1

2 3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

you to wear. Do you wish to wear those civilian clothes?

THE DEFENDANT: I feel comfortable in the outfit that I have on now.

I will interpret your answer that THE COURT: you have given to me at least three or four times as nonresponsive to my actual question. I will however interpret you are comfortable wearing those clothes as a rejection of the civil clothes.

I will also note for the record that the Court has made it clear that you have civil clothes that you are able to wear. And your intention to stay here in your silence, if you in fact stay here in your jail clothing and your chains, your shackles, is your choice.

At any point in time if you wish to change your mind and not choose to be here dressed that way you are welcome to make that choice. But it is this Court's interpretation of your answers that you are in fact choosing to stay present in your jail clothing in the shackles.

I will tell you that it is my understanding of the supreme court's review of these matters that they would not find an appellate issue for you. Although to the extent that whatever you are doing here is by design for that purpose because this is your voluntary waiver of your right to not be compelled to be here this way.

Ultimately, to say it differently, you have the right to wear the civilian clothes. You have now been informed of that right. You have now been told that those civilian clothes are available, if in fact you weren't told previously, which I suspect you were, but you have certainly been told now and your response to the Court of you are comfortable in theses clothes, which you appear to want to continue to repeat, and you are welcome to repeat it as often as you would like, will be considered by the Court your answer that you wish to remain in the court in the jail clothes in the shackles.

And all of those things collectively will potentially impact the jurors in your presumption of innocence. But, again, to the extent that you believe that somehow you are creating some appeal issue, it is this Court's belief that the presumption of innocence is not distinguished between whether you have the jail clothing on or the chains or both and that the prejudice, the impact will be there but as long as you voluntarily and knowingly waive that right that is your right to do.

The Court has made every effort to protect this process from your choices and to protect you to the extent that you want to be pre-protected from your choices but at this point in time we have now had two days where we have had this discussion. I believe you

are well aware of what your rights are. I believe you are making a volitional choice to dress the way you wish to dress. I think you have reasons why you are doing that that will not turn out to be successful for you, but, again, that's your choice.

I am going to ask at this time that counsel without obviously violating any attorney-client privilege indicate to the Court -- the Court has asked counsel two things; whether or not the Court should be aware of issues of competency involving Mr. Collins at this time as we proceed with trial as of today's date, as well as whether counsel has advised Mr. Collins of his choice in this matter and the potential consequences of that choice and the potential for the impact on the presumption of innocence and the likelihood of there being no appeal related to that.

Counsel has responded in chambers to those questions that competent counsel would have brought those matters to the attention of the client and that counsel if there was a competency issue with regard to Mr. Collins would have also brought that to the attention of the Court.

Mr. Schieck, can you please confirm that discussion that we had in chambers.

MR. SCHIECK: (No audible response.)

THE COURT: Mr. Collins, I asked Mr. Schieck the question. If you need to have a conference with him I will ask you and Mr. Schieck to step into the holding area to have a conversation. But I need Mr. Schieck's answer to the question.

If you want to speak to your client first,
Mr. Schieck, you let me know. But I am not letting
Mr. Collins drive your answer to this question.

MR. SCHIECK: Your Honor, we did meet in chambers and the Court inquired whether or not defense counsel felt there was a competency issue with regard to Mr. Collins and I advised the Court that if there was a competency question in our minds we would have been required to bring that to the Court's attention and we have not done so.

With respect to conversations that we had with Mr. Collins leading up to today and even this morning, I indicated to the Court with respect to the exact conversations we had that I felt those were privileged conversations, however, I did inform the Court that competent counsel, being Mr. Hyte and myself, would be expected to have those conversations with any client if this issue were to arise and that I feel that Mr. Hyte and I were indeed competent counsel.

THE COURT: Thank you. Mr. Hyte, did you have

anything that you wish to add?

MR. HYTE: Nothing to add, Your Honor.

and Mr. Collins to take a seat. He has chosen to be present dressed as he is and the Court will proceed and no mention further will be made of the circumstances, obviously, in front of the potential jurors. But at this time it is the Court's determination that he has knowingly and voluntarily waived his right to wear civilian clothes.

There has been ample discussion in the record for any appellate court to see that this choice is Mr. Collins' and Mr. Collins' alone for whatever reason he chooses to proceed in this fashion.

My marshal has just stepped out to see if the panel is here. My notes from yesterday says that we would have two vacant seats that I need to fill in the top 32 seats. This is just going off of my notes and comparing it with my marshal's notes.

MS. LUZAICH: I don't have two vacant. I have 13, 20, 21, 22 and 32 vacant.

THE COURT: Say it again.

MS. LUZAICH: 13, 20, 21, 22 and 32 in the first 32 seats.

MR. SCHIECK: And I think, Your Honor, we

discussed having three alternates, which would result in an additional alternate preempt for each side.

THE COURT: We just had that conversation yesterday.

MS. LUZAICH: Two preempts, but it would require qualifying one more of 33 instead of 32.

THE COURT: Pardon my confusion. But we just had a conversation yesterday about whether we needed to qualify more than 32 and I thought the conversation was because the preempts are the same --

MS. LUZAICH: It is one more than 32 because there's going to be one extra person on the jury, so 15 jurors, plus 18 preempts; 9 each, is 33 in my mind.

Because usually what we do is there's 14 jurors for two alternates --

THE COURT: Right.

MS. LUZAICH: -- and 18 preempts is 32, so just because there is one more alternate it would be qualify 33 but the preempts remain the same.

THE COURT: All right. Yes. You are right and that is just not something that the Court thought through beyond that point. And as I said this is our first experience with that request being made.

MS. BLUTH: Judge, two questions for Your Honor.

Ms. Luzaich and I were speaking yesterday and we do not

remember receiving a roll call when everybody came in.

2.3

THE COURT: I don't do roll calls.

MS. BLUTH: Oh, you don't. All right.

THE COURT: I have my marshal do the roll calls.

MS. BLUTH: And secondly, there was a juror who tried to speak to the four of us while we were waiting for the elevator and I couldn't remember if the Court gave the admonishment. Is that something Your Honor normally does?

THE COURT: I don't think we got to that yesterday. I certainly do that at some point in the process. I indicated that the marshal would be the person that they would speak to but I didn't necessarily give an admonishment out of the gate not to talk to anybody because by the time we finish and they go in and out they are not talking to anybody and then we're done. But obviously in these circumstances we need to admonish.

Do you have any recollection of who it was?

MR. HYTE: An older gentleman.

MS. BLUTH: He didn't even get anything out before we said something.

MR. HYTE: My recollection, Your Honor, is that Ms. Bluth kindly informed him that he could not speak with us and it appeared to be a pleasant exchange so I don't think there's any prejudice.

We'll just do a general reminder. 1 THE COURT: Thank you, Your Honor. 2 MS. BLUTH: I will do a roll call of the 32 when 3 THE COURT: 4 we fill the seats. 5 MS. BLUTH: Okay. Thank you. Juror No. 114 was not present. THE MARSHAL: 6 7 MS. LUZAICH: He might not have been here yesterday because Ms. Bluth and I asked about the roll 8 call when people were sitting there yesterday our number 9 10 32 was female but the 32nd person was male. THE COURT: We did not have 114 as a no-show 11 12 from yesterday. But as I explained to counsel I don't do 13 the roll call in here because my understanding is the 14 roll call is done when Tom brought the people up here. 15 So, Tom, do you have a record that 114 was not present? 16 17 THE MARSHAL: No. THE COURT: Do you have a record of doing a roll 18 19 call and he was present? 20 THE MARSHAL: I believe that he was present. THE COURT: I have Middlebrooks as number 37 not 21 I get this list of everybody with their actual seat 22 32. 23 numbers but I have been working off the same ones you guys have been working off of and Middlebrooks was 37 not 24

25

32 on my list.

MS. BLUTH: I was confused because Ms. Marotta 1 was sitting right here in this seat, Your Honor, and then 2 right next to her was Mr. Brar and Mr. Middlebrooks 3 should have been sitting right in between them. I don't 4 5 think he ever showed up. MS. LUZAICH: Well, just based on the numbers 6 because Marotta is 104, Middlebrooks is 114 and Brar is 7 8 120. THE MARSHAL: I don't have a record of checking 9 him off. 10 11 THE COURT: But you do not have him on the list of no-shows? 12 THE MARSHAL: No. Not that Jury Services gave 13 me and my own record of checking him off says that he was 14 15 here. MS. BLUTH: We'll just do a roll call today. 16 THE COURT: All right. Let's bring them in and 17 18 do the roll call and we'll figure it out. THE COURT: You did a roll call today, Tom? 19 20 THE MARSHAL: Yes. THE COURT: Jury Services is contacting us that 21 there are other no-shows, that you have only indicated 22 that 114 is missing. They might not have checked in with 23

Jury Services. That's possible.

What are the numbers that did not check in with

24

25

1 Jury Services? THE CLERK: 009, 080, 086, 093. 2 MS. LUZAICH: 080 was gone yesterday. 3 THE COURT: Whoever Jury Services is saying didn't show I want all the numbers and then we will 5 reconcile it with the ones we let go yesterday who 6 apparently did not go back to Jury Services to check out 7 or for whatever Jury Services didn't get it, so we'll 8 9 figure out what's left. So just read off all the numbers. 10 THE CLERK: 094, 136, 170, 182, 193, 196, 197, 11 239, 245, 250, 254, 317, 319 and 331. 12 THE COURT: So apparently no one who got excused 13 went back down to Jury Services or they didn't account 14 for it, which is more likely. 15 MS. LUZAICH: Some of those people weren't 16 17 excused. 18 THE COURT: Right. Some were not excused so we have to double check. 19 20 So just for your list, 331 was excused yesterday. 319, 317, 254, 250. I do not have 245 being 21 22 excused. MS. LUZAICH: I don't either. 23 24 THE COURT: 239 was, 197 was, 196 was, 194 was, 192, 170, 136, 94, 93. I do not have 86 being excused.

1 MS. LUZAICH: Neither do we.

THE COURT: And I do not have 9 being excused.

MS. LUZAICH: Neither do we.

THE COURT: So of that list everybody but 009, 086 and 245 were excused yesterday during the course of our handling of the selection between 2:00 and 4:30 and were told to go back down to the third floor to check out, so I believe that they have that information and they just didn't reconcile it with the list.

But as far as these other three, Tom, can you please go and check right now on 009, 086 and 245 and see if they are currently present. Maybe they came up here and just didn't check in.

THE MARSHAL: All three are present. All three say they did check in.

THE COURT: Okay. We'll make that clarification with Jury Services also.

Let's bring them all in.

(Potential jurors enter courtroom.)

THE COURT: At this time because we did lose a few folks, I want to make sure that the vacant seats that we have do match. I think everybody sat in the right place. I am going to do a brief roll call at this point and I am going to do it this way to expedite it.

As I call your name please raise your hand.

(Whereupon, roll call was taken.)

THE COURT: Okay. Yesterday I indicated that we were going to qualify 32 people. We are actually going to qualify 33 people to ensure that we have the proper number of jurors to cover the 12 who will deliberate and three alternates. So we have 33 jurors that we are going to qualify. Right now those seats are through and including Mr. Reynold's seat.

Right now because we have vacant seats we are going to call you forward in the order in which you are seated. At this point we are going to focus on the questions with regard to the individual seats I just named.

I do see a gentlemen whose hand is raised. Is it related to the hardship discussion that we had yesterday?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.

THE COURT: What is your name and last three digits of your badge number?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Robert Chesnovsky, 230.

About a week ago my boss told me they thought the company would pay for me to be on jury duty. Today he texted me and said there is no pay for jury duty. I live paycheck to paycheck. It is going to be devastating for me and my family if I am in trial for more than a couple days.

THE COURT: I don't know what, and I'm not necessarily asking what your rate of pay is, are you aware of what the pay for jury services is?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.

THE COURT: And we appreciate that the voucher of the daily stipend is not necessarily wages but that in and of itself is not a basis for excusal.

What I would like to do at this time is proceed because we are already somewhat delayed in getting started. You are already here for today's purposes, let's see if and when we reach you and we may have an answer for you after I have a chance to confer with counsel but at this point I would like to proceed.

I have a vacant seat No. 13 in the middle row and that will be filled by Katherine Isom. And then the first seat as you reach them in the front row here the next person in line to be called forward is Douglas Von Heeder. And next to Mr. Von Heeder will be Phillip Loomer. Next to Mr. Loomer will be Ms. Soto. And then next in line is Mr. Manuel Bernardino.

At this time ladies and gentlemen the 33 of you, again, as I explained how the process will work yesterday at this point in time unless we develop some information that indicates to us that you for whatever reason may not serve in this trial you are otherwise considered

qualified.

As we continue to go forward the Court has any number of questions it will be asking and then the conclusion of the process will be counsel to ask questions of the potential jurors. We are going to focus all of our questions at this time now on the 33 of you who are seated here.

Anybody who is in line behind now where Mr. Reynolds is seated would only be called forward if and when there is a vacancy in the seating in the first 33.

What we are going to do to begin this process is I have a list of questions that I have placed on the board there in front of you. I appreciate for those folks that are in the seats 25 through 33 that it might be a little more difficult to see, but at the end of the day I think by the time we get to you I think you will have a pretty good idea of the information that we are looking for initially. And, of course, I am happy to assist you and direct you through those questions.

The information in this first set of information generally what we are trying to find out is who you are, what you do for a living, what is your current or former occupation. If you are retired or unemployed, what your job was that you most recently did. If you have a spouse

or domestic partner who they are and what their jobs are.

And let me be clear, we are looking for the title of your job and your employer. We are looking for some specifics. Same for your spouse or domestic partner if you have one. What your highest level education is. We would like to know the -- and I have that slightly in a different order here -- you may speak about yourself first, your job or former job, highest level of education. And then again your spouse or domestic partner's job or former job.

If you have any children old enough to work in this jurisdiction we would like to know where they work. One of the reasons we ask these questions about jobs is not only to get to know you a little bit better but there might also be some connection with family members to the trial that we would reveal through that information.

We would like to know how long you have lived in Las Vegas. If it has been less than five years we would like to know before you moved here. And we would also like to know if you have ever been a juror before. That question is specific to jury service here or anywhere. It is not just jury service here.

If you have, we would like to know whether it was a criminal or civil trial whether or not a verdict was reached, not when the verdict was, and whether or not

you were the foreperson in that trial.

So that is the list of questions we are going to start with. After I run through that list of questions with the 33 of you then we will take a break and come back and I will have some more specific questions for the group as a whole.

I will start with the first juror in the top row. First, please identify yourself and then give us the last three digits of your badge.

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Alexandra Foss, Badge No. 006. I am a cashier at Hobby Lobby. I am currently taking my second year at UNLV for college.

THE COURT: What are you studying?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Psychology. I do not have any spouse. I don't have any children. I lived in Las Vegas my whole life, so 19 years, and I have never been a juror before.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

Ms. Loera.

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Raquel Loera, 009. I work for Apex Medical Center as a medical assistant. I completed through high school. I went to a medical assistant school.

THE COURT: So is it an associates program? What is the medical assistant program?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I went to a program for a couple years in California.

THE COURT: Okay.

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: My husband works at the Aria Casino as a banquet worker.

THE COURT: His name?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Stephen. I have a daughter, Jennifer. She works at an exterminator company.

THE COURT: Name of the company?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I do not know. I have been here in Vegas for nine years.

THE COURT: Jury service here or anywhere else?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Otto Wusnack, 036. I have lived here 11 years. I am retired from Cirque de Solei. I worked as an usher at Ka. Before that I retired as an attorney, which I did for 30 years in Mississippi.

THE COURT: What kind of law?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Seven to eight years in private practice. Did criminal defense work. Did some prosecution work for the City of Long Beach. I was a court-appointed attorney for criminal cases. In the middle 70s that is all we had; we had no public

defender's. And the last 17 years I spent at legal 1 services. And I left in 2004 to come here. My wife is 2 Kathy. She is assistant head of wardrobe at Aria at 3 Zarkana. And I have a daughter, Victoria, who works at the Venetian as a server. And that is the whole family. 5 THE COURT: Have you ever been a juror before? A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, ma'am, I was in 1983. 7 I had a short stay in California and I was on a jury in 8 Glendale. It was a criminal case and we did reach a 9 10 verdict.

THE COURT: Were you the foreperson?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, I was.

THE COURT: Thank you.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Jennifer Allee, 048. I am self-employed. I am a writer. My fiance is Nicholas Barry. He is a taxi driver for Yellow Checker Star. Sorry if I miss anything because I cannot actually see the questions.

THE COURT: Your highest level of education.

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Second year of college but I do not have a degree.

THE COURT: Do you have any children old enough to work in our community?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. William Allee, graduated from UNLV. He is 22 and he works at UNLV now.

Not as a teacher; he is working on a project where they are creating a new computer language. It's very technical. I have lived here about nine years. I almost was on a jury. I made it through the whole process and then they declared a mistrial because something happened in the elevator between two people and so that is as far as I got in that process.

THE COURT: And that is the only time you have ever been called?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.

THE COURT: So I am going to take a minute and break before we move on to the next juror because what you just mentioned is something that I need to remind folks of, although, I was going to wait until our first break to do that.

But counsel did advise me that there was one of the panel members who engaged in a polite conversation at the elevators unrelated to the case, of course, but one of the things once you are seated you will be admonished about and will need to understand is that it is an ethical obligation of all of us, the Court as well as the counsel, parties, everyone except the marshal who can be a conduit of conversation to the Court, we are not allowed to speak with you. We are not allowed to have

any conversation whether it is about the case or anything else.

And you, of course, will be admonished on a regular basis because the supreme court requires that I admonish you on a regular basis once you are seated because once you are seated I will also read the admonishment that you are not to speak about this case with anyone else even yourselves until you actually go into the room to deliberate.

So it is certainly human nature that when we see people, especially people that we now recognize, we might want to acknowledge them or say hello or engage in some polite conversation but we cannot have those conversations.

It may be an innocent conversation at the elevator but somebody standing across the hallway who sees a potential juror and sees counsel having a conversation, they are not going to know what that conversation is about.

And our ultimate goal always is to avoid the appearance of impropriety, so we need to do that in all circumstances. So it is not that we're antisocial or that we don't like you or very much appreciate your service it's just ethically we cannot have those conversations.

The safest people in the building to talk to are the ones wearing the exact same badges because you know they are of the same admonishment.

But now let's proceed with the next potential juror.

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: My name is Amnesty Woodhall, 054. I work for Southwest Airlines for the past 15 years.

THE COURT: What do you do for Southwest?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I'm flight attendant. I
am not married and I do not have any children. I have
never been a juror and I have lived in Las Vegas for 18
years.

THE COURT: Thank you. Next.

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Rhonda Fulkerson, 055. I am a senior security specialist for National Security Technology. I am not married. I do have a son who is IT for National Security Technology. I have lived in Las Vegas for about 16 years. I have been a juror before. It was a criminal case. I was not the foreperson and we did reach a verdict. And my education is high school.

THE COURT: I am not familiar with National Security Technology.

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: It is a contractor to the Department of Energy. They are a management and

operations contractor.
THE COURT: Se

THE COURT: So they are not the folks that do anything at the airport or that type of security?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.

THE COURT: You deal with the Department of Energy. And you are a senior security technologist.

Does that mean you are a computer --

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Senior computer specialist for personnel and physical security for locations.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you. And you said that prior trial was a criminal trial?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, ma'am.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Mr. Douglas.

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: My name is Troy Douglas, 056. I am building facilities engineer at Ballys, Las Vegas. My education is some trade school after high school. Spouse's name is Tammy Douglas. She is a Keno shift supervisor at the Orleans. I have one son who is old enough to work. He is a valet attendant at the new Summerlin mall. And I have been in Las Vegas for 36 years. I have never been a juror before.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: James Bowers, Badge No.

058. My job is I am the graphic specialist with Sun Dial

Controls. My highest level of education is digital 1 2 entertainment and game design from ITT. I have no 3 spouse. I have no children. I have lived in Las Vegas for 13 years and I have never been a juror before. 4 Thank you, sir. 5 THE COURT: A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Earl Wedgeworth, 062. 6 7 am retired but I did work for Boeing as a project engineer on the shuttle program. I have a high school 8 9 educate with some college. No degrees. I have a spouse 10 and her last employment was here as a Clark County clerk downstairs. 11

THE COURT: Can we get her name.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Beverly Wedgeworth.

THE COURT: And you say a clerk. We have a couple of different clerk positions. Was she a court clerk?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. Downstairs in the County Clerk's Office.

THE COURT: Okay. County Clerk. Which building was she in?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: In this building downstairs.

THE COURT: Okay.

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I have a son -- we have a son that is presently out of work but works typically as

Ι

an IT doing sales and services in small businesses. 1 moved here in 2003. I have served on a criminal case 2 that had no decision and a personal injury suit that they 3 settled before we came to a verdict. 4 THE COURT: So that first case is the civil case 5 that you did not --6 7 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. The first case was a It was a hung jury. 9 THE COURT: Okay. 10 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: And the second one was an 11 accident and they settled before we came to a verdict. 12 THE COURT: During the course of the second case 13 did you also receive evidence and how long did the case go before it settled? 14 15 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: It went about three days into the case before they came into the agreement. 16 17 THE COURT: Were you the foreperson on either of 18 these juries? A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, I was not. 19 20 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. 21 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Sandra Gibbons, 067. 22 unemployed right now. I was an administrative assistant. 23 I have three children. 24 THE COURT: Do you have a spouse?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I have a spouse.

1	THE COURT: What does he do for a living and
2	what is his name?
3	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: He works for the Bellagio.
4	THE COURT: What does he do for the Bellagio?
5	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Electrical engineer.
6	THE COURT: Are any of your children working in
7	our community now?
8	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. One works for a
9	pharmacy. I do not know the name and she also is also a
10	hairdresser, independent. My other two do not work. One
11	live in California and one lives here.
12	THE COURT: How long have you worked here?
13	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I have lived here six
14	years. I have been a juror in California.
15	THE COURT: How long ago was that?
16	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: In 1992.
17	THE COURT: So some time ago. Do you remember
18	if it was a civil or criminal trial?
19	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Criminal.
20	THE COURT: And do you remember if a verdict was
21	reached?
22	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.
23	THE COURT: You don't remember or, no, there
24	wasn't one?
25	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: It was a hung jury.

1	THE COURT: Were you the foreperson?
2	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.
3	THE COURT: Okay. Sir, back to you,
4	Mr. Wedgeworth, and I am not sure if you said, but how
5	long ago was your jury service in the first criminal case
6	that you described?
7	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: A long time ago.
8	THE COURT: So it did not take place here in
9	Nevada?
10	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Southern, California.
11	THE COURT: You say long time. Was it 10 years,
12	20 years?
13	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Oh, 10 to 15 years.
14	THE COURT: As far as the civil case, was that
15	here?
16	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. Both cases were in
17	Southern California.
18	THE COURT: How long ago approximately?
19	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Both were around the same
20	time frame.
21	THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
22	Next.
23	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Heidi Cwik, 069. I am a
24	special education teacher. I have a bachelors degree in
25	teaching students with specific learning disabilities. I

1	am divorced. My child is not old enough to work. I have
2	lived in Las Vegas for 21 years and I have been a juror
3	before on a civil case where we had to award somebody a
4	certain sum of money.
5	THE COURT: Civil damages case?
6	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
7	THE COURT: Was it a car accident? What type of
8	case?
9	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. She was walking
10	downstairs and the stairs crumbled.
11	THE COURT: So slip and fall type?
12	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
13	THE COURT: Was that here?
14	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
15	THE COURT: And how long ago?
16	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: About 12 years ago.
17	THE COURT: Did you say a verdict was reached?
18	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
19	THE COURT: Were you the foreperson?
20	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.
21	THE COURT: Thank you.
22	Ma'am.
23	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Hope Juarez, 078. I am a
24	makeup artist at Sephora. Trade technical school is the
25	highest education. I am not married. I do not have any

I have lived here for 26 years and I have never 1 2 been a juror before. THE COURT: You have never been a juror here or 3 anywhere? 4 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. 5 THE COURT: Thank you. Ms. Isom. 7 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: My name is Katherine Isom, 8 I work for a home builder in town selling new 9 The name of the builder is Harmony Homes. 10 try to sell houses. My education is high school and real 11 estate school. I am divorced. I have two adult 12 children. I have a son who is 33 and works for the 13 library system. I have a daughter who is 30 who is a 14 hairdresser. I have lived in Las Vegas for 46 years and 15 I have never been a juror before. 16 THE COURT: Your ex-spouse, I don't know how 17 long ago that occurred, but what was his occupation? 18 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Home inspector. 19 20 THE COURT: And Ms. Cwik, the same question for you. I knew there was a question I forgot to ask you. 21 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: He was also a teacher. 22 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. 23 24 Next. A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Richard Seligman, Badge 25

No. 082. I am an auto mechanic at Frias Transportation.

I have a 12th grade education and then GM training after that. I am a part-time fiddle player. My wife is Jackie Seligman and she works at Harbor Freight part time and my son is 31. He is unemployed. My daughter is 33 and lives in Florida and works at a Christian preschool.

THE COURT: The main reason of where they work would be to know who is working in this community and that might overlap with the case. So the other jurisdictions are not likely to have that impact, but we appreciate you letting us know.

How long have you lived here?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Over 20 years.

THE COURT: Have you ever been a juror here or anywhere?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.

THE COURT: Next, Ms. Andrews.

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: My name is Debra Andrews, 085. I am currently retired. I have about 30 years of local governmental experience at both the city and county level. My last job was in Houston, Texas. I was the chief assistant account auditor over all the accounting functions in Houston. I have a bachelors degree in business. I have a certificate -- I am a certified public accountant.

THE COURT: Have you ever worked for the government local or whatnot here in Nevada?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.

THE COURT: You just retired here.

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Retired to Nevada. We were looking for less rain.

THE COURT: Understood.

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: My husband is Ralph
Andrews. He is also retired. He again has 30 years as
an attorney. His last position was as a federal US
attorney prosecutor where he did major drug cases and the
assets forfeitures of them. We have no children. We
relocated to Las Vegas. We do not live in Las Vegas. We
live in a Mesquite, so I have a three-hour commute every
day and I am about to impose on the county about between
\$800 to \$1000 of mile charges, which I would ask you all
to keep in consideration.

THE COURT: We appreciate that. I was aware that there were some from Mesquite in the panel. I was aware that there was someone from Laughlin who may be in the additional panel that we are going to perhaps need.

Clark County is a very large county and it is necessary unfortunately sometimes as we reach into the pool to secure jurors from those areas. But we do appreciate you bringing that to our attention and we are

1 and we will be mindful of that. 2 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: We have lived out here for 3 about 14 years. I did serve on a jury in about 1980 in Corpus Christi, Texas. It was a civil matter and there 4 5 was a verdict reached. 6 THE COURT: Were you the foreperson? A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, I was not a 8 foreperson. THE COURT: How long ago? 9 10 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: About 1980. THE COURT: Thank you so much. 11 12 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: My name is Georgios 13 Bougalis, Badge No. 086. I am a mechanical engineer at 14 Coal Laboratories. I have a masters degree in 15 information systems. No spouse. No children. I have 16 lived in Las Vegas for six years and I have not served as 17 a juror before. 18 THE COURT: Where did you live prior? 19 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I was oversees. 20 THE COURT: Military service? 21 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. 22 THE COURT: You said you have been here six 2.3 You have never been a juror here or anywhere? years. 24 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.

THE COURT: Can you go back for a minute. I am

not familiar with the laboratory that you mentioned and you said you were a mechanical engineer. I am just trying to understand a little bit better what is the work that you do.

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I design and research systems and components.

THE COURT: Thank you.

And just so folks know as we go through these initial questions I am going to come back and we are going to have questions about folks who perhaps know folks who are in law enforcement and the legal services.

So those of you who have already addressed that we will be coming back and asking you more questions about those who might have familiarity with, again, attorneys and law enforcement. I am not going to go into those now because we are just trying to get the basic information from you first.

I know that we have a great deal of information from the questionnaires but I think it is always important that we get a little bit of the information flushed out from you now.

Thank you, Mr. Bougalis. And moving on to -A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Sacoya Counce, 087. I
work at Express Scrips Pharmacy as a patient care
advocate. I have one year of college still pending. No

degree yet. No spouse. My child is not old enough to 1 work. I have lived her for 30 years and I have never 2 3 been on a jury. THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Ms. Counce. 4 5 Sir. A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Alexander Savell. 6 7 not have a job or ever had one. I finished high school. No spouse. No children. Lived here 18 years and I have 8 9 not served on a jury. THE COURT: Is that your age, how long you have 10 lived here? 11 12 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. I have lived here my 13 whole life. THE COURT: Did you say you completed high 14 school? 15 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. 16 THE COURT: Are you looking for employment? 17 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I am not currently. 18 19 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. 20 Front row. A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Wennie Balaoro, 089. I 21 work as a cashier at M and M's World on the strip. I 22 graduated high school and six months of bookkeeping. 23 my husband's name is Jimmy Balaoro and he works at Ballys 24

as a cook. I have two children. One is a student and

the other one is old enough to work but I do not know
where he's at. I lived here for 14 years now and I have
never been on a jury before.

THE COURT: Is English your first language or your second language?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Second.

THE COURT: How long have you lived here in the US?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Half of my life.

THE COURT: So some period of time. What would you say is your percentage of understanding of English?

I do not want to presuppose that it is not 100 percent.

I also want to make sure that if you had any questions or concerns with language in terms of following the proceedings that we identify that.

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Well, in regards to law I am not really good.

THE COURT: You mean legal terms, legalese. Is that what you mean when you say in regards to the law?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. This thing, this case, I am not really --

THE COURT: Well, I do not think any anybody
here except perhaps maybe our attorney that is on the
panel and perhaps the lady's whose husband is an attorney
would be terribly familiar with how these processes work

and these legal terms.

What I am really trying to get at is not whether you are familiar with the process yet but whether or not there is a language barrier. Have you perceived any language barriers so far?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.

THE COURT: Can you help me understand what that barrier has been. You were able to answer the questions and we appreciate that. You did not indicate that I recall on the questionnaire having language issues. You said you lived here half your life and you have employment that I am assuming requires you to converse with the public primarily in English?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.

THE COURT: So can you help me understand if there have been barriers what they have been. I know it is a difficult question to answer what is it that you do not understand, but what I am trying to help me understand is where was there something so far that you have not followed?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Well, when it comes to like in this room right now, well, if you ask me what you are going to be for -- like punishment, I am not really good with that.

THE COURT: That is a different question. I am

obviously going to have questions that talk about other 1 potential issues that may impact your ability to serve. 2 Right now I am asking about language barriers. Do you 3 4 have any language barriers? A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: 5 I understand. THE COURT: Okay. We will get back to your 6 7 other issues. We will have plenty of opportunity to 8 speak with everyone. Next in that row. 9 10 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Douglas Von Heeder, 184. I am a self-employed photographer. I have two years of 11 college. No degree. My wife, Lisa Von Heeder, is a 12 secretary with the Southern Nevada Water Authority. I 13 have no children in this state and I have lived here for 14 15 16 years. THE COURT: Have you ever been a juror? 16 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: 17 No. You are a photographer. Did you 18 THE COURT: 19 indicate where you work? 20 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I have my own studio. THE COURT: So still photographer, portrait 21 22 photographer, not a news person. 23 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. 24 THE COURT: Thank you.

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Philip Loomer, 189.

work in a shop right now, a body shop. 1 THE COURT: Which one? 2 3 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Tucker's. Education is some trade school. I am married to Melissa Loomer. 4 5 I have one child. THE COURT: What does she do? 6 7 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: She works at the Cosmo. THE COURT: Doing what? 8 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Guest relations. 9 THE COURT: So front desk. 10 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. And then lived here 11 12 for ten years and I have never been a juror. 1.3 THE COURT: Here or anywhere? 14 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Anywhere. THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. 15 16 Ma'am. 17 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: My name is Gabriela Soto, I just got a job at Cesar's Palace as a runner. 18 Yesterday was supposed to be my first day but I didn't go 19 20 because I was here. I have three years at UNLV. 21 currently still there majoring in human services and minoring in public heath. I have no spouse. I have no 22 I lived here my whole life, which is 21 years and 23 24 I have never been a juror.

THE COURT: Did you have a conversation with

1 your employer about --A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, they understood. 2 THE COURT: They understand. Good. 3 4 Next. A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: My name is Patricia 5 Tiffany, 099. I work at Sunrise Hospital. I work in the 6 Environmental Service Department. I have a high school 7 education. My husband is medically retired. 8 THE COURT: From what profession? 9 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: He used to be in carpet, 10 worked for Carpeteria and they went out of business and 11 then he got hurt and he medically retired. 12 13 THE COURT: Okay. A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I have four children. 14 oldest, Jackie, works for the post office. Jason works 15 at Terribles. Matthew is disabled, he has SSI. Heather 16 works at the Excalibur, she does reservations and that 17 kind of stuff. I have lived here for 29 years and I have 18 19 not been on a jury. 20 THE COURT: Here or anywhere? A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. 21 22 THE COURT: Thank you. Sir. 23 24 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: My name is Roger Molett.

I am VA disability now. I have held a number of jobs.

My last job I just held for a couple months I taught
English at a language school in Henderson. Before that I
was a legal adviser for a company called Spector Trading
and Evaluation. I have a BA in political science and a
juris doctorate. My wife is a food server at a
restaurant on Spring Mountain. I have a son but he does
not live here and is not old enough to work. I have
lived here three times. Most recently I moved back here
January of 2014 and before that I was living in Dubai. I
have never been on a jury.

THE COURT: Where else have you lived?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I lived in United Arab Emirates for two years and then I lived in Turkey and before that I was in Reno.

THE COURT: Okay. You said VA disability.

Thank you for your service. Were you an attorney in the service?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, I was enlisted. I was in communications.

THE COURT: You said you had a juris doctorate.

Did you practice law?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.

THE COURT: You mention being a legal adviser to a company. Can you give us a little bit more information about where and when you practiced law.

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I was a legal advisor in 1 the United Arab Emirates, basically I was general counsel 2 and then I practiced here in Las Vegas for a couple 3 4 years. THE COURT: What time frame? 5 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: From '99 to 2002. 6 THE COURT: Did you practice private? 7 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. Of course, I did my 8 time in the salt mines doing construction defect and then 9 I did criminal defense and family law and stuff like 10 that. 11 THE COURT: So a little bit of everything. 12 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. 13 THE COURT: Was that the only time that you 14 practiced law was here in Las Vegas in '98 to '02? 15 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Other than the UAE, yes. 16 THE COURT: All right. Thank you, sir. You 17 said you have never been a juror before? 18 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. But when I was a law 19 20 clerk up in Carson City I supervised the juries. THE COURT: Who did you clerk for? 21 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Judge Griffin. 22 THE COURT: What time frame was that? 23 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: 1999. 24 THE COURT: All right. Thank you, sir. 25

Now we are going to move over to our 25 seats 1 here, starting with you, ma'am. 2 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Sally Marotta, 104. I am 3 a single mom with two kids that are not old enough to 4 5 work. THE COURT: And you are not working yourself? 7 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I am currently unemployed. I was an assistant manager. THE COURT: Do you have a spouse or prior 9 10 spouse? A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No spouse. One ex is 11 actually in prison now. I am not sure where the other 12 13 one is at. THE COURT: And just to make those connections, 14 what was it that your ex-spouse did for a living? 15 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: He is in construction. 16 THE COURT: Okay. And you mentioned one of them 17 is in incarcerated. Is that here in Nevada? 18 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: In California. 19 THE COURT: Okay. Can you help us understand 20 21 what the incarceration is for. 22 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: That was drug related. is in on a felony right now. I lived in Vegas for 14 23 24 years. I completed high school. I have never served on

a jury here or anywhere else.

1 THE COURT: All right. Next seat, Mr. Brar.

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: My name is Harpreet Brar,
Badge No. 120. I am self-employed at a convenience
store. My wife is a dental assistant. I have two kids
who are not old enough to work yet. I have been here for
11 years and never been on a jury.

THE COURT: So Mr. Brar, same question I asked the other lady on the panel that appears that English would be your second language; is that correct?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. I do not have any problem.

THE COURT: Is English your second language?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.

THE COURT: How long have you been in the United States?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: 25 years.

THE COURT: And at this point you are indicating to me that you have not had any language barriers with anything that you have heard so far.

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.

THE COURT: There is going to be testimony that will come in some of which may be scientific related to the allegations in the case and obviously whatever evidence that comes to light. You don't believe that there is going to be any problem with you receiving that

1	evidence?
2	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. No problem.
3	THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Brar.
4	Mr. Tom.
5	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: C. Tom, 126. I worked for
6	Master Securities Technologies. I have been there for 50
7	years.
8	THE COURT: So do you all know each other?
9	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. So I travel to test
10	sites. I am a widow. I have two step children, Kelly
11	works for the school district. Karen, I don't know where
12	she is or what she does. She was a problem child.
13	I have two years college. I have been on a
14	civil case. It settled before it went to trial.
15	THE COURT: You said it was a civil case?
16	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
17	THE COURT: Was that here in Clark County?
18	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
19	THE COURT: How long ago was that?
20	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I think ten years ago.
21	THE COURT: So you did not have an opportunity
22	to deliberate; is that correct?
23	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Correct.
24	THE COURT: How many days were you on the jury
25	before it settled?

1	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: We did not even get
2	started.
3	THE COURT: So it settled right out of the gate.
4	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
5	THE COURT: But you were selected to be on the
6	panel.
7	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
8	THE COURT: Thank you, sir.
9	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Dan Mast, 137. My wife's
10	name is Darlene. She is a mortgage banker for Wells
11	Fargo.
12	THE COURT: Did you say what you do?
13	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Graphic artist.
14	THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. Any children old
15	enough to work in our community?
16	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No children.
17	THE COURT: Okay. How long have you lived here?
18	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: 63 years.
19	THE COURT: Have you ever been a juror before?
20	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. Once. It was a
21	civil case and it settled out of court.
22	THE COURT: Did you have any opportunity to
23	serve as a juror before it settled or when did it settle?
24	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: It was the second day and
25	it was beginning questions just like we are having now

and they settled it out of court. 1 This is voir dire. So you never THE COURT: 2 received evidence? 3 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. 4 THE COURT: That was here in Clark County? 5 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. 6 7 THE COURT: How long ago? A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: It must have been in the 8 early 90s. 9 THE COURT: All right. Thank you, sir. 10 11 Mr. Torrence. A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. My name is Sammy 12 Torrence, 153. I currently work for the Department of 13 Aviation in McCarran as a assistant superintendant of 14 15 terminal operations. My education is high school. I am not married. I have one son that does work here in 16 customer service as an IT rep. I do not know the name of 17 the company. I lived out here for about 26 years. 18 have served on a jury before about three years ago. It 19 was a criminal case. It was not a jury because he took a 20 21 plea agreement.

THE COURT: So you never actually deliberated.

The case resolved prior to --

22

23

24

25

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Correct. And I was not a foreperson.

THE COURT: Did it resolve after the 1 2 deliberations had already started? A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: It actually started after 3 4 they had presented certain parts of the evidence. 5 THE COURT: I see. A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: And then the judge went to 6 a recess and then it resolved. 7 8 THE COURT: How long ago was that? A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: About three years ago. 9 THE COURT: So that's fairly recent here in 10 Clark County. 11 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Correct. 12 THE COURT: We already asked if you have 13 recognized any of the counsel or names of the potential 14 15 witnesses, but you had another day to reflect on that. 16 Does anybody appear familiar to you? 17 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. THE COURT: We may have some additional 18 questions about that for you, but thank you for letting 19 20 us know that. Sir. 21 22 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Francisco Isakoff, 161. work for Title Freight as a pickup and delivery driver in 23 the city. I lived here for ten years. My wife's name is 24

Elaine Isakoff. She is retired. We have two kids. One

1	works as audit controller at Costco and the other one is
2	a nurse at Sunrise Hospital.
3	THE COURT: What position did your wife retire
4	from?
5	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Office manager.
6	THE COURT: Have you ever been a juror?
7	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Twice.
8	THE COURT: Take your time. What was the first
9	case, civil or criminal?
10	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: The first case was they
11	were both criminal. One in California and one here in
12	Clark County.
13	THE COURT: The first one in California predated
14	the one here; was a verdict reached?
15	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
16	THE COURT: Were you the foreperson?
17	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.
18	THE COURT: The one that was here, when did that
19	take place?
20	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Last two years.
21	THE COURT: Was a verdict reached in that case?
22	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
23	THE COURT: Were you the foreperson that time?
24	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.
25	THE COURT: In that particular case, same
	Γ. Λ

questions that I asked to Mr. Torrence. Upon reflection,
have you recognized anybody related to this case?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.

THE COURT: Okay. And you said you were not the foreperson. Normally there is a couple of years that goes on between service. Was it at least that much time?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I think so.

THE COURT: But you did deliberate and there was a verdict reached?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Mr. Torrence, let me just ask you, your former spouse, what did they do for a living?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: She was a nurse's assistance within the state of Texas.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, sir.

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Manuel Bernardino, 204. I work at the Alper's as a house person from eight to four and then six to 12 from the airport. My wife is 65. She is retired as a Keno runner. I have been in Las Vegas for eight years. I have two children. My oldest daughter is working at Walmart as a cashier and my son is in the Philippines,

THE COURT: Have you ever been a juror here or anywhere?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: 1 Is English your second language? 2 THE COURT: A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: 3 THE COURT: Have you followed all of the proceedings that we have had so far? I appreciate before 5 you were seated in the next row back you may have been a 7 little removed from the proceedings. You are now a little closer in and we are actually conversing now on some things. Have you had any language barriers to 9 understand the proceedings so far? 10 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I understand. 11 THE COURT: You do not believe that you would 12 have any barriers to receive the evidence and deliberate 1.3 14 with your fellow jurors? 15 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, I understand. THE COURT: Well, we may have some further 16 questions to ask about that but we will come back to you. 17 18 Ms. Lopez. A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Mariana Lopez, 172. 19 work at Soltice Sunglasses. Education I finished 10th 20 grade and I have two daughters who are not old enough to 21 22 work. I have lived here 18 years. THE COURT: Have you ever been a juror before? 23 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: 24

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Reynolds.

1	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I am currently unemployed.
2	I have only been in Nevada for a year and four months.
3	THE COURT: What was your prior occupation?
4	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Produce in grocery stores.
5	THE COURT: Okay.
6	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I am married. I have one
7	child but not in this state.
8	THE COURT: Where did you live previously?
9	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: New York.
10	THE COURT: Have you ever been a juror before
11	here or there?
12	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.
13	THE COURT: Have you ever had any other
14	occupations besides that?
15	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, but mostly in food
16	service.
17	THE COURT: And no jury service here or in New
18	York?
19	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.
20	THE COURT: All right. What we are going to do
21	at this time is we're going to take a recess. We will
22	return at 3:30.
23	Let me just remind you of a couple things. We
24	will resume with some additional questions that the Court
25	will have for the panel. I am going to read you an

admonishment that I mentioned that once you are seated as jurors you will hear it on every break that we take. It is something that the supreme court requires us to do but it is that important and even though it is tailored for folks who are already serving because we have had that question come up please understand that during this recess you are admonished not to talk or converse among yourselves or with anyone connected with this trial or read, watch or listen to any report of or commentary on the trial or any person connected with this trial by any means of information including without limitation newspaper, television, radio, Internet or social media of any kind, or to form or express any opinion on any subject connected with the trial until the case is finally submitted to you.

We will see you back here at 3:30.

(Potential jurors exit courtroom.)

THE COURT: It is my hope to finish all of my questions today.

MS. LUZAICH: I was going to ask you if we could start tomorrow even if you finish. If I can go through some of this I think I can cut a lot of my questions out.

THE COURT: I think that's fine.

(Whereupon, a recess was taken.)

THE COURT: I want to see the shirt outside of

1 the chains --

THE DEFENDANT: I cannot write.

THE COURT: You just did it the whole time we were in here.

THE DEFENDANT: No, I didn't because when I sit down I took it back out.

THE COURT: I want to see the shirt outside the chains and then I want to see the availability of the chains on the side. They appear to be available to me. I don't see how that is impeding your ability to write in any way.

THE DEFENDANT: When I was sitting down I was trying to write like this (indicating) and it was going against my skin, my bare skin. I was comfortable with me doing it this way.

Mr. Collins has made a further choice to have the chains displayed outside of his shirt, which the Court does not perceive to be necessary in his efforts to be able to communicate with counsel. But as Mr. Collins has made the choice to have the chains visible outside of the shirt that the shackles at this point will be visible to the jurors.

It was not my impression that it was visible prior to the break we just took, but at this time it is

likely as he is standing. Certainly there is no reason why the shirt cannot be covering the chains while you are standing up and don't need to write. So the shirt will be outside the chain while you are standing up and don't need to write. You may then do as you did previously, which is if you sit down adjust the shirt accordingly so you can do your writing.

Officer please adjust the shirt -- Mr. Collins, thank you for already doing so.

THE DEFENDANT: It was already adjusted like this when the jury came in.

THE COURT: Sir, the Court observed -- asked the officer to pull the shirt over the chains, which the officer did. The Court observed it. There was no chains visible. As you stood as the jurors came in you may have made that adjustment after you were seated, which you can do again as we sit, but that is not the case and that is not what the record will reflect.

We are ready for the jurors to return.

THE COURT: Mr. Collins, leave the shirt outside the chains while the jurors come in.

THE DEFENDANT: No. When I was already sitting down he asked me -- he came and you can ask him. He came after I was sitting down.

THE COURT: Mr. Collins, the Court heard every

bit of it. Stop talking please while the jurors are entering the courtroom.

(Potential jurors enter courtroom.)

THE COURT: Please make sure your cells phones are off or silenced.

The next set of questions that the Court will have to ask of you, what I am going to do is ask them of a group, to the 33 of you that we just have spoken to, and if you have an answer to give to the question, just like yesterday when we talked about the hardship and time to serve, if you have an answer to give raise your hand first and I will note and see where the hands are and depending on how many there are I may go right to you or I may have to go row by row to make sure we get everyone.

Raise your hands first so I can see. These are going to be general questions to the group to find out if in fact you have an answer to the questions and then we can go further into the answer to the question.

MR. HYTE: Pardon, me, Your Honor. I forgot to bring this up. From where I am seated the podium is obscuring my view. May I move that?

THE COURT: Certainly. Nobody appears to be using it.

MR. HYTE: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: One of the things that we discussed

yesterday before we got started or at least in sort of the early part of the process was to understand that in our American system of justice there are certain principles of law that apply in every criminal trial.

I stated one of those principles, which, of course, is the defendant as he sits there today is in fact innocent and the only way he would be determined to be guilty of any one or more of the charges is if the State meets its burden to prove his guilt beyond a reasonable doubt.

The total principles that would apply in this as in any criminal trial are that there is an information or indictment, a charging document, if you will, which will charge the defendant with a particular crime or more than one crime and that is simply a charging document. It is an accusation only. It is not any evidence of guilt of the defendant, that the defendant is in fact presumed innocent or is in fact innocent until proven guilty and that the State must prove the guilt beyond a reasonable doubt. That is the fuller statement, if you will, of our principle of American justice.

May I see by a show of hands if there is anyone who does not understand those principles of our American justice system? Seeing no hands.

Is there anyone here that would not follow those

principles of our American justice system? Seeing no hands. We had some discussion with each of you as we went along. Some of you who identified that you were either attorneys yourselves or you had a close family member who was an attorney.

At this time I am going to ask can I see by a show of hands anyone in the panel who is themselves an attorney, or if you have a -- hold on -- all of these questions are going to be related to you as the potential juror, any family member or any close friend.

So just assume whether I say it or not that I am asking that question beyond the scope of just you individually but to address your family members, close friends, people that might have because of your knowledge of their work it may have some influence on you potentially to serve on this case, okay.

So with that sort of large caveat, and I appreciate anyone who is themselves an attorney or ever practiced or has a family member who has ever practiced as an attorney or has a close friend who has ever practiced as an attorney, may I see by a show of hands.

So I believe it is the three individuals that we have already spoken to. Is there anything about the service as an attorney that we did not discuss that you would want to address further?

I think we have had the folks who were the practitioners, juror in the 3 spot and then in the 24 spot. And just again to make sure that I am clear for our record, the folks who raised their hand are Juror No. 036, Juror No. 100, and Juror No. 085.

And, Ms. Andrews, I believe your husband was an attorney. We'll come back to that. I believe with the other gentleman you did at some time in your careers, correct me if I'm wrong, engage in the practice of criminal practice. I think one of you indicated, primarily on the defense side, I think one of you indicated as a prosecutor at some point in time.

Let me start with Mr. Wusnack. Can you give us a little bit more information about how long again you practiced in that area of criminal practice.

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, ma'am. I left law school in '73 and by June of '74 I was appointed to represent a defendant in a murder case. So I did about six of those cases over the years. Mostly court appointed because that was the system we had at the time.

After a while I went to prosecuting in the City of Long Beach and also in the youth court, so I have been on actually both sides of it, although my prosecutions were limited to misdemeanors and traffic. No felonies.

THE COURT: Okay. So you did not prosecute

felonies, but as you have indicated you have seen both sides.

Counsel, I'm certain, will want to ask you more questions about that service. But let me just ask you sort of the general obvious question. Is there any reason that you believe that your prior service as an attorney whether or not the criminal practice that you served or any other practice would prevent you from being fair and impartial as a juror in this trial?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Absolutely not. Nothing at all.

THE COURT: Is there any reason why you would tend to lean more to one side or the other based on your prior practice or for any other reason?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Like I said, I think counsel may have some more questions to flush that out but I just wanted to highlight those issues that might identify where someone might have had some prior experience or exposure that might impact their ability to serve. And the natural follow-up question will be, Well, will it in fact impact your ability to serve.

Let me let move to the other attorney, Mr.

Mollett. I believe you indicated that you had done

criminal defense work. I can't recall if you had also

done any prosecution work. Has it only been the one side?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. I never did prosecution.

THE COURT: Okay. And the criminal defense work that you did, was it inclusive of felony charges?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.

THE COURT: So you have technically worked one side of the fence but you are certainly as an attorney understand the American Justice System. Do you believe that your prior practice or any other for any other reason that it would impact your ability to be fair and impartial in this trial?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. It would not affect my ability to serve. I have been a law clerk standing on both sides, look at both sides.

THE COURT: You have had occasion to address both sides or at least to be impartial I think is what you are indicating from your law clerk service.

So just to clarify, there is no reason that you could see that you would start with any one side or the other having any advantage.

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.

THE COURT: And you would understand that the State bears the burden beyond a reasonable doubt the

defendant's guilt, that the defense actually has nothing 1 that they would have to prove or show at any point during 2 trial. If the State does not meet its burden then there 3 could not be a conviction. Do you understand that 4 5 process? A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. THE COURT: And same question for you, 7 8 Mr. Wusnack. A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, ma'am. 9 10 THE COURT: Thank you. Ms. Andrews, you indicated that your husband was 11 12 an attorney, a federal prosecutor. 13 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: He had also been a county 14 prosecutor also. THE COURT: Did he ever work on the defense side 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

of the process?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. Very shortly in the

THE COURT: I am assuming that you would have discussed his work with him over the years.

beginning part of his career.

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Bits and pieces, yes.

THE COURT: Is there any reason why you believe you would be or why you would favor I guess I should say one side or the other in this case simply because of that experience that you had with your husband's work?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. But being a CPA I would be very analytical in my review of things.

THE COURT: Certainly.

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Sometimes black and white likes to be right there.

and I think everybody -- there's a specific jury instruction that talks about you obviously cannot completely separate yourself from your life experiences, but we obviously would want people to set aside any experiences that would tend to bias them and go ahead and receive the evidence in this trial and apply the law as the Court gives it and then deliberate with their fellow jurors to reach a fair and impartial verdict.

And that is ultimately what we are looking for for someone to do. And how everyone approaches that, the instruction very specifically says that you must bring to your deliberations your common sense as reasonable men and women and that I think naturally brings with it how folks tend to think about things.

But understanding that you would be analytical do you still at this time believe that you would be able to receive the evidence, give it whatever weight to which you believe it is entitled, apply the law, deliberate with your fellow jurors to reach a fair and impartial

1 verdict?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.

THE COURT: Thank you.

The next question I have is broader than just the legal profession. What I am looking for now is to find out if any of you, and interestingly enough, I don't think I heard any of the 33 mention that they had any family members who currently serve in law enforcement, but I am asking the question now again from the broadest scale, you yourself in any prior position or a family member or a close friend, is there anyone here in the panel that has anybody in that regard, themselves, again, family member, close friend that currently or formally served as a member of law enforcement.

Okay. We do have quite a few more hands, so let's do this. Let me start with the back row. Juror in the number four position.

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Jennifer Allee, 048. My uncle is retired now. His name is Joel Stats. He was deputy sheriff LAPD. He has been retired for probably 20 years now and lives in Arizona.

THE COURT: Is that the only family member with connection to law enforcement that you have?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.

THE COURT: Did you ever discuss with your uncle

his profession?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. We are not close at all.

THE COURT: You seem likable so I don't know why that would be the case, but in all seriousness, the follow-up question would be would there be any reason why having a family member in law enforcement, would you tend to give the testimony of a law enforcement person any greater, or frankly lesser weight, simply because they are a member of law enforcement?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.

THE COURT: The other way to ask that question a little more artfully, would you receive evidence that came in through law enforcement equally to all other evidence and give it the weight to which you deem it is entitled and then deliberate fairly and impartially with your fellow jurors regarding that evidence?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, ma'am.

THE COURT: Thank you. Next person.

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Amnesty Woodhall, 054. I have a distant cousin in Utah.

THE COURT: What is the position?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I believe he is just a police officer.

THE COURT: Did you have occasion to discuss his

1 | work with him at all?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.

THE COURT: Do you have any reason to believe that having a family member in law enforcement will affect your ability to be fair and impartial in this trial?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Would you give the weight of law enforcement, again, just such weight as you deem it entitled but no greater or lesser weight, but just such weight as you deem entitled as you received that evidence?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Any other hands in that row?

Yes, sir.

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Earl Wedgeworth, 062. My father was a reserve deputy with the sheriff's department in the Firestone area in Southern California. He passed on by the time I was 16 so we did not do a whole lot of talking about that, but that was his primary job.

THE COURT: But of course it being your father and it being a job that he held it may be something that you would hold in a certain regard.

I guess the question, again, what we need to

1 know is would you have any reason to give greater weight or undue weight to any evidence or testimony simply 2 3 because it was coming in from a member of law 4 enforcement? 5 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. THE COURT: Would you receive any evidence 6 7 including that of law enforcement equally to just give it whatever weight you deem it entitled? 8 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I can do that. 9 10 THE COURT: Is there any reason why having that connection to law enforcement would affect your ability 11 to be fair and impartial? 12 13 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, it wouldn't. THE COURT: All right. Thank you. 14 15 The middle row. 16 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Sandra Gibbons, 067. 17 THE COURT: And what is your connection to law enforcement? 18 19 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: My uncle is a sheriff. 20 THE COURT: Where? 21 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: In LA. And I guess I kind of raised her, she is a police officer in LA. 22 23 THE COURT: And what is that family connection? 24 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: My best friend's daughter. I kind of took care of her. 25

THE COURT: So you consider her part of your family?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.

THE COURT: She is an officer?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you have occasion or had occasion to speak to either of them about the work that they do?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.

THE COURT: And do you believe that that would impact how you would receive evidence in this case if the evidence was coming from a member of law enforcement?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, ma'am.

THE COURT: You don't believe you would give it any greater weight just simply because you have close family members or friends that are in law enforcement?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.

THE COURT: The question that I have asked and I know it sounds repetitive after a while, but I need each juror's answer to this to be sure, and there is no right or wrong answer to these questions, or for any of the questions that the Court asks.

We are simply looking for, you took your oath yesterday, honest answers. And I don't have any reason to doubt that anyone was not giving me honest answers, but we want honest and complete answers.

So the follow-up question, of course, is will you receive the evidence from a member of law enforcement equally to anyone else, give it just such weight as it is entitled in your mind and ultimately deliberate with your fellow jurors to reach a fair and impartial verdict?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

The next person.

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Hope Juarez, 078. Both of my neighbors work for North Las Vegas Police Department. One is a vice cop and investigator and the other one is a dispatcher.

THE COURT: Do you have occasion to speak with them about their work?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you have any reason to believe that the work that they do that are in law enforcement would that affect your ability to be fair and impartial in this trial?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.

THE COURT: Do you believe that you would give the testimony of any law enforcement officer just equal weight or whatever weight you deem it entitled but no greater weight than any other witness.

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.

1.8

THE COURT: I probably asked that question badly because I was expecting a yes to that.

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yeah.

THE COURT: Will you weigh that evidence equally and give it no greater weight than any other evidence?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.

THE COURT: So you are not going no be partial to one side or the other simply because evidence may be coming in from law enforcement; is that correct?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.

THE COURT: Thank you. Anybody else in this middle row?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR? Debra Andrews, 085. I have quite a bit of experience and involvement with law enforcement from everything from finance of the City of Corpus Christy, I would be asked on a Friday afternoon with a phone call to do flash money to do drug deals from the police officers.

I was also an assistant city manager over administrative services which had all the police and fire contracts; therefore, I wanted to get a better understanding of police and fire and I served -- I had the opportunity to be in the citizen's police academy for six weeks and got a much better understanding of what a police officer's job is and such.

I had direct involvement with the police chief, assistant chief and such in administrative meetings. I was a city manger in Jersey Village, Texas, of which I was basically over the police department. We had a small city staff of 48, so I had direct knowledge of the police officers and I also had personal friends, previous police chief of Houston, who then became a judge.

THE COURT: And it is understandable why someone who worked in government certainly in the capacity in which you worked would have had all of those connections.

I also would suspect that someone who is obviously as analytical as you would be would recognize the importance of being analytical and actually receiving evidence and weighing it.

What we are looking for is folks who will do exactly that, who will receive the evidence, be analytical, not give anything any greater weight other than what they think it is entitled, and would not be influenced by those prior work connections in this case.

And so the question really for you is can you and will you be impartial and analytical in your receipt of evidence and deliberate with your fellow jurors or do you believe that those ties that you have to law enforcement would bias you in some way?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I think my experiences

n outon. I cultur my outpourous

show that law enforcement people having the training that they have to go through and plus what they have to encounter then become much better observers of the circumstance that is going on.

And many times the individual who be it the person involved in it, a family member, you are not always as cognizant to all the facts that are coming in.

As to a traffic accident, sometimes a person who is at the accident can't even identify what the correct color of the car is that may have been in the accident, so I do probably put a much higher degree of their analytical and their ability to see what has gone on at the scene.

THE COURT: And certainly, again, from the experience, and you're entitled to give whatever weight you believe is entitled to the evidence, and there would be various different types of ways in which law enforcement encountered the evidence or observed the evidence in this case, but I guess what we are looking for is the State already ahead of the game?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Maybe.

THE COURT: If everybody is lined up are they even or is one ahead of the other?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I think a police officer is going to be able to see the facts better.

THE COURT: I know you have already told me what you believe to be the case of what a police officer will or will not do and I understand that that is your particular opinion, but that is not really my question and I do not think that that was responsive to my question.

My question is the State has a burden to meet.

Is the State already ahead of the game, so to speak, are they on their way to or from your perspective met their burden even before they present any evidence?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Well, I do not know what the State's case is so I can't answer that.

THE COURT: Well, you can answer whether or not in your mind they already have an advantage based on your prior experiences.

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Well, I would, again, evaluate the information that I got from an analytical point of view.

THE COURT: Respectfully, I think that those can be two different things so I am going to try one more time to see if I can get an answer to my question, and then of course counsel will have an opportunity to ask you some questions as well.

My question is we understand that you have these experiences that you have and the ways in which you would

perhaps weigh the evidence, but what we are again looking 1 for is someone who recognizes that as we start this trial 2 that they do not have any evidence at this point, that as 3 the evidence comes in they will receive the evidence, 4 weigh it fairly and impartially with their fellow jurors 5 to reach a verdict, and that they are not going to start 6 7 the trial believing that one side or the other is advantaged. 8 Do you believe that you will receive and weigh 9 the evidence impartially and that the State is at no 10 greater advantage as you sit here today. 11 12 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, based on my life 13 experiences. THE COURT: Okay. Anybody else in this row. 14 15 Yes, ma'am. 16 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Sacoya Counce, 087. My uncle, Sal Goins is a police officer here. 17 THE COURT: Is that with Metro? 18 19 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. THE COURT: What position? 20 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Police officer. I don't 21 know the extent. We don't discuss his work. 22 THE COURT: But he is with Metro? 23 24 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you believe that having a family

member, and actually most of the other folks their connections are outside of this jurisdiction, but you have someone who is with Metro. Would you have any reason to believe that would impact your ability to be fair and impartial here?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.

THE COURT: And I have heard this question asked a different way, so I am going to ask it of you this way. Would you have any problem depending on the outcome of this case going back and facing a family member who is police if you were to find that the evidence was not sufficient to prove guilt beyond a reasonable doubt, the State had not met its burden and the choice of the jury was to acquit, would you have any problem doing that?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I do not think I am really understanding.

THE COURT: As we sit here today the defendant is innocent. The State has the burden to prove beyond a reasonable doubt guilt as to the charges against the defendant. If the jurors in weighing the evidence deliberate and find that the State has not met its burden, so therefore they cannot determine guilt, would you have any problem returning to your family when all is said and done, because they are going to know that you are on a criminal trial, going back and relaying, You

know what, there was not enough evidence there so we acquitted. Do you think that would be difficult for you?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.

THE COURT: Okay.

Sir.

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Richard Seligman, 082. My son-in-law's father recently retired as Metro.

THE COURT: His name.

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Glenn Denny.

THE COURT: Okay.

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: And then Carol Denny, they just recently divorced, is still active in the bureau.

Now she has never talked about any work-related stuff and he has talked a little bit like maybe we were sitting in a restaurant and he was off duty and seen somebody take a tip off the table and showed them his badge and they will put it back. That is all they ever said.

THE COURT: So it sounds like you have not had a lot of opportunity to discuss with them their work but with the fact that you have this family connection, would that impact your ability to be fair and impartial here?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.

THE COURT: Do you think you would give any greater weight to the testimony to someone specifically because they are a member of law enforcement?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.

THE COURT: You would weigh all the evidence equally and give it what weight you think it is entitled?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you, sir.

Going now to the front row.

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Roger Mollet, Badge 100.

My brother just retired as chief of police from the City of Silverton, Ohio.

THE COURT: Do you talk to him about his work?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yeah. When I lived in

Ohio I went on a few ride-alongs with him and stuff and
also most of my military career I was full time in the

International Guard in Ohio and we did some law
enforcement things for the State. We were activated one
time during a prison riot and also during some natural
disasters.

THE COURT: Okay. I have asked a question from the perspective of you as an attorney and as someone who has worked in primarily criminal defense in the criminal justice system, but from this perspective of having family members with that connection and certainly people you would have worked with, friends, is that going to impact your ability to be fair and impartial in this trial?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. Besides my brother I have some friends who are police officers. People are people. I am not influenced one way or another based on whether they are a police officer or not.

THE COURT: You would not necessarily give any greater weight to someone who has testified simply because they are a member of law enforcement?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.

THE COUR: Would you appreciate that whatever you have experienced or whatever those connections are that you would be able to set those connections aside and deliberate fairly and impartially with whatever evidence you find and apply the law as I give it to you in this case; would you be able to do that?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Absolutely.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Anybody in the row behind counsel table.

A couple folks. Let's start with Mr. Tom. What is your connection with law enforcement?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: C. Tom, 0126. I have a friend that I know as a coworker and also a friend I play golf with and his son is a Metro sergeant. All I hear is stories from him and I don't even know what the evidence is.

THE COURT: That's true, nobody at this point

1 knows what the evidence is.

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I have heard stories but I don't remember anything.

THE COURT: And we know that you recognize that you have not heard any evidence yet in case. And as you said, you heard stories but clearly none related to this case, correct?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Correct.

THE COURT: The question, of course, that I need to ask you is the same question I have asked all the others who have a law enforcement connection. Are you going to be influenced in any way to be bias toward one side or the other in this case because you know someone in law enforcement?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: It is not that I know somebody or the stories I've heard because I don't remember but when something comes up that I do remember it may affect my decision.

THE COURT: Well, let me just be sure I'm clear. You have no reason to believe that something may come up and you are going to somehow recognize that you already know about this case, right? You are just talking about general?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: General. Something his son went through that may affect my decision but I don't

know what that is.

THE COURT: I appreciate we have the unknown here, okay, and that is important to always keep in mind that until actual evidence is presented we don't know what that evidence is or will be.

I guess what I'm asking is at whatever point in time, and I appreciate you cannot predict the future but at whatever point in time, do you believe that you can set aside whatever you have heard, stories otherwise, and just make a decision in this case based on the evidence in this case?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I believe so.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, sir.

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Sammy Torrence, 153. I worked as a state correctional officer for one year here in the state of Nevada in Indian Springs and I also was a correctional officer for the federal government for five years.

THE COURT: How long ago was that that you worked in that --

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I have been retired. I was medically retired from the Department of Justice about 20 years ago now.

THE COURT: So it has been more than 20 years since you have worked in this capacity?

1 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.

THE COURT: So you have seen a different side of the law enforcement process than some of the other folks that we have talked to here today.

But let me ask you from your perspective would you -- is either side here starting out ahead of the game or would you be able to consider this case from its inception, which is you are going to have to receive evidence, weigh that evidence with your fellow jurors, apply the law and reach a fair and impartial verdict related to this case only; are you able to do that?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I am able to do that, yes.

THE COURT: So you will not necessarily give any greater weight to anyone in the case simply because they are a member of law enforcement.

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.

THE COURT: Was there anybody else in that row? Mr. Reynolds.

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Juror 173. My wife has a family on her father's side, virtually the whole family is in law enforcement.

THE COURT: You have only been here a year so is that some place else?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. In Arizona.

THE COURT: So your in-laws are in law

enforcement. Do you have occasion to speak with them about their work?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. We go up a couple times a year for a couple weeks at a time to stay with her grandmother and we stay the whole time with that side of the family.

THE COURT: Is that something you believe would impact your jury service here?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Perhaps.

THE COURT: When you say perhaps do you want to give us an idea of --

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: My problem was like what the other lady was saying; I spent a lot of time with them so I trust them and know what their opinions are and how they were trained and things like that and so I think I would probably -- I do not like to have to say it but I would probably give the State more weight.

THE COURT: Again, we are just looking for candid answers. Counsel may have some further questions to ask.

The thing that strikes me and I want to at least point out and get your take on is as is with Ms. Andrews and you, these are not individuals that are part of the law enforcement personnel here in Clark County.

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.

THE COURT: So would you be able to set aside your familiarity with the training and/or the operation and/or the handling of matters there and address whatever you see as the evidence and weigh the evidence here?

1.0

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I am not sure.

THE COURT: Like I said, we already talked about and you did not raise your hand, but we already talked about the principles of our American justice system; there is a charging document. That is not evidence. That there is a presumption of innocence for the defendant, and of course, it is the State's burden to prove the guilt of the defendant.

Would you follow those principles of American justice?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.

THE COURT: And your concern then or question would be you are not certain that you wouldn't tend to give greater weight to someone simply because they are a member of law enforcement.

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Exactly.

THE COURT: We, again, will have other opportunities to flush that out a little bit more. Any other connections to law enforcement?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.

THE COURT: The next set of questions that the

Court wishes to ask you are going to be more specific to you or a family member or a close friend, encounters that you may have had with the criminal justice system itself.

Obviously, we have the folks we have already talked to who has either legal professional or related to legal professionals or law enforcement and have had those connections.

What I am looking for now is by a show of hands if there is anyone here who they themselves, family member or close friend has ever been accused of a crime?

Looks like we have a few hands here. Please understand we are not trying to be prying into your personal business or to be invasive in any way. What we are trying to do, again, is further understand whether or not there might be some things that might create a problem for you to serve on this jury, and if that is not the case, that's not the case and if it is the case then, of course, we would need to know.

There's enough hands that I will have to go row by row, so I will start with the back row.

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Wennie Balaoro, 009. My brother he was 11 years old when they accused him of killing somebody.

THE COURT: Where did this occur, ma'am?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: In California. He was

1 43 years old and he just got out last year.

THE COURT: So you have a younger brother who was accused and ultimately convicted of a crime or did he plead guilty?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: He pled guilty. He pled guilty because of his friends.

THE COURT: So you have a younger brother who at the age of 11 was accused of and ultimately pled guilty to a crime and is still serving time.

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: He got out for that case and then he went back to prison again. I was young. I don't remember that much.

THE COURT: That was going to be my next question. How old were you at the time?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Like 13.

THE COURT: So you are slightly older than he is but you have a experience in your family -- how do you feel that the system handled that circumstance with your brother?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I don't know. I was young and my mom did not talk to us about it. I just know that he was in prison for that. We did not discuss it that much.

THE COURT: Do you harbor any negative feelings about the criminal justice system because of that?

1 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. THE COURT: Have you had other experiences with 2 other family members or close friends with the criminal 3 justice system? 4 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: 5 6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Do you believe with what you do know about your brother's circumstances or the fact that he was someone that was incarcerated, would that impact your ability to be fair and impartial in this trial?

No.

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.

THE COURT: Would you tend to consider one side or the other at an advantage at this point or would you just receive the evidence and proceed?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Receive the evidence and proceed.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Mr. Wusnack.

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Otto Wusnack, 036. brother at age 61 was arrested in Arizona for transporting some drugs. He spent five years in prison there. He is out now and is off parole and back at his old job.

THE COURT: Did he plead guilty?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: He plead guilty. I spoke with him at length about the case. He pled guilty.

was the suggestion. 1 2 THE COURT: How do you feel that the system handled the circumstances in your brother's case? 3 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Very well, Your Honor. 4 THE COURT: We have already had many questions 5 with you about the system and your feelings about it and 6 the fact that that would not impact your ability to be 7 fair and impartial here but what about these 8 circumstances with your brother, any reason to believe 9 that that would impact your ability to be fair and 10 impartial? 11 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I don't think so, not at 12 all. 1.3 THE COURT: Thank you. 14 15 Anybody else in that first row? A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Amnesty Woodhall, 054. 16 was arrested myself for a DUI, which was reduced down to 17 18 reckless driving. THE COURT: How long ago was that, ma'am? 19 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: February. 20 THE COURT: Of this year? 21 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. 22 THE COURT; Was it a fairly quick process that 23 you ultimately had that reduction and entered that plea? 24

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: It took a few months.

THE COURT: The reason I ask is because I am 1 really ultimately going to ask what your experience was, 2 how do you feel that the system overall handled your 3 4 case? A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Very fair. 5 THE COURT: Do you have any concerns or questions or would you harbor any negative feelings about 7 8 the criminal justice system? A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: 9 THE COURT: You would not try to somehow bring 10 11 that into this case, right, you would be able to set that aside? 12 13 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I really do not even want 14 to talk about it. 15 THE COURT: You would not have even told anyone 16 unless I asked you. 17 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Right. 18 THE COURT: Well, everybody makes mistakes, ma'am, and it sounds like you have addressed them so we 19 20 appreciate you being candid about that here today.

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Is this just for people who were convicted or like victims?

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: As I said victim of crime, so that does not necessarily have to mean that it ultimately resulted in some conviction.

1 Obviously, what is happening here is we are dealing with people who are accused of a crime. 2 question actually was more if somebody had been the 3 victim of a crime but since we are getting the answers if 4 5 you have something that you think might be responsive, go 6 ahead. I'm still going to come back and ask it again. 7 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: My ex-girlfriend was a 8 rape victim in Clark County. 9 THE COURT: How long ago was that, sir? 10 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: We were in high school at 11 the time, so it was probably about eight years ago. 12 THE COURT: Was this somebody that was known to 13 her? 14 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: He was known to her. 15 THE COURT: 16 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: THE COURT: Did the case go to trial?

Was the person charged?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The way you asked your question THE COURT: makes me think the outcome was other than a conviction but ultimately were you involved directly in the experience, meaning, did you experience it at the time or is that something that you heard about after the fact?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I was a friend of hers at the time and when it happened to her I got very concerned and asked the family some questions and of course they could tell me what they could by how the trial went he got her and as the trial went on it seemed like the defense latched on to something because she was young and probably said the wrong thing and they latched onto it and the prosecution could not push any further and he pretty much got a slap on the wrist, had to move out of the county and that was the end of it.

THE COURT: To some degree from the way you expressed that, those facts, from your understanding of them it sounded like you have a negative feeling about the handling of that case; would that be accurate?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.

THE COURT: Would you be able to set aside that experience that you had and not bring it in here and have it influence your service as a juror in this case?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I am kind of 50/50 on it because I know it's a different trial and different circumstances but to me I would have to say the prosecution seemed like they just kind of handed the case, what they had, to the judge and they heard all the testimony and then the defense just latched on to it.

THE COURT: Well, at the end of the day there was a jury that reached a verdict, correct?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I am not sure if there was

1 or not.

THE COURT: If it was a criminal case there would have been a jury.

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Okay. Like I said, I was just a friend at the time. I did not know how in detail that case was handled.

THE COURT: Were you ever present in court?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.

THE COURT: So is the information about how that was handled more secondhand than firsthand?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: More secondhand.

THE COURT: I still come back around to you and I think you said you were 50/50, so you know there may be some more questions certainly that counsel may want to ask and may give you some time to think about that when you come back tomorrow.

But we are looking for folks who whatever their life experiences have been can still set those aside, or if the answer is that they could not, understood. But to understand that this case this is as you said right out of the gate this is a different case and that bears no relationship to that case and that would receive the evidence as you find it to be, apply the law as the Court gives it to you and weigh it fairly and impartially with your fellow jurors. Do you believe as you sit here today

1	that you can do that?
2	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
3	THE COURT: So your qualms and maybe where you
4	were 50/50 is just not being sure how
5	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: How it was handled because
6	I was not there firsthand.
7	THE COURT: Do you have any doubts on how it
8	would impact you or just doubts about what you know of
9	the circumstances?
10	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: What I know of the
11	circumstances.
12	THE COURT: Thank you. We will probably have
13	further questions for, you Mr. Bowers.
14	Now on to the middle row.
15	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Sandra Gibbons, 067. My
16	daughter's husband is going to trial the 1st of August
17	for violence against her.
18	THE COURT: Here in Clark County?
19	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
20	THE COURT: So your daughter currently is
21	involved in a case and you said it was her husband?
22	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
23	THE COURT: And he was accused of and is facing
24	charges for what?
25	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Violence.

THE COURT: And you said that trial is happening 1 2 next month? A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. First week of 3 4 August. 5 THE COURT: Is that the first appearance or is that the trial? 6 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I am not sure. All I know 7 is that he is supposed to show up to court. 8 9 THE COURT: What are you feelings generally about how the system so far has worked in your daughter's 10 11 case? 12 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: (No audible response.) 13 THE COURT: Do you have any problems with how 14 the case has been handled up to this point? 15 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: So far, no. 16 THE COURT: Is there any reason that that case 17 pending in the circumstances of having something with the 18 criminal justice system, would that impact your ability to be fair and impartial here? 19 20 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I do not think so. 21 THE COURT: You hesitated just a little bit 22 Another way to ask is are you going to be able to 23 set that aside and just be a juror in this case and just 24 receive the evidence and deliberate in this case?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I cannot really answer

that because I don't know how I would feel. If that makes sense.

THE COURT: Certainly.

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I could set it aside and say it would be okay but I do not want to lie.

THE COURT: Maybe it would help me to sort of pinpoint where you have concerns. Are you afraid that even though you know this case is completely unrelated to that one that somehow you might --

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: My daughter, if this could happen to her, you know, so I really can't say yes or no. I am going to say yes because I am going to try.

THE COURT: Like I said, people will bring to the case their common sense as reasonable men and women and they are going to have had their life experiences.

As you sit there today do you have any bias one way or the other as to either side of this case?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.

THE COURT: Okay. We will have some more questions for you I'm sure.

Anymore in the middle row?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Katherine Isom, 176. I was a victim of a crime in my early 20s. A rape. And it never went to trial. The person was never found but when the police officers came to my apartment they pretty much

treated me like I had invited this person into my apartment and it was not handled well.

THE COURT: And I can see that it brings out some emotions for you now at this time. And, again, the last thing in the world we want to do is upset anyone or be invasive in anyone's privacy. But, of course, if there is any reason why that would impact your ability to be fair and impartial in this trial we would need to know that.

How do you feel that circumstance would impact your ability to be fair and impartial in this trial?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I think for a long time I was resentful for the way the officers handled it and the way I think they treated me but I think I would be okay.

THE COURT: You said it was some time ago, but obviously some of those feelings are still fresh.

Obviously, I ask the people who had law enforcement connections. Most of them we would presume potentially in a positive way, although, we did make one joke about the possibility because the family members weren't close that maybe it was not in a positive way.

But do you believe as you sit there today that the testimony coming in from law enforcement that you could give it the weight to which you believe it is entitled.

1 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: (No audible response.) THE COURT: You are nodding your head yes, but 2 3 would there be any reason why you believe because of your experience you would tend to not give it fair weight. 4 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. I think I would be 5 6 good. What about the circumstances of just 7 THE COURT: yourself having been the victim of a crime with 8 circumstances related or allegations of a crime being 9 committed; do you think that might be difficult for you? 10 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: 11 Yes. THE COURT: Do you think that the difficulty 12 would be such that it would impact your ability to 13 actually receive the evidence and then ultimately 14 15 deliberate and weigh the evidence? 16 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I would like to say it 17 wouldn't but it might. Thank you, Ms. Isom, for your 18 THE COURT: candor. 19 20 Sir. A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Richard Beligman, 082. My 21 son has been in and out of prison since he was like 18 22 23 years old. THE COURT: Different criminal issues? 24 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. He started off with 25

stealing a car then driving it to California and spent like three years in prison down there.

And then he told me it has pretty much turned him into a very violent person from all the fighting and so all his other charges are pretty much battery.

THE COURT: I asked the questions a couple different ways as we talked about this area, but do you have any concerns with how your son's various cases have been handled in the criminal justice system?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. Like when he would call from jail, it seemed like it was always, Well, if I plead guilty to this then I would only get this amount of time; if it goes to trial I could get ten years. So they were always trying to make a deal type of thing.

THE COURT: And separate and apart from that or those concerns can you set aside the circumstances you know to exist with your son or your perceptions of what has occurred in his case and not bring that here to your deliberations as a juror in this case.

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, I do not have a problem with it.

THE COURT: You believe that you can be fair and impartial here?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Sure.

THE COURT: You are not giving one side or the

other any greater weight? 1 2 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. I was a victim of his assaults on me at one point too. 3 4 THE COURT: So you have seen both sides. 5 have a family member --A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. Get a restraining 6 order against him and then he disappeared from the state 7 and then three years later he got arrested in Arizona and 8 they took him back to California and then he ended up 9 back here and beat up somebody else and then he finally 10 paid for it, the charges that I filed against him. 11 THE COURT: Did your case ever go to an actual 12 trial? 13 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. But I remember him 14 15 saying that he got like three months for attacking me and that was added on for the time he had gotten for 16 17 attacking someone else. 18 THE COURT: So he did have some punishment. A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. It was just years 19 20 later. THE COURT: How long ago was all this? 21 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Five years ago. 22 THE COURT: Fairly recently. And you said it 23 24 was here?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: He did serve here.

never served in prison here it was always in the county 1 jail because it was always under a year. 2 THE COURT: Okay. Do you believe that you could 3 set that aside --4 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I would not have a problem 5 6 with it. 7 THE COURT: Thank you. Anybody else? Ma'am. A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Sacoya Counce, 087. 9 10 cousin did two years for them saying that he murdered someone and he didn't so they let him out but they 11 12 tormented him to come by our house and drive by and look at him and then they like destroyed my grandmother's 13 14 house, broke down doors and stuff like that. 15 THE COURT: I am only going to interrupt you because you are saying "they" and "them" and that's not 16 17 clear. First of all, let me break it down. So you said 18 19 he did two years. Do you mean that while he was pending 20 the charges? A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. 21 22 THE COURT: So he never actually pled guilty or 23 was convicted. 24 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Right. 25 THE COURT: Was he out of custody or in custody?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: He was in custody. 1 2 THE COURT: Because I thought when you said he 3 did two years that's what you meant. A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: 4 Yes. 5 THE COURT: But somehow while he was in custody 6 that there was some harassment by the police. A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Well, they came and picked 7 him up from my grandma being in the hospital, he was 8 9 visiting my grandma in the hospital and some un-uniformed 10 officer came in the room and removed him from the room 11 and then they followed us from the hospital and other 12 officers in uniform broke down my grandmother's door. 13 THE COURT: To do the search? 14 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Right. 15 THE COURT: What jurisdiction was this? A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: This one. 16 17 THE COURT: Metro. 18 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. 19 THE COURT: And we obviously talked about the 20 fact that you have a family member who is in Metro law 21 enforcement, correct? A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. 22 THE COURT: And so this is somewhat of opposite 23 24 experience perhaps in terms of how you might have

25

perceived it.

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yeah.

THE COURT: Would you have any impact from that experience that might impact your ability to be fair and impartial in this case?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. As long as there is like actual evidence I would be fine.

THE COURT: And there will be questions that counsel is going to ask in terms of what evidence and what the expectations are. And that goes true for both sides.

I mentioned it briefly earlier in speaking with one of the attorney potential jurors, but as I indicated, the defense is under no obligation to put on any defense whatsoever. It is the State's burden and the State's burden entirely to prove the guilt of the defendant to the charges against him.

But we have to flush out what expectations are you going to have. Are you going to hold the State to a higher burden than beyond a reasonable doubt to do their job?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I will just say as long as it is just there. Okay. Like, that's it. I don't want to be part of assuming something.

THE COURT: Ultimately, it is hard as your jobs as jurors is to find what the evidence is. The State's

job is to present the evidence through the witnesses and the exhibits, but it is ultimately up to the jurors to determine to be the factfinders. That is entirely what your job is. Do you believe that you can do that?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.

THE COURT: And the burden that you would hold the State to, would you follow the law as the Court gives you regardless of what you think the law ought to be?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Anybody else in that row? How about the front row?

Mr. Loomer.

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Phillip Loomer, 189. My brother was arrested because his wife's sister's friend that was a cop led his child to say that he was beating his kid.

THE COURT: So you have a brother who was arrested for child abuse.

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. He was arrested for child abuse so that way she could have her child that she cheated on him with in the hospital and tried to get him in prison for ten years for that and the cop was friends with her sister and --

THE COURT: Obviously these circumstances are

THE COURT. ODVIOUSLY ENCIGE CITCUMS CARROLL AIR

very unique. I am only cutting you off because I do not know how much detail we need about these circumstances, but these circumstances are very unique to those people.

2.0

Is that going to impact your -- we talked a minute ago about connections with law enforcement. I tried to write down --

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I don't really personally know any police officers but I just don't really trust them as a whole.

THE COURT: Well, we are getting to that. So I am asking about connections to law enforcement, family member or close friend, and you have a brother here who, if I am understanding correctly, has a child with someone who is in law enforcement?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. My brother was married to someone -- her sister went to church with a police officer and she was friends with him.

THE COURT: So family members with some friend connection.

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.

THE COURT: So through this one experience that has caused you to have questions about law enforcement in general?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.

THE COURT: Would you be able to set that aside

and hear the evidence in this case and weigh it and give it whatever weight you think it deserves?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.

THE COURT: You said a minute ago that you don't trust law enforcement.

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I mean I don't trust them as a whole. I'm not going to say that they are all criminals but I have known a few police officers that had run-ins in the law and they are not always accurate with what they do.

THE COURT: Would it be fair to say that you have known police officers who have done good things and law officers who have done bad things?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.

THE COURT: Would you, again, be able to set aside whatever those experiences were and take in the evidence in this case?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes and no.

THE COURT: Are you going to give negative weight because the person testifying is a member of law enforcement?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I will be cautious and pay attention to what they say but I would be open minded.

THE COURT: But you do not believe that you would weigh it more harshly or weigh against it simply

1 because they are law enforcement?

1.8

2.3

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I will not be prejudice.

THE COURT: All right. I am sure counsel will have some follow-up questions. This is just the Court getting through some basic understanding of your experiences.

Any other experiences that you should bring to our attention?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Smaller things.

THE COURT: Your own experiences?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. I was arrested because I understand that they had a gray area to believe it but I was arrested because I had an ex-girlfriend, who no longer lived with me, break in and I called the cops and they arrested me for domestic violence and she did not even live there and I had not even seen her for a couple of months and she broke in.

THE COURT: So that was prompted by actions she did or --

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Well, yeah, because I called the cops and she ran after them and saw the car before I had a chance to talk to them and they believed her.

THE COURT: What happened with that case?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: It was dismissed.

1	THE COURT: Is there any reason that that
2	particular case would impact you any differently than
3	what you have already described?
4	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. Same story.
5	THE COURT: Okay. Is there anything else that
6	you think we should know about?
7	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.
8	THE COURT: Okay. Next down the row.
9	Ma'am.
10	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Patricia Tiffany, 099. I
11	have a brother-in-law who is in Indian Springs.
12	THE COURT: For what crime?
13	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Murder,
14	THE COURT: Murder?
15	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
16	THE COURT: How long ago was he incarcerated?
17	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: 1970.
18	THE COURT: Since 1970?
19	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
20	THE COURT: Did you
21	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I know nothing about it.
22	All I know is where he's at and I've been told what he
23	has done and that's all. I have not even seen him in
24	over 20 years.
25	THE COURT: But you were in the relationship

with your husband when this happened? I mean you were 1 2 aware of it at the time? A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: (No audible response.) 3 THE COURT: I guess what I'm trying to get at is 4 had this occurred before you got married or was this 5 6 something that --A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: After we got married. 7 husband was overseas in the war when this happened. 8 9 THE COURT: Okay. And so you don't have any direct knowledge of it, just the outcome, if you will. 10 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Just the outcome. 11 12 THE COURT: Okay. Is there any reason that you believe that the experience of that family member would 13 14 impact you? 15 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. 16 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Roger Mollet, Badge No. 17 18 100. I was charged with battery domestic violence in I believe 2003 in Henderson. 19 THE COURT: And what became of that case? 20 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I pled no contest. 21 THE COURT: How do you feel that that matter was 22 handled? 23 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Police were doing their 24 25 job. It was something that happened.

THE COURT: Understand. Is that going to impact 1 2 your ability to be fair and impartial in this trial? A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, not at all. 3 THE COURT: Thank you, sir. 4 Anybody in the row behind counsel table? 5 Mr. Torrence. 6 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Sammy Torrence Badge No. 7 My son was arrested as a juvenile for misdemeanor 8 break in and entering and he went to juvenile and was 9 released that night to my custody. He did 200 hours of 10 community service, so he was treated fairly. 11 THE COURT: Did he get more punishment from his 12 dad? 13 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: He did. 14 15 THE COURT: I was suspecting that might be the case. Was there any concern that you have about how that 16 17 matter was handled? A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. 18 The officers from north town as well juvenile handled it very well. 19 THE COURT: Okay. Anything about that 20 circumstance that would affect your ability to be fair 21 22 and impartial? A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: 23 THE COURT: Anybody else in that row? 24 25 Ma'am.

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Sally Marotta, 104. 1 have a daughter and her father is in prison right now in 2 3 California. THE COURT: Oh, right. We said we would come back to you and speak about that. Did you indicate it 5 was on drug-related charges? 6 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. Drug related. 7 THE COURT: How long has he been incarcerated? 8 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I have been with him for 9 10 14 years. THE COURT: Was it after you began your 11 12 relationship? 13 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: It was before and is 14 continuing now. THE COURT: So what are your feelings about how 15 the system handled his charges? 16 17 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Fair. THE COURT: Do you have any negative feelings 18 19 about the criminal justice system based on those 20 experiences? No, not at all. 21 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: THE COURT: Is there anything about the fact 22 23 that he is currently incarcerated or has gone through those experiences and your knowledge of them that would 24

impact your ability to be fair and impartial here?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, not at all. 1 2 THE COURT: Okay. Now let me move down to the 3 end. Go ahead, Ms. Lopez. A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Mariana Lopez, 172. My 4 boyfriend's brother is in jail in Colorado for something. 5 I'm am not sure but I think it is for transporting drugs. 6 7 THE COURT: Is he awaiting charges or has he already pled quilty and been convicted of those charges? 8 9 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Honestly, I don't' know because every time we ask him he just says that he has a 10 court date. 11 THE COURT: So you are not sure if he has been 12 13 convicted yet? 14 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. THE COURT: Do you have any direct knowledge 15 16 about what has occurred in this case? A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. 17 THE COURT: Is there any reason why knowing this 18 19 circumstance would impact your ability to be fair and 20 impartial in this trial? A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: 21 No. THE COURT: Would you keep it out of this trial 22 23 and just deliberate on the facts and evidence in this 24 trial? 25 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.

1 THE COURT: Thank you. Is there anyone else?

I am going to come back to the panel now because when I originally asked the question it was my intention to ask the question in two parts. The fist being anyone having experience with the criminal justice system as a victim of crime and then the second part can be is there anyone who has had experience with the criminal justice system as accused of a crime, and of course, that being themselves, a family member or close friend.

I think we got both answers but I just want to make sure as I come back to the panel, is there anyone here who now that you have heard other folks who have had those experiences themselves, family member or close friend who has not yet raised their hand and shared that information with us? Again, either accused of or the victim of a crime.

All right. May I have counsel at the bench. (Off-the-record bench conference.)

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen of the panel, it is ten minutes to five. I have completed the set of questions that I intended to inquire of the panel before I turn it over to counsels' questions and they are going to commence their questions tomorrow when we return.

As I indicated to you we were going to probably take up to three days to select the jury and could

possibly even go to a fourth day. So, again, with those folks who have not been brought forward yet, our apologies to you. But the reason that we have the number of people that we have, and as you can see we have already gone through a great number of people in attempts to qualify 33 people.

We do need you all to return tomorrow for jury selection. It is possible that we will complete the selection tomorrow. If we do not then we will resume on Thursday. We will definitely complete selection this week at some point tomorrow or Thursday. But we do need you all to return.

Same process. Please make sure that you go to Jury Services first with your badge to check in and then return up here so that when we are ready to start at 1:30. Please remember where your seats are.

Remember your admonishment that you are not to discuss this trial with anyone or speculate with regard to anything regarding this case and although you can certainly tell people that you are involved in a criminal trial, criminal jury selection, nothing beyond that at this time.

Thank you all. Have a good evening and we will see you all tomorrow at 1:30.

(Prospective jurors exit courtroom.)

THE COURT: Just a couple of quick housekeeping things. I do want to acknowledge that Mr. Collins when he stood up did have his shirt over his chains, so thank you for that. We do appreciate that.

The additional 20 jurors to the extent that we may need them, they are going to return tomorrow. The questionnaires were provided and I believe my JEA brought them in on the last break.

The way the list was provided it looks different than the other list that we have. It picks up with Juror No. 91 on the list and they were just tacked on at the end.

It is my intention, I will double check it with my marshal and I will confirm it with him tomorrow, but my intention would be to leave them downstairs rather than bring them up to the room since we are as far along the process as we are. There is pros and cons to it.

When we bring folks up and they have not been canvassed -- I certainly don't want to bring them up, canvass them, do the hardship and do all of that. We do have one juror in the pool who I suppose we could ask Jury Services to tell him not to return that has travel that he identified in his questionnaire. And that is Jury No. 395, Justin Moreno. He has travel so we could excuse him and that would give us 19 additional. Does

1	anybody have a problem with that?
2	MR. SCHIECK: No objection from the defense,
3	Your Honor.
4	MS. LUZAICH: No, Your Honor.
5	THE COURT: Okay. I will notify Jury Services
6	to excuse Mr. Moreno. And then otherwise we will have
7	the other 19. If we do determine to change our mind we
8	will give you a heads-up, but at this point we will
9	excuse him.
10	Is there anything that we need to address before
11	we adjourn for the night?
12	MR. SCHIECK: No, Your Honor.
13	MS. BLUTH: Your Honor, can counsel come back at
14	1:15?
15	THE COURT: Certainly, I have no problem
16	starting at 1:15.
17	(Proceedings were adjourned.)
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE	
2		
3	STATE OF NEVADA)	
4	COUNTY OF CLARK)	
5		
6	I, BRENDA SCHROEDER, a certified court reporter	
7	in and for the State of Nevada, do hereby certify that	
8	the foregoing and attached pages 1, inclusive,	
9	comprise a true, and accurate transcript of the	
10	proceedings reported by me in the matter of THE STATE OF	
11	NEVADA, Plaintiff, versus LSEAN TARUS COLLINS, Defendant,	
12	Case No. 09C252804, on July 28, 2015.	
13		
14		
15		
16	Dated this 10th day of January, 2016.	
17		
18	/s/ Brenda Schroeder BRENDA SCHROEDER, CCR NO. 867	
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
		120

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

LESEAN COLLINS

Electronically Filed May 16 2016 09:01 a.m. Tracie K. Lindeman Clerk of Supreme Court

Appellant,

VS.

THE STATE OF NEVADA

Respondent.

Docket No. 69269

Direct Appeal From A Judgment of Conviction Eighth Judicial District Court The Honorable Kathleen Delaney, District Judge District Court No. 25

APPELLANT'S APPENDIX VOLUME 4 OF 11

JoNell Thomas
State Bar #4771
Deputy Special Public Defender
David M. Schieck
State Bar #0824
Special Public Defender
330 South 3rd Street
Las Vegas, NV 89155
(702) 455-6265
Attorneys for Collins

<u>VOLUME</u>	PLEADING PG. NO.	
3	Affidavit's [sic] (8/25/14)	
3	Affidavit of Abigail Frierson (8/25/14) 565-66	
7	Amended Jury List (8/4/15)	
8	Amended Jury List (8/11/15)	
1	Amended Notice of Expert Witnesses And/or Rebuttal Expert Witnesses (1/22/10)	
4	Certificate for Attendance of out of State Witness Rufus Hicks (7/20/15)	
11	Criminal Court Minutes (Not Filed)	
8	Defendant's Proposed Trial Phase Instructions (8/10/15) 1527-65	
4	Fifth Supplemental Notice of Witnesses And/or Expert Witnesses (7/2/15)	
3	Fourth Supplemental Notice of Witnesses And/or Expert Witnesses (8/25/14)	
1	Information (3/25/09)	
10	Judgment of Conviction (11/24/15)	
5	Jury List (7/29/15)	
10	Jury Instructions (8/12/15)	
1	Motion for Discovery (1/28/10)	
1	Motion in Limine to Preclude Admission of Photographs (1/28/10)	

1	Motion in Limine to Preclude References To the Deceased as the "Victim" (1/28/10)
1	Motion to Allow Jury Questionnaire (1/28/10)
1	Motion to Bar Improper Prosecutorial Argument (1/2810)
1	Motion to Compel Disclosure of Existence and Substance of Expectations, Of Actual Receipt of Benefits or Preferential Treatment for Cooperation With Prosecution (1/28/10)
2	Motion to Continue Jury Trial (10/30/13) 391-94
3	Motion to Dismiss Counsel (8/27/14)
2	Motion to Dismiss Counsel and Appointment of Alternate Counsel (10/21/13)
2	Motion to Disqualify the Clark County District Attorney's Office (7/17/14)
1	Motion to Exclude Other Bad Acts, Character Evidence, and Irrelevant Prior Criminal Activity (1/28/10) 120-23
2	Motion to Exclude Other Evidence of Arson Charges and Any Allegations Related Thereto as Bad Act Evidence or Irrelevant Prior Criminal Activity (7/18/14)
1	Motion to Federalize All Motions, Objections, Requests and Other Applications (1/28/10)
3	Motion to Withdraw Counsel (8/27/14)
10	Notice of Appeal (11/25/15)
2	Notice of Defendant's Expert Witnesses (2/5/10) 248-67

4	Notice of Defendant's Supplemental Witnesses (7/16/15) 729-31
3	Notice of Defendant's Witnesses (8/22/14) 557-59
1	Notice of Expert Witnesses And/or Rebuttal Expert Witnesses (1/21/10)
2	Notice of Hearing (12/15/10)
3	Notice of Intent to Seek Punishment as Habitual Criminal (8/25/14)
3	Notice of Motion (8/27/14)
4	Notice of Motion and Motion in Limine (7/17/15) 737-42
1	Notice of Witnesses (1/21/10)
2	Notice of Witnesses And/or Expert Witnesses (10/3/13) 358-85
4	Order Denying Defendant's Motion to Disqualify the Clark County District Attorney's Office (9/11/14) 703-04
4	Order Denying Defendant's Motion to Exclude Other Evidence of Arson Charges And Any Allegations Related Thereto as Bad Act Evidence or Irrelevant Prior Criminal Activity (8/27/14)
1	Order Denying Defendant's Writ of Habeas Corpus (6/25/09)
3	Order Denying Oral Motion to Stay Proceedings (8/25/14) 595
4	Order for Payment of Witness Fees (7/20/15) 743-44
1	Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus (4/24/09)
4	Request for Attendance of out of State Witness Rufus Hicks (7/20/15)

1	Return to Writ of Habeas Corpus (5/14/09)
8	Second Amended Jury List (8/11/15)
3	Second Supplemental List of Witnesses And/or Expert Witnesses (7/31/14)
2	Second Supplemental Notice of Defendant's Expert Witnesses (8/20/10)
2	Second Supplemental Notice of Expert Witnesses (10/5/12)
4	Seventh Notice of Witnesses And/or Expert Witnesses (7/17/15)
4	Sixth Supplemental Notice of Witnesses And/or Expert Witnesses (7/15/15)
1	State's Opposition to Defendants Motion For Discovery (2/3/10)
1	State's Opposition to Defendants Motion In Limine to Preclude Admission of Photographs (2/2/10)
1	State's Opposition to Defendant's Motion in Limine to Preclude References to the Deceased as the "Victim" (2/1/10)
1	State's Opposition to Defendant's Motion to Allow Jury Questionnaire (2/1/10)
1	State's Opposition to Defendant's Motion to Bar Improper Prosecutorial Argument (2/1/10)
1	State's Opposition to Defendant's Motion to Compel Disclosure of Existence and Substance Of Expectations, or Actual Receipt of Benefits Or Preferential Treatment for Cooperation With Prosecution (2/1/10)

3	State's Opposition to Defendant's Motion to Disqualify the Clark County District Attorney's Office (8/7/14) 490-507
2	State's Opposition to Defendant's Motion To Exclude Other Bad Acts, Character Evidence, and Irrelevant Prior Criminal History (2/4/10)
3	State's Opposition to Defendant's Motion to Exclude Other Evidence of Arson Charges And Any Allegations Related Thereto as Bad Act Evidence or Irrelevant Prior Criminal Activity (7/25/14)
1	State's Opposition to Defendant's Motion to Federalize All Motions, Objections, Requests, And Other Applications (2/1/10)
8	Stipulation and Order to Waive Penalty Hearing (8/11/15) 1567-68
3	Supplemental Exhibits in Support of Defendant's Motion to Disqualify the Clark County District Attorney's Office and Defendant's Motion to Exclude Other Evidence of Arson Charges and Any Allegations Related thereto as Bad Act Evidence or Irrelevant Prior Criminal List (8/26/14) 596-679
2	Supplemental Notice of Expert Witness And/or Rebuttal Expert Witness (8/23/10)
2	Supplemental Notice of Witnesses (9/8/10)
2	Supplemental Notice of Witnesses And/or Expert Witnesses (7/24/14)
3	Third Supplemental Notice of Witnesses And/or Expert Witnesses (8/22/14)
1	Transcript of Hearing on March 26, 2009 (12/04/15) 4-7
1	Transcript of Hearing on April 13, 2009 (12/15/15) 8-12

1	Transcript of Hearing on June 08, 2009 (12/15/15)
2	Transcript of Hearing on February 8, 2010 (12/16/15) 260-75
2	Transcript of Hearing on February 12, 2010 (06/13/14) 276-87
2	Transcript of Hearing on February 17, 2010 (12/17/15) 288-92
2	Transcript of Hearing on September 08, 2010 (12/18/15) 307-11
2	Transcript of Hearing on September 15, 2010 (12/21/15) 312-17
2	Transcript of Hearing on January 3, 2011 (11/30/15) 318-25
2	Transcript of Hearing on September 21, 2011 (11/30/15) 326-29
2	Transcript of Hearing on September 26, 2012 (1/21/16) 330-37
2	Transcript of Hearing on November 19, 2012 (1/21/16) 340-45
2	Transcript of Hearing on December 5, 2012 (1/20/16) 346-52
2	Transcript of Hearing on September 18, 2013 (1/20/16) 353-57
2	Transcript of Hearing on November 4, 2013 (1/20/16) 395-400
2	Transcript of Hearing on November 13, 2013 (1/20/16) 401-11
2	Transcript of Hearing on July 9, 2014 (11/30/15) 412-21
3	Transcript of Hearing on July 28, 2014 (1/20/16) 478-84
3	Transcript of Hearing on August 18, 2014 (09/04/14) 508-24
3	Transcript of Hearing on August 20, 2014 (09/03/14)
3	Transcript of Hearing on August 25, 2014 (09/01/14) 574-94
3	Transcript of Hearing on August 27, 2014 (1/19/16) 689-700

4	Transcript of Hearing on November 17, 2014 (1/20/16) 705-12
4	Transcript of Hearing on January 26, 2015 (1/15/16) 713-18
4	Transcript of Hearing on July 20, 2015 (1/15/16)
4	Transcript of Jury Trial on July 27, 2015 (01/10/16) 769-99
4	Transcript of Jury Trial on July 28, 2015 (01/10/16) 800-919
5	Transcript of Jury Trial on July 29, 2015 (02/01/16) 920-1116
6	Transcript of Jury Trial on August 3, 2015 (1/14/16) 1118-243
7	Transcript of Jury Trial on August 4, 2015 (1/14/16) 1244-395
8	Transcript of Jury Trial on August 5, 2015 (1/14/16) 1397-522
9	Transcript of Jury Trial on August 10, 2015 (1/19/16) 1569-728
10	Transcript of Jury Trial on August 11, 2015 (01/10/16) 1729-842
10	Transcript of Jury Trial on August 12, 2015 (01/10/16) 1879-90
10	Transcript of Hearing on September 30, 2015 (1/15/16) 1891-96
10	Transcript of Hearing on November 9, 2015 (1/15/16) 1897-901
10	Transcript of Hearing on November 18, 2015 (1/14/15) 1902-24
10	Trial Exhibits List (Unfiled)
10	Verdict (8/12/15)
8	Written Objections to State's Proposed Jury Instructions (8/10/15)

ORIGINAL

Electronically Filed 08/27/2014 02:41:53 PM

Alm b. Chum

ORDR
STEVEN B. WOLFSON
Clark County District Attorney
Nevada Bar #001565
JACQUELINE BLUTH
Chief Deputy District Attorney
Nevada Bar #010625
200 Lewis Avenue
Las Vegas, NV 89155-2212
(702) 671-2500

Attorney for Plaintiff

CLERK OF THE COURT

DISTRICT COURT

CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

THE STATE OF NEVADA,

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Plaintiff,

-VS-

LESEAN COLLINS, #0857181 CASE NO:

09C252804

DEPT NO:

XXV

Defendant.

ORDER DENYING DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO EXCLUDE OTHER EVIDENCE OF ARSON CHARGES AND ANY ALLEGATIONS RELATED THERETO AS BAD ACT EVIDENCE OR IRRELEVANT PRIOR CRIMINAL ACTIVITY

DATE OF HEARING: AUGUST 20, 2014 TIME OF HEARING: 9:00 A.M.

THIS MATTER having come on for hearing before the above entitled Court on the 20TH day of AUGUST, 2014, the Defendant being present, represented by DAVID SCHIECK, SPD, the Plaintiff being represented by STEVEN B. WOLFSON, District Attorney, through JACQUELINE BLUTH, Chief Deputy District Attorney, and the Court having heard the arguments of counsel and good cause appearing therefor,

25 | //

26 | //

27 | //

28 | //

W:\2008F\N24\67\08FN2467-ORDR-(COLLINS_LESEAN_8_20_2014)-001.DOCX

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO EXCLUDE OTHER EVIDENCE OF ARSON CHARGES AND ANY ALLEGATIONS RELATED THERETO AS BAD ACT EVIDENCE OR IRRELEVANT PRIOR CRIMINAL ACTIVITY, shall be, and is, DENIED as limited evidence and facts of the Defendant's previous arson case will come in under NRS 41.05 to show plan and consciousness of guilt.

DATED this day of August, 2014.

STEVEN B. WOLFSON Clark County District Attorney Nevada Bar #001565

BY

Chief Deputy District Attorney

Nevada Bar #010625

hjc/SVU

Electronically Filed 09/11/2014 01:57:42 PM

1 **ORDR CLERK OF THE COURT** STEVEN B. WOLFSON 2 Clark County District Attorney Nevada Bar #001565 3 JACQUELINE BLUTH Chief Deputy District Attorney Nevada Bar #010625 4 200 Lewis Avenue Las Vegas, NV 89155-2212 (702) 671-2500 5 6 Attorney for Plaintiff 7 DISTRICT COURT 8 CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA 9 10 THE STATE OF NEVADA, 11 Plaintiff. 12 CASE NO: 09C252804 -VS-13 XXV DEPT NO: LESEAN COLLINS, #0857181 14 15 Defendant. 16 ORDER DENYING DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO DISQUALIFY 17 THE CLARK COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S OFFICE 18 DATE OF HEARING: AUGUST 18, 2014 TIME OF HEARING: 9:00 A.M. 19 THIS MATTER having come on for hearing before the above entitled Court on the 20 18th day of August, 2014; the Defendant being present, represented by MICHAEL HYTE, 21 SPD, and DAVID M. SCHIECK, SPD; the Plaintiff being represented by STEVEN B. 22 WOLFSON, District Attorney, through JACQUELINE BLUTH, Chief Deputy District 23 Attorney, and the Court having heard the arguments of counsel and good cause appearing 24 therefor, 25 // 26

 $/\!/$

//

27

28

W:\2008F\N24\67\08FN2467-ORDR-(COLLINS_LESEAN_9_2_2014)-001.DOCX

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Defendant's Motion to Disqualify the Clark County District Attorney's Office, shall be, and is, DENIED, conditional to State's filing affidavits by JACQUELINE BLUTH, Chief Deputy District Attorney, LISA LUZAICH, Chief Deputy District Attorney, TERRA JONES, Deputy District Attorney and ABIGAIL FRIERSON, Deputy District Attorney.

DATED this 10 day of September, 2014.

STEVEN B. WOLFSON Clark County District Attorney Nevada Bar #001565

BY

Chief Deputy District Attorney Nevada Bar #010625

hjc/SVU

Electronically Filed

	01/20/2016 10:46:46 AM	Λ
1	DISTRICT COURT CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA	
2	CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA CLERK OF THE COURT	-
3	CLERK OF THE COURT	
4		
5		
6	THE STATE OF NEVADA,)	
7) Case No. 09C252804 Plaintiff,)	
8) Dept. No. XXV vs.	
9	LESEAN TARUS COLLINS,)	
10) Defendant.)	
11))	
12		
13		
14		
15	BEFORE THE HONORABLE KATHLEEN DELANEY	
16	NOVEMBER 17, 2014, 9:00 A.M.	
17	REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF	
18	STATUS CHECK: RESET TRIAL	
19		
20	APPEARANCES:	
21		
	(See separate page)	
22		
23		
24		
25	REPORTED BY: BRENDA SCHROEDER, CCR NO. 867	
	1	

1	APPEARANCES:
2	For the Plaintiff:
3	JACQUELINE BLUTH, ESQ. Chief Deputy District Attorney
4	200 Lewis Avenue Las Vegas, Nevada 89155
5	LISA LUZAICH, ESQ.
6	Chief Deputy District Attorney 200 Lewis Avenue
7	Las Vegas, Nevada 89155
8	For the Defendant:
9	
10	DAVID M. SCHIECK, ESQ. Deputy Special Public Defender 330 S. Third Street, Suite 800
11	Las Vegas, Nevada 89155
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

LAS VEGAS, CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA 1 MONDAY, NOVEMBER 17, 2014, 9:00 A.M. 2 PROCEEDINGS 3 4 5 THE COURT: State of Nevada versus Lesean 6 Collins. We don't have Mr. Collins here today. 7 Court set this on calendar to reset the trial date in light of the rulings from the supreme court. 8 9 MR. SCHIECK: Correct, Your Honor. We actually 10 filed a petition for rehearing on Friday. We have no 11 objection while that's pending if the Court wants to set a trial date now so that if the supreme court denies the 12 13 hearing we don't have to come back to reset the trial 14 date. 15 MS. LUZAICH: That's what we would like to do. 16 THE COURT: We can do that too. There is a 17 couple of other things out there as well and we did not 18 get Mr. Collins here today, but he has filed two pro se 19 motions; one to withdraw counsel and one to dismiss 20 counsel. They are essentially the same. 21 MS. LUZAICH: Oh, I have not seen them. 22 the Court what us to respond in writing? 23 MR. SCHIECK: Are those recent? 24 THE COURT: No. These were filed back in

You might remember the calendar call before the

25

August.

writ was filed he was talking about wanting to represent himself and there was some discussion about that and he indicated at the time that he would have to file a motion.

And then shortly after that, I would say within a few days, he did file those two motions. They've just been sitting there because when it went up to the supreme court they just sat there.

So we probably will need to move on them at some point, but I don't know if there have been any communication, Mr. Schieck, that would lead you to believe that he might not still be trying to file those motions and pursue those motions.

MR. SCHIECK: I have seen him numerous times since those motions were filed, even as late as last Tuesday, Your Honor, so I do not think that those will be an issue.

If we could set this for a status check in 30 days and if the Court desires, bring him in.

THE COURT: Why don't we to this. Why don't we get our trial date, if we can, with the folks that are here and we will just put in the minutes and we'll make sure that a copy gets provided, or you will make sure that a copy gets provided to Mr. Collins, and that if he still wants to pursue those motions he will need to

re-file them, okay? 1 MR. SCHIECK: Yes, Your Honor. 2 THE COURT: And we will go ahead -- and I think 3 obviously because we have a jury questionnaire in this 5 situation that we need to set a firm setting so that we know what we're dealing with. 6 7 Have you guys talked about when you might want 8 to go? 9 MR. SCHIECK: We talked about July, Your Honor, however, Your Honor does have a case in July that might 10 affect our ability to go in this department in July. 11 THE COURT: I think it would definitely do that. 12 13 MR. SCHIECK: I think all parties are pretty 14 well full in April, which is your next stack. I think 15 July is the most viable option. THE COURT: Well, we have two capital cases 16 17 going in the April/May stack alone, so it's not looking good. We are looking at maybe the following stack then. 18 19 Does anybody have any heartburn over that in the 20 circumstances? MS. LUZAICH: We had not looked at September 21 22 because we could all do July of 2013. 23 THE COURT: I know for a fact we will be in that 24 trial. We booked that trial at the very beginning of

July and it could go two to three weeks depending on the

1 circumstances. We just kind of assumed we were going to use up the bulk of July. We could put you toward the 2 end. 3 MS. LUZAICH: That's fine. 4 5 THE COURT: What is the end of the stack? THE CLERK: July 27th is the last week of that 6 7 stack. THE COURT: We potentially need two weeks for the trial, and I don't like to do this typically but 9 August is usually kind of thin in terms of going forward 10 11 with a civil trial. 12 What we will do is give you the last week of 13 July just to be sure it doesn't cross over into my civil trial and then the first week of our civil stack. 14 15 THE CLERK: So your calendar call will be 16 July 20th at 9:30, with a trial date of July 27th at 17 10:30. THE COURT: And that will be firm. 18 19 MS. LUZAICH: And then we will put it on 20 calendar earlier for jury questionnaires to get together 21 and get them out. 22 THE COURT: Yes, we definitely want to do that. 23 We probably should have a status check anyway somewhere

in there. We don't need to come back too soon. Any

preference with that date?

24

MR. SCHIECK: Let's do late January. THE COURT: That sounds good. January 26th at 9:00. THE CLERK: MS. LUZAICH: Thank you. THE COURT: Thank you all. (Proceedings were concluded.)

1	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE
2	
3	STATE OF NEVADA)
4	COUNTY OF CLARK)
5	
6	I, BRENDA SCHROEDER, a certified court reporter
7	in and for the State of Nevada, do hereby certify that
8	the foregoing and attached pages 1-8, inclusive, comprise
9	a true, and accurate transcript of the proceedings
10	reported by me in the matter of THE STATE OF NEVADA,
11	Plaintiff, versus LESEAN TARUS COLLINS, Defendant, Case
12	No. C252804, on November 17, 2014.
13	
14	
15	
16	Dated this 19th day of January, 2016.
17	
18	/s/ Brenda Schroeder BRENDA SCHROEDER, CCR NO. 867
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	TRAN 01/15/2016 10:21:27 AM
2	CASE NO. 09-C-252804 DEPT. NO. 25
3	CLERK OF THE COURT
4	
5	DISTRICT COURT
6	CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA
7	* * * *
8	
9	THE STATE OF NEVADA,)
0	Plaintiff,) REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT) OF
1) STATUS CHECK vs.
2	LESEAN COLLINS,)
3) Defendant.)
5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4	BEFORE THE HONORABLE DAVID BARKER DISTRICT COURT JUDGE DATED: MONDAY, JANUARY 26, 2015
5	REPORTED BY: Sharon Howard, C.C.R. #745

	·				
1	APPEAR	ANCES:			
2	For the	e State:		JACQUELINE BLUTH, ESQ	·
3				ELISSA LUZAICH, ESQ.	
4					
5					
6					
7	For the	e Defendant:		DAVID SCHIECK, ESQ.	
8				MICHAEL HYTE, ESQ.	
9					
10					
11			* * * * *		
12		,			
13					
14			,		
15					
16					
17					
18					
19					
20					
21					
22					
23					
24					
25					

1 LAS VEGAS, NEVADA; MONDAY, JANUARY 26, 2015 2 PROCEEDINGS 3 5 THE COURT: Page 1, State of Nevada vs. Lesean 6 Collins, C-252804. Mr. Collins is present in custody with 7 counsel from the special PD's office. 8 State your appearances. 9 MR. HYTE: Michael Hyte, bar No. 10088. MS. LUZAICH: Elissa Luzaich and Jacqueline 10 11 Bluth for the State. 12 MS. BLUTH: Good morning. 13 THE COURT: This is time set for status 14 check/juror questionnaire. Trial dates pending -- trial 15 date set July 27th. 16 Frankly I just stepped into this. I gave the minutes 17 a quick review I received through court staff. I believe 18 questionnaire --19 MR. HYTE: I believe the questionnaire we did 20 the eve of trial, just let the court know, we were right 21 at the threshold of trial. We had the jury questionnaire 22 done. We filed a writ in our office and the Supreme Court 23 granted our stay of a trial. So we prosecuted that writ. 24 It was denied. We filed for rehearing. It was denied. 25 We've elected not to file for petition for on bond.

1 I thought today's purpose was to advise the court as 2 far as we were concerned our prosecution writ is --3 THE COURT: Interlocutory efforts failed. 4 Moving forward for date set. Do I need to make any 5 decisions or does Judge Delaney, more particularly, need to make decisions or involve herself in the questionnaire 6 7 at all. 8 MR. HYTE: Not to my knowledge. 9 MS. LUZAICH: They were done. The jury questionnaires were done. We can use the same one. 10 11 THE COURT: We, the court, had the questionnaire 12 that's been agreed to by the parties and it's going to be 13 handled through court staff to get that questionnaire to 14 jury commissioner so they can move forward as they have 15 to. 16 MS. LUZAICH: Correct. 17 THE COURT: The status check is off calendar. 18 Questions are answered. Mr. Collins, do you have any 19 questions. Do you understand. 20 THE DEFENDANT: I'll talk to my attorney. 21 THE COURT: All right. 22 Next date set is July 20th for calendar call, with 23 July 27th jury trial date. Unless there is anything else, 24 we'll move to the next case.

MS. LUZAICH: Thank you.

1	MR.	HYTE:	Thank you.	
2				
3				
4				
5				
6			* * * *	
7				
8				
9				
10				
11				
12				
13				
14				
15				
16				
17				
18 19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				

CERTIFICATE OF CERTIFIED COURT REPORTER I, the undersigned certified court reporter in and for the State of Nevada, do hereby certify: That the foregoing proceedings were taken before me at the time and place therein set forth; that the testimony and all objections made at the time of the proceedings were recorded stenographically by me and were thereafter transcribed under my direction; that the foregoing is a true record of the testimony and of all objections made at the time of the proceedings. Sharon Howard C.C.R. #745 2.5

Electronically Filed 07/02/2015 10:59:20 AM

1 2 3 4 5 6	NWEW STEVEN B. WOLFSON Clark County District Attorney Nevada Bar #001565 JACQUELINE BLUTH Chief Deputy District Attorney Nevada Bar #010625 200 Lewis Avenue Las Vegas, Nevada 89155-2212 (702) 671-2500 Attorney for Plaintiff	CLERK OF THE COURT		
7	DISTRICT COURT CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA			
8				
9	THE STATE OF NEVADA,			
10	Plaintiff,	CASE NO: 09C252804		
11	-VS-			
12	LESEAN TARUS COLLINS, #0857181	DEPT NO: XXV		
13 14	Defendant.			
15	FIFTH SUPPLEMENTAL	L NOTICE OF WITNESSES		
16				
17	AND/OR EXPERT WITNESSES [NRS 174.234(2)]			
18	TO: LESEAN TARUS COLLINS, I	Defendant; and		
19	TO: DAVID SCHIECK and MICH.	AEL HYTE,		
20	Special Public Defenders, Cour			
21	YOU, AND EACH OF YOU, WILL PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that the STATE OF			
22	NEVADA intends to call the following expert witnesses in its case in chief:			
23	*indicates additional witness(es) and/or modification(s)			
24	ADAMS; LVMPD#10072			
25	ALBY; LVMPD#01810			
26	BEASLEY, DONITA; 2901 FERRET FALL AVE, NLV 89030			
27	BORLA, FELICIA; CLARK COUNTY CORONER'S OFFICE			
28	//			
		W/\2008F\N24\67\08F\\2467-NWEW-(COLLINS LESEAN)-001.DOCX		

CABRALES, ALLEN; LVMPD#02045; Will testify as an expert as to the nature, process and limitations of crime scene investigation, and/or as to the crime scene investigation in the instant case.

CHAVEZ; NLVPD#1660

COR or Designee; AVIS CAR RENTAL

COR or Designee; CCDC

COR or Designee; LVMPD COMMUNICATIONS

COR or Designee; LVMPD RECORDS

COR or Designee; NLVFD

COR or Designee; NLVPD COMMUNICATIONS

COR or Designee; NLVPD DETENTION CENTER

COR or Designee; NLVPD RECORDS

*CUSTODIAN OF RECORDS, SPRINT/NEXTEL, Will testify as an expert in the area of cellular phones and cellular system technology, including cell tower generation of calls and ability to determine the location where generated based upon historical records of cellular phones as well as the creation, functioning, data collection and information received and collected by cellular provider sites, its analysis and conclusions which can be drawn therefrom and is expected to testify thereto.

DAVISON, DONALD; 5965 S BRONCO ST, LVN 89118

EDDINS, SHALANA; 176 JUDY CT #B, HND 89015

EDDINS, ROBERT; c/o CCDA-SVU

FRIED, JONATHAN; LVMPD#08174; Will testify as an expert as to the nature, process and limitations of crime scene investigation, and/or as to the crime scene investigation in the instant case.

FURLOW, VIVIAN; c/o CCDA-SVU

GAUTHIER, KELLIE; LVMPD#08691; Will testify as an expert as to the nature, process and limitations of DNA collection, analysis and identification, and/or as to the collection, analysis and identification of DNA evidence in the instant case.

1	GRANDE, BEN; 4073 ARROWWOOD DR, LVN 89147				
2	HARDY; LVMPD#03031				
3	HENSON; LVMPD#03918				
4	HICKS; LVMPD#06069				
5	HICKS, RUFUS; 5855 VALLEY DR #2160, NLV 89031				
6	HOLSTEIN, DANIEL; LVMPD#03861; Will testify as an expert as to the nature,				
7	process and limitations of crime scene investigation, and/or as to the crime scene				
8	investigation in the instant case.				
9	HORN, DAVID; LVMPD#01928; Will testify as an expert as to the nature, process				
10	and limitations of crime scene investigation, and/or as to the crime scene investigation in				
11	the instant case.				
12	JEFFREY, ERIKA; 2701 N BUCHANAN BLVD #1016, LVN 89108				
13	KELSON, JOANNE; 7300 RED CINDER ST, LVN 89131				
14	KELSON, MICHAEL; 2814 CENTRAL AVE, ALAMEDA, CA 94501				
15	KOBRYS; LVMPD#04983				
16	LOMPREY, JEFF; NLV FIRE AND RESCUE; Will testify as an expert as to the				
17	nature, process and limitations of fire investigations, and/or as to the fire investigation in				
18	the instant case.				
19	LOPEZ, MARIA; HUNTINGTON BEACH POLICE DEPARTMENT; Will testify				
20	as an expert as to the nature, process and limitations of crime scene investigation, and/or as				
21	to the crime scene investigation in the instant case.				
22	MADRIGAL, PEDRO; 1913 ALWILL ST #D, LVN 89106				
23	MOGG, CLIFFORD; LVMPD#05096				
24	MONTGOMERY; NLVPD#1800				
25	MORGENSTERN; LVMPD#04665				
26	NARVAEZ; NLVPD#2001				
27	PAYTON, GLORIA; 333 ORCHID OASIS AVE, NLV 89031				
28	PAYTON, TAMMY; 2554 OLIVE DR #124, PALMDALE, CA 93550				

- 11	
1	The substance of each expert witness' testimony and a copy of all reports made by or
2	at the direction of the expert witness has been provided in discovery.
3	A copy of each expert witness' curriculum vitae, if available, is attached hereto.
4	STEVEN B. WOLFSON Clark County District Attorney
5	Clark County District Attorney Nevada Bar #001565
6	BY DITT
7	JACQUELINE BLUTH Chief Deputy District Attorney Nevada Bar #010625
8	Nevada Bar #010625
9	
10	CERTIFICATE OF ELECTRONIC MAIL
11	I hereby certify that service of State's Fifth Supplemental Notice of Witnesses and/or
12	Expert Witnesses, was made this 2 nd day of July, 2015, by e-mail to:
13	DAVID SCHIECK, Deputy Special Public Defender
14	E-Mail: dschieck@clarkcountynv.gov
15	MICHAEL HYTE,
16	Deputy Special Public Defender E-Mail: mhyte@clarkcountynv.gov
17	TA CHARLETT CED ALD
18	KATHLEEN FITZGERALD, Legal Executive Assistant E-Mail: kfitzger@clarkcountynv.gov
19	E-Mail: <u>kitizger@clarkcountyffv.go-</u>
20	BY: Gladvertso
21	J. Robertson Secretary of the District Attorney's Office
22	4
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	TO A CONTRACT OF THE CONTRACT
28	S UOI INZTUIZAJIIIA TO

Electronically Filed 07/15/2015 02:48:56 PM

NWEW 1 STEVEN B. WOLFSON **CLERK OF THE COURT** Clark County District Attorney 2 Nevada Bar #001565 JACQUELINE BLUTH 3 Chief Deputy District Attorney Nevada Bar #010625 4 200 Lewis Avenue Las Vegas, Nevada 89155-2212 5 (702) 671-2500 Attorney for Plaintiff 6 7 DISTRICT COURT CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA 8 THE STATE OF NEVADA, 9 Plaintiff. 10 09C252804 CASE NO: 11 -VS-LESEAN TARUS COLLINS, XXV **DEPT NO:** 12 #0857181 13 Defendant. 14 SIXTH SUPPLEMENTAL NOTICE OF WITNESSES 15 AND/OR EXPERT WITNESSES **INRS 174.234**] 16 17 LESEAN TARUS COLLINS, Defendant; and TO: 18 DAVID SCHIECK AND MICHAEL HYTE, TO: Special Public Defenders, Counsel of Record: 19 YOU, AND EACH OF YOU, WILL PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that the STATE OF 20 NEVADA intends to call the following witnesses and/or expert witnesses in its case in chief: 21 *indicates additional witness(es) and/or modification(s) 22 ADAMS; LVMPD#10072 23 ALBY; LVMPD#01810 24 BEASLEY, DONITA; 2901 FERRET FALL AVE, NLV 89030 25 BORLA, FELICIA; CLARK COUNTY CORONER'S OFFICE 26 // 27 28

11)	ı
1	MORGENSTERN; LVMPD#04665	
2	NARVAEZ; NLVPD#2001	
3	PAYTON, GLORIA; 333 ORCHID OASIS AVE, NLV 89031	
4	PAYTON, TAMMY; 2554 OLIVE DR #124, PALMDALE, CA 93550	
5	PENDLETON; LVMPD#03289	
6	PERKINS, MICHAEL; LVMPD#04242	
7	PRATT, WANNETTE; 515 N LAMB BLVD #5, LVN 89110	
8	PROIETTO, DANIEL; LVMPD#08180; Will testify as an expert as to the nature,	
9	process and limitations of crime scene investigation, and/or as to the crime scene investigation	
10	in the instant case.	
11	SCOTT; LVMPD#04532	
12	SIMMS, DR. LARY; CLARK COUNTY CORONER'S OFFICE; Will testify as an	
13	expert as to the nature, process and limitations of post-motem examinations, and/or as to post-	
14	mortem examination of the victim in the instant case.	
15	SPOOR, MONTE; LVMPD#03856; Will testify as an expert as to the nature, process	
16	and limitations of crime scene investigation, and/or as to the crime scene investigation in the	
17	instant case.	
18	STANCIL; NLVPD#2149	
19	TURNER, JASON; CUSTODIAN OF RECORDS, AVIS	
20	WHEELER; NLVPD#2144	
21	WILLIAMS; LVMPD#05456	
22	WILLIAMS, THERESA; 5330 E CHARLESTON BLVD #78, LVN 89142	
23		
24	These witnesses are in addition to those witnesses endorsed on the Information o	r
25	Indictment and any other witness for which a separate Notice of Witnesses and/or Exper	Ţ
26	Witnesses has been filed.	
27	//	
28	//	

1	The substance of each expert witness' testimony and copy of all reports made by or at
2	the direction of the expert witness has been provided in discovery.
3	A copy of each expert witness' curriculum vitae, if available, is attached hereto.
4	
5	STEVEN B. WOLFSON
6	Clark County District Attorney Nevada Bar #001565
7	\sim
8	BY AND THE
9	JACQUELINE BLUTH Chief Deputy District Attorney Nevada Bar #010625
10	Nevada Bar #010025
11	CERTIFICATE OF ELECTRONIC MAIL
12	I hereby certify that service of State's Sixth Supplemental Notice of Witnesses and/or
13	Expert Witnesses, was made this 15th day of July, 2015, by e-mail to:
14	DAVID SCHIECK, Deputy Special Public Defender
15	E-Mail: dschieck@clarkcountynv.gov
16	MICHAEL HYTE,
17	Deputy Special Public Defender E-Mail: mhyte@clarkcountynv.gov
18	
19	KATHLEEN FITZGERALD, Legal Executive Assistant
20	E-Mail: kfitzger@clarkcountynv.gov
21	BY: A. Collectson
22	1 Robertson Secretary of the District Attorney's Office
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	08FN2467X/jr/MVU

NWEW 1 DAVID M. SCHIECK **CLERK OF THE COURT** SPECIAL PUBLIC DEFENDER 2 State Bar No. 0824 MICHAEL W. HYTE 3 Deputy Special Public Defender 4 State Bar No. 10088 330 South Third Street, 8th Floor 5 Las Vegas, NV 89155 Tel: (702) 455-6265 Fax: (702) 455-6273 6 dschieck@clarkcountynv.gov mhyte@clarkcountynv.gov 8 Attorneys for Collins DISTRICT COURT 9 **CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA** 10 CASE NO. 09C252804-1 STATE OF NEVADA, 11 DEPT. NO. 25 Plaintiff, 12 13 vs. LESEAN COLLINS, #0857181, 14 15 Defendant. 16 NOTICE OF DEFENDANT'S SUPPLEMENTAL WITNESSES 17 DATE: N/A 18 TIME: N/A 19 THE STATE OF NEVADA, Plaintiff, and TO: STEVEN WOLFSON, District Attorney, Attorney for Plaintiff 20 TO: YOU, AND EACH OF YOU, WILL PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that Defendant, LeSean 21 Collins, by and through his attorneys, DAVID M. SCHIECK, Special Public Defender, and 22 MICHAEL W. HYTE, Deputy Special Public Defender, intends to call the following witnesses in 23 addition to those already provided in the previous Notice of Witnesses: 24 25 Donita Beasley aka Donita Starks 2221 W Bonanza Rd # 83 26 LVN 27 Curtis McKinzie 100 S. Martin Luther King 28 LVN

1 2	Tricia Brewer 840 N. Clearview Ave. Odessa TX 76763	
3	Manual Vital NLVPD	
4		
5	Carolyn White NLVPD	
6 7	Ryan McDonald, Deputy District Attorney 200 Lewis Ave. Las Vegas NV	
8	Rufus Hicks Unknown Address	
9	Wannette Pratt	
10	Unknown Address	
11	Melvin Earley Unkown Address	
12 13	In addition, the defense reserves the right to call any and all witnesses noticed by the State of	of
	Nevada including but not limited to those in the Information/Indictment and any amended	
14 15	Information/Indictment.	
	Dated: July 16, 2015.	
16	RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED	
17 18	DAVID M. SCHIECK SPECIAL PUBLIC DEFENDER	
19	/s/ MICHAEL W. HYTE	
20		
21	DAVID SCHIECK	
22	MICHAEL W. HYTE Attorneys for Collins	
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTRONIC FILING

I hereby certify that service of the above and foregoing, was made on July 16, 2015, by Electronic Filing to: DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S OFFICE by email: motions@clarkcountyda.com

/s/ Kathleen Fitzgerald

Legal Executive Assistant for Special Public Defender

Electronically Filed 07/17/2015 09:59:50 AM

NWEW 1 STEVEN B. WOLFSON **CLERK OF THE COURT** 2 Clark County District Attorney Nevada Bar #001565 JACQUELINE BLUTH 3 Chief Deputy District Attorney Nevada Bar #010625 4 200 Lewis Avenue Las Vegas, Nevada 89155-2212 5 (702) 671-2500 Attorney for Plaintiff 6 7 DISTRICT COURT CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA 8 9 THE STATE OF NEVADA, Plaintiff, 10 09C252804 CASE NO: 11 -VS-LESEAN TARUS COLLINS, XXV **DEPT NO:** 12 #0857181 13 Defendant. 14 SEVENTH NOTICE OF WITNESSES AND/OR EXPERT WITNESSES 15 [NRS 174.234] 16 LESEAN TARUS COLLINS, Defendant; and 17 TO: DAVID SCHIECK AND MICHAEL HYTE, TO: 18 Special Public Defenders; Counsel of Record: 19 YOU, AND EACH OF YOU, WILL PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that the STATE OF 20 NEVADA intends to call the following witnesses and/or expert witnesses in its case in chief: 21 **indicates additional witness(s) and/or modification(s) 22 ADAMS; LVMPD#10072 23 ALBY; LVMPD#01810 24 BEASLEY, DONITA; 2901 FERRET FALL AVE, NLV 89030 25 BORLA, FELICIA; CLARK COUNTY CORONER'S OFFICE 26 27 // // 28

1	**MOLNAR, DAVID L., Supervisory Criminal Investigator, Office of the Inspector
2	General, 3955 W. Russell Road, Las Vegas, Nevada 899118
3	MONTGOMERY; NLVPD#1800
4	MORGENSTERN; LVMPD#04665
5	NARVAEZ; NLVPD#2001
6	PAYTON, GLORIA; 333 ORCHID OASIS AVE, NLV 89031
7	PAYTON, TAMMY; 2554 OLIVE DR #124, PALMDALE, CA 93550
8	PENDLETON; LVMPD#03289
9	PERKINS, MICHAEL; LVMPD#04242
10	PRATT, WANNETTE; 515 N LAMB BLVD #5, LVN 89110
11	PROIETTO, DANIEL; LVMPD#08180; Will testify as an expert as to the nature
12	process and limitations of crime scene investigation, and/or as to the crime scene investigation
13	in the instant case.
14	SCOTT; LVMPD#04532
15	SIMMS, DR. LARY; CLARK COUNTY CORONER'S OFFICE; Will testify as an
16	expert as to the nature, process and limitations of post-motem examinations, and/or as to post-
17	mortem examination of the victim in the instant case.
18	SPOOR, MONTE; LVMPD#03856; Will testify as an expert as to the nature, process
19	and limitations of crime scene investigation, and/or as to the crime scene investigation in the
20	instant case.
21	STANCIL; NLVPD#2149
22	TURNER, JASON; CUSTODIAN OF RECORDS, AVIS
23	WHEELER; NLVPD#2144
24	WILLIAMS; LVMPD#05456
25	WILLIAMS, THERESA; 5330 E CHARLESTON BLVD #78, LVN 89142
26	
27	

1	These witnesses are in addition to those witnesses endorsed on the Information or
2	Indictment and any other witness for which a separate Notice of Witnesses and/or Expert
3	Witnesses has been filed.
4	The substance of each expert witness' testimony and copy of all reports made by or at
5	the direction of the expert witness has been provided in discovery.
6	A copy of each expert witness' curriculum vitae, if available, is attached hereto.
7	
8	STEVEN B. WOLFSON Clark County District Attorney
9	Nevada Bar #001565
10	11 + Dada Da
11	BY M. FLECK TOR
12	Chief Deputy District Attorney Nevada Bar #010625
13	14CVada Dar 11010001
14	
15	CERTIFICATE OF ELECTRONIC MAIL
16	I hereby certify that service of State's Seventh Supplemental Notice of Witnesses
17	and/or Expert Witnesses, was made this 15th day of July, 2015, by e-mail to:
18	DAVID SCHIECK, Deputy Special Public Defender
19	E-Mail: dschieck@clarkcountynv.gov
20	MICHAEL HYTE,
21	Deputy Special Public Defender E-Mail: mhyte@clarkcountynv.gov
22	
23	KATHLEEN FITZGERALD, Legal Executive Assistant E-Mail: <u>kfitzger@clarkcountynv.gov</u>
24	E-Mail: kfitzger@clarkcountynv.gov
25	BY: Qallerton
26	A Robertson Secretary of the District Attorney's Office
27	Devicing of the 2-state of
28	08FN2467X/jr/MVU

Electronically Filed 07/17/2015 01:27:40 PM

_		1. 10
1	MOT STEVEN B. WOLFSON	Alun & Chum
2	Clark County District Attorney Nevada Bar #001565	CLERK OF THE COURT
3	JACOUELINE BLUTH	
4	Chief Deputy District Attorney Nevada Bar #010625	•
5	200 Lewis Avenue Las Vegas, Nevada 89155-2212	
6	(702) 671-2500 Attorney for Plaintiff	
7	70 Y COTTO Y C	OT COLUT
8		CT COURT NTY, NEVADA
9	THE STATE OF NEVADA,	
10	Plaintiff,	
11	-VS-	CASE NO: 09C252804
12	LEASEANN TARUS COLLINS,	DEPT NO: XXV DEPARTMENT XXV
13	#0857181	NOȚICĘ OF HEARING
14	Defendant.	DATE 7/22/15 TIME 91.0000, APPROVED BY &
15	NOTICE OF MOTION A	AND MOTION IN LIMINE
16	DATE OF HEAR	NG: HULY 27, 2015 RING: 10:30 A.M. 9',00am
17	TIME OF HEA	RING: FO:30 A.M. Typoday
18	COMES NOW, the State of Nevada	a, by STEVEN B. WOLFSON, Clark County
19	District Attorney, through JACQUELINE BI	LUTH, Chief Deputy District Attorney, and files
20	this Notice Of Motion And Motion In Limine	è.
21	This Motion is made and based upon	all the papers and pleadings on file herein, the
22	attached points and authorities in support her	reof, and oral argument at the time of hearing, if
23	deemed necessary by this Honorable Court.	
24	//	
25	//	
26	//	
27	//	JUL 1 7-2015
28	//	

w:\2008F\N24\67\08FN2467-NOTM-(Collins_Leseann)-001.docx 0737

NOTICE OF HEARING

will bring the foregoing motion on for setting before the above entitled Court, in Department XXV thereof, on Monday, the 27th day of July, 2015, at the hour of 10:30 o'clock A.M., or as soon thereafter as counsel may be heard.

DATED this 17th day of July, 2015.

STEVEN B. WOLFSON Clark County District Attorney Nevada Bar #001565

JACQUELINE BLUTH
Chief Deputy District Attorney
Nevada Bar #010625

The State asks this Court to limit the testimony of designated Defense expert, John Paglini, Psy.D. As currently noticed it appears as though Dr. Paglini, "will testify as to the state of mind of the Defendant at the time of the offense." While an expert may review and rely upon otherwise inadmissible evidence, they certainly are not entitled to rely on or opine over any unsworn statement given to them by a Defendant. The State is unclear as to whether or not Dr. Paglini has spoken with the Defendant, however, it's difficult for the State to see how Dr. Paglini would have any knowledge of Defendant's state of mind at the time of crime without doing so. That being said, unless the Defendant takes the stand and discusses his mental state at the time of the crime, Dr. Paglini will have no vehicle in which to provide testimony on the topic.

OPINIONS AND DEFENDANT'S STATEMENTS ARE INADMISSIBLE

A defendant cannot call an expert to testify to their thoughts in an effort to avoid taking the witness stand themselves thereby avoiding cross-examination. See Walker v. State, 113 Nev. 853, 944 P.2d 762 (1997), cert. denied, 525 U.S. 950, 119 S. Ct. 377 (1998). In Walker v. State, 113 Nev. 853, 944 P.2d 762 (1997), cert. denied, 525 U.S. 950, 119 S. Ct. 377 (1998), Walker attempted to admit the testimony of an internal medicine doctor detailing Walker's

11 12

13 14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23

24

25

26 27

28

history of abuse of drugs and alcohol and his level of intoxication at the time of the crime. Walker sought to admit the testimony to claim he lacked the mens rea for the crime of first Id. at 871, 944 P.2d at 774. The proposed testimony was hearsay. In degree murder. excluding the testimony, the trial court determined that the testimony did not fall under the medical diagnosis exception to the hearsay rule, id., 944 P.2d at 774, and therefore, the doctor could not testify as to what Walker told him about his state of intoxication at the time of the crime.

NRS 50.285(2) states that "[i]f of a type reasonably relied upon by experts in forming opinions or inferences upon the subject, the facts or data need not be admissible in evidence." In other words, the statute allows experts to rely on information which may not conform to the rules of evidence. The statute, however, does not allow for the rules of evidence to be suspended so that the expert may recount this inadmissible evidence in their testimony to the jury. The statute simply allows experts to review information which may not be admissible to form an opinion if such information is normally relied upon in their field. Nowhere in the statute is it said that an expert can recite this inadmissible evidence to a jury.

In fact, when referencing NRS 50.285(2), the Nevada Supreme Court has specifically recognized that while the statute allows experts to rely on inadmissible evidence to form an opinion, it does not allow for the admission of hearsay through an expert. In Estes v. State, 122 Nev. 1123, 146 P.3d 1114 (2007), the State presented the testimony of Dr. Elizabeth Neighbors. Dr. Neighbors was called to testify regarding whether Estes was competent. When Dr. Neighbors testified, she testified to the "collective opinion" of other doctors as well herself. The Nevada Supreme Court noted:

We conclude that Dr. Neighbor's testimony as to the opinions of other doctors was likely erroneous in that such testimony constituted inadmissible hearsay. NRS 50.285, however, allows experts to base their opinions on facts or data that are otherwise inadmissible, if such information is of a type reasonably relied upon by experts in that field. Thus, Dr. Neighbors' reasonable reliance upon the opinions of her colleagues in forming her own diagnosis was marginally appropriate.

 <u>Id.</u> at 1126. Significantly, the Court did not conclude that the testimony that Dr. Neighbors related regarding the opinions of other non-testifying doctors was somehow admissible via NRS 50.285. In fact the court noted that admission of such testimony violated the statute against hearsay. <u>Id.</u> n.51. The court merely said that it was "marginally" appropriate for Dr. Neighbors to rely on those other opinions in forming her own diagnosis.

In addition, NRS 50.295 does not allow for the admission of hearsay evidence or, significantly, for an expert to detail a version of facts offered by a witness or a defendant. NRS 50.295 states that "[t]estimony in the form of an opinion or inference otherwise admissible is not objectionable because it embraces an ultimate issue to be decided by the trier of fact." In other words, if deemed relevant, an expert may testify that a defendant or victim suffers from a certain psychological or mental condition. However, this latitude regarding expert opinion testimony does not allow experts to give a version of facts offered by a victim or defendant in lieu of the individual testifying. Such a holding would invade the fact-finding function of the jury and would essentially put inadmissible evidence which had not been subject to cross-examination before the jury.

For instance, in *Townsend v. State*, 103 Nev. 113, 734 P.2d 705 (1987), the State introduced the testimony of an expert who examined the child-victim of a sexual assault. The State presented expert testimony that the child had, in fact, been sexually assaulted and that Townsend was the perpetrator. In that non-expert, factual testimony was elicited from the expert along with the expert's diagnosis, the Nevada Supreme Court found error. It explained:

Here the expert not only opined that the child had been sexually assaulted, but proceeded to identify Townsend as the perpetrator. This was improper testimony as it transcended the test of jury enlightenment and entered the realm of fact-finding that was well within the capacity of the lay jury. . . it was improper to identify the victim's father as the specific source of the assault.

<u>Id</u>. at 118, 734 P.2d at 708. Thus, the Nevada Supreme Court precludes an expert from relaying factual information to a jury. Equally important, in *Townsend*, the victim testified and it was still error for the expert to relay information that related to fact-finding. A jury is to determine facts--whether certain events did or did not occur. That is not the province of an

//

//

expert. See also In re Assad, 185 P.3d 1044 (Nev. 2008) (expert testimony is not admissible simply because it helps the proponent's case; if the testimony is irrelevant or if it impermissibly encroaches on the trier of fact's province, then it is properly excluded); Lickey v. State, 108 Nev. 191, 196, 827 P.2d 824, 827(1992) (noting that an expert may not comment on the veracity of a witness because that would invade the prerogative of the jury).

The State has not yet determined whether or not Defendant's statement to law enforcement will be presented during trial. Further, it is unclear whether or not Defendant has made the decision to testify. Either one would be a pre-requisite for this information to potentially become admissible or relevant. "If [expert testimony] is irrelevant or if it impermissibly encroaches on the trier of fact's province, then it is properly excluded." In re Assad, 124 Nev. 391, 400, 185 P.3d 1044, 1050 (2008).

CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth above, the instant Motion should be granted. DATED this 17th day of July, 2015.

STEVEN B. WOLFSON Clark County District Attorney Nevada Bar #001565

JACQUELINE BLUTH

Chief Deputy District Attorney

Nevada Bar #010625

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTRONIC MAIL

I hereby certify that service of Notice of Motion and Motion In Limine was made this 17th day of July, 2015, by e-mail to:

DAVID SCHIECK, Special Public Defender E-MAIL: <u>dschieck@clarkcountynv.gov</u>

MICHAEL HYTE, Special Public Defender E-MAIL: mhyte@clarkcountynv.gov

KATHLEEN FITZGERALD, Legal Exec. Asst. E-MAIL: kfitzger@clarkcountynv.gov

BY:

Secretary for the District Attorney's Office

08FN2467X/JB/jr/MVU

Electronically Filed 07/20/2015 02:28:43 PM

1	ORDR		Alm X. Elman
2	STEVEN B. WOLFSON Clark County District Attorney		CLERK OF THE COURT
3	Nevada Bar #001565		
4	Chief Deputy District Attorney Nevada Bar #010625		
5	200 Lewis Avenue		
6	Las Vegas, Nevada 89155-2212 (702) 671-2500 Attorney for Plaintiff		
7	DISTRIC	T COURT	
8	CLARK COU	NTY, NEVADA	
9	THE STATE OF NEVADA,		
10	Plaintiff,	A . A	000000004
11	-VS-	CASE NO:	09C252804
12	LESEAN TARUS COLLINS, #0857181	DEPT NO:	XXV
13	Defendant.		
14	Doiondant.		
15	ORDER FOR PAYME		
16	Upon the ex parte application and repr		
17	Attorney, by and through his Chief Deputy		
18	compelled witness RUFUS HICKS is entit		
19	compelled appearance on the week of Aug	gust 3, 2015, in th	e case of THE STATE OF
20	NEVADA vs. LESEAN TARUS COLLINS,	Case Number 09C	252804.
21	//		
22	//		
23	// .		
24	//		
25	//		
26	//		
27	//		
28	//		

1	IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Comptroller of Clark County, State of Nevada, is
2	directed to make immediate payment to the said RUFUS HICKS for witness fees in the total
3	sum of \$25.00.
4	DATED this 17th day of July, 2015.
5	Xalleyleine
6	DISTRICT JUDGE
7	STEVEN B. WOLFSON
8	District Attorney Nevada Bar #001565
9	
10	BY JACOUELINE BLUTH
11	JACQUELINE BLUTH Chief Deputy District Attorney Nevada Bar #010625
12	Nevaua Dai #010025
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	

Electronically Filed 07/20/2015 02:23:39 PM

1 CRTF STEVEN B. WOLFSON **CLERK OF THE COURT** Clark County District Attorney 2 Nevada Bar #001565 JACOUELINE BLUTH 3 Chief Deputy District Attorney Nevada Bar #010625 4 200 Lewis Avenue Las Vegas, Nevada 89155-2212 5 (702) 671-2500 Attorney for Plaintiff 6 DISTRICT COURT 7 CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA 8 THE STATE OF NEVADA, 9 Plaintiff, 10 CASE NO: 09C252804 11 -VS-DEPT NO: XXV LESEAN TARUS COLLINS, 12 #0857181 13 Defendant. 14 CERTIFICATE FOR ATTENDANCE OF OUT-OF-STATE 15 WITNESS RUFUS HICKS 16 I, Kathleen Delaney, Judge of the Eighth Judicial District Court of the State of Nevada, 17 in and for the County of Clark, a Court of Record, do hereby certify: 18 That there is now pending in District Court the above entitled criminal 1. 19 prosecution by the State of Nevada against LESEAN TARUS COLLINS, Defendant, wherein 20 said Defendant stands accused and charged with having committed the following criminal 21 offense(s) against the laws of the State of Nevada, to wit: the crimes of MURDER (Felony -22 NRS 200.010, 200.030) and ROBBERY (Felony - NRS 200.380), in the following manner, to 23 24 wit: That LESEAN TARUS COLLINS, the Defendant above named, on or about September 25

2, 2008, at and 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

26

27

28

State of Nevada,

W:\2008F\N24\67\08FN2467-CAOW-(COLLINS_LESEAN)-001_DOCX

did then and there wilfully, unlawfully, feloniously, without authority of law, and with malice aforethought, kill BRANDI PAYTON, a human being, by asphyxiation and/or blunt force trauma and/or manner and means unknown; said killing having been: (1) willful, deliberate and premeditated; and/or (2) committed during the commission or attempted commission of a felony, to-wit: Robbery.

COUNT 2 - ROBBERY

did then and there wilfully, unlawfully, and feloniously take personal property, to-wit: a 2008 Hyundai bearing Nevada License No. 428UZS, cellular phone, jewelry, and/or a purse and contents, from the person of BRANDI PAYTON, 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 BRANDI PAYTON.

- 2. That the trial therein has been set by the Court to be held before the Eighth Judicial District Court of the State of Nevada, in and for the County of Clark, commencing on July 27, 2015, at the hour of 10:30 o'clock A.M. of said day.
- 3. That RUFUS HICKS, whose address is 150th E. 57th Street, Apartment No. 3, Long Beach, CA. 90805, is a necessary and material witness and a principal witness for the State of Nevada in such prosecution by reason of the following:

RUFUS HICKS is an essential witness because he was the boyfriend of the murder victim and he was the last person to have contact with her and see her alive.

- 4. That the presence of the said RUFUS HICKS personally in said District Court for the trial of the Defendant for the purpose of giving testimony therein upon the part of the State of Nevada on the week of August 3, 2015, at the hour of 10:30 o'clock A.M. of said day will be required for a period of one (1) day(s).
- 5. That if the said RUFUS HICKS as such witness comes into the State of Nevada in obedience to a Subpoena directing him to attend and to testify at said trial, the laws of the State of Nevada and of any other state through which said witness may be required to pass by the ordinary course of travel to attend said trial, give him protection from arrest or the

Electronically Filed 07/20/2015 02:26:15 PM

1 RAOW STEVEN B. WOLFSON **CLERK OF THE COURT** Clark County District Attorney 2 Nevada Bar #001565 JACQUELINE BLUTH 3 Chief Deputy District Attorney Nevada Bar #010625 4 200 Lewis Avenue Las Vegas, Nevada 89155-2212 5 (702) 671-2500 Attorney for Plaintiff 6 DISTRICT COURT 7 CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA 8 THE STATE OF NEVADA, 9 Plaintiff, 10 09C252804 CASE NO: 11 -VS-XXV DEPT NO: LESEAN TARUS COLLINS, 12 #0857181 13 Defendant. 14 REQUEST FOR ATTENDANCE OF OUT-OF-STATE 15 WITNESS RUFUS HICKS 16 The Honorable Judge of the above entitled Court: TO: 17 The undersigned, JACQUELINE BLUTH, Chief Deputy District Attorney of the 18 County of Clark, State of Nevada, hereby reports and certifies as follows: 19 That there is now pending in District Court the above entitled criminal 1. 20 prosecution by the State of Nevada against LESEAN TARUS COLLINS, Defendant, wherein 21 said Defendant stands accused and charged with having committed the following criminal 22 offenses against the laws of the State of Nevada, to wit: the crime(s) of MURDER (Felony -23 NRS 200.010, 200.030) and ROBBERY (Felony - NRS 200.380), in the following manner, to 24 25 wit: That LESEAN TARUS COLLINS, the Defendant above named, on or about September 26

2, 2008, at and within the County of Clark, State of Nevada, contrary to the form, force and

27

28

W:\2008F\N24\67\08FN2467-CAOW-(COLLINS_LESEAN)-001.DOCX

effect of statutes in such cases made and provided, and against the peace and dignity of the State of Nevada,

COUNT 1 - MURDER

did then and there wilfully, unlawfully, feloniously, without authority of law, and with malice aforethought, kill BRANDI PAYTON, a human being, by asphyxiation and/or blunt force trauma and/or manner and means unknown; said killing having been: (1) willful, deliberate and premeditated; and/or (2) committed during the commission or attempted commission of a felony, to-wit: Robbery.

COUNT 2 - ROBBERY

did then and there wilfully, unlawfully, and feloniously take personal property, to-wit: a 2008 Hyundai bearing Nevada License No. 428UZS, cellular phone, jewelry, and/or a purse and contents, from the person of BRANDI PAYTON, 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 BRANDI PAYTON.

- 2. That the trial therein has been set by the Court to be held before the Eighth Judicial District Court of the State of Nevada, in and for the County of Clark, commencing on July 27, 2015, at the hour of 10:30 o'clock A.M. of said day.
- 3. That RUFUS HICKS, whose address is 150th E. 57th Street, Apartment No. 3, Long Beach, CA. 90802, is a necessary and material witness and a principal witness for the State of Nevada in such prosecution by reason of the following:

RUFUS HICKS is an essential witness because he was the boyfriend of the murder victim and he was the last person to have contact with her and see her alive.

- 4. That the presence of the said RUFUS HICKS personally in said District Court for the trial of the Defendant for the purpose of giving testimony therein upon the part of the State of Nevada on the week of August 3, 2015, at the hour of 10:30 o'clock A.M. of said day will be required for a period of one (1) day(s).
- 5. That if the said RUFUS HICKS as such witness comes into the State of Nevada in obedience to a Summons directing him to attend and to testify at said trial, the laws

of the State of Nevada and of any other state through which said witness may be required to pass by the ordinary course of travel to attend said trial, give him protection from arrest or the service of process, civil or criminal, in connection with matters which arose before his entrance into said state pursuant to said Summons.

WHEREFORE, it is requested, for and on behalf of the State of Nevada, that your Honor certify to the above and foregoing by the issuance of a Certificate thereto under the seal of the Eighth Judicial District Court of the State of Nevada, in and for the County of Clark, for the purpose of being presented to a Judge of a Court of Record in the State of California in a proceeding to compel the attendance of the said RUFUS HICKS as a witness at said trial for the time and date above set forth, and pursuant to law.

day of July, 2015, in the City of Las Vegas, County of Clark, State of Nevada.

> STEVEN B. WOLFSON Clark County District Attorney Nevada Bar #001565

BY

Deputy District Attorney

Nevada Bar #010625

jr/MVU

AFIDAVIT

STATE OF NEVADA)
COUNTY OF CLARK) ss:)

JACQUELINE BLUTH, being first duly sworn deposes and says:

That she is employed in the Office of the Clark County District Attorney, State of Nevada and is engaged in the prosecution of criminal matters and has been so employed for the period of seven (7) years.

This matter has been set for jury trial, said hearing to commence at or about 9:00 a.m. on the 27th day of July, 2015 in said Court.

Your affiant will advise the Court that one Rufus Hicks, ID# 01998634, of Las Vegas, Clark County, Nevada, is in fact a material witness in the above-captioned matter.

Your affiant will further advise the Court on information and belief that said witness is avoiding testifying before the Eighth Judicial District Court in which he is a material and essential witness.

In June of 2015, Mr. Hicks was subpoenaed to testify in the trial currently commencing on July 27^{th} before this Court.

I have been the prosecuting attorney on this case since its inception in 2008. This matter has been set for trial multiple times over 7 years, I do not believe that service has ever been effectively made on Mr. Hicks.

When I learned that Mr. Hicks was not responding to service and that his family members would not discuss his whereabouts, I asked District Attorney Criminal Investigator, Ron Acuna to attempt to serve Mr. Hicks. His affidavit of his efforts are attached as "Exhibit 1".

The District Attorney's Office now has information that Mr. Hicks is living in Long Beach, California. Again, as aforementioned, he will not respond to any attempts to make contact with him and his family will not advise the State as to where he is.

THEREFORE, your affiant would respectfully pray that this Honorable Court under the authority of NRS 178.494 issue an Order directing that any police officer of this State shall forthwith take the said Rufus Hicks, ID# 01998634, into custody and forthwith convey to the jail of the County of Clark, State of Nevada, for incarceration to insure his presence before the Eighth Judicial District Court.

I declare	e under penalty of pe	rjury that the forego	oing is true and correct	
Executed on	1/	9	RING	
Executed on	Date		(Signature)	

FIDAVIT

1	AFFIDAVIT
2	STATE OF NEVADA) ss:
3	COUNTY OF CLARK)
4	RON ACUNA, being first duly sworn deposes and says:
5	That I am employed in the Office of the Clark Count
6	Nevada as an investigator assigned to the Major Violators Uni

1

2

3

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

e of the Clark County District Attorney, State of Major Violators Unit of the Clark County District Attorney's Office. I have been employed with Clark County since March of 2005.

Your affiant will further advise the Court on information and belief that said witness is avoiding testifying before the Eighth Judicial District Court in which he is a material and essential witness.

One of my duties is to locate and serve criminal subpoenas for those witnesses who are material to the matter before the court. I have made the following attempts to locate and serve Rufus Hicks.

I have recently been assigned to assist the prosecution of the State of Nevada v. Lesean Tarus Collins, C252804. This case is set for trial on July 27, 2015 at 9:00 A.M.

On June 30th, 2015, I ran a National Comprehensive report of Rufus Hicks. I learned through this report, Rufus Hicks has a last known address of 5529 Dairy Ave, Long Beach California.

I also ran a search through California DMV which shows he has an expired Driver's License listing his address as 150th E. 57th St Apt. #3 Long Beach California.

I then checked for local, (Nevada) driver's license and/or utilities for local addresses. Could not locate current a current residence.

I ran a database search through "NCIC" and saw a 2008 arrest for transporting PCP out of Long Beach California.

I checked to see if Rufus Hicks was in custody in Nevada and California and found that he is not in custody at the local or state level.

I checked California Department of Probation, Hicks is off probation with no current holds.

I contacted Homicide Investigator Mark Mattia, 562-247-2200, Long Beach Police Department. I requested his assistance in locating Rufus Hicks in the Long Beach area Det. Mattia contacted residents at the following locations: 5529 Dairy Ave #2 Long Beach Calif. This is the residence of Monica Hicks, sister of Rufus Hicks. Claims no contact with Rufus Hicks. She also would not provide any forwarding information as to her brother. Contact was also made at 150th E. 57th Street, Apartment No. 3, Long Beach, California. This address shows utilities in the name of Rufus Hicks. Occupants of the apartment complex would not provide any information regarding Rufus Hicks.

Contact has been made with multiple individuals related to Mr. Hicks, they are unwilling to provide any information on his whereabouts.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on 1/15/15 (Date)

Marie P157
(Signature)

1	TRAN Electronically Filed 01/15/2016 10:22:58 AM
2	CASE NO. 09-C-252804 DEPT. NO. 25
3	CLERK OF THE COURT
4	SEEMASI THE GOOM
5	DISTRICT COURT
6	CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA
7	* * * *
8	
9	THE STATE OF NEVADA,)
0	Plaintiff,) REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT) OF
1) CALENDAR CALL
2	vs.) LESEAN COLLINS,)
3	Defendant.)
4	Defendant.)
.5 .6	
8	BEFORE THE HONORABLE KATHLEEN DELANEY DISTRICT COURT JUDGE
9	DATED: MONDAY, JULY 20, 2015
)	
-	
5	REPORTED BY: Sharon Howard, C.C.R. #745

1	APPEARANCES:	
2	For the State:	ELISSA LUZAICH, ESQ.
3	·	JACQUELINE BLUTH, ESQ.
4		
5		
6		
7	For the Defendant	: DAVID SCHIECK, ESQ.
8		MICHAEL HYTE, ESQ.
9		
10		
11		* * * *
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25	•	

1 LAS VEGAS, NEVADA; MONDAY, JULY 20, 2015 2 PROCEEDINGS 3 4 5 THE COURT: Page 8, State of Nevada vs. Lesean 6 Collins. We know this matter is ready to go, I believe. 7 I think there are a couple of housekeeping matters we 8 should address. You may have an order. 9 MS. LUZAICH: I do. When we were -- the defense 10 and I were with the court's clerk last week copying 11 exhibits from the arson case, there are some things she 12 did not have the ability to copy, they're discs. So the 13 court signed an order releasing the discs to me. 14 copy them and give a copy to defense and give them right 15 back to the clerk. 16 THE COURT: Okay. We are ready. Did we identify --17 18 MS. LUZAICH: Exactly what they are. 19 THE COURT: Thank you. 20 Mr. Schieck, anything from --21 MR. SCHIECK: Mr. Collins requested not to be 22 transported today for the calendar call, so we'd ask you 23 to waive his appearance. 24 THE COURT: He stood up when I called the matter 25 and nobody else was here, so we were surprised as well.

But he is --

2.0

MR. SCHIECK: It was not on our transport order.
Our order was not served on the prison.

MR. HYTE: Your Honor, we got the jurors we've agreed to excused. That was emailed over this morning.

THE COURT: We were anticipating that by noon today. When it comes in my JEA will process it. We were just looking for, I think what you indicated you were going to give us, a complete listing of the ones you've agreed upon. I think we had some contact with regard to some others that we had also excused.

MS. LUZAICH: The Defense and the State had agreed to all of the ones that the court sent us. They were on our list as well, we just have a few above and beyond that.

MR. HYTE: I'll e-mail that this morning.

THE COURT: We'll look for that.

MR. HYTE: Additionally your Honor, the State on Friday filed a motion to limit the testimony of the expert that we endorsed, Dr. Pagalini. We're not opposing that motion. I don't know if it makes sense to vacate that hearing. It is set for Wednesday.

THE COURT: We could have a stipulation to vacate that hearing. I'd like to have an order in the record. Is someone willing to prepare that.

MS. BLUTH: The State will, your Honor.

THE COURT: I'll have the State prepare the order. We'll accept that stipulation and vacate the matter on calendar for Wednesday.

Anything else.

MR. HYTE: Additionally, your Honor, I've got an order to transport Mr. Collins for the trial next week.

May I approach.

THE COURT: You may.

I did sign the ex-parte order to transport the

Defendant. I don't know why that would be the case, but I know we have had circumstances in the past where sometimes if the order is coming from someone other then the State it doesn't happen. But we have officers here and my assumption would be they would be making notes he's to be transferred back for trial. I don't know if it's worth a call from the State to make sure that happens. I don't anticipate a problem, but one never knows.

I would like to pick our start time for next week as well. I know it is in the system as 10:30. That's the standard time frame we give. We can't start the jury selection until the afternoon. I would anticipate we're looking at a couple of days of jury selection.

MS. LUZAICH: State agrees.

1.0

1 THE COURT: Unless someone tells me otherwise. 2 MS. LUZAICH: Can we approach on an unrelated 3 issue. 4 THE COURT: Please. 5 (Discussion held at the bench.) 6 THE COURT: Thank you. 7 I appreciate the opportunity to discuss that 8 scheduling matter, which we'll address more specifically 9 when we commence the trial on Monday. Our start time for 10 jury selection is 1:30. 11 Is there anything else we need to address. 12 MS. LUZAICH: Just real quickly. Do you 13 think -- this is -- we won't hold you to it. Will Tuesday 14 be starting in the morning at the end of your civil 15 calendar or would that be an afternoon also -- just 16 Tuesday. 17 THE COURT: I know that we have a terrible 18 calendar tomorrow and the following Tuesday is bad. 19 will have to be an afternoon start. But we can start at 20 1:00. 21 MS. LUZAICH: 1:00 o'clock Tuesday. 22 THE COURT: Yes. By Monday I'll have a clear 23 idea of what the remainder of the week will be and looking 24 into the following week to the best of our ability.

have crazy calendars right now. I don't know what's going

on with them. They are out of control.

Mr. Schieck, anything else.

MR. SCHIECK: Your Honor, a couple of things.

We have an out-of-state expert we intend to utilize concerning cell phones. We have flexibility on that date. We had planned bring him in on Monday to testify Tuesday of the second week of trial, and we had discussions outside and again at the bench there would be some accommodation of calling him out of order if necessary. One thing that we want to be able to do is call him after the State presents their cell phone testimony. So there may have to be some flexibility there. Otherwise, I think we're ready to go.

There is one additional matter that has come to my attention. This flows out of the arson case. As the court is aware, there was a post-conviction proceeding in the arson case in Department 12, which has been denied by the court. There has not been a written order filed yet so there hasn't been an appeal pursued yet out of that Department 12 case.

However, at the argument, we ordered the transport out of Department 12 to confirm this information. At the argument it was represented by the State that their arson expert's testimony at the Petrocelli hearing was in some manner incorrect, and that they were going to correct that

during the course of the trial. Well, your Honor based the decision at the Petrocelli hearing based in part on that testimony.

2.0

We have received no notice as to how it was incorrect and the what explanation is for it being incorrect and why it hasn't been corrected in the record up to this point when we're at calendar call getting ready to go to trial. We may need to have another Petrocelli hearing so we have the correct testimony for the court to make its ruling on.

If in fact the State is aware their witness gave incorrect testimony, we should have been noticed as soon as they were aware of that, not learning it second hand from the post-conviction hearing.

THE COURT: Ms. Bluth.

MS. BLUTH: Jacqueline Bluth on behalf of the State.

I was the individual who made the representations in Department 12. The representations I made was that Mr. Schieck was the one who figured out the representations during the Petrocelli hearing were incorrect. If you remember at trial the arson expert testified there were 3 independent fires started. In the Petrocelli hearing he said 4. And then Mr. Schieck is the one that said that would be incorrect because at trial you stated there were

3. It kind of went back and forth.

It was my understanding from his investigation from the first trial there were 3. So I'm not sure whether there was 3 fires or 4 fires, what that has to do with anything having to do with the Petrocelli hearing.

The fact that he made a mistake and said there was the starting of one more fire then his original testimony, I don't believe that's relevant in any way in regards to the decisions your Honor made before -- after the elimination of the Petrocelli hearing.

I apologize. It's not that I was trying to hide the ball from Mr. Schieck. It was my understanding that Mr. Schieck was the one who had figured that out during the hearing in and of itself. So what I meant by it being corrected was if we do choose to use the arson case in the murder, then we would have a pretrial and discuss whether there were 3 independent fires started or 4. It has always been the State's position and always has been the fire investigator's opinion there were 3 independent fires started.

It's my belief that he was just mistaken and said 4 during the Petrocelli hearing. That is all that went on during Department 12's post-conviction hearing.

MR. SCHIECK: I have the transcript and my question was, the question I'm getting to is how many

distinct areas of fire did you find in the house.

Their arson investigator said, there was 4, sir.

It wasn't something I made up and tricked him into saying there were 4 distinct areas of fire.

THE COURT: I don't hear anyone accusing you of tricking him. I hear the argument being that it would not change the outcome of the Petrocelli hearing. I'm just getting this information for the first time right now. I would be happy to look at the transcript and see. I can't anticipate at this point that it would change the outcome of the hearing, but I do think we would want to clarify that testimony if and when the State is going to procure it for this case.

But I need obviously to review that and see. But innocent misrecollection of testimony is not going to be something that's going to change the basis upon which the court determined that the prior trial would be able to, on a limited basis, be utilized in this trial. But I'll take a look at the transcript and we can address it on Monday.

MR. SCHIECK: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Let's plan on being together at 1:15. That way we have a little time for housekeeping matters, address this further.

MR. SCHIECK: Mr. Collins had indicated to me

earlier he was not going to come to the trial. So your Honor, the transport order is in place and we'll deal with that --

THE COURT: For the record, I can hear that Mr. Collins is saying something. I can't make out what that is.

THE OFFICER: He wants out.

THE COURT: Because defense counsel is between me and Mr. Collins.

I'll note that Mr. Collins has requested to be removed from the court. We are removing him from the courtroom at his request.

So you are aware, Mr. Schieck, we have had prior trials where the Defendant has absented himself from the courtroom. I did so in those circumstances with a full canvass of the Defendant, making sure he understood what his rights were.

It is the right of a Defendant not to have to be forced to be present for the time of trial, but that he understands the potential consequences of that. And I had an admonishment that I read to the jurors. It's patterned very much after the right of a defendant not to be compelled to testify. I read it each day that the defendant chose not to be present.

So we obviously with Mr. Collins being removed just

now have not had the opportunity to engaged in that canvass. I trust and the best course of action right now is between now and when we return on Monday you'll have further opportunity to speak with Mr. Collins and encourage him to be present at the time of voir dire. If he is not present as we commence trial Monday, I may do an order to compel him to be present at least for me to do the canvass, not for forcing him to stay for the trial. I believe it's his right not to be present.

2.0

MR. SCHIECK: As it stands now, I think we need to be prepared to do the canvass Monday. We'll address the issue at that time.

THE COURT: If he refuses to come we'll do an order to compel.

MR. SCHIECK: We are endeavoring to speak with him at the prison this week.

THE COURT: If he's here Monday we'll address it then. If he is not here Monday, we'll figure out a way to address that.

MR. SCHIECK: If the court could, provide us with a copy of the admonishment and canvass you would do on the defendant so we can prepare him for that or voice our own.

THE COURT: I have the instruction. I called it an admonishment, but it's more an instruction to the

1 I don't have the canvass because I sort of made 2 that up because we weren't expecting it in the prior 3 trial. But it would be -- again, the whole thing for me 4 is patterned after the canvass we'd do for someone who is 5 making a determination whether or not they are going to 6 elect to testify. The instruction flows from the choice 7 not to testify in those circumstances. 8 I would be happy to forward that to you. The 9 possibility of not testifying came up in a trial recently 10 and I forwarded them that information so they can see what 11 the instruction looked like and where it was include in 12 the circumstances. This is a case Ms. Luzaich would be 13 familiar with -- Dr. Zangie. 14 MS. LUZAICH: Mr. Zangie. 15 THE COURT: Thank you. 16 So I will make sure that counsel gets copied on 17 that. 18 MR SCHIECK: Thank you. 19 THE COURT: Thank you all. See you Monday at 20 1:15. 21 THE CLERK: July 27th at 1:15. 22 23 24 25

CERTIFICATE OF CERTIFIED COURT REPORTER I, the undersigned certified court reporter in and for the State of Nevada, do hereby certify: That the foregoing proceedings were taken before me at the time and place therein set forth; that the testimony and all objections made at the time of the proceedings were recorded stenographically by me and were thereafter transcribed under my direction; that the foregoing is a true record of the testimony and of all objections made at the time of the proceedings. Sharon Howard C.C.R. #745

Electronically Filed 01/10/2016 12:22:52 PM DISTRICT COURT 1 CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA 2 **CLERK OF THE COURT** 3 4 5 THE STATE OF NEVADA, 6 Case No. 09C252804 7 Plaintiff, Dept. No. XXV 8 vs. LESEAN TARUS COLLINS, 9 Defendant. 10 11 12 13 14 BEFORE THE HONORABLE KATHLEEN DELANEY 15 JULY 27, 2015, 1:15 P.M. 16 REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF 17 JURY TRIAL 18 19 APPEARANCES: 20 (See separate page) 21 22 23 24 REPORTED BY: BRENDA SCHROEDER, CCR NO. 867 25 1

1	APPEARANCES:
2	For the Plaintiff:
3	JACQUELINE BLUTH, ESQ. Chief Deputy District Attorney
4	200 Lewis Avenue Las Vegas, Nevada 89155
5	LISA LUZAICH, ESQ.
6	Chief Deputy District Attorney 200 Lewis Avenue
7	Las Vegas, Nevada 89155
8	For the Defendant:
9	DAVID M. SCHIECK, ESQ.
10	Deputy Special Public Defender 330 S. Third Street, Suite 800
11	Las Vegas, Nevada 89155
12	MICHAEL W. HYTE, ESQ. Deputy Special Public Defender
13	330 S. Third Street, Suite 800 Las Vegas, Nevada 89155
14	•
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

LAS VEGAS, CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

MONDAY, JULY 27, 2015, 1:15 P.M.

PROCEEDINGS

4

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2

3

4

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

THE COURT: We are on the record in the State of Nevada versus Lesean Collins. For counsel's knowledge my marshal is on his way down to get the jurors. We have 70 jurors at this point with the ones that were previously agreed upon to be excluded because of their travel plans or other hardship issues. There was a juror, Number 20, who we have not excused but who is not present today and she is on our list. The last three digits are 028, first page, Ms. Garcia.

Apparently, she already has -- and this is just for the record, the note that we got from Jury Services this morning was Gissella Garcia is scheduled to return today for a panel for Department 25. She is not coming in due to a preplanned trip. She did not send any documents either. And so she could possibly have an order of contempt.

In her questionnaire she did not say anything about any travel. She did have some information that she provided. She checked the box on the line that said, No, she couldn't serve, but she did not indicate any travel

issues just other issues. So the Court is still

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

11

contemplating how to address this and whether to issue a contempt order or not. Likely will but that will not have any impact on us proceeding today.

My marshal is on his way down to get the panel. We can fit a couple of counsel chairs behind us to those rows. We can actually fit 70 people in the courtroom, so because that is the number we have, rather than leave anybody downstairs or anybody in the hallway, we will just bring them all in because I have a hunch we are going to lose some additional folks if not for additional hardship reasons, we've got some language issues. None of those were pre-excused, so I don't doubt for a minute that the room will be emptier, so to speak, once we get started.

The main issue, obviously, that I think we have to address at this time is we have been notified earlier today that Mr. Collins had opted not to dress out for purposes of the trial to commence. And I assumed clearly and correctly so that that meant that Mr. Collins was going to follow through on what he had said last week at calendar call which was his intent not to be present at the time of trial.

Obviously, we know we would have to have Mr. Collins here at some point to have a discussion with him about his rights whether or not to be present.

What Mr. Collins has represented to me by your counsel right before we went on the record this morning is that you intend to remain present while we commence 3 during jury selection in your jail blues. And the officer indicated that you did not wish to have your 5 chains removed.

I will tell you right now, Mr. Collins, I am not about to go down the road here where we set a trial up before we even begin for appeal because you are desiring to be present wearing a certain set of clothing and wearing your chains. That's just not going to happen.

You certainly have the right not to be compelled to be present for the trial, and I will hear from counsel in the event they wish to speak to this. I do not believe you have the right to set up this trial for a mistrial. And I don't believe that you have the right to be present dressed in a certain way that would clearly do that in my opinion.

So we need to, obviously, address this. And, again, you have the right not to be present, which is what you said last week and that's fine. We need to have a discussion about that. But that's fine. So I guess I am asking you directly, Mr. Collins, and I will note for the record that at no time as I have been speaking to you or your counsel have you looked up or acknowledged or

engaged with the Court in any way. Now you are looking up and I appreciate that. But I need you to advise me 2 whether or not you are going to choose to exercise your right not to be present once we bring the jurors in to

start the jury selection and commence with trial. Are you going to be here or are you not going to be here?

7 THE DEFENDANT: I am going to be here. 8 THE COURT: You are going to be here?

9 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am. 10

THE COURT: What is the purpose behind your desire to be present in your blues with your chains?

12 THE DEFENDANT: I have a right to be here. THE COURT: I did not say you didn't have a 13

right to be here. What is your purpose for being here 14 15 dressed in your blues with your chains?

THE DEFENDANT: Do I have an excuse why? 16 17 THE COURT: I am asking you if you have a

18 reason.

THE DEFENDANT: No. No specific reason. 19 THE COURT: Then if you don't have a reason then 20 21 you can dress out and put on regular clothes, right?

THE DEFENDANT: What do you mean regular 22 23 clothes? I don't wear other people's clothes. I don't need other people's clothes. 24

THE COURT: You may not need other people's

4

clothes but if you don't have a reason for being in your blues and chains then you could be here in regular clothes and not chains.

So I could have the officers take you back down and dress you out and bring you back up.

> THE DEFENDANT: No. I am comfortable. THE COURT: Does the State have any position? MS. LUZAICH: I cannot remember if the case is

Duckworth, but the supreme court is very clear that if he is in chains and/or jail blues it is incredibly prejudicial and we would object.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24 25

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I had a case some 15, 20 years ago where Judge Loeher had her law clerk go to Fremont Street and buy a T-shirt and a pair of pants for the defendant who was refusing to dress out or wear somebody else's clothes. So there is always that option. Fremont Street is not that far.

THE COURT: Mr. Schieck.

MR. SCHIECK: Your Honor, I can represent that our office has offered to provide street clothes for Mr. Collins to wear if that was his desire and he indicated it was not his desire, that he wished to wear his jail blues.

THE COURT: Do you want to address the other issue with regard to the prejudice that would be

7

off the chains if you turned the blues inside out so that you cannot see "CCDC" --2

3 MR. SCHIECK: Your Honor, I apologize. I cannot listen to my client tell me one thing if Ms. Luzaich is 4 making argument at the same time.

THE COURT: That's fine. Go ahead, Mr. Schieck. 6 7 MR. SCHIECK: Give me one second and then I will be able to pay attention. 8

THE COURT: No problem.

MR. SCHIECK: Your Honor, Mr. Collins points out that he has the right to testify if he so chooses and if he does testify the fact that he is convicted of previous felonies is going to be known by this jury anyway and if they are going to know then there's no prejudice for them actually seeing him in his jail clothes because they are going to know eventually that he is convicted, that he has a record. And it is, again, his position that given the fact the jury is going to learn this information anyway.

And, again, we had a situation with the arson case which had come in only recently in Nevada, we kept stating in case they weren't going to admit the arson we thought that arson conviction was going before the jury. And so it is Mr. Collins' wish to be comfortable and he

25 is most comfortable in the blues -- actually it's jail

9

occasioned of Mr. Collins? If you don't have a position on that I suppose that's fine. But I think we should have a full record as to counsel's position on that.

MR. SCHIECK: Your Honor, it is my position and our position that a defendant that appears in front of a jury in shackles is prejudiced by that appearance because it appears to the jury that he is of such a nature that he has to be shackled to sit at counsel's table.

Likewise, it is always my advice to clients that they wear regular clothes to court so that they are not seen in their jail clothes and that is the advice that I have given to Mr. Collins. I cannot, however, force a client to wear something he does not wish to wear.

THE COURT: Understood.

So, Mr. Collins, I ask you again, what is your reasoning for wanting to wear your jail blues and wanting to wear your chains?

> THE DEFENDANT: I'm comfortable. THE COURT: I find that hard to believe, sir.

At the end of the day, here's how we're going to address this. I'm going to send you -- you can keep talking to your counsel all you want, Mr. Collins, but the Court is making its determination now. Do you want to confer with your counsel?

MS. LUZAICH: In theory, as long as they take

1 clothes.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: I used that terminology as well. So one of the issues of prejudice, Mr. Collins, is not just that the jurors might at some point find out that you have another conviction within the last ten years which could at least be what the conviction is and that alone would come in unless you somehow denied it and then more details could come in.

But that does not speak to the situation of your current incarceration, the fact that you would be wearing chains which could be perceived as you being somehow particularly dangerous in this moment. The wearing of the jail garb and the chains is a present moment prejudice. It is not a they might find out if you take the stand that there is a conviction. That is not the concern.

So I appreciate that you are now at least articulating something about why you have a thought process that you have, but that does not address the concerns that the Court has about setting this case up for a mistrial or setting this case up for more likely an appellate issue because you choose to sit there in what you are describing as more comfortable wearing your chains. That's not going to happen. Bottom line the chains are coming off.

10

Now, if you want to sit there in your blues, what Ms. Luzaich was pointing out and while you were talking to your counsel and we stopped that communication at that moment was that there is only one aspect of your clothing that reflects CCDC and otherwise there is a lot of people that run around in scrubs and sweat clothes and whatever other things that might be more comfortable and that would not automatically reveal.

Now, I'm assuming, and I didn't look to see if he's got the sandals and the orange socks --

MR. SCHIECK: He does.

THE COURT: So some people may know what that means but there is only so much we can do. It is not my intention, sir, to have you sitting here in chains and in your jail clothes.

Now there's one of two ways we can do this. I can send you back down with the officers because it is still going to take a few minutes to get these jurors up here and you can change your clothes into street clothes and give your counsel and this trial the opportunity to proceed fairly and whatever shenanigans you want to do put them aside. Or you can go in the back here, we'll take the chains off and we'll take the orange socks off and we'll turn your shirt inside out.

If you go back down to change your clothes and

THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, I decline all the options that you put forth. If you have to force me to do something then you have to force me to do it.

THE COURT: I will force you then to step in the

back. We will remove the chains and turn the shirtinside out and we will take the orange socks off. You

7 will remain present here without any visible outward

8 indicia that you are currently housed at the Clark County

9 Detention Center. I will ask the officers to take you in10 the back.

By the way, I would note that I just checked with my JEA and the jurors are still not up here yet. We had built in a few minutes anyway separate and apart from this issue to address anything that might be outstanding.

Do we have anything further that we need to address?

MS. LUZAICH: One thing I was just thinking, could we potentially get three alternates instead of two since we are going to go over two weekends?

THE COURT: I do not have an opposition to that it's just in terms of how many people we have to qualify and redo the math in my head, I haven't done it yet.

MS. LUZAICH: No. It's just one more person because if there's one alternate we get one preempt. If there's two or more alternates we get two preempts, so

decide not to come back up you certainly have your right not to be present at the time of trial. So arguably wouldn't you be more comfortable some place else but I want you here but it's stili your choice.

So if this is all about your comfort, take a choice: Clothes you have on now with some adjustments and no chains, go down and actually put some reasonable appropriate clothes on for somebody who is facing a jury and protesting their innocence, or go back down and don't return because you have that right as well.

THE DEFENDANT: There is no such thing as appropriate clothes.

THE COURT: I am not here to debate you, sir.

Those are your three choices. What do you want to pick?

MR. SCHIECK: Can we go in the back and talk with him for a few minutes, Your Honor?

THE COURT: Absolutely. We'll take a brief recess.

(Whereupon, a recess was taken.)

THE COURT: All right. Back on the record. I want to note for the record that counsel and Mr. Collins have now returned to the courtroom. Before we took that break for counsel to speak with Mr. Collins I posed three options to Mr. Collins. Mr. Collins, what is your choice?

the one more alternate is equal to one more person.

THE COURT: I haven't actually had that come up
before so I didn't realize -- like the preempts I thought
we just had to add a person to the alternates or how many

5 people we were going to qualify.

MS. LUZAICH: It is my understanding that, no, one preempt for one alternate; two for two or more.

Agree? Disagree?

9 MR. SCHIECK: I believe that is correct.

THE COURT: Okay. Good to know. All right. Do you have any opposition to us having a third alternate?

MR. SCHIECK: No opposition, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. HYTE: Your Honor, one more thing. I did notice when going through the questionnaires in this case there was a body found out in the desert and unfortunately that is not an uncommon way that bodies are found in murder cases and so there are a number of jurors that did indicate on their questionnaire I might have known something about the case based on the media.

I think one gentleman said he saw this on Fox news as an open-and-shut case. I just want to make sure that when we are dealing with those types of situations that we are maybe handling that in a sequestered manner and not in front of the jury.

THE COURT: I appreciate you bringing that up 1 because there was a couple of those circumstances, plus the language people. Would it be perhaps in the long run 3 faster if we started off with a few folks coming in and 4 getting them under oath because if we have severe 5 language problems or we've got severe prejudice problems 6 or anything like that or knowledge problems that way then 7 we could eliminate them and bring in the whole panel when 8 we're ready. It's just a thought. We don't have to do it that way. 10 11

MS. LUZAICH: That is fine.

THE COURT: So if you want to I had noted the language ones. I hadn't noticed the others. Just trying to figure out ways to shorten it.

MR. HYTE: And, Judge, just to follow-up on that, are we voir diring only as to that issue and then if they are okay we send them back out?

THE COURT: Yes.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. HYTE: So we are not going to do the whole thing for that juror?

THE COURT: No, no. Because we are not going to do the rest of them one by one that way so I would prefer to just eliminate those that we have a pretty good idea that we can and we should or at least talk to the ones who think that they know the publicity, have a quick

15

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24 25

5

9

But I certainly have no problem talking to her 1 2 separately.

3 MR. HYTE: I guess my sensitivity was that if she, you know, has been traumatized by this sitting in a room for three days hearing about murder and those things so maybe dismiss her so she does not have to sit through 6 7 that.

MS. LUZAICH: Well, right, but she will come in first and she may be fine. There was nothing in her questionnaire that indicated she really couldn't be in here.

THE COURT: Who is the one who had said that they for certain saw this story on the news and that they perceived it to be an open-and-shut case.

MS. LUZAICH: See, I disagree with his description. I think in the beginning the person said they know nothing and then towards the end he said it was an open-and-shut case.

THE COURT: I'm not seeing my notes for the language people so if anybody has notations on those people I would appreciate it otherwise I can go dig it out of my pile on my desk.

MS. LUZAICH: I have one: This case makes me feel uncomfortable I because I don't like "AA's." What are AA's?

17

introduction as to who is who.

MR. HYTE: In that one vein, Your Honor, there was also a juror who indicated on her questionnaire that at 11 years old she was kicked out by her father and her mother was killed in front of her --

THE COURT: I saw that one too.

MR. HYTE: -- and maybe this isn't the jury for her. I'm wondering if even making her sit through a voir dire is insensitive to someone in that position.

THE COURT: That one I had flagged too. Her name is Ruby Ortiz. Again, we did not have an agreement in advance to excuse so I don't typically pull the trigger, so to speak, on anybody independently of that.

But we could bring her in and ask because I don't know that I want to presuppose. It was flagged but she seemed to indicate as I read her questionnaire --

MS. LUZAICH: That she was fine.

THE COURT: -- that she could go forward and did not necessarily feel like this was an impediment to her. And I'll give an example of someone in a trial not too long ago, the jurors expressed something that had occurred with them with a family member earlier in their life, but how they had dealt with it through counseling and gotten through other issues and I wasn't going to

presume the bias when they weren't expressing the bias.

MR. HYTE: African Americans. 1

2 MS. LUZAICH: That's what I thought but there 3 was that one question that was asked and that person said 4 no.

MR. HYTE: Your Honor, Juror No. 058 --

6 THE COURT: James Bowers.

7 MR. HYTE: That's right.

THE COURT: Does anybody have their notations? 8

MS. BLUTH: I do for the odds, Your Honor.

10 Numbers 0293, 0317 and 0193 that said no English.

MR. HYTE: I will give you my evens here in a 11 12 moment then.

THE COURT: Is that how you broke them out? 13

MS. LUZAICH: Right. 14

MR. SCHIECK: Did you say 093? 15

16 MS. LUZAICH: 0193.

17 MR. SCHIECK: I am odds, Your Honor.

MS. LUZAICH: I have 196 and 254 that don't 18 19 speak English.

MR. HYTE: I also have 196. I have 194. She indicated that she did not speak English well. Her reading comprehension, I don't know that that bears that out except that she wrote things like, "Defense attorneys are sophisticating." And that was Juror 0194.

THE COURT: So that may be one to speak with.

18

20

21

22

23

24

25

1	MS. LUZAICH: 194, yes. She wrote, "Do not	1	refusing to take the chains off.
2	understand" under hardship.	2	CORRECTIONS OFFICER: Yes and I didn't want to
3	MR. HYTE: And you said 254?	3	escalate the situation by forcing his chains off so I
4	MS. LUZAICH: 196 and 254 were my only two.	4	called my supervisor and if need be we'll get an order to
5	THE COURT: But 254 is Clara Pretel. I did not	5	take them off.
6	have any	6	THE COURT: Is the supervisor on the way up?
7	MS. LUZAICH: She wrote, "I don't say	7	CORRECTIONS OFFICER: Yes.
8	i-n-g-l-i-s-h w-a-l-l," which is what led me to believe.	8	THE COURT: Will the supervisor let us know what
9	THE COURT: Well, she may not write it well.	9	order they need?
10	MS. LUZAICH: Can you give us an idea how you	10	CORRECTIONS OFFICER: Yes.
11	want us to conduct jury selection. I have picked a lot	11	THE COURT: We have given Mr. Collins several
12	of juries in your court obviously but never with	12	options for comfort but I think the Court has gone beyond
13	questionnaires before	13	accommodating Mr. Collins.
14	THE COURT: Right.	14	I know what Mr. Collins appears to want to do
15	MS. LUZAICH: And then odds and evens.	15	which is to be present in front of the jurors looking
16	THE COURT: Well, honestly, the questionnaire	16	like a shackled defendant and creating a prejudice and an
17	although it expedites some things it has not really	17	appealable error and I'm not going to let it happen.
18	changed the way I have done the selection otherwise.	18	MS. LUZAICH: I will just ask if it is going to
19	MS. LUZAICH: Okay.	19	escalate the situation and if he ends up being in chains
20	THE COURT: As far as odds and evens, I pretty	20	that you either advise the jury that he is dressed like
21	much let counsel decide on which order they wish to go in	21	that in chains by his own choice.
22	but it's fine however you wish to break it up.	22	THE COURT: It is an option but I would prefer
23	MS. LUZAICH: But you are still going to ask the	23	to address it without getting direct because I don't see
24	questions that you always ask.	24	that the supreme court will receive it that way
25	THE COURT: I'm sorry, yes. And we have added	25	regardless.
	19		21
	-1 - tion level to the steel experience and then I still	1	MS. LUZAICH: As long a he makes the record that
1	education level to the stock questions and then I still ask the questions about the American justice system and	2	it's his choice outside the presence of the jury I think
2	the criminal justice system either as a victim of crime	3	we have done what we can. The State of Nevada doesn't
3	or accused of a crime and extended to close friends and	4	want there to be any prejudice to the defendant. We want
4	family members and get through all of that before I even	5	to try a clean case so we have said we would rather he
5 6	turn it over to you guys.	6	not be dressed like that and not shackled. But if he is
7	So at this point I have two to canvass that	7	choosing to do that I think as the record is clear is
8	might be because of their prior circumstances or	8	that it's his choice but therefore I would ask you to
9	knowledge of the case that would need to be excused.	9	advise the jury that it is his choice and that they
10	That being Ruby Ortiz and James Bowers.	10	shouldn't feel sympathy and all of those things.
11	MS. LUZAICH: What are the numbers?	11	THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. Well, we are
12	THE COURT: Bowers is the first in the order in	12	still trying to figure this out anyway.
13	the list and he is at 058. Then Ruby Ortiz is 136.	13	Do we have an ETA on the supervisor?
14	MR. HYTE: Your Honor, in addition to Mr. Bowers	14	CORRECTIONS OFFICER: Our supervisor is on her
15	I have the following jurors who indicated that they might	15	way.
16	have heard about the case on the news and their numbers	16	THE COURT: And I will say this for the record,
17	are 126, 172, 244.	17	I perceive this to be an issue of if we don't nip this in
18	THE COURT: 244 was one of our no shows, so	18	the bud today with whatever the circumstances are then we
19	that's only two more so let's go ahead and take care of	19	are just going to have more efforts and attention-seeking
20	them. And these are the ones that might have more	20	behavior or manipulation of the Court and counsel from
21	general not as you perceived Mr. Bowers to be more	21	the defendant and I am not going to tolerate it in this
22	specific to this case.	22	trial so we will figure it out.
		1	

22

20

23

24

(Pause in the proceedings.)

25 individual people first because it will make it easier

THE COURT: Tom, I would like you to bring these

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

MR. HYTE: The CO indicated that Mr. Collins is

(Pause in the proceedings.)

23

24

for us to follow. 2 THE MARSHAL: Okay. THE COURT: The first one's last three digits 3 are 126, that's initial C, last name Tom. I then have 4 5 136, Rudy Ortiz. I apologize first is Juror No. 058, James Bowers. We'll take Bowers first and then Tom and 6 then Ortiz. Next I have 172, Lopez and then 193. 7 8 There were also language concerns expressed about No. 194, Gabriela Soto; 196, Luis Salcedo; 254 9 Pretel; and then 317, Ghyasi. 10 11 THE MARSHAL: Okay. THE COURT: So those are the ones we'll bring in 12 first. 13 (Sergeant Trotter enters the courtroom.) 14 THE COURT: Hi, there. Thank you for coming on 15 16 up. SGT. TROTTER: Not a problem. 17 THE COURT: First of all, let me get your name 18 19 for the record. SGT. TROTTER: Sergeant Trotter. 20 THE COURT: Thank you, Sergeant Trotter. 21 22 So the defendant refused earlier today to dress out and we knew that was the case and we asked the 23 24 defendant to be brought up if he was not willing to come. We had not yet issued an order to bring him under any 25

have indicated that my choice is to have him since he is already here in his blues, the first option, which is to remove the chains, turn the shirt inside out or we can 3 figure out a way to find another shirt for him to wear or turn the shirt inside out so the CCDC is not visible and remove the socks and bring him back in the courtroom.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

16

17

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

He has refused to do that and so now we are at the point of what do you need from us. Is that something that can be carried out?

Truthfully, I am very concerned that if we allow the defendant to engage in this attention-seeking behavior and manipulating-the-court process that we are just going to have more of same throughout the trial. So I need it to be clear that when the Court has given 14 options and he has refused them and the Court has made a 15 decision that that decision gets carried out. But I also appreciate that there is a process here so any guidance you can give us would be appreciated. 18

SGT. TROTTER: From my understanding, he has inferred that he -- or it was supposed to be told amongst the jury that he was already a convicted felon and that he was basically in custody already. So that was his understanding.

THE COURT: I have already clarified that -- he did raise that through his counsel and I have already

25

means necessary but he had last week made a statement that he was not going to be present for trial. I assumed the refusal to dress out was a precursor to the refusal to come up at all but he did in fact come up in his blues, which was fine because we needed to have a discussion with him anyway about if he was going to not

consequences. 8 Rather than that be what has occurred, what has 9 occurred is his demand to remain in the courtroom in 10

be present at the time, that was his choice and the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

front of the jurors in trial while wearing his blues and his chains.

SGT. TROTTER: Correct.

THE COURT: I indicated that he has one of three choices and those three choices are to remain in the courtroom in the blues without the chains with the shirt turned inside out so the CCDC is not visible, if that actually would work and presume it would, and the orange socks off so that those indicia of his being in custody are removed, or to go back downstairs and dress out in the civilian clothes that his counsel prepared for them, or to go back downstairs and stay and not return.

He went back and spoke with counsel briefly, came back out and counsel represented that he refuses all of those options and so we are at the point now where I

clarified for him that unless and until he takes the stand the State is absolutely precluded from making any mention of the fact that he is previously convicted or in custody. And the fact that someone is previously 5 convicted does not necessarily mean that they are in 6 custody.

And the bigger concern, the potential prejudice 7 and we had a discussion while Mr. Collins has been in the 8 9 courtroom, is the jurors seeing him in a manner that makes him appear to be a present danger and in other ways 10

indications that he is a convicted felon and he is in 11 custody, that type of thing. That those are the

12

prejudices that we need to avoid. That the supreme court 13

has made it clear to us that those are potential 14

appellate issues and I'm not about to let a defendant 15

create right out of the gate an appellate issue that 16

17 might result in the reversal of this case. So it is not

going to come to light to the jurors that he is 18 convicted. It is not going to come to the light of the 19

jurors that he is in custody unless and until we get to 20

21 the point in trial he takes the stand and that alone

still does not address the issue of why would he be 22

dressed this way in court otherwise, especially someone 23

who is here under a not guilty plea entry and seeking to 24 25 defend himself of the charges.

26

I asked him, by the way, what his reasoning was for wanting to remain dressed that way and he had none. And then when I told him that he indicated I really need to know his reasoning and he said it was more comfortable to be wearing his blues and wearing his chains.

And then when I still said that that was not an option that is when he raised the issue, What difference does it make because they are already going to know I am convicted anyway. So that was the third thing he brought up as to his interaction now.

SGT. TROTTER: Okay. In the past, we have had people come in and say that it was their right to dress in the blues, which if that is something that they want to do I cannot necessarily say that you have to be in those. I can talk to him and see what he's thinking and where his mindset is.

But, again, he brought us to the reason why he wanted to dress in his blues is because it was going to be put out. That's what he heard. So, again, I have not talked to him personally. I can go in and see what his mindset is and where it is stemming from now.

THE COURT: Did you want to add something, Mr. Schieck?

MR. SCHIECK: Yes. My concern, I think we had moved passed that he was wearing the blues, I think we

one. His second explanation after further questioning was that it was more comfortable. And then after further discussion, his third explanation was, Well, what difference does it make because they already know that I am convicted anyway. So that is sort of the evolution of 6 this thing.

I believe he is just playing games. I believe he is testing this court to see how far he can push it. I don't think for one minute this is anything other a desire to, again, whatever it is, either get attention or actually in fact set up that appeal error, which, again, I am not going to allow.

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

5

9

11

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

27

Last week when he was here he said he was not coming up at all, which I had the ability to canvass and allow him to proceed and that's why I gave him as one of the options if you want to go back downstairs and not be here, that's fine. Or you can go back downstairs and change out into the civi's which would make more sense for someone who has pled not guilty and is trying to do their best to pretend and through their counsel defend their case. Or if you insist because it is somehow more comfortable for you and the officer did express that it is someone else's clothes and he doesn't want to wear someone else's clothes, that that is fine, that he can be here in these clothes with some alterations, meaning the

moved past that.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

SGT. TROTTER: I just got in on this, though. MR. SCHIECK: I think you were called as a result of he did not want the chains taken off and the transport officers did not want the situation to escalate by trying to take his chains of against his wishes and so my concern was, as with any client, I don't want the situation to escalate that puts more tension into the situation. So I was just concerned. I do not want anything to escalate with Mr. Collins.

THE COURT: And the State has also expressed an option from their perspective to not escalate or just to simply inform the jurors that it is his choice to be sitting here this way. I am not okay with that option because, again, I firmly believe that if we allow this case to proceed with a defendant who is sitting there even by his own choice when it is not necessary otherwise wearing chains and obvious jail garb that that's going to create a prejudice in the minds of the jurors that we cannot undo and that is why I want to avoid that process.

I know that counsel has already spoken with their client a couple of times. I would very much appreciate you speaking with him. Again, I give you that background in terms of his first explanation for why he wanted to be dressed this way was that he didn't have

chains come off, socks come off and the shirt goes inside 2

SGT. TROTTER: Does counsel have dress clothes 3 for him? 4

THE COURT: I believe they do.

MR. SCHIECK: We did not check clothes in for 6 him because he had already indicated that he was not 7 8 going to wear clothes.

THE COURT: Oh, so you didn't bring any.

10 SGT. TROTTER: Okay. So maybe another option could be, and I don't know if this is possible but if he could wear his own clothes he brought in. 12

MR. SCHIECK: He has been up at High Desert for 13 14 many years.

THE COURT: And does not mean that we couldn't go find some but at this point I just have him refusing to have the chains taken off and do anything else.

I think switching the shirt inside out and taking the socks and chains off is the easiest and quickest path.

SGT. TROTTER: If I could have a word with him for one moment.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. SCHIECK: We do have clothes at the office for him, Your Honor, if he was willing to wear those but 30

it was my understanding over the weekend that he was not 2 going to --

THE COURT: Sergeant Trotter, that is an option if he is willing to do that.

SGT. TROTTER: Yes, ma'am. I will talk to him right now.

> THE COURT: Thank you. (Pause in the proceedings.)

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: I want to note for the record as we return to the state of Nevada versus Lesean Collins that Mr. Collins has returned to the courtroom. It appears that Sergeant Trotter is now removing his chains. We appreciate your assistance, Sergeant, but we also appreciate Mr. Collins making a decision that will allow us to proceed with him present, which is obviously preferable over other options.

Well, the other changes that were occasioned with his chains was that his shirt would be turned inside out and his socks taken off.

SGT. TROTTER: He does not want to turn his shirt inside out.

THE COURT: Okay. Bring him back in so I can have one last discussion before I send him back to his

Okay. Noting for the record as we return to

31

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

25

THE COURT: You are shaking your head so I am 1 2 taking that as a response, no, that you don't wish to comply with the Court's directive. 3

Can you give for the record your reason why even 4 though you allowed your chains to be removed that you will not turn your shirt inside out or take your socks 7 off.

THE DEFENDANT: I am very comfortable in my outfit.

THE COURT: Again, in the circumstances the Court does not recognize comfort as a basis for the position that you are taking. I believe you are making an effort to try to create what would be an appellate error for this trial to proceed if you were to proceed present in your prison, or I should say in this case jail blues and the other indicators that you are in custody.

Now, we had the chains removed which removes one of the concerns of the prejudice that the Court has but not all of them. And before I make a final determination stated to Mr. Collins directly of how the Court intends to proceed for today's purposes does either counsel have 22 anything they wish to add for the record?

MR. SCHIECK: Just that it is our position that Mr. Collins has expressed his position that his desire to

be present wearing clothing that he desires to wear and

33

State of Nevada versus Lesean Collins that Mr. Collins has returned to the courtroom. He is currently not wearing his chains. The sergeant and CO's are present with him.

Mr. Collins, I have been informed by this sergeant but I would like you to inform me yourself that despite the Court having made it clear what your three choices are and despite some indication that you had chosen one of those options by having your chains removed that you are now refusing to comply with the remaining conditions, which is have your shirt turned inside out and have the orange socks removed.

I need to hear that from you directly and then I need to speak with you about the Court's position on that. But I want to make sure that I understand you clearly that even though you agreed to have the chains removed that the other circumstances that would allow you to you remain in the courtroom in the current outfit that you wanted to wear you said was more comfortable that you are now refusing even that. What is your you position?

THE DEFENDANT: (No audible response.) THE COURT: Mr. Collins, the Court is addressing you directly, I would ask you to please respond. Are you going to turn your shirt inside out?

THE DEFENDANT: (No audible response.)

1 that is his right.

THE COURT: Mr. Schieck, do you have anything 2 3 specific to point to that would make it a right such that

the Court wold be in some way violating some

5 Constitutional right by refusing to accept your client's desire of how he wishes to be dressed. 6

MR. SCHIECK: I do not have a case to cite, Your 7 Honor, as I stand here at this moment. I would indicate 8

that the Constitution entitles the defendant to be 9

present during the proceedings and the Constitution does 10 not speak about what clothing the defendant should wear 11

when he has the right to be present during his court 12

proceedings and I would on behalf of Mr. Collins assert 13

that he has the right to wear what he chooses to wear. 14

15 THE COURT: Ms. Luzaich, did you have anything you wanted to add for the record? 16

MS. LUZAICH: I do briefly, Judge. I'm looking at a case called Estelle, E-s-t-e-l-l-e versus William, a United States Supreme Court case that says that a defendant cannot be compelled to go to trial in prison or jail clothes because of the impairment of the presumption of innocence, et cetera, et cetera.

So I think that if the defendant's choice is to be wearing the shirt and the orange socks that say CCDC, I would just ask that rather than send him back that you

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

inform the jury that it was his choice.

THE COURT: Okay. And, Mr. Schieck, back to you for a moment. This is, of course, the first day of trial and in fact the first day of jury selection. We have not yet had any jurors present in the courtroom, but we do have a method in which we intend to proceed in terms of how we are going to inquire of the jurors once we get started.

Is there any reason why you or Mr. Hyte believe that you cannot proceed and protect the rights of Mr. Collins should he not be present during the course of jury selection?

MR. SCHIECK: Well, Your Honor, Mr. Hyte and myself believe we are competent to select a jury. The problem is a defendant's input into jury selection is always something I solicit and so to say can we competently select a jury, I would say, yes, but we would be doing so without the defendant's input and without his presence.

And with respect to Ms. Luzaich's suggestion that we somehow inform the jury which highlights, there is no need to inform the jury of anything.

MS. LUZAICH: I take that back. That is true. It would draw attention to it.

THE COURT: All right. So here is the Court's

1 2

He has been given three choices. These are all reasonable choices. His arguments of comfort do not have any relationship to where the Court would find a reasonable argument when he can be just as comfortable sitting there in the exact same clothing with the shirt turned inside out. And some would argue that it is cooler with no socks on, not to be ridiculous or facetious about this.

At the end of the day, there is no relationship to any reasonable argument that this court can discern. I think Mr. Collins is trying to manipulate this process and I think he is trying to set this case up for appellate error and I'm not going to allow it.

So I will have you removed from the courtroom at this time. It's your choice because you do not wish to select one of the three options that the Court gave you, two of which would allow you to remain in the courtroom, that you are volitionally choosing to not remain in the courtroom and I am going to remove you.

Tomorrow you will be given the same choice upon which to dress out and I will direct counsel to bring you clothes, fresh clothes that can be your clothes, that you can wear and the Court will expect that you will dress out and return here if in fact it is your desire to participate in jury selection.

decision. Mr. Collins, you don't have to look at me if you don't wish but I just want to be clear for the record, and I will note now that you are at least looking at me and listening to what I am saying.

At this point in time it is a quarter to three on Monday. It is very clear to me that we are going to likely get no further in the course of jury selection than identifying those who have hardships and are unable to serve and that we are very unlikely to get to any specific actual discussion/inquiry with these individuals that would impact Mr. Collins' opinion or Mr. Schieck's or Mr. Hyte's ability to elicit Mr. Collins' opinion in the event you should return tomorrow appropriately dressed.

However, for today, I am not going to concede the point that it is any right that supercedes the concern that this court has over the prejudice that would be created.

I find the same outcome if I were to compel him to be sitting there in his prison garb or his jail garb that's his choice to sit there the prejudice still attaches. I am not going to have a problem with this trial before we even bring the first juror in this courtroom and I am not going allow the defendant to decide how this courtroom and how this trial proceeds.

to understand that it is your choice and I am going to advise you right now that for any day of the trial in which you are not present then the Court will inform the jurors that it is the right of the defendant in a criminal trial that he may not be compelled to be present at the time of trial and that they should not draw any inference from his lack of presence and that his presence here today should not be factored in in any way in the ultimate deliberations for anyone who should be empaneled and serve as jurors in this case.

If you refuse to return tomorrow then you have

At this time I realize this is a little bit of a unique situation because this is not you refusing to be here. It is the Court determining that you are effectively refusing to be here by refusing to follow the Court's orders and dress appropriately. But we will revisit this each day.

I will also put in place an order that you be brought present to the Court under any means necessary for tomorrow's purposes because if you are not going to be here tomorrow then we need to have a fuller canvass as to why and what your intentions are going forward.

But I hope that you understand that the Court is not going to play these games. I hope that you understand that the Court has made a determination here

today that this will not affect your ability to aid and assist counsel in your jury selection because we are not likely going to get to any substantive discussions with any jurors, only to identify those jurors who cannot remain in the trial and to excuse them.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

19

23

24

And at this point in time we expect you to be present tomorrow and you still have the two options for your presence, which is you either wear civilian clothes that your counsel will provide or to be dressed in the courtroom here in what you have deemed to be comfortable for you but at least appropriately disguises the fact that those are in fact jail clothing. All right.

Anything further for the record before I have Mr. Collins removed from the courtroom?

MR. SCHIECK: Mr. Collins did express to me that if he was not going to be here today he would like to be transported back to High Desert State Prison where he is serving his sentence.

THE COURT: He will remain at the Clark County Detention Center until he is bought up tomorrow of his own choosing about the Court's order to make a final expression of whether he intends to be present at the time of trial. I am not sending him back and forth to NDOC each day. But at this point I don't have a clear determination unless that was already the transport

39

9 10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

2

3

7

8

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

All right. Thank you. We will see you 1 tomorrow, Mr. Collins. 2

3 Anything else before we bring the jurors in? MR. SCHIECK: I think we would like to remove 4 5 the empty chair so as to not highlight his absence.

THE COURT: I do not disagree with that. 6 7 Let me inquire of you, Mr. Schieck the sort of 8 admonishment --

MR. SCHIECK: Court's indulgence.

THE COURT: So, Mr. Schieck, I appreciate and I don't disagree and we have all gotten on the same page about ways in which we do not wish to highlight what's going on but I think that there would be an expectation that there would be somebody present and my intention would be to advise the jurors that the defendant has chosen not to be present for today, not the circumstances and background as to why but to at least make that clear so they do not read anything into it or consider it in any way.

MR. SCHIECK: I do not disagree with you. THE COURT: Okay. Then let's go ahead and bring them in.

THE MARSHAL: Don't you want the individuals that you named first? 24

THE COURT: Oh, that's right. Thank you. Let's

41

order, I'm not going to interfere with that. But I am going to have him stay here today to make a determination -- I'm assuming he was going to stay at CCDC tonight; am I wrong about that?

MR. SCHIECK: Actually, he was not supposed to be brought down until today from High Desert.

THE COURT: Well, I can't speak to that. I was not obviously involved in that decision. But it was their intention to keep him here, correct?

MR. SCHIECK: That is my understanding of their intension and if it's the Court's order that he needs to be brought back tomorrow and kept here tonight I think tomorrow would probably be if things haven't changed re-asking that he be allowed to go back to High Desert tomorrow.

THE COURT: The Court's order is that he be kept here this evening in Clark County Detention Center and 17 that he have a chance to think through whether he is 18 going to stay here and participate in this trial and aid and assist his counsel, or whether by his own volitional 20 choosing he doesn't wish to be present pursuant to the 21 Court's options that it has given him and if he wishes to 22 absent himself and go back to NDOC we will canvass him at that time and that certainly is his option if he wishes 25 to choose it.

start with Mr. Bowers first.

MR. HYTE: And these are the ones that are being brought in for the limited purpose.

THE COURT: Right. Just to find out if they 4 5 have a bias or a language barrier that would preclude 6 them from service.

MR. HYTE: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Hello, Mr. Bowers.

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Good afternoon. 9

THE COURT: We know that we have a whole group 10

of you waiting outside. Let me just first introduce 11 myself. I am Judge Kathleen Delaney. I am the judge who 12

13 is presiding over the trial. You have been brought

forward with a lot of other folks in a case the State of 14

Nevada versus Lesean Collins. I know you already know 15

that because you filled out a questionnaire prior to 16

coming back here today and were asked some questions and 17

18 were given a little bit of information about this trial.

In that questionnaire, you expressed the fact that you may have knowledge of this particular case in some way. I am not trying to put words in your mouth. I want you to be able to perhaps explain that to us.

The facts and circumstances of this case although on one hand unique to it are certainly not unique in that they have never otherwise occurred, so we

want to be sure that before we presume someone has knowledge of the case that would exclude them from being 2 able to be jurors that we are sure that that is in fact 3 4 the case. 5

What I would typically do is at the beginning of the process introduce my entire staff, ask the counsel to introduce themselves, state any witnesses, and ultimately to make a statement about what the case is regarding. But at this point before I do that if that is even necessary what is it that you believe you know about this case?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I just heard a report on the news about a man who was arrested and just from the description it just clicked in my mind. But as for the details and whatnot it has been so long ago that I might have just forgot.

THE COURT: Do you have a recollection of when you might have heard it on the news?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Maybe around March. I'm not too sure.

THE COURT: Is it your specific recollection that it was this particular case or just the facts were similar to what you remember here?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Probably around the facts, you know somebody went missing and somebody was caught

2

3

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

21

23

24

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

24

25

story that you heard was related to a different story?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: It was probably a different one.

4 THE COURT: Regardless of whether or not it was related to a different case, is it going to impact your ability to be fair and impartial here? 6 7

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. What they said was that they got him and it was quiet after that so there were no details and if there was I didn't see it.

THE COURT: Because obviously there is going to be a whole lot of questions that are going to be posed to the jurors once we figure out who can stay and who can't go. I think we already asked this question in the questionnaire but let me switch gears for one minute.

Originally we thought the trial would complete by the end of next week. In fact, although, we are going 16 to have trial days this week and next week we are also going to go over into the following week for at least a 18 couple of days. We are trying to qualify jurors for the 19 additional days of August 10th, 11th and 12th. Do you 20 have any reason to believe that you would not be able to 22 be present for those additional dates?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: The only thing I can think of is like my company we are getting a lot of big projects coming up and we are starting to get real busy

45

and just brought in. I thought that was already done by 2 how long ago it was.

THE COURT: Yes. There was some indication, too, that we could interpret that a couple different ways about whether you thought from what you had seen that case should be done, so to speak, or was in fact done. It sounds like what you are telling me is you thought it might have been over.

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. They had him and it was already in process and done at least by now.

THE COURT: Have you had the experience of hearing more than one news story similar to this one?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.

THE COURT: Okay. Let me ask counsel, is there any reason that there may have been a news story related to this case in March of this year?

MS. LUZAICH: No.

THE COURT: So is there any doubt that you might have in terms of time frame you are talking about? It was this year for certain?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. I know it was this

22 year. 23

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

24

25

THE COURT: We would not be aware that there would have been any news story related to this case in the news in that time frame, so is it possible that the

and I would hate to miss all that work. And if my

company could at least cover me for so many days and then

we could talk to them again about covering additional

days, but with everything gearing up the way it is I 4

5 would really hate to miss all that work.

THE COURT: And just so that you know, and we'll have more discussion on that, you would not be here five days a week. You would be here up to potentially four days this week, three days only next week and three days only at the most the following week.

The Thursdays and Fridays for the next two weeks you would not be here.

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: All right.

THE COURT: So I would hope that that would lessen the impact. I just meant, and I should have been more specific, you don't have any prepaid travel beyond the dates that we had previously given you, do you?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: The only thing I have is I have to see my doctor on the 6th.

THE COURT: Which is a Thursday.

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.

THE COURT: And we would not be in court that 22 23 day for certain.

And so coming back now to the other questions that we were asking. Obviously at this point from

46

everything we know, it is likely if not certain that the story you might have seen was not related to this case --2 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yeah, I think not. 3 THE COURT: But regardless of any of those 4 things, are you going to be able as a juror to set aside 5 any preconceived ideas that you might have and be able to 6 receive the evidence in this case should you be one of 7 the jurors and deliberate fairly and impartially with 8 your fellow jurors and reach a verdict that you think is 9 appropriate from the evidence in this case? 10 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. 11 THE COURT: All right. Does the State have any 12 questions for Mr. Bowers? 13 MS. LUZAICH: No, Your Honor. 14 THE COURT: Does the defense? 15 MR. HYTE: Just briefly, Your Honor. 16 Good afternoon, Mr. Bowers. You indicated in 17 your questionnaire that you didn't remember maybe the 18 facts but that it sounded like an open-and-shut case. 19 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: It seemed like they got 20 him and because of how fast it was that it just left the 21 news, it just seemed like they got him. She went 22 missing, they looked for him, they got him and then it 23 was closed and never talked about again. 24 MR. HYTE: Okay. And the reason I am asking is 25 47 because open and shut, as the judge pointed out, kind of globally has a different meaning as well. In other 2

This is the trial of the State of Nevada versus Lesean Collins. And we know that you know that or at least some information about this trial already because you had to fill out a questionnaire. In that questionnaire you had indicated that 5 there's a possibility that you might have some 6 familiarity with this case or this trial based on something that you might have seen in the news. It was 8 very general as I perceived what you wrote but we just 9 wanted to make sure before we got started that you did 10 not actually have any familiarity with this case. 11

And more importantly, that whatever it is that you think you may have seen in the news that you would be able to set that aside and be a fair and impartial juror should you be selected in this case.

So can you tell us a little bit more about what it is that you saw in the news.

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, I can't. It was just something in the news that I thought that I might mention.

THE COURT: Did you remember seeing the name Lesean Collins in the news? 22

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. 23

24 THE COURT: Okay.

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: But I heard something

49

words, there's not much there for the defendant to defend on. You know, they caught him and the case is as good as 4 done because he's got no shot. 5

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: It was just how fast it fell off the news radar.

MR. HYTE: Okay. And you specifically said that you saw this on Fox. Do you remember if that was local news program?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. It Fox Five Las Vegas and that is the only one I really watch and so that was before work and I thought I heard something about it and I didn't want to omit that so I just brought it up.

MR. HYTE: Thank you, Mr. Bowers.

Nothing further, Your Honor.

16 THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Bowers. I am going 17 to ask you to step back outside. We will recall the 18 group back in, including you, as soon as we're able to, 19 20 okay?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Okay.

THE COURT: The next one is the language guy, 22 Mr. Tom. No. 126. 23

Mr. Tom, welcome. My name is Judge Delaney and I am the district court judge presiding over this trial. 48

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

25

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

22

23

24

about a death or somebody in the desert or something. I'm not sure if that's what it was. 2

THE COURT: Well, again, whatever the facts are in this case those will be brought forward at the time of trial and given to the jurors who are selected.

Can you recall approximately when you might have seen the news story that you thought might relate to this?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: About a month ago. THE COURT: Okay. I don't believe that there would have been any reason why this case would have been in the news a month ago. Is it possible that whatever you saw was unrelated?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Very possible. THE COURT: I appreciate that. And you just appreciate our caution and wanting to be sure.

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.

THE COURT: Even if it was possible if not certain that what you saw was unrelated to this case, can vou still set aside whatever it is you might have seen and recognize that whatever the verdict is in this trial has to be the product of fair deliberations of the jurors based upon the evidence presented in this case.

Would you be able to carry out your duty as a juror to receive the evidence as you find it to be, apply

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

21

24

the law as I give it to you and deliberate with your 2 fellow jurors and reach a verdict? A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I believe so. I don't 3 4 even know what I saw. THE COURT: Good to know. 5 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I was just trying to 6 7 answer the questionnaire. THE COURT: We appreciate that and that's why we 8 are asking the questions. 9 10 One more thing unrelated to that topic. The 10 11 Court is aware now, recent development in terms of 11 12 scheduling that we are not going to be able to complete 12 13 the trial by the end of next week as we originally hoped 13 14 but we are going to have less trial days next week and 14 15 then carry over into and including qualifying jurors 15 today through August 10th, 11th and 12th. Do you have 16 16 17 any prearranged travel or anything else that would be a 17 18 problem for you to serve on those dates? 18 19 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I just have an event 19 20 20 coming up. 21 THE COURT: That is your work concerns. And 21 22 we'll have a chance to discuss those and you are 22 23 certainly welcome to raise that as we actually have the 23 whole group in here to talk about potential hardships 24 24 25 during the time to serve. 25 51

your particular case the reason is because of the 2 circumstance that you pointed out in your questionnaire 3 of the --A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: My dad. 4

THE COURT: The circumstances in your family.

5

7

I'm trying to think of a delicate way to put it but I 6 don't suppose I need to. The circumstances of what occurred with your father and your mother and in these circumstances I do not want to put words in your mouth. 9

I thought you were very candid in your questionnaire about that circumstance and I perceived from that ultimate review of your questionnaire that you felt that you could proceed in this trial and be a fair and impartial juror. But, again, I do not want to put words in your mouth and now you are here today and now you are going to be dealing with the actual fact and circumstances at some point if you are chosen as a juror in this trial.

What is your opinion as you sit here today of your ability to serve in this trial?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Honestly, I think it would be too traumatic because even afterwards I was thinking about it while I was writing it and I tried to put it as best as I could.

THE COURT: Okay. Does either counsel want to

53

Just so that you are thinking about it while you 1 go back out there before we bring you back in with the 2 group. The dates now will be through and including 3 possibly Thursday of this week, possibly only Wednesday but up through and including Thursday of this week; 5 Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday afternoons next week, and 6 Monday, Tuesday possibly Wednesday afternoons the 7 following week. No Thursday or Friday other than 8 possibly this Wednesday. 9 10

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: It's just the schedule of what I am doing at work.

THE COURT: Okay. I appreciate your time. Does the State have anything for Mr. Tom? MS. LUZAICH: No, Judge. Thank you.

THE COURT: Does the defense?

MR. HYTE: We do not.

11

12

13

14

15

17

19

20

21

22

16 THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Tom. I will ask you to step back outside. We will bring you back in when we 18 bring in the entire panel.

The next one will be Ruby Ortiz, Badge No. 136. We appreciate you coming in today, Ms. Ortiz, not only for your service but I wanted to bring you in

individually. There were some folks, and we already 23 brought a couple people in and we have a few more to 24

bring in, that we wanted to talk to individually. And in

ask any questions? 2

3

4

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. HYTE: No, Your Honor.

MS. LUZAICH: No.

THE COURT: So, Ms. Ortiz, coming in here today, again, we did not pre-excuse you because we did not want to presume anything and certainly from your answers you have done remarkable things to deal with what none of us could possibly fathom, the difficulties that you have had to deal with, but that is why we brought you in today.

Secondly, because we wanted to know have you had any other thoughts since you filled out your questionnaire and whether or not this would be problematic for you.

The last thing in the world we would want, first and foremost, is to have anything be traumatic to a juror. But even equal to or just as important if not more important than that is this has to be a fair trial for the State and the defendant and ultimately to be understood that he is innocent unless and until he is proven guilty and for the State to prove beyond a reasonable doubt his guilt as to the charges.

And every juror that is there listening to the evidence, weighing the evidence and it is going to go on for a while, this trial, and then the evidence is going to come in and then they are going to have to hear the

54

law to be applied and weigh that with their fellow jurors 1 THE COURT: It would have been in the past? 2 and deliberate on those facts. We just want to make sure 2 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yeah. I thought I saw 3 that whoever is doing that is going to do that as fairly 3 something in the news. Maybe it would have been a 4 and impartially as possible and it is completely 4 similar case but I don't know. 5 understandable if you don't believe that you can do that. 5 THE COURT: Well, rather than try to get you to You said traumatic, but is it ultimately that 6 6 force your memory, as you sit here today it seems, and, 7 you are telling us that you don't believe that you could 7 again, I don't want to put words in your mouth so you 8 sit through the trial? 8 tell me if I'm wrong about this or tell us your thoughts, 9 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. 9 it seems that you might have seen something in the news THE COURT: Okay. Thank you for your time 10 10 but it doesn't, that you know of, actually pertain today. You are excused. Please take your badge and 11 11 12 directly to this case. 12 return to the third floor Jury Services. A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. 13 All right. The next one will be Mariana Lopez, 13 THE COURT: That's correct? 14 Badge No. 172. 14 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. 15 Ms. Lopez, thank you so much for being here 15 THE COURT: And regardless of what you might 16 today. My name is Kathleen Delaney and I am the 16 have seen, though, and whether or not it might pertain to presiding judge overseeing this trial in the case of the 17 17 this case, whatever you may have seen in the news, 18 State of Nevada versus Lesean Collins. We are going to 18 whatever you may see in the news related to any case, can bring the whole panel in here in a minute but we had a 19 19 20 you set that aside? 20 few folks that we wanted to talk to separately for a A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. couple of reasons but in your particular case you had 21 21 THE COURT: And if you are selected as a juror 22 mentioned perhaps seeing some pretrial publicity or 22 receive the evidence that comes in in this trial, apply 23 seeing some publicity of some kind that might have 23 the law that I give to you and then deliberate with your related to this trial. And obviously we want whoever is 24 24 fellow jurors to reach a fair and impartial verdict. Do 25 going to be potentially on this panel and ultimately 25 55 you believe you can do that? selected for this jury to be fair and impartial and not A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. have any knowledge of the actual case or any preconceived 2 2 THE COURT: And unrelated to sort of that issue 3 ideas about the case. 3 because I have you here, we originally anticipated this 4 I think your information was very general. It 4 trial to go through this week and next, but not go over didn't seem that you had specific recollection of seeing 5 to the next week after that, but we have determined that 6 something about this specific case. And the last thing 6 we are not going to be able to have a couple of trial we want to do is ask those questions in front of 7 7 dates later this week and the end of next week, so we are everybody else and then have someone go, Oh, yeah, I saw 8 going to go over into August 10th, 11th and 12th. We this, that and the other thing. 9 might complete by the 11th, but we are going to qualify 10 So do you recall -- and you have already filled 10 people, meaning, that they can serve if needed the 12th, out the questionnaire so you have some idea. Do you 11 11 so I just want to see if you have any prearranged travel? recall if you saw anything that was specific to this 12 12 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. 13 13 case? THE COURT: Does the State have any questions? 14 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. The first time I 14 MS. LUZAICH: No. 15 heard about it was when I read the questionnaire. 15 THE COURT: Does the defense? 16 THE COURT: Okay. In terms of the specific name 16 MR. HYTE: None. 17 of the defendant and the facts? 17 THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Lopez. I am going to 18 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. 18 ask you to rejoin the group and we will bring you all in 19 THE COURT: You said you might have seen 19

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.

58

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Okay. Thank you.

THE COURT: Okay. The rest of these folks are

This next one is Ms. Bermudez, No. 193.

Ms. Bermudez, you may have a seat.

57

56

20

21

22

23

24

25

shortly.

language folks.

this year?

20

21

22

23

24

25

something on the news, though. How long ago was that

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I honestly don't remember.

THE COURT: Would it have been like sometime

that you might have seen something?

I just thought I saw something.

1	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I don't speak English.	1	THE COURT: Ms. Bermudez, we have brought an		
2	THE COURT: Can you tell me how long you have	2	*		
3	been in the United States? How long you lived here?	3	The Court is having a hard time understanding that you		
4	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Excuse me?	4	are unable to understand the Court in any way because we		
5	THE COURT: Do you work here? Do you have a job	5	have a questionnaire that you filled out that indicates		
6	here?	6	at least some basic understanding of the English		
7	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.	7	language.		
8	THE COURT: You do not have a job?	8	Do you have any understanding of the English		
9	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: (No audible response.)	9	language?		
10	THE COURT: Hold on. I need to pull out her	10	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR (THROUGH THE INTERPRETER):		
11	questionnaire. Please have a seat.	11	No, I don't understand. You're reading, I		
12	Ms. Bermudez, you filled out this questionnaire.	12	understand some of it when it's written.		
13	Do you remember that?	13	THE COURT: Well, one of the questions that she		
14	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.	14	answered was how long has she lived in Las Vegas and the		
15	THE COURT: Does this look familiar to you?	15	answer she gave was 19 years.		
16	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I'm sorry I do not know.	16	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR (THROUGH THE INTERPRETER):		
17	THE COURT: I do not have the facility to ask	17	That's correct.		
18	the questions in any other way other than English, so I	18	THE COURT: So she has been here 19 years and		
19	don't know if we want to try to get an interpreter. I	19	has never had to learn the English language; is that		
20	mean there are answers to questions that are clearly -	20	correct?		
21	MS. LUZAICH: That indicate that she	21	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR (THROUGH THE INTERPRETER):		
22	understands.	22	No.		
23	THE COURT: And I don't know if she had someone	23	THE COURT: Can you ask her what her job is.		
24	helping her but she has indicated right now that she	24	,		
25	cannot understand a single word I am saying. I find that	25	I have not had a job for two years. 61		
	59		01		
1	difficult to believe but that is the response I am	1	THE COURT: Okay. What was her job previously?		
2	getting from Ms. Bermudez, Juror No. 193.	2	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR (THROUGH THE INTERPRETER):		
3	MS. LUZAICH: She can come back tomorrow with an	3	I worked for 15 years washing dishes.		
4	interpreter.	4	THE COURT: Where?		
		1 -	TIE COULT THE TENT		
5	THE COURT: That's true, she certainly can. Or	5	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR (THROUGH THE INTERPRETER):		
5 6		5 6			
	THE COURT: That's true, she certainly can. Or	1	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR (THROUGH THE INTERPRETER): In Boulder Station. THE COURT: And I have had some experience with		
6	THE COURT: That's true, she certainly can. Or we can try to get one up here.	6	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR (THROUGH THE INTERPRETER): In Boulder Station. THE COURT: And I have had some experience with kitchen worker positions in hotels not the Station Hotel,		
6 7	THE COURT: That's true, she certainly can. Or we can try to get one up here. MR. SCHIECK: There are a number of Spanish	6 7 8 9	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR (THROUGH THE INTERPRETER): In Boulder Station. THE COURT: And I have had some experience with kitchen worker positions in hotels not the Station Hotel, and while I understand much of the job can be done in		
6 7 8	THE COURT: That's true, she certainly can. Or we can try to get one up here. MR. SCHIECK: There are a number of Spanish speakers so maybe that would be helpful on all of them.	6 7 8 9	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR (THROUGH THE INTERPRETER): In Boulder Station. THE COURT: And I have had some experience with kitchen worker positions in hotels not the Station Hotel, and while I understand much of the job can be done in your native language, I also know that the casinos offer		
6 7 8 9 10 11	THE COURT: That's true, she certainly can. Or we can try to get one up here. MR. SCHIECK: There are a number of Spanish speakers so maybe that would be helpful on all of them. THE COURT: Good point. THE CLERK: All right. Someone is on their way up.	6 7 8 9 10 11	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR (THROUGH THE INTERPRETER): In Boulder Station. THE COURT: And I have had some experience with kitchen worker positions in hotels not the Station Hotel, and while I understand much of the job can be done in your native language, I also know that the casinos offer opportunities for language classes to learn English and I		
6 7 8 9 10 11 12	THE COURT: That's true, she certainly can. Or we can try to get one up here. MR. SCHIECK: There are a number of Spanish speakers so maybe that would be helpful on all of them. THE COURT: Good point. THE CLERK: All right. Someone is on their way up. THE COURT: Have a seat, Ms. Bermudez. Well, we	6 7 8 9 10 11 12	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR (THROUGH THE INTERPRETER): In Boulder Station. THE COURT: And I have had some experience with kitchen worker positions in hotels not the Station Hotel, and while I understand much of the job can be done in your native language, I also know that the casinos offer opportunities for language classes to learn English and I also know that the casinos offer the vast majority of the		
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	THE COURT: That's true, she certainly can. Or we can try to get one up here. MR. SCHIECK: There are a number of Spanish speakers so maybe that would be helpful on all of them. THE COURT: Good point. THE CLERK: All right. Someone is on their way up. THE COURT: Have a seat, Ms. Bermudez. Well, we can send her back out and we will be calling you back in	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR (THROUGH THE INTERPRETER): In Boulder Station. THE COURT: And I have had some experience with kitchen worker positions in hotels not the Station Hotel, and while I understand much of the job can be done in your native language, I also know that the casinos offer opportunities for language classes to learn English and I also know that the casinos offer the vast majority of the information to employees in English.		
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	THE COURT: That's true, she certainly can. Or we can try to get one up here. MR. SCHIECK: There are a number of Spanish speakers so maybe that would be helpful on all of them. THE COURT: Good point. THE CLERK: All right. Someone is on their way up. THE COURT: Have a seat, Ms. Bermudez. Well, we can send her back out and we will be calling you back in so you are not to leave.	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR (THROUGH THE INTERPRETER): In Boulder Station. THE COURT: And I have had some experience with kitchen worker positions in hotels not the Station Hotel, and while I understand much of the job can be done in your native language, I also know that the casinos offer opportunities for language classes to learn English and I also know that the casinos offer the vast majority of the information to employees in English. A PROSPECTIVE JUROR (THROUGH THE INTERPRETER):		
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	THE COURT: That's true, she certainly can. Or we can try to get one up here. MR. SCHIECK: There are a number of Spanish speakers so maybe that would be helpful on all of them. THE COURT: Good point. THE CLERK: All right. Someone is on their way up. THE COURT: Have a seat, Ms. Bermudez. Well, we can send her back out and we will be calling you back in so you are not to leave. (Interpreter enters the courtroom.)	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR (THROUGH THE INTERPRETER): In Boulder Station. THE COURT: And I have had some experience with kitchen worker positions in hotels not the Station Hotel, and while I understand much of the job can be done in your native language, I also know that the casinos offer opportunities for language classes to learn English and I also know that the casinos offer the vast majority of the information to employees in English. A PROSPECTIVE JUROR (THROUGH THE INTERPRETER): I'm sorry. Can you say that again.		
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	THE COURT: That's true, she certainly can. Or we can try to get one up here. MR. SCHIECK: There are a number of Spanish speakers so maybe that would be helpful on all of them. THE COURT: Good point. THE CLERK: All right. Someone is on their way up. THE COURT: Have a seat, Ms. Bermudez. Well, we can send her back out and we will be calling you back in so you are not to leave. (Interpreter enters the courtroom.) THE COURT: Hello, madam interpreter. Thank you	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR (THROUGH THE INTERPRETER): In Boulder Station. THE COURT: And I have had some experience with kitchen worker positions in hotels not the Station Hotel, and while I understand much of the job can be done in your native language, I also know that the casinos offer opportunities for language classes to learn English and I also know that the casinos offer the vast majority of the information to employees in English. A PROSPECTIVE JUROR (THROUGH THE INTERPRETER): I'm sorry. Can you say that again. THE COURT: There would have been the		
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	THE COURT: That's true, she certainly can. Or we can try to get one up here. MR. SCHIECK: There are a number of Spanish speakers so maybe that would be helpful on all of them. THE COURT: Good point. THE CLERK: All right. Someone is on their way up. THE COURT: Have a seat, Ms. Bermudez. Well, we can send her back out and we will be calling you back in so you are not to leave. (Interpreter enters the courtroom.) THE COURT: Hello, madam interpreter. Thank you for coming up so quickly.	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR (THROUGH THE INTERPRETER): In Boulder Station. THE COURT: And I have had some experience with kitchen worker positions in hotels not the Station Hotel, and while I understand much of the job can be done in your native language, I also know that the casinos offer opportunities for language classes to learn English and I also know that the casinos offer the vast majority of the information to employees in English. A PROSPECTIVE JUROR (THROUGH THE INTERPRETER): I'm sorry. Can you say that again. THE COURT: There would have been the opportunity to take English classes and that the		
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	THE COURT: That's true, she certainly can. Or we can try to get one up here. MR. SCHIECK: There are a number of Spanish speakers so maybe that would be helpful on all of them. THE COURT: Good point. THE CLERK: All right. Someone is on their way up. THE COURT: Have a seat, Ms. Bermudez. Well, we can send her back out and we will be calling you back in so you are not to leave. (Interpreter enters the courtroom.) THE COURT: Hello, madam interpreter. Thank you for coming up so quickly. Can we just get your name for our record.	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR (THROUGH THE INTERPRETER): In Boulder Station. THE COURT: And I have had some experience with kitchen worker positions in hotels not the Station Hotel, and while I understand much of the job can be done in your native language, I also know that the casinos offer opportunities for language classes to learn English and I also know that the casinos offer the vast majority of the information to employees in English. A PROSPECTIVE JUROR (THROUGH THE INTERPRETER): I'm sorry. Can you say that again. THE COURT: There would have been the opportunity to take English classes and that the information that the casino provides about benefits and		
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	THE COURT: That's true, she certainly can. Or we can try to get one up here. MR. SCHIECK: There are a number of Spanish speakers so maybe that would be helpful on all of them. THE COURT: Good point. THE CLERK: All right. Someone is on their way up. THE COURT: Have a seat, Ms. Bermudez. Well, we can send her back out and we will be calling you back in so you are not to leave. (Interpreter enters the courtroom.) THE COURT: Hello, madam interpreter. Thank you for coming up so quickly. Can we just get your name for our record. THE INTERPRETER: Tanya King.	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR (THROUGH THE INTERPRETER): In Boulder Station. THE COURT: And I have had some experience with kitchen worker positions in hotels not the Station Hotel, and while I understand much of the job can be done in your native language, I also know that the casinos offer opportunities for language classes to learn English and I also know that the casinos offer the vast majority of the information to employees in English. A PROSPECTIVE JUROR (THROUGH THE INTERPRETER): I'm sorry. Can you say that again. THE COURT: There would have been the opportunity to take English classes and that the information that the casino provides about benefits and other information is always in English. So is it still		
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	THE COURT: That's true, she certainly can. Or we can try to get one up here. MR. SCHIECK: There are a number of Spanish speakers so maybe that would be helpful on all of them. THE COURT: Good point. THE CLERK: All right. Someone is on their way up. THE COURT: Have a seat, Ms. Bermudez. Well, we can send her back out and we will be calling you back in so you are not to leave. (Interpreter enters the courtroom.) THE COURT: Hello, madam interpreter. Thank you for coming up so quickly. Can we just get your name for our record. THE INTERPRETER: Tanya King. THE COURT: Okay, Ms. King, so here's what we	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR (THROUGH THE INTERPRETER): In Boulder Station. THE COURT: And I have had some experience with kitchen worker positions in hotels not the Station Hotel, and while I understand much of the job can be done in your native language, I also know that the casinos offer opportunities for language classes to learn English and I also know that the casinos offer the vast majority of the information to employees in English. A PROSPECTIVE JUROR (THROUGH THE INTERPRETER): I'm sorry. Can you say that again. THE COURT: There would have been the opportunity to take English classes and that the information that the casino provides about benefits and other information is always in English. So is it still her position that she has had no opportunity to and does		
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	THE COURT: That's true, she certainly can. Or we can try to get one up here. MR. SCHIECK: There are a number of Spanish speakers so maybe that would be helpful on all of them. THE COURT: Good point. THE CLERK: All right. Someone is on their way up. THE COURT: Have a seat, Ms. Bermudez. Well, we can send her back out and we will be calling you back in so you are not to leave. (Interpreter enters the courtroom.) THE COURT: Hello, madam interpreter. Thank you for coming up so quickly. Can we just get your name for our record. THE INTERPRETER: Tanya King. THE COURT: Okay, Ms. King, so here's what we are doing. This is a juror, Ms. Bermudez. Can you	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR (THROUGH THE INTERPRETER): In Boulder Station. THE COURT: And I have had some experience with kitchen worker positions in hotels not the Station Hotel, and while I understand much of the job can be done in your native language, I also know that the casinos offer opportunities for language classes to learn English and I also know that the casinos offer the vast majority of the information to employees in English. A PROSPECTIVE JUROR (THROUGH THE INTERPRETER): I'm sorry. Can you say that again. THE COURT: There would have been the opportunity to take English classes and that the information that the casino provides about benefits and other information is always in English. So is it still her position that she has had no opportunity to and does not understand any English that is spoken.		
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	THE COURT: That's true, she certainly can. Or we can try to get one up here. MR. SCHIECK: There are a number of Spanish speakers so maybe that would be helpful on all of them. THE COURT: Good point. THE CLERK: All right. Someone is on their way up. THE COURT: Have a seat, Ms. Bermudez. Well, we can send her back out and we will be calling you back in so you are not to leave. (Interpreter enters the courtroom.) THE COURT: Hello, madam interpreter. Thank you for coming up so quickly. Can we just get your name for our record. THE INTERPRETER: Tanya King. THE COURT: Okay, Ms. King, so here's what we are doing. This is a juror, Ms. Bermudez. Can you please help her understand that we would like her to go	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR (THROUGH THE INTERPRETER): In Boulder Station. THE COURT: And I have had some experience with kitchen worker positions in hotels not the Station Hotel, and while I understand much of the job can be done in your native language, I also know that the casinos offer opportunities for language classes to learn English and I also know that the casinos offer the vast majority of the information to employees in English. A PROSPECTIVE JUROR (THROUGH THE INTERPRETER): I'm sorry. Can you say that again. THE COURT: There would have been the opportunity to take English classes and that the information that the casino provides about benefits and other information is always in English. So is it still her position that she has had no opportunity to and does not understand any English that is spoken. A PROSPECTIVE JUROR (THROUGH THE INTERPRETER):		
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	THE COURT: That's true, she certainly can. Or we can try to get one up here. MR. SCHIECK: There are a number of Spanish speakers so maybe that would be helpful on all of them. THE COURT: Good point. THE CLERK: All right. Someone is on their way up. THE COURT: Have a seat, Ms. Bermudez. Well, we can send her back out and we will be calling you back in so you are not to leave. (Interpreter enters the courtroom.) THE COURT: Hello, madam interpreter. Thank you for coming up so quickly. Can we just get your name for our record. THE INTERPRETER: Tanya King. THE COURT: Okay, Ms. King, so here's what we are doing. This is a juror, Ms. Bermudez. Can you please help her understand that we would like her to go be seated in the jury box and you go with her and join	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR (THROUGH THE INTERPRETER): In Boulder Station. THE COURT: And I have had some experience with kitchen worker positions in hotels not the Station Hotel, and while I understand much of the job can be done in your native language, I also know that the casinos offer opportunities for language classes to learn English and I also know that the casinos offer the vast majority of the information to employees in English. A PROSPECTIVE JUROR (THROUGH THE INTERPRETER): I'm sorry. Can you say that again. THE COURT: There would have been the opportunity to take English classes and that the information that the casino provides about benefits and other information is always in English. So is it still her position that she has had no opportunity to and does not understand any English that is spoken. A PROSPECTIVE JUROR (THROUGH THE INTERPRETER): Our employees all of them they speak Spanish. When		
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	THE COURT: That's true, she certainly can. Or we can try to get one up here. MR. SCHIECK: There are a number of Spanish speakers so maybe that would be helpful on all of them. THE COURT: Good point. THE CLERK: All right. Someone is on their way up. THE COURT: Have a seat, Ms. Bermudez. Well, we can send her back out and we will be calling you back in so you are not to leave. (Interpreter enters the courtroom.) THE COURT: Hello, madam interpreter. Thank you for coming up so quickly. Can we just get your name for our record. THE INTERPRETER: Tanya King. THE COURT: Okay, Ms. King, so here's what we are doing. This is a juror, Ms. Bermudez. Can you please help her understand that we would like her to go be seated in the jury box and you go with her and join her.	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR (THROUGH THE INTERPRETER): In Boulder Station. THE COURT: And I have had some experience with kitchen worker positions in hotels not the Station Hotel, and while I understand much of the job can be done in your native language, I also know that the casinos offer opportunities for language classes to learn English and I also know that the casinos offer the vast majority of the information to employees in English. A PROSPECTIVE JUROR (THROUGH THE INTERPRETER): I'm sorry. Can you say that again. THE COURT: There would have been the opportunity to take English classes and that the information that the casino provides about benefits and other information is always in English. So is it still her position that she has had no opportunity to and does not understand any English that is spoken. A PROSPECTIVE JUROR (THROUGH THE INTERPRETER): Our employees all of them they speak Spanish. When I started I went to some classes that were given there.		
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	THE COURT: That's true, she certainly can. Or we can try to get one up here. MR. SCHIECK: There are a number of Spanish speakers so maybe that would be helpful on all of them. THE COURT: Good point. THE CLERK: All right. Someone is on their way up. THE COURT: Have a seat, Ms. Bermudez. Well, we can send her back out and we will be calling you back in so you are not to leave. (Interpreter enters the courtroom.) THE COURT: Hello, madam interpreter. Thank you for coming up so quickly. Can we just get your name for our record. THE INTERPRETER: Tanya King. THE COURT: Okay, Ms. King, so here's what we are doing. This is a juror, Ms. Bermudez. Can you please help her understand that we would like her to go be seated in the jury box and you go with her and join	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR (THROUGH THE INTERPRETER): In Boulder Station. THE COURT: And I have had some experience with kitchen worker positions in hotels not the Station Hotel, and while I understand much of the job can be done in your native language, I also know that the casinos offer opportunities for language classes to learn English and I also know that the casinos offer the vast majority of the information to employees in English. A PROSPECTIVE JUROR (THROUGH THE INTERPRETER): I'm sorry. Can you say that again. THE COURT: There would have been the opportunity to take English classes and that the information that the casino provides about benefits and other information is always in English. So is it still her position that she has had no opportunity to and does not understand any English that is spoken. A PROSPECTIVE JUROR (THROUGH THE INTERPRETER): Our employees all of them they speak Spanish. When		

		T .			
1	and things like that.	1	MR. SCHIECK: No, Your Honor.		
2	THE COURT: All right. There were other	2	THE COURT: Ms. Bermudez, you are excused from		
3	questions on the questionnaire. Does she remember	3	service. I want you to be clear that I have my doubts		
4	filling out the questionnaire?	4	that you are being candid with us about your language		
5	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR (THROUGH THE INTERPRETER):	5	comprehension, but at the end of the day we need people		
6	Yes.	6	on the jury who will be able to receive the evidence and		
7	THE COURT: Did she fill it out on her own?	7	understand and receive the law to be applied to the		
1	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR (THROUGH THE INTERPRETER):	8	evidence and deliberate fairly and impartially with their		
8	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	9	fellow jurors. And as we have the concern that your		
9	Yes.		-		
10	THE COURT: So nobody assisted you in filling	10	language would be a barrier to that we are going to		
11	this out?	11	excuse you.		
12	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR (THROUGH THE INTERPRETER):	12	You need to now return to the third floor Jury		
13	No. I just was able to put in there what I could	13	Services and give them your badge and get any further		
14	understand.	14	instructions they may have for you.		
15	THE COURT: One of the questions that she	15	Does she have any questions about what she needs		
16	answered was regarding her marital status and there were	16	to do now?		
17	four choices and she chose one very specific one and hand	17	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR (THROUGH THE INTERPRETER):		
18	wrote it out in English. So, again, I am just trying to	18	No. Just to go down well, She has doubts about		
19	understand what her level of comprehension is.	19	how to reach the Jury Services office.		
20	What is her current marital status?	20	THE COURT: Well, I do not understand that		
	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR (THROUGH THE INTERPRETER):	21	because you came from there so I do not know how to tell		
21		22	her to go back there other than to go back the way she		
22	I am separated.	1	_		
23	THE COURT: That's what she indicated here.	23	came up. There's a public elevator, go down to the third		
24	She also answered a number of questions. There	24	floor. Look for the information that says Jury Services.		
25	were some questions that she did not answer but there	25	You said you read better than you speak English language.		
	63		65		
1					
1	were some questions that she apparently attempted to	1	Take a right out of the elevator and go to Jury Services.		
2	answer.	2	I am sure that there will be someone there that can give		
3	Let me ask another question. Does she have any	3	you further instructions but you have to turn in your		
4	relatives or close friends who work in the justice	4	badge.		
5	system?	5	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR (THROUGH THE INTERPRETER):		
1	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR (THROUGH THE INTERPRETER):	6	And then I go to the third floor. My daughter is		
6		7	waiting for me.		
7	No.	8			
8	THE COURT: You do not have any friends who are	1	THE COURT: Where is she waiting for her?		
9	attorneys or police officers or corrections officers,	9	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR (THROUGH THE INTERPRETER):		
10	anything having to do with criminal justice of any kind?	10	In the room or lounge.		
11	Friends or family members.	11	THE COURT: That sounds like that is where she		
12	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR (THROUGH THE INTERPRETER):	12	is going back to but she has to turn in her badge and		
13	I have a nephew in California who is a police	13	check out with Jury Services first.		
14	officer.	14	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR (THROUGH THE INTERPRETER):		
15	THE COURT: Okay. I focused on that one so I	15	Okay. I am really sorry about that.		
16	would have a question to compare with the answer that she	16			
17	gave versus what may be the correct answer being able to	17	194.		
18	converse with her in her native language.	18	Ms. Soto, we have an interpreter here that will		
19	I am not trying belabor the point. It just	19	assist you just in case it's necessary.		
20	always bothers me when someone is not necessarily genuine	20	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Okay.		
1	•	21	THE COURT: Please take a seat here. The		
21	about their level of comprehension of the English	1			
22	language, which is the concern I have here.	22	interpreter is here to help but that is for you and to		
23	Does either counsel wish to inquire of	23	speak to each other.		
24	Ms. Bermudez?	24	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. I speak perfect		
25	MS. BLUTH: The State does not, Judge.	25	English.		
	64		66		
		1			

1	THE INTERPRETER: Oh, no problem.	1	MR. HYTE: No, Your Honor.		
2	THE COURT: Good to know. Your questionnaire	2			
3	was flagged as the possibility of there being some	3	•		
4	concern about the English language, so that's why we were	4	step back out.		
5	not going to have an interpreter up here because we had	5	The next one is Luis Garcia-Salcedo, 196.		
6	hoped it would be the dialogue that you and I are about	6	,		
7	to have not and you would not need the assistance of an	7	Ms. Soto, the reason I had flagged her was just for the		
8	interpreter. But the first juror we brought in indicated	8	Court's edification first question: Are you able to		
9	she could not speak English at all so we needed the	9	serve as a juror? No. And then the response to the		
10	assistance of an interpreter.	10	second question she put I don't understand.		
11	So is English your second language?	11	But I do note that the rest of her questionnaire		
12	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, actually it's my	12	seemed like she was comprehending fine.		
13	first.	13	THE COURT: Okay. We'll find out more I guess		
14	THE COURT: Okay. I'm sorry for the confusion.	14	about that.		
15	I am not sure where that came in.	15	Mr. Garcia-Salcedo, we have an interpreter here		
16	I guess one of the things since we have you in	16	because we want to be sure that we are able to ask you		
17	here to ask would be we now know that the trial is going	17	some questions about your ability to serve and		
18	to be a little bit longer than we anticipated. We are	18	specifically that you indicated maybe you would have		
19	going to have less days that we are in trial over the	19	difficultly with the language.		
20	next two weeks but then we will actually spill over into	20	Do you need the help of an interpreter to		
21	the first few days of the following week which would be	21	communicate with me?		
22	August 10th and 11th and possibly the 12th. So everybody	22	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR (THROUGH THE INTERPRETER):		
23	we are qualifying is through and including the 12th.	23	Well, I can't do it by myself actually.		
24	Other than perhaps the inconvenience of it, is	24	THE COURT: Let me ask you a question. How long		
25	there any prepaid travel plan or any other hardship that	25	have you lived in Las Vegas? I know this information may		
	67		69		
1	you know that would mean that you couldn't serve.	1	be on your questionnaire but since I don't have it in		
2	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, not really. I just go	2	front of me right now just indulge me and let me ask you		
3	to work and school.	3	a couple questions. How long have you lived in Las		
4	THE COURT: So you are busy.	4	Vegas?		
5	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.	5	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR (THROUGH THE INTERPRETER):		
6	THE COURT: What's going to happen just so you	6	Since 2001.		
7	know because we are going to bring in the whole panel in	7	THE COURT: Did you move here from outside the		
8	a minute and we are going to ask about hardship issues	8	country or did you come from another state? How long		
9	with serving during the time frame once I give everybody	9	have you been in the United States?		
10	the new time frame but I figured since I had you in here	10	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR (THROUGH THE INTERPRETER):		
11	I could ask you.	11	I arrived here in '98.		
12	We will go through three, possibly four days	12	THE COURT: So you have been here for a fairly		
13	this week to complete the jury selection process. Then	13	significant period of time. Have you worked since you		
14	we are going to reconvene for three days next week;	14	have been here in the United States?		
15	Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday only. Not Thursday or	15	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR (THROUGH THE INTERPRETER):		
16	Friday. They will be half days 1:30 to 5:00.	16	Yes.		
17	And then we will reconvene the following week	17	THE COURT: Do you currently work?		
18	Monday and Tuesday and if necessary Wednesday, again,	18	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR (THROUGH THE INTERPRETER):		
19	1:30 to 5:00 to complete the trial process with a	19	Yes.		
20	possible half hour swing maybe as early as a 1:00 start	20	THE COURT: What is your job?		
21	but no later than 1:30. So those three days. No	21	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR (THROUGH THE INTERPRETER):		
22	Thursday or Friday of the following two weeks.	22	I do maintenance.		
23	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Okay.	23	THE COURT: Where?		
		24	A DROGREGERY E RIDOR (TIROTICH THE INTERDRETER).		
24	THE COURT: Does either counsel have any	24	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR (THROUGH THE INTERPRETER):		
	THE COURT: Does either counsel have any questions?	25	In a company. An apartment company.		
24					

			1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1		
1	THE COURT: You mean it's a company that has a	1 2	been excused and see if they have any further		
2					
3	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR (THROUGH THE INTERPRETER):	3	•		
4	Yes.	4	- · · · ·		
5	THE COURT: Okay. How long have you worked for	5 6	THE COURT: Jury Services on the third floor		
6	• *		where you came from, yes. I do not know what else they		
7	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR (THROUGH THE INTERPRETER):	7	will tell you. I don't know what other instructions they		
8	I started there the 27th of April.	8	may have for you so when you go back down there tell them		
9	THE COURT: This year?	9	that you have been excused here, turn your badge in and		
10	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR (THROUGH THE INTERPRETER):	10	see if they have any additional information for you.		
11	Yes.	11	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR (THROUGH THE INTERPRETER):		
12	THE COURT: Where did you work before that?	12	All right. Thank you.		
13	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR (THROUGH THE INTERPRETER):	13	THE COURT: Thank you.		
14	Doing the same for another company.	14	Next is Ms. Pretel, Juror No. 254.		
15	THE COURT: Have you ever worked in any position	15	Ms. Pretei, please take a seat in the jury box.		
16	other than maintenance?	16	Do you speak English?		
17	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR (THROUGH THE INTERPRETER):	17	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Not too much.		
18	No.	18	THE COURT: But a little bit. Where are you		
19	THE COURT: Have you ever worked for any of the	19	from?		
20	casino companies here in town?	20	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Guatemala.		
21	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR (THROUGH THE INTERPRETER):	21	THE COURT: We have a Spanish interpreter here		
22	No.	22	that could assist you. Would that help you?		
23	THE COURT: What would you tell me your estimate	23	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR (THROUGH THE INTERPRETER):		
24	of what percentage of English you can speak and	24	Yes.		
25	understand.	25	THE COURT: So we are just going to communicate		
	71		73		
-	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR (THROUGH THE INTERPRETER):	1	then with the interpreter. We brought you in for that		
1	Could be 30, 40 percent.	2	reason. We noticed on your questionnaire that you		
3	THE COURT: Okay. Does the State have any	3	indicated you might have difficulty with the English		
4	questions?	4	language as this trial obviously the evidence presented		
5			milbande an ann and an indiana franchis		
1		15	is going to be in English and the law that you would have		
1 K	MS. LUZAICH: No.	5	is going to be in English and the law that you would have to apply to the evidence would be presented in English.		
6	THE COURT: The defense?	6	to apply to the evidence would be presented in English.		
7	THE COURT: The defense? MR. HYTE: No. I will just point out that on	6 7	to apply to the evidence would be presented in English. But we wanted to ask you a few questions before		
7 8	THE COURT: The defense? MR. HYTE: No. I will just point out that on his questionnaire, Questions 1 and 2 are incomplete and	6	to apply to the evidence would be presented in English. But we wanted to ask you a few questions before we got started with the whole group here today to see if		
7 8 9	THE COURT: The defense? MR. HYTE: No. I will just point out that on his questionnaire, Questions 1 and 2 are incomplete and four were left blank and in the comment section he wrote,	6 7 8 9	to apply to the evidence would be presented in English. But we wanted to ask you a few questions before we got started with the whole group here today to see if we could even keep you or whether we need to let you go		
7 8 9 10	THE COURT: The defense? MR. HYTE: No. I will just point out that on his questionnaire, Questions 1 and 2 are incomplete and four were left blank and in the comment section he wrote, I don't speak English well. On Question 10 regarding	6 7 8 9 10	to apply to the evidence would be presented in English. But we wanted to ask you a few questions before we got started with the whole group here today to see if we could even keep you or whether we need to let you go at this point.		
7 8 9 10 11	THE COURT: The defense? MR. HYTE: No. I will just point out that on his questionnaire, Questions 1 and 2 are incomplete and four were left blank and in the comment section he wrote, I don't speak English well. On Question 10 regarding what's the occupation of your spouse his answer was no.	6 7 8 9 10 11	to apply to the evidence would be presented in English. But we wanted to ask you a few questions before we got started with the whole group here today to see if we could even keep you or whether we need to let you go at this point. How long have you lived in the United States?		
7 8 9 10 11 12	THE COURT: The defense? MR. HYTE: No. I will just point out that on his questionnaire, Questions 1 and 2 are incomplete and four were left blank and in the comment section he wrote, I don't speak English well. On Question 10 regarding what's the occupation of your spouse his answer was no. THE COURT: Obviously, we need to be sure that	6 7 8 9 10 11 12	to apply to the evidence would be presented in English. But we wanted to ask you a few questions before we got started with the whole group here today to see if we could even keep you or whether we need to let you go at this point.		
7 8 9 10 11 12 13	THE COURT: The defense? MR. HYTE: No. I will just point out that on his questionnaire, Questions 1 and 2 are incomplete and four were left blank and in the comment section he wrote, I don't speak English well. On Question 10 regarding what's the occupation of your spouse his answer was no. THE COURT: Obviously, we need to be sure that whoever is going to be a juror in this or any trial has	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	to apply to the evidence would be presented in English. But we wanted to ask you a few questions before we got started with the whole group here today to see if we could even keep you or whether we need to let you go at this point. How long have you lived in the United States? A PROSPECTIVE JUROR (THROUGH THE INTERPRETER): Since 1970.		
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	THE COURT: The defense? MR. HYTE: No. I will just point out that on his questionnaire, Questions 1 and 2 are incomplete and four were left blank and in the comment section he wrote, I don't speak English well. On Question 10 regarding what's the occupation of your spouse his answer was no. THE COURT: Obviously, we need to be sure that whoever is going to be a juror in this or any trial has the ability to receive all of the evidence as it comes	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	to apply to the evidence would be presented in English. But we wanted to ask you a few questions before we got started with the whole group here today to see if we could even keep you or whether we need to let you go at this point. How long have you lived in the United States? A PROSPECTIVE JUROR (THROUGH THE INTERPRETER): Since 1970. THE COURT: 1970. That is an awfully long time		
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	THE COURT: The defense? MR. HYTE: No. I will just point out that on his questionnaire, Questions 1 and 2 are incomplete and four were left blank and in the comment section he wrote, I don't speak English well. On Question 10 regarding what's the occupation of your spouse his answer was no. THE COURT: Obviously, we need to be sure that whoever is going to be a juror in this or any trial has the ability to receive all of the evidence as it comes into evidence and has the ability to understand and apply	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	to apply to the evidence would be presented in English. But we wanted to ask you a few questions before we got started with the whole group here today to see if we could even keep you or whether we need to let you go at this point. How long have you lived in the United States? A PROSPECTIVE JUROR (THROUGH THE INTERPRETER): Since 1970.		
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	THE COURT: The defense? MR. HYTE: No. I will just point out that on his questionnaire, Questions 1 and 2 are incomplete and four were left blank and in the comment section he wrote, I don't speak English well. On Question 10 regarding what's the occupation of your spouse his answer was no. THE COURT: Obviously, we need to be sure that whoever is going to be a juror in this or any trial has the ability to receive all of the evidence as it comes into evidence and has the ability to understand and apply the law that the Court would give to the jurors and then	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	to apply to the evidence would be presented in English. But we wanted to ask you a few questions before we got started with the whole group here today to see if we could even keep you or whether we need to let you go at this point. How long have you lived in the United States? A PROSPECTIVE JUROR (THROUGH THE INTERPRETER): Since 1970. THE COURT: 1970. That is an awfully long time to be in the United States and not have developed the English language better. Have you been employed since		
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	THE COURT: The defense? MR. HYTE: No. I will just point out that on his questionnaire, Questions 1 and 2 are incomplete and four were left blank and in the comment section he wrote, I don't speak English well. On Question 10 regarding what's the occupation of your spouse his answer was no. THE COURT: Obviously, we need to be sure that whoever is going to be a juror in this or any trial has the ability to receive all of the evidence as it comes into evidence and has the ability to understand and apply the law that the Court would give to the jurors and then deliberate with the fellow jurors to reach a verdict.	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	to apply to the evidence would be presented in English. But we wanted to ask you a few questions before we got started with the whole group here today to see if we could even keep you or whether we need to let you go at this point. How long have you lived in the United States? A PROSPECTIVE JUROR (THROUGH THE INTERPRETER): Since 1970. THE COURT: 1970. That is an awfully long time to be in the United States and not have developed the English language better. Have you been employed since you have been here?		
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	THE COURT: The defense? MR. HYTE: No. I will just point out that on his questionnaire, Questions 1 and 2 are incomplete and four were left blank and in the comment section he wrote, I don't speak English well. On Question 10 regarding what's the occupation of your spouse his answer was no. THE COURT: Obviously, we need to be sure that whoever is going to be a juror in this or any trial has the ability to receive all of the evidence as it comes into evidence and has the ability to understand and apply the law that the Court would give to the jurors and then deliberate with the fellow jurors to reach a verdict. And because we have those concerns of your	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	to apply to the evidence would be presented in English. But we wanted to ask you a few questions before we got started with the whole group here today to see if we could even keep you or whether we need to let you go at this point. How long have you lived in the United States? A PROSPECTIVE JUROR (THROUGH THE INTERPRETER): Since 1970. THE COURT: 1970. That is an awfully long time to be in the United States and not have developed the English language better. Have you been employed since you have been here? A PROSPECTIVE JUROR (THROUGH THE INTERPRETER):		
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	THE COURT: The defense? MR. HYTE: No. I will just point out that on his questionnaire, Questions 1 and 2 are incomplete and four were left blank and in the comment section he wrote, I don't speak English well. On Question 10 regarding what's the occupation of your spouse his answer was no. THE COURT: Obviously, we need to be sure that whoever is going to be a juror in this or any trial has the ability to receive all of the evidence as it comes into evidence and has the ability to understand and apply the law that the Court would give to the jurors and then deliberate with the fellow jurors to reach a verdict. And because we have those concerns of your ability to do that with your language, we appreciate your	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	to apply to the evidence would be presented in English. But we wanted to ask you a few questions before we got started with the whole group here today to see if we could even keep you or whether we need to let you go at this point. How long have you lived in the United States? A PROSPECTIVE JUROR (THROUGH THE INTERPRETER): Since 1970. THE COURT: 1970. That is an awfully long time to be in the United States and not have developed the English language better. Have you been employed since you have been here? A PROSPECTIVE JUROR (THROUGH THE INTERPRETER): Yes.		
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	THE COURT: The defense? MR. HYTE: No. I will just point out that on his questionnaire, Questions 1 and 2 are incomplete and four were left blank and in the comment section he wrote, I don't speak English well. On Question 10 regarding what's the occupation of your spouse his answer was no. THE COURT: Obviously, we need to be sure that whoever is going to be a juror in this or any trial has the ability to receive all of the evidence as it comes into evidence and has the ability to understand and apply the law that the Court would give to the jurors and then deliberate with the fellow jurors to reach a verdict. And because we have those concerns of your ability to do that with your language, we appreciate your candidate answers to our questions here today we are	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	to apply to the evidence would be presented in English. But we wanted to ask you a few questions before we got started with the whole group here today to see if we could even keep you or whether we need to let you go at this point. How long have you lived in the United States? A PROSPECTIVE JUROR (THROUGH THE INTERPRETER): Since 1970. THE COURT: 1970. That is an awfully long time to be in the United States and not have developed the English language better. Have you been employed since you have been here? A PROSPECTIVE JUROR (THROUGH THE INTERPRETER): Yes. THE COURT: What jobs have you had since you		
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	THE COURT: The defense? MR. HYTE: No. I will just point out that on his questionnaire, Questions 1 and 2 are incomplete and four were left blank and in the comment section he wrote, I don't speak English well. On Question 10 regarding what's the occupation of your spouse his answer was no. THE COURT: Obviously, we need to be sure that whoever is going to be a juror in this or any trial has the ability to receive all of the evidence as it comes into evidence and has the ability to understand and apply the law that the Court would give to the jurors and then deliberate with the fellow jurors to reach a verdict. And because we have those concerns of your ability to do that with your language, we appreciate your candidate answers to our questions here today we are going to go ahead and excuse you from the service.	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	to apply to the evidence would be presented in English. But we wanted to ask you a few questions before we got started with the whole group here today to see if we could even keep you or whether we need to let you go at this point. How long have you lived in the United States? A PROSPECTIVE JUROR (THROUGH THE INTERPRETER): Since 1970. THE COURT: 1970. That is an awfully long time to be in the United States and not have developed the English language better. Have you been employed since you have been here? A PROSPECTIVE JUROR (THROUGH THE INTERPRETER): Yes. THE COURT: What jobs have you had since you have been here?		
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	THE COURT: The defense? MR. HYTE: No. I will just point out that on his questionnaire, Questions 1 and 2 are incomplete and four were left blank and in the comment section he wrote, I don't speak English well. On Question 10 regarding what's the occupation of your spouse his answer was no. THE COURT: Obviously, we need to be sure that whoever is going to be a juror in this or any trial has the ability to receive all of the evidence as it comes into evidence and has the ability to understand and apply the law that the Court would give to the jurors and then deliberate with the fellow jurors to reach a verdict. And because we have those concerns of your ability to do that with your language, we appreciate your candidate answers to our questions here today we are going to go ahead and excuse you from the service. What you will need to do is take the badge that	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	to apply to the evidence would be presented in English. But we wanted to ask you a few questions before we got started with the whole group here today to see if we could even keep you or whether we need to let you go at this point. How long have you lived in the United States? A PROSPECTIVE JUROR (THROUGH THE INTERPRETER): Since 1970. THE COURT: 1970. That is an awfully long time to be in the United States and not have developed the English language better. Have you been employed since you have been here? A PROSPECTIVE JUROR (THROUGH THE INTERPRETER): Yes. THE COURT: What jobs have you had since you have been here? A PROSPECTIVE JUROR (THROUGH THE INTERPRETER):		
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	THE COURT: The defense? MR. HYTE: No. I will just point out that on his questionnaire, Questions 1 and 2 are incomplete and four were left blank and in the comment section he wrote, I don't speak English well. On Question 10 regarding what's the occupation of your spouse his answer was no. THE COURT: Obviously, we need to be sure that whoever is going to be a juror in this or any trial has the ability to receive all of the evidence as it comes into evidence and has the ability to understand and apply the law that the Court would give to the jurors and then deliberate with the fellow jurors to reach a verdict. And because we have those concerns of your ability to do that with your language, we appreciate your candidate answers to our questions here today we are going to go ahead and excuse you from the service. What you will need to do is take the badge that you were given at Jury Services on the third floor, so	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	to apply to the evidence would be presented in English. But we wanted to ask you a few questions before we got started with the whole group here today to see if we could even keep you or whether we need to let you go at this point. How long have you lived in the United States? A PROSPECTIVE JUROR (THROUGH THE INTERPRETER): Since 1970. THE COURT: 1970. That is an awfully long time to be in the United States and not have developed the English language better. Have you been employed since you have been here? A PROSPECTIVE JUROR (THROUGH THE INTERPRETER): Yes. THE COURT: What jobs have you had since you have been here? A PROSPECTIVE JUROR (THROUGH THE INTERPRETER): I have worked in a factory.		
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	THE COURT: The defense? MR. HYTE: No. I will just point out that on his questionnaire, Questions 1 and 2 are incomplete and four were left blank and in the comment section he wrote, I don't speak English well. On Question 10 regarding what's the occupation of your spouse his answer was no. THE COURT: Obviously, we need to be sure that whoever is going to be a juror in this or any trial has the ability to receive all of the evidence as it comes into evidence and has the ability to understand and apply the law that the Court would give to the jurors and then deliberate with the fellow jurors to reach a verdict. And because we have those concerns of your ability to do that with your language, we appreciate your candidate answers to our questions here today we are going to go ahead and excuse you from the service. What you will need to do is take the badge that	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	to apply to the evidence would be presented in English. But we wanted to ask you a few questions before we got started with the whole group here today to see if we could even keep you or whether we need to let you go at this point. How long have you lived in the United States? A PROSPECTIVE JUROR (THROUGH THE INTERPRETER): Since 1970. THE COURT: 1970. That is an awfully long time to be in the United States and not have developed the English language better. Have you been employed since you have been here? A PROSPECTIVE JUROR (THROUGH THE INTERPRETER): Yes. THE COURT: What jobs have you had since you have been here? A PROSPECTIVE JUROR (THROUGH THE INTERPRETER):		

1	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR (THROUGH THE INTERPRETER):	1	questions for Ms. Pretel?	
2	Christmas - they would manufacture those Christmas	2	MS. LUZAICH: Not by the State.	
3	bulbs and Christmas decorations.	3	MR. HYTE: No, Your Honor. And for the record,	
4	THE COURT: Where was that?	4	on her questionnaire she left blank more than 50 percent	
5	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR (THROUGH THE INTERPRETER):	5	of the questions. And on the comment section she noted,	
6	Back in Los Angeles, California.	6	I don't speak English well.	
7	THE COURT: Where else have you worked?	7	THE COURT: And that was your comment when she	
8	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR (THROUGH THE INTERPRETER):	8	first came in as well.	
9	I used to live there.	9	So, Ms. Pretel, you are excused at this time	
10	THE COURT: Where else have you worked?	10	because of our concerns of your ability to receive the	
11	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR (THROUGH THE INTERPRETER):	11	evidence and weigh the evidence and apply the law given	
12	I work here in the Mirage casino for 17 years.	12	to you if you were to be seated as a juror in this case.	
13	THE COURT: All right. What years did you work	13	You will need to return to third floor Jury	
14	at the Mirage casino?	14	Services and turn in the badge that you have on your	
15	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR (THROUGH THE INTERPRETER):	15	shirt. Go back to this third floor Jury Services and	
16	I started in '99 and ended back in December of this	16	explain to them that you have been excused. Turn in your	
17	last year.	17	badge and receive any further instructions that they	
18	THE COURT: Okay. So, actually, I don't know	18	might have.	
19	I will tell you that I worked at the Mirage casino for	19	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR (THROUGH THE INTER	PRETER):
20	part of the time that you were describing, a very small	20	Okay.	
21	part of the time that you are describing, so I have some	21	THE COURT: Thank you. Next is Mr. Ghyasi, 317.	
22	understanding. What did you do for the Mirage?	22	Come on in and sit down, Mr. Ghyasi. My name is	
23	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR (THROUGH THE INTERPRETER):	23	Kathleen Delaney. I am the judge presiding over this	
24	Housekeeping and room service.	24	trial. We asked you in and you did in fact fill out a	
25	THE COURT: Now, my understanding of how those	25	questionnaire previously; do you remember doing that?	
	75			77
1	places worked, how those jobs worked is while there was	1	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.	
2	some communication in your native language that there	2	THE COURT: We wanted to talk to you about what	
3	would have still been the need to understand English for	3	you indicated on your questionnaire about the trouble you	
4	benefits purposes, for other purposes, and that English	4	might have with English. Can I ask you how long have you	
5	as a second language classes were provided. Did you ever	5	lived in the United States.	
6	take advantage of any of those classes?	6	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: 33 years.	
7	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR (THROUGH THE INTERPRETER):	7	THE COURT: While you have been here have you	
8	I started to take some at the job because they give	8	been employed?	
9	these classes there but only for a short time.	9	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.	
10	THE COURT: Again, I only overlapped with your	10	THE COURT: What jobs have you done?	
11	service for a brief period of time.	11	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Landscaping.	
12	Obviously, we want people who are able to serve	12	THE COURT: Where? Is that the only job you've	
13	on the jury who can receive the evidence, understand the	13	had?	
14	evidence and apply the law.	14	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. After this I am a	
15	Can you tell me at this point even with the	15	bus person.	
16	amount of time that you have been here, and again it is	16	THE COURT: You are a bus person?	
17	difficult to understand, what percentage would you	17	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I used to be.	
18	estimate of English do you understand reading or	18	THE COURT: What casinos did you work for?	
19	speaking?	19	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Frontier and after that I	
20	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR (THROUGH THE INTERPRETER):	20	worked in the Circus Circus.	
21	Spoken English I understand a little bit more but	21	THE COURT: So certainly I know in the bus	
22	written English is almost nothing. It is too few.	22	person job and certainly as a dealer job you would have	
23	Spoken language I understand more but when people speak	23	to communicate with guests so you would have to have some	
24	fast I do not understand.	24	English capacity, correct?	
25	THE COURT: Does counsel have any further	25	A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.	
	76	l		78

THE COURT: What would you estimate to be your understanding percentage wise of English being spoken or 2 3 3 written? 4 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: My problem is reading and 5 5 writing. 6 THE COURT: I asked you to estimate for me the 6 percentage of English do you read and write. 7 7 8 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Most of the time I cannot 8 9 9 understand the question. THE COURT: Did anybody assist you in filling 10 10 11 out the questionnaire? 11 12 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. I did it. 12 THE COURT: Do you believe that you understood 13 13 the questions on the questionnaire? 14 14 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. 15 15 THE COURT: Again, the difficulty that the Court 16 16 17 17 has is it needs to be sure before it excuses anybody that there is a justification to do that and it's hard to 18 18 understand that someone who has lived here for 30 plus 19 19 years, worked for a casino company in which the vast 20 20 21 majority of the information that would be provided to you 21 22 22 to understand your pay, your benefits, et cetera, would all be in English, certainly not in Persian, and yet you 23 23 24 24 are here today indicating that you do not read, write or

risk this trial with regard to having anybody on the jury that cannot or would not understand the information that is provided, understand the law that is to be applied and to deliberate fairly and impartially with their fellow jurors, so I am going to excuse you at this time with some doubts in my mind. Again, return to the third floor Jury Services to return your badge. A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Okay. Appreciate it. THE COURT: Thank you. I think that is about all of our individual canvassing. Let's have the whole panel brought in. (Potential jurors enter the courtroom.) THE COURT: I will ask the panel to please stand to take an oath as we proceed with questioning you as potential jurors. Please all stand. THE CLERK: You do solemnly swear that you will well and truly answer such questions put to you touching upon your qualifications as jurors on the case at issue so help you God.

(Potential jurors answer in the affirmative.) THE COURT: Thank you all. As you take your seats I will just remind the remainder of you to please make sure you have your cell phones are off or silent. And certainly no one is to be using the cell phone while

25 they are in here; no texting, no facebook, no tweeting,

81

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I understand it but most 2 questions I do not answer the question. THE COURT: Does the State have any questions

for Mr. Ghyasi?

MS. BLUTH: No, Your Honor.

understand the English language at all.

25

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Does the defense have any questions?

MR. SCHIECK: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you want to make any record?

MR. SCHIECK: I would just note for the record,

Your Honor, that he did not answer at least half of the questions. And on the last page he did indicate he is having difficulty with the English language. And the spelling on his answer was phonetic at best.

My concerns would be on complicated jury instruction type issues or issues of a technical nature he would struggle with understanding of the English version of what that testimony was.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Ghyasi, you are excused, however, you do still need to take that badge that was given to you that is on your shirt, you have to return down to the third floor Jury Services where we brought you up from so that you can tell them that you have been excused.

I have concerns about the information that has been provided today but at the end of the day I cannot

blogging or anything like, okay?

have been here the better part of the day anticipating coming in for the jury selection. We had a number of matters we had to address. And then of course we have talked to a number of your fellow jurors already to address certain pieces of information and that is one of the benefits when we can have a questionnaire because it sort of helps us expedite the process.

We appreciate it's 4:00 on a Monday and you all

First of all, I need to ask and I need to be sure that Jury Services has not sent us someone who is ineligible to serve and there are two basic criteria's to make sure that you are eligible to serve: You must be a US citizen; and if you are a convicted felon you must have had your rights restored to enable you to have jury service, right to vote, et cetera.

Is there anyone here who is not a US citizen or is a convicted felon whose rights have not been restored?

19 I see one hand. Sir, if you can give us your name and the last three digits of your badge number.

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Mr. Adams, 211.

22 THE COURT: Mr. Adams, what is the circumstance 23 that makes you ineligible to serve?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I was convicted of a felony in 2000 and I have never had anything restored or

82

79

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8 9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

21

24

anything like that.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: All right. I probably could take a minute and look you up. Was that here in Clark County?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.

THE COURT: And when you say you haven't had your rights restored, did you serve a term of incarceration, were you on probation, what happened? A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I was on probation. THE COURT: All right. So were you honorably

discharged?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.

THE COURT: At that point in time I believe that your rights would be automatically restored; is that not the case?

MS. LUZAICH: No. You have to affirmatively move to get them restored.

THE COURT: Okay. I thought I heard differently recently.

At this time, Mr. Adams, I do not have any basis to independently confirm that. You would not necessarily have to come back to court to do that but you would have had to ask for and do something that would have got your rights restored. So if you do not believe that your rights have been restored then you would be ineligible to serve.

83

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

last three digits of your badge number. That is just a pre-reminder and I will continue to remind you as we go 2 3 along.

Also in the courtroom is Dania Batiste, the 4 5 court clerk and I have Tom Lobkowitz who is our marshal and he will be the one if you do have to have any communications with the Court he will be the one who will 7 facilitate that for you. 8

I also have behind the scenes two additional staff members. I have a judicial executive assistant. Her name is Cindy Springberg. I have a law clerk by the name of Jamie Combs and I have a court extern who is a Boyd Law School student at this time named Kyle Wyant. Those are all the staff members for the Court.

I am going to ask now for the State and for the defense to introduce themselves and their witnesses. But I will note that the case that you have been sent to serve as potential jurors is the case of the State of Nevada versus Lesean Collins. I know that you are probably aware of that from the questionnaire that you filled out.

I will note for the record that Mr. Collins is not present with us here today. It is the right of a defendant to elect to not be present for any portion of the trial. And Mr. Collins has in fact elected his right

I will ask you to please return to third floor Jury Services to turn in your badge and explain to them and see if they have any further instructions for you.

The next circumstance I would like to address is we need to find out if there is anyone here who is acquainted with, knowledgeable of either me, members of my staff, the counsel who will be trying this case, parties or witnesses relevant to this case. And so I will take a moment now and introduce my staff and then I am going to ask counsel to each introduce themselves and any witnesses they may call and to give you a very brief understanding of what the case is about from their perspective.

I will note as we proceed -- well, let me go ahead and first introduce my staff. Again, my name is Kathleen Delaney. I am the district court judge presiding in Department 25 of the Eighth Judicial District Court. That is where you have been assigned as potential jurors.

members of my staff. I have a court reporter, Brenda Schroeder. And I will tell you in advance it is very important any time that you are going to speak because she has the duty of writing down everything that is discussed that you identify yourself by name and by the

I have present in the courtroom with me several

not to be present for today's purposes, so he will not be 2 here.

3 You are instructed to not consider that in any 4 way, one way or the other. It is certainly, again, his right to make that choice. And if you are impaneled to serve on this jury not to have that considered in your 7 deliberations in any way, okay?

Let me ask at this time for the State's counsel to introduce themselves and their witnesses and their statement of the case.

MS. BLUTH: Thank you, Your Honor.

Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. My name is Jacqueline Bluth. Sitting with me at counsel table is Lisa Luzaich. We are both chief deputy district attorneys with the Clark County District Attorney's Office and we have been assigned to prosecute the case of the State of Nevada versus Lesean Collins.

We intend to present evidence to you that on September 2nd of 2008 the defendant murdered Brandi Payton at his home or a home he shared with an individual by the name of Shalana Eddins.

22 After that was done he then transported her body on State Route 156, which is near the 95 freeway as you 23 head out north. 24

During the trial we intend to call some of the

86

25

following people. And I will read those names out right

2 now. From the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department:

3 Tiffany Adams, Rocky Alby, Allen Cabrales, Jonathan

4 Fried, Kelly Gauthier, Ken Hardy, Jason Henson, Oscar

5 Hicks, Daniel Holstein, David Horn, Brian Kobrys, Maria

6 Lopez, Cliff Mogg, James Pendleton, Michael Perkins,

7 Daniel Proietto, John Scott, Monte Spoor, Illian

8 Williams, Ken Morgenstern.

9 From the North Las Vegas Police and Fire

Department: Sean Montgomery, Officer Chavez, Officer Stancil, Officer Wheeler, Jeffrey Longprey.

From the Clark County Coroner's Office:

13 Dr. Lary Simms, Felicia Borla.

10

11

12

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23 24

25

1

2

3

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

From the Office of the Inspector General: David Molnar and the following lay witnesses: Donita Beasley, Maurio Carter.

Custodian of records from Avis: Jason Turner, Donald Davidson, Shalana Eddins, Robert Eddins, Vivian Furlow, Ben Grand, Darlene Heer, Rufus Hicks, Erika Jeffery, Joanne Kelson, Michael Kelson, Pedro Madrigal, Gloria Payton, Tammy Payton, Wannette Pratt and Theresa Williams. Thank you.

THE COURT: I will ask the defense at this time to introduce themselves and any witnesses they wish to call.

87

1 identified.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

It is very possible that if you serve on this
jury and somebody comes in to actually give testimony on
the witness stand that you might recognize them. They
could be your son or daughter's soccer coach, they could
be someone you know from church but you just didn't
recognize the name. If that were to occur then of course
you would notify the Court through a note that you would
give to the marshal.

But at this point in time we understand that there may be some names that sound familiar and that you may or may not be sure. We certainly want you to identify for us if you think you recognize the name and then we can ask further of you why. But we want you to appreciate that we do this part of the process fairly quickly because, again, we know that you are going to know if you for sure know one of those people or you know facts or circumstances related to this case and then of course we'll deal with the other aspects of who you might find out you know as we go along.

Can I see at this time by a show of hands if there is anyone who believes that they know or recognize any of the names of any of the people participating or conducting this trial that were just offered to you.

I see two hands. So what I'm going to do and

89

MR. HYTE: Certainly. Thank you, Your Honor. Good afternoon ladies and gentlemen. My name is

Michael Hyte. Seated with me at counsel table is David

4 Schieck from the Clark County Special Public Defender's

5 Office and together we represent the accused in this6 case, Lesean Collins.

Mr. Collins has pleaded not guilty to the charges. In addition to the names that the State has just read to you we may call the following as witnesses during this trial:

Thomas Blackburn, Tricia Brewer, Melvin Easley, Juan Gollioto, Todd Grey, Philip MacKenzie and Carolyn White. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Hyte.

Before I ask for anyone to identify if they believe they are acquainted with any of the names you have just heard either from me or from counsel, we appreciate that that's a lot of names and we appreciate that you didn't have the chance to write them all down.

Let's put it this way, if you knew one of those people and/or you knew that they were somehow involved in this case you would probably know that, okay. That's what we are looking for you to identify here, anybody who certainly is aware of this case or the people that have been identified in their positions that they have been

this will sort of give you a flavor of how we're going to

2 proceed is we are going to call on folks always in the

3 order in which they are seated. And for your

4 understanding the way that you are seated is the way you

are listed, which is entirely random. We have no control

6 over that. That is how the system sort of spits

7 everyone's name out.

If you are seated with the first seat in order being the top left of the jury box area all the way to the left corner. So we are looking at you from left to right starting with the back row all the way through and up through and including the rows behind counsel table with the last folks seated over here.

And so that you have even a better idea of why you were seated that way what the Court needs to do for purposes of this trial is I will need to qualify 32 people from whom 15 are going to be elected to serve as jurors. That will include the 12 jurors who will be those who will deliberate and three of those who will serve as alternates who will all be present during the course of the trial. But of course the alternates will be asked to stand by to deliberate if and when there would be a need. So we will qualify out of 32, 15 people.

So for all intents and purposes the folks in the

-90

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: John Fried and Dan first 32 seats are going to be considered qualified 1 Holstein. They are both crime scene analysts. 2 unless and until circumstances are brought to light that indicate that you cannot serve for some reason. The 3 THE COURT: How do you know them? 3 4 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: My wife was a crime scene 4 folks beyond that first group of 32 which ends in the analyst during that time. They were acquaintances of 5 first row behind counsel table on the right. For 5 everybody seated behind them in the order in which you 6 ours. 6 are seated is how you would be called forward to fill an 7 THE COURT: And when you say acquaintances, I 7 know that means something specific to me but I don't know 8 8 empty set in the 32. 9 what that means to you. Are these people that you are 9 So at this point if it hasn't quite clicked in, 10 currently socially active with? the folks seated in the second row here are the first 10 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Not recently but during 11 that would be called forward on through, okay? So that 11 is kind of the process of how it will work. 12 that time we had been over to their houses. 12 THE COURT: And when you say "that time" which 13 13 And what we are going to do now is I will 14 time frame are you talking about? 14 inquire of the folks who raised their hand. So, ma'am, A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: She was with Metro from if you could give us your name and you last three digits 15 15 16 2004 to 2008. 16 of your badge number for the record first. 17 THE COURT: Your wife. 17 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Meghan Corrigan, 094. A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. THE COURT: Okay. Who is it that you believe 18 18 THE COURT: Of course there is going to be a 19 19 you are acquainted with? A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: The question you asked 20 time when we talk to folks about any connections they may 20 21 have with law enforcement and the criminal justice earlier I did not answer but I did believe my rights were 21 system. But as you sit here today, let me just ask you 22 automatically restored but after hearing you have to 22 23 this question at this point, would your acquaintances actually apply for it I have to say that I have never 23 with these two individuals do you believe that that would 24 24 applied for it. impact your ability to be fair and impartial in this 25 25 THE COURT: Have we sent you into a panic now 91 1 trial? that you don't think you have restored rights? 1 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I don't feel that it A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, a little bit. 2 2 3 would. 3

THE COURT: Again, it is just not a part of the process that I would typically handle, so I apologize to you that I can't say for certainty that you would not have had your rights restored, but out of an abundance of caution was your circumstance here in Clark County?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: It was a felony in some other jurisdiction?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.

THE COURT: Because we can't be certain and of course we would have no way to either independently verify I will with regret excuse you at this point in time, but thank you for your candor on that. Please go down to the third floor Jury Services, return your badge and advise them of the reason you were excused and see if they have any further directions for you.

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Thank you.

THE COURT: And then I saw one hand in the back row. Could you please identify yourself and give us the last three digits of your badge.

> A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Brian Chongtai, 206. THE COURT: Mr. Chongtai, who is it that you

believe you are acquainted with?

THE COURT: And like I said, there may be

And so it is imperative and the whole purpose of

4

5

6

7

8 9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

further questions on that issue. Certainly, and I think we all know and let me just sort of preface it as we come into this discussion and what our American system of justice is, is that the defendant as he is accused however is innocent and he will only be determined to be guilty if the jurors find that the State meets its burden to prove beyond a reasonable doubt his guilt as to the charge or charges against him. 12

this selection process, which we anticipate will take several days, is to ensure that the people who are going to be selected to serve can and will receive the evidence in this trial and only the evidence in this trial to weigh and apply the law as the Court gives it to them without regard to what they think the law ought to be but they actually follow what the law is that the Court gives them and sit down with their fellow jurors and deliberate fairly and impartially to reach a verdict which does equal justice to the parties, but also, again, recognizes that it is the State that bears the burden to prove the

25 defendant guilty beyond a reasonable doubt.

94

93

That is what we are looking for here today. So we may have further questions of you, Mr. Chongtain, but 2 3 at this point we can proceed. Now that everybody has had a little bit more 4 5 time to think about it, is there anybody who believes 6 that they may by acquainted with or may know any of the 7 folks related to the trial? 8 Yes, ma'am. 9 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Paula Rodriguez, Badge No. 093. 10 11 THE COURT: Yes, Ms. Rodriguez. A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I do not speak too much 12 13 English. I need someone to help me. THE COURT: Well, Ms. Rodriguez, the only reason 14 I am a little surprised but it may just be that this is 15 16 something that we did not understand from your questionnaire but we went through all of the 17 questionnaires and one of the reasons we are so late 18 starting here today is we brought in each and every one 19 of the people who indicated some inability to serve, not 20 21 the least of which were language problems and we did not 22 perceive that from your questionnaire. So there were plenty of places where that could have been indicated. 23 So let me ask you now how long have you lived in 24

THE COURT: I am just going back over your 1 2 questionnaire, ma'am, because I don't recall seeing this 3 information in your questionnaire, but I certainly also 4 have some indication that some of the questionnaire was 5 not completed either. 6

Can I have counsel just briefly at the bench.

(Discussion held at the bench.)

THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Rodriguez. In light of the medical concerns that you have but primarily because of the language concern that you have stated and in re-reviewing your questionnaire seeing perhaps what I did not see to begin with is the number of questions that vou did not answer.

Obviously, we would need folks on the panel who can receive all of the evidence, weigh the evidence with their fellow jurors, apply the law as the Court gives it to them. We need to be sure that every juror can accomplish that task and because we do now have concerns that you cannot I am going to excuse you at this time.

Please return to the third floor Jury Services and take your badge and give it to the people on the third floor and get any further instructions. If you have any other questions you can ask the marshal.

> A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Thank you so much. THE COURT: As far as anybody with knowledge

97

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: 15 years. THE COURT: Do you work?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the United States?

THE COURT: Where do you work?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: In the electrical cables

but everybody speaks Spanish, nobody speaks English. THE COURT: I understand that there are jobs

where you can mainly speak Spanish, however, certainly most employers, especially the larger employers any information they give you with regard to your pay, any information with regard to your benefits, et cetera, usually is always in English and you have been here for 15 years.

So I guess what I am going to ask you at this time is if you can estimate for me what percentage of English do you believe that you understand spoken or written, what percentage?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: My question is I have ten years of the hospital. I had an operation.

THE COURT: Are you talking about a medical reason why you cannot serve?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. Friday I call and you say, I don't care, you come in Monday at 1:00. And today I don't take my medicine because it is too much sleep.

with regard to any circumstances of the case or the

2 potential parties involved or the witnesses involved in

3 the case is there anybody else that we have not talked

4 to?

5

8

9

10

11

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

7

8

9 10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

95

Go ahead, sir.

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Allen Paguet, Badge No. 6 262. Your Honor, you and went I to high school about 32 7

years ago.

THE COURT: Okay. You don't have to give a number. That is just wrong. Go Chargers.

A couple of juries ago I actually had somebody 12 raise their hand that turned out to be my eighth grade 13 teacher and that was horrifying to me that she remembered 14

Nice to see you again. I have had a few folks that have come in on the panel who would have known me or who would have had interactions in the past. Is there anything about the fact that we went to high school together all those years ago going to impact your ability to serve fairly and impartially in this trial.

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, Your Honor. THE COURT: All right. Nice to see you again.

All right. The next thing that we have to address of course and some of this was addressed in the questionnaire and some folks we have already excused

98

because of what we had in their questionnaire is the time for trial and whether or not you all have conflicts.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9 10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Mainly, of course, what we are looking for is people who have already paid for travel that they cannot get refunded for, perhaps travel related to work, surgeries that are scheduled. I am not trying to give you the list because you know what your schedule is, what your potential hardship is.

Before we get to that, though, I need to tell you that some of the circumstances have in fact changed with regard to the timing of the trial and so when we did the first questionnaire, when we did the questionnaire initially it was our understanding and we did anticipate the trial would go through the remainder of this week and next week and then that would be the end of the trial.

The number of days are still the same but the dates have changed. It is our expectation that we will complete jury selection this week, likely perhaps by Wednesday, at the latest by Thursday, but that we will then not have any further trial this week. So we will not be in trial on Friday this week and we may be in trial only partial day on Thursday.

Our timing would be 1:30 start tomorrow, 1:30 start Wednesday and 10:00 a.m. start on Thursday and that is because the Court has other scheduled matters that it

it takes to deliberate. We do not control that in any

2 way. But we are qualifying people here today through and

3 including August 12th with the understanding that we are

4 talking about half days other than if we need you this

Thursday, and no Thursdays and Fridays after this week.With that understanding is there anybody here

With that understanding is there anybody here
who needs to and has not already through their
questionnaire expressed a hardship with their ability to
serve during the time frame that I have given you.

10 I do see a few hands. I will go through and 11 speak with each of you one by one in the order in which 12 you are seated. So what I am going to do to make it 13 easier is go row by row. So in the back row, which is, 14 again, our first nine jurors listed, I think I saw one hand but let me see again by a show of hands of anyone 15 16 with a hardship that makes them unable to serve. Okay. 17 Now the second row.

18 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yahaira Ramos, Badge No.
19 080. I stated on my questionnaire financial hardship and

20 I am going to start a new job on Monday and I am having a

21 financial hardship. I am trying to get food stamps right

22 now. And they would not want me to not show up on my

23 first day of work. But I did not tell them I had jury

24 duty. I did not want to keep coming up with excuses

25 because I was told that it was going to last five days so

101

has to address unrelated to the trial, so I give you that information to weigh and digest as far as what the impact will be.

So for the next two days we are talking 1:30 to 5:00 Tuesday and Wednesday and from 10:00 until we complete if we even need to go Thursday.

The following week we would only be in trial Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday. That would be the 3rd, 4th and 5th of August. We would not be in trial on the 6th or the 7th. There are several reasons for that inclusive of the Court's schedule as well as witness availability. Each of those days would be 1:30 start time and complete at 5:00 but just Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday. No trial Thursday or Friday.

But we would return the following week and these are the dates that we had not known at the time and had not asked you about, which would be the Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday of the following week. It's possible that we can complete and deliver the evidence and instructions and the closing arguments to you by Tuesday but we are qualifying everybody through Wednesday the 12th just to be safe to make sure we have ample time to complete the trial.

And then, of course, however long it is that it takes for the jurors take to deliberate that's how long

1 I told them I would start on Monday.

THE COURT: I do not think that trial was evergoing to complete in five days.

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Well, when we were filling out the questionnaire I thought it was a three to

6 five-day trial that is why I had left this weak for this.

7 THE COURT: When you say you do not want to have 8 anymore continuations or excuses have you already

9 postponed the start of your job before?

10 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. I was with an agency11 doing day-to-day projects.

12 THE COURT: What is the job that you are starting on this Monday?

14 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Medical assistant at

Nevada Health Center Clinic.THE COURT: And you have not disclosed to the

16 THE COURT: And you have not disclosed to them17 at this point that you have jury duty?

18 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Correct.

THE COURT: Was there anybody else in that row?How about the first row?

21 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Marie Rasco, 196. I am a banquet provider and bartender and I am the bread winner

in my house; my husband is disabled and basically if I
don't work I don't get paid.

THE COURT: What is your typical schedule?

102

100

99

9 THE COURT: Well, I was asking the question a certain way for a certain reason and I think maybe you 10 11 understood it a different way. When I asked could it fluctuate around the schedule, I meant can you tell your 12 employer to schedule you in a way that allows you to work 13 around what is otherwise a very limited schedule. We are 14 talking about three and a half hours each afternoon other 15 than if we need partial time on Thursday which would 16 actually be before the typical start time you just stated 17 18 and three days out of five in the week. 19 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No because my functions start at a certain hour so we have so much time for set 20 up for the function and you are done. Usually like five 21 22 hours. THE COURT: Have you spoken to your employer 23 24 about the fact that you have been called for jury service? 25 103 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, I have. 1 2 THE COURT: Have you spoken with them about the 3 possibility of scheduling around your time frame? A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No because we work on a 4 5 rotation and when it's your turn, it's your turn. THE COURT: What is the name of the company you 6 7 work for? A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Venetian Hotel. 8 9 THE COURT: So you work for a hotel that as I understand it is quite well aware of the importance of 10 jury service in our community. 11 12 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. 13 THE COURT: You have not yet discussed with them 14 the effect of jury service on your duties; is that 15 correct? 16 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Well, I spoke with my boss and he told me, Make sure you bring the paperwork work 17 in. And they will pay me my hourly, however, I will not 18 be included in the gratuity pool. 19 20 THE COURT: Understood. Thank you, ma'am. Anybody else in that row? Okay. Now to the row 21 behind counsel table. 22 23 Ma'am. A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: My name is Floripinas 24 25 Thompson, Badge 170. I am a private business owner. I 104

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: It fluctuates

functions and there are lunch functions and evening

functions. And the evening functions usually start at

THE COURT: If it fluctuates, can it fluctuate

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. There are private

have a beauty salon and it's my clients and me and I have 2 to pay the rent. If I do not work I cannot pay the rent 3 and my bills. 4 THE COURT: I have not added up all the hours but relatively speaking we are talking about ten hours 5 total this week, maybe a little bit more if we have to go 6 into Thursday, ten hours the following week and the possibility of less perhaps maybe six or seven hours the 8 9 following week up to potentially ten hours that week. As the owner of the salon do you have the 10 ability to schedule around those times? 11 12 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: It is the end of the month and so I have to pay the rent and I do not know if I can 13 make the rent if I miss my appointments. 14 THE COURT: Thank you. You may have a seat. 15 Anybody else in that row? 16 17 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Sandra Clark, Badge No. 182. I am a food server at a local bar and restaurant 18 and my hours I work 11:00 to 4:00 on Wednesday, Thursday, 19 20 Friday and from 6:00 in the morning until 2:00 in the 21 afternoon on Tuesday. I work six days a week. I work 22 Saturdays and Sundays. My only day off is Mondays. 23 I have talked to my boss she has another girl out on vacation this week and there is no way I can pick 24 25 up extra hours after 5:00. 105 1 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, ma'am. Anybody

2 else in that row? 3 Sir. 4 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Mark Barnes, Badge No. 197. My wife was diagnosed with an emergency medical condition last week and just today before my coming here 6 7 was scheduled for surgery tomorrow. 8 THE COURT: Did you bring any of that medical 9 paperwork? 10 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, I did. THE COURT: You say the surgery is scheduled for 11 12 tomorrow? A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. It will be an 13 14 overnight stay at the hospital and then extended care 15 afterwards. 16 THE COURT: Thank you, sir. Anybody else in 17 that row? 18 Sir. 19 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Ben Philips, 239. 20 Scheduling issue for next Monday the 3rd, I have to be 21 out of town for a meeting in Los Angeles. And the

following week, August 9th through the 16th, I will be

prepared to bring that latter information because we

THE COURT: I know you would not have been

out of town on vacation.

106

22

23

24

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

tremendously.

2:00 in the afternoon.

around the days we have given you?

3 acquire. 3 3rd? A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I just found out today but 4 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, sir. 4 5 Anybody on this side? 5 I have an e-mail from my boss that confirms it and I have 6 Ma'am. e-mails about my travel arrangements on the 9th. 6 7 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Lisa Cretella, Badge No. 7 THE COURT: Is this a meeting that could take 331. I stated on my questionnaire that I am 8 place by you participating by phone? 8 self-employed. I am a piano teacher. The only two days A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No because it is out of 9 9 that I am working in the summer are Tuesdays and 10 10 town. 11 Wednesdays and that schedule was already created at the THE COURT: I understand that but I am asking if 11 beginning of the summer. I lose most of my clientele 12 12 you are unable to be excused and you are unable to during the summer months because they travel and so all travel, would you still be able to attend that meeting? 13 13 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. I would be excused 14 the clients were scheduled on the Tuesday and Wednesday. 14 I just recently went through a divorce at the 15 15 from the meeting. 16 time that I filled out the questionnaire my ex-husband THE COURT: Okay. What is the nature of your 16 and I were still cohabiting. I have found a place to 17 17 role in the meeting? live and in the last two weeks have been moving out and I A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I am controller with a 18 18 have to be out of my residence by the 2nd, which is this 19 19 construction company. Sunday and my ex just lost his sister so he flew back 20 20 THE COURT: And the meeting is for what? east and I have the sole responsibility of having A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: A town hall meeting for 21 21 22 everything moved. 22 the West Coast in Los Angeles. 23 THE COURT: Your time frame for your move again THE COURT: And your travel on the 9th through 23 24 is this weekend? the 16th, do you have plane travel? 24 25 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I have been trying to get A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. 25 107 109 it done over the last two weeks but as of Sunday I have THE COURT: And what is your destination? 1 to be out of the current residence. And this Thursday I A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Atlanta, Georgia. 2 3 have piano clients scheduled. 3 THE COURT: Is that non-refundable? 4 In regards to income, I received payment for A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: It is refundable. 4 goods next month the last week of the month, so tomorrow 5 THE COURT: Thank you for your information 5 and Wednesday would be the two days that I would be there. But you do have the proof that you could show us 6 7 receiving income for the month of August, so if I don't in your phone or something? 7 go tomorrow and Wednesday to teach these students I have 8 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. no income for August. I do not receive any alimony. I 9 THE COURT: Thank you. Anybody else in that 9 have no other source of income period, so I am in a very 10 10 row? difficult financial situation right now. 11 11 Sir. THE COURT: All right. Thank you, ma'am. A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Jesse Tadych, 250. The 12 12 Anybody else. Ma'am. 13 reason being I am self-employed and the roommate and 13 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Hi. My name is Deborah girlfriend is moving out so I am solely responsible for 14 14 Formica, Badge 319. I had made a doctor's appointment 15 15 the rent and I'm self-employed. for my nine-year-old daughter back in June and she was 16 16 THE COURT: What is your employment? diagnosed with a skin disease, so I just was able to make A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Massage therapist. And I 17 17 her appointment for the 5th and 6th at the Las Vegas Skin 18 work 11:00 to 5:00 six days a week. 18 and Cancer Center so I would have to be there with her THE COURT: Did you talk to the employer about 19 19 20 for that. the possibility of being on jury duty and the possibility 20 THE COURT: What time is the appointment? 21 21 of other scheduling? A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Two. 22 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: The shifts are only 11:00 22 23 THE COURT: You said the 8th? 23 to 5:00 throughout day. A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. It's the 5th. 24 THE COURT: Where is this that you work? 24 THE COURT: You just mentioned the 5th and 6th A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I do foot massage. I am 25 25 108

2

didn't know that we were going to be into that week, but

did you provide documentation about your travel for the

2

an independent contractor for a company so I am not an

employee so I get only straight commission of what I

and I was just questioning because the 6th obviously we are not going to be in court.

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: It's the 5th. And my husband also had a tumor on his neck and we are scheduled to go to UCLA Medical Center.

THE COURT: When is that?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: In August.

8 THE COURT: When?

A PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I have a paper in my wallet. And then my mother-in-law was just admitted into St. Rose at 8:30.

THE COURT: Go ahead if you can, Ms. Formica, retrieve the information from your phone so that you can show the marshal and what I am going to do is ask folks to keep their seats but I will ask counsel to meet with me briefly in chambers and we will be back shortly to let you know the outcome of our review.

(Off-the-record discussion in chambers.)

THE COURT: Thank you everybody. I have discussed matters with counsel and the Court at this time is determined that we are going to excuse some folks from the panel and then what we are going to do is adjourn for the evening and return tomorrow.

When we return tomorrow any of the seats that are vacant in the first 32 we will bring forward the next

1 leave your badge. So you need to go back to third floor2 Jury Services on your way out.

The rest of you just go ahead and go home with your badges and return here as we have already discussed.

The individuals who are excused at this time are Juror 080, Ms. Ramos; Juror 096, Ms. Rasco. Please keep

7 your seat until I read all the names. I'm sorry if I

8 wasn't clear about that. Next juror is 170, Ms.

9 Thompson; Juror 182, Ms. Clark; Juror 197, Mr. Barns;

10 Juror 239, Mr. Phillips; Juror 250, Mr. Tadych; Juror

11 319, Ms. Formica; and Juror 331, Ms. Cretella. Thank

12 you. That is all the names. You are now excused.

13 Please return to Jury Services on the third floor and

turn in your badges. Everyone else we will see youtomorrow at 1:30 outside of our courtroom door.

Thank you all. Have a good night.

17 (Jurors exit courtroom.)

THE COURT: I will have to sign the order to bring Mr. Collins under any means necessary, if they need it. What they always do is they keep it in their back pocket, they tell them they have it. He knows because I told him we were going to have it. Hopefully, he will come up regardless in whatever manner he so chooses.

24 Hopefully he will dress out and there can be some

25 conversation with that or we can just get forward and get

in line to fill those seats and then we will begin the process of questioning the folks that we, again, have identified the first 32. Essentially we are going to consider you qualified until we get information that that is not the case.

The remainder of you, everyone who is not excused as I read your names here shortly, everyone needs to return here tomorrow. And here's how you will do that. You will go to the third floor Jury Services as you did today. The badge that you were given, scan that in, check in essentially, and then you will come up here to this courtroom door 15A and wait outside until we are ready to bring you in. And you should be outside this door ready to begin at 1:30. So build in whatever time you need to park and make your way in to the third floor to scan your badge and check in and then come up here at 1:30. That is for everybody who will be returning.

The only people who will not be returning at this time, and for you all please as you exit today, everybody else can leave, for those who hear their name now you are in fact excused from the trial, you and the other people who were previously excused, need to go to the third floor now and turn those badges in. There should be someone there to receive them. If they are not present then there will be instructions on where you can

- past this nonsense but I will be prepared for whatever.
- 2 But we will do that order for him to be here at 1:15 so
- 3 we have the time to do whatever we need to do.

4 MS. LUZAICH: Thank you.

THE COURT: Anything else?

6 MR. SCHIECK: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you all and have a good night.

(Proceedings were adjourned.)

1	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE
2 3	STATE OF NEVADA)
4) ss. COUNTY OF CLARK
•	COUNTY OF CLARK
5	
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	I, BRENDA SCHROEDER, a certified court reporter in and for the State of Nevada, do hereby certify that the foregoing and attached pages 1-130, inclusive, comprise a true, and accurate transcript of the proceedings reported by me in the matter of THE STATE OF NEVADA, Plaintiff, versus LESEAN TARUS COLLINS, Defendant, Case No. C252804, on July 27, 2015. Dated this 5th day of January, 2016. //s/ Brenda Schroeder BRENDA SCHROEDER, CCR NO. 867
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
20	115

and the second s

Electronically Filed 01/10/2016 12:25:08 PM

	01/10/2016 12:25:08 PM
1	DISTRICT COURT CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA
2	CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA CLERK OF THE COURT
3	CLERK OF THE COURT
4	
5	
6	THE STATE OF NEVADA,)
7) Case No. 09C252804 Plaintiff,)
8) Dept. No. XXV vs.
9	LESEAN TARUS COLLINS,)
10	Defendant.)
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	BEFORE THE HONORABLE KATHLEEN DELANEY
16	JULY 28, 2015, 1:15 P.M.
17	REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT
18	OF JURY TRIAL
19	
20	APPEARANCES:
21	(See separate page)
22	
23	
24	
25	REPORTED BY: BRENDA SCHROEDER, CCR NO. 867
	lacksquare

1	APPEARANCES:	
2	For the Plaintiff:	
3	JACQUELINE BLUTH, ESQ. Chief Deputy District Attorney	
4	200 Lewis Avenue Las Vegas, Nevada 89155	
5	LISA LUZAICH, ESQ.	
6	Chief Deputy District Attorney 200 Lewis Avenue	
7	Las Vegas, Nevada 89155	
8	For the Defendant:	
9	DAVID M. SCHIECK, ESQ.	
10	Deputy Special Public Defender 330 S. Third Street, Suite 800	
11	Las Vegas, Nevada 89155	
12	MICHAEL W. HYTE, ESQ. Deputy Special Public Defender	
13	330 S. Third Street, Suite 800 Las Vegas, Nevada 89155	
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
		2

LAS VEGAS, CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA TUESDAY, JULY 28, 2015, 1:15 P.M.

PROCEEDINGS

* *

2.3

THE COURT: Calling to order the State of Nevada versus Lesean Collins. I am noting now we have counsel for the State present as well as counsel for the defense and Mr. Collins is present in custody wearing his CCDC clothing. I don't recall if I could see whether he had his chains on or not. He does appear to have his chains on as well.

My understanding was that counsel was having a discussion with Mr. Collins with regard to his intentions for today. What is his intentions for today?

MR. SCHIECK: His intentions are this is what he desires to wear for court, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Collins, I need to sort of canvass again or discuss again the things we discussed yesterday. What is your reasoning today for wanting to be dressed in your jail clothing and wearing your chains?

THE DEFENDANT: I feel comfortable.

THE COURT: Are you explaining to me that you couldn't or wouldn't feel comfortable without the chains?

THE DEFENDANT: I feel comfortable this way.

THE COURT: I understand you feel comfortable

1 2

that way. I am asking for discussion on what other ways you might feel comfortable. Yesterday at one point after the sergeant came forward and there was a discussion you came into court and you allowed the chains to be removed. What is the purpose for having the chains on again today?

THE DEFENDANT: I feel safe and I feel comfortable now.

THE COURT: You have to explain that to me better because I don't understand what that means you feel safe.

THE DEFENDANT: I feel safe and I feel comfortable the way -- I feel comfortable in the outfit that I'm in and I feel safe with the belly chains that I have on.

THE COURT: You keep repeating the same thing but I don't understand it. Help me understand it.

THE DEFENDANT: That is as specific as I can be, ma'am.

THE COURT: I don't think it's as specific as you can be, Mr. Collins. I think it's as specific as you want it be.

Again, we have already talked about it in detail about the fact that you are making a choice, if the Court allows you to make it, that will absolutely put you in front of jurors that have not been selected yet

ultimately to serve but of the panel those will be some who will be selected to serve who will see you in clothing that places you in custody in chains that places you in whatever presumption they might make about that being necessary for custody.

Also the possibility that you present some danger to the Court that the Court has not found you to present to the Court that otherwise this is your choice to be dressed this way. And it most certainly will occasion the possibility of some prejudice in the minds of these jury members as to your case and your defense.

Why would you want to put forth --

THE DEFENDANT: That's speculation.

THE COURT: It's not speculation because we have a US Supreme Court decision that says if the State were to compel you to dress this way that that would absolutely be prejudicial to you. There is no difference in that regard whether the State compels you to dress this way or you choose to dress this way.

So you are voluntarily placing yourself in a position to be in front of jurors who are going to decide the outcome of this case in a prejudicial light. Why are you choosing to do that?

THE DEFENDANT: I feel comfortable in the outfit that I'm in and I feel safe with the chains.

1 THE COURT: I do not know where you got the
2 language and I don't know why you keep repeating the

1.3

2.3

Mr. Collins, I want you to acknowledge for the record that you understand that you have a right not to be compelled to wear any jail or prison clothing. Do you understand that you have a right not to be compelled to do that?

language, but that does not do us any benefit here today.

THE DEFENDANT: If that is what you are saying.

THE COURT: You are going to answer my question, Mr. Collins, one way or the other. I asked you a point blank question. Do you understand that you have the right not to be compelled to wear jail clothing and these chains? Do you understand that you have the right not to be compelled, yes or no?

THE DEFENDANT: No, I don't understand.

THE COURT: All right. Then we need to have a discussion further about it, don't we.

I just had a discussion with you now that there's really no practical difference between the State forcing you to dress this way or you choosing to dress this way. I am asking if you understand that the State cannot force you to dress this way; do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: No. I do not understand that.

THE COURT: All right. Can I have counsel in 1 chambers. Take Mr. Collins back to the holding cell. 2 (Discussion held in chambers.) 3 THE COURT: Reconvening now after the chambers 4 conference in the State of Nevada versus Lesean Collins. 5 We have counsel present along with Mr. Collins. 6 Mr. Collins, I still have a few questions that I 7 need to ask you rather than revisit the questions that I 8 have already asked you. What I need to have you 9 acknowledge and confirm for me is did counsel bring you 10 civilian clothes to wear? 11 THE DEFENDANT: I don't know. 12 THE COURT: You don't know if counsel brought 13 you civilian clothes to wear? 14 15 THE DEFENDANT: I don't know. MR. SCHIECK: For the record, Your Honor, we did 16 drop off last night civilian clothing at the jail. 17 THE COURT: Would there be a record at the jail 18 of whether or not Mr. Collins was shown and offered those 19 20 clothes? CORRECTIONS OFFICER: There wouldn't be a record 21 necessarily that he saw the clothes but there would be a 22 record that they were dropped off and received. 23 THE COURT: At this time, Mr. Collins, counsel 24

has indicated they have civilian clothes available for