAY WHERE MR. HILLIARD
22	IS EMPLOYED; DO YOU KNOW?
23	A AT THE METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT.
24	Q DO YOU KNOW WHAT HIS FUNCTION IS THERE?
25	A HE IS A SERGEANT.

1	Q DO YOU RECALL ON WHAT DAY YOU SPOKE TO OFFICER
2	HILLIARD OR SERGEANT HILLIARD?
3	A THE 6TH OF DECEMBER '84.
4	Q AND YOU TOLD OFFICER SERGEANT HILLIARD EVERYTHING?
5	A YES.
6	Q AND THEN WHAT DID SERGEANT HILLIARD TELL YOU?
7	A THAT I HAD TO GO DOWNTOWN, TALK TO DETECTIVE
8	LEVOS.
9	Q AND YOU WENT DOWNTOWN AND TALKED TO DETECTIVE
10	LEVOS?
11	A AND, ALSO, GAVE ANOTHER FULL STATEMENT.
12	Q AND WHAT ELSE?
13	A YES, BUT I ALSO GAVE ANOTHER FULL STATEMENT TO
14	HIM.
15	Q YOUR FULL STATEMENT TO SERGEANT HILLIARD, DO YOU
16	KNOW, WAS THAT A WRITTEN STATEMENT?
17	A YES. IT WAS IN HIS HOME.
18	Q IT WAS IN SERGEANT HILLIARD'S HOME?
19	A YES.
20	Q YOU WROTE OUT A STATEMENT?
21	A WROTE OUT AS I WAS SPEAKING. HE WAS WRITING IT
22	AS I WAS SPEAKING AND HE REALIZED HOW SERIOUS IT WAS AND HE
23	SENT ME TO SERGEANT I MEAN, DETECTIVE LEVOS.
24	Q DID SERGEANT HILLIARD EVER SHOW YOU THAT STATEMENT
25	THAT HE WROTE OUT WHICH WAS REALLY YOUR STATEMENT?
	892

1	A NO. I DIDN'T LOOK.
2	Q SO YOU NEVER ACTUALLY SAW WHAT HE WROTE?
3	A NO.
4	Q AND ON DECEMBER 7TH, 1984, YOU WENT DOWNTOWN AND
5	SPOKE TO DETECTIVE LEVOS; IS THAT CORRECT?
6	A YES. IT WAS THAT SAME NIGHT IN THE WEE HOURS OF
7	THE MORNING.
8	Q AFTER TWELVE O'CLOCK?
9	A YES.
10	Q AND DO YOU RECALL MAKING A STATEMENT AT THAT TIME?
11	A YES, I DO.
12	Q MISS SALDANA, DO YOU CONSIDER YOURSELF A TRUTHFUL
13	INDIVIDUAL?
14	A YES, I DO.
15	Q YOU DIDN'T LIE TO OFFICER BERNI WHEN YOU TOLD HIM
16	THE THINGS YOU TOLD HIM, DID YOU?
17	A NO, I DIDN'T.
18	Q AND I AM SURE YOU ARE GOING TO SAY THAT YOU DIDN'T
19	LIE TO MR. AVANTS ABOUT THE THINGS YOU TOLD HIM, DID YOU?
20	A I DIDN'T LIE.
21	Q AND YOU DIDN'T LIE TO SERGEANT HILLIARD, I AM SURE
22	YOU WOULD SAY, ABOUT THE THINGS YOU TOLD HIM, DID YOU?
23	MR. SEATON: I AM GOING TO OBJECT TO DEFENSE
24	COUNSEL'S COMMENTARY AND THE NATURE OF HIS QUESTION, YOUR
25	HONOR, THE "I AM SURE" PART.
	893

1	MR. HANDFUSS: I WILL REPHRASE THE QUESTION.
2	THE COURT: ALL RIGHT.
3	BY MR. HANDFUSS:
4	Q DID YOU LIE TO MR. AVANTS WHEN YOU TOLD HIM YOUR
5	STORY?
6	A NO, I DIDN'T.
7	Q DID YOU LIE TO SERGEANT HILLIARD WHEN YOU TOLD HIM
8	YOUR STORY?
9	A NO, I DIDN'T.
10	Q DID YOU LIE TO DETECTIVE LEVOS WHEN YOU TOLD HIM
11	YOUR STORY?
12	A NO, I DIDN'T.
13	Q ARE YOU LYING HERE IN COURT TODAY?
14	A NO, I AM NOT.
15	O NOW, YOU STATED EARLIER UPON EXAMINATION, DIRECT
16	EXAMINATION BY MR. SEATON THAT MR. FLANAGAN TOLD YOU THAT
17	SEVERAL PEOPLE WERE PRESENT ON THE NIGHT OF NOVEMBER 5TH AND
18	HE MENTIONED SEVERAL NAMES; DO YOU RECALL THAT?
19	A YES.
20	Q THEN YOU SAID THAT HE MENTIONED ROY MCDOWELL'S
21	NAME?
22	A YES.
23	Q WAS THAT A LIE WHEN YOU SAID THAT?
24	a no.
25	Q THAT WAS THE TRUTH?
	894

1	A	YES.
2	Q	JUST AS TRUTHFUL AS WHEN YOU GAVE YOUR DECEMBER
3	STATEMENT T	O DETECTIVE LEVOS; ISN'T THAT CORRECT?
4	λ	YES.
5	Q	AND YOU WERE TRUTHFUL AT THE PRELIMINARY HEARING,
6	WEREN'T YOU	?
7	λ	YES.
8	Q	YOU DIDN'T LIE AT THAT PRELIMINARY HEARING, DID
9	YOU?	
10	А	NO, I DID NOT.
11	Q	JUST AS TRUTHFUL AS YOU ARE IN COURT HERE TODAY,
12	AREN'T YOU?	
13	A	YES.
14	Q	YOU RECALL COMING TO AN EVIDENTIARY HEARING JUST A
15	WEEK OR SO	AGO? DO YOU RECALL THAT?
16	A	YES.
17	Q	AND YOU WERE TRUTHFUL THERE, TOO, WEREN'T YOU?
18	A	YES.
19	Q	JUST AS TRUTHFUL AS YOU ARE TODAY?
20	A	YES.
21	Q	DO YOU RECALL ON DECEMBER 7TH WHEN YOU GAVE YOUR
22	STATEMENT !	TO DETECTIVE LEVOS WHEN HE ASKED YOU ABOUT
23		MR. SEATON: WHAT PAGE?
24		MR. HANDFUSS: I AM SORRY. PAGE NUMBER SIX AND IT
25	IS ABOUT T	HIRD OF THE WAY DOWN, THE FIRST QUESTION AND ANSWER.
		895

1	BY MR. HANDFUSS:
2	Q ON THE SECOND QUESTION AND ANSWER THAT I BELIEVE
3	DETECTIVE LEVOS ASKED YOU, HOW DID HE SAY IT WAS DONE
4	REFERRING TO MR. FLANAGAN. AND YOU MENTIONED SOME NAMES; DO
5	YOU RECALL THAT?
6	A YES.
7	Q DO YOU RECALL WHAT NAMES YOU MENTIONED?
8	A YES.
9	Q DID YOU MENTION ROY'S NAME?
10	A NO, I DIDN'T.
11	Q YOU JUST FORGOT, I GUESS; IS THAT RIGHT?
12	A YES, I SUPPOSE. THIS IS ALL A YEAR AGO. IT IS
13	VERY HARD TO REMEMBER.
14	Q MISS SALDANA, I AM ASKING YOU A SPECIFIC QUESTION.
15	YOU DIDN'T MENTION ROY MCDOWELL'S NAME, DID YOU?
16	A NO, I DIDN'T.
17	Q YOU REMEMBER SPECIFICALLY NOT SAYING HIS NAME?
18	MR. SEATON: ASKED AND ANSWERED.
19	THE COURT: SUSTAINED.
20	MR. HANDFUSS: I WITHDRAW AND ASK ANOTHER
21	QUESTION.
22	BY MR. HANDFUSS:
23	Q AS A MATTER OF FACT, IT WAS REITERATED TO YOU. IT
24	WAS TWICE TALKED ABOUT THE NAMES AND TWICE YOU NEVER SAID THAT
25	DALE SAID THAT ROY MCDOWELL WAS THERE; IS THAT TRUE?

1	A I DON'T REMEMBER IF IT WAS SAID TWICE.
2	MR. HANDFUSS: MAY I APPROACH THE WITNESS, YOUR
3	ECNOR?
4	THE COURT: YES, YOU MAY.
5	BY MR. HANDFUSS:
6	Q MISS SALDANA, I AM SHOWING YOU YOUR STATEMENT OF
7	DECEMBER 7TH, 12:20 A.M. CAN YOU PLEASE LOOK AT THAT,
8	SPECIFICALLY, PAGE NUMBER SIX. LOOK AT THE WHOLE STATEMENT IF
9	YOU LIKE.
10	A ORAY.
11	Q DOES THAT REFRESH YOUR RECOLLECTION?
12	A YES.
13	Q AND THE QUESTION WAS ASKED "HOW DID HE SAY IT WAS
14	DONE; IS THAT CORRECT?
15	A YES.
16	Q AND YOU ANSWERED, "HE SAID THAT HE PLANNED IT AS
17	IT WOULD LIKE LIKE A ROBBERY AND THAT HIMSELF, TOM, JOHNNY
18	RAY, MIKE AND RANDY WERE ALL THERE;" IS THAT CORRECT?
19	A YES.
20	Q YOU DIDN'T SAY ROY MCDOWELL, DID YOU?
21	A NO, I DIDN'T.
22	Q AND THEN IT WAS WHOEVER ASKED THE QUESTION SAID,
23	*WHEN YOU SAY TOM, JOHNNY RAY, MIKE AND RANDY, ARE YOU
24	REFERRING TO TOM AKERS, RANDY MOORE, JOHNNY RAY AND MIKE
25	WALSE?" AND YOU SAID, "YES." IS THAT CORRECT?

1	A YES.
2	Q AGAIN, YOU DIDN'T SAY THAT ROY MCDOWELL WAS THERE,
3	DID AODS
4	MR. SEATON: ASKED AND ANSWERED.
5	MR. HANDFUSS: IT IS ANOTHER
6	MR. SEATON: SHE DIDN'T SAY IT, I WILL STIPULATE
7	IT.
8	THE COURT: WELL, WE HAVE DWELLED ON THIS QUITE A
9	LOT, COUNSEL.
L O	BY MR. HANDFUSS:
11	Q DID YOU LOOK AT YOUR WHOLE STATEMENT?
12	A I HAVE IT HERE WITH ME. I HAVE SEEN ALL OF IT.
13	Q WERE YOU REFERRING TO YOUR STATEMENT DURING MR.
14	SEATON'S QUESTIONING OR DURING MR. SMITH'S QUESTIONING?
15	A THIS IS THE FIRST TIME I HAVE OPENED IT. THAT'S
16	IT. I HAVEN'T BEEN READING OFF OF IT OR ANYTHING. IT WAS
17	JUST IN CASE I NEEDED IT TO LOOK AT FOR THIS PURPOSE HERE.
18	Q DID ANYBODY TELL YOU TO BRING THAT WITH YOU?
19	A NO.
20	Q YOU HAVEN'T OPENED IT WHILE YOU WERE ON THE STAND?
21	A NO. I HAD RIGHT HERE AND I HAD IT SITTING LIKE
2 2	THIS AND I HAVEN'T HAD IT OPEN.
23	Q OKAY. WHEN WAS THE LAST TIME YOU READ YOUR
24	STATEMENT, MISS SALDANA?
25	A TWO DAYS AGO. I HAVEN'T READ ALL THE WAY THROUGH.
	898

1	Q YOU DIDN'T READ IT ALL THE WAY THROUGH?
2	A NO.
3	Q THE BEST OF YOUR RECOLLECTION, DO YOU RECALL HOW
4	MANY PAGES YOUR STATEMENT IS?
5	a ten.
6	Q AND TEN PAGES. DO YOU RECALL AT ANY POINT IN YOUR
7	STATEMENT YOU SEE ROY MCDOWELL'S NAME MENTIONED?
8	A I DON'T REMEMBER RIGHT NOW. I DON'T REMEMBER.
9	Q MISS SALDANA, DO YOU RECALL TESTIFYING AT A
10	PRELIMINARY HEARING IN THIS MATTER ON MONDAY, FEBRUARY 11TH,
11	1985?
12	A WHICE WAS THE FIRST? THAT WAS THE PIRST
13	PRELIMINARY?
14	Q THERE WAS ONLY ONE PRELIMINARY HEARING. THERE WAS
15	AN EVIDENTIARY HEARING A WEEK OR SO AGO.
16	YOU REMEMBER BACK IN FEBRUARY YOU WERE CALLED,
17	SUBPOENAED BY THE STATE TO TESTIFY?
18	A YES, OKAY, YES.
19	Q DO YOU REMEMBER BEING ASKED I AM REFERRING
20	SPECIFICALLY TO PAGE 102, COUNSEL YOU WERE BEING ASKED ABOUT
21	WHAT MR. FLANAGAN SAID TO YOU, AND THE QUESTION WAS, "DID HE
22	SAY AT THIS TIME WHAT TOM AKERS HAD DONE OTHER THAN TO DRIVE
23	THE CAR OVER?" DOES THAT SOUND FAMILIAR?
24	A YES.
25	Q AND YOU ANSWERED, "HE HAD ONLY SAID THAT HE WAS
	1 888

1	SITTING. BE WAS WATTING OUTSIDE ON THE KOAD IN THE CAK. DO
2	YOU RECALL YOUR ANSWER THERE?
3	A YES.
4	Q AND THE QUESTION WAS ASKED, "DID HE TELL YOU WHAT
5	ROY MCDOWELL WAS DOING?" DO YOU REMEMBER THAT QUESTION?
6	A NO.
7	Q IP I SHOW YOU THE TRANSCRIPT, WOULD IT HELP
8	REFRESH YOUR RECOLLECTION?
9	A YES, PLEASE.
10	MR. HANDFUSS: MAY I APPROACE THE WITNESS?
11	THE COURT: YES.
12	BY MR. HANDFUSS:
13	Q UNDER THE HALF OF THE PAGE, WOULD YOU READ THAT TO
14	YOURSELF?
15	A ORAY.
16	Q DOES THAT HELP REFRESH YOUR RECOLLECTION?
17	A YES.
18	Q AND YOU WERE ASKED, "DID HE TELL YOU WHAT ROY
19	MCDOWELL WAS DOING?" DO YOU RECALL THAT NOW?
20	A YES.
21	Q AND YOUR ANSWER WAS, "NO, I HAD NO IDEA AT THIS
22	TIME THAT ROY WAS THERE. " YOU SAID THAT, DIDN'T YOU?
23	A YES, I DID. I HAD FOUND OUT FROM TOM AKERS THAT
24	HE WAS THERE, ALSO.
25	THE COURT: I THINK WE MIGHT ADJOURN AT THIS TIME,

PICK THIS UP IN THE MORNING. MR. BAILIFF, WOULD YOU APPROACH THE BENCH, PLEASE. (THE ADMONITION WAS READ.) THE COURT: I WOULD LIKE TO THANK YOU THUS FAR POR YOUR PATIENCE. I THINK COUNSEL JOINS ME. I WOULD ASK YOU TO BE HERE AT TEN O'CLOCK TOMORROW MORNING. COURT IS ADJOURNED. (EVENING RECESS TAKEN.)

ORIGINAL

FILE

1	CASE NO. C069269	±
2	DEPARTMENT POURTEEN	FEB 14 1986
3		BRINGE MC
4	IN THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTR	CT COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA
5	IN AND FOR THE	COUNTY OF CLARK
6		
7	THE STATE OF NEVADA,	1
8	PLAINTIF	REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT
9	VB.	OF
10	DALE EDWARD PLANAGAN, RANDOLFI	JURY TRIAL
11	MOORE AKA SMITH, JOHNNY RAY LUCKETT AND ROY MCDOWELL,	ž
12	defendan ^a	rs.
13	-	
14	BEFORE THE HONORABLE DON	ALD M. MOSLEY, DISTRICT JUDGE
15		
16		7
17	APPEARANCES:	
18	FOR THE STATE:	MELVYN T. HARMON, ESQUIRE
19		DANIEL M. SEATON, ESQUIRE DEPUTIES DISTRICT ATTORNEY
20	FOR DEFENDANT PLANAGAN:	
21	FOR DEPENDANT MOORE:	MURRAY POSIN, ESQUIRE
22		
23		WILLIAM H. SMITH, ESQUIRE
24	FOR DEFENDANT MCDOWELL:	ROBERT J. HANDFUSS, ESQUIRE
25	Reported by: Sharon J. Thiel	man, Official Court Reporter

ORIGINAL

1	LAS VEGAS, NEVADA, THURSDAY, OCTOBER 3, 1985
2	
3	THE COURT: THE CONTINUATION - OF CASE C69269,
4	STATE OF NEVADA VERSUS DALE FLANAGAN, RANDOLPH MOORE, JOHN
5	LUCKETT AND ROY MCDOWELL.
6	THE RECORD WILL REFLECT THE PRESENCE OF EACH OF
7	THE DEFENDANTS, MR. PIKE REPRESENTING MR. FLANAGAN, MR. POSIN
8	REPRESENTING MR. MOORE, MR. SMITH, MR. LUCKETT, MR. HANDFUSS,
9	MR. MCDOWELL.
10	THE RECORD WILL REFLECT THE PRESENCE OF MR.
11	HARMON AND MR. SEATON REPRESENTING THE STATE.
12	MISS CLERK, WILL YOU CALL THE ROLL OF THE JURY,
13	PLEASE.
14	THE CLERK: YES, YOUR HONOR.
15	(ROLL CALL TAKEN.)
16	THE CLERK: ALL PRESENT, YOUR HONOR.
17	THE COURT: THE RECORD WILL SO REFLECT. GOOD
18	MORNING, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN. MR. HANDFUSS, YOU WISH TO
19	RESUME YOUR CROSS-EXAMINATION OF MISS SALDANA?
20	MR. HANDFUSS: YES, YOUR HONOR. WE WILL BE
21	BRIEF.
22	
23	CROSS-EXAMINATION (RESUMED)
24	BY MR. HANDFUSS:
25	Q MISS SALDANA?

1	A YES.
2	Q YOU WERE MISTAKEN YESTERDAY WHEN YOU SAID THAT
3	DALE FLANAGAN SAID THAT ROY MCDOWELL WAS THERE; IS THAT
4	CORRECT?
5	A YES.
6	Q JUST ONE OR TWO OTHER QUESTIONS. IN THE
7	CONVERSATIONS WITH DALE FLANAGAN THAT YOU HAD AFTER THE
8	DEATHS OCCURRED, YOU SAID THAT MR. FLANAGAN TOLD YOU WHAT
9	HAPPENED ON NOVEMBER THE 6TH; IS THAT RIGHT?
10	A YES.
11	Q AND DID HE TELL YOU WHO WENT INTO THE HOUSE AND
12	REMOVED THE PURSE FROM THE CLOSET
13	A YES.
14	Q OF THAT HOUSE. AND WITHOUT SAYING WHO, HE
15	SAID WHO DID IT, DIDN'T HE?
16	A YES.
17	Q AND THAT WAS NOT ROY; IS THAT RIGHT?
18	A NO.
19	MR. HANDFUSS: I HAVE NO FURTHER QUESTIONS.
20	THE COURT: OKAY. FURTHER CROSS-EXAMINATION?
21	MR. PIKE: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.
22	
23	CROSS-EXAMINATION
24	BY MR. PIKE:
25	Q MISS SALDANA, OR MA'AM, HOW OLD ARE YOU?
	903

1	λ	20.
2	Q	YOU WERE 19 WHEN YOU WERE LIVING WITH DALE
3	Flanagan?	
4	λ	YES.
5	Q	AT THE TRAILER. WHEN DID YOU FIRST MEET DALE?
6	λ	APPROXIMATELY TWO WEEKS BEFORE I MOVED IN.
7	Q	TWO WEEKS BEFORE YOU MOVED IN. AND WHERE DID YOU
8	MEET HIM?	•
9	A	AT BOGIE'S NIGHTCLUB.
10	Q	AT THAT TIME WHERE WERE YOU RESIDING?
11	λ	WITH A GIRLFRIEND.
12	Q	DO YOU RECALL
13		THE COURT: SPEAK UP, PLEASE.
14		THE WITNESS: WITH A GIRLFRIEND.
15	BY MR. PIKE	i:
16	Q	DO YOU RECALL HER NAME?
17	A	DEBBIE SAMPLES.
18	Q	WAS SHE LIVING WITH ANYBODY ELSE?
19	A	BLAKE WATSON.
20	Q	YOUR SISTER, ALSO, MICHELLE GRAY?
21	A	YES.
22	Q	ARE YOU ACQUAINTED WITH A YOUNG GIRL BY THE NAME
23	OF LISA LIC	CATA?
24	A	YES.
25	Q	WAS LISA LIVING WITH YOU AT THAT APARTMENT?
		904

1		
1	λ	NO.
2	Q	SHE WASN'T. SHE WAS LIVING WITH DALE?
3	λ	YES.
4	Q	AND THEN DALE AND LISA BROKE UP AND YOU MOVED IN
5	WITH DALE?	
6	λ	YES.
7	Q	AND WHAT WERE YOU DOING FOR A LIVING DURING THAT
8	TIME?	· ·
9	A	I WAS DANCING.
LO	Q	YOU WERE DANCING AT BOGIE'S?
11	A	YES.
12	Q	YOU WERE A STRIPPER, WEREN'T YOU?
13	λ	YES.
14	Q	NOW, WHAT WAS YOUR RELATIONSHIP WITH LISA LICATA?
15	A	BARELY A FRIEND. I HAD ONLY KNOWN HER A SHORT
16	TIME.	
17	Q	WASN'T IT AN ANTAGONISTIC ONE AS FAR AS DALE WAS
18	CONCERNED?	
19	A	NO.
20	Q	THERE WEREN'T ANY HARD FEELINGS BETWEEN YOU AND
21	SEE?	
22	A	THERE WERE A LITTLE BUT NOT ENOUGH TO FIGHT OR
23	WORRY ABOU	T IT.
24	Q	NEVERTHELESS, YOU FELT?
25	A	YES.
	1	905

1	Q ALL DURING THIS TIME, DALE IS WORKING AT
2	MCDONALD'S?
3	A YES.
4	Q HOW LONG FROM THE DAY THAT HE MET YOU WAS IT
5	UNTIL YOU AND HE MOVED IN TOGETHER?
6	A TWO WEEKS.
7	Q AND YOU MOVED IN TOGETHER AS BOYFRIEND AND
8	GIRLFRIEND?
9	A YES.
10	Q NOW, YOU INDICATED ON YOUR TESTIMONY WHEN MR.
11	SEATON ASKED YOU, THAT YOU AT ONE TIME STARTED LOOKING FOR A
12	WILL?
13	A YES.
14	Q WHILE YOU WERE LIVING AT THE TRAILER WITH DALE,
15	HIS UNCLE MOVED INTO THE HOUSE; ISN'T THAT TRUE?
16	A YES.
17	Q HIS UNCLE'S NAME IS ROBIN?
18	A YES.
19	Q AND ISN'T IT TRUE THAT ROBIN ALSO LOOKED FOR A
20	WILL?
21	A YES.
22	Q ISN'T IT TRUE THAT EVERYBODY IN THE WHOLE FAMILY
23	LOOKED FOR A WILL?
24	A AS FAR AS I KNOW, YES.
25	Q AND TO YOUR KNOWLEDGE, DID ANYONE EVER FIND A

1	
1	WILL?
2	A NO.
3	Q TO YOUR KNOWLEDGE, DID ANYBODY EVER FIND ANY
4	INSURANCE POLICY?
5	A NO.
6	Q NOW, WHEN MR. SEATON OR I BELIEVE MR. SEATON WAS
7	QUESTIONING YOU, ASKED YOU ABOUT WHEN YOU MOVED INTO THE
8	TRAILER, YOU MOVED INTO THE TRAILER IMMEDIATELY AFTER THE
9	DEATHS?
10	A YES.
11	Q ISN'T IT TRUE THAT YOU DIDN'T MOVE IN IMMEDIATELY
12	AFTER THE DEATHS BECAUSE THE TRAILER WAS SEALED AND YOU HAD
13	TO STAY A FEW OTHER PLACES DURING THAT TIME?
14	A I STAYED AT MY AUNT'S.
15	Q YOU STAYED AT YOUR AUNT'S. DIDN'T YOU STAY ONE
16	NIGHT WITH DALE AND HIS PATHER AT THE HILTON HOTEL?
17	A YES.
18	Q AND THAT WAS RIGHT AFTER THE DEATHS?
19	A YES.
20	Q AND THE TRAILERS WERE SEALED RIGHT AFTER THE
21	DEATHS?
22	A I DON'T KNOW.
23	Q FOR A COUPLE OF DAYS?
24	A I DIDN'T KNOW.
25	Q BUT YOU HAD NOT MOVED BACK INTO THE TRAILER UNTIL
	907

1	A COUPLE DAYS AFTER THE DEATHS; ISN'T THAT TRUE?
2	A YES, BUT WE WERE TOGETHER.
3	Q OKAY. I UNDERSTAND THAT. I AM SAYING YOU WERE
4	TOGETHER IMMEDIATELY AFTER THE DEATHS BUT YOU COULDN'T MOVE
5	BACK INTO THE TRAILER UNTIL A COUPLE DAYS AFTER?
6	A YES.
7	Q WAS THERE A TELEPHONE IN THE TRAILER?
8	A YES.
9	Q AND DURING THAT TIME AFTER THE DEATHS UNTIL YOU
.0	MOVED INTO THE TRAILER, YOU AND DALE PRETTY MUCH SPENT ALL
.1	YOUR TIME TOGETHER?
.2	A NO.
.3	O YOU DIDN'T?
.4	A HE WORKED AND
.5	Q WHEN YOU WEREN'T AT WORK, I MEAN, YOU SPENT THE
16	REST OF THAT TIME TOGETHER?
17	A YES.
18	Q NOW, AFTER YOU INDICATED THAT DALE HAD HAD A
19	CONVERSATION WITH THE DETECTIVE AND YOU THEN WENT OVER TO
20	OFFICER BERNI WITH A KNIFE?
21	A YES.
22	Q YOU WENT OVER TO OFFICER BERNI BECAUSE YOU HAD
23	KNOWN HIM?
24	A YES.
25	Q HOW MANY YEARS PREVIOUSLY HAD YOU KNOWN OFFICER
	200

1	BERNI?	
2	A	TWO, ALMOST THREE.
3	Q	PARDON?
4	A	TWO, ALMOST THREE.
5	Q	AND HE WAS A BOYFRIEND OR JUST AN ACQUAINTANCE?
6	λ	BOYFRIEND.
7	Q	AND YOU TOOK THE KNIFE BACK AND HE TOLD YOU THAT
8	IF YOU COULT	GET ANY MORE INFORMATION BUT BE CAREFUL?
9	A	YES.
LO	Q	AND SO YOU QUESTIONED DALE AND TOM; ISN'T THAT
11	TRUE?	
12	A	ONLY TOM. I NEVER QUESTIONED DALE.
13	Q	NOW, YOU WERE LIVING WITH TOM OR, EXCUSE ME, YOU
14	WERE LIVING	WITE DALE AS BOYFRIEND AND GIRLFRIEND; ISN'T THAT
15	TRUE?	.
16	λ	YES.
17	Q	AND THEN DALE, YOU WERE QUESTIONING HIM TO GET
18	INFORMATION	AND YOU WERE GIVING HIM SEX?
19	A	YES.
20	Q	IN FACT, YOU TALKED TO HIM ABOUT GETTING MARRIED?
21	A	YES.
22	Q	DID YOU EVER INTEND UPON MARRYING HIM?
23	A	NO.
24	Q	DID YOU EVER INTEND UPON MARRYING DALE?
25	A	NO.
	l .	

1	Q AND YOU TALKED TO DALE ABOUT GETTING MARRIED,
2	THOUGH, DIDN'T YOU?
3	A YES.
4	Q IS THIS THE SAME TIME?
5	A YES.
6	Q AND, IN FACT, YOU WERE EVEN HAVING SEX WITH TOM
7	IN DALE'S TRAILER?
8	A NO.
9	Q YOU DIDN'T. WHILE YOU GOT THIS INFORMATION, YOU
10	THEN WENT TO BEECHER AVANTS; ISN'T THAT TRUE?
11	A YES.
12	Q AND WHILE YOU WERE IN THE PROCESS OF GETTING THIS
13	INFORMATION, YOU TALKED WITH TOM AKERS ABOUT THE POSSIBILITY
14	OP GETTING A \$2,000 REWARD CONCERNING TURNING IN DALE; ISN'T
15	THAT TRUE?
16	A THAT IS NOT TRUE.
17	Q DID YOU EVER TALK WITH TOM AKERS ABOUT THE
18	POSSIBILITY OF RECEIVING A \$2,000 REWARD?
19	A I HAD NO IDEA ABOUT THE REWARD.
20	Q MY QUESTION IS DID YOU EVER TALK WITH TOM ABOUT
21	THE POSSIBILITY OF RECEIVING A \$2,000 REWARD?
22	A No.
23	Q DO YOU RECALL GIVING TESTIMONY IN THIS CASE AT
24	THE PRELIMINARY HEARING ON FEBRUARY 11TH?
25	A YES.
	910

1	Q AND THAT TIME YOU WERE BEING ASKED QUESTIONS BY A
2	PEW ATTORNEYS; ISN'T THAT TRUE?
3	A YES.
4	MR. PIKE: FOR COUNSEL'S BENEFIT, IT IS PAGE 119.
5	MAY I APPROACE THE WITNESS, YOUR HONOR?
6	THE COURT: YOU MAY.
7	MR. PIKE: THANK YOU.
8	BY MR. PIKE:
9	Q MISS SALDANA, I WOULD ASK YOU IF YOU WOULD TO
10	LOOK AT LINE 11 AND READ THAT QUESTION AND YOUR RESPONSES
11	DOWN TO ABOUT LINE 18. CAN YOU READ THAT FROM WHERE IT'S AT?
12	A OKAY.
13	Q HAVE YOU HAD AN OPPORTUNITY TO READ THAT?
14	A YES.
15	Q NOW, AT THE PRELIMINARY HEARING YOU WERE ASKED
16	THE QUESTION, AND I WILL QUOTE, "DID YOU EVER DISCUSS WITH
17	MR. AKERS OR ANYONE ELSE THE POSSIBILITIES OF RECEIVING A
18	\$2,000 REWARD FOR INFORMATION YOU MIGHT HAVE WITH RESPECT TO
19	THE KILLING OF MR. AND MRS. GORDON?"
20	AND YOU ANSWERED THAT WITH, "YES. AFTER THEY
21	WERE ARRESTED, AFTER THE BOYS WERE ARRESTED, YES.
22	IS THAT TRUE?
23	A YES, ON THE PHONE.
24	Q ON THE PHONE AND YOU TALKED WITH DALE ON THE
25	PHONE OR NOT DALE, EXCUSE ME. YOU TALKED WITH TOM ON THE
	911

1	PHONE?
2	A YES. I THOUGHT YOU MEANT PRIOR.
3	Q SO THIS CONVERSATION OCCURRED AFTER EVERYBODY HAD
4	BEEN ARRESTED?
5	A YES.
6	Q AND DID TOM CALL YOU UP OR DID YOU CALL HIM UP?
7	A TOM HAD CALLED ME.
8	Q AND EVEN AFTER TOM WAS ARRESTED, YOU STILL TALKED
9	TO HIM ABOUT GETTING MARRIED?
10	A YES, FOR MORE INFORMATION.
11	Q FOR MORE INFORMATION?
12	A YES.
13	Q AND WHICH POLICE OFFICER HAD INSTRUCTED YOU TO
14	PLAY ALONG WITH THEM TO GET ADDITIONAL INFORMATION? WAS IT
15	OFFICER BERNI OR WAS IT BEECHER AVANTS?
16	A IT WAS NO OFFICER. IT WAS MY UNCLE WHO ASKED ME
17	TO DO THAT.
18	Q IS YOUR UNCLE A POLICE OFFICER OR AFFILIATED WITH
19	A LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCY IN ANY WAY?
20	A YES. HE USED TO BE AN ATTORNEY.
21	Q AND THIS CONVERSATION WITH DALE THAT YOU HAVE
22	TESTIFIED ABOUT, YOU INDICATED THAT IT WAS JUST IT STEMMED
23	FROM AN ARGUMENT THAT YOU HAD CONCERNING ABOUT YOUR
24	RELATIONSHIP AS BOYFRIEND AND GIRLFRIEND?
25	A YES.
	612

1	
1	Q AND YOU SAID THAT DALE WAS JEALOUS ABOUT A
2	BOYFRIEND?
3	A YES.
4	Q DO YOU RECALL VOICING ANY SENTIMENTS OF JEALOUSY
5	OR ANY STATEMENTS OF ANIMOSITY ABOUT LISA LICATA AT THAT
6	TIME?
7	A YES.
8	Q AND SO YOU WERE STILL AWARE OF HER?
9	A YES.
١0	Q DO YOU KNOW WHAT LISA DID FOR A LIVING?
11	A I DON'T THINK SHE WORKED AT ALL.
12	Q HOW ABOUT MICHELLE GRAY?
13	A SHE DIDN'T WORK EITHER.
14	Q DO YOU HAVE ANY IDEA HOW SHE SUPPORTED HERSELF?
15	A SHE LIVED WITH HER SISTER.
16	Q NOW, DURING THIS CONVERSATION, DURING THIS
17	ARGUMENT, IT WAS STRICTLY FROM A BOYFRIEND-GIRLFRIEND
18	STANDPOINT AND DALE WASN'T ASKING YOU TO RENDER HIM ANY
19	ASSISTANCE OR FOR YOU TO PARTICIPATE IN ANY WAY IN ANY SORT
20	OF COVER-UP; ISN'T THAT TRUE?
21	A NOT IN LITERAL CONVERSATION, NO.
22	THE COURT: WHAT DID YOU SAY?
23	THE WITNESS: NOT LITERALLY IN WORDS, NO.
24	BY MR. PIKE:
25	Q SO HE NEVER DID. THE WHOLE POINT OF THE
	913

1	CONVERSATION WAS TO ESTABLISH HOW TOO TWO DIGGS AND DOTTED
2	AND GIRLFRIEND?
3	A I DON'T THINK THE ENTIRE CONVERSATION WAS BASED
4	ON THAT.
5	Q WELL, DO YOU RECALL BEING ASKED THAT QUESTION AT
6	THE PRELIMINARY HEARING AND ANSWERING YES TO THAT?
7	A I RECALL BEING ASKED IF IT IS HOW IT STARTED.
8	MR. PIKE: MAY I APPROACH THE WITNESS AGAIN, YOUR
9	HONOR?
10	THE COURT: YOU MAY.
11	MR. PIKE: COUNSEL, I AM ON PAGE 109 OF THE
12	PRELIMINARY HEARING TRANSCRIPT.
13	BY MR. PIKE:
1,4	Q MISS SALDANA, I WOULD ASK YOU TO LOOK AT PAGE
15	109. THE QUESTION STARTING AT LINE 14. I ASK YOU TO READ
16	THAT QUESTION TO YOURSELF AND THE RESPONSE TO IT.
17	HAVE YOU HAD AN OPPORTUNITY TO DO THAT?
18	A (WITNESS NODS AFFIRMATIVELY.)
19	Q NOW, MISS SALDANA, AT THE PRELIMINARY HEARING YOU
20	WERE ASKED THIS QUESTION, "THE SOLE PURPOSE OF THIS
21	CONVERSATION WAS TO ESSENTIALLY SORT OUT HOW YOU TWO STOOD AS
22	BOYFRIEND AND GIRLFRIEND; IS THAT RIGHT?"
23	AND YOU GAVE THIS ANSWER, "YES."
24	IS THAT TRUE.
25	A YES.

YOU INDICATED THAT IT WAS UPON YOUR UNCLE'S 1 ADVICE THAT YOU, IN EFFECT, WERE GOING TO PUMP, FOR LACK OF A 2 BETTER WORD, OR I CAN'T THINK OF A BETTER WORD, PUMP HIM, TOM 3 AND DALE, FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION. YOU SAY MR. AVANTS NEVER TOLD YOU TO LET THE 5 POLICE OR THE D.A.'S OPFICE KNOW ANYTHING ELSE YOU MIGHT LEARN? 7 I HAD TOLD HIM MYSELF THAT I WOULD TELL HIM OR 8 SOMEONE IN THE POLICE OFFICE, POLICE DEPARTMENT. 9 WELL, AT THE EVIDENTIARY HEARING, WERE YOU 10 MISTAKEN THEN WHEN YOU WERE ASKED THIS QUESTION AND GAVE THIS 11 ANSWER AND FOR THE COUNSEL'S BENEFIT IT IS PAGE 112 OF THE 12 HEARING, NOT THE PRELIMINARY HEARING, THE EVIDENTIARY 13 14 **HEARING.** QUESTION, "DID BEECHER AVANTS ASK YOU TO LET HIM 15 KNOW OR LET THE POLICE OR THE D.A.'S OFFICE KNOW ANYTHING 16 17 ELSE YOU MIGHT LEARN?" ANSWER, "YES." 18 QUESTION, "AND BASED UPON THAT WHEN YOU HAD THE 19 20 CONVERSATION WITH MR. AKERS AND HE ASKED YOU TO MARRY HIM, YOU BASICALLY SAID YES JUST SO THAT HE WOULD TRUST YOU?" 21 22 RIGHT? 23 AND TO GIVE HIM MORE INFORMATION; IS THAT 24

915

25

CORRECT?

ı	A YES.
2	Q AND THEN YOU WOULD GO IF YOU LEARNED ANY MORE
3	INFORMATION, YOU WOULD GO RIGHT TO TELL METRO OR MR. BERNI
4	OR, EXCUSE ME, OFFICER BERNI OR MR. AVANTS OR PERHAPS EVEN
5	MR. SEATON OR SOMEBODY FROM THE D.A.'S OFFICE ABOUT WHAT YOU
6	LEARNED?
7	A YES.
8	Q AND THIS WAS BEFORE OR AFTER YOU LEARNED ABOUT
9	THE \$2,000 REWARD AVAILABLE?
LO	A THIS IS AFTER.
11	Q NOW, YOU HAD RECEIVED A NUMBER OF TELEPHONE CALLS
12	FROM TOM AKERS FROM JAIL; ISN'T THAT TRUE?
13	A I CAN ONLY RECALL THREE.
L 4	Q DO YOU RECALL ONE ON CHRISTMAS
15	A YES.
16	Q OF LAST YEAR, WHERE DURING THAT TELEPHONE
17	CONVERSATION, MR. AKERS ASKED YOU TO DISPOSE OF SOME
18	EVIDENCE; ISN'T THAT TRUE?
19	A YES.
20	Q WHAT SPECIFICALLY DID HE ASK YOU TO DO?
21	A HE ASKED ME TO GET RID OF A STICK.
22	Q DID HE TELL YOU WHERE A STICK WAS?
23	A I DON'T REMEMBER. I KNEW WHERE IT WAS ALREADY,
24	THOUGH.
25	Q HE ASKED TO YOU GET RID OF IT. DID YOU EVER GO
	916

Ţ	AND RETRIEVE THAT SILCK!
2	A YES, I DID.
3	Q WHAT DID YOU DO WITH IT?
4	A I GAVE IT TO DAN SEATON.
5	MR. PIKE: MAY I APPROACE THE WITNESS, YOUR
6	BONOR?
7	THE COURT: YES.
8	BY MR. PIKE:
9	Q SHOWING YOU WHAT'S BEEN MARKED FOR EVIDENTIARY
10	PURPOSES STATE'S PROPOSED EXHIBIT NUMBER 96.
11	I WOULD ASK TO YOU LOOK AT THAT. TELL ME
12	WHETHER OR NOT YOU RECOGNIZE THAT?
13	A WELL, A LITTLE. IT HAS BEEN TORN UP SINCE I
14	BROUGHT IT IN BUT, YEAR, IT LOOKS LIKE THE STICK.
15	Q IT LOOKS LIKE THE STICK YOU TOOK INTO MR.
16	SEATON'S OFFICE?
17	A YES.
18	Q AND IT'S THE STICK THAT TOM AKERS TOLD YOU TO GET
19	RID OF?
20	A YES.
21	Q NOW, YOU HAD AN OPPORTUNITY TO KNOW TOM AKERS AND
22	DALE FLANAGAN. DID YOU KNOW RANDY MOORE?
23	A NO, I DIDN'T.
24	Q DID YOU KNOW ROY MCDOWELL?
25	A I HAD KNOWN HIM, I THINK, A YEAR PRIOR. I HAD
	917

,	
2	Q JOHNNY RAY LUCKETT?
3	A ABOUT THREE YEARS AGO.
4	Q AND TOM AKERS THEN WAS ACTIVELY INVOLVED IN
5	TRYING TO COVER UP THESE CRIMES TWO MONTHS AFTER THEY
6	OCCURRED?
7	MR. SEATON: OBJECT, THAT CALLS FOR SPECULATION
8	ON THE PART OF THE WITNESS, YOUR HONOR.
9	THE COURT: COUNSEL.
10	MR. PIKE: LET ME REPHRASE THAT.
11	BY MR. PIKE:
12	Q SOME TWO MONTHS AFTER, ALMOST TWO MONTHS AFTER
13	THE DEATHS OF THE GORDONS, TOM AKERS WAS ACTIVELY SEEKING YOU
14	TO COVER UP AND HIDE EVIDENCE?
15	A YES.
16	Q DALE NEVER ASKED YOU TO DO THAT?
17	A NOT IN WORDS, NO.
18	Q NOW, YOU INDICATED THAT YOU AND DALE LIVED
19	TOGETHER FOR ABOUT A MONTH. DURING THAT TIME, YOU NEVER SAW
20	DALE WITE ANY .22 PISTOL OR REVOLVER, DID YOU?
21	A YES.
22	MR. PIKE: AGAIN, FOR COUNSEL'S BENEFIT, PAGE 119
23	OF THE PRELIMINARY HEARING. MAY I APPROACH THE WITNESS
24	AGAIN, YOUR HONOR?
25	THE COURT: YES.
	918

1	
1	BY MR. PIKE:
2	Q MISS SALDANA, I WOULD ASK YOU TO LOOK AT THE
3	BOTTOM OF THIS PAGE, READ THE LAST QUESTION AND THE LAST
4	ANSWER. HAVE YOU HAD AN OPPORTUNITY TO READ THAT?
5	A YES.
6	Q MISS SALDANA, DO YOU RECALL BEING ASKED THIS
7	QUESTION AT THE PRELIMINARY HEARING AND GIVING THIS ANSWER.
8	DID YOU EVER SEE ANY .22 CALIBER PISTOL IN THE
9	POSSESSION OF MR. FLANAGAN IN HIS TRAILER AT ANY TIME DURING
10	YOUR ONE MONTH RESIDENCY WITH HIM?"
11	answer, "no."
12	DO YOU RECALL BEING ASKED THAT QUESTION AND
13	GIVING THAT ANSWER?
14	A YES.
15	Q AND CONCERNING YOUR EMPLOYMENT, DO YOU RECALL
16	GIVING TESTIMONY AT THE PRELIMINARY HEARING THAT YOU WERE NOT
17	EMPLOYED AT ALL AND I WILL REFER COUNSEL TO PAGE 120?
18	A COULD YOU ASK THAT AGAIN.
19	Q OKAY. AT THE PRELIMINARY HEARING, DO YOU RECALL
20	BEING ASKED THIS QUESTION, "YOU WERE NOT MAKING MONEY OF ANY
21	SORT DURING THAT TIME DOING ANYTHING?"
22	ANSWER, "NO."
23	A THAT'S TRUE.
24	Q BUT YOU ACTUALLY WERE WORKING AT THAT TIME?
25	A NO, NOT, NO.

- 1		
1	Q	YOU WEREN'T GETTING PAID FOR STRIPPING AT
2	BOGIE'S?	
3.	λ	YES, BUT NOT WITH A PAYCHECK.
4	Q	HOW WERE YOU GETTING PAID?
5	λ	TIPS.
6	Q	HOW DID YOU GET TIPS?
7	λ	BY DANCING.
8	Q	DO THEY THROW THEM UP ON STAGE?
9	λ	THEY HAND THEM TO YOU.
10	Q	AND WHILE YOU WERE LIVING IN THE TRAILER WITH
11	DALE, EXCEP	T FOR TIMES WHEN YOU WERE EMPLOYED OR WORKING OR
12	DANCING AND	HE WAS WORKING, YOU WERE LIVING WITH HIM 24 HOURS
13	A DAY?	÷
14	λ	ASK THAT ONE MORE TIME, PLEASE.
15	Q	EXCEPT FOR THE TIMES WHEN EITHER YOU WERE DANCING
16	OR WORKING	AND HE WAS WORKING, YOU WERE RESIDING TOGETHER
17	AS BOYFRIEN	D-GIRLFRIEND, MAN AND WIFE IN THAT
18	A	YES.
19	Q	DID YOU HAVE A CAR AT THAT TIME?
20	A	NO.
21	Q	DID DALE PROVIDE TRANSPORTATION FOR YOU?
22	A	NO.
23	Q	WHO DID PROVIDE TRANSPORTATION FOR YOU?
24	A	TOM AKERS.
25	Q	AND HOW LONG HAD YOU KNOWN MR. AKERS PRIOR TO

1	MOVING IN WITE MR. FLANAGAN?
2	A I HAD MET HIM ABOUT THE SAME TIME I MET RAY
3	BERNI.
4	Q MET RAY BERNI?
5	A I MET TOM AKERS ABOUT THE SAME TIME I MET RAY
6	BERNI WHICH WAS ONLY ONCE AND THAT WAS IT.
7	Q DO YOU RECALL BEING ASKED THAT QUESTION AT A
8	PRELIMINARY HEARING IN THIS MATTER?
9	AND, COUNSEL, I AM REFERRING TO PAGE 121. MAY I
10	APPROACE THE WITNESS AGAIN, YOUR HONOR?
11	THE COURT: YES.
12	BY MR. PIRE:
13	Q AND I DIRECT YOUR ATTENTION TO THE LAST QUESTION
14	AND AGAIN THE LAST ANSWER.
15	A OKAY.
16	Q DO YOU RECALL BEING ASKED THIS QUESTION AND
17	GIVING THIS ANSWER, "HOW LONG HAD YOU KNOWN MR. AKERS PRIOR
18	TO MOVING IN WITE MR. FLANAGAN?"
19	"A WEEK, I THINK A WEEK." IS THAT TRUE?
20	A YES. I HAD MET TOM AKERS AT A SHERIFF, WHAT DO
21	YOU CALL IT, A POLITICAL CAMPAIGN AND I HAD MET HIS MOTHER
22	AND HIM. I JUST REMEMBER THAT, THAT'S ALL.
23	Q AND YOU HAD MET HIM ONCE BUT THEN THE FIRST TIME
24	YOU ACTUALLY MET HIM, GOT TO KNOW HIM WAS ABOUT A WEEK BEFORE
25	YOU MOVED IN WITE DALE FLANAGAN?

2	Q ABOUT HOW LONG WAS IT AFTER YOU MOVED IN WITH
3	DALE FLANAGAN THAT YOU STARTED HAVING SEX WITH TOM AKERS TO
4	GET INFORMATION FROM HIM?
5	A APPROXIMATELY, I THINK, TWO WEEKS.
6	Q AND SO WITHIN THAT TIME FRAME YOU HAD TALKED WITH
7	OFFICER BERNI, YOU HAD TALKED WITH OTHER INDIVIDUALS AND YOU
8	WERE DETERMINED AT THAT TIME TO GET INFORMATION?
9	A YES.
10	Q AND YOU KNEW AT THAT TIME ABOUT THE REWARD?
11	A NO, I DIDN'T.
12	Q AND YOU WERE GIVING SEX TO TOM AKERS, DALE
13	FLANAGAN TO GET INFORMATION FOR THEM AS SOME SORT OF CIVIC
14	DUTY?
15	A REPHRASE THAT, PLEASE.
16	Q HOW HAVE YOU BEEN INFORMED YOU WILL RECEIVE THE
17	\$2,000 THAT YOU ARE GOING TO GET ONCE YOU FINISH TESTIFYING
18	IN THIS CASE?
19	A DETECTIVE LEVOS TOLD ME THAT AFTER I MADE MY
20	STATEMENT, AFTER THE CRIME WAS JUSTIFIED, THEN I WOULD BE
21	REWARDED.
22	Q THEN YOU WOULD BE REWARDED?
23	A YES.
24	Q AND THEY HAVE CONDITIONED THAT UPON THE
25	CONVICTION OF THESE YOUNG MEN HERE; ISN'T THAT TRUE?
	922

1	A NO.
2	MR. PIKE: I HAVE NO FURTHER QUESTIONS.
3	THE COURT: CROSS-EXAMINATION, MR. POSIN.
4	MR. POSIN: YES.
5	
6	CROSS-EXAMINATION
7	BY MR. POSIN:
8	Q MISS SALDANA, IN YOUR CONVERSATIONS WITH DALE
9	PLANAGAN, YOU INDICATED THAT HE HAD STRIKE THAT.
10	YOU HAD HAD CONVERSATION WITH DALE FLANAGAN
11	OSTENSIBLY ABOUT THAT WHICE HAD HAPPENED AT THE HOME OF HIS
12	GRANDPARENTS; DO YOU RECALL THAT TESTIMONY?
13	A JUST TALKING TO HIM.
14	Q YOU DON'T UNDERSTAND THE QUESTION?
15	THE COURT: DO YOU RECALL THAT TESTIMONY?
16	THE WITNESS: I DIDN'T EVEN UNDERSTAND THE
17	QUESTION.
18	BY MR. POSIN:
19	Q YOU TESTIFIED EARLIER THAT YOU HAD HAD
20	CONVERSATION WITH DALE FLANAGAN RELATING TO THAT WHICH HAD
21	OCCURRED AT HIS GRANDPARENTS' HOME?
22	A YES.
23	Q DO YOU RECALL. AND DURING THE COURSE OF THAT
24	CONVERSATION, DALE HAD MENTIONED RANDY MOORE, HAD HE?
25	A YES.

1	Q AS BEING ONE OF THE PI	EOPLE WHO HAD GONE TO THE
2	HOME OF THE GRANDPARENTS?	
3	A YES.	
4	Q DID HE EVER TELL YOU	THAT HE HAD SEEN RANDY MOORE
5	FIRE A SHOT?	· ·
6	A NO.	
7	Q DID YOU HAVE CONVERSA	TION WITH RANDY MOORE
8	REGARDING THAT WHICH HAD HAPPENED	ON THE NIGHT OF NOVEMBER
9	5 TH?	
10	A NO.	
11	Q DID YOU EVER HAVE CON	VERSATION WITE RANDY MOORE
12	WITH REGARD TO ANYTHING THAT HAD	HAPPENED AT THE HOME OF THE
13	GORDONS?	÷
14	A NO.	
15	Q JUST BY WAY OF CLARIF	ICATION IF I MAY, YOU TOLD
16	US THAT YOU HAD MET DALE FLANAGAN	ABOUT TWO WEEKS BEFORE YOU
17	MOVED IN WITH HIM?	
18	A YES.	
19	Q BUT YOU STARTED YOUR	BOYFRIEND-GIRL FRIEND
20	RELATIONSHIP IMMEDIATELY UPON MEE	TING HIM, WAS THAT YOUR
21	TESTIMONY?	
22	A YES.	
23	Q THE NIGHT YOU MET HIS	1?
24	A YES.	•
25	Q BUT THAT WAS SOMEPLA	CE OTHER THAN THE TRAILER?
	0.2	4

1	A YES.
2	Q WHERE DID YOUR RELATIONSHIP THAT TRANSLATES
3,	INTO SEXUAL INVOLVEMENT, DOES IT NOT? YOU HAD SEXUAL
4	RELATIONSHIP WITH HIM THE NIGHT YOU MET HIM?
5	A YES.
6	Q WHERE WAS THAT, AT THE TRAILER OR SOMEPLACE ELSE?
7	A THAT WAS AT DEBBIE SAMPLES' APARTMENT.
8	Q NOW, I WASN'T ABLE TO HEAR YOUR ANSWER EARLIER
9	WITE REGARD TO YOUR CONVERSATION WITE YOUR UNCLE. DID YOU
10	SAY THAT HE IS A LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENT?
11	A HE USED TO BE AN ATTORNEY.
12	Q HE USED TO BE AN ATTORNEY?
13	A YES.
14	Q HE WAS NEVER PART OF A LAW ENFORCEMENT
15	ORGANIZATION?
16	A I HAVE NO IDEA.
17	Q WAS HE EVER A PROSECUTOR, DO YOU KNOW?
18	A I DON'T KNOW. I HAVE NO IDEA.
19	Q NOW, BACK TO YOUR EARLIER TESTIMONY AGAIN FOR
20	PURPOSES OF CLARIFICATION. I BELIEVE YOU HAD TESTIFIED ABOUT
21	A CONVERSATION WITH DALE THE MORNING OF NOVEMBER 6TH OR
22	DURING THE DAY OF NOVEMBER 6TH. I BELIEVE YOUR TESTIMONY WAS
23	THAT THAT WAS SOLELY FOR THE PURPOSE OF CLARIFYING YOUR
24	BOYFRIEND-GIRLFRIEND RELATIONSHIP; IS THAT TRUE?
25	A NOT ON NOVEMBER 6TH, NO.

1	Q	WHEN WAS THE CONVERSATION?
2	λ.	DECEMBER 5TE.
3	Q	DID DALE ASK YOU AT THAT TIME TO COVER FOR HIM IN
4	ANY WAY, DI	D HE?
5	A	NO.
6	Ō	HE NEVER ASKED YOU SPECIFICALLY TO COVER FOR HIM
7	OR IN SOME	PASHION PROTECT HIM, DID HE?
8	A	NO, HE DID NOT SAY IT IN WORDS, NO.
9	Q	I BELIEVE THERE WAS SOME TESTIMONY ABOUT
10	SOMETHING A	ABOUT THE OCCULT. DO YOU RECALL HAVING TESTIFIED
11	ABOUT THAT?	•
12	A	I THINK SO, YES.
13	Q	ABOUT ANY OCCULT ACTIVITY THAT WHICH ANYONE WAS
14	INVOLVED?	
15	A	THAT THEY WERE INVOLVED OR I WAS INVOLVED?
16	Q	THEY WERE INVOLVED.
17	A	YES.
18	Q	DID YOU EVER SEE ANY SUCH INVOLVEMENT?
19	A	NO. THEY WOULD NEVER SHOW IT IN FRONT OF ME.
20	Q	YOU NEVER SAW ANYTHING?
21		MR. POSIN: I HAVE NO FURTHER QUESTIONS OF THIS
22	WITNESS.	
23		THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. REDIRECT.
24		MR. SEATON: YES, YOUR HONOR, THANK YOU.
25	11	
	1	626

	REDIRECT EXAMINATION
1	
2	BY MR. SEATON:
3	Q MISS SALDANA, YOU INDICATED TO MR. HANDFUSS THAT
4	YESTERDAY YOU HAD MADE A MISTAKE IN YOUR TESTIMONY REGARDING
5	WHETHER OR NOT DALE HAD TOLD YOU IN HIS CONVERSATION WITH YOU
6	THAT ROY MCDOWELL WAS ONE OF THE SIX INDIVIDUALS WHO HAD GONE
7	OUT TO THE HOUSE?
8	A YES, THAT WAS A MISTAKE.
9	O DID DALE FLANAGAN EVER TELL YOU THAT ROY MCDOWELL
10	DID NOT GO OUT THERE?
11	A NO, HE DIDN'T.
12	Q HE JUST SIMPLY FAILED TO MENTION HIS NAME; IS
13	THAT CORRECT?
14	A THAT'S RIGHT.
15	MR. HANDFUSS: OBJECTION, YOUR HONOR. HE CAN'T
16	SAY WHETHER HE FAILED TO MENTION. IT CAME OUT HE MENTIONED
17	SPECIFIC NAMES.
18	HE NEVER MENTIONED ROY MCDOWELL. SHE DOESN'T
19	KNOW IF HE PAILED. SPECIFIC NAMES WERE MENTIONED. ROY
20	MCDOWELL'S NAME WAS NOT ONE OF THOSE SPECIFIC NAMES THAT WERE
21	MENTIONED.
22	MR. SEATON: I WILL WITHDRAW THE QUESTION, MR.
23	HANDFUSS.
24	THE COURT: LET'S PROCEED.

BY MR. SEATON:

1	Q YOU HAD INDICATED THAT YOU TESTIFIED HERE TODAY
2	IN RESPONSE TO A QUESTION BY MR. PIKE THAT YOU HAD SEEN DALE
3	WITH A .22 PISTOL AND HE THEN READ TO YOU FROM PAGE 119 OF
4	THE PRELIMINARY HEARING TRANSCRIPT WHERE IT SAID, "DID YOU
5	EVER SEE ANY .22 CALIBER PISTOL IN THE POSSESSION OF MR.
6	FLANAGAN IN HIS TRAILER AT ANY TIME DURING YOUR ONE MONTH
7	RESIDENCY WITH HIM?" AND YOU ANSWERED, "NO" THERE.
8	DID YOU EVER SEE
9	A NOT IN HIS TRAILER. THAT IS WHERE I WAS A LITTLE
LO	CONFUSED BECAUSE HE ASKED ME AT ANY TIME.
11	Q LET ME ASK YOU, AT ANY TIME DID YOU EVER SEE A
L2	.22 PISTOL IN THE POSSESSION OF DALE FLANAGAN?
13	A YES.
L 4	Q WHERE?
ľ 5	A AT RANDY MOORE'S APARTMENT.
L6	Q WHEN?
17	A THAT'S GOING TO BE TOUGH.
18	Q AFTER THE DEATHS OF CARL AND COLLEEN GORDON?
19	A YES.
20	Q THANK YOU. WHAT WAS HE DOING WITH THE GUN, DO
21	YOU REMEMBER?
22	A I DON'T KNOW IF I AM ALLOWED TO MENTION ONE OF
23	THE OTHER BOY'S NAME WHO IS NOT HERE.
24	Q SURE YOU ARE.
25	A MIKE WALSH WERE GETTING READY TO GO ON FREMONT
	1

2	Mr. Dalli. I Did. I bill.
3	SORRY, YOUR ECNOR.
4	BY MR. SEATON:
5	Q SAY IT LOUDER.
6	A DALE FLANAGAN, MIKE WALSE WERE LEAVING THE
7	APARTMENT TO GO TO FREMONT STREET WITH THE WEAPON.
8	MR. PIKE: I OBJECT, YOUR HONOR, THE OTHER ACTS
9	DOCTRINE. THIS IS INFORMATION THAT IS BEING SOUGHT BY THE
10	DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S OFFICE THAT IT MAY IMPLICATE MR. FLANAGAN
11	IN OTHER ACTS.
12	MR. SEATON: I MAY BE MISTAKEN, YOUR HONOR, BUT
13	IT SEEMS TO ME MR. PIKE, HE OPENED THIS DOOR ASKING, PINNING
14	HER DOWN THAT SHE HAD NEVER SEEN THE .22 PISTOL AND NOW WE
15	ARE FINDING OUT WHERE SHE ACTUALLY SAW THE PISTOL.
16	MR. PIKE PERHAPS SHOULD HAVE TAKEN THAT INTO
17	CONSIDERATION WHEN HE ASKED THE QUESTION.
18	THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. I THINK YOU HAVE
19	ESTABLISHED, MR. SEATON, WHERE THE WITNESS HAS SEEN THE
20	PISTOL. THUS PAR, THERE HAS BEEN NO BAD ACT OR CRIME
21	ALLEGED. NOW, WITH THE ADMONITION THAT SUCH WOULD BE DEEMED
22	IMPROPER AT THIS JUNCTURE, WE WILL PROCEED.
23	MR. SEATON: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.
24	BY MR. SEATON:
25	Q THAT PISTOL WAS IN THE HANDS OF DALE FLANAGAN AT

YES. IT WAS IN BOTH OF THEIR HANDS. THEY WERE 2 A HOLDING IT BACK AND FORTH BEFORE THEY LEFT. 3 NOW, I THINK PERHAPS THREE OR FOUR, MAYBE EVEN FIVE TIMES DURING THE CROSS-EXAMINATION I HEARD YOU SAY 5 SOMETHING TO THE EFFECT THAT "DALE DIDN'T ASK HE TO COVER UP ANYTHING. HE DIDN'T SAY IT IN SO MANY WORDS. 7 NOW, NO ONE'S ASKED YOU TO EXPLAIN TRAT. I WOULD 8 LIKE TO. WHAT DO YOU MEAN BY ALL THAT? 9 I WAS GIVEN THE IMPRESSION --10 MR. PIKE: OBJECTION. 11 MR. POSIN: IF YOUR HONOR PLEASE, THE QUESTION 12 WAS ASKED AND ANSWERED AND OBVIOUSLY THE ANSWER WAS THAT 13 NOBODY EVER HAD, EVER SAID OR DALE NEVER SAID ANYTHING ABOUT 14 15 COVER UP IN SO MANY WORDS. NOW, WHAT WE ARE REACHING FOR IS SPECULATION AS 16 TO WHAT THIS WITNESS THOUGHT WAS GOING ON IN SOMEONE ELSE'S 17 MIND AND THAT IS TOTALLY IMPROPER. 18 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. 19 MR. PIKE: I JOIN IN THAT OBJECTION, YOUR HONOR. 20 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. IT WOULD BE PROPER FOR 21 THE WITNESS TO INDICATE WHAT HER IMPRESSION WAS AND WHAT SHE 22 BASED IT ON. BUT NOT WHAT SHE THOUGHT MR. FLANAGAN'S 23 IMPRESSION WAS. PROCEED. 24 25 BY MR. SEATON:

930

THAT TIME, THOUGH; IS THAT CORRECT?

1	
1	Q DO YOU UNDERSTAND WHAT THE JUDGE JUST SAID, MISS
2	SALDANA?
3	A I THINK SO.
4	Q WHAT WE WANT TO LEARN IS WHAT YOU PELT, NOT WHAT
5	YOU THOUGHT DALE FLANAGAN WAS FEELING AND TRYING TO IMPRESS
6	UPON YOU, BUT WHAT YOUR IMPRESSIONS WERE. WITH THAT IN MIND
7	AND WITH REGARDS TO WHETHER OR NOT YOU FELT THAT YOU WERE
8	SUPPOSED TO HELP IN ANY SORT OF A COVER-UP, WOULD YOU EXPLAIN
9	YOUR FEELINGS AND IMPRESSIONS, PLEASE?
10	A WELL, WHEN HE WAS TELLING ME THESE THINGS, I
11	MENTIONED SOMETHING, HEARSAY SOMETHING THERE. I FELT LIKE I
12	WAS SUPPOSED TO JUST LISTEN TO HIM AND COVER UP FOR HIM.
13	WHEN DETECTIVE LEVOS CAME BY OR JERGOVIC CAME BY,
14	I WAS TO EITHER KEEP MY MOUTH SHUT OR GO ALONG WITH HIS
15	STORY, YOU KNOW. IT WASN'T TO GO AHEAD AND TELL THEM. I
16	KNOW THAT.
17	Q BUT HE DIDN'T SAY THAT TO YOU IN SO MANY WORDS,
18	DID HE?
19	A NO. HE WOULD JUST TELL ME WHAT HE HAD TO SAY AND
20	I WAS LISTENING.
21	Q THERE HAS BEEN MUCH TO-DO ABOUT THE TIMING OF
22	CERTAIN MEETINGS THAT YOU HAD WITH PEOPLE. I HAVE REFERENCE
23	TO THE OCCASION YOU HAD TO SPEAK WITH OFFICER BERNI.
24	A YES.
25	Q AND THEN THE OCCASION YOU HAD TO SPEAK WITH MR.

1	AVANTS?	
2	A THERE WERE TWO MEETINGS WITH OFFICER BERNI.	
3	Q OKAY. AND THEN THE MEETING THAT YOU HAD WITH	
4	DETECTIVE LEVOS AFTER HAVING SPOKEN WITH DETECTIVE OR MR.	
5	AVANTS. LET'S SEE IF WE CAN PIN THOSE DOWN AND UNDERSTAND	
6	THEM WITH SOME CLARITY.	
7	IN RELATIONSHIP LET'S DO IT THIS WAY. WHEN	
8	DID YOU FIRST GO SPEAK WITH OFFICER BERNI?	
9	A THE SAME WEEK THAT DALE HAD BOUGHT THE SECOND	
10	KNIFE. THAT WAS THE PIRST CONVERSATION WITH OFFICER BERNI.	
11	Q WAS IT AFTER DALE HAD BOUGHT THE SECOND KNIFE AND	
12	SHOWN IT TO YOU?	
13	A YES.	
14	Q IS THAT THE THING THAT TRIGGERED YOUR GOING TO	
15	OFFICER BERNI?	
16	A YES.	
17	Q IT WAS YOUR TESTIMONY THAT YOU SHOWED HIM THE	
18	KNIFE AND HE TOLD YOU TO PUT IT BACK WHERE IT CAME FROM?	
19	A YES.	
20	Q DID OFFICER BERNI AT THAT TIME SUGGEST IN ANY WAY	
21	THAT YOU BECOME AN AGENT OF LAW ENFORCEMENT AND GO ELICIT	
22	INFORMATION FROM DALE FLANAGAN?	
23	A NO.	
24	Q WHOSE IDEA WAS THAT?	
25	A MINE.	

1	Q	YOURS ALONE?
2	. A	MINE ALONE.
3	Q	AND DID YOU GO BACK AND PUT THE KNIFE BACK?
4	A	DEFINITELY.
5	Q	AND DID YOU ASK THINGS OF DALE FLANAGAN TO TRY TO
6	SOLICIT INP	ORMATION OR DID YOU WAIT FOR HIM TO OFFER?
7	A	I BASICALLY WAITED FOR HIM TO GO ON HIS OWN ROLL
8	WITH TALKIN	G. SO I TRIED TO BE VERY CAREFUL ABOUT ASKING
9	QUESTIONS.	
10	Q	ALL RIGHT. WAS THE NEXT MEETING THEN THE SECOND
11	MEETING WIT	H OFFICER BERNI?
12	A	YES.
13	Q	WHEN DID THAT TAKE PLACE?
14	λ	AFTER THE BOYS OR, EXCUSE ME, AFTER DALE HAD TOLD
15	ME THAT HE	HAD DONE IT.
16	Q	THAT WAS YOUR CONVERSATION WITH DALE IN THE
17	TRAILER ON	DECEMBER THE 5TH?
18	A	YES.
19	Q	WAS IT DECEMBER THE 5TH OR SOMETIME THEREAFTER
20	WHEN YOU WE	NT TO SEE OFFICER BERNI FOR THE SECOND TIME?
21	A	DECEMBER THE 6TH.
22	Q	THE NEXT DAY?
23	A	YES.
24	Q	AND AT THAT MEETING, DID YOU SIMPLY TELL OFFICER
25	BERNI EVERY	THING THAT DALE HAD TOLD YOU?

1	A	NOT ON THAT THERE. I MEAN, ON THAT SECOND
2	MEETING.	
3	Q	WHAT DID YOU TELL OFFICER BERNI AT THAT MEETING?
4	A	I JUST TOLD HIM I NEEDED TO KNOW WHO TO TALK TO
5	ABOUT A STA	TEMENT THAT WAS JUST GIVEN TO ME.
6	Q	YOU DIDN'T TELL HIM WHAT THE STATEMENT WAS,
7	THOUGH?	
8	λ	NOT TO HIM PERSONALLY. HE WAS THERE WHEN I GAVE
9	THE STATEME	ENT.
10	Q	WHAT ADVICE DID HE GIVE YOU? WHO DID HE TELL YOU
11	TO GO TO?	
12	А	HE TOLD ME TO GO TO BEECHER AVANTS.
13	Q	AND DID YOU GO TO BEECHER AVANTS?
14	A	YES.
15	Q	WHERE?
16	Α	HE CAME TO MY AUNT'S HOUSE.
17	Q	HE CAME TO YOUR AUNT'S HOUSE?
18	A	YES.
19	Q	DOES BEECHER AVANTS KNOW YOUR AUNT?
20	λ	YES.
21	Q	ARE THEY PERSONAL FRIENDS?
22	A	YES.
23	Q	DID YOU AT THAT TIME WITH BEECHER AVANTS TELL HIM
24	THE STATEM	ENT THAT DALE HAD TOLD YOU AND THAT YOU HAVE TOLD
25	THE IS JURY	YESTERDAY?
		934

1	A	YES.
2	Q	AND DID BEECHER AVANTS TELL YOU TO GO SEE ANYONE
3	AT THAT TIM	E?
4	λ	YES.
5	Q	WHO DID HE TELL YOU TO GO SEE?
6	λ	BOB HILLIARD.
7	Q	BOB HILLIARD IS THE POLICE?
8	A	HE IS THE SERGEANT AT METROPOLITAN POLICE
9	DEPARTMENT.	
LO	Q	SERGEANT WITH METRO?
11	A	YES.
12	Q	DID YOU GO TO SEE SERGEANT HILLIARD AT THAT TIME?
13	A	YES, I DID.
14	Q	AND DID YOU TELL HIM THE SAME STORY?
15	A	YES.
16	Q	AND DID HE TELL YOU TO GO SEE ANYONE?
17	A	YES.
18	Q	WHO?
19	A	DETECTIVE LEVOS.
20	Q	NOW, DETECTIVE LEVOS IS THE DETECTIVE WHO ALONG
21	WITH DETECT	TIVE GEARY IS IN CHARGE OF THIS PARTICULAR MURDER
22	CASE, IS HE	NOT?
23	A	YES.
24	Q	DID YOU GO SEE HIM?
25	· A	YES, I DID.
		935

1	Q IS THAT WHEN YOU GAVE THE STATEMENT WHICH IS
2	DATED DECEMBER THE 7TH AT 12:20 IN THE MORNING?
3	A YES.
4	Q THIS IS 20 MINUTES AFTER MIDNIGHT OF THE 6TH?
5	A YES.
6	Q THE DAY THAT YOU ARE TELLING BERNI, AVANTS,
7	HILLIARD, AND THEN LEVOS?
8	A YES.
9	Q WERE YOU EVER THE DID ANY OF THEM, ALL OF THE
10	INDIVIDUALS WE HAVE NAMED, BERNI, AVANTS, HILLIARD, LEVOS,
11	DID ANY OF THEM EVER REQUEST OF YOU TO BECOME THEIR AGENT AND
12	GO TRY TO ELICIT INFORMATION FROM DALE FLANAGAN?
13	A NO.
14	Q YOU DID IT ALL ON YOUR OWN?
15	A ALL ON MY OWN.
16	Q YOU TOLD MR. PIKE ON CROSS-EXAMINATION THAT YOU
17	HAD NOT TALKED TO TOM AKERS REGARDING THE REWARD AND HE READ
18	TO YOU THIS QUESTION AND ANSWER.
19	"DID YOU EVER DISCUSS WITH MR. AKERS OR ANYONE
20	ELSE THE POSSIBILITY OF RECEIVING A \$2,000 REWARD FOR
21	INFORMATION YOU MIGHT HAVE WITH RESPECT TO THE KILLING OF MR.
22	AND MRS. GORDON?" AND THERE YOU ANSWERED, "YES."
23	AND THAT IS TRUE, ISN'T IT?
24	A YES, BUT I THOUGHT HE MEANT BEFORE THEY HAD BEEN
25	ARRESTED.

1	Q WELL, HE DIDN'T READ THE REST OF YOUR ANSWER TO
2	YOU. YOU SAID, "ISN'T IT TRUE, YES. AFTER THEY WERE
3	ARRESTED, AFTER THE BOYS WERE ARRESTED, YES.
4	A THAT'S TRUE.
5	Q THAT IS WHEN YOU SPOKE WITH TOM AKERS?
6	A YES, ON THE PHONE.
7	Q AND THE NEXT QUESTION, AS A MATTER OF FACT, SAID
8	"SO YOU WERE AWARE OF THE \$2,000 REWARD; IS THAT RIGHT?" AND
9	WASN'T YOUR ANSWER, "NOT UNTIL AFTER I MADE MY STATEMENT. I
10	WASN'T AWARE OF IT."
11	A THAT'S TRUE.
12	Q SO IS IT YOUR TESTIMONY THAT YOU DID SPEAK WITH
13	MR. AKERS ABOUT THE REWARD BUT SOMETIME AFTER YOU HAD GIVEN
14	THE STATEMENT TO THE POLICE, IN FACT, SOMETIME AFTER HE WAS
15	ARRESTED AND PUT IN JAIL?
16	A YES.
17	Q AND BY THAT TIME YOU WERE AWARE OF THE REWARD?
18	A YES.
19	Q NOW, AFTER OBTAINING THE INFORMATION FROM DALE
20	FLANAGAN ON YOUR OWN, AND NOT BEING AN AGENT OF THE LAS VEGAS
21	METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT
22	MR. POSIN: YOUR HONOR PLEASE, THAT IS A
23	GRATUITOUS CONCLUSION IN THAT QUESTION.
24	MR. SEATON: I AM JUST TRYING TO SET THE TIMING.
25	MR. PIKE: COMMENTING ON THE EVIDENCE.

1	mi wom. 227 7 127-127-127-127-127-127-127-127-127-127-
2	MR. SEATON: OKAY.
3	BY MR. SEATON:
4	Q SO WE CAN GET THE TIMING DOWN. IT'S TRUE, ISN'T
5	IT, THAT YOU GAVE YOUR FIRST AND ONLY STATEMENT TO THE POLICE
6	ON THE 7TH OF DECEMBER AT 12:20 A.M.?
7	A YES.
8	Q AND WAS IT SOMETIME AFTER THAT THAT YOU FIRST
9	LEARNED THAT YOU WOULD BE ELIGIBLE FOR REWARD MONEY THROUGH
10	SECRET WITNESS?
11	A YES, APPROXIMATELY ABOUT AN HOUR LATER.
12	Q ABOUT AN HOUR AFTER?
13	A YES.
14	Q WHO TOLD THAT YOU?
15	A DETECTIVE LEVOS.
16	Q WAS DETECTIVE GEARY ALSO PRESENT?
17	A YES.
18	Q DO YOU KNOW IF YOU ARE GETTING THE \$2,000 REWARD
19	MONEY FOR TESTIFYING OR IF YOU ARE GETTING IT FOR HAVING
20	HELPED SOLVE THIS MURDER CASE?
21	A YES. IT WAS FOR HELPING SOLVE THE MURDER.
22	THAT'S ALL. AND I HAVEN'T GOTTEN IT YET.
23	MR. SEATON: I HAVE NO FURTHER QUESTIONS.
24	THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. IS THERE ANYTHING
25	FURTHER, COUNSEL?

1	MR. PIKE: I WAS LOOKING, I AM SORRY.
2	THE COURT: ALL RIGHT.
3	MR. SMITH: I DON'T HAVE ANY QUESTIONS.
4	MR. HANDFUSS: JUST ONE QUESTION
5	
6	RECROSS-EXAMINATION
7	BY MR. HANDFUSS:
8	Q MISS SALDANA, THE ONLY REASON I AM ASKING YOU
9	THIS, THIS IS BROUGHT OUT BY OTHER COUNSEL. YOU NEVER SAW
10	ROY MCDOWELL HAVE ANYTHING TO DO WITH ANY CULT OR OCCULT OR
11	ANYTHING LIKE THAT, DID YOU?
12	MR. SEATON: OUT OF THE SCOPE. LET HER ANSWER.
13	BY MR. HANDFUSS:
14	Q YOU NEVER SAW ROY IN A COVEN OR ANYTHING?
15	A I NEVER SAW ANYBODY OF THESE IN A COVEN. THEY
16	HAVE ALL TOLD ME THAT THEY WERE EXCEPT FOR ROY.
17	MR. HANDFUSS: I HAVE NO FURTHER QUESTIONS.
18	THE COURT: ALL RIGHT.
19	MR. SMITH: I HAVE A QUESTION.
20	THE COURT: GO AHEAD.
21	
22	RECROSS-EXAMINATION
23	BY MR. SMITH:
24	Q IS IT YOUR TESTIMONY THAT JOHN LUCKETT TOLD YOU
25	HE WAS INVOLVED IN A COVEN?

1	A YES. HE'S BEEN DRAWING PICTURES. I HAVE SEEN
2	IT. HE WEARS THE
3	Q JOHN LUCKETT?
4	A YES.
5	Q DO YOU RECALL ME ASKING YOU IN SOME DETAIL ABOUT
6	THIS AT THE EVIDENTIARY HEARING?
7	A ABOUT HIM BEING IN THE OCCULT?
8	Q YES.
9	A I DON'T REMEMBER BUT
LO	Q LET ME SEE IF I CAN REFRESH YOUR MEMORY ON THAT.
1	AND I BEG THE COURT'S INDULGENCE?
L2	MR. SEATON: WHAT PAGE DOES YOUR CROSS START ON?
13	MR. SMITH: 95. COUNSEL, I AM AT PAGE 98. MAY I
L 4	APPROACE?
15	THE COURT: YES.
16	BY MR. SMITH:
L 7	Q MISS SALDANA, READ 98 STARTING AT LINE 18,
L 8	CARRYING OVER TO PAGE 99, AND ENDING AT PAGE 100 AT LINE SIX.
19	A STARTING WEERE?
20	Q LINE 17 ON PAGE 98 AND THROUGH THE END OF YOUR
21	TESTIMONY ON PAGE 100.
22	HAVE YOU HAD ENOUGH TIME TO READ IT AND THINK
23	ABOUT IT BEFORE I ASK YOU THE NEXT QUESTION?
24	A UH-HUH, YES.
25	Q GOOD. I WOULD LIKE TO READ THIS TESTIMONY AND

THEN WITH COUNSEL AND COURT'S PERMISSION I WILL ASK YOU TO 1 EXPLAIN HOW YOU CAN JUSTIPY YOUR LAST ANSWER IN LIGHT OF THIS 2 TESTIMONY. 3 MY QUESTION AT THE EVIDENTIARY HEARING ON SEPTEMBER THE 24TH. 5 QUESTION, "NOW, MOVING ONTO ANOTHER MATTER. DID 6 YOU EVER HAVE A CONVERSATION WITH THE NEWS REPORTER 7 CONCERNING OCCULT ACTIVITIES OR SATANIC OR BLACK MAGIC 8 ACTIVITIES PURPORTEDLY ENGAGED IN BY ANY OF THE 9 CODEFENDANTS?" 10 YOUR ANSWER IS, "YES." 11 QUESTION, "DO YOU HAVE ANY PERSONAL KNOWLEDGE 12 THAT IT IS BASED ON YOUR OWN OBSERVATIONS THAT ANY OF THESE 13 CODEFENDANTS WERE INVOLVED IN ANY TYPE OF BLACK MAGIC OR 14 SATANIC ACTIVITIES?" 15 YOUR ANSWER IS, "YES." 16 QUESTION "AND CAN YOU TELL US ABOUT WHAT YOU 17 OBSERVED?" 18 ANSWER, "PENTAGRAMS. THEY WERE INTO PENTAGRAMS." 19 QUESTION, "IT'S TRUE, IS IT NOT, THAT YOU NEVER 20 SAW YOURSELF JOHNNY RAY LUCKETT EVER ENGAGE IN ANY TYPE OF 21 BLACK MAGIC OR OCCULT ACTIVITY; ISN'T THAT TRUE?" 22 23 YOUR ANSWER, "I NEVER SEEN ANY OF THEM ENGAGE IN IT. I HAVE ONLY SEEN WHAT THEY HAVE OWNED AMONG THEM, 24 PERSONAL ITEMS. "

1	QUESTION, "YOU HAVE ONLY SEEN ESSENTIALLY
2	PARAPHANALIA AT RANDY MOORE'S HOUSE AND DALE FLANAGAN'S
3	HOUSE; ISN'T THAT TRUE?"
4	ANSWER, "YES. BECAUSE THEY WOULDN'T DISCUSS IT
5	WITH ME WHAT THEY DO."
6	QUESTION, "SO THEN YOU CANNOT SAY OF YOUR OWN
7	PERSONAL KNOWLEDGE THAT JOHN RAY LUCKETT HAS EVER BEEN
8	PERSONALLY INVOLVED IN ANY TYPE OF THAT ACTIVITY?"
9	ANSWER, "NO I CAN'T."
10	QUESTION, "HE CERTAINLY NEVER TOLD YOU THAT HE
11	WAS, DID HE?"
12	ANSWER, "NOPE."
13	QUESTION, "NOW, DID RANDY EVER TELL YOU THAT HE
14	was?"
15	ANSWER, "DALE HAD TOLD ME THAT RANDY WAS, YES."
16	QUESTION, "DID RANDY EVER TELL YOU THAT HE WAS?"
17	Answer, "Not Himself, No."
18	NOW, IT'S TRUE, IS IT NOT, THAT YOU DID OBSERVE
19	CERTAIN PARAPHERNALIA AT RANDY AND DALE'S HOUSE, RIGHT?
20	A YES.
21	Q AND YOU ARE AWARE THAT JOHN LUCKETT HAPPENED TO
22	LIVE FOR A PERIOD OF TIME AT RANDY MOORE'S, RIGHT?
23	A YES.
24	Q YOU NEVER SAW HIM AT DALE FLANAGAN'S TRAILER
25	EVER, DID YOU?

```
NO.
1
                  YOU NEVER SAW HIM ENGAGED IN USING PARAPHERNALIA
2
      OR TALKING ABOUT THIS ACTIVITY OR ANYTHING LIKE THAT, DID
3
      YOU?
                  I HAVE SEEN HIM DRAW PICTURES. HE HAS WORN
 5
      EARRINGS WITH THE GRIM RIPPER.
 6
                 WHY DIDN'T YOU TELL US ABOUT THAT?
 7
                 BECAUSE I JUST REMEMBERED.
 8
                  YOU JUST REMEMBERED. THAT IS A BALDFACED LIE,
9
      ISN'T IT, MISS SALDANA?
10
                 NO, IT'S NOT.
11
                  MR. SEATON: THAT IS ARGUMENTATIVE, YOUR HONOR.
12
      IT COULD BE WORDED A LITTLE DIFFERENTLY.
13
                  THE COURT: I AGREE.
14
      BY MR. SMITH:
15
                 WHY DIDN'T YOU TELL US ABOUT IT EARLIER?
16
             Q
                  BECAUSE I JUST REMEMBERED. WHAT ELSE CAN I TELL
17
      YOU.
18
                  IT DIDN'T COME TO YOU WHEN I ASKED YOU ABOUT IT A
19
      LITTLE OVER A WEEK AGO?
20
21
                  NO.
             A
22
                  MR. SMITH: I WILL PASS.
23
                  THE COURT: COUNSEL.
                  MR. PIKE: YES, YOUR HONOR.
24
25
      //
```

1	RECROSS-EXAMINATION
2	BY MR. PIKE:
3	Q YOU STILL KEPT IN TOUCH WITH TOM AKERS AFTER ALL
4	THIS IS SAID AND DONE, HAVEN'T YOU?
5	A NO.
6	Q HE IS EMPLOYED BY YOUR UNCLE AT THE PRESENT TIME,
7	ISN'T HE?
8	A I HAVE NO IDEA. I HEARD THAT HE WAS.
9	Q YOU HEARD THAT HE WAS. YOU HAVE MET WITH HIM AT
10	LEAST ONCE AFTER HE GOT OUT OF JAIL; ISN'T THAT TRUE?
11	A YES. HE CAME OVER TO THE HOUSE STRICTLY TO GET
12	PAID.
13	Q PARDON?
14	A STRICTLY TO GET PAID.
15	Q WERE YOU PAYING HIM?
16	A OF COURSE NOT. I WASN'T HIS EMPLOYER.
17	Q SOMEBODY FROM YOUR FAMILY WAS PAYING HIM?
18	A MY UNCLE WAS.
19	Q SO THEN YOU KNOW HE WAS EMPLOYED OR POSSIBLY
20	STILL IS EMPLOYED BY YOUR UNCLE?
21	A I KNEW HE WAS EMPLOYED THEN OR HE WAS GOING TO BE
22	OR SOMETHING, I DON'T KNOW, SO HE CAME OVER TO GET PAID AND
23	HE LEFT.
24	Q NOW, THIS GUN THAT YOU SAY THAT YOU SAW DALE
25	WITH, WHAT KIND OF A GUN WAS IT? WAS IT A PISTOL, AUTOMATIC OF

1		
1	WHAT KIND?	
2	λ	AUTOMATIC.
3.	Q	IT WAS AN AUTOMATIC?
4	λ	YES.
5	Q	AND YOU KNOW THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN A PISTOL OR A
6	REVOLVER AN	D AN AUTOMATIC?
7	A	YES.
8	Q	AND THIS ONE YOU DEFINITELY CAN SAY WAS AN
9	AUTOMATIC?	
10	A	YES.
11	Q	DO YOU KNOW THE CALIBER THAT IT WAS?
12	A	IT LOOKED LIKE A .22.
13	Q	PARDON?
14	A	IT LOOKED LIKE A .22.
15	Q	HAVE YOU HANDLED A .22 AND A .25?
16	A	I DON'T THINK I HAVE EVER HANDLED A .25.
17	Q	HAVE YOU HANDLED .22'S BEFORE?
18	A	YES.
19	Q	YOU STATED ON MR. SEATON'S QUESTIONING THAT IT
20	WAS YOUR ID	EA AND YOUR IDEA ALONE TO GO AND HAVE SEX WITH TOM
21	AKERS AND D	ALE FLANAGAN TO GET INFORMATION FROM THEM?
22	A	YES.
23	Q	DID YOU EVER EXPRESS TO ANYBODY YOUR DESIRE THAT
24	YOU WANTED	TO BE AN INVESTIGATOR AND THAT YOU DO THESE
25	THINGS?	

1	A YES. IN FACT, I HAD TOLD DALE MYSELF THAT I
2	WANTED TO DO THAT AND HE STILL TOLD ME.
3	Q YOU WANTED TO BE A PRIVATE INVESTIGATOR?
4	A YES.
5	Q OR INVESTIGATOR IN A CRIMINAL ACTIVITY?
6	A YES.
7	Q AND THIS YOU SAW AS YOUR BIG OPPORTUNITY TO DO
8	THAT?
9	A YES.
10	Q NOW, YOU DIDN'T HAVE ANY QUALMS ABOUT HAVING SEX
11	WITH TWO MEN AT THE SAME TIME TO GET INFORMATION?
12	A NO, I DIDN'T.
13	Q YOU INDICATED THAT YOU GAVE INTERVIEWS TO
14	NEWSPAPERS. HOW MUCH WERE YOU PAID FOR YOUR INTERVIEW, SAY,
15	WITH THE REVIEW JOURNAL?
16	A NOT A CENT, AND I DIDN'T ASK FOR A CENT.
17	Q WITH THE SUN NEWSPAPER?
18	A I DIDN'T ASK FOR A CENT AND HE WASN'T OFFERING A
19	CENT.
20	Q YOU NAME WAS PREDOMINANT IN ALL THOSE ARTICLES;
21	ISN'T THAT TRUE?
22	A I DON'T KNOW WHAT ARTICLES. I HAVE BEEN GONE FOR
23	A WHILE. I ONLY KNOW OF ONE.
24	Q YOU HAD NO QUALMS ABOUT RESIDING AND BEING
25	INTIMATE WITH THESE TWO INDIVIDUALS EVEN THOUGH YOU FELT THAT

i	
1	AT THAT TIME THAT YOU WERE POSSIBLY INVESTIGATING THEM ON A
2	DOUBLE HOMICIDE?
3	A YES.
4	Q DO YOU RECALL MAKING A STATEMENT SIMILAR TO THIS
5	OUTSIDE OF THE COURTROOM, "IT'S EASY TO GET ON THE STAND. I
6	JUST THINK OF HOW MUCH I HATE THEM"?
7	A NO. I DIDN'T MAKE THAT STATEMENT.
8	Q YOU NEVER MADE THAT STATEMENT?
9	A NO, I DIDN'T.
10	MR. PIKE: I HAVE NO FURTHER QUESTIONS.
11	THE COURT: ANYTHING FURTHER?
12	
13	RECROSS-EXAMINATION
14	BY MR. POSIN:
15	Q THE STATEMENT JUST REFERRED TO, DID YOU MAKE THAT
16	STATEMENT TO MEHLIA MOORE?
17	A WHO?
18	Q LEAH.
19	A NO. I STATED THAT I HAVE TO GO UP THERE WITH A
20	LITTLE BIT OF HATE SO THAT I DON'T HAVE TO START CRYING OR
21	WHATEVER WHEN I WATCH THESE GUYS OR WHEN I KNOW THAT THEY ARE
22	STARING AT ME.
23	Q DIDN'T YOU SAY THAT IT WOULD BE VERY EASY FOR YOU
24	TO TESTIFY BECAUSE YOU HATE THEM SO MUCE?
25	A NO, I DID NOT SAY, NO. IT IS NOT EASY AT ALL.

1	Q DID YOU COME THERE WITH A DEGREE OF HATE SO THAT
2	YOU WOULD NOT CRY?
3	A YES.
4	Q AND ARE YOU ENJOYING YOUR TESTIMONY HERE TODAY?
5	A I AM NOT. I HATE IT.
6	Q YOU HATE?
7	A I HATE IT BECAUSE I HAVE TO LOOK AT THESE GUYS
8	AND THEY ARE STARING AT ME SAYING I KNOW WHAT THEY ARE
9	SAYING TO THEMSELVES. IT'S NOT VERY EASY AND I DON'T KNOW
.0	WHY YOU GET THAT IMPRESSION THAT IT IS.
11	Q IS THIS NOT CONSISTENT WITH THE ROLE THAT YOU
.2	PERCEIVE AS BEING A PRIVATE INVESTIGATOR?
13	A NO.
14	Q PRIVATE INVESTIGATORS COME TO COURT AND TESTIFY?
15	A I AM SURE THEY DO BUT THIS IS VERY DIFFICULT.
L 6	IT'S VERY DIFFICULT. I HAVE GOT FOUR YOUNG MEN HERE WITH
17	THEIR LIVES ON THE LINE AND I REALIZE HOW SERIOUS THIS IS AND
18	I AM SCARED AS HECK.
19	ARE YOU SATISFIED WITH THAT ANSWER?
20	Q DID YOU NOT REALIZE HOW SERIOUS IT WAS WHEN YOU
21	WERE PLAYING PRIVATE INVESTIGATOR?
22	A YES. I REALIZE HOW SERIOUS IT WAS.
23	Q WERE YOU ENJOYING IT AT THAT TIME?
24	A I WAS SCARED THEN.
25	Q BUT YOU WERE ENJOYING IT. YOU WERE DOING IT

1				
1	VOLUNTARILY, NOT BECAUSE A POLICE OFFICER ASKED YOU TO DO IT?			
2	A I WANTED THE EXPERIENCE, YES.			
3 .	Q DID YOU NOT WANT THE EXPERIENCE OF TESTIFYING IN			
4	COURT?			
5	A NO.			
6	Q DID YOU NOT CONNECT THE TWO?			
7	A YES, I DID.			
8	Q YOU REALIZED THAT IF YOU WERE TO BE A PRIVATE			
9	INVESTIGATOR THAT YOU WOULD BE CALLED UPON TO TESTIFY AS THE			
10	RESULT OF YOUR INVESTIGATION?			
11	A YES.			
12	Q AND THAT IS WHAT YOU ARE DOING HERE NOW?			
13	A YES.			
14	Q AND YOU ARE TELLING US YOU ARE NOT ENJOYING IT?			
15	A NO, I AM NOT ENJOYING IT.			
16	MR. POSIN: I HAVE NO FURTHER QUESTIONS.			
17	THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. ANYTHING?			
18	MR. SEATON: NO REDIRECT.			
19	THE COURT: MISS SALDANA, YOU ARE EXCUSED. I ASK			
20	YOU NOT TO DISCUSS YOUR TESTIMONY WITH THOSE OUTSIDE.			
21	, MR. HARMON: MIKE MORLOCK.			
22				
23	MARK HORLOCK,			
24	WAS CALLED AS A WITNESS ON BEHALF OF THE STATE AND, HAVING			
25	BEEN FIRST DULY SWORN, TESTIFIED AS FOLLOWS:			

ORIGINAL

FILFT

		<i>z</i> '
1	CASE NO. C069269	FEB 14 1986
2	DEPARTMENT FOURTEEN	Angerrania
3	1.	Brunde Want
4	IN THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTR	ICT COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA
5	IN AND FOR THE	COUNTY OF CLARK
6	1473	
7	THE STATE OF NEVADA,	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
8	PLAINTIF	F, REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT
9	vs.	OF
10	DALE EDWARD PLANAGAN, RANDOLP	B JURY TRIAL
11	MOORE AKA SMITH, JOHNNY RAY- LUCKETT AND ROY MCDOWELL,)
12	DEFENDAN	TS.)
14 15 16	BEFORE THE HONORABLE DON	ALD M. MOSLEY, DISTRICT JUDGE
17	APPEARANCES:	THE STATE OF THE S
18	FOR THE STATE:	MELVYN T. HARMON, ESQUIRE
19		DANIEL M. SEATON, ESQUIRE DEPUTIES DISTRICT ATTORNEY
20	DAD DORONDAND OF ANACAN.	
21	FOR DEFENDANT FLANAGAN:	
22	FOR DEFENDANT MOORE:	Control depth (Charles) In the Control of Co
23		WILLIAM H. SMITH, ESQUIRE
24	FOR DEFENDANT MCDOWELL:	ROBERT J. HANDFUSS, ESQUIRE
25	Reported by: Sharon J. Thiel	man, Official Court Reporter

	2	1
3	3.	1
		STAT
5		LUCK
6		
7		THE :
8		PLAN:
9		LUCKE
10	-	
11		HARMO
12	-	
13		PLEAS
. 14		•
15	-	
16		•
17		
18	R	EFLEC:
19	В	BGIN 1
20		
21		
22	CA	RL AN
23		AFFIC
24		USEWI
25		•

LAS	VEGAS,	NEVADA,	THURSDAY,	OCTORED	10	

THE COURT: THE CONTINUATION OF CASE C69269, TE OF NEVADA VERSUS DALE FLANAGAN, RANDOLPH MOORE, JOHN ETT AND ROY MCDOWELL.

THE RECORD WILL REFLECT THE PRESENCE OF EACH OF DEFENDANTS, THEIR COUNSEL; MR. PIKE REPRESENTING MR. AGAN, MR. POSIN REPRESENTING MR. MOORE, MR. SMITH, MR.

ETT, MR. HANDFUSS REPRESENTING MR. MCDOWELL.

THE RECORD WILL ALSO REFLECT THE PRESENCE OF MR. N AND MR. SEATON REPRESENTING THE STATE.

MISS CLERK, WILL YOU CALL THE ROLL OF THE JURY,

THE CLERK: YES, YOUR HONOR.

(ROLL CALL TAKEN.)

THE CLERK: ALL PRESENT, YOUR HONOR.

THE COURT: THANK YOU. THE RECORD WILL SO

GOOD MORNING, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN. THE STATE MAY THEIR CLOSING REMARKS.

MR. SEATON: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN OF THE JURY, I GIVE TO YOU D COLLEEN GORDON. CARL GORDON, 58 YEARS OLD, AN AIR

CONTROLLER AND HIS WIFE COLLEEN, 57 YEARS OLD, A

PE.

CARL AND COLLEEN GORDON, WHO, AS FAR AS WE KNOW,

,

 WERE HARD WORKING, PRODUCTIVE MEMBERS OF THIS SOCIETY. THEY
HAD WORKED ALL THEIR LIVES FOR THE THINGS THAT THEY HELD DEAR
TO THEM.

THEY WERE READY FOR RETIREMENT. THEY HAD A NICE HOUSE, THEY HAD AN R.V. TRAILER OUT IN THE BACK, PROBABLY FOR THEIR RETIREMENT YEARS.

THEY HAD A FAMILY. THEY HAD GRANDCHILDREN. AND I AM SURE AS THEY WENT TO BED ON NOVEMBER THE 5TH, 1984, AT THEIR HOME AT 5851 WASHBURN, THAT THEIR HEADS WERE FILLED WITH THE IDEALIC DREAMS THAT THEY HAD REALIZED AND WERE ABOUT TO REALIZE.

AND I GIVE TO YOU, ALSO, FOUR YOUNG MEN SITTING IN THIS COURTROOM. WE HAVE RANDOLPH MOORE, WE HAVE DALE FLANAGAN, WE HAVE ROY MCDOWELL AND WE HAVE JOHNNY RAY LUCKETT.

FOUR MEN CHARGED WITH THESE CRIMES. FOUR MEN WHO HAD AS THEIR FRIENDS GANG MEMBERS. THESE PEOPLE WERE SCHOOL DROPOUTS. THEY WERE DRUG USERS. THEY WERE DEVIL WORSHIPERS.

AND ON NOVEMBER THE 5TH, 1984, AS CARL AND COLLEEN GORDON WERE INDEED GOING TO BED, THESE FOUR AND OTHERS WERE HATCHING A DIABOLICAL PLOT, A DIABOLICAL PLOT TO KILL TWO GOOD HUMAN BEINGS WHO HAPPENED TO BE THE GRANDPARENTS OF ONE OF THESE MEN.

AND THEY WERE GOING TO DO IT FOR AN INHERITANCE, SO THEY COULD SPLIT THE PROCEEDS AND THAT, THAT IS WHAT THIS

CASE IS ALL ABOUT.

I AM GOING TO PROCEED IN MY ARGUMENT TO YOU ALONG THE FOLLOWING LINES SO THAT YOU CAN UNDERSTAND WHERE I AM GOING. YOU HEARD, AS YOU WERE SELECTED AS JURORS, ABOUT ALL OF THE BURDENS AND THE DUTIES AND THE RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE STATE WHICH APPLY NOT ONLY IN THIS CASE BUT IN ALL CASES.

AND THEY'RE OBVIOUSLY THINGS THAT ARE CREATED BY OUR SYSTEM OF JUSTICE AND OUR CONSTITUTION. THINGS THAT MR. HARMON AND I, AS WELL AS EVERY OTHER PROSECUTOR, WARMLY EMBRACE.

THESE ARE THE THINGS THAT MAKE OUR SYSTEM APPROPRIATE AND SO WE ARE NOW GOING TO -- I AM GOING TO ATTEMPT TO DISCUSS WITH YOU TWO THINGS ESSENTIALLY ABOUT THIS CASE IN BROAD TERMS.

ONE, WERE THERE CRIMES COMMITTED? THAT IS THE FIRST QUESTION THAT MUST BE ANSWERED IN EVERY CRIMINAL CASE.

AND, TWO, IF THERE WERE CRIMES COMMITTED, WHO DID THEM? AND, SO, I WILL TALK, FIRST OF ALL, ABOUT THE CONSPIRACY TO DO VARIOUS CRIMES, THE BURGLARY, THE ROBBERY AND THE MURDER AND WERE THEY COMMITTED.

AND, SECONDARILY, EACH ONE OF THE DEFENDANTS.

DID THAT PERSON COMMIT CERTAIN CRIMES AND, IF SO, WHICH ONES
AND WHAT PROOF DO WE HAVE TO SHOW ALL OF THOSE THINGS?

THAT WILL BE THE GENERAL DIRECTION OF MY ARGUMENT HERE THIS MORNING. AS TO THE CRIMES THAT WERE COMMITTED, THE

.

FIRST ONE WE SHOULD LOOK AT IS BURGLARY.

NOW, YOU WERE READ INSTRUCTIONS YESTERDAY. FIRST TIME YOU'VE EVER HEARD THOSE PARTICULAR INSTRUCTIONS AND I AM GOING TO SELECT SOME OF THEM. AND, REMEMBER, THAT ALL OF THEM ARE IMPORTANT.

BUT I AM GOING TO SELECT SOME OF THEM THAT TALK
TO YOU IN TERMS OF THE PARTICULAR SUBJECT MATTER THAT I AM
DISCUSSING AT THE TIME.

THE FIRST ONE IS INSTRUCTION NUMBER SEVEN. AND IT DEALS WITH THE DEFINITION OF THE CRIME OF BURGLARY. AND IT SAYS, IN ESSENCE, EVERY PERSON WHO ENTERS ANY HOUSE WITH THE INTENT TO COMMIT LARCENY, ROBBERY OR MURDER, IS GUILTY OF BURGLARY.

SO WE HAVE TO SHOW THAT THERE WAS AN ENTRY INTO A HOUSE AND WE HAVE TO SHOW THAT THE PERSONS ENTERING THE HOUSE HAD THE INTENT, THEY DESIRED TO ROB, TO STEAL, TO MURDER, ANY OF THOSE.

WELL, PRETTY EASILY DISPOSED OF. WE KNOW THAT
THE HOUSE AT 5851 WASHBURN HAD A SIDE WINDOW WITH A LARGE
SCREEN COVERING IT. WE HAVE THAT SCREEN HERE IN EVIDENCE. A
KNIFE WAS USED TO CUT THAT SCREEN OPEN. EVERYONE TESTIFIED
TO THAT.

THE SCREEN WAS RIPPED OPEN. A STICK, WHICH IS ALSO IN EVIDENCE HERE, WAS UTILIZED TO BREAK THAT WINDOW AND WE KNOW THAT PEOPLE WENT INTO THE HOUSE, PEOPLE WHO TOOK A

4 .

.8

.9

PURSE, PEOPLE WHO STARTED TO MOVE FURNITURE, PEOPLE WHO KILLED.

SO WE KNOW THAT THERE WAS AN ENTRY INTO THE HOUSE. THAT SATISFIES THE FIRST PROBLEM.

HOW ABOUT THE SECOND ONE? WAS THERE AN INTENT BY
THESE PEOPLE TO STEAL, TO ROB, TO COMMIT MURDER?

WELL, YOU HEARD A LOT OF EVIDENCE ABOUT A LOT OF MEETINGS. AND I WON'T GO OVER ALL THOSE MEETINGS NOW. WE WILL TOUCH ON THAT A LITTLE BIT LATER.

BUT AT ALL OF THOSE MEETINGS TO ONE DEGREE OR ANOTHER -- AND THOSE ARE CONSPIRATORIAL MEETINGS. AT ALL OF THOSE MEETINGS, THE PLANS WERE DISCUSSED, THE PLANS TO GO IN AND TO BREAK THE WINDOW AND TO GET INSIDE AND TO MAKE IT LOOK LIKE A BURGLARY AND TAKE A PURSE AND TO KILL THE GRANDPARENTS THAT WERE IN THERE.

THAT IS EVIDENCE OF THE INDIVIDUAL'S INTENT. IT
IS REALLY QUITE SIMPLE AND NO ONE SHOULD HAVE ANY DIFFICULTY,
PROBABLY NOT EVEN THE DEFENSE ATTORNEYS, THAT A BURGLARY WAS
INDEED COMMITTED.

NOW, WE LOOK AT A ROBBERY. THAT'S INSTRUCTION NUMBER 10, THE DEFINITION OF ROBBERY. AND I AM GOING TO PARAPHRASE A LOT OF THESE SO WE SAVE HAVING TO READ ALL OF THEM.

BUT A ROBBERY IS THE UNLAWFUL TAKING OF PERSONAL PROPERTY FROM SOMEBODY ELSE, EITHER DIRECTLY FROM THEM OR IN

VIOLENCE.

OUT OF IT.

8

10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17 18

19

20

22

23 24

25

21

7

THERE WAS EVEN SOME -- I THINK JOHN LUCAS SAID, I THINK, A PURSE CAME BACK BUT CERTAINLY A WALLET WITH ITS CONTENTS WAS TAKEN FROM THAT HOUSE AND TAKEN TO THE APARTMENT AT 337 NORTH 13TH STREET.

THEIR PRESENCE, AGAINST THEIR WILL, BY MEANS OF FORCE OR

THINGS HAPPEN. BECAUSE IF THEY DIDN'T, THOSE ELEMENTS ARE

HOUSE, A WALLET. THE PURSE WAS MOVED AND THE WALLET TAKEN

NOT MET, THEN THE CRIME OF ROBBERY DID NOT OCCUR.

SO WE HAVE TO ASK OURSELVES DID ALL OF THOSE

WELL, THERE WAS PERSONAL PROPERTY TAKEN FROM THAT

NOW, THE QUESTION ARISES, WAS IT TAKEN FROM THE PERSON OF SOMEBODY? NO, IT WAS TAKEN FROM A CLOSET. BUT THAT DOESN'T MATTER ACCORDING TO THE ROBBERY INSTRUCTION, FROM THE PERSON OF ANOTHER OR IN HIS OR HER PRESENCE.

WELL, I SUBMIT TO YOU THAT CARL GORDON, UP IN THE UPSTAIRS BEDROOM, AND COLLEEN GORDON, IN THE DOWNSTAIRS BEDROOM, AT ONE TIME AND AT ANOTHER TIME BOTH LAYING WITHIN THEIR BEDROOM, ONE ON THE BED AND ONE ON THE FLOOR, CERTAINLY BRINGS US WITHIN THE AMBIT OF PRESENCE.

THE WALLET WAS IN THEIR PRESENCE. HOW ABOUT BY MEANS OF FORCE OR VIOLENCE? HOW MUCH MORE FORCE CAN YOU GET THAN TO KILL SOMEONE?

THE LAST SENTENCE IN THIS INSTRUCTION IS SUCH

. 9

TAKING CONSTITUTES ROBBERY WHENEVER IT APPEARS, THAT ALTHOUGH THE TAKING WAS FULLY COMPLETED WITHOUT THE KNOWLEDGE OF THE PERSON FROM WHOM TAKEN, SUCH KNOWLEDGE WAS PREVENTED BY THE USE OF FORCE OR FEAR.

IT CAN'T BE ARGUED ACCORDING TO THIS INSTRUCTION THAT, "WELL, THEY WERE DEAD, THEY DIDN'T KNOW THEY WERE BEING ROBBED, SO ROBBERY REALLY DOESN'T COUNT." THAT DOESN'T MATTER.

THE FORCE AND VIOLENCE THAT CAUSED THE ROBBERY TO BE ABLE TO TAKE PLACE JUST WENT A STEP FURTHER THAN THE TYPICAL STICKING A GUN INTO SOMEBODY'S RIBS AND SAYING, "GIVE ME YOUR WALLET." THAT IS THE TYPICAL ROBBERY AS WE KNOW IT.

IN THIS SITUATION, THEY NOT ONLY STUCK THE GUN INTO THEM BUT THEY KILLED THEM. AND THAT FORCE OR VIOLENCE PREVENTED THE INDIVIDUALS CARL AND COLLEEN GORDON FROM BEING AWARE THAT A ROBBERY WAS TAKING PLACE. AND THAT ROBBERY CHARGE, AS YOU WILL REMEMBER, HAS ADDED TO IT THE USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON.

THAT IS ANOTHER ELEMENT THAT WE MUST PROVE IN THIS PARTICULAR CASE. AND IT ALMOST GOES WITHOUT SAYING THAT IS MAYBE THE MOST OBVIOUS THING IN THIS CASE.

WE HAVE TWO OF THE GUNS THAT WERE USED HERE BEFORE YOU AND THE GUNS WERE CERTAINLY, BY THE INSTRUCTIONS, CONSIDERED TO BE DEADLY WEAPONS.

WE HAVE ALLEGED AGAINST THE FOUR DEFENDANTS THE

9 · ·

CRIME OF FIRST DEGREE MURDER. GETTING TO FIRST DEGREE MURDER IS A SEVERAL STEP PROCESS AS YOU WILL COME TO LEARN IT THROUGH THESE INSTRUCTIONS.

IT BEGINS WITH INSTRUCTION 15. THE INSTRUCTIONS THAT I AM GOING TO CITE TO YOU THAT ARE IMPORTANT IN THIS REGARD ARE 15, 16, 17 AND 18 AND 26.

LET'S START WITH INSTRUCTION NUMBER 15. MURDER
IS THE UNLAWFUL KILLING OF A HUMAN BEING WITH MALICE
AFORETHOUGHT. ALL RIGHT. WE HAVE TO ESTABLISH, NUMBER ONE,
THAT THERE WAS AN UNLAWFUL KILLING.

THIS CASE HAS BEEN A LITTLE UNUSUAL IN THAT YOU DID NOT HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO HEAR THE TESTIMONY OF DR. SHELDON GREEN, OUR CORONNER. AS YOU LEARNED THROUGH OTHER TESTIMONY, HE WAS OUT OF STATE AND UNAVAILABLE.

HOWEVER, AS EXHIBITS BEFORE YOU, WHICH YOU WILL HAVE AN OPPORTUNITY TO READ AND PERUSE AT YOUR LEISURE WHEN YOU ARE DELIBERATING, ARE THE AUTOPSY REPORTS.

THERE IS ONE AUTOPSY REPORT ON CARL GORDON AND THERE IS ANOTHER ON COLLEEN GORDON AND YOU WILL BE ABLE TO LOOK AT BOTH OF THOSE TO SEE WHAT THEY SAY.

IN ESSENCE, WHAT THEY SAY IS THAT MRS. GORDON WAS SHOT IN THE LEFT EAR, JUST THROUGH THE EAR AND IT GRAZED THE BACK OF HER SHOULDER AND THAT WAS NOT A FATAL WOUND.

SHE WAS ALSO SHOT TWICE IN THE RIGHT SIDE OF HER HEAD. ONE BULLET WAS ABOUT FIVE INCHES ABOVE HER EAR, HER

 RIGHT EAR AND ABOUT TWO INCHES -- NO, INCH AND A QUARTER -- IF I REMEMBER CORRECTLY, INCH AND A QUARTER TO THE REAR OF HER HEAD SO ONE HERE.

THE OTHER ONE WAS THIS AREA TWO INCHES ABOVE THE EAR AND ABOUT TWO AND A QUARTER INCHES IN FRONT OF THE EAR. BOTH OF THOSE SHOTS WERE PATAL.

BOTH OF THEM CAUSED THE DEATH OF COLLEEN GORDON AND AS SUCH WAS AN UNLAWFUL KILLING.

AS TO MR. GORDON, HE RECEIVED SEVEN SHOTS, TWO IN THE BACK, TWO IN THE UPPER RIGHT ARM, ONE IN THE ABDOMEN, ONE IN THE CHEST, THE LOWER LEFT CHEST AND ONE IN THE UPPER CHEST, RIGHT HERE.

AND THIS WAS THE FATAL ONE. THIS ONE WENT IN AND KILLED CARL GORDON. SO WE HAVE TWO UNLAWFUL KILLINGS.

THE NEXT QUESTION IN THIS INSTRUCTION TO

DETERMINE WHETHER OR NOT MURDER OCCURRED IS WAS THERE MALICE

AFORETHOUGHT AND THAT IS DEFINED FOR YOU IN INSTRUCTION

NUMBER 16.

AND IT READS, MALICE AFORETHOUGHT, AS USED IN THE DEFINITION OF MURDER, MEANS THE INTENTIONAL KILLING OF ANOTHER HUMAN BEING WITHOUT LEGAL CAUSE, LEGAL EXCUSE OR WHAT THE LAW CONSIDERS ADEQUATE PROVACATION.

THE CONDITION OF MIND DESCRIBED AS MALICE
AFORETHOUGHT MAY RISE NOT ALONE FROM ANGER, HATRED, REVENGE
OR FROM PARTICULAR ILL WILL, SPITE OR GRUDGE TOWARD THE

.7

 PERSON KILLED. BUT MAY RESULT FROM ANY UNJUSTIFIABLE OR UNLAWFUL MOTIVE OR PURPOSE TO INJURE ANOTHER WHICH PROCEEDS FROM AHEART FATALLY BENT ON MISCHIEF OR WITH RECKLESS DISREGARD OF CONSEQUENCES AND SOCIAL DUTY.

IT TALKS ABOUT IT DOESN'T HAVE TO COME -- THE MALICE DOESN'T HAVE TO COME ALONE FROM ILL WILL, SPITE OR GRUDGE. AND I THINK THERE IS EVIDENCE HERE THAT DALE FLANAGAN THOUGHT THAT HIS GRANDPARENTS DIDN'T PARTICULARLY LIKE HIM.

THAT COULD BE ONE OF THE THINGS THAT CAUSES YOU TO BELIEVE THAT THERE IS MALICE AFORETHOUGHT IN THIS CASE.

IT ALSO TALKS, HOWEVER, BUT MAY RESULT FROM ANY UNJUSTIFIABLE OR UNLAWFUL MOTIVE.

WELL, I SUBMIT TO YOU, THAT THE MOTIVE OF WANTING TO GET THE MONEY FROM THE GRANDPARENTS THROUGH SOME MANNER OTHER THAN AN ALLOWANCE AND IN THIS WAY THAT THEY TRIED, THROUGH KILLING THEM AND GETTING IT IN THE WILL, FITS RIGHT INTO MALICE AFORETHOUGHT.

THERE IS TWO KINDS OF MALICE, EXPRESS MALICE AND APPLIED MALICE. INSTRUCTION NUMBER 17 TALKS TO YOU ABOUT THAT. EXPRESS MALICE IS THAT DELIBERATE INTENTION UNLAWFULLY TO TAKE AWAY THE LIFE OF A FELLOW CREATURE.

WELL, THAT SORT OF GOES TO PREMEDITATION. THEY INTENDED, THEY WANTED TO TAKE THE LIFE OF CARL AND COLLEEN GORDON. SO THERE IS EXPRESS MALICE IN THIS CASE.

APPLIED MALICE, LET ME READ THIS. MALICE SHALL BE APPLIED WHEN NO CONSIDERABLE PROVACATION APPEARS OR WHEN ALL THE CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE KILLING SHOW AN ABANDONED OR A MALIGNANT HEART.

IN A BARROOM FIGHT, FOR EXAMPLE, ONE PERSON HAS BEATEN UP THE OTHER PERSON AND THE SECOND PERSON KILLS.

WELL, THERE MIGHT HAVE BEEN ADEQUATE PROVACATION WHICH WOULD ELIMINATE APPLIED MALICE.

THAT DIDN'T HAPPEN HERE. CARL AND COLLEEN GORDON ASK TO BE KILLED? THEY ASKED TO BE LEFT ALONE, TO HAVE A PEACEFUL LIFE.

THEY DIDN'T ASK THEIR GRANDSON DALE TO COME TO THEM AND KILL THEM SO THEY COULD GIVE HIM AND HIS DEVIL-WORSHIPING BUDDIES A PIECE OF THEIR ESTATE A LITTLE MORE QUICKLY.

AND THIS INSTRUCTION REALLY SAYS IT ALL, DOESN'T IT, WHEN IT SAYS OR WHEN THE CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE KILLING SHOW, AND IT SAYS, AN ABANDONED AND MALIGNANT HEART.

I WILL CHANGE THAT TO HEARTS. THAT IS WHAT WE HAVE HERE. THERE IS SO MUCH MALICE IN THIS CASE, IT REEKS OF IT IN THIS COURTROOM AND HAS FOR THE PAST MANY DAYS.

THERE CAN BE NO DOUBT THEN THERE WAS AN UNLAWFUL KILLING AND THAT IT WAS DONE WITH MALICE AFORETHOUGHT AND THAT GIVES US MURDER, PLAIN AND SIMPLE.

THE NEXT QUESTION IS, IS THAT PARTICULAR MURDER

FIRST DEGREE OR IS IT SECOND DEGREE?

INSTRUCTION NUMBER 18 TELLS YOU ABOUT THE DEFINITION OF FIRST DEGREE MURDER. IT SAYS MURDER OF THE FIRST DEGREE IS MURDER WHICH IS, NUMBER ONE, PERPETRATED BY MEANS OF ANY KIND OF WILFUL, DELIBERATE AND PREMEDITATED KILLING.

PREMEDITATION IS THE KEY HERE AS YOU WILL SEE

LATER ON. SO ONE KIND OF MURDER OF THE FIRST DEGREE IS THAT

WHICH IS PREMEDITATED. OR, NUMBER TWO, ANY KIND OF MURDER

WHICH IS COMMITTED IN THE PERPETRATION OR ATTEMPTED

PERPETRATION OF BURGLARY OR ROBBERY.

THIS IS WHAT IS KNOWN AS THE FELONY MURDER RULE.

IF YOU COMMIT A MURDER, IF A MURDER IS COMMITTED DURING THE

PERPETRATION, THE COMMISSION OF CERTAIN KIND OF FELONIES,

THEN IT IS AUTOMATICALLY FIRST DEGREE MURDER.

LET'S TALK ABOUT PREMEDITATION, FIRST OF ALL.

INSTRUCTION 18 GOES ON TO DISCUSS PREMEDITATION.

PREMEDITATION IS DESIGN, A DETERMINATION TO KILL, DISTINCTLY

PORMED IN THE MIND AT ANY MOMENT BEFORE OR AT THE TIME OF THE

KILLING.

IT GOES ON TO TELL ABOUT HOW LONG YOU HAVE TO PREMEDITATE. MOST OF US WOULD THINK, "WELL, PREMEDITATION, LET'S SEE, THAT MEANS THAT THE PERSON DOING IT HAS TO HAVE SAT AND THOUGHT ABOUT IT FOR A WHILE."

WELL, WE HAVE THAT IN THIS CASE BUT LISTEN TO HOW

SHORT PREMEDITATION IS. PREMEDITATION NEED NOT BE FOR A DAY,
AN HOUR OR EVEN A MINUTE. IT MAY BE AS INSTANTANEOUS AS
SUCCESSIVE THOUGHTS OF THE MIND.

THAT FAST. IF A PERSON DECIDES THAT QUICKLY TO KILL AND THEY HADN'T BEEN THINKING ABOUT IT BEFORE AND THEY KILL THE MOMENT AFTER, IT'S PREMEDITATION AND IT'S FIRST DEGREE MURDER.

BUT LOOK WHAT WE HAVE IN THIS CASE. THE LONGEST TIME I CAN THINK OF IS THAT PEOPLE WERE SAYING THAT THERE WAS A MEETING A COUPLE OF MONTHS BEFORE. SO WE KNOW THAT AT LEAST FOR TWO MONTHS IN THESE CONSPIRATORIAL MEETINGS, THE PLANNING, THE DETAILING, THE PREMEDITATION OF THE KILLING WAS TAKING PLACE.

I COULD STOP RIGHT THERE AND ARGUE TO YOU NO MORE ABOUT WHETHER OR NOT THIS IS FIRST DEGREE MURDER AND IT'S FIRST DEGREE MURDER. THERE ISN'T A DEFENSE ATTORNEY IN HERE, I THINK, THAT WOULD GET UP AND TAKE ISSUE WITH THAT.

BUT I DON'T BELIEVE IN DOING THINGS IN AN INCOMPLETE FASHION. LET'S FIND ANOTHER WAY TO GET FIRST DEGREE MURDER.

THE FELONY MURDER RULE AND HERE IT IS. MURDER WHICH IS COMMITTED IN THE PERPETRATION OR ATTEMPTED PERPETRATION OF BURGLARY OR ROBBERY IS DEEMED TO BE MURDER OF THE PIRST DEGREE, WHETHER THE KILLING WAS INTENTIONAL, UNINTENTIONAL OR EVEN ACCIDENTAL.

THAT IS HOW STRONG THE FELONY MURDER RULE IS.

WELL, WE ALREADY KNOW THAT A BURGLARY WAS COMMITTED, WE

ALREADY KNOW THAT A ROBBERY WAS COMMITTED AND WE KNOW THAT

THE MURDER WAS COMMITTED IN A CERTAIN COHESIVENESS WITH THOSE

CRIMES SO THE MURDER WAS DEFINITELY COMMITTED IN THE

PERPETRATION OF A ROBBERY AND OF A BURGLARY.

AND SO WE HAVE TWO WAYS TO GET TO FIRST DEGREE

1 2

AND SO WE HAVE TWO WAYS TO GET TO FIRST DEGREE MURDER AND IN THIS CASE, IT IS JUST ABSOLUTELY CRYSTAL CLEAR THAT THAT HAPPENS.

AND THE ONE FINAL THING I SHOULD SAY ABOUT THE FELONY MURDER RULE IS WHAT IT DOES IS TO TAKE THE PLACE OF PREMEDITATION.

PREMEDITATION IS NECESSARY TO MAKE IT SERIOUS ENOUGH TO BECOME FIRST DEGREE MURDER, BECAUSE THE LAW WANTS THE INDIVIDUAL WHO IS CONVICTED OF FIRST DEGREE MURDER TO HAVE BEEN A BAD ENOUGH PERSON TO HAVE THOUGHT ABOUT IT AHEAD OF TIME IRRESPECTIVE OF HOW SHORT A TIME.

BUT TO HAVE THOUGHT ABOUT IT SO THEY COULD HAVE WITHDRAWN AND SAID, "NO, I DON'T WANT TO DO IT." IF THEY THOUGHT ABOUT IT AND DONE IT, IT IS BAD ENOUGH TO BE FIRST DEGREE MURDER.

FELONY MURDER RULE IS SAYING THE SAME THING. WE ARE NOT GOING TO LOOK FOR THE PREMEDITATION BECAUSE THE FACT THEY WERE DOING A BURGLARY AND ROBBERY AND HAD PLANNED TO DO THESE THINGS IS BAD ENOUGH TO TAKE THE PLACE OF THE

PREMEDITATION AND SO THAT IS THE REASON THEY DO IT THAT WAY.

AND JUST TO FINALIZE THIS FROM THE OTHER SIDE OF THE COIN. IF IT'S NOT MURDER OF THE FIRST DEGREE, IT IS

MURDER IN THE SECOND DEGREE AND IT IS A VERY EASY

INSTRUCTION.

MURDER IN THE SECOND DEGREE IS MURDER WITH MALICE AFORETHOUGHT BUT WITHOUT PREMEDITATION. AND ALL MURDER WHICH IS NOT MURDER OF THE FIRST DEGREE IS MURDER OF THE SECOND DEGREE.

SO I THINK THE CASE IS PRETTY CLEARLY MADE THAT
THIS IS OBVIOUSLY A FIRST DEGREE MURDER CASE. AND, REMEMBER,
AT THIS JUNCTURE WE ARE NOT TALKING ABOUT WHO COMMITTED
CRIMES, BUT WERE CRIMES COMMITTED AND, IF SO, WHICH CRIMES.

NEXT QUESTION IS ABOUT CONSPIRACY AND LET ME GET THOSE INSTRUCTIONS FOR YOU. FIVE AND SIX. FIVE SAYS A CONSPIRACY IS AN AGREEMENT BETWEEN TWO OR MORE PERSONS TO COMMIT ANY CRIMINAL OR UNLAWFUL ACT. THAT IS EASY.

INSTRUCTION NUMBER SIX SAYS WHERE SEVERAL

PARTIES JOIN TOGETHER IN A COMMON DESIGN TO COMMIT AN

UNLAWFUL ACT, EACH IS CRIMINALLY RESPONSIBLE FOR THE ACTS OF

HIS CONFERENATES COMMITTED IN FURTHERANCE OF THE COMMON

DESIGN.

IN CONTEMPLATION OF THE LAW, THE ACT OF ONE IS THE ACT OF ALL. THOSE ARE SIGNIFICANT WORDS IN THIS CASE, HIGHLY, HIGHLY SIGNIFICANT WORDS.

6

8 9

10 11

7

12 13

15

18

21

23

25

14

16 17

19 20

22

24

LET'S THINK ABOUT THE ACT OF ONE IS THE ACT OF ALL, AND LET ME SEE IF I CAN GIVE YOU SOME EXAMPLES. DALE FLANAGAN WENT TO THE STORE AND BOUGHT A KNIFE. HE DID IT TO COVER UP THE FACT THAT THE POLICE OFFICERS HAD FOUND HIS KNIFE OUTSIDE THE WINDOW.

AND WE HAVE GOT IT IN HERE IN EVIDENCE AND IT WAS THE KNIFE THAT WAS USED TO START THE BURGLARY WHICE STARTED THE WHOLE CHAIN OF EVENTS TO KILL THE GORDONS.

THAT KNIFE IS HIGHLY SIGNIFICANT AND IT'S IMPORTANT TO HIM AND TO HIS CO-CONSPIRATORS THAT THAT KNIFE BE COVERED. AND SO HE WENT TO THE STORE WITH TOM AKERS AND HAD TOM AKERS BUY THE KNIFE FOR HIM AFTER HE SHOWED HIM WHICH KNIFE IT WAS.

NOW, JOHNNY RAY LUCKETT, ROY MCDOWELL, RANDY MOORE, THEY WEREN'T THERE. THEY DIDN'T BUY THAT KNIFE. THE ACT OF ONE IS THE ACT OF ALL. DALE FLANAGAN BUYING THAT KNIFE IS AS INCRIMINATING AGAINST THESE OTHER THREE COHORTS OF HIS AS IT IS AGAINST HIMSELF, EQUALLY INCRIMINATING.

JOHNNY RAY LUCKETT, JOHN LUCAS AND RANDY MOORE WENT OUT TO THE LAKE TO THROW THE RIPLES OUT. ROY MCDOWELL DIDN'T GO OUT THERE. THE ACT OF ONE IS THE ACT OF ALL. THAT WAS ROY MCDOWELL'S ACT. IT WAS AN ACT DONE IN FURTHERANCE OF THE CONSPIRACY.

DALE FLANAGAN MADE STATEMENTS TO ANGELA SALDANA. JOHNNY RAY LUCKETT DIDN'T MAKE ANY STATEMENTS TO ANGELA

SALDANA. THOSE STATEMENTS MADE BY DALE FLANAGAN TO ANGELA SALDANA ARE AS DAMAGING AND AS INCRIMINATING TO JOHNNY RAY LUCKETT OR ANY OF THE OTHER DEFENDANTS AS THEY ARE TO DALE FLANAGAN, BECAUSE THE ACT OF ONE, THE STATEMENT OF ONE IS THE ACT OR THE STATEMENT OF ALL.

17 .

WELL, REMEMBER, IN INSTRUCTION FIVE IT SAYS A CONSPIRACY IS AN AGREEMENT BETWEEN TWO OR MORE PERSONS. WAS THERE AN AGREEMENT? WELL, THERE WERE MANY MEETINGS. NOW, WE WILL TALK A LITTLE BIT ABOUT THOSE MEETINGS.

THE FURTHEST ONE AWAY, I CAN REMEMBER, IS A COUPLE OF MONTHS BEFORE THE INCIDENT OCCURRED ON NOVEMBER 5TH. THAT WAS AT THE DOME HOUSE, RANDY'S DOME HOUSE OUT NEAR BLUE DIAMOND ROAD OR SOMEPLACE LIKE THAT.

THERE WAS AN OCTOBER MEETING AT RANDY MOORE'S HOUSE. THERE WAS A MEETING THAT RUSTY HAVENS TALKED ABOUT, I THINK, AND I AM GOING TO GET THESE CONFUSED BUT IT WAS A WEEK AND A HALF OR SO BEFORE THE KILLING.

THERE WAS THE NOVEMBER 5TH GET-TOGETHERS AND THAT IS INTERESTING. THERE WAS MORE THAN ONE CONSPIRATORIAL MEETING. THERE WAS EVEN A CONSPIRATORIAL TELEPHONE CALL, WHICH IS A MEETING, WHICH IS A PART OF THE AGREEMENT THAT WE HAVE TO SHOW.

REMEMBER, WHEN DALE FLANAGAN GOT ROY MCDOWELL'S
PHONE NUMBER FROM RANDY MOORE AND HE CALLED ROY -- WELL, I
WILL FINISH THIS THOUGHT AND GO BACK. I GOT AHEAD OF MYSELF.

HE CALLED ROY AND HE SAID, "DID YOU GET THE TOY?"

NOW, COME ON, WHAT IS HE REFERRING TO? A TEDDY BEAR. TOY

IS THE SAME DARN GUN THAT ROY MCDOWELL BROUGHT LATER ON THAT

NIGHT. THAT IS AN AGREEMENT BETWEEN TWO OR MORE PERSONS. IT

IS A PART OF A CONSPIRACY.

DON'T EVER BE MISLED THAT THE CONSPIRACY MEETS IN A BOARD ROOM AROUND A TABLE AND SOMEBODY GAVELS THE MEETING TO ORDER. IT IS DONE SNEAKY. IT'S DONE AS QUIETLY, SHROUDED IN SECRECY AS POSSIBLE AND IT ALWAYS DOESN'T HAVE THE SAME PEOPLE THERE.

WE ARE LUCKY WE ARE ABLE TO ARMCHAIR QUARTERBACK.
WE CAN LOOK BACK AT THESE MEETINGS AND DETERMINE WHO THE
BROAD CONSPIRACY ENCOMPASSES EVEN THOUGH WE KNOW IN THAT ONE
MEETING IT WAS ONLY DALE FLANAGAN TALKING TO ROY MCDOWELL.

AND YET THE ACT OF ONE IS THE ACT OF ALL. SO IT'S PART OF YOUR CONSPIRACY, JOHNNY RAY LUCKETT, AND EVERYBODY ELSE SITTING DOWN THERE.

THERE WAS ALSO THE STATEMENT MADE, I THINK BY
DALE PLANAGAN PRIOR TO THAT TELEPHONE CALL, THAT WHAT THEY
WERE GOING TO DO HAD TO HAPPEN THIS WEEKEND. THEY HAD TO DO
IT THIS WEEKEND. ALL BY ITSELF IN THIS CASE THAT MEANS
NOTHING. THAT MEANS NOTHING.

IT'S LIKE HOLDING UP A PIECE OF A JIGSAW PUZZLE AND LOOKING AT IT AND TRYING TO DECIDE WHAT DOES THIS MEAN.
WITH THE OVERALL PICTURE, YOU WOULD KNOW. BUT YOU KNOW

5

MORE THAN THAT. YOU HAVE GOT THE BOX THAT SHOWS THE WHOLE PICTURE OF THE JIGSAW PUZZLE.

AND IN RELATIONSHIP TO THAT BOX, AND AS YOU PUT THE PIECES OF PUZZLE TOGETHER, IT BECOMES ABUNDANTLY CLEAR WHAT HIS SAYING THAT "WE HAVE TO DO IT RIGHT AWAY" MEANS.

AND THEN MOST IMPORTANTLY ABOUT NOVEMBER 5TH

IS THE MEETING THAT TOOK PLACE LATER THAT NIGHT WITH EVERYONE

PRESENT. SO THERE WERE MANY, MANY MEETINGS.

WAS THERE AN AGREEMENT THAT TOOK PLACE IN THOSE MEETINGS? WELL, AGAIN, BY HINDSIGHT WE ARE ABLE TO LOOK BACK, TAKE EVERYBODY'S TESTIMONY IN AND DECIDE FOR OURSELVES WHAT THE AGREEMENT WAS.

WELL, IT'S PLAIN AND SIMPLE WHAT THE OVERRIDING TENOR OF THIS AGREEMENT WAS. THE AGREEMENT WAS THAT THIS GROUP OF PEOPLE WAS GOING TO GO OVER TO THE GORDONS' HOUSE AND THEY WERE GOING TO KILL THE GORDONS FOR THE INHERITANCE.

AND THEY WERE GOING TO GATHER TOGETHER GUNS IN ORDER TO DO THAT. AND THEY WERE GOING TO BREAK A WINDOW AND ENTER THROUGH THE SIDE WINDOW. REMEMBER, HOW IT EVOLVED.

"WELL, THEY KEEP THE BACK DOOR OPEN. WE CAN GO IN THAT WAY. THAT IS THE SIMPLE WAY." "NO," RANDY SAID, "THAT IS NOT A GOOD IDEA, DALE. IT DOESN'T LOOK LIKE A BURGLARY THEN. WE HAVE TO BREAK A WINDOW." THEN THEY CAME AROUND, "OKAY, WE WILL BREAK THE WINDOW THEN."

THEY WERE GOING TO GO IN, THEY WERE GOING TO

STEAL THINGS. THEY WERE GOING TO STEAL A MICROWAVE AND I DON'T EVEN REMEMBER WHAT ALL. AND THEY WERE GOING TO PUT IT IN A PICKUP TRUCK THAT WAS GOING TO BE THERE. AND THEY WERE GOING TO DRIVE THE PICKUP TRUCK OUT INTO THE CALIFORNIA DESERT AND HAVE IT BE DISCOVERED LATER ON.

AND DALE WAS GOING TO HAVE BEEN SHOT IN THE LEG BY RANDY. AND HE WAS GOING TO SAY THAT HE HAD BEEN OUT TO THE TRAILER, HE HEARD A COMMOTION, HE WENT OVER THERE. HERE WERE THE TWO BLACK GUYS COMING OUT, THEY HAD A DODGE CAR OR SOMETHING AND HE GOT SHOT BY THEM.

THESE AREN'T UNSOPHISTICATED BOYS THAT WE ARE DEALING WITH IN THIS COURTROOM. THAT WORD CONSPIRATOR STARTS TO TAKE ON NEW MEANING WHEN YOU REALIZE THE CARE WITH WHICH, AND OVER THE LENGTH OF TIME, THAT THEY NURTURED AND DEVELOPED THIS AGREEMENT.

AGREEMENT. IT SOUNDS LIKE SOMETHING YOU WOULD SEE IN A LEGAL DOCUMENT. IT WAS A DAMNED CONSPIRACY TO KILL TWO PEOPLE. THAT'S WHAT IT WAS. I DON'T LIKE THE WORD AGREEMENT IN THIS PARTICULAR CASE.

AND THE CLINCHER OF THAT AGREEMENT IS THAT THEY
WERE ALL TO BE PAID WELL. ISN'T THAT SOMETHING. HE THOUGHT
HE WAS GOING TO GET A \$200,000 POLICY AND IT DIDN'T EVEN EXIST.
HE THOUGHT HE WAS GOING TO GET THE HOUSE. HE THOUGHT HE WAS
GOING TO GET THE RV, WHATEVER OTHER THINGS WERE AVAILABLE POR
HIS GREEDY LITTLE PURPOSES.

AND HE IS NOT SO GREEDY. HE WAS GOING TO SHARE
IT WITH ALL OF HIS PRIENDS. PROBABLY DIVVY IT UP IN THE
MIDDLE OF A COVEN PROCEEDING OR SOMETHING.

THAT'S THE AGREEMENT. THAT'S THE CONSPIRACY.

THAT'S THE DARK AND EVIL PLAN THAT WAS CREATED OVER A PERIOD

OF TIME AND PUT INTO ACTION AND FINALIZED ON THAT FATEFUL

NIGHT.

AND THERE WERE MANY PEOPLE WHO TESTIFIED ABOUT THAT. THIS ISN'T SOMETHING I AM JUST DREAMING UP OR TRYING TO RELY ON ONE OF THE STATE'S WITNESSES TO CONVINCE THE 12 OF YOU WHO WILL DELIBERATE THIS CASE.

A LOT OF PEOPLE SAID IT. THERE WERE FOUR PEOPLE WHO WERE PRESENT WHEN THESE THINGS WERE TALKED ABOUT, WHO SAT ON THAT STAND RIGHT THERE AND THEY TOLD YOU THAT THEY HEARD THESE THINGS.

RUSTY HAVENS WHO WAS GOING TO BE ONE OF THEM, BUT FOR THE GRACE OF GOD HE IS SITTING AT THAT TABLE. FOR SOME REASON, THEY DIDN'T GET AHOLD OF HIM AND BRING HIM BACK INTO THIS THING.

TOM AKERS, JOHN LUCAS AND ONE OF OUR DEFENDANTS,
JOHNNY RAY LUCKETT. THEY ALL SAT ON THE STAND AND THEY ALL
TOLD YOU THE SAME STORY.

THIS IS PROBABLY A GOOD TIME -- LET ME GO ONE STEP FURTHER AND THEN I WILL SAY THAT. THERE WAS ONE OTHER PERSON WHO WASN'T PRESENT WHO TOOK THE STAND AND TOLD YOU.

.7

22.

THAT WAS ANGELA SALDANA. AND SHE TOLD YOU WHAT HAPPENED IN THE LAST CONSPIRATORIAL MEETING THROUGH WHAT SHE HAD HEARD FROM DALE FLANAGAN IN THE TRAILER THAT DAY. DALE HAD TOLD HER THE WHOLE DEAL AND SHE WASN'T THERE.

SHE JUST HEARD THIS SECONDHAND, WHAT IS TYPICALLY HEARSAY BUT ALLOWED IN BECAUSE IT IS A CO-CONSPIRATOR STATEMENT. IT IS THE ACT OF ONE THAT BINDS ALL OR THE STATEMENT OF ONE WHICH BINDS ALL.

SO WE HAVE FOUR PEOPLE WHO WERE THERE AND HEARD THE WORDS SPOKEN. ACTUALLY, A FIFTH, DALE FLANAGAN, AS TOLD THROUGH THE SIXTH, ANGELA SALDANA.

NOW, THIS IS WHERE I WANT TO THROW IN A LITTLE BIT OF INTERJECTION. I WANT TO TALK ABOUT PEOPLE AND PERCEPTIONS AND CREDIBILITY AND BELIEVABILITY AND THERE IS AN INSTRUCTION AND YOU CAN REST ASSURED THAT THE DEFENSE ATTORNEYS ARE GOING TO STAND BEFORE YOU AND THEY ARE GOING TO SLANDER TO THE BEST OF THEIR ABILITY EVERY ONE OF THOSE WITNESSES WHO TESTIFIED AGAINST THEIR INTERESTS.

THAT WILL BE THE INTERESTING THING HOW WE

PERCEIVED THINGS DIFFERENTLY. ONE OF THEM WILL SAY, "AKERS
IS NO GOOD BECAUSE HE HURTS MY CLIENT." THE OTHER ONE WILL

SAY, "AKERS IS THE PARAGON OF TRUTH AND YOU MUST BELIEVE

HIM."

WELL, I AM NOT GOING TO BE JUDGMENTAL.

FORTUNATELY OR UNFORTUNATELY, THAT IS YOUR JOB ULTIMATELY. I

WILL SAY TO YOU THAT WE HAVE ALL SAT IN THE SAME COURTROOM AND WE HAVE ALL PERCEIVED THE SAME THINGS, PERHAPS IN DIFFERENT WAYS, BUT WE HAVE WATCHED THE SAME THINGS HAPPEN ON THAT STAND.

AND THERE ARE PEOPLE WHO HAVE TAKEN A SACRED OATH AND LIED OR THEY ARE TERRIBLY MISTAKEN BECAUSE THERE IS A LOT OF DIFFERENT TESTIMONY IN THIS CASE.

AND YOU MIGHT NOT HAVE LIKED THINGS THAT YOU
HEARD ABOUT SOME OF THE PEOPLE AND YOU THOUGHT, "BOY, ANYBODY
WHO IS THAT KIND OF A PERSON PROBABLY WOULDN'T TELL THE
TRUTH," AND MAYBE YOU WOULD BE RIGHT IF THAT WERE THE ONLY
PERSON WHO TOOK THE STAND.

BUT THE POINT I WANT TO MAKE TO YOU IS THAT FOR ALL THE SLANDER THAT WILL BE THROWN OUT AT VARIOUS WITNESSES, REMEMBER ONE THING, THEY ARE CONSISTENT IN MANY RESPECTS.

THIS AGREEMENT IS ONE OF THEM. THEY ALL SAID THE SAME THING. DID ALL OF THESE PEOPLE MEET DOWN THE HALLWAY HERE IN ANOTHER CONSPIRACY AND SAY, "LOOK, WE GOT TO GET THESE GUYS AND SO LET'S GET TOGETHER AND MAKE OUR STORIES STRAIGHT"?

THAT WAS NEVER BROUGHT OUT. THEY ALL TOLD THE SAME THING AND FOUR OF THEM WERE THERE. AND THE LAST POINT TO BE MADE ABOUT WHETHER OR NOT CONSPIRACIES OCCURRED IS THAT THE CONSPIRACIES, THE AGREEMENTS, THE MEETINGS GO UNCONTRADICTED.

.18

NO ONE HAS TAKEN THE STAND IN THIS CASE THAT I REMEMBER, NO ONE HAS TAKEN THE STAND AND SAID, "WAIT A MINUTE. THOSE PEOPLE ARE LYING. THOSE MEETINGS DIDN'T TAKE PLACE."

MR. POSIN: YOUR HONOR, I HATE TO INTERRUPT COUNSEL'S OPENING ARGUMENT BUT I THINK WE ARE GOING AT THIS POINT IN TIME TO THE COURT'S DIRECTION, TO JURY INSTRUCTIONS, OPENING INSTRUCTIONS REGARDING THE OBLIGATION OF DEFENDANTS WHO TESTIFY ON THEIR OWN BEHALF.

MR. SEATON: COUNSEL SAID THAT, I DIDN'T. THERE HAVE BEEN MANY WITNESSES WHO TESTIFIED ABOUT BEING AT THE MEETINGS.

THE COURT: I DON'T THINK MR. SEATON DID NOT INDICATE THE DEFENDANTS DID NOT TAKE THE STAND.

MR. PIKE: I JOIN IN THE MOTION.

THE COURT: UNDERSTAND.

MR. SEATON: THERE IS NO DOUBT IN THIS CASE, AND I HAVE PROBABLY TAKEN TOO LONG TO CONVINCE YOU, THAT ALL OF THE CRIMES CHARGED IN THIS CASE TOOK PLACE, ROBBERY, BURGLARY, MURDER AND CONSPIRACY TO COMMIT ALL THOSE CRIMES.

THERE JUST ISN'T THE SLIGHTEST SHREAD OF A DOUBT.
YOU DON'T EVEN TALK ABOUT BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT IN THAT
SITUATION.

THE MAJOR QUESTION THAT THE DEFENSE ATTORNEYS ARE GOING TO WANT TO QUIBBLE WITH YOU ABOUT IS WHO'S GUILTY. IT

COMES DOWN TO A WHODUNIT.

2 .

WELL, BEFORE WE GET INTO THE SPECIFICS OF EACH ONE OF THESE DEFENDANTS, LET ME TALK TO YOU FOR A MOMENT ABOUT THEORIES OF CRIMINAL RESPONSIBILITY.

IF SOMEONE GOES OUT AND COMMITS A CRIME, THAT'S EASY. THEY DID IT. THEY ARE THE ACTOR AND IT IS EASY TO FIND THEM GUILTY.

BUT THERE ARE OTHER WAYS THAT SOMETIMES PEOPLE

DON'T THINK ABOUT AND WE CAN FIND THAT IN INSTRUCTIONS 31 AND

32. LET'S DIRECT OUR ATTENTION TO THOSE FOR A MINUTE.

LET ME READ PART OF 31. EVERY PERSON CONCERNED IN THE COMMISSION OF A CRIME WHETHER HE, ONE, DIRECTLY COMMITS THE ACT CONSTITUTING THE OFFENSE. THAT IS WEAT I WAS JUST TALKING ABOUT, THE PERSON WHO ACTUALLY DOES THE CRIME.

OR, NUMBER TWO, AIDS AND ABETS IN ITS COMMISSION.
WHAT DOES AID AND ABET MEAN? INSTRUCTION NUMBER 32, TO AID
AND ABET IS TO ASSIST OR SUPPORT THE EFFORTS OF ANOTHER IN
THE COMMISSION OF A CRIME.

THESE ARE REAL SIMPLISTIC. YOU DON'T NEED LEGAL INSTRUCTIONS TO KNOW THIS. IF I COMMIT A CRIME AND YOU HELP ME, WE ARE BOTH GUILTY. THAT IS WHAT THE LAW SAYS.

AND, INDEPENDENTLY. THE INSTRUCTION GOES ON TO SAY YOU CAN DO EITHER ONE OF THOSE TWO THINGS AND BE GUILTY OF THE CRIME WHETHER PRESENT OR ABSENT. YOU DON'T NEED TO BE THERE.

AND IT GOES ON TO SAY ANY OF THE PEOPLE WHO DO
THAT ARE PRINCIPLES AND SHALL BE PROCEEDED AGAINST AND
PUNISHED AS SUCH. SO THE PERSON WHO DOES THE ACT IS NO MORE,
NO LESS GUILTY THAN THE PERSON WHO ASSISTS OR SUPPORTS THE
PERSON IN COMMITTING THAT CRIME.

LET'S THINK OF SOME EXAMPLES. ANYONE WHO ENTERED THE HOUSE, WHO WALKED THROUGH THE WINDOW, HAVING THE INTENT IN THEIR MIND TO ROB OR TO KILL IS THE PERSON WHO COMMITTED THE BURGLARY AND THEY ARE GUILTY UNDER NUMBER ONE. THEY DIRECTLY COMMITTED THE ACT.

ANYONE WHO PULLED THE TRIGGER AND WHOSE BULLET KILLED EITHER CARL OR COLLEEN GORDON IS THE PERSON WHO COMMITTED THE ACT AND IS GUILTY UNDER NUMBER ONE.

NOW, UNDER THE AIDER-ABETTOR THEORIES, ANYONE WHO BROKE THE WINDOW, WHICH ALLOWED SOMEONE TO GO IN, BUT THAT PERSON THEMSELVES WHO BROKE THE WINDOW DIDN'T GO IN, HYPOTHETICALLY, THEY DIDN'T COMMIT THE CRIME OF BURGLARY. THEY SUPPORTED, THEY ASSISTED, THEY AIDED AND ABETTED AND THEY ARE EQUALLY GUILTY OF BURGLARY.

ANYONE WHO SUPPLIED A GUN WHICH WAS USED TO KILL AIDS AND ABETS. ROY MCDOWELL, WHEN YOU BROUGHT THAT GUN OVER TO THE APARTMENT AND YOU PUT IT INTO THE HANDS OF DALE FLANAGAN, THE MOMENT HE PULLED THAT TRIGGER AND KILLED HIS GRANDMOTHER, YOU WERE GUILTY OF FIRST DEGREE MURDER.

THAT'S THE LAW. THAT'S AID AND ABET. ANYONE WHO

CARRIED A GUN AND SHOT AND MISSED, AND IT CANNOT BE PROVEN THAT THEIR SHOT KILLED, IS GUILTY OF MURDER.

AND SO, JOHNNY RAY LUCKETT, WHEN YOU CARRIED THE SAWED-OFF .22 RIFLE, AND I KNOW YOU SAY YOU DIDN'T BUT WHEN YOU DID, BECAUSE I WILL SHOW LATER ON THAT YOU DID, AND RANDY MOORE SHOT AND KILLED MR. GORDON, YOU WERE AS GUILTY AS HE BECAUSE HE WAS ASSISTING RANDY.

HE WAS, IN RANDY'S WORDS, HIS BACKUP. UNDER THE AID AND ABET THEORY, IT MAKES HIM EVERY BIT AS GUILTY AS RANDY MOORE OF THE DEATH OF CARL GORDON.

NOW, WE HAVE TO INTERRELATE SOMETHING HERE. THE AID AND ABET THEORY SORT OF GOES HAND IN HAND WITH THE CO-CONSPIRATOR RULE. YOU ARE GOING TO HEAR IT A LOT. THE ACT OF ONE IS THE ACT OF ALL IS THAT RULE.

AND I HAVE ALREADY SAID IT IN ONE WAY BUT NOW COMBINING THOSE TWO THEORIES. IF YOU HELP AND ASSIST SOMEBODY AND IF THE ACT OF ONE IS THE ACT OF ALL, IF YOU GO THERE —— IF THIS GROUP OF PEOPLE WENT TO THE HOUSE AND THEY WENT THERE WITH THIS OVERALL PLAN THAT MAYBE NOT NECESSARILY THEY WOULD DO IT, BUT THAT THERE WOULD BE A BURGLARY, A ROBBERY AND TWO KILLINGS, ALL OF THEM ARE AS GUILTY AS THE OTHER IRRESPECTIVE OF THE ACT WHICH THEY PERFORMED BECAUSE THEY AIDED AND ABETTED.

AND THEY HAVE TO LIVE AND DIE WITH THE ACT OF THEIR CO-CONSPIRATORS. AND WHILE WE ARE TALKING THEORIES OF

CRIME THEN, OF COURSE, THE FELONY MURDER RULE KICKS IN AND MAKES A MURDER INTO A FIRST DEGREE MURDER AND IT ALONG WITH THE AID AND ABET AND THE CO-CONSPIRATOR RULE MAKES IT APPLICABLE TO ALL OF THE CODEFENDANTS.

SO IN SHORT, WHEN THESE MEN GOT INVOLVED IN THE CONSPIRACY, WHEN THE ULTIMATE AGREEMENT WAS MADE AND THEY HEADED OUT TO DO THE ACTS, THEY WERE STUCK. THEY WERE STUCK WITH WHATEVER WAS SAID LATER AND THEY WERE STUCK WITH WHATEVER WAS DONE AND IT WAS AS MUCH THEIR RESPONSIBILITY NO MATTER WHAT THEY THEMSELVES DID.

NOW, THAT TAKES US DOWN TO EACH OF THESE
INDIVIDUALS AND WHAT PARTICULAR CRIMES THEY COMMITTED. AND I
AM GOING TO TALK ABOUT THEM IN GROUPINGS. I AM GOING TO TALK
FIRST ABOUT DALE FLANAGAN AND RANDOLPH MOORE TOGETHER,
BECAUSE THEY ARE ALMOST LIKE A SHADOW, ONE TO THE OTHER.

VIRTUALLY EVERYTHING ONE DID, THE OTHER DID WITH THE EXCEPTION OF SOME SPECIFIC ACTS. BUT ALL OF THE THEORIES AND REASONINGS THAT I AM GOING TO USE APPLY EQUALLY TO ONE AS TO THE OTHER. SO LET'S START WITH THE CONSPIRACIES.

WERE THEY A PART OF THE VARIOUS CONSPIRACIES TO ROB, TO BURGLE, TO MURDER? WELL, WE KNOW THAT BY THE TESTIMONY OF THE WITNESSES THAT CAME OUT HERE, THEY WERE AT, AND I MAY BE WRONG ABOUT MAYBE ONE MEETING, BUT VIRTUALLY THEY WERE BOTH AT ALL OF THE MEETINGS.

AND I MAY BE WRONG ON THAT, BUT ALMOST ALL OF THE

MEETINGS THAT THEY WENT TO, THE DOME HOUSE, THE OCTOBER

MEETING, THE MEETING A WEEK AND A HALF BEFORE, THE AFTERNOON

OF THE 5TH AND THE EVENING OF THE 5TH.

THEY WERE, IN FACT, THE MAIN CO-CONSPIRATORS.

THEY WERE THE TALKERS, THEY WERE THE PLANNERS. THEY LED THIS

THING. THEY DIDN'T ONLY LEAD THE COVEN, THEY LET THEIR BLACK

AND THEIR WHITE MAGIC SPILL OVER INTO THIS CONSPIRACY AND IT

WAS THEY WHO DID ALL OF THE PLANNING OF THE THINGS THAT WE

HAVE TALKED ABOUT BEFORE.

THEY ARRANGED FOR THE GUNS. THEY DEVISED A METHOD TO GET INTO THE HOUSE. THEY DEVISED THE COVER-UP STORIES. THESE TWO WERE THE PRIMARY MOVERS.

AND REMEMBER ONE THING WHEN I SAY SOMETHING LIKE THAT. THAT DOESN'T LESSEN TO ONE DEGREE IN MY ARGUMENT AND MY APPROACH TO YOU THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE OTHER TWO.

EQUALLY BAD. BUT THERE ARE PEOPLE WHO ARE LEADERS AND THERE ARE PEOPLE WHO ARE FOLLOWERS AND THEY CAN BE EQUALLY BAD. I MEAN, WHERE ARE LEADERS WITHOUT FOLLOWERS AND ESPECIALLY WHEN WE ARE TALKING ABOUT THIS AGE GROUP. THEY PEED OFF OF ONE ANOTHER'S IDEAS AND STRENGTHS AND WILLINGNESS TO PERFORM ACTS THAT INDIVIDUALLY PERHAPS THEY WOULDN'T DO.

THERE WAS AN ABSOLUTE AND A DEFINITE CONSPIRACY
THAT RANDY MOORE AND DALE FLANAGAN WERE A PART OF.

HOW ABOUT THE BURGLARY? WELL, DALE GAVE THE KNIFE TO RANDY, RANDY CUT THE SCREEN, THE WINDOW WAS BROKEN

BY SOMEONE ELSE ALTHOUGH THERE WAS TESTIMONY THAT DALE BROKE IT WITH HIS PIST.

AND BOTH FLANAGAN AND MOORE WALKED THROUGH THAT WINDOW. AND WE ALREADY KNOW FROM THEIR PLANS AND THEIR MEETINGS AND EVEN AFTER THE FACT THEIR ACTS, WHAT THEY PLANNED, WHAT THEY INTENDED TO DO.

THEY INTENDED TO ROB AND TO STEAL AND TO MURDER.

AND SO THEY WENT THROUGH THE WINDOW WITH THE INTENT TO DO

THOSE THINGS AND THAT IS BURGLARY AND, PLAN AND SIMPLE, THE

BURGLARY WITH REGARD TO THOSE TWO PEOPLE CAN EASILY BE CAST

ASIDE.

THE ROBBERY IS THE SAME WAY. THE KILLING WAS THE FORCE OR VIOLENCE, AS I TALKED TO YOU BEFORE, AND THEY BOTH PARTICIPATED IN THE KILLING.

EVEN THOUGH THE GRANDPARENTS, ARE DEAD, IT'S STILL A ROBBERY. SOMEONE ELSE TOOK THE PROPERTY BY SOME OF THE TESTIMONY. ROY MCDOWELL, HE TOOK THE WALLET AND THE PURSE OR FROM THE PURSE.

BUT THAT'S THE AID AND ABET SIDE OF IT. THEY
WERE AIDING AND ABETTING HIS ABILITY TO DO THAT. HE COULDN'T
HAVE DONE THAT IF THEY HADN'T KILLED THE GRANDPARENTS. THE
GRANDPARENTS WOULD HAVE STOPPED HIM.

AND IT WAS THE TESTIMONY OF LUCAS AND AKERS AND I
DON'T REMEMBER FOR SURE ABOUT JOHNNY RAY LUCKETT, BUT THAT I
THINK HIS TESTIMONY, TOO, THEY -- THEY MEANING DALE FLANAGAN

AND RANDOLPH MOORE WENT THROUGH THE CONTENTS OF THE WALLET, EXTRACTED CERTAIN MONIES AND BURNED IN AN ASHTRAY THE REMAINDER OF THE CONTENTS.

AND IN CASE THERE IS ANY QUESTION IN ANYBODY'S MIND ABOUT THIS BURGLARY AND ROBBERY SEEMING AWFULLY SIMILAR, AWFULLY PART OF THE SAME CRIME, LET INSTRUCTION NINE PUT YOUR MIND AT REST.

THE OFFENSE OF BURGLARY IS COMPLETE WHEN THE HOUSE IS ENTERED WITH THE SPECIFIC INTENT TO COMMIT LARCENY, ROBBERY OR MURDER. IT'S COMPLETE UPON THE ENTRY. NOTHING MORE NEED BE DONE.

IF, THEREAFTER, LARCENY, ROBBERY OR MURDER ARE COMMITTED, THE PERPETRATORS HAVE COMMITTED VARIOUS CRIMES AND MAY BE CHARGED AND CONVICTED OF BURGLARY AS WELL AS THE OTHER CRIMES WHICH WERE COMMITTED AFTER ENTRY WAS MADE INTO THE PREMISES.

SO, YOU SEE, THE ROBBERY IS INDEED SOMETHING DIFFERENT FROM THE BURGLARY AS OBVIOUSLY THE MURDER IS.

MURDER. WELL, WE KNOW THAT DALE FLANAGAN SHOT HIS GRANDMOTHER. A LOT OF PEOPLE HAVE TOLD US THAT. HE THROUGH ANGELA SALDANA AND OTHERS HAS TOLD US THAT.

TOM AKERS SAID -- AND I AM TRYING TO TALK ABOUT EACH ONE OF THE PERSON'S TESTIMONY VERY BRIEFLY AS TO WHAT THEY SAID DALE FLANAGAN DID.

TOM AKERS SAID THAT HE SAW DALE FLANAGAN WITH THE

IMAGINE?

PISTOL, THE .22 PISTOL THAT ROY MCDOWELL HAD GIVEN HIM, THAT HE, IN FACT, HAD BEEN THROWN THE PISTOL AT ONE TIME TO CHECK IT OUT BY DALE AND HE GAVE IT BACK TO DALE AND HE KNEW THAT DALE HAD THE PISTOL WITH HIM ON THE CAR RIDE OUT THERE.

NOW, HE WAS IN A POSITION IN THE TRAILER THAT HE DIDN'T SEE WHAT DALE FLANAGAN DID. IN PACT, NO ONE SAW WHAT DALE FLANAGAN DID WITH THE EXCEPTION OF MRS. GORDON.

BUT TOM AKERS SAID THAT WHEN THEY GOT BACK TO THE APARTMENT, DALE FLANAGAN TOLD HIM AND THE OTHERS -- THEY WERE ALL TELLING EACH OTHER WHAT THEY HAD DONE. HE TOLD THEM THAT HE HAD GONE INTO THE BEDROOM, GRABBED HIS GRANDMOTHER.

I AM GOING TO TRY TO QUOTE AS MUCH AS I CAN. HE GRABBED HIS GRANDMOTHER BY THE JAW AND HE WAS DEMONSTRATING.

DALE DEMONSTRATED THIS FOR EVERYBODY. HE GRABBED HIS GRANDMOTHER BY THE JAW AND HE SHOT HER IN THE HEAD.

CAN YOU IMAGINE? IN YOUR WILDEST DREAMS, CAN YOU

JOHN LUCAS SAID THE SAME STORY ESSENTIALLY THAT DALE HAD TOLD EVERYONE THERE THAT HE HAD SHOT HIS GRANDMOTHER.

ANGELA SALDANA SAID THAT IN THE TRAILER, DALE TOLD HER, "HOW DO YOU LIKE THIS, I KILLED MY GRANDPARENTS. I PUT MY HAND ON HER MOUTH, I WRESTLED HER TO THE BED AND I SHOT HER IN THE HEAD." HE TOLD ANGELA SALDANA THAT.

JOHNNY RAY LUCKETT GOT ON THE STAND FOR US AND HE

SAID THAT DALE FLANAGAN HAD THE PISTOL. HE SAID THAT HE HEARD — AND WE ARE GOING TO TALK ABOUT THE VIABILITY OF ALL OF THIS STORY A LITTLE LATER ON. BUT LET'S JUST TAKE HIM AT HIS WORD RIGHT NOW FOR WHAT HE HEARD AND SAW. WHERE HE WAS AND WHAT HE WAS DOING MAY BE A DIFFERENT QUESTION.

HE HEARD DALE SAY, "DO IT NOW." AND THE WINDOW
WAS BROKEN. AND HE SAW DALE GO IN THE HOUSE. THE LIGHT CAME
ON AND HE SAW THE OTHERS STILL OUTSIDE THE WINDOW WAITING FOR
THE GRANDFATHER TO COME DOWN.

AND WHILE THEY WERE OUTSIDE THE WINDOW AND AKERS WAS IN THE TRAILER AND LUCKETT WAS WHEREVER WE ARE ULTIMATELY GOING TO BELIEVE HE WAS, AND I SUBMIT IT WAS AT LEAST OUTSIDE THE HOUSE, THE ONLY PERSON INSIDE THE HOUSE WAS DALE FLANAGAN AND SHOTS WERE HEARD FROM WITHIN THE HOUSE.

THAT'S PRETTY GOOD CIRCUMSTANTIAL EVIDENCE THAT

DALE FLANAGAN WAS THE PERSON WHO KILLED HIS GRANDMOTHER

WITHOUT ALL THE ADMISSIONS AND OTHER THINGS THAT WE HAVE.

LATER AT THE HOUSE, JOHN RAY LUCKETT TOLD US THAT DALE FLANAGAN TOLD EVERYBODY, JUST LIKE LUCAS AND AKERS SAID, THAT HE GRABBED HIS GRANDMOTHER AND HE SHOT HER THREE TIMES IN THE HEAD.

IS THERE ANY DOUBT? IS THERE ANY DOUBT IN THIS COURTROOM? I WISH I COULD ASK YOU QUESTIONS. I CAN'T. I CAN'T IMAGINE ANY DOUBT EXISTING IN THIS ROOM AT THIS MOMENT THAT DALE FLANAGAN SHOT HIS GRANDMOTHER TO DEATH.

HOW ABOUT RANDOLPH MOORE? WE ARE ALLEGING THAT
HE SHOT DALE'S GRANDFATHER. BACK TO TOM AKERS. HE KNEW THAT
RANDOLPH MOORE HAD THE LONG RIFLE AS OPPOSED TO THE
SAWED-OFF. HE SAW HIM WALK TOWARD THE HOUSE WITH THE OTHER
PEOPLE.

AND RANDOLPH MOORE TOLD TOM AKERS BACK AT THE
APARTMENT THAT HE HAD KNEELED DOWN, AFTER THE WINDOW WAS
BROKEN AND AFTER DALE FLANAGAN HAD GONE INTO THE HOUSE, AND HE
WAITED FOR THE GRANDFATHER TO COME DOWN THE STEPS.

AND WHEN HE DID, HE SHOT AT THE GRANDFATHER AND MISSED AND SHOT AGAIN AND SHOT AGAIN AND HIT HIM AND KILLED HIM. THAT'S WHAT HE TOLD TOM AKERS AND THE OTHERS.

AND LUCAS SAID ABOUT THE SAME THING. HE SAID IT
A LITTLE DIFFERENTLY. YOU ARE NEVER GOING TO GET A VERBATIM
RECITATION OF THESE STATEMENTS. BUT JOHN LUCAS'S STORY WAS
THAT MOORE HAD SAID, "I SHOT THE GRANDFATHER FOUR TIMES AS HE
CAME DOWN THE STAIRS. AND I WENT IN THE HOUSE AND I SHOT HIM
AGAIN."

ANGELA SALDANA SAID THAT DALE FLANAGAN TOLD HER THAT RANDY MOORE HAD SAID THAT HE HAD SHOT THE GRANDFATHER WITH THE LONG RIFLE.

JOHNNY RAY LUCKETT'S TESTIMONY FASCINATED ME IN THIS REGARD. HE SAID THAT HE HAD SEEN RANDY LOAD BOTH RIFLES, HE HAD SEEN RANDY MOORE HAVE THE LONG RIFLE IN HIS

POSSESSION AND GO TO THE WINDOW. HE SAW HIM WITH IT IN HIS HAND WHEN THE LIGHTS CAME ON THROUGH THE WINDOW AND HE SAW RANDY MOORE SHOOT INTO THE HOUSE.

9.

HERE IS WHAT PASCINATES ME. YOU HEAR THESE
LITTLE THINGS IN A TRIAL THAT TELL YOU SOMETHING ABOUT THE
PEOPLE THAT YOU ARE TRYING AND WITH WHOM YOU ARE DEALING.
RANDOLPH MOORE, "WELL, I WENT INTO THE HOUSE AND THE
GRANDFATHER WAS ON THE FLOOR AND HE WAS STILL SQUIRMING AND
SO I SHOT HIM AGAIN." DID YOU REALLY SAY THAT?

I CAN'T BELIEVE -- I CAN, I GUESS, EN THE CONTEXT OF THIS CASE -- THAT STATEMENT. THERE IS NO DOUBT THAT RANDOLPH MOORE AND DALE FLANAGAN SHOT COLLEEN GORDON AND CARL GORDON. THERE IS NO DOUBT THAT IT IS AN UNLAWFUL KILLING, THAT IT IS A MURDER.

THAT BY VIRTUE OF THE FELONY MURDER RULE, IT IS FIRST DEGREE MURDER. BY VIRTUE OF THE CO-CONSPIRATOR RULE, BY VIRTUE OF AID AND ABET THAT THEY ARE NOT ONLY GUILTY OF MURDERING THE PEOPLE WHO THEY ACTUALLY MURDERED, BUT THE OTHER PERSON'S VICTIM.

ROY MCDOWELL. WAS ROY MCDOWELL A CONSPIRATOR?

DID HE ATTEND THE MEETINGS? DID HE AGREE TO JOIN INTO THIS

PLAN TO KILL CARL AND COLLEEN GORDON?

WELL, WE KNOW HE WAS AT SOME MEETINGS. HE WAS AT THE OCTOBER MEETING. HE WAS AT THE NOVEMBER 5TH MEETING IN THE EVENING. HE WAS IN A POSITION, AND IT WAS SAID THAT

1.

ANYONE ELSE COULD HEAR, TO HEAR THE PLANS BEING MADE.

HE OFFERED NO DISSENT. YOU NEVER ONCE HEARD
ANYBODY TESTIFY THAT WHEN DALE FLANAGAN SAID, "LET'S GO IN
THROUGH THE BACK DOOR," AND RANDOLPH MOORE SAID, "NO, LET'S GO
IN THROUGH THE WINDOW," THAT ROY MCDOWELL SAID, "WAIT A
MINUTE. WHAT ARE WE TALKING ABOUT HERE? I DON'T LIKE ANY OF
THIS."

NO, HE SAT THERE AND INSOFAR AS THESE KIND OF CONVERSATIONS ARE CONCERNED, HE ADOPTED WHATEVER WAS SAID. AND MORE THAN THAT, AT ONE OF THE MEETINGS, THE OCTOBER MEETING, HE AGREED TO BRING A .22 PISTOL THAT HE POSSESSED.

HE SAID THAT HE HAD IT AND THAT HE WOULD BRING IT. HE WAS REMINDED OF HIS DUTY, HIS ROLE TO BRING THAT WEAPON ON NOVEMBER THE 5TH, 1984 SOMEWHERE BETWEEN ELEVEN O'CLOCK IN THE MORNING AND ONE O'CLOCK IN THE AFTERNOON WHEN DALE FLANAGAN GOT THE TELEPHONE NUMBER OF ROY MCDOWELL FROM RANDY MOORE AND HE CALLED HIM AND HE SAID, "DID YOU GET THE TOY?"

IF THAT IS AT ONE O'CLOCK, BY TEN O'CLOCK THAT EVENING ROY MCDOWELL BROUGHT THE TOY. HE BROUGHT THE .22 PISTOL. WE KNOW THAT BECAUSE JOHNNY RAY LUCKETT TOLD US THAT HE DID. HE CAME IN AND THE FIRST TIME HE SAW THE PISTOL WAS WHEN ROY JUST CAME IN, SECONDS AFTER HE CAME IN THE DOOR AND HE WAS ONE OR TWO FEET AWAY FROM THE DOOR AND HE WAS HANDING THE PISTOL TO DALE FLANAGAN.

NO, HE DIDN'T KNOW FROM WHAT PART OF HIS BODY IT CAME BUT HE HAD IT AT THAT MOMENT AND HE HAD NOT SEEN IT BEFORE.

TOM AKERS SAID THE SAME IN THAT HE SAW ROY

MCDOWELL BRING THE WEAPON AND HE SAW HIM GIVE IT TO DALE

FLANAGAN. AND, FURTHER, THAT DURING THAT DISCUSSION THAT NIGHT

THAT IT WAS UNDERSTOOD BY ALL PRESENT, INCLUDING ROY

MCDOWELL, THAT IT WAS HIS ROLE, HIS SECOND ROLE -- HIS FIRST

WAS TO BRING THE GUN. IT WAS HIS SECOND ROLE, DUTY TO MAKE

IT LOOK LIKE A BURGLARY.

AND WHEN IT WAS UNDERSTOOD THAT THAT WAS TO BE
THE CASE, YOU DIDN'T HEAR ANYBODY TESTIFY THAT ROY MCDOWELL
SAID, "WAIT A MINUTE. I DON'T WANT ANY PART OF THAT." LUCAS
DIDN'T TELL YOU THAT, AKERS DIDN'T TELL YOU THAT, LUCKETT
DIDN'T TELL YOU THAT.

WE KNOW OF NO OPPOSITION TO ANY OF THIS BY ROY MCDOWELL. IN FACT, NOT ONLY DID HE BRING THE GUN BUT HE DROVE OUT THERE WITH THEM.

THAT IS ALL AS TO THE CONSPIRACY AND IT SEEMS
CLEAR THAT ROY MCDOWELL WAS GUILTY, IS GUILTY OF CONSPIRING
TO COMMIT ALL OF THESE VARIOUS CRIMES.

NOW, HOW ABOUT THE BURGLARY? WELL, JOHN LUCAS WAS ABOUT THE BEST HELP THAT ROY MCDOWELL HAD IN THIS PARTICULAR TRIAL IN THAT REGARD. LUCAS SAID WHEN THEY ALL CAME BACK INTO THE HOUSE, HE DIDN'T KNOW IF ROY HAD THE

WALLET ON HIS POSSESSION.

 ALL HE COULD SAY IS THAT HE SAW HIM COME BACK
INTO THE HOUSE WITH EVERYBODY ELSE AND THE WALLET APPEARED SO
LUCKETT COULDN'T PUT IT IN HIS POSSESSION. I READILY ADMIT
THAT. TOM AKERS AND JOHNNY RAY LUCKETT, HOWEVER, ARE A HORSE
OF A DIFFERENT COLOR.

AKERS SAID THAT NOT ONLY WAS HE AWARE, AS WAS ROY,
THAT IT WAS ROY'S ROLE TO BURGLARIZE THE PLACE, BUT THAT HE
SAW ROY WALK TOWARD THE HOUSE OF THE GORDONS WITH THE OTHER
PEOPLE, AND THEN, OF COURSE, HE LOST TRACK OF WHAT WAS GOING
ON.

BUT WHEN HE TURNED AROUND AND SAW EVERYBODY

COMING FROM THE HOUSE AS HE WAS TRYING TO FIX HIS CAR, TOM

AKERS NOW I AM SPEAKING OF, HE SAW ROY MCDOWELL ALONG WITH

ALL OF THE OTHER DEFENDANTS SAVE AND EXCEPT JOHNNY RAY

LUCKETT.

AND THE INTERESTING THING TO NOTE ABOUT THAT IS
THAT THEY WERE COMING FROM THE AREA OF THE FRONT DOOR. AND
WHEN YOU LOOK AT THE DIAGRAM, YOU WILL SEE THAT THE FRONT DOOR
IS ON ONE SIDE OF THE HOUSE AND THE WINDOW WAS ON THE OTHER.

IT WAS ON THE WINDOW SIDE THAT THE CAR WAS. SO THERE WAS NO HISTAKE. HE WASN'T COMING FROM THAT WINDOW AREA NEVER HAVING GONE INTO THE HOUSE. YOU CAN'T BELIEVE THAT.

HE WAS COMING AROUND BY THE FRONT DOOR WITH EVERYBODY ELSE WHICH INFERS AT LEAST THAT HE WAS IN THE HOUSE

AT SOME TIME.

AKERS ALSO SAID THAT ROY SAID THAT HE WAS IN THE HOUSE AFTER THE SHOOTING. AND WHAT IS THE PROOF OF ALL OF THIS PUDDING? THE PROOF IS THAT HE HAD THE WALLET.

TOM AKERS SAW HIM WITH THE WALLET. AND HE PUT IT ON THE KITCHEN TABLE SO THAT OUR LEADERS, DALE FLANAGAN AND RANDOLPH MOORE, COULD RIFLE THROUGH IT AND GET THIS PITIFUL AMOUNT OF MONEY THAT WAS THE ULTIMATE PROCEEDS OF THIS KILLING AND BURGLARY AND ROBBERY.

JOHNNY RAY LUCKETT SAID SORT OF THE SAME THING.

ROY MCDOWELL WENT TO THE HOUSE. HE SAW ROY MCDOWELL GO INTO

THE HOUSE AND ROY, IN FACT, LATER ON SAID THAT HE HAD GONE

INTO THE HOUSE.

AND, AS I REMEMBER MR. LUCKETT'S TESTIMONY, THAT
HE WAS LOOKING FOR SOMETHING. HE NEVER DID IDENTIFY TO
JOHNNY RAY LUCKETT WHAT IT WAS. AND THAT HE SAW ROY MCDOWELL
GIVE THE WALLET TO DALE FLANAGAN.

AGAIN, IT'S THE ONLY TESTIMONY YOU HAVE. NOWHERE IN THIS TRIAL WAS IT SAID THAT ROY MCDOWELL DIDN'T DO THOSE THINGS. SO THERE CAN'T BE ANY DOUBT ABOUT THE BURGLARY.

HOW ABOUT THE ROBBERY? WELL, WE HAVE GONE
THROUGH THIS BEFORE. THE TAKING OF THE WALLET OBVIOUSLY IS
THE PROPERTY THAT IS TAKEN IN THE ROBBERY AND WE KNOW WHAT
THE FORCE IS.

INTERESTING COMMENT BY ROY MCDOWELL TO DALE AT

RANDY MOORE'S APARTMENT. HE SAID, "DALE, IT WAS ON TOP OF THE CLOSET JUST AS YOU SAID IT WOULD BE." THERE CAN'T BE ANY DOUBT THAT HE WAS THE PERSON WHO WENT INTO THE CLOSET, RIFLED THROUGH IT, SPREAD THE THINGS OUT THAT YOU WILL SEE IN THE PHOTOGRAPHS, FOUND THE PURSE, TOOK THE WALLET FROM THE PURSE AND RAN OUT THE FRONT DOOR AND THAT IS ROBBERY.

HOW ABOUT MR. MCDOWELL'S INVOLVEMENT, CULPABILITY IN THE MURDERS? WELL, HE DIDN'T PULL ANY TRIGGERS. I AM NOT HERE TO TELL YOU THAT. NO ONE HAS. NO ONE WILL. SO HE CANNOT BE HELD ACCOUNTABLE AS A PRINCIPLE IN THAT CRIME BECAUSE HE COMMITTED THE ACT. HE DID NOT. I WILL TELL YOU THAT RIGHT NOW, HE DID NOT.

BUT REMEMBER OUR DISCUSSION ON AIDING AND ABETTING. HOW DID THIS FELLOW AID AND ABET THE DEATH OF CARL AND COLLEEN GORDON? LET'S TAKE COLLEEN GORDON, FIRST OF ALL.

BUT FOR THE BRINGING ALONG OF THAT .22 PISTOL, AND PUTTING IT IN THE HANDS OF A PERSON LIKE DALE FLANAGAN, COLLEEN GORDON DOESN'T DIE. AT LEAST, SHE DOESN'T DIE BY THAT WEAPON.

IT WAS THE WEAPON THAT ROY MCDOWELL BROUGHT THAT KILLED COLLEEN GORDON. HOW CAN HE BE IN A WORSE LIGHT AS AN AIDER AND ABETTOR? HOW CAN HE BE? IT'S IMPOSSIBLE.

HE DID THE BURGLARY AND THE ROBBERY TO ASSIST THE COVERUP OF THE KILLINGS. THAT'S PART OF THE AID AND ABET THEORY.

WHEN YOU READ THE CONSPIRACY INSTRUCTION, IT USES THE WORDS INDIRECTLY ENCOURAGED. IS DOING WHAT HE DID TO INDIRECTLY ENCOURAGE THE OTHERS TO DO WHAT THEY DID? WELL, OF COURSE IT IS AND HE NEVER DID THE OPPOSITE.

HE NEVER DISCOURAGED ANYBODY. HE NEVER DID, AS
JOHNNY RAY LUCKETT WILL HAVE US BELIEVE, THAT HE DID TRY TO
PUT A HALT TO THIS THING, TO TRY TO BRING SOME SENSE AND A
FEELING OF DECENCY TO THIS GROUP, THAT THEY WERE DOING SUCH A
HEINOUS ACT AND FOR EVERYBODY TO STOP IT.

HE NEVER DID THAT. AND HE IS AS GUILTY OF THE MURDERS OF CARL AND COLLEEN GORDON AS IF HE HAD PULLED THAT TRIGGER HIMSELF. JUST AS GUILTY. ALL OF WHICH BRINGS US TO JOHNNY RAY LUCKETT.

MR. SMITH IS HIS ATTORNEY, A CAPABLE ONE AT THAT AND HE STOOD RIGHT HERE, MR. SMITH DID, AND HE SAID, AND I QUOTE, "MY CLIENT IS IN A DIFFERENT POSITION THAN ANY OTHER DEFENDANT IN THIS COURTROOM." AND, YOU KNOW WHAT, HE WAS RIGHT.

NOT BECAUSE THE CASE IS ANY STRONGER OR WEAKER
AGAINST JOHNNY RAY LUCKETT AND THAT IS WHAT HE WAS REALLY
ALLUDING TO. NO.

HIS CLIENT IS IN A DIFFERENT POSITION THAN ANYONE ELSE IN THIS COURTROOM BECAUSE HIS CLIENT TRIED TO CON ME.

NO ONE ELSE HAS DONE THAT IN THIS COURTROOM THAT I KNOW OF.

HIS CLIENT TRIED TO SELL YOU A PACKAGE OF WHO AND WHAT JOHNNY

RAY LUCKETT REALLY WAS.

LET'S STOP AND THINK ABOUT INITIAL PERCEPTIONS.

HOW IS HE DRESSED TODAY? SAME AS HE ALWAYS HAS BEEN. HE

LOOKS GREAT, GOT A VEST ON, TIE. IT IS NICE AND NEAT. HIS

DEMEANOR IS GOOD AND QUIET AND DECENT. HE IS NOT AN

OBSTRUCTIONIST IN THIS TRIAL.

HE DOESN'T CHANGE HIS EXPRESSION WHICH IS
INTERESTING IN A DIFFERENT WAY. AND HE TOOK THE STAND AND HE
WAS WILLING TO BARE HIS SOUL TO YOU AND TO CROSS-EXAMINATION
AND HE TOLD ALL OF US WHAT A GOOD AND DECENT PERSON HE WAS.

AND WE BECAME IMPRESSED WITH HIM BECAUSE THIS
YOUNG MAN, WHO ONLY WENT THROUGH TENTH GRADE, IS SO ARTICULATE
UP THERE. AND SO INTELLIGENT AND SO CALM AND SO SEEMINGLY
GOOD. AND HE HAS A MOM AND A SISTER AND IS FAMILY ORIENTED
AND HE IS GOOD IN GRAPHIC ARTS.

AND IF THEY THOUGHT ABOUT IT, HE PROBABLY GOES TO CHURCH. YOU KNOW, WE ARE ALL GENERALLY CAUGHT WITH THE SAME ATTITUDE. WE RELY ON FIRST IMPRESSIONS AND I ASK YOU NOT TO IN THIS CASE. I ASK YOU AS PART OF YOUR JOB AS A JUROR TO INVESTIGATE, INVESTIGATE MY IDEAS.

AS I SAY THEM TO YOU, QUESTION THEM, MAKE SURE THEY'RE RIGHT. AND BY THE SAME TOKEN, AS JOHNNY RAY LUCKETT SITS UP THERE IN THAT STAND, YOU QUESTION HIM BECAUSE THERE IS AN INSTRUCTION THAT TELLS YOU ABOUT BIAS OF WITNESSES AND REASONS THAT PEOPLE HAVE FOR TELLING UNTRUTHS.

, 6

 AND DON'T BELIEVE FOR A MOMENT THAT BECAUSE HE SWORE AN OATH TO TELL THE TRUTH THAT HE DID. I SUGGEST TO YOU THAT JOHNNY RAY LUCKETT IS A LIAR, THAT HE PERJURED HIMSELF IN THIS COURTROOM. AND HE LIED TO EACH AND EVERY ONE OF YOU AND I WANT TO INVESTIGATE THAT NOW.

SO LET'S SEE, FIRST OF ALL, WHO JOHNNY RAY
LUCKETT REALLY IS. WELL, HE TOLD US HE WAS INCORRIGIBLE AT
ONE TIME. HE TOLD US THAT HE USES DRUGS. NOT JUST MARIJUANA
BUT ACID, LSD. WE KNOW THAT HE IS INVOLVED IN DEVIL WORSHIP.

WE KNOW THAT HE'S KNOWN AS THE RIPPER, THAT HE IS A LONE RIPPER. AND I SUGGEST TO YOU WHEN YOU HEAR THE ENTIRETY OF THE POEM THAT HE WROTE, YOU ARE GOING TO KNOW THAT HE HAS AN EVIL, AN EVIL, DARK MIND. THAT DIDN'T COME OUT IN THESE COURTROOM PROCEEDINGS.

BACK TO PERCEPTIONS. LET'S THINK A MINUTE ABOUT JOHNNY RAY LUCKETT. AND LET'S GO OVER ON HIS SIDE FOR A MOMENT AND BELIEVE WHAT HE TOLD US. IF WE BELIEVE WHAT HE TOLD US, HE IS A TOTALLY INNOCENT YOUNG MAN, CAUGHT UP IN A GROUP OF PEOPLE WHO ARE OUT TO DO HORRENDOUS ACTS, ACTS THAT MOST OF US DON'T EVEN CONSIDER IN OUR DAY-TO-DAY LIVES.

AND HE WAS SWEPT ALONG IN THIS, WHATEVER IT WAS.

I THINK MR. SMITH WILL CHARACTERIZE IT AS COERCION OR DURESS,
THREATS. HE WAS FORCED.

HE WAS CERTAINLY, ACCORDING TO HIMSELF AND HIS ATTORNEY, AN UNWILLING PARTICIPANT. AND HERE HE WAS STANDING

 OUT IN THE DESERT AND ALL OF THESE THINGS WERE HAPPENING.

THERE WERE CRIMES, BURGLARIES AND ROBBERIES GOING ON. HE WAS

REALIZING THAT THERE HAD BEEN CONSPIRACIES BEFORE. AND THERE

WERE MURDERS.

AND THIS POOR YOUNG MAN IS ALL OF A SUDDEN IN THIS COURTROOM. HE FINDS HIMSELF ASSOCIATED WITH THESE OTHER PEOPLE WHO HE READILY TOLD YOU HOW BAD THEY WERE.

AND HOW DID HE ACT ON THE STAND? DID HE ACT LIKE SOMEBODY LIKE THAT? NO. NO. THIS YOUNG MAN WAS COOL, HE WAS CALM, COLLECTED. HE IMPRESSED ME WITH HIS INTELLECT.

HE PARRIED THE QUESTIONS OF ATTORNEYS, ATTORNEYS ON CROSS-EXAMINATION. AND MR. HARMON AND I WEREN'T THE ONLY ATTORNEYS INTERESTED IN CROSS-EXAMINING MR. LUCKETT. OTHERS WERE, TOO, BECAUSE HE SAID SOME PRETTY NASTY THINGS ABOUT THEM.

HE PARRIED WITH THEM. HE FOUGHT OFF THEIR
QUESTIONS. HE ANSWERED THEM EASILY. YOU HAD A HARD TIME
ANSWERING THE QUESTIONS WHEN YOU WERE SITTING UP HERE IN THE
JURY BOX AND NOBODY WAS ACCUSING YOU OF ANYTHING AND HE HAS A
DEATH PENALTY POTENTIALLY HANGING OVER HIS HEAD AND HE ACTED
LIKE HE DID, THIS INNOCENT LITTLE LAMB.

LET'S ALLUDE TO THAT POEM, JUST A PORTION OF IT

FOR THE PURPOSES OF A POINT I AM MAKING NOW. HE SAID THIS IN

STATE'S EXHIBIT -- I AM SORRY, DEFENDANT'S EXHIBIT B. "EVEN

THOUGH I HURT, I DON'T SHOW MUCH ATTITUDE BECAUSE I GREW UP

HARD, ABUSED AND CRUDE. "

NOW, JOHNNY RAY LUCKETT DISAVOWED ALL WORDS ON THIS DOCUMENT. BUT HE USED TWO "I'S" -- I AM SORRY, THREE "I'S," REFERRED TO HIMSELF THREE TIMES IN THIS THING.

AND I SUGGEST TO YOU THE WORDS ON THIS PIECE
OF PAPER THAT I JUST READ TO YOU ARE MORE INDICATIVE OF
JOHNNY RAY LUCKETT THAN REALLY MEETS THE EYE WHEN YOU STOP TO
THINK ABOUT IT.

THESE THINGS ARE INSIGHTFUL THINGS THAT TELL US WHO WAS OPERATING UP ON THAT STAND AND WHY.

HE IS COLD AND HE DOESN'T SHOW MUCH ATTITUDE.

AND I DON'T THINK HE SHOWED MUCH ATTITUDE THAT NIGHT ON NOVEMBER THE 5TH. SO NOW WE ARE STARTING TO GET A LITTLE DIPPERENT LOOK AT JOHNNY RAY LUCKETT.

NOW, IN THE INTERESTS OF BEING OBJECTIVE, I WANT TO SUGGEST TO YOU THAT THERE WERE TWO STORIES TOLD ABOUT JOHNNY RAY LUCKETT, ONE ON HIS BEHALF, ONE AGAINST HIM AND THEY WERE TOLD BY DIFFERENT PEOPLE.

AND I WANT TO PRESENT THIS AS OBJECTIVELY AS I CAN RIGHT NOW ON LUCKETT'S BEHALF. JOHN LUCAS SAID HE GAVE A STATEMENT ON DECEMBER THE 10TH 1984, JOHN LUCAS DID, IN THE POLICE DEPARTMENT.

IN THAT STATEMENT, HE SAID THAT MICHAEL WALSH SHOT AT THE GRANDFATHER AND IT WASN'T JOHNNY RAY LUCKETT. THAT'S TO JOHNNY RAY LUCKETT'S BENEFIT. TOM AKERS SAID IT

1 WAS WALSH WHO TOOK THE GUN FROM JOHNNY RAY LUCKETT AND HE
2 FIRED THE SHOT.

AND JOHNNY RAY LUCKETT HIMSELF SAID, AND I AM GOING TO TICK OFF A FEW THINGS HERE THAT GET THE FLAVOR OF HIS TESTIMONY. HE KNEW OF NO CONSPIRACY, HE DIDN'T HAVE A GUN UNTIL HE GOT TO THE GORDONS' HOUSE.

RANDY MOORE HAD THREATENED HIM POINTING THAT GUN RIGHT AT HIS CHEST AND MADE HIM GO ALONG AND MADE HIM HAVE THE SAWED-OFF. OUT AT THE SCENE, RANDY MOORE HAD CHOSEN JOHNNY RAY LUCKETT TO BE HIS BACKUP. THAT JOHNNY RAY LUCKETT PLEADED AND BEGGED, WERE HIS WORDS, TO STOP, TO GO HOME, TO STOP THIS THING.

AND THAT MICHAEL WALSH GRABBED THE GUN OUT OF HIS HAND. RANDY MOORE SAID, "I KNEW WE SHOULD HAVE LEFT YOU HOME. STAY RIGHT HERE." AND THEY WENT OFF AND THEY DID THE SHOOTING.

AND JOHNNY RAY LUCKETT, INNOCENT JOHNNY RAY LUCKETT DID NOTHING. HE WAS TOTALLY INNOCENT LIKE A LITTLE LAMB.

WELL, THERE ARE SOME PEOPLE WHO DON'T AGREE WITH THAT. AMONG THEM THE VERY PEOPLE WHO CREATE THIS STORY ON BEHALF OF HIM. LET'S LOOK AT THAT. LET'S GO BACK TO LUCAS.

JOHNNY RAY LUCKETT WAS AT THE APARTMENT DURING THE CONSPIRACY TALK. THIS IS ON NOVEMBER THE 5TH. HE WAS THERE, HE HEARD IT GOING ON. JOHN LUCAS DIDN'T REMEMBER

ANYTHING ABOUT ANY TEREATS GOING ON OR JOHNNY RAY LUCKETT SAYING, "WAIT A MINUTE. I DON'T LIKE THE SOUND OF THIS. I DON'T WANT TO DO IT. I AM GOING HOME."

 HE DIDN'T SEE -- JOHN LUCAS DID NOT SEE RANDY
MOORE AND JOHNNY RAY LUCKETT GO INTO THE BEDROOM. I AM NOT
SAYING IT DIDN'T HAPPEN. I DON'T KNOW IF IT HAPPENED OR NOT.

BUT I DON'T THINK WHAT WAS DISCUSSED IN THERE IS WHAT YOU HEARD IN THIS COURTROOM BUT THAT IS BESIDE THE POINT. JOHN LUCAS, WHO WAS A PARTICIPANT IN THESE AFFAIRS, DID NOT SEE THESE TWO GO INTO THE BEDROOM ON THAT PARTICULAR EVENING.

HE SAID THAT THEY ALL LEFT THE APARTMENT TOGETHER WILLINGLY, NO ONE WAS COMPLAINING ABOUT IT, THEY ALL CAME BACK TOGETHER AT THE SAME TIME, WILLINGLY, NOBODY WAS COMPLAINING.

AND THAT JOHNNY RAY LUCKETT -- NOW, THIS IS WHAT YOU HEARD AT THE TRIAL UP ON THE STAND. IT IS WHAT YOU ALSO LEARNED JOHN LUCAS TESTIFIED TO AT THE EVIDENTIARY HEARING ABOUT A MONTH AGO.

JOHN LUCAS TESTIFIED AT BOTH OF THOSE OCCASIONS
UNDER OATH THAT JOHN RAY, JOHN RAY LUCKETT SAID IN THE
APARTMENT THAT HE, JOHN RAY LUCKETT, TOOK A SHOT AT THE
GRANDFATHER AND MISSED. THERE WAS NO MENTION BY JOHN LUCAS
OF THE FACT THAT MICHAEL WALSH HAD TAKEN THE GUN FROM JOHNNY
RAY AND DONE IT HIMSELP.

THAT IS GOING TO COME UP A LITTLE MORE OFTEN THAN YOU THINK. THAT'S A STORY WITHIN A STORY. THIS WHOLE SCENARIO, OF COURSE, IS WORTHY OF PEOPLE TALKING ABOUT IT LATER ON IF THEY ARE A PARTY TO IT.

BUT THE FACT THAT SOMEBODY BACKED OUT AND WAS A CHICKEN, AND THAT IS A BIG THING TO PEOPLE AT THIS AGE, SOMEBODY WAS A CHICKEN AND A YOUNGER KID 16 YEARS OLD HAD TO GRAB THE GUN AWAY FROM HIM AND DO HIS SHOOTING FOR HIM, THAT IS BIG TIME TALKING STUFF AND EVERYBODY IS GOING TO BE TALKING ABOUT.

JOHN LUCAS DIDN'T REMEMBER ANY CONVERSATION LIKE THAT. HE DIDN'T TESTIFY TO THAT.

THE COURT: MR. SEATON, I SHOULD INFORM YOU WE WILL HAVE A RECESS IN LESS THAN TEN MINUTES.

MR. SEATON: I AM SORRY, YOUR HONOR?

THE COURT: WE WILL BE TAKING A RECESS IN LESS THAN TEN MINUTES.

MR. SEATON: I WILL FIND A PLACE TO STOP AND LET THE COURT KNOW BEFORE THAT TIME.

THE COURT: VERY GOOD.

MR. SEATON: TOM AKERS WAS ALSO THERE. HE KNEW
THAT THE PLAN WAS FOR JOHN RAY LUCKETT TO HAVE THE SAWED-OFF
.22. WHEN THEY CAME OUT OF THE BEDROOM AND TOM AKERS DID SEE
THEM GO INTO THE BEDROOM, YES, HE SAID THAT JOHNNY RAY
LUCKETT LOOKED SCARED AND NERVOUS BUT HE DIDN'T KNOW WHAT WAS

1 | SAID IN THERE.

2.

AND HE DIDN'T TELL US ANYTHING ABOUT RANDY MOORE SAYING ANYTHING MORE THE REST OF THE NIGHT TO JOHN LUCKETT. HE DIDN'T REMEMBER HEARING ANY THREATS AT THAT TIME.

WHEN THEY ALL GOT TO THE HOUSE AND AS HE LEFT FOR THE TRAILER AND THEY LEFT FOR THE HOUSE, JOHN LUCKETT HAD THE GUN. THERE WERE NO THREATS THAT HE HEARD AT THAT TIME. AND AFTER THE SHOTS HAD TAKEN PLACE, JOHN RAY LUCKETT STILL HAD THE SAWED-OFF .22. NOW, JOHN RAY LUCKETT WOULD HAVE US BELIEVE MIKE WALSH THREW IT TO HIM AND HE GOT IT AGAIN.

IN AKERS' STATEMENT, DECEMBER 7TH, 1984, MADE TO THE POLICE DEPARTMENT, TOM AKERS SAID THAT RANDY SAID, "JOHN RAY LUCKETT SHOT AT THE SAME TIME I DID."

AND IN THAT SAME STATEMENT, TOM AKERS SAID THAT
JOHN RAY HAD TOLD HIM, "I SHOT AT THE GRANDFATHER. I MISSED.
I TRIED TO RELOAD BUT BY THE TIME I DID, EVERYTHING WAS ALL
OVER."

ANGELA SALDANA SAID THAT DALE TOLD HER THAT
JOHNNY RAY WAS AT THE PLANNING MEETINGS, HE HAD THE SAWED-OFF
SHOTGUN. HE, JOHNNY RAY LUCKETT, I AM SORRY, SHOT AT THE
GRANDFATHER AND THAT NOTHING HAD BEEN SAID ABOUT THREATS TO
JOHNNY RAY, JOHNNY RAY QUITTING, MIKE TAKING THE GUN. THIS BIG
EXPLOSIVE SITUATION, NOTHING WAS SAID.

EVEN SCOTTY SLOANE CAME IN HERE AND TESTIFIED
THAT JOHNNY RAY LUCKETT HAD TOLD HIM IN THE DETENTION CENTER

1	THAT HE HAD SHOT AT THE WARMDIATION.
2	YOUR HONOR, THIS WOULD PROBABLY BE AS GOOD A TIME
3	AS ANY TO CALL A HALT TO THE PROCEEDINGS.
4.	THE COURT: VERY GOOD THEN.
5	(THE ADMONITION WAS READ.)
6	THE COURT: WE WILL RECESS FOR LUNCH AND
7	RECONVENE PROMPTLY AT QUARTER AFTER ONE. COURT IS IN RECESS.
8	(RECESS TAKEN.)
9	THE COURT: THE CONTINUATION OF CASE C69269,
10	STATE OF NEVADA VERSUS DALE FLANAGAN, RANDOLPH MOORE, JOHN
11	LUCKETT AND ROY MCDOWELL.
12	THE RECORD WILL REFLECT THE PRESENCE OF THE
13	DEPENDANTS AND THEIR RESPECTIVE COUNSEL, MR. HARMON AND MR.
14	SEATON REPRESENTING THE STATE.
15	WILL COUNSEL STIPULATE THAT ALL MEMBERS OF THE
16	JURY ARE PRESENT AND PROPERLY SEATED?
17	MR. SEATON: YES.
18	MR. SMITH: YES, YOUR HONOR.
19	MR. PIKE: SO STIPULATED.
20	MR. POSIN: SO STIPULATED.
21	MR. HANDFUSS: YES, YOUR HONOR.
22	THE COURT: MR. SEATON, YOU MAY RESUME YOUR
23	CLOSING REMARKS.
24	MR. SEATON: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR. WELL, WHERE
25	WE LEFT OFF JUST BEFORE THE LUNCH BREAK WAS WITH A LITTLE

COMPARING AND CONTRASTING OF THE STORIES ON BEHALF OF AND AGAINST JOHNNY RAY LUCKETT.

AND WITH TWO OF THOSE WITNESSES, AS I POINTED OUT EARLIER, THE STATEMENTS AND THE STORIES HAD CHANGED, THAT BEING THE STATEMENTS AND TESTIMONY OF JOHN LUCAS AND TOM AKERS.

NOW, THE PROBLEM THAT YOU AS A JURY HAVE GOT, I GUESS, IS DETERMINING WHO OF THOSE PEOPLE, WHICH OF THOSE STORIES TO BELIEVE. LET'S INVESTIGATE, IF WE CAN FOR A FEW MINUTES, EACH OF THEIR STORIES AND THE REASONS THAT WERE DRAWN OUT FROM THEM AS TO WHY THEY SAID ONE THING AND THEN LATER ANOTHER.

WE WILL TAKE JOHNNY LUCAS FIRST. IF YOU REMEMBER, HIS STORY WAS THAT -- THE FACTS WERE THAT IN HIS STATEMENT GIVEN ON DECEMBER THE 10TH, HE SAID THAT WALSH HAD DONE THE SHOOTING AND NOT LUCKETT. AND IN THE TRIAL AND AT THE EVIDENTIARY HEARING, HE SAID IT WAS JOHNNY RAY LUCKETT WHO HAD DONE THE SHOOTING.

ALL RIGHT. NOW, HE WAS ASKED, "WHY DID YOU MAKE THAT CHANGE? WHY IN YOUR STATEMENT DID YOU SAY IT WAS WALSH WHO DID THE SHOOTING IF HERE UNDER OATH AND AT THE EVIDENTIARY HEARING UNDER OATH YOU SAID THAT OR SAY THAT IT IS JOHN RAY LUCKETT?"

HE SAID, AS I RECALL IT, HE WAS TRYING TO COVER AT THE TIME OF THE STATEMENTS. NOW, LET'S THINK ABOUT WHERE

JOHN LUCAS WAS AND UNDER WHAT CIRCUMSTANCES HE WAS OPERATING WHEN HE ORIGINALLY MADE THAT STATEMENT TO THE POLICE DEPARTMENT.

្ត16

HE HAD BEEN AT THE APARTMENT AND HEARD ALL OF
THESE THINGS THAT WERE ABOUT TO BE DONE. HE WAS TOLD TO STAY
THERE BY RANDY MOORE AND RECEIVE TELEPHONE CALLS AND TO TELL
THE PEOPLE WHO CALLED, IF ANYONE DID, THAT EVERYBODY HAD GONE
OFF TO TOM'S OR TO DALE'S TRAILER TO GET TAPES AND THAT THEY
WERE GOING TO GET SOME BEER AND COME BACK TO THE APARTMENT.

A FAIRLY INNOCUOUS STORY AND ONE WHICH, OF COURSE, WOULD FIT WITH THE ALIBI THAT DALE FLANAGAN WAS GOING TO LATER TRY TO GET UP FOR HIMSELF.

JOHN LUCAS AT THAT TIME, AT THE TIME OF MAKING THE STATEMENT, WOULD UNDOUBTEDLY HAVE THOUGHT THAT HE WAS UNDER AS MUCH CRIMINAL LIABILITY AS WERE ANY OF THESE DEFENDANTS BECAUSE HE WAS PRESENT DURING THE CONSPIRATORIAL PART OF IT AND HE AIDED AND ABETTED.

HE SUPPORTED AND ASSISTED IN THAT HE DID THE BIDDING OF RANDY MOORE IN STAYING THERE AT THE APARTMENT. IF HE FELT THAT WAY, IT'S REASONABLE TO ASSUME THAT IT WAS TO HIS BEST INTEREST TO MAKE SURE THAT ALL WERE PROTECTED, THAT NONE CAME UNDER THE CONTROL OF THE POLICE DEPARTMENT.

AND AT THAT TIME, NONE HAD BEEN. AND IF YOU REMEMBER HIS TESTIMONY, IN FACT, THE TESTIMONY OF OTHER PEOPLE, AT THAT TIME, MICHAEL WALSH WAS GONE. HE WAS ON THE

.7

TRIP WITH RANDY MOORE AND HIS GIRLFRIEND AND LEAH MOORE.

THAT WAS JUST BEFORE THEY GOT -- BEFORE RANDY

MOORE GOT CAUGHT DOWN IN MEXICO AND MICHAEL WALSH EVENTUALLY

GOT CAUGHT BACK IN ARIZONA OUTSIDE OF WILLOW BEACH.

SO WHEN HE MADE HIS STATEMENT, MICHAEL WALSH WAS GONE, HE WAS ON THE RUN. THE COPS COULDN'T GET AHOLD OF HIM, IN THE MIND OF JOHN LUCAS AS HE TOLD US.

JOHNNY RAY LUCKETT NOW WAS A DIFFERENT STORY.

JOHNNY RAY LUCKETT WAS HERE. HE WAS IN LAS VEGAS. AT THAT

TIME, THE 10TH OF DECEMBER, I AM NOT SURE WHERE HE WAS LIVING,

AT RANDY'S, AT LEAH'S, AT HIS MOTHER'S. I AM NOT SURE. HE

WAS IN TOWN AND HE WAS SUSCEPTIBLE TO BEING ARRESTED AND

QUESTIONED MORE IMPORTANTLY BY THE POLICE.

SO IT WAS TO JOHN LUCAS'S BEST INTERESTS, I
SUGGEST, THAT HE TELL THE POLICE THAT IT WAS MICHAEL WALSH
WHO DID THE SHOOTING AND JOHNNY RAY LUCKETT DID NOT SO THEY
WOULD HAVE A LESSER INTEREST IN JOHNNY RAY LUCKETT.

ONCE THE TRIAL COMES AROUND, ONCE THE EVIDENTIARY
HEARING COMES AROUND, EVERYBODY IS CAUGHT, EVERYBODY IS IN
CUSTODY. NOW THERE IS NO MORE REASON TO LIE.

JOHN LUCAS HAS NO LIABILITY THAT HE KNOWS OF, AT LEAST AT THAT TIME. HE COULD HAVE LIABILITY FOR PERJURY BUT NOT FOR HAVING MADE THAT FALSE STATEMENT. THAT IS BEHIND HIM.

AND SO HERE ON THE STAND, HE TELLS US THAT HIS

1

2

5 6

7 8

9 10

11 12

13 14

15 16

17

18 19

20 21

22 23

24

25

REASON FOR LYING WAS TO PROTECT BOTH MICHAEL WALSH AND JOHNNY RAY LUCKETT BY SAYING MICHAEL WALSH DID THE SHOOTING BECAUSE HE IS OUT OF STATE AND JOHNNY RAY LUCKETT IS HERE.

NOW COMES THE TRIAL, HE WILL TELL THE TRUTH AND THE TRUTH IS HE SAID JOHNNY RAY LUCKETT ACTUALLY DID THE SHOOTING.

TOM AKERS' STORIES CHANGED. HE WAS JUST THE REVERSE. IN HIS STATEMENT, HE SAID THAT JOHNNY RAY LUCKETT DID THE SHOOTING AND AT THE TRIAL HERE BEFORE YOU, HE SAID THAT IT WAS MICHAEL WALSH WHO HAD DONE THE SHOOTING.

HIS REASONS, I SUGGEST TO YOU, ARE NOT QUITE AS GOOD, NOT QUITE AS PALATABLE AS THE REASONS OF JOHN LUCAS. TOM AKERS SUGGESTED THAT THE REASON -- AND HE DIDN'T LIE, HE SAYS.

HE SAID, "I MADE A MISTAKE AT MY STATEMENT WITH THE POLICE OFFICERS. I HADN'T KNOWN JOHN RAY LUCKETT, MICHAEL WALSE OR ROY MCDOWELL FOR VERY LONG.

"I HAD KNOWN RANDY AND DALE PRETTY WELL. I KNEW WHO THEY WERE BUT I WAS CONFUSED. " HE SAID, "THE POLICE WERE SHOWING ME PHOTOGRAPHS AND THROWING NAMES AT ME AND I WAS CONFUSED. "

WELL, I DON'T KNOW IF THAT WASHES IN YOUR MINDS I HAVE A LITTLE TROUBLE WITH IT. HE HAD KNOWN THEM FOR SOME TIME. HE HAD BEEN TO PARTIES WITH THEM, BEEN TO CIRCUS CIRCUS WITH THEM. HE HAD SPOKEN WITH ALL OF THESE

PEOPLE.

4 -

CERTAINLY, HE KNEW THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN A BLACK PERSON AND A WHITE PERSON. HE KNEW WHO MICHAEL WALSH, ROY MCDOWELL AND JOHN RAY LUCKETT WERE.

I WOULD SUGGEST THAT THERE REALLY WASN'T MUCH OF A REASON FOR HIM TO BE MISTAKEN.

TOM AKERS' STATEMENT WAS ALLUDED TO A GREAT DEAL WHEN HE WAS ON THE STAND. AND HE WAS ASKED IN THAT STATEMENT IF HE KNEW WHO JOHNNY RAY LUCKETT WAS.

AND HE SAID, YES. I DON'T KNOW HIS LAST NAME.

IS HE A BLACK MALE? YES. HE IS A MINOR AGE 17. WHERE DOES
HE LIVE AT? AT 13TH STREET WITH RANDY. AND HE WAS ASKED ALL
THE OTHER NAMES OF THE PEOPLE AND HE WAS ABLE TO TELL THEM ON
PAGES TWO AND THREE.

ON PAGE SIX, HE WAS DIRECTLY CROSS-EXAMINED ABOUT THIS. HE WAS ASKED THE QUESTION, AND, REMEMBER, WE ARE TRYING TO RESOLVE HERE WHICH IS THE TRUTH, DID MICHAEL WALSH DO THE SHOOTING OR DID JOHN RAY LUCKETT DO THE SHOOTING?

HE WAS ASKED THE QUESTION, "DID RANDY SMITH AT ANY TIME SAY TO YOU WHO HE SHOT?" "NO." THIS IS HIS ANSWER, "HE SAID HE SAW SOMEONE COMING DOWN THE STEPS OR HE WAS STANDING THERE AND JOHNNY RAY SHOT AT THE SAME TIME THAT RANDY SHOT.?

QUESTION, "DID JOHNNY RAY EVER MAKE A STATEMENT TO YOU THAT HE DID SOME SHOOTING?"

"NO, NOT DIRECTLY TO ME." TOM AKERS ANSWERED.

TOM AKERS SAID, "I HEARD HIM TALKING TO RANDY. I HEARD JOHN
RAY TALKING TO RANDY WHEN WE GOT BACK TO THE HOUSE. HE SHOT
THE SAWED-OFF. HE DID NOT THINK HE HIT HIM. HE RELOADED AND
BY THAT TIME EVERYTHING ELSE WAS OVER."

HE MADE THAT STATEMENT TO RANDY. HE MADE THE STATEMENT TO THE PEOPLE WHO WERE THERE.

NOW, THOSE STATEMENTS DON'T SOUND TO ME LIKE THE STATEMENTS MADE BY A PERSON WHO WAS CONFUSED AS TO WHO WAS MAKING THOSE STATEMENTS OR WHO WAS MIXED UP ABOUT WHO WAS MAKING THOSE STATEMENTS.

I THINK, AND AGAIN I DON'T WANT TO GET INTO THE ARENA OF BEING JUDGMENTAL, BUT THERE MAY BE SOME VALIDITY THAT CAN BE ATTACHED TO THE TESTIMONY THAT CAME BEFORE YOU THAT TOM AKERS MAY HAVE BEEN AT LEAST SHADING SOME PORTIONS OF THE TRUTH TO SOME EXTENT TO PROTECT JOHNNY RAY LUCKETT.

TO WHAT END, FOR WHAT REASON, I DON'T KNOW. BUT I THINK IT'S SOMETHING THAT IS CERTAINLY WORTHY OF ALL OF YOUR CONSIDERATION.

WITH THAT AS THE EVIDENCE HAS BEEN PORTRAYED SO FAR, THERE IS A FEELING THAT JOHN RAY IS THE INDIVIDUAL WHO DID THE SHOOTING IN SPITE OF HIS PROTESTATIONS AND THAT IS BUTTRESSED EVEN MORE WHEN YOU CONSIDER THE FACT THAT DALE FLANAGAN SAID IT WAS SO. HE TOLD ANGIE.

WHEN DALE FLANAGAN TALKED TO ANGELA SALDANA IN

THE TRAILER, REMEMBER, HE TOLD HER THAT JOHN RAY WAS THE INDIVIDUAL WHO DID THE SHOOTING. AND HE DIDN'T MENTION ANYTHING ABOUT THREATS.

AND, MORE IMPORTANTLY, AND SOMETIMES MORE CAN BE LEARNED IN TRIALS FROM WHAT'S NOT SAID THAN WHAT IS SAID.

AND, MORE IMPORTANTLY, DALE FLANAGAN, AS HE RELATED VIRTUALLY EVERYTHING THAT HAPPENED THAT NIGHT TO ANGELA SALDANA, SOMEHOW LEFT OUT THIS STORY WITHIN A STORY, THAT JOHN RAY LUCKETT HAD TURNED CHICKEN AND THAT THE YOUNG KID, MIKE WALSH, HAD TO GRAB THE RIFLE FROM HIM AND GO UP TO THE WINDOW AND DO THE SHOOTING FOR HIM.

NOW, IT JUST DOESN'T MAKE SENSE THAT THAT

STORY WITHIN A STORY IS GOING TO BE LEFT OUT. LET'S SEE

IF WE CAN CARRY THIS A STEP FURTHER IN DETERMINING WHETHER

OR NOT JOHN RAY LUCKETT WAS TRYING TO CON EVERYONE IN

THIS COURTROOM WHEN HE TOOK THE STAND, WHETHER OR NOT HE WAS

COMMITTING PERJURY, AS I SUGGEST TO YOU THAT HE WAS.

LET'S LOOK AT SOME BASIC PREMISES THAT HE TRIED

TO GET ALL OF US TO BELIEVE AND SEE WHETHER OR NOT USING OUR

GOOD COMMON SENSE LEARNED FROM EVERYDAY EXPERIENCES WHETHER OR

NOT THESE STATEMENTS REALLY HAVE A RING OF TRUTH TO THEM OR

NOT.

FOR EXAMPLE, HE WANTS US ALL TO BELIEVE THAT HE HAD NEVER BEEN IN ON THE CONSPIRACY. HE HADN'T ANY KIND OF AN AWARENESS THAT ALL OF THESE HORRENDOUS THINGS WERE GOING

TO GO ON.

HE LIVED IN AN APARTMENT WITH RANDY MOORE AND MICHAEL WALSH FOR ABOUT TWO MONTHS. THE THREE OF THEM TOGETHER. EVEN NOT LIVING THERE, HE WAS THERE ALL THE TIME AS WERE SO MANY OTHER PEOPLE WHEN THEY WERE PARTYING AND DOING WHATEVER THEY DID OVER AT THAT PLACE.

JOHN LUCAS AND TOM AKERS HAVE TOLD US THAT HE WAS AT SOME OF THE PLANNING MEETINGS. EVERYONE ELSE KNEW ABOUT THE PLAN, EVERYONE ELSE KNEW ABOUT THE ALIBI. WHY IS IT, HAVE YOU ASKED YOURSELVES, WOULD THESE PEOPLE HAVE WITHHELD THIS INFORMATION FROM ONE INDIVIDUAL?

WHY CHOOSE JOHN RAY LUCKETT TO BE SECRETIVE IN FRONT OF? THERE IS NO REASON. HE IS A PART OF THE CROWD. THEY TOLD ANYBODY WHO WOULD LISTEN THAT THIS THING WAS GOING TO GO ON.

RUSTY HAVENS WAS ASKED TO KILL THE GRANDMOTHER AND WASN'T EVEN INVITED OVER NOVEMBER THE 5TH. THERE WAS NOTHING SECRET ABOUT WHAT WAS GOING ON HERE WITHIN THE CIRCLE OF FRIENDS AND JOHN RAY LUCKETT WAS CERTAINLY WITHIN THAT CIRCLE OF FRIENDS WITHOUT ANY DOUBT.

ALONG THOSE LINES, WHAT WAS HE ASKED TO DO
ACCORDING TO HIS OWN STATEMENTS AND EVERYBODY AGREED WITH
HIM, OF COURSE. HE WAS ASKED TO TAKE THE SAWED-OFF .22 RIFLE
AND BE A BACKUP. HE WAS ALLOWED TO HANDLE A WEAPON WITH A
BULLET IN IT.

-

 THAT, I SUGGEST TO YOU, IS THE THIRD GREATEST RESPONSIBILITY THAT THIS GROUP OF PEOPLE HAD. THE FIRST TWO ARE SORT OF TIED WITH ONE ANOTHER. THEY HELD THE PISTOL AND THE LONG RIPLE AND WERE ASSUREDLY TO KILL TWO GRANDPARENTS.

THE NEXT RESPONSIBILITY WAS THE PERSON WHO ALSO HAD IN HIS HANDS A GUN AND HAD THE ABILITY TO FIRE IT AND TO TRY TO KILL SOMEBODY.

IS THIS GROUP REALLY GOING TO GIVE THE THIRD GREATEST RESPONSIBILITY, THAT OF SHOOTING A GUN, TO THE PERSON THAT THEY HAVE BEEN WITHHOLDING ALL THIS INFORMATION FROM? IS THAT RATIONAL, IS IT SOMETHING THAT WE CAN REALLY SAY IS LIKELY TO HAVE HAPPENED?

IT'S BULL IS WHAT IT IS. WHAT ELSE ABOUT WHAT HE SAYS IS IMPLAUSIBLE? THE FACT THAT RANDY THREATENED HIM IN THE BEDROOM. SORT OF THE SAME ARGUMENT APPLIES HERE.

RANDY WAS OPEN WITH EVERYBODY ELSE. EVERYBODY
ELSE KNEW WHAT WAS GOING ON THROUGHOUT THEIR RELATIONSHIP
WHICH WAS A GOOD RELATIONSHIP. HOW DID IT START OFF? RANDY
MOORE FIGHTING ON BEHALF OF JOHN RAY LUCKETT AND GETTING HIM
OUT OF A SCRAPE AT CIRCUS CIRCUS AND IT CARRIED ON THAT WAY.

THESE PEOPLE WERE ONE AND THE SAME. THEY WERE BUDDIES AND PARTNERS AS WELL AS CONSPIRATORS. AND THEY DID EVERYTHING TOGETHER. THEY SHARED DRUGS, THEY PARTIED, THEY SHARED BEER, THEY SHARED WITCHCRAFT.

THEIRS WAS NOT THE KIND OF RELATIONSHIP WHERE

ONE THREATENED THE OTHER. SURE, HE KNEW RANDY HAD A TEMPER, PROBABLY EVERYBODY KNEW THAT, BUT IT WAS NEVER EXHIBITED AGAINST JOHN RAY LUCKETT UNTIL THE NIGHT OF NOVEMBER 5TH WHEN RANDY MOORE PULLED JOHN RAY LUCKETT INTO THE BEDROOM AND OUT OF THE BLUE POINTED A WEAPON AT HIM AND TOLD HIM THERE WOULD BE HELL TO PAY IF HE DIDN'T COME ALONG AND HELF THAT NIGHT.

WELL, NOW, WHAT CAUSED THAT? THAT'S OUT OF CHARACTER. IT IS OUT OF SINK. WE HAVEN'T SEEN ANY HINT OF THAT SORT OF THING HAPPENING.

HE DIDN'T DO THAT WITH ROY MCDOWELL OR DALE
PLANAGAN OR TOM AKERS OR ANYBODY ELSE. HE WAS SO UNCONCERNED
ABOUT IT. HE DIDN'T CALL RUSTY HAVENS AND SAY, "RUSTY, GET
OVER HERE, WE NEED YOU TO GO BLUDGEON THE GRANDMOTHER AS WE
TALKED ABOUT DOING BEFORE."

IT WAS THAT MEANINGLESS. SO JOHN RAY LUCKETT EXPECTS US TO BELIEVE, EXPECTS YOU TO BELIEVE THAT ALL OF A SUDDEN OUT OF NOWHERE THESE TERRIBLE THREATS COME.

AND, YOU KNOW, SOMETHING INTERESTING ABOUT THAT AND SOMETIMES PEOPLE SAY THINGS AND THEY JUST DON'T REALIZE WHAT THEY HAVE SAID AND IT COMES BACK TO HAUNT THEM AND HERE IT COMES, JOHN RAY.

I REMEMBER DISTINCTLY, AND WROTE IT DOWN
VERBATIM, ONE OF THE REASONS RANDY MOORE GAVE TO JOHN
LUCKETT, ACCORDING TO JOHN LUCKETT, FOR BRINGING HIM IN AT

THE LAST MINUTE ON WHAT WAS GOING ON IS THAT NO ONE CAN BE LEFT AT THE APARTMENT.

WELL, COME ON, JOHN RAY, JOHN LUCAS GOT LEFT AT THE APARTMENT. NOW, HE'S HEARD ALL THE PLANS. ISN'T IT EASIER TO LEAVE JOHN LUCKETT THERE THAN IT IS TO LEAVE JOHN LUCAS?

NONE OF THAT MAKES SENSE. WHAT ELSE IS

IMPLAUSIBLE? JOHN RAY LUCKETT CLAIMS THAT HE DIDN'T KNOW THE

SERIOUSNESS OF WHAT'S GOING ON BASED ON THE INFORMATION THAT

HE HAD.

WELL, HE HAD A WEALTH OF INFORMATION. AND HE IS A LOT DENSER THAN HE ACTED UP HERE ON THE STAND IF WE ARE TO BELIEVE WHAT WE SAID.

HE HEARD DALE TELL PEOPLE THAT IT WAS GOING TO GO
DOWN THIS WEEKEND. HE HEARD DALE CALL ROY MCDOWELL AND ASK
HIM IF HE GOT THE TOY.

AND ANYBODY LIVING IN THAT APARTMENT KNEW WHAT
THE TOY WAS. HE HEARD DALE TALKING ABOUT, "I POUND A WAY IN.
I'LL MEET YOU ALL AT THE HOSPITAL. WE ARE GOING TO MOVE
FURNITURE AROUND."

THESE ARE JUST BITS AND PIECES OF THAT

CONVERSATION THAT YOU MIGHT REMEMBER. DALE ASKED RANDY, "CAN

WE TRUST HIM? CAN WE TRUST JOHN RAY?"

JOHN RAY'S GOT TO BE WONDERING TO HIMSELF, "WHY ARE THEY ASKING THAT? I AM A PART OF THIS GROUP. I HAVE

DONE EVERYTHING TO BECOME A PART OF THE ACES BUT GET INITIATED. THEY HAVE EVEN GIVEN ME A NICKNAME."

THAT HAD TO RAISE A SUSPICION TO SOME DEGREE.

WHEN HE CAME OUT OF THE BEDROOM, DALE IS TELLING EVERYONE,

INCLUDING JOHN RAY LUCKETT, "NOW REMEMBER YOUR STORY."

AND HE SAID, "I AM TO BE SHOT AFTER I CHECK OUT THE HOUSE." ISN'T JOHN RAY ABOUT THAT TIME SCRATCHING HIS HEAD AND SAYING, "WHAT ALIBI, WHAT AM I SUPPOSED TO REMEMBER, DALE? IT DOESN'T MAKE SENSE."

THESE PEOPLE HAVE BEEN TOO CAREFUL THROUGHOUT.

THEY ARE NOT GOING TO THROW A GUY LIKE JOHN RAY LUCKETT, WHO

NEVER KNEW ANYTHING ABOUT IT, IN IT FOR A MOMENT, AT THE LAST

MOMENT'S NOTICE AND EXPECT HIM TO BE ABLE TO GO ALONG WITH.

THIS CONSPIRACY AND THE COVERUP THAT THEY HAVE SO CAREFULLY

PLANNED.

IT'S A LUDICROUS STORY. WHAT ELSE DID HE KNOW IN JUDGING WHETHER OR NOT HE KNEW THE SERIOUSNESS OF THIS THING? HE SAW RANDY WITH THE RIFLES, ONE OF WHICH IS SO SERIOUS, THIS BUSINESS, IT WAS POINTED AT HIM.

HE SAW RANDY LOAD BOTH RIFLES, HE SAW ROY BRING
THE PISTOL AND GIVE IT TO DALE AND DALE LOAD THE PISTOL. HE
HEARD RANDY TELL JOHN LUCAS ABOUT, "IF ANYBODY CALLS, TELL
THEM WE HAVE GONE TO GET THE TAPES AND WE ARE GOING TO BUY SOME
BEER."

HE SAW THEM TAKE THE GUNS TO THE CAR. HE DROVE

WITH THEM FOR FIVE OR SIX MILES FOR AT LEAST A HALF HOUR PERIOD OF TIME, IF I REMEMBER THE TESTIMONY, DURING WHICH OSTENSIBLY NOTHING WAS SAID.

THEY'RE NOT REHEARSING THIS PLAN. RANDY AND -- I AM SORRY, DALE FLANAGAN AND TOM, AT LEAST, ARE NOT DISCUSSING EVERYONE'S ROLES AND HOW TO COVER UP THE CRIMES DURING THIS DRIVE.

THERE IS AN EERIE SILENCE, HE SAID. COME ON, JOHN RAY, YOU CAN DO BETTER THAN THAT. AND THEN THERE WAS THE TEST FIRING OF THE GUN AND WITH ALL OF THIS, HE SUGGESTS TO YOU THAT HE DIDN'T KNOW THE SERIOUSNESS OF WHAT WAS GOING ON UNTIL HE WAS TOLD THAT HE WAS TO BE A BACKUP.

AND HE WAS AFRAID TO TELL ANYBODY. NOW, REMEMBER HOW INNOCENT HE IS IF HIS STORY IS TRUE. THINK ABOUT THAT IN TERMS OF COMPARING, CONTRASTING HIS INNOCENCE WITH THEIR GUILT AND THE HORRENDOUS MORAL DILEMMA THAT WOULD PUT SUCH A PERSON IN.

I CAN CONCEIVE OF SITUATIONS WHERE A PERFECTLY
MORAL PERSON WOULD FEEL CONSTRAINED NOT TO GO TO THE
AUTHORITIES UNDER CERTAIN CIRCUMSTANCES AND TELL THE
AUTHORITIES WHAT HAS HAPPENED AND THAT THEY ARE INNOCENT AND
THAT PERSON IS INNOCENT AND THE REST OF THEM ARE GUILTY. I
CAN CONCEIVE OF THAT. I CAN'T CONCEIVE OF IT IN THIS CASE.

HE HAS LIVED AT 337 NORTH 13TH FOR ALL THESE COUPLE OF MONTHS. HE STAYS THERE FOR THREE MORE WEEKS. HE

SAYS HE IS WORRIED ABOUT HIS FAMILY, BUT REMEMBER THE STRONG RELATIONSHIP HE HAS WITH HIS MOTHER.

HE CAN GO TO HIS MOTHER AND SAY, "LOOK, WE HAVE GOT SOME REAL PROBLEMS HERE. WE HAVE TO GET ALL OF US IN A PROTECTED SITUATION BUT IT IS IMPERATIVE THAT I TELL SOMEBODY OF THIS HORRIBLE THING THAT'S GONE ON AND THAT I AN INNOCENT AND THAT THERE ARE OTHER PEOPLE WHO ARE GUILTY."

IT JUST DOESN'T MAKE SENSE FOR HIM TO DO ANYTHING ELSE. AND THEN IF IT'S RANDY MOORE THAT HE IS AFRAID OF, WHEN RANDY MOORE GOES TO PHILADELPHIA, WHY DOESN'T JOHN RAY LUCKETT TELL THE POLICE THEN?

AND, REMEMBER, WHEN JOHN RAY LUCKETT WAS

ARRESTED, DALE FLANAGAN HAD BEEN IN JAIL FOR ABOUT TWO WEEKS

AND RANDY MOORE WAS IN PHILADELPHIA OR IN SAN DIEGO OR IN

MEXICO.

SO HE HAD NOTHING TO FEAR FROM THE TWO MOST PEARSOME PEOPLE AS HE WOULD HAVE US BELIEVE. AND YET WITH ALL THIS MORAL DILEMMA ON HIS SHOULDERS, HE DIDN'T THINK IT WAS WISE IN BALANCE TO GO TO THE POLICE.

AND THAT JUST ISN'T REALISTIC. NOT FOR THE THOUGHT PROCESSES OF SOMEONE LIKE JOHN RAY LUCKETT WHO SAT UP IN THAT STAND AND EXPOSED HIMSELF TO US.

WHEN YOU COMBINE ALL OF THAT, THE IMPLAUSIBILITY
OF THE STORIES WITH THE CHARACTER, AS I HAVE SEEN THE
EVIDENCE TELL IT, OF JOHN RAY LUCKETT, AND ALL THE DEVIL

WORSHIP AND THE DRUGS AND THE GANG AND THE FIGHTING AND THE GUNS AND EVERYTHING ELSE, YOU START TO GET A REAL FEEL FOR WHO JOHN RAY LUCKETT IS AND WHETHER OR NOT HE WAS TELLING US THE TRUTH.

R

AND WITH THAT IN MIND, I NOW WANT TO READ TO YOU DEFENDANT'S EXHIBIT B. THIS, THIS IS JOHN RAY LUCKETT. THIS IS — AND HOW MANY OF YOU OF YOU HAVE DONE IT IN YOUR PASTS? THIS IS A MOMENT WHEN SOMEONE CAN SIT BY THEMSELVES UNINTERRUPTED AND WRITE THOUGHTS FROM THE GUT. THOUGHTS THAT A LOT OF US AREN'T ABLE TO EXPRESS.

THEY ARE THE REAL THING IN US. SOMETIMES IT COMES OUT IN POETRY, SOMETIMES IT COMES OUT IN FEARFUL WRITING. LISTEN TO WHO JOHN RAY LUCKETT REALLY IS.

"I TRY TO SEEK DARKNESS. I HAVE LOST ALL MY FEAR. I AM SOMETIMES CONFUSED. I CAN'T SHED A TEAR. SOME THINK I'M CRAZY, STRANGE OR DIFFERENT. WHAT MAKES ME THAT WAY? I THINK I AM EQUIVALENT.

"LIFE IS A TRIP. WHY IS IT SO DEMENTED AND SUCH?
WHAT I REALLY NEED IS TO BE WANTED AND LOVED. I AM USED TO
BEING LONESOME AND BEING ON MY OWN IN LOTS OF WAYS. HOW COME
MY LIFE'S NOTHING BUT INSANE, VULGAR AND DEADLY DAYS?

"I ALWAYS HAVE WICKED, WEIRD AND SENSELESS

DREAMS. THE PAIN IS SO BAD MY INSIDES SCREAM. EVEN THOUGH I

HURT, I DON'T SHOW MUCH ATTITUDE BECAUSE I GREW UP HARD,

ABUSED AND CRUDE.

 "IF I HAD A CHOICE, I'D SOAR LIKE A HAWK. I'D SEARCH FOR MY PREY ONLY AT DARK. VENGEANCE TO ME IS A VERY BIG WORD BUT WHEN I STRIKE IT'S A LIPETIME CURSE." YOU REALLY THINK THESE THINGS?

"IF PEOPLE COULD ONLY FEEL WHAT RUNS THROUGH MY HEAD, BUT IF THEY DID PROBABLY FEEL DEAD."

DO YOU THINK CARL AND COLLEEN GORDON HAD ANY INKLING OF WHAT RAN THROUGH THIS NICE LOOKING YOUNG MAN'S HEAD ON NOVEMBER THE 5TH, 1984? I DOUBT IT.

THIS, THIS RIGHT HERE IS JOHN RAY LUCKETT. NOT WHAT YOU HAVE SEEN THROUGHOUT THESE PROCEEDINGS. DON'T LET THESE ANTISEPTIC WALLS AND THIS NICE CALM DEMEANOR OF THIS COURTROOM FOOL YOU INTO THINKING HE IS SOMETHING ELSE. THAT PIECE OF PAPER IS JOHN RAY LUCKETT.

I SUBMIT TO YOU THAT THE EVIDENCE IN THIS CASE AS TO JOHN RAY LUCKETT SUPPORTS THE BELIEF THAT HE COMMITTED ALL OF THE CRIMES THAT HAVE BEEN CHARGED AGAINST HIM. HE WAS INVOLVED IN THE PLANNING MEETINGS AND HE CONSPIRED TO COMMIT MURDER.

HE WILLINGLY WENT TO THE GORDONS. HE WILLINGLY HANDLED THE SAWED-OFF SHOTGUN, HE WILLINGLY WENT TO THE WINDOW AND HE WAS RANDY MOORE'S BACKUP.

HE SHOT AT MR. GORDON. AND HE WENT BACK TO THE APARTMENT AND HE DRANK THREE BEERS. AND DO YOU KNOW WHERE THAT MONEY CAME FROM? THAT CAME OUT OF MRS. GORDON'S WALLET.

AND HE WENT TO THE LAKE AND HE HELPED DISPOSE SOME WEEKS LATER, THIS PERSON WHO IS SO WORRIED ABOUT HIS COMPLICITY, HE HELPED DISPOSE OF THE GUNS BY DRIVING OUT TO THE LAKE.

HE WANTS YOU TO BELIEVE THAT HE WAS COERCED. HIS DEFENSE ATTORNEY, MR. SMITH, IS GOING TO COME UP HERE AND HE IS GOING TO TALK TO YOU ABOUT THAT. HE IS GOING TO SAY THERE WAS THREATS, IT IS COERCION, IT IS DURESS.

MR. JOHNNY RAY LUCKETT WOULDN'T HAVE DONE THOSE THINGS THAT HE IS ACCUSED OF HAD IT NOT BEEN FOR RANDY MOORE AND HIS FORCEFULNESS.

WELL, LET'S LOOK AT INSTRUCTION 29 WHICH TALKS
ABOUT THAT SORT OF THING. AND LET ME GIVE YOU THE BOTTOM.

LINE FIRST AND THEN WE WILL TALK ABOUT IT AND THEN WE WILL
READ THE INSTRUCTION.

THE BOTTOM LINE IS, MR. LUCKETT, THAT THE DEFENSE OF COERCION IS NOT AVAILABLE TO YOU. IN FACT, LET ME READ THE SECOND PARAGRAPH OF NUMBER 29.

THE ABOVE MENTIONED DEFENSE, WHICH WE ARE GOING TO TALK ABOUT IN A MOMENT, IS UNAVAILABLE WHERE THE CRIME CHARGED IS PUNISHABLE WITH DEATH.

NOW, I WILL BE INTERESTED TO HEAR WHAT MR. SMITH HAS TO SAY ABOUT THAT. HERE IS WHAT IT READS. A PERSON WHO COMMITS AN UNLAWFUL ACT WHICH IS CHARGED UNDER THREATS OR MENACES SUFFICIENT TO SHOW THAT HE HAD A REASONABLE CAUSE TO

BELIEVE AND DID BELIEVE HIS LIFE WOULD BE IN DANGER IF HE REPUSED OR THAT HE WOULD SUFFER GREAT BODILY HARM, IS NOT LIABLE TO PUNISHMENT UNLESS THE CRIME IS PUNISHABLE WITH DEATH.

THE ABOVE MENTIONED DEFENSE IS UNAVAILABLE WHERE THE CRIME CHARGED IS PUNISHABLE WITH DEATH.

MURDER OF THE FIRST DEGREE IS PUNISHABLE BY DEATH. IT IS THE LAW. THAT IS THE THING THAT YOU ALL RAISED YOUR HANDS AND SWORE TO UPHOLD.

AND JUST SO WE CAN GET IT OUT OF THE WAY, LET'S
TALK ABOUT -- LET'S EVEN ASSUME THAT YOU ARE GOING TO
CONSIDER FOR SOME REASON THESE THREATS OR MENACES. THIS IS
HOW THEY HAVE TO BE.

SUCH THREATS OR MENACES MUST BE PRESENT AND IMMEDIATE AND OF SUCH A NATURE AS TO INDUCE A WELL-FOUNDED FEAR OF IMPENDING DEATH OR SERIOUS BODILY INJURY. AND THERE MUST BE NO OPPORTUNITY TO ESCAPE THE THREATS OR MENACES WITHOUT COMMITTING THE CRIME OR CRIMES.

HE'S GOT TO BE PUSHED RIGHT TO THE EDGE BEFORE THIS DEFENSE COMES IN WITH REGARDS TO CRIMES WHICH ARE NOT PUNISHABLE BY DEATH.

HE WASN'T PUSHED TO THE EDGE. EVEN IF WE TAKE
HIS STORY AT PACE VALUE, EVEN ACCEPTING EVERYTHING JOHNNY RAY
LUCKETT TOLD US, HE HAD NO IMMEDIATE THREATS. A THREAT TO
HIS PAMILY. WELL, THEY WEREN'T AROUND. THAT IS NOT

. 7

IMMEDIATE. THAT IS NOT PRESENT.

I DON'T REMEMBER ANYBODY SAYING THAT RANDY MOORE TOLD HIM, "I AM GOING TO KILL YOU RIGHT NOW OR I AM GOING TO DO SERIOUS BODILY INJURY TO YOU RIGHT NOW IF YOU DON'T COME ALONG AND DO AS WE ASK."

LET ME TELL YOU WHAT WE ARE REALLY TALKING ABOUT. WHAT REALLY HAPPENED, IT WAS A LITTLE PUSHING IN THIS CASE.

I DON'T THINK EVERYBODY WAS CLAMORING OUT TO BE THE PIRST PERSON TO BE ABLE TO DO AN ACT. THERE WAS WILLINGNESS.

WHAT MR. SMITH IS GOING TO GET UP HERE AND ARGUE TO YOU IS WERE THREATS AND COERCION AND DURESS ARE WHAT WE HAVE ALL KNOWN ALL OUR LIVES AND CALLED PEER PRESSURE. PEER PRESSURE. THAT'S ALL IT WAS.

THESE ARE SIX YOUNG MEN HAVING THE SAME INTERESTS TO ONE DEGREE OR ANOTHER, THE SAME LACK OF MORALITY, WHO WERE FEEDING UPON ONE ANOTHER.

THEY WERE A SNOWBALL THAT WAS GOING, GETTING LARGER AND MORE POWERFUL AND MORE ABLE TO DO DAMAGE AS IT ROLLED ALONG.

THREATS AND COERCION AND DURESS IS SOMETHING THAT HAS BEEN EXPANDED INTO SO AS TO GET YOU TO SAY, "WELL, THIS POOR YOUNG PELLOW HAS SOME SORT OF A DEFENSE." HE HASN'T ANY BECAUSE IT ISN'T THERE. IT JUST DIDN'T HAPPEN THAT WAY.

THESE FOUR, DALE FLANAGAN, RANDOLPH MOORE, ROY

MCDOWELL, JOHNNY RAY LUCKETT, ALONG WITH TOM AKERS AND MICHAEL WALSH, CONSPIRED, GOT TOGETHER, DEVISED A PLAN. TOGETHER THEY DID THIS.

AND THEY ALL HAD THEIR ROLES TO PLAY. WE HAVE NOTICED THAT AS TIME GOES ON.

DALE FLANAGAN'S ROLE WAS TO SHOOT HIS GRANDMOTHER. AND HE WAS ALSO TO ULTIMATELY GET THE INHERITANCE AND SPLIT IT WITH EVERYONE.

RANDY MOORE'S ROLE WAS TO SHOOT THE GRANDFATHER.

JOHNNY RAY LUCKETT'S ROLE WAS TO BE A BACKUP TO RANDY MOORE

AND TO SHOOT IF HE HAD TO.

ROY MCDOWELL'S ROLE WAS TO BRING THE .22 PISTOL AND TO GO INTO THE HOUSE EVENTUALLY AND MAKE IT LOOK LIKE A BURGLARY AND TAKE THE PURSE.

AND ALL OF THEM FULFILLED THEIR ROLES TO A "T."

NOW, YOU OF THE JURY HAVE A ROLE TO PLAY. AND ON BEHALF OF

CARL AND COLLEEN GORDON, I CAN ONLY HOPE AND PRAY THAT YOU

FULFILL YOUR ROLE EVERY BIT AS WELL AS THEY FULFILLED THEIRS.

THANK YOU.

THE COURT: THANK YOU, MR. SEATON. DEFENSE COUNSEL.

MR. SMITH: GOOD AFTERNOON, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN.
PIRST OF ALL, AND MOST SINCERELY, I WANT TO THANK EACH ONE OF
YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION IN THIS CASE UP TO THIS POINT.
POR THE LAST 11 DAYS, YOU HAVE SACRIFICED AND

1.

I WOULD ASK YOU PLEASE PORGIVE ME IF I HAVE
INSULTED ANY OF YOU, IF MY MANNER IN THE COURTROOM YOU FOUND
INSULTING BUT THAT SHOULD NOT BE TAKEN AGAINST ROY. I MEAN,
IT IS VERY SERIOUS AND, OBVIOUSLY, HE HAS NO CONTROL HOW I
HANDLE THE CASE AS A LAWYER.

AGAIN, I WOULD THANK ALL COUNSEL, THANK THE COURT AND THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND PATIENCE.

THE COURT: THANK YOU, MR. HANDFUSS. MR. HARMON.

MR. HARMON: JUDGE MOSLEY, COUNSEL, LADIES AND

GENTLEMEN. ACCORDING TO MY CALCULATIONS, YOU HAVE HEARD FIVE

HOURS AND SIX MINUTES OF ARGUMENT FROM COUNSEL NOW.

I HAVE HEARD SOME OF THE ATTORNEYS SAY THAT THEY

APPROACHED THIS CASE WITH TREPIDATION. FRANKLY, I DIDN'T. I

APPROACHED THIS CASE HOPEFULLY WITH THE SAME ENTHUSIASM AND

THE SAME SENSE OF CONVICTION THAT I APPROACH EVERY CASE.

BUT AFTER FIVE HOURS AND SIX MINUTES OF ARGUMENT, I HAVE GOT TO SAY FOR THE FIRST TIME I AM FEELING A LITTLE TREPIDATION. I AM AFRAID THAT YOU MIGHT SHARE THE FEELINGS OF SHAKESPEARE WHO'S QUOTED ONCE AS SAYING, "NOW THE FIRST THING WE DO IS HANG ALL THE LAWYERS."

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN, IT IS ALSO TEMPTING TO SAY,
BECAUSE I SENSE ALL OF YOU ARE READY TO GO HOME, IT'S
TEMPTING TO SAY LET'S JUST GO HOME BECAUSE, FRANKLY, I AM READY
TO.

BUT I WANT TO SAY SOMETHING ELSE BEFORE I GET

 INTO THE SUBSTANCE OF WHAT I HAVE TO SAY. AND THIS QUOTATION MEANS VERY MUCH TO ME. GOETHE IS QUOTED AS SAYING, "I CAN PROMISE YOU TO BE SINCERE, NOT IMPARTIAL."

LIKE MANY OF YOU, I HAD GRANDPARENTS. I REMEMBER VERY FONDLY THE LOVE AND THE SACRIFICE THAT THEY EXHIBITED TOWARDS ME AND SO I RELATE IN A VERY PERSONAL WAY TO THIS CASE.

I SAW A MOVIE A FEW MONTHS AGO. IT WAS LIKE MOST MOVIES, ACTUALLY, IT WAS LOUSY. BUT IT HAD A HAUNTING TITLE.

THE TITLE WAS "SOMETHING WICKED THIS WAY COMES."

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN, SOMETHING WICKED CAME TO
5851 WASHBURN ROAD THE NIGHT OF NOVEMBER THE 5TH, 1984. AND,
MR. SMITH, I AM GOING ON TELL YOU AND, MR. HANDFUSS, I TELL
YOU, AND EACH OF THE ATTORNEYS AND EACH OF THE DEFENDANTS,
PROM THE POINT OF VIEW OF THE STATE AND FROM THE EVIDENCE IN
THIS CASE, THERE ISN'T ANY DIFFERENCE. THE WICKEDNESS WHICH
OCCURRED, THE EVIL WHICH WAS PERPETRATED, WAS A JOINT
VENTURE.

MR. PIKE SAYS CONSIDER CAREFULLY THE FATE OF DALE FLANAGAN BECAUSE WHAT YOU DO IS IRREVOCABLE. YOUR DECISION IS IRREVOCABLE. AND, MR. PIKE, I SAY THE BULLETS OF YOUR CLIENT DALE FLANAGAN WHEN HE PUMPED THREE SHOTS INTO THE HEAD OF HIS GRANDMOTHER AND COMMITTED MATRICIDE ARE IRREVOCABLE.

I WOULD SUGGEST THAT THE DECISIONS WHICH WE MAKE HERE BE JUST AS IRREVOCABLE AND JUST AS DEADLY AS THE BULLETS

FIRED BY THESE YOUNG MEN.

MR. SMITH SAYS THE CONTENTION BY THE STATE THAT HIS CLIENT JOHN RAY LUCKETT PULLED THE TRIGGER IS INTELLECTUAL DISHONESTY. HE SAYS THAT'S JUST DISHONEST.

WELL, MR. SMITH, I DON'T LIKE TO BE CALLED DISHONEST. IT'S MY RECOLLECTION OF THE EVIDENCE IN THIS CASE THAT TOM AKERS, WHEN HE WAS FIRST INTERVIEWED BY THE POLICE DEPARTMENT ON DECEMBER 7, 1984 AND HE FIRST ACKNOWLEDGED THAT HE HAD INFORMATION ABOUT THIS CASE, STATED THAT RANDY MOORE SAID THAT JOHNNY RAY LUCKETT WAS A SHOOTER AND THAT JOHNNY RAY LUCKETT SAID IN HIS PRESENCE THAT HE WAS A SHOOTER.

IT'S FURTHERMORE MY RECOLLECTION OF THE EVIDENCE THAT JOHN LUCAS, WHEN HE WAS QUOTED AS TESTIFYING AT THE PRELIMINARY HEARING IN THIS MATTER, FEBRUARY THE 11TH, 1985, WAS QUOTED AS SAYING HE OVERHEARD SOMEONE IN THE GROUP SAY AFTER THESE CRIMES HAD OCCURRED THAT JOHN RAY LUCKETT HAD FIRED A SHOT AND MISSED.

SO, MR. SMITH, WHY SHOULD WE CHARACTERIZE THE POSITION AS INTELLECTUAL DISHONESTY?

WHEN MR. LUCAS TESTIFIED AT THE EVIDENTIARY
HEARING IN THIS COURTROOM JUST A FEW WEEKS AGO, HE IDENTIFIED
JOHN RAY LUCKETT AS THE PERSON WHO HAD SAID IN HIS PRESENCE
THAT HE FIRED A SHOT.

WHEN DALE FLANAGAN TALKED TO HIS FRIEND ANGIE SALDANA ON DECEMBER THE 5TH, 1984, HE SAID THAT MOORE AND

LUCKETT WERE THROWING SHOTS AT THE GRANDFATHER AS HE CAME DOWN THE STEPS.

MR. SLOANE ALSO IDENTIFIED MR. LUCKETT AS A SHOOTER BUT THAT'S A LITTLE DIFFERENT. WITH DUE RESPECT TO MR. HANDFUSS AND HIS CLIENT MR. MCDOWELL, THE VERY FACT THAT THEY WOULD CALL SOMEONE LIKE SCOTT SLOANE, WHO IS CONVICTED OF FIRST DEGREE MURDER WITH A WEAPON AND RAPE, WHO OBVIOUSLY IS A PERSON WHO HAS NO CREDIBILITY, WHO ADMITTED ON THE WITNESS STAND THAT HE HAD WRITTEN A LETTER TO MR. LUCKETT BUT DENIED WRITING THE TWO DOCUMENTS PRESENTED TO HIM, HE HAS SHOWN US HE IS A LIAR.

AND IF MR. MCDOWELL IS GOING TO RELY ON SOMEONE OF THE LACK OF CREDIBILITY OF SCOTT SLOANE, THAT JUST SHOWS HOW DESPERATE HE IS.

MR. SMITH TALKS ABOUT A SUBPLOT IN THIS CASE. I
THINK I QUOTE HIM, "THE OTHER DEPENDANTS HATCHED A SUBPLOT OF
TREACHERY AND INTIMIDATION TO KEEP JOHN RAY LUCKETT OFF THE
WITNESS STAND."

THEN HE MADE ALLUSION TO THE ACES GANG. WHATEVER THE ACES GANG IS, HE SAYS THEY HAVE LONG TENTACLES.

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN, I SAID THAT THE ONLY
SUBPLOT WHICH HAS BEEN HATCHED IN THIS CASE WAS HATCHED BY
MR. LUCKETT AND HAS BEEN PERPETUATED BY HIS SPOKESMAN MR.
SMITH AND BY MR. MCDOWELL.

THESE ARE PEOPLE WHO SAY, "WE WERE MERELY

1 .

PRESENT. WE DIDN'T KNOW WHAT WAS GOING TO HAPPEN. WE ARE VICTIMS OF CIRCUMSTANCE. WE WERE COERCED INTO GOING ALONG."

AND, MR. SMITH, THIS NOTION THAT SOMEHOW ALL THE OTHER DEFENDANTS GOT TOGETHER AND GANGED UP ON YOUR GUY AND THAT THERE WAS SOME TYPE OF PLOT TO NAIL HIM, IS PURE SPECULATION. YOU ASK US, MR. SMITH, TO SHOW PROUD SKEPTICISM.

AND, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN, WHEN YOU PUT THIS CASE
IN PERSPECTIVE AND REALIZE THAT THESE FOUR YOUNG MEN, WHO ARE
ON TRIAL, ARE ALL PRIENDS AND ASSOCIATES, A NUMBER OF THEM
LIVED TOGETHER, THEY WERE ALSO FRIENDS AND ASSOCIATES OF
AKERS AND WALSH; AND WHEN YOU CONSIDER THE EVIDENCE OF
DISCUSSIONS AND PLANNING AND CONSIDERATION OF ALTERNATIVE.
APPROACHES TO COVER UP THESE CRIMES; AND WHEN YOU CONSIDER
THAT THEY LEFT TOGETHER AND THEY TEST FIRED A GUN TOGETHER,
AND THEY WENT TO THE SCENE TOGETHER, AND THEY ACTED IN
CONCERT AND THEN THEY CAME BACK TOGETHER AND THEN THEY
DISCUSSED THERE CRIMES TOGETHER, IT'S VERY APPARENT THAT

YOU KNOW, I CALL THE DEFENSE BY MR. LUCKETT THAT HE WAS SOMEHOW FORCED INTO GOING ALONG A DEFENSE OF LAST RESORT.

I SAY THAT THAT DEFENSE WAS NOT BORN ON NOVEMBER THE 5TH, 1984 OR THE MORNING OF NOVEMBER THE 6TH, 1984. JOHN RAY LUCKETT DIDN'T GET ON THE TELEPHONE AND CALL THE POLICE

 OR CALL HIS FAMILY TO EXPLAIN WHAT A HORRIBLE DILEMMA HE WAS IN. HE DIDN'T GO TO A NEIGHBOR.

WHEN DECEMBER ROLLED AROUND, HE WASN'T ON THE TELEPHONE. THAT DEFENSE WAS BORN IN AUGUST RIGHT HERE IN THIS COURTROOM.

BECAUSE ON AUGUST THE 30TH, 1985 SOMETHING
TREMENDOUSLY SIGNIFICANT HAPPENED. ONE OF THE CONSPIRATORS
TURNED STATE'S EVIDENCE.

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN, I AM NOT HERE TO VOUCH
HOOK, LINE AND SINKER FOR THE CREDIBILITY OF TOM AKERS. AND
I AM NOT PROUD OF THE FACT THAT THE STATE OF NEVADA HAD TO
DEAL WITH HIM. HE IS NO DIFFERENT THAN THESE PEOPLE.

I DON'T AGREE VERY OFTEN WITH MR. HANDFUSS BUT'
WHEN HE SAYS MR. AKERS TOOK A WALK, I AM INCLINED TO AGREE
WITH HIM. BASICALLY, HE DID.

AND ANY TIME YOU ARE CHARGED WITH MURDER AND ROBBERY AND BURGLARY AND CONSPIRACY AND YOU CAN GET OFF WITH VOLUNTARY MANSLAUGHTER AND GET FIVE YEARS PROBATION, BASICALLY YOU TOOK A HIKE.

NOW, WHY DID THE STATE DO THAT? WELL, I THINK THAT IS FAIRLY SIMPLE. IT IS REALLY A QUESTION OF MATHEMATICS, ISN'T IT? THE STATE OF NEVADA NEEDED -- AND IT'S BOTH FOR LEGAL AND PACTUAL REASONS. WE NEEDED THE TESTIMONY OF MR. AKERS.

IT WAS APPARENT BY ALL ACCOUNTS HE DID NOT GO IN

THE HOUSE, HE DIDN'T HANDLE A GUN, HE DIDN'T APPROACH THE WINDOW. HE WENT TO THE TRAILER.

20.

THAT ISN'T TO SAY AS AN AIDER AND ABETTOR HE
ISN'T RESPONSIBLE BECAUSE HE WENT OVER THERE AS PART OF THE
ALIBI. I AM SURE HE WAS OVER THERE TO SEE IF LIGHTS CAME ON
IN NEIGHBORING HOUSES AND HE WAS GOING TO ALERT HIS FRIENDS
AND CONFEDERATES IF THAT HAPPENED.

BUT IT WAS NECESSARY TO STRIKE A DEAL WITH SOMEONE. WHY IS THAT? THAT'S BECAUSE OF THE NATURE OF CONSPIRACIES. YOU THINK IT IS EASY TO PROVE A CONSPIRACY?

MR. SMITH SAYS, "WHERE IS THE EVIDENCE THAT MR. LUCKETT KNEW BEFOREHAND THERE WAS A CONSPIRACY TO MURDER?"

WELL, POLKS, IT'S TOUGH TO GET INSIDE THE HEAD OF A CONSPIRATOR. THEY'RE DIFFICULT TO PROFFER AND WHAT WE USUALLY HAVE TO DO IS TO LOOK TO WHAT WE CALL CIRCUMSTANTIAL EVIDENCE, NOT SOMETHING YOU DIRECTLY PERCEIVE BUT WE MAKE REASONABLE INFERENCES FROM THE CIRCUMSTANCES.

THE FACT REMAINS THE STATE STRUCK A BARGAIN WITH TOM AKERS BECAUSE IT APPEARED OF ALL THE CONSPIRATORS PERHAPS HE WAS THE LEAST CULPABLE.

AND ON AUGUST THE 30TH, 1985 AT AN EVIDENTIARY
HEARING IN THIS COURTROOM, HE TESTIFIED FOR THE FIRST TIME
AGAINST FOUR -- IN FACT, IT WAS FIVE AT THAT TIME, MR. WALSH
WAS ALSO PART OF THE SETTING -- FOR THE FIRST TIME AGAINST
HIS FIVE CONFEDERATES.

B

9 .

AND THAT CHANGED THE PROSPECTIVE OF THIS CASE
BECAUSE CERTAIN PEOPLE REALIZED THEN THAT THEY WERE GOING TO
BE PLACED AT THE SCENE. THAT WAS INESCAPABLE.

AND SO SOME PEOPLE DID SOME REEVALUATION. AND I SUBMIT ON THAT DATE, THE DEFENSE OF COERCION WAS BORN IN THE MIND OF MR. SMITH AND HIS CLIENT.

A DEFENSE OF LAST RESORT. CAN'T VERY WELL SAY HE WAS INSANE, BECAUSE TO SELL ANY TYPE OF STORY YOU HAVE TO PUT HIM ON THE WITNESS STAND AND INSANE JOHN RAY LUCKETT IS NOT.

IF AN EYEWITNESS WHO IS THERE IS GOING TO TAKE
THE WITNESS STAND, AND I REFER NOW TO AKERS, AND SAY LUCKETT
WAS THERE, AND MCDOWELL WAS THERE, THEN YOU CAN'T VERY WELL
SAY, "SOME OTHER DUDES DID THIS."

AND SO YOU SAY ONE OF TWO THINGS, "I WAS EITHER COERCED OR I WAS MERELY PRESENT." AND ISN'T IT INTRIGUING EVEN MR. AKERS SUGGESTED THAT HE HAD TO BE COAXED INTO GOING ALONG.

WHAT I WONDER THEN IS WHO WAS INVOLVED?

EVERYBODY WANTS TO SAY THEY WERE MERELY PRESENT. EVERYBODY

WANTS TO SAY THEY WERE COAXED OR FORCED INTO GOING ALONG

WHEN, IN FACT, THE EVIDENCE WOULD SUGGEST THAT NONE OF THAT

IS TRUE.

THESE YOUNG MEN WILLINGLY AND VOLUNTARILY FOR WHATEVER DEVIANT AND DARK REASONS ENTERED INTO A PACT TO KILL.

AKERS. "I HEARD TWO DEAD THUMPS. I HEARD A GUNSHOT, A LADY SCREAM, ANOTHER GUNSHOT, A MAN YELL AND SEVERAL MORE GUNSHOTS. THE MAN YELLED LIKE HE HAD BEEN HIT WITH A BASEBALL BAT OR HAD BEEN SHOT AND IT WAS A YELL OF PAIN."

WHY DID THAT HAPPEN? WELL, IT HAPPENED BECAUSE FOR WHATEVER HIS MOTIVATIONS, FOR WHATEVER BEEF OR DISAGREEMENT OR SENSE OF NOT BEING UNDERSTOOD DALE FLANAGAN HAD WITH RESPECT TO HIS RELATIONSHIP WITH HIS GRANDPARENTS, AT SOME POINT HE BEGAN TO THINK THE UNTHINKABLE.

I SAID THAT IN THE OPENING STATEMENT AND I REPEAT
IT BECAUSE I CAN ONLY RELATE TO MY OWN EXPERIENCE AND I
CANNOT CONCEIVE OF CONTEMPLATING THE MURDER OF MY
GRANDPARENTS. BUT THERE IS SOMEONE IN THIS COURTROOM WHO IS
CAPABLE OF DOING THAT AND HE DID.

THAT'S THE EVIL, THE WICKEDNESS THAT FOUND ITS WAY TO 5851 WASHBURN ROAD AND WHAT'S EVEN MORE SHOCKING IS THAT MR. FLANAGAN FOUND WILLING HELPERS.

AND ALL THREE OF THESE YOUNG MEN ARE EQUALLY GUILTY. MR. SEATON DISCUSSED WITH YOU TWO VERY BASIC AND ELEMENTARY RULES OF LAW.

THE FIRST RULE IS THE CONSPIRACY RULE. IT'S NOT COMPLICATED. IT SIMPLY MEANS THAT ONCE IT HAS BEEN CLEARLY SHOWN THAT THERE IS A DESIGN BY PEOPLE TO COMMIT UNLAWFUL ACTS, AND THEY BEGIN TO PURSUE THOSE UNLAWFUL ACTS, THE ACTS

OF ONE BECOME THE ACTS OF ALL.

1.

NOT EVERYBODY HAS TO HOLD THE GUN. THERE CAN BE A DRIVER, THERE CAN BE A LOOKOUT MAN, THERE CAN BE SOMEBODY WHO BREAKS THE WINDOW TO GET INSIDE. THERE CAN BE SHOOTERS, THERE CAN BE SOMEONE TO FURNISH A FIREARM. AND EVERYBODY'S GUILTY IF THEY AIDED AND ABETTED IN THE COMMISSION OF THE CONSPIRACY.

INSTRUCTION 31 MAKES IT VERY CLEAR THAT THERE ARE BASICALLY THREE CATEGORIES THAT CAN CAUSE PEOPLE TO BE CRIMINALLY RESPONSIBLE FOR BAD ACTS.

NUMBER ONE, IF YOU WERE THE ACTUAL PERPETRATOR WHO ACTUALLY KILLED CARL GORDON AND COLLEEN GORDON. WHEN WE IDENTIFY THOSE PERSONS, THEN THEY ARE THE ACTUAL PERPETRATORS OF MURDER.

I QUOTE, "MR. FLANAGAN SAID HE WENT DIRECTLY TO THE ROOM, TO HIS GRANDMOTHER'S ROOM. HE GRABBED HIS GRANDMOTHER BY THE LOWER JAW, PUT HER DOWN ON THE BED AND SHOT HER."

I QUOTE MR. LUCKETT, "I HAD HEARD DALE SAY HE HAD RAN INTO THE HOUSE AND GRABBED HIS MOTHER AND THREW HER DOWN AND SHOT HER IN THE HEAD THREE TIMES."

TWO EYEWITNESS ACCOUNTS. NOVEMBER THE 5TH, 1984, THREE BULLETS INTO THE HEAD FROM DALE FLANAGAN WITH HATE.

I WAS TAUGHT TO HAVE RESPECT FOR THE INHERENT DIGNITY OF OTHER HUMAN BEINGS, TO APPRECIATE THE SANCTITY OF

LIFE BUT EVIDENTLY MR. MOORE DOESN'T SHARE THAT POINT OF VIEW.

I QUOTE, "MR. MOORE SAID HE WENT IN THE HOUSE.

HE KNEELED DOWN. HE SAID, 'HE WAS COMING DOWN THE STAIRS

FASTER THAN I THOUGHT HE WOULD. I SHOT. I KNEW I MISSED. I

SHOT AGAIN. I KNOW I HIT HIM AND I SHOT AGAIN.'" THE

TESTIMONY OF AKERS.

THE TESTIMONY OF MR. LUCKETT WHO SAYS HE HEARD A FINAL SHOT THAT WAS PERHAPS 20 OR 30 SECONDS AFTER THE OTHERS. AND AFTER THE OTHERS GOT TO THE CAR, HE ASKED MR. MOORE WHAT THAT WAS ALL ABOUT.

THIS IS THE INTRIGUING THING. IF LUCKETT WAS A PART OF THIS, WHY DOES MOORE TELL HIM WHAT IT WAS ALL ABOUT? AND WHY DO THESE MEN FREELY DISCUSS WHAT THEY DID IN HIS PRESENCE BACK AT THE APARTMENT?

BUT THIS MAN BY HIS ACCOUNT HAD CHICKENED OUT AND WHO HAD PLED WITH THE OTHERS NOT TO GO FORWARD, ASKED ONE OF THE PRIMARY PERPETRATORS AND MOORE TELLS HIM.

"I HAD HEARD RANDY SAY HE SHOT MR. GORDON WHEN HE WAS COMING DOWN THE STAIRS AND THAT MR. GORDON STILL PROCEEDED DOWN THE STAIRS AFTER RANDY SHOT HIM, I THINK, THREE OR FOUR TIMES AND SO HE HAD KEPT SHOOTING. AND I HEARD RANDY SAY MR. GORDON WAS STILL SQUIRMING SO HE WENT OVER AND SHOT HIM IN THE HEAD."

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN, THE AUTOPSY REPORTS AREN'T

GOING TO SHOW THAT ANYBODY WAS SHOT -- THAT MR. GORDON WAS SHOT IN THE HEAD. THEY ARE GOING TO INDICATE VERY MUCH AS WE OUTLINED FOR YOU DURING MR. SEATON'S ARGUMENT AND, ALSO, MY OPENING REMARKS, THERE WERE SEVEN SHOTS.

1.

THERE IS ONE RIGHT HERE, THERE IS ONE DOWN TO THE LOWER LEFT CHEST, ONE JUST TO THE LEFT OF THE NAVEL, TWO IN THE ARM AND TWO IN THE BACK.

SO IS THAT ACCURATE TESTIMONY? WELL, I LEAVE IT FOR YOU TO DECIDE. HOWEVER, THE AUTOPSY REPORT OF MR. GORDON WILL REVEAL THAT THE SHOT WHICH ENTERED RIGHT HERE WENT DOWNWARD FROM HEAD TOWARD TOE AT APPROXIMATELY 45 DEGREE ANGLE.

SO WE KNOW SOMETHING, WHEN MR. GORDON FIRST STARTED TO COME DOWN THE STAIRS, THE FELLOW WHO SHOT EITHER FROM THE LIVING ROOM FLOOR IN FRONT OF THE WINDOW OR FROM OUTSIDE ON THE GROUND WOULD HAVE BEEN SHOOTING AT AN UPWARD ANGLE SO HE DIDN'T GET A 45 ANGLE DOWNWARD WITH THAT SHOT.

WHAT IT DOES SUGGEST IS THAT MAYBE THE SHOT WHICH WAS INTENDED FOR MR. GORDON'S HEAD DIDN'T HIT HIS HEAD. IT WENT IN RIGHT HERE WHEN HE WAS SQUIRMING ON THE FLOOR AND THAT WOULD ACCOUNT FOR THE 45 DEGREE ANGLE DOWNWARD.

NOVEMBER THE 5TH, 1984 FROM RANDY MOORE TO CARL GORDON WITH DISRESPECT.

INSTRUCTION 31 MAKES IT CLEAR THAT THE SECOND

CATEGORY IS THAT OF AIDING AND ABETTING. AND ANYONE WHO AIDS

AND ABETS IN THE PERPETRATION OF THE CRIMES IS GUILTY.

2 .

ASSUME THAT FOUR PEOPLE GET TOGETHER AND DECIDE TO KIDNAP A USED CAR SALESMAN SO THEY CAN STEAL A PANCY USED CAR, A LUXURY VEHICLE. AND SUPPOSE THE PERSON WHO CONCEIVED THE PLAN SAYS, "I WANT YOU TO DO THAT BUT WHATEVER YOU DO DON'T HURT HIM," AND HE GIVES HIS THREE CONFEDERATES SPECIFIC ADVICE NOT TO DO THAT.

AND THEN THAT PERSON WHO THOUGHT UP THE PLAN STAYS HOME, THE OTHER THREE GO OUT, THEY KIDNAP THE CAR SALESMAN. UNFORTUNATELY, THEY MURDER HIM DURING THE KIDNAPPING AND DURING THE TAKING OF THE VEHICLE.

BY LAW IN THIS STATE THE PERSON WHO HAD CONCEIVED THE PLAN, WHO HAD ENCOURAGED THE OTHERS TO DO IT, WHO HAD AIDED AND ABETTED IN THE CRIME, EVEN THOUGH HE TOLD THEM NOT TO HURT THE VICTIM, IS GUILTY.

THAT IS BECAUSE WHEN ANY PEOPLE EMBARK UPON A

JOINT VENTURE WHICH INVOLVES THE COMMISSION OF INHERENTLY

DANGEROUS FELONIES -- IS A HOT PROWL BURGLARY AT 11:30 OR

MIDNIGHT IN A RESIDENCE OCCUPIED BY HUMAN BEINGS INHERENTLY

DANGEROUS TO SOMEONE? IS ROBBERY WITH USE OF A WEAPON

INHERENTLY DANGEROUS?

WELL, THE LEGISLATURE THINKS SO AND THAT IS THE REASON THEY HAVE MADE A POLICY STATEMENT. THAT IS THE REASON THE LAW IS THAT YOU GET THE FIRST DEGREE MURDER IN TWO WAYS AS MR. SEATON HAS DISCUSSED.

R

YOU CAN HAVE A PLANNED MURDER BY PREMEDITATION
AND DESIGN AND THAT'S CLEARLY FIRST DEGREE MURDER. AND YOU
ALSO CAN HAVE A MURDER WHICH ARISES OUT OF THE COMMISSION OF
BURGLARY OR ROBBERY.

AND ANYBODY INVOLVED IN THAT TYPE OF OFFENSE IS DEEMED TO BE GUILTY OF MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE AS LONG AS THEY ARE SHOWN TO HAVE AIDED AND ABETTED.

DID MR. MCDOWELL AID AND ABET IN THE COMMISSION
OF THESE CRIMES? MR. HANDFUSS SAYS WE HAVE JUST BEEN TREATED
TO THE AKERS AND LUCKETT SHOW IN THIS COURTROOM. HE SAYS
WHERE IS ROY MCDOWELL'S PARTICIPATION IN THE CONSPIRACY?

WELL, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN, IN THE FIRST PLACE I
HAD A HARD TIME DECIDING WHETHER MR. HANDFUSS WAS ADMITTING HIS
MAN WAS PRESENT AT THE SCENE OR WHETHER HE WAS STILL
MAINTAINING, BECAUSE OF WHAT HIS FRIEND JOHN LUCAS SAID ON
THE WITNESS STAND, THAT HE WASN'T THERE.

MR. HANDFUSS DID CHARACTERIZE MR. LUCKETT AS SIMPLY HAVING A FELONIOUS EXISTENCE, MERELY BEING PRESENT.

HE SAYS THAT'S NOT ENOUGH. THE NOT ENOUGH PART AND THE MERE PRESENCE PART ARE CLEARLY INAPPLICABLE TO ANY OF THESE YOUNG MEN.

WHEN THE COURT TALKED ABOUT MERE PRESENCE IN INSTRUCTION 33, YOU CAN BE SURE THAT WHAT IS ENVISIONED AS A MATTER OF LAW THAT SOMEBODY LIKE GENEAL MCGREGOR OR A NEIGHBOR IS OUT PERHAPS WALKING HER DOG.

SHE LIVES THERE. SHE IS IN THE AREA AND SEES A CRIME COMMITTED. SHE SEES PEOPLE FIRE SHOTS, SHE SEES A WINDOW BROKEN. THAT IS THE TYPE OF PERSON WHO IS MERELY PRESENT.

 BOB MANRING TESTIFIED. HE IS A YOUNG BOY WHO
LIVES IN THAT NEIGHBORHOOD. SUPPOSE HE WAS OUT JOGGING AND
HE HAPPENED TO BE PRESENT. THAT IS MERE PRESENCE. ROY
MCDOWELL, BY THE TESTIMONY, FURNISHED THE MURDER WEAPON OF
COLLEEN GORDON IN THIS CASE.

THE TESTIMONY IS BETWEEN 11 A.M. AND ONE O'CLOCK P.M. ON NOVEMBER THE 5TH, 1984, DALE FLANAGAN ASKED RANDY MOORE FOR MCDOWELL'S TELEPHONE NUMBER. AND DALE IMMEDIATELY WENT TO THE TELEPHONE AND HE SAID, "HI, ROY, DID YOU GET THE TOY?"

AND THEN HE SAID, "ALL RIGHT. THAT'S OKAY." AND THEN LATER THAT NIGHT, MCDOWELL CAME TO THE APARTMENT AND BY THE ACCOUNT OF TWO WITNESSES WHO WERE THERE, AKERS AND LUCKETT, HE HAD A GUN WITH HIM AND HE GAVE THAT GUN, A HANDGUN, TO DALE FLANAGAN.

MR. MCDOWELL WAS PRESENT WHEN THE MODUS OPERANDI
OF THESE CRIMES WAS DISCUSSED. NOW, I REALIZE THAT JOHN
LUCKETT TESTIFIED -- EXCUSE ME, JOHN LUCAS TESTIFIED FROM THE
WITNESS STAND THAT ALL FIVE WERE PRESENT BEFORE IT OCCURRED
AT MR. MOORE'S APARTMENT BUT NOT MCDOWELL.

I THINK IT'S IMPORTANT TO REMEMBER, HOWEVER, THAT

WHEN MR. LUCAS'S MOTHER TESTIFIED, IT WAS DEVELOPED THAT MCDOWELL HAS PATHERED A CHILD BY A SISTER OF JOHN LUCAS.

IT'S ALSO SIGNIFICANT TO NOTE THAT WHEN LUCAS

GAVE THE FINAL OF HIS STATEMENTS TO THE POLICE DEPARTMENT ON

DECEMBER THE 10TH, 1984 WHEN HE WAS ASKED WHAT PERSONS WERE

THERE, HE LISTED ALL SIX.

WELL, OF COURSE, MR. MCDOWELL WAS PRESENT,
OTHERWISE, WHEN DID HE JOIN THE OTHERS? THESE PEOPLE WHO
HAVE EMBARKED UPON A PLAN TO COMMIT BURGLARY AND ROBBERY AND
MURDER AREN'T GOING TO TAKE DETOURS. EVEN MR. LUCAS
ACKNOWLEDGED THAT ALL SIX CAME BACK TOGETHER BETWEEN ONE AND
1:30 IN THE MORNING.

WHY WOULD SIX GO TO THE SCENE OF THESE INTENDED CRIMES? WELL, BASICALLY, BECAUSE THE STRENGTH IN NUMBERS.

BASICALLY BECAUSE, AS MR. SEATON HAS EXPLAINED, THEY ALL HAD A ROLE TO PLAY.

AND WHEN THEY GOT THERE, THE EVIDENCE IS THAT MCDOWELL WENT INTO THE HOUSE, HE TRIED TO MAKE IT LOOK LIKE A BURGLARY.

THE EVIDENCE IS THAT WHEN THEY GOT BACK TO THE APARTMENT, HE HAD THE WALLET OUT OF HER PURSE AND HE AND MOORE AND FLANAGAN TOOK THE CONTENTS OUT, THE MONEY, THE PHOTOGRAPHS AND THE IDENTIFICATION AND THEN FLANAGAN AND MOORE BURNED EVERYTHING BUT THE MONEY IN AN ASHTRAY IN THE KITCHEN.

I HAVE A QUESTION FOR MR. HANDFUSS. WHY WASN'T THE REVOLVER RECOVERED AT THE LAKE? WE HAVE HAD TESTIMONY THAT THE SAWED-OFF RIFLE AND THE LONG RIFLE WERE FOUND BY REPRESENTATIVES OF THE PARK SERVICE. WHY WASN'T THE REVOLVER THERE?

WELL, IT WASN'T THERE BECAUSE AS THE TESTIMONY INDICATES, THE NIGHT IT HAPPENED THAT GUN WAS RETURNED TO THE PERSON WHO BROUGHT IT AND THE TESTIMONY IS ROY MCDOWELL PUT IT BACK IN HIS POCKET.

MR. HANDFUSS WANTS TO KNOW WHY DID MR. MOORE CALL THE MOTHER OF JOHN LUCAS THE FOLLOWING DAY AND ASK FOR THE RETURN OF A GUN. IT'S APPARENT IF HE WOULD DO THAT, THAT THE CONSPIRATORS DIDN'T REALLY NEED TO HAVE MCDOWELL BRING A GUN. WELL, PERHAPS THEY WANTED A GUN THAT COULD NOT BE TRACED.

WHEN MR. MOORE CALLED MARILYN LUCAS, HE ASKED IF SHE WAS THROUGH WITH THE GUN. SHE HAD EXPLAINED THAT SHE HAD BEEN USING IT FOR HER PROTECTION.

SAID THAT WAS ABOUT 11 A.M. AND MOORE CAME BY AT ABOUT ONE O'CLOCK P.M. AND PICKED IT UP. WELL, WE KNOW THAT WASN'T THE MURDER WEAPON BECAUSE IF SHE HAD BEEN USING IT FOR HER PROTECTION, THEN WHETHER SHE SPECIFICALLY SPELLED THIS OUT OR NOT SHE OBVIOUSLY HAD HAD IT THERE LONG BEFORE THE NIGHT OF NOVEMBER THE 5TH.

AS I REMEMBER THE EVIDENCE, MOORE SAID HIS FRIEND NEEDED THE GUN BACK AND IF THERE WAS A FRIEND WHO OWNED THAT

GUN, THAT WAS A GUN THAT COULD BE TRACED AND THE CONSPIRATORS
WANTED MR. MCDOWELL TO BRING A TOY THAT WAS GOING TO BE USED
WHICH COULD NOT BE TRACED BY THE AUTHORITIES.

MR. HANDFUSS SAYS ANGIE SALDANA EVEN TESTIFIED
THAT WHEN DALE FLANAGAN TALKED WITH HER ON DECEMBER THE 5TH,

1 2

1984, HE DIDN'T MENTION ROY MCDOWELL. WHY WASN'T ROY
MCDOWELL MENTIONED?
WELL, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN, IN THE PIRST PLACE HE
MAY HAVE BEEN. I AM SURE THERE WERE LOTS OF THINGS MENTIONED

MENTIONED WERE NOT RECALLED BY THE PEOPLE.

THERE IS NO TESTIMONY THAT SALDANA HAD A NOTE

PAD, THAT WHEN MR. FLANAGAN SAID -- AND IT REALLY AROSE OUT

OF AN ARGUMENT BETWEEN HIM AND HER ABOUT A PRIOR BOYFRIEND.

BY THESE PEOPLE TO VARIOUS FRIENDS AND MANY OF THE THINGS

THERE IS NO INDICATION SHE SAID, "HOLD IT, DALE.

BEFORE YOU GO ANY FURTHER, LET ME GET MY NOTEBOOK OUT. I

WANT TO GET THIS DOWN SO THAT I CAN GO TO THE POLICE SO I CAN

GET IT DOWN WORD FOR WORD."

WELL, THAT SORT OF THING IS PACETIOUS. IT

DOESN'T HAPPEN IN REAL LIFE. SHE TRIED TO REMEMBER WHAT HE
SAID AND SHE DID NOT REMEMBER HIM MENTIONING MCDOWELL.

IS THAT REALLY SIGNIFICANT AND IS IT SIGNIFICANT THAT FLANAGAN TELLS SALDANA, "I WENT INTO THE HOUSE AND I AM THE ONE THAT TOOK THE PURSE OUT OF THE CLOSET."

PERHAPS DALE FLANAGAN UNDERSTOOD VERY WELL ON

B

19 ·

DECEMBER THE 5TH, 1984 THE MEANING OF THE CONSPIRACY RULE,
THE ACT OF ONE IS THE ACT OF ALL. OTHERWISE, WHY WOULD HE
HAVE BEGUN THE CONVERSATION WITH THIS POINT, "ANGIE, HOW DO
YOU LIKE THIS. I DID IT. I KILLED MY GRANDPARENTS."

WELL, WHETHER THAT WAS INADVERTENT OR INTENDED,
THE FACT REMAINS HE DIDN'T KILL THEM BOTH BUT HE IS
RESPONSIBLE. MR. MOORE DIDN'T KILL THEM BOTH BUT HE IS
RESPONSIBLE. AND MCDOWELL AND LUCKETT DIDN'T KILL EITHER BUT
THEY ARE RESPONSIBLE BECAUSE THEY AIDED AND ABETTED IN THE
COMMISSION OF THESE CRIMES.

JOHN RAY LUCKETT EMBARKED UPON A DANGEROUS AND DEADLY COURSE WHEN HE ELECTED TO GO ALONG WITH HIS FRIENDS AND ASSOCIATES. HE WAS PRESENT WHEN THESE CRIMES WERE DISCUSSED.

THE EVIDENCE BY AKERS IS THAT HE HELD THE SAWED-OFF GUN IN THE APARTMENT. HE CARRIED THE GUN TOWARDS THE HOUSE. REMEMBER, AKERS SAID HE WENT TO THE TRAILER AND THE OTHER FIVE HEADED TOWARDS THE HOUSE AND MOORE HAD THE LONG RIFLE AND FLANAGAN HAD THE HANDGUN AND JOHN RAY LUCKETT HAD THE SAWED-OFF RIFLE.

AND THOSE MEN WERE WALKING TOGETHER. THE
TESTIMONY, WHICH I HAVE ALREADY ALLUDED TO, AND THE
STATEMENTS BY AKERS, LUCAS AND SALDANA, IS THAT LUCKETT FIRED
A SHOT.

MR. SMITH SAYS MR. LUCKETT WAS JUST PRESSED INTO

В

 THIS AT THE LAST MINUTE. THE PERSON THAT THEY REALLY INTENDED TO HAVE GO WAS MR. LUCAS. BUT HE HAD PASSED OUT.

WELL, THAT IS WHAT MR. LUCAS IN A VERY

SELF-SERVING WAY SAID. HE SAID HE PASSED OUT. HE SAID IT

WAS SOMEWHERE AROUND ELEVEN O'CLOCK P.M. AND WHEN HE NEXT WAS

AWARE OF ANYTHING, THERE WAS A KNOCK ON THE DOOR WHICH WOKE

HIM UP BETWEEN ONE AND 1:30.

HOWEVER, MR. SMITH, YOUR CLIENT JOHN RAY LUCKETT SAID THAT MR. LUCAS WAS AWAKE WHEN THEY LEFT. MR. SMITH, YOUR CLIENT SAID THAT LUCAS WENT OVER AND LOCKED THE DOOR.
AND, IN FACT, THAT IS WHAT THOMAS AKERS ALSO SAID.

SO IF JOHN LUCAS WASN'T ASLEEP, IF HE HADN'T PASSED OUT, THEN OBVIOUSLY LUCKETT JUST WASN'T A SUBSTITUTE FOR HIM AT THE LAST MINUTE BECAUSE HE WAS INCAPACITATED.

WHAT IS MORE LOGICAL IS WHAT HAS COME OUT IN THE TESTIMONY. THAT LUCAS'S ROLE WAS TO TAKE ANY TELEPHONE CALLS THAT MIGHT COME FROM VARIOUS FRIENDS. WE HAVE ALREADY HEARD FROM THE TESTIMONY THAT A NUMBER OF PEOPLE HAD CALLED THAT NIGHT AND THEY HAD BEEN TOLD, "WE DON'T HAVE ANYTHING PLANNED, CALL BACK TOMORROW."

THAT'S BECAUSE THE OCCUPANTS ENEW THAT THEY
WEREN'T GOING TO PARTY THE NIGHT OF NOVEMBER THE 5TH, 1984.
THEY HAD SOMETHING FAR MORE SERIOUS PLANNED.

AND SO LUCAS WAS TO TELL ANYONE WHO CALLED,
"THERE ISN'T ANY PARTY TONIGHT, THE OTHERS HAVE ALL GONE OVER

TO THE TRAILER TO GET TAPES." AND THAT WAS TO BE THE ALIBI.

1 2

Q

WELL, THE EVIDENCE CLEARLY IS THAT MR. LUCKETT WAS POSSESSING A GUN AFTER THIS OCCURRED. WHEN AKERS CAME BACK FROM THE TRAILER, LUCKETT HAD THE SAWED-OFF RIFLE. I KNOW HE'S ARGUED SOMEHOW THE GUN GOT FROM HIM TO WALSH AND THEN BACK TO HIM IN A MATTER OF MINUTES AND THIS GUN WAS SUPPOSEDLY TOSSED BETWEEN 30 AND 50 FEET BACK TO HIM.

AND HE'S TOLD US THE ONLY REASON HE PICKED IT UP
IS BECAUSE HE GOT TO THINKING, "I MIGHT NEED IT FOR
PROTECTION." HE SAYS HE FORGOT WHEN HE REACHED DOWN AND
PICKED IT UP THAT IT WAS ONLY A SINGLE SHOT. HE SAID HE
DIDN'T REALIZE THAT.

BUT MR. SMITH SAYS IN RESPONSE TO THE PROSECUTION ARGUMENT WHY DIDN'T MR. LUCKETT, WHO WAS ARMED WITH A GUN, USE THAT GUN TO PREVENT THESE CRIMES FROM OCCURRING, WELL, HE WAS FACING A WHOLE ARSENAL.

MR. SMITH POINTED AT THE SAWED-OFF AND SAID IT IS ONLY A LITTLE OLD SINGLE SHOT. MR. SMITH, YOUR CLIENT DIDN'T KNOW THAT ACCORDING TO HIS TESTIMONY AT THAT TIME. BECAUSE HE SAID THE REASON HE PICKED UP THE GUN WAS BECAUSE HE THOUGHT IT STILL HAD BULLETS IN IT. AND IT WASN'T UNTIL AFTER HE PICKED IT UP THAT HE REALIZED IT WAS A SINGLE SHOT.

THIS ISN'T A CASE OF MERE PRESENCE. IT IS NOT A CASE OF COERCION. IF THERE IS ANY PRESSURE AT ALL PURELY AND SIMPLE IS A MATTER OF PEER PRESSURE AS MR. SEATON HAS

SUGGESTED.

WHEN I WENT TO SCHOOL, IN CERTAIN CLASSES THEY
TAUGHT US ABOUT A HERD INSTINCT. AND THE FACT IS THERE ARE
LOTS OF TIMES WHEN YOU GET A GROUP TOGETHER, THEY FEED ON
EACH OTHER AND THEY GET MORAL JUSTIFICATION AND STRENGTH FROM
THE FACT THAT THERE ARE MORE PERSONS THAN ONE AND SO SIX
WOULD DO SOMETHING PERHAPS THAT ONE WOULDN'T.

THE FACT IS LUCKETT WAS DRIVING THE GETAWAY CAR -EXCUSE ME, AKERS WAS DRIVING THE GETAWAY CAR AND WITHOUT
LUCKETT'S HELP, HE WOULDN'T HAVE GOT THE CAR STARTED SO THESE
PEOPLE WOULD ALL HAVE BEEN STUCK THERE AT THE SCENE OF THEIR
CRIMES. THESE ARE ACTIONS OF SOMEONE WHO HAS AIDED AND
ABETTED IN THE COMMISSION OF THESE CRIMES.

MR. SMITH WANTS TO TALK ABOUT A SITUATION WHERE THERE WAS SIMPLY PREPARATION ON HIS CLIENT AND HE DIDN'T DO ANYTHING CULPABLE.

THE PROBLEM WITH THAT IS THE EVIDENCE CLEARLY SHOWS HE AND THE OTHERS HAD ENTERED INTO A CONSPIRACY TO COMMIT BURGLARY AND ROBBERY AND MURDER. IT GOT BEYOND MERE PREPARATION.

IT'S NOT MERE PREPARATION WHEN YOU TALK ABOUT IT AND YOU GET EVERYBODY TOGETHER AND YOU GET THREE GUNS AND YOU LOAD THEM. AND THEN YOU GET INTO A CAR AND YOU DRIVE SIX MILES ACROSS THE TOWN, AND THEN SOMEBODY TEST FIRES A GUN.

AND THEN YOU GO TO THE SCENE AND YOU DIVIDE THE GUNS UP AND

YOU GO ABOUT CARRYING OUT YOUR ROLES.

THAT ISN'T MERE PREPARATION. THAT IS AN ATTEMPT AND IN FELONY MURDER, EITHER ATTEMPT OR THE ACTUAL PERPETRATION WHERE A KILLING RESULTS, LEADS TO MURDER IN THE PIRST DEGREE.

NOW, IT MAY HAVE BEEN THAT AT SOME POINT JOHN RAY LUCKETT WITHDREW. I SUBMIT BASED UPON THIS EVIDENCE, IT WAS AFTER HE PIRED HIS SHOT AND HE KNEW VERY WELL WHEN HE TOOK THAT GUN UP TO THE WINDOW IT ONLY HAD ONE SHOT.

NOW, HE HAD BEEN TOLD BY MR. FLANAGAN THERE IS
JUST GRANDMA AND GRANDPA IN THE HOUSE. BUT MR. LUCKETT
DIDN'T KNOW THAT FOR SURE. IN FACT, NONE OF THESE PEOPLE
KNEW THAT FOR SURE.

AND SO WHEN JOHN RAY LUCKETT FIRED HIS ONE SHOT,
THERE WAS OTHER SHOOTING AND HE WAS CONCERNED THAT THERE
MIGHT BE RETURN FIRE FROM SOMEBODY INSIDE THE HOUSE AND SO HE
SCOOTED AND MR. AKERS FOUND HIM OVER THERE HIDING BEHIND A
TUMBLEWEED.

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN, IT IS VERY, VERY CLEAR FROM THE INSTRUCTIONS YOU HAVE BEEN GIVEN BY THE COURT THAT THE DEFENSE OF COERCION IS NOT AVAILABLE IN A CASE OF PIRST DEGREE MURDER.

I CAN'T THINK OF A CASE WHICH MORE CLEARLY
ESTABLISHES THAT IT WAS FIRST DEGREE MURDER, BECAUSE OF THE
FELONY MURDER RULE AND ALSO BECAUSE OF THE CLEAR PLAN AND

DESIGN TO MURDER TWO HUMAN BEINGS.

.24 COERCION IS NOT AVAILABLE TO JOHN RAY LUCKETT AS A DEFENSE TO MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE.

I WANT TO TALK FOR A FEW MINUTES ABOUT A PROPER BASIS FOR VERDICTS. IN FACT, I HOPE I AM RIGHT. I GOT THE ASSISTANCE OF THE CLERK IN THIS REGARD.

THERE ARE 77 PROPOSED VERDICTS IN THIS CASE.

IT'S GOING TO BE YOUR RESPONSIBILITY TO GO THROUGH AND DECIDE

AS TO EACH DEFENDANT WITH RESPECT TO EACH COUNT WHERE A

DEFENDANT IS CHARGED, WHAT VERDICTS ARE APPROPRIATE.

NOW, SUFFICE IT TO SAY, YOU MUST SELECT AS TO EACH COUNT WHERE SOMEONE IS CHARGED, THE ONE APPROPRIATE VERDICT. THE FACT THAT VERDICTS SAY WAS A DEADLY WEAPON USED OR WASN'T IT MEANS THAT THERE ARE MORE VERDICTS THAN PERHAPS YOU MIGHT ANTICIPATE.

BUT YOU ARE TO SELECT ONE PER DEFENDANT FOR EACH COUNT. BY MY CALCULATION OUT OF THE 77, YOU WILL END UP WITH ABOUT 25 VERDICTS.

NOW, WHAT WILL BE A PROPER BASIS FOR THOSE

VERDICTS? CERTAINLY NOT BIAS, CERTAINLY NOT RACE, CERTAINLY

NOT SYMPATHY OR SPECULATION, AT THIS STAGE OF THE PROCEEDINGS,

ABOUT PUNISHMENT.

NOT YOUTH. REGARDLESS OF THEIR AGES AT THE TIME THESE CRIMES WERE OCCURRED ON WHATEVER CHARGES ARE IDENTIFIED AS BEING ALLEGED AGAINST A PARTICULAR DEPENDANT, THESE YOUNG

MEN ARE BEING TRIED AS ADULTS. AND AT THIS STAGE OF THE PROCEEDINGS, YOUTH IS NOT AN APPROPRIATE BASIS FOR YOUR VERDICTS.

I SYMPATHIZE WITH FRIENDS AND FAMILY OF THESE
YOUNG MEN. I DON'T STAND UP HERE LIGHTLY. I WANT TO TELL
YOU, I HAVE GOT A SON WHO IS 20 AND A DAUGHTER WHO IS 18. I
LOVE MY CHILDREN AND I CAN RELATE TO THE AGONIES THAT FAMILY
AND FRIENDS MUST FEEL AT HAVING THESE YOUNG MEN ON TRIAL.

AND I LISTENED WITH ATTENTION WHEN TWO MOTHERS OF DEFENDANTS CAME INTO THE COURTROOM AND TESTIFIED THAT THEY HAD NEVER SEEN THEIR BOYS DO ANYTHING VIOLENT. I LISTENED WHEN FRIENDS TESTIFIED THAT THESE DEFENDANTS ARE BASICALLY VERY GOOD, VERY NICE BOYS.

I HAVE ONLY THIS TO SAY. THE CORPSES OF COLLEEN AND CARL GORDON ARE A SOMBER AND GRUESOME REBUTTAL OF THE CHARACTER EVIDENCE.

THERE ARE KILLERS IN THIS COURTROOM DESPITE THEIR HANDSOME, INNOCENT, FUZZY-CHEEKED DEMEANOR.

IN NOVEMBER 1984 -- YOU HAVE HEARD THESE LINES

BEFORE -- THEY PROBABLY LOOKED AND ACTED LIKE ORDINARY APPLE

PIE AMERICAN BOYS, WHO LOVED HORSES AND BASEBALL AND

BUDWEISER BEER AND THE CLIFFS AND CHASING CHICKS.

BUT, UNFORTUNATELY, THERE WAS A DARKER AND DEVIANT SIDE TO EACH OF THESE YOUNG MEN. IT'S A CHILLING THOUGHT TO CONTEMPLATE. IT'S HARD TO CONTEMPLATE IT.

THAT SIX YOUNG MEN, YOUNG HOOLIGANS WOULD PLAN
THE MURDER OF TWO INNOCENT HUMAN BEINGS. THIS ISN'T A CASE
WHERE THE KILLINGS OCCURRED ON AN IMPULSE. THIS ISN'T A CASE
OF ACCIDENTAL KILLINGS. IT'S NOT A CASE WHERE A SPOUSE COMES
HOME AND FINDS HIS MATE AND KILLS AS A RESULT OF AN
IRRESISTIBLE IMPULSE.

THESE YOUNG MEN DREW UP A BLUEPRINT DAYS, WEEKS,
MONTHS PERHAPS BEFORE, BECAUSE TOM AKERS SAID IT WAS ABOUT A
MONTH BEFORE IN OCTOBER WHEN HE HEARD THE PLANS DISCUSSED.

THEY GOT GUNS, THEY GOT THE PEOPLE TOGETHER, THEY GOT THE VEHICLE AND THEY WENT ACROSS TOWN WITH ONE PURPOSE, A HOT PROWL MURDER. MR. PLANAGAN, "IT WAS GOING TO HAPPEN TONIGHT. WE ARE GOING TO GO OVER THERE. WE ARE GOING TO KILL THEM."

AFTERWARDS, MR. MCDOWELL, WE SAID THAT AFTER MOST OF THE SHOOTING WAS OVER, HE WENT IN THE HOUSE. HE WENT DIRECTLY TO THE CLOSET. HE FOUND THE PURSE. HE TOOK THE WALLET. HE STARTED TO MOVE FURNITURE AND HE DIDN'T HAVE MUCH TIME.

MR. LUCKETT, HE SAID HE DIDN'T HAVE ENOUGH TIME
TO GET INTO THE HOUSE ACCORDING TO TOM AKERS. MR. PIKE
POINTS OUT THERE WASN'T A WILL. PERHAPS \$96,000 IS
SIGNIFICANT MONEY BUT THE BENEFICIARY OF CARL GORDON'S
EMPLOYMENT-ORIENTED INSURANCE WAS HIS WIFE. THAT DOESN'T
MEAN THESE PEOPLE WEREN'T INVOLVED IN THE KILLING. THAT JUST

MEANS IT WAS TOTALLY SENSELESS.

20.

WHAT IS SIGNIFICANT IS THE STATE OF MIND OF DALE FLANAGAN AND HE THOUGHT THERE WAS INSURANCE. AND HE THOUGHT HE WAS EITHER THE SOLE HEIR OR A PERSON WHO WOULD SPLIT THE ESTATE RIGHT DOWN THE MIDDLE.

THAT'S WHAT HE TOLD HIS CONSPIRATORS BY THE TESTIMONY BEGINNING WITH MR. HAVENS AND THAT'S WHAT HE TOLD ANGELA SALDANA.

I HAVE JUST A COUPLE MORE THINGS TO GET OFF MY CHEST ABOUT THIS CASE. INSTRUCTION 16 TALKS ABOUT RECKLESS DISREGARD, SOCIAL DUTY AND CONSEQUENCES. I HAVE ALWAYS BEEN IMPRESSED WITH WHAT A DIFFERENCE SOMETIMES ONE PERSON CAN MAKE.

AND AS I VIEW THE CRIME SCENE PHOTOGRAPHS OF CARL AND COLLEEN GORDON AND, ALSO, AS I LOOK AT THEM IN THE FORM OF CORPSES COLD AND DEAD WITH RIGOR MORTIS HAVING SET IN ON THE SLAB AT THE MORGUE, I THINK HOW SENSELESS THESE KILLINGS ARE.

WHAT A DIFFERENCE ONE PERSON COULD HAVE MADE.

ONE TELEPHONE CALL. THAT'S WHY COERCION ISN'T A DEFENSE TO
MURDER.

MR. LUCKETT HAD ACCESS TO TELEPHONES, SO DID MR.
MCDOWELL. THEY DIDN'T HAVE TO IDENTIFY THEMSELVES. ALL THEY
HAD TO DO WAS CALL. MAKE IT AN ANONYMOUS CALL BUT ALERT THE
AUTHORITIES.

WHERE WAS THE DECENCY, WHERE WAS THE CONSCIENCE, WHERE WAS THE SENSE OF SOCIAL DUTY ON THE PART OF THE MEN WHO NOW IN SELF-SERVING WAYS SAY, "WE WERE MERELY PRESENT. WE WERE COERCED INTO GOING ALONG"?

23.

THE WRITER OF PROVERBS SAID, "A WORD SPOKEN IN DUE SEASON HOW GOOD IT IS." THE FAMILY OF THE GORDONS WISH SOMEONE HAD SPOKEN A WORD IN DUE SEASON DURING THE WEEKS AND PERHAPS MONTHS BEFORE NOVEMBER THE 5TH WHEN THIS PLAN WAS BEING DISCUSSED.

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN, THESE YOUNG MEN ACTED IN RECKLESS DISREGARD OF THEIR SOCIAL DUTY. AS A RESULT OF THAT, I SAY, BASED UPON THE LAW WHICH APPLIES TO THIS CASE, AND BASED UPON THE EVIDENCE YOU HAVE HEARD, YOU HAVE A LEGAL DUTY.

THEY DECIDED TO BECOME A TEAM, THEN YOU CAN MAKE SURE THAT THERE AREN'T ANY WINNERS.

ACCOUNTABILITY. ISN'T THAT WHAT THE WHOLE CASE
COMES DOWN TO. MR. LUCKETT SAYS — I DON'T KNOW WHETHER HE
WAS JUST TRYING TO DREAM UP A POEM OR LYRICS TO IMPRESS
SOMEBODY IN THE MUSIC BUSINESS OR FOR SOME OTHER REASON OR,
AS MR. SEATON ARGUES, THE LITTLE POEM WHICH HE WROTE REFLECTS
THE TRUE MR. LUCKETT.

THE FACT REMAINS MR. LUCKETT AT ONE POINT SAID,
"IF I HAD A CHOICE, I'D SOAR LIKE A HAWK. I'D SEARCH FOR MY
PREY ONLY AT DARK."

MR. LUCKETT, YOU HAD A CHOICE. MR. MCDOWELL, YOU HAD A CHOICE. THEY ALL HAD CHOICES. NONE OF THEM HAD TO GO ALONG.

1,

THEY ARE FREE AGENTS ON NOVEMBER THE 5TH, 1984.

THE YOUNG MAN WHO SAYS HE WAS COERCED BACK THEN HAS NOT SHOWN
ANY RELUCTANCE IN TAKING THE WITNESS STAND AND TO DISH OUT

VERBAL GUT-PUNCHES TO EVERYBODY ELSE. SOMEHOW THAT IS

INCONSISTENT WITH THE WAY HE SAYS HE WAS ON NOVEMBER THE 5TH,

1984.

MR. FLANAGAN WANTS TO BLAME MR. MOORE THROUGH MR. WITTIG. MR. WITTIG SAID THAT DALE TOLD HIM IT WAS MOORE'S IDEA TO DO IT. MR. WITTIG SAYS IT'S HIS OPINION BECAUSE HE KNOWS DALE REAL WELL THAT HE HAD TO HAVE SOME HELP.

AND THEN MR. LUCKETT THROUGH HIS ATTORNEY DECIDED TO PROJECT THIS NOTION OF WHITE AND BLACK MAGIC INTO THE CASE. I DON'T KNOW THAT IT HAS ANY RELEVANCE BUT IT WAS PROJECTED INTO THIS CASE FOR A REASON.

THAT IS, BECAUSE IT WAS CONTENDED THAT MR. MOORE
IS THE USER OF WHITE MAGIC, DALE FLANAGAN WAS SECOND IN
COMMAND, HE IS BLACK MAGIC BUT THE WHITE IS IMPORTANT BECAUSE
THE ONE WHO USES WHITE IS THE MANIPULATOR.

IN OTHER WORDS, MR. FLANAGAN AND MR. LUCKETT AND,
I GUESS, MR. MCDOWELL WERE SAYING, "WHATEVER RANDY WANTS, RANDY
GETS." AND THE WITNESSES ON BEHALF OF MR. MOORE SAY, "HE IS A
KIND PERSON, I'D NEVER SEEN HIM DO ANYTHING. I HAVE LENT --"

MR. SCHROEDER SAYS, "HE NEVER KILLED ANY OF MY HORSES."

AND MR. MCDOWELL BLAMES ALL THE OTHERS AND MR.

LUCKETT BLAMES THE OTHERS. HE EVEN CLAIMS HE IS A VICTIM OF
A SUBPLOT NOW AND HE SAYS HE WAS COERCED AND NOBODY WANTS TO
ACCEPT RESPONSIBILITY FOR WHAT THEY DID.

BUT THEY ARE RESPONSIBLE. WE ARE IN THIS
COURTROOM AND IT'S NEARLY PAST SEVEN O'CLOCK NOW, NOT BECAUSE
YOU WANTED TO BE HERE, NOT BECAUSE I ASKED TO BE ASSIGNED TO
THIS CASE.

WE ARE HERE BECAUSE THESE YOUNG MEN OF THEIR OWN FREE WILL DECIDED TO TAKE THE LAW INTO THEIR OWN HANDS. THEY WALKED OUT TO THE VEHICLE, THEY TOOK THE GUNS. IT IS THEIR FINGERS WHICH PULLED THE TRIGGER.

AND THEN MR. LUCKETT SAYS BACK AT THE APARTMENT EARLY THE MORNING OF NOVEMBER THE 6TH, 1984, THEY HAD STARTED LIKE EXPLAINING THE ADVENTURE OF DOING THIS AND APPARENTLY THAT'S THE WAY THESE FELLOWS PERCEIVED IT.

THIS WAS SOME TYPE OF ADVENTURE. THIS MORE THAN ANYTHING ELSE WAS PROBABLY JUST A THRILL KILLING.

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN, I STARTED WITH SHAKESPEARE
IN A PACETIOUS WAY. I WANT TO END WITH IT VERY SINCERELY.
HE SAID IN HIS REDUCTION OF MERCHANTS OF VENICE, "TRUTH WILL
COME TO LIGHT, MURDER CANNOT BE HID LONG."

AND MURDERS HAVE BEEN EXPOSED AND IN THIS
COURTROOM YOU HAVE LEARNED THE IDENTITY OF THE MURDERERS AND

THE PEOPLE WHO AIDED THEM IN THEIR MURDER.

THE TERRIBLE TRUTH IS THAT A GRANDSON PLOTTED TO KILL HIS GRANDPARENTS. AND HE ENLISTED THE HELP OF CERTAIN FRIENDS, PIVE OF THEM IN NUMBER, WHO WILLINGLY AND VOLUNTARILY BECAME PART OF THAT SAME PLOT.

WHEN YOU WERE SELECTED AS JURORS IN THIS CASE,
YOU PROMISED WHEN YOU RAISED YOUR RIGHT HAND AND TOOK YOUR
OATH THAT YOU WOULD BASE YOUR VERDICTS UPON THE EVIDENCE IN THE
CASE.

YOU PROMISED YOU WOULD DO EQUAL AND EXACT JUSTICE
TO THE DEFENDANTS AND TO THE STATE OF NEVADA. YOU PROMISED
IN A SENSE YOU WOULD CONVICT IF THE EVIDENCE PROVED THEY WERE
GUILTY.

IN THE STATE'S OPENING REMARKS, AT THE COMMENCEMENT OF THE EVIDENCE IN THIS CASE, WE PROMISED YOU THAT WE WOULD PROVE OUR CASE BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT. I SAY WE HAVE KEPT OUR PROMISE. I NOW ASK YOU TO KEEP YOURS.

THE COURT: THANK YOU, MR. HARMON. MR. BAILIFF, WILL YOU COME FORWARD, PLEASE, AND BE SWORN, TAKE CHARGE OF THE JURY.

(BAILIFF WAS DULY SWORN.)

THE COURT: THANK YOU. LADIES AND GENTLEMEN, I
WANT TO THANK YOU FOR YOUR PATIENCE TODAY. IT'S BEEN A LONG
DAY. I AM GOING TO ASK THAT YOU GO WITH THE BAILIFF TO THE
JURY ROOM TO SELECT A FOREMAN AND NOT DO MUCH BEYOND THAT

THIS EVENING. ADJOURN, COME BACK TOMORROW MORNING WHEN YOU CAN BEGIN IN EARNEST YOUR DELIBERATION. MR. BAILIFF. COURT IS ADJOURNED.

(COURT RECESSED FOR JURY DELIBERATIONS.)