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 IQ, 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 $I Q$. 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
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 were 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 should 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 cur you can't smoke in now cur your ass is underground. Cross me, I blow like a bomb. Took three niggaz from they moms. I'm a thrill 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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| Alleged | 121：11 | （2）16：13 45：2 | 51：9 68：3 68：4 69：9 72：1 110： |
| ［5］66：20 69：25 91：7 101：5 | Appreciate | Attest | 23 111：5 112：21 121：8 <br> Baseline |
| 119：12 | ［2］110：1 110：1 | （1）130：10 | 【ま〕 113：14 |
| Allegedly | Approach | Attitude | Basic |
| （1）67：18 | ［2］4：9 60：21 | （2）15：18 62：4 Attitudes | [1] 24:20 |
| Allocution | Appropriate | （1）16：3 | Basis |
| ［2］58：25 60 | ［16］61：17 66：11 66：18 69：11 |  | ［4］11：13 68：25 84：24 85：16 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { Allow } \\ \text {（4）36：23 } & 57: 4 & 104: 10 & 109: 19\end{array}$ | 77：7 90：15 96：16 96：17 96：19 | Attorney 1980.214 | Basketball |
| \｛4］36：23 57：4 104：10 109：19 Allowed | 105：14 107：10 107：16 108：3 | （4］1：18 1：19 8：2 59：14 | ［7］28：1 31：16 32：3 32：23 36： |
| Allowed ［2］ $57: 12$ $74: 20$ | 108：21 125：16 125：22 | Attorney＇s | $17128: 1$ 31：16 32：3 32：23 36： $1947: 197: 7$ |
| ［2］57：12 74：20 | Appropriately | （11）7：15 | Bat |
| Allowing | ［1］107：25 | Attoxneys | ［1］47：3 |
| ［1］34：9 | Approved | （4）5：25 57：10 58：7 62：2 |  |
| Allows | ［2］4：21 4：22 | Attract | Became <br> （1）53：19 |
| ［1］107：3 | April | ［1］43：1 |  |
| Almost | ［3］15：12 24：21 25：12 | Audible | Become <br> ［1］53：20 |
| ［3］19：1 22：16 41：25 | Area | ［1］64：10 | Bedroom |
| Alone | ［2］30：16 31：1 | Audience | Bedroom |
| ［1］95：4 | Argue | ［1］61：19 | ［2］ $30: 8$ 95：5 $)^{4} \cup 2 ; 4$ |
| Alternate | ［4］53：11 57：11 115：7 115：9 | Auditory | ［1］ $34: 9$ |
| ［1］129：23 | Argued | （3］23：16 23：20 23：24 | Beforehand |


| (2) 6:10 55:17 | [1] 95:19 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Befriended | BC | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Eudd }{ }^{\prime} \mathrm{S} \\ & \text { [15] 10:19 11:23 } \end{aligned}$ | Caught <br> (2] 92:17 92:20 |
| [1] 97:6 | $[1]-47: 2$ | 18:7 22:14 27:15 27:20 43:25 | Caused |
| Begin | Bomb | 44:3 45:17 46:3 $46: 14$ 54:6 | [4] 93:12 125:1 125:2 128:9 |
| (1] 129:16 | (2) 104:2 128:22 | 124:18 |  |
| Beginning | Eonding | Buddies | [1] 114:9 |
| [3] 29:6 77:5 107:13 | (1) 16:18 | $\text { [1] } 28: 12$ | Causing |
| Begins | Bonds | Buddy | (2) $93: 20$ 108:9 |
| (1] 28:3 | [1] 19:3 | [2] 28:14 $46: 1$ | $C C D C$ |
| Behalf | Books | Bullets | $\text { [1] } 91: 16$ |
| (3) 9:22 74:9 81:17 | (2] 72:18 90:23 | [5] 92:6 93:22 127:1 127:7 | CCR |
| Behavior | Borderline | 1.27:8 | [2] 1:25 130:16 |
| [7] 15:9 15:15 15:17 15:19 | [5] 22:11 23:3 49:10 49:14 | Eunch [3] 16:7 27:14 120:3 | Cell |
| 17:7 39:9 53:2 | 49:15 | Buried | (3) 42:23 42:24 91:3 |
| Behavioral | Borders | Buried | Center |
| [5] 13:9 21:10 25:20 26:14 | [2] 100:3 100:3 | [1] 53:21 | (1) 42:18 |
| 27:12 | Born | Bus | Central |
| Behaviors | [4] 17:12 17:17 90:6 96:2 | (2) 52:18 127:23 | (2) 17:15 41:2 |
| [1] 39:25 | Bottom | Button | (2) 17:15 41:2 |
| Behind | [1] 51:22 | [5] 116:21 116:23 116:24 117: | Certain <br> [7] 13:1 59:15 75:20 1 |
| [2] 28:21 29:18 | Bounced | 1 117:8 | $\begin{aligned} & 100: 8123: 22 \quad 123: 23 \\ & 100: 89 \end{aligned}$ |
| Belief | [1] 34:20 | Buy | Certainly |
| [1] 62:5 | Boundaries | Byrd | [16] 9:9 57:4 84:7 86:21 88: |
| Beliefs | [11] 75:20 | Byrd [4] $43: 17$ $45: 25$ $46: 3$ | 989:2 90:25 91:6 92:16 92: |
| [1] 15:18 Believability | Box | Byrd's | 21 93:1 93:7 102:2 106:6 110: |
| Belize | [4] 19:14 21:5 96:2 126:19 | C | (1) 87:14 |
| [7] 17:14 17:14 18:20 19:24 | Boyfriend | C | Cetera |
| 30:11 33:9 36:17 | (1) 18:6 | C193182 | [2] 18:4 18:4 |
| Eelongings | Boys | 11 | Chair |
| [1] 130:1 | (6] 93:22 93:24 93:24 94:1 | California | [1] 111:3 |
| Eelow | 95:2 97:5 | [3] 19:11 21:7 50:13 | Chance |
| (5) 22:10 22:12 22:12 25: B | Brain | Callus | [8) 13:8 14:2 14:18 15:14 15: |
| 50:2 | [2] 11:18 | (1) 124:11 | 16 16:25 38:17 109:17 |
| Bench | Break | Calm | Change |
| [1] 60:22 | (2) 57:5 57:20 | [2] 43:10 128:6 | [2] 92:18 115:18 |
| Benefit | Breath | Cannot | Character |
| (21 75:9 122:23 | (1) 127:16 | (3) 16:13 94:8 114:16 | [6] 11:11 41:22 42:15 42:16 |
| Best | Brief | Capable | 68:23 84:22 |
| [13] 16:10 25:8 26:9 28:24 | [4] 4:15 40:10 40:13 54:17 | [1] 41:19 | Characteristic |
| $33: 21 \quad 36: 6 \quad 36: 8 \quad 37: 15 \quad 42: 9$ | Briefly | Capital | [1] 10:14 |
| 43:18 44:3 116:3 118:24 Better | (4) 43:4 47:3 106:8 113:1 | [1] 111:24 | Charge |
| [8] 9:12 10:21 22:18 | Ering | Captain | [1] 129:19 |
| $\begin{aligned} & {[8] \text { 9:12 } 10: 2122: 18} \\ & 49: 1889: 2 \quad 103: 9125: 1 \end{aligned}$ | [3] 69:19 $76: 17 \quad 77: 10$ | [2] 4:25 116:19 | Cheok |
| Between | Brings | Car | [2] 70:24 119:24 |
| [5] 32:9 44:17 44:20 47:21 | [2] 13:1 32:25 | (4) 20:20 2日:14 41:11 54 | Checklist |
| 49:9 | Eroken | Card | (1) 39:19 |
| Beyond | [2] 19:14 28:15 | [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 |
| 23 101:25 117:4 | [29] 1:21 56:7 57:9 5B:2 65: | [2] 38:4 90:16 | Child |
| Big | 12 65:14 67:17 68:1 68:6 72: | Care | [10] $13: 1313: 1413: 1513: 22$ |
| (2) 37:14 91:24 | 7 72:12 72:15 72:21 72:24 74: | (6) 18:18 36:8 39:17 45:9 78: | $\begin{array}{lllllllllll}14: 2 & 14: 4 & 15: 25 & 30: 10 & 36: 1\end{array}$ |
| 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: | $2178: 23$ 日2:4 86:9 94:5 97: | Career | Childhood |
| 4 37:10 37:25 | 25 98:1 112:12 112:13 114:15 | (1) 108:36 | [8] 13:15 17:18 18:25 19:6 |
| Birth | Erooks 's | Caring | 33:5 35:16 86:1 123:2 |
| [1] 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 | $\begin{array}{lllllll}\text { [13] } \\ 43: 10: 19 & 19: 19 & 26: 9 & 29: 11\end{array}$ | (11) 42:13 | Children |
| 96:4 98:5 98:6 106:19 | 43:10 43:18 $45: 9$ 45:10 $64: 4$ | Carried | [6] 16:14 35:23 35:23 44:6 45:11 45:14 |
| Black | Brothers | (3) 46:22 47:2 124:13 | Children's |
| [1] 67:22 | $\text { (1) } 62: 14$ | Case | $[1] 45: 14$ |
| Blame | Brought |  | Choice |
| 111 93:18 | (3) 14:25 74:23 87:15 | $\begin{array}{lllll} 9: 20 & 11: 23 & 22: 14 & 58: 18 & 61: 0 \\ 65: 2 & 66: 20 & 69: 11 & 69: 18 & 71: 14 \end{array}$ | (6) 12:9 93:21 93:21 93:23 |
| Blank | Brutally | 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 |
| 8lathering | Bucid | 96:20 101:4 101:24 103:6 103: | (3) 12:6 13:1 122:9 |
| [11 114:4 | [791 1:6 2:6 3:5 7:21 7:25 8: | 25 106:17 107:13 108:5 109: | Choose |
| Blew | 1 1:4 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 |
| Blood | 22 18:5 18:12 22:19 26:20 28: | 7 129:2 129:4 129:7 | 118:14 |
| [1] 127:16 | 15 31:12 32:5 32:10 43:9 43: | Cases | Chose |
| Blow | 18 43:20 44:2 $44: 7$ 74:12 44: | [7] 5:19 5:19 7:6 7:6 7:97: | (2) 59:8 88:13 |
| [2] 29:7 128:21 | 18 44:20 44:21 44:25 45:9 45: | 107112 | Circumstance |
| Blue | $\begin{array}{llllll}11 & 46: 4 & 46: 16 & 46: 18 & 46: 20 & 46: \\ 21 & 46: 23 & 46: 25 & 47: 2 & 49: 21 & 50\end{array}$ | CAT | [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 |
| Elues | 9 58:3 58:6 59:7 60:10 60:14 | Categories | 72:11 82:11 82:14 82:22 83:3 |
| (11 128:15 | 60:20 61:20 64:13 74:16 75:8 | [2] 85:8 86:11 | 83:4 83:7 83:22 84:8 84:10 |
| Board | 75:9 75:14 76:18 76:21 77:9 | Category | 94:21 96:14 100:25 101:5 101: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Board } \\ & {[1] \quad 5: 17} \end{aligned}$ | 79:9 80:2 80:3 80:24 81:4 81: | [1] 109:10 |  |
| Bodies | 109:17 109:20 109:25 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Catholic } \\ & \text { f11 4:19 } \end{aligned}$ | 119:5 119:12 119:20 120:8 |
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## Court's

[4] 56:8 68:6 68:12 110:5 Courtroom
 79:6 124:23 129:16 130: Courts

| Cousins | 115:16 120:24 122:15 | $100: 15110: 16$ | Dependence |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| [1] 19:4 | Dz 12 | Deck | [1] 14:12 |
| Covered | [2]-1:2 87:2 | [1] 116:18 | Dependency |
| [1] 37:23 | Damaging | Declaration | [3] 14:19 38:18 38:24 |
| Cr | [1] 52:21 | (1) 60:6 | Dependient |
| [1] 2:2 | Danger | Declined | [1] $51: 1$ |
| Crawl | (6] 108:2 108:4 100:7 108:11 | (1) $45: 17$ | Depressed |
| [1] 127:14 | 10B:14 108:25 | Decreased | [2] 29:8 34:12 |
| Crawling | Dangerous | [1] 38:14 | Deprivation |
| [2] 127:12 127:13 | [2] 108:8 112 | Dedo | [1] 115:2 |
| Create | Da | [3] 44:14 44:19 45:22 | Dept |
| [1] 112:22 | [2] 32:25 62:5 | Deeply | (1] 1:6 |
| Credibility | Daughter | (2) 61:25 63:2 | Deputy |
| [1] 69:15 | [2] 45:22 118:5 | Defend | [4] 1:18 1:19 1:21 1:23 |
| Credit | Daughter's | [5] 46:25 47:3 95:5 108:4 | Derrick |
| [21 28:20 29:2 | [1] 118:12 | 117:10 | [13] 73:9 73:12 73:15 81:22 |
| Credits | David | Defendant |  |
| [1] 113:18 | [2] 1:25 130:16 | [66] 1:7 1:21 6:16 7:1 9:24 | 115:15 120:25 122:16 126:25 |
| Crime | Days | 11:12 11:17 42:16 57:22 57: | Described |
| [19] 10:14 12:10 12:14 14:5 | (2) 92:20 124:21 | 24 $58: 9$ $58: 13$ $58: 21$ $58: 23$ $59:$ <br> 21 $61: 1$ $62: 18$ $62: 21$ $62: 24$ $63:$ | [6] 43:10 43:16 44:2 44:12 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}30: 1 & 30: 19 & 31: 1 & 32: 24 & 42: 1 \\ 67: 4 & 67: 10 & 85: 14 & 92: 17 & 99: 3\end{array}$ | DC | $1063: 20 \quad 64: 1$ 64:10 66:3 66: | 44:24 50:4 <br> Describing |
| 67:4 $67: 1085: 1492: 1799: 3$ $99: 20 \quad 108: 18109: 9109: 9109:$ | (1) 4:19 | $1266: 16$ 67:4 67:7 67:968: | (1) 70:21 |
| 11 110 | $\text { [2] } 95$ | 7 83:10 84:2 85:10 85:13 85: | Desert |
| Crime-ridden | Deadl | 16 85:21 87:20 98:1 88:12 80: | [1] 5:3 |
| [2] 30:19 31:1 | [1] 84:4 | 24 89:13 90:3 90:8 91:11 91: | Deserve |
| Crimes [2] $10: 601: 15$ | Deal | 20 $91: 23$ $32: 1$ $92: 16$ $93: 19$ <br> 20 $94: 22$ $95: 12$ $96: 21$ $104: 20$ | [2] B0:15 123:25 |
| [2] 10:6 91:15 | [4] 53:6 54:7 88:13 95:12 | $119: 13 \quad 120: 6 \quad 120: 7 \quad 123: 9 \quad 124:$ | Deserved |
| [17] 6.7 11.3 $14.19 \quad 15.15$ 16: | Dealer | 25 125:1 129:12 | (11) 125:16 |
| [17] 6:7 11:3 14:19 15:15 16: 25 32:19 30:18 38:24 60:15 | [1] 97:15 | Defendant's | Deserves |
| 67:5 85:11 102:12 109:15 108: | Dealing | (18) 11:11 11:17 67:10 67:12 | (2) 81 |
| 16 108:19 108:22 109:6 | [8] 50:5 69:25 70:5 70:11 70: | 67:23 68:21 68:23 84:1984: | Desire |
| Criminality | 13 70:18 86:5 88:6 |  | (1] 75:22 |
| (2) 15:25 16:17 | Deals | 10 93:13 122:23 124:14 129:0 | Despair |
| Criminally | [3] 83:21 119:6 119:23 | Defender | [1] 29:24 |
| (2) 11:5 35:2 | Death |  | Desperation |
| $\begin{array}{llll}\text { Cross } \\ 161 & 59: 11 & 59: 14 & 75: 19 \\ 81: 7\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{llllll} 651 & 5: 19 & 7: 6 & 7: 8 & 7: 11 & 7: 17 \\ 9: 20 & 11: 13 & 34: 13 & 34: 16 & 35: 8 \end{array}$ | Defender's <br> (3) 8:16 26:17 103:8 | [6] 52:3 52:6 52:6 52:9 102: $22102: 22$ |
| $161 \quad 59: 11 \quad 59: 14$ $87: 25 \quad 128: 21$ | $9: 20$ $11: 13$ $34: 13$ $34: 16$ $35: 8$ <br> $38: 5$ $40: 12$ $40: 14$ $44: 1$ $44: 12$ | Defenders | Destabilized |
| Cross-examination | 45:5 45:20 46:7 46:16 46:17 | [1] 5:25 | (1) 30:2 |
| [6] 48:15:59:1 59:11 75:19 | 54:4 62:12 66:7 66:9 69:1 71: 13 71:17 71:20 72:16 73:11 | Defense | Detail |
| 61:787:25 | 73:14 73:20 73:23 74:2 83:8 | $[30]$ 2:2 3:10 5:25 6:11 7:18 | (3) 100:20 107:18 115:3 |
| Cross-examine | 83:11 84:25 86:2 96:19 97:22 | 9:23 11:12 56:10 57:10 60:13 | Details |
| [2] 7:18 60:7 | 102:20 103:22 104:20 105:5 |  | (11 111:8 |
| Cross-examined | 105:17 105:24 106:4 106:5 | $74: 20$ <br> $86: 1$ <br> $86: 20$ <br> $101: 7$ <br> 97 | Detention |
| (11) 59:14 | 107:6 107:7 107:10 107:16 | 112:1 126:6 128:25 129:2 129: | (1) 42:18 |
| Cryin' | 107:24 108:2 108:21 109:2 | 12.1 126:6 128:25 129:2 129. | Deteriorated |
| [1] 128:19 | 121:21 121:25 122:4 125:15 | Defiance | (2) 51:15 53:3 |
| Cs | 126:1 126:7 | [3) 25:21 26:22 40:22 | Deteriorates |
| (2) 21:10 |  | Defiant | [1] 33:11 |
| Culminate | (4) 1:14 3:1 17:12 32:10 | [1] | Deteriorating |
| [1] 52:13 | Decent | Deficien | (2) 34:18 48:3 |
| Culmination | (14) 10:5 10:13 16:8 17:17 | [2] 28:20 29: | Deterioration |
| [1] $48: 2$ | 20:11 30:16 33:9 35:23 36:16 | Deficits | [2] 30:24 44:11 |
| Culpability | 37:6 37:7 45:25 47:24 48:5 | [1] 43:21 | Determination |
| (6] 11:15 12:2 68:22 84:19 | D | Definitio | (4) 42:17 74:16 82:21 84:6 |
| 86:16 86:17 | [18] 82:10 83:3 83:5 83:10 | [1] 11:3 | Detarmine |
| Cultural | 96:12 96:13 100:18 100:23 | Degree | [31 82:14 94:16 112:6 |
| (1) 12:12 | 101:23 102:3 103:14 105:14 <br> 115:17 116:9 120:8 123:1 125: | [12] 4:18 4:20 64:20 65:25 | Determined |
| Culture | $15126: 11$ | 66:21 66:25 67:3 68:21 84:1 | (1] 69:16 |
| [4] 19:13 19:16 33:20 102:17 | Deci | 84:3 106:12 125:20 | Determining |
| Curls | (4) 74:11 101:10 102:1 104:24 | Delano | [2] 69:5 69:10 |
| (1) 127:15 | Decides | [1] 24:7 | Devastating |
| Current | [3] 95:12 109:22 127:23 | Deleted | [1] 104:8 |
| [3] 5:7 5:13 6:22 | Deciding | [1] 112: | Develop |
| Custody | (1) 66:11 | Deliberation | [3] 14:21 40:20 41:8 |
| [1] 108:2 | Decision | 16] 69:13 69:21 89:16 102:9 | Developed |
| cut | [50] 42:14 51:19 52:11 52:14 | 114:12 130:4 | [1] 41:7 |
| (2) 22:18 112:13 | 52:15 52:16 52:18 53:8 50:19 | Deliberations | Development |
| Cuz | 63:3 68:12 74:18 81:24 82:17 | [3] 70:7 107:1 129:17 | (2) 13:17 41:22 |
| (2] 128:20 128:20 | 96:10 96;15 96:18 96:19 97: | Delinquency | Developmental |
|  | 13 97:15 99:8 100:9 100:13 | [11] 16:19 | [4] 11:18 12:10 14:13 17:18 |
| Oacim_L | 100:16 101:1 $8101: 11$ $103: 24 ~ 104: 14 ~ 105: 1 ~$ | Demands | Die |
| Dad 4 (4] 20:1 20:4 35:10 $35: 11$ | $\begin{array}{llll}805: 12 & 106: 22 & 110: 19 & 110: 22\end{array}$ | (2) 111:22 114:19 | [4] 81:22 109:21 127:24 128:2 |
| (4) 20:1 20:4 35:10 35:11 | 110:23 110:24 111:6 112:3 | Denial | Died |
| Dad's | 112:24 116:8 116:10 117:21 | (1) 75:3 | [9] 30:3 $37: 13$ 38:13 44:16 |
| [2] 20:2 27:7 | 121:13 121:22 125:21 125:24 | Denials | 45:18 45:24 55:18 87:23 127:8 |
| Daily | 125:25 127:22 | [1] 60:1 | Dies |
| [1] 19:2 | Decision-making | Departed | [5] 29:4 33:10 33:23 35:17 |
| Dajon | [1] 51:19 | III 60:2 |  |
| 1131 71:271:4 71:781:22 95: | Decisions | Department | Difference I 2, |
| 4 95:18 $96: 4$ 96:5 97:1 110:9 | [6] 53:12 54:1 100:8 100:14 | [4] 5:24 14:25 15:11 17:5 | (31 63:13 118:8 125:20 |


| Different | [2] 33:6 43:11 | [1] 84:6 | [1] 79:6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1211 10:10 11:20 12:16 12:20 | Do | Easy | Enterprise |
| 12:21. $16: 916: 14$ 27:5 $33: 22$ | [10, 17:10 71:9 96:23 103:9 | (3) 13:18 84:2 120:12 | (2) 55:10 55:12 |
| $\left\lvert\, \begin{array}{lllll} 35: 9 & 36: 4 & 36: 12 & 37: 22 & 37: 23 \\ 48: 20 & 54: 9 & 59: 11 & 61: 2 i & 92: 19 \end{array}\right.$ | 105:11 113:9 118:7 122:6 122: | Economic | Entirety |
| 101:19 102:17 |  | (6) 51:24 54:5 55:22 97:12 | [1] 66:23 |
| Differentiy | Door [1] $42: 25$ | 97:14 127:22 | Entitled |
| (1) 12:25 | Dope | Economics | (2) 103:2 125:8 |
| Difficult | [1] 128:2 | Edaie | Envies |
| 171 96:9 96:9 98:13 98:16 | Dorsey | [3] $44: 3$ 45:25 $64: 5$ | (1) 118:23 |
| 110:19 112:3 112:24 | [1] 27:20 | (3) 44:3 45:25 64:5 Edition | Envi.romment |
| Difficulties | Doubt | Edition | (2] 12:20 36:13 |
| $\begin{aligned} & (8) \\ & 19: 1 \\ & 86: 22 \\ & 86: 23: 35 \\ & 87: 8 \\ & 23: 22 \\ & 102: 19 \end{aligned}$ | [9] 69:9 70:10 82:12 84:9 93: | Education | Equates <br> (2) 11:14 12:2 |
| Difficulty | 12 100:24 101:25 117:2 117:4 Down | [4] 4:16 28:4 34:6 45:1 | Equation |
| [1] 23:19 |  | Educatio | (1) 104:2 |
| Diminished | 56:4 64:8 $95: 14103: 6103: 9$ | (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 | [8] 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 80:7 | 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 | Effects | [1] 50:15 |
| Directions | [1] 90:10 |  | Escapes |
| (1) 27:5 | Drink | Eight | [2] 42:21 43:2 |
| Directly | [1] 103:12 | 31:4 31:6 31:23 $44: 15 \quad 56: 8$ | ESQ |
| [1] 78:6 | Drive | Eighth | (4) 1:17 1:19 1:21 1:22 |
| Dixty | [1] 30:22 | $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { 110] } & 21: 14 & 24: 18 & 24: 20 & 24: 23\end{array}$ | Essentially |
| [1] 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 |
| (11) $5: 6$ | Dropped | Either | (1) 115:8 |
| Discipline | (2) 31:12 45:19 | [7] 8:7 24:6 49:1 58:1 100:9 | Estimation |
|  | Dropping | 105:3 129:5 | [1] 68:19 |
| Discouraged | [2] 16:18 29:2 | Elected | Et |
| [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: | [11 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 |  | (2) 26:17 47:9 | [3] 19:10 20:4 29: B |
| 102:2 104:13 106:19 |  | Emotional | Everyday |
| Discussed | Dry | 131 45:4 67:885:22 | [1] 69:20 |
| [4] 59:16 106:18 120:1 123:6 | [1] 103:11 | Emotionally | Evicted |
| Discussing |  | (1) 45:6 | [6] 30:7 30:14 31:3 31:10 46: |
| [1] 60:19 | [2] 21:10 25:18 | Emphasize | 1886:6 |
| Discussion | Dudley | (3) 49:15 49:16 104:21 | Evidence |
| [1] 87:11 | [3] 44:3 44:4 44:10 | Employed | [46] 39:8 42:14 43:14 68:5 |
| Disintegration | Dudleys ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | [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] 10:20 29:6 79:16 126:16 | 22 86:4 86:19 88:9 89:15 94: |
| (3) 14:13 14:16 38:19 | (1) 3:20 | Ending | $8194: 1098: 6 ~ 101: 2101: 3 ~ 101: ~$ 21 102:14 102:35 102:19 104: |
| Disorders | During | $\begin{array}{lllllll}\text { (3) 82:18 } & \text { 107:2 } & 107: 2\end{array}$ | 21 102:14 102:15 102:19 104: |
| (21 11:19 37:20 | [15] 11:25 17:22 20:5 24:4 | Ends | 111:21 112:1 112:12 112:16 |
| Disorganization | $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { 2B:11 } & 28: 17 & 33: 7 & 35: 18 & 36: 9 \\ 44: 19 & 56: 17 & 69: 21 & 65: 6 & 107\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{lllllllllll}151 & 26: 10 & 27: 10 & 27: 11 & 28: 22\end{array}$ | 112:17 113:4 113:4 113:8 113: |
| [1] 17:1 | 13 107:21 | 29:2 | 19 114:6 114:7 114;17 121:9 125:14 |
| Display | Duty | Engage | Evolved |
| [1] 46:22 | (4) 56:18 65:21 111:23 125:23 | (1) 51:19 | [11 10:22 |
| Dispute | Dying | Engaged |  |
| [1] 86:21 | [1] 87:6 | [2] 39:1i 96:1 | [2] 6:22 6:22 |
| Disregard <br> (1) 60:4 | E | Engaging <br> (1) $15: 14$ | Ex-girlfriand |
| District | Eari | English | 11] 43:13 |
| (6) 1:1 1:38 1:19 6:8 $7: 15$ | [1] 86:24 | [1] 19:35 | Ex-gixlfxiends |
| 59:14 | Early | Enjoy | [1] 6:22 |
| Disturbance | [7] 15:16 $28: 18 \quad 32: 1933: 5$ | [1] 126:20 | Ex-wives |
| 12] 67:8 95:23 | 40:6 40:24 41:0 | Enjoyed | [11 6:22 |
| Diverse | Earned | (1) 44:8 | Exact |
| (1) 11:16 | (4) 50:18 81:23 97:22 129:8 | Enormity | [1] 73:9 |
| Doctor | Earning | [1] 117:21 | Exactly |
| [14] 4:9 4:13 5:2 48:11 48: | [2] 55:988:7 | Enommously | [3] 66:3 99:16 122:8 |
| $\begin{array}{llllllllllll}18 & 50: 10 & 52: 17 & 53: 11 & 54: 11\end{array}$ | Earth | (1) 104:5 | Examination |
| 56:3 76:25 78:6 78:9 78:15 | [4] 226:3 126:21 127:3 128:16 | Enter | 171 4:7 54:15 59:11 75:1980: |
| Doctorate <br> (2) 4:20 5:1 | Easier | $\text { [1] } 114: 12$ | $\begin{aligned} & 781: 787: 25 \cup 2) 388 \\ & \text { Examine } \end{aligned}$ |
| (2) 4:20 5:1 | [3] 24:2 24:10 27:25 Easiest | Enterad | [1] 125:14 |


| Examined | [1] $80: 18$ | 46:17 48:3 53:3 ${ }^{\text {cax }}$ 32:10 | [1] $123: 21$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (2) 3:22 59:14 | Ex ssions | 62:11 62:20 62:2 :18 63: | Firm |
| Example | [1) 99:24 | 18 63:23 63:24 67>+2 67:23 | [2] $72: 372: 8$ |
| [4] 24:2 45:5 99:25 100:2 | Extended | 75:23 80:13 80:13 80:16 80: <br> 16 86:18 87:2 87:5 87:6 87:7 | Firmer |
| Excellent | [1] 19:23 | 93:10 93:13 93:15 93:18 94:1 | [1] 34:11 |
| [1] 65:11 | Extension | 96:6 96:24 102:18 102:19 102; | Eixst |
| Exception | (1] 29:16 | 20 110:9 115:13 115:16 124: | [40] 3:20 9:5 18:14 10:20 19: |
| [1] 19:7 | Extensively | 15 124:10 125:3 125:9 125:18 | $20 \quad 23: 17 \quad 23: 24 \quad 28: 21 \quad 30: 20$ |
| Exceptionaliy | (1) 8:18 | Family's | 57:11 64:20 65:21 65:25 66: |
| [1] 44:21 | Extent | (3) 44:11 46:6 46:15 | 21 66:25 71:14 75:12 78: $282:$ |
| Excessively | [1] 77:3 | Fancy | 7 84:1 84:3 84:12 85:10 100: 20 100:22 101:13 101:20 106: |
| (1) $45: 6$ | Extonuate | [1] 64:7 | 10 106:12 111:22 113:5 114: |
| Excitement | (1) 86:17 | Far | 13 117:19 118:18 119:17 121: |
| [1] 127:21 | Extenuating | (7) 20:8 51:6 64:2 65:17 110: | 1 121:9 124:1 128:2 129;22 |
| Excuse | (2] 68:20 84:18 | 25 121:9 127:10 | Fit |
| [3] 68:18 99:10 111:25 | Extemminated | Fast | [6] 19:16 85:7 86:8 86:10 97: |
| Excused | [1] 112:9 | [2] 21:17 30:2 | 4 127:21 |
| [1] 129:16 | Extermination | ast-forward | Eits |
| Exauses | [1] 126:23 | [11] 21:17 | [2] 42:4 50:1 |
| [1] 84:17 | Extreme | Father | Five |
| Execute | [3] 38:5 67:7 85:22 | [23] 13:19 18:7 $18.1318: 15$ | [11] 14:24 $15: 14$ 30:5 66:1 |
| [1] 118:13 | Extremely | $27: 9 \quad 30: 3 \quad 33: 4 \quad 33: 4 \quad 33: 7 \quad 36:$ | 67:11 70:10 70:23 93:11 94:2 $115: 22 \quad 122: 11$ |
| Execution | [1] 96:9 | 21 37:4 37:7 37:11 38:1 86:2 | Five-tim |
| [5] 67:12 67:23 93:10 124:13 | Eye | 86:4 95:22 96:3 | [1] |
| 126:18 | [1] 22:21 | Father's | Fix |
| Executor | Eyes | [11] 37:24 | [2] 65:24 68:1 |
| [1] 41:5 | (1] 118:12 | Fault | Fixing |
| Exercise | F | $(4)$ 93:17 126:2 126:2 126:2 | (1) 70:14 |
| [2] 59:13 81:5 |  | rable | Fled |
| Exhibit | Face | [2] 15:19 16:3 | (1) 126:25 |
| (3) 11:12 21:15 89:18 | [8] 3:17 11:8 62:11 95:18 | Fed. | Flee |
| Exhibiting | 109:12 126:3 126:21 128:15 | [2] 29:12 45:12 | [1] 95:10 |
| (1] 25:20 | Faced | Feed | [1] 95:10 |
| Exhibits | (1) 16:12 | [1] 29:14 |  |
| [1] 69:22 | Faceless | Eeeds |  |
| Exist | [1] 95:20 | [1] 110:14 | (1] 91:23 |
| [12] 69:6 71:22 82:11 82:14 | Fact | Feelings | Focus |
| 82:15 86:14 93:8 94:18 101: | [25] 47:21 50:17 50:21 51:20 | [1] 62:3 |  |
| 23 102:4 120:2 121:4 | 53:3 55:14 65:5 75:11 75:24 | Fell | Focused |
| Existence | 78:13 日成:13 94:23 95:5 95:12 | [1] $45: 8$ | Focused |
| (5) $66: 13$ $100: 24$ 66:15 $70: 8$ $70: 11$ | $\begin{array}{llll} 97: 19 & 101: 11 & 102: 7 & 102: 16 \\ 103: 1 & 103: 6 & 105: 24 & 114: 6 \quad 123: \end{array}$ | Felt: |  |
| $100: 24$ <br> Exists | 9 124:20 129:22 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | [3] 43:20 51:25 53:9 | (2] 82:3 98:14 |
| $\text { (1) } 82: 23$ | Factor | Female | Following |
| Exited | [11 66:19 | [1] 9:22 | (5] 64:21 66:19 66:22 67:1 |
| [2] 57:2 61:19 | Eactors | Fetal | 70:17 |
| Expect | [27] 10:23 12:12 13:6 13:7 | (1) 127:15 | Follows |
| [2] 20:7 34:14 | 14:6 14:6 15:3 15:6 15:8 15 : | Few | [1] 3:23 |
| Expelled | 13 15:20 $16: 14$ 16:16 $16: 20$ | [91 12:19 17:3 19:2 19:17 23: | Food |
| [2] 27:12 27:17 |  | 21 30:11 31:15 31:18 106:19 | (4) $29: 13$ 55:15 86:7 110:13 |
| Expensive | 16 86:15 94:16 94:25 | Eifth | Force |
| [1] 54:23 | Facts | 11) 23:10 | (4) 4:23 4:24 4:25 5:4 |
| Experienca | [11 111:24 | Fig | Ford |
| [2] 5:7 5:8 | Failed | [1] 120: | (1] 51:10 |
| Experianced | (1) 73:4 | Fights | Foxensic |
| (1) 102:22 | Failure | [1] 43: | (7) 5:11 5:18 6:6 6:13 6:15 |
| Experiencing | [1] 16:17 | Figure | 6:24 7:5 |
| (1) 35:4 | Faix | [2] 107:11 117: | Foreperson |
| Expertise | [1] 78:11 | Figured | (1) 76.24 |
| (1) 73:1 | Fairly | Fil 40 dil | Forgive |
| Explain | (5) 12:17 14:3 27:22 32:18 | Filed (1) $40: 10$ | (4) $938: 14$ 103:11 111:14 113: |
| 110] 33:15 80:22 84:15 99:16 | 36:15 | Fil $40: 10$ |  |
| 100:19 116:13 118:25 119:2 | Fairness | Fliled | Forgotcen |
| 122:21 124:11 | [1] 68:20 | [1] 20:13 | [2] 111:16 111:17 |
| Explained | Faked | Final | Form |
| (7) 58:3 58:7 75:10 75:17 98: 10 113 :21 113:21 | [1] 124:19 | ```(6) 105:13 105:13 106:3 105: 7 121:15 121:16``` | (19) 12:1 23:20 25:6 51:9 56: $2271: 171: 14$ 71:17 72:3 72: |
| $10 \quad 113: 21 \quad 113: 21$ | Falling | Finality | 9 73:24 103:4 119:11 121:6 |
| Explanation | [2] 29:18 49:13 | [1] 115:20 | 121:18 121:24 122:12 122:13 |
| [2] 54:8 75:11 Explore | Falls | Finally | 125:20 |
| Explore | (2] 22:22 85:18 | Finaly 73.23 112.8 | Formal |
| [1] 14:22 | Families | (3) 56:24 73:23 112:8 | (1) $57: 20$ |
| Expose | (8) 30:18 30:18 94:4 115:14 | Financial | Formally |
| (1) 126:21 | 115:15 115:17 125:20 116:2 | [21 35:17 86:19 | (2) 75:178:8 |
| Exposed | Family | Einancially | Formation |
| [1] 15:8 | [92] 6:22 8:8 12:20 13:2 13: | [1] 38:7 | [1] 41:24 |
| Exposure | 5 13:15 13:24 14:11 14:12 14: | Fine | Formative |
| (2] 17:3 $24: 14$ | 17 15:4 15:20 16:1 16:7 17: | [9] 17:19 19:3 21:12 28:16 | [2] $13: 16$ 40:6 |
| Express | 11 17:16 17:24 17:25 19:4 18: | 32:7 61:16 72:18 79:5 90:14 | [2] 13:16 40:6 |
| [3] 25:6 56:22 89:13 | $\begin{array}{llll}17 & 21: 4 & 21: 12 & 26: 11 \\ 7 & 29: 22 & 30: 2 & 30: 4 \\ 30: 6 & 33: 11\end{array}$ | Finished | Formed |
| Expressed | $\begin{array}{lllll}7 & 29: 22 & 30: 2 & 30: 4 & 30: 6 \\ 34: 8 & 34: 17 & 36: 3 & 36: 14 & 36: 23\end{array}$ | [1] 5:1 | [1] 10:24 |
| [1] 44:25 | $37: 3 \quad 37: 21 \quad 38: 5 \quad 38: 6 \quad 38: 13$ | Fire | Foxms Fold |
| Expressing | 38:17 $43: 25 \quad 43: 25 \quad 44: 4 \quad 44: 8$ | (1) 93:22 | [6] 70:6 70:1 $/ 4.2$, 19:19 |
|  | 44:14 44:22 44:22 45:4 46:3 | Fired | 120:16 122:11 |


| Forth | [1] 91:1 | [1] 31:14 | 87:1687:20 87:25 88:988:15 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| [3] $5: 15$ 34:20 111:23 |  | Group | 88:18 90:21 97:13 112:22 113: |
| Fortunate |  | $\begin{array}{llll}{[10]} & 10: 8 & 10: 17 & 25 \\ 30: 16 & 43: 24 & 23: 16\end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4114: 8 \quad 114: 18 \\ & 124: 21 \end{aligned}$ |
| [1] 26:16 | 6 44:6 44:18 $45: 545: 13$ | 30:16 43:24 93:11 100:13 101: | 124:21 |
| Forward | Girlfriend | $1102: 1$ | Heaxing |
| [3] 21:17 76:22 94:14 | [1] 31:21 | Grove |  |
| Four | Gixlfriends | [1] 4:23 |  |
| [19] 18:9 35:7 35:10 44:19 | 131 6:22 6:23 55:19 | Growing | [2] 63:14 64:6 |
| 50:13 68:2 $67: 10$ 70:23 71:16 | Gixls | [1] 90:9 |  |
| 82:9 83:13 88: 16 88:16 92:10 | [4] 28:13 29:21 31:17 43:1 | Guarantee | (2) 97:10 128:6 |
| 93:6 95: 11 105:15 121:18 128: | Given | (1) 118:9 | Heavy |
| 17 | [15] 24:20 61:6 109:17 118: | Guess | (1) 104:8 |
| Four-step | 20 119:3 119:5 120:14 120:16 | [3] 21:2 40:9 52:8 | Hainous |
| (1) 82:9 | 120:18 121:12 121:24 122:4 | Guidance | [1] 12:10 |
| Fourth | 122:7 123:7 124:10 | [1] 38:6 | Help |
| (11) 23:11 | Glass | Guide | [13] 7:18 13:22 21:23 32:8 |
| Franklin | [3] 45:2 | (2) 13:3 63:6 | 34:23 37:12 98:17 99:6 99:7 |
| [1] 24:7 | Glen | Guides | 99:12 107:11 110:17 110:18 |
|  | (9] 20:12 21:15 29:10 29:19 <br> 34:22 35:9 37:19 51:10 63:25 | [1] 53:4 | Helped <br> [2] 11:22 45:10 |
| $\begin{aligned} & {[6] \quad 60: 1275: 15 \quad 79: 1789: 18} \\ & 109: 16: 119: 9 \end{aligned}$ | Glen's | Guiding | Helping |
| Free | [6] 20:24 33:5 33:8 33:10 36: | 12 | [2] 20:13 53:5 |
| [4] 9:13 $53: 24 \quad 59: 1083: 13$ | 8 45:8 |  | Helps |
| Freediom | rr | $19$ | (6) 28:24 28:24 29:10 29:11 |
| [1] 127:10 | [33] $1: 6$ 2:6 $49: 2151: 2$ <br> $1980: 280: 980: 21$ <br> $99: 8$ | Guilty | 37:3 122:21 |
| Friend | 15 101:6 102:7 106:12 107:25 | [2] 84:3 111:18 | Hensley |
| (5) $36: 8$ 44:3 46:12 96:22 97; | 108: 6 108:22 109:4 109:17 | Guise |  |
| 8 | $109: 20$ $109: 25$ <br> $112: 6$ $112: 711: 10$ <br> $16: 111: 18$  | (1) 127:24 | (1) $13: 15$ |
| Friend's | 112: 6 112:7 112:9 113:7 113: <br> 16 114:2 114:7 114:22 114:25 | Gun | (1) 13:15 <br> Herself |
| [3] 28:22 28:24 31:18 | $117: 4: 17: 6$ | [6] 92:2 92:3 92:5 92:7 92:9 | $\text { [1] } 77: 11$ |
| Frienda | Glenford's | $92: 12$ | Hesitant |
| $\begin{array}{llllllll}{[14]} & 8: 9 & 13: 24 & 18: 3 & 21: 3 & 21: \\ 3 & 30: 17 & 30: 25 & 37: 35 & 43: 18 & 46:\end{array}$ | (5] 99:1 102:31 111:8 111:25 | Gunning | [1] 21:1 |
| $1950: 6 \quad 62: 9 \quad 67: 24 \quad 93: 16$ | 115:16 | (1) 95:14 | Heterogenous |
| Friendship | Glenn | $\text { [12] } 9: 24 \quad 10: 2 \quad 12: 18$ | [2] 10:8 10:16 |
| [1] 127:25 | [1] 18:19 | 23:19 25:9 $37: 637: 7 \quad 45: 25$ | Hide |
| Frightening | Goal | 48:19 48:21 49:11 | [2] 92:3 92:19 |
| [1] 63:5 |  | Guys | High |
| Front |  | [5] 46:13 46:19 54:5 98:11 | [13] 16:18 21:19 26:35 26:16 |
| [2] 65:10 127:2 |  | 128:1 | 27:20 27:23 28:20 40:1 41:12 |
| Frontal | (2) 98:22 | H | Higher |
| 111 | Graces | Hair | [8] 5:21 6:10 13:13 14:2 25: |
|  | (1) $55: 18$ | (3] 90:7 90:7 90:9 | 3 25:14 38:17 38:23 |
| (11 28:20 | Grade | Half | Highlighted |
| Fueled [1] 110:12 | [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 |
| F̌ul1 | 24:21 25:16 26:3 26:5 26:6 | Hallway | [1] 42:16 |
| [4] 22:23 49:3 66:10 130:10 | 27:7 39:13 120:7 | (1] 127:1 | Hightlighted |
| Full-page | Graders | Hand | 111 38:20 |
| [1] 66:10 | [1] 24:28 | (3) 3:16 22:21 121:21 | Himself |
| FuIIy | Grades | Handle | [7] 25:6 46:25 47:3 89:13 90: |
| [1] 56:23 | (3) 21:6 28:6 80:25 | (1] 91:24 | 19 95:5 97:14 |
| Euture | Grandmother | Hang | Hired |
| [4] 64:3 75:7 104:7 109:16 | 161 18:13 18:16 19:4 35:16 | (2) 16:20 29:21 | (2) 6:1 9:20 |
| G | 6 | Hanging | History |
| Gad | [2] 95:22 95:24 | [1] 31:1 |  |
| [1] 28:23 | Grasp | Happiness | 43:23 47:7 48:6 48:8 67:5 85: |
| Gainfully | (1) 8:22 |  | 12 108:19 109:11 |
| [1] 50:22 | Grateful. | Happy | Hit |
| Game | [2] 99:22 99:22 | [1] 21:12 | (4) $29: 5$ 40:23 116:23 117:8 |
| (2) 62:7 127:25 | Great | Hard | Hits |
| Gang | $\begin{array}{lll}{[4]} & 89: 3 & 107: 18 \\ \text { 110:12 } & 123: 7\end{array}$ |  | (11) 28:14 |
| [3] 39:5 43:23 47:2 | Greater | $80: 1780: 2281: 2595: 1695:$ $1798: 13$ $106: 9113: 13126: 9$ | Hitting |
| Gangs | [3] 15:9 16:25 78:16 | Harms | (1) 41:13 |
| [3] 16:21 30:23 46:22 | Greg | (1) 123:23 | Hole |
| Gap | [14] 69:17 89:23 89:25 90:1 | Harsher | [1] 20:13 |
| [1] 20:13 | $90: 6$ $90: 9$ $90: 11$ $90: 17$ <br> $90: 24$ $91: 2$ $91: 10: 18$  | 111 99:4 | Hollering |
| Garcia | Grew | Hate | [1] 73:3 |
| (1) 129:22 | [3] 11:19 12:17 17:13 | (8) 110:12 110:12 110:13 110: | Holocaust <br> [1] 110:13 |
| Gees | Grief | 14 110:14 110:15 110:16 111:5 | [1] 110:13 Home |
| [1] 17:20 | [2] 93:13 115:19 | Hatred | (12] 11:19 13:21 28:23 29:10 |
| General | Grieve ${ }^{\text {Gra }}$ (15:19 | (2] 110:12 129:2 | $\begin{array}{llllll}112] & 11: 19 & 13: 21 & 28: 23 & 29: 10 \\ 30: 8 & 35: 13 & 44: 10 & 44: 25 & 55: 2\end{array}$ |
| 111 113:25 | [2] 115:17 125:3 | Head | 55:4 91:4 125:10 |
| Generally | Griaving | (1) 92:28 | Homeless |
| (2) 10:12 | [1] 110:9 | Healthy | [1] 87:1 |
| Gentlemen | Grievous | (4) 13:4 13:4 13:17 17:17 | Homeworlc |
|  | [1] 123:24 | Hear [4] $52: 23 \quad 79: 22 \quad 98: 17 \quad 123: 14$ | [5] 2B:25 29:12 36:10 45:2 45:11 |
| 109:23 118:18 129:15 129:25 George | Grim |  | $45: 11$ |
| George [1] 24:7 | [1] 109:16 | Heard <br> $[24]$ <br> $10: 4$ <br> $104: 21$ <br> $84: 25$ <br> $85: 1$ | Honor [27] 3:9 3:10 a, 6 fot |
| Gift | Grocery | 85:4 85:25 86:4 86:5 86:19 | 56:2 56:11 57:7 57:19 58:5 |


| 50:4 68:7 71:874:5 74:1976: |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | fmrrant | Individual | Interestingly <br> (2) 7:7 91:9 |
| 24 6 $110: 4$ $80: 9$ $80: 23$ $81: 4$ $81: 10$ $94:$ <br> 6 110:4 | Immigration | [16) 9:25 10:4 13:19 15:4 15: | Interfering |
| Honorable | (1) 38:1 | $\begin{array}{llllllllll}12 & 15: 13 & 39: 15 & 41: 25 & 43: 10 \\ 43: 16 & 100: 14 & 103: 18 & 104: 22\end{array}$ | [1] 54:6 |
| [2] 1:13 5:6 | Impact |  | Interject |
| Hooked | (5) 45:4 67:11 67:22 93:9 94: | Individually | (1) 59:3 |
| [11] 29:16 |  | [8] 100:17 101:21 101:22 102: | International |
| Hope | Impaired [3] 23:10 23 | 3 103:14 103:19 104:14 105:6 | (1] 49:6 |
| (3) 86:23 99:7 127:3 | 13) 23:10 23:23 | Individuals | Internship |
| Hopefully | importance | [3] 10:6 22:18 51:25 | [1] 4:22 |
| (2) 9:6 10:19 | (3) 45:1 61: | 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: <br> 25 62:25 82:6 83:1 83:19 102: | Inflames | Interrogation |
| Horrendous | 13 12:16 122:25 123:11 | [2] 110:10 110:11 | [1] 126:22 |
| (2) 52:13 52:16 | Tmportantly | Influence | Interview |
| Horrible | [1] 91:19 | (2) 67:7 85:22 | (3) 6:16 35:21 78:5 |
| [81 16:9 53:8 63:18 99:20 | Impose | Influenced | Interviewed |
| 108:23 109:8 109:9 126:35 | [11] 66:9 73:20 83:12 83:13 | [2] 12:10 17:6 | $\text { [5] } 8: 16 \quad 16: 6 \quad 26: 18 \text { 43:5 54: }$ $18$ |
| Horrific | 83:18 99:4 105:23 106:5 129; | Inform | Interviewing |
| (11) 108:17 | 1 129:3 129:6 | [1] 60:18 | interviewing |
| 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 55:9 | $\begin{aligned} & {[8] \quad 6: 208: 8 \quad 8: 198: 21 \quad 17: 23} \\ & 40: 3 \text { 40:3 } 47: 9 \end{aligned}$ |
| (11) 5:9 | [1] 32:22 | 112:4 |  |
| House | Impoverished | Informed | Intimidated <br> [1] 47:2 |
| $\left\lvert\, \begin{array}{llllll} {[8]} & 27: 14 & 27: 15 & 27: 20 & 28: 22 \\ 29: 16 & 31: 11 & 31: 18 & 127: 11 \end{array}\right.$ | [3] 31:25 33:25 34:19 | [1] 57:24 | Intimidation |
| 29:16 Housing | Impul.se | Infractions [2] 42:21 43:3 | [1] 126:22 |
| [1] 31:23 | Impulsiv | Initiation | Intoxicated |
| HOWARD | [1] 41:19 | [1] 15:17 | [1] 18:9 |
| [1] 1:21 | Impulsiveness | Injuries | Introduced |
| Human | [1] 41:3 | [1] 11:18 | (2) 19:19 69:12 |
|  | Inability | Ink | Inviting |
| 104:7 104:9 123:15 126:16 | [1] 102:23 | 111 67:22 | [1] 73:6 |
| Humos | Inappropriate | Inmate | Involved |
| [1] 89:6 | [1] 94:6 | (2) 108:8 108:8 | 18) 16:21 20:8 28:12 30:23 |
| Hundred | Inattentive | Innocence | $36: 16 \quad 36: 17 \quad 37: 12 \quad 46: 22$ |
|  | [1] 33:15 | [11 69:15 | Involvement <br> [5] 16:2 36:1 36:23 39:5 43: |
| $\begin{aligned} & 223: 18 \quad 48: 1949 \\ & 18 \\ & 1811: 3 \\ & 121: 19 \end{aligned}$ | Incarcerated | Inpatient | $23$ |
| 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 | Incuixy | [1] 126:15 |
| Hungxy | Incarceration | $12177: 277: 12$ | Involving |
| (1) $45: 12$ | [2] 50:24 61:24 | Instability | (1] 8:24 |
| Hurting | Include | [2] 14:14 38:5 | Iowa |
| (4) 124:19 124:20 124:21 127: | $\begin{array}{lllll}{[8]} & 71: 20 & 72: 16 & 73: 4 & 73: 14 \\ 74: 2 & 75: 3 & 105: 15 & 121: 25\end{array}$ | Instances | (1) 24:20 |
| 23 |  | [1] 42:20 | IQ |
| Husband | Included | Instant | [291 9:11 21:18 21:22 22:1 |
| [3] 20:23 33:23 34:17 | 121 71:25 72:9 | (1] 83:24 | 22:1 22:2 22:15 22:23 23:9 |
| Husband ' $s$ | Includes | Instead | 27: 34 3:24 36:1 42:7 42:6 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 |  |
| 11] 15:13 | [2] 67:13 71:17 | (1) 109:8 | IQs |
| Hypothesis | Income | Instruct | [1] 22:23 |
| [7] 51:9 51:12 51:16 51:21 | [2] 51:7 51:18 | (2) $57: 481: 13$ | Isolatio |
| 51:23 52:17 54:3 | Incomplete | Instructed | Isolation [1] 42:24 |
| Hypothetically | [1] 41:23 | [3] 66:19 69:10 75:1 | [1] 42:24 |
| [1] $51: 17$ | Inconceivable | Instruction | Issue |
|  | (1) 125:7 | [19] 56:24 64:18 64:24 66:10 | [2] 60:20 61 |
| 1 | Inconsistent | 68:2 68:13 70:18 82:8 82:16 | Issues |
| Idea | (2] 73:4 125:8 | 83:15 63:18 83:20 83:21 84:7 | [3) B:24 4.1. |
| (3) 14:8 17:8 65:23 | Increase | 84:12 84:13 84:20 85:1 85:2 | Items |
| Ideal | (3) 16:16 38:23 55:21 | Instructions | Itself |
| (1) 108:7 | Increased (2) $38: 2148: 3$ | 74:4 81:16 $82: 283: 15$ 84:11 | [2] 89:19 104:4 |
| Identified | (2) $38: 21$ 48:3 | 94:7 102:6 103:1 122:11 | 12] 8.19 104.4 |
| (2) 15:4 77:4 | Increases | Instructs | $J$ |
| Identify | Indeed | [1] 112:10 | Jail |
| (1) 110:9 | [1] 58:18 | Instrumental. |  |
| Identifying | [1] 58:18 | [1] $39: 16$ | 14] 11:23 42:15 87:7 91:16 Jamaica |
| [1] 15:2 | (1) 69:? | Insurance | [1] 20:11 |
| Idiot | Indicate | [1] 41:11 | Janice |
| [1] 114:4 | [2] 29:13 47:23 | Intact | [2] 1:25 130:16 |
| ${ }_{111}$ [2] $49: 2449: 25$ | Indícated | [2] 14:17 36:16 | January |
| (2) 49:24 49:25 Illegal | [1] 122:10 | Intelligence | [2) 29:25 32:9 |
| I1 legal [2] 87:11 87:12 | Indicates | (13) 22:12 23:1 50:1 67:11 | Jason |
| [2] 87:11 87:12 | (3) $25: 4$ 39:4 $39: 23$ | 98:17 91:7 91:18 91:22 93:7 | [13] 73:18 73:21 73:24 81:23 |
| Illinois | Indi cating Ind | 94:24 95:3 102:15 113:20 | $95: 1495: 1896: 597: 1110: 7$ |
| [1] 4:20 | Indicating | Intend | 115:15 121:1 122:17 127:9 |
| Immaturity | [1] 77:17 | [1] 126:10 | Jesus |
| [2] 10:10 42:7 | incicia | Interesting | [1] 128:19 r- |
| Immediately | [1] 54:20 | [5] 19:24 20:20 25:3 36:6 55: | Jewelry fulz |
| (1] 70:17 | Indisputable | 5 | (1) 54:24 |


| Jim | [1] $20: 2$ | [14] 5:10 26:20 30413 31 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| [1] 115:8 |  | 42:19 74:14 91:1 3 110: | $\text { [1] } 4: 14$ |
| Job | 161-96:18 116:20 116:22 116 : | 25 118:1 124:21 A. 5 126:20 | Lie |
| [16] 29:9 29:23 31:13 32:3 | 24 117:1 117:7 | 127:3 | [1] 63:14 |
| 34:19 50:17 87:16 87:20 88: | Kick | Late 13 31:9 37:6 41:8 | Life |
|  | (2) 16:5 111:3 | [3] 31:9 37:6 41:8 |  |
| 23 119:1 123:16 123:17 | Kicked | Latter | $15: 24 \quad 17: 8 \quad 17: 9 \quad 20: 928: 2 \quad 28:$ |
| Jobs | [2] 31:2 31:6 | (2) 8:14 17:2 | $932: 12 \quad 38: 21 \quad 39: 3 \quad 44: 16 \quad 45:$ |
| [31 33:23 33:24 87:19 | Kid | Launching | 14 47:21 48:5 51:15 51:18 53: |
| John | [9] 25:9 25:16 34:7 40:5 44: | [1] 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 81:1 86:22 $96: 23$ 87:8 99: |
| Joints | Kid's | (11) 18:1 | 18 99:21 104:3 104:4 104:7 |
| 111 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 86:8 | 105:3 105:4 $105: 16105: 16$ $105: 22 \quad 106: 24 \quad 109: 16 \quad 109: 18$ |
| [1] $89: 5$ | $[11]$ 18:15 27:2 27:14 $29: 15$ | 81:14 98:20 105:25 106:20 | $\begin{array}{llll}105: 22 & 105: 24 & 109: 16 & 109: 18 \\ 109: 20 & 1: 1: 8 & 111: 25 & 12: 25\end{array}$ |
| Jones | 30:10 34:3 40:20 40:23 45:7 | 107:8 111:22 112:10 112:23 | 114:10 114:24 $115: 1 \quad 115: 2$ |
| [18] 71:2 71:4 71:7 81:22 81: | 91:13 91:16 | 114:19 117:14 117:161117:20 | 115:7 115:7 115:10 115:11 |
| 22 92:15 95:4 95:9 95:9 95: | Kill | 117:21 120:18 129:22 129:24 | 116:5 116:5 116:6 116:6 116: |
| 24 97:1 110:8 110:8 120:24 | [7] 92:1 93:23 97:18 104:1 | Lawyer | 11 116:15 117:6 117:24 118:3 |
| 120:25 122:16 122:16 126:25 | 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 |
| [122] 48:12 54:17 57:9 57:15 | (2) 128:14 128:23 | [2] 98:14 126:7 | 129:8 129:9 12 |
| 59:6 59:18 $60: 18$ 61:6 61:15 | Killed | Lazon | Lifestyle |
| 64:15 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 |
| Judging | 128:17 ${ }^{17}$ (120.21 | Learning | Iighter |
| [11] 12:8 | Killing | (11) 19.13 | [1] 125:6 |
| Judgment | (7) 97:9 101:7 107:2 109:24 | Learns | Lightiy |
| (4] 40:23 41:23 69:20 111:4 | 122:16 122:16 122:17 | [1] 41:22 | (1) 104:11 |
| July | Kim | Least | Likely |
| [2] 8:2 8:4 | [1] 43:14 | 171) 82:9 92:8 100:24 118:24 | [2] 52:12 61:21 |
| Junior | Kind | 123:5 123:11 123:13 118:24 | 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 14:8 15:7 16:4 17:7 17:19 | (7) 61:13 63:6 72:5 72:6 100: | Limited |
| [12] 76:24 77:11 77:19 77:22 | $\begin{array}{llll}17: 23 & 19: 3 & 19: 6 & 19: 12 \\ \text { 20:3 } & 19: 13\end{array}$ | 11 101:13 118:2 | [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 21:7 | Led | Limits |
| 79:4 103:5 120:5 | 21:9 21:18 $24: 13$ 24:13 25:3 | [1] 12:14 | [1] 35:20 |
| Jurors | 26: 26:14 26:21 26:22 26:22 | Left | Lincoln |
| [5] 61:18 69:6 111:23 129:19 | 24 27:4 27:9 28:6 28:16 28: | [3] 65:9 113:18 128:17 | [2] 24:8 24:9 |
| 130:5 | 25 31:20 31:24 31:25 32:15 |  | Linda |
| Juxy | 32:21 33:11 33:14 33:19 34:2 | ${ }_{\text {Leg }}^{\text {[1] } 28: 14}$ | (11) 86.24 |
| [59] 1:11 3:8 4:15 7:488:25 | 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 |
| 58:4 $58.8858: 1658: 17{ }^{58: 20}$ | 37:24 38:11 38:15 40:17 40: | (1) 110:24 | [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 | Legal | Lines |
| 62:8 63:2 63:3 63:8 65:24 66: | 43: 0 43:8 47:6 47:13 48:7 55: | [5] 36:24 58:11 68:17 98:7 | (1) 120:3 |
| 1 66:9 68:20 69:10 70:24 71: | ${ }_{4}^{4}$ 115:8 117:2 118:4 $118: 5$ | 115:25 | Lisp |
| 14, 71:18 $71: 21.71: 24,72: 10$ | 127:19 | Legalese | [1] 120:7 |
| 73:25 74:23 75:2 75:16 75:25 | Kinds | [1] 75:14 | List |
|  | (2) 33:23 89:14 | Legally | [4] 23:14 85:8 102:6 102:25 |
| $\left\lvert\, \begin{array}{llll}80: 11 & 80: 12 & 80: 12 & 80: 25 \\ 81: 16 & 94: 9 & 98: 2 & 98: 12 \\ 99: 4\end{array}\right.$ | Knowing | [2] 72:3 72:8 | Listed |
| 100:4 107:14 107:21 121:3 | [1] 50:24 | Legitimate | [4] 82:19 83:14 94:25 120:10 |
| Justice | Knowledge | [4] 87:17 87:18 87:20 88:14 | Listen |
| $(51101314: 25 \quad 15: 12 \quad 17: 6$ | (2] 77:3 77:21 | Leniency | [3] 56:20 70:16 70:17 |
| 111:19 | Known | [3] 59:25 60:16 75:6 | Listened |
| Justification | 111 6:23 | Lenient | (1) 10:3 |
| (11) 68:17 | Knows | [2] 114:21 116:4 | Listing |
| Justifications |  | Less | [1] 91:5 |
| (1) $84: 17$ |  | [18] 8:3 11:13 14:6 14:18 14: | Lists |
| Justify | Kokitha <br> [2] 87:3 96:3 |  | [2] 85:2 122:18 |
|  |  | 69:1 84:24 91:22 122:22 | Live |
| Juvenile (7) $39: 4$ $39: 5$ $39: 6$ $39: 8$ $39: 8$ | L |  | [8] 16:24 44:18 51:2 87:4 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { (7) } & 39: 4 & 39: 5 & 39: 6 & 39: 8 & 39: 8 \\ 40: 12 & 40: 14\end{array}$ | Lack | [1] 115:19 | 109:17 109:20 111:7 115:2 |
|  | (5] 28:5 38:5 38:22 109:5 | Letter |  |
| K | 109:6 | 116] 89:17 89:17 89:19 89:20 |  |
| Kane | Lacks |  | [4] 18:13 32:5 52:11 129:13 |
| [55] 1:17 2:5 3:9 48:13 48: | (1) 39:16 <br> Ladies | $90: 16$ 90:24 $91: 391: 591: 6$ $91: 9114: 5$ | Living |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}16 & 54: 13 & 56: 1 & 56: 2 & 56: 12 \\ 13 & 57: 7 & 57: 13 & 57: 15 & 57: 18 \\ 13\end{array}$ |  | Letting | [7] 26:8 51:24 54:25 55:1 55: |
|  | 109:23 118:17 129:15 129:25 | [2] 92:14 125:19 | 4 88:8 90:21 |
| 12 61:14 64:16 64:24 65:5 65: | Lady | Level | Lizzie |
| ${ }^{9}$ 67:20 68:10 68:14 70:2 71: | [2] 33:18 43:17 | (6) 23:8 23:10 23:11 53:1 53: | [1] 95:23 |
| 7 71:12 72:4 72:9 72:13 72: | Landlord | 787:9 | Lobes |
| 17 73:2 74:5 74:8 74:24 75:8 | (1] 31:7 | Levels | (1) 41:4 |
| 75:12 $76: 276: 13$ 76:16 $78: 19$ | Language | (1) 16:1 | Logical |
|  | [1] 25:15 | Levy | [1] 119:10 |
| 129:14 $11{ }^{\text {a }}$ | Largex | (3) 113:6 113:6 113:11 | Logically |
| Karen | [1] 15:7 | Lewis | [2] 73:3 125:8 |
| [2] 18:5 44:5 | Largest | (12) 89:18 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 |
| [7] 5:13 30:4 33:24 36:3 97: | Las | 91:10 91:11 92:25 | Long-term [id |
| 17 128:20 129:23 | [31 3:1 32:5 89:7 | Lewis's (2) $90: 2491: 2$ | [4] 23:23 23:25 [4:6 62:23 |
| Keoping | Last | (2) $90: 2491: 2$ | Look |
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| [2] 89:11 121:18 | $\begin{array}{cc}61: 23 & 65: 25 \\ 98 & 78: 10 \\ 83: 24 & 91: 4\end{array}$ | [1] 22:7 | Presumption |
| Parties | 97:19 97:20 101:6 101:8 104: | Porch | [1] 105:25 |
| [2] 3:5 79:10 | $\begin{array}{lll}13 & 104: 14 & 105: 1 \\ 12 & 108: 20 & 109: 7 \\ 1082\end{array}$ | [1] 30:22 | Pretend |
| Party | 12 108:20 109:7 110:10 124:24 Person's | Porti | (1) 100:4 |
| (1) 34:8 | Person [4] 6;21 13:8 78:9 | [1] 111:19 | Eretrial |
| Pass | Personal | Posed | [1] 5:21 |
| [1] 48:12 | [2] 63:7 116:10 | [1] 90:1 | Pretty |
| (3) 97:11 98:22 127;20 | Pexsonality | Position | 151 13:18 20:15 55:12 91:11 |
| Passions | [11 39:25 | 131 4:17 61:21 127:15 | 120:12 |
| (2) 110:11 110:11 | Personally | Positions | Prevented |
| past | (1) 65:6 | [1] 68:8 | (1) 109:24 |
| (1) 104:9 | Perspective | Positive | Ereviously |
| Pat | [1] 33:20 | [13] 11:21 14:1 14:15 14:16 <br> 17:24 20:16 $37: 5 \quad 38: 9 \quad 38: 11$ | [2] 6:8 74:10 |
| (1) 111:11 | Pertaining | 39:6 43:12 $47: 22$ 88:24 | Principal |
| Patient | [3] 40:12 46:4 46:6 | Possibilities | [3] 26:18 26:19 47:11 Prison |
| [1] 21:20 | Petit | (1) 34:25 | Prison <br> [25] 20:5 20:23 2012501 |
| Patricia | [1] 39:12 | Possibility | $\begin{array}{llll} {[25]} & 20: 5 & 20: 23 & 30 \\ 26: 5 & 27: 7 & 27: 8 & 35: 6 \end{array}$ |
| [1] 43:17 | Phase | (9] 66:2 73:11 73:14 73:23 |  |
| Patterns | [6] 11:7 58:12 74:4 81:14 84: | 99:19 105:3 105:4 105:18 121 | 99:21 105:3 105:16 108:2 109 |



| [1] 111:19 | [1] 22:13 | 101:18 | Sense |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rent | Re cled | Scans | [8] 15:7 41:9 50:25 51:25 69: |
| [1] 29:16 | [3].1:17 49:21 49:23 | [1] 40:16 | 20 71:10 111:1 111:1 |
| 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 19:21 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: 21 27:23 28:6 28:B 28:11 28: | [13] 11:13 66:11 68:25 83:12 |
| [11 97:9 | (3) 6:17 8:20 74:3 | 21 $29: 23$ <br> 21 $28: 2$ <br> $31: 12$ $43: 19$ <br> 4 $44: 20$ | $83: 18 \quad 84: 24 \quad 96: 1696: 1799: 4$ $104: 19 \quad 105: 2 \quad 105: 18: 125: 6$ |
| Repeat | Reviewed | 2 45:20 47:12 47:12 89:2 89: | 104:19 105:2 105:18 125:6 <br> Sentences |
| [1] 98:15 | [4] 8:13 8:17 42:18 104:15 |  | Sentences <br> [1] 74:2 |
| Repeated | Reviewing | Science | [1] 74:2 <br> Sentencing |
| (1) 65:23 Report | (1) 101:10 | [1] 25:15 | [S] 42:17 66:8 71:5 99:4 99: |
| Report [5] 6:18 49:3 49:20 50:22 51: | Revised | Score | $18$ |
| ```[6] 6:19 49:3 49:20 50:22 51: 20 56:20``` | [3] 39:19 65:12 107:9 | [2] 39:22 40:2 Scored | Separate |
| Reported | Ridden [2] 30:19 31:1 | Scored [1] $24: 10$ | [71 17:21 61:22 72:2 72:14 |
| (2) 1:25 46:3 | Ripped | Scores | 119:23 120:16 129:23 |
| REPORTER'S | [2] 51:17 52:1 | [4] 23:5 24:18 27:1 39:25 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Separated } \\ & \text { [7] 5:5 18:10 } 18: 11 \quad 19: 12 \quad 19: \end{aligned}$ |
| [1] 1:11 | Rise | Screamin' | $\begin{aligned} & 113 \\ & 22: 5 \\ & 35: 65: 2 \end{aligned}$ |
| Represented | [1] 87:9 | [1] 128:19 | Separation |
| [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: | [1] 29:19 | $635: 13$ ( ${ }^{6}$ |
| [1] 123:20 | $6 \quad 15: 2 \quad 15: 6 \quad 15: 8 \quad 38: 23$ | Seat | September |
| Request | Road | [2] 77:14 126:4 | [2] 5:5 日:5 |
| (1) 74:20 | [1] $28: 13$ | Seated | Sequence |
| Requice | Role | [4] 3:25 79:8 80:4 100:2 | (1) 27:17 |
| [1] 66:9 | [3] 8:4 37:8 53:5 | Second | Serious |
| Reguired | Room | (24) 7:12 12:3 14:23 16:15 | [6] 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 | 82:21 84:1 85:19 65:20 86:10 | [1] 5:5 |
| Requires | 100:12 100:15 100:20 100:20 | : 3 | Set |
| [1] 120:18 | 100:21 100:22 101:13 101:14 |  | [9] 57:17 65:16 65:20 71:3 |
| Researchers | $\begin{array}{llll}101: 15 & 101: 16 & 101: 20 & 103: 13 \\ 103: 15 & 104: 12 & 104: 18 & 105: 2\end{array}$ |  | 71:6 110:16 111:4 111:5 116: |
| [11 14:25 | 105:13 105:13 106:3 106:7 |  |  |
| Reserved | 106:15 106:16 106:16 107:6 |  | Sets |
| [1] 126:8 | $\begin{array}{lllllllllll}\text { 114:12 } & 114: 14 & 114: 15 & 119: 17\end{array}$ | Secrat | [1] 69:23 |
| Residences | 121:15 130:4 |  | Settle |
| (2) 86:6 92:20 | Rooms | (1] 98:11 | [1] 7:9 |
| Residential | (3) 100:2 117:17 118:21 | ctio | Settling |
| [1] 16:2 | Roosevelt | [1] 31:23 | (2) 7:10 41:14 |
| Resiliency | [1] 24:8 | Secure | Seven |
| [4] 10:23 13:6 14:6 38:22 | Roper | Security | [16] 5:10 9:19 19:20 31:4 53: |
| Resist | [1] $40: 11$ | Security [2] $38: 387$ | $\begin{array}{lllllll}20 & 64: 22 & 66: 6 & 67: 24 & 70: 23 & 82: \\ 8 & 82: 19 & 85: 2 & 85: 7 & 94: 16 & 95: 9\end{array}$ |
| (1) 27:4 | Rough | [2] $38:$ See | 8 $82: 19 \quad 85: 2$ 85:7 94:16 $95: 9$ $102: 6$ |
| Respeet | [1] 31:25 | [20] 15:22 24:8 27:1 32:7 32: | Seventh |
| [4] 68:12 70:24 71:5 81:13 | Roughly | 16 39:1 40:4 40:7 42:12 43:3 | [4] 21:8 23:8 85:19 06:10 |
| Respectful. | [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 | $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { [12] 5:21 } & 29: 24 & 30: 3 & 32: 23\end{array}$ |
| Respond | (3) 65:22 117:13 117:15 | Seem | 39:14 45:16 46:19 69:23 89: |
| (2) 13:23 114:4 | Ruled | [21 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 39:24 45:4 111:15 |
| 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 | 171 23:10 23:23 25:13 29:8 |
| [2] 89:2490: | 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 | [2] 105:21 127:16 | Self-defense | Shall |
| [5] 11:4 45:8 45:24 46:21 99: | S | [5] 97:11 107:23 108:3 108:5 | (3) 65:24 66:1 66:4 |
| 11 118 |  | 109:1 | Shalt |
| Responsible | Safeguaxds | Self-esteem | [1] 107:15 |
| [6] 11:5 12:24 29:22 35:2 93: | [1] 106:2 | [1] 46:5 | Shape |
| 19 124:24 | Saitta | Sell | [1] 13:15 |
| Rest | [1] 1:13 | [4] 20:19 32:23 39:11 95:13 | Shaped |
| [6] 56:10 76:11 81:11 115:1 | Sales | Selling | [2] 10:24 12:25 |
| 116:3 116:6 | [1] 51:1 | [12] 21:5 37:4 50:5 50:19 51: | Shaping |
| Rested | Sample | $1655: 787: 21$ 日7:22 87:29 88: | [1] 35:3 |
| (2] 76:12 79:19 | [1] 23:1 | 4 97:15 102:24 | Shave |
| Result | Saratoga | Sells | (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 20:14 46:18 65:7 | Sends | Short |
| Retaining | 77:22 93:15 109:14 | [1] 90:21 | [4] 23:16 $23: 17 \quad 27: 13$ 34:16 |
| [1] 24:14 | Scale | Senior | Short-t6ry 3.9 y |
| Retardation | [5] 22:1 22:15 22:23 49:7 | [3] 28:18 28:19 36:9 | $[2] 23: 16{ }^{2} 314.31$ |


| Shorty | [2] 127:11 | [3] 89:24 90:11 90.23 | [3] 20:10 27:7 37:3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (1] 90:5 |  | Spectrum | Stepfather |
| Shot | [1) 26 20 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) $92: 9$ | [2] 4:3 25:5 | 17 36:22 $37: 6$ 37:13 37:25 37: |
| [11 128:17 | Smal1 | Spelling | $2538: 12 \quad 44: 16 \quad 45: 18 \quad 45: 24$ $46: 14 \quad 55: 5 \quad 55: 18 \quad 86: 287: 23$ |
| Shoulder | [4] 19:13 46:24 47:3 55:13 | [2] 23:8 25:2 | $\begin{aligned} & 46: 14 \quad 55: 5 \quad 55: 18 \quad 86: 287: 23 \\ & 102: 21 \end{aligned}$ |
| [1] 45:8 | Smallz | Spend | Stepfather ${ }^{\text {s }}$ |
| Show | (1) 128: | [2] 85:17 106: | [4] 35:8 38:4 45:20 46:16 |
| [2] 99:8 99:15 | Smart | Spent | Stepped |
| Showed | (9) 90:25 91:20 92:1 92:2 92: | [2] 60:19 127: | (1) 37:11 |
| (1) 211:16 | 4 92:16 92:21 92:22 93:1 | Spring | Still |
| Showing | Smartes | [2] 50:11 88:2 | [14] 29:19 30:10 31:15 41:23 |
| (11) 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 | 10 |
| Shows | Smoking | $\begin{array}{llllllllllllll}\text { [5] } & 12: 17 & 13: 20 & 13: 21 & 35: 5\end{array}$ | Stimulated |
| (2) 47:6 114: | [2] 29:20 31:15 | 35:13 | (1) 41:2 |
| Shy | Soceer | Stacks | Stipulate |
| [2] 19:15 44:2 | [1] 36:17 | [1] 120:23 | [2] 3:779:11 |
| Siblings | Social | Stadium | stole |
| [61 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 | Socialization | [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 | [9] 9:8 74:17 76:18 80:4 93: | Stores |
| [1] 68:9 | (3) $39: 14 \quad 39: 15$ 40:8 | 15 114:23 116:25 124:18 130:4 | [1] 31:14 |
| Sign | Sociopathic | Standard | Stories |
| [3] 108:10 119:111 119:19 | [1] 39:24 | (1) 23:9 | [1] 87:6 |
| Signed | Sold | Standardized | Storm |
| (1) 70:10 | (4) 20:17 33:9 36:22 50:23 | [1] 21:25 | [1] 5:3 |
| Significant | Someone | Standing | Story |
| (9) 18:24 23:22 30:24 34:15 | [日] 9:11 9:24 55:1 77:22 78: | [21 3:16 55:22 | (1) 9:19 |
| 39:6 67:5 85:11 89:7 108:18 | 14 85:1 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 16:11 16:13 18:2 | Stanford | Straightforward |
| Similar | 20:19 25:19 29:14 45:15 46: | [1] 25:12 | [1] 52:17 |
| [1] 104:3 | 24 101:17 | Start | Strangers |
| Similarly | Somewhat | (11) 92:1 | [1] 95:20 |
| [1] 72:16 | [2] 35:24 114:25 | Started | Street |
| Simons | Somewhere | (3) 9:4 11:1 118:23 | (2) 18:14 128:13 |
| (1) 40:11 | [3] 30:19 53:21 88:20 | Starting | Stress |
| Simple | Son | [2] 25:17 25:24 | [6] 36:5 36:14 4B:1 48:1 51: |
| (11) 78:13 | ${ }^{171}$ 20:8 31:11 64:4 95:21 95: | Starts | $1453: 1$ |
| Simplex | 25 118:5 118:12 | 121 21:6 21:15 | Stressed |
| [1] 75:10 | Son's | State | [3] 26:11 34:13 123:8 |
| Simply | [1] 118:12 | [23] 1:3 1:17 3:5 4:2 50:21 | Stressors |
| (19) 67:21 $99: 6$ 99:12 $99: 15$ | Sonya | 61:2 $61: 18$ 64:13 74:6 76:14 | (3) 34:15 36:21 52:12 |
| 101:9 105:14 106:22 108:24 | [1] 44:3 | 79:9 79:19 81:6 81:17 84:20 85:12 85:14 100:23 101:4 101: | Strong |
| 112:8 | Sophomore | 11 119:16 128:25 129:3 | [2] 13:19 33:3 |
|  | 12] 27:11 28:3 | State's | Strongly |
| [9] 87:5 115:14 116:10 116: <br> 11 116:15 117:1 117:4 117:11 | Sorrow | [1] 89:10 | [1] 123:4 |
| $118: 10$ | [1] 75:24 | Statement | Struck |
| Sister | Sorry | [11] 58:1 58:25 59:8 59:20 | [1] 9:25 |
| (10) 16:7 $26: 8$ 28:24 29:11 | [7] 9:12 63:22 63:23 71:11 $80.14 \quad 120.18 \quad 111.12$ | 59:23 60:1 65:18 75:2 75:5 | Structure |
| 30:11 $31: 17 \quad 43: 7 \quad 43: 987: 2$ |  | 81:6 107:16 | [3] 14:16 32:11 38:14 |
| 95:21 | Sound | Statements | Structured |
| Sisters | [1] 124:11 | $\text { [5] } 6: 18 \quad 75: 6 \quad 75: 7 \quad 107: 14$ | [1] 115:3 |
| (4) 19:23 62:14 67:14 93:16 | Source (2] $34: 6$ 51:7 | $\begin{aligned} & 107: 19 \\ & \text { States } \end{aligned}$ | Structuring |
| Sit ${ }_{\text {(1) }} 12 \mathrm{~A}$ | (2] 34:6 51:7 Sources | States [6] 4:23 15:11 18:12 19:12 | [1] 35:22 |
|  | [4] 29:13 33:17 34:2 39:10 | 22:1 24:4 | Struggle |
| (3) 61:22 61:23 126:4 | South | Statistically | [4] 16:12 25:10 25:25 27:2 |
| Situation | [1] 42:13 | [1] 41:13 | Struggled |
| [3] 52:9 53:9 98:21 | Space | Stature | [1] 38:13 |
| Situational | (1) 120:9 | [1] 46:24 | Struggles [1] $38: 7$ |
| [1] 12:12 | Spare | Status | Struggling |
| Six | [2] 75:22 81:1 | 11] 87:11 Statutes | Struggling <br> [2] 21:9 27:10 |
| [18] 15:16 $15: 1818: 25 \quad 30: 5$ | Spared | [1] 107:9 | Student |
| $\left\lvert\, \begin{array}{lllll} 30: 14 & 31: 5 & 32: 10 & 35: 18 & 39: 7 \\ 66: 4 & 67: 22 & 70: 23 & 87: 24 & 88: 1 \end{array}\right.$ | [1] 60:17 | 11] 107:9 Stay | [3) 18:22 89:5 89:8 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll} 68: 4 & 67: 22 & 70: 23 & 87: 24 & 88: 1 \\ 88: 6 & 93: 11 & 94: 2 & 97: 15 & \end{array}$ | Speaks [2] 19:14 $89: 19$ | [5] 77:10 79:4 100:9 104:18 | Studies |
| Sixth | [2] 19:14 $89: 19$ Special | 105:2 2 | [1] 15:2 |
| 121 21:6 23:7 | $[14169: 24 \quad 70: 4 \quad 70: 11 \quad 70: 12$ | 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 | [13] 56:4 79:1 82:9 82:12 82: | (4) 23:13 34:5 98:12 104:13 |
| $\begin{array}{lcllllll}{[5]} & 22: 19 & 22: 20 \quad 24: 20 \quad 48: 5\end{array}$ | Specialized | $1282: 2182: 2482: 2594: 18$ | Stupid |
| 99:14 | [1] 5:11 | 94:19 118:21 118:21 121:16 | [1] 92:13 \% ${ }^{\text {a }}$ (0) |
| Skipper | Specific | Step-by-step | Subconscioticl ${ }^{\circ} \times 8$ |
| [1] 42:13 | [1] $54: 4$ | [1] 118:21 | [1] $53: 22$ ( |
| Slaughter | Specifically | Stepdad | Subject |


| [4] $59: 166: 2469: 1475: 19$ | [1] 25:22 | 62:16 65:23 66:12-67:8 70:6 | Tried |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Submarine | $\mathrm{T} \mathrm{N}^{\prime} \mathrm{N}$ | $70: 15$ 70:23 71: $\quad: 273: 17$ | [4] 30:4 75:13 87:18 87:18 |
| (11) 116:18 | 11 [ 19 | $\begin{array}{lllll}73: 21 & 73: 24 & 84: 4 & 13 & 85: 15 \\ 92: 10 & 92: 24 & 93: 22 & 93: 24 & 93:\end{array}$ | Trouble |
| Submit | Talks | 92:10 92:24 93:22 93:24 93: <br> 24 95:2 96:18 97:20 106:12 | [5] 25:24 26:25 27:19 47:4 |
| (7] 71:12 104:1 105:23 107:1 | [7] 12:22 19:2 19:8 20:1 64: | $\begin{array}{ll}110: 20 \quad 111: 16 & 120: 15 \\ 120: 16\end{array}$ | 47:14 |
| 109:24 113:10 113:15 | 19 84:13 120:7 | 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) 56:24 69:23 | [1] 25:23 | Three-bedroom | Trust |
| Subatance | Tampered | [1] 30:8 | (11 72:25 |
| [31 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 | Thrilla | 25 退 |
| Substituted | Tardy | [1] 128:23 | Try |
| [1] 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 | $24128: 1$ |
| (2) 13:23 35:25 | (6) 88:22 88:23 89:2 89:7 | 61:24 | Trying |
| Sudden | 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 34:22 34:23 41:11 55:6 |
| Suffer | [1] 25:21 | Thursday | 95:10 95:10 97:4 98:20 99:10 <br> 113:13 |
| [1] 125:3 | Teen | [1] 1:14 | Turn |
| Suffered | [1] 41:8 | TIMOTHY | [7] 28:9 83:19 92:12 112:21 |
| (11 46:5 | Tempere | [1] 1:22 | 116:22 117:1 117:7 |
| Suffering | [1] 117:6 | Today | Turned |
| [4] 93:18 106:24 107:2 109:23 | Tend | $\text { [8] } 5: 12 \quad 9: 2 \quad 9: 3 \quad 9: 17 \quad 10: 18$ | (2) 29:15 45:16 |
| Sufficient |  | 46:1 46:9 85:5 | Tutored |
| [1] 67:2 | Tendenci | rogether | [1] 43:19 |
| Suggest | Term | 191 13 $93: 11$ $100: 11$ 108 100:20 | Twice |
| (125) 93:7 99:21 103:20 104:6 | $\begin{array}{lll}171 & 23: 16 & 23: 17\end{array}$ | Toilet | (2) 7:17 127:14 |
| 106:10 108:20 120:22 120:23 | 41:6 60:9 92: | 11 | Twisted |
| $\left\lvert\, \begin{array}{lll} 123: 5 & 123: 10 & 124: 6 \\ 124 \cdot & 124: 10 \end{array}\right.$ | Terms | Tolerate | [1] 90:10 |
| Suggested | [15] 15:3 23:5 33:3 37:7 41: | [1] 124:17 | Two |
| $\left\{\begin{array}{l} \text { Suggested } \\ 12] \quad 114: 3125: 11 \end{array}\right.$ | 20 42:7 51:18 52:9 52:16 53: | Tomoriow | (36] 4:24 11:24 15:1 15:14 |
| Suggesting | $\begin{aligned} & 5 \\ & 18 \end{aligned} 5: 686: 15 \text { 87:15 88:10 98: }$ | (1) 125:10 | 16:24 19:23 22:7 22:23 33:24 37:15 38:19 39:21 42:19 43: |
| [5] 111:11 111:12 111:14 119: | Ter | Took | 13 50:15 65:22 67:6 70:23 71: |
| 4 124:17 | [1] $63: 5$ | (8) 18:18 52:11 68:8 93:25 97:6 97:16 128:1 128:22 | $\begin{array}{cccc:c} 1 & 73: 8 & 73: 12 & 73: 15 & 82: 12 \\ 10 & 90: 4 & 101: 19 & 101: 20: 107: 19 \end{array}$ |
| Suggestion | Terrorism | Top | 108:19 113:17 113:17 115:22 |
|  | [2] 110:13 110:14 | [2] 65:8 85:10 | 120:11 122:4 123:5 124:21. |
| Summary | Test | Tore | Two-page |
|  | [15] 6:11 日:11 8:12 21:22 23: | [1] 127: | [1] 71:1 |
| Summer | 14 23:14 23:15 24:6 24:20 25: | T | Twofold |
| [1] 31:20 | 12 42:11 49:5 49:8 99:12 113: |  | (1) 86:13 |
| Superior |  | [1) 96:6 | Type |
| (2) 22:6 22:6 | Testified |  | 111 66:17 |
| Supervised | (81 3:23 6:11 7:4 7:7 77:1 | [1] 47:10 | Types |
| [11 44:13. | 86:24 86:25 113:7 Testify | Tota <br> (1) 25 | [2] 66:12 86:7 |
| Supervision | Testify | Touches |  |
| 121 34:5 44:7 | [4] 3:21 8:24 57:23 62:3 | rouches | U |
| Support | (3) 7:12 9:22 93:17 | To | Ultimate |
| [6] 19:24 32:12 37:14 97:4 <br> 116:14 117:9 | 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 65:5 85:25 87:15 88:22 | [1] 46:21 | [2] 104:9 126:22 |
| Suppose | 95:23 | Towards | Unable |
| [1] 38:20 | Testi | [3] 29:22 51:22 127:14 | [1] 119:9 |
| Supr | [3] 8:10 8:11 6:19 | Towels | Unanimous |
| (2) 40:11 4 | Tests | [1] 127: | (3) 82:17 101:1 102:2 |
| Survive | [3] 6:17 23:21 113:20 | Town | Unanimously |
| (2) 55:6 55 | Theme | [1] 30:8 | [3] 81:25 119:18 122:1 |
|  | (2) 105:21 105:23 | Tragic | Unammed |
|  | Themselve | [1] 44:12 | [1] 95:5 |
|  | [1] 31:25 | Traits | Unashamadily |
| Swayed | Therefore | [1] 39:2 | (1) 114:23 |
| (11] 125:23 | [2] 73:14 98:17 | Transcript | Unattended |
| Swear | Thereupon | [2] 1:11 130:10 | [1] 45:7 |
| [3] 129:18 129:21 129:22 | [6] 57:2 61:18 79:6 81:16 | Transformed | Unattentive |
| Sweet | 129:20 129:24 | [1] 127:5 | [1] 95:7 |
| [1] 43:16 | Thievery | Traumatic | Uncle |
| Sworn | [1] 39:12 | [1] 11:18 | [7] 27:15 27:19 32:5 32:17 |
| (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: | (4) 20:15 43:15 77:25 78:14 | Unconscious |
| Sympathy | 13 97:9 102:9 | Treatment | (1) 28:15 |
| (1] 98:23 | Thimd |  | Uncler |
| Synthesized | [8] 71:21. $92: 24$ 82:25 94:18 | Tremendous | [10] 41:7 56:24 58:1 59:21 |
| [1] 15:1 | 94:19 100:6 107:5 120:7 | Tremendous | 60:5 67:7 75:18 85:21 108:23 |
| System | Thirty | [3) 17:16 45:7 46:20 | 108:25 |
| [4] 19:24 $32: 12 \quad 37: 15$ 106:2 | [1] 22:6 | Trends | Undergoing |
| T | Thou | [1] 5:14 | [1] $41: 23$ |
| 1 | (1) 107:15 | Trial. | Undergroun |
| Table | Three | (8) 1:11 11:8 57:21 61:25 65: 24 74:4 81:15 84:3 | [1] 128:21 |
| $\{5] 104: 20 \quad 105: 5 \quad 111: 3116:$ | $\begin{array}{lllllll}149] & 5: 4 & 17: 13 & 18: 15 & 23: 18 \\ 27: 16 & 27: 21 & 30: 8 & 30: 10 & 33: 24\end{array}$ | 24 74:4 81:15 64:3 <br> Trials | Underlyirfal 2729 |
| Taco | 44:19 46:13 $51: 10 \quad 52: 11 \quad 54: 4$ | [1] 6:11 | Understandable |


| 111 110:20 | Verbally | [1] 128:14 | 127:9 127:9 127:17 127:17 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Understood | I $8: 7$ | Weed | 127:18 127:18 127:19 128:3 |
| [2] 15:11 101:17 | Veráict | (2) 97:10 128: | 128:3 128:3 128: |
| Unemployed | [37] 69:18 69:24 70:4 70:6 | Week | 120.3 120.3 120. |
| (1) $31: 15$ | 70:10 70:11 70:12 70:14 70: | 11) 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 72:973:8 <br> 73:12 73:15 73:17 73:21 73: | [1] 32:1 | Write |
| Unfortunately | $24 \quad 103: 4 \quad 118: 19 \quad 119: 5 \quad 119: 11$ | Weeks | Write |
| (1] 10:25 | $119: 23 \text { 121:3 121:10 121:18 }$ | (4) 30:14 31:2 31:6 31:18 | [10] 64:8 89:20 90:14 90:15 |
| Union | 121:24 122:7 122:12 122:13 | Weigh | 90:17 90:25 114:5 120:4 120: |
| [2] 123:15 123:17 | 122:15 | [2] 103:16 104:5 | 9 128:11 |
| Unique | Verdicts | Weighing | Writes |
| [11 60:15 | [10] 69:24 119:3 120:11 120: 14 120:20 120:24 120:25 121: | [10] 78:16 101:16 101:18 101: | Writes <br> (1) 92:25 |
| United | 14 120:20 120:24 120:25 121: $1 \quad 122: 5 \quad 122: 11$ | ```19 101:20 103:13 103:15 104: 12 106:16 106:16``` | [1] 92:25 |
| [6] 4:22 15:11 18:11 19:10 22:1 24:4 | Verified | Weight | Writing |
| Universe | [1] 44:17 | [8] 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) 46:8 64:5 | Weightiest | (4) 25:6 89:22 91:6 123:19 |
| [1] 4:19 | Versus 4 [S] 3:5 40:11 42:13 64:13 79: |  |  |
| Unless <br> [2] 72:6 122:1 | ${ }_{9} 9$ 9 $3: 5$ 40:11 42:13 64:13 79: | Weighty [2] 104:8 107:3 | Wrote $\text { [1] } 89: 17$ |
| Unnecessary | Vice | Welcome |  |
| [1] 109:25 | [2] 26:19 47:11 | [2] 3:3 79:7 | X |
| Unremarkable | (1] 71:5 | Welcomed | XVIII |
| I1] 19:6 | Victim's | Well-mannered | [1] 1:6 |
| $\{1\} 12: 20$ | (2] 80:13 94:3 | [1] 44:24 | Y |
| Unsupervised | Victims | Well-pritten | $Y$ |
| (1) 45:14 | [1] 85:15 | [1] 91:6 | Ya'11 |
| Unsworn | Violence <br> (121 5:23 15:3 17:3 26:23 | Wes | [1] 128:19 |
| [8] 59:1 58:24 59:7 59:23 60: | 6 39:16 43:11 43:23 45:25 46: | [1] 91:4 | Year |
| 1 60:6 75:3 81:6 Unusual | 23 48:6 108:9 | Whiz [2] 21:21 $46: 2$ | $\begin{array}{llllll}15] & 4: 24 & 25: 11 & 27: 11 & 28: 3\end{array}$ |
| Unusual $\text { [1] } 60: 25$ | Violent | Whole | $28: 10 \quad 28: 1128: 18 \quad 28: 18 \quad 28:$ |
| Up | 20 44:10 47:15 108:12 109:11 | 121 3:21 37:13 | 19 28:21 35:19 36:10 |
| [44] 5:1 9:7 10:24 11:19 12: | Violently | Wholly | $115: 22 \quad 128: 4$ |
| 14 12:17 15:4 17:6 17:14 22: | [1] 48:8 | [1] 58:11 |  |
| 7 22:15 27:11 27:11 29:22 29: | Virtually | Wife | Years |
| 2 32:25 36:7 37:11 39:22 48: <br> 21 57:17 61:23 63:4 82:18 87: | (11 100:7 | (1) 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 | [6] 14:9 22:21 23:17 23:25 | [3] 20:10 44:1 44:18 | 18 19:21 19:25 21:19 21:25 |
| 116:25 119:2 119:1 119:10 | $24: 15 \quad 37: 18$ | Winston's | $22: 17 \quad 40: 6 \quad 40: 6 \quad 40: 21 \quad 41: 8$ |
| 120:22 122:25 123:18 124:6 | Vocabulary | (1) 44:12 | $41: 10 \quad 41: 14 \quad 41: 25 \quad 42: 19: 43:$ |
| 126:19 ${ }^{\text {Uphil1 }}$ | [1] 24:22 | Wired | $1343: 17 \quad 44: 15 \quad 46: 19 \quad 46: 25$ |
| [1] 16:12 | VOLUME <br> [1] 1:7 | Wish 417 | $51: 25 \quad 97: 21 \quad 105: 18 \quad 115: 22$ |
| Upset | Vote | [6] 58:19 74:7 77:2 78:22 76: | 115:23 115:23 115:23 115:23 |
| [1] 27:15 | [2] 119:18 122:3 | 24118:1 | 121:19 |
| Unged | Votad | Witness |  |
| [1] 75:16 | [1] 118:12 | [13] 3:12 3:20 4:1 4:4 6:18 | Years/four |
| Usage |  | $7: 19$ 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 | [2] 05 50: |
| [1] 127:24 | W | [4] 81:9 85:7 06:1 86:20 | [2] 85:5 88:23 |
| Utilities | Wait | Wives | Young |
| [1] $45: 15$ | [1] 91:14 | [1] 6:22 |  |
| V | Waking | Wonder [1] 107:7 | $33: 3 \text { 34:24 35:19 36:25 } 37: 12$ |
| 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 | Wax | 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 | 118.13126 .1126 .3 |
| [2] 12:0 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 24:7 | (2) 14:3 98:12 | 31:11 45:9 85:16 |
| Variety | Waste | Worlds | 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 | Yourselves |
|  | Watched | Worse | yourselves |
| [5] 3:1 32:6 32:17 50:16 88:7 | (1) 45:10 | [51 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 |  |
|  | Ways | [44] 28:9 109:3 209:3 109:4 | (3) 15:8 67:9 85:13 |
| [4] 27:18 27:23 28:11 89:9 | (11) 26:23 | $\begin{aligned} & 109: 4109: 10 \quad 109: 10 \quad 109: 13 \\ & 109: 13112: 7112: 7117: 3117 \end{aligned}$ | Yu |
| Vengeance | Weapon | $\begin{aligned} & 109: 13112: 7112: 7117: 3117: \\ & 3126: 8126: 9126: 11 \quad 126: 11 \end{aligned}$ | [1] 42:8 |
| (3) 110:24 111:2 111:5 | $[1] 84: 4$ |  |  |
|  | Weapons | 126:13 128:13 126:14 126:14 | 112440 |
|  | [1] 46:22 Wearing | $\begin{array}{lllll}126: 17 & 126: 16 & 126: 23 & 125: 24 \\ 126: 24 & 126: 24 & 127: 8 & 127: 9\end{array}$ |  |

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 DEEENDANT: 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 27 th, 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 were 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, were 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. From 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. Eirst 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
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 her 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 IQ, 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 $u p$ 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 $I Q s$, 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 $I Q$ 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 were 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 $I Q$ 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 Fs 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 rougny 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 IQ, 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. Eather'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 20 s. 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 30s. 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 IQ, 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 Budd, 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. Budd 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 life. No skills, low $I Q$, 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 $I Q$ 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 95th 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 IQ, 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 $I Q$ 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 else. 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 DEEENDANT: 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 DEEENDANT: 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 DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.
THE COURT: Do you feel badly 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
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.

Counsel, not, to not testifying in this case?
THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.
THE COURT: In other words, standing behind that right?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.
THE COURT: Mr. Kane, Ms. Pandukht,
anything you think I should add?
MR. KANE: No, your Honor.
THE COURT: Mr. Brooks, Mr. O'Brien, anything you think I should add?

MR. BROOKS: Not for this, your Honor.
THE COURT: Very well. Then the record should reflect that the Carter instruction has been given. The defendant understands that he cannot be compelled to testify and that if his attorneys specifically request, I will give that instruction.

I guess we can bring the jury in now.
MR. BROOKS: Just another housekeeping matter, judge. Once the state has rested and we have read the stipulation into the record as part of the defense case, I believe after consultation today with Ms. Pandukht and Mr. Kane, that we can probably resolve jury instructions in approximately 10 minutes.

THE COURT: The only instruction that I had that was in dispute at all was one that may have changed since I got that mid-morning. But that will be fine. So, what you're really suggesting is that we go ahead and close off the case and bring the jury back tomorrow for closings?

MR. BROOKS: If that's what the defense would suggest, yes.

MS. PANDUKHT: All of our exhibits have been admitted with the exception of one which we would like to withdraw or --

THE COURT: This would be proposed exhibit --

MS. PANDUKHT: Proposed Exhibit No. 5.
MR. KANE: It was going to be a marked up copy of that apartment diagram, but it wasn't - -

THE COURT: Understood.
MS. PANDUKHT: But my, I show everything else was admitted.

THE COURT: I always ask you, please check with the court clerk to be sure that everybody is on the same page.

MS. PANDUKHT: we can do that afterwards, judge --

THE COURT: Okay.
MS. PANDUKFT: -- if you would like.
THE COURT: With that, anything else?
MR. BROOKS: Not from the defense, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Pandukht, Mr. Kane?
MR. KANE: No, your Honor.
THE COURT: Let's bring the jury back. (Thereupon, the jury entered the courtroom.)

THE COURT: Counsel, will you approach while the jury is assembling?
(Conference at the bench.)
THE COURT: Welcome back. Let the record reflect that all parties are present with counsel.

Will you stipulate, please, to the presence of the jury?

MR. KANE: Yes, your Honor.
MR. BROOKS: Defense will, your Honor.
THE COURT: Very well. Mr. Kane, who's next?

MR. KANE: Judge, the State has no further witnesses to call but wishes to announce to the jury, with your permission, that the prosecution and defense have agreed to two stipulations.

THE COURT: Before you go on, Mr. Kane, let met interrupt briefly. A stipulation is an, and you'll likely hear a jury instruction on this, but a stipulation is an agreement, in this case between the State and the defendant's counsel, that certain facts, as we're about to hear, are agreed upon, no dispute, no witness testimony required. But you can consider the stipulation as if it were evidence given by a witness.

With that, Mr. Kane, you may continue.
MR. KANE: The two stipulations are, first, your Honor, with respect to records of the Clark County Detention Center. It is stipulated that the defendant and Gregory Lewis were housed in the same unit in the Clark County Detention Center, which is unit 9C, from September the 29 th of 2003 through November the 13 th of 2003 and also that the defendant, Glenford Anthony Budd, was moved to a single unit within the Clark County Detention Center, that being 9C-18, on May the 24 th of 2004.

The second stipulation has to do with records of the court, and the stipulation is that as of August of 2004 when the letters that were referred to here in court were delivered,

Mr. Budd's trial date was set as November the 15 th of 2004 .

THE COURT: Mr. Brooks, Mr. O'Brien, is that a correct statement of the stipulation that you entered into?

MR. BROOKS: That's correct, your Honor.
THE COURT: Very well. All that information, then, can be considered by each and every one of you as jurors.

And with that, save and except a recheck, if you will, of exhibits, Mr. Kane, Ms. Pandukht, do you, does the State rest?

MR. KANE: That is correct, your Honor.
THE COURT: Very well. Mr. Brooks?
MR. BROOKS: Judge, the defense would like to read a stipulation to the jury, also, which I believe has been filed.

THE COURT: Very well. And again, ladies and gentlemen, another stipulation. It means the parties have agreed that the information about to be provided to you is true and accurate. Both sides agree that no actual or live witness testimony is necessary. And you may consider this in the same way that you would any other evidence that has been admitted or the testimony of any
other witness.
MR. BROOKS: I'll file it in open court. December 12th, 2005, stipulation, the State and defense stipulate that Defense Exhibits B and C have been admitted into evidence. These exhibits are photographs taken at the Saratoga Palm Apartments, Las Vegas, Nevada. Exhibit C shows the view from the balcony of Celeste Palau's apartment, looking at apartment 2068 in building nine. Exhibit $B$ shows the light fixture over the stairs outside apartment 2068. The light fixture is between apartment 2068 and apartment 2067. The State and defense stipulate that Steven Yoshida, an investigator for the Clark County Public Defender Office, took these photographs. The distance between the bottom of the stairs outside Celeste Palau's apartment and the bottom of the stairs outside apartment 2068 in building nine is 218 feet. The stipulation is signed by myself and by Mr. Kane.

THE COURT: And, ladies and gentlemen, as I've indicated, you may consider that as you would any other evidence provided in this case by a witness and/or by evidence that is admitted and become a part of the Court's record.

On behalf of the defendant, Mr. Brooks, Mr. O'Brien, do you have other witnesses?

MR. BROOKS: Judge, the defense rests.
THE COURT: Thank you very much. The next thing that will happen in the course of our trial, ladies and gentlemen, is that I will instruct you on the law, and then our attorneys can make summations. It means that they will sum up or summarize for you what they believe the evidence shows or does not show.
It is nearly 5:00 o'clock. I'm,
sometimes in these instances the instructions are long. They are always written in the language that we refer to as legalese. And so it's very important that I can be fresh when I read them, that you can be fresh when you hear them, although you will have copies of these instructions with you when you begin your deliberations because of how important the statement of law is. We're going to be in recess for today. There are no more witnesses that we will hear. The next thing that will happen will be the reading of the jury instructions and the closing arguments by counsel. We will continue this trial, then, until 1:30 tomorrow.

I have to remind you, you're very close to the end of the trial phase in this case. It's extremely important that you carefully listen to the admonishment that I'm going to give you and that you remember how important it is not to discuss this case among yourselves or with anyone else. You cannot read, watch, listen to a report of or commentary on anything which might be associated with this matter. You cannot 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.

It is tempting at this point, when I tell you that the evidence is closed, to begin to form opinions about the case. And as subtle as it may be in your own mind when you're driving home tonight, when you're getting ready for your evening or for your bedtime, you cannot do that. You've only gotten through phase one. You got to hear the instructions, and you have to hear the closing arguments before you can form any opinion. Don't do any research of any type on any of these issues. And I look forward to seeing you tomorrow at $1: 30$. We will stand in the evening recess. (Recess taken.)

THE COURT: State versus Budd? I had a copy here of a proposed packet of instructions. The only one that I know right now that is at issue reads as follows: It is, State, was yours this two-liner? I presume yours was --

MR. KANE: The original, yes.
THE COURT: And the original is proposed by the State as follows: In your deliberation you may not discuss nor consider the subject of punishment. Your duty at this time is confined in determination of guilt or innocence of the defendant.

The proposed instruction offered by the defense to replace the one proposed by the State reads, in your deliberation you may not discuss or consider the subject of punishment. Your duty at this time is confined to determination of whether or not the State has proven the guilt of the defendant beyond a reasonable doubt.

Now, before I hear further argument let me go on the record. I suspect that you both have already heard this. I consistently make a record as the Court that there are a couple of stock instructions within the State's instructions that use the term determination of the guilt or
innocence of the defendant. I consistently note my concern about these instructions, because I think they are wrong.

MR. KANE: Judge, can I interrupt?
THE COURT: Sure.
MR. KANE: And I'll take the risk. I agree with you. I've never understood why that language is in there. And I guess it's because defense lawyers don't object to it. The instruction, the second one that you read is my product after discussing this with Mr. Brooks this morning, and will, at least from now on for me, be the stock instruction. And I'm going to suggest it to the other deputies in my office, because I don't think the guilt or innocence --

THE COURT: Excellent. Excellent. And if you would, there is at least one other instruction that has the same use, determination of guilt or innocence. And I'll try to find it.

MS. PANDUKHT: It's the one that, you are not to consider the guilt of any other person --

THE COURT: But the guilt or innocence of -- that should also be corrected. But believe it or not, I've had defense lawyers to whom I bring this to their attention, because it's, as I
said, I want to go on the record as saying how I believe it is incorrect and an incorrect statement of law. And I've had several defense attorneys who still want it to be given.

MR. BROOKS: Judge, just to make things really simple here, if we, if we go ahead and number the instructions, I have two objections at that point. And I have the case law here that says, according to the Nevada Supreme Court, that I am wrong. So, I'm going to make my objections to those two instructions. I would like to make my record as far as why I think that the Supreme Court is wrong. And this is going to be really simple for us.

THE COURT: All right. Let's start numbering. Number one, and you both, you all know how I do this: Number one, it is my duty as judge to instruct you... Number two, if in these instructions... Number three, an information is but a formal method of accusing... Number four, in this case the defendant... Number five, murder is unlawful -- of human being... Number six, malice aforethought -- intentional... Number seven -- of first degree, which is murder which is perpetrated by means... Number eight, law does
not measure in units of time the length of period during which the thought must be upon... Number nine, all murder which is not murder in the first degree is murder in the second degree. Number 10, you are instructed that if you find beyond a reasonable doubt the State has... Number 11, manslaughter is the unlawful -- of human being without malice... Number 12 -- heat of passion -it is manslaughter. Number 13, if you find beyond a reasonable doubt that the State has established and defendant has committed murder... Number 14, deadly weapon means any instrument which...

Number 15, if you find beyond a reasonable doubt the defendant committed murder... Number 16, to constitute the crime charged... Number 17, presume innocent if the contrary is proven... Number 18, the evidence which you are to consider in this case consist of the testimony of witnesses... Number 19, credibility or believability of a witness should be determined... Number 20, a witness who has special knowledge, skill, experience... Number 21, you are -- strike that. Although you are to consider only the evidence in this case in reaching a verdict... Number 22, in your deliberation you may not
discuss nor consider the subject of punishment. Oops! That has been, pull that one out. We are now going to substitute the agreed-upon instruction that reads as follows: In your deliberation you may not discuss nor consider the subject of punishment. Your duty at this time is confined to the determination of whether or not the State has approved the guilt of the defendant beyond a reasonable doubt. Number 23 , when you retire to consider your verdict... Number 24 , if during your deliberations... Number 25, now you will listen to counsel... And then there is a verdict form.

Mr. Brooks, did you want to make a record of objections?

MR. BROOKS: Yes, judge. On instruction 10, everything after line eight I object to, and it is unnecessary and adds nothing. My legal argument for this will be the same precise argument that $I$ will make with regard to instruction 13, also, to which I also object. On instruction 13 everything after line seven is unnecessary and is wrong and is not in accordance with the actual statutory law in the state of Nevada.

Now, having said that, the Nevada Supreme Court has ruled in Green v. State, 80 pacific 3rd 93 119, Nevada Advanced Report 59, parentheses December 11th, 2003, closed parentheses, that these two instructions, 10 and 13, are, in fact, correct statements of the law. But I just want to make my record on this. First of all, judge, going back a number of years, we never saw this issue arise at all, because the essence of this is saying, not only are we going to tell the jury what the lessers are, we're also going to tell them how they're going to go about looking at the lessers and in what order they're going to look at the lessers and how exactly we're going to go from one lesser to other. There is nothing in Nevada statutory law that authorizes any procedure for that. In fact, the law, the law is that the jury can simply look at all of that and figure it out among themselves. And about four or five years ago the State started posing a instruction that said you have to look at one first and then look at the other. And then there was a, a court in a county in Nevada which granted this, this instruction and, in fact, went so far as to say you can't even consider second degree murder
unless you unanimously find that the defendant is not guilty of first degree murder. And so the Nevada Supreme Court came up with this new language.

THE COURT: Having rejected the one that was used in the other county?

MR. BROOKS: Correct. And my personal belief is that is basically what we now have, is we have two instructions here and some law that the Nevada Supreme Court has said, this is how we're going to do it. But I don't think it accords with any statutory authority. So, that's my objection.

THE COURT: Mr. Kane, do you wish to be heard?

MR. KANE: Of course, Nevada Supreme Court law, as it exists, is always controlling. But the Green case made it real clear. They didn't just say this is a good instruction. They said this is how you instruct on lesser included defenses, and this is the way you better do it. So, it's not a discretion area.

THE COURT: At least at this point it is my understanding, based upon that case, that as judges in the trial court, we are precluded from,
at least by, I guess we do it occasionally. But in light of the Supreme Court decision in Green, this is supposed to be the instruction that is given.

Your argument, Mr. Brooks, is noted for the record. This really actually might be more simply stated as the lesser included objection that $I$ think is being frequently made, and that is how I would consider it. However, based upon the Supreme Court's directive, I'm going to give both 10 and 13.

With that in mind, are there any other objections to the numbered instructions?

MR. BROOKS: Not from the defense, your Honor.

MR. KANE: Not from the State, your Honor.

THE COURT: Have you both reviewed the verdict form which is proposed in this case?

MR. BROOKS: Defense has, and there is no objection.

THE COURT: Very well. These are the instructions that will be given. As you know, it is my practice and it has been recommended by the jury commission and various other authorities that
copies of these instructions be given to the jury upon their, when they retire to deliberate. It is my habit to do that.

Is there any objection to that?
MR. KANE: No, your Honor.
MR. BROOKS: Not from the defense.
THE COURT: Very well. We'll be in
recess until tomorrow at $1: 30$.
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| Item <br> [3] 72:8 72:11 80:11 <br> Items <br> [2] 76:2 76:23 <br> Itself <br> (3] 41:1 67:11 102:8 <br> Iverson <br> (1) 81:18 |  |  | ```Light [20] 4:18 S:9 5:19 5:24 6:13 6:23 6:25 124:5 124:15 124: 18 124:20 124:21 124:25 124: 25 125:1 144:16 144:17 154; 10 154:11 164;2 Lukely [1] 152:3 Line``` |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| J | $\text { [2] } 85: 1988: 21$ | (1) 82:10 | (2) 161:17 161:22 |
| 01480 V <br> [1] 93:17 | Kid's | Learn 18] 18:12 59:8 61:1 79:19 79: | Linned |
| Jacket | Kidding | $23 \text { 80:14 81: }$ <br> Learned | Iiner <br> (1) 157:5 |
| [1] 113:15 | [1] 64:20 | (9] 59:9 62:3 62:8 81:19 81: | Lines |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { Jaill } \\ \text { [22) } 22: 18 & 23: 4 & 26: 9 & 34 ; 18\end{array}$ | Kids <br> [5] 13:3 15:1 15:3 46:1 46:9 | 25 81:25 82:12 82:21 98:25 Iearning | t7] 38:11 $38: 15$ 38:18 $38: 23$ $38: 24$ 41:11 $75: 5$ |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}35: 15 & 37: 4 & 37: 9 & 37: 11 & 37: 11 \\ 37: 14 & 38: 8 & 41: 14 & 51: 10 & 85: 18\end{array}$ | Killa | 上earning <br> (1) 92:24 | 38:24 41:11 <br> Lineups |
| 85:21 88:2 88:24 103:9 103: | 33:9 | Least | [1] 88:24 |
| 13 107:24 108:5 109:16 | Killed <br> [7] 13:3 13:6 33:16 33:16 89: | [8] 6:7 32:1 64:2 140:24 158: 12 158:17 163:23 164:1 | Listed |
| James | [7] $13: 313: 6 \quad 33: 16$ 33:16 89: <br> 18 89:18 98:17 | 12 158:17 163:23 164:1 | [1] 69:3 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll} 151 & 2: 7 & 16: 19 & 52: 23 & 53: 4 \\ 13 \end{array}$ | Killex | Leave [3] 6:22 80:5 127:14 | Listen [6] 65:3 117:22 141:5 156:3 |
| Janice | [1] | Leaving | 156:7 161:12 |
| [2] 1:25 1 | Ki | [2] 57:17 117:17 | Listening |
| Jason | [1 | Led | [1] 118:21 |
| (14] 75:19 75:20 76:5 76:22 | Ki | [1] 120:20 | Lit |
| 89:12 90:14 90:17 116:6 118: | 15 26:22 28:4 41:16 44:17 46: | Leeway | [1] 125:3 |
| 19 20 128:21 124 | 21 50:16 68:17 71:21 73:16 | [1] 109:23 | Live |
| Jesus | $76: 7 \quad 85: 15 \quad 94: 11 \quad 124: 22 \quad 124:$ $23145: 4$ | Left [10] $33: 16$ 62:2 71:5 71:6 76: | $\begin{array}{lllll} {[8]} & 11: 8 & 11: 9 & 11: 11 & 46: 22 \\ 12 & 56: \\ 116: 11 & 138: 16 & 153: 22 \end{array}$ |
| [1] 33:18 | Kisk | $1989: 25$ 110:15 121:1 125:18 | Lived |
| Job | [4] 130:17 130:19 138:24 138: | 126:25 | [6] 15:1 82:2 112:21 121:18 |
| [1] 80:4 | 25 ( 250.17130 .19138 .24 | Lag | 126:19 126:20 |
| Joine | Kitchen | [1] 77:4 | Lives |
| [1] 125:20 | [2] 71:87 | Legal | [2] 137:22 139: |
| Jo | Knocked | [1] 161:18 | Living |
| [1] 126:1 | [1] | Legalese | [12] 71:7 72:3 72:4 72:16 73: |
| Jones | Knowing | [1] 155:14 | $14 \quad 74: 22 \quad 112: 4 \quad 112: 5 \quad 112: 11$ |
| [17] 62:7 70:16 70:22 72:21 | (2) 105:2 1 | Length |  |
| $73: 573: 1774: 2378: 1979: 9$ | Knowledge | (2) 10:16 160:1 | [6] 68:20 81:3 91:23 82:6 83: |
| 79:15 79:17 79:18 89:11 89: 11 90:12 95:23 96:2 | (31) 43:19 44:1.160:21 | Lesser | $183: 15$ |
| Journal | Know | [3] 162:15 163:20 | Located |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}{[4]} & 97: 22 & 97: 24 & 98: 5 & 88: 10\end{array}$ | [3] 10:23 51:9 98:3 | Lessers <br> (3] 162:11 162:13 | [4] 56:2 68:14 84:12 84:18 |
| Judge | Knows <br> [1] 98:10 | Letter | Location <br> (8) $56: 15$ 73:17 73:21 74:23 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll} {[32]} & 4: 5 & 7: 21 & 30: 12 & 31: 16 & 31: \\ 17 & 34: 9 & 49: 7 & 49: 9 & 113: 20 & 127: \end{array}$ | Krissy | [85] 18:12 18:16 18:24 19:12 | 75:14 82:3 83:18 83:20 |
| 20 127:25 140:9 140:15 140: | 161 2:11 110:25 111:5 111:22 |  | Log |
| $21 \quad 141: 15142: 9142: 16143: 8$ | 111:24 112:1 | 22:8 22:22 23:3 23:5 23:22 | [2] 56:15 79:11 |
| 143:19 144:2 145:10 145:13 | I, | 23:23 24:16 24:17 25:2 25:2 | Look |
| 149:20 150:25 151:21 153:15 |  | 27:2 27:15 28:8 28:12 28:15 | [14) 15:17 25:13 38:16 36:16 |
| 155:3 158:4 159:5 159:17 161: | Lacking | 28:19 28:22 $28: 24$ 31:3 36:19 | 52:5 70:5 86:7 $99: 25$ 148:23 |
| 16 162:7 | (11) 49:15 | $\begin{array}{llllll}36: 23 & 37: 20 & 37: 25 & 39: 20 & 39:\end{array}$ | 156:23 162:13 162:18 $162: 21$ |
| Judges | Ladies | 25 40:1 40:3 40:23 41:1 41: | 162:21 |
| [1] 163:25 |  | 21 44:22 45:23 46:25 47:3 47: | Looked |
| Judicial | $154: 21155: 6$ | 5 47:13 $47: 22$ 48:5 $48: 7$ 48: | [31 24:7 29:16 90:16 |
| [3] 142:18 143:4 143: | Landing | $\begin{array}{llll}20 & 48: 22 & 48: 23 & 48: 25 \\ 10 & 49: 13 & 49: 17 & 49: 21 \\ 50: 2 & 59: \\ & \end{array}$ | Looking |
| July | [3] 68:23 75:16 90:18 | 5 50:17 93:9 93:12 93:24 94: | [21] 4:16 61:13 67:3 71:4 71: |
| [2] 51:25 52:1 | Language | 5 94:16 94:20 94:22 95:1 95: | 6 71:17 72:18 73:12 74:20 77: |
| Juniox | [8] 7:23 44:7 44:12 44:18 | 2 101:23 105:21 105:23 106; | $1479: 1197: 997: 1298: 11$ |
| [3] 130:12 130:13 130:22 | 137:9 255:13 158:8 163:4 | 22 106:25 108:2 108:9 108:10 | 101:24 $120: 24$ 136:4 $136: 5$ |
| Jurors | Languages | 109:8 142:23 143:13 | 144:14 154:3 162: <br> Looks |
| [1] 153:9 | [1] 137:11 | l1] 94 | [2] 25:19 39:8 |
| Jury | Large | Letters | Lower |
| [45] 1:11 8:2 8:10 30:10 37: <br> 23 54.25 58:10 63.9 63:24-65: | [1] 126: | $[7] \quad 23: 17 \quad 39: 21 \quad 48: 18 \quad 101: 25$ | [1] 108:2 |
| $\left[\begin{array}{l} 23 \\ 14: 25 \\ 14 \\ 65: 1 \\ 56: 6: 10 \\ 67: 3: 9 \\ 61: 2: 24 \\ 72: 24 \end{array}\right.$ |  | $108: 1 \quad 142: 20 \quad 152: 24$ | Lowered |
| 79:24 81:9 87:21 128:13 140: | $20 \quad 53: 22 \quad 54: 15$ 70:1 80:17 | Level | [1] 22:4 |
| 23 141:13 142:14 142:15 143: | 138:1 138:5 139:2 144:13 154: | [2] 77:21 77:22 | Luck |
| 7 143:14 145:25 146:17 147:9 |  | Lewis | [1] $52: 15$ |
| 147:14 147:19 149:188149:24 | Last | [30] 2:3 8:18 8:19 8:23 9:8 | Lying |
| 150:6 151:8 151:9 151:11 151: | (5) 5:17 118:24 129:7 138:7 | 21:9 21:14 $23: 6$ 34:3 $90: 22$ | [1] 75:20 |
| 16 $151: 23$ <br> 22 $152: 3$ | 139:11 | 91:16 92:7 93:4 93:8 93:25 | Lyxics |
| 22 162:10 $162: 17164: 25165: 1$ Justice | Law | 94:23 99:15 100:20 104:14 | $\left[\begin{array}{lll} {[1]} & 27: 15 \end{array}\right.$ |
| Justice 11] 1:13 | [17] 65:8 87:15 141:9 147:21 | $\begin{array}{llll}104: 24 & 106: 1 & 106: 9 & 106: 14 \\ 106: 20 & 109: 9 & 110: 3 & 110: 5 \times 40\end{array}$ | - M |
|  | 155:7 155:19 156:12 159:3 | 136:20 142:2 152:14 |  |
| K | 159:8 $159: 25 \quad 161: 24 \quad 162: 6$ | Lewis's | Ma 'am |
| Kane | 163:17 | (5] 94:16 105:6 105:16 110:4 | [14] 111:1 146:7 146:12 146: 14 146:20 147:1 147:11 147: |
| [54] 1:17 2:12 4:6 4:7 5:3 | Lawyers | 110:17 | $\begin{array}{lllll}14 & 146: 20 & 147: 1 & 147: 11 & 147 \% \\ 17 & 148: 6 & 148: 9 & 148: 13 & 148: 18\end{array}$ |
| 29:23 31:16 32:2 64:6 100:5 | [2] 158:9 158:24 | Lieutenant's | $149: 2149: 5$ |
| 100:18 110:25 111:18 112:17 |  | (11) 97:15 | Mail |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}113: 8 & 113: 12 & 113: 19 & 115: 20 \\ 123: 9 & 127: 15 & 127: 16 & 140: 9\end{array}$ | $[1] 30: 2$ | Life | 121 22:16 51 \% \& O |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}123: 9 & 127: 15 & 127: 16 & 140: 9 \\ 142: 21 & 142: 12 & 142: 16 & 143: 3\end{array}$ | [1] 30:20 <br> Lazon | [3] 80:3 136:20 136:20 | [21 22:16 51:3 <br> Malice |


| ［2］159：23 160：8 | ［1］159：20 | Motion | ［1］135：9 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Man | Me dically | （1）32：12 | Nevada |
| ［8］55：5 75：19 81：12 82：4 日6： | （1）${ }^{\text {（1）}} 4$ | Move | （21）1：1 1：3 4：1 4：15 12：6 |
| 8 97：23 99：23 101：16 | Matro | ［7］20：18 27：10 $30: 8 \quad 49: 20$ | 21：6 21：8 56：3 56：8 144：13 |
| Managing | （1） $21: 11$ | 63：7 63：8 79：4 | 146：23 154：7 159：9 161：25 |
| ［1］92：16 | Metro＇s | Moved | $162: 1 \quad 162: 3 \quad 162: 15162: 23$ |
| Manner | ［1］99：23 | ［2］142：5 152：19 | 163：3 163：10 163：16 |
| ［1］104：8 | Metropolitan | Movements |  |
| Manslaughter | ［4］53：21 53：23 70：1 80：17 | ［1］82：12 | [6] 48:21 106:6 106:12 125: $10158: 7162: 8$ |
| ［2］160：7 160：9 | Microphone | Movie | New |
| March | （1］129：17 | （1）59：8 | ［3］64：20 144：18 163：3 |
| ［2］52：13 52：13 | Mid | Moving | News |
| Maxijuana | ［1］150：3 | ［2］80：7 82：15 | ［2］33：10 97：19 |
| ［7］14：3 34：24 89：14 89：22 | Mid－morning | Mrk＇d | Next |
| 89：24 98：22 134：3 | ［1］150：3 | （1）3：2 | ［16］20：23 52：9 52：21 55：3 |
| Mazk | Middle | Multi | 55：7 55：8 85：1 90：15 92：25 |
| ［1］66：20 | ［2］59：8 78：14 | ［1］66：10 | 97：1 110：24 127：19 140：8 151： |
| Marked | Midnight | Malti－unit | 20 155：5 155：21 |
| ［11］19：5 $20: 23 \quad 22: 24 \quad 24: 11$ | ［5］54：23 55：20 95：13 95：18 | $\text { [1] } 66: 10$ | Nice |
| $\begin{aligned} & 29: 3 \quad 29: 17 \quad 39: 24 \quad 62: 15 \quad 65: 25 \\ & 140: 10150: 16 \end{aligned}$ | 95：20 | Munee | （2）101：22 102：3 |
| Marks | Might | ［3］24：20 24：20 24：22 | Niche |
|  | （14］7：12 57：23 61：23 65：4 | Murda | ［1］109：2 |
|  | 81：7 87：23 105：7 109：4 132：9 | ［1］33：6 | Nickname |
| Maxtin | $\begin{aligned} & 140: 18 \\ & 164: 6 \end{aligned} 141: 6 \quad 145: 15 \quad 156: 8$ | Murder | ［5］24：23 24：24 81：15 113：1 |
| Marty | Mild | ［10］35：15 159：21 159：24 160： |  |
| （7）80：21 80：22 100：1 100：8 | ［1］125：2 | $3160: 3160: 4 ~ 160: 11$ | ［1］ 10 |
| 100：10 100：12 100：13 | Mildly | 162：25 163：2 | Niggas |
| Master 72.19 73．4 | （3）124：25 125：3 125：5 |  |  |
| ［7］71：7 71：19 $72: 19$ 73：4 73： $5771880: 8$ | Millimeter | Music | Niggers |
| $577: 18 \text { 80:8 }$ <br> Material | ［2］76：12 77：8 | ［6］33：6 35：23 35：24 | （3）34：1 $44: 18$ 44：23 |
| ［11 97：3 | Milling | 118：21 119：13 | Night |
| Matter |  | Must | （7）55：12 56：14 96：3 122：14 |
| ［13］4：3 8：6 21：15 21：15 65： | （3）21： | （3）64：25 141：2 160：2 | 122：20 123：4 123：19 |
| $5 \mathrm{f} 2: 24$ 110：15 141：7 145：2 | Mindset | N | Nine |
| 145：11 145：22 149：20 156：9 Mean | ［1］61：16 | Name | $\begin{array}{llllll}1151 & 4: 17 & 5: 1 & 60: 25 & 66: 12 & 66: \\ 13 & 66: 16 & 67: 18 & 76: 12 & 77: 8 & 77:\end{array}$ |
| ［17］12：14 34：21 44：2 44：22 | Mine | ［24］8：16 9：9 34：11 35：6 40： | 23 144：15 144：25 154：10 154： |
| 45：22 $47: 25 \quad 48: 757: 1 \quad 59: 6$ | ［3］64：8 64：9 95：1 | 8 53：11 53：13 55：17 81：12 81： | $18160: 3$ |
| 60：5 64：14 96：25 99：10 107： | Minute | 13 81：15 81：18 85：19 95：10 | Nine－millimetex |
| 17 117：20 118：4 124：12 | ［1］95：18 | 111：12 111：20 115：25 116：9 | （2）76：12 77：${ }^{\text {a }}$ |
| Meaning | Minutes | 120：7 129：7 130：11 133：19 | Nobody |
| ［1］31：17 | ［13］56：16 65：9 85：21 117：2 |  | （1）43：17 |
| Means | 117：12 118：10 118：13 119：16 | N | None |
| ［9］31：15 46：20 54：25 58：11 | 127：3 132：20 140：20 141：12 | ［1］23：7 | （2）86：16 126：24 |
| 108：21 153：19 155：星 159：25 | 149：25 | N | Normal |
| 160：12 | Miranda | ［7］36：9 80：20 81：17 90：21 | ［1］42：7 |
| Meant | ［2］87：3 87：5 | 94：15 112：23 125：20 | North |
| （2］31：20 131：12 | Mom | N |  |
| Measure | ［3］112：13 112：15 114：20 | （2）10：1 109：2 | Note |
| ［1］160：1 | Moment | Nancy | （3）69：2 86：17 158：1 |
| Media | ［2］56：19 108：20 | ［1］1：13 | Notebook |
| （3）57：22 57：23 96：21 | Moms | Narc | ［3］38：5 38：20 41：11 |
| Medical | ［1］33：22 | （2）108：12 108：22 | Noted |
| （3）61：21 61：21 62：1 | Monday | Narcotics | ［4］66：16 128：3 130：5 164：5 |
| Medically | ［1］1：14 | ［2］54：11 109：24 | Notes |
| ［1］70：15 | Money | N | ［3］89：1 90：5 90：8 |
| Meet | （2］131：19 132：15 | ［1］137： | Nothing |
| ［2］10：18 10：21 | Monitor | Nature | ［10） $9: 1$ 53：7 81：14 86：18 |
| Meeting | ［1］64：7 | ［1］59：5 | 107：19 109：10 111：8 136：23 |
| ［1］ $85: 22$ | Monitor | Near | 161：18 162：15 |
| Member | ［1］64：14 | （1）11：16 | Notice |
| （2） $80: 1580: 20$ | Month | Nearly | （6］134：25 135：3 142；18 143： |
| Members | ［1］114：2 | （1］155：11 | 4 143：9 143：11 |
| ［5］79：20 80：9 81：22 82：6 | Months | Necessary | Noticed |
| 126：21 | ［7］10：25 21：22 45：6 45：日 | ［1］153：23 | ［1］69： |
| Memorial | 138：12 138：17 139：5 | Need | Notified |
| （8）55：14 85：15 112：2 113：22 | Moore | ［7］8：20 17：6 62：5 64：13 132： | ［1］55：23 |
| 139：13 139：15 139：16 139：18 | ［6］75：20 75：20 76：5 89：12 | $5140: 2 \quad 145: 25$ | November |
| Memory | 90：14 90：17 | Needed | ［8］12：22 15：20 16：15 142：1 |
| ［1］132：21 | Morning | ［3］61：25 131：23 132：1 | 142：22 143：13 152：17 153：1 |
| Men | （15）79：6 79：10 96：10 97：1 | Needs | Number |
| ［1］21：13 | 97：17 98：4 98：9 130：15 131：1 | （2）17：6 77：3 | ［43］6：14 7：13 63：12 67：21 |
| Mention | 131：17 131：22 132：25 134：5 | Neighbor | 67：22 67：24 $74: 17 \quad 36: 4 \quad 76: 10$ |
| ［3］49：1 97：25 133：19 | 150：3 158：12 | ［1］121：13 | 76：16 77：14 77：25 85：9 86：22 |
| Mentioned | Mortuary | Neighboring | $86: 23159: 7$ 159：16 159：17 |
| ［3］13：24 62：23 97：4 | ［1］68： | 121 7：961：3 | $159: 18$ $159: 19$ $159: 20$ $159: 21$ <br> $159: 22$ $159: 23$ $159: 25$ $160: 2$ |
| Mesnard | Most | Nephew | $159: 22 \quad 159: 23159: 25160: 2$ $160: 4$ $160: 6160: 8$ $160: 9$ $160:$ |
| ［1］96：1 | ［1］123： | ［13］130：9 130：21 131：3 132： | 11 160：13 160：14 160：15 260 ： |
| Met | Mostly | $\begin{array}{llllllll}4 & 132: 24 & 134: 4 & 134: 13 & 134: 18\end{array}$ | 17 160：19 160：21 160：22 160： |
| ［6］50：6 85：18 91：25 99：15 | ［1］60：23 | 135：15 135：22 135：25 136：6 | 25 161：9 161：10 161：11 $162: 8$ |
| 100：20 152：2 | Mother | 136：9 | Numbered U © 218 |
| Method | ［1］131：19 | Nephew＇s | ［1］164：13 $\mathrm{Fs}^{\text {c }}$ |


| Numbering |  | 118:5 | Perhaps |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| [2] 7:18 159:16 | $[6) 5$ 5:6 5:12 5:12 6:19 | Pandukht. | (2) 141:16 142:18 |
| Numbers | 7:8 $6: 21$ 25:14 31:10 32:20 | [81] 1:19 2:4 2:85:3 7:87: | Period |
| (2] 62:22 67:18 | $\begin{array}{lllll} 33: 4 & 46: 2 & 54: 10 & 57: 10 & 57: 25 \\ 58: 14 & 58: 15 & 59: 2 & 62: 9 & 62: 22 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 158: 119: 79: 15 \\ & 10: 17 \quad 19: 119: 4 \quad 20: 17 \\ & 10: 24 \\ & 20: 24 \end{aligned}$ | (4) 6:24 82:11 82:13 160:1 |
| O | 62:22 $63: 963: 963: 22 \quad 66: 24$ | 27:10 27:14 27:17 27:21. 29:6 | Permission |
| O'Brien | $\begin{array}{lllll}67: 25 & 70: 7 & 70: 14 & 77: 3 & 77: 4 \\ 78: 5 & 78: 12 & 78: 13 & 78: 2 \pm & 79: 6\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{llll}29: 9 & 30: 8 & 30: 20 & 30: 24 \\ 32: 12 & 32: 15 & 33: 1 & 34: 3 \\ 41: 22\end{array}$ | Permit |
| (11) 1:22 7:10 7:14 64:8 64: | 79:20 80:9 81:1 87:17 89:19 | 44:7 46:24 49:7 49:11 49:22 | [1] 147:13 |
| 11 128:22 128:24 142:25 149: | 95:18 97:4 99:21 103:14 105: | 52:17 $52: 18$ 52:20 52:22 53: | Perpetrated |
| 9 153:3 155:2 | 14 110:12 121:2 121:3 142:16 | 18 63:7 63:14 63:20 65:15 65: | (1) 159:25 |
| O'clock | $150: 2 \quad 150: 11153: 9156: 19$ | 21 65:23 67:1 82:25 83:9 83: | Person |
| [9] 79:6 85:25 114:17 123:19 | 158:20 159:16 159:17 161:2 | 16 101:15 104:5 105:9 105:19 | [15] 13:16 13:19 28:5 70:11 |
| $\begin{array}{llll}123: 24 \\ 155: 11 & 124: 7 & 131: 1 & 131: 16\end{array}$ | $162: 15 \quad 262: 21 \quad 163: 5$ | $\text { 107:8 } \quad 109: 10 \quad 109: 18 \quad 110: 21$ | 70:24 84:18 84:20 18:17 99:8 |
| 155:11 | Ones | 127:20 127:24 128:21 129:6 | 125:20 125:24 128:10 128:15 |
| Oa | [2] 62:13 | 129:13 139:22 140:4 149:6 | 132:7 158:21 |
| (2) 8:21 128:16 | Oops | 149:23 150:10 150:15 150:19 | Personal |
| Object | Oops | 150:24 151:2 151:6 153:11 | (1) 163:7 |
| [8] 30:12 49:7 82:18 109:18 | 12 | 158:20 | Personalized |
| 142:11 158:9 161:17 161:21 |  | Pane | (2) 104:19 104:21 |
| Objection | [8] 4:9 27:24 28:3 37:19 37: | [1] 78:6 | (2) 104:19 104:21 |
| [19] 20:19 20:21 27:12 27:18 | 20 51:2 143:10 154: | Paper | Personaliy |
| 32:13 49:12 49:23 63:10 83:6 | Opened |  | [2] 93:24 96:4 |
| 83:21 101:15 104:5 105:9 128: | [4] 24:8 27:23 28:3 37:17 | 38:5 38:21 39:1 41:6 41:7 41: | Personnel |
| 1. 143:16 163:13 164:7 164:21 | Operator*s | 10 41:11 41:13 41:17 42:17 | (2] 56:18 58:25 |
| 165:4 | [1] 64:23 | 60:3 74:7 74: 6 | Phase |
| Objections | Opinion | Paragraph | [3] 128:13 156:2 156:19 |
| [4] 159:7 159:10 161:15 164: | [5] 65:6 78:16 141:7 156:10 | (3) 5:7 5:18 144:18 | Phone |
| 13 | 156:21 | Paramedics | [61 91:1 130:16 130:20 130: |
| Objec | Opinio | [1] 74:24 | 20 131:2 131:22 |
| [1] 74:1 | [1] 156: | Parentheses | Photograph |
| Obligation | Opportuni | 161 31:11 31:12 32:日 32:8 | [13] 66:24 67:4 67:15 71:16 |
| [1] 109: | \{2\} 30:23 84:11 | 162:3 162:4 | 72:18 73:9 74:1 74:18 75:21 |
| Observation | Opposed | Paxix | 76:11 77:15 85:8 85:17 |
| [1] 76:12 | [1] 135:10 | [1] 115:1 | Photographer |
| Obstructing | Order | Parking | [1] 71:25 |
| [1] 73:17 | [2] 20:2 | [2] 57:24 60:19 | Photographs |
| Obtain | Oxganizations | Parole | [15] 4:14 4:23 62:12 62:23 |
| [1] 107:21 | [1] 60:7 | [24] 18:16 20:14 21:7 45:8 | 67:7 78:9 78:11 78:22 84:17 |
| Obvious | Original. | 46:17 $46: 2047: 147: 547: 12$ | 84:18 86:4 144:12 144:22 154: 6 154:15 |
| [1] 136:3 | [6] 31:18 32:22 32:1 51:13 | $52: 6 \quad 52: 8 \quad 52: 11 \quad 52: 1594: 15$ | Photos |
| Obviously | 157:6 157:7 | $105: 21 \quad 105: 24 \quad 106: 2 \quad 106: 13$ | Photos |
| [4] 46:14 66:1 75:21 98:8 | Originally | 105:19 |  |
| Occasion | [1] 100:14 | Part | Phrases <br> (1) 108:1 |
| (3) 10:18 16:17 | Otherwise | $[9]$ 33:4 36:23 39:14 69:5 86: | Ehysical |
| Occasionally | [1] 75:22 | $294: 11$ 128:7 149:21 154:25 | Ehysical |
| [2] 50:6 164 | Outfit | Particular | [1] 88:23 |
| Occasions | (1) 130:1 | [8] 54:2 55:6 55:11 56:21 60: | Ehysically |
| [2] 58;18 6 | Out | 21 62:2 67:9 97:4 | (1] 91:7 |
| Occupied | [25] 4:18 4:24 4:25 5:19 6: | Paxties | Pick |
| (1) 104:14 | $24 \quad 57: 22$ 50:19 68:4 69:20 | [5] 8:7 65:12 141:20 151:14 | (4] 131:24 132:2 132:5 134:12 |
| Occux | $\begin{array}{lll}118: 21 & 119: 11 & 121: 25 \\ 124: 5\end{array}$ | 153:20 | Picked |
| [4] $55: 9$ 62:2 102:16 103:19 | 124:16 124:17 124:18 125:12 | Partner | (3) 134:18 135:14 139: |
| Occurred | 126:10 140:16 144:16 144:23 | [8] 55:5 55:16 58:14 80:21 | Picnic |
| (2) 59:14 138: | 144:24 154:11 154:16 154:18 | 81:2 100:1 100:12 106:16 | [2] 114:10 115:25 |
| Occurs | Overall | Pass | Picture |
| [2] 55:3 95:13 | (4) 57:7 67:10 1.24:24 124:25 | [7] 34:4 52:15 95:4 107:4 | [3] 6:11 $64: 671: 22$ |
| October | Own | 123:9 127:14 139:21 | Piece |
| (3] 12:22 15:20 1 | $\begin{aligned} & {[6] 91: 2392: 13143: 5143: 6} \\ & 147: 2156: 16 \end{aligned}$ | Passed |  |
| Offer |  | [2] 74:8 74:11 | 60:3 72:13 103:14 |
| (1) 140:10 | P | Passing | place |
| Offered | P.m. |  | \{2] 79:9 106:4 |
| 111 157:13 | (2) 1:14 4:1 | Pass | Places |
| Office | Pacific | [1] 160:8 | [1] 32:7 |
| [14] 4:22 19:23 21:1] 21:12 | [1] $162: 2$ | Fast | Plaintiff |
| 60:8 68:8 90:25 106:10 128: | Pack | [1] 74:19 | (1) 1:4 |
| 22 132:21 144:21 147:14 154: | $\text { (1) } 74: 6$ | Patio | Plastic |
| $15158: 14$ | packet | 18] 75:17 76:1 76:17 76:20 | [4] $76: 7134: 24135: 1135: 7$ |
| Officer | Packet [1] 157;2 | 76:23 76:25 119:19 120:16 | Play |
| 14] 28:6 54:18 55:9 68:3 | Pad | Patrol. | [1] 128:7 |
| Officer-involved | Pad | [3] 54:20 59:13 68:2 | Played |
| [1] $55: 9$ | [1] 38 | Paying | [2] 14:13 116:3 |
| Officers | Page | [1] 115:4 |  |
| [10] 56:22 56:25 57:4 57:14 | (7) 25:2 27:3 27:14 90:6 90: | Pencil | player $1181: 17$ |
| 57:17 59:4 59:13 61:6 73:18 | 794:9 150:23 | (2) 37:25 39:16 | 1) 81:17 |
| 83:12 | Pages | People | Rlaying |
| Often | (5] 24:13 40:6 50:1 50:2 94:5 | [29] 13:10 14:24 $25: 21 \quad 25: 24$ | (4) 14:19 116:5 116:17 116:23 |
| [1] 81:23 | Palau's | 26:10 33:25 36:2 36:11 51:7 | Pleading |
| Old | [6] 4;16 4:24 144:14 144:23 | 57:16 59:7 59:8 68:4 69:5 70: | (1) 33:18 |
| 111 14:21 | 154:8 154:17 | $1781: 691: 22 \quad 98: 17$ 99:10 | pleasant |
| Once | Palm | 100:1 108:25 109:1 112:20 | [1] 101:22 |
| [14] 23:19 23:19 $26: 7$ 52:3 | [3] 4:14 144:12 154:6 | 121:18 121:21 121:24 126:11 | plus |
| 58:1 61:5 69:1 73:3 95:22 | Palms |  | [1] 54:16 (1) |
| 114:18 119:24 121:8 135:14 | (10) 11:4 11:4 11:5 12:11 33: | Perfora | Pod |
| 149:20 | 23 34:22 55:24 112:7 114:13 | [1] 78:4 | [4] 91:19 91:23 91:25 109:13 |


| Point <br> [22] 9:18 15:19 16:16 45:4 61:13 79:9 81:21 83:3 83:14 90:3 90:19 97:14 98:18 108: 17 113:5 122:11 126:10 129: 24 129:24 156:13 159:8 163:23 Pointed <br> [1] 113:12 <br> Police <br> (29) 16:11 $21: 11$ 53:21 53:23 <br> 54:14 56:15 56:18 56:20 56: <br> 22 57:4 57:14 57:16 58:25 59: <br> 3 68:6 70:2 79:11 80:17 95: <br> 17 98:1 98:6 122:12 122:15 <br> 122:24 123:3 126:1 126:5 127: <br> 9 136:1 <br> Pool <br> 11) 76:8 <br> Porch <br> (1) 124:12 <br> Pose <br> [1] 102:9 <br> Posing <br> (1] 162:20 <br> Position <br> [1] $97: 15$ <br> Positions <br> [2] 109:5 <br> Possession <br> [4] 44:3 101:2 102:12 107:18 <br> Possibility <br> [1] 104:23 <br> Possible <br> [2] 132:12 136:15 <br> possibly <br> (21 68:7 136:19 <br> Postmark <br> [2] 23:23 49:17 <br> postmarked <br> [2] 24:1 49:14 <br> Pound <br> [2] 14:5 89:24 <br> Powder <br> [1] 120:22 <br> Practice <br> [1] 164:24 <br> Precise <br> [2] 101:10 161:19 <br> Precisely <br> [3] $30: 14$ 30:16 41:7 <br> Precluded <br> [1] 163:25 <br> Prefer <br> (2) 32:16 136:14 <br> Premises <br> [2] 81:20 126:5 <br> Presence <br> [5] 8:10 65:12 65:14 140:16 151:16 <br> Present <br> [7] 8:6 8:9 60:16 84:24 59: 10 113:3 151:14 <br> Presently <br> (2) $6: 9$ 83:5 <br> Press <br> (2] 97:3 97:15 <br> Presume <br> (4) $135: 25$ 245:15 157:5 160 : 16 <br> presumption <br> [1] 147:22 <br> Pretty <br> [13] 16:5 29:21 30:2 30:2 30: <br> $\begin{array}{ll}13 & 30: 17 \\ 8 & 49: 20 \\ 87: 24 & 96: 23 \\ 107: 4 & 54: 18 \quad 75:\end{array}$ <br> Er <br> [4] 20:23 84:16 128:1 144:3 <br> Printed <br> (1] 97:20 <br> Prison <br> 1121 21:19 22:6 45:5 45:10 <br> 45:15 46:15 104:15 104:24 <br> 105:6 105:8 110:4 136:20 <br> Private | [1] 91:14 <br> Pr tion <br> Problem <br> [1] 143:25 <br> Problems <br> (1) 110:5 <br> Procedure <br> [2] 105:20 162:16 <br> Proceed <br> [3] 61:8 65:22 129:5 <br> Froceeding <br> (1) 128:16 <br> Proceedings <br> [1] 165:11 <br> Process <br> [2] 106:1 107:23 <br> Prociucing <br> [2] 48:4 48:17 <br> product <br> [4] 104:19 104:21 106:6 158: 11 <br> Professional <br> [1] $81: 17$ <br> Profile <br> (1) 86:3 <br> Progression <br> (1) 80:19 <br> Projector <br> [1] 64:16 <br> Promise <br> (11) 92:8 <br> Promises <br> (1) 18:3 <br> Properly <br> (1) 83:7 <br> Property <br> (2] 56:23 57:18 <br> Proposed <br> [21] $3: 3$ 3:4 $3: 5$ 3:6 3:7 19 ; <br> 6 22:24 24:12 25:5 25:12 27: <br> 11 29:3 62:15 140:11 150:13 <br> 150:15 157:2 157:7 157:13 <br> 157:14 164:19 <br> Prosecution <br> [2] 21:16 151:24 <br> Prosecutor <br> [5] 41:22 92:15 92:18 93:2 100:15 <br> Protect <br> [3] 57:5 110:3 110:8 <br> Protected <br> [4] 56:24 57:2 57:9 57:14 <br> Proven <br> [2] 157:18 160:16 <br> Provide <br> (2) 107:24 108:25 <br> Provided <br> [7] 4:6 87:6 日7:17 100:21 <br> 108:15 153:21 154:23 <br> Providing <br> [1] 109:5 <br> Proximity <br> [1] $86: 11$ <br> Public <br> [7] 1:21 1:23 4:22 97:9 98: <br> 16 144:21 154:14 <br> Publish <br> [1] 63:8 <br> Pull <br> (11) 161:2 <br> Pullback <br> [3] 67:5 67:25 68:12 <br> Punishment <br> (4) 157:10 157:16 161:1 161:6 <br> Purpose <br> [4] 21:8 $25: 25$ 30:9 93:7 <br> Purposes <br> [1] 140:10 <br> Put <br> $16727: 22$ 31:20 60:4 63:22 $80: 2293: 17$ | Questions <br> (8) 21:17 34:12 87:11 107:9 129:15 129:16 136:25 149:7 <br> Quoting <br> (1) 49:9 | $\begin{array}{llll}10] & 22: 15 & 22: 21 & 37: 14 \\ 70: 10 & 93: 16 \\ 7 & 109: 3 & 130: 16 & 131:\end{array}$ 2 136:16 <br> Received <br> (6) 37:4 59:12 83:11 93:8 93: 22 94:20 <br> Recess <br> [11] 8:4 64:18 65:1 65:10 <br> 140:22 141:1 141:2 155:20 <br> 156:24 156:25 165:8 <br> Recheck <br> [1] 153:10 <br> Recite <br> (1) $87: 20$ <br> Recognize <br> $\begin{array}{lllll}{[15]} & 19: 6 & 22: 25 & 23: 2 & 23: 11\end{array}$ <br> 23:14 24:13 25:5 25:8 25:13 <br> 25:16 25:18 26:23 42:2 62:18 <br> 33:16 <br> Recollection <br> [3] 85:14 89:4 145:5 <br> Recommended <br> [1] 164:24 <br> Record <br> [46] 7:21 8:5 8:17 9:21 17: <br> 17 21:1 21:3 32:17 32:18 32: <br> 22 32:24 33:2 33:13 53:12 63: <br> 13 65:11 85:4 92:4 94:6 111: <br> 13 113:8 113:17 128:3 129:6 <br> 128:20 128:21 129:8 130:2 <br> 130:3 137:13 142:6 144:4 145 <br> 3 145:11 145:19 149:12 149: <br> 21 151:13 154:25 157:21 157: <br> 22 159:1 159:12 161:14 162:7 <br> 164:6 <br> Recorded <br> [1] 9:13 <br> Recorder <br> (2) 64:13 64:16 <br> Records <br> (7) 140:12 141:20 141:23 143: <br> 143:6 152:12 152:23 <br> Recover <br> [1] 78:21 <br> Recovery <br> [1] 75:4 <br> Recr <br> (1) $2: 2$ <br> RECROSS-EXAMINATION <br> (I) 109:13 <br> Redirect <br> (5) 52:18 107:5 107:7 210:21 <br> 139:23 <br> Redr <br> [1] $2: 2$ <br> Refer <br> [7] 14:24 55:2 85:12 89:3 90: <br> $8101: 24$ 155:14 <br> Reference <br> [1] 81:16 <br> Referred <br> [4] 109:1 142:6 142:23 152:25 <br> Referring <br> [5] 29:7 44:8 44:11 44:14 55: 13 <br> Reflect <br> [13] 8:6 3:21 9:23 32:22 65: <br> $1285: 485: 6 \quad 113: 8$ 113:18 <br> 130:2 130:3 149:13 151:14 <br> Refresh <br> (21 85:14 89:4 <br> Reg <br> [2] 80:20 80:21 <br> Regard <br> (5] 61:4 63:3 69:8 109:8 161: 20 <br> Regarding <br> (4) 130:21 132:1 232:11 141: 20 <br> Regardiess <br> [1] 47:21 <br> Regular <br>  <br> Reiterdte <br> (1) 128:1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


| Rejected | $17155: 1262: 369: 11$ 79:2 86: 9 7 $110: 16$ | [1] 145:22 | 18] $18: 23 \quad 18: 2419: 1269: 22$ $105: 21 \quad 106: 12106: 18 \quad 106: 22$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (1) 163:5 <br> Relation | Res.unsible | $\begin{array}{lllllll}\text { Saw } & & \\ \text { [10] } & 10: 24 & 19: 14 & 35: 5 & 59: 9\end{array}$ | Sentence |
| [2] 74:1 91:17 | [2] 58:3 58:15 | 73:6 90:14 90:17 120:22 135: | (7) 5:17 6:23 6:25 21:20 22: |
| Relationship | Rest | 9 162:8 | 4 47:9 90:16 |
| (1] 114:1 | [2] 145:14 153:12 | Scene | Sentenced |
| Release | Rested | (331 56:24 57:5 57:6 57:8 57: | (2) 22:13 51:22 |
| (6) $33: 5$ 33:5 46:20 46:22 79: | [1] 149:20 | $1058: 4$ 58:16 58:17 60:14 61: | Sentences |
| 14 97:15 | Rests | $\begin{array}{ll} 6 & 01: 8 \\ 63: 1 & 67: 6 \\ 69: 2 \quad 69: 769: 11 & 69: \end{array}$ | [1] 136:16 |
| Released | [1] 155:3 | 12 74:15 75:6 79:8 78:11 79: | Sentencing |
| (5) 52:6 96:20 97:8 97:11 97: | Result | 1 79:3 79:14 81:10 85:18 98: | [1] 47:6 |
| 13 | [6] 48:11 48:14 130:20 133:3 | 21 95:19 100:9 | September |
| Remain | 133:7 148:3 | Scenes | [2] 141:25 152:16 |
| (6). 52:25 87:12 87:13 111:1 | Results | [1] $78: 22$ | Serving |
| 128:23 140:23 | [2] 51:19 59:19 | Scheme | (1] 21:19 |
| Remains | Retixe | [1] 7:18 | Set |
| [2] 65:1 141:3 | (2) 161:10 165:2 | Schwartz | (3] 55:5 142:21 153:1 |
| Remember | Retrieved | (25) $2: 16$ 19:18 21:18 46:25 | Seven |
| 1211 12:21 13:2 15:4 15:6 15: | [1] B0:23 | 48:8 $48: 22$ 94:15 94:21 94:23 | [2] 159:24 161:22 |
| 7 15:15 16:10 16:23 56:11 72: | Return | 100:14 105:21 105:23 106:4 | Several |
| 22 89:8 92:21 94:23 94:24 94: | [1] 114:13 | 106:22 129:13 130:2 130:6 | [3] 82:17 87:22 159:3 |
| 25 112:10 120:13 123:5 132: | Returned | 131:8 131:11 131:14 133:6 |  |
| $\begin{array}{ll}14 & 132: 18 \\ \text { 120:5 }\end{array}$ | Returned <br> [1] 80:6 | 135:20 136:24 139:22 140:1 | Shake <br> [1] 56:13 |
| Remind | Retyped | Scooter | (1] 55:13 <br> Shated |
| 13] 64:25 141:2 156:1 Removed | Retyped <br> [2] 7:23 144:8 | [3] 76:6 76:7 77: | shaked |
| Removed. | [2] 1:23 144:8 | Screaming | [1] 110:5 |
| (2) 62:7 91:13 | Review <br> [5] $99: 6$ <br> 10 | (1) 33:18 | Shakes <br> [1] $137 \cdot 12$ |
| Renew | [5] 89:6 97:22 97:24 98:5 98: $10$ | Scre | [1] 137:12 |
| [1] 32:12 | Reviewed | [2] 63:25 66:19 | Shaking |
| Repeat | (2) 4:7164:18 | Screened | [1] 108:13 |
| [4] 18:14 63:12 132:3 132:10 | Revoked | (1) 57:17 | Shaped |
| Rephrase |  | Script | [1] 72:3 |
| [2] 6:12 148:23 | $\begin{aligned} & 6\} 22: 251: \\ & 51: 2251: 23 \end{aligned}$ | (4) 104:4 104:10 104:12 104: | Share |
| Replace | Rights | 14 | (21 11:23 58:14 |
| [1] 157:14 | $\text { [7] } 87: 387: 5$ | Scrutiny | Shawn |
| Replies | 20 88:4 88:10 | [1] 108:14 | [4] 116:6 121:11 121:13 125: |
| [1] 120:1 | Riak | Search |  |
| Report | (1) 1 | [1] 108:10 | Sheet |
| [11] 65:3 70:10 70:13 89:2 | Rob | Searched | [2] 107:24 107:25 |
| 90:7 100:9 100:10 100:11 141: | [4] 132:17 133:2 $233: 4133: 8$ | [2] 103:13 108:6 | Shirt |
| 5 156:7162:3 | Robbed | Seated | [3] 9:20 85:2 113:13 |
| REPORTED |  | [4] 9:4 53:10 85:1 111:11 | Shit |
| (1) 1:25 |  | Second | [11 33:25 |
| Reporter | [1] 75:7 | [13] 25:2 28:20 60:25 77:21 | Shoot |
| [1] 97:23 | 11175 | 84:7 90:7 93:4 102:24 131:5 | [2] 16:13 133:9 |
| REPORTER'S | Room (23) $37: 24 \quad 71: 7$ $72: 3$ $72: 4$ | 152:22 158:10 160:4 162:25 | Shooter |
| (1) 1:11 | $16 \quad 73: 14 \quad 73: 19 \quad 74: 11 \quad 74: 22$ | Section | (11) 76:14 |
| Reports | 75:18 78:3 78:14 98:19 88:20 | [1] 61:7 | Shooting |
| [1] 59:17 | B8:23 98:23 91:14 91:14 91: | Secure | [11] 15:13 15:16 16:3 55:9 |
| Represent | 18 91:22 91:24 91:25 110:13 | [1] 126: | 55:24 80:13 115:9 120:2 120: |
| (2) 34:11 $95: 11$ | Rooms | Secured | 3 122:5 138:1 |
| Recruest | (1) 91:22 | [2] $58: 458: 6$ | Shootings |
| [3] 103:25 147:3 149:16 | Roughly | Sedona | (1) 14:12 |
| Recruested | [1] 138:12 | [1] 112:5 | Short |
| [1] 59:19 | Ruled | See | (3) 15:22 86:21 141:21 |
| Requests | [2] 128:2 162:2 | [351 8:1 19:13 23:24 26:12 | Shorter |
| (i) 147:20 | Rules | $\begin{array}{llllllll}26: 14 & 27: 23 & 31: 1 & 31: 11 & 37: 24 \\ 43: 24 & 57: 8 & 62: 15 & 53: 25 & 65: 18\end{array}$ | (2) 15:21 39:4 |
| Required | [1] 33:8 | $\begin{array}{lllllll}\text { 43:24 } & 57: 8 & 62: 16 & 83: 25 & 65: 18 \\ 67: 11 & 71: 5 & 72: 20 & 72: 21 & 75: 25\end{array}$ | Shortiy |
| (1) 152:9 | Ruling | $76: 18 \quad 78: 4 \quad 78: 21 \quad 86: 8 \quad 86: 12$ | (3) 63:4 92:22 93:4 |
| Requires | (1) 128:4 | 93:12 97:21 103:13 105:6 118: | Shot |
| (1) 55:10 | Run | 16 118:18 120:20 125:16 129: | [22] 5:13 13:7 13:8 13:10 14: |
| Research | (5) 120:3 120:4 120:9 121:23 | 21 135:6 141:11 | 25 66:7 66:10 66:15 67:5 68: |
| [1] 156:22 | 136:14 | Seeing |  |
| Resided | Runs | [3] 39:18 90:4 156:23 | $24 \quad 120: 17 \quad 133: 11133: 23$ |
| [1] $82: 1$ | (1) 120:1 | Seeking | Shots |
| Residence | S | (2) 98:2 98:6 | [6] 67:8 67:9 67:10 67:25 |
| [3] 79:15 82:15 82:15 |  |  | 120:21 125:16 |
| Resolve |  | [1] 109:17 | Shoulder |
| (1) 149:24 | Saitta | Self | (3) 10:15 10:16 33:25 |
| Resolved |  | [1] 136:12 | Show |
| (11) 65:19 | Samp | Self-authenticated | [13] 7:15 24:10 29:12 47:2 |
| Respect |  | [1] 142:7 | 62:11 62:12 62:13 62:14 68: |
| (3) 83:7 128:24 152:12 |  | Sell | 10 76:4 86:22 150:19 155:10 |
| Respectively | Samples (5) 107:10 107: | [2] 38:3 110:4 | Showed |
| [1] 140:13 | (5) 107:10 107: | Sending | [3] $46: 2488: 22 \quad 122: 12$ |
| Responding |  | 12] 51:7 105:23 | Showing |
| [11 129;11 | (14) 9:14 12:4 | Sends | [4] 19:5 22:23 65:24 93:14 |
| Response | 5 33:22 34:22 $55: 24 \quad 112: 5$ | [1] 37:13 | Shown |
| (4) 56:20 61:24 100:3 136:22 | 112:7 114:13 118:5 144:12 | Sense | [5] 36:16 78:8 84:3 125:20 |
| Responsibilities | 154:6 | (2) 7:18 70:16 | 125:22 |
| [2] $58: 12$ 59:2 | Save | Sensitivity | Shows |
| Responsibility | [1] 153:10 Saving | [1] 45:3 Sent | [12] 4:15 4:18 5:18 6:13 6: <br>  |


| 154:7 154:30 155:10 | Sommone | [1] 5:23 | Strike |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sic |  | State | (2] $32: 23$ 160:22 |
| (5] 31:11 31:17 31:21 32:3 | 80: -6.25 99:3 100:6 128:7 | \{38] 1:3 1:17 4:34:10 4:20 | Struck |
| 32:8 | Sometime | $8: 78: 128: 1612: 6$ 36:16 47: | [1] 78:18 |
| Side | [7] 10:6 16:24 52:9 95:13 98: | 1 48:18 $52: 22 \quad 53: 1165: 16$ 111:12 129:7 144:9 144:19 | Stucco |
| (3) 86:3 86:7 86:7 | $798: 9$ 114:12 | $145: 23 \quad 149: 20 \quad 151: 21 \quad 152: 5$ | [1] 77:22 |
| Sides | Sometimes | $153: 12 \quad 154: 3 \quad 154: 13 \quad 157: 1$ | Stuff |
| (1) 153:22 | [5] 5:13 64:22 79:25 112:6 | 157:4 157:8 157 :14 157:18 | (4) 26:12 $51: 7121: 2 \quad 145: 4$ |
| Sign | 155:12 | 160:6 160:10 161:8 161:24 | Style |
| [2] 66:3 122:17 | Somewhere | 162:2 162:20 164:16 | [5] 16:1 25:23 27:7 102:6 |
| Signature | (7) 7:11 11:15 117:14 117:24 | State's | 102:13 |
| [1] 19:14 | 118:5 121:10 140:24 | [40] $2: 23: 27: 22 \quad 19: 5 \quad 22: 24$ | Styles |
| Signed | Song 36.4 37:1 38.19 | $24: 12 \quad 25: 5 \quad 25: 12 \quad 27: 10 \quad 29: 3$ | [1] 101:21 |
|  | $\begin{array}{llllllllll}{[15]} & 26: 18 & 33: 4 & 37: 1 & 38: 19 \\ 38: 25 & 41: 22 & 43: 14 & 43: 17 & 43\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{llllll}30: 9 & 36: 17 & 46: 24 & 62: 15 & 65: 25\end{array}$ 66:5 67:2 67:14 68:9 71:1 71: | Stylized |
| 2 144:8 145:1 154:19 | $38: 25$ $41: 22$ $43: 14$ <br> 25 $43: 7$ $44: 18$ <br> $10: 17$ $50: 20$  | 66:5 $67: 267: 14$ 68:9 $71: 1$ 14 $71: 23$ $72: 5$ $72: 17$ $72: 25$ $73:$ | (21 42:11 42:22 |
| Significance | 100:22 101:25 | 22 75:14 75:24 77:1 77:9 84: | Subject |
| (1) 33:20 | Songs | 23 86:1 93:15 94:6 100:22 |  |
| Silent | (e) 36:3 36:5 36:7 36:9 36: | 103:21 140:12 144:9 146:22 | 161:1 161:6 |
| [2] 87:12 87:13 | 11 36:14 42:13 101:2 | 157:24 | Submitted |
| Similar | Soon | statement | [3] 65:7 141:9 156:11 |
| [1] 26:15 | [3] 46:15 58:5 63:24 | (18) 17:17 17:20 17:24 18:6 $16: 922: 1231: 631: 7 \quad 92: 992:$ | Substance |
| Simple | Sorxy | 15 96:24 98:13 113:15 123:1 | [1] 120:22 |
| (3) 21:2 159:6 159:14 | [16] 29:10 33:24 33:24 85:20 | 127:9 153:4 155:19 159:2 | Substituta |
| Simply | 99:18 90:9 101:20 108:23 121: | Statements | [1] 161:3 |
| [6] 6:15 92:14 100:5 108:8 | 12 125: 4 127:7 138:3 139:14 | [6] 6:1 15:11 59:18 88:16 | Subtle |
| 162:18 164:7 | 140:6 143:22 146:13 | $\text { 128:15 } 162: 6$ | (1] 156:15 |
| Sin | Sort | States | Suggest |
| [1] 125:22 | $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { [11] } & 42: 11 & 57: 20 & 71: 17 & 72: 2 \\ 75: 5 & 78: 13 & 78: 14 & 91: 20 & 94: 4\end{array}$ | [1] | (4) 5:24 100:4 150:9 158:13 |
| Single | $\begin{aligned} & 10: 5 \\ & 100: 2101: 22 \end{aligned}$ | Station | Suggesting |
| [2] 142:5 152:19 |  | [I] 91: | [2] 7:5 150:5 |
| sit | 141 71:11 72:2 72:16 | Statutor | Suggestions |
| (1) 114:22 | Southeast | (3) 161:24 162:16 163:12 | (11) 136:8 |
| Site |  | Stay | Suggests |
| [5] 61:2 77:20 78:12 78:15 |  | (6] 112:6 112:8 122:7 122:8 | [11 6:9 |
| 78:17 | $\text { [3) } 73: 15 \quad 74: 20$ | 126:24 132:7 | Suit |
| Sites |  | Stayed | [2] 113:7 113:10 |
| [3] 74:6 74:6 74:10 |  | [3] 112:11 122:9 125:1 | Sum |
| Sitting |  | Step | (1) $155: 8$ |
| [6] 59:22 59:24 90:17 115:15 |  | [4] 68:24 110:22 127:17 140:7 | Summarize |
| 124:12 128:16 | (1) $147: 8$ | Stepped | [1] 155:9 |
| Situation | Special | [1] 119: | Sumany |
| (3) 80:13 87:7 92:13 | (3) 42:12 58:12 160:21 | Steps | [1] 30:15 |
| Six | Specific | (1) 104:22 | Summations |
| [10] 10:25 58:21 62:24 63:14 |  | Steven | (1) 155:8 |
| 77:21 77:24 138:12 138:17 | Specifically | [3] 4:21 144:20 154:13 | Sumup |
| 139:5 159:22 | [3] 84:17 147:20 149:16 | Stilil | [2] 79:7 81:21 |
| Size | Spell | [16] 15:24 26:22 37:3 55:17 | Supervised |
| (1) 39:1 | (3) 8:16 53:11 111:12 | 57:22 75:21 76:20 81:1983: | [1] $46: 21$ |
| Sized | Spelling | 14 114:6 124:5 126:3 131:6 | Supervisors |
| (1) 76:8 | $\begin{array}{llll}{[2]} & 111: 19 & 129: 7\end{array}$ | 131:10 137:23 159:4 | [2] 58:23 61:7 |
| Skill | Spend | Stipulate | Suppose |
| (1) 160:22 | (2) 78:23 79:1 | [12] 4:11 $4: 208: 965: 13141:$ | (1) 101:7 |
| Skip | Spending | $\begin{array}{ll} 24 & 143: 5 \\ 19 & 143: 11 \\ 15: 35 & 154: 4 \\ \hline 154: 10 & 144: \end{array}$ | Supposed |
| [11 86:23 | (1) 80:1 | Stipulated | [31 60:11 132:17 164:3 |
| sleep | Spent | (1) 152:13 | Supxeme |
| [1] 56:13 | 12] 67:19 74:14 | Stipulation | (8) 159:9 159:12 162:1 163:3 |
| Slow | Stair | [24] 4:4 4:10 141:19 142:10 | 163:10 163:16 164:2 164:10 |
| 121 79:3 115: | [1] 69:3 | 142:13 142:19 143:2 : $433: 22$ | Surprise |
| Slowly | Staircase | 143:23 144:2 144:7 145:6 145: | [3] 109:15 109:25 110:3 |
| (2) 61:8 129:17 | [5] 6:18 6:19 6:21 68:2 68:11 | 19 149:21 152:2 152:4 152:8 | Surprised |
| Sma11. | Stairs | 152:22 152:23 153:4 153:16 | [1] 44:17 |
| (1) 88:23 |  | 153:19 154:3 154:19 Stipulations | Surrounding |
| Smal1s | $\begin{array}{cccc} 6: 3 & 6: 24 & 57: 25 & 61: 9 \\ 14 & 68: 3 & 68: \\ 14: 21 & 68: 22 & 69: 17 & 70: 13 \end{array}$ | Stipulations <br> [3] 145:14 151:25 152:11 | [1] 126:17 |
| (1) 33:7 | 70:17 70:18 70:20 70:21 75: | Stock | Suspect |
| Smith | 15 90:11 90:16 114:22 115: | (2) 157:23 158:13 | [8] 6:6 81:3 81:12 83:1 84 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { (5) } \\ 111: 15 & 110: 25 & 111: 5 & 111: 14\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{lll} 115: 16 & 120: 10 & 121: 3 \\ 121: 4 \\ 121: 9 & 121: 23 & 144: 16 \end{array} 144: 23$ | stolen | 11 97:13 146:8 157:21 |
| 111:15 Smoke | $\begin{array}{llll} 121: 9 & 121: 23 & 144: 16 & 144: 23 \\ 144: 24 & 154: 11 & 154: 16 & 154: 18 \end{array}$ | Stolen [2] 89:13 89:24 | Suspects |
| $\text { [1] } 33: 19$ | Stand | Stop | Sustain |
| Smoked | (9] 8:15 8:20 59:25 108:9 | 121 97:6 98: | [1) 93:5 |
| [2] 14:13 34:24 | 146:4 147:4 148:11 148:16 | Storage | Sustained |
| Smoking |  | [2] 74:9 75:18 | (2) 30:19 101:17 |
| [3] 14:9 15:9 15:16 |  | Story 96.8 | SHAT |
| Snitch | Stan | 131 66:10 97:8 98:5 | [1] 54:1a |
| (1] 50:8 | [7] 52:25 78:3 73:11 78:13 | Straigh | Switch |
| Snitches (6] $34: 1 \quad 49.269 .550 .11 \quad 50$. | $111: 2 \quad 128: 23 \quad 149: 3$ | 11] 231:6 | (1] 64:9 |
| [6] 34:1 49:2 69:5 50:11 50: $1850: 21$ | Start | Strange [1] 101:24 | Sworn |
| 18 50:21 | [1] 159:15 | (1) 101:24 | 14) $9: 25,53: 6111: 7128: 24$ |
| $\text { [1] } 76: 21$ | Started | [1] 101:24 | T |
| Solving | [3] 79:11 122:3 162:20 Starting | Street | Table $1 /$ |
| (1) 21:12 | Starting | (2) 33:8 81:15 | [1] 72:4 |


| TALEEN | [2] 74:674:8 | Two-story | VD |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| [1] 1:19 |  | [1] 66:10 | [1] 2:2 |
| tape | 12) : $1988: 21$ | Type | Vegas |
| (5] 17:17 57:8 57:20 92:4 | Tomorrow | [5] 25:16 29:22 38:20 119:13 | [14] 4:1 4:15 21:7 21:10 53: |
| 122:17 | (4] 150:6 155:25 156:23 165:8 | 156:22 | 20 53:22 54:15 70:1 80:17 |
| Tape-record | Tonight | Typed | 138:1 138:5 139:2 144:13 154: |
| [2] 17:17 92:4 | [1] 156:17 | [1] 17:20 |  |
| Taped | Took | 7ypes | Vehicle |
| [3] 57:7 32:14 93:19 | (12) 4:22 13:4 14:8 14:19 17: | [2] 41:24 42:5 | [2] 57:17 68:7 |
| Team | 4 33:21 68:12 70:18 71:22 | TYpewritten | Vehicles |
| [5] 55:4 81:22 82:6 83:12 99: | 104:22 144:21 154:15 | [2] 30:15 32:24 | (2) 57:16 68:6 |
| 25 25.4 81.2282 .683 .12 O0. | TOP | Typical. | Verbiage |
| Teams | (8] $5: 8 \quad 24: 19$ 64:10 66:18 74: | [1] $66: 8$ | (1) 68:13 |
| (1) $55: 5$ | 9 76:6 90:8 99:13 | U | Verdict |
| Techniques | To | U | (4) 160:24 161:10 161:13 164: |
| $\text { [1] } 69: 13$ | (5] 39:6 39:11 39:12 39:14 | Untimately |  |
| Technology |  | [1] 83:17 | Versus |
| (4) 64:3 64:19 64:21 65:19 | Tosse | Unanimously | [3] 4:3 8:7 157:1 |
| Telephone | [2] 110 | (1) $163: 1$ | Victim |
| [2] 106:8 118:22 | Total | Uncle | (11) 70:14 |
| Tempting | 14] 53:23 | 121 82:3 137:17 | Victims |
| [1] 156:13 | Totally | Under | [1] 70:14 |
| Term | 12183:2484 | (7] 65:7 99:6 128:15 141:9 | View |
| [1] 157:25 | Touch | 145:15 146:22 156:11 | [3] $4: 15144: 13154: 8$ |
| Texminolog | [2] 66:19 131:18 | Undercover | Voice |
| [11 88:12 |  | [1] | [1] 9:12 |
| Terms | [2] 74:22 90:8 | Underneat | VOLUME |
| [6] 11:16 15:18 39:1 52:5 64: |  | [1] 121:16 | [1] 1:7 |
| $592: 12$ dita | [3] 12:1 72:19 90:26 | Inderstood | Volunteered |
| Testified | Trade [2] 22:23 36:13 | [8] 5:14 32:5 87:18 88:3 89: 6 142:24 150:18 158:7 | [1] 90:3 |
| [11] 9:2 $30: 13$ 53:8 93:10 99: | 12] 22:23 36:13 | 6 142:24 150:18 158:7 |  |
| $1499: 17100: 20111: 9139: 7$ $147: 15147: 24$ | Trained <br> [1] 57:5 | Unit | [1] 1:5 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 147: 15 \text { 147:24 } \\ & \text { Testify } \end{aligned}$ | fl] 57:5 Transcript | [13] 11:18 11:20 54:2 54:8 66:10 74:9 122:10 142:2 14 | Vulgar |
| Testify | Transcript |  | [1] 44:12 |
| 82:23 111:7 128:18 146:6 146 |  | United | W |
| 10 $146: 16$ $146: 24$ $147: 4$ <br> 12 $147: 18$ $147: 22$ $148: 16$ | [1] 32:2 | [1] 1 | Wait |
| ${ }_{12}^{12}$ | Translation | Unit | $[5]$ 8:1 $55: 8 \quad 102: 24 \quad 117: 6$ |
| Trestifying | [2] 31:16 31:24 |  | 131:5 |
| [1] 149:1 | Transpo |  | Waited |
| Testimony | [1] 62:10 |  | [1] 17:1 |
| [9] 42:1 110:2 128:14 128:17 | Travel |  | Waive |
| 140:6 152:7 153:23 153:25 | [1] 71:11 | 16 | [1] 88:10 |
| 160:18 | Trial |  | Walk |
| Themselves | [11) 1:11 6:6 21:14 128:13 | Unnecessary | [2] 61:11 71:9 |
| (1) 162:19 | 142:21 143:13 153:1 155:6 | (2) 161:18 | Walk-through |
| Thereto | 155:24 156:2 163:25 | Unu | [1] 61:11 |
| (3) 6:177:27:8 | Trouble | (2) $44: 25$ | Walked |
| Thereupon | 121 |  | [3] 73:1 74:19 116:21 |
| [3] 129:24 141:13 151:9 | True | $\begin{array}{llllll}{[71]} & 6: 18 & 6: 19 & 6: 20 & 9: 13 & 10: \\ 18 & 10: 21 & 18: 21 & 24: 8 & 30: 23 & 35:\end{array}$ | Walking |
| Thinking | (2) 153:21 | 11 $35: 14 \quad 36: 2 \quad 36: 5 \quad 36: 7 \quad 36: 9$ | [2] 59:7 61:15 |
| [3] 7:11 7:11 69:19 | Truth | 36:11 37:19 45:13 52:8 55:2 | Wall |
| Thizd | 1111 8:25 8:25 9:1 $53: 653: 6$ | 55:4 55:5 55:6 55:8 57:25 60: | [4] 72:16 78:17 78:18 78:21 |
| [2] 46:4 68:23 | 53:7 82:24 111:7 111:7 111:8 <br> 123.3 | 20 61:9 61:12 63:22 67:21 68: | Wants |
| Three | 123:3 Try | $\begin{array}{lllllll}1 & 68: 11 & 68: 15 & 68: 24 & 69: 1 & 69: \\ 5 & 71: 22 & 72: 6 & 73: 23 & 74: 16 & 75:\end{array}$ | [2] 80:2 100:5 |
| $\begin{array}{llllllllllll}\text { [15] } & 13: 11 & 13: 13 & 14: 24 & 17: 14\end{array}$ |  |  | Warned |
| 17:15 21:13 33:16 33:21 46:6 | $17158: 19$ (1) | 25 79:9 83:6 87:13 88:14 88: | [1] 50:10 |
| 82:11 88:22 89:17 98:15 127: | Trying | 22 90:16 102:22 120:18 122: | Warning |
| 12 159:19 | [12] 7:3 14:15 14:16 61:15 | $12124: 12 \quad 124: 25 \text { 126:10 131: }$ | $\text { [2] } 50: 18 \quad 50: 20$ |
| Three-day | 78:23 83:14 110:3 110:8 133: | $\begin{array}{ll}24 & 132: 2 \\ 13 & 132: 5 \quad 134: 12 \quad 134: 12\end{array}$ | Watch |
| [1] 82:11 | 2 133:4 133:7143:11 | 134:18 135:14 139:8 147:3 |  |
| Threshold |  | 148:19 150:16 155:9 163:3 | [3] 65:3 141:5 156:7 |
| [2] 71:4 119:7 | [9] 130:14 130:25 131:8 131 | Upper | Water |
| Thrilla | 8 131:13 131:17 131;22 132: | (1) 108:2 | [1] 135:18 |
| [1] 33:22 | 25 134:5 | Ups | Waves |
| Throughout | Turn | (11) 67:12 | [1] 122:10 |
| (1) 51:10 | (4) 40:20 55:3 69:1 136:12 | Upstairs | Weapon |
| Throw | Turned | [1] 74:24 | [2] 12:6 160:1 |
| (1) $56: 14$ | (3) 52:3 64:5 71:21 | Upwards | Wearing |
| Tie | Two | (2] 58:21 58:25 | [3] 9:19 33:9 129:25 |
| (3] 9:20 113:7 113:10 | [38] 5:15 5:25 6:18 17:14 24: | V | Weaver |
| Tight | $1331: 1832: 7$ 35:9 40:6 41: |  | [2] 80:21 80:21 |
| [3] 57:19 |  |  | Wednesciay |
| TIMOTHY | $\begin{array}{lllll} 55: 5 & 59: 21 & 59: 24 & 60: 9 & 61: 1 \\ 62: 8 & 66: 10 & 71: 12 & 72: 1 & 78: 12 \end{array}$ | $21 \quad 19: 24 \quad 22: 12 \quad 22: 15 \quad 52: 23$ | [6] 97:21 $134: 16$ 134:19 135: |
| (1) 1:22 | 82:11 101:21 135:10 135:15 | 52:24 $53: 4 \quad 53: 14 \quad 53: 14 \quad 84: 10$ | 9-135:15 139:8 |
| Tociay | 141:20 151:24 152:11 157:5 | 95:10 102:24 109:20 | Weed |
| 1121 9:16 9:19 84;25 87:21 | 159:7 159:11 159:18 162:5 | Valley | $\begin{array}{lllllll} {[14]} & 13: 3 & 13: 25 & 14: 2 & 14: 4 & 14: \\ 8 & 14: 9 & 14: 13 & 15: 9 & 15: 16 & 33: \end{array}$ |
|  | 163 | (2) 55:3 56:12 | $19 \quad 98: 23 \quad 133: 24 \quad 133: 25 \quad 134: 2$ |
| 22 129:25 149:23 155:20 | Two-1iner | Various | Weekend |
| Togethex | [1] 157:5 | [1] 164:25 | (4) 55:7 55:2 55c) \& 06:15 |
| [2] 35:23 91:23 | Twomman | Vault | Weird |
| Toilet | (1] 55:5 | (1) 80:23 | \%eird |

Welcome
(3) 8:5 65:11 151:13
Well-aware
(1] 50:7
Well-light.
[1] 124:25
Well-secured
(1) $58: 6$
Nes
(1) $36: 9$
West
[3] 66:16 73:12 77:19
West-facing
(11)77:19
White
[6] $9: 20$ 9:20 38:4 38:20 41:
10 85:2
Whitties
(1] 100:2
Whole
[14] 8:25 21:4 40:18 50:8 53:
6 54:18 59:5 60:24 74:4 85:
15 102:2 105:20 111:7 116:16
Wildemann
[7] 55:18 55:18 80:22 88:20
95:1 100:13 106:16
Wind
[2] 35:11 126:10
Window
[9] 77:17 77:19 78:6 120:23
120:23 120:25 121:1 121:1
121: 6
Finds
[1] 35:14
Winston
[4] 2:15 129:9 129:9 140:7
Wise
[1] 65:16
Wish
[1] $163: 14$
Wishes
[1] $151: 22$
Withdraw
[1] 150:12
Witness
[51] 8:14 8:15 8:18 8:24 9:
14 10:15 19:2 32:23 33:14 34:
4 52:16 52:19 53:2 53:5 53:
13 59:1B $59: 25 \quad 66: 21 \quad 95: 4$
$\begin{array}{llll}13 & 59: 18 & 59: 25 & 66: 21 \\ 101: 10 & 101: 20: 4 & 105: 15 & 107: 4\end{array}$
108:23 109:19 110:20 111:6
$\begin{array}{llll}111: 14 & 112: 16 & 113: 16 & 115: 19\end{array}$
123:9 125:5 126:8 127:7 127:
14 127:19 128:9 128:18 129:9
$\begin{array}{ll}135: 19 & 137: 14 \\ 139: 21 & 147: 3\end{array}$
152:7 152:9 153:22 154:1 154:
24 160:20 160:21
Witnesses
$\left[\begin{array}{lllll}{[6]} & 58: 18 & 59: 13 & 151: 22 & 155: 2\end{array}\right.$
155:21 160:19
Wondering
(2) 140:17 141:18
Word
(3) $31: 18 \quad 31: 20 \quad 44: 14$
Worded
[1] 6:9
Words
[7] 31:23 33:11 44:9 44:11
88:1 128:17 149:3
W上ite
[16] 26:4 26:9 26:9 26:12 31:
$20 \quad 33: 24 \quad 41: 6$ 42:13 42:16 42:
$\begin{array}{llllll}17 & 42: 19 & 43: 1 & 43: 14 & 43: 18 & 50\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{ll}17 & 42: 19 \\ 20 & 103: 8\end{array}$
Writer
(1] 31:20
Writing
[15] 25:18 25:23 25:24 26:3
26:5 26:6 26:14 26:15 26:19
26:22 41:8 41:18 47:17 48:4
26:22
142:20
Written
[17] 18:12 18:16 19:17 20:12

# DISTRICT COURT 

 CLARK COUNTY, NEVADAFILED
STATE OF NEVADA, HAR 7910 A月, 'O6 vs.


GLENFORD ANTHONY BUDD,
 ) Case No. C193182 ) Dept. No. XVIII

Defendant.
VOLUME 8-B

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF JURY TRIAL

Before the Honorable Justice Nancy M. Saitta
Thursday, December 15, 2005 1:30 p.m.

APPEARANCES:

For the State:

For the Defendant:

REPORTED BY: JANICE DAVID, CCR NO. 405note note


LAS VEGAS, NEVADA, DECEMBER 15, 2005, 1:30 P.M.

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, $p-a-g-1-i-n-i$.

## 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 Eorce, Malcolm Grove Hospital, Andrews Air Force Base. That was one year. My next two years was with Nellis Air Eorce 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 Eorensic 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 23rd and 24th, 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. Eamily 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
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 April, 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
that's something you want to know about?
A. Of course.
Q. And if someone is giving aid to Glenford Budd, that's something you want to know about?
A. Yes.
Q. And, in fact, under certain circumstances that could be a crime, depending on what the person knew?
A. Yes. I'm sure it was.
Q. I mean, you've arrested people for that before, haven't you?
A. Maybe. I can't think about it right off the top of my head but --
Q. Okay. Now, you testified here that you met Greg Lewis in, I think, August of 2004?
A. Yes. It would be August 13 th.
Q. And I believe you've testified that you're the lead detective on this case?
A. Yes.
Q. This is your case? You've been with this case from day one all the way through today?
A. Yes.
Q. And you're really Metro's man in charge of this case, aren't you?
A. Well, we look at it as a team approach,
but my partner, Marty, and I are really the people involved with this case. It sort of whittles down from the initial response. The reason that I would even suggest that I was the lead --
Q. Let me simply, if Mr. Kane wants to talk to someone about the case, he's going to call you, right?
A. Or Marty. The reason that we say I'm the lead is because I authored the report, the scene report. That makes you the lead. Had Marty done the report, he would be the lead on it.
Q. And Marty is your partner?
A. Yes, Marty Wildemann.
Q. Now, it's originally David Schwartz was the prosecutor in this case, correct?
A. Yes, he and Ms. Pandukht.
Q. Okay. And then later on he was not on the case, and Mr. Kane came on the case?
A. Yes.
Q. You've testified that Greg Lewis met you, I think, in August of 2004. He provided to you the rap song, which is State's Exhibit 49C?
A. That's right.
Q. And you seen that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. It would be very, very helpful to you if you had in your possession other rap songs in that handwriting that you knew belonged to Glenford Budd; isn't that right?
A. For like a comparison for handwriting?
Q. Absolutely.
A. I suppose.
Q. Don't you think it would be incredibly helpful to have a document that you knew was Glenford Budd's in that precise handwriting?
A. Well, I don't think it would be incredibly helpful.
Q. Of course, it would be.
A. But I have --

MS. PANDUKHT: Objection, argumentative.
MR. BROOKS: Okay. Let the man answer.
THE COURT: Sustained.
THE WITNESS: Well, I had --
THE COURT: Or to explain his answer.
THE WITNESS: Yeah. I'm sorry. I had what I, appeared to be two different styles of handwriting. We had a, sort of a nice pleasant cursive in the letter, and then we had this strange-looking, I don't even know how to refer to what those letters were in the song.

BY MR. BROOKS:
Q. Okay. I don't care about the whole issue of his nice handwriting.
A. Right.
Q. Wouldn't it be helpful to you to have handwriting from Glenford Budd in that rap style that you know is Glenford Budd's?
A. I, it didn't, it didn't pose itself to me. I didn't think that that would be helpful to me.
Q. All right. So, you're saying it would not be helpful to you to have in your possession a handwriting in that style which you know is Glenford Budd's? It would not be helpful to you?
A. No. I'm not saying it would not be helpful. It didn't occur to me to further that, to try to find more of that.
Q. Wouldn't it be helpful to you?
A. I don't know whether it would be comparable or not because, as I said, I knew what his handwriting was. I don't know what that was. And I guess we could beat that up all afternoon about whether --
Q. Mr. Vaccaro, wait a second. You know what I'm getting at. Let's assume that you could
have a document in the same handwriting --
A. Uh-huh.
Q. -- as 49C --
A. Okay.
Q. -- that you know comes from Glenford Budd. That would certainly be helpful to you, wouldn't it?
A. If I had him write that, sure.
Q. Absolutely. And the jail is cooperative with you; isn't that right?
A. Yes. They did, I would say they are.
Q. Did you initiate any effort to have the contents of his jail cell searched to see if you could find one piece of rap music in that handwriting?
A. No, I didn't.
Q. Okay. But that would be helpful to you if you did?
A. It didn't occur to me at the time, no.
Q. But it would certainly be helpful to you? It would be helpful to you if the State's Exhibit 49C had Glenford Budd's fingerprints on it, wouldn't it?
A. Yes.
Q. Was there ever a request made to do a
fingerprint analysis of that document?
A. No.
Q. It would be very helpful to you if you found out that, that 49 C that, that gang script -MS. PANDUKHT: Objection.

MR. BROOKS: What?
THE COURT: It's not been characterized in that manner.

BY MR. BROOKS:
Q. Okay. I'll take away gang script. Excuse me.

The rap, the rap script, it would be helpful to you if you found a document with that script in the cell occupied by Greg Lewis in the prison?
A. I disagree.
Q. Why?
A. I thought that that, when I read it, was personalized enough that it was the product of Glenn Budd. So, it has enough things in it that personalized it to me that it's his product, and so I took no further steps.
Q. So, you don't care about the possibility that Greg Lewis wrote that in his cell at prison? Is that what you're saying?
A. No. I'm not saying I don't care about that. Certainly I would be interested in knowing if that was the case, but I have no way of knowing that.
Q. And wouldn't it have been helpful just to go through Greg Lewis's cell at prison and see if you might find that exact handwriting there in his prison cell?

MS. PANDUKHT: Objection, asked and answered.

MR. BROOKS: No. I don't think it has been answered.

THE COURT: I would agree with it, but I'll give you one more shot.

THE WITNESS: I didn't examine Mr. Lewis's cell or Mr. Budd's cell. I didn't cause that to happen. BY MR. BROOKS:
Q. Okay. Ms. Pandukht has asked you about the whole procedure that happened when Mr . Schwartz sent the letter to the parole board.

Did you have conversations with David Schwartz about his sending that letter to the parole board?
A. No. I said, David, don't forget

Mr. Lewis. And I don't know what his process was. It's not my arena for me to address the parole board on behalf of an inmate. And so I knew something had taken place with Mr. Schwartz, but I did not know nor have I been copied with that. So, I don't know. I've never seen the product.
Q. But you had a conversation with him on the telephone, which you said, don't forget Mr. Lewis?
A. Actually I think he was in the office, and it was a face-to-face thing.
Q. Okay. You yourself, you never sent any information to the parole board on behalf of Mr. Lewis?
A. No. No.
Q. Did your, your partner, Mr. Wildemann?
A. No.
Q. Do you know of anyone else who sent information to the parole board on behalf of Mr. Lewis?
A. I don't, no. I have, you know, I know that Mr. Schwartz sent a letter. That's the extent of it. I don't know of anybody else that wrote the board.
Q. And that's the only letter that you're
aware of?
A. That I am aware of, yes.

MR. BROOKS: Thank you very much. I'll pass the witness.

THE COURT: Redirect?

## REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MS. PANDUKHT:
Q. Just a couple of questions. Mr. Brooks asked you if you got handwriting samples, other samples from the defendant.

Did you have any information that other handwriting samples existed or were found --
A. No.
Q. -- of the defendant's?
A. No. I didn't know of any others.
Q. I mean, if other handwriting samples came into your possession or you were made aware of --
A. I had nothing but what we have here today in those exhibits.
Q. And generally how do you obtain handwriting samples of an individual?
A. There is a process where I would cause a, the jail, they have a sheet. They can provide the inmate with that sheet, and then he's to copy down
certain phrases, certain letters in cursive, block letter, upper case, lower case, so on and so forth. Whether that was done or not, I don't know.
Q. And, and why did you not have the jail cell searched for the defendant?
A. I, I don't know. I, to be honest with you, I would just simply say that I accepted the letter and let it stand for what it said there in the letter. I didn't cause the search to happen and probably more importantly, I know from my experience as a narc, working with informants, that going there to the pod and shaking his cell out could cause some scrutiny. And I have an individual who's provided me with some information, and I didn't want to do that at that point. So, that was probably more of the reason than anything else.

THE COURT: I'm going to just interrupt for a moment and ask the detective, please, to define what he means by his experience being a narc.

THE WITNESS: Okay. I'm sorry. As a narcotics detective for 10 years, you work with people that provide us with information all the
time. And these people are referred to by lots of names, informants, cooperating individual, niche, and so. When we receive information, we handle it delicately, as you might imagine that we're in positions where someone's providing us with information, and we have an obligation to filter or use the information. And in my experience, I handled it the right way with regard to the letter from Mr. Budd to Mr. Lewis.

MS. PANDUKHT: Thank you. I have nothing further.

## RECROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. BROOKS:
Q. Would it surprise you to know that I've had lots of cases where they go and into the jail cell and seize documents?

MS. PANDUKHT: I would object to defense counsel acting as a witness.

MR. BROOKS: Mr. Vaccaro just did the same thing.

THE COURT: I'm going to give him a little leeway. BY MR. BROOKS:
Q. Would that surprise you?
A. No, sure doesn't surprise me.
Q. Okay. Your testimony here today is that you are trying to protect Greg Lewis, and you thought that if Greg Lewis's sell at prison was shaked down, it would cause Greg Lewis problems, right?
A. No, not Greg's so much as I was Mr. Budd.
Q. So, you're trying to protect Mr. Budd?
A. No. No. That's not what I'm saying at all here. What I'm saying is if he has a conversation with an individual and he has maybe told no one else that information and then he gets his room torn down, he may very well make a conclusion about who he had that conversation with. So, I left the matter alone. And I take the responsibility. I didn't cause his cell to get tossed, nor did I to have Greg Lewis's get tossed.

MR. BROOKS: Okay. Thank you.
THE WITNESS: Okay.
MS. PANDUKHT: No re-redirect.
THE COURT: No re-re? You may step down, detective. Thank you so much.

Who's next?
MR. KANE: Krissy Smith, your Honor.

THE BAILIEE: Ma'am, if you'll remain standing, please, raise your right hand, and face the clerk.

## KRISTY SMITH,

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

THE WITNESS: Caronol -- Smith, C-a-r-o-n-a -- S-m-i-t-h.

## DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. KANE:
Q. So, that long spelling was your first name?
A. Yes.
Q. But you go by Krissy?
A. Yes.
Q. Can we use Krissy here?
A. Yes, we can.
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Q. Krissy, I want to talk to you about, I want to talk to you about Memorial Day. That is May the 27th back in 2003.

Where were you living then?
A. I was living in Sedona Hills, Saratoga.
Q. Did you also stay sometimes at the Saratoga Palms Apartments?
A. Did I stay?
Q. Yeah.
A. Yes.
Q. And who was living there who you stayed with?
A. My mom and grandma.
Q. Okay.

THE COURT: I can't, my mom and --
THE WITNESS: Grandparents.
BY MR. KANE:
Q. Do you remember what their apartment was?
A. I believe 1040 .
Q. Okay. Did you know other people who lived in the complex?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you know an individual named Glenford Budd?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. Do you know his nickname?
A. AI.
Q. Is AI present here in court?
A. Yes.
Q. Point to him, please, and tell me what he has on.
A. He has on a tie and a suit.

MR. KANE: Ask that the record reflect identification of the defendant, your Honor.

THE COURT: Tie and a suit isn't going to do it.

MR. KANE: Well, she pointed also, but tell me what color shirt.

THE COURT: It's the gentleman without a jacket. Would that be a fair statement?

THE WITNESS: Yes.
THE COURT: Very well. The record will reflect identification of the defendant. BY MR. KANE:
Q. Thanks, judge.

Now, had you and AI been dating prior to Memorial Day of 2003?
A. No.
Q. Okay. Were you dating at that time?
A. No. We was --
Q. What was your relationship?
A. Before we dated for about a month.
Q. Okay. But you weren't dating as of May the 27 th of 2003?
A. No.
Q. Were you still friends?
A. Yes.
Q. Were you hanging around with AI on that day? That is May the 27th, 2003.
A. Yes. We went to a picnic with his family.
Q. Okay. And at sometime during that day did you and AI return to the Saratoga Palms Apartments?
A. Yes, we did.
Q. And about what time was that?
A. About 8:30, 9:00 o'clock.
Q. And what happened once you got back to the apartment complex?
A. Well, me and Rayanna, we went to my mom house. Well, we went to my house afterwards. We went to go sit on the stairs that, where everything, where it happened at. Anthony was going to the basketball court. So, we followed behind him, me, Rayanna, and the guy that we went,
who went with us to the park. Anthony approached Derrick and them. They was talking, but I'm not for sure what they was talking about. I wasn't paying attention.
Q. Okay. Let me slow you down a little bit. You said you were hanging around on the stairs by the apartment where everything happened?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, you know there was a shooting at apartment 2068?
A. Yes.
Q. That's the apartment you're talking about?
A. Yes.
Q. So, a few of you were sitting there on the stairs, correct?
A. Uh-huh.

THE COURT: Is that yes?
THE WITNESS: Yes.
BY MR. KANE:
Q. Then you went over to the basketball --
A. Yes. We followed behind them.
Q. Who was that went to the basketball --
A. AI, me, Rayanna, and the guy from, went to the picnic with us. I believe his name was

Arnell. And that's it.
Q. And was there a basketball game then played at the basketball court?
A. Yes.
Q. Who was playing?
A. AI, AI, Shawn, Arthur, Jason, Derrick, and Casper.
Q. And who's Casper?
A. Casper is, I believe his name is Lazon, Lazon. I'm not for sure, Lazon or --
Q. Did he live in apartment 2068?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And he went by the nickname of Casper?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, were you there the whole time that they were playing basketball?
A. No.
Q. Where did you go?
A. I went, first I went home, and I came back, and I walked Rayanna halfway home.
Q. Now, while you were there and they were playing basketball were you aware of any arguments or fights between anybody?
A. No.
Q. How long did the basketball game go on?
A. For about 30 minutes maybe.
Q. After the basketball game where did you go?
A. We went, well, I went to apartment 20 -wait, the apartment where everything happened.
Q. Okay. And who went there with you?
A. Anthony, AI.
Q. Okay. And how long were you at the apartment at the same time AI was there?
A. For a little bit, not long.
Q. Longer than 15 minutes?
A. No.
Q. And did you then leave to go somewhere else?
A. Yes.
Q. What was your reason for leaving?
A. Day Day, which is Dajon, asked me could he use a CD.
Q. Okay. And, and what do you mean when you say use a CD?
A. Could he listen to a CD.
Q. Okay. And you didn't have it there, and you went somewhere to get it?
A. Yes. I went home.
Q. Okay. Now, when you say home, where are you talking about?
A. 1040 .
Q. Okay. So, you mean the apartment right there in Saratoga Palms, not somewhere else?
A. Yes. Yes.
Q. So, you went to 1040 to get the CD?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you then go back to apartment 2068?
A. Later on, about maybe 15 minutes later I went back.
Q. Okay. You anticipated my question. So, you were gone about 15 minutes by the time you got back?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, when you got back, did you see AI?
A. No.
Q. Who did you see when you got back?
A. Jason and Derrick.
Q. And where were they?
A. Jason was outside listening to music, and Derrick was inside on the telephone.
Q. Now, when you went back to the apartment this, this last time with the $C D$, did you go inside the apartment?
A. I stepped in the doorway, because Derrick asked me a question.
Q. Okay. And was it a question about the $C D$ or something else?
A. A question about drinking.
Q. Okay. And you answered that question from right on the threshold of the apartment right in the doorway?
A. Yes.
Q. What happened then?
A. Afterwards I had went outside, and Jason, he told me I could get my CD. I guess it wasn't the type of music he liked or whatever. So, I got my $C D$, and I was talking to him for a little bit, because he asked me the same question Derrick did. And like a couple minutes later we heard a shot, and we hit the deck.
Q. Now, when you say we, who's out there in the patio?
A. Jason and then, Jason and myself.
Q. And anybody else who's in the apartment is inside, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. What happens once you hear the shot?
A. We get down on the ground. He gets over
me. Derrick and Casper runs out. Casper replies that they're shooting. He say, he tells us they're shooting, and he tells us to run. So, I run with him.
Q. Okay. So, you and Casper, who's actually which, which of the boys? Do you know his real name?
A. Lazon, I believe.
Q. Okay. So, you and Lazon run down the stairs, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Where does everybody else go?
A. I'm not for sure. I remember Derrick went back inside the house, and $I$, Lazon ran. I don't know. I'm not for sure where he ran to, but I ran downstairs.
Q. Now, you said you heard a shot while you were up on the patio?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you see anything that led you to believe shots were being fired?
A. I saw powder substance come from the window, the bedroom window.
Q. And that's, as you're looking at the door, that is a window on your right, and there is
a window on your left. That's the bedroom window, which one was it that stuff came out of?
A. It was the one by the stairs, above the stairs.
Q. As far as you know, that's the bedroom window?
A. Yes.
Q. And once you got to the bottom of the stairs what happened? Did you go with Lazon somewhere?
A. No. I ran to the Shawn house.
Q. I'm sorry?
A. Shawn, downstairs, the neighbor downstairs.
Q. And is that the apartment that's directly underneath apartment 2068?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you know the people who lived there?
A. Yes.
Q. So, you were acquainted with them as well as the people in 2068?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, when you run down the stairs, are the people in apartment 1068 in their apartment or outside or --
A. Inside. Inside.
Q. Okay. What happens then?
A. I started banging on the door. He answered. He said, what's happening? I told him that Casper said they were shooting, and then I went into the house. He told me to come inside.
Q. Okay. And do you stay in there, well, how long do you stay in --
A. I stayed in there for a long time, until he waves the gang unit.
Q. Now, you realize that at some point police had showed up, and they were investigating?
A. Yes.
Q. Did they talk to you that night, the police?
A. No. They just told us to get behind the yellow, the caution sign, the little caution tape.
Q. Right.
A. And that was it.
Q. So, you weren't interviewed that night about anything that you may have seen?
A. No.
Q. A couple days later you were contacted by the police, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And you gave a statement to them?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you tell the police the truth about what happened that night as well as you could remember it?
A. Yes.
Q. Have you done the same thing today?
A. Yes.

MR. KANE: Pass the witness, your Honor. THE COURT: Mr. Brooks?

## CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. BROOKS:
Q. You were with AI most of that day, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And you and AI did not actually arrive at that apartment at 2068 until approximately 8:30 or 9:00 o'clock at night?
A. We arrived at home. They dropped me off at home.
Q. What time did ya'll actually arrive at apartment 2068?
A. Between 8:30, 9:00 $0^{\prime}$ clock.
Q. Okay. And you had not been there before,
at that apartment that day?
A. No.
Q. That was your first time?
A. Yes.
Q. Was it still light outside?
A. When we arrived?
Q. When you arrived at 8:30 or 9:00 $0^{\prime}$ clock?
A. No.
Q. It's already dark?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. How would you characterize, I mean, you're sitting out there on the porch up there on the balcony, aren't you, with Jason?
A. Yes.
Q. Is it light out there, or is it dark?
A. It's dark outside.
Q. It's dark? It's dark outside. There is a light outside the apartments?
A. Uh-huh.
Q. Is that a bright light or not such a bright light?
A. It's kind of bright.
Q. Kind of bright. But would you say that the overall atmosphere out there, even with that light up, was it overall well-light or just mildly

## light?

A. Mild.
Q. Mildly lit?

THE COURT: I'm sorry?
THE WITNESS: Mildly. BY MR. BROOKS:
Q. Were you ever actually inside the apartment?
A. No, just by the doorway.
Q. Okay. You never actually went inside?
A. No.
Q. You stayed outside?
A. Yes.
Q. You heard gunshots, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. You did not see who fired the shots?
A. No.
Q. You left and went downstairs, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And you joined a person named Shown?
A. Shawn and a couple others.
Q. Is Shown also called Sin?
A. No.
Q. It's a different person?
A. Yes.
Q. The police arrived, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. You're still downstairs, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. The police secure the premises?
A. Uh-huh.

THE COURT: Is that a yes?
THE WITNESS: Yes.
BY MR. BROOKS:
Q. You wind up going outside at some point and joining the crowd of people there?
A. Correct.
Q. How big is the crowd?
A. It was only about four, four of us.
Q. Four of you? Later on was it larger?
A. People came from the apartment.
Q. People from the surrounding apartments came?
A. I'm not for sure where they lived. Just who lived in the apartments came out.
Q. Were any family members out there of the deceased?
A. No.
Q. None? Later, how long did you stay there before you left?
A. Not long.
Q. How long?
A. I say about 20 minutes.
Q. So, you were gone pretty early?
A. Uh-huh.

THE COURT: Is that a yes?
THE WITNESS: Yes. I'm sorry.
BY MR. BROOKS:
Q. You didn't give a statement to the police until May 30th?
A. I believe so.
Q. About three days later?
A. Yes.

MR. BROOKS: Pass the witness.
THE COURT: Mr. Kane?
MR. KANE: No, your Honor.
THE COURT: You may step down. Thank you.

Can this witness be excused? Who's next?
MS. PANDUKHT: Judge, at this time we're going to do the reading.

THE COURT: Very well. Did you have a reader?

MS. PANDUKHT: I do.
MR. BROOKS: Judge, I would just
reiterate the objection that was made previously in which the Court has already ruled.

THE COURT: It is noted for the record. The same ruling will be made or has been made.

In fact, ladies and gentlemen, we're going to read a transcript into the record. We're going to have someone actually play the part of a reader. In fact, he will be reading what is designated as the witness, who could not be here. Anything that that person said at the time of the other examination, he will be responding. You're going to get an instruction on this when we go to the jury instruction phase of this trial, but for now you should consider this testimony just as if the person who actually made the statements under oath in the prior proceeding was sitting here and giving testimony. In other words, it is the same as any other witness who you have heard testify here in the courtroom.

And you're calling for the record?
MS. PANDUKHT: For the record, this is
Glen O'Brien with the district attorney's office. THE COURT: Remain standing, sir. (Thereupon, Glen O'Brien was sworn with respect to the reading of the transcript.)

MR. BROOKS: Court's indulgence, your Honor. May we approach?

THE COURT: You may, yes.
(Conference at the bench.)
THE COURT: You may proceed.
(AS READ BY MS. PANDUKHT): Would you state your first and last name, spelling them both for the record?

THE WITNESS: Winston Budd, W-i-n-s-t-o-n $B-u-d-d$.

## DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. SCHWARTZ (AS READ BY MS. PANDUKHT):
Q. Mr. Budd, I'm going to ask you a few questions, and then Mr. Brooks will ask you some questions. We'd appreciate it if you answer slowly and speak into this microphone so everybody can hear what you're saying.

Mr. Budd, do you know Glenford Budd?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Do you see Glenford Budd in the courtroom today?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Could you point, point to where he is and describe what he's wearing today?
A. A blue outfit.

MR. SCHWARTZ: May the record reflect -that's me. May the record reflect the identification of the defendant, your Honor?

THE COURT: That will be noted. BY MR. SCHWARTZ:
Q. Thank you. How, how is it that you know the defendant?
A. My nephew.
Q. And do you know the defendant by any other name besides Glenford?
A. Junior.
Q. Junior, okay. Let me direct your attention now to Tuesday, May $27 \mathrm{th}, 2003$ at about 3:30 in the morning.

Did you receive a phone call from your brother, Kirk?
A. Yes.
Q. Without telling us what Kirk said to you on the phone, as a result of that phone call did you become concerned regarding your nephew, Junior?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Now, let me direct your attention to May the 27th -- that's Tuesday -- at about

11:00 o'clock in the morning.
Did you receive a phone call from the defendant, your nephew?
A. Yes.

THE COURT: Wait a second. Let me keep this straight. Eleven a.m., is this still the 27th?

MR. SCHWARTZ: Tuesday. Tuesday, yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Still the 27th?
MR. SCHWARTZ: Yes.
THE COURT: That's, actually I meant to say Tuesday. Thank you.

BY MR. SCHWARTZ:
Q. Okay. What did the defendant tell you when he called you at about 11:00 o'clock that Tuesday morning?
A. He asked me to get in touch with their mother to get some money so he can get out of here.
Q. And what else did he say when you talked to him on the phone this Tuesday morning?
A. He also told me that he needed me to come pick him up.
Q. What, okay. What did he say? What, if
anything, did he say regarding why he needed you to pick him up?
A. Could you repeat that again?
Q. Sure. Why did the, why did your nephew need you to come pick him up?
A. Because where, where, wherever he was, the person didn't want him to stay there no more.
Q. What did the defendant tell you about any trouble he might be in?
A. Could you repeat it?
Q. What did the defendant say regarding what possible trouble he could be in? What had he done that caused you some concern?
A. I couldn't remember. He told me that he went to get some money.
Q. Uh-huh.
A. Get some, they were supposed to rob him or something, or something. I don't remember exactly.
Q. About 20 minutes ago you and I spoke in my office, and you had a clear memory then, didn't you?
A. Yes.
Q. Why don't you tell us what your nephew told you that Tuesday morning?
A. He told me that he went, he told me that they was trying to rob him.
Q. What did you do as a result of them trying to rob him?

THE COURT: What did he do?
BY MR. SCHWARTZ:
Q. What did he do as a result of them trying to rob him?
A. He said he shoot them.
Q. Okay. Did he tell you how many of them he shot?
A. No.
Q. Did you ask him anything about the gun?
A. Yes.
Q. What did you ask him?
A. I asked him where the gun at.
Q. What did he say?
A. He said he give it back to some friend.
Q. Did he mention the name of the friend who he gave the gun back to?
A. No.
Q. Did he indicate what he was being robbed, robbed of when he shot them?
A. Weed.
Q. Weed?
A. (Nods head.)
Q. Do you know what weed is?
A. Marijuana, same thing.
Q. Did your nephew, the defendant, indicate where he was when he called you Tuesday morning?
A. Yes.
Q. Where did he say he was?
A. Henderson.
Q. Henderson?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Did there come a time when you drove up to and went to Henderson to pick up your nephew, sir?
A. Yes.
Q. And would that have been the following day, Wednesday?
A. Yes.
Q. And when you picked up your nephew, the defendant, on Wednesday, was he alone?
A. Yes.
Q. Did he have anything in his hands?
A. Yes.
Q. What did he have?
A. Plastic bag with some clothes.
Q. Could you notice anything unusual about
the clothes that was in the plastic bag?
A. Yes.
Q. What did you notice about the clothes?
A. About the clothes?
Q. Yeah?
A. I didn't see the clothes. I only seen in the plastic bag.
Q. Was there anything different about your nephew's appearance when you saw him on Wednesday as opposed to a day or two earlier?
A. Yes.
Q. What was different about his appearance?
A. He cut, cut his hair.
Q. Okay. Where did you, once you picked up your nephew on Wednesday where did the two of you go?

THE COURT: Mr. Budd, do you want some water?

THE WITNESS: To get to my house. BY MR. SCHWARTZ:
Q. Who was at your house when you and your nephew arrived, sir?
A. My family.
Q. Okay. Did there come a time while you were at your house with your nephew when the
police arrived?
A. Yes.
Q. And was it obvious to you who they were looking for?
A. Yes.
Q. They were looking for your nephew?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you make any suggestions to your nephew as to what you thought he should do?
A. Yes.
Q. What did you tell him?
A. To turn his self in.
Q. What did he say to that?
A. He say he prefer to run.
Q. Did you talk to him about what possible sentences he could receive?
A. Yes.
Q. What did you say to him?
A. I say he could possibly get death or life, life in prison.
Q. And what, if anything, did he say in response to that?
A. Nothing.

MR. SCHWARTZ: I have no further questions, your Honor.

THE COURT: Cross-examination?

## CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. BROOKS:
Q. Mr. Budd, you speak with an accent. Are you from Belize?
A. Yes.
Q. But you speak English? That's your native language?
A. Broken English.
Q. Do you speak any foreign languages?
A. (Shakes head.)

THE COURT: For the record --
THE WITNESS: No.
THE COURT: Thank you.
BY MR. BROOKS:
Q. You are Glenford's uncle. Is his father your brother?
A. Yes.
Q. What's the name of his father?
A. Glenford Budd.
Q. And his father, Glenford Budd, lives in Belize still?
A. Yes.
Q. How long was my client, AI or Glenford,
in Las Vegas before the shooting occurred?
A. I think in December.
Q. I'm sorry?
A. In December.
Q. He came to Las Vegas in December?
A. Yes.
Q., Of last year?
A. Yes.
Q. So, he's been here since December of 2002?
A. Yes.
Q. So, he's been here roughly six months?
A. Yes.
Q. Was he living with you at your house?
A. No.
Q. Did he live at your house at all during the six months?
A. No.
Q. Do you know where he was living?
A. With my brother.
Q. With your brother?
A. (Nods head.)
Q. What is your brother's name?
A. Kirk.
Q. Is that $k-i-r-k$ ?
A. Yes.
Q. And he lives here in Las Vegas?
A. Yes.
Q. Is that where my client was living almost the entire six months as far as you know?
A. Yes.
Q. You've testified that when you picked him up on Wednesday the 27 th, his hair was cut, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Prior to that day when was the last time you had seen him?
A. Memorial Day.
Q. I'm sorry?
A. Memorial Day.
Q. Memorial Day?
A. Uh-huh.
Q. And at that time on Memorial Day his hair was not cut?
A. No.

MR. BROOKS: Pass the witness.
MR. SCHWARTZ (AS READ BY MS. PANDUKHT) : No redirect, your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: And Mr. Budd is free to go, I presume?

MR. SCHWARTZ: Yes, your Honor.
THE COURT: I don't think we need to read much more, do we?

MS. PANDUKHT: No.
THE COURT: Very well. That concludes the testimony of Mr. Budd, Mr. -- I'm sorry -Winston Budd. Thank you, sir. You may step down.

Who's next?
MR. KANE: Judge, I would like to have marked for purposes of identification and offer State's Proposed 50 and 51, which are certified copies of the custody records of the defendant and Greg Lewis respectively.

THE COURT: Mr. Brooks?
MR. BROOKS: Judge, I would ask for a brief hearing outside the presence, please.

THE COURT: Very well. I'm wondering if this might be a good time, how long do you anticipate that hearing will take?

MR. BROOKS: No more than five minutes, judge.

THE COURT: Let's take a brief recess, then. I'll excuse the jury, ask them to remain in a close-by area, at least somewhere where they don't have to take too many elevators.

During the recess, ladies and gentlemen, I must remind you that during the recess it remains your duty not to discuss this case among yourselves or with anyone else. 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.

Mr. Bailiff will keep close by. See you in a few minutes.
(Thereupon, the jury exited the courtroom.)
THE COURT: Okay, Mr. Brooks.
MR. BROOKS: Judge, I'm just concerned that perhaps this information which is, which consist of data that came off of a computer, is very confusing. And I'm wondering if this cannot better be done with a stipulation between the parties regarding the gist of these two records.

MR. KANE: Absolutely. And let me short circuit things. What I'm interested in establishing through the records -- and if we can stipulate to it, that's fine -- would be that between the dates of September the 29th, 2003 and

November the 13 th, 2003 the defendant and Mr. Lewis were in the same unit at the Clark County Detention Center, that being unit 9C, also that on May the 25th of 2004 the defendant was moved to unit 9C-18, a single cell. These are both things that are referred to in the record and are self-authenticated.

THE COURT: Would that --
MR. BROOKS: Yes, judge. The defendant would enter the stipulation as to those basic facts. I just object to the idea of giving the --

MR. KANE: That's fine.
THE COURT: Stipulation is always better and almost always clearer for the jury.

Can we bring the jury back in?
MR. KANE: One other thing, judge, if I could, and on that same issue, I was going to ask the Court to take judicial notice -- and perhaps we can do this by stipulation as well -- that as of the time of the writing of the letters, which was August of 2004, the currently set trial date for Mr. Budd was November the 15th of 2004. Again that's referred to in the letter.

THE COURT: Understood. Mr. Brooks, Mr. O'Brien?

MR. BROOKS: That would not be coming into the stipulation, though.

MR. KANE: Well, I'll either ask the Court to take judicial notice of that from the Court's own records, or we can stipulate to it.

THE COURT: Now, Court's own records don't go to the jury.

MR. KANE: No. I understand that, judge, but I would ask you to take judicial notice, and then I would announce in open court that you've taken notice, or we can stipulate. I'm not trying to hide the ball. The defendant says in the letter, my trial date just got bumped to November. And I want to be able to say to the jury that's a fact.

MR. BROOKS: Okay. I have no objection to that.

THE COURT: Very well.
MR. BROOKS: Also, judge, while we're here --

THE COURT: So, it will be by stipulation? I'm sorry, but it will be by stipulation, then?

MR. BROOKS: That's correct. I have no problem with that.

THE COURT: Very well.
MR. BROOKS: Judge, we have a stipulation which we have previously discussed here on the record. And I would ask to read this now and make sure it's clear with the Court's permission.

THE COURT: Certainly.
MR. BROOKS: The stipulation which we've now had retyped and signed by Mr. Kane and myself state's the following: The State and defense stipulate that Defense Exhibits B and C have been admitted into evidence. These exhibits are photographs taken at the Saratoga Palm Apartments, Las Vegas, Nevada. Exhibit C shows the view from the balcony of Celeste Palau's apartment, looking at apartment 2068 in building nine. Exhibit B shows the light fixture over the stairs outside apartment 2068. The light fixture is between apartment 2068 and apartment 2067. New paragraph.

The State and defense stipulate that Steven Yoshida, an investigator for the Clark County Public Defender Office, took these photographs. The distance between the bottom of the stairs outside Celeste Palau's apartment and the bottom of the stairs outside apartment 2068 in building nine is 218 feet.

And this document is signed by both myself and Mr. Kane. I would ask that the matter be entered into the record and filed and all that kind of stuff.

THE COURT: Is that your recollection, Mr. Kane, of what the stipulation was?

MR. KANE: It is, your Honor.
THE COURT: Very well. It will be admitted.

MR. BROOKS: And, judge, may I ask a housekeeping matter here on the record so we can, Court's indulgence.

Judge, it's my understands from Mr. Kane that he intends to rest after the stipulations. Under those circumstances it might be appropriate for us to go ahead now and take care of the admonition for Mr. Budd, because it's my expectation that we will probably just have the stipulation read into the record, and that would be the defense case.

THE COURT: Very well.
MR. BROOKS: Just as a matter of saving time here.

THE COURT: I think it's appropriate. We don't need to take the jury in and out or delay them anymore.

Mr. Bailiff, we're almost there.
Mr. Budd, I am certain that your attorney -- would you stand, please -- that your attorneys have discussed with you the right that you have to testify; is that correct?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.
THE COURT: And, in fact, I suspect that they have also explained to you the absolute right that you have not to testify in this case; is that correct?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.
THE COURT: I'm sorry?
THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.
THE COURT: And they have, I presume, told you that if you choose not to testify, that I can give an instruction to the jury that says that they can't hold that against you.

Do you understand that?
THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.
THE COURT: And, in fact, formally in the constitution of the United State's, under the constitution of the state of Nevada, you cannot be compelled to testify in this case.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.
THE COURT: And you may, at your own request, give up this right and take the witness stand and testify. If you do, you will be subject to cross-examination by the district attorney, and anything that you may say, be it on direct or cross-examination, will be the subject of fair comment when the district attorney speaks to the jury in his final argument.

Do you understand that?
THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.
THE COURT: If you choose not to testify, the Court will not permit the district attorney's office to make any comments to the jury because you have not testified.

Do you understand that?
THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.
THE COURT: If you elect not to testify, I will instruct the jury, if your attorney specifically requests, an instruction that would read as follows: The law does not compel -- to testify and -- presumption may be raised -inference -- drawn from the fact that the defendant has not testified.

And actually that's what we call a Carter
instruction. In fact, this entire formal admonition that $I$ 'm reading to you is essentially taken from or as a result of findings in that case.

Do you understand that?
THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.
THE COURT: Do you have any questions for me?

THE DEFENDANT: No, ma'am.
THE COURT: Do you fully understand the fact that you do not have to take the stand in this case?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.
THE COURT: And, in fact, the constitution of our country does not ever compel a defendant to take the stand and testify.

Do you understand that?
THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.
THE COURT: Are you comfortable giving up that right?

THE DEFENDANT: Huh?
THE COURT: You know what? Let me rephrase that. You look at me questioningly with good reason.

Are you comfortable, upon the advice of
rather have it than not have it?
A. Yeah.
Q. But there's no connection between your producing this information and the writing of this letter, or is there a connection?
A. Could you be more specific?
Q. Sure. I mean, basically the letter that's identified as 50 from Mr. Schwartz to the parole board --
A. Yeah.
Q. -- is really given to you as a result of your work in this case?
A. Yes.
Q. It's given to you as a result of your cooperation?
A. Yes.
Q. And your cooperation was producing these letters to the state and also giving us, talking to the detectives about what Mr. Budd told you?
A. Yes. But prior to me getting that letter they never told me anything about you'll get a letter, or I didn't even know who David Schwartz was. I didn't even know that the letter was coming.
Q. In your letter dated August 9th, 2004,
which is Defense Exhibit $A$, you mention in there that there are snitches around, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And you told Glenford to be careful about snitches?
A. Correct.

MS. PANDUKHT: Judge, I'm going to object to him quoting a letter. It hasn't been admitted.

MR. BROOKS: Okay, judge. I'll ask that the letter be admitted.

MS. PANDUKHT: And the only foundational objection I had so far is, I don't think we've established the date of when that letter was postmarked. I think that's the only foundational thing we were lacking.

BY MR. BROOKS:
Q. Okay. What is the postmark on the letter if you can tell?
A. August 10th, 2004.

MR. BROOKS: Okay. I will move to admit the letter as Defense Exhibit A.

MS. PANDUKHT: with that $I$ have no objection.

THE COURT: Defense Exhibit A?
MR. BROOKS: Correct, your Honor. And A
includes the envelope and two pages.
THE COURT: Two pages, letter and envelope. BY MR. BROOKS:
Q. So, basically in this letter to Glenford in August of 2004, before you met with the detective, you were already well-aware of the whole snitch business, correct?
A. Yeah.
Q. And you warned him to be careful about snitches?
A. Does it say that in here? Can I check that out?
Q. Sure. Go through it. You can find it.
A. Yes, I did, right here.
Q. It's kind of interesting, isn't it, that in the letter that's 49C, the rap song, there is also warning about snitches, isn't there?
A. Yes.
Q. But you didn't write the rap song warning about snitches, correct?
A. Correct.

MR. BROOKS: Court's indulgence. THE COURT: Of course.

BY MR. BROOKS:
Q. We talked about the fact that they open your mail at CCDC. Do you know why they do that?
A. Yeah, pretty much.
Q. Why is that?
A. I have an idea, like I guess they don't want people sending stuff to the facility that's, that you're not allowed to have.
Q. And that fact is commonly known throughout the jail, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. And also in August of 2000 -well, so you got probation on your original case, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And then you were revoked off probation?
A. Yes.
Q. And so in August of 2004 you are awaiting results of whether you're going to get revoked off probation?
A. I was already revoked. I was already sentenced and revoked.
Q. You were revoked when, in early August, 2004?
A. July 28th.
Q. July 28 th?
A. Yeah.
Q. Okay. So, once you actually turned this information over to the detective the only thing you can look forward to in terms of getting released is really the parole board?
A. Yeah.
Q. And you'll be going up before the parole board again this next year sometime?
A. Yes.
Q. When will you be going before the parole board?
A. Like about March, about March, '06. MR. BROOKS: Okay. Well, thank you, sir, and good luck at the parole board. Pass the witness.

THE COURT: Ms. Pandukht?
MS. PANDUKHT: I have no redirect.
THE COURT: The witness may be excused?
MS. PANDUKHT: Yes.
THE COURT: Who's next?
MS. PANDUKHT: State calls Detective James Vaccaro.

THE BAILIFF: Detective Vaccaro, if you would remain standing, please, raise your right
hand, and face the clerk.
THE WITNESS: Sure.

## JAMES CHARLES VACCARO,

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

THE WITNESS: My name is James Charles Vaccaro, V-a-c-c-a-r-o.

THE CLERK: Thank you.

## DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MS. PANDUKHT:
Q. How are you employed?
A. I'm employed with the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department.
Q. How long have you been with the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department in total?
A. In total, a little bit more than 28 years.
Q. Are you currently assigned to a particular unit or division?
A. Yes. I'm a homicide detective.
Q. How long have you been a homicide detective?
A. For 12 years, more than 12 years.
Q. And before that were you a detective in a different unit?
A. Yes.
Q. Which one?
A. I was an undercover narcotics detective for 10 years before that.
Q. So, in total how long have you actually been a detective with the police department here in Las Vegas?
A. Well, the 10 and the 12 , plus $I$ was actually considered a detective as of four years SWAT officer, too. So, pretty much the whole time I've been here I've been a detective except for some patrol time.
Q. Now, were you on duty or on call on May 26 th or May 27 th, 2003 around the hour of midnight?
A. Yes.
Q. Could you tell the jury what it means to
be on call? How does that work?
A. We refer to it as being up. It's your turn. The next homicide that occurs in the valley is the team that's up. We have 24 detectives, and they are set up in two-man teams. And my partner and I happen to have our up on that particular holiday weekend. And, and the next thing, when you're up, you have to wait for the next homicide to occur or officer-involved shooting or whatever it may be that requires homicide investigators to go there. And on that particular occasion that was our responsibility on that night.
Q. And by holiday weekend, you're referring to the Memorial Day weekend?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, who was your partner at the time?
A. He still is. His name is Martin Wildemann, $W-i-l-d-e-m-a-n-n$.
Q. Now, did you get a call on that evening around the hour of midnight between May 26 th, May 27th, 2003?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. Were you notified at that time that there was a shooting at the Saratoga Palms II East apartment complex?
A. Yes.
Q. And is that located at 2865 East Charleston in Clark County, Nevada?
A. I think it's 2895.
Q. Yeah. Did I get the address wrong?
A. I think that's right.
Q. Okay. Thank you for correcting me. That is in Clark County, Nevada?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, about how long did it take you to get there, do you remember?
A. Well, I live out in Green Valley. So, by the time I shake out the sleep when you get called at night and throw on some clothes and get in your police car, you log on and drive to the location, could have taken me 30 to 45 minutes to get there.
Q. Now, when you got there, were there already other police personnel already there?
A. Oh, yes, right from the moment that the initial call for police response, in this particular case it was almost immediate, because we know that there were police officers on the property at the time of the incident. So, yes, the scene is immediately protected by those officers awaiting our arrival.
Q. Now, could you describe what you mean by protected? What actually had you seen around the apartment and apartment complex?
A. Well, as police officers, we're all trained to protect the crime scene. And so when I arrive at a crime scene as homicide detective, I expect to find that it is taped out with that yellow crime scene tape that we all see and, and hopefully it's been protected in, in a way that no one can get in or out of that scene to alter anything that may be of evidence to us in our investigation.

So, in this case the front entrance was protected by police officers, and that would be the entrance on the, Charleston. I believe only police vehicles were allowed to go in, and people leaving by vehicle were being screened by officers that were on the property and, of course, very tight around the building in question we had yellow tape. And we create sort of a buffer for investigators to arrive inside of a buffer. But still the media is outside of that buffer. So, the media might have been out on Charleston. But we were allowed to get inside the parking area, but no one can go up the stairs to that apartment
once we've determined that there has been a homicide there except for those that are responsible for that investigation.
Q. And the scene was already secured in that fashion as soon as you arrived?
A. When I arrived, it was well-secured, yes.
Q. Now, was there an actual detective that was assigned as the lead detective?
A. That would be me.
Q. That was you? Could you tell the jury what it means to be assigned as the lead detective? What special responsibilities do you have?
A. My partner and I share duties. One, in one instance I will be responsible for the investigation of the crime scene and work with the crime scene analysts, and his duties on those occasions would be to interview witnesses that have information about the case. And we flip every, every other time. However, there, in this case I believe there were probably upwards of six homicide detectives that were called. That includes supervisors and other detectives that were asked to help us out. All total there were probably upwards of 30 police personnel in that
complex right at the time that this happened.
Q. Now, is one of the responsibilities that you have is to get information from other police officers and other detectives?
A. That's the nature of the whole game. I mean, you're constantly getting information from other people, because we're walking into the middle of a movie, and we learn from those people that are there what they saw, what they learned, what they can tell us so that we can begin our investigation.
Q. And in this case you received information from other patrol officers, witnesses, and detectives about what had already occurred before you got there?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you also get all of the reports, witness statements, analysis of evidence that is requested, results of those analysis?
A. Yes. That would be a combination of these two books right here. Just about everything you wanted to know about this case is sitting right here on the desk.
Q. Those two big binders sitting there on the witness stand are all for this case?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, every time something happens, a piece of paper is generated on this case, it goes to you to put in that binder?
A. Yes. I mean, there is an exception. Occasionally there is some correspondence between different organizations, district attorney's office and such that I may not have in here but, yes, anything that's investigative is in these two books right here.
Q. Generally that's how it's supposed to work?
A. Right.
Q. Now, when you arrived at the crime scene, in this case at apartment 2068, could you describe who was actually present inside the apartment and what was being done?
A. Actually when I arrived, we were briefed outside the apartment in the parking lot so that we have an understanding of what we're up against. In this particular case we knew that the apartment and the immediate area around that apartment was probably mostly what we were going to be concerned with. It wasn't like the whole complex. So, it was building nine in the second floor apartment
two -- 2068. We would later learn that there was an impact site from a bullet on another building neighboring, but that was as far away as we really got with regard to our homicide investigation.

Once we were briefed by the detectives and the officers that are at the scene, myself, supervisors from the homicide section would go with crime scene investigators and proceed slowly up the stairs to the apartment so that we could begin to assess what we had. And this is basically a walk-through to have an understanding of what we're up against. There is no evidence being collected at this point. We're looking. We're documenting. We're being careful where we're walking, and we're trying to document and get in your mindset where we're going to go with this investigation.
Q. And there was a crime scene analyst that were already there upon your arrival?
A. Yes.
Q. What about medical? Had medical already come and gone by the time you got there?
A. Yes. As you might imagine, with my 30 -minute to 45 -minute response time, had they, had they been needed, they would have already have
arrived, done their medical evacuation, and have left. So, in this particular case that did occur. And I learned that, as my responsibility for the scene is to find out who was there, who was in my scene, because I need to know who was there.
Q. So, you were advised, then, that Derrick Jones had actually been removed from the scene?
A. Yes. What I learned was that we had two deceased and one that was very critical, and he had been transported.
Q. Now, I would like to show you some photographs. And I'm going to show defense counsel exactly which ones I'm going to show him. I'm going to show you what has been marked as State's. Proposed Exhibit 6 through -let's see here -- through 31 and then 43 through 46. And what I would like you to do is just flip through these and let me know if you recognize these photos.
A. Yes, I do.
Q. Now, we're going to go through all of these one by one, but as a group the numbers that I've already mentioned, do these photographs fairly and accurately depict, first let me say six through 31, do they fairly and accurately depict
the scene at apartment 2068 on May 27th, 2003?
A. Yes, they do.
Q. And then with regard to 43 through 44 , do they accurately depict the defendant shortly afterward?
A. Yes, they do.

MS. PANDUKHT: I'm going to move to admit all of these now, and then we'll move to publish for the jury and go through them one by one.

MR. BROOKS: No objection.
THE COURT: They will be admitted. Would you repeat the number of those exhibits again for the record, please?

MS. PANDUKHT: Yes. Well, six through 31. However, 18, 21, and 24, I believe, have already been admitted. And that's the first group I'm going to go through, and then the other ones are 43 through 46.

THE COURT: Very well.
BY MS. PANDUKHT:
Q. Okay. All ready to go. Okay. So, I want, like I'm going to put each one at a time up on the board, and I would like you to describe them for the jury. And then as soon as, and you can see it on your screen.
A. Okay.

THE COURT: Or at least you should.
We're getting used to the technology.
Mr. Bailiff, are we sure that this is turned on in terms of connection?

MR. KANE: That picture was on my monitor.

MR. O'BRIEN: Mine as well. When you first hit the switch, it appeared on mine.

THE COURT: At the top.
MR. O'BRIEN: Yeah.
THE COURT: Far be it from me, Ms. Recorder, but do we need to ask permission again? I mean, does that go to gallery monitors by any chance?

THE COURT RECORDER: It's a projector.
THE COURT: Well, in fact, we can probably take our afternoon recess and come back while we work on our technology. You know, all kidding aside, this is very, very new and very advanced technology. So, it's not easy to make it work. And sometimes there is a reason it's not working, and it's not the operator's fault. But let's take about a 10 -minute break.

Ladies and gentlemen, I must remind you
that during the recess it remains your duty not to discuss this case among yourselves or with anyone else. 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.

About 10 minutes, please.
(Recess taken.)
THE COURT: Welcome back. Let the record reflect the presence of all parties.

And will you stipulate to each of, the presence of the jury?

MS. PANDUKHT: Yes on behalf of the State.

MR. BROOKS: Defense will, your Honor.
THE COURT: And I see that we have either our technology resolved or the expert here to help us.

MS. PANDUKHT: Yes.
THE COURT: You may proceed.
BY MS. PANDUKHT:
Q. Thank you. I am showing you first what has been marked as or admitted as State's Exhibit

No. 6. Obviously, could you tell the jury what this is?
A. The sign out in front of the apartment complex.
Q. This is State's Exhibit No. 7. Could you describe this for the jury?
A. That's just a long range shot of the typical building that's in the complex there, and that's the building in question. And it's just a far away shot of, they're multi-unit, two-story buildings.
Q. So, this is building nine?
A. Building nine.
Q. Where would apartment 2068 be?
A. You know, I've seen this shot before. If this is the west face of building nine, then that building in question or the apartment in question is going to be top right.

THE COURT: And if you touch the screen, it should mark it for you.

THE WITNESS: Okay. You know, if this is here, if this is it, then I would say that, if that's the building, but I'm sure there is a better photograph than that one.

BY MS. PANDUKHT:
Q. Okay. Now, this is State's Exhibit No. 8. Could you tell the jury what we're looking at in this photograph?
A. Yeah. It's just another pullback shot. When these crime scene analysts come, they take overall photographs of the area, and we direct them to take many shots. We even, in some occasions, take aerial shots. In this particular case we had them take overall shots of the complex itself, and so I can't see or differentiate the exact building, but I know we have some close-ups of the building.
Q. And now State's Exhibit No. 9, would you tell us what this photograph shows?
A. Okay. So, clearly now we've come into the apartment in question. Right here would be the numbers 2068. This is building nine, and this is the apartment that we spent hours in investigating this homicide.
Q. And number 10 is just a close-up of the apartment number?
A. Yes.
Q. How about number 11?
A. Eleven is one of those pullback shots.

Here's our apartment up here. This is the staircase leading down, and we have a patrol officer here at the bottom of the stairs, and there is some people milling about outside here. These are all people involved with our investigation, though, police vehicles and possibly a vehicle from the mortuary or coroner's office there.
Q. And State's Exhibit No. 12, what does this show?
A. This is the staircase going up to apartment 2068. And we took this as a pullback shot, because there was some evidence that we located on these stairs as we're getting our investigation. So, up and to the right is the 2068.
Q. Now, what kind of evidence were you talking about?
A. Blood evidence.
Q. And where did you locate it on the stairs?
A. I think here below the stairs on the landing is a drop of blood. I think on the third or fourth step up in this area it was another drop of blood. And I think there was another further
up here once you make the turn. And so I made note of that. I have it, either the crime scene analyst have it listed, the exact stair and such, but we noticed that we had blood droplets coming either up or down. So, that became part of our investigation.
Q. Did you ask crime scene to do anything with regard to those blood droplets?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. What did you ask them to do?
A. As I said, my responsibility is the scene and to work with the crime scene investigators. I instructed them to use their techniques to take a sample of those blood drops so that I could use those to examine them at a later time to determine whose blood that was. I wanted to know who it was that came down those stairs that was bleeding, and that would go into, further into my investigation. So, I'm thinking about everything when I'm there. And I have blood outside of the apartment. I want to know whose that is.
Q. Did you then have that sent out for analysis?
A. Yes.
Q. That, those blood droplets were analyzed
by someone employed at the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department?
A. Yes.
Q. Who was that?
A. You know, I could look at the file. I'm not sure if it was David welch in this case or not, but he's one of our DNA criminalists.

Do you want me to make sure who I'm talking about here?
Q. Well, you know, did you receive a report from that person?
A. Sure, I did. And I got a definitive report back that the blood on the stairs was that of one of the victims, that victim that I talked about that was medically evacuated, that Derrick Jones. So, that made sense to me, because it was on the stairs. And I know the ambulance people took him down those stairs.
Q. So, the blood droplets, all of the blood droplets that you had found on the stairs and on the base of the stairs were attributed as belonging to Derrick Jones?
A. Yes.
Q. And not to any other person?
A. No.
Q. Now, in State's Exhibit No. 13, could you tell the jury where this is in the apartment?
A. Yes, I can. You are standing at the threshold looking into the apartment, as you can see, the, the door here to the left. And you're looking into the apartment, and to the left this way is a master bedroom, and this is a living room area here. The kitchen area would be back here deep into the apartment. And if you were to walk in and go around the back of this couch and head in that direction, you would travel to the south to two other bedrooms and a bathroom that's back in that area.
Q. Could you describe what is in State's Exhibit No. 14?
A. Yes. This is a photograph taken from sort of back by the hallway looking north. Again here's the front door of the apartment. And this would be the doorway to the master bedroom of the apartment, and to the right this way would be that kitchen area. So, we've kind of turned and backed up and took that picture.
Q. And State's Exhibit No. 15?
A. Okay. We're, the door, the entry door is behind you now if you're the photographer. And
this is in this area the hallway towards those two south bedrooms, and they had the couches sort of L shaped here in the living room area, little coffee table here. So, this is the living room.
Q. Now, in State's Exhibit No. 16, what is this a close-up of?
A. Well, actually there should be a closer shot of that, but this little item right in here is a cartridge case. And that was of interest to us because of what had happened inside the apartment. So, that became an item of evidence for us.
Q. And that piece of furniture that it's on --
A. That would be the couch that's on the south wall in the living room.
Q. In State's Exhibit No. 17?
A. Okay. This is a photograph looking towards the north. This is the master bedroom door again, and I can see here on the floor the body of Dajon Jones. I can see him. He's right behind the door. I remember that from being there. And there is a little closet here, too.
Q. Now, can you tell the jury about what is in State's Exhibit No. 18?
A. Okay. Well, we've just walked into that bedroom that I just described. Here's that little closet that I talked about. So, now once you enter the bedroom, the master bedroom, here is the master bath here and, and this is Dajon Jones, where I first saw him when I was doing my investigation.
Q. And 19?
A. It's another photograph of Dajon there.
Q. How about in 20?
A. Okay. We are standing in the southeast bedroom looking to the west. And if you could imagine, this is the hallway that takes you to the living room that way. Okay. If you went this way, you would go into the southwest bedroom, and this debris in the hallway here is kind of obstructing the location where Derrick Jones was found by officers when they entered the apartment. He was on the floor there. The door to this room was closed at the time that, that he was shot at that location.
Q. In State's Exhibit No. 21, is this a close-up of that same area?
A. Yes, same thing, a couple feet forward.
Q. Was anything found in that same
photograph in relation to the objects in that hallway?
A. Well, there was, there's a lot right in this whole area right here that we could get into, probably five cartridge cases, bullet impact sites, bullet impact sites in this pack of toilet paper. That's there where the bullets actually passed through the toilet paper. There are cartridge cases on the top of this storage unit. There are impact sites in the carpet inside of this room after the bullets had passed through the door of this closed bedroom door. Oops! That was bad. This closed bedroom door here. And so this was a very busy area for us. We spent a lot of time there with the crime scene investigators.
Q. And I have another close-up actually from another angle in number 22 . Could you describe this photograph?
A. Yes. We've just walked past all that into that southwest bedroom. We're now looking back. This would be that hallway we talked about going toward the living room. And this is the location where Derrick Jones was before he was evacuated by the paramedics that came upstairs.
Q. And again this door here, right here?
A. Yes. This door, if you could imagine, it was closed. And we know that because of the bullet impacts that were on the door and the recovery of the bullets in the carpet here inside the bedroom, and everything just sort of lines up with, just when we were there at the scene, we used some rods and made sure they lined up. That's how we were able to find the bullets in the carpet.
Q. And this was the door to which bedroom again?
A. To the southwest bedroom.
Q. Okay. Now, could you describe what is depicted in State's Exhibit No. 23?
A. Sure. As you come up the stairs to apartment 2068, as you're arriving on the landing here there is a little patio, balcony, if you will, and a storage room right there. And here is the body of a man that I came to know as Jason Moore. Jason Moore is lying right here, and obviously he's still there in the photograph, because he wasn't alive at the time. Otherwise, he would have been evacuated as well.
Q. How about in State's Exhibit No. 24?
A. It's a close-up of the same, you see some
things out here on the patio. We would later find items of evidence there in the form of cartridge cases and bullets.
Q. Let me show you a close-up, number 25.
A. Yeah. Here is Jason Moore, a bucket with a radio on top of it. There is a kid's scooter right here, some kind of plastic scooter and a pretty good-sized blood pool that's formed here over to the doorway to the closet.
Q. A further close-up in number 26 ?
A. This is an important photograph for us because of the observation of that nine-millimeter cartridge case. And it would give us an indication about the location of the shooter at the time that that shot is fired.
Q. How about in number 27? Is this also on the patio?
A. Yes, it is. You could see here in the bottom left corner some of that blood that I talked about. So, we're still on the same patio deck. Here's a little bit of the socked foot of Jason. These are just some chairs that were on the patio. And we found some other items of evidence in and amongst the things that were on the patio there.
Q. Now, in State's Exhibit No. 28, tell me if I'm holding this the right way.
A. I think that needs a 180 flip. One more. Okay. Here is the leg of one of those green chairs, and this is just a kid's scooter knocked over. But what's of interest to us is that right there, that's another cartridge case in nine-millimeter.
Q. How about in State's Exhibit No. 29? Do I have that the right way?
A. Yeah. That's good. And there is the cartridge case a little bit closer, a little bit clearer.
Q. Now, what are we looking at in number 30 ?
A. Okay. I directed this photograph because of that hole. In my experience, that is caused by a bullet passing through a window. And that is the exterior of the master bedroom. It's a west-facing window, and it's clearly a bullet hole. And we would later find an impact site on building six at about the same level, second floor level, but it hit the stucco. And that would be the building across from nine, and it would be the east face of building six.
Q. Now, in number 31, is this a close-up
shot?
A. Yes. We can tell that, since the blinds were on the inside here, we're inside the room. And we see that the bullet has perforated or gone through that one blind right there and gone through the double pane window.
Q. Now, is there anything else about the crime scene that wasn't shown in any of those photographs that was important?
A. Yes. It's hard to just describe the scene in just a handful of photographs. There was an impact site on one of the two couches. You'll recall one couch was sort of free-standing in the middle of the room, and it created sort of a hallway. We found an impact site there. It's directionality, in my opinion, was to the south. We also had another impact site on the wall. This would be where a bullet struck the wall just before you enter the hallway where Derrick Jones was found, and we were able to dig that out of the wall and recover it. And I didn.'t see that in one of the photographs. These are big scenes, and we have to spend a lot of time in there trying to find everything.
Q. Now, approximately how much time did you
spend at the scene that day?
A. Because it's my responsibility to work the crime scene, we're going to go as slow as we can and move our way methodically through that apartment. And I know that by the time I arrived, let's say, it's one, 1:00 o'clock in the morning. We were there for sunup and well beyond. So, we were in there for hours and hours. We may have Ereed that place up to Ms. Jones at some point later on that morning. I don't recall, without looking at the actual police log, when we started to clear out of there.
Q. And after you did finally complete your investigation of the scene you did release the residence back to Ms. Jones?
A. Yes.
Q. And that was Cheryl Jones?
A. Cheryl Jones.
Q. Now, did you later learn that something had been found by one of the family members at that apartment?
A. Yes.
Q. What did you learn? Could you tell the jury about that?
A. Yes. Sometimes when we have these
apartments and we're spending so many hours in there and there is someone that wants to get back into that apartment to try to get their life back, so we try to do our best job that we can do when we're in there and leave and give it back to them. In this case we returned it to Cheryl, as I said. And as they were, I think were moving out of the apartment in the clothing in the master bedroom a bullet was found by one of the family members. I'm not sure who it was, but I know that it eventually became an item of evidence, and it was analyzed and analyzed by our firearms examiner, and it was, no doubt, from our shooting situation.
Q. Did you come to learn that that bullet that was found by the family member was then given to a district attorney investigator and then given over to the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department?
A. Yes. That's the progression. The family member gave it to an investigator named Reg Weaver. Reg Weaver gave it to my partner, Marty Wildemann. And Marty put it into the evidence vault so it can be retrieved by the firearms examiner and be examined with the other ballistics in the case.
Q. Now, one of the things that you and your partner had to do during the course of your investigation is attempt to locate the suspect?
A. Yes.
Q. How did you go about doing that? Did you talk to people to try and get information about where he might be and who he was?
A. Yes, we did.
Q. Would you tell the jury about that?
A. So, here we are at this crime scene, and we're beginning to learn information that the suspect is a man that goes by the name of AI. That's all we know. Maybe his first name is Anthony. We learn that that's really nothing more than a nickname or a street name for him. We come to find out that it's in reference to a professional basketball player named Allen Iverson. In fact, his actual name is Glenford Budd. And we learned that while we're there still on the premises.

We at some point after sunup contact members of our criminal apprehension team, which are other detectives that often help us locate suspects in our cases, and based on the fact that we learned about Glenford Budd, we also learned
that he resided in building 12 of the very same apartment complex, and he lived there with his uncle. So, other detectives went to that location and made some contact there with that man. Based on that information we had these criminal apprehension team members try to locate Mr. Budd, and it was approximately 48 hours or so later, maybe a little bit more than that, that he did get taken into custody. I know that's a big leap for you, but there was a lot of investigation in that two- to three-day period and a lot we learned about his movements during that time period.
Q. Did you find out where he was actually moving to, from what residence to what residence? Did you get information about that?
A. I know of, of several things that I'm -MR. BROOKS: I'm going to object now, your Honor. I think we're in the realm of hearsay.

THE COURT: Whether or not he learned about other things?

MR. BROOKS: If you can testify as to the truth of the matter, yes, I think it is hearsay.

MS. PANDUKHT: It goes to how he was able
to locate the suspect.
MR. BROOKS: That's irrelevant at this point.

THE COURT: So long as the foundation is as it presently is, I'm going to have to sustain the objection unless you can back up a little bit and properly found it with respect to the investigation.

BY MS. PANDUKHT:
Q. You already testified that you had received information from other detectives and CAT team officers?
A. Yes.
Q. And you were still at this point trying to locate the defendant?
A. Yes.
Q. You had stated that he was ultimately found at a certain location?
A. Yes.
Q. What location was that?

MR. BROOKS: Objection, irrelevant.
MS. PANDUKHT: How is it irrelevant?
MR. BROOKS: It's absolutely irrelevant. Who cares where he was arrested. It's totally irrelevant to this case where he was arrested
unless it goes to an issue of guilt or innocence. The circumstances of arrest are not admissable unless they can be shown to be admissable by some other way. And in this case it's totally irrelevant.

THE COURT: And, counsel, would you approach for a second?
(Conference at the bench.)
BY MS. PANDUKHT:
Q. Detective Vaccaro, did you have an opportunity to contact the suspect after he had been located?
A. Yes.
Q. Where did you contact him?
A. At the Clark County Detention Center.
Q. Now, previously you have identified photographs, specifically 43 through 46 . These photographs are of the person that was located?
A. Yes, they are.
Q. And that person you contacted at the Clark County Detention Center?
A. Yes.
Q. In State's Exhibit No. -- well, first of all, let me ask you this: Is he present in court today?
A. Sure, he is. He's seated next to Mr. Brooks with a white shirt on. And that's Glenford Budd.

MS. PANDUKHT: May the record reflect the identification of the defendant?

THE COURT: It will so reflect. BY MS. PANDUKHT:
Q. Is this a photograph of the defendant in number 43?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. And that was taken on what date?
A. The date of his arrest, and can I refer to that?
Q. If that would refresh your recollection?
A. That whole Memorial Day weekend was kind of confusing date-wise, but I can tell you immediately. I caused that photograph to be taken by a crime scene analyst that met us at the jail by the name of Tom Kerns. Not so immediately. Sorry. 5/29/03 at 1640 hours was the arrest time. So, within 20 minutes or so $I$ was at the jail meeting with Mr. Budd --
Q. Okay.
A. -- on the 29 th of '03, probably around 1700, 5:00 0'clock in the afternoon.
Q. Now, State's Exhibit No. 44 shows what part of the defendant?
A. Right side profile.
Q. Why were you taking these photographs?
A. A couple of reasons, you know. It's been my experience to take what I call 360s. I'll take front, side, back, side, and I want to look at this man to see if he has any marks or injuries on him as well. I think it's my responsibility to document his appearance at the time of his arrest, and it was in a close enough proximity of time from the incident that I wanted to see if he had had any injuries on him.
Q. Did the defendant have any injuries on him?
A. No, none that I noted.
Q. Did you note anything about his hair?
A. Well, it was nothing as it was described early in the investigation. We were told that he had braids or, or long hair that was in braids, and so here we have him with very short hair.
Q. And I'm just going to show you number, I'll skip to number 46.
A. Back shot.
Q. That's the back?
A. Back.
Q. Did you advise the defendant of his constitutional or Miranda rights?
A. Yes.
Q. What are Miranda rights?
A. Well, these are rights that are provided to an individual if he's in a custodial situation and certainly if he's in the Clark County Detention Center. I knew that it was my responsibility to advise him of that before I asked him any questions. So, I told him that he had the right to remain silent and that if he gave up the right to remain silent and told me anything, that those things could be used against him in a court of law. I told him that he had the right to an attorney and that if he couldn't afford an attorney, one would be provided to him for free. And I asked him if he understood his rights, and he told me that he did understand.
Q. Did you recite those rights to the defendant exactly how you did today to the jury?
A. Yes. I've done it several times, you might imagine, over the years, and I have it down pretty good. When I have a card with me, I take advantage of reading it directly from the card,
but I know that those are the words that I said to Mr. Budd inside the jail.
Q. Did he indicate whether he understood those rights?
A. Yes, he did.
Q. How did he indicate that he understood them?
A. He communicated with me and said, yes, I understand.
Q. Did he agree to waive those rights and agree to speak with you?
A. It was not in the terminology or the verbiage that you said, but he, I told him that I was interested in talking with him to clear up what happened in the apartment. And he made some statements to me.
Q. And you were the person that he actually spoke with?
A. Yes. I was in the room. Detective Wildemann was in the room. And I think that that was before a crime scene investigator, Tom Kerns, showed up. So, it would have been the three of us in the room. It was a small room where physical lineups are conducted at the jail.
Q. And what did the defendant tell you?
A. Well, I have some handwritten notes that I attached to the back of the arrest report. Can I refer to those so that I could be accurate?
Q. If it would refresh your recollection?
A. Okay.
Q. Please review them and let me know when you're done.
A. Okay. I remember well now.
Q. What did the defendant tell you?
A. He told me that he was present in the apartment with Dajon Jones, Derrick Jones, and also with Jason Moore and that he had gone to the apartment to inquire about who had stolen his marijuana. He said that while he was in the apartment he heard a gunshot, and he ran from the apartment. And I asked him basically, how could it be that those three individuals were hurt and killed, eventually killed -- I'm sorry -- and that he's the only one that ran away. And he said, well, I heard the shot and ran away. And that was all he really wanted to tell me.
Q. And then did he say how much marijuana?
A. Yes, he did. He said that it was a half a pound of marijuana that he had stolen from him.
Q. And did he say who else left the
apartment?
A. No. I don't think so. He, I don't think he volunteered that to me at that point, no, unless I'm not seeing it here in my handwritten notes.
Q. Could you refer to page five of your arrest report? It would be the second page of your handwritten notes toward the top.
A. Oh, okay. I'm sorry. I will read it. He said when he heard the gunshot, he ran out of the apartment down the stairs. He said Lazon Jones also ran from the apartment.
Q. Okay. And then did he say anything about whether he saw Jason Moore and where?
A. Yes. He indicated in the very next sentence that he looked up the stairs back towards the apartment door, and he saw Jason Moore sitting on a bucket on the landing in front of the door.
Q. Okay. Thank you. And then at some point after, in 2004, okay. On or about August 13th, 2004 were you contacted by an individual named Greg Lewis?
A. Yes, I was.
Q. How did that come about?
A. He called the homicide office, and I
answered the phone, said homicide. And he identified himself.
Q. And did he contact you on that same day, August 13th, 2004?
A. Yes. He contacted, he contacted me on the 13th, and I contacted him the same day a little bit later, physically face to face.
Q. Did you actually interview him on that day?
A. Yes.
Q. Where did you interview him?
A. He was in the Clark County Detention Center, and I caused him to be removed from his room basically and brought to a private room where I could talk to him.
Q. Where was Greg Lewis being housed in relation to the defendant?
A. I don't think they were in the same room, but I think they were in the same pod, as they're called. These are sort of like an airport docking station if you will. There is a lot of little rooms off of a center room, and people can gather together in that pod, but they each have their own room. And I don't think they were in the same room, but I think they met in the pod.
Q. Would that be on the same floor?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, when you went over to interview him, did you tape-record that conversation?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. Before you actually interviewed and spoke with Greg Lewis for the first time did you make him any promise in his exchange for his making a statement?
A. No, I did not.
Q. Did you tell him you would do anything for him in exchange for that information in terms of his own situation?
A. I simply told him, as it is in the taped statement, that I would talk to the prosecutor attorney that I knew was managing the case at the time.
Q. And did you later talk to a prosecutor attorney?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you remember about when that was?
A. I'm sure it was shortly after, because the case, as you can tell, is May 27 th of 103 , and here I have fresh information that I'm learning in August of the next year. So, I, I would have
wanted to get that information to, to that prosecutor right away.
Q. Let me ask you this: Were you contacted a second time by Greg Lewis shortly after August 13th, 2004?
A. Yes, I was.
Q. What was the purpose of that contact?
A. Mr. Lewis told me that he had received correspondence in the form of a letter and asked me if I wanted it. And he said that it was from Mr. Budd, and I told him, yes, I did want the letter. And I came to see him again at the Clark County Detention Center.
Q. I'm showing you what's been already admitted as State's Exhibit 49A, B, and C. Do you recognize this?
A. Yeah, because I put my J1480V initials on there and the date, 8/18/04. That's five days later than when $I$ did the taped interview.
Q. What's the significance of the date of 8/18/04?
A. That's the date that I received it from Greg.
Q. Did you receive that letter personally from Greg Lewis?
A. Yes. He handed it to me just like you did, and the contents.
Q. And those are the contents in there?
A. Yeah. I recall there's sort of a handwritten letter, a couple pages.
Q. And, for the record, that's State's Exhibit 49B?
A. Right.
Q. And then there is a half of page that is 49C, Exhibit 49C. And it's really written in some funny kind of lettering, but it was a part of the correspondence as well?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, were you aware that a deputy district attorney named David Schwartz had written a letter to the parole board on Greg Lewis's behalf?
A. I was.
Q. How did that come about, and was it before or after you received that letter?
A. Everything with David Schwartz was after the receipt of the letter. And I, and all I said to Mr. Schwartz was, hey, remember Greg Lewis, and do you remember the information that he gave us? And I don't remember by whose design it was that a
letter was written. It certainly wasn't mine.
But I didn't author the letter or design it, but I knew that there was a correspondence.

MS. PANDUKHT: Pass the witness.
THE COURT: Cross-examination,
Mr. Brooks?

## CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. BROOKS:
Q. Mr. Vaccaro, my name is Howard Brooks. I represent Mr. Budd.

Going back to the 26 th, May 26 th, the killing occurs sometime before midnight, correct?
A. I would --
Q. As far as you know?
A. I would say, because it's 0001, is the time of the police call. So, I would imagine it was busy before one minute after midnight.
Q. And you arrived at the crime scene within an hour after midnight?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Once you arrived you eventually interviewed Lazon Jones, correct?
A. It wasn't me. Actually it was another detective. Luzon was interviewed by Detectives

Mesnard and Wildemann.
Q. You did not interview Lazon Jones that night?
A. Not personally, no.
Q. Okay. After Lazon was interviewed, though, the focus of the investigation was on AI, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And you had that information in your hands that evening in the early morning hours?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And within 24 hours or 12 hours you basically knew AI is Glenford Budd?
A. Within how many? Did you say 24?
Q. Say, 12 hours?
A. Yes. That's a good estimation, sure.
Q. Okay. And you didn't catch, AI was not caught the 27 th?
A. No.
Q. Okay. The information was released to the media on the 27 th?
A. Gee, I'm not, you know, I don't know exactly when. I'm pretty sure that there was a statement made --
Q. I mean --
A. - the next morning.
Q. Correct.
A. I may have some press material here. I know that this particular one was mentioned on the 29th, Mr. Brooks, but I would --
Q. Let me stop you.
A. Go ahead.
Q. Do you know when the story was released to the public that you guys were looking for Glenford Budd?
A. I don't think it was ever released that we were looking for Glenford Budd. I think a description of a suspect was released at some point, but I really don't, you know, that's the lieutenant's position to do the press release. And I'm not aware of what exactly was said on the morning of --
Q. The information in your book, there is a news article the date of the 29 th, correct?
A. Actually it's printed on the 29 th , but I see it says May 28th, Wednesday, '03. And it's an article from the Review Journal, and it has a young man being interviewed by a reporter from the Review Journal.
Q. Does it mention Glenford Budd?
A. It does. Here it does say that police are seeking 20-year-old Glenford Anthony Budd, who was known as AI. So, that would be --
Q. Let me stop you. So, as of the morning of the 28th the Review Journal has a story that the police are seeking Glenford Budd?
A. Sometime on the 20 th , yes.
Q. So, obviously we can conclude that sometime before the early morning hours of the 28th the Review Journal knows that you guys are looking for Glenford Budd?
A. It's right there.
Q. That's a fair statement?
A. I'll go with you on that.
Q. Okay. And basically the information was out there in the public domain that you have three people killed, correct?
A. Yes. I think at that point Derrick had expired, yes.
Q. And you also have the information that it was over a drug deal or over some, some weed or marijuana?

## A. Yes.

Q. Okay. Now, in your investigation if you learned that someone was harboring Glenford Budd,
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LAS VEGAS, NEVADA, DECEMBER 12, 2005, 1:30 P.M.

THE COURT: In the matter of State versus Budd, there is a stipulation.

MR. BROOKS: Judge, Howard Brooks on behalf of Mr. Budd. I provided to Mr. Kane and Mr. Kane has reviewed and signed the following document, which I've also signed, in which I'll be asking to file in open court. The document states the following: Stipulation, the State and defense stipulate that:

Defense Exhibits B and C have been admitted into evidence. These exhibits are photographs taken at the Saratoga Palm Apartments, Las Vegas, Nevada. Exhibit $C$ shows the view from the balcony of Celeste Palau's apartment looking at apartment 2068 in building nine. Exhibit B shows the light fixture over the stairs outside apartment 2068.

The State and defense stipulate that Steven Yoshida, an investigator for the Clark County Public Defender Office, took these photographs. The distance between the bottom of the stairs outside Celeste Palau's apartment and the bottom of the stairs outside apartment 2068 in
building nine is 218 feet.
And the document is signed by myself and also signed by Mr. Kane. With the Court's permission, I would like to file both of these documents, this one document.

THE COURT: I have one question. And I'm not sure what paragraph it was, but you made a comment about the light at the top of the stairs.

MR. BROOKS: Yes, your Honor.
THE COURT: Will you read that again, because I want to be sure that we're talking about the one that $I$ envisioned as being the one that sometimes is shot out but wasn't apparently in that building. And it was, as I understood it, it was actually between the two apartments. Now, I'm sure that --

MR. BROOKS: Exhibit, the last sentence of the first paragraph says, Exhibit B shows the light fixture over the stairs outside apartment 2068.

THE COURT: Is it more accurate, and you can do this -- but do you enter -- by crossing it out, starting it over again. Would it be more accurate to suggest that it's a light between the two apartments? Isn't it actually --

MR. BROOKS: Both statements are accurate.

MS. PANDUKHT: Yeah, because the stairs are between.

THE COURT: I don't know how much of an issue this is going to be in the trial. I suspect we're going to hear at least argument about it. To me, that was how I envisioned it. And I think that the way it is presently worded suggests that it is closer to the apartment than I believe the picture depicts it as.

MR. BROOKS: How about if we rephrase it to be Exhibit $B$ shows the light fixture, I don't know what the apartment number is on the --

THE COURT: You can simply say between 2086 and the apartment immediately adjacent thereto, because all these buildings are the same way, staircase go up, and you got two apartments, right? You go up the staircase, you go to one apartment, another apartment, go up the staircase --

MR. BROOKS: How about if we leave the sentence, Exhibit $B$ shows the light fixture over the stairs outside apartment 2068, period. Then add a sentence that says the light fixture is
between apartment 2068 and the apartment adjacent thereto.

THE COURT: And I'm not trying to be weird about it. I'm just concerned, because to me the way it reads, it's suggesting that it's closer to one apartment than the other. And I think that they're, it's equally spaced.

MS. PANDUKHT: Adjacent thereto with the neighboring apartment.

THE COURT: And I think Mr. O'Brien may be thinking what I'm already thinking. Somewhere on this we might already know the other apartment number on --

MR. O'BRIEN: And I believe this is, I'm going to show it to Ms. Pandukht, because I believe the adjacent apartment would be 2067 .

THE COURT: Well, that would sure make sense, depending upon what the numbering scheme is.

MR. BROOKS: Why don't we go ahead, judge, and we'll just go off the record again, and at the close of the State's case, and I will get this retyped with that additional language.

THE COURT: That's fine.
MR. BROOKS: Okay.

THE COURT: We' ll wait to see whether or not we've got a full jury, and then we'll come back.
(Recess taken.)
THE COURT: Welcome back. Let the record reflect that we are again present in the matter of State versus Glenford Budd, 193182. All parties are present with counsel.

Will you stipulate, please, to the presence of the jury?

MS. PANDUKHT: Yes, on behalf of the State.

MR. BROOKS: Defense would, your Honor.
THE COURT: Very well. We have a witness already in the witness stand.

Sir, would you state your name and spell it, please, for the record.

THE WITNESS: Greg Lewis, G-r-e-g L-e-w-i-s.

THE COURT: And you need to stand and raise your right hand to take the oath.

## GREG LEWIS,

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.

## DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MS. PANDUKHT:
Q. Mr. Lewis, do you know an individual by the name of Glenford Budd?
A. Yes.
Q. Is he in the courtroom?

THE COURT: You have to keep your voice up. Everything is being recorded.

THE WITNESS: Yes. BY MS. PANDUKHT:
Q. Is he in the courtroom today?
A. Yes.
Q. Could you point him out and describe something he's wearing today?
A. White $T$-- white shirt, tie, bald head.

MS. PANDUKHT: May the record reflect identification of the defendant?

THE COURT: It will so reflect. BY MS. PANDUKHT:
Q. Did you know the defendant by any other
names?
A. Budd.
Q. Any other nicknames? Just Budd?
A. Yeah.
Q. Now, when you knew the defendant back in 2003, about sometime before May of 2003, what was his hair like?
A. Long, it was like in braids.
Q. And what did you say before it was in braids?
A. It was long.
Q. About how long was it?
A. Like this long.

THE COURT: This long indicating -THE WITNESS: Shoulder. THE COURT: -- about shoulder length. BY MS. PANDUKHT:
Q. And did you have an occasion to meet up with the defendant again after May 27th of 2003?
A. Yeah.
Q. Where did you meet up with the defendant?
A. In Clark County Detention Center.
Q. And how long had you known him before you saw him at the Clark County Detention Center?
A. About six months, a year.
Q. How did you know him?
A. From around the way in some apartments.
Q. What apartments?
A. The Palms East, the Palms, Saratoga.
Q. The Saratoga Palms East?
A. Yeah.
Q. And how did you know him there? Did either of you live there?
A. I didn't live there. I used to just be around.
Q. Did Mr. Budd live there?
A. From what I'm, I'm, I understand, from what I was understanding.
Q. Okay. And then when you went to the Clark County Detention Center, were you somewhere near to the defendant in terms of where you were housed?
A. Yeah, the same unit.
Q. Okay. And when you were, when you're on the same unit, you're on the same floor?
A. Yeah, the same floor, the same, it's the same area.
Q. Okay. Did you actually share a cell with him?
A. No.
Q. Now, the defendant, well, first let me ask you this: Do you have a prior felony conviction?
A. Yes.
Q. Is it for challenge to a fight with a weapon from 2004 in the State of Nevada?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, when you were with the defendant at the Clark County Detention Center, did he talk to you about anything that happened at the Saratoga Palms Apartments?
A. Briefly.
Q. Okay. How did that happen?
A. What do you mean? How did the conversation --
Q. Did he approach you or you approached him? How did it come about?
A. We was just talking. I didn't approach him. He didn't approach me. We was just already talking.
Q. Do you remember about when that was?
A. About October, 2003, November, between there.
Q. And what did the defendant say?
A. What had happened in the apartments, why
it happened, real brief, though.
Q. Do you remember exactly what he told you?
A. Some kids got killed about some weed that he thought they took from him, and it happened in the apartments, in the Saratoga.
Q. Did he say how they got killed?
A. He shot them.
Q. Did he say who shot them?
A. He did. He said he did.
Q. Did he say how many people he shot?
A. Three.
Q. All right. Did he say that it was more than three?
A. No.
Q. Did he say anything about a fourth person?
A. Yeah.
Q. What was that?
A. I guess the fourth person got away. That's what I was told.
Q. Okay. And I'm just asking you what he told you.
A. Yes.
Q. You said that he mentioned something about weed, right?
A. Yeah.
Q. What is weed?
A. Marijuana.
Q. Okay. And did he say how much weed?
A. I think it was a half a pound or something like that.
Q. Okay. Did the defendant say anything about why he thought they did it, took his weed?
A. I guess because they was smoking weed, and they had it. They usually didn't have it.
Q. Did he say anything about what he did with them before the shootings?
A. Hung out, played ball, smoked weed.
Q. Okay. Did he say anything about how he was trying to figure out --
A. That was how, I guess, he was trying to figure it out.
Q. Figure out what?
A. Who took it, by hanging out and playing basketball.
Q. Did he say anything about how old they were? Did he call them anything?
A. No.
Q. How did he refer to the three people that he shot?
A. It was just kids that was, that lived around the, in the apartments.
Q. Did he call them kids?
A. As I remember.
Q. Is that, did you say that's what you remember?
A. Yeah. That's what I remember.
Q. Okay. All right. And then did he say anything about himself smoking weed?
A. Yeah.
Q. Did he make any statements to you about whether or not he was high at the time of the shooting?
A. No. No. I don't think he was. I don't remember him saying he was high at the time of the shooting, but prior to it they was smoking weed.
Q. How did he look when you talked to him in terms of his hair?
A. At what point?
Q. In October or November of 2003?
A. He had shorter hair.
Q. How short was it?
A. It was like in a little Afro, I guess.
Q. Was it still in the braids?
A. In little braids now, different, a
different style of braids.
Q. Okay. And did he say anything about what he did after the shooting?
A. Cutting his hair off, he said he cut his hair off, and that was pretty much it.
Q. Did he say he went anywhere?
A. To some girl's house to hide out, I guess.
Q. Okay. And is there anything else that you remember him saying about what he was going to say to the police?
A. That he was there just like everybody else was, but he didn't shoot.
Q. Now, you were at the Clark County Detention Center, then, in October or November of 2003. At some point did you then have the occasion to talk to a detective?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you talk to Detective James Vaccaro?
A. Yes.
Q. Was that about August of 2004?
A. Yeah, if I recall correctly.
Q. So, do you remember whether it was sometime after you had talked to the defendant?
A. Yeah, it was.
Q. Could you explain why you waited to tell the detective?
A. Because $I$ figured if it, if that's what happened, it took some time on, on my brain, but I figured if that's what happened, then he, what's right needs to come out, and they need to know what happened.
Q. Now, when you talked to the detective, did the detective initiate contacting you, or did you call him?
A. No. I contacted him.
Q. And when you contacted him, how long did it take him to come out and talk to you?
A. About two days, three days. I don't know, about three days.
Q. Okay. And when the detective came out to talk to you, did he tape-record a statement with you?
A. Yeah.
Q. And that statement was then later typed out about what you said?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And you've seen a copy of that statement, also?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, before he actually talked to you about what happened, Detective Vaccaro, did he make any promises to you?
A. No.
Q. Did he say he would do anything for you in exchange for giving him a statement?
A. No.
Q. Now, you told him, Detective Vaccaro, you know, you made your statement, right?
A. Right.
Q. After that time, so after August of 2004 did you learn that a letter had been written on your behalf?
A. Could you repeat the question?
Q. Well, did you find out that there was a letter that someone had written to the parole board?
A. Did I find out before or after?
Q. After August of 2004?
A. Yes.
Q. How did that come up? How did that happen?
A. Well, because it was sent to me. The letter was sent to me, but I only had it for a couple days.

MS. PANDUKHT: May I approach the witness?

THE COURT: You may. BY MS. PANDUKHT:
Q. I'm showing you what we have marked as State's Proposed Exhibit No. 50. Do you recognize what this is?
A. Yes.
Q. Have you seen something like this before?
A. Yes.
Q. What is it?
A. It's the letter that was sent to me.
Q. Now, I see here it's not signed. The letter that you saw, did it have a signature on the bottom?
A. Yes.
Q. And who is the letter written by?
A. David Schwartz.
Q. Did you know who he was?
A. Kind of. I didn't know of him. I had heard of him about one time between, from Vaccaro.
Q. Did you know that he worked in the district attorney's office?
A. When Vaccaro told me when I talked to him beforehand.
Q. Now, you're familiar with the contents of this letter?
A. Yes.
Q. This is the letter that you had seen, you said, when you were --
A. Yeah.
Q. Were there, is there a date on the letter?
A. Yes.
Q. What is that date?
A. December 8th, 2004.
Q. Of 2004? And who is the letter written to?
A. Me. It was written to the parole board.
Q. And then what you got was just a copy?
A. Yeah.

MS. PANDUKHT: And is this letter, well, Ism going to move to admit the letter. I don't know if there is going to be an objection from the defense.

MR. BROOKS: No objection.
THE COURT: It will be admitted as either previously marked or next in order. BY MS. PANDUKHT:
Q. Okay. Now, in the letter does it, I'm
just going to have him read it into the record, make that simple.

Can you read that into the record for us?
A. The whole thing?
Q. Yeah. Would you mind?
A. December 8th, 2004, Nevada Board of Parole Commissioners, 2601 East Sahara, Las Vegas, Nevada. To whom it may concern, the purpose of this letter is to inform you that Greg Lewis has been extremely cooperative to both the Las Vegas Metro Police Department and the Office of the District Attorney's Office in solving a homicide case where three young men were murdered. Mr. Lewis has agreed to testify in the trial in this matter. His help in this matter has greatly assisted me in this prosecution. If you have any questions, please don't hesitate to call me at (702) 671-2830, David P. Schwartz.
Q. And you're currently serving a prison sentence right now, right?
A. Yes.
Q. You're doing 28 to 72 months?
A. Yes.
Q. You actually had gotten probation right before?
A. Yes.
Q. And then you were revoked?
A. Yeah.
Q. Your sentence wasn't lowered --
A. No.
Q. -- when you went to prison?
A. No. It's the same.
Q. And is that the only letter or assistance that you are aware of?
A. Yes. This is it.
Q. And that happened after you made the statement to Detective Vaccaro?
A. Yeah. I was already sentenced.
Q. Okay. Now, you spoke to Detective Vaccaro in August of 2004. Did you receive something in the mail from the defendant a few days later?
A. While $I$ was in the county jail?
Q. Yes.
A. Yes.
Q. What did you receive?
A. A letter.
Q. I'm going to trade you. I'm now showing you what has been marked as State's Proposed Exhibit 49A. Do you recognize this?
A. Yes.
Q. What do you recognize it as?
A. A letter I got when I was in the county jail.
Q. Who was the letter addressed to?
A. To me, Greg Lewis.
Q. And your name's on there?
A. Yeah.
Q. Does it say who it's from?
A. Yeah, Budd, 190089.
Q. Now, do you recognize the handwriting that's on the envelope?
A. Yes.
Q. Whose handwriting do you recognize it to be?
A. Budd's.
Q. Now, have you gotten letters from the defendant before?
A. Once. Once when I was already at home.
Q. Okay. How do you know that it's his handwriting?
A. Because of the letter I got before.
Q. Okay. Now, the postmark on that letter, can you see that?
A. Yeah.
Q. When is it postmarked?
A. August 13th, 2004.
Q. You didn't get it on that same day, did you?
A. No. I got it like a day afterward.
Q. Okay. And then inside, I'm taking out the contents. And is this kind of how it looked when you opened it up?
A. Yeah.
Q. Now, the first thing I'm going to show you here from the inside of it is marked as State's Proposed Exhibit No. 49B. Do you recognize this in its two pages?
A. Yeah.
Q. What is it?
A. It's a letter.
Q. And who's the letter from?
A. Sud.
Q. Here it's, at the very top it says it's addressed to Mine, $M-u-n-e-e$ ?
A. Yeah.
Q. Who's Mane?
A. It's me, my nickname.
Q. That's a nickname that Rudd had for you?
A. Yeah. That's what everybody called me.
Q. And then at the end of the letter, on the second page of the letter is it signed by anyone?
A. Budd.
Q. Okay. And again in the contents of State's Proposed Exhibit 49B, do you recognize the handwriting?
A. Yes.
Q. And whose handwriting do you recognize it to be?
A. Budd's.
Q. Okay. Now, this piece of paper is State's Proposed Exhibit 49C. Okay? Could you take a look at this and tell me if you recognize, one, that it came inside the envelope?
A. Yeah.
Q. Okay. And then do you recognize the type of handwriting this is?
A. Yeah. I recognize the writing.
Q. It looks different than the handwriting in 49B. Do you know why?
A. It's harder to read for other people.
Q. Why is that?
A. Because when you writing in that style of writing, you make it for hard for other people to read. That's the purpose of it. You don't want
it to be deciphered.
Q. Have you, you know, ever written this kind of writing?
A. No. I write regular, cursive.
Q. Have you seen anyone writing this kind of writing?
A. Once.
Q. Who?
A. In jail we write, well, they write like that when you make raps and you don't want people reading your stuff.
Q. And who did you see write like this?
A. Budd.
Q. Did you actually see him writing out something similar to this kind of writing?
A. Yeah.
Q. What was he doing?
A. Writing a rap song.
Q. And were you there when he was doing that?
A. Yeah.
Q. And this kind of writing, you still recognize it as belonging to someone?
A. Yeah.
Q. As whose?
A. Budd.
Q. Now, this actual letter, this is exactly, this page is exactly how you found it in the envelope?
A. Yeah.
Q. And on the back there is some handwriting. Is that written the same style as on the front?
A. Yeah.

MS. PANDUKHT: I move to admit State's Proposed Exhibits 49A, B, and C.

MR. BROOKS: I have no objection, but can we clarify again what is the $C$ and $B$, please?

MS. PANDUKHT: $C$ is the page with the rap lyrics. $B$ is the handwritten letter.

MR. BROOKS: Is A the envelope?
MS. PANDUKHT: A is the envelope.
MR. BROOKS: Thank you. No objection.
THE COURT: They will be admitted as 49A, $B$, and $C$. BY MS. PANDUKHT:
Q. Now, this, this, put this back in here in this envelope. I see that it's been opened. Did you open the envelope?
A. No.
Q. How did you get this envelope?
A. It was, I got it like that, but I didn't open it. The COs opened it.
Q. And $C O$ is an abbreviation for what kind of person?
A. Correction officer.
Q. Okay. Now, when, when you got this letter from the $C O$, how did he hand it to you?
A. Just like that.
Q. Just like this from $C O$ to you?
A. Yeah.
Q. And then did you give this letter to somebody?
A. No.
Q. Did you give this letter to the detective?
A. Yeah.
Q. And when the detective came back to get this letter from you, did he interview you a second time?
A. No.
Q. He just came and got the letter?
A. Yeah.
Q. And you handed this letter directly to the detective?
A. Yeah.
Q. Okay. Now, have you seen what's been marked for identification as State's Proposed Exhibit 49D?
A. Yes.

MS. PANDUKHT: And do you know what I'm referring to now?

MR. BROOKS: Yes, I do. BY MS. PANDUKHT:
Q. Sorry. I'm all the way over here. All right.

Now, 49D, did I show you this --
A. Yes.
Q. - before?
A. Yes.
Q. Have you looked at this piece of paper and compared it to the piece of paper marked and admitted as 49C?
A. Yes.
Q. How does the 49D compare to 49C?
A. It's pretty much the same.
Q. Now, you didn't type out 49D. That was actually my co-counsel, Mr. Kane. But is it the same as --
A. Yeah.
Q. -- as 49C?
A. Pretty much. Pretty much.
Q. And that includes the entire front of this piece of paper but not the back?
A. Yeah.
Q. Okay. So, it's just the front?
A. Yeah, just the front.

MS. PANDUKHT: Okay. At this time I move to admit State's 49D for the purpose of assisting the jury in being able to understand the contents of 49 C .

MR. BROOKS: Judge, I'm going to object. He just testified it was pretty much the same. He did not testify it was precisely the same. It's a typewritten summary of what's in 49C. If it's not precisely the same, it shouldn't be admitted. If it's just pretty much and close, it's not, it doesn't work.

THE COURT: Sustained.
MS. PANDUKHT: I can lay some additional foundation.

THE COURT: I will give her an
opportunity to back up a bit. BY MS. PANDUKHT:
Q. And here I'm going to, all right. I'm
going to see if, can you hold that for me? All right. If there is something that's different between this letter in 49C and then 49D, could you let me know what it is?
A. This on the back, this, only thing that's different is the statement on the back.
Q. Okay. This statement on the back of 49C?
A. That's the only thing that was different. That's not on here.
Q. What about, the one thing that comes out at me is on 49D I see the parentheses, s-i-c, parentheses. Is that actually in this exhibit, which is 49C?
A. No, it's not.
Q. Okay. And that means again -MR. KANE: Judge, it's my translation. Judge, I inserted sic, meaning thus in the original there are two times when the word of is used in the document. I believed that what the writer meant to write was the word off. So, I put sic to indicate that's the way it was written in the original.

THE COURT: And, in other words, it also indicates that it is not an exact translation of what appears before, and/or it indicates there was
an error, at least grammatically, in the original.
MR. KANE: It is an exact transcription with grammatical error intact. The sic indicates that I think it's an error.

THE COURT: Understood. BY MS. PANDUKHT:
Q. So, with the exception of the two places that says, parentheses, s-i-c, end parentheses and what's written on the back of 49 C , are the contents of 49 C identical to the contents of 49D?
A. Yes.

MS. PANDUKHT: Renew my motion to admit.
MR. BROOKS: No objection.
THE COURT: It will be admitted as 49D. BY MS. PANDUKHT:
Q. Now, which would you prefer reading into the record? I'm going to ask that you read it into the record. Do you want to read it off 49 C or $D$ ?
A. This one.
Q. Okay.

THE COURT: Let the record reflect that the defendant -- strike that -- that the witness has chosen to read in the record the typewritten copy.

## BY MS. PANDUKHT:

Q. Could you read it into the record exactly as it's written there?
A. This is part one of my song. I'm gonna release it when they release me. Killer in Me off the Murda Music CD.

They call me Smalls, 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.

It got some curse words in here.
THE COURT: You can read them into the record.

THE WITNESS: Blew these niggas of the earth. That's the way it had to go. I only killed three, but I should have killed four. Left them dead on the floor, but just right before they was crying and pleading, screaming for Jesus. Ya'll can keep the weed, because you can't smoke it now, because your ass is in the ground. Cross me, I blow like a bomb, took three niggas from their moms. I'm a thrilla killa. Ask Saratoga Palms.

Sorry, so sorry. This is how I write so people can't read over my shoulder. This shit is
for your eyes only. Some niggers is snitches, CD coming fall '06.

MS. PANDUKHT: Thank you, Mr. Lewis. I'll pass the witness.

THE COURT: Cross?

## CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. BROOKS:
Q. Thank you, judge. May I call you Greg?
A. Yes.
Q. My name is Howard Brooks. I represent Glenford Budd. I just have a few questions to ask you to clarify a few things.

You did know Glenford prior to going to Clark County Detention Center, correct?
A. Yeah. I knew of him.
Q. So, ya'll were not friends before you were in jail?
A. No. We were cool. We weren't friends, associates if you want to call it that.
Q. I mean, you had hung out with him at the Saratoga Palms?
A. Yeah. I hung around him.
Q. Okay. You smoked marijuana with him, hadn't you?
A. Yeah.
Q. Okay. So, you guys were acquaintances. You had been around each other, right?
A. Right.
Q. And if you saw him, you would be able to say who he was? You would say his name?
A. Right.
Q. Okay. And there was no bad, ill will between the two of you, right?
A. No.
Q. So, basically you wind up getting arrested, and you're at CCDC, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And he winds up being at $\operatorname{CCDC}$-- this is the jail -- over this murder charge, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And you guys were on the same floor?
A. Yes.
Q. And during the course of being on the same floor you guys would talk?
A. Yes.
Q. And during the course of being on the same floor you guys would do rap music together and talk about rap music?
A. Yes.
Q. And the fact is, you both were involved with a group of people where ya'll would make up rap songs, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And Glenford would make up rap songs?
A. Yes.
Q. You would make up rap songs?
A. Yes.
Q. A guy named Wes would make up rap songs?
A. Yes.
Q. And other people would make up rap songs?
A. Yeah. It was about five of us.
Q. And you would trade them among each other and read each other's rap songs?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, the State has shown you -- and I hope I have this correct -- State's Exhibit 49A? A. Yes.
Q. Which is a letter from Glenford to you, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Forty-nine $A$ is the envelope. Forty-nine $B$ is the first part of the letter in Glenford's regular handwriting, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Forty-nine $C$ is the rap song, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. It's my understanding you're still at CCDC, the jail when you received this?
A. Yes.
Q. Is that right or wrong?
A. That's correct.
Q. And his address on there is, in fact, the jail?
A. Yes.
Q. So, he's in jail, and you're in jail?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. He sends this to you, and you receive it there in the jail?
A. Yes.
Q. When you receive it, this is already opened?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And you open it up, and when you open this, you read a letter in Glenford's handwriting, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And, in fact, the jury will get a chance to see this and take it back to the room. This is a letter written in pencil?
A. Yes.
Q. Correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And I guess you would call it white notebook paper that comes in a pad. Is that fair to say?
A. Yes, fair to say.
Q. They sell this at the jail, don't they?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And, in fact, it has little blue lines across it, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay.
A. Well, if you can bring it to me so I can identify it, I'm not sure if it had blue lines.
Q. Okay. Take a look at that. Look at the, is this 49B?
A. Yeah. It has blue lines.
Q. And 49C, which has the rap song, is also the same type of white, I'll call it notebook paper. Is that fair to say?
A. Yes. That's fair to say.
Q. And it also has the same blue lines?
A. Yeah. It has the same blue lines.
Q. Now, this 49 C with the rap song is not as
long as 49 B in terms of the size of the paper, is it?
A. No, it's not.
Q. It's shorter?
A. Yes.
Q. And something has been torn off the bottom, correct?
A. Correct, from what it looks like.
Q. Do you know anything about that?
A. No.
Q. So, it arrived to you already torn off?
A. Already torn off.
Q. And you have no idea what was on that part that was torn off?
A. No.
Q. Both of those are in pencil; is that correct?
A. Yes, from what I'm seeing.
Q. Okay. Now, you and Glenford were friends. He wrote you a letter. You also had written him letters, hadn't you?
A. Yes.
Q. In fact, I'm going to approach now with what's been marked as Defense Exhibit A. And this is a letter, well, you tell me. What is that?
A. That's a letter I wrote him.
Q. Okay. Where are you when you wrote him that letter?
A. In Clark County Detention Center.
Q. Okay. It has here, by the way, an envelope and two full pages, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And the envelope has on there your name with the address for Clark County Detention Center?
A. Yeah.
Q. And it also, that is going to Glenford Anthony Budd, also in the Clark County Detention Center?
A. Yeah.
Q. Is that your handwriting?
A. Yes.
Q. In fact, this whole document has your handwriting, correct?
A. Could you turn through it?
Q. Certainly. You can handle it.
A. Okay. Yeah.
Q. That is, in fact, your letter?
A. Yes.
Q. That is your handwriting on the envelope
and the letter itself?
A. Yes.
Q. That's your handwriting on the back of the envelope?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, the paper that you're using to write to Glenford is precisely the same paper that was used in Glenford writing to you, isn't it?
A. Yes.
Q. It's the same paper with the, the white notebook paper with blue lines, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. It's the standard paper that you would get in the jail?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. So, you were using the same kind of paper when you wrote your communications that he is using in writing to you?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, in discussing Exhibit 49B and C, which is the letter Glenford wrote to you and the rap song, Ms. Pandukht, the prosecutor, has basically said the handwritings are two entirely different types of handwriting, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And it's your testimony that you recognize both of these as being Glenford's handwriting?
A. Two different, yes. It's just two different types.
Q. And the handwriting on $49 B$ is what we would call normal handwriting, correct?
A. This is 49B?
Q. Correct.
A. Yes.
Q. And 49C is sort of a highly stylized special handwriting that someone would use to write rap songs?
A. Yeah.
Q. And you say that you have seen Glenford write that way before?
A. Have I seen him write this paper right here?
Q. No. Have you seen him write like that before?
A. Yeah.
Q. In the highly stylized rap way?
A. Yeah.
Q. Okay. But you're saying you yourself have not written like this?
A. I don't know how to write like that. I wrote regular.
Q. So, you --
A. Cursive.
Q. So, you would agree, then, this is absolutely not your handwriting?
A. Yeah.
Q. That you're --
A. Would I agree that that's not my handwriting?
Q. Correct, 49C?
A. Correct.
Q. And you're saying here that you did not write this rap song?
A. Yes.
Q. And, in fact, you're, you're sure that nobody else wrote this rap song?
A. I'm sure I didn't write it.
Q. Okay. To your knowledge, has anyone ever asked you to contribute a handwriting analysis to examine with this thing?
A. No.
Q. Has anyone ever checked fingerprints, as far as you know, to see if your fingerprints or the fingerprints of Mr. Budd are on the rap song?
A. Not to my knowledge.
Q. I mean, you would admit your fingerprints could be on this, because you had possession of 49C?
A. Yes.
Q. When you were discussing with Ms. Pandukht the language in the rap song -- and we're referring now to both 49C and 49D -- you said that there were curse words in here, correct?
A. Yeah.
Q. Which curse words are you referring to?
A. As, just vulgar language that's, I guess, not appropriate for the courtroom.
Q. So, you're just referring to the word ass?
A. Niggas.
Q. So, were you kind of surprised at the language of niggers in this rap song?
A. No.
Q. Isn't that pretty common?
A. Yeah.
Q. I mean, the fact is, in your letter to Mr. Bud you talk about niggers?
A. Yeah.
Q. Okay. So, it's not that unusual?
A. It's just not for courtroom. I didn't want to read it out unless it was approved.
Q. And I appreciate your sensitivity on that point.

Now, you're currently in prison for 72 months, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. With parole eligibility after 28 months?
A. Yeah.
Q. You don't like being in prison?
A. No.
Q. You don't like being told when to go to bed and when to get up?
A. No.
Q. You don't like the food in prison?
A. Well, the food is all right.
Q. The food's okay? Okay. You don't like being deprived of freedom?
A. No.
Q. If you got out, you've got something to go back to, don't you?
A. As far as, what do you mean?
Q. Well, in your letter to Mr. Budd you talk about having a girlfriend, don't you?
A. Yeah.
Q. And you also talk about having two kids and one on the way?
A. Yeah.
Q. Did you have the third child?
A. Yeah.
Q. So, you have three children now?
A. Yeah.
Q. And you want to get out to help these kids?
A. Yeah.
Q. And you want to get out to be with this girlfriend?
A. Not really.
Q. Not really? Okay. But you obviously want to get out of prison as soon as you can?
A. Yeah.
Q. And the way to do that is to get parole, correct?
A. Yeah.
Q. Parole means they're going to release you, and you'll be on some kind of supervised release, and you can live with your family?
A. Correct.
Q. Now, Ms. Pandukht showed you State's Exhibit 50, which is a letter from David Schwartz
to the State Board of Parole Commissioners. I'm going to show it to you again.

What is the date of this letter?
A. December 8 th, 2004.
Q. Now, that letter is to the parole board. It's not to a sentencing court, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. So, it's not going to affect your actual sentence, is it?
A. No.
Q. It's just going to affect whether you get parole, correct?
A. Is that letter going to affect whether I get parole or not?
Q. Well, you hope it does, right?
A. Yeah.
Q. And you're hoping that by the DA writing to the parole board on your behalf, the parole board will give your application for parole consideration?
A. They're going to consider it regardless of that letter or not.
Q. But clearly it's going to help, isn't it?
A. It should, yes.
Q. It should help you? I mean, you would

