#### IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

WILBURT HICKAM, JR. AKA WILLIAM HICKS,

Appellant,

V.

THE STATE OF NEVADA,

Respondent.

Electronically Filed Feb 18 2015 11:42 a.m. Tracie K. Lindeman Clerk of Supreme Court

Case No. 64776

#### **RESPONDENT'S APPENDIX**

KRISTINA WILDEVELD, ESQ. Nevada Bar #005825 CAITLYN MCAMIS, ESQ. Nevada Bar #012616 The Law Offices of Kristina Wildeveld 615 S. 6th Street Las Vegas, Nevada 89101 (702) 222-0007

STEVEN B. WOLFSON Clark County District Attorney Nevada Bar #001565 Regional Justice Center 200 Lewis Avenue Post Office Box 552212 Las Vegas, Nevada 89155-2212 (702) 671-2500 State of Nevada

ADAM PAUL LAXALT Nevada Attorney General Nevada Bar # 012426 100 North Carson Street Carson City, Nevada 89701-4717 (775) 684-1265

Counsel for Appellant

Counsel for Respondent

## **INDEX**

<u>Document</u>	Page No.
Order Denying Defendant's Writ of Habeas Corpus in Part and Granting filed 04/09/12	in Part, 10-11
Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus (Pre-Trial), filed 02/28/12	1-9
Recorder's Transcripts of 09/06/13 (Jury Trial – Day 4), filed 03/18/14	12-38

#### **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify and affirm that this document was filed electronically with the Nevada Supreme Court on 18<sup>th</sup> day of February, 2015. Electronic Service of the foregoing document shall be made in accordance with the Master Service List as follows:

ADAM PAUL LAXALT Nevada Attorney General

KRISTINA WILDEVELD, ESQ. CAITLYN MCAMIS, ESQ. Counsel for Appellant

CHRIS BURTON
Deputy District Attorney

/s/ j. garcia

Employee, Clark County District Attorney's Office

CFB//jg

0014	Alun D. Chum
PHILIP J. KOHN, PUBLIC DEFENDER NEVADA BAR NO. 0556	CLERK OF THE COURT
309 South Third Street, Suite #226 Las Vegas, Nevada 89155	
(702) 455-4685 Attorney for Defendant	
DISTE	RICT COURT
CLARK CO	OUNTY, NEVADA
In the Matter of the Application of,	
}	CASE NO. C-12-278699-1
WILBURT HICKMAN, a.k.a.	DEPT. NO. V
William Hicks, for a Writ of Habeas Corpus.	DATE: March 21, 2012
	TIME: 9:00 a.m.
PETITION FOR WI	RIT OF HABEAS CORPUS
TO: The Honorable Judge of the Eighth Jud	licial District Court of
The State of Nevada, in and for the Cou	unty of Clark
The Petition of Wilburt Hickman	an submitted by ERIKA D. BALLOU, Deputy Public
Defender, as attorney for the above-captioned	individual, respectfully affirms:
1. That she is a duly qualif	ied, practicing and licensed attorney in the City of Las
Vegas, County of Clark, State of Nevada.	
2. That Petitioner makes a	pplication for a Writ of Habeas Corpus; that the place
where the Petitioner is imprisoned actually or	constructively imprisoned and restrained of his liberty
is the Clark County Detention Center; that th	e officer by whom he is imprisoned and restrained is
Doug Gillespie, Sheriff.	
3. That the imprisonment	and restraint of said Petitioner is unlawful in that:
Wilburt Hickman is being held to answer for	all counts of Attempt Murder with Use of a Deadly
Weapon when no legal probable cause was	provided at the time of the preliminary hearing. In
addition, Mr. Hickman is being held to ans	wer to one of the counts of Assault with a Deadly
Weapon under a theory for which no probab	le cause was provided at the time of the preliminary
hearing. Finally, Mr. Hickman was held to an	swer for Malicious Destruction of Property as a felony

1	when no legal probable cause regarding the allegation of damage over \$5,000 was provided at the
2	time of the preliminary hearing.
3	4. That Petitioner has previously waived his right to be brought to trial within 60
4	days.
5	5. That Petitioner consents that if Petition is not decided within 15 days before
6	the date set for trial, the Court may, without notice of hearing, continue the trial indefinitely to a date
7	designated by the Court.
8	6. That Petitioner personally authorized his aforementioned attorney to
9	commence this action.
10	WHEREFORE, Petitioner prays that this Honorable Court make an order directing
11	the County of Clark to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus directed to the said Doug Gillespie, Sheriff,
12	commanding him to bring the Petitioner before your Honor, and return the cause of his
13	imprisonment.
14	DATED this 28th of February, 2012.
15	PHILIP J. KOHN CLARK COUNTY PUBLIC DEFENDER
16	CLARK COUNTT FUBLIC DEFENDER
17	D /o/EDIVA D. DALLOLI
18	By: <u>/s/ ERIKA D. BALLOU</u> ERIKA D. BALLOU, #8365  Deputy Public Defender
19	Deputy Fublic Defender
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	

#### **DECLARATION**

ERIKA D. BALLOU makes the following declaration:

- 1. I am an attorney duly licensed to practice law in the State of Nevada; I am the Deputy Public Defender assigned to represent the Defendant in the instant matter, and I am familiar with the facts and circumstances of this case.
- 2. That I am the attorney of record for Petitioner in the above matter; that I have read the foregoing Petition, know the contents thereof, and that the same is true of my own knowledge, except for those matters therein stated on information and belief, and as to those matters, I believe them to be true; that Petitioner, WILBURT HICKMAN, personally authorizes me to commence this Writ of Habeas Corpus action.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. (NRS 53.045).

EXECUTED this 28th day of February, 2012.

<u>/s/ ERIKA D. BALLOU</u> ERIKA D. BALLOU

## 2

## 3 4

## 5

## 6

## 7

## 8 9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

#### MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

#### IN SUPPORT OF PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS

COMES NOW the Petitioner, WILBURT HICKMAN, by and through his counsel, ERIKA D. BALLOU, of the Clark County Public Defender's Office, and submits the following Points and Authorities in Support of Defendant's Petition for a pre-trial Writ of Habeas Corpus.

#### STATEMENT OF FACTS

A Criminal Complaint was filed against Mr. Wilburt Hickman charging him with two counts of Battery with Use of a Deadly Weapon (Counts I and II), six counts of Assault with a Deadly Weapon (Counts III-VIII), one count of Invasion of the Home (Count IX), and one count of Malicious Destruction of Property (Count X) as a felony as the value was over \$5,000. A Preliminary Hearing was held on January 4, 2012. At the Preliminary Hearing, Aneesah Franklin, Allen Burse, Washington Thompson, Marquetta Jenkins, Rahmeka Adams, Sharon Powell, Tiffany Trass, and Ericka Severs testified. All of the above listed witnesses, except Ms. Severs, testified to the fact that Mr. Hickman's vehicle crashed into the New Antioch Christian Fellowship church on December 18, 2011. Following all evidence at said hearing, the state amended the Criminal Complaint to add eight counts of Attempt Murder with Use of a Deadly Weapon (Counts I-VIII), amended one count of Battery with Use of a Deadly Weapon to allege that it resulted in substantial bodily harm (Count X), and amended the charge of Invasion of the Home to a charge of Burglary (Count XVII). Mr. Hickman is charged by way of Information with: Counts I-VIII – Attempt Murder with Use of a Deadly Weapon; Count IX – Battery with Use of a Deadly Weapon; Count X - Battery with Use of a Deadly Weapon Resulting in Substantial Bodily Harm; Counts XI-XVI -Assault with a Deadly Weapon; Count XVII - Burglary; and Count XVIII - Malicious Destruction of Property as a felony alleging damage of over \$5,000. The crimes are alleged to have happened on December 18, 2011. The Preliminary Hearing Transcript was filed on February 9, 2012. Mr. Hickman's calendar call is currently set for September 24, 2012, with a trial date of October 1, 2012.

#### **ARGUMENT**

To establish probable cause to bind a defendant over for trial, the state must demonstrate probable cause that (1) a crime has been committed and (2) the defendant committed it. NRS §

171.206; *Jones v. Sheriff*, 93 Nev. 297, 565 P.2d 325 (1977). The standard of review for a pretrial habeas challenge to the sufficiency of the evidence is that the state has the burden of showing "slight or marginal" evidence that a crime has been committed and that the defendant committed it. *Sheriff v. Hodes*, 96 Nev. 184, 186, 606 P.2d 178, 179 (1980). A writ of habeas corpus will not be denied if there is a showing of a lack of probable cause that a crime was committed and that the defendant committed the crime. *In re Rowland*, 74 Nev. 215, 218, 326 P.2d 1102, 1103 (1958). Only legal evidence may be received at a preliminary hearing. *Goldsmith v. Sheiff*, 85 Nev. 295, 303, 454 P.2d 86, 91 (1969). "No other type of evidence may be considered by the magistrate. The rules of evidence require the production of legal evidence and the exclusion of whatever is not legal." *Id., quoting People v. Schuber*, 163 P.2d 498 (Cal.App. 1945).

Mr. Hickman was held to answer to eight counts of Attempt Murder with Use of a Deadly Weapon. NRS § 193.330 states, in pertinent part, "An act done with intent to commit a crime, and tending but failing to accomplish it, is and attempt to commit that crime." Therefore, in order to be charged with attempt murder, one must have the specific intent to kill.

When amending the Criminal Complaint, the state specifically relied on the case of Priscilla Ford and analogized Mr. Hickman's case with that of Ms. Ford. In its closing remarks, the state argued:

With respect to attempt murder, the defense has argued that these counts should not stand simply because the defendant did not say anything to any specific individual that would indicate he wanted to kill him; however, the fact of the matter is, is that mere words are not the only evidence, direct or circumstantial, that can indicate a person's intent to kill another, a specific intent.

Here there has been extensive evidence given that this defendant tried to kill all of these witnesses that have testified today. This case bears great similarity to the Priscilla Ford case from 1980. On Thanksgiving day on [sic] 1980, Priscilla Ford decided to take her four-door sedan, drive it up onto a sidewalk and run over a crowded group of people.

She killed six people and almost killed 23 others, and she was convicted on all of these charges because the very act of taking a 2,000-pound vehicle and driving it into a crowd of people demonstrates a person's intent to kill them. (Emphasis added.)<sup>1</sup>

The state neglected to inform the magistrate that Priscilla Ford was not convicted on all counts based solely on the act of driving a car into a crowd. In fact, in Ms. Ford's case there were

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> See Reporter's Transcript of Preliminary Hearing, January 4, 2012 (attached as Exhibit A), pp. 127-128.

14

16 17

18

19 20

21 22

23

24

25

26

27

28

"such declarations and admissions by the defendant as: 'I will get you honkies,' 'I deliberately planned to get as many as possible. A Lincoln Continental can do a whole lot of damage, can't it?,' 'How many did I get?,' 'The more dead the better. Give the mortuaries the business. That's the American way. Did I get 50? How many did I get? I hope 75." Ford v. State, 102 Nev. 126, 130 fn4, 717 P.2d 27, 30 fn4 (1986). The Nevada Supreme Court went as far as to state that "All of the evidence points to the fact that Ford drove onto the sidewalks of Reno with the intent to kill pedestrians. This evidence includes inculpatory statements made by Ford both before and after the November incident and the statements of witnesses to the incident." Ford v. State (Ford II), 105 Nev. 850, 852, 784 P.2d 951, 952 (1989) (Emphasis added.). When Ms. Ford died in 2005, the Las Vegas Review Journal discussed her crime and noted that "Before the 1980 crime that became known as the 'Thanksgiving Day Massacre,' Ford had said 'the people of Reno will pay in death' for taking her daughter. She also told a U.S. attorney in Maine in 1979 that she would run down pedestrians if he did not help her get her daughter back."<sup>2</sup> (Emphasis added.)

Here, there is no evidence that Mr. Hickman made any such inculpatory statements. See generally Exhibit A. In fact the state specifically instructed the magistrate to guess as to any intent on the part of Mr. Hickman when it stated that "because the very act of taking a 2,000-pound vehicle and driving it into a crowd of people demonstrates a person's intent to kill" without any reliable evidence as to his intent. Without even "slight or marginal" evidence of Mr. Hickman's specific intent to kill, as required by case law, all of the counts of Attempt Murder with Use of a Deadly Weapon must be dismissed.

Mr. Hickman was held to answer for the charge of Assault with a Deadly Weapon in Count XV against Sharon Powell. The evidence produced at the time of the Preliminary Hearing relating to this charge was the testimony of Ms. Powell that she "got this overwhelming feeling just to move, and as I moved a car came straight through the door where I was standing."<sup>3</sup> She also testified that had she stayed "in the position, the car would have hit me."<sup>4</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> See Death row inmate Ford dies: Woman drove car down Reno sidewalk in '80, killing six, injuring 23, January 30, 2005; online at http://www.reviewiournal.com/lyri home/2005/Jan-30-Sun-2005/news/25766120.html (Attached as Exhibit B).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> See Exhibit A), p. 104.

In regards to Count XV, Mr. Hickman is alleged to have committed the assault against Ms. Powell under alternate theories. This charge is alleged to have occurred in that Mr. Hickman "did then and there willfully, unlawfully, feloniously and intentionally place another person in reasonable apprehension of immediate bodily harm and/or did unlawfully attempt to use physical force against another person."

The plain language of NRS § 200.471 allows for the crime of Assault with a Deadly Weapon to occur under either of these alternate theories. However, the state has not shown even "slight or marginal" evidence, as required by *Sheriff v. Hodes*, 96 Nev. at 186, 606 P.2d at 179, that Ms. Powell was in reasonable apprehension of immediate bodily harm. She never testified that she was in fear, only that she had a feeling that she should move so she did so. In fact, as the direct examination by the state progressed, it appeared that Ms. Powell was not in a position where she could have seen the oncoming vehicle. The charge of Assault with a Deadly Weapon cannot stand under the theory that Ms. Powell was placed in apprehension of immediate bodily harm.

Finally, Mr. Hickman is charged with Malicious Destruction of Property as a felony under NRS § 206.310 and NRS § 193.155. Specifically, NRS § 193.155 allows for damage to property over \$5,000 to be treated as a category C felony. If the damage is over \$250 but less than \$5,000, the offense is to be treated as a gross misdemeanor.

The only evidence adduced at the preliminary hearing relating to this charge was the testimony of Ericka Severs, the church administrator of New Antioch Christian Fellowship.<sup>7</sup> Ms. Severs testified that she signed a contract for repairs to the church doors in the amount of \$2,869.42.<sup>8</sup> In addition, Ms. Severs testified that she had received a verbal estimate for "about \$7,000" for damage to the carpet.<sup>9</sup> This statement was relied upon by the magistrate in holding Mr. Hickman to answer for this charge.<sup>10</sup>

According to NRS § 51.035, "Hearsay' means a statement offered in evidence to prove the truth of the matter asserted." There are exceptions which remove certain of these kinds of

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> See Information, electronically filed January 11, 2012 (attached as Exhibit C), p. 4.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> See Exhibit A, p. 105.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> *Id*. at 117. <sup>8</sup> *Id*. at 119-120.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup> *Id.* at 121.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>10</sup> *Id.* at 126-127.

	3
	4
	5
	6
	7
	8
	9
1	0
1	1
1	2
1	3
1	4
1	5
1	6
1	7
1	8
1	9
2	0
2	1
2	2
2	3
2	4
2	5
2	6
2	7
2	8

statements from being considered hearsay. See NRS § 51.035 (1-3). Hearsay evidence is inadmissible unless there is an applicable hearsay exception. NRS § 51.065. Ms. Severs' statement regarding the damage to the carpet is hearsay in that she received this information from someone who did not testify at the Preliminary Hearing. Because only legal evidence may be received at a preliminary hearing, Goldsmith, 85 Nev. at 303, 454 P.2d at 91, the magistrate's reliance upon Ms. Severs' hearsay testimony regarding any damage over \$2,869.42 is misplaced. Therefore, the felony charge of Malicious Destruction of Property cannot stand that this charge must be amended to reflect a gross misdemeanor with damage of less than \$5,000.

#### **CONCLUSION**

Based on the above and foregoing, Petitioner, Wilburt Hickman, respectfully requests that this Honorable Court issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus dismissing Counts I-VIII. In addition, Mr. Hickman respectfully requests that this Honorable Court issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus amending Count XV (Assault with a Deadly Weapon) to remove the allegation that Mr. Hickman willfully, unlawfully, feloniously, and intentionally placed Sharon Powell in reasonable apprehension of immediate bodily harm. Finally, Mr. Hickman respectfully requests that this Honorable Court issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus amending Count XVIII (Malicious Destruction of Property) to reduce the value to \$2,869.42 and thereby reducing said charge to a gross misdemeanor rather than a felony.

DATED this 28th of February, 2012.

PHILIP J. KOHN
CLARK COUNTY PUBLIC DEFENDER

By: /s/ ERIKA D. BALLOU ERIKA D. BALLOU, #8365 Deputy Public Defender

1	NOTICE
2	TO: CLARK COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY, Attorney for Plaintiff:
3	YOU WILL PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that the foregoing PETITION FOR WRIT OF
4	HABEAS CORPUS will be heard on 21st day of March, 2012, at 9:00 a.m. in Department No. V
5	District Court.
6	DATED this 28th day of February, 2012.
7	PHILIP J. KOHN
8	CLARK COUNTY PUBLIC DEFENDER
9	
10	By: <u>/s/ ERIKA D. BALLOU</u> ERIKA D. BALLOU, #8365
11	Deputy Public Defender
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	CERTIFICATE OF ELECTRONIC SERVICE
22	A COPY of the above and foregoing Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus was sent via
23	electronic to the District Attorney's Office at PDMotions@ccdanv.com on this 28th day of February,
24	2012.
25	
26	By: <u>/s/ KONIE BALDWIN</u>
27	An employee of Clark County Public
28	Defender's Office

# ORIGINAL

**ORDR** 1 STEVEN B. WOLFSON Clark County District Attorney Nevada Bar #001565 3 CHRISTOPHER S. HAMNER Deputy District Attorney 4 Nevada Bar #11390 200 Lewis Avenue 5 Las Vegas, NV 89155-2212 (702) 671-2500 6 Attorney for Plaintiff 7 8 9 10 THE STATE OF NEVADA. 11 12 -VS-13 WILBURT HICKMAN, aka

7912 APR -9 P 3: 12

CLITAL OF THE COURT

#### DISTRICT COURT CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

Plaintiff.

Defendant.

William Hicks, #0905481

CASE NO: C-12-278699-1

DEPT NO: V

ORDER DENYING DEFENDANT'S WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS IN PART AND GRANTING IN PART

> DATE OF HEARING: 3/28/12 TIME OF HEARING: 9:00 A.M.

THIS MATTER having come on for hearing before the above entitled Court on the 28th day of March, 2012, the Defendant being present, represented by ERIKA BALLOU, Deputy Public Defender, the Plaintiff being represented by STEVEN B. WOLFSON, District Attorney, through CHRISTOPHER S. HAMNER, Deputy District Attorney, and the

Court having reviewed the briefs of the parties and good cause appearing therefor, 24

///

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

///

///

(C-12-278699-1 ORDD Order Denying 1821123



P:\WPDOCS\ORDR\FORDR\121\12169501.doc

RA 000010



IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Defendant's Writ of Habeas Corpus, shall be, and it is granted in part as to Count 15 – Assault with a Deadly Weapon against Sharon Powell. As to one of the State's theories of liability under Count 15, the Court finds that there was not slight or marginal evidence presented during the preliminary hearing to prove that Defendant willfully, unlawfully, feloniously and intentionally, placed Sharon Powell in reasonable apprehension of immediate bodily harm. Thus, the Court denies this theory of liability under Count 15. However, Count 15 will not be denied in its entirety as the Court finds that the State did provide slight or marginal evidence that Defendant unlawfully attempted to use physical force against Sharon Powell.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the State prepare an Amended Information reflecting this Court's Order as to Count 15 – Assault with a Deadly Weapon against Sharon Powell.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Defendant's Writ of Habeas Corpus, shall be, and it is denied as to its remaining two allegations. The Court finds that the State provided slight or marginal evidence to support Counts 1 through 8 – Attempt Murder with a Deadly Weapon as well as Count 18 – Malicious Destruction of Property.

DATED this \_\_\_\_ 5th\_ day of April, 2012.

DISTRICT JUDGE

STEVEN B. WOLFSON Clark County District Attorney Nevada Bar #001565

CHRISTOPHER S. HAMNER

Deputy District Attorney Nevada Bar #11390

jr

Electronically Filed 03/18/2014 04:26:00 PM

RTRAN

CLERK OF THE COURT

2

1

3

4

5 6

7

•

8

9

10

VS.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

DISTRICT COURT
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

THE STATE OF NEVADA,

Plaintiff,

WILBURT HICKS

Aka WILLIAM HICKS,

Defendant.

BEFORE THE HONORABLE CAROLYN ELLSWORTH, DISTRICT COURT JUDGE FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 6, 2013

RECORDER'S PARTIAL ROUGH DRAFT TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
JURY TRIAL, DAY 4

APPEARANCES:

For the State: RICHARD H. SCOW, ESQ.

Chief Deputy District Attorney CHRISTOPHER S. HAMNER, ESQ.

**Deputy District Attorney** 

CASE#: C278699

DEPT. V

For the Defendant: MITCHELL L. POSIN, ESQ.

RECORDED BY: LARA CORCORAN, COURT RECORDER

## **INDEX OF WITNESSES**

2			
3	STATE'S WITNESSES		
٦		<u>DAY</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
4	KEVIN MADDEN	4	_
_	Direct Examination by Mr. Hamner	1	5
5	Cross-Examination by Mr. Posin Redirect Examination Mr. Hamner	1	38 42
6	Redirect Examination Wil. Hamile	1	42
7	ALLEN BURSE		
.	Direct Examination by Mr. Scow	2	4
8	Cross-Examination by Mr. Posin	2 2	27
9	Redirect Examination by Mr. Scow	2	29
9	WASHINGTON THOMPSON		
10	Direct Examination by Mr. Hamner	2	30
11	Cross-Examination by Mr. Posin	2	46
''	Redirect Examination by Mr. Hamner	2 2	48
12		_	.0
40	MARQUETTA JENKINS		
13	Direct Examination by Mr. Scow	2	52
14			
	ANNEESAH FRANKLIN		00
15	Direct Examination by Mr. Hamner	2	66
16	Cross-Examination by Mr. Posin	2	81
	ANYLA HOYE		
17	Direct Examination by Mr. Scow	2	83
18		_	
	CRAIG HUTTON		
19	Direct Examination by Mr. Scow	3	5
20	TIFFANY TRASS		
21	Direct Examination by Mr. Hamner	3	17
-	Cross-Examination by Mr. Posin	3	28
22	Redirect Examination by Mr. Hamner	3	29
_		-	-
23	SHARON POWELL		
24	Direct Examination by Mr. Scow	3	31
_			
25			

Partial Rough Draft Transcript, Day 4-2

RA 000013

## **INDEX OF WITNESSES**

**DAY** 

**PAGE** 

2
3
3

**STATE'S WITNESSES** 

Direct Examination by Mr. Hamner

Recross Examination by Mr. Posin

Redirect Examination by Mr. Hamner

Cross-Examination by Mr. Posin

Direct Examination by Mr. Scow

Direct Examination by Mr. Hamner

**DAVE CORBIN** 

**DARREN GREEN** 

**BAKMEKA ADAMS** 

## 

## 

## 

## 

## 

## 

#### 

## 

## 

## 

#### 

	_	
ı	1	

## 

## 

## 

# 

## 

IND	FX	OF	<b>FXH</b>	IBITS

	<u>DAY</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
State's Exhibits 1 through 5 State's Exhibits 10, 11 and 12 State's Exhibits 6,7, 8, 9,13, 14 State's Exhibit 16 State's Exhibits 21, 22, 23 State's 24 [stipulated] State's Exhibits 15, 17, 18, 19 State's Exhibit 20	1 1 2 2 3 3 3	8 28 34 25 78 4 42 46

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

2425

MR. HAMNER: That's correct.

That's correct

#### [Outside the presence of the jury]

THE COURT: All right. We're back on the record outside the presence of the jury in case number C12278699, State of Nevada versus Wilburt Hickman.

The record will reflect the presence of the Defendant with his counsel and Deputy District Attorney prosecuting the case and all officers of the Court.

Now, counsel, are you each familiar with Instruction numbers 1 through 29?

MR. POSIN: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And does the State object to giving of any of the instructions -jury instructions numbered 1 through 29?

MR. HAMNER: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Does the State have any additional instructions to propose?

MR. HAMNER: We would just, at least, note for the record that when we had discussed the instructions previously in chambers that, just for the record, that it was kind of agreed upon that the defense counsel did not want an expert witness instruction to be given because I think -- the thought process was that wasn't really -- the observations of the officer was not really at issue and we just want that to be just part of the record. But other than that, we don't have anything else to note.

THE COURT: Okay. And you agree with defense counsel that you wouldn't give the expert instruction?

MR. HAMNER: That's correct.

THE COURT: That's why you're not offering?

THE COURT: Does the Defendant object to any of these instructions which are going to be given as 1 through 29?

MR. POSIN: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Does defense have additional instruction to propose?

MR. POSIN: Court's indulgence.

Your Honor, I'm sorry. I know that in chambers we had discussed there were one or two that I had proposed that you were not giving. I'm afraid I didn't flag them in my notes.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. POSIN: So, perhaps we can identify them and in a later point in the proceedings I can --

THE COURT: I have them here. I was just hoping that you would type them.

All right. So, I have two. If you'd like to approach.

MR. POSIN: Thank you, Your Honor. There was two proposed instructions I had submitted. One was read as follows: If the jury believes from the evidence that the condition of the Defendant from intoxication was shown -- was such to show that there was no specific intention to cause the death of an individual, they cannot find the Defendant guilty of attempted murder. And as -- for that, I had cited NRS 193.220.

I'd also submitted an instruction that read in order to convict the Defendant of attempted murder, the jury must find either the Defendant was in control of his mental faculties and entertaining intent to kill when the crime occurred or that he had formed this intent before he lost control of his faculties. Mere intent to harm or intimate is not sufficient to warrant a guilty verdict for attempted murder. Nothing less than a criminal intent to kill must be shown. And as authority for that, I

have cited the case of *Ford v. State at 102 Nevada 136* and *Keys versus State* at 104 Nevada 739 [sic]. If I may approach I'll give the Court back --

THE COURT: Thank you.

MR. POSIN: -- these copies.

THE COURT: All right. The copies that you handed me obviously are written on because they were my working copies when we worked on these in chambers. So, I'm going to write -- I'm going to strike the language for the writing on it that I wrote in chambers and then I will write on the first one which was your jury instruction, proposed jury instruction number 12, Defendant's proposed, which is the one that says if the jury believes from the evidence the condition of the Defendant from intoxication or otherwise to show that there was no significant intention to cause the death of an individual they cannot find the Defendant guilty of attempted murder. I'm not giving that because it's covered. The specific intent is covered in the other instructions. Otherwise, I think actually when we discussed it you're willing to strike the or otherwise language; is that right?

MR. POSIN: That's correct, Your Honor. And that's why what I just read into the record I read it without the or otherwise --

THE COURT: All right. So --

MR. POSIN: -- language.

THE COURT: -- it was your intention to offer it without the stricken part and so that's what it shows on here. But I believe that it's duplicative of other instructions and that is why I did not give it.

Does the State wish to make any further record?

MR. HAMNER: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. I'm going to mark it as Defense proposed but not

given. And I will sign that and ask the clerk to mark that as Defendant's proposed jury instruction. Actually we can probably do both as one exhibit. The other one is marked as jury instruction number 13. You already read it into the record and likewise if this went up, I've stricken the language or the handwriting, hand printing that I put on during our working session. Now I will notate that it is defense proposed but not given. I will sign it and that will be marked likewise for the record.

And does the Defendant -- do you wait until the final witness has testified before you make the decision?

MR. POSIN: Your Honor, I think we can go ahead and canvass him right now as to his right to testify.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Hickman, if you'll stand please, sir.

Under the Constitution of the United States and under this constitution of the state of Nevada, you cannot be compelled to testify in this case; do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.

THE COURT: You may, however, at your own request, give up that right and take the witness stand and testify but if you do you'll be submit to cross-examination by the District Attorney and anything that you did say be it on direct or cross-examination while you are on the stand would be subject to fair comment by the District Attorney when he speaks to the jury in closing argument; do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. If you choose not to testify, the Court will not permit the District Attorney to make any comment to the jury because you've not testified because that is your constitutional right; do you understand that?

8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2425

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: If you elect not to testify, the Court will instruct the jury but only if your attorney specifically requests he has done so, and actually we have included in the jury instructions -- the jury instruction which indicates that the law does not compel a Defendant in a criminal case to take the stand and testify and no presumption may be raised and no inference of any kind may be drawn from the failure of a Defendant to testify. And so that instruction will be given at your attorney's request. Do you have any questions about these rights?

THE DEFENDANT: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Have you.

THE DEFENDANT: May I --

THE COURT: Yes.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And have you decided whether you would like to testify?

THE DEFENDANT: No, I'm not going to testify.

THE COURT: All right. And you made that decision after consultation with your counsel?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you very much.

THE DEFENDANT: Thank you, ma'am.

THE COURT: All right. Where is our marshal?

[Inside the presence of the jury]

THE COURT: Thank you. Please be seated.

Ladies and gentlemen, this is the continuation of State of Nevada versus Wilburt Hickman, case number C12 278699. The record will reflect the

1	presence of the Defendant with his counsel, the Deputy District Attorney prosecuting			
2	the case, and all officers of the Court, all 12 members of the jury as well as the two			
3	alternates; will counsel so stipulate?			
4	MR. POSIN: Yes, Your Honor.			
5	MR. HAMNER: Yes, Your Honor.			
6	THE COURT: Okay. Call your next witness.			
7	MR. HAMNER: The State calls Rahmeka Adams to the stand.			
8	THE MARSHAL: Please step up to the stand and raise your right hand,			
9	please.			
10	RAHMEKA ADAMS			
11	[having been called as a witness and being first duly sworn, testified as follows:]			
12	THE COURT CLERK: Please be seated. If you could please state and spell			
13	your first and last name for the record.			
14	THE WITNESS: My name is Rahmeka Adams; it is R-A-H-M-E-K-A Adams,			
15	A-D-A-M-S.			
16	THE COURT: Proceed.			
17	MR. HAMNER: Thank you.			
18	DIRECT EXAMINATION			
19	BY MR. HAMNER:			
20	Q Ms. Adams, do you live here in Las Vegas currently?			
21	A No.			
22	Q Where do you currently live?			
23	A Louisiana.			
24	Q What do you do for a living?			
25	A I'm in the military.			

the first car?

A About 15 or 20.

Q Okay. Now they're all congregated the church --

A No; they're walking from their cars. Some of them are gathered around the door. I mean, of course there's something going on so everybody is kind of watching and on looking.

Q So, you're feeling a little bit concerned. So, what do you decide to do with you and your daughter at that point?

A I tell her to hurry up and get out the car. So, at that time I'm looking down towards the car with the gentleman and Dwayne and Dwayne is basically talking to him saying, man, we can't help you here. Could you please leave. We can't help you here. And so by that time my daughter is getting out, the man has gotten in to his car. As I am midway across the parking lot, I see him pull out of his parking space and he pulled out and slowing started to approach the church.

- Q All right. I want to stop you there. I want to take a couple steps back for a second; okay? So, where do you and your daughter walk from. You walk -- you say, hurry up, let's go. Are you going to someplace in particular?
  - A We are walking towards the doors of the church.
  - Q Okay. Is that the double doors of the church?
  - A Yes, the double doors of the church.
  - Q Would that be these double doors kind of located about here?
  - A Yes, sir.
- Q All right. So, when you are looking back are you still only looking at him when your by your car or are you also kind of looking back as you're walking towards the front entrance of the church?
  - A I'm looking back towards his car as he's driving as I'm walking towards

1	A	Yes.
2	Q	What is he doing at that point with his hands?
3	А	Turning his wheel.
4	Q	He's turning his wheel?
5	A	Yes.
6	Q	Is he slumped over asleep in his car?
7	А	No.
8	Q	Not passed out or something in the car?
9	А	No, sir.
10	Q	Are his eyes open?
11	A	Yes.
12	Q	Where's he looking?
13	A	He's looking towards the front entrance of the church.
14	Q	Okay. When you see him turning this wheel and accelerating and
15	driving towards you and the church, what do you do at this point?	
16	А	I started screaming and telling people to move out of the way, get out
17	the way.	
18	Q	Do you do anything more than just scream?
19	A	No; my daughter was in front of me and there was another child in front
20	of me so I'm trying to push people out the way.	
21	Q	What's the scene like at that point in time?
22	А	At that time it was a little bit chaotic
23	Q	Okay.
24	А	because people outside were screaming too so
25	Q	Now, Ms. Adams, as this car's coming towards you, do you hear the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

MR. HAMNER: All right. Thank you. No further questions at this time.

THE COURT: Cross.

MR. POSIN: No cross, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you. May this witness be excused?

MR. HAMNER: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you very much for your testimony.

THE WITNESS: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you have any further witnesses?

MR. HAMNER: No, Your Honor. At this time if we could just check to see before we rest. I just want to make sure. I think all the exhibits have been admitted. They have. At this time, the State rests.

#### [The State rests]

THE COURT: Does the defense wish to present?

MR. POSIN: Defense rests, Your Honor.

#### [The Defense rests]

THE COURT: Thank you. All right. Ladies and gentlemen, the State has rested its case and the defense has rested this case. So, I'm going to now instruct you on the law as it applies to the case. I'll like to instruct you just orally without reading to you, but these instructions with are typewritten are very important. Each and every word is important and they are carefully constructed to comport with the law. So, I'm going to be reading these to you, but you don't need to worry that you need to take notes because you're going to have these written instructions with you in the jury room to read. So, best just to listen now and then you can read them more closely when you get into the jury room to deliberate.

[The Court reads the Instructions to the jury -- not transcribed]

[State's Closing Argument not transcribed]		
[Defense Closing Argument not transcribed]		
[State's Rebuttal not transcribed]		
[The Clerk swore in the officers to take charge of the jurors]		
[The jury retires to deliberate 12:30 p.m.]		
THE COURT: The record will reflect the jury has departed the courtroom.		
Are there any matters outside the presence?		
MR. HAMNER: No, Your Honor.		
MR. POSIN: I just am curious. Assuming they're still deliberating this		
afternoon, would you come back tomorrow or we could come back Monday?		
THE COURT: Well we're not coming back Saturday.		
MR. POSIN: Okay.		
THE COURT: No; because that would require lots of overtime which we can't		
afford here. So, we would bring you back Monday. But it's only 12:30. I did ask		
them to order lunch. When we call you come back to the third floor courtroom		
instead of up here. All right. Thank you. We're off the record.		
[Jury Trial, Day 4, concludes at 12:31 p.m.]		
ATTEST: Pursuant to Rule 3(c)(d) of the Nevada Rules of Appellate Procedure, I acknowledge that this is a rough draft transcript, expeditiously prepared, not		
proofread, corrected, or certified to be an accurate transcript.		
Particia Stattery		
PATRICIA SLATTERY Court Transcriber		