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THE COURT: Ne'll make that, the old one, a Court's exhibit, to solidify what we talked about, and we will exchange this one which I made my, while we were waiting for you guys to come, we just added weapon.

MS. PANDUKHT: Okay.
THE COURT: And if thet's okay with both
sides, we'll switch them out and send it back.
That's all they wanted to let us know.

MS. PANDUKET: Okay. No problem. No
objection.

THE COURT: Okay, great. Thanks. We'll
go back off the recond.

MS. PANDUKHT: Okay.
(Whereupon, a recess was had while the
jury deliberated,
THE COURT: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. We're on the record on State of Nevada versus Evaristo Garcia. Case No. C262966.

Let: the record reflect the
defendant's present with his attoxneys, Mr. Goodman and Mr. Figler. And for the State, Ms. Pandukht is present.

We're in the presence of the jurors, and it's my understanding that the jury has reached

```
a verdict. Is that correct, whoever the foreperson
is?
    FOREMAN ARCANA: That's coxrect.
        THE COURT; And Can you state your name?
    And you're Juror No. }3\mathrm{ for the record.
        FOREMAN ARCANA: That's right, yes. My
    name is Michael Arcana.
        THE COURT: Okay.
        FOREMAN ARCANA: Juror No.3.
        THE COURT: All right. Can you hand it
    to the marshal and we will record the verdict? All
    right. I'm gonna ask the defendant to please stand
    and my clerk will now read the verdict out loud.
        THE CLERK: In the District Court, Clark
        County, Nevada, the State of Nevada, plaintiffe,
        versus Evaristo Jonathan Garcia, defendant. Gase
        C262966. Depamtment 15, verdict.
                            We the jury in the abovementitled
case find the defendant Evaristo Jonathan Garcia as
follows:
    Count T, conspireoy wo commit
muxder, not guilty.
    Gount IT, murder wuth use of a
deadly weapon, guilty of second-degree muxder with
use of a deadly weapon.
```

```
            Signed and dated the 15th day of
    July 2013. Signed by jury foreperson Michael
Arcana.
                                Ladies and gentlemen, are these your
verdicts as read so say you one so say you all?
    THE UURY: Yes.
    THE COURT: All right. Does either of
the parties desire to have the jury polled?
    MS. PANDUKHT: Not the State, Your Honor.
    MR. FIGLER: Yes, Your Bonor.
    THE COURT: All right. Defense would
like the fury polled.
    THE CLERK: Lisa Griffis, are these your
verdicts as read?
    JUROR GRTFPIS: Yes, they are.
    THE CLERK: Namit Bhatnagar, are these
your verdicts as read?
    JUROR BHATNAGAR: Yes.
    THE CLERK: Michael Arcana, are these
your verdicts as read?
    JUROR ARCANA: Yes, they are.
    THE CLERK: Pamela Olson, are these your
verdicts as read?
    JUROR OLSON: Yes, they are.
    THE CLERK: Jackie Wiese, are these your
```
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```
verdicts as read?
    UUROR NTESE: yes.
    THE CLERK: Angelica Numez-Morarrez, are
thege your verdicts as read?
    JUROR NUMEZ-MORARREZ: Yes.
    THE COURT: Keith Trombetta, are these
your verdicts as read?
    JUROR TROMBETTA: YES.
    THE CLERK: Chwistina Beber, are these
your verdicts as read?
    JUROR BEBER: YES.
    THE CLERK; Erica Villanueva, are these
your verdicts as read?
    UUROR VINIANUEVA: YeS.
    HGE CHERK: Joseph Catello, are these
your verdicts as read?
    JUROR CATETUO: YeS.
    THE CLERK; David McCallum, are these
your verdicts as read?
    JUROR MCCALLUM: Yes.
    MHE CLERK: ElNzabeth Uhrle, are these
your verdicts as read?
    UUROR UHRTE: YeS.
    THE COURT: All right. The clerk is now
gonna record the verdict in the minutes of the
```

JO ANN MELENDEZ - (702) 283-2151

```
court.
```

Ladies and gentlemen, as you know,
the right to a trial by a jury is one of our basic
and fundamental constitutional rights. So on behalf
of counsel, the parties in the Eighth Judicial
District court, I want to thank you for your carefult
deliberation which you gave to this case.

The question may arise as to whether you may now talk to other persons regarding this matter. I advise you that you may, if you wish, talk to other persons and discuss your deliberation which you gave to this case, but you are not required to do so.

If anybody pesters you or you don't want to and you're being, you know, harassed, you just let the Court know and we'll take care of that, but you may speak to whoever you want to as well about this case now that you're gonna be excused.

So again, on behalf of the State of Nevada, I want to thank you again and you're excused as jurors. I'd ask you to follow Marshal Ellis to the conference room.
(Whereupon, the jury exited the courtroom.)

THE COURT: All right. We're outside the

```
presence of the jury. I Just want to make sure that
stipulation had been filed for purposes of making a
record.
                    Has that stipulation on punishment
on the first been filed?
    MR. FIGLER: We didn"t get that filed.
I'm sorry, Your Honor. It doesn't matter now.
    THE COURT: Tt's not gonna matter now. I
think it`s moot.
    MS. PANDUKHT: I agmee.
    THE COURT: And, you know, we've made
continual records. So I just don't think it matters
at this point.
            Would both parties agree with me?
    MR, FTGLER: I would, Your Honor, And itw
was only in relation to first-degree murder. The
jury did not come back with fixst-degree murder.
    THE COURT: Correct.
    MS. PANDUKHT: Yes.
    WHE COURT: So at this time sentencang
will be up to the court.
    MS. PANDUKHT: Yes.
    THE COURP: And whet I'm gonna do is
remanding the defendant, no bail at this point. His
sentencing date will be two months.
```

Here's the next court date.

THE CLERK: September 12 th at 9 a. m .
MR, FTGLER: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you very much, We'II
go off the record.
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DISTRICT COURT CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

THE STATE OF NEVADA, Plaintiff, -vs.

EVARISTO JONATHAN GARCIA, Defencant.

Case No. C 252966
Dept No. XV

## VERDICT


GARCIA, as follows:
COUNT 1 - CONSPIRACY TO COMMIT MURDER
(please checl the appropriate box, select only one)
$\square$ Guilty of Conspiracy to Commit Murder
Not Guilty

COUNT 2 -MURDER WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON
(please check $\begin{gathered}\text { lie appropriate box, select only one) }\end{gathered}$
$\square$ Guilty of First Degree Murder with Use of a Deadly Weapon
$\square$ Guilty of First Degree Murder
Guilty of Second Degree Murder with Use of a Deadly Weapon
$\square$ Guilty of Second Degree Murder
$\square$ Guilty of Voluntary Manslaughter with Use of a Deadly Weapon
$\square$ Guilty of Voluntary Manslaughter
$\square$ Not Guilty

DATED this 15 day of July, 2013


MOT
ROSS C. GOODMAN, ESQ.
Nevada Bar No. 007722
DAYVID J. FIGLER, ESQ.
Nevada Bar No. 004264
615 S. 6th Street
Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
Phone (702) 222-0007
Fax (702) 222-0001
Attorneys for Defendant,
EVARISTO J. GARCIA

## DISTRICT COURT CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA *****

STATE OF NEVADA, Plaintiff,
vs.
EVARISTO J. GARCIA,
Defendant.
) CASENO. 10C262966-1
) DEPT. NO. XV)
) MOTION FOR ACQUITTAL OR IN THE ) ALTERNATIVE, MOTION FOR NEW ) TRIAL )

COMES NOW the Defendant, EVARISTO J. GARCIA, by and through his attomeys, DAYVID J. FIGLER, ESQ. and ROSS C. GOODMAN, ESQ., and submits this Motion for Acquittal or in the Alternative, Motion for New Trial pursuant to NRS 175.381 and NRS 176.515. This motion is supported by the attached points and authorities, and hereby incorporates by reference all prior pleadings in this matter as well as any argument deemed necessary by this Court.

DATED this 22nd day of July, 2013.
Respectfully Submitted by:
/s/Davvid J. Figler. Esq.
DAYVID J. FIGLER, ESQ.
Nevada Bar No. 004264
615 S. 6th Street
Las Vegas, NV 89101 Attorneys for Defendant, EVARISTO J. GARCIA

## NOTICE OF HEARING

TO: STATE OF NEVADA, Plaintiff;
TO: CLARK COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY, Attorney for Plaintiff;
TO: NOREEN C. DEMONTE, ESQ., Chief Deputy District Attorney, and SCOTT L. BINDRUP, ESQ., Chief Deputy District Attomey, Attomeys for Plaintiff;

YOU, AND EACH OF YOU, WILL PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that the undersigned will bring the foregoing motion of for setting before the above entitled Court, in Department XV, thereof, on the 1 st day of August , 2013, at the hour of 9:00 A. Whock A.M. or as soon thereafter as counsel may be heard.

DATED this 22nd day of July, 2013.
Respectfully Subnitted by:
/s./ Dayvid J. Figler, Esq, DAYVID J. FIGLER, ESQ.
Nevada Bar No. 004264
615 S. 6th Street
Las Vegas, NV 89101
Attorneys for Defendant,
EVARISTOJ. GARCIA

## POINIS AND AUTHORITIES

## STATEMENT OF FACTS AND CASE

Evaristo Garcia, 16, was accused of shooting and killing Victor Gamboa, 15, as the ostensible outgrowth of a schoolyard brawl, though there was no evidence that the boys knew each other or ever engaged in any conflict or actual fight even up to the seconds before the shooting. Indeed, of the dozen or so available witnesses who indicated they were in or an observer to the brawl, none (with the exception of Jonathan Harper) were able to identify Evaristo Garcia out of a line-up as even being at the school, let alone being the shooter. No physical evidence placed Evaristo Garcia at the scene of the shooting, or the prior fight, or the car, which allegedly transported Evaristo Garcia to the school, or the gray hoodie the shooter was agreed upon by almost every witness to have worn. In fact, no reliable evidence even placed the Defendant in Sal Garcia's apartment where the parties who went to the school were located when the call came in to go to the school.

Indeed, one of the State's key witnesses, Betty Graves, testified that she stared directly into the face of the boy she attributed as the shooter, and yet there was no evidence that she was able to identify Evaristo Garcia as being that boy at any time.

The State had originally alleged that this was an outgrowth of gang violence and that Evaristo Garcia was both a member of the gang, and that the shooting was an act done in furtherance of the gang. Halfway through the trial it became abundantly clear that the State could not meet the burden for showing that the group of kids charged in the conspiracy were a "gang" under the legal definition, let alone that this random shooting was an act done in furtherance for the benefit of this non-existing gang. The Defense made an oral motion for mistrial based (1) on the bad faith of bringing gang charges when there was no sufficient basis and (2) the prejudice to the Defendant having to endure voir dire, opening statements, and the first half of the trial under the specter of being in a gang. The State was allowed to make a written memo in support of why the gang theory was pursued and the Court denied the Defense motion without prejudice to readdress the issues contained therein if warranted.

Once the gang enhancements were gone, the State ultimately abandoned the "challenge to fight" theory of first-degree murder under NRS 200.450 prior to submission to the jury.

The trial proceeded with some significant surprises along the way that operated to the prejudice of the defendant.

First, Melissa Gamboa (the sister of the decedent) was expected to identify the Defendant in Court as she had done so at the preliminary hearing. Prior to trial, however, the Defendant had moved this Court to exclude and suppress Ms. Gamboa's prior in-court identification as being overly suggestive. It is undisputed that Ms. Gamboa did not pick the Defendant out of a photo line-up prior to the preliminary hearing (there was contradicting evidence as to whether or not she was shown a line-up). The Court denied the Defendant's Motion to Suppress. At trial, Ms. Gamboa was unable to identify the Defendant as the person who shot her brother, thus bolstering the Defendant's concern about the prior identification coming into evidence and prejudicing him. The State, over objection, was allowed to bring a photo of the Defendant taken around two months prior to the preliminary hearing and asked Ms. Gambon if that was the person who shot her brother. This was an improper back-door method of presenting an already tainted identification that no amount of cross examination could correct. What should have been the end of any testimony on the subject (failure to identify the Defendant at trial) turned into a better scenario for the State wherein the State urged the jury to excuse the failure to identify as the outgrowth of the Defendant aging. Most of the other witnesses who observed the Defendant at the time of the preliminary hearing had no difficulty identifying him Court.

Second, to the surprise of the Defendant, the State called Edshel Calvillo while ensconced in chains under a so-called "material witness" warrant. There were a number of reasons why the Defendant was shocked that Edshel Calvillo was called to the stand. Beyond not telling the Defense despite a veneer of cooperation, Edshel Calvillo had once before testified in an ancillary proceeding (the shooting of Jonathan Harper) in a manner that the same counsel in the present matter had labeled very succinctly as "lies" in her closing statement. As such, the State placed on the stand an individual who they already had encountered as a perjurer.

Next, it was clear from a reading of Calvillo's statement to the police that his testimony was so utterly unbelievable from its internal inconsistencies and external contradictions ${ }^{1}$ that it would be a farce to present him as a credible State's witness. Finally, and most troubling, there has yet been any exploration why Calvillo was brought into the courtroom in chains and how in was determined that he was in need of a "material witness warrant." It is the Defendant's position that bringing the known perjurer, Calvillo, unexpectedly into the courtroom in chains was a charade designed to garner credibility to the otherwise non-credible witness.

Indeed, this maneuver was done so suddenly at the second day of trial and without any discourse before the Court that this Court should take great pause. When the subject was discussed, the State indicated that while served properly, Calvillo "did not show up" to the optional pre-trial conferences on "as expected on Monday." Monday was jury selection and there were no witnesses observed by the Defense as having showed up at the courtroom that day at noon. According to the Court record, the ex pate application for a material witness warrant was submitted and signed by 2:00 P.M. that same day. It should be of special note that in the State's ex parte application it was averred that Calvillo would have information about the gang enhancement (which was dropped) and admitted that Calvillo was part of "an orchestrated attempt by members of the Puros Locos gang to secure the acquittal of Salvador Garcia." Yet, at the sudden and without warning the now "sympathetic" Calvillo was brought in front of the jury to testify that the Defendant had admitted the offense to him, though all parties, and especially the State knew it was unreliable testimony at best.

Third, and to no surprise of the Defendant, Detective Ken Hardy testified that he had concerns that the gun at issue had not been properly tested for DNA. To corroborate this, the Defense had produced what was later marked as Defense Exhibit A showing that it was a belt buckle of the decedent, and not the gun slide that was tested. The Defense and State went arounc
${ }^{1}$ For starters, Calvillo told police that he voluntarily was giving the statement to tell the truth and then proceeded to lie that he received a phone call from the Defendant. When the police debunked that, he claimed the Defendant picked him up in a non-existent white car and drove him to a park to confess. When the police debunked that, Calvillo couldn't even remember the
this issue for a short while through witness, but ultimately (after Motion to Dismiss was denied), the State convinced this Court that the swabbing of the slide was in fact the one that was tested. yet curiously the State never was able to fulfill its offer of proof necessary to even have that swab (State's proposed Exhibit 109) admitted into evidence. There was an incomplete chain of custody and the actual record now belies any suggestion that the correct swabbing was done. The person who allegedly took the proper swab was never called to testify and the exhibit was not admitted. The Defendant's motion to dismiss was therefore proper and should have been granted. Moreover, the State admitted that no other efforts were made to preserve any DNA on the weapon. It most also be noted that no DNA linked the gun to the Defendant.

Finally, Jonathan Harper testified. The Court ruled that he was an uncharged accomplice and therefore his testmony was required to be corroborated. Jonathan Harper, despite having lost 23 percent of his brain tissue, testified in the way expected by the Defense as a result of efficient pre-trialing by the State. If one were, however, to look at Jonathan Harper's prior testimony both at the preliminary hearing and grand jury in this matter, it is clear that Jonathan Harper was testifying either as a result of (1) confabulation or (2) falsehood. One cannot look at Jonathan Harper's trial testimony as the truth since it so vastly differs from his prior testimony. Notably, his prior testimony was repeatedly rehabilitated through prior inconsistent statements from his original statement; he either claimed different knowledge or no memory when he testified. Now, and several years later, Jonathan Harper was able to flawlessly go through the events of the day without a single need by the State to rehabilitate with prior statements as they had been required to do dozens of times at the earlier proceedings.

Additionally, Jonathan Harper testified that he in close enough proximity to the shooting to actually hear Giovanny Garcia encourage the Defendant to shoot Victor Gamboa. No othen witness (not Melissa Gamboa, Principal Dan or any other State's witnesses) heard such an exchange. Moreover, every State witness indicated there was either one or two boys pursuing Gamboa, no one mentioned a third in close proximity (Jonathan Harper). If nothing else, this

Defendant's name when asked who the parties were who returned from the school shooting Calvillo tellingly first uttered... Sal (the alleged leader of the group of kids).
either proves that Harper was (a) lying or (b) was one of the two boys pursuing Gambon and may, himself, have been the shooter. Likewise, Harper testified that the shooter unloaded his clip into the body of Gamboa, which was contracticted by the Coroner.

In a word, Jonathan Harper's testimony was a farce, and that's why the Defense objected to his testimony without a Court-order direct examination by Dr. Roitman to psychologically get to the core of this issue. The Court, without the benefit of seeing the discrepancy it witnessed at trial, denied the Defense motion. And while Dr. Roitman was able to testify as to general characteristics, his lack of actual examination of Jonathan Harper (which is hindsight would have been legally proper) was exploited by the State. More importantly, only Calvillo corroborated Harper and then only ambiguously since Calvillo adamantly denied he was at the school (though he did finally admit contrary to his statement to the police that he never left Sal's apartment).

Thus, the State proceeded on a very weak case. The only actual evidence that linked the Defendant to the offense was that two of his fingerprints (out of three of value and countless. more that were not of testing quality) appeared on the gun, and two years later he was located in Mexico. Regarding the former, the Defense more than adequately elicited testimony that the Defendant's fingerprints on the gun meant nothing more than at some time and place the Defendant had held the gun - a point not disputed by the Defense - but that does not rise to the level of reasonable doubt necessary to establish he was the shooter. Regarding the latter, the State did not establish when the Defendant went to Mexico or under what circumstances. The State was unable to show that the Defendant went to Mexico after the arrest warrant was issued (June, 2006), or if he had, that he hadn't gone done to Mexico years after the shooting. In sum, there was NO evidence as to when the Defendant first left Las Vegas. Even together with other evidence adduced, there was insufficient evidence to meet the high burden of reasonable doubt.

The jury was presented with a two-count Indictmeat alleging conspiracy to commit murder and murder (which included as an alternate theory -. conspiracy). The Defendant was acquitted of conspiracy and found guilty of second-degree murder with use of a deadly weapon. The instant motion follows.

## LEGAL ARGUMENT

A Motion for an Acquittal notwithstanding the verdict is allowed pursuant to NRS 175.381. A Motion for New Trial is allowed pursuant to NRS 176.515. Both Motions are timely filed in the case sub judice as the Verdict was not received until July 15, 2013. This Motion is being filed timely.

## A. MOTION FOR ACQUITTAL

NRS 175.381 (2) and (3) provides:
(2) The court may, on a motion of a defendant or on its own motion, which is made after the jury returns a verdict of guilty or guilty but mentally ill, set aside the verdict and enter a judgment of acquittal if the evidence is insufficient to sustain a conviction. The motion for a judgment of acquittal must be made within 7 days after the jury is discharged or within such further time as the court may fix during that period.
(3) If a motion for a judgment of acquittal after a verdict of guilty or guilty but mentally ill pursuant to this section is granted, the court shall also determine whether any motion for a new trial should be granted if the judgrnent of acquittal is thereafter vacated or reversed. The court shall specify the grounds for that determination. If the motion for a new trial is granted conditionally, the order thereon does not affect the finality of the judgment. If the motion for a new trial is granted conditionally and the judgment is reversed on appeal, the new trial must proceed unless the appellate court has otherwise ordered. If the motion is denied conditionally, the defendant on appeal may assert error in that denial, and if the judgment is reversed on appeal, subsequent proceedings must be in accordance with the order of the appellate court.

The Defendant avers that as a matter of law, the State did not produce even the minimum threshold of legally sufficient evidence to support a conviction of Evaristo Garcia was guilty under EITHER of the alternate theories of liability presented. Indeed, the jury specifically rejected the conspiracy theory and as such, must have found (though unsupported) that the Defendant was the shooter (albeit one lacking in premeditation or deliberation despite having shot the victim in the back after a chase). And while the State arguably proved beyond a reasonable doubt that the young man in the gray hoodie was the shooter, there was scant
evidence (let alone that beyond reasonable doubt) that Evaristo Garcia was the boy in the gray hoodie, In fact, the Court ruled that as a matter of law Jonathan Harper needed to be corroborated and as a matter of law, the record is devoid of legally allowable corroboration as would support a conviction. As such, this Court has the authority on the record as it stands to grant an acquittal.

## B. MOTION FOR NEW TRIAL

In the alternative, the Defense would submit that the State's manipulation of the facts (not borne out at trial) in pre-trial motions warrants the granting of a new trial. Spectically, if the Court knew at the pre-trial motion hearings, what it ultimately learned at trial, there would have been a very different outcome.

NRS 176.515 provides that:

1. The court may grant a new trial to a defendant if required as a matter of law or on the ground of newly discovered evidence.
2. If trial was by the court without a jury, the court may vacate the judgment if entered, take additional testimony and direct the entry of a new judgment.
3. Except as otherwise provided in NRS 176.0918, a motion for a new trial based on the ground of newly discovered evidence may be made only within 2 years after the verdict or finding of guilt.
4. A motion for a new trial based on any other grounds must be made within 7 days after the verdict or finding of guilt or within such further time as the court may fix during the 7 -day period.

The record is replete with support for a new trial.
For instance, the State should not have been able to refer in any way to Melissa Gamboa's faulty in-court identification of the Defendant, let alone bolster it by showing her a picture of the Defendant from 2008. In fact, showing the picture was a greater violation of an overly suggestive identification than what was being initially challenged. The Defense objected strenuously, but the State was able to benefit even greater from a legally insufficient identification.

Likewise, Jonathan Harper should not have been able to testify without being fully subjected to a psychological analysis to determine his competence as a witness. While giving a fluid and damning account of events at trial seven years after his brain had been blown out by Sal Garcia (and possibly in orchestration with Edshel Calvillo), the Court must now see after review of the earlier testimony and the testimony of Dr. Roitman that this Jonathan Harper was not a competent witness in that his testimony could NOT have been truthful, or capable of truthfulness. Indeed, the fluid, almost flawless testimony of Harper at trial is a red flag of unreliability given his prior testimony and the context. If anything, it had to be so polished and rehearsed that it was error to even be presented; and the defense despite pre-trial motions designed to uncover this charade were stymied. In a tew trial, the Defense would renew its effort to examine Jonathan Harper and/or exclude his testimony as is proper.

Further, Edshel Calvillo should not have had a material witness warrant issued against him and the discussion of whether or not he be presented in chains should have been discussed before he was paraded out in front of the jury. Clearly, the jury's view of Mr. Calvillo in this setting was designed to bolster his credibility (i.e. "forcing" him at great personal suffering to testify in chains against his "friend"). Further, there can be certain circumstances where the coercive environment is so overwhelming that it is akin to securing a witness to testify in a particular fashion. "Government misconduct that amounts to substantial interference with a witness' free and unhampered determination to testify may be deemed a violation of due process." United States v. Foster, 128 F.3d 949, 953 (6th Cir.1997). In considering "prosecutorial misconduct," the U.S. Supreme Court has stated that prosecutors must "refrain from improper methods calculated to produce a wrongful conviction." Berger v. United States, 295 U.S. 78, 88. 55 S.Ct. 629, 79 L.Ed. 1314 (1935). The Supreme Cout has also held that the appropriate standard of review for prosecutorial misconduct is "the narrow one of due process," because a defendant's due process rights are violated when a prosecutor's misconduct renders a tria "fundamentally unfair." Darden v. Wainwright, 477 U.S. $168,181,106$ S.Ct. 2464, 91 L.Ed.2d 144 (1986). See also Greer v. Miller, 483 U.S. $756,765,107$ S.Ct. 3102,97 L.Ed. 2 d 618 (1987); Donnelly v. DeChristoforo, 416 U.S. 637, 642,94 S.Ct. 1868, 40 L.Ed. 2 d 431 (1974). As such.
the State's tactics here were designed either to make sure Calvillo testified in a certain way favorable to the State and/or presented him in a way in chains to bolster credibility - either way, it was a violation of the Defendant's due process rights to have this evidence received in such a fashion.

Also, while the Defense was aware of Calvillo's earlier statement, it was so far-fetched that Calvillo, a person known to the State to be a perjurer, would be called to testify and so the Defense to some degree was caught at unawares. More significantly, however, is that the Defense learned new information on the stand that Calvillo did not reveal to the police in the earlier statement, to wit, that he did in fact embark upon a journey to the school to engage in a fight. (He told police he didn't). As such, the Defense faced with this new evidence could now do an investigation into Calvillo as an alternate suspect. Certainly, he fits the general description of the shooter, and his denial that he did not make it all the way to the school should be treated with the same reliability as when he told the police he did not leave the apartment. In other words, Calvillo's admission that he and Sal actually got in a car and headed to the school is a game changer, in and of itself, warranting a Motion for a New Trial.

Next, it was error for the State to rehabilitate the "swab" as being properly gathered and tested when the evidence that was admitted suggested it wasn't, and the offer of proof the State presented was never fulfilled. Specifically, the State, contrary to its promise, never completed the chain of custody regarding the swab of the gun slide, and never admitted the swab into evidence. As such, the suggestion that the proper swab was taken and submitted for testing is, cumulatively, additional grounds for a new trial.

Finally, it was absolute prejudice for the State to proceed through this trial with a gang enhancement theory. Their unfounded pursuit of this theory tainted jury selection and opening statements as well as other witnesses cross-examination. And while the State did a yeoman's job in explaining to the Court through its Meno that they expected witnesses to testify that the Defendant was "in their gang" - they made no legitimate representation that the State could eves prove that LEGALLY this was a gang. The Defense had objected by writ, and during trial, and yet the State proceeded. Nothing in the memo changes that there was a bad faith effort to sully
the Defendant and the proceedings with gang references when in fact they could NEVER have PROVEN that this a gang per statute with felonious activities as their commonality. The State knew there were never sufficient felony convictions to establish a gang, and yet proceeded anyhow in violation of statute and their obligation to seek justice under the law. Jimenez v. State, 112 Nev. 610, 618, 918 P.2d 687, 692 (1996) ("The prosecutor represents the state and has a duty to see that justice is done in a criminal prosecution.'); ABA Standards for Criminal Justice, Prosecution Function Standard 3-1.2(c) (3d ed. 1993) ("The duty of the prosecutor is to seek justice, not merely to convict."); Id. cmt. ("[I]t is fundamental that the prosecutor"s obligation is to protect the innocent as well as to convict the guilty, to guard the rights of the accused as well as to enforce the rights of the public"). See also, Berger v. United States, 295 U.S. $78,88,55$ S.Ct. 629, 79 L.Ed. 1314 (1935), Darden v. Wainwright, 477 U.S. 168, 181, 106 S.Ct. 2464, 91 L.Ed. 2 d 144 (1986). Greer y. Miller, 483 U.S. $756,765,107$ S.Ct. 3102, 97 L.Ed. 2 d 618 (1987); Donnelly y, DeChristoforo, 416 U.S. $637,642,94$ S.Ct. 1868,40 L.Ed. 2 d 431 (1974). The motion for mistrial is still ripe.

In the present case, the State attempted to corroborate an accomplice who in all likelihood was incompetent to testify with a known perjurer (specifically one who "orchestrated testimony" in this prosecutor's words in another one of her related cases) who was brought into court in chains without benefit or time for a pre-trial discussion. The State also created out of whole cloth a second $1 D$ of the defendant from a picture shown to Melissa Gamboa when the State knew that the prior in-court ID was already tenuous and subject to suppression. Finally, the State discarded all the witnesses (basically everyone else) who did not identify Garcia as the shooter and was able (because of their misguided effort to convict when the evidence did not support) conflate the gray-hoodied individual with the Defendant. A careful reading of the record will reven that every witness who had close contact with the shooter in the gray hoodie (i.e, Principal Dan, Betty Graves, Joseph Harris, Crystal Perez, Bryan Marquez, etc.) DID NOT identify Evaristo Garcia as the boy in the hoodie.
"Historically, Nevada has empowered the trial court in a criminal case where the evidence of guilt is conflicting, to independently evaluate the evidence and order another trial if
it does not agree with the jury's conclusion that the defendant has been proven guilty beyond a reasonable doubt." State y, Purcell, 110 Nev, 1389,887 P. 2 d 276 (1994) citing Washington $y$. State, 98 Nev. 601, 604, 655 P.2d 531, 532 (1982) (quoting State y. Busscher, 81 Nev. 587, 589, 407 P. $2 \mathrm{~d} 715,716$ (1965)). Further, in State v. Walker, 109 Nev. 683, $685-86,857$ P.2d 1, 2 (1993), the Nevada Supreme Court stated: "[A] conflict of evidence occus where there is sufficient evidence presented at trial which, if believed, would sustain a conviction, but this evidence is contested and the district judge, in resolving the conflicting evidence differently from the jury, believes the totality of evidence fails to prove the defendant guilty beyond a reasonable doubt." See also State v. Purcell, 110 Nev, 1389, 887 P. 2 d 276 (1994).

In the present case, the Court saw the Defense eviscerate the credibility of Edshel Calvillo and prove how he provided no basis for the necessary corroboration of Jonathan Harper. Further, the Court heard all about the prior testimony under oath of Jonathan Harper, as well as the circumstances of his original statement, and how he conflicted with himself, as well as other witnesses. Finally, the Court was able to survey the totality of circumstances including the vast amount of conflicting evidence (and lack of evidence) resulting in the State relying in essence on two things: (1) the happenstance of the Defendant's fingerprints on a gun admitted uncontestedly handled by numerous parties (including Edshel Garcia, Sal Garcia, Manuel Lopez and Jonathan Harper) and (2) Defendant's presence in Mexico during an unknown duration. These two facts. given the totality of the circumstances, are insufficient to support a conviction for murder.

Likewise, the Court heard how the parties involved were at Sal Garcia's house, that Manuel Lopez got the call, how Manuel Lopez owned the gun, how Manuel Lopez owned and drove the car, and how Manuel Lopez had prior connection to the site of the gun retrieval after the fact, and in fact, himself tried to retrieve it. Manuel Lopez was able to plead to a voluntary manslaughter conviction.

There was no similarly convincing evidence against Evaristo Garcia warranting conviction. A new trial is required.

Moreover, because of the tortured due process concerns from the onset of this case in the District Court, the Defense suggests that pursuant to his Constitutional rights. "Cumulative error
applies where, although no single trial error examined in isolation is sufficiently prejudicial to warrant reversal, the cumulative effect of multiple errors has still prejudiced a defendant," Whelchel $v$, Washington, 232 F.3d 1197, 1212 (9th Cir.2000) (internal quotation marks and alterations omitted). The touchstone inquiry is whether the aggregated errors " 'so infected the trial with unfairness as to make the resulting conviction a denial of due process." "Parle y . Runnels, 387 F.3d 1030, 1045 (9th Cir.2004) (quoting Donnelly v . DeChristoforo, 416 U.S. 637 , 643, 94 S.Ct. 1868, 40 L.Ed.2d 431 (1974)). Defendant suggests that given the nature and circumstances of this case, it cannot be said that because of the machinations both pre-trial and at trial, he ultimately received the protections of due process.

DATED this 22nd day of July, 2013.
Respectfully Submitted by:
/s, Dayvid J. Figler, Esq.
DAYVID J. FIGLER, ESQ.
Nevada Bar No. 004264
615 S. 6th Street
Las Vegas, NV 89101
Attorneys for Defendant,
EVARISTOJ, GARCIA
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PROCEEDTNGS

THE COURT: So the last case on calendar is Evaristo Garcia. Case No. C262966. He's present in custody with his counsel Mr. Figler, Mr. Goodman. For the State, Ms. Demonte and Ms. Pandukht.

Okay. So I read the points and authorities. I'm happy to hear any further argument.

I am embarrassed that the State used
like two quotes of mine. Something about a babbling baby and -- I don't think I'm gonna -- you know, I just talk.

MR. FIGLER: Right.
THE COURT: And I got the babbling baby right back in my face. So that's great for the supreme court.

MR. FIGLER: I won't belabor it, judge. You said --

THE COURT: Very judicious, very judicious when I talk about competency and a babbling baby. So you know I read it.

MR. FIGIER: Right.
THE COURT: Go ahead and tell me more.
MR. FTELER: Right. And, and we didn't
file a reply brief because we know that you read all the stuff and we know that you lived through the, the proceeding.

I mean, basically we were looking at it this way: That the state had two facts that were undentable, which was that he was found in Mexico and that his fingerprints were on the gun. Everything else was in play.

And it's, it's our position that based on the points that were raised in the, the brief, the conflicting evidence that was remarkable, the lack of corroboration of Jonathan Harper and the issues with Jonathan Harper, the issues surrounding the prior identification all together led for ultimately lack of faith in the ultimate verdict that was received based on the state of the evidence.

And we felt that despite the fact that they had acquitted him on the conspiracy to commit murder obviousiy came to some manner of interesting compromise for giving him a lesser included on the main charge that the verdict still
cannot withstand a sufficiency of the, of the evidence. That would amount to an acquittal from the court. However, if the court merely found that there was conflicting evidence that was significant enough to not support the verdict, then your Honor could order a new trial.

Based on all that, that we presented in the brief, we would say that that would be -either one of those would be an appropriate analysis of the case.

So of course we would ask for it to be an acquittal, but we understand that it's a higher standard, that a new trial would be appropriate as well.

THE COURT: Okay. The only thing 1 wanted to mention is that when $I$ read the statement of facts, the state was correct in their version that Melissa Gamboa did not identify him at prelim and they did not question her regarding that booking photo.
so 1 agree with the state's
rendition because $I$ remember specifically thinking in my mind gee, how come they didn't go back and get like the booking photo of him three years ago.

Now, the next witness that took the

```
stand, they did that.
    MR. FTGLER: Right.
    THE COURI: And I think that was Jonathan
Harper. But the rendition that you put in your
moving papers because I want this record to reflect
I was there and I heard the evidence, and I thought
it very odd after Melissa Gamboa did not identify
him at trial why no other I guess stab at it, I
guess I'll say that in my transcript, why the state
didn't put another stab at it through trying to get
identification a different way.
    And then I read in the pleadings on
their opposition that they didn't have the booking
photo until the next morning.
    MR. FIGLER: Right.
    THE COURT: So they weren't able to
    rehabilitate that witness at all with the booking
photo. So they didn't ask him about a booking
photo.
                    Now, did they say did you identify
him at a prelim, yeah. But, I mean -m
    MR. FIGLER: And this is what he looked
    like. And, you know, we objected to the use of that
        photo in any regard because then what's the
        relevance if they didn't tie it back up to Melissa
```

Gamboa. So $I$ appreciate -
THE COURT: And at - -

MR, FIGHER: I misspoke.
TBE COURT: And at the end of the day,
she testified that it was a blonde haired person that looked to be 19 and - - you know, $T$ mean, they 1istened to her testimony.

MR. FIGLER: But they wried to olean it up by saying light was light hair instead of blonde hair, et cetera.

See, this was our, our concern with the way that the state proceeded in, in doing these kind of ancillary things that bolstered the otherwise weak circumstantial case.

So the problem that we had was -- so for instance, with this photograph, okay, i'm not surprised that $I$ mis, misrepresented those particular facts by accident because the whole point of the state was to not have her say no, that wasn t the guy, but after she had testified to then kind of suggest to the jury, see, this is whet he looked like back then.

Of course she dicn't identify him here today which is sort of a backdoor way of getting an in-court identification in when we heaxd

```
from all the detectives or bailiff that he didn't
really change so much in appearance that he wasn't
recognizable. I mean, certeinly Mogg and Hardy and
all those guys said yeah, that's the same guy from
back then. They were able to do in court
identifications, and they said that they saw him in
'08, that was the last time that they saw him.
    So that was our problem with
everything that kind of happened.
    You know, bringing up all that gang
stuff, bringing up all these photos, because we
objected to that photo a hundred times. And you,
Your Honor remembers, when they brought out that
booking photo, we objected to itss use, we objected
to its admissibility, we objected to it being
published to the jury, we objected to any sort of
argument that would stem from it.
    So in essence what we felt that
happened was was a back door walk around of her
failure to identify our client in court.
                    And, of course, she was in the best
position to be able to identify and she didn't
identify our client which goes to the lack of
substantial evidence for his conviction.
    She didn't identify him, Betty
```

```
Graves who saw the person face to face didn't
identify Evaristo Garcia. Erincipal Dan didn't
identiEy him.
    THE COURT: EE never did though.
    MR. FMGLER: Right.
    MHE COURT: And she"s the only one that
    had before, and now you're malking a period of seven
or eight years.
    MR, FIGLER: Oh, right, but I'm telking
gbout at the time.
                            THE COURT: In court she said she
couldn't make that identification after this many
years.
    MR. FTGIER: Right. But what I'm
saying --
    THE COURT: And the jury listens to that.
    MR. FHCLER; Right, And I hear that.
But also, you know, there was a big -- and I hope
that the jury heard it because I know the court
heard it, that there were - - 
    THE COURT: Clearly the Couxt heard it
beoause that was my memory.
    MR. FIGLER; Right,
    TEE COURT: She did not show her a
booking photo.
```

MR. FIGLER: Right. But I think that the Court also heard that all the witnesses who were in the best place to identify the shooter, Betty Graves who looked into the shooter's face straight on for a minute never identified Evaristo Garcia at the time or later.

The guy who was on the bike, I just - - John -- that was the, the other witness who saw the guy run right by him didn't ever identify Evaristo Garcia.

I mean, all the witnesses who verifiably were in a place to observe and, and be able to identify evaristo Garcia didn't in this case. I mean, it's just not fair. And that's, that"s part of our sufficiency argument.

So, so the whole thing that
happened, happened with the photo, whether she was shown it or not, the implicetion was very clear is that she identified him at the preliminary hearing, here's what he looked like at the preliminary hearing, oh, look, he's changed so much even though he really hadn't.

MR. GOODMAN: One of the point -- and a point, Your Honor, just real quickly, is that Melissa Gamboa testified at the preliminary hearing

```
that her description of the shooter at the time of
the incident was, was wrong, it was incorrect, that
ghe misidentified m- that her description of the
shooter did not match Mr. Gamcia who was sitting in
court at the preliminary hearing.
    And that was the besis of my motion
to exclude it in the first place.
    THE COURT: Thank you. All right. I'll
hear from the state.
                            MS. DEMONTE: Your Honor, I won*t belabor
it. Our responge I believe was somewhere axound 33
pages.
                    MHE COURT: I was really surpmised how
well written both sices were. Right after that
trial, I thought to myself -- honestly I thought to
myself if you guys were civil attorneys, do you know
how much money you would make based on how good both
sides were.
    MS. DBMONTE: Phank YOU.
    MR. EIGMER: I appmeciate that.
    MHE COURT: Honestly, that's what went
through my head as I read it, like wow, I've got to
say my hats oft to both sides. Really, really good
lawyeming on both sides. Really, really well
written and so fast after the trial.
```

```
    MR. #'GLER; Well, you know, we have
seven days to m-
    MHE COURT: I know tbat. Wel, I know
you have seven days, but I mean, that's what's so
amazing is it was -- and they, they came up with a
reply very quick, too.
    And to put evervthing that you put
in itr I was honestly just floored at how well
written both sides -m I mean, I just don't see that
good of lawyering cmiminally that often.
    MS. DEMONTE: Thank your Youm Honor.
    THE COURT: Civilly we do and that was as
good as anything I've ever seen. So I really have
to tell you, you guys both did a really good job.
Both sides.
    MS. DEMONTE: Thank you, Your Honor.
    THE COURT: Besides coordination,
    MS. DEMONTE: Yes. I Was just - - I did
guote you back to you that I would be --
    THE COURT: You didn't like my rulings
during trial, but now you dor don't you, with that
verdict?
    MS. DEMONTE: Thank you, Your Honor. I'm
not gonna belabor it. The jury heard all of the
nuances of Melissa Gambod's testimony, they heard
```

```
about all of these inconsistencies. They reached
their decision as triers of fact and the state does
not believe their decision should be overturned in
any way.
                    And with that, we'll submit it.
                            THE COURT: Is there anything in
response?
MR, FLGLER: No, Your Honor.
THE COURT: All right. You know, the Court's read the points and authorities. I've actually, I've actually granted an acquittal before. Shockingly, It's something I never thought \(I\) would do. So I have done it and I got affimmed on appeal by the supmeme court as well.
This is a case where the jury had every opportunity to sit and listen to every single witness and make a determination of whether or not this defendant did it or he don't it.
And at the end of the day, they clearly believed the two witnesses that identified him and were friends with him. And that is Jonathan Harper and Edshat - - I can't even say his name. Edshatel or whatever.
MR. FIGLER: Edshel Calvillo.
TEE COURT: And, you know, they listened
```

```
to it, these two witnesses talked about what had
happened before, during the commission of the crime.
And then what was really damning to the defense was
what he was telling them after the crime which the
jury heard.
    I believe one of the witnesses that
Shateal (phonctic) sald that -- did I just make him
Jewish? Shateal. I think I made him Jewish, but
they heard him say that he was laughing about it and
that he shot the kid.
    Now, they have every opportunity to
believe him or disbelieve him, but the testimony of
him was quite damning̣, Mr. Shateal.
    And quite frankly, Harper --
    MR. FIGLER: Calvillo. Calvillo.
    THE COURT: Well, hold on, I'm talking.
    MR. FIGLER: No, Calvillo, I was just
giving you his name.
    THE COURT: Calvillo.
    MS. FIGLER: Sure.
    THE COURT: I thought you were gonaa
interrupt me.
    MR. FIGLER: No, no.
    THE COURT: And quite frankly, Harper was
not a babbling baby once I saw him. He was toe to
```

toe with both defense counsel. You know, with - I'm trying to think was it - I think it wes Mr. Goodman that crossed him.

And, and it - - the State picked up on it in their opposition, at some point said well, you know, isn't everybody under stress, you know, in stressful situations.

He had very -- he came back with some things that I would not have expected, you know. When you read the pleadings ahead of time and you see somebody's been shot in the head and, you know, the state brought up that I had brought up from a prior murder case, I had somebody shot in the head two times and she was the best witness in the case, when you see him, he's certainly not what, in the court's opinion because $I$ sat and listened to it, what the defense is claiming, like oh, his brains are blown out.

Did he have problems? He had problems walking up there, but he was able to definitely relate back whatever happened.

Now, whether they believe him or not based on his going, you know, flipping like a fish, whether they -- you know, you have daming evidence against -- per cross-examination that he's sick and

```
tired of whet the prosecutors are telling him. And
you argued all of that to the jury. They heard it
all and they have the determination at the end of
the day to determine that.
    I just don't think that based on the
statute this court could touch that jury's verdict.
    If the supreme court disagrees, you
know, they'l1. reverse based on whatw they see in the
mecord.
                    But they listened to the evidence,
there was certainly enough evidence to convict him,
albeit, you know, obviously not the strongest case
that we see in the criminal justice system.
                            They certainly had the opportunity
to either disbelieve it and take the defense
position that it was not the defendant, or at the
end of the day say it was the defendant, in which
case they come back with a mumder two,
    And that was their choice. 12
people unanimously heard all the same evidence and
they chose to believe those witnesses.
                            And so that's really, you know, how
the state -- or how the state. How the Court looks
at it as far as making a determination. Hard
pressed to overturn any kind of verdict based on
```

that.

So respectfully, the Court is going
to, based on all of the reasons set forth methodically in the state's opposition, and I'd ask the state to prepare an order denying the motion for the reasons set forth in that opposition and list them how you did. You had like six points.

MS. DEMONTE: I will, Your Honor.
THE COURT: And it was well written. I'm not gonna redo it. I just ask that you send it in to me. Send it into him first and I'll sign off on it.

MS. DEMONTE: Absolutely.
THE COURT: So based on that, we'll see everybody at sentencing.

Oh, by the way, did you want me to
do it sooner? And if you do, I would get both sides together on it because I'm sure both families will want to speak.

MR. GOODMAN: There's a PSI already, Your
Honor. I'm not sure. I mean, I guess it $-\cdots$
THE COURT: Well, I guess - -
MR, GOODMAN: -- if the family does want to speak.

THE COURT: Right. What happened is

```
after we left, it dawned on me there's a PSI because
    I let nim withdraw a guilty plea.
    MS. PANDUKHT: Right.
    THE COURT: So there is a PST. I can
sentence him at any time. My question is what I
would do is get both sides together, find the time
amenable in the next m- you know, I can do it
soonex.
    MS. DEMONTE: Sure.
    THE COURT: And, you know mm
    MR. FIGLER: We'd like to do it earlier
than later --
    "HE COURT: Sure.
    MR. FIGIER: mo at the convenience of
the, the --
    THE COURT: Right.
    MR. FIGLER: -- victim's family, mhat,
that" would be appropriate.
    THE COURT: Yeah. They can come in, you
know, next week, but I don't know. Do you want
to --
MS. PANDUKHE: Yeah. As long as we have two weeks. I think if we had two weeks that would be sufficient.
THE COURT: Here's what I would do: I'm
```

```
gonra mbke it fox two weeks. If there's any
problem, teleconference my chambers and I'll do a
minute order changing the date for everybody, so
they don't have to come back and then do anothex
date. Teleconference me m- Like say somebody's out
on vacation, you know, the mother or something,
then, you know, that's not right, I just set it
during a vacation.
    MS. DEMONTE: Yeah. The only problem we
anticipate is potentially Melissa Gamboa's baby
being born. Because she was -- - 
    MS. PANDUKHT: She was about to give
bimth.
    THE COURT: Right. Okay, Well, I heard
her testimony, too, so I know she might want to
speak but*.
                            MS , DEMONTE: Yeah.
                            THE COURT: But it's up to you if you
want to hold up the sentencing based on that. I
menn --
                    MS. DEMONGE: Right. We can, we can
always ---
    THE COURT: She may not --
    MS. DEMONTE: -- something from her in
widting.
```

THE COURT: -- to be holding her child --
MS. DEMONTE: Yeah.
THE COURT: -- getting all upset either.
MS. DEMONTE: Yeah.
THE COURT: So if we could just set it
for two weeks, let's do that. If there's any
problem on either side, again, teleconference, both sides call me, werli change that date, make it amenable to everybody else.

MS. DEMONTE; Absolutely. Okay.
THE COURT: Give me like three days and I'll - I just thought it was stupid we need a -just if you want a sentence, I heard the whole thing, we can just sentence.

MS . DEMONTE: Okay.
MR. GOODMAN: Very good. Thank you, Your Bonor.

THE CIERK; Judge, your book's really heavy on -- in two weeks because the Tuesday you're not here.

THE COURT: Oh.
THE CLERK: So it would be -- it's gonna be compounded with a lot of other sentencings. I'm gonna suggest August 22nd.

THE COURT: The only thing is I don't

```
have any trials. So why don't I just say 10:30.
```

    THE CLERK: OKay.
    THE COURT: So if I have a big calendar,
    you guys just come in after your calendars at 10:30.
MR. FIGLER: What date?
THE CLERK: So we ${ }^{\text {re }}$ gonna do August $15 t h$
at 10:30 then?
THE COURT: Yeah.
MR. GOODMAN: Thank you.
THE COURT: And we'll figure 1 t will take
until about noon, We'lı take that morning at 10:30.
MS. DEMONTE: OKay.
MR. FIGLER: Thanks. It's three days
before my birthday.
'HE COURT: Oh, happy birthday.
MR. EIGLER: Thanks. Appreciate it.
MAE COURT: I'll try to remember that,
too.
MR. FIGLER: Okay, great.
MS. DEMONTE: 29?
MHE COURT: You're much younger than me.
MR. FIGLER: 39.
MS. DEMONTE: 39.
MR. FIGLER: That's not true.
MS. DEMONTE: Thank you, Your Honor.

TRE COURT: All right. Thank you.
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EVARISTO J. GARCIA,
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DISTRICT COURT
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

CASE NO: 10-C-262966-1
DEPT NO: 15
SENTENCING MEMO

COMES NOW, the Defendant, EVARISTO J. GARCIA, by and through his attorneys, DAYVID J. FIGLER, ESQ. and ROSS C. GOODMAN, ESQ. and submits this Memorandum in Support of a Term of Years for the Single Count of Second Degree Murder with Use of A Deadly Weapon found by jury verdict. This memorandum is supported by the attached points and authorities, and hereby incorporates by reference all prior pleadings in this matter as well as any argument deemed necessary by this Court.

DATED this 13th day of August, 2013.

## DAYVID J. FIGLER, ESQ

/s./ Dayvid J. Figler, Esq. Nevada Bar No. 4264 615 S. 6th Street Las Vegas, Nevada 89101 Attorneys for Defendant

## POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

## STATEMENT OF FACTS AND CASE

Evaristo Garcia, 16, was found guilty of shooting and killing Victor Gamboa, 15 , as the ostensible outgrowth of a schoolyard brawl, despite no evidence that the boys knew each other or ever engaged in any conflict or actual fight even up to the seconds before the shooting. Indeed, of the dozen or so available witnesses who indicated they were in or an observer to the brawl none (with the exception of Jonathan Harper) were able to identify Evaristo Garcia out of a lineup as even being at the school, let alone being the shooter. No physical evidence placed Evaristo Garcia at the scene of the shooting, or the prior fight, or the car, which allegedly transported Evaristo Garcia to the school, or the gray hoodie the shooter was agreed upon by almost every witness to have worn. In fact, no reliable evidence even placed the Defendant in Sal Garcia's apartment where the parties who went to the school were located when the call came in.

Likewise, there was insufficient evidence that at the time of the shooting, Evaristo was affiliated with a gang. Furthermore, there was insufficient evidence that the gang referred to by any witnesses was legally or techncally a gang under the definition as given by the law. As such, any references to "gang" or Evaristo's membership in a gang, especially Puros Locos - should be stricken.

Further, the jury also acquitted Evaristo of any conspiracy and therefore found that while he was the shooter, his conduct must have been devoid of premeditation or deliberation.

Finally, the District Attomey and the Defense made oral record at trial that in the event that Evaristo was found guilty of FIRST DEGREE murder by the jury, the State was comfortable with a term of years instead a life tail as an appropriate punishment.

Thus, and in essence, the jury found the 16 yyear old Evaristo to have acted rashly, and though with malice, that he did not deliberate upon or really plan his decisions before engaging in the act for which he was found guilty. The State has assessed that even if the premediation and deliberation were present, that a term of years is appropriate. There is no sufficient basis, or new information that the State has from the time of that stipulation to the date of sentencing. As
such, they have no legitimate reason to change position simply because the jury found Evaristo guilty of a lesser-related offense than that which the State asked for during closing arguments.

## MITIGATING FACTORS

## 1. LACK OF PRIOR CRIMINAL HISTORY

The existence (or lack thereof) of a prior criminal record is a major factor to consider in determining whether to impose a greater or lesser sentence. Indeed, the ONLY enumerated reason for granting a Motion for New Sentencing is the situation where the Court misperceived or received wrong information regarding prior criminal conduct. See Edwards v. State, 112 Nev . $704,708,918$ P. $2 \mathrm{~d} 321,324$ (1996) citing Passanisi $v$. State, 108 Nev. 318, 831 P.2d 1371 (1992); Townsend v. Burke, 334 U.S. 736,68 S.Ct. 1252 (1948).

Furthermore, "no significant history of prior criminal activity" is a specifically enumerated mitigating circumstance to first degree murder, and it follows that it would equally apply to second degree murder. NRS 200.035.

In the present case, the conviction for second-degree murder is his only offense. He was free from any criminal activity as a juvenile. As such, this inures to his benefit and supports a term of years for his offense.

## 2. YOUNG AGE

But for the nature of the offense and automatic certification pursuant to NRS 62B,330(3), Evaristo would have been under the jurisdiction of the juvenile court. There, a number of assessments would have been conducted pursuant to statute most notably a determination of whether or not the child has substance abuse or emotional or behavioral problems and the substance abuse or emotional or behavioral problems may be appropriately treated through the jurisdiction of the juvenile court. NRS 62B.390. In any event, he would certainly not be facing a life consequence as a minor, but for the offense.

That said, the youth of an offender is always considered a mitigating circumstance, and additionally is a specifically enumerating mitigating factor for first-degree murder, and equally applies to second degree murder. NRS 200.035(6). Evaristo was 16 at the time of the offense. It
is undisputed that 16 is very young. As such, this inures to his benefit and supports a term of years for his offense.

## 3. MENTAL INFIRMITY

The defense had previously attempted to introduce evidence of the mental infirmity and low IQ of Evaristo Garcia during the trial phase and as such introduced the findings of Dr . Paglini and indeed found it to be proper penalty information, (See Reporter's Transcript, September 21, 2010 hearing). As such, the Defendant hereby incorporates by reference the prior Motion to Admit Evidence of Defendant's low IQ and all attached exhibits.

A defendant's mental capacity is an important factor in determining mitigation of sentence. See Evans v. Lewis, 855 F. 2 d 631 ( $9^{\text {th }} \mathrm{Cir}$. 1988). As such, and because of his low 1 Q , this is yet another factor that inures to Evaristo's benefit and supports a term of years for his offense.

## 4. GREATER EXPOSURE TO WEAPON ENHANCEMENT

After the crime at issue occurred in 2006, the Nevada legislature has subsequently revised the exposure any defendant has to a weapon enhancement to a maximum of 20 years in a murder case. See NRS 193.165 (enacted July 1, 2007). Thus, while Evaristo who was convicted in 2013 faces a possibility of life in prison as an enhancement for use of a deadly weapon, a person exactly situated who committed a murder in Nevada one year later could only face a maximum of $8-20$ years - and then only if the Court determined it to be appropriate after considering enumerated information including the lack of criminal history of the defendant. Id.

Plainly stated, and while the Nevada Supreme Court has specifically indicated that the new, more favorable statute is not retroactive, this Court is not precluded from considering as a matter of proportionate sentencing whether the new enlightened sentencing range for use of a deadly weapon should inform its decision in whether to give Evaristo a term of years. Certainly, it makes sense that if an adult cannot today be sentenced to more than $8-20$ years for the use of a deadly weapon, that the Court can properly exercise its discretion in giving Evaristo the minimum sentence for the enhancement of 10-25 years. As such, the Court would still be giving Evaristo an additional 2 years on the bottom and 5 years on the top for the mere circumstance of
the year in which the offense was committed. Such an analysis comports with the notions of fairness and equity in sentence. See generally, State $v$. Second Judicial Dist. Court ex rel. County of Washoc, 124 Nev. 564, 188 P.3d 1079 (2008).

This does not mean, however, that the Defendant is abandoning a challenge pursuant to the Due Process and Equal Protection clauses of the United States Constitution as well as the Fifth, Sixth and Eighth Amendments, that he should under law receive the benefit of the new sentencing structure under NRS 193.165, especially in light of the fact that as a juvenile, he will as a matter of law be receiving a disproportionate sentence to adults who lack even the most remote of mitigating factors that he possesses. Both at law and at equity, it is truly a denial of fundamental fairness and justice that a juvenile be forced to served a minimum of 20 to 50 years in prison, when but for the enlightenment of the legislature a mere year after the offense was committed that maximum range of punishment for ANY offender who were to receive a term of years is 18 to 45 years. Further, that the minimum sentence for a similarly situated defendant could be as low as 11 to 27.5 years. As such, the Defendant moves to be sentenced under the new statute, but understands the precedent of the Nevada Supreme Court.

## CONCLUSION

The State has already stipulated on the record that it was amenable to a term of years for Evaristo should the jury have found first-degree murder. This was unrelated to any plea agreement but was forged out of fairness and the State's assessment of Evaristo as of the date of the verdict. Nothing has changed. There is ample mitigation and support for the giving of a term of years for this youthful offender, and the Court is humbly requested to impose this sentence.

DATED this $13^{\text {th }}$ day of August, 2013.
RESPECTFULLY SUBMTTTED:
By: _/s/Dayvid I, Figler
DAYVID J. FIGLER, ESQ.
Nevada State Bar No. 4264
615 S. $6^{\text {th }}$ Street
Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
(702) 222-0007

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, the undersigned, hereby certify that on the $13^{\text {th }}$ day of August, 2013, a copy of the attached SENTENCING MEMORANDUM was electronically served upon the appropriate parties hereto in accord with the electronic filing master service list for the instant case.

STEVEN WOLFSON, ESQ.
Clark County District Attorney
Nevada Bar No. 1565

NOREEN NYIKOS
Deputy Clark County District Attomey
Nevada Bar No. 8213
/s/: Dayvid Figler
Dayvid Figler, Esq.
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THE COURT: We're now gonna move on to State versus Evaristo Garcia. Case No. -- what page is he on?

THE CLERK: 13.
THE COURT: C262966. Let the record reflect that he is present in custody with his attorneys Mr. Goodman and Mr. Figler. And for the State, Ms. Demonte.

And it's now the time set for sentencing. Is there any legal cause or reason why judgment should not be pronounced?

MR. GOODMAN: No, there's not, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right, sir. By virtue of jury verdict, you're hereby adjudicated guilty on Count II, second-degree murder with use of a deadyy weapon.
state.
MS. DEMONTE: Thank you, Your Honor. Your Honor, the presentence investigation report in
this case reoommends the life tail. We are under the old law which would be 10 yeats to life, plus an equal and conseoutive 10 years to life which is what E \& ${ }^{2}$ 's recommendation would be. The State concurs with that recommendation.
l. will point out first that yes, the State was willing, had we gotten a verdict of first-degree murder, to stipulate to a term of years. But under the sentencing structure for firstmdegree murder, that would have amounted wo 100 years on the top end which is essentially a life sentence which explained why the state was wiling to do that and is now asking for a life sentence here today.

Youx Honor, you've heard the trial. I'm not gonna belabox the facts of the trial. He shot a kid in the back while he was running avay, he fled to Mexico and had to be extradited back.

Your Honor, the defendent's pre -- I mean, the defendant's presentence - - I mean, the defendant's sentencing memorandum references an $I Q$ of 79. That comes from a report generated by Dr. Paglini prepared pretrial a couple of years back.

And that score actually, according to Dr. Paglini, is an underestimate of mis true
cognitive abilities. Because he soored so low on the verbal sections, it weighted down the rest of his. His learning disabilities are partly in his own making, By his own admission, he -- when he was in school was truant three times a week up to four times a week. Spent nine weeks im d behavioral school until he believes he was expelled from school in December of 2005. So he probably would have done better had he actually shown up wo school.

Additionally, since he's been in
custody, he's been quite the behavioral problem within the Clark County Detention Center. He had, in February and March of 2009, been placed in disciplinary housing for gang-related politics.

In both of those, he actually denied being a member, but in one incident refexred to himself as I'm a soldier. And it was noted that he does have 'East Side' tatooed on his arms.

In the other incident, he had stated that he actually denjed being a member of the sereno $s$ but stated that he would consider himself to be a South Bider.

Additionally, in an instance on
March 25 th of 2010 , while coming to court and being transported with Manuel Lopez, he called him a

```
snitch and the two of them got into a physical
altercation.
This is not somebody who's been a model citizen by any stretch of the imagination while he's been here awaiting trial. The state cextainly expects that to contimue.
There are two victim speakers.
So we are asking for a term of 10 to
life, plus the equal and consecutive 10 to life. Thamk you.
```

THE COURT: All right. Defense, T have read the sentencing memorandum, but I'm happy to hear any further axgument at this time.

MR. FIGLER: Thank Voux Honox, Yeah, I would like to do everythang step by step about the defendant's age, his mental infixmity, the cixcumstance surfounding everything else with regard two the term.

With regard to his time in custody, sometimes a person has a target on their back. And certainly $\pm$ think Mr. Bindrup previously had brought up the Manuel Lopez situation and that it did appear as though Mr. Garcia was actually the target of Mr. Lopez.

```
That said, Youm Honor, that
```

shouldn't sway the court in determining whether or not to give a term to life. Either way, it's really just an unfair, just a couple of months lacer and he would have been looking at significantly less of a sentencing if Your Bonor were to max him out. There is a manner of equity that should play into the court.

And while legally the court can't go back retroactively, even though we raised that issue, certainly the court can be cognizant of the disparity, so that the equal portionality at sentencing of people who just happened to be differing offenses within two or three months.

I think that's really it as far as Mr. Garcia goes. I mean, certainly he maintained his innocence and he shouldn't be punished for that, but he will have a significant term either way.

And again, since he does have two terms that he's gonna go under, he has to either be paroled or expired from the first one before the second one even starts.

So whatever Your Honor does today, it will be guaranteeing that Mr. Garcia has a very lengthy period of time in custody far more than anyone who would comit that crime today under the
same exact circumstances.
Additionallyr giving him the life
sentence, just the only thing that is really
different from practical standpoint is, is different
housing, different opportunities for him while he's
in prison to try to better himself. And then also
has an additional burden upon the state because it
would be a dimect full appeal as opposed to the fast
track appeal, et cetera.
I think this case actually merits a
fast track treatment, not the full blown treatment
that -- in other words, if it's not a life tailr
then it goes to the fast track. It's more expedient
with regard to the amount of time and effort and
energy that have to be put into the appeal and
certainly the cost from the difference between doing
a fast track and doing a full blown appeal.
Just all these various concerns I
think ultimately is the conclusion that the best
sentence and, and appropriate sentence for Mr.
Garcia would be the term of years, which is still
pretty harsh at 20 to 50 year sentence.
And $I$ don't think anyone's gonna
think that someone got off lightiy on the second
degree murder because he got 20 to 50 years,

```
especially concerning what that would bring today.
    Thank you, Your Honor.
    THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Figler. Sir,
do you have anything to say in mitigation of
punishment at this time?
    THE DEPENDANT: Yes, I do. You knowf I
would like to apologize to the victim's family on
behalf of me and Giovanny and Manuel Lopez and the
pain we caused you guys for the, you know, for the
victim.
                    You know, Your Honor, as you know,
I've been here for five years and a half. I've been
incarcerated since IT was 1.8.
                            You know, I would like to get a
chance to actually live, to, you know, to become a
man out there in society, not in here.
    I mean, I ask you to look at this
case, you know, as I know you got to carry out the
rightful sentence on which you believe, but, you
know, dating back to 2006, we were all teenagers, we
were all 16, 17. Nobody, you know, was an adult
then.
    I could say nobody that was there
was anything of anything. You know what I'm saying?
Everybody was there for, you know, for a reason.
```

It escalated to something that it shouldn't have, but, you know, I would actually like to have the chance to become a - - to know what life 1s, not life behind a door. You know what I'm saying?

You've got - - you have two tamilies
here today. I know you've got to consider the victim's family, but then again, I haven't been with my family for seven years. I would like to be there for Thanksgiving dinner or, you know, for Chaistmas, you know. I would like to get that opportunity, you know. I mean, $T$ can't do it behind, behind the fence.

I ask you not to look at me as the man I've become now as the DA said. You know, back in the day, $I$ wasn't gang affiliated, even though now they have recoxds of me denying aaying I'm a South Sider or, or my prison gang affiliation. That pretty much has - - to me has nothing do with 2006 When this murder ocourred, you know.

On my behavior status in county, well, you know, we're not surxounded by model citizens. That's why everybody's in here for a reason.

With that, I would just like $\quad$ oo

```
apologize once again to the victim's family. And
that's pretty much about it. Ihank you.
    MHE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Garcia.
    All right. We'll hear from your
victim speakers. If you could just have them come
up by you, Mrs. Demonte.
    MS. DEMONTE: Absolutely.
    THE COURT: And they can stand next to
you or sit next to you.
    MS. DEMONTE; Your Honor, one of them
requires the interpreter so we'll call her first.
    THE COURT: We have the Spanssh speaking
interprecer.
                            Can T get the interpreter's name for
this proceeding?
    MR. PICO: Ricardo Pico, Spanish
ynterpreter.
    THE COURT; w need the first one to come
on up here, Come on up here, ma'am, around here.
Go ahead and stand by Ms. Demonte.
                                All right. Go ahead and raise your
right hand.
                            (Whereupon, Mazia Oyervidez was duly
                            sworn to tell the truth. the whole truth
                                and nothing but the truth.)
```

```
            THE COURT: Please state your full name
    and spell it for the record.
            VICTIM SPEAKER OYERVIDEZ: Maria
Oyervidez. O-y-e-r, V as in Victor, i-d-e-z*
    HHE COURT: Yes, ma*am. If there's
cellular phones on, please turn them off. Rold on.
I hear something. Thank you. Yes, ma'am.
    VIC'IM SPEAKER OYERVIDEZ: How I feel. I
feel empty. I'm desperete. I wish I could see my
son, I wish I could foxgive him, but I can't, I
can't be a hypocrite. I know there's nothing he can
do to give me my son back and I don't believe thet
he"g remorgetul.
                    No one knows how I feel. It's not
just me when I, when I go to the graveyard to visit
my son. I take my grandchildren. They see me
crying, but the youngest ones tells me mom, let's go
see Hugo (phonetic) and let's bring him back, I
wish I could. But no,
                    I wish there was someone that could
tell me how to ease this pain. I"m always asking
God to give me strength, you know, for my other
children.
                    I don't know how to explain to you
so you can understand the pain that I feel, I know
```

that on y someone that - m only know that someone who has gone thatogh what I've gone through can understand. No one else.

I don't know what to say. Only I
know how $I$ feel. Like $I$ said, $I$ can't explain it. I don"t know.

THE COURT: Thank you very much, ma'am, for coming in and addressing the court. Thank you.

MS. DEMONTE: And Melissa Gamboa is next, Your Honor.

THE COORF: Can you please raise your right hand and spell your name for the record?
(Whereupon, Melissa Gamboe was duly sworn
to tell the truth, the whole truth, and
nothing but the truth.
THE CLERK: Please lower your hand and state your full name for the record.

VICITM WITNESS GAMBOA: MeLissa Maria Gambos, $\quad M-e-1-i-s-s w a, \quad M-a-r-i-a, \quad G a m b o a$, $\mathrm{c}-\mathrm{a}-\mathrm{m}-\mathrm{b}-\mathrm{o}-\mathrm{a}$.
"HE COURT: Yes, ma'am.
VICTIM WTTNESS GAMBOA: Pretty much you saw my mom here. I whink itw's hard enough for all of us seeing my mom suffer. I've seen the big changes for my mom. Tt's hard for us, for everybody
to see that.

On February 6th, I saw my brother got shot. And I don't think I could never forget that or get that off my mind. It's hard enough to know that I can't do anything about it.

Every day I feel guilty, just wishing I can go back. I was just trying to do good for myself and get an education for me and my son. And I truly regret going back to school.

I think my family's been going
through so much. Even though it's seven years, I still see it like it was that same day. Just the fact that we can't see him here, it's hard just knowing that we car't see him, speak to him. It hurts a lot.

Even though it's passed seven years, I pray to God every time that just to give me a sign for him, to talk to him, to see him, anything, and we can't bring him back.

I don't think it's harsh enough fox him to get 20, I think he should get life. I don't think it's fair enough that my family doesn't get to see my brother no more. His family at least gets to talk to him, see him, visit him. We can't speak to my brother, nothing. It's so hard for us.

```
    And I know from the bottom of my
heart you are not sorry.
    My brother was only 15 years old. I
remember him telling me he wanted to be in the Army,
do a Iot of things; buy my mom a house, everything.
And we don't have him here no more,
    I just really hope you get life.
Really. We don't get to do no more holidays for us
ofther. I know you want to spend time with your
family.
                    And trust me, we want to see our
brother, but you took his life away. You didn't
give him no chance so I don't think it's fair for
you to get a chance either.
                    Nothing's the same. Our holidays,
nothing's the same. We don't even spend holidays
together, nothing. I just really, really hope you
don't get out at a11.
                    The good thing you have is your
parents get to see you, visit you. You get to talk
to them.
                    You don't know how bad I wish for
God, I pray to God that I can talk to my brother,
for him to tell me anything. I really wish I had
him here. That's all.
```

```
THE COURT: Thank you for addressing the court, ma'am. All right. It's now submitted to the Court. The Court did preside over the trial and heard all the facts from all the sides and has taken also the sentencing into - - the sentencing into consideration.
One thing the defendant said troday gave the Court pause. And that was that you said I didn't - - it was interesting that the defendant said that - or inferxed that somehow the victim wasn't innocent in this case of anything, And it was in the context of you know, everybody that was there was not innocent of anything. And so it's interesting that you would actuglly have said that because i picked up on it when you said it. T Listened to the whole trial. I didn't hear anything about" the wictim doing really anything. Was everybody involved in a fight? Yeah. But it's interesting that you picked those words to say today or inder that somehow the victim wasn"t, wasn't innocent while he was there. It gives the Court some pause. It's interesting that you have those words.
```

And it doesn't change what $T$ was gonna do. I just think I find it tntexesting that
you would choose those words.
The Court doesn't disagree that you're probably somewhat different than when you were a teenager. Both families are different. There's been a lot of time that's gone by.

At the end of the day, both families have been just destroyed on what is a completely selfish, stupid, immature -- - I could go on and on for just this, this decision that you made to bring a gun to a fight. And not only to bring a gun but to use the gun. Such a senseless murder that was committed.

And again, it's just destroyed … you know, the Court feels bad for both families. The victim's famply has suffered tremendously. And to a large extent the defendant's family sits here, they suffer as well. Both sides. Nobody wins in this case.

And no matter what the Court does, the court can't bring back this woman's son or this other woman's brother. So the court can't make anybody whole. It's just a tragic, tragic event and a tragic loss.

$$
\text { In addition to the } \$ 25 \text { assessment }
$$

fee, the $\$ 150$ DNA fee and submit to genetic testing,
$\$ 38,000$ in restitution, you're hereby sentenced on murder in the second degree to a life with parole eligibility beginning after a minimum of 10 years has been served.

Fox the deadly weapon enhancement, an equal and consecutive term of life.

Your credit for time served -- can $I$ get credit as of today?

MS. DEMONTE: 1,959, YOUN HOROR.
THE COURT: 1,900 and what --
MS + DEMONTE: 59.
THE COURT: - - 59 days will be the oredit for time served. And that will close this case out. Thank you.

MS. DEMONTE: Thank you.
MR, FTGLER: Your Honor, may we approach? THE COURT: Approach, sure.
(Whemeupon, the following proceedings
were had in open conrt at the bench and outside the presence of those present in
the courtroom.)
MR. FTGTER: Your Honot, we have an order for appeal to appoint Mr. Goodman. If you can sign that.

THE COURT: Oh, yeah, yeah. Soxry. Yes,

I'll do that.
MR. FIGLER: Thanks.
THE COURT: Thank you.
THE COURT: All right, Thank you.
(Whereupon, the bench conference ended.)
THE COURT: I have just signed an order
for the defense, for Mr. Goodman's appointment on appeal. That's just been signed and you can file that today.

Then this will now conclude the
proceedings. Thank you.
MS. DEMONTE: Thank Your Honor.
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| 2 |  |  |  | changerll－15：24 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 20[3]-7: 22,7: 25,13: 21 \\ & 2005[1]-4: 8 \\ & 2006[2]-8: 20,9: 19 \\ & 2009[11-4: 13 \\ & 2010[1]-4: 24 \\ & 2013[2]-1: 13,2: 1 \\ & 25 t h[1]-4: 24 \\ & 29[2]-1: 13,2: 1 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  | children $\{11$－11：23 <br> choose（1）－16：1 <br> Christmas in－9：10 <br> circumstance $[1]-5: 17$ <br> circumstances［1］－7：1 <br> citizen 11－5：4 <br> citizens［ x －$-9: 23$ <br> CLARK ${ }^{2}$－1：4，2：1 |
| 3 |  |  |  | CLERKK（2）－2：9，12：16 |
| 370 ［2－1：25，18：17 |  |  |  | close［i］－17：13 cognitive（1）－ $4: 1$ |
| 5 |  |  |  | cognizant 41 － $6: 10$ <br> coming $[2] \times 4: 24,12: 8$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 50[21-7: 22,7: 25 \\ & 59[2]-17: 11,17: 12 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { commit [1]-6:25 } \\ & \text { committed [1] }-16: 12 \end{aligned}$ |
| 6 |  |  |  | concerning $[1]-8: 1$ |
| 6thtil 13：2 |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { concerns }[1]-7: 18 \\ & \text { conclude }[1]-18: 10 \end{aligned}$ |
| 7 |  |  |  | conclusion（1）－7：19 <br> concurs［1］－3：4 |
| 79 14－3：22 |  |  |  | conference［1］－ $18: 5$ <br> consecutive－3－ $3: 3,5: 9,17: 6$ |
| 9 |  |  |  | consider（2］－4：21，9：7 |
| 9：00（2）－1：14，2：2 |  |  |  |  |
| A |  |  |  | continue（1］－ $5: 6$ <br> cost t － 7 ：16 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { AMM }_{[4]}-1: 14,22 \\ & \text { ABBI }_{[1]}-1: 12 \\ & \text { abilities }[1]-4: 1 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  | Count fit－2：21 <br> COUNTY（2）－1：4， $2: 1$ <br> County［2］－4：12， $9: 2 t$ |



| ```incarcerated \(11.8: 13\) incident [ג] -4:16, 4:19 infer \([1]\) - 15.20 inferred [1] - 15:10 intirmity c 1 - \(5: 16\) innocence [t] - 6:16 innocent [3] - 15:11, 15:13: 15:21 instance 11 m .4 .23 interesting [5-15:9, 15:14, 15:19. 15:22, 15:25 interprater \({ }^{3}-10: 11,10: 13,10: 17\) interpreter's [1] - 10:14``` | ```12.21, 15:2 maintained [1]-6:15 \(\operatorname{man}(2)-6: 16,9: 15\) manner[1]-6: 6 Manuel (3)-4:25, 5:22, 8:8 March [2] - 4:13, 4:24 Maria \({ }^{3}\) - \(10: 23,11: 3,12: 18\) matter [1] - 16:19 max [1]-6:5 mean [0] - 3:20, 6:15, 8:17, 9:12 Melendez [20 1 1;25, 18:16 MELENDEZ: \(1 \mathrm{H}-18: 16\) Melissa [3] - 12:9, 12:13, 12:18 member [2] - 4:16, 4:20 memorandum (2) - 3:21, 5:12 mental [1]-5:16 merits :11 - 7:10 Mexioo \(1-3: 18\) mind \([7]\) - \(13: 4\) minimum [i]-17:3 mitigation [1]-8:4 model (20 - 5:4, 9:22 mom [6]-11:17, 12:23, 12:24, 12:25, 14:5 months 园-6:3, 6:13 move [1] - 2:6 MR [6] - 2:17, 5:14, 10:16, 17:16, 17:22, 18:2 MS [8] - 2:24, 10:7, 10:10, 12:9, 17:9, 17:11, 17:15, 18:12 murder m-2:21, 3:8, 3:10, 7:25, 9:20, 16:41, \(17: 2\)``` | $000[1]-23$ <br> open t1. 17:19 <br> opportunities [7] 7 :5 <br> opportunity [t] 9: 11 <br> opposed [1] - 7:8 <br> order (2) - 17:22, 18:8 <br> outside 11-17:20 <br> own (2) 4:4 <br> OYERT-11:4 <br> Oyervidez [2] - 10:23, 11:4 <br> OYERVIDEZ $[2]-11: 3,11: 8$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| investigation "4-225 Involved [1]-15:18 |  | P |
| IQ $[1]-3: 21$ iscue [1] $-5: 10$ |  | ```P's [t]-3:4 page [1] - \(2: 7\) Paglini (a) - \(3: 23,3: 25\) pain [3] - 8:9, 11:21, 11:25 parents (1) \(14: 20\) parole [1] - 17:2 paroled [1] - 6:20 partly [1] - \(4: 3\) passed [1] - 13:16 pause [a] - 15:8, 15:22 people \|1. \(6: 12\) period (3)-6:24 person [1] \(=5: 20\) phones bj - 11:6 phonetic [f] - 11:18 physical \([1]-5: 1\) picked (2) - 15:15, 15:19 PICO[1]-10:16 Pico (1)- 10:16 placed !11-4:13 Plaintiff er - 1:7, 1:17 play 1 值 \(-6: 6\) plus [2]-3:2, 5:9 point[1]-3:6 politics [1] \(4: 14\) portionality [1]-6:11 practical fl-7:4 pray (2) - 13:17, 14:23 pre [1] - 3:19 prepared \([1]\) - \(3: 23\) presence [1] ~ 17.20 present \((2]-2: 11,17: 20\) presentence :21-2:25, 3:20 presidern-15:3 pretrial 1 1- \(-3: 23\) pretty[4] - 7:22, 9:19, 10:2, 12:22 previously [1] - 5:21 prison an \(^{-7: 6,9: 13}\) problem (1) - 4:11 proceeding [1]-10:15 proceedirgs [2] - 17:18, 18:11 PROCEEDINGS [1] - 18:14 pronounced t1-2:16 punished [y] -6:16 punishment [1]-8:5``` |
| J |  |  |
| JO [1]-18:16 <br> JoAnn [2] - 1:25, 18:16 <br> JONATHAN [7] - $1: 9$ <br> JUDGE [1] - 1:12 <br> juagment [1] - 2:16 <br> jury 1 ti -2.20 |  |  |
| K |  |  |
| kid [i]-3:17 knowing [1] - 13:14 knows [1] 11:14 |  |  |
| $L$ |  |  |
| large [1]-16:16 $14 S_{11}-2 \cdot 1$ | $N$ |  |
| ```law [1]-3:2 Iearning [1] 4:3 least [1] - 13:23 legal [t - 2:15 legally (1) -6:8 lengthy 51-6:24 less [1]-6:4 life[17] - 3:1, 3:2,3:3, 3:11, 3:13,5:9, 6:2,7:2,7:12,9:3, 9:4, 13:21, 14:7, 14:12, 17:2, 17:6 Hightly [!] - 7:24 Histened [1] 15:16 live [1] - 8:15 look[2]-8:17, 9:14``` | ```name (4) - \(70: 14,11: 1,12: 12,12: 17\) need 14 - 10:18 NEVADA [2]-1:4; 1:6 never [ 3 ] - 13:3 next \([3]-10: 8,109,129\) nine 1 - \(4: 6\) NO m-1:1, 1:2, 18:17 nobody 3 . \(\mathrm{B}: 21,8: 23,16: 17\) Noreen [1]-1:17 noted [il - 4:17 nothing \({ }^{18}-9: 19,10: 25,11: 11,12: 15\), 13:25, 14:17 nothing's [2] - 14:15, 14:16 \(N V_{[1]}-2: 1\)``` |  |
| Lopez [4] - 4:25, 5:22, 5:24, 8:8 | 0 |  |
| loss [1] - 16:23 <br> tow [i] 4 -1 <br> Iower 11-12:16 | ```occurred [1]-8:20 OF \({ }_{[3]}\) - 1:6, 1:8, 18:14 offenses [17-6:13 old [2] \(-3: 2,14: 3\) once 1 - \(10: 1\) one [6] - 4:16, 6:20, 6:21, 10:10, 10:18, 11:14, 12:3, 15:7 ones [1]-11:17``` |  |
| M |  |  |
| M-ar-4wa[1]-12:19 <br> M-ennins-sra 11 - 12:19 <br> ma'am[6] - 10: 19, 11:5, 11:7, 12:7, |  |  |



| victim's 4 - $8: 7,9: 8,10: 1,16: 15$ <br> Victoriti - $11: 4$ <br> virtue [1] - 2:19 <br> visit (3) - 11:15, 13:24, 14:20 <br> vs (t) 1 18 |
| :---: |
| W |
| ```weapon [2] -2:22, 17:5 week [ 2 ] - 4:5, 4:6 weaks [1] - 4:6 weighted [1] - \(4: 2\) whole :44 " \(10: 24,12: 14,15: 16,16: 22\) willing [ 2 ] \(-3: 7,3: 12\) wins (1) - 16:17 wish [0] - 11:9, 11:10, 11:19, 11:20. 14:22, 14:24 wishing m 4 13:7 WITNESS [ 2 - 12:18, 12:22 woman's (al - 16:20, 16:21 words [4] - 7:12, 15:19, 15:23, 16:1``` |
| X |
| $\mathrm{XV}_{[1]-12}$ |
| Y |
| ```year [1] - 7:22 years [19] - 3:2, 3:3, 3:9, 3:11, 3:23. 7:21,7:25, 8:12, 9:9, 13:11, 13:16. 14:3, 17:3 youngest [1] - 1:17``` |

## DISTRICT COURT

CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

## THE STATE OF NEVADA,

Plaintiff,
CASE NO. C262966-1
-VS-
DEPT. NO. XV

## EVARISTO JONATHAN GARCIA \#2685822

Defendant.

JUDGMENT OF CONVICTION (JURY TRIAL)

The Defendant previously entered a plea of not guilty to the crimes of COUNT 1 - CONSPIRACY TO COMMIT MURDER (Category B Felony), in violation of NRS 200.010, 200.030, 199.480; and COUNT 2 - MURDER WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON (Category A Felony), in violation of NRS 200.010, 200.030, 193.165; and the matter having been tried before a jury and the Defendant having been found guilty of the crime of COUNT 2 - SECOND DEGREE MURDER WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON (Category A Felony), in violation of NRS 200.010, 200.030, 193.165; thereafter, on the $29^{\text {TH }}$ day of August, 2013, the Defendant was present in court for sentencing with his counsels, ROSS GOODMAN, ESQ. and, DAYVID FIGLER, ESQ., and good cause appearing,

THE DEFENDANT IS HEREBY ADJUDGED guilty of said crime as set forth in
the jury's verdict and, in addition to the $\$ 25.00$ Administrative Assessment Fee, \$150.00 DNA Analysis Fee including testing to determine genetic markers, and to PAY $\$ 38,000.00$ RESTITUTION, the Defendant is SENTENCED to the Nevada Department of Corrections (NDC) as follows: COUNT 2 - LIFE with a MINIMUM Parole Eligibility of TEN (10) YEARS plus an EQUAL and CONSECUTIVE term of LIFE with TEN (10) YEARS MINIMUM for Use of a Deadly Weapon; with ONE THOUSAND NINE HUNDRED FIFTY-NINE $(1,959)$ DAYS Credit for Time Served. Defendant found NOT GUILTY as to COUNT 1.

DATED this $\qquad$ day of September, 2013


DISTRICT JUDGE gm


NOTC
Ross C. Goodman, Esq.
Nevada Bar No. 7722
GOODMAN LAW GROUP
CLERK OF THE COURT
A Professional Corporation.
520 S. Fouth Street, Second Floor
Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
Telephone: (702) 383-5088
Facsimile: (702) 385-5088
Attorneys for Defendant
Evaristo Jonathan Garcia

## DISTRICT COURT

CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

Case No: $\quad$ C262966
Dept. No.: XV
NOTICE OF APPEAL

NOTICE is hereby given that Defendant EVARISTO JONATHAN GARCIA, hereby appeals to the Supreme Court of the State of Nevada from his sentence on August 15, 2013. The Wudgment of Conviction having been entered on September 11, 2013.

Dated this $11^{\text {th }}$ day of October, 2013.

GOODMAN LAW GROUP, A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION
/s/: Ross C. Goodman, Esq. Ross C. Goodman, Esq.
Nevada Bar No. 7722
Altorney for Defendant Evaristo Garcia

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I am an employee of the GOODMAN LAW GROUP, P.C. and that on the $11^{\text {th }}$ day of October, 2013,1 served a true and correct copy of the following NOTICE OF

APPEAL by:
[X] Mail on all pathes in said action, by placing a true copy thereof enclosed in a sealed envelope in a designated area for outgoing mail, addressed as set forth below.
[ ] Personal delivery by causing a true copy thereof to be hand delivered this date to the addtess(es) at the address(es) set forth below.
[ ] Courtesy copy by facsimile on the parties in said action by causing a true copy thereof to be telecopied to the number indicated atter the address(es) noted below.
[ ] Federal Express or other overnight delivery

Steven B. Wolfson, Esc. Clark County District Attomey Office of the District Attorney 200 Lewis Avenue, 3rd Floor
Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
Evaristo Garcia
\#1108072
High Desert State Prison
P.O.Box 650

Indian Springs, Nevada 89070

SI: Tiffanie Johannes
Employee of Goodnan Law Group, A Professional Corporation

CASA
Ross C. Goodman, Esq.
Nevada Bar No. 7722
GOODMAN LAW GROUP
CLERK OF THE COURT

520 S . Fourth Street, Second Floor
Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
Telephone: (702) 383-5088
Facsmile: (702) 385-5088
Altorneys for Defendant
Evaristo Joncthan Garcia

## DISTRICT COURT

CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

THE STATE OF NEVADA,
Plaintiff,
vs.
EVARISTO JONATHAN GARCLA,
Defendant.

Case No: C262966
Dept. No.: XV
CASE APPEAL STATEMENT

## CASE APPEAL STATEMENT

1. Appellant : Evaristo Jonathan Garcia
2. Judge : Honorable Abbi Silver
3. Parties in District Court : State of Nevada v. Evaristo Jonathan Garcia
4. Parties in Appeal : Evaristo Jonathan Garcia y. State of Nevada
5. Counsel on Appea1 : Ross C. Goodman, Esq.

520 S. Fourth Street, 2 nd Floor
Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
(702) 383-5088

Steven B. Woltson, Esq.
District Attorney
200 Lewis Avente
Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
6. Appellant was represented by Ross C. Goodman, Esq. and Dayvid Figler, Esq. in the District Coutt.
7. Appellant is currently represented by Ross C. Goodman, Esq. on appeal.
8. On August 15, 2013, Defendant Evaristo Jonathan Garcia was sentenced by Honorable Abby Silver. The Judgment of Conviction was entered on September 11, 2013. Dated this $11^{\text {th }}$ day of October, 2013.

GOODMAN LAW GROUP, A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION

Is/: Ross C. Goodman, Esq. Ross C. Goodmant, Esq. Nevada Bar No. 7722 Attorney for Defendant Evaristo Garcia

## CERTIFICATE OLSERVICE

I hereby certify that I man amployee of the GOODMAN LAW GROUP, A Professional Corporation and that on the $11^{\text {th }}$ day of October, 2013,1 served a true and correct copy of the followigg CASE APPEAL STATEMENT by:
[ X] Mail on all parties in said action, by placing a true copy thereof enclosed in a sealed envelope in a designated area for outgoing mail, addressed as set forth below.
[ ] Personal delivery by causing a true copy thereof to be hand delivered this date to the address(es) at the address(es) set forth below.
[ ] Courtesy copy by facsimile on the parties in said action by causing a true copy thereof to be telecopied to the number indicated after the address(es) noted below.
[. ] Federal Express or other overnight delivery

Steven B. Wolfson, Esq. Clark County District Attorney Office of the District Attorney 200 Lewis Avenue, 3 rd Floor Las Vegas, Nevada 89101

Evaristo Garcia \#1108072
High Desert State Prison P.O. Box 650 Indian Springs, Nevada 89070

S/: Tiffonie Johomes
Employee of Goodman Law Group, A Professional Corporation

