your opinion if you knew that a jury found him guilty of domestic battery. Would it change your -- were allowed to then challenge his opinion with specific incidents. And so rather that doing all of this at the bench when Mr. DeSalvio hits the stand I just wanted to put it on the courts radar that's our position on how that witness ought to go.

THE COURT: Ms. Palm.

MS. PALM: Your Honor, we did litigate all the bad act stuff at the first trial. The courts ruling was we could talk about the relationship as it was from the time he got out of prison, and what they would be able to do is admit the prior felony conviction and that was the balancing determination that was made.

Mr. Desalvic is going to talk about how he sent Brian to alcohol counseling because Brian came to him with a problem. He is going to talk about that Brian was excited to introduce Victoria to him and that they worked together at the Union, and that she helped on the phones and he helped in the campaign.

He's not to get -- he's not giving an opinion other that what he saw. He's -- he's just saying that the time they met them they seemed like they were a couple and he seemed excited to introduce her.

MR. LALLI: Then it's irrelevant. What -- what -the reason they're offering it, Your Honor, is to show that he
cared for her, he was happy to introduce her to his Union

ROUGH DRAFT TRANSCRIPT

friend's, that he loved her, that he cared for her and that feeling is inconsistent with him wanting to kill her. It's character evidence and they're using to show that he acted in conformity there with on the night of the murder. It's character.

MS. PALM: And -- and --

MR. LALLI: So if it's character there is specific ways that the evidence code allows that evidence to be introduced. And then --

THE COURT: Ms. Palm, under 48.045(1), evidence of a person's character or trait is not admissible for purpose of proving that he acted in conformity therewith. And that's what -- isn't that what your asking, is that he acted in conformity of a loving boyfriend?

MS, PALM: Well, then the State is introducing these threats from Cheryl Morris and that he wanted to kill her. And this is to -- this is evidence to rebut that, that he was sitting around wanting to kill her, and he hated her, and he wanted to kill the bitch and all the other evidence that they get to introduce.

That was the courts balancing determination that was made a long time ago. The State never brought a motion on this. They know that Mr. DeSalvio was going to testify, and here we are again doing everything at the last minute. I'd like a chance to brief it if the Court's not going to let have

him testify. MR. LALLI: I'm not saying he can't testify, I'm just 2 saying that the Rules of Evidence need to be followed. 3 THE COURT: Well, you --4 MS. PALM: Well, then --5 THE COURT: You can -- Mr. Lalli do you have an 6 objection to him testifying that he saw them together, he saw 7 them having dinner together, at a picnic together before this event? I don't know what the time frame was, I don't recall what the time frame was of the --10 MS, PALM: It was --11 THE COURT: -- community picnic. 12 MS. PALM: It was just before the election in 13 November and just before the incident that they came in and 14 Brian introduced her to Mr. DeSalvio. He seemed like he was 15 excited to introduce her, and Mr. DeSalvio knew that they were 16 both working on the campaign together, that she was helping out 17 with the Union stuff too. 18 MR. LALLI: It's character evidence. 19 THE COURT: On the opinion issue --20 MR. LALLI: You could ask him, do you have an opinion 21 based upon they were a loving, forward-looking couple? Yeah, I 22 think they were. But that's the extent of it. They can't 23 specific incidents. MS. PALM: We can't go into that he met them both, or

25

they worked at the Union together and that's how he had an 11 opinion? I mean, I think I could just say the basis of his opinion is that he saw them, and then you could ask him why else his opinion. But I think what he's asking to do is then admit other bad acts to -- to counter his opinion, that they were a loving couple, then he want's to say, and did you know about this and did you know about that.

3

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. LALLI: Well, first of all the bad act issue, the Court's already ruled that's relevant to motive and it certainly is.

Even if the Court had ruled that it was relevant to motive, we can challenge a witnesses opinion based upon specific acts. Arguably, I would be able to -- and I don't want to create an appellate issue -- but arguably I'd be able to ask the witness about every time the defendant had battered her and every time the police -- did you know the police came on this date? Did you know the police came on that date?

And I'm not saying I'm going to do that. But what I certainly am going to challenge, or what we will challenge the opinion with are the bad acts that the Court has already admitted and were certainly allowed to challenge on opinion with bad acts.

THE COURT: What was that ruling before, Ms. Palm? Refresh my memory on -- that is -- something along the lines of anything subsequent to his prison release?

MS. PALM: That's correct.

THE COURT: When we discussed that issue -- specifically what was the -- refresh my memory on that.

MS. PALM: That as long as we kept his relationship to talking about his relationship in the context of after prison, his relationship with Victoria, then we were not opening the door to any of his other bad acts besides the prior felony conviction that the Court said was going to be admissible for motive. And then the Court -- the -- the statements of Cheryl Morris the Court had also ordered were admissible.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. LALLI: Your Honor, the -- I'm not saying that this -- and -- and maybe counsel is misunderstanding, I'm not saying this evidence is not admissible. I mean, and I'm not sure, I'd -- I'd -- I have not been able to find that portion of the -- of the transcript.

Leaving that aside, I'm not saying the evidence is not admissible, I'm just saying they've got to follow the statute in admitting it, that's all I'm saying. And the statute allows for the evidence to be admitted in the form of an opinion only, not in specific incidents. So sure, if they want to bring it in they can, but they have to follow the rules of evidence in so doing.

THE COURT: And then if he says, I have an opinion

that they had a loving boyfriend/girlfriend relationship --MR. LALLI: He has to say that, that's the --2 THE COURT: Okay. 3 MR. LALLI: -- only way it's admissible. THE COURT: Right. Then you're seeking to admit his 5 conduct prior to him going to prison? MR. LALLI: Well, no. Well, prior to him -- well, 7 the -- the incident was lead for the -- the -- the evidence that the Court's already said is admissible as to motive, so the -- the fact that he was convicted of battering her, that he 10 -- that a judge sent him to prison, all of that's -- all of 11 that's in the record, all of that's in the -- in the judgment 12 of conviction that the Court indicated is admissible. 13 So we would be able to challenge with those specific 14 incidents and the way it work is would say, would it change 15 your opinion if you knew that the defendant had battered her? 16 Would it change your opinion if -- if you knew that a jury had 17 convicted him? Would it change your opinion if you knew that a 18 judge had sent him to prison because of it? Would any of those 19 things change your opinion as to whether he was a loving 20 boyfriend? And the witness can say, yeah, that would change my 21 opinion, or the opinion was a no, it wouldn't. 22 MS. PALM: And -- you know, I wasn't even -- I was 23 just going to ask them, what did you see, and it was going to 24 be that Brian was happy to introduce her, he seemed excited to

introduce her. That's all he knows. He doesn't have a full context of the relationship. He knows that they spent time 3 together doing Union stuff together and that Brian was happy to introduce her. THE COURT: Well, there's two paths you can take, Ms. 5 6 Palm. You can ask him his opinion, whether or not they had a 7 living relationship, and under 045 the State will be allowed to go into specific conducts. 8 9 I'm going to allow you to -- if were talking about this picnic situation, did you see them there, what were they 10 doing, but you can't give an opinion. If you -- if he gives an 11 opinion it needs to open up to the specific acts, I saw them 12 there, they were laughing, were not going to get into any 13 conversations, because then were getting into hearsay. If your 14 15 going to ask him the opinion then you -- you've opened the door to --

MS. PALM: Okay, so as long as I say, what did you see?

THE COURT: What did you see them do.

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

MR. LALLI: But -- but Your Honor those are -- those are the specific acts that 48.055 prohibits. All they can do is offer the opinion. They can not offer specific incidents on direct.

THE COURT: Well, it's not -- I don't know that it's going necessarily to character, to say that they were laughing and joking and having lunch together.

MR. LALLI: Well, that is character evidence. It's not percipient evidence either immediately before or immediately after the crime.

If -- if for instance a witness had observed them walking into the apartment together and they were holding hands and kissy, kissy and -- and that sort of a thing, well, that's almost as if it were res gestae evidence and I think it -- it -- it certainly is admissible.

And -- and again I'm not saying that the evidence is not, they just have to offer it in the form as contemplated by 48.055.

MS. PALM: But, you know, I mean were going to have this issue with every witness then because last time this was never an issue and it -- their -- their percipient witnesses that testify have said things like, they seemed like they were way in love, from what the people in the apartment heard.

Because they're talking about these noises and they're trying to make the implication that there must have been a beating going on, because of what goes on in the apartment. And the downstairs neighbors say they hear noises from time to time. And then other neighbors say, he seemed way in love, they seemed happy, they would be out on the porch drinking.

THE COURT: Well, they're -- they're giving an

```
opinion. If they're going to say, they seem to be in love,
   they're giving an opinion testimony.
3
             MR. LALLI: Well, it's character evidence.
 4
             MS. PALM: So they're going to be able to admit
   noises on other dates then?
 6
             THE COURT: There's --
7
             MS. PALM: I mean, if they're going to talk about
8
   noises going on in the apartment on other dates than I --
             MR. LALLI: Were not going to elicit any other dates.
9
             THE COURT: Just this date?
10
             MR. LALLI: Right.
11
             MS. PALM: So, I can ask their witnesses, what did
12
   you see these two doing?
13
             MR. LALLI: Those are -- those are specific
14
15
   incidents.
             MS. PALM: Well --
16
17
             MR. LALLI: I didn't make up the rules in our
18
   evidence code, they're -- they're there --
19
             MS. PALM: But you know what --
20
             MR. LALLI: -- and --
             THE COURT: (Indiscernible) --
21
              MR. LALLI: -- they ought to be followed. And you
22
23 l
   know Ms. Palm has said now from time to time, on the last trial
   we did this and the last trial -- the last trial we didn't edit
   a statement the way we're editing it now, so to suggest were
```

```
somehow bound by what happened last time, obviously that --
    that's not occurring.
 3
             MS. PALM: Well --
             THE COURT: Well, I don't see this as character
 4
   evidence. So Ms. Palm your witness can testify, for example, I
    saw them walking hand in hand, okay? Or I mean if that's the
    testimony, I have no idea. I saw them carrying groceries in
7
   together. I saw them having a barbeque together, okay? I mean
 9
    if we were just talking a couple weeks beforehand --
             MS. PALM: Okay.
10
11
             THE COURT: -- or the day of. But be very carful on
12
   the questioning as far as -- because -- I saw them walking hand
    in hand, they looked they a loving couple, then the door is
13
   open.
14
15
             MS. PALM: Okay.
16
             THE COURT: So, I would admonish them very carefully
17
   because, you know, that could hurt your -- your client's case.
18
             MS. PALM: True. Okay.
19
             THE COURT: All right?
20
             MS. PALM: Thank you.
21
             THE COURT: All right. Lets bring the jury in.
22
             MS. PALM: And -- and that witness is out there so
23
   I'm going to need to talk to him before we call him.
24
             THE COURT: Okay. Who do have first up for the
25
   State?
```

1	MR. LALLI: Cheryl Morris.
2	THE COURT: All right.
3	(Pause in proceedings)
4	(In the presence of the jury)
5	THE MARSHAL: Officers, members of the Court,
5	Department 17 jurors. You may be seated. Ladies and
7	gentlemen, let's check and make sure our cell phones are all
8	turned off, please.
9	THE COURT: Good morning ladies and gentlemen. I
10	hope hope you had a good evening. Were going to call our
11	first witness now.
12	MR. LALLI: Your Honor, do we stipulate to the
13	presence of the jury in this department? I'm not sure.
14	THE COURT: No, the record will show that the jury is
1,5	here.
16	MR. LALLI: Okay, thank you. Your Honor the State
17	will call Cheryl Morris.
18	THE MARSHAL: And ma'am, if you could just remain
19	standing. Please raise your right hand and face the Clerk.
20	CHERYL MORRIS, STATE'S WITNESS, SWORN
21	THE MARSHAL: Please have a seat and slide up to
22	microphone. And if at anytime you need to stand just go ahead
23	and stand, okay?
24	THE WITNESS: Thank you.
25	THE MARSHAL: I you need you to please state and

spell your name for the record. 2 THE WITNESS: Cheryl Morris, C-H-E-R-Y-L, last name 3 1 is Morris, M-O-R-R-I-S. 4 MR. LALLI: Is it okay if I just set these down? 5 THE WITNESS: Um-h'm. 6 MR. LALLI: Okay. 7 DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. LALLI: Now, Ms. Morris I think the record should reflect 10 that you hobbled to the stand on crutches and your leg is in a cast? 11 12 A Yes. If you -- and sometimes you experience some 13 discomfort if you sit for a while; is that true? 14 15 A Correct. So if you -- if you need to stand up I'm sure it 16 would acceptable to the Court just to stand up or change your 17 position so that you're a little more comfortable okay. 18 Okay. Thank you. 19 A 20 Q Okay, can you tell us what you do? Currently I'm just a student. 21 A What are you studying? 22 Q Criminal justice. 23 A Okay, do you know an individual by the name of Brian 24 25 O'Keefe?

A Yes I do. 2 Do you see Mr. O'Keefe in the courtroom? 3 A Yes I do. MS. PALM: We'll stipulate to his identity Your 5 Honor. 6 MR. LALLI: Thank you. BY MR. LALLI: 8 Can you please point to him and tell us what he's Q wearing today? 10 A That's the gentlemen right there, he's wearing a blue shirt, dark suit and a tie. 11 12 MR. LALLI: Your Honor may the record reflect the witness has identified the defendant as well as the stipulation 13 by defense? 14 THE COURT: Yes. 15 MR. LALLI: Thank you. 16 17 BY MR. LALLI: When did you first meet the defendant? 18 0 Back in -- it was actually December. I -- I met him 19 in 2007. 20 Where? 21 Q We were at Arizona Charlie's. 22 Arizona Charlie's, the kind of locals hotel casino 23 24 here in Las Vegas? 25 A Correct.

1 0 How was it that met him there? 2 I was actually there with a friend who was gambling 3 and I don't usually gamble so I'll sit down and I'll -- I was eating at the Sourdough Cafe, when he and his friend came up to counter and sat down next to me. Okay. Without telling me anything specifically that 6 Q was said, did the two of you talk? 8 A Yes, we did. 9 Did you -- at some point did you leave the Arizona Charlie's? 10 11 A Actually I was still there, he was --Well, eventually at some --12 0 A 13 Yes. 14 0 -- point --A 15 Yes. 16 Q -- later on did you? 17 A Yes. 18 And did both you and the defendant agree to stay in touch? 19 Yes. 20 A Did a friendship or a romantic relationship 21 Q eventually develop based upon that initial contact and 22 23 subsequent contacts? 24 A Yes. 25 0 Okay. At either that period of time or shortly

thereafter did you know where the defendant was living? 2 A Ye,s, I did. 3 O Where did he live? 4 He was living in a trailer on a friend's property, 5 0 Okay. While he was living in that trailer was your 6 relationship ongoing? 7 A Yes it was. 8 And was yours the type of relationship where you would go to his trailer and spend time with him? 10 A Yes. 11 Okay. Would you sometimes spend the night there? A Yes. 12 Q Okay. Now, I want to direct your attention to 13 Father's Day, June of 2008? 14 15 A Correct. 16 On that particular day was there a phonecall that the defendant received? 17 18 A Yes, he did. 19 Was there a phone in the trailer? Q 20 No. Can you please explain to the jury if you would how 21 Q it was that he would received phone calls? 23 He'd actually go into his friend's house and receive 24 the phonecall there cause there was no way that he could a

phone line out to the trailer.

25

1 So on this particular day did he go inside the house 2 to receive a phonecall? 3 A Yes, he did. And was he gone for a time? 4 5 A Maybe about 15 minutes or so. 6 And then he returned to his trailer? 7 A Yes, he did. 8 Did he tell you had called? Yes he did. 9 A What did he tell you? 10 He said that it was his daughter that was calling him A 11 to wish him happy Father's Day. 12 Q Okay. 13 A And then after awhile he came out and said, "I can't 14 lie to you. It was Victoria that called. " 15 Who is Victoria? 16 17 Victoria is a woman that he has had an ongoing relationship with since 2001. 18 Q Do you know Victoria's last name? 19 Whitmarsh. 20 A 21 Okay. Did he tell you what the conversation was about? 22 He told me that the conversation was she was calling 23 to tell him that he was -- she was sorry just to clear her 24 25 conscience and the fact that she was dying.

1	Q	So he made it pretty clear that it was she who had
2	called h	Lm?
3	A	Correct.
4	Q	Did you have a conversation with him about his
5	feelings	toward Victoria?
6	A	Yes I did.
7	Q	Can you tell us about that?
8	A	I told him that I felt that he was he still had
9	unfinishe	ed business with Victoria as far as emotions, and so I
10	told him	that if he chose to go and be with her that was fine,
11	I'd step	aside. And if found out later on that he didn't want
12	to be wit	th her then, you know, if I was still around I'd be
13	there wit	th him.
14	Q	At some point does the defendant move out of his
15	trailer?	
16	A	Um, actually he got kicked out of the trailer.
17	Q	Okay, he no longer lives there
18	A	Correct.
19	Q	at some point? Where does he go?
20	A	He comes to stay with me and my friend.
21	Q	What's your friend's name?
22	A	Her name is Dorothy.
23	Q	Do you know her last name?
24	A	Robe.
25	o	Can you spell Robe for the record?

	1	
1	А	R-O-B-E.
2	Q	Okay, thank you. So you at that time are living with
3	Dorothy?	
4	A	Correct.
5	Q	And who else is living there?
6	A	My daughter.
7	Q	And the defendant comes and stays with you?
8	A	Correct.
9	Q	And are you living together as boyfriend and
10	girlfrien	ıd?
11	A	I guess that's what you would call us, yes.
12	Ω	All right. And during that period of time would you
13	observe t	he defendant afterhours when he wasn't working or
14	or would	you spend a lot of time together?
15	A	Yes.
16	Q	Would the defendant talk about Victoria?
17	A	Yes, he did.
18	Q	When?
19	A	Quite often.
20	Q	Okay.
21	A	Most of the time it was when he was drinking and he
22	would sta	rt describing and reminiscing about events that
23	happened	prior to our meeting.
24	Q	Were you aware that the defendant was sent to prison
25	based upo	on a trial that was conducted involving Victoria?

	i	
1	A	Yes.
2	Q	Would he talk about that?
3	A	Yes.
4	Q	What would he say?
5	A	He would become angry and would say that he was angry
6	with her a	and that he how do I he'd say that he hated the
7	bitch and	that he wanted to kill her.
8	Q	Would was that one incident or was that multiple
9	incidents:	
10	A	Multiple incidents.
11	Q	Okay. During those same conversations would the
12	defendant	tell you about his experience in the military and
13	killing pe	eople?
14	A	Yes excuse me. Yes.
15	Q	What would he tell you?
16	A	He would describe to me some of the events that
17	how he wou	ald go through and it would either be kill or be
18	killed and	i the type of weapon he would use.
19	Q	Did he describe how did he ever describe for you
20	his abilit	y to kill?
21	A	Yes, he
22	٥	What would he say?
23	A	He said that the military trained them to kill
24	basically.	
25	Q	How?

	1	
1	А не	was very equipped with the hand to hand combat,
2	basically us:	ing a knife.
3	Q Wor	ald he describe how he would insert a knife into
4	someone?	
5	A Yes	s, he would.
6	Q Wha	at would he say?
7	A He	d say that you he could take a knife and shove
8	in towards	- it's it would be your sternum and then just
9	pull up and t	that's how he would describe killing someone. Or
10	perhaps comin	ng from behind and and taking the knife from the
11	left side of	the neck to the right side.
12	Q Oka	y. When he would would these conversations
13	occur at the	same that he would tell you that he was angry with
14	Victoria and	wanted to kill the bitch?
15	A Not	necessarily.
16	Q Oka	y, would the conversations occur together at
17	times?	
18	A At	times, yes.
19	Q Oka	y, would he ever talk about killing people with a
20	gun?	
21	A No.	
22	Q Wou	ald he ever talk about killing people by
23	strangulation	or by beating them with a club?
24	A No.	
25	Q It	was only a knife?

1 A Yes. Did the defendant ever tell you one of the reasons he 2 was attracted to Victoria was because she was submissive? 3 4 A Yes. 5 What did he tell you about that? 6 Basically the fact that anything that he would tell A her she would basically do. He'd say that, if I yelled at her 8 she would you know, kind of be very submissive and -- and do whatever it is that I ask. Did he ever tell you, ever, since the entire time 10 that you've known him that he was ever concerned that she might 11 12 harm him? A No. 13 Did be ever tell you that he was concerned that she 14 15 might use a weapon against him? 15 A No. 17 How long did you and the defendant live with your Q 18 friend Dorothy? 19 A About -- I would say maybe a little over a month and a half. 20 21 Q Sometime just prior to the both of you moving out was your relationship deteriorating? 22 23 A Yes. 24 Q Can you tell us about that? 25 Shortly after June of that phonecall he didn't show

up back to his friend's house, his trailer for about a week and there was no phonecall, there was nothing. Nobody knew where he was. I believe he called that Thursday of that - that week 3] that he was gone and spoke to the -- a little girl, but no adults in the house. He was just -- said that tell everybody 6 I'm fine. 7 Q Well I'm -- I'm -- is this the period of time just 8 before you and he moved out of Dorothy's home? 9 No, this is -- this is just before he was kicked out 10 of the trailer. Okay, I'm -- I'm asking you now about when the two of 11 you move out of Dorothy's home. Okay? 12 13 A Okay. Was your relationship in decline at that point? 14 15 A Yes, it was. 16 And can you describe for us the state of your relationship? 17 18 It was to the point where I didn't want to be with him, but I also couldn't just leave without taking him out of 19 the resident of my friend's house. I -- I didn't feel 21 comfortable, so I actually agreed to move in with him in order for him to be out of my friend's house. 22 23 Q Where did you move to? 24 A 5001 El Parque Avenue. 25 MR. LALLI: May I approach the witness Your Honor?

1 THE COURT: Yes. BY MR. LALLI: 3 Ms. Morrie I'm going to show you what we've marked as State's Proposed 2 for identification purposes. Do you recognize that? 5 A 6 Yes, I do. 7 Q What is it? 8 A It's the apartment complex where we moved in. 9 Is that a fair and accurate depiction of the apartment complex? 10 A Yes it is. 11 12 MR. LALLI: Your Honor, move for the admission of State's Proposed 2? 13 14 MS. PALM: No objection. 15 THE COURT: 2 will be admitted. (Exhibit 2 admitted) 16 17 MR. LALLI: Okay, now that the -- the focus has kind 18 of kicked in. BY MR. LALLI: 19 20 In the -- in the top portion of -- of the State's Q Exhibit 2, there is a door that appears to be open? 22 A Correct. 23 Was that the unit in which the two of you resided? 24 A Yes. 25 Do you remember approximately when it was when the

- 1 two of you moved into this apartment?
- A I think it was around the later part of August, or the maybe the beginning part of August.
- 4 Q Okay. Do you stay there for a long time?
- 5 A No, actually I was only there for about four days.
- 6 Q What happened?
- A I received a phonecall after Ms. O'Keefe did not come
 home, but he stated that he was coming home basically, and he
 was bringing Victoria home.
- Q And what was your -- he was bringing Victoria to your -- your apartment --
- 12 A To the apartment, correct.
- 13 Q For what purpose?
- A I guess that the fact that they wanted to go to sleep.
- 16 Q Was it your impression from talking then that he
 17 wanted Victoria to move in?
- 18 A The was I felt was, yes.

25

- 19 Q How did that set with you?
- A I was more hurt at the fact, because two days prior
 to that we already broke up and we had sat out there on that
 little balcony discussing parameters, or boundaries, you know,
 since our things were all together and I had no where else to
 move back into. I needed 30 days to be able to try to find a

ROUGH DRAFT TRANSCRIPT

place to store my -- my belongings. And we had agreed that no

one was going to bring anyone over the house and we were going to, you know, just be mutually living there until I was able to get out.

Q When -- during this period of time when you and the defendant had moved into that apartment did you sleep together in the same bed?

A When we've -- when we first started moving things in we did, because our room that we were going to set up -- I think they had to clean the carpet, so we slept a day or two -- a couple of days out in the living room. And then shortly after that I moved my things into the master bedroom, he slept out on the couch, and I had maintenance come in and put a lock on the bedroom door.

Q Okay, was -- was the -- was the couch then at that point made up as a bed?

A Yes.

Q All right. And so lets go back to this conversation that you had when the defendant wanted Victoria to come over to your apartment. Did you also -- did Victoria also get on the phone?

A Yes, she did.

Q And without telling us what she said, what was her demeanor; was she rude, was she mean, was she yelling, just -- just describe her affect on the phone if you would?

A She was a little loud in her statement, but other

than that -- and she was a little rude, but other than that that was it. 3 Okay. Was her affect, her demeanor on the phone threatening in any way? 5 A No. No. 6 After the phonecall, do you call a friend? 7 A Yes. 8 And what was the purpose of that? 9 To get out of the apartment, because I was not sure whether or not they were going to actually come back there 10 11 anyway. 0 Okay. So, at that point your friend comes and picks 12 13 you up? A Correct. 14 15 Q And you -- is --16 I leave, and I'm not back there for about a week, I believe. And then I make arraignments to come in and start 17 18 moving everything out. But essentially when you left that day after that 19 phonecall that was the last time that you lived with the 20 defendant? 21 22 Correct. 23 Okay. Now, were you aware that the defendant was arrested for murder in this case on November 6th of 2008? 24 25 A Yes.

1	Q	I want to talk about the week before that, okay?
2	During th	at sometime in that week before did you receive a
3	telephone	call from him while you were at a Wal-Mart?
4	A	Yes, I did.
5	Q	And did he want something?
6	A	He wanted me to come over.
7	Q	What did he say?
8	A	He just wanted he wanted to see me, he wanted me
9	to come o	ver. I asked him questions, you know, where's
10	Victoria,	what's going on, is everything all right. And
11	Q	Well, let me ask you this
12		MS. PALM: Your Honor Your Honor, can we approach?
13		THE COURT: Okay.
14		(Off-record bench conference)
15	BY MR. LA	LLI;
16	Q	Ms. Morris, he had called you and asked you to come
17	over?	
18	A	Correct.
19	Q	Did did you tell him did you tell him you would
20	not come (over?
21	A	Correct.
22	Q	And this was a week before he was arrested for
23	murder?	
24	A	Yes.
25	Q	Did the defendant when talking about Victoria ever
- 1		

```
accuse her of taking years from him?
 2
         A
              Yes.
3
             What did he say?
 4
             He would that he was mad at her because he took --
   she took three years of his life, because he was sent to
 6
   prison.
 7
        Q
             Based -- based upon the --
            Based --
 8
              -- domestic violence conviction?
 9
10
         A
           Correct.
            Thank you.
11
        Q
             MR. LALLI: Nothing further.
12
              THE COURT: Cross examination?
13
             MS. PALM: Thank you.
14
15
                           CROSS-EXAMINATION
   BY MS. PALM:
16
17
         0
             Good morning Ms. Morris.
18
         A
              Good morning.
              So you started dating Brian in January of 2008?
19
         Q
20
              Correct.
              And when did your relationship become serious?
21
         Q
              I don't really think it actually became serious.
22
         A
23
         Q
              Okay.
              I mean, define serious for -- for this particular
24
         A
25
   purpose.
```

ĩ	Q	Committed relationship, in your mind.
2	A	I barely was dating him, I was only with him for
3		ht months.
	e e	
4	Q	Okay, so when when he was living in the trailer
5	that was	up through what month?
6	A	June. Later part of June.
7	Q	June, 2008?
8	A	Correct, yes.
9	Q	Okay, and so during that time your relationship was
10	not very	serious?
11	А	No, we were we I mean, we talked a bit. We
12	didn't ta	lk about any future plans or anything else.
13	Q	Okay.
14	A	We were just
15	Q	Okay. Just kind of casual dating?
16	A	getting to know each other.
17	Q	Did you did you get a bank account with Brian?
18	A	Yes, I did.
19	Q	And what month was that?
20	A	I don't recall.
21	Q	Would it have been February of 2008?
22	A	I don't recall.
23	Q	Is it possible?
24	A	Probably.
25	٥	If I show you bank records would it help you

```
remember?
 2
         A
              Sure.
 3
              MS. PALM: May I approach the witness Your Honor?
 4
              THE COURT: Yes.
 5
             MS. PALM: I'm showing her defense proposed exhibit K
   and these are records from (indiscernible).
             THE WITNESS: Okay. Um-h'm.
 7
   BY MS. PALM:
 8
             Does that appear to be dated February --
9
        0
10
        A
            Yes.
            -- of 2008?
11
            Yes it does.
12
        A
13
            And -- and you signed for that bank account with him?
            Yes, I did.
        A
14
15
             And how did you indicate your relationship to Brian
   on that bank account?
16
17
        A
              I didn't put that spouse there.
18
        0
             You didn't write that spouse?
19
        A
             No, ma'am.
20
        O
             Somebody else wrote that --
        A
            Correct.
21
             -- next to your signature?
22
        Q
23
             Yes, it's not my handwriting.
             Is this your signature next to where it --
24
25
        A
             This --
```

1 Q -- says spouse? 2 A -- is my signature, correct. So in February of 2008, he put you on his joint bank 3 0 account, but you were dating casually? 4 5 A Yes. 0 6 When did you buy the car together? 7 A I don't recall. You don't remember the month at all? 8 Q 9 A No, I do not. 10 Q You bought a car together that was on your credit? Yes, it was. The reason for that was because Mr. 11 O'Keefe's car was stolen, it was -- I guess it was impounded. 12 . His father and step-mother went down to try to retrieve the 13 car, it cost to much, so he aske,d, lets go see if we can look 14 at cars. 15 Well, of course we ended up getting one, he was in 16 17 construction. Being that I was in a relationship with him we 18 decided okay, well, we'll see what we can do, ended up having to purchase a car for him to get back and forth. I was the one 19 20 who put the money down for it. 21 Okay, and is that during the time of your casual dating still? 22 23 A Yes. 24 Q Okay. And then that car was registered to you both jointly? 25

1	A	Yes.
2	Q	And when you were testifying about how he would
3	cry or	how he would talk about being in the service?
4	A	Yes.
5	Q	And when he did that he cried, didn't he?
6	u A	No, not all the time.
7	Q	If you said in your statement that he would cry many
8	nights about it because it conflicted in his belief in God,	
9	would that be incorrect?	
10	A	No, that would be correct.
11	Q	Do you recall ever saying anytime before testifying
12	today about the slicing of a of a throat?	
13	A	Yes.
14	Q	Where did you say that?
15	A	I was in the Marshal's office, I believe.
16	Q	So you think that's in your statement?
17	А	Yes,
18	Q	Have you looked at your statement lately?
19	A	No, not lately.
20	Q	Did you meet with the DA's before you came to testify
21	today?	
22	A	I went in on Monday, I believe, or two weeks ago.
23	Q	Did they give you a copy of your statement?
24	A	Yes.
25	Q	Did they give a copy of prior testimony?

1	A	I believe so.
2	Q	Did you read it before you came here today?
3	A	No.
4	Q	They gave it to you and you didn't read it at all?
5	A	I glanced through it. This is something that I
6	prefer no	t to remember.
7	Q	So the whole slicing with a knife in the sternum
8	area, cou	ld you demonstrate where the sternum area is?
9	A	I just
10	Q	For the jury.
11	A	Know that it's right here.
12	Q	Okay, and then what you're
13		THE COURT: Ma'am, can you stand up?
14		THE WITNESS: Oh.
15		THE COURT: I don't know if the jurors can see.
16		THE WITNESS: That'd be right here.
17		MS. PALM: And she's pointing to her sternum area.
1.8	And then	what he said is
19		MR. LALLI: Well, Your Honor could if I could just
20	clarify,	she's pointing to the area in the center of her chest
21	it looks	like.
22		THE WITNESS: Yeah.
23		MR. LALLI: I think that's the sternum
24		THE WITNESS: This is
25		MR. LALLI: but just for purposes of our records

1	she's poi	nting at the center of her chest.
2		MS. PALM: And then he was
3		THE COURT: The record will reflect that, because we
4	don't wan	t the attorneys to testify where the sternum is.
5	BY MS. PA	LM:
б	Q	And he was talking about slicing upward?
7	A	Yes, he was talking about pulling the knife upward.
8	Q	Now, after Victoria initiated the contact with Brian
9	and he wa	s gone for that week, and he came back home, you tried
10	to resume	a relationship with him?
11	A	Yes, I did. I tried to figure out what was going on,
12	what was	the reason. He was the one that actually contacted
13	me, becau	se I was over at my friend's house and he called me.
14	Q	Okay, ma'am if you could just yes or no, and if it's
15	a yes or	no, and then if I want an explanation I'll ask you for
16	one, okay	?
17	A	Yes.
18	Q	Thank you. And Victoria was persistent in calling
19	you after	that, wasn't she?
20	A	Yes.
21	Q	And she called you many times through the summer?
22	А	I'd say only maybe three or four times.
23	Q	And during the summer Brian was still seeing her?
24	A	Brian was not seeing her that I knew of.
25	Q	Did you did you think he was seeing her?

A Yes. 1 2 And she was calling you? A 3 Yes, she'd called me, she wanted to meet me. MR. LALLI: I'm going to object as to hearsay Your 4 5 Honor. THE COURT: Sustained. 6 BY MS. PALM: 7 8 Was it your understanding that she wanted --MR. LALLI: I'm going to object as to what her 9 understanding was, that's going to call for the context of the 10 -- the content of the conversations. It's hearsay. 11 THE COURT: Sustain the objection. 12 BY MS. PALM: 13 So when you get the apartment on El Parque and the Q 14 two of you are going to live there it's your testimony your 15 were going -- going to just live there as roommates? 16 No, we were originally were going to move in together 17 and set up a room for his two daughters. 18 Okay, and then within a couple of days you decided to 19 just be roommates? 20 A I did, because he --21 If you could just yes or no. 22 Q 23 A Yes. 24 And Brian was honest with you about telling you he

loved Victoria, wasn't he?

25

1 A Yes. 2 And -- and he told you he didn't love you the same 3 way; is that true? A Correct. 5 And was your relationship with him a sexual one? 6 Well, if your asking if we had sex, yes. Α Okay. And you that Victoria had Hepatitis C, didn't 7 8 you? 9 A Not until after he told me. And -- and on Father's Day when she called? 10 He didn't even tell me that on Father's Day that I 11 12 recall. 13 When did you find out that she had Hepatitis C? 14 A I don't recall, I think it was once when he was -- he had come home after awhile, that's all I can remember. 15 16 Okay, but you continued to have a sexual 17 relationship? 18 Once, with a condom. 19 And was it just the one time that she called you up yelling at you? Victoria? 20 A 21 Yes. And that's when -- when she basically wanted to come 22 back to the apartment? 23 MR. LALLI: I'm going to object as to the content of 24 25 the conversation, it's hearsay.

1 THE COURT: Sustained. BY MS. PALM: She called you up yelling at you at the time that Brian wanted to come back to apartment with her? 5 A Yes. 6 And how many times did she call you that day? 7 A I think the phone probably rang a couple more times. 8 If you previously testified four or five calls would that be about accurate? 10 Yes. 11 And was she hanging up on you? 12 No, I hung up on her a couple of times. If you previously stated that she hung up on you, 13 Q would that be incorrect? 14 15 A No. 16 0 Were you aware that she wasn't welcome at home with her husband? 17 18 A I'm sorry? 19 Were you aware --0 20 MR. LALLI: Objection, foundation as to how she would 21 know. 22 THE COURT: Let me hear the -- I couldn't hear the 23 question. MS. PALM: Whether she was aware that Victoria was 24 25 | not welcome at home with her husband.

MR. LALLI: I'm going to object to hearsay, calls for 1 speculation, foundation, how she would know. 2 3 MS. PALM: I'm asking if she knew. THE COURT: Well, I'm going to sustain the objection, 4 if you would try -- try to rephrase it. 5 BY MS. PALM: 7 Did Brian ever tell you she wasn't welcome at home with her husband? 9 MR. LALLI: Objection, hearsay. 10 THE COURT: I'm going to overrule that objection. BY MS. PALM: 11 12 O You can answer. A Both Brian and Victoria told me. 13 THE COURT: Okay, were just -- what Brian told you. 14 MS. PALM: Thank you. 15 BY MS. PALM: 16 17 Q So, you -- you knew Brian had a conviction with Victoria? 18 A Yes. 19 He told you that? And you were sort of living 20 transient with him; is that a fair assessment, until you get 21 the apartment? 22 23 A Can you word it a different way? I -- I don't understand the question? 24 Well, you -- you sort of had a unstable living 25 0

situation with him until you get the apartment. 2 I -- we didn't actually live together. I'd go and spend the night there or spend the weekend there, sure. 3 4 Okay, but didn't you say you spent a couple of months with Dorothy Robe? 5 6 A That's where I lived, yes. 7 Okay, that's not your house right? 8 A No. 9 That's Dorothy's house? Q 10 A Correct. 11 And she let you live there? 12 A Correct. And then she let Brian move in there? 13 14 A Correct. 15 Okay, and you were there a couple of months and then 16 you get this apartment together? 17 A Correct. 18 0 And you know he's got a drinking problem? Yes. 19 20 Q And you put your name on a joint account with him in February? 21 22 A. Correct. 23 And you know he's cheating on you? 24 A Correct. 25 0 And he's cheating on you at -- at some you know with

1	somebody v	who has Hepatitis C?
2	A	Correct.
3	Q	And you say he talks about wanting to kill her?
4	A	Correct.
5	Q	And you put up with all these things?
6	A	Correct.
7	Q	And he told you he still loved her?
8	A	Correct.
9	Q	And you put up with that?
10	A	Correct.
13	Q	And weren't you upset when he wanted her in the end?
12	A	No.
13	Q	You weren't angry with him for that?
14	A	No.
15	Q	Do you remember telling Jimmy Hatchcox that you were
16	angry?	
17	A	Who's Jimmy?
18	Q	The guy who lived next door to you and Brain in the
19	El Parque	apartment.
20	A	No.
21	Ω.	You never told him that?
22	A	I don't recall it.
23	Q	Do you remember telling people in the office that she
24	bad AIDS a	and Hepatitis C?
25	A	I don't recall that.

1 Might you have? 0 2 A I don't recall that. 3 You had to go there and fill out papers when you got your name off the lease, right? 5 A No, I did not have to, that I recall. 6 If you talked before about meeting with Ron Brady 7 (phonetic), you don't recall that? 8 I actually just went to talk to him about getting the lease, anything that was -- that was in my name, anything that had information about me, I wanted that removed. 10 11 Okay, so in that conversation you didn't tell anybody that she had AIDS and Hepatitis C? 12 13 A Not that I recall. Did Brian ever take you to his Union, his Union 14 offices? 15 16 A To make payments, look for jobs, yes. 17 0 Okay, did he ever take you to the Union social events? 18 A No. 19 Did you ever go to alcohol counseling with him? 20 21 A We may have gone once. I remember telling him that he needed to follow through. 22 But you didn't go into a long term counseling 23 Q 24 situation with him?

25

No.

1 Q And after you found out Brian was arrested you went 2 to the police on your own, didn't you? 3 I -- before going to the police --I'm -- yes or no --4 5 A Yes. 6 -- will do. So you contacted the police on your own? 7 A Yes. 8 And then you meet with them to give them a statement about Brian? 9 A 10 Yes. And that was in November of 2008? 0 11 I don't recall, but I'm sure that's what it is. 12 A Okay, they didn't contact you? 13 A 14 No. MS. PALM: Court's indulgence. 15 16 BY MS. PALM: After Brian -- after Brian took off in June when 17 Victoria called him, did you go down to his Union looking for 18 him? 19 A 20 Yes. 21 Q And were you crying because you wanted to be back with him? 22 A Yes. 23 24 MS. PALM: Thank you. No more questions. 25 THE COURT: Any redirect?

ī		MR. LALLI: Briefly.
		SEET SECULIARIES CONFERENCES CONFERENCES
2		REDIRECT EXAMINATION
3	BY MR. L	ALLI:
3	Q	Ms. Morris, Ms. Palm asked about your description of
5	the stabl	bing's, do you remember that? When he was indicating
6	for you	how he would stab somebody, do
7	A	Yeah.
8	Q	you remember her questions about that?
9	A	Yes.
10	Q	And she asked whether that was something you had said
11	before to	oday, whether you had indicated that to the police back
12	in Novem	ber of 2008, do
13	A	Yes.
14	Q	you remember that question?
15	A	Yes.
16	Q	Do you remember whether you told the police that?
17	A	I believe I did. I actually remember demonstrating
18	it I bel	ieve to the marshal.
19	Q	Okay, would you be more certain in that recollection,
20	whether	you said if I showed you a copy of that statement?
21	A	Yes.
22		MR. LALLI: May I approach the witness?
23		THE COURT: Yes.
24		MR. LALLI: Page 11 and 12.
25	is L	MS. PALM: Thank you.

1	BY MR. L	ALLI:
2	o o	If you want to just look down here at the bottom.
3	A	Um-h'm, Yes sir, I remember that.
4	Q	So you you in fact did tell the police about his
5	boasting	about stabbing back at that time; is that correct?
6	A	Yes.
7	Q	During that conversation you told the police that
8	Brian to	ld you that
9		MS. PALM: Leading, Your Honor, objection.
10		THE COURT: Sustained.
11	BY MR. LA	ALLI:
12	Q	Did you did you tell the police that
13		MS. FALM: Objection, Your Honor, leading.
14		MR. LALLI: Well, I'm asking if she did; that's not
15	leading,	
16		THE COURT: Why don't you ask her. What else did you
17	tell the	police, and we'll go from there.
1.8		MR. LALLI: Okay.
19	BY MR. LA	ALI,I:
20	Q	What else did you tell the police?
21	A	Just the fact that he knew how to use his hands
22	Q	Okay.
23	A	as weapons.
24	٥	Did you tell the police the what you've told the
25	jury toda	ay?

```
1
         A
              Everything.
 2
         Q
              Thank you.
 3
              MR. LALLI: Nothing else.
             THE COURT: Any recross?
 4
 5
             MS. PALM: Thank you.
6
   BY MS. PALM:
7
        Q
              That -- 11 -- page 11, 12 of your statement, what you
   were just referencing doesn't say anything about a throat, does
8
9
    1t7
        A
             I didn't recall reading all of it, no.
10
        Q
             If I could show you what he just showed you.
11
12
             MS. PALM: May I approach?
              THE COURT: Yes.
13
   BY MS. PALM:
14
15
        0
              You look at that and tell me it's just talking about
   the whole allegation about the sternum's upward slicing; is
16
    that correct?
17
18
        A
              That's correct.
19
        Q
             Thank you.
20
             MS. PALM: No further questions, Your Honor.
             THE COURT: Anything else by the State?
21
              MR. LALLI: Well, I could keep leading this horse but
22
23
   I won't.
              THE COURT: Okay, any questions by any of the jurors?
24
   No questions. All right, thank you Ms. Morris for your
25
```

1 testimony you are excused. 2 THE WITNESS: Thank you. THE COURT: Thank you. Do you need some help getting 3 4 down from? 5 THE WITNESS: No, I'm okay. 6 THE COURT: Just -- where's our Marshal? 7 MS. PALM: Your Honor, I'm just going to go out and 8 speak to the --THE COURT: All right. 9 MS. PALM: -- the next witness briefly. 10 THE COURT: Thank you, officer. 11 MS. PALM: Thank you, Your Honor. And we had sort of 12 agreed I could call a witness out of order because he has to 13 leave the State. 14 MR. LALLI: That's correct, Your Honor. 15 MS. PALM: And that would --16 THE COURT: Ladies and gentleman the trial starts 17 with the State presenting their evidentiary portion, and then 18 the defense does the same. Because of scheduling issues the --19 the parties have agreed that Ms. Palm can call one of her 20 witnesses out of order at this time, so this is part of the 21 22 defendant's case. And your witness? MS. PALM: Lou DeSalvio. 23 THE COURT: Officer, if you don't mind you can help 24 us out. 25

1	THE MARSHAL: What's the name?
2	THE COURT: DeSalvio.
3	THE MARSHAL: Okay.
4	THE COURT: Sir, if you can come on up to the witness
5	stand here.
6	LOUIS DESALVIO, DEFENDANT'S WITNESS, SWORN
7	THE CLERK: Please be seated. Pull yourself up to
8	the mic and state and spell your name for the record.
9	THE WITNESS: It's Louis DeSalvio, L-O-U-I+S,
10	D-E-L-S-A-L-V-I-O.
11	THE COURT: Go ahead, Ms. Palm.
12	MS. PALM: Thank you. Good morning, Mr. DeSalvio.
13	THE WITNESS: Good morning.
14	BY MS. PALM:
15	Q Can you tell the jury how your employed?
16	A I'm with Labors Local 872 as the Assistant Political
17	Director.
18	Q Okay, and back in November of 2008, how were you
19	employed with the Union?
20	A I was the assistant excuse me, apprentice
21	coordinator.
22	Q Okay, and is that a local Union?
23	A Correct.
24	Q Here in Las Vegas?
25	A Correct.

1 And what does the apprentice coordinator do for the Union? 3 Oversees the apprenticeship program, as well as the 4 journeyman upgrades for that local Union. 5 Q Okay, and -- and can you explain what the 6 apprenticeship program and journeyman are because --7 A Okay ---- not all the jurors know that? 9 9 -- apprenticeship program is a group of individuals 10 that apply for a program for a career path. We basically -- we teach them our trade. Our trade consists of working with other 11 trades. Once they go through that apprenticeship program then 12 they will journey out and become a journey person within that 13 trade. 14 15 So my job at that training center was to oversee the 16 daily operations as well as bringing new apprentices into the 17 program, give them -- and then hopefully provide them with a 18 career path at the end of it. 19 And -- and through your job as the apprenticeship 20 coordinator, did you come to know Brian O'Keefe? A Yes, I did. 21 O And is he the gentleman sitting at the table to my 22 23 right? Yes, he is. 24 A

How did you come to know him?

25

1	A	He applied just like anybody else in the program,
2	which com	nsists of an application, a test, an interview, and
3	should yo	ou score high enough, which you need to score 70 or
4	above to	get into the program. BI elieve he scored an a 74,
5	so he was	s invited into the program.
6	Q	Okay, and was he actively participating in that
7	program?	
8	A	Yes, he was.
9	Q	And that's working on his way towards a journeyman?
10	A	That's correct.
11	Q	And is it a big pay difference when hit journeyman?
12	A	It it goes in pay scale, you start out at a 50
13	percent a	apprentice and work your way up to 100, so each jump is
14	a few mon	re dollars an hour on the check.
15	Q	Was he getting close?
16	A	If I recall, yes, he was working his way towards
17	journeyma	an status.
18	Q	Okay. And was there a point that he came to you for
19	help?	
20	A	Yes, there was.
21	٥	And what was that about?
22	A	Alcohol.
23	0	Okay, and why did he come to you?
24	A	Because as the apprentice coordinator I'm kind of
25	like thei	r glorified babysitter, I mean, is what it really is.

I kind of mentor these men and women and make sure they stay on a, you know, a good path to a career. A lot of people that come to us normally don't have the opportunity to have a career path, so we provide them -- that career path. So, I'm kind of like a mentor to them. And he came to me with a problem one day at my office.

Q Okay, and what -- and what did you do after him coming to you?

A The minute he came to me we sat down, we talked, we -- to find -- get down to the nuts and blots of what the issue was which seemed to be alcohol. If I remember correctly he did show up to my office smelling like alcohol and think that's when he realized he needed help.

Immediately I called our patient advocate, which is our -- our end within our own organization and asked for a recommendation of who I could send this gentleman to to get the best treatment he could get.

They then Doug Twellegar (phonetic) was his name.

And then he turned me on to guy named Mike Thompson with MINE & Associates, which is an organization that we use to help our members should they be in trouble. And I then sent him -- I believe that day he actually left my office and then went home and showered and meet with Mike Thompson on that day.

So, I mean he started his -- immediately, it's not like he waited a few a days not -- I mean he went home,

1	Q	And we've talked about manner of death or we've
2	talked ab	out cause of death, rather. Did you reach an opinion
3	as to man	ner of death?
4	A	Yes.
5	Q	And what is the manner of death?
6	A	Homicide.
7	Q	What is a homicide? What is your definition of that?
8	A	The forensic definition is death of the hands of
9	another.	
10	Q	What is suicide?
11	А	Suicide is self-inflicted injury or death.
12	o	Did you observe
13	A	Or of death, sorry.
14	Q	anything on the body of Ms. Whitmarsh that was
15	consisten	t with a suicide?
16	A	No.
17	Q	Can you is there anything about the directionality
18	of her st	ab wound that helped you to rule out suicide?
19	A	I did not use the directionality, per se. In looking
20	at manner	, again, circumstances are very important. Also, the
21	nature of	the injury is important. Location would be
22	important	. For instance, a stab wound in the middle of the
23	back you	wouldn't anticipate that an individual would be able
24	to reason	ably do that to themselves.
25	0	So location, type of injury and circumstances are

ROUGH DRAFT TRANSCRIPT

1 very important in determining manner. 2 Okay. Was the location of Ms. Whitmarsh's injury 3 important in your determination? A 4 Yes. 5 Okay, how so? 6 I thought it was an inconsistent location with someone who was trying to kill themselves. 7 8 0 Why? 9 That is not usually what I've observed in suicides. 10 Usually it's the wrists, I've seen self-inflicted injury that caused death, typically in men, slashing of the throat. Women 11 12 it's usually the wrists. Even abdominal wounds. But this -the location is a little awkward. And so if you were trying to 13 harm yourself why make it more difficult to do that? 14 15 MR. LALLI: Thank you, your Honor. That concludes 16 direct examination. 17 THE COURT: Is the jury okay? Do we need a break at 18 this time? You're okay? 19 MS. PALM: I need to get some exhibits marked. THE COURT: We'll take a very quick -- I'm sorry? 20 MS. PALM: I need to get some exhibits marked. 21 22 THE COURT: All right, we're going to take a break, a 23 short recess. Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, during this recess, it is your duty not to converse among yourselves or with anyone else on any subject connected with this case or to 25

read, watch or listen to any report of or commentary on the trial by any person connected with the trial or by any medium 2 of information, including without limitation, newspaper, 3 television, radio or the Internet. 4 5 You are not to form or express an opinion on any subject connected with the case until this matter is submitted 6 7 to you. We'll see you back in approximately five minutes. Mr. Lalli, if you could speak with the (indiscernible) about the 8 9 (indiscernible). 10 (Court recessed at 4:45 p.m. until 4:58 p.m.). (In the presence of the jury). 11 THE MARSHAL: You may be seated, ladies and 12 gentlemen. Let's make sure our cell phones are turned off, 13 14 please. Please remain seated and come to order. Department 17 of the Eighth Judicial District is again in session. The 15 Honorable Judge Michael P. Villani presiding. Let's make sure 16 17 our cell phones are turned off, please. 18 THE COURT: Dr. Benjamin, you understand you're still 19 under oath? 20 THE WITNESS: Yes. 21 THE COURT: All right, go ahead, Ms. Palm. 22 CROSS-EXAMINATION 23 BY MS. PALM: 24 Good afternoon, Dr. Benjamin. Q 25 A Good afternoon.

```
1
               I just want to run through some of the bruising noted
    on your autopsy report that you just testified about.
 2
 3
              MS. PALM: May I approach the witness, your Honor?
 4
              THE COURT: Yes.
 5
              MS. PALM: Thank you.
 6
    BY MS. PALM:
 7
              Showing you what's been marked as Defendant's
    Proposed Exhibit C. Do you recognize that?
 8
 9
              Yes.
10
              And is that the same bruise that you were just
11
    testifying about, the contusion on the forehead?
12
         A
              Yes.
              MS. PALM: Your Honor, I would move to admit.
13
14
              THE COURT: Any objection to C.
15
              MR. LALLI: No, your Honor, I don't object to the
    admission of any of the photos, I'm sorry, that Ms. Palm showed
16
17
    me. I don't object to any of them.
18
              THE COURT: All right. Ms. Falm, why don't you
19
    identify all of them, and we can admit them right now to speed
20
    it up.
21
             MS. PALM: Those would be Defense C, B, D, E, F, G,
22
   H, I, J, and A.
23
              THE COURT: Okay, those will be admitted.
        (Exhibits A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I and J admitted).
24
25
             MS. PALM: Thank you.
```

BY MS. PALM: 2 Looking at -- this -- this writing is really weird. I'm going to see if I can (indiscernible) make this clearer. 3 Is -- can you see that bruising there on the forehead? 5 A Yes. 6 That's what you were talking about, the contusion on 7 the forehead? B A Yes, it contusion and hematoma. 9 Okay. And that one you said was acute because it had Q bleeding under the -- underneath it, hemorrhaging? 10 11 Yeah, there was hemorrhage in the subcutaneous A tissue. 12 Okay. And how many of the contusions that you 13 Q checked had hemorrhaging or -- do you recall? 14 Α I would have to refer to my autopsy notes. 15 16 Q (Indiscernible). 17 There were three with hemorrhage in the subcutaneous tissue, but not all of the -- all of the contusions were 18 examined. 19 Okay. And -- and of those three, were those ones the 20 ones that you determined were acute? 21 22 A They were either acute or subacute. 23 Okay. What does subacute mean? 24 The subacute again, is very broad ranges. Acute, 25 minutes to hours or so. The subacute, likely days. And again

ROUGH DRAFT TRANSCRIPT

a more precise dating would be easier to be -- to determine 2 with microscopic examination. Okay. And so the three that were either acute or 3 Q subacute, what -- one acute is in front of the head. Was the other acute in the back of the head? 5 6

A Yes.

1

7

8

9

14

15

17

18

19

- Okay.
- A That's correct.
 - And the then the third one was subacute?
- The -- both on the -- on the head, the forehead and 10 the back of the head were described as acute. There were 11 others that were incised that I thought were either acute or 12 13 subacute, it was difficult to tell.
 - Q Okay. This injury on her forehead was the only injury in her facial area?
- 16 Yes.
 - And then showing you Defense H. And from -- from that photograph were any of these bruises determined to be acute?
- Those bruises were not incised, so I did not look at 20 21 the subcutaneous tissue.
 - Okay. Did you notice any of those looking green? Q
- 23 If I did, it would be described in the autopsy A
- 24 report.
- 25 0 Okay. You can refer to your autopsy report, Doctor.

1 If you want to start with the -- the first green I see is the 2 thorax (indiscernible). 3 A Okay. Okay. And can you point out on the body where that 4 Q 5 green one is? 6 A This is not a good photograph for thorax, abdomen and 7 back. 8 0 Okay. This is a better photograph for, of course, the left 9 arm. So if you had another one, that would be good. 10 (Indiscernible) another photograph. What -- what 11 Q 12 area is the thorax? 13 A The thorax is the chest area. 14 Q The chest area? 15 Yeah. So something in the chest area was green? 16 Q 17 Correct. 18 And how about the -- you can see these little bruises here on the right side of her abdomen. 19 Uh-huh. 20 21 Was one of those greenish? 22 A No, they're not described as green. 23 Q Okay. If you could look at the second paragraph under the thorax, abdomen and back. Is there one described as 25 green or marcon?

	4
1	A Green, maroon and the other predominantly maroon.
2	Q Okay. And then on the right side of the back, some
3	of those ones were green also; is that correct?
4	A Yes.
5	Q And then the the one that you incised above the
6	buttock, and I'm showing you Defense J, is this large one here?
7	That's the one you're talking about that you incised?
8	A Yes.
9	Q Okay. And that one you determined was not acute
10	because can you explain that again?
11	A It was not acute because I did not see any hemorrhage
12	in the subcutaneous tissue.
13	Q Okay, so you determined that this this one here
14	was an older bruise?
15	A Correct.
16	Q Okay. And then she had another green bruise on one
17	of the bruises on the right arm was green? The lateral aspect?
18	A Yes.
19	Q Okay. And then there's a puncture mark also on the
20	right arm.
21	A It's described as a possible puncture.
22	Q Okay. And the the one going back to the one on
23	the buttock, that is that is a a red bruise, but it is
24	not acute?
25	A Correct.

1	Q And then the the right hand you talked about the
2	injury, showing you Defense F. Looking at that injury, did
3	that determine did that appear to be a fresh injury to you?
4	A It's an abrasion, and there's dried blood at the
5	base. It looks more acute than old.
6	Q Would it help you to look at the hand injury, if I
7	can show you a picture up close?
8	A No, I can see it. I can see it on the screen, yeah.
9	Q You saw it well enough? Okay. So so you thought
10	that was a newer injury?
11	A It looks if I had to date I'd say it's more acute
12	than old because there's still blood in the dermis.
13	Q And then going to the shins, you described some of
14	these bruises on the shins as green; is that correct?
15	A I believe that was a dorsum of the food and yes.
16	Yes.
17	Q And and also green on the dorsum of the foot? And
18	so the way cirrhosis scars the liver it affects the clotting
19	factor so that somebody bruises more easily; is that correct?
20	A The force necessary to cause a bruise may be a little
21	different. You would see the bruise being more prominent than
22	with someone who is not cirrhotic.
23	Q Okay. So you would have a bigger bruise on a
24	slighter contact?
25	A Yes, that's fair.

1	Q Right? And and blunt force trauma, as you
2	explained, can be something that somebody does to themselves or
3	something that happens to them?
4	A Yeş.
5	Q And none of the bruises in this case are life
6	threatening on their own, were they?
7	A No, they are not.
8	Q And and you testified that there's no really
9	scientifically accepted theory that you can really gauge
10	bruises by color?
11	A That's correct.
12	Q Okay. Do bruises generally change color in a
13	predictable fashion, though?
14	A Yes.
15	Q And what what colors do they go through?
16	A Red, red, maroon or blue to to green to
17	yellow/brown. And that's basically the color is changing
18	because the heme pigment and red blood cells, the hemoglobin is
19	being broken down.
20	Q Okay. So so as as the colors change, would
21	that vary depending on the person?
22	A That can vary depending on the person, the person's
23	state of health, other factors such as whether they're
24	cirrhotics. There are variables.
25	Q Okay. So for instance, in Ms. Whitmarsh we have the

one older bruise that's still a red bruise. Does that mean 1 that it takes her much longer for bruising to turn through the 2 colors number it gets to green? 3 A 4 No. 5 Q Why not? 6 The colors change in a predictable fashion, but I can't tell you if she had two bruises at the same time that one 7 is going to change faster than the other, if that's what you're 8 asking. 9 10 Okay. So it's -- it's different depending on the area she's bruised or what's -- what's the variable? 11 12 The -- there's variability by the particular A individual. There's variability if you are a diabetic, for 13 instance, and you have poor circulation to your extremities. 14 15 Your bruises may stay red longer because your circulatory system doesn't work very well in that region. 15 17 Do you recall how old Ms. Whitmarsh was at the time 18 of her autopsy? 19 A I believe she was 54. 20 Q Okay. Does -- does aging affect bruising at all? 21 It can if you have a peripheral vascular disease, 22 yes. 23 Okay. Would you have seen evidence of that on the Q autopsy? 24 We typically don't dissect legs, so I wouldn't know 25 A

- 1 if she had peripheral vascular disease.
- Q Bruises don't tend to change color post-mortem,
- though, do they?

- A No, they do not.
- Q So it stops at the time of death? That's the color it's going to stay?
- 7 A That's correct.
- Q Do -- do hematomas continue to grow. Would a bump 9 continue to grow after death?
- 10 A It depends on if there's blood leakage continuing in
 11 that area or if the person is dependent. If they were face
- 12 down and you have blood pooling, the hematoma may have gotten a
- 13 little larger.
- 14 Q The liver in Ms. Whitmarsh was on her back area?
- 15 A The liver is on the front on the right.
- 16 Q On the front right?
- 17 A Are you saying livor or liver?
- 18 Q Livor, I'm sorry?
- 19 A Livor. I'm sorry.
- 20 Q I don't know how to pronounce it.
- 21 A Livor is on the back.
- 22 Q Okay.
- 23 A It was on the back.
- 24 Q And -- and how does the alcohol affect bruising
- 25 differently than the cirrhosis does?

1	A Alcohol is known to inhibit platelet function, and
2	platelets are also part of the, what we call the clotting
3	cascade.
4	Q So if somebody has a clotting problem because of the
5	liver and you combine it with the alcohol, does that make a
6	greater clotting problem because it's two different kinds?
7	A It would be expected to be additive, yes.
8	Q And you noted when you did the autopsy on Ms.
9	Whitmarsh that her spleen was also enlarged?
10	A Yes.
11	Q What did you attribute that to?
12	A To her cirrhosis of the liver.
13	Q Okay. And I want to talk a little bit about the
14	the drugs that were found in her system on the toxicology
15	report. You testified about the Effexor, that it was a 990, is
16	that milligrams?
17	A It's nanograms per ml.
18	Q Nanograms per ml? Showing you what's Defense Exhibit
19	B. Did you consider her other medications which she was
20	taking? Can you see those?
21	A Not really, sorry.
22	Q Would it help if I approach and show you?
23	A I can't make out what it says.
24	Q Is that helpful to you? What other medications was
25	she on besides the Effexor?

- A The Trazodone and Spironolactone.
 - Q And what are those medications?

2

3

5

7

8

9

10

11

13

14

- A Trazodone is sometimes used for sleep. I believe it was also used as an anti-depressant. And Spironolactone, I believe, is a diuretic sort of medication, if I recall correctly.
- Q And do you recall finding either of those in her system?
- A Those were not listed on the toxicology report.

 However, they would have had to -- in some cases unless we specifically ask for a drug to be looked for, it won't be tested for it. There are thousands of drugs and our drug screening won't pick up all of them.
 - Q Are those some of the drugs that might not pick up?
- A I am not sure at this point. I would have to check

 16 with our toxicology lab.
- Q Okay. And the prescription for her Effexor, do you agree it was 150, is it nanograms? I'm not sure how you say that.
 - A The Effexor says 75 milligrams.
- 21 Q Twice a day?
- A I -- I can't see that on this -- it says take to capsules, yes, so 150.
- 24 Q So 150 a day?
- 25 A Correct.

1 Q And Effexor's broken down in the liver? 2 It's metabolized in the liver, yes. 3 Okay. And then there were also Effexor metabolites Q in her blood; is that correct? 4 5 A That's correct. 6 And what was the level of the Effexor metabolites? 7 The metabolite O-desmethylvenlafaxine was 870 8 nanograms per ml. 9 Okay. And are -- are those the levels you would 10 expect to see on somebody that was taking 75 milligram capsules 11 twice a day? 12 I actually would not evaluate the levels in that context because that -- what you're seeing here on this tox 13 report where it gives you the milligrams and it what is the 14 15 reference ranges refers to steady state. And steady state means that you have the same amount of drug being absorbed as 16 is being eliminated. So it's steady state in the blood. 17 18 And that occurs, according to this report, I believe, it's two hours after taking the drug. Having not known when 19 she took the drug, I couldn't say that I would expect this to 20 21 be her steady state level. I don't know that. 22 0 Okay. So she -- does that seem like a high level, if 23 it was her steady state level? If it was her steady state, according to these 24 A

reference ranges, it would be high, yes.

1	Q Cirrhosis can also cause impaired cognition; is that
2	correct?
3	A It can if it results in hyporeninemia, meaning that
4	the liver is failing to breakdown ammonia, it will cause
5	confusion, yes.
6	Q And is that something that you tested for in the
7	autopsy?
8	A No, we don't test for ammonia levels.
9	Q And alcohol also impairs cognition; is that correct?
10	A That is correct.
11	Q I want to talk to you a little bit about the wound
12	path because I'm a little confused when I look at the
13	photograph. Showing you State's 130. And do you recall on the
14	autopsy report indicating a wound path?
15	A Do I
16	Q In your autopsy report?
17	A Yes, a wound path is stated in here.
18	Q Okay. I I thought you just testified that it was
19	right to left, front to back and downward. I mean, I thought
20	you just testified it was back to front (indiscernible).
21	A I don't I don't recall what the testimony was, but
22	it is in the report what I thought the path was.
23	Q Okay. And the report says right to right to left,
24	front to back and downwards; is that correct?
25	A That's correct.

1	Q And is that what is indicated on this photograph?
2	A What's indicated with the trajectory rod is you can
3	barely make out that it's right to left. What it's trying to
4	show is that it's downward.
5	Q Okay. How about the front to back?
6	A The front to back is better seen internally because
7	it's going from like the front of the well, it's more the
8	side, but it's better described as front and to the back of the
9	liver. So it would be more toward from the front of the body
10	surface to the back.
11	Q Okay, So you're not talking about from the front of
12	the body to the back of the body when you're describing that?
13	A When I'm describing the wound path, that is what I'm
14	trying to do here, but it's not as clear cut as let's say it
15	was on the front here and it went to the back of the liver.
16	It's it's actually from side to back, but it was described
17	as front to to back, if that makes sense.
18	Q Showing you Defense A, looking at this photograph,
19	can you describe how how the wound is in relationship to a
20	knife, and I guess my question is the top of the knife and I
21	forget what you call it, the non-sharp part of the knife, can
22	you indicate where that is in the picture?
23	MR. LALLI: Your Honor, I object to the question as
24	vague and ambiguous.
25	MS. PALM: I know this question's badly phrased

(indiscernible). 2 THE COURT: Sustain the objection. 3 MS. PALM: Okay. BY MS. PALM: 5 Q Can you -- is there one part of that wound that is wider than the other part? Is there one -- I'm sorry, can you rephrase? 7 8 On both ends of the wound from sharp cutting? 9 The wound is described one end is sharp or pointed, 10 the other end is square. 11 0 Okay. And what end is the square end? 12 Let's see, the square end is more towards the front and lower part of the body. So if you'd like me to point it 13 would be --15 0 Sure. 16 -- like right -- or like right here. 17 Q Okay. So the sharp end is facing the back of the 18 body? I can't say that. I don't know which end of the 20 knife was where, but I'm -- I'm describing what the skin injury 21 looks like. 22 Q Okay. 23 A That's what that description is. 24 Q Okay. And the -- how -- how deep does the wound go? 25 A There's an estimate in my report of approximately

ROUGH DRAFT TRANSCRIPT

2 All right. And were there any boney structures along Q 3 the path of that wound? There were -- there obviously are boney structures. A S The ribs are there. 6 Well, could you tell if an object hit any boney 7 structures going in? There was no boney structures that was hit. 8 A 9 And I believe you testified that she would have bled out rather quickly give her physical condition? 10 11 I believe my testimony was that I couldn't tell exactly how quickly, but that's -- yeah, given her medical 12

Q Okay. When you determine the manner of death, whether it's homicide or some other manner of death, you don't go to the scene yourself; you just said that, right?

conditions probably more quickly than someone who did not have

A Correct.

four and a quarter inches.

1

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

cirrhosis.

Q And you're relying on, you said, the circumstances and who did you get your information from regarding the circumstances of the scene?

A The information regarding the circumstances comes from our -- the coroner investigator and also law enforcement officials who are usually at the table at the autopsy, and I get to ask them questions at that time.

ROUGH DRAFT TRANSCRIPT

1	Q	Okay. So you rely on some of the homicide
2	detectives?	
3	A	Yes.
4	Q	Do you ever look at police reports?
5	A	Occasionally, yes.
6	Q	Okay. It sounded to me from your testimony like
7	other the	an the odd location of the wound there's nothing that
8	you could	say from the body that rules out suicide?
9	A	That's correct.
10	Q	Okay. So it's physically possible to stab yourself
11	in that location or a person stabs themselves there?	
12	A	It is I believe it's physically possible, just
13	very awkward.	
14	Q	Can you could you determine whether the injury to
15	her head	would have rendered her unconscious?
16	A	I can't tell that just from the examine, but just
17	from pers	sonal experience it meems unlikely.
18	Q	It wasn't that significant of a head injury?
19	A	Correct.
20	Q	Can you determine whether Ms. Whitmarsh would have
21	been capa	ble of purposeful activity after getting that stab
22	wound?	
23	Ä	It seems likely that she would have been. Typically,
24	again, he	r aorta was not severed, so it wouldn't have been
25	immediately incapacitating.	

- Q Okay. Would that depend on how quickly she bled out?
- A Yeah, it -- for instance, if you hit an artery, you're going to bleed out faster than if you hit a vein or a smaller vessels. And so while you're losing blood pressure, of course, you're still capable of purposeful action until your blood pressure drops to where you become unconscious and then clearly you're not capable of purposeful action at that point.
- Q And would it depend on how much activity she was engaging in after the stab wound? How quickly she would have not been capable of purposeful action? Does the level of her activity decrease the amount of time she had that she'd be moving around?
 - A Theoretically, yes.
- Q When -- when you're considering bruising in connection with the cause of death as an ME, do you consider the fact that a person operating on high alcohol level might have been bumping into things?
- A Yes.

- Q All right. And you can't rule out that any of the bruises were from bumping into things, can you?
- A Some of the bruising I thought were unlikely to be from bumping into things. Usually, and folks who are chronic habitual alcohol users do bump into things and we typically see that on more extensor surfaces. You don't see that on the inner surface of the arm, per se. And I typically don't see

1	buttock bruising on alcoholics.	
2	Q On the inner surface of the arm there was a little	
3	grouping of bruises; is that correct?	
4	A Yes, I believe that was the left arm.	
5	Q Showing you Defense I. These bruises right here what	
6	you were talking about?	
7	A Yes, there's one there.	
8	Q Okay, And are those bruises consistent with somebody	
9	grabbing on arm?	
10	A They could be, yes.	
11	Q Okay. But you can't say from looking at those	
12	bruises whether they were caused by somebody grabbing an arm to	
13	assist somebody or grabbing an arm to hurt somebody?	
14	A Correct.	
15	Q And from considering just the body in this case and	
16	not the evidence from homicide detectives or anything else,	
17	considering just the body, can you rule out an accidental wound	
Lθ	sustained during struggle over a knife?	
19	A Given those circumstances I probably still would not	
20	have called that an accident. It would have either been	
21	homicide or undetermined.	
22	Q Okay. But with that scenario you can't rule that out	
23	a hundred percent, could you?	
24	A No.	
15	MR. LALLI: I object to 100 percent, your Honor.	

I THE COURT: Sustained. 2 MS. PALM: She said probably. I'm trying to clarify 3 what's the range of probability. THE COURT: Well, you can ask it in medical terms, 4 you know. 5 MS. PALM: Okay. 6 7 BY MS. PALM: Well, again, from looking at the body, you can't 8 completely rule out whether this injury was sustained or in an accidental struggle over -- is that correct? 10 11 That's correct. Is it possible to say how long she would have been 12 conscious after receiving the injury? 13 14 I have no objective way of determining that. A 15 MS. PALM: That's all the questions, I have. Thank 16 you, Doctor. 17 THE COURT: Any redirect by State? MR. LALLI: Very brief, your Honor. 18 19 REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. LALLI: 20 Doctor, I think you described the process of healing 21 of a bruise as starting with red, maroon and then moving to 22 green and then moving to yellow/brown; is that correct? 24 Correct. Yes. A 25 And you can't tell us how long that process takes,

	1	
1	but you	can tell us that it a bruise goes through that
2	process	of healing?
3	A	That is correct.
4	Q	All right. And there were red and maroon bruises on
5	Victoria'	's body?
6	A	Yes.
7	Q	There were green bruises on her body?
8	A	Yes,
9	Q	So there were bruises in various stages of healing?
10	A	Yes,
11	Q	Is that consistent with somebody being roughly
12	handled i	in an ongoing manner?
13	A	It could be consistent with that scenario, yes.
14	Q	Okay. You indicated that there was this awkwardly
15	position	stab wound to the side of the body. I think you
16	referred	to it as awkwardly positioned?
17	А	If that's how I referred to it, I
18	Q	Okay. Would you refer to it that way?
19	A	Well, it's awkward for a suicide, yes.
20	Q	Okay. So if somebody's going to commit suicide
21		not going to make it that difficult for themselves; is
22	that what	you're saying?
23	A	In general. In my experience, no.
24	Q	Okay. You did not call this an accident, correct?
25	A	Correct.

	1	
1	Q	You could have if you wanted to?
2	A	I could have if the circumstances were of such that I
3	thought i	t was an accident, yes.
4	Q	You didn't call it a a suicide?
5	А	No.
6	Q	You could have if you wanted to?
7	А	Again, if the circumstances and the examination
8	supported	l that, yes.
9	Q	As part of your determination of whether the case was
1.0	homicide	or something else, you look beyond the body; is at
11	that true	20
12	A	Yes.
13	Q	You look to the circumstances of how the injuries
14	were obta	ined, if you know them?
15	A	Yes,
16	Q	Would you also look at perhaps things that a
17	perpetrat	or had said?
18	a A	Yes, if I had those statements from the police, yes.
19	Q	Okay. So if you had known, for example, that the
20	defendant	had threatened to kill or wanted the victim dead, for
21	example,	would that put you more in the camp of homicide?
22	A	Well, certainly that would be considered, but I'd
23	also have	to look at the whole totality of the scene and the
24	and the a	utopsy findings as well.
25	O	But that would help you?
- 1		

1	A It would be a factor, yes.
2	Q If you had known that the defendant said I didn't
3	mean to hurt you in describing what had occurred, would that
4	help you categorize this more firmly into the homicide
5	category?
6	A Yes, the the implication in that state would have
7	been that I burt you, but I didn't mean to, so yes, I
8	Q You did, in fact, call this a homicide, correct?
9	A Yes.
10	Q Death at the hands of another person?
11	A Correct.
12	MR. LALLI: Nothing further.
13	THE COURT: Ms. Palm,
14	MS. FALM: No redirect, your Honor. I mean, no?
15	THE COURT: I'm sorry, Ma'am?
16	MS. PALM: Nothing.
17	THE COURT: Okay. Any questions from any of the
18	jurors? No questions. Dr. Benjamin, thank you for your
19	testimony. You are excused.
20	THE WITNESS: Thank you.
21	THE COURT: Thank you very much.
22	MR. LALLI: Your Honor, we have another witness. She
23	my guess is she she's going to be anywhere from, well, at
24	least an hour or longer. Whatever the court's pleasure, we can
25	Start, we can

1 THE COURT: We're going to -- it's been a --MR. LALLI: -- come back tomorrow. 2 THE COURT: -- a long day for the jury, and --3 MR. LALLI: Okay. 4 5 THE COURT: -- like I said, I think we're adjourn for 6 the day. I do appreciate the jury willing to stay a little 7 later today. Thank you very much. We're going to come back 8 tomorrow at 10:00 o'clock, and we'll resume the testimony of 9 the various witnesses. 10 During this evening recess, it is your duty not to converse among yourselves or with anyone else on any subject 11 connected with this case or to read, watch or listen to any 12 13 report of or commentary on the trial by any person connected with the trial or by any medium of information, including without limitation, newspaper, television, radio or the 15 16 Internet. You are not to form or express an opinion on any 17 subject connected with the case until this matter is submitted to you. Ladies and gentlemen, please have a good evening. 18 19 We'll see you back at 10:00 a.m. 20 (Court recessed at 5:34 p.m. until 5:37 p.m.). 21 (Outside the presence of the jury). 22 THE COURT: All right. Mr. Lalli, you had something on the -- you wanted to put on the record. 23 24 MR. LALLI: Yes, your Honor. I just wanted to make a note of multiple references during Ms. Palm's opening

statement. She indicated that the defendant and the descendant were a very loving couple. I counted at least five -- or at least three times, rather, when she made that statement.

In truth, there is a long history of police responding to domestic disputes between the two of them. There are at least five occasions when the police had responded outside of what the court has already allowed into evidence. And it's my position that in giving her opening statement in the manner in which she did, she has opened the door to that information.

THE COURT: Ms. Palm.

MS. PALM: Your Honor, the court's ruling that was that as long as we stayed in the parameters of the time frame when he got out of prison forward, we could talk about the relationship. We did that last time. That's always been the ruling. And that 's what I did again. And it was my understanding that that's the court's ruling.

MR. LALLI: I've read the court's ruling many times because I wasn't here last time, and I wanted to be sure that I was obedient to it, and I'm not seeing that anywhere in the ruling. So maybe -- maybe -- you know, I'll have a look again or maybe somebody can point it out to me, but it is -- it is certainly disingenuous for -- for -- if terms of the presentation of the evidence to portray this as a -- as a loving couple when, in fact, the police had responded multiple

times to incidents between them.

MS. PALM: And, your Honor, I brought it up against yesterday that that was my understanding of the court's ruling. I think it was yesterday during argument on something. That's always been my understanding of what we were doing as long as we stayed prison forward we were okay.

THE COURT: I don't recall the specifics of that.

But, Mr. Lalli, you were free to object at the time and also the jury will be advised that what's stated in opening and closing arguments is not evidence, and, you know, if -- if that evidence doesn't come out, Mr. Lalli, you know, you can -- I'm sure you'll know how to attack that during closing.

MR. LALLI: So -- okay, so if a witness -- if -- if -- if this issue comes up about -- I certainly won't be bringing it up, but if it is brought up by the -- by the defense, I can certainly attack that evidence the way I would any other opinion with respect to whether they were a loving couple?

THE COURT: Well, it really depends -- I mean, it's going to be very question specific --

MR. LALLI: Okay.

THE COURT: -- on behalf of the defense. I can't give you an advance ruling on --

MR. LALLI: I understand.

THE COURT: -- how --

MS. PALM: Well --

THE COURT: -- that may or may not come out, I have no idea.

MS. PALM: Well, your Honor, I can tell you that I had planned to present the same evidence we presented last time. Under the ruling that we've always been under is the people to talk about their relationship and how they treated each other when they got back together, period. And that has never opened the door in his prior offenses.

The court considered all of that. We -- the court ruled what prior offenses were going to be admissible and they got to have the felony conviction.

MR. LALLI: Well, it --

MS. PALM: So I -- I need to know if I can call my witnesses or not because that's what they're coming for, to talk about what they saw of their relationship.

THE COURT: I -- I think if you tailor it to the last year they were together or whenever they -- they became reacquainted as boyfriend and girlfriend, you know, what did you -- you know, what did you observe, then that's fine. If you ask have they always been a loving -- in a loving relationship, have they always acted that way, has he always treated her appropriately, then you've opened the door, I would think.

MS. PALM: And I -- I won't to that, and I -- I was

careful to limit my discussion to how they -- how they were 1 2 (indiscernible). THE COURT: And it's going to be (indiscernible) -- I 3 4 mean, I can't anticipate all your questions, and I'm sure the State will object on the appropriate occasion. But I'm sure 5 both sides will be aware of not to open inappropriate door. 7 MS. PALM: Thank you, your Honor. 8 THE COURT: I need the disk of the -- the statement. 9 MS. PALM: Okay. Well, I have my edited version with 10 me. 11 THE COURT: And can you give me -- I can't -- I wrote down the -- the time frame, and I can't find that note. If you 12 can give that to me again of what the State is showing and what 13 you request. 14 MS. PALM: Well, can I just show you my disk because 15 it's time stamped on there. 16 17 THE COURT: Okay. 18 MS. PALM: I don't have a start time, but if you open it, this is exactly what I'm requesting. 20 THE COURT: Okay. And Mr. Lalli, can you give me the time frame that you're saying is appropriate? 21 22 MR. LALLI: Yes. 23 THE COURT: I had -- like I said, you gave it to me before and I -- I cannot find my note. 25 MR. LALLI: Oh, the court has the entire -- actually,

the court has the entire video that was admitted at the last 1 trial. All of this -- well, at least the -- the portion that I 2 am seeking admission of is on that. All of it is on that. 3 MS. PALM: I don't think the full thing was admitted. 5 They redacted some of it. 6 MS. GRAHAM: They only redacted the break, that's it. That's all that was redacted. 7 8 MS. PALM: Okay. 9 THE COURT: Okay, so it says starts at 1:38 and goes to 1:43. So you want all that section, correct? 10 MS. PALM: Yes, and I put the two (indiscernible) 11 after the end of the interview is also on there from the end of 12 the -- or the -- the interview ends, then there's a little 13 break, and it starts back up when Dan Ford comes in the room. And I want that on there until the end at 4:05. What's on 15 16 there is exactly what I want. And it's time stamped the time 17 frame it is. THE COURT: I think your note on this is confusing 18 me. It said the -- it starts at 1:38 and it goes to 1:43. 19 20 MS. PALM: Right. 21 THE COURT: That's the pre-interview time frame? 22 MS. PALM: Yes. 23 THE COURT: Okay. And then we have the interview, MS. PALM: I don't have a start up time again for the 24 post-interview time frame because that was just my note. I 25

1 didn't know we were going to be doing this today. 2 THE COURT: Okay. I mean, do I -- do I need to do this tonight? 3 4 MR. LALLI: Your Honor, my --5 MS. PALM: I can admit it -- I might want to do it through the detective, though, when this is. 6 7 THE COURT: I -- I just don't understand your note here because I understood it better when I -- when we spoke 8 about it this morning. 10 MS. PALM: Okay, my -- my note was just for my own personal, but if you watch the video, it's got the time stamps 11 on there from the times that I want, but it basically includes 12 that first pre-interview part until 1:43 when the actual 13 interview starts. And then it picks up again when Dan Ford comes in the room after the interview is over. But I don't 15 16 have a time on that note. 17 THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Lalli, we gotta work backwards. What portion do you want to play for the jury? 18

MR. LALLI: What I written down here, your Honor, is starting the interview at 1:35:47, which is the time that the detectives enter the room, and concluding the interview at

3:28:34, which is the time that the detectives leave the room.

THE COURT: Okay.

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. LALLI: With all of the edits that the court has ordered me to make, including the hour break in the middle.

And it's my position that any statements that the defendant made when crime scene analysts or detectives were in the room much later are not within the scope of this interview and they're hearsay if they're being offered by the defense.

B

They cannot offer his self-serving statements. He's probably going to testify and he'll be able to explain things that he might have said. But they're not entitled to admit his statements or for that matter, the other statements of the investigators and police officers that were in the room. It's hearsay.

THE COURT: Okay, so Ms. Palm, on your -- on your -posted it stays start at 1:38. Mr. Lalli's saying that his
interview's going to start at 1:35, so it actually starting
before your requesting time.

MS. PALM: Yeah, and that part of the interview is not Mirandized, so, you know, Mr. Lalli couldn't admit those additional three minutes anyway.

MR. LALLI: Well, I certainly can because what happens is the detectives walk in and the defendant starts giving them the business. So he starts making epontaneous statements, not in response to any interrogation. So that's certainly admissible evidence.

THE COURT: Okay, Ms. Palm, again, you're saying anything prior to 1:38 should be excluded; is that correct?

MS. PALM: Yes, because I think it's -- it's --

```
unfairly prejudicial to him and, you know, he's talking about
     Bucky and those kind of things and that's where I cut it -- you
  2
     know, where I started from it when -- when they start talking
     about the incident.
  5
              THE COURT: And then you want to go from 3:28 to
     4:05, basically another half hour?
 6
 7
              MS. PALM: Well, not -- no, not really because
    there's a big break before Dan Ford comes in the room. And
 8
    that's -- that's -- the interview ends at 3:28, then they have
    a break where he sits there by himself. I cut all of that out.
10
11
    So I pick it back up when Dan Ford comes in the room. And I
    don't have that time on that note. But you can see the time if
13
    you look at the video.
14
              THE COURT: Okay, so I have to scroll through this
    from 3:28 to 4:05 and find out when he comes into the room?
16
              MS. PALM: It's -- no, no. That video only has what
17
    I want.
18
              THE COURT: Okay.
19
              MS. PALM: It's about a six minute video.
              THE COURT: Okay.
20
              MS. PALM: That's what I'm saying, I -- I -- I clip
21
    it had to together.
22
             THE COURT: I think I understand, I'll --
23
24
             MS. PALM: Okay.
25
             THE COURT: -- try to review it tonight.
```

	T and the second
1	MS. PALM: Thank you.
2	THE COURT: Okay.
3	MS. PALM: And then your clerk asked for us to e-mail
4	him jury instructions.
5	THE COURT: We have the State's. They're on my desk.
6	With and without citations.
7	MS. PALM: I filed mine the first day.
8	THE COURT: Okay. So then we have if you could
9	e-mail them to us, we'd appreciate it.
10	MS. PALM: Okay.
21	THE COURT: All right. Anything else?
12	MR. LALLI: I don't think so, your Honor.
13	THE COURT: Okay. And like I said, we'll check with
14	the jurors in the morning or
15	THE MARSHAL: 5:30.
16	THE COURT: 5:30 tomorrow.
17	THE MARSHAL: No later than 5:30.
18	THE COURT: All right.
19	MS. GRAHAM: For purposes of lining up witnesses they
20	can stay until 5:30?
21	THE MARSHAL: 5:30.
22	MS. GRAHAM: And we start at 10:00, Judge?
23	THE COURT: 10:00.
24	MR. LALLI: Great.
25	THE COURT: All right. Actually, counsel can be here

at 9:45 just in case any issues pop up over the evening hours that you want to bring to my attention. MS. PALM: Okay. Thank you. THE COURT: Thank you. THE MARSHAL: We'll have the defendant here at 9:45? THE COURT: Yes, 9:45. (Court recessed at 5:47 p.m., until Thursday, August 26, 2010).

	WI	TNES	SES	2									
NAME	DIREC				Pis		RE	DI	REC	T	R	ECF	oss
PLAINTIFF'S WITNESSES			-13-13				14116A	Ser Ale					
Jacqueline Benjamin	*			87				10	17				
		* *	<u>.</u>										
	ES	HIB	TTS.										
DESCRIPTION:	::										ΔD	MITT	TED
PLAINTIFF'S EXHIBITS:											* 7.60	-	
Exhibits 81 through 12 Exhibit 130	20 	/ * 70	(882) (1843)	€: •6:		•		\$1 3 5	2 (3 3 (8	31 E	0	## ## (2)	60 61
DEFENDANT'S EXHIBITS:													
Exhibits A through J	94 64 640 4	* * *	i ii	85 1 8	£ ¥	52		<u> </u>	¥ 5	1020	1	9	. 88

VERBATIM DIGITAL REPORTING, LLC + (303) 798-8880

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

ATTEST: Pursuant to Rule 3C(d) of the Nevada Rules of Appellate Procedure, I acknowledge that this is a rough draft transcript, expeditiously prepared, not proofread, corrected, or certified to be an accurate transcript.

Verbatim Digital Reporting, LLC Littleton, CO 80120 303-798-0890

JULIE LORD, TRANSCRIBER

11-15-10

DISTRICT COURT CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA FILED

Nov 23 18 22 AM '18

for 18 mm CLEME IN THE COURT

THE STATE OF NEVADA,

Plaintiff,

CASE NO. C-250630

VS.

DEPT. NO. 17

BRIAN KERRY O'KEEFE,

Defendant.

图 排除 數 麗 俊 郑 河豚 新 独

Transcript of Proceedings

BEFORE THE HONORABLE MICHAEL VILLANI, DISTRICT COURT JUDGE

ROUGH DRAFT TRANSCRIPT OF JURY TRIAL - DAY 4

THURSDAY, AUGUST 26, 2010

080260630 TRANS Transcript of Proceedings 1570238

APPEARANCES:

FOR THE PLAINTIFF:

CHRISTOPHER LALLI, ESQ.

Assistant District Attorney

STEPHANIE GRAHAM, ESQ. Deputy District Attorney

FOR THE DEFENDANT:

PATRICIA PALM, ESQ.

Special Deputy Public Defender

COURT RECORDER:

TRANSCRIPTION BY:

MICHELLE RAMSEY District Court

VERBATIM DIGITAL REPORTING, LLC

Littleton, CO 80120 (303) 798-0890

Proceedings recorded by audio-visual recording, transcript produced by transcription service.

RECEIVED

NOV 3 2 2010

CLERK OF THE COURT

1	LAS VEGAS, NEVADA, THURSDAY, AUGUST 26, 2010, 10:04 A.M.
2	(Outside the presence of the jury)
3	THE COURT: Is Cliff in the hallway?
4	MR. LALLI: Are you ready for the jury judge?
5	THE COURT: I think we have some
6	THE COURT RECORDER: (Indiscernible) outside the
7	presence?
8	THE COURT: We're on the record, Michelle?
9	THE COURT RECORDER: Oh, we are?
10	THE COURT: Are we? I'm asking you.
11	THE COURT RECORDER: Yes, we are.
12	THE COURT: Okay.
13	THE COURT RECORDER: Outside the (indiscernible).
14	THE COURT: Tape recorder turned on?
15	THE COURT RECORDER: Yes.
16	THE COURT: All right. Ms. Palm, I had an
17	opportunity to review the requested sections of the DVD you
18	provided me yesterday, which we'll have this marked for the
19	record next in line for defense exhibit.
20	MS. PALM: I
21	THE COURT: Yes.
22	MS. PALM: didn't have it marked yet but yes.
23	THE COURT: All right. Well
24	MS. PALM: I would like it
25	MS. GRAHAM: Court defense

2

1 THE COURT: -- the Clerk will mark it right now. 2 MS. PALM: Thank you. 3 THE COURT: All right. And Mr. Lalli had an objection to the admission of those sections. 5 MR. LALLI: Well, I have -- I had an objection Your Honor to the admission of the portion after the point in time when the detectives leave the room. And my objection is on hearsay. Anything that anybody said is hearsay and the defendant is not allowed to enter his own statement because is -- it's not an admission of party opponent, so that's the basis 10 of our objection. 11 12 THE COURT: All right, Ms. Palm. MS. PALM: My response to that is under the rule of 13 completeness if they admit a portion of a statement I get to 14 admit other portions of it. And they are seeking to admit 15 l 16 his -- almost his entire statement so I'm allowed to do that to 17 counter what is in that part of the statement. THE COURT: Okay. 18 19 MR. LALLI: Your Honor what --20 MS. PALM: And it's relevant to his defense and it's relevant to what happened in the room when they were collecting 21 22 his DNA. THE COURT: Okay. Well, let's -- let's address that. 23 24 You said it's relevant to his defense, let's address that 25 issue. Now is it --

1 MS, PALM: Well --2 THE COURT: relevant to his defense? 3 MS. PALM: Cause I think they've made the claim that he's not saying what happened. And as drunk as he is, he is saying what happened when he's saying, "I tried to grab the knife, I tried to grab the knife." He's saying what happened. 6 That's part of his defense is he was telling them the best that 7 8 he could tell them what happened. 9 THE COURT: Isn't that --10 MS. PALM: And --11 THE COURT: -- a self-serving statement, it's not a 12 statement against interest? 13 MS. PALM: Well, regardless if -- if it's self servin, g, they're making the claim in the interview he didn't 14 tell them what happened. That's part of what happened and he 15 16 is telling them, so it counters what they're saying happened. 17 And it's part of the contact with law enforcement; if they want to admit part of it I get to admit what I want to admit. 18 THE COURT: Well, not nessecarily. I mean --19 MS. PALM: Well, I'm -- I -- I -- would say under the 20 law I would get to. 21 22 MR. LALLI: Your Honor --23 THE COURT: Well, under the completeness doctrine, that doesn't mean everything comes in. It's -- I mean if that 25 means you don't take things out of context. You make sure it's

in the proper context so the jury can understand the situation. There -- there isn't any claim being presented that is part of it at the end of the tape, or in the recording. It shows it was officer Ford or -- or CSI Ford taking various photographs and hand swabs of the defendant. There -- there isn't any claim here that the swabs were taken in an inappropriate manner, that DNA was contaminated. Is there -- I mean there isn't any claim in that regard is there?

IO

MS. PALM: With the later swabs, yes. As far as that part goes there is a claim about them steadying him to balance him while they're taking the photographs of him. Them -- the interaction with him in the room at that time when he was off balance and appeared to intoxicated so there is a claim with that.

MR. LALLI: Your Honor, detective Wildemann is going to testify. He can certainly describe the defendants gait when they are in the room. Mr. Ford can do the same.

The problem is they're not allowed to enter self-serving statements of the defendant that are not being offered as part of a statement that was taken by the police. This is completely outside of that.

And as far as completeness is concerned, I've been complete as possible. I start when detectives enter the room and I end when they ultimately leave and the interview is concluded. They don't have any completeness argument at all.

The issue with what they want to do is they want to admit hearsay. And yeah, it's nice that maybe in -- in some little respect it might show some other things. But what they're 3 really trying to do is get in this hearsay and it's inadmissable. Those people are going to be present. I fully expect the defendant is going to testify and all of that evidence can come in, but they don't get to admit hearsay. 8 THE COURT: Ms. Palm if -- I mean what I'm hearing from you is your fallback argument is, also shows his condition as far as his intoxicated condition. 10 11 MS. PALM: That's correct. 12 THE COURT: Okay. MS. PALM: And it's the first time that he stood up 13 14 and that you could see him standing up and how he was balancing. And in addition to that, in his state of mind how 15 16 is he to know that is interview is over. They walked out of 17 the room once for an hour and came back and kept interviewing, 18 they walked back again and started talking to him. So I don't know how he's supposed to know the interview is over once it's 19 20 began. THE COURT: Well, there wasn't any interrogation 21 22 during that time. They asked him to stand up face -- turn left, turn right, face backwards, take the photographs, put 23 your hands out. I mean they're not interrogating or 24

25

interviewing him at that time.

```
1
              If you feel that the -- his condition goes to the
    issue of voluntariness of his confession I don't have a prompt
    showing the -- his gate with the sound turned off if that's
    what you -- if -- if you -- if your intent is to show that he
    was so drunk he didn't know what he was saying, that he was
    very unsteady on his feet. In that regard if that's what you
 6
    want to do I would allow that but we'd have to turn the sound
 8
    off.
 9
              MS. PALM: Okay, so he can't say you know, I -- I was
10
    trying to grab the knife, look at my hand, I got cut, how --
              THE COURT: No.
11
             MS. PALM: -- would I get cut.
12
              THE COURT: If he takes the --
1.3
              MS. PALM: Okay.
14
15
              THE COURT: -- stand you can say that.
              MS. PALM: But he can't show it, that he told them
16
17
    that all the time.
             THE COURT: Now, if --
18
19
             MS. PALM: Okay.
20
             THE COURT: -- no. But if --
21
             MS. PALM: I understand.
22
             THE COURT: -- you want to use it to show his
23
   unsteady gait --
24
             MS. PALM: And then I do, I'll take it however I can
25
   get it.
```

A

1 THE COURT: Okay, and so we would just need somehow -- I don't know if you can -- if we can mute it or 2 probably Michelle can mute or something. 3 4 MR. LALLI: Well, here is the problem with that Your Honor, if it's evidence it'll go back to the jury room. And if there is sound on the video, then the jury would at some point during their deliberations be able to hear it. It's not just 7 8 enough to turn it off here --9 THE COURT: All right. 10 MR. LALLI: -- so they'd have to get --THE COURT: Is there somebody to edit this? 11 MR. LALLI: -- they'd have to get a -- the sound 12 13 tract removed. MS. PALM: I don't know how you would remove the 14 sound tract from it. I think the Court could order the jury, 15 "You're not allowed to listen to the sound on that." If they 16 needed to replay they could ask for a replay and we could make 17 sure they won't turn the sound up. I -- I don't know how to 18 19 edit sound out of a video. THE COURT: Isn't there one of these like Kinkos --20 21 MR. LALLI: There's software that does it. 22 THE COURT: Yeah. I mean there's --MS. PALM: Well, I don't have it and I'm telling you 23 this late in the trial I'm not going to able to get it. 24 25 MR. LALLI: Well, I object to the exhibit in its

```
current condition.
 2
              THE COURT: If there is a way for us to provide it to
    the jury with the sound off, then I have no objection to that.
 3
    We'll admit it -- I mean -- there's got to be some -- someone
    in town that can do that on very short notice, just take the
    sound off. I mean I -- I don't personally know how to do it
   but it seems to me -- maybe even like Kinkos or someplace like
    that copying this.
 8
             MS. PALM: I'll try. And the first part of the --
9
10
    the video we have a dispute as to the --
11
             THE COURT: Right. And anything else --
             MR. LALLI: Your Honor, did the Court get what I
12
    (indiscernible) as --
13
14
             THE COURT: And --
15
             MR. LALLI: (indiscernible.
16
             THE COURT: -- we could not play it, you have some
17
   code on your disk. It says C-O-D-E-C and it won't play in our
   machines.
18
             MR. LALLI: Oh, it's -- there's a codex issue?
19
             THE COURT: Yeah.
20
21
             MR. LALLI: I -- would the Court like me to play it
22
   on -- I can play it right now. There's -- there's really
   not --
23
24
             THE COURT: Let's do it at the lunch hour so we can
25
   get the jury in.
```

	•		
1	MR. ;	LALLI:	Very good.
2	THE (COURT:	But I could not play it.
3	MR. I	LALLI:	Okay.
4	THE (COURT:	Does Ms. Palm have a copy of this?
5	MR.)	LALLI:	She has it.
6	THE	COURT:	Okay.
7	MR. I	ALLI:	She doesn't have the edited version but
8	she has		
9	THE	COURT:	Okay.
10	MR. I	LALLI:	she has the defendant's
11	THE (COURT:	But we
12	MR. I	LALLI:	statement.
13	THE (COURT:	It wouldn't play. Blank screen.
14	MR. I	LALLI;	Hum.
15	THE (COURT:	I mean it just popped up said
16	MR. I	LALLI:	Coded.
17	THE (COURT:	the computer can't play
18	MR. I	ALLI:	Right.
19	THE (COURT:	or some (indiscernible)
20	MR. I	ALLI:	You need to upgrade your your computer
21	judge, there's	an issu	e there.
22	THE C	COURT:	Tell the county that. Anything else?
23	MR. I	ALLI:	Your Honor, one one issue and it
24	pertains again	to this	character evidence issue. I think Mr.
25	DeSalvio is go:	ing to h	be testifying at some point today and he's

-- at least at the prior trial he testified as to seeing the defendant or -- and the victim together and they -- the gist of it was they appeared to be a loving couple based upon what he saw. That of course is character evidence. And it is our position -- it is -- it is our position that is in an improper method by which to prove character under 48.055 --

THE COURT: Yes?

3 1

MR. LALLI: It talks about proving character and how that is done, and it says, "In all cases in which evidence of character or trait of character of a person is admissible, proof may be made by testimony as to reputation or in the form of an opinion."

And then were allowed to cross on specific incidents. So, for example if they want Mr. DeSalvio to testify that Mr. O'Keefe was a loving boyfriend, the way that they are required to do that is in the form of an opinion, not as they did in the last trial with specific incidents. Then were allowed to challenge that opinion with specific incidents.

So in other words Mr. DeSalvio takes the stand, he's asked does he have an opinion as to whether the defendant was a loving boyfriend, yes, what's your opinion, I believe he was a loving boyfriend.

Then we are allowed to ask would that -- would it change your opinion if you knew that the defendant had been sent to prison for a domestic battery charge. Would it change

his life. He's done. He -- he served his time, he's out on parole, he wants to have a new life.

And he meets Cheryl Morris. And Cheryl Morris is who they want you to rely on for evidence that he made threats against Victoria whom he loved. Cheryl Morris is the person they want you to rely on for he demonstrated how he could (indiscernible) --

MR. LALLI: I'm sorry, your Honor. I'm sorry, Ms. Palm.

MS. PALM: -- kill people.

MR. LALLI: I'm going to object. This is argumentative.

THE COURT: Sustained. Just rephrase the statements.

MS. PALM: Cheryl Morris is the witness who's going to come forward and tell you these things. Cheryl Morris is girl friend when he gets out of prison. And he and Cheryl Morris are building somewhat of a future together. She's staying at his house, his little trailer, on and off, and -- and she's putting up -- and he's -- he's drinking again. He's got a bad drinking problem, and she's putting up with his drinking problem.

And she's putting with sort of transiency issues and wasn't real stable where they were living. They went and lived with some friends. And she's putting up with him telling her from the beginning that he still loved Victoria. He was honest

1 with her about it and said I love this woman.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2 And so that goes on from January when their 3 relationship starts until June of 2008. And Victoria seeks Brian. Brian did not seek Victoria. Victoria sought Brian out. And he went and met with her just after Father's Day, and as a result of that, he wanted to be back in that relationship. And he came back and -- and expressed it to Cheryl, you know, his feelings.

She was upset first he lied to her. And then he told her to the truth. I -- I can't lie, I was with -- with Victoria. She still puts up with it. She puts up with him still seeing Victoria. And throughout the course of the summer this is still going on and she's still staying with him. And they're doing things like buying a car together on her credit because he didn't have very good credit. And then they look for an apartment together, and they get an apartment together.

And about that same time she decides she's tired of it. Meanwhile, throughout the summer Victoria was calling Cheryl. Victoria's pursuing Brian and calling Cheryl. And they get had apartment together, and they decide what they're going to just go their separate ways and live together as friends and it works for a few days, and then Brian calls up Cheryl and he wants to come back to the apartment. But he wants to be with Victoria, too. They want to be together. And Cheryl, of course, doesn't like that idea. And

Victoria gets on the phone and she talks to Cheryl. And in the end Cheryl ends up leaving and Victoria and Brian live in that apartment together. And -- and that apartment was a cute little apartment. They made a cute little home together. I'm just going to show you some of the pictures of how that place looked. It's -- it's small, but it's nice, it's clean, and it's a home.

В

And this is the living room area going into the bedroom and this is the master bedroom back here. And again, just another kitchen one. But you can see, they -- they made a nice little home together. They were living together there as a couple.

And you're going to hear from our other witnesses as they were as a couple. And our other witnesses are going to tell you that they were very loving with each other. And that Brian lit up when Victoria walked in the room. And they did things as a couple together.

Brian tried to get help for his alcoholism again, and he goes to his union leader, and he says I need help. I -- I have this problem. I don't know what to do. And the union leader sends him into counseling. He goes to MINES (phonetic) counseling. First he goes through detox. He goes through several days of detox and then he gets put into an after-patient counseling program. And Victoria goes with him. And the counselor's going to come in here and talk to you and

tell you that they were a loving couple. They were support of each other. They were talking about their future together.

And Victoria's still drinking at the time, but Brian's not. Brian's dry. And -- and he makes it through the entire program that way. And the other thing about it is Brian knew that he had cirrhosis or that -- that Victoria had cirrhosis. And he knew that she had Hepatitis C and he knew that that was communicable. And he didn't care because he wanted to be with Victoria.

He just wanted ten good years with her. She was a little older than him. When they met Brian was about 38 and she was about eight and a half years older than he was. And he didn't think she had much time left, but he wanted whatever time she had.

And he took her to meet his little girls by his second wife. And they went to -- and they did union activities together. They went to -- they worked on the presidential campaign in 2008 together for the union. And Victoria was a big part of that. They were a part of each other's lives in every way and a very loving couple. And the people at the apartment will tell you the same thing. They appeared to be a very loving couple.

And a couple of nights before the incident, and you're going to hear evidence of this from one of the police officers who -- who looked at the prescriptions that Victoria

had at the apartment. She -- she had gone off -- she wasn't taking her meds like she was supposed to. And she was having some problems. She was having problems because she got denied on SSD. She was having problems because her unemployment had stopped. She was having emotional problems.

So a couple nights before the incident she's having issues and she wakes Brian pointing a knife at him and yelling at him and poking the knife at him. And he's sober at the point so he's able to calm her down. What are you doing? And he calms her down. And that settles down, and she's okay again. But she's still having problems because of these things going on in her life. And then Brian, who's been out of work since he went through the counseling, gets a call -- or calls somebody and finds out that, you know, he's got a good prospect of going back to work in the next week.

And he's happy, and he's an alcoholic and so he wants to reward himself in several ways. One for being sober for so long and one forgetting the job prospect and he wants to go drink. So he and Victoria go out and they go to can -- well, first they run and get a little vacuum part because they had a vacuum that they needed to fix at their house for things they wanted to do there. And then they go to the Paris. And they start drinking at the Paris.

And they get there I'd say roughly around 6:00, 6:30 in the evening, I think it is, and -- and Brian is slamming

them because drinking are free when you're gambling. And he takes about 20 shots and some mixed drinks in the course of several hours. And Victoria was drinking, obviously, from her blood alcohol content. And when -- they'd been there for long enough, and they decide it's time to go home.

They get in the car, and she is driving because he's too drunk to drive. And she's drunk, but he's more drunk than she is. So she's driving. And you'll see that from the photographs of the car. The passenger seat is pushed back, leaned back, reclined, because he fell asleep on the way home, and the driver's seat is pushed way up. And you see two glasses in there. Those are alcohol. And you'll hear that.

And so she drives home, and they get there. And there's a little argument because she's mad about several things. She's mad, she didn't want -- she has to cook. She didn't want to cook. She wanted to go out to eat, and he's passing out on the driver's seat. And so she ends up being angry and she goes upstairs and Brian stays down there and sleeps.

And you're going to hear then from the neighbors, who tell you that they start hearing banging noises or bamming noises or however the various neighbors describe it. They start hearing it from their reports anywhere between 9:00 and 10:00 o'clock. And then they say it goes on until about 11:00 o'clock. And that's when Mr. Toliver, Cooky Toliver, goes

upstairs to see what the noise is.

Well, the problem with that time period is her body from the bruises could not have sustained a two hour beating, not with her condition. She would have been bruised head to toe, and she wasn't. So the evidence is going to show you that she -- she couldn't have been being beat, which is an implication from the evidence of we hear these bangs noises going on. That's the only guilty implication from it.

But given her history, the evidence is going to convince you that she was upstairs banging things around because she was mad. When you look at those photographs of the apartment, you don't see any disarray, except for in that bedroom. You can look in every room of that house, it's clean, it's neat, nothing's out of order. And then there's the bedroom.

And even the area where the knife is taken from, the corner of the kitchen where the knife is, when you look at a bigger shot of that, no disarray in that area. Nothing's bumped over. The knife wasn't grabbed out of there during some kind of altercation we're they're trying to go get a knife to have a fight. Somebody just took it out of there.

And so the evidence is going to show you that it was Victoria that took the knife, and she took the knife in the back room and she was in there with the knife. And Brian wakes up and he comes upstairs and he walks into the apartment and

walks in toward the master bedroom and sees that she's in the bathroom. There's a bathroom in there.

3

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

20

21

22

23

24

25

The master bedroom does not have an overhead light. They use the bathroom light to light it up. The door is closed. She's in there. He knows she's mad. He still wants to smoke. He goes, he uses the bathroom. He comes outside to stand there and smoke.

I missed a part. On the way up when he was walking up, he bangs the rail and Cooky Toliver hears the bang on the -- not Cooky. Jimmy Hatchcox hears the bang, comes out, sees Brian going into his apartment. That is about 15 minutes before the police were called. He sees Brian walking in.

So it just doesn't match up time frame wise that Brian's in that apartment. The other thing that doesn't match up is nobody hears any yelling, nobody hears any screaming, there's no kind of -- of domestic going on that involves any kind of yelling or talking even that anybody hears. The most you'll hear of the noise of voices is that perhaps there was some crying going on, but that was not even explained in the 19 first statement by Joyce Toliver. Joyce Toliver's first statement doesn't mention any crying. She doesn't mention crying until she testified in March of 2009 that there was crying.

So the evidence will show you that there's just no kind of noise going on other than some banging around a little bit during the course of one or two hours. And then there's a lot of noise because what happens is Brian walks back in, he's getting too hot. He drank a lot, he was wearing his coat.

He's getting too hot and he walks back into the house, he's going to go hang up his jacket.

24 1

And as he's going to hang up his jacket, Victoria comes at him. She comes out of the bathroom and he is -- he is drunk and in a fog and in a haze and she's coming at him with a knife. And what does he do? He takes his jacket and he waves it at her to get the knife away from him. The jacket flies into the blinds, which is supported by the physical evidence. This is the jacket and those are the blinds in the bedroom, and you'll see other pictures of it, too. But it flies across the room into the blinds.

And this is the layout of this bedroom. You can't see what very well. So this here by -- by the feet of the body is a dresser. Where you see that number ten over there is where the jacket was found. And so he's not able to ward her off with the jacket and she is still coming at him and he tries to grab the blade of the knife and he gets cut.

And you'll see paragraphs of the injury on his hand.

And you will hear from our expert who says that that is a

defensive wound. This is the cut on his hand, on the inside of
his hand. He's trying to grab the knife and he gets cut. He's

unsuccessful and he lets go because he's bleeding.

So he's hurt and she's still coming at him. And facing each other he's able to grab her hands. Finally he gets both of their hands and they're struggle back and forth and she is holding the knife in her right hand. She's right handed and my client's also right handed. She's holding the knife in her right hand and holding onto her wrist facing her and they're struggle in that bedroom because he's trying to get out of there and they fall backwards onto the bed.

And when they fall backwards onto the bed, he starts to get his bearings again and then he realizes that she's snot moving very much. She's laying too still. And he's sitting there, and then he realizes the bed's getting wet. He knows something is wrong, and he doesn't know what happened, but he knows what she's done before, and he's thinking that maybe she did something to herself.

He doesn't know for sure if she got stabbed when they fell. And nobody was in the room, so nobody else knows either. But our experts are going to tell you that her wound was consistent with either an accidental stabbing, which cannot be ruled out, or an intentional suicidal stabbing. Even though it's in a weird funny place, it could have still been a suicide attempt. So Brian doesn't know what's going on and he's looking for the blood and -- and she's bleeding fast because of her blood clotting problem because the cirrhosis is a little bit like -- like having hemophilia disorder where you just

bleed really easily and -- and so he's -- he's trying to figure out what's going on and he can't see where it is.

B

So he pulls her off the bed and he's very drunk and he drops her on the floor and that's when the neighbors are hearing the commotion and they come upstairs. And when they come upstairs, Cooky Toliver comes in and Brian's Cooky, come here, come in here, come get her because Brian wants to get her out to the living room where there's some light.

In the meantime, Brian had pulled her pants up, and you'll see that in the photographs or in the -- in the DNA report that his blood is on the ankle of her little jogging suit which is covered with blood on the side. And he's pulling them up because they're drenched with blood. He wants to see if she cut herself somewhere.

So he's trying to figure out where on her body the injuries are. And he's kind of in automatic mode trying to stop what he can find as an injury. But it's kind of dark in there and he's really, really drunk.

So he's in there trying to aid her and Cooky comes in and he sees what's happening and no -- he runs out. And -- and when he runs out, he calls 9il. And so the police response is on the way. But then he comes back upstairs with Todd Armbruster who was not what Brian expected and Brian was protective of his girlfriend. He didn't want Todd to see her laying there naked, so Brian comes in. And when Brian walks in

-- or when -- when Todd walks in, Brian's trying to pick her up
by the waist and he's dropping her because he's drunk. He's
trying to pick her up, he's saying come on baby, come on baby,
get up, don't do this to me, come on, get up, get up. That's
what Todd sees.

Brian sees Todd and his girlfriend's naked and he takes a swing at him and he almost falls over because he doesn't want somebody coming in there just to look at her.

Then the police come. And, I mean, you're going to hear words like baiting and stand off and -- and really what this was was never baiting, it was never a stand off. Brian was acting erratic because he was so drunk. But when the police get there, what they find is him laying on the floor right here, right on the side of Victoria between her and the closet, which is a couple feet. He's laying right there, he's stroking her head, he's staring at her, he's talking to her. That's all he's doing.

He doesn't have a weapon near him. He's not doing anything else. He just won't get away from Victoria. And so the police come, and they're rightly concerned about baiting. I mean, they don't know what they're walking into, and they hear downstairs from management that she's got AIDS and Hepatitis C, and they're worried about that blood. She didn't have AIDS, but that's the rumor that was going around there.

But they're worried about and rightly so. And so

they're careful going into it. But it turns out there's no big deal about baiting. He wasn't baiting anybody. He was just a drunk man who was laying there and wouldn't get up. And they come in, and it's about. I think, they said that they were in the bedroom for seconds once they get in there, seconds before they arrest him.

And they stack up right outside the door there, and then he's not listening and they're warning him we're going to taze you, get away from her, we're going to taze you. And he still won't stop looking at her and he's petting her head, and he won't pay attention to their commands get away from her.

And so they taze him.

And one taze doesn't really bring him under control.

During that taze one officer at least goes to the other side of his body where you see those numbers five and six, sort of.

And they're trying to get him into custody, but the taze isn't really effective on him and he falls on his arm and he's not complying with their efforts to get him in cuffs.

And so they decide to taze him again. Each of those tazes is about 50,000 volts of electricity. And they taze him again and then they're -- they're able to -- to get control of him. And the officer's testimony varies widely an how many officers were over there. It's somewhere between four and five or maybe between two and five. I can't tell. And none of them really remember exactly. And you'll see a lot of

inconsistencies there.

And they were so -- but, you know, when these kind of things happen, they're shocking and adrenaline causing and there's a lot of -- it's a dynamic situation.

MR. LALLI: I'm sorry, your Honor, and I'm sorry, again, Ms. Palm. I'm going to interpose another argumentative objection, your Honor.

MS. PALM: Well, the -- the evidence will show -- THE COURT: I'm going to overrule the objection.

MS. PALM: -- that that was the kind of situation it is. And they do not remember all the details. And so their stories don't match up about what was where in the bedroom.

But very consistently they all deny that they saw anybody going onto the bed. However, there are apparent footprints on that bed. There's one right here. And this what you see -- that's not very clear. When you see the pillowcase that is up on top of that knife -- I'm not sure how to make this (indiscernible). I don't know if it's going to get any clearer. Oh, okay.

There's an apparent footprint right there on that pillowcase. And you'll be able to see that again because it's going to come in other ways. That's the pillowcase that's laying on top of the knife blade. And if that pillowcase is stepped on, and we think the evidence is going to show that it was, then you can't trust the results of DNA that they got off the knife blade. Even if you can trust them, it's going to

show you it's not inculpatory with Brian, but if they're up there stepping on it, a bloody pillowcase that's laying on top of the blade, it's going to get contaminated, and we think that the evidence is going to show you that it did.

And they have -- they have Brian's footprints from the bathroom where he went in and he was trying to get things to stop the bleeding. So they know what his footprints were like. But it was never compared to the prints on the bed. So we think the evidence is going to show you that the officers did go up over that bed and possibly contaminated the crime scene. And the officers did bump into Victoria's body.

And that accounts for a possibility of bruising that can't be linked to Brian. And with this whole situation, the evidence that they're relying onto show you culpability is just not that reliable. If this case is based on -- the evidence will show you this case is based on exaggeration and innuendos, and I don't think that they're going to be able to prove guilt beyond a reasonable doubt.

Plain and simple story is that Brian acted badly. He acted very badly. He should have (indiscernible), but the evidence will show you that he just didn't want to leave Victoria. And he was so intoxicated that he wasn't in his rite mind. And that the entire scenario from the first call until he's taken custody is 12 minutes, but it's seconds in the bedroom.

And then after -- after Brian is taken into custody, after being tazed a couple times, he's dropped on his head in the bedroom or in the living room. Although, different officers say different places and different officers say different officers were carrying him at the time. He know he fell on his face somewhere. We know he was dropped somewhere. But we don't know where, bedroom, living room, which officers were carrying him. None of that stuff was consistent in the State's evidence.

And then so after all of that they take him down to the homicide offices to interview him. He sits in a room for awhile, and the interview starts and he is erratic and he's emotional and he's not making sense. And the interview continues, and he's not giving them what they want, so they take an hour long break because the evidence is that it's frustrating, but they take an hour long break and they come back and he's still not giving them what they want.

But what he is -- he is telling them some things. He is telling them how he hurt his hand, trying to grab a knife. He's telling them that. And it's going to show you it's consistent with somebody that thought his girlfriend was alive and didn't it want to get her in trouble because they told him she was alive.

They take advantage of his drunken stupor. They know how drunk he is when they're trying to talk to him, and they

tell him, she's still alive. Yeah, they're going to tell you when things change and they're trying to talk to him about that. And so he's vague and he's dancing around and, you no, that goes on for awhile until almost the end of the interview. And when they tell him she's dead, he asks for a cup of coffee and when the female detective leaves the room, he starts balling. He starts crying.

He's begging them to tell him that's not true. Tell me that's not true. And you'll see when you watch the -- the video of the interview, these detectives are very skilled and -- and how they're framing questions and they're very frustrated. But they also know it's being videotaped and they know it's going to be used for evidence and something if charges are brought.

And you'll notice things like at one point Brian's been saying do this, do that, please get this evidence, please go to the Paris and get the tapes from Paris, you'll see where we were, you'll see, please do this for me. And then when he asks the female detective to do something he says, where I this down, write this down, and the male detectives go don't order her around.

The evidence is going to show you that's partly for show. That's partly for this is how he treats women, he order them around. That's the inference you should make from that evidence or take from that evidence.

When the detectives don't get what they want and they end the interview, they do not attempt to preserve my client's blood alcohol level. They can do it. It's possible to do it there. In fact, we'll show you Metro's department manual which says you can do this. And for example, in a situation of a homicide suspect that appears to be slightly intoxicated. Can preserve it because it might be important to the defense. They didn't to that for us.

We'll never be able to show exactly how intoxicated he was. And yet, the evidence of him being belligerent and not cooperative and all of those things that are due to him being intoxicated is being relied on as evidence of his guilt.

There's other problems with the investigation in this case, and we'll have an expert that talks to you about those things too. But when the interview ends and they -- and the detectives leave and they come back in with the CSA Dan Ford to take DNA samples from my client, he's completely cooperative. And they're having to steady him to help dress him and they're having to steady him to help dress him and they're having to steady him to booties on when he has to change his clothes.

And he's trying to tell them again. I just -- look at my hand, look at my hands. Just -- and what you'll see how he's talking. It's disjointed and it's weird, but he is trying to tell a story. He just is very, I guess, circumspect about it. But at this point he doesn't believe what they're telling

him. He doesn't know if Victoria's alive or Victoria's dead 1 because they told him she was alive and then they told him she's dead, and now he doesn't know what to think.

2

3

4

5

6

8

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

If there's one thing that guessing to resound throughout this case is that a tragedy occurred. This case is a tragedy. But at the time of this offense Brian and Victoria were in love, they were having a loving relationship. Everybody says it. Everybody who saw him knows it. They were doing couple things. He loved her. He didn't think he had much time left with her. The last thing he wanted was for her to leave him. He thought he had whatever time she had left. He hoped it was ten years.

And he didn't know what happened. And he wasn't able to explain what happened because he was so drunk and because of her history, he didn't know, had she done something to herself. And you'll see that in his questions. He thought she'd done something to herself, he didn't know. He couldn't figure it out, and he certainly couldn't figure it out in those hours when they were trying to talk to him and he was still trying to process it.

This was either an accident which occurred when Brian was defending himself from an attack by Victoria, or it was a suicide in which she stabbed herself just prior to coming at him. Bither way it's a tragedy, but neither way does it indicate that might client is guilty of anything. Thank you.

ROUGH DRAFT TRANSCRIPT

1 THE COURT: All right, thank you, Ms. Palm. State, are you ready with your first witness? 2 3 MR. LALLI: We, your Honor. I just want to preserve the fact that I need to make a record regarding Ms. Palm's 5 opening --6 THE COURT: All right. 7 MR. LALLI: -- statement at some point. THE COURT: Okay. 8 9 MR. LALLI: Thank you. Your Honor, State calls Dr. 10 Jacqueline Benjamin. 11 THE MARSHAL: Dr. Benjamin, if you'll remain standing. Please raise your right hand and face the clerk. 13 JACQUELINE BENJAMIN, STATE'S WITNESS, SWORN. THE MARSHAL: Please be seated, Ma'am. Slide up to 14 15 the microphone, state and spell your name for the record. 16 THE WITNESS: Jacqueline Benjamin, 17 J-a-c-q-u-e-l-i-n-e. Last name is B-e-n-j-a-m-i-n. 18 THE COURT: Go ahead, Counsel. 19 MR. LALLI: May I proceed, thank you. Your Honor, 20 may I just move the podium out of the way? THE COURT: Yes. 21 22 MR. LALLI: Can I just ask the clerk for the photos. Okay. 23 24 DIRECT EXAMINATION 25 BY MR. LALLI:

	1	
1	Q	Can you tell us how you're employed?
2	А	I'm currently employed as a neuropathology fellow at
3	Los Angel	es County USC Medical Center.
4	Q	And what is that?
5	A	Neuropathology fellowship is a post-doctoral training
6	program i	n diagnosing diseases of the brain.
7	Q	I want to direct your attention to November of 2008.
8	What was	your profession at that point?
9	A	I was a forensic pathologist with the Clark County
10	Coroner's	Office.
11	Q	For how long?
12	A	At that time, I believe, it was over a year.
13	Q	And can you explain what you did at the Clark County
14	Coroner's	Office?
15	A	I performed autopsies to determine the cause and
16	manner of	death.
17	Q	Did you work as a forensic pathologist there?
18	A	Yes.
19	Q	Can you tell us about your formal education that
20	qualified	you to be a forensic pathologist Coroner's Office?
21	A	Certainly. I obtained a medical degree from the
22	University	of California at Irvine. After graduation from
23	medical school I spent a year internship with Kaiser Oakland in	
24	internal m	medicine and three years of pathology residency
25	program in	anatomic pathology. After that I did a one year

1 fellowship in forensic pathology. Okay. Have you ever qualified as an expert in the 2 area of forensic pathology of the courts of either Nevada or 3 other states? 5 A Yes. 6 Q Approximately how many times? 7 A Six to seven. MR. LALLI: Your Honor, at this point I'd ask that 8 Dr. Benjamin be allowed to render opinions in the area forensic 9 10 pathology. 11 THE COURT: Yes. 12 BY MR. LALLI: 13 Can you tell our jury what is forensic pathology? 14 Porensic pathologists as opposed to just autopsy A 15 pathologists that work in a hospital, we deal with trauma. We are specialists in evaluating traumatic injury. 16 17 Okay. And what is -- what is the objective of 18 forensic pathology? What do you ultimately trying to find or 19 determine? 20 Α The ultimate goal is to determine the cause of death 21 and the manner of death. 22 Do you use a process to analyze your patient or 23 descendant to arrive at those conclusions? 24 A Yes. The process actually starts with scene 25 investigation, what occurs at the scene. We look -- in some

states the pathologist go to the crime scene or the scene of 1 2 death. In this state the pathologist usually we do not go to the scene. But the process starts with investigation of the 3 scene. 5 So it's looking at photographs, hearing what the 6 police officers have to say, what witnesses have to say. Then 7 the body is examined by the forensic pathologist. We do an external examination, also an internal examination. There's B 9 fluids, blood, urine --10 I'm sorry, can you -- can you just wait just one Q 11 moment. 12 (Pause in the proceedings). THE COURT: Go ahead, Mr. Lalli. 13 14 MR. LALLI: Okav. 15 BY MR. LALLI: 16 Please continue. 17 There's blood and urine, sometimes solid organs that are obtained at autopsy in order to test -- we test those 19 specimens to find out what drugs are in the descendant's system. And after looking at all that data, we arrive at a 20 21 cause of death and manner of death. 22 What do you mean by the -- the phrase cause of death? 23 The cause of death is the disease or injury that resulted in that person's demise. 24 25 Q The actual thing that killed them?

1	A Correct
2	Q And what is what do you mean by manner of death?
3	A Manner of death is how the cause arised. There's
4	several different manners of death. It could be a natural
5	death. For instance, atherosclerotic or coronary artery
6	disease is a natural death. There's also suicide. Suicide is
7	obviously self-inflicted injury. There can be homicide as
8	another manner, where the injury is inflicted by someone else.
9	There's also an accidental death, the most common of which is
10	motor vehicle accidents.
11	And when we can't determine based on all the data
12	that we have, we use a manner of undetermined.
13	Q I want to direct your attention to November 7th of
14	2008. Did you conduct a pathologic exam on the body of
15	Victoria Whitmarsh?
16	A I did.
17	Q Where was that conducted?
18	A At the Clark County Coroner's Office.
19	MS. PALM: Your Honor, I'd just like to note again my
20	objection for the record of
21	THE COURT: I'm sorry?
22	MS. PALM: I just wanted to note my objection that we
23	previously discussed on the autopsy photographs.
24	THE COURT: All right. Okay.
25	MR. LALLI: May I approach the witness, your Honor?

I THE COURT: Yes. 2 BY MR. LALLI: Q Dr. Benjamin, if you could just take a moment and 3 look through those. Doctor, for the record, have you looked at State's Proposed Exhibits 81 through 120? 5 6 A Yes. 7 Do they fairly and accurately depict the condition of 8 Victoria Whitmarsh's body when you observed it at autopsy? 9 A Yes. MR. LALLI: Your Honor, move or the admission of 10 11 those proposed exhibits. 12 THE COURT: Ms. Palm. MS. PALM: Objection, for the record, your Honor. 13 THE COURT: All right, they'll be admitted, 81 14 15 through 120. You may publish. 16 (Exhibits 81 through 120 admitted). 17 MR. LALLI: Thank you. BY MR. LALLI: 18 19 One other photo I'd like to show you, Dr. Benjamin, 20 is State's Proposed 130. 21 A Okay. 22 Do you recognize that? Q 23 A Yes. 24 0 Is that also a photo from autopsy? 25 A Yes.

1 MR. LALLI: Your Honor, move for the admission of 2 State's Proposed 130 as well. 3 MS. PALM: No objection. THE COURT: 130 will be admitted. 4 5 (Exhibit 130 admitted). 6 BY MR. LALLI: 7 Dr. Benjamin, can you explain for our jury the condition of Ms. Whitmarsh's body when you received it? When the seal was broken, the deceased was wrapped in 9 a standard white sheet, hospital type sheet. After removal of 10 the sheet, she was clothed in a -- it was a black jacket and 11 black shirt. 12 Was there any clothing on the lower extremities of 13 0 14 her body? Α From the waist down she was unclothed. 15 16 As part of the autopsy process, do you ascertain the 17 weight and height of the descendant? 18 A Yes. 19 0 Did you do that in this case? 20 A Not personally, but the technician did, yes. It -- that's done as part of the process? 21 Q 22 A Correct. 23 0 What was Ms. Whitmarsh's weight? 24 108 pounds. A 25 Q And what was her height?

1	A Five feet, five inches.
2	Q Did you observe any evidence of blunt force trauma on
3	her body?
4	A Yes.
5	Q I'd like you to describe any blunt force trauma you
6	observed on her head and/or neck area.
7	A On the head in the middle of the forehead close to
8	her hairline was hematoma, and basically a hematoma is blood
9	underneath the skin, and it elevates the skin away from the
10	bone so you actually see a bone.
11	Q Okay. I'm going to show you State's Exhibit 86. Is
12	that well, first of all, let me turn the photograph this way
13	for just a moment. There appears to be a tag of some sort on
14	the photo. Do you see that?
15	A Yes,
16	Q Can you describe for your jury what that is.
17	A The tag is a case identification number. The first
18	two numbers are the year, so it's 2008. And the autopsy number
19	is 8747.
20	Q Okay. So it identifies these photos to the pick
21	autopsy that you performed?
22	A Correct.
23	Q Ckay. Now, you were describing the injuries to the
24	forehead?
25	A Yes.

In addition to looking at the injury externally, do 1 you as a forensic pathologist look at the injury under the skin? A Yes, we do. 5 How did you do that in this case? 6 After the external examination is complete, the body 7 is opened, and usually the -- we examine the head last for a 8 number of reasons. An incision is made behind the ear and it goes across the crown of the head in ear to ear, and the skin 9 is peeled forward and backward, and I look at the scalp at that 10 11 time. 12 0 Okay. You wrote in your autopsy report that there is 13 hemorrhage in the subcutaneous tissue under the forehead 14 contusion scalp hematoma; is that correct? 15 A Yes. Can you explain to us what that means and what, if 16 17 any, significance you would attribute to that? Yes. The hemorrhage in the subcutaneous tissue means that there were broken blood vessels, that there is blood 19 actually in the tissue and that's what causes the bruising and 20 21 the contusion that you see on the skin. A contusion is basically a bruise, and that comes about from broken blood

ROUGH DRAFT TRANSCRIPT

usually indicates that this was an acute injury.

So when you see a lot of blood with the naked eye, it

vessels.

23

24

25

What do you mean by the term acute? Q It's a -- we have general classifications for sort of 2 dating and timing injury. It can be acute, subacute or chronic 3 or old. So an acute means that it happened recently. How recent? It's difficult to say whether it was minutes or hours, 5 but it's certainly not days or weeks. 6 7 Q What about chronic? 8 Chronic is old. It means that it's weeks usually or 9 -- yeah, days or weeks, typically. 10 Okay. So you classified the injury to Ms. Whitmarsh's forehead that we're seeing in this exhibit as 11 12 acute? 13 A That's correct. 14 Or recent? 15 A Yes. 16 And did you say that your definition of acute was 17 minutes to hours old? 18 A Roughly, yes. 19 Okay. Now, in addition to looking under the skin on 20 the forehead, do you have the ability to look under the skin 21 all around a person's head during the course of the autopsy? 22 A Yes, that's done, that's standard procedure. 23 Okay. In doing that with Ms. Whitmarsh, did you 24 observe any other evidence of trauma to her head? 25 A Yes, there was hemorrhage or blood in the scalp

tissue towards the back of the head in the middle. This was
not noted on the external exam because there's hair. She had
very long thick black hair. And so the hair covered the injury
in that area. Until the scalp was reflected, I did not see the
injury.

Q Okay. Were you able to ascertain whether the injury to the back of the head was acute?

A It looked acute. There was also hemorrhage in the subcutaneous tissue.

Q Okay. Were -- in your autopsy report, you categorized these as areas of blunt force trauma?

A Yes.

Q What -- can you explain to our jury what you mean by blunt force trauma?

A Yes. Injury, we usually put it in several categories. It can be incised, meaning it was caused by a sharp object such as a knife, a bottle, and those types of injuries, like stab wounds or even a surgical incision is an incised wound. And there are missile wounds, such as gunshot wounds, projectile injuries. Or blunt trauma, which is a broad category of injury. And contusions or bruises are caused by blunt force trauma.

And there are a number of things that can cause blunt trauma. Someone punching you in the eye and giving you a black eye, that's blunt trauma. Someone hitting you with a baseball

bat is blunt trauma. Falling onto the concrete and bruising 2 yourself, that's also blunt trauma. 3 So is it fair to say that blunt force trauma can be 4 something kind of induced by others or induced by self or even 5 induced by accident? A 6 Correct. 7 So if I were to fall down, I might get blunt force 8 trauma on my body somewhere? 9 Yes. Now, does forensic science allow you to kind of 10 categorize the amount of force necessary to create an injury 11 such as the one on the -- the front of Ms. Whitmarsh's head? I could not tell you of any precision the amount of 13 A force that was required to cause that hematoma that we're 14 15 looking at. Okay. Now I want to move down in your report. You 16 17 described blunt force trauma on the thorax, abdomen and back; is that correct? 19 A Yes. 20 I'm going to show you State's Exhibit No. 91. Can 21 you describe that for us? 22 Yes, that's the -- a photo of the left shoulder and looking at, looks like two contusions on the front of the left 23 24 shoulder.

What is a contusion?

25

Q

1	A	A contusion, again, is is a medical term for a
2	bruise.	
3	Q	I'm going to show you State's Exhibit 107.
4	Specifica	lly the area where my finger's indicating. Can you
5	see anyth	ing there?
6	A	There's redness of the skin, and I believe that's
7	likely li	vor, if that's the back surface, which is what it
8	looks like.	
9	Q	What is livor?
10	A,	Livor is the pooling of blood independent positions
11	that occu	r after death.
12	Q	Oksy is livor injury?
13	A	No.
14	Q	It's just a condition, an artifact of death?
15	A	It's one of the changes that occur with death.
16	Q	I'm going to show you State's Proposed Exhibits
17	actually 1	here admitted Exhibits 88 and 89. What are we seeing
18	there?	
19	A	That's the left arm and there's a contusion.
20	Q	And is State's Exhibit 89 another photograph of that
21	same area	of contusion, but the back part of it?
22	A	It's the same arm with yes, it's the posterior
23	back surfa	ace with three contusions.
24	Q	Okay. And the same area shown in State's Proposed or
25	actual Exh	nibit No. 907

	1	
1	A	Yes.
2	Q	What are we seeing in State's Exhibit 92?
3	A	It's the back of the right arm and there's a
4	contusion	there as well.
5	Q	State's Exhibit 93?
6	А	I believe that's the right arm. On the front there's
7	a contusi	on.
8	٥	State's Exhibit 95?
9	A	That's the back or the dorsal of the right hand. And
10	again, wh	at we're looking at are contusions.
11	Q	What are we seeing in State's Exhibit No. 96?
12	A	It's the back of the left hand with an abrasion.
13	Q	What's an abrasion?
14	A	Abrasion is when the upper area of the skin is rubbed
15	off, and	what you are seeing is actually the underlayer of the
16	skin or t	he dermis.
17	Q	So this was a scrape of some sort?
18	A	A scrape is a good way to describe that.
19	Q	Okay. I'm going to show you State's Exhibit 98, the
20	large red	mark. What was that?
21	A	That is a contusion.
22	Q	I'm going to show you State's Exhibit 99. What is
23	that?	
24	A	Those are two contusions on her abdomen on the rite
25	side.	
- 1		

Q Do you have any way of ascertaining either from the color or from any other manner approximately how old (indiscernible)?

B

A There's literature that talks about dating bruises based on color. In the old literature it was thought that you actual decree do that. But subsequent studies have shown that you can have an injury -- two injuries that occurred at the same time in similar location and the colors are different, although they were sustained at the same time.

So we don't use colors to date injury. If I were to take a microscopic section -- if I were to take a section of that tissue, process it and look at it under a microscope, I can give you a general idea in terms of whether it's acute, subacute or chronic, and that would be based on certain cells that come in to an area of injury and start cleaning off the blood. When we see those cells, they're called macrophages, then that's a subacute injury.

When you have fibrous tissue, a little bit of macrophages and most of the blood is cleaned up, that's a older injury. When it's all fresh blood, then that's an acute injury.

Q I'm going to show you State's Exhibit 100. What is that?

A Those are two contusions on the left side of the body.

1	Q Now I want to show you State's Exhibit No. 106, and I
2	want to direct your attention to the back area here. Did you
3	well, what are we look at first of all?
4	A Again, as you mentioned, it is the the back right
5	side and we're looking at a contusion near the top of the
6	shoulder.
7	Q Okay. Now, on this particular injury, did you make
8	an incision into it?
9	A Yes, I did,
10	Q And what what is your what is your purpose in
11	doing that?
12	A When I make the incision, I am I'm looking for
13	whether there's a lot of hemorrhage or no hemorrhage and a
14	subcutaneous tissue to give me an idea of whether this is an
15	acute or an older type of injury.
15	Q Okay. In your autopsy report you indicated that the
17	incision through the skin reveals a small amount of hemorrhage
18	in the subcutaneous tissue; is that correct?
L9	A Yes.
20	Q What does that mean?
21	A That means that there wasn't a lot of blood. There
2	was some, but not a lot.
23	Q What is that it terms of relating that injury to
4	being acute or chronic?

Again, it's difficult to say because a microscopic

section was not taken. There is blood there, but I don't know if there are macrophages that had cleaned up more blood that was there previously. So it's difficult to date.

- Q Okay. Would you -- would it be your opinion that is not an old injury?
- A It wouldn't be classified as a chronic injury. It's either acute or subacute.
 - Q And what's the difference between acute and subacute?
- A Again, just for qualitative stand point, acute.

 there's lot of red blood cells. There -- there are no cells

 there that are cleaning up the red blood cells. Subacute,

 there's red cells and there's also the cells that are cleaning

 up the red cells. And in terms of time, acute is probably more

 minutes, hours. Subacute is on the order of days.
- Q Okay. So the injury to -- that we're -- we're looking at now, you would classify that as acute or subacute, based upon what you observed?
- 18 A Correct.

- Q All right. Now I want to show you State's Exhibit 108. Can you tell us what we're seeing here?
- A Yes, this is the lower back end buttocks, and there's a large contusion on the right buttock and there's also actually a contusion further up on the back area.
- Q Okay. Now, with respect to the contusion in the -in the middle of the back, did you attempt to, I guess, dissect

ROUGH DRAFT TRANSCRIPT

1 that or open it up to have a look at the subcutaneous tissue? 2 The one in the middle of the back I made an incision A through to look at the subcutaneous tissue. 3 Okay. And what did you observe? 4 Q 5 A I believe, I also observed there was hemorrhage in the subcutaneous tissue. 6 7 Q Okay. Is that inconsistent with being acute? 8 A Acute or subacute, yes. All right. What about the large bruise on the 9 10 buttocks, did you incise that as well? I did. When I incised that, there was no hemorrhage 11 12 in the subcutaneous tissue. 13 Q And what is that indicative of? It's indicative that it's not an acute injury. 14 15 0 So it's older? It's older, yes. 16 A 17 All right. Showing you State's Exhibit 110, particularly the -- the lower back of the leg there. Can you 18 19 explain to us what we're seeing? And if it's easy for me to 20 show you the photo before I put this on the monitor, I'm happy to do that as well. 21 22 A Actually, I don't see a whole lot there. 23 Q Okay. 24 A So maybe -- it's a little blurry. 25 MR. LALLI: May I approach the witness, your Honor?

1	THE COURT: Yes.	
2	THE WITNESS: There's some discoloration to the skin	
3	that that may be contusions.	
4	BY MR. LALLI:	
s	Q This is something that's more difficult to classify?	
6	A Correct.	
7	Q All right. What are with seeing on State's Exhibit	
8	1117	
9	A We're looking at both legs, and on the side of the	
10	left leg we see a couple of contusions.	
11	Q What are we seeing in State's Exhibit 113?	
12	A There's a contusion just above the ankle on the	
13	right.	
14	Q Okay, I'm going to show you State's Exhibit No. 114.	
15	Can you tell us what we're seeing there?	
16	A Yes, there's this is the body face up, and there	
17	are some contusions on the left leg.	
18	Q State's Exhibit 115.	
19	A I believe, that's the medial aspect of the right leg	
20	showing a couple of contusions.	
21	Q All right. What are we seeing in State's Exhibit	
52	1167	
23	A That is the side of the right leg showing a contusion	I
24	above the ankle.	
25	Q How about Exhibit 117?	
110		

1 This is the top of the left foot showing some 2 bruising. 3 Now, you had indicated in your report that you observed an area of stab wound; is that correct? Yes. 6 I want to show you first State's Exhibit 101. you did -- I don't know if you can touch your screen and -- and kind of circle where the stab wound is. 8 9 Cops, sorry. I circled over it. 10 0 Okay. Right. And where is that on Ms. Whitmarsh's 11 body? 12 It's on the side of the body on the right. A 13 Okay. Under the armpit? 14 Yes. 15 And I want to he show you State's Exhibit 102. What is that? 16 17 That is the stab wound again. 18 Okay. Can -- in addition to looking at the wound 19 externally, are you able, much as you did the head, look at it 20 internally? 21 Yes, that's how I determined it was a stab wound. Just looking at it externally, it's difficult to tell whether 22 23 it's an incised wound that's -- that's just a cut or a stab wound which is deeper into the body or longer into the body 25 than it is on the surface. That's how you classify a stab

1 wound.

4

5

6

7

9

10

17

18

19

20

25

- Q Okay. Can you tell us the -- and it's your opinion that this was a stab wound?
 - A Yes.
 - Q Can you tell us the path that the -- the -- the object that caused this injury took through the body?
 - A Yes. It entered the chest on the right side. The lung was not injured. It cut through the diaphragm, which separates the chest cavity from the abdominal cavity and it went from the front of the liver to the back of the liver.
- Q Were any major blood vessels, arteries, things of that nature struck?
- A No. There are smaller vessels, the intercostal
 arteries and veins, and of course, the liver is very vascular,
 but in terms of a major blood vessel like the aorta or the vena
 cava, no.
 - Q Okay. When you ascertained the path of the -- the stab into the body, do you also use a trajectory rod to make it more easy to discern or easier to discern the directionality of the stab wound in the body?
- A The trajectory rod is -- I do use that because I
 think it makes it visually it's easier to understand with the
 trajectory rod in place. I don't actually need it to tell
 directionality.
 - Q But it's for the purposes of illustrating direction

1 to others? 2 A Correct. 3 Such as juries and lawyers? And law enforcement. 4 And law enforcement. Okay. I'm going to show you 5 Q State's Exhibit No. 130. What is that? 6 7 That's the trajectory rod. 8 So does this mean that a -- the knife entered Victoria's body in the direction of the rod into her body? 9 10 That's the -- more than likely. It's the path of least resistance. So wherever the rod easily goes, it's an 11 indication that's how -- whatever implement was used, that's 12 13 how it went in. 14 Q Okay. I think you indicated at the beginning of your examination that toxicology samples are taken from descendants 15 16 at autopsy? 17 A Yes. With as that done in this case? 18 19 Yes. 20 Was the blood analyzed? 21 It was. 22 Was it analyzed specifically for Hepatitis C? 23 Yes, we had indication that the deceased may have been Hepatitis C positive, so a test was sent for that. We don't routinely do that. 25

Did that test confirm that she was, in fact, 1 2 Repatitis C positive? 3 Yes. Can you explain for our jury what Hepatitis C is? Q Hepatitis C is a virus that's acquired usually by 5 blood borne infection. And over time that virus can cause 6 7 damage to the liver. Okay. And -- and just in -- in -- in terminology that somebody like myself, a non-doctor could understand, what does -- how does Hepatitis C affect the body? What does it do 10 11 as a practical matter? 12 As a practical matter the virus causes inflammation. And that inflammation, if we're dealing -- it just as an 13 example, the inflammation in the liver will result in damage to the normal liver cells. And after a certain point those cells 15 stop regenerating, and what you have is not replacement with 16 17 liver cells, which are called hepatocytes, but it's replaced with fibrous tissue which obviously does not function as a 19 normal liver cell would function. During the course of the autopsy, did you have the 20 21 occasion to examine Victoria's liver? 22 A Yes, all organs are examined. Can you explain the condition of her liver for our 24 jury? 25 Her liver was very hard and composed of multiple A

large nodules, and that's appearance by the naked eye is called 1 2 cirrhosis. 3 0 As part of this particular toxicology examination was her blood alcohol level tested? A 5 Yes. 6 What was her blood alcohol level? 7 A It was.24. 8 Q Now, with -- going back to this discussion of cirrhosis, does Repatitis C contribute or create cirrhosis in the body? 10 11 There are a number of causes of cirrhosis. Hepatitis C is one. 12 13 Q How about excessive alcohol use? Yes, that's the probably the most common in the 14 A forensic community that cirrhosis is caused by alcohol abuse 15 16 over long periods of time. 17 Does cirrhosis affect bruising on the body? 0 18 A Yes. 19 How? 20 Again, when the liver cells are replaced with fibrous tissue they -- the fibrous tissue does not function like a 21 normal liver cell. Part of the function of the liver is to 22 23 make, excuse me, clotting factors which cause your blood --24 cause you to stop bleeding when you're injured. So if you 25 don't have the normal synthetic function of the liver, the

liver is not producing as much clotting factor as it normally 1 would, so you would tend to bleed a little longer than most the 2 individuals who don't have cirrhosis. 3 So is it fair to say that cirrhosis makes bruising 4 more prominent or more visible than it otherwise would be? 5 Ç A Yes. 7 Would you also agree that there has to still be some underlying trauma to cause the bruise, however? 8 9 Correct. A So it would -- cirrhosis in effect makes it easier 10 for us to see trauma that occurred on the body? 11 12 Yes. 13 Q Okay. It doesn't make a person more likely to bruise, only the bruising more visible; would you agree with 15 that? 16 I would agree with that. You don't spontaneously bruise with cirrhosis, that I'm aware of. 17 18 Okay. Now, with respect to cirrhosis, if you take it to its end point, its ultimate stage of development within the 19 20 body, can you die from it? 21 Yes. 22 Was Victoria Whitmarsh in fear -- not in fear, but 23 close to death as a result of the condition of her liver? 24 I actually do not know that. I look at her liver A gross and microscopically, and I -- it's a visual examination, 25

it's not a functional study. So in order to know that I would 1 have had to be her treating physician. I would have seen a decline in the function of the liver. The -- the liver is responsible for many things, one of which is metabolism of drugs, production of clotting factors. And there are certain 5 enzymes that a treating physician would follow to see if her 6 liver function is declining. 8 And I -- I don't have that data, and I obviously was not her treating physician, so I wouldn't be able to answer that. 10 Okay did her condition of cirrhosis contribute in any 11 12 way to her death? 13 No. I want to talk more about her blood. Did you find any evidence of a drug called Venlafaxine, 15 V-e-n-1-a-f-e-x-i-n-e? 16 17 A Yes. 19 Is there a, I guess, a brand name of that drug that perhaps more people would be familiar with? 19 20 A Yes, it's called Effexor. What was the amount of Effexor in Victoria's blood? 21 0 22 A It's 990 nanograms per ml. 23 Q And excuse me question, but is that a lot? 24 A No. 25 0 What -- is that within therapeutic levels?

1	A	Yes.
2	Q	Now, did you reach an opinion with respect to the
3	cause of	death of Victoria Whitmarsh?
4	A	I did.
5	Q	What was that?
6	A	A stab wound of the chest.
7	Q	In your report you indicate that there was another
8	significa	int condition; is that true?
9	A	That is true.
10	Q	What was the other significant condition?
11	A	Cutaneous contusions or I'm sorry, it's cutaneous
12	blunt tra	uma.
13	Q	Are those the bruises on her body?
14	A	Yes.
15	Q	Why is that included in your report?
16	Ą	I included it for two reasons. One, the actual
17	mechanism	of death. So there is cause of death, manner of
18	death, and	d we also look at the mechanism of death. And the
19	mechanism	is something non-specific. In this case the
20	mechanism	is exsanguination or bleeding out. So you would get
21	that same	mechanism with a stab wound or a gunshot wound or if
22	you're ant	i-coagulated.
23		So because her mechanism of death is bleeding out or
24	exsanguina	tion, I had contributed the cutaneous blunt trauma
25	because ar	y any injury that causes blood to be outside of

the blood vessels and outside of the vasculature system would 1 2 contribute to the demise. And I didn't want to minimize the amount of external trauma that I saw. That's for those two 3 reasons I included it as other significant conditions. 5 Q Okay. Now, exsanguination just means blood loss? 6 Correct. 7 Is there any way for you to estimate how long it took for Victoria to die as a result of the stab wound? 8 9 No. 10 Why -- why not? They do it on CSI on TV all the 11 time. Why can't you do it? That's entertainment. This is real life. 12 A 13 Q Okay. 14 A There are a number of factors. In any biological system you can't expect things to work the same each time. 15 There are conditions that would alter things, even under 16 17 experimental conditions. Say for instance, we were to bleed 18 rats and to see how long those rats would die. There's a 19 range. It's never it takes them two hours to die. 20 So there's always a range. You know, it can take between five minutes and two hours. And -- and that depends 21 22 on, for instance, we're using rats, so that depends on the 23 individual rat factors. 24 In this case it's one of the factors that would alter

my determination is the fact that she is cirrhotic. The

cirrhosis decreases her clotting factors. So she's going to continue to bleed. Whereas, someone else might start to clot and the process would be maybe a little quicker with her than with a normal individual. So that's one reason.

Also, if -- if her blood alcohol content is indicative of chronic alcohol abuse, alcohol also inhibits platelet function. And platelets are also involved in stopping bleedings. And so with her platelets perhaps being abnormal, she may have also bled out a little faster than a individual who didn't drink chronically or had cirrhosis of the liver.

Q So are those unknowns in -- in the evaluation of this issue?

A They're unknowns in the fact that it would alter.

Even if we had experimental data, it would alter that data.

Q Okay. When ascertaining how long it would take for one to die from this sort of an injury, do you take into account that no major blood vessel was severed?

A Yes, that's considered. If she had a transsection, which is a complete cut across the aorta, which is the largest artery in your body, the aorta pumps blood to the rest of your body. So if that vessel was injured, I would be more comfortable saying that she passed away within seconds to less than -- seconds to minutes because there's still a variation.

Q So not finding something like the aorta severed would it be your opinion that death in this case took minutes or

1	longer?
2	A That's reasonable, yes.
3	Q Probably not hours, but
4	A No, not hours.
5	Q certainly minutes, a number of minutes?
6	A Yes.
7	Q Now, hypothetically if they were a neighbor
8	downstairs who had heard crying, which turned to mouning, and
9	that entire process took approximately ten minutes, is that
10	consistent with what you observed in terms of how long it would
11	take for this woman to die?
12	A Well, it's not it wouldn't be an observation,
13	obviously. It would be conjecturing. It is it would I
14	guess it could be consistent, yes.
15	Q Okay. Not your own observation
L 6	A Correct.
17	Q but the the time is consistent with what a
8	woman might have heard?
9	A Yes.
0	Q Okay. And if there was a disturbance that was heard
1	which lasted the better part of an hour, certainly at least
2	with respect to the injuries that you observed on Ms. Whitmarsh
3	that you would categorize as acute, could those injuries have
4	been caused in that hour preceding her death?
5	A They could have been, yes.

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

BRIAN K. O'KEEFE, Appellant, vs.

THE STATE OF NEVADA Respondent. Supreme Court No.:

District Court Case No.: 08C250620 Filed
Electronically Filed
Dec 01 2015 10:53 a.m.
Tracie K. Lindeman
Clerk of Supreme Court

APPELLANT'S APPENDIX - VOLUME IX - PAGES 1600-1799

MATTHEW D. CARLING 51 East 400 North, Bldg. #1 Cedar City, Utah 84720 (702) 419-7330 (Office) Attorney for Appellant

STEVEN B. WOLFSON Clark County District Attorney 200 Lewis Avenue, 3rd Floor Las Vegas, Nevada 89155 Counsel for Respondent

CATHERINE CORTEZ MASTO
Attorney General
100 North Carson Street
Carson City, Nevada 89701-4717
Counsel for Respondent

27

28

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

INDEX O'Keefe, Brian

i

Document	Pag
(Ex Parte) Motion to Appoint Counsel filed on 12/06/13	4698-4700
"Amended" Exhibits to "Amended Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus by	-
a True Pretrial Detainee filed on 10/03/14	5008-5036
"Evidentiary Hearing Request" (Amended Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus Pursuant to NRS 34.360 Exclusive 1 Based on Subject-Matter of Amended Information Vested in Ninth Circuit by Notice of Appeal then "COA" Granted on a Double Jeopardy Violation with No Remand Issued Since) filed on 10/03/14	4995-5007
"Reply" to State's Response and Motion to Dismiss to Defendant's Pro Per Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus Prsuant to NRS 34.360 filed on 10/27/14	5052-5061
"True Pretrial Detainee's" Reply to State's Opposition(s) Admitting the State has a Jurisdictional Defect by the Aung of a Notice of Appeal Which Diveste Jurisdiction of the Matter Appealed; i.e., O'Keefe's Pretrial Habeas Matter Appealed to the 9th Circuit on the Subject Matter of the Amended Information Already Named a Double Jeopardy Violation filed on 10/01/14	4989-4994
Affidavit of Matthew D. Carling, Esq. filed on 06/29/15	5447-5453
Affidavit of the Honorable Michael P. Villani filed on 09/24/14	4981-4983
Amended Information filed on 02/10/09	0175-0177
Amended Notice of Appeal filed on 10/29/15	5565-5568
Appendix of Exhibits for: Motion to Dismiss based Upon Violation(s) of the Fifth Amendment Component of the Double Jeopardy Clause. Constitutional Collateral Estoppel and, Alternatively, Claiming Res Judicata, Enforceable by the Fourteenth Amendment Upon the States Precluding State's Theory of Prosecution by Unlawful Intentional Stabbing with Knife, the Alleged Battery Act Described in the Amended Information filed on 03/16/12	3225-3406
Case Appeal Statement filed on 03/14/14	4850-4851
Case Appeal Statement filed on 04/11/14	4862-4863
Case Appeal Statement filed on 05/21/09	0334-0336
Case Appeal Statement filed on 08/04/15	5476-5477
Case Appeal Statement filed on 08/12/15	5484-5485
Case Appeal Statement filed on 09/02/14	4925-4926
Case Appeal Statement filed on 09/04/12	3536-3537
Case Appeal Statement filed on 09/24/12	4625-4628
Case Appeal Statement filed on 10/20/15	5547-5548
Case Appeal Statement filed on 10/21/15	5554-5556
Case Appeal Statement filed on 11/04/15	5572-5573
Case Appeal Statement filed on 11/24/14	5070-5071
Certificate of Mailing filed on 05/03/11	3048

Certificate of Service filed on 06/29/15	5454
Clerks Certificate Judgment Reversed and Remanded filed on 05/06/10	1023-1027
Criminal Bindover filed on 12/26/08	0004-0020
Criminal Order to Statistically Close Case filed on 07/31/13	4662
Defendant O'Keefe's Opposition to Motion in Limine to Admit Evidence of Other Bad Acts Pursuant to NRS 48.045 and Evidence of Domestic Violence Pursuant to 48.061 filed on 01/18/11	2877-2907
Defendant's Brief on Admissibility of Evidence of Alleged Victim's History of Suicide Attempts, Anger Outbursts, Anger Management Therapy, Self-Mutilation (With Knives and Scissors), and Erratic Behavior filed on 03/20/09	0293-0301
Defendant's Motion to Require Court to Advise the Prosepective Jurors as to the Mandatory Sentences Required if the Defendant is Convicted of Second Degree Murder filed on 03/04/09	
Defendant's Motion to Settle Record filed on 03/24/09	0317-0322
Defendant's Proposed Jury Instructions filed on 03/20/09	0302-0316
Defendant's Proposed Jury Instructions filed on 08/23/10	1335-1393
Defendant's Submission to Clark County District Attorney's Death Review Committee filed on 12/31/08	0021-0027
Defendant's Supplemental Proposed Jury Instructions filed on 03/20/09	0290-0292
Defendant's Supplemental Notice of Witnesses filed on 08/16/10	1294-1296
District Court Amended Jury List filed on 03/19/09	0245
District Court Jury List filed on 03/16/09	0239
Ex Parte and/or Notice of Motion and Motion to Chief Judge to Reassign Case to Jurist of Reason Based on Pending Suit 3:14-CV-00385-RCJ-WGC Against Judge Michael Villani for proceeding in Clear "Want of Jurisdiction" Thereby Losing Immunity, Absolutely filed on 08/28/14	4903-4912
Ex Parte and/or Notice of Motion filed on 08/28/14	4913
Ex Parte Application for Order Requiring Material Witness to Post Bail filed on 03/10/09	0232-0236
Ex Parte Motion for an Order Shortening Time filed on 08/16/10	1292-1293
Ex Parte Motion for Appointment of Counsel Pursuant to NRS 34.750 filed on 09/15/14	4950-4952
Ex Parte Motion for Defense Costs filed on 06/30/10	1037-1043
Ex Parte Motion for Production of Documents (Specific) Papers. Pleadings and Tangible Property of Defendant filed on 01/13/14	4714-4720
Ex Parte Motion for Reimbursement of Legal Cost of Faretta Canvassea Defendant to Above Instant Case filed on 12/13/13	4701-4707
Ex Parte Motion for Release of Medical Records filed on 04/08/11	3041-3042
Ex Parte Motion to Extend Prison Copywork Limit filed on 06/24/15	5438-5441
Exhibits to Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus by a True Pretrial Detainee filed on 09/15/14	4954-4980
Ex-Parte Motion for Reimbursement of Incidental Costs Subsequent the Court Declaring Defendant Indigent and Granting Forma Pauperis filed on 01/21/14	4722-4747

Ex-Parte Motion to Extend Prison Copywork Limit filed on 01/28/14	4764-4767
Filing in Support of Motion to Seal Records as Ordered by Judge filed on 04/19/12	3438-3441
Findings of Fact, Conclusion of Law and Order filed on 10/02/15	5528-5536
Information filed on 12/19/08	0001-0003
Instructions to the Jury (Instruction No. 1) filed on 09/02/10	1399-1426
Instructions to the Jury filed on 03/20/09	0246-0288
Judgment of Conviction (Jury Trial) filed on 09/05/12	4623-4624
Judgment of Conviction filed on 05/08/09	0327-0328
Judicial Notice Pursuant NRS 47.140(1)-NRS 47.150(2) Supporting Pro-	
Se Petition Pursuant NRS 34.360 filed on 03/12/15	5082-5088
Jury List filed on 06/12/12	3456
Jury List filed on 08/25/10	1396
Letters in Aid of Sentencing filed on 05/04/09	0324-0326
Motion by Defendant O'Keefe filed on 08/19/10	1329-1334
Motion for Complete Rough Draft Transcript filed on 04/03/12	3430
Motion for Judicial Notice the State's Failure to File and Serve Response	
in Opposition filed on 02/24/14	4800-4809
Motion for Judicial Ruling filed on 05/24/10	1028-1030
Motion for Leave to File Supplemental Petition Addressing All Claims in	
the First Instance Required by Statute for Judicial Economy with	
Affidavit filed on 06/15/15	5420-5422
Motion for Relief from Judgment Based on Lack of Jurisdiction for U.S.	
Court of Appeals has not Issued any Remand, Mandate, or Remittitur	1
filed on 07/23/14	4871-4889
Motion to Continue Trial filed on 06/01/12	3450-3455
Motion to Dismiss Counsel filed on 10/03/11	3164-3168
Motion to Modify and/or Correct Illegal Sentence filed on 01/27/14	4749-4759
Motion to Place on Calendar filed on 10/26/11	3169-3182
Motion to Place on Calendar filed on 11/28/11	3184-3192
Motion to Withdraw as Counsel filed on 04/29/11	3044-3047
Motion to Withdraw Counsel filed on 11/28/11	3193-3198
Motion to Withdraw Counsel for Conflict and Failure to Present Claims	
when I.A.C. Claims Must be Raised Per Statute in the First Petition	
Pursuant Chapter 34 filed on 06/08/15	5148-5153
Motion to Withdraw filed on 09/14/10	1434-1437
Notice of Appeal filed on 03/13/14	4843-4849
Notice of Appeal filed on 04/11/14	4858-4861
Notice of Appeal filed on 05/21/09	0332-0333
Notice of Appeal filed on 07/31/15	5467-5472
Notice of Appeal filed on 08/11/15	5478-5483
	4923-4924
Notice of Appear filed on 08/29/14	1743 1747
Notice of Appeal filed on 08/29/14 Notice of Appeal filed on 10/21/15	5552-5553

Notice of Appeal filed on 11/21/14	5067-5069
Notice of Change of Address filed on 06/06/14	4864-4865
Notice of Defendant's Expert Witness filed on 02/20/09	0180-0195
Notice of Defendant's Witnesses filed on 03/06/09	0224-0227
Notice of Entry of Findings of Fact, Conclusion of Law and Order filed on 10/06/15	5537-5546
Notice of Expert Witnesses filed on 03/05/09	0222-0223
Notice of Motion and Motion by Defendant O'Keefe for a Reasonable Bail filed on 09/24/10	1441-1451
Notice of Motion and Motion by Defendant O'Keefe for Discovery filed on 08/02/10	1211-1219
Notice of Motion and Motion by Defendant O'Keefe for Evidentiary Hearing on Whether the State and CCDC have Complied with Their Obligations with Respect to the Recording of a Jail Visit Between O'Keefe and State Witness Cheryl Morris filed on 08/02/10	1220-1239
Notice of Motion and Motion by Defendant O'Keefe to Admit Evidence Pertaining to the Alleged Victim's Mental Health Condition and History, Including Prior Suicide Attempts, Anger Outbursts, Anger Management Therapy, Self-Mutilation and Errratic Behavior filed on 07/21/10	1064-1081
Notice of Motion and Motion by Defendant O'Keefe to Admit Evidence Pertaining to the Alleged Victim's Mental Health Condition and History, Including Prior Suicide Attempts, Anger Outbursts. Anger Management Therapy, Self-Mutilation and Erratic Behavior filed on 07/21/10 Notice of Motion and Motion by Defendant O'Keefe to Admit Evidence	1099-1116
Showing LVMPD Homicide Detectives Have Preserved Blood/Breath Alcohol Evidence in Another Recent Case filed on 08/02/10	1199-1210
Notice of Motion and Motion by Defendant O'Keefe to Dismiss on Grounds of Double Jeopardy Bar and Speedy Trial Violation and. Alternatively, to Preclude State's New Expert Witness, Evidence and Argument Relating to the Dynamics or Effects of Domestic Violence and Abuse filed on 01/07/11	2785-2811
Notice of Motion and Motion by Defendant O'Keefe to Preclude Expert Festimony filed on 08/16/10	1284-1291
Notice of Motion and Motion by Defendant O'Keefe to Preclude the State from Introducing at Trial Other Act or Character Evidence and Other Evidence Which is Unfairly Prejudicial or Would Violate his	
Constitutional Rights filed on 07/21/10	1047-1063
Notice of Motion and Motion by Defendant O'Keefe to Preclude the State from Introducing at Trial Other Act or Character Evidence and Other	
Evidence Which is Unfairly Prejudicial or Would Violate his Constitutional Rights filed on 07/21/10	1082-1098
Notice of Motion and Motion by defendant O'Keefe to Preclude the State from Introducing at Trial Improper Evidence and Argument filed on	
01/03/11	1682-2755

Statements to Police, or, Alternatively, to Preclude the State from Introducing Portions of his Interrogation filed on 08/02/10	1152-1198
Notice of Motion and Motion for Leave of Court to File Motion for	1132-1190
Rehearing – Pursuant to EDCR, Rule 2.24 filed on 08/29/14	4914-4921
Notice of Motion and Motion in Limine to Admit Evidence of Other Bad	
Acts Pursuant to NRS 48.045 and Evidence of Domestic Violence	
Pursuant to 48.061 filed on 01/06/11	2762-2784
Notice of Motion and Motion to Admit Evidence of Other Crimes filed on	2.702-2701
02/02/09	0150-0165
Notice of Motion and Motion to Admit Evidence of Polygraph	
Examination Results filed on 03/29/12	3412-3415
Notice of Motion and Motion to Dismiss based Upon Violation(s) of the	17
Fifth Amendment Component of the Double Jeopardy Clause,	
Constitutional Collateral Estoppel and, Alternatively, Claiming Res	
Judicata, Enforceable by the Fourteenth Amendment Upon the States	
Precluding State's Theory of Prosecution by Unlawful Intentional	
Stabbing with Knife, the Alleged Battery Act Described in the Amended	10035 10000
Information filed on 03/16/12	3201-3224
Notice of Motion and Motion to Seal Records filed on 03/22/12	3416-3429
Notice of Motion and Motion to Waive Filing Fees for Petition for Writ of	
Mandamus filed on 12/06/13	4695-4697
Notice of Motion and Motion to Withdraw as Attorney of Record filed on	-
09/23/15	5517-5519
Notice of Motion and Motion to Withdraw as Attorney of Record filed on 09/29/15	5525-5527
Notice of Motion filed on 01/13/14	4721
Notice of Motion filed on 01/21/14	4748
Notice of Motion filed on 01/27/14	4760
Notice of Motion filed on 02/24/14	4810
Notice of Motion filed on 03/04/14	4833
Notice of Motion filed on 06/08/15	5154-5160
Notice of Motion filed on 07/23/14	4890
Notice of Motion filed on 08/29/14	4922
Notice of Motion filed on 09/15/14	4953
Notice of Witness and/or Expert Witnesses filed on 02/03/09	0166-0167
Notice of Witnesses and/or Expert Witnesses filed on 02/17/09	0178-0179
NV Supreme Court Clerks Certificate/ Judgment Affirmed filed on	
02/06/15	5072-5081
NV Supreme Court Clerks Certificate/Judgment Affirmed filed on	
07/26/13	4653-4661
NV Supreme Court Clerks Certificate/Judgment Dismissed filed on	
06/18/14	4866-4870
NV Supreme Court Clerks Certificate/Judgment Dismissed filed on 03/12/15	5089-5093
NV Supreme Court Clerks Certificate/Judgment Dismissed filed on	3.403 VO3D

09/28/15	5520-5524
NV Supreme Court Clerks Certificate/Judgment Dismissed filed on 10/29/14	5062-5066
O'Keefe's Reply to State's Opposition to Motion to Admit Evidence Showing LVMPD Homicide Detectives have Preserved Blood/Breath Alcohol Evidence in Another Recent Case filed on 08/13/10	1256-1265
Opposition to State's Motion to Admit Evidence of Other Bad Acts filed on 02/06/09	0169-0172
Order Authorizing Contact Visit filed on 03/04/09	0219-0220
Order Authorizing Contact Visit filed on 08/12/10	1253-1254
Order Denying Defendant's Ex Parte Motion to Extend Prison Copywork Limit filed on 08/13/15	5486-5488
Order Denying Defendant's Ex-Parte Motion for Reimbursement of Incidental Costs Declaring Defendant Ingigent and Granting Forma pauperis filed on 03/11/14	4840-4842
Order Denying Defendant's Motion for Relief From Judgment Based on Lack of Jurisdiction for U.S. Court of Appeals had not Issues any Remand, Mandare or Remittatture filed on 09/04/14	4927-4929
Order Denying Defendant's Motion to Dismiss filed on 04/11/12	3434-3435
Order Denying Defendant's Motion to Seal Recoreds and Defendant's Motion to Admit Evidence of Plygraph Examination filed on 05/24/12	3448-3449
Order Denying Defendant's Petition for Writ of Mandamus or in the Alternative Writ of Coram Nobis; Order Denying Defendant's Motion to Waive Filing Fees for Petition for Writ of Mandamus; Order Denying Defendant's Motion to Appoint Counsel filed on 01/28/14	4761-4763
Order Denying Defendant's Pro Per Motion for Judifical Notice- The State's Failure to File and Serve Response in Opposition filed on 04/01/14	
Order Denying Defendant's Pro Per Motion for Leave to File Supplemental Petition Addressing all Claims in the First Instance Required by Statute for Judicial Economy with Affidavit filed on 07/15/15	5464-5466
Order Denying Defendant's Pro Per Motion to Modify and/or Correct Illegal Sentence filed on03/25/14	4852-4854
Order Denying Defendant's Pro Per Motion to Withdraw Counsel for Conflict and Failure to Present Claims When I.A.C. Claims Must be Raised Per Statute in the First Petition Pursuant to Chapter 34 filed on 07/15/15	5461-5463
Order Denying Matthew D. Carling's Motion to Withdraw as Attorney of Record for Defendant filed on 11/19/15	5574-5575
Order Denying Motion to Disqualify filed on 10/06/14	5037-5040
Order filed on 01/30/09	0149
Order filed on 11/06/10	1462-1463
Order for Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus filed on 10/15/14	5051
Order for Production of Inmate Brian O'Keefe filed on 05/26/10	1032-1033
Order for Return of Fees filed on 11/10/11	

in:		1752000000
1	Order for Transcripts filed on 04/30/12	3442
2	Order Granting and Denying in Part Defendant's Ex-Parte Motion for Production of Documents (Specific) Papers, Pleadings, and Tangible Property of Defendant filed on 02/28/14	4040-4000
3		4818-4820
4	Order Granting Ex parte Motion for Defense Costs filed on 07/01/10	1044-1045
	Order Granting Request for Transcripts filed on 01/20/11	2966-2967
5	Order Granting Request for Transcripts filed on 04/27/11	3043
c	Order Granting Request for Transcripts filed on 09/14/10	1430-1431
5	Order Granting Request for Transcripts filed on 09/16/10	1438-1439
7	Order Granting, in Part, and Denying, in Part, Motion by Defendant O'Keefe for Discovery filed on 08/23/10	1394-1395
3	Order Granting, in Part, and Denying, in Part, Motion by Defendant O'Keefe to Preclude the State from Introducing at Trial Other Act or Character Evidence and Other Evidence Which is Unfairly Prejudicial or	
)	Would Violate his Constitutional Rights filed on 09/09/10	1427-1429
i S	Order Granting, in Part, the State's Motion to Admit Evidence of Other Bad Acts filed on 03/13/12	3199-3200
52.11	Order Releasing Medical Records filed on 04/08/11	3039-3040
	Order Requiring Material Witness to Post Bail or be Committed to	
e	Custody filed on 03/10/09	0230-0231
200	Order Shortening Time filed on 08/16/10	1283
į	Petition for a Writ of Mandamus or in the Alternative Writ of Coram	×
· ·	Nobis filed on 12/06/13	4663-4694
	Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus or in the Alternative Motion to	
	Preclude Prosecution from Seeking First Degree Murder Conviction	
	Based Upon the Failure to Collect Evidence filed on 01/26/09	0125-0133
280	Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus Pursuant to NRS 34,360 Exclusive 1 Based On Subject-Matter of Amended Information Vested in Ninth	
200	Circuit by notice of Appeal Then "COA" Granted on a Double Jeopardy Violation with No Remand Issued Since filed on 09/15/14	4940-4949
0000	Petitioner's Supplement with Exhibit of Oral Argument Scheduled by the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals for November 17, 2014, Courtroom #1 filed on 10/01/14	4984-4988
è	Pro Se "Reply to State's Opposition to Defendant's Pro Se Motion to	Walter of the Arthur States
į	Modify and/or Correct Illegal Sentence filed on 03/04/14	4821-4832
124.45	ProSe "Reply" to State's Opposition to Defendant's (Ex-Parte) "Motion	
	for Reimbursement of Incidental Costs Subsequent the Courts Declaring Defendant Indigent and Granting Forma Pauperis" filed on 02/24/14	4792-4799
ŝ	Receipt of Copy filed on 01/03/11	2761
9	Receipt of Copy filed on 01/12/11	2812
	Receipt of Copy filed on 01/12/11	2813
	Receipt of Copy filed on 01/18/11	2876
	Receipt of Copy filed on 01/27/09	0134
i.	Receipt of Copy filed on 01/30/09	0146
8	Receipt of Copy filed on 02/06/09	0168

33	<u>y</u>	
9	Receipt of Copy filed on 03/04/09	0221
2	Receipt of Copy filed on 03/24/09	0323
-	Receipt of Copy filed on 05/24/10	1031
3	Receipt of Copy filed on 06/13/11	3163
0.47	Receipt of Copy filed on 06/30/10	1036
4	Receipt of Copy filed on 08/02/10	1240
5	Receipt of Copy filed on 08/02/10	1241
V-55.00	Receipt of Copy filed on 08/02/10	1242
6	Receipt of Copy filed on 08/02/10	1243
7	Receipt of copy filed on 08/13/10	1255
880	Receipt of Copy filed on 09/14/10	1432
8	Receipt of Copy filed on 09/17/10	1433
Sec.	Receipt of Copy filed on 09/21/10	1440
9	Receipt of File filed on 07/01/10	1046
10	Reply in Support of Supplemental Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus	1 72 5
S. Production	(Post-Conviction) filed on 08/25/15	5500-5510
11	Reply to State's Response to Defendant's Pro Per Post-Conviction	Contractor Entertor
12	Petition for Habeas Corpus filed on 06/16/15	5423-5432
12	Reply to State's Response to Defendant's Supplemental Petition for Writ	6408480 9849469
13	of Habeas Corpus filed on 08/24/15	5489-5499
19112	Requist for Rough Draft Transcripts filed on 10/21/15	5549-5551
14	Request for Rough Draft Transcripts filed on 07/17/12	3458-3460
15	Request for Certified Transcript of Proceeding filed on 09/09/09	0772-0723
	Request for Rough Draft Transcript filed on 05/21/09	0329-0331
16	Request for Rough Draft Transcripts filed on 11/20/12	4629-4631
17	Return to Writ of Habeas Corpus filed on 01/29/09	0135-0145
2.7	Second Amended Information filed on 08/19/10	1326-1328
18	State's Opposition to Defendant's (Ex-Parte) "Motion for Reimbursement of Incidental Costs Subsequent the Courts Declaring Defendant Indigent	
10	and Granting Forma Pauperis" filed on 02/07/14	47/0 4701
19	State's Opposition to Defendant's Motion for a Reasonable Bail filed on	4768-4791
20	09/27/10	1452-1461
21	State's Opposition to Defendant's Motion for Judicial Notice - The	
21	State's Failure to File and Serve the Response in Opposition filed on	
22	03/10/14	4834-4839
~~	State's Opposition to Defendant's Motion to Dismiss filed on 03/21/12	3407-3411
23	State's Opposition to Defendant's Motion to Preclude the State from	
24	Introducing at Trial Improper Evidence and Argument filed on 01/12/11	2814-2871
25	State's Opposition to Defendant's Motion to Seal Records filed on 04/05/12	3431-3433
	State's Opposition to Defendant's Motion to Suppress his Statements to	
26	Police, or, Alternatively, to Preclude the State from Introducing Portions	
27	of his Interrogation filed on 08/17/10	1306-1319
	State's Opposition to Defendant's Motion to Withdraw Counsel for	
28	Conflict and Failure to Present Claims When I.A.C. Claims Must be	

1	Raised Per Statute in the First Petition Pursuant to Chapter 34 filed on 06/25/15	5442-5446
2	State's Opposition to Defendant's Pro Per Motion for Leave of Court to	3442-3446
3	File Motion Rule 2.4 filed on 09/12/14	4935-4939
4	State's Opposition to Defendant's Pro Per Motion to Chief Judge to Reassign Case to Jurist of Reason Based on Pending Suit Against Judge	5
5	Michael Villani for Proceeding in Clear "Want of Jurisdiction" Thereby Losing Immunity, Absolutely filed on 09/12/14	4930-4934
6	State's Opposition to Defendant's Pro Per Motion to Modify and/or Correct Illegal Sentence filed on 02/24/14	4811-4817
7	State's Opposition to Motion for Evidentiary Hearing on Whether the State and CCDC have Complied with their Obligations with Respect to the Recording of a Jail Visit Between O'Keefe and State Witness Cheryl	** ** ******
9	Morris filed on 08/10/10	1244-1247
10	State's Opposition to Motion to Admit Evidence Pertaining to the Alleged Victim's Mental Health Condition and History, Including Prior Suicide	<u> </u>
11	Attempts, Anger Outbursts, Anger Management Therapy, Self-Mutilation and Erratic Behavior filed on 08/16/10	1277-1282
12 13	State's Opposition to Motion to Admit Evidence Showing LVMPD Homicide Detectives Have Preserved Blood/Breath Alcohol Evidence in Another Recent Case filed on 08/10/10	1240-1262
	State's Opposition to Motion to Dismiss and, Alternatively, to Preclude	1248-1252
14	Expert and Argument Regarding Domestic Violence filed on 01/18/11	2908-2965
15	State's Opposition to Motion to Preclude Expert Testimony filed on	\$1000000000000000000000000000000000000
16	08/18/10 State's Response and Motion to Dismiss Defendant's Motion for Relief	1320-1325
17	from Judgment Based on Lack of Jurisdiction for U.S. Court of Appeals had not Issued any Remand, Mandare or Remittature of filed on 08/07/14	4891-4902
18	State's Response and Motion to Dismiss to Defendant's Pro Per Petition	
19	for Writ of Habeas Corpus Pursuant to NRS 34.360 Exclusive based on Subject-Matter of Amended Information Vested in Ninth Circuit by	l
20	Notice of Appeal Then "COA" Granted on a Double jEopardy Violatio with No Remand Issued Since (Post Conviction), Amended Peition and	
21	Accompany Exhibits, Opposition to Request for Evidentiary Hearing, and Opposition to Pro Per Motion to Appoint Counsel filed on 10/10/14	5041-5050
22	State's Response to Defendant's Motion to Preclude the State from	2011 2000
23	Introducint at Trial Other Bad Acts or Character Evidence and Other Evidence that is Unfairly Prejudicial or Would Violate his Contitutionsal	
24	Rights filed on 08/16/10 State's Response to Defendant's Position for a Wild of Mandanting Control of the Cont	1268-1276
25	State's Response to Defendant's Petition for a Writ of Mandamus or in the Alternative Writ of Coram and Response to Motion to Appoint	
26	Counsel filed on 12/31/13 State's Response to Defendant's Pro Per Post-Conviction Petition for Writ	4708-4713
27	of Habeas Corpus filed on 06/02/15	5145-5147
28	State's Response to Defendant's Pro Per Supplemental Petition for Writ	

of Habeas Corpus and Evidentiary Hearing Request, "Motion for Leave to	0
File Supplemental Petition Addressing all Claims in the First Instance	40
Required by Statute for Judicial Economy with Affidavit," "Reply to	
State's Response to Defendant's Pro Per Post Conviction Petition for	
Habeas Corpus," and "Supplement with Notice Pursuant NRS 47.150(2);	
NRS 47.140(1), that the Untied States Supreme Court has Docketed (#14-	51
10093) the Pretrial Habeas Corpus Matter Pursuant 28 USC 2241(c)(3)	
from the Mooting of Petitioner's Section 2241 Based on a Subsequent	
Judgment Obtained in Want of Jurisdiction While Appeal Pending" filed on 07/09/15	The state of the s
**************************************	5455-5458
State's Response to Defendant's Reply in Support of Supplemental Post-	CONTRACTOR
Conviction Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus filed on 09/03/15	5511-5516
State's Response to Defendant's Supplement to Supplemental Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus (Post-Conviction) filed on 07/31/15	
State's Supplemental Opposition to Motion to Seal Records filed on	5473-5475
04/17/12	2422-2427
Stipulation and Order filed on 02/10/09	3436-3437 0173-0174
Substitution of Attorney filed on 06/29/10	1034-1035
Supplement to Supplemental Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus (Post-	1034-1033
Conviction) filed on 07/13/15	5459-5460
Supplement with Notice Pursuant NRS 47.150 (2); NRS 47.140 (1), That	
the United State's Supreme Court has Docketed (#14-10093) The Pretrial	
Habeas Corpus Matter Pursuant 28 U.S.C.§ 2241 ©(3) From the Mooting	
of Petitioner's Section 2241 Based on a Subsequent Judgment Obtained in	ā
Want of Jurisdiction While Appeal Pending filed on 06/17/15	5433-5437
Supplemental Appendix of Exhibits to Petition for a Writ of Habeas	
Corpus Exhibits One (1) Through Twenty Five (25) filed on 06/12/15	5161-5363
Supplemental Notice of Defendant's Expert Witnesses filed on 07/29/10	1117-1151
Supplemental Notice of Expert Witness filed on 05/17/12	3443-3447
Supplemental Notice of Expert Witnesses filed on 01/03/11	2756-2760
Supplemental Notice of Expert Witnesses filed on 08/13/10	1266-1267
Supplemental Notice of Expert Witnesses filed on 08/16/10	1297-1305
Supplemental Notice of Witnesses filed on 01/14/11	2872-2875
Supplemental Notice of Witnesses filed on 03/10/09	0228-0229
Supplemental Notice of Witnesses filed on 03/11/09	0237-0238
Supplemental Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus (Post Conviction) filed	THE ANALOG STATE AND ADDRESS OF THE
on 04/08/15	5094-5144
Supplemental Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus filed on 06/15/15	5364-5419
Verdict filed on 03/20/09	0289
Verdict filed on 06/15/12	3457
Verdict Submitted to the Jury but Returned Unsigned filed on 09/02/10	1397-1398
Writ of Habeas Corpus filed on 01/30/09	0147-0148

TRANSCRIPTS

Document	Page N
Transcript - All Pending Motions and Calendar Call filed on 02/04/11	2996-3038
Transcript - All Pending Motions filed on 07/10/09	0351-0355
Transcript - All Pending Motions filed on 08/30/12	3461-3482
Transcript - All Pending Motions filed on 11/23/10	1464-1468
Transcript - All Pending Motions on 07/10/09	0348-0350
Transcript - Calendar Call filed on 02/04/11	2968-2973
Transcript - Calendar Call filed on 08/30/12	3520-3535
Transcript - Continued Hearing: Motion in Limine to Present Evidence of Other Bad Acts filed on 08/30/12	3483-3509
Transcript - Defendant's Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus (Post Conviction) filed on 10/29/15	5560-5564
Transcript - Defendant's Pro Per Motion to Dismiss Based Upon Violation(s) filed on 08/30/12	3510-3519
Transcript - Defendant's Motion to Settle Record filed on 07/10/09	0342-0345
Transcript - Entry of Plea/Trial Setting filed on 07/10/09	0356-0358
Transcript - Jury Trail - Day 1 filed on 10/14/09	0724-1022
Transcript - Jury Trial - Day 1 filed on 07/10/09	0582-0651
Transcript - Jury Trial - Day 1 filed on 07/10/09	0652-0721
Transcript - Jury Trial - Day 1 filed on 09/04/12	4278-4622
Transcript - Jury Trial - Day I filed on 11/23/10	1579-1602
Transcript - Jury Trial - Day 2 filed on 07/10/09	0515-0581
Transcript - Jury Trial - Day 2 filed on 11/23/10	1603-1615
Transcript - Jury Trial - Day 2 on 09/04/12	4001-4227
Transcript - Jury Trial - Day 3 filed on 07/10/09	0462-0514
Transcript - Jury Trial - Day 3 filed on 11/23/10	1616-1738
Transcript - Jury Trial - Day 3 on 09/04/12	3779-4000
Transcript - Jury Trial - Day 4 filed on 07/10/09	0408-0461
Transcript - Jury Trial - Day 4 filed on 11/23/10	1739-2032
Transcript - Jury Trial - Day 4 on 09/04/12	3600-3778
Transcript - Jury Trial - Day 5 filed on 07/10/09	0359-0407
Transcript - Jury Trial - Day 5 filed on 09/04/12	3538-3599
Transcript - Jury Trial - Day 5 filed on 11/23/10	2033-2281
Transcript - Jury Trial - Day 6 filed on 11/23/10	2282-2507
Transcript - Jury Trial - Day 7 filed on 11/23/10	2508-2681
Transcript - Jury Trial - Day 8 filed on 11/23/10	1469-1470
Transcript - Jury Trial - Day 9 filed on 11/23/10	1471-1478
Transcript - Matthew D. Carling's Motion to Withdraw as Attorney of	31-20-00 H (10-00-00)
Record for Defendant filed on 10/29/15	5557-5559
Transcript - Motions Hearing - August 17, 2010 filed on 11/23/10	1479-1499
Transcript - Motions Hearing - August 19, 2010 filed on 11/23/10	1500-1536
Transcript - Motions Hearing - August 20, 2010 filed on 11/23/10	1537-1578

- 12 -

1

2:

26 27

Transcript – Notice of Motion and Motion by Defendant O'Keefe to Preclude the State from Introducing at Trial Improper Evidence and Argument filed on 02/04/11	2974-2989
Transcript - Partial Transcript of the Jury Trial - Day 2 filed on 03/18/09	0240-0244
Transcript - Petrocelli Hearing filed on 05/19/11	3049-3162
Transcript - Proceedings filed on 01/02/09	0028-0124
Transcript - Sentencing August 16, 2012 filed on 12/03/12	4632-4635
Transcript - Sentencing August 28, 2012 filed on 12/03/12	4636-4652
Transcript - Sentencing filed on 07/10/09	0337-0341
Transcript - Status Check: Availability of Dr. Benjamin for Trial filed on 02/04/11	2990-2995

1 to allow that type of questioning. 2 MR. LALLI: Thank you. 3 MS. GRAHAM: Thank you, your Honor. 4 THE COURT: And we're going to have the other jury. They'll be in here at 10:00 o'clock. They'll be on my left 5 side so they can start hearing the questions. We'll probably 7 just put them under oath before the other jury comes in and 8 explain to them why they're here. And then just continue on. Hopefully we can get a jury picked tomorrow. IU MS. PALM: So --11 MR. LALLI: Well, we'll have to do -- I'm sorry. MS. PALM: Is the court going to do your general 12 questions, then, first or are we going to start --13 14 THE COURT: No, we're going to --15 MS. PALM: -- and finish? THE COURT: -- finish up here. 16 17 MS. PALM: Okay. 18 THE COURT: But I'll explain to them where we're at. what we've done so far. And then we'll just move on. 19 20 MS. PALM: Okay. And then -- then finish that --21 MR. LALLI: We'll need to --22 MS. PALM: -- the -- the people who are sitting in 23 this area and then I'll take over. THE COURT: Right. Once the State finishes, we have 24 two or three more in the front row --

2040	Nation of the or and the second
1	MR. LALLI: Yes.
2	THE COURT: and then you'll take over here. All
3	right, any other questions?
4	MR. LALLI: No, other than just the observation that
5	we'll have to reindicate to the new group that comes in who are
6	the witnesses are so that they have some knowledge of that.
7	THE COURT: Right.
8	MR. LALLI: That the introduction that's normally
9	done will have to be made to them.
10	MS. PALM: Thank you.
11	THE COURT: Yes.
12	MR. LALLI: Thank you, your Honor.
13	THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
14	MS. GRAHAM: And 9:45 Judge?
15	THE COURT: 9:45 for the attorneys, yes.
16	MS. GRAHAM: Thank you.
17	(Court recessed at 5:32 p.m., until Tuesday,
18	August 24, 2010).
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
- 0	

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

AFTEST: Pursuant to Rule 3C(d) of the Nevada Rules of Appellate Procedure, I acknowledge that this is a rough draft transcript, expeditiously prepared, not proofread, corrected, or certified to be an accurate transcript.

Verbatim Digital Reporting, LLC Littleton, CO 80120 303-798-0890

JULIE LORD, TRANSCRIBER

11-15-10

DATE

DISTRICT COURT CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA FILED

Nov 23 10 21 AN 10

THE STATE OF NEVADA,

Plaintiff,

VS.

BRIAN KERRY O'KEEFE.

Defendant.

.

CASE NO. C-250630

DEPT. NO. 17

Transcript of Proceedings

BEFORE THE HONORABLE MICHAEL VILLANI, DISTRICT COURT JUDGE

ROUGH DRAFT TRANSCRIPT OF JURY TRIAL - DAY 2

> PARTIAL TRANSCRIPT (EXCLUDES VOIR DIRE)

TUESDAY, AUGUST 24, 2010

080250830 TRAKS Transcript of Proceedings 1979229



APPEARANCES:

FOR THE PLAINTIFF:

CHRISTOPHER LALLI, ESQ.

Assistant District Attorney

STEPHANIE GRAHAM, ESQ. Deputy District Attorney

FOR THE DEFENDANT:

PATRICIA PALM, ESQ.

Special Deputy Public Defender

COURT RECORDER:

TRANSCRIPTION BY:

MICHELLE RAMSEY District Court

VERBATIM DIGITAL REPORTING, LLC

Littleton, CO 80120 (303) 798-0890

Proceedings recorded by audio-visual recording, transcript produced by transcription service.

RECEIVED NOV 23 2018 CLERK OF THE COURT LAS VEGAS, NEVADA, TUESDAY, AUGUST 24, 2010, AT 10:04 A.M.
[Outside the presence of the jury].

THE COURT: We're outside the presence of the jury.

Ms. Palm, you wanted to put some items on the record.

MS. PALM: Yeah -- yes, thank you, your Honor. I was a little bit -- I just need to make sure that I've got a clear ruling on yesterday from the victim's mental health history. I know what the court had said of the statement that we could use. But subject to that ruling then, the implication is that I also can't all experts to talk about Victoria Whitmarsh's diagnoses and treatment, what those diagnoses mean and what the manifestations of having those diagnoses could be.

And I just want to make sure that that's object the record that subject to the court's ruling, excluding all those other things out of what we wanted to admit, that I would then be limited with my experts also.

of those items, for example, on Page 1, paragraph two, it talks about that she was depressed, she cut her wrists, there's attempt suicide issues, she's tried to kill herself numerous times. So they're free to address any of the items that I'm allowing in as far as the records are concerned. So if that's part of their opinion, they're free to voice that opinion. Their opinion's based upon that information.

MS. PALM: Well, their opinion would be the

3

1 diagnoses, which you're not allowing in. So that's why it's a 2 little confusing to me. I'm not sure what they would say other 3 than yes, this is in other record, and I really couldn't say --4 I mean, I -- I'm understanding I'm not allowed to say and you -- and she's been diagnosed with bipolar disorder, what is S bipolar disorder? What are the manifestations of bipolar 6 7 disorder? THE COURT: Right, that --8 9 MS. PALM: You know, I just need to clarify what the 10 court's ruling is because I have experts that I need to talk to and I need to know, you know, if I can address that with my 11 client's testimony or any other witness. 13 THE COURT: Well, anything that I said is coming --14 is allowed in, they can address those items. 15 MS. PALM: So they can say that she cut herself, 16 according to the records? 17 THE COURT: And -- and you'll see on paragraph two of 18 Page 2, they talk about mood swings, they talk about poor 19 appetite, anxiety, and there's some other issues that you may 20 be of interest to you. I have no idea, but they can address 21 any of those items that the court's allowing in. 22 So there are some, you know, psychological issues, mood swings, irritability. 23 24 MS. PALM: Okay, but --

THE COURT: It says poor anger management. That's

1 also in there.

MS. PALM: Right. I'm just not sure how they would -- what are you saying, that they can say yes, that she had those things but they could not say what diagnosis was attached to those things?

THE COURT: Well, for -- I'm not really sure what you're saying because for example, it says here that she has anxiety, low energy, that she has poor anger management skills, impulsive behavior. So they can address those issues in there.

MS. PALM: Okay. I still -- I don't know what -- you know, what they would -- would they not then be able to add anything that's not in the portions that the court has said are coming in? If they could just say that yes, these things are in her record, then there's no point to call an expert because they couldn't, you know, elaborate on it from --

THE COURT: Well, they --

MS. PALM: -- as (indiscernible) understand the court's ruling.

MR. LALLI: Your Honor, are -- I -- as I interpret the court's ruling, experts can talk about that evidence which you are admitting and nothing more. So the court has excluded, for instance, bipolar disorder, and I believe correctly. It would certainly circumvent the court's ruling if an expert is then allowed to come in and say well, she suffered from bipolar disorder. That's just circumventing the order.

ROUGH DRAFT TRANSCRIPT

So I think Ms. Palm's interpretation of the order is the correct one, an expert can only discuss those things that will be contained in our stipulation and nothing more.

THE COURT: That's correct. Now, if they can form some opinion, a proper opinion, Ms. Palm, then they're free to address any of those issues.

MS. PALM: Thank you.

THE COURT: And there's --

MS. PALM: So --

THE COURT: -- numerous -- numerous identification in here of suicide or cutting herself. You know, I'm not going to tell you how they can couch their opinion, but, you know, if they can draw some opinion from these items that are -- that are allowed in, they're free to testify.

MS. PALM: Okay, so they -- they could opine to a diagnosis bases on these items?

MR. LALLI: Well, I don't think there's sufficient information on those two sheets of paper or three sheets to reach an opinion. So I would certainly interpose objections on speculation, things of that nature. I'm not sure -- and I'm certainly not telling Ms. Palm how to do her case. I'm not sure that an expert -- well, an expert could just, I mean, testify as to what depression is or to what anxiety is or maybe why people cut themselves.

THE COURT: There's things in here of anger outburst,

Ms. Palm. I'm not trying to highlight for -- things for you, 2 but --3 MS. PALM: No, I understand that they can say she had 4 those things, but they can't put them in the context of a 5 mental health disorder. And -- and for the record, I'm not sure if the court intend to do this or not, but with the 2006 7 admission, she also had a self-inflicted wrist laceration and B that's part of what the court took out. And I thought the 9 court was allowing us to have the lacerations. 10 THE COURT: And where was that? Which page and which 11 paragraph? 12 MS. PALM: The bottom of Page 1 where we took out the entire paragraph. That's the only mention of her wrist 14 laceration with that admission. 15 THE COURT: I'm sorry, which paragraph? 16 MS. PALM: The bottom paragraph, records 2006 17 admission to Monte Vista, also has self-inflicted wrist laceration, about the third line down. That is the only 19 reference to that laceration. 20 THE COURT: That --21 MR. LALLI: Your Honor, I didn't --22 THE COURT: If I excluded that, because that does 23 deal with the wrist lacerations, that that would be allowed in. 24 MS. PALM: Okay, thank you. 25 MR. LALLI: Your Honor, I didn't realize we were

```
1
   going to revisit this issue, and I don't have my --
 2
             THE COURT: Well -- well --
             MR. LALLI: -- don't have my materials for it.
 3
             THE COURT: -- actually, it was -- I think it's an
 4
    error of the court. I missed that identification, wrist
 5
    laceration.
 6
 7
             MS. PALM: Thank you.
 8
             THE COURT: We're not going to argue on any other
 9
   issues.
10
             MS. PALM: Okay, thank you.
             THE COURT: All right.
11
12
             MS. PALM: And then, you know, just so I'm clear, no
13
   other evidence either aside from experts. Brian couldn't get
   up and talk about the other suicide attempts he's aware or
14
15
   anything, that he should keep his -- I just don't want to
16
   violate the court's order. He should keep his testimony
17
   limited to what's in the -- this document? It --
             THE COURT: Well, we're -- because I thought these
18
   documents here related to your experts testifying.
19
20
             MS. PALM: No, my motion was to admit the evidence,
21
   the evidence of her mental health history --
             MR. LALLI: Your Honor --
22
23
             MS. PALM: -- and --
24
             MR. LALLI: Oh, I'm sorry.
25
             MS. PALM: -- I wanted to admit her records, I wanted
```

to admit experts to testify about her diagnoses and what that 2 meant and I wanted to be able to talk about that evidence, 3 Brian could testify to what he knows. That was the motion. The ruling as to this, I understand the court's ruling, and I'm 5 not -- I'm not telling you I'm not accepting it. I just am trying to understand what the limitations would be on the other 7 evidence I introduced. 8 Now, I understand the experts, but I'm talking about 9 Brian's testimony, Mr. O'Keefe's testimony, how that should be limited. Should it be limited to conform with what's 10 11 admissible in this -- in this excerpt order? 12 MR. LALLI: Well, your Honor, it's -- it's --13 certainly the -- the defendant's testified before, and I -- I 14 mean, he didn't mention -- my recollection of reviewing his 15 testimony, and I've done that quite thoroughly, I don't recall 16 him testifying in a specific way to anything more than what is 17 contained in -- in our stipulation so --18 MS. PALM: We had an order last time it wasn't 19 admitted (indiscernible). 20 MR. LALLI: Well, he still made references to the 21 victim being in mental health counseling and attempted suicide. 22 So maybe he violated your order the last time, I don't know. 23 But it is in his testimony. The -- it would be my position, your Honor, that the defendant cannot testify that the victim 24 25 suffered from bipolar disorder. That would be again,

irrelevant under Daniel and under Petty and under our character statutes.

Certainly, he could testify about any other specific incidents of cutting, self-inflicted cutting that the victim did or if he wants -- if they want to make an offer of proof as to what else is out there, and I think certainly that would be appropriate, but if they want to make an offer of proof as to what is out there that he may testify to, then we can litigate it just like we've litigated up to this point.

MS. PALM: Well, I mean, my offer of proof was in my motion, which I filed back on July 21st. And it's incredible to me that Mr. Lalli is talking about this at this point I need to make an offer of proof. Mr. O'Keefe knows everything that Ms. Whitmarsh went through, including all of her suicide attempts.

He wasn't testifying to that last time. I think he did make one slip when he did, but he was limited on testifying to everything that he knew. So he's never been given that opportunity. But we did litigate this last time. He does know about all of it. I understand that if the court is saying you cannot talk about the diagnoses because you're not a doctor and I've limited you on diagnoses, but can he talk about all her saw side attempts because it's in his mind when the stuff's going on in the bedroom what she might be doing.

THE COURT: I think anything contained in the reports

that's coming in, he can testify about if he has that 2 knowledge, that foundation. 3 MS. PALM: Okay, so the two suicide attempts he can 4 say, you know, I know -- I know she's a cutter --5 THE COURT: If she --6 MS. PALM: -- and I know, you know, she's made these 7 two previous attempts and not talk about the other ones? 8 THE COURT: Whatever's contained in these reports --MS. PALM: Okay. 9 10 THE COURT: -- he can -- if he knows about them. 11 MS. PALM: He was there. 12 THE COURT: Okay, well --MS. PALM: He does know about them. 13 14 THE COURT: Then he can testify to those items. 15 MS. PALM: Okay. Thank you. 16 MR. LALLI: And just -- the -- the stipulation that 17 we received or the outline that I received is more inclusive than the information contained in the motion that Ms. Palm is 18 19 referring to. So to suggest that we are presented with a 20 plethora of information a month and a half ago and -- and --21 and somehow spaced it, I mean, that's just not what happened. 22 We received the -- the outline from Ms. Palm, I believe last week at which it contained more information than 23 -- than was in the motion so --24 25 THE COURT: I'm not faulting either side.

1 MR. LALLI: Thank you. 2 MS. PALM: Well, and -- and that's simply not true. My motion had all the exhibits attached to it, referred to the 3 Exhibit B that we filed last time that had all her medical 5 records, so that's --6 THE COURT: And I'm not going to be --7 MS. PALM: -- simply not true. B THE COURT: I'm not faulting either side. And if 9 it's motions have been filed and opposition filed, they are 10 part of the record. 11 MS. PALM: Thank you, your Honor. 12 MR. LALLI: Thank you. THE COURT: Okay. 13 14 MS. PALM: We -- we have just one scheduling thing. 15 I do have Dr. Grey flying in from Utah and Dr. -- or George Schiro flying from Louisiana on Thursday because I thought we'd 16 17 be further along like we were last time. And then I also have 18 Lou DeSalvio who's about a ten minute witness that has to testify on Thursday because he has a cancer in the family that 19 20 he's gotta leave for. 21 So, I mean, hopefully we can accommodate that with 22 our scheduling. But I -- I can't change doctors' flights at this late hour. 23 THE COURT: I don't see why we couldn't do that. Do 24 you, Mr. Lalli? 25

1 MR. LALLI: I -- I don't other than I also have 2 witness limitations as well. So --3 THE COURT: The court's inclined to work with everyone's schedule and do what we can. And hopefully -- and 5 some of these days the jurors can stay later than 5:00. Although, we're supposed to keep down our overtime. But 7 because of the nature of the case and that we are behind, I mean, no fault of anybody, but you have to be thorough on В 9 picking your jury. 10 If the jurors can stay until 5:30 or 6:00 we'll tell you every single day, and then we'll give you as much advance 11 notice as possible so you can get more witnesses lined up --MR. LALLI: Okay. 13 14 THE COURT: -- so we can get back on track. MR. LALLI: Thank you, your Honor. 15 MS. PALM: Thank you. 16 17 THE COURT: All right, thank you. 18 (Court recessed at 5:09 p.m., until Wednesday, 19 August 25, 2010). 20 21 22 23 24 25 0

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

ATTEST: Pursuant to Rule 3C(d) of the Nevada Rules of Appellate Procedure, I acknowledge that this is a rough draft transcript, expeditiously prepared, not proofread, corrected, or certified to be an accurate transcript.

Verbatim Digital Reporting, LLC Littleton, CO 80120 303-798-0890

JULIE LORD TRANSCRIBER

11-15-10

DATE

DISTRICT COURT CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

* * * *

FILED

Nev 23 10 21 AN '10

CLI.RM - F II.: COURT

THE STATE OF NEVADA.

Plaintiff,

VS.

BRIAN KERRY O'KEEFE,

Defendant.

CASE NO. C-250630

DEPT. NO. 17

Transcript of Proceedings

BEFORE THE HONORABLE MICHAEL VILLANI, DISTRICT COURT JUDGE

ROUGH DRAFT TRANSCRIPT OF JURY TRIAL - DAY 3

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 25, 2010

080250830 IRANS Transcript of Proceedings 1879223

APPEARANCES:

FOR THE PLAINTIFF:

CHRISTOPHER LALLI, ESQ.

Assistant District Attorney

STEPHANIE GRAHAM, ESQ. Deputy District Attorney

FOR THE DEFENDANT:

PATRICIA PALM, ESQ.

Special Deputy Public Defender

COURT RECORDER:

TRANSCRIPTION BY:

MICHELLE RAMSEY District Court

VERBATIM DIGITAL REPORTING, LLC

Littleton, CO 80120 (303) 798-0890

Proceedings recorded by audio-visual recording, transcript produced by transcription service.

RECEIVED NOV 2 3 2010

CLUME OF THE OCIUM

LAS VEGAS, NEVADA, WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 25, 2010, 9:43 A.M.

(Outside the presence of the jury).

THE COURT: We're on the record. Someone had a issue outside the presence of the jury panel.

MR. LALLI: Well, I guess two issues, your Honor.

One, Ms. Palm had some scheduling issues with her witnesses.

Mr. DeSalvio needs to testify tomorrow morning, I guess,

sometime around 10:30, and we're certainly able to accommodate

that. He's a very short witness.

The other witness is Dr. Grey from Utah. He needs to testify tomorrow at about 1:00 o'clock. We'll certainly still be in our case at that time, but I think I don't believe that is going to be a problem for us to accommodate and allow her to call that witness out of -- out of order.

The other piece is Mr. Schiro, I think, does he need
-- I'm not sure if he needs to testify Friday morning?

MS. PALM: Yeah, he would need to testify Friday morning. I did tell him I thought -- I thought I only had him yesterday, but he was able to accommodate me so he could stay for Friday morning, but then he has to leave in the afternoon. So -- and he's going back to Louisiana. So he'll stay the extra day to do it on Friday so we're not interrupting their case too much. But he does need to get on Friday morning.

MR. LALLI: We -- we may still be in our case, but just -- I mean, we'll do everything we can to accommodate them.

THE COURT: All right, I appreciate that.

MR. LALLI: I don't --

THE COURT: I don't have any objection to that as long as you make sure everyone's schedules are accommodated.

I'm assuming Ms. Palm you'll accommodate the State's schedule as well?

MS. PALM: Certainly. Thank you.

MR. LALLI: Your Honor, one other issue, and it pertains to the redaction of the video of the defendant's statement to the police. The court will certainly recall we litigated all of the redactions and we did that last week to give us sufficient time to create a video of that, which we have done. I mean, all the redactions that the court has ordered have been made.

And I -- I wanted -- during the course -- I'm not sure if it was over the weekend or if it was Friday, but there was some discussion via e-mail between Ms. Palm and myself about where the tape would start and where the tape would stop. And our original discussion was to stop at the very beginning -- to start at the very beginning of the video and run through taking the redactions out, including the -- the approximate one hour in between the first part of the interview and the second part.

And then a question was where would we stop the video at the end because the video goes on for quite some time

afterwards. After the investigators leave, once their interview has been concluded, the defendant is photographed by crime scene analysts, things of that nature. He's making statements or make some statements throughout that part.

And sorting it all out, having concern for potential objection that we would deprive the defense of the complete story of the statement, what I did is not start at the very beginning of the video, but start at the point in time when law enforcement enters the room and stop just shortly after they leave for the break, and then it picks up again when they return and ends upon their release. These are defendant statements. They're hearsay to the defense. They can't admit them. Only I have the right to admit those and — and that is admitting a fair portion of the tape, but still not depriving the defense in any way of the complete story of — of that interview.

And I informed Ms. Palm this morning that the tape starts -- the video portion start at 1:35:47 a.m. and concludes at 3:28:34 a.m., but there is an issue -- now, I guess, if I understand Ms. Palm correctly, she wants more of the -- of the front part of the interview redacted, and she wants other portions after the police leave on the video.

And so I wanted to resolve that as soon as possible because I edit my own video, and it's extremely time consuming and it's not something that can just be done on the fly when

5

we're here in court. I mean, it's something that is -- that is 1 2 going to take me several hours to do and has taken me many hours to do up to this point. So I'd like some clarification 3 of that. 5 MS. PALM: And if I could respond to that. Last week after the court's ruling on what had to be redacted out of the 7 video, Chris and I had a discussion, and then he asked me what 8 -- where do you propose we start and stop, and I told him where I wanted to start and where I wanted to stop. And where I want 9 to start is a little bit before the Miranda, but not entirely 10 11 before the Miranda, and he's not Mirandized at that point, so the State can't admit that part. 12 13 And if they admit his statement, we get to admit other parts to show for --14 15 THE COURT: How much --16 MS. PALM: -- under the rule of completion. 17 THE COURT: -- more time do you want --MS. PALM: I --18 THE COURT: -- of the defendant? 19 20 MS. PALM: -- I wanted it to start at 1 -- well, 21 here's what happened. I said I wanted to start at 1:38, and I 22 want it to go -- include the crime scene analyst, when Dan Ford 23 comes in and they start talking to him there because there's some more statements there that are exculpatory. And -- and 24

then I wanted it to end when he starts undressing because the

ĸ

jury doesn't need to see him get naked and take his DNA and stuff. We can do that another way.

So I wanted it to go from Dan Ford entering the room after the interview until 4:05, and I want it to start at 1:38 and then -- and so we couldn't agree on that, and so Chris said go ahead and make your own -- your own video, which I did, which took me hours to do. And then he comes in this morning and tells me that he wants to include some of that that he didn't want to include before.

So it's not that, you know, there hasn't been some discussion, but the part that I want in is 1:38 forward. I've made a video of the portions that I want in that could not include the part of the video that's on the transcript. If you understand what I'm saying that the transcript does not reflect the entire encounter. But I wanted 1:38 until the start of the interview because --

THE COURT: Well, you thought Mr. Lalli said it starts at 1:35:47.

MS. PALM: No, it starts much earlier than that. He's not Mirandized during that entire period --

THE COURT: All right.

MS. PALM: -- up until the interview starts at 1:43.

So what my video is is about a six minute little clip. It's -it's from 1:38 to 1:43 and then afterwards when Dan Ford enters
the room until 4:05. That -- and -- and I have gone to the

trouble to make a video that includes that, based on our discussions. 3 THE COURT: Maybe I misunderstood Mr. Lalli said that his video starts at 1:35 and 47. 4 MS. PALM: Right and there -- there's some things in 5 there that I would be objecting to, then, and it's not 6 7 Mirandized, so --8 MR. LALLI: And I -- it's our position that he starts 9 off as soon as the police enter the room making spontaneous 10 statements. Not -- they're not the product of my 11 interrogation. So, you know, I was certainly concerned that now they were going to be requesting more redactions. So it's just something that we're going to have to resolve, your Honor, 13 before -- before that video is played. 15 I don't intend to play the video in my opening 16 statement, and I don't anticipate using it until Detective 17 Wildemann testifies. So we'll have some time, but I'm not sure 18 19 THE COURT: Is there a transcript that someone can 20 highlight for me the sections --21 MS. PALM: No, your Honor, because the part that I want in is not on the transcript --23 THE COURT: Okay. 24 MS. PALM: -- because the transcript only has the

25 Mirandized portion on it.

1 THE COURT: Right.

MS. PALM: And the part that he wants in is not on the transcript either, but he wants more than I do.

MR. LALLI: Well, I have it on my computer.

MS. PALM: And less than I did in some ways. Less than I do at the end of the interview and, you know, after he's been Mirandized, which is -- is fine with me if it comes in. But the -- the before part, he wants more than I do. I want it to not start until 1:38.

THE COURT: You want three minutes later --

MS. PALM: That's correct.

THE COURT: -- basically. And what's going on there in those three minutes?

MS. PALM: He's just -- he's going off about various subjects, Dr. Buchanan, those kind of things. And so that's why I started it where I did because I felt the rest of it was just too prejudicial and he hadn't been Mirandized yet, and the police officers were talking to him and asking him questions or having interaction with him.

THE COURT: Well, if it's only three minutes, I can review that in one of the breaks.

MS. PALM: And if the court wants to look at the -the video that I made --

MR. LALLI: Well, it's a little -- it's -- you're not going to see the portions that I want in.

ROUGH DRAFT TRANSCRIPT

9

1 THE COURT: Right, so --2 MR. LALLI: And -- and what's -- what's telling is, 3 you know, this man is claiming that someone was -- was -someone had died accidentally or via suicide who he loved. And 5 it's incredibly telling to see his demeanor and affect when he first encounters the police. And they're not interrogating 7 him. He's making spontaneous statements. 8 THE COURT: Right. Well, let me just review the -the beginning of the -- the three minutes that's in dispute. 9 MR. LALLI: From the very start until Miranda? 10 THE COURT: Right, because Ms. Palm says she's okay 11 with 1:38 on. 12 13 MS. PALM: And where I've edited it, it starts right 14 after the Bucky comment --15 THE COURT: Okay. 16 MS. PALM: -- if that goes -- if that helps the 17 court. THE COURT: All right. And then Mr. Lalli starts at 18 19 basically three minutes -- it shouldn't take me long to review three minutes. And on the -- on the tail end, Ms. Palm, you 20 wanted -- Mr. Lalli wants to stop at 3:28:34. When do you want 21 yours to stop? 22 MS. PALM: Well, I -- I actually cut out some and so 23 I don't have a start time on here, but I want it to stop --24 THE COURT: Isn't there a counter on the --25

1 MS. PALM: Yeah, you can -- you -- well, if the court wants to look at the counter on this one, it start -- mine starts when Dan Ford enters the room and they have more interaction with him because he's sitting alone for a while. Dan Ford enters the room and then goes number 4:05. 5 6 It's not very long. 7 THE COURT: Okay, but what I'm saying is the State 8 wants to stop at 3:28. You want to stop at 4:05? 9 MS. PALM: Basically, but cut out the part where he's 10 sitting by himself. 11 THE COURT: Okay. Well, it doesn't seem like it's that much time. I mean, I can review that hopefully this 12 afternoon or tonight. 14 MR. LALLI: We'd be interposing objections to it. It's hearsay, any statements that are made. We're not offering 15 16 them. What happens there has nothing to do -- it's not taking my of the previous interview out of context or putting it more 18 in the context. There's no -- there's no complete --19 completeness argument and so it's our position that it is -- is 20 THE COURT: Okay. 21 MR. LALLI: -- hearsay. 22 THE COURT: Well, I'll be more than happy to listen 23 to argument. I've got to review it. 24 25 MS. PALM: Right.

MR. LALLI: Right, so --

20 |

THE COURT: I appreciate you bringing that to my attention.

MR. LALLI: Okay, thank you.

THE COURT: Is that it? Let's call the jury in.

(In the presence of the jury).

THE COURT: All right, ladies and gentlemen, those of you in the gallery, I'd like to give you my thanks for -- for going through this process and your willingness to serve as a juror in this particular matter. At this time the clerk will now issue the oath of your office as a juror.

(Swearing in the jury panel).

THE COURT: All right, have a seat, please. Ladies and gentlemen, as I had mentioned before and at the beginning of this case, we expect this trial to last through the week and perhaps Monday or Tuesday. The attorneys have advised me that they believe they should be able to complete the evidentiary portion of this case by Monday.

I don't know if there's an outside chance of Friday, but we will stay on track as far as our expect the ending time. I just want to advise you that each day we hope to start around 9:30 or 10:00, we'll take our breaks typically around noon. If we're right in the middle of a witness, we'll probably wait until the examination of that witness has been completed and then we would take a lunch break.

Typically between 3:00 and 3:30 in the afternoon we'll take a mid afternoon break and we'll try to adjourn around at 5:00 o'clock. Again, if we're in the middle a witness, we may go a little longer.

Each day the marshal will check with you to see if you can stay later. If we can get more witnesses in on any give day, we can make sure that we do end on time. So that will be up to all of you each day. The marshal will check with you to see if perhaps you can stay 5:30 one day or 6:00 o'clock one day. If someone has a doctor's appointment and you need to leave at 5:00, we'll accommodate you.

And at this time I'm going to read to you some preliminary instructions. At the end of the trial you'll be give more detailed instructions which is the law of this particular case. After I read you the general instructions at this time we'll have a quick recess, the attorneys will prepare their -- their Power Points and -- and everything and the court -- courtroom here will be prepared for their opening statements.

After the opening statements are given we will start calling witnesses this afternoon.

(Pause in the proceedings).

THE COURT: Everybody okay? All right, good. Ladies and gentlemen, this is a criminal case brought by the State of Nevada against the defendant. This case is based on an

information. The clerk will now read the information and state the plea of the defendant.

22 |

(Clerk reads Information; not transcribed)

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, as we had mentioned earlier, you should understand that the Information just read to you is simply a description of the charge made by the State against the Defendant. It is not evidence of anything. It does not prove anything. Therefore, a defendant starts out with a clean slate. The defendant has pled not guilty and is presumed innocent.

This is a criminal case. There are -- and there are two basic rules you must keep in mind. First, the defendant is presumed innocent unless and until proved guilty beyond a reasonable doubt. The defendant is not required to pesent any evidence or prove his innocence. The law never imposed upon a defendant in a criminal case, the burden of calling any witnesses or introducing any evidence.

Second, to convict the State must prove beyond a reasonable doubt that the crime was committed and the defendant is the person who committed it.

It will be your duty to decide from the evidence to be presented whether or not the defendant is guilty or not guilty. You are the sole judges of the facts. You will decide what the facts are from the evidence which will be presented. The evidence will consist of testimony of witnesses and

documents and other things received into evidence as exhibits. You must apply the facts to the law which I shall give you, and in that way reach your verdict.

It is important that you perform your duty of determining the facts diligently and conscientiously, for ordinarily there is no way of correcting an erroneous determination of the facts by the jury. You should not take anything I may say or do during the trial as indicating my opinion as to how you should decide the case, or to influence you in any way in your determination of the facts. At times, I may even ask questions of witnesses. If I do so, it is for the purpose of bringing out matters which should be brought out and not in any way to indicate my opinion about the facts, or to indicate the weight or value you should give the testimony of a witness.

In deciding the facts of this case you may have to decide which witnesses to believe and which witnesses not to believe. You may believe everything a witness says, or only part of it, or none of it. In considering the weight or value of the testimony of any witness, you may consider the appearance, attitude and behavior of the witness when testifying, and a number of other things, including the witness's ability to see, or hear, or know of the things the witness testifies to, the quality of the witness's memory, the inclination of the witness to speak truthfully, whether or not

the witness has any interest in the outcome of the case, or any motive, bias or prejudice. Whether the witness is contradicted by anything the witness said or wrote before the trial, and how reasonable is the witness's testimony when considered with other evidence which you believe.

24 |

In decide whether or not to believe a witness, keep in mind people sometimes forget things. You need to consider whether a contradiction is an innocent lapse of memory or an intentional falsehood, and that may depend on whether it has to do with an important fact or only a small detail.

The weight or value of the evidence does not necessarily depend on the number of witnesses testifying for one side. You must consider all the evidence, and you may decide the testimony of a smaller number of witnesses on one side, has more weight or value than that presented by a larger number of witnesses on the other side.

There are two kinds of evidence, direct and circumstantial. Direct evidence is testimony about what the witness personally saw, heard, or did. Circumstantial evidence is indirect evidence. It is proof of one or more facts from which you can find another fact.

By way of example, if you wake up in the morning and see the ground, the sidewalk and the streets are all wet and water is running down the gutters, you may find from those facts that it rained during the night. It is proof of one or

more facts from which you can find another fact.

If you were awake during the night and saw the rain fall, thit would be direct evidence, which is something you personally saw. You may consider both direct and circumstantial evidence in deciding this case. The law permits you to give equal weight or value to both. But it's for you to decide how much consideration to give any evidence.

Certain things are not evidence and you must not consider them as evidence in deciding the facts of this case. Statements and arguments by the attorneys, questions and objections of the attorneys, testimony I instruct you to disregard, and anything you may see or hear if Court is not in session, even if what you see or hear is done or said by one of the parties, or by one of the witnesses.

Remember, evidence is sworn testimony by a witness while Court is in session, and documents and other things received into evidence as exhibits.

You will be given the opportunity to ask written questions of any of the witnesses called to testify in this case. You are not encouraged to ask a large number of questions, because that is the primary responsibility of counsel. Questions may be asked only in the following manner: After both lawyers have finished questioning the witness, and before I excuse the witnesses, and only at that time, if there are additional questions you would like to ask the witness, you

may then seek permission to ask the witness a written question.

Should you desire to ask a question, write your question down and your juror number of a piece of paper and raise your hand. All questions from jurors must be factual in nature and designed to clarify information already presented.

In addition, jurors must not place any undue weight on the responses to their questions. The Marshal will pick up your question and give it to me. All questions must be directed to the witness and not to the lawyers or to the Judge. After I consult with counsel, I will determine if your question is legall proper. If I determine that your question may be properly asked, I will ask the question.

No adverse inference should be drawn if the Court does not allow a particular question.

There are rules of law which control what can be received into evidence. When the lawyer asks a question, or offers an exhibit into evidence, and the lawyer on the other side things that it is not permitted by the rules, that lawyer may object. If I overrule the objection, the question may be answered or the exhibit received. If I sustain the objection, the question cannot be answered and the exhibit cannot be received.

Whenever I sustain an objection to a question, ignore the question and do not guess what the answer might have been. Sometimes I may order evidence stricken from the record and

tell you to disregard or ignore such evidence. This means when you are decide the case, you must not consider the evidence which I have told you to disregard.

It is the duty of a lawyer to object to evidence which the lawyer believes may not be permitted by the rules. You should not be prejudiced in any way against a lawyer who makes objections on behalf of the party the lawyer represents.

Also, I may find it necessary to admonish a lawyer.

If I do, you should not be prejudice towards the lawyer or

client because I have found it necessary to admonish the the

lawyer.

Until this case is submitted to you, do not talk to each other about it, or about anyone who has anything to do with it until the end of the case when you go to the jury room to decide your verdict. Do not talk with anyone else about this case or anyone who has anything to do with it until the trial has ended and you have been discharged as jurors.

Anyone else includes members of your family and your friends. You may tell them that you're a juror in a criminal case, but don't tell them anything else about it until after you have been discharged by me. Do not let anyone talk to you about the case, or about anyone who has anything to do with it. If someone should try to talk to you, please report it immediately to me by contacting the Marshal.

Do not read any news stories, listen to any radio

broadcasts, watch any television or do any internet research about the case, or about anyone who has anything to do with it.

You may be tempted to visit a particular location.

Please do not do so. In view of the time that has elasped since this case has come to trial, substantial changes may have occurred at a particular location.

Also if you make an unauthorized visit without the benefit of explanation you may get an erroneous interpretation or impression, excuse me. Therefore, please avoid going near or past the location until after this case has been completed.

At the end of the trial, you will have to make your decision based upon what you recall of the evidence. You will not have a written transcript to consult and it is difficult and time-consuming for the court recorder to play back lengthy testimony. I urge you to pay close attention to the testimony as it is given.

If you wish, you may take notes to help you remember what a witness said. If you do take notes, please keep them to yourself until you and your fellow jurors go to the jury room to decide the case. Do not let note-taking distract you so that you do not hear other answers by the witnesses. You should rely upon your own memory or what was said and not be overly influenced by the notes of other jurors.

Do not make up your mind about what the verdict should be until after you have gone to the jury room to decide

the case and you and your fellow jurors have discussed the evidence. It is important that you keep an open mind throughout the trial.

A juror may not declare to a fellow juror any fact relating to this case of which the juror has knowledge. If any juror discovers during the trial, or after the jury has retired, that the juror or any other juror has personal knowledge of any fact in controversy in the case, that juror shall disclose such situation to me in the absence of the other jurors.

This means, if you learn during the course of the trial that you have personal knowledge of any fact which is not presented by the evidence in this case, you must declare that fact to me. You communicate to me through the Marshal.

During the course of this trial, the attorneys for both sides and all court personnel, other than the Marshal, are not permitted to converse with members of the jury. These individuals are not being anti-social, they are bound by ethics and the law not to talk to do, for to do so might contaminate your verdict.

The trial will proceed in the following manner. One of the Deputy District Attorneys will make an opening statement, which is an outline to help you understand what the State expects to prove. Next, the defense attorney may, but does not have to, make an opening statement. Opening

statements serve as an introduction to the evidence which the party making the statement intends to prove.

B

The State will then present its evidence and counsel for the defendant may cross-examine the witnesses. Following the State's case, the defendant may present evidence and the deputy district attorneys may cross-examine the witnesses.

However, as I have said, the defendant is not obligated to present any evidence.

After all the evidence has been presented I will instuct you on the law. After the instructions of the law have been read to you, each side has the opportunity to present oral argument. What is said in closing argument is not evidence. The arguments are designed to summarize and interpret the evidence.

Since the State has the burden of providing the defendant guilty beyond a reasonable doubt, the State has the right to open and close the arguments. After the arguments have been completed, you will retire to deliberate your verdict.

Ladies and gentlemen, we're going to take a quick recess so the parties can arrange their notes and prepare for the opening and then we will start calling witnesses this afternoon.

You may be aware that in a criminal case we have 12 jurors deliberate in the jury room. There are 14 of you seated

in the jury box. Jurors No. 13 and 14 are not necessarily the alternates. We will have two alternates in this case. Those alternates will be randomly selected. So it's important that all of you pay attention to the evidence.

It's important that we have alternates because if during the trial one of the jurors becomes disqualified for some reason, we will need to have an alternate deliberate when this case is over. If we didn't have an alternate, we would have to start the entire process over and pick a whole new jury so you can understand why it's important that we have an alternate.

So, ladies and gentlemen, let's take a recess while the parties prepare for their opening, which should just be five to ten minutes.

During this recess, it is your duty not to converse among yourselves or with anyone else on any subject connected with this case, or to read, watch, or listen to any report of or commentary in the trial by any person connected with the trial, or by any medium of information, including without limitation, newspaper, television, the radio or the internet.

You are not to form or express an opinion on any subject connected with this case until this matter is submitted to you. I think most of you have this admonishment memorized, but I am required by law to read it to you every time we take a break.

1 So we'll see you back in five to ten minutes. 2 (Court recessed at 2:45 p.m. until 2:59 p.m.). 3 (In the presence of the jury). THE MARSHAL: All right, you may be seated, ladies 4 and gentlemen. Let's make sure all cell phones are turned off, 5 please. 6 7 THE COURT: State ready to proceed? 8 MR. LALLI: Yes, your Honor. 9 THE COURT: And defense ready? 10 MS. PALM: Yes, your Honor, thank you. 11 THE COURT: All right, State, your opening. 12 STATE'S OPENING STATEMENT 13 MR. LALLI: Thank you. May it please the court, Brian O'Keefe was found guilty by a jury of felony battery constituting domestic violence in 2006. The victim in that 15 16 case, Victoria Whitmarsh is the same woman he murdered on 17 November 5th, 2008. 18 The evidence will show that he stabbed her, that she suffered a fatal stab wound under her arm and that she died as 19 a result of essentially bleeding out. Her death was by no 20 21 means instantaneous. And really, the murder should come as no 22 surprise. You will learn that the defendant never really got 23 over the fact that Victoria was responsible for putting him in 24 prison.

He would say that he wanted to kill the bitch. After

25

1 the defendant went to prison, his relationship with Victoria came to an end, at least for a time. Shortly after his 2 release, he began a romantic relationship with a woman by the name of Cheryl Morris. And there was a somewhat eery resemblance between Victoria and Cheryl.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

You will learn that like Victoria, Cheryl is a small Asian woman. The defendant's girlfriend Cheryl, the two of them became very close, and it was in this context that the defendant shared with Cheryl his feelings about Victoria. And he shared with her his ability to kill.

You will learn that the defendant would boast about being in the military. He bragged about knowing how to kill people. And whenever he talked about doing this, he only talked about doing it with a knife.

While his relationship with Cheryl was ongoing, the defendant began to secretly see Victoria again. Like most domestic violence relationships, there was a fatal attraction between the two. At one point the defendant even tried to move Victoria into the spartment in which he was living with Cheryl, while Cheryl was still living there. And Cheryl would have nothing to do with it. And she eventually moved out.

After a time the defendant took up a relationship in that apartment, 5001, El Parque, Unit 35, along with Victoria. In many ways Victoria Whitmarsh led a tortured life. She suffered from depression. Like many people who suffer from

that disease, she would cut herself at times to cope with her emotions.

You will learn that she had attempted suicide before. She took medication to help her deal with her depression. You will learn that at autopsy she had a drug called Effexor in her system, which is an anti-depressant. Victoria had been infected with Hepatitis C, she was estranged from her husband and from her daughter. By all accounts, the evidence will show that she was vulnerable, at times even pathetic.

At the time of her death she weighed just 108 pounds, Just the sort of woman the defendant could control. As I told you, the defendant lived in this apartment complex located at 5001 El Parque. His unit was the upstairs unit. And you'll learn that many of the neighbors in the apartment complex knew each other, they were somewhat close, somewhat friendly, certainly good neighbors.

You will learn about the Tolivers. Charles Toliver, who's known to his friends as Cooky, as well as his wife, Joyce. And the Tolivers lived just below the defendant. Well. back on November 5th of 2008, you will hear from the Tolivers that it was about 10:00 o'clock at night. And Mrs. Toliver is fairly certain of the time because she will tell you that something she did at this period was watched the Soap Opera Network. Night time was kind of her opportunity to catch up on the scaps.

And at about 10:00 o'clock was a soap opera that she would usually watch. Well, on this particular evening at that time she began to hear a disturbance upstairs directly above her apartment. And it continued for some 30 minute, getting louder and louder. Mr. Toliver, Cooky Toliver, is an early riser, he goes to bed early at night. He heard the disturbance. It woke him from a sleep.

1

2

3

đ

5

6

7

B

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

And in an attempt to let whatever was going on upstairs become aware that they were being bothered, they took a broom and they began to bang the -- the ceiling to make a noise to let the people up above, you know, to cool it, but the noise didn't stop. At one point Mrs. Toliver will tell you that she actually heard a woman crying. And over the course of about ten minutes that crying turned to moaning and then fell silent.

Mr. Toliver was quite angry at being awokened and actually ascended those stairs to confront the defendant about making all the noise. When he gets to the front door, he sees the defendant and the defendant tells him come in here and get her. Mr. Toliver walks into the back bedroom and this is what he sees. He sees Victoria's legs on the floor. They are obstructed by the bed. She is naked from the waist down, and there is a great deal of blood in the room.

He looks at the defendant and he says man, what the 25 | hell have you done? He runs out in an attempt to get help. He runs to the unit of an individual named Tom Armbruster. Both Todd and Cooky ultimately return to this apartment. They go up the stairs and into the room. Todd enters the room with Cooky just behind him. He sees Victoria's body.

The defendant is standing over or close to Victoria and saying words to the effect of come on, get up, come on, get up. Out of nowhere once the defendant realizes that Todd is in the room, he stands up and actually takes a swing at him. And then tells him to get the hell out of here.

The evidence will show that the defendant never called the paramedics. He never called for a firefighter. He never called the police. He never called anybody to try to help Victoria Whitmarsh on that evening. But 911 is called. Calls are placed to the authorities. Not by the defendant, but by among other people, Todd Armbruster, and you will hear that 911 call.

The police begin to arrive almost immediately. They make their way up to the apartment. They enter the living room area of the apartment and they are naturally very cautious. They have received information that there is a woman down who has been stabbed. There's blood in the area, the -- they don't know exactly what to make of the situation. They know that there is a male in the room where the female is at.

They enter, they attempt to talk to the defendant. They tell him he needs to come out so that they can help

Victoria. He refuses to come out. He tells them get in here. You will learn what a CIT officer is. A crisis intervention team officer. Metro has a group of officers who are trained in deescalating situations like this. It just so happened that a crisis intervention team or a CIT officer was very close by who makes his way on scene almost immediately.

And he begins to explain to the defendant his need to come out of the back room so that officers and paramedics can come in to help Victoria. The police feel as though they're being baited. At one point the defendant says she's alive, come in here and help her or words to that effect. Then he's saying no, she's dead, it's too late. They have no idea what they're dealing with.

Eventually, they make the decision that they must enter the back bedroom to remove him so that they can assess Victoria and give her help if she needs it. So you'll learn that officers in a very methodical manner enter the room. As they're entering the room, they see Victoria's body naked from the waist down and the defendant almost laying on her.

And what does the defendant do when the police officers enter? He says don't look at her. He's putting her hands out. Don't look at her as though this is my woman and I don't want anybody else to see her in the nude. Eventually, he struggles with the police officers. He refuses to leave. They try to cuff him, he is fighting with them. They have to deploy

to tazer.

Eventually, they're able to actually pick him up and move him out of that room. Paramedics are very close by, but unfortunately it's too late. When the first police officer, Sergeant Dan Newberry, reaches Victoria's body, he attempts to find a pulse and he's up able to do so. Paramedics come in, they look for any signs of life, and unfortunately there are none.

Now, the defendant is taken out of the immediate area and eventually taken to a police car, he's put in the back seat of a patrol car. And he starts making statements that are spontaneous statements. So in other words, statements that are not in response to any questions that anybody had asked him.

And what he says at one point is I swear to God, V -and he would refer to Victoria as V -- I swear to God, V, I
didn't mean to hurt you. What I -- what did I do wrong? Let's
go do the ten years. Homicide detectives respond to the scene,
along with other members of law enforcement. Crime scene
analysts, the CSI people that we see on TV sometimes, they
respond to the scene.

The knife that was used to stab Victoria is located and impounded. It's photographed and packaged for forensic testing. They noticed that the defendant has received a cut on his hand. He has blood on his hand. And what you will learn is that in violent attacks it is not at all uncommon for the

ROUGH DRAFT TRANSCRIPT

stabber to actually suffer some injury on his hands while perpetrating the crime.

Now, the knife that was used to kill Victoria was processed by DNA scientists. And you will learn that they attempted to get fingerprints from the knife. And you will learn of the various techniques they employed, but they were unable to do so. The most they could do was get a partial print on the handle of the knife, but there was not sufficient information on that print to make a comparison.

You will learn that the blood on the knife and the knife itself was also processed by a DNA expert by the name of Jennifer Bas. And analyst Bas found just what one would expect. On the very end of the handle and the blood on the very top part of the blade, that blood was the defendant's blood.

Blood found in the middle of the blade was determined to be a mixture of Victoria's blood and the defendant's blood.

And blood on the very end of the tip of the knife was Victoria's blood.

Now, an autopsy was conducted on Victoria's body just two days later on November 7th of 2008. And the autopsy was conducted by a medical doctor by the name of Jacqueline Benjamin. And she will tell you that Victoria died as a result of a stab wound to the right side of her chest.

However, there are many other things that Dr.

ROUGH DRAFT TRANSCRIPT

Benjamin was able to learn during the course of the autopsy.

As part of that process, the blood is analyzed. And as I

alluded to before, she found evidence of Effexor in Victoria's

blood. She also found a large quantity of alcohol. Her blood

alcohol was 24. Probably some of you have heard that the legal

limit in the State of Nevada is 08. Well, Victoria's was 24,

well over that limit.

There was also a great deal of blunt force trauma on Victoria's body. And that really is just a fancy way of saying that her body was badly bruised. Now, while it is true that Victoria suffered from the disease of Hepatitis C, which accentuates bruising in the body, in other words it makes it more visible, you will learn that each bruise on Victoria's body represents some form of trauma or hitting.

Many of the bruises will be described by Dr. Benjamin as acute or recent. But you will learn that Victoria suffered trauma on her head, both the front of her head and the back of her head. The head trauma was acute. She had trauma on her chest. She had trauma on her back. She had trauma on her buttocks. She had suffered trauma on her left arm, on her right arm, on her left leg, on the right leg.

So much bruising, in fact, on this woman's body that Dr. Jacqueline Benjamin listed blunt trauma as an other significant condition in her death. An anonymous domestic violence survivor once made this observation. If you can't be

thankful for what you have, be thankful for what you have escaped. Well, unfortunately Victoria was not able to escape from the defendant, and he murdered her in a brutal way.

At the conclusion of this trial we will ask you for justice for Victoria's murder. We will ask you to find the defendant guilty of murder of the second degree with use of a deadly weapon. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Lalli. Ms. Palm, do you wish to exercise your right for an opening at this time?

MS. PALM: I do, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right.

DEFENSE'S OPENING STATEMENT

MS. PALM: Thank you. Good afternoon again, ladies and gentlemen. This is where we get to give our road map of how the evidence -- how we expect the evidence to come in and what we would like you to pay attention to as it comes in, what we think is important about this case.

This -- the evidence is going to show you that this is not a murder case. This is not any kind of killing by my client, Brian O'Keefe. The only way you can get to murder in this case is by exaggerating, exaggerating what the bruises on Victoria's body mean. By that mean, I mean she had advanced cirrhosis. She had Hepatitis C. She was drinking that night.

She -- from Hepatitis C and cirrhosis, you bruise on slighter than normal contact. Some of those bruises on her

legs, you'll hear, were most likely from bumping into things. This woman was very drunk at the time that she was -- at the time that she died and at the time that they performed her autopsy. So you can't rule out that she got some of those bruises from just walking around.

The other thing you're going to find out is that bruise cannot be dated, not with any kind of scientific certainty. Some of the bruises they show you in those pictures had green on them. If -- if you talk about how bruises age, they start with red, they kind of go maroon, then they kind of lighten up, start getting green around the edges. Some of those bruises had those. None of them can be tied to the time of her death. And I think that doctor Benjamin will testify that way and certainly our medical examiner's going to testify that way.

So I think to -- to get where they want you to get, you have to rely on extreme exaggeration of the evidence, of the evidence of the bruising in the context of her entire body, and, you know, don't be fooled by multiple pictures of the same bruise or -- or bruises blown up. Look at the pictures of the entire body and see -- see how many bruises this woman had and if they look old and if the testimony comes in that they're -- they can't be tied to the time of her death.

She could have gotten those bruises from accidentally stumbling around. And she could have gotten bruises from the

police bumping into her body, which is going to be another issue in this case. The -- the room that they were arrested in was -- or the -- that Brian was arrested in when the police came in was extremely small. And you will hear testimony from the police who tried very hard to avoid, admitting that they might have bumped into her.

S

13 .

But the fact is they had to go over her body to get to him. And there's only one report that even references the fact that the arrest involved her body at all. And that report is a private report called a use of force report. It's not in any of the regular police reports. But they did have to go over her body, and it's possible they bumped into her during that process.

And when they tazed Brian, he fell on top of her body, and there's four or five policemen there trying to get him into custody. So I think that the evidence is not going to convince you that these bruises are any reliable evidence of any kind of beating.

I want to go back and talk about Brian for a minute. Brian -- Brian has had a problem with alcohol for a very long time. He -- when he was 17 years old he went into the 82nd Airborne Army. When he was 18 years old he married his first wife, Pamela Sue. When he was 20 years old he got a bronze star for meritorious achievement in combat.

When he was 20, his first child was born. When he

was 21, he was promoted to sergeant. He had two more children at the age of 24 and 26. And then that marriage fell apart.

Brian was drinking a lot. And that marriage ended when he was 30. And then he met his second wife out here and got married when he was 34, and he had two more little girls by that wife.

And because of his current alcoholism that marriage fell apart.

And in 2001, Brian was admitted to Monte Vista
Hospital. And he was admitted for detox. He was trying to
deal with his alcoholism. And so he's in there and that's
where he meets Victoria Whitmarsh. And Victoria was in there
herself getting treatment for psychological issues. She had
tried to kill herself.

And she reported that what happened in that incident was that she got in an argument with her husband, she went beserk, and she tried to cut herself and she overdosed. And Victoria also admitted to a long history of self-mutilation. By the time of her death she had been self-mutilating for about 15 years. And her problem, as she reported it, I cut myself when I'm angry. And she turned to knives and she turned to scissors.

So in 2001, Brian and Victoria meet and these two very flawed people cling onto each other. She start a relationship. And during that relationship he did go to prison for domestic violence. And he was in prison and they stopped contact, and he got out, and in early 2008, he's going on with