report that was filled out on July 11, 2013?
A It is.
MR. COOPER: Move to admit State's Proposed
Exhibit 9, Your Honor.
MS. BONAVENTURE: No objection.
THE COURT: State's Exhibit 9 is admitted.
(Whereupon, State's Exhibit 9 was
admitted into evidence.)
BY MR. COOPER:
Q Again, this is a similar report that we were just looking at?

A Yes.
Q And the address he put down is at Main and Wyoming?

A Yes.
Q Now, when you were, I guess, meeting with him in July what, if anything, did you talk to him about?

A His noncompliance, the fact that he was not attending counseling. In fact, I wasn't able to see him at his house, his cross streets, that he was not paying his fees, that he wasn't working. It had been where time had elapsed to the point where we were coming to a point where 1 have to file charges on him for being noncompliant.

Q And did you do that in July of 2013?
ordinary course of your duties?

A Ido.
MR. COOPER: At this point, Your Honor, I would move to admit the State's Proposed Exhibit 10?

MS. BONAVENTURE: No objection.
THE COURT: State's Proposed 10 is admitted.
(Whereupon, State's Exhibit 10 was
admitted into evidence.)
MS. HOJJAT: Your Honor, we would just maintain the previous objection that had been made.

THE COURT: The previous objection is noted for the record.

MS. HOJJAT: Thank you.
MR, COOPER: Permission to approach, Your Honor.
THE COURT: You may.
BY MR. COOPER:
Q So on the upper top portion it says "refused."
Do you see that?
A Yes.
Q What does that mean?
A Refused UA, meaning that he refused to have a urinalysis so I could test for controlled substances.

Q Would that have happened on the 15 th day of August?

A Yes.
Q So walk me through your discussion with the defendant on the 15th day of August when he reported to your office.

A Right away when he comes in, I ask, Are you ready to give a UA? And he's like, I'm not doing it. I don't know his exact words but he refused.

So at that point I took him upstairs to my supervisor's office for noncompliance. He was not listening to me. He can deal with my sergeant. And even my sergeant couldn't get across to him. And at that point he still refused to a UA --

Q Let me stop you there. So did you actually go in the office of Officer Zana as well?

A I was in the office.
Q And what did the defendant say at that point?
A I was pretty much out of the conversation. It was Sergeant Zana and McNeill talking.

Q Well, what did you overhear the defendant say?
MS. BONAVENTURE: Your Honor, I am going to object as hearsay at this point.

THE COURT: The question was what did you
overhear the defendant say. You have an objection with regard to what the defendant said?

MS. BONAVENTURE: Yes, Your Honor, because it is
hearsay at this point in time. They have witness Officer
Zana, and Officer Zana will be here to testify as to
exactly the conversation he had.
THE COURT: Overnled.
MR. COOPER: You can say it.
THE WITNESS: Okay. The language was something
like, I will not be kept like a dog on a leash. I refuse
UAs. I will refuse the curfew hours. I will sleep wherever I want to sleep. You have no authority over me basically.

And, specifically, I remember he said that he was doing Parole and Probation a favor by showing up at least one a month to drop off a monthly report. And that was it.
BY MR. COOPER:
Q Now, while he was in Officer Zana's office with you, did you attempt to give him any additional requirements on his probation period?

A At that time I felt there was no point to direct him anymore because he flat out refused to do everything and be compliant with his Supervision Agreement.

Q Now, referring your attention back to that on the screen. Is that what you are referring to when you say he is noncompliant?

A Right.
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Q So what does it mean by "no UA"?
A He did not produce and he refused to do a
urinalysis test:
Q What does it mean by "no curfew"?
A He refused to be placed on a curfew. He
verbally said, I am not going to be placed on a curfew.
Q This was -- well, let me back up. So was it technically the third curfew?

A Like I said, I adjusted the curfew from 5:00 to 8:00. Again, I was going to say, Hey, man, you're on a curfew, but he said, I ann not going to be placed on a curfew.

Q So in March, I think you said he was placed on a curfew?

A Right.
Q And he came back to you at some other point and said that he needed more time?

A Yeah, I give him an extension. It's hot out or whatever, and he wanted me to push it back and I did agree to give him the 8:00 p.m. curfew.

Q In August were you basically saying you were on a curfew or were you trying to give him a new curfew?

A Continuing saying you are still on a curfew.
Q And is that when he said no?
A Yes.

Q What's the "no one time weekly $\mathrm{OV}^{\prime}$ " mean?
A That would be that we would want him to come into the office once a week to report since he was
homeless and we could not track him down at his
residence. He refused to come in one time a week for an office visit, which would be "OV."

Q And "not registering everything 30 days," what does that mean?

A Sergeant Zana brought that up. At that time I was unaware, when you are homeless you have to register every 30 days --

MS. HOWAT: Your Honor, I am going object to as hearsay.

THE COURT: Overruled.
THE WITNESS: Sergeant Zana was saying that every 30 -

THE COURT: Hold on. Before you werent saying what Officer Zana said.

MR. COOPER: I can clarify that, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Please.
BY MR. COOPER;
Q What is your understanding of when a homeless person has to register?

A Every 30 days.
Q And it looks like on the right-hand side here it
says "Sergeant Zana office." Is that what you were referting to when --

A We were in his office when we discussed those things.

Q Now, at some point after August of 2013, did you have contact with the defendant again?

A Not physical contact, no.
Q What type of contact did you have?
A Sergeant Zana did show me a letter addressed from Steve McNeill. The letter was addressed to Captain Sawyer who is in charge of Parole and Probation. It was a cease and desist letter.

Q Essentially, what did that letter say?
A Basically, it said that Parole and Probation has no authority over him and to stop contacting him.

Q After August of 2013, did you see the defendant again in Probation and Parole at the office?

A I did not.
Q Did he contact you again after August 2013 ?
A He did not.
Q Between August 2013 and March 2014, did you have any contact with the defendant?

A No.
Q Between that time period, did you attempt to contact the defendant?

A Yes.
Q And can you describe to the ladies and gentlemen of the jury what attempts you made.

A Phone calls and more home attempts at Main and

## Wyoming.

Q And were you able to find him at Main and Wyoming?

A I was not.
Q And at this point he was still required to come in regularly once a month?

A Yes.
Q And between August and March that would have been about nine months?

A Correct.
Q Nine months of no contact?
A Nocontact.
Q Now, let me ask you a question. We talked about lifetime supervision. Does lifetime supervision actually mean lifetime?

A No. After ten years --
MS. HOJJAT: Objection, Relevance.
THE COURT: Mr. Cooper.
MR. COOPER: Your Honor, this goes directly to the charge. I don't understand how it is not relevant.

THE COURT: I need more explanation of how it
goes to this particular charge.
MR. COOPER: May we approach Your Honor?
THE COURT: You may.
(Discussion held at the bench.).
THE COURT: The objection is sustained. You may
not answer the question. And I will ask counsel to
proceed.
MR. COOPER: Court's brief indulgence.
BY MR. COOPER:
Q All the different violations we're talking
about, the curfew and the not reporting, that all
happened here in Clark County, Nevada?
A It did.
Q Do you recall testifying in May at a previous
hearing in this matter?
A 1 do.
Q And was that your first time testifying in a
hearing like that?
A It was.
Q Describe your state of mind at that point?
MS. HOMJAT: Objection. Relevance.
THE COURT: Mr. Cooper.
MR. COOPER: Can we approach, Your Honor?
THE COURT: Sure.
(Discussion held at the bench.)

THE COURT: The objection is sustained as to the form of the question.

You may proceed.
MR. COOPER: Thank you, Your Honor.
BY MR. COOPER:
Q I think you said you remember that you testified at a previous hearing?

A Idid.
Q And during that previous hearing, do you recall if you testified the exact same way as you testified today?

A I did not.
Q Do you remember anything that you may have misstated at hat previous hearing?

A Xes. I deftinitely got confused on dates.
Q What do you mean by that?
A When his lifetime supervision started, when I started supervising him, things of that nature.

Q Do you recall what date you said you started supervising him in that previous hearing?

A I believe I misspoke and said March 2012.
Q Were you even a probation officer in March of 2012?

A I was not.
Q And when did you actually become a probation
officer?
A Well, in April 2012 I started the academy.
Q Did you remember anything else that you might have misspoke on or anything like that?

A I believe I was asked a question about maps, if he had drawn any maps, and at that point I didn't have my monthly reports in front of me to say for certain that he had, but now that I did go back and look at the monthly reports he did draw me maps.

Q Those would have been the maps that you would have used in order to try to find him?

A Yes. I take those out in the field with me and tried to look for the offender using those maps.

MR. COOPER: I will pass the witness, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Ms. Bonaventure.
MS. BONAVENTURE: Thank you, Your Honor.

## CROSS-EXAMINATION

## BY MS. BONAVENTURE:

Q Nice to see you again, Officer Mangan. How are you doing today?

A I'm really good. Thank you.
Q Good. So Mr. Cooper started getting into this when he first started talking to you, basically, your

```
experience, right?
    A Experience in what?
    Q I'm sorry. As a probation officer in general.
    A Okay.
    Q Let me just reask the question.
    A Okay.
    Q So you said that you were hired April 2012 ?
    A Yes.
    Q Okay. That's when you were hired. And you said
you did go to an academy?
    A I did.
    Q How long was that academy?
    A I graduated September 19, 2012.
    Q Congratulations.
    A Thank you.
    Q After you did the academy, you did say that you
did field officer training; is that right?
    A Field training, yes.
    Q And you had a senior officer with you?
    A 1 had several senior officers.
    Q How long did your field training last?
    A I would say approximately two months.
    Q Two months?
    A Approximately, yes.
    Q So it's your testimony today that by
```

December 2012, you were done with your field training?
A It's possible. I do not know the exact date
Q Okay. You did testify that you graduated from
the academy in September?
A Yes.
Q You did about two months of field training?
A I did.
Q So that would take us into December, maybe
December/January?
A Probably December/January.
Q Okay. January of 2013?
A I would say yes.
Q Now, the sex offender probation or the lifetime
supervision, is that a special detail in your office?
A Sex offender unit is a special detail within
Parole and Probation.
Q Now did you receive any additional training
after your academy in order to deal with this population?
A Idid.
Q What training was that?
A It was general training as in the rules of
lifetime supervision, It was something like -- in the
Department of Parole and Probation we have like a
4 thousaind-foot rule, so no sex offender can live within a
thousand feet of a school, park, stuff like that. You
know like if he's a tier 1, tier 2, tier 3 being a high risk --

MS. HOJJAT: Objection.
MS. BONAVENTURE: We are going to withdraw that objection, Your Honor.
BY MS. BONAVENTURE:
Q How many hours of training do you think you received in specialized training for this special unit?

A I could not even approximate that. I do not know.

Q So then you went from your field training --
A Yes.
Q - to getting assigned cases?
A Right.
Q So when you were in field training, were you working on your own cases or were you working with the stapervising officer?

A I had my own caseload and my supervisor would watch me as I am supervising my other officers, so it trickled down.

Q So they would always be with you?
A Not always but a lot of the time they were.
Q So you told me that you were off of your field training about January 2013?

A Between December and January I believe that
would be a good approximation.
Q And then earlier you did testify that in
March 2013 that is when you got your first group of cases?

A Yes, sex offender cases.
Q So that's when you first got your sex offender cases?

A That's when I transferred to the sex offender unit in March of 2013.

Q So up until this point you were working on your own cases with the superior, right?

A Yes.
Q And that was generally other kinds of felonies?
A Yes. Anybody on parole and probation.
Q Okay. I am following you here. So suffice it to say at this poirit you had been on your own since January, February and March. So this was your third month kind without a field training officer to run to like a field officer?

A Oh, there's always people to talk to.
Q Like Sergeant Zana, which we already know --
A Any senior officer.
Q So at this point you were working up your own cases though?

A I was.

## detail?

A I am.
Q So previously to becoming Mr. McNeill's lifetime
supervision officer, he did have other lifetime
supervision officers before you, correct?
A He did.
Q He had four lifetime supervision officers to be exact before you?

A Okay.
Q Is that not correct?
A I did not look back or count. I can only go off of what you say.

Q Okay. So when you received this case were you in receipt of a file?

A I was.
Q Were there notes from previous lifetime supervision officers in that file?

A There was.
Q Did you avail yourself of that information when you became his case manager?

A Yes, I looked back at the file.
Q Did you becone aware of the fact that he did in fact have four previous probation officers?

A I know he had previous officers. I did not count the number.

```
Q Okay. So we have already established that he started lifetime supervision in 2007 , correct?
A Yes.
Q So by the time you became assigned as his probation officer he had basically been on probation for about five years?
A Lifetime supervision?
Q Yes. I'm sorry. Lifetime supervision,
A Yes.
Q Okay. So after you availed yourself of the information from the notes left by the previous supervising officers, did it ever come to your attention that he was ever arrested on a prior violation for violating lifetime supervision?
```


## A I do not recall.

```
Q He did actually, and I'm sure you know this because I know you said that you went through the notes, that he did not become homeless up until I believe it was February of 2013 , correct?
A I would say January.
Q January?
A I would say January.
Q So based upon the notes left to you by the prior lifetime supervision officer, he was able to maintain a stable residence for that prior time period?
```

A He had a residence. I do not know how stable it was.

Q So he had been reporting the exact same residence for the last five years?

A Oh, I don't know about that. I don't know if it was the last five years. I just know as I look back he was staying at a Casino Center address. That's all II know.

Q So that's the only address you remember from the prior note?

A Yes. From the file, yes.
Q And reviewing those prior case notes, I am sure you are aware that he was employed previously to you becoming his supervising officer?

A I know at one time he did report employment. I don't know what those dates are.

Q Okay. There were also periods of unemployment, correct?

A Yes.
Q Now based on those prior case notes, to your knowledge, he had previously submitted to urinary analysis, correct?

A Yes, he did.
Q Which is the drug testing that you say he had refused you?

A Yes.
Q Now based on those prior case notes, I am sure you are aware that Mr. McNeill was previously put on a GPS monitoring when he first started his lifetime supervision?

A I was not aware of that, no.
Q You were not aware of that?
A No.
Q Did you ever see any indication in the case notes that he had violated any kind of GPS?

MR. COOPER: Objection, Your Honor. She was not aware that he was on GPS so how is she going to know if he violated GPS.

THE COURT: So the objection is that it's outside of this witness' knowledge?

MR. COOPER: It's outside and technically asked and answered in the last question and assumes a fact not in evidence.

MS. BONAVENTURE: Well, Your Honor, just because she says she doesn't know whether he was on GPS monitoring doesn't meant that she wouldn't know there is a violation as a result of not following the GPS monitor.

THE COURT: If she knows. Overruled.
THE WITNESS: I do not know if he was violated on any GPS system.

BY MS. BONAVENTURE:
Q But you did previously testify that he was never previously violated?

A I don't recall. I believe I said I do not recall. I don't know if he was or was not. I was only concerned with what the does under my supervision.

Q And so he had been pretty much making most, if not all, of his monthly reports based on those prior case notes?

A He had been showing up submitting monthly reports.

Q And by showing up you mean presenting himself physically at the Deparment of Parole and Probation?

A Yes.
Q So based on the prior case notes in the file, some other supervising officers did in fact conduct house checks, correct?

A Yes.
Q In fact, I don't know if you know anymore of the details of it, but when they did do some of the house calls - is that what you call them?

## A Home contact.

Q Home contact, okay. HC, home contact. Okay. When they did do these house visits he wasn't always at home, correct?

A I don't know what happened in the past. I don't know. He could have been. I do not have any proof in front me or a computer to show me he was at home or wasn't at home.

Q Okay. From here on out, when I ask you questions I mean from the time in which you became his probation officer.

## A Since March 2013 ?

Q Yes.
A Okay.
Q So you previously testified that when you became his probation officer, you did what you usually do which is ailempt to contact the person you are assigned to supervise?

A Yes. $\mathbf{H e}$ is on lifetime supervision.
Q Did you try to contact him?
A I did.
Q. And you said you were you unable to contact him?

A I believe $I$ wrote something along the lines of $I$ attempted to contact him but was unable by phone to make contact with him. I don't know if that meant I got a voice mail or the phone got disconnected. I'm not sure. I just know I was unable to get ahold of him.

Q At that time did you annotate your notes in the case file saying that you suspected him of being a
potential absconder?
A Yes.
Q Can you for the jury's sake explain what an absconder is?

A An absconder is someone who is no longer reporting as directed by the Parole and Probation Office.

Q But when you recall the previous case notes, do
you recall whether or not Mr. McNeill had made his
February 2013 appointment which was the month that immediately predated the month you became his supervising officer?

A I believe it is but I would not be able to confirm that without the file in front of me.

Q Would it refresh your recollection to see it?
A I would be able to see the monthly report and the date on it to see if that is a monthly report with the February date.

MS. BONAVENTURE: Your Honor, may I approach?
THE COURT: You may.
BY MS. BONAVENTURE:
Q Tell me what this is that you are looking at?
A It is a monthly report dated $2 / 5 / 2013$, Officer Van Dyke. Filled out by Steve McNeill.

Q So this is the month before you became his probation officer?

A Yes.
Q Did he in fact report the month before you
became his probation officer?
A Hedid.
Q And then in March he did in lact teport to you?
A I was surprised by him reporting, but, yes.
Q Okay. And surprised because you had put him down as an absconder?

A No. Because I make appointments to see my offenders to come see me so they don't show up at the office and I'm not there. So I make appointments. So I had no appointment with him for March.

Q Did you go look for him at this point?
A I might have. I might have tried to drive by. I don't know for a fact.

Q If you had gone out would you have annotated your notes?

A Yes.
Q Did you review that file before you came in here today?

A It would be on my computer: It's called a "chrono list." So if I revicwed the chrono list I would see if I did try to make phone contact.

Q If I showed you the chrono list would you be able to look at it?

A Yes, definitely.
MS. BONAVENTURE: If I may approach, Your Honor. THE COURT: You may.

## BY MS. BONAVENTURE:

Q I know it might take a second as to the dates.
It is not easy to read.
A Looks like March 26th atfempted to reach him by
phone and was unsuccessful.
Q Now does it say anything about you conducting a potential home contact?

A I do not see it on here. I think this should have only been one page.

Q So you did not attempt a home contact at that point?

A Idid not.
Q But then he showed up in March?
A Hedid.
Q Do you remember where he was registered?
A I did not check the sex offender registry at that moment.

Q I am talking about in the monthly report that he was submiting to the Department of Parole and Probation. Maybe this will help you recall.

Do you recall him being registered at the comer
of Main and Colorado?

A I could not testify to where he was registered,
only what he is reporting on his monthly report.
Q Fair enough.
A What was your question again?
Q What corner did he put on his monthly report?
A For what menth?
Q For the month you were assigned his case?
A March?
Q Yes.
A It doesn't say.
Q So safe to say it was either one?
A Either one of those two. He reports the same thing every time.

Q So this was the report I had shown you previously, the February report?

A Yes.
Q So this is the February report that you had looked at before. This is the one that the supervising officer before you had seen and this would have been infomation you had going in to his case, correct?

## A Yes. Colorado and Main.

Q Thank you. So he was registered at Colorado and Main, correct?

A No. I would nut say he was registered --
Q I'm sorry. I keep confusing the words. Thank
you. He was reporting that his residence was at that intersection?

A Yes, he was.
Q And he reported the intersection at the direction of his previous PO , correct?

A I can't speak to what they discussed or I do not know anything about what happened before I was his PO really.

Q Okay. Would that information have been put into a statement?

A lf the officer put it in, yes.
Q Sohe is reporting to the Department of Parole and Probation an intersection because he is, homeless correct?

A Yes.
Q And he does that because homeless people are required by law to register, if they did not have a fixed address to register at a comer closest to where they habitually sleep, correct?

A Yes.
Q So now let's turn to your preliminary hearing testimony because that is very curious to me.

A Okay.
Q Mr. Cooper brought it up on direct, and you did in fact testify at preliminary hearing, I asked you, I
was like, Officer Mangan, did Mr. McNeill ever provide you a map specifically indicating where he sleeps?

A I remember that.
Q And you said, No, he never drew me a map?
A Yes. I did say no.
Q Which, like I said, is very curious because everybody did previously see these maps?

A They did.
Q Therc is not just one map, but there's two maps?
THE COURT: Counsel, for our record, if you are going to publish, can you identify which proposed or admitted exhibit that is.

MS, BONAVENTURE: Absolutely, This is the State's Exhibit 6. And this is the monthly report that he submitted for April 12th of 2013. So there was this one map. And not only was there one map, there were two maps. But everybody did in fact see that map.

THE COURT: And that is State's exhibit --
MS. BONAVENTURE: This is State's Exhibit 7. BY MS. BONAVENTURE:

Q So suffice it to say that not just one but two maps existed and you had no recollection of that at preliminary hearing?

A Right. Without my monthly report I could not recall if he had drawn me a map or not.

Q In fact based on your own case notes I believe you annotated that not only were the maps drawn but you and Mr. McNeill looked it up Google earth.

A I pulled up Google carth on ny computer, yes.
Q Where he indicated to you on Google earth where he says he sleeps at night?

A Yes.
Q Yet you had no recollection of that at preliminary hearing?

A 1 believe the question was of him drawing me a map not whether I looked up a map on my own on Google earth.

Q You made no mention of that at preliminary hearing?

A I was not asked that question.
Q Okay. Mr. McNeill report toed you in March of 2013. He reported to you in April of 2013. He reported to you in March of 2013 --

A May, yes.
Q Yes, I mennt May. And you had said on direct that some other officer was his officer for the month of June?

A Yes. I belicye Orfice White was his officer. I wasn't transferred. I don't know if it was May or June.

Q It was sandwiched right in there, yeah.

```
    A Yes.
    Q And then you received a monthly report from
Mr. McNeill in July?
    A Yes.
    Q So by July -- and July 11 is the date that you
arrested him for violations of lifetme supervision?
    A I did.
    Q And so by July you had only seen him three or
met with him prior three times, correct?
    A March, June, April -- June, so July that would
be four times.
    Q I believe the monthly reports indicate that you
met with him March --
    A Oh, are you speaking of the other officer?
    Q Yes.
    A Yes.
    Q March, April and May?
    A Yes.
    Q Not June?
    A Okay.
    Q And then you met him again in July?
    A Yes.
    Q Okay. And July is the monthly reporting date
that you arrested him?
    A He filled out his monthly report on July 11th.
```

He came in the office. We talked and I arrested him.
Q And like you testified earlier, nothing came of
those charges?
A No.
Q He was released from custody?
A Hewas.
Q So you arrested him on July 11 th and then he
reported to you in August, correct?
A Hedid.
Q He reported to you on August 19th to be exact?
A That was a typo. The actual physical date he
reported is on $8 / 15$. I entered it in the computer on
8/19 and that's where I got that date from.
Q So you entered -- it was a typo that you entered
into the computer?
A It is not a typo. It is just - so he comes in
on the 16th and I see him. But lets say that was a
Thursday, so that was my Friday. I come back on Monday
and I would enter when it happened. So on the computer,
it puts in that date, which would have been the 19th.
Q Okay.
A So when I am looking at the computer it will say
$8 / 19$ this is what happened, this is what I saw when it
actually it occurred on the 15 th.
Q And I see corroborating proof of that. In fact
this is State's Exhibit 10, and right here you can see
the report date that Mr. McNeill himself wote down was
August 15 th ?
A Yes.
Q So the computer etror was because of a typo?
A I entered the information on a different date
then the 15th.
Q Got it. Okay. So on August 15th you testified
on direct that he came in, you asked him to take urinary
analysis test and he flat out tefused?

A Yes.
Q Did you at any point hand him a cup to, for lack of a better word, pee in?

A I don't believe we would have got that far. I don't recall having a cup in my hand or anything like that. I don't think $I$ had a cup and I'm not sure how that makes a difference.

Q So you don't remember whether or not you gave him a cup?

A Idon't.
Q And then you said you took him directly to Officer Zana's office?

A I took him to my supervisor, Sergeant Zana.
Q Sergeant Zana, sorry, who is your supervisor?
A Yes, he is.

Q So at that point you overheard a conversation between Sergeant Zina and Mr. McNeill?

A I was in the room as they were speaking.
Q So you overheard a conversation?
A Yes.
Q And so you said that you overheard them have a conversation about the curfew?

A Yes.
Q Wherein somehody wanted to put him on a curfew?
A Well, he had to abide by his curfew.
Q Okay. And you saiet hat he had flat out refused?

A He refused to be placed on a curfew.
Q So a curferw was never set?
A Well, his old curfew would still be in effect unless I said this curfew is no longer in effect, which I never did.

Q Okay. So a new curfew was never set? On August
15th no new curfew was set?
A No new curfew.
Q And you did not amest him that day, correct?
A I did not.
Q Sergeant Zanta did not arrest him that day?
A No.
Q By all accounts Mc. McNeill walked out of the

Department of Parole and Probation that day?
A Hedid.
Q So you testified on direct that you never heard from Mr. McNeill again?

A I saw the letter he sent but I don't recall ever having a conversation with him.

Q Right. You never saw him again, you never had any verbal or telephone communication with him?

A No, I don't believe so.
Q So the only indication of his existence that you got was a cease and desist letter?

A Yes. MS. BONAVENTURE: May I approach, Your Honor? THE COURT: You may.
BY MS. BONAVENTURE:
Q Is this a true and accurate representation of the cease and desist letter you were shown in reference to Mr. McNeill?

A I believe it is.
Q You had testified on direct that the basic gist of it is he is telling Parole and Probation don't contact me?

A To cease and desist contact with him.
Q Any and all contact in fact?
A Yes.

THE COURT: Ms. Bonaventure, if you want to
discuss the document substantively. I don't have a problem with as long as it has been admitted. Do you seek to move to admit it?

MS. BONAVENTURE: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: We have marked it now as Defense's
Exhibit Proposed A. Any objection?
MR. COOPER: No, Your Honor.
THE COURT: No, then, Defense Proposed A is admitted and you may publish.
(Whereupon, Defendant's Exhibit A was
admitted into evidence.)
MS. BONAVENTURE: Thank you.
BY MS. BONAVENTURE:
Q So the first couple of pages are the actual notice of the cease and desist letter, right?

A I am not really familiar with these kind of. letters. I just read it over. But I am not familiar with what this entails.

Q I would put it here just so that the jury can see what we are looking at.

A Okay.
Q So at the top, can see that this is cease and desist in restrictions and harassments, correct?

A That's what it says.

```
Q Okay. And so was this included in the letter that you saw that day?
A I belicye it was.
Q It is a commercial affidavit open verification from Steve McNeill, correct, as part of his cease and desist letter?
A It came tin the mail, that's all II know.
Q And also here is included a UCC financing statement; was that included in the packet?
A It was included in the letter.
Q Letter, okay. And then this also, an affidavit of political status.
A I believe it was included in the letter.
Q Looks like it is signed by Mr. Steven Dell McNeill.
A Yes.
Q So this was in fact an accurate representation of the actual cease and desist letter?
A It appears so, yes.
Q You previously testified the last time you saw him was August 15, 2013?
A Yes.
Q You received -- do you remember what day you received the cease and desist letter?
A I did not receive it. My sergeant showed it to
```

me on 8/29/13, around that time. It was later August
that he had known me the letter that the captain had received.

Q So a little bit after your last meeting with him?

A Yes.
Q And so you never heard from him again?
A I did not.
Q Now the charges you filed in this case -- you filed that report with the alleged charges in this case. in March of 2014, correct?

A Can I see -- I believe so. I know I started that December. I started writing the new charges then and there was a series of corrections that happened and then it was sent to the DA and it comes back with, We want more information. They sent it back, so it was kind of like a back and forth process. But I believe I started writing the charges in December, which should be noted on there.

Q So it actually got filed -- here it is. Does that look familiar?

A Well, this is part of it. It's not my complete packet, but it is part of it. It was finally approved by my sergeant on 3/10/14.

Q So that is the day that it goes to -- when it
gets filed with the court which is why there is a stamp there?

A Yes.
Q And it's fair to say it's filed on that date, the 14th?

A Yes.
Q Thank you very much. And so the preliminary hearing transeript that we had earlier alluded to, you testified then that the reason you waited so long or the reason it took so long was that you were attempting to contact Mr. McNeill?

A That was part of the reason, yes.
Q And you even testified on direct that you said you made attempts to drive by the location he had previously reported?

A Yes.
Q And to make phone calls?
A Yes.
Q If you had done those would you have annotated them in your case notes?

A They should be noted.
Q Do you remember the dates that you made these calls?

A I do not remember the dates.
Q If I were to show you your case notes would you
be able to refresh your recollection?
A Yes,
Q Please take your time in looking at that and let me know if you see any notes of any calls or any visits made to contact Mr. McNeill between the dates of August 2013 to March 2013 related to the charges in this case.

THE COURT: You mean March 2014. MS. BONAVENTURE: I do.
THE WITNESS: February 27, 2014, I tried to look
for the subject in alley and cross streets of Main and
Wyoming. Subject was not observed. And then the same day I continued my surveillance between Main and Wyoming.
I drove around multiple alleys and roads on or near
Colorado and Las Vegas Boulevard, Wyoming, Commerce, Utah. That is the only thing I see.
$\mathbf{Q}$ Between those two dates?
A Yes.
Q So your case notes they only reflect that you made one attempt to go down to try to locate Mr. McNeill in February, correct?

## A Correct.

Q February 27ıh?
A Correct.
Q And there were no case notes that you could find
that you made any calls?
A It was not written down, no.
Q Okay. And just to clarify because I krow all these dates get confusing to us and they get confusing for our jury members. So you were never able to find him at the comers he had registered al, correct?

A I never personally sawy him at Main and Wyoming, yeah.

Q You did not see him there while he was reporting to you, correct?

A I did not.
Q And you never saw him there after'?
A Right.
Q Okay. Now I know we touched upon this in the preliminary hearing a little bit, but one of the theories of the State's case is he was tailing to cooperate with you, his iifetime supervision officer.

Now, so that basically means not cooperating
with you, he is not abiding by the terms of his supervision, correct?

A Can I actually read what cooperation says under his Lifetime Supervision Agrecment to better recollect?

Q Okay. Here you go.
A Cooperation: You shall at all times cooperate with your supervising officer and behavior should justify
the opportunity granted to you by this lifetime supervision.

Q Okay. So now a violation of that clause would be violating your lifetime supervision?

A Yes.
Q So what you had said earlier you said he refused. urinary analysis, correct?

A Yes.
Q And so that is part and parcel of his failing to cooperate, right?

A I would think so, yes.
Q By just making that one violation. It is not
just one violation for refusing to do the urinary
analysis, but it's actually two violations because it
violates not just having to do the urinary analysis, but
it is also a violation of not cooperating with the
lifetime supervision?
A It seems to be the case, yes.
Q So kind of like a twofer; two violations --
A It's in there and I can violate on it.
Q Okay. That is fine. So part of the State's
theory of the case is also that he was terminated from sex offender counseling, correct?

A He was.
Q And I know that you testified that you had
ordered him to return to sex offender counseling?
A Idid,
Q Specifically you called Marcia Lee?
A To get reenrolled in counseling.
Q Yes. Did you ever yourself just call Marcia
Lee?
A I am sure we spoke. I den't know the date or time,

MS. BONAVENTURE: No more questions, Your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: Mr. Cooper, any redirect?
MR. COOPER: No, Your Honot.
THE COURT: I gave the insiructions yesterday so
hopefully the jurors will remember that we give the opportunity for the jurors to ask questions of the witness. May I see by a show of hands if any of you have any questions for this witness. Seeing no hands I believe you are excused, Officer. You may exit the couttroom.
(Witness exits the courtroom.)
THE COURT: Okay. I think this would be a good time to take a break, ten minutes.

During the recess, you are admonished not to talk or converse among yourselves or with anyone else on any subject connected with the trial or read, watch or
listen to any report of or commentary on the trial or any person connected with the trial by any medium of information including without limitation newspaper, television, radio, Internet or social media of any kind, or to form or express any opinion on any subject connected with the trial until the case is finally submitted to you.

THE COURT: We'li have to take some time to put on the record the bench conferences that we have had today -- to the extent that I can remember them.

MR. COOPER: There was a maltitude of them.
(Whereupon, a recess was taken.)
THE COURT: Now that he have all the jurors present we will have ask the State for their next witness.

MR. COOPER: Sergeant Zana.

Whereupon,
BRIAN ZANA, was administered the following oath by the court clerk.

THE CLERK: You do solemnly swear that the testimony you give in this action shall be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth so help you God.

THE WITNESS: I do.
THE CLERK: Please state and spell your full
name for the record.
THE WITNESS: Brian Zana, B-rina-n, Z-a-n-a.
THE COURT: Thank you, sir. You may be seated.
Mr . Cooper, whenever you are ready.
MR. COOPER: Thank you, Your Honor.

## DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. COOPER:
Q Mr. Zana, how are you currently employed?
A I am a sergeant with the Department of Public Safety Division of Parole and Probation.

Q How long have you been employed with the Division of Parole and Probation?

A Nearly 16 years.
Q How long have you been a sergeant?
A Six years.
Q What particular area or assignment are you as a sergeant?

A For the pasi three years I have been assigned to the sex offender unit.

Q I want to turn your attention specifically to August of 2013; do you recall this time period?

A Yes.
Q And during this time period, did you have an occasion to meet anyone that you recognize here in court?

Q Can you please point to that person and describe something they are wearing.

A The person who is wearing a khaki shirt with a checkered black and green tie.

MR. COOPER: May the record reflect the identification of the defendant, Your Honor.

THE COURT: The record will so reflect. BY MR. COOPER:

Q Are you familiar with what's called a Lifetime Supervision Agreement?

A Yes.
Q And what is that agreement?
A The Lifetime Supervision Agreement is an agreement created under NRS 213.1243 outlining the conditions of the lifetime supervision offender's supervision.

Q And to your knowledge was the defendant under a Lifetime Supervision Agreement in August of 2013?

A Yes, he was.
Q Now, can you describe how you came in contact with him and what happened as a result of that contact?

A My officers routinely when they have issues with some of their offenders will ask to bring an offender in to speak with me so I can kind of give them a little more
guidance. We call it kind of like the "come to Jesus
meeting" to give them one last opportunity to comply
usually. Officer Mangan came into my office and said that she had Mr. McNeill at her desk and would it be all right if she brought him in for me to have a talk with him and I told her of course it would be fine.

Q Do you remember the actual date of that?
A August 15th.
Q And what happened at that point when he came in your office?

A He came into my office. I listened to him and he was complaining about how Officer Mangan wanted to put him on weekly reporting and he said that, Well, I am only reporting to her once a month as a courtesy to her now and I explained to him that the law required him to report as instructed by his officer.

We got into a little back and forth quoting NRS's and I explained to him that he's going to have to abide by the conditions of his agreement.

He continued to go back and forth with me about how be would report when he wanted to report and we discussed other issues, such as his residence where he was living and Officer Mang an had difficulty finding him there. And at that point he said, Well, I'll live where I want to live, and I'm not going to be a dog on a
leash.
Q Did he say anything to you in relation to whether or not he is taking a urinalysis?

A Officer Mangan had reported to me that he would not take a urinalysis.

Q And specifically during your conversation with him -- how did that conversation end?

A Basically, I could tell he just wanted to be argumentative. There was no reason to continue the banter back and forth. I explained to him that he would be required to follow the conditions of his Lifetime Supervision Agreement and follow the rules that are set forth by his officer. And if he didn't report as instructed and do what he was explained to do, that a warrant would issue for him.

Q Now, at some point after Alugust 15th, 2013, did you bave occasion to receive a letter or anything of that nature?

A Yes, I did.
Q What did this letter entail?
A I was called up on I believe it was A ugust 29th, my captain called me up to his office and said that he had received a certified letter from Mr. McNeill and he was confused as to why he was receiving it. I reviewed the letter and it appeared to be kind of a
self-generating cease and desist letter.
MR. COOPER: Permission to publish, Your Honor. THE COURT: You may.
BYMR COOPER:
Q This is Defendant's Exhibit A; is this that letter that you were talking about?

A Yes, that looks like it is.
Q And when you received this letter did you forward it on to your supervisor or other individuals?

A The captain advised me to forward it to our deputy AG that represents this case.

Q And based on all the information you received, did you continue to supervise the defendant?

A Yes, we did.
Q To your knowledge, that letter had no baring on your ability to I guess follow a court order and supervise him?

## A None whatsoever.

Q Now, during your conversation with him in your office, do you recall any other statements he might have made to you or anything of that nature in relation to if he was going to show back up or if he thought that you guys should be --

MS. BONAVENTURE: Your Honor, I am going to object. This is leading at this point. Where is the
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## question?

MR. COOPER: I can rephrase or I can say it again because that question is not leading.

THE COURT: I will sustain and ask you to
rephrase. I think the question was did you remember any
other comments made by the defendant and that would
suffice.
BY MR. COOPER:
Q Do you remember any other comments made by the defendant?

A During our conversation he had stated in our banter back and forth about NRS, he was quoting NRS and stating that he wasn't required to register with sex offenders, he wasn't require to report to us. $I$, of course, was quoting NRS 176.0931 that clearly states that, you know, lifetime supervision is where these 23 most egregious offenses passed the law on October 1st, 1995.

After the banter, I decided that he was just going to want to continue to argue. I had explained to him that he would report as instructed by his officer. And at that point he said that he wasn't going to be coming in. And I told him, Well, if you don't comply, if you don't report, if don't do what you are ordered to do, then there will be a warrant issued.

MR. COOPER: Thank you. No further questions, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Ms. Bonaventure.

## CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MS. BONAVENTURE:
Q Officer Zana, you said that Officer Mangan told you that he refused a UA?

A That's correct. When she came in and asked if I would talk to him.

Q And UA meaning urinary analysis?
A That's correct.
Q Did you ever ask him to do a UA?
A No, I did not.
Q You never handed him a cup or anything?
A No, I did not.
Q You testified that he refised to be put on a curfew?

A That's correct.
Q Was a curfew ever set that day - on August 16th did you set a curfew for him?

A No. Officer Mangan would have set one. I do not micromanage my officers.

Q Okay. Now are there any situations in which you make annotations to the case notes for a particular
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person on lifetime supervision?
A If I get a phone call from a counselor or a family member or the offender themselves, if I get a phone call or something like that without the officer present I will make a notation in the CODIS system.

Q Doyou ever remember annotating Mr . McNeill's file?

A On which day?
Q Any day.
A Yes. When I review a crime report, warrant request, it's routine that I put in there that I reviewed it, if there needed to be some corrections or additions I would make notes that that necds to be done and send to the offleer to be done.

And then once a report would be finalized and it was acceptable then I would put another chronological entry noting that it was accepted and sent to the officer and forwarded to the District Attorney's Office, something like that.

Q Do you recall particularly in this case making an annotation on June 12th of 2013?

A 1 do not remember specifically.
Q If I showed you the chron notes in this case would that help refresh your memory?

A Yes.

|  | I hope nobody has any difficulty with that <br> 2 slight adjustment to the start time. Otherwise, I do <br> 3 <br> 10 social media of any kind, or to form or express any <br> 11 opinion on any subject connected with the trial until the <br> 12 case is finally submitted to you. <br> (Jury exits the countroom.) <br> THE COURT: So I gave you my card that had my <br> e-mail address where I can receive the jury instructions. <br> I think the earliest 1 would probably be able to work on it would be after 9;00 tonight so no need to rush it. <br> MR. COOPER: All right. Thank you, Your Honor. <br> THE COURT: I want to try my best to put into <br> the record those key bench conferences that we have had throughout the course today. A number of them took place during opening statements, but I am actually going to start with the bench conferences that occurred when Officer Mangan was on the stand. <br> We have already addressed the objection that was <br> made when Officer Mangan testified what was State's <br> Proposed and is now State's Exhibit 2, the Lifetime Supervision Agreement that was signed while the defendant was incarcerated and was what prompted us to actually excuse the jury. <br> And we have already put in the record with regard to the request for a mistrial and those circumstances. I just wanted to invite to see if anybody had anything further to add in the record on that before I then go back to the other bench conferences that I noted. <br> MS. HOJJAT: Yes, Your Honor. We had also objected and then at the bench further elaborated on our objection that the State's Exhibit 2 that was admitted, we were objecting that it was a fugitive document because it was not a document that was signed while the defendant was on lifetime supervision. It was not a document -essentially, it was a document that was signed while he was still incarcerated prior to his sentence. <br> And our objection was essentially the terms of lifetime supervision are fairly clear in the statute. A term of supervision does not begin until all other sentences have expired. That includes parole and probation and incarceration. THE COURT: And your basis for -- you use the |
| :---: | :---: |
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term "fugitive document" and I have to be honest, at the time at the bench, and you used it again now, it doesn't really resonate with me. I have a very specific idea of what, to me, a fugitive document is, but that doesn't necessarily mean that it isn't. That just did not resonate with me, as I said. To me a fugitive document is one that's filed that shouldn't be filed.

Can you help me understand on what basis do you argue that it's a figgitive document? I mean, clearly, it is a document that was signed by this defendant. That's not protested as I understand. And clearly it was a document that was part and parcel of the process.

Are you suggesting that it is fugitive because it should not have been signed at the time that it was signed, or I guess I am not clear on what you mean by it being a fugitive document.

MS. HOJJAT: I guess I can rephrase the terminology for the Court, I guess. Basically, what I am saying is lifetime supervision, nothing about lifetime supervision commences, nothing having to do with lifetime supervision commences until all prior terms, sentences have been finished, including parole, probation and imprisonment.

If he was still incarcerated in prison, he was not on lifetime supervision. It is not a valid document.

Essentially, it was a document that was signed regarding lifetime supervision before anybody had any authority over him via lifetime supervision. It's very clear. There is no authority of lifetime supervision. It doesn't begin until after everything is done and everything was not done, This document is not valid.

THE COURT: Okay. Before I respond, Mr. Cooper, did you want to respond?

MR. COOPER: Their argument factually flawed in the sense of when you are on lifetime supervision you have to at some point sign your lifetime supervision agreement. Why would they release someone from prison and then let them run around the streets and then weeks later say, Hey, oh, by the way, we did not have you sign your Lifetime Supervision Agreement.

Obviously, there has to be a first time for it to be signed and the only reasonable time for that to be is when they are still in prison when we can still find them and we can say, Hey, you are about to get out in ten days. You need to sign this Lifetime Supervision Agreement because this is explaining to you the terms of your lifetime supervision that you are --

THE COURT: Well, before we go too much further down the road of making either argument sound ridiculous and counterargument that that's ridiculous, at the end of
the day, there is a point in time when someone is releasing from incarceration and they get their stuff, they sign something and they walk out the door. So presumably it could be signed as he was walking out the door. Presumably it could be signed at some other time. I don't think that is the point,

I think really the argument is this document is something that the defendant signed. You argued that it had relevancy. I allowed it to be admitted. We are just making a record now I think primarily of what was argued at the bench and ultimately trying to set forth so that there is clarity for the Court when we had this bench conference at the time that this document was objected to, this was the nature of the discussion.

So rather than sort of embellish on the argument now too much, along those lines do you have anything that you want to either put in the record that was said at the bench that we haven't covered or do you have anything else specific to add --

MR. COOPER: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: - I am not going to change my mind and kick the document out.

MR. COOPER: Just as a base, I think they said it was a fugitive document and I think the Court also agreed it wasn't a fugitive document when it was signed
by the defendant and it obviously has relevance in this case and I think that should be enough.

THE COURT: That is the Court's ultimate detenmination was that the document is relevant. That there were three variations on this Lifetime Supervision Agreement in terms of when they were signed. I can't speak to for purposes of the admissibility of the evidence, I could, but I am not going to speak to in terms of whether or not the NDOC is following a procedure in which perhaps is in some way flawed because of some interpretation that defense counsel has that others may share that it really shouldn't be done until he has completed his term of incarceration.

I think it would have been inappropriate to address that issue in temms of their protocol through this ruling. What this court is looking at is whether or not there was any issue as to the authenticity of the document, the fact that the defendant signed the document, the facts that $I$ do want to put in the record that at the bench the main concern expressed, and it was expressed on the record in the previous argument as well when we were discussing redactions prior to starting the trial, that the main concern about that particular exhibit version of Lifetime Supervision Agreement was that Mr. McNeill had written "under duress."

That testimony was not elicited at this time.
Yes, it is still remaining on the document. I did not redact it. Should the jurors choose to look at that exhibit when they go to deliberate, they may very well see it, but there was no testimony or information elicited that indicated that indicated that this type of protesting occurred then prior to Officer Mangan or anything else, so at this point I think that record is completed as to that.

The only other objection that took place during
Officer Mangan's testimony was an initial objection as she began responding to a question from Mr . Cooper regarding what is lifetime supervision and she was explaining what it means to her and she was liking it io a type of parole and probation and there was an objection posed as to she should not testify to the law.

I honestly I cannot recall if I sustained or overruled the objection but I did ask Mr. Cooper to further clarify that we were just looking for what specifics of lifetime supervision applied to this defendant in this case and the witness's knowledge with regard to that.

But I think she was allowed to sort of finish her knowledge base and I think I indicated it was relevant for her to share what she understands it to be
with the understanding that we are ultimately going to provide to the jurors the clarification of what the law is in regards to this case.

And so is there anything that either counsel said that they would like to add to the record for that objection?

MS. HOJJAT: Yes, Your Honor. I wanted to ask that that objection also kind of supplement the previous objection that we discussed about the Lifetime Supervision Agreements and knowledge because our objections on those two were kind of connected. We objected and said that she should not be instructing the jury on what the law is and what lifetime supervision is and further objected that she was giving an incorrect statement. And when we objected to the lifetime supervision agreement we objected to relevance as well at the bench to all three documents.

Specifically, to Exhibit 2, we objected to it being a fugitive document but we also stated to the Court that the Lifetime Supervision Agreement was not an accurate statement of the law and we objected on that ground.

And just to supplement that record, I do have a copy of NRS 213.1243 that the defendant is being charged under. I mean, you can mark it as a court exhibit --
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THE COURT: Well, we'll have the reference for the record and the Court will obviously have it as well.

MS. HOJJAT: Yes. Basically, to supplement what we were saying at the bench, obviously, we have this time to make a more protracted argument, but what we were saying is we did object to relevance and we said that it's not an accurate statement of the law.

Essentially, I believe I said some of the
requirements are not enumerated into 213.1243. And then at that point things were getting longer and we were told that we would put this on the record later.

But essentially our position is that NRS
213.1243 lays out very specifically and enumerates the conditions that Parole and Probation have the authority to impose on sex offenders. We completely agree that the Department of Parole and Probation does have the authority to impose conditions, but the plain language of the statute lists the conditions. It enumerates every single one and there is no catchall phrase. There is no subordinate as it deems necessary to impose any other conditions. There is no statement of any other conditions set forth by the Division, nothing like that. There is no catchall that allows Parole and Probation to set whatever regulations they want to.

The enumerated regulation gives Parole and

Probation -- essentially, it says that we have decided P and $P$ is the best organization to take care of this because they supervise many other people in the sense that they are equipped to do this, but it doesn't give them the cart blanche that exists in Parole and Probation statutes and that these are Parole and Probation statutes for sex offenders that do give Parole and Probation those catchalls and that cart blanche and express and enumerate those things that are in the Lifetime Supervision Agreement.

Those are not contained in NRS 213.1243, so our objection was that this is not a relevant document because it is not an accurate statement of law. And in fact it is an inaccurate statement of the law that can confuse the jury.

THE COURT: All right. I am assuming that we will have tomorrow is the settling of the jury instructions with regard to jury instructions on this point. But we will address that then.

Mr. Cooper, do you have anything you want to add on this point or if you want to reserve further diseussion for the jury instructions tomorrow.

MR. COOPER: I would reserve for the jury instructions since these issues have already been ruled on.

THE COURT: Okay. And the main part of me putting this in the record now is so that what occurred at the bench conference is in the record because obviously it wasn't otherwise reported contemporaneous with the discussion. But appreciate the foreshadowing for the discussion tomorrow.

The other bench conferences that occurred, I noted five, there may have been more. There was two during State's opening and three during the defense opening. And the one that I noted specifically at the beginning of the State's opening, again, went to the issue of whether or not counsel could speak to what the law of lifetime supervision was.

There was some discussion about whether or not that had actually been broached or simply a statement of what the charge was. And then we again clarified that the discussion should proceed by counsel not generally discussing what the law requires because that is something that is ultimately what the Court will instruct on and the jury will need to apply to the facts, but that to speak specifically as to what the evidence is intended to show or is expected to show with regard to this particular defendant's requirements. So I did in fact sustain that objection.

I honestly can't pull together my notes of what
the second or if there were more objections during the State's opening. I know that there was at least one other. I don't think it was significant. It was simply some guidance as to the tenor of the discussion but I don't remember the specifics.

MS. HOJJAT: I believe it was again relating to the instructions of law essentially that -- oh, $\mathrm{T}^{\prime} \mathrm{m}$ sorry. It was to the statement about what Marcia Lee would be testifying to. That was the second objection that we made because --

MS. BONAVENTURE: No progress.
MS. HOJJAT: Right. There was a ruling about her not being able to get into expert testimony. To clarify the defense's position on that, the defense had originally been requesting that she can't testify to anything other than those two things that were checked off.

My understanding is that that defense request was denied. There were redactions made. It was ordered that she could not testify to any predictions about future conduct and that she could not testify to any sort of -- anything having to do with expert testimony due to the insufficient notice, but that she could testify to things as aggressive behavior in therapy only as it relates to what she observed, not from a professional
perspective but just from a layperson's perspective of behavior.

The State pointed out that we were objecting to something that we had originally asked for but there was a modified ruling. Part of what we wanted was not granted and then there was a modified ruling.

And so our position is that the Court's ruling at this point is that she cannot render any expert opinion because her expert notice was stricken. That she can testify to things she observed as a layperson and to the financial reasons for termination. And so we objected to what we believe was going into the professional diagnosis.

THE COURT: The only clarification I need is I am not certain it was my intent behind my ruling, although the wording of it may have given that impression. The issue that was raised was with regard to notes that appeared to opine to being moderate, I believe, in parentheses, at best, to re-offend and some aspect of that in these notes and what began the discussion and the Court determined that it would be inappropriate and those statements needed to be redacted for her to do that.

However, the Court did indicate that she could testify as the professional that she is in her treatment
of the defendant and the determination of that counseling and the basis for that and the circumstances. And so I am concerned about the way you are phrasing what you believe the Court's ruling to be that somehow she is a lay witness who can only testify to certain things.

She is a professional and she is able to testify to her professional encounters with the defendant. What she is not able to do because she wasn't noticed as an expert witness is opine to something of a particular expertise that has not been allowed or established. But as a counselor in this context her counseling with this defendant and the circumstances of it and the circumstances of the conclusion of it are all fair game to testify to. So I just want to make sure we are not on different pages as far as that goes.

MS. HOJJAT: And, Your Honor, I think we were on different pages. And for the record, I guess we did not receive a CV and we did not receive actual reports, so the defense would ask the Court to reconsider -- we misunderstood the ruling because --

THE COURT: And I don't disagree you are misunderstanding the ruling, so let me try to say it one more time. Anything up to the conclusion of her treatment of the defendant, she can testify to. I never said otherwise. What you were concerned about is if she
were to be allowed to testify to her belief of what his
likelihood to re-offend is or other aspects that would
call for her to have been noticed as an expert witness
and that expertise to be established to give that kind of
testimony. I wasn't going to allow it because, again,
this was just provided to you and this was something that we hadn't had notice of as an expert.

But her ability to testify as a percipient
witness and her treatment is -- I guess, I don't think
we're saying different things unless somehow once she got
up there and said, Well, I was counseling and this is
what as a counselor I observed. And you are going to go,
Oh, no, objection because that requires expert testimony.
I'm going to overnule that. If we're on the same page, then, okay, we're on the same page.

But I can't inagine that what you are suggesting is that this treating physician as a percipient witness to her treatment of this individual she can't testify about her treatment and her observation during her treatment. That's not what you are suggesting, is it?

MS. HOJJAT: What we are suggesting is because the State has talked about him acting out in the group
session. Our suggestion was for percipient things that she had observed, such as him acting out. That's different in my one-on-one with him, not reaching to
expert conclusion, but saying in my one-on-one with him I didn't believe he was making any progress.

It is our position that's still an expert opinion. We haven't had the opportunity to challenge it and she wasn't properly noticed as an expert and we still dont' have a CV to challenge her on.

THE COURT: Then we were not on the same page because I clearly, I believe, sorty, I can't say that because if it wasn't understood it wasn't clear and that is my responsibility, that anything that led to her determination that treatment was concluded or terminated and the basis upon that determination of treatment was fair game to testify to. I never said in my opinion that it wasn't. I never intended to say that it wasn't.

I simply feit that you were correct in your assessment that she could not further opine to something that would fall into the realm of an expert type report of this is what I think he is going to do in the future. That it was speculation and that it was expert.

But in terms of her being able to say that she did not feel that -- whatever underpinning there were for the termination of the counseling in terms of not making progress, which is clearly marked, and the nonpayment, she can testify to those and I don't believe I ever indicated she couldn't testify to those.

MS. HOJJAT: Okay.
THE COURT: And I remember distinctly you indicating can she just testify to what were the underpinnings again of her determination but not beyond that. So I am sorry if there was confusion on that point. That's ultimately my responsibility, but I'm glad we ironed that out today.

MS. HOJJAT: Yes, Your Honor. In that case, we
would ask that the State be ordered to bring us a CV. If she is going to be rendering opinions based on her training and experience, we still don't have a CV to this day. My understanding just from Googling, I don't see any sort of training that she has actually had as a sex offender counselor. I have seen marriage and family counseling as the only counseling experience that she has. I am sure there is other stuff, I just don't have a CV, so I don't know about it.

THE COURT: Do you have one handy?
MR. COOPER: I don't have a CV for her.
MS. HOJJAT: And the Court can see where our concern comes from if defense counsel -- if her degree isn't even remotely related to sex offender and she has no training.

THE COURT: Actually, no, I would not agree with you, counselor, because I happen to know any number of 170
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So, again, you seeing her CV in advance -- he doesn't have it. I can't make him give it to you. And she is not being allowed to be an expert and I don't want to get into the territory of, oh, now you have a CV so now she can testify. And the State is going to ask if she can testify to all this other stuff that I've already precluded.

Bottom Iine is that she has one with her tomorrow, then I will give you a few minutes to take a look at it and see what you want to do with it. You have already done your research, you can see what you think she has. If you believe that marriage and family therapy licensing doesn't give her any of that background, you know, go for it. It very well may be that she's gotten it from other sources.

I get it that you want to go into that area because you believe that her percipient witness testimony of her evaluation of him during the term of her handing of him and why she checked the box, Iittle or no progress, opens the door to, you know, wanting to now
question her credentials, go for it. But it is not going to be reliant on you getting a CV in advance and if you don't have a CV now she's an expert and you can't -that's not what is happening here.

She checked the box "little or no progress."
She is allowed to testify why she checked the box and what she observed and that doesn't change. But if you want to go after what you believe her credentials or her training or her expertise is to do that I don't have a problem with you doing that and I will give you some time to take a look at her CV if she has one with her tomorrow.

But we have already determined that she's already an expert and we already determined that she cannot testify to certain things that would require that, okay?

MS. HOJIAT: Yes, Your Honor.
MR. COOPER: Your Honor, just to correct the record, all of her reports were previously handed over and in my discovery review that I previously was -- we are talking about all of her reports were contained in there. I don't know what they are talking about a final report or something like that, but every report she ever made was given to them previously.
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MS. HOJJAT: The only comments I had made, yes, we did receive monthly therapy assessments. It's
basically like a two-sentence synopsis. When I said we didn't receive the report, what I meant was typically speaking, when a therapist or psychiatrist, people with those credentials sit down and talk with someone for an
hour or more usually the report gets generated
particularly upon termination or things like that, a
little bit more detailed, a little bit mote like what we see in competency court or things like that where there's some sort of assessment. Here's what we talked abouk, here's my assessment of what I'm basing it on. What I am saying is we did not receive one. We did receive the monthly two-sentence synopsis.

THE COURT: It sounds like whatever there was you did receive, so we'll work with that.

Bear with me here, I noted we have three bench conferences during the opening of the defense. The first is related to sort of a counterargument of that you were commenting on the law in basing the comments in regard to when lifetime supervision would kick in and the way that
that was being argued.
I sustained that objection sort of the same way I did from the State's side basically that you needed to keep it to what the law that was applicable in this case was about starting after be had completed his other proponents of his sentence. And then be specific as to requirements with regard to this defendant and so that is how we will address the first one.

Does anybody have anything fiurther to add to that?

MS. HOJJAT: I will submit, Your Honor.
MR. COOPER: No, Your Honor.
THE COURT: The second bench conference was an objection made by Mr. Cooper that there were certain facts not in evidence that were being testified to and it would not be able to be brought into evidence unless the defendant himself testified. Specifically, a reference to the fact that he was withouf employment and some other things that the argument was made that that evidence would only be able to come in if the defendant testified.

The counterargument at the bench was that, no, if in fact, this information exists in these monthly reports, or the check-in reports with the parole and probation officer but that ultimately the PO had noted or the defendant had noted and then the PO had further with
these records indicated things and there was a whole
argument about whether it was hearsay, whether it was a hearsay exception there was some business records. There was some argument that opened the door if those are business records other business would come in.

Ultimately the Court determined that it was information contained in a record. It was a defendant statement. There was any number of basis upon which hearsay would be excepted even if hearsay would be applicable in the circumstances. And, of course, was this being offered for the same thing that he was in fact unemployed.

But the opening statement was fair garne to go into this information because they were contained in the Probation Department's official record and they were provided by the defendant.

Does anybody have anything that they want to add to that objection or that bench conference?

MS. HOJJAT: I will submit it, Your Honor,
MR. COOPER: No, Your Honor.
THE COURT: And then the last objection that I noted was, again, related to facts not being in evidence. And I believe I sustained this objection but this was specifically related to the argument that was being made in the defense's opening going into sort of the state of
mind of whether the PO liked Mr. McNeill, whether
Mr. McNeill liked the PO, whether this was a clash of personalities.

I didn't preclude the theory of the defense in terms of that clash of personalities but I did indicate 6 that there couldn't be any testimony with regard to the 7 defendant's opinion of whether the PO liked him because, 8 again, that would be something that unless the defendant took the stand there would not be any independent evidence of that and it was not likely to be elicited testimony from the PO, so I did preclude that but I did allow the theory of the defense to still be argued.

Does anybody have anything to add to that?
MR. COOPER: No, Your Honor.
MS. HOJJAT: Submit it, Your Honor.
THE COURT: All right. Those are the bench conferences that I noted. Can anybody think of anything that I did not note. There might have been a few minor ones here and there that sort of follow-ups to other ones that have already been addressed and sort of clarification.

And then my ruling was made on the record in terms of whether I sustained or overruled. But I don't $h$ have any other bench conferences that I thought had substance that needed to be put into the record.

MS. HOJJAT: I don't recall any, Your Honor.
There was one new matter that the defense wanted to raise. We did not object to the testimony at the time because it was so fast and we did not want to draw the 5 jury's attention to it, but we are moving for a mistrial again.
that you had already talked to him and he understood he wasn't to comment on the law.

MR. COOPER: My intern talked to him and he said he was not going to comment on the charge and lewdness with a minor charge. And I think there was another thing he wasn't supposed to talk about.

THE COURT: Well, we had the discussion about we weren't going to comment on the law.

MR. COOPER: And he did neither one of those things.

THE COURT: But this discussion, and I distinctly heard that and actually looked over because I think I anticipated that there would be an objection was of a general nature not related to this particular defendant, however, obviously was talking about lifetime supervision as being required in certain circumstances.

Again, I guess I will take it under advisement and we'll address it tomorrow if you believe it needs a mistrial and/or a curative instruction. Again, I did not perceive it as it was occurring that it would be anything that would require a mistrial or anything that would be inappropriate.

The difficulty that we have here, again, and I think this all comes back to the mistrial, and I did have my law clerk pull those few cases while we were on the
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break and take a look at a few of them. All of these circumstances that go to not wanting to discussing incarceration goes because we are trying to avoid the fact of a prior criminal history coming to the jury's attention such as that would be used against him to bias the defendant or in this circumstance in terms of a sex offense that requires lifetime supervision without necessarily it biasing them against the defendant.

But the reality is this is the charge. This is
this the defendant. He is a defendant with a sex offense subject to lifetime supervision. There is no sugarcoating that. There is no sanitizing that further than what we have had. And the testimony here is not going to be anything other than what these individuals would, I believe, already perceive to be of a convicted felon who is under lifetime supervision.

So I fail to see how there is manifest injustice that would be occasioned by a reference of a general nature to a lifetime supervision applies to a certain type of crime. And that's just giving you, again, the benefit of my thoughts.

But I will certainly take it under advisement and I will give a final determination on whether or not to grant a mistrial, whether or not to give a curative instruction, or whether or not to do neither.

But at this point, again, I am failing to see where this type of required or proposed sanitizing is required in a case such as this.

MS. HOJJAT: Very well, Your Honor. Would the Court prefer to reserve my argument for tomorrow?

THE COURT: No. I would like to complete the arguments now and make my ruling tomorrow. I am guessing that the settling of instructions is not going to be as quick as I anticipated and then my putting together the instructions is not going to be as quick, so this is one of the reasons why I want to get it done now.

MS. HOJJAT: Thank you, Your Honor.
Just to finish my argument, our argument is it rises to manifest injustice. At this point, I understand the Court's position that this is what it is. It is a sex offender. It is a violation of lifetime supervision, and that's correct. But the Court and attomeys are coming from a place of familiarity with the law. The jurors do not have familiarity with the law and they do not need familiarity with these specifics of the law.

It's one thing to tell them he's a sex offender and he's on lifetime supervision. They don't know what that means. They don't know what that means. They don't know what level offense rises to a sex offender on lifetime supervision.

## What will happen with each of the State's

 witnesses is it's becoming familiar that they are backdooring in evidence. The first one talking about incarceration. The second one talking about one of the 23 most serious sex offenses. And I may be misquoting him but I'm trying to get it specific. He said it's one of the 23 more serious sex offenses, that's how you get on lifetime supervision.So, now the jury is hearing, well, one of the more serious ones. He was sent to prison for this. It is putting evidence before the jury that the jury does not need to make this determination. And it's become evidence on top of evidence on top of evidence. It seems like a little bit on its own but when you take the evidence in conjunction with each other, it's painting an impression for the jury that is not relevant and is incredibly prejudicial.

## THE COURT: Mr. Cooper.

MR. COOPER: Your Honor, I think a curative instruction should be sufficient. I believe anymore, I guess, harmful to the defendant than saying imprisonment or incarceration or whatever it was that my first witness did say.

I guess I believe that the jury knows more about the law than the defense is attempting to give them
credit for. That they don't know that a lifetime supervision is not your run-of-the-mill case.

I guess they want to assume that they don't know that. But, I mean, it does not rise to the level of manifest injustice by any stretch of the word.

Like the Court already said, the charge is the charge. Violation of lifetime supervision by a sex offender. They know he's a sex offender and they know he's a convicted feion. They know that he has a lot of different requirements that he needs to abide by.

I mean the common sense argument is that obviously the State is not going to waste their resources on making someone do all these conditions if they are just peeing in a park. I mean, it just doesn't make any sense for them to think that the jury doesn't already know any of the stuff that has already come out.

And I think the curative instruction to tell the jury that, Hey, you can't think about that or it can't enter into your deliberation is sufficient because -- and I don't have any cases because this is kind of being sprung on me, but I do remember previous cases that I have read where other things that have come out in front of the jury.

For example, in a case it comes out that someone is incarcerated but it's not this type offense. It's not
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an ex-felon in possession. It is not a lifetime
supervision casc, but it did come out that he was
incarcerated. I think it magnifies the situation the
prejudicial effect is far greater when the jury should be
seeing this guy as a first time offender and he has never done anything wrong before or anything like that, when in fact that's not the case here. And I have seen those cases be upheld when they had a curative instruction.

THE COURT: Well, the case law that I saw indicated that this primary concern when the reference to incarceration either in the past or currently, and there is cases on both, go to the issue of whether or not it revealed that there is a prior criminal history or a criminal history related to the defendant in question.

There is no issue with regard to the fact that there is a criminal history with this defendant in this case based on these charges. But that alone isn't the concluding factor.

Ultimately, the one statement of the document being signed while incarcerated, it was not set forth in a time frame. It wasn't set forth in terms of length of incarceration. It was a reference that was absolutely ended and admonishment given to the witness and a curative instruction given to the jury.

The only other mention of anything related to
the history of the defendant was the mention by Sergeart
Zana in the general remarks of what a lifetime
supervision defendant of how someone gets on lifetime
supervision.
And, again, I will take under advisement the request of a mistrial and/or the curative instruction and address that tomorrow.

MR. COOPER: Your Honor, I would just note that the defense can't create their own mistrial in the sense of when they heard it they should have objected at that point. And ihey should bave said something at that point. A curative instruction would have happened close in time after that.

Now they are waiting until after the jury is gone. And now they want to say, Oh, we need a mistrial.
They obviously heard it so I don't understand. I guess they have their strategic reasons why they didn't want to object, and that's fine. But --

THE COURT: And you had just concluded Sergeant Zana's testimony and this request is timely. And how the Court will address it will still be determined.

Is there anything else before we adjourn for the evening?

MR. COOPER: No, Your Honor.
MS. HOSJAT: No, Your Honor.
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


| $\begin{aligned} & \text { voir }[3]-6: 18,27: 10, \\ & 46: 4 \end{aligned}$ | wit (1] - 41:14 withdraw [1]-114:4 witness [54]-19:7, | $\begin{gathered} \text { Wyoming [13] - 42:3, } \\ 91: 5,93: 5,93: 12, \\ 95: 6,98: 4,100: 14, \\ 108: 5,108: 7, \\ 139: 12,139: 13, \\ 139: 15,140: 7 \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| W | 20:6, 20:9, 20:22, 21:15, 22:9, 24:18, |  |
| waited i11-138:9 | $24: 24,25: 6,25: 9$, 25:24, 27:19, 28:17, |  |
| waiting $[3]-33: 11$, | 52:14, 53:9, 53:11, $56: 12,57: 2,58: 9$, | Y |
| waive [2]-29:4, 29:6 | 58:12, 60:5, 62:6, | year [3]-28:1, 46:2, |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { walk }[3]-85: 23, \\ 103: 2,158: 3 \end{gathered}$ | $62: 8,62: 16,63: 8$, $64: 3,66: 13,74: 3$, | 72:11 |
|  | 74:21, 75:1, 76:12, | years [11]-48:15, $51: 5,54: 15,55: 18$ |
|  | 76:21, 78:24, 84:15, | 108:20, 118:6, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { wants }[2]-49: 23, \\ & 81: 17 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 89: 6,94: 1,96: 14, \\ & 99: 11,101: 13 . \end{aligned}$ | 119:4, 119:6, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { warrant }[3]-147: 15, \\ & 149: 25,151: 10 \\ & \text { warranted }[1]-65: 22 \\ & \text { warrants }[2]-63: 5, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 104:1, 111:14 } \\ & \text { 142:16, 142:17 } \end{aligned}$ | $144.19$ |
|  | 143:15, 153:9. <br> 153:20, 167:5, | $\begin{gathered} \text { yesterday }[22]-4: 16, \\ 5: 11,5: 16,20: 7, \end{gathered}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 71: 10 \\ & \text { waste }[1] \times 182: 12 \end{aligned}$ | 167:9, 168:3, 168:9, | $\begin{aligned} & 24: 19,25: 25,26: 23, \\ & 27: 4,27: 9,27: 18, \end{aligned}$ |
|  | 168:17, 171:22, | 31:3, 33:17, 39:9, |
|  | 181:22, 183:23 | 5, 40:3, 52:18, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 114:19, 142:25, } \\ & 154: 6 \end{aligned}$ | WITNESS (14)-53:22, 53:25, 75:6, 75:16, | $\begin{aligned} & 68: 20,68: 24,72: 9 \\ & 142: 13,153: 16, \end{aligned}$ |
| watched $\{1\}-55: 11$ | 75:20, 75:24, 80 | 173:1 |
| ways [1] $\times 116: 14$ weapons [2]-81:1, | 104:6, 106:55, $120: 24,139: 10$ | young [1] - 5:4 |
|  | 143:24, 144:2, | yourself $[3]$ - 117: 19, <br> 118:10, 142:5 |
| $81: 9$ wearing $\mathrm{m}_{\mathrm{f}}-56: 9$, 56:10, 145:3, 145:4 | 153:11 | yourselves [3] - |
|  | Witness (2] - 75:4, | 61:21, 142:24, 15 |
| Wednesday [1] 21:17 | witness' $[$ [ $]$ - 120:15 | Z |
| week [14]-7:7, 7:9, | witness's [i] - 160:21 witnesses [5] - 19:16, |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 7: 20,9: 5,9: 14, \\ & 15: 10,15: 17,16: 8, \end{aligned}$ | 53:6,63:9, 153:13, $181: 2$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Z-a-n-a }[1]-144: 2 \\ & \text { Zana }[2]-19: 14, \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 17: 1,17: 6,17: 12 \\ & 106: 3,106: 5 \end{aligned}$ | Wolfson [2] - 40:18, | 20:8, 103:14, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { weokly }[4]-7: 12, \\ & 7: 15,106: 1,146: 13 \end{aligned}$weeks [3] - 15:23, | $\begin{aligned} & 42: 5 \\ & \text { word } 60 \text { - } 22: 2,48: 13, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 103: 18,104: 2 \\ & 106: 9,106: 15 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | 76:5, 91:18, 132:13, | 106:18, 107:1, |
| weeks [3]-15:23, 68:21, 157:13 | 182:5 | 107:9, 115:21, |
| weigh [1]-37:17 | wording [2]-31:21. | 132:23, 132:24, |
| whatsoever [3] - | 166:16 | 133:2, $133: 23$, |
| 10:19, 39:14, 148:18wherain 6 f$]$ - 133:9 | words [5] - 12:14, | 143:16, 144:2. |
|  | 36:8, 50:11, 103:7, | 144:9, 150:7, 153:10, 177:7, 184:2 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { White }[3]-38: 1, \\ & 96: 12,97: 18,97: 19, \\ & 129: 23 \end{aligned}$ | 126:25 works [3]-16:11, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 153:10, 177:7, 184:2 } \\ & \text { ZANA } 11-143: 19 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | 44:13, 61:2 | Zana's [3] - 104:16, |
| White out [1] - 38:1 | worried [1] -6:3 | 132:22, 184:20 |
| whole $\{11\}-10: 25$, 25:19, 35:3, 36:2 | worse [1] - 44:22 <br> worst [2]-66:2, 66:3 |  |
| 53:21, 61:2, 77:7, | wrap [2] - 23:25, $24: 7$ |  |
| $82: 3,95: 23,143: 23$ | writing [2] - 137:13, |  |
|  | 137:18 |  |
|  | written [5]-15:6, |  |
| $41: 22$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 67:17, 91:11, 140:2, } \\ & 159: 25 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| wink [2] - 31:25, $32: 1$ | wrote [2]-122:19, |  |
| wise [1]-63:25 | 132:2 |  |
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THE COURT: Okay. We discussed several things up at the bench on Mr. McNeill's matter, including but not limited to the trial schedule. My understanding is that both sides are calling ready; is that correct?

MS. BONAVENTURE: Yes, Your Honor.
MR. JONES: That is correct, Your.
THE COURT: Okay. And so I went through and showed you the Judge's calendar, and so you said you would be ready to go on Monday picking a jury at 1:00 p.m.

Then the Department is advising me that you would be dark in the trial on Tuesday, not because she is not doing anything but because she has a full docket that day. And then you could start 10:30 on Wednesday.

And then for the record, how many witnesses is it for the state?

MR. JONES: Your Honor, for the record, three to four witnesses and one to two days.

THE COURT: And the defense told me up at the bench that you concurred in that estimate. You may have more witnesses but that you concurred it might be able to
be done in two days.
MS. BONAVENTURE: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: But if it wasn't done then I have advised the parties that the next available date for trial would be July 1.5 th at 10:30. So the understanding is maybe you will finish on Wednesday, but if you don't when you are picking a jury you have to keep in mind the schedule, which is a Monday, Wednesday, Tuesday trial.

So everybody is in agreement with that and we know that going in, right?

MS. BONAVENTURE: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: State, right?
MR. JONES: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay. And you said three to four witnesses, one to two days. Any out of state?

MR. JONES: I show no out of state.
THE COURT: How about for you, any out-of-state witnesses?

MS. BONAVENTURE: No, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Do you have witnesses?
MS . BONAVENTURE: At this point, Your Honor, that is unknown.

THE COURT: Okay. So the trial is set. Let's go then to Defendant's Motion for Discovery. I would like to go to the last page, starting with Number 1, any
and all written sworn statements made by agents in the police department, including but not limited to the $P$ and P file.

State, your response to this was that you -MR. JONES: We have disclosed everything that should be disclosed, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And that you have requested it from McNeill or that you already got it? It says that you requested it from McNeill on page 6 of your response. MR. JONES: I am going to submit on the written opposition with respect to that question, Your Honor. THE COURT: Did you get it yet?

MS. BONAVENTURE: Your Honor, we did get a substantial amount of discovery based on Number 1. I did have one issue, Your Honor, based on facts that have come to light. Apparently there was an arrest -- or two arrests which were in July of 2013 and October of 2013, which $I$ believe had to do with violations of his lifetime supervision.

What we have been trying to do, Your Honor, is get violation reports that went along with those violations as they will have bearing on the case and is relevant to our defense.

We attempted to get those files, the court files, through the Clerk's office and we were told that
we had to get an order from the court releasing those documents for us to acquire it and it was never turned over by the State, Your Honor.

THE COURT: So in this case you have violation reports from July and October of 2013 pending in the case that is the subject of the trial, the one that he's on probation for or should have been on lifetime supervision for. I mean, that's what I am trying to understand what it is you want the Court to give you.

MST. BONAVENTURE: I would like the court to grant me an order releasing the documents that were filed in that case by either the state or the $P$ and $P$ officer that went to very similar charges that are very reminiscent in this case that have to do with violations of his lifetime supervision.

THE COURT: Okay. So let's just go back to the request. The request says give us McNeill's file. The answer says, the State's response, copy of all relevant information as legally required to the extent any exist contained in the $P$ and $P$ file for Mr. McNeill has been requested and will be provided once received.

So you are telling me that what was provided from Mr. McNeill's file did not include those things; is that what you are saying?

MS. BONAVENTURE: Yes.

THE COURT: And you believe that the Court has them on the left side of the file?

MS. BONAVENTURE: Yes.
THE COURT: Any objection?
MR. JONES: Your Honor, I'm sort of standing here with my hands tied because I was not aware of that particular request. I am covering this matter for Jonathan Cooper.

THE COURT: Don't take this the wrong way, but I don't know what your objection possibly is.

MR. JONES: I don't know what it would be either, Your Honor, but I --

THE COURT: I am going to let you know out of courtesy, I hope I'm not cutting you short, but your motion is granted. You need to submit an order that requires the Clerk's Office to produce a copy of the left side of the file of the subject case. Do you have a case number for the record, not this case but the other case. MS. BONAVENTURE: Yes, Your Honor. There is two case numbers. One is $13-\mathrm{F} 11219-\mathrm{X}$, the other is 13-F17150-X.

THE COURT: So are you saying that both of these cases were bound over to district court?

MS. BONAVENTURE: No, Your Honor. I am saying that these were filed and nothing ever came from them.

But they are violation reports that I believe were filed in order to even get them to that place that has information that would be relevant to our case that was not turned over.

THE COURT: Okay. I can order production by the Clerk's Office anything on the left side file of the district court case. I have no power to get these documents in a justice court case that was never bound over, so I'm kind of confused.

If you have a pending district court case where there was a violation the Court prepared and it's on the left-hand side of the file with the PSI and everything else, I can get you that. If, however, you have documents that you believe to be out of a justice court Case you are in the wrong court. I have no ability to order discovery there. I don't even know what they have.

But, I mean, if it's a violation report prepared by $P$ and $P$ it should be in some district court case, no?

MS. BONAVENTURE: Not that I know of, Your
Honor. It was never turned over and there has never been any other violation in this defendant's record.

THE COURT: My Clerk's Office told you need a court order -- I mean you're in the wrong Clerk's Office, Number 1; you have to go to justice court.

Even if I give you an order you are still going
to have to go to the Justice Court's Clerk's Office. We're not the keeper of the justice court record.

MS. HOJJAT: And, Your Honor, just to clarify the record, that was what we were requesting. We were requesting an order to serve on the Justice Court Clerk's Office.

THE COURT: That's fine.
MS. HOJJAT: It's not a district court violation of --

THE COURT: Okay.
MS. HOJJAT: -- lifetime supervision so the case is filed in the justice court, discovery that was turned over to the justice court. The cases were just never pursued. We believe there is exculpatory material in that discovery, that's why we are trying to get our hands on it.

THE COURT: I will sign an order for the Justice Court Clerk to provide any and all records on file for 13-Fl1219-X and 13-F17150-X.

Number 2, any and all lifetime supervision agreements signed by Mr. McNeill from 2007 and 2012.

State, your response was any and all lifetime supervision agreements have been requested and provided once received.

MR. JONES: And, Your Honor, I show those are
provided. That information has been previously provided. MS. BONAVENTURE: And, Your Honor, upon a review of my file we have the one from 2012 but we do not have the one from 2007.

THE COURT: Okay. Is it something that would normally be kept? I mean this is one of those things where it's not in Mr. McNeill's file and has nothing to do with this particular case, or the underlying case that is the subject of trial.

THE DEFENDANT: Begging the Court's pardon. It is specifically of November of 2007.

MS. BONAVENTURE: It does have to do specifically with this case, Your Honor. It is the lifetime agreement that was signed that resulted in his responsibility and which was violated in this casc.

MR. JONES: Your Honor, according to the copy I have it says this information has been provided.

THE COURT: Okay. Counsel, can you show that to her, please.

MR. JONES: Yes.
THE COURT: Can you make another copy?
MR. JONES: I will do that and give it to defense as soon as this hearing is over, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. So that will be produced in court today.

Number 3 , cease and desist letter.
MS. BONAVENTURE: We have it, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay. Number 4, letter from sex offender counseling referred to by both Probation Officers Ashley Mendez and Marsha Lee at preliminary hearing.

MS. BONAVENTURE: We have one, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay. Standard State requirement if there has been any inconsistent statements made to you or any representative of your office that you have to produce those and advise the defense of their existence.

MR. JONES: And I will submit on our response, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I am going to ask that you make a record of that at the time of trial. You asked for it and that the State's position is during pretrial conferences they don't have to give you that information. So that the inquiry can be made for the record, you reserve that at the time of trial.

Next, any information on criminal history of any material witnesses in the case. Is this more than probation officers?

MS. BONAVENTURE: It is their probation officer, Your Honor.

THE COURT: You want me to --

MS. BONAVENTYRE: Your Honor, I just include that as standard language.

THE COURT: Okay. You understand in order to keep their peace officer certification they cannot be convicted of any crime. Post would not allow them to continue on their job at this point. And if they were to get a conviction at any time during the term of their employment there's audits, there's intermittent criminal background checks.

And so are you withdrawing that or do you want a ruling?

MS. BONAVENTURE: I want a ruling, Your Honor.
THE COURT: All right. It's denied as being an unreasonable burden and waste of taxpayer money.

Anything else?
MS. BONAVENTURE: No, Your Honor.
THE COURT: So you did say you have a writ that you filed. I don't have a copy of it. The parties are asking me to set that on the 7 th so it gets heard before the trial.

And then you said something else. Was there something else you wanted to discuss?

MS. BONAVENTURE: No, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay. Sir, you are Number 1 to go to trial on Monday, July 7 th, at 1:00. There is a writ
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THE COURT: Call the State of Nevada versus Steve McNeil.

MR. COOPER: Jonathan Cooper on behalf of the State.

MS. BONAVENTURE: Xiomara Bonaventure on behalf of the state.

MS. HOJATT: Nadia Hojjat.
THE COURT: Good morning. Thank you.
I've got the Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus, I've got the State's return to that. There was an issue raised in the return, and there's not been a reply filed, so I just want to address the issue first with regard to the timeliness of the Petition, if you could.

MS. BONAVENTURE: Yes, Your Honor. As far as the timeliness goes, there had been an issue with the filing because this was the trial that was set on a 60-day-speedy-trial setting, we only received the transcript on the 6 th of June. The 21 st day would have been, I believe, the $27 \mathrm{th}, 28 \mathrm{th}$ of June. I had given this to my secretary, I believe, the 24 th of June, which was within that filing period. I believe she attempted
to file the writ and it was rejected.
I do have communication between my secretary, Carolyn Gray, and somebody from your office, Jamie Combs, your law clerk, I believe, trying to figure out exactly what the problem was because it was getting rejected from the Clerk's Office.

Apparently, things were only able to be figured out by the 30 th, at which pointed it was officially electronically e-filed, Your Honor.

At this point, it was filed on the 30 th, although, we did attempt to file it previous to that time and simply had to deal with the procedural aspects of it.

On top of that, Your Honor, the State has already had time to reply. They have replied. I don't seen any prejudice at this point in time to the State.

MR. COOPER: Well, Your Honor, there is prejudice because obviously, if I was given my statutory allowed ten days to actually respond my response would have been a lot more in depth. I actually would have went into the facts a little bit more. This was set on a short setting. I did not get this until, I believe, Tuesday of last week, and so I had two days to respond to a writ, and pursuant to statute I am actually supposed to have ten judicial days to respond. So I don't even know how it got short set, but regardless of that, it was
untimely, so I think it's procedurally barred based on that fact alone.

THE COURT: Well, you know, we were originally looking at the record that Arraignment Master DeLaGarza saw that if everything, you know, went before us then there would be an even earlier request, but the transcript didn't come out. There is some question about when the transcripts were due. It's pretty close.

While I don't typically give too much leeway on these things, I am not going to consider this a bright line procedural bar. I think there is some good cause for the circumstances of the delays.

I am actually growing ever increasingly
concerned about how long it's taking these transcripts to come out. I have another case on the calendar today where we have been looking for something since April. It is still not there from what we can see from the record.

So I don't know what the circumstances were, but I'm going to give, since it was just a few day swing, the benefit of the doubt in terms of the procedural component of this. I'm going to deem it as it is possible that it is untimely, however, I am going to exercise my discretion to show good cause for that few days of untimeliness and I'm going to proceed substantively.

MR. COOPER: Your Honor, also the other problem
is I had no idea this was even going to come. Obviously, they could have contacted my office and let me know, Hey, we've been trying to file this writ, or something of that nature.

I did not find out until after calendar call. Calendar call happened in front of Judge Togliatti. The defense and the state announced ready. It's not until that afternoon where I get a writ. I don't understand how somebody can announce ready on a trial and then file a writ a couple hours later. I just don't think it makes sense.

And the problem is $I$ did not get my ten days response, so if this writ is going to be heard substantively, I would actually ask for my ten-day time to actually sit down and do a complete response. That would actually bump his trial date. Pursuant to statute if he files a writ his 60 day trial date is waived.

So again, it was the case where I put together an extremely quick response; as you can see it's only a couple of paragraphs. It puts the state in a very bad position where $I$ am expected to go forward with trial today and now we are going to hear a writ and I've only had two days to respond to it.

MS. BONAVENTURE: Your Honor, if I could respond to his comments?

TAE COURT: Yes.
MS. BONAVENTURE: I actually showed up at. calendar call surprised that nobody had received copies of my writ. In fact, if you do pull the transcript you will 100 percent see that. It was my understanding that the writ had already been filed the week before, and that the DA had already been sent a courtesy copy at that point, which is why $I$ was also extremely unhappy that the Court had not yet received a copy, and it was Judge Togliatti sitting in on that day.

THE COURT: Yes. There had been some communication -- my law clerk is confirming for me so we have it in the record -- been some communication from your office November 26th, as indicated. And so, again, whatever the circumstances were, this is why I feel there is good cause to find that to the extent that it could be deemed untimely, once the dust settles when exactly it was filed and when exactly it was due that there is good cause and it came when it came.

But Mr. Cooper has asked for additional time to supplement his return to the petition. I agree with his assessment that the filing of the writ does effectuate the waiver of his right to speedy trial, so at this point I am inclined to consider his request for additional time to file further or a more supplemental, more established
response if he so wishes.
What is your position on that, Ms. Bonaventure? MS. BONAVENTURE: Well, Your Honor, I would ask just for a moment of the Court's time so $I$ can confer With my client. So $I$ do want to trail it.

THE COURT: Yes. Why don't you take a few minutes and we will recall it.

MS. BONAVENTURE: Thank you, Your Honor.

*     *         * 

THE COURT: Let's recall page 10 , McNeill.
Ms. Bonaventure.
MS. BONAVENTURE: Thank you very much, Your Honor. We had a chance to speak to Mr. McNeill. He would like to at this point continue to invoke his right to a speedy trial. Based on that we will withdraw the writ under consideration.

THE COURT: All right. If he wants to withdraw the writ we will proceed with trial if you're ready.

MR. COOPER: I am, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Then we will proceed with trial today.

MR, COOPER: And, Your Honor, one additional matter. I do have an Amended Information. I actually went through the transcripts in this matter and in the transcripts Mr. Zadrowski actually amended the Complaint.

It was just never transferred into the actual Information. So I have the page of the transcript where the amendment happened.

It is one minor amendment on count $1_{r}$ Your Honor. It says the original Complaint -- I believe that he signed the document in 2007. And I added in "or November 2012." That actually is what conforms to the Criminal Complaint that changes line 64 of the transcript. I do have a copy for the defense.

It goes from -- just for some reason it was a typo that didn't get changed in the actual Information itself.

Can I approach with this Amended Information, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Yes.
Ms. Bonaventure, any questions or concerns about that?

MS. BONAVENTURE: No, Your Honor.
THE COURT: All right. So we have the amended charging document and it looks like we can proceed.

Well, then, I will state for the record I accept the representations that the Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus has now been withdrawn and that we will proceed with trial at $1: 00$. We will bring the jury up and begin the selection.

It would be my hope that we would have opening statements if everybody is prepared to do that. The only reason I suggested that was because I don't know how long jury selection would or should take. I typically do it very quickly. We have not had occasion, I don't think, with either counsel here for a trial but you may have spoken with your colleagues. The questions that I will allow are of a general nature to the panel to see what positive responses are had and then follow-up inquires of those positive responses.

There will be some opportunity for individual questioning following up on questions that I asked of the panel. But ultimately the vair dire is usually a fairly quick process. I know we do not have the ability to do trial tomorrow. I know you are aware of that. And then we are reconvening on Wednesday and I am unavailable the remainder of the week, so if we don't complete by Wednesday then we are looking to have to carry it over to the next week, but as you know, I have a trial that needs to get started on Monday, so it would be a little tricky. I am trying to create as many efficiencies and get us as much trial time in as possible.

MS. HOJATT: Your Honor, we are prepared to do opening statements today. The only thing that I was going to suggest is if it gets to about $4: 00$ or 4:30 and
we are done finishing that voir dire, my suggestion was going to be that we do the preliminary objections to the jury. And then because there is that Tuesday off. I think openings are going to be relatively short here. Again, it is going to depend on when voir dire finishes, but because openings literally are so short it might be just a little easier for the jury in terms of retaining information.

THE COURT: It's not my favorite thing to do when they're in the shock of realizing that they ended up on the panel and to then end up do opening statements at the same time.

MS . HOJATT: Right.
THE COURT: So depending on the timing of it, let's just see how we do with voir dire.

Again, I have a set of questions; they are not lengthy. They would be mostly general type questions to elicit positive responses, not a one by one type of thing. But beyond that $I$ think we can create some efficiencies. Let's see how it goes. Well have the panel here at $1: 00$ and be ready to get started.

MR. COOPER: Thank you, Your Honor.
MS. HOJATT: Thank you, Your Honor.
MS. BONAVENTURE: Thank you, Your Honor.
(Proceedings were concluded.)

REPORTERS CERTIFICATE
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { STATE OF NEVADA } \\ \text { COUNTY OF CLARK } & \text { ) } \mathrm{ss} .\end{array}$

I, BRENDA SCHROEDER, a certified court reporter in and for the state of Nevada, do hereby certify that the foregoing and attached pages $1-12$, inclusive, comprise a true, and accurate transcript of the proceedings reported by me in the matter of THE STATE OF NEVADA, Plaintiff, versus STEVE DELL MCNEILI, Defendant, Case No. C297725, on July 7, 2014.

Dated this 26 th day of March, 2015.
/s/ Brenda Schroeder BRENDA SCHROEDER, COR NO. 867




generally know what that case refers to. I have heard of it before. And that case was a felon case.

Obviously, this court is fully aware that any

23 I don't know that any of that would be shown to the jury.
24 But we would have to take the time to do that; you could
felon found in possession of a firearm, it's a crime. So just stipulating to the fact that a felon is cnough. In this case, stipulating to the fact that he's a sex
offender is not enough because he has to also be on lifetime supervision.

The JOC I have actually explicitly lays out that he is further ordered a special sentence of lifetime supervision. Just being a sex offender is not enough for me to prove my case. I have to also prove that he is on lifetime supervision --

THE COURT: But they said they would stipulate to that as well.

MR. COOPER: If they are stipulating to be's on lifetime supervision as well --

THE COURT: Yes. They said they would stipulate to both.

MR. COOPER: Okay. I'm sorry.
THE COURT: At first when we first started talking we were just talking about the one stipulation, but at the conclusion she indicated, correct me if I'm wrong, that he would stipulate to both predicates for the crime and I think in that respect it does seem that that
is sufficient and we don't need the other details.
MR. COOPER: So he would agree that he is a sex offender and that he is on a sentence of lifetime supervision.

I guess the only issue would be the redacting of documents because I just now received this information. And I would say a majority of my documents do mention the fact that he has an attempt lewdness with a minor.

For example, the Lifetime Supervision Agreement dated from November of ' 07 , the Lifetime Supervision Agrecment dated from December of '07, the Lifetime Supervision Agreement, again, dated from I think this is 2012. All of these say "attempt lewdness with a minor" in the very first paragraph.

I would have to actually sit down and redact these documents. I wish I would have known this issue was going to come up before and I could have done that previously. But, obviously, now I need to take time to actually revise these documents to conform with any court order.

THE COURT: Well, I think we would have time to do that in that, you know, if we were to get to openings, have a staff member do that. We would just need to have
time to review to ensure that the redactions were
complete because people are human and mistakes do get made.

MR. COOPER: The other issue is that, again, I was just brought this issue right now, is that Marcia Lee, who is his therapist, is expected to testify on Wednesday and my understanding is that individuals that are some type of sex offenders get certain counseling, other type of sex offenders get a different type of counseling. So for her to go into detail about the type of counseling he was receiving and how he was not actually being compliant with that therapy, she is going to have to go into detail about he was doing this kind of counseling and it bodes the question why was he in that kind of counseling versus the other kind of counseling.

There are a lot of different issues that get raised. And I like I said, if I would have known about this issue earlier, if there was a motion in limine filed or something like that I would have definitely been able to address these issues, so $I$ am kind of put in a bad situation.

MS. HOJJAT: Your Honor, if I may address that? THE COURT: Go ahead.
MS. HOJJAT: Well, actually Marcia Lee was going to be the second issue that we wanted to address with the 9
in limine. Motions in limine are issues that can be raised by objection during trial. There is no required motion in limine. So for the State to say that somehow it's our burden to somehow litigate something like this ahead of time --

THE COURT: No. I think all the State is saying is this is a lot of maneuvering that he's going to have to do to make sure that witnesses are prepared and that documents are accurate so what is not supposed to go to the jury doesn't, and he hasn't had a heads-up. That's all I hear him arguing.

So in fairness, if and when you all knew you were going to have this stipulation and you were going to not have all this stuff in the record, you should bave given him a heads-up so he had time to do it, that's all.

MS. HOJJAT: And, Your Honor, as to the issue of Marcia Lee, that is actually the second issue we wanted to address.

First and foremost, Your Honor, Marcia Lee was not properly noticed as an expert in this case. We received a document saying that she was going to be called to testify. We didn't receive a CV from Marcia Lee. We didn't receive any sort of -- I mean we received summary reports but there is no report from Marcia Lee
explaining how she reached the conclusion she reached about the defendant, why she reached the conclusion she reached.

Just to give an example, in competency court we receive reports saying competent or incompetent and there's a report that backs it up. Here's what was said, here's what was argued, here's what the exchange was, this is why I find this person is incompetent. No such report has been produced from Marcia Lee. No CV was given to us by Marcia Lee. She had not been properly noticed as an expert.

Additionally, the reason for termination, the only thing we received that explains the reason for termination is a document that essentially says that Marcia Lee determined she thinks he is going to re-offend. That's not admissible, Your Honor. That's, again, no bad acts motion was filed and, frankly, it's not even a bad act. It's an anticipated potential future bad act that's why he was terminated from counseling.

And I have that document, the termination summary, if I can approach with a copy for the Court so the Court can see precisely what it is.

THE COURT: You may.
MS. BONAVENTURE: And, Your Honor, if I may, I did bring this up prior to trial with Mr , Cooper at our
final review and I asked him, I need the CV for Marcia
Lee, you have her noticed as an expert. And he said, I'm not calling her as an expert in the sense that she needs to testify to expert opinions.

THE COURT: It was not my understanding that he wasn't calling her as an expert. All I heard him say was that he was - you know, one of the predicates to the violation and the predicate acts, the predicate to Count 1 was that he was terminated from the sex offender counseling and that is one of the underlying for the violation of lifetime supervision. It's one of the and/or's but there's a number of matters.

So, I mean, he's on notice that that's a
possibility and this is the witness that would testify that he was in fact terminated. We can certainly figure out what the parameters of that examination would be, but I don't think it's a basis to exclude her as a witness.

MS. HOJJAT: We are not moving to exclude her.
THE COURT: Oh, okay,
MS. HOJJAT: We're just -- the reason I brought
it up in that light was because Mr. Cooper seemed to be implying that -- at least what I heard was he was talking about tier offender and type of treatment that was going to be received and determinations that were made from the treatment, those are things we will be addressing too
because that crosses the line into expert testimony.
Certainly if she is just going to get up there and say, I treated him, he was terminated. We are not objecting to her testifying to that. We are objecting to testimony that goes into expert opinion because there was not proper expert notice, CVs weren't prepared, reports weren't prepared. And, frankly, the opinion is about future behavior that hasn't been shown in this case.

I mean, again, I could say that a bad acts motion needs to be filed to bring in testimony that is that prejudicial but it is not even a bad act that is something that occurred. It something that she believes may occur in the future. That's our understanding of why he was terminated from the counseling. And we just don't believe it's appropriate and that no proper motion has been filed for that kind of opinion to be presented to the jury.

MR. COOPER: Your Honor, I do not anticipate her saying that. When I talked to her in length, she did not say the reason she terminated him was because she thought he was going to be a danger in the future. There was some other reason given to me as to why she terminated him. I will get those out. But obviously I know it would be prejudicial for me to get that he might re-offend in the future. I don't plan on going down that
road.
And I don't plan on asking her for her expert opinion or anything like that regarding his ability to do anything. I am just going to strictly ask her about what she did in this specific case with this specific defendant and why he was terminated in this specific case. There is not going to be any opinions or anything like that from this witness.

THE COURT: Well, we will have to tread lightly. But this last little piece that you said determining when you talk about, you know, why she terminated because she does say in her own report here, He lacks integration of the treatment concepts such that he is a moderate, at least, risk to re-offend given the opportunity.

MR. COOPER: Your Honor, if the Court wants me to admonish her not to say he's a moderate risk to re-offend, that's fine. I can make sure I admonish her. I actually planned on admitting that document, so I can have that redacted out of there as well.

THE COURT: Well, it's a fine line to walk, right. I mean, she terminated him. Why did she terminate him. There's some reference to inability to pay, going back through the file. So I don't know if it was a pay issue. I don't know if it was a -- you nomally make the evaluation of somebody tikelihood to
re-offend when you are completing your process, not that's your reason to cut someone loose. So I'm assuming that the reason that she ended it was because he wasn't coming or he wasn't paying and it wasn't anything to do with this. And this was sort of like now that it's clone, here's what I think my thoughts are. I mean that makes sense to me why she would put that there.

So I think depending on when you talk to her what her basis for the termination was but I think you would need to assess that, but I would like her to be admonished that any speculation that she might have had even if it's based on her, again, expertise or her thought process of once she terminated as his therapist what she thought would happen in the future she cun't testify to that.

She can only testify as to what caused the separation from the treatment or what caused the termination. Now, if it is anything other than failure to appear or pay, and it goes into things that would go into the facts and the details of her supposition that he's going to re-offend, then we would have to figure out how we do that.

MR. COOPER: Your Honor, I can tell it is things other than being able to be pay. I don't think it's going to go into his ability to re-offend. It was
basically his behavior in the program itself. AndI can make sure to admonish her not to say that she thinks he is going to re-offend or anything like that. So that should be fine.

MS. HOJJAT: And, Your Honor, I think, again, we are getting into -- basically this sheet without the handwritten portion talking about re-offending, we are not objecting to this sheet without that handwritten portion because I think it fairly reflects little or no progress, refused to make payment. That we're not objecting to. We think that that's appropriate testimony.

But once we are starting to get into -- if she is going to start talking about behavioral and my expert opinion, that behavior indicated it wasn't going to be successful, things that are expert opinions, again, she was not noticed as an expert.

MR. COOPER: And I did not say I was to going have an expert opinion, Your Honor. She can say what she observed him do in classes in treatment and she can say that that was either beneficial to the group, that hurt the group. She can say everything like that. I am not asking her, In your expert opinion does that behavior make you think that he is going to re-offend? I don't plan on going down that road whatsoever.

THE COURT: If the underlying basis for violation of lifetime supervision in addition to some of these other things that are listed that the officers can testify to. If the doctor is going to testify to being terminated, what is the relevancy of the basis for the termination?

MR. COOPER: Your Honor, she is going to say that he was terminated, but then obviously she is going to need to cxplain why he was terminated.

THE COURT: Why? What's the relevance? As long as I can make an analysis for the balance of the relevancy against the substantial prejudice. What was clearly a substantial prejudice here, potential from what you are describing to me she is going to say.

MR. COOPER: Well, Your Honor, I guess I was not detailed enough as to what she was going to say. Basically, all she is going to say is he was aggressive in group and he was not complying with what I told him to do. She is not going to go down any road about how he's going to re-offend or anything like that. So, I mean, that is basically what she is going to say. He didn't do what I wanted him to do. He said that he wanted to leave so I said, that's fine, you can leave. And that was it. That is basically my questioning for her.

THE COURT: Okay. So it's more of his demeanor
17
and attitude at the time of treatment not the treatment itself.

MR. COOPER: Exactly, Your Honor. THE COURT: Okay. Did you want to discuss it further?

MS. HOJJAT: If the Court wants us to object contemporaneously we can certainly do that. Again, our position is little or no progress in treatment is what we received in the termination find. That is a big difference from aggressive in group. I mean, aggressive, again, it is implying a bad act. It's implying some sort of violent tendencies it sounds like.

Our position would be that - - and $I$ agree with the Court's assessment of relevance versus probative nature. Probative nature they need to show that he was terminated. We are not trying to keep them from showing he was terminated. We just think that couldn't make payments and little or no progress in treatment, which is precisely what was checked off on the termination sheet is sufficient to reach that probative value and it would limit the undue prejudice that would otherwise result from things like aggressive to group, which we have not heard before today.

MR. COOPER: And, Your Honor, I'm going to need to be able to explain what do you mean by little or no

| progress in treatment, and she's going to say, Well, he <br> acted like he was entitled. He didn't want to do things, blah, blah, blah. She is not -- I mean, these are the violations. It's not like I am going out on a limb right now. <br> THE COURT: From counsel's explanation of what the testimony will be I believe that that testimony is valid. It is relevant and it is not outweighed by substantial prejudice. I do still though want Mr. Cooper to admonish the witness that anything that would go into her expertise area of her evaluation of him as a candidate likely to re-offend or anything in that regard is not permissible. I do believe that going into that analysis, that discussion would be substantially prejudice and would outweigh the relevancy. <br> MR. COOPER: I agree. <br> THE COURT; But the minimal explanation of what <br> the circumstances were, why there was little or no progress is valid and doesn't sound like that crosses the line. So, appreciate that. But no expertise, no expert testimony. <br> MS. HOJIAT: Thank you, Your Honor. <br> And we would just ask in line with the Court's <br> ruling that all witnesses be admonished on that because I <br> know POs are often aware of what the counselors say and <br> we would ask that all of State's witnesses be admonished <br> not to talk about anything about tisk to re-offend or <br> things like that they might be aware of. <br> And we would also ask that that document -- <br> we're not necessarily objecting to its entry but we would <br> ask that that handwritten portion be redacted. <br> MR. COOPER: Your Honor, I would agree, and I will make sure my witnesses are admonished. Obviously, I am not going to backdoor the Court by any means, however, on the document, again, I would agree that maybe the last part of that sentence needs to be redacted, such that he is a moderate at least risk to re-offend, but I think <br> Steven completed his homework -- actually it's beneficial to him -- however it appears he lacks integration or the treament concept. I think that should be left. The only thing that should be redacted is, "such that he is a moderate at least risk to re-offend given the opportunity." <br> MS. HOIJAT: And, Your Honor, we would ask that the whole paragraph be redacted. <br> THE COURT: The most difficult balance in this whole case, and I really do appreciate that we have the time to talk about this, but just because it's weighing on my mind, what's the status on the shoes, anything? MS. BONAVENTURE: No. I haven't heard anything. | THE COURT: All right. Keep checking on that if <br> you can. <br> The difficult balance here is that if this <br> gentleman is going to be convicted on these charges it <br> cant't be because of any kind of bias or prejudice of him <br> because of what his prior conviction is. And the line <br> that we have to walk here has to be because, again, he <br> fits the elements of these crimes. <br> And the line that we have to walk here is how <br> much information comes in about the prior such that and <br> we get the predicate but we don't inflame and we don't <br> cause concern. <br> As I look at this, I don't disagree that the <br> first part of this is handwritten notation could be complimentary or a positive, that he has completed his homework, he passed his history by a polygraph. <br> But then going into the lacks integration of the <br> treatment concept, you know, again, this is all sort of <br> talking about who he is as this convicted sex offender <br> and those kinds of details of treatment I am worried <br> about crossing that line. <br> So because there are some things that are <br> positive and there are some things that are negative, out <br> of an abundance of caution if the termination summary <br> needs to come in to show that he was in fact terminated, <br> it should come in with all of the handwritten portions <br> above the date of intake, date of last session and the <br> amount owed. Anything in that small paragraph that is sort of adjacent to Section $B$ should be redacted. <br> MS. BONAVENTURE: Thank you, Your Honor. <br> THE COURT: And, of course, that is just part <br> and parcel of the various redactions that are going to be necessary to remove the reference to charge and to remove anything that would run afoul of the stipulation. <br> Now, I don't know, Mr. Cooper, that I got it nailed for the record. Do you accept the stipulation to the fact that he is a convicted sex offender and subject to lifetime supervision, and I appreciate the difficulties of the need to redact and admonish the witnesses, but do we think we can accomplish that by Wednesday? <br> MR. COOPER: I can redact it and have everything done by Wednesday, yes. Obviously, for the record I would just object. I think my previous recitation of the facts as well as the law about whether or not the IOC is admissible was appropriate and should come in, but obviously I understand the Court's order and I will make sure everything is redacted. <br> THE COURT: Okay. We witl go ahead and note the stipulation for the record that that is how we would |
| :---: | :---: |


what we need to accomplish, Mr. McNeill, is your counsel is doing a lot of talking for you, obviously, when it comes to certain things like whether or not you would intend to testify on your own behalf, which we won't discuss that until it's closer to the time to do that.

But for purposes of today, as we are proceeding, we have you through your counsel indicating that you are choosing to do a stipulation to a patticular fact, that particular fact being that you are someone who is currently subject to a requirement of lifetime supervision, that you did in fact sign the Lifetime Supervision Agreement back in 2007, and then another one it sounds like in 2012, although 1 haven't seen the reference to that.

And if you stipulate to those facts then that means that there is not the same requirement on the State to establish all the details to establish those facts to the jury. You would just stipulate and agree to them. But if you do that, you are stipulating to facts that are a component of the crime charged. So it's not the same as stipulating that you are guilty, but it is basically stipulating that you are guilty to a fact which may in turn result in you being found guilty to the charge as a whole.

Do you understand what all that means? Do you 27
understand the circumstances of what you are doing? THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I can comprehend that. THE COURT: Okay. Can I just get you to indicate for the record then what it is you are agreeing to for purposes of this hearing; what fact or facts are you agreeing to stipulate to.

THE DEFENDANT: I am agreeing I am a sex offender and I am on lifetime supervision.

THE COURT: Okay, Anything else that we should canvass or question to complete the record?

MS. HOJJAT: I think the record is --
THE COURT: As long as we heard it from Mr. McNeill directly, which is what we need to achieve, and so we have.

MR. COOPER: Your Honor, my other issue would just be that if Mr. McNeill did decide to testify the
State still would be able to introduce his certified JOC pursuant to statute because it is still within the time period allowed and everything like that. None of the rulings that happened today affect the State's right to go forward with impeachment with the JOC. I just wanted to make sure that we are clear on that point.

THE COURT: I would agree with you in terms of the fact if you look at what the State's rights are with a conviction that's been within ten years and what the
inquiry can be with regard to that, although it is still very limited, that it might implicate something that today we've otherwise agreed to try to redact in the record and have not introduced.

But in keeping with what we were trying to do, we would probably need to address that in some fashion unless it's already likely that the defendant won't testify. So I think what would happen is I would like to canvass Mr. McNeill at the appropriate time regarding his desire to testify. I typically do that after the State rests, before the defense begins their case. If they are going to have witnesses then maybe later in the case, but before if they are not going to have witnesses, certainly before we bring the jury back.

If something were to occur that he would wish to testify certainly that canvass whether he wishes to or doesn't wish to would include what could be gotten into as far as the prior history. But typically it is what the charge is and not the details and the background, but that there was a charge --

MR. COOPER: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: -- or what the conviction was only if there was to be some representation with documentation necessarily be provided.

So, again, I am not sure we are going to cross
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that line and have a problem, but I don't know until we get there. And I am assuming at this point there has been some discussion but it is unlikely that Mr. McNeill is going testify. We'll just leave it at that to be determined at a future date.

Anything else that we need to cover -- well, just to summarize, there is a stipulation that has been accepted by counsel and by the Court that Mr. McNeill is a convicted sex offender subject to lifetime supervision, as such, that obviates the need to go into what the actual prior conviction in 2004 was for.

The records that are going to be -- the evidence that is going to be introduced by the State will be redacted to remove reference to the prior charge and the witnesses will be admonished not to go into the details of the prior charge. And further, there was an issue raised with regard to the treatment provider and that there is no CV been provided so that treatment provider will not be qualified or be able to testify as an expert, but will be allowed to testify as a percipient witness to the treatment, the reasons of the termination of the treatment but no details further as to what was the offense or how that would be ranked.

And then as far as the further need to canvass as far as the defendant testifying, we will do that in
the normal course and address any issues that might be implicated by that testimony should he give it at that time.

Is there anything that we need to cover further?
MS. BONAVENTURE: No, Your Honor.
MS. HOJJAT: I do not think there is anything firther, Your Honor. Just the defense's objection based on the shoes.

MS. BONAVENTURE: And I have Mr. Gutierrez right now going down to the murder team who has a closet fill of stuff and they are checking right now to see if they have size 14 shoes. And we do have pretty big guys on the homicide team.

THE COURT: Okay. Officer, what is the rule with regard to the socks; do we bave to keep those on?

UNIDENTIFIED OFFICER: No. If they don't have socks we will provide socks for them, but we didn't have socks or shoes for him over at the jail.

THE COURT: All right. I was just curious.
I will give it a little bit longer, but in all honesty, it would be my intention if we camnot locate shoes within the next 10 or 15 minutes that we would remove the socks and allow him to proceed with the sandals.

Again, I look at those and I don't necessarily
perceive those to be anything that would be indicative of -- plus the way he is seated with his feet adjacent to the desk and where the jury panel is going to be, he might stand up briefly to be introduced, but other than that -- oh, do we have shoes?

MS. BONAVENTURE: Yes, size 13's are on the way, Judge.

THE COURT: We'll make them work. All right. Good to know.

I looked through the list and I did not recogaize any names on the potential panel. We did bring forward a slightly additional number of people just because, again, even though we're not going to necessarily I would think be canvassing folks on, you know, well, I take that back, we might have to go into and I typically would with any kind of sex offense, I would typically when I do the part of the questioning about whether or not you have had any prior involvement with the legal criminal justice system and we talk about victim of crime or accused of crime, I will typically in any case that involves a sex offense further inquire specifically about whether there has been any sex abuse or sex history. So I will be doing that.

And, again, just a fine line to walk in terms of depending on what panel we get is how much detail to go
into. So nobody misunderstands that this case is not the 2004 case.

MS. HOJJAT: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: This is the current. But we'll figure it out. I'm going to step out so somebody let me know when the shoes get here.

MS. HOJJAT: Thank you, Your Honor.
MS. BONAVENTURE: Thank you, Your Honor.
(Whereupon, a recess was taken.)
THE COURT: All right. I guess we are ready to bring the jury in.
(Jury enters the courtroom.)
THE COURT: Welcome to Department 25 of the
Eighth Judicial District Court. My name is Kathleen Delaney. I am the district court judge who will be presiding over the trial. You have been sent to Department 25 as potential jurors for the case of the State of Nevada versus Steve Dell McNeill, and the record will reflect the presence of counsel for the State, counsel for the defense and the defendant.

In a moment we will give you a little bit more information with regard to the case specifically, but I will do some introductions right now because we need to first and foremost find out if there are any of you here today that are familiar with any of us, and whether or
not that will interfere with your ability to serve as fair and impartial jurors.

We will also get into somie discussion and details about the length of this trial and whether or not there is any conflicts of your ability to serve.

I can always tell when I see folks coming in, especially on a Monday afternoon, oftentimes they would rather be anywhere but here. But I'm sure you can appreciate that if you feel that way, certainly parties to the case who have endeavored to be prepared, but obviously this matter has been unable to be resolved in any other way, that we need to have that fair and impartial jury that will be attentive to the details of the case here and do their duty as jurors.

So we just really appreciate your service in advance, and we also want to be sure that you are going to be honest and candid in all of your responses to our questions.

But I do have one piece of business before we get started and that is that I will ask each of you to stand and pay attention to my court clerk here. Raise your right hand and she will swear you in as possible jurors.

THE CLERK: You do solemnly swear that you will well and truly answer such questions that may be put to

something extraordinary happens you can be pretty sure that you are not going to be called forward, but we never know. If you are in the front of this secondary panel, it is very possible that you may be filling one of the seats, but we never know. But I like to give folks sort of the understanding of why you are seated where you are and what's going on.

So let me introduce the rest of my staff present in the courtroom. I've got my marshal, who just stepped out of the courtroom, Jonathan Crenshaw. You have already seenhim as he has escorted you into the courtroom. I have a court clerk, Kristen Brown. I have a court reporter, Brenda Schroeder. Behind the scenes I have a judicial executive assistant, Cindy Springberg. I have a law clerk Jamie Combs. And I have an extern for the summer who's name is Eli Trodatt. That's my staff.

I am going to now turn it over to Mr . Cooper to ask you to introduce yourself and any potential witnesses for the State, and then we will hear from the defense.

MR. COOPER: Thank you, Your Honor.
Greetings, ladies and gentlemen. My name is Jonathan Cooper and I am a deputy district attorney with the Clark County District Attorney's Office. The defendant in this case is charged with violation of lifetime supervision by a convicted sex offender and one
count of prohibited acts by a sex offender.
These violations and prohibitive acts were said to have occurred between December 2012 and March 2014. In my case-in-chief I plan on calling three witnesses; Probation and Parole Officer Ashley Mangan, Probation and Parole Sergeant Brian Zana, and licensed therapy Marcia Lee. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. Ms. Bonaventure. MS. BONA VENTURE: Thank you, Your Honor. Good aftemoon. My name is Xiomara Bonaventure. I was previously known as Xiomora Ferrera, just for some people that I might recognize here. This is my co-counsel, Nadia Hojjat. We are counsel for Mr. McNeill and he has pled not guilty to these charges. Thank you very much.

THE COURT: Thank you. So may I see by a show of hands at this time if there are any members of the potential jury panel that are familiar with any of the names, any of the witnesses that have been identified.

I see just a couple of hands. Let me tell you how this works. Until we get to know you a little bit better we need you to identify yourself by your name and the last three digits on the badge that you are wearing. There is a long number on there but we just need those last three so that we can find you on our list and be

```
able to make notes.
    So, sir, what is your name and the last three
digits of your badge number.
    A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Jacob Spooner, Nurnber 708.
    THE COURT: All right. Mr. Spooner, who are you
familiar with?
    PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 708; Eli.
    THE COURT: And how do you know Mr. Trodatt?
    PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 708; I went to a couple
of classes at UNLV with him.
    THE COURT: Do you believe that there is any
reason why having a familiarity with my extern would
interfere with your ability to be a fair and impartial
juror in this case?
    PROSPECTTVE JUROR NO. 708: No.
    THE COURT: All right. Anybody else?
    Ma'am?
    A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Bonnie Schultz, Number
958. I was your eighth grade teacher.
    THE COURT: I don't even want to say how long
ago that was. And I am sorry I did not recognize you.
But thank you for remembering me. I hope it's in a good
way. For the record, Cashman Junior High. Born and
raised in Las Vegas so I have a lot of connections.
    Any reason why you being familiar with me would
```

interfere in any way of you being able to be a fair and
impartial juror?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 958: No.
THE COURT: Thank you. Good to see you again.
Was there anyone else? Seeing no other hands.
Let me advise you then that this is a two-day trial,
however, it is a little unique because the court
otherwise was obligated on Tuesday to handle a matter
unrelated to the trial. The trial is going to commence
today with jury selection and then resume again on
Wednesday, midmoming, about 10:30 for opening statements
and presentation of evidence.
We do anticipate absent some unique
circumstances that even with a lunch recess on Wednesday
that we would be able to at least deliver the case to you
for deliberations on Wednesday. Now, whether or not that
is late enough in the day that you would elect to come
back another day to deliberate or to further deliberate
that day. But it is our belief that we can complete this
trial within that two day time frame.
Is that still true for counsel?
MR. COOPER: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: All right. So it is essentially two
days of your time, with the second day being Wednesday
approximately 10:30 in the morning. So unlike some
trials where we have had multiple days or weeks, and it is very difficult and we appreciate that with people's schedules to accommodate that time, we hope that this limited amount of time will not be difficult beyond any typical inconvenience for folks.

Now, of course, it needs to be something much more significant than a typical inconvenience that would prevent you from jury service. Mainly if someone has travel plans for which they have already paid for airline tickets that's nonrefiundable or a doctor's appointment that cannot be rescheduled, although in most cases even that is not necessarily a basis to preclude your service. But we need to know if you do in fact have a hardship with this time frame. So can I see by a show of hands if anybody does have a hardship.

1 see just a few hands so I will call on you in the order in which you are seated. Gentleman in the very back left; what is your name and badge number?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Darrell Hoss, Badge No. 008. I have a traveling job and I'm supposed to be leaving Thursday morning. If this goes too long then I will not be able to go.

THE COURT: What is your job?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 008: I am a concert
technician or you can call me a "roady."
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## THE COURT: And your next travel is Thursday morning. Would there be any ability to delay that slightly if needed? <br> PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 008: No. <br> THE COURT: All right. We don't necessarily anticipate that this is going to carry over that time frame but I do appreciate you bringing that to our attention. <br> I saw another hand. Sir, in the back row. <br> PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO: Jeffrey Swain, 679. We have set plans for Monday to travel to San Diego. It should be okay but...

THE COURT: I would not anticipate this trial going that long. Now if you were to travel on Monday, when would you be returning?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 679: Monday, and were coming back this Saturday.

THE COURT: I do not -- the difficulty with this
is if we finish on Wednesday in terms of deliberating --
if we finish on time to deliver the evidence to you and
you are able to start your deliberations, then it is up
to you whether you continue through on Wednesday to deliberate and reach a verdict, or you need to come back.
If you need to come back, you would probably come back on
Thursday. The Court would not be available on Thursday,
there is a State bar conference which I am required to
attend and I would not be present. But the jury could certainly deliberate and one of the other judges available could receive the verdict if need be.

If, however, we have not completed evidence, it is possible that we would need to return for that and that would be one day next week. So, again, I do not think it is likely at all. We are going to do everything we can to complete the trial and deliver it for deliberations in time, but I do appreciate you letting me know about that.

But our main need to know is if you have hardstip with these two days or any portion.

Ma'amı
A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Erika Rojas, Badge No. 913. I have a daughter who is 22 months. She was born with down syndrome and she has an appointment this Wednesday at $2: 10$ with her hematologist.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
Go ahead, sir.
A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Merrill Whittenberger,
951. My wife is eight months pregnant and it is a high risk pregnancy. She works during the day and I work at night and we also have a toddler and we have no daycare.

THE COURT: Okay. How is that being handled
today?
PROSPECTTVE JUROR NO. 951: I dropped her off at a friend's house.

THE COURT: So you were already able to pick up your child from the daycare and take her somewhere. I'm trying to understand what you indicated. Your wife is eight months pregnant but she is in fact working?

PROSPECTIVE FUROR NO. 951: Yes, in the moming.
THE COURT: So who picks up your child at daycare?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 951; I take care of her during the morning when she goes to work. When she comes back she takes care of her.

THE COURT: I see. So you are unavailable in the day but found a babysitter for today.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 951: Yes.
THE COURT: Would you be able to do something for tomorrow like that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 951: It's possible but it is hard.

THE COURT: I appreciate your candor.
Next.
A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Mary Neven, 936. I baby
sit my grand baby on Thursday and Friday for the summer
while she is out of school. My son is a single parent
and so it helps him out.
THE COURT: Okay. Has he ever had occasion to use a different babysitter if you were not available?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 936: Yes, he has.
THE COURT: So in the off chance that we needed you on Thursday, you might be able to make other arrangements? PROSPECTTVE JUROR NO. 936: It would not be easy.

THE COURT: It would not be easy but you might be able to do it; is that fair? PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 936: My grand baby would not like it but I could do it. THE COURT: I appreciate that. Anybody in the row behind counsel table? All right. Thatik you. Give me just a moment with counsel at the bench and we will get back to you.
(Discussion held at the bench.)
THE COURT: All right. Thank you. At this time
I will excuse and I want to thank very much for your
service, and since it is so early please go back to Jury
Services to see if they might have something else for you.

At this time we are going to excuse Juror No. 913, Erika Rojas; Juror No. 936, Mary Neven; and Juror

No. 951, Merrill Whittenberger. Thank you for your time.
Please take your belongings. Again, please go back down
to Jury Services on the third floor to check in with them
to make sure they don't need you for any other purposes.
I will ask my clerk to fill the vacant seat starting with the middle row, the middle spot.

THE CLERK: Badge No. 985, Justin Walker.
THE COURT': All right. Next.
THE CLERK: Badge No. 987, Steven Manning.
THE COURT: Take the first seat in the front row
here on the left.
Next.
THE CLERK: Badge No. 000, Martin Burgess.
THE COURT: All right. Thank yout very much.
I guess I should ask just out of an abundance of caution Jury Service is very good about catching these things but just to make sure, is there anyone here who is not a US citizen or who is a convicted felon who has not had their rights restored? May I see by a show of hands.

Sir.
A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I am a convicted felon
from '92. I don't know if my rights are restored.
THE COURT: Well, there is after you -- well, I don't want to go necessarily into too much detail --
first of all, give us your name and number.

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Culver Smith, 532.
THE COURT: Mr. Smith, did that take place here or in another state?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 532: In Ohio,
THE COURT: And obviously if you were either convicted and served a successful term of probation or served some incarceration and successful term for both. I mean how did you complete your --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 531: It was drug abuse and I was on probation for five years and then at the end of my five years I absconded and so I went and did six months in the penitentiary in Ohio.

THE COURT: All right. And that was all completed back when?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 531: I got the case in ' 92 and then $I$ absconded and - I ended up getting out in '97.

THE COURT: All right. Did you ever do any parole or that was the service of --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 531: It was just a simple drug --

THE COURT: So you basically conmpleted your underlying sentence?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 531: Right.
THE COURT: I am not sure if you would have had

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 531: Thank you.
THE COURT: All right. Seat 6, then, next juror in line.

THE CLERK: Juror No. 001, Brian Lagomarsino.
THE COURT: Now, for the remainder of the time we are going to inquire of the panel, we are going to mainly focus our attention to the group here in the first 24 seats. The folks over there, pay attention because if you are called forward you may be asked some of the similar questions.

But for now we are going to try to get to know these folks a little bit better and find out in fact if there are any conflicts that you may have that would require you to be excused from this trial, based on the subject matter of the trial, the circumstances of the trial, we are going to figure that out now. I do not anticipate that, but we have some questions we need to ask,

So we are going to focus our attention on these 24 folks here. But, again, I do ask you to pay attention just in the event that you might be called forward. Once we have fully qualified the 24 folks, then the remainder of you will be excused. But until then you are still part of our potential panel.

The first thing then that I guess I would like
to remind you is that you did just take an oath, and to be honest in your answers to all of our questions. It is never our intention to pry into your personal lives or in circumstances that would be uncomfortable for you, but we do by nature of ensuring justice be done and be fair to both sides of the case, the State and the defense, that this is a fair and impartial trial, we must do our best at this process of selection to be sure that whoever is here is not harboring any biases, not going to be unfair or not impartial that would be a problem for our case.

So I just want to remind you again that you did take an oath. As we commence this process, there may be some times that I refer to notes just to be sure I haven't missed anything and that we are covering everything that we need to cover.

We have already talked about the length of this trial. We know that you are not likely to have hardships with what we anticipate to be the time of the trial. I do want to remind everybody about something that is very, very basic in our criminal justice system and make sure that I have your responses to that,

This is, again, a criminal trial. That means that you as the members of the jury are sitting collectively as the judges of the questions of facts in the case. And as the judge in this case I am the one who

| is going to determine what law you will apply to the | 1 |
| :--- | :--- |
| facts as you find them to be if you end up being ou | 2 |
| panel that deliberates. | 3 |
| It is my responsibility to give you those | 4 |
| instactions and I will do so. Some of the instructions | 5 |
| will come early on in the process and the majority and | 6 |
| the final set of instructions will come at the end of the | 7 |
| process. You will each have your own copy set. It would | 8 |
| be a violation of your duty as jurors to render a | 9 |
| judgment based upon anything other than what's in those | 10 |
| instructions or what you find to be the facts. | 11 |
| $\quad$ In other words, you cannot base your judgment on | 12 |
| what you believe or think the law should be, you have to | 13 |
| base it on what I give you as the instructions on the | 14 |
| law. | 15 |
| With that in mind, is there anyone here who | 16 |
| feels that they cannot be fhe factfinders and follow my | 17 |
| instructions and applicable law in this case? | 18 |
| A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: My badge number is 032. | 19 |
| Being a person who bas had a lot of sexual issues growing | 20 |
| up, I think it would be hard to be fair and impartial. | 21 |
| THE COURT: Okay. I appreciate your candor. | 22 |
| There are other questions that I am going to ask that | 23 |
| will be a little bit more about anyone's involvement with | 24 |
| the criminal justice system, whether it be as a victim of | 25 |

crime, whether it be as someone who has been accused of a crime, specifically any involvement with regard to sexual event type crimes.

I can have a little bit of that questioning here with you. It is not, again, an intent to embarrass you or to go into any details of something that you would prefer not to go into, but it is important that we understand at least minimally the nature of what that potential bias would be.

So can I ask you this: The time frame for your experience was that when you were younger? Was it more recent?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 032: Younget.
THE COURT: Was it a situation that ever involved the criminal justice system?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 032: Yes.
THE COURT: Was it someone who was knowe to you?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 032: Yes.
THE COURT: Was that person -- ultimately, did
you go through a trial process and that person was convicted?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 032: No.
THE COURT: Okay. Was there ever any police involvement?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 032: Yes.

THE COURT: Was there a plea?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 032: Yes.
THE COURT: So ultimately a conviction in the case from a plea it sounds like.

Was it here in Nevada?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 032: Nevada.
THE COURT: All right. And so your connection to that, you do obviously recognize that none of the individuals involved in this case would have had anything to do with that case, I'm assuming from the time frame you are describing.

## PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 032: Right.

THE COURT: And I think that you appreciate but it may not be entirely clear that the charges in this case relate to the requirements to have followed directives of lifetime supervision and following directives of the specific charges of violation of lifetime supervision by a convicted sex offender, again, related to address and reporting requirements.

So understanding that this is not a case
involving directly any allegations of sex offense. But, again, what those particular charges are, do you still
believe that you would be unable to be fair and impartial?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 032: Yes, ma'am.
THE COURT: You don't believe that you would be able to receive the evidence provided in this case and apply the law as I give it to you?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 032: No, ma'am.
THE COURT: I appreciate your candor.
Is there anyone else who would raise their hand to the question that I asked? All right.

Under our criminal justice system more generally we have certain principles that we apply to every criminal case. Those principles are that this information as I discussed, the charging document, is simply an accusation. It is in no way, shape or form eviderce of guilt.

The defendant as he sits here in the courtroom today is not only presumed innocent, he is in fact innocent. He would only be determined to be guilty if the State has proven that he is guilty beyond a reasonable doubt.

Does anyone not understand or believe in these basic principles of our American justice system? Seeing no hands.

I believe we asked if anybody was familiar with
any of the parties in the case, but just to confirm, is
there anyone in the panel who is in anyway familiar with the facts or the circumstances of this case? All right. Seeing none.

What I would like to do at this time then is I would like to ask individually, one by one, and you can remain seated if you can speak up a little bit and if not we may ask you to stand.

You will see a set of questions on the board, hopefully you can see them, and if not I can certainly assist you by reading the questions to you. But we would like to get to know you a little bit better, who you are, what job you currently have or if you were recently retired or unemployed, what job or jobs you have had recently. A spouse or domestic partner and what is their occupation. If you have any children old enough to work what is their occupation and for whom.

This whole idea here is to identify here whether there are inadvertently perhaps some connections to the facts and circumstances of the case.

And also how long have you lived here. If it has been less than five years we would like to know where you have lived previously. And we would also like to know whether you have had jury service before, what type and whether a verdict was reached, not what it was, and
whether or not you were the foreperson.
Let me start with the juror in the Number I
position. Answer those questions there.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 008: My name is Darrel Hoss, 008. As I said, before I am a roady.

THE COURT: What company do you work for or how does that work?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 008: Im kind of
independent.
THE COURT: You do not have a paycheck from a company?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 008: Whatever band 1 am traveling with.

THE COURT: Just ont of curiosity, who are you traveling with this weekend?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO, 008: Currently a band called The Reverend 14.

THE COURT: I have a friend who would be very jealous of me right now because she's a very big fan.
All right. Can you go ahead and answer the remaining questions.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 008: My wife's name is
Lonnie Argyle. She is a pharmacy technician at UMC. No children. Been in Vegas coming up on eight years. Never been a juror.

```
THE COURT: Where did you live previously? PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 008: Boise, Idaho.
THE COURT: Okay. And just to be clear the question regarding jury service is here or there.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 008: No.
THE COURT: Thank you very much. Next.
A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: My name is Linda Alarcon,
Number 032. I work for United Nissan. I am not married.
I have one child at home who is not old enough to work.
I have lived here for almost tell years in Las Vegas. I
have never been a juror here or anywhere.
THE COURT: Thank you.
Sir.
A PROSPECTTVE JUROR: Jace Mande, 055. I own my own business. I live with my girlfriend. She works for me. No children. Never been a juror. Lived here ten years.
THE COURT: Never been a juror here or anywhere? PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 055: No.
THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Joe Rivera, Badge No. 060.
```

I'm a business agent for the Brick Layer's Union. I'm a delegate. I have a wife and I have two children.

THE COURT: Your wife's name is?
PROSPECTTVE JUROR NO. 060: Lucile DeLucca,
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THE COURT: And what does she do?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 060: She is a housewife.
I have a daughter and she is not working. She is a
student at Berkley University. I have been in Las Vegas
since 1990. I have been a juror before.
THE COURT: Do you remember if it was a civil or a criminal case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 060: Criminal.
THE COURT: And did you actually start any part of the jury trial process?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 060: No. I was kicked out of the jury.

THE COURT: So you were not actually selected? PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 060: No.
THE COURT: I see. That question is geared more towards people who were in fact selected and maybe there was a deliberation process and whether or not they were the foreperson. But I am happy to know that you were called but you were not actually selected; is that correct?

PROSPECTTVE JUROR NO. 060: Yes.
THE COURT: Thank you.
Ma'am.
A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: My name is Gianni Cardoza. My number is 166 . I am a full-time student. 1 am
married. My husband's name is James Shoemaker. He is a
Metro police officer and I have one child who does not
work. I lived here all my life, so 29 years, and I have
never been a juror.
THE COURT: Thank yon.
A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: My name is Brian
Lagomarsino, 001. I work at Mandalay Bay. I am a
director of guest services. I am not married. No
children. Been in Las Vegas for 11 years in August. I
have never been a juror.
THE COURT: Here or anywhere?
PROSPECTTVE JUROR NO, 001: No.
THE COURT: Thank you. Just double checking. Go ahead, sir.
A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Jeff Swain, 679. I work at Encore Casino. My wife's ame is Emma Swain. She
also works at Encore. We bave a live-year-old daughter.
THE COURT: What do you and your wife do at
Encore?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 679: She is a dealer and
I'm a baccarat manager.
THE COURT: Okay.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 679: I have lived in Las
Vegas for 15 years. And I have made it to the selection
process but was not actually selected as a juror.
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THE COURT: Never on a panel.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 679: Right.
THE COURT: Thatk you.
Sir.
A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: My zame is Jacob Spooner,
708. I am a poker dealer at Planet Hollywood. I have a
fiance who stays at home with my two children.
THE COURT: What is her name?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 708: Linda. I have lived
in Vegas for about five years and I lived in Wisconsin
before that and I have aever been a juror.
THE COURT: Where did you live in Wisconsin?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 708: O'Claire area.
THE COURT: Aad then you said you moved here
about five years ago?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 708: Yes.
THE COURT: Thank you.
Sir.
A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Isaac Vilchez, 883. I am
a ramp agent at the airport.
THE COURT: What kind of agent?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 883: Ramp ageat.
THE COURT: Oh, okay. Go ahead.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 883: I am not married.
No kids. Bom and raised in Vegas. Never been a juror

```
before.
    THE COURT: Never been called, huh?
    PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 883: No.
    THE COURT: All right.
    A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: My name is Jason Moore,
885. I sold a business. December 2012 was the last time
I worked.
    THE COURT: What kitid of business was it?
    PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 885: It was a direct mail
company, money mailer.
    THE COURT: Okay.
    PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 885: I went back to
school and got my bachelors degree. My wife is in
pharmaceutical sales.
    THE COURT: What is her name?
    PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 885: Katherine Moore. I
do have children. I have three children. One is old
enough to work. He did work part time as a sales clerk
at the Smith Center. Born and raised here. I also went
to Cashman.
    THE COURT: So you remember Ms. Schultz?
    PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 885: Actually, I don't.
And I have never been a juror before.
    THE COURT: What did you get your bachelors in?
    PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 885: Business
```

administration and management.
THE COURT: Okay. Sometimes these are questions
that the counsel like to follow up on, too, so I try to
question where I can. Thank you.
Matam.
A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: My name is Idalia Demetria
Rice-Wilson, 905. I am a licensed practical nurse. Work
for the VA Hospital. I am divorced. I have three
children. Two are old enough to work. One is here in
Vegas with me, he does not work. And one is in Detroit.
THE COURT: Just interested in the ones that
might work in our community and might have potential,
again, unknown but crossover with the case.
So he doesa't work?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 905: No.
THE COURT: And your ex-spouse is here?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 905: No.
THE COURT: Okay. Proceed.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 905: I have been here
five years. Never been a juror, never served.
THE COURT: And I assume you moved here from
Detroit?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 905: Correct.
THE COURT: Thank you.
Sir.


```
California. And we didn't come to a conclusion because
it was a civil case and they settled before -- we were
deliberating and they said --
```

    THE COURT: And they settled instead.
    PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 987: Yes. Exactly,
    THE COURT: But you had the opportunity to be
    selected, sit as a factinder.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 987: And I was not the
foreperson.
THE COURT: All right. But you were able to
undertake in deliberations so you know what the process
is like?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 987: Yes
THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
Sir.
A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: My name is James
Bakkedah1, 940 . I am a umion electrician here in town.
My wife, Angela Bakkedahl, is a non-food manager for
Smiths. We have two children. My stepchild, Alicia, my
daughter, Jane. They are 16 and 4 . She does not work
right now but is driving now. Lived here over 13 years
off and on. Never been a jury before in this state or in
California.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you very much. Sir.
A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: My name is Martin Burgess,
and my badge is 000 . I work for Cox Communications as an
HFC tech. My wife, Julie, is a CNA for a hospital. I
have beea here about 14 years.
THE COURT: Have you ever been a juroz before?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 000: Never been on a jury
before.
THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I am Bonnie Schultz and my
badge number is 958 . I am a relired school teacher. My
husband, Gary Schultz, is a retired police officer. We
don't have children. I have been here for 52 years. I
have been on a jury. We did rcach a verdict and I was
not the foreperson.
THE COURT: Do you remember if it was civil or
crimina!?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 958: It was criminal.
THE COURT: And how long ago was that?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 958: That was in 2000.
THE COURT: So 14 years ago. You did
deliberate, the verdict was reached but you were not the
foreperson?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 958: Correct.
THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: My name is Joey Hamilton,

Badge No. 971. I am tattoo artist at Club Tattoo in
Planet Hollywood. My wife is Leona Hamilton. She is a IV pro-athlete, like bodybuilder-type stuff. I have a son who is not old enough to work. I have lived in Las Vegas for eight years. I have never been on a jury before.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Hamilton, A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Phyllis Ash, 976. I am retired. I am a widow. Ihave a daughter who is a school teacher at Lee Middle School. I have lived in Las Vegas for 22 years and I have never been a juror.

THE COURT: What position did you retire from?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 976: Actually, I have not worked for 11 years. I worked at the Star Dust poker room and I took cake of my husband while he was ill.

THE COURT: What profersion was he in?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 976: He was an orthopedic surgeon.

THE COURT: And you said you have never done jury service?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 976: No. I got called while be was sick and I could not do it.

THE COURT: All right. I appreciate that.
My follow-up questions then, there are a couple of folks who indicated that they have a comection to law
enforcement. The remaining questions that I have for you are directed to whether you yourself or a family member or a close friend, okay, can answer these questions.

So, first question is has anyone on the panel themselves or close friend or family member ever worked in the area of law enforcement?

I know we hiad a couple of folks that answered that already, but let's see your hands again and then I will ask a few more questions and details.

Let me start with Juror No. 1. If you can give us your name and badge number and then your response.

PROSPECTTVE JUROR NO. 008: Darrell Hoss, 008. You did say close friend, right?

THE COURT: Yes.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 008: One of my very good friends used to be a marshal here.

THE COURT: In the courthouse or a corrections officer?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 008: In the courthouse.
THE COURT: Used to be you said?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 008: Up until a couple years ago, yeah.

THECOUR'T: Okay. And is that the only law
enforcement connection that you have then?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 008: Yes.

```
    THE COURT: Okay. I know that you mentioned
that you had some concerns in terms of time frame of the
trial, but let me ask you a more specific question about
that connection to law enforcement. Is there any reason
that you believe because of that familiarity with that
person that you would tend to give sigrificantly more
weight to the testmony of someone just because they are
a member of law enforcement.
```

    PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 008: No. Just answering
    the question.
THE COURT: I appreciate that. Is there any
reason why knowing someone in law enforcement would
impact your ability to be fair and impartial.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO, 008: Yes, yes.
THE COURT: So that would impact your ability to
be fair and impartial?
PROSPECTIVE JRROR NO. 008: Absolutely.
THE COURT: But it would not cause you to give
undue weight to testimony from someone in law
enforcement?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 008: No.
THE COURT: How would it impact you in terms of
your impartiality?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 008: Not a big fan of the
whole system to be honest with you.

THE COURT: And that's the kind of thing that I
try to elicit a little bit of information in my questions and then I let the counsel do some fotlow-up stuff. So I am going to give you some questions in a minute that might help us understand better that response.

One of the questions that's going to be
fortheoming is going to be, agaiu, if anyone has ever had
dealings with the criminal justice system either as a
victin or accused or whatever those circumstances may be.
So we'll get to that.
But appreciate that you feel that perhaps your interests would be more in line with the defense, would that be fair, that you are not a fan of the system. Or are you talking about the system as a whole?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 008: Fair.
THE COURT: Okay. Now, I did ask about the
basic principles of innocent until proven guilty. The
State has the burden to prove beyond a reasonable doubt
and you did not indicate that you couldn't follow that.
Does it go that deep?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 008: I must have missed
that.
THE COURT: So our basic principles of American
justice, again, the defendant is innocent until he's
proven guilty. In fact, as he sits there today, he is in
fact innocent. He would have to be proven guilty by the State meeting its burden to prove him guilty beyond a reasonable doubt. That's our basic tenent of American justice. So do you have any questions or concerms about that? Would you be able to follow that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 008: Maybe.
THE COURT: I think we will get some more details here in a minute.

Law enforcement section. Sir.
A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Jace Mande, 055. A couple of friends are cops back in New York.

THE COURT: Okay. How long has it been since you lived in New York?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 055: Ten years.
THE COURT: Are you still friends with them?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 055: Yes.
THE COURT: Do you believe that those folks being your friends would cause you to give either greater or lesser weight to law enforcement, would that cause you to weigh the testimony of law enforcement auy greater or different than with anyone else?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 055: (No audible response.)

THE COLRT: The real question is would you be biased in favor, would you weigh significantly more in
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favor of law enforcement just because you have these friends?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 055: No.
THE COURT: Do you believe that you would still be able to be fair and impartial in being a juror and receiving the evidence in this case, receiving the law as I instruct you on the law and actually detiberating fairly and impartially. Do you believe you would be able to do that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 055: Sure. THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. Anyone else on law enforcement? Ma'am. PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 166: My husband and grandfather.

THE COURT: Okay. You mentioned that your husband is a current member of Metro; is that correct? PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 166: Yes. THE COURT: And your grandfather? PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 166: Yes. THE COURT: And your grandfather's position? PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 166: Police officer. THE COURT: Do you believe that your husband currently being a member of Metro would cause you to give significantly more weight to the testimony of a law enforcement officer?

```
mindset. mindset.
```

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 166: I have a similar
THE COURT: Okay. That's an interesting way to answer that question. Counsel may want to follow up further.

Do you believe that you would be able to receive
the evidence that's provided in this case and weigh it and understand how important it is that that evidence be found to be whatever the facts are by the jury, the law that I give apply to it, and that is basically how our system of justice works.

Do you believe that you would be able to do that in this case and be fair and impartial in your
deliberations?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 166: I could.
THE COURT: Okay. Law enforcement connections in the middle row. Ma'am.

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Shirley Towers, 924. Law
enforcement, does that include probation?
THE COUR'T: Yes. Any connection with law enforcement of any type would be valuable for us too.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 924: My nephew just had a graduation ceremony a couple of weeks ago.

THE COURT: For what?
PROSPECTIVE JROR NO. 924: I believe probation.
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THE COURT: Parole and Probation or a
corrections officer?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 924: Yes.
THE COURT: All right. Having a relative that
is in that capacity do you think that would cause you to
be bias towards or against a law enforcement witness in any way?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO, 924: Not at all.
THE COURT: Do you believe that you would still
be able to receive the evidence in this case, apply the
law as I give it to you and be able to be fair and
impartial in your deliberations?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 924: Yes.
THE COURT: Okay. Anybody else in the middle
row? How about the front row?
THE COURT: Ms. Schultz.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 958: My husband is retired since ' 96 and we have several friends also who were police officers.

THE COURT: Also retired?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 958: Yes.
THE COURT: Do you believe that you would be
able to receive the testimony from a law enforcement
officer and give it substantially greater weight than any
other witness in this case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 958: No.
THE COURT: Do you believe you believe you would be able to be fair and impartial?

PROSPECTIVE JJROR NO. 958: Yẹ.
THE COURT: The next question that we would have
for you, and this goes a litte deeper, closer to the criminal justice system itself. But I am going to ask here if there is anyone on panel who themselves have ever encountered the criminal justice system because they have been a victim of crime.

Okay. And I am keeping this that genetal because I want to get your candid answers. But it would include, though, if there would ever be a crime of a sexual offense type crime.

So, ma'am, you gave us some basic information.
We may or may not need more information. Can you ptease identify yourself again.

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Linda Alarcon, 032.
THE COURT: In addition to what you have already told us is there any other situation where you encountered the criminal justice system?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 032: No, ma'am.
THE COURT: Okay. So that one circumstance. And we have already I think explored that. And counsel is welcome to further inquire if they wish to do so.

Back tow, sir.
A PROSPECTIVE JRROR: I was not a victim. I was arrested a couple times.

THE COUR'T: We'll get to that in a minute. Let me first ask -- and remember this applies to you yourself have ever been a victim of crime or a family member or close friend. We are trying to understand if you have had direct knowledge of, or even if it's been through a close friend or family member, involvement with the criminal justice system that might in some way influence your ability to te fair and impartial.

In the back row, sir.
A PROSPECTIVE JRROR: I'm Jeffrey Swain, 679. I
had my car stolen last month.
THE COURT: Was anybody caught?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 679: No.
THE COURT: Is the case still active?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 679: Yes.
THE COURT: How do you feel about how that case has been handled so far by the police?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 679: I don't know.
THE COURT: It's just out there.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 679: Yeah, it's out there.

THE COURT: Was your car recovered?


```
anything from Metro.
    THE COURT: Anything about that that would cause
you to have a difficulty in a criminal case such as this
to receive the evidence and weigh it and be impartial?
    PROSPECTIVE JRROR NO. 000: No, not at all.
    THE COURT: Okay.
    PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 000: The other thing is I
was rear-ended by an impared driver last week and that
went fine -- the cops were fine.
    THE COURT: Do you know if that person was
arrested?
    PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 000: She was taken away
in an ambulance with two motorcycle cops following.
    THE COURT: But you do not know what has come of
that?
    PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 000: No.
    THE COURT: But so far, as you said, you still
believe that you could still receive the evidence in this
case and be fair and impartial?
    PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO,000: Absolutely.
    THE COURT: Alt right. Ms. Schultz, did I see
your hand up?
    PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 958: Yes. }46\mathrm{ years ago
my husband's car was stolen.
    THE COURT:That was a long time ago but I think
```
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    you also know that we know you have the connection to law
enforcement that you have. But do you believe anything
about that incident would impact your ability to be fair
and impartial?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 958: No.
THE COURT: Okay. The next question, and I
believe Mr. Mande got into it. This question is sort of
the mirror of that. But if you or a family mernber or
close friend has ever been accused of a crime of any
type, and we are trying to find out, again, how that
might have affect you and your ability to serve as a fair
and impartial juror.
So, Mr. Mande, you indicated that you were
arrested at some point?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO, 055; It was over 20 years
ago and everything was dropped.
THE COURT: Can you just let us know what the
circumstances of that were briefly.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 055: I owned a nightclub
and I was harassed by the police repeatedly. The chicf
of police owned a restaurant down the street and they
wanted our business so they did everything they could to
drive us out of there.
THE COURT: Sounds like one of those things we
would see in a movie about New York. But everything was
you also know that we know you have the connection to law enforcement that you have. But do you believe anything about that incident would impact your ability to be fair and impartial?

PROSPECTHVE JUROR NO. 958: No.
THE COURT: Okay. The next question, and I
believe Mr. Mande got into it. This question is sort of
the mirror of that. But if you or a family member or
close friend has ever been accused of a crime of any
type, and we are trying to find out, again, how that
might have affect you and your ability to serve as a fair
and impartial juror.
So, Mr. Mande, you indicated that you were arrested at some point?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 055; It was over 20 years ago and everything was dropped.

THE COURT: Can you just let us know what the
circumstances of that were briefly.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 055: I owned a nightclub
and I was harassed by the police repeatedly. The chicf
of police owned a restaurant down the street and they
wanted our business so they did everything they could to
drive us out of there.
THE COURT: Sounds like one of those things we would see in a movie about New York. But everything was
dropped?
PROSPECTIVE JROR NO. 055: I was arrested one more time because a friend of mine had come to the club and he had drugs on him.

THE COURT: How did that case turn out? PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO, 055: It was dropped.
THE COURT: Okay, So you have had a couple of situations where you had to deal with law enforcement, and you had some friends in law enforcement but you have also had some run-ins with law enforcement. Do believe that that would impact your ability to be fair and impartial in this case?

PROSPECTTVE JUROR NO. 055: No.
THE COURT: You don't think you would be favorable or disfavor law enforcement in any way? PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 055: I would hope I wouldn't. It was over 20 years ago. I have changed my life around.

THE COURT: All right. We just need your best candid answer. And counsel may have some follow-up questions for you. But I appreciate your candor.

PROSPECTTVE JUROR NO. 055: Is this going to rely on police testimony?

THE COURT: Well, counsel pointed out that there is going to be law enforcement testimony with regard to
the circumstances. And so that is why we ask these questions. And, again, it is a criminal trial at the basis so we will tind out. I appreciate your candor.

Anybody else?
A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Joe Rivera, 060. I was accused of contracting without a license. I did a favor for a neighbor and he turned me in that I was contracting without a license. So I went to the court system, which they had me paid restitution because I did not have the license. But I was not contracting. I just did some work at his house and tumed out I had to pay everything back and went through the court system. Of course I was not here in town.

THE COURT: So it sounds like the case went forward and you were not present to defend it.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 060: Exactly.
THE COURT: So it sounds like you have some reason to believe that what occurred in that case should have been different than what occurred?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 060: Yes.
THE COURT: How do you feel about that in terms of how the system worked for you?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 060: I didn't have the
chance to present myself to the case. The judge at the time said since you were not here they get the file so

| $\begin{array}{l}\text { you end up being guilty. } \\ \text { THE COURT: All right. That circumstance that }\end{array}$ | 1 |
| :--- | :--- |
| you had I guess most people would consider it somewhat | 2 |
| negative about the justice system. Do you think that | 3 |
| would impact your ability to sit in this case as a juror, | 4 |
| and understand that this is an unrelated case, but it | 5 |
| will have facts in evidence that you would have to | 6 |
| determine facts and weigh what the law as I give it to | 7 |
| you. Do you believe that you can still do that? | 8 |
| PROSPECTVE JUROR NO. 060: It would not affect | 10 |
| me at all. | 11 |
| THE COURT: Okay. Anybody else in terms of, | 12 |
| again, accused of a crime, yourself, family member or | 13 |
| friend. | 14 |
| Go ahead, sir. | 15 |
| A PROSPECTVE JUROR: Are you asking the | 16 |
| question if you have been arrested? | 17 |
| THE COURT: That would be considered to be | 18 |
| accused of a crime. I hate to say arrested because if I | 19 |
| say arrested then there's other folks that might have | 20 |
| been questioned and not arrested. But amested, again, | 21 |
| you, close friend or family member as I think again you | 22 |
| get the gist I am trying to find out if you had |  |
| interactions with the criminal justice system or law | 23 |
| enforcement. | 24 |

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Correct.
THE COURT: And you are again?
A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Jason Benson, 927. So I
have two. The first is I was arrested for littering
approximately 25 years ago in New Hampshire and I have a
class C substance arrest about 20 years ago.
THE COURT: And those cases, were they
citations? Did they get dropped? How did that get resolved?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 927: The first one, the
littering was a fine paid and the second one was a no contest plea.

THE COURT: And the most recent one you said was
about 20 years ago?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 927: Yes.
THE COURT: And how did you feel about that circumstance with your dealing with the criminal justice system?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 927: Everything went
fine.
THE COURT: Thought it was fair?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 927: Correct.
THE COURT: Any reason why you having been
involved with those circumstances would impact your
ability to be a fair and impartial juror here?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 927: Not at all.
THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
Sir.
A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Gilbert Canales, 930.
About 13 years ago I was arrested for kidnapping, assault with a deadly weapon in Califomia.

THE COURT: Okay.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 930: All charges were
dropped. And all of my family is not good. They get in trouble with the law. A lot of drug trafficking.

THE COURT: The charges in your case were dropped. What was the time frame of when these charges were pending?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 930: Within a month it was all dropped because the guy basically - this case statted breaking into houses and cars and me and my brother-in-law got fed up with it so we called the cops told them to come. And he would do drugs in front of his kids and it really bothered us so one day we confronted him outside and we took him for a ride to get him about an hour away from the house so he could have a long walk home to think about it and he pressed charges on us so we pressed charges on him and then he was stealing from our house including my watch and other stuff so when they asked specifics on the watch, I had all the details of
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it. But when I went to press charges on him he was set free.

THE COURT: So neither side's charges went forward?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO, 930: Right.
THE COURT: Have you appreciated since then that maybe acting as your own law enforcement is not the best idea?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 930: Yes. They told me to just keep calling.

THE COURT: Okay. You indicated your family members have had interaction with law enforcement.
Again, you have heard the questions that I've asked of others who have same or similar circumstances. We could go one by one, the point really is here has those interactions with law enforcement impacted you in such a way that you would not be able to be fair and impartial to both sides of this case, the State and the defense, weigh the evidence and apply the law; do you think you could still do that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 930: I could.
THE COURT: Think you would be okay, Okay.
Like I said, counsel may have some follow-up questions
for you. I appreciate your candor.
Did I see any more hands? Sir.


The discussion about whether we are going to excuse anybody for cause will take place out of the presence of the jurors either up at the bench or in the hallway. If it is really just that one that remains then so be it.

But what will happen, Mr. Cooper, when you finish you don't have to say I pass the panel. Youl can just say I have completed my questions. And then you can undertake your questions. And then we will deal with whatever cause issues there might be.

If you really feel strongly about one and you don't want to inquire further because you think you have gotten to the point where there is really no going back and no rehabilitation, you can ask to approach and we can discuss that potential juror then. But typically I would rather complete it. Let you complete, and then we will talk and have our cause discussion about who is going to go and who is going to stay. I don't know if you want to inquire of that individual, you are welcome to. I just know that she was pretty adamant.

MR. COOPER: And, Your Honor, I might have missed this for the preemptory challenges. Is it four and then one for the altemate?

THE COURT: No, five. The altemates will be the last two seated.

MR. COOPER: Thank you, Your Honor.
MS. HOJJAT: But we can exercise all five on whoever?

THE COURT: Absolutely. MS. HOJJAT: Thank you, Your Honor.
The State just handed over some monthly reports.
We already had these monthly reports in evidence. Some of them need to be redacted. The State just handed over their proposed redactions. We are going to make a copy of this. We might have some proposed additional redactions. We are going to work with the State to see if we can reach redactions that everybody is comfortable with, if not, we may need to address it with the Court.

THE COURT: Okay.
MS. HOJJAT: But at this point it looks like hopefully we can reach a state that everybody is happy with and we can just go forward tomorrow moming.

THE COURT: Okay. Sounds good.
(Whereupon, a recess was taken.)
THE COURT: So something has come up that I just want to bring to the panel's attention and see if anybody would have an issue. When you came in here today and we talked about the time frame for the trial, the two days, that has only changed slightly and here's what the change is. The Court's obligation that it had that would have
prevented us from having trial tomorrow has now been -- I. don't know how to describe it -- something has occurred unexpectedly that will now free up that time for us tomorrow.

And what the Court intends to do is do what it would have liked to have done from the beginning, which is run the trial dates consecutive and get the trial finished for certain by Wednesday so we did not have any concern or question about the time frame.

When I mentioned and we talked about the hardships and not having trial tomorrow, is there anybody that would have a problem with having trial tomorrow?

Seeing no hands that is good to know. It is likely, however, from what we know about the witnesses' availability because with that issue we also had to determine who was available. We still will be present for the remainder of trial on Wednesday but it is quite certain that we will be able to deliver the evidence to you and allow you to begin your deliberations sometime midafternoon on Wednesday.

And, of course, depending on your time frame for deliberation, that you would be able to complete on Wednesday. So it does not mean that we don't come on Wednesday it just means that we will absolutely be certain we will complete on Wednesday. So I just wanted 97
to clarify that. Does anybody have a question or concern about that? All right. Thank you very much.

I will invite Mr. Cooper at this time to inquire of the panel.

MR. COOPER: Thank you, Y our Honor.
Ladies and gentlemen, the process of jury selection is a little bit of a unique process. It allows the attomeys both for the prosecution and the defense to ask you guys questions in order to ascertain if you guys are the best suited jurors for this case in particular. And everyone is suited to sit on different types of cases.

For example, if there was a lawsuit over the producers of the game of Drone, or something like that, because I love that show, I wouldn't be able to sit on that jury. I would be bias. And that is because of our life experiences, our opinions, everything of that nature.

So there are no right or wrong answers to any of my questions. There is only your answers. And with that said, I know we all remember back in middle school, I know Ms. Schultz does, when the teacher picked on us in front of the whole class and made us answer a question and it's kind of a nerve-wracking experience. I am going to ask a couple of questions that will be a little less
nerve wracking.
Does anyone watch NCIS or CSI? I see a lot of hands there. Who thinks NCIS is the best? I see a lot of hands going up. Does anybody think that everything that happens on NCIS or CSI is real hife? I see no hands.

Did anyone see the episode where they got fingerprints off of running water? No one thinks that can happen, right? Does anyone expect in every criminal case for there to be forensic evidence? Who does? I see no hands on that as well.

Now, part of instructions the judge has already talked to you guys about is that both sides, the defense and the State, are entitled to a fair and impartial jury. Does everybody understand that?

Does anybody think for any reason or any opinion they may have that they might not be able to be fair and impartial to both the defense and to the State?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I have been reading true crime books for about 50 years --

MR. COOPER: What is your name and badge number?
A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Phyllis Ash, 976. I have
been reading true crime novels for about 50 years at
least and I think I would have a hard time being impartial.

MR. COOPER: Do you mean being impartial toward the defense or toward the Staic?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO, 976: To the defense. I do not think I could be that impartial.

MR. COOPER: You do understand the concept that everyone is presumed innocent until they are found guilty?

PROSPECTTVE JUROR NO. 976: Yeah, but I think by the time we get to court and there is evidence enough to convict.

MR. COOPER: Well, let me ask you this: If I didn't do anything throughout the trial and I submitted to you, would you still find him guilty?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 976: Well, if you did not do anything, I mean that's impossible.

MR. COOPER: I did not prove my case.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 976: That's just impossible for you not to do anything. That is not a valid question.

MR. COOPER: Do you understand the concept of beyond a reasonable -- guilty beyond a reasonable doubt?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 976: Yes.
MR. COOPER: Do you think can you apply that concept to the facts of this case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 976: I still have in the
back of my mind that I could not be that impartial.
MR. COOPER: Would you want someone like you sitting on this jury?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 976: On this case, no.
MR. COOPER: Thank you.
Was there any other -- go ahead, ma'am,
A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Linda Alarcon, 032. I
would not be able to fair and impartial either way.
MR. COOPER: What do you mean by either way?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 032: For the defense or for the State.

MR. COOPER: Could you give me a little more of what you mean. Would you be able to listen to all of the evidence that is given?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 032: Yes.
MR. COOPER: And at the end of listening to all of the evidence, do you think you would be able to reach a decision of the guilt or innocence of the defendant?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 032: My brain says he is guilty right now.

MR. COOPER: Thank you. Did anyone else want to answer that question or have anything else to add?

Now, Ms. Rice-Wilson, you were saying that your son was robbed in a park?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 905: Yes, at gunpoint. 101

MR. COOPER: How do you feel the police investigated that matter; do you think they did a good job?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 905: I really can't say because after a period of time $I$ did not hear anything about it. They didn't really contact us as far as the outcome of it so.

MR. COOPER: So it might still be going on?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 905: Yes,
MR. COOPER: And you said that one person was caught but not both people were caught.

PROSPECTIVE JROR NO. 905: Right.
MR. COOPER: Do you know if my office, the Clark County District Attorney's Office would have prosecuted the individual charged?

Well, let me ask you, did it happen in Las Vegas?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 905: Yes.
MR. COOPER: And based on your interactions with the attomey in charge of that case, did you get any type of opinion on the criminal justice system or anything like that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 905: I don't remember having any contact, just the two investigators.

MR. COOPER: Okay. Well, based on your

promise that they are going to be able to follow that law?

What if there is a law that you don't agree
with? Do you think you will still be able to follow a
law even if you don't agree with it?
A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.
MR. COOPER: So if there was a law you don't
believe you would be able to follow it if the judge gave it to you?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: If it something that I do not agree with or believe in, no, absolutely not.

MR. COOPER: Now, do you also feel the same way, ma'am?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Linda Alarcon, 032. Yes.
MR. COOPER: And, sir, you also said no.
A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, Jace Mande, 055.
MR. COOPER: Do you also agree with Juror No. 1 ?
A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I cannot speak for Juror
No. 1, but if something goes against my own morals then I
would not be able to follow it.
MR. COOPER: Well, let me ask everyone this: If this was a marijuana case, this isn't, but if it was, and you believe that marijuana should be legal but I prove beyond a reasonable doubt --

MS. HOJJAT: Objection. Your Honor, may we

## approach?

THE COURT: You may.
(Discussion held at the bench.)
THE COURT: All right. Thatik you, I am going
to sustain the objection and take a different tactic to
see if maybe we can make it a little clearer to the
potential jurors what we are talking about here when we
say follow the law, what the jury instructions will
actually entail. And your duty as jurors to follow those instructions.

## Go ahead.

MR. COOPER: So if there were a law given to
you, you said if you disagree with your morals you
wouldn't be able to follow it.
PROSPECTIVE JJROR NO. 055: Right.
MR. COOPER: Okay. I guess do you have an example where that could happen?

THE COURT: Actually, I am going to interrupt on that because I want to try to clarify here. There aren't going to be any instructions that I can magine would
offend yours or any other person's morals. The
instructions are exactly these, how you as jurors carry
out your duties. You need to understand what you are
supposed to do.
The instructions that will be read to you, if
you are in fact on the panel, will instruct you on how to do that. Some of those instructions will cover what is the charge and what are the elements of the charge and what is the State's burden to prove beyond a reasonable doubt those elements of those charges. That's what the instructions are. That's all we are talking about when we say "follow the law."

This isn't hypothetical out in somewhere land where something is going to be offensive to your dignity or anything like that. This is very specific to this case and what has been alleged in this case and what the burden is by the State to prove this beyond a reasonable doubt to the charges in this case.

And ultimately we will also have instructions that will help you understand what the defendant's rights are and how to carry out your job. So with that clarification, is there any reason that you believe that you would not be able to apply the law as I give it you if you are empaneled?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 055: No. I can follow instructions.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
Anything further, Counsel?
MR. COOPER: Just briefly. That was a lot better than I could ever do so thank you for that.

Does your opinion still remain the same based on the Judge's recitation?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 008: Which question?
MR. COOPER: On whether or not you would be able to follow the law and instructions?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 008: Yes.
MR. COOPER: Does yours as well, ma'am? PROSPECTTVE JUROR NO. 032: Yes.
MR. COOPER: Thank you, Your Honor. I am done with my questioning.

THE COURT: Thank you.
Ms. Bonaventure.
MS. BONAVENTURE: Thank you.
So we have ail heard from Ms. Alarcon. We know she has a very strong opinion at this point in time. She did say that she cannot be impartial. She says right now if she was asked whether or not he was guilty she would say he was guilty.

Who else here shares that opinion? Anybody else share that opinion? Okay. Well, we have something that is very important. It's called the presumption of innocence. At this point in time, as Mr. McNeill sits there by every law in this land, by the Constitution of the United States he is considered innocent.

In fact, you heard Judge Delaney when you sat
down after she read you your oath that he is considered innocent at this point by all accounts.

Does anybody have any concerns or issues with that at this point?

Your badge?
A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: 976.
MS. BONAVENTURE: Ms, Ash, you said that you would not be impartial because you rcad a lot of criminal novels.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 976: True crime novels. l just think by the time something gets to court they've got enough evidence to declare the person guility. I am just old and I am set in my ways. I'm sorry.

MS. BONAVENTURE: That's fine. I am, too, also an avid reader of crime novels. Obviously, my profession in and of itself contradicts what you are saying. 1 have read many crime novels, would you agree it cuts the other way, too, that somebody has been wrongly accused?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 976: I don't know. For the last 20 years it just seems like everybody bargains unless they have the dead nuts on it,

MS. BONAVENTURE: I'm sorry. The what on it?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 976: Just the stone cold facts to, you know.

MS. BONAVENIURE: So you thought -- I don't want 111
to put words in your mouth.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 976: No. It's just that the District Attomey's Office is not going to spend
their time on a case that they are not probably
99 percent sure it is going to be in his favor.
MS. BONAVENTURE: Okay, Well, speaking as a person who has gottea not guilty in courtrooms, I have to respectfilly disagree with you. But I absolutely respect your opinion.

Does anybody else share that opinion? No. Everybody here understands the presumption of imocence? Great.

So we all understand that is a pretty important concept here. Another concept that is really important here is it's the State that has the burden to prove Mr. McNeill is guilty beyond a reasonable doubt.
Somebody here said they sat on a civil jury. Can you raise your hand.

Did it not come to resolution?
A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: They settled. In fact we had just got in the jury room and we had not been there more than five minutes and they came in and interrupted us and said that they had settled.

MS. BONAVENTURE: Okay. That's a lot of time to invest in something. Do you remember what the burden of
proof was in that case?
A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I don't. It was almost 20
years ago. All I remember the thing that actually happened. We were there for five minutes.

MS. BONAVENTURE: Yes. I'm sorry about that. I
am sure you put a lot of time and consideration to
everything that was presented before you.
The burden at trial in a civil case is much
different than the burden at a criminal trial, as $I$ am
sure you can appreciate. The burden is much higher. In fact, the State, Mr. Cooper, has to prove every element of every charge that he puts before you.

In fact, I and my co-counsel, Ms. Hojjat, can sit there and twittie our thumbs the entire time and not say one word and it would still be the State's
responsibility to prove to you every element of the
charge. We have absolutely no burden in this courtroom to prove anything.

We do not have to prove that Mr. McNeill is introcent, which leads me to his right not to testify.
Does anybody know -- well, you all said you watched NCIS and CSI. Who heard of the Fifth Amendment? Okay.

Ms. Schultz, can you tell me what the Fifth
Amendment is.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 958: You have the right
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not to incriminate yourself.
MS. BONAVENTURE: And do you believe that that right extends to trial?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 958: Absolutely.
MS. BONAVENTURE: Absolutely true. He has the right not to incriminate himself. He does not have to take that stand. But there is a lot of reasons why people decide not to take the stand. Can you think of one?

Sir, what's your badge number?
A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: 909.
MS. BONAVENIURE: Can you think of any reason why Mr. McNeill wouldn't take the stand?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 909: No. It's up to him whether he wants to take the stand or not.

MS. BONAVENTURE: Do you agree that maybe he would be afraid to take the stand?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO, 909: No. Like you said, there are certain reasons why he might not want to take the stand.

MS, BONA VENTURE: He may be shy PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 909: Or whatever. He can refuse. That's his business.

MS. BONAVENTURE: Right. As a matter of fact I might even tell him not to take the stand. As his
attorney, I definitely have that ability to advise him as
to whether or not we believe the State has proven their case beyond a reasonable doubt and whether or not that would be a good thing for him to do at that time, correct?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 909: Correct.
MS. BONAVENTURE: Okay. Great.
Somebody here said they sat on a criminal trial
awhile back. What's your name again, ma'am?
A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Shirley Towers, 924.
MS. BONAVENTURE: And you said there was a verdict rendered in that case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 924; Correct.
MS. BONAVENTURE: Out of curiosity, what was the outcomc?

MR, COOPER: Your Honor, can we approach?
THE COURT: You may.
(Discussion held at the bench.)
THE COURT: I will sustain the objection. We
will not inquire as to what the verdict was, but
certainly some questions with regard to the jury service
is available if you would like to proceed, Ms.
Bonaventure.
MS. BONAVENTURE: Thank you, Your Honor.
So without telling us the actual verdict, based
on your experience since you were there from opening to
closing, do you feel that you would be able to render a
verdict of not guilty if the State does not prove their
burden?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 924: Yes.
MS. BONAVENTURE: Is there anybody here that thinks that they would not be able to render a verdict of not guilty if the State is unable to prove their case beyond a reasonable doubt? I got you Ms. Alarcon, don't worry.

And just before we leave the subject of his Fifth Amendment right not to testify, is there anybody here that would hold it against him if he did not take the stand? Is there anybody here who thinks that if he is not guilty then why wouldn't he say his peace? No hands.

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Jorge Morales, 907. The way I see it, if you have nothing to hide, why not? That is what I feel.

MS. BONAVENTURE: Okay. So you think that if he did not take the stand he has something to hide?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 907: That is my opinion. That's the way I see it now. If you don't tell the truth or if you don't mention what you did you are guilty.

MR. BONAVENTURE: You over here, you said you
had the same opinion? What's your name and badge?
A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Phyllis Ash, 976 .
MS. BONAVENTURE: Oh, I'm sorty. The lady behind you.

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Tami Taylor, 933 .
MS. BONAVENTURE: Thark you. Can you explain your response.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 933; I believe that if you don't want to defend yourself that there's a reason why. There's something hidden that you are not coming forth, you are not defending yourself, and I do not understand why somebody would not want to defend yourself.

MS. BONAVENTURE: Now, you understand that as Mr . McNeill's attorney we are hore to defend him.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 933: But if he takes the stand, ir he was telling his side of it.

MS. BONAVENTURE: So you feel that unless he takes the stand you just are at a default he is guilty?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 933: I did not say he is guilty. But I would not understand why he didn't do it because he would be able to clarify his side of what happened or whatever the situation was.

MS. BONAVENTURE: Okay. I know a lot of you said you had children. When you send your kids out in
the world are you ever afraid that they would be subject to peer pressure, that somebody might force them based on their opinions to make a certain decision one way or the other?

Ma'am, I see you shaking your head. Explain.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 905: Well, in the day in which 1 am living in that is what our kids are up against. A lot of kids are getting a lot of things off of the Internet going on as much -- as much as we can as a parent to teach them not to do they don't want to listen to those that they are around, their friends and their peers.

MS. BONAVENTURE: And, sir, you were nodding your head as well. Your name and badge number.

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Justin Walker, 985.
MS. BONAVIENTURE: You nodded your head. Do you agree?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 985: Well, yeah, for the most part I recall what I did as a juvenile and probably got away with a lot of stuff that I shouldn't have and I came from a lower income and l'm trying to have my kids have more, and this is the greatest country in the world. We can be whatever we want to be. So I try to really -4 I'm their bubble. I try to protect them and show them a better way. I want them to pay for me when I am retired.

```
MS. BONAVENTURE: So you hope that you kids don't fall victim to peer pressure? PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 985: Absolutely. My wife is monitoring constantly.
MS. BONAVENTURE; So do you try to practice those own values in your own life?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 985: Absolutely. MS. BONA VENTURE: So if you are picked to be on this jury, and I will direct this question to both of you and then to the rest of the panel. If you are chosen to be on this jury and you get back there with the entire jury, there is going to be 12 of you back there with potentiaily, if you felt one way and everyone else was thinking another way, would that sway you from changing your opinion just based on cverybody's else's opinion and maybe them getting on you about your own opinion?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 985: No. I think I am very objective and working with others in a group and I sometimes am very vocal about what I want to do and it contradicts what the feam wants to do and then we work it out, all sides say what they need to say and we come to a resolution.
MS. BONAVENTURE: So you feel like you can stand by a decision?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 985: Yes. 1 also feel
that others can help influence me to change my ways. So sometimes, if I fully believe something very, very strongly that someone is going to have to persuade me otherwise.

MS. BONAVENTURE: They have to give you what to persuade you?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 985: Objective quantifiable evidence.

MS. BONAVENTURE: All right. Thank you.
Ma'am, if you are back there with the juy and
if you had already made up your mind either for the State or the defense, that you would feel peer pressure if everybody else was of a different mind.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 905: No. I am not one
for peer pressure. If I have my mind made up that is what 1 am going to stand on.

MS. BONAVENTURE: But are you open to logical argument?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 905: I am, but they have to make sense to me. If it didn't make sense I know I have to be able to see it.

MS. BONAVENTURE: Okay. And does everybody kind of feel the same way? Is there anybody who feels differently? No? Yes? No responses. Okay.

I know some of you are retired but I know even
people who have been retired worked potentially in a work place environment. Conflicts always happen when you get more than three people in a room, I think you are likely to get some kind of a conflict.

Let me pick on somebody specifically.
Mr , Manning.
PROSPECTIVE JRROR NO. 987: Yes.
MS. BONAVENTURE: You said that you were an analyst?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 987: Yes.
MS. BONAVENTURE: Did you ever work in a work place environment?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 987: Yes. It was quite sometime ago, but yes. It was always very stressful.
Corporate accounting was a very stressfiul place to work in. They had many requirements and they always wanted things done yesterday. And, of course, general ledger ran everyday and if there were problems at night, of course, the bank branches can't open until the general ledger finishes. You have to solve these problems, so it is very high pressure.

MS. BONAVENTURE: I would imagine high conflicts then?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 987: Sometimes. You cannot avoid that.

MS. BONAVENTURE: Sometimes you cannot avoid conflict. Did you ever have an instance where you yourself came into conflict with somebody else at work or with two people around you or if your supervisor and you came into some type of a conflict?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 987: Not so much at Home Savings but carlier in my career there were several things that I can think about that were conflicts. And you just have to work through those.

MS BONA VENTURE: By work through them, what do you mean? Talk to out?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 987: Yes. Talk it out.
MS. BONA VENTURE: Okay. Ms. Taylor, you work at
Vons?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 933: Yes.
MS. BONAVENTURE: I know every time I go to Vons they have lots of coworkers there, correct?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 933: Yes.
MS. BONAVENTURE: Lots of people working together. And that is a large supermarket, correct?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 933: Yes, ma'am.
MS. BONAVENTURE: Have you ever run into any type of conflict at work?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 933: Every day.
MS. BONA VENTURE: Every day. How do you deal
with conflict?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 933: To the best of my ability I try to diffuse it.

MS. BONAVENTURE; How do you diffuse it?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 933: By me weighing the
situation of what is being presented to me. What they
are telling me. What the issue is, what the problem is
and if I can take care of it I will take care of it
myself, and if I cannot I will call a supervisor over and have them take care of the situation.

MS. BONAVENTURE: So that goes to say that you try not to do anything to exacerbate it.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 933: I would not want to exacerbate it. That can get ugly.

MS. BONAVENTURE: Okay. Is there somebody here who has a lot of kids, three or four kids?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I do.
MS. BONAVENTURE: I will ask the both of you
together, you have quite a few children. Have your kids
ever fought, not with each other but with other kids?
A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.
MS. BONAVENTURE: Your kdds never fight?
A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Not that I know of.
MS. BONAVENTURE: Sir.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 909: When they were
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younger they would get in scrapes but they knew their dad was around to teach them better.

MS. BONAVENTURE: How did you teach them better?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO, 909: I just lay down the
law. If they didn't behave they got in trouble. We was
always good to our kids. Always took them camping and
fishing. They were raised pretty good.
MS. BONAVENTURE: Well, that's good to hear.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 909: It is easier to stay
out of trouble then to get out of trouble.
MS. BONAVENTURE: Right. So I know there is a lot of people in the jury who have family members,
friends, who are police officers. Is there aaybody here
who has friends or familily or who they themselves have
previously served in the military?
Your badge, sir.
A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Joey Hamilton, 971. Ten years in the Air Force.

MS. BONAVENTURE: Okay. Do you think that experience would at all bias you in this case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 971: No.
MS. BONAVENTURE: No. Okay.
Ma'am, your badge number.
A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Number 958. My husband was in the Air Force and my brother was in the Army. My
dad was in the Army.
MS. BONAVENTURE: Do you think that would bias you in any way?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 958: No.
MS, BONAVENTURE: Okay.
Sir, we need your badge number.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 000: Number 000. I was in the Air Force for four years.

MS. BONAVENTURE: Okay. And do you think that that would bias you in any way?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 000: No,
MS. BONAVENTURE: Okay. Anybody else?
Sir.
A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I have a son that was in the Army and a daughter that was in the Amy and I was in the Army.

MS. BONAVENTURE: Okay.
Go ahead, sir.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 927: Badge 927. I did six months in the Army. I had a medical discharge.

MS. BONAVENTURE: Okay. And, sir, you had raised your hand.

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: My dad was in the Marines and I was in the Amny.

MS. BONAVENTURE: Your name and badge number?
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A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Gilbert Canales, 930.
MS. BONA VENTURE: Anybody else?
Ms. Rice-Wilson.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 905: I worked for the VA.
MS. BONAVENTURE: Ms, Alarcon, did you raise your hand?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 032: Yes. I have a brother in the Navy.

MS. BONAVENTURE: Sir.
A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Badge No. 606. I was in the Anny for two years.

MS. BONAVENTURE: Do you think that would bias you in any way?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 606: No.
MS. BONAVENTURE: And I forgot to ask you, ma'am. Do you think your current service working for Provider Services for the VA would that bias you in any way?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 032: I cannot see how it could.

MS. BONAVENTURE: Okay. Did anybody else raise their hand for that question I did not ask? Okay.

Now, I know that some of you sat on juries
previously, and I am sure some of you in the past have
had legal issues whether they were civil or even trying
to look up property or zoning law, any kind of issue.
Who thinks the law is easy? Who thinks it is easy to read the law? Who thinks it's easy to interpret the law? Who thinks it is really hard to do that? Has anybody bad any legal training?

Sir.
A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I took a hasic law class in college.

MS. BONAVENTURE, How long ago was that? A PROSPECTTVE JUROR: 20 years ago.
MS. BONAVENTURE: Do you remember how easy that class was?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: It was contraci law. It
was not anything like criminal or anything like that. It was complex and nuances that had to be understood.

MS. BONAVENTURE: Yes. I know somehody else raised their hand. Sir.

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Juror 060. As a union
representative in the union being a delegate we have to
he trained on labor law.
MS. BONAVENTURE: Are they very complicated?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 060: Yes, they are.
MS. BONAVENTURE: Does the union have their own attorneys?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 060: Yes, we do.

MS. BONAVENTURE: Why do you guys employ your own attomeys?

PROSPECTTVE JUROR NO. 060: Why? We do not go to law school. We don't take training within the labor
law and the regulations and all that so we have to be
aware.
MS. BONAVENTURE: But it is very difficult,
right? That is why you have an attorney?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 060: Correct.
MS. BONAVENTURE: If you had a legal problem do you guys think you would all go to an attomey or try to
do it by yourself?
A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Attomey.
MS. BONAVENTURE: Have you ever handled a legal issue by yourself, even if it was with your landlord?

Ms. Rice-Wilson.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 905: I had a legal issue with my landlord and I had an attomey.

MS. BONAVENTURE: Was it still very complicated?
PROSPECTTVE JUROR NO. 905: No. It was in and out.

MS. BONAVENTURE: Anybody else ever handled -Sir.
A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: 060. Yes, I handled the contracting without a license.

MS. BONAVENTURE: Still very complicated, I'm
sure.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 060: Oh, yes.
MS. BONAVENTURE: Your Honor, can we approach?
THE COURT: Yes, you may.
(Discussion beld at the bench.)
THE COURT: I have a couple of questions and then counsel is going to follow up with some additional questions that have not heen asked yet.

Let me start with Mr. Morales. Mr. Morales, you were one of the two folks that expressed a concern, maybe that's the wrong word, but indicated what you might like to see with regard to the defendant's testimony. What I would like to do is I am going to read to you the instruction now that would be included in the packet that would be given at the end of the trial should you be a juror. And I am going to ask you some questions about it after I read it, okay?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 907: Okay.
THE COURT: This is how the instruction that goes to the jury reads:
"It is a constitutional right of a defendant in a criminal trial that he may not be compelled to testify, thus, the decision as to whether he should testify is
left to the defendant on the advice and counsel of his attomey. You must not draw any inference of guill from the fact that he does not testify nor should this fact he discussed by you or enter into your deliberations in any way."

Do you have any reason to believe you would not be able to follow that instruction when it came time to deliberate?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 907 : Since you put it that way, no.

THE COURT: Well, the instruction is worded that way for a very specific reason because there could be a whole host of reasons why someone would not take the stand in a criminal trial and be subject to cross-examination by the State and for any other reason that has nothing to do with guilt or innocence, but simply by, again, advice of counsel and determination. And it is a constitutional right for a reason.

Sol always want to address it with folks who indicate, and we appreciate the candor, of what they might like to see to help them understand that the actual law on this point is that you must not draw any inference of guilt from the fact that a defendant does not testify nor may you discuss this or it enter into your verdict in

\section*{any way.}

So I just want to be sure that you would understand that that is the instruction and that you would be able to follow it.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 907: Yes.
THE COURT: Ms. Taylor, same question to you.
Would you understand that instruction and would you be
able to follow that instruction if you were to be on the panel and deliberate?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 933: (No audible response.)

THE COURT: Regardless of what it is that you might like to see and regardless of whether or not you can perhaps in your mind think of hypothetical reasons why someone would not testify, would you be able to recognize that this is a constitutional right. There are a myriad of reasons why that might be exercised and that ultimately that camot be used as a basis for your deliberations. Would you be able to respect that and be able to follow that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 933: I think I would have
a hard time with it.
THE COURT: I don't typically like to ask these kind of open-ended questions because of course everybody has their own views and I don't necessarily want to
influence anybody else's views, but I guess, I am a
little surprised by your answer. l'm going to be candid with you. Just because of the other answers you had given indicate to me that overall you appear to be able to be a fair and impartial juror, and it would seem strange to me that that issue would be something that might mean that you could not be fair and impartial.

What I am really ullimately asking you is can you be fair and impartial. And part of that goes along with this idea of whether you understand why or not, there is the basic issue the State has to prove beyond a reasonable doubt. The defense doesn't have to do a single thing. They don't have to put on a single witness. They don't have to do anything.

If the State proves its burden and you find so, so be it, and if they don't and you find so, so be it. But the defense does not have to do a thing. And when folks begin to maybe go back to what they have seen on TV or read in books believe that somehow that this is a civil case, if you will, why one side has to prove something and the other side has to defend something and prove guilt, prove innocence, that's not how this works at all. Period. End of story.

The State has to prove gailt. If they don't meet their burden, then they don't meet their burden.

But there is no requirement on the defense to prove innocence. In fact innocence is already in place, right,

So I ouly give that additional information and in no way, shape or form am I trying to put you on the spot. I a just want your candid reason for why this would be difficult for you to help me better understand the thought process.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 933: I have always had a hard time with -- my life has always been very black and white. Very little grey in between. And so I just don't understand why somebody woutd not want to speak up for themselves.

THE COURT: Maybe they do, but for many reasons they don't. Can you shift your black and white focus over to the idea that the State proved beyond a reasonable doubt the elements that lead to a finding of guilt on the charges or they do not and that be your focus and not be your focus on what you need or expect to hear from the defense.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 933: I can try. I can give it a good try.

THE COURT: I appreciate your candor.
I will invite counsel now to make your further inquiries and then give the State an opportunity to follow up to any of those questions.

\footnotetext{
MS. HOJJAT: Thank you, Your Honor. Just to follow-up on questions to the State's?

THE COURT: Yes. And Mr. Cooper has the opportunity to foilow up.

MS. HOJJAT: Thank you, Your Honor.
Mr. Morales, the Judge just read directly the instruction you will be given at the end of the case. When you said, Well, when you put it like that, then, yes.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 907: Yes.
MS. HOJJAT: But what you said earlier was, The way I was raised, kind of my whole life the way I thought if you don't have anything to hide why don't you tell your side. And you also said if he doesn't take the stand he has something to hide.

Now, obviously, you will be given the instruction that you should not think those things while you are deliberating. But it sounds like something that you felt strongly about your whole life. This is not something that you just walked into the courtroom today and thought, You know what, if that guy doesn't take the stand, I think he's got something to hide. You have always felt you don't have anything to bide you have to tell your side of the story?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 907: Right.
}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline 1 & MS. HOSIAT: And that has been ingrained in you \\
\hline 2 & for years and years. \\
\hline 3 & PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 907: Since I was a little \\
\hline 4 & kid. \\
\hline 5 & MS. HOJJAT: So let me ask you, if you are \\
\hline 6 & selected for jury service and Mr. McNeill chooses not to \\
\hline 7 & testify, do you think you could put aside the way you \\
\hline 8 & felt your whole life about this idea and not hold it \\
\hline 9 & against him at all if he doesn't testify? \\
\hline 10 & PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO, 907: Um -- \\
\hline 11 & MS. HOJJAT: There is no wrong answer. We just \\
\hline 12 & want the tuth. \\
\hline 13 & PROSPECTTVE JUROR NO. 907: You are making a lot \\
\hline 14 & of sense. I think I should not think about the way I \\
\hline 15 & used to think, the way I was raised. Even though in the \\
\hline 16 & past my dad was the one, you know, if it was black, even \\
\hline 17 & if it's yellow, it's black. That is the way he thinks. \\
\hline 18 & MS. HOJJAT: You think you could do that \\
\hline 19 & PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 907: Yes. \\
\hline 20 & MS. BONAVENTURE: So you do not think you will \\
\hline 21 & have a problem if he does not testify? \\
\hline 22 & PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 907: No. \\
\hline 23 & MS. HOJJAT: Thank you. \\
\hline 24 & And, Ms. Taylor, I guess even in speaking with \\
\hline 25 & the judge, it sounds like this is something you feel
\[
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\hline 1 & strongly about as well? \\
\hline 2 & PROSPECTIVE, JUROR NO. 933: Yes. \\
\hline 3 & MS. HOJAT: And it sounds like this is not \\
\hline & something that you just came up with today, You have \\
\hline 5 & always felt this way? \\
\hline 6 & PROSPliCTIVE JUROR NO. 933: That is how I was \\
\hline & raised. You stood up for yourself and that's how I have \\
\hline 8 & always been. \\
\hline 9 & MS. HOJJAT: And in fact we actually talked a \\
\hline 10 & little bit to some of the jurors why somebody would chose \\
\hline 11 & not to testify and you heard those reasons? \\
\hline 12 & PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 933: Yes. \\
\hline 13 & MS. HOJJAT: But you still, you know, just in \\
\hline 14 & the back of my mind it's going to be why isn't he \\
\hline 15 & testifying, he must have done something wrong if he is \\
\hline 16 & not testifying. \\
\hline 17 & PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 933: I do not understand \\
\hline & why somebody would not want to stand up for themselves. \\
\hline 19 & I was raised you stand up for yourself and that's how it \\
\hline 20 & has always been. \\
\hline 21 & MS. HOJJAT: Okay. You heard the jury \\
\hline & instruction word for word, the instruction that you will \\
\hline 23 & be given if you are chosen for the jury, the instruction \\
\hline 24 & says that you cannot hold it against Mr. McNeil! at all \\
\hline 25 & if he doesn't testify. That it cannot even enter into 136 \\
\hline & 136 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
your deliberations. Do you think you can follow that
instruction or do you think, If I get back there I am
going to be thinking about it and I might hold it against him?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 933: Like I can try.
That's all I can say. I don't know what the
circumstances are.
MS. HOJJAT: Well, you do know what is ahead of
you. But what \(I\) am asking is the one thing \(I\) am asking
if you knew he is not going to testify, if you knew he is
not going to testify do you think you could tell us -let me rephrase the question.

If you were sitting in Mr. McNeill's seat, you were the one on trial and there was a potential that you weren't going to be testifying and there was a juror sitting in the panel who felt the way you felt, who was saying, You know what, I'm going to try, but I can't be sure that I wouldn't hold it against him if she didn't testify, would you want that juror sitting on your jury?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 933: I can't answer that because you are asking me to try to go against - I don't understand why somebody won't testify on their own behalf.

MS. HOJJAT: Okay. You just said, You are asking me to go against, and I think you were going to
say, I don't want to put words in your mouth, but
basically go against what you thought for a very long time.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 933: Yes, exactly. So what are you asking me?

MS. HOJJAT: I am asking you not to hold it against him. Can you do that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 933: That's how I have been raised. It was pounded in my head for years and years and years as a child.

MS. HOJJAT: So just sitting there you can't say for sure I won't hold it against him?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 933: No, I can't.
MS. HOJJAT: I appreciate your honesty.
Now, ladies and gentlemen, you were told that the charges here are violation of lifetime supervision by a sex offender. That means Mr. McNeill is a convicted sex offender who is on lifetime supervision.

The judge instructed you that you are to presume
him innocent. The presumption of innocence is going to
go whether or not he violated lifetime supervision not to
whether or not he is a sex offender. You are going to
hear in this trial that Mr. McNeill is a convicted sex
offender.
Is there anybody here who thinks, You know what,
knowing that information, I don't know that 1 can be fair and unbiassed towards him in rendering a verdict.

\section*{Ms. Alarcon.}

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 032: I can't.
MS. HOJJAT: Thank you for your honesty.
Is there anybody else here hearing the word sex
offender that makes you really uncomfortable, I don't know if I could be fair. Secing no hands from the panel.

Ms. Cardoza, I wanted to speak with you specifically you mentioned that your husband is a police officer. And I belive the judge was asking you about whether or not that would influence you whether or not you could be fair. And I believe you made the comment, and correct me if I'm wrong, I thought you said, I bold the same vicws as my husband.

PROSPLCTTVE JUROR NO. 166: In what sense?
MS. HOJAT: Well, I wasn'l sure what you were
referring to when you said, I hold the same views as my
husband, in the response to the question, Can you be fair.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 166: When I said I can be fair \(I\) think there is a lot of things as in evidence that
I see legal terms, probable cause, then, yes, I do go
back and look at everyihing that comes to me with evidence and weigh in on other situations. Like what if
-- it's hard to explain. What if he did this, what other
things are in the situation. I know there's a crime that
has been violated so he is obviously guilty in that
sense. Do you want me to elaborate?
MS. HOJJAT: Go ahead, please.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 166: A lot of things when
it comes to being opeu minded, \(I\) am. But there is things
that I also think, Okay, maybe this is there on a guilty
sense, I think a lot in facts in a mistaken way.
MS. HOJIAT: Okay. You mentioned probable
cause.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 166: When you come in there is a reason why -- it's kind of hard for me to explain.

MS. HOJJAT: Okay. Well, let me ask you, and I believe Ms. Ash had mentioned this earlier about the idea, Well, he's sitting there.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 166: Not because he's sitting here.

MS. HOIJAT: Okay.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 166: Fie cannot not be
sitting bere and still have a case upon him does not meall
3 he is guilty. But that the cases have to be -- there is
24 a reason why. It's not about he is guilty because he's
25 here. I am not assuming he is guilty. I want to know
why he is here, what made him be in the situation.
MS. HOJJAT: Okay.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 166: There is a lot of reasons that led to this situation.

MS. HOJJAT: I see. And correct me if I am
misunderstanding you, are you saying basically you see
him here but you do not necessarily think he's guilty but you are thinking about --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 166: That is not my first automatic go to.

MS. HOJJAT: Okay. But you are wondering why is he here?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 166: Yes.
MS. HOJJAT: Okay. Does the fact that he is here make you feel like, well, maybe he did do something wrong otherwise he would not be sitting bere?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 166: Maybe he could have violated. I don't know.

MS. HOJJAT: Does anybody else feel that way about what I just started to say the idea of there has to be a reason if is he sitting here? Seeing no hands from the panel.

Speaking about cops, I did want to ask does anybody here have strong feelings about cops good or bad feelings about cops in general. Anybody here think --
oh, Ms. Cardoza.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 166: They are human and
cops could be great at their job but they also can be really crappy at their job. It goes both ways because they are all human,

MS. HOJJAT: Anybody here disagree with that on the panel? Seeing no hands. So does anybody here think, you know what, if a cop gets up there, I just don't see what reason they have to lie. Seeing no hands.

Anybody here feel like, you know what, I just can't imagine why a cop would make something up. Cops just don't make things up. If they are saying it, perhaps, there has to be something to it. Seeing no hands from the panel.

Auybody here think that a cop would never lie to get somebody in trouble? They might tell a fib here or there but a cop would never deliberately tell a lie just for the purpose of getting somebody in trouble. Anybody bere feel that way? Seeing no hands.

I have no more questions.
Thie COURT: Mr. Cooper.
MR. COOPER: No follow-up.
THE COURT: My I have counsel at the bench please.
(Discussion held at the bench.)
(Discussion held in chambers.)
THE COURT: All right. We will resume at this time and I will let you know that I have three jurors who at this time we are going to excuse but thank you for your service. At this time I excuse from the panel, Juror No. 032, Linda Alarcon, Juror No. 933, Tami Taylor, and Juror No. 976, Phyllis Ash. Thank you for your service.

We will call now the next three members to the jury box.

THE CLERK: Juror No. 003, Jason Alper.
THE COURT: Next juror,
THE CLERK: Jutor No. 005, Gary Pollard.
THE COURT: And the next juror.
THE CLERK: Juror No. 006, John Burris.
THE COURT: So we are going to start with
Mr . Alper. If you can please answer the questions on the board here.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 003: Badge No. 003. My
22
23
24
25.
name is Jason Alper. I work for a company called Cal
Pour, it's ready mix concrete. My spouse is Emrily Alper.
She works al Anoff Partners, which is an RV company.

And I also went to Cashman Junior High School.
THE COURT: What year did you graduate high school?

PROSPECTIVE JRROR NO. 003: I graduated in '94.
THE COURT: Okay.
PROSPECTIVF, JUROR NO. 003: I have one child. I
was borin and raised in Las Vegas. Never been a juror before.

THE COURT: First of all, did you know Ms.
Schultz?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 003: I did nol.
THE COURT: Do you have any connections with law enforcement?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 003: I do. My
stepbrother works for Metro. I speak to him a couple
times a day. Another good fiiend works out of the north
west and then my brother-in-law is the medical director
at Metro and another good fiend of mine is on SWAT.
THE COURT: I think that is the record for the most law enforcement connections.

Let me see if we can kind of sum it up. You do have these connections with law enforcement. You obviously have the obligation not to discuss this case with anybody in law enforcement. Would you have any problem following that instruction?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO, 003: Not at all.
THE COURT: Does the fact that you have these connections with friends and family to law enforcement cause you to believe that you would give any greater weight to the testimony of law enforcement?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 003: No.
THE COURT: Is there any reason why you would not be able to be fair and impartial to both sides of
this case, the State and to the defense, to receive the evidence and apply the law and fairly and impartially deliberate with your fellow jurors?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 003: I have no problems with that.

THE COURT: I appreciate that. Have you ever been, close friend or farrily member ever been a victim of a crime or had interaction with the criminal justice syscem or accused of a crime?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 003: When I was a child I
was hit by a drunk driver. He was convicted.
THE COURT: Do you have a specific recollection of that? Did you have to testify?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 003: I don't think I was old enough to testify. I was in physical therapy for aboul 10 to 12 years, so I still have some effects of that.


THE COURT: But the person was caught and you say they were convicted?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 003: Correct.
THE COURT: Is there anything about that dealings with the criminal justice system that would affect your ability to be fair and impartial here?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 003: No.
THE COURT: Have yon or a friend or family member ever been accused of a crime or connection with the criminal justice system in that way?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 003: I do not believe so.
THE COURT: Anything that you heard us discuss with the other folks that you would think would impact your ability to be fair and impartial in this trial?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 003: No.
THE COURT: Thank you. Let me turn then to
Mr. Pollard. Please answer the questions that are on the board.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO, 005: I am retired from the grocery business. I am divorced. I have two children, two sons. One is say policeman in North Las Vegas the other is a podiatrist. I have lived in Vegas way too long. And \(I\) have never been a juror before even though I have been summoned three times. Just never picked.

THE COURT: Never made it to the end. Okay.
You said you have -- is it your son in law enforcement? PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 005: My oldest son.
THE COURT: Okay. So how about you and same
questions as well with Mr. Alper, is that going to
influence the way you receive the evidence if it is
coming from law enforcement?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 005: No, it won't.
THE COURT: Is it going to impact you in any way
being fair and inmpartial if you are selected as a juror in this case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 005: I don't thirk so.
THE COURT: You say you don't think so. I
appreciate and we have actually had some discussion with
counsel about no one can ever say definitively how they
would be, but do you believe that you would be able to
receive the evidence that is provided in this case and
weigh it fairly, apply the law to it and with your fellow jurors deliberate fairly.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 005: Yes.
THE COURT: Ever been accused of or been the vietim of a crime or involved with the criminal justice system that way?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 005: I have been a victim
of crime but it's never gotten to court. I had a vehicle
stolen and it was never recovered and that is about it.
THF COURT: Ald right. Any feclings about the
criminal justice system itself and how that operated that
might impact you ability to be fair and impartial here?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 005: There's always room
for improvernent, but I have no problem.
THE COURT: I don't think that anybody would
disagree with you that there is always room for
improvement.
Any questions that you bave heard or anything
that you think you need to bring to our attention?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 005: No.
THE COURT: Thank you. Last, but not least,
Mr. Burtis.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 006: John Burris. I am
an attomey. I do civil titigation business commercial.
My wife is a stay-at-home mom. The children are too
young to work, I have lived in Las Vegas since 2008 and
before that I was in Salf Lake City. I practiced there.
And I have never been a juror before. I do not have any
contacts with police officers or the criminal justice
system.
THE COURT: No law enforcement in your extended
family circle or friend circle?
PROSPFCTIVE JUROR NO. 006: No. And I do
believe very strongly in our principles of the criminal justice system.

THE COURT: Do you have a brother who is an attomey as well?

PROSPECTIVE 厅UROR NO. 006: No, but I sometimes
get --
THE COURT: Do you get asked that a lot? PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 006: Steve?
THE COURT: Yes.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO, 006: I get asked that.
THE COURT: I thought you might be related when
I first saw you, and I saw the name and it took me a
minute to realize you weren't the other attorney. I
appreciate that. I do not think I have anything further.
I will turn it over to Mr. Cooper.
MR. COOPER: Thank you, Your Honor.
This is just for the three gentlemen who just
joined us. All three of you, do you understand that at
the end of all the cvidence the judge is going to give
you some instructions on the law. Does everyone think that they can follow those instructions?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 003: Yes.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 005: Yes.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 006: Yes.
MR. COOPER: Even if you don't agree with them
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would you still be able to follow them?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 006: Yes.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 003: Yes.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 005: Yes.
MR. COOPER: No further questions. Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Who is going to go?
MS. HOJJAT: I am, Judge.
Hello, gentlemen. Welcome to the panel, So I
just want to go over some things that we have been
talking about with the panel. The presumption of innocence.

Do any of you feel the presumption of innocence is kind of bogus, kind of ridiculous. He's sitting here, there must be a reason be is siting here. Any sort of thoughts like that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 006: He is sitting here becaluse he thinks be is innocent is my presumption.

MS. HOJJAT: Does anyone disagree with Mr.
Burris? Okny. Great.
We talked about him not testifying. We talked about different reasons people might not want to testify. Is there any reason you can think of why someone would not testify?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 006: Sure. The
prosecution would be able to cross-examine him and that could mischaracterize him.

MS. HOJJAT: Okay. That's interesting. You are talking about the prosecution cross-examining him. Do you think cross-examination is something that is scary for somebody?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 006: Absolutely. And it could also be misleading.

MS. HOJIAT: Do you think cross-examination would be especially scary if somebody is aiready a convicted sex offender?

PROSPECTTVE JUROR NO. 006: It could be very complicated.

MS. HOJJAT: If he did not testify in the back of your mind would you be a little bit uncomfortable with it and maybe wonder why he is not speaking'?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 005: I think you always
have that question in the back of your mind but it does
not mean they aren't imocent. They might have a specch
impediment or sonething or some other reason. Who knows.
MS. HOJJAT: So you do not know why he is not
testifying.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 005: And you heard the
jury instruction that Judge Delaney will be giving you at
the end of the trial about not holding it against Mr.

McNeill if he does not testify?
PROSPECTIVE IUROR NO. 005: Yes.
MS. HOJAT: Could you follow that instruction?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 005: Yes.
MS. HOJJAT: Mr. Burris, could you follow that
instruction?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 006: Yes, I could.
MS. HOJJAT: I want to talk about the State's
burden of proof. Mr. Buris, I know you know this one,
law school 101, right?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 006: Yes.
MS. HOJJAT: The burden of proof, essentially
the judge is going to instruct you that myself and Ms.
Bonaventure don't have to do anything. We can sit here
and do absoluteiy noting through the whole tial. And
Mr. Cooper has the burden of proving beyond a reasonable
doubt every element of every charge that the State has
brought against my client.
So even if I do not say a word and Ms.
Bonaventure doesn't say a word and Mr. McNeill doesn't
say a word, if he doesn't prove the burden you must
acquit. Are you comfortable with that? Would you have
any problem retuming a verdict of not guilty if you
believe the defense did not mount a defense? Any problem
with that?

PROSPECTTVE JUROR NO. 005: Maybe a little.
MS. HOJJAT: If the State fails to meet their
burden of proof would you be comfortable of returning a verdict of not guilty?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 005: If they can prove that be is not guilty of the charges.

MS. HOJJAT: Let me ask a little bit more about that. Do you think we need to prove that he is not guilty of the charges?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 005: I think it would depend on the case.

MS. HOIJAT: Depends on the case. Okay. Judge Delaney is going to instruct you that I don't bave to prove anything and Ms. Bonaventure doesn't have to prove anything, so if we don't prove it but the State also doesn't prove that he's guilty, what would your verdict be?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 005: Probably not guilty.
MS. HOJJAT: Probably not guilty.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 005: I have to hear all
the evidence. We are presuming. So I am going to presume I have heard all the evidence and if I hear all the evidence then he is not guilty.

MS. HOJJAT: Okay. Well, let me ask you a question. Right now you have not heard a bit of
evidence.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 005: Right.
MS. HOJJAT: The State has not met their burden,
right? They haven't shown you a bit of evidence.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 005: Right.
MS. HOJJAT: If you were sent to the back and
banded a verdict form and you had to vote guilty or not
guilty, what would you vote?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 005: Probably not guilty.
MS. HOJJAT: Mr. Burris, what are your thoughts on that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 006: Not guilty. MS. HOJJAT: Why is it not guilty?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 006: The State has to
prove every single element beyond a reasonable doubt, so
they have their check list and they have to meet every single one of them.

MS. HOJJAT: Would you agree or disagree with what Mr. Burris just said?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 005: I would agree.
MS. HOJJAT: So if you were to vote right now
it's got to be not guilty because they haven't met their
burden, right?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 005: That's true.
MS. HOJJAT: What about your thoughts on cops.

Does anybody here feel that cops are more honest than
other witnesses may be?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 003: They are just human
beings just like us. They are everyday people.
MS. HOJJAT: So you are saying they are human,
some are honest and some are nol.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 003: Right. Just like
everybody.
MS. HOIJAT: What did you think about what I
said earlier about when I asked the panel, Would a cop
ever lie to deliberately try to put piessure on somebody.
Is that something you think is possible or, no, that's
just crossing the line. A cop wouldn't do that.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 003: I am sure there are
cops that probably push the cnvclope and then there are
cops out there that are 100 percent.
MS. HOJJAT: Okay. What about you, sir; what do you think?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 005: 1 think cops are
human. They might lie. And there have been incidents
where a cop has placed evidence to get sornebody glilty.
So, yes, overall I think policeman are very honest. From my experience with the police.

MS. HOJJAT: Okay. So overall you think they are very honest?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 005: Yes.
MS. HOJJAT: But there are occasions where --
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 005: Yeah, there is
always a bad apple in the barrel.
MS. TOJJAT: Do you think cops get a higher
presumption -- if a cop is up there are you going to
think, Well, he is more likely to be telling the truth?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 005: Yes.
MS. HOJJAT: What about you, Mr. Alper.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 003: 1 have heard stories
from people and there are some prelly bad apples, so I
really cannot tuly yay.
MS. HOJJAT: What are your thoughts, Mr. Burris?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 006: Cops are just like
people. Stake out a position and if they believe in it
then they probably find ways to support that position
just like anybody would be. Might be mistaken. Might be
lying. Just like lawyers are people.
MS. HOJJAT: Okay. Do any of you gentiemen
think, Well, he's sitting here, so he must have done
something, there must be a reason he's sitting here.
A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Not necessarily.
MS. HOJJAT: What about you, Mr. Alper.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 003: Maybe a procedure that was not done properly or maybe something as simple
as that
MS. HOJJAT: Okay. Is it possible he did nothing wrong and he's sitting here?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 003: Could be an interpretation of something done wrong.

MS. HOJJAT: What do you think, Mr. Pollard, is it possible that he did nothing wrong and he's sitting here?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 005: Somebody could have framed him.

MS. HOJJAT: And then the last thing I want to talk to you guys about was he is a convicted sex
offender. Does that cause you any concern in terms of
giving him a falis triat?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 003: He probably has to work twice as hard not to be here.

MS. HOJJAT: Do you think that it is going to influence your ability to look at things impartially because he is a sex offender?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 003: Not at all.
MS. HOJJAT; What about you, Mr. Pollard?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 005: Yes, I think it would influence my judgment.

MS. HOJJAT; Okay. Now, when you are saying influence your jadgment did you think that if you were
chosen for the jury when you were deliberating would you hold it against him?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 005: I would try not to.
I would try to keep it out because that is not what the trial is about.

MS. IIOJJAT: So even though he is a sex offender you would not find him guilty?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 005: If the evidence proves he is not guilty. If the evidence proves the other way I would find him to be guilty.

MS. HOJJAT: But the fact that he is a sex offender --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO, 005: Would not make a difference.

MS. HOJJAT: So if the State does not meet their burden you would not convict him. What are your thoughts, Mr. Burris?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 006: I would not hold it
against him, It does not mean that he actually was a sex
offender, I would not hold it against him.
MS. MOJJAT: Okay. That's interesting, you said convicted, that does not mean that he necessarily is one.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO, 006: There are people that get convicted incorrectly.

MS. HOJJAT: That's interesting. For the people
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in the back who maybe conldrit hear him he said there are people who get convicted incorrectly.

So you believe it's possible for a person to be convicted of a crime they didn't commit?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 006: Sure. I cannot help
but go through some of the complications of what is at
work here. People make mistakes. Cops make mistakes.
Lawyers, not the Court of course. I would not hold it
against him if he is here for a different charge.
MS. HOJJAT: And you would only look at the evidence of --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 006: I would only look at that charge.

MS. HOJJAT: Does anybody here feel differently?
Seeing no hands.
I have no more questions, Your Honor.
THE COURT: We'll qualify the panel and that allows me to excuse the retuainder of the panel. But we have qualified the 24 that we nced to qualify to ultimately wind up with a pasel of 14 . I am going to allow the attorneys now to complete their final selection process. The remainder of you are excused. I do believe there is someone in Jury Service so just check in for further instruction. Thank you very much for your service.

\section*{So what is going to happen now is counsel is} going to make their final sclection, and unlike in previous times when I read oft names and numbers that meant that you are excused then you know that you are on the panel. The final selection will leave us with a panel of 14 individuals, 12 of who will detiberate and two of whom will be altemates throughout the course of the trial. You will not know obviously which of you are the alternates.

I am going to read some basic instructions to sort of orient you for how the process will continue for those of you who are able to and will in fact remain on the panel. And for those of you who are not selected, we just want to thank you again. 1t's been a long afternoon and we appreciale your service very much.

I should also note for those who are going to be returning tomorrow that we are going to start tomortow at 1:00 p.m., so you will have the moming free and maybe you can get some work in, and we do expect to break at or around 5:00. Typically we don't go past 5:00. Today, of course, I wanted to make sure we had the full panel before I let the remainder go. So that is for your schedule tomorrow.

During the course of this trial, the atomeys for both sides, the parties, the witnesses and couri
personnel, other than the marshal are not permitted to converse with members of the jury. These individuals are not being antisocial. We are bound by ethics and the law not to talk to you, to do so might contaminate your verdict whether intended or not.

You are admonished additionally that you are not to visit the scene of any acts or occurrences made mention of during the trial unless specifically directed to by me and you are not to investigate this case or anyone who has anything to do with this case on your own or undertake any legal or factual research on your 0 wn .

Those are the very, very basic general instructions. Basically, what will happen is obviously each day when you return here tomorrow at 1:00 -- but you never know who might be in the hallway, it might be a witness, we just don't want anybody to misunderstand if we happen to sec you if your run into us somewhere and say, Nice day or Hello or wave and somebody from across the hallway sees that and doesn't understand that that is not a conversation about the case. We just try to avoid improper appearances.

So you can converse with and speak to the marshal, but otherwise the rest of us will not converse with you. The safest people to talk to are the ones wearing the jury badges just like you because they are
under the same admonishment.
You are not to discuss this case with anyone, not to do any research to try to understand the case better. Whatever your verdice is will be based on the cvidence that is provided in this trial as you find it to be, and the law as I give it to you in the insimuctions at the end of this case. And then you will deliberate from that and that alone.

Again, this is a criminal case brought by the State of Nevada, oftentimes referred to as the State. And it is based upon what will be the information or a charging document. That will be read to you tomorrow before we begin opening statements, and you will have a specific understanding of what the charges are that have been filed against Mr. McNeill.

You need to be reminded, however, and I have already gone over this a little bit in the questioning of the jury panel, but that this charging document is simply that. It is simply a charge. It is not in any sense cvidence of the allegations it contains. The defcndant bas pleaded not guilty to these two charges that are set forth in the information that you will hear tomorrow.

The State, therefore, has the burden of proving each of the essential elements of the charges beyond a reasonable doubt. As the defendant sits there now he is
imnocent. And unless and until he is proven guilty by the State he will remain so.

The purpose of this trial is to determine whether the State will meet the burden. It is your primary responsibilities as jurors to find and determine the facts.

Under our system of criminal procedure you are the sole judges of the facts. You are to determine the
facts from the testimony you hear and the other evidence including exhibits introduced in court. Anything you hear or see outside of courtroom is not evidence and may not be considered by you.

It is up to you to determine the inferences which you feel may be properly drawn from the evidence. At times I may sustain objections or direct that you disregard certain testimony or exhibits. You must not consider any evidence to which an objection has been sustained or which I have instructed you to disregard.

Anything that you may, again, have seen or heard outside of the courtroom is not evidence and must be disregarded. You must also not be influenced in any degree by any personal feelings or sympathy or prejudice against the State or the defendant. Both sides are entitled to the same fair and impartial consideration. When considering the weight and value of the testimony of
any witness you may take into consideration the appearance, attitude and behavior of the witness, the interest of the witness in the outcome of the case, if any, the relation of the wimess to the defendant or the State, the inclination of the witness to speak truthfully or not, and the probability or improbability of the witness's statement and all of the facts and circumstances in evidence, thus, you may give the testimony of any witness just such weight and value you believe the testimony of the witness is entitled to receive.

There are two kinds of evidence, direct and circumstantial. Direct evidence is testinnony by a witness about what that witness personally saw or heard or did. Circumstantial evidence is testimony or exhibits which are proof of a particular fact from which if proven you may infer a second fact.

You may consider both direct and circumstantial evidence in deciding the case. The law permits you to give equal weight to both. But it is of course for you to decide how much weight to give to any of the evidence.

This is something new that most jurors are not familiar with if they haven't served recently, but you are given the opportunity to yourself ask questions of the witnesses when they testify. This is not done
verbally by you cngaging with the witness. What will
happen is once the witness questioning has commenced and
completed then 1 will invite jurors if they have
questions to write a question down. You will all be given notepads and pens, and you will write your question or questions down.

I will then go over the questions with counsel and if they are pennitted to be asked, they are proper questions and done in the proper format, then we will ask it of the witness. The Court will read the questions verbatim to the witness. The witness will answer and counsel will be given an opportunity to follow-up.

There is no right or wrong way to do it, it's just that you are govemed by the same rules that counsel are governed by. So obviously you can't ask something that would be impermissible to be asked, and you may or may not know what that is, but the Court will make that determination.

And your questions of course should be based on what evideace and questioning has already taken place, things for clarification or further questioning on certain topics that have been asked. But anything that is outside of the scope of what has been asked is also not available to you. And there may be other restrictions. But you do not have to worry about that.
\[
165
\]

If you have a question please do not hesitate to write it down during the course of the testimony because, again, at the end I will ask for questions and you will show me by way of hand if you have a question and my marshall will collect it and bring it to me and then we will proceed.

Remember that the questions must be factual in nature and are designed to clarify information already presented. Of course you may not place any undue weight on a response just because a juror asked it and you should not have any adverse inference drawn if the Court determines not to ask a question. Do not speculate as to why that may be the case; there could be any number of reasons.

Opening statements and closing arguments of the attorneys are intended to help you in understanding the evidence and applying the law, but they are not themselves evidence. Until this case is submitted to you, again, you must not discuss it with anyone even your fellow jurors. You cannot discuss it with anyone outside, I think everyone knows that, and anyone else means family members and friends. You can of course let them know that you are on a criminal trial jury but that is it until the case is done and you are discharged, at which point you can discuss it with anyone in any way you
see fit. But you are aiso not entiled to discuss it
with other jurors because we don't want there to be any appearance or actual deliberation occurring until all the evidence is received and you have now been instructed on the law and you are now ready to deliberate.

If for any reason you cannot hear a witness or you have any other reason to get the Court's attention during the course of while we are in trial, please raise you hand. I will acknowledge you and you can make a written note or you can give a note or speak to the marshal on a break.

I will take regular breaks with wimess testimony to let everybody have the opportunity to use the restrom and stretch their legs. Again, if you need to get in touch with the Court let the marshal know.

I may take notes during the course of the trias of what the witness's is testimony. Please do not make any inference from that action. I am required to prepare for legal arguments and any objections that may be made by counsel and also to put things in the record that are appropriate to put in the record that might take place outside of the jury's presence.

You, of course, should be prepared to take your own notes. You are not required, but we will provide a notepad and pen for you to do that.

You will not have a transcript at the end of the trial to consult and readbacks are very, very difficult. And if while you are deliberating want to identify a necessary part of the trial be read back you have to be very specific about what that is so the reporter can gather her notes. That is not encouraged, so we are encouraging you to take notes during the course of the trial.

Of course we do not want you to be so busy taking notes of certain testimony that you ruiss subsequent testimony. So you really have to figure out how to balance receiving the information and taking notes that will help remind you at the end of trial.

The rial will proceed in the following manner. The Deputy District Attomey will make an opening statement, which is an outline to help you understand what the State intends to prove. Of course, again, you are reminded that is not in and of itself evidence. That is simply helping you to understand what is coming and what the State will prove.

Next the defendant's attorney may but does not have to make an opening statement. Opening statements serve as intioductions to the evidence to the party making the statements intend to prove.

The State will then present its evidence and
counsel for the defendant may cross-examine the witnesses.

Following the State's case the defendant may present evidence if they chose and the Deputy District Attorney may cross-examine the witnesses. However, as I have said and we talked about repeatedly in this wir dire process, the defendant is not obligated to present any evidence.

Alter all of the evidence has been presented, I will instruct you on the law. After the instructions on the law have been read to you, each side has the opportunity to present oral argument in closing.

What is said in closing just like what is said in opening is not evidence. It is simply designed to summarize and interpret the evidence, remind you what has been provided into evidence and give you suggestions on how to interpret.

Since the State has the burden to prove the defendant guility beyond a reasonable doubt to each of the charges and the elements of each of those charges the State has the right to open and close the argument.

After the arguments have been completed you will retire to deliberate your verdict. Again, let me remind you that until the case is subnitted to you do not talk to each other about it or anyone who has anything to do
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with it until the end of the case when you go to the jury room to decide on your verdict.

Do not talk with anyone else about this case or about anyone who has anything to do with it until the trial has ended and you have been discharged as jurors. Anyone else includes members of your family and friends. You may tell them that you are a juror on a criminal case but do not tell them auything else about it until after you have been discharged by me.

The firther detailed instructions obviously that you will need to have some of these will be repeated and then additional instructions added including, again, the elements of the charges and all of the instructions you need to have will be made available to you when the case closes before closing arguments and you will each get a copy set so that you have that to refer to. And you will also have all the evidence that was presented in the trial at the time you deliberate and you will have the form of verdict for you to complete your duty.

I will check in with counsel at this time to see where we are in the process.

MS. BONAVENTURE: On the last one. We're almost done.

THE COURT: All right. So as soon the counsel will complete their selection process we will announce
who the 14 jury members. If any of you do need a letter from the court for your work, we will be happy to provide one to you, you just have to let the marshall know and my JEA will prepare one for you. And you will get additional instructions from the marshal.

Okay. It looks like we are ready to go.
MS. HOJJAT: Your Honor, may we approach briefly?

\section*{THE COURT: You may}
(Discussion held at the bench.)
THE COURT: I appreciale the opportunity to clear up with counsel a question that they had. We have now done that. The 14 names are now going to be read and let me remind you if you do not hear your name you will remain until the names are all called and then you will be excused.

THE CLERK: Juror No. 1 is Jason Alper; Juror No. 2, Gerald Rivera; Juror No. 3, Brian Lagomarsino; Juror No. 4, Jeffery Swain, Juror No. 5, Jacob Spooner; Juror No. 6, Isaac Vilchez; Juror No. 7, Jason Moore; Juror No. 8, Idalia Rice-Wilson; Juror No. 9, Justin Walker; Juror No. 10, Gilbert Canales; Juror No. 11, Steven Manning; Juror No. 12, James Bakkedahl; Juror No. 13, Bonnie Schultz, and Juror No. 14 is Jocy Hamilton.

THE COURT: All right. If you did not hear your
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name your are excused.
For those of you who are remaining thank you in advance for your time today. We very much appreciate, the counsel and the Court, that you will serve as jurors in this case and fairly and impartially deliberate once you receive the evidence and the law from me.

We are going to start tomorrow at \(1: 00\) with opening statements and we will read the Information and take at least two of the three witnesses who were identified by the State which then should complete our afternoon.

I am still trying to determine the return time on Wednesday. It is possible that it could be as late as 1:00. It will really depend on what the Court's calendar looks like. I will certainly be able to tell you tomorrow whether or not we will return in the morning or in the afternoon. Right now I would say it will most likely be the afternoon on Wednesday as weil. So at least your mornings are free and hopefully will have as little impact on your work and personal life as possible.

But, again, very serious business that we will be doing here in terms of determination of whether the State meets its burden on the charges of Mr. McNeill.

And we do anticipate completing at 5:00 tomorrow. Once we provide the case to you and you begin
your deliberations, how long that takes of course depends on how long you wish to take in those deliberations.

Thank you. I will go ahead and excuse you for today. We will see you back tomorrow at 1:00. Thank you.
(Jurcrs exit the courtroom.)
THE COURT: We do have some things that we need to put on the record. There was a challenge raised and I apologize 1 misunderstood the nature of the challenge. When counsel asked to approach, the challenge that was raised was that the five preemption selections made by the State were all to white males. The same as the defendant. There was some discussion here at the bench with regard to the basis, appropriate basis for a Batson challenge and whether or not that would be an appropriate basis which is why I had indicated that I wanted to have that discussion on the record.

I had made a determination based on the full argument that was made at the bench that the Court would not change the makeup of the panel as selected by counsel, but that I would allow for argument to be made in the record.

One of the things that I did note at the bench was that a large number of the remaining jurors are also white males and that was just noted in terms of the
discussion.
But let me go ahcad and turn it over to counsel for Mr. McNeill to make any further argument or clearer record on this challenge.

MS. HOJAT: Thank you, Your Honor. Yes, we were challenging the fact that all five of the State's preemptory challenges were white males. . I understand the Court's characterization of who is left on this panel, however, the defense would respectfully disagree in terms of Mr. Rivera who is a Hispanic male. I think Mr. Vilchez is a Hispanic male. Ms. Rice-Wilson is an African-American female. So there are people -- we are not just looking at a panel that is all white males.

THE COURT: And Mr. Canales is Hispanic.
MS. HOJAT: Yes. And Mr. Canales is a Hispanic male. All of the challenges to white males, frankly, it shows a pattern of conduct and so we raised a Batson challenge at the bench. The Court did deny that challenge. We did ask the State for race-neutral reason.

THE COURT: The State indicated that we would -let's just be clear, too, of the five preemptions there was not a dispute raised as to Juror No. 1, Darrell Hoss

MS. HOJJAT: That's correct.
THE COURT: -- as we know, and I don't think we

1 necessarily made any record yet of the cause challenges,
2 but Mr . Hoss was the one juror that the State asked to 3 have removed for cause. The Court determined that he did
not reach the level of bias that would be necessary to remove him for cause, that he had indicated ultimately that he would do his analysis, fair and impartial.

He indicated concem and questions about the criminal justice system, primarily it appeared to be a bias of the system as a whole against both sides. In any given criminal case I felt that his responses were sufficient that he had not exhibited a basis for the Court to excuse him for cause, so 1 did encourage that if there was going to be an excusat it would have to be a preemptory challenge which the State exercised as their fifth of their challenges. So that one was not being disputed.

But as to Jury No. 3, Jace Mande; Juror No. 16, Richard Benson; Juror No. 21, Martin Burgess; and Juror No. 24, John Burris. And I ann referencing these jurors by their seat number not the juror number. Just to be clear in our record, Juror No. 055, Jace Mande; Juror 927, Richard Benson; Juror No. 000, Martin Burgess, and Juror No. 006, John Burris, those are the ones that are being challenged.

MS. HOJJAT: That's correct, Your Honor. Those 175
are the challenges we raised at the bench.
THE COURT: And your basis for belicving that Batson would apply to white males is simply that they share the same race identification with the defendant and therefore that's the circumstance --

MS. HOJJAT: Well, Your Honor, in this case they do share the same race identification as the defendant, however, that is not the basis for the challenge. It is our position that Batson stands for the idea that no group should be discriminated against based on their gender that Batson and the follow-up case -- I apologize, I cannot remember the name of the case, but the case dealing with gender essentially that race and gender -

THE COURT: An Alabana case.
MS. HOJJAT: Right. That those cases say race and gender should not be a basis for discrimination and it doesn't matter whether the individual is of a classification that is classified as a minority or classified as a majority. The idea is a person should never be excluded from service based upon their race or ethnicity.

And in this case we have five white males kicked. One of whom we understand the State raised a cause challenge on, but the other four of whom there does not appear to be as far as we can see a race-neutral
reason. We are seeing four white males kicked off of this jury and we would ask the State for a race-neutral reason.

THE COURT: Mr. Cooper, you did indicate that you had race-neutral reasons. I had speculated at the bench that I can detemine race-neutral reasons to at least two of the four that are being challenged by them. I wanted to give you the opportunity -- my basis, just so it's clear in the record, for not allowing the jurors to step out and have this discussion before anyone was excused was I do not believe that Batson would apply in this circumstance; however, to the extent that that Batson does apply in this circunstance we need to have a complete record. And I will ask Mr. Cooper at this time if he has race-neutral reasons.

MR. COOPER: Yes, Your Honor. And I would concur with the Court's assessment, I think Batson does not apply in this type of scenario. I would also note from my calculation, obviously, I did not go into anyone's ethnicity or background. But there were still eight white males that were still on the jury even now. So, obviously, I was not just kicking white males. I mean I had to kick someone. There was a lot of white males on this jury. So by default a lot of white males are going to be kicked.

\section*{But with that said, Your Honor, going through my} race-neutral rcason, I think the juror that was in position 3, Mande, I think that was the first person I kicked. He actually indicated that he had a dispute with police officers back in New York. He seemed to indicate that it was, I guess, a very contentious dispute and police officers were subsequently falsifying issues with him or his business in order for them to drum up business on themselves.

Obviously, this Court is aware, my witnesses in this case are law enforcement and he had prior bad experience with law enforcement and could definitely taint his ability to be fair and impartial when he sees somebody with a badge get up there and says something happened. That was my reason for that juror.

Benson, I think that was the juror in position 16, Richard Benson. He indicated that he was arrested for drug possession and littering. Obviously, the littering is not as concerning as drug possession, but he had a bad interaction with police officers. He also indicated that he had no kids. That was also a concern to the State as well.

THE COURT: Can you be more specific on that concern.

MR. COOPER: Well, Your Honor, no kids was just

1 indicating to me that he had no real responsibilities. I
2 think he also indicated that he was also single. He is single, he has no kids and he gets picked up for drugs and littering and that was not the type of person that I would want on my jury because obviously he has shown that he does not really have that much in responsibility, and in this case that is going to be very important to actually ascertain what the responsibility of the defendant had, whether or not they were reasonable to a certain extent, and whether or not he followed through with those responsibilities. For someone that does not have the responsibilities that a lot of people his age have, I would say I did not want him on my jury. THE COURT: Okay.
MR. COOPER: And the next one was Burgess.
Mr. Burgess, he also indicated that he did not have children as well. He did have a wife, but he didn't have children. Again, a man of that age without children doesn't have the responsibility, not that's he wrong in that, he just doesn't have the responsibility that someone with children have so he might not look as favorably upon the responsibilities that are being put upon this defendant thinking that they are overburdensome, that he shouldn't have to go through with that.

And then also he did indicate that he con abo law that so I think that he might try to interpret the law in his own way and not give full deference to this court that's due. And that's actually the same reason I kicked the last one, Burris, No. 24. He was an attomey. He made a lot of statements that basically he knows what the burden is and that people are -- I think he said people are wrongfully accused or something.

He said a couple things to me that indicated to me that he had somewhat of a bias against the prosecution and actually as he was leaving he looked at the defense attorneys and said, Good luck. So, I mean, it seemed that he did have a bias and that bias was confirmed when he said good luck to them. So I had a reason for him as well.

And that would be the same rcason I had for Mr. Burgess who took a contract law class and there was some contracts that are going to be involved in this case and he might think he knows too much.

THE COURT: Okay. Anything you would like to add?

MS. HOJJAT: Yes, Your Honor. And I jusi want to clarify, the only reason given for Mr . Benson was that he has no kids, right?

MR. COOPER: I did not say that, Your Honor. He was single, had no kids and he also was atrested for drug possession and littering.

MS. HOJJAT: Your Honor, 1 do have some responses to that.

THE COURT: Okay.
MS. HOJJAT: The third prong of Batson is the defense has the opportunity to present the race-neutral reason are pretextual. At this point we would submit to the Courl that the Slate has now made a reference that two individuals were stricken, at least partially because they had no kids. Mr. Lagomarsino also indicated that he has no kids. Mr. Vilchez also indicated that he has no kids.

In terms of that being the reason for Mr. Benson and Mr. Burgess to be kicked -- in terms of Mr. Benson being kicked because he had some sort of criminal arrest, Mr. Morales pretty much confessed to first degree kidnapping chering voir dire today and he was not kicked off of the jury. He is not a white male. So, I mean, if we are talking about people who conmitted crimes and had contact with law enforcement, he was arrested for some really serious charges; kidnapping and assault with a deadly weapon. He was not kicked off. He is not a white male. We have Mr. Lagomarsino, we've got Mr. Vilchez who 181
has no children. So we would submit to the court that these are protextual race-nctitral reasons to kick these people off the jury.

In fact, there were quite a few people who talked about having had contact with law enforcement who haven't had artests who were not kicked by the State.

MR. COOPER: And, Your Honor, I can't kick everyone. That's not as simple as it goes. I have to base it on their answers so that's why I kicked them. It had nothing to do with their race. I can't kick everyone. I don't know what I'm supposed to do.

MS. HOJJAT: And, Your Honor, if I can just finish the record. I apologize.

THE COURT: No, go ahead.
MS. HOJJAT: As to Mr. Burris, I mean, he indicated that he would follow the burden and follow the presumption of innocence. He certainly didn't say anything about knowing better than anybody what the burden is or understanding, you know, he's going to follow his own law, he's not going to follow the Court's instruction. I heard him say, Good luck as he walked out of here. He kind of looked at both tables and said, Good luck to everybody and walked out. We certainly didn't interpret him as saying good luck to us. It seemed like he was talking to all counsel in general who were going
to be in trial.
So we would submit that these are pretextual reasons that these four individuals were kicked because they were white males.

THE COURT: Well, again, the Court indicated it does not feel that Batson would apply in these circumstances to the extent that that would apply in these circumstances the Court would find that there is race-neutral basis that has been articulated.

I understand you're arguing it's pretextuak because there may be others that on balance maybe that one should have been struck before this one was stuck, but as coumsel pointed out there are only a certain number of challenges.

Just a couple things that I woutd add for the record for what they're worth. There are 8 white males by my count that remain on the panel out of 12 that will deliberate. There are 9 total out of the 14 iucluding the one alternate. If Mr. Burris had not been selected he would have been the alternate instead of Mr. Hamilton, so we remain with a white male in the second atternate position, just not Mr. Burris.

And, again, by my count there are 8 white males of the 12 that will ultimately be detiberating unless we lose a juror for whatever reason and have 10 go to an
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alternate, at which point we have a white female and a
white male in the altemate position. So that's just
information to conclude the record.
    But the Court did make the determination that
the panel would remain as is and I trust we will have
fair and impartiai jurors that will help us receive the
evidence aud weigh it and reach a verdict. So I will go
ahead and conclude today and see you all at \(!: 00\)
tomorrow.

I do need to know that at some point tomorrow I will get jury insinuctions?

MR. COOPER: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Because I can't reccive them on Wednesday morning and still have the opportulity to settle them and get them ready to go. If I can get them at least - well, it depends. As long as I have them by the time we leave court or sometime in the evening, just not too late, it gives me an opportunity to work on them.

MR. COOPER: Yes, Your Hoaor.
(Proceedings were adjourned.)
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THE COURT: Is there anything we need to address before we bring in the jury?

MS. HOJJAT: Yes, Your Honor. We did have a couple of preliminary matters outside the presence.

First, before we start with the legal preliminary matters, when we were coming up one of the jurors scurried in the elevator and got in behind us and got in the elevator with us and we just ignored him, but if we could just ask the Court to remind them that we are not ignoring them, it's just --

THE COUR'T: I did read that in the instructions when you were doing your selection yesterday.

MS. HOJJAT: Right. He tried to say hi and we just ignored him.

THE COURT: I told them that we were not to even acknowledge them, but I will remind them of that.

MS. HOJAT: Thank you very much, Your Honor.
As to the legal matters --
MR. COOPER: Your Honor, I'm sorry. Can we also
just when the juror comes in maybe at the next break we
can just put on the record what juror that was.
4

MS. BONAVENTURE: It's the one that sits in the far comer over there.

MS. HOJJAT: Yeah, Vilchez I think. I believe it's Juror No. 9, the young Hispanic male, Vilchez.

THE COUR'T: All right. We'll verify that with him and we will remind them in the record.

MS. HOJJAT: Okay. He did not say anything and we didn't say anything. I don't see any problems with it. I just do not want the jurors to think we are ignoring them or anything.

THE COURT: I covered it yesterday but I will remind them of this now that they are in fact on the panel.

MS. HOJJAT: Thank you very much, Your Honor.
As to the legal matters, we did put it on the record yesterday that we had received the State's proposed redactions from the Division of Parole and Probation that we were working on with the State to agree upon the redactions. We have agreed upon most of the redactions. There are two matters that we wanted to bring to the Court's attention that we disagreed on.

THE COURT: All right.
MS. HOJJAT: If I could approach with the relevant reports.

THE COURT: Sure.

MS. HOJATT: Thank you. The reports from March 29, 2013 and April 15, 2013, the areas with the red tabs the DA has agreed to redact. What we are worried about is for the March report, the DA has agreed to redact reference to the knife on page 2 of the March report; however, there is also reference to unemployment and food stamps that we would ask to be redacted.

We believe there is no probative value to the fact that he is receiving unemployment benefits or food stamp benefits. We are not disputing he was transient, the DA will be able to present that to the jury that he was transient. But we believe that unemployment and food stamps are prejudicial.

A lot of people feel very, very strongly about government entitlement, about individuals receiving entitlement. A lot of people have a lot of prejudices towards people who receive entitlement.

We did not voir dire the jury on this issue. It is not probative to any fact in this case. It is not probative to a single alleged violation. It's not probative to the fact that he's a sex offender. There is just no probative value to the fact that he's on food stamps and unemployment.

There's probative value to the fact that he was transient and living on a street corner, and those aren't
facts that we are trying to get redacted. But the fact that he is on food stamps and unemployment we would ask to be redacted.

THE COURT: What is your other issue and then we'll hear from Mr. Cooper.

MS. HOIJAT: The second page of the August report, we received these reports last week, Your Honor.
To put this in context, all of these Division of Parole and Probation monthly reports we received this last week. There is some notes jotted at the bottom.

There is one in particular that talks about no one time weekly $O V$. We did not know what that was. We were just being informed today and the Parole and Probation officer did say that she tried to put him on once weekly office visits. There was no testimony on this at the preliminary hearing. This was not included in any reports, police report, Parole and Probation reports that we originally received.

None of the discovery that we had up until last week mentioned that. And then once we received that we didn't know what "OV" was. It is only today that we are learning what that is, so we would ask that that be redacted as well given that the defense has had no notice of this.

And, frankly, it's a new theory of the case that
we are learning about mid-trial. And the not registering
every 30 days that's also something that was never
brought up at the preliminary hearing, never brought up in any of the reports.

Failure to have his address approved and failure to change his address after he moved were allegations but not registering every 30 days has never been an allegation in this case. And it has not been contained in any of the reports.

THE COURT: Just looking back and then looking obviously at the prior Amended Information but not the one that we are going to read to the jurors --

MS. HOJJAT: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: -- but I have as the basis for the violation: Failure to submit a UA, failing to report, failing to have residence approved, failing to cooperate with supervising officer, failure to maintain and abide by curfew and being terminated from counseling.

MS. HOJJAT: Right. And we are not opposing the first two bullet points. We are only asking that the last two bullet points be redacted. And when we are talking about failing to report in the information, the testimony at preliminary hearing and what was contained in the police report and the original Parole and Probation reports that we received was after August of
2013. That has always been the theory of the case that we were given. That's always been the theory of the violation that we were given was between August of 2013 and March of 2014. This now talking about refusing to report once a week.

THE COURT: Well, one of my points of confusion, and I apologize, you had referenced that you had reports from March 29th of 2013, and April 15th, 2013, but you actually handed me a report from August 15 th.

MS. HOJJAT: I'm sorry. I meant August not April.

THE COURT: So this is within the time frame.
MS. HOJJAT: Yes, Your Honor. It's just the idea of him having to report once a week and it has never been brought up before.

THE COURT: Okay. Anything further before I hear from Mr. Cooper?

MS. HOJJAT: There was one other matter.
THE COURT: Okay. My clerk just informed me that there may be some dispute as to how the Second Amended Information was going to be handled. But we'll deal with that later.

All right. Mr. Cooper, on these two concerns with regard to the Parole and Probation monthly reports.

MR. COOPER: Yes, Your Honor. Your Honor, the 8 9
first issue, I guess, I don't see what the prejudicial effect is for knowing that he is on food stamps or unemployment.

THE COURT: Well, I think more importantly they are arguing relevancy.

MR. COOPER: It is relevant because obviously this officer is going to have to be able to attest how he was being able to live. He is a homeless individual, so she is not going to get into he was panhandling or breaking the law or anything like that.

I mean, he had a governmental entitlement there's prejudicial effect. But she needs to be able to say that he wasn't living at a homeless shelter, which she actually tried to get him into and he said no. And one of the reasons for that is because he already had food stamps, so he didn't really have to go to a homeless shelter. He was actually getting unemployment benefits which actually goes directly to why he was not employed.

So there is no prejudicial effect whatsoever and I think it is probative.

THE COURT: I am not sure I am tracking to the probative value. I apologize. Bear with me. I did eat lunch so I should be more in tune, but why does your officers need to go into the details by what means he was living. The whole point is, is it not, where he
identified his address to be and she went there and he wasn't there for her search. Or what is the probative value of the use of government entitlement, if you want to call them that. I agree that there are people who differ on these type of things. I don't know that this is substantially prejudicial, but I also don't know that it's relevant.

If there is relevance then we have to determine that it's substantially prejudicial and would be excluded, but I am not seeing the relevancy.

MR. COOPER: Your Honor, my position is I think it is relevant in order to be able to ascertain how he was able to live. This officer --

THE COURT: For what purpose to prove your case?
MR. COOPER: Your Honor, because this officer was trying to get him into some type of homeless shelter. He didn't go to that homeless shelter. Obviously, if he would have went to that homeless shelter, because he didn't have money or something of that nature, he would have actually had a bed, had an actual place she could have went to see him at this Catholic charity.

Because he decided not to do that because he was getting food stamps, that's why he was sitting on the street or laying behind the church or wherever he was laying at.
But it all goes back to I tried to get him into a Catholic charity, he didn't want to go because he already had money.
MS. HOJJAT: Your Honor, if I could just
respond?
THE COURT: Yes.
MS. HOJJAT: The State is almost trying to turn it into a bad act. That plays directly into the
stereotypes and the prejudice.
THE COURT: Well, what is your theory about why he wasn't living somewhere where she could go and find him, because he had to live on the street, right? I mean, isn't that your theory? I mean, I am not trying to put words in your mouth. I don't know what you are going to present to the jury; I haven't heard it yet.
But your defense, or at least your counter to -I mean, the bottom line is he has requirements as a convicted sex offender to comply with lifetime supervision agreement requirements.

## MS. HOJJAT: Right.

THE COUR: He didn't do that. One of your arguments, I'm assuming, is he couldn't do that or some reason why he didn't do that. Or, maybe your argument just is that he was there and she just didn't find him. I don't know.

But I mean to the extent that you are going to
for me why you were trying to make the argument that this is why he was where he was ot doing what he was doing. So if you are not in that realm, I hear you, but something you said made me think otherwise. MS. HOJJAT: No, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Anything further on that? MS. HOJJAT: On that matter --
MR, COOPER: Your Honor, obviously, I am not
going to sit here and say that the probative value is so
outlandish. It is slight probative value, but the
prejudicial effect has to substantially outweigh the
probative value. I mean, all they are doing is just
speculating that maybe one juror might not like people
that get food stamps or might not like somebody that has a government entitlement. It is just complete speculation.

Obviously, I understand that having a knife in his pocket or something like that is not necessarily a bad act, that is prejudicial. I understand that. I have agreed to redact that part already. The food stamps, I don't understand why they are so mad about it.

THE COURT: The pat from "had knife on him" all the way down is redacted. I do not find the relevancy of any of those entries.

MS. HOJJAT: Thank you, Your Honor.
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THE COURT: As to the other matters you were
arguing, Mr. Cooper, with regard to the August 15, 2013
monthly report which has references to no UA and no curfew.

MR, COOPER: Yes, Your Honor. Basically, those are notes that actually were written by the defendant's 7 supervising officer during the actual interview. I guess I understand that no questions were asked of the officer at the preliminary hearing whether or not he tried to put him on a one time a week check-in, but that doesn't mean that this information doesn't come.

Obviously, it is directly probative as to whether or not he was complying with his supervising officer's recommendations, which is one of the theories that he wasn't complying with supervision.

Basically, what happened is the officer says, I am going to put you on a one time a week check-in. He said, No, I'm not going to do that. That's all I am going to get into. Just because somebody did not ask the question at prelim doesn't mean it's not probative, it doesn't mean that it's not relevant.

And I am actually checking my e-mail right now. It might have been as late as two weeks ago because I know we did a file review and I didn't have these items.
25 But the file review was done before the calendar call.

And I would say I am 99 percent sure that I sent all of these items before calendar call, which would have been last Monday.

Again, I have to check my e-mail to verify the date but I am very sure I would have sent them before the calendar call date. If I didn't, at the very latest they would have received them on Monday or Tuesday of last week.

They had an ample opportunity to talk to the officer. They have the officer's information. They know where she works at. They could have easily called her and could have easily have asked her these questions. I mean, just because they didn't do their own research to determine what OV meant, it's not the State's fault. And I should be able to get into it because it goes directly to one of the elements of ny charges.

MS. HOJJAT: Your Honor, it is a brand new theory of the case that the State has never before asserted. It is a theory of the case that wasn't consumed in the preliminary hearing transcript. It wasn't contained in a police report that was filed. It wasn't contained in the original Parole and Probation report that was filed.

Maybe it was handed over last Friday rather than last Monday. We are talking about the difference of a
week then, but the point is they lad 60 days to turn this over from lower level and we were in justice court before that. This is not something that we've had time to know about or look through. And this wasn't two pages that was handed over to us. This was a big chunk of discovery that was handed over to us last week. We are talking about, 1 would guesstimate in the realm of over 50 pages of discovery that was handed over to us that we're going through.

Today we show up and we hear, Oh, OV means office visit. By the way, we told him he had to report once a week and he didn't report once a week. This is the first time we are hearing that.

The not register every 30 days, again, this is not something that was talked about at prelim. This isn't something that was in the police report. This isn't something in a $P$ and $P$ report. And when they handed over a big chunk of discovery like that last minute we are trying to do the best we can to go through everything. We didn't request a continuance. We didn't know about this until this morning.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. COOPER: Your Honor, it is kind of misleading that I handed over 50 pages of discovery. I mean, they were all 50 pages like this (indicating).

Each page maybe has 20 pages on it. It's not like she had to sit there line by line and go through every single little item.

THE COURT: I am not as persuaded by the timing
of it as I am what is contained here and whether it is in
fact a new theory. I don't perceive it to be a new
theory of the case. The hearing department failed to cooperate and there are any number of them that seem to fall within. I am not going to have a false impression of who the defendant is and what the defendant did.

Ultimately, at the end of day, this officer is going to testify to what occurred in terms of supervision and you are going to be able to cross-examine. But I will not require redaction of the August 15th, 2013 report. It falls within the time frame that has been argued. It falls within the theory of the case and it is in fact who he is and what he was doing.

The time frame of the disclosure is not persuasive for any basis to exclude it. I find it relevant. I find it not overly prejudicial because or required to be excluded because of the timing.

So the August 15 th report, no redactions required. And the March 9th report, the required redactions that are outlined.

MS. HOPPER: Thank you, Your Honor.

## approach?

 admonishment to your witness as you are questioning. Sometimes it is not clear when they are testifying if it is something that they have direct knowledge of or if it's know from somebody else. And so I do need them tobe admonished that if he is testifying that the presumption is going to be that it's from his own direct knowledge.

If he gets into obviously something that was hearsay and there isn't some exception that would allow it, if defense objects to it, obviously, we'll deal with it. But it would be helpful to not have that if we can avoid it.

MR. COOPER: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Did you have something?
MS. HOJJAT: That was it, Your Honor.
MR. COOPER: Your Honor, $I$ do have a few issues to address with the Court as well. The first is just a scheduling matter. I know we talked about 1:00 tomortow, but the issue is when I spoke to my witness last night she initially thought she was going to be testifying Wednesday morning because I thought the Court was going to be dark today, and then I told her we might be starting at 1:00. She indicated that she had cleared her schedule for the morning --

THE COURT: How early in the morning, because I have a calendar.

MR. COOPER: Yes, Your Honor, I am actually doing that calendar, so hopefully it won't be too long. When I talked to her 11:00 a.m. would actually
work for her. If we push it to 11:30 or something I am sure I can get the word to her.

THE COURT: Let's just start at 11:00. We'll make sure we're ready to start. We'll take a lunch break somewhere in there and maybe after that testimony, depending on where we are, I still need time to settle insiructions.

MR. COOPER: Yes, Your Honor. And that was my last witness, so I don't know if you want to just settle insiructions. We can send the jury to lunch, settle instructions.

THE COURT: Take a little bit longer time to settle them. Like I said, I believe I was going to be getting them today --

MR. COOPER: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: One of the things I need, you are going to have your stock but you are going to have some that are going to be directly in opposition to the ones they are proposing or newly proposed and I need to be able to -- I cannot just get two chunks -I I mean, I can do that, but it is going to take me a hell of a lot longer to get through everything and figure out what matches up. Give me a break. Give your stock and give me your specials, if you want to call them that, if you have specific ones where you know, and you tell me which 22

## of theirs is in dispute.

And this can all be done by e-mail. Say, here's our proposed and we think these match up with those and this is basically what we're ditching out for these topics, and here's the extra ones that we're proposing, if you can. I mean, give me a little bit of where your thought process is at so that we can expedite the settling of them the following day at lunchtime.

MR. COOPER: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: If there's not that many that are being disagreed upon, that's fine. I don't usually take that long to settle them. But I want to get everything as prepared as possible because I am not going to have a lot of time once we settle them to actually puill the final set together. And I do that myself. I don't delegate it to you all because then it has to go back to staff and then it takes forever. And I don't delegate it to my staff because they are not in here and they don't know what we discussed. So I just need some time to do that and the more information you can give me the better.

MR. COOPER: Yes, Your Honor.
MS. HOJJAT: Yes, Your Honor. Would Your Honor like us to send you a copy with cites and without cites?

THE COURT: You can just send them with cites. But I need you to e-mail them to me before we wrap for
the day otherwise I will give you another e-mail address to send it to.

MR. COOPER: And, Your Honor, just so we're clear, we send them to both sides?

THE COURT: Absolutely.
MS. HOJJAT: And I can tell the Court we are not going to be able send ours before we wrap up today.

THE COURT: I will give you a special e-mail to send them to because I don't once I'm home I don't have access to my e-mail here. But I do need them within some reasonable time this evening.

MS. HOJJAT: We will have them to you.
MR. COOPER: And, Your Honor, the only other issue, I know that the defendant is already stipulating to the fact that he is a sex offender and that be is on lifetime supervision, but my understanding is that stipulation needs to be made in front of the jury because obviously me just asking a witness --

THE COURT: We had this discussion yesterday, Mr. Cooper, why are we revisiting this now?

MR. COOPER: Your Honor, only because it's a procedural matter of the actual stipulation because my understanding is that they were talking about me just asking a witness, Is he a sex offender. That's not a stipulation.

## A stipulation is them actually agreeing to the

 fact in front of the jury. And I just want to make sure we're clear on that because if that's not what they are doing, then that's noi a stipulation and obviously we are right back at square one.I can ask my witness if he is a sex offender no matter what; I don't need their permission to do that.

THE COURT: Well, I thought we had addressed this more than just it would come up with this witness. We addressed this first of all that we had the stipulation in the record, which was going to lead to the Second Amended Information, which I still don't have.

MR. COOPER: I have it right here, Your Honor.
THE COURT: And that right there was going to have the reference to the date in which we find the agreement to be under lifetime supervision and it was going to have the reference to the prior sex offense, that it was able to be referenced that he had these chief characteristics. The whole point was just to have that in place in advance with counsel so that it removed the references and we had the redaction so that the actual prior charge was out.

Then it opened the door to be able to obviously ask the witness to deal with that. I talked about and yesterday we went back and forth and I was convinced at
that time that we did not need to have a particular
stipulation stated to the jury and I talked about if we
were going to do that how we were going to do that and
that my preference would be something along the lines of
when we are reading the information that we would
indicate the parties have stipulated to this situation
and that there's the information. And we talked about
that and I don't know that that was rejected but we had
some discussion. But we are not going to have them stand
up in front the jury and say this is what we agreed to.
MR. COOPER: Yes, Your Honor. I understand.
I'm sorry. I must have missed the part when we talked about actually reading the information. That is completely fine with me, Your Honor. I just needed the jury to know that we stipulated to these facts. I don't care who says it, just the jury needs to know, because the jury obviously doesn't know what's going on in here right now, so when I get up there and start asking all these questions and doing all this other stuff they will have no idea that it is a stipulated fact that he is a sex offender.

THE COURT: Well, like I said, we had that discussion yesterday about how we needed to do it and I thought we settled on that it would be inquired of and come out at some point in the trial that these facts had
been agreed to. But if there is going to be a dispute or some confusion on that point, I will make the statement to the jury to clear it up in conjunction with the information is the way I intended to handle it yesterday when we were first discussing.

But let me hear from counsel what your concerns
are.
MS. HOJJAT: Your Honor, I would submit to the Court, I think the way we worked it out yesterday was I stood up in voir dire and said, He's a sex offender; we're not arguing he's not a sex offender.

THE COURT: So what's the problem with me saying it as a stipulated fact in conjunction with the information?

MS. HOJJAT: That's fine.
MR. COOPER: That is fine with the State as well, Your Honor. I apologize. I must have misunderstood what we talked about yesterday. I thought they had only agreed to allow me to ask a witness if he was a sex offender and that would not be a stipulation.

Obviously, if the Court tells the jury it's stipulated that he's a sex offender and stipulated that he is on lifetime supervision, I am fine with that: That is not a problem with the State.

The only other issue would just be that pursuant
to statute and my JOC I would also be giving out the year he was convicted as well as the county he was convicted in. And the county is important because pursuant to the statute I can only prosecute someone in the county in which they were subsequently put on lifetime supervision or something like that. It does not necessarily matter where the violations happened. It matters were they were convicted at.

So as long as the stipulation just says he was convicted in Clark County in 2004, he's a sex offender and he's on lifetime supervision, the State has no problem with that stipulation.

THE COURT: Well, we discussed the stipulation of he's a convicted sex offender and that he is on lifetime supervision and that was what I would say.

You would then elicit the remainder, if necessary, testinony from your witness. I don't know that the stipulation was ever agreed to in specific detail, although in the Amended Information it does specify when he went on the lifetime supervision and that he had a prior sex offense on a certain date in Clark County.

MR. COOPER: I would not be able to get into my JOC. And my officer, she would get objected to for hearsay if she said that he was convicted in 2004 in

So that was all just information we put it in. It is not changing any theory of the case. It is not adding any additional -- it's not taking away from any defenses or anything like that. They have already agreed he is on lifetime supervision. They have already agreed that he's a sex offender. I think it clears up the language and I don't think that there is any substantive issues to his rights.

The statute says that the court may permit the information to be admitted at the time for verdict if no different or additional charges are added, which is not the case in this situation, and the substantial rights of the defendant are not prejudiced. And I don't know in any way why his rights would be prejudiced just by taking out information.

MS. HOJJAT: I'm sorry. I just want to clarify. Is all of this argument over the fact that he took out the fact that the Lifetime Supervision Agreement was signed --

THE COURT: Sounds like it.
MS. HOJJAT: We are not objecting to that.
MR. COOPER. Okay.
MS. HOJJAT: We do have one objection to the Second Amended Information, though. Is says on line, I think it's between 4 and 5, they have him in 2004 being

Clark County because she has no personal knowledge. She was not even working with $P$ and $P$ in 2004 in Clark County.

MS. HOJJAT: Your Honor, we'll waive the objection.

THE COURT: You will waive the objection. Okay. We're fine. I will say the stipulation. You will get to the information.

MR. COOPER: Yes, Your Honor. I do have the
Second Amended, and I am sure there will be some objections to it, so I have not filed it yet, and I will show a copy to the defense.

But basically, Your Honor, as this court is fully awate, the State has the ability to amend the Information up until before a verdict and that is pursuant to NRS 173.095. The State would actually be admitting their information because the initial Amended Information gave a lot more information that is actually isn't required by the statute.

I do have the statute right here and the statute specifically says that an individual that is on lifetime 22 supervision that violates lifetime supervision is guilty.
23 There is no mention of the date in which they signed an
24 agreement. There is no mention of anything of that nature.
wink, we all know it's something really bad. It has a
certain connotation.
MR. COOPER: Your Honor, that is not the
connotation I meant.
THE COURT: So it's something you might object to but you don't have the means to correct it and reprint it?

MR. COOPER: I thought they might object to the actual language, the actual part that they didn't object to. That's what I thought they were going to object to.

THE COURT: If you needed to make a change, how were you going to do it?

MR. COOPER: It's from the --
THE COURT: If I want to change something in here, how are we going to do it?

MR. COOPER: I have multiple different copies with me right now, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Hard copies?
MR, COOPER: Yes.
THE COURT: I need an electronic version. Where is your electronic version?

MR. COOPER: It's on my work computer, Your Honor. But I have a hard copy that fixes the problem. THE COURT: I like the language "convicted of a sex offense requiring lifetime supervision." Do you have 32

MR. COOPER: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Can we do that?
MR. COOPER: And, Your Honor, just so I am clear, what is the exact language you want?

THE COURT: At line 4, "having in 2004 been convicted of a sex offense requiring lifetime
supervision." So that removes any of the questions or concerns. It addresses your concern, I believe, and still has a correct statement so that we're not just saying sex offense that may not require it despite that it's clear.

My clerk has worked out a way to read the Information without having to have the Second Amended electronic version right now. So we are going to do that somewhere later today, tonight, figure that out. But my clerk has basically taken the version you handwritten and handed us so she can read it to the jury. So we have the Second Amended Information that we will read from and be good there.

What is the ongoing concern of redactions?
MS. HOJJAT: We just received a new copy. I understand the State's position is that they sent us a copy. There is a different date. There is a new Lifetime Supervision Agreement that we just received today. If I can approach with a copy to show the Court.

THE COURT: You may.
MR. COOPER: Your Honor, I sent that all at the same time. All I did was take the whole stack I have and sent it all over. I don't know why they don't have it but I sent it, And I can look in my e-mail and --

THE COURT: Mr. Cooper, I will look at it and maybe my tuling is going to be to stay the way that it is and we won't have a problem.

MS. HOJJAT: And if the Court can see, they are both dated 2004.

THE COURT: I'm not concemed about the timing of when they were produced. I'm just trying to get this nailed down what evidence we are going to put in front of this jury.

I'm sorry, what is it you wanted to say?
MS. HOJJAT: As the Court can see, they are both dated in 2007. We were under the impression we had the Lifetime Supervision Agreement from 2007. The new one says "under duress" next to his signature. We did not have that in the copy we have.

THE COURT: Well, these are two different documents entirely.

MS. HOJJAT: They are two different documents. We had the one that has multiple pages.

MR. COOPER: Your Honor, I went through all my

1 e-mails to make sure I sent it to them. I know I did so
all I did was take the whole stack and sent it directly
over. There is no reason for me not to send one Lifetime
Supervision Agreement.
MS. HOJJAT: And the Court is literally holding everything that we received in terms of Lifetime Supervision Agreements. And our objection is to the words "under duress."

MR. COOPER: Your Honor, I just found it. I did send it. I have an actual e-mail that I sent directly to them under the attachment and it says right here the e-mail name was "Discovery for McNeill." I don't have the page number for some reason. But it says Steve McNeill under duress. It's that document. I don't know why they don't have it. I sent it. I can show my e-mail to the Court.

THE COURT: Any idea why there would be two full Lifetime Supervision Agreements?

MR. COOPER: Yes, Your Honor. I can actually explain that to the Court. Basically, what happened is that when he was in prison they make them sign a Lifetime
Supervision Agreement in front of his caseworker or someone like that. And then as soon as he gets out and goes directly to the Department of Parole and Probation they make them sign another one. I don't know why but 36
they do. And then after that when the actual terms of
his probation period are actually completely articulated they make them sign a third one that encompasses everything. So there is a total of three different documents.

THE COURT: Do we have all three?
MR. COOPER: Yes. All three have been provided.
THE COURT: And they are all redacted?
MR. COOPER: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Counsel, come get your copies.
These are obviously all the agreements. You can explain the under the duress. This is not a point -- it sounds like it has been provided. It sounds like it is part and parcel of this documentation and we will just address it.

We know that the defendant has agreed to certain things and not agreed to certain things and we need to get the testimony in before the jury so they can weigh it.

Any other matters to discuss before we bring the jury in?

MS. HOJJAT: No, Your Honor,
MR. COOPER: No, Your Honor. I just want to give your clerk my exhibits and we do have to make some redactions. And I know that is going to take some time because the redactions just got changed on this

March 2013 document. I have White-out night now. I can make the reactions really quick and then run back and make the copies.

THE COURT: All right. Let's take a couple minutes to do that. We'll plan to start in ten minutes.
(Whereupon, a recess was taken.)
THE COURT: Are we ready?
MR. COOPER: Yes, Your Honor. All my exhibits have been sent over and I did show all of my redactions before I made them.

THE COURT: Okay. Great. Like I said, we'll deal with the Second Amended Information later.

MR, COOPER: Your Honor, my intern was gracious enough to go upstairs and my secretary is doing it now, but I believe we can start without it.

THE COURT: All right. We will start without it. Let's bring in the jurors.
(Jury enters the courtroom.)
THE COURT: As soon as you reach your seats please remain standing and my clerk will swear you in.

THE CLERK: Please raise your right hand. You and each of you do solemnly swear that you will well and truly try the case at issue and a true verdict rendered according to the evidence so help you God.
(Jury answers in the affirmative.)
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THE COURT: Thank you everybody. Please take your seats. We appreciate you patience very much while we addressed some housekeeping matters to make sure that we would have everything ready so we can proceed uninterrupted once we get started today.

Before we get started, though, there is one preliminary matter. We just want to be sure that the folks are reminded of at least one instruction that I went over yesterday and that is it is very important that you understand that none of the participants in the case, the counsel, parties, staff cannot acknowledge you or : talk to you in any way, although the Court can acknowledge you, or respond to you or talk to you in any way whatsoever. So if you just happen to come across us we must ignore you. It is our ethical obligation.

Please don't read anything into it or think that we are being rude or antisocial. It's just our ethical obligation. And it would really help us if you did not acknowledge us or interact with us in any way so then we do not have to feel so bad when we have to ignore you.

So, again, that is just the nature of the beast and it doesn't happen very often, so I just wanted to remind everybody of that because over the course of today and tomorrow that may very well occur.

As I indicated, yesterday, we would begin the

## 3

4

1 trial today with the reading of the charging document in
this case so you understand what the charges specifically
enforcement agency before threc business days passed and since he changed his address from his last registered address at Main and Wyoming, Las Vegas, Clark County,

The defendant has pleaded not guilty to the charges, and therefore, the State has the burden of proving each of the elements of the charge beyond a reasonable doubt.

At this time I will ask my clerk to please read the charging document.

THE CLERK: District Court, Clark County, Nevada, State of Nevada, Plaintiff, versus Steve Dell McNeill, Defendant, Case No. C-14-297725-1, Department No. 25. Second Amended Information.

The State of Nevada, County of Clark, Stephen B. Wolfson, District Attomey, within and for the County of Clark, State of Nevada, in the name and by the authority of the State of Nevada informs the court that Steve Dell McNeill, the defendant above named having committed the crimes of violation of lifetime supervision by a convicted sex offender, category B felony, NRS 213.1243-53481 and the prohibited act by a sex offender, category D felony, NRS 179D.441, 179D.441, 179D.447, 40

## 179D.550-52950.

On or between December 14, 2012 and March 10, 2014, within the County of Clark, State of Nevada, contrary to the form, force and effect of statute in such cases made and provided and against the peace and dignity against the State of Nevada.

Count I-violation of lifetime supervision by a convicted sex offender.

Did then and there willfully, unlawfully, knowingly and feloniously violate the conditions of lifetime supervision imposed on said Steve Dell McNeill pursuant to having in 2004 been convicted of a sex offense that requires lifetime supervision in the Eighth Judicial District Court, Clark County, Nevada, to-wit: By refusing to submit to a urinalysis, failing to report, failing to have his residence approved, failing to cooperate with his supervising officer, failing to maintain fall-time employment, failing to abide by a curfew and/or was terminated from his sex offender counseling.

Count 2 - Prohibited act by a sex offender.
Did willfully, unlawfully and feloniously pursuant to his conviction in 2004 of a sex offense in the Eighth Judicial District Court, Clark County, Nevada, did fail to appear in person at the appropriate law

Nevada to his current unknown address.

Steven B. Wolfson, Clark County District Attorney, signed by Jonathan Cooper, Deputy District Attorney to which the defendant has entered a plea of not guilty.

THE COURT: Thank you. At this time I would invite the State to make opening remarks.

MR. COOPER: Thank you, Your Honor.
Ladies and gentlemen, the defendant, Steve McNeill was convicted of a sex offense in 2004. As part of his sentence he was required to register and also to be sentenced to a term of lifetime supervision pursuant to Nevada law.

Lifetime supervision is a program ran by the Nevada Department of Public Safety through their Division of Probation and Parole. And essentially the offender he is given a probation officer. They are required to check in on a regular basis and there is also conditions on that as well. They have to let their probation officer know where they are living, who they are living with.

MS. HOJJAT: Judge, I am going to object. If we can approach?

## THE COUR'T: Of course.

(Discussion held at the bench.)
THE COURT: I appreciate the opportunity to clarify.

Youmay proceed, Mr. Cooper.
MR. COOPER: 'Thank you, Your Honor.
As I was saying, the defendant had conditions to abide by while on lifetime supervision. He had to let his probation officer know where he is living. He had to report, things of that nature.

And the probation officer also would assign tasks to the offender as well. For example, a probation officer could assign a task to complete counseling or something like that.

Now, for the most part the defendant did his requirements until about December of 2012 when he finally just had enough and was fed up with everything. He didn't want to do it anymore. The evidence will show that in December of 2012 he stopped following his Lifetime Supervision Agreement.

You will hear from Marcia Lee, who is a licensed therapist and she was also the counselor for the defendant during his sex offender treatment, she will talk to you about how he began to get aggressive. How he was distuptive in group and how he was showing little or
no progress in his treatment.
MS. HOJJAT: Objection. May we approach?
THE COURT: Please approach.
(Discussion held at the bench.)
THE COURT: The objection is overruled.
You may proceed, Mr. Cooper.
MR. COOPER: Thank you, Your Honor.
Marcia Lce will tell you that she gave him several opportunities to fix his behaviors but he didn't. He told her, I don't want to be here. So he was terminated from counseling.

You will also hear from Officer Ashley Mangan, and she works with the Department of Parole and Probation as a parole officer, and she was the defendant's supervising parole officer starting in March of 2013.

Now the defendant was on lifetime supervision well before March of 2013. But like in a lot of offices, people in Probation and Parole they get promoted, they switch positions, so the offender doesn't always have the same probation officer.

And Officer Mangan will tell you that as his probation officer his behavior got worse. It did not get
better when she started supervising him. He was refusing to do drug tests. He was refusing to be put on a curfew. He didn't live where he said he was living. He even told 44

Probation and Parole that he was doing them a favor for showing up.

Then in August of 2013, the defendant sent Parole and Probation a letter. And basically the letter said he was not going to comply anymore. He was done. And he did just that. He didn't show up to Parole and Probation. He did not call his officer. His officer tried to locate him, she couldn't find him. And this Went on for nine months until March of 2014. The defendant was in the wind.

The evidence will show that on several different occasions the defendant violated the terms of his lifetime supervision and he also committed an act that is prohibited by sex offenders.

And at the close of the evidence [ will ask you to return a verdict of guilty on both counts. Thank you. THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Cooper. Ms. Hojjat.
MS. HOJJAT: Thank you, Your Honor.
Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. The State just started talking to you about 2012, 2013. Officer Mangan. They want you to focus in. They want this case to be about very little. And that's why you just heard very little from the State.

To understand what is going on in this case, you
need to take a step back and look at the bigger picture.
This case starts in 2007 not 2005. 2007 is the year that
Steve McNeill was placed on lifetime supervision. He is a sex offender. I told you that in voir dire. No one is trying to hide the ball. Steve is a sex offender and he is on lifetime supervision but he got placed on lifetime supervision in 2010.

To be clear, you are going to hear lifetime supervision is not probation, it's not parole. The State talked about it as part of his sentence.

Lifetime supervision, what you are going to hear is what sex offenders are required to do after their sentence is done, after they paid their debt to society.

MR. COOPER: Your Honor, can we approach?
THE COURT: Sure.
(Discussion held at the bench.)
THE COURT: All right. Thank you. The objection is sustained. And with that clarification you may proceed.

MS. HOJJAT: Steve was not placed on lifetime supervision until any term of probation or parole is expired. Lifetime supervision is a different thing than parole or probation. Steve was placed on lifetime supervision in 2007.

In 2007 he reported to his officers, he
registered his address, he had a job. He was paying for his apartment and he was trying to get along. And he continued doing that in 2007 until 2013.

There were ups and downs during that time period. Everybody has experienced ups and downs during 2007 and 2013. During that time Steve lost his job. During that time he wasn't able to have a place to stay because he couldn't afford his apartment.

MR. COOPER: I'm sorry. Your Honor, may we approach again?

THE COURT: Yes.
(Discussion held at the bench.)
THE COURT: The objection is overruled. You may proceed.

MS. HOJJAT: As I was saying, you are going to hear that in 2007 Steve was checking in with his officer.
He had a place to stay. He had a job. He was doing his best. Same with 2008. Same with 2009 . Same with 2010. Same with 2011. Same with 2012.

You are going to hear Steve was doing his best to follow the rules. During that time between 2007 and 2013, his parole officer changed four different times. When I say parole officer, I mean lifetime supervision officer. Four different people supervising him.

And in all that time not a single one ever

1 arrested him for violation of lifetime supervision. Not
a single one said, Steve, you are not registered at the
right address. Steve, why aren't you employed. Steve, you failed to check in. He was doing what he was told to do.

So what changed in 2013. You are going to bear Steve, he was still the same person, be was following the rules in 2007 to 2013. But in March of 2013, his officer changed. In March of 2013 someone new is assigned, Officer Mangan.

You are going to hear that before Officer Mangan ever met him, before she ever made contact with him, before she had spoken a single word to him, she already noted in her file "possible absconder." This is a guy who for five and a half years had made every check-in, had always registered his address, had always been doing what he needed to do and had never been arrested for violation of lifetime supervision.

Before she set eyes on him, in her mind be was a possible absconder. On their first meeting she asked him where he was staying. He told her, I'm registered at a street corner. I am homeless right now, I told my last PO , I'm registered to a comer. I'm registered to a corner.

She told him, You better be standing on that
comer. He said, Well, no, I don't stand on this comer 24/7. She said, If I drive by that comer you'd better be standing on that comer. He said, I'm not there all the time. I stay other places sometimes. I am generally there.

At their second meeting she told him, If you are not there when I go check, I'm arresting you. Violation of lifetime supervision. You are registered to a corner, you can stand on that corner.

He's transjent, he's homeless. You are going to bear, their third meeting, she arrested him for violation of lifetime supervision. This is the same Steve who since 2007 had never been arrested for violation of lifetime supervision. Four different parole officers, never picked up for a single violation.

Officer Mangan is his officer for one month, three meetings, possible absconder, arrested for violation of lifetime supervision. That arrest did not stick. She was told, No, we're not doing this. Steve is released.

By this time Steve got the message. Officer Mangan does not like bim. Officer Mangan does not like him and she wants to put him exactly in the seat he is sitting in to day.
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MR. COOPER: Your Honor, I'm sorry. May we 49
approach again?
THE COURT: You may.
(Discussion held at the bench.)
THE COURT: The objection is sustained. Please proceed.

MS. HOJJAT: So Steve gets arrested. Steve gets released. At that point, you are going to hear there was a personality difference between Steve and Officer Mangan. You are going to hear that that relationship deteriorated quickly. You are going to hear they didn't get along. You are going to hear they had words. You are going to hear when Steve went into her office and she started setting new guidelines, she set guidelines such as a curfew. You are going to bear she tried to set a curfew on a homeless person. That's one of the violations.

But you are going to hear that he was never actually placed on at least one of the curfews she claims he violated. There were multiple curfews; $5: 00 \mathrm{p.m}$. to 5:00 a.m., 8:00 p.m. to 5:00 a.m. It changed. And because Steve said no she considered that a curfew of violation.

You are going to bear that at least one of the curfews she put on him she never even drove out to actually see if he was there. His statement was, no.

She accepted bis curfew violation.
You are going to hear that there was a lot of 3 back and forth between Officer Mangan and Steve. You are
going to hear all of this started happening in March of
2013. Five and a half years Steve was following all the conditions of his lifetime supervision.

You are going to hear that a lot of them have to do with the fact that he is transient. One of the conditions you beard about is that he did not have a job. You are bere today to determine if he committed a category $B$ felony because he did not have a job.

Ladies and gentlemen, Count 2. The State said he violated a condition. They did not tell you what it was. The Information that was read to you, he moved and didn't change his address. You are going to bear that Officer Mangan this time when she submitted charges again changed things up a little bit from last time.

The first time sbe submitted charges they got denied. Second time sbe submitted charges they were a little more detailed, A little more comfortable. She learned. Tbis time she submitted two. This time she said, When I drove to that location he wasn't there. He must bave moved. He moved and he didn't change his address. He's has a entirely new felony all on his own. That's how you get Count 2 .
defendant was under an agreement of lifetime supervision and that the defendant was a convicted sex offender.
Anything else mentioned in opening statement is not in and of itself evidence. That evidence that you will determine what the facts from the evidence will be what comes through the witnesses and the exhibits that are received.

At this time, Mr. Cooper, if you are ready to call your first witness.

MR. COOPER: Thank you, Your Honor.
The State's first witness is Officer Ashley

## Mangan.

THE COURT: Officer Mangan, please remain standing and my clerk will swear you in.

Whereupon,

## ASHLEY MANGAN,

was administered the following oath by the court clerk,
THE CLERK: You do solemnly swear that the testimony you give in this action shall be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth so help you God.

THE WITNESS: I do.
THE CLERK: Please state and spell your full name for the record.

THE WITNESS: Ashley Mangan. A-s-h-l-e-y,

## M-a-n-g-a-n.

THE COURT: Thank you. And you may be seated.
Mr. Cooper, whenever you are ready.
MR. COOPER: Thank you, Your Honor.

## DIRECT EXAMINATTON

BY MR. COOPER:
Q Is it okay if I call you Ashley?
A Itis.
Q Ashley, how are you currently employed?
A Parole and Probation, Department of Public Safety, Sex Offender Unit.

Q And how long have you been employed in this capacity?

A Two years and two months.
Q Are you employed in a particular type of task or type of assignment in the section?

A I just currently supervise sex offenders.
Q Are you a parole officer?
A Well, my title is Parole and Probation Officer.
Q And in order for you to become a parole and
probation officer are you required to do any special type
of training or have any type of experience or anything
like that?
A Yes. I went through a police academy and
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graduated that. And then when I graduated the academy $I$ put in for Parole and Probation and received field training experience for that specific division.

Q What type of training do you go through in the academy?

A In the academy you are dealing with learning laws, officer safety, firearm practice, things of that nature.

Q What about your field training, what did you learn doing that?

A I followed around a senior officer, watched them supervise offenders. Learned how an offender is supposed to report. What is expected of them and what our job is as an officer to make sure that they are complying with conditions.

Q Do you have any other police experience?
A I was a correctional sergeant with the
Department of Corrections for seven years.
Q Did you work at a particular prison?
A I worked at prisons throughout the state.
Q I want to turn your attention to March of 2013. Do you recall this time period?

A Yes.
Q What was your assignment in Parole and Probation during that time period?

## A I was recently assigned to the sex offender

 unit.Q Where were you before the sex offender unit?
A General supervision.
Q Do you recognize anyone in court here today that you would have had contact with in March of $2013 ?$

A Ido.
Q Can you please point to that person and describe what he is wearing.

A Sure. Steven McNeill who is wearing a greenish colored tie.

THE COURT: The record will reflect the witness has identified the defendant.

MR. COOPER: Thank you.
BY MR COOPER:
Q Are you aware if he is a convicted sex offender?
A He is.
Q And pursuant to his conviction is he required to comply with the requirements of lifetime supervision?

A Yes, he is.
Q What is lifetime supervision?
A The best way I can describe lifetime supervision is similar to a type of parole. It's almost the exact same condition, and actually the Parole Board does MS. HOJJAT: Objection.

THE COURT: What is the basis of your objection? MS. HOJIAT: Your Honor, the witness is stating the law.

THE COURT: All right, Go ahead and approach. (Discussion held at the bench.)
THE COURT: The objection is overruled. You may
proceed. I will ask Mr. Cooper to restate the question.
BY MR, COOPER:
Q What is lifetime supervision?
A Lifetime supervision is a type -I would describe it as a type of parole where - it's not really parole, though, if you violate lifetime supervision you would be subject to new felony charges. Where, if you violated parole you would just be subject to parole violation.

There is specific conditions that the Parole
Board mandates that the offender comply by. Things like reporting, residence, reporting to your officer, curfew, submitting to urine analysis and things of that nature. They sign that agreement saying that they will abide.

Q Let me ask you this, how is an offender made aware of these conditions?

A Usually, there is a Lifetime Supervision Agreement that is signed by the offender and by the officer.

Q Are those type of agreements, would those be kept in any type of file or anyihing like that?

A Yes. The supervising officer should have that in their file.

Q Do you have a file for Mr. McNeill?
A Ido.
Q And were those agreements in your file?
A They were.
MR. COOPER: Permission to approach the witness,
Your Honor.
THE COURT: You may.
MR, COOPER: Permission to approach the witness,
again, Your Honor.
THE COURT: You may approach.
BY MR. COOPER:
Q I am now showing you the State's Proposed
Exhibit 2. Do you recognize this exhibit?
A Ido.
Q How do you recognize this exhibit?
A This is a Lifetime Supervision Agreement.
Q Was this the Lifetime Supervision Agreement that was kept in your file?

A Itis.
Q And how are you able to ascertain that?
A This was in the file. It's a Lifetime

Supervision Agreement. It appears to have some
signatures on it.
Q Was this the Lifetime Supervision Agreement in relation to Steve McNeill?

A Yes. It does say so at the top.
Q Is this a true and correct copy of the document that you kept in your file?

A Yes.
Q Do you use that document every day in the course of your duties?

A Ido.
MR, COOPER: At this point, Your Honor, I would move for admission of Exhibit 2.

MS. HOJJAT: Your Honor, I will object to lack of foundation.

THE COURT: Foundation seems to have been established. She said this is a true and correct copy as the one in her file. Are you objecting to this Exhibit 2 or the other one? MS. HOJJAT: We're objecting to this exhibit. THE COURT: What is your objection with regards to foundation? MS. HOJJAT: It has not been established that the defendant has this fugitive document. THE COURT: Counsel, approach with all three.
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(Discussion held at the bench.)
THE COURT: Thank you. The objection is
overruled, however, Mr. Cooper, you do have three
exhibits there that you are going to be seeking to
introduce through this witness and they all relate some
way, if you could lay a foundation for what those
documents are and how they relate to each other that
would be helpful.
MR. COOPER: Yes, Your Honor.
BY MR. COOPER:
Q So in order to do that, I will show you all three documents.

A Okay.
Q This is Exhibits 2 and 3. And this is State's Propose Exhibit 4.

A Okay,
Q Do you recognize all of these different documents?

A Ido.
Q And what are these documents, starting with State's Exhibit 2.

A Lifetime Supervision Agreement for Steve McNeill and Pending Parole Board Order, and Possibility of Release. This was given to him before he was released from prison.

Q Can you explain for the ladies and gentlemen of the jury how that whole process works when they get on lifetime supervision?

A Well, he was incarcerated with --
MS. HOJJAT: Objection.
THE COURT: Basis?
MS. HOJJAT: Your Honor --
THE COURT: Do you need to approach?
MS. HOJJAT: Yes, Your Honor.
(Discussion held off the record.)
THE COURT: All right. Thank you. I am going to go ahead and ask the jury to take a brief recess. We have some matters that we need to place in the record and resolve a couple of matters before we resume.

So I do need to admonish you. Our supreme court requires us to admonish every jury at every break whether it be a short break or a lunch break or an evening recess because they are that important. So let me read this to you now.

During the recess, you are admonished not to talk or converse among yourselves or with anyone else on any subject connected with the trial or read, watch or listen to any report of or commentary on the trial or any person connected with the trial by any medium of information including without limitation newspaper,
television, radio, Internet or social media of any kind, or to form or express any opinion on any subject connected with the trial until the case is finally submitted to you.
(Jury exits the courtroom.)
THE COURT: I will ask the witness to please step down while we have this discussion.
(Witness exits the courtroom.)
It is my intention before we resume with this jury to address this most immediate issue in the record, but also to address the others to the best of my ability.

I think Thave most of my notes and certainly a lot of the things overlap and we just kind of verified each time you approached the bench.

So let's take care of, first of all, objections related to this witness starting with the last one first, which was the testimony I did ask Mr . Cooper to create some foundation about the circumstances of when each of these would be signed and how they interrelate with each other.

That elicited the testimony of at least one point in time the defendant had been incarcerated. Certainly did not raise any other specifics as to his current status or anything else. But the mere fact that he has been incarcerated then prompted their request for
the bench conference, which then prompted counsel to request a mistrial.

So at this point I would ask for you to please state for the record your basis upon which you believe this testimony warrants a mistrial.

MS. HOJJAT: Yes, Your Honor. We did object and moved for a mistrial at the bench. It is completely improper for a witness to be talking about prior incarceration. And all of the State's witnesses should be admonished be fore they even got on the stand that they are not supposed to talk about prior incarcerations. Obviously, $P$ and $P$ officers are in a delicate position, they know about prior incarcerations and the State should be admonished not to talk about those things.

Foundation for a document is was this signed in July of 2007? Yes. It was signed in July of 2007. There is no need to get into incarceration to lay a proper foundation. It is the date that it was signed. Was he already on lifetime supervision at that point, yes or no.

And the State's argument at the bench was that this foundation that was needed that we had addressed with you was absolutely not the foundation that was needed. The foundation for the document was when it was signed date-wise and whether he was on lifetime

1 supervision at this time not whether he was sitting in custody.

It is completely improper for a State's witness to talk about him sitting in custody and they should have 5 been admonished and they know not to talk about it.

THE COURT: And maybe they were and maybe at 7 this point in the discussion it is what popped out. But what I am not hearing, Counsel, is that it reaches to the standard of requiring a mistrial and why it cannot be cured by a curative instruction to the jury at this time.

Again, let's keep this in perspective. This is a charged crime for someone who has already been stipulated to the facts of and the charging document makes clear, a convicted sex offender. It is not outside the realm of possibility that the jurors would have some belief or understanding that there might have been some sort of incarceration at some point. I understand that we obviously typically would not elicit this testimony. But why would this matter require a mistrial versus a curative instruction?

MS. HOJJAT: Your Honor, there isn't an instruction that -- it's information that can't be erased from the minds of the jury.

THE COURT: What is prejudicial about it to the level of it creates manifest injustice? If you are not
going to argue for me why you need a mistrial using the law and the case law and the standard, then we are done with this discussion.

I don't want to hear anymore about what you 5 think might be in the minds of the jury. I am done with those conversations at the bench. Okay.

What is the standard and why does it meet it?
MS. HOJJAT: Your Honor, it is prejudicial for the level of manifest injustice because there is multiple potential penalties -- even an individual who is sentenced with lifetime supervision it speaks to the nature of the underlying offense which they've already been precluded from hearing about, and it speaks to the severity of the underlying offense and incarceration occurred as opposed to probation lifetime supervision after a term of probation.

They've also heard that lifetime supervision occurs after probation, which is a true fact. It's prejudicial to the level of manifest injustice because it's telling them this was a really bad crime. This wasn't just a crime, this was a really bad crime that warranted prison time. Bad guy right there, that's what it tells them and that is highly prejudicial.

THE COUR'T: Mr. Cooper.
MR. COOPER: Your Honor, first and foremost, the
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law specifically lays forward the type of offenders that could be put on lifetime supervision; it's only the worst of the worst. It's tier three offenders only. So to state somebody gets probation or something like that or whatever they are saying, it doesn't really bode by the law. And I looked it up earlier today.

The problem also is that I was just about to admit the document and then they say that it's a fugitive document. But then I get to lay foundation as to why there's three different documents. The foundation as to why there is three different documents --

THE COURT: You are obviously arguing,
Mr . Cooper, that it was okay for this witness to lay the foundation that he signed it while he was incarcerated, she could have laid the foundation that there is a initial time that there is a document signing. There's a second time that there is a document signing, there's a third time there is a document signing. This is essentially the same document that the defendant is asked to sign at various times for various reasons without actually going into the fact that he's incarcerated.

Are you actually trying to argue to me that it is part of the foundation that she had to say that he was incarcerated?

MR. COOPER: Your Honer, the document itself
talks about the fact that he was incarcerated. The document that they had already agreed to the redactions of. I redacted the document and then they said this was fine. I get it marked and then we actually go forward to admit and the document says --

THE COURT: Which document are we talking about now, 2,3 or 4 ?

MR. COOPER: All three of them say it. All three of them say State of Nevada to imprisonment in the Nevada state prison system for the crime of. The only thing I was supposed to do was take out the part that said the crime. That was it. That's what we agreed to. I did that. They agreed to my redaction. It says it in the document.

SoI do not understand how it can be prejudicial for her to say he was in prison when the document says he was in prison. And that is how the document is written because he wasn't given probation. That mischaracterizes what happened, that mischaracterizes why he was on lifetime supervision. That mischaracterizes why this officer gave him certain requirements.

And I think it is prejudicial to the State to not be able to get down that road. Because we already know he's a sex offender. We already know he's on lifetime supervision. Do they want to argue that any

1 person that might do anything is subject to lifetime
supervision, which is not the law and it's not --
THE COURT: I just want you to argue what the standard is and whether it meets the standard of manifest injustice.

MR. COOPER: It doesn't meet the standard of manifest injustice, Your Honor, because these documents that I have already provided that have been marked and have already been approved by opposing counsel --

THE COURT: I am anticipating another objection is forthcoming, Mr. Cooper, that they don't think that that language should be on the document either, so why don't you address that now, whether it's appropriate for that to be part and parcel of this case or not.

And if either of you have some cases that you want to throw at me that I am not aware of feel free.

MR. COOPER: Your Honor, I do not have any case law off the top of my head. I didn't know this issue was going to come up.

Yesterday when we redacted this document -- they had these weeks ago. They knew what was in the document, so for them now to say that it needs to be -- I mean, it's argument, it needs to be redacted, it's whatever they want to do. But the fact is yesterday we sat down, we talked about this earlier this morning. We got the

## redactions.

I said, Okay, you want me to redact this? I showed this to them. They said, Yes, that's fine.

THE COURT: This is not about whether they
agreed or disagreed. This is about whether this should
be in the document, okay, and this is where we are now.
But at the end of the day, whether this should be in the
document or not, I just want to hear your final argument.
MR. COOPER: It should be in the document, Your
Honor, because that is the reason he was on lifetime
supervision. That's what happened in his case to get him to lifetime supervision. He was not on probation first.
He did not go straight from parole. So all these
different things play into the case as to why he wasn't responding to this officer, because if he had a parole officer first then it would be a different situation with a parole officer acted one way and my lifetime supervision officer acted another way. But that's not what happened in this case. He went directly from prison to lifetime supervision and I think that's important.

THE COURT: Okay. Counsel.
MS. HOJJAT: Your Honor, if I am understanding the State's argument, I think it is prejudicial to them if they don't bring in the fact that he was incarcerated. There is no case law that says that.
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THE COURT: I am not focusing on that. MS. HOJJAT: Okay.
THE COURT: Let's hear what you have to say about the document, what's pertinent in it and how we proceed.

MS. HOJJAT: Your Honor, we believe that it should not mention that he was sentenced to imprisonment. We believe that that should also be redacted. It is not proper for the jury to hear that this defendant has been in prison. There is case law on that. I apologize, I do not have specific cases to give to the Court. I did not anticipate this coming up.

THE COURT: That's fine. The Court needs to make a ruling. The Court's aware of the case law to the best of my ability. I don't have the citations in front of me either.

We have a specific case here with a specific charge and I guess ultimately what I am asking you to establish for me is why you believe -- I mean, we have already sanitized this through our discussion that the prior charge under which he was convicted, I agree, we didn't need that to make the predicate case. And that potentially could be substantially prejudicial beyond what was necessary obviously and relevant about the fact that there was a prior sex offense.

I think this is a very different situation.
This is a situation where, in fact, this individual was incarcerated, in fact, this person went directly to lifetime supervision from incarceration.

While we typically would not want to inflame the jurors by suggesting somebody spent time in prison and somehow that now they see the basis of the circumstances or that they are currently incarcerated. At the end of the day, this is somebody who was convicted of an offense that warrants him being in prison and he was in prison.

We are not going to overemphasize it but $I$ am not familiar with case law that would require me to further sanitize this case to create some other impression or leave open the question of whether or not he was ever incarcerated. That is not where we are at in this case. That is not what this case is. But I just give you that flavor of my thought process.

MS. HOJJAT: I appreciate that, Your Honor. We would submit to the Court that hearing about incarceration greatly aggravates the impression of the underlying charge. I understand the Court saying these are the facts of this case but a lot of cases have a lot of facts in terms of this defendant's priors. That's what this is essentially, Your Honor, the fact that this is a sex offense and the fact that he's on lifetime
supervision are necessary for the chatge here. We understand that. We have stipulated to that.

But the fact that he was in prison before is not necessary for them to establish that he did not change his address or didn't go to counseling. It's not relevant. There's no relevancy to him having been in prison to the elements of their charges that they need to 8 establish. Especially since we are not talking about an talking a commiting these violations today. We are that he was in five-and-a-half-year gap between the time violations had occurred.

THE COURT: Which you established in your opeting.

MS. HOJJAT: Things that happened so long ago just in general even when we are talking about bad acts that ate admissible, when we look at the time span and how long ago something occurred, relevancy decreases as we go back in time. We are talking about something that has nothing to do with the elements here. The elements here, the elements that they need have already been met.
We stipulated to them. There is nothing about the
imprisonment that they need in this case. There is
nothing about the imprisonment that makes it more or less
likely that he committed the crimes in this case.
The imprisorment is solely prejudicial and it's implications of what the underlying crime are. And what the underlying crime was is not relevant to this case but for the fact that he's a sex offender and he is on lifetime supervision.

THE COURT: Anything further, Mr, Cooper?
MR. COOPER: Notbing further.
THE COURT: I am going to redact the reference
to imprisoument in the first paragraph of each of the
documents. The motion for mistrial is denied. I am
going to give a curative instruction to disregard the reference to incarceration. I believe that is
sufficient. I will indicate that that is not relevant to the charge in terms of imapris onment.

At the end of the day, I believe this is not the manifest injustice necessary to require a mistrial. It was a reference to that there was a time when this individual was in jail, as I said, likely to be in the thought process, in the mindset of all of the jurors. We are not going to belabor the point but we will redact the reference here so that it doesnt come up in the future and we will ask to disregard.

And then the additional foundation, I will give you the permission, Mr. Cooper, to lead and just indicate
that that is typical for these things to be signed
multiple times, are these the multiple variations of
them, et cetera, without asking this witness to further potentially go into those circumstances, okay?

MR. COOPER: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: But the mistrial request, again, is denied and we will do this further redaction.

MS. BONAVENTURE: And, Your Honor, permission to lead for this purpose.

THE COURT: Just for this purpose. I thought
you were going to lead already with these are multiple
documents, are they the same thing type of thing. You just kind of show them to her and this is where they came from.

So at the end of the day, we don't need this in the testimony, I agree with counsel, at the base of this the fact that he was incarcerated at some point in time is not relevant to your predicate charges; however, I do not believe we need to declare a mistrial at this point.

MR. COOPER: Your Honor, would you like me to talk to my witness right now so we don't have this happen again?

THE COURT: We will bring her back in and admonish her before we bring the jury back in.

MR. COOPER: Do you want her to come back to the 74

## wituess stand now?

THE COURT: Yes. I will take care of the rest
of the record in a minute.
(Witness returns to the stand.)
THE COURT: I just have a reminder for you.
THE WITNESS: Okay.
THE COURT: There is an objection lodged about the statemetts that the document which was identified as the State's Proposed Exhibit 2, had a reference, or your testimony with regard to this was signed when he was incarcerated. There has been objection to it not being appropriate to put before the jury that this individual was incarcerated at any point in time. We are only dealing with what the charges are here and it is certainly not relevant to these charges.

THE WITNESS: Okay.
THE COURT: We appreciate that you were giving us the foundation of those records, but I am going to redact from the documents the referetce to imprisonment.

THE WITNESS: Okay.
THE COURT: And I'm going to admonish you to
please uot make any references to anytime being incarcerated.

THE WITNESS: Okay.
MR. COOPER: And, Your Honor, hecause I will be

1 using those documents do we want to do the redactions now?

THE COURT: Sure. Give them back to me and
we'll take care of that real quickly. Right up to the word "to the underlying imprisonment in the Nevada State prison" from each of the documents.

All right. Let's bring the jurors back in.
(Jury enters the courtroom.)
THE COURT: The Court has addressed the objection that was made prior to the break and specifically I wanted to at this time give you a specific direction that there was a statement made by the witness regarding incarceration of the defendant at a certain point in time and that that statement is to be disregarded. It is not to considered by you, or enter into your deliberations in any way. It is not relevant to the charges in this case and, again, should be disregarded and not considered by you in any way. Mr. Cooper, you may proceed. MR. COOPER: Thank you, Your Honor. Pemission to approach the witness, Your Honor? THE COURT: You may.

1

## BY MR. COOPER:

Q Now, Ashley, we were going through these different documents, and I will start again on State's Proposed Exhibit 2. During the time period of lifetime supervision, does one, I guess, get different Lifetime Supervision Agreements or how does that whole process work?

A They are given the original at the time of the original agreement. And on it will say "Pending Parole Board Order" and that is just a way for the Parole Board to add or modify conditions later on. And so --

Q Let me stop you there. So would that be the first one, State's Exhibit 2?

A Yes.
Q And that is the one dated on November 8th, 2007?
A Yes.
Q And going forward, it looks like on December
4th, 2007, the defendant would have signed a second
Lifetime Supervision Agreement?
A Yes. This is a Lifetime Supervision Agreement that also is still pending Parole Board order.

Q And $I$ guess at some point the Parole Board comes down and gives whatever they are going to give?

A Yes.

Q And is that the agreement that we are looking at right now on State's Proposed Exhibit 3 ?

A Yes. This is the Lifetime Supervision Agreement with his signature and date of $11 / 7 / 12$.

Q And on the back of it is a third page. Is that the Certificate Board of Parole Action?

A Yes. They are the conditions that the Parole Board has ordered per the Lifetime Supervision Agreement.

Q Okay. And that is the State's Proposed Exhibit 4?

A Yes.
Q And it's common to have the different agreements just based on what period of lifetime supervision they are at?

A Yes, sir.
MR. COOPER: At this point, Your Honor, the State would move for admission of State's Proposed Exhibits 2, 3 and 4.

MS. HOJJAT: Your Honor, the defense would just renew the previous objections.

THE COURT: And I would just ask you to establish the additional foundation of State's Proposed Exhibits 3 and 4. We only got as far as 2 in terms of it came from the file and that this witness was aware that it is a true and correct copy. So can you just tie that
up and then we could proceed.
MR. COOPER: Yes, Your Honor.
MR. COOPER:
Q State's Proposed Exhibit 3, do you recognize that docuntent?

A Yes.
Q Is that the document that was contained in your file?

A It was.
Q And State's Propose Exhibit 4, do you recognize that document?

A Ido.
Q And is that another document contained in your file?

A Yes.
Q So all three of these are contained in your file?

A Yes.
Q All three are the Lifetime Supervision Agreements of the defendant, Steve McNeill?

A Yes.
MR. COOPER: At this point, Your Honor, the State would move to admit Exhibits 2, 3 and 4.

THE COURT: These are not the originals, they are true and correct copies of the originals; is that

```
correct?
    THE WITNESS: Yes.
    THE COURT: I will admit the State's Exhibits
2,3 and 4, the various signed versions of the Lifetime
Supervision Agreement.
MR. COOPER: Thank you, Your Honor.
    (Whereupon, State's Exhibits 2, 3 and 4
    were admitted into evidence.)
    MR. COOPER: Permission to publish.
    THE COURT: You may.
    BY MR. COOPER:
    Q So this the agreement that he would have signed?
    A Yes.
    Q And it looks like on the left-hand side, there's
    some numbers 1 through 12 on the careen. What are those
    different categories there, what are they referring to?
    A Conditions that he has to abide by.
    Q So Number }1\mathrm{ there, is that reporting --
    A Reporting/release.
    Q And Number 2?
    A Residence.
    Q Just go through them forme.
    A Okay. Read them?
    Q Just the bold parts.
    A Number 3 would be intoxicants. Number 4 would
        80

A The same conditions.
Q Now, back in March of 2013, were you assigned to the defendant as an offender or how does that whole process work?

A In March of 2013 I was a new officer to the sex offender unit. At that time I was given a caseload and Steve McNeill was part of that caseload that I received.

Q And are you only assigned lifetime supervision people or do you have a multitude of different individuals?

A My cases are a mixture of probation, parole, and lifetime supervision.

Q Approximately how many people do you supervise at any given time?

A Approximately 55.
Q What's the first thing you do when you get a new assignment or a new offender?

A My first thing would be to make contact with that offender and set up an appointment to meet them up in my office and try to get a feel for what is going on.

Q And did you do that in this case?
A I did.
Q Now, do recall the first time that you actually made contact with the defendant?

A Ide.

Q When was that?
A March 29, 2013.
Q Before March 29th, did you ever try to contact him before that point?

A I believe I tried to make a phone call to his
listed phone number and I was not able to get through.
Q Did that cause you any concern?
A Not at that moment, no, because it is common for offenders to have nonworking phone numbers.
Q. At that point did you also know whether or not the had a stable residence or he was homeless?

A At that point I believe he was homeless.
Q So you actually had contact with him on March 29th?

A I did.
Q Can you describe for the ladies and gentlemen of the jury how that contact happened? What you were doing? What happened at that point?

A Yes. On that day I was out in the field away from the office. And I had got a call from another officer who was at the office and said that one of my offenders was there trying to drop off a monthly reporting statement --

MS. HOJJAT: Judge, object to hearsay.
THE COURT: Sustained.

\section*{BY MR. COOPER:}

Q And without saying what that officer told you, just describe what you did as a result of what that officer said.

A So I got the call that my offender was at the office. I reported back to the office and was able to meet with Mr. McNeill and go over his monthly report.

Q And you said monthly report. Any time someone actually comes to the Division of Probation and Parole are they required to fill out documentation?

A They are.
Q And what type of documentation is there?
A It is a monthly reporing form.
MR. COOPER: Your Honor, may I approach the witness?

THE COUR'T: You may.
BY MR. COOPER:
Q I am now showing you what has been previously marked as State's Proposed Exhibit 5. Do you recognize this exhibit?

A Ido.
Q What is this?
A This is Steve McNeill's monthly report dated 3/29/2013.

Q And would that document be kept in the ordinary
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course of your duties as probation officer?
A Yes. I keep it in his file.
Q. Now, who actually fills out that report?
A. This was filled out by Steve McNeill.

Q And is that a true and correct copy of the report that was filled out on March 29th of 2013?

A Itis.
MR. COOPER: At this point, Your Honor, State
would move to admit State's Proposed Exhibit 5.
MS. BONAVENTURE: No objection.
THE COURT: State's proposed Exhibit 5 is admitted.
(Whereupon, State's Exhibit 5 was
admitted into evidence.)
MR. COOPER: Permission to publish.
THE COURT: You may.
BY MR. COOPER:
Q This is the first monthly report that the defendant would have filled out while you were supervising him?

A Yes.
Q And you said he filled this out on March 29 th. Now, briefly just walk through with me the different type of things that they have to fill out and the form in general.

A I just go down line by line and discuss, you know, where are you living; is this a good number for you; are you employed. I ask how he gets to the office, what his transportation is.

Further down if he has been attending counseling I like to address that with sex offenders. And just kind of get a general idea of what is going on in his life.

Q Now there also seems to be some handwriting on the left-hand side; do you see that handwriting in the margin?

A Yes.
Q And whose handwriting would that be?
A That's my handwriting.
Q Are you actually able to make out what that says?

A Yes.
Q What does it say?
A It says "5:00 p.m. to 5:00 a.m. curfew." And by your address it says "no spot he lays his head."

Q What does that mean?
A Basicaily that means he does not have a fixed address, so he is homeless so he is putting down that he lives at Main and Colorado at the corner there, but he probably does not lay specitically on that exact corner so there is no specific spot where he lays down his head. 86

Q Now, at any point during your supervision of the defendant did you tell him that he needed to stand at a certain comer at all times?

A Not at all times. But if his residence is going to be Main and Colorado then he needs to be there at night.

Q Now, Main and Colorado, does that signify to you that he was in fact homeless?

A Yes, it did.
Q And the 5:00 p.m. to 5:00 a.m. curfew, what does that mean?

A It means between 5:00 p.m. and 5:00 a.m. he needs to be at the corner of his address he reported as Main and Colorado.

Q Now, does he have to report that specific intersection or can he report like a landmark or somewhere else?

A No. He has to report a specific -- lt would be cross streets, I guess, a landmark would be helpful but they have to report some physical address.

Q Are you familiar with this comer of Main and Colorado?

A lam.
Q And are you familiar if there is also types of inlets and allies in that area?
```

A There are multiple alleyways in that area.
Q Now, let me ask you a question, I'm sorry, I
meant to ask this earlier. Going back to this Lifetime
Supervision Agreement --
MR. COOPER: Permission to publish State's
Proposed Exhibit 4, Your Honor?
THE COURT: You may.
BY MR. COOPER:
Q Do you see the date on that one?
A Yes,I do.
Q And would this be the most recent one to your
knowledge?
A Yes.
Q And do you see where it says "agreement of
offender"?
A 1do.
Q And I am going to go ahead and give you this.
Just read for me what that says. Are you familiar with
that area, that paragraph where it says "agreement of
offender"?
A Yes.
Q In this paragraph does it talk about the
penalties if they don't complete those conditions?
A Yes.
Q Thank you. So when was the next time you came
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in contact with the defendant after March 2013?
    A I believe it was April 12, 2013.
    Q And would he have filled out a monthly report at
that time?
    A Yes.
        MR. COOPER: Permission to approach the witness,
Your Honor.
    THE COURT: You may.
BY MR. COOPER:

Q Do you recognize this document?
A Yes.
Q Is this document kept in the ordinary course of your duties as a probation and parole officer?

A Yes.
Q Is that document a fair and accurate depiction of the do cument that's contained in your file?

A Yes.
Q Does that document relate to Mr . Steve McNeill the defendant?

A Yes.
Q And is that the report we were just talking about from April 12th of 2013?

A Yes.
MR. COOPER: At this point, Your Honor, the State would move to admit Exhibit 6.

MS. BONAVENTURE: No objection.
THE COURT: State's 6 is admitted.
(Whereupon, State's Exhibit 6 was
admitted into evidence.)
MR. COOPER: Permission to publish, Your Honor,
THE COURT: You may.
BY MR. COOPER:
Q So this is State's Exhibit 6. And, again, this would be the report from April of 2013. I actually wart to focus with you on the middle part there where it says, "Need to call Marcia Lee." Whose handwriting is that?

A That is my handwriting.
Q What does that mean?
A Basically it means that he is checking "no" for counseling, which concerns me because I have no proof in my.tile that he has completed sex offender counseling.
So he last reported that he was seeing Marcia for counseling, so I would need to call her and see what the status is and why he is not attending counseling.

Q So as long as you were his parole officer he was not in counseling?

\section*{A He was not.}

Q And on the second page of this document, bottom portion, do you see that thing that kind of looks like a map?

A Ido.
Q And what is that?
A That was done in order so \(I\) could get a better feel of where he is living and he showed the cross
streets of Main and Wyoming and Commerce. And there's an alleyway between Commerce and Main and there's a circle there, most likely where he would be staying.

Q And is that something be would have drawn or would you bave?

A I know -- I believe he did draw this map. I don't know if I would have written on it as well.

Q Would this be an area that you would be able to find him during his curfew period?

\section*{A What he's claiming.}

Q And, again, you are familiar with that area?
A Yes.
Q Now it looks like on the left-hand side here I think the word curfew is cut off. It says "few \(8: 00\) p.m." Do you see that?

A That would have been "curfew 8:00 p.m."
Q Do you see that?
A Yes. That is curfew 8:00 p.m.
Q Describe for me how that happened or what's going on with that.

A When I initially set his curfew in March it was
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set for 5:00 p.m. During this discussion in April he had asked for an extended curfew, so it would be effective
from 8:00 p.m. to 5:00 a.m. instead of 5:00 p.m. to 5:00
a.m. So he asked for an extension to 8:00 p.m. and I granted that. I said yes, it is hot during the day.
8:00 p.m. will be fine. Just be there at your residence at 8:00 p.m.

Q And the residence you were referring to is that circle right there in that alleyway?

\section*{A Yes.}

Q So it was not necessarily directly on the corner?

\section*{A No, it's not.}

Q Now at some point when you realized that the defendant was homeless, did you try to get him a place to stay or anything like that?

A Yes. I referred him to Catholic Charities.
There was a bed and food and assistance that could be had there and he refused.

Q Now, in April of 2013, did you have any other contact with the defendant?

A I believe I did try to see him at his home cross street.

Q Were you successful?
A I was not.
```

    Q Do you recall the time you went out there?
    A I believe it was 8:20 p.m.
    Q And do you recall how long you actually looked
    ```
for him?

A Yes. After my home attempt at Main and Wyoming, 1 started my surveillance up until about 9:41 I surveyed the areas going down alleyways. At no point did I see the offender anywhere near those areas.

Q And going down the alleyways would include kind of using this map and going down alleyways?

A The alleyways and I drive down Main, drive down
Wyoming, drive down commerce, back up again and through alleyways of course.

Q When is the next time you had contact with him -- I guess you had contact on April 12 th?

A Right.
Q And you said you tried to go find him and you could not find him?

A Right.
Q When is the next time you had contact with him at that point?

A May 2013.
Q Again, did he fill out a monthly report during that time as well?

A Yes.

MR. COOPER: Permission to approach the witness,

\section*{Your Honor?}

THE COURT: You may.

\section*{BY MR. COOPER:}

Q I am now showing you what has been previously marked as State's Proposed Exhibit 7; do you recognize this exhibit?

A Ido.
Q How do you recognize this exhibit?
A That is a monthly report dated \(5 / 8 / 13\) from Steve MeNeill.

Q And is that a true and correct copy of the report that is kept in your file?

A It is.
Q Do you use that report in your daily duties as a probation and parole officer?

A I do.
MR. COOPER: At this point, Your Honor, the State would move to admit State's Exhibit 7.

MS. BONAVENTURE: No objection.
THE COURT: It is admitted.
(Whereupon, State's Exhibit 7 was
admitted into evidence.)
MR. COOPER: May I publish, Your Honor?
THE COURT: Youmay.

BY MR. COOPER:
Q This is, I guess, a similat report to the one we have previously seen?

A Yes, monthly report.
Q What did he put for an address?
A Now he is reporting Wyoming and Main.
Q Is that still in the area in which you looked?
A Yes.
Q I am now showing you the last page of this one. This is a three-page document. Do you recognize this page?

A Ido.
Q And what is this page depicting?
A This is another map trying to locate Mr. McNeill and where he sleeps.

Q And why was this map drawn?
A Because I was not able to find him on my last home attempt.

Q Is this map more detailed?
A Yes.
Q And was this still the same general area in which you were looking the last time?

A Yes. I looked through that whole area.
Q What, if anything, did you talk to the defendant about in May of 2013?

A Probably diseussed where he lays his head at night, which would be behind a Spanish church in a gated area. I was just trying to locate, you know, trying to discern where he is living. That was probably the majority of what our conversation was in May.

Q Did you have any contact with him in June of 2013?

A I believe I did.
Q At some point during your contact or at some point during your supervising the defendant, did another supervising officer come in as well?

A Yes. I bellieve that was in June, Officer White my have had Mr. McNeill.

MR. COOPER: Permission to approach the witness,
Your Honor.
THE COURT: You may.
BY MR. COOPER:
Q Now, are all parole and probation officers
trained to make sure that the offender fills out the same
type of monthly report?
A Yes.
Q And the offender is actually the one that fills that report out?

A Yes.
Q I am now showing you what has been previously
marked as State's Proposed Exhibit 8. Do you recognize this exhibit.

A Yes.
Q Is that a true and correct copy of the exhibit that would appear in your file?

A Yes.
Q And what is that?
A It is a monthly report dated June 6, 2013,
filled out by Steve McNeill.
MR. COOPER: At this point, Your Honor, I would
move to admit State's Proposed Exhibit 8.
MS. BONAVENTURE: No objection.
THE COURT: State's 8 is admitted.
(Whereupon, State's Exhibit 8 was
admitted into evidence.)
BY MR. COOPER:
Q Now you said that at this point it was Officer White and not you?

A Yes. Officer White was the supervising officer at that time.

Q And why is that? Do you know what happened or anything like that?

A Periodically parole and probation officers change depending on location. Like right now my location is I supervise offenders on Boulder Highway in Henderson, 97
so during that time they may have been a situation where
he was no longer in the area that II supervised, so I
would transfer him to an officer who would go to the area of Main and Wyoming.

Q Now, at some point did he actually come back on your caseload?

\section*{A He did.}

Q About how long after June of 2013 ?
A The next time he reported to me was in July.
Q Between July and June did you have any contact with him?

A Yes, I did.
Q Do you recall was that over the phone or in person?

\section*{A it was over the phone.}

Q Can you describe to the ladies and gentlemen of the jury what happened at that point?

A Yes. I was attempting to get ahold of Mr. McNeill so \(I\) could tell him that I was his PO again, probation/parole officer, and set up an appointment so he could come in and discuss residence again. I was not able to get very far with him; he hung up on me twice. And then the third time I was going to say come in for your July appointment and he said something to the effect of, You fucking cunt, and then hung up on me.

MS. HOJJAT: Objection.
THE COURT: Basis.
MS. HOJJAT: Relevance, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Overnuled.

\section*{BY MR. COOPER:}

Q At some point you were able to come in contact with him in July though?

A Yes, he did report in July.
Q And he filled out another monthly report?
A He did.
MR. COOPER: Permission to approach the witness,

\section*{Your Honor.}

THE COURT: You may.
BY MR. COOPER:
Q I arn now showing you what has been marked as State's Proposed Exhibit 9; do you recognize this exhibit?

A Ido.
Q And how do you recognize this?
A This is a monthly report dated July 11, 2013, filled out by Steve McNeill.

Q At that point were you his probation officer again?

A Iwas.
Q And is this a true and correct copy of that```
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