IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

No. 69139

GENARO PERRY

Appellant,

VS.

STATE OF NEVADA

Respondent.

Appeal from a Judgment of Conviction

Eight Judicial District Court, Clark County

The Honorable Elissa F. Cadish, District Court

APPENDIX VOLUME II

TRAVIS E. SHETLER, ESQ. Travis E. Shelter, P.C. Nevada Bar No. 004747 844 E. Sahara Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada 89104 Telephone: (702) 866-0091 Fax: (702) 866-0093 Counsel for Appellant GENARO PERRY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Appendix Volume I

Case Summary	AA 00001-00004
Initial Arraignment Minutes	AA 00005
Amended Criminal Complaint	AA 00006-00009
Preliminary Hearing	AA 00010
Information	AA 00011-00014
Jury Trial Day 1	AA 00015-00149
Jury Trial Day 2	AA 00150-00161
Calendar Call Transcript	AA 00162-00167
Petrocelli Hearing	AA 00168-00181
Calendar Call Transcript	AA 00182-00186

CASE SUMMARY CASE NO. C-14-298879-1

State of Nevada vs Genaro Perry

Defendant

Perry, Genaro Richard

Location: Department 6
Judicial Officer: Filed on: 06/19/2014
Cross-Reference Case Number: Defendant's Scope ID #: 1456173
ITAG Case ID: 1599129

Lower Court Case # Root: 14F07966 Lower Court Case Number: 14F07966X

Case Information			
Offense 1. ROBBERY WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON 2. FALSE IMPRISONMENT WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON 3. GRAND LARCENY AUTO 4. ASSAULT WITH A DEADLY WEAPON	Deg F F F	Date Case Type: 05/01/2014 Case Flags: 05/01/2014 05/01/2014	Felony/Gross Misdemeanor Ball Set Appealed to Supreme Court Custody Status - In Custody Charge Description Updated In Custody - CCDC
5. COERCION 6. BATTERY RESULTING IN SUBSTANTIAL BODILY HARM CONSTITUTING DOMESTIC VIOLENCE	F	05/01/2014 05/01/2014	
7. PREVENTING OR DISSUADING WITNESS OR VICTIM FROM REPORTING CRIME OR COMMENCING PROSECUTION	Ţ.	05/01/2014	

DATE	CASE ASSIGNMENT		
	Current Case Assignment		
	Case Number Court Date Assigned Judicial Officer	C-14-298879-1 Department 6 06/19/2014 Cadish, Elissa F.	

PARTY INFORMATION

		702-866-0091(W) Wolfson, Steven B 702-671-2700(W)	
Plaintiff	State of Nevada		
DATE	EVENTS & ORDERS OF THE COURT	LNDEX	
06/19/2014	Criminal Bindover Criminal Bindover		
06/25/2014	Internation Information		
06/25/2014	Notice of Witnesses and/or Expert Witnesses Notice of Expert Witnesses		
06/26/2014	Initial Arraignment (1:00 PM) (Judicial Officer: De La Garza, Melisa)		

Lead Attorneys

Shetler, Travis E Retained

CASE SUMMARY CASE NO. C-14-298879-1

06/29/2014	Reporters Transcript
	Reporter's Transcript of Walver of Preliminary Hearing 06-19-14
07/03/2014	Supplemental Wilness List Supplemental Notice of Expert Wilnesses
07/03/2014	Notice of Witnesses and/or Expert Witnesses Notice of Witnesses
07/09/2014	Notice of Witnesses and/or Expert Witnesses Notice of Witnesses
07/21/2014	Calendar Call (9:30 AM) (Judicial Officer: Cadish, Elissa F.)
(77/28/2014	CANCELED Jury Trial (10:00 AM) (Judicial Officer: Cadish, Elissa F.) Vacated - per Judge
09/22/2014	Calendar Call (9:30 AM) (Judicial Officer: Cadish, Elissa F.)
09/23/2014	Stipulation and Order Stipulation and Order to Continue Trial
09/29/2014	CANCELED Jury Trial (10:00 AM) (Judicial Officer: Cadish, Elissa F.) Vacated - per Judge
10/16/2014	Ex Parte Molion Ex Parte Molion for Release of Medical Records
(0/16/2014	2] Order to Release Medical Records Order Releasing Medical Records
10/17/2014	Ex Parte Motion Ex Parte Motion for Release of Medical Records
10/17/2014	Ex Parte Motion Ex Parte Motion for Release of Medical Records
10/17/2014	Order to Release Medical Records Order Releasing Medical Records
10/17/2014	Order to Release Medical Records Order Releasing Medical Records
11/24/2014	Calendar Call (9:30 AM) (Judicial Officer: Cadish, Elissa F.)
12/01/2014	CANCELED Jury Trial (10:00 AM) (Judicial Officer: Cadish, Elissa F.) Vacated - per Judge
01/08/2015	Supplemental Witness List Supplemental Notice of Witnesses

CASE SUMMARY CASE NO. C-14-298879-1

	CASE NO. C-14-298879-1
02/09/2015	Calendar Call (9:30 AM) (Judicial Officer: Cadish, Elissa F.)
02/17/2015	CANCELED Jury Trial (10:00 AM) (Judicial Officer: Cadish, Elissa F.) Vacated - per Judge
02/18/2015	Status Check (8:30 AM) (Judicial Officer: Cadish, Eliasa F.) 02/18/2015, 02/23/2015 Status Check Negotiations
04/27/2015	(2) Calendar Cull (9:30 AM) (Judicial Officer: Cadish, Elissa F.) 04/27/2015, 04/29/2015
05/04/2015	CANCELED Jury Trial (10:00 AM) (Judicial Officer: Cadish, Elissa F.) Vacated - per Judge
05/06/2015	2] Jury Trial (1:30 PM) (Judicial Officer: Cadish, Elissa F.) 05/06/2015-05/07/2015
05/14/2015	Supplemental Witness List Second Supplemental Notice of Expert Witnesses
06/15/2015	Motion Motion to Admit Evidence Pursuant to NRS 48,045
07/01/2015	Ex Parte Motion Ex Parte Motion for Release of Medical Records
07/01/2015	Order Order Releasing Medical Records
07/01/2015	Ex Parte Motion Ex Parte Motion for Release of Medical Records
07/01/2015	Order Order Releasing Medical Records
07/01/2015	Ex Parte Motion Ex Parte Motion for Release of Medical Records
07/01/2015	Order Order Releasing Medical Records
07/01/2015	Ex Parte Motion Ex Parte Motion for Release of Medical Records
07/01/2015	Order Order Releasing Medical Records
07/01/2015	Ex Parte Motion Ex Parte Motion for Release of Medical Records
07/01/2015	Order

CASE SUMMARY CASE NO. C-14-298879-1

	Order Releasing Medical Records
07/01/2015	Ex Parte Motion Ex Parte Motion for Release of Medical Records
07/01/2015	ब्र्न्ड Order Order Releasing Medical Records
07/20/2015	Opposition State's Opposition to Defendant's Motion to Admit Evidence Pursuant to NRS 48.045
08/05/2015	Notice of Motion State's Notice of Motion and Motion to Admit Evidence Pursuant to NRS 48,045
08/11/2015	Opposition to Motion Opposition to State's Motion to Admit Evidence Pursuant to NRS 48.045
08/31/2015	Motion to Admit Evidence (8:30 AM) (Judicial Officer: Cadish, Elissa F.) 08/31/2015, 09/17/2015 Motion to Admit Evidence Pursuant to NRS 48.045
09/17/2015	Petrocelli Hearing (8:30 AM) (Judicial Officer: Cadish, Elissa F.)
09/17/2015	All Pending Motions (8:30 AM) (Judicial Officer: Cadish, Elissa F.)
09/21/2015	Calendar Call (9:30 AM) (Judicial Officer: Cadish, Elissa F.)
09/28/2015	CANCELED Jury Trial (10:00 AM) (Judicial Officer: Cadish, Elissa F.) Vacated - per Judge
09/29/2015	Bench Trial (1:30 PM) (Judicial Officer: Cadish, Elissa F.) 09/29/2015-10/01/2015
[0/01/2015	& Verdict
10/01/2015	Stipulation and Order Filed by: Plaintiff State of Nevada Stipulation and Order
10/01/2015	Listructions to the Jury
11/04/2015	Notice of Appeal (criminal) Notice of Appeal
11/16/2015	Sentencing (8:30 AM) (Judicial Officer: Cadish, Elissa F.)

DISTRICT COURT CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

Felony/Gross Misdemeanor

COURT MINUTES

June 26, 2014

C-14-298879-1

State of Nevada

Genaro Perry

Tune 26, 2014

1:00 PM

Initial Arraignment

HEARD BY: De La Garza, Melisa

COURTROOM: RJC Lower Level Arraignment

COURT CLERK: Dania Batiste

Deborah Miller

RECORDER:

Kiara Schmidt

REPORTER:

PARTIES

PRESENT:

Perry, Genaro Richard

Roberts, Tara M. Smillie, Ross State of Nevada

Defendant

Attorney Attorney Plaintiff

JOURNAL ENTRIES

- DEFT. PERRY ARRAIGNED, PLED NOT GUILTY, and INVOKED the 60-DAY RULE. COURT ORDERED, matter set for trial. COURT ORDERED, pursuant to Statute, Counsel has 21 days from today for the filing of any Writs; if the Preliminary Hearing Transcript has not been filed as of today, Counsel has 21 days from the filing of the Transcript.

CUSTODY (COC)

7/21/2014 9:30 A.M. Calendar Call (Dept. 6) 7/28/2014 10:00 A.M. Jury Trial (Dept. 6)

PRINT DATE: 11/06/2015

Page 1 of 21

Minutes Date:

June 26, 2014

FILED IN OPEN COURTON

JUSTICE COURT, LAS VEGAS TOWNSHIP CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

2

1

3

THE STATE OF NEVADA,

-VS-

Plaintiff,

Defendant.

GENARO RICHARD PERRY #1456173.

4

5

6

7

8

9 10

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23 24

25

26

27

28

CASE NO: 14F07966X

DEPT NO:

AMENDED

10

CRIMINAL COMPLAINT

The Defendant above named having committed the crimes of ROBBERY WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON (Category B Felony - NRS 200.380, 193.165 - 50138); FALSE IMPRISONMENT WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON (Category B Felony - NRS 200.460 - 50185); GRAND LARCENY AUTO (Category B Felony - NRS 205.228.2 -56011); ASSAULT WITH A DEADLY WEAPON (Category B Felony - NRS 200.471 -50201); COERCION (Category B Felony - NRS 207.190 - 53159); BATTERY RESULTING IN SUBSTANTIAL BODILY HARM CONSTITUTING DOMESTIC VIOLENCE (Category C Felony - NRS 200.481; 200.485; 33.018 - 57937) and PREVENTING OR DISSUADING WITNESS OR VICTIM FROM REPORTING CRIME OR COMMENCING PROSECUTION (Category D Felony - NRS 199.305 - 52996), in the manner following, towit: That the said Defendant, on or about the 1st day of May, 2014, at and within the County of Clark, State of Nevada,

did then and there wilfully, unlawfully, and feloniously take personal property, to-wit: car keys and/or cellular telephone, from the person of CORLA CARPENTER, or in her presence, by means of force or violence, or fear of injury to, and without the consent and against the will of the said CORLA CARPENTER, with use of a deadly weapon, to-wit: a knife.

COUNT 2 - FALSE IMPRISONMENT WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON

COUNT 1 - ROBBERY WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON

did then and there wilfully and unlawfully confine and detain, without sufficient legal

 authority, the personal liberty of another, to-wit: CORLA CARPENTER, with use of a deadly weapon, to-wit: a knife, by battering the said CORLA CARPENTER and threatening her by said knife and refusing to allow her to leave.

COUNT 3 - GRAND LARCENY AUTO



did then and there wilfully, unlawfully, feloniously, and intentionally, with intent to deprive the owner permanently thereof, steal, take and carry away, drive away or otherwise remove a motor vehicle owned by another person, having a value of \$3,500.00, or greater, in the possession of CORLA CARPENTER, to-wit: a 1999 Mercedes CLK 430, bearing Nevada License No. 617LTU.

did then and there wilfully, unlawfully, feloniously and intentionally place another person in reasonable apprehension of immediate bodily harm and/or did willfully and unlawfully attempt to use physical force against another person, to-wit: CORLA CARPENTER, with use of a deadly weapon, to-wit: a knife, by threatening to kill the said CORLA CARPENTER while holding said knife and/or by slashing at/towards her with said knife and/or by holding said knife to her throat.

COUNT 5 - COERCION

did then and there wilfully, unlawfully, and feloniously use physical force, or the immediate threat of such force, against CORLA CARPENTER, with intent to compel her to do, or abstain from doing, an act which she had a right to do, or abstain from doing, by throwing the telephone belonging to the said CORLA CARPENTER against the wall and/or into the toilet to prevent her from calling the police and/or by not allowing her to leave the residence.

COUNT 6 - BATTERY RESULTING IN SUBSTANTIAL BODILY HARM / . \ CONSTITUTING DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

did then and there wilfully, unlawfully, and feloniously use force or violence upon the person of his spouse, former spouse, or any other person to whom he is related by blood or marriage, a person with whom he is or was actually residing, a person with whom he has had

or is having a dating relationship, a person with whom he has a child in common, the minor child of any of those persons or his minor child, to-wit: CORLA CARPENTER, by grabbing the said CORLA CARPENTER and striking her head against/into the floor and/or by kicking her repeatedly in the face, resulting in substantial bodily harm to the said CORLA CARPENTER.

COUNT 7 - PREVENTING OR DISSUADING WITNESS OR VICTIM FROM REPORTING CRIME OR COMMENCING PROSECUTION

did then and there wilfully, unlawfully, and feloniously, by intimidation or threats, prevent or dissuade, or hinder or delay CORLA CARPENTER, from reporting a crime to the police by threatening to kill the said CORLA CARPENTER and her husband if she called the police.

All of which is contrary to the form, force and effect of Statutes in such cases made and provided and against the peace and dignity of the State of Nevada. Said Complainant makes this declaration subject to the penalty of perjury.

(Mac

14F07966X/td/dvu LVMPD EV# 1405011127;

(TK14)

NOTICE OF WITNESSES [NRS 174.234] TO: Defendant or attorney of record: YOU, AND EACH OF YOU, WILL PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that the STATE OF NEVADA intends to call the following witnesses: NAME ADDRESS CUSTODIAN OF RECORDS Communication Bureau Law Enforcement Agency – Clark County, Nevada These witnesses are in addition to those witnesses noted in the discovery or other documents provided. DATED May 29, 2014.

1 TRAN MARE NO. GOVESTO 2 3 IN THE JUSTICE'S COURT OF LAS VEGAS TOWNSHIP 4 COUNTY OF CLARK, STATE OF MEYADA 5 6 STATE OF DEVADA, 7 Plaintiff. 8 CASS No. 1470"360A 9 SEMARE STOCKET PERSON, 10 Sefendant. 11 12 13 ASPORTER'S PRANSCRIPT 14 06 15 WALVER OF PRELIMINARY MEARING 16 BEFORE THE HONORABLE MELANIE ANDRESS-TOBLASSON JUSTICE OF THE PEACE 17 THOPSDAY, COHE 19, 2014 18 19 APPEARANCES: 20 21 TRESERV POGAB Deputy District Attracy For the State: 22 23 For the Defendant: ROSS SMOTLEE Attorney at Law 24 25 l Reported by: Donna J. McCord, CCR #337

1

25

3

```
1
       MAS YEGAS, METACA, JOHN 19, 1919, 10:00 A.M.
2
3
                        . . . . 1
4
5
             THE COURT: 14F07966X, Genaro Perry. He
ő
    la present in custody with Mr. Smille.
             MR. SMILLIE: Good morning, your Honor.
7
8
             THE COURT: Good morning. What's the
9
    status?
10
             MR. SMILLIE: We want to walve pretim and
11
    get an arraignment date.
12
             THE COURT: So you're waiving the prelim
13
    unconditionally without negotiations?
14
             MR. SMILLIE: There were negotiations but
15
    they have fallen through.
16
             THE COURT: Okay, So it's an
17
    unconditional walver without negotlations at this
    point?
18
             MR. ROGAN: That's correct,
19
20
             THE COURT: All right. So, sir, do you
21
    understand that?
22
             THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.
23
             THE COURT: All right. You've discussed
24
    that with your attorney?
```

THE DEFENDANT: Absolutely.

THE COURT: Do you understand when you ጎ 2 unconditionally waive your right to a preliminary 3 hearing you're giving up that right forever? 4 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am. 5 THE COURT: At a preliminary hearing you 6 would have the right to confront the State's 7 witnesses. You'd also have the right to testify and 8 present your own evidence. You're giving up those 9 rights as well; do you understand? 10 (At this time, Mr. Smille consulted 11 with the defendant.) THE COURT: Not forever, just at a 12 13 prellminary hearing. 14 THE DEFENDANT: Oh, yes, ma'am. THE COURT: All right. When you get up to 15 16 District Court one of two things will happen, this 17 case will either get negotiated or it will go to 18 trial, it just won't come back here for a 19 preliminary hearing; do you understand? 20 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am. 21 THE COURT: All right. It appears to me 22 from the complaint on file that crimes have been 23 committed, to-wit: Count 1, robbery with use of a 24 deadly weapon; Count 2, false imprisonment with use of a deadly weapon; Count 3, grand larceny auto;

1 Count 4, assault with a deadly weapon; Count 5, 2 coercion; Count 6, battery resulting in substantial bodily harm constituting domestic violence; and 3 4 Count 7, preventing or dissuading a witness or 5 victim from reporting crime or commencing 6 prosocution, and the defendant having 7 unconditionally waived his right to a preliminary 8 hearing, I hereby order said defendant be held to 9 answer to said charges in the Eighth Judicial 10 District Court, County of Clark, State of Nevada at 11 the following date and time. 12 THE CLERK: June 26th, 1:00 p.m. THE COURT: You will be remanded on Counts 13 14 6 and 7 but the bail won't change, it will just stay 15 the amount It is now. 16 17 18 Attest: Full, crue, accurate transcript of 19 proceedings, 20 /S/Engage I, Roding a promise to Manager Top approximation of the contract of 21 22 23 24 25

AA 00010

Electronically Filed 1 INFIM 06/25/2014 09:15:00 AM STEVEN B. WOLFSON 2 Clark County District Attorney Nevada Bar #001565 3 ROBERT STEPHENS Deputy District Attorney CLERK OF THE COURT 4 Nevada Bar #011286 200 Lewis Avenue 5 Las Vegas, Nevada 89155-2212 (702) 671-2500 6 Attorney for Plaintiff 7 I.A. 06/26/14 DISTRICT COURT 1:00 PM CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA T, SHETLER 8 9 THE STATE OF NEVADA, CASE NO: C-14-298879-1 10 Plaintiff, DEPT NO: VΙ 11 GENARO RICHARD PERRY. 12 #1456173, 13 INFORMATION Defendant. 14 STATE OF NEVADA 15 \$8. COUNTY OF CLARK 16 STEVEN B. WOLFSON, District Attorney within and for the County of Clark, State 17 of Nevada, in the name and by the authority of the State of Nevada, informs the Court: 18 That GENARO RICHARD PERRY, the Defendant(s) above named, having committed 19 the crimes of ROBBERY WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON (Category B Felony -20 NRS 200,380, 193,165 - NOC 50138); FALSE IMPRISONMENT WITH USE OF A 21 DEADLY WEAPON (Category B Felony - NRS 200,460 - NOC 50185); GRAND 22 LARCENY AUTO (Category B Felony - NRS 205.228.3 - NOC 56014); ASSAULT 23 WITH A DEADLY WEAPON (Category B Felony - NRS 200.471 - NOC 50201): 24 COERCION (Category B Felony - NRS 207,190 - NOC 53159); BATTERY 25 RESULTING IN SUBSTANTIAL BODILY HARM CONSTITUTING DOMESTIC 26 VIOLENCE (Category C Felony - NRS 200,481; 200,485; 33,018 - NOC 57937) and 2.7 PREVENTING OR DISSUADING WITNESS OR VICTIM FROM REPORTING 28

CRIME OR COMMENCING PROSECUTION (Category D Felony - NRS 199,305 -

NOC 52996), on or about the 1st day of May, 2014, within the County of Clark, State of Nevada, contrary to the form, force and effect of statutes in such cases made and provided, and against the peace and dignity of the State of Nevada,

COUNT 1 - ROBBERY WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON

did then and there wilfully, unlawfully, and feloniously take personal property, to-wit: car keys and/or cellular telephone, from the person of CORLA CARPENTER, or in her presence, by means of force or violence, or fear of injury to, and without the consent and against the will of the said CORLA CARPENTER, with use of a deadly weapon, to-wit: a knife.

COUNT 2 - FALSE IMPRISONMENT WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON

did then and there wilfully and unlawfully confine and detain, without sufficient legal authority, the personal liberty of another, to-wit: CORLA CARPENTER, with use of a deadly weapon, to-wit: a knife, by battering the said CORLA CARPENTER and threatening her by said knife and refusing to allow her to leave.

COUNT 3 - GRAND LARCENY AUTO

did then and there wilfully, unlawfully, feloniously, and intentionally, with intent to deprive the owner permanently thereof, steal, take and carry away, drive away or otherwise remove a motor vehicle owned by another person, having a value of \$3,500.00, or greater, in the possession of CORLA CARPENTER, to-wit: a 1999 Mercedes CLK 430, bearing Nevada License No. 617LTU.

COUNT 4 - ASSAULT WITH A DEADLY WEAPON

did then and there wilfully, unlawfully, feloniously and intentionally place another person in reasonable apprehension of immediate bodily harm and/or did willfully and unlawfully attempt to use physical force against another person, to-wit: CORLA CARPENTER, with use of a deadly weapon, to-wit: a knife, by threatening to kill the said CORLA CARPENTER while holding said knife and/or by slashing at/towards her with said knife and/or by holding said knife to her throat.

COUNT 5 - COERCION

did then and there wilfully, unlawfully, and feloniously use physical force, or the immediate threat of such force, against CORLA CARPENTER, with intent to compel her to do, or abstain from doing, an act which she had a right to do, or abstain from doing, by throwing the telephone belonging to the said CORLA CARPENTER against the wall and/or into the toilet to prevent her from calling the police and/or by not allowing her to leave the residence.

COUNT'6 - BATTERY RESULTING IN SUBSTANTIAL BODILY HARM CONSTITUTING DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

did then and there wilfully, unlawfully, and feloniously use force or violence upon the person of his spouse, former spouse, or any other person to whom he is related by blood or marriage, a person with whom he is or was actually residing, a person with whom he has had or is having a dating relationship, a person with whom he has a child in common, the minor child of any of those persons or his minor child, to-wit: CORLA CARPENTER, by grabbing the said CORLA CARPENTER and striking her head against/into the floor and/or by kicking her repeatedly in the face, resulting in substantial bodily harm to the said CORLA CARPENTER.

COUNT 7 - PREVENTING OR DISSUADING WITNESS OR VICTIM FROM REPORTING CRIME OR COMMENCING PROSECUTION

did then and there wilfully, unlawfully, and feloniously, by intimidation or threats, prevent or dissuade, or hinder or delay CORLA CARPENTER, from reporting a crime to the

///

///

23 | ///

24 | ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1	police by threatening to kill the said CORLA CARPENTER and her husband if she called the		
2	police,		
3	STEV	VEN B. WOLFSON	
4	Ciark Neva	County District Attorney da Bar #001565	
5	nxr	RIVAT	
6	BY	ROBERT STEPHENS	
7	,	Deputy District Attorney Nevada Bar #011286	
8			
9			
10	Names of witnesses known to the District Attorney's Office at the time of filing this		
11	Information are as follows:		
12	NAME	<u>ADDRESS</u>	
13	BRAGG, ALMEDIA M.	LVMPD #4150	
14	CARPENTER, CORLA	C/O DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S OFFICE	
15	CUSTODIAN OF RECORDS	CCDC	
16	CUSTODIAN OF RECORDS	LVMPD COMMUNICATIONS	
17	CUSTODIAN OF RECORDS	LVMPD RECORDS	
18	LASTER, GEORGE TIMOTHY	LVMPD #5658	
19	MARRIOTT, DEBORAH	District Attorney Investigator	
20	PATTERSON, DEBRA	District Attorney Process Server	
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27	DA#14F07966X/td/dvu LYMPD EV#1405011127; 1312092558		
28	(TK14)		

Electronically Filed 04/13/2016 02:04:38 PM

RTRAN CLERK OF THE COURT 2 3 4 5 DISTRICT COURT CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA 7 8 CASE #: C298879-1 THE STATE OF NEVADA, 9 DEPT. VI. Plaintiff, 10 VS. 11 12 GENARO PERRY, 13 Defendant. 14 15 16 BEFORE THE HONORABLE ELISSA F. CADISH, DISTRICT COURT JUDGE WEDNESDAY, MAY 6, 2015 17 RECORDER'S ROUGH DRAFT TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS 18 JURY TRIAL - DAY 1 19 20

APPEARANCES:

For the State:

MICHELLE SUDANO, ESQ. COLLEEN BAHARAV, ESQ. **Deputy District Attorneys**

22

For the Defendant: TRAVIS S. SHETLER, ESQ.

24 25

23

21

RECORDED BY: JESSICA KIRKPATRICK, COURT RECORDER

Rough Draft Transcript - Day 1, Page 1

1

[Outside the presence of the prospective jury panel]

4

3

THE COURT: All right, folks. Go ahead and state your appearances for the

5

record.

MS. BAHARAV: Colleen Baharav, bar number 1177 and Michelle Sudano.

6 7

bar number 13260 on behalf of the State.

8

MR. SHETLER: Good afternoon, Your Honor. I'm Travis Shetler, 4747, on

behalf of Genaro Perry who is present in custody.

10

THE COURT: Okay. So, I appreciate you putting over the start of the trial till today from yesterday because of some unexpected issues I had to deal with

11 12

vesterday and for the late start now. Apparently we're having some technical

13

difficulties with the recorder's computer.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24 25

Now I need to make sure this happens. So, in terms of scheduling, I had as I normally do an evidentiary hearing set for tomorrow morning. Usually that's what I do Thursday mornings although we were just told a little while ago that the attorney on that case seems to think that that evidentiary hearing will take like several hours. And so given where we are on this trial and a couple other issues, I'm getting that hearing ready. I'm going to end up pushing that hearing off to another day. It's on a habeas petition, a post-conviction habeas, and so there was just no way to do it all. So, I'm going to have to put that one off which means on the good side for you guys that I'm free all tomorrow morning. So, I was -- and I don't know what your schedules are like; I don't know how far hopefully we can get jury selection done, but maybe we could start at nine tomorrow morning if that works for you. I don't know what your --

 MR. SHETLER: I was just, with the Court's indulgence, I can check the DV calendar on a contract attorney down there and Ms. Baharav has one case, she thinks.

MS. BAHARAV: Yes. Mine should not be that big a deal though. So, I can always give mine to somebody else. But I know that Travis or Mr. Shetler is in charge of his track in domestic violence and tomorrow is his day. So, I'm not sure if there's anything for him there.

THE COURT: Okay. Well obviously if you've got those issues we'll work around them. I'm trying to make sure we're able to get the trial done.

MR. SHETLER: Right,

MS. BAHARAV: And, Your Honor, we've — in that vein, we have had some communications about making sure we're finished on Friday. Mr. Shetler has a trial that's supposed to start on Monday next week --

THE COURT: Right.

MS. BAHARAV: -- which is pretty important as well as this.

THE COURT: That's what I gather.

MS. BAHARAV: Right. And so the State in this trial is making every effort that we can to accommodate that particular trial schedule. So, we've already had some discussions about potentially stipulating to some medical records in lieu of a doctor's testimony on Friday. We're hoping that we won't get there, but if that's what has to happen then we'll resolve it.

THE COURT: The doctor's testimony you mean?

MS. BAHARAV: Yes. We are anticipating having a doctor testify at 11 a.m. on Friday. It looks like we won't -- if having that person testify will result in us moving the trial into Monday we -- between counsel and the State have discussed

6 7

8

9 10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22 23

24

25

potentially stipulating to admission of medical records in lieu of live testimony. I'm including some documentation from the Defense expert as well. So, we'll address that tomorrow depending on where we are per the Court.

THE COURT: Okay. Thanks.

MR. SHETLER: I do have -- it looks like there are two prelims and some status checks. Those are generally relatively quick.

THE COURT: Tomorrow?

MR. SHETLER: Tomorrow is going to be challenging. The Court knows that I'm trial for most of the month. So, we'll get it done as quick as we can. The only other concern I have is we have calendar call for overflow, but myself and Mr. Stevens had that Friday morning on the case for next week. That should be relatively quick, but it's early on Friday.

THE COURT: Right, right. That's at 8:30.

MR. SHETLER: You're correct, Your Honor.

MS. BAHARAV: Yes, with Judge Barker.

THE COURT: So, what are you looking at tomorrow -- so would those matters that you have tomorrow, what time realistically do you think we can start?

MR. SHETLER: Justice Tobiasson, I believe, is still out and so that can sometimes slow down the calendar a little bit.

THE COURT: Right. So, you got to pro tem?

MR. SHETLER: Right. They do try to keep it somewhat consistently for each week. And so I'll just push and depending on how long my people have been in custody that's where I run into the biggest rub.

MS. BAHARAV: Do you think eleven would be too soon?

MR. SHETLER: I would certainly think that by eleven we would if not be

ready. I would know if I was going to have prelims by eleven -- I'm sorry Judge -- I had two lawyers. I just don't anymore.

THE COURT: Okay. So, I mean, I just -- I need to put it on calendar for sometime tomorrow.

MR. SHETLER: If we said eleven do you think that's reasonable.

THE COURT: Eleven? Well that would give time for them to deal with the technical issues in the morning. I mean, as long -- I mean, you guys know the case. I don't know the case.

MR. SHETLER: Colleen's been there a million times two -- excuse me -- Ms. Baharav.

MS. BAHARAV: How many -- you said you have two prelims?

MR. SHETLER: Two separate clients, one has two cases.

MS. BAHARAV: Okay. Your Honor, when we're finished today -- or actually I can text the person who is handling the calendar tomorrow and to see if we have something in returns for his clients for tomorrow. That will obviously speed up the process if we're not able to proceed. So, I'll communicate with my team to make sure right now what the timing is for that, but I think eleven would be a good conservative estimate for tomorrow if that's okay with the Court.

MR. SHETLER: And certainly if I've got some earlier indication which we may have; I can get word to chambers. But it doesn't help --

THE COURT: Right, right.

MR. SHETLER: -- for the jury, yeah.

THE COURT: Right. We need to -- I need to put it on calendar for a certain time. Obviously by the end of the day we'll need to let the jurors know what time they're coming back; eleven?

THE COURT: Yeah. Why don't we -- we may end up here a little late after

25

5

7

8

10 11

12

13 14

15

16

17 18

19

20 21

22

23

24 25 five this evening, but why don't we try to get the jurors in and then we can talk after that. Probably we should try to do that today rather than waiting until eleven tomorrow.

MR. SHETLER: Right.

MS. BAHARAV: And, Your Honor, I was going to review the jury instructions provided by the Defense. The only thing that I saw that was different was the selfdefense instructions. The State has actually provided the total self-defense instruction packet.

THE COURT: Right.

MS. BAHARAV: So, if there is evidence of self-defense obviously that will -those will come in. It's my understanding the remaining jury instructions were the same as ours. So, jury instructions should also take a short period of time to settle.

MR. SHETLER: And it is sometimes possible that in that DV track sometimes there's a little bit of a gap in there between about 9:15 and 10:15 where if we did have an evidentiary issue we might be able to pop in here. I don't know how much the Judge would love that, of course but --

THE COURT: I mean, if I'm available I don't mind trying to accommodate.

MR. SHETLER: We'll probably get it taken care of this evening. Thank you.

THE COURT: And just to add more complication, although it's right here, but I've got a committee -- I'm the chair of the Bar's Law Related Education committee and we're having a meeting tomorrow at noon back here in the jury rooms. I don't have to go far so it's not a huge deal.

MR. SHETLER: They did mention that, yes.

THE COURT: I'm supposed to be going tomorrow evening to the Federal Bar Association dinner, you know, right after work. We'll do what we can. Obviously we

.16

need to make sure that the case gets the attention it needs -

MR. SHETLER: Right.

THE COURT: -- while we accommodate all of our schedules, but hopefully we can do that.

MR. SHETLER: That has always been my experience with Ms. Baharav. I don't think that will be an issue.

THE COURT: Great. And now on more mundane matters. With the charges that we have in this case, it's five preempts each. It's not -- there's no life tail; correct?

MS. BAHARAV: That's correct.

THE COURT: Okay. And so I don't think you've tried a case in here before. So, let's just talk in general terms then. First, throughout the trial including when you're at the bench, everything that happens in this courtroom is on the record. Okay. So, when you come up to the bench we put on the white noise to try to prevent others from hearing and we try to keep our voices down. But having said, you can't just do little whispers because then it won't be picked up by the mic up here and we need it to be picked up by the mic here so it's on the record because I'm not going to later summarize what happened at the bench because it's already on the record when it happens. So, you kind of need to be loud enough to be heard by the mic but not so loud everyone else hears you. And particularly with the two ladies this may more of an issue as to identify yourself when you're speaking up here so someone later who wasn't here transcribes it they knew who is talking at any given time.

So, when we do jury selection when we bring in the group of jurors, I first have the general questions for the whole group. In the course of those general

 questions, I'll be asked the State to introduce yourselves, identify witnesses that may be called and briefly describe the nature of the charges that we're dealing with in this case. And after that I'll be asking Mr. Shetler to similarly introduce himself and his client. I don't think you have any independent witnesses.

MR. SHETLER: No, not that I'm aware of at this point, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. So, we'll do that and I'll talk to them about the expected length of the trial. I'm going to say that we're going to finish by Friday with trial although I'm going to just mention to them the possibility that they could have to come back Monday to deliberate depending on when we finish on Friday so they're not shocked if that happens and ask about undue burden and all those questions.

At the end of the general questions that I ask of the group as a whole, I'll call you up here to the bench to go over that — go over the matter so you'll bring your notes up and we'll go through and anyone that needs to be excused for cause in my view, we'll then excuse those.

We then do individual questioning of the 24 that are shown on the chart that's been prepared for your convenience. We'll start with Juror number 1. I will ask Juror number 1 individual questions, then it goes to the State to pass for cause or ask questions you have for that juror and then to the Defense to ask questions of that juror. If you have a cause challenge during the course of those questioning, just ask to approach and we'll address any such challenges up here at the bench so that the jurors don't hear our discussion about that and then we'll go on. So, your direct questioning of the jurors is on an individual basis.

Once we've passed 24 jurors for cause is when we'll do the peremptory challenges using the chart that will be prepared. Just so you're aware, when we do those perempts I'll be excusing the jurors from the courtroom rather than having

them sit there uncomfortably while you pass the paper back and forth. So, take whatever notes you need to take to be able to do your perempts without looking at them. And we also, unless you object now, we also don't pick who of -- alternate jurors will be. My intention is to select 14 jurors and if we still have more than 12 at the end then we randomly select which one or two would be the alternates and would not go back with the other 12. And because of our practice of doing it that way and having alternates, when you do your preempts you'll give five preempts to use anywhere in the list. In other words, rather than four for the petty jury and one for the preempts you'll give to use anywhere in the list of those who have passed for cause. So, then we'll have -- we will have passed 24 for cause. You'll each get five preempts. That takes it down to the 14 for the trial. Okay. Is that understood?

MS. BAHARAV: We have no objection to randomly selecting the alternates, Your Honor.

MR. SHETLER: No, nor do we. Is there -- if we waive a challenge, is it waived period or --

THE COURT: So, when you do the preempts if you waive any it doesn't necessarily waive future challenges. And what happens is so the list goes down the page of those that we passed for cause. If any of the challenges are waived, then the first 14 starting at the top that aren't challenged sit as the jurors.

MS. BAHARAV: And, Your Honor, does Your Honor have any objection to Ms. Sudano asking some -- like switching off sometimes for the jurors?

THE COURT: No; I mean, you know --

MS. BAHARAV: We won't both ask questions. Just that we argue one -THE COURT: But you can alternate, yeah, yeah. I've had people do that
before.

MS. BAHARAV: And just to be clear. If you waive one you're not waiving the rest of them?

THE COURT: Right.

MR. SHETLER: You're just waiving that individual challenge.

MS. BAHARAV: Yes.

THE COURT: Right, right. If you waive on number three but then you see who they do on four and now you want to challenge someone, you still can use the others. Okay. We'll try to move through this. Just for my benefit although I'm not going to do a lot of talking about it, so obviously one of the charges is domestic violence. What is the alleged relationship between the Defendant and the victim?

MS. BAHARAV: At the time of the incident they had been broken up but they were at one point in time boyfriend and girlfriend.

THE COURT: Okay All right. Obviously when I ask you to briefly describe the case just brief neutral description --

MS. BAHARAV: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: -- not opening statement.

MS, BAHARAV: I generally say the State has alleged that on or about this date the Defendant committed the following crimes and we're going to call these witnesses.

THE COURT: Great. Okay. Do we have the jurors ready, Anthony? Okay. Let's go ahead and bring 'em in.

MR. SHETLER: Your Honor, table, podium, do you have a preference?

THE COURT: Either one as long as you're on a mic somewhere because we are recording. And, right, if you're away from a mic you can get the hand mic to be picked up. The jury will have the mic so you need to be on a stable one.

4.

THE COURT: All right. So, good afternoon, everyone. I appreciate your patience. This is the time set for the trial of case number C298879, the State of Nevada, plaintiff versus Genaro Richard Perry, the Defendant. The record will reflect the presence of the Defendant and his counsel, the Deputy District Attorneys and all officers of the Court. Are the parties ready to proceed?

MS. BAHARAV: Yes, Your Honor, the State's ready.

MR. SHETLER: Defense is ready, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Great. Okay. So, Ladies and gentlemen, you're in Department 6 of the Eighth Judicial District Court of the state of Nevada. My name is Elissa Cadish and I'm the presiding judge in this department. Let me take this opportunity to introduce the Court staff with whom you may be coming into contact during the course of these proceedings.

To my far right is Jessica Kirkpatrick. She is our court recorder. She'll be making sure everything that is said during the proceedings is recorded so it can be transcribed later for any appeals or further proceedings. So, it is important when you speak during these matters that you keep your voice up.

To my immediately right is Keith Reed. He is our courtroom clerk. He swears witnesses, marks exhibits, keeps track of evidence, and prepares minutes or descriptions of the proceedings for the official record.

You've already met Anthony Russo. He is our marshal. He is in charge of courtroom security and the only person that you may talk directly with during the trial except of course when we're actually having conversation with you on the record in open Court.

Now at this time does any party wish to present a challenge to the

2

5

7 8

10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17 18

19 20

21 22

23

24 25 prospective jury panel as a whole?

MS. BAHARAV: The State does not.

MR. SHETLER: The Defense does not, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you. All right. So, Mr. Clerk, please call the roll of the panel of prospective jurors. When your name is called, please answer present or here.

[The Court Clerk called the roll of the prospective jury panel] THE COURT: Thank you. Is there anyone whose name was not called? No hands. Okay. Good.

So, we're about to begin what's called the voir dire process. That's the legal term for the process where I and the attorneys can ask you questions bearing on your ability to serve as fair and impartial jurors in this particular case. At times it may seem like the questions are kind of personal and it's not that we're trying to invade your privacy, but sometimes we need to ask questions of that nature to make sure that you can be fair and impartial in this particular case given the nature of the nature of the case and the parties who are involved.

I'll be asking some general questions of the whole group of you and then we'll be going individually for the folks up front. But even when we're doing that I need the folks in the back pay attention because if anyone up front needs to be excused, we'll be bringing up some of you from the back to replace them. So, it helps if you pay attention and have an idea of what the questions are during the course of the process.

Now during the whole process, there are two methods by which any of you may be excused from jury service in this particular case. There's one process which is for cause which means if any of you can't be fair and impartial in this

particular case or for some other reason you cannot serve during the course of this case, you may be excused for cause. And that's my decision as the Judge.

Once we pass enough jurors for cause, at the end the attorneys will be allowed to exercise what are called peremptory challenges; that is, there are a certain number of challenges that they get by statute where they can excuse a certain number of jurors without giving any particular reason. Please don't be offended if you're excused using either of these challenge procedures. It's just part of the process designed to ensure a fair trial for everybody involved.

Now this process of the questioning is done under oath. So would you all please stand and raise your right hand so the clerk can administer the oath.

[The jury panel is sworn in by the Clerk]

THE COURT: Okay. Before we get too far into the process, let me just ask, do any of you have difficulty understanding the English language? If you have trouble with that, would you raise your hand and we can talk to you about that. Okay. I see one gentleman up front. Sir, can you tell me your name and badge number, please.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #009: My name is Javier Gonzalez, badge number is 009.

THE COURT: Correct. Okay. All right, sir. You have difficulty understanding English?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #009: My English is not a hundred percent.

THE COURT: Okay.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #009: I got a problem with writing and sometimes reading, actually, yes.

THE COURT: So, you have some trouble reading English; yes?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #009: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. Do you understand spoken English? In other words, if witnesses are on the stand testifying about things that happened or things they observed, would you able to understand that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #009: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Thanks very much. I appreciate you letting us know about that. Anyone else? No. Great. Okay.

Now we're about — and just so it's clear. I'm going to be asking a lot of questions and getting a lot of information from people. After I finish asking questions of the whole group of you I'll be talking to the attorneys about all the information I've gathered and determining whether anyone needs to be excused as a result of that information. So, I'm not ignoring anything that we talk about. So, first we're going to have some introductions now. So, please pay attention to these introductions because you're going to be asked in a few minutes if you know anyone involved in the case or anything about it.

So, first with the State. Please introduce yourself and your colleague, tell prospective jurors the names of the witnesses you intend to call and a general description of the nature of the case.

MS. BAHARAV: Yes, Your Honor.

Good afternoon. My name is Colleen Baharav and I along with Michelle Sudano represent the State of Nevada in the case of the State of Nevada versus Genaro Perry. The State has alleged that on or about the first day of May 2014, Mr. Perry committed the crimes of robbery with use of a deadly weapon, false imprisonment with the use of a deadly weapon, grand larceny auto, assault with a deadly weapon, coercion, battery resulting in substantial bodily harm constituting

domestic violence and prevent or dissuading witness or victim from reporting crime or commencing prosecution. We have alleged that those crimes all occurred here in Clark County Nevada. To provide events on our case, the State anticipates calling some maybe not all of the following witnesses: Corla Carpenter also known as Corla Muhammed, Ahmedia Bragg, Franklin Elam, George Laster, Danielle Keller, Dr. Steven Leibowitz, Shakeel Abdal-Karim, Justin Terry, and Deborah Ashenfelder formerly known as Deborah Marriott [phonetic]. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you very much. Counsel, introduce yourself and your client.

MR. SHETLER: Thank you, Your Honor.

Ladies and gentlemen, my name is Travis Shetler. I'm a solo practitioner here in town. I represent Genaro Perry. The State's accused him of the crimes Ms. Baharav just talked of. In addition to possibly hearing testimony from Mr. Perry, you may hear some testimony or some information from Dr. Steven Gabeef [phonetic] who is a reconstructive surgeon here in town. Thank you.

THE COURT: Okay. So, I have a few basic questions first which I'm required to ask in every case. So, if you do need to respond in the affirmative to any of these questions, raise your hand. We'll get you the mic and then before you explain why you raised your hand, if you could state your name and the last three digits of your badge number.

So, first, have any of you been convicted of a felony? Please raise your hand if you have. No hands. Okay. Are any of you not a United States citizen? Raise your hand if you're not a citizen. No hands. Good. Now do any of you have such a sympathy, prejudice or bias relating to age, religion, race, gender or national origin that you feel that would affect your ability to be an open minded, fair and

20

21

22

23

24

25

impartial juror? Anyone feel that way. Okay. We've got one hand up front and one the back, a couple in the back. Okay. So, we'll start up front and then we'll get the mic back to you and hear what your views are there.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #002: Andy Yi, 002.

THE COURT: Okay, sir. Why did you raise your hand on that question?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #002: I raised by my hand because I personally have been robbed at gunpoint and I never had a fair shot to go to a trial because they never found the gentleman.

THE COURT: Okay. So, they never found the person who did that to you?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #002: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. And so how long ago was that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #002: About 14 years ago.

THE COURT: Okay. And was that here in Las Vegas?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #002: No.

THE COURT: Where was it?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #002: It was in Chicago, Illinois.

THE COURT: In Chicago.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #002: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. Got it. And so would how would that incident that happened to you affect your ability to be fair and impartial or cause you any sympathy, prejudice or bias in this case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #002: From my personal experience and from other people I know that went through the same thing, I believe they got off easier, like they never found the person and that's the reason why it happens, you know, so often. And I feel as in this case, you know, I would, you know, judge the case

biasedly.

2

3

4.

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: So, do you think that you would hold it against Mr. Perry here because of someone robbing you at gunpoint those years ago?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #002: Yes, I believe so.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Thank you. And there were a couple people that raised hands in the back.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #050: I'm Doris E. Foley, 050. I'm understanding -- anyway, I have a long list of police in my family, prosecutor's office including. I have been -- had a misdemeanor, and I'm not a fan of undercover cops and since he's got a long list already, I already presume he's guilty.

THE COURT: He's got a long list of what?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #050: Of things that he's being, you know, on trial for. So, to me, he's already guilty.

THE COURT: Okay.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #050: That's it, ma'am.

THE COURT: And so the police and prosecutors in your family, have they conveyed that view that someone that's charged with a lot of crimes must be guilty?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #050: Yes; especially from the prosecutor's office.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, ma'am.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #055: Terry Arcemont, 055. I have several things. First, my belief does not allow me to pass judgment on another human being and, second, I'm very, very opinionated so I have to keep it to myself and I cannot be fair to Court because I'm brutally honest and I'm being right up four front. I will form an opinion on myself.

THE COURT: Okay. So, you're both judgmental and can exercise a

3

4.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2021

22

23 24

25

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #055: Yes. And I cannot pass a judgment on another human being. That's not up to me.

THE COURT: And is that based on certain religious beliefs that you have?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #055: I have many religious beliefs and it's hard to explain because we are all children of God.

THE COURT: Right.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #055: But yet I am partially to atheism also. So, I cannot swear on a bible.

THE COURT: Okay. Rather than swear you could affirm to meet the requirements.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #055: Yeah.

THE COURT: I understand some folks don't want to swear and that's fine.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #055: And I'm very, very opinionated.

THE COURT: You're very, very opinionated.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #055: Yes.

THE COURT: But you can't pass judgment on somebody?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #055: I can't because I'm in conflict. That's how come I cannot be a fair juror at all. I never served in jury duty.

THE COURT: Okay. So, if you were sitting on the jury after hearing all of the evidence and then went back to the jury room with the other jurors, you couldn't vote guilty or not guilty?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #055: No, ma'am, and I will be kicked off the jury before that because a couple of judges already did because I already told them that I already formed an opinion and I cannot sit in the jury box. And that's the honest

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Thanks very much.

Do any of you know the Defendant, Mr. Perry, or his counsel, Mr. Shetler? No hands. Okay. Do any of you know our Deputy District Attorneys, Ms. Baharav or Ms. Sudano? No hands. Okay. Do any of you know our District Attorney Steve Wolfson or other personnel in the District Attorney's office? Yes, okay.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #039: Yeah, I'm Martin Orsinelli, 039. I've worked with Steve Wolfson when he was a defense attorney. I'm a Deputy City Attorney with the City of Las Vegas. I don't know these two deputies but I do know Steve Wolfson.

THE COURT: Right. Okay. And that was what I asked. And so was that like when he was on the city council?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #039: City council, as a Defense attorney. I don't know him personally outside the office. I've seen him at functions.

THE COURT: Right.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #039 But, yeah, I do know. If we saw each other in the elevator we would say hi. That's about it.

THE COURT: Okay. Fair enough. And that is what I asked. So, let me ask you this. As a result of your relationship as you've described it with Mr. Wolfson, would that affect your ability to be fair and impartial as a juror in this case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #039: No, it would not.

THE COURT: Do you think you'd have a tendency to favor the District Attorney's office because of your relationship with Mr. Wolfson?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #039: No, I do not.

 THE COURT: Okay. You think you can be fair to both sides? PROSPECTIVE JUROR #039: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: Great. Thank you. Okay. Do any of you know any of the witnesses whose names were read by either of the attorneys? One hand in the back.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #055: I believe it's Dr. Steven Leibowitz.

THE COURT: I need your name and badge number again.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #055: Oh, Terry Arcemont, 055. Sorry.

THE COURT: It's okay.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #055: Yeah. Dr. Leibowitz did an operation on left eye and I still have no feeling in it. So, I got a little issues with him.

THE COURT: Okay. Great, I appreciate you letting me know about that,

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #055: I'm honest,

THE COURT: Yes; thank you.

All right. So, it's now -- it's Wednesday; right? It's now Wednesday afternoon. The trial itself is going to be complete by this Friday so that's good news for you. It's possible that we would finish the trial on Friday but the jurors might still be deliberating on Monday. So, I want to give a heads up about that in case any of you have issues on Monday. So, with that being said, I understand it's difficult for everyone to be here as a juror. You all have other things you should be doing, perhaps other things you would rather be doing whether it's at work or at home, whatever you would ordinarily be doing if you weren't here, and I get that. But my question is whether serving these few days as a juror would represent an undue burden for any of you, that is, more of a burden than it is for everyone else who has got to be here to serve as a juror. Okay.

21

22

23

24

25

So, what we'll do is we'll start going through the folks — so we'll hand it to the first person and then once they're done if the other folks raise their hands so we can pass it around and get the information from all of you who have raised your hands. Okay. Yes, ma'am, name and badge number.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #003: Phoebe Downing, badge number 003.

THE COURT: Yes, ma'am, what's your issue?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #003: Child care. If it goes through -- because me and my husband we schedule ourselves opposite days for one of us to be home with the kids, if it ends on Friday that's fine but if it goes on to Monday that'll be a problem for me.

THE COURT: So, your husband works on Monday?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #003: Yeah.

THE COURT: And so you would be the one with the children?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #003: Yes.

THE COURT: And how old are the children?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #003: Nine and 13.

THE COURT: Okay. So, are they in school during the day?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #003: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. So, is it just an issue of drop and pick up?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #003: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. So, what time do they need to be dropped off?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #003: My son gets dropped off by 8 o'clock, my daughter at nine. They both get picked up by 3:20.

THE GOURT: Okay. If you were able to do the drop off in the morning, is there anyone, a friend or anyone, who might be able to help out with pick-up in the

consider this an undue burden; I do. I have a new boss starting on Monday who I

will be reporting to. I would really like to be there on Monday. There's some stuff

24

9

10 11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21 22

23

2425

traveling over the weekend. And at this moment I don't have anybody else to care for him. His grandmother is in the hospital right now. So, this is a very, very bad timing. And grandpa travels. He's a comedian on Carnival Cruise ships. So, he's never here. And I, quite frankly, don't like leaving my kid with anybody I don't know.

THE COURT: Okay. So, when you say -- so dad's there to watch the baby to day.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #014: Today. I actually moved -- my brother passed way a couple months ago. He was shot in a triple homicide off of Sahara and Fort Apache. I don't know if anybody heard about this. So, being in this courtroom right now is not doing me good at all. But I moved it, my jury service, to today so that I could be here. However, my boyfriend got a job, a gig in another state. I don't know how long this thing runs, but he's got to leave Friday morning.

THE COURT: Okay. So, when you say he's got to be gone for the weekend he's leaving Friday morning?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #014: Yeah.

THE COURT: Okay. So, on Friday you don't have any coverage for your tenmonth old?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #014: Correct.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #015: Badge number 015, Mary Logan.

THE COURT: Okay, ma'am, thank you.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #015: Your question was framed in convenience; is that correct?

THE COURT: No. My question is it would be an undue burden for you to be here.

11

12 13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20 21

22

24 25 PROSPECTIVE JUROR #015: Okay, yes. All right. I have a disability. I have arthritis in my spine and sciatic nerve damage and I have great difficulty either sitting for a long period of time or standing for a long period of time, and I'm afraid that the pain level would increase substantially and as a result I would lose my ability to concentrate on the details. I am taking — I take medication, prescribed medication for my condition and I just believe that that would be a burden for me.

THE COURT: So, just so I understand. Is the -- do you only take the medication if you get the pain to where it's difficult for you otherwise or do you take the medication regularly to avoid the pain?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #015: Both. Actually I take the medication on a regular basis and then I take more medication --

THE COURT: Okay.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #015: -- if it, you know, requires such.

THE COURT: And so the medication that you take, that interferes with your ability to concentrate?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #015: I'm afraid that the pain would make it such that eventually I would not be comfortable seated and I would -- that would draw my concentration away.

THE COURT: Okay. So, how long can you sit for?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #015: Probably an hour, 45 minutes or an hour.

THE COURT: And then -- so when you get to that point like, okay, I can't sit anymore, you just -- do you need to stand up or do you need to be able to walk around?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #015: I prefer to get up and walk around because it's the sciatic that goes down my left leg.

THE COURT: Got it. Okay. Do you work, ma'am?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #015: No; I'm retired.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Thanks very much.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #015: Thank you.

THE COURT: Anyone else in that row? Okay.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #018: Badge number 018, Michelle Zira.

THE COURT: Yes, ma'am.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #018: Currently I am the sole manager of two real estate communities, new homes communities. At this time I don't have any backup. I am the sole person, the sole agent running these two communities of which I am commissioned based. And having the doors closed for three days with no opportunity to work with the customers that I've been working with in the past to convert into incoming sale along with the people that would be coming in throughout those three days that I would lose the amount of income to have the doors closed for three days would be pretty devastating financially.

THE COURT: Okay. So, when you say it would be financially devastating, how would it affect you? I mean, would you be able to, you know, pay your rent or mortgage, have food on the table, things like that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #018: That's a unforeseen answer. It depends on what would come in throughout those three days. It could significant and it could be insignificant which is the purpose of having to be there for those three days to be able to generate any form of income that would be possible during those three days.

THE COURT: So, are you saying it's like model homes and you're sitting there on site or --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #018: I have two communities and individual

communities that are in the same neighborhood that I'm operating, yes. So, if I'm not there I have no opportunity to earn any income.

THE COURT: Right. Okay. And are you the sole support in your household? PROSPECTIVE JUROR #018: I am.

THE COURT: Okay. And so -- okay. All right. Thank you.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #021: I'm Brian Mersis, 0021. I actually very recently moved to California. I drove back from LA this morning just to get here. Unfortunately I work freelance. I work executive protection and body guarding and I have a client that I'm supposed to be back for this evening and work this evening through next Monday. And that's really my sole income, my sole client for this month. So, as far as rent or car payment or anything it would be severely devastating to the monthly situation.

THE COURT: When did you move to California?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #021; Within the last two weeks.

THE COURT: So, you've actually moved your permanent residence there from here?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #021: Yes; I still have my -- I didn't get a chance to get my California driver's license yet. I'm coming back just to finish wrapping up, you know, my loose ends here. I still have my valid Las Vegas ID.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #019: Mike Brillant, 019. I'm a program manager for a company based out of the East Coast. We are currently in negotiations for a contract. The period performance ends tomorrow. The negotiations are ongoing today and tomorrow. I've missed a couple meetings today that requires my decisions. It would be extremely difficult to get through those negotiations by the

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

period performance end date and then negotiate an extension for the following six months. The performance of the contract includes overseas locations and continental United States locations I would say ten or 15 different sites where we employ folks to work on unmanned aircraft. So, if I don't get the contract extended and properly pushed and signed it is a hardship for me as a program manager.

THE COURT: All right. And, you know, I don't know about your company or whatever but there's no one else who can take it over for you?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #019: No, ma'am. Unfortunately I'm the only program manager that does this kind of work in the company. Business developers, they don't have the decision making authority to do so, so it would be me.

THE COURT: Okay.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #019: I have a boss, of course. He could probably make those decisions in my stead but it's mine to win or lose.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #025: Number 025, Shawn Waldman.

THE COURT: Yes.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #025: I have a ten month old daughter. My wife and I are full time employees. So, we are the ones doing childcare for our daughter. So, we rotate with our days off so I have nobody to watch my daughter tomorrow. So, that would be an issue for me.

THE COURT: So, tomorrow your wife works?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #025: Correct.

THE COURT: And you normally would not be working tomorrow?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #025: Correct. I'm off Wednesday, Thursday my wife is off the weekends. The person that watches our child on Monday, Tuesday,

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #052: I got a friend of a friend to watch it -- sorry --

care of your baby today?

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16 17

19 20

21

22 23

24 25 THE COURT: Okay. Lunderstand. It's okay. So, you have a friend taking

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #052: Yes, my wife's friend.

THE COURT: Right. But you don't have -- you wouldn't have any coverage the other days. She works during the day tomorrow and Friday?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #052: She works today, tomorrow, and Friday. I'm off today and tomorrow.

THE COURT: Okay.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #052: It's just that if she is able to take off that would be fine, but if she's not able to take off then that would be the situation there.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #055: Terry Arcemont, 055. I hate to sound like I'm whining but I carry on a Asian tradition and I take care of my elderly mother and then I'm a provider for her. I quit my hourly job four years ago so I became a full hundred percent commission employee so I could basically schedule my own schedule and leave work at any time to take care of my elderly mother. She has a degenerative disk. So, she needs assistance to move around. And then now it's kind of hard on me because I got a Jones fracture on my right leg and gained 30 pounds in the last three months. So, anyways, that's it.

THE COURT: Thank you. All right. A couple more questions before I talk to counsel about all the information we've got.

First, a little bit about the role of a judge and jury in a case like this. As the judge I'm the judge of the questions of law. It's my job to know what the law is and to instruct the jurors on the law that applies to this case. The jurors are the

judges of questions of fact. They decide what really happened with respect to the charges that are brought, but the jurors are required to follow my instructions on the law that applies. With that in mind, is there anyone who thinks you may not be able to follow my instructions on the law even if they were different from what you thought the law ought to be? Anyone have difficulty with that? No hands. Great. Thank you.

Under our system of justice there are certain principles of law that apply in every criminal trial. They are that the charging document filed in this case is a mere accusation and is not evidence of guilt; that the Defendant, Mr. Perry, is presumed innocent and the State must prove that he is guilty beyond a reasonable doubt. Does anyone not understand or believe in these basic principles of American justice? Okay. I got a hand up front.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #023: Kara Shrader, Juror 0062. I basically -- THE COURT: Okay. It's 23. Okay.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #023: 023.

THE COURT: Thank you.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #023: I basically just don't think it's right to put anybody in jail no matter what they do. I think God will take care of that. That's what I have to say about that.

THE COURT: Okay. So, if you were on the jury would you be able to evaluate the evidence in accordance with the law I give you and vote as to whether guilt was proven beyond a reasonable doubt or not?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #023: I just don't think -- irregardless it's not right to send anybody to jail; that they can find their own spiritual path without jail.

THE COURT: Okay. So, the jurors won't have anything to do with

12 13

14 15

16

17

18 19

20

21 22

24

25

23

sentencing in this case; does that make a difference for you?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #023: Yeah; as long as I don't have to -- my decision is a result of, you know, I wouldn't say anything that's going to make somebody have to go to jail.

THE COURT: The jurors' decision will be as to each of the charges considering whether Mr. Perry is guilty or not guilty based on the evidence and the law presented; is that something you could do?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #023: I probably would not say guilty if he's going to have to go to jail.

THE COURT: Okay. So, you think people who commit any crimes should just be out walking the streets anyway?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #023: I think everything happens for a reason and that, you know, God has a law over everything and things will be taken care of as they're supposed to. I don't think it's right just for people to just always go to jail.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Thank you. Anyone else? No. Okay.

Does anyone know anything about this case other than what's been stated in the courtroom so far? No hands. Okay. Good.

All right. Counsel, come on up and bring your notes, please.

[Bench conference -- begins]

THE COURT: We've got some interesting folks in the crowd today.

MR. SHETLER: That certainly is true. You have an amazing poker face, Judge.

THE COURT: Okay. So, unfortunately we have several that I think we're going to have to excuse but we'll probably be okay. So, I'm just going to go in order through the list. So, 002, Mr. Yi.

MS. BAHARAV: That's fine, Your Honor. I don't know. Maybe if you want to

MS. BAHARAV: Yeah, she's out.

4

5

6

7

12

13

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. SHETLER: Mr. Brillant's out; Kara's out. Thank you for your patience, Judge.

THE COURT: Okay.

MS, BAHARAV: Thank you,

[Bench conference -- concluded]

THE COURT: Okay, folks. Thanks for your patience. I'm going to excuse the following people at this time. After I'm done reading this list, then the folks who I announce will be excused. You'll need to report down to the third floor and let them know that I've excused you. So, wait till I'm done reading these folks out loud and then we'll be continuing with the jury selection process with the rest of you. 002, Andy Yi, 009, Javier Gonzalez, 013, Donna Jolly, 014, Ashley Gomez, 015, Mary Rogan, 018, Michelle Zira, 019, Michael Brillant, 021, Brian Mersis, 023, Kara Shrader, 025, Shawn Waldman, 050, Doris Foley, 051, Hung Nguyen, 052, Steven Stowers, 055, Terry Arcemont. If I read your name you're excused. Report down to the third floor.

THE COURT CLERK: Next in seat number 1, Badge number 029, Jennifer Ward; next, seat number 8, Badge number 030, Kateley Grayson; seat number 12, Badge number 032, George Ward; seat number 13, Badge number 034, Erik Adamek; seat number 14, Badge number 036, Jennifer Bautista; seat number 16, Badge number 037, Serena Compton; seat number 17, Badge number 038, Karlo Maalouf; seat number 19, Badge number 039, Martin Orsinelli. Next in seat number 20, Badge number 040, Stephanie Ruiz.

THE COURT: Okay. We'll get her when she comes back in.

THE COURT CLERK: And in seat 22, Badge number 041, Melinda Lopez.

THE COURT: Okay. So, we have Ms. Ward; correct?

1	jurors of a like frame of mind as yourself sitting in judgment?
2	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #029: Yes.
3	THE COURT: And, ma'am, how long have you lived in Clark County?
4	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #029: Forty-one years.
5	THE COURT: And what's the highest level of education you completed?
6	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #029: Associates degree.
7	THE COURT: In what?
8	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #029: Nursing.
9	THE COURT: And are you employed?
10	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #029: Yes.
11	THE COURT: Doing what?
12	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #029: Registered nurse.
13	THE COURT: Okay. And are you married?
14	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #029: Yes.
15	THE COURT: Is your spouse employed?
16	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #029: Yes.
17	THE COURT: Doing what?
18	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #029: He works at the Mandalay Bay, a
19	maintenance engineer.
20	THE COURT: Okay. Do you have children?
21	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #029: Yep.
22	THE COURT: How many?
23	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #029: Two girls.
24	THE COURT: And how old are they?
25	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #029: Sixteen and 14

case?

6

8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24

25

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #029: No.

MS. BAHARAV: And if the State proves after you listen to the instructions by the Court, if the State meets the elements beyond a reasonable doubt, would you be able to find a verdict of guilty in that instance?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #029: Yes.

MS. BAHARAV: If the State doesn't meet every element beyond a reasonable doubt, would you be able to vote not guilty?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #029: Yes.

MS. BAHARAV: Thank you. State will pass for cause.

THE COURT: Thank you. Mr. Shetler.

MR. SHETLER: Thank you, Your Honor.

Ms. Ward, notwithstanding the budget limitations of the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department, would you still expect them to thorough investigate a crime scene?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #029: Yes.

MR. SHETLER: And if they didn't thorough investigate a crime scene, could you still be a fair and impartial juror?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #029: Yeah.

MR. SHETLER: Do you have -- Ms. Baharav asked you -- I forgot to ask one question I was curious about. What type of field of nursing are you involved in?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #029: I postpartum nursing and same day surgery nursing.

MR. SHETLER: Have you ever had experience in your -- and you've been a nurse for how long?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #029: Seven years.

 MR. SHETLER: Have you ever had to deal with victims of domestic violence in your career?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #029: I don't know. We've had suspected in our postpartum unit but nothing that was directly evident or that was reported. We've had people that didn't want certain people coming to their room because of possibilities of threats of that.

MR. SHETLER: Understand. It's unfortunate. Would any of your experiences in those situations impact your ability to be a fair and impartial juror here today?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #029: No.

MR. SHETLER: How long have you been out in Boulder City?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #029: Forty-one years.

MR. SHETLER: You heard earlier in Ms. Foley's comment and as Judge Cadish said, we're not here to pry or get into your personal life, but you understand the Constitution gives my client a right to a trial by jury of his peers and that the State although budget restraints and extremely qualified lawyers notwithstanding, they have a duty to establish my client's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt; do you understand that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #029: Yes, I do.

MR. SHETLER: Ms. Baharav asked you if there was anything if you were sitting at either table if you would want a person such as yourself on the jury and you're comfortable with [indiscernible] for either person?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #029: Yes.

MR. SHETLER: I started to mention Ms. Foley. I'm sorry. I got sidetracked. Her comment was a little surprising but that's the kind of honesty unfortunately that

we need. This is Mr. Perry's probably the most important couple days of his life right now, and we all come in with certain prejudices and opinions. I'm certainly well aware of that when I drive through the streets of Las Vegas. It's the ability to set aside those personal beliefs as some people have said that they couldn't do, right, as we were going through this and purely judge Mr. Perry based on the evidence that the State produces, that Judge Cadish allows into trial and that you take back and then you're going to -- this is a long question; I'm sorry. You're going to get a set of jury instructions at the end and I think we're going to end up with somewhere around 25 pages of instructions. You have to take the evidence you heard here and apply it to those jury instructions or vice versa. Maintaining that lack of a pre-formed opinion which is difficult and some people are much more vocal about what they can and can't do and what they do and don't want to do, however you want to interpret that. That long winded -- [indiscernible] unidirectional question aside, does any of that strike a bell with you at all or do you hear anything in there that you believe would give you a problem, Ms. Ward?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #029: No.

MR. SHETLER: Thank you for your patience. I appreciate that. Your Honor, we would pass Ms. Ward for cause

THE COURT: Thank you. Go ahead and pass the mic to the next juror. Thank you. All right. So, Ms. Downing, how are you doing?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #003: Okay.

THE COURT: I took note of what you told me earlier about your childcare issue and counsel and I agreed that we will make sure we accommodate your need to do drop off and pick up for your children on Monday if you have to be here Monday. Okay.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #003: Yes.

23

24

25

violence?

7 8

9 10

11

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20 21

22

2324

25

THE COURT: Okay. And so the charges relate to an alleged domestic violence incident. Do you think that you could listen to the evidence and evaluate the evidence under the law that I give you to reach a verdict based on the evidence and the law?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #003: I'm not sure truthfully. I don't know how emotional I would get doing it.

THE COURT: Right. I can see you're getting emotional now talking about it. You're nodding yes. So, a verdict can't be based on sympathy or prejudice. It's got to be based on the facts and the law. Now we're all human beings. We may all have sympathy when we all come with our own biases and prejudices. But the decision that the jurors make as a jurors in the case can't be based on that; it has to be based on the facts and the law. So, do you think that you would be able to do that or do you think you can't.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #003: I don't think I could.

THE COURT: Okay. And who is it -- obviously I'm not looking for names, but who is it who you are aware of who have been victims of domestic violence?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #003: Just close friends that I've known, actually three or four people that I can think of right off the top of my head.

THE COURT: Okay. And have they --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #003: Verbal and physical.

THE COURT: I apologize. I was talking over you. What did you say?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #003: Both verbal and physical.

THE COURT: Right. And do you know whether they have reported those issues to the police?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #003: Yes; they're out of it now but it was just a long

Vandenberg Air Force Base, and my oldest son works at the test site and it's his

1	wife who is works for Metro.
2	THE COURT: Okay. Got it. Okay. State.
3	MS. SUDANO: Thank you, Your Honor. Hi, Ms. Etnire, I'm Michelle. How
4	are you doing?
5	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #042: I'm fine. Thank you.
6	MS. SUDANO: So, have you or a close family member ever been the victim
7	of a domestic violence?
8	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #042: No.
9	MS. SUDANO: Have you or a close family member ever been accused of
10	domestic violence?
11	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #042: No.
12	MS. SUDANO: And I'm going to ask the same question Ms. Baharav asked.
13	Do you watch the CSI shows?
14	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #042: We watch the NCIS shows, not Las Vegas
15	but, yeah.
16	MS. SUDANO: Same general idea though. You understand that some of th
17	things in those shows aren't necessarily realistic?
18	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #042: Yes.
19	MS. SUDANO: You understand that the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police
20	Department can't do some of the fancy high tech things
21	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #042: Exactly.
22	MS. SUDANO: Right. And you understand that witness testimony and
23	statements and things like that are also evidence to be considered?
24	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #042: Yes.
25	MS. SUDANO: Would you be able to come back with a verdict in this case

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23 24

25

MS. SUDANO: So, the fact -- when you say that he's been treated more than fairly, do you want to explain a little bit?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #042: You know, sometimes I felt like there should have been a longer sentence for him actually than he got.

MS. SUDANO: So, anything about that experience in thinking that our office maybe the Judge was too lenient on your son; would that affect your abilities to be fair and impartial?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #042: No.

MS, SUDANO: Court's indulgence. Do you have any personal beliefs or religious convictions that would affect your ability to sit in judgment of someone else?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #042: No.

MS. SUDANO: Your Honor, the State would ass Ms. Etnire for cause.

THE COURT: Thank you. Mr. Shetler.

MR. SHETLER: Thank you, Your Honor. Ms. Etnire, this is a fine way to celebrate teacher appreciation week.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #042: Thank you.

MR. SHETLER: Thank you for being here. I want to ask again just as I inartfully did with Ms. Ward. Your honestly is greatly appreciated, and just as Ms. Downing's was. It's serious stuff and it impact people's lives on a daily basis. In the cases involving your son, I didn't hear if you mentioned if there was any drug usage or drug activity involved in those cases?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #042: Yes.

MR. SHETLER: You may well hear testimony of drug usage or drug activity in this case; will that impact your decision to be a fair and impartial juror?

6

7

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

21

20

22 23

24 25 PROSPECTIVE JUROR #042: No.

MR. SHETLER: People have pretty strong feelings about drugs.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #042: I have strong feelings about drugs, but that can be a basis, I guess, of causing behavior.

MR. SHETLER: And I mean this completely respectfully; I'm not trying to pry. Your son's activities do you believe that drugs played a significant role in his --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #042: Yes.

MR. SHETLER: Okay. So, people might act differently under the influence of drugs?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #042: 1 believe so, yes.

MR. SHETLER: And I know I'm asking you the same question one more time. Please bear with me. You can separate a person's activities while possibly using drugs or trying to acquire drugs from -- as they sit here in front of you for judgment?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #042: I'm not sure I understand.

MR. SHETLER: If there were testimony put on that talked about Mr. Perry and drug usage or possibly drug -- selling drugs, is that going to impact your ability to listen to the evidence and make a determination just on those jury instructions as to what he's charged with here?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #042: No.

MR. SHETLER: Does that make sense or am I making it too muddy?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #042: It just seems like you're talking about -- I don't know if you're saying drug use played a role in the crime that he's accused of or you're just saying that's incidental and it might be brought up.

MR. SHETLER: If evidence -- and there are certain rules on what I can and I can't say right at this point.

10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24

25

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #042: Right. I understand.

MR. SHETLER: But if evidence were to come out in either of those fashions, would that impact your ability to sit as a fair and impartial juror, and most importantly, this is what Mr. Perry is worried about. If you were in a situation similar to Mr. Perry and a person with your experiences and what you've had to go through with your son's cases, will sitting on a jury would you be comfortable with that person sitting in judgment on you? That's really the nut of the matter.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #042: I believe so, yes.

MR. SHETLER: That's fair enough. That's -- your patience is much appreciated. Thank you. Your Honor, we pass Ms. Etnire; correct? We pass for cause, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you. Ms. De Paz, how are you?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #004: Hello. Sorry I'm short.

THE COURT: Me too. It's all right. Is there any reason you could not be fair and impartial in this case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #004: I don't believe so.

THE COURT: Can you wait in forming your opinion on the appropriate result until all of the evidence has been heard?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #004: Yes.

THE COURT: Have you or anyone close to you worked in law enforcement?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #004: Kind of. I've been rein -- I can't say the word right now -- reacquainted with my mother's side of the family. I have an aunt who is a Los Angeles Sheriff and my mother's birth mother is a civilian service member with -- fortunately -- abuse cases, trials of domestic abuse.

THE COURT: Is that someone who you are close with?

22

23

24

25

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #004: No.

THE COURT: Okay. But she is a relative so I figured you need to know.

THE COURT: No, I do. I appreciate you letting me know. Thanks. So, my question is whether the fact that you've got those relatives who were in law enforcement would affect your ability to be fair and impartial in this case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #004: I don't believe so.

THE COURT: And the person you were just talking about, your mother's birth mom, does she work here in Las Vegas?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #004: No; she lives in San Francisco.

THE COURT: Okay. And do you think that you would have a tendency to give extra weight or credibility to the testimony of law enforcement officers because they're law enforcement officers?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #004: No; everybody's human, everybody makes mistakes.

THE COURT: Okay. So, you think you could weigh their testimony like you would weigh any witness testimony?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #004: Yes.

THE COURT: Have you or anyone close to you been charged with a serious crime?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #004: My father was charged with domestic abuse when I was 13 and before I was born he stole a car. I don't remember what that's called.

THE COURT: Okay. That's fine. The domestic abuse issue, were you present during the incident?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #004: It was against -- it was because of me and my

В

2

sister. At the time I truly -- my stepmother or step-grandmother blew things out of proportion. We got hit by my dad. I -- now as an adult with kids of my own truly believe we deserved to get hit. We should not have been doing what we were doing which was hitting each other, but it blew out of proportion. The Court's threw it in as being beaten and so on and so forth and we were hit, we weren't beaten. So, that was the issue with that case. But we had a -- what is it called -- the social worker, he kept pushing it and pressing it and making it bigger than it was. Once we changed social workers, it completely away.

THE COURT: Was he actually convicted of a crime, your dad I mean?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #004: He served time for the grand theft auto but not for -- he went to jail but he didn't go to prison for the domestic violence.

THE COURT: Okay. So, as you know, one of the charges here is for a domestic battery.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #004: 1 do.

THE COURT: And the different charges relate to, I think, the same one incident. Okay. So, there are different charges that are brought and obviously we haven't heard any evidence about them yet. But my question is given that the nature of it involves a domestic situation, do you think that you could put aside your personal experience and base your decision in this case on the evidence presented and the law that I give you?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #004: 1 do.

THE COURT: And do you have any difficulty following my instructions on the law even as to what does or doesn't constitute the crime of battery domestic violence?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #004: No, I don't have a problem with that.

MS. BAHARAV: You're not going to require the State to present that

1	particular type of evidence?
2	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #004: No.
3	MS. BAHARAV: You'll be able to listen to testimony and view photographs
4	and things of that nature?
5	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #004: Yes.
6	MS. BAHARAV: Yes.
7	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #004: And based upon that evidence will you be
8	able to come to a conclusion?
9	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #004: Yes.
10	MS. BAHARAV: If the State meets every element of the crimes beyond a
11	reasonable doubt, will you be able to find the Defendant guilty?
12	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #004: Beyond a reasonable doubt, yes.
13	MS. BAHARAV: And similarly if we do not meet those elements beyond a
14	reasonable doubt, would you be able to vote not guilty?
15	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #004: Yes.
16	MS. BAHARAV: So, I have to ask about this.
17	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #004: Go ahead.
18	MS. BAHARAV: This case involves domestic violence. I apologize for prying
19	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #004: It's okay.
20	MS. BAHARAV: You indicated that the issue with your father and you two
21	girls got blown a little bit out of proportion?
22	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #004: Yes.
23	MS. BAHARAV: Do you understand that there are situations where people
24	can cross a line?
25	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #004: Vesting Learnheady understand, It is just

that situation we totally deserve what we got, and it wasn't as bad as it turned out being said it was.

MS. BAHARAV: You understand that some -- it's maybe a mandatory reporter have learned that you had been harmed in any physical way that they do have an obligation to provide that information to law enforcement.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #004: Yes.

MS. BAHARAV: Okay. So, given the fact that you believe that issue was blown out of proportion but also that your mother was the victim of domestic violence, would you say that the issue involving your mother and father was different than the issue involving you and your sister?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #004: Yes. I understand. I've spoken with both of them and I do know people who have had those kind of relationships. The thing is, is everybody is different. There's certain things that are going on, you know, people make mistakes and people can change. So, I believe that I can be impartial.

MS. BAHARAV: If you're provided some instructions by the Judge indicating that a particular behavior is a crime even if you maybe you think that was blown out of proportion, would you still be able to find somebody guilty of that charge?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #004: I can, yes.

MS. BAHARAV: Now you indicated that aside from your father and your mother, did you know anyone else that has been the victim of domestic violence?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #004: Not personally but heard of them. Not closely. I've known people in the neighborhood who have had situations, but we were never really close to our neighbors growing up but I know of it, yes.

MS. BAHARAV: What about accused of domestic violence; do you know anyone else like that?

understand what's going on before I say anything or pass judgment.

MS. BAHARAV: Do you think you're a fair person?

24

 PROSPECTIVE JUROR #004: 1 do.

MS. BAHARAV: And do you think that if somebody was facing or if you were sitting in the shoes of Mr. Perry that you would like yourself -- somebody like yourself on the jury?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #004: Yes.

MS. BAHARAV: We'll pass for cause, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you. Mr. Shetler.

MR. SHETLER: Thank you, Your Honor.

Ms. Paz, you've heard my earlier questions?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #004: Yes.

MR. SHETLER: Any of those questions bring up any issues for you other than maybe slight boredom?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #004: No, not at all.

MR. SHETLER: I think you are uniquely situated in some regards to sit on this jury. You understand that if -- what type of social work do you do?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #004: I'm not in the social work field but I started to study it and I just — I couldn't get past certain things. When you're a social worker for children you have to defend both the parent who abused the child and the child. I couldn't get past the sexual element of that. That's the only issue that I had. Personally growing up I had different types of social workers. I understand the pros and the cons. I understand that the law says that if you hit a child and you raise a welt'or its red that is considered abuse. I understand that that is also considered overboard or not something that, you know, that can be blown out of proportion. I seriously should have got smacked for hitting my sister that day. Like, I understand these things. So, the only issue that I have with the social work deal that I couldn't

1

finish it was the sexual abuse part of it.

MR. SHETLER: We understand that. You understand that if someone is in fear of being hurt that they can defend themselves?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #004: Yes.

MR. SHETLER: And that's somewhat involved in the situation with you and your sister. Your father, without getting into details, intervened to stop further violence, you could say.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #004: Yes; with violence but it was necessary at the time.

MR. SHETLER: Right, right. And you understand that in Nevada if I walk into Ms. Baharav's home and I put my hand in my pocket and I aim at her and I tell her to do whatever, give me the keys to her car, if she thinks I have a gun and she doesn't know I only have my finger in a pocket and she thinks I have a gun, well whatever she thinks I have, but if she thinks I'm going to kill her she can kill me and it's okay with that.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #004: Yeah. I was blown apart by that ruling in California. We don't have that or at least under my understanding.

MR. SHETLER: We are slightly different than California.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #004: Yeah. It kind of blew my mind but, yes, I understand.

THE COURT: We'll instruct on the law later.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #004: Sorry.

MR. SHETLER: Thank you, Your Honor. But it's just what's in her mind at the point in time that she makes that decision that's relevant.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #004: Yes, yes, Lunderstand.

THE COURT: Have you or anyone close to you been the victim of a serious

have a hard time finding Mr. Perry not guilty; would you say you're in that same

24

25

situation?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #005: Not -- just since this has been talking I've been thinking back and I think recognize the situation, the case or whatever you want to call it whatever happened. It's just starting to sound familiar. If it is what I was thinking of I thought it was pretty heinous. I'm guess I'm entering this a little prejudiced already.

MS. SUDANO: So, you think you might have some previous knowledge about this case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #005: Nothing more than whatever you've read or heard.

MS. SUDANO: Okay. So, something you saw in the newspaper or the news? PROSPECTIVE JUROR #005: Yes.

MS. SUDANO: Okay. So, if you do know anything about this case, do you think you could set aside what you know and what you may have heard in the media about this case and just judge it based on the evidence that's presented to you in the courtroom?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #005: I think so.

MS. SUDANO: So, you could set all that stuff aside and when you go back into the jury room all that's in your mind is what's come before you?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #005: I think to think so.

MS. SUDANO: Your Honor, the State would pass for cause.

THE COURT: Mr. Shetler.

MR. SHETLER: Your Honor, can you approach?

THE COURT: Yeah. Why don't you come on up.

[Bench conference -- begins]

MR. SHETLER: In the interest of time, do you want me to ask -- I don't think

25

at this time. Thanks very much for your time today. Just go down to the third floor

at jury services and let them know I excused you.

THE COURT CLERK: Next in seat number 4, Badge number 043, Douglas Nelson.

THE COURT: Okay. Folks, so we're going to take a short break in just a minute and let everyone use the facilities because we've been going for a while. But before we take a break I need to explain some things to you about that.

First, the attorneys, parties, witnesses, everybody involved in the case they're not allowed to talk to you during the course of these proceedings. That's probably pretty obvious. But not only can they not talk to you about the case but they shouldn't even be talking to you about anything, the weather, clothing, shoes, whatever. So, they know to avoid talking with you guys even during the breaks during the trial and you should also avoid having interactions with them. And so if they kind of walk the other way, avoid taking an elevator with you or kind of try to distant themselves from you, please don't be offended. They're just complying with their duty not to have those interactions with you.

Additionally, you are required while you're a jury not to discuss the case with anybody until after you're excused from jury service regarding this case. And when I say you're not allowed to discuss this case that includes discussing the charges themselves, anybody involved with the case or even the questions and answers that are given during the jury selection process. So, when you go out on break you can't be talking about oh can you believe this one asked that question or can you believe this juror gave that answer. Don't have questions or discussions like that. And it would also include not only in person conversations with each other but also any communications with anyone else, your spouse's boyfriend's whoever else you might communicate with. You can't talk about the case in any way shape

or form. You can let your boss or childcare givers and things like that know that you are here as part of the jury selection process; that if you're part of the jury that the case will go the rest of this week and possibly Monday. You can let them know that much but don't get into any of the details of the case, what it's about, anything else.

Also when I say you're not to communicate it includes not only in person discussions, it includes telephone calls; it includes social media. So, don't go on Facebook and make a post I can't believe Judge Cadish is still talking; no Tweets, no other communications of any kind about the case until after you're completely done as a juror with this case. Okay. That's very important.

Also, you're not allowed to do any independent research regarding the case. So, you know, these days everyone as soon as they hear about some new issue or person they want to get on their phones and start Googling everybody. You can do that in your ordinary life outside your jury service, but as a juror you can't do that. So, you're not allowed to do any independent research; you can't start Googling anybody involved with the case or any other related issues or laws or anything like that. All the jurors have to base their decision on the evidence they see here in the courtroom and on the law instructions that I give you. So, you can't do any independent research whatsoever. And of course the folks who sit as jurors shouldn't be forming any opinion about the case until after all the evidence is presented and they go back to the jury room to deliberate at the end. So, don't allow yourselves to be forming any opinions in the case prematurely.

So, I'm about to read these admonitions that I'm required to read to you each time we take a break during the course of the trial. It's just basically a summary of the instructions I just gave you and they're so important that I'm required to read them to you each time we take a break. Okay. During this recess,

you are admonished not talk or converse among yourselves or with anyone on any subject connected with this trial or to read, watch or listen to any report or commentary on the trial or any person connected with this trial by any medium of 3 information, including without limitation, newspapers, television, the internet or radio or to form or express any opinion on any subject connected with this trial until the case is submitted to you. Try to keep it to about ten minutes so we can get going again. 7 [Recess taken at 4:01 p.m.] 8 9

[Proceedings resumed at 4:11 p.m.]

[Outside the presence of the prospective jury panel]

THE COURT: On the good side I've arranged for the jury commissioner to bring in like ten extra jurors tomorrow just in case we need them. Things are going slowly but I really can't really fault you based on some of the answered we've gotten.

MR. SHETLER: It's been an interesting pool.

THE COURT: So, you guys are being pretty cooperative. It just takes a while sometimes. So, we'll keep moving.

MR. SHETLER: Ms. Baharay did find out that we do have warrant returns on at least one of those prelims for tomorrow.

MS. BAHARAV: Just one.

MR: SHETLER: Oh, just one. So, we'll know more in the morning, Judge.

THE COURT: Okay.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. BAHARAV: That doesn't mean they go forward. That usually means they resolve because our victims are there.

THE COURT: Right. I mean, the thing is look if I'm going to tell the jurors not

Rough Draft Transcript - Day 1, Page 85

THE COURT: Okay. And are you married?

from and evaluate them just based upon what you're tell you?

THE COURT: Where was that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #006: One was somewhere in the state of Wisconsin because we were on tour when we got picked up. And then a second one was in Utah so that was it.

THE COURT: Okay. And do you feel you were treated fairly in those cases? PROSPECTIVE JUROR #006: Yeah.

THE COURT: Anything about those circumstances that would affect your ability to be fair and impartial in this case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #006: No.

THE COURT: Have you or anyone close to you been the victim of a serious crime?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #006: As in like domestic or --

THE COURT: Domestic would be serious.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #006: Okay. Case in point back in my old life when I was out there, I had been domestically abused so yes.

THE COURT: And did you report that abuse to the police at all?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #006: Oh, yeah.

THE COURT: Okay. And was that person charged?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #006: He spent a night in jail and then -- I forget. I was still in my alcoholic frenzy. So, I was just kind of fleeing. I think I left state nine days after the scenario and just dropped it.

THE COURT: Okay. And so although you've had that prior experience with domestic abuse, do you think you could put aside your personal experiences and base a decision in this case on the evidence presented in the courtroom and the law that I give you?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #006: Yes.

MS. SUDANO: I'm sorry I'm going to ask you this. I don't want to pry too

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #006: That all sounds great but unfortunately, no.

MS. SUDANO: Have you ever had contact with the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department or Henderson Police, anything like that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #006: For like traffic tickets or whatnot?

MS. SUDANO: Yeah.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #006: Sure.

MS. SUDANO: Do you have positive negative interactions with them or are they fairly neutral?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #006: A positive. I'm going to say ninety eight percent positive.

MS. SUDANO: Okay. So, anything about that that would affect your ability to be fair and impartial in this case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #006: No.

MS. SUDANO: Are you going to give more or less weight to a police officer's testimony just because he or she is a police officer?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #006: Not at all.

MS. SUDANO: Is there anything about your life experiences that would prevent you from sitting in judgment of anybody else?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #006: No; I actually think it would be beneficial. It sounds strange.

MS. SUDANO: What do you mean by that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #006: Well being clean and sober I'm aware of the fact that, you know, our views are altered by old habits. So, someone trying to, you know, change their -- if something dramatic happens in your life -- and I've had girls come to me getting sober where, you know, they've approached me for, you know, sponsor walking through the steps, and it's really about being accountable and

21

22

23

24

25

having gumption and improving your life. So, sometimes scenarios in life like the case in point myself, when I had gotten arrested for possession and charges and having to deal with that and take care of those situations. Those, I think, are acts of providence and that I've been able to take that and turn it around and help somebody else who is going through the same thing.

MS. SUDANO: First of all, congratulations on your sobriety.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #006: Hey, man, it ain't all me.

MS. SUDANO: So, if you're in -- if you were in the State's position would you want somebody such as yourself on the jury?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #006: Sure.

MS. SUDANO: What about if you were in Mr. Perry's position?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #006: Yeah.

MS. SUDANO: Okay. Your Honor, the State would pass for cause.

THE COURT: Thank you. Mr Shetler.

MR. SHETLER: Ms. Wokasch.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #006: Yes.

MR. SHETLER: Again, thank you for your honesty. That's all I can possibly hope for or Mr. Perry can hope for. I appreciate it. And just congratulations on still being on the planet.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #006: Yeah, right. Those are the options death or jail or --

MR. SHETLER: In the situation where you were still out using and still running and getting, did you ever have an opportunity to come into contact with people who might falsely accuse somebody to the police to try and achieve some benefit?

 PROSPECTIVE JUROR #006: Sure, yeah.

MR. SHETLER: It didn't surprise you if activity like that came out of that type of lifestyle?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #006: It wouldn't surprise me at all, no. Actually, honestly, nothing surprises me.

MR. SHETLER: Right. You talked to -- you mentioned that you worked with different people in the program. When people come into the program early on, are you treating them with a different level of credibility that someone who's got some more time under their belt?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #006: I think if you're new in recovery and you're trying to change your old habits, it's harder in the beginning from my own experience, and I needed that longevity with people with hardcore recovery around me. I needed to stick with 'em to learn how to live differently. You know, changing your life is hard especially when that was your path for so long, you know, and now I've surpassed the years of recovery now than of years of wreckage I've done. So, I'm kind of like in unfamiliar territory which is pretty awesome, you know, it's like a whole another life. So, when I speak of those old things that happened to me it was another lifetime ago. But, yeah, people who are very new they're just starting to learn this. If they really have a willingness and their honest and they're open minded to the concept of changing their life for the better, it really kind of opens like a clean slate for them to really start anew and look at themselves on their side of the street and clean house. You know, it's really about helping others too in the end. Did I answer your question? I don't know.

MR. SHETLER: You're doing fantastic.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #006: Okay.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #006: -- and their perception.

MR. SHETLER: Right.

24

6 7

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23

24 25 PROSPECTIVE JUROR #006: And in my -- even in my career because I act as a steward at times in my union. So, I have to take facts and not emotions when sitting in like grievance and arbitration in situations or if there's, you know -- but everyone has a perception and everyone has, you know, they're way of seeing things and you can find the equilibrium there. I don't feel I need to hold the torch to anybody. I think everyone has their own torch.

MR. SHETLER: Clearly an individual who has a high level of sensitivity and passion, and there will be photographs of injuries in this case. Is that going to be problem for you?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #006: No.

MR. SHETLER: And I'm sure that there will be testimony that's just plain unpleasant.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #006: Sure.

MR. SHETLER: Ms. Wokasch, thank you very much. Pass for cause.

THE COURT: Thank you. Ms. Hamilton, how are you today?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #007: I'm good. How are you?

THE COURT: Good. Is there any reason you could not be fair and impartial in this case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #007: No.

THE COURT: Can you wait in forming your opinion on the appropriate result until all of the evidence has been heard?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #007: Yes.

THE COURT: Have you or anyone close to you worked in law enforcement? PROSPECTIVE JUROR #007: No.

THE COURT: Have you or anyone close to you been charged with a serious

1	or popular opinion?
2	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #007: Yes.
3	THE COURT: Have you ever been a juror before?
4	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #007: No.
5	THE COURT: If you were a party to this case would you be comfortable with
6	jurors of a like frame of mind as yourself sitting in judgment?
7	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #007: Yes.
8	THE COURT: How long have you lived in Clark County?
9	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #007: Forty-two years.
10	THE COURT: And what's the highest level of education you completed?
11	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #007: Twelfth; high school.
12	THE COURT: And are you employed?
13	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #007: No; I'm retired.
14	THE COURT: What did you before?
15	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #007: Food service.
16	THE COURT: Food service?
17	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #007: Yes.
18	THE COURT: Are you married?
19	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #007: Yes.
20	THE COURT: Is your spouse employed?
21	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #007: No; he's retired also.
22	THE COURT: And what did he previously do?
23	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #007: He was a truck driver, construction truck
24	driver.
25	THE COURT: Do you have children?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #030: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. Do you think, you know, growing up with that background and those relatives in law enforcement would affect your ability to be fair and impartial in this case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #030: I think it used to because I've actually been a jury box and was struck immediately after answering that question when I said I may be -- put more weight towards a police officer's opinion because that was honestly what I thought due to the influence of my dad and my uncles and relatives. But I'm very well aware that they do not represent all police officers or people in the profession. So, I don't think that would affect my ability at all.

THE COURT: So, although you may have previously had a tendency to favor law enforcement, are you saying you now you don't have a particular bias in that regard?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #030: I do not have a bias. I just need to see the information from both sides.

THE COURT: You think you could weigh the testimony of law enforcement officers just as you would weigh any witness testimony?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #030: Yes.

THE COURT: Have you or anyone close to you been charged with a serious crime?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #030: No.

THE COURT: Have you or anyone close to you been the victim of a serious crime?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #030: No.

THE COURT: Is there anything about the charges in this case that would

19

20

21

23

24

25

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #030: Yes.

MS. BAHARAV: And you understand that Las Vegas specifically has about half the size of the entire population of Wisconsin?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #030: Yes.

MS. BAHARAV: Okay. There are two million people here and Wisconsin has about five million. Okay. We talked a little bit about CSI before. Knowing that your family is from a small town in Wisconsin, you understand that not every police department has those types of technology?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #030: Correct.

MS. BAHARAV: And we've also learned that most of that was smoke and mirrors and wasn't even daylight?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #030: Yes.

MS. BAHARAV: We're not going -- you're not going to hold that against the State of Nevada; are you?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #030: No.

MS. BAHARAV: And you've already indicated this but nothing in your history with regards to your family is going to cause you to automatically think that Mr. Perry is guilty?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #030: No; and certainly with my legal studies later in life I can appreciate the process a lot.

MS. BAHARAV: You understand that we the State, Ms. Sudano and I, have the burden of proof in this case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #030: Yes.

MS. BAHARAV: And if we got up and said hello and sat back down and presented no evidence, Mr. Perry's not guilty?

 honesty. You mentioned that you had had a change of --! don't want to put words in our mouth -- but you feel differently about the question would you hold police officers in a higher esteem possibly or give their testimony more credence; that's really what it's about; right?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #030: Yes.

MR. SHETLER: And was there specific event, was it just not being selected for that jury, was it your legal training, what it just going through the walks of life?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #030: It was me just growing up. I've since done a lot more studying. I was like -- I was very young on that panel and I've since done a lot of traveling and just opened up my views a lot more. I don't live in a small town anymore so I have a lot more interaction with, you know, big cities and different types of people.

MR. SHETLER: And you mentioned that you hadn't work in either side of the criminal field. Was there not for any specific reason it just hasn't come up or because of any opinions you have about the criminal field itself?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #030: No opinions. This is actually the first law firm I've worked in.

MR. SHETLER: The self defense questions I was asking earlier, does that present any issues or concerns for you?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #030: It does not.

MR. SHETLER: And there was one other point. Were you involved in the -- this is the first law firm so you were not involved in legal activities in Sacramento?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #030: No, I wasn't.

MR. SHETLER: What type of work were you doing there? Were you working there?

ŀ	
1	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #030: I was in food service while I was going to
2	school.
3	MR. SHETLER: Okay. And where'd you go to school there?
4	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #030: I went to MTI College for my paralegal
5	studies.
6	MR. SHETLER: All right. Thank you very much for your honesty, Ms.
7	Grayson, I appreciate it. Pass for cause, Your Honor.
8	THE COURT: Thank you. Let's try to do one more.
9	Ms. Erickson, how are you today?
10	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #010; Great. Thank you.
11	THE COURT: Is there any reason you could not be fair and impartial in this
12	case?
13	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #010: No.
14	THE COURT: Can you wait in forming your opinion on the appropriate result
15	until all of the evidence has been heard?
16	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #010: Yes.
17	THE COURT: Have you or anyone close to you worked in law enforcement?
18	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #010: I have an ex-husband that works for Metro.
19	THE COURT: Okay.
20	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #010: He's not a police officer; he's a patrol services
21	representative.
22	THE COURT: Okay.
23	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #010: They call 'em PSRs.
24	THE COURT: Okay. How long have you been split from him?
25	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #010: It's been probably over six years.

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Okay. I guess -- was he with Metro the whole time you were together?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #010: Well prior to working for Metro he was on some type of volunteer program. He was out in the field and drove in the cars, carried a gun and everything. That particular program was dissolved. He did -- when he wasn't doing that he was a truck driver. And then retired from that and then started working for Metro. So, it was probably about three years of our relationship time.

THE COURT: Okay. So, during the time you were together and he was with Metro, were you also socializing with other Metro employees?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #010: There was times, yeah.

THE COURT: And would those relationships affect your ability to be fair and impartial in this case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #010: No.

THE COURT: Do you think that you would have a tendency to give extra weight or credibility to the testimony of law enforcement officers because they're law enforcement officers?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #010: No.

THE COURT: Do you think you could weigh their testimony as you would weigh any witness testimony?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #010: Yeah, yeah.

THE COURT: Have you or anyone close to you been charged with a serious crime?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #010: No.

THE COURT: Have you or anyone close to you been the victim of a serious

THE COURT: Did you meet with police and prosecutors during the course of

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #010: Yes, I did.

THE COURT: Okay. You don't know these two ladies who are here now

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #010: | don't.

THE COURT: Okay. Anything about that set of circumstances that would affect your ability to be fair and impartial in this case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #010: I don't think so. I don't have any of the

THE COURT: Sure. Well right. I mean, obviously it's appropriate for you to evaluate the case based on the evidence. What I want to be sure though that you're not going to favor police or prosecutors because of their assistance in pursuing that

THE COURT: Okay. You think you can be fair to both sides here?

THE COURT: Is there anything about the charges in this case that would make it difficult for you to be fair and impartial?

THE COURT: Can you base your verdict solely on the evidence brought out at trial and the law that applies as stated in my instructions without fear of criticism

THE COURT: Have you ever been a juror before?

	'
1	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #010: No.
2	THE COURT: If you were a party to this case would you be comfortable with
3	jurors of a like frame of mind as yourself sitting in judgment?
4.	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #010: Yes.
5	THE COURT: How long have you lived in Clark County?
6	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #010: Almost 23 years.
7	THE COURT: What's the highest level of education you completed?
8	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #010: High school and then I have some college.
9	THE COURT: Did you have a particular major or course of study in college?
10	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #010: It was mostly in finance and real estate.
11	THE COURT: And are you employed?
12	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #010: Yes.
13	THE COURT: Doing what?
14	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #010: I work for a home builder, work with the sales
15	and escrow and the broker.
16	THE COURT: Okay. And are you married?
17	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #010: Yes.
18	THE COURT: Is your spouse employed?
19	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #010: No; he's retired.
20	THE COURT: What did he do before retiring?
21	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #010: He was a manager for a rental yard in
22	California.
23	THE COURT: And how many children do you have?
24	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #010: I have two, two daughters.
25	THE COURT: And what do they do?

24

25

MS. SUDANO: Thank you, Your Honor. The State passes for cause.

THE COURT: Mr. Shetler.

MR. SHETLER: Thank you, Your Honor.

Ms. Erickson, thank you for being so honest. I've got a couple of questions. I'm sorry. Were you able to attribute why things changed in the relationship with your first husband after the first 16 years?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #010: I'm sorry, say that again.

MR. SHETLER: What changed after the first 16 years; would you ever able to figure out?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #010: We moved here from California and he got involved with drugs, I think was mostly the problem.

MR. SHETLER: And you said -- you made a comment, I believe, that he tried to -- I don't want to misquote it -- but isolate you from your family and friends a little bit?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #010: He had some cousins that lived here that helped me; is that what you're asking as far as --

MR. SHETLER: I may have misunderstood the question whether he, your first husband, tried to isolate you from other family and friends.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #010: Yeah. He kind of just -- he just tried to convince me that there was nowhere for me to go, that I didn't have any money or I couldn't make it on my own.

MR. SHETLER: Did you have -- again please bear with me. I appreciate it and I'm terribly sorry I have to ask you these questions.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #010: It's okay.

MR. SHETLER: Did the drugs actually make it into the home?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #010: I never could find any. He did admit during the divorce -- I didn't know that there was any for a long time. I couldn't figure out was wrong with the behavior. He admitted to me later on that that's what he was doing and he admitted to -- we had a court mediator during the divorce and he admitted to that person. And so then there was some -- he had to go through some drug testing, but that was about it, and as far as I know he hasn't touched any since.

MR. SHETLER: That experience is a traumatic experience and unfortunately you've had other traumatic experiences as well. I want to talk just briefly about the perpetrator in your daughter's case. Did that case go to trial?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #010: Yes.

MR. SHETLER: Were you -- the fact that person went to trial, does that have any impact on your ability to sit here on a jury?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #010: I don't believe so.

MR. SHETLER: In other words, do you think that it was okay that it went to trial?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #010: Do I think what?

MR. SHETLER: It was okay that it went to trial?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #010: That that case was okay to go to trial?

MR. SHETLER: It was okay that he went to trial as opposed to taking a deal?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #010: I can't hear you.

MR. SHETLER: It's probably this damn -- excuse me.

THE COURT: Hey, hey, hey.

MR, SHETLER: I'm sorry.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #010: I don't hear very good.

MR. SHETLER: No, it's my -- the fact that he went to trial and did not take a

1	deal, do you feel that it was appropriate for him to go to trial?	
2	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #010: Yes.	
3	MR. SHETLER: And obviously if that case went to trial there were a number	
4	of uncomfortable moments in there for yourself and your daughter; did that	
5	experience leave anything in your cause you any reason not to sit on this jury?	
6	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #010: No.	
7	MR. SHETLER: In that domestic violence in a domestic relationship if one	
8	person is being physically violent with another person, do you think it's okay for the	
9	other person to use violence to stop it?	
10	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #010: To defend themselves.	
11	MR. SHETLER: Correct. And did you ever find yourself in that situation	
12	where you had to defend yourself?	
13	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #010: Yes.	
14	MR. SHETLER: Were you able to do so?	
15	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #010: Not very well.	
16	MR. SHETLER: I understand. But that concepts makes perfect sense to you'	
17	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #010: I'm sorry?	
18	MR. SHETLER: That concept makes perfect sense to you?	
19	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #010: Yes, it does.	
20	MR. SHETLER: Thank you again for all your honesty. I sincerely appreciate	
21	it.	
22	MS. BAHARAV: Your Honor, can we approach?	
23	THE COURT: Yeah, come on up.	
24	[Bench conference beings]	
25	MS_BAHARAV: I know we said eleven but I'm concerned that he has a self	

21

22

23

24

return on that case tomorrow.

THE COURT: That he has what?

MS. BAHARAV: There's a subpoena return on the case that Mr. Shetler has to appear on tomorrow. So, I'm wondering would the Court be okay with one. That would allow you to get your meeting. Or do you want it go at eleven?

MR. SHETLER: Yeah. I just -- it's entirely possible to go till -- even a pro tem we'll probably end up in there until noon.

THE COURT: I don't mind. I'm just worried because we still have a lot of jury selection left. We're not leaving any time for the actual trial.

MS. BAHARAV: 1 know.

THE COURT: So, I'm just concerned.

MR. SHETLER: And my concern, the other case not withstanding, my obligation is not withstanding but certainly my obligation to Mr. Perry.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. SHETLER: And I know the Court recognizes that.

THE COURT: Yeah, I mean, because tomorrow is Thursday. So, if we start at one and it takes us, you know, at least a couple hours to finish jury selection, I don't know how many witnesses you have?

MS. BAHARAV: We have six; we might have five.

THE COURT: So, we could -- you could call some tomorrow afternoon. Can you start Friday morning?

MR. SHETLER: I just have that calendar call on the other darn case which is appropriate because they need to know what's going on; right?

THE COURT: On overflow at 8:30. So, overflow shouldn't be done in 15 minutes, you know.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. BAHARAV: You can tell Barker that you have to go first.

MR. SHETLER: Ms. Baharav can tell him that.

THE COURT: I can tell him that.

MR. SHETLER: Yes.

MS. BAHARAV: I think -- because three of our witnesses are very fast, ten minutes apiece.

THE COURT: Right.

MS. BAHARAV: Three of them are a little longer but I don't anticipate we will need to go into Monday still. I think we can finish it.

MR. SHETLER: Could we come back to this juror?

MS. BAHARAV: Do you have more questions?

MR. SHETLER: No, I don't have questions. I'm worried that I believe there could be testimony that he tried -- that my client tried to isolate the victim in this case from friends and family. There are text messages to that effect. I'm worried that that may be --

MS. BAHARAV: Well I'm not planning on admitting this.

MR. SHETLER: -- too close to -- I don't know. I mean, it's just a concern. {
don't -- I like certainly some of her responses and I'm quite comfortable with, but it is
pretty close to the bone and I don't know that particular issue and there was a lot of
head nodding from one of the potential jurors in the front row on that question. I'm
concerned about her. I would like to challenge but.

MS. BAHARAV: The State's going to object to your challenge for cause. I think the peremptory would be most appropriate in this situation. She indicated she could be fair and impartial.

THE COURT: Right. I mean, what I've heard from her to me doesn't

establish that there's cause to excuse her although she had some similar circumstances, she did indicate she could separate that from the evidence here and could be fair. So, I'm going to deny the challenge.

MR. SHETLER: Lunderstand. Thank you.

MS. BAHARAV: Okay.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

THE COURT: So, 1 o'clock.

MS. BAHARAV: We'll do it. A Judge will make it happen.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. SHETLER: Thank you, Judge.

[Bench conference -- concluded]

THE COURT: All right, folks. So, I apologize. I know it is a little past five now. I am going to be excusing you for the day and we're going to be picking up tomorrow. Because of some other conflicting hearings and things that we're involved in, we're going to be starting tomorrow at 1 o'clock not in the morning. I still -- we're still talking.

UNKNOWN PERSON: 1 a.m.?

THE COURT: Sorry. 1 p.m. I will not be here at 1 a.m. I should have been more clear. One in the afternoon. So, you don't need to be here in the morning.

But what I'm telling you though is what I told you about the schedule earlier that we're still expecting to finish the presentation of the trial Friday is still accurate but there may be some deliberations still going on on Monday for your own planning purposes.

Remember what I talking about earlier in terms of not talking to anyone about the case other than the minimal information that you are in jury selection in a criminal case and what the general timeframe you're looking at is. So, between now

and tomorrow at one in the afternoon, you are admonished not to talk or converse among yourselves or with anyone else on any subject connected with this trial or to read, watch or listen to any report of or commentary on the trial or any person connected with the trial by any medium of information, including without limitation, newspapers, television, the internet or radio or to form or express any opinion on any subject connected with this trial until the case is finally submitted to you. See you tomorrow afternoon at one.

[Jury Trial, Day 1, concluded at 5:12 p.m.]

ATTEST: Pursuant to Rule 3(c)(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.

PATRICIA SLATTERY

Court Transcriber

Electronically Filed 04/13/2016 02:05:35 PM

RTRAN CLERK OF THE COURT 2 3 4 5 DISTRICT COURT 6 CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA 7 8 CASE #: C298879-1 THE STATE OF NEVADA, 9 DEPT. VI Plaintiff, 10 VS. 11 12 GENARO PERRY, 13 Defendant. 14 15 16 BEFORE THE HONORABLE ELISSA F. CADISH, DISTRICT COURT JUDGE THURSDAY, MAY 7, 2015 17 RECORDER'S ROUGH DRAFT TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS 18 **JURY TRIAL - DAY 2** 19 APPEARANCES: 20 For the State: MICHELLE SUDANO, ESQ. 21 COLLEEN BAHARAV, ESQ. Deputy District Attorneys 22 For the Defendant: TRAVIS S. SHETLER, ESQ. 23 24 25 RECORDED BY: JESSICA KIRKPATRICK, COURT RECORDER

Rough Draft Transcript - Day 2, Page 1

3

1

[Outside the presence of the prospective jury panel]

4

MS. BAHARAV: Your Honor, to be fair --

5

THE COURT: It's no longer morning.

6

7

MS. BAHARAV: Good afternoon. The State recently had two witness issues.

So, we are down to four witnesses.

8

THE COURT: Okay.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23 24

MS. BAHARAV: But in light of the fact that one of the witnesses was the doctor that is no longer available; he had an emergency surgery in California tomorrow. He had to cancel the reason he was going to be in Las Vegas because of that emergency surgery. I believe that opposing counsel has a request of the Court to make. So, that's why we asked to talk to you outside the presence of the jury.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. SHETLER: Very briefly, Your Honor,

Ms. Baharav has been extremely gracious in putting together the notes and agreeing to use her doctor to get in my expert's testimony because he is also unavailable. In reviewing the notes and talking with my client, we would ask to continue the matter because we think that having no doctor here to talk about anything for the jury is a little too risky because that is one of the aggravating factors of the crimes we're charged with.

MS. BAHARAV: The State's prepare to present its case without the testimony of a doctor and to, I guess, allay some of the concerns of opposing counsel. We did agree to admit some information from their doctor along with our medical records

9

10

11 12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Right. So -- okay. So, to back up, and I know you guys had talked about some of this before. You had retained a doctor for the Defense --MR. SHETLER: Correct. THE COURT: -- but that doctor wasn't available this week.

THE COURT: If they want to challenge whether there's substantial bodily

mean this will all sincerity for the record and for my colleague who it's a pleasure to

work with, they have bent over backwards to accommodate us on the records.

MR. SHETLER: It's the crux of the most significant issue of my client's. And I

MR. SHETLER: Correct.

THE COURT: So, then you were both going to proceed using --

MS. BAHARAV: Our doctor.

THE COURT: -- the doctor State was going to present. Is that actually a treating doctor?

MS. BAHARAV: He actually did the surgery to the victim's eye --

THE COURT: Right.

MS. BAHARAV: -- to repair the orbital fracture.

THE COURT: Okay. So, yes, it's a treating.

MS, BAHARAV: Yes; sorry.

THE COURT: Okay. And now that doctor who did that is not available

MS. BAHARAV: He did.

THE COURT: And so yesterday there was some conversation about the possibility, for other reasons, that you might not call the doctor and there was some talk about whether you could reach certain stipulations or use the records. So I gather that after further discussion and analysis that you feel like that's not sufficient without a witness.

MR. SHETLER: Right. After reviewing the record which again the State very generously took care of the redactions and putting together the documents. I talked about it with my client and what that entails, what the risk are, and what part of our Defense is possibly disabled by not being able to get questions and answers with the treating professional because of the serious bodily injury element. That's been the primary factor that he's been mostly concerned about throughout the course of the case. We probably would have resolved the case earlier but for that factor. And I understand completely where the State's at. They have documentation that says she has a fractured orbit and they've got to protect the public. I completely understand that.

THE COURT: Right. So -- I understand that to some extent there's strategy and attorney-client communication. So, I'm not trying to unduly infringe on that, but as a strategy or to best represent your client you think that it's better to have the doctor on the stand to attack instead of the records without a witness?

MR. SHETLER: But there are --

THE COURT: I'm just asking.

MR. SHETLER: - it's a very legitimate question, Your Honor, and it's a little bit like Mr. - I can't pass judgment and yet I have a lot of judgment to say -- there's

 two sides to the argument.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. SHETLER: There are two sides to — there are some great value to not having a magic witness on the stand that the jury can listen to and become enamored with and just have paper with the proper instructions to our currently sitting Ob-Gyn on the jury. However, such it is a key element of the crime, that's the strategy that we've discussed in length, the pros and cons, and my client's most comfortable with having a doctor on the stand at this point in time. And you've gone right to the crux of the matter.

THE COURT: The doctor that you had who unfortunately isn't available this week but you had consulted with him about how to address this issue --

MR. SHETLER: Right. And he had reviewed the records --

THE COURT: -- is that to say?

MR. SHETLER: -- her prior and current medical records as well and as a great deal of commentary which a lot of that is still within the redacted section. Some of our allegations are overtreatment or pre-existing conditions although the fracture is pretty difficult to lay a solid foundation for that issue.

THE COURT: Okay. So, State feels that you can proceed in establishing our case without the doctor using the records.

MS. BAHARAV: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And obviously Defense feels that he can't fully present his defense without a witness.

MR. SHETLER: Correct, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And did you ever reach any stipulation about the medical records?

24 MS. BAHARAV: Yes; we did converse this morning and after I found out that our doctor is unavailable, to see about which particular information from his doctor would be admissible and then also the records from our physician that would be admissible. It's my understanding that counsel at this point did not have an issue with the records as they are. He indicated he wanted to talk to his client first before discussing whether or not he needed a witness also.

THE COURT: Right. Because to be specific, the reason for my question is that if this is the Defense's position and I don't know where you are but if, as a result of that they won't stipulate to the records coming in without the doctor, you may have a problem with your case as well.

MS. BAHARAV: Yes, Your Honor, we would at this point have a problem. She could testify but I think it strengthens the substantial bodily harm with the medical records themselves.

THE COURT: Right. You've got -- the victim could testify to some extent about her injuries.

MS. BAHARAV: But the short answer is yes. Without actual documentation that she sought medical attention for those, I mean, the argument can always be made that she's exacerbating so that would put the State at a disadvantage.

MR. SHETLER: Your Honor, I'm happy to consult once again with my client after this discussion here in the courtroom and make sure that the full -- both sides of the sword are clearly presented. It may have a different impact but --

THE COURT: Let's talk a little more about logistics and then I'll give you some time.

MR. SHETLER: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: So, the underlying events of this case apparently happened

20

21

22

23

24

25

May 1st of 2014; right?

MS. BAHARAV: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: So, a year ago. Has he been in custody this whole time for a year now? Okay. And if we need to continue this --

MS. BAHARAV: Yes. If we need to continue I guess we need to look [indiscernible].

MR. SHETLER: I misspoke. He was apprehended not immediately, there were a couple weeks.

THE COURT: Okay. So, it wouldn't have been right then but --

MS. BAHARAV: Fifty weeks he's been in custody.

THE COURT: Right. So, close to a year. Okay. So, if we're not doing it right now, you know, in the stack I'm in the middle of, the next criminal trial stack I have starts June 29th through the week of July 27th. That's five weeks there. And then I have another one in September.

MS. BAHARAV: I could do the week of the 13th.

THE COURT: Of July.

MS. BAHARAV: Of July, yes.

THE COURT: Obviously this would be overflow eligible.

MS. BAHARAV; Yes.

THE COURT: I needed to put it in there. So, I at least wanted you to have in mind what we were looking at. If you feel we can't proceed and if you want to go ahead and call things off at this point, we haven't seated a jury so jeopardy hasn't attached yet. So, potentially we could do that obviously. That's not the ideal for anybody. But I wanted you to at least know what we were looking at if we do need to continue it.

[Off the record at 1:42 p.m.]

25

[Proceedings resumed at 1:48 p.m.]

[Outside the presence of the prospective jury panel]

THE COURT: Okay. So, now that you've had an opportunity to talk with your client, where are we?

MR. SHETLER: Your Honor, we would like to continue the matter until we can have our physician attended and be able to cross-examine everybody. That goes to the crux of our Defense. And we have looked at some dates with the clerk and with the government and we do have a date that seems to work for everybody.

THE COURT: Okay. And to be clear and we've talked about this before, but you knew your doctor wasn't available but you at least thought you were going to be able to have the State's doctor --

MR. SHETLER: Yes.

1

2

3

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: -- and agreed to proceed on that basis. But now that that doctor is no longer available because of an unforeseen emergency which is beyond all of our control, he also can't be here for this trial.

MS, BAHARAV: Right.

MR. SHETLER: That's correct, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. BAHARAV: And counsel found out at ten this morning.

THE COURT: Right. Let's have a clear record. Thank you. Okay. So, what are you looking at?

MR. SHETLER: It appears that you have availability the week of September 28th for trial.

THE COURT: I do; yeah, we can put it over to there. I mean, it's fine with me. There's always cases set. You could always go to overflow if you need to as

Rough Draft Transcript - Day 2, Page 9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

long as Mr. Perry understands that that's, you know, four more months -- well more.

MR. SHETLER: We did talk at length about that and he understands that it is time sitting in custody and it's unfortunate.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, you know, as I'm sure you recognize it could be another opportunity for you to talk further about a possible negotiation. That ultimately obviously that's up to, you know, it's up to you guys to discuss and ultimately up to Mr. Perry Okay. And Mr. Perry, I want to have a clear record. You agree with your -- what your client has said in terms of wanting to put off -- over the trial because of not having a doctor and re-scheduling it for the week of September 28th?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am. Patience is a virtue and both of these people work hard all year round. I mean, I've been here a year and the stuff that I've seen and cases. I mean, people need a break. And I know he definitely need a vacation.

THE COURT: Well we're not doing it because of that but that's fine.

THE DEFENDANT: Well you know I'm a man.

THE COURT: Right.

THE DEFENDANT: Patience is a virtue.

THE COURT: Right. I see. You had vacation scheduled in July. Got it.

MR. SHETLER: The earlier date did -- correct.

THE COURT: Right. And I, you know, I would rather not cause you to lose your vacation as well. Okay.

MR. SHETLER: Thank you. My wife thanks everybody.

THE COURT: So, let's schedule a calendar call and trial.

THE DEFENDANT: As long as I keep you, Judge Cadish, because you are a

3

4.

5

6

7 8

ň

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24

25

very honest judge.

THE COURT: Well I appreciate that.

THE DEFENDANT: And fair and all that. Everybody likes you.

THE COURT: Oh, thank you. We should be clear though that you may get sent to overflow in any given week.

THE DEFENDANT: I'll sit until we can see you.

THE COURT: Well I appreciate your support. We'll see what happens. I mean, who knows what's going to go in any given week. I have a couple murder trials set that week. I have our friend, Mr. War Machine's trial, set that week.

MS. BAHARAV: Oh, so it's definitely your case because Rob's on that case too.

THE COURT: But, again, whether any of those will actually go that week remains to be seen and that's true for any week.

MR. SHETLER: One of the most challenging parts of this profession that complete lack of control. Thank you, Judge.

THE COURT: Let's go ahead and get that on the record.

THE COURT CLERK: Calendar call September $21^{\rm st}$ at 9:30; jury trial September $28^{\rm th}$ 10 a.m.

THE COURT: Okay. With respect to the jurors who have been waiting out there, you can just let them know that the trial is not proceeding and that they're dismissed. If they want to they can talk about the case now.

All right. Unfortunately we had these circumstances beyond our control for all of us all week. So, I appreciate that all of you have been very professional and courteous all week and I'm sure you will continue to be.

MS. BAHARAV: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. MR. SHETLER: A pleasure to be here. [Jury Trial, Day 2, concluded at 1:52 p.m.] 4. ATTEST: Pursuant to Rule 3(c)(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. Court Transcriber

Electronically Filed 03/31/2016 02:09:41 PM RTRAN CLERK OF THE COURT 2 3 DISTRICT COURT 4 CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA 5 6 THE STATE OF NEVADA, 7 CASE NO. C298879-1 8 Plaintiff. DEPT. VI 9 VS. 10 **ROUGH DRAFT** GENARO RICHARD PERRY, 11 TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS Defendant. 12 13 14 BEFORE THE HONORABLE ELISSA F. CADISH, DISTRICT COURT JUDGE 15 MONDAY, JULY 21, 2014 16 CALENDAR CALL 17 18 19 APPEARANCES: 20 For the State: ROBERT STEPHENS, ESQ. Deputy District Attorney 21 22 For the Defendant: TRAVIS SHETLER, ESQ. ROSS SMILLIE, ESQ. 23 24 RECORDED BY: JESSICA KIRKPATRICK, COURT RECORDER 25

~1 ~

Rough Draft

3

Richard.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE MARSHAL: Bottom of page 13, State of Nevada v. Perry, Genaro

MR. STEPHENS: Rob Stephens for the State.

MR. SHETLER: Good morning, Your Honor, Travis Shetler and Ross Smillie on behalf of the Defendant who's present, in custody.

THE COURT: Okay, good morning.

MR. SMILLIE: Good morning.

THE COURT: Okay, you're on for calendar call today. Where are we?

MR. SHETLER: We've -- we'll let Mr. Stephens speak.

MR. STEPHENS: Your Honor, I handed some discovery to Defense counsel some of the CCDC records along with some jail phone calls. Additionally, Your Honor, I will be forthcoming -- the victim is still seeking treatment for some of the injuries she sustained and so I have not obtained all the medical records at this time to disclose to Defense counsel.

Having said that, the State would be ready, although if the Defense would like a continuance being that I haven't disclosed all the discovery as of yet -it's still ongoing, Your Honor, so it's not like I don't have it and don't want to give It to them. Like I said, ---

THE COURT: No, I know.

MR. STEPHENS: -- it's ongoing.

THE COURT: No, I'm not -- I understand you're giving what you can give and what you have.

MR. STEPHENS: Yeah.

THE COURT: Right, I --

MR. STEPHENS: So I'd have no objection, though, if the Defense requested a continuance.

THE COURT: Right. I mean he was also arraigned June 26th and invoked and here we are, you know, July 21st.

MR. SHETLER: Right, it's been a quick run, Your Honor, and I've -- I was involved in a ridiculous tax trial, at least what it took from mental capacity was ridiculous, not --

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. SHETLER: -- the rest of it --

THE COURT: Right.

MR. SHETLER: -- for about a month and a half.

I've spoken with our client, explained to him the lack of the medical records right now, explained that there's a possibility of the injury to the eye being significant enough that there may be a problem with retaining the eye on the victim and that that's an important issue for us to have resolved before we make a final decision about resolution and before we go to trial. He did invoke. He would prefer to keep the trial on for when it's going. We talked about the fact that my advice is we don't go to trial until we have those records and know exactly what our universe of potential outcomes is.

He does have another matter that he's currently detained on. If there is a stack in September, what I would ask is the Court's permission to talk to my client a little bit and see if that's a feasible resolution for him but we are in a little bit of a difficult spot.

THE COURT: Is this going to be an overflow eligible case when it goes?

with our client, if it's possible to go on that -- September 29th did we say, Mr. Stephens? 2 MR. STEPHENS: Yes. Perfect. 3 THE COURT: Right, September 29th. 4 Okay, so it's -- in light of the short-type, short setting and the additional 5 discovery still being provided, Defense requested for a continuance; correct? в MR. SHETLER: That's correct, Your Honor. 7 THE COURT: And -- with the understanding that I'm going to put it 8 September 29th; is he waiving to allow that to happen? 9 MR. SHETLER: That is what we discussed over there. The Court. I 10 understand, may need to address that further and I tried to brief him for that and --11 THE COURT: Okay, 12 MR. SHETLER: -- prepare him. 13 THE COURT: So, Mr. Perry, with the understanding that I'm intending to 14 continue the trial to September 29th, are you waiving your right to a speedy trial to 15 allow that to happen? 16 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 17 THE COURT: Okay, let's go ahead and continue the trial then. 18 THE CLERK: Calendar call September 22nd, 9:30; jury trial September 29th, 19 10:00 a.m. 20 MR. STEPHENS: Thank you, Your Honor. 21 THE COURT: Thank you. 22 111111 23 ||/////|25 1/////

[Proceedings concluded at 10:15 a.m.]

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

4.

CYNTHIA GEORGILAS
Court Recorder/Transcriber
Eighth Judicial District Court Dept. XVIII

-6-

Electronically Filed

		03/31/2016 02:12:42 PM	
1	RTRAN	Alun & Lenine	
2			
3			
4	DISTRICT COURT		
5	CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA		
6 7 8	THE STATE OF NEVADA, Plaintiff,))) CASE NO. C298879-1	
9	vs.) DEPT. VI }	
10	GENARO RICHARD PERRY,	ROUGH DRAFT	
11	Defendant.	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS	
12		\	
13	PZTTNASA INA A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A	<u> </u>	
14	BEFORE THE HONORABLE ELISSA F. CADISH, DISTRICT COURT JUDGE		
15	THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 17, 2015		
16	DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO ADMIT EVIDENCE PURSUANT TO NRS 48.045 PETROCELLI HEARING		
17			
18 19	APPEARANCES:		
20	For the State:	MICHELLE L. SUDANO, ESQ.	
21		Deputy District Attorney	
22	For the Defendant:	TRAVIS SHETLER, ESQ.	
23	Tormo bosongane	ANAIS-MARIE CACCAMO, ESQ.	
24			
25	RECORDED BY: JESSICA KIRKPATRICK, COURT RECORDER		
		. 1	

Rough Draft

this incident at the TJ Maxx did occur. She would acknowledge that she did tell the Defendant, Mr. Perry, about that. So in light of that, I don't know that we need to call her to testify to those things. I believe that Mr. Shetler also was potentially going to call a security guard from TJ Maxx just to verify that it happened and maybe even his client to confirm that his client was aware of it. But in light of Ms. Carpenter's representations to me that I don't have any reason to doubt, I don't know that we need to take the Court's time by putting her up there. I think that we just need to then move on to the analysis of whether or not that comes in, if its more probative than prejudicial, and addressing the scope of how far into that we're going to get.

MR. SHETLER: I -- she's of course got it right I think.

THE COURT: So, I think at the last hearing we had on this matter my recollection of what you told us is that your intention was to use it only in support of the self-defense defense, that is, in an attempt to show that because your client knew about this prior incident that that affected how he responded to what happened that day.

MR. SHETLER: I think that that's the most meat for that Information. I agree with that, Your Honor.

There is one other angle and that is going to be a little bit more of a battle for us and that is the idea that if, in fact, the victim was willing to use a knife on somebody in the middle of TJ Maxx then why wouldn't she do it in the privacy and comfort of her own home which now it's an argument basically that she did it once why didn't she do it again? And I understand that the government's going to be much more excited about that argument but --

THE COURT: Not in a good way.

MR. SHETLER: No, not in a positive fashion whatsoever. You're right.

You're right. But that would be the other benefit we would try and get in from that, Your Honor, but that's going to be very much dependent on the testimony at trial because it's going to have to come up at trial now.

THE COURT: So are you trying to use it to show she's a violent or aggressive person?

MR. SHETLER: Well, in a -- if everything lined up perfectly, yes, I understand that I'm -- that's my far reach. But the main thing is, look, we have -- we know this happened and we had to protect our self and that's solid ground I believe that we're in a good position on that.

THE COURT: Okay, so to the extent it's just being used to show what your client was aware of for a possible self-defense that's one thing. But to the extent that it's attempted to be used regarding Ms. Carpenter's character for aggression or violence, then that opened the door for the State to introduce similar evidence to rebut that position.

MR. SHETLER: Right, and that's a conversation that needs to be gone through a little more detail with Mr. Perry.

THE COURT: So what are we doing today?

MS. SUDANO: So today I think we just need to address whether or not this is going to be more probative or prejudicial as to the self-defense claim. I think obviously if that's the theory of Defense that they put forward at the time of trial it's going to be pretty darn probative and we're going to have a hard time arguing that it's prejudicial. But that obviously depends on them raising the self-defense claim at the time of trial. If we don't get into self-defense it's obviously not relevant at all for any purpose. And then to the extent that it's going to be used as character evidence or propensity evidence for Ms. Carpenter, its -- that's completely improper under the

statute and as Your Honor said it does open the door to his prior acts of violence at that point I think.

THE COURT: Well, I mean if it's trying to show that she was the aggressor, I mean there are some case law that allows evidence to show that, but yes, it opens the door for rebuttal evidence.

MS. SUDANO: That's correct. And so I think today one of the things that we need to address is the scope to which we're going to get into that information with her. It's the State's position that the question should be limited to, you know, very briefly, hey, did this incident happen? To the extent they think that that's going to be crucial, was there a knife involved, and then, you know, move on beyond that, you know, no testimony from any of the additional witnesses, no gory details, for lack of a better word, into it, just, hey, it happened and you told him and then we move on from it.

MR. SHETLER: I do feel -- no, go ahead.

THE COURT: Well, what I was going to say is to the extent that its being -that we're talking about possibly using knowledge of it on the self-defense issue,
number one, that would be about the incident itself and wouldn't get into whatever
legal convictions she may have from it. It would be about the incident itself is what
would be at issue that --

MR. SHETLER: That's all that goes to our state of mind. You're right, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. And that would not include whether she lied about her name at the time she was picked up; correct?

MR. SHETLER: Right.

THE COURT: Okay. I see a nodding; that's not on the record.

2

3

4

6

O

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14 15

. .

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

MR. SHETLER: You're right. I'm sorry, Judge.

THE COURT: Okay. And in that narrow circumstance I think it would be relevant to a self-defense defense, if he's raising a self-defense, and with respect to the other prongs under <u>Petrocelli</u>, the clear and convincing evidence, it sounds like based on talking to her you're not disputing clear and convincing evidence that the incident happened --

MS. SUDANO: And that he knew about it.

THE COURT: -- and that he knew about it.

MS, SUDANO: Correct.

THE COURT: So, it's -- the relevance, the clear and convincing and not more prejudicial. I mean --

MR, SHETLER: [Indiscernible].

THE COURT: -- to the extent its used in that context, I don't think it's more prejudicial and I think it could come in as -- to present some evidence that, yes, this incident happened and he was aware of it and that was part of what was in his mind when he was dealing with her that day.

MR. SHETLER: Right, and that's certainly the most important --

THE COURT: And -- okay, --

MR. SHETLER: - item that comes out of this whole --

THE COURT: -- so that I think you win. If that's the context, I would allow based on the representation about Ms. Carpenter's testimony and the fact that that part of it is not disputed at this point.

MS. SUDANO: That's correct.

THE COURT: Okay. Now, when you say that's most of it, that doesn't give me great comfort because then we need to deal with whatever the rest of it is.

 MR. SHETLER: Well, the issue regarding how she talked to my client about this matter and there's only one way really to get that in if she doesn't want to get into that and that's another issue because my client's very uncomfortable testifying and is not ready -- not in a position -- he's not made the decision yet he's willing to waive that right even for these limited purposes. There's other information that I don't even want to get into with the Court right now because I don't have it in the record any other way then from my busy little brain, but it is -- there is other information that [indiscernible] developed during trial that would go to what she had to say about that --

THE COURT: About?

MR. SHETLER: — the fashion in which she told him about how that incident went down, the — I'm trying to be very careful, Your Honor, the — her analysis of how the system dealt with her and would deal with her in the future, if I can be slightly vague. Those are matters that are only residing in our heads and I don't anticipate that even on the stand those are things that she would get into, [indiscernible] —

MS. SUDANO: And I don't understand how any of that's relevant to the self-defense claim.

MR. SHETLER: It's -- no, no, I agree. We're -- I completely can see that that's not going to be part of our self-defense claim. It's purely trying to show prior bad -- basically bad character, character [indiscernible] which very dangerous and it goes both ways and it -- and that's a little bit developed depending on how it develops at trial.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. SHETLER: The number one issue we're fine. The number two issue I can't put completely to bed because it's not completely my decision and we don't

 know exactly what's going to happen with my client and his desire to waive or not waive his right to get on the stand. And from a strategy and legal advice point of view, I think stopping the bus at the point where we are may well be in my client's best interest. I just can't —

THE COURT: Well, okay. I mean ! --

MR. SHETLER: -- leave chips on the table.

THE COURT: -- hear what you're saying about that, but at the same time other bad act stuff needs to be at least -- there are times that we -- that <u>Petroceili</u> hearings are had right before the trial starts or even during the trial on a break without the jury. But having said that, there's -- I at least need to know what you're moving to admit I think. I don't know. I mean I --

MR. SHETLER: I don't think I have a basis to -- that's my problem, I don't have a basis to move to admit anything yet. I mean you need to know what she's going to say or we all -- it would be great but we're not going to know.

THE COURT: So, you want to leave it as, okay, so to the extent that he raises self-defense at trial and seeks to admit evidence about this incident of which he was aware to show what he -- to show that it affected his state of mind on this day, I would grant your request.

MR. SHETLER: And with the limitations that you've put on that and the -- to -- I'm comfortable with that. That makes sense and I --

THE COURT: But to --

MR. SHETLER: -- think that's all they're --

THE COURT: -- the extent --

MR. SHETLER: -- entitled to --

THE COURT: -- you're asking --

MR. SHETLER: - right now.

THE COURT: — for anything else, I would not be granting that yet today.

You're not clearly requesting more than that today, and so you would need to raise it outside the presence of the jury and take it up and we would need to do whatever hearings were necessary at that point should you want to introduce more.

MR. SHETLER: I would like to leave that option available. I don't want to waste time during trial and I know we're here today and I'm happy to do that, I just don't have — my client is not in a position where he's willing to make the final decision on that issue right now whether he testifies or testify even in this limited — even if we were to have the hearing right now in this limited capacity he's not comfortable with that.

THE COURT: Ms. Sudano?

MS. SUDANO: I mean I don't know what else we can do here. It sounds like there's no additional information that we could even have a <u>Petrocelli</u> hearing on at this point. We've addressed the self-defense—

THE COURT: Right.

MS. SUDANO: -- prong and the rest of it we'll have to address during trial if it --

THE COURT: Right, but -- so here's --

MS. SUDANO: -- becomes relevant.

THE COURT: — what I would say. I mean there is some case law out there that would indicate that in a dispute between two people that there is some area to introduce some character evidence about somebody's character for violence or aggression, whatever you want to call it, but it's also clear that if at least offered by an accused —

1

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. SHETLER: Right.

THE COURT: -- and it's also clear under NRS 48.045(1) that in that context it allows similar evidence to be offered by the prosecution to rebut that evidence and if you're seek -- to the extent you chose to try to go into that area we'll have to talk about to what extent it opens the door for the State to rebut that by showing evidence that might indicate to the contrary.

MR. SHETLER: Exactly, and that's – you're correct, Your Honor, and that's the part where Mr. Perry and I need to have a long, relaxed –

THE COURT: Right, because --

MR. SHETLER: -- discussion.

THE COURT: -- it could certainly end up coming back to bite him.

MR. SHETLER: Yes. Yes.

THE COURT: Okay.

So, I guess I'm granting your motion to admit evidence to the limited extent I described --

MR. SHETLER: As -- yes.

THE COURT: -- in connection with a proposed self-defense defense and based on him knowing about this incident and not getting into the -- and that -- about the incident itself, not getting into the conviction, not getting into lying about her name, but focused on the confrontation or, you know, act with the knife or a tire iron with this woman in the TJ Maxx store.

MR. SHETLER: Right.

MS. SUDANO: And this also doesn't get into her beliefs about the criminal justice system or anything like that; right, Your Honor?

THE COURT: Right.

3

4 5

6

7

8

9 10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20 21

22

24

23 25 MS. SUDANO: Right.

THE COURT: I don't have anything before me to indicate how that would become relevant.

MR. SHETLER: I understand what you're saying.

THE COURT: Okay. So, perhaps one of you should prepare an order so it's clear what I have and haven't done today.

MR. SHETLER: I'm happy to work on that and have Ms. Sudano check and make sure I've not ---

THE COURT: And we didn't have the evidentiary hearing, but based on the representations and the offer of proof made about what she would say satisfied that those requirements are met under Petrocelli.

MS. SUDANO: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I guess we're done with this for today. I mean we're back next Monday for calendar call so there's not a whole lot --

MR. SHETLER: Right.

THE COURT: -- more time.

MR. SHETLER: Correct. And my client, of course, is extremely -- there's two issues -- one other issue I think we should mention. My client does want to remain in this courtroom. My client is willing -- and it's only a request, it hasn't been decided and it's not our decision, my client would be comfortable with a bench if the Court -- I understand the government may have a different opinion about that but we have not addressed it. We just don't want to give you any extra surprises, Judge,

THE COURT: Right. I do have I think one murder case still set the same week as you so I have to see how that goes. Other cases that were set there that are high priority cases have for the most part moved off of that week for various

10

11 12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

22

23 24

25

reasons but I have at least one left. I mean so I understand and I appreciate your confidence in me but you know there are so many weeks that nothing goes to trial but you know then it happens where they all want to go at once and you know we do the best we can to deal with it. I mean have you yet been in contact with the witnesses that you'll be bringing to know their availability?

MS. SUDANO: We don't have a lot of witnesses on this case to my knowledge.

THE COURT: Well, we already had to continue it once -

MS. SUDANO: Correct.

THE COURT: -- because one became --

MS. SUDANO: One of the doctors.

THE COURT: -- not available.

MS. SUDANO: Yeah, so they're going to be the hang-up I think again potentially would be the doctors. To my knowledge at this point we are prepared to go forward barring some emergency surgery like last time. We shouldn't have an issue.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. SHETLER: My client does understand -- my client understands there are delays. You'll recall from the last hearing -- I'll stop talking. We've been here a long time but I think that -- I just don't want to surprise the Court. I want the Court to know at least as much as we know and --

THE COURT: Right.

MR. SHETLER: -- [indiscernible].

THE COURT: Okay. All right, so that much is granted. We can talk more at calendar call when I see what else we have on for that week and -- so this criminal

```
stack you're on the second to last week of the stack. The last week of this criminal
    stack is October 5th. Obviously, -- I mean I've got you know of course a bunch of
    cases set every week and --
3
          MR. SHETLER: Right.
4.
          THE COURT: - you never know if they're going to go or not go, but.
5
          MR. SHETLER: Was it a two week stack then or three week stack?
6
          THE COURT: No, it's a five week stack but --
7
          MR. SHETLER: We're at the end. We're --
8
          THE COURT: Right.
9
          MR. SHETLER: Okay.
10
          THE COURT: Right, its -- right, it started a few weeks ago, so.
11
          MR. SHETLER: Okay.
12
          THE COURT: Right.
13
                So, that's the current stack and then I go into a five week civil and then
14
    the next criminal stack is November 16<sup>th</sup> through December 14<sup>th</sup> weeks,
15
          MR. SHETLER: All right, Judge. We'll get an order. Do you need the order
16
    before we're here next Monday?
17
          THE COURT: Not necessarily, but certainly before trial.
18
          MR. SHETLER: Right, Okay.
19
          THE COURT: Okay.
20
          MS. SUDANO: Thank you, Your Honor.
21
          THE COURT: Thanks.
22
   1////
23
   11111
   1/1/1/1
25
```

MR. SHETLER: Thank you for the courtesy, Judge. THE COURT: Okay. [Proceedings concluded at 9:05 a.m.] ATTEST: I do hereby certify that I have truly and correctly transcribed the audio/video recording in the above-entitled case to the best of my ability. Court Recorder/Transcriber Eighth Judicial District Court Dept. XVIII

Electronically Filed 03/31/2016 02:13:30 PM

		03/31/2016 02;13:30 PM		
1	RTRAN	Alum & Blummer CLERK OF THE COURT		
2				
3				
4	DISTRICT COURT			
5	CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA			
6				
7	THE STATE OF NEVADA,			
8	Plaintiff,	CASE NO. C298879-1		
9	vs.	DEPT. VI		
10	GENARO RICHARD PERRY,	ROUGH DRAFT		
11	}	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS		
12	Defendant.	THE STATE OF THE S		
13	<u> </u>			
14	BEFORE THE HONORABLE ELISSA F. CADISH, DISTRICT COURT JUDGE			
15	MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 21, 2015			
16	CALENDAR CALL			
17				
18				
19	APPEARANCES:			
20	For the State:	MICHELLE L. SUDANO, ESQ.		
21		Deputy District Attorney		
22	For the Defendant:	TRAVIS SHETLER, ESQ.		
23				
24				
25	RECORDED BY: JESSICA KIRKPATRICK, COURT RECORDER			
		4		
	~ 1 ~			

week to help cover those, but that would be great.

8

9

10 11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18 19

20 21

22

23 24

25

THE COURT: Okay, so -- because my criminal calendar next Monday is going to be pretty hefty. We put a lot over there although the rest of the week shouldn't be too bad on my end, so Monday at 1:30. Are we okay there? Hopefully

MR. SHETLER: Yes, Your Honor,

THE COURT: -- that means we could get it done next week if we set it there.

MS. SUDANO: I anticipate --

MR. SHETLER: I feel confident.

MS. SUDANO: - that shouldn't be an issue, Your Honor, no.

MR. SHETLER: Yes. And my client would like to renew his request that we waive the need for a jury, notwithstanding the State of Nevada's not super excited about that.

MS. SUDANO: And the State's not going to agree -

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. SUDANO: -- to waive the right to a jury trial in this particular case.

THE COURT: Okay, that's fine. I understand. So, we will have a jury then because we don't have a stipulation.

So, let's get the trial set for the 28th at 1:30.

THE CLERK: Okay, September 28th at 1:30.

THE COURT: And I would ask to get proposed instructions -- well, I'm going to be out this Wednesday but if you could get them to us Thursday that would be great.

MR. SHETLER: What type of format, Your Honor?

THE COURT: In Word with citations and without citations to my assistant, Mr. Kelly. You can get his e-mail address if you don't have it.

MR. SHETLER: I think we do from last time. We're good. 1 THE COURT: Okay, and I think that's about it. 2 MR. SHETLER: I know it's been a long morning and know the Court's 3 4 made --5 THE COURT: It has. MR. SHETLER: - a decision, my client would very much like to just make a 6 comment about the need or not need for jury. I don't know if the Court would be 7 willing to entertain that. I understand --8 THE COURT: Without a stipulation there's nothing I can do in response to 9 that. So I appreciate his confidence but the State has a right to a jury trial as well and if they're exercising that right we're going to have a jury. 11 MR. SHETLER: Tunderstand, Tjust want to make sure. 12 Thank you, Judge. 13 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. 14 [Proceedings concluded at 11:31 a.m.] 15 16 ATTEST: I do hereby certify that I have truly and correctly transcribed the 17 audio/video recording in the above-entitled case to the best of my ability. 18 19 20 Court Recorder/Transcriber Eighth Judicial District Court Dept. XVIII 21 22 23

24

25

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

No. 69139

Electronically Filed Jun 21 2016 03:27 p.m. Tracie K. Lindeman Clerk of Supreme Court

GENARO PERRY

Appellant,

VS.

STATE OF NEVADA

Respondent.

Appeal from a Judgment of Conviction

Eight Judicial District Court, Clark County

The Honorable Elissa F. Cadish, District Court

Appendix Volume I

TRAVIS E. SHETLER, ESQ. Travis E. Shelter, P.C. Nevada Bar No. 004747 844 E. Sahara Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada 89104 Telephone: (702) 866-0091 Fax: (702) 866-0093 Counsel for Appellant GENARO PERRY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Appendix Volume II

Bench Trial Day 1
Bench Trial Day 2
Bench Trial Day 3
Stipulation and Order Waiving Jury TrialAA 00405-00406
Judgement of ConvictionAA 00407-00409
SentencingAA 00410-00417
Sentencing continuedAA 00418-00427
Notice of AppealAA 00428-00433

Electronically Filed 04/13/2016 01;54;25 PM

		0-4 (0/2010 01,54;25 PM			
1 2	RTRAN	Alun & Burn CLERK OF THE COURT			
3					
4					
5	DISTRICT COURT				
6	CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA				
7					
8)			
9	THE STATE OF NEVADA,) CASE#: C298879			
10	Plaintiff,	DEPT. VI			
11	GENARO PERRY,	\			
12	Defendant,	\			
13	таринандаруна да дары, станина оторого түчүн менен да дарын кататарын ката				
14 15	BEFORE THE HONORABLE ELISSA CADISH, DISTRICT COURT JUDGE TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 29, 2015				
16	RECORDER'S ROUGH DRAFT TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS				
17	BENCH TE	RIAL - DAY 1			
18	APPEARANCES:				
19	For the State:	ROBERT BRAD TURNER, ESQ.			
20		Chief Deputy District Attorney MICHELLE SUDANO, ESQ.			
21		Deputy District Attorney			
22	For the Defendant:	TRAVIS E. SHETLER, ESQ.			
23					
24					
25	RECORDED BY: JESSICA KIRKPATRICK, COURT RECORDER				
	,				
	Rough Draft Transcript - Day 1 - 1				

INDEX OF WITNESSES

,			
d	٤		

STATE'S WITNESSES	<u>DAY</u>	PAGE
STEVEN LEIBOWITZ Direct Examination by Ms. Sudano Cross-Examination by Mr. Shetler Questions by the Court	1 1 1	13 25 37
CORLA CARPENTER Direct Examination by Ms. Sudano Gross-Examination by Mr. Shetler Redirect Examination by Ms. Sudano Recross Examination by Mr. Shetler Questions by the Court	1 1 1 1	39 80 114 118 119
JUSTIN TERRY Direct Examination by Ms. Sudano Cross-Examination by Mr. Shetler	2 2	6 16
ALMEDIA BRAGG Direct Examination by Ms. Sudano Cross-Examination by Mr. Shetler Redirect Examination by Ms. Sudano Recross Examination by Mr. Shetler	2 2 2 2	18 34 43 44
DANIELLE KELLER Direct Examination by Ms. Sudano Cross-Examination by Mr. Shetler	2 2	45 57

DEFENSE WITNESSES	DAY	PAGE
[None presented.]		

INDEX OF EXHIBITS

4.

STATE'S EXHIBITS

1 through 37 [Stipulated]

DAY PAGE

<u>DEFENSE EXHIBITS</u>

<u>DAY</u> <u>PAGE</u>

[None presented.]

Rough Draft Transcript - Day 1 - 3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

2324

25

THE MARSHAL: All rise. District Court, Department 6 is now in session. The Honorable Judge Cadish presiding.

Please be seated. Come to order.

THE COURT: All right, folks, go ahead and state your appearances for the record.

MS. SUDANO: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Michelle Sudano and Brad Turner on behalf of the State.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. SHETLER: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Travis Shetler on behalf of Mr. Perry, who's present at the counsel table in custody.

THE COURT: Okay. So let me just confirm on the record. It's my understanding that both parties have agreed for this to be a bench trial, with me at the trier of fact rather than a jury.

The State agree?

MS. SUDANO: That's correct, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Defendants?

MR. SHETLER: That is correct, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. And I guess part -- because it's a bench trial, rather than a jury, Mr. Perry was not dressed out --

MR. SHETLER: Right.

THE COURT: -- today. I've seen him in the jail uniform before, so we know he's in custody, and I'll still rule based on the facts and the law.

MR. SHETLER: Right. Thank you, Your Honor. Noted.

THE COURT: Okay. No objection to --

MR. SHETLER: On objection.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

And although -- so we put this over till today from yesterday because there were some issues about the doctor availability. And now it's my understanding that he is available.

MS. SUDANO: That is --

THE COURT: Somehow he made himself available.

MS. SUDANO: That is correct, Your Honor. I apologize for all the confusion and I do want to thank Your Honor and the department for being accommodating and pushing this back for us for a day in order to attempt to get the doctor here.

THE COURT: Okay. Trying to think if -- I did get instructions on the law from the State. And I -- even though it's a bench trial I think it's useful to have instructions even, you know, for my own use and to make sure that we're on the same page about the law that applies as we go through the trial and ultimately when you argue at the end.

I expect that when we end it and I'm — I'll sort of take some time with the evidence in chambers and then call you back when I've got a decision. I don't expect it to be a particularly — I mean, lengthy time, but however much time it takes for me to review it and feel comfortable. But there will sort of be a deliberation among me, myself and I, I guess.

MR. SHETLER: Good. That's all we could ask for, Judge.

THE COURT: Okay. So with that, is there anything else we need to discuss before we just do like an opening statement?

MR. SHETLER: No, Your Honor. We do think that we can probably wrap up

24

25

things, if not today, certainly tomorrow.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. SHETLER: And Ms. Sudano and I had spoken about what the Court wanted as far as an opening statement or not. I know her doctor is supposedly ready to go at 1:30.

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. SUDANO: I just checked out there. Hé had not arrived --

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. SUDANO: -- a few moments ago. He may be there now and I have confirmed that he's on his way here.

THE COURT: Okay.

THE MARSHAL: What's his name?

MS. SUDANO: Dr. Leivowitz.

MR. SHETLER: But we're certainly happy to accommodate the doctor's schedule if you want to start --

THE COURT: Right.

MR. SHETLER: However the Court prefers.

THE COURT: Sure. So first, before I forget, I think we should schedule to start I think 10:30 tomorrow. Does that work for you? Is that --

MR. SHETLER: I think I have three in the morning. I have a sentencing; another calendar call, and that's in a court that sometimes take a little bit of time, Your Honor. I'll try and get it pulled, but that might be a little bit tight to make it by 10:30.

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. SUDANO: That works for the State, Your Honor. I don't know why --

19 20

22

21

23 24

25

THE COURT: I mean, I'm hoping --

MS. SUDANO: -- I was thinking you had --

THE COURT: -- I'll be done --

MS. SUDANO: Okay.

THE COURT: -- with my regular morning calendar by then. The calendar's a little shorter than some of what we've had lately. That doesn't necessarily mean it's short, but -- I mean, we could call at, you know, 11 --

MR. SHETLER: I'm pretty sure by -- I would know what's going on. If there's a problem I could give the Court a heads up much before then.

THE COURT: Right, I mean --

MR. SHETLER: Yeah.

THE COURT: We don't have -- I don't have a jury to stress over, so if we run a few minutes behind 10:30 that's okay. I may be a little behind; you may be a little behind, but --

MR. SHETLER: Thank you, Judge.

THE COURT: -- if we can get started then that would be good because -- because of a personal appointment I have, I'd like to be out of here by 3:30 tomorrow. Maybe we'll be done by then, but if we're not I'm going to want to finish, so we'll see how it goes.

MR. SHETLER: That sounds fine, Your Honor.

MS. SUDANO: Absolutely, Your Honor.

MR. SHETLER: Easily doable. Thank you, Judge.

THE COURT: Ten-thirty tomorrow.

And then -- so a lot of times when I have -- so usually when I have bench trials it's in civil cases not criminal cases. It's the second time I've had one in

a criminal cases. So -- but usually in a civil case, when I have a bench trial, I read their pretrial briefs and I don't necessarily ask for an opening. I guess it's up to you -- I mean, if -- I've seen the instructions and gone through it, but -- and I know we've had some motion practice, but if you want to quickly outline what you expect to present it might be helpful just -- especially if we have a minute before the doctor starts.

MS. SUDANO: Absolutely, Your Honor.

So in this case the State intends to prove that on the evening of April 30th of 2014 the Defendant in this case, Genaro Perry, arrived at his ex-girlfriend's house, that being Corla Carpenter. They had just broken up after about six months of dating shortly prior to that. Once Mr. Perry arrived, Ms. Carpenter agreed to let him stay in the house for the evening and then he was going to take his belongings and leave the following morning.

Early on the morning of May 1st, 2014, Mr. Perry woke up and was in an agitated state. He began making threats and statements to Ms. Carpenter that were very concerning to her. She attempted to call 9-1-1 while she was still in her bed. Once she attempted to call 9-1-1 the Defendant took her phone and threw it against a wall. She tried to get out of the bedroom and into a bathroom to get away from him. Once that happened, he began punching and kicking her; knocked her to the ground inside the bathroom. Once she was on the ground in the bathroom the struggle continued. She was able to pick up — or pick herself up. She bit the Defendant to get downstairs.

Once she was about halfway downstairs he caught up with her; kicked her down the remaining stairs and into a landing inside her kitchen. Once she was in the kitchen, she was still on the ground, he continued to beat and kick her while

she was on the ground in the fetal position in the kitchen. He then located kitchen knife that was on a counter just to her side. He picked up the kitchen knife, began swinging it at her; forced her to go inside the living room at knife point. While she was in the living room he continued making threats against her and her family. Made several statements to her about how he was going to kill her that evening.

While she was still in the kitchen he locate -- or he still had that knife, he located her keys; picked up the keys to her 1999 Mercedes Benz and told her that he was going to take the car. He then forced her back upstairs at knife point and put her back into a back bathroom in the house and told her that she was not to leave until she heard the garage door close. He again threatened to kill her and her family or cause them great harm if she attempted to leave or call the police. He then left he bedroom, went and got her cell phone that he had prior -- previously thrown against a wall, came back into the bathroom and threw the cell phone in the toilet and again told her not to call the police. She then heard the car leaving and was able to go downstairs; attempted to leave the house to find a neighbor; was unable to do so and then used her phone that was still wet to call the police.

You're going to also hear from the first responding police officer, Officer Almedia Bragg, who responded to the scene and was able to observe the injuries to Ms. Carpenter.

You're also going to hear from the crime scene analyst, Danielle Keller, who was there to document the scene; the blood and the items found at the house, as well as the kitchen knife with apparent blood on it that was located in the garage.

And finally you're going to hear from Officer Justin Terry of the Las Vegas Police Department; will tell you that the following day, so May 2nd of 2014, he located the victim's car approximately two to three miles away from where she lived

25 THE CO

and where it had been taken the day prior.

And at the end of the evidence the State's going to ask that you, Your Honor, acting as our trier of fact today, find the Defendant, Genaro Perry, guilty of all of the counts as charged.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Mr. Shetler?

MR. SHETLER: Your Honor, the crux of our case, there are some of the facts that are going to be in dispute and some we may be in agreement upon.

THE COURT: Mm-hmm.

MR. SHETLER: Mr. Perry's position is this stemmed from a dispute regarding money that was loaned for drug purposes. That he went to get his — there was a fallout between the two of them a few days before the alleged date of the incident. That he went to get his stuff from her house; tried to make arrangements to do that. There was some discussion about what took place when he got there. What he was worried about is that she was the aggressor. He knew of her previous incident where she had used a knife on somebody. Any actions he did take were taken at self-defense. And that we have — there's no evidence that's going to tie him to the Mercedes. But all his actions were taken in self-defense and any injuries that she sustained as a result of that. There's also a question to the extent of her injuries in light of the bodily harm charge. We'll get into that with the examination of the doctor, but the x-rays do show at the emergency room that there was a fracture of the orbit, so that's challenging.

THE COURT: Mm-hmm. Okay, you done?

MR. SHETLER: Yes, ma'am.

THE COURT: Sorry. Okay.

BY MS. SUDANO:

3

Q

4

5

6

А

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

21

23

24 25 Sir, how are you employed?

Α I'm self-employed.

What's your educational background? Q

I went to Brandeis University for undergraduate. Then I went to Columbia College of Physicians and Surgeons in New York for medical school. And I did my internship in internal medicine at Stanford University. And I did my ophthalmology residency and fellow -- and fellowship in ophthalmic plastic and reconstructive surgery and orbital surgery at Harvard University.

Q How long have you been practicing medicine?

Α I think 20 -- 27 -- since 1985.

Now do you have any additional certifications beyond the ones that Q you've already listed?

Well, I'm board certified in ophthalmology by the American Board of Α Ophthalmology. And I'm a member of the American Society of Ophthalmic Plastic and Reconstructive Surgeons, ASOPRS, which isn't really a board certification, but in order to do that you have to do an approved fellowship, which now I think there's 17. At my time there was only 14 in the country. You have do a written exam and an oral -- a written exam, a thesis, and an oral exam.

Q Do you have any sort of teaching background?

Yeah, I'm assistant clinical professor at UCLA, the Jules Stein Eye institute.

Q What do you teach there?

A Ophthalmology, ophthalmic plastic and reconstructive surgery.

Well, I was very suspicious of it by the examination, but I also had the

25

Α

21

22

23

24

25

CT scan available at the time, which I actually still have in my chart. So when I looked at the CT scan I could confirm it.

Q Which eye fracture --

THE COURT: You confirmed that --

THE WITNESS: She had a orbital fracture.

THE COURT: Okay.

BY MS. SUDANO:

- Q And which eye was that orbital fracture in?
- A It was the right eye.
- Q Were you able to determine any other fractures based on the CT scan?
- A Well, the CT report, if I could read you that, it's fair -- you know, fairly specific. There it is. The impressions -- you know, they have a whole -- long report, but this is the impressions.
- Q Now, doctor, I'm going to interrupt you there; I apologize. Would you be able to remember all of this information without looking back at your chart?
- A I can only remember what -- the part that I do, which is that she had a right orbital fracture. You asked me about other fractures that don't really pertain to my work; that's why I wanted to review the -- from the chart. But from my -- my recollection she had a typical blow -- what we call blowout fracture, which is an orbital fracture of the orbital floor, as well as a fracture of the medial orbital wall, which is called the lamina papyracea.
- Q Now when we're talking about the right orbital, where is that on the face?
- A The orbit are bones around the eye. Like the socket is -- it would be a -- you know, layman's way of talking about it. There's four sets of walls around the

eye that house it. And when there's a -- what they call a blowout fracture, there's really two different theories as to how they happen. Both of them are very interesting in that -- usually happens like from a punch or something like that where a blunt trauma, where the eye itself compresses almost to -- they've shown this with fast action photography, compresses to the size of a -- you know, of a pancake, but doesn't -- the eyeball is more like a rubber ball and doesn't lacerate unless it's a sharp object.

And the two theories as to what causes the blowout fracture are that when the -- one is that the eyeball, when it expanse, the force of it blows out the walls at the weakest portions, which are the inferior wall, down below eye, or the medial wall on the side of the eye. And when I said lamina papyracea for the side of the eye that's -- means paper plate, so you can it's paper thin. And those both connect with sinuses. Those walls connect with the two sinuses. The inferior wall connects with the maxillary sinus and the medial wall connects with the ethmoid sinus.

Q Now you said that there were two theories for how --

A A second theory is that the actual trauma itself turns the bone itself and the torque of it blows out the orbits.

Q Now through your training and experience, doctor, are blowout fractures generally associated with some sort of trauma?

A It's almost always blunt trauma because as you can see if it were -- let's say with a stick or something or whatever -- the actual orbital rim, which is the bone you feel right here, doesn't fracture. It's underneath the eye or on the side of the eye at the weakest points. So it's really a -- an injury that happens from the blunt trauma, but it's not where directly the trauma hits.

- Q So if a client were -- or a patient were to have some sort of other ongoing medical history -- history of say lupus or something along those lines, would that be consistent with an orbital fracture?
 - A I don't understand the question.
- Q So if an individual had a pre-existing medical condition, such as lupus, is that something on its own that could cause an orbital fracture?
 - A No -- no way.
- Q Okay. Now you indicated that you were able to observe the orbital fracture on Ms. Carpenter. Were you able to make any other diagnoses on May 27th of 2014?
- A Well -- I mean, do you want to know what the problems were; why I thought there was a blowout fracture or what are you asking?
 - Q We'll start there and then we'll go onto the other diagnoses as well.
- A Okay. So the things that the symptoms that people have when they have a blowout fracture is one is the diplopia, in other words, double vision. And the reason for that is because there are six muscles that move the eye like pulleys. And the inferior rectus muscle is on directly right below your pupil at the bottom, and you can see it's right where the orbital rim is. So when there's a fracture, that muscle becomes somewhat entrapped in the fracture cite itself, so people can't move their eye up and down real well and that's why they have diplopia. So that's one of the main things you have. In her particular case, she also had numbness of the cheek, upper lip and teeth area, which indicates a more posterior fracture; in other words, a bigger fracture going further back.
- Q Now did she also report any additional issues, or were you able to observe any issues perhaps with where the eye was located?

7

9

10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17 18

19

20 21

22

23 24

25

A Well, she had enophthalmos, I'm sure.

THE COURT: She had what?

THE WITNESS: Enophthalmos, E-N ophthalmos. And -- E-N-O-P-H-T-H-

THE COURT: Thank you.

THE WITNESS: -- A-L-M-O-S.

THE COURT: Thank you.

THE WITNESS: Enophthalmos --

THE COURT: Uh-huh.

THE WITNESS: -- which means the eyeball is sunk in.

THE COURT: Okay.

THE WITNESS: And the reason for the eyeball being sunk in is pretty obvious and it's a volume question. So the eye is in its normal position, but if there's more volume; in other words, the bone is all of a sudden down, the eyeball sinks in because there's — it's — there's — it's taking up more of the volume of the orbit. It would be like where the attorney is standing —

THE COURT: Mm-hmm.

THE WITNESS: -- if all of a sudden was a hole in the floor there, she would be halfway into the 14th floor.

THE COURT: Right.

THE WITNESS: Okay. And she would be sink back -- you would only see half of her. That's why you would see -- that's why there's enophthalmos and that's what basically happens when there's a orbital floor fracture. If you could picture where her feet are, are where the inferior rectus muscle is. You can see why it would get entrapped into the fracture cite itself because right now the floor is solid there.

THE COURT: You --

 BY MS. SUDANO:

Q And would that refresh your recollection, doctor?

A I hope so. It would have the date on it, so it should -- oh, here it is. And it was --

THE COURT: Okay.

BY MS. SUDANO:

Q And you're looking at -- you said your op report, doctor?

A Well, I didn't even make it there yet, but I'm looking at the face sheet, which was on 6-14-14. And then the next page is the op report.

THE COURT: Okay.

BY MS. SUDANO:

Q Can you just walk us through, very generally, the surgery that you performed on --

A Okay. We'll get back to the hole in the floor analogy where you're standing. If you -- if there was a hole in the floor and you were halfway on the 14th floor what would we do? We'd lift you up with a hoist, although you don't seem that heavy we could just pick you up, and we would put a piece of plywood down underneath your feet. And the construction people would come and fix the floor and then everybody would be okay.

Same kind of thing in the orbit. We don't usually repair the medial fracture, the lamina papyracea, even though that does still cause traumatic enophthalmos — you know, can cause enophthalmos. We want to fix mostly the inferior wall problem because the eyeball and the muscle are sinking down into the sinus; that's not good. So what we do is we — I go in by a cosmetic approach, where I go in from the inside of the eyelid called the conjunctiva, so there's no scar

 on the outside, and I go right down to the orbital bone, the orbital rim right here; you can feel it. I make an incision in the lining of that bone called the periosteum, and I lift up the periosteum and try to get everything that was formally in the orbit back in the orbit. So you want to -- the stuff that's in the sinus, by hand-over-hand maneuvering you lift it up to -- with both a elevator and a retractor to try to get the stuff back in the orbit.

Q Now when you say the stuff, are you referring to pieces of bone, or you're referring to the eye matter; what are you referring to?

A No, it's the orbital contents. You want to get whatever was in the orbit before, the periosteum, the muscle, the fat, everything that's now in the sinus that doesn't belong there back to where it belongs. So then — I told you we'd put a piece of plywood underneath your feet, we put an orbital implant there that's to — to make the new floor. In her case I used a titan orbital implant, I believe, which is —

Q Are you referring back to your op report again, doctor?

A Yes, I am. Yeah, titan implant. And that's the state-of-the-art implant in that it's -- about ten years ago we used just titanium mesh, okay, but a lot of the -- which you use -- like titanium is used in your golf clubs and stuff. But what we found is that a lot of the orbital contents stuck to the mesh itself. So there's a material called porex [phonetic], which is devised by the Porex Company, that's -- allows vascularization to grow into it. So they have the new -- when I put this in, this was a fairly new implant. Now it's the number one used implant in the country. And it allows the vascularization to grow into the porex and shields it away from the titanium.

Now you say why would you even do that? The reason I put that implant in as opposed to just a piece of silastic plastic is that a lot of the floor was

doesn't happen from, you know, just hitting your head on the floor. When you hit your head on the floor you just get like a black and blue mark all over your face, but not an orbital fracture.

Q Now can you make any conclusions I suppose about whether the trauma was from a single blow or from multiple blows?

A No.

MS. SUDANO: Okay.

Court's indulgence.

THE COURT: Uh-huh.

MS. SUDANO: I apologize, doctor.

BY MS. SUDANO:

Q Can you make any conclusions or opinions about the amount of force that would be required to sustain this level of trauma?

A Not really. I mean, it's — you know, it's basically being punched out. I mean, that's really how I would describe it. I mean, I unfortunately see quite a bit of this. And lots of times — you know, as from a — it's a reportable event. We're supposed to report abuse of some kind or another. And — so the first question I ask is how did this happen. And — you know, or is — you know, if the — if the patient is — you know, says that oh, the guy's already in jail or something I leave it at that, but otherwise — you know, lots of times they try to shield the person who did this, you know, I try to have more intense questioning about it because it's obvious that this was, you know, an abuse situation from the clinical pattern.

Q Now when you spoke with Ms. Carpenter about this case, did you have that conversation with her about what happened that caused this trauma?

A Absolutely.

Q Okay. What did she tell you?

A She said she was assaulted and the -- the guy's in jail. And then we had her sign up for the Victims of Crime.

MS. SUDANO: No further questions, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Cross.

MR. SHETLER: Thank you, Your Honor.

Dr. Leibowitz, my name is Travis Shetler and I appreciate you being here today. Thank you for rearranging your schedule and making yourself available.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. SHETLER:

Q I want to ask you a couple of questions. The -- you just stated to Ms. Sudano's last question that it was obvious that this was an abuse situation. Is that based on what you observed independently of what Ms. Carpenter related to you, or is that based on what she told you?

A It's based on the clinical observation of what I see; that she was punched out. I assume it was abuse. I mean, it could've been any other kind of fight, but it looked as though she was punched out. That's --

Q And that's -- and that's of course the crux of my concern, you used the term abuse. It could've been mutual combat; correct?

A Well -- I mean, I think when someone gets punched by their significant other that's abuse. I'm not a lawyer, but that's what it seems like to me.

Q Right, but you're not -- you're here to talk about her eye. You're not here to talk about whether she was a victim of abuse; right?

A Well, I'm also -- the reason I came is because I don't think this stuff should happen. You know, I -- I see -- I have, you know, a sister and daughter and I

wouldn't want them punched out and that's how I look at it.

And I appreciate that. And I could assure you I don't believe there's anybody in this courtroom, and I could certainly speak for myself, that wants this to happen to anybody, male or female. It's -- but my concern, because we are in the courtroom, is your use of the term abuse. Did -- it's entirely possible, based on your training and expertise, that an injury like this could happen from you and I in a fight; correct?

A Anyone could have punched this person.

Q And so when you use the word abuse that brings in some -- an extra truckload of baggage with it to this courtroom proceeding. Well, you're here --

A Well ---

Q -- to talk about just the mechanism of injury; is that correct?

A Well, I'm supposed to as a physician evaluate that also and try to — as I said, it's a report — my understanding is that it's a reportable event for me, so I have to determine that — what happened.

Q Right. Are --

A And that's why I assumed -- I concluded that it was abuse because I'm charged with that as the treating physician.

Q Would the -- once you -- is it your --

A I'm not just a guy who fixes the stuff. I'm supposed to -- you know, if I -- if I thought that someone was punched out by someone, and it was an abuse situation, I'm supposed to report it.

Q Right. Then you said you would then have some additional follow-up questions; right? You would have a -- I think -- I don't want to misquote you, but I believe you said once you thought that there might be some sort of abuse you would

then have other questions you would follow up on; is that correct?

A Right. I would ask if they've reported it to the police, which is the first step. And if they haven't reported it, I'm supposed to report it. And if not -- and in this case, we sent her to Victims of Crime.

Q Right. Right. If I came in and -- and I had the same injuries as Ms.

Carpenter, what you observe there, and you asked me what happened and I said I was in a fight, would that be a reportable event?

A Well, possibly. I mean, if it was an assault situation; yes.

Q You said earlier that you assumed it was abuse or you then concluded it was abuse. You said both; correct?

A Well, I asked her questions and I asked her what happened and she -- I asked her who did this. It wasn't like there were two girls, you know, doing this in the middle of the night at a bar or something or she punched herself out. I mean, that's -- you know, to me when someone -- some other person, especially a significant other -- a man punches you that's abuse. I mean, that's how I think about it.

- Q But abuse can occur between two women as well; correct?
- A There can be assault between two women, but I consider this abuse.
- Q Well, that's not my question. Abuse -- abuse is not gender specific; is that correct?

A Once again, this is not my area. I would -- but if another woman had punched her I would report that also.

Q Right. That's exactly where -- have you ever seen an injury such as what you've observed in Ms. Carpenter that was not the source of abuse -- or result of abuse? Excuse me for misspeaking.

A Well, once again, I -- I have -- theoretically you could have -- and I have seen construction injuries and so on cause a blowout fracture, but 99 percent of the time it's because they're punched out.

Q Dr. Leibowitz, you stated that the symptomology -- not -- let me keep it simple. I don't want to get mixed up on the words. You stated that not every orbital fracture needs to be repair; is that correct?

A Yes.

Q And you specifically stated in this case that you believed it needed to be repaired because the double vision and the displacement of the eye; is that correct?

A The enophthalmos of the eye.

Q Right, which is the displacement?

A It's -- the eye really -- she did have displacement, or called globe ptosis, which is the eye sinking down, but that's not what I was meaning. The enophthalmos, the eyeball sinking back, is the reason for the trauma enophthalmos. Those are the two criteria that insurance company -- that's not my criteria, but they -- she fit both of them. You need only one of them to have the operation --

Q Do --

A - to be approved.

Q Do -- at any point, in your opinion, was Ms. Carpenter at risk of losing her eyesight in that eye as a result of this injury?

A It's not an eyesight issue; okay. It's not a -- the trauma to the eye that I do is not an eyesight issue. You could lose obviously vision in your eye from trauma for lots of reasons. One is that the vessels to the eyes the vasculature gets compromised by the trauma; that did happen in this case, or two is that, you know, have trauma to the lens or the retina or so on. Now she was sent to me by the

history?

A Not really.

Q Did you find any evidence in there -- or do you note any evidence in your chart of problems with conjunctivitis?

A No, but conjunctivitis wouldn't -- a lot -- people wouldn't even tell me about that because that really isn't a -- what I'm looking for. When I ask them have they had anymore eye problems in the past -- I mean, conjunctivitis is a minor thing that half the population has had at one point, including myself. I mean, I wouldn't give that in my history if I had a blowout fracture. I mean, I'm asking -- I ask them if they've had any history of glaucoma, retinal detachment, cataracts.

Q Right,

A Those are the three things I usually ask them. That's what I consider more significant ocular history.

Q And are those matters that you have to rely on the patient reporting to you, or are those matters that you can observe independently based on your training and education?

A Well both. I mean, the part I'm saying now is what I ask them, but then when I do the physical examination and look with the slit lamp, you know, I can see if they've had cataract surgery. I mean -- you know, I -- you know, they'll be an implant there rather than a lens. I mean -- and this happens all the time. I say, you ever had any eye problems; no, no, nuh-uh, nuh-uh. And then I look with a slit lamp and there's two implants in there and I go, well, you had cataract surgery; oh, yeah, yeah, I had cataract surgery. I mean, that's pretty standard stuff. It's not, you know --

Q Ms. Sudano asked you if a prior -- if a history of lupus would've had any

impact on your observations or treatment. I would ask you the same question regarding any sickle cell anemia.

A No, sir. I mean, these are medical issues that we have to deal with [indiscernible] and they have to be cleared for surgery ---

- Q Right,
- A -- but not the actual causation of the problem.
- Q What was your prognosis after you conducted your affairs to Ms. Carpenter's --
 - A Well --
 - Q -- eye orbit, I guess?

A I always tell people it's never gonna be perfect. You know, it's just not. You're dealing -- now in her case -- let me just get the timeline again. The -- I saw -- the assault was supposedly on 5-1-14. And I operated on her on -- what date did I give you there?

THE COURT: 6-14 maybe?

THE WITNESS: Yeah, so that's, you know, a month and a half later. That's not good. The optimal time to operate is ten days to two weeks by our academy. All literature tells you that because after that, I always tell the patient God's been healing it. And if there's material that's in the orbit that's into the sinus now, there's already scar tissue around that and everything else, so it's not — the prognosis is not nearly as good. If it's a fresh fracture, ten days to two weeks — and it's the same if you fractured your arm. You wanna — they want to set it right away before it starts to heal itself, so that's one thing that I always tell the patient about.

The other issue is that, you know, the numbness of the cheek, upper lip and teeth area could be permanent in nature. And I actually can make it worse by

10

11 12

13

14 15

10

16 17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24 25 fooling around with it during the operation because the nerve that cause — it's call in the infraciliary nerve, and that goes right through the bone that's been fractured. So when we're leaving the fracture we're traumatizing that nerve some more. We tell patients that if it comes back it takes a full six months to come back, and then it may not come back at all. It feels like you've been to the dentist on one side. People can't see it. You know, they don't — they don't — they can't — it's not a motor problem. They can't see like one side of your face being numb —

MR. SHETLER: Right.

THE WITNESS: -- but, you know, you feel it. And people have trouble chewing; they bite their tongue. It's an annoying thing.

BY MR. SHETLER:

- Q Is that factor -- is the timeframe that took place here -- and let me lay a little foundation. I'm sorry. If there was no -- if she sustained this injury -- Ms. Carpenter sustained this injury and there was no -- if I use the words displacement of any of the eye orbit is that --
 - A Enophthalmos.
- Q I can't say that word. I can't do it. I'm sorry. The -- if there was no -- you said there are times you don't repair this injury; is that right?
 - A Correct,
 - Q One of those times --
 - A This wasn't one of those.
 - Q would be right.
 - A This wasn't one of those,
- Q Is that factor -- you said there were two factors. A double -- or at least --

A Right.

Q -- two factors you mentioned. I don't mean two factors exclusively, the double vision or the displacement --

A Right, enophthalmos.

Q -- enophthalmos. Would the timeframe, the six weeks that had transpired, would that also be a factor in making that decision?

A No, it wouldn't be a factor in the decision making process. A decision in the prognosis -- it's a factor in the prognosis, that's the problem.

Q Can you elaborate a little bit on that?

A Well, it's like I said, the optimal time to operate is ten days to two weeks. When I go in there -- and I told you I lift up the stuff, you know, and try to put it back where it belongs and then put the implant in -- slide the implant in. It's a lot easier when the stuff hasn't stuck down and made a scar. It's -- you know, it -- when it's made a -- it's already -- when it's six weeks already it's tough because it -- it's made a scar with the sinus tissue; now it's merged with that. Any -- anything heals, you know, so it makes into a scar and it's tougher to separate the stuff that should be in the orbit from the stuff that's in the sinus.

And I tell all the patients that, you know. It's -- you know -- you know, I had a kid last week that, you know, was hit by a soccer ball and had a fracture around the eye and I told him I was going to -- I operated this past weekend and I told him I'd fit him in and they were busy. They had stuff to do, so I said, well, that's not real smart, but that's what they chose to do. So in this case, I didn't have a choice because she came to me, which is very common by the way. By the time they get to me I'm a tertiary guy; it's already past ten days to two weeks. They don't send them right away.

		·				
	Q	Is that when you talk about the difference in the diagnosis or the				
progr	osis is	that also a factor in whether or not it's going to be covered by insurance				
or not covered by insurance. That timeframe						
	Α	No.				

Q -- not an issue at all?

A No, insurance covers it if they have the two criteria is what I -- that's not a criteria whether they're going to cover it or whether I'm going to do it. I've done fractures six months later, you know, but I tell them that, you know, the prognosis is worse; that's all. It's not a Fixodent.

Q Is it possible that another doctor with your training would have looked at Ms. Carpenter's injury and said it did not need to be repaired surgically?

A Well, anything's possible. I don't think it would be good medicine, but anything's possible.

Q Do you believe there's any part of your treatment of Ms. Carpenter that wasn't necessary? And I mean that with all due respect, doctor.

A Oh, absolutely not. I would tell you if I did.

Q Do you have --

A Absolutely not.

Q -- do you have, as you sit here today -- did you have any opportunity to visit with Ms. Carpenter after your follow-up visit?

A No. And, you know, that's unusual in itself because what my usual pattern is, is I see people like a week or, you know, eight days or ten days depending on when we do the surgery. If I did it on a Saturday I'll see them like a week from Monday or Tuesday for their first post-op visit and then I see them three months later. And apparently she didn't come for the three month later appointment,

but, you know, that's when I usually see them because then I see if, you know, A they're — you know, what — if something else has to be done or not. Insurance doesn't usually approve a second surgery until three months anyway, so that's why I have them come back three months later to see if they need any more surgery. But, you know, no news is good news too. A lot of people don't come back when they're doing better.

Q So if she -- if Ms. Carpenter had report to other individuals three months later that she was worried about losing her vision, would you have expected her to show up for your appointment?

- A Once again, the vision part is not mine.
- Q Nothing to do with this injury?

A I wouldn't be dealing with this surgery. You know, they would go to her — I think she went to Dr. Yee and Dr. Voo. Dr. Yee is a general ophthalmologist corneal specialist and Dr. Voo is a retinal specialist, so they would be more handling the actual vision part of it.

Q If she had complaints like that to a third party and didn't follow up with any of those doctors would you be surprised?

A Nothing really surprises me. I mean -- you know, I have -- honestly, nothing really surprises me. I have patients that lost -- I had one patient this year that I -- I treat a lot of thyroid disease around the eye. That's the orbital problem, you know, because the eyeballs stick out, the opposite problem to this, and I've had two patients in the 20 years of practice I've been here in Las Vegas who went blind in the eye from -- that they didn't have surgery and that their optic nerve was compressed. The first one, you know, normally called me that minute and, you know, we worked on it and that's a normal response. The second one came a

THE COURT: Uh --

1	A	The end of April 2014.			
2	Q	Now was your relationship physical during that period, fall of 2013 to			
3	spring of 20	00 or sorry fall of 2013 to 2014 in the spring?			
4	A	When you say physical what do you mean?			
5	Q	Was it sexual in nature?			
6	A	It got sexual at some point.			
7	Q	About when did it get sexual?			
8	А	Towards the winter of 2013.			
9	Q	Did it continue on that course? Was it still sexual up until the end of			
10	April 2014?				
11	A	It was off and on.			
12	Q	Now I want to draw your attention to the end of April 2014. Were the			
13	two you said the two of you broke up?				
14	А	Yes, I broke up with him. I ended the relationship.			
15	Q	Do you recall when that was?			
16	А	Yes, it was mid to the end of April 2013.			
17	Q	2013?			
18	A	2014; I'm sorry.			
19	Q	Now I want to fast forward a little bit to April 30th of 2014. Were you and			
20	the Defendant dating on April 30 th of 2014?				
21	Α	No, we were not.			
22	Q	Had you seen the Defendant since you broke up a couple weeks prior?			
23	А	No, I had not.			
24	Q	Had you been in communication with him at all?			
25	Α	Yes.			

٦ İ	Q	Now where were you sleeping?			
2	A	I slept in my bed.			
3	Q	So I want to fast forward then to the following morning on May 1st of			
4	2014. Was the Defendant still in your bed when you woke up?				
5	Α	I think he had gotten up before me and had went to use the restroom.			
6	Q	Do you know approximately what time you woke up?			
7	A	It was seven in the hour seven o'clock hour.			
8	Q	In the morning?			
9	A	Yes.			
10	Q	Now so you said the Defendant had gotten up and gone to the			
11	bathroom?				
12	A	Yes.			
13	Q	Was he still in the bedroom when you woke up?			
14	A	Yes.			
15	Q	Was he clothed?			
16	Α	Yes.			
17	Q	What about shoes; was he wearing shoes?			
18	A	Yes.			
19	Q	How about you; were you clothed?			
20	A	I was clothed. I normally don't wear clothes when I sleep, but I did have			
21	on a like a sports bra, but from the waist down I was not clothed. That's how				
22	more comfortable sleeping.				
23	Q	So that's just your normal practice, I guess?			
24	A	Normal pattern; yes.			
25	Q	Okay. Now did you ever have a conversation with the Defendant on the			
- 1	I				

11

12 13

14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24 25 morning of May 1st of 2014?

A When I got up that morning, I believe I asked him -- I didn't wake up talking to him as if it was normal, but I did say, okay, you know, you spent the night. You had a chance to take your blood pressure medication, I want you to leave.

Q How did the Defendant respond to that?

A He started using profanity. He started making remarks about my mother that were unkind. And at that point I kinda knew I was in trouble because he still appeared agitated.

Q When you say he still appeared agitated, when was he agitated previously?

A I noticed he was agitated that evening, but I just dismissed it as he had just been in a fight, 'cause that's what he told me, so he was still worked up. I was not alarmed at that point, but in the morning he was aggressive and he was moving kinda fast paced in my room. He was cursing. He was making up — you know, just using obscene language about my mother. And that really upset me and I realized, oh, God, I should've followed my gut; I'm in trouble now, so I went to grab my phone.

- Q Now where were you when you went to grab for your phone?
- A In my bed.
- Q Were you lying down or sitting up?
- A I sat up at that point.
- Q Where was your phone?
- A In close proximity to me.
- Q Was it on the bed or --
- A It was on the bed.

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

21

22

20

23

25

24

the statement, because he knew from a previous marriage I was married to a Muslin man, and he said you're going to go see Allah tonight. And I sat there — I don't know if you could see it, but there's — for whatever reason a Bible on that couch. I don't read the Bible daily, so I'm not sure how it even got there. I just sat there, kinda gripped the Bible like, oh, my God, this is how I'm gonna die.

- Q Now how long were you on the couch?
- A About 50 minutes.
- Q Fifty, 5-0?
- A Fifty, 5-0.
- Q Now the entire time you were on the couch where was the Defendant?
- A He was standing in front of me pacing back and forth. I don't know if you have slides to show it, but there's a fireplace. He was walking back and forth in front of the fireplace with a knife in his hand making more plans to kill me.
 - Q When you say that was he making additional statements?
 - A He was.
 - Q Do you recall any of those statements?
- A Yes. He said, I'm going to kill you. I'm gonna -- he said, I'm going to kill. He said, I'm going to leave you here until this evening and you're gonna die. He was cursing and saying things about my family, my children, my ex-husband; he was a very jealous person. And I think -- what -- what really stood out was you're gonna go see Allah tonight. And I just -- I just thought, oh, my God, this is how I'm going to die. And my sister and everybody else told me so; I should've let this man alone.

THE COURT: Okay. What --

MR. SHETLER: Objection, Your Honor. This is beyond the scope. There's

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

no relevance; there's no foundation for what's going on here.

THE COURT: Sustained, so I'll strike the last part of that answer. Go ahead.

MS. SUDANO: And, Ms. Carpenter, I just want to focus on what you did. I don't want to focus on what anybody else told you; okay.

BY MS. SUDANO:

- Q Now at some point do you get up off the couch?
- A I do.
- Q Where'd you go?
- A I exited to the half bath downstairs.
- Q Where was the Defendant when you went to the half bathroom?
- A Behind me with the knife in my back.
- Q Was he making you go to the half bathroom?

A No, he wasn't making me go to the half bath, but at that point -instinctually, by being a paralegal, I was like well, if I'm gonna die I'm gonna leave
some evidence to show that there was a struggle, I was bleeding, something
happened. So I went to wipe blood on the wall and spit in the sink because I was
bleeding so heavily. And because he had made the statement previously, look at
your eye, I wanted to see my eye. I hadn't seen it before then, but I know I was
bleeding profusely as I sat on the couch.

- Q Now I'm showing you Exhibit 10; what's depicted in Exhibit 10?
- A That's the half bathroom that I exit -- that I went into from the living room and I wiped my hand on the wall as I went in.
- Q Let me zoom in on that a little bit. Can you mark on this photo where you wiped your hand?
 - A Sure.

Q When you went to the hospital were you able to talk to some doctors?

A Yes.

Q Now I want to talk a little bit about your injuries now. So we heard about your eye. What was -- specifically what happened with your eye?

A I had a right orbital blowout and it was fractured, it was swollen, I had a black -- two black eyes at this point.

Q Did you have any additional fractures to your face?

A I did. I had a broken nose.

Q Now did you have to undergo any sort of treatment for the injuries to your eye?

A Yes.

Q Specifically what treatment?

A Initially I had to see a specialist that had to determine what damages were done to my eye. And then I had to -- I had started seeing what's called flashes and floaters, so I had to see a retina specialist to make sure that I didn't have a detached retina. And then I had to -- they diagnosed me with an onset of glaucoma due to trauma, so I had to go see another doctor -- another specialist that treated that particular injury. And then I started seeing -- well, I didn't start seeing -- I had been seeing a pain management doctor, but I had -- the hospital had notified my pain management doctor that I had -- had some pretty serious injuries and was it okay for them to -- because I had signed a narcotic agreement, if it was okay, and the doctor said give her anything she needs. He was --

Q Now -- so prior to this day -- prior to May 1st of 2014, you said that you were already seeing a doctor for pain management?

A Yes.

Α

Yes.

11

14

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Α

Correct.

1

3

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15 16

. .

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24 25 A Sure. I had a girlfriend that owed me some money. The money was allocated already to purchase my severely disabled daughter's summer school clothes because he had attended what's called ESY, extended school year, and she had asked me to meet her there.

- Q Now did you go to that T.J. Maxx?
- A Yes, I did.
- Q. Were you able to meet this woman there?
- A Yes, I did.
- Q Did something else happen while you were in the store?
- A Yes, it did.
- Q Tell me about what happened.

A Sure. So I got there — but prior to me arriving there she had kinda led me on a goose chase. I had just gotten out of the hospital from having like a spinal tap surgery, so we had been to a Walgreens; we had been to a bank, and this was finally what I considered shenanigans. And so when we finally got to T.J. Maxx I was really irritated.

- Q So you meet her at the T.J. Maxx; right?
- A Yes.
- Q What happened inside the T.J. Maxx?

A I chased her. We had a brief argument and I chased her through the store. I think I had a weapon. It was a crowbar and I chased her. What happened was when we had the altercation she did not have the amount of money that she had said she would have. And at that point I was furious. All I could think about is I am so sick, and here it is my daughter has to return to school, and she's led me on a

blow it -- get that -- that sort of dried out blood from out of there.

25

THE COURT: Relevance?

MR. SHETLER: Your Honor, our position is that there was a dispute that night that took place related to drug money, drug loans. And there are -- is evidence in text messages that the victim was aware that Mr. Perry was involved in drug usage, drug sales. And I'd like a little bit -- well [indiscernible] the answer. Anyhow, I believe it's relevant because I believe that's what the source of the dispute possibly could have been that night and a dispute over money that the victim believed she was owed by the Defendant, which is referenced in text message.

THE COURT: Ms. Sudano?

MS. SUDANO: Your Honor, in going through the text messages there's reference to money, but I don't believe that that's what the money is for. There's no relevance or foundation for that question or that line of inquiry, frankly, in this case.

THE COURT: So your theory is that it's a dispute about drug money that gave rise to this dispute.

MR. SHETLER: Specifically that the victim was expecting money from my client that she wanted some of the money that evening. And --

THE COURT: And there's going to be some evidence relating to that in this trial?

MR. SHETLER: The -- they're in the text messages, yes. I don't think it would take special lawyering to get there, Judge.

THE COURT: All right, I'll give you some leeway. Go ahead. Overruled. BY MR. SHETLER:

Q You were aware that -- you communicated by text message with Mr. Perry frequently; is that right?

A Yes.

1	Α	I'm sorry, inside my apartment?
2	Q	No, inside your bed with you. Is there some place else he could have
3	slept in the condo?	
4	А	Possibly, yes.
5	Q	Did you suggest that he sleep somewhere else?
6	А	No.
7	Q	Did he tell you where he was going to sleep?
8	A	No.
9	Q	How did the decision come to be made that he was going to sleep in
10	your bed?	
11	Α	He just got in the bed.
12	Q	Were you comfortable with that?
13	Α	I didn't care.
14	Q	Do you remember what it was that woke up, either you or him, in the
15	morning?	
16	Α	I believe he woke me up.
17	Q	Do you remember how?
18	Α	No.
19	Q	Were you alarmed when he woke you up?
20	A	No.
21	Q	Do you remembered what happened after he woke you up when you
22	first felt threatened or scared or worried?	
23	A	Yes.
24	Q	What was that?
25	A	He started pacing the floor, cursing about my mother and other things

Q Why 7 p.m.?

3

 2

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

Α I don't know.

- Q What caused him to go from pacing -- it was just trying to use your cell phone that caused him to go from pacing to first reaching out and doing anything?
 - Α I'm not following.
- Q You wake up and at some point in time between waking up and all this starting he's pacing and in an agitated manner. You feel the need to call for help: right?
 - Yes. Α
 - But you don't call for help because he takes your phone away; right? Q
 - Α Correct.
- Q And there was no incident that you're aware of that went from sleeping to pacing to taking away your phone?
- Α I believe what happened was that he was still agitated by the fight that he had told me he had the night before. I also had not -- I had not been in an environment of drug users, what that behavior looked like. So when he woke up the next morning and he was erratic, pacing, and cursing and talking about my mother I didn't know whether he had been involved in some sort of illicit drugs or if he was still hyped up about the fight he had gotten into the night before. All I know is that I had asked him to leave the next morning, I had given him the privilege of staying the night and taking his blood pressure medicine, I was ready for him to go ahead, made that clear, and I went to grab my phone when I saw him acting erratic because I knew at that point it was not gonna - I was in some sort of danger. It wasn't gonna lead to anything that I wanted it to lead to.

25

And you heard the garage door open after Mr. Perry allegedly left you upstairs in the bathroom; correct?

- Yes.
- But somebody else could have taken the car?
- No.
- It's not possible at all; 100 percent?
- I don't believe it to be possible.
- That's fair enough, What was the next time you saw Mr. Perry after this alleged incident?
- Two weeks later on Boulder Highway.
- Can you explain how that came about?

Sure. I was pretty determined that he would not go without -- he was not gonna victimize me and think he was gonna walk the streets. So, I started because I know that, you know, Metro doesn't have the manpower to go after one criminal. They run into them and find out that they have an arrest, they arrest them. But they -- he hadn't been charged for the crime that he had committed on me so I figured I would assist and be proactive and helping locate Mr. Perry. So, I went in a rental car that I had that my insurance had given me because my car had been stolen by Mr. Perry and I went to places that I knew he would frequent hoping to bump into him, and that day that I did bump into him. I called the police and said I see him and he has a warrant. It was not at that time for me but I knew that he had a warrant and I asked them to apprehend him and explained to him that I had been attacked by the same person two weeks prior.

You believe that he had that warrant when he showed up at your condo Q that night?

1	Q	And as you sit here today you still don't know that?
2	A	I don't know that for sure.
3	Q	You believe you may lose your vision in that eye?
4	A	- I don't know.
5	ର	Did you do everything you could medically to try and insure that doesn't
6	happen?	
7	, A	Yes, I have.
8	Q	Do you remember having a post-op visit with Dr. Leibowitz?
9	Α	Yes.
10	Q	And do you remember him telling you that he wanted you to come back
11	three months later?	
12	A	No.
13	Q	If there was another appointment that Mr. Leibowitz Dr. Leibowitz
14	wanted you to go to would you have gone to that appointment?	
15	Α	Yes.
16	Q	And if he testified that you didn't would you have any explanation for
17	that?	
18	А	I would not?
19	MR. SHETLER: Thank you very much.	
20	THE WITNESS: Thank you.	
21	THE COURT: Redirect?	
22	MS. SUDANO: Briefly, Your honor.	
23		REDIRECT EXAMINATION
24	BY MS. SUDANO:	
25	Q	Now, Ms. Carpenter, you were asked whether you saw the Defendant

Rough Draft Transcript - Day 1 - 119

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you ma'am, I appreciate your time.

Okay. So for tomorrow, how many witnesses does State have?

MS. SUDANO: State has three witnesses tomorrow, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. About how long do you think they'll take?

MS. SUDANO: They should all be fairly quick. It's the first responding officer, the crime scene analyst and then the officer who found the car.

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. SUDANO: I would anticipate two hours, maybe, for all three of them.

MR. SHETLER: That's sounds accurate.

THE COURT: Okay. And are you anticipating presenting any witnesses?

MR. SHETLER: Mr. Perry still has to make a decision about whether he's going to take the stand. I have one witness lined up, a second one possibly but we may not. They may be [indiscernible] we don't need to use the Court's time for and if I can avoid that I will.

THE COURT: Okay. Why don't you stand up for a minute, Mr. Perry.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Ma'am.

THE COURT: I'm going to take this opportunity to advice you of your rights during this trial.

THE WITNESS: Yes Ma'am.

THE COURT: Under the Constitution of the United States and under the constitution of the State of Nevada you cannot be compelled or forced to testify in this case. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Ma'am.

THE COURT: You may, at your own request, give up this right and take the witness stand and testify and if you do you'll be subject to cross examination by the

o

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16 17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24 25 State and anything you say whether on direct or cross would be the subject of fair comment by the State when they argue at the end of the case. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Ma'am.

THE COURT: And, of course, if you choose not to testify because that is your right, I, as the trier of fact, am not permitted to take that into consideration or to draw any inference of guilt from the fact that you choose not to testify. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.

THE COURT: If you have a felony conviction in the last ten years that could be raised if you testified. Do we have -- what do we got?

MS. SUDANO: There is one yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. So what do we got?

MS. SUDANO: I have a certified Judgment of Conviction out of the state of Illinois from 2005 for unlawful delivery for a controlled substance.

THE COURT: Okay. Now, so that means if you, I mean, I'm the trier of facts so this is a little unusual situation, but if you take the witness stand and testify the State will be allowed to ask you whether you've been convicted of a felony, what the felony was, and when it happened but without going into the details regarding that offense; do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Ma'am.

THE COURT: So that would be part of the evidence in the case. Now, the decision whether to testify is a decision that is left to you as the Defendant in this case; do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Ma'am.

25

III

///

1	THE COURT: Have a good night.		
2	MR. TURNER: Thank you, Your Honor.		
3			
4	[Bench Trial, Day 1, concluded at 5:02 p.m.]		
5	* * * * * *		
6			
7			
8			
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16	ATTEST: Pursuant to Rule 3(c)(d) of the Nevada Rules of Appellate Procedure, I		
17	acknowledge that this is a rough draft transcript, expeditiously prepared, not proofread, corrected, or certified to be an accurate transcript.		
18			
19	Sandra A Pauchnic SANDRA PRUCHNIC		
20	Court Transcriber		
21	ATTEST: Pursuant to Rule 3(c)(d) of the Nevada Rules of Appellate Procedure, I		
22	acknowledge that this is a rough draft transcript, expeditiously prepared, not proofread, corrected, or certified to be an accurate transcript.		
23	Dan. 9.0.		
24	DALYNE EASLEY		
25	Court Transcriber		

Electronically Filed

04/13/2016 01:55:54 PM **RTRAN** CLERK OF THE COURT 2 3 4 5 DISTRICT COURT 6 CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA 7 8 THE STATE OF NEVADA. 9 CASE#: C298879 Plaintiff, 10 DEPT, VI VS. 11 GENARO PERRY, 12 Defendant. 13 BEFORE THE HONORABLE ELISSA CADISH, DISTRICT COURT JUDGE 14 WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 30, 2015 15 RECORDER'S ROUGH DRAFT TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS 16 **BENCH TRIAL - DAY 2** 17 APPEARANCES: 18 19 For the State: ROBERT BRAD TURNER, ESQ. Chief Deputy District Attorney 20 MICHELLE SUDANO, ESQ. Deputy District Attorney 21 22 For the Defendant: TRAVIS E. SHETLER, ESQ. 23 24 RECORDED BY: JESSICA KIRKPATRICK, COURT RECORDER 25 Rough Draft Transcript - Day 2 - 1

INDEX OF WITNESSES

	ATTHOUGH THE CONTRACT OF THE C		
2			
3	STATE'S WITNESSES	DAY	PAGE
4	STEVEN LEIBOWITZ		
5	Direct Examination by Ms. Sudano Cross-Examination by Mr. Shetler	1 1	13 25
6	Questions by the Court	1	37
7			
8	Direct Examination by Ms. Sudano Cross-Examination by Mr. Shetler	1	39 80
9	Redirect Examination by Ms. Sudano Recross Examination by Mr. Shetter	1 1	114 118
10	Questions by the Court		119
11	JUSTIN TERRY Direct Examination by M		_
12	Cross-Examination by Mr. Shetler	2 2	6 16
13	ALMEDIA BRAGG		
14	Direct Examination by M Cross-Examination by Mr. Shetler	2	18 34
15	Redirect Examination by	2 2 2	43
16	Recross Examination by Mr. Shetler	2	44
17	DANIELLE KELLER Direct Examination by M	2	45
18	Cross-Examination by Mr. Shetler	2	57
19		•	
20			
21			
22	*****		
23	<u>DEFENSE WITNESSES</u>	DAY	PAGE
24	[None presented.]		

[None presented.]

INDEX OF EXHIBITS STATE'S EXHIBITS DAY <u>PAGE</u> 1 through 37 [Stipulated] **DEFENSE EXHIBITS** $\underline{\mathsf{DAY}}$ <u>PAGE</u> [None presented.]

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 30, 2015 1:07 P.M.

2

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

•

9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23 24

25

THE MARSHAL: Please rise. District Court Department Six is now in session. The Honorable Judge Elissa Cadish now presiding.

Please be seated. Come to order.

THE COURT: Good afternoon.

MS. SUDANO: Good afternoon.

MR. SHETLER: Good afternoon, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Unfortunately, my calendar, which page wise looked like it wasn't going to be that long, turned out to be really long. So, it's okay.

MR. SHETLER: Understood. And I was -- but I was stuck in 19, I think, so.

THE COURT: That's what I understand. Okay.

We can pick up now. I am -- thank you -- trying to reschedule the appointment -- what happened to my pen?

THE MARSHAL: You keep taking them, Judge.

THE COURT: Not me; got to talk to the new law clerk.

THE MARSHAL: All right, I'll yell at her then.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you,

I'm trying to reschedule the appointment I had this afternoon that has me trying to leave at 3:30 because we're just starting and it's after one. So I'm trying to work that out.

MR. SHETLER: I'm not confident it's going to pose a huge problem, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay, well, we'll see. We can get going anyway.

MS, SUDANO: The State's case should be done --

MR. SHETLER: Absolutely, Judge.

25

1	THE COURT: Okay. All right. Then, let's begin.		
2	MS. SUDANO: State calls Justin Terry.		
3	THE COURT: After the last few weeks I still keep wanting to say, you know,		
4	do you stipulate to the presence of the jury, or wanting to admonish them when we		
5	take a break, and like, oh yeah, they're not here.		
6	MR. SHETLER: It does go a bit quicker, doesn't it?		
7	THE COURT: Yeah.		
8	THE MARSHAL: If you could step up in the box and remain standing.		
9	Raise your right hand and face that young lady right there.		
10	JUSTIN TERRY		
11	[having been called as a witness and being first duly sworn, testified as follows:]		
12	THE COURT CLERK: Please be seated.		
13	Would you please state and spell your first and last name for the		
14	record.		
15	THE WITNESS: Name is Justin Terry, it's J-U-S-T-I-N, last name T-E-R-R-Y.		
16	THE COURT CLERK: Thank you.		
17	THE COURT: Go ahead.		
18	MS. SUDANO: Thank you, Your Honor.		
19	DIRECT EXAMINATION OF JUSTIN TERRY		
20	BY MS. SUDANO:		
21	Q Sir, how are you employed?		
22	A Work for the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department.		
23	Q In what capacity?		
24	A Police officer.		
25	Q How long have you been a police officer?		
	1		

Α

I believe so.

1	Q	Now, were you able to get inside the vehicle?
2	A	No.
3	Q	Why is that?
4	A	The vehicle was locked.
5	Q	Could you see the keys anywhere inside the vehicle?
6	А	No.
7	Q	While you were at that scene at 2635 Karen Court, did anybody else
8	arrive?	
9	Α	Um, I have a vague recollection but I'm not a 100 percent sure if - you
10	talking about other officers did arrive, yes.	
11	Q	Do you know if the registered owner arrived as well?
12	Α	I'm not real sure if I spoke to them but I think they did arrive while I was
13	there.	
14	Q	Now, what happened to the car after you had recovered it?
15	A	I don't know exactly. I know it was returned to the owner. Actually I'm
16	pretty sure that the owner did return while I was still there and I think it returned to	
17	the owner but that the owner did not have the keys at the time, if I recollect right.	
18	Q	Okay. So, there were no keys in the vehicle?
19	A	No.
20	Q	And the owner, you said, didn't have the keys either?
21	A	l don't think so, no.
22	Q	Now, normally when you recover a vehicle is there any sort of recovery
23	form or pap	perwork that you have to fill out?
24	Α	Yeah, there is. Yes, there is.
25	Q	What is the purpose of that paperwork?
i		

Q Anything about the fact that it was a domestic relationship that would have factored into the decision on whether or not to call ID out and have criminalistics done?

A Um, if the vehicle is used within the domestic violence incident and there was some type of evidence that the vehicle could provide, possibly,

Q Did you have any information that the vehicle was involved in the domestic situation in this case?

A Not that I knew other than, I mean, to what I understood is that it was a taking without owner's consent kind of situation, or that the vehicle possibly had been used by the suspect prior. But I didn't know all the details, so.

Q And when you say that the vehicle had possibly been used by the suspect prior, can you explain how that factored into your decision making process a little bit more?

MR. SHETLER: Your Honor --

A Usually in a --

THE COURT: Hold.on.

MR. SHETLER: I'm going to object to relevance. He didn't make the decision whether criminalistics was going to be called. And now he said, several times, he was just responding on behalf of another officer.

MS. SUDANO: And I'm just asking for his training experience whether or not knowing if this was a domestic situation would have factored into the decision making process.

THE COURT: Okay. So he can talk about in general how that might factor in.

MR. SHETLER: Thank you, Judge.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

No, I did not, Α

Q Why is that?

I -- there were no car keys to the vehicle and it was returning to the Α owner. I don't believe the owner had keys as well.

Now, normally would you inventory a car before returning it to a registered owner?

Α Typically, yes, we would.

Q But again, in this case did you have any reason to believe that there was anything of evidentiary value inside the car?

I didn't know of any, no, otherwise I would have probably objected it --А to us -- probably would have tried to influence the officer that was requesting or at least talk to him about it and made sure that he understands that there's evidence in there. And I don't remember any evidence that was specific to the -- that was relevant that I understood.

Now, if you didn't have keys to a vehicle that you're trying to inventory Q and its locked what would you need to do in order to be able to inventory the vehicle?

Α Um, we would -- if it didn't have keys? I can't think of a time I ever inventoried a vehicle if it didn't have keys. I mean, if it's a major case and I'd possibly would request a hold on the vehicle and seal the vehicle, that's the only other -- that's the only time I would do something like that if it was a serious enough case that we would actually keep the vehicle and have it sealed and have it impounded.

Q In this case, did you have any information that something like that was

Um, I'm pretty sure it was keyed. What do you mean?

24

25

Α

Q

Just that, I mean --

- 1			
1	Raise your right hand and face that young lady right there.		
2	ALMEDIA BRAGG		
3	[having been called as a witness and being first duly sworn, testified as follows:]		
4	THE COURT CLERK: Please be seated.		
5	Would you please state and spell your first and last name for the		
6	record.		
7	THE WITNESS: Almedia Bragg, A-L-M-E-D-I-A B-R-A-G-G.		
8	THE COURT CLERK: Thank you.		
9	THE COURT: Go ahead.		
10	MS, SUDANO: Thank you, Your Honor.		
11	DIRECT EXAMINATION OF ALMEDIA BRAGG		
12	BY MS. SUDANO:		
13	Q Ma'am, how are you employed?		
14	A I'm retired.		
15	Q Where did you retire from?		
16	A Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department.		
17	Q When did you retire?		
18	A December 31, 2014.		
19	Q How long were you with the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police		
20	Department?		
21	A 23 years 10 months.		
22	Q And what was your job title when you were with the Metropolitan Police		
23	Department?		
24	A Patrol officer.		
25	Q Were you working on May 1 st of 2014 at approximately 9:30 a.m.?		
- 1	I and the state of		

Α

Yes.

ĺ			
1	Q	So nobody else was present, initially?	
2	A	I don't think so.	
3	à	Do you recall the next person who showed up at the scene?	
4	A	I think it was one of her friends or else it was Officer a different	
5	officer.		
6	Q	Who would that officer have been?	
7	A	Um, what's his name? I know his first name.	
8	Q	What is his first name?	
9	А	Frank.	
10	Q	What that be Frank Elam?	
11	Α	Yes.	
12	Q	Now, who else did anyone else arrive at the scene?	
13	А	One of her friends did, the ID tech did, and then another officer, I think,	
,14	also came.		
15	Q	Now, at some point you said that you were going through the scene and	
16	assessing what was going on at the house; is that correct?		
17	Α	Yes.	
18	; Q	Okay. So, I want to walk through that with you a little bit. I'm going to	
19	show you here, State's Exhibit 2, initially. Do you recognize what's depicted in that		
20	photo there?		
21	Α	That's her apartment.	
22	Q	And that would be the 2461 Old Forge address?	
23	Α	Yes.	
24	Q	All right. Now, do you recall how big the apartment was? Was it a one	
25	bedroom apartment or were there more than one bedrooms?		

1	A	Cups thrown over, looks like a towel maybe that he tried looks like it	
2	has blood on it a little bit.		
3	Q	Now, is that just a closer image of what we were looking at before in	
4	State's Exhibit 7?		
5	Α	Yes.	
6	Q	So can you see that same blood stain there in State's Exhibit 8?	
7	Α	Yes.	
8	Q	As it's just sort of in the center of the picture?	
9	A	Yes.	
10	Q	Okay.	
11	Α	Looks like there's blood on the refrigerator also.	
12	Q	And so that would be over on the left of the photo?	
13	Α	Yes.	
14	Q	Now I'm going to show you next State's Exhibit 10. What's depicted	
15	there in Sta	ate's Exhibit 10?	
16	Α	That's the exit door from the house to the garage.	
17	Q	Is there anything else of significance located in this particular photo?	
18	·A	Blood on the door in the doorjamb.	
19	Q	Now, I'm going to show you next State's Exhibit 11. Do you recognize	
20	what's dep	icted there?	
21	Α	Yes.	
22	Q	Is that just a close up photo of that blood from State's Exhibit 10?	
23	А	Yes.	
24	Q	Okay, on that same doorjamb?	
25	A	Yes.	

i	i	<u> </u>	
		·	
1	A	Yes.	
2	Q	Now, I'm going to show you here Exhibit 27. Is that an actual close up	
3	shot of that knife?		
4	A	Yes.	
5	Q	And, you indicated that there was blood or apparent blood on that	
6	knife?		
7	A'	Yes.	
8	Q	Where was the blood located?	
9	Α	On the end. I believe it was on the end.	
10	Q	And when you say the end, do you mean	
11	А	The jagged edge.	
12	Q	Okay. So the actual blade of the knife as opposed to the handle?	
13	A	Yes.	
14	Q	Okay. Now, was there anything else of significance about the garage in	
15	your invest	igation?	
16	Α	The vehicle was gone.	
17	Q	Now, had Ms. Carpenter told you, given you information that the vehicle	
18	had previou	usly been located in the garage?	
19	A	Yes.	
20	Q	And when you arrived, there's obviously no vehicle in the garage; is that	
21	fair?		
22	А	Yes.	
23	Q	What, if anything, did you do with the information that the vehicle was	
24	missing?		
25	A	Just put it on the radio to be on the look-out. She said he'd probably be	
	F.		

Ţ	<u> </u>		
į			
	ŀ		
1	Á	Or you can tell when there's a struggle.	
2	Q	Thank you, that's much cleaner.	
3	Α	Yes.	
4.	Q	Thank you. And you're talking about the later, a struggle?	
5	А	Yes.	
6	Q	And in this case there was evidence of both present, right?	
7	A	Well, it wasn't the cleanest house but you could tell there was a	
8	struggle.		
9	Q	That was a nicer way to put it, thanks for helping me out.	
10		The information that you testified to about the perpetrator taking her	
11	car, stealin	g her car, that came from Ms. Carpenter; right?	
12	A	Yes.	
13	Q	You didn't conduct any other investigation into that or talk to any other	
14	witnesses about that?		
15	Α	What witnesses?	
16	Q	Any.	
17	A	She was the only witness.	
18	Q	She was the only source for that information?	
19	A	Yes.	
20	Q	Ms. Carpenter testified yesterday that she took some selfies of her	
21	injuries. You're familiar with what a selfie is?		
22	A	Yes.	
23	Q	Have you had a chance to look at those photographs at all?	
24	Α	No.	
25	Q	Can you tell me any additional information or any if there's any	

said the car wasn't parked in the garage. That was -- you believed the car was

A	In the garage, yes; there was.	
Q	What was located in the garage?	
Α	There was a steak knife on the floor.	
Q	Let me show you this one. State's Exhibit 26; is that the steak knife you	
were talking about?		
A	Yes.	
Q	Now, was there anything additional of significance with that steak knife?	
A	There was some apparent blood on the steak knife.	
Q	Based on that apparent blood what, if anything, did you do with the	
steak knife?		
A	Frecovered it and impounded it.	
Q	Now, after you were done documenting the garage where did you go	
after that?		
A	I believe upstairs to the master bedroom.	
Q	Q Now, was there anything of evidentiary value located inside the master	
bedroom?		
A	There was apparent blood on the bedding of the bed in the room.	
Q	Okay. Showing you State's Exhibit 13; is that a photo of the master	
bedroom wi	th the bed in it?	
A	Yes.	
Q	Okay. Now, showing you State's Exhibit 19; is that a close up shot of	
that bedspread and bed?		
A	Yes.	
Q	Now, can you see any of the apparent blood you were talking about?	
Α	Yes, there's some right here and then I think a little bit on the floor as	
	Q A Q were talking A Q steak knife? A Q after that? A Q bedroom? A Q bedroom wi A Q that bedspr A Q	

1	Α	Yes, and there should be some close ups as well of those.	
2	Q	Let's start with Exhibit 31. Is that one of the close up photos you took?	
3	A	Yes.	
4	Q	And, specifically, what area are you focusing on in 31?	
5	A	It was her right eye.	
6	Q	And then how about State's Exhibit 32; what area are you focusing on	
7	in 32?		
8	А	That's the same photo. I will take a picture both with a scale and	
9	without just to show that there's nothing that was covered up by the scale.		
10	Q	So same area of that right eye area?	
11	А	Yes.	
12	Q	Was there anything significant as far as injuries on that right eye?	
13	A	It just looked swollen and maybe starting to bruise.	
14	Q	Now, showing you Exhibit 33. What's depicted in Exhibit 33?	
15	Α	That's her left eye.	
16	Q	Is there anything significant as far injuries in Exhibit 33?	
17	A	Same thing, swollen and just getting discolored from bruising.	
18	Q	And now State's Exhibit 34. What's depicted there?	
19	A	Her mouth.	
20	Q	Anything significant about the victim's mouth?	
21	A	There was some apparent blood and then also swelling and discoloring.	
22	Q	Is there apparent blood anywhere other than her mouth in that photo?	
23	A	It looks like closer to her nose there.	
24	Q	Now, after you took your notes and documented the scene with photos	
25	did you do anything else to process this particular scene?		

1	Q	Now, in addition to the presumptive blood testing did you do anything	
2	else at the scene?		
3	Α	I recovered the knife.	
4	Q	What did you do with the knife when you recovered it?	
5	A	I put it in a package so that it could, if they wanted to later test it for	
6	DNA, fingerprints, whatever they wanted to.		
7	Q And so you impounded it into evidence?		
8	Α	Yes.	
9	Q	But then as far as any sort of testing that would later be done on that is	
10	that something you would do?		
11	А	Sometimes we will, but in this case I did not.	
12	Q	So you just booked it into evidence, essentially?	
13	А	Yes.	
14	Q	Did you have any additional involvement at the scene?	
15	А	No.	
16	MS.	SUDANO: Your Honor, I have no further questions.	
17	THE	COURT: Okay. Cross?	
18	MR.	SHETLER: Thank you, Your Honor.	
19		CROSS-EXAMINATION OF DANIELLE KELLER	
20	BY MR. SHETLER:		
21	Q	Ms. Keller, my name is Travis Shetler and I represent Mr. Perry.	
22	A	Okay.	
23	Q	I've got just a couple questions for you. Are you okay comfort-wise?	
24	A	Yes, I'm okay.	
25	Q	You, take a break?	

i			
1	Α	No, I'm okay, thank you.	
2	Q	It's a lot of stuff.	
3		Ms. Sudano asked you if you recalled any blood going up the stairway.	
4	A	No, I don't.	
5	Q	If there was blood there would you have photographed it or	
6	documented it?		
7	A Yes.		
8	Q	If there was something there and you thought it was blood would you	
9	have photographed it and documented it?		
10	Α	Yes.	
11	Q	Right. You're not testing it at that point, you're just	
12.	A	No.	
13	Q	Q And when you took photographs of Ms. Carpenter's injuries you're	
14	trying to document any injury that she has		
15	Α	Yes.	
16	Q	that you that would come out on a photo?	
17	A	Yes.	
18	Q You didn't take any photographs of her hands, is that correct?		
19	A	No.	
20	Q	Did she tell you that she had cuts on her hands?	
21	А	No.	
22	Q	Do you rely on the victim to let you know what injuries there are or do	
23	you make your own determination about that?		
24	A Yeah, typically unless it's something really obvious we'll just ask them,		
25	you know, where they're injured and try to look and see if there's anything visible to		

 see how that would be pertinent to that issue.

MR. SHETLER: Right. And I did speak about this with Mr. Perry. He understands what's going on. I just wanted to make sure we talked about it.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. SHETLER: The only other request we'd have at that time, and I'm slightly ahead of the scheduling here, is I would like the opportunity to speak with Mr. Perry and prepare for closing, if it would be possible to do our closings tomorrow. I don't know if the Court's amenable to that.

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. SUDANO: And, Your Honor, I'm not going to belabor the point with the security guard, I do think that Your Honor's prior ruling is sufficient there.

As far as Mr. Shetler's request on closings, I'm prepared to go forward today or we can do it tomorrow, whatever Your Honor's preference, and whatever's most convenient for Mr. Shetler, I'm fine with.

THE COURT: Right. I mean, I could, you know, we could do them now. I don't mind if you want to do them tomorrow, but are you prepared to talk about the Instructions?

MS. SUDANO: Oh, that's right.

MR. SHETLER: No. I spent my time back in the luxurious confines of the little room. Maybe if -- I don't think we're going to have an issue there. I just -- it would probably make sense to take a second and do that. In an hour we could put that on right before closing, whatever you're comfortable with, Your Honor.

I'm not. The short answer is no, I'm not,

THE COURT: Right. Okay. Well, on the good side we won't have to make 14 copies of the Instructions, so. I guess we'll deal with that first when you come

1 back at 10 in the morning. 2 So, to be clear, Defense is resting then at this point, right? 3 MR. SHETLER: Yes. I didn't say that either. Yes, Your Honor. 4 THE COURT: Okay, I just wanted to be clear. MR. SHETLER: And if I do come across something I will make sure that I do 5 6 that before the afternoon is over and send an email to the Court and everybody on 7 the issue. 8 THE COURT: Right. So, we can address the Instructions first and then I will read the Instructions to myself before we proceed. I don't need to read them out loud in Court and then have closings, I guess, tomorrow and then I'll probably just 10 vacate for some time to contemplate, review the Exhibits and my notes and come 11 12 back with a verdict. 13 Okay. So, with the evidence being complete, we'll come back at 10 14 tomorrow. We'll first address Instructions and then do closings, okay? 15 MR. SHETLER: Thank you, Your Honor, 16 THE COURT: Great. 17 MS. SUDANO: Thank you, Your Honor. 18 THE COURT: Thank you. 19 [Bench Trial, Day 2, concluded at 2:41 p.m.] 20 21 22 ATTEST: Pursuant to Rule 3(c)(d) of the Nevada Rules of Appellate Procedure, I acknowledge that this is a rough draft transcript, expeditiously prepared, not 23 proofread, corrected, or certified to be an accurate transcript.

Court Transcriber

24

25

Electronically Filed

		04/13/2016 01:57:38 PN	
1	RTRAN	Alum & Lluin CLERK OF THE COURT	
2			
3			
4			
5	DISTRICT COURT		
6	CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA		
7 8		•	
9	The I have to state the transfer of the transf	·	
10	THE STATE OF NEVADA,	CASE#: C298879	
11	Plaintiff,	DEPT. VI	
12	GENARO PERRY,		
13	Defendant.		
14)	
15		A CADISH, DISTRICT COURT JUDGE CTOBER 1, 2015	
16		·	
17	1	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS RIAL - DAY 3	
18	,		
19	For the State:	ROBERT BRAD TURNER, ESQ. Chief Deputy District Attorney	
20		MICHELLE SUDANO, ESQ. Deputy District Attorney	
21	For the Defendant:	TRAVIS S. SHETLER, ESQ.	
22	To the Defendant.	ITAVIS S. SHETLER, ESQ.	
23			
24			
25	RECORDED BY: JESSICA KIRKPATRI	ICK, COURT RECORDER	

Rough Draft Transcript Day 3 - Page 1

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 1, 2015 AT 10:39 A.M.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1

THE COURT: Good morning.

MS. SUDANA: Good morning, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And what have we here?

MS. SUDANO: Your Honor, I know that we put it on the record --

THE COURT: Go ahead and sit down.

MS. SUDANO: -- previously.

THE COURT: Hold on. Just, go ahead and have a seat.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes Ma'am.

MS. SUDANO: I know that we put it on the record previously that both sides were waiving the jury but we do just want to have it in writing.

THE COURT: Yes.

MS. SUDANO: And so if Your Honor would sign our stipulation and order after the Defendant has looked over it we would appreciate that.

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. SUDANO: May I approach to have that filed?

THE COURT: Yep.

MS. SUDANO: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you need me to sign?

MS. SUDANO: Oh, yes, if you would, I apologize.

THE COURT: That's okay. So, it's just multiple copies of the stip and order?

MS. SUDANO: It is. I just wanted to have one original but I guess we have them all signed.

THE COURT: Okay. So the clerk will file those or file the stip and return the

25

MS. SUDANO: Thank you.

3

1

2

THE COURT: Okay. So we've got the Instructions to discuss.

4

6

7

10

11 12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20 21

23

22

24 25

MR. SHETLER: Your Honor, we did phone chambers last night to let you know that we were in good shape on the Instructions themselves. Ms. Sudano

wants to make a presentation regarding the self-defense Instructions.

MS. SUDANO: That's correct, Your Honor. I didn't hear any evidence throughout the case even in inference of slight -- or self-defense so even though those were initially included with the packet and they were presented to Your Honor, at this point I don't think that there's any evidence to support the giving or the including of the self-defense Instructions in this particular case. So that was Instructions on pages 35 through 40.

THE COURT: Okay, Mr. Shetler.

MR. SHETLER: Your Honor, the evidence itself to support those Instructions, it's a good argument that we didn't establish enough evidence to get to that point. Certainly the victim did not assist us in that endeavor and Officer Braggs [sic] did not -- Braggs right; did not say that she saw any evidence.

I will argue in closing that it's possible our officer was slightly biased, with all due respect for her service, and I'll make an argument about that. I -- I'm saying everything I think I can.

THE COURT: Right, I appreciate that, Right,

So, there is no evidence that Ms. Carpenter made any threat or threatened any kind of violence or held a weapon or said she was going to do anything to cause the Defendant harm. So, I think the State is correct that there is not evidence to support the giving of those Instructions in this case. I just -- there

as I indicated, what i'd like to do is read them to myself. I don't think I need to read them out loud.

MR. SHETLER: Right.

THE COURT: So, I guess, I don't know how you feel about it. I -- if I I like read them, the full set in chambers, and come in and say I've done that and sign it, is that sufficient for you or do you think I need to sit in front of you and read them? I don't want a problem later so, however you prefer.

MS. SUDANO: And, Your Honor, I would leave that to you. I'm certainly comfortable with you going back to chambers if that's where you're more comfortable to read them and then letting us know on the record that you have reviewed them all.

THE COURT: And then I would sign them and make them part of the record.

MR. SHETLER: Right. I've talked with Mr. Perry about that. We're both comfortable with that as well, Judge.

THE COURT: Okay. So I guess what I'm going to do then is take a few minutes to do that in chambers and then I'll come back in and we'll do closings; okay? All right. We'll take a few minutes here.

MR. SHETLER: Thank you

[A brief recess was taken at 10:49 a.m.]

[Proceedings resumed at 11:11 a.m.]

THE COURT: Okay. I think you were given the revised instructions which are numbered now one through forty-one. I believe they are in accordance with our discussion a few minutes ago. Are there any concerns about that? Hearing none --

MS. SUDANO: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. So I did, as we discussed, in chambers read to myself

3

5

6

7

8

10

11 12

13 14

15

16

17 18

19

20 21

22 23

24 25 Instructions 1 through 41. I'm going to now sign indicating that I have given myself those instructions. Today's October 1st; correct?

MR. SHETLER: Correct.

MS. SUDANO: Yes, Your Honor,

THE COURT: Okay, So I'm giving that to the clerk and the clerk has the verdict form ready to go. So with that, closing argument.

MS. SUDANO: Thank you, Your Honor.

CLOSING ARGUMENT BY THE STATE

BY MS. SUDANO:

Now, Your Honor, we're in a unique position here today. Obviously, you understand all of the instructions that were provided to you so I'm not going to go through those with you. The one thing that I do want to say first is that the insinuations that you may have heard through Mr. Shetler's questions are not evidence. So instead, what I'm going to do is walk through the scene that was in Ms. Carpenter's house April 30th of 2014 into the morning of May 1st of 2014.

So you heard testimony from Ms. Carpenter that on the evening of April 30th of 2014 the Defendant, Genaro Perry, arrived at her house late in the evening in order to pick up some medication. Because it was late she agreed to let him spend the night in the house, they went to bed without much discussion. They woke up early that next morning on May 1st of 2014 and they were here in Exhibit 13, the master bedroom located upstairs in that residence.

Now, the Defendant woke up first and he still appeared to be agitated from the fight or whatever had happened the night previous. Ms. Carpenter originally didn't understand why he was agitated but he began threatening her family, began making statements that she began to be concerned about. Prior to

this she had not been concerned but once she became concerned while she was still sitting in that bed that's depicted there in Exhibit 13, she picked up her cell phone and she attempted to make the first call to 9-1-1 of that morning.

Now, upon seeing her pick up that phone the Defendant took the phone from her and he threw it against the wall. While he threw that phone against the wall he made some statement along the lines of you're not calling the police. Now that's part of the coercion charge here in this case was the taking of phone, throwing it so that she could not call 9-1-1 which she was perfectly, lawfully permitted to do. Now, as I've mentioned that is part of coercion count I believe here is charged as Count 5.

Now, after throwing the phone Ms. Carpenter got up and she tried to go into the bed -- or to the bathroom, you can see that depicted here in Exhibit 14. So she got up and she walked to the door to the left which was the bathroom. Before she made it into the bathroom the Defendant punched her, knocked her down into the ground in the bathroom. While she was down on the ground with her feet kind of hanging back into that bedroom he then struck her repeatedly while she was on the ground more than once she said, I believe, no more than five times. She began to struggle back and was able to bite him, get released get free from that situation. And then she took off through that second door, the door to the right there, out into the hallway to go downstairs. Now, the incidents that took place up in that bathroom in that bedroom is the first part of the battery count that Your Honor's heard about,

Now, when she got about halfway down the stairs the Defendant caught up with her and he kicked her, he knocked her down the rest of the stairs. You can see here to the left of State's Exhibit 6 that bathroom -- or that stairwell that she was kicked down. When she was kicked she slid out into the middle of the kitchen that you can see in Exhibit 6, and landed approximately where that blue towel was in

front of the stove in State's Exhibit 7. Now even though she was still on the ground the Defendant continued to punch and kick her while she was there in that kitchen. She had injuries consistent with being punched and kicked while she was on the ground. All of the injuries were to the right side of her face. She also had injuries to her hip, she had a bruised or sore rib all consisted with being kicked while she was already down on the ground. Now, at some point during this struggle she's begging for the Defendant to stop, she's begging that he stops beating her and he does but not for any good reason.

Now, she testified that on top of this stove that you can see here in Exhibit 9 was a steak knife. The Defendant picked that steak knife up and began threatening her with it; he began swinging it at her. So that right there is the assault with a deadly weapon. As used in this particular case, that knife constitutes a deadly weapon, Your Honor. And he was obviously intending to hit Ms. Carpenter to strike her with that knife because she did -- or because he did.

She testified that that's where the injuries to her hand came from. You can see here in State's Exhibit 37 the bottom photo there's something that looks like a cut mark there, and if you look at it it's actually consistent with being struck with a serrated knife. There are two separate parts to that cut or at least two separate parts to that cut that are consistent with being struck with a serrated knife.

Now, once the Defendant has that knife in his hand he does heed her prayers and her requests to stop beating on her in the kitchen but what he does instead is he drags her up, still holding the knife in her -- in his hand and puts her into the living room. Now when she ends up in the living room she's just sitting there on the couch in the living room. She's sitting there for approximately 50 minutes while he's pacing back in front of her with the knife. Now, the entire time that he's

1 2 3

pacing back in front of her with the knife she's not free to leave. She's not free to get up, go out of the house, go anywhere else in the house. So, that's our false imprisonment with a deadly weapon because he still had that knife for the entire time, Your Honor.

Now, as he's got her standing there he's making threats to her, to her family, to her children, to her husband, he's telling her that he's going to kill her. For some reason he picks seven p.m. that night as a time that he's going to kill her and he's telling her — he's referencing her Muslim background history and telling her she's going to go see Allah tonight.

Now, at some point while she's up on that couch or she's sitting on the couch she gets up and she goes into the bathroom downstairs, you can see here the entrance to that bathroom in State's Exhibit 10. She's saying that the entire time she's sitting on that couch she's trying to plan her escape, to see if she can get far enough out. She doesn't think that she can so instead what she does is she tries to leave some evidence behind and you can see that, you can see the blood smear on the door in Exhibit 10 because she believes that the Defendant is going to kill her throughout this entire thing.

Now, once we get into Exhibit 12, which is actually the inside of the bathroom, you can still see again that blood that she was leaving intentionally hoping that if things went wrong there would be enough evidence to tie it back to her to what happened here. Now, once she is in that living -- or done with the bathroom she goes back and she sits back on that living room couch again. The Defendant still has the knife and he's still holding her there and still not letting her leave.

At some point though he finds the car keys; the car keys are sitting somewhere downstairs and the victim, Ms. Carpenter, actually sees the Defendant

grab those car keys and pick them up. And he says something along the lines of I'll take these and that's clearly done while he still has the knife and it's done in her presence. So that right there is our robbery with use of a deadly weapon, still holding onto that knife, threatening her with force if she tries to resist while he's taking those car keys.

You know, he also makes a statement while he's taking those keys, something along the lines of: I stood up for you when you got this car, implies that he's going to take that car from her because he believes that he's somehow entitled to it because he was there when she bought it and he helped her negotiate the price.

Now, after they're downstairs and he's got those keys in his hand already and he's still has the knife he takes her back upstairs, forces her back upstairs at knifepoint into the other bathroom. And once she's back in that other bathroom he goes and he gets that cell phone again, Your Honor, that same cell phone that he'd previously thrown against wall. He takes it and he brings it back to her in that bathroom where he's forced her up to at knifepoint, and he tells her again that she's not to call the police and she's not going to be able to call the police, and he takes the phone and he throws it into the toilet. Now that's the other part of the coercion in this case, he was again making sure that she couldn't call the police.

Now, when he had her in that bathroom he also made the statement that she was to stay in that bathroom until he left in the car, until she heard the car drive away. And that if she left the bathroom or tried to get help prior to hearing that he was going to kill her, her ex-husband, her family and things were just going to go very badly for her if she left. So, based on all of those threats she stayed in the bathroom while he left the house. Now, that right there is our dissuading a witness.

He actively told her that if she took steps to call the police or commence the prosecution in this case that he would kill her or her family.

Now, after he leaves the bathroom she hears him go downstairs, hears the garage door open, hears her car drive away and that's within about 30 seconds worth of time. Now, once he leaves she's finally able to get out of the bathroom, tries to go find a neighbor, she's unable to do so. She comes back in and, thankfully, she pulls her phone out of the toilet and it works well enough for her to make that 9-1-1 call.

Now, when the officers respond -- you heard from Officer Bragg that in 25 years' worth of doing domestic violence work this is one of the more severe cases that she's ever seen. Now, Officer Bragg also corroborates all of the injuries that were present on Ms. Carpenter's face. She sees the raccoon eyes, she sees the cut on the hands, she sees the state that Ms. Carpenter's in. Initially she tells Ms. Carpenter -- or Ms. -- Officer Bragg that she's not going to open the door because she's terrified. She thinks initially that it's the Defendant who's coming back to her house.

Now after that, after they get the scene evaluated, Carpenter's still terrified. She still thinks that the Defendant is going to come back, and so she actually has to call officers back a second time and they help her change her locks because she's so scared that the Defendant has her keys in this case.

Now, what you also got from Officer Bragg and the crime scene analyst was that this crime scene that we've walked through here spreads all over the house. And Officer Bragg testified that from her training experience this wasn't just a short interaction between these two people this was something that took a lot of time. There was disarray and that was in addition to just the general clutter that was

 in the house. There were signs of struggle there and that indicated to her again that this isn't just some short interaction, it's a long struggle. She also said that everything she saw at this crime scene was consistent with what Corla Carpenter told her had happened in this case.

Now, you also heard from Officer Terry that on May 2nd of 2014, so the day after all of this, he finds the car. And he finds the car here in States Exhibit 3 over to the left here is that Karen Court address. Over to the right is Ms. Carpenter's apartment at 2461 Old Forge Lane. Now, the car is gone by the time that Officer Bragg and the crime scene analyst get there and it's not found until Corla remembers that she has this GPS tracking the following day in the car.

So, in order for there to be any inference that the Defendant isn't the one who took the car you would have to believe, Your Honor, that somehow Ms. Carpenter, in her state that morning, got the car over to this area on Karen Court where she said she's got no connections but she knows the Defendant has ties. So she drops it off there and then walks back to her apartment, which she testified was approximately a mile away, in the state that she was in that morning.

Now, I also want to talk a little bit about the crime scene itself. You heard from Ms. Carpenter that she was a paralegal and that she was thinking about maybe leaving some evidence and making sure that somebody would be able to see this. But do you really think that in her state, Your Honor, she would decide that she needed to leave that knife in the garage; that same knife that she said that the Defendant had, and in the garage right by where her car was? Do you think she was in a state of mind to really plan that all out and to think enough in order to leave this garage -- or that knife in the garage, that's depicted here in State's 25 and 27, to leave it right by that car, to leave it with apparent blood on it where the crime scene

analyst are going to find it; and where the reasonable inference would be, that the Defendant ran out into the garage, dropped the knife, got into the car and took off. Now, I don't think that she was in any state of mind and I don't think that the evidence has shown, Your Honor, that she was capable of thinking that far ahead to really do something like that.

Now, I want to talk a little bit about the car. You heard from her that she purchased it — it was a Mercedes, a 1999 Mercedes that she purchased in March of 2014 for \$4200.00 which is more than the 3500 required by statue. And then after this case started she went back and she looked on a Kelly Blue Book or a similar site and ascertained the value as about \$5100.00. So either of those values are above the \$3500.00 limit.

Now, as far as the grand larceny auto: You again heard the Defendant make that statement when he had the car keys that was something along the lines of I stood up for you when you got this car, which indicated that he thought he was somehow entitled to it, that he's intending to take it because he helps her get the deal, helps her get the car—or the deal done or get the car. And so he's not borrowing it, he doesn't intend to return it; he says I stood up for you so I'm taking these, the keys meaning that he's also going to take the car. There's no indication that he ever intended to return it. All indications show that he meant to permanently deprive her of that automobile.

Now, the last thing that I want to talk about here are the injuries that Ms. Carpenter sustained this day on May 1st of 2014. You saw in State's Exhibit 28 and some of the additional exhibits her state and what she looked like, and you heard from Officer Bragg that that's pretty consistent. Either Officer Bragg or the crime scene analyst, one of them, said those pictures don't even really do justice to how

beat up she was, she actually, in person, looked even worse than that. Now, that's important for a couple of reasons. This isn't -- you don't have any evidence before you, Your Honor, that this was self-defense but even if there were some slight inference of self-defense at some point this stopped being self-defense. Even if there was some sort of altercation, which again you have no evidence of in front of you, Your Honor, but even if that were the case at some point the Defendant won the fight and he didn't need to continue beating her up this way. There's no indication that any of this was done in any sort of mutual combat.

She's lying down on the ground and she's got those injuries that are consistent with being kicked while she's on the ground; the injuries to the hips and the ribs. And you heard from Dr. Leibowitz that the blow out fracture she sustained to her right eye is always consistent with trauma, 100 percent of the time is from some sort of trauma. He said 99 percent of the time it's from somebody getting punched out. He also said it's possible that that comes from somebody being kicked. Both of those are consistent with what Corla Carpenter told you happened. She said that the Defendant punched her in the face multiple times and that while she was on the ground he was kicking her while he was wearing those Nike boots or his shoes.

Now, you also heard that that wasn't the extent of her injuries. She also, still to this day, has numbness and pain and nerve damage in the right side of her face. She's missing teeth, eventually she's going to have to get an implant to have that done. She had to go and get physical therapy in order to deal with the hip pain that she didn't have prior. She also is still undergoing surgery; she's had two and she's going to have a third for the nerve damage and the nerve blocking in her face. Now, she also has that diagnosis of potential glaucoma which is related back

to this trauma and what did she say about that; she said I haven't really gotten an answer but it's possible that I'm gonna lose my eyesight as a result of this trauma here.

Now, you also heard her say that while she was sitting on the living room couch the Defendant was in front of her yelling at her making all those statements and those threats to kill her. One of the things that he said was look at what you made me do, look at your eye. Now, Your Honor's seen enough of these cases to know that that's unfortunately not uncommon in this type of case but what Your Honor—

MR. SHETLER: Objection, Your Honor. I believe that calls for the trier of fact to make a decision beyond the evidence presented in the case.

THE COURT: Okay. Sustained. Let's talk about this case.

MS. SUDANO: Okay. Move on.

MS. SUDANO:

So, what Your Honor sees here and what Your Honor knows from that statement that look at what you made me do, look at my eye, is that the Defendant's action in this particular case and what he did, none of that was Corla Carpenter's fault. All of the evidence that you have before you, Your Honor, indicates that the Defendant was not only the initial aggressor but that he took all of these actions against Ms. Carpenter simply because he was upset and he was agitated, there wasn't really any good reason given to you.

And with that, Your Honor, when you go back to deliberate in this case the State's going to ask that you find the Defendant, Genaro Perry, guilty of all seven counts.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Shetler.

MR. SHETLER: Thank you, Your Honor.

Court's indulgence one moment; let me make this a little quicker.

THE COURT: Uh-huh.

CLOSING ARGUMENT BY THE DEFENSE

MR. SHETLER:

Your Honor, I want to thank you for your time and the professional courtesy you have extended to myself and my client here in this trial. I'm cognizance of the fact that our victim is in the courtroom, and I mean no disrespect, but I'm doing my job that I have to do here. I say that to the Court and to her.

The concern in this case and what I would ask this Court to do is to hold the State to their burden. To prove my client guilty beyond a reasonable doubt of the elements required for each of the charges.

We have an officer, who I have a great deal of respect for, I believe some of her testimony indicates that she may have been slightly biased against people who are charged with domestic violence. I think that she, Ms. Sudano was clearly correct when she stated that she corroborated everything that Ms. Carpenter stated and in fact, I think she went a little further. I think that she tried to corroborate the hand injury that was documented at some point after this went down the same day, four days later, it's not clear. The evidence would suggest it was the same day because of the clothing.

The cell phone: She was adamant the cell phone was in the toilet and then the toilet downstairs. She stuck on that pretty hard. It's our position that perhaps the cell phone was in the toilet downstairs, or perhaps that was the story that was related to the police. The evidence introduced by the victim is that the cell phone was thrown into the toilet after the cell phone was already taken away from

her and that it remained in the toilet for some unknown period of time, but it's very difficult to get any reliable time estimates out of any of the testimony that came out of this trial. But after that period of time it was able somehow, to make that one phone call.

We have the photograph taken by CSA Keller that shows our victim on the bed on the mattress in the living room next to a cell phone. I'm not saying that's a cell phone. The evidence doesn't say that's a cell phone. The evidence also doesn't say that's not the cell phone.

We have the selfies. The victim wasn't able to tell us what phone those were taken with or what camera it was taken with. Both items were mentioned in cross-examination. I don't believe that the evidence can — has established that the cell phone was ever in the toilet beyond the victim's testimony on the stand. I asked Officer Bragg several times and she was adamant that it was in the toilet and possibly in the toilet when she got there. Those are inconsistent statements.

The crime scene: And I'm sorry, I should have referenced those. The first exhibit talking about the cuts on the hand, it's Exhibit 37. The exhibit showing Ms. Carpenter on the bed is Exhibit 28. Utilizing Exhibit 7 which shows the kitchen area where Ms. Carpenter says she came to rest after she went down the stairs, was pushed, kicked down the stairs, forced down the stairs. I believe the evidence is clear that she testified she was somehow forced down the stairs quicker than walking, and ended up falling coming to a stop in front of the stove.

She was adamant that she was curled up in a fetal position facing the stove. That's not a wide kitchen. Mr. Perry, as everybody else in this courtroom, is considerably smaller than I am, but there's not a lot of room in this area between the refrigerator and the stove. I asked her several times how he was able -- she was

adamant that he was kicking her in the face. I asked her several times how that could be in there and she was looking at the stove; there was no answer.

And this is what it comes back to, you know, the horrific events of abuse that occur on a daily basis in our town. Nobody deserves to be injured. But our Constitution requires that the government establish beyond a reasonable doubt each element of the crime. Our Constitution requires that there is sufficient reliable evidence to get to this stage. Our Constitution requires and our rules of evidence require that the trier of fact make their decision just based on the evidence presented in the trial.

And a significant element and in fact, the only remaining element we have to work with on those jury Instructions is the fact that if the trier of fact believes that a witness, out of respect, was inconsistent at some point in time that that could be taken into consideration. It doesn't mean the witness has to be completely dismissed, but it is a factor and it's a significant factor. And this Court — that right to face our accused is one of the strongest rights in the Constitution. And nobody's comfortable in a courtroom setting. Nobody wants to be asked questions by a lawyer, but your story's got to make sense. It's got to be a linear story that explains some ideas.

The holes or the problems, the inconsistencies in Ms. Carpenter's story are not just: I can't be sure how much time it was, I can't be sure what happened. There are significant inconsistencies. She has been present many times in preparing for this case. There's no doubt that the story at T.J. Maxx was going to come up. It escaped her memory that she happened to have a knife in her purse until I asked her later. That's a significant factor that there's a kitchen knife in your purse at a department store; a significant factor, Your Honor. That's not I don't

remember if I had my car keys or my apartment keys.

The significance of the phone initially, for no -- which there's not a clear reason given. And perhaps my client was a drug-addled maniac, perhaps there was a dispute that was ongoing between of them, perhaps they were engaged in economic transactions to generate money and interest to support the promissory note --

MS. SUDANO: I'm going to object, Your Honor. That assumes a lot of facts not in evidence.

THE COURT: Right --

MR. SHETLER: She denied all those things.

THE COURT: -- so you've got to focus on what the evidence is.

MR. SHETLER:

She denied all those things. But the story of this man who hurt me previously, shows up at my door, I know he has a bench warrant and I know he needs his medication because that causes problems for people, sounds very humane and very compassionate. It also sounds somewhat inconsistent with a person who may have been scared of a person who act in that fashion, who shows up at her door in the middle of the night, and I mean this in absolutely no disrespect to Ms. Carpenter, everybody should be able to do what they want to do, but to greet a former lover at the door essentially disrobed, not direct him to the mattress in the living room downstairs but he comes upstairs, gets in bed with her and again, I don't need to say it again, it's -- those are not the actions of a woman, no matter how tired she is, who's worried about this person.

She told him earlier in the text messages that she would leave his stuff outside, that didn't happen. She told him earlier that she would send him to the

police station, that didn't happen. She knew he had a warrant. She knew the weeklies where he stayed, that didn't happen. That's unusual.

The morning after, he's agitated. He's walking around and for no reason he takes my cell phone and throws it. Okay. He says -- she said twice maybe three times that he said something about my mother, and I'm not minimizing it, but then he punches her in the face so hard that he fractures her eye socket, maybe. Maybe that happened downstairs when we're between her and the stove kicking her in the face, maybe. The doctor did say that he was pretty adamant that mostly these are as a result of abuse but he also said that a kid had just gotten a similar injury from a soccer ball.

We're going to convict a man of several felonies here and the standard needs to be observed.

The -- Ms. Carpenter knew that my client needed his medication. She didn't take any steps to do anything with it other than let him into her home.

She was a trained paralegal who knows what evidence is important.

She knows it was important to leave this blood trail on the door jam. Perhaps, contrary to what Ms. Sudano says, perhaps, it's important that that knife get dropped in the garage before he gets in the car because it makes more sense.

There's not a clear explanation of what happens between this incident in the floor in the kitchen and this undetermined period of time where we're happy to leave a blood trail, and where at some point my client forces her back upstairs and sets her down and then throws this cell phone in the toilet and then leaves. There's not a clear timeline. There's not a reason, why does it stop. Ms. Sudano said at some point this fight was over. At some point it was no longer self-defense or there was no longer a mutual combat -- I'm going to be very careful -- excuse me, but

there's no explanation as to why it changed.

She said he cut her hands and Officer Bragg was confident that he cut her hands, and Ms. Sudano says that those injuries are in the bottom of Exhibit 37 are consistent with a serrated knife. I think that's a bit of a stretch. We don't know when those were. We don't know when that occurred but we know the CSA did not document them. The CSA is a trained professional, this is her job.

We know that this woman was in so much pain that she couldn't get up and do standups for the CSA, which is how they do their business. And I'm sure they're accommodating at the scene but they want stuff done the way they want stuff done. The decision to take these photographs with her lying down, I'm sure, was not made lightly but that same woman doesn't allow an ambulance to transport her. She somehow gets up and walks up on this injuried [sic] hip that she talked about to get in the car and go to the hospital and walk into the emergency room. That doesn't make sense.

The common sense Instruction is, of course, controlling here and it's frequently all the criminal Defendants have to work with. It's important. It's -- our position is it's not enough and it's not common sense enough to get to a conviction.

Ms. Carpenter's special training and knowledge of not only the legal system but of the activities of her partner that she talked about; she talked about driving him up and down Boulder Highway selling drugs. She knew where he lived on Boulder Highway. She talked about specifically going and staking him out on Boulder Highway weeks after this so the police could find him.

This just sounds like a case of overreaching. It sounds like a case where whether it's a fatal attraction, whether it's a mutual combat, whether it's an agreement that's gone wrong maybe a business agreement that's gone wrong.

There's no logical step from, I woke up to I have a fractured eye socket. And, no matter what my client is involved in or doing or the allegations are against my client, and his irregular activities or his irregular behavior, there's no step from I'm lying in bed and he says something about my mother and I have a fractured eye socket. That's not connected, Your Honor.

The car: Our position is that there is completely insufficient evidence to connect us to the car. Ms. Sudano's explanation or discussion of this occurring down the street or her getting up and doing it and then injuring herself, there's just nothing there. That's too far to reach.

Mr. Perry may not be a model citizen and he may be a convicted felon or at least prior convictions for these injuries, similar; but just as I objected to during Ms. Sudano's argument, this trier of fact needs to focus on the facts of this case and this trial. The State has to show these elements. The State has very skillfully presented this case. Both sides are working with the evidence that they have and there's insufficient evidence to convict this man of seven felonies. There's insufficient evidence and the trier of fact's not be allowed to fill in gaps that don't flow.

We're confident in this trier of facts to be able to analyze the case. And once again, I thank you for your time and I again, on behalf of the victim, I do this as my job and I feel for her being here.

Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you. Final argument?

MS. SUDANO: Thank you, Your Honor.

May I have the Court's brief indulgence while I grab one more? THE COURT: Sure.

REBUTTAL ARGUMENT BY THE STATE

BY MS. SUDANO:

Your Honor, Mr. Shetler stood before you and said that there was no link between waking up in the morning and having a fractured eye socket. That it just doesn't all add up, that something's missing. I would submit, Your Honor, that you did hear some testimony and some evidence of this relationship, this domestic type relationship that was going on. They'd been together for approximately six months. They'd broken up, kind of on again off again relationship.

Now, you heard from Ms. Carpenter that they'd broken up at some point before April 30th of 2014 but that prior to that, even though there was some history between the two of them, she wasn't afraid of the Defendant in this case. So when the Defendant wanted to come over and get his medicine she told him no but when he showed up she empathized. She said you know what you need your medicine that's fine. And then Mr. Shetler pointed out that she wasn't wearing a lot of clothing when he arrived. She wasn't wearing a lot of clothing when she went to bed. She let him sleep in the bed with her.

Now, we've heard that that following morning the Defendant's just upset. He's just angry he's making statements about Ms. Carpenter and her family. I would submit to you, Your Honor, that is it possible that he wanted to reconcile and he was given some signals by this woman who's letting him sleep in her bed while she's not wearing a ton of clothing that maybe she wants to reconcile? But that she told you up on the stand she didn't want to reconcile. She didn't give him any additional indication of that other than that just letting his stay over for the night. But is it possible that that's what started this all was him wanting to reconcile and then finding out that morning that she wasn't interested in reconciling? That's for your

 Honor to determine but you're free to use your common sense in evaluating that situation.

Now, you also heard Mr. Shetler's argument, Your Honor, that Officer Bragg, who sat up here and was very happily retired, had some bias because she'd worked so many domestic violence cases. But what did she tell you? She told you that three or four times she's been wrong. She admitted that there have been cases where she's been wrong. She also told you that she didn't believe that this was one of those cases where there was anything inconsistent. So she didn't seem like a witness who was biased and had to be right and had to have everything fit with her version of events. No. She told you that the way that she investigated this case everything seemed consistent, and this wasn't a case where she was concerned about anything.

Now, you also heard that there was some confusion about that phone being in the toilet. Now, Officer Bragg was adamant that at some point she's learned the phone was in the toilet but she couldn't remember if it was in the phone -- or in the toilet, excuse me, when she arrived. She was adamant that that phone that she saw had a cracked screen. So I would submit to Your Honor that that cracked screen is still evidence of that coercion and still corroborates the coercion because regardless of when and if the phone ends up in the toilet, throwing the phone against the wall, taking the phone away from the victim, throwing it against the wall when she's attempting to call 9-1-1 after the Defendant's getting agitated and making threats, that in-of-itself is sufficient for the coercion.

MR. SHETLER: Your Honor, I'm sorry, I have to object. The testimony was not that the phone was thrown against the wall the testimony was that the phone fell short of the wall.

 THE COURT: That's not my recollection. So I'll rely on my recollection of the evidence. Go ahead.

MR. SHETLER: Thank you, Your Honor.

MS. SUDANO: Thank you, Your Honor.

MS. SUDANO:

Now, there was also testimony and argument here about what happened at the T.J. Maxx. And Mr. Shetler told you that it was inconsistent and it didn't make any sense the way that Ms. Carpenter relayed to you what happened at the T.J. Maxx. Two arguments that are important on that point, Your Honor, one: you heard evidence of what happened at that T.J. Maxx based on the belief that this was going to be a self-defense case and you were going to hear additional evidence that this was self-defense. You didn't hear any of that evidence, so what happened at that T.J. Maxx, respectfully, probably isn't even properly before Your Honor at this point.

Now in addition, what happened at that T.J. Maxx, none of those facts are material to what happened here, Your Honor. And the Instruction on the creditability of witnesses tells you that if you believe a witness has lied or has been untruthful or inconsistent about a material fact you're free to disregard their testimony or limit the consideration you give to their testimony. Anything that happened at that T.J. Maxx is not a material fact regarding what happened here, what happened at Ms. Carpenter's house on May 1st of 2014.

Now, Mr. Shetler also argued that it was inconsistent. That based on the prior history of Ms. Carpenter and the Defendant that she wouldn't be afraid of him and she would just let him back in, but what did she say about that? She said that she'd let him back into her life previously, that she'd given him chances 1 | be 2 | Ho 3 | loo 4 | ln 5 | sh 6 | be

because she was just a girl trying to be in love. And that was her phrase, Your Honor. That she was willing to give the Defendant chances, probably more than, looking back, she wishes she had but that was just because she this girl trying to be in love. And so as far as her story being inconsistent or not making sense because she wasn't always afraid of the Defendant no, she was overlooking a lot of things because she wanted to believe, and she wanted to believe that they could have a future and that she could be his queen like he promised.

So, none of that is inconsistent. It doesn't require Your Honor to make leaps that don't comport with your common sense. Now that's just her explanation of why she kept giving him chances.

Now, you also heard again that your common sense is going to guide and that there are too many holes for Your Honor to fill in. But I would submit that your common sense, Your Honor, would tell you that Ms. Carpenter did not do this to herself. That these injuries are not something that somebody's going to fabricate or go to all of these lengths, which seemed to be the insinuation by Mr. Shetler, that she's this paralegal and she's, for whatever reason, just particularly upset with the Defendant on this day.

Now, you also heard testimony that she was after the fact — after this she was kind of looking around for the Defendant because she wanted to make sure that he was held accountable for what had happened to her. And Mr. Shetler tried to infer and argue to Your Honor that that was because of this vendetta that she has. I would submit, Your Honor, that that's just because she was finally done being embarrassed. She had said previously that she'd overlooked some things because she was embarrassed and she just wanted to let it all go but this was kind of the final straw for Corla Carpenter, Your Honor. And this, what you have before Your

25

Honor in Exhibit 30, was why she was willing to follow this man around and look for him for two weeks just to make sure that he didn't get away with what he did to her.

And with Your Honor -- with that, Your Honor, I would submit it to you for deliberation.

THE COURT: Thank you. Okay.

So, what I'm going to do is, I'll be going into chambers to deliberate. I'll get the exhibits and I have the verdict form and I guess we'll give you guys a call when I'm ready. I don't think it'll be too long but I will go through the evidence and my notes before rendering a verdict.

So I guess just make sure we have your cell numbers to reach you when that happens.

MR. SHETLER: I will, Your Honor. And I do -- just to inform, that there's a prelim downstairs that's waiting for me right now --

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. SHETLER: - so I will be in Justice Court 10.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. SHETLER: And see if we can get that wrapped up as quickly as possible, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. SHETLER: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you.

MS. SUDANO: Thank you, Your Honor.

[The Court retired to deliberate at 11:58 a.m.]

[Proceedings resumed at 12:59 p.m.]

THE COURT: Okay, folks. Thanks for coming back.

 I did review my notes and the exhibits and have reached a verdict, so I'm now handing the verdict to the Clerk.

Defendant and his counsel please stand and the Clerk will read the verdict out loud.

THE COURT CLERK: District Court, Clark County, Nevada, the State of Nevada, plaintiff, versus Genaro Richard Perry, Defendant, case number C14298879-1, Department Six, Verdict.

I, the finder of fact in the above entitled case find the Defendant,
Genaro Richard Perry, as follows: Count 1, robbery with use of a deadly weapon,
guilty of robbery with use of a deadly weapon. Count 2, false imprisonment with use
of a deadly weapon, guilty of false imprisonment with use of a deadly weapon.
Count 3, grand larceny auto, guilty of grand larceny auto value \$3,500.00 or more.
Count 4, assault with a deadly weapon, guilty of assault with a deadly weapon.
Count 5, coercion, guilty of coercion with force. Count 6, battery resulting in
substantial bodily harm constituting domestic violence, guilty of battery resulting in
substantial bodily harm constituting domestic violence. Count 7, preventing or
dissuading witness or victim from reporting crime or commencing prosecution, guilty
of preventing or dissuading witness -- excuse me -- witness or victim from reporting
crime or commencing prosecution. Dated this 1st day of October, 2015, District
Court Judge Cadish.

THE COURT: Thank you. You can go ahead and have a seat.

Defendant will be remanded into custody without bail pending sentencing. Let's go ahead and set a sentencing date.

THE COURT CLERK: That will be November 16th, 8:30.

THE COURT: Okay. Thanks for your professionalism and courtesy all week.

MS. SUDANO: Thank you, Your Honor. [Bench Trial, Day 3, concluded at 1:01 p.m.] -8 ATTEST: Pursuant to Rule 3(c)(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. DALYNE EASLEY Court Transcriber

FILED IN OPEN COURT SAO STEVEN D. GRIERSON STEVEN B. WOLFSON CLERK OF THE COURT 2 Clark County District Attorney Nevada Bar #001565 OCT 0 1 2015 3 MICHELLE SUDANO Deputy District Attorney Nevada Bar #013260 200 Lewis Avenue S. BOYLE, DEPUTY 5 Las Vegas, Nevada 89155-2212 (702) 671-2500 6 Attorney for Plaintiff DISTRICT COURT CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA 8 9 THE STATE OF NEVADA, 10 Plaintiff, 11 -VS-CASE NO: C-14-298879-1 12 GENARO RICHARD PERRY, DEPT NO: VI #1456173 13 Defendant. 14 15 STIPULATION AND ORDER COMES NOW, the Defendant, GENARO RICHARD PERRY, by and through his 16 counsel, TRAVIS SHETLER, and the State of Nevada, by and through MICHELLE 17 SUDANO, Deputy District Attorney, and pursuant to NRS 175.011(1), hereby agree and 18 19 stipulate to the following: 20 Defendant, GENARO RICHARD PERRY, consented to allow his 1. attorney Travis Shetler to request a bench trial as opposed to a jury trial 21 in case C-14-298879-1. Defendant, GENARO RICHARD PERRY, thoroughly discussed the differences between a bench trial and a jury trial with his attorney prior to requesting a bench trial. Defendant, GENARO RICHARD PERRY, 22 2. 23 understands that by requesting a bench trial, he gives up his right to have 24 an impartial jury decide the case. Instead, the Judge will determine guilt or innocence. 25 /// 26 /// 27 /// 28 III

1	DATED this 15 day of October 2015.
2	ATTORNEY FOR DEFENDANT CLARK COUNTY DISTRICT
	ATTORNEY
4	BY: BY: BY:
5 6	TRAVIS SHETLER MICHELLE SUDANO Attorney for Defendant Deputy District Attorney Nevada Bar #004747 Nevada Bar #013260
7	Nevada Bar #004747 Nevada Bar #013260
8	A
9	Denaro Ferry
10	GENARO RICHARD PERRY
11	
12	IT IS SO ORDERED.
13	Dri Fladia
14	DISTRICT JUDGE
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	a/L-3
28	

Electronically Filed 01/22/2016 11:56:08 AM

JOC

CLERK OF THE COURT

DISTRICT COURT

CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

THE STATE OF NEVADA.

Plaintiff,

Defendant.

-VS-

CASE NO. C298879-11

DEPT. NO. VI

GENARO RICHARD PERRY

#1456173

 JUDGMENT OF CONVICTION
(JURY TRIAL)

The Defendant previously entered a plea of not guilty to the crimes of COUNT 1 — ROBBERY WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON (Category B Felony) in violation of NRS 200.380, 193.165; COUNT 2 — FALSE IMPRISONMENT WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON (Category B Felony) in violation of NRS 200.460; COUNT 3 — GRAND LARCENY AUTO (Category B Felony) in violation of NRS 205.228.3; COUNT 4 — ASSAULT WITH A DEADLY WEAPON (Category B Felony) in violation of NRS 200.471; COUNT 5 — COERCION (Category B Felony) in violation of NRS 207.190; COUNT 6 — BATTERY RESULTING IN SUBSTANTIAL BODILY HARM CONSTITUTING DOMESTIC VIOLENCE (Category C Felony) in violation of NRS

14

18 19

17

21 22

23

24

20

25 26

27 28

11

200.481, 200.485, 33.018; COUNT 7 – PREVENTING OR DISSUADING WITNESS OR VICTIM FROM REPORTING CRIME OR COMMENCING PROSECUTION (Category D Felony) in violation of NRS 199.305; and the matter having been tried before a jury and the Defendant having been found guilty of said crimes; thereafter, on the 6th day of January, 2016, the Defendant was present in court for sentencing with his counsel, TRAVIS SHETLER, ESQ., and good cause appearing,

THE DEFENDANT IS HEREBY ADJUDGED guilty of said offense(s) and, in addition to the \$25.00 Administrative Assessment Fee, \$35.00 Domestic Violence Fee. \$250.00 Indigent Defense Civil Assessment Fee, Restitution in the amount of \$18,103,28, and a \$150.00 DNA Analysis Fee including testing to determine genetic markers, plus a \$3,00 DNA Collection Fee, the Defendant is SENTENCED to the Nevada Department of Corrections (NDC) as follows: AS TO COUNT 1 - TO A MAXIMUM of ONE HUNDRED TWENTY (120) MONTHS with a MINIMUM Parole Eligibility of THIRTY-SIX (36) MONTHS, plus a CONSECUTIVE term of ONE HUNDRED TWENTY (120) MONTHS MAXIMUM with a MINIMUM Parole Eligibility of THIRTY-SIX (36) MONTHS for use of a Deadly Weapon; AS TO COUNT 2 - TO A MAXIMUM of SIXTY (60) MONTHS with a MINIMUM Parole Eligibility of EIGHTEEN (18) MONTHS, Count 2 to run CONCURRENT with Count 1; AS TO COUNT 3 - TO A MAXIMUM of NINETY-SIX (96) MONTHS with a MINIMUM Parole Eligibility of TWENTY-FOUR (24) MONTHS, Count 3 to run CONSECUTIVE to Counts 1 & 2; AS TO COUNT 4 - TO A MAXIMUM of SIXTY (60) MONTHS with a MINIMUM Parole Eligibility of EIGHTEEN (18) MONTHS, Count 4 to run CONCURRENT with Count 3; AS TO COUNT 5 - TO A MAXIMUM of SIXTY (60) MONTHS with a MINIMUM Parole

Eligibility of EIGHTEEN (18) MONTHS, Count 5 to run CONCURRENT with Count 4;

AS TO COUNT 6 - TO A MAXIMUM of FORTY-EIGHT (48) MONTHS with a MINIMUM

Parole Eligibility of EIGHTEEN (18) MONTHS, Count 6 to run CONCURRENT with

Count 5; and AS TO COUNT 7 - TO A MAXIMUM of THIRTY-SIX (36) MONTHS with a

MINIMUM Parole Eligibility of TWELVE (12) MONTHS, Count 7 to run CONCURRENT

with Count 6; with FIVE HUNDRED NINETY-SEVEN (597) DAYS credit for time served.

Defendant's AGGREGATE TOTAL SENTENCE is THREE HUNDRED THIRTY-SIX

(336) MONTHS MAXIMUM with a MINIMUM of NINETY-SIX (96) MONTHS.

DATED this _____ day of January, 2016.

ELISSA F. CADISH DISTRICT COURT JUDGE

Electronically Filed 03/31/2016 02:11:23 PM

RTRAN

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

VS.

Jun A. Comm

CLERK OF THE COURT

DISTRICT COURT

CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

THE STATE OF NEVADA,

Plaintiff,

CASE NO. C298879-1

DEPT. VI

GENARO RICHARD PERRY,

Defendant.

ROUGH DRAFT

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

BEFORE THE HONORABLE ELISSA F. CADISH, DISTRICT COURT JUDGE MONDAY, NOVEMBER 23, 2015

SENTENCING

APPEARANCES:

For the State:

MICHELLE L. SUDANO, ESQ.

Deputy District Attorney

For the Defendant:

TRAVIS SHETLER, ESQ.

Victim Impact Speaker:

CORLA CARPENTER

24 25

RECORDED BY: JESSICA KIRKPATRICK, COURT RECORDER

-1-

Rough Draft

7

LAS VEGAS, NEVADA, MONDAY, NOVEMBER 23, 2015, at 10:01 A.M.

THE MARSHAL: Top of page 16, State of Nevada v. Perry, Genaro Richard.

THE COURT: Good morning.

MR. SHETLER: Good morning, Your Honor, Travis Shetler on behalf of Mr. Perry who's present, in custody.

MS. SUDANO: Good morning, Michelle Sudano on behalf of the State.

MR. SHETLER: Your Honor, first let me apologize for not being here last week and being late this morning. I received the Presentence Investigation Report on November 12th. I hand carried it over to CCDC, gave it to CCDC, and it came back to me in the mail with insufficient postage on Monday following that, which I didn't have any postage, it's true, but I didn't think I needed it. We forwarded a second copy to Mr. Perry. He had that last Tuesday when I was not here and he was. There are -- the recommendations for a significant amount of time.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. SHETLER: Mr. Perry would like to sit down with me face to face and go over this together so we can submit a proper sentencing memo, so I am going to ask for some time. I know the State's objecting and I know the victim's here for a second time and I apologize for that. If there's any way I can assist in that matter — but I do think in light of the time that's out there I need the time to meet with him face to face and prepare a memorandum to make sure I do my job, Your Honor.

MS. SUDANO: And, Your Honor, yes, for the record, the State is going to be objecting to that again just because we do have the victim present again for the second time with several members of her family. When we were here last week! understand Mr. Shetler was ill and there's not much we can do about that one --

 THE COURT: Right.

MS. SUDANO: -- but they did specifically ask for just a week to get Mr. Shetler back up to health and up to speed.

THE COURT: So, they returned the PSI to you the first time and then it was given to him last week --

MR, SHETLER: Correct.

THE COURT: -- but you haven't been able to meet with him?

MR. SHETLER: I have not been able to. I haven't recovered one hundred percent. I have a strep throat and --

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. SHETLER: -- it was like revisiting elementary school at my own house again for a while, but it's completely on me. It's not the Court's problem or Mr. Perry's, and | again | apologize. It's just unfortunately the way it was, Your Honor. If there's a fee or something I'm happy to cover that on behalf of the victim. I just --

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. SUDANO: And I'm not sure if Your Honor would entertain potentially allowing -- or Mr. Shetler allowing the victim to speak today and then continuing the sentencing.

MR. SHETLER: I'm not horribly opposed to that. We do have some issues with some of that but it's not like we would have a chance to examine her on that matter, so it might facilitate for the victim --

THE COURT: I would be in kind to allow that rather than inconveniencing her again. I'd be happy to hear what she would like to add. Obviously I heard her testimony at trial.

MS. SUDANO: Correct, Your Honor. Give me one moment --

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: And so you're not objecting?

MR. SHETLER: No.

THE COURT: Okay.

Go ahead and talk with her. And so then I'd be continuing the sentencing other than hearing from her.

MR. SHETLER: Correct.

MS. SUDANO: And Ms. Carpenter does wish to address the Court today, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I understand that. Okay. So, let's get her up to the table and we'll swear her in.

MR. SHETLER: Your Honor, do you mind if I join Mr. Perry in the box?

THE COURT: You can go over there, yes.

VICTIM IMPACT SPEAKER: CORLA CARPENTER

[having been called as a witness and being first duly sworn, testified as follows:]

[Colloquy between Court and Witness]

THE COURT CLERK: Please state your first and last name and spell it for the record.

THE WITNESS: Corla Carpenter, C-O-R-L-A, C-A-R-P-E-N-T-E-R.

THE COURT: Okay, ma'am, go ahead.

THE COURT CLERK: Thank you.

THE WITNESS: So as I sit before the district court today I'd like to thank God for even being here and being alive, Honorable Judge, Elissa Cadish, and my legal team, my friends, family, and colleagues that have been so patient, and those in the courtroom and those that couldn't be here, and my doctors who have been instrumental in my healing and piecing me back together.

So, Judge, as you -- I guess I was prepared for a sentence to be set today.

THE COURT: Right, and I'm sorry that, for reasons beyond our control, that's not happening but I appreciate you speaking today.

THE WITNESS: What I'd like to say is on the morning of May 1st, 2014, the Defendant -- I just pray that he pays for his crimes against me and his past victims. And I have been instrumental in being here and being diligent and doing my part to make sure that this does not happen and that he thinks twice about harming anyone else. And it's just funny to me how he never seem to -- not that I want anyone hurt, but he never seemed to attack men, just women that he thinks he can overpower.

So, Judge, as you decide on a sentence that is appropriate, I want you to understand that he left me for dead and that --

THE COURT: Ms. Sudano, want to hand her the -- thanks.

THE WITNESS: Thank you,

I have a disabled child who's blind who does not talk. If he's able to make good on his threats to come back and kill my entire family she wouldn't be able to escape unassisted. He's threatened me numerous times. I currently have a temporary protection order. And I just need to say this. I've come to court with makeup, hair done, trying to be presentable but don't make any assumptions that this is how I am every day. Some days it is very hard. My right face is numb for the rest of my life and when my kids go to kiss me I don't feel it anymore. I don't get to feel their warmth. I have an implant in my eye.

THE COURT: Right.

THE WITNESS: The Defendant is a menace to this community. And I haven't been perfect but I am a 30 year resident of Nevada and I have done

12

11

14

13

15 16

17

18

19

20 21

23 24

25

22

community service. I have talked to women in abusive relationships. I've done several things with UNLV and disabled children. And during the time, the brief period of time, I was in a relationship with him I was just a girl in love, just a girl in love. I did not ask for any of this. I was very diligent in making sure he was caught. I know it doesn't work like it does on TV so I went to every place that I thought he might be until we found him and that was my responsibility to the community.

I have years of rehabilitation. My eyesight will never be the same. I actually rent -- one of the attorneys I work for I rent his house. My blood is stained throughout that house which will be addressed in a separate civil matter, but -- he's never paid for his crimes, not for me and not for people in the past and I just ask that as you make an appropriate sentence that it's a lengthy amount of time because I will never fully recover.

And I thank you for letting me address the Court. I do not want to ever come back here and be in his presence again. And I pray that he gets everything coming to him. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you very much. I appreciate your time today.

So now that we heard from the victim I will go ahead and continue the remainder of the sentencing hearing.

MR. SHETLER: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I am out next week, and having tried the case I would like to impose the sentence.

MR. SHETLER: And, Your Honor, I have trial set for both of the following weeks of that -- after that. I've -- I could do it the week right before Christmas which would be super fun, or the week inbetween Christmas and New Year's which would be almost as much fun. I'll do whatever you tell me, Judge. I'm the slow poke here, so.

2

1

J

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: I could do it -- I understand you just said you're in trial, I could do it on the 14th or the 16th, or I can do it in January.

MS. SUDANO: Whichever works for the State, Your Honor -- or for the Court, Your Honor. We can do it --

THE COURT: And he's remanded so --

MR. SHETLER: If January is possible then we -- I would appreciate that courtesy if it's possible, Judge.

THE COURT: So --

MR. SHETLER: There's crazy trials --

THE COURT: -- are you available the first week in January?

MR. SHETLER: No, the third week looks pretty good, but I will do what you tell me. I'll have plenty of time to get my stuff. I'll just have to get a judge that works with me as you did so I can do my county commitments. It's going to be a whirlwind couple of weeks. The 14th or 15th would not be ideal for me, but anything after that I'm going to take whatever you tell me, Judge.

THE COURT: After that?

MR. SHETLER: The 14th or 15th of December, those first two days.

THE COURT: Oh, but I'm -- so --

MR. SHETLER: Anything after that I'll work around.

THE COURT: So the beginning of January we could do it like --

MR. SHETLER: I'll make it work.

THE COURT: January 6?

MR. SHETLER: Yeah. Yes.

THE COURT: Okay, let's put it then.

1	THE COURT CLERK: January 6, 2016, 8:30, sentencing.	
2	THE COURT: Okay,	
3	MR. SHETLER: Thank you for all the courtesy, Judge. I appreciate it.	
4	THE COURT: Thank you.	
5	[Proceedings concluded at 10:11 a.m.]	
6	****	
7	ATTEST: I do hereby certify that I have truly and correctly transcribed the audio/video recording in the above-entitled case to the best of my ability.	
8		
9	Cynthia Georgias	
10	Court Recorder/Transcriber	
11	Eighth Judicial District Court Dept. XVIII	
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
Ì		

Electronically Filed 03/31/2016 02:08:53 PM **RTRAN** CLERK OF THE COURT 2 3 DISTRICT COURT 4 CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA 5 6 THE STATE OF NEVADA, 7 CASE NO. C298879-1 8 Plaintiff, DEPT, VI 9 VS. 10 ROUGH DRAFT GENARO RICHARD PERRY, 11 TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS Defendant. 12 13 14 BEFORE THE HONORABLE ELISSA F. CADISH, DISTRICT COURT JUDGE 15 WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 6, 2016 16 SENTENCING 17 18 19 APPEARANCES: 20 For the State: MICHELLE L. SUDANO, ESQ. Deputy District Attorney 21 22 For the Defendant: TRAVIS SHETLER, ESQ. 23 24 RECORDED BY: JESSICA KIRKPATRICK, COURT RECORDER 25

-1-

MR. SHETLER: Ms. Sudano didn't seem as impressed with those as I am so

22

23

24

25

she doesn't care if we're copied [indiscernible].

THE COURT: Understand. Let me take a quick look at these certificates.

These are copies for me?

MR. SHETLER: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. SHETLER: And does the Court object if I join Mr. Perry in the box?

THE COURT: I do not object.

THE RECORDER: Just stay close --

THE COURT: Just make sure you're --

THE REOCRDER: -- to [indiscernible] mic.

THE COURT: - on a mic, yeah.

MR. SHETLER: Yes.

[Pause in proceedings]

THE COURT: Right, so I've reviewed the stack of Certificates of Completion which run from June of 2014 until July of 2015 it looks like.

MR. SHETLER: The last few may be out of order.

THE COURT: Oh no, there are some after that date.

MR. SHETLER: Right.

THE COURT: They're not necessarily in order but — so spanning a period of time that he has been in custody at CCDC encompassing various anger management programs, marriage and family relationships, and maybe a couple of other programs that he has attended in custody.

With that, this is the time set for entry of judgment and imposition of sentence. Is there any legal cause or reason why judgment should not be entered at this time?

 MR. SHETLER: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: By virtue of the verdict rendered at trial in this case, I hereby adjudicate you guilty of Count 1, robbery with use of a deadly weapon, a B felony; Count 2, false imprisonment with use of a deadly weapon, a B felony; Count 3, grand larceny auto, value \$3,500.00 or more, a B felony; Count 4, assault with a deadly weapon, a B felony; Count 5, coercion with force, a B felony; Count 6, battery resulting in substantial bodily harm constituting domestic violence, a C felony; Count 7, preventing or dissuading witness or victim from reporting crime or commencing prosecution, a D felony. Did I get all 7 counts?

THE COURT CLERK: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay, thank you.

Okay, so we are set to proceed with sentencing then today. I would note at the prior time scheduled for sentencing, although Mr. Shetler requested and was granted a continuance of the sentencing, we did have the victim speaker present at that time and the parties agreed and I agreed to allow her to speak at that time which she did so we heard from her at that time and of course heard her testimony at the time of trial as well.

With that being said, let me hear from the State about sentence.

MS. SUDANO: Thank you, Your Honor.

In this case and Mr. Shetler's sentencing memorandum he's asking for a 3 to 8 which is essentially the minimum that the Defendant can receive on this case because of the robbery with the deadly weapon conviction.

THE COURT: Right.

MS. SUDANO: This is absolutely not a case that deserves the minimum sentence. If you look at P&P's recommendation, they actually recommend that all 7

of these counts run consecutive. So their total sentence that they recommend on this Defendant is a 14 to 53 year sentence and I'm going to submit it to Your Honor on the recommendation of P&P as far as what's an appropriate sentence.

But the thing that I do want to reiterate is just absolutely this is not a minimum sentence type crime. This Defendant has one prior drug felony. He has two prior domestic violence convictions. Officer Bragg testified at the time of the trial that in her 20 years of experience in working a ton of DV cases this is one of the worst cases that she's ever seen. And we also heard from the doctor that this was a serious fracture that this Defendant inflicted on Corla Carpenter and she required an implant in her eye based on that. We also heard from the victim that in addition to that implant in her eye she's still suffering from numbness and pain. She lost a bunch of teeth. She may end up losing her eyesight as a result of this. She had back pain, ongoing things. Even now I think it's almost a year and a half afterwards those things were still going on. She said she's going to suffer those impacts and those effects for the rest of her life because of the Defendant.

The other thing that I think is particularly telling in this case and means that this is not a case that deserves the minimum sentence is what the victim said she did after the crimes. After the crimes she knew that the Defendant had another warrant out for a domestic violence on another woman and she wouldn't lay down and just accept the abuse and walk away from the case because she knew that he was going to do this to another woman. He's done it to multiple women in the past. He did it to her. She thought that she was going to be different, that they were in love. And when that proved false, she decided that she had to be the one to go forward with these cases so that he couldn't do this to anybody else. And so that's what brought us here, Your Honor. You know Corla thought she was going to be

ď.

5

6

8

9

11 12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21 22

23

24 25 lucky and she was going to be different and I don't think that anybody would say that she was lucky for what this Defendant did to her but certainly she may be luckier than the next woman when he gets out of prison.

And so with that, I would submit it to Your Honor. He has 597 days credit.

THE COURT: Five hundred and what?

MS. SUDANO: Ninety-seven, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you. Okay.

Mr. Perry, is there anything you would like to tell me today before I impose sentence?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am. First of all, I want to say Happy New Year to you. I want to say Happy New Year to the DA and Happy New Year to my lawyer Travis Shetler. I wish you all a prosperous and peaceful new year. I been quiet all through this trial. I feel like we family, Judge Cadish, 'cause I been with you for quite some time.

THE COURT: Yes.

THE DEFENDANT: But today I do have to fight in my defense. Since I been incarcerated, Judge Cadish, I — noticed that is two type of people in the world. There's builders and destroyers. Obviously, you know, I have a weakness with women. Sometimes I always get with the women that destroy. I even [indiscernible] the Bible verse. In the Bible it say: The wise women be over her house but with her own hands the food is one that tears her down — and obviously I got in the process of — with a woman that tears hers down.

With the victim statement that I have in my PSI I have my <u>Brady</u> material and documents that is inconsistent but I know we don't have time to go

through that.

THE COURT: You've been convicted so we're --

THE DEFENDANT: Right, also, --

THE COURT: -- not going back over that.

THE DEFENDANT: -- Judge Cadish, I want to just say if you will have mercy on me today for the sentences of my PSI that I read, the mandatory sentences, its 24 to 60, 12 to 36, and the 18 to 48 in Count 2, 3, 4, 5, and 7 run concurrent with all of them, so I can go on with my life and build something new. And I just wish that you have mercy to me -- on me today, Judge Cadish.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Mr. Shetler?

MR. SHETLER: Thank you, Your Honor, and thank you for the courtesy of continuing this until this month.

Let me say very briefly, I disagree with Ms. Sudano that this is a case that merits more than the minimums, not surprisingly. But we do agree on one other fact and that is the conduct of Corla after this incident went down. He'd been convicted. I've had a long talk with my client about what that means and where -- what flows from that. Our Courts, our laws in Nevada recognize that the danger an individual feels at any point in time is completely subjective. And I'm not going to minimize what she said she went through, but I do think it's very important this Court bear in mind two things: she went and hunted him down on Boulder Highway to find him. I think that cuts both ways. I also think that we have a woman who received in essence essentially \$18,000.00 in benefits from Victims of Crime. And this is the same woman who told this Court about her behavior in a department store where a dispute with somebody over \$450.00 bearing a kitchen knife, and the final result of

1 | 2 | 3 |

ъ

7

the security guard taking her down was her going through a plate glass window. I think those are important considerations that bear on her perception of things and what's appropriate and essentially reality, Your Honor.

The Parole & Probation and report contemplates a sentence of 15 to over 50 years on behalf of my client. Clearly, that's excessive. They even go so far as to require the installation of an interlock device in his vehicle. At the end of all that, which has absolutely no bearing whatsoever on anything in this case, I know that -- let me just stop at that. Fifteen to fifty years; there's absolutely no basis and no support for that. This Court -- I know my client feels comfortable with this. We're very comfortably in front of this judge on this matter for this sentencing. I'm happy to elaborate on any of these details or any questions that the Court has. I know that you read through the paperwork. Fifteen years on the bottom end is excessive for this man.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. So, obviously -- I mean I sat -- I didn't just sit through the trial, I tried it because you stipulated to a bench trial in this case so it's my verdict of guilty in this case, so obviously I was persuaded beyond a reasonable doubt that he is guilty of each of these charged crimes based on the evidence presented before me. And whether Ms. Carpenter was angry at Mr. Perry, whether she demanded money from him, which really no evidence of that ever came out at trial, but even assuming that something like that happened, in no way, shape, or form would that ever justify the events that followed that and the injuries that were inflicted on her which frankly she's lucky to be alive. So -- and you're lucky you're not facing a murder charge. So, I think it warrants a significant sentence. I'm not saying on the level of what P&P recommended, but it warrants a significant sentence.

So, I will impose administrative assessment fee of \$25.00; DNA analysis fee \$150.00 and require you to submit to testing for genetic markers; DNA collection fee \$3.00; domestic violence fee \$35.00; civil indigent defense assessment \$250.00. Those fees are a lien against you and collection can be pursued on them.

On Count 1, I'm sentencing you to 120 months in the Nevada

Department of Corrections, minimum parole eligibility after 36 months, class A,

consecutive term of 120 months with minimum parole eligibility after 36 months for
use of a deadly weapon.

The restitution request is for \$18,103.28. I am awarding that amount of restitution as well. Do you need the number again?

[Colloquy between Court and clerk]

THE COURT: On Count 2: 60 months with minimum parole eligibility after 18 months, concurrent with Count 1.

Count 3: 96 months with minimum parole eligibility after 24 months, consecutive to Counts 1 and 2.

Count 4: 60 months with minimum parole eligibility after 18 months, concurrent with Count 3.

Count 5: 60 months, minimum parole eligibility after 18 months, concurrent with Count 4.

Count 6: 48 months with minimum parole eligibility after 18 months, concurrent with Count 5.

Count 7: 36 months with minimum parole eligibility after 12 months, concurrent with Count 6.

I believe that is an aggregate sentence of 336 months with minimum

parole eligibility after 96 months with 597 days credit for time served. Good luck. MR. SHETLER: Thank you, Your Honor. THE COURT: Thank you. [Proceedings concluded at 9:38 a.m.] ATTEST: I do hereby certify that I have truly and correctly transcribed the audio/video recording in the above-entitled case to the best of my ability. Court Recorder/Transcriber Eighth Judicial District Court Dept. XVIII

Electronically Filed 11/04/2015 02:04:35 PM

1 2 3 4 5	TRAVIS E. SHETLER, ESQ. Nevada Bar No. 004747 TRAVIS SHETLER, P.C. 844 East Sahara Avenue Las Vegas, NV 89104-3017 Telephone: (702) 866-0091 Facsimile: (702) 866-0093 Attorney for Defendant		
6	DISTRICT COURT		
7	CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA		
8	STATE OF NEVADA) CASE NO.: C-14-298879-1		
9) Dept. No.: VI Plaintiff,		
10	v.)		
11	GENARO RICHARD PERRY,) NOTICE OF APPEAL) #1456173		
12	Defendant.		
13			
14	Notice is hereby wires that problem or comments		
15	Notice is hereby given that Petitioner GENARO RICHARD PERRY, Petitioner above named, hereby appeals to the Supreme		
16			
17	Court of Nevada from the jury verdict in this action on the 1st day of October, 2015.		
18	day of occoper, zono.		
19	Dated this day of November, 2015		
20	day of November, 2015		
21	LAW OFFICE OF TRAVIS SHETLER		
22	DAW OFFICE OF TRAVIS SMETTER		
23	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
24	By: TRAVIS E. SHETLER, ESQ.		
25	Nevada State Bar No. 4747 844 East Sahara Avenue		
26	Las Vegas, NV 89101 Attorney for Petitioner		
27	GENARO RICHARD PERRY		
28			

1	TRAVIS E. SHETLER, ESQ.				
2	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
3	844 East Sahara Avenue Las Vegas, NV 89104 Telephone: (702) 866-0091 Facsimile: (702) 866-0093				
4					
5	Counsel for Petitioner GENARO RICHARD PERRY				
6					
7	DISTRICT COURT				
8	CLARK COUNTY NEVADA				
9	STATE OF NEVADA				
10	Plaintiff,)))) Coop No. 7 10 200100 ***			
11	A.) Case No. A-13-692122- ¢)			
12	GENARO RICHARD PERRY,				
13	#1456173	CASE APPEAL STATEMENT			
14	Defendant.				
15	* ()	/			
16	CASE AD	Peal Statement			
1.7		nt filing this case appeal			
18	statement is GENARO				
19		ISH, was the Judge issuing the			
20	judgment appealed.	was one oudge resulting the			
21		and myself are the extent of the			
22		eedings in the District Court.			
23		is the only party involved in			
24	this appeal.	and the following for the first for the firs			
25	<i>n</i>	ESQ., LAW OFFICE OF TRAVIS SHETLER,			
26	•	nue, Las Vegas, Nevada, 89104,			
27		ner GENARO RICHARD PERRY in			
28	District Court				

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	İ
10	ĺ
11	
12	Į
13	
14	١
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	!
21	
22	
23	I
24	
25	
26	
	11

28

6. Appellant had appointed counsel in the District Court

7. The Initial Arraignment was held on or about June 2,

2014.

Dated this _____ day of November, 2015

TRAVIS E. SHETLER, ESQ. Nevada State Bar No. 4747

LAW OFFICE OF TRAVIS E. SHETLER

844 East Sahara Avenue

Las Vegas, NV 89101 Telephone: (702) 866-0091 Facsimile: (702) 866-0093

Attorney for Petitioner GENARO RICHARD PERRY

1 2 3 4 5	TRAVIS E. SHETLER, ESQ. Nevada Bar No. 004747 TRAVIS SHETLER, P.C. 844 East Sahara Avenue Las Vegas, NV 89104-3017 Telephone: (702) 866-0091 Facsimile: (702) 866-0093 Attorney for Defendant		
6	DISTRICT COURT		
7	CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA		
8	STATE OF NEVADA) CASE NO.: C-14-298879-1		
9) Dept. No.: VI Plaintiff,		
10	V		
11) <u>NOTICE OF APPEAL</u> GENARO RICHARD PERRY,) #1456173		
12) Defendant.		
13)		
14	Notice is beachy given that Batalahan GRADO Drawn		
15	Notice is hereby given that Petitioner GENARO RICHARD		
16	PERRY, Petitioner above named, hereby appeals to the Supreme		
17	Court of Nevada from the jury verdict in this action on the 1st		
18	day of October, 2015.		
19			
20	Dated this day of November, 2015		
21			
22	LAW OFFICE OF TRAVIS SHETLER		
23			
24	By:		
25	TRAVIS E. SHETTER, ESQ. Nevada State Bar No. 4747		
26	844 East Sahara Avenue Las Vegas, NV 89101		
27	Attorney for Petitioner GENARO RICHARD PERRY		

1 2 3 4 5	Nevada St LAW OFFIC 844 East Las Vegas Telephone Facsimile Counsel f	SHETLER, ESQ. ate Bar No. 4747 E OF TRAVIS E. SHETLER Sahara Avenue , NV 89104 : (702) 866-0091 : (702) 866-0093 or Petitioner CHARD PERRY		
7		DISTRICT	COURT	
8		CLARK COUN	ITY NEVADA	
9	STATE OF	NEVADA		
10		Plaintiff,	Cago No. 7	12 600100 ~
11	v.	radiicaa,	Case NO.	A-13-692122-C
12		VOCEO CONTO		
13	GENARO RICHARD PERRY,) #1456173) CASE APPEAL STATEMENT			
14		Defendant.		
15				
16		CACH ADDAL		
1.7	1	CASE APPEAL		_
18	1.	The name of appellant i		ise appeal
19		statement is GENARO RIC		
20	2.	JUDGE ELLISA F. CADISH,	was the Judg	ge issuing the
21		judgment appoaled.		
22	3.	THE STATE OF NEVADA and		
23		parties to the proceedi	ngs in the Di	strict Court.
24	4.	GENARO RICHARD PERRY is	the only par	ty involved in
25		this appeal.		
26	5.	TRAVIS E. SHETLER, ESQ.	, LAW OFFICE	OF TRAVIS SHETLER,
27		844 East Sahara Avenue,	Las Vegas, N	Jevada, 89104,
27 28 i		represented Petitioner	GENARO RICHAF	D PERRY in
۷.0		District Court.		

Τ	1
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
1.6	
17	ŀ
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	

28

6. Appellant had appointed counsel in the District Court

7. The Initial Arraignment was held on or about June 2,

2014.

Dated this____

day of November, 2015

TRAVIS E. SHETLER, ESQ.
Nevada State Bar No. 4747
LAW OFFICE OF TRAVIS E. SHETLER
844 East Sahara Avenue
Las Vegas, NV 89101

Telephone: (702) 866-0091
Facsimile: (702) 866-0093
Attorney for Petitioner
GENARO RICHARD PERRY