IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

No. 69139

Electronically Filed Jun 22-2016 02:59 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

AMENDED 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 I

Case Summary
Initial Arraignment MinutesAA 00005
Amended Criminal ComplaintAA 00006-00009
Preliminary HearingAA 00010
Information
Jury Trial Day 1AA 00015-00149
Jury Trial Day 2AA 00150-00161
Calendar Call TranscriptAA 00162-00167
Petrocelli HearingAA 00168-00181
Calendar Call TranscriptAA 00182-00186

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

State of Nevada vs Genaro Perry Location: Department 6
Judicial Officer: Filed on: 06/19/2014
Cross-Reference Case Number: Defendant's Scope ID #: 1456173
ITAG Booking Number: 1400025770
ITAG Case ID: 14F07966
Lower Court Case Number: 14F07966

		one de co co	ITAG Booking Number: ITAG Case ID: Lower Court Case # Rook Lower Court Case Number:	1400025770 1599129 14F07966	
		CASE INFOR	MATION		
Offense	· MACHELLINE VIEW VIEW VIOLENCE VIOLENC	Deg F	Date Case Type: 05/01/2014	Felony/Gross Misdemeanor	
ROBBERY WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON FALSE IMPRISONMENT WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON		F	05/01/2014 Case Flags:	Ball Set Appealed to Supreme Court	
3. GRAND LA	ARCENY AUTO	F	05/01/2014	Custody Status - In Custody Charge Description Updated	
4. ASSAULT	WITH A DEADLY WEAPON	F	05/01/2014	In Custody - CCDC	
5, COERCION	\(\(\)	\mathbf{F}	05/01/2014	In State of Cope	
6. BATTERY RESULTING IN SUBSTANTIAL, BODILY HARM CONSTITUTING DOMESTIC VIOLENCE		F	05/01/2014		
VICTIMF	NG OR DISSUADING WITNESS OR ROM REPORTING CRIME OR TING PROSECUTION	F	05/01/2014		
DATE		CASE ASSIG	NMENT		
	Court Der Date Assigned 067	4-298879-1 partment 6 19/2014 lish, Elissa F.			
	I	PARTY INFOR	RMA'TION		
Defendant	Perry, Genaro Richard			Lead Attorneys Shetler, Travis E Retained 702-866-0091(W)	
Plaintiff	State of Nevada			Wolfson, Steven B 702-671-2700(W)	
DATE	EVENTS	s & Orders	OF THE COURT	INDEX	
06/19/2014	ធ្វី Criminal Bindover Criminal Bindover				
06/25/2014	[1] Information Information				
06/25/2014	06/25/2014 Notice of Wilnesses and/or Expert Witnesses Notice of Expert Witnesses				
06/26/2014	4 (Liltial Arraignment (1:00 PM) (Judicial Officer: De La Garza, Melisa)				

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

	1
06/29/2014	Reporters Transcript Reporter's Transcript of Waiver of Preliminary Hearing 06-19-14
07/03/2014	Supplemental Witness List Supplemental Notice of Expert Witnesses
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	Culendar Call (9:30 AM) (Judicial Officer: Cadish, Elissa F.)
07/28/2014	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	2] 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	[A] Ex Parte Motion Ex Parte Motion for Release of Medical Records
10/16/2014	Sal 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 Rolcase 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, Elissa F.) 02/18/2015, 02/23/2015 Status Check Negolitations
04/27/2015	GI Calendar Call (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	QJ Jury Trial (1:30 PM) (Judicial Officer: Cadish, Elissa F.) 05/06/2015-05/07/2015
05/14/2015	21 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 Parle 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 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	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 Henring (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	Calcadar 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
10/01/2015	& Verdict
10/01/2015	Filed by: Plaintiff State of Nevada Stipulation and Order
10/01/2015	Linear Linear Lands and La
11/04/2015	Notice of Appeal (criminal) Notice of Appeal
11/16/2015	Sentencing (8:30 AM) (Judicial Officer; Cadish, Efissa F.)

DISTRICT COURT CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

Felony/Gross Misdemeanor

COURT MINUTES

June 26, 2014

C-14-298879-1

State of Nevada

Genaro Perry

June 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

TOURNAL 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

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 THE STATE OF NEVADA.

Plaintiff,

~VS=

GENARO RICHARD PERRY #1456173.

Defendant.

CASE NO:

14F07966X

DEPT NO: 10

AMENDED

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,

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 / STREET 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.

<u>COUNT 7</u> - 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.

7 128/2014/llug

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 4. NEVADA intends to call the following witnesses: <u>NAME</u> **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
     TPAR
DAZB MC. COMMSTO
2
3
          IN THE JUSTICE'S COURT OF LAS VEGAS TOWNSHIP
4
                COUNTY OF CLARK, STATE OF WEVADA
5
6
     STATE OF REVADA,
7
                Clainsfed,
8
            778.
                                          CARE NOT 14FET DECK
9
     BEHART SITTING SERVICE
10
                Sefendant.
11
12
13
                      REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT
14
15
                  WAIVER OF PRELIMINARY HEARING
16
        BREORE THE HONORABLE MELANIE ANDRESS-TOBIASSON JUSTICE OF THE PEACE
17
                     THUP SOAY, JUNE 19, 2914
18
19
     APPEARANCES:
20
21
       Pot the Brace:
                                 TEFFRET ROGAN Deputy Pretrict Accounty
22
23
       For the Defendant:
                                 ROSS SMITTING
Autorney at Law
24
    Reported by: Donna J. McCord, CCR #337
```

```
1
       DAS YERAS, METACA, JUNE 19, 2014, 10:00 R.M.
2
3
                        . . . , ,
4
             THE COURT: 14F07966X, Genaro Perry, He
5
ő
    is present in custody with Mr. Smillle.
7
             MR. SMILLIE: Good morning, your Honor.
8
             THE COURT: Good morning. What's the
g
    status?
10
             MR. SMILLIE: We want to waive prelim and
11
    get an arraignment date.
12
             THE COURT: So you're waiving the prelim
13
    unconditionally without negotiations?
             MR. SMILLIE: There were negotiations but
14
    they have fallen through.
15
16
             THE COURT: Okay, So it's an
17
    unconditional waiver without negotiations at this
18
    point?
19
             MR. ROGAN: That's correct.
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.
25
```

1 THE COURT: Do you understand when you 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 your 6 would have the right to confront the State's 7 witnesses. You'd also have the right to testify and present your own evidence. You're giving up those 9 rights as well; do you understand? 10 (At this time, Mr. Smillie consulted 11 with the defendant.) THE COURT: Not forever, just at a 12 13 preliminary hearing. 14 THE DEFENDANT: Oh, yes, ma'am. 15 THE COURT: All right. When you get up to District Court one of two things will happen, this 16 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'anı. 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;

3

1 Count 4, assault with a deadly weapon; Count 5. 2 coorcion; Count 6, battery resulting in substantial 3 bodily harm constituting domestic violence; and 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, true, accurate transcript of 19 proceedings, 20 - /S/Logna I. Modern 21 22 23 24 25

Electronically Filed 1 INFM 06/25/2014 09:15:00 AM STEVEN B. WOLFSON 2 Clark County District Attorney Nevada Bar #001565 3 ROBERT STEPHENS Deputy District Attorney GLERK OF THE COURT Nevada Bar #011286 4 200 Lewis Avenue Las Vegas, Nevada 89155-2212 5 (702) 671-2500 6 Attorney for Plaintiff I.A. 06/26/14 DISTRICT COURT 1:00 PM CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA 8 T, SHETLER 9 THE STATE OF NEVADA, CASE NO: C-14-298879-1 10 Plaintiff, DEPT NO: VΙ 11 ~VS-GENARO RICHARD PERRY, 12 #1456173. 13 INFORMATION Defendant. 14 15 STATE OF NEVADA 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 27 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

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

. 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

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

///

///

24 | ///

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1	police by threatening to kill the said CORLA	A CARPENTER and her husband if she called the		
2	police.			
3	ST	EVEN B. WOLFSON		
4	VI. Ne	EVEN B. WOLFSON ark County District Attorney evada Bar #001 5/65		
5	,	· RATA		
6	B.	ROBERT STEPHENS		
7	,	ROBERT STEPHENS 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	ADDRESS		
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 TIMO1HY	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 LVMPD EV#1405011127; 1312092558			
28	(TK14)			
		4		

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

RTRAN CLERK OF THE COURT 2 3 4 5 DISTRICT COURT 6 CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA 7 8 THE STATE OF NEVADA, CASE #: C298879-1 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 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 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.

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. BAHARAV: Colleen Baharav, bar number 1177 and Michelle Sudano. bar number 13260 on behalf of the State.

MR. SHETLER: Good afternoon, Your Honor. I'm Travis Shetler, 4747, on behalf of Genaro Perry who is present in custody.

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 yesterday and for the late start now. Apparently we're having some technical difficulties with the recorder's computer.

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

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?

10 11

12

13

15

16 17

18 19

20 21

22

23 24

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 MR. SHETLER: Right.

.16

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.

18

19

16

20

22

23

21

24

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.

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

MS. BAHARAV: The State does not.

3

2

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

5

THE COURT: Thank you. All right. So, Mr. Clerk, please call the roll of the

here.

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20 21

22

23

24 25 panel of prospective jurors. When your name is called, please answer present or [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

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.

1

2

3

4

5

7

8

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

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20 21

22

23 24

25

judgment?

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.

13 14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

2425

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 COURT: 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

20

21

22

23

24

25

afternoon if you were?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #003: [Witness nodding head in the negative].

THE COURT: No? Okay. You're nodding, for the record. Okay. Thanks. Okay. Go ahead.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #012: Adam Taylor, 012. I'm fine for every day but just if it -- I don't know how long these things go for. That was the question I had a for a long time. If it ends at like five or so, that's fine, because the job I'm in is -- I'm the only one that can do it. So, there's no replacement for me on the job and it runs Friday, Saturday, Sunday. That's it.

THE COURT: So, you work Friday, Saturday, Sunday.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #012: Mm-hmm.

THE COURT: And what time?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #012: I have to be there at six, 6:30ish, but no later than that. I just don't know how late these go. Any day is fine.

THE COURT: Okay. So, you could be here on Friday as long as we had you out by about five?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #012: Yeah, that's perfect.

THE COURT: And you could get to work?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #012: Mm-hmm. And up until them I'm cool.

THE COURT: Okay. Thanks very much.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #012: Than you.

THE COURT: Okay.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #013: I'm Donna Jolly, it's 0013. I don't know if you 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

16

18

19 20

21 22

23

24

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 ten month 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.

 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! 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

9

10 11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22 23

24

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

period performance end date and then negotiate an extension for the following six

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,

her. Sorry. Just nervous.

THE COURT: Okay. I understand. It's okay. So, you have a friend taking care of your baby today?

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

8

10 11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

23

22

25

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.

 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 foud 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

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. | 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.

25

10 11

12 13

14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

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

process. THE COURT: Were you supporting them at all through the legal process? 2 PROSPECTIVE JUROR #003: Yes; I was listening to them and I think that's 3 what makes me more emotional. THE COURT: Yeah. Okay. Counsel, come on up, please. 5 [Bench conference -- begins] 6 THE COURT: Okay. Are you seeking to excuse her? 7 MR. SHETLER: She just seems to have hard time -- I mean, at this point in 8 time she's pretty emotional and I don't know how we would get through actual testimony. 10 THE COURT: Sure. And I should note for the record it looks like she's 11 tearing up while she's talking about it. 12 13 MS. BAHARAV: You can hear it in her voice. THE COURT: Once we got to an issue about the charges and she had to 14 address domestic violence she's getting all teary eyed. 15 MR. SHETLER: You want to ask her guestions? 16 MS. BAHARAV: ['Il submit it. 17 MR. SHETLER: Yeah. Judge, we can let her go. 18 THE COURT: All right. I'll excuse her. It's getting empty back there. 19 MR. SHETLER: Thank you, Your Honor. 20 THE COURT: Okay. [Bench conference -- concluded] 22 THE COURT: Ms. Downing, I'm going to excuse you at this time because of 23 the nature of the case and I can see the emotional effect it has on you. Thanks very 24 much for your time today.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #042: The closest my daughter-in-law is a Metro

25

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

25

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 the
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

8

9

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23

24

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 20

21

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: I 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: Helio. 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?

9

10 11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

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

sister. At the time I truly -- my stepmother or step-grandmother blew things out of 2

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

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

25

7

being said it was.

MS. BAHARAV: You understand that some -- it's maybe a mandatory

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

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?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #004: I 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

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, I understand.

situation?

25

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 helinous. 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

22

23

24

25

MR. SHETLER: Yeah, there's too much there. It's that comment, that bothersome comment, but I don't want to take a lot of time. He shouldn't be here. I don't think. And I recognize [indiscernible]. I don't mean that, Your Honor.

THE COURT: No, no, no. I wasn't taking offense. I just want to be clear that -- I mean, that you think there's cause to excuse him in this situation.

MR. SHETLER: Yes.

MS. BAHARAV: Based upon my concern about his comment that he'd be fine if he was the Defendant but noting that Mr. Perry's different and he thinks he's guilty, I'm going to submit it.

MR. SHETLER: And, Your Honor --

MS. BAHARAV: I submit it,

MR. SHETLER: Yeah.

THE COURT: Okay. Then I guess I'll go ahead and excuse him.

MR. SHETLER: Sorry, Judge.

THE COURT: You might want to check and see if there's more jurors tomorrow.

MR. SHETLER: We're awfully late I know, but my client says he's about to have an accident, bathroom accident.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. SHETLER: I can take the heat if you need me to but -

THE COURT: No, that's fine So, I will excuse him and then we can take a short break.

[Bench conference -- concludes]

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Williams, I'm going to go ahead and excuse you at this time. Thanks very much for your time today. Just go down to the third floor

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.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22.

23

24

25

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 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.

[Recess taken at 4:01 p.m.]

[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. Baharav 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.

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

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

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.

Rough Draft Transcript - Day 1, Page 95

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

24

19

20

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

2

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

23 24

25

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

İ	
1	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #008: Yes.
2	THE COURT: Is your spouse employed?
3	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #008: No.
4	THE COURT: Do you have children?
5	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #008: Yes.
6	THE COURT: How many?
7	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #008: I have one daughter.
8	THE COURT: And how old is she?
9	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #008: She is 12 years old.
10	THE COURT: Okay. State.
11	MS. SUDANO; Thank you, Your Honor. Hi. Dr. Luh.
12	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #008: Hi.
13	MS. SUDANO: So, in your profession have you ever come across victims of
14	domestic violence?
15	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #008: Yes.
16	MS. SUDANO: Anything about that experience that would make it difficult fo
17	you to be fair and impartial in this case?
18	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #008: No.
19	MS. SUDANO: Outside of your practice, do you know anybody else that's
20	been the victim of domestic violence?
21	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #008: No.
22	MS. SUDANO: You or any close family members or friends ever been
23	accused of a domestic violence?
24	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #008: No.
25	MS. SUDANO: Okay. You understand that the State may not be able to

1	MR. SHETLER: Thank you, sir. Thank you, Dr. Luh. Pass for cause.
2	THE COURT: Thank you. Ms. Grayson.
3	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #030: Yes.
4	THE COURT: How are you today?
5	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #030: Doing well; yourself?
6	THE COURT: Is there any reason you could not be fair and impartial in this
7	case?
8	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #030: No.
9	THE COURT: Can you wait in forming your opinion on the appropriate result
10	until all of the evidence has been heard?
11	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #030; Yes.
12	THE COURT: Have you or anyone close to you worked in law enforcement?
13	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #030: My father and two uncles.
14	THE COURT: Okay. And have they worked with Metro?
15	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #030: No; this is back in Wisconsin.
16	THE COURT: Okay. You said your father and two uncles?
17	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #030: Mm-hmm.
18	THE COURT: And so was your father a police officer when you were growing
19	up?
20	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #030: Yes; for 30 years.
21	THE COURT: Okay. So, was he friends with a lot of law enforcement officers
22	as well?
23	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #030: Yes.
24	THE COURT: Did you kind of have law enforcement people around your
25	house a lot?

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 ail.

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

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #030; Yes.

presented no evidence, Mr. Perry's not guilty?

23

24

Rough Draft Transcript - Day 1, Page 118

MS. BAHARAV: And if we got up and said hello and sat back down and

honesty. You mentioned that you had had a change of -- I 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?

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

1	crime?
2	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #010: Yes; my daughter.
3	THE COURT: And what happened to her?
4	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #010: She was molested when she was 12.
5	THE COURT: Okay. And was that by someone you knew?
6	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #010: Yes; it was by her best friend's mom's
7	boyfriend.
8	THE COURT: Okay. Did that get reported to law enforcement?
9	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #010: Oh, yes.
10	THE COURT: How long ago was that, by the way?
11	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #010: That was about sorry she's it was abou
12	13 years ago.
13	THE COURT: Okay. So, was that here in Las Vegas?
14	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #010; Yes.
15	THE COURT: And it was reported at the time?
16	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #010: Yes.
17	THE COURT: And was that person charged?
18	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #010: Yes.
19	THE COURT: And convicted?
20	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #010: Yes.
21	THE COURT: Did he go to prison?
22	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #010: Yes.
23	THE COURT: Okay. And was that person prosecuted by the District
24	Attorney's office?
25	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #010: Yes

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

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #010: Yes, I did.

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

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #010: I 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 evidence so I don't know.

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 case involving your daughter.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #010: No.

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

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #010: Yes.

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

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #010: No.

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 or popular opinion?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #010: Yes.

THE COURT: Have you ever been a juror before?

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?

25

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

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. I 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

6

7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23 24

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.

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.



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 V5. 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

1

[Outside the presence of the prospective jury panel]

3

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

4 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

MS. BAHARAV: But in light of the fact that one of the witnesses was the

10 11 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

12

of that emergency surgery. I believe that opposing counsel has a request of the

13

Court to make. So, that's why we asked to talk to you outside the presence of the

14

. ∥jury,

THE COURT: Okay.

15 16

MR. SHETLER: Very briefly, Your Honor.

17

Ms. Baharav has been extremely gracious in putting together the notes

18

and agreeing to use her doctor to get in my expert's testimony because he is also

19 20 unavailable. In reviewing the notes and talking with my client, we would ask to

21

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

22

of the crimes we're charged with.

23

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

24 25

agree to admit some information from their doctor along with our medical records

22

23

24

and then allow the parties to argue. The State is of the opinion that we could proceed without a doctor. I'm not sure if they're arguing that it's their theory of defense or that it is part of their defense that they will need a doctor. So, if that's something that they're arguing then that obviously goes to an issue that they might have. I understand --

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

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

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.

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

tomorrow because he had some emergency come up?

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

10 11

12 13

14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24

25

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?

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 GOURT: 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

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

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.

25

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

25

7

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22 23

24

25

[Outside the presence of the prospective jury panel] THE COURT: Okay. So, now that you've had an opportunity to talk with your

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.

client, where are we?

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

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

4

5

6

7

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

23

22

24

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 21st at 9:30; jury trial September 28th 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.] 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

Rough Draft Transcript - Day 2, Page 12

Electronically Filed 03/31/2016 02:09:41 PM

		03/31/2016 02:09:41 PM	
1	RTRAN	Alun to Lluin	
2	A HAMA	CLERK OF THE COURT	
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	Defendant.	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS	
12	wording.		
13		}	
14	BEFORE THE HONORABLE ELISSA F. CADISH, DISTRICT COURT JUDGE		
15	MONDAY, JULY 21, 2014		
16 17	CALENDAR CALL		
18			
19	APPEARANCES:		
20			
21	For the State:	ROBERT STEPHENS, ESQ. Deputy District Attorney	
22	For the Defendant:	TRAVIS SHETLER, ESQ.	
23		ROSS SMILLIE, ESQ.	
24			
25	RECORDED BY: JESSICA KIRKPATRICK, COURT RECORDER		
ĺ	~ 1 ··		
	*	1 "	

Rough Draft

4

5 6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

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

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? 6 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 12 THE COURT: Okay. 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 1//// 23 |IIIII|IIII|

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

Court Recorder/Transcriber Eighth Judicial District Court Dept. XVIII

||

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.

-i 6 -

Rough Draft

Electronically Filed

03/31/2016 02:12:42 PM RTRAN 1 CLERK OF THE COURT 2 3 DISTRICT COURT 4 CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA 5 6 THE STATE OF NEVADA, 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 THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 17, 2015 15 16 DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO ADMIT EVIDENCE PURSUANT TO NRS 48.045 PETROCELLI HEARING 17 18 APPEARANCES: 19 For the State: MICHELLE L. SUDANO, ESQ. 20 Deputy District Attorney 21 22 For the Defendant: TRAVIS SHETLER, ESQ. ANAIS-MARIE CACCAMO, ESQ. 23

RECORDED BY: JESSICA KIRKPATRICK, COURT RECORDER

24

.. 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: 1 -- 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. (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.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

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 I --

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>Petrocelli</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 —

8

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.

 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 <u>Petrocelli</u>.

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

8

10

11

12 13

14 15

16

16

17 18

19

20

21 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
10
          MR. SHETLER; Okay.
          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
23
   \parallel / / / / /
   MIIII
24
   11111
```

MR. SHETLER: Thank you for the courtesy, Judge. THE COURT: Okay. [Proceedings concluded at 9:05 a.m.] 4. 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 **RTRAN** 1 CLERK OF THE COURT 2 3 DISTRICT COURT 4 5 CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA 6 THE STATE OF NEVADA. CASE NO. C298879-1 8 Plaintiff. DEPT. VI 9 VS. 10 GENARO RICHARD PERRY, ROUGH DRAFT 11 TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS Defendant. 12 13 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. Deputy District Attorney 21 22 For the Defendant: TRAVIS SHETLER, ESQ. 23 24 RECORDED BY: JESSICA KIRKPATRICK, COURT RECORDER 25

.. 1 ..

Rough Draft

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

25

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. 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 --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 10 and if they're exercising that right we're going to have a jury. 11 MR. SHETLER: I understand. I just want to make sure. 12 Thank you, Judge. 13 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. 14 15 [Proceedings concluded at 11:31 a.m.] 16 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