## IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA 1 2 JOSHUA C. SHUE, No. 67428 3 4 **Electronically Filed** Appellant, Jul 21 2015 08:50 a.m. 5 Tracie K. Lindeman v. Clerk of Supreme Court 6 THE STATE OF NEVADA, 7 8 Respondent. 9 APPELLANT'S APPENDIX VOLUME VIII PAGES 1349-1521 10 11 STEVE WOLFSON PHILIP J. KOHN Clark County Public Defender 309 South Third Street Las Vegas, Nevada 89155-2610 Clark County District Attorney 200 Lewis Avenue, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor Las Vegas, Nevada 89155 12 13 Attorney for Appellant ADAM LAXALT 14 Attorney General 100 North Carson Street Carson City, Nevada 89701-4717 (702) 687-3538 15 16 Counsel for Respondent 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28

## INDEX JOSHUA C. SHUE Case No. 67428

PAGE NO. Ex Parte Motion for Release of Medical Records filed 04/04/2014......241-242 Ex Parte Motion for Release of Medical Records filed 04/04/2014.......245-246 Motion for Individual Voir Dire of Jurors by Counsel to Protect Defendant's Right to a Fair Motion to Dismiss Indictment Because of Violation Based on Inadequate Notice filed 08/06/2014.......254-256 Motion to Reset Bail as Previously Set by Magistrate Judge or Grant a Bail Less than Notice of Hearing filed 04/17/2014......253 

1	Notice of Witnesses filed 09/03/2013
2	Notice of Witnesses filed 08/22/2014
3	Opposition to State's Motion in Limine filed 04/15/2014
4	Order Releasing Medical Records filed 04/04/2014
5	Order Releasing Medical Records filed 04/04/2014
6	Reply to State's Opposition to Defendant's Motion for Psychiatric Examination of Alleged Victim filed 10/23/2013
7	Reporter's Transcript of Preliminary Hearing heard 02/27/2013
8	Reporter's Transcript of Proceedings before the Grand Jury heard 03/12/2013 038-109
10	Return to Writ of Habeas Corpus filed 04/30/2013
11	Second Supplemental Notice of Witnesses filed 09/19/2013
12	State's Opposition to Defendant's Motion for Individual Voir Dire of Jurors by Counsel to Protect Defendant's Right to a Fair Trial filed 09/24/2013
13	State's Opposition to Defendant's Motion for Psychiatric Examination of Alleged Victim filed 10/07/2013
14	State's Opposition to Defendant's Motion to Dismiss Indictment filed 08/18/2014 275-281
l5 l6	State's Oppositon to Defendant's Motion to Reset Bail as Previously Set by Magistrate Judge or Grant a Bail Less than \$75,000.00 filed 03/20/2013
١7	State's Opposition to Defendant's Motion to Vacate Trial Date and Reset filed 04/03/2014 237-240
18	State's Response to Defendant's Motion for Discovery filed 12/11/2013
20	State's Sur-Reply to Defendant's Reply to State's Opposition to Defendant's Motion for Psychiatric Examination of Alleged Victim filed 11/06/2013
21	Supplemental Notice of Witnesses filed 09/12/2013
22	Verdict filed 08/29/2014
23	Writ of Habeas Corpus filed 04/17/2013
24	
25	
26	<u>TRANSCRIPTS</u>
27	Transcript of Proceedings,  Jury Trial—Day One  Data of Heart 08/25/2014
28	Date of Hrg: 08/25/2014

1	Transcript of Proceedings,  Jury Trial—Day Two
2 -	Date of Hrg: 08/26/2014
3	Transcript of Proceedings,  Jury Trial—Day Three
4	Date of Hrg: 08/27/2014
5	Transcript of Proceedings,
6	<b>Jury Trial—Day Four</b>   Date of Hrg: 08/28/2014
7	Transcript of Proceedings,
8	Jury Trial—Day Five   Date of Hrg: 08/29/2014
9	Recorder's Transcript of Proceedings,
10	Calendar Call   Date of Hrg: 08/21/2014
11	Recorder's Transcript of Proceedings,
12	Calendar Call; State's Motion in Limine Date of Hrg: 05/29/2014
13	Recorder's Transcript of Proceedings,
14	Defendant's Motion for Appointment of Attorney for Appeal Date of Hrg: 02/05/20151520-1521
15	Recorder's Transcript of Proceedings,
16	Defendant's Motion for Discovery Date of Hrg: 12/17/2013
17	Recorder's Transcript of Proceedings,
18	Defendant's Motion for Psychiatric Examination of Alleged Victim Date of Hrg: 10/08/2013
19	Recorder's Transcript of Proceedings,
20	Defendant's Motion to Dismiss Indictment Because of Violation Based on Inadequate Notice Date of Hrg: 08/19/2014
21	Recorder's Transcript of Proceedings,
22	Defendant's Motion to Vacate Trial Date and Reset Date of Hrg: 04/08/2014
23	Recorder's Transcript of Proceedings,
24	Evidentiary Hearing Date of Hrg: 05/19/2014
25	Recorder's Transcript of Proceedings,
26	Hearing; Defendant's Motion for Psychiatric Examination of Alleged Victim  Date of Hrg: 11/07/2013
20   27	Recorder's Transcript of Proceedings,
28	Sentencing Date of Hrg: 12/09/2014
۵۵	Date of firg. 12/09/2014 1494-1490

1 2	Recorder's Transcript of Proceedings, Sentencing Date of Hrg: 01/15/2015
3	Recorder's Transcript of Proceedings, Status Check: CPS Records Date of Hrg: 02/04/2014
5	Recorder's Transcript of Proceedings, Status Check: CPS Records
6	Date of Hrg: 02/20/2014
7	Transcript of Proceedings, Calendar Call; Defendant's Motion for Individual Voir Dire of Jurors by Counsel to Protect
8	Defendant's Right to a Fair Trial Date of Hrg: 10/03/2013
9 10	Transcript of Proceedings, Defendant's Motion in Limine
11	Date of Hrg: 09/26/2013
12	Transcript of Proceedings, Defendant's Motion to Reset Bail Date of Hrg: 04/25/2013
13	Transcript of Proceedings,
14 15	Defendant's Motion to Reset Bail as Previously Set by Magistrate Judge or Grante a Bail Less than \$75,000.00; Indictment Warrant Return Date of Hrg: 03/28/2013
16	Transcript of Proceedings,
17	Defendant's Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus Date of Hrg: 05/02/2013
18	Transcript of Proceedings, Overflow
19	Date of Hrg: 08/22/2014
20	
21	
22   23	
23   24	
25	
26	
27	
28	

CLERK OF THE COURT

TRAN

DISTRICT COURT CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

THE STATE OF NEVADA,

Plaintiff,

CASE NO. C288172-1 DEPT NO. XXI

VS.

JOSHUA C. SHUE,

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

Defendant.

BEFORE THE HONORABLE VALERIE ADAIR, DISTRICT COURT JUDGE

JURY TRIAL - DAY 5

FRIDAY, AUGUST 29, 2014

APPEARANCES:

For the State:

LEAH C. BEVERLY, ESQ.

MARIA LAVELL, ESQ. Chief Deputy District Attorneys

For the Defendant:

TERRENCE M. JACKSON, ESQ.

RECORDED BY: JANIE OLSEN, COURT RECORDER TRANSCRIBED BY: KARR Reporting, Inc.

## INDEX

## WITNESSES FOR THE DEFENSE:

JOSHUA SHUE (Continued)

Follow-Up Examination by Ms. Lavell	68	
Follow-Up Examination by Mr. Jackson	80	
Follow-Up Examination by Ms. Lavell	. 80	
Closing argument for the State by Ms. Beverly	93	
Closing argument for the Defense by Mr. Jackson		
Rebuttal argument for the State by Ms. Lavell		

LAS VEGAS, CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA, AUGUST 29, 2014, 9:02 A.M.

1

25

KARR Reporting, Inc.

beginning with Count 1 you have the 41 counts of the

KARR Reporting, Inc.

25

MR. JACKSON: -- either on appeal or anything else.

So I'll withdraw that.

THE COURT: Okay. The other one that I think should be withdrawn is, There is evidence that a principal witness for the State has received cash payments from the State, because there was no testimony about a witness fee or anything. Nobody asked it.

MR. JACKSON: All right. Well, there is no -- I'd like the record to reflect that I would've gone into that if the Court had allowed me. So I simply want that marked as a proposed instruction that I would've presented if the Court had allowed me -- and I'm just making a record on this -- to go into the fact that she was getting cash payments from the agency that was a -- at least a quasi-state agency, rental payments, and the Court ruled I couldn't get into that, and I accept the Court's ruling.

THE COURT: Okay. I would just --

MR. JACKSON: So --

THE COURT: I'm sorry. I would just say, in terms of the \$25 witness fee, you could've asked about that. Nobody chose to ask about that. So there's no --

MR. JACKSON: Oh, I was more concerned about the rent payments she was getting over a number of months.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. JACKSON: And it didn't come -- it came out at the evidentiary hearing she wasn't getting it from the DA's

office, but she was given it from a quasi-government agency, and I think that that may have biased her testimony. The Court ruled otherwise, and I prepared this — these instructions, you know, several months ago. If I had been allowed to get into that on cross-examination — and I think the Court restricted me on that, and I abided by the Court's restriction — I would have submitted that instruction. So I simply want it marked as an instruction I would've given if I had been allowed to get into that. I respected the Court's ruling and didn't ask questions about that.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Turning to then the remainder of your proposed instructions. Let's start with the first one, and the first one is -- okay. The first one is mere nudity, and that instruction apparently comes from a federal case -- what's -- and I apologize. I didn't pull this case. What circuit is this?

MR. JACKSON: I believe it's the Third Circuit. Let me pull the file. I've got a whole file on this. Let me pull my case law file. I apologize. I rushed over here. I had to walk over here because my legal assistant wasn't here. Let me see if I can find it. Maybe it's in my trial brief. Let me just go to my trial brief and see if it's there.

THE COURT: I mean, I'm okay -- first, I mean it's not the Ninth Circuit, but I would be okay giving a nudity instruction if we had something from Nevada law because I think

it's basically true that mere nudity isn't pornography, but --

MS. BEVERLY: Yes, but I object to this, Judge, because the statutes relating to this -- these particular charges give the definitions of what is considered pornography, and they say it's either sexual conduct, or it's a sexual portrayal. Sexual portrayal and sexual conduct are both defined by statute, and there's the case -- I cite to the case of State V Wilson, which I believe I provided in a packet this morning to Your Honor. If not, I have an extra copy of it.

And in State V Wilson, the charges were the exact same charges as were here, which is the use of minor in production and then possession of visual depictions depicting sexual conduct of a minor, and this is sort of a leading case on these issues, and the statutes are clear as to what the definition in Nevada is of pornography. So anything varying from that statutory definition the State objects to because it's not — it's not a federal case. Nevada law has already spoke on this issue.

THE COURT: Yes. I mean, truthfully, Mr. Jackson, if we had, you know, a definition of this from a Nevada case, I would be inclined to give it, but I'm not inclined to give something from a Federal Circuit decision.

MR. JACKSON: Well, you know, the problem is the Nevada law is vague. You know, what is -- what is -- and -- and if you look at that --

THE COURT: We know it when we see it.

MR. JACKSON: Yes. And, you know, I -- you know, there is pornography and then there is pornography. Now, you cannot under the First Amendment restrict certain things. That's the United States Constitution. You cannot tell someone something is pornography unless there is a definition of it, and if you look at the Nevada statute, it says things like if it's lewd or obscene or if it's -- has some kind of sexual content to it. A picture of someone standing naked in a shower, well --

THE COURT: Well, they have to prove that it was appealing to his prurient interest in sex. So that's an element that they have to prove, that he wasn't doing it for, you know, kicks. He wasn't doing it as a practical joke. I mean, let's just say theoretically, you know, some guy is in a locker room, maybe somebody hides a camera and films another guy and shows it at the bachelor party. Okay. Maybe you could argue then, well, that was just, you know, a practical joke or something like that. So they have to prove that it was for a sexual purpose, that it wasn't just artistic. It wasn't, you know, in good family fun.

So, you know, I would just say that, again, this definition, I think it's correct, but it comes from the Third Circuit, and I think we already have a definition here in Nevada.

MR. JACKSON: Well, again I think it goes to a 1 federal constitutional issue. You have to have a -- and a due 2 process issue because you have to have notice. 3 THE COURT: Well, it was quoting from Justice -- I 4 can never remember which Justice said --5 MR. JACKSON: Justice Potter. I know it when I see 6 7 it. THE COURT: Justice Potter. You know it when you see 8 9 it. MR. JACKSON: Well, if I can argue that, if I can 10 argue the jury has to look at this and determine whether it's 11 pornography under all reasonable statutes based on, you know, 12 what -- you know --13 THE COURT: Well, of course you can argue to the 14 15 jury --MR. JACKSON: They determine it's pornography. It's 16 based on the instruction given to them. This instruction 1.7 points -- it's not an unreasonable instruction. I proposed it. 18 It came out of a federal circuit. Is says, Does it really 19 focus on the genitalia? Is it posed? Are the pictures, like, 20 where, you know, the girl was posing. So she's trying to, you 21 know, show off her nudity. It doesn't -- does it --22 THE COURT: Well, she's not posing because --23 MR. JACKSON: Well, no, of course because these

KARR Reporting, Inc.

weren't -- these weren't production of pornography. If

24

2.5

anything, they may have been accidental pictures. They weren't designed, and that's my argument to the jury, and I think the jury should be instructed — there's five factors that does

Amiral [phonetic] case lays out. Maybe two of them favor the State, three of them favor me; or maybe two and a half favor me, two and a half favor the State. It's a balanced instruction. The State could argue it just as well.

And I don't object to the one the State's giving, which gives the Nevada statutory instruction, but Nevada statutory instruction is incomplete. This more focuses it. It gives the jury something to hang their hat on so they can try to figure out, you know, what does it mean. What is pornography?

MR. JACKSON: How do we evaluate these pictures?

MS. BEVERLY: And, Judge, we --

THE COURT: Well, you can always -- okay. First of all, you have a common sense instruction, as you know, and you can certainly, you know, argue to the jury, look, these are innocent. There's no sexual touching here. It's not focused on any particular part of the body. You can argue all those things. You don't need that instruction. I mean, you can appeal to their common sense and tell them, you know, they're not doing anything sexual, blah, blah, blah. It's not pornography, and --

MR. JACKSON: Okay.

MS. BEVERLY: And, Judge --

2.1

I mean, it is. You know -- and it's the collective judgment.

I mean, that's why we have a cross section of the community.

It's the collective judgment of the jurors if collectively the 12 of them think, well, this is done for a sexual purpose. If they don't think that, if they think, okay, these are innocent shower pictures, then that collective judgment, a cross section of our community, says it's not pornography. You need all 12 of them to say that in their judgment this is a sexual portrayal.

MS. BEVERLY: Right.

THE COURT: So I think that, you know, you're certainly free to argue all of these things, that it's not sexually suggestive.

MR. JACKSON: Well, you know --

MS. BEVERLY: And, Judge, if I can -- if I can, you know, first of all, when Nevada has spoken to this particular issue -- and in fact the statute says, Sexual portrayal, whether or not the subject is aware that they're -- they're in a performance. So whether they're posing or not is irrelevant because it's still under the statute considered pornography, even if the child is unaware that they are in a performance.

This particular instruction, we don't even know what federal statue the federal pornography statute is and if it's

different from Nevada's instruction. So that -- the law in Nevada has already spoken to this issue. It's already given us very clear definitions as to what is considered pornography, and he can make whatever objections -- I mean -- excuse me -- arguments that he wants to, and we'll make whatever arguments we need to make, but the law is extremely clear on this issue.

THE COURT: Okay. I'm not inclined to give it.

MR. JACKSON: All right.

1.3

THE COURT: But it's part of the record, and as I said, you certainly can argue these factors. You can appeal — I mean, basically, again, it's a judgment of them collectively as members of the community. Is this stuff pornographic or is it not? So you're free to argue that.

Lesser-included offense, the issue is whether or not capturing the private image of another is a lesser-included offense of use of a child in production.

MR. JACKSON: Well, we have facts here that show that if in fact the defendant captured the image of another without her consent -- and that's exactly what Hazel says. These images were taken without her consent. They were found on the defendant's computer. So let us assume that the jury believes that these images are not pornography. Let's make that assumption, but they believe that he took the image of Hazel without her consent. That is a crime, which is capturing the image of another without their consent. It is a gross

1 misdemeanor.

And the interesting thing about this case is

Detective Jaeger when he wrote his report, he wrote, Capturing
the image of another. That's what he originally wrote on the
report right there. Now, for them to say it's not a
lesser-included offense, it denies what our -- it simply
assumes that it is pornography, and he did produce it.

THE COURT: Well, if you look --

MR. JACKSON: Now --

MS. BEVERLY: I cite to --

MR. JACKSON: Well, let me finish. Let me finish my argument. There are substantial case law that even if a defendant denies any involvement or whatever he's still entitled to lesser-included offenses of the main charge, and this is clearly a lesser-included offense of the -- of the charge.

THE COURT: Well, I think what they're looking at is whether the elements -- you know, there are additional different elements --

MS. BEVERLY: Right, Judge, and I do --

THE COURT: -- because pornography, it doesn't involve consent.

MS. BEVERLY: Right.

MR. JACKSON: Well --

THE COURT: I mean, you can have pornography where

the -- where the victim is consenting and posing and doing all of those things. So this adds the elements of consent and takes away the element. So you're taking away an element, and you're adding an element, as opposed to having just taking away an element, which would be a lesser-included offense. This would be more like a lesser-related offense than a lesser-included offense because of the addition of the element of consent, which isn't an element.

1.3

1.8

I mean, they covered it in their questioning, but -well, actually they didn't even call -- I mean, here's your
other problem. They didn't even call Kurt as a witness, and I
think it did come out on cross.

MR. JACKSON: I called Kurt as a witness.

THE COURT: I know. I'm saying, but you're adding a new element, the element of consent, which isn't an element for pornography.

MS. BEVERLY: Right. And, Judge, I do cite to the case again, Wilson V -- State V Wilson -- excuse me -- which is again the leading case on this. In Wilson, which is 121 Nevada 345, they cite to the Blockbuster test, which we use in the State of Nevada. That test says, If the elements of one offense are entirely included in the elements of a second offense, the first offense is a lesser included. The test ultimately revolves -- excuse me -- itself on whether the provisions of each of the different statutes require the proof

of a fact that the other does not. 1 2 In Wilson -- and this is the second jury 3 instruction --4 THE COURT: I just said that. 5 MS. BEVERLY: Yes. 6 THE COURT: It's the additional element of consent, 7 which isn't an element for pornography. 8 MS. BEVERLY: Right. 9 MR. JACKSON: Well, I'd just like marked the police 10 officer's report, where in the beginning of the report in 11 writing what the crime was, he wrote, Capturing the image of 12 another. 13 MS. BEVERLY: And at that time he had -- the search 14 of the computer had not been done. 15 Well, but initially --MR. JACKSON: 16 THE COURT: I'm happy to have that --17 MR. JACKSON: -- so I believe it's a lesser-included 18 offense because --THE COURT: I don't -- it's a -- I don't think it's a 19 20 lesser related --21 MR. JACKSON: Well --22 THE COURT: -- a lesser included -- I misspoke --23 number one. Number two, since when are we governed by the 24 decision that's been made by a nonlawyer police officer in determining what the law is, and finally -- I may have said 25

this -- I don't -- you know, you can mark it as an exhibit. I don't have a problem with that in the police report and marking that as the court's exhibit. I'm fine with that if you'd like to make that part of the record.

I'm just saying we are not bound by what the

I'm just saying we are not bound by what the decision -- I mean, how often does a police officer charge kidnapping, and then the Court kicks it out or in screening they kick it out. Well, we don't say, Oh, well, it must be a kidnapping because the police officer thought it was a kidnapping. So it works both ways, but I'm happy to make that a court's exhibit, and Ms. Husted is going to mark it for us.

MR. JACKSON: I just want, you know, the first page of the voluntary statement that was prepared by Detective Jaeger.

MS. BEVERLY: Actually, we'll mark the whole one because we were supposed to be marking the whole -- defendant's whole statement anyway. So that's fine.

MR. JACKSON: Yes, that's fine.

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. BEVERLY: We can mark the whole thing.

THE COURT: That's fine. Okay. So that should be in there already --

MS. BEVERLY: No --

MR. JACKSON: I've only got the first 16 pages.

THE COURT: That should actually be in there already,

or if it's not, then we wanted that.

MR. JACKSON: All right. Well, if it's already in there, that's fine.

THE COURT: It's not, Ms. Husted said. So let's mark the statement. I wanted that as a court's exhibit anyway.

MR. JACKSON: All right.

THE COURT: All right. Let's move on to the next one, A person who knowingly and willingly and wilfully has in his possession, and this has the lesser charge of visual presentation depicting sexual conduct of a child.

MR. JACKSON: Well, if it's not — if he didn't produce the child pornography, if he isn't the one that produced it, you know, when they find it on his computer, he's just in possession of it. That's clearly a lesser, and so I think all the —

THE COURT: Yes, I think that's fine as a lesser.

MS. BEVERLY: Judge, however, Wilson V State has addressed this exact issue, and they say it's, quote, Possession of visual presentation depicting sexual conduct of a person under the age of 16, i.e., possession of pornography, was not a lesser-included offense of use of minor in producing pornography or a subject of sexual portrayal in a performance. This is from 2005, Wilson V State, 121 Nevada 345.

MR. JACKSON: Well, in this case the defendant has denied he produced it, and so we got evidence to --

THE COURT: Yes, I'm not sure how that cannot be a lesser included.

MR. JACKSON: He's at least got a right to his theory of the case.

THE COURT: I'm not -- I'm not familiar off the top of my head with the facts of the Wilson case.

MS. BEVERLY: If I can approach — if I can approach, Your Honor, but basically what it was in Wilson was there were five photographs of a child who the defendant had taken nude photos of, and so the State charged four counts of use of child in production and four counts of possession of child pornography. Now, the main issue in Wilson was whether one —

THE COURT: Subsumed the other?

MS. BEVERLY: Well, the main issue was whether if four photos are taken in one sitting, whether that's one count or four counts, and the Nevada Supreme Court said that's one count.

THE COURT: One count.

MS. BEVERLY: But they also -- the defendant also raised the issue of whether possession of child pornography was a lesser included of use of child in production, and the Nevada Supreme Court said, no, because the act of taking the photos is the production count. Then continuing to possess them after producing them is second. They also used a Blockbuster -- excuse me -- test again and talked about how the elements of

each charge are different, and in that case they held those two 1 2 charges are not lesser includeds. THE COURT: Here's where I'm --3 MR. JACKSON: Well, she's confusing the law. 4 THE COURT: Here's where I'm going with this though. 5 On this particular case, you know, the jury could think, Well, 6 we don't know who put the camera there, but they were found on 7 his computer. So I'm kind of inclined to give the possession charge and, you know -- as like --9 MR. JACKSON: The jury can believe him or not, but 10 I -- it's certainly our theory of the case. 11 MS. BEVERLY: I'm just saying what the Supreme Court 12 has said. 13 THE COURT: No, I know. I mean, I'm --14 MR. JACKSON: They can find both, he possessed it, 15 and he produced it --16. 17 MS. BEVERLY: Right. MR. JACKSON: -- but they can also find he didn't 18 produce it and just possessed it. So I have a right to the 19 lesser-included offense --20 MS. BEVERLY: I'm just saying what the Supreme 21 22 Court --MR. JACKSON: -- there is plenty of case law on 23 that --24

KARR Reporting, Inc.

25

MS. BEVERLY: -- what the Supreme Court has said.

MR. JACKSON: That isn't what the Supreme Court said.

MS. BEVERLY: They did.

22-

THE MARSHAL: Counsel, one at a time. Stop talking over each other, please.

THE COURT: Well, it does seem that -- what they're trying to do in this case is have him convicted of both charges. I mean, that's -- I mean, they do say it's not a lesser included. All right. Let me think about that one.

MS. BEVERLY: Okay. Thank you.

THE COURT: Because, like I said, I mean, a jury could reasonably think, Well, we don't know who put the camera there, but he did know they were on his computer. So --

MS. BEVERLY: And then we'll just lose those counts, you know, of the use -- of the production, but to say that it's a lesser included -- I mean, if they don't believe that he took the videos, then we lose all the use counts in general.

THE COURT: Right.

 $\,$  MS. BEVERLY: And so we also lose -- I mean, if he didn't make the videos, in theory we would also -- because the possession is based on him --

THE COURT: Well, like I said, they could think -- I mean, I don't know. They could think Hazel made the video, but he knew it was on his computer and saved it on his computer or something like that, I guess, because, you know, you have concrete proof it's on his computer and then inference that

he's the one that made it, theoretically.

2.5

MS. BEVERLY: So can we just come back to that one?

MR. JACKSON: That's exactly what the jury will do if they follow the defense theory of the case, and that's why we're entitled for that instruction.

THE COURT: Well, the defense theory of the case is he didn't --

MR. JACKSON: Just because they might lose the counts, that's -- that's exactly the reason we proposed the instruction.

THE COURT: Well, wait a minute, Mr. Jackson. The defense theory of the case is that Hazel masterminded this whole thing, and she saved them on his computer, and he didn't know they were on his computer, and he didn't know the camera was there, because she's jealous of his relationship with the mother. That seems to me to be the defense theory of the case.

MR. JACKSON: And our trial brief also points out that you can both deny it, and you can also ask for lesser-included offenses.

THE COURT: No, I know. I know you can have alternatives.

MR. JACKSON: And the Supreme Court of Nevada has made clear that in the cases I've cited. You have an absolute right to lesser-included offenses, which is what we're asking for, and this is clearly a lesser-included offense.

doesn't have to be sexually explicit?

б

1.3

2.5

MS. BEVERLY: Well, the entire instruction is wrong.

THE COURT: Well, it says, Sexually explicit conduct. It doesn't have to be. The child doesn't have to be doing something sexually explicit. That's not the definition of pornography. So, I mean, you're placing the onus on the child to do something basically, and that's not the statute. So I'm not going to give Proposed Instruction I.

The next one --

MR. JACKSON: All right. I'd just like it marked as defense --

THE COURT: Yes, these are all part of the record, Mr. Jackson.

Credibility of a witness, law enforcement officer.

MS. BEVERLY: I think to single out a witness separately when we already have a general instruction that credibility of a witness is to be determined, I mean, that's singling -- I mean, I could say the defendant should be -- you know, the credibility of the defendant should be judged. If we're going to single out every single witness, then I'd like an instruction on every single witness, and we already have a general instruction that we use for all witnesses, and in jury selection, we say police officers should be treated the same as any other witness.

MR. JACKSON: I didn't have the cite on this, but it

comes out of a manual for jury instructions from the Ninth Circuit. We don't have a similar manual in Nevada of jury instructions, but in this particular case, they had three police officers testify, and their credibility is an issue, and juries sometimes give greater weight to police officers than they should. This simply reminds them to treat them like anybody else; and for that reason we think this instruction is important. It's not singling out police officers or anything. It's a neutral unbiased instruction given by Courts.

I'm not saying that police officers are liars and totally unworthy of belief. The instruction is neutral, and it advises that — the jury that they should be given no greater or lesser weight than any other witness. Now, that's not an instruction that they should be afraid of if they are confident in their police officer's testimony.

 $$\operatorname{MS.}$$  BEVERLY: I mean, this is not the standard that we -- whether the jury should be afraid --

THE COURT: All right. Well --

MR. JACKSON: Well --

7.

MS. BEVERLY: -- it's whether --

THE COURT: All right. I don't know that we need to single out his -- the testimony of a police officer. We've already told them that.

Certainly, Mr. Jackson, without the instruction, you're free to argue, look, you were told in voir dire that you

KARR Reporting, Inc. 25

MR. JACKSON: I'm sorry. I thought --

24

2.5

1

2

3 4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Well, if we do it that way, then obviously we'd have to go through and change the verdict form --

MS. BEVERLY: Right.

THE COURT: -- as to all of those, and have guilty of abuse of a child and then guilty of possession.

MR. JACKSON: That's simpler than having it reversed on appeal because we didn't get a proper instruction.

MS. BEVERLY: Well, Judge, and then another thing about it --

I'm sorry.

-- just to make this clear, there is also the element of the age of 16 versus being a minor. In use of child in production, it's a minor. In possession, you have to be 16. So that's another element that is added to possession, and that's why Hazel is not charged in any of the possession counts.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. JACKSON: And that's exactly why we want that instruction because it will be very important to the defendant that the jury is so instructed because that will definitely impact the verdict on a number of the counts because she was 16 or over on many of the counts, and if they get that lesser-included offense, they may not be able to find him guilty on some of those counts, and  $\ensuremath{\mathbb{I}}$  may ask for a directed

verdict on some of those counts.

2.4

THE COURT: Well, honestly --

MS. BEVERLY: But that's why I kind of want to say -THE COURT: I mean, to me, this is an either-or case.

Either the jury believes that it's Mr. Shue who planted the camera and — to film Hazel and the brother, or they don't believe that. They believe that it was Hazel or some other family member that did it and put all those films on his computer, and he didn't know about it. So it's kind of an either—or to me. It's either one or the other.

MR. JACKSON: There is one other possibility. They could believe --

THE COURT: I guess they could think -- yes.

MR. JACKSON: -- he planted the camera, or he took some pictures but that they don't believe these particular pictures are pornography, and they could believe that he is guilty of some lesser offense, or they could believe that he -- that someone else took the pictures and put them on his computer, and then the question will be if he kept them in his possession knowingly. Then he is guilty of the lesser offense of having possession of these pictures if they think they are pornography, on his -- on his machine.

THE COURT: I just have a question, a factual question that I was curious about.

MS. BEVERLY: Sure.

24

25

KARR Reporting, Inc.

were all using the bathroom, why are only two people and the

THE COURT: I just thought that was curious. If they

25

KARR Reporting, Inc.

THE COURT: Okay. That's really where I was going --

1 MS. BEVERLY: -- and it's just. 2 THE COURT: -- not to speculate, but --3 MS. BEVERLY: Yes, I know. I've gone through all of 4 the videos. 5 THE COURT: -- he looked -- maybe he used another 6 bathroom, or -- okay. So --7 MS. BEVERLY: He could've used another bathroom. 8 THE COURT: -- I thought that was curious. 9 MS. BEVERLY: He could've been deleted. We don't 10 know. 11 But just to be clear though, when we're talking about 12 lesser included, it's -- we're talking about elements of a 13 crime and whether those elements are different under the 14 Blockbuster test. So I know Mr. Jackson wants to keep talking about the facts, but we are talking about -- the case law is 15 16 very clear under Wilson. That is an elements-based test, and 17 if the elements are different, then it is not a lesser 18 included. 19 THE COURT: Let me ask this. 20 Here's Mr. Shue. 21 Ms. Lavell, you said you only had a couple more 22 minutes? 23 MS. LAVELL: I'm going to --24 THE COURT: Pass? 25 MS. LAVELL: Pass.

MR. JACKSON: I've never heard that rule before, that 1 I can't talk to my client about the questions I'm going to ask 2 him. I don't understand that. 3 THE COURT: Well, typically when you're in the middle 4 of a witness, before you're finished with the witness, you 5 6 don't --7 MR. JACKSON: Can she cite me some --THE COURT: -- talk --8 MR. JACKSON: -- some case or some ethical standard. 9 I can't talk to my client about --10 THE COURT: Typically --11 MR. JACKSON: He's -- he's the defendant. He's not 12 13 another witness. THE COURT: I know. Typically with the State's 14 witnesses and other witnesses, civil witnesses, whatever, if 15 we're in the middle of the testimony, we tell them, don't talk 16 to anybody about your testimony because -- until you're 17 finished so that there can't be comments on, Well, you answered 18 it this way. Maybe you need to do this or that. 19 MS. LAVELL: Exactly. 20 THE COURT: That's the point of that. So I'm not 21 sure what the rule is or the, you know, ethical rule, I mean, 22

MS. LAVELL: I would say that the fact that it's the

KARR Reporting, Inc.

other than the general ethical rules, and I'm not going to

insult you by going over those with you.

23

24

I'm not sure where that comes from, frankly. I mean, it's just kind of a general rule because you don't want coaching to occur in the middle of the testimony according to what's already been answered. That's the point. I mean, it's kind of based I guess on common sense. I don't know where that rule comes from, but that's the point of it. So --

MS. LAVELL: Well, and the same thing as if he couldn't ask to take a break after my cross of his client to talk about what his next series of questions are going to be. It's just highly inappropriate. So — and he just indicated that he — he should be able to talk to his client about the questions he's going to ask. No, his client needs to be able to answer the questions on the stand as they're asked and not prepare for them.

MR. JACKSON: Well, my clients prepare for questioning all the time. I talk to them before we go into court. I say, you know, we're going to discuss these issues --

THE COURT: Well, obviously you prepare for --

MR. JACKSON: -- issues at A, B, C and D. That's -- that's what you -- that's what an attorney does. If I didn't do that, that would be ineffective assistance of counsel.

THE COURT: Obviously, the point that Ms. Lavell is

trying to make is that you talk to your client and prepare him, and you say these are probably going to be the questions on cross or whatever you do. The point is, she doesn't want you coaching him based on what's already been asked or to direct his answers in any way, which would be inappropriate anyway, and I know you wouldn't do that because it would be unethical for you to tell him what to answer.

MR. JACKSON: Well, I can ask him what his response would be if I asked him this, and if he says, this, I can decide not to ask him that question.

THE COURT: You can decide not to ask him, but you can't coach him, to say, No, no, say this.

MR. JACKSON: Right. No, I don't coach --

THE COURT: Of course not. I'm just --

MR. JACKSON: -- but if I ask him a question and then I decide, you know, I would rather not put you on the stand and ask that question, I certainly have a right to ask him how he would respond.

THE COURT: All right. I think we've set the parameters for what is ethically allowable. So --

MR. JACKSON: Because, you know, he might respond in some way that will damage his case. So I have a right to ask him if -- I will ask you this question, and what would your response be? And he says, ask --

THE COURT: If that's all -- of course, if that's all

you're going to do, then that's -- then that's fine.

 $$\operatorname{MR}.$$  JACKSON: Yes, and that's what attorneys do. Otherwise I'd be ineffective.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. JACKSON: Now, I don't tell him, Well, you better change your answer this way because the prosecution or the jury won't like it or whatever.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. JACKSON: No, I don't do that.

THE COURT: Obviously, that would be unethical for you to do that. You can't coach --

 $$\operatorname{MR}.$$  JACKSON: And for the prosecutor to insinuate I'd do that --

THE COURT: I don't think --

MR. JACKSON: -- I think it's --

THE COURT: -- she's insinuating that.

MR. JACKSON: Well --

THE COURT: What the prosecutor is suggesting is every other witness, you know, you just -- because we've had breaks and things like that -- to not kind of get a benefit for one side or the other, to maybe go over testimony that they didn't foresee or something like that because of the questioning on cross. That's the point of that --

MR. JACKSON: I want to put something else on the record right now.

THE COURT: -- so that was what Ms. Lavell's point
was. I don't think Ms. Lavell was trying to accuse you of any
kind of misconduct or anything like that.

Was that your point, Ms. Lavell?

MS. LAVELL: Yes, Your Honor. We don't get to take breaks and talk to our witnesses. It's just a flow, and because this stopped last night and we weren't able to finish, had this not stopped last night, he wouldn't have been afforded the opportunity to speak to his client before he recrossed — or redirected him. That's my issue.

THE COURT: Okay. We've dealt with that. Next.

MR. JACKSON: While we're on the record, I'm going to put something else on the record that greatly offends me. I've been informed that one of my witnesses was intimidated by one of the DA's officers to try to get them not to testify, and that disturbs me greatly. That's actually grounds for dismissal, and we can have a hearing on that.

MS. LAVELL: Who's the witness?

MS. BEVERLY: Who was the witness?

MR. JACKSON: The witness was Frances Carreon.

MS. LAVELL: We didn't even know about her.

MR. JACKSON: Well --

MS. BEVERLY: Because my investigator went back and talked to her because I didn't --

MR. JACKSON: Attempted to get her not to testify.

פ

2.4

MS. BEVERLY: The Judge allowed her to testify.

THE MARSHAL: Counsel, one at a time.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, here's the deal. We're not going to deal with this right now. You can make your record.

I'm going to go -- I want to read this case, okay.

MS. BEVERLY: Thank you.

THE COURT: And we're going to number the jury instructions, and then we're going to make a record because, you know, you can't -- we can't just leave the record with unsubstantiated allegations --

MR. JACKSON: All right.

MS. BEVERLY: Thank you.

THE COURT: -- which, you know, on postconviction or an appeal then, you know, five years from now somebody's going to want to know about, and hopefully I'll be retired by then.

And so, you know, here's the thing. Mr. Jackson, I want you to make your record of what happened, and the State can make their record, and they can bring their investigator in to make their record of what was said.

I would just point out my own recollection was that they weren't aware until Friday or whenever that Ms. Carreon was going to be a witness. They hadn't talked to her. I said she could still testify over the State's objection, and I think she was in the vestibule, and I said, Look, if she is willing to talk with the investigator, then the investigator can talk

to her, and they can get a little heads up, just like they would have had they had the witness notice 10 days ahead of time or whatever. If she doesn't want to talk to the investigator, she doesn't talk to the investigator. So I said that.

I did create the opportunity. They didn't have a lot of time. It was like 10 minutes --

MS. BEVERLY: Right.

THE COURT: -- because I wanted you to be able to call that witness, and you were able to call the witness.

MR. JACKSON: Yes, and that's not why I wasn't making a big deal about it, but when she's accusing me of ethical violations --

MS. BEVERLY: That is not true.

MR. JACKSON: No.

THE COURT: I don't think Ms. Lavell was accusing you of ethical violations.

MR. JACKSON: When she's telling me I can't talk to my client before I put him on the witness stand to, you know, ask him what the answers to certain questions will be, that's wrong.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, I think we're taking away from the time we could all be preparing for the next phase. So let's everybody go do what they're going to do, and I'll be back in like five or 10 minutes, and we'll number these.

Sherry will retype the ones we're going to give from the defense's packet --2 3 MS. BEVERLY: Thank you. THE COURT: -- so that they fit in nicely with the 4 State's font, and then we can get started, and then we'll make 5 a more thorough record of this alleged witness intimidation. 6 MS. LAVELL: And I would just ask on the record, if 7. we're going to have some sort of hearing, the State would 8 object to counsel speaking as to what the investigator 9 allegedly did, but he would need to get his witness back here 10 so she can be sworn in and actually state what the investigator 11 did, and we'll bring our investigator as well. 12 MR. JACKSON: I don't know if I can get ahold of her 13 while I'm in the middle of trial because I don't have my legal 14 assistant available now. It may take me -- but I'd much 15 rather -- if the Court orders it, I can take a recess from the 16 trial, but I'd much rather prepare a closing argument. 17 THE COURT: No. No. We're going to finish it. 18 We're going to finish the trial. 19 MS. BEVERLY: Thank you. 20 THE COURT: And then we'll deal with this other 21 22 issue. MS. BEVERLY: Thank you. 23 MS. LAVELL: Thank you, Your Honor.

1

24

25

KARR Reporting, Inc. 39

(Proceedings recessed 9:43 a.m. to 9:55 a.m.)

THE COURT: -- case. It does not appear that that is a lesser-included offense, according to the Supreme Court, of production. So I'm not going to give it as a lesser included.

As I said, I am going to give your negative instruction. You'll see right there in front of you, my JEA has retyped that so that the font matches the font --

MR. JACKSON: Thank you.

THE COURT: -- of the other instructions. Then we're going to insert that into our packet as we go through and number.

MR. JACKSON: All right. Thank you, Your Honor. And I just -- I'd just like it marked. Maybe I can change the Supreme Court's mind if I need to later.

THE COURT: I hope you don't -- well, I don't care.

MR. JACKSON: You hope I don't -- oh.

THE COURT: I mean, it makes sense to me, your argument, but I'm relying on, you know, the case law.

MR. JACKSON: You have to rely on the law as given.

Now, I have — I want to correct the record on one thing. I had information that I thought Frances Carreon was intimidated. I did speak to her just on the phone just now. She said that she felt somewhat pressured, but I don't believe she was intimidated after speaking to her. I misspoke. I had information from another witness that she felt Frances was intimidated by this witness. I misspoke, partially out of

I apologize to the district attorney or their staff. I don't believe that's an issue because — after speaking directly to Frances Carreon, which is what I wished to do. I wasn't even going to raise it because I — I don't want — I want this trial to go forward, but I wanted to find out exactly from Frances Carreon what was said. I spoke to her. It's not an issue.

THE COURT: All right. Let's go ahead and number the instructions. I'm keeping them in the order the State presented them to me, and we'll figure out where to insert the negative instruction --

MR. JACKSON: Can I -- hang on. Let me get my -- THE COURT: -- that Mr. Jackson offered.

MR. JACKSON: Okay. I'm ready, Your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. Instruction No. 1, It is now my duty as Judge.

2, If in these instructions.

The next one that should be 3 is, An indictment is but. So we'll make that -- so we'll make that 3.

Oh, you know what, this is missing the stock language of, You are to consider each charge separately and the evidence relating to it. There is a stock that goes at the end of the

indictment that's missing. Do you know what I mean? 1 MR. JACKSON: So maybe we'll make that No. 4? 2 THE COURT: Each charge should be considered 3 separately and the evidence pertaining to it --4 MS. BEVERLY: Okay. 5 THE COURT: -- or something like that goes at the end 6 of all of the indictment -- or the information, the charges. 7 Do you know what I'm talking about? 8 9 MR. JACKSON: Yes. MS. BEVERLY: Yes. 10 MS. LAVELL: Yes. 11 THE COURT: Okay. That's not here. 12 MS. BEVERLY: Okay. Can we just add that in? 13 THE COURT: We'll add that in, but I don't know what 14 it is off the top of my -- I don't have that memorized. 15 Can you have Sherry pull the instructions from the 16 last case, last criminal case that we did. 17 MS. BEVERLY: Thank you. 18 MS. LAVELL: But that will be 3. 19 THE COURT: All right. 4 should be, The evidence 20 which you are to consider in this case. 21 Then let's make 5, To constitute the crime charged. 22 MR. JACKSON: Wait. I'm --23 THE COURT: I pulled 5 out. It was in the position 24 of No. 3, and now it's 5 because it didn't make sense where it 25

1 was. MR. JACKSON: Okay. 5. Now, so where are we going 2 3 to put in the stock one, after --THE COURT: Well, it normally comes in right after 4 the --5 MR. JACKSON: So we can make it 4, right after 3? 6 THE COURT: No, it will be part of 3. I'm just going 7 to write it in, and then --8 MR. JACKSON: Oh, you're going to write it in as part 9 of 3. All right. 10 MS. BEVERLY: At the end of the indictment. 11 THE COURT: Yes. Because it always comes at the end 12 of the indictment, the language, but they missed it. 13 MR. JACKSON: All right. 14 THE COURT: So I'm just going to write it in, and 15 then we'll have Sherry type it while we're --16 MR. JACKSON: All right. That's fine. 17 THE COURT: Okay? 18 MS. BEVERLY: Okay. 19 THE COURT: So then 5 is, To constitute the crime 20 21 charged. MS. BEVERLY: Okay. 22 THE COURT: 6, a person who wilfully. 23 7 --24 MR. JACKSON: Wait. I'm --25

MS. BEVERLY: It's the child abuse instruction. 1 THE COURT: Now, we're getting to the instructions on 2 the elements and stuff. 3 MR. JACKSON: I see that -- the next one I see is, 4 The evidence which you are to consider. 5 MS. BEVERLY: That's No. 4. 6 I made that No. 4. THE COURT: 7 Do you want me to just number them and then give you 8 9 the packet? MR. JACKSON: That might make it easier for me 10 because I am -- I'm --11 THE COURT: All right. So I just put -- stay with me 12 in case I miss something. I don't want to be -- you know, I 13 don't want everybody depending on me in case I make a mistake. 14 Then it's on me. If we're all following and I make a mistake, 15 then it's on you guys. 16 MS. BEVERLY: Okay. 17 THE COURT: So 5 is going to be, To constitute the 18 crime charged. 19 6 is going to be, A person who wilfully causes a 20 child who is less than 18. 21 7 is, Abuse or neglect. 22 8, Sexual abuse includes. 23 9, Sexual exploitation includes. 24 10, Mental injury means. 25

	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
1	11, The word wilfully.
2	12, A person who.
3	13, Minor means.
4	14, Performance means.
5	15, Sexual portrayal means.
6	16, A person who.
7	MS. BEVERLY: I think I'm sorry. After I think
.8	after this one is where you should put in Mr. Jackson's
9	THE COURT: Well, I was going to do consent of a
10	minor.
11	MS. BEVERLY: Oh, okay.
12	THE COURT: And then, In order to be found guilty.
13	MS. BEVERLY: Okay.
14	THE COURT: So I was going to do 17 is, Consent of
15	a minor.
16	And then, Mr. Jackson, I'm going to make
17	MR. JACKSON: 17 is, Consent of a minor? I don't see
18	that one.
19	THE COURT: It's before, Any person who commits.
20	MR. JACKSON: 17, Consent of a minor. What about, A
21	person who wilfully or knowingly?
22	THE COURT: Well, that's next, but I was going to put
23	it
24	MR. JACKSON: Oh, you're going to make that 18?
25	THE COURT: Well, I was going to make 18 your

instruction, In order to be found guilty of possession of child pornography.

MR. JACKSON: Okay. So, In order to be found guilty will be 18?

THE COURT: Right.

And then 19, Any person who commits.

- 20, In your deliberation.
- 21, The credibility or believability.
- 22, The defendant is presumed innocent.

Okay. One thing we didn't talk about, and I just realized it, is when there was a mention of the right to counsel. I offered to give an instructions similar to -- I think it's the Fifth Amendment instruction, and we talked about that.

And, Mr. Jackson, you said maybe you wanted that. Do you want that or not?

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$$  JACKSON: I'm going to draft my own instruction on that as soon as we're done with the --

THE COURT: Wait a minute. We're numbering right now. So we need --

MR. JACKSON: All right. I want an instruction to the effect that a defendant can cut off questioning at any time, and the jury cannot draw an adverse inference from the fact that he cut off questioning.

THE COURT: Okay. Is Sherry pulling that last

packet? 1 2 THE CLERK: Yes. Well, she was on the phone --3 THE COURT: Okay. Tell her to pull it. Get off the 4 phone because --5 She is off the phone. THE CLERK: 6 THE COURT: All right. 7 MS. BEVERLY: Do you know where you're going to want 8 to put it so I can --9 THE COURT: Well, I was going to put that one in at, 10 like, after 22 because normally after the reasonable doubt 11 instruction I put in the Fifth Amendment instruction. 12 MS. BEVERLY: Okay. 13 THE COURT: So I'm just going to put that in and make 14 that 23. 15 MS. BEVERLY: Okay. 16 MR. JACKSON: 22 is reasonable doubt. 17 THE COURT: Sherry, can you pull the Fifth Amendment 18 instruction if it's not in this packet. I can't remember if it 19 is or not. 20 Oh, it is. Okay. Great. 21 We pulled a packet from another case. So --22 MS. BEVERLY: I'm sorry. I just want to also be 23 clear for the record that when Mr. Shue was testifying, 24 Mr. Jackson asked him, Didn't you invoke your right to an 25 attorney?

MR. JACKSON: That's fine.

Okay.

MR. JACKSON:

we could just ask them when they first come in. Mr. Jackson 1 can say I have no -- well, Ms. Lavell --2 MS. LAVELL: Well, I have to first --3 MS. BEVERLY: -- I have no further --4 MS. LAVELL: -- pass the witness. 5 THE COURT: No. No. 6 MS. BEVERLY: Then he can pass the witness then --7 THE MARSHAL: We are still missing one. 8 THE COURT: Hopefully we don't have any. 9 This has been the craziest trial. I've 10 MS. BEVERLY: never -- they've asked, like, over a hundred questions. 11 THE COURT: For most -- our record -- some trials we 12 have no questions. Our record was a wrongful death civil case. 13 Remember that, with Don Campbell? 14 THE CLERK: Yes. 15 THE COURT: And we had like 250 juror questions. 16 was the all-time record. I don't think it's the record for the 17 Eighth Judicial. It's our record though. 18 MS. BEVERLY: I think they're good questions. 19 THE COURT: Oh, yes. Jurors always have good 20 questions, but there were tons of questions in that case. 21 (Pause in the proceedings.) 22 (Jury entering 10:18 a.m.) 23 THE COURT: All right. Court is now back in session. 24 The record should reflect the presence of the State through the 25

deputy district attorneys, the presence of the defendant Mr. Shue with his counsel, the officers of the Court, and the ladies and gentlemen of the jury.

When we concluded yesterday, Ms. Lavell, you were cross-examining the defendant. Did you have any additional questions for the defendant?

MS. LAVELL: I do not, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

Mr. Jackson, did you have any redirect examination for the defendant?

MR. JACKSON: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Did we have any juror questions for the defendant?

All right. Mr. Shue, I need you to come back up to the witness stand, please, sir, and have a seat.

And I'll see counsel up here at the bench.

(Conference at the bench not recorded.)

THE COURT: All right. I have a number of juror questions up here, and I'm going to ask them in no particular order.

THE WITNESS: Okay.

THE COURT: All right. A juror wants to know, seeing the camera of yours in the bath time -- I'm sorry -- in the bathroom multiple times, wouldn't you remove it so that one of the kids couldn't knock it in the sink or ruin it while using

the sink?

THE WITNESS: We always removed it when we were done.

THE COURT: Okay. Your statement was that the camera was put away after each use. Why was it not put away each time you saw it in the restroom?

THE WITNESS: Sometimes Hazel would be using it, and I wouldn't know what she was using it for. So it really didn't matter.

THE COURT: In the restroom?

THE WITNESS: She -- anywhere, restroom, bathroom, she carried laptops and stuff in there, too. So I was used to seeing electronics in there.

THE COURT: Okay. Can everybody hear the witness?

(No response.)

THE COURT: Okay. Why was the camera issue of finding it in the restroom not addressed with the kids or Hazel if you didn't put it there?

THE WITNESS: Like I said, Hazel had a habit of bringing electronics in there on a regular basis. So it just became commonplace, and if you told her not to, she'd just ignore it anyway.

THE COURT: Okay. The pictures show you in just a towel. Did you not feel this was inappropriate to run around the house, you know, just in a towel?

THE WITNESS: The only time I was just in a towel was

2.5

going from the bathroom to the bedroom, which was right across the hall. The kids were supposed to have their own bathroom. So it shouldn't have been an issue, but occasionally it was.

THE COURT: Okay. How many times have you been drunk around the children while watching them?

THE WITNESS: It's pretty rare. I usually only drink maybe once a week, if that, and that's only if I've had a hard week at work.

THE COURT: Okay. Have you been drunk when alone with Hazel?

THE WITNESS: No, not with just Hazel. No.

THE COURT: Okay. Do you know how to hide files on a computer?

THE WITNESS: No.

THE COURT: Do you know how to use parental controls on a computer?

THE WITNESS: No.

THE COURT: Okay. Did your laptop get transported to and from the two locations, your home and the apartment, or did it mainly stay at the apartment?

THE WITNESS: No, it traveled wherever I was going to be staying for the few days. So if I was staying at Annie's house for a few days, it would stay there. If I was staying at my place for a few days, it would stay there. So it traveled constantly.

25

THE WITNESS: Those videos had to have been taken

from the videos of me and Annie because I wouldn't have left it in there any other time. So they must've been cut or taken from other videos that I had made.

THE COURT: Okay. What video editing software is on your computer?

THE WITNESS: The one that I mainly use came with -- I know we call it Photoshop, but it's not called Photoshop. It was like PC Movie Maker or something like that. It actually came with the computer. So -- and Hazel was the one that was trying -- she tried to teach me how to move it -- use it a little bit because we were going to make a -- like, a collage of the family for one of the events. So I know it was on there, but I don't remember exactly what it was called. It was something like Movie Maker or Movie Magic or something like that.

THE COURT: Okay. And it's the thing -- the software that comes with the computer when you buy it?

THE WITNESS: Yeah, it came with the computer. Yeah.

THE COURT: Okay. Why were the videos of Hazel and Kurt hidden on your laptop?

THE WITNESS: I don't know.

THE COURT: Do you know why the folders with the videos of Hazel and Kurt were named Yummm and Hmmm on your laptop?

THE WITNESS: I have no idea.

that.

 THE WITNESS: They were put in my profile, and they were told not to go there, and they were — you know, Hazel specifically, since she used my computer. I told her before. I said, There's naked pictures of me and your mommy. So unless you want to see that, don't go there, and I believed that that should've been enough. I don't think that was something that she would want to view.

THE COURT: Okay. The file you put in the video pictures of you and Anita, was it password protected?

THE WITNESS: No.

THE COURT: And why not?

THE WITNESS: I actually didn't really know how to do

THE COURT: Okay. In prior testimony, we heard that the files you had the videos on of Hmmm and Yummm were hidden on your computer, and the ordinary person would have trouble finding them. Do you -- do you know how Hazel would know how to find them or hide them?

THE WITNESS: Hazel is more familiar with computers than I am. I would guess she might be able to, or she could probably figure out how to, but I don't know for sure.

THE COURT: Okay. You said Hazel has problems you're uncomfortable dealing with. What were some of the issues that you and Hazel had, just in your relationship?

THE WITNESS: Just in our relationship specifically?

THE COURT: Right.

THE WITNESS: She was a -- pretty rebellious and disobedient. Mother didn't let me take too much of a hand in disciplining her, but when I did, she would just outright ignore it, like -- like, we'd catch her ditching from school quite often, and so we talked to her about it. We talked to the school about it, and then she'd just continue doing it, things of that nature. She just would intentionally do the opposite a lot of times of what she would told when it came to discipline issues.

THE COURT: Okay. When you -- when you videoed yourself and Anita in the bathroom, where was the video camera placed?

THE WITNESS: Usually right next to the sink.

THE COURT: Okay. You said -- was it just there in plain view on the sink, or did you like put a towel over it?

THE WITNESS: No, it was in plain view.

THE COURT: Okay. You said sometimes she would ask you -- you said sometimes Hazel would ask you to kiss her good night. Do you think this is appropriate for a young attractive woman? That's -- I guess a --

THE WITNESS: In hindsight, probably not. At the time, I thought, well, okay, that's being cute. I thought she was warming up to me as a parent figure, but looking back on it now, that was probably pretty stupid.

THE COURT: Do you agree that when someone is drinking they will do things that they normally would not do if they had not been drinking?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

THE COURT: Did Hazel send you a request to be her Facebook friend?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

THE COURT: When was the Burning Man festival that you talked about before?

THE WITNESS: It was the year prior to I met her. It goes on the same week of every year. It's actually going on right now. So it was the August of the year before, so like August -- the last week of August, first week of September in 2009.

THE COURT: Okay. And that was the festival you attended and had the pictures from?

THE WITNESS: Yes. Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. Were you jealous of Hazel's boyfriends?

THE WITNESS: No.

THE COURT: Why did you tell the detective you were attracted to Hazel? Did you feel pressured from the detective?

THE WITNESS: The detective made himself very intimidating, but ultimately, Hazel is an attractive woman. So I didn't feel that admitting that was inappropriate.

THE COURT: Okay. Did you let your roommates use your laptop?

1.1

2.2

THE WITNESS: It was in my room, and it was unlocked. They could have, but, you know -- and I wouldn't have complained if they had, but they had never asked or mentioned that they had used it.

THE COURT: Okay. When you were willing -- oh. When you were willing to have Detective Jaeger look at your laptop, you implied to the detective that you had some inappropriate files on it. Why didn't you delete them if you weren't the one who downloaded them to your laptop?

THE WITNESS: The inappropriate files I was talking about referred to Burning Man, and there was no reason to delete them because I wasn't even sure that they were illegal, but they may be viewed as inappropriate because the festival — the festival is a drunken hippie drug festival. So there's things on there that I wasn't sure it was legal to actually have on there, but there was no reason to erase them because they were just from a party I went to basically.

THE COURT: Okay. If you knew Hazel was sneaky, dishonest, good with editing videos and had snubbed you, why did you give her free reign to use your laptop?

THE WITNESS: Well, for the most part, she knew more about the laptop than I did, and even if I would try to put a password on it -- because the one we bought for Franzkie, he

did put a password on it, and she knew how to just take it off again. She just looked up online, and I guess there is a way just to reset it and took it away. So that would've been pointless, and on top of that, her mother felt that there was no reason to really babysit her on the computer because we really thought it was just for homework and Facebook and things of that nature.

THE COURT: Okay. Why do you believe Hazel felt uncomfortable around you?

THE WITNESS: She never expressed discomfort around me in that manner.

THE COURT: In the videos where it showed you adjusting the video camera in the bathroom, were you intentionally trying to hide the video camera?

THE WITNESS: The camera I own would've been impossible to intentionally hide. It's about this big. I mean, even if you throw a towel over it, it's going to be blatantly obvious that it's there.

THE COURT: Okay. And by this big, can you --

THE WITNESS: It's like a -- the one I had was a blue gray, like a -- what it's called? Snapshot I think is the name of it or something like that, and it's just, like --

THE COURT: So you're indicating 6 inches by 2 and a half inches, something like that?

THE WITNESS: Probably like -- probably, like, 6 by 4

seized? 1 2 THE WITNESS: Yes. 3 THE COURT: Okay. So they should still be there --THE WITNESS: Yes. 5 THE COURT: -- as far as you know -- okay. 6 When Hazel walked around the house inappropriately, 7 did you ever address that? 8 THE WITNESS: I would tell her mother. 9 THE COURT: And did you ever address it with Hazel? 10 THE WITNESS: I left the discipline to her mother 11 because she was pretty adamant about that. 12 THE COURT: The mother was adamant about it? 13 THE WITNESS: About discipline was her responsibility since they weren't actually my children, and at that point we'd 14 only been dating, you know, a year or so. It was still her 15 domain to form discipline, especially on Hazel because Hazel 16 17 was so much older. 18 THE COURT: How did Hazel walk around the house 19 inappropriately? Describe for us what you witnessed. 20 THE WITNESS: The worst of it was one time she 21 actually came out of the restroom completely nude, and her 22 mother came unglued. So that would be extremely inappropriate. 23 That would be the worst that she had done. 24 THE COURT: And that was the hallway bathroom or --

KARR Reporting, Inc.

THE WITNESS: The hallway bathroom.

trouble. So then she waited for another time when she had a

awful lot of questions about Photoshop --

25

them, do you? 2 No. 3 So you have no proof that she ever saw these videos 4 on your computer? 5 Α No. 6 So you have no proof that she ever used those videos 7 to somehow manipulate videos that she took to suggest that you 8 took them by placing you in the picture? 9 Α Correct. 10 You said that the reason you didn't password protect it is because you didn't know how to do that, correct? 11 12 I didn't really know how to do it. The kids knew how 13 to, but like I said, Hazel was able to overcome that when --14 one time Franzkie did it. 15 Okay. And if I ask you a yes or no question, can you do me a favor and just answer yes or no? 16 17 Α Sure. Thanks. You indicated that you didn't password 18 19 protect your computer because you didn't know how to do it, 20 correct? 21 Α Yes. 22 But you had asked, at least the boys and on occasion 23 Hazel, how to help you with various elements of the computer, 24 correct? 25 Α Yes.

1

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Okay. And, ladies and gentlemen, just to remind folks on the jury, from time to time, we'll have conversation, what was said, and the State may remember it one way. The defense may remember it another way. I may not remember it at all, or I may remember incorrectly. It doesn't matter what any of us say the testimony was. It's your collective recollection as to the testimony that controls your

deliberation.

So even if I say, Oh, I didn't hear that, or I don't remember that, you know, if that's different from your recollection, it's your recollection that's important, not what any of us say because that's just all talk. The only thing that matters is the sworn testimony and the exhibits.

MS. LAVELL: And just --

MR. JACKSON: Can I just make an objection. I believe — and I may be wrong in my recollection, but I believe what he said was he wasn't involved in the discipline, and because what — and Anita took it, and so the district attorney is taking out of context his answer.

THE COURT: Yes, that was my recollection, that he wasn't involved in the discipline based on the request of Anita who felt she should do the discipline.

MS. LAVELL: I didn't --

THE COURT: So go on.

THE WITNESS: Correct.

THE COURT: Just ask your question.

And again, ladies and gentlemen, we all remember it differently. It's collectively what you folks remember that's important.

MS. LAVELL: And just for the record, I'm not asking about discipline, and he indicated that he did --

THE COURT: Ms. Lavell, state your question.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

KARR Reporting, Inc.

Okay. But you just testified that it didn't appear

up here, and as I told you, ladies and gentlemen of the jury, the questions from the jurors are governed by the same rules of evidence that control what the lawyers ask. So some of your questions may not be asked. You stated that you told Hazel about the videos and

instructed her not to go there. Did you really believe that a teenager would not be curious and want to look at them?

THE WITNESS: Her own mother, yes.

THE COURT: Okay. How many drinks had you had on the night you took the pictures of Hazel under her skirt?

THE WITNESS: Probably two or three.

THE COURT: Would you generally lock your room at the home you shared with the other roommates?

> THE WITNESS: No.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: In the video of you in the towel, you said you go straight to the bedroom when just wearing the towel, but you left the video camera on even though you said you were finished in the restroom. Why would you leave it on if you were finished?

THE WITNESS: If it was one of the videos of me and Annie, it was because I was going to get her.

THE COURT: How many times have you seen Hazel nude?

THE WITNESS: I've only seen her fully nude once.

THE COURT: And that's the time you talked about?

THE WITNESS: She came out of the bathroom, yeah.

THE COURT: Okay.
THE WITNESS: Yes.
THE COURT: Have you ever seen Kurt nude?
THE WITNESS: No.
THE COURT: Have you ever seen Franzkie nude?
THE WITNESS: No.
THE COURT: Oh, Franzkie. I'm sorry.
THE WITNESS: Franzkie.
THE COURT: Franzkie.
THE WITNESS: Sorry.
THE COURT: How often did you ever ever edit
videos?
THE WITNESS: Me, I don't know how to edit videos.
THE COURT: What do you think the benefit would be to
Hazel for blackmailing you?
THE WITNESS: She probably wanted something, like she
usually did, stay with her boyfriends, new camera, something
along those lines.
THE COURT: Okay. Did you install the gaming
software on your you know, the games you talked about on
your laptop yourself?
THE WITNESS: Yeah, you just plug in the CD, and it's
all automated.
THE COURT: Okay. Where did you buy your computer?
THE WITNESS: Best Buy.

## FOLLOW-UP EXAMINATION 1 BY MR. JACKSON: 2 The main reason you had for -- the reason you got a 3 computer was for gaming; is that correct? 4 Α Yes. 5 And you like to play video games; is that right? 6 7 Α Yes. MR. JACKSON: I have no further questions. 8 THE COURT: Ms. Lavell, any follow-up to those last 9 juror questions or Mr. Jackson's last question? 10 MS. LAVELL: Yes, follow-up for the jury questions, 11 thank you, just a few. 12 FOLLOW-UP EXAMINATION 13 BY MS. LAVELL: 14 You said that you on the night before Hazel went to 15 the police you'd had two to three drinks? 16 Α 17. Yes. Do two to three drinks generally get you drunk? 18 It gets me pretty tipsy, yeah. 19 Because you previously testified that you were in 20 21 fact drunk? 22 Α Yes. You said that you believe Hazel would have 23 Q manipulated these videos -- taken the videos and then 24

KARR Reporting, Inc.

manipulated them in such a way so that she could blackmail you

25

(Conference at the bench not recorded.)

THE COURT: You stated that you knew everyone was referencing Photoshop. Then you stated that actually you mainly used was more Movie Maker and described the program. You never — but you just stated you never used it. Can you clarify.

THE WITNESS: Yeah, I saw Hazel using it to make — to help me make the collage. I didn't actually use it. She helped me figure out how to put the videos and the pictures together to make a — I guess a collage. I guess that's maybe not the right term but, you know, a bunch of family stuff together for a video for one of the birthdays.

THE COURT: Okay. So did you have both Photoshop and Movie Maker?

THE WITNESS: I don't know if Photoshop was actually on there or not.

THE COURT: Okay. Did you ever see anyone viewing inappropriate things on your laptop?

THE WITNESS: No.

THE COURT: If -- when -- was there a light or indicator to show that the video was recording? Your video camera, would there, like, be a green light or a red light or something that would go on when it was in the record mode?

THE WITNESS: I don't remember.

THE COURT: Okay. We heard in previous testimony

that Hazel's father had purchased her a camera. Did you ever purchase a camera for Hazel?

THE WITNESS: No.

THE COURT: Okay. You said you loaded a few games on your laptop. What, if you remember, are the names of the games that you loaded onto your laptop?

THE WITNESS: I think the only two I really played was -- shoot. What's it called now? Fallout. It was, like, a game. It was the old one. Now, they have a newer one for console, and then World of Warcraft. I played that a lot.

THE COURT: World of Warcraft?

THE WITNESS: Yeah, it's a online video game where you just kill stuff.

THE COURT: Okay. And is that one, like -- I know, like, Bejeweled, you just get online. Is that one you have to buy the disc and download, or is that one you just kind of find online and play?

THE WITNESS: No. No. No, you have to buy a disc.

THE COURT: Okay.

THE WITNESS: Then you put it in, and --

THE COURT: Okay. And then you download it, and then you can play with other people?

THE WITNESS: Yeah, then you -- then you -- yeah, it prompts you to make an account, and then you hop online and play.

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Jackson, any follow-up to that 1 2 last series of questions? MR. JACKSON: Your Honor, I don't know how to play 3 4 video games. So I have no questions. THE COURT: Do you know how to turn on a computer? 5 MR. JACKSON: Just barely. 6 7 THE COURT: All right. MS. LAVELL: No questions. 8 THE COURT: Ms. Lavell, any other questions -- all 9 10 right. I don't see any other -- we didn't see any other 11 12 questions from the jury. Mr. Shue, you may return to counsel table, next to 13 Mr. Jackson. 14 THE WITNESS: Thank you. 15 THE COURT: And, Mr. Jackson. 16 MR. JACKSON: At this time the defense rests. 17 18 THE COURT: All right. Do we have any rebuttal evidence from the State? 19 MS. BEVERLY: No, we'll rest, too. 20 THE COURT: All right. Ladies and gentlemen, that 21 concludes the presentation of evidence in this case. As I told 22 you at the outset, that's followed by the instructions on the 23 law, which I shall read to you shortly, and then the attorneys 24 will make their closing arguments. Because the State has the

KARR Reporting, Inc.

25

4.

Before we move into the instructions on the law, we're going to take a quick 10-minute break until 11:25, and then we're going to go straight through with maybe one break for the arguments. Lunch will be provided for you today. So we're going to finish up with the arguments, and then we'll provide lunch for the jury.

So before I excuse you for the brief recess I must remind you that you're not to discuss the case or anything relating to the case with each other or with anyone else. You're not to read, watch or listen to any reports of or commentaries on the case, any person or subject matter relating to the case. Don't do any independent research by way of the Internet or any other medium. Please don't form or express an opinion on the trial.

Notepads in your chairs. Follow the bailiff through the double doors.

(Proceedings recessed 11:16 a.m. to 11:30 a.m.)

(Outside the presence of the jury.)

THE COURT: -- present, and you have indicated you would like to make a motion out of the presence of the jury.

MR. JACKSON: Yes, I'd make a motion for directed verdict. I think under Jackson versus Virginia, the State cannot meet its burden of proof on any of the counts. Now, I

can take them one by one, but the State has the burden of proving beyond a reasonable doubt the charges in this indictment. The burden requires more than just probable cause. It requires proof beyond a reasonable doubt.

The Court I think has a duty to take this case from the jury because they haven't met the burden. They have to establish the elements of the offense of child pornography or the production of child pornography in the counts that it is alleged because, number one, the exhibits they presented aren't child pornography. Number two, they haven't established that the matters found on Mr. Shue's computer were put there by him. He has denied it. They haven't had any credible evidence that he put them on his computer.

The Exhibits 3 through 11, we had testimony from Officer Ramirez that Mr. Shue was not involved in that investigation. Those counts in particular --

THE COURT: Well, that's not what he said. You kept saying that, and they never objected, and I probably would've sustained an objection. It was that he was involved in the investigation of who took the picture, but he was — the investigation was he had the picture, but they didn't charge him with taking the picture. So you kind of twisted it in the way you asked your questions. They didn't object. So I didn't say anything, that the testimony was the investigation of who took the picture.

As you know, it's illegal to possess child pornography if you know about it, and so it doesn't matter if he took the picture or not for that count. That's what that testimony was.

MR. JACKSON: Right. But they've got no evidence that he possessed it knowingly. That's — and the Court gave that instruction. They have no evidence whatever. What they have is they did a — executed a search warrant, and they found evidence on the computer. Now, that's insufficient as a matter of law I would submit for those charges.

Now, as far as the charges of child abuse and neglect, I'd like to address those specifically. The charges of child abuse and neglect involve injury, mentally or physically to the child. All of the children said that, number one, they didn't even know about any of this so-called pornography or these pictures. There isn't -- isn't any evidence that they were hurt or in any way injured by this. So I -- how can there be any child abuse or neglect?

This is a manufactured charge. Oh, well, they must've been hurt because this happened. It doesn't meet the statue. It's a charge that's added on by the district attorney, and, Your Honor, should at this time based on the evidence presented tell the jury that there is insufficient evidence. This charge is taken from you.

Now, the charge of open or gross lewdness, the

so-called kiss, she herself said she doesn't even remember whether it was a -- more than a simple kiss on the lips. She didn't say she was harmed by it. Open or gross, if you look at the instruction, this doesn't amount to anything that's criminal.

A man kissing a 16 year old on the lips is not necessarily a crime. In fact, in Nevada -- in fact, I think she was 17 years of age on August 23rd of 2012. A man kissing a 17 year old is not necessarily guilty of open or gross lewdness, especially with the testimony we have from this alleged victim. That doesn't amount to any criminal offense whatsoever. The Court should remove this charge from the jury. I think it's prejudicial.

The State hasn't met its burden by -- certainly not by any reasonable doubt. The testimony of the State's own witness establishes they didn't meet this charge. Under Jackson versus Virginia, they can't prove it, and it shouldn't go to the jury. The only reason for having it I think is to either gain some kind of sympathy for the jury or to argue that the defendant is a bad man.

THE COURT: Well, obviously they can't argue that.

MR. JACKSON: Well, but it shouldn't go to the jury because they — it's not a crime. The age of consent of actually having sexual intercourse with a 16 year old in this state is 16 years of age. A mere kiss isn't a crime. She

didn't -- she didn't say -- you know, simply kissing someone on the lips the way she described it didn't suggest there was any gross actions involved, and based on that, based on her testimony, they haven't met their burden in this case that there was any kind of gross lewdness or anything else involved here, and I'll submit that that charge certainly should be dismissed.

I don't think that they've met any of their charges by the standards of the United States Supreme Court as laid out in Jackson versus Virginia.

THE COURT: All right. Well, first of all, they don't have -- I mean, they can make an inference that he knew. It was his computer. They don't have to eliminate any other potential suspects in order for it to go to the jury. Any time there's a case, you know, involving possession, drugs, you know, meth lab, whatever, there is always a defense it could've been somebody else. Somebody else maybe lived there, had access, whatever. They don't have to eliminate any other potential suspect in order for the -- you know, for there to be enough evidence to give it to the jury. So, you know, that's what we have here.

Like I said, you know, pretty much every case where, you know, either the charge or the evidence is based on possession, there's always other people who could have had access to the -- I mean, drugs is the obvious example. So I

don't really find that argument very compelling.

Ms. Beverly --

You know, looking at the definition of open and gross lewdness, I think that's their weakest count. You know, it could've been offensive to her, especially the timing of the kiss. You know, whether it's vulgar -- I think it was vulgar, obscene -- I don't remember the other word. I think that's a weaker count certainly than some of these others, given the testimony. It was a peck, or she couldn't remember if it was a peck.

Ms. Beverly, do you want to be heard on that?

MS. BEVERLY: Sure. On the open and gross lewdness charge, certainly that timing is absolutely important, but first and foremost, the defendant is the mom of her mother's boyfriend. He is a grown --

THE COURT: Daughter.

MS. BEVERLY: Daughter. I'm sorry.

THE COURT: The daughter is -- the defendant is the boyfriend --

MS. BEVERLY: — the boyfriend of the victim's mother Anita, just for clarity sake. The fact that he's — he's not her father. He's not a family member. He's the mother's boyfriend. So the fact that he would be kissing in any way a 17 year old on the lips after he took a picture up her skirt is certainly — we should be able to argue that's open and gross

lewdness and that that was offensive. She said it made her uncomfortable. She didn't want him to kiss her on her lips, no matter what kind of kiss it was. So I think that's -- you know, whether the jury finds that to be the case, then so be it, but that's certainly something we should be able to argue to the jury.

I'm going to, you know, give it to the jury, and they can determine what the evidence means. I think there is enough evidence. You know, if you draw the inferences in the light most favorable to the State, there's certainly enough evidence for the jury to convict this defendant, and it's up to them.

So, you know, it's up to them what inferences to draw, not up to me, as long as they're reasonable. I think they can make reasonable inferences in the State's favor on these counts. So for that reason your motion is denied.

Kenny, bring them all in.

(Jury entering 11:40 a.m.)

THE COURT: Court is now back in session. The record should reflect the presence of the State through the deputy district attorneys, the defendant and his counsel, the officers of the court and the ladies and gentlemen of the jury.

Ladies and gentlemen, as I told you before our break, the next phase of the trial involves the -- me reading to you the instructions on the law. You will have a number of copies

It is important that I read these instructions exactly as they are written. I am precluded from trying to expound upon them or clarify them in my own words in any way. Each instruction has been numbered for your convenience and ease of reference.

(Reading of instructions not transcribed.)

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, that concludes the instructions on the law.

Is the State ready to proceed with their closing argument?

MS. BEVERLY: Yes, I am, Judge.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

(Closing argument for the State.)

MS. BEVERLY: It's a sad day in our community when the people who are supposed to be protected the most are the people who are being exploited, and it's a sad day in our community when someone's own mother doesn't want to protect them from people like Joshua Shue.

You heard Hazel testify that she told her mom about inappropriate things that Joshua was doing, and then you heard Anita come on the stand and say, My daughter is a liar. I

didn't do anything. Joshua didn't do anything. Hazel is making this whole thing up. I would let my kids see him again today if he's not convicted. I would talk to him again because he's done so much for me and my family. And that's a sad day.

And we've been sitting through this trial for the last week. It's been a difficult trial. We've had to sit through this trial because Joshua Shue chose to put a video camera in that bathroom, and it's his actions and his behavior and his conduct why he's charged with 41 counts in this case and why he's guilty of all 41 counts in this case.

Now, in every criminal trial, the State must always prove two things, that a crime was committed and that the defendant is the person who committed that crime. Now, in this case, we read the indictment at the beginning of this trial, but you'll have a copy of it to go back with you so you can refer to it.

A total of 41 counts, one count of child abuse, 29 counts of use of child in production, 10 counts of possession of child pornography and one count of open and gross lewdness. So again you'll have the indictment to go back and refresh your recollection. We tried to go through each video and relate it to the counts, but you'll have it to take back with you.

Now, to refresh your recollection, a little background, these are the victims in this case. We have Hazel. We have Kurt. We have these two other unidentified male

juveniles, and you've seen those pictures throughout the trial.

2.4

Now, a little bit of background, we know that the defendant Mr. Shue was in a relationship with a Anita Iral between 2010 and 2012, and we know that Anita had three children -- well, she actually had five children, but she had three children that were living with her here in Las Vegas at the Kolendo apartment during that time frame, and that was Hazel, Kurt and Franzkie.

And we know that between summer of 2010 and August 23rd of 2012, the defendant would stay at the Kolendo apartment, he said about four nights a week. We heard it was very frequently although he also had this address that he was renting a room from at the Palm Wash address in Henderson.

So we know that on August 23rd of 2012, Hazel filed a police report talking about the picture up her skirt and talking about the kiss that the defendant had given her the night before. Hazel was interviewed by Detective Jaeger. So was the defendant. We then know that search warrants were served on those two addresses, the Kolendo and the Palm Wash address, and we know that Detective Ramirez conducted a forensic analysis on both the blue camera and the Sony VAIO laptop computer.

A couple of other things to note, the VAIO laptop was found in the defendant's room. Hazel identified the computer as the defendant's. The defendant also identified the computer

as his own. The computer was registered to Mr. Shue. It was found on a desk in close proximity to those items in the drawer that we saw many times throughout this trial.

2.4

And we know the video files at question in this case were found in folders called Yummm and Hmmm on Mr. Shue's computer, and they were hidden, and Detective Ramirez testified that they were — that those folders were created in 2011.

Again, photo of the Sony VAIO laptop computer next to that drawer containing all of those items, and again you'll have these photos to take back with you.

So let's get into the actual charges and the elements of those charges and how the facts lead to those elements of the charges, and as the Judge said, you'll have a copy of the jury instructions to take back with you. So use of child in production, a person — I apologize. It's a little cut off, but you can see it for the most part hopefully — A person who knowingly uses, encourages, entices, coerces or permits a minor to be the subject of a sexual portrayal in a performance is guilty of this crime, regardless of whether the minor knew they were involved in this performance.

A couple of definitions, minor means a person under the age of 18. Performance is any play, film, visual presentation. In this case it's videos, but anything that amounts to a visual presentation is considered a performance. Sexual portrayal, one of the most important parts of this

definition, means the depiction of a person in a manner which appeals to the prurient interest in sex and which does not have serious literary, artistic, political or scientific value.

Now, sometimes we come into a trial with preconceived notions about what constitutes child pornography, but this is the law. Child pornography can be sexual conduct. It can also be the sexual portrayal of minors in a particular way. So this is what the law says is child pornography.

A couple of things to note about the law regarding child pornography, a couple of things the State does not have to prove. There is no requirement anywhere in the instructions that the defendant must watch these videos over and over again, or he must look at these photos over and over again or at all. The crime is making the video and the presentation. It's not whether he watched it a bunch of times afterwards. So you can't go back to the jury room and say, Well, we don't know if he watched these videos. So he must not be guilty. Because the State doesn't have to prove that. It's not an element of the crime.

Additionally, consent is not a defense, and that goes to some of the photographs of the other younger boy. It looks like he's kind of posing in some of the photos, and he might be smiling. It doesn't matter. Even if you were to believe that Hazel and Kurt or any of the other kids knew that they were being filmed or photographed, it doesn't matter. It's not a

defense to say, Oh, well, these kids knew about it. So my conduct is okay.

1.8

Additionally, it doesn't matter what camera the defendant used. You saw a camera in that drawer. You also heard testimony about another Snapshot camera that the defendant used. It doesn't matter what camera it was. We know that it was a video camera because we have video files. So the State doesn't have to prove which camera was used as long as a camera was used, and we know that for a fact because we have these video files.

Okay. Now, again because there are so many counts on this case, I just want to make sure that we know which videos apply to which counts. I know I saw all of you taking very copious notes during this kind of long part of the testimony with Hazel, but it was important that we go through and match up each video to the particular counts.

So when we're talking about the charges of use of child in production. First of all, we have Count 1, and that's the photo up the skirt, and then we have the following video files, which relate to the different counts, and you can see that the ones listed have both Hazel and Kurt, and then Counts 26 through 38 are all the other video files, which just involved Hazel. So again you're going to have these videos to take back with you and can match them up to the counts, but I just wanted to make sure that we got that clear.

Finally -- well, actually -- additionally, in terms of what the videos overall portray, they're all very similar in nature. We have the defendant setting up the camera. We have Hazel, Kurt or both children entering the restroom. They then shower, use the restroom, do other bathroom activities. The children then leave the bathroom. The camera cuts off, and we know that each video is a different day because remember the testimony of Hazel, who said, My hair was different. I wore different -- I had different clothes on. I didn't take more than one shower a day during that time period. So we know each video was a different day.

So the elements, knowingly uses or permits a minor to be the subject of a sexual portrayal. Okay. Knowingly, that means he did it on purpose. Okay. How do we know Mr. Shue purposely took these videos? Well, here he is right here setting up the camera. Here he is in another video setting up the camera, another video with his hand adjusting the angle of the camera, another video with his face in the camera, another video with him fixing the camera and walking out of the bathroom. Over and over again it's Mr. Shue who's setting up the camera. It's Mr. Shue who is changing the angle of the camera. So we know that he did it on purpose.

We also know from his testimony, from his interview with the police, that he told Detective Jaeger, I'm going to have some things on my computer that are not on the up-and-up.

Well, he got on the stand and said, Oh, well, I was talking about some other adult conduct, except that Detective Jaeger wasn't asking him about adult conduct. He was asking him about pictures of children. So we know that it was Mr. Shue who took these videos.

A minor, both Hazel and Kurt were under the age of 18. We know that because there was testimony about their birthdays. There was also testimony that the police didn't even become involved until after — until before Hazel had even turned 18. So we know that both children were under the age of 18 at the time these videos were being made.

Uses or permits. Okay. What do we know in this case? We know that the defendant set up this video camera in a place where he knew the children would be naked. He didn't set it up in the living room or the kitchen or some other bedroom. People become naked in the bathroom, and we saw Hazel coming in there fully clothed, and we saw her then getting naked, same thing with Kurt. So he put the camera in a place that he knew the kids would be nude.

We also know that the camera was positioned in many of the videos towards the shower. Again, in order to get in the shower, you have to become naked. So the camera is positioned towards the shower. It also changed positions, but a lot of the videos are towards the shower where he knew they would be naked. Why else are you placing a camera in the kids'

bathroom where you know they're going to be naked and facing it towards the shower? It's because you're trying to capture the kids nude. That's the only possible explanation.

And we know with the picture up the skirt, which is again Count 1, it's -- a person who takes a picture up a skirt knows that they're going to capture some person's genitals.

Why else are you taking a picture up someone's skirt? Mr. Shue got up here and said, Oh, I was trying to teach her a lesson.

I'm not sure what lesson that would be. He could've just told her don't bend over, but he took a picture up her skirt. That doesn't make sense. So why else are you doing that? Because you want to capture someone nude or their genital area. So we know that he was specifically doing this to capture those kids.

Second -- last part of this definition, Appeals to the prurient interest in sex. That's a sexual portrayal. That means appeals to the lustful thoughts or lustful desires of a person. Okay. How do we know that's why he was taking these videos as opposed to him taking the videos as a joke or just to be funny or be cute? Well, he admitted to the detective that he had romantic feelings for Hazel and she was an attractive girl. We also know that he's attracted to young boys based on the other items that were found on the computer.

The computer happened to be found next to the desk drawer containing all those other items, and you as the jury can infer what he was doing with those items next to the

computer with a bunch of videos of his girlfriend's kids naked on -- in folders called Yummm and Hmmm and hidden on the computer. There is no other reason to put a camera in the bathroom where kids are unless it's for your sexual satisfaction. It's not funny. It's not a joke. It's not something you play around with. There is only one reason.

And there's actually a jury instruction that says, you know, use your — you can use your common sense. You know, we ask you to come in here as members of the community with different walks of life. You can use your common sense, and there's no way that someone puts a camera in the bathroom for any other reason but for his own sexual gratification, and so we know that those videos were made for that purpose.

And no artistic or literary value. You know, sometimes you go to an art museum, and you might see photographs or paintings of the human body in its nude form, and it's for an artistic purpose, or you might go to a science museum and see the parts of a human body for purposes of science.

There is no artistic, scientific or literary value in placing a camera and capturing your girlfriend's kids nude.

There is no value. So this is not a situation where it's -- where we're trying to show how beautiful the human body is.

These are kids showering, going about their own business, doing very private bathroom things that Mr. Shue was -- is capturing,

no other purpose. So because of those — how those facts fit with the elements of the crimes, he's guilty of all 29 counts of use of a child in production.

The next crime is possession of child pornography, and there's a lengthy definition. Again, you'll have it to take back with you, but it's essentially knowing — knowingly possessing a film, visual presentation of a child under 16 as the subject of a sexual portrayal or engaging in sexual conduct.

Now, one thing you might be wondering is why Hazel is not charged in the possession of child pornography counts and only Kurt is charged in those counts. Now, the reason for that is because of — we have the element of under the age of 16, and when Hazel testified, she said, I was between 15, 16, sometimes she wasn't sure. So she may not have been under the age of 16, and so that's why she's not charged in those counts, based on the elements of the statue.

Again, just to be clear, we have these counts relating to the particular videos involving Kurt, for the possession charges that you can take back and again look at, and we have Count 40 and 41 for the photos of the other juveniles not related to Kurt or Hazel. So I just wanted to make sure we match up the video files with the correct counts.

Elements of possession of child pornography, knowingly and wilfully had in his possession photo, visual

presentation, person under 16, sexual portrayal or engaging in sexual conduct. Let's talk about the videos first and foremost. We know the defendant made the videos. So he must have known that he had them because he's the one that made them. He put the videos on his computer. The computer was found in his room. The computer belonged to him. So he knew about these videos, and he knew and possessed them knowingly.

In terms of the photos of the other identified children, those were found on the defendant's computer as well, found in his room, computer registered to him, and we know he has an interest in young boys. He's filming Kurt as well. The question is, who else would have any reason to download files of nude juveniles other than Mr. Shue? Unless it's a situation where I guess Hazel is downloading photos of these boys or Kurt or Franzkie is downloading these photos. Nobody has any reason except Mr. Shue to download photos of young male children. So we know that he knowingly possessed those items.

Digital presentation, again, videos and photos, those are both visual presentations, and all the children were under the age of 16. Detective Ramirez testified that the boys in the photos, one was 12, the other one also looked to be under the age of 16, and we know that Kurt was also under the age of 16 at the time based on his birthday and the fact that he's 16 now. So he couldn't possibly have been 16 or older at the time that these videos were actually found.

Prurient interest in sex and sexual conduct. You know, obviously there's sexual conduct in this video. We talked about what prurient interest in sex means. We obviously have little boys in showers posing. Why else would you possibly have that other than your sexual gratification?

We also have Kurt in the shower. Why else do you have Kurt in the shower unless it's for your sexual gratification? And so it's kind of the same philosophy as why you're producing the videos in terms of the purposes for making those videos. Same reason you're possessing them, for your own sexual gratification. So he's guilty of all 10 counts of the possession of child pornography.

Count 39 is open and gross lewdness. Any person who commits an act of open or gross lewdness is guilty of that crime. Now, you kind of have some lengthy definitions of what open and gross lewdness means, and you'll have that jury instruction to take back with you, and essentially it's an act done that's offensive, that is obscene and that is likely to —it's a sexual act that's likely to offend the victim.

What do we have here? What's the act of open and gross lewdness? It's kissing Hazel on the mouth. Hazel said she wasn't sure if it was a pack or a longer kiss, but we know it was a kiss on the mouth. Well, we also know that this kiss came right after he took a picture up her skirt.

We also know that Mr. Shue was the boyfriend of

Hazel's mom. Why would Anita's boyfriend be kissing her daughter on the mouth? That's offensive. That's indecent, and that's sexual in nature. There is no reason for that. And you actually heard Mr. Shue testify that he never kissed the boys like that, but he's kissing Hazel like that. So she didn't want him to kiss her. She didn't want him taking a picture up her skirt. So that's the act of open and gross lewdness, and he's guilty of that charge as well.

2:0

Finally, child abuse, this is the definition of child abuse. Again, we come into — into trial with our own perception of what child abuse is, but this is the legal definition of child abuse that we must follow. The child abuse charged here is based on the allegations of taking a picture up the skirt, kissing Hazel on the mouth and videotaping her, all of which acts would cause someone mental suffering, knowing that they have to sit here and be exposed in front of strangers.

Abuse and neglect, this is the definition of that. The main one we're focused on in this case is sexual abuse and sexual exploitation. Sexual abuse, any act constituting — for purposes of this trial — open or gross lewdness, which we just talked about, and then sexual exploitation, the filming of children and their genitals, which we know we have in this case.

Mental injury, it means injury to the intellectual or

emotional capacity of a child causing them not to function within their normal range of functioning, and what the statue actually says is it either causes them mental suffering or places them in a position where they might suffer mental suffering. Either one, you're still guilty of child abuse.

Elements, wilfully causes child less than 18 suffer mental -- excuse me -- suffer mental suffering or be placed in a situation to suffer mental suffering and as a result of sex abuse or sex exploitation. And what do we have here? We have that the defendant wilfully took a picture up Hazel's skirt, wilfully kissed her and wilfully filmed her. As of August 23rd, we know that Hazel was under 18, and Hazel felt uncomfortable by his actions. That's why she reported it to the police.

Any person having to watch videos of themselves nude in front of strangers is going to be placed in a situation where they might suffer mental harm. It's embarrassing. It's exploiting Hazel, and we know that she's exploited by the defendant using her to create pornography. So he is guilty of child abuse, which is again Count 1 of the indictment.

And it's the defendant's conduct, it's his actions, it's his behavior that makes him guilty of all 41 counts in the indictment, and at the end of these arguments the State is going to ask that you find him guilty of each and every one of those counts.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Ms. Beverly. Mr. Jackson, are you ready to proceed with your closing argument? MR. JACKSON: Yes. Can I move this --THE COURT: Of course. Sure. MR. JACKSON: -- podium around. I don't have the fancy -- oh, I broke it. THE COURT: Kenny, can you help Mr. Jackson. (Closing argument for the defense.) MR. JACKSON: I don't have the fancy technology the DA has with the Teleprompter and everything else, and if I screw it up, I hope you will help me. 

I thank you all for being here. This has been a tough trial for everybody. This has been a difficult case. One thing we've learned in this trial is you've got to be careful who you kiss and when you kiss them. If you get drunk, just be careful if you kiss somebody on the lips.

My client came into court and he admitted that he kissed his girlfriend's daughter on the lips, and he realized that was an indiscretion. He shouldn't have done it. You have to decide whether it was a crime.

Back in the 1600s, there was a famous trial, the Salem witch trials, and there were people that were basically hanged for being witches. What we have here I think is a prosecution that has gone a little bit overboard in looking at

evidence and making what is not a crime or shouldn't be considered criminal acts, criminal acts.

2.4

You've seen the evidence. You've heard the Judge's instructions. Now you have to decide first of all whether the evidence presented is pornography, whether the pictures, the pictures of Hazel Iral and her brother getting in and out of the shower, getting in and out of the bathroom without their clothes on and standing stark naked is pornography. Standing naked, the way God brought you into the world, without any clothes on, are those pictures for prurient interest? Are those the kind of pictures that are going to make you want to go out and get all excited?

The prosecution themselves admitted all these pictures are about the same. They're all — if you look at each one of those exhibits — and, you know, the prosecution, they had those pictures up on that screen, and they liked to leave them up there. If anybody wanted to appeal to the prurient interest, it was the prosecutor.

MS. LAVELL: I'm going to object to that.

THE COURT: That's sustained.

MR. JACKSON: Well, we'll talk about what's prurient interest. You have to decide. It's not the prosecutor who decides what's prurient interest. The Judge has given you the instructions, but you decide based on your common sense, based on what you know about life. That's an instruction. I believe

it's No. 24.

1.

2.3

There was also an instruction that tells you you're to evaluate this evidence according to what you know. The prosecutor talked about you don't -- you look at whether there's any artistic or any other scientific reason for this. She talked about whether something like this would be in museums. If any of you have ever been to Paris, to the Louvre, there's a whole floor in the Louvre. You may have seen this in your common experience. Picasso, he has hundreds of drawings of nude pictures of young women. Well, he's a great artist. People come from all over the world to look at it, admire it. It might be erotic art to some people, but people aren't arrested for looking at it. Some people might even buy reproductions of it and take it home and put it in their bedroom.

Now, you have to decide whether these pictures amount to pornography, or the famous Supreme Court Justice, Potter Stewart, when asked what's the meaning of obscenity, or what's the meaning of pornography, he said, I don't know how to define it, but I know it when I see it. Well, you're going to have to make a decision, first of all, whether what you've seen is pornography.

Now, the Exhibits 3 through 11, the exhibits showing oral sex between some young boys, which -- first we were told were unidentified boys, and that's what it said in the

indictment. It wasn't until we did cross-examination of

Detective Ramirez that we found out that the prosecution really
knew who these boys were.

MS. BEVERLY: I'm going to object to that.

MR. JACKSON: Well --

MS. LAVELL: Your Honor, I'm objecting to that.

MR. JACKSON: Well, this is what the truth is.

THE COURT: All right. Well, that -- I think that's sustained. I think it was -- my recollection was it wasn't the oral-sex picture the detective was talking about, number one --

MR. JACKSON: All right. But the other pictures --

THE COURT: -- and again, ladies and gentlemen, it's your recollection --

MR. JACKSON: Right.

Now, if you look at the indictment, it says unknown individuals, and Officer Ramirez said clearly they did know. This was part of an ongoing investigation, and he made clear that Mr. Shue wasn't the suspect in this, and he didn't take those pictures.

Mr. Shue got on the witness stand, sat in the witness chair, and he said, No, I didn't take those pictures, and I didn't put them on my computer, and you have to decide whether he's telling the truth or not. If you think he took those pictures, or if you think that he knowingly put those on his computer, then find him guilty because those pictures I think

were -- maybe met the definition of pornography, but he said he didn't put them on his computer, and he didn't know about them. They sat in a police lab for -- or his computer sat in a police lab for about three days. Other people used his computer, but he didn't take those pictures according to Officer Ramirez. He wasn't involved in that investigation.

And it's pretty clear that they're totally different, both in quality and in the nature from the other pictures, which are — which are all related. The pictures of Kurt Iral and Hazel Iral are very similar. They're all in the same bathroom. They're all the same types of pictures. They all basically are pictures of Hazel and Kurt coming in and out of the bathroom. The others are different, and they really have nothing to link Mr. Shue to them except that they were found on his computer.

Now, the State tried to suggest to you that, well, they're young boys, and since Kurt Iral was a young boy, you must therefore think that they're linked to him. Well, that's pretty -- pretty big a strain of logic.

Excuse me, Your Honor. May I have some water?
THE COURT: That's fine.

MR. JACKSON: That's a pretty big leap of logic. They're pictures of young boys. So because Kurt Iral is a young boy, the defendant has a picture of young boys on his computer, they must be related. I don't think so.

We brought you witnesses, and it was difficult because we didn't want to put witnesses on that would be embarrassed and whatever about this, but we brought you witnesses that knew Mr. Shue because we wanted everything to come out.

We brought you the brothers of Hazel Iral, Kurt, the older one, and Franzkie. What did they tell you? What did Kurt and Franzkie tell you? They knew Josh. They liked him. Now, whatever you think about Annie, if you think, Oh, Annie -- Annie is covering up for Josh because she loves him. She's -- she's the mother, and the State started right off in their opening saying, Oh, Annie, what a terrible mother. What a sad day that Annie is covering up for her boyfriend. Well, she didn't say anything about the boys. She didn't mock the boys and say the boys are coming in here and lying for Joshua. Maybe she will in rebuttal.

But the boys came in and said, No, we like Josh. We believe him. He never did anything bad to us. Josh never tried to molest us. Josh wasn't a pervert with them. He never showed them dirty pictures. He never tried to grab them or touch them or do anything wrong to them.

Now, the State through the whole trial is trying to get you to infer that Josh is some kind of bad evil pervert because of what they found on his computer. You're to jump to that conclusion, automatically presume he's guilty. Now, these

are tough cases. These are tough cases, but the standard of reasonable doubt tells you that you must, you must consider both sides. You're not to jump to the conclusion that Josh is quilty.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

We've had four people come in and say, No, Josh isn't that kind of person. We've had his girlfriend Anita, who's lived with him for three, four years. He met her in 2010. She was with him until, you know, he was arrested in 2012. She's the mother of three children. The prosecution thinks it's terrible. She's still standing by him. The two boys are still standing by him.

What did the boys say about Hazel? They said that she lied. They said that she used the computer a lot. She used it sometimes to make sexual images of herself. Well, are they the only ones that said that? Are they the only ones that talked about that? If they were, maybe, you know, Annie was feeding them that. Maybe Annie was telling them, you know, say that to help my good friend Josh out. They aren't the only ones who said that.

Who else said that? The great aunt, Frances Carreon. She took the witness stand, came in here. Did she look like a liar to you? Did you watch her demeanor? Do you think she was coming in testifying under oath, making up what she said about Hazel? She said Hazel was a rebellious child. She said Hazel came over to her house sometimes. She said she saw Hazel one

time using her computer, transferring sexual images or with sexual images on her computer of herself. She was upset about that. Rightly so.

Now, do you think that Frances Carreon would make that up, come into court and testify under oath about that?

Now, if that's true, do you think there's even the slightest possibility, enough for reasonable doubt, enough for reasonable doubt that Hazel may have been fooling around on the computer that Josh has? We've had testimony from the boys and from Anita that Hazel used Josh's computer. Hazel herself admitted that she used the computer. She had access to the computer. She didn't deny it. She couldn't deny it because everybody knew it. Now, is it such a stretch to believe that Hazel may have been the one that made some of the videos, if not all of them?

Hazel was somewhat vague in her testimony. I know she was a little bit uncomfortable testifying on the witness stand. I don't blame her. It's somewhat embarrassing to get up there. Kurt was a little bit embarrassed to be up there. Franzkie got up and testified, and he seemed comfortable as a witness. He didn't seem to have any problems, and he testified quite capably I believe, but that's my opinion. Your opinion is what counts, and anything I say in recounting the evidence to you doesn't matter. It's what you observe, and I'm very confident that all of you were very engaged in watching the

witnesses and taking notes and then asking very intelligent questions.

If you look at the video really closely, I think you'll notice on it least one or two of the videos when Hazel gets out of the shower she's, like, looking, like she's looking at the camera, like she is aware the camera is there. Take a look. Maybe you'll see that. That's something I may have observed. Maybe it was just a — something, an insignificant thing, but if you see that, you should try to consider what that meant, like if she actually knew she was being filmed or whether she was aware someone was there.

Again, we're not arguing that she consented to be filmed. We're not arguing that. We're arguing that she may have done this herself, and she certainly, according to the testimony, was aware of how to use a video camera. We've had testimony from a number of witnesses that support that.

We don't have to establish why or how or when Hazel may have done this. In fact, the State has not established any dates on any of these charges. They've blurred a whole bunch of counts together. They've charged 40-some counts, and they're all basically the same thing except for the five or six different ones involving the unknown individuals — or the actually known individuals that they originally said were unknown. The others all involved Hazel and her brother doing basically the same thing, and the State even admits that.

Joshua Shue did not have to present any evidence in this case. He didn't have to take the witness stand and subject himself to very vigorous cross-examination, subject himself to very embarrassing kind of testimony about his private life. I mean, he was — was even asked if he masturbated. I mean, what kind of — I don't know, but he answered each of these questions forthrightly, as best he could despite the embarrassment and humiliation he was put in.

16.

2.3

These -- this is a difficult case. You'll have to make a difficult decision. I won't get a chance to respond to what the prosecutor says in their rebuttal argument. There are many things I've left unsaid. This is a complicated case, but it really comes down to very simple things. Simple thing number one is whether or not any of the evidence that the State has presented is pornography, and the second thing is whether the defendant was involved in it.

And the third is, you know, on the issue of child abuse. The State is alleging there was child abuse, but then they claim that neither of the witnesses knew about it. If you read the instructions, it says, you know, you've got to do harm to someone for there to be child abuse. Well, they're claiming that Hazel and Kurt didn't even know they were being filmed. It wasn't until after the police and everybody got involved that there was any child abuse. It wasn't until the prosecution had made a big stink about this case that any harm

was done to Hazel or her brother.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Now, they have a right to bring charges they think are justified. You have the right as a jury to say, no, no The defendant is not quilty. It's your duty, your solemn duty to look at the charges and do what you believe is right. The defendant is confident when you look at all the evidence and look at the law that you'll do the right thing.

If I've done anything during the trial to offend you -- and attorneys, when they're fighting for their client -and that's the State, too -- do what they can. If we overstep the bounds, the Judge here is -- will try to keep us in line, but it's because we have a duty to do what we can to represent our client zealously. If I've done anything wrong, I ask for your forgiveness and hope you don't hold it against Mr. Shue.

But I ask you when you go back into that jury room to do your best to be fair to both sides. I'm confident if you do you will find my client not guilty.

Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Mr. Jackson. Rebuttal.

MS. LAVELL: Thank you, Your Honor. (Rebuttal argument for the State.)

MS. LAVELL: Before I get too far under way, ladies and gentlemen, I just want to clear up the last comments that counsel made in regards to the child abuse and neglect count.

Kurt is not named it that count, and he asked how could there be child abuse and neglect when Kurt and Hazel didn't even know about the videos. Well, when you go back, you'll take a look at the counts, but as Ms. Beverly indicated to you, it's specific to the defendant taking pictures up Hazel's skirt, which she was aware of, kissing her on the mouth, which she was bothered by.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And subsequent to her contacting the police in relation to that, she has since learned about the fact that he videotaped her. So the fact that she has only -- or learned about that after the defendant's computer was seized does not then make it less child abuse and neglect. There's not a special time when she has to find out. It's the fact that she found out.

And, you know, counsel indicated that it was really difficult for the defendant to get up on the stand and talk about certain things, and I asked him about masturbating. Well, I want you to remember it was likely even more difficult for Hazel to have to get up in front of a bunch of strangers and look at video after video after video of herself naked and her brother naked.

I just -- I just have to say, I'm not sure that any of the images you saw on the video or the photographs can be compared to a Picasso. So I would apologize to Picasso. There's certainly a difference between Picasso's work, which

does have some artistic merit, very expensive artistic merit, and the possession of the video and the pictures that the defendant had. So apologies to Picasso.

So I'm just going to deal with a few things that counsel said, and then I'm just going to kind of talk to you. I think it's really, really important that if you believe that the defendant committed these crimes Ms. Beverly has clearly shown you the evidence that was obtained during this trial and applied it to each and every element of each and every crime that we had to prove.

Now, Mr. Jackson may not believe that the videotape equates to pornography or sexual depiction. I asked you when we were doing voir dire if any of you had a preconceived notion of what pornography is, and my guess is --

Can I use the exhibits, please.

State's Exhibit 4, I guess — guessing that when you think of kiddie pornography — and if you'll just look at the screen — that State's Exhibit No. 4 and State's Exhibit No. 3 are probably what most of you may have in your mind in terms of child pornography, and counsel would have you believe that Hazel and Kurt being videotaped naked in the bathroom doesn't constitute child pornography. Ms. Beverly explained to you very, very clearly how the videotapes fit the various charges they're associated with.

So if you believe the defendant did it, I can sit

\_

down right now -- I'm not asking you -- but I can sit down right now, but I want to give you some further assurances or some further information so that you can be comfortable that the defendant did in fact do it.

He talked about witnesses that came up here and how the State's kind of trying to defame Anita, Hazel's mom, because Ms. Beverly said, What a shame. Well, you have a jury instruction that says that you are to — or you certainly are encouraged to, and this is Jury Instruction No. 21 — The credibility or believability of a witness should be determined by his or her manner upon the stand, his relationship to the parties, his fears, motives, interests or feelings, his opportunity to have observed the matter to which he testified, the reasonableness of his statements and the strength or weaknesses of the recollections.

And it says, If you believe that a witness had lied about any material fact in the case, you may disregard the entire testimony of that witness or any portion of his testimony. Well, I'm going to provide some information that would suggest that Anita lied during her testimony, and I'm going to ask you not to disregard it. I'm going to ask you to take it back in the deliberation room and remember it when you're determining who was credible on the witness stand and who wasn't, and the same applies to the defendant.

So let's first talk about Anita, Hazel's mom. Every

opportunity that she had, she portrayed her daughter in a bad light. At every opportunity she had, she portrayed the defendant in a good light, even when she is faced with the evidence smack in her face, when she was shown the pictures of the little boys she said she'd never seen before, and I don't know if you were able to observe her demeanor when she saw those photos. If you were, I think that was very telling.

Who put those photos on his computer? The detectives. The detectives planted those photos because they do that kind of thing, and interestingly enough, there is — there was a series of questions by counsel in regards to Detective Ramirez about could people access the computer. Could it be hacked? Could other people plant evidence on the computer? And interestingly, she indicated that very same thing, and the first time she saw the computer, she suggested that the detective may have done that. Now, she said she hasn't talked to the defendant. You determine whether or not that's true based on her answer to that question.

As it pertains to probably the most obvious thing is this -- and I'm going to probably say it wrong -- this SUB (sic) port, flash drive that she claims she found, so here's what I find most -- excuse me it doesn't matter what I find interesting -- here's what you may find very interesting. She said she's not sure if she found it before or after the defendant was arrested, before or after the computer was

seized. She says that her daughter comes to her and says, I've lost my flash drive, mom. Can you look for it, and Anita finds it in Hazel's bedroom.

Now, there was no evidence before that except that Hazel had a Facebook where Anita had indicated that she had seen the pictures but that friends had said she appears to be too grown up. Keep an eye on her. Beyond that, no information to suggest that Anita had any concerns about Hazel and Hazel's use of the computer, but for whatever reason, she magically finds this flash — flash drive. She calls the aunt over, who counsel is suggesting is extremely credible, and she views these videos for the first time, but when she viewed the videos, the defendant's face wasn't on those videos. They must've been added after the fact because they weren't on that flash drive.

Why is she looking at the flash drive? Why is she calling the aunt over to help her open the flash drive? She had no concerns about what her daughter was doing on the computer beyond the Facebook where there might be some grown-up pictures of her. Why are they examining this flash drive?

But why isn't she telling anybody about it? My goodness. Mr. Jackson, Detective Jaeger, I found the flash drive months ago or weeks ago or days ago that's my daughter's, and it had all of the same images of the bathroom, of my daughter and my son. My goodness, here, or I gave it back to

her, or I destroyed it, but you need to know this. Never said a word. Never said a word. Why? Because there was no flash drive. She found absolutely nothing.

1.5

Let's talk about the aunt, the grandaunt. She indicated when Ms. Beverly asked her about this computer that you can see on one of the videos that Hazel brings into the bathroom, one she's brought in for music, she says, Oh, no, that was the defendant's computer. Well, how do you know that? Because Hazel and the boys didn't have a computer. That was the only computer in the house. So you know that to be true? You know that? There was no other computer? No.

And, you know, when the young one got on, and initially when counsel had asked him, did you boys have a computer? He indicated, No, but then when I talked to him and I asked him, Hey, what happened to the computer that you and your brother had that your sister used? Oh, they took it. When? After the defendant got arrested. But she sat up here and she was adamant, adamant that the only computer that any of these people used was the defendant's computer.

Now, all throughout this trial, there's this big discussion that — that Hazel is wonderful with — okay, not wonderful with computers but wonderful with Photoshop. Photoshop. Photoshop. I saw her changing her hair color, I think it was that her mother or her aunt said. Then all of a sudden when it's brought out that you can't use

Photoshop for videos, there was no Photoshop. It was some video program.

And for some reason, everyone in this family appears to be super aware of Hazel's expertise with computers. How is that happening? Generally, do most teenagers when they're on the computer, are they usually surrounded by their family? How do you — how does the defendant know what her technical abilities are? How does the mother know what they're — what her technically — what her technical abilities are? They don't. They have no clue, but they're going to make her Steven Spielberg. They're going to put her up here, and — when they're on the stand and make her the most technologically astute computer person to explain why his face is all over those videos.

Counsel said, This is a tough case. It's a complicated case. Well, the subject matter is tough, but it's not a hard case, and it's not a complicated case. It's a very simple case, and counsel would have you believe that the State overcharged the defendant. Well, guess what? If he only took one video of these kids, he'd be charged with one count. If he only possessed one photo, he'd be charged with one count.

He chose to videotape these kids in the bathroom over and over again, from different angles, close up so you can see the vaginal areas and the penis, real close up in some of them, different angles where they're taking the towels off

and drying off because they're there longer. Then let's see them come out of the shower when they're stepping out. He chose to videotape these kids day after day after day after day, possibly year after year because this could have been going on from 2010 to 2012. And counsel objects that the State didn't minimize or limit the dates or say specifically when the dates were. Well, we weren't there, but we do know it happened between 2010 and

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2012, and we're allowed to charge it that way, and that's what 10 we did. He's charged with as many counts as he is because he committed all of those crimes, and he needs to be heldresponsible for each and every crime he committed.

And with respect to you, ladies and gentlemen, it's not up to you to determine what is pornography. It's up to you to read the law --

MR. JACKSON: I'm going to object to that, Your They have to determine --

THE COURT: Yes, that's sustained. It's up to them to determine whether or not the images fit within the definition --

MS. LAVELL: Well, and that's where I was going with what I was --

THE COURT: -- of pornography --

MS. LAVELL: Yes.

THE COURT: That's their role to make that

\_\_\_

determination.

MS. LAVELL: That's where I was headed before I was interrupted.

THE COURT: So I  $\operatorname{\mathsf{--}}$  so that objection is sustained.

MS. LAVELL: What I was going to say was it's up to you to read the law and determine whether or not what you observed is pornography based on the law that you've agreed to follow.

Counsel said you must consider both sides. Well, what you must consider is the evidence presented by the State and by the defense. Now, he talks a lot about the fact that there are a lot -- counsel asked a lot of questions of the younger boys. Did he ever touch you? Did he ever threaten you? Did he ever abuse you? Well, they're not -- he's not charged with that. The littlest one isn't even a named victim in this case. So I'm not really sure what that line of questioning was about or what that argument in closing was about in regards to both the boys.

Okay. So in terms of Anita, she wants to get back with the defendant. She told you that, that if he were to go home -- you know, if he was to -- this was all over and he's home again, would she want to have a relationship with him, and she said she would. She said that she would still allow him to have contact with the kids, even after she saw the video, even after she saw the photos. She just is not going to believe, no

matter what you say, that the defendant had anything to do with this and for various possibilities that you can -- you can determine.

She claimed that she didn't need him for financial assistance, and yet she had to immediately move in with her aunt after he left because she couldn't afford the apartment. So how is she not relying on him for finances? Or maybe she truly, truly loves him and love is blind. Clearly she's not concerned for her children's safety. So whether or not that's because she truly believes he's not guilty or because she truly loves him, that's, you know, for you to consider, but she got up here, and her testimony was not believable.

The defendant got up here, and he had an answer for everything except when I started to talk to him about the images on the camera when he suggested that his face was planted by Hazel, this great editor. How is it that every time you're in there and you move the camera, either to a different location in the bathroom or to a different —— I'm going to say focus, but I know that that's not the correct word, but so that, you know, you can see closer, he leaves, the kids come in, and that camera is in the exact same position? It hasn't moved an inch. Look at it. Look at it.

So they want you to believe that Hazel found video of the defendant and Anita having sex, cropped out the defendant's face or body, attached it to video -- or had to actually take

into consideration the angle of video when he put it in there for Hazel (sic) and himself, and then she would've had to put her camera when she's videotaping her and the boys in the exact same position so that when she clips his head on without any splicing that is apparent — you look and determine — the video, the angle hasn't moved an inch. I mean, that's spectacular. You need to look at that.

All right. So there's no doubt that the defendant's face is on there because the defendant is the one that did this. You can see him leave and the kids come in. His girlfriend is never in the bathroom with him. He indicated, Well, that's because I was -- I'm leaving to go get her.

Where are they having sex? Look at the angles of the camera and determine where it is that -- he's looking. I mean, he's making sure making sure the camera is where he wants it.

Where are he and Anita having sex based on the position of that camera? Remember one time it's facing the door. There's not a lot of area there. It's never facing the floor, which they may end up on. It's never really facing the shower -- well, that's not true. There are -- I think there are a few videos where it's actually facing the shower, so if they were in the shower, but a lot of times it's facing to the left of the shower where there's some sort of a shelf or something where the kids get out and dry off. So where are they having sex based on where he's angled this camera? So it's illogical. It's illogical.

Remember, ladies and gentlemen, you're going to have Instruction No. 22, which is probably the most important instruction, and that's talking about reasonable doubt, and for doubt to be reasonable, it must be actual and not mere speculation. The defense has speculated, I think it was Hazel because of this. I think it was Hazel because she didn't like me. I think it was Hazel because she was jealous. I think it was Hazel because she's used my computer. I think it was -- no one saw Hazel do anything.

And the camera that the defendant described -- jury's indulgence -- the camera that the State showed you in one of the exhibits inside the drawer, does everybody remember that camera that was inside the drawer, the video camera? Does it appear to be the camera the defendant claims that he -- that the defendant admitted that he was placing in the bathroom, which he said was a Snapshot camera, only six inches by four inches, which is a relatively small camera, easy to hide?

So, ladies and gentlemen, the State has proven to you beyond -- not only beyond a reasonable doubt, but beyond any doubt whatsoever that the defendant committed each and every crime charged, and we are confident that when you go back and you look at all the information -- I encourage you to look at the videos again. I encourage you to look at the pictures -- that you will come back and find him guilty of each and every count, and Hazel will know that it was worth coming in here and

testifying about what the defendant did to her.

Thank you.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Ms. Lavell.

The clerk will now swear the officer to take charge of the jury.

## (Officer sworn.)

THE COURT: All right. Ladies and gentlemen, before you leave, as some or all of you may know, a criminal jury is composed of 12 people. There are 14 of you. Two of you are the alternates who are seated in chairs that were designated prior to jury selection. Those are Jurors No. 6 and 7.

So Mr. Brown and Mr. Luecke, you are our alternates. I'm going to have you gather your belongings and your notepads and exit with the other jurors, and then you're welcome to eat lunch, or you can be excused.

The prohibition about speaking about the case and doing anything relating to the case is still in effect because, God forbid, one of the regular jurors should become ill or something like that before a verdict is reached, one or both of you would be called in to take those jurors places. So again you must be mindful of the prohibition.

And before you leave, you're to give the bailiff or my secretary phone numbers where you can be contacted if, as I said, one of the jurors becomes ill or something like that, and you need to be called in.

So if all of you would please collect your belongings and your notepads and please follow the bailiff through the rear door.

(Jury recessed for deliberation 1:04 p.m.)

THE COURT: All right. We're going to give them lunch, and then Denise brings back all the stuff and everything.

MS. BEVERLY: And for the record, I did get them a clean laptop.

THE COURT: Okay. And I need you guys -- I know
Ms. Beverly is probably going to be gone by the time there's a
verdict, but, Ms. Lavell and Mr. Jackson, you need to give
numbers where you can be reached so we can contact you when the
jury has a verdict, and don't go super far. You know, don't go
to Boulder City or Lake Mead.

MR. JACKSON: I'm going to stay in my office until probably 5 o'clock, and then it's been a long week. I'll go home, but I live in Green Valley. It takes, like, 30 minutes.

THE COURT: Okay. Can you do this. Normally --

MR. JACKSON: I'll call before I leave.

THE COURT: Yes, call before you leave because normally at 5 --

MR. JACKSON: Because I don't want to be caught in halfway going there or whatever.

THE COURT: Normally at 5 we go in if they don't have

25.

a verdict, you know, but they may have a verdict right at 5, or Kenny may go in at 5:05 or something like that. So what I don't want to have happen is you're driving to Green Valley right when we're calling everybody for the verdict. So don't --

MR. JACKSON: It's like a 25-minute drive for me from my house to here, and before I leave, I'll call around 10 to 5 to make sure, you know, that they're not close to a verdict or you've got a verdict.

THE COURT: Yes. Well, we don't go in. Just so you know, we don't go in before we're ready to excuse them because we don't want to influence them to hurry up or anything like that.

MR. JACKSON: Oh, yes. Right.

THE COURT: So we don't go in. You know, it's, like, you've got a verdict or you go home because we don't want to have an impact on anything.

MR. JACKSON: I'll leave both my cell phone and my home phone, and I'm going to also -- I'm going to get two numbers from Josh as well. I'm going to tell him to stick around for a while, but they're going to lunch. They won't be starting deliberating until --

THE COURT: Right. It's not going to be at least for another hour that they'll have a verdict, I'm sure. So, I mean, I'm more concerned about if they have one at --

Mr. Jackson, so don't go home until we give you permission to go home because it'll be around 5, but what I don't want to have happen is if they come in with a verdict at 5:15, that we then have to wait for you until 6 o'clock or something on the Friday before the Labor Day.

MR. JACKSON: I won't leave, I mean, if you tell me to stick around. I do want to go get some lunch now because I haven't had anything to eat since 6 in the morning.

THE COURT: That's fine. Go to lunch. You can go back to your office. I'm just saying, you know, at 5 o'clock they're either going to have a verdict or they're not.

MR. JACKSON: Yes, I understand.

THE COURT: If they don't have a verdict, we send them home.

MR. JACKSON: Now, you don't keep them sequestered over the -- you send them home for the evening with the admonishment.

THE COURT: For the weekend, and then they come back on Tuesday.

MR. JACKSON: Oh, they won't -- so they won't --

MS. BEVERLY: I'm sure that won't be a problem.

MR. JACKSON: All right.

THE COURT: Yes, because it's Labor Day. I mean, they don't come in and deliberate on Saturday and Sunday. They go home and come back on -- come back on Tuesday.

1 MR. JACKSON: All right. So you will keep them 2 probably until 5 or 6 at the latest probably and them send them 3 home? 4 THE COURT: Yes, at the latest. I mean --5 MR. JACKSON: And they won't come back until Tuesday. 6 They won't -- all right. Well --7 THE COURT: Right it would be Tuesday at 9 o'clock. 8 MS. LAVELL: Thank you, Judge. 9 MS. BEVERLY: Bye, Judge. 10 (Proceedings recessed 1:08 p.m. to 5:38 p.m.) 11 (In the presence of the jury.) 12 THE COURT: All right. Court is now back in session. 13 The record should reflect the presence of the State through the deputy district attorney, the presence of the defendant and his 14 15 counsel, the officers of the court and the ladies and gentlemen of the jury. 16 17 Who is the jury foreperson? 18 JUROR NO. 03: I am. 19 THE COURT: All right. Juror No. 3, Ms. Petkewich, 20 has the jury in this matter reached a verdict? 21 JUROR NO. 03: Yes, we have. 22 THE COURT: Would you please hand the forms of 23 verdict to the bailiff. The clerk will now read the verdict out loud and 24 25 inquire if this is the verdict of the jury.

THE CLERK: Yes, Your Honor.

District Court, Clark County, Nevada, the State of Nevada, plaintiff Versus Joshua Shue, defendant, Case C288172, Department 21 verdict. We the jury in the above entitled case find the defendant as follows:

Count 1, Child abuse, neglect or endangerment, Guilty of child abuse, neglect or endangerment.

Count 2, Use of child in production, Guilty of use of child in production.

Count 3, Use of child in production, Guilty of use of child in production.

Count 4, Use of child in production, Guilty of use of child in production.

Count 5, Possession of visual presentation depicting sexual conduct of a child, Guilty of possession of visual presentation depicting sexual conduct of a child.

Count 6, Use of child in production, Guilty of use of child in production.

Count 7, Use of child in production, Guilty of use of child in production.

Count 8, Possession of visual presentation depicting sexual conduct of a child, Guilty of possession of visual presentation depicting sexual conduct of a child.

Count 9, Use of child in production, Guilty of use of child in production.

KARR Reporting, Inc. 137

presentation depicting sexual conduct of a child, Guilty of

Count 20, Possession -- Possession of visual

24

25

2	child.
3	Count 21, Use of child in production, Guilty of use
4	of child in production.
5	Count 22, Use of child in production, Guilty of use
6	of child in production.
7	Count 23, Possession of visual presentation depicting
8	sexual conduct of a child, Guilty of possession of visual
9	presentation depicting sexual conduct of a child.
10	Count 24, Use of production Use of child in
11	production, Guilty of use of child in production.
12	Count 25, Use of child in production, Guilty of use
13	of child in production.
14	Count 26, Possession of visual presentation depicting
15	sexual conduct of a child, Guilty of possession of visual
16	presentation depicting sexual conduct of a child.
17	Count 27, Use of child in production, Guilty of use
18	of child in production.
19	Count 28, Use of child in production, Guilty of use
20	of child in production.
21	Count 29, Use of child in production, Guilty of use
22	of child in production.
23	Count 30, Use of child in production, Guilty of use
24	of child in production.
25	Count 31, Use of child in production, Guilty of use

possession of visual presentation depicting sexual conduct of a

of child in production. 1 Count 32, Use of child in production, Guilty of use 2 of child in production. 3 Count 33, Use of child in production, Guilty of use of child in production. 5 Count 34, Use of child in production, Guilty of use 6 of child in production. 7 Count 35, Use of child in production, Guilty of use 8 of child in production. 9 Count 36, Use of child in production, Guilty of use 10 of child in production. 11 Count 37, Use of child in production, Guilty of use 12 of child in production. 13 Count 38, Use of child in production, Guilty of use 14 of child in production. 1.5 Count 39, Open and gross lewdness, Guilty of open and 16 gross lewdness. 17 Count 40, Possession of visual presentation depicting 18 sexual conduct of a child, Guilty of possession of visual 19 presentation depicting sexual conduct of a child. 20 Count 41, Possession of visual presentation depicting 21 sexual conduct of a child, Guilty of possession of visual 22 presentation depicting sexual conduct of a child. 23 Dated this 29th day of August, 2014. Sonia 24 Petkewich, Foreperson.

> KARR Reporting, Inc. 139

25

1	Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, is this your	
2	verdict as read, so say you one, so say you all?	
3	JURORS: Yes.	
4	THE COURT: All right. Before the verdict is	
5	recorded into the minutes of the court, does either side have	
6	the desire to have the jury polled?	
7	MS. LAVELL: The State does not.	
8	THE COURT: Mr. Jackson?	
9	MR. JACKSON: Yes.	
10	THE COURT: All right. The clerk will now poll the	
11	members of the jury.	
12	THE CLERK: Juror in Seat 1, is this your verdict as	
13	read?	
14	JUROR NO. 01: Yes.	
15	THE CLERK: Seat 2, is this your verdict as read?	
16	JUROR NO. 02: Yes.	
17	THE CLERK: 3, is this your verdict as read?	
18	JUROR NO. 03: Yes.	
19	THE CLERK: 4, is this your verdict as read?	
20	JUROR NO. 04: Yes.	
21	THE CLERK: 5, is this your verdict as read?	
22	JUROR NO. 05: Yes.	
23	THE CLERK: 8, is this your verdict as read?	
24	JUROR NO. 08: Yes.	
25	THE CLERK: 9, is this your verdict as read?	

22

23

24

25

JUROR NO. 09: Yes. THE CLERK: 10, is this your verdict as read? JUROR NO. 10: Yes. THE CLERK: 11, is this your verdict as read? JUROR NO. 11: Yes. THE CLERK: 12, is this your verdict as read? JUROR NO. 12: Yes. THE CLERK: 13, is this your verdict as read? JUROR NO. 13: Yes. THE CLERK: 14, is this your verdict as read? JUROR NO. 14: Yes.

THE COURT: All right. The verdict will now be recorded into the minutes of the court.

Ladies and gentlemen, this concludes your service as I want to thank you very much for your service and your attentiveness during these proceedings. The prohibition about speaking about the case is now lifted. You're free to speak with each other or with anyone else you choose.

Sometimes the lawyers like to speak with members of the jury. If these individuals want to do so, it's perfectly fine for you to speak with them. Conversely, if you'd rather not speak with them, obviously they'll respect your wishes in that regard.

We have arranged to have your vouchers available for

you on the third floor. So I'd ask you all to collect your things and follow the bailiff from the courtroom.

(Jury excused 5:47 p.m.)

THE COURT: All right. We have to set a sentencing date.

And is this one we need a psychosexual for? MS. LAVELL: Yes, Your Honor, and at this time, if this is the appropriate time, the State would ask that the defendant be remanded without bail.

THE COURT: Mr. Jackson.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. JACKSON: Well, he's been on bail and made all court appearances. I don't know what's -- you know, he hasn't been sentenced yet, and he hasn't had a psychosexual evaluation.

THE COURT: I mean, here's my feeling --

MR. JACKSON: I know it's a mandatory sentence on some of the counts. Whether or not I would ask for bail pending appeal is an issue that I haven't researched or briefed yet. I don't think he's going to flee. I think he's made all court appearances, and he knows that if he did he'd be dead meat. Any chance of any issues on appeal of course would be -that would -- that would ruin any chance for him.

Obviously, you know, there's always the anticipation of an adverse verdict, and I've explained that to him, and I realized the State would seek to remand him today, and he knew

that if he was convicted. So, you know, I still am asking the Court to consider leaving him on the bail that he's posted and require, you know, maybe house arrest or something else.

Again, I do -- naturally, he has an automatic appeal for something this serious, and I haven't been retained for the appeal, but I know I have to do a fast track I believe in this matter in any event, but I've discussed with the family, you know, the possibility of doing a more extensive appeal, whether they would retain me for that or not. He's indigent of course if he's in custody.

THE COURT: If not, I mean, obviously counsel will be appointed for him for the appeal. You know, based on the seriousness of the charges that he's just been convicted of, I did before coming in check to see how much bond he posted. His bond was \$75,000, which is a relatively modest amount given the charges in this case. So based on that, you know, I don't know very much about this defendant — he has shown up — other than what he testified to, about his background and the fact that he's now been convicted of all of these things. So he is remanded, held without bond.

The bond that has been posted will be exonerated, and we'll give you a sentencing date.

And Ms. Husted will give a date.

THE CLERK: December 9th at 9:30.

MS. LAVELL: Thank you, Your Honor.

MR. JACKSON: Okay. I don't have my --THE COURT: And then obviously that starts once --your appeal starts once we've sentenced him. MR. JACKSON: Well, it'll be 30 days after that. THE COURT: Right. MR. JACKSON: I don't have my calendar with me. I think that date is okay. If not, I will so advise the court. THE COURT: Okay. If not, let us know, or put it on calendar, and we'll move it, or we can move it from chambers, just as long as you let the State know. And, Mr. Jackson, if anyone cares, Ms. Lavell, I'll just briefly thank them, and then the bailiff will escort them to the third floor. MS. LAVELL: I'll go down. Thank you, Your Honor. (Proceedings adjourned 5:51 p.m.) 

KARR Reporting, Inc.

#### CERTIFICATION

I CERTIFY THAT THE FOREGOING IS A CORRECT TRANSCRIPT FROM THE AUDIO-VISUAL RECORDING OF THE PROCEEDINGS IN THE ABOVE-ENTITLED MATTER.

### **AFFIRMATION**

I AFFIRM THAT THIS TRANSCRIPT DOES NOT CONTAIN THE SOCIAL SECURITY OR TAX IDENTIFICATION NUMBER OF ANY PERSON OR ENTITY.

KARR REPORTING, INC. Aurora, Colorado

KIMBERLY LAWSON

Electronically Filed 03/26/2015 09:32:34 AM

		Alun J. Lahrum
1	RTRAN	CLERK OF THE COURT
2		
3 4		
5	DISTRIC	T COURT
6	DISTRICT COURT  CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA	
7	CLARK COUNTT, NEVADA	
8	THE STATE OF NEVADA,	)
9		( ) ) CASE#: C288172
10	Plaintiff, vs.	) ) DEPT. XXI
11	JOSHUA C. SHUE, aka	
12	JOSHUA CALEB SHUE	
13	Defendant.	
14	BEFORE THE HONORABLE VALERIE P. ADAIR, DISTRICT COURT JUDGE	
15	TUESDAY, DECEMBER 9, 2014	
16	ł .	CRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS ENCING
17		
18	APPEARANCES:	
19	For the State:	TIERRA D. JONES, ESQ. Deputy District Attorney
20		
21	For the Defendant:	TERRENCE M. JACKSON, ESQ.
22 23		
23 24		
25	RECORDED BY: JANIE OLSEN, COUR'	T RECORDER
-		

## TUESDAY, DECEMBER 9, 2014 AT 9:46 A.M.

4

THE COURT: All right. State versus Joshua Shue, who is present in custody.

And I appreciate that you did contact -- you spoke to with my law clerk and we were given a heads up that we would be continuing this. So I appreciate that because I didn't read everything.

MR. JACKSON: I advised the deputy district attorney as well. Dr. Paglini needs additional time to complete his report. He advised me of that last Thursday or Friday, whatever it was. And I think he needs about three weeks, so that's going to put us right about Christmas. Whatever the Court's pleasure.

THE COURT: Let's put it into the New Year then --

MR. JACKSON: Yeah.

THE COURT: -- with the holiday. And that could also affect --

MR. JACKSON: Okay.

THE COURT: -- his ability to get the report done. So Ms. Husted will give a new date the first of the year.

MS. JONES: The State would just ask for not the 7<sup>th</sup> or the 12<sup>th</sup> of January.

THE COURT: Okay. And also I show that we did have victim speakers. So make sure, if they're not here today --

MS. JONES: We'll notify them.

THE COURT: -- that they're notified of the new date.

MS. JONES: We will.

THE COURT CLERK: January 15th at 9:30.

[][

1	MR. JACKSON: Thank you, Your Honor.		
2	THE COURT: All right. Thank you.		
3	[Proceedings concluded at 9:47 a.m.]		
4	* * * * * *		
5			
6			
7			
8			
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20	·		
21	ATTEST: I do hereby certify that I have truly and correctly transcribed the audio/video proceedings in the above-entitled case to the best of my ability.		
. 22			
23	Sandra A Pruchnic SANDRA PRUCHNIC		
24	SANDRA PRUCHNIC		
25	Court Transcriber		

Electronically Filed 03/26/2015 09:36:17 AM

**RTRAN** CLERK OF THE COURT 2 3 5 DISTRICT COURT 6 CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA 7 THE STATE OF NEVADA, CASE#: C288172 Plaintiff, VS. 10 DEPT. XXI 11 JOSHUA C. SHUE, aka JOSHUA CALEB SHUE 12 Defendant. 13 BEFORE THE HONORABLE VALERIE P. ADAIR, DISTRICT COURT JUDGE 14 THURSDAY, JANUARY 15, 2015 15 RECORDER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS 16 **SENTENCING** 17 **APPEARANCES:** 18 19 For the State: LEAH C. BEVERLY, ESQ. **Deputy District Attorney** 20 For the Defendant: TERRENCE M. JACKSON, ESQ. 21 22 ALSO PRESENT: 23 Victim Impact Speaker: HAZEL IRAL 24 RECORDED BY: JANIE OLSEN, COURT RECORDER 25

## THURSDAY, JANUARY 15, 2015 AT 10:00 A.M.

THE COURT: State versus Joshua Shue. Mr. Shue is present in custody with Mr. Jackson. We have Ms. Beverly for the State.

This is the time set for the rendition of sentence. Are both sides prepared to go forward?

MS. BEVERLY: I am, Your Honor.

MR. JACKSON: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. And I believe we have a speaker. Is that correct?

MS. BEVERLY: Yes, we do. Hazel Iral.

THE COURT: All right. And I'm assuming you would like her to address the Court last; is that correct?

MS. BEVERLY: Yes, please, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. JACKSON: Your Honor, is that the tradition to have the speaker go last after --

THE COURT: Pursuant to statute it is.

MR. JACKSON: All right.

THE COURT: All right. This being a jury verdict, obviously, the State has the right to argue. Ms. Beverly.

MS. BEVERLY: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And I did -- just for the record, I would like to note that I did receive the evaluation as well as a submission of numerous letters in support of Mr. Shue. So I'd like the record to reflect that --

MR. JACKSON: Thank you.

THE COURT: -- and that I have reviewed all of that.

MS. BEVERLY: I did receive both of those --

THE COURT: All right.

MS. BEVERLY: -- as well, Your Honor. Thank you.

As Your Honor knows, this was a jury trial and Your Honor sat through this case. It was about a week long and so I don't want to go over the facts of the case too much, but there's a couple of different areas I want to address during my argument.

First, just talking generally about this case. This case was never a case about the credibility of the victim, Hazel Iral. No matter how -- how much we tried to make it about the credibility of her it was not. These crimes were caught on video. And one of the saddest things about this case is that Hazel Iral had to watch these videos over and over and over again. She had to watch them in my office when we were talking about charging this case. She had to watch them in front of strangers at the grand jury. She had to watch them in front of strangers at the jury trial. And each time she had to watch these videos she had to be re-victimized having to watch herself and her brothers naked in front of strangers doing private bathroom things that nobody should have to be exposed to. Nobody should have to deal with that type of stress and that type of embarrassment.

But she also had to deal with not only having to watch these videos over and over again, but she had to deal with the fact that not only did the Defendant take these videos, but more than likely, based on the photos we saw during trial of where this -- this computer and this camera were found, that more than likely he was pleasuring himself to these videos.

MR. JACKSON: I'm going to object to her making conclusions.

Ç

 THE COURT: Well, I would just say stick to the evidence. But there was some evidence in the drawer, I believe, of the computer station where allegedly -- or he was -- appeared to be watching the videos. So I think that's probably what Ms. Beverly is talking about, some of the items. And there was dispute during the trial what the meaning of the items was, but the items in the drawer. Is that what you're talking about --

MS. BEVERLY: Yes.

THE COURT: -- Ms. Beverly?

MS. BEVERLY: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. BEVERLY: Thank you, Your Honor.

So -- again, she had to deal with all of this embarrassment and this humiliation based on the Defendant's conduct. She had to not only watch herself being videotaped; she also had to watch her brother being naked in the bathroom.

And this is a case where the Defendant was beginning to escalate. We had all of these videos being filmed over a period of time. And we have then the culmination of this is when Hazel came home and the Defendant took a picture up her skirt and tried to inappropriately kiss her. And I think that logic and reason says that the Defendant was beginning to escalate. He was getting bolder in his approach. The videos were no longer enough for him. He was now moving on to physical contact with these victims. And who knows what would have happened had Hazel not reported this on the day that she reported this.

During this trial also, despite this crime being on video and despite the State showing video after video after video, the Defendant still took the stand and lied about these videos. He lied about accidently leaving this camera in the

bathroom -- the kids' bathroom. He lied about him and Anita doing these sexual things in the bathroom and maybe that's why the camera was in the bathroom despite multiple witnesses testifying that this was the children's bathroom. He lied about Hazel being the person to crop these videos and somehow put the Defendant's face on these videos and then merged the videos to have herself and her brother in these videos.

He has not for one second taken responsibility for his behavior. All he has tried to do is humiliate Hazel and destroy her. And I think that we can see that from the stand completely calling her, you know, a liar and telling her -- saying that she did all of these things. All of these things that have been said about Hazel throughout this trial they're disgusting and they're horrible. And yet the trial -- and this whole proceeding with Mr. Shue has tried to shift the focus away from his behavior and onto Hazel and that's not what we're here for. So for these reasons alone he deserves to spend the rest of his life in prison. But he also deserves to spend the rest of this life in prison because this was not something that just happened one time, it didn't happen twice; it happened over and over and over again.

Now during the trial we had only a portion of the video. But there were multiple other videos in this case that the jury didn't hear about. These videos went on for days. And at some point during my charging of the case I had to stop charging because there were too many videos and we had to make this case somewhat manageable. But now that we're here at sentencing we can talk about all of these other videos that were found on his computer and all of these other images that were found on his computer. And what that shows is, that each and every day he chose to put that camera in the bathroom and film these children he was

committing a crime. And that is not a continuous course of conduct; it's each and every day. And so each and every day he deserves to be punished for.

Now I want to talk about -- a little bit about some of the items in the PSI that was prepared.

THE COURT: Right. And you know that we have a supplemental PSI on this one.

MS. BEVERLY: Yes, Your Honor. And that was because -- because of the age of the children. There are different punishments based on the age of the children.

Now I'm sure that when Mr. Jackson argues he's going to argue that the Defendant doesn't have a criminal history. And I think it's more appropriate to say that he doesn't have a documented criminal history.

MR. JACKSON: I think that's an inappropriate argument. If what she --

THE COURT: Well --

MS. BEVERLY: If I can finish my argument.

THE COURT: Okay. As long as there's -- when you say documented -- I mean, there has to have been an arrest or evidence of it that was produced to Mr. Jackson in this case or something like that. So if you don't have anything that we can look to I think it's probably inappropriate argument. I don't know where you're going with this, frankly.

MS. BEVERLY: Okay. I'm -- and let me just move on. What I mean to say is that he doesn't have any prior arrests; that's true. He doesn't have a prior -- what we would consider for PSI purposes as a criminal history. But every time he filmed these kids every single day -- and we know it's a different day because Hazel testified to that and we -- you know, she testified she had different clothes on,

different hairstyles. So every time that he chose to put that camera in the bathroom for the significant length of time he was committing a crime. And we know that in these types of cases these are crimes of secret. So it's not surprising that he doesn't have any prior arrests or that he seems to be this great person in the community. But he was committing a crime every single day. So I think if we look at each of these videos separately we'll see that he has a pattern of victimizing these children.

Now another thing about his PSI is that the Defendant reports that he had a good childhood, there was no abuse, there was no mental health issues, no trauma in his life. And that just raises the question to me -- you know, he has no excuses. This behavior is so unacceptable. He had a great family. In fact, most of his family seems to be here today. And so why -- why would he do this? He also reports that, true, he was in the army. Looked like he worked a good job for a while. I mean, Mr. Shue looks like a great person on paper except for the fact that he has this dirty little secret, which is his sexual obsession for children, and it's evidenced by these video; it's evidenced by his contin -- his escalation now to -- beginning to kiss Hazel and take a picture up her skirt.

He also doesn't give a statement in his PSI. It's not surprising because not for one day this entire time we've had this trial has he at any point accepted responsibility for his conduct. He doesn't care about Hazel. He doesn't care about these boys. He wants to just do what he wants to do and he still thinks that he really did nothing wrong.

I also want to talk about some of these letters from his family members.

There's a letter from his sister Sara [phonetic]. And his sister Sara says the

Defendant was like a father figure to the kids in his past relationships. She doesn't

know how the kids will make it without him. That is so disturbing and so unbelievable to me that despite him being found guilty of charges involving these same children for some reason his family still thinks he's a good father figure to these kids and she doesn't know what they're going to do without him. Well, I think what they're going to do without him is not be victimized every single day.

She also says -- and I'm sorry. Let me just say that I purposely did not call the two younger boys, Hazel's brothers, in this trial. I know that Mr. Jackson did. But I purposely didn't call them because I'm not trying to expose them to something that they don't need to be exposed to. You know, it's a hard position for the State to be in because they are the victims, but at the same time I'm also trying to protect them and so that's the reason the State didn't call them in trial. Hazel was able to cover all of that area.

THE COURT: I mean, I'm not going to hold it against the State that you didn't call the children. And obviously, you know, his family has their perception of him based on their dealings with Mr. Shue. You know, they're probably not familiar with all of the evidence in the case. And, candidly, sometimes, you know, people will victimize one set of children and not another set of children because of what their relationships are. So that doesn't seem particularly curious to me, quite frankly, that his sister trusts him and -- you know, maybe he has had a good relationship with those children. As I said, that's not unusual for people to treat different children differently.

MS. BEVERLY: Absolutely, Your Honor.

And I just want to --

THE COURT: And I think there may have even been a suggestion of some of that in this case.

I

. 8

MS. BEVERLY: Absolutely.

And I just want to note though, Your Honor, though that also in his sister's letter she talks about this long terrible journey the Defendant has been through. And it just bothers me because there's all these people here for the Defendant, yet Hazel -- there's nobody here for her. And I want to specifically talk about the letter from Anita Aguilar [phonetic], who I assume is Anita Iral, based on her statement. And I want to note that Anita is here today. She's in the courtroom. She's not with her daughter, but --

THE COURT: Right. And that was -- I mean, obviously, I just remind -- you know, Ms. Beverly, some of these issues were brought out at -- during the trial --

MS. BEVERLY: Sure.

THE COURT: -- in terms of the dynamic that's going on here between the victims' mother and the Defendant. And we talked about that and we had a hearing, so I'm fully -- I just want to remind you I'm fully aware of a lot of this history. You know, we had the hearing before, even a trial on some issues.

MS. BEVERLY: Thank you, Your Honor.

So I would just ask that Your Honor just pay close attention to Anita's letter and remember her testimony at trial and how this has really affected Hazel and her relationship with Anita. And the fact that she's even here today, not with her daughter, is very disturbing to the State.

I also want to just briefly talk about the psych eval that was done on him. He talks about what a fun child he had -- childhood he had and he had no drama. Again, there's no responsibility being taken here. And the psych eval notes that he is a moderate risk to offend, so that's also disturbing to the State.

Lastly, Your Honor, what I'm going to ask for in this case is we have

 counts -- Count 1, I would ask for a 19 to 48. Then we have the counts relating to Curt, which is on page 1 of the PSI. I would ask -- those counts carry a sentence of 10 to life. I would ask that Your Honor sentence him on each of those counts relating to Curt to a sentence of 10 to life and run all of those consecutive because these are separate days; these are separate incidences.

Then we have on page 2 the counts relating to Hazel for use of minor in production. There's multiple counts of that. That sentence is 5 to life. I would ask that Your Honor sentence him on each of those counts to 5 to life. Run each of those consecutive, but concurrent to the counts relating to Curt.

Then we have the counts of possession of child pornography. On those counts I would ask Your Honor to sentence him to a max of 28 -- excuse me, 28 to 72; run those concurrent. Those are based on the same videos. And Count 39 I would ask for the full 364 days; those running concurrent.

So the main thing I'm asking for is that the videos on page 1 relating to Curt, and some including Hazel as well, run consecutive because I believe that each of these days was a different event and each day they were victimized.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Ms. Beverly.

Mr. Shue, what, if anything, would you like to say to the Court before the Court pronounces sentence against you this morning?

THE DEFENDANT: I would like to say that I'm very sorry I'm in this situation, but I will allow my attorney to speak for me.

THE COURT: All right. And obviously the matter's on appeal.

Mr. Jackson?

MR. JACKSON: Well, the first thing I'd like to say is I thought the rules of professional conduct as a prosecutor isn't to vouch for his witnesses -- his or her

witnesses. And Ms. Beverly's done an excellent job vouching for her main witness, the victim in this case. And we all feel sorry for a victim in any criminal case; however, that being said, the prosecutor made a good case for me pointing out all the people that said things at the trial and after the trial about the victim's credibility.

I'm not going to say anything about the victim's credibility. I think I've already done that at the trial and through cross-examination and whatever. I think the young woman had difficulty. She was being paid by the State to come here. We know that.

MS. BEVERLY: Your Honor, I'm going to object to that.

THE COURT: Well --

MR. JACKSON: Well, I got -- she got a chance to speak.

MS. BEVERLY: I'm going -- we talked about this so many times.

THE MARSHAL: Counsel, one at a time.

THE COURT: Okay. Ms. Beverly, I'm going to say the same thing to Mr. Jackson and I'll reiterate what I just said to you. I heard the trial. I heard the hearing where we took the testimony on the allegation that she was being paid by the State. And the evidence was that she received a payment based on her status as a foster child. And the Court found that that wasn't related to the District Attorney's Office and had nothing to do with her testifying in the case. So that record has already been made, and it's been remade, and remade again, and made again. And so, you know, I heard all of this and I reviewed everything for today, so that was what it was. And other than that we -- you know, we had the hearing about the allegations. And those were, I thought, fully flushed out. And Mr. Jackson maybe doesn't agree and he still believes that there was something going on, but the evidence is what the evidence was. And we actually set aside time, which was

unusual to have a hearing on this issue --

MR. JACKSON: I'm sorry, Your Honor.

THE COURT: -- long prior to the trial.

MR. JACKSON: It's a semantic issue. I mean, she says things about my client --

THE COURT: All right.

MR. JACKSON: -- and I'm saying things about the victim, which I think were developed on the record. She did receive money as a foster child and that is undisputed. And there is certainly questions about what exactly happened and what the extent of it is.

Now the problem with this case is the State has taken a very simple case and made it seem like my client is like Jack the Ripper or a serial sex offender when he's never been in trouble before. The State is implying, well, he's done all these things. The worst case, if you look -- if he did everything they proved in front of the jury without any legal problems with it, he took pictures of young woman -- 16, 17-year-old woman in the shower and a young boy sitting on a bathroom toilet. Now this isn't a giant sex offense. There's no evidence of sexual penetration, sexual acts committed with these children. The worst they have is that he attempted to kiss this young girl one night.

Now based on that, they act like he's the worst sex offender they've had -- child sex offender in the last 40 years charging all of these offenses this way.

They had a camera running in a bathroom taking pictures of what was going on in a bathroom when they got in and out of the shower, sitting on a toilet. The government tries to imply these are major pornography. We looked at the pictures.

The prosecutor claims this was terribly offensive, terribly disturbing to the young girl

1 | t 2 | c 3 | 7

to look at these. The prosecution's the one that made her look at them over and over; made the jury look at them. I'm sorry that she had to look at these pictures. They're pictures of herself standing naked in the shower. Well, that's a -- I didn't think the naked body was that offensive a thing.

They have the temerity to come in an argue he should get multiple 10 to life sentences for this offense. I believe the sentences should all run concurrently. I think he should get the minimum sentences in all of these. I think the case should be reversed on appeal, but that's my argument to the Court if I'm appointed to represent him on appeal.

I think there was a statute, which I argued before, that he should've been charged at most a gross misdemeanor that he was taking images of someone without their consent. But the Court ruled against me on that and the Court heard all the arguments I made on that. But to argue that these are multiple 10 to life sentences, he should get these run back-to-back like he's a -- I've had murderers that commit --

THE COURT: Right. Mr. Jackson, you know, P and P looks at this defendant compared to other defendants. The Court looks at this defendant compared to other defendants. And, you know, I'm aware they have defendants committing sexual assaults on minors and they get probation. So --

MR. JACKSON: Well, they get their information --

THE COURT: -- the Court's aware of where this --

MR. JACKSON: -- from the DA's Office.

THE COURT: -- of where -- meaning that's negotiated. You know, the Court has its own opinion of the pictures. I don't need Ms. Beverly to tell me what the pictures look like. I don't need you to tell me --

MR. JACKSON: Right.

THE COURT: -- what the pictures look like because I sat here and I watched the pictures. And, you know, again, I think P and P takes that into consideration where he kind of falls and -- yes, we had a -- we had -- you know, I don't think we had worst people on this week than Mr. Shue in my estimation in terms of his conduct and the lifetime effect on the victim. So -- you know, I think your point on that is well taken. Like I said, maybe not today, but just this week, in my estimation, we have people who've committed more egregious conduct, reference these types of crimes, and in my opinion have probably had a more detrimental impact on the lives of their victims.

MR. JACKSON: I'll wrap it up very quickly. I ask the Court to consider carefully Dr. Paglini's report. He did an analysis of Mr. Shue's background taking into consideration his record; doing some standard tests on him. He assessed him as being low to moderate risk to reoffend, and two to three percent likelihood that he'd reoffend within the next five years once he's released. He said that while in prison he should take whatever counseling is available for sex offender type programs. He did a well-balanced report. He was given all -- I made a list of all the things he was given. I think that his report was -- was balanced and an accurate report as far as Mr. Shue's likelihood to reoffend.

The Defendant's background is not the typical background of a sex offender. He does not have any priors. He does not have any background of any criminal history. He served his country in the military. He had a regular job. This is not the kind of person that typically gets these kind of charges. Whether he made a mistake this time, whether the Court — the appellate court will sustain the conviction or not, I think that anything but a minimum sentence in this matter would be a very

### **VICTIM STATEMENT**

### BY THE SPEAKER:

To me, it impact me a whole lot. It's a lot of change for me. And I became aware of everything and everyone. I get really self-conscious about myself. And it was difficult throughout the three years that that happened to me I couldn't trust anyone; any man that tries to talk to me. I -- even when I take the bus I don't look at anyone 'cause it's hard, you know, feeling violated like that. It's -- it hurts me deep inside and it tore me like emotionally because someone that I trusted, that I thought was gonna be the man that's gonna be like my dad treated me as if I'm just some trash like that, you know. I'm not that kind of person. I'm not the type of person that would try to flirt with him. I'm not that kind of woman. I saw him more as a father. I saw him as someone I could trust. And he took advantage of that and that just leaves me speechless for anything else.

THE COURT: All right. Is there anything else you'd like to say before I sentence the Defendant in this case?

THE SPEAKER: Yes, there's this one last thing.

#### BY THE SPEAKER:

The thing that happened during the summer that escalated to this point, I don't know exactly what happened, but I just said whatever I remembered. And it scared me to the point where I just -- I just didn't want to be around people because I don't know what he put in there. I don't know what he put in my drink. I can't tell you. I can't say it's a drug. I can't say if it's alcohol. I don't know. It makes me really emotional and it scares me a lot as I'm only 20 and what am I gonna say to this guy that I'm gonna marry like that happened to me. What if this video leaks out somewhere and I didn't know about it, you know. It's hard. It's really hard for me.

Ĭ

And my relationship with my mother, it's like she doesn't even understand. Like I don't try to get attention. I'm not that kind of person. I just want my mom to love me, you know. I don't [crying] --

THE COURT: All right. Anything else, Ms. Beverly?

MS. BEVERLY: No.

THE COURT: Mr. Jackson?

MR. JACKSON: I have no questions.

THE COURT: All right.

Thank you very much for coming in and being here today.

THE SPEAKER: Yeah. Thank you.

THE COURT: Very courageous of you.

All right. Mr. Shue, by virtue of the jury's verdict, you're hereby adjudged guilty of Count Number 1, Child Abuse, Neglect or Endangerment; Counts 4, 7, 10, 13, 16, 19, 22 and 25, Use of a Child in Production Age 14 Years or Less; Counts 2, 3, 6, 9, 12, 15, 18, 21, 24, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37 and 38, Use of a Child in Production Minor 14 Years of Age or Older; Counts 5, 8, 11, 14, 17, 20, 23, 26, 40 and 41, Possession of Visual Presentation Depicting a Sexual Conduct of a Child, and Count Number 39, Open and Gross Lewdness.

In addition to the \$25 administrative assessment, the \$150 DNA analysis fee, and the fact that you must submit to a test for genetic markers and restitution in the amount of \$3,540.39, on Count Number 1 you are sentenced to a minimum term of 24 months in the Nevada Department of Corrections and a maximum term of 72 months in the Nevada Department of Corrections.

On Count Number 2, Use of a Child in Production, you're sentenced to ...

life with the possibility of parole beginning after a minimum of five years has been

served and a fine in the amount of \$1,000. That is imposed consecutively to the time I gave you in Count Number 1.

On Count Number 3, Use of a Child in Production, you're sentenced to a minimum term of life with the possibility of parole beginning after a minimum of five years has been served. That is imposed concurrently with Count Number 2. I'm also sentencing you to a fine of \$1,000.

On Count Number 4, Use of a Child in Production, you're sentenced to a minimum term of life with the possibility of parole beginning after a minimum of ten years has a been served and a fine in the amount of \$1,000. That is imposed concurrently with the time you received on Count Number 3.

On Count Number 5, Possession of Visual Presentation Depicting the Sexual Conduct of a Child, you're sentenced to a minimum term of 12 months in the Nevada Department of Corrections and a maximum term of 36 months. That is imposed consecutively to Count 4.

Count Number 6, Use of a Child in Production, you're sentenced to a minimum term of life with parole eligibility beginning after five years has been served and a fine in the amount of \$1,000. That is imposed concurrently with Count Number 3.

On Count Number 7, Use of a Child in Production, you're sentenced to life with your parole eligibility beginning after a minimum of ten years has been served. That is imposed concurrently with Count Number 6 and a fine in the amount of \$1,000 is also imposed.

On Count Number 8, Possession of Visual Presentation Depicting the Sexual Conduct of Child, you're sentenced to 12 to 36 months. That is imposed concurrently.

 On Count -- with Count -- on Count Number 9, Use of a Child in Production, you're sentenced to life with a minimum parole beginning after five years has been served. That is imposed concurrently. You're also sentenced to a fine of \$1,000.

On Count Number 10, Use of a Child in Production, you're sentenced to life with your parole eligibility beginning after ten years has been served and a fine of \$1,000. That is imposed concurrently.

On Count Number 11, Possession of Visual Presentation Depicting the Sexual Conduct of a Child, you're sentenced to 12 to 36 months. That is imposed concurrently.

On Count Number 12, Use of a Child in Production, you're sentenced to a minimum term of life with your parole eligibility beginning after five years has been served and a fine in the amount of \$1,000. That is imposed concurrently.

On Count Number 13, Use of Child in Production, you're sentenced to life with your parole eligibility beginning after a minimum of ten years has been served and a fine in the amount of \$1,000. That is imposed concurrently.

On Count Number 14, Possession of Visual Presentation Depicting the Sexual Conduct of a Child, you're sentenced to a minimum term of 12 months; a maximum term of 72 months. That is imposed concurrently.

On Count Number 15, Use of a Child in Production, you're sentenced to life with the minimum parole eligibility after five years has been served and a fine in the amount of \$1,000. That is imposed concurrently.

On Count Number 16, Use of a Child in Production, you are sentenced to life with the minimum parole eligibility beginning after ten years has been served and a fine in the amount of \$1,000. That is imposed concurrently.

On Count Number 17, Possession of Visual Presentation Depicting the Sexual Conduct of a Child, you're sentenced to a minimum term of 12 months; a maximum of 72 months. That is imposed concurrently.

On Count Number 18, Use of a Child in Production, you are sentenced to life with the minimum parole eligibility beginning after five years and a fine in the amount of \$1,000. That is imposed concurrently.

On Count Number 19, Use of a Child in Production, you are sentenced to life with your parole eligibility beginning after a minimum of ten years has been served and a fine in the amount of \$1,000. That is imposed concurrently.

Count Number 20, Possession of Visual Presentation Depicting the Sexual Conduct of a Child, you are sentenced to a minimum term of 12 months; a maximum term of 72 months. That is imposed concurrently.

On Count Number 21, Use of a Child in Production, you are sentenced to life with parole eligibility beginning after five years has been served and a fine in the amount of \$1,000. That is imposed concurrently.

On Count Number 22, Use of a Child in Production, you are sentenced to a minimum term of life with your parole eligibility beginning after ten years has been served and a fine in the amount of \$1,000. That is imposed concurrently.

On Count Number 23, Possession of Visual Presentation Depicting the Sexual Conduct of a Child, you're sentenced to a minimum term of 12 months; a maximum of 72 months. That is imposed concurrently.

On Count Number 24, Use of a Child in Production, you are sentenced to life with the minimum parole eligibility beginning after five years has been served and a fine in the amount of \$1,000. That is imposed concurrently.

On Count Number 25, Use of a Child in Production, you are sentenced

to life with your parole eligibility beginning after a minimum of ten years has been served. That is imposed concurrently.

On Count Number 26, Possession of Visual Presentation Depicting the Sexual Conduct of a Child, you're sentenced to a minimum term of 23 months; a maximum term of 72 months. That is imposed concurrently.

On Count Number 27, Use of a Child in Production, you're sentenced to life with the parole eligibility beginning after five years has been served and a fine in the amount of \$1,000. That is imposed concurrently.

On Count Number 28, Use of a Child in Production, you're sentenced to life with your parole eligibility beginning after five years has been served and a fine in the amount of \$1,000. That is imposed concurrently.

On Count Number 29, Use of a Child in Production, you are sentenced to life with your parole eligibility beginning after five years has been served; a fine in the amount of \$1,000. That is imposed concurrently.

Count Number 30, Use of a Child in Production, you are sentenced to life with the parole eligibility beginning after five years has been served and a fine in the amount of \$1,000. That is imposed concurrently.

On Count Number 31, Use of a Child in Production, you are sentenced to life with your parole eligibility beginning after five years has been served; a fine in the amount of \$1,000. That is imposed concurrently.

On Count Number 32, Use of a Child in Production, you are sentenced to life with the parole eligibility beginning after a minimum of five years. That is imposed concurrently and I'm also imposing a fine in the amount of \$1,000.

Count Number 33, Use of Production, you're sentenced to life with your parole eligibility beginning after five years has been served; a fine in the amount of

 \$1,000. That is imposed concurrently.

Count Number 34, Use of a Child in Production, you are sentenced to life with your parole eligibility beginning after five years has been served; a fine in the amount of \$1,000. That is imposed concurrently.

Count Number 35, Use of a Child, you're sentenced to life with your parole eligibility beginning after five years has been served; a fine in the amount of \$1,000. That is imposed concurrently.

Count Number 36, Use of a Child in Production, you're sentenced to life with your parole eligibility beginning after five years has been served; a fine in the amount of \$1,000. That is imposed concurrently.

Count Number 37, Use of a Child in Production, you're sentenced to life with your parole eligibility beginning after five years has been served; a fine in the amount of \$1,000. That is imposed concurrently.

And Count Number 38, Use of a Child in Production, you're sentenced to life with your parole eligibility beginning after five years has been served. That is imposed concurrently. I'm also assessing a fine of \$1,000.

On Count Number 39, Open and Gross Lewdness, you're sentenced to 364 days in the Clark County Detention Center. That is imposed concurrently.

On Count Number 40, Possession of Visual Presentation Depicting the Sexual Conduct of a Child, you're sentenced to a minimum term of 12 months; a maximum term of 72 months. That is imposed concurrently.

On Count Number 41, Possession of Visual Presentation Depicting the Sexual Conduct of a Child, you're sentenced to a minimum of 12 months; a maximum of 72 months. That is imposed concurrently.

I show that you are entitled to 106 days of credit for -- let's see. He had

1	106 days. Has anyone done the calculation on what he now has?	
2	MS. BEVERLY: I believe it's going to be I think it was 141.	
3	THE COURT: Does that sound right to you, Mr. Jackson?	
4	MR. JACKSON: [No audible response.]	
5	THE COURT: One hundred and forty-one days of credit for time served.	
6	MS. BEVERLY: Thank you.	
7	THE COURT: All right. Thank you.	
8	[Proceedings concluded at 10:39 a.m.]	
9	* * * * * *	
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21	ATTEST: I do hereby certify that I have truly and correctly transcribed the audio/video proceedings in the above-entitled case to the best of my ability.	
22	audio/video proceedings in the above-challed base to the best of my ability.	
23	Sanna A Pruchnic	
24	SANDRA PRUCHNIC	
25	Court Transcriber	

		Alun D. Lehum
1	RTRAN	CLERK OF THE COURT
2		
3		
4		
5	DISTRICT COURT	
6	CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA	
7		
8	THE STATE OF NEVADA,	<b>)</b>
9	Plaintiff,	CASE#: C288172
10	VS.	DEPT. XXI
11	JOSHUA C. SHUE, aka JOSHUA CALEB SHUE	\ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \
12		
13	Defendant.	\ 
14	BEFORE THE HONORABLE DOUGLAS E. SMITH, DISTRICT COURT JUDGE	
15	THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 5, 2015  RECORDER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS	
16		NTMENT OF ATTORNEY FOR APPEAL
17		
18	APPEARANCES:	
19	For the State:	CAROLINE BATEMAN, ESQ.
20		Deputy District Attorney
21	For the Defendant:	TERRENCE M. JACKSON, ESQ.
22		
23		
24		
25	RECORDED BY: JANIE OLSEN, COUR	I RECORDER
	·	

# THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 5, 2015 AT 9:31 A.M.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: C288172, Joshua Shue.

I spoke to Drew Christensen. Mr. Jackson, you're allowed to withdraw and we're going to appoint the public defender to handle the appeal.

MR. JACKSON: That's fine, Your Honor.

I've spoken to the family. You know, the cost of getting the transcripts and whatever I think is beyond their means at this time. I will provide all my records to the Public Defender's Office in a timely manner.

The notice of appeal needs to be filed before February 19<sup>th</sup>. I'm advising the public defender of that. I will cooperate with them in getting the documents I have in my file. The -- it was a fairly lengthy trial. I have lots of pretrial stuff I'll box up and give to them --

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. JACKSON: -- and make it available to them within a few days.

THE COURT: Okay. Thanks, Terry.

[Proceedings concluded at 9:32 a.m.]

ATTEST: I do hereby certify that I have truly and correctly transcribed the audio/video proceedings in the above-entitled case to the best of my ability.

Court Transcriber

1	IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA	
2		
3	JOSHUA C. SHUE, ) No. 67428	
4	Appellant, )	
5	v. )	
6	)	
7	THE STATE OF NEVADA, )	
8	Respondent. )	
9	APPELLANT'S APPENDIX VOLUME VIII PAGES 1349-1521	
10	ATTELLANT SATTENDIA VOLUME VIITAGES 1349 1321	
11	PHILIP J. KOHN  Clark County Public Defender  STEVE WOLFSON  Clark County District Attorney	
12	Clark County Public Defender 309 South Third Street Las Vegas, Nevada 89155-2610  Clark County District Attorney 200 Lewis Avenue, 3 <sup>rd</sup> Floor Las Vegas, Nevada 89155	
13	Attorney for Appellant ADAM LAXALT	
14	Attorney General 100 North Carson Street	
15	Carson City, Nevada 89701-4717 (702) 687-3538	
16	Counsel for Respondent	
17	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE	
18	I hereby certify that this document was filed electronically with the Nevada	
19	Supreme Court on the day of 2015. Electronic Service of the	
20	foregoing document shall be made in accordance with the Master Service List as follows:	
21	CATHERINE CORTEZ MASTO HOWARD S. BROOKS STEVEN S. OWENS WILL WATERS	
22	I further certify that I served a copy of this document by mailing a true and	
23	correct copy thereof, postage pre-paid, addressed to:	
24	JOSHUA C. SHUE	
25	NDOC # 1133873 c/o HIGH DESERT STATE PRISON	
26	PO Box 650	
27	Indian Springs, NV 89070	
28	Employee, Clark County Public Defender's Office	