will be in prison for the rest of his life. He's going to live a life of deprivation in a structured confinement. I'm not going to detail all the things that he's not going to have and that he's going to miss, because these young men aren't going to have those things. Now, some might argue that a life in prison, a life in that kind of prison that Jim Esten talked to us about, some might argue, you know, that that's worse than death. I don't buy it. I still ask you for life. Choose life.

You know, I also ask for mercy for the family. And that can be a point of mitigation for any single one of you, mercy for the families, mercy for the families of Jason, Derrick, and Dajon and mercy for Glenford's family. Whatever you decide, these families are going to grieve. You can't change that. But you do have the ability to lessen that grief. You have the ability to give these families some finality. We all understand that the death penalty isn't going to be imposed in one year or two years or five years or 10 years or maybe 20 years or 25 years. We all know that. And each little maneuver that comes down the little, each little legal maneuver
is going to resurrect this case, and these families are going to be reliving it. Let's put this matter to rest the best we can. And again, no lenient options here. I'm asking you for severe punishment. Just choose life. Even a life for the rest of his life in prison, choose life.

Now, let's, let's talk about this decision you have to make, that you are about to. What you are about to decide is, is a very personal decision. Any single one of you can choose life, and any single one of you can take death off the table. You don't have to justify it. You don't have to explain it. You don't have to support it. You don't have to quantify it. Any single one of you can choose life. One way to think about this is the launching of a nuclear missile. You know, we've all seen those movies where they're on the deck of a submarine and, you know, you got the captain, and you got some officer, and they both got a key, and they both got a button. And not one man can set off that nuclear missile. They both got to turn the key, and they both got to hit the button. Well, each one of you has a key, and you have a button. And when you stand up there considering whether to
turn that key and press that button, any single one of you that has any kind of doubt that this is not the worst of the worst, any one of you who has a single doubt that Glenford is not beyond redemption, any one of you who feels like you can give Glenford this tempered mercy of life in prison, you have that power. Don't turn the key. Don't hit the button. You don't have to talk about it. You don't have to support it. You don't have to defend it. You have the power to do that all by yourself, any single one of you.

The one thing that doesn't abide by majority rule is a person's conscience. And the law acknowledges that. Let me say it again. The one thing that doesn't abide by majority rule is my conscience. And the law acknowledges that. And that's why we have all these rooms they're talking about, and that's why we have all these seemingly artificial procedures that first you got to figure this out and then, because the law knows the enormity of this decision, and the law gives you a way out. Remember, all we're asking for is severe, severe punishment. All we're asking for is life.

Of course, Mr. Kane is going to have an
opportunity to speak with you last, and I wish I had that opportunity. But let me leave you with one thought. On those occasions in our life where we're kind of looking back, and maybe we're with a son or a daughter, and we're kind of telling them about the things we're proud of, the things we've done that we're proud of, the things that we have participated in that made a difference. I guarantee you that when that time comes, there is not one person here, there is not a single one of you, not one of you who's going to look in that son, son's or daughter's eyes and say, I voted to execute a young man. It's not going to happen. Choose life. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. O'Brien. Mr. Kane?

MR. KANE: Thank you. Ladies and gentlemen, the first thing that $I$ want to talk to you about is the special verdict forms that you'll actually be given. All this, all this talk about rooms that you go into and step-by-step processes are nice, but I said to you when this hearing started, nobody envies the job you have to do. And the best that we can do for you is at least explain the mechanics of it so you can concentrate
on the job and not get too hung up with, hung up with those mechanics. So, let me explain the verdicts that you're given and what we're suggesting that you do with them.

You're going to be given one verdict that just deals with the aggravator circumstance in this case. And as you've been told by each lawyer that's talked to you, nothing in a death penalty case is automatic. But, frankly, I'm unable to come up with a logical way in which you could not sign this verdict form. That, the aggravator circumstance that we've alleged is that the defendant in this case has been convicted of more than one count of murder. He was. You know he was, because you're the people who did it. So, what the State is asking is, when you get back to the secure room, the first thing you do is take a vote and, and when you've agreed unanimously, go ahead and sign this one that the aggravating circumstance is present, because it is.

Now, when you're talking about the mitigating circumstances, you're going to get a special, separate special verdict that just deals with those, and it's got little check marks that you can make next to any of the mitigating
circumstances that we discussed here in court that you, that even one of you feel exist. And on the second page it's got a bunch of blank lines, and what that's for is for any of you to write anything in. If any individual juror feels that anything, the defendant got in a fight in the third grade; the defendant talks with a lisp; anything you decide is a mitigating circumstance, that's what that space is there for you to write in. And make sure that you get them all listed. So, those are the two special verdicts, aggravator, mitigating. Those are pretty easy to understand.

You'll also be given penalty verdicts for each of the three counts of murder. And there is three separate forms that you'll be given. And again this may seem needlessly complicated, but the law requires that you be given each of those options. Now, you'll get three potential penalty verdicts for each of the three murders. So, you'll have nine all together. Put them in what I suggest to you, how you do it is up to you. I suggest you put them in three stacks. You have the Dajon Jones penalty verdicts. You have the Derrick Jones penalty verdicts. And you have the

Jason Moore penalty verdicts. And the first thing you'll see is that one of them is a penalty verdict for you to use if the jury finds that no aggravating circumstance exist. Again I don't know how you could find that in this case, but it's a potential outcome, and it's a form that we have to provide for you if you want to use it. What I ask you to do based on the evidence, first thing you do when you get this far is take this penalty verdict and just put it aside, because it doesn't apply. Secondly, you'll be given an alternative to use if you make the decision that the aggravating circumstances outweigh any mitigating circumstance. And this is the one that gets you into that final room or the final step of the process or whatever you want to call it. Because you'll notice that this particular verdict form lists all four potential penalties, hundred years, life with the possibility of parole, life without parole, and the death penalty. On the other hand, if you reach the decision that mitigating circumstances outweigh the aggravating circumstance, you're given a verdict form to use for that. And as you will notice, that does not include the death
penalty, because unless you all unanimously agree that the aggravating circumstance outweighs all of those mitigating circumstances, you can't vote for death. And that's why you're given these two alternative special verdicts. Please make sure that when you're done, you only return one penalty verdict on each count. We've given you these alternatives as exactly that, alternatives or choices. And when you get done, you should have, as I think the judge indicated when she read the instructions to you, five verdicts forms, your special verdict form on the aggravator circumstance, your special verdict form on the mitigating circumstance, and then one penalty verdict for each of the murders, one for the Dajon Jones killing, one for the Derrick Jones killing, one for the Jason Moore killing.

That's mechanics. As to substance, you've heard a lot about mitigating circumstance. And a mitigating circumstance again can be anything that you feel helps to explain why this happened, make it less serious. And in your, to the defendant's benefit anyway. But how much weight you give to those mitigating circumstances and how important they are, that's up to you. You
can decide, yeah, there is a mitigating circumstance. He had a tough childhood. But lots of people have tough childhoods. I'm not going to consider that very strongly, and I'm going to suggest to you that at least two of the mitigators that you've heard discussed are ones that should not be given great weight by you. And one is a mitigator that's been really stressed in argument, and that's the fact that the defendant has no prior record. And I'm going to suggest to you that that should be one of the least important mitigating circumstances, and you should give it the least weight of any of the mitigating circumstances you'll hear about, and the reason is, membership in the human race is not a union job.

In a union job you get progressive discipline. No matter how bad you mess up, you get an oral warning, and then you get a written reprimand, and then maybe some time later you get fired. Life doesn't work that way. Whether you have a prior record or not, there are certain offenses that are so serious, certain harms that are so grievous that if you cause those, you deserve the ultimate penalty. And it doesn't
matter if it's the first time that you've been convicted of any major offense, and it doesn't matter that you have no prior record. So, while that's a mitigator that's present and you've got to consider it and give effect to it, what effect you give to it is up to you. And I would suggest to you, for the reason stated, that that be very little.

And the other mitigator that I would suggest to you shouldn't be given much to you, and this may sound callus, and I'll explain it. Don't give a lot of weight to the effect that this execution, if it is carried out, will have on, would have on the members of the defendant's family. And I do not mean to minimize what they're going through. I would not suggest and I wouldn't tolerate anyone else suggesting that any of Mr. Budd's family members got on that stand and faked anything. They were hurting. They told you they were hurting. And that's a fact. You've heard nothing but hurting for the last two days. You've sat through a universe of pain in this courtroom. But as my colleague's already pointed out, there is only one person that's responsible for that, and that's the defendant. And for a
defendant to come in and say to you, I have caused all these people pain. I have caused all these people, my family members to suffer and to grieve and to worry, and because I did that, I want you to consider that as a mitigating circumstance and give me a lighter sentence than you would otherwise is just inconceivable. It is so logically inconsistent that you are entitled to reject it. I'm sure it would make his family members feel better if you sent him home tomorrow. But if anybody suggested you do that, you would say, well, we can't do that. That's not the right thing to do.

Well, if you examine all the evidence and you decide that, that the death penalty is the appropriate and worthy and deserved punishment and then you don't do it just because you feel bad for the pain it's going to cause his family, that would be just as wrong as letting him go. It's a difference in degree, not in the form of what you're doing. You've got to arrive at a decision as to an appropriate penalty, and I suggest that you not be swayed in performing that duty by the pain that your decision will cause, because that decision, just like everything else that throws
from the death of these three young men, isn't your fault, isn't my fault, isn't the fault of anyone on the face of the earth but the young man sitting in the middle seat at that table.

The last thing I want to talk to you about is a suggestion that was made by the defense lawyers in this case, and that's that the death penalty ought to be reserved for the worst of the worst. That's hard to quarrel with, and I don't intend to quarrel with it. But having said that, how do you decide what's the worst of the worst? And the worst of the worst what? The worst of the worst murder? The worst of the worst murderer? Can there be a worst of the worst murder? Isn't every murder just horrible? I mean, it involves the end of a human life. Can one murder be worse than another? Sure it can. What's the worst of the worst murder? Maybe it's the execution of a child. Maybe it's waking a 14 -year-old boy up from the last sleep that he's ever going to enjoy on the face of the earth to expose him to intimidation, interrogation, and ultimately extermination. Maybe that's the worst of the worst. Or maybe the worst of the worst is the agony that Derrick Jones went through as he fled
down a narrow hallway for his life as bullets tore into his body from front and back, as he spent his last moments on earth clinging to the vain hope that a bag of toilet paper and paper towels would somehow be transformed into something that would save his life, that somehow paper would stop bullets. But, of course, paper doesn't stop bullets, and he died. Is that the worst of the worst? Or is maybe the worst of the worst Jason Moore, so close to freedom and yet so far, collapsed on the threshold of the slaughter house, crawling for his life, shot in the back once, crawling further but in the wrong direction, towards a corner, shot twice, continuing to crawl until he curls up in a fetal position in the corner and runs out of time and breath and blood. Worst of the worst, your call, not mine.

And worst of the worst murderers, what's the worst kind of murderer? Could it be somebody that doesn't kill out of passion, out of excitement, out of a sudden fit of rage but somebody who makes an economic decision, somebody who decides, people are hurting my business so they have got to die, somebody who uses the guise of his friendship to play a ball game with these
guys and try and feel out which one of them took his dope, so which one is going to die first. Is that the worst of the worst? Or maybe the worst of the worst is somebody that takes a year to think about what they have done, somebody who, not in the heat of the moment but after calm reflection, after a time to have been able to consider the consequences of his actions, the pain that those actions have caused, the agony that everyone is going through and will continue to go through, somebody who can sit down and write this: They call me Smallz aka AI. Every day on the street I used to get high. There's rules for a killa. Don't get it confused. I'm wearing county blues with my face on the news. Blew these niggaz off the earth. That's the way it to go. I only killed three but I shoulda killed four. Left them dead on the floor, but just right before they was cryin' and pleadin', screamin' for Jesus. Ya'll can keep the weed cuz you can't smoke in now cuz your ass is underground. Cross me, I blow like a bomb. Took three niggaz from they moms. I'm a thrilla killa. Ask Saratoga Palms. Call me Murda Mann.

Defense counsel suggest that the State
asks you to impose the ultimate penalty in this case out of hatred. Wrong. Defense counsel asserts that the State asks you to impose the ultimate penalty in this case out of anger. Wrong. It would be wrong for you to do either of those things. We are asking you to impose the ultimate penalty in this case, because the defendant's earned it. The defense says life is precious. We agree. That life was precious. That life was precious. And that life was precious. And precious things are purchased with precious coin. The defendant purchased those three lives, and the coin is his own. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Kane.
Ladies and gentlemen, you will now be excused from the courtroom to begin your deliberations.

Ms. Clerk, would you swear the bailiff to take charge of the jurors?
(Thereupon, the bailiff was sworn.)
THE COURT: Would you swear him and my law clerk? In fact, let's swear Mr. Garcia first to keep the alternate separate.
(Thereupon, the law clerk was sworn.)
THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, I would
ask that you now collect your belongings, your notebooks, and I believe that Mr. Bailiff is going to come back into the courtroom and take you to your deliberation room. We will stand in recess. Mr. Bailiff, you may take your jurors. THE BAILIFF: Thank you. THE COURT: We're in recess. (Recess taken.)
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| $\left[\begin{array}{ll}\text { 43:18 44:3 116:3 118:24 } \\ \text { Better }\end{array}\right.$ | [4] 43:4 47:3 106:8 113:1 | [1] 111:24 | Charge |
| Better <br> [8] 9:12 10:21 22:18 24:15 | Bring | Captain | [1] 129:19 |
| 19:18 89:2 103:9 125:10 | [3] 69:19 76:17 77:10 | [2] 4:25 116:19 | Check |
| Between | Brings | Car | (21 70:24 119:24 |
| [5] 32:9 44:17 44:20 47:21 | (2) 13:1 32:25 | [4] 20:20 28:14 41:11 54:21 | Checklist |
| 49:9 | Broken | Card | 111 39:19 |
| Beyond | [2] 19:14 29:15 | [3] 87:13 90:17 91:1 | Chicago |
| (7) 7:2 70:9 82:11 84:8 100: | Brooks | Cards | (2) 4:21 12:18 |
| 23 102:25 177:4 | [29] 1:21 56:7 $57: 9$ 58:2 65: | [2] 38:4 90:16 | Child |
| Eig | $12 \quad 65: 14$ 67:17 68:1 $68: 6 \quad 72$ : | Care | [10] $13: 1313: 1413: 1513: 22$ |
| [21 37:14 91:24 | 7 72:12 72:15 72:21 72:24 74: | (6) 18:18 36:8 39:17 45:9 78: | 14:2 14:4 15:25 30:10 $36: 17$ |
| Biological | 13 76:3 76:5 76:10 77:6 78: | 5 113:22 | 126:19 |
| [7] 27:9 33:4 33:7 36:21 37: | 21 78:23 82:4 86:9 94:5 97: | Career | Childhood |
| $437: 10$ 37:25 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 25 98:1 112:12 112:13 114:1 | [1] 108:16 | [8] 13:15 17:18 18:25 19:6 |
| Bixth | Brooks's | Caring | 33:5 35:16 86:1 123:2 |
| (11) 87:13 | [1] 114:13 | [2] 13:19 33:4 | Childhoods |
| Bit | Brother | Carolina | [1] 123:3 |
| (8) 9:12 29:20 60:25 77:11 | [13] 19:19 19:19 26:9 29:11 | [1] 42:13 | Children |
| 98:4 98:5 98:6 106:19 | $\begin{array}{llll} 43: 10 & 43: 18 & 45: 9 & 45: 10 \\ 64: 4 \\ 67: 13 & 93: 17 & 95: 20 & 96: 4 \end{array}$ | Carried | (6] 16:14 35:23 35:23 44:6 |
| Black | Brothers | [3] 46:22 47:2 124:13 | $45: 11 \quad 45: 14$ <br> Children's |
| [1] 67:22 | [1] 62:14 | Case | Children's <br> [1] $45: 14$ |
| Elame | Brought | [46] 1:5 7:87:17 7:21 8:13 | Choice |
| [1] 93:18 | (3) 14:25 74:23 87: 15 |  | [6] 12:9 93:21 93:21 93:23 |
| Blank | Erutally | 65:2 66:20 69:11 69:18 71:14 71:23 72:15 74:21 75:25 76:7 | 93:23 93:25 |
| [1] 120:3 | [2] 95:2 95:4 | 76:15 79:20 83:14 83:22 $93: 8$ | Choices |
| Blathering | Budd | 96:20 101:4 101:24 103:6 103: | $[3] 12: 613: 1122: 9$ |
| [1] 114:4 | [79] 1:6 2:6 3:5 7:21 7:25 8: | 25 106:17 107:13 108:5 109: | Choose |
| \#lew | $18: 4$ 8:9 8:24 14:11 15:22 | 22 110:1 111:20 111:24 116:1 | [9] 112:25 114:9 114:24 115: |
| [1] 128:15 | 15:25 16:17 17:11 17:20 17: | 119:7 119:9 119:13 121:5 126: | 11 116:5 116:6 116:11 116:15 |
| Elood | 22 18:5 18:12 22:19 26:20 28: | 7 129:2 129:4 129:7 | $118: 14$ |
| (1) 127:16 | $\begin{array}{llll}15 & 31: 12 & 32: 5 & 32: 10 \\ 18 & 43: 20 & 44: 2 & 44: 7 \\ 44: 12 & 43:\end{array}$ | Cases | Chose |
| Elow | $\begin{array}{lllll}16 & 43: 20 & 44: 2 & 44: 7 & 44: 12 \\ 18 & 44: 20 & 44: 21 & 44: 25 \quad 45: 9 & 45:\end{array}$ |  | [2] 59:8 88:13 |
| [2] 29:7 128:21 | 11 $46: 4$ 46:16 $46: 18$ 46:20 46 : |  | Circumstance |
| Rlue | 21 46:23 46:25 47:2 49:21 50: |  | [46] 66:20 67:2 69:25 70:3 |
| [2] 15:21 15:23 | 4 50:17 50:22 50:23 51:10 55: | (1) $40: 15$ | 70:9 70:13 70:19 71:15 71:22 |
| Blues | $958: 3$ 58:5 59:7 60:10 60:14 | Categories | 72:11 82:11 82:14 82:22 83:3 |
| (1) 128:15 | 60:20 61:20 64:13 74:16 75:8 | (2) 85:8 86:11 | B3:4 83:7 83:22 84:888:10 |
| Board | 75:9 75:14 76:18 76:21 77:9 | Category | 94:21 96:14 100:25 101:5 101: |
| 111.5:17 | 79:9 80:2 80:3 80:24 81:4 91: $9999: 89: 15107: 25 \quad 109: 4$ | [1] 109:10 | 12 102:13 $103: 21 \quad 105: 6106: 4$ $108: 25 \quad 112: 23: 113: 2: 14: 10$ |
| Bodies | 109:17 109:20 109:25 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Catholic } \\ & {[1] \quad 4: 19} \end{aligned}$ | 119:6 119:12 frat ${ }^{\text {dita }}$ ? |


| $\begin{aligned} & 121: 4121: 14121: 23122: 2 \\ & 122: 13 \quad 122: 14 \quad 122: 19 \quad 122: 20 \end{aligned}$ | Comfortable <br> (2) $58: 6$ 60:14 | Confident <br> [1] 111:7 | Converge <br> [1] $12: 13$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 123:2 125:5 | Coming | Confine | Conversely |
| $\text { (66) } 11: 12 \quad 60: 5 \quad 64: 21 \quad 66: 14$ | [7] 10:24 43:9 76:22 92:3 97: | [1] 94:12 | (1] 22:8 |
| 66:15 $66: 22 \quad 67: 1 \quad 67: 25 \quad 68: 16$ | 3 99:27 99:23 | Confinement | Convicted. |
| 68:24 69:2 69:3 69:4 69:5 70: | Commentary | [1] 115:3 | [7] 65:25 83:25 84:9 101:7 |
| 1 70:5 70:12 70:22 71:16 71: | [1] 56:20 | Confirmed | 106:11 119:13 124:2 |
| 19 72:20 73:16 74:1 82:15 82: | Commission | [5] 44:11 46:6 46:15 46:20 | Conviction |
| 20 82:23 83:2 83:6 83:17 84: | [1] 68:18 | 46:23 | [1] 71:3 |
| $\begin{array}{ll}15 & 84: 23 \\ 13 & 84: 20 \\ 13 & 96: 12 \\ 895: 86: 13 & 85: 24 \\ 98: 19\end{array}$ | Commit | Confirming | Convictions |
|  | [3] $10: 13$ 14:5 92:17 | (1) 45:23 | [1] 108:16 |
| 101:24 102:4 102:18 103:16 | Commits | Conflict | Coordination |
| 103:17 104:17 104:18 104:24 | [1] 96:17 | [1] 13:23 | [1] 22:21 |
| 104:25 107:4 107:5 107:17 | Committed | Confused | Cords |
| 108:24 111:24 115:22 120:1 | (7) 10:3 10:6 10:25 67:6 83; | (1) 128:14 | (1) 29:16 |
| 121:13 121:22 122:3 122:24 | 23 85:21 109:8 |  |  |
| 123:12 123:14 | Committing | Contusion | Corner |
| City | Committing <br> (11 91:15 | [1] 71:10 | (2) 127:14 127:16 |
| [1] 17:14 |  | Congra | Co |
| Civil. | Commo | (2) 90:3 90:3 | [27] 7:16 49:22 49:24 50: |
| (1) $24: 4$ | [3] 15:7 45:11 69:20 | Congratulations | 50:8 51:3 51:4 51:8 52:22 52: |
| claxk | Commonality | [1] 90:5 | 24 53:14 53:15 53:17 53:22, |
| [2] 1;1 42:18 | [1] 10:11 | Connected | 53:24 58:12 64:15 64:23 65: |
| Class | Community | [1] $30: 17$ | 25 79:23 86:9 94:11 |
| (1] 25:19 | (6) 12:12 15:5 15:10 16:23 | Conscience | Correctly |
| Cleaned |  | (3) 39:17 117:13 117:16 | [1] 52:4 |
| [11 42:25 | Compare $39.13 \quad 39.1849 .17$ | Consequences | Corridor |
| Clear | [4] 21:24 39:13 $39: 18$ 49:17 | [2] 41:21 128:8 | [1] 79:1 |
| [17] 49:19 57:10 57:23 58:23 | Compared | Consider | Cost/benefit |
| 59:19 61:15 61:16 74:25 90: | I | [29] 22:9 66:7 66:12 66:17 | [1] 41:5 |
| 13 94:7 108:1 108:4 10B:6 | Competency | 68:22 69:12 69:14 69:17 70: | Counsel |
| 108:10 108:11 108:14 108:24 | (1) 5:22 | 25 75:15 84:22 94:3 94:22 | Counsel 60.1360 .2161 .163 , |
| Clearly | Complementary | 101:3 101:21 102:14 102:15 | (12] 3:6 60:13 60:21 61:1 63: $670: 16 \quad 74: 22 \quad 75: 17 \quad 79: 10 \quad 98: 1$ |
| [3] 7:4 26:20 102:12 | [1] $46: 14$ | 102:17 102:18 102:21 103:3 | $2128: 25 \quad 129: 2$ |
| Clerk | Complete | 107:21 112:11 114:16 114:20 <br> 123:4 124:5 125:5 128:9 | Counseling |
| (6) 3:17 3:25 4:2 129:18 129: | [2] 65:20 102:11 | Considerable | [1] 78:5 |
| 22 129:24 | Completed | [6] 55:9 60:19 65:5 87:10 89: | Counsels |
| Client | [5] 4:16 18:20 39:7 45:1 74:3 | $393: 12$ | [1] 91:10 |
| [2] 103:7 105:2 | Completely |  | Count |
| cliff | (1) 107:19 | (3) 69:19 106:25 110:2 | (14] 70:7 71:2 71:4 71:6 71: |
| (1] 114:18 | Complicated | [3] 69:19 106:25 110:2 Considered | $\begin{array}{llll}13 & 73: 8 & 73: 12 & 73: 15 \\ 73: 17 & 73:\end{array}$ |
| Clinging | [31 98:13 105:20 120:17 | 16) $22: 5$ 68:19 84:18 94:8 | 21 73:24 111:2 119:14 122:7 |
| (1) 127:3 | Comprehend | 102:24 104:7 | Country |
| Clinical. | [2] $25: 7$ | Considering | (6) 16:10 17:15 35:9 36:4 87: |
| (2) 4:14 40:3 | Comprehension | (3) 84:14 108:17 116:25 | 129713 |
| Clip | [1] 24:25 | Considers | Counts |
| (1) 92:8 | Comprehensive | [1] 94:9 | (5] 70:15 72:2 B4:4 106:12 |
| Close | [1] 6:25 | (1) 94:9 | 120:15 |
| $[6]$ 44:5 46:12 57:5 79:16 96: | Compromise | (1) B:1 | County |
| $6127: 10$ Closad | (2) 68:4 68:12 | Consistency | [3] 1:1 42:18 128:14 |
|  | Concede | (2) 14:16 38:13 | Couple |
| Clothes | [1] 85:9 | Consistent | [2] 64:25 85:9 |
| (1) $20: 19$ | Concentrate | [1] 35:20 | Course |
| Cocaine | [2] 98:7 118:25 | Consistently | $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { (12) } & 54: 19 & 56: 9 & 61: 24 & 61: 25 \\ 63: 6 & 70: 19 & 74: 1 & 91: 21 & 98: 20\end{array}$ |
| (3) 20:4 33:7 36:21 | Concepts | [1] 34:1 | ```63:6 70:19 74:1 91:21 98:20 110:6 117:25 127:7``` |
| Cognitive | [1] 43:22 | Constant | Court |
| [5] 8:10 12:12 40:9 42:6 42: | Conceptualization | (1) 17:22 | [107] 1:1 3:3 3:11 4:11 6:11 |
| 10 (10 | [1] 14:9 | Constitute | 7:13 9:9 40:11 42:14 48:13 |
| Coin | Conceptualize | [2] 67:3 68:17 | 56:1 56:3 56:6 56:9 56:12 56: |
| (2) 129:12 129:13 | (1) 14:9 | Contact | 14 57:3 57:13 57:16 57:22 50: |
| Cold-blooded | Concern | [2] 20:2 27:8 | 2 58:6 58:10 58:14 59:2 59:5 |
| [1] 97:12 | [1] 60:12 | Context | 59:10 60:3 60:9 60:19 60:21 |
| Collapsed | Concerned | (4) 36:3 112:2 1 | 60:23 61:10 61:16 61:20 62: |
| (1) 127:11 | ${ }^{(2]} 61: 25 \quad 63: 2$ | Continuation | 19 62:22 62:25 63:16 63:21 <br> 64:12 64:17 65:3 65:7 65:11 |
| Collateral | Concerning | [4] 27:18 27:23 28:6 89:9 | 65:16 65:19 67:18 67:21 68:7 |
| [11] 6:20 8:8 8:21 29:13 33: | [1] 66:6 | Continue | 68:10 68:15 69:23 70:4 71:9 |
| 17 34:2 34:6 35:21 39:10 40: | Conclude | (3) 60:4 68:2 128:10 | 71:10 72:1 72:7 72:19 72:22 |
| ${ }^{3}$ 47:9 | (1) 107:3 | Continued | 72:25 73:7 74:6 74:974:14 |
| Collaterals | Conclusion | Continued | 74:22 75:1 75:8 75:13 76:3 |
| [1] 47:23 |  | (1) 39:2 | 76:7 76:12 76:16 76:21 77:9 |
| Colleague's | (3) 10:7 104:16 108:13 | Continues | 77:20 77:24 78:4 78:8 78:13 |
| [1] 124:23 | Conditions | (6) 26:13 28:4 28:10 32:22 | 78:19 78:21 78:24 79:5 79:7 |
| Colleagues | (1) 16:24 | 41:7 45:3 | 79:15 80:1 80:3 80:24 81:3 |
| [1] 9:21 | Condone | Continuing | 81:8 81:12 81:16 81:17 81:20 |
| Collect | [1] 53:2 | (1) 127:14 | $\begin{array}{lllllll}94: 11 & 94: 14 & 97: 24 & 98: 1 & 110: 3 \\ 110: 6 & 118: 15 & 120: 1 & 129: 14\end{array}$ |
| [1] 130:1 | Conduct | Contradicts | 129:21 129:25 130:7 |
| Collaction | (3) 6:17 6:19 41:20 | [1] 91:6 | Court's |
| [1] 54:23 | Conducted | Control | [4] 56:8 68:6 68:12 110:5 |
| Combine | (4) 6:6 8:7 47:8 47:9 | (3) 12:8 13:21 43:14 | Courtroom |
| [1] 22:23 | Conference | Controlling | [8] 57:2 61:13 61:19 74:15 |
| Combined | [1] 60:22 | [1] 41:20 | 79:6 124:23 129:16 130:3 |
| [1] 108:19 | Confidence | Controls | Courts |
| [1] 10.19 | [1] 49:6 | [1] 69:4 | $116: 7 \quad 4 y$ |



| Drifferent | [2] 33:6 43:11 | [1] 84:6 | [1] 79:6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (21) 10:10 11:20 12:16 12:20 | Done | Easy | Enterprise |
| $\begin{array}{lllllll}12: 21 & 16: 9 & 16: 14 & 27: 5 & 33: 22\end{array}$ | [10] 17:10 71:9 96:23 103:9 | (3) 13:18 84:2 120:12 | [2] 55:10 55:12 |
| $35: 9 \quad 36: 4 \quad 36: 12 \quad 37: 22 \quad 37: 23$ | 105:11 113:9 118:7 122:6 122: | Economic | Entirety |
| 48:20 54:9 58:11 61:21 92:19 | 9 128:5 | [6] 51:24 54:5 55:22 97:12 | [I] 66:23 |
| 101:19 102:17 | Door | 97:14 127:22 | Entitled |
| Differently | [1] 42:25 | Economics | (2] 103:2 125:0 |
| [1] 12:25 | Dope | [11] 34:17 | Envies |
| Difficult | [1] 128:2 | Eddie | [1] 118:23 |
| [7] $96: 9$ 96:9 98:13 $98: 16$ $110: 19112: 3112: 24$ | Dorsey | [3] 44:3 45:25 64:5 | Environment |
|  | (1) 27:20 | Edition | [2] 12:20 36:13 |
| Difficulties [8] 19:1 21:15 23:22 24:13 | Doubt | [1] 39:20 | Equates |
| [8] 19:1 21:15 23:22 24:13 $86: 22 \quad 86: 23 \quad 87: 8 \quad 102: 19$ | (9) 69:9 70:10 82:12 84:9 93: | Education | $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { [2] } & 11: 14 & 12: 2\end{array}$ |
| Difficulty | 12 100:24 101:25 117:2 117:4 | [4] 4:16 28:4 34:6 45:1 | Equation |
| [1] 23:19 | Down | Educational | [1] 104:2 |
| Diminished | $\begin{array}{llll}\text { [12] } & 14: 7 & 22: 22 & 27: 17 \\ 56: 4 & 64: 8 & 95: 14 & 103: 6 \\ 103\end{array}$ | [3] 21:16 28:5 43:22 | Equivalent |
| [12] 67:10 88:17 91:7 91:18 | 115:25 127:1 128:11 | EDWARD | [1] 12:6 |
| 93:6 94:24 95:3 113:2 113:5 | Dr | [1] 1:17 | Error |
| 113:19 114:2 114:7 | (81 2:2 3:14 3:15 54:18 76: | Effect | [1] 49:1 |
| DIRECT | 25 77:17 112:4 113:20 | [10] 65:1 68:22 84:14 84:21 | Errors |
| (2) 4:7 60:7 | Draw | 112:11 114:17 114:20 124:5 | [1] 73:6 |
| Direction | [1] 89:10 | 124:5 124:12 | Escalated |
| (3) 35:1 65:23 127:13 | Dread | Effe | [1] 50:15 |
| Directions | [1] 90:10 | (1) 41:6 | Escapes |
| [1] 27:5 | Drink | Eight 20.2030. | [2] 42:21 43:2 |
| Directiy | [1] 103:12 | [9] 5:10 $22: 22$ 30:12 $30: 14$ | ESQ |
| (1] 78:6 | Drive | Eighth | (4) $1: 17 \quad 1: 191: 21 \quad 1: 22$ |
| Dirty | (1] 30:22 | (10) 21:14 24:18 24:20 24:23 | Essentially |
| 111 18:1 | Drive-by | 24:24 25:16 26:3 26:5 27:6 | [2] 58:4 105:25 |
| Disagree | [1] $30: 22$ | 39:12 | Esteem |
| [1] 103:20 | Driver | Eighty | (1) 46:5 |
| Discharge | [1] 29:5 | [1] 22:10 | Esten |
| (1) 5:6 | Dropped | Either | [1] 115:8 |
| Discipline | (2) 31:12 45:19 | [7] 8:7 24:6 49:1 58:1 100:9 | Estimation |
| [2] 35:20 123:18 | Dropping | 105:3 129:5 | (1) 68:19 |
| Discouraged | [2] 16:18 29:2 | Elected |  |
| [1] 36:20 | Drove | (2) 59:13 81:5 | [2] 18:4 18:4 |
| Discourages | [1] 102:23 | Electricity | Evaluate |
| [1] 13:25 | Drug | [1] 29:15 | [2] 7:21 7:25 |
| Discover | [15] 13:11 13:12 13:13 13:25 | Elementary | Evaluated |
| [2] 15:24 17:3 | 14:12 14:19 14:21 36:23 38: | [1] 12:5 | [2] 8:1 8:4 |
| Discovered | 18 38:24 54:6 54:20 55:10 55: | Eligible | Evaluation |
| (1) 15:6 | 11 97:15 | [3] 66:4 83:7 83:9 | (4] 6:14 6:15 6:25 8:18 |
| Discovery | Drugs | Embarrassed | Evaluations |
| [4] 6:17 8:13 8:15 8:20 | [9] 21:5 26:4 33:9 36:19 37: | [1] 43:20 | [4] 5:22 6:7 6:19 7:5 |
| Discuss | 25 87:21 88:13 95:13 102:24 | Emily | Eventually |
| [7] 10:18 16:15 56:18 69:14 | (1) 29:5 | [2] 26:17 47:9 | [3] 19:10 20:4 29:8 |
| 102:2 104:13 106:19 | (1) 29:5 Dry | Emotional | Everyday |
| Discussed |  | (3) 45:4 67:8085:22 | [11 69:20 |
| [4] 59:16 106:18 120:1 123:6 | Ds 103:11 | Emotionally | Evicted |
| Discussing |  | [1] 45:6 | [6] 30:7 30:14 31:3 31:10 46: |
| [1] 60:19 | [2) 22:10 | Emphasize | 18 86:6 |
| Discussion | Dudley | [3] 49:15 49:16 104:21 | Evidence |
| (1) 87:11 | [3) 44:3 | Employed | [46] 39:8 42:14 43:14 66:5 |
| Disintegration | Dudleys' | [1] 50:23 | 66:13 66:13 66:14 66:16 66: |
| [3] 46:7 46:15 102:20 | [1] 44:8 | End | 17 69:8 69:12 69:18 69:19 69: |
| Disorder | Duly | [4] 10: | 22 86:4 86:19 88:9 88:15 94: |
| [3] $14: 13 \quad 14: 18 \quad 38: 19$ | [1] 3:20 | Ending | B 94:10 98:6 101:2 101:3 101: |
| Disorders | During | [3] 82:18 107:2 107:2 | 21 102:14 102:15 102:19 104: <br> 15 105:7 105:8 105:9 105:10 |
| [2] 11:19 37:20 | [15] 11:25 17:22 20:5 24:4 | Ends | 111:21 112:1 112:12 112:16 |
| Disorganization | $\begin{array}{lllllll}28: 11 & 28: 17 & 33: 7 & 35: 18 & 36: 9 \\ 44: 19 & 56: 17 & 69: 21 & 85: 6 & 107\end{array}$ | (5) 26:10 27:10 27:11 28:22 | 112:17 113:4 113:4 113:8 113: |
| (1) 17:1 | $13107: 21$ | $29: 2$ | 19 114:6 114:7 114:17 121:9 |
| Display | Duty | Engage | 125:14 |
| [1] $46: 22$ | [4] 56:18 65:21 111:23 125:23 | (1) $51: 19$ | Evolved |
| Dispute | Dying | Engaged | [1] 10:22 |
| [1] 86:21 | [1] 87:6 | [2] 39:11 96:1 | EX |
| Disregard | E | Engaging | [2] 6:22 6:22 Ex-girl friend |
| [1] 60:4 |  | [1] 15:14 | Ex-girlfriend |
| District | Earl | English | [1] 43:13 <br> Ex-girlfriends |
| $\begin{array}{llllll} {[6]} & 1: 1 & 1: 18 & 1: 19 & 6: 8 & 7: 15 \\ 59: 14 \end{array}$ | [1] 86:24 | (1) 19:15 | Ex-girlfriends <br> [1] 6:22 |
| Disturbance |  | Enjoy | Ex-wives |
| (2) 67:8 85:23 | $\begin{array}{llll} {[71} & 15: 16 & 28: 18 & 32: 19 \\ 40: 6 & 40: 24: 5 & 41: B \end{array}$ | (1) 126:20 | (1) 6:22 |
| Diverse | Earned |  | Exact |
| [1] 11:16 | [4] 50:18 81:23 97:22 129:8 | Enormity | [1] 73:9 |
| Doctor | Earning | $\text { [1] } 117: 21$ | Exactiy |
| 1141 4:9 4:13 5:2 48:11 48: | [2] 55:9 88:7 | Enormously | [3] 66:3 99:16 122:8 |
| $1850: 1052: 17 \quad 53: 1154: 11$ | Earth | [1] 104:5 | Examination |
| 56:3 76:25 78:6 78:9 78:15 | [4] 126:3 126:21 127:3 128:16 |  | 171 4:7 54:15 59:11 75:19 80: |
| Doctorate | Easier | Enter | $781: 787: 25$ \% |
| [2] 4:20 5:1 | (3) 24:2 24:10 27:25 | [1] 114:12 | Examine |
| Domestic | Easiest | Entered | [1] 125:14 Of1]996 |


| Examined <br> (2) 3:22 59:14 <br> Example <br> [4] 24:2 45:5 99:25 100:2 <br> Excellent <br> [1] 65:11 <br> Exception <br> [1] 19:7 <br> Exceptionally <br> (1] 44:21 <br> Excessively <br> [1] $45: 6$ <br> Excitement <br> [1] 127: 21 <br> Excuse <br> [3] 68:18 99:10 £11:25 <br> Excused <br> [1] 129:16 <br> Excuses <br> [1] 84:17 <br> Execute <br> [1] 118:23 <br> Execution <br> (5) 67:12 67:23 93:10 124:13 <br> 126:18 <br> Executor <br> [1] 41;5 <br> Wxercise <br> (2] 59:13 81:5 <br> Exhibit <br> (3] 11:12 21:15 89:18 <br> Exhibiting <br> (1) 25:20 <br> mxinibits <br> [1] 69:22 <br> Exist <br> [12] 69:6 71:22 62:11 82:14 <br> 82:15 86:14 93:8 94:18 101: <br> 23 102:4 120:2 121:4 <br> Existence <br> [5] 66:13 65:15 70:8 72:11 <br> 100:24 <br> Exists <br> [1] 82:23 <br> Exited <br> (2] 57:2 61:19 <br> zxpect <br> (2) 20:7 $34: 14$ <br> Expelled <br> [2] 27:12 27:17 <br> Expensive <br> 111 54:23 <br> Experience <br> [2] 5:7 5:8 <br> Experienced <br> (1] 102:22 <br> Experiencing <br> [1] 35:4 <br> Expertioe <br> [1] 73:1 <br> Explain <br> [10] 33:15 80:22 84:15 99:16 <br> 100:19 116:13 118:25 119:2 <br> 122:21 124:11 <br> Explained <br> [7] 58:3 58:7 75:10 75:17 98: <br> 10113:21 113:21 <br> Explanation <br> [2] 54:8 75:11 <br> Explore <br> (1) 14:22 <br> Expose <br> [1] 126:21 <br> Exposed <br> [1] 15: 6 <br> Exposure <br> (2) 17:3 24:14 <br> Express <br> (3) $25: 656: 22 \quad 89: 13$ <br> Expressed <br> 111 44:25 <br> Expressing | [1] $80: 18$ <br> Expreasions <br> (1) $59: 24$ <br> Extended <br> [1] 19:23 <br> Extension <br> (1) 29:16 <br> Extensively <br> (1) 8:18 <br> Extent <br> [1] 77:3 <br> Extonuate <br> [1) $86: 17$ <br> Extenuating <br> (2) 68:20 84;18 <br> Exterminated <br> (1) 112:9 <br> Extormination <br> [1] 126:23 <br> Extreme <br> [3] 38:5 67:7 85:22 <br> Extremely <br> [1] 96:9 <br> EYe <br> [1] 22:21 <br> Eyes <br> (1) 118:12 $\bar{F}$ <br> Face <br> (8) 3:17 11:8 62:11 95:18 <br> 109:12 126:3 126:21 128:15 <br> Faced <br> (1) 16:12 <br> Faceless <br> [1] 95:20 <br> Fact <br> [25] 47:21 50:17 50:21 51:20 <br> 53:3 55:14 65:5 75:11 75:24 <br> 78:13 89:13 94:23 95:6 95:12 <br> 97:19 101:11 102:7 102:16 <br> 103:1 103:6 105:24 114:8 123: <br> 9 124:20 129:22 <br> Factor <br> [1] 66:19 <br> Factors <br> [27] 10:23 12:12 13:6 13:7 <br> 14:6 14:6 15:3 15:6 15:8 15: <br> 13 15:20 16:14 16:16 16:20 <br> 16:23 17:5 17:8 35:3 38:22 <br> 38:23 51:14 53:13 68:16 84: <br> 16 86:15 94:16 94:25 <br> Facts <br> (11) 111:24 <br> Failed <br> [1] 73:4 <br> Eailure <br> [1] $16: 17$ <br> Eair <br> (1] 78:11 <br> Fairly <br> [5] 12:17 14:3 27:22 32:18 <br> 36:15 <br> Faimness <br> (1) $68: 20$ <br> Eaked <br> [1] 124:19 <br> Falling <br> [2] 29:18 49:13 <br> Falls <br> [2] 22:22 85:18 <br> Families <br> [8] $30: 18$ 30:18 94:4 115:14 <br> 115:15 115:17 115:20 116:2 <br> Family <br> (921 6:22 8:8 12:20 13:2 13: <br> 5 13:15 13:24 14:11 14:12 14: <br> 17 15:4 15:20 16:1 16:7 17: <br> 11 17:16 17:24 17:25 18:4 18: <br> 17 21:4 21:12 26:11 27:9 29: <br> 7 29:22 30:2 30:4 30:6 33:11 <br> $\begin{array}{llll}34: 8 & 34: 17 & 36: 3 & 36: 14 \\ 36: 23\end{array}$ <br> 37:3 37:21 38:5 38:6 38:13 <br> $\begin{array}{lllll}38: 17 & 43: 25 & 43: 25 & 44: 4 & 44: 8 \\ 44: 14 & 44: 22 & 44: 22 & 45: 4 & 46: 3\end{array}$ $\qquad$ |  | (1] 123:21 Firm <br> (2) $72: 3$ 72:8 <br> Firmer <br> [1] 34:11 <br> First <br> (40) 3:20 9:5 18:14 18:20 19: 20 23:17 23:24 28:21 30:20 57:11 64:20 65:21 65:25 66: 21 66:25 71:14 75:12 78:2 日2: 7 84:1 84:3 84:12 85:10 100: 20 100:22 101:13 101:20 106: 10 106:12 111:22 113:5 114: 13 117:19 118:18 119:17 121: 1 121:9 124:1 128:2 129:22 <br> Fit <br> (6] 19:16 85:7 86:8 86:10 97: 4 127:21 <br> Fits <br> [2] 42:4 50:1 <br> Five <br> [11] 14:24 15:14 30:5 66:1 <br> 67:11 70:10 70:23 93:11 94:2 <br> 115:22 122:11 <br> Five-time <br> [1] 15:14 <br> Fi.x <br> (2) 65:24 66:1 <br> Fixing <br> (1) $70: 14$ <br> Fled <br> [1] 126:25 <br> Flee <br> [1] 95:10 <br> Floor <br> [1] 128:18 <br> Fly <br> (1] 91:23 <br> Focus <br> (4) $9: 282: 784: 984: 11$ <br> Focused <br> [1] $34: 3$ <br> Follow <br> (2) 82:3 98:14 <br> Eollowing <br> (5) 64:21 66:19 66:22 67:1 <br> 70:17 <br> Follows <br> [1] 3:23 <br> Food <br> (14) 29:13 55:15 86:7 110:13 <br> Force <br> [4] 4:23 4:24 4:25 5:4 <br> Ford <br> (1) 51:10 <br> Forensic <br> (7) 5:11 5:18 6:6 6:13 6:15 6:24 7:5 <br> Foreperson <br> [1] 76:24 <br> Forgive <br> [4] 98:14 103:11 111:14 113: <br> Forgotten <br> (2) 111:16 111:17 <br> Form <br> (19) 12:1 23:20 25:6 51:9 56: <br> 22 71:1 71:14 71:17 72:3 72: <br> 9 73:24 103:4 119:11 121:6 <br> 121:18 121:24 122:12 122:13 125:20 <br> Formal <br> 11) $57: 20$ <br> Formally <br> (2) 75:1 76:8 <br> Formation <br> [1] 41:24 <br> Formative <br> (2) 13:16 40:6 <br> Formed <br> [1] 10:24 <br> Forms <br> $[6]$ 70:6 70:11 71:13 118:19 <br> 120:16 122:11 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


| Forth | [1] 91:1 | (1) 31:14 | 87:16 87:20 87:25 88:988:15 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (3) 5:15 34:20 111:23 | Gil1 | Group | 88:18 90:21 97:13 112:22 113: |
| Fortunate | [9] 20:21 30:9 33:17 34:744 | [10] 10:8 10:17 21:25 22:16 |  |
| [1] $26: 16$ | 6 44:6 44:18 $45: 5$ 45:13 | 30:16 43:24 93:11 100:13 101: |  |
| Forward | Girlfriend | 1 102:1 | Hearing <br> [3] $66.5 \quad 99.18 \quad 118.22$ |
| (3) 21:17 76:22 94:14 | (1) 31:21 | Grove | (3] 66:5 99:18 116:22 Heart |
| Four | Girlfriends | [1 | (2) 63:14 64:6 |
| [19] $18: 9 \quad 35: 7 \quad 35: 10 \quad 44: 19$ | [3] 6:22 | Growing | Heat |
| $50: 13$ $66: 1$ $67: 10$ $70: 23$ <br> $82: 9$ $73: 13$ $88: 16$ $88: 16$ <br> $182: 10$    | Gixsls ${ }_{\text {[4] } 28: 13} 29: 21$ 31:17 43:1 | Guarantee | [2] 97:10 128:6 |
| 82:9 93:6 95:11 17 105:15 121:18 128: | Given | [1] 118:9 | Heavy |
| 17 | [15] 24:20 61:6 109:17 118: | Guess | (1] 104:8 |
| Four-step | $20 \quad 119: 3$ 119:5 120:14 120:16 | [3] $21: 2$ 48:9 52:8 | Heinous |
| (1) $82: 9$ | 120:18 121:12 121:24 122:4 | Guidance | (1) 12:10 |
| Fourth | 122:7 123:7 124:10 | [1] 38: | Help |
| [1] 23:11 | Glass | Guide | [13] 7:18 13:22 21:23 32:9 |
| Franklin | (3] 45:21 46:9 46:23 | [2] 13:3 63:6 | 34:23 37:12,98:17 99:6 99:7 |
| (1) 24:7 | Glen | Guides | 99:12 107:11 110:17 110: |
| Erankly | [9] 20:12 21:15 29:10 29:19 | [1] 53:4 | Helped |
| 161 60:12 75:15 79:17 89:18 | $34: 22$ Glen's 3 | Guiding | $\text { [2] } 11: 22 \quad 45: 10$ |
| 109:16 119:9 | Glen's <br> (6) $20: 24 \quad 33: 5 \quad 33: 8 \quad 33: 10 \quad 36:$ | [2] 13:19 33:4 | Helping $\text { [2] } 20: 1353: 5$ |
| Free | [6] 20:24 $33: 5 \quad 33: 8 \quad 33: 10 \quad 36$ : $845: 8$ | Guilt | [2] 2日:13 53:5 Helps |
| [4] 9:13 53:24 59:10 83:13 | Glenford | [5] 58:11 60:1 69:14 72:2 75: | $\text { (6] } 28: 24 \quad 28: 24 \quad 29: 10 \quad 29: 11$ |
| Freeciom | (33) 1:6 2:6 49:21 51:24 54: |  | 37:3 122:21 |
| [1] 127:10 | $1980: 2$ 80:9 80:21 99:8 99: | Guilty | Hensley |
| Friend | 15 101:6 102:7 106:12 107:25 | 121 84:3 111:18 | [1] 43:14 |
| (5) $36: 8$ 44:3 46:12 96:22 97: | 108:5 108:22 109:4 109:17 | Guise | Heredity |
| Friand's | 109:20 109:25 111:10 111:18 <br> 112:6 112:7 112:9 113:7 113: | (1) 127:24 | [1] 13:15 |
| Friend's | $\begin{aligned} & 112: 6112: 7 \times 12: 9113: 7113: \\ & 16 \text { 114:2 } 114: 7114: 22 \quad 114: 25 \end{aligned}$ | Gun | Herself |
| [3] 28:22 28:24 31:18 | 117:4 117:6 | (6) 92:2 92:3 92:5 92:7 92:9 | [1] 77:11 |
| Friends | Glenford's | 92:12 | Hesitant |
| $\left\lvert\, \begin{array}{cccc} 11418: 9 & 13: 24 & 18: 3 & 21: 3 \\ 3 & 21: \\ 30: 17 & 30: 25 & 37: 15 & 43: 18 \end{array} 46\right.:$ | (5) 99:1 102:11 111:8 111:25 | Gunning | [1] 21:1 |
| $11950: 6 \quad 62: 9 \quad 67: 24 \quad 93: 16$ |  |  | Heterogenous |
| Friendship |  | (12] 9:24 10:2 12:18 20:11 | [2] 10:8 10:16 |
| (1) 127: | 11 it | 23:19 25:9 37:6 37:7 45:25 | Hide |
| Frightening | Goal. | 48:19 48:21 49:71 | (2) 92:3 92:19 |
| (1) 63:5 |  | Gu | High |
| Front | (1) 77:13 | [5] 46:13 46:19 54:5 98:11 | $\begin{array}{lllllll}\text { [13] } & 16: 18 & 21: 19 & 26: 15 & 26: 16 \\ 27: 20 & 27: 23 & 28: 20 & 40: 1 & 41: 12\end{array}$ |
| (2) 65:10 127:2 | (I) 77:13 <br> Governed | 128:1 | $27: 20$ $27: 23$ $28: 20$ $40: 1$ <br> $43: 19$ $44: 19$ $47: 12$ $128: 13$ |
| Frontal | (2) 98:22 | H | Higher |
|  | Graces | Haiz: | (0) 5:21 6:10 13:13 14:2 25: |
| Fa | [1 | (3) 90:7 90:7 90: | 3 25:14 38:17 38:23 |
| [1] 28:20 | Grade | Half | Highlighted |
| Fueled | (17) 18:20 21:6 21:8 21:14 | [5] 11:24 15:16 19:19 42:19 | (4) 15:21 15:23 17:10 43:7 |
| (1) 110:12 | 23:7 23:10 23:11 24:19 24:19 | 113:17 | Highly |
| Full | 24:21 25:16 26:3 26:5 26:6 | Hallway | [1] 42:16 |
| $\left(\begin{array}{llll}\text { (4) } & 22: 23 & 49: 7 & 66: 10 \quad 130: 10\end{array}\right.$ | 27:7 39:13 120:7 | [1] 127:1 | Hightlighted |
| Full-page | GI | Hand | [1] 38:20 |
| (1) 66:10 | (1) 24:2 | [3] 3:16 22:21 121:21 | Himself |
| Fully | Grades | Handle | (7) 25:6 46:25 47:3 89:13 90: |
| [1] 56:23 | [3] 21:8 28:6 88:25 | (1) 91:24 | 19 95:5 97:14 |
| Future | Grandmother | Hang | Hixed |
| [4] 64:3 75:7 104:7 109:16 | [6] 18:13 18:16 19:4 35:16 | (2) 16:20 29:21 | (2) 6:1 9:20 |
| G | Grandson | Fanging | History |
| Gadeau | [2] 95:22 95:24 | (1) 31:16 | $38: 25 \quad 39: 4 \quad 39: 11 \quad 39: 16 \quad 43 ; 15$ |
| [1] 28:23 |  | Happiness | 43:23 47:7 48:6 48:8 67:5 85 |
| Gainfully | [1] | (1) 32:2 | 11 108:19 109:11 |
| [1] $50: 22$ | Grateful | Happy | Hit |
| Game | [2] 99:22 99:2 | (1) 21:1 | (4) 29:5 40:23 116:23 117:8 |
| (2) 62:7 127:25 | Great | Hard | Hits |
| Gang | (4] 89:3 107:18 110:12 123:7 | [13] $41: 17$ 49:18 $52: 1961: 21$ | (1) 28:14 |
| (3) 39:5 43:23 47:2 | Greater | 80:17 80:22 81:25 95:16 95: <br> 17 98:13 106:9 113:13 126:9 | Hitting |
| Gangs | (3) 15:9 16:25 78:16 |  | [1] 41:13 |
| (31 16:21 30:23 46:22 | Greg | (1] 123:23 | Hole |
| Gap | 114] 89:17 89:23 89:25 90:1 |  | [1] 20:13 |
| [1] 20:13 | 90:6 90:9 90:11 90:17 90:18 |  | Hollering |
| Garcia | 90:24 91:2 91:10 91:11 92:25 |  | (1) 73:3 |
| (1] 129:22 | Grew | [8] 110:12 110:12 110:13 110. | Holocaust |
| Gees | [3] 11:19 12:17 17:13 | 14 110:14 110:15 110:16 111:5 | [1] 110:13 |
| (1] 17:20 | Grief |  | Home |
| General | [2] 93:13 115:19 | [2] 110:12 129:2 | [12] 11:19 13:21 28:23 29:10 |
| (1) 113:25 | Grieve [2] 115:17 | Head | $\begin{array}{llllll}30: 8 & 35: 13 & 44: 10 & 44: 25 & 55: 2\end{array}$ |
| Generally | Grieving | [1] 92:18 | 55:4 91:4 125:10 |
| (1) 10:12 |  | Healthy | $\text { (1) } 87: 1$ |
| Gentlemen | Grievous | [4] 13:4 13:4 13:17 17:17 | Homework |
| (a) 56:14 79:16 81:12 98:2 | [1] 123:24 | Hear | (5) 28:25 29:12 36:10 |
| 109:23 118:18 129:15 129:25 | Gxim | [4] 52:23 79:22 98:17 123:14 | 45:11 28.23 29:12 36:10 45 |
| George |  | Heard | Honor |
| [1] $24: 7$ | Gracery | [24] 10:4 84:21 84:25 85:1 | [27] 3: |
| Gift | grocery | $85: 4$ 85:25 86:4 86:5 86:19 | 56:2 56:11 57 (1511 ${ }^{1 / 1}$ |


| 50:4 68:771:8 74:574:1976: | Immigrant | [1] 114:3 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & 566: 678: 2079: 13 \\ & 2480: 960: 2381: 481: 1479: 94: \end{aligned}\right.$ | [3] 16:11 31:13 97:3 | Indivicual | (2) 7:7 91:9 |
| $6110: 4$ | Immigration | [16] 9:25 10:4 $13: 19$ 15:4 15 : | Interfering |
| Honorable | [1] 38:1 | $12 \quad 15: 13$ 39:15 41:25 43:10 | [1] 54:6 |
| [2] 1:13 5:6 | Impact | $104: 23 \quad 106: 22 \quad 120: 5$ | Interject |
| Hooked | (5] 45:4 67:11 67:22 93:9 94: | Individually | [1] 59:3 |
| [1] 29:16 |  | [8] 100:17 101:21 101:22 102: | Internationa |
| Hope | Impaired | $3103: 14$ 103:19 104:14 105:6 | [1] 49:6 |
| (3) 86:23 99:7 127:3 | [3] 23:10 | Individuals | Internship |
| Hopefully | Importance | [3] 10:6 22:18 51:25 | [1] 4:22 |
| (2] 9:6 10:19 | [3] 45:1 61:6 104 | Indulgence | Interpret |
| Hoping | Important | (2) 56:8 110:5 | [1] 52:8 |
| [1] 99:13 | [13] 17:7 21:19 29:3 42:5 47: $2562: 25$ 82: 683.183 .19102. | Inflames | Interrogation |
| Horrendous | $\begin{array}{ll}13 & 112: 16 \\ 122: 25 & 123: 11\end{array}$ | (2) 110:10 110:11 | [1] 126:22 |
| (2) 52:13 52:16 | Importantly | Influence | Interview |
| Horrible | (1) 91:19 | [2] 67:7 85:22 | [3] 6:16 35:21 78: |
| (4) 16:9 53:8 63:18 99:20 | Impose | Influenced | 0116 16:6 |
| 108:23 109:8 109:9 126:15 | [11] 66:9 73:20 83:12 83:13 | [2] 12:10 17:6 | (5) 8:16 16:6 26:18 43:5 54: |
| Horrific | 83:18 99:4 105:23 106:5 129: | Inform |  |
| [1] 108:17 | 1 129:3 129:6 | [1] 60:18 | Interviawing |
| Hospital | Imposed | Information | [1] 20:21 |
| [1] 4:23 | (2) 69:11 115:22 | [11] 7:1 8:14 8:23 18:2 21:1 | Interviews |
| Hospitalizations | Imposition | 23:20 $24: 5$ 41:16 $42: 5$ 55:8 | (8) 6:20 8:8 8:19 8:21 17:23 40.3 40.3 47:9 |
| [1] 5:9 | [1] 32:22 | 112:4 |  |
| House | Impoverished | Informed | Intimidated |
| (81 27:14 27:15 27:20 28:22 | (3) 31:25 33:25 34:19 | [1] 57:24 | [1] 47:2 |
| 29:16 31:11 31:18 127:11 | Impulse | Infractions | Intimidation |
| Howsing | [1] 12:8 | [2] 42:21 43:3 | [1] 126:22 |
| (1) $31: 23$ | Impulsive | Initiation | Intoxicated |
| HOWARD | [1] 41:19 | [1] 15:17 | [1] 18:9 |
| (1) 1:21 | Impulsiveness | Injuries | ced |
| Human | [1] 41;3 | [1] 11:18 | [2] 19:19 69:12 |
| (8) 103:22 104:1 104:3 104:4 | Inability | Ink | Inviting |
| 104:7 104:9 123:15 126:16 | (1) 102:23 | [11) 67:22 | [1] 73:6 |
| Humor | Inappropriate | Inmate | Involved |
| (1) 89:6 | [1] 94:6 | (2) 108:8 108:8 | [8) 16:21 20:8 28:12 30:23 |
| Hundred | Inattentive | Innocence | 36:16 36:17 37:12 46:22 |
| (12) 5:21 22:3 22:4 22:16 23; | [1] 33:15 | (1) 69:15 | Involvement |
| 2 23:1日 48.19 49:9 49:17 105: | Incarcerated | Inpatient | [S] 16:2 36:1 36:23 39:5 43: 23 |
| 18 111:3 121:19 Hung | [7] 11:23 11:25 33:1 47:22 | (1) 5:8 | Involves |
| (3) 97:5 119:1 119:1 | 75:23 108:9 108:12 | Inquixy | [11 126:15 |
| Hungry | Incarceration | [21 77:2 77:12 | Involving |
| [1] 45:12 | (2] 50:24 61:24 | Instability | [1] 8:24 |
| Huxting | Includa | [2] 14:14 38:5 | Iowa |
| 14] 124:19 124:20 124:21 127: |  | Instances | [1] 24:20 |
| 23 124:121:21 |  | [1] 42:20 |  |
| Husband | I | Instant |  |
| [3] 20:23 33:23 34:17 | (2) 71:25 72:9 | [11 83:24 | 22:1 22:2 22:15 22:23 23:9 |
| Husband ${ }^{1} s$ | Includes | Instead | 27:1 34:24 36:1 42:7 42:8 47: |
| [1] $34: 13$ | (2) 11:21 73:11 | [1] 88:13 | 22 48:5 48:17 48:21 49:7 49: |
| Hyperactive | Including | Institutionalized | 10 53:7 88:18 88:21 89:1 113: |
| 111 15:13 | [2] 67:13 71:17 | [1] 109:8 | 2 113:5 113:7 114:2 114:7 |
| Hypothesis | Income | Instruct | 10s |
| 171 51:9 51:12 51:16 51:21 | [21 51:7 51:18 | [2] 57:4 81:13 | [1] 22:23 |
| 51:23 $52: 17$ 54:3 | Incomplete | Instructed | Isolation |
| Hypothetically | [1] 41:23 | [3] 66:19 69:10 75:1 | [1] 42:24 |
| (11) $51: 17$ | Inconceivable | Instruction | Issue |
|  | (1) 125:7 | [19] 56:24 64:18 64:24 66:10 | (2) 60:20 61:7 |
| I | Inconsistent | 68:2 69:13 $70: 18 \quad 82: 8 \quad 82: 16$ | lssumes |
| Idea | [2] 73:4 125:8 | 83:15 63:18 83:20 83:2184:7 | (3) 8:24 |
| [3] 14:8 17:8 65:23 | Increase | 84:12 84:13 84:20 85:1 日5:2 | Items |
| Ideal | [3] 16:16 38:23 55:21 | Instructions | 11 34:4 |
| [1] 108:7 | Increased | [13] 64:15 65:13 65:17 65:22 | Itself |
| Identified | [2] $38: 21$ 48:3 | $74: 4 \quad 81: 16 \quad 82: 2 \quad 83: 15 \quad 94: 11$ | (2) 89:19 104:4 |
| [2] 15:4 77:4 | Incraases | 94: Instructs | J |
| Identify | [1] 13:8 | [1] 112:10 |  |
| (1) $110: 9$ | Indeed | Instrumental |  |
| Identifying | Il] 58:18 | Ins 39:16 | (4] 11:23 42:15 87:7 91:16 Jamaica |
| 11] 15:2 | Independent [1] 69:7 | Insurance |  |
| Idiot | [1] 69:7 <br> Indicate | (I) 41:11 | [1] 20:11 <br> Janice |
| [1] 114:4 | [2] 29:13 47:23 | Intact |  |
| 111 | (2) 29:13 47:23 | [2] 14:17 38:16 | [2] 1:25 130:16 |
| (2) 49:24 49:25 | Indicated | 12] 14:17 38:16 | January |
|  | [1] 122:10 | Intelligence | [2] 29:25 32:9 |
| [21 87:11 87:12 | Indicates | [131 22:12 23:1 50:1 67:11 | Jason |
| Illinois | [3] 25:4 39:4 39:23 | 88:17 $91: 791: 18$ $94: 24$ $95: 3$ $102: 15113: 20$ | 113] 73:18 73:21 73:24 91:23 |
| [1] 4:20 | Indicating | 94:24 $95: 3$ 102:15 113:20 Intend | 95:14 95:18 96:5 97:1 110:7 |
| Immaturity | [1] 77:17 | [1] 126:10 | Jesus |
| [2] 40:10 42:7 | Indicia | Interesting | [1] 128:19 |
| Immediately | [1] 54:20 | [5] 19:24 20:20 25:3 36:6 55: | Jewelry it |
| 11) $70: 17$ | Indisputable | 5 | [1] $54: 24$ UUJ. ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |


| Jim | [1] 20:2 | [14] 5:10 26:20 30:13 31:5 | Licensed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| [1] 115:8 | Key | 42:19 74:14 91:12 98:3 110: | (1) 4:14 |
| Job | [6] 98:18 116:20 116:22 116: | 25 118:1 124:21 126:5 126:20 | Lie |
| [16] 29:9 29:23 31:13 32:3 | 24 117:1 117:7 |  | (1) 63:14 |
| 34:19 50:17 87:16 87:20 88: | Ki | Late 31 31:9 37.6 41.8 | Life |
| ${ }_{14}^{14} 100: 22 \quad 102: 23103: 9118$ : | (2) 16:5 111:3 | [3] 31:9 37:6 11:8 | 1791 6:21 10 |
| 23 119:1 123:16 123:17 | Kicked | Latter | 15:24 17:8 17:9 20:9 28:2 28 : |
| Jobs | [2] 31:2 31:6 | [2] 8:14 17:2 | 9 32:12 38:21 39:3 44:16 45: |
| (3) 33:23 33:24 87:19 | Kia | Launching | 14 47:21 48:5 51:15 51:18 53 |
| John | [9] 25:9 25:16 34:7 40:5 44: | (11) 116:16 | 5 53:6 53:13 60:17 66:2 75: |
| [4] 2:3 3:14 3:19 4:4 | 13 47:14 47:24 48:5 54:25 | Laundry | 22 81: ${ }^{86: 22} 86 ; 23$ 87:8 99 |
| Joints | Kid's | (1) 18:1 | 1899:21 104:3 104:4 104:7 |
| (11) 32:15 | (2) 38:21 51:15 | Law | 104:9 104:10 104:11 105:3 |
| Jokes | Kids | [20] 56:24 60:15 65:18 66:8 | $105: 22 \quad 106: 24 \quad 109: 16 \quad 109: 18$ |
| (1) 89:5 | [11] 18:15 27:2 27:14 29:15 | 81:14 98:20 105:25 106:20 | 109:20 111:9 111:25 112:25 |
| Jones | 30:10 34:3 40:20 40:21 45:7 | 107:8 111:22 112:10 112:23 | 114:10 114:24 115:1 115:2 |
| [18] 71:2 71:4 71:7 81:22 81: | 91:13 91:16 | 114:19 117:14 117:16 117:20 | 115:7 115:7 115:10 115:11 |
| 22 92:15 95:4 95:9 95:9 95: | Kill | 117:21 120:18 129:22 12 | 116:5 116:5 116:6 116:6 116: |
| $24 \quad 97: 1$ 110:8 $110: 8$ 120:24 | [71 92:1 93:23 97:18 104:1 | Lawyer | 11 116:15 117: 6 117:24 118:3 |
| 120:25 122:16 122:16 125:25 | 107:15 107:23 127:20 | (4] 53:19 53:20 103:8 119:7 | 118:14 121:19 121:20 123:21 |
| Judge | Killa | Lawyers | 126:16 127:1 127:6 127:12 |
| (22) 48:12 54:17 57:9 57:15 | $128: 14$ | [2] 98:14 126:7 |  |
| 59:6 59:18 60:18 61:6 61:15 | Killed | Lazon | Lifestyle |
| 64:16 65:2 65:14 65:21 68:14 | [14] 9:24 51:10 51:11 93:2 | [3] 92:14 96:3 97:1 | [1] 12:21 |
| 72:21 74:13 74:24 76:10 77:7 | 93:3 $93: 5$ 96:3 $97: 19$ 97:20 | Learned | Light |
| 78:23 82:2 122:10 | 101:6 109:14 110:21 128:17 | [2] 10:15 112:20 | (1) 29:17 |
| Judiging | 129:17 | L | Lighter |
| [1] 12:8 | Killing | [1] 19: | [1] 125:6 |
| Judgment | ${ }^{17}$ 97:9 101:7 107:2 |  | Lightiy |
| [4] 40:23 41:23 69:20 111:4 | 122:16 122:16 122:17 | [1] $41: 2$ | (1) 104:11 |
| July | Ki | Least | Likely |
| [2] 8:2 8:4 | 111 43:14 | (17) 82:9 92:8 100:24 118:24 | (2) 52:12 61:21 |
| Junior | Kind | 123:5 123:11 123:13 | Limitations |
| [4] 28:10 28:11 28:18 36:9 | [80] 9:25 12:3 12:4 12:13 13: | Leave | (2) 58:17 59:23 |
| Juror | 18 14:9 15:7 16:4 17:7 17:19 |  | Limited |
| [12] 76:24 77:11 77:19 77:22 | 17:23 19:3 19:6 19:12 19:13 |  | [4] 75:5 102:25 112:17 112:18 |
| 78:1 78:7 78:12 78:18 78:22 | 20:3 20:11 20:12 21:2 21:? | Led | Limits |
| 79:4 103:5 120:5 | $\begin{array}{llll}21: 9 & 21: 18 & 24: 13 & 24: 13 \\ 25: 8 & 25: 18 & 25: 19 & 26: 4 \\ 26: 13\end{array}$ | [1] $12:$ | (1) 35:20 |
| Jux | 25:8 $25: 18$ 25:19 26:4 $26: 13$ $26: 14$ $26: 21$ $26: 22$ $26: 22$ 26: | Left | Lincoln |
| [5] 61:18 69:6 111:23 129:19 | 24 27:4 27:9 28:6 28:16 28: | [3] 65:9 113:18 | [2] 24:8 24:9 |
| 130:5 | 25 31:20 31:29 31:25 32:15 | Leg | Linda |
| Jury | 32:21 33:11 33:14 33:19 34:2 |  | [1] 85:24 |
| [59] 1:11 3:8 4:15 7:4 8:25 | 34:4 34:25 35:3 35:14 36:1 |  |  |
| 10:2 11:5 42:17 57:2 57:25 | 36:4 36:11 36:12 37:2 37:20 | Legacy | Line |
|  | 37:24 38:11 39:15 40:17 40: | [1] 110:2 | [2] 22:15 51:18 |
| 59:21 59:24 60:4 60:10 62:1 | 18 41:5 41:9 41:9 41:12 42:4 | Iegal | Lines |
| 62:8 63:2 63:3 63:8 65:24 66: | 43:8 43:8 47:5 47:13 48:7 55: | [5] 36:24 58:11 68:17 98:7 | [1] 120:3 |
| 1 66:9 68:20 59:10 70:24 71: | 4 115:8 117:2 110:4 118:5 | 115:25 | Lisp |
| 14 71:18 $71: 21.71: 24.72: 10$ | 127:19 | ae | (1) 120: |
| $73: 25 \quad 74: 23 \quad 75: 2 \quad 75: 16$ 75:25 $76: 17$ $79: 3$ $79: 6$ $79: 12$ $79: 22$ | $s$ | [1] 75:14 | List |
| $\begin{array}{llll}76: 17 & 79: 3 & 79: 6 & 79: 12 \quad 79: 22 \\ 80: 11 & 80: 12 & 80: 12 & 80: 25 \quad 81: 5\end{array}$ | (2) 33:23 69:14 | Legally | [4] 23:14 85:8 102:6 102:2 |
| 81:16 94:9 98:2 98:12 99:4 | Knowing | [2] 72:3 72: | Listed |
| 100:4 107:14 107:21 121:3 | [1] 58:2 | Legitimate | [4] 82:19 83:14 94:25 120:10 |
| Justice | Knowledge | [4] 87:17 87:18 87:20 88:14 | Listen |
|  |  | Leniency | [3] 56:20 70:16 70:17 |
| 111:19 | Known | [3] 59:25 60:16 75:6 | Listened |
| Justification | (1) 6:23 | Lenient | [1] 10:3 |
| [1] 68:17 |  | (2) 114:21 116:4 | Listing |
| Justifications (1) 84:17 | [6] 49:12 76:24 76:25 91:3 91:25 117:20 |  | (1) $91: 5$ |
| Justify | Kokitha. | [18] 8:3 11:13 14:6 14:18 14: <br> 22 22:3 28:1 37:1 41:19 41: | Lists |
| (1) 116:12 | [2] 87:3 96:3 | 19 45:22 46:18 46:19 51:18. | [2] 85:2 121:18 |
| Juvenile | L | 69:1 84:24 91:22 122:22 | [8] 16:24 44:18 51:2 87:1 |
|  |  | Iessen | 109:17 109:20 111:7 115:2 |
| 40:12 40:14 | Lack | [1] 115:19 | Lived |
| K | 109:6 | (161] 89:17 89:17 89:19 89:20 | [2] 12:19 44:2 |
| ane | Lac | 89:22 89:25 90:5 90:6 90:8 |  |
| [55] 1:17 2:5 3:9 48:13 48: | [1] 39:16 | $90: 16$ $91: 9114: 5$ 90: | [4] 18:13 32:5 52:11 129:13 |
| 16 54:13 $56: 11$ 56:2 56 :12 56 : | Ladies | 91:9 114:5 |  |
| 13 57:7 57:13 57:15 57:18 57: | 191 56:14 79:15 81:12 98:2 | Letting | 17] $26: 8$ 51:24 54:25 55:1 55: <br> 4 88; 8 90:21 |
| 19 $58: 22$ $59: 18$ $60: 23$ $61:$ <br> 12 $61: 14$ $64: 16$ $64: 24$ $65: 5$ | 109:23 118:17 129:15 129:25 | [2] 92:14 125:19 | Lizzie |
| 9 67:20 58:10 68:14 70:2 71: |  |  | [1] 95: |
| 7 71:12 72:4 72:9 72:13 72: | Landlord | 76123:8 23:10 23:11 53:1 53: 7 87:9 | Lobes |
| 17 73:2 74:5 74:8 $74: 24$ 75:8 | [1] 31:7 | Levels | [1] 41:4 |
| 75:12 76:2 $76: 13$ 76:16 $78: 19$ | Language | [1] 16:1 | Logical |
| $\begin{array}{\|l\|} 78: 20 \\ 81: 19 \\ 81 \\ 117: 25131: 3814 \\ 118: 16 \\ 118: 17 \end{array}$ | Language | Levy | [1] 119:10 |
| 129:14 |  | (3) 113:6 113:6 113:11 | Logically |
| Karen |  | Lewis | [2] 73:3 125:8 |
| [2] 18:5 44:5 | Largest | [12] 99:18 89:23 90:1 90:1 | Long-range |
| Keep | [1] 111:19 | 90:6 90:9 90:12 90:18 90:18 | (1) $41: 21$ |
| 171 5:13 30:4 33:24 36:3 97: | Las | 91:10 91:11 92:25 | Long-term |
| 17 128:20 129:23 | (3) 3:1 32:5 88:7 | Lewis | [4] 23:23 23:25 41:6 92:23 |
| Keeping | Last 32.580. | [21 90:24 91:2 | Look r:17100 |


| [7] 33:18 86:13 88:10 95:16 | [1] 139:24 | [3] 26:13 26:24 39:4 | 36:25 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 103:2 106:8 118:11 | Marriage | Miles | Modeling |
| Looked | (21 13:20 35:5 | [1] 12:19 | [3] 14:15 38:11 55:5 |
| [1] 47:4 | Marriad | Milestones | Models |
| Looking | (1) 17:13 | [1] 17:18 | 12) 37:8 53:5 |
| [2] 86:12 118:4 | Material | Miller | Moderate |
| Los | [2] 12:7 34:4 | (3) 20:10 20:15 20:17 | (2) 39:4 55:10 |
| [1] 27:16 | Maternal. | Millex's | Modieied |
| Loses | [2] 18:12 19:4 | (4) 44:1 $45: 5$ 46:7 46:17 | [1] 64:18 |
| [1] 29:8 | Math | Millimeter | Modify |
| Losing | (2) 23:10 25:14 | [1] 92:7 | (1) 64:22 |
| (3) 30:24 30:25 52:7 | Matriarch | Mind | Mom |
| Loss | (1) 18:17 | [1] 63:17 | (9) 18:3 18:6 19:2 19:8 27; |
| [4] 33:12 62:9 62:9 62:11 | Matter | Mine | 14 29:22 35:12 35:23 44:21 |
| Lost | [9] 3:4 56:22 60:5 64:13 79: | [1] 127:17 | Mom ${ }^{3}$ |
| $\begin{array}{llllllllll}\text { [7] } 25: 7 & 29: 23 & 32: 11 & 34: 79\end{array}$ | 9 116:3 123:18 124:1 124:3 | Minimal | [1] 26:10 |
| 37:12 38:10 38:12 | Mature | [1] | Moment |
| Louise | [3] 40:24 41:19 91:11 | Minimize | [1] 128:6 |
| (1) 44:14 | Meals | (1) 124:15 | Moments |
| Loved | (1] 45:9 | Minor | (2) 17:3 127:3 |
| (4) 35:23 44:6 67:24 110:10 | Mean | [3] 39:12 $58: 16 \quad 58: 18$ | Moms |
| Loves | [14] 12:23 14:3 14:20 22:25 | Minute | (1) 128:22 |
| [2] 20:1 21:12 | $39: 17$ 47:5 51:13 72:8 72:8 | [1] 77; | Money |
| Loving | 99:19 101:18 114:3 124:15 126:15 | Minutes | 171 32:13 32:13 50:18 51:2 |
| [1] 20:11 |  | [4] 56:16 57:1 57:17 106:19 | 55:10 88:8 90:23 |
| Low |  | Mislead | Montebello |
| $\begin{array}{lllllllll}\text { [22] } & 16: 1 & 16: 17 & 22: 25 & 23: 3\end{array}$ | Meaningful | [1] 48:2 | [2] 26:15 47:11 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}23: 6 & 24: 25 & 25: 15 & 34: 5 & 34: 24 \\ 35: 25 & 36: 2 & 42: 7 & 42: 8 & 46: 5 & 47\end{array}$ | (1) $79: 18$ | Miss | Month |
| 22 48:5 49:10 49:14 49:16 53: | Means | [1] 115:5 | (3) 19:2 26:20 30:20 |
| $788: 21$ 113:24 | \{5\} 14:2\} 21:24 22:1 22:25 | Missed | Months <br> [15] 5:4 21:23 21:25 26:7 27: |
| Lyrics | 66:3 | [2] 20:13 103:1 | [15] 5:4 21:23 21:25 26:7 27: |
| [1] 93:1 | Mechanics | Missile | 5 32:24 39:8 $42: 2$ 44:19 92:24 |
| M | [3] 118:25 119:2 122:18 | [2] 116:17 116:22 | Moore |
|  | Meet | Missing | [11] 73:18 73:21 73:24 81:23 |
| Ma 'am | [1] 26:1 | [1] 25:19 | 86:25 95:14 96:5 110:7 121:1. |
| [4] 58:9 58:21 62:18 62:21 | Meetin | Mistake | 122:17 127:10 |
| Mad | [1] $8: 2$ | 11 | Moores |
| [1] 91:25 | Member | Mistaken | [1] 86:24 |
| Magazine | [1] | 11 | Moxal. |
| [1] 42:22 | Members | Misunderstand | [7] 11:14 12:2 41:22 68:21 |
| Major | [141 8:9 16:7 47:2 67:12 67: | [1] 67:16 | 84:19 86:16 86:17 |
| (3) 26:23 29:7124:2 | $24 \quad 93: 10 \quad 93: 13 \quad 93: 19 \quad 94: 1$ | Mitigated | Morally |
| Majoxity | 110:9 124:14 124:18 125:3 | [3] 64:20 66:21 66:25 | [1] 12:23 |
| (2) 117:13 117:15 | 125:10 | Mitigates | Morning |
| Malcolm | Membership | [2] 88:12 91:8 | [3) 4:9 27:24 45:15 |
| [11 4:23 | (11) 123:15 | Mitigating | Most |
| Male | Memory 23.1423 .1423 .15 | [60] 66:15 67:2 67:25 68:16 | [11] 16:22 $17: 17$ 19:6 20:14 |
| [1] 53:5 | [13] 9:11 23:14 23:14 23:15 | 69:2 69:3 69:5 70:5 70:13 70: | $\begin{array}{llllllllll}21: 11 & 29: 3 & 36: 14 & 43: 12 & 47: 25\end{array}$ |
| Maltreatment | 23:16 23:18 23:23 23:24 23: | 22 71:16 71:19 82:15 82:19 | 48:5 91:9 |
| [1] $15: 25$ | 25 23:25 24:1 24:15 92:23 | 82:22 83:1 83:5 83:16 84:10 | Mother |
| Man | Men | 84:14 85:3 85:8 85:23 85:13 | [23] 13:20 16:7 18:11 19:9 |
|  | (7] 52:11 62:17 97:21 110:20 | 94:9 94:20 94:25 96:12 96:13 | 19:21 26:8 29:7 31:10 31:22 |
| 24 35:19 37:1 37:12 37:16 41: | 111:16 115:5 126:1 | 98:19 99:5 99:12 101:23 102: | 33:14 33:15 35:22 36:22 43:6 |
| $\left\lvert\, \begin{array}{ll} 24 & 35: 19 \\ 107: 1 & 37: 12 \\ & 37: 16 \end{array}\right. \text { 41: }$ | Mental | 4 102:13 103:16 103:21 104: | 44:4 46:14 62:13 67:13 86:3 |
| 109:11 116:21 118:13 126:3 | [4] 22:13 67:8 85:22 102:14 | 16 104:24 105:8 105:9 107:4 | 90:17 90:22 93:16 95:7 |
|  | Mentally | 112:22 113:2 114:10 119:22 | Mother's |
| M |  | 119:25 120:8 120:12 121:14 | (3) $36: 7$ 90:19 91:2 |
| [1] 48:4 |  | 121:22 122:3 122:14 122:19 |  |
| Management |  | 122:20 122:24 123:1 123:12 |  |
| [1] 16:2 | Me | 123:13 125:5 | (1) 37:15 |
| Mandatory | [1] 7:3 | Mitigation | Motivato |
| [1] 83:11 | Mentoring | [26] 9:3 9:18 9:18 10:21 11: | [1] 110:12 |
| Maneuver | (3) 14:1 34:25 37:5 | $311: 611: 9$ 11:10 11:14 11: | Motive |
| (2) 115;24 115:25 | Mercy | 16 11:20 11:21 12:1 12:1 39: | (2) 54:3 54:5 |
| Mann | [12] 69:20 99:8 99:15 99:22 | 2 47:19 88:10 98:8 101:22 | Motor |
| (1) 128:24 | 114:23 114:24 114:24 115:12 | 106:17 111:27 115:13 12: | [1] 29:4 |
|  | 115:14 115:15 115:15 177:6 | 115 | Mouth |
|  | Mere | M | (1) 103:11 |
| (1] 81:6 | [1] 69: |  | Move |
| Mannexed | Mess | Mitigatox |  |
| [1] 44:24 | (2) 9:7 123:18 | [11] 73:11 87:9 89:12 93:5 | $17 \quad 32: 6 \quad 33: 13 \quad 37: 14 \quad 44: 17 \quad 47:$ |
| Maxch | Messed | 102:11 103:6 103:10 106:22 | 17 47:18 94:13 94:14 94:15 |
| (1] 31:10 | (1) 92:16 | 123:8 124:4 124:9 | 94:18 100:10 106:2 106:14 |
| Margin | Met | Mitigators | Moved |
| (1) 49:1 | [1] 96:4 |  | [31 30:15 32:10 38:10 |
| Marijuana | Mid | 94:16 102:5 102:6 103:2 103: <br> 4 103:5 103:14 106:9 123:5 | Moves |
| [25] 20:18 28:3 29:20 31:15 | [1] 40:24 | Mob | $[12] 18: 11 \quad 19: 10 \quad 29: 10 \quad 31: 19$ |
| $\begin{array}{lllll} 32: 14 & 32: 23 & 35: 22 & 37: 4 & 39: 11 \\ 50: 5 & 50: 13 & 50: 15 & 50: 19 & 50: 23 \end{array}$ | Midale | $\text { [1] } 110: 15$ | $\begin{aligned} & 31: 2131: 2232: 1632: 17 \quad 32: \\ & 1735: 18 \quad 35: 18 \quad 38: 7 \end{aligned}$ |
| 50:5 50:13 50:15 50:19 50:23 <br> 51:2 51:1.6 52:1 55:7 86:5 87: | [2] 18:24 126:4 | Mobility |  |
| 22 88:1 88:3 88:6 35:13 97:16 | Might | [1] 16:2 | (1) 116:17 |
| Marked | [9] 45:18 51:19 53:20 56:21 | Model |  |
| [1] 55:21 | 59:21 89:15 108:21 115:7 115: | [1] 13:21 | (2) 26:15 36:3 |
| Marks | Mila | Modeled | MRIS $\because \cup 2001$ |


|  | New <br> (3) 5:13 19:13 19:16 <br> News <br> [1] 128:15 <br> Next <br> (23) 3:12 4:24 13:6 19:25 27: <br> 13 29:16 29:24 30:6 37:17 40: <br> 5 46:8 56:6 61:22 64:24 70: <br> 20 71:1 71:4 71:6 73:8 73:16 <br> 73:20 80:1 119:25 <br> Nice <br> [6] 9:25 10:2 30:16 33:18 43: <br> 25 118:22 <br> Nieces <br> [1] 62:13 <br> Niggaz <br> [2] 128:15 128:22 <br> Nine <br> [3] 66:10 92:7 120:21 <br> Nine-millimeter <br> (11) $92: 7$ <br> Ninth <br> [6] 22:24 24:19 26:6 27:6 39: <br> 12 49:7 <br> Nitpick <br> [1] 59:19 <br> Nobody <br> [6] 80:15 80:16 80:17 92:3 <br> 96:22 118:23 <br> None <br> [2] 79:17 108:16 <br> Note <br> [6] 1:25 76:22 77:16 80:3 85: <br> 15 114:18 <br> Notebooks <br> [1] 130:2 <br> Notes <br> [1] 64:8 <br> Nothing <br> [111 3:22 19:5 20:7 47:14 47; <br> 15 55:24 63:1 88:23 107:9 <br> 119:8 124:21 <br> Notice <br> [4] 55:21 91:3 121:17 121:25 <br> November <br> [2] 32:4 32:9 <br> Nuclear <br> (3) 104:2 116:16 116:22 <br> Number <br> (45) $15: 8 \quad 48: 17 \quad 48: 18 \quad 65: 22$ <br> 65:23 66:1 66:1 66:4 66:6 66: <br> 6 66:10 66:18 66:20 67:4 67: <br> $\begin{array}{lllll}6 & 67: 8 & 67: 10 & 67: 11 & 67: 22 \\ 24 & 68: 15 & 69: 3 & 69: 4 & 69: 8 \\ 69: 9\end{array}$ <br> 69:13 69:15 69:17 69:20 69: <br> 23 70:15 76:24 82:8 83:20 83: <br> 21 84:7 84:12 85:1 85:2 85: <br> $1085: 13$ 88:16 88:16 93:6 94: <br> 2 <br> Numbers <br> [2] 91:4 91:4 <br> Numerous <br> [4] $6: 9$ 19:25 $39: 9$ 47:23 <br> Nurse's <br> [1] 33:21 <br> Nurturing <br> [2] 13:20 34:4 <br> Nuturing <br> (1) $38: 6$ <br> O'Erian <br> $\begin{array}{llllllll}{[52]} & 1: 22 & 2: 4 & 2: 7 & 3: 10 & 3: 12\end{array}$ <br> 3:13 4:8 $4: 12 \quad 9: 15 \quad 46: 10 \quad 48:$ <br> 11 54:16 55:24 56:6 56:8 56; <br> 10 57:8 57:12 58:2 58:5 59:3 <br> 59:6 59:12 60:18 63:11 63:22 <br> 64:2 65:12 72:7 74:19 76:3 <br> 76:6 76:20 78:21 79:14 79:21 <br> 79:24 80:2 80:5 80:8 80:23 <br> 81:9 81:10 82:4 86:9 98:5 98: <br> 5 106:18 110:3 110:4 110:7 <br> 118:15 <br> o'clock <br> [1] 45:15 <br> Oath | [2] 58:1 75:18 <br> Obeyed <br> (1) 44:22 <br> Object <br> [4] $60: 3$ 68:2 75:5 94:5 <br> Objection <br> 161 57:13 61:5 65:15 66:24 <br> 74:11 76:15 <br> Objective <br> (1) 69:7 <br> Obligation <br> (1] 69:6 <br> Observe <br> [1] 113:16 <br> Obvious <br> (3) 89:4 102:5 102:10 <br> Obviously <br> [6] 52:10 52:13 62:12 73:2 <br> 102:7 100:10 <br> Occasion <br> [3] 7:14 50:12 50:14 <br> Occasional <br> (2) $20: 6$ 28:7 <br> Occasionally <br> [2] 6:1 25:22 <br> Occasions <br> [2] 45:16 118:3 <br> Occupation <br> [1] $4: 13$ <br> Occur <br> [1] 34:14 <br> Occurred <br> [3] 17:11 42:1 51:14 <br> Occurs <br> [1] 32:24 <br> October <br> (1) 8:5 <br> Offender <br> [1] 5:23 <br> Offending <br> [2] 13:8 48:9 <br> Offense <br> ${ }^{[6]}$ 68:18 68:24 70:20 83:25 84:23 124:2 <br> Offenses <br> [2] 91:8 123:23 <br> offer <br> [2] 111:21 111:22 <br> Offered <br> [1] 111:9 <br> Office <br> (4] 7:15 7:20 8:16 103:8 Officer <br> (3) 26:18 39:7 116:20 <br> Officially <br> [1] 79:19 <br> Often <br> [1] 55:14 <br> Old <br> (7) 12:16 40:21 41:11 41:14 42:1 43:17 97:21 <br> Older <br> [1] 102:10 <br> Once <br> \{27] 7:16 11:15 14:19 15:12 <br> 23:24 31:6 35:1 36:2 37:13 <br> 45:17 45:23 47:19 53:1 82:23 <br> 83:10 83:16 86:25 94:16 96: <br> 11 100:8 100:12 101:10 103: <br> $\begin{array}{ll}13 \\ 12 & \text { 104:25 106:16 114:11 127: }\end{array}$ <br> One <br> [128] 4:24 7:8 9:21 10:15 11: <br> 1 17:4 20:2 22:6 28:17 29:16 <br> 30:10 30:21 32:4 34:2 34:14 <br> 35:8 36:6 36:7 39:6 42:22 46: <br> ${ }^{8}$ 50:12 $54: 8$ 64:19 64:21 65: <br> 21 66:23 67:4 69:9 69:24 70: <br> ${ }^{2} 70: 4$ 70:6 70:20 70:22 71:2 <br> $71: 4 \quad 71: 6 \quad 73: 8 \quad 73: 10 \quad 78: 14$ <br> 81:25 82:7 82:10 82:12 82:15 <br> 83:13 83:23 83:25 84:2 84:5 <br> $84: 12 \quad 85: 4 \quad 85: 4$ 85:10 $85: 19$ $85: 20$ <br> 85:20 86:13 90:2 94:17 94:17 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


| Oterwhelmed | (2) 13:9 47:6 | ${ }^{3} 85: 6$ | 20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (3) 29:23 34:21 45:6 | Payments | Phone | Possible |
| Own | [1] 29:18 | (1) 91:3 | [4] 72:5 74:1 83:13 98:25 |
| [6] 26:7 $26: 8$ 88:16 103:3 | Peer | Photos | Possibly |
| 112:22 129:13 | (3) 15:5 16:20 38:9 | [1] 110:10 | (1) 52:2 |
| P | Peer-relate | Physically | Potential |
| P.m. | Peers | Physi | (4) 4B:3 120:19 121 |
| [2] 1:14 3:1 | [4] 11:5 16:22 36:14 36:16 | [1] 77:23 | [13) 62:11 73:20 73:25 |
| Packet | Penalties | Pick | Pound |
| 111 65:4 | [2] 83:14 | [11 112:20 | (1) 111:3 |
| Page | Penalty | Picked | Pounds |
| [171 50:21 $51: 22$ 51:23 66:10 | [66] 5:19 7:67:8 7:117 7:17 | [1] 46:24 | (6) $50: 13$ 50:15 87:25 88:1 |
| 71:1 90:4 120:3 | 9:20 11:7 11:8 40:12 40:14 | Picture | $88: 697: 16$ |
| Paglini. | 57:25 66:5 66:7 66:9 69:11 | [1] 111:10 | Poverty |
| [15] $2: 3$ 3:14 $3: 15$ 3:19 4:4 |  | pictures | [3] 16:23 16:24 48:2 |
| 4:5 54:18 $76: 25$ 77:17 87:21 | 12 73:15 73:17 73:21 73:23 | [4] 19:17 95:16 95:17 109:14 | Power |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { B8: } & 88: 18 & 37: 14 & 112: 4 & 113: 20\end{array}$ | 83:8 83:9 83:11 85:6 96:19 | Pitiful | [5] 9:4 9:6 9:12 117:7 117:10 |
| Pain <br> [6] 93:12 124:22 | 97:22 97:23 105:17 105:24 | [1] 111:10 | Practice |
| $\begin{array}{llll}\text { 18 } & 125: 24 & 128: 8\end{array}$ | 108: 2 108:21 109:3 115:21 | Place | [2] 5:7 5:12 |
| Paint |  | [7] $31: 3$ 31:5 31:24 34:20 34: | Practices |
| [1] 111:9 | 120:25 121:1 121:2 121:10 | 20 64:14 87:4 | [1] 16:1 |
| palms | 121:21 122:1 122:6 122:14 | placed | Precious |
| 111 128:23 | 123:25 125:15 125:22 126:8 | [1] 75:18 | ${ }_{\text {[7] }} 105: 22$ 129:9 129:9 129: |
| Pandukht | 129:1 129:4 129:7 | plaintiff | 10 129:11 129:11 129:12 |
| [141 1:19 56:12 60:24 61:11 | People | [1] 1:4 | Predisposed |
| 68:11 82:19 81:20 81:21 94: |  | plan | (1) 13:14 |
| 12 94:13 94:15 37:24 98:10 | $\begin{array}{llll}11 & 10: 12 & 10: 13 & 10: 13 \\ 16: 8 & 16: 9 & 18: 3 & 22: 16 \\ 30: 12\end{array}$ | [11] 57: 4 | Predominantly |
| 103:20 |  | plans | (11 5:12 |
| Paper | 40:4 40:5 $43: 5$ 43:24 $44: 15$ | [2] 64:2 75:7 | Prejudice |
| (4) 127:4 127:4 127:6 127:7 | 45:12 49:18 51:10 52:21 54: | play | [1] 17:4 |
| Parameters | 19 55:19 89:15 92:6 92:10 92: | (1) 127:25 | Prepared |
| (2] 59:15 59:20 | 11 93:2 93:3 100:1 102:8 102: 10 119:15 123:3 125:2 125:3 | played | [21 57:681:18 |
| Parent | 10 119:15 $223: 3 \quad 125: 2 \quad 125: 3$ $127: 23$ | [2] 36:18 97:7 | Presence |
| c | Percent | playing | (4) 3:7 61:1 61:2 79:11 |
| Parent/child | $\begin{array}{llllllllllll}\text { [4] } & 22: 7 & 22: 17 & 22: 17 & 93\end{array}$ | (3) $31: 16$ 32:23 47:1 | Present |
| Parental | Percentile | plays | [131] 3:4 3:5 75:17 79:979; |
| (11] 13:20 15:24 16:2 16:3 | (171 22:13 22:22 22:24 23:7 | [31 19:4 28:7 32:2 | 108:14 109:24 119:20 124: |
| 18:10 19:7 $33: 12$ 35:5 35:16 |  | plea | Presenta |
| 36:1 44:17 | $49: 6 \quad 49: 849: 17$ | 11 | (3) 9:5 10:20 48:9 |
| Parentheses | Perception | Pleadin | Presented |
| [2] 52:1 52:2 | [1] 12:8 | [1] 128:19 |  |
| Parenthetically | Perceptions | pleads | $112: 19 \quad 113: 8$ |
| [1] 70:21 | Perceptions | 121 59:25 75:6 | Presently |
| Parents | Perceptualization | Point | (1) 80:4 |
| [7] 13:10 13:12 13:21 17:13 | Perceptualization 11] $22: 20$ |  | Preserve |
| 17:20 18:11 35:6 | Performed | $\begin{array}{llll}21: 16 & 28: 17 & 33: 11 & 38: 6 \\ 57.3 & 50: 7\end{array}$ | (1) 104:10 |
| parole | [1] 11:24 | 57:3 60:11 60:16 83:9 96:11 | Preserved |
| [11] 5:24 66:2 66:4 99:19 | Performin | $114: 16 \quad 115: 13$ | (2) 65:16 109:3 |
| 105:4 $105: 4 \quad 105: 16$ 105:17 | (1) 125:23 | pointed | Preserving |
| part | Perhaps | [1] 124:23 | (2) 106:24 106:24 |
| (23) $6: 1416: 2317: 2 \quad 17: 17$ | [11 37:10 | points | President |
| 19:7 20:14 21:11 26:5 26:6 | Period | (2) 39:21 39;22 | [1] 24:3 |
| 27:6 36:15 41:2 41:15 43:12 | [1] 34:16 | Police | Press |
| 48:6 53:6 58:15 75:15 75:23 | Periods | (1) 6:18 | [1] 117:1 |
| 78:4 84:6 96:5 106:10 | [1] 55:14 | pooh | Pressing |
| partial | Permissive | (2) 21:2 21:2 | (1) 28:8 |
| (1) 78:1] | [6] 34:5 36:22 35:24 36:22 | Poor | Pressure |
| Participated | 46:4 95:8 | [9] 16:1 17:15 40:22 44:7 51: | [4] 34:22 34:22 $35: 4$ 53:10 |
|  | Person | 19 52:10 52:15 111:10 111:10 | Presumably |
| Particular | [22] 6:23 12:14 13:4 14:20 | Population | [1] 77:14 |
| [2] 89:11 121:18 | 61:23 65:25 78:10 83: 24 91:4 | [1] 22:7 |  |
| Parties | 97:19 97:20 101:6 101:8 104: 13 $104: 14$ $105: 107: 22 ~ 108: ~$ | Porch | [1] 105:25 |
| l2] 3:5 $79: 10$ | 13 104:14 105:1 107:22 108: <br> 12 108:20 109:7 114:10 124:24 | [1] 30:22 | Pratend |
| Party | Person's | Portion | [1] 100:4 |
| Pass | [4] 6:21 13:8 78:9 117:13 | (11) 111: | Pretrial |
| [1].48:12 | Pexson | Pos | [1] 5:21 |
| Passion | ${ }^{\text {[2] 63: }}$ 63 116:10 | [1] 90:1 | Pretty |
| [3] 97:11 98:22 127:20 | Personality | Position ${ }^{\text {a }}$ 4.17 61:21 127 . | [5] 13:18 20:15 55:12 91:1 |
| Passions | [1] 39:25 | [3) 4:17 61:21 127:15 | 120:12 |
| [2] 110:11 110:11 | Personally [1] $65: 6$ | positions <br> (1) $68: 8$ | Prevented <br> (1) 109:24 |
| Past <br> [1] 104:9 | Perspective | positive | Previously |
| Pat | [1] 33:20 | [13] 11:21 14: 14.1514 14:16 | (2) 6:8 74:10 |
| [1] 111:11 | Pertaining | $\begin{array}{llll}17: 24 & 20: 16 & 37: 5 & 38: 9 \\ 39: 6 & 38: 12 & 47: 22 & 88: 24\end{array}$ | Principal |
| patient | (3) 40:12 46:4 46:6 | 39:6 43:12 $47: 2288: 24$ Possibilities | (3) 26:18 26:19 47:11 |
| [11 21:20 | Petit | possibilities | Prison |
| Patricia | [1] 39:12 |  | [25] 20:5 $20: 23$ 20:25 $21: 4$ |
| [11] 43:17 |  | Possibility <br> (9] 66:2 73:11 73:14 73:23 | 26:5 27:7 27:8 33:8 35:7 37: <br> $538: 1$ 42:15 66:2 B6:4 99:18 |
| Patterns | [6] 11:7 58:12 74:4 81:14 84: | 99:19 105:3 105:4 105:18 121: | 99:21 105:3 10656 |


| ```1147:75:1 115:7 115:8 116:6``` | [1] 5:8 <br> Psychological | [1] 49:5 | Recollection |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Private | Psychological $[17]$ $5: 17$ $6: 4$ $6: 7$ 6:13 6:15 | Ranks <br> 111 24:22 | $\text { (1) } 79: 18$ |
| [11) 5:6 | 6:17 6:19 6:24 7:5 8:10 8:19 | Rap ${ }^{\text {R }}$ | Reconcile <br> [1] 107:20 |
| Probability | $8: 19$ $38: 19$ 12:5 14:13 14:18 37:20 | [1] 93:1 | Record |
| [1] 15:9 | 38:19 | Raxely | $[26]$ 3:3 4:3 11:11 57:9 57: |
| Probation | Psychologist | (2) 20:1 46:24 | $2458: 23$ 59:19 61:3 61:764: |
| [3] 5:25 39:8 111:13 | (6) $4: 145: 15: 39: 22$ $49: 11$ | Rate | 12 $88: 23$ $71: 8$ $74: 25$ $75: 15$ $76:$ <br> 4 $79: 8$     |
| Problem [3] 14:21 $36: 2186: 3$ | Paychologists | [1] 16:19 | $\begin{array}{lllll}4 & 79: 8 & 84: 22 & 102: 12 & 108: 15 \\ 108: 22 & 109: 5 & 109: 6 & 109: 6 & 123:\end{array}$ |
| [3] 14:21 36:21 86:3 Problems | (11) 48:20 | Rates | $\begin{aligned} & 108: 22 \quad 109: 5105 \\ & 10: 23: 22 \quad 124: 3 \end{aligned}$ |
| Problems (26) 13:11 2 | Psychology | [1] 41:12 | Records |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}{[26]} & 13: 11 & 13: 12 & 13: 14 & 18: 24 \\ 20: 4 & 21: 10 & 21: 16 & 25: 19 & 25: 20\end{array}$ | [4] 4:21 5:2 5:11 5:18 | Ratio | [1] $42: 19$ |
| 26:14 $26: 24 \quad 27: 12 \quad 32: 1933: 5$ | Psychosocial | [1] 41:5 | Recovers |
| 33:7 $35: 17 \quad 36: 24 \quad 37: 21 \quad 39: 24$ | [1] 8:24 | Rational | [1] 28:16 |
| 43:15 44:20 44:23 44:23 61: 8 | Public | [2] 98:24 98:25 | Recr |
| 86:19 87:3 | [7] 1:21 1:23 5:25 0:15 21:6 | Rationally | [1] 2:2 |
| Procedural. | 26:17 103:7 | [2] 71:24 72:4 | Redempt |
| (1) 8:2 | Punish | Raw | [1] 117:5 |
| Procedure | [11 114:22 | [1] 12:6 | REDIRECT |
| (1) $98: 8$ | Punishment | Re | [3] 54:15 |
| Procedures | (8) 65:24 70:14 71:3 105:15 | (1) 48:9 | Redr |
| (2) 98:7 117:19 | 111:15 116:5 117:23 125:16 | Re-offending | [1] 2:2 |
| Proceed | Purchased | [1] 48:9 | Reduce |
| [2] 80:5 91:18 | [4] 50:13 50:14 229:11 129:12 | Reach | [2] 67:3 86:17 |
| Proceeding | pure | (1) 121:22 | Reducing |
| [8] 58:11 58:15 60:13 79:17 | [1] 14:15 | Reaching | [3] 68:21 84:19 86:16 |
| 83:24 103:7 104:6 106:13 | Purpose | (i) 69:18 | Redundant |
| Proceedings | (2] 66:18 112:1 | Reacted | [2] 35:14 35:15 |
| [1] 130:11 | Put | [1] 52:24 | Reeder |
| Process | (16) 24:6 35:1 62:12 65:4 65: | Read | [2] 26:17 47:9 |
| $[18] 7: 24$ 42:9 $82: 988: 2182:$ | 5 95:17 103:6 103:9 105:8 | [12] 12:4 52:4 56:19 66:23 | Referred |
|  | 109:9 120:23 121:10 21-2 | 81:16 82:2 89:17 89:20 89:20 | [1] 9:23 |
| 105:25 106:10 106:31106:15 | Putting | 89:21 90:14 122:10 | Reflect |
| 121:16 | $\text { [1] } 90: 23$ | Reading | [2] 3:4 79:8 |
| processes | Puzzle | [3] 24:24 25:14 51:22 | Reflection |
| [3] 41:16 98:16 118:21 | (1) 107:12 | Ready | [1] 128:7 |
| Processing <br> (3) 23:20 24: | Q | (2) 74:23 79:2 Real | Regard |
| Product | Qualitie | [1] 80:1 | [5] 86:18 89:15 89:11 93:5 93:9 |
| [1] 53:13 | (1) $10: 5$ | Realistically | Regarding |
| Profession | Quality | [1] 106:14 | (3) 7:5 8:23 113:19 |
| (1) 5:14 | [1] 12:7 | Reality | Regards |
| Professional | Quantify | (2) 12:5 38:4 | [1] 53:1 |
| [3] 4:21 6:2 63:7 | [1] 116:14 | Realize | Reject |
| Proffers | Quantity | [1] 110:19 | (1) 125:9 |
| [2] 68:25 84:24 | [1] 87:24 | Really | Related |
| Profits | Quarrel | [26] 14:7 16:20 16:21 17:21 | [2] 15:5 16:20 |
| [6] 52:2 52:7 52:21 54:6 54: | [2] 126:9 126:10 | 18:1 18:16 19:5 $20: 2020: 25$ | Relating |
| 20 97:17 | Questions | 21:10 30:17 36:20 38:15 38: | (3) 85:1 101:3 102:19 |
| Program | [3] 63:9 76:23 69:25 | ${ }^{16} 39: 23$ 41:12 46:2 48:6 48: | Relationship |
| [1] 27:23 | Quickly | $\begin{aligned} & 18 \text { 48:25 } 60: 1175: 2180: 19 \\ & 88: 1188: 11 \quad 123: 8 \end{aligned}$ | [8] 12:11 43:13 44:5 77:4 77: |
| Progressive | (3) 46:3 47:19 65:19 |  | 21 78:978:10 89:3 |
| [1] 123:17 | Quiet | [2] 39: | Relationships |
| prohibit | (2) 44:2 44:24 | $\begin{aligned} & 2] 39: 2 \\ & \text { Realms } \end{aligned}$ | [3] 14:15 17:25 38:10 |
| [1] 13:25 | Quit | [1] 39:2 | Relative's |
| Prohibited | (1] 91:15 | Reason | [1] 31:11 |
| 111 36:20 |  | $\begin{array}{lllllllllll}\text { [4] } & \text { 40:14 } & 69: 9 & 123: 14 & 124\end{array}$ | Relatively |
| Pronunciation | $\text { [2] } 6: 24 \quad 109: 16$ | Reasonable | [4] 17:15 19:15 19:20 20:16 |
| (1) 23:6 | R | (8) 34:14 40:25 69:8 70:9 82: | Relevant |
| [1] 40:19 | Race | 12 84:8 100:24 101:25 | $69: 8103: 15$ |
| Propensity | [1] 123:15 | Reasons | Reliving |
| (12) 13:13 38:24 | Raced | [2] 39:15 53 | [1] 116:2 |
| Proposed | (1) 18:12 | Rebuttal | Reload |
| (2) 71:12 74:4 | Racial | [2] 56:13 76:14 | [1] 92:7 |
| Prosecution | (1) 17:4 | Receive | Rely |
| (4) 6:1 6:12 9:21 75:4 | Rage | [1] 55:8 | (1) 55:17 |
| Protective | [2] 17:4 127:21 | Received | Remain |
| [1] 17:24 | Raise | (2) 8:14 76:22 | (4) 3:16 75:22 76:8 108:11 |
| Proud | [1] 3:16 | Receiving | Remains |
| (2) 118:6 118:? | Raised | [1] 7:1 | (1) 56:18 |
| Proved | (1) 35:16 | Recentiy | Remember |
| (2) 100:23 101:12 | Raising | (11) 31:23 | [9] 37:18 50:7 64:17 79:18 |
| Proven | (1) 18:15 | Recess | 98:22 92:23 93:2 113:3117:22 |
| 141 70:9 82:11 84:8 101:25 | Rallies | $\begin{aligned} & {[6] 56: 1556: 1764: 11130: 4} \\ & 130: 7 \quad 130: 8 \end{aligned}$ | Remembered |
| Provicle | $\text { [1] } 110: 15$ | Recognition | [2] 26:20 97:4 Remind |
| (2) 112:2 121:7 Provided | Range | Recognition $\text { (2) } 24: 124: 3$ | Remind <br> [1] $56: 17$ |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { (17) } 23: 723: 1824: 1124: 16 \\ & 24: 25 \quad 25: 825: 13 \quad 25: 15 \end{aligned}$ | Recognized | [1] $56: 17$ <br> Remorse |
| ${ }_{6}^{515]} 8: 20$ 44:6 59:14 77:16 78: | $\begin{array}{lllll} 24: 25 & 25: 8 & 25: 13 & 25: 15 & 41: 21 \\ 48: 22 & 49: 9 & 49: 13 & 50: 2 & 74: 1 \end{array}$ | [1] 10:7 | Remorse $\text { [3] } 59: 25 \quad 75: 675: 24$ |
| Psychiatric | 88:20 113:23 113:25 | Recognizes | Rendered |
|  | Ranges | [1] 28:19 | $641 / 14$ |


| (\%] 111:19 | [1] 22:13 | 101:18 | Sense |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rent | Retarded | Scans | (8) 15:7 41:9 50:25 51:25 69: |
| [1] 29:18 | [3] 11:17 49:21 49:23 | (1) 40:16 | $2071: 10 \quad 111: 1 \quad 111: 1$ |
| Reopen | Return | School | Sent |
| [2] 74:20 79:20 | [4] 70:10 91:12 91:14 122:6 | (38) 4:20 4:22 15:5 16:18 16: | [5] 26:4 27:15 27:19 90:19 |
| Reopening | Revealed | 18 16:19 18:19 18:21 21:7 21: | 125:10 |
| [1] $76: 15$ | (1) 39:9 | 19 25:4 26:12 26:15 26:16 26: | Sentence |
| Repaid | Review | 25 27:3 27:12 27:17 27:18 27: <br> 21 27:23 28:6 28: 8 28:11 28: | [13] 11:13 66:11 68:25 83:12 |
| $\text { [1] } 97: 9$ | [3] 6:17 8:20 74:3 | 21 29:2 31:12 43:19 44:20 45: | 83:18 84:24 96:16 96:17 99:4 104:19 105:2 105:18 125:6 |
| Repeat | Reviewed | 2 45:20 47:12 47:12 89:2 89: | 104:19 105:2 105:18 125:6 <br> Sentences |
| 11] 98:15 | [4] 8:13 8:17 42:18 104:15 | 9 113:6 113:10 113:12 | Sentences |
| Repeated | Reviewing | Science | [1] 74:2 |
| [1] 65:23 | [1] 101:10 | (1) 25:15 | Sentencing <br> (5) 42:17 66:8 71:5 99:4 99: |
| Report | Revised | Score | $\left[\begin{array}{ll} {[5]} & 42: 17 \\ 18 & 66: 8 \\ 71: 5 & 99: 4 \end{array} 99:\right.$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & {[6]} \\ & 20 \\ & 56: 18 \end{aligned} \text { 49:3 } 49: 20 \quad 50: 22 \quad 51:$ | [3] 39:19 65:12 107:9 | [2] 39:22 40:2 | Separate |
| 20 56:20 | Ridden | Scored | (7) 17:21 61:22 72:2 72:14 |
| Reported | (2) $30: 1931: 1$ | (1) 24:10 | 119:23 120:16 129:23 |
| (2) 1:25 | Ripped | Scores | Separated |
| REPORTER'S $\text { [i] } 1: 11$ | (2) 51:17 52:1 | [4] 23:5 24:18 27:1 39:25 | [7] 5:5 18:10 18:11 19:12 19: |
| [1] 103:7 | Risk. | Screwing | [6] 16:4 18:10 19:8 33:6 35: |
| Reprimand | [9] 5:22 5:23 10:23 13:7 14: | (11) 29:19 |  |
| [1] 123:20 | 6 15:2 15:6 15:8 38:23 | Seat | September |
| Request | Road | [2] 77:14 126:4 | [2] 5:5 8:5 |
| [1] 74:20 | [1] 28:13 | Seated | Sequence |
| Require | Role | [4] 3:25 79:8 80:4 100:2 | 11) $27: 17$ |
| [1] 66:9 | [3] 8:4 37:8 53:5 | Second | Serious |
| Required | Room | [24] 7:12 12:3 14:23 16:15 | 161 26:23 42:21 43:2 47:15 |
| [3] 71:25 105:23 106:5 | (43) 61:13 61:15 61:16 89:16 | 17:12 20:22 22:13 23:11 25:2 | 122:22 123:23 |
| Requirement | 100:3 100:3 100:5 100:6 100: | 26:5 34:13 39:19 50:14 71:17 | Service |
| [1] 57:21 | 7 100:9 100:10 100:11 100:11 | $82: 2184: 185: 1985: 2086: 10$ | [1] 5:5 |
| Requires | 100:12 100:15 100:20 100:20 | 101:14 101:15 106:15 106:15 | Set |
| [1] 120:18 | $\begin{array}{llll}100: 21 & 100: 22 & 101: 13 & 101: 14 \\ 101: 15 & 101: 16 & 101: 20 & 103: 13\end{array}$ | 120:3 | (91 57:17 65:16 65:20 71:3 |
| Researchers | $\begin{array}{llll}101: 15 & 101: 16 & 101: 20 & 103: 13 \\ 103: 15 & 104: 12 & 104: 18 & 105: 2\end{array}$ | Secondary | 71:6 110:16 111:9 111:5 116: |
| [1] 14:25 | 105:13 105:13 106:3 106:7 | Secondily |  |
| Reserved | 106:15 106:16 106:16 107:6 | [1] 121:11 | Sets |
| [1] 126:8 | 114:12 114:14 114:15 119:17 |  | [1] 69:23 |
| Residences | 121: $515130: 4$ | S | Settle |
| $\text { [2] } 86: 692: 20$ | Rooms | (1) 98:11 | [1] 7:9 |
| Residential | (3) 100:2 117:17 118:21 | Sectio | Settling |
| [1] 16:2 | Roosevelt | [l] 31:23 | [2] 7:10 41:14 |
| Resiliency | [1] 24:8 | Secure | Soven |
| [4] 10:23 13:6 14:6 38:22 | Roper | [ | 1161 5:10 9:19 19:20 31:4 53: |
| Resist | (11 40:11 | Security [2] 38:3 77 | $2064: 22 \quad 66: 667: 24 \quad 70: 23 \quad 62:$ |
| [1] 27:4 | Rough | [2] 38:3 87: |  |
| Respect | 111 31:25 | [20] 15:22 24:8 27:1 32:7 32: | Seventh |
| [4] 68:12 70:24 71:5 81:13 | Roughly | $1639: 140: 4 \quad 40: 742: 12 \quad 43: 3$ | [4] 21:8 23:8 85:19 86:10 |
| Respectiul | (3) $28: 2$ 30:1 49:16 | 47:16 57:1 62:12 65:4 65:20 | Several |
| (4) $36: 11$ 44:7 44:9 44:24 | Rule | 78:3 82:9 91:23 113:14 121:2 | [12] 5:21 29:24 30:3 32:23 |
| Respond | (3) 65:22 117:13 117:15 | Seem | 39:14 45:16 46:19 69:23 89: |
| (2) 13:23 114:4 | Ruled | [2] 7:9 120:17 | 24 92:19 92:20 107:14 |
| Responded | (2) 42:14 65:16 | Seemingly | Severe |
| [1] 52:2 | Rules | (1) 117:19 | [7] $35: 17 \quad 39: 24 \quad 45: 4 \quad 111: 15$ |
| Responding | [2] 44:22 128:13 | Sees | 116:5 117:23 117:23 |
| [2] 89:22 90:11 | Ruling | [3] 19:1 32:1 92:3 | Severely |
| Responds | [2] 68:7 68:8 | Selection | [3] 23:10 23:23 25:13 29:4 |
| [2] 89:24 90:8 | Run | [2] 107:14 107:22 | 44:1 46:16 114:22 |
| Response | (1) 95:10 | Self | Sexual |
| (1) 64:10 | Runs | [3] 46:5 97:11 107:23 | [1] 5:23 |
| Responsibility | (21 105:21 127:16 | Self-defense | Shall. |
| [5] 11:9 45:8 45:24 46:21 99: | S | [5] 97:11 107:23 108:3 108:5 | [3] 65:24 66:1 66:4 |
|  | Safeguards | Self-e | (1] 107 |
| [6] $31: 512: 24 \quad 29.22 \quad 35: 293$. | (1) 106:2 | [11 46:5 | Shape |
| [6] $11: 5$ 12:24 29:22 35:2 93: | (1) 206:2 | [1] 46:5 | Shape |
| 19 124:24 | Saitta | Sell | (1] 13:15 |
| Rest | [1] 1:13 | [4] 20:19 32:23 39:12 95:13 | Shaped |
| [6] 56:10 76:11 81:11 115:1 | Sales | Selling | [2] 10:24 12:25 |
| 116:3116:6 | (1) 51:1 | (12] 21:5 37:4 50:5 50:19 51: | Shaping |
| Rested | Sample | $1655: 787: 2187: 22$ 日7:24 88: | [1] 35:3 |
| [2] 76:12 79:19 | [1] 23:1 | 4 97:15 102:24 | Shave |
| Result | Saratoga | Salls | [1] 92:18 |
| (3) 12:9 38:5 38:23 | (1) 128:23 | (5] 26:4 32:13 32:14 32:14 | Shermaine |
| Resulted | Sat | 37:25 | [11 $67: 14$ |
| [1] 33:6 | [1] 124:22 | Seminars | Shoot |
| Resurrect | Save | [2] 5:14 5:16 | [2] 92:5 92:8 |
| [1] 116:1 | (1) 127:6 | Send | Shooting |
| Retained | Saw | [2] 90:18 114:18 | (3) 92:11 95:8 95:11 |
| [3] 7:14 7:16 7:20 | [7] $19: 17 \quad 20: 1446: 18 \quad 65: 7$ | Sends | Short |
| Retaining | 77:22 93:15 109:14 | (1) 90:21 | [4] 23:16 $23: 17 \quad 27: 13$ 34:1 |
| (1) 24:14 | Scale | Senior | Short-term ( $)$ l i) |
| Retardation | [5] 22:1 22:15 22:23 49:7 | [3] 28:18 28:19 36:9 | (2) 23:16 23:17 |


| Storty | [1] 127:11 | [3] $89: 24$ 90:11 90:23 | (3) 20:10 27:7 37:3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| [1] 90:5 | Sleep | Spectrum | Stepfather |
| Shot | [1] 126:20 | (1] 50:1 | [25] 19:17 19:18 20:24 26:4 |
| (3) 30:22 127:12 127:14 | Slugs | Spell | 29:4 $30: 3$ 33:9 33:10 35:7 35: |
| Shoulda | [1] 92:9 | 121 4:3 25:5 | $17 \text { 36:22 37:6 37:13 37:25 37:1 }$ |
| [1] 128:17 | $5 \mathrm{mal1}$ | Spelling | 25 38:12 44:16 45:18 45:24 <br> 46.14 55:5 $55: 18$ 66:2 $87: 23$ |
| Shoulder | [4] 19:13 46:24 47:3 55:13 | (2) 23:8 25:2 | $102: 21$ |
| [1] 45:8 | Smallz | Spend | Stepfather's |
| Show | [1] 128:12 | (2) 85:17 106:13 | [4] $35: 8 \quad 38: 4$ 45:20 $46: 16$ |
| (2) 99:8 99:15 | Smaxt | Spent | Stepped |
| Showed | (9] 90:25 91:20 92:1 92:2 92: | $[2] ~ 60: 19127: 2$ | [1] 37:11 |
| (1) 111:16 | 4 92:16 92:21 92:22 93:1 | Spring | Still |
| Showing | Smartest | [2] 50:11 88:2 | [14] 29:19 30:10 31:15 41:23 |
| [1] 113:12 | [1] 98:12 | Stability | 42:4 49:10 64:3 64:5 83:11 |
| Shown | Smoke | (3) 14:16 35:19 38:14 | 90:9 103:13 103:15 106:5 115: |
| [1] 114:1 | [2] 28:3 128:20 | Stable |  |
| Shows | Smoking | $\begin{array}{lllllllllllllll}\text { (5) } & 12: 17 & 13: 20 & 13: 21 & 35: 5\end{array}$ | Stimulated |
| (2) 47:6 114:6 | [2] 29:20 34:15 | 35:13 | (1) 41:2 |
| Shy | Soccer | Stacks | Stipulate |
| (2) 19:15 44:2 | [1] 36:17 | [1] 120:23 | $1213: 7$ 79:11 |
| Siblings | Social | Stadium | Stole |
| (6) $16: 22$ 32:1 34:23 46:21 | [5] 8:15 26:18 30:25 38:3 87: | [1] 10:9 | [2] 25:22 97:10 |
| 47:1 47:4 | 13 | Stage | Stop |
| Side | Socialimation | (21 60:12 62:7 | [5] 61:4 92:12 105:1 127:6 |
| [3] 28:13 49:1 61:12 | [2] 14:1 37:5 | Stand | 127:7 |
| Sides | Sociopath | 191 9:8 74:17 76:18 80:4 93: | Stores |
| [1] 68:9 | [3] 39:14 39:15 40:8 | 15 114:23 116:25 124:18 130:4 | [1) 32:14 |
| Sign | Sociopathic | Standard | stories |
| [3] 108:10 119:11 119:19 | (1) 39:24 | [1] 23:9 | $11187: 6$ |
| Signed | Sold | Standardized | Storm |
| [1] 70:10 | [4] 20:17 33:9 36:22 50: 23 | [1] 21:25 | [1] 5:3 |
| Significant | Someone | Stancing | Story |
| [9] 18:24 23:22 30:24 34:15 | (8) 9:11 9:24 55:1 77:22 78: | (2) 3:16 55:22 | (1) $9: 19$ |
| $39: 6 \text { 67:5 85:11 } 89: 7108: 18$ | 14 89:1 89:20 107:21 | Standpoint | Straight |
| Significantly | Sometimes | [3] 99:1 99:1 99:5 | (1) 109:12 |
| (2) 34:12 38;14 | [10] 10:13 $16: 1116: 1318: 2$ | Stanford | Straightforward |
| Similar | $20: 19 \quad 25: 19 \quad 29: 14 \quad 45: 15 \quad 46:$ | $\text { [1] } 25: 12$ | (1) 52:17 |
| [1] 104:3 | $24101: 17$ | Start |  |
| Similarly | Somewhat | $\text { [i] } 92: 11$ Started | $\text { [1] } 95: 20$ |
| [1] 72:16 | $\text { [2] } 35: 24 \text { 114:25 }$ | Started | street |
| Simons | Somewhere | 131 9:4 11:1 118:23 | (2) 18:14 128:13 |
| (11 40:11 | [3] 30:19 53:21 88:20 | Starting | Stress |
| Simple | Son 171 20.8 $31.1164 .495: 2195$. | 12] 25:17 25:24 | [6] 36:5 36:14 48:1 48:1 51: |
| (1) 78:13 | [7] 20:8 31:11 64:4 95:21 95: | Starts | 14 53:1 |
| Sixaplex | 25 118:5 118:12 | [2] 21:6 21:15 | Stressed |
| (1) 75:10 | Son's | State | [3] 26:11 34:13 123:8 |
| Simply | 11] 118:12 | 1231 1:3 1:17 3:5 4:2 50:21 | Stressors |
| 191 67:21 99:6 99:12 99:15 | Sonya | $\text { 61:2 61:18 64:13 74: } 676: 14$ | [3] 34:15 38:21 52:12 |
| $101: 9$ $112: 8$ 105:14 106:22 108:24 | [1] 44:3 | 79:9 79:19 61:6 81:17 84:20 <br> 85:12 $05: 14$ 100:23 101:4 101: | Strong |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 112:8 } \\ & \text { Single } \end{aligned}$ | Sophomore |  | $\text { (2) } 13: 19 \quad 33: 3$ |
| [9] 67:5 115:14 116:10 116: | 121 27:11 28: Sorrow | State's | Strongly |
| 11 116:15 117:1 117:4 117:11 | [1] 75:24 | [1] 89:18 | [1] 123:4 |
| 118:10 | [1] 75:24 | Statement | Struck |
| Sister | Sorry | [11] $58: 1.58: 25 \quad 59: 859: 20$ | (1] 9:25 |
| 1101 16:7 26:8 28:24 29:11 | (7) 9:12 63:22 63:23 71: $80: 1460: 18111: 12$ | 59:23 60:1 $65: 18 \quad 75: 2 \quad 75: 5$ | Structure |
| $\begin{aligned} & 30: 11 \\ & 95: 21 \end{aligned} 31: 17 \quad 43: 7 \quad 43: 987: 2$ | Sound | 81:6 107:16 <br> Statements | (3) 14:16 32:11 38:14 |
| Sisters | [1] 124:11. | [51 6:18 75:6 75:7 107:14 | Structured |
| [4] 19:23 62:14 67:14 93:16 | Source | 107:19 | [1] 115:3 |
| Sit | [2] 34:6 51:7 | States | Structuring |
| (1) 128:11 | Sourcea | [61 4:23 15:11 18:12 19:11 | (1) 35:22 struggle |
| Sitting | (4] 29:13 33:17 34:2 39:10 | 22:1 24:4 Statistically | struggle <br> (4) 16:12 25:10 25:25 27:2 |
| [3] 61:22 61:23 126:4 | South | statistically | Struggled |
| Situation | [1] 42:13 | [1] $41: 13$ <br> Stature | Struggled <br> (1) $38: 13$ |
| [3] 52:9 53:9 98:21 Situational | Space [1] 120:9 | Stature [1] 46:24 | Struggles |
| Sxtuational <br> [1) 12:12 | Spare | Status | [1] 38:7 |
| Six | (21 75:22 81:1 | [11 87:11 | Struggling |
|  | Spared | Statutes | (2) 21:9 27:10 |
| 30:14 31:5 32:10 35:18 39:7 | [1] 60:17 | [1] 107:9 | Student |
| 66:4 67:22 70:23 87:24 88:1 | Speaks | Stay | [3] 18:22 89:5 89:8 |
| 98:6 93:11 94:2 97:15 Sixth | (2) 19:14 89:19 | (5] 77:10 79:4 100:9 104:18 | Studies |
| Sixth | Special | 105:2 | [1] 15:2 |
| [2] 21:6 23:7 | [14] 69:24 $70: 4 \quad 70: 11270: 12$ | Stayed | Studio |
| Skill | 70:18 70:21 71:1 118:19 119: | (2) 59:15 75:19 | (3) 30:9 30:13 31:4 |
| [1] 53:6 | 23 119:23 120:11 122:5 122: | Step | Stuff |
| Skills | 12 122:13 |  | [4] 23:13 34:5 98:12 104:13 |
| 15] $89: 14$ | Specialized | $12 \quad 82 ; 21 \quad 82: 24 \quad 82: 25 \quad 94: 18$ | Stupid |
| 89:14 | [1] 5:11 | 94:19 118:21 118:21 121:16 Step-by-step | [1] 92:13 |
| Skipper | Specific | Step-by-step | Subconscious |
| (1) 42:13 | [1] 54:4 | [1] 118:21 |  |
| Slaughter | Specifically | Stepdad | Subject |


| [4] 59:1 66:24 69:14 75:19 | [1] 25:22 | 62:16 65:23 66:12 67:8 70:6 | Tried |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Submarine | TATEEN | 70:15 70:23 $71: 12 \quad 32: 2 \quad 73: 17$ | [4] 30:4 75:13 87:18 87:18 |
| (11) 216:18 | [1] 1:19 | 73:21 73:24 84:4 85:13 85:15 | Trouble |
| Submit | Talks | 24 95:2 96:18 97:20 106:12 | [5] 25:24 26:25 27:19 47:4 |
| $\begin{array}{lllllll}\text { (7) } & 71: 12 & 104: 1 & 106: 23 & 107: 1 \\ 109: 24 & 113: 10 & 113: 15\end{array}$ | [7] $12: 22 \quad 19: 2 ~ 19: 8 ~ 20: 1 ~ 64: ~$ $1984: 13$ 120:7 | $110: 20 \quad 111: 16 \quad 120: 15 \quad 120: 16$ | 47:14 |
| 109:24 113:10 113:15 | $1984: 13$ 120:7 | 120:19 120:20 120:23 126:1 | True |
| Submitted | Tamale | 128:17 128:22 129:13 | (4) 12:22 50:20 63:25 130:10 |
| (2] 55:24 69:23 | [1] 25:23 | Three-bedraom | Trust |
| Substance | Tampered | [1] $30: 8$ | [1] 72:25 |
| (3) 16:3 37:21 122:18 | [1] 114:25 | Threshold | Truth |
| Substantial | Tape | (1) 127:11 | [5] 3:21 3:21 3:22 63:15 63: |
| [1] 106:17 | [1] 78:25 | Thxilla |  |
| Substituted | Tardy | (1) 128:23 | Try |
| 11] 65:2 | [1] 25:19 | Throughout | (6) 7:2 27:3 37:12 43:1 98: |
| Success | Teacher | (5) 19:18 19:25 40:5 61:23 | 24 128:1 |
| (2) 13:23 35:25 | (6) 88:22 88:23 89:2 89:7 | 61:24 | mrying |
| Sudiden | 113:6 113:11 | Throws | [15] 19:15 25:6 26:10 29:20 |
| (2) 40:23 127:21 | Teachers | (1) 125:25 | $33: 24 \quad 34: 22 \quad 34: 23$ 41:11 55:6 |
| Suffer | [1] 25:21 | Thursday | 95:20 95:10 97:4 98:20 99:10 113:13 |
| [1] 125:3 | Tee | [1] 1:14 | Turn |
| Suffered | [1] 41:8 | TTMOTHY | (7) 28:9 83:19 92:12 112:21 |
| (1] 46:5 | Tempere | (1) 1:22 | 116:22 117:1 117:7 |
| Suffaring | [1] 117:6 | Today | Turned |
| (4) 93:18 106:24 107:2 109:23 | Tend |  | [2] 29:15 45:16 |
| Sufficient | [1] 41:18 | $46: 148: 985: 5$ | Tutored |
| (1) 67:2 | Tendencies | Together | (1) 43:19 |
| Suggest | T1] 4 |  | Twice |
| [15] 93:7 99:21 103:20 104:6 | [7] 23:16 $23: 17$ 23:23 23:2 | roilet | [2] 7:17 127:14 |
| $106: 10$ $123: 5$ 123 $123: 108$ 120 | 41:6 60:9 92:23 | [1] 127:4 | Twisted |
| $124: 16 \quad 125: 22 \quad 128: 25$ | Terma | Tolerate | 0 : |
| Suggested | [15] 15:3 23:5 33:3 37:7 41: | [1] 124:17 | [36] 4:24 11:24 15:1 15: |
| (2) 114:3 125:11 | $\begin{array}{ll}20 & 42: 7 \\ 5 & 51: 18 \\ 55: 6 & 86: 15 \\ 87\end{array}$ | Tomorrow | 16:24 19:23 22:7 22:23 33:24 |
| Suggesting | $\begin{aligned} & 585: 686: 1587: 1588: 10 \\ & 18 \end{aligned}$ | (1) 125:10 | 37:15 38:19 39:21 42:19 43: |
| [5] 111:11 111:12 111:14 119: | Terrifying | Took 181 18:18 $52: 11 \quad 68: 893: 25$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1350: 15 \quad 65: 22 \quad 67: 6 \quad 70: 23 \quad 71: \\ & 173: 8 \quad 73: 12 \quad 73: 15 \quad 82: 12 \quad 84: \end{aligned}$ |
| 4 124:17 | [1] 63:5 | 181 18:18 $52: 11$ 68:8 $93: 25$ 97:6 97:16 128:1 128:22 | $\begin{array}{cccc:c}1 & 73: 8 & 73: 12 \quad 73: 15 & 82: 12 & 84: \\ 10 & 90: 4 & 101: 19 & 101: 20 & 107: 19\end{array}$ |
| suggestion <br> [1] 126:6 | Terrorism | Top | 108:19 113:17 113:17 115:22 |
|  | [2] 110:13 1 | (2) 65:8 85:10 | 120:11 122:4 123:5 12 |
| $[1] 4: 16$ | Test | Tore | Two-page |
| Summer | [15] 8:11 8:11 8:12 $21: 22$ | (1) 127:1 |  |
| (1) 31:20 | 12 42:11 49:5 49:8 49:12 113: | Torn | Twofold |
| Superior |  | [1] 96:6 |  |
| [2] 22:6 22:6 | Testified | Total |  |
| Supervised | 181 3:23 6:11 7:47:777:1 | [1] 47:1 |  |
| (11) 44:13 | 86:24 86:25 113:7 | Total | (2) 66:12 86:7 |
| Supervision | restify <br> (4) 3:21 8:24 57:23 62:3 | Touches |  |
| (2) 34:5 44:7 | Testifying |  | U |
| Support | [3] 7:12 9:22 93:17 | Tough | Ultimate |
| $\left\lvert\, \begin{array}{lll} {[6]} & 19: 24 & 32: 12 \\ 126: 14 & 117: 9 \end{array}\right.$ | Testimony | 14\} 26:22 113:11 123:2 123:3 | (4) 123:25 129:1 129:4 129:7 |
| Suppose | [10] 7:22 10:4 59:17 78:16 | Toward | Ultimately |
| [1] 77:7 | 84:25 85:5 85:25 87:15 88:22 | [1] | 4:9 126: |
| Supposed |  | Towards | [1] 119:9 |
| [1] $38: 20$. | (3] 8:10 8:11 | [3] 29:22 51:22 127:14 | [1] 119:9 <br> Unanimous |
| Supreme | Tests | Towe | [31 82:17 101:1 102:2 |
| 121 40:11 42:14 | (3) 6:17 23:21 113:20 | town | Unanimously |
| Survive | Theme | [1] 30 | [31 81:25 119:18 122:1 |
| (2) 55:6 55:13 | [2] 105:21 105:23 | Tragic | Unarmed |
| Surviving | Themselves | [1] 44:12 | [1] 95:5 |
| [1] 32:15 | [1] 31:25 | Traits | Unashamedly |
| Swayed | Therefore | [1] 39:25 | [1) 114:23 |
| (1) 125:23 | (2) 73:14 98:17 | Transcri | Unattended |
| Swear | Thereupon | [2] 1:11 130:10 | (1) 45:7 |
| (3) 129:18 129:21 129:22 | (6) $57: 261: 18$ 79:6 81:16 | Transformed | Unattentive |
| Swaet | 129:20 129:24 | [1] 127:5 | [1] 95:7 |
| [1] 43:16 | Thievery | Traumatic | Uncla |
| Sworn | [11 39:12 | [1] 11:18 |  |
| (7) 3:21 58:15 59:16 59:22 | Thinking | Treated | 32:18 32:19 64:4 |
| 75:3 129:20 129:24 | [7] 5:20 8:7 41:20 42:9 51: | $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { [4] 20:15 } & 43: 15 & 77: 25 & 78: 14\end{array}$ | Unconscious |
| Sympathy | $1397: 9102: 9$ | Treatment | (1) 28:15 |
| [1] 98:23 | Third | [1] 78:6 | Under |
| Synthesized | [8] 71:21 82:24 82:25 94:18 | Tremendous |  |
| [1] 15:1 | $94: 19 \quad 100: 6 \quad 107: 6 \quad 120: 7$ | Tremendous [3] 17:16 45:7 46:20 | $60: 567: 775: 10 \quad 85: 21 \quad 108: 23$ |
| System | Thirty | Trends | 109:25 |
| (4) 19:24 32:12 37:15 106:2 | [1] 22:6 | Trencs | Undergoing |
| T | Thou | the ${ }^{\text {Trial }}$ | (1) $41: 23$ |
| Table | Three | (8) 1:11 11:8 57:21 61:25 65: | Underground <br> (11) $128: 21$ |
| (5) 104:20 105:5 111:3 116: | [49] 5:4 17:13 18:15 23:18 | 24 74:4 81:15 84:3 | Underl |
| 12 126:4 | 27:16 27:21 30:8 30:10 33:24 | Trials | [1] 12:9 UUC. ( |
| Taco | 44:19 46:13 51:10 52:11 54:4 | [1] 6:11 | Understandable |


| Idel 110:20 | Verbally | [1] 128:14 | 127:9 127:9 127:17 127:17 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Wnderstood | [1] 18:7 | Weed | 127:18 127:18 127:19 128:3 |
| (2) 15:11 101:17 | Verdict | (2) 97:10 128:20 | 128:3 128:3 128:4 |
| Unemployed | [37] 69:18 69:24 70:4 70:6 | Week | Worthy |
| [1] 31:15 | 70:10 70:11 70:12 70:14 70: | (1) 31:16 | Worthy |
| Unethical | 18 70:21 71:1 71:2 71:4 71:6 | Weekend | (1) 125:16 |
| [1] 94:7 | 71:13 71:14 72:3 72:9 73:8 <br> 73:12 73:15 73:17 73:21 73: | [1] 32:1 | Write |
| Unfortunately | 24 103:4 118:19 119:5 119:11 | Weeks | [10] 64:8 89:20 90:14 90:15 |
| [1] 10:25 | 119:23 121:3 121:10 121:18 | [4] 30:14 31:2 31:6 31:18 | [10] 64:8 89:20 90:14 90:15 |
| Union | $\begin{array}{llllllllll}121: 24 & 122: 7 & 122: 12 & 122: 13\end{array}$ | Weigh | 90:17 90:25 114:5 120:4 120; |
| [21 123:15 123:17 | 122:15 | (2) 103:16 104:5 | 9 128:11 |
| Unique | Verdicts | Weighing | Writes |
| (11) 60: 15 | $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { [10] } & \text { 69:24 } & 119: 3 & 120: 11 & 120: \\ 14 & 120: 20 & 120: 24 & 120: 25 & 121:\end{array}$ | (10) 78:16 101:16 101:18 101: <br> 19 101:20 103:13 103:15 104: | $\text { [1] } 92: 25$ |
| United $\text { (6) } 4: 22 \text { 15:11 18:111 }$ | $\begin{aligned} & 14120: 20 \text { 120:24 120:25 121: } \\ & 1 \text { 122:5 122:11 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{lllll} 19 & 101: 20 & 103: 13 & 103: 15 & 104: \\ 12 & 106: 16 & 106: 16 \end{array}$ | [1] 92:25 |
| $22: 124: 4$ | Verified | Weight | Writing |
| Universe | [1] 44:17 | (18) 78:16 106:20 106:24 114: | [1] 65:10 |
| [1] 124:22 | Vernon | 15 122:24 123:7 123:13 124:12 | Written |
| University | [2] 46:868:5 Versus | Weightiest | [4] 25:6 89:22 91:6 123:19 |
| [1] 4:19 | [5] 3:5 40:11 42:13 64:13 79: | Weight | Wrote |
| Unless $[2] \quad 72: 6 \quad 122: 1$ |  | [2] 104:8 107:3 | $\text { [1] } 89: 17$ |
| Unnecessary | Vice | Welcome |  |
| [1] 109:25 | (2) 26:19 47:11 | (2) 3:3 79:7 | X |
| Unremarkable <br> [1] $19: 6$ | (1) 71:5 | Welcomed <br> (1) $55: 3$ | XVIII |
| Unstable | Victim's | Well-mannered | (1) 1:6 |
| [1] 12:20 | (2) 80:13 | [1] 44:24 | Y |
| Unsupervised | (1) 85:15 | Well-written | Ya 11 |
| [1] $45: 14$ | Violence | [1] 91:6 | Ya 11 |
| Unsworn | [12] 5:23 15:3 17:3 26:23 33: | Wes ${ }_{\text {[1] }} 91: 4$ | [1] 128:19 |
| [8] $58: 158: 2459: 759: 23$ 60: $160: 675: 381: 6$ | 6 39:16 43:11 43:23 45:25 46: |  | Year |
| 1 60:6 75:3 81:6 Unusual | 23 48:6 108:9 | (2) 21:21 46:2 | [15] 4:24 25:21 27:11 28:3 |
| [11] 60:25 | (9) 15:9 15:17 17:6 39:10 42: | Whole | 28:10 28:11 28:18 28:18 28: |
| Up | 20 44:10 47:15 108:12 109:11 | (2) 3:21 37:13 | 19 28:21 35:19 36:10 92:24 |
| [44] 5:1 9:7 10:24 11:19 12: | Violently | Wholly | 115:22 128:4 |
| 14 12:17 15:4 17:6 17:14 22: | [1] 48:8 | [1] 58:11 | 115.22128 .4 |
| 7 22:15 27:11 27:11 28:22 29: | Virtually | Wife | Years |
| 2 32:25 36:7 37:11 39:22 48: <br> $2157: 17$ 61:23 63:4 62:18 87: | (1) 108:7 | [11 20:15 | [37] 4:25 5:10 9:19 10:5 11: |
| 24 90:10 92:9 92:16 96:15 97: | Visual | Winston | 24 12:16 14:24 15:1 17:2 19: |
| 15 99:25 103:3 112:20 113:12 | (61 14:9 22:21 23:17 23:25 | [3] 20:10 44:1 44:18 | 18 19:21 19:25 21:19 21:25 |
| 116:25 119:1 119:1 119:10 | 24:15 37:18 | Winston's | 22:17 40:6 40:6 40:21 41:8 |
| 120:22 122:25 123:18 124:6 | Vocabulary | [1] $44: 12$ | 22:17 40:6 40:6 40:21 41:8 |
| 126:19 127:15 | [1] 24:22 | Wi.red | 41:10 41:14 41:25 42:19 43: |
| Uphill | VOLUME | [1] 41:17 | 13 43:17 44:15 46:19 46:25 |
| [1] 16:12 | [1] 1:7 | Wish | 51:25 97:21 105:18 115:22 |
| Upset | Vote | 161 58:19 74:7 77:2 78:22 78: | 115:23 115:23 115:23 115:23 |
| [1] 27:15 | (2] 119:18 122:3 | $24118: 1$ | 121:19 |
| Urged | Voted | Witness |  |
| [11] 75 :16 | (1] 118:12 | [13] 3:12 3:20 4:1 4:4 6:18 | Years/four |
| Usage | $\mathrm{Vs}$ | 7:19 9:16 48:12 56:5 69:16 | [1] 42:2 |
| [1] 36:23 | [2] 1:5 22:1 | 79:22 80:1 80:4 |  |
| Uses | $W$ | Witnesses | Xesterday |
| [1] 127:24 | W | [4] 81:9 85:7 96:1 86:20 | [2] 85:5 88:23 |
| Utilities [1] $45: 16$ | Wait [1] 91:14 | Wives $\text { [1] } 6: 22$ | Young |
| V | Waking | Wonder | (26) 19:14 19:14 21:5 22:18 |
| V | [1] 126:19 | (1] 107:7 | 33:3 34:24 35:19 36:25 37:12 |
| Vain | Wants | Words | 37:16 40:16 41:10 41:15 42:4 |
| (1] 127:3 | [1] 73:5 | [2] 65:1 101:17 | 48:4 52:11 62:16 97:20 102:7 |
| Value | War | Worker | 102:8 110:20 111:16 115:5 |
| (1) 104:3 | [1] 24:4 | [2] 8:15 26:18 | 118:13 126:1 126:3 |
| Values | Warning | Works | Yo.13 126.1 126.3 |
| [2] 12:9 38:11 | [1] 123:19 | (1] 109:7 | Younger |
| Variables | Washington | World | [7] 26:9 29:11 29:11 29:14 |
| [1] 54:9 | [2] 4:19 24:? | 121 14:3 98:12 | 31:11 45:985:16 |
| Variety | Waste | Worlis | Yourself |
| [1] 85:6 | [1] 110:21 | (1) 10:10 | Yourself |
| VD | Watch | Worxy | [1] 117:11 |
| [1] 2:2 | [2] 56:20 110:9 | (1) 125:4 |  |
| Vegas | Watched. | Worse | Yourselves |
| [5] 3:1 32:5 32:17 50:16 88:7 | [1] 45:10 | [5] 22:19 29:19 99:3 115:9 | (3) $56: 19$ 106:7 107:5 |
| Vehicle | Water | 126:16 | Youth |
| [1] $29: 4$ | [1] 103:12 | Worst | [3] 15:8 67:9 85:13 |
| Veil 14 l $27.18 \quad 27.23 \quad 28.1189 .9$ | Ways | [441 28:9 109:3 109:3 109:4 $109: 4$ 109:10 109:10 109:13 | (3) 15:8 67:9 85:13 |
| (4) 27:18 27:23 28:11 89:9 | [1] 26:23 | $\begin{aligned} & 109: 4 \quad 109: 10 \\ & 109: 13 \\ & 112: 7 \\ & 112: 7 \\ & 109 \\ & 1177: 3 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| Vengeance [3] 110:24 111:2 111:5 | Weapon | 3 126:8 126:9 126:11 126:11 | (1) $42: 8$ |
| (3) 110:24 111:2 111:5 Verbal | (11) 84:4 | 126:12 126:12 126:12 126:13 |  |
| Verbal. (7) 22:1 $22: 14122: 18 \quad 23: 20$ | Weapons | $\begin{array}{lllll}126: 13 & 126: 13 & 126: 14 & 126: 14\end{array}$ |  |
| [7] 22:1 22:14 22:18 23:20 | (1) $46: 22$ | 126:17 126:18 126:23 126:24 | : $2+1$ ) 8 |
| 24:1 24:2 39:7 | Wearing | 126:24 126:24 127:8 127:9 |  |

words added and give effect, and I added those and gave you the substituted case, judge.

THE COURT: Do you know whether or not it was put into this packet? Let me see.

MR. KANE: I did. In fact, I put it in personally.

THE COURT: Because you saw that on the top.

MR. KANE: Right. And I left that on in the front just because it had your writing on it. THE COURT: Excellent. Okay. Mr. Brooks, Mr. O'Brien, have you seen the revised instructions?

MR. BROOKS: Judge, we have. And with the understanding that our prior objection, which was ruled upon by the Court, is preserved, the set of instructions we now have is, as far as we know is a correct statement of law.

THE COURT: Let's quickly go through them and see if we have a complete agreed-upon set. The first one, it is now my duty as judge... Number two, if in these instructions any rule, direction, or idea is repeated... Number three, the trial jury.shall fix the punishment for every person convicted of murder of the first degree.

Number four, the jury shall fix... Number five, life in prison without the possibility of parole means exactly what it says, that the defendant shall not be eligible for parole... Number six, in the penalty hearing evidence may be presented concerning... Number seven, in order to even consider the death penalty as an option for sentencing... Number eight, the law does not require the jury to impose the death penalty... Number nine, the full-page instruction, in deciding on an appropriate sentence for the defendant, you will consider three types of evidence, evidence relevant to the existence of aggravating circumstances, evidence relevant to the existence of mitigating circumstances, and other evidence presented against the defendant. You must consider each type of evidence for its appropriate purpose.... Number 10, you are instructed that the following factor is the only circumstance alleged in this case... Number 11, murder of the first degree may be mitigated by any of the following circumstances -- we're going to read this in its entirety, because this is the one that was the subject of the original objection. Murder of the first degree may be mitigated by any
of the following circumstances, even though the mitigating circumstance is not sufficient to constitute a defense or reduce the degree of the crime. Number one, the defendant has no significant history of prior criminal activity. Number two, the murder was committed while the defendant was under the influence of extreme mental or emotional disturbance. Number three, the youth of the defendant at the time of the crime. Number four, the defendant's diminished intelligence. Number five, the impact of the defendant's execution on his family members, including his mother, grandmother, brother, and sisters Shermaine and Angel.

Is that Angel or Angela? Did I misunderstand?

MR. BROOKS: It should be Angela.
THE COURT: That's what I thought. I could correct it here.

MR. KANE: I apologize.
THE COURT: That's okay. I just simply added an A in black ink. Number six, the impact of the defendant's execution on his other family members, friends, and loved ones. Number seven, any other mitigating circumstances.

Mr. Brooks, is that, I know that you continue to object to this instruction, but this is what you anticipated based on, if you will, the compromise that I make based upon your earlier argument; is that correct?

MR. BROOKS: Well, it was the Court's ruling, your Honor, yes, that the Court made a ruling that, that took into account both positions and both sides.

THE COURT: Very well. Mr. Kane, Ms. Pandukht, you understand that this was the Court's decision with respect to a compromise instruction?

MR. KANE: Yes, judge.
THE COURT: Very well. Number 12, mitigating circumstances are those factors which, while they do not constitute a legal justification or excuse for the commission of the offense in question, may be considered, in the estimation of the jury, in fairness and mercy, as extenuating or reducing the degree of the defendant's moral culpability. You must consider and give effect to any aspect of the defendant's character or record and any of the circumstances of the offense that the defendant proffers as a basis for a sentence
less than death. In balancing aggravating and mitigating circumstances, it is not the mere number of aggravating circumstances or mitigating circumstances that controls. Number 13, in determining whether mitigating circumstances exist, jurors have an obligation to make an independent and objective analysis of all the relevant evidence... Number 14, a reasonable doubt is one based on reason... Number 15, the jury is instructed that in determining the appropriate penalty to be imposed in this case, that it may consider all evidence introduced... Number 16, in your deliberation you may not discuss or consider the subject of guilt or innocence... Number 17, the credibility or believability of a witness should be determined... Number 18, although you are to consider only the evidence in the case in reaching a verdict, you must bring to the consideration of the evidence your everyday common sense and judgment... Number 19, during your deliberation you will have all the exhibits which were admitted into evidence... Number 20, the Court has submitted several sets of verdicts to you. There is one special verdict dealing with the alleged aggravating circumstance.

Should that be circumstances?
MR. KANE: No. There is only one aggravating circumstance.

THE COURT: There is one special verdict dealing with the mitigating circumstances. There are three penalty verdict forms, one for each count. At the conclusion of your deliberations, if you find that the existence of the aggravating circumstance has been proven beyond a reasonable doubt, you should return five signed verdict forms, the special verdict dealing with the aggravating circumstances, the special verdict dealing with the mitigating circumstance, and a penalty verdict fixing the punishment for each of the three counts... Number 21, now you will listen to the arguments of counsel... There is a, immediately following the listen to the instruction there is the special verdict dealing with aggravating circumstance. And, of course, that is more than one offense. The next is special verdict parenthetically describing mitigating circumstances. And then there are one, two, three, four, five, six, seven opportunities to have the jury to check with respect to those mitigators that they consider. So, that's a
two-page special verdict form, the next penalty verdict, count one, having to do with Dajon Jones and the punishment to be set for that conviction, the next penalty verdict, count one, Dajon Jones as the victim with respect to sentencing to be set, the next penalty verdict, count one.

MR. KANE: That's also for Dajon Jones. And, for the record, your Honor, this is the way that I've done it, just so the court understands. THE COURT: You can sense my confusion. I'm sorry.

MR. KANE: I submit three proposed verdict forms for each count in a death penalty case. The first verdict form says the jury finds that the aggravating circumstance outweighs the mitigating circumstances and has the four options, including the death penalty. The second form is for the jury to use if they find that the mitigating circumstances outweigh the aggravator, and it does not include the death penalty. The third option is for the jury to use if they don't find that any aggravating circumstance exist. In this case I understand that, I don't know how the jury could rationally do that, but I think it's required that it be included.

THE COURT: This was not based upon the finding of guilt on three separate counts. Is this verdict form even legally firm?

MR. KANE: I don't think it's rationally possible, but I don't know that I can leave it out unless the defense says it's okay to leave it out.

THE COURT: Mr. Brooks, Mr. O'Brien, I mean, is it legally firm? I mean --

MR. KANE: I included a verdict form for, for the jury to use if they don't find the existence of an aggravating circumstance.

MR. BROOKS: Which --
MR. KANE: Because they have to make that separate finding here in the penalty.

MR. BROOKS: In which case it's the alternative, similarly do not include death.

MR. KANE: Correct.
MR. BOOKS: That's fine.
THE COURT: But can they find no aggravating circumstances?

MR. BROOKS: Yes, judge, they could.
THE COURT: Even though there are multiple murders?

MR. BROOKS: Yes, they could.
THE COURT: Okay. I, I trust both of
your expertise.
MR. KANE: Well, obviously I would be. hollering about it, because it's logically inconsistent. But I think if I failed to include it when the defense wants it in, I would be inviting errors.

THE COURT: No question. No question. The next one, then, is penalty verdict, count two, having to do with Derrick, the exact same thing. This is the one where aggravators outweigh mitigator, includes the possibility of death. Penalty verdict, count two, Derrick where they find mitigators outweighing the aggravators, therefore, include the possibility of death. Penalty verdict, count two, Derrick, again they find no aggravating circumstances. Next is penalty verdict, count three, having to do with Jason Moore. This is where they found, would find that the aggravator outweigh the mitigators, and they can potentially impose death. Next in penalty verdict, count three, Jason Moore, again with the mitigators outweighing the aggravators, no possibility of death. And finally the penalty verdict form, count three, as to Jason Moore where the jury would potentially find no aggravating
circumstances and, of course, the possible range of sentences does not include death.

Have we completed a review of the proposed instructions for this phase of the trial?

MR. KANE: Yes, your Honor.
THE COURT: State, do you have anything you wish to add?

MR. KANE: No, I do not.
THE COURT: And on behalf of the defendant, other than the previously stated and argued and decided upon objection, anything further?

MR. BROOKS: No, judge.
THE COURT: Very well. When I was last here in the courtroom, we were making a determination as whether or not Mr. Budd was going to take the stand.

Have we made that decision?
MR. O'bRIEN: We have, your Honor. Defense would request that we be allowed to reopen our case.

THE COURT: Very well. Then, counsel, are we ready for the jury to be brought back?

MR. KANE: Judge, I believe that it's
clear on the record, but I just wanted to make
sure that the Court formally instructed the defendant that his statement to the jury, whether sworn or unsworn, is not to include any denial of guilt -- and if that happens, the prosecution would object -- but that the statement is limited to statements of remorse, pleads for leniency, and statements of future plans.
the COURT: Mr. Budd, and, Mr. Kane, for your benefit, I spoke, as you know, with Mr. Budd and explained what I believed to be, was a simpler explanation of what you just said. In fact --

MR. KANE: Than would be the first time.
THE COURT: I tried to take some of the legalese out of it and talked to Mr. Budd. And, frankly, this is going to be part of the record. I urged him to consider talking to the jury. I explained, with both counsel present, that he would not, A , be placed under oath, would not be subject to cross-examination so long as he stayed within certain boundaries, and that the only thing he really can talk about here is a plea that they spare his life, a desire that he has to remain, even though incarcerated, a part of his family, and, if, in fact, he feels remorse or sorrow for what happened in this case, he can tell the jury
that as well.
MR. KANE: Thank you.
THE COURT: Mr. Brooks, Mr. O'Brien, anything else for the record?

MR. BROOKS: No, your Honor.
MR. O'BRIEN: No, your Honor.
THE COURT: Then the defense case will be formally, will remain open. I don't know that you said --

MR. BROOKS: Judge, I don't think we did rest.

THE COURT: I don't think you rested.
MR. KANE: I thought they did, and I said no rebuttal. But whatever happened, the State has no objection to reopening the case.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Kane. I think what we'll do is, we'll bring the jury back in. Why don't we get Mr. Budd on the stand before they come in?

MR. O'BRIEN: Thank you.
THE COURT: Oh, and while Mr. Budd is coming forward I just received a note. I'm assuming that this came from Mr. Bailiff, says juror number 12, your foreperson, said she knows Dr. Paglini, says she knows the doctor that just
testified.
Do you wish for me to make inquiry as to the extent of her knowledge or, and/or relationship? You identified him in the beginning?

MR. BROOKS: No. I don't think we did, judge. So, I suppose that would be appropriate just to ask her.

THE COURT: Mr. Bailiff -- and Mr. Budd can stay right where he is -- why don't we bring that juror in by herself, let us make a bit of inquiry.

Good afternoon, Ms. Goldner. You don't have to take your seat. Presumably we're probably going to be here for a minute.

Mr. Bailiff provided to me a note indicating that you think you know Dr. Paglini; is that correct?

JUROR NO. 12: Yes.
THE COURT: What is the nature of your knowledge and/or relationship:

JUROR NO. 12: Someone I know saw him as a physician.

THE COURT: Okay. So, you've never treated with him; is that correct?

JUROR NO. 12: No. I accompanied him on his, the first time he went but, and then I didn't further see --

THE COURT: You weren't a part of the interview or the, the counseling or care and treatment that the doctor provided directly?

JUROR NO. 12: No.
THE COURT: Okay. Is there anything about that person's relationship with the doctor and your relationship with that person that would affect your ability to be fair and partial here?

JUROR NO. 12: Not at all, no.
THE COURT: So, the simple fact that someone that you know at one time treated with the doctor is not going to have you in any way weighing his testimony in, with any greater weight than anyone else, is it?

JUROR NO. 12: Not at all.
THE COURT: Mr. Kane?
MR. KANE: No, your Honor.
THE COURT: Mr. Brooks, Mr. O'Brien, anything you wish to ask this juror?

MR. BROOKS: Judge, we have no questions.
THE COURT: You know, I wish I had that on tape.

You can step back out into the corridor. And I believe, Mr. Bailiff, we're ready for the jury to come in.

JUROR NO. 12: Should I just stay, then?
THE COURT: Yeah. That's fine.
(Thereupon, the jury entered the courtroom.)
THE COURT: Welcome back. You may be seated. Let the record reflect that we are again present in the matter of State versus Budd. All counsel and parties are present.

Will you stipulate to the presence of the jury?

MR. KANE: Yes, your Honor.
MR. O'BRIEN: Defense will, your Honor.
THE COURT: Very well. Ladies and gentlemen, we are very close to the end of this proceeding and, frankly, none of us can, with any meaningful recollection, remember whether or not the State, the defense officially rested their case. If they did, we are going to reopen it, because, Mr. O'Brien, I believe you have another witness that you would like to have the jury hear from; is that correct?

MR. O'BRIEN: We do, your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: And that next witness is?
MR. O'BRIEN: Glenford Budd.
THE COURT: You'll note that Mr. Budd is presently seated here in the witness stand.

And, Mr. O'Brien, you may proceed.

## DIRECT EXAMINATION

 BY MR. O'BRIEN:Q. Thank you, your Honor. Glenford, I understand there is something you want to tell the jury.
A. Yeah, not, not just the jury but jury, the victim's family, and my family. I want to say that I'm sorry. I'm not just saying that. It's from here. Nobody deserve to go through this, nobody at all, not the family, not my family, nobody here. This is real hard for me. I'm not good with expressing myself, you know. I'm sorry. I really am.
Q. Do you want to say anything else, Glenford?
A. It's hard. I can't explain it. MR. O'BRIEN: Thank you, your Honor. THE COURT: Mr. Budd, is there anything else you would like to tell the jury?

THE DEFENDANT: Spare my life, please, please.

THE COURT: Thank you, sir. Mr. Kane?
MR. KANE: Your Honor, as Mr. Budd has elected to exercise his right to address the jury in the manner of an unsworn statement, the State has no right of cross-examination.

THE COURT: Thank you very much. Thank you, Mr. Budd. Mr. O'Brien, any other witnesses?

MR. O'BRIEN: No. Thank you, your Honor. The defense will rest.

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, it is now the time for me to instruct you with respect to the nature of the law for this phase of the trial.
(Thereupon, the Court read the jury instructions.)
THE COURT: On behalf of the State, Mr . Kane, are you prepared to proceed?

MR. KANE: Ms. Pandukht.
THE COURT: Ms. Pandukht?
MS. PANDUKHT: The defendant deserves to die for the murders of Dajon Jones, Derrick Jones, and Jason Moore. He has earned that right. But that is a decision that all of you have to make unanimously, and it is a hard one. There is a lot
that you have to do before you can get there. And the judge has read the instructions that you have to follow, and I want to go through them with you, as I know that Mr. Brooks and Mr. O'Brien are also going to want to go through them with you, because they are so important.

Now, they, the first one I want to focus on is instruction number seven. Basically it's a four-step process, at least the way $I$ see it. You, one, have to decide, is there the aggravating circumstance that exist? Is it proven beyond a reasonable doubt? That's step one. Step two, then, is, if you find that an aggravating circumstance exist, you have to then determine, do one or more mitigating circumstances exist?

Now, this instruction will tell you that that decision doesn't have to be unanimous, and you don't need to find all of what's ending up being listed as seven, I believe, mitigating circumstances, but you have to make the determination in the second step of the process to find whether or not a mitigating circumstance or circumstances exists. Now, once you go through that process, then comes the third step.

Now, the third step is very, very
important. And that is, do any of the mitigating circumstances outweigh the aggravating circumstance? And if you decide that the aggravating circumstance, or let me say it this way: If you decide that the mitigating circumstances do not outweigh the aggravating circumstance, now the defendant is eligible for the death penalty. And it is only until that point that he is even eligible for that penalty. Now, once you decide that the defendant can even get the death penalty, it still is not mandatory. You do not have to impose that sentence. You are free to impose any one of the four possible penalties in this case. And those are listed as well in the instructions. But this instruction tells you that once you find that the mitigating circumstances do not outweigh the aggravator, you can impose that sentence. And that instruction is very, very important. And I'm going to now turn to instruction number 10 .

Instruction number 10 deals with the aggravating circumstance in this case, and there is only one, and it is, the murder was committed by a person who has, in the instant proceeding, been convicted of more than one offense of murder
in the first or second degree. Now, this is an easy one, because you just found the defendant guilty in the trial phase of first degree murder with use of a deadly weapon, three counts. It's more than one. You've already found that. This should be the easiest part of your determination, instruction number 10. Certainly the aggravating circumstance has been proven beyond a reasonable doubt. You all convicted him. So, I will focus on the mitigating circumstance, and there is two instructions that I want to focus on.

The first one is instruction number 12, and that is basically, this instruction talks about considering and giving effect to mitigating circumstances. And they explain what they are. They're basically factors that are not justifications. They're not excuses. But they may be considered by you as extenuating or reducing the defendant's moral culpability, and it does state in this instruction, just as you've already heard, that you have to give effect to and consider the defendant's character or record and any of the circumstances of the offense that he proffers as a basis for a sentence less than death. And you heard testimony about that, and
you heard it relating to instruction number 11.
Instruction number 11 lists seven mitigating circumstances. And what I want to do is go through these one by one. You heard considerable testimony yesterday as well as today during this penalty phase from a variety of witnesses, and they fit into these seven categories, this list of mitigating circumstances. A couple of these I'm going to concede right off the top. First of all, number one, the defendant has no significant history of prior criminal activity. The State agrees with that as well as number three, the youth of the defendant at the time of the crime. The State also agrees, I would also note that all three of the victims were younger than the defendant at the time of their murders. But I want to spend some time with what I believe is the, what probably falls within the second one and the seventh.

And the second one is, the murders were committed while the defendant was under the influence of extreme mental or emotional disturbance and any other mitigating circumstances. And I wanted to address that, because you heard a lot of testimony from the
defense witnesses about the defendant's childhood, the death of his stepfather, his father having an alcohol and abuse problem with his mother. You heard evidence about his father going to prison for dealing marijuana. You heard a lot about being evicted from residences, not having enough food, all of those types of things. And where do, where do they fit in? I could be wrong, and Mr. Brooks or Mr. O'Brien may correct me, but I believe they fit in the second and seventh categories. What I wanted to address with you is basically, you have to, in looking at these mitigating circumstances, look at it twofold. One is, do they exist? And then you have to think about them in terms of, are any of these factors a basis for reducing his moral culpability? Do they extenuate or reduce his moral culpability?

Now, with regard to his family and financial problems, you heard evidence from the defense witnesses about all of that. I'm not going to dispute that he certainly had difficulties in his life. We all have difficulties in our life.. I hope that you recall the Moores when they testified. Earl and Linda Moore had testified about how they were once
homeless. I believe that they stated that as well as Dajon's family. I believe Dajon's sister, Kokitha, told you that they have had problems where they have had, haven't had a place to live. Every single family could probably give you stories about somebody in their family dying, somebody in their family going to jail, having difficulties in their life. The question is, do those rise to the level that they are a mitigator? Now, there was also considerable discussion about the defendant's illegal status, that he was an illegal alien here in this country without a social security card, without a birth certificate, I believe, as well. And he has brought through that testimony basically in terms of why he couldn't find a job. You heard that he could not get legitimate work, even though he allegedly tried to get legitimate work, tried to apply for jobs. But what we do know is that the defendant didn't have a legitimate job. You heard from Mr. Paglini that he was selling drugs from age 17 until age 21. He was selling marijuana just like his stepfather did before he died. He was selling that to the quantity of up to six pounds. You heard on cross-examination that the
defendant got six pounds of marijuana just in 2003 before the murder. So, in the spring of 2003 that's a considerable amount of marijuana. This isn't just selling an ounce here and an ounce there as Mr. Paglini would like you to believe. He had six pounds of marijuana that he was dealing in Las Vegas, and that was how he was earning his living, and that was how he was making money. Certainly the evidence that you heard in mitigation, look at that as well in terms of, of what really is going on there. Is that really something that mitigates what the defendant did, the fact that he chose to deal drugs instead of have a legitimate job?

Now, you also heard evidence with regard to number four, I believe it is. Number four is the defendant's diminished intelligence. You heard from Mr. Paglini that he had an average iQ of, I'm not sure if it was 80,84 . It was somewhere in that range. But it was basically a low average IQ. Well, I would ask you to recall the testimony of his teacher. Remember the teacher yesterday that said that she had nothing but positive things to say about this defendant? She said that he had average grades and average

IQ. And who would know how someone is doing in school better than their teacher. They certainly had a great relationship. She liked him very much. That was very, very obvious. She thought that he was a good student, even got her jokes and her humor, I believe she said. So, according to his teacher, who he had for a significant amount of time, he was an average student and did well enough at Veil. That was the continuation school. But what I would also like to draw your attention to with regard to this particular mitigator is, there was a lot made out of the defendant not being able to express himself, not being able to have the same kinds of skills that other people might have. Well, I would ask that when you go back into that deliberation room, you read the letter, the letter he wrote to Greg Lewis, which is State's Exhibit No. 49B. Frankly, this letter speaks for itself. Because when you read this letter, you read someone that can write very well, you know. He can read well enough, because he's responding to a letter written by Greg Lewis, and you know that, because he specifically responds to several things in this letter that are answering questions that Greg

Lewis posed to him. Greg Lewis tells him he just had a baby and another one is on the way. The defendant congratulates him. He congratulates him and says -- I believe it is on page two of the ' letter -- congratulations on your shorty being born. He also, Greg Lewis asks him in the letter, you know, how is your hair? Is your hair long? And the defendant responds in his letter back to Greg Lewis, you asked if I'm still growing my hair out. Right now I got it twisted up, going dread. He is responding specifically to things that Greg Lewis asked him.

He also not only makes it clear that he can read and write just fine, he has the ability to even know when it's appropriate to write thank you cards. He says in the letter that he knew to write a thank you card to the mother of Greg Lewis. And he didn't send it to Greg Lewis himself and sent it to his mother's address, because he says that he didn't know where he was living. He hadn't heard from him. So, he sends it to his mother. But he wanted to thank him specifically for putting money on his books, which was in Greg Lewis's letter to him. So, he's certainly smart enough to know not only to write a
thank you card when somebody gives you a gift, he knew Greg Lewis's mother's address. Also in the letter you'll notice that he knows cell phone numbers and home numbers of the person named Wes. He's listing those in the letter. It is a very well-written letter and certainly contradicts any alleged diminished intelligence that the defense would like you to believe mitigates his offenses. But most interestingly in that letter, he counsels Greg Lewis. He gives him advice that's pretty mature. The defendant tells Greg Lewis, this time when you return, have it be your last. You have kids. That ain't where it's at, feel me? Get out and wait for my return. He's basically telling him to quit committing crimes, because you've got kids. And this jail, CCDC, that's not where it's at. That isn't from somebody with that diminished of an intelligence.

More importantly than all of that, this defendant was smart enough to do a lot of things in the course of these murders that somebody with less intelligence may not have thought to do, because, you see, this defendant doesn't just fly off the handle and have a big argument where everybody knows that he's mad at them and he's
going to kill them. This defendant is smart enough to get ahold of a gun and smart enough to hide that gun so that nobody sees him coming. He is smart enough to know that, I'm going to need me a gun that's going to be able to shoot a lot of people with a lot of bullets without having to reload. He had a gun that was a nine-millimeter with a clip that could shoot at least $11,12,13$, up to probably 15,16 slugs. He needed a gun like that, because when you got three people or four people in an apartment and you start shooting, you don't want somebody to stop you and turn that gun on you, do you? He wasn't stupid. The only thing that he made a mistake about was letting Lazon Jones get away. That's the only thing that this defendant messed up on. He was certainly smart enough to commit this crime without getting caught right away. He was able to shave his head, change his appearance, hide out at several different residences without being caught for several days, certainly was smart enough to do that.

And he was also smart enough and had enough long-term memory to remember what he did a year and three months after the murders. We know that, because he writes it to Greg Lewis in those
rap lyrics. He certainly was smart enough to remember how many people he killed, how many people he should have killed. And he also remembered what they probably said before he killed them. So, with regard to the mitigator of number four, the defendant's diminished intelligence, I would certainly suggest that that does not exist in this case.

Now, with regard to the impact of the defendant's execution on his family members, and I'm going to group five and six together. There is no doubt that this has caused considerable pain and grief for the defendant's family members. There is no question. There is no question that you saw that on the stand when his family, friends, and his mother and his sisters and his brother were testifying. But whose fault is that? Who is to blame for the suffering of his family members? The defendant is 100 percent responsible for causing all of that. Because the defendant had a choice. He had a choice whether or not to fire those bullets into those three boys, and he had the choice to kill them, a choice that he didn't give to the three boys. Those three boys didn't have the same choice, and he took away
those boys from their family members, too. So, in addressing number five and six, I would also ask that you consider the impact on the victim's families.

MR. BROOKS: I'm going to object, your Honor. This is inappropriate argument. It's unethical. The instructions are absolutely clear that that evidence cannot be considered where the jury considers the adequacy of mitigating evidence.

THE COURT: That is correct. I would ask Ms. Pandukht to confine --

MS. PANDUKHT: I will move on.
THE COURT: Move forward.
MS. PANDUKHT: I will move on. These are the seven mitigators, factors. Once you determine that any one of these or more than one of these exist, you then move on to the third step.

The third step is whether or not any of these mitigating circumstances outweigh the aggravating circumstance. And this is where you need to consider what this defendant did on the day of these murders and is the fact that he may have diminished intelligence, any of the other mitigating factors listed there, is that
outweighing what he did on May 27th, 2003 when he brutally murdered those three boys. So, I would ask, does his diminished intelligence outweigh brutally murdering Dajon Jones when he is alone in that bedroom, unarmed, no way to defend himself? Does it outweigh what he did to him? Is the fact that his mother was unattentive to him or too permissive, does that outweigh shooting Derrick Jones seven times, murdering Derrick Jones as he's trying, trying to flee the apartment to run away from a man shooting him four times in the back? Is the fact that the defendant decides to deal drugs and sell marijuana, does that outweigh gunning down and murdering Jason Moore on the balcony?

These pictures are hard to look at. These pictures are hard. But you have to put a face on them, because Jason, Derrick, and Dajon aren't just dead bodies. They aren't just faceless strangers. They're somebody's brother. They were somebody's son, somebody's sister, somebody's grandson, and somebody's father. I would ask that you recall the testimony of Lizzie Jones who stated that her grandson, who's actually, you know, she adopted him as her son.

He was engaged and had a baby on the way. And that little boy wasn't even born yet when his father was killed. Kokitha had a baby, and Lazon had a baby brother that Dajon never met, that Dajon will never know. And Jason Moore was part of a very, very close family, and they were torn apart by this. And I would ask that you recall that as well.

This is an extremely difficult, difficult decision, but it is one that you are going to have to make. And once you get to that point where you decide that the mitigating circumstances, if you decide that the mitigating circumstances do not outweigh the aggravating circumstance, then it's up to you to make the decision of what the appropriate sentence is. And what is the appropriate sentence for somebody who commits three murders? The decision is yours. But the death penalty is the appropriate decision in this case.

This defendant, he acted like he was their friend. He acted in such a way that nobody ever would have thought he would have done something like this. But just like his family never thought he would do anything like this, same
with Lazon Jones and Dajon and Jason and Derrick, you know. There was a lot of talk about him coming to this country and being an immigrant and trying to fit in and not having the support. Well, you know what? Those boys, they hung out with him. They befriended him. They took him in and played basketball with him. They accepted him, and they thought he was their friend, and he repaid them by killing them over thinking they stole some weed. This wasn't some heat of passion, self-defense, anything like that. This was cold-blooded murder. This was an economic decision. And you heard that from Mr. -Mr. Paglini himself. This was an economic decision. He was a drug dealer selling up to six pounds of marijuana, and he thought they took some of his profits, and he was going to keep them, he was going to kill them over it. And it was bad enough that he killed one person, but the fact that he killed more than one person, three young men, one of them 14 years old, his actions have earned him the right for the death penalty. And that's a penalty that he deserves. Thank you. THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Pandukht. Mr. Brooks?

MR. BROOKS: May it please the Court, counsel, and ladies and gentlemen of the jury. This is my last time to talk to you. What we're going to do is, I'm going to talk a bit, and Mr. O'Brien is going to talk a bit. Mr. O'Brien is going to talk a bit about the evidence. I'm going to concentrate more on the legal procedures, the aggravation, mitigation, and the procedure you will go through. And you may say, well, Ms. Pandukht just explained that to us. But let me tell you a little secret. You guys may be the smartest jury in the world, but this stuff is difficult, and it's complicated, and this is hard for even lawyers to follow. So, forgive me if I repeat some of the things that she has said, but I think these are difficult processes and, therefore, it may help to hear them again.

The key terms are aggravating circumstances and mitigating circumstances. And, of course, what the law is trying to do here is, they're saying in this situation, we're not going to be governed by passion. We're not going to be governed by outrage and sympathy and things that are not rational. We're going to try to be as rational as possible in this process. Erom our
standpoint, Glenford's standpoint, aggravating circumstances are bad. They're things that make the crime worse. They're things that make a sentencing jury want to impose a harsher sentence. Mitigating circumstances, from our standpoint, are things that simply help you understand why this happened. And they would help you, we hope, make a decision to show some mercy on Glenford Budd. And please understand, in no way at all should anyone say that we are trying to excuse what we did or, or avoid responsibility or anything like that. Mitigating circumstances simply help us understand why this happened. And we are hoping that if you understand everything, that you will simply show Glenford Budd mercy.

Now, let me also explain exactly where we're coming from. What we want in this sentencing hearing is life in prison with or without the possibility of parole. I mean, this is a horrible crime. We're not in any way going to suggest otherwise. If we get life in prison, we are grateful. We are grateful for that mercy. That's where we're coming from here.

Now, to understand this process I'm going to use an example. And I didn't come up with
this. Other people did. I'm going to use the example of rooms. Right now you are seated in a room, and the borders of your room are borders of the jury box. And I want you to pretend that there is another room that goes right over here and then a third room that's right over here. In each room you have certain things you have to do, certain decisions you have to make. Once you make a decision you will either stay in that room, or you will move to another room. All of you will. leave one room and go to another room together. However, once you, what, what you do in each room is not necessarily a group decision. Some of the decisions you have to make are individual decisions. There are times you will be in a room and you will have a decision to make that somebody, each one of you individually must decide.

Now, I'm going to explain this in more detail. The first room, the room you're in right now, I'm going to call it the aggravation room. While you're in the first room your job is to decide whether the State has proved beyond a reasonable doubt the existence of at least one aggravating circumstance. It has to be a
unanimous decision. That's a group decision. When you make that decision, the only evidence you can consider is the evidence relating to the aggravator. Now, in this case the State has alleged one aggravating circumstance, that Glenford killed more than one person and was convicted in this proceeding of killing more than one person. So, in making that decision you simply are mentally going through the process of reviewing what you have already decided once. If you make the decision that, in fact, the State proved the one aggravating circumstance, then all of you will leave the first room, and you go to the second room.

I'm going to call the second room the weighing room. And I apologize for my accent. Sometimes my words are not understood. By weighing I mean like a scale, and here we're weighing two different things. What you're going to do in the weighing room is two things. First you are to individually consider evidence of mitigation. Individually each one of you, you are to decide what mitigating circumstances exist in the case. These circumstances do not have to be proven beyond a reasonable doubt. They do not
have to be decided upon by your group in a unanimous way. You can certainly discuss it, but each one of you individually must decide what mitigating circumstances exist.

Some mitigators are obvious. One of the instructions list, I think, seven mitigators, obviously that Glenford is a young man, the fact that young people don't necessarily do things with the, with the same deliberation and thinking process that older people do. Another obvious mitigator is Glenford's complete absence of a prior criminal record. Now, that is clearly a very important mitigating circumstance. You will also consider evidence about his mental intelligence. You will consider evidence about his background, about the fact that he came here from a different culture. You will consider his family circumstances. You will consider the evidence relating to the difficulties his family had, the disintegration of his family, the death of his stepfather. You will consider the desperation that he experienced, the desperation and inability to get a job that drove him to selling drugs. All of this could be considered by you. You are not limited to the list in the
instructions. In fact, we may have missed mitigators. And you are entitled to look at that and consider that and come up with your own mitigators. The verdict form says any other mitigators, anything you can think of. One juror in one case put down as a mitigator the fact that the client was represented by the public defender's office. If you feel another lawyer could have done a better job, put it down as a mitigator.

Forgive me. I get dry mouth. That's why I have to drink so much water.

You're still in the weighing room. Once you individually decide what mitigators are relevant, then while still in this weighing room you must weigh the mitigating circumstances and the aggravating circumstances. This again is an individual process that each one of you individually makes. And, by the way, I, I must disagree with Ms. Pandukht when she suggest that somehow finding that mitigating circumstance outweighs the death of a human being is somehow something that this, how could it ever happen. We're not talking about that. The decision is what to do in this case. And is it necessary to
kill another human being? And I will submit to you that the nuclear bomb in that equation is similar to the value of a human life. The taking of human life in and of itself is of such importance that that has to weigh enormously in your proceeding. And I suggest to you that the future taking of a human life must be considered as more devastating and heavy and weighty than a past taking of a human life, because ultimately what we want to do is preserve life, not allow life to be taken lightly.

While you're in this weighing room you can discuss this stuff, but each person makes the decision individually. And if one person says, I have reviewed the evidence and, in my opinion; I have come to the conclusion that the mitigating circumstances outweigh the aggravating circumstances, then you stay in this room. At that point in time you will now sentence the defendant, and death is off the table. And I want to emphasize this. Each and every one of you has the individual authority to do this. Each and every one of you has the individual authority to say, I have decided that mitigating circumstances outweigh aggravating circumstances. And once one
person makes that decision, then you stop. You stay in this room, and you sentence the client to either life in prison or life with the possibility of parole, life without the possibility of parole, but death is off the table. Only in that circumstance where each one of you individually says, in my opinion, the aggravating evidence outweighs the mitigating evidence, or to put it another way, the mitigating evidence does not outweigh the aggravating evidence, at that point all of you have, all, if all of you have done that process and made that decision, all of you go into the final room. And in the final room, that is where you simply decide what the appropriate punishment is, and you can include all four alternatives, life in prison with parole, life without parole, the death penalty, and there is a hundred years sentence with the possibility of parole.

Now, this is a very complicated process. It's onerous, but there is a theme that runs in the process, and that is that life is precious. And the theme is, you are never required to impose the death penalty. And, in fact, there is a presumption in the law essentially by the process
that you should not do that. Because there are so many safeguards as you move through the system. But if you get to the final room, you do have death as an option. And in that circumstance you still are not required to impose the death penalty, but you certainly can if you find yourselves in that final room.

Now, let's look briefly at the aggravators and mitigators. It is very hard to suggest that the first part of this process isn't very much of a process. You've already convicted Glenford of three counts of first degree murder in this proceeding. So, I'm not going to spend a lot of time there. Realistically, you would move on to the second process, the second room, into the weighing room. Once you get in the weighing room there is substantial mitigation in this case. And we discussed before, Mr. O'Brien is going to discuss a little bit in a few minutes.

The law never tells you how much weight you must give to one aggravator or to one mitigator. It's simply an individual decision that you have to make. I submit to you that the weight of preserving life and preserving suffering is the weightiest consideration that you will have
in these deliberations. And I submit to you that the ending of suffering, the ending of killing is so weighty that it allows you to conclude that the mitigating circumstances do outweigh the aggravator circumstances. If you find yourselves in the third room with death as an option, you may wonder, well, how do we know when death is the right penalty? The law doesn't tell you that. There is nothing in the Nevada Revised Statutes that tells you when death is the appropriate option. But I think I can help you figure this puzzle out.

At the very beginning of this case during jury selection we talked about several statements, one of which was, thou shalt not kill. Another statement was, the death penalty is appropriate in some circumstances. Now, we didn't get into it in great detail, but it could be argued that those two statements are completely opposed to each other. But they, they could be reconciled when we also consider what someone said during jury selection. And they said, a person has the right to kill in self-defense. And that is where we understand how the death penalty should appropriately be used. If Glenford Budd is a
clear and present danger to the community in custody, in prison, then the death penalty would be appropriate, because it is self-defense to defend against a clear and present danger. In this case we know that the right of self-defense is not applicable, because Glenford is not a clear and present danger. He is virtually an ideal inmate. He is not a dangerous inmate. He is not causing violence while incarcerated. And obviously that would be a clear sign that he did remain a clear and present danger if while incarcerated he was a violent person.

Adding to this conclusion that he is absolutely not a clear and present danger is his record. This man has no prior criminal convictions, none. This is not a career criminal and I want to say this: Considering the horrific nature of this crime, if the man had a significant criminal history, then those two things combined together would suggest that this is a person that the death penalty might be appropriate for. But Glenford has no criminal record. He has this one day where he did this horrible thing. Under these circumstances he simply is not a clear and present danger, and under that circumstance we should not
use our right of self-defense against him.
There is also a saying that the death penalty is preserved for the worst of the worst. Glenford Budd is not the worst of the worst, and we know that because of his record or his lack of record, lack of criminal record. We know that because he is a person who works well institutionalized. Yes, he committed a horrible crime, but a horrible crime does not put you in the category of the worst of the worst. If this man had a long history of violent crime, I couldn't say this with a straight face, but he doesn't. He's not the worst of the worst. He doesn't need to be killed. You saw the pictures of the prison. And I think you would agree it's a grim life. And, quite frankly, that is the future of Glenford Budd if he is given the chance to live out a natural life.

What we are asking you for is to allow Glenford Budd to live his natural life until he dies, as we're all going to die when nature decides that such is the case. By doing that, ladies and gentlemen, a lot of suffering can be prevented. And I submit to you that the killing of Glenford Budd is absolutely unnecessary in this
case. We appreciate your time. We appreciate your consideration. Thank you very much.

THE COURT: Mr. O'Brien?
MR. O'BRIEN: Thank you, your Honor. Court's indulgence.

THE COURT: Of course.
MR. O'BRIEN: Jason Moore was 19. Derrick Jones was 19. Dajon Jones was 14. When we watch grieving family members identify their loved ones from photos like that, it inflames our passions. It inflames our passions to a point of hatred. Hate is a great motivator. Hate fueled the holocaust. Hate is the food of terrorism. Terrorism feeds off of hate. It's hate that rallies the mob. However, hate does not make for good decisions. We have to set the hate aside. It's not going to help any of us, and it's certainly not going to help you to make this very difficult decision. I realize that you are angry. That's understandable. These three young men were killed. It's such a waste. We understand the anger. But don't make this decision in anger. Don't make this decision based on anger and vengeance. The legacy of this decision that you're about to make is going to last far longer
than your sense of anger or any sense of vengeance. Acknowledge the anger. Count to a hundred. Pound on the table. Kick a chair. But set it aside. You're not here to make a judgment based on hate and vengeance. Set the anger aside, and then and only then can you make a decision that you will be confident that you can live with. Now, the details of Glenford's life haven't been offered because we want to paint a picture of poor, poor, pitiful Glenford. And no one is suggesting we pat him on the back and tell him how sorry we feel. And no one is suggesting that we give him probation, and no one is suggesting that we forgive him. We are here asking for a very severe punishment. No one has forgotten those three young men I've just showed you. Certainly you haven't forgotten it. You've already found Glenford guilty. You've already rendered the largest portion of justice in this case.

When we offer this mitigation evidence, first of all, the law demands we offer it. I have an affirmative duty to put forth to you, as jurors in a capital case, the facts and circumstances of Glenford's life. Again it's not an excuse, and
it's not a defense. The purpose of this evidence is to provide you with a context, because you have a very difficult decision to make. And I think Dr. Paglini was able to take this information and put it into a further context for you, and you need this context to determine if Glenford is the worst of the worst, if Glenford is so dangerous that he must simply be deleted and, finally, if Glenford must be exterminated.

Now, the law instructs you, you must consider and give effect to the mitigation evidence. And, as Mr. Brooks told you, and I'm going to cut out much of this, because Mr. Brooks has talked to you about it, and you've, and I believe you all have a good understanding of the evidence we presented. But the important thing to know is the mitigation evidence is not limited to what we presented to you. It's not limited to the way we presented it to you. You can take what you learned here, and you can pick it up, and you can turn it any way you want, or based on anything you heard here you can create your own mitigating circumstance. The law acknowledges what a difficult decision this is, and it gives you every opportunity to choose life.

I want to address briefly the mitigation, mitigating circumstance of diminished IQ. And I would like you to remember what we say here isn't evidence, and I think the evidence you heard on diminished $I Q$, first of all, I don't believe Ms. Levy -- Ms. Levy is the school teacher -- ever testified that Glenford had an average IQ. There was no evidence presented at all that there was any assessment done like that in that alternative school. I would further submit that, that, as tough a teacher as Ms. Levy said she was, when you're in an alternative school, you're showing up and you're trying hard, you know, maybe that's the baseline to see. I don't know. But I would submit that additionally she did not have a long time to observe Glenford. As you may recall, I think she said he only had two or two and a half credits, and then he left. The point is, the only evidence we have regarding his diminished intelligence are those tests that Dr. Paglini explained to you. And he explained to you that, you know, I don't care who's giving this test. He's going, he's going to range, forgive me if I'm too low, but I believe it was from 75 to 84 , something in that general range. So, there is no
question whether or not we've shown you that Glenford has a diminished IQ. That's indisputable. I mean, we never suggested that he was a blathering idiot that couldn't respond to a question or write a letter or anything like that. The fact is, the evidence shows, the only evidence, Glenford does have a diminished IQ. All those other things you heard and anything that touches you, anything that causes you to choose life can be a mitigating circumstance, anything. Now, if any one of you feels, once you enter that deliberation room, and to go along with Mr. Brooks's analogy, you're through that first room, we understand that, and you're into what Mr . Brooks calls the weight room. If any one of you at that point feels that you cannot consider and give effect to the mitigation evidence that you heard, send Cliff a note, because you can't, you can't do that. The law demands that you consider it and give effect to it. You must.

I do not ask you to be lenient. I ask you to severely punish Glenford. I do ask you for mercy. Unashamedly, I stand before you and ask you for mercy, ask you to choose life. The mercy I ask for is somewhat tampered, because Glenford
together for two years, and they synthesized 66 studies, and their goal was identifying risk factors in terms of violence. And what they came up with, they identified individual, family, school, peer-related, community, and neighborhood risk factors. What they discovered -- and this is kind of common sense, too -- is that the larger number of risk factors the youth was exposed to, the greater probability of violent behavior in the community. And this is some of the things they understood. The United States Department of Justice, once again Apri1, 2000 individual factors. If the individual is hyperactive, they have a two- to five-time chance of engaging in criminal behavior. If they have been aggressive, it's like a half to six times chance. Early initiation of violent behavior, that times it by six. And then, you know, beliefs and attitude, favorable -- antisocial behavior.

Now the family factors, I have
highlighted in blue some of the things that apply to Mr. Budd. So, anytime you see something highlighted in blue, this is something we're going to discover as I talk about his life. Parental criminality, child maltreatment but for Mr. Budd,
poor family management practices, low levels of parental involvement, residential mobility, parental attitudes favorable to substance abuse, and parent/child separation. Now, before I kind of kick this off I want to be able to address something. I feel I've interviewed Mr. Budd's mother and sister and a bunch of family members. And these are all decent people. They're not horrible people. They came from a different country. They're doing the best that they could. But, you know, sometimes as an immigrant you come here. You're faced with an uphill struggle. And sometimes you cannot be as attentive to your children because of different factors. So, we're going to discuss that in a second.

Here are some more factors that increase criminality: Academic failure, for Mr. Budd, low bonding in school, dropping out of school, high delinquency rate in school. He doesn't have that. Peer-related factors, he really didn't hang out. He wasn't involved with any gangs. He really didn't, he never -- siblings or peers for the most part. Community and neighborhood factors, poverty times two. If you live in poverty conditions, you have a greater chance of criminal acting out.

Community disorganization, that happened a little in his latter part of his years, we're going to discover in a few moments. Exposure to violence and racial prejudice rage is another one. So, these are some of the factors that the department of justice came up with that influenced violent behavior. And it's important just to kind of get an idea of these factors in Mr. Budd's life.

Now, we're going to talk about his life. And what I've done is I've highlighted some of the things that have occurred in his family. Mr. Budd was born on December 23rd, 1982. He's a second of three. His parents were not married. He grew up in Belize City, Belize, which is basically a country in Central America that's relatively poor. He had a tremendous amount of family around him, and for the most part he was born healthy, decent childhood, no developmental milestones, on time. Everything was kind of fine. But when I talked to Mr. Budd, I said, gees, why did your parents separate? He goes, well, I'm really not sure. And the constant thing with Mr. Budd was, during all my interviews, is that he was kind of protective of his family. He has positive relationships with everyone in his family, and he
didn't really like to air any dirty laundry. And so sometimes I would have to get information from other people, like maybe his mom or friends of the family, et cetera, et cetera.

So, we found out from Mrs. Budd or Karen, which is his mom, is that her boyfriend, Mr. Budd's father, was an alcoholic and verbally and physically abusive to hex when he was intoxicated. So, at the age of four this should be a parental separation. They separated. The parents separated, and mother now moves to United States. And Mr. Budd is raced by his maternal grandmother, and his father lives across the street. Now, the first question I have is, why isn't the father raising the three kids? But apparently the grandmother is really available, and she's probably the matriarch of the family, and she took care of things.

So, Glenn went to school, and he completed the first grade in Belize. So, he went on, and he seemed to adjust to school and was probably like a $C$ student. But what we're going to find out a little later on is he had some significant academic problems. Now, in middle of childhood, he goes through age six to 11 without
much difficulties. He sees his father almost daily. He talks to his mom a few times a month, and everything is kind of fine. He bonds with his maternal grandmother. He plays with his cousins, and there is really nothing outstanding. It's kind of an unremarkable childhood for the most part with the exception of the parental separation. He talks to his mom, but he's not with his mother.

And, so he eventually moves to the United States in California. And what happens now, he's separated from his father, and he's kind of learning a new culture. He's kind of a small young man or young boy, and he speaks broken English. He's relatively shy, and he's trying to get into a new culture and fit in. And he also has a stepfather. He saw a few pictures of his stepfather throughout the years. And he has a brother, a half brother that he's introduced to for the first time. So, for relatively seven years he's not seen his mother.

So, what happens now is he's separated from, actually should be two sisters, his extended support system in Belize. And, interesting enough, throughout the next numerous years he
rarely talks to his father, loves his dad, but his dad's the one really not keeping in contact with him. And, as you kind of find out later on, his dad had some cocaine problems and eventually is now in prison. So, but during the time there was, you know, occasional talking, you know, but not much, nothing you would expect for a father to be involved with his son, even if you're far away. So, he's adjusting to his life. He actually likes his stepdad, Mr. Winston Miller. He's from Jamaica, a decent guy, kind of loving, you know. And as I think Glen said, you know, hey, he kind of filled the hole, the gap, because I missed my father. And he also saw that, for the most part, I think Mr. Miller treated his wife pretty good. So, that was relatively positive.

However, Mr. Miller didn't work. He sold marijuana. So, that's what he was doing. Sometimes he would sell clothes outside of his car. Now, it was interesting when I was interviewing Mrs. Gill, we're going to get to this in a second. You know, I asked her. I said, you know, well, you know, your husband went to prison, you know, Glen's stepfather. I said, what did he go to prison for, you know? And she was really
hesitant to tell me this information. You know, it was kind of pooh pooh. And I guess even some of the friends, a lot of the friends that knew the family didn't know that he went to prison for selling drugs. So, here we have this young boy adjusting, and he starts sixth grade in a public school in California, and he's getting kind of like okay grades. Seventh grade comes along. He's kind of struggling a little academically, some Cs and Ds, not really any behavioral problems at this time. And he's, for the most part everything is fine, loves his family. He's happy where he's at.

Now we come to the eighth grade. Now we have difficulties here. Glen starts to exhibit more educational problems. And at this point what I think I want to do is, I want to fast-forward and talk about his $I Q$, because this is kind of important to understand his high school years. So, if you can be patient with me, I'm going to whiz through some of this. Here it is. Okay.

We gave an IQ test about, what, about 15 months ago. And now let me help you with what this means. I had to compare him to 20 to 24 years 11 months, the standardized group in the

United States. VS IQ means verbal scale IQ. An average $I Q$ is 100. So, if you have like, let's say, a 90 to a hundred and 10 , that's more or less average. If you're about a hundred and 10 to 119 , that's considered above average. And 120 to 129 is superior, and 130 is very superior. One thirty and up is about two percent of the population. Now, conversely, when we go the other way, you know, if you have about a 90, 91, 92, I consider that like average. Eighty to 89 is below average. And 70 to 79 is what we call borderline intelligence. And below, 69 and below is called mental retardation at the second percentile. Now, in Mr. Budd's case, he has a verbal scale IQ of 84. So, when I line him up with a hundred people from the group of 20 , almost 25 years, 86 percent, 86 percent of those individuals, young adults have better cut verbal skills than Mr. Budd. And it gets a little worse. When we talk about perceptualization skills, visual, eye, hand coordination and things like that, he falls down to the eight percentile. Now, when we combine these two IQs, his full scale IQ is an 80 , which is at the ninth percentile. So, what does that mean? That means he is of low
average intelligence. And if we sample him 95 out of a hundred times, he would be anywhere from borderline to low average.

Now, I also administered some, some assessment in terms of achievement scores. And his pronunciation abilities were in the low average range of the 12 th percentile, sixth grade level. His spelling abilities are at the seventh percentile compared to his standard IQ at the fifth grade level. And math is severely impaired, the second percentile, fourth grade level.

Now, I'm going to talk about, let me get a little more stuff here. I also gave him a memory test. Now, the memory test, I didn't list everything here, but in the memory test his short-term auditory memory was assessed as a 62, at the first percentile. His visual short-term memory was in the average range, hundred and three of the 58th percentile. This guy had difficulty processing auditory information in verbal form. Now, that's just based on a few tests, but he had some significant difficulties. And then his long-term memory was severely impaired for his auditory memory, once again the first percentile. And his visual memory, long-term memory was
average. So, his verbal recognition memory, which is much easier, I'll give you an example of verbal recognition. If I say, who was the president of the United States during the Civil War, that would be, you have to recall that information. But if I put it on a test and I said, well, it's either, you know, George Washington, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, or Abraham Lincoln. Then you see it and go, oh, yeah. That's Lincoln. So, that's a little easier. And he actually scored in the average range with that, about the 37 th percentile. So, you know, I think that he has difficulties kind of processing and kind of retaining, but if he can get a little exposure, he's doing much better. And his visual memory is within the average range.

Now, I want to go back to some of his achievement scores. And he was assessed in eighth grade, and we don't, this is ninth grade. But he was given the Iowa Test of Basic Skills in eighth grade on April, 1997. And he was compared to national percentile ranks. His vocabulary was assessed at the eighth percentile compared to the nation of eighth graders. His reading comprehension was actually the low average range
of the 25 th percentile, which wasn't bad. His spelling was at the second percentile, which is kind of interesting. So, this is a little higher. But what that indicates is, when he's doing school work, you know, he can't spell. So, when he's trying to express himself in written form, he's totally lost. And his ability to comprehend is kind of in the below average range at best. So, this is the guy, this is a kid who's going to struggle academically.

And then a year later they give him the Stanford Achievement Test in April, 1998, and he was assessed in the severely impaired range for reading, and he was a little higher for, for math, language, and science, in the low average range. So, here we have a kid who is now in eighth grade, and what we have is, he's starting to have academic problems. He's getting Ds. He's kind of sometimes missing class. He's kind of tardy. And now he's exhibiting some behavioral problems, also, a little -- defiance with the teachers. He occasionally, I think he stole, not a taco or tamale or something like that. And he was in trouble from that. And so he's starting to struggle.

Now, let me go back to, it's not working. There we go. Okay.

So, what happens in eighth grade, his stepfather, kind man who sells drugs, he's sent to prison for the second part of the eighth grade and for part of the ninth grade, for approximately 13 months, and he's on his own. Well, not on his own. He's living with his mother and his sister and younger brother, and he's doing the best he can. But mom's working more, trying to make ends meet. So, the family is a little more stressed, and he's not doing well in school at all. So, this kind of continues. He has some mild behavioral problems, and so now we're kind of moving long. He goes to high school at Montebello High School, and we were fortunate enough, you think, Emily Reeder of the public defender's officer, social worker interviewed the principal, the vice principal. I think it was within the last month. And he clearly remembered Mr. Budd. And he said, you know, he was kind of, you know, kind of some oppositional defiance, kind of tough in some ways, no violence, no major, serious problems but always kind of getting in some mild trouble and not doing well in school at all. And
we can see with his IQ and his achievement scores that he would struggle. And usually kids who are not doing well in school are going to try to, in feeling bad about it, kind of resist that and move in different directions.

So, you know, eighth and part of ninth grade his dad's in prison. His stepdad is in prison. He's not in much contact with his biological father. His family is kind of struggling, but they're getting by. And he ends up, in the sophomore year he ends up getting expelled from school for behavioral problems, and what happens next is a short time after that he has a bunch of kids in his house. His mom gets upset. And he's sent to his Uncle Budd's house in Los Angeles for three months. So, if I'm getting the sequence down, he gets expelled from school. He goes to Veil, which is continuation school. He gets in trouble, and then he's sent to his uncle Budd's house in LA. And he goes to Dorsey High School for about approximately three months, does okay there, does fairly well. He goes back to Veil High School, which is a continuation program, that he's there from like 8:30 in the morning until about 12:30, and it's much easier. And then
he plays basketball. And so that's more or less his life. And around this time in roughly his sophomore year he begins to smoke marijuana.

Now, he continues that education to have educational lack, but he's actually doing okay at this continuation school. His grades are kind of like Cs, an occasional B, but it's not that, you know, it's not a pressing school. So, this is where his life takes a turn for the worst. What happens at his junior year, he continues at this school, Veil. During his junior year he's involved in $a$, well, he and his buddies are helping these girls on the side of the road, and this car hits them. His buddy gets his leg broken, and Mr. Budd is unconscious, and he recovers, and everything is kind of fine. But that happens. And then at one point during his junior year, early senior year, actually I think it was in his senior year. He recognizes he's credit deficient, because he had all Es in high school his first year. So, he's behind. And he ends up at a friend's house. I think it was Mrs. Gadeau's home if I'm not mistaken. And she helps him, and his best friend's sister helps him with homework, and he kind of gets it together for
a little while. But since he's credit deficient, he ends up dropping out of school. And then, then this is the most important thing that happens, is at age 18 his stepfather dies in a motor vehicle accident. I think a drunk driver hit him. And this is the beginning of, I would say, the end of the family. This is such a, a major blow. Mother is severely depressed. Eventually she loses her job.

Glen moves back home, helps out with his younger brother, younger sister, helps him with his homework, make sure he's fed. At times there is not enough food. Collateral sources indicate that the neighbors sometimes feed the younger kids. The electricity is turned off. They have extension cords hooked from one house to the next to give them some light for a while. They're falling behind in the rent payments, and things go from bad to worse. Glen is still screwing around a bit, smoking marijuana and, you know, trying to hang with the girls and, but he's a little more responsible towards the family needs, because mom lost her job. She's just overwhelmed with despair. And what happens next is, within several months, in approximately January, 2002, now this
is roughly 16 months before the crime. And this is how fast the family is destabilized. I think the father, the stepfather died several months before that, and the family tried to keep it together for about five or six months.

What happens next is that the family has to move. They get evicted from their three-bedroom town home. So, they move into a studio apartment. And there is Mrs. Gill and her three kids -- because there is still one child in Belize -- and then, I think, her sister and a few more people. So, they have eight people in a studio apartment. And this last about anywhere from six to eight weeks, and they get evicted, because they have too many people. And they moved from a decent area where they had a nice group of friends and you got really connected to their families and did a lot with their families to now somewhere in LA that was crime-ridden. And within that first month he was there he was with, I think, one of his aunts, and he was just on the porch, and there was a drive-by, and he was shot at. And he was not involved in any gangs at all. So, a significant deterioration of losing his friends, losing his social network, going to a
crime-ridden area. You're there for $X$ amount of weeks. And then you're kicked out. You're evicted. So, now they go to another place, another studio, another seven or eight people in the place, and they last about another six to eight weeks there until they're kicked out once the landlord finds out. They got to move them out.

So, now we're at approximately late March, 2002. They're evicted again. The mother takes the younger son to a relative's house, and Mr. Budd, who's dropped out of school, attempts to get a job, but he's an immigrant, applies at ma and pa grocery stores, can't get anything going. He's unemployed, still smoking marijuana a few times a week, playing basketball, hanging with the girls. He's with his sister, and he move into his friend's house for maybe a few weeks, and then that doesn't work out. And then he moves again. Now we're kind of like in the summer of 2002. And he moves in with a girlfriend of his and, and her mother. And he moves in with her, but they're on section eight housing, and they had recently got, just got this place. So, they're kind of impoverished themselves. So, it's kind of rough
going. He sees his siblings on the weekend. It gives him a lot of happiness. He plays basketball. He's not getting a job. He said he can't find one. And so within, by November, 2002 he calls his Uncle Budd, who now lives in Las Vegas, and he says, hey, can I move out there with you? And he goes, okay. Fine, see what I can do to help you out.

So, between January of ' 02 and November of '02 and December of ' 02 Mr . Budd is moved six times. So, we can say that he lost his structure, his support system. Life, he doesn't have any money. What does he do to get money? He sells marijuana. He sells an ounce here, sells some joints, little baggies, and he's kind of surviving that way. So, now he moves to, let's see. He moves to Vegas. He moves in with his uncle and aunt. He gets along fairly well with his uncle. I think his uncle had some criminal problems early on, also. And he doesn't get along too well with his aunt. I think his aunt feels it's kind of an imposition to have him there. And he continues to sell marijuana, playing basketball. Several months later, in May, 2003 the crime occurs, and . that brings us up to date. And now he's
incarcerated.
So, now I want to go into what went wrong with this young man. Well, in terms of strong, caring, guiding father, his biological father had alcohol problems in, early in Glen's childhood. Domestic violence resulted in the separation. Biological father had cocaine problems during Glen's adolescence, and he's now in prison in Belize. Stepfather, decent man, sold drugs. Okay. At age 18 Glen's stepfather dies, and the family kind of deteriorates from that point on and, you know, there is a parental loss there, too. Let's move on.

Now, the mother, I want to kind of explain when it says mother inattentive, because based on, you know, when I talked to some of the collateral sources of people who know Mrs. Gill, they say, look. She's a nice lady. All right? But you have to kind of understand it from a perspective where she comes to this culture. She's doing the best she can. She's a nurse's assistant. Other times she has other different kinds of jobs. After her husband dies she's working two, three jobs trying to keep things together, and they're impoverished. And so, but,
you know, consistently, you know, when things are kind of going good, one of the collateral sources said that she was more focused on giving the kids material items as opposed to kind of the nurturing stuff. Low supervision, permissive with alcohol and education, that came from a collateral source who likes Mrs. Gill but said, you know, the kid, he's like 15 or 16 , and they're at a family party, and she's allowing him to have beer, and she goes, well, what can you do? She should have been much more firmer with him.

Significantly, she was depressed and stressed after the second husband's death, which is reasonable. One could expect that to occur. And we're talking about significant stressors in a short period of time. You know, the death of a husband, of the economics, of the family deteriorating, we're talking about now you're impoverished. You lost your job. You're being bounced back and forth from place to place, probably feeling overwhelmed. And the same pressure was on Glen, the same pressure of trying to help his siblings, trying to make it work, being a young man with a low $1 Q$, not having many possibilities, not having any mentoring to kind of
put him in the right direction. Once again criminally responsible. Okay. But these are factors that kind of were shaping him, you know, the pressure that he's experiencing.

Stable parental marriage, well, this is not, this should be separation. Parents separated age four. At times his stepfather was in prison, the stepfather's death. One parent always in a different country from Glen. You know, from the age of four until 11 he was with his dad, and then from the age of 11 on he was not with his dad. He was with his mom. So, there was always a separation going on there. Stable secure home, well, this kind of a redundant, we're getting redundant from the other thing, but basically, you know, raised in childhood by parental grandmother, severe financial problems when stepfather dies, multiple moves, the six moves during his 18 th year, not a lot of stability for this young man. Consistent discipline and limits, basically, you know, I think the collateral interview said the mother was permissive and not structuring the children, loved the children, decent mom but, you know, somewhat permissive.

Academic success, we talked about his low

IQ, and kind of the parental involvement for academics was low but, you know, let's once again keep this in context. We have a family moving here from a different country, you know, the kind of stress to make things work. They're doing the best they can. But one of the interesting things we're going to come up to is one of the mother's of Glen's best friend, when she was taking care of him during that, I think his junior or senior year, she had him do his homework, and he was very respectful, and he was actually kind of doing well for a little while. He was kind of in a different environment, you know. There was probably a lot of family stress. Accepted by peers, for the most part, you know, yes. He was doing fairly well. He had decent peers. He wasn't involved in, he was involved in soccer as child in Belize. He played some organized baseball for a little while, basketball for a little while. Drugs and alcohol abuse discouraged, prohibited, not really. Biological father, alcohol and cocaine problem, stepfather sold marijuana, mother permissive to allow alcohol usage. Family had drug involvement legal problems.

So, what's being modeled for this young
man? Well, it's not, it's not more or less that, you know, you shouldn't be doing these kind of things. You know, stepdad helps the family by selling marijuana. Biological father is in prison. So, positive socialization and mentoring in late adolescence, stepfather is a decent guy. I'm sure the father is a decent guy. But in terms of being role models, some good, some not so good. He didn't have anybody there at the age of 18 . You would think that maybe perhaps the biological father would have stepped up a little and got more involved to try to help this young man. He lost his whole neighborhood once the stepfather died and they had to move. And that was a big support system for the two mothers of his best friends. So, that's what went wrong with this.young man.

Now, what I want to talk about next is, remember this visual aid we had? And this is Glen. And the base here where we had, you know, kind of a no psychological disorders for the family and no substance abuse problems, we have a lot of different things going on, a lot of different mitigations we covered. I'm just going to kind of go over it again. Father's alcoholism, stepfather sells drugs, stepfather and biological
father go to prison. Immigration, not able to work. Well, you know, there is a lot of people that work even if they don't have social security cards. That's the reality. So, stepfather's death result in extreme family instability, lack of guidance, nuturing at that point, family struggles financially, multiple moves that we talked about.

So, what happens? Positive peer relationships, well, he lost those when he moved. Okay? Modeling of positive values, that was kind of lost also at the age of 18 when the stepfather died and the family struggled. Consistency, structure, and stability decreased significantly. He's not really getting this anymore. He's kind of on his own. He has never really had an intact family. And so then there is a higher chance of drug dependency and criminal history. I'll give the psychological disorder. So, these two are supposed to be hightlighted here. So, the stressors of this kid's life, all right, increased and then the lack of resiliency factors and the increase of the risk factors result in a higher propensity of drug dependency and criminal history. And that's what happens. This is what
happens here. Now, let me see if I'm, okay.
Continued mitigation, we talked about his
life. Now I want to add on some things. His juvenile history indicates mild to moderate acting out as juvenile. No gang involvement, which is positive. One significant juvenile arrest, which is verbal abuse of an officer. He completed six months juvenile probation, no evidence of juvenile antisocial behavior as revealed by numerous collateral sources, and no prior adult violent history. He did sell marijuana, and he engaged in some minor petit thievery in the eighth and ninth grade. And when we compare him, I don't think he's a sociopath. And I say that for several reasons. A sociopath is an individual who has a history of instrumental violence and lacks a conscience. I mean, he just doesn't care about anything, ever. And, and when we compare him to, when we did the -- Checklist, revised second edition, this is on 20 realms, and you can get as much as 40 points. So, each realm gives you two points. And if you get a score of like 30 and up, you know, that indicates that you really have some severe problems, and you have sociopathic personality traits or behaviors. He scores about
a 9.5, which is not necessarily, it's not a high score at all. Now, I base that on not only my clinical interviews but the collateral interviews, talking to other people, which you're going to see next, but people who knew this kid throughout his formative years and early adult years. So, based on that, you know, I don't see him as being a sociopath.

Now, let's talk about cognitive immaturity. There is a brief filed with the supreme court, Roper versus Simons in 2005 pertaining to the juvenile death penalty. And because of that brief, what they did is, they outlawed juvenile death penalty. And the reason why they did it is because they had all these CAT scans and MRIs of these adolescents and young adults, and they figured out -- they already kind of knew this, but now this kind of gave them proof -- that when you're, you know, as you develop, as, if you have kids, you can understand this. When your kids are $15,16,17$ years old, there's more defiance, more acting out, poor judgment. And then all of a sudden they hit their, maybe early, mid 20s. They mature a little more, and they're much more reasonable. Well,
it's because what they found out, that in the central part of the brain is over stimulated when it comes to impulsiveness and, and issues like that. And in your frontal lobes, which is the executor, where you kind of do cost/benefit ratio, should I do this? What are the long-term effects of this? It's under developed. It continues to develop in the late teen years and early 20s. And that kind make sense. That's kind of why if, you have, if you're like a young man and you 20 years old and you're trying to get car insurance and your rates are really high, because they kind of know statistically that when you're hitting about 25 years old, you're settling down. Okay? So, and that's part of because of how a young adult or an adolescent processes information. They're not hard wired as, I would say, I am as a 44-year-old or somebody in their 30 s. So, adolescents tend to be less mature, more impulsive, less capable of controlling their conduct and thinking in terms of long-range consequences. Adolescents -development which learns character and moral judgment are incomplete and still undergoing formation.

Now, this individual is almost 23 years
old. And the crime occurred probably when he was a little over 20 years/four months. So, he's not an adolescent. We all know that. But he's a young adult. And that kind of still fits. And I thought that was information that was important to give. We already talked about the cognitive immaturity in terms of his low IQ. So, if you have a low $I Q$, how are you processing? How are yu thinking? Well, you can only process the best that you can based on your cognitive ability. Now, we already went through the test here. Let's see what else we have. Okay.

Skipper versus South Carolina, another supreme court decision, ruled that evidence of adjustment in prison, jail goes to the character of the defendant, character is highly relevant to the jury sentencing determination. So, what did I do? I reviewed the Clark County Detention Center records for the last two and a half years. And what we found out is he has no violent instances, no attempted escapes, and no serious infractions. What does he have? One time he had a magazine in his cell. I think he got a day for that of isolation, whatever. Another time his cell wasn't cleaned. Another time he was banging on the door
to try to attract the girls. That was it. No fights, no attempted escapes, no serious infractions. Let's see what else we have here. What I would like to do briefly is go through some of the people I interviewed. I'm not going to go through the mother. This is his sister, and some things I highlighted here, just to, so you can kind of understand where I kind of was coming from. Ms. Angela Rudd, his sister, described her brother as a calm individual, gets along well with others, no domestic violence. You know, for the most part she has a positive relationship. His ex-girlfriend of two years, Ms. Kim Hensley, no evidence of anger control problems or history of aggression, always treated her well, described him as a sweet individual. Patricia Byrd, this lady is about 23 years old. Her brother is best friends with Mr. Budd. She tutored him in high school, and she acknowledge that Mr. Sud felt embarrassed because of his academic deficits, and he couldn't understand educational concepts. She also stated he has no history of violence or gang involvement, associated with a good group of people. Mr. Budd's family was nice, and the family was
severely affected by Mr. Winston Miller's death. Mr. Budd was described as very quiet and shy. Ms. Sonya Dudley, Mr. Budd's best friend, Eddie Byrd's mother, Ms. Dudley knew the family very well. She had a close relationship with Ms. Karen Gill. Mrs. Gill loved her children, yet provided poor supervision. Mr. Budd was always respectful, always enjoyed the Dudleys' family outings, called her auntie, always affectionate and respectful in the home. He was never violent. Ms. Dudley confirmed the family's deterioration after Mr. Winston's tragic death, described Mr. Budd as a very good kid who did well when supervised. Ms. Louise Dedo, she also knew the family for about eight years. These are the people in his life until the stepfather died and they had to move. Verified parental arguments between Mrs. Gill and Mr. Winston. Mr. Budd live with Ms. Dedo for three or four months during high school, secondary problems between Mr. Budd and his mom. Mr. Budd got along exceptionally well with her family, obeyed family rules, and had no problems. She had no problems with him. She described him as quiet, well-mannered, respectful. And when Mr. Budd lived at her home, she expressed
the importance of education, and he completed all his homework and was attentive to school needs. She continues and says that, you know, there was a severe emotional impact on the family after Mr. Miller's death, that, for example, Mrs. Gill was emotionally overwhelmed, worked excessively, and kids were unattended. Tremendous amount of responsibility fell on Glen's shoulder to take care of his younger brother. Mr. Budd made meals for his brother, watched him, and helped him with his homework. Common for the Budd children to be hungry. Other people in the neighborhood fed them. Mrs. Gill was much more absent in the children's life. The children were unsupervised sometimes even at 1:00 o'clock in the morning. Utilities were turned off on several occasions. And Mr. Budd's academics declined once his stepfather died. I think actually that might be wrong, because I think he had dropped out of school right before his stepfather's death.

Ms. Glass, this is the 18-year-old daughter of Ms. Dedo, more or less said, confirming once again that, you know, he had a lot of responsibility when his stepfather died, no violence, decent guy. Mr. Eddie Byrd, this is his
buddy. I don't know if he came here today. If he did, I'm just going to whiz through this really quickly. Mr. Byrd reported Mr. Budd's family were permissive pertaining to academics. Mr. Budd suffered from low self-esteem, was ashamed pertaining to academics, confirmed the family's disintegration after Mr. Miller's death.

Let's go on to the next one. Vernon Glass, is he here today? BY MR. O'BRIEN:
Q. No.
A. No? Okay. Another close friend, these three guys were in the accident together, was complementary of Mr. Budd's mother and stepfather, confirmed the family's disintegration after stepfather's death. Now Mr. Budd was severely affected by Mr. Miller's death. After the family was evicted he saw less and less of Mr. Budd. These guys were friends for several years. Confirmed Mr. Budd had a tremendous amount of responsibility toward siblings. Mr. Budd was not involved in gangs, carried weapons, or display of violence. Mr. Glass confirmed that Mr. Budd was of small stature, sometimes picked on, rarely defend himself. When Mr. Budd was 16 years of
age, he was playing basketball with his siblings, was intimidated by gang members. Mr. Budd carried a small bat briefly to defend himself and his siblings and never looked for trouble. And that doesn't mean he wasn't wrong with this thing, but just kind of shows some of the patterns and his history.

So, basically I conducted approximately 11 collateral interviews. Emily Reeder conducted approximately 10 . So, there's 21 total. As stated, I think the vice principal of Montebello High School is, you know, say he wasn't in school a lot, and he was kind of a opposition defiant kid. He was getting in some trouble but nothing violent tendencies, nothing serious. So, let's see where we're at here. Okay. We're going to move away from that.

So, what I would like to do is move back once again just quickly. This is the mitigation. Okay? You have a lot of things that went wrong in this guy's life between this, the fact that he has positive adjustment while incarcerated, low IQ, the numerous collaterals that indicate that he was actually a decent kid before all these things happened. I think the most important thing I want
to stress is, is the stress, all of the culmination of the poverty, the, the, all the family deteriorating that increased the potential for something to go wrong in this young man's Iife. No skills, low IQ, decent kid for the most part, really no history of violence before this. Kind of minimal. All right? So, we don't have a long history of somebody who's violently re-offending, and that's, I guess, my presentation for right now.

MR. O'BRIEN: Thank you, doctor.
Pass the witness, judge.
THE COURT: Mr. Kane?

## CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. KANE:
Q. The IQ number of 80 that you gave us, that's not really a hard number, is it, doctor?
A. If we assess this guy a hundred times, if we have a psychologist, different psychologists assess this guy, he will come up with this IQ. Let me give you the range. I want to, this way I don't mislead you.
Q. That, you've anticipated my question. What you're really saying by that 80 is there is a
margin of error for either side? And that is -
A. Yes, sir.
Q. -- 30 of your report.
A. Yeah. I'm going to actually, I'm taking the test out, because we have ranges at the 95 th percentile, the 95 th confidence international okay. His full scale $I Q$ is 80 at the ninth percentile. So, if we test him 95 out of a hundred times, he's going to range between 76 , borderline $I Q$, and 84 , still low average. So, any psychologist you're going to get here, if the guy knows how to administer the test, which I'm sure they do, he's going to be falling in that range, borderline to low average. And I'm not going to emphasize borderline as much as I'm going to emphasize low average, roughly at the 90 th percentile. So, when you compare him to a hundred people, 91 operate a little better than he does.
Q. Now, I want to be clear about what's not in your report.

Glenford Budd is not mentally retarded, correct?
A. He is not mentally retarded.
Q. He is not mentally ill, correct?
A. He is not mentally ill.
Q. On the spectrum of intelligence, he fits into the below average range?
A. Correct.
Q. You described things that Mr. Budd told you about his marijuana dealing, selling a bag here and there to friends and things like that. Do you remember that?
A. Correct.
Q. Actually it was more than that, wasn't it, doctor?
A. In the spring of 2003 before his arrest, he told me that on one occasion he went to California and purchased four pounds of marijuana, and on a second occasion he purchased, I think, two pounds of marijuana. So, it escalated when he was in Vegas here.
Q. Well, in fact, Mr. Budd never had a job, and the only way he had ever earned money was from selling marijuana, isn't it?
A. That is true.
Q. And, in fact, you state on page 14 of your report, Mr. Budd had never been gainfully employed. Mr. Budd sold marijuana from the age of 17 until his incarceration in May of 2003?
A. That would make sense to me.
Q. And he was dependent on those sales of marijuana for the money that he used to live, correct?
A. I would think that would be a correct assumption.
Q. As far as what he or what anyone else told you, he had no other source of income?
A. Correct.
Q. Based on that, did you form a hypothesis as to why Glen Ford Budd killed the three people that he killed?
A. Well, my hypothesis, and I'm just, and I'm just thinking about this. I mean, you think about all of the stress factors that occurred and how this kid's life deteriorated. And if he's selling marijuana, my hypothesis would be that, hypothetically if it was ripped off, that would be more or less his life line in terms of income and, and he might engage in poor decision-making.
Q. And, in fact, you stated in your report, it is this are author's hypothesis that, I'm reading from page 18 towards the bottom of the page. It is this author's hypothesis that since Glenford was living day to day in an economic sense for years, if he felt these individuals
ripped him off of his marijuana, parentheses, and profits, closed parentheses, he possibly responded out of desperation.

## Did I read that correctly?

A. Yes. Yes.
Q. And desperation would be desperation over losing his profits?
A. I guess you can interpret it that way, desperation in terms of, for him, his situation, which would not, obviously it's a very poor decision. He took the lives of three young men. But the stressors and everything else, they likely culminated in him making obviously a horrendous decision.
Q. In addition to being a poor decision and a horrendous decision, in the terms of your hypothesis, doctor, it was just a straightforward business decision, wasn't it?
A. Well, I wouldn't, that's hard for me to say.
Q. These people were damaging his profits, correct?
A. I hear what you're saying.
Q. He reacted to that, correct?
A. I would say to you that it's multifaceted
in regards to his stress level which, once again, does not, you know, condone his behavior, but the fact that, you know, the family had deteriorated so much and that he didn't have any guides in his life in terms of male role models in helping him deal with this part of his life or he has no skill level, low IQ and he gets to the point where he makes a horrible decision, so it just, I think it's a multifaceted situation where he felt a lot of pressure.
Q. Doctor, I'll accept, and I won't argue with you. All of the decisions that we make in our life are the product of multiple factors, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And a lot of them we aren't even aware of, correct?
A. Yeah. You're right.
Q. I may think I know why I became a lawyer, and I might have become a lawyer for seven reasons that I'm not even aware of buried somewhere back in my subconscious, correct?
A. Could be.
Q. But we all have free will, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And we all make decisions?
A. Right.
Q. And your hypothesis was that the motive for this specific action, the death of these three guys, was the economic motive that they were interfering with the profits from Mr. Budd's drug deal?
A. Now, that would be, yeah, one explanation with a lot of different variables. Now, however, let me just add something.
Q. Doctor, that's all I asked.
A. Okay.

MR. KANE: Thanks.

## REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. O'BRIEN:
Q. Brief, judge.

Now, Dr. Paglini, you interviewed many people. Of course, you talked to Glenford. Tell me about this indicia of all these drug profits. Did he have a car?
A. No.
Q. Did he have an expensive collection of jewelry?
A. This is a kid who's living day to day.

That's my understanding. He was living in someone else's home, you know. He was separated from his family, and he didn't feel, I think, too welcomed in the home, and he was living day to day and kind of, interesting enough, modeling his stepfather, you know, in terms of trying to survive in that realm of selling marijuana.
Q. Did you receive any information that Mr. Budd was earning a considerable or even a moderate amount of money from any drug enterprise?
A. Well, I, I wouldn't call it a drug enterprise. I would say it was probably pretty small, but he was using it to survive, yeah.
Q. And, in fact, he often had periods of no food?
A. That seemed to be more relevant, I think, beforehand that he would, you know, rely on the good graces, after his stepfather died, of neighbors and other people and girlfriends and things like that.
Q. But you didn't notice any marked increase in his economic standing, did you?
A. Not, not that I'm aware of, sir. MR. O'BRIEN: Thank you. Nothing further.

THE COURT: Mr. Kane?
MR. KANE: No, your Honor.
THE COURT: Doctor, thank you. You may step down.

THE WITNESS: Thank you.
THE COURT: Who's next, Mr. O'Brien, Mr. Brooks?

MR. O'BRIEN: Court's indulgence, please.
THE COURT: Of course.
MR. O'BRIEN: Defense will rest, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Kane, Ms. Pandukht?
MR. KANE: No rebuttal.
THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, I think we'll take our afternoon recess. We'll take about 15 minutes.

During the recess I must remind you, it remains your duty not to discuss this case among yourselves or with anyone eise. Don't read, watch, listen to a report of or commentary on anything which might be associated with this matter. Don't form or express an opinion in any of these issues until it has been fully and finally submitted to you under instruction of law by me.

We'll see you in about 15 minutes.
(Thereupon, the jury exited the courtroom.)
THE COURT: At this point it would certainly be my plan to instruct and allow you to close after the break.

Are you all prepared to do that?
MR. KANE: Yes, your Honor.
MR. O'BRIEN: Yes.
MR. BROOKS: Judge, just for the record, I think this is clear, but both defense attorneys are allowed to argue. I'll be arguing first, then Mr. O'Brien.

THE COURT: Mr. Kane, no objection to that?

MR. KANE: No, judge.
THE COURT: Very well. Take about 15 minutes or however long you need to get set up. Mr. Kane?

MR. KANE: Yes, your Honor. Before we break I don't think there is any formal requirement that, as there is at trial that the Court advise the defendant of his right to testify, but I think it should be made clear on the record that the defendant has been informed that he has the right to address this penalty jury
either under oath or by an unsworn statement.
THE COURT: Mr. Brooks, Mr. O'Brien, have you explained to Mr. Budd the opportunity that he would have to essentially talk to this jury?

MR. O'BRIEN: Yes, your Honor.
THE COURT: Mr. Budd, are you comfortable that your attorneys have explained to you the right that you have to talk to this jury?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.
THE COURT: You know you can, this is a wholly different legal proceeding than the guilt phase? You understand that, correct?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
THE COURT: And you don't even have to be sworn in this part of the proceeding if you want to talk to the jury. There are some minor limitations on what you could say to the jury but, indeed, they're minor.

Is it your decision that you wish not to talk to this jury?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.
MR. KANE: And I just ask that it be clear on the record that the defendant is doing this knowing that if he were to make an unsworn statement in allocution, that he would not be
subject to cross-examination.
THE COURT: Yeah.
MR. O'BRIEN: May I interject, your
Honor?
THE COURT: Yes.
MR. O'BRIEN: Judge, I've advised Mr. Budd of his right to make an unsworn statement. I've advised him that if he chose to --

THE COURT: To be free of cross-examination?

MR. O'BRIEN: I told him if, if he elected to exercise that right, he would not be cross-examined by the district attorney, provided he stayed within certain parameters. I also discussed with him the ability to do sworn testimony.

MR. KANE: Judge, I don't want to nitpick, but I just, I want a clear record the parameters that would apply to any statement the defendant might make to the jury on, under my understanding, would apply both to sworn or unsworn statement. That is the limitations of what he could say to a jury would be expressions of remorse and pleads for leniency, without
denials of guilt. If he gave an unsworn statement in allocution, if he departed from that, I get to object to that and ask the Court not to let him continue and have the jury disregard it. But under no circumstances, no matter what he said in an unsworn declaration, would I have the opportunities to cross-examine him. And I want to make sure he understands.

THE COURT: That's why I use the term, Mr. Budd, you have the right to talk to the jury, because really that's what it is at this point. My concern, frankly, at this stage of the proceeding is whether or not both defense counsel are comfortable that Mr. Budd understands what I think is a unique opportunity in criminal law he has at this point to ask for leniency, ask that his life be spared.

MR. O'BRIEN: Judge, I will inform this Court I have spent considerable time discussing this very issue with Mr. Budd.

THE COURT: Counsel, will you approach?
(Conference at the bench.)
THE COURT: We're going, to Mr. Kane, Ms. Pandukht, I'm going to ask for something that is a bit unusual in that I want to speak to the
defendant in the presence of his counsel but without, without the presence of the State. I will make a record of it.

Let me stop there and ask whether or not you have objection to me doing so.

MR. KANE: Judge, given the importance of this issue, as long as there will be a record made of it in case of any appeal problems, no, I do not.

THE COURT: Thank you. I'm going to do that now. I would ask, then, that Ms. Pandukht and Mr. Kane please, and actually this side of the room leave the courtroom, please.

MR. KANE: If we're going to do that, judge, can we just clear the room?

THE COURT: Clear the room is fine, yes. I think that's appropriate. (Thereupon, the jurors, the State, and the audience exited the courtroom.)

THE COURT: Mr. Budd, I want to talk to you from a different position. It is likely hard that you can separate me sitting next to you from the person that's been sitting up here throughout the course or your incarceration and throughout the course of this trial. I am deeply concerned
about you not talking to this jury. I, I understand, because your attorneys have told me your feelings about not wanting to testify. They have told me what your attitude and what your belief is about what actually happened on the date in question. But you don't have to talk that in, at this stage of the game. All you have to do is to talk to this jury about how you feel about the loss of your friends, how you feel about the loss that their family feels, how you feel about the loss that you potentially face from your family if you're put to death. Obviously you will never see your mother, grandmother, nieces, nephews, brothers, sisters. You don't have to talk about what happened on that day.

Do you feel badly about those three young men?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.
THE COURT: Do you feel badly about what their family went through?

THE DEEENDANT: Yes, ma'am.
THE COURT: Do you feel badiy about what your family is going through?

THE DEFENDANT: Yeah.
THE COURT: I think it is important that
you tell, if nothing else, that you tell that to the jury. I am deeply concerned about the decision that this jury would make without you getting up there and talking to them. I know how frightening, how terrifying it must be but, and I will leave it, of course, to counsel to guide you. But it is my personal and professional opinion that you should speak to this jury.

Do you have any questions for me?
THE DEFENDANT: No.
MR. O'BRIEN: She's telling you this, because of everything I've been telling you. This could make a difference. We just want you to say what's on your heart. We don't want you to lie. We just want you to tell the truth.

THE COURT: Is there any question in your mind that what everybody went through, your family, their family, is a horrible thing to go through?

THE DEFENDANT: I'm going to do it.
THE COURT: He's going to do it.
MR. O'BRIEN: You're sorry for what their family is going through, and you're sorry for what your family is going through. That's just the truth, Glen. That's how you feel; is that true?

THE DEFENDANT: Yeah.
MR. O'BRIEN: Now, as far as your plans for the future, you want to still be able to be a son, right, and a brother and an uncle? Don't you still want to talk to Eddie Byrd and Vernon? If you do, just say it from your heart, doesn't have to be fancy.

Do you want to write down some notes? Do you know what you're going to say?

THE DEFENDANT: (No audible response.)
(Recess taken.)
THE COURT: Let's go back on the record in the matter of State versus Budd. I think that we're to the place now where we can order the instructions; is that correct?

MR. KANE: Yes, judge.
THE COURT: Very well. As I remember, the only instruction that was to be modified had to do with the one that talks about murder in the first degree being, may be mitigated by any of the following circumstances, and there was a one through seven that the defense wanted to modify; is that correct?

MR. KANE: Well, the next instruction right after that, the defense wanted a couple of
many times, he don't want to say it. So, that was kind of hard for him.
Q. Now, you mentioned that he and his stepfather ultimately got very close. Is that fair to say?
A. Yes, they did.
Q. Can you tell me more about their relationship?
A. Well, right there they become close. And, you know, I had to go work. And my husband take care of Raheem and Glen; he make sure they go to school. He drop them off he picked them up. He drop me off at work. You know, he just keep my family together. He was there for me.
Q. I'm going to show you --

MR. O'BRIEN: And I've previously shown this to the State, and we're just going to use it for demonstrative purposes.

THE COURT: Very well.
BY MR. O'BRIEN:
Q. Karen, I'm putting up here -- I thought this might help you a little bit, since the movements are a little hard to keep track of. Can you see that on your screen, there?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, in the lower left-hand comer of this diagram, there's a circle underneath it that designated as

Belize. Of course, this follows over to the right, and it goes through Glenford first arriving to the United States. I'd like to talk to you about some of those blue circles, those yellow circles, and that red circle. Okay?

Now, you've already told us about the new country, the new culture, the new stepfather. Talk to us a little bit about what Louise DeDeaux talked to us about, getting kicked out of the house. Tell us how that came about.
A. It was hard for me because after Winston had passed, I always tried to keep my family together, tried to hold on as much job as I can, and put a lot of responsibility to Glen. I figured, you know --
Q. Do you think you were a little too tough on him?
A. Yes.
Q. Of course --
A. It was --
Q. I'm sorry. Go ahead. What did you want to say?
A. I think I just put a lot of pressure on him. And my baby he come to me and said, "Just let me have one night. Just Friday for myself." And even when Friday come, he would still take care of Raheem, his little brother with him.
Q. Did it frustrate Glenford that he couldn't find a job?
A. Yes.
Q. Can I ask you why -- did the family ever take any efforts to get him in the amnesty program or anything else, to fix that for him?
A. No. I was just too scared. I was just too scared. I did not know -. I did not know the law. I did not know that I could apply.
Q. But the subject came up, and you talked about it at times?
A. Yes.
Q. Just never pursued if?
A. No.
Q. Tell me a little bit about -- and we're looking at -- excuse me -- we're looking at this photo here, just after he leaves Louise's house, Winston dies, and you guys are trying to keep that nice home you had together. Tell me about that period of time.
A. Well, Glen tried everything he can. He said, "I'm going to get a job." He tried. He did not have a Social. He couldn't go to college, because he didn't have a Social Security.
Q. Of course, he never finished high school, did he?
A. No. But when he eleventh grade, they had -like, military people came from the different school, and
they tried to get him into the military, or whatever, their program, anything at all. He couldn't never did nothing. He needed a Social Security. So --
Q. Okay. Let me bring you back. I know this is hard. Winston's died. You're scrambling to find work. Tell me about what's going on in the family as you're trying to keep that home together and you're trying to keep that family together. Talk to me about that.
A. That's hard, because I had my three children in the home; Glen was the oldest. And, you know, he came to me and he said, "Mom, don't worry about nothing. Winston not here, but I'm going to help you. I'm going to help you to raise Raheem. I'm going to take care of Angie. I'm going to help you."

I said, "well, I don't know how you're going to do that, Glenford. I have to take on another job." I was working for B of A, Bank of America, and I take on another job at CitiBank. And then I have my son doing everything for me -- pick them up, drop them off. You know, the only thing they couldn't do was cook. And I taught him how to cook.

And then when he learned to cook, he start cooking, so I didn't have to cook. I just take on a third job, because I couldn't -- I had to. I wanted to keep the house I had. I wanted to keep my kids together, and I
wanted to make sure they wore a coat. And then I just fell apart. I just fell apart, and I couldn't manage no more. And they kicked me out of that house. I went and got a single apartment, and single --
Q. Let me stop you there for a second, Karen.

Was it hard on Glenford to leave that
neighborhood and his friends?
A. Yeah. He was crying that day. He was, like -his girlfriend at the time came to me; she gave me a check. She said, "How much money you owe?" She said, "My mom sent you the check."

By the time she sent me the check, it was already too late. I had owed, like, maybe 3- or 400, and they wouldn't rent it, because they know the next month I couldn't pay. They said, "Take the money. Take it and go somewhere else." He didn't want to leave, because he don't know nowhere but Montebello.
Q. Tell me about -- I don't know if I should call it a home -- tell me about this studio apartment you were forced to move into.
A. It was definitely hard, because every time we would go -- just go visit my family and leave him there, he never really like that. The neighborhood we live in, it was not a nice neighborhood.
Q. A lot of gangs?
A. It was a lot of drugs, a lot of crack. Even though the neighborhood we live in was a lot of seniors, but they have a lot of crack in that neighborhood.
Q. Un-huh.
A. And we was in there. And I had my sister staying in there with me to help me with my children, and she was going through the same thing I was going through. So, she stayed there with me just to help. I didn't allow any people in there. They said it was too many of us in the room. This time it not that I couldn't pay, it was because there was too many of us in there. So, they kicked me out of there, too.
Q. And when they kicked you out of there, the family was separated?
A. Yeah.
Q. What happened?
A. I took the little ones, Raheem and Angie, and I went with my friend. And Glen stayed with one of his friends. And then shortly after that, he came to live with us in Las Vegas.
Q. Did he have to kind of shuttle between various friends?
A. Yeah; between his friends and his girlfriend.
Q. And now we're going to talk about Uncle Kurt a little bit. But I want to talk to you about this circle
here.
Did there come a time when Junie went to live with his Uncle Kurt?
A. Yes.
Q. And why did you think that was a good idea?
A. Because, I said, "I'm going through a lot. And this is family." And they love him as they were -- I can't do it by myself. Somebody have to help me. And I went to the family.
Q. And what did Kurt do?
A. And he say, "Yeah, my nephew can stay with me." And then he put him in a school, and the school that he put him in was gang related. And they tried to jump him one day. And when he told me that, I was home -- I said, "You have to came back home." And Kurt said, "No. He stay. I'm going to take care of him."
Q. Okay. Did Kurt take care of Glen?
A. No.
Q. Tell me about that.
A. Kurt was having problems with his wife and his girlfriend. He left the lady that he was with to go back to his wife, and he didn't take my son with him. The girl called me and she said, "Karen, Kurt don't live here no more," she said, so -- "but your boy is here." I said, "What do you mean my boy is here?" She said, "He didn't
take him."
So, I talked to her and I said, "Why he left?" I mean, "Why didn't you take your nephew with you?" And he was, like, "Karen, he's going to be out of there." I said, "No, he's not. You promised you're going to take care of him."
Q. Did Glen kind of look up to Kurt?
A. Yes.
Q. And Kurt agreed, "Hey, you know, I'll take care of him. I'll watch him"; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. And then he just left?
A. Yes. The lady and him have problems, and he went back to his wife. And I think he went --
Q. And he just left Glenford with this other woman?
A. Yes. I don't think he would -- I don't think he left like that, but he would came back -- but he would have came back for him. The point, he left and he didn't take my son with him. So, I told him, you know, "I'm going to go back," and I go back and I got him back.
Q. And at some point, after you're going through all these evictions and Glenford is ruming from friend to friend trying to find a place to sleep, he comes to Las Vegas; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. And who was he coming to stay with in Las Vegas?
A. He was coming to stay with his uncle.
Q. Uncle Kurt?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you think that was a very good idea? He doesn't --
A. Well, promised me and assured me this time is different, that it's going -- you know, and I said, "Well, it's only going to be for a short time," because I know what type of person he is now. But this time he had his grandfather over here, too.
Q. Okay.
A. So, he was between the grandfather and the uncle for support. His grandfather was going to be there financially; but for a place to sleep, he was going to be with Kurt.
Q. During this time, did you talk with Glen on the phone?
A. All the time. He would tell me that he don't have no food. They treat him bad. They said he eat up all the food and they don't want him eating up all the food. And he just said, "Mommy, just come over and get a place." And said, "I got to save up enough money and then I'11 come."

And then he called me back and he said, "I got a
place." And I said, "How are you going to have a place? You don't have a job."
Q. And he said some friends have a place and they can't afford to pay for the place." And, he said, "They're going to give it to me." And I said, "I'll come, but I would have to have that place in my name. I would have do all that."
Q. So, he's trying to get you an apartment?
A. Yeah. He's trying to get me an apartment over here. But it never happened. It didn't go like that. It never happened.
Q. Now, when you were talking -- who wasn't giving him food? Who was treating him so poorly at Kurt's house?
A. Kurt's mother-in-law. His wife's mother.
Q. Was Kurt gone a lot?
A. Yeah. Kurt was -- at that time, Kurt was in jail. Kurt had went to jail.
Q. And tell me more about this -- Kurt's mother-in-law and how she treated Glen.
A. She was real mean to him, and she didn't like him. I don't know why she didn't like him. But she was, like, "You're not going to eat all my grandkids' food," and -- you know, she was just mean to him. And then the wife was coming -- she was, like, "Karen, that is my mom and she's leaving town, and take care of your son." She
always does. She's, like -- she'll call me and tell me everything that was going on. She was, like -- even if it's her mom -- she'd tell me. And that's her fault that he was treated bad.

But, "I'm going to send for you. As soon as I get myself together, I'm going to send for you." It didn't happen.
Q. What kind of contact have you had with your son over the last two, two and a half years?
A. I visit my son three times a month, at least. Sometimes four times a month. Every weekend.
Q. And you life in Los Angeles?
A. Yes.
Q. Sometimes I take a Greyhound. I drive. I fly. Sometime I visit him, and I don't have no monies. Sometime I put \$10 on his book, \$5 dollars, whatever I got. But I'll come. I'll say, "I don't care, Son. I don't have no money, but I'm going to come." And I would take the little one. I'd take Angela. I take her baby. My family. My friends. Anybody who want to ride with me or offer me ride that would come. But I would never leave him there. All I got is my family and my kids. That's all I have.
Q. What do you hope for the future as far as having contact with Glen and for the rest of your family with
contact with Glen?
A. I would love to be able to just come wherever he at; wherever they send my son, wherever he at, I'm just going to have to move closer to where he's at, to be there for him. It's hard. It's hard. It's like every time I leave somewhere, they pull the rug. Everytime I sit with him, I'm not at home. It's like I'm going through a roller coaster. I don't know when it's going to stop. But I would love to be able to come see him, visit him, just be there for him.
Q. Now, of course, your family has been going through very terrible times lately, in the last two and a half years. Where's Glenford's concerns been during this time?
A. Me and my family. He keeps saying, "Everything's going to be hard, but we'll be all right." He knows I'm not going to leave him nowhere. You know, he keeps telling me -- he's just worried about me.
Q. What do you think Glenford -- do you think Glenford can be -- still be a son, if in prison?
A. Yes. He still is, even now. Even now, when he calls me, you know, I just look forward to the call. I look forward to the mail. I do everything. I tell him everything. Everything.
Q. It's important for you to keep that?
A. It is. It's very important for me. I don't have nothing. I grow up with my kids, you know. That's all I have is my children.
Q. So, you think he's going to be able to be -still be a brother to his sisters and his little brother?
A. Yes. Everything. He is. And they look forward to him, too. The little one -- you know, everything happen in his life, he put on paper, and he send it to him, you know. I'm coming, Mormy. I'm coming. Wait for me." Because I can't go. Glen get a visitor on Friday. My little one get out of school at 3:00 ' clock on Fridays, and if I'm driving, I won't make it in time to catch that visit, then I would have to fly. And I would have to buy two tickets to fly. And the little one tell me, "I'm coming." I can't tell -- I can tell him no, but he wants to tell him stuff that he lie and didn't want to tell me. And then he's giving me -- I'm, like, "What are you saying?" You know, "I didn't do good in school," or "I have this girl." You know, everything.
Q. This is Raheem?
A. Yeah. I said, "You got a girlfriend?" I didn't even know he had a girlfriend." He tells him everything. Everything. It's hard. It's hard for Raheem, too. Because he was like Raheem's father, after Raheem's father left. You know, he just look up to Glenford. He cleans
his shoes the same way. He wears his clothes the same way. You know, for everything. You know, "I can't wait for my brother to get hame."
Q. Is there anything else you want to tell these people?
A. Please, just consider my son. You know, it's real sad for what happened. I really apologize for them families. It's hard for their family, for my family. I'm sorry, you know. But at least just give me that chance to still be able to see my son, to be there with him. I would really appreciate that.

MR. O'BRIEN: Thank you, Karen.
Pass the witness.
MR. KANE: The State has no questions for Mrs. Gill?

THE COURT: You may step down.
THE WITNESS: Thank you.
THE COURT: Who's next, Mr. O'Brien?
MR. O'BRIEN: The Court's brief indulgence.
MR. KANE: Judge, can I be excused from the courtroom briefly, on an unrelated matter.

THE COURT: Certainly.
MR. O'BRIEN: Would you like me to wait for Mr. Kane?

THE COURT: Ms. Pandukht, are you prepared to
proceed without Mr. Kane in the courtroom?
MS. PANDUKHT: Who do you plan to call?
MR. O'BRIEN: Eddie Byrd.
MS. PANDUKHT: That's fine.
THE COURT: You may proceed.
MR. O'BRIEN: The defense will call Eddie Byrd. EDDIE BYRD,
having been first duly sworn though the clerk to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, was examined and testified as follows:

THE CLERK: please be seated.
Will you please state your name and spell it for the record.

THE WITNESS: Eddie Byrd, E-d-d-i-e B-y-r-d. DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. O'BRIEN:
Q. Good morning, Eddie.
A. Good morning.
Q. Can you tell us how you know Glenford?
A. He's been one of my close friends since seventh grade; when we were in the seventh grade.
Q. And you met him in seventh grade in that Montebello neighborhood?
A. Yes.
Q. Tell me about Glenford in seventh grade and how
you guys became friends and --
A. Well, he couldn't -- couldn't speak a lot of clear English. So, when I met him, myself, I kept saying, "What? What did you say?" And he was, like, "Nothing. Nothing. Nothing. Nothing." And I was asking where he was from, and he said he was from Belize. And I was, like, "Okay." We went to different schools, though. I went to Montebello Intermediate, and he went to LaMerced.

And, so, I used to see him after school, and I saw him and wondered why -- I thought he went to a way different school, and I was, like, "Man, what school do you go to?" And he said LaMerced, but I couldn't understand what he was saying, though. So, we just started playing basketball together and going to the parks and playing down the street at other people's houses and became close friends after that.
Q. Tell me a little bit about the neighborhood you guys grew up in and hung out in.
A. It was predominantly a Mexican neighborhood. It was just like Ms. Louise said, there was only, like, five or six families of African-American on the street.
Q. And I am guessing the adults in that neighborhood got along fairly well; is that fair to say?
A. What adults? The -- our family?
Q. Well, I mean, like the grown-ups, like Louise
and Karen. How did the kids get along or --
A. Well, everybody got along. Are you talking about the African-Americans or --
Q. Well, no. I'm talking about the neighborhood, in general.
A. Everybody knew each other, so -- it was a dead-end street. So, it was, like, whoever live on the street, you pretty much knew their families; like, when the cousins came over, you knew everybody by name, so it was really close.
Q. Did you ever witness any confrontations in the neighborhood between teenagers, things like that?
A. Yeah. That's common. That's everywhere you go.
Q. Can you tell he about that?
A. Well, it was a lot of conversation between -like, basically, growing up around a lot of Mexican people, you get called names a lot. Montebello is not Los Angeles. It's not predominantly African-American. You can only live in certain places. So, it was like you get called names. "Go back where you came from," things like that.

And I was the main one, the predominate one, who wanted to get in fights, wanted to do everything. And Vernon, Ms. Louise's son and Glen told each other, "Why you got to fight 'em? It ain't enough of us. You
can't -- you can't do that."
And I had a bad attitude, I was, like, "I don't care. What are they going to do to me?" But Glen and Vernon started saying, "Man, you can't do that. You can't do that." So, I was the one who really wanted to just push the issue; but teenagers are going to be teenagers, and I had to realize that from my friends. And I got into a couple of fights, but Glen and Vernon, they -- I went to a different school, so I fought here, and when I come home, like, everything's fine, everything's cool.
Q. Well, it sounds like you've been able to straighten yourself out pretty good. Why don't you tell the jury what you're doing now, what you've have been doing for the last year.
A. I attended the University of Charleston for two years. I went to East Los Angeles College, first, for two years. I played football. I got a scholarship to the University of Charleston for two years, and I got recognized well from the NFL, but I had -- I had a child. His name's Eddie Byrd, III. I call him Trey. And Glen's never seen him.

But my life is going pretty good. I'm going to the NFL camp in April. I go to Cal State L.A. now in Los Angeles, but I came home to be with my son, because I thought that's what a father's supposed to do, because I
never had my father in my life. So, I came home to be with my child for a while.

And I work out, and I played this year on a semi-pro team and won a championship in November.
Q. So, education has been a real way out for you, so to speak, or a way to a better life, I should say.
A. Yes. Well, as they say, like in some places, I guess, I was the one who made it out of the Hood. Like, I was the one who went to school and kept going to school. I'm the only one in my family who graduated collage. I graduated with an A.A. degree in 2003 from East Los Angeles College, in general education.

And when I went to Charleston, I didn't graduate because I came home to be with my son, because I had a child; but I'll continue my education.
Q. What kind of discussions would you have with Glen about education?
A. Education was a big thing to me, personally; because I felt like if you can't do nothing else other than sports and you get hurt, you have to have your education to fall back on. And I got that drilled into me, not even from my mom, not even from, like, close friends, it was a coach who told me that when I was growing up. And it was always instilled in my brain that you've got to go to school. You've got to get good
grades.
Q. What kind of things in high school was Glen proud of?
A. Wood shop.
Q. Wood shop?
A. Yeah.
Q. Tell me about that.
A. It was like -- because he got in trouble and we went to Montebello High School together for three years. And he got in trouble at the school for something dumb. He got sent to Vail High School. And every time I come home from school, he was talking about wood shop, what he did in wood shop. And I'm, like, "Is that the only class you got?" And he's, like "No, that ain't the only class I got." I was like, "You ain't in no other class?" He was, like, "I got a reading class. I got math class. I've got. this class." I was like, "Why do you just talk about wood shop?"
"Because it's cool. You get to build this, you get to build that, you get to build that." I was, like, "Okay." Because I'm not a hands-on person. I ain't building nothing. I play sports. That's all I'll do. But, I mean, wood shop was the only class he really loved. He made a lot of things in there, too.
Q. I'm going to put on the overhead a picture.

MR. O'BRIEN: For the record, this is has been admitted as Defense Exhibit S .

BY MR. O'BRIEN:
Q. Do you recognize that picture, Eddie?
A. Yeah.
Q. Can you tell me about it?
A. Yeah. That's Glen when he was at LaMerced High. He loved LaMerced, the intermediate school, in like 7th grade. He didn't look that old, but that's how old he was. He was, like, 13.
Q. That's in 7th or 8 th grade?
A. Yeah.
Q. What was Glen's life -- did you know Glen's stepfather?
A. Yes.
Q. Tell me about the life of the Budd family before his stepfather died.
A. It was good. It was it was a typical family who had a father in it. So, I would always be over there, because I didn't have my father in my life. My mom had five kids. I have two older sisters and two younger brothers; I'm the middle child. So, it was like -- I just think about it, like, they had their family. Like, it was them. And they had a father in their family. And I was always over there, because it was good to see when the
father came home, everybody say hi to them. They ate dinner together, they did a lot of things together, and I never had that.
Q. Were you in Glen's life when the stepfather died?
A. Yeah. He was with me.
Q. I'm sorry? Who --
A. Glen was, when it happened. I was with him. Like I said, it was a family get-together. And we went over; they called everybody, and we went to the hospital. And everybody's at the hospital, and I was there when they told Karen the news that he had passed away.
Q. How did Glenford react?
A. It was like -- it was like he was shocked. He didn't move. He didn't -- he didn't -- he just kept saying, like, "This is messed up. This is messed up." He didn't say that, but he just kept shaking his head back and forth. But he didn't cry. He didn't really show his emotion about it. And I never understood that, but his stepbrother, Winston's other son, he went berserk; like a lot of people went berserk, but Glen didn't.
Q. Do you feel like Glenford didn't show any emotion because he didn't care?
A. Of course not. He didn't show -- I wouldn't say that. Some people don't. I don't. My grandma passed
away, my uncle. I would never cry. I'd just stand there. I just take it.
Q. Tell me about how this affected Glenford in months and years afterwards, and if you guys talked about that at all.
A. Yeah, we talked about it. It was kind of weird how you talk about it. Because it was, like, we'd all be together, all of us: Me; Vernon, Ms. Louise's son; Terrice (phonetic), Vernon's godbrother; and my brother, Marcus. And a couple other people. And we would just talk about the good times, about when is when Bloody (phonetic) -- Winston -- they had a swimming pool. And my brother, he's kind of big; right? So, they had a swimming pool, and my brother used to just dive and, like, winston would be there with a water hose, and my brother would just dive into the pool and all the water would come out. And, like, everybody would laugh.

But we used to talk about little certain things about like that, and --
Q. Well, I mean, you guys, as friends, would kind of reminisce about things?
A. As a group, yeah.

And then when me and Glen would talk -- me and Glen talked a lot. It was, like, I was the person he would really talk to. You know how you have certain
friends you talk to and confide in. You know, I guess I was that person he could talk to; because I told him things about my life that I didn't tell other people, too; like, about his case and where I was going. To me, he was just looking at me and things like that.
Q. So, you would confide a lot with Glen?
A. Yeah.
Q. You guys are best friends, I take it?
A. You could say that, yeah. I don't call a lot of people my friends; so, yeah.
Q. Would Glenford confide in you all the time, as well?
A. Yeah. You know, it was weird, because I didn't take it as confiding. I thought he was just talking, until you have to just listen. I have to say that he talk quietly; he don't talk very loudly. So, you have to listen to what he's saying.

And, then, like, he would tell you about -about Winston, about how he has to take care of his brother and walk him to school every day. And I used to make fun of him about that, when he used to have to walk him to school and pick him up. "Man, you got to pick him up every day?"

He's all, "Yeah."
"Wait. He can't walk him by himself?

He's, like, "No."
"I thought he was old enough to walk home by himself. He lives around comer."

And he's, like, "Nah, I got to pick him up. My mom told me I have to pick him up." And, so, I talked to him a lot about a lot of things, and he confided in me jut on a one-on-one-basis, not in a group.
Q. Tell me about how the family was doing financially after winston died.
A. Oh, like the testimonies you had before. It was like -- it was hell. It didn't go right. Like, when you have something going so good for so long and you just have it tooken away from you and you have to struggle on your own and not having a man in the household, it's hard. My mom had to do it for all her life. I seen the troubles my mom went through, and it was hard for me to see it that Glen's mom had to go through it, too.
Q. Were you able to watch Glenford get frustrated from not being able to find a job?
A. Yeah.
Q. What kind of things would he tell you?
A. He would just get pissed off and be like --
Q. Did he tell you, "Hey, I'll an illegal. I can't get a job"?
A. He didn't tell me that until -- how old was

I? -- 18, 19. Because I moved when I was a senior in high school. I moved to Pasadena, California, to get a job in high school, because I wanted to play football.

So, I thought, "Why ain't you getting a job? Why ain't you getting a job?" And he was telling me about his birth certificate, "You know, oh, I got to wait for it. I'm waiting for it. I'm waiting for it." And then finally he told me. I looked at him like he's crazy. I said, "You can get a job."

He's, like, "Fool, I got no Social Security card." I was, like, "Who don't have a Social Security card?" He was, like, "I'm serious."

So, it was -- it was shock to me. But like he tells me everything else, until he finally told me.
Q. Was he ashamed of it, though?
A. If he's holding it in for that long, he's got to be ashamed of it, yeah.
Q. Did you think that Budd's family showed their emotions a lot?
A. No. Because like some people -- some people don't shoe their emotions. Some people hold it in, and some people care it on their shoulders.
Q. And how would you describe the Budd family?
A. They're holding it in, try to keep -- I'd say try to keep it in-house.
Q. Keep secrets?
A. Not -- every -- not secrets to each other --
Q. Right.
A. -- it's just secrets to the outer world.
Q. Even to best friends?
A. Well, you could say that. But it's not really a secret, because it's just something you just -- you just can't tell certain people some things, because you don't know how they're going to react, best friends or not.
Q. Uh-huh.
A. Anybody can tum on you at any point on any day, SO --
Q. Were you around when Winston went to prison?
A. I stayed, I think -- when that happened, I lived with my grandmother. But I used to always come back to my mom's house. But, yeah, I heard about it. They told me he was in Jamaica. So, I was like, okay.
Q. Oh. So, you never knew he was actually in prison?
A. No. I found that out later on, that he was in jail.
Q. Okay. So, they had made up this story about Jamaica?
A. Yeah. He's always going there anyway, so I just thought he was there again.
Q. Tell me about your hopes for the future as it relates to your friendship with Glen.
A. I've been -- I've been away -- I went to West Virginia for two years. So, when this happened, I was at that school. And this is one of the main times I've got to see him, and he hasn't seen my son. Like I said before, I got a child. And I just recently showed him a picture of him. He talks to my sisters, my brothers and writes them letters and stuff. But my school address and everything is getting messed up, and I'm not home not.

It's kind of -- it's kind of like you're losing somebody, but you're not; like, he's away, but he's still here, and I want him to still be here. I don't want it to be like, "Oh, I have a friend, but he's not here anymore. I have a friend, but he's going away." My friend's always going to be here, no matter where he's at, and I still want that.
Q. Now, I understand your mother very much wanted to be here; is that true?
A. Yeah.
Q. Does she know Glen?
A. Yeah.
Q. Is she close to Glen?
A. Yeah.
Q. Can you tell us why she's not here?
A. She has high blood pressure and she has anxiety attacks. And just recently, in the past two weeks, she had two of them, so she couldn't make it. She don't fly, no way. And her driving, she would have to drive by herself. So, she really just wanted me to tell Glen that she loves him, you know. Yeah, that's it.
Q. Anything else you wanted to tell the jury, Eddie?
A. This thing about how as this trial goes on -- I know it's already done -- but there's another life at stake. That's basically it.

MR. O'BRIEN: Thank you. I'll pass the witness, Your Honor.

MR. KANE: The State has no questions for Mr. Byrd.

THE COURT: You may step down.
I'm wondering if we should take our morning recess now.
(The Court admonishes the jury for the morning recess.)

THE COURT: We'11 take about ten minutes, Mr. Bailiff.
(The jury exits the courtroom.)
THE COURT: Counsel, would you approach.
THE COURT: We'll be in recess for a few
moments.
(Brief recess taken.)
THE COURT: Please be seated.
We'll go back on the record in the matter of
State versus Budd. All parties are present with counsel.
Will you stipulate to the presence of the jury? MR. KANE: Yes, Your Honor.

MR. O'BRIEN: The defense shall, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Mr. O'Brien, who's next?
MR. O'BRIEN: Thank you, Your Honor. The
defense would call Shermaine Budd. SHERMAINE BUDD,
having been first duly sworn through the clerk to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, was examined and testified as follows:

THE CLERK: Please be seated.
Will you please state your name and spell it for the record.

THE WITNESS: Shermaine Budd, S-h-e-r-m-a-i-n-e $B-u-d-d$.

DIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MR. O'BRIEN:
Q. Good moming, Shermaine.
A. Good morning.
Q. Tell the jury who you are in your
relationship -- or, I should say, your relationship with Junie.
A. I'm Shermaine Budd. Junie is my brother. Glenford is my brother.
Q. And you live in Belize?
A. Yes.
Q. You just flew in last night; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. How was your trip?
A. Kind of scary. My first time out this far. I had to ask a lot of questions; but, you know, I had to be here.
Q. Well, thank you for coming all that way.
A. You're welcome.
Q. Could you tell the jury a little bit about growing up in Belize with Junie?
A. My younger -- my brother, he was a bit shy, always shy. A Granny's boy. Granny's boy. I mean, you know, Granny had to do everything for him. Make him tea, fry his eggs. Because when he first came out here, he expected my mother to do everything for him, you know. He said, "Granny always prepare my breakfast, everything." So, she said, "Well, you are grown, you have to do it yourself." And he had to learn, you know. But eventually I guess he learned how to feed his self. Granny not their
own; right? Granny's boy.
Q. He was grandma's little baby, huh?
A. Yeah. Everything. My younger sister, Angela, you know, he would always be home by his self, you know, building his stuff. You could play with it, but when he's finished. And Angela is like a pea, you know. "Granny said I be over here," you know. But once he finished, everybody is allowed to play with it, but not before.

And he even got his -- you know, his own set of tools, his harmer; you know, they by him nails, because, you know, that's what he like, you know, out there building stuff.
Q. That's what always give him pleasure --
A. Yeah.
Q. -- the putting things together, building things?
A. Yeah.
Q. Of course, you were in Belize when Glenford left for the United States.
A. Yes.
Q. You already told us what a Grandma's boy he was.
A. Uh-huh.
Q. Tell me how Glenford reacted to that, what you watched, how he felt, if you know.
A. Well, he was, you know, sad that he was leaving his grandmother, because that's his second mom; and also
excited that, you know, he go meet his mom, so, you know, continue to where they left off. But it was kind of sad to me because, you know, he cried. I even, you know, when we would talk and things, I tell, "I will meet you soon," you know, so you don't have to worry. But when we got to the airport, he cried, cried home.
Q. So, he's happy on one hand but --
A. Yeah. Happy, and also sad. But it was good.
Q. Now, you've never lived in the United States; is that right?
A. Never.
Q. So, after Glenford left Belize City, when he was 11 --
A. Uh-huh.
Q. -- you haven't had much personal contact with him; right?
A. No. Just talk on the phone, write. Even now, I am still in contact with him because he writes. It's just that I have laminate the letters because, you know, they are in pencil, and I want -- I want to keep them, you know. Always did.
Q. You want to save them?
A. Save them, yes. That's why I got them laminated. But we are still in contact.
Q. Now, you have a family in Belize?

A Yes, I have my own family. I have two boys and, you know, my husband who I'm living with. Not married, but living together a couple of years.
Q. What kind of contact, what kind of role would you like Glenford to play in your life in the future and your family's life?
A. Well, he's my brother; he's always been my brother, you know. And I want him to be here to talk to my boys, you know. They are boys, and he's a -- he's a man; right? So, he could talk to them, you know, advise them, you know, "Listen to mormy. Make sure you do what mommy do -- make sure you do what mommy tell you to do, you know, not upset mormy. Always be there because there's no one like your mother, you know. "

I want him -- they know that they have a uncle you know; because when he write the letters, you know, I read it to them. You know, "Uncle Junie says hi." When I write back, I say JJ and Sero (phonetic) send kisses," you know. So, they know they have uncle; it's just that they don't meet in person, but they have pictures.
Q. Is there anything else you'd like to tell us, Shermaine?
A. Well, I'm really sorry an awful lot about what happened. But people change, you know. There is always -- you could give somebody another chance, you
know. Our God is a forgiving God. Why shouldn't we?
MR. O'BRIEN: Thank you, Shermaine.
I'll pass the witness, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Mr. Kane?
MR. KANE: The State has no questions for Ms. Budd.

THE COURT: You may step down, ma'am. Thank you very much.

THE WITNESS: Ladies and gentlemen, I think that we'll take an early lunch break today. Once again, we have provided lunch for you. You'll have a bit more time to enjoy it today. We will reconvene at $1: 15$, Counsel.
(The Court admonishes the jury for the lunch recess.)
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THE COURT: Welcome back. Let the record reflect we are again present in the matter of State versus Budd. All parties are present with counsel.

Will you stipulate to the presence of the jury?

MR. KANE: Yes, your Honor.
MR. O'BRIEN: Defense will, your Honor.
THE COURT: Very well. Who's going to be our next witness, Mr. O'Brien?

MR. O'BRIEN: Thank you, your Honor. Dr. John Paglini.

THE BAILIfF: Dr. Paglini, if you will remain standing, please, raise your right hand, and face the clerk.

## JOHN ANTHONY PAGLINI,

called as a witness, and having been first duly sworn to testify to the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, was examined and testified as follows:

THE CLERK: Please be seated.

THE WITNESS: Thank you.
THE CLERK: Will you please state your name and spell it for the record?

THE WITNESS: John Anthony Paglini, p-a-g-l-i-n-i.

## DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. O'BRIEN:
Q. Good morning, doctor. If I may approach?
A. Good afternoon.

THE COURT: Yes, you may. BY MR. O'BRIEN:
Q. What is your occupation, doctor?
A. I'm a licensed clinical psychologist.
Q. And could you give the jury a brief summary of the, the education you completed to attain that position?
A. Sure. I have a bachelor's degree at Catholic University in Washington DC. My doctorate degree was at Illinois School of Professional Psychology in Chicago, an AP approved school, my AP approved internship from the United States Air Force, Malcolm Grove Hospital, Andrews Air Force Base. That was one year. My next two years was with Nellis Air Force Base as a captain,
as a psychologist. I finished up my doctorate at that time, a doctor of psychology. In 1991 I was in Desert Storm as a psychologist for the air force, did that for approximately three months, separated from the service in September, 1991 with an honorable discharge. Then $I$ went into private practice from 1991 to current. Experience usually was about, experience as inpatient psychiatric hospitalizations as well as outpatient. For the last approximately seven to eight years I've specialized in forensic psychology, and that's predominantly where my practice is today.
Q. And do you, do you keep current on new trends in your profession, attend seminars and so forth?
A. Yes. I attend seminars with the American Psychological Association, American Board of Forensic Psychology, worked on approximately 20 to 30 death penalty cases, many more murder cases, probably anywhere from, I'm thinking 50 to 75 or higher, several hundred we call pretrial competency evaluations. I also do risk assessments, violence and sexual offender risk assessments for the department of parole and probation, public defenders, defense attorneys, as
well as occasionally I'm hired by the prosecution.
Q. And what about professional
organizations?
A. Member of the American Psychological Association.
Q. And have you conducted forensic psychological evaluations for the criminal courts in this district previously?
A. Yes, numerous times, like I've outlined beforehand. You know, probably 50 to 75 or higher murder trials, testified in court for defense as well as the prosecution.
Q. What is a forensic psychological evaluation?
A. Forensic psychological evaluation is when you talk to the defendant. You interview him, conduct psychological tests, review the discovery such as the police report or witness statements, any prior psychological evaluations, also conduct collateral interviews, which is basically you're talking to the people in the person's life, family, ex-girlfriends, ex-wives, current girlfriends, anybody who has known the person for quite some time. And so a forensic psychological evaluation is very comprehensive. It's just not
get and receiving information from the defendant but try to go above and beyond.
Q. And I believe you may have mentioned this for the jury, but you clearly have testified regarding forensic psychological evaluations in both murder cases and death penalty cases?
A. I've testified actually, interestingly enough, in only one death penalty case, because all the cases that I'm on, they settle. They seem to be settling. And so of the cases I've been on, I've been on approximately 20 to 25 death penalty cases. And this will be my second time testifying in court.
Q. And on occasion you have been retained by the district attorney's office?
A. Correct. I've been retained once on, actually twice on a death penalty case as working with them to help them cross-examine the defense witness.
Q. And has my office retained you to evaluate Mr. Budd in this case and secure your testimony?
A. Yes.
Q. And tell us the process you went through to evaluate Mr. Budd.
A. Well, I evaluated Mr. Budd. I had a procedural meeting with his attorney in July 19, 2004 where I more or less tell him who I am, what my role is. And then I evaluated Mr. Budd on July 23rd, August 24th, September 4 th and 5th, October 23 rd and 24 th, 2004. In addition to that I conducted approximately, I'm thinking either 10 or 11 collateral interviews where I talked to family members and friends who know Mr. Budd, also administered psychological testing, cognitive testing, which is an IQ test, a memory test, and an achievement test. In addition to that what I did is, I reviewed the discovery in the case. And in a latter part I received information on discovery from the social worker for the public defender's office -- she had interviewed some additional people -- and reviewed that. So, my evaluation consisted of, extensively of psychological interviews, psychological testing, review of the discovery provided, and then collateral interviews.
Q. Do you feel you have a, an adequate grasp and adequate information regarding the psychosocial issues involving Mr. Budd to testify to this jury?
A. Yes.
Q. And what are you going to focus on today?
A. Today I'm going to talk about mitigation. And if I may get started, I'm going to use a power point presentation here. Now, this is my first time with a power point. So, hopefully I'm not going to mess too many things up here.

Your Honor, is it okay if I stand?
THE COURT: It certainly is. And I understand that you do have, if you will, a, and I don't want to call him an assistant but someone who may know the power point a bit, sorry, better than you. If you need his assistance, he is free to assist at any time.

MR. O'BRIEN: Thank you, your Honor.
THE WITNESS: Thank you very much. Okay. What I would like to do today is talk about mitigation. And before we get to mitigation I want to tell you a story about seven years ago when I was in a death penalty case. I was hired by the prosecution. And one of my colleagues, a female psychologist, was testifying on behalf of the defense. And she had referred to the defendant, who had killed someone, as a good guy, a nice individual. And that kind of struck me,
because I said to myself, well, how do you, how do you tell a jury he's a nice guy when he's committed a murder? And as I listened to the testimony, what I heard was, this individual had decent qualities. And through my years working with murders and individuals who committed crimes, what I've recognized is that murders are a heterogenous group, meaning that, it's like if you go to a baseball stadium with 40,000 people, there is probably 40,000 different worlds. It's a commonality among people. Some people are good. Some people are, you know, generally bad. Sometimes decent people or okay people commit a crime, and it's not necessarily characteristic of them. And so one of the things I've learned about murderers is, like I said, their a heterogenous group.

Today what we're going to discuss is Mr. Budd's life. We're going to, hopefully by the end of my presentation you're going to have a better understanding of what mitigation is, what his life is about, how he evolved, and things called risk and resiliency factors, how he was shaped and formed into coming up to the time when, unfortunately, he committed these murders. And

I'm going to get started here, but there is one thing we have to talk about before I get into the definition of mitigation, and that is criminal responsibility. He's already been found criminally responsible by a jury of his peers. So, that's not mitigation. We've already got to that point, and that was at the penalty phase, not the penalty face, the trial. So, my point here is, we're going to be talking about mitigation. So, what is mitigation? Any aspect of the defendant's character or record or any other circumstances of defense the defendant exhibit as a basis for a sentence less than death. Mitigation is multifaceted and equates to moral culpability. Now, once again, everyone is very diverse. And mitigation can be anything, if the defendant's mentally retarded, if the defendant has any traumatic brain injuries or developmental disorders or grew up in a very abusive home. These are all different aspects of mitigation. Mitigation also includes positive things, if he's helped people or what has his time been like in jail. In Mr. Budd's case, he's been incarcerated for two and a half years. How has he performed during that time while incarcerated? That is
another form of mitigation or -- mitigation equates to moral culpability. And we're going to kind of just understand what that is in a second. I'm going to read this. It's kind of long. Elementary psychological reality, you do not arrive at all our choices on equivalent, raw material. The nature of quality of understanding perception, impulse control, judging values, underlying choice, even the ones that result in a heinous crime, are influenced by developmental, cognitive, neuropsychological, relationship, cultural, community, and situational factors. These all kind of converge into what we have as a person who led him up to this crime.

So, and if you think about this, we're all different. I'm 44 years old but, you know, the neighborhood I grew up in is fairly stable. There could have been another guy in Chicago that lived about a few miles away, was in a very unstable family environment that had a different lifestyle or different perceptions than I did, and that's very true. And this is what this talks about. Now, this doesn't mean he's not morally responsible, because he is. But what this is talking about is everyone is shaped differently
that brings them to certain life choices.
Now, we're going to talk about family history. And what I would like to do is guide you through what a healthy person is and a healthy family and then, and this is what we call resiliency factors. And then the next thing we're going to talk about is risk factors, what happens that increases a person's chance of offending. So, as we all know, you know, behavioral patterns are multigenerational. If you have parents who are drug addicts or have alcohol problems and their parents had drug and alcohol problems, there is a higher propensity for the child to have drug or alcohol problems. The child is predisposed to heredity. Family shape child, and childhood is formative.

Now, for healthy development this is pretty easy to kind of understand. If an individual has a strong, caring, guiding father, a nurturing mother, stable parental marriage and stable secure home, if the parents model, control aggression, they help the child understand how to respond to conflict, if there is academic success, if they have adhesive friends and if the family discourages drug and alcohol abuse or prohibit it
and there's positive socialization and mentoring, you have a higher chance that your child is going to do fairly well in the world. It doesn't mean that if your child has all these things, he's not going to commit a crime. But there is more resiliency factors and less risk factors, and that's what really it comes down to.

Now, this is a good idea, kind of conceptualize, this is a visual conceptualization of what I'm talking about. Let's assume this is Mr. Budd. Okay? If there is no family history of alcohol or drug dependence, no family history of psychological disorder, no developmental abandonment or instability, and if he has positive, pure relationships, modeling of positive -- consistency, structure, stability, acceptance, and affirmation and intact family, then the less chance of psychological disorder, drug dependency, and criminal activity. Once again, it doesn't mean that if this person has all this, he's not going to develop a drug problem, but it's less so. Now, we're going to explore in a second here what this means.

Now, approximately five years ago the department of justice brought 22 researchers
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LAS VEGAS, CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA THURSDAY, DECEMBER 15, 2005; 8:30 A.M.
-000-
PROCEEDINGS
THE COURT: please be seated.
Welcome back to all of you. Sorry for the delay this moming. I understand that perhaps some of you were actually caught in elevator problems. I'm not sure. I'm just hearing that an awful lot, so I may not begin to believe it anymore.

But let the record refect we are present in the matter of State versus Budd. All parties are present. Counsel will you stipulate to the presence of the jury.

MR. KANE: Yes, Your Honor.
MR. O'BRIEN: The defense will, Your Honor. THE COURT: Very well.

We are in the defense case. Mr. O'Brien or Mr. Brooks, are you prepared to call your next witness? MR. O'BRIEN: We are, your Honor. Thank you. Louise DeDeaux.

LOUISE DE DEAUX,
having been first duly sworn through the clerk to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, was examined and testified as follows:

THE CLERK: Please be seated.
Please state your name and spell it for the record.

THE WITNESS: Louise DeDeaux, L-o-u-i-s-e, capital D-e, capital D-e, again, -a-u-x.

THE CIERK: Thank you.
DIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MR. O'BRIEN:
Q. Good morning, Ms. DeDeaux.
A. Good morning.
Q. I understand you flew in from Gulfport, Mississippi?
A. Correct.
Q. And I understand your house suffered significant damage --
A. Yes.
Q. -- from the hurricane.
A. Uh-huh.
Q. I'd like you for taking the time out to come here.
A. Thank you.
Q. Why would you put all those pre-pressing matters aside and be here to talk to the jury today?
A. For my love of Glen. I prayed about this, that I wouldn't fall apart. But I'm glad they came a part of
my family, because of my children, we all grew up -- we all found yourselves single mothers with raising children.

We were on our street in Montebello. There was only five black families that was on that street. Three of us were a single parent, raising anywhere from two to three, and five children. So finding ourselves and struggling mothers, we became close. And there was a part where we knew where our children were at any given point, because they could all go from one person's house to another person's house; and that way we knew that they were well taken care of.
Q. And tell us about your son and his relationship with Glen.
A. My son was two years older than Glen, and Eddie. They looked up to him because he was the oldest in the neighborhood. He was like their older brother. They went to movies, they hung out, go to the mall, play basketball.

And they do have a history, whereas one night they were on their way to the movies. They had met these young ladies and they all decided to, from the movies, to go to the beach. The young lady's car broke down on the freeway, so they stopped to help her fix her car. In the process, a drunk diver on a motorcycle was coming at Glen, Eddie and my son, and Glen was in the front. My son reached up and pushed him out of the way and took the
blunt of the motorcycle, himself.
Q. And I understand your son was severely injured?
A. Yes.
Q. And Glenford and Eddie Byrd were injured, too?
A. Yes.
Q. Tell me about that, the aftermath of that.
A. My son sustained -- on his right hip, it was broken in five places. His left leg was broken in half. His left arm was broken in two.
Q. And I'm sorry to interrupt you. I know Vemon was severely hurt in that accident --
A. Yeah.
Q. -- and I know he was in the hospital for a substantial time; is that right?
A. Any months.
Q. Tell me about the interactions between Glen and Vernon, and the rest of your family during that time.
A. Well, each -- each one of those boys was taken to a different hospital at that point in time. But as they were released, they insisted on having their parents bring them to the hospital to ensure that my son was okay. So, they wanted to see him to ensure that he was all right.

And, so, they came, and they decided to stay with me all day at the hospital until he came out of
the -- one of the sungeries. My son had to have at least seven surgeries. But for the first surgery, that night, they decided to stay with me to make sure that their friend, their brother, was okay.
Q. Now, you had a good understanding and some personal knowledge regarding the Budd household; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. Can you describe to me the household before Mr. Miller, the stepfather, was killed in that accident -in a different drunk driving accident --
A. Yeah.
Q. -- not to confuse the jury.
A. The household was stable. They had food, utilities, everything that a loving family would want. The children didn't have to want for anything, and Mr. Miller took care of everything.

Karen was the mother. She provided for her children at that point in time, and did what a mother was supposed to do for her children.
Q. Now, you may have said it, but tell me again. When was the first time you met Glen? Do you know how old he was or what grade or --
A. I think he was about $16,17$.
Q. Okay.
A. Because it was about 18 when he came and started living with me.
Q. Tell me about that.
A. When he came to -- the way it came about, you know, living with me, is that him and his mother got in an argument. She had gave -- given him instructions of what she wanted him to do that day, and they wasn't done, his chores. And, so, he argued with her, and words were passed. She told him that she was the parent, that she was responsible for him, and if he felt that he was grown, then, you know, he could leave.

So, he decided that he wanted to leave. And wind up -- my son noticed that he was sleeping outside in the alley by the garage, so he opened up the door and went out and talked with Glen and asked him what was going on. And he said that, you know, him and his mother got in a little disagreement. And, so, my son says, "Well, you don't have to sleep out here. You can come and sleep in my room."

So, he made the decision to bring Glen into the house, and they slept and talked about what was going on. My son, in that instance, decided to talk with him and let him know, you know, about -- "Junie, your mom is doing all that she can. If she asks you to take out the trash, that's what you should do."

So, he stayed with me at least four months before he -- I insisted for him to return home to his mother. And at that point in time, I insisted that he go with his mother because Mr. Miller had deceased.
Q. Tell me more about -- of course, you don't learn more about a person --
A. Uh-huh.
Q. -- than when they're living with you. Tell me more about what additional facts you learned about Glen during this period that he lived with you and your family.
A. Well, Glen lived with me. I had no problems with him. Whenever I asked him to do something, he did it.

I had an extra mattress that was out in my garage, and that's what he would pull in every on night for him to sleep on; gather blankets, pillows. Every morning, he would take that mattress and put it back where belonged. Cleaned up behind himself, and did chores around my house, taking out trash, washing the dishes. If I asked him to do a load of laundry, I had no problem with that; he did it.

The -- I did notice while he was with me that Glen was a very shy, loving person. Never heard his voice above a whisper. Everything was, "Yes, Ms. Louise. Okay, Ms. Louise." I had no problem with Glenn at all.
Q. How did he get along with the rest of your family, the children?
A. They were brothers and sisters. They were like brothers and sisters. My daughter is 19; my son is 26 -will be 26 in two weeks. They got along so well that my daughter calls Glen her older brother. And Glen looked at Vernon as his older brother. It's like the family's became one. We all were family after the -- you know, living in that area, going through the struggles that we had to go through as single mothers raising our children, you know, in a predominantly Mexican neighborhood; where our children were being -- to the point where if they went out looking for jobs, they were not given any jobs.

If they -- I remember once I went to this Catholic church to apply for the Christmas gifts that they normally give families. I put my name on the list, and I was not called. No one pulled that name up, because on the application you are -- you do put your race down there. So, this was a Mexican Catholic church in our area, like three, four blocks away from our house. But no one in that church pulled that ticket or that card to give gifts to a black family in the neighborhood.
Q. Was this the kind of neighborhood that was -you had to go out of your way to get yourself into trouble?
A. The neighborhood was very quiet. The only times that there was any action going on around the neighborhood was when the paramedics came for one of the senior citizens that was having problems, or an emergency. But as far as any gang activity, there was activity. But I must say that our children lived in that neighborhood. They were friends with other neighbors. We all got along fine. We shared recipes we shared meals. And like I says, as far as any fights, race fights in the neighborhood, we did not have that.
Q. Tell me about how the death of the stepfather changed things at the Budd household.
A. The death of Mr. Winston (sic) was very devastating to the entire family, as well as to the extended families. On the night that this all happened, they were at a family function. Mr. Winston and his nephew, I do believe, went to the store to get some ice and sodas, and was struck by a drunk driver.

The phone call from the nephew came to my house; that was the only number that he could remember, was my number. And, in turn, I didn't have Ms. Karen's sister's number, which was where she was, so I had to get Ms. Sonya to help me.

And the three of us was on the phone. And the friend that was making the phone call, we had to push her
to get her to tell us what was going on. And in the background, I heard Mark tell her, "Tell her -- tell Ms. Louise Bloody's (phonetic) dead." And at that point in time, I didn't want to believe what he was saying. And, as well, Sonya's on the line, too.

So, we give this information to Ms. Karen, and she goes to one hospital, where they stated that he was supposed to be. He was not there. Then we had to drive to a second hospital, where, when we got there, the police was waiting for her. And the doctor came out in the middle of the lobby, asked her who she was. She advised him who she was and, at that point in time, in the middle of the lobby, the doctor advised her that he had deceased -- he was deceased.

At that point in time, everybody -- the children, Ms. Karen, almost fainted. We were literally trying to grab the children because they were just running. They didn't know where to go, what to do. They couldn't believe it. It was total devastation for the entire family.

About an hour later they brought Mark to the hospital, the friends; they released him from the hospital that he was at. They brought Mark to the hospital for him to be there with the family to go through trying to understand what had happened.
Q. How do you feel this event affected Glen?
A. I feel that this event affected him deeply. Because Mr. Miller was a father figure, he was a friend, he was a provider. And to erase that equation, the family -- he didn't have a job. No way of making any income, and now it's --
Q. When you say "he," who are you talking about?
A. Glen. He was not -- he would go looking for a job and come back empty-handed, as well as my son and the other young men that was in the neighborhood. So, to erase that equation, it affected them very, very deeply. The entire family, as a matter of fact, was affected by this deeply.

Because, then, Ms. Karen had to take on the responsibility of being provider, mother, and go out and work. So, at that point in time, she had to take two jobs to be able to put a roof and provide food and clothes for her children.
Q. She was trying to keep that home together?
A. Yes.
Q. And setting aside the emotional affects for Glen --
A. Uh-huh.
Q. - what practical day-to-day effects did this have on Glen? What added responsibilities did he have to
do?
A. The responsibility was his brother Raheem. He was left to get Raheem up every moming, take him to school. Before school, Glen would iron his clothes and Raheem's clothes, so that they would have pressed clothes instead of wrinkled clothes to go to school. Get him breakfast, make sure he brushed his teeth and washed his face. Glen would walk him to school, put him on campus; and, then, in tum, go to Vail High School, which is the alternative school.

Raheem would get out of school about $2: 30$, quarter to 3:00. It was Glen's responsibility to be standing at the gate. When he came -- was dismissed from school, to be there, to walk Raheem back to the house, and be responsible for him until Ms. Karen came home from work.
Q. Would Glen go to basketball games and football games with your son and Eddie Byrd?
A. Yes. And Raheem would go right along.
Q. Glenford would always take Raheem?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, you talked about how Karen was struggling to keep the home together and keep the family together.
A. Yes.
Q. Was she successful in doing that?
A. At points in times, no. There was times that the utilities were turned off; where she had to have help from the neighbors, where an extension cord was from her garage to their garage, in order for them to have electricity. There was points in times where that went on; several times, that I can recall, seeing an extension cord from the garage go to a neighbor's house to let them have light in the apartment.
Q. Were they eventually evicted from that home?
A. They were evicted from that home.

At that point in time, my understanding was that they went to live with her sister; where the sister, her husband, and her children were there, along with Karen and her three children at the time. Because, at that point, in time, Angela, the younger sister, had come from Belize to be with her mother and her brothers. So, Karen and her three children were there with the sister and her family. So, it was, to my understanding, like a studio apartment that everybody was sharing at that point in time.
Q. Do you have any -- did you get to see Karen -excuse me -- did you get to see Angela, Glen's younger sister, and Glen interact together? Do you know anything about that relationship?
A. Yes. Glen loved his sister. And they would play around like children. Kids. They'd picked at each
other, and then wind up with a hug and, you know, kissing on each other affectionately as a brother and sister would.

The same with Raheem. He would be outside, if he was playing basketball, he would interact with his younger brother, play basketball, play games. If Raheem was playing with one of his toys, Glen would stop and spend some time with him at that point in time and play with him with his toys. It was Glen's responsibility to be the man of the house, I should say; and he took that responsibility to the utmost, that that's what he wanted to do for his mother and his sister and his younger brother, be the man.
Q. What happened to this apartment in Los Angeles?
A. The one in Los Angeles?
Q. The studio apartment you described.
A. They were evicted from that.

And, from there, I do believe she went on to stay with a friend.
Q. When you say "she," who?
A. Karen.
Q. And did Glen accompany her?
A. No.
Q. So, the family split up?
A. The only ones that I do believe that went on to
say with Ms. Sonya was Raheem and Karen.
Q. Tell me -- if you can, tell me a little bit about the Budd family, in general, and how they deal with their emotions.
A. The way that they deal with their emotions are to the point where they hold things back. They do not outwardly express what's really going on in their hearts, what's really going on in their lives, what's going in their minds. It's to the point where it's like you have to function, but you're not really functioning because you're not able to really let everybody in and see what's going on.
Q. Now, why do you say that? Do you have some examples? Or why would you draw that conclusion?
A. Well, it was to the point where when we had to do the obituary for Mr. Winston, I was the one that helped Ms. Karen type it up, and the information was given to me. And, at that point in time, in doing it, I was trying to do it one way, and we had to do it another way, because at that point in time is when I was confidentially told that the family was here illegally. And, so, we had to word it so as to not cause a lot of problems for the -- for her or the children.
Q. Was this the first time that you or your son had heard about Glen's illegal immigration status?
A. Yes. At that point in time it was, like, you know, secrets were being told. And this is our first awareness of it, and --
Q. What kind of secrets would Glen -- or, what kind of lies or secrets, what-have-you -- what kinds of things would Glen say to you?
A. That he didn't have a birth certificate. He was asking his mom to get a birth certificate for him. And she had to send back to Belize for it, and it hadn't come. They're looking for it, or they couldn't find it at the time. So, it was like a -- a stall, I should say. I'll use it as that, a stalling situation.
Q. How about this -- the point -- were you present in the neighborhood when Mr. Miller was absent --
A. Yes.
Q. -- for a long period of time?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you know he was in prison?
A. No.
Q. Did the family - what did the family tell you?
A. In asking, you know, where he was, I was told that he was in Jamaica, that he was in Jamaica on business. Because he was buying clothes from downtown and sending them back as a business. And that he had to go back to take a shipment to Jamaica or to Belize. But it
was that he was out of town. We were not told that he was in jail.
Q. Is it fair to say that this was a family who held in their emotions and very carefully avoided showing their feelings?
A. Yes.
Q. What do you -- do you have any hopes for the future, as far as your relationship and Vernon's relationship with Glen?
A. Yes. I would hope to be able to come and visit him. I would hope that my son and my daughter, my grandson, would get a chance to know him, Glen, and continue to be a part of our family, as he is a part of our family.
Q. You understand he's been convicted of a very terrible crime?
A. Yes.
Q. Why would you want Glen to have contact with your family?
A. In all honesty, I do not believe that Glen did this. In all honesty, the person that the media have --
Q. Well, let me stop you there --
A. -- depicted is not the person that I know.
Q. Okay. I understand. I understand what you're saying.

Even if --
A. Uh-huh.
Q. -- by virtue of this jury's verdict, Mr. Budd has been found guilty --
A. Uh-huh.
Q. -- given that fact, why would you want Glen to have this kind of contact with your sons and daughters, nieces, nephews, all of that?
A. Because we love him. I love him.
Q. What would he have to give to those people?
A. His love in retum. Just to know that he's there to be able to talk with us, to be able to see him, to know that he's okay. And be around for the nephew that is going to be bom in a couple of weeks. He has nephews that he has never even seen that are in Belize. For him to be an impact on his nephews and his nieces, however this young one is coming to be, that he be able to be around to know them and for them to know him and know the type of person that he really is. And for him to express his love for his mother, his grandmother and his family and extended friends.

MR. O'BRIEN: Thank you very much. And I want to thank you again for putting all your own troubles aside and taking this time to come out to Las Vegas.

THE WITNESS: All right. Thank you.

MR. O'BRIEN: Pass the witness, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. O'Brien.
Mr. Kane?
MR. KANE: Just a couple of questions,
Mrs. DeDeaux.
CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MR. KANE:
Q. During the period of time that you knew Glenford Budd, he appearance to you to be a responsible person, did he not?
A. Yes.
Q. In fact, he had a lot more responsibilities than a lot of people his age, am I right?
A. Yes.
Q. And he didn't shirk those responsibilities?
A. No, he did not.
Q. He willing accepted them?
A. Yes.
Q. In fact, would it be fair to say he displayed a maturity above what you might expect from a person that age?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you also have some interaction with Glenford about his school work?
A. Yes. I noticed one day he was helping Raheem
with his homework, and ran across a word that he did not understand, and asked me, "What does -- Ms. Louise, what does this mean?" And, at that point in time, I noticed that Glen was not up to reading speed, as what he should have been for a 10 th grader or an 11th grader, that he was at that time.
Q. Now, Glen lived with you for a little bit, didn't he?

A Yes, he did.
Q. And during that period of time, did he, in fact, do all of his homework?
A. Yes.
Q. Did he appear attentive to his school needs?
A. Very.
Q. And, in fact, his school work fell off after the unfortunate death of Mr. Winston and all that that entailed; am I right?
A. Correct.
Q. Up until then, he was doing his school work and managing?
A. Yes.

MR. KANE: Nothing further.
MR. O'BRIEN: Nothing further.
THE COURT: Thank you. You may step down. Who's next Mr. O'Brien?

MR. O'BRIEN: The defense would call Angela
Sud.
ANGELA BUND,
having been first duly sworn through the clerk to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, was examined and testified as follows:

THE CLERK: Please be seated.
Would you please state your name and spell it for the record.

THE WITNESS: Angela Budd, A-n-g-e-l-a B-u-d-d.

## DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. O'BRIEN:
Q. Good morning, Angela.
A. Good morning.
Q. Can you tell the jury where you live?
A. I live in Los Angeles, California.
Q. And you are Eddie's younger sister; is that right?
A. Correct.
Q. Can you tell the jury about your life in Belize prior to Glen coming to the United States?
A. My life in Belize, it was like any other ordinary kid. We had everything we ever needed. My grandmother took care of us, and my dad.
Q. Okay.
A. It was me and my older sisters, and we had other cousins and uncles.
Q. Now, when -- and how much older is Glen than yourself?
A. He's two years older than me.
Q. Do you remember when Glen was in Belize and your mom was in Los Angeles?
A. I do.
Q. How did Glen feel about the loss of his mother?
A. We both -- I mean, all three of us shared the same feelings about our mom, that we all understood that she left to better her life and get us over here. We never felt left out, because we had conversation with our mom. We would talk to her on the phone, we had pictures, and so forth; everything that -- when she worked, she would send us stuff. Christmas, we'd get gifts; Easter, we'd get gifts. I mean, my grandmother filled in when she wasn't there. She was like our second mom.
Q. Tell me about -- of course, when Glenford is eleven, you were -- what? -- seven or eight? Eight years old then?
A. If he's two years older, I'd probably say I was, like, nine.
Q. So, when -- at eleven, when Glen comes to the United States, you stayed behind in Belize; is that right?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. Tell me about how that decision and that fact of him leaving his grandma and the only home he knew affected Glen?
A. Well, we all understood that when my mom left she was supposed to send for us. And she sent for my brother first. So, we all had to understand that. we all knew that we were coming anyway.

When he left, I was made; because, like, "Why he get to go first? Why didn't -- I'm the baby. Why didn't I get to go first?" But, I mean, we all dealt with it. He left, I was pretty much sad; because me and Glen, we shared a relationship. We're basically like twins. Anything he feel, I feel. Anything I have, we share. I mean, if I'm going through something, that's the person I talk to. Even now, that's the person I -- I feel like going to. We basically share a relationship that it was perfect. It was just -- he was my big better, and I look up to him.
Q. Now, how old were you when you came to --
A. I was 15.
Q. -- to the United States?
A. I was 15; 15 years old.
Q. What did -- tell me about Glenford and yours relationship, then?
A. When I came?
Q. When you came.
A. Yes. When I came --
Q. Well, let me stop you for a moment. Was it scary coming to a new country?
A. Pretty much. Pretty much.
Q. There was a lot of unknowns, I bet?
A. There was?
Q. There were a lot of unknown things.
A. Well, I watch TV, so I really -- I seen different stuff that were not in our country, over here.
Q. Was it a lot like TV, or did you have a little hard time?
A. I mean, TV can make you sad, put in more than it's really like. They will make you feel like something's really bad. Or, like, McDonald's, they'll show you a big burger, but when you get to McDonald, it's really small, or something like that.
Q. What did Glenford do for you to help ease that transition?
A. Well, I could remember the first time I stepped into airport. The first person, I saw my mom and then I saw my brother. We walked out the aimport, and all of sudden I seen this tall building, I seen nothing by cars on top of it. And I said, "Glen," I said, "how did the
cars get up there?" He started laughing. I said, "You shouldn't be laughing at me. Because when you came, I'm pretty sure you asked the same things, how did the cars reach up there."

He said, "Oh, no, just watch and see." We get into the building; when we're coming out, I noticed the cars keep going around and around and around, until they get to the bottom. So, that was my first laugh that he gave me, and when he was clowning. I don't know. "What you mean, how the cars get up there?" I mean, the first time, I don't really know. And then he gave me the information.

Just myself, he was -- I would dress different.
Q. You would what?
A. I would dress differently. I would put on tennis shoes. As long as my tennis shoes was clean, I didn't care. I would put on some tennis shoes, some pink shirt, some purple pants. As long as I'm clean, I'm fine. He said, "No, that doesn't match. This is how.it goes. You don't tie your laces like that. You don't put it too tight. You loosen it a little bit." So, he helped me adjust and leam how to live my life in the U.S.
Q. Now, were you in the household when the stepfather Winston Miller died?
A. Yes, I was.
Q. Tell me, generally, how that affected the family.
A. Well, it affected us very much, because Mr. Miller, my stepfather, we looked up to him, and he was our provider. He gave us what we needed, and not necessarily what we wanted. We had to work for what we wanted. And for Glen, it affected him deeply. I mean he knew Mr. Miller way more than I did. I was barely getting to know him. And the little I knew about him was enough. I mean, he's an amazing person. I mean, he took us in as his.
Q. Is your brother -- is your older brother the kind of person that's able to deal with his emotions and shows his emotions?
A. It's hard to get him to really show his emotions; but, I mean, he deals with it. I mean, from me, being his sister, I could see -- you know, I could see certain things that another person wouldn't see, because I know him.
Q. Tell me about the kind of things Glen did after the stepfather died to help the family try to keep home and hearth together?
A. Well, when my mom would go to work, he was the one that - like Ms. Louise said, he'll get my brother -he will also get me; because, I was -- I sleep a lot.

He'll also make sure I'm up, and I had to be at school.
When we get home, we had to do our honework. I couldn't be outside, of course, because I was understanding age and I was a girl. I couldn't hang out with his friends -- with any of his friends. I had to be in the house at a certain time. And --
Q. And who's giving you all this direction?
A. My brother.
Q. I see.
A. And even though my certain things my would agree that I could do, Glen would be like, "Oh, no, Mom, she can't do this. She's just 16," or "this is not allowed." Or, you know, he will be the man. He will take all the responsibility. Like anything that my father would disagree with, he will disagree with. So, that was his job. Was like father and a brother to me after Mr. Miller passed away.
Q. Economically, how did things change after the stepfather passed?
A. It was kind of hard for us, really; because my mom, like I said, had to work two jobs. The kids had to -- what our mom always told us was it was her job to provide, and our job was to go to school and do the homework, do the house chores and be at school the next day. That was our job. We weren't supposed to worry
about all that.
But, I mean, as far as Glen, he's the older one. He wanted to make sure that my mom didn't have to struggle, she didn't have to go through all that by herself. So, he decided to take that -- he took heavy load and carried with him, with her. So, he basically was the one that had to be strong for me and my little brother.
Q. What was it like for the family when you were evicted from the family home?
A. It was pretty hard, because we basically had to go live with my aunt. It was a single house. It was me and --
Q. It was a single house? What do you mean by that?
A. It was a single apartment. It was like -- it's not even a one bedroom. It's just a big old --
Q. Like a studio apartment?
A. Yeah. And it was me, my cousins -- three of my cousins, my aunt, my mom, my brother. I mean, it was one bathroom and -- I mean, we still holded out. All the kids was at school. My mom was at work. Every day my auntie will stay home and she will cook and make sure that when we come home we got something to eat. I mean, we struggled, but we got through it. We got through that
part.
Q. What was the neighborhood like, there?
A. The second neighborhood that we moved into wasn't too good. But, I mean, the kids -- we didn't come outside for nothing. We was always in the house.
Q. Is that because of your own choice or did you have direction?
A. Towards the end, we had directions that we had to follow, and we followed them.
Q. And you lost that home, as well --
A. We lost that also.
Q. -- is that right?
A. We lost that also.
Q. Did the family end up splitting up then?
A. We did. My mom --
Q. Can you tell us a little bit about that?
A. If I was comfortable? No. But we had to do what we had to do. I mean, we couldn't complain. We had to pick up and carry on.
Q. Tell me a little bit about who went where and how did it affect all of you?
A. Well, my mom went to Ms. Sonya's house. Me and my brother went to my other aunt's, Jennifer's house, and that's how we -- we went there. From there, I was in school. Raheem was going to school, and he was with my
mother. And we talked on the phone, like any other -- any family when they would split up.
Q. And did Glenford also have to live with various friends on occasions?

A Yes, he did. But even though he was living with other friends, like I said, me and him, we shared a real close relationship. If I would have to leave from school and be where he was at, I would do that. I would go however far he was to be with him.
Q. Now, Glenford's been in jail for quite some time now. What kind of contact have you had with him directly and through the family?
A. Letters. I would ask my boss for off days to be out here, to be able to see him. And, basically, that's he did -- I mean, that's all we could do. We can't be there physically with him; but at least I talked to him and see him on the screen. And bring him -- send him pictures, update him about how my son is doing, because he do have a nephew that's two, and a niece that's on the way.
Q. What are your hopes for the future, Angela? I mean, we've talked about this, and you realize the best case scenario here is Glenford's going to be in prison for the rest of his life. What do you hope for the future?
A. My hope for the future is for him to still be
able to come and be there, as far as -- I mean, like I said, I have a son. My son doesn't really know him like that, but he knows that's he's uncle. And he always asks for him. He's only two, but he's a real smart kid. He asks for his uncle. And for the future -- I mean, even though he'll be locked up, I want to be able to visit him, sit there and talk, tell him how life is. Let him see how his nephew and niece are growing. Let him bond with them, even though he's still locked up.
Q. Thank you. Is there anything else you'd like to say before I pass you to the State?
A. I don't know. I'd like to tell my brother that I love him and I'll always be there for him, no matter what.

MR. O'BRIEN: Thank you, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Mr. Kane?
MR. KANE: I have no questions for the state.
THE COURT: Thank you.
THE WITNESS: You're welcome.
THE COURT: Who's next?
MR. O'BRIEN: Judge, we would call Raheem
Miller.
THE COURT: What is the age of this witness?
MR. O'BRIEN: Thirteen.
Is that correct, Raheem?

THE WIINESS: Yes.
THE COURT: Counsel, do you feel a need for me to canvas the witness with respect to the usual that we do with children?

MR. KANE: No, Judge, not under the circumstances.

THE COURT: Very well.
RAHEEM MILUER,
having been first duly sworn through the clerk to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, was examined and testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION
THE CLERK: Will you please state your name and spell it for the record.

THE WITNESS: Raheem Miller, R-a-h-e-e-m M-i-1-1-e-r.

THE CLERK: Thank you.
DIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MR. O'BRIEN:
Q. Good morning, Raheem.
A. Good morning.
Q. What kind of big brother is Glen?
A. He's a good brother. He's always a good brother to me. He always made sure I went to school on time, made sure my clothes are ironed; everything that a big brother
always do.
Q. Okay. When your dad was still alive, tell the jury about what kind of relationship you had with Glen.
A. I had a good relationship with him. Like, he'll take me anywhere he goes. Like, he always keep me out of trouble. Always been around him, you know.
Q. Okay. Did Glen -- what do you call your brother?
A. I call my brother Junie.
Q. All right. Junie.

Did Junie ever teach you anything special?
A. Yeah. He told me how to play basketball.
Q. Can you tell us a little bit about that?
A. He was the one who inspired me to play basketball. That's how I leamed to play basketball.

MR. O'BRIEN: Are you guys hearing him okay?
THE COURT: Speak up just a little bit.
I'm sorry, Mr. Miller.
THE WITNESS: Yeah. He told me how to play basketball and how to shot the ball better. He told me, like, the rules of like everything about basketball. I used to shoot, like, funny. I used to shoot like -- I used to toss the ball without even looking at the rim or nothing; so, he told me how to position the ball right. You know, how to dribble better.

BY MR. O'BRIEN:
Q. Now, I'm sorry to have to ask you about this, Raheem, but Winston Miller was your natural father?
A. Yes.
Q. Needless to say, his passing was very hard on you; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. Can you tell us how Glen helped you deal with that situation?
A. Yeah. Like, always, like, when we wake up and start crying just thinking about it, he always come and, like, tell me the right things. And then I'll stop crying. He'll be, like, "Everything's going to be all right. I'll help you through it." He'll always be there for me.
Q. So, emotionally, he was always there for you?
A. Yes.
Q. How about just -- was your mother around as much after your dad died?
A. No; she was mostly at work. But she would come home in the afternoon, too.
Q. So, tell me how that changed things for you, and tell me who did all those things a mother or father would do for you after your dad died.
A. My brother. He'll always like -- he'll always
wake me up in the morning, make sure I ate something, make sure that I took a shower and got ready for school.

And, then, right after school, he'd always be there to pick me up; you know, and make sure I had something to eat and make sure I did my homework.
Q. What would you guys do on Friday nights?
A. We'll go, like, see a movie or go to a high school football game.
Q. When you say "we," who are you talking about?
A. Me and my brother and his friends. He'd take me along.
Q. Okay. There's about almost ten years' difference between you and Glen; right?
A. Right.
Q. Did he have any problem with letting you hang out with him and his buddies?
A. No. He didn't have no problem taking me along. We always go to the football games or to the mall or go see a movie.
Q. Is your big brother a good artist?
A. Yeah. While he was in there, he drew, like a picture of me. I sent him a picture, and then he drew, like, my face off the picture. And --
Q. Did he send that back to you?
A. Huh?
Q. Did he send that back to you?
A. Yeah; he sent it to me. Yeah, the one that he drew of me.
Q. So, it sounds like you -- while he's been in jail you've had contact with him; is that right?
A. Yeah. I talk to him on the phone on his birthdays or, you know, send him Christmas cards, or go visit him.
Q. Now, when you visit him, you can't be in the same room with him; right?
A. No.
Q. It's just on the TV?
A. Yeah.
Q. But those visits are still important for you?
A. Yeah. I like visiting him.
Q. You understand what's at stake here?
A. Huh?
Q. You understand what's at stake at this hearing, and you understand that Glen is going to be in prison at a minimum for the rest of his life; is that true?
A. Yes.
Q. What do you want -- what do you want from the future? What kind of contact do you want with Glen? Why is that going to be important for you? What can he do for you?
A. I want to keep on visiting him and talking to him, and writing to him, to ; let him know how I am doing.
Q. Why is that important to you, Raheem?
A. 'Cause, he's like my big brother.
Q. You're going to be going into high school soon, next year?
A. Yeah.
Q. If you had a big, big problem, or a big weighted decision, who would you go to?
A. My brother. Since he already went to high school, you know, I could ask him about anything about high school.
Q. Is there anything else that you want to say to Raheem?
A. That I'd like to still talk and -- I like talking, writing to my brother and telling him what's up.

MR. O'BRIEN: Thank you, Raheem.
I'll pass the witness, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. O'Brien.
MR. KANE: The State has no question for
Mr. Miller, Your Honor.
THE COURT: You may step down.
THE COURT: Who's next, Mr. O'Brien?
MR. O'BRIEN: Kheleen Glen.
Do you feel up to it, though?

Judge, at this time, may I state something for the record?

THE COURT: Certainly.
MR. O'BRIEN: We've marked for identification purposes some family photographs, and they've been marked as N through U. Mr. Kane has been good enough to stipulate to their admission, so we won't have to go through the formality.

THE COURT: Thank you very much.
KHETEEN GIENN, having been first duly sworn by the clerk to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, was examined and testified as follows:

THE CJERK: Please be seated.
MR. O'BRIEN: And, Judge, for the record, may I move for admission of the exhibits, Defense Exhibits N through U?

THE COURT: Basically, by stipulation, they will be admitted, and you have permission to publish.

MR. O'BRIEN: Thank you.
(Defense Exhibits $N$ through $U$ were admitted into evidence.)

THE CIERK: Will you please state your name and spell it for the record.

THE WITNESS: Kheleen Glen, K-h-e-1-e-e-n

G-1-e-n-n.
THE CIERK: Thank you.

## DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. O'BRIEN:
Q. You're Glenford's grandmother?
A. Yes.
Q. And you go by Dolly? Would you like me to call you Dolly?
A. Okay.
Q. Can you tell me what Glenford was like as a boy?
A. Well, Glenford was quiet, and he was kind and gentle. Loved to play with his sister -- the two sister, and a cousin. They always play together. From school, they play together on Saturdays. Glenford like to play in the back in the yard, building house out of old board. Well, Angela like go and touch the board. He tell me, "Granny, please make Angela stop fooling with those things." I had to call Angela inside.
Q. Now, when you say a house, what kind of house is he making?
A. Making out of old board.
Q. Like, a playhouse?
A. Yeah. And they could play in there.
Q. And once he finished that house, would he let Angela play in it?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you remember -- when Glenford was a -- I believe it was the first or second grade, did he have to repeat a year of school in Belize?
A. Well, yeah, he repeat.
Q. Do you remember what grade that was?
A. I think it was second grade. Third. Third.
Q. Third grade?
A. Uh-huh.
Q. When -- let me take you back to the time when Karen left to come to the United States. Was that difficult for Glen?
A. Well, at first it was difficult because he want to follow her, you know.
Q. Uh-huh.
A. And I tell him, well, you have to stay with Granny."
Q. But, as the years went by, he was becoming more attached to you?
A. Yes.
Q. When he had to leave your home, when he was 11 years old -- leave you and leave his sisters -- how did that make Glen feel? Do you know?
A. Well, at the first -- he never feel too good to leave -- go and leave his sisters, you know. He wanted to
go, but I tell him, "Mormy wants you, so you have to go."
Q. Okay. He didn't want to leave?
A. No.
Q. It was kind of hard for him?
A. (Witness nods head in the affirmative.)
Q. I'm going to show you this photograph.

MR. O'BRIEN: For the record, Judge, this is Defense Exhibit $P$.

THE COURT: "p" has already been admitted.
MR. O'BRIEN: Thank you, Your Honor.
BY MR. O'BRIEN:
Q. Can you see that on the screen, Dolly?
A. Yes.
Q. Can you -- can you point to Glenford? You can just touch the screen real quickly with your finger.
A. (Witness complies.)
Q. That's Glenford there, with the striped hat?

THE COURT: Stripped shirt.
MR. O'BRIEN: Striped shirt, I should have said.
Thank you, Judge
BY MR. O'BRTEN:
Q. Tell me about this picture. What's going on?
A. It was his cousin's birthday. And he was nine at that time.
Q. So, this was just a couple years before he had
to leave?
A. Yeah.
Q. Dolly, will it be important for you to keep some kind of contact with Glenford -- or Junie, I should say, because you call him Junie -- is it important to you to have the ability to write or talk to Junie in the future?
A. Yes.
Q. Is there anything else you want to tell us, Dolly?
A. I just want to say that Glenford was very quiet and gentle and nice to grandmother. No trouble. He gives me no trouble.

MR. O'BRIEN: Thank you very much, Dolly.
I'll pass the trouble, Your Honor.
MR. KANE: The State has no questions for Mrs. Glenn.

THE COURT: You may step down. Thank you.
Who's next, Mr. O'Brien?
MR. O'BRIEN: Karen Budd. I'm sorry, Karen Gill. Pardon me. KAREN GIL山, having been first duly sworn by the clerk to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, was examined and testified as follows:

THE CIERK: Please be seated.

Would you please state your name and spell it for the record.

THE WITNESS: Karen Gill, K-a-r-e-n G-i-1-1.
THE CLERK: Thank you.
DIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MR. O'BRIEN:
Q. Good moming, Karen.
A. Good moming.
Q. I know this is hard for you, so let me -- let me start just by showing you some photographs, and we'll talk about those a little bit. Okay?
A. Yes.
Q. For the record, I'm showing -- I'm putting on the monitor what has been admitted as Defense Exhibit N. Who's that?
A. Glen. That's Glenford, my son.
Q. What age is he there?
A. Two.
Q. So, at this age, you guys had a pretty tight family; is that right?

A Yes. I was still at home with my family.
Q. Showing you now what's been admitted as Defense Proposed Exhibit 0, tell me about this picture.
A. That's Glenford and his sister Shermaine, Glenford was three, I think his sister was five in that
picture.
Q. So, this is about a year before the family splint up; is that right?
A. Yes. He was already in school.
Q. Tell me about that decision to leave Belize and leave your children and come to the United States.
A. It was very hard for me to leave my country and leave my family behind. But I had to move on. I had to try to make a better life for my family. So, I came here. I left Glenford at age four, and I came here with the intent that -- I was trying to get them here as soon as possible. But it wasn't easy for me. It was a lot of ups and downs, and it took me a long time. But I get my son here. It was hard for him, because it was a like a bitter sweet thing. He was leaving his grandma and his family, but he was happy to come here with me.

And he came and he was just right up on me. He was attached to me, he was very quiet, very shy, like always. Even on birth, when he was born, you know, my friends that used to came to the house, they was, like, "Karen, do you have a baby?" I would hear the baby crying, and I was, like, "You've got to excuse me. My baby's crying." They would say, "I don't hear anything." I said, "I do." You know, he was always quiet. Always.

And the same way when he grew up and he came, he
was still quiet. And I had a new boyfriend at the time, and he was just right up on me. He never left -- you know, he was right up on me.
Q. And you're talking about Winston?
A. Yes. And one day while Glen was there, me and Mr. Miller had an argument. And to my surprise, Glen said, "You better not hit my mom." And he tells him, "I'm not gonna hit your mom. I have a lot of respect for your mom." And he said, "But I respect you, Glen, as a little man that you have respect for your mom." You know, and then Mr. Miller gave him a hug, and, like I say, Glen was always shy, and then started opening up to Winston, you know. And from there on they get real, real close.
Q. Okay.
A. Pretty close.

And it turns his life again. You know, he turned around to Glen. Because that little shy boy started opening up. He started meeting friends.
Q. Uh-huh.
A. You know, he was kind of shy, even when I put him in school; because he was really small for his age. And he was always in school, and I did everything I could do for my family.
Q. Do you remember Glen having to repeat a grade? Now, of course, you weren't there, but I'm sure --
A. Yes. I remember Grandma calling me. The report cards, they always mailing report cards to me, to keep everything up on me. And I said, "What do you mean you fail? How are you gonna fail? Why should you fail?" You know, but it was hard for him. That's right after I left. Right after I left, he just fail. He just -- it just was hard for him.
Q. Glenford was pretty good with wood shop and things like that?
A. Yes. He love a hammer. He love a nail. He always -- anything he could find, he build something out of it.
Q. So, he's good with his hands?
A. The school work was a little bit more of a challenge for him?
A. Yes.
Q. When Glen came here at 11 -- of course, you've described it as being bitter sweet, having to leave his grandma -- did he have a heavy accent at that time?

A Yes, he did. And he wouldn't talk because he was -- he would have to repeat over and over. And just rather not say nothing, or he would wait for me.
Q. When you say he'd have to repeat over and over again, the other kids would have him --
A. "Say it again. Say it again." And after too

