IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

JOSHUA BACHARACH)	DOCKET NUMBE	ER:	69677
Appellant, vs.)))		Trac	tronically Filed 09 2016 09:48 a.m. ie K. Lindeman k of Supreme Court
THE STATE OF NEVADA,)			
Respondent.)))			
APPELLANT'S FAST	ΓRACΙ	K APPENDIX VOL	UME	<u>ZVI</u>
ROCHELLE T. NGUYEN, ESQ. NGUYEN & LAY Nevada Bar Identification No. 8205 732 South Sixth Street, Suite 102 Las Vegas, Nevada 89101 Telephone: (702) 383-3200		STEVEN B. WOLL Clark County Distr Nevada Bar Identif 200 Lewis Avenue Las Vegas, Nevada Telephone: (702) 6 ADAM PAUL LA Nevada Attorney C Nevada Bar Identif 100 North Carson S Carson City, Nevada Telephone: (775) 6	rict Affication 8910 571-25 XALT Senera fication Street da 892	ttorney on No. 1565 01 500
Attorney for Appellant JOSHUA BACHARACH		Attorney for Respo	onden	t

TABLE OF CONTENTS (ALPHABETICAL)

VOLUME / PAGE Fourth Supplemental Notice of Witnesses and/or Expert Notice of Witnesses and/or Expert Witnesses Second Supplemental Notice of Witnesses and/or Expert Supplemental Notice of Witnesses and/or Expert Third Supplemental Notice of Witnesses and/or Expert

COURT MINUTES

VOLUME / PAGE Minutes: All Pending Motions, July 28, 2014 I / 134 Minutes: Calendar Call, October 28, 2015 I / 135 Minutes: Grand Jury Indictment, July 16, 2014 I / 133 Minutes: Jury Trial, November 02, 2015 I / 137-138 Minutes: Jury Trial, November 03, 2015 I / 139-140 Minutes: Jury Trial, November 04, 2015 I / 141-142 Minutes: Jury Trial, November 05, 2015 I / 143-144 Minutes: Sentencing, December 30, 2015 I / 145-147 Minutes: Status Check: Negotiations, October 29, 2015 I / 136

TRANSCRIPTS

VOLUME / PAGE

Transcript of Proceedings, At the Request of the Court: Status Check: Negotiations, October 29, 2015
Transcript of Proceedings, Calendar Call, October 28, 2015
Transcript of Proceedings, Initial Arraignment, Indictment Warrant Return, July 28, 2014
Transcript of Proceedings, Jury Trial – Day 1, Volume I, November 02, 2015
Transcript of Proceedings, Jury Trial – Day 1, Volume I (Bifurcated Trial), November 05, 2015
Transcript of Proceedings, Jury Trial – Day 2, Volume II, November 03, 2015
Transcript of Proceedings, Jury Trial – Day 3, Volume III, November 04, 2015
Transcript of Proceedings, Jury Trial – Day 4, Volume IV, November 05, 2015
Transcript of Proceedings, Sentencing, December 30, 2015

TABLE OF CONTENTS (CHRONOLOGICAL)

VOLUME / PAGE

Indictment, filed July 16, 2014	I / 1-7
Notice of Witnesses and/or Expert Witnesses [NRS 174.234], filed February 23, 2015	I / 8-18
Supplemental Notice of Witnesses and/or Expert Witnesses [NRS 174.234], filed February 25, 2015	I / 19 - 29
Second Supplemental Notice of Witnesses and/or Expert Witnesses [NRS 174.234], filed October 15, 2015	I / 30-39
Third Supplemental Notice of Witnesses and/or Expert Witnesses [NRS 174.234], filed October 20, 2015	I / 40-45
Fourth Supplemental Notice of Witnesses and/or Expert Witnesses [NRS 174.234], filed October 22, 2015	I / 46-51
Amended Indictment, filed November 02, 2015	I / 52-58
Jury List, Filed November 02, 2015	I / 59
Amended Jury List, filed November 02, 2015	I / 60
Second Amended Jury List, filed November 04, 2015	I / 61
Instructions to the Jury, filed November 05, 2015	I / 62-100
Instructions to the Jury, filed November 05, 2015	I / 101-120
Verdict, filed November 05, 2015	I / 121-124
Verdict, filed November 05, 2015	I / 125-126
Judgment of Conviction, filed January 08, 2016	I / 127-129
Notice of Appeal, filed January 26, 2016	I / 130-132

COURT MINUTES

VOLUME / PAGE Minutes: Grand Jury Indictment, July 16, 2014 I / 133 Minutes: All Pending Motions, July 28, 2014 I / 134 Minutes: Calendar Call, October 28, 2015 I / 135 Minutes: Status Check: Negotiations, October 29, 2015 I / 136 Minutes: Jury Trial, November 02, 2015 I / 137-138 Minutes: Jury Trial, November 03, 2015 I / 139-140 Minutes: Jury Trial, November 04, 2015 I / 141-142 Minutes: Jury Trial, November 05, 2015 I / 143-144 Minutes: Sentencing, December 30, 2015 I / 145-147

TRANSCRIPTS

VOLUME / PAGE

Transcript of Proceedings, Initial Arraignment, Indictment Warrant Return, July 28, 2014
Transcript of Proceedings, Calendar Call, October 28, 2015
Transcript of Proceedings, At the Request of the Court: Status Check: Negotiations, October 29, 2015
Transcript of Proceedings, Jury Trial – Day 1, Volume I, November 02, 2015
Transcript of Proceedings, Jury Trial – Day 2, Volume II, November 03, 2015
Transcript of Proceedings, Jury Trial – Day 3, Volume III, November 04, 2015
Transcript of Proceedings, Jury Trial – Day 4, Volume IV, November 05, 2015
Transcript of Proceedings, Jury Trial – Day 1, Volume I (Bifurcated Trial), November 05, 2015
Transcript of Proceedings, Sentencing, December 30, 2015

TRAN CLERK OF THE COURT 2 **DISTRICT COURT** 3 CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA 4 5 THE STATE OF NEVADA, CASE NO. C299425 6 Plaintiff, DEPT. VIII 7 VS. 8 9 JOSHUA W. BACHARACH, 10 Defendant. 11 12 BEFORE THE HONORABLE DOUGLAS E. SMITH, DISTRICT COURT JUDGE 13 WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 4, 2015 14 TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS **JURY TRIAL - DAY 3** 15 **VOLUME III** 16 17 **APPEARANCES:** 18 19 For the State: JOHN FATTIG, ESQ. MEGAN S. THOMSON, ESQ. 20 **Chief Deputy District Attorneys** 21 For the Defendant: ROCHELLE T. NGUYEN, ESQ. 22 23 RECORDED BY: JILL JACOBY, COURT RECORDER 24 25 TRANSCRIBED BY: BRITTANY MANGELSON, INDEPENDENT TRANSCRIBER Rough Draft Transcript, Volume III - Page 1

WITNESS INDEX

1

25

2 **STATE'S WITNESSES PAGE** 3 **BRECK HODSON** Direct Examination by Ms. Thomson 29 4 33 Cross-Examination by Ms. Nguyen 5 **BEATA VIDA** 6 Direct Examination by Ms. Thomson 36 Cross-Examination by Ms. Nguyen 47 7 Redirect Examination by Ms. Thomson 54 Examination by the Court (Jury Questions) 56 8 Follow-up Examination by Ms. Thomson 56 9 **ANYA LESTER** 10 Direct Examination by Ms. Thomson 57 Cross-Examination by Ms. Nguyen 78 11 Redirect Examination by Ms. Thomson 80 Cross-Examination by Ms. Nguyen 82 12 Examination by the Court (Jury Questions) 83 13 83 Follow-up Examination by Ms. Thomson Follow-up Examination by Ms. Nguyen 85 14 Examination by the Court (Jury Questions) 87 Follow-up Examination by Ms. Nguyen 87 15 Examination by the Court (Jury Questions) 88 16 Follow-up Examination by Ms. Thomson 88 89 Follow-up Examination by Ms. Nguyen 17 Further Follow-up Examination by Ms. Thomson 90 Examination by the Court (Jury Questions) 90 18 Follow-up Examination by Ms. Thomson 91 19 Follow-up Examination by Ms. Nguyen 92 Examination by the Court (Jury Questions) 92 20 Follow-up Examination by Ms. Thomson 92 93 Follow-up Examination by Ms. Nguyen 21 22 **RYAN JAEGER** Direct Examination by Mr. Fattig 95 23 Cross-Examination by Ms. Nguyen 123 Redirect Examination by Mr. Fattig 135 24

Rough Draft Transcript, Volume III - Page 2

1	STATE'S WITNESSES		<u>PAGE</u>
2	MARNIE CARTE Direct Exar	R mination by Mr. Fattig	137
3			
4			
5		EXHIBIT INDEX	
6	<u>NUMBER</u>		<u>PAGE</u>
7	STATE'S EXHIBITS	Dia ata amanda a	0.4
8	203 182 183	Photographs Photographs Photographs	31 71 75
9	14	Aerial Map	73 99
10	3, 4, 8, 9, 10, & 11	Aerial Maps	102
11	204 & 205	Photographs	105
12	206 & 207 202	City Map and Key Bacharach Jail Calls	119 121
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

1	WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 4, 2015 AT 9:32 A.M.
2	
3	[Outside the presence of the jury]
4	THE COURT: All right. You guys have looked at these. I got one set.
5	MS. THOMSON: Yes, Your Honor, we have.
6	MS. NGUYEN: Yes.
7	THE COURT: You're objecting to something.
8	MS. NGUYEN: Yes. Would you like me
9	MS. THOMSON: She's objecting to flight and the prior inconsistent statemen
10	instruction.
11	MS. NGUYEN: And then we have some other objections that I would like to
12	argue as well.
13	MR. FATTIG: Yeah, and other little things of witnesses that
14	THE COURT: All right.
15	MR. FATTIG: we're going to deal with.
16	MS. NGUYEN: I'll waive his presence if you want to do it right now.
17	THE COURT: Okay.
18	MR. FATTIG: Well, only the instructions, right?
19	THE COURT: Just the instructions.
20	MR. FATTIG: Yeah.
21	MS. NGUYEN: Yes.
22	MR. FATTIG: And then we'll do the other little things when he's here.
23	THE COURT: All right. Instruction Number 1, Then members of the jury.
24	The introduction.
25	Instruction 2, If in these instructions.

1	And I will give you copies of this. We'll have Alan make 13, 14, 15, 16,
2	17.
3	MS. NGUYEN: Do they read over them? Do they have them when we're
4	going
5	THE COURT: They have them.
6	MS. NGUYEN: Okay.
7	THE COURT: I'll read them to them.
8	All right. Number 2, If in these instructions.
9	Number 3 is the information or indictment.
10	Now if I have a since it's been such a short trial, do you want me to
11	read these to them or do you guys waive me reading that Instruction 3.
12	MS. NGUYEN: Wait, what's on Instruction 3?
13	THE COURT: That's the indictment.
14	MR. FATTIG: Listing all the charges.
15	THE COURT: Since they just got it read to them. I mean
16	MS. NGUYEN: Yeah, I don't have a problem with that. Well no, I don't
17	have a problem with that.
18	THE COURT: All right. Number 4, To constitute the crime charged.
19	Number 5, The Defendant is presumed innocent.
20	Number 6, You are here to determine.
21	Number 7, The evidence which you are to consider.
22	Number 8, The credibility or believability.
23	Number 9, A witness who has special, knowledge, skill, experience.
24	Number 10, Attempt murder is.
25	Number 11, Malice aforethought as used.

1	And 12, It is not necessary to prove premeditation.
2	Number 13, The elements of an attempt to commit a crime are.
3	14, If you find the Defendant guilty of attempt murder.
4	15, Deadly weapon.
5	16, If you find beyond a reasonable doubt.
6	17, A person who is in or under a structure.
7	18, It shall be unlawful within the city limits.
8	19, It is unlawful and willfully discharge a firearm.
9	20, Assault means.
10	21, You are instructed that.
11	22, If you find beyond a reasonable doubt.
12	23, A driver of a motor vehicle.
13	24, A person in any case.
14	25, A person shall not knowingly possess.
15	26, The law recognizes two kinds of possession.
16	27, The flight of a person. Now that's got cites on it.
17	MS. NGUYEN: That's correct, Your Honor, and that's the one that we would
18	object to.
19	THE COURT: All right. My understanding of the current status of law that
20	this the flight of a person immediately after commission of a crime, or after he is
21	accused of a crime, is no sufficient in itself to establish his guilt, but is a fact which,
22	proved, may be considered by you in light of all other facts in deciding the question
23	of his guilt or innocence. Whether or not the evidence of flight shows a
24	consciousness of guilt and the significance to be attached matter are matters for
25	your deliberation.

Tom, get Alan in here for me.

Put on record your objection.

MS. NGUYEN: And Your Honor, I would just say that I don't think that there has been anything presented that show consciousness of guilt. A lot of times when you see these flight instructions you see someone who is actually trying to flee the area. This -- in this case, even if you believe the State's argument, one -- if you believe the State's argument that there is -- he engaged in some sort of shootout on the street, I would say that that's evidence that he wasn't fleeing, he was actually there and not retreating.

Second of all, a lot times you'll see this when someone retreats to another jurisdiction. They go to Mexico, the go to another state, and they're actively hiding and concealing themselves for long periods of time and that's evidence in consciousness of guilt. In this case, I think from start to finish this whole thing occurred in a seven-minute timespan. And that's from the time that that body camera came to the time that they apprehended a suspect in this case. And with that I'd submit.

THE COURT: Do you want to put anything on record?

MS. THOMSON: Just that the definition of flight includes no timeline. Clearly here we have flight over and over and over again. The fact that he's found hiding in a dark backyard and does not submit to commands, I think speaks significantly to his intent to flee.

THE COURT: And he left the property under the truck; the bullet-proof vest and the gun. I'm going to give the flight instruction over the objection -- do we have a clean --

MS. NGUYEN: Can I --

1	THE COURT: Clean copy?
2	MS. THOMSON: I will e-mail a new full set that has everything clean.
3	THE COURT: I'm numbering these.
4	MS. THOMSON: Then I won't do that. I'll e-mail
5	THE COURT: Just
6	MS. THOMSON: a new full set
7	MS. NGUYEN: Maybe Alan could delete it.
8	MS. THOMSON: that has that clean.
9	THE COURT: Can you delete those?
10	THE JUDICIAL EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT: Yeah.
11	THE COURT: All right. Alan will delete.
12	MS. NGUYEN: And Your Honor, if I could just make one more brief record
13	THE COURT: All right.
14	MS. NGUYEN: on that? I also think that this particular instruction and the
15	case law that supports it actually shifts the burden. And I don't believe that's
16	something that's actually been addressed by the Nevada Supreme Court. So I thin
17	it is appropriate for the Court to make a ruling on that.
18	THE COURT: All right.
19	MS. NGUYEN: I think when you this instruction essentially with the
20	evidence of guilt, I think it burden shifts.
21	THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
22	[Colloquy between the Court and the Clerk]
23	THE COURT: All right. I'm going to give that instruction over the objection o
24	the Defense.
25	28 Mere presence

29, If necessary to prevent escape.

30, You have heard evidence of prior inconsistent statements. You may consider those for purposes of impeachment or as substantive evidence, at your discretion.

MS. NGUYEN: And Your Honor, this is one where I'm also objecting to.

MS. THOMSON: And Your Honor, it's our position that it's supported by the statute, in addition to case law, specifically, *Levi v. State*, which was a '79 case. And *Atkins v. State*, which later confirmed the holding in --

THE COURT: Wait. She hasn't argued yet her --

MS. THOMSON: Oh, sorry.

THE COURT: Put your object -- just --

MS. NGUYEN: Your Honor, this is indicates that we've heard evidence of prior inconsistent statements. It's my understanding that Detective Jaeger -- what's his -- is that his name?

MS. THOMSON: There is a Detective Jaeger, but Detective Hodson is the one who's on it.

MS. NGUYEN: Hodson, okay. That there will be a witness that comes in to testify, perhaps to lay the foundation for this prior inconsistent statement. I would argue that we don't have that at this point. There hasn't been any kind of evidence of any prior inconsistent statements.

In addition, I think while having that evidence admitted, you know, as perhaps appropriate I think that the credibility determination instruction and those things kind of cover this. I think when you say you've evidence of prior inconsistent statements, it's a forgone conclusion that that's exactly what they heard. And I think that's a determination and that's in the province of the jury to determine whether or

not those statements are inconsistent.

So, the legal rulings as far as, you know, determining whether or not those statements are even admissible I think is in the province of the Court. But I think determinations of whether or not those are actually inconsistent is up to the jury. And I think this instruction instructs the jury that they are inconsistent. And I think that's up to their determination to determine whether or not the statements are in fact inconsistent.

THE COURT: Okay. Now finish your argument.

MS. THOMSON: Sorry, Judge. While we haven't yet had the evidence of the prior inconsistent statement, the detective is here, it is going to come in to -- I mean, obviously the jury's going to be aware that they've heard two different versions of the same fact associated to one witness that's not a shock that it is a prior inconsistent statement. The case law is hear that that may be considered substantively.

And what we have on the instruction credibility talks about impeachment but it doesn't discuss the fact that they may consider that prior statement substantively instead of just for purposes of impeachment and they have a right to know what they can consider.

THE COURT: Well we sort of had a prior inconsistent because she said no, I didn't say anything about the bullet-proof vest but you had eluded to it.

MS. THOMSON: But that information hasn't come in --

THE COURT: Hasn't come in yet.

MS. THOMSON: -- yet, but it will.

THE COURT: All right. I'm going to give that with the understanding I'll pull it if they don't get that in, over your objection.

1	MS. NGUYEN: Okay.
2	THE COURT: 31, It is the constitutional of a Defendant not to be compelled
3	to testify. Is it your anticipation he's not going to or do you know?
4	MS. NGUYEN: At this time I don't believe he is.
5	THE COURT: All right. 32, Although you are to consider.
6	33, In your deliberation.
7	34, When you retire.
8	35, Playback.
9	36 is then the signature line.
10	We'll have Lana make fix 27. With that understanding, State you're
11	familiar with Jury Instructions 1 through 36?
12	MS. THOMSON: Yes, Your Honor.
13	THE COURT: Do you have are you satisfied with them?
14	MS. THOMSON: Yes, Your Honor.
15	THE COURT: Do you have any more that you wish to offer the Court?
16	MS. THOMSON: No, Your Honor.
17	THE COURT: You've reviewed the verdict form?
18	MS. THOMSON: Yes, Your Honor.
19	THE COURT: You're satisfied with it?
20	MS. THOMSON: You have the version that has on Count 10, guilty of
21	discharge of firearm from or within a structure
22	THE COURT: Yes.
23	MS. THOMSON: or vehicle, not of vehicle?
24	THE COURT: Or vehicle.
25	MS. THOMSON: Okay. I had made a typo, so I just wanted to make sure

1	had the one that's proper.
2	THE COURT: All right.
3	MS. THOMSON: Perfect. Thank you.
4	THE COURT: All right. Defense, you're familiar with Jury Instructions 1
5	through 36.
6	MS. NGUYEN: that's correct.
7	THE COURT: Except for the objections that you already made, do you have
8	any further that you wish to supply?
9	MS. NGUYEN: No, Your Honor. And there were just for record, there were
10	changes that the State did accommodate on some of the instructions that we
11	previously included prior to submitting them to the Court.
12	THE COURT: So I'll make 13 and you've reviewed the verdict form?
13	MS. NGUYEN: I have. I do have some questions and concerns about the
14	verdict form.
15	THE COURT: Okay. What's that?
16	MS. NGUYEN: I know that it is unusual. I don't think it's been done before,
17	but I don't think there's any precedent that it can't be done. Because there are so
18	many different charges involving discharge of a firearm from within a structure or
19	vehicle and assault with a deadly weapon and they are pled with more specificity
20	within the charging document, I don't know if the Court would consider putting
21	something in there so we know the location to which the State is referring.
22	MS. THOMSON: I have no problem doing that
23	MS. NGUYEN: For each one of those things.
24	MS. THOMSON: quickly and I
25	THE COURT: Why don't you do that

1	MS. THOMSON: can forward that to
2	THE COURT: and supply that
3	MS. THOMSON: It'll still be attached
4	THE COURT: with the streets.
5	MS. THOMSON: to the instructions because separating it out is a hassle,
6	but it'll be the last pages.
7	THE COURT: Okay. That's fine.
8	MS. THOMSON: And it's going to come from my personal e-mail address,
9	which is absolutely preposterous, but it's the only one I know how to log in to on this
10	computer.
11	THE COURT: WE will publish it.
12	All right. I will Alan make 13, 14, 15, 16. Do we only need one copy for
13	Jill? Do you need okay.
14	MS. NGUYEN: Can I get two for my table
15	THE COURT: 17, 18.
16	MS. NGUYEN: so I don't have to share?
17	THE COURT: Yeah.
18	MS. NGUYEN: Thank you.
19	THE COURT: Make 18 copies, please.
20	MS. NGUYEN: And then I have some objections to make on some stuff that's
21	coming in.
22	THE COURT: Okay.
23	MS. NGUYEN: So I don't know if you want to wait for my client to be here.
24	THE COURT: Yeah, we want to wait until he gets here. In fact, if you're
25	sending those, why don't you take the cites out of 27.

1	MS. THOMSON: I'm sorry?
2	THE COURT: Take the cites out of 27
3	MS. THOMSON: Okay.
4	THE COURT: if you're sending them over.
5	[Pause in proceedings]
6	THE MARSHAL: They're all here, Judge.
7	THE COURT: All right. We're ready? Are you guys ready?
8	MS. THOMSON: Yes, Your Honor.
9	THE COURT: All right. Okay. Bring the jury in, Tom.
10	MS. THOMSON: Are you go
11	MS. NGUYEN: Oh, can we make the argument on these?
12	THE COURT: Oh, wait, wait. Yes. We settled Jury Instructions 1 through 36.
13	You looked at the verdict forms?
14	MS. NGUYEN: I did, I did.
15	THE COURT: And he's printing them
16	MS. NGUYEN: that's correct.
17	THE COURT: and your client will have one and you'll have a copy.
18	MS. NGUYEN: Thank you, Your Honor.
19	Your Honor, it's my understanding the State intends to seek three
20	separate jail phone calls made by my client. And if I could just discuss
21	THE COURT: Okay.
22	MS. NGUYEN: them? There's one jail call I'm going to it's referred to as
23	Jail Call Number 3.
24	MS. THOMSON: Rochelle, we don't have his aren't labeled. Will you just
25	put date and time.

22

20

23

24

25

MR. FATTIG: [Indiscernible].

MS. NGUYEN: Oh, I'm sorry. July 12th, 2014 at 8:43.

THE COURT: Now do we have to take -- to -- have you got them cleaned up, so it doesn't say jail call?

MR. FATTIG: No, it's going to say CCDC, this is a recorded call. But these -- all the calls are within a couple weeks of the arrest. None of them are anywhere near the trial.

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. NGUYEN: These are calls -- obviously they're from the Clark County Detention Center. One, I would say that they're prejudicial. It clearly indicates that he is incarcerated.

THE COURT: All evidence is prejudicial.

MS. NGUYEN: I understand. I think that, you know, we go to such great lengths to show that he is not incarcerated and not wearing things and then we play a phone call that starts off, this is a phone call from the Clark County Detention Center. But that aside, we did go through -- I think that they should be kept out in their entirety and I'll get into that for each reason. But if they are allowed in, I know that we were able to go through and redact the things that we both agreed shouldn't be in there in there on some of these calls.

THE COURT: I wish when you redact you would take CCDC issues.

MR. FATTIG: My concern with that, Your Honor, is, you know --

THE COURT: I mean, they know he was arrested. They know it's going to be a jail call. But we should take that out when we can. I don't know that it's necessarily overly prejudicial because it's close in time, but in the future if you can take it out, I would. We did that in that murder case.

MR. FATTIG: Yes. Sometimes some jurors then speculate well, why is the government listening in on his calls? What's the basis here?

MS. NGUYEN: They listen in on calls.

MR. FATTIG: Well they do when you're an inmate and they have a right to, but they need to know the context of that.

MS. NGUYEN: I think Snowden showed us they listen all the time. So, anyway, that was a side note.

THE COURT: There's a building in Utah that listens to everything. And you can't even get within 500 yards of that place.

MS. NGUYEN: Well I'm going to talk --

THE COURT: True story.

MS. NGUYEN: With -- specifically with this call I also have issues, pursuant to NRS 48.045, I think character evidence is inadmissible. The reason that I think that the character evidence in this particular call is inadmissible is this call centers around a telephone call that Mr. Bacharach had with Eufrasia Nazaroff. She was a witness that previously testified.

THE COURT: Right.

MS. NGUYEN: This obviously didn't come in through her testimony, but it goes through and it talks about a truck. It talks about Mr. Bacharach's truck, it talks about selling it. There's some insinuation that perhaps they're current on some sort of payments. I think that this is an uncharged bad act. I think that it is not relevant. I don't think it's appropriate. And I don't think this particular call and the contents of this call should be admitted. We do have the transcripts here if the Court would like to review those transcripts.

THE COURT: What --

1	MR. FATTIG: Your Honor
2	THE COURT: Why do you what do you want them for?
3	MR. FATTIG: She never mentioned she didn't want the truck stuff. I don't
4	want it for the truck stuff.
5	THE COURT: What do you want it for?
6	MR. FATTIG: So we're willing to take that out.
7	THE COURT: What do you want it for?
8	MR. FATTIG: This particular call
9	THE COURT: Let me see, Rochelle.
10	MR. FATTIG: They begin a conversation about testifying and they're referring
11	to the Grand Jury that occurred around the time of this call. The Grand Jury was
12	actually commenced two days after this call on July 14th of 2014 and they're talking
13	about
14	THE COURT: Okay. Tell me what it starts with because
15	MR. FATTIG: It starts on page 8, this conversation. The Defendant is
16	concerned that witnesses are subpoenaed to come testify against him. She's
17	commenting she's she has been subpoenaed as well as she makes some
18	statements regarding another female.
19	THE COURT: Okay. Where tell me where you're at?
20	MR. FATTIG: Page 8, the middle of the page. It says JB, being Joshua
21	Bacharach. Quote: I guess they served her a subpoena to come testify against me
22	too, I guess.
23	And then EN is Eufrasia Nazaroff. So it starts there and continues on
24	page 9, the Defendant

THE COURT: Who is she talking -- who is he talking about is getting

1	subpoenaed?		
2	MR. FATTIG: Well they're talking about Eufrasia was subpoenaed, as well as		
3	another female. And I believe they're talking about Marisala Tarango, who is the		
4	Defendant's girlfriend/ex-girlfriend, depending on the day.		
5	Page 9, he talks about it		
6	THE COURT: Okay, but		
7	MR. FATTIG: doesn't matter, you're not		
8	THE COURT: Okay, but oh, okay, you're going to tell me what the		
9	relevance is. I the a part about an uncharged act on the truck I'm not real		
10	concerned with.		
11	MR. FATTIG: Okay.		
12	THE COURT: And I'm going to overrule it. The relevance though, I want to		
13	know what relevance this is.		
14	MR. FATTIG: Well he talks about you're not supposed to testify against		
15	nobody. That's on page 9.		
16	And then she says: They can show that I let you use my car and all this		
17	and that.		
18	And he says: Yeah, well then guess what what that does?		
19	What?		
20	That means I'm you're incriminating me.		
21	And then she says: Shut the fuck up. No, that means that you didn't		
22	steal my car out of my fucking parking lot.		
23	He says: I		
24	She says: Mother fucker.		
25	He says: I don't know who had my car.		

1	She says: You had my car you asshole.		
2	He says: No, I didn't.		
3	She says: You didn't have my car.		
4	He said: Somebody I don't know. Somebody else must have been		
5	driving it.		
6	So it directly goes to the issue of who was in the car.		
7	THE COURT: It appears to be relevant and over the objection of the		
8	Defense, I'll allow that one in.		
9	MR. FATTIG: DO you want us to redact the portion about the truck and the		
10	earlier part of that call?		
11	THE COURT: No, conversations need they it is what it is. I just don't		
12	think you're going into the truck. You want the issue about the testimony. That's		
13	fine.		
14	MR. FATTIG: Correct. It's the latter portion of the call.		
15	THE COURT: Right. Okay. What's the next one?		
16	MS. NGUYEN: If we look at call dated 7/7/2014 at 10:10.		
17	THE COURT: Okay. And why don't you want that in?		
18	MS. NGUYEN: I'm going to direct you to the page and then I'll approach so		
19	you can see it. If you go to page 8 and I'll approach.		
20	THE COURT: Okay.		
21	MS. NGUYEN: There's a section in there and I know the State wasn't aware		
22	of who that individual was, but I think that kind of portrays kind of like this Bonnie		
23	Polley as like some nefarious figure that we don't know who is coming and telling		
24	the client certain things. He's just repeating something that was told to him. This		
25	isn't any kind of admission, he's just repeating something that was told to him. And		

1	think the reason		
2	THE COURT: You know		
3	MS. NGUYEN: that I have issues with this		
4	THE COURT: you know who Bonnie Polley is.		
5	MS. NGUYEN: I know who Bonnie Polley is.		
6	THE COURT: Okay.		
7	MS. NGUYEN: The State wasn't aware of who Bonnie Polley is?		
8	THE COURT: They didn't?		
9	MS. NGUYEN: I don't know if the detective knows who Bonnie Polley is.		
10	MR. FATTIG: I'd never heard of her.		
11	THE COURT: I'm sure the detectives do. She's the minister over in the jail.		
12	MR. FATTIG: Yeah.		
13	MS. NGUYEN: And so my point is, is I think just by itself the jury doesn't		
14	know that person is and short of me having to now subpoena that person at the las		
15	minute to come and testify as to who she is and those are		
16	THE COURT: No, we can tell them who she is.		
17	MR. FATTIG: Well if the detective knows it, she could ask the detective.		
18	MS. NGUYEN: And I'm fine doing it that way. Or if the State's willing to		
19	stipulate that that's who that is instead of		
20	THE COURT: That's who it is.		
21	MR. FATTIG: I would be willing to stipulate, but could maybe we could get		
22	it in through the detective. I'll check with the detective.		
23	MS. NGUYEN: Okay.		
24	MR. FATTIG: Okay.		
25	MS. THOMSON: I'll go tell him.		

certainly view it as an admission that he is driving that car, because when we look at

the body camera video I would certainly agree that this happened very, very fast,

24

1	from the point in time when it began, to the point in time when he shot him at the	
2	officer on the corner and then hid.	
3	And then it kind of goes on from there. He makes some statements	
4	about how he's never, ever coming home. He's got a lot of time to do. That's on	
5	page 6. And it kind of	
6	MS. NGUYEN: You know what, we had already agreed to redact those	
7	actually, Tim.	
8	MR. FATTIG: I thought we were	
9	THE COURT: All right. Make sure you take out the bad stuff. I think it's	
10	relevant when it talks about	
11	[Colloquy between Counsel]	
12	THE COURT: Just make sure they're redacted the way that you guys have	
13	agreed to. But it is relevant when he takes about it happened real, real, real fast.	
14	MS. NGUYEN: And then	
15	THE COURT: If it's redacted and taken out any crimes or things like that,	
16	then we need to make sure that I mean, if we have to do a jury instruction	
17	MS. THOMSON: Hi.	
18	THE COURT: We have to do a jury instruction that says, you know, there's	
19	been evidence of other uncharged misconduct that, you know, like drug usage	
20	sometimes. I don't think it's come in on this case, but I've had other trials where we	
21	say you can't use that against him as being a bad person.	
22	MR. FATTIG: Yeah.	
23	THE COURT: It just tells the whole story. So if we	
24	MR. FATTIG: No, that's fine.	
25	THE COURT: have to, we'll do that.	

1	MS. NGUYEN: And Your Honor, I don't know if for clarity I know that Tim is			
2	kind of arguing some of this stuff but I had talked most of the redaction information			
3	with Megan. So I don't know Megan, do you want			
4	MR. FATTIG: She			
5	MS. NGUYEN: to put on the record what we what was taken out?			
6	MS. THOMSON: Sure.			
7	MS. NGUYEN: Because it's not very much			
8	MS. THOMSON: Which one do you want me to start with?			
9	MS. NGUYEN: Whatever one you want to start with.			
10	THE COURT: Well there was one in there that I read that talked about getting			
11	some crack. That probably should be redacted.			
12	MR. FATTIG: We definitely redacted that.			
13	MS. THOMSON: That was taken out. So Track 3, which is the July 12th didn't			
14	have any redactions. So everything stayed in because that was the one that didn't			
15	have anything that came out.			
16	MS. NGUYEN: Okay.			
17	MS. THOMSON: July 7 th of 2014 on we should probably mark one of these			
18	as a court exhibit.			
19	Page 6 he states: Cause I know they're going to give me some time			
20	man. I know they're going to get a I'm going to get a lot of time. I'm not like			
21	I'm not ever come not coming home, but I'm just going to have a lot of time to do.			
22	I took that out.			
23	And then on the next page, page 7, he states: So I know they give me			
24	a good 15 years.			
25	That one may have been one where I had to take out a little bit more of			

1	the paragraph. In fact, I'm sure it is because I just couldn't get it segmented out in a	
2	way that didn't sound ridiculous. But that statement was taken out and I think in to	
3	that the part where he talks about being in his cell last night. I'm pretty sure that	
4	came out also because I couldn't get it out otherwise.	
5	Page 8 he states or I'm sorry. Marisala states: Did you get your	
6	receipt yet?	
7	He says: Yes, I got it. Thank you. I got me some crack.	
8	That came out.	
9	MS. NGUYEN: And just so you know, crack is slang for coffee at the jail.	
10	MS. THOMSON: It is.	
11	MS. NGUYEN: Okay.	
12	THE COURT: Oh, it is?	
13	MS. NGUYEN: Yes.	
14	THE DEFENDANT: Yeah.	
15	MS. THOMSON: It's I mean, contextually it is.	
16	MS. NGUYEN: Yeah.	
17	MS. THOMSON: But it just	
18	MS. NGUYEN: Obviously I don't think anyone else might know that.	
19	THE COURT: Oh.	
20	MS. NGUYEN: So we took that out	
21	THE COURT: I didn't know.	
22	MS. NGUYEN: as abundance of caution.	
23	MS. THOMSON: And then on page 11	
24	THE COURT: I do know now.	
25	MS_THOMSON: I took out everything after one minute remaining. It was	

1	just easier.
2	THE COURT: Okay. What about the
3	MS. THOMSON: On
4	THE COURT: I think it's relevant that I talked about I've ruled on the
5	second call. Now the third call?
6	MR. FATTIG: This is actually the first call. We were going backwards.
7	MS. NGUYEN: Yeah. I'm sorry. I picked them up in the wrong order.
8	MS. THOMSON: On July 1 st the
9	MS. NGUYEN: There's a reference to they put me in some psych ward.
10	MS. THOMSON: Page 2. I took that out, so it's going to hear: They just
11	they didn't move me around man, they put this is in this medical. They they just.
12	So that comes out, the psych ward portion. And then page 4, at the
13	end, she, being Eufrasia states: Your your you're for a long time.
14	And that is out. And then on page 5, she also states: We'll be we'll
15	be down there to see you every year. I got to figure out how to and then it's
16	inaudible for the transcript but it says something about figure out the jail or the
17	prison and we'll be down there. I took that out.
18	On page 7 I took out Eufrasia states: Anyways, just know that we'll
19	be down there. Inaudible, inaudible. I have to figure out how to, inaudible, so where
20	I take, inaudible, but when you go, inaudible, be there.
21	And that's referencing there her coming down with the children to the
22	prison to visit him. That's taken out. And
23	THE COURT: What's the relevance in this call?
24	MR. FATTIG: This particular call it's on page 5. I don't know if you have the
25	transcript.

1	THE COURT: I don't.			
2	MR. FATTIG: Eufrasia indicates it's the middle of page 5.			
3	You had my high beams on. That's why they pulled you over. None of			
4	this when you left the house I said turn off my high beams. That's that's why			
5	they pulled you over because of your high beams.			
6	And Defendant says: Oh yeah?			
7	And she says: Yeah.			
8	And he says: Yeah.			
9	So that certainly is corroborative that he is the driver because he was			
10	pulled over for his high beams.			
11	THE COURT: It looks like he decided way she just shut up. High beams.			
12	Shut up.			
13	MR. FATTIG: Yeah.			
14	THE COURT: He knows it's being recorded.			
15	MR. FATTIG: Yes.			
16	MS. NGUYEN: Your Honor, I understand the relevance there. I'm not sure			
17	why we need the remaining 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6			
18	THE COURT: Well			
19	MS. NGUYEN: 7 pages. I don't know if they have anything if the State			
20	wants to prove it show any relevance there. I think at that point, I mean, we just			
21	get into some pretty foul language, putting money on books			
22	MR. FATTIG: This is July 1 st of 2014, so we're talking about one of the first			
23	calls.			
24	MS. NGUYEN: We're talking about getting visits up at the jail and			
25	THE COURT: AS long as we take out that the psych part, I'm happy with			

that. I mean, I -- it's admissible, over the objection of the Defense. What I would like you to do though is make copies of each of those transcripts and provide them to the Court and we'll mark them as Court's exhibits not to go back to the jury.

MS. THOMSON: Unless the Court has an objection to it, I will provide the ones where I actually have the marking of what I took out. Everything in pink is what I took out.

THE COURT: Pink is your color.

MS. THOMSON: Well there's some stuff in yellow. But pink's what I redacted.

THE COURT: All right.

MS. NGUYEN: And Your Honor, just on -- on the -- and the calls -- I mean, my concern is, is -- I mean, there's some like graphic kind of like sexual language about her not sleeping with anyone else and -- I don't know I just -- I don't know how that's relevant, but.

THE COURT: All right. What else?

MS. NGUYEN: That's all.

THE COURT: All right. Bring them in, Tom.

[Colloquy between Counsel]

MS. NGUYEN: Oh, there was a *Facebook* picture that was, I guess, taken by one of the detectives off of a *Facebook* page with the name Joshua Bacharach on it. IT had a gun. There were two guns on it. One of them doesn't look like any of the guns that we have, so I know the State did redact that photo out. And then there was reference in the status line to two guns and they redacted that out. So the only gun that is pictured in there appears to be similar to one of the weapons that was impounded here. I would just --

1	MR. FATTIG: And that has been if Your Honor wants to look at it, it's been		
2	marked as Proposed 203. We again redacted out the second gun, any reference to		
3	it.		
4	THE COURT: Okay.		
5	MR. FATTIG: But that's the gun that we believe is the gun used to shoot at		
6	Officer McNabb.		
7	THE COURT: All right.		
8	MS. NGUYEN: And Your Honor, I would just say it's not relevant. It's just a		
9	picture of a gun. It's not a picture of him with a gun. It is on obviously on his		
10	Facebook page.		
11	THE COURT: It came off his Facebook.		
12	Okay. Bring them, Tom.		
13	Hey, if we can get all your witnesses on this morning, take a late lunch		
14	and then you'll come back.		
15	MS. THOMSON: I like it.		
16	MR. FATTIG: Yes.		
17	[In the presence of the jury]		
18	THE MARSHAL: All rise, please.		
19	And be seated.		
20	THE COURT: Stipulate to the presence of the jury.		
21	MR. FATTIG: Yes, Your Honor.		
22	THE COURT: Thanks.		
23	MS. NGUYEN: Oh, I'd stipulate to the presence of the jury.		
24	THE COURT: Thanks for being prompt, ladies and gentlemen. Again, it's m		
25	fault that we're drawn out.		

1		Call your next witness, State.	
2	MS.	ΓΗΟMSON: Judge, the State calls Detective Hodson.	
3		BRECK HODSON	
4	[having b	een called as a witness and being first duly sworn, testified as follows:]	
5	THE	THE CLERK: Thank you. Please be seated. State your full name, spelling	
6	your first ar	your first and last name for the record, please.	
7	THE	THE WITNESS: I'm Detective Breck Hodson. It's B-R-E-C-K, H-O-D-S-O-N.	
8	THE	THE COURT: Go ahead.	
9	MS.	MS. THOMSON: Thank you, Your Honor.	
10		DIRECT EXAMINATION	
11	BY MS. TH	OMSON:	
12	Q	Good morning. Directing your attention back to June 26th of 2014, were	
13	you a firear	ms detective?	
14	A	Yes, I was.	
15	Q	And since then Metro has reorganized and now you're generally just	
16	a general d	etective, is that fair?	
17	A	That's correct.	
18	Q	Okay. In June of 2014, did you have contact with an individual by the	
19	name of Eufrasia Nazaroff?		
20	A	Yes, I did.	
21	Q	And was that pursuant to an investigation regarding an incident that had	
22	occurred or	June 26 th ?	
23	A	That'd be correct.	
24	Q	When you had contact with Ms. Nazaroff, where was that?	
25	A	It was at an apartment complex. I believe it was in the area of	
	I		

Rough Draft Transcript, Volume III - Page 29

1	Cheyenne and Michael.		
2	Q	And approximately how far is that apartment complex from the area of	
3	Carey and	Dolly?	
4	A	At least ten miles away.	
5	Q	When you had contact with Ms. Nazaroff, were you discussing an	
6	individual b	y the name of Joshua Bacharach with her?	
7	A	Yes.	
8	Q	And during that conversation with her, did you show her any	
9	photograph	s or stills?	
10	A	Yes, I did.	
11	MS.	THOMSON: May I approach the witness?	
12	THE COURT: Yes.		
13	BY MS. THOMSON:		
14	Q	Showing you what's been marked as State's Proposed Exhibit 203. Do	
15	you recognize what I'm showing you here?		
16	Α	Yes.	
17	Q	Okay. And is this something that you had shown to her during your	
18	discussion?		
19	A	Yes, it was	
20	Q	And is this a still from a Facebook page?	
21	Α	Yes.	
22	Q	And specifically was that a page that you had determined belonged to	
23	Joshua Bacharach?		
24	Α	Yes, it was.	
25	Q	And did you determine that by name and other photographs on the	

1	page?	
2	A Yes, that'd be correct.	
3	Q Okay. Those other photographs, do they include photographs of Mr.	
4	Bacharach?	
5	A I believe so, yes.	
6	MS. THOMSON: I'd move for admission of State's Proposed Exhibit 203.	
7	MS. NGUYEN: Submit.	
8	THE COURT: It'll be admitted.	
9	[STATE'S EXHIBIT 203 ADMITTED]	
10	BY MS. THOMSON:	
11	Q And during your contact with Ms. Nazaroff, when you showed her what	
12	has now been marked as State's Exhibit 203, did you discuss whether she had see	
13	Joshua with firearms?	
14	A That'd be correct.	
15	Q And did she indicate to you that she had in fact seen him with	
16	MS. NGUYEN: Objection, Your Honor, hearsay.	
17	MS. THOMSON: Your Honor, at this point, it's impeachment.	
18	THE COURT: She's already testified, so	
19	MS. NGUYEN: I would just argue that the jury's already had the opportunity	
20	to hear directly from her.	
21	THE COURT: Okay. Overruled. Go ahead.	
22	MS. THOMSON: Thank you, Your Honor.	
23	BY MS. THOMSON:	
24	Q Did she indicate to you that she had in fact seen him with three	
25	separate firearms?	

1	А	Yes, she did.	
2	Q	And one of those was the firearm depicted in this still?	
3	А	That'd be correct.	
4	Q	Did she indicate to you whether she saw that Facebook post or if he	
5	had sent ph	otographs to her phone?	
6	А	Yes, she did.	
7	Q	And which was it?	
8	А	She stated that it was on his Facebook and that he also sent it directly	
9	to her phon	e.	
10	Q	When you spoke with her, did she indicate to you how recently she had	
11	seen him w	ith those guns?	
12	A	They had been with him it was a close I can't remember exactly	
13	specifically	what how many days, but it had been recent.	
14	Q	Okay. Do you recall her indicating that he she had last seen the guns	
15	right before	he came back and that he had come back earlier in the week?	
16	MS. N	NGUYEN: Objection, Your Honor, leading.	
17	THE	COURT: Sustained.	
18	MS. 7	THOMSON: may I approach?	
19	THE	COURT: Yes.	
20	BY MS. THOMSON:		
21	Q	You recorded the conversation with her, correct?	
22	А	That's correct.	
23	Q	I'm going to direct you first to page 6 and have you read that over	
24	quietly to yo	ourself.	
25	A	Okay.	

1	Q	And then for context, page 2, and read that quietly over to yourself.
2	A	Okay.
3	Q	And in reviewing that, does that refresh your recollection as to when
4	she indicat	ed she had last seen the firearms?
5	A	Yes.
6	Q	And what did she tell you?
7	A	She told me a couple days prior to our conversation.
8	Q	And when you spoke with her, did you discuss with her whether she
9	had seen the Defendant with a ballistic or bullet-proof vest?	
10	A	Yes.
11	Q	And did she indicate to you that she had?
12	A	She stated he was wearing the evening that he left. So the night in
13	question, th	ne 26 th .
14	Q	And you spoke with her on the 27 th ?
15	A	Yes.
16	Q	And did you ask her if he was wearing it underneath or over his
17	clothing?	
18	A	I did and she stated it was over his clothing.
19	MS.	THOMSON: Court's indulgence.
20		Pass the witness.
21		CROSS-EXAMINATION
22	BY MS. NO	BUYEN:
23	Q	Was it just you when you met with Ms. Nazaroff?
24	A	During our conversation, yes. My team was on scene within probably
25	20 feet of n	ne.

1		Q	Okay. The picture that was reference to in there, was it printed out like
2	that?		
3	,	Д	It was I believe it was on
4	ľ	MS. T	HOMSON: Judge can we
5		MS. N	NGUYEN: I'm sorry.
6		MS. T	HOMSON: Okay.
7	ľ	MS. N	IGUYEN: I can clarify that question.
8	BY MS	. NG	UYEN:
9		Q	Was it in a print format or was it on your phone?
10	,	Д	It was on the phone.
11		Q	Okay. So you showed her the Facebook page from your phone, is that
12	correct	t?	
13	,	Д	That's correct.
14		Q	Okay. Prior to recording the conversation, did you have a conversation
15	with he	er?	
16	,	Д	Yes, we did.
17		Q	Okay. So the entirety of your conversation was not recorded, is that
18	fair to	say?	
19	,	Д	No, because we were going consent for her apartment.
20		Q	Okay. During the course of your investigation and your meeting with
21	her, were you aware that she was upset that she did not have her vehicle?		
22	,	Ą	Yes.
23		Q	Okay. And she had inquired of you about how she could get her
24	vehicle	back	k, is that correct?
25	-	That's	s correct.

1	Q	Okay. And that was her one mode of transportation for her and her
2	children, is	that correct?
3	A	Outside of his vehicle that she didn't want to drive.
4	Q	Okay. And at the time was she pregnant?
5	A	Yes.
6	Q	And so having that vehicle was important to her?
7	A	That's correct.
8	Q	Okay. Did she make it known on multiple occasions during that
9	conversation	on that she was upset about the car?
10	A	Yes.
11	Q	Okay. And there were her property was also in the car, is that
12	correct?	
13	A	I would assume. I don't remember recall exactly.
14	Q	Okay. Do you remember her indicating if she could get her property or
15	her kids' property out of that vehicle?	
16	A	She did want the vehicle back, I know that.
17	Q	Okay. During the course of your conversation with her, either recorded
18	or not reco	ded, do you remember her also being upset about another woman that
19	she knew o	of Joshua Bacharach's life?
20	A	I don't remember her being upset about it. She knew about it.
21	Q	Okay. And so she was aware of this other woman, is that correct?
22	A	That's correct.
23	Q	Okay. Is it fair to say that she was unhappy about this whole situation?
24	A	In general or
25	Q	Yes, in general.

1	A In general, yes.
2	MS. NGUYEN: Okay. Nothing further.
3	MS. THOMSON: I have no further questions.
4	THE COURT: Jury have any questions of this witness? Seeing no hands.
5	You're free to go, Detective.
6	THE WITNESS: Thank you very much.
7	THE COURT: Call your next witness, State.
8	MS. THOMSON: Court's indulgence.
9	The next witness is Beata Vida.
10	BEATA VIDA
11	[having been called as a witness and being first duly sworn, testified as follows:]
12	THE CLERK: Thank you. Please be seated. State your full name, spelling
13	your first and last name for the record, please.
14	THE WITNESS: My name is Beata Vida and it's spelled B-E-A-T-A, V-I-D-A
15	MS. THOMSON: May I proceed?
16	THE COURT: Uh-huh.
17	DIRECT EXAMINATION
18	BY MS. THOMSON:
19	Q Good morning, how are employed?
20	A I am employed by the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department as a
21	forensic scientist II in the biology/DNA section?
22	Q And for how long have you been in that position?
23	A I have been with them since June of 2010.
24	Q What training or education did you go through to get that position?
25	A I have a Bachelor's of Art degree in Biology, with a minor in Chemistry

and I also have an Associate's of Science degree in crime scene technology. In addition to my formal training, I also have on-the-job training, most of which took place at my former employer which was the Florida Department of Law enforcement in Orlando where I worked as a DNA analyst for approximately four years and one year of that was just training.

And then when I was hired at Metro in 2010 I went through another training program that lasted about eight months.

- Q And what do you do for the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department?
- A I examine various items of evidence that comes into the laboratory for biological materials. Most often I look for things such as blood, semen, or saliva. And once a stained is identified I perform DNA analysis on it to either include or exclude specific individuals. In addition to body fluids I also look for touch DNA, which is DNA that is transferred to items from skin cells and it happens when a person either comes into contact with or touches an item.
 - Q SO does -- do we leave DNA behind every time we touch something?
 - A Not every time. It depends on a lot of circumstances.
- Q And if we touch an item and we are leaving DNA behind, is there always enough for you to be able to compare?
 - A No, there is not.
 - Q Can you explain for -- why that is?
- A Yes. So for example, if I was to touch this folder, there's a lot of factors that depend on whether I not -- whether or not my skin cells transferred to it. It depends on how long I handled the item, the longer I touch it the more DNA I'm likely to leave. It depends on the surface, if a surface area is rough, DNA sticks to it better versus smooth surfaces where DNA can come off of easier.

It also depends on how the item is stored or where it's kept after it's been touched. Things such as heat, humidity, and sunlight will destroy DNA on an item. And lastly, if I was to swab this item, it would depend whether I swab it really lightly or really hard. If I swab it harder I'm probably get more DNA. Also, if I clean off the file or if I wear gloves, I'm not going to leave any DNA.

Q And are there situations where there's too much DNA?

- A Yes, there are.
- Q Can you explain that for us?

A Yes. So we have what are called mixture DNA profiles, which are DNA profiles from multiple individuals. So if I went out there and I swabbed the handle of the door I would expect to find a mixture because so many people have handled that handle, so I would get a mixture and I wouldn't be able to make any conclusions on that because too many people have touched it and left DNA on it.

Q Are there situations where you have a mixture of say two profiles and you're able to determine to whom those two belong?

A Yes. Sometimes if we do have a mixture, if one person leaves more DNA than another person, I'm able to actually pull the two DNA profiles apart and that way I can tell who left what DNA profile.

Q And can you explain for us what -- how you compare profiles? How you make that determination?

A Yes. So once a DNA profile is obtained -- let's say there is a stain at a crime scene. So the detectives or police officers will collect that stain for me and then I will take it on through DNA. Then I also usually get what are called buckle swabs or standards, which are DNA profiles from known individuals. And all that is is taking a swab from a person's cheek with a Q-tip and then attaching a name to it,

1	and then I g	get that, and that also runs through a DNA process.
2		After that I compare the Q sample, which is the blood stain from the
3	crime scene	e to the person's DNA profile to see if they match or not.
4	Q	And were you asked to com to do some comparison of 140626-4091
5	А	Yes.
6	Q	Okay. And as part of those comparisons you had a known sample?
7	А	Yes.
8	Q	And that was a known sample for Joshua Bacharach, correct?
9	А	Correct.
10	Q	Okay. Showing you what's been marked as State's Exhibit 201. Is this
11	a package	that you received that's a little bit better from the vault for purposes
12	of comparis	son?
13	А	Yes.
14	Q	And how can you tell that you've handled this package?
15	А	On the top right is has the lab number, the item number, the date, and
16	my number	on the bottom. And I also signed on the bottom, the chain of custody,
17	and the blu	e seal, that's also my number.
18	Q	So the writing up in the top right hand corner of the envelope is your
19	writing?	
20	А	Yes.
21	Q	And the blue seal along the bottom, those are your initials with your P-
22	number?	
23	А	Yes.
24	Q	And what is the reason for putting the initials and P-number over the
25	tape?	

1	A	We do that to make sure that the evidence hasn't been tampered with
2	and that I was the one who sealed it.	
3	Q	And this is in the same condition as when you last saw it?
4	A	Yes.
5	Q	Showing you what's been marked as State's Exhibit 194. Is this also a
6	item that y	ou examined?
7	A	Yes.
8	Q	And you can tell from the writing and the tape again?
9	A	Yes.
10	Q	Okay. And each of these envelopes included swabs that were taken b
11	a CSA and impounded for your comparison, is that correct?	
12	A	Yes.
13	Q	Now, when they are impounded they include a description of where
14	they came from, is that correct?	
15	A	Yes.
16	Q	That way you don't just get five random swabs and come back with five
17	results that you don't know what they associate to?	
18	A	Correct. It usually it may or may not say on the outside of the
19	package, t	out if it doesn't it there is a swab box within the package and it will
20	usually say what it's from.	
21	Q	Were you asked to compare swabs that were taken from a Colt .45?
22	A	Yes.
23	Q	And were you able to form a conclusion with regard to those swabs?
24	A	Yes.
25	Q	And can you explain for us what your conclusion was?
	-	

1	A	May I look at my report?
2	Q	Yes, if that would help refresh your recollection.
3	A	And which item was it?
4	Q	And I don't have your report in front of me. I apologize.
5		That is Lab Item Number 16.
6	A	Okay. So for that one I got what we call an inconclusive result.
7	Q	Okay. And can you explain for us what an inconclusive result is?
8	A	Yes. So that just means that I did get some sort of a DNA profile but it
9	was limited	that I wasn't able to make any conclusions. So I wasn't able to include
10	or exclude of	or make any kind of determinations on it. All I can say is that there was
11	something t	here but it was basically useless.
12	Q	Okay. And you were also provided a swab from the base or feed ramp
13	of the maga	zine on that firearm, correct?
14	A	Yes.
15	Q	As Lab Item 17?
16	A	Correct.
17	Q	Okay. Were you able to form a conclusion on that swab?
18	A	Yes. I did not obtain a DNA profile from that item.
19	Q	Did you receive a swab from a Colt .25, which was Lab Item Number
20	20?	
21	A	Yes.
22	Q	And were you able to determine if there was any DNA on there that you
23	could test?	
24	A	Again, it was inconclusive because I didn't obtain enough data.
25	Q	And did you also receive a swab from the base and feed ramp of the
	I	

1	magazine for that firearm?	
2	A	Yes.
3	Q	And what was your conclusion associated to that swab?
4	A	I did not obtain a DNA profile from that item.
5	Q	And so that means that there was no DNA on the swab for you to be
6	able to prep	pare?
7	A	Either yeah, either there was no DNA or our testing is not sensitive
8	enough to p	pick up the DNA that was there.
9	Q	And Lab Item Number 22. Did you receive a swab from the trigger
10	trigger, fore	estock, and butt of a rifle?
11	A	Yes.
12	Q	And did you form a conclusion associated to that?
13	A	Again, it was inconclusive results.
14	Q	Did you receive several swabs associated to a vehicle?
15	A	Yes.
16	Q	And those were from several different locations within the vehicle?
17	A	Correct.
18	Q	And did you compare each of those swabs?
19	A	Compare them for
20	Q	To the known to the buckle?
21	A	Yes, I did do DNA analysis on all of them.
22	Q	Speaking of Lab Item Number 25, was one of those swabs from the
23	driver's inte	rior door handle?
24	A	Yes.
25	Q	And were able to form a conclusion about that swab?
	i e	

1	A	So as far as the statistics was approximately 1 in 163,000 unrelated
2	individuals	in the population could be included in that mixture.
3	Q	Can you use that statistic and sort of explain what it means in a way
4	that is more	e communicable?
5	A	Yes. So what that means is if I randomly took a person from the
6	population	that was not related to whoever is in my mixture, the probability of them
7	having the	DNA profile that would fit into my mixture would be 1 in 163,000.
8	Q	Did you also receive a swab from the gear shift of that vehicle?
9	A	Yes, I did.
10	Q	And were you able to form a conclusion associated to that?
11	Α	Yes.
12	Q	And what was that conclusion?
13	Α	The DNA profile obtained was consistent with an unknown female
14	individual.	
15	Q	Okay. Showing you what's been marked as State's Exhibit 129. Are
16	you able to	tell if this is the steering wheel cover that you received and swabbed?
17	A	I am not.
18	Q	The steering wheel cover that you received, however, was impounded
19	under the same event number?	
20	A	Yes.
21	Q	And did you also receive a bullet-proof vest to examine?
22	A	Yes, I did.
23	THE	COURT: Is it unusual not to find DNA?
24	THE	WITNESS: On handguns or just generally speaking?
25	THE	COURT: Handguns and you're about to see a vest.

THE WITNESS: Yes, because like -- as I mentioned before, touching something it's very -- there's a lot of factors that influence it, whether DNA will be left on or not. So for touch, yes. But for blood, semen, and saliva which are body fluids, it contains a lot more DNA, so we are most likely going to find DNA in those.

THE COURT: So our TV shows are wrong.

THE WITNESS: Yes, they are. They, yes, very wrong.

BY MS. THOMSON:

- Q And to clarify, it's unusual to find touch DNA, but not when there are body fluids left behind?
- A Correct. And I would also like to say that for guns, we either have -- get no DNA profiles or if I do get a DNA profile it's from a lot of people because a lot of people tend to handle firearms. So, again, it's -- it would be inconclusive because too many people have touched it.
- Q Showing you what's been marked as State's Exhibit 192. Can you tell if you have had contact with that box?
 - A I have, yes.
 - Q And how do you know?
- A It has, again, the lab number, the item number, the date that I examined, and my P-number, and also there is a blue seal with my initials.
 - Q Okay. And when you received it, it was sealed with the red seal?
 - A Correct.
- Q Okay. And typically you will open a package like we saw with the envelopes in a place where it has not been sealed with the red seal, is that fair?
- A Yes. Unless it's sealed in all places, then I will have to cut through the seal that's already there.

1	that's on the	ere.
2	Q	When you say you swabbed the entire item, is that the entirety of the
3	surface?	
4	A	Yes.
5	Q	Okay. And the Q-tip that you use, is it just from CVS, it's a sterilized
6	A	Yes, it is.
7	Q	When you swabbed the vest, did you come to a conclusion on DNA?
8	A	Yes.
9	Q	And what was that?
10	A	Again, I obtained a mixture of at least four people or more. So I
11	obtained so	much information off that item that again, it was useless information and
12	I couldn't m	ake any conclusions off of it.
13	Q	You indicated when we first began speaking that there are times that
14	you'll have	a mixture profile, lots of different people, but one person will be stronger
15	than the oth	ners and you can pull them out. Is that kind of a fair
16	A	Yes.
17	Q	Okay. And do you expect there to be a stronger profile when there is a
18	lot of some	one's body fluids?
19	Α	Absolutely.
20	Q	Okay. Would you anticipate there being a lot of fluids if, for example,
21	the vest wa	s worn over clothing?
22	A	No, because obviously the skin contact has to occur for that to happen
23	MS.	THOMSON: Court's indulgence.
24		Pass the witness.
25		CROSS-EXAMINATION

1	BY MS. NGUYEN:	
2	Q	When you're looking items such as like a vest or a jacket or something,
3	are there c	ertain areas that you focus that you believe there would be more touch
4	DNA to col	lect from?
5	А	Yes, I do.
6	Q	Like for example, like the areas where something might zip up, would
7	you focus y	our attention there?
8	A	Yes. So if I jacket I would probably focus on the pockets, the neck
9	area, and t	he armpits, and the zippers.
10	Q	So you look at places where there's more likely to be contact, is that
11	correct?	
12	A	Yes.
13	Q	And is that something that you've learned in your training?
14	A	Yes.
15	Q	And common sense?
16	A	Correct.
17	Q	You had indicated that obviously if you go to a scene and there's blood
18	all over the	place and pools of liquid, it's probably easier to find DNA, is that correct
19	A	Yes, it is.
20	Q	Okay. And touch DNA is a little bit more difficult?
21	A	Correct.
22	Q	So for and if there are more people that have come into contact, it's
23	more diffict	ult too?
24	А	Yes.
25	Q	Okay. So if a hundred people touch something and you were

1	comparing	it, it's going to be more difficult than if say two people touched it, is that
2	fair to say?	
3	Α	Yes.
4	Q	Okay. So you'd expect in areas with high traffic like a doorknob, you
5	might be at	le to collect DNA, but too many people have touched that area?
6	А	Yes.
7	Q	You said that touch DNA is influenced by a lot of different things or
8	other is to	ouch DNA just fingerprints or is that does that include other things?
9	Α	It's just skin cells.
10	Q	Okay.
11	А	Skin cells contain DNA, so I need skin cells in order to get the DNA.
12	Q	Okay. So for example you wouldn't be just this would be considered
13	touch DNA	is that correct?
14	А	Correct.
15	Q	If I was to touch something?
16	А	Yes.
17	Q	Would touch DNA also include like the skin cells on the back of like my
18	jacket wher	e my neck and jacket touch?
19	А	Yes. So clothing items, things like that hats would also be considered
20	touch.	
21	Q	Those kind of things would be touch DNA, is that correct?
22	А	Yes.
23	Q	Okay. And you said things can influence that, like humidity, is that
24	correct?	
25	A	As in so far as how long the item has sat in humid area or air, sunligh

and UV, thin	gs like that. But just, you know, because I touched this, the humidity
might not ne	cessarily destroy it, unless it sits there for maybe a couple weeks, a
month and the	hen I take a swabbing of it.
Q	And the items that you reviewed items did you review those all on
the same da	y?
A	I believe so. I would have to double-check my notes.
Q	Would it refresh your recollection to look at your notes in your report?
A	Yes.
Q	Okay. Can you take a look at those to see when you reviewed those
items?	
A	Well I actually started examination on November 4 th , 2014. And it
appears that the ballistic vest, I actually looked at November 5 th . And the buckle	
swab I looke	ed at November 13 th .
Q	Okay. Of the items that you I think it was 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10.
There were	ten total items that you examined, is that correct?
A	Yes.
Q	Were there any other items that you examined that you did not include
in this?	
A	No, there were not.
Q	Okay. As far as choosing what items to examine are do you make
that determin	nation or are you directed to those items?
A	I do not make the determinations. I'm usually told what the detective o
whoever wa	nts me to look at because I'm not at the scene and I have no
background	story or anything, so they have to tell me what they want me to look at.
Q	Okay. But as far as what to examine on, for example, the ballistic vest
	might not nemonth and the Q the same date A Q items? A appears that swab I looke Q There were A Q in this? A Q that determine A Q The Q That determine A Q The Q That determine A Q The Q The Q That determine A Q The Q Th

1	do you make a determination on what areas to swab, is that correct?	
2	A	Yes. That's correct.
3	Q	And that's based on what we talked about before?
4	A	Yes.
5	Q	The swabs when we look at Item Number 19, the swab from the
6	trigger grip	inside of the Colt .45 handgun, did you actually swab that handgun or
7	was that so	mething that had previously been swabbed by someone else?
8	A	It was just the swab that I received and it was swabbed by somebody
9	else.	
10	Q	Okay. So you did not do the collection of that DNA?
11	A	That's correct.
12	Q	Okay. And the same things with Item Number 20, the swab from the
13	base and feed ramp of the magazine, that wasn't a swab that you collected?	
14	A	Correct.
15	Q	Okay. The swab from the trigger grip inside of the Colt .25 handgun,
16	again, you	did not collect that, is that correct?
17	A	That's correct.
18	Q	Okay. And is it fair to say all those swabs that were just we just
19	talked abou	ut that were included in the evidence, you did not collect those swabs, is
20	that correct	:?
21	A	That's correct. The only thing I got were the actual swabs.
22	Q	Okay. And as far as the steering wheel cover and the swab from the
23	gear shift k	nob, did you collect those?
24	A	I actually swabbed the steering wheel cover myself, but the gear shift,
25	did not, tha	t was a swab that was submitted to me.

1	Q	The ballistic vest, you swabbed that?
2	A	I did.
3	Q	Okay. So those two items you actually were the one that collected and
4	testing thos	se items?
5	A	Yes.
6	Q	Okay. And you did you started your in the collection from the
7	steering wh	eel cover and the ballistic vest, you did that in October or had you don't
8	that prior to	October?
9	A	It all took place in November.
10	Q	I meant November. I'm sorry, I apologize.
11	A	Yes, I did in November.
12	Q	Okay. And you're aware that this incident occurred in June of that
13	same year,	June of 2014?
14	A	I was not aware.
15	Q	Okay. So you don't know the difference between when the evidence is
16	collected ar	nd when you process it?
17	A	No, it doesn't really influence my testing in any way, so usually it's not
18	really some	thing that matters to us.
19	Q	Is that something that can influence your results?
20	Α	It depends on how the evidence is stored.
21	Q	Okay. So that may influence on how much DNA can be collected from
22	a particular	item, is that correct?
23	A	It may and yeah like as I said, depending on how it was stored.
24	Q	Could it affect something like if you had the ballistic vest for example,
25	if the min	ute when it was collected let's say it was saturated with some sort of

1	A	There were not.
2	Q	Okay. So the only known sample that you compared these how
3	many item	s are there? 1, 2, 3, 4
4	A	Nine.
5	Q	Nine items to just that one individual, is that correct?
6	A	That's correct.
7	Q	People hear about running getting DNA hits through like a database
8	Is this som	ething any of these items, were they run through any kind of general
9	database o	of DNA?
10	A	No. There are certain guidelines that we have to follow for us to
11	actually pu	it something in those databases and I did not put anything in there.
12	Q	Okay. And you weren't directed to put anything in there by any other
13	detectives,	is that correct?
14	A	Correct. Although even if they did direct me, guidelines weren't met
15	that would	allow me to put them in there. So even if they would have directed me,
16	couldn't ha	ive put anything in.
17	Q	Okay. You never received a court order directing you by order a court
18	to do that a	as well?
19	A	I never did.
20	Q	Okay.
21	MS.	NGUYEN: Nothing further.
22		REDIRECT EXAMINATION
23	BY MS. NO	GUYEN:
24	Q	What are the guidelines that affect whether or not you put information
25	 into databa	ase?

1	EXAMINATION BY THE COURT (JURY QUESTIONS)
2	BY THE COURT:
3	Q How long does it take for DNA to degrade a surface of clothing materia
4	before or fabric before it is no longer useable in analysis?
5	A Well, gain, it depends on a lot of things. But if I leave a shirt outside in
6	this in Las Vegas heat, the UV, the heat will destroy it. If I throw a shirt into wate
7	it's probably going to destroy it. So it again depend on something like different
8	variables. But I would say maybe from like four or five days to whatever weeks,
9	months.
10	THE COURT: State?
11	FOLLOW-UP EXAMINATION
12	BY MS. THOMSON:
13	Q Just to confirm. With regard to the bullet-proof vest, it wasn't that there
14	was not DNA, it was just that there was too much for you to be able to make a
15	conclusion, is that fair?
16	A Correct.
17	MS. THOMSON: Pass.
18	MS. NGUYEN: No further questions.
19	THE COURT: Thank you. You're free to go. Call your next witness.
20	MS. THOMSON: State calls Anya Lester or Anya Sanko.
21	ANYA LESTER
22	[having been called as a witness and being first duly sworn, testified as follows:]
23	THE CLERK: Thank you. Please be seated. State your full name, spelling
24	your first and last name for the record, please.
25	THE WITNESS: My name is Anya, A-N-Y-A; Lester, L-E-S-T-E-R.

MS. THOMSON: May I proceed?

THE COURT: Yes.

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MS. THOMSON:

Q Good morning, ma'am, how are you employed?

A I am employed at the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department forensic laboratory in the firearms and tool marks analysis unit as a forensic scientist.

Q And what training or education did you go through for that position?

A I have a Bachelor's of Science degree in Forensic Science. And since being hired with the Metropolitan Police Department I underwent a training program which consisted of about 2500 hours of training. I did things such as internal courses, external training courses. I did tours of firearm and ammunition manufacturing facilities. I attended various firearms armorers' courses from the manufacturers.

And when I finished that training I did a series of supervised cases underneath an experienced examiner. And at the end of that training I took a series of competency exams which allowed me to begin my own independent case work in the spring of 2011.

- Q And for how long have you been with Metro?
- A I started with Metro in December of 2008 as a forensic laboratory aid and I promoted into the forensic scientist position in October of 2009.
- Q Can you explain for us, what is the process when you're asked to do a comparison associated to a firearm?
 - A Well, if I have a firearm the first thing I do is I of basically a check on the

firearm to make sure that I can fire it. I do things such as look at the serial number, looking at the barrel length, the overall length, measure the trigger pull. I make sure that it's not damaged in any way, nothing that I note. I look at the safeties on it, the magazine, all of those different items, and I basically convince myself that it's safe enough for me to test fire it.

Then I take that gun and I load it with ammunition from our collection -from our general supply that we have at the laboratory and I test fire into an indoor
shooting tank. It's a tank which has about 600 gallons of water in it. It allows me to
shoot into that water and obtain pristine samples of the bullets and of the cartridge
cases from that particular firearm that I fired myself so I know that they came from
that gun.

Then if I have a piece of evidence, either a bullet or a cartridge case that I'm asked to compare it to, the first thing I do is take two knowns, the ones that I fired myself, I put them on my comparison microscope -- it's like two microscopes that are hooked together with an optical bridge. It allows me to look through it and see two things side by side, together, simultaneously. I look at the marks that are on the two knowns, see how good that gun marks, see those marks, how they repeat from one to the other, and determine if there is enough information there for me to do a comparison.

Once I've made the determination I will take the piece of evidence that I've asked to compare, I'll leave the known on one side, the evidence on the other side on my microscope and I do that microscopic comparison looking for those individual characteristics for me to make a determination of identification to that particular firearm.

Q So when a firearm shoots a bullet, it will leave individualized marks on

the casing and the bullet?

- A Yes, that's correct.
- Q And you said that you, when you're examining the firearm to decide if you are safe to fire it that you look at the serial number. Does every firearm have a serial number?
 - A Yes.
 - Q It's manufactured with it?
 - A Yes, that's correct.
- Q Can you explain for us what is the operation of a semi-automatic weapon?

A Semi-atomic firearm is a firearm teat for each singular pull of the trigger it fires one shot. And if you think of the word semi-automatic, it's partially automatic, so it's not like a full automatic gun which is where if you hold the trigger down it keeps firing, you have to pull the trigger every single time. But because it is semi-automatic it does perform some part of the firing cycle for you. It's usually the loading process. Usually the extraction and ejection and loading of a new cartridge.

So, for example, if you have a semi-automatic pistol you would have a magazine, which you put in your cartridges, your ammunition, you load that into the firearm, you have to do an action to load a cartridge into the chamber which is usually you take the slide to rack one or put one forward into the chamber. At that point in time the gun's cocked, you have one in the chamber, and you're ready to shoot.

When you pull the trigger what happens is the firing pin goes forward, hits the primer on the cartridge, it makes a little spark, that ignites the powder that's inside that cartridge, that powder when it expands it liberates gas and it pushes the

bullet down the barrel and out of the muzzle of the firearm.

You have that action of the bullet going forward, you have the cartridge case which is being pushed backwards. It gets pushed backwards against the back of the slide. You have a hook which is called an extractor, pulls that out of the chamber. You have a piece which is called the ejector which it hits against and it's ejected out of the firearm.

So then the slide, it has a spring. When it goes backward that spring is compressed and then when that spring energy is released that slide goes back forward and it picks up the next cartridge out of that magazine and loads it into the chamber and that way it's ready for you to pull the trigger again and fir the next shot.

- Q When the cartridge is being moved by the extractor and ejector, will that leave marks on the cartridge?
- A Yes, the extractor and the ejector can both leave marks on the cartridge case.
 - Q Okay. Will it always leave marks?
 - A Not necessarily.
- Q And when the casing is ejected, is it always at the same angle and the same direction?
- A No, it depends on the specific firearm, the manufacturer, and the model. In general, they tend to go back and to the left, but that would be if you were standing stationary, holding the firearm upright, and it's just sort of in general that's the way that they tend to go. They can go in different directions depending on the gun.
- Q And would it also be affected by outside factors; wind, items in the way, things like that?

1	A	Yes.
2	Q	Were you asked to compare excuse me or I'm not examine
3	four firearm	s in Event Number 140626-4091?
4	A	Yes, I was.
5	Q	And along with that request there were several casings and cartridges,
6	is that fair?	
7	A	Yes, there were.
8	Q	First of all, talking about State's Exhibit 180, were you asked to
9	examine a	Glock 9 mm?
10	A	May I refer to my case file?
11	Q	Yes. Would that help refresh your recollection?
12	A	Yes.
13		Yes, I was asked to examine a Glock pistol, 9 mm Luger caliber.
14	Q	Okay. And for you that was Lab Item Number 1?
15	A	Yes, that's correct.
16	Q	And were you did you know to whom this firearm belonged?
17	A	I did not know specifically to whom it belonged. I knew just because of
18	the fact that	the case was submitted to me as an officer-involved shooting that it was
19	an officer's	firearm.
20	Q	And when you examined the Glock, is it the same firearm as we're
21	seeing in th	is exhibit?
22	A	Can you move it in so I can see the serial number?
23		Yes, it that has the same serial number as the one that I did examine
24	Q	And this is State's Exhibit 180. When you examined this firearm, was it
25	operational	?
	1	

1	A	Yes, it was.
2	Q	Okay. Functioned normally?
3	A	Yes, it did.
4	Q	And can you explain for us what is on sort of below where the barrel is
5	on the firea	rm?
6	A	That's a flashlight.
7	Q	And that was working?
8	A	Yes, it was.
9	Q	Along with that firearm, did you also receive casings that were 9 mm?
10	A	Yes, I did.
11	Q	And did you examine whether those 9 mm casings associated to this
12	firearm?	
13	A	Yes, I compared eight 9 mm Luger +P cartridge cases to this particular
14	firearm.	
15	Q	And you went through the same process you particular described of
16	expelling but	ullets into the water tank and comparing the cartridges?
17	A	Yes, I went through the process that I described; did the function exam
18	test fired th	is particular firearm, looked at the cartridge cases that I test fired from
19	this gun to	each other and then compared those to the unknowns that I was given in
20	the case.	
21	Q	And the eight cartridges that you were provided that were the 9 mm
22	Luger + P,	did all or any of them match as having been expelled from this firearm?
23	A	Those eight cartridge cases that I was asked to compare, the 9 mm
24	Luger + P,	I identified all eight of them as having been fired by this firearm.
25	Q	Were you also asked to examine a Colt .45?

1	A	I was asked to examine a Colt pistol .45 auto caliber, yes.
2	MS.	THOMSON: And may I approach?
3	THE	COURT: Yes.
4	BY MS. TH	OMSON:
5	Q	Showing you what's been marked as State's Exhibit 191. Is this and
6	specifically	191a. Is this the firearm that you examined?
7	A	Can I see the front of that?
8	Q	Yes.
9	A	Yes, it is.
10	Q	Okay. And how do you know?
11	A	The box has my signature and my personnel number, as well as
12	evidence ta	pe with my signature and date on it, and the firearm itself has a sticker
13	on it, on the slide, which I placed there with our laboratory event number, our	
14	laboratory i	tem number, and my initials and personnel number.
15	Q	And it's hooked into the box with orange tabs. Are those tabs that you
16	use in the lab?	
17	A	Yes. We in the lab we use these orange safety straps to strap the
18	gun open a	nd to secure it into the box.
19	Q	Okay. And you use orange instead of black so you can tell that you
20	removed th	e firearm and placed it back in?
21	A	That's correct.
22	Q	And at the vault they used the black safety straps?
23	A	Yes, they do.
24	Q	In comparison or in your examination of this firearm, did it operate
25	normally?	

1	A	Yes, it did. It had no noted malfunctions.
2	Q	And did you notae the serial number from this firearm when you
3	examined it	?
4	Α	Yes, I did.
5	Q	and what was the serial number?
6	A	Serial Number CP33432.
7	Q	When you received the firearm you also received the magazine with it,
8	is that corre	ect?
9	A	Yes.
10	Q	And that's the magazine that's been marked as 191b?
11	A	It should be, yes.
12	Q	It has
13	A	Does it have my sticker on the back? Oh, there we go. It has my
14	initials, and	my personnel number, and our laboratory number, and item number or
15	it. Yes, tha	nk you.
16	Q	And when you put it back in box it was secured in but that has since
17	been chang	ed, is that fair?
18	A	Yes.
19	Q	Okay. When you examined the magazine, how many cartridges did it
20	hold?	
21	A	It held ten cartridges.
22	Q	Okay. And when you received it, it was empty, is that fair?
23	A	Yes.
24	Q	But anytime you receive a magazine is it empty?
25	A	Not necessarily. Sometimes they are booked with cartridges?
1	I	

1	can be are	as where the cartridge slides against those and it can create marks.
2		So there were marks there and also that extractor that we talked about
3	which is th	at hook that pulls the cartridge out can make a mark underneath the rim
4	and that ma	ark can be there too if that cartridge is fed, extracted, cycled through that
5	firearm, bu	t yet, not necessarily fired.
6	Q	Okay. And you said that that can occur when one loads it up into the
7	chamber a	nd then racks to eject it, is that correct?
8	A	Yes
9	Q	The other cartridges the other Speer and the Winchester, they did no
10	have those	markings?
11	A	One had a small amount of extractor markings but it was not sufficient
12	for me to make any determination either way.	
13	Q	Okay. And was that the Speer or the Winchester?
14	A	If I may refer to my notes?
15	Q	Yes, if that will help refresh your recollection.
16	A	It was my Item 30, which was the Speer. Item 12, it had a very light
17	extractor m	arks, but again, it was insufficient for me to make any association based
18	on those m	arks.
19	Q	And you made reference to Item Number 11. That was the CSA's item
20	number, not the lab number, correct?	
21	A	That's correct.
22	Q	You were also asked to examine a .25 caliber firearm, correct?
23	Α	Yes.
24	Q	And did you receive that in State's Exhibit 198?
25	A	Yes.

- Q And you can tell the same thing with this package that you examined it based on the tape and your markings on the --
 - A My signature and my personnel number.
- Q Okay. When you examined this firearm, did you go through the same process that you described previously in determining if it's safe to fire?
 - A Yes.
 - Q And that included, you said, looking for the serial number?
 - A Yes.
 - Q Were you able to locate a serial number on this firearm?
 - A I was not.
- Q And you said that all firearms have serial numbers when they're manufactured?
 - A Yes.
- Q What did you do, if anything, to determine what the serial number to this firearm was?

A I noted that in the area of the gun where this manufacturer typically places a serial number there was an area of what looked like to be obliteration. IT looked like grinding marks in that area. There was also some dirt and corrosion over top of that area so I used some acetone, it's like fingernail polish remover, cleaned that area so that I was able to visualize that area a little bit better, looked at those grinding marks, and then we have a process that we use to attempt to restore a serial number.

When a serial number is stamped into metal, the metal -- what you actually have is molecules that are hold together by bonds. And that stamp, what it does is, it breaks those bonds. It does it the whole way down on a molecular level.

So even if there's grinding on the surface down below in that metal there's bond breakage. So if you have grinding where someone tries to grind off a serial number, as long as it's not below that area of the breakage, you can make a restoration or attempt to make a restoration.

So, what I did after I cleaned it was I polished it to kind of make the metal nice and smooth and then I used a reagent, it's called Fry's Reagent. It's basically a dilute hydrochloric acid. And what happens when you put that on metal, if there's areas where the bonds have been broken and areas where the bonds haven't been broken, it actually eats it away at two different rates. The area where the bonds have been broken eats it away at a faster rate than in the unbroken area.

So I applied that reagent to that area and looked to see if I could raise any numbers or characters if I could see anything in that specific area. I did that multiple times, took some photographs, inspected it under a microscope, and was unable to restore any characters in that area, most likely due to the depth to which that grinding was done on that metal.

MS. THOMSON: I'd move for admission of State's Proposed Exhibit 182. I believe that Ms. Nguyen will stipulate to it.

MS. NGUYEN: That's correct.

THE COURT: It'll be admitted.

[STATE'S EXHIBIT 182 ADMITTED]

BY MS. THOMSON:

Q And you indicated that you took some photographs. Showing you what's been marked as State's Exhibit 182. Is this a document that you created associated to those photographs?

A Can I see the top right? And then the bottom?

you able to tell where specifically to look for it?

A We have a firearms reference collection, which contains approximately 2500 guns and we had two of this particular model in our collection, which allowed me to look and see where typically that manufacturer would place the serial number.

- Q And the location where it is typically placed is where the red arrow points?
 - A Yes, that's correct.
 - Q The next photograph is how you received it, is that fair?
- A Yes, it's just a magnification of that area where I have the red arrow pointing and that is the area in which I received it. I said earlier there was some grinding marks and what appeared to be some rust or dirt also on top of that area.
 - Q And you cleaned off the rust and dirt?
 - A Yes.
- Q And can you show us in this photograph what you're referring to with the grinding marks? The after cleaning photograph.
- A Yes. You see those round-shaped marks here that go the whole way around both sides.
- Q And then you said after cleaning, you used the Fry's Reagent. The next photograph down, is that what you're referring to?
- A Yes, that's after I polished it. I actually polished the area with a Dremel tool and that's just to make it smooth, so that when I apply the reagent there's not pieces on it, you know, to make -- to make it nice and smooth when I do that. You can still see a little bit of the remnants of the grinding. There's a line there, maybe a line over here. But that was after I smoothed it down to sort of get rid of those marks and after my first application of the reagent.

1	Q	Okay. And as you've described what the reagent pulls up is the
2	breaking of	bonds. So your smoothing it isn't further destroying any serial number
3	that would I	be there?
4	A	Correct, because we're looking down on the molecular level of that
5	metal.	
6	Q	And then the final result is the photograph that shows that there was no
7	serial to be	extract or no serial number able to be extracted?
8	A	Yes.
9	Q	And this firearm, when you tested it, did it operate normally?
10	A	Yes, it did.
11	Q	Finally, were you asked to examine a rifle?
12	A	Yes, I was.
13	Q	And showing you what's been marked as State's Exhibit 200. Is this the
14	package yo	ou received with the rifle in it?
15	A	Yes.
16	Q	And what is the serial number associated to this rifle?
17	A	004478.
18	Q	Looking inside State's Exhibit 200, is that the rifle that you in fact
19	received?	
20	A	Yes.
21	Q	And you went through the same process of examining this item?
22	A	Yes, I did.
23	Q	Did it operate normally?
24	A	It was found to be operational, although I did note that there were some
25	modification	ns that had been made to it.

1	Q	Did those modifications affect its ability to expel rounds?
2	A	No.
3	Q	The modifications, did they make it from a manual to a semi-automatic?
4	A	No, the firearm was designed as a semi-automatic and functioned as a
5	semi-autom	natic when I test fired it.
6	Q	Did you also receive a magazine for that firearm?
7	A	Yes, I did.
8	Q	And what was the capacity of the magazine?
9	A	31.
10	Q	Okay.
11	MS.	THOMSON: Move for admission of State's Proposed Exhibit 183.
12	MS. NGUYEN: No objection.	
13	THE	COURT: Be admitted.
14		[STATE'S EXHIBIT 183 ADMITTED]
15	MS.	THOMSON: Permission to publish?
16	THE	COURT: Yes.
17	BY MS. TH	OMSON:
18	Q	And is this a document that you created associated to that rifle?
19	A	Yes.
20	Q	Looking at the top two photographs, are those actual photographs of
21	this particul	ar firearm or are those representative photographs?
22	A	Those are the actual photographs that I took of this particular firearm.
23	Q	And can you explain for us on the top photograph and I'm just going
24	to zoom in	a little bit to the main portion. Other than obviously the handle, I think we
25	all know wh	nat part that is, can you describe what each of the parts that we're seeing

are?

A This part up you have up here is the barrel. This wooden part here we call the forend, that's the area that you would hold with your front hand. This metal whole area here, this is a receiver. And then the back part would be the stock or the butt stock -- the back wooden part.

Q Is there a portion on this firearm that is commonly referred to as a charging handle?

- A Yes.
- Q And where is that located?
- A Can you move the pink -- or the -- thank you. This piece right here.
- Q What does a charging handle do?

A Just like we talked about with pistols, semi-automatic, you have to pull the slide back and move it forward to get one of the cartridges from the magazine and into the chamber. On this particular firearm it doesn't have that slide because it's a rifle. So what you have instead is what we call a charging handle.

So in order to load this gun you would load the cartridges into the magazine, insert the magazine into the magazine well, and then to get one of those cartridges into the chamber you will pull that handle back and when it went forward it would pick up that top cartridge and put it into the chamber.

- Q And in your examination of firearms, would it be fair to say that they typically aren't super smooth surfaces?
 - A Some of the surfaces are smooth, some are not as smooth.
- Q Okay. Specifically handles, do you find common to have rough or textured handles?
 - A Handles in general tend to be textured or ribbed or rigged just so that it

1	makes	s it an	easier surface to grip for your hand.
2		Q	And that would help prevent moving around as you're firing?
3		Α	And for your hand to move or slip.
4		Q	And when you fire a firearm, does it have any kind of reaction in the
5	actual	body	of the weapon that you can feel in your hand?
6		Α	Recoil?
7		Q	Yes.
8		Α	Yes.
9		Q	Can you explain for us what that is?
10		Α	It's the felt pressure that comes back towards you when the gun gets
11	fired.	So lik	ce I talked about earlier, when the bullet goes forward you have all the
12	pressure pushing that bullet forward and for every reaction you have an equal and		
13	opposition reaction, so you have the pressure of the cartridge case pushing		
14	backwards against you.		
15			So you have a forward action and a backward action and that is an
16	action	that	can be felt back, a recoil towards you if you fire that firearm.
17		Q	And if that's not accounted for by the shooter that could potentially
18	affect	the tra	ajectory of the bullet that comes out of the weapon, is that fair?
19		Α	Potentially, yes.
20		Q	Okay.
21		MS. 7	ΓΗΟMSON: Court's indulgence.
22			[Colloquy between Counsel]
23	BY M	S. TH	OMSON:
24		Q	So Mr. Fattig was listening more closely to what were you saying and
25	what y	you w	ere doing than I was. When you described the semi-automatic and the

1	mark on the	at, you would be able to compare?
2	A	Yes, that's correct.
3	MS.	NGUYEN: Nothing further.
4		REDIRECT EXAMINATION
5	BY MS. TH	OMSON:
6	Q	The markings that you're talking about, the same gun will repeat or
7	leave those	on their cartridges or cartridge casings, is that fair?
8	A	Yes.
9	Q	Okay. And when you talked about the extractor and the other word that
10	goes with the	hat
11	A	The ejector.
12	Q	Thank you. Extractor and ejector. That will not necessarily always
13	leave a ma	rking, correct?
14	A	That's correct.
15	Q	Do you know approximately how far generally a casing will fly when it is
16	ejected from the Colt .45 caliber?	
17	A	I do not. It's very difficult to say.
18	Q	Okay. And same question with regard to the 9 mm Glock?
19	A	Yeah. Unfortunately, it's very difficult to say.
20	Q	Okay. And with regard to that Colt .45 caliber that we were talking
21	about, you	indicated that the slide locked back. Is that what happens when the last
22	bullet is exp	pended or can that be done manually, can you
23	A	Yes, it can also be done manually. IF the magazine is empty and you
24	pull the slid	e back it will lock back. But you can pull it back and if I may refer to
25	my notes	

1	Q	Yes.
2	А	quickly?
3		Yes. There's a slide stop on the side of this particular firearm. So you
4	could pull th	nat back and push that lever up and that would hold it open also.
5	Q	Okay. If the magazine is empty and you pull it back, do you have to put
6	the slide sto	op up to hold it up?
7	Α	No, it's the magazine that pushes that slide stop up, so when you pull it
8	back and le	t it go, it will be held back in that open position.
9	Q	Okay. So if it doesn't have a magazine, you pull it back, it'll come back
10	into	
11	Α	That's correct.
12	Q	Okay. And the assuming that the final bullet that was in the
13	magazine is	s expelled in the traditional way from a firearm, would that slide lock back
14	or would it o	go back into the forward position?
15	А	Assuming that the firearm is functioning as it is meant to, if you have
16	one last car	tridge that's in the chamber and no more in the magazine and you pull
17	the trigger a	and you fire it and it fires, and the bullet goes forward and the cartridge
18	case is extr	acted and ejected and that slide moves backwards, it will lock open in a
19	lock back p	osition.
20	MS. ⁻	THOMSON: Court's indulgence.
21	BY MS. TH	OMSON:
22	Q	The Colt .45 that you45 caliber that you examined, you said that the
23	magazine th	nat came with it and by that I mean that you received in evidence, had
24	a capacity o	of ten cartridges. When that is fully-loaded, is it possible for the firearm to
25	actually hav	ve 11 cartridges in it?
1	I	

1	A	Yes, because there could be one in the chamber as well. So you could
2	have one the chamber and ten in the magazine and there would be 11 total	
3	cartridges i	n the firearm.
4	Q	And that ten cartridge magazine, is that an extended magazine for that
5	firearm?	
6	A	I know there's different capacity magazines that exist for those firearms,
7	some are s	even, eight, nine, ten. This particular magazine, it was not a Colt
8	magazine,	it was from another manufacturer. So it was a ten-round magazine.
9	MS.	THOMSON: Pass the witness.
10		CROSS-EXAMINATION
11	BY MS. NG	GUYEN:
12	Q	It's not unusual for people to have different magazines that are of a
13	different ma	anufacturer for a gun, is that correct?
14	A	Yes, that's correct, it's no unusual.
15	Q	Okay. There are different manufacturers that make compatible
16	magazines	, is that correct?
17	A	Yes.
18	Q	Okay. And you said the Colt. 45 could be in a locked position because
19	it was the la	ast bullet or because someone manually just put it that way, is that
20	correct?	
21	A	Yes, I did.
22	MS.	NGUYEN: Nothing further.
23	MS.	THOMSON: I have no further questions.
24	THE	COURT: Jury have any questions for this witness?
25	[Pause	e in proceedings while the Court and Counsel discuss jury questions]

A From a semi-automatic firearm, the only opening you have on it is at the muzzle, but you also have that ejection port area, so you could get some from that area as well.

- Q Okay. You indicated that the residue can be around -- on anything that is around where the firearm is expelled, is that correct?
 - A Yes.
- Q Okay. Based upon that, would you agree that residue is not an accurate predictor of who has expelled a firearm?
 - A Yes, I would agree with that.
 - Q Is that something that the lab tests for?
- A We do a test for distance determination, which is based on gunshot residue. We do that in the lab. But for the gunshot residue which is collected off of the hands of a suspected shooter that is not a test that we do in the laboratory. That actually requires a scanning electron microscope which is an instrument that we don't have to examine that powder. And we actually would send that out to another lab if we had a request for that exam.
- Q Okay. And you used a phrase and I don't remember specifically what it was, but it was associated to distance of gun powder residue that you do in the lab?
- A Yes. That is an examination that we do. I didn't do it in this case. But if you have a shooter and a victim and that victim has clothing on them and we get clothing in as evidence, we could be asked to determine the distance from the muzzle of the firearm to the clothing -- the garment on that specific victim.
- Q Okay. And you'd be able to do that based upon whether or not there was gun powder on it?
 - A We use three different tests. We use a gun powder pattern that we look

1	at microscopically. We also do two different chemical tests, one for nitrites, which is
2	products of that burned gun powder, and also for lead, which is a process of the
3	combustion of that cartridge. So we use those three different tests to examine a
4	garment to figure out the distance from which the muzzle was to that garment.
5	Q If I were, for example, standing here, I shot a gun and then Mr. Fattig
6	came into this area very quickly thereafter, is there a possibility that he would have
7	gun powder residue on him from having come through the area where I had just
8	shot the firearm?
9	A I would say that's a possibility, yes.
10	MS. THOMSON: Pass the witness.
11	FOLLOW-UP EXAMINATION
12	BY MS. NGUYEN:
13	Q You your lab does have the capability to do certain gun powder
14	residue, is that correct? Testing?
15	A Just that distance determination test that I described.
16	Q Okay. And obviously there is a science and there are tools that are
17	able to test gun powder residue. You just said you sent it out to a laboratory that
18	has that capability, is that correct?
19	A If we had a request to determine whether the dabbings from a potentia
20	shooter's hands did contain gunshot residue if we got that request that does get
21	sent out to another laboratory.
22	Q In this case you never received such request, is that correct?
23	A I did not, no.
24	Q Okay. And did you handle all of the testing involving this case and any
25	firearms testing in this case?

1	Q	Okay. So most of the time you're talking about a fairly limited space.
2	You're not talking about yards, is that correct?	
3	A	That's correct.
4	Q	Okay. Or I should say you're not talking about more than three yards'
5	A	Correct.
6	Q	And that was 72 inches was an unusually usual far distance that
7	you're able	to collect that?
8	A	That's pretty long.
9	Q	Okay.
10	MS. NGUYEN: Nothing further.	
11	THE COURT: All right.	
12	EXAMINATION BY THE COURT (JURY QUESTIONS)	
13	BY THE C	OURT:
14	Q	The weapons recovered were any recently fired prior to your testing?
15	Α	I don't do any testing to make any determination as to whether or not
16	those firearms had been recently fired.	
17	THE	COURT: State?
18	MS.	THOMSON: Nothing, Your Honor.
19	MS.	NGUYEN: Just briefly.
20	THE	COURT: Defense?
21		FOLLOW-UP EXAMINATION
22	BY MS. NO	BUYEN:
23	Q	Are you able to determine whether or not the time period of when
24	something	was fired?
25	A	Time period? No.

1	Q	Thank you.
2		FOLLOW-UP EXAMINATION
3	BY MS. NO	GUYEN:
4	Q	I'm sorry. I'm referring to your report on page 2. Lab Item 29 you refer
5	to that and	that is the Speer .45 auto cartridge, is that correct?
6	A	Yes.
7	Q	And in that case you said that the association is based on an
8	examinatio	on of marks relating to the cycling process of the firearm. So this wasn't
9	fired, but it	appears to you that it was cycled through a firearm, is that correct?
10	A	Yes.
11	Q	Okay. And then on the next line you said that two cartridges, Lab Item
12	28 and 30	so that would be the Winchester .45, is that correct?
13	A	Yes, that's 28.
14	Q	Cartridge?
15	Α	Yes.
16	Q	And then also another Speer .45 auto cartridge, is that correct?
17	Α	Yes.
18	Q	You said could not be associated with the submitted Colt pistol and
19	that's the .4	45, is that correct?
20	A	Yes.
21	Q	Due to insufficient marks, is that correct?
22	A	Yes.
23	Q	Okay. So only one of them had markings that you could associate with
24	being proc	essed through a gun, is that correct?
25	A	Had sufficient marks
1	I	

1	Q	Sufficient marking.
2	A	for me to associate it to a particular gun.
3	Q	Okay. So they had marks that they had been cycled through a gun, not
4	shot and fi	red through a gun, but had been cycled through a gun?
5	A	Yes.
6	Q	Okay.
7	MS.	NGUYEN: Nothing further.
8	MS.	THOMSON: Can I have one follow-up on that?
9	THE	COURT: Yes.
10		FURTHER FOLLOW-UP EXAMINATION
11	BY MS. TH	IOMSON:
12	Q	The marks that were not sufficient to associate it to that gun, were they
13	sufficient to	tell you that they did not go through that gun? Does that question make
14	sense?	
15	A	It does make sense. I was unable to make a determination of
16	identification	on or elimination to that particular gun, due to the insufficiency of those
17	marks.	
18	Q	Thank you.
19	MS.	NGUYEN: Nothing further.
20		EXAMINATION BY THE COURT (JURY QUESTIONS)
21	BY THE C	OURT:
22	Q	What are some common operation issues with the Colt model
23	presented	today? In other words, what mechanical problems would the average
24	person exp	perience using it?
25	A	I don't have any study or article or anything stating any known particular

problems with that specific firearm. I think I stated earlier there could be feeding issues, potentially. Like say if you loaded the magazine and didn't put it -- load it the whole way in that could affect feeding the cartridge. There could maybe be a problem with eh extraction if you were holding the gun in a certain away. But I don't know of any particular common known issues with that specific firearm.

THE COURT: State?

FOLLOW-UP EXAMINATION

BY MS. THOMSON:

Q When you say that there could be a problem with the extraction holding the gun in a particular way is -- are there any particular ways that you are aware of that cause problems or is that generally if you were holding it in a bag and it gets jammed kind of thing?

A If you hold the gun the way that it's meant to be -- the way that it's meant to function, you hold it with a tight grip. If you hold it with sort of a loose grip, when you have that detonation of the cartridge and the bullet goes forward, there's less force for the cartridge case to come back on because if you're not holding it tight it doesn't have anything to push back on.

So, you can get a jam from that from -- in the extraction and ejection of a fired cartridge case just from holding the grip loosely.

- Q Every time you've sort of demonstrated holding a firearm, you're holding it the way I think that we're all sort of taught at the range, the straight out. Was there anything about angle that it would be held that could affect the extraction?
 - A I didn't do any testing on that, so I couldn't really say.
- Q Generally, with your experience with firearms, are you aware of any affect that the angle being held on the firearm would affect that?

1	A	I'm not aware of an effect on the angle, just of the effect of the
2	looseness of the grip.	
3	Q	Thank you.
4		FOLLOW-UP EXAMINATION
5	BY MS. NO	GUYEN:
6	Q	Based on your experience, holding it improperly could affect your aim?
7	A	I would say that's fair, yes.
8	Q	And your accuracy?
9	A	Yes.
10	Q	And some of the things that you mentioned, those aren't manufacturer
11	errors are is that correct?	
12	A	I'm sorry, which things were you referring to?
13	Q	the question had to do with any known malfunctions with a Colt .45.
14	Α	Oh like the feeding and the extraction errors.
15	Q	Those are kind of user errors, is that correct?
16	A	Yes.
17	MS.	NGUYEN: Nothing further.
18	THE	COURT: I saw some movement over in the jury box.
19		EXAMINATION BY THE COURT (JURY QUESTIONS)
20	BY THE COURT:	
21	Q	Did any of the bullets match up to what was shot at Officer McNabb?
22	A	I was not asked to examine any bullets in this case.
23	THE	COURT: State?
24		FOLLOW-UP EXAMINATION
25	BY MS. TH	HOMSON:
1		

1	Q You were asked to examine casings, is that correct?		
2	A Cartridge cases, yes.		
3	Q Okay. And are you aware of whether there were any actual bullets		
4	impounded into evidence?		
5	A I am not aware one way or another. I only work on a request-based		
6	basis. And I was asked to examine only the four firearms, the cartridge cases, and		
7	the cartridges that I've mentioned.		
8	Q Okay. And just sort of a recap. The bullet is the part that goes inside		
9	the cartridge, right?		
10	A Yes, that's correct.		
11	THE COURT: The lead part, basically?		
12	THE WITNESS: Lead part can also have a jacket.		
13	THE COURT: A jacket. But that's the part where the it goes out the end of		
14	the gun once it's fired?		
15	THE WITNESS: Yes, that's correct.		
16	THE COURT: Defense, any questions?		
17	FOLLOW-UP EXAMINATION		
18	BY MS. NGUYEN:		
19	Q The only .45 auto cartridge cases that you examined were Items 13,		
20	14, and 15 Lab Items 13, 14, and 15, is that correct?		
21	A Yes.		
22	Q And the other ones that we just referenced, the Winchester and the		
23	other two, they were actually cartridges, is that correct? Like the full bullet intact?		
24	A Yes.		
25	MS. NGUYEN: Nothing further.		

1	THE COURT: Thank you. You may step down.
2	THE WITNESS: Thank you.
3	THE COURT: We'll take a five-minute recess. We're going to try and finish
4	up our witnesses before we go to lunch.
5	During the recess you're admonished not to talk or converse among
6	yourselves or with anyone else on any subject connected with this trial. Or read or
7	watch or listen to any report of or commentary on the trial or any person connected
8	with this trial by any medium of information including, without limitation, newspapers
9	television, the radio, or the internet. Or form or express an opinion on any subject
10	connected with the trial until the case is finally submitted to you.
11	Take five minutes, please.
12	[Outside the presence of the jury]
13	THE COURT: Watch too much CSI I can tell you that.
14	All right. Take five minutes.
15	How many witnesses do you have left? Three?
16	MR. FATTIG: Two.
17	MS. NGUYEN: Two.
18	THE COURT: Two. Oh, good.
19	[Recess taken at 12:09 p.m.]
20	[Trial resumed at 12:17 p.m.]
21	[Outside the presence of the jury]
22	THE COURT: Are you ready?
23	MS. THOMSON: Yes, Judge.
24	THE COURT: All right. Bring them in.
25	[In the presence of the jury]

1	THE MARSHAL: All rise.	
2	And be seated.	
3	THE COURT: Stipulate to the presence of the jury.	
4	MS. THOMSON: Yes, Your Honor.	
5	MS. NGUYEN: Yes, Your Honor.	
6	THE COURT: All right. Call your next witness, State.	
7	MR. FATTIG: Ryan Jaeger.	
8	RYAN JAEGER	
9	[having been called as a witness and being first duly sworn, testified as follows:]	
10	THE CLERK: Thank you. Please be seated. State your full name, spelling	
11	your first and last name for the record, please.	
12	THE WITNESS: My name is Ryan R-Y-A-N; Jaeger, J-A-E-G-E-R.	
13	THE COURT: Go ahead.	
14	DIRECT EXAMINATION	
15	BY MR. FATTIG:	
16	Q Sir, how are you employed?	
17	A Currently I'm employed as a detective with the Las Vegas Metr	opolitar
18	Police Department.	
19	Q How long have you been with Metro?	
20	A 17 years.	
21	Q And are you a detective assigned to a particular unit?	
22	A I am. I'm a detective assigned to the force investigation team.	
23	Q And that's commonly referred to as FIT?	
24	A That's correct.	
25	Q And how long have you been a FIT detective?	

1	A	That's correct.
2	Q	And what is your role or was your role in this particular investigation?
3	А	I was the case agent on this or the project manager. My role is to
4	manage the	tasks that all need to be done and then combined everything into one
5	report.	
6	Q	Are you familiar with the term a walk-around, as it relates to this
7	particular ca	ase?
8	Α	A walk-around or a walk-through?
9	Q	A walk-through, I'm sorry.
10	Α	Yes, I am.
11	Q	Okay. What is a walk-through?
12	Α	A walk-through is after there's an officer-involved shooting then we take
13	the officer th	nat was involved in the shooting and we have him walk us through his
14	steps, so we	e know where any evidence may be.
15	Q	And in this particular case that was Officer Ryan McNabb, correct?
16	Α	That's correct.
17	Q	And did you do the walk-through with Officer McNabb?
18	Α	In this case it was a very long scene. It was over a few miles, so we
19	actually had	him in a car where he had us drive his same route until we got to where
20	the pursuit e	ended and then we had him walk us through that portion.
21	Q	So the area it was sort of a drive-through
22	А	And it turned into a walk-through.
23	Q	to a walk-through.
24	А	That's correct.
25	Q	Okay. And so did it start at Walnut and Lake Mead, in that vicinity?
	1	

1	A	That's correct.	
2	Q	And then it went up Walnut to Carey and across to Dolly?	
3	A	That's correct.	
4	Q	Now at the for that particular walk-through, was there crime scene	
5	analysts als	so present for that?	
6	A	There was.	
7	Q	And you were present for that?	
8	A	I was.	
9	Q	You were did you become aware that there was a body camera on	
10	Officer McNabb during the incident?		
11	A	Yes, I was.	
12	Q	Did you have occasion to review that body camera video that night on	
13	scene?		
14	A	We did.	
15	Q	And how how did you how were you able to do that?	
16	A	I'm not a tech guy, but each patrol car has a laptop computer inside the	
17	patrol car and the body worn cameras are able to pair with that computer and you		
18	can watch the footage on that computer screen.		
19	Q	Did you also do a kind of a walk-around of the crime scene?	
20	A	I did.	
21	Q	And what is that? How is that different than that walk-through?	
22	A	The walk-through is directed by the officer that fired the shots. The	
23	walk-around is done by me just to make sure nothing gets missed.		
24	Q	And obviously you're not alone in that, correct?	
25	A	That's correct.	

	•	
1	Q	There are crime scene analysts that assist in that?
2	A	That's correct.
3	Q	Anyone else?
4	A	We have we work in pairs. For this one, Detective Gillis was with me
5	and then w	e also would have the crime scene analyst supervisor that normally
6	works with us. It's just it's better having multiple sets of eyes looking at each	
7	scene so nothing gets missed.	
8	Q	I'm going to show you a couple of exhibits.
9		[Colloquy between Counsel]
10	MR.	FATTIG: Your Honor, I believe the parties are stipulating to the
11	admittance of 14.	
12	MS. NGUYEN: That's correct.	
13	THE COURT: It'll be admitted.	
14		[STATE'S EXHIBIT 14 ADMITTED]
15	BY MR. FA	TTIG:
16	Q	I'm going to start, Detective, show you here with State's 12. Do you
17	recognize this picture?	
18	A	I do.
19	Q	This would be Dolly running across, correct?
20	A	That's correct.
21	Q	Carey, El Tovar. Can you describe generally where you and the other
22	crime scene	e analysts that were doing the walk-around were looking and what are
23	you attemp	ting to locate?
24	A	This is where the pursuit terminated so when he walked this area, the
25	big do yo	u guys have a screen?

1	Q	You can touch the	
2	THE	COURT: You can actually touch the screen.	
3	BY MR. FATTIG:		
4	Q	screen and then it will show up on the TV.	
5	A	Okay. We searched around this patrol car for any cart casings from	
6	McNabb. V	Ve searched around this vehicle here for any cart casings that would	
7	have been fired by the suspect.		
8	Q	I didn't see a mark when you said this vehicle here. Can you okay.	
9	Your		
10	A	Is the mark up there?	
11	Q	It just did it, yes.	
12	A	We searched this entire desert lot down here for any impacts from	
13	Officer McN	Nabb. We also searched all the way down Dolly this way for any impacts	
14	We search	ed from the suspect vehicle up west.	
15	Q	That would be northwest?	
16	A	Up northwest for any impacts. And we also searched the backyard of	
17	the residence right is it working? Of the residence here on El Tovar.		
18	Q	And are you trying to indicate the second	
19	А	That's correct.	
20	Q	yard to the west	
21	A	West.	
22	Q	of Dolly?	
23	A	Yes.	
24	Q	It's on El Tovar.	
25	A	And then we we also searched and we located a bullet-proof vest and	

1	a handgun	underneath this white Nissan pickup parked right here on El Tovar.
2	Q	Okay. Now there were some aerial these aerial photographs were
3	actually tak	en on the morning early morning of June 27th, correct?
4	А	Yes, we went up in the LVMPD helicopter and these are aerials that
5	were taken	the next morning just so we could get a Birdseye view of the crime
6	scene.	
7	Q	And that was before things were disturbed. In other words, the maroor
8	Intrepid was	s remained there, correct?
9	А	That's correct.
10	Q	And the patrol car remained there?
11	А	That's correct.
12	Q	And
13	А	If you look on El Tovar you can still see the crime scene tape up that's
14	across the	road protecting the where the handgun and the bullet-proof vest was
15	located.	
16	Q	And State's 13 shows that as well,
17	А	That's correct.
18	Q	correct?
19	А	That's correct.
20	Q	State's 14 is kind of an aerial straight above the scene on Carey and
21	Dolly?	
22	А	That's correct.
23	Q	And if I zoom in here it looks like there's some items spray painted on
24	the street; r	numbers?
25	A	That's correct.
1	Ī	

1	Q	It looks like in that particular zoom-in off of State's 14 we see the
2	numbers 6	7, and 8, correct?
3	A	That's correct.
4	Q	And those were various the items where various items of evidence
5	were locate	ed from the crime scene diagram, they were the same number was
6	actually pa	inted on the ground, correct?
7	A	That's correct.
8	Q	Okay. Again, all of this occurred that morning of June 27th?
9	A	That's correct.
10	Q	Showing you
11	MR.	FATTIG: Your Honor, my understanding is pursuant to stipulation,
12	State's 3, 4	, 8, 9, 10, and 11 are being admitted.
13	MS.	NGUYEN: That's correct.
14	THE	COURT: They'll be admitted.
15		[STATE'S EXHIBITS 3, 4, 8, 9, 10, and 11 ADMITTED]
16	BY MR. FA	ATTIG:
17	Q	And those aerial maps, Detective, actually were taken of the entire area
18	from the ar	ea of Walnut and Lake Mead which is what we're seeing here on State's
19	Number 3.	North Walnut, across Carey, et cetera, all the way over to what we've
20	just saw?	
21	A	That's correct.
22	Q	Okay. So State's 4 is kind of an area showing Judson and Walnut with
23	Carey at th	e top and you might recognize a landmark of a church on the west side,
24	North Walr	nut?
25	A	That's correct.

1	Q	Okay. State's Number 9 kind of shows a view of Lamb, Carey as it runs	
2	down with El Tovar here on the upper right, correct?		
3	А	That's correct.	
4	Q	State's 10 is kind of a close-up of more with El Tovar here and Carey	
5	and et ceter	ra?	
6	А	That's correct.	
7	Q	So during the walk-through you're looking for any cartridge casings,	
8	bullet strike	s, bullets, et cetera?	
9	А	That's correct.	
10	Q	Did you find anything of note in any of those of areas that you	
11	searched?		
12	Α	We found cart casings or cartridge casings.	
13	Q	And those were the casings in the area of the intersection there,	
14	correct?		
15	А	That's correct.	
16	Q	You also found some cartridges, unfired	
17	А	At Dolly and Carey.	
18	Q	Yes.	
19	А	That's correct.	
20	Q	In and around or you didn't search inside the car at the scene,	
21	correct?		
22	A	Not at the scene, no.	
23	Q	Not the Dodge Intrepid I'm talking about.	
24	Α	That's correct.	
25	Q	But you found two near that car?	
1	I		

	•	
1	A	We found two on the ground towards the rear driver's side of the car.
2	Q	You found one on the sidewalk across near the lamp post?
3	A	One live round, yes.
4	Q	Yes, yes.
5	A	Yes.
6	Q	And that was all documented by the crime scene analyst, correct?
7	A	That's correct.
8	Q	Now by the time you arrived was there a suspect in custody?
9	A	There was.
10	MR. I	FATTIG: May I approach the witness, Your Honor?
11	THE	COURT: Yes.
12	BY MR. FATTIG:	
13	Q	Showing you what's been marked as State's 204 and 205. Do you
14	recognize tl	nese?
15	A	I do.
16	Q	And what is 204?
17	A	204 is a picture of a fluorescent yellow shirt that was worn by MR.
18	Bacharach.	
19	Q	And 205, is that a picture of the man in custody that was identified as
20	Joshua Bacharach?	
21	A	Yes, it is.
22	Q	And that's a facial shot of generally what he looked as of June 26th of
23	2014?	
24	A	That's correct.
25	MR. I	FATTIG: Move to admit 204 and 205.

1	MS. NGUYEN: No objection.		
2	THE	COURT: It'll be admitted.	
3		[STATE'S EXHIBITS 204 & 205 ADMITTED]	
4	BY MR. FA	TTIG:	
5	Q	205 is Mr. Bacharach. He had long hair that evening, correct?	
6	A	That's correct.	
7	Q	204 is the shirt that he was wearing when you saw him in police	
8	custody?		
9	A	That's correct.	
10	Q	And fair to say it's kind of a neon greenish-yellowish type shirt?	
11	A	That's correct.	
12	Q	And there's some dirt on it as well?	
13	A	Yes.	
14	Q	Was there any attempt to obtain any gunshot residue from Mr.	
15	Bacharach?	?	
16	A	There was not.	
17	Q	And why is that?	
18	A	Gunshot residue just isn't reliable. I've been a detective almost ten	
19	years now.	I don't think I've ever collected gunshot residue because it's just so	
20	erratic. It can be transferred really easy and it's just not really reliable.		
21	Q	Okay. Major contamination issues?	
22	A	Yes.	
23	Q	There can be false positives even if you get a positive?	
24	A	There can be. The way police officers qualify with their weapons they	
25	normally sta	and shoulder to shoulder at a firing range and a bunch of them shoot at	
1	I		

	•	
1	the same ti	me and that gunshot residue spreads in the air. It can get on their
2	equipment, it can get on their hands, it can get on their clothes, and as soon as	
3	someone's	touched that residue, it is passed. So it's just it's just not reliable and
4	it's just not	something that's used.
5	Q	So in this particular case you had a situation where officers obviously
6	had their w	eapons out, correct?
7	A	That's correct.
8	Q	While they were looking for a suspect in a dark backyard?
9	A	That's correct.
10	Q	They knew he had been shooting at a fellow officer?
11	A	That's correct.
12	Q	They ended up taking him into custody, correct?
13	A	That's correct.
14	Q	And they did so at gunpoint?
15	A	That's correct.
16	Q	and officers that were handcuffing the suspect obviously were just in
17	contact with	n firearms that were loaded?
18	A	True.
19	Q	Was the do you see Joshua Bacharach here in court today?
20	A	I do.
21	Q	Could you please point to him and identify a piece of clothing he's
22	wearing?	
23	A	He has the brown tie and the grayish colored shirt on.
24	THE	COURT: The record will reflect he's identified Mr. Bacharach.
25	BY MR. FATTIG:	

1	Q	Was the Defendant sent to the hospital for treatment regarding his dog
2	bite?	
3	A	He was.
4	Q	Now you already indicate that you became aware of other crime scenes
5	where thi	s began. Specifically, let's go back to Walnut and Lake Mead, correct?
6	A	That's correct.
7	Q	And you also became aware of where the pursuit went, correct?
8	А	That's correct.
9	Q	I'm going to show State's Number 2. Walnut and Lake Mead is down
10	here in th	e left corner, correct?
11	А	That's correct.
12	Q	Up to Carey. You became aware that there was some cartridge
13	casings tl	nat were found on the roadway, correct?
14	A	That's correct.
15	Q	One was located at 2354 North Walnut, which is indicated at this point
16	on State's	s 2, correct?
17	Α	That's correct.
18	Q	And that's near that church, which is right near this near across the
19	other side	e of the street?
20	А	Yes.
21	Q	And that was in the northbound lane of that?
22	А	That's correct.
23	Q	One was located just to the east of the residence at 3945 East Carey?
24	A	That's correct.
25	Q	There was a third and this street here would be Gateway, correct?
	1	

1	A	That's correct.	
2	Q	That's the first street west excuse me, east of Walnut?	
3	A	That's correct.	
4	Q	One was located just before Gateway, correct?	
5	A	That's correct.	
6	Q	And one was located a little bit after Gateway?	
7	A	Yes. East and west of Gateway.	
8	Q	But both well before Lamb Boulevard?	
9	A	That's correct.	
10	Q	The third casing was located in the extreme farther northern gutter of	
11	that traffic la	ane?	
12	A	Yes. Which would be the westbound lanes of Carey.	
13	Q	Correct. There was no indication in looking at the body cam video or	
14	any of the o	ther evidence you had that the pur that the Dodge Intrepid actually	
15	was driving down the wrong side of the road at that particular point in		
16	A	There was not.	
17	Q	Okay. But the casing ended up over there?	
18	A	Casings end up in strange places. That's where we located the casing	
19	Q	The we've had some testimony from the firearms examiner about	
20	casings, they generally		
21	MS. N	NGUYEN: Objection, Your Honor, leading.	
22	THE	COURT: Sustained.	
23	BY MR. FA	TTIG:	
24	Q	In your experience, they get ejected	
25	MS. N	NGUYEN: Objection, Your Honor, leading.	
	•		

1	THE COURT: He didn't ask the question.	
2	BY MR. FATTIG:	
3	Q In your experience with firearms, where can the casings end up?	
4	A Casings are really unpredictable. Just picture the way most people	
5	hold a handgun. If they're holding a handgun perfectly straight up and down, the	
6	casing should go up and to the right. But as soon as you throw a motion in there, if	
7	you [indiscernible] the gun this way they're going straight back. If you're leaning this	
8	way, the casings are going over here. If you throw movement in there, if you throw	
9	different surfaces that the casings hit.	
10	On this case they were on a freeway that hadn't been shut down yet, so	
11	cars are coming by and moving the cart casings. Cart casing are very random on	
12	where you find them.	
13	Q So obviously you were involved in speaking with Officer McNabb about	
14	how many shots were fired, correct?	
15	A That's correct.	
16	Q And the general locations of the shots?	
17	A That's correct.	
18	Q Now during the pursuit, how many shots did he indicate occurred from	
19	the Dodge Intrepid during the pursuit?	
20	A Six.	
21	Q Now let me perhaps that was a poorly worded question. How many	
22	shots were fired while the suspect was actually in the car during the pursuit?	
23	A One, when he went to stop him.	
24	Q On Walnut.	
25	A On Walnut. And then five during the pursuit.	

1	Q	All the way through Carey and Dolly?
2	A	That's correct.
3	Q	Okay. So is it fair to say that in this particular part of town, Carey itself
4	would be a	busier street than a lot of these other side streets?
5	A	Carey is a major east-west thoroughfare.
6	Q	Yeah. Just like Lamb Boulevard would be?
7	A	It would be a north-south, that's correct.
8	Q	Yes. And Lake Mead, obviously. That's one of the main streets here.
9	A	That's correct.
10	Q	So the majority of the shots occurred on or near Carey, fair to say?
11	A	That's correct.
12	Q	Know you're aware that Officer McNabb indicated as he went through
13	Lamb there	were two additional shots on East Carey, east of Lamb?
14	A	That's correct.
15	Q	No casings were found in that area, correct?
16	A	We did not recover any.
17	Q	There were a number of cars that would have traversed that area
18	before it wa	s cordoned off?
19	A	We had a lot of citizen traffic through there and the majority of the traffic
20	was respon	ding officers that arrived to the call on Carey.
21	Q	You're familiar with the surveillance video taken from the Wagner
22	residence c	n East Carey just south of where the patrol car ended up?
23	A	That's correct.
24	Q	And that video confirms a lot of that, correct?
25	A	It does.
	-	

1	Q	In terms of civilian cars going back and forth on Carey, both east and
2	west, right around the time of this?	
3	A	That's correct.
4	Q	The area didn't get cordoned off right away?
5	A	It wasn't.
6	Q	So are your surprised that two casings were not found in that part of
7	Carey?	
8	A	Not at all.
9	Q	Based upon what you've testified to?
10	A	That's correct.
11	Q	Now the same questions I have regarding the shot at the actual
12	intersection	. Showing you 173, the crime scene diagram which is the blowup of
13	Carey and Dolly. Now in this particular crime scene Officer McNabb indicated that	
14	there was one shot after the suspect exited the vehicle at him when he was near the	
15	location in the patrol car, correct?	
16	A	That's correct.
17	Q	You did not find a cartridge casing similar to the three that were on the
18	roadway tha	at were recovered on this in this crime scene?
19	A	We did not.
20	Q	Clearly there was a number of cars that traversed on Carey through
21	Dolly, fair to say?	
22	A	That's correct.
23	Q	I'm sure it was extensively searched however?
24	A	It I mean, I walked the entire crime scene from the termination point
25	all the way	to the where the pursuit started. I mean, we the casings that we
	i e	

1	found we collected.	
2	Q	Yeah. You personally walked from Walnut/Lake Mead area up
3	А	I did.
4	Q	through all the way over to El Tovar area?
5	А	I did.
6	Q	Okay. About how long was that in terms of
7	А	It's over a mile. I don't know the exact distance.
8	Q	It took a little while obviously?
9	А	I mean, worked the scene into the next day. We didn't get to process
10	the car until	that the next evening. So we were probably on the scene 14 or 15
11	hours.	
12	Q	You were?
13	А	Yes.
14	Q	Now we talked a little bit about the firearm that was recovered
15	underneath	the white truck. Showing you State's 105. This is the firearm we're
16	talking abou	ut, correct?
17	А	That's correct.
18	Q	It's a Colt .45 caliber. The magazine for this particular Colt carried a
19	capacity to hold ten different cartridges, correct?	
20	А	That's correct.
21	Q	And in theory, if you kept the gun with one in the chamber that would
22	mean 11, co	orrect?
23	А	That's correct.
24	Q	So on the roadway, three were recovered, correct?
25	А	Yes.

1	Q	Two shots from East Carey were not recovered, correct?
2	A	Correct.
3	Q	One from the corner at Dolly and Carey was not recovered, correct?
4	A	Correct.
5	Q	That would be six. Full cartridges were recovered outside the car,
6	Items 11 an	d 12 on the crime scene diagram, correct?
7	A	Live rounds, correct.
8	Q	Live rounds, .45 cartridges, same head stamp as the cartridges from
9	the street?	
10	A	That's correct.
11	Q	So we're up to seven and eight, correct?
12	A	That's correct.
13	Q	And I know I'm jumping a little bit ahead of the story, but eventually you
14	look inside	that car, the Dodge Intrepid, correct?
15	A	We do, under the direction of a search warrant, we search the vehicle.
16	Q	And we'll get into those details, but during that search you found two
17	live cartridg	es, .45 caliber on the floorboard by the driver's seat.
18	A	That's correct.
19	Q	That would get us to ten, correct?
20	Α	Correct.
21	Q	Across the street, Item 10 on the crime scene diagram, State's 173, is
22	another .45	cartridge unfired, correct?
23	A	Live round, that's correct.
24	Q	Live round. Now that one is the only one that has a different head
25	stamp?	

1	А	It does.
2	Q	Winchester.
3	A	That's correct.
4	Q	Okay. If that is associated with the gun that would get us to 11,
5	correct?	
6	А	That's correct.
7	Q	You're familiar with the vest that the gun was laying on top of?
8	A	I am. It's an American Body Armor, Threat Level II-A, as in Adam.
9	Q	What does that mean, Threat Level II-A?
10	А	Each vest is rated at different threat levels. The rating basically says
11	what kind o	f round that vest will stop. There's really no difference from this vest to
12	vest that ar	ny of the officers working the street are wearing. Most of the officers that
13	are working	the streets, their vests are also Threat Level II-A's.
14	Q	That particular Dodge Intrepid that was registered to Eufrasia Nazaroff
15	correct?	
16	A	That's correct.
17	Q	And that turned out to be the mother of the Defendant's children?
18	A	That's correct.
19	Q	Did you do a records check to see if that Dodge Intrepid had been
20	reported sto	olen on or near that date?
21	A	I did.
22	Q	And was it reported stolen?
23	A	It was not.
24	Q	At the scene did you notice some damage to the driver's side of that
25	vehicle?	

1	A	I did.
2	Q	And was that inspected a little bit closer after the vehicle was taken to
3	the lab?	
4	A	At the scene the vehicle was sealed, it was put on a flatbed trailer, and
5	actually foll	owed it back to the sterile environment of the lab where we could actual
6	work on it,	so we could open up the traffic lanes. There was bullet impacts to the
7	driver's side	e rear of the vehicle.
8	Q	Now you said a flatbed truck, so you're talking about the Dodge Intrepi
9	was literally	put on all four wheels onto a truck?
10	A	It is. The flatbed tow truck has a bed that tips up and then comes back
11	and they us	se a wench to pull the car up onto the truck and then the whole vehicle is
12	riding on to	p of the tow truck.
13	Q	At the scene the back passenger tire appeared to be fully inflated,
14	opearationa	able.
15	A	It was.
16	Q	Now after the car was towed you did some examination and a search
17	you said of	the Dodge Intrepid?
18	A	We did.
19	Q	And was that the evening of June 27 th ?
20	A	It would have been that evening, yes.
21	Q	And that was pursuant to a search warrant, correct?
22	A	It was.
23	Q	You received court authorization to do that?
24	A	That's correct.
25	Q	And that's when you actually examined the interior of the car?

1	A	We did.
2	Q	And the damage to the driver's side that you already mentioned?
3	A	We did.
4	Q	At the lab you noticed that the back passenger tire was in a different
5	condition?	
6	A	It was flat.
7	Q	Now we don't know what caused that?
8	A	We I don't.
9	Q	Could have been a slow leak?
10	A	Could have.
11	Q	Showing you State's 165. Does this show generally the locations of
12	some of tha	t damage that our observed?
13	A	It does.
14	Q	And you worked with a crime scene analyst in terms of documenting
15	and using a	trajectory rod?
16	A	I did.
17	Q	And based upon your examination of the car, how many different areas
18	of damage	were consistent with bullets to that side of the car, the driver's side?
19	A	This is the rear passenger door, just to so you guys know what you're
20	looking at.	
21	Q	You just passenger door. Is this the passenger
22	A	It's rear driver's side door.
23	Q	Okay.
24	A	There's the first impact it's not showing on there.
25	Q	And when you use the term first, there's no way to know in time which
	I	

1	Q	And were all four of these markings, were they consistent with an object
2	going from	the front of the car towards the back of the car?
3	A	That's correct.
4	Q	In the front passenger floorboard do you remember that there was a
5	black bag?	
6	A	There was.
7	Q	And in that bag you found a Colt .25?
8	A	It was a .25 caliber semi-automatic handgun, that's correct.
9	Q	And fair to say there was no serial number on that gun?
10	A	The serial number had been ground off or where the serial number
11	should be, i	t was ground off.
12	Q	Throughout the car you found is it fair to say the car was full of a lot of
13	different iter	ms?
14	A	That's correct.
15	Q	A lot of paperwork?
16	A	There was, yes.
17	Q	You found paperwork throughout the car in the name of Joshua
18	Bacharach?	
19	A	We did.
20	Q	You found paperwork in the name of his son?
21	A	We did.
22	Q	You found paperwork in the name of Eufrasia Nazaroff?
23	A	We did.
24	Q	And you found paperwork in the name of Susanna Bacharach?
25	A	We did.

1	Q	Did a crime scene analyst at the garage there, after you towed the car
2	and you we	ere examining it, collect DNA from various spots in the car?
3	A	We collected DNA, yes
4	Q	And one of those was the steering wheel cover or was the steering
5	wheel cove	er recovered off of the car?
6	A	It was.
7	Q	So later the DNA analyst could look at it?
8	A	It was swabbed and then removed.
9	Q	And that would have been impounded under the same event number?
10	A	That's correct.
11	Q	On the night of the 26 th and the early morning of the 27 th , was Officer
12	McNabb's t	firearm taken from him?
13	A	It was. A countdown was done, his overall condition was
14	photograph	ned, the equipment on his belt was photographed, his firearm was
15	photograph	ned and collected.
16	Q	And that's standard for officer-involved shootings, correct?
17	A	That's per LVMP policies.
18	Q	And that's so we could later do some testing ballistically?
19	A	That's correct.
20	MR.	FATTIG: The parties I believe are stipulating to the admission of 206 and
21	207.	
22	MS.	NGUYEN: That's correct.
23	THE	COURT: They'll be admitted.
24		[STATE'S EXHIBITS 206 & 207 ADMITTED]
25	BY MR. FA	ATTIG:

1	Q	You're familiar with the area obviously where this occurred in terms of is
2	it introduction	on he county or is it in the city?
3	A	It's actually in the county.
4	Q	In the county, okay. I'm going to show you a map, 207. And this would
5	be a map o	f the city, correct, which indicates kind of the boundaries of the city, of
6	the county,	and populated areas and what not?
7	A	I believe the City of Las Vegas area is kind of in the gray and then the
8	Clark Coun	ty is shown with a kind of yellowish color.
9	Q	So the and there's another 17 I'm sorry, 206 has a key to what
10	the colors n	nean. County portion of illegal there we go. County portion of illegal
11	discharge	· illegal firearm discharge area, correct?
12	A	That's correct.
13	Q	Okay. This particular incident was in an a populated area, correct?
14	A	That's correct.
15	Q	You had occasion to listen to some jail calls of Mr. Bacharach
16	A	
17	Q	after he was arrested, correct?
18	A	I did.
19	Q	And they were close in time to the arrest, correct?
20	A	They were.
21	MS. 1	NGUYEN: And Your Honor, I would just object again, pursuant to our
22	previous	
23	THE	COURT: You've made the objections and it's noted for the record.
24	BY MR. FA	TTIG:
25	Q	Can you explain how the system works and the Clark County Detention

1	Center in te	rms of when an inmate wants to make a call?
2	A	When an inmate calls out, he's assigned
3	Q	To a non-attorney, for the record.
4	A	He's assigned a number and then with that number there's a voice
5	recognition	system where they have to speak their name. So someone can't type in
6	someone el	se's number, they actually have to speak their name. And there's the
7	way the sys	tem works it's it recognizes your voice; your pitch, rate, and cadence
8	of the way y	ou say your name. And then when that matches up it identifies the
9	person mak	ing the call and they're allowed to make the call.
10	Q	I'm going to play three calls. These have been marked as Proposed
11	202. And ye	ou're familiar with the calls?
12	A	I am.
13	MR. F	FATTIG: We would move to admit State's 202 at this time, Your Honor.
14	THE	COURT: It'll be admitted over the prior objection is noted.
15		[STATE'S EXHIBITS 202 ADMITTED]
16	BY MR. FA	TTIG:
17	Q	And the first call we're going to listen to, is this a call that was placed or
18	July 1st of 20	014?
19	A	It was.
20	Q	And this is between Mr. Bacharach and Eufrasia Nazaroff?
21	A	That's correct.
22	Q	And both parties there's a standard recording that gets played to so
23	both parties	understand that the call is being recorded, correct?
24	A	Yes, there is.
25		[July 1, 2014 Jail Phone Call Played]
- 1	1	

1	THE	E COURT: Please turn your phone in the jury.
2		[July 1, 2014 Jail Phone Call Continues Playing]
3	BY MR. F.	ATTIG:
4	Q	You're familiar another call that he placed to Eufrasia on July 12th of
5	'14?	
6	А	That's correct.
7	Q	And we'll listen to that one.
8		[July 12, 2014 Jail Phone Call Played]
9	BY MR. F.	ATTIG:
10	Q	There is also a third call that was placed on July 7 th and in that call Mr.
11	Bacharacl	n spoke to Marisala Tarango?
12	A	That's correct.
13	Q	And in that call there was a point in time where Mr. Bacharach indicate
14	he receive	ed a visit from a person named Bonnie Polley. That's an actual minister a
15	CCDC, co	errect?
16	A	That's correct.
17	Q	We're not going to play that call, but the jury will be able to listen to it in
18	the interes	st of time. We'll let them do that if they choose to.
19		Now, in your experience, Detective, officers usually qualify with their
20	own duty	weapons, is that fair to say?
21	A	That's correct.
22	Q	Were you aware if the Defendant was a police officer or a security
23	officer?	
24	A	He was a police officer.
25	Q	I'm sorry, the Defendant, Joshua Bacharach?
1	I	

1	А	Oh, no, he was not.
2	Q	Okay. What you were referring to is Ryan McNabb?
3	А	That's correct.
4	Q	Okay. Did you do anything with regards to attempting to ascertain
5	whether or	not any casings might have ended up in any tires of patrol cars or law
6	enforceme	nt personnel vehicles?
7	А	We did. It's my theory that the casings that we couldn't find were stuck
8	in the tread	s on the tires of a patrol car or in someone's boots. They're kind of like
9	rocks and s	sometimes you get a rock stuck in the tread of your shoe. We sent out a
10	message to	all the patrol guys that responded at Northeast Area Command to chec
11	their car tire	es to see if there was any casings there and to check their boots when
12	they got ba	ck in to see if there was any shell casings stuck in them and we didn't
13	recover any	ymore.
14	Q	Or it could have ended up in a tire that you didn't have access to, non-
15	Metro?	
16	A	That's correct.
17	Q	You had mentioned regarding Carey, I think you mentioned you
18	called it a f	reeway at one point, it's
19	A	It's a major thoroughfare.
20	Q	A street, as opposed to a freeway, fair to say?
21	Α	That's correct.
22	Q	Okay.
23	MR.	FATTIG: I have no other questions at this time.
24		CROSS-EXAMINATION
25	BY MS. NO	BUYEN:

1	Q	You said you were there 15 hours, is that correct?
2	А	That's correct.
3	Q	Okay. And it was dark when you first arrived?
4	A	It was.
5	Q	How soon after getting the call did you arrive at the scene?
6	А	It would have been travel time, so I'm sure once I got the text that I
7	needed to r	espond within a half hour.
8	Q	It's fair to say that people arrived on this scene pretty quickly, is that
9	correct?	
10	A	That's correct.
11	Q	Okay. And is that because of the nature of the call involving an officer-
12	involved sh	ooting?
13	A	That's correct.
14	Q	Okay. And you had indicated that you saw at least 20 or so patrol cars
15	is that corre	ect?
16	A	People would kind of respond in waves. The first wave would have
17	been all the	e first responders, all the patrol guys. I'm one of the last people to
18	actually arr	ive.
19	Q	And we heard previously that this was kind of in between the time of
20	swing and o	graveyard shift, is that correct?
21	A	It was when there would be double coverage for patrol.
22	Q	Okay. And you said that you were part of the force investigation team
23	or the FIT to	eam or FIT, is that correct?
24	Α	That's correct.
25	Q	And you had been doing that for two years?

1	A	That's correct.
2	Q	Okay.
3	A	Well not while I've been doing it at the time it was I've been assigned
4	to it since its	s inception, but it was a fairly new then so a few months then.
5	Q	Is your focus, when you arrive on a scene such as this, to focus on the
6	officers invo	olved or are you the lead on the entire case or how does that work?
7	A	We are the lead on the entire case.
8	Q	So you are the head of the whole thing, is that correct?
9	A	That's correct.
10	Q	Okay. And so you're the one directing the other detectives and the
11	officers and	the other administrators to the scene?
12	A	Well by head of the whole thing the whole investigation is mine to
13	Q	Okay.
14	A	orchestrate.
15	Q	So you're the one that puts together the complete report, is that
16	correct?	
17	A	That's correct.
18	Q	You I think you described yourself as a case agent or a manager?
19	A	The project manager. I mean, we call it the case agent, but I guess a
20	more civilia	n term would be the project manager.
21	Q	Okay. You would take all the individual reports, is that correct?
22	A	That's correct.
23	Q	You would take and review all of those?
24	A	I don't know if reviews the right word. But we would direct someone to
25	conduct and	d interview. When that interview is done I would listen to that interview

1	was in its ir	fancy and I believe this is one of the first actual officer-involved
2	shootings o	aptured. I wouldn't have the exact number, but it's
3	Q	Okay. Was it one of the first that you had worked on
4	A	One of the first that I had I worked.
5	Q	in your capacity on FIT?
6	A	That's correct.
7	Q	Okay. And you said that you reviewed that body camera video within
8	the patrol c	ar of Officer McNabb, is that correct?
9	A	It wasn't McNabb's patrol car. I believe it was one of the responding
10	supervisor's	s car that I was in.
11	Q	Okay. Can you review those body camera videos on any computer?
12	A	I don't know about any computer. I think it has to have a department
13	gateway to	the computer. I'm not a tech guy. It has to be a Metro computer.
14	Q	Okay. But you were able to view it on the scene?
15	A	Yes.
16	Q	Did you watch it multiple times there at the scene?
17	A	I did.
18	Q	Okay. And you did that to kind of confirm your interview with Officer
19	McNabb, is	that correct?
20	A	That's correct.
21	Q	Okay. And it's important to aid your investigation to obtain all of the
22	different pe	rspectives, is that correct?
23	A	We need to know where to look for evidence. So anything that could
24	help us, we	review.
25	Q	Okay. And so you got that from speaking with lay witnesses?

1	A	That's correct.
2	Q	And you got that from speaking with Officer McNabb?
3	A	That's correct.
4	Q	And you received that from corresponding video from the body camera
5	as well as t	he civilian?
6	A	That's correct.
7	Q	Was there any other information that you used to aid in your
8	investigatio	n?
9	A	We did. I mean, we had DNA was done, latent prints was done.
10	Q	Determination on prints and DNA, was that done at your direction?
11	A	It was.
12	Q	Okay. So if you if evidence was collected, it was your determination
13	on whether or not it was going to be processed further, is that correct?	
14	A	That's correct.
15	Q	Did you direct the CSAs that arrived on the scene to collect?
16	A	To collect?
17	Q	Any evidence?
18	A	It I guess, yes, but the CSAs know what they need to collect. I didn't
19	stand over them and say pick up this casing, pick up that casing. We've worked	
20	together for a couple years, so we all have an understanding of what needs to get	
21	picked up.	
22	Q	And so you they did their own self-directed investigation, as well as
23	were pointed in direction of things that had already been previously	
24	A	Yes, yes.
25	Q	located?

1	A	Yes.
2	Q	Is that fair to say?
3	А	Yes.
4	Q	There were several items of evidence that were either tested for
5	fingerprints	or DNA later. Is was that done at your direction?
6	А	That would have been done at my direction, yes.
7	Q	You had indicated that you did not feel that gun residue was an
8	effective or accurate	
9	A	Gunshot residue, that's correct.
10	Q	Gunshot residue, I'm sorry.
11	A	That's correct.
12	Q	Okay. There are officers or detectives that do choose to use that, is
13	that correct?	
14	А	I don't know any detectives that have used it for in the last several
15	years.	
16	Q	Okay. Certain types of gunshot residue testing is done at the lab, is
17	that correct?	
18	A	I don't think they do it at our lab. I think they actually have to send it ou
19	and have there's only a few vendors that do it yet, so it would have to be sent ou	
20	from our lab.	
21	Q	Okay.
22	A	I don't think they even do it at our lab.
23	Q	But it's not something that you choose to use?
24	A	No.
25	Q	And it's not something that ordered in this particular case?

1	А	It was not.
2	Q	Okay. We saw a picture of a shirt here that was recovered. Did you
3	recover tha	t shirt?
4	A	I did not.
5	Q	Okay. Did you arrive at the hospital to speak with the suspect or to
6	collect di	rect the collection of this shirt at the hospital?
7	А	I did not. We had other detectives from the force investigation team
8	that responded to the hospital.	
9	Q	But this you were aware that this had been collected?
10	А	That's correct.
11	Q	Okay. And it was collected at the hospital, is that correct?
12	A	It was.
13	Q	Oh. This shirt. Is that correct?
14	A	Yes. I saw it when it was you
15	Q	Sorry. I don't even care for that.
16		You said that you had done a walk-through of that area and you
17	physically started at Walnut and walked those streets approximately a mile or so, is	
18	that correct	?
19	А	I did.
20	Q	But you weren't the only one that did that, is that correct?
21	A	No.
22	Q	In fact, there were probably several CSAs that walked that area?
23	А	There each spot where we found a shell casing was cordoned off and
24	kind of esta	ablished as a crime scene. So we had patrol officers on each spot. Once
25	everything	was collected a group of us walked from the end all the way to the
1		

1	beginning ju	ust to make sure that nothing got missed.
2	Q	Okay. And was that done during at night or during the daytime?
3	А	It was daylight by that time.
4	Q	Okay. We heard from some other the crime scene analysts that they
5	were there	into the morning hours when there was daylight. Is that the same for
6	you?	
7	А	Well into the morning hours, into the afternoon hours.
8	Q	This area was you learned very quickly of where this stop or incident
9	began, is that correct?	
10	А	I did.
11	Q	Okay. In addition to speaking with Officer McNabb, you also have
12	there are other ways that you track officers in the field, is that correct?	
13	А	Track officers in the I would have no way to track officers in the field.
14	Q	When an officer is making a stop they usually call in
15	A	Oh, through radio track.
16	Q	to dispatch, is that correct?
17	А	Yes. I could order the radio traffic that they broadcast.
18	Q	Okay. And did you do that in this case as well?
19	А	I did.
20	Q	And that radio traffic, can you describe to the jury what that means and
21	what's included in that document or that log?	
22	А	As far as meaning
23	Q	What's included in the catalog?
24	Α	Well the CAD is the computer-automated dispatch. It helps our
25	dispatchers	keep track. When they assign an officer to a call there's one line put the

1	Q	So if a K9 Unit was deployed or was released in this case, would this be
2	a situation	where you would also be involved?
3	A	A standard K9 deployment, the dog goes, bites someone, they go to the
4	hospital an	d get stitched up, we would not get sent on it. That same dog bites
5	someone i	n the neck and they almost die or they lose fingers or lose an eye or
6	something, we would get sent on.	
7	Q	So stitches, no. Loss of
8	A	Serious injury is the way it's worded.
9	Q	And stitches would not be considered serious?
10	A	No.
11	Q	In this case were you aware if there were any serious injuries as a
12	result of the dog bite?	
13	A	Not life threatening injuries. He did receive I don't have the stuff but
14	he had pretty good bites on his leg.	
15	Q	Okay. Were stitches required to your knowledge?
16	A	Oh, for sure.
17	Q	Okay.
18	MS. NGUYEN: Court's indulgence just for a moment.	
19		[Colloquy between Counsel and the Defendant]
20	BY MS. NGUYEN:	
21	Q	You had indicated that the scene in your opinion perhaps could have
22	been disrupted because of car traffic by civilians off of those major roads?	
23	A	It was. I mean, by the time the scene the incident happened, the first
24	wave of fire	st responders get there. Once he was taken into custody then patrol
25	worried about shutting down all the surrounding roads. So for sure the scene was	

1	disrupted.		
2	Q	Okay. In the area there was like a dirt lot kind of over to the I guess i	
3	you're asking me cardinal direct		
4	A	Southeast corner.	
5	Q	south. That's correct. But you said that you did thoroughly check	
6	that area?		
7	A	We did. We checked that area. That was the direction that Officer	
8	McNabb wa	as hooting in. We were kind of hoping to find some impacts or even	
9	some proje	ctiles in that lot, but we weren't we were unable to.	
10	Q	And had you been informed that he felt he had been shot at in that	
11	general area?		
12	A	That's correct.	
13	Q	From that general area?	
14	A	We also went to the northwest, which would be kind of behind where	
15	Officer McN	labb was because that was the area he felt that rounds were coming at	
16	him. There	was a bunch of buildings there that we scoured for any impacts and we	
17	did not find any.		
18	Q	And you didn't find any impacts from his discharged firearm or the	
19	alleged discharged from the suspect, is that correct?		
20	A	The only impacts we found from the suspect was on his car.	
21	Q	And the shell casings, were you the one that located any of those shell	
22	casings that were on		
23	A	I didn't locate any of them.	
24	Q	on Carey?	
25	A	There was the first wave of responding officers that actually found mos	

1	of them.	And then we confirmed the areas where to look during the drive-through o
2	walk-through with McNabb.	
3	Q	As far as the shell casings from Officer McNabb's firearm, you were
4	able to locate all of those, is that correct?	
5	A	I believe all but one.
6	Q	So your recollection was all but one?
7	A	I would have to look at the report. I think it's all but one.
8	Q	Do you have your report with you or
9	A	I don't.
10	Q	Okay. But those were recovered on the scene, is that correct?
11	A	They were.
12	Q	Okay.
13	A	And his were a little bit easier to find because there was just two groups
14	of his.	
15	Q	Okay. But you weren't able to locate any other shell casings from any
16	other fire	arms in that area at Dolly and El Tovar?
17	A	And by like cart casings like expended rounds?
18	Q	Expended rounds.
19	A	We only found 9 mm from Officer McNabb at the area of Carey and El
20	Tovar there.	
21	Q	And you thoroughly searched that area?
22	A	We did.
23	Q	Okay.
24	MS	S. NGUYEN: Nothing further.
25		REDIRECT EXAMINATION

1	BY MR. FATTIG:	
2	Q There were no other suspects found in the area besides MR.	
3	Bacharach, correct?	
4	A No. After he was taken into custody the Air Unit was broadcast, patro	
5	had a really tight perimeter. Basically a perimeter they just go every hundred yard	
6	or so and they set a car and they make a circle around the last area. They had K9	
7	search the area and the Air Unit search the area with the FLIR which looking for an	
8	heat traces and no other people were located.	
9	Q And no other items of evidence	
10	A That's correct.	
11	Q as well, other than the ones we've been talking about?	
12	A That's correct.	
13	MR. FATTIG: No other questions.	
14	MS. NGUYEN: Nothing further.	
15	THE COURT: The jury have any questions of this officer? Seeing no hands	
16	You're free to go.	
17	THE WITNESS: Thank you.	
18	THE COURT: Call your next witness.	
19	THE WITNESS: Thank you, Your Honor.	
20	THE COURT: Thank you.	
21	MR. FATTIG: Marnie Carter.	
22	MARNIE CARTER	
23	[having been called as a witness and being first duly sworn, testified as follows:]	
24	THE CLERK: Thank you. Please be seated. State your full name, spelling	
25	your first and last name for the record, please.	

1	THE	WITNESS: My name is Marnie Carter. M-A-R-N-I-E, C-A-R-T-E-R.	
2	DIRECT EXAMINATION		
3	BY MR. FATTIG:		
4	Q	Good afternoon to you.	
5	A	Good afternoon.	
6	Q	How are you employed?	
7	A	I am a forensic scientist in the latent print detail of the Las Vegas	
8	 Metropolita	n Police Department's Forensic Laboratory.	
9	Q	And what do you do specifically in that laboratory?	
10	A	As a forensic scientist in the latent print detail I in some cases I get	
11	evidence fr	om a crime scene and process those at that evidence. Some	
12	instances the evidence has already been processed and we get the latent prints to		
13	compare. Ultimately my job is to try to either recover latent prints or use those latent		
14	prints to compare to the late the known prints of listed subjects or any unidentified		
15	prints will be searched through our AFIS database.		
16	Q	And how long have you been employed as a fingerprint examiner?	
17	A	I've been a fingerprint examiner almost nine years.	
18	Q	How long have you been with Metro?	
19	A	Almost 12.	
20	Q	What could you briefly explain your education and training in order to	
21	become employed as a fingerprint examiner?		
22	A	Sure. I have a Bachelor's degree with a double major in Biology and	
23	Chemistry.	In 2003 I was hired on with Metro as a crime scene analyst. In that	
24	capacity, at	bout three and a half years doing that, I got quite a bit of experience in	
25	fingerprint p	processing, recovery, photography, evidence collection and preservation.	

In 2 -- in March of 2007 I tested and promoted into the laboratory as a forensic scientist trainee in the latent print detail and went through an 18-month formal rigorous training program to qualify me to do independent case work in latent prints.

In December of 2009 when I had enough experience as a bench analyst I went through the process to test and apply for certification. So I am a certified latent print examiner with the IAI, which is the International Association for Identification. I am a member of the Nevada State IAI, also the IAI -- the international IAI. I have presented latent print related material to my own department, the crime scene analysts, also in Phoenix and in Utah.

In January of 2013 I co-authored an article in the Forensic Encyclopedia of Forensic Sciences called *Palm Prints*. And I'm also proficiency tested annually.

- Q And have you previously testified in court as an expert in the area of fingerprints identification?
 - A Yes, I have.
 - Q About how many times?
 - A This is the 13th in District Court.
 - Q What is a fingerprint?

A A fingerprint. So on our fingers and the palms on our hands, also on the toes and the soles of our feet, we have specialized skin called friction ridge skin. It's different than any other skin on our bodies. So if, similar to an ink stamp, if I were to take an ink stamp and put it in ink and put it on a piece of paper I'm going to leave an impression of that stamp -- that ink.

So our friction ridge skin has ridges, it has details, it has lots of characteristics in it that make us unique. If I -- with the matrix which is that residue

6 7 8

9 10

12

11

14

13

15 16

17 18

19 20

21

22

24

23

25

that's on our skin, similar to that ink, if I touch that res -- if I get residue on my fingers and I touch a surface I will possibly leaven an impression of that skin. That is what we call a latent print.

So we have ink prints. If you were ever fingerprinted for a job, for instance, those are known recordings. Those are ink prints. That's what we actually use to compare. And the latent prints are those prints that are left kind of unbeknownst to you leaving it. Latent, by definition means present but no readily visible.

So we can go through processes to develop that latent print and allow us to see it. It might be a powder processing technique. We have different kind of chemical processes we can do to allow us to visualize it so that we can see it. Ultimately we need to see it to render any sort of comparison.

- One of those processes would involve a superglue type process? Q
- Yes. Α
- How do you go about the process of comparing a print, either lifted off Q of a particular item or taken from scene to a known print?

Sure. We have kind of a framework system that we go through that we Α call ACE-V. The analysis -- A just stands for analysis, that's when we actually look at that latent print. We actually look at our known prints too. The known prints have to have enough information also. But we look and we just gather data in that latent print. Is it enough for me to render a reliable conclusion? Is there enough detail in these ridges and in the -- in that impression for me to do something with?

So we go through the analysis, I determine that I have good detail in there for me to look for. So -- and then in the comparison phase, once I know that -- maybe that area of skin I might be able to tell right off that it's a fingerprint. I

5

6 7

8

9 10

12

11

14

13

15

16

17

19

18

20

21

22

23

24

25

might be thinking maybe it's a palm. I may be unsure. But once I've made that determination that I know where in that source skin that I'm going to look, I can do a comparison.

And then the comparison entails the known prints of a person and I do a side-by-side literally looking for the detail in my latent print to the detail in my known print. And I'm looking for either agreement or disagreement to make a conclusion of possibly identification or maybe exclusion and there's different degrees of inconclusive in there. But that's the comparison phase.

The E stands for evaluation and that's based on the analysis and the comparison, I render a conclusion and my evaluation. And verif -- the V stands for verification. Any conclusions that we make goes to a second qualified examiner and they go through that process to see if they reach the same conclusions.

- Are each person's fingerprints different than everyone else's? Q
- Yes, that we know of. Α
- Is it possible for someone to touch an object or a surface like I'm Q touching this pedestal here and not be able to come over, even if I was trying to perhaps leave a fingerprint, not be able to actually recover my fingerprint from that pedestal?
 - Yes, it is possible. Α
 - Are there -- describe that. Why is that possible? Q
- Sure. There's -- there's actually quite a few factors that come into play whether we will actually leave a fingerprint or not. So to start kind of on the basic level with the skin first. If you have -- some people's skin based on maybe their occupations or maybe just on genetics have poor friction ridge skin. They might be very faint or very soft and not very robust.

So if you are a brick-layer or a construction worker or even people who work with paper a lot, those friction ridges actually get kind of worn down and they won't -- you won't have really thick ridges. So -- or if you cover the skin with fabric or gloves or something like that. Or even just barring some kind of injury or disease that damages that. So the skin has to be in good enough condition to leave an impression.

Then there's the -- that substrate -- that matrix that we call -- that's on the skin. So if I am very, very sweaty or oily or I just finished eating a bunch of french fries, I can actually have too much residue on my fingers and it might blur the impression. So again, kind of going back to that ink analogy, if I took an ink stamp and I rubbed it in the ink and I kind of really rubbed it really hard and I got it all gooey and then I put it on the paper and pressed really hard, I can actually deform that impression and not be able to read the stamp properly. So that comes into play -- that residue.

How we touch it. Again, similar to the ink stamp if I press too hard. If I press too lightly I won't leave an impression properly. If I press too hard I can obscure those ridges. Sometimes sliding, twisting, dragging, different things. Our skin is very flexible so it's pliable and those ridges can move. They can move amongst themselves like an accordion sort of. So how I touch that skin can certainly affect the impression that's left or not left.

And then the environmental factors that go into play. How much time has passed? What the object -- what has actually been touched, if it's surface conducive to latent prints or not. If I touch, you know, a nice smooth desk top that's clean I would expect to leave an impression. If I touch, you know, this foamy microphone I would not necessarily expect to leave an impression. So the surface

certainly comes into play.

And then again, like I said, how much time has passed, whether it's been wiped off or rubbed off or left out in the sun or the dirt or the rain. All those different things can affect whether a latent print is even left for -- or recovered.

- Q Many, many factors.
- A Yes.
- Q What about firearms in general? Can you speak to being able to get fingerprints off of firearms?

A Sure. Firearms in general are poor surfaces. Based on some studies that we've done internally in our laboratory, also a study that I know about from the ATF and an agency, Minneapolis Police Department did some firearms testing. So, firearms, based on the materials that the guns themselves are made out of, sometimes they're nice smooth metals. Oftentimes they're not. They're polymers, they're plastics, they're different things. They might be textured.

In a conventional way that you handle a gun you will holding it, you know, generally in a place that's going to be textured in some kind of way because you don't -- the firearms are manufactured so you don't drop them. They have some areas of grip, you know, for you to hold on to. So the grips are generally textured, the trigger might even have some sort of texture to it where you would move -- you know, move the slide might have some texturing on it.

They're often coated with different things that resist rust. So if they're resisting rust, usually they resist some sort of moisture. So they're resisting fingerprints. So our studies -- we did a two year study over -- from 2008 to 2009 we looked at all the firearms evidence that we had processed in the laboratory and we had a recovery rate of 13 percent on fire -- on just pistols, about 14 percent on

1	magazines,	the ATFs was about 10 percent across the board, and Minneapolis was
2	12 percent.	So it's not very high in general on firearms evidence.
3	Q	Were you asked to do some comparisons in relating to Las Vegas
4	Metropolitar	n Police Event Number 140626-4091?
5	А	Yes.
6	Q	And what specifically were you given to look at?
7	А	I was given photographs of latent prints.
8	Q	In this particular case you weren't given actual items of evidence, fair to
9	say?	
10	A	Correct, yes.
11	Q	And a crime scene analyst took the photographs of the fingerprints?
12	A	Correct.
13	Q	Okay. Showing you 177. Do you recognize let me zoom out. Do yo
14	recognize th	nis?
15	A	Actually I do not.
16	Q	Okay. You were given some photographs is it fair to say you were
17	given sever	al photographs relating to two different items of evidence that the crime
18	scene analy	vst processed?
19	A	That's correct.
20	Q	Okay. 178. Do you recognize that photograph?
21	A	That does look more familiar, yes.
22	Q	Okay. And this was identified as coming from Item 28 from the crime
23	scene analyst?	
24	A	That I don't know from looking at that. I'm
25	Q	Would you be to tell by looking at your report?

1	A	Honestly, I
2	Q	Or your notes?
3	A	I just so the latent print card is all I mean, the photograph is all
4	get hat has	a label on it.
5	Q	Okay.
6	A	Oftentimes I mean, without being able to tell if that's the label that
7	was in the label that I looked at. Do you understand what I'm saying?	
8	Q	Yes.
9	A	So
10	Q	In other words, would it help to look at the I know it was a little blurry
11	Would it he	Ip to look at the picture perhaps?
12	A	It might. Does he have an actual identifica identifier on there is what
13	he called th	e latent print that he marked?
14	Q	I don't know.
15	A	Okay. Yeah.
16	MR.	FATTIG: Can I approach?
17	THE	COURT: Yeah. Show her.
18	THE	WITNESS: Sorry, I just
19	THE COURT: That's all right.	
20	BY MR. FA	TTIG:
21	A	Because he sometimes he may have taken more than the pictures
22	that I looked	d at. So okay, so the little LP2 looks like yes, it was LP2 that he had
23	marked. Ye	es.
24	Q	Okay.
25	A	I see that now.

1	Q	What does that mean, LP2, to you?
2	A	To me I would assumed that that was the second latent print that he
3	had photog	raphed. That's what it means in our lab.
4	Q	Okay. And are you able to tell if that came off of his Item 28?
5	A	That I
6	Q	LP2?
7	A	Just based on the lift card that would have said that. I never did see the
8	item. So.	
9	Q	That's fine. But you're familiar with this this would be a latent
10	fingerprint that he developed?	
11	A	That photograph, yes.
12	Q	Okay. A photograph of the fingerprint, fair to say?
13	A	Correct.
14	Q	And again, you received several photographs. This is just one of them?
15	A	Correct.
16	Q	And you compared those to an individual identified as Joshua
17	Bacharach,	correct?
18	A	Yes.
19	Q	You were asked and Mr. Bacharach had an ID number of 1900105,
20	correct?	
21	A	Without looking at my report
22	Q	Yes. Would looking at your report refresh your recollection?
23	A	For that number, yes.
24	Q	Yes, please.
25	A	Okay. Thank you.
	1	

1	Q	Please do so. And again, I'm why question went to the known prints
2	you were co	omparing against.
3	A	Yes. And do you want me to repeat that ID number or
4	Q	Yes.
5	A	Okay. So 1900105. Yes.
6	Q	And Mr. Bacharach's prints were kept in the ordinary course of the Las
7	Vegas Metropolitan Police Department, correct?	
8	A	That's correct.
9	Q	And the Metropolitan Police Department has literally thousands of
10	different people's prints? Tens of thousands probably?	
11	A	I think we have over a million records actually.
12	Q	Okay.
13	A	Yes.
14	Q	Over a million. And they're kept for all sorts of reasons. People getting
15	employment. My fingerprints would be in there, correct?	
16	A	They could be. Mine are.
17	Q	They are.
18	A	Yes.
19	Q	I can tell you.
20	A	Okay.
21	Q	Yours are.
22	A	Yes.
23	Q	Many people. Okay. When you examined this particular fingerprint,
24	what did yo	ou find?
25	A	For LP2 there were no suitable prints for me to compare.

1	A	That's correct.
2	Q	And that appears to be similar to an area on 191b towards the base of
3	the magazi	ne, correct?
4	A	I would not be able to say for sure that it's that magazine, but
5	Q	Yes.
6	A	But
7	Q	That was a different that was the crime scene analyst, correct?
8	A	Correct, yes.
9	Q	But it's similar?
10	Α	Sure.
11	Q	Now did you compare this particular fingerprint?
12	Α	Yes, I did.
13	Q	And did you reach any conclusions regarding this fingerprint?
14	A	I did.
15	Q	What was that conclusion?
16	A	That conclusion was that fingerprint is belongs to the left thumb of
17	Joshua Ba	charach.
18	MR.	FATTIG: I have no other questions.
19	MS.	NGUYEN: No questions.
20	THE	COURT: The jury have any questions of this witness? Seeing no
21	hands. Yo	u're free to go. Thanks.
22	THE	WITNESS: Okay. Thank you.
23	THE	COURT: Call your next witness, State.
24	MR.	FATTIG: The State would rest at this point.
25	THE	COURT: Okay. With the admission of all of the evidence the State has
	1	

moved into evidence, the State rests.

We're going to take our lunch break. Be back at 3:00.

During the recess you're admonished not to talk or converse among yourselves or with anyone else on any subject connected with this trial. Or read or watch or listen to any report of or commentary on the trial or any person connected with this trial by any medium of information including, without limitation, newspapers, television, the radio, or the internet. Or form or express an opinion on any subject connected with the trial until the case is finally submitted to you.

See you back here at 3:00.

[Outside the presence of the jury]

THE COURT: See you guys at 3:00.

MS. NGUYEN: Your Honor, do you want to canvas my client?

THE COURT: Oh, yes, I got to -- let me read this again to you Mr. Bacharach.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Under the Constitution of the United States and under the Constitution of the State of Nevada, you cannot be compelled to testify in this case, do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: You may, at your own request, give up that right and take the stand and testify. If you do, you'll be subject to cross-examination by the Deputy District Attorneys and anything you may say, be it on direct or cross-examination, will be the subject of fair comment when the Deputy District Attorneys speak to the jury in their final argument, do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: If you choose not to testify, the Court will not permit the Deputy

1	District Attorneys to make any comments to the jury because you have not testified
2	do you understand that?
3	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.
4	THE COURT: If you elect not to testify and if your attorney specifically
5	requests, this jury instruction will be given, quote: The law does not compel a
6	Defendant in a criminal case to take the stand and testify. And no presumption ma
7	be raised and no inference of any kind may be drawn from the failure of a Defenda
8	to testify.
9	Do you understand that?
10	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.
11	THE COURT: And then if do you have any questions about your rights?
12	THE DEFENDANT: No, sir. I understand.
13	THE COURT: What do you want to do?
14	THE DEFENDANT: I'm going to not testify.
15	THE COURT: Okay.
16	THE DEFENDANT: All right. Thank you.
17	THE COURT: All right.
18	MS. NGUYEN: And, Your Honor, we would like that instruction given.
19	THE COURT: All right. That instruction I think is Jury Instruction 27.
20	MS. NGUYEN: And Your Honor, did you want to address the instruction that
21	you were taking under advisement regarding the prior inconsistent statement?
22	THE COURT: Yeah.
23	MS. THOMSON: And Judge, it's our position that now that the detective has
24	testified, Detective Hodson, those statements which were inconsistent have been
25	admitted both for impeachment purposes and substantively and I think the jury's

1	entitled to that.
2	MS. NGUYEN: And Your Honor, again, I would object. I think it's covered by
3	the credibility of the witnesses instruction. I think that they can take that into
4	consideration in determining whether or not I think it is shifts the burden or does
5	definitively say that there was prior inconsistent statements and I think that's in the
6	province of the jury to decide.
7	THE COURT: Well, as we've talked before, I think that there was some
8	with is to do with the vest. There was some inconsistent statements made and
9	over your opposition, I'm going to allow that in.
10	MS. THOMSON: Thank you, Your Honor.
11	THE COURT: Okay. See you guys at 3:00. Make sure your
12	MR. FATTIG: Do we have the a copy of instructions yet or
13	THE COURT: Yeah, they're right there.
14	MR. FATTIG: Oh, cool.
15	THE COURT: Jill, do you want to give them copies? Give two to Ms.
16	Nguyen. And Tom will put them out on the chairs.
17	THE CLERK: Do you have any exhibits?
18	THE COURT: And then if
19	MR. FATTIG: Do we have any exhibits?
20	MS. THOMSON: No.
21	MR. FATTIG: I don't think we do.
22	THE COURT: You got everything?
23	THE CLERK: It'll take a while for me to figure it out. I don't have
24	THE COURT: Yeah, make sure you don't have any exhibits with you.
25	THE CLERK: I'm just looking for the one just now.

1	MS. THOMSON: I would check towards the back of the stack.
2	THE CLERK: Okay.
3	[Recess taken at 1:57 p.m.]
4	[Trial resumed at 3:03 p.m.]
5	[Outside the presence of the jury]
6	THE COURT: Are you guys ready?
7	MS. NGUYEN: Yes.
8	THE COURT: You ready?
9	MS. THOMSON: Uh-huh.
10	THE COURT: They're ready. Bring them in.
11	[In the presence of the jury]
12	THE MARSHAL: All rise, please.
13	And be seated.
14	THE COURT: Stipulate to the presence of the jury.
15	MS. NGUYEN: Yes, Your Honor.
16	MS. THOMSON: Yes, Your Honor.
17	THE COURT: Thanks for being prompt. Ladies and gentlemen, I'm going to
18	now read to you the jury instructions. You have a copy of them. At the back you'll
19	have
20	MR. FATTIG: Your Honor
21	THE COURT: Oh, yes. Sorry. Did you rest?
22	MS. NGUYEN: Oh. Yes, Your Honor, we would rest.
23	THE COURT: All right. You'll have the verdict form. What you should do is
24	your jury foreperson will mark the jury the verdict form and you just have to check
25	the boxes. You'll get this is the official one. That's the one that's attached to the

back. Make notes as you read -- as I read these to you. Follow along. If you think it's important you can set it aside and when you get back to the jury room you can discuss it.

This is District Court. Clark County. Nevada. State of Nevada versus.

This is District Court, Clark County, Nevada, State of Nevada versus Joshua Bacharach, Case C299425, Department VIII, Instructions to the Jury.

Instruction Number 1: Members of the jury it is now my duty as judge to instruct you in the law that applies to this case. It is your duty as jurors to follow these instructions and to apply the rules of law to the facts as you find them from the evidence.

You must not be concerned with the wisdom of any rule of law stated in these instructions. Regardless of any opinion you may have as to what the law ought to be, it would be a violation of your oath to base a verdict upon any other view of the law than that given in the instructions of the Court.

Instruction Number 2: If, in these instructions, any rule, direction, or idea is repeated -- excuse me -- or stated in different ways, no emphasis thereon is intended by me and none may be inferred by you. For that reason, you are to single -- you are not to single out any certain sentence or any individual point or instruction and ignore the others, but you are to consider all the instructions as a whole and regard each in the light of the others.

The order in which the instructions are given has no significance as to their relative importance.

Instruction Number 3 is about three or four pages of the indictment.

The stipulation between the parties is that I didn't -- I would not read that to you. You can read it if you -- when you go back. It's the same thing that the clerk read to you on Monday or Tuesday.

Instruction Number 4: To constitute the crime charged, there must exist a union or joint operation of an act forbidden by law and an intent to do the act.

The intent with which an act is done is shown by the facts and circumstances surrounding the case.

Do not confuse intent with motive. Motive is what prompts a person to act. Intent refers only to the state of mind with which the act is done.

Motive is not an element of the crime charged and the State is not required to prove a motive on the part of the Defendant in order to convict.

However, you may consider evidence of motive or lack of notice as a circumstance in the case.

Instruction 5: The Defendant is presumed innocent unless the contrary is proved. This presumption places upon the State the burden of proving beyond a reasonable doubt every element of the crime charged and that the Defendant is the person who committed the offense.

A reasonable doubt is one based on reason. It is not mere possible doubt but is such a doubt as would govern or control a person in the more weighty affairs of life. If the minds of the jurors, after the entire comparison and consideration of all the evidence, are in such a condition that they can say they feel an abiding conviction of the truth of the charge, there is not a reasonable doubt. Doubt to be reasonable must be actual, not mere possibility or speculation.

If you have a reasonable doubt as to the guilt of the Defendant, he is entitled to a verdict of not guilty.

Instruction 6: You are here to determine whether or not the State has proven each of the charges beyond a reasonable doubt from the evidence in the case. You are not called upon to return a verdict as to the guilt of any other person.

So, if the evidence in the case convinces you beyond a reasonable doubt of the guilt of the Defendant, you should so find, even though you may believe one or more persons are also guilty.

Instruction 7: The evidence which you are to consider in this case consists of the testimony of the witnesses, the exhibits, and any facts admitted or agreed to by Counsel.

There are two types of evidence; direct and circumstantial. Direct evidence is the testimony of a person who claims to have personal knowledge of the commission of the crime which has been charged, such as an eyewitness. Circumstantial evidence is the proof of a chain of facts and circumstances which tend to show whether the Defendant is guilty or not guilty.

The law makes no distinction between the weight to be given either direct or circumstantial evidence. Therefore, all of the evidence in the case, including the circumstantial evidence, should be considered by you in arriving at your verdict.

Statements, arguments and opinions of Counsel are not evidence -excuse me -- in the case. However, if the attorneys stipulate to the existence of a
fact, you must accept the stipulation as evidence and regard that fact as proved.

You must not speculate to be true any insinuations suggested by a question asked a witness. A question is not evidence and may be considered only as it supplies meaning to the answer.

You must disregard any evidence to which an objection was sustained by the Court and any evidence ordered stricken by the Court.

Anything you may have seen or heard outside the courtroom is not evidence and must also be disregarded.

Instruction 8: The credibility or believability of a witness should be determined by his manner upon the stand, his relationship to the parties, his fears, motives, interests or feelings, his opportunity to have observed the matter to which he testified, the reasonableness of his statements and the strength or weakness of his recollections.

If you believe that a witness has lied about any material fact in the case, you may disregard the entire testimony of that witness or any portion of his witness which -- of the -- his testimony which is not proved by other evidence.

Instruction 9: A witness who has special knowledge, skill, experience, training or education in a particular science, profession or occupation is an expert witness. An expert witness may give his opinion as to any matter in which he is skilled.

You should consider such an expert opinion and weight the reasons, if any, given for it. You are not bound, however, by such an opinion. Give it the weight to which you deem it entitled, whether that be great or slight, and you may reject it, if, in your judgment, the reasons given for it are unsound.

Instruction 10: Attempted murder is the performance of an act or acts which tend, but fail, to kill a human being, when such acts are done with express malice, namely, with the deliberate intention unlawfully to kill.

11: Malice aforethought, as used in the definition of Attempted Murder, means the intention to kill another human being without any legal cause, legal excuse or what the law considers adequate provocation. The condition -- excuse me -- of mind described as malice aforethought may rise, not alone from anger, hatred, revenge or particular ill will, spite, or grudge toward the person killed, but may result from unjustifiable or unlawful motive or purpose to injure another which

proceeds from a heart fatally bent on mischief or with reckless disregard of consequences and social duty.

Malice aforethought does not imply deliberation or the lapse of any considerable time between the malicious intention, but denotes rather an unlawful purpose and design in contradiction to accident and mischance.

Instruction 12: It is not necessary to prove the elements of premeditation and deliberation in order to prove attempt murder.

Instruction 13: The elements of an attempt to commit a crime are: 1) the intent to commit the crime; 2) performance of some act towards its commission; and 3) failure to consummate its commission.

In determining whether or not such an act was done, it is necessary to distinguish between mere preparation, on the one hand, and the actual commencement of the doing of the criminal deed, on the other. Mere preparation, which may consist of planning the offense or of devising, obtaining or arranging the means of its commission, is not sufficient to constitute an attempt; but acts of a person who intends to commit a crime will constitute an attempt where they themselves clearly indicate a certain, unambiguous intent to commit that specific crime, and, in themselves, are an immediate step in the present execution of the criminal design, the process -- excuse me -- the progress of which should be contemplated unless -- completed unless interrupted by some circumstance not intended in the original design.

Instruction 14: If you find the Defendant guilty of Attempt Murder, you must also determine whether or not a deadly weapon was used in the commission of this crime.

Instruction 15: Deadly weapon means any instrument which, if used in

the ordinary manner contemplated by its design and construction, will or is likely to cause substantial bodily harm or death; any weapon, device, instrument, material, or substance which, under the circumstance in which it is used, attempted to be used or threatened to be used, is readily capable of causing substantial bodily harm or death; or a dangerous or deadly weapon specifically described as a gun, pistol, spring pistol, revolver, or other firearm.

You are instructed that a firearm is a deadly weapon.

Instruction 16: If you find beyond a reasonable doubt that a defendant committed Attempt Murder with the Use of a Deadly Weapon, then you are instructed that the verdict of Attempt Murder with the Use of a Deadly Weapon is the appropriate verdict.

If, however, you find that a deadly weapon was not used in the commission of the Attempt Murder, but you do find that an Attempt Murder was committed, then you are instructed that the verdict of Attempt Murder without the Use of a Deadly Weapon is the appropriate verdict.

You are instructed that you cannot return a verdict of both Attempt Murder with the Use of a Deadly Weapon and Attempt Murder without the Use of a Deadly Weapon.

Instruction 17: A person who is in or under a structure or vehicle and who maliciously or wantonly discharges or maliciously or wantonly causes to be discharged a firearm within or from the structure or vehicle while the structure or vehicle is within an area designated by city or county ordinance as a populated area for the purpose of prohibiting the discharge of weapons is guilty of Discharging a Firearm from or within a Structure or Vehicle.

Instruction 18: It shall be unlawful within the City limits, except in a

regular licensed shooting gallery to willfully discharge any pistol, firearm, air gun, musket, or instrument of any kind, character, or description which throws a bullet or missiles for any distance by means of the elastic force of air or any explosive substance.

Instruction 19: It is unlawful to willfully discharge any pistol, firearm, air gun, musket or instrument of any kind, character or description which throws a bullet or missile of any kind for any distance by means of an elastic force or an air or any explosive substance -- excuse me -- within the County except at shooting ranges, or a sanctioned event by federal, state, county or an incorporated city currently licensed to -- by business license.

The areas addressed within this case are within the County.

Instruction 20: Assault means: 1) Unlawfully attempting to use physical force against another person; or 2) Intentionally placing another person in reasonable apprehension of immediate bodily harm.

Instruction 21: You are instructed that if you find a defendant guilty of Assault, you must also determine whether or not a deadly weapon was used in the commission of this crime.

Instruction 22: If you find beyond a reasonable doubt that a defendant committed Assault With the Use of a Deadly Weapon, then you are instructed that the verdict of Assault With the Use of a Deadly Weapon is the appropriate verdict.

If, however, you find that a deadly weapon was not used in the commission of the Assault, but you do find that an Assault was committed, then you should -- are instructed that the verdict of Assault is the appropriate verdict.

You are instructed that you cannot return a verdict of both Assault With a Deadly Weapon and Assault.

Instruction 23: A driver of a motor vehicle who willfully fails or refuses to bring the vehicle to a stop, or who otherwise flees or attempts to elude a peace officer in a readily identifiable vehicle of any police department or regulatory agency, when given a signal to bring the vehicle to a stop is guilty of evading where the driver operates the motor vehicle in a manner which endangers or is likely to endanger any other person or the property of any other person.

The signal by the peace officer must be by flashing red lamp and siren. Instruction 24: A person who, in any case or under any circumstances not otherwise specially provided for, willfully resists, delays, or obstructs a public officer in discharging or attempting to discharge any legal duty of his or her office with use of a firearm in the course of such resistance, obstructing or delay is guilty of Resisting Public Officer with Use of a Firearm.

Metropolitan Police Department Police Officers are public officers. Instruction 25: A person shall not knowingly possess a firearm on which the serial number has been intentionally changed, altered, removed or obliterated.

Instruction 26: The law recognizes two kinds of possession: Actual possession and constructive possession. A person who knowingly has direct physical control over a thing, at a given time, is then in actual possession of it.

A person who, although not in actual possession, knowingly has both the power and the intention, at a given time, to exercise dominion or control over a thing, either directly or through another person or persons, is then in constructive possession of it.

The law recognizes also that possession may be sole or joint. If one person alone has actual or constructive possession of a thing, possession is sole. If

4 5

6

7

8

10 11

9

12

13 14

15

16 17

18

19 20

21

23

22

24

25

two or more persons share actual or constructive possession of a thing, possession is joint.

You may find that the element of possession as that term is used in these instructions is present if you find beyond a reasonable doubt that a defendant had actual or constructive possession, either along or jointly with others.

An act or a failure to act is knowingly done, if done voluntarily and intentionally, and not because of mistake or accident or other innocent reason.

Instruction 27: The flight of a person immediately after the commission of a crime, or after he is accused of a crime, is not sufficient in itself to establish his guilt, but is a fact which, if proved, may be considered by you in light of all other proved facts in deciding the question of his guilt or innocence. Whether or not evidence of flight shows a consciousness of guilt and the significance to be attached to such a circumstance are matters for your deliberation.

Instruction 28: Mere presence at the scene of a crime or knowledge that a crime is being committed is not sufficient to establish that a defendant is guilty of an offense, unless you find beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant was a participant and not merely a knowing spectator.

However, the presence of a person at the scene of a crime and companionship with another person engaged in the commission of the crime and a course of conduct before and after the offense are circumstances which may be considered in determining whether such person aided and abetted the commission of that crime.

Instruction 29: If necessary to prevent escape, an officer may, after giving warning, if feasible, use deadly force to effect the arrest of a person only if there is probable cause to believe that the person: 1) Has committed a felony which

involves the infliction or threat of serous bodily harm or the use of deadly force; or 2) Poses a threat of serious bodily harm to the officer or to others.

Instruction 30: You have heard evidence of prior inconsistent statements. You may consider those for purposes of impeachment or as substantive evidence, at your discretion.

Instruction 31: It is a constitutional right of a defendant in a criminal trial that he may not be compelled to testify. Thus, the decision as to whether he should testify is left to the defendant on the advice and counsel of his attorney. You must not draw any inference of guilt from the fact that he does not testify, nor should this fact be discussed by you or enter into your deliberations in any way.

Instruction 32: Although you are to consider only the evidence in the case in reaching a verdict, you must bring to the consideration of the evidence your everyday common sense and judgment as reasonable men and women. Thus, you are not limited solely to what you see and hear as the witnesses testify. You may draw reasonable inferences from the evidence which you feel are justified in the light of common experience, keeping in mind that such inferences should not be based on speculation or guess.

A verdict may never be influenced by sympathy, prejudice, or public opinion. Your decision should be the product of sincere judgment and sound discretion in accordance with these rules of law.

Instruction 33: In your deliberation you may not discuss or consider the subject of punishment, as that is a matter which lies solely with the court. Your duty is confined to the determination of the guilt or innocence of the Defendant.

Instruction 34: When you retire to consider your verdict, you must select one of your members to act as foreperson who will preside over your

deliberation and will be your spokesman -- or spokesperson here in court.

During your deliberation, you will have all the exhibits which were admitted into evidence, these written instructions and forms of verdict which have been prepared for your convenience.

Your verdict must be unanimous. As soon as you have agreed upon a verdict, have it signed and dated by your foreperson and then return with it to this room.

Instruction 35: If, during your deliberation, you should desire to be further informed on any point of law or hear again portions of the testimony, you must reduce your request to writing signed by the foreperson. The officer will then return you to court where the information sought will be given you in the presence of, and after notice to, the District Attorney and the Defendant and his counsel.

Playbacks of testimony are time-consuming and are not encouraged unless you deem it a necessity. Should you require a playback, you must carefully describe the testimony to be played back so that the court recorder can arrange her notes. Remember, the court is not at liberty to supplement the evidence.

Instruction 36: Now you will listen to the arguments of Counsel who will endeavor to aid you to reach a proper verdict by refreshing in your minds the evidence and by showing the application thereof to the law; but, whatever Counsel may say, you will bear in mind that it is your duty to be governed in your deliberation by the evidence as you understand it and remember it to be and by the law as given to you in these instructions, with the sole, fixed, and steadfast purpose of doing equal and exact justice between the Defendant and the State of Nevada.

Given by District Court Judge, Douglas E. Smith.

You ready?

1	MS. THOMSON: Yes, Your Honor.
2	THE COURT: Go.
3	MS. THOMSON: Can we switch over?
4	CLOSING ARGUMENT BY THE STATE
5	BY MS. THOMSON:
6	It's been a relatively short trial compared to many of them, but you've
7	received a lot of evidence, heard a lot of testimony and you'll have a lot of exhibits to
8	go over in the deliberation room.
9	As in every criminal case across the country, the State has the burden
10	to prove the case beyond a reasonable doubt. And that means that we must prove
11	every element of the offenses charged. Every element of the offenses, not every
12	fact that could be brought up. The element of the offenses are as they are
13	outlined within your packet and you have the instructions as to what constitutes
14	each of the offenses.
15	It doesn't mean we have to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that that
16	shirt is highlighter yellow or highlighter green. That's not an element of the offense.
17	The elements are outlined in the packet. Your our
18	THE COURT: [Indiscernible].
19	MS. THOMSON: I'm sorry. Oh.
20	THE COURT: I'm just making sure she can hear you because you're away
21	from the podium. That's okay. No, don't. You can hear her okay?
22	THE COURT RECORDER: Yeah.
23	THE COURT: Okay. Sorry.
24	MS. THOMSON: I'll talk louder too. Sorry.
25	BY MS THOMSON:

Reasonable doubt is not beyond all doubt. It is reasonable doubt, not based on speculation, not based on mere possibility. Consider that. Keep that in mind when you're deliberating.

So, we are proving beyond a reasonable doubt both that crimes were committed and that it's the Defendant who committed these crimes. So let's talk first about what you're here to determine. You're not here to determine whether or not the officer made the right decision in shooting. You're not here to determine whether or not there was someone else involved. Your determination is strictly based on whether or not that man committed each of the crimes that are charged within the indictment and listed out on, I think it's Instruction 3 of your packet.

There are 13 charges within those and I'm going to go through -- and we'll go through sort of as a group. I won't talk about each one separately but we'll go through each of the different charges. Defendant; how do we know that he's one who is involved in all of this? That he's the person who was driving that car on Walnut that Officer McNabb tried to stop to issue a citation or warning for bright headlights?

Well, first of all it's the car that we heard Eufrasia say that she gave to him that night. It's the same car that she owned. He is the father of her children, there is relationship there. This isn't a random person who owns this vehicle. It makes sense that he'd have this vehicle. And we've heard testimony specifically that he would have -- did have the vehicle.

He's ultimately taken into custody two houses in from where that vehicle was located, one house behind from where that vehicle is left. There is his fingerprint on the magazine of the gun that is right outside the house where he's taken into custody. That gun is with the bullet-proof best that he's seen wearing.

5

6 7 8

10 11

9

13 14

12

15 16

17 18

19

21

20

22

24

23

25

You've heard several people describe that he's wearing a white shirt -- the person who commits -- committed all these crimes is wearing a white shirt. We had that white bullet-proof vest that would have covered that bright shirt that he's ultimately taken into custody wearing.

We have the casings along the route, the casings that match back to that gun that has his fingerprint on the magazine. The fact that that vest is found -the gun is found underneath that truck is such close proximity to where he's taken into custody. The fact that he's identified by Officer McNabb and Ricardo Quezada Robles as being the same individual that they say. There's no appreciable loss of sight between the time that Officer McNabb tries to stop the vehicle on Walnut, to the time that the Defendant goes into the backyard on El Tovar.

That course of conduct -- if he committed one of those crimes, he committed all of those crimes. It's not that one person could have committed the initial discharging from a vehicle and then there's a different person who's committing the assault with deadly weapon at the corner of Carey and Dolly. If he's guilty of one, he's guilty of all in the sense of proof that it is him in identity; not saying that we have necessarily met all of the elements. We're going to discuss that separately -- consider each of the charges separately.

But, if we've proven beyond a reasonable doubt that he committed one of them then it must be his identity as to all of them. And we have. These factors all come in together and show that there is no one else. There was no one else found in the area. A perimeter was set up. They used, you heard from Detective Jaeger, something -- and I can't remember the name of it, but that showed the heat and that there were no other people. This is not an area where they went ah, we don't see anyone and go. They're out there for several hours. It sounded like more than 12

and nearly a day.

Most, if not all the charges involve use of a deadly weapon. You have the instruction a firearm is a deadly weapon. There is no doubt that this is a firearm. This is the firearm that was used. We know because it matches the casings along the path where Officer McNabb was following the Defendant in that vehicle, the Intrepid.

So, first count, attempt murder with used of a deadly weapon. We'll just talk about the attempt murder portion because the deadly weapon portion -- we know it's a deadly weapon. Attempt murder is conduct which tends but fails to kill human being, done with express malice, namely with the deliberate intention unlawfully to kill. That has to be without legal cause, reason, meaning it's not an attempt murder if someone comes into your home, they have a weapon, you protect yourself, you shoot at them. No, you have -- you're justified, you're in your home, you're protecting yourself. That's reasonable. That wouldn't count as malice.

Also it can't be an accident or a mischance. The -- bad example, but the example, cleaning the gun, going to take it apart, accidentally shoot, it goes past someone's head. Not an attempt murder, it's an accident. Here we know that those justification and mistake are not in existence, though totality of the circumstances demonstrate for us that this was in fact an attempt to kill Officer McNabb that failed.

We have the trajectory of the injuries to the vehicle. While we can't say when those got there, it's reasonable, using our common sense that the totality of circumstances, the description given by Officer McNabb of one in the air and four fired back -- and reasonably one would expect it to be fired this way, not try and turn your hand as you're driving along. Four fired back and there are four independent lines of where a bullet would hit.

Looking at the C and D, I believe were the labels -- and you'll have the closer exhibits in the back. They have something of a straight line; however, if you look at C, that's not a hole. That is a divot. For it to be a divot, the bullet must have hit and reasonably had some turn rather than going straight. Therefore C and D arguably cannot be from the same bullet.

At very minimum, there are three for sure separate -- State's position that there's four. You heard testimony from the CSA that it was consistent with four different strikes, four different bullets. Consistent with what Officer McNabb testified was shot at him. Four attempts to hit him and kill him

The Defendant's intent is not something that we're ever going to have or at least in very, very rare circumstances will we ever have a verbalized, I'm going to go kill an officer, or written out, or any of those things. We, by the nature of our actions, can tell each other's intents by what we've done, what we're doing, and what we're going to do.

We look at the totality of circumstances; preparation, what -- how we've behaved, our reactions to determine what we're thinking, how we interact with each other. We do it on a daily basis. All of us have the ability to judge what someone else is thinking and react, otherwise we'd have a completely dysfunctional society. We wouldn't be able to walk down hallways without bumping into each other.

Looking at the Defendant's actions that night, we know his intent. He goes out with three guns, all with ammunition in that vehicle, wearing a bullet-proof vest on the outside of his clothing. He's ready to go. He is looking for an altercation. He goes out with his high beams on and when the officer attempts to stop him, he does not do what driver's do. He does not pull over, he does not slow down. He shoots in the air.

18

19

He's demonstrated his intent that night to get into an altercation and then he demonstrated his intent to end that altercation with a loss of life. He shoots in the air and when Officer McNabb doesn't respond to that warning shot, he starts shooting at Officer McNabb. He shoots five shots at Officer McNabb. He may not be a good shot, but he attempts to hit Officer McNabb five separate times with his weapon. And we have all ten of the bullets that would fit into his magazine accounted for.

When you go through the evidence we have the five that are shot from the vehicle. The bullet that is shot from the car, as testified by Officer McNabb, in the trunk of the car. We have the other five casings and then we have the final casing that could be the 11th if it was in the chamber, the Winchester that is over by the street light. Now, interesting that we have ten that are Speers and one Winchester. But arguably that Winchester is associated to this both because it is of the correct caliber for that firearm.

And if we think about sort of how we would naturally use our weapons, reload our weapons. Weapon is getting low, you reload it. Do you take out the one bullet left in the magazine and reload it with the new ones and put the old one on top. This isn't like yogurt in the refrigerator. It's not the like the bullet is going to go bad. You leave the old bullet in the bottom and you refill. So the last bullet that would have come out of that gun is going to be that last -- the first one loaded into the magazine, it makes sense that that would be the one that's a different caliber and that's consistent with the movement of that firearm along the scene of the crimes.

We have the Defendant aiming directly at the officer not just in the vehicle but when he gets out of the vehicle at the corner of Dolly and Carey. He

6

15

22

21

24

23

25

stands at that trunk of the car, he waits. He waits for the officer to arrive and aims his gun and he shoots his gun from the trunk of the car. He goes over to the street light, he again aims at the officer. And then when he's at the Nissan where, given totality of circumstances, he realizes that his gun is empty and he needs to run. He sits at the Nissan and he has that gun aimed, based on the testimony of Norayama and the Quezadas.

Looking at the video from the Wagner's home, we can see his intent because of the time. We see brake lights as he's slowing to go make that turn at 21:53 and 23 seconds. 23 seconds being the important part. At 21:53 and 52 seconds, the officer is just out of his vehicle and running after. That is 30 seconds. From the overhead shot, reasonably we know that it would not take 30 seconds to get from approximately there -- given that this is in the center of the camera shot, it would not get -- take 30 seconds for a vehicle that's going 80 but braking, to get from here to there.

That is not a 30 second travel. He should long since be either across the street or down the street by the time the officer comes to a stop. He's staying, he's waiting. He's now no longer in a moving vehicle, no longer having to deal with a moving target and making sure he doesn't hit something. Now he can stay standing and shoot at the officer who is forced to come directly at him. And attempt murder.

He misses and then something goes wrong with the gun. We don't know what. The gun was operable when it was reloaded by the firearm's examiner. Operable -- functioned properly. But she also testified that there are times that guns jam, things go wrong, it happens. Don't know what went wrong but we know that something did go wrong because he quit firing and he was manipulating the firearm.

We know that something went wrong because we have the casing -- I'm sorry, not casing. The cartridge that's outside the vehicle that was expelled from that gun having been -- having worked through the firearm, not just taken out. We know that it has the markings that show that firearm had it come up in to the chamber and then expelled from the top of the chamber.

When you're watching the video, look very closely, you'll be able to -on the disc, put it on a slower play. Obviously that's not the benefit that Officer
McNabb had in real life. You can't press pause, you can't slow down the situation.
But you'll be able to and when you do so, you'll be able to watch and look closely,
you can actually see him as he's by the vehicle, waiting for Officer McNabb to pull
up.

You can see the movement there. It's difficult because there are reflections. It's difficult because it's nighttime. And we know that the camera is not as good as one's eye, obviously. But you still have video evidence of what happened at that corner, as he lie in wait, waiting for Officer McNabb to be closer, to be a sitting duck as they say.

An attempt would be completed unless interrupted by some circumstance not intended in the original design. If we look at the totality of what we know in this case, he goes out with a bullet-proof vest, three weapons with plenty of ammunition to do what the wants to do; get in an altercation and take someone out. Why are the two weapons left in the vehicle? Because it's going differently than he planned. He's fired four shots, they haven't hit. The officer's still behind him.

Remember, when he gets out of that vehicle, the gun's still working. He still gets off a shot outside the vehicle. And by the time he realizes that there's something wrong, it's too late to get back in the vehicle and get those other two

weapons. It's too late to load the rifle. Because now the officer is stopped, is there, and is not hurt. He has to get out of there. He's guilty of the attempt murder with use of a deadly weapon.

Next ten counts, five are assault with deadly weapon and five are discharging from a vehicle. We'll go through all of the assaults instead of switching back and forth. Assault is unlawfully attempting to use physical force against another person or intentionally placing another person in reasonable apprehension of immediate bodily harm.

So, the five assault with deadly weapon counts that you have -- excuse me -- for your deliberation associate to three, sort of individual locations; individual situations. First, the fact that he's waiting until the patrol car is facing straight on Carey to shoot those two rounds, Counts 3 and 5, at the patrol car.

He shoots a shot into the air on Walnut. That's not an assault with deadly weapon because he's not intentionally placing the officer in reasonable apprehension of immediate bodily harm. The shot's in the air. There's no reasonable apprehension that that shots going to go up in the air, change direction and come back at the officer. He obviously is not attempting to use physical force on Officer McNabb because, again, the shot's in the air.

But we know that he is attempting to use physical force against Officer McNabb and Officer McNabb is in reasonable apprehension of that force when he hears a bullet go by his ear as he's on Carey, as he has now turned directly, and the Defendant has a good aim at the vehicle being completely straightened out behind him.

The Defendant again shot twice after he ran the red at Lamb. That's Counts 7 and 9. Again, these shots are coming back at the officer and they're not in

the air. We can't see them on the video. Absolutely true. But we do have that side of the vehicle that shows us where those bullets were going and that they were going backwards towards the officer, not in the air, not in some other direction.

He aimed directly at the officer's car as Officer McNabb pulls up to Dolly and that's where he shoots. That's Count 11. And we know that that's his intent based on the fact that the waited, based upon the fact that he is located where he is instead of already being down Dolly or going out to the dirt lot; that he is there waiting. We have David Wagner who testified that the first shots came from the direction of Dolly; that those were dir -- fired in the area of Dolly, coming back towards the direction of the officer.

As I mentioned, again, the vehicle corroborates the fact that we know that those bullets are coming back at Officer McNabb. He fires the warning shot. That is sort of that first step to put Officer McNabb in fear, get him off your tail, get away, or started. Officer McNabb does his job. He doesn't say, oh, you fired a gun, sorry, I'll be over here. He goes after the vehicle. He hears the bullet as it's going by and they're not in the air. He's guilty of assault with deadly weapon for each of those five shots that he fired at Officer McNabb.

Here we have where -- on the video when you slow it down you'll be able to see -- and the first few times you watch it, it may be difficult because sort of getting used to it, looking for what you're looking for. But we can see as he's standing on the corner. And the initial thought is it's grainy, can we tell which direction he's facing? But what we know about him is he has long, dark hair.

When you look closely at that, you'll see that you cannot see that long, dark hair described by some witnesses as in a ponytail, down the center of that figure. He's standing, facing Officer McNabb, waiting for Officer McNabb. He

1 | 2 | 3 | 4

shoots from the car, comes across the street, aims again, and that's where something goes wrong with the gun. He can't shoot again. We know because we have the cartridge out on the street underneath the street lamp, right in that area incidentally.

There we have where Officer McNabb is shooting and he's moving, so he's more of a blur. He's starting to move, go down Dolly. He is guilty for all of those five times that he stopped, got, and pointed the weapon at Officer McNabb and shot at Officer McNabb.

Discharging firearm from a vehicle, cut it down. He's in the vehicle. He intentionally discharges that gun, it's not an accident. It is out of the vehicle. And he's in a populated area. Obviously there's houses everywhere, you have the overhead. This is a deserted area. This is not urban. We're talk -- not rural. This is not rural. We're talking about a populated area.

Count 2 is the shot that he shoots up in the air on Walnut. Counts 4 and 6 are the two shots he shoots on Carey, just after the turn from Walnut. And Counts 8 and 9 are the two shots he shoots right after he goes through the stoplight at Lamb and Carey. Obviously he's in the vehicle, that's not a question. He's intentionally doing it. Obviously you have to point the gun outside the vehicle to shoot from the vehicle in the way that he did. There's physical evidence all over the place that supports these counts.

Looking at the map that you have and the testimony that was elicited from the CSA, we had the casing that was located at 2354 North Walnut, consistent with the shot up in the air. The casing -- and these are approximate locations, obviously. The 3945 East Carey and the 4060 East Carey. We did not have any casings that were located at Lamb and Carey, but the totality of circumstances

demonstrates to us that that is not because the shots were not fired.

It's because when the officers arrived on scene and there is a person who is armed, at least to the extent that they're aware because they haven't found the gun yet, who's willing to shoot not just at a police officer but in areas where we know there's houses, we know there's other cars; willing, really, to put the entirety of that neighborhood in danger, they're not going to stop and say wait, let's make sure that the evidence is protected before we find this guy.

We know that there were cars that are coming through Carey. We can see on the Wagner video, in fact that 18-wheeler that comes through. That's a whole lot of wheels to be picking up cartridges. There's other vehicles that come through there. We know Metro did what they could to preserve the scene as soon as it was safe to do so. They get him in custody and then they start shutting things down.

They walked that area. Multiple people walked a pretty significant distance to attempt to locate. They checked their boots. They checked the car tires of the vehicles that they reasonably could. It's not reasonable to expect them to check every car tire that could have been in that area that night. They did the best they could to find the evidence that physically supported and they in fact did find three cartridges in a very significant, frankly, distance to be looking for something that big. Much like the old adage, needle in a haystack, and they found three of them.

The testimony you heard from Maurine Palmer who lives -- lived at 2409 Walnut Road further corroborates that there was the discharging from the vehicle. She talked about seeing the taillights. She talked about having heard the three sets of pops. She also talked about having heard an argument. Reasonably

She also told us the last pop that she heard, it was further up Carey, she thought it was close to her sister's apartment or sister's home and that here sister lived at 4080. We know that that third casing was located at 4060. Everything that she said is corroborated here by testimony of other witnesses, by the test -- or by the physical evidence. This all comes back and corroborates Officer McNabb's rendition of what occurred in those two or so minutes from the time that he tried to stop the car, to the time that the Defendant was hiding in the backyard.

Stop required on signal of a police officer is when a driver intentionally refuses to stop the vehicle, flees or attempts to allude the police officer in a notable vehicle. I'm not going to spend any time on that, obviously it's a patrol car. He's given the signal to stop the vehicle and he operates the vehicle in a way that is likely to endanger himself or others. I'm sorry. Is likely to endanger others, being other -- being people or people's property.

Clearly he knew Officer McNabb was trying to stop him. The vehicle in between Officer McNabb and the Defendant's vehicle pulled over without an issue. It knew. There's no reason to believe that the Defendant did not know that those lights were intended for him. And in fact, his conduct shows us that he knew that they were intended for him; his shooting of the single shot out of the window, his speeding up, his running the stop sign, his running the red light.

All of those things show us that he knew what was going on. It's not normal behavior for someone just driving down the street, even here in Las Vegas. There were other cars on the road, he's putting those people in danger as he's running the stop sign, as he's running the red light. Neighborhood's -- granted it's

5 6

7 8 9

11

10

13

12

15

14

16

18

17

19

20 21

22

24

23

25

10:45 at night, but we also know based on the testimony of all the witnesses, there's still people out, there's still children playing outside in this neighborhood, at that time of night. Driving 80 miles per hour down a residential. Even if a main thoroughfare in that residential area, is putting people in danger.

Now the stop required on signal of an officer does delineate that that signal is a red flashing light and sirens. We know from the video that the siren was put on just before Lamb, but there is no distance requirement. There's nowhere in that rendition of elements that says for at least 50 feet, or must happen over a mile. What we know is that after that lights and sirens are put on, he's still going approximately 80 miles per hour, he in fact crashes the vehicle that belongs to Eufrasia, and it's residential and we know that from the Wagner video; from the front of their house it actually watches him fly by. He is guilty of stop required on signal of an officer.

Resisting with a firearm is a person who willfully resists, delays, or obstructs a police officer from doing his job with the use of a firearm. Officer attempted to stop for the brights, the officer then had probable cause and reason to stop him for the assault with deadly weapon, for the discharging of the firearm out of the vehicle. When the Defendant got out of his vehicle, pointed the firearm at Officer McNabb and refused to stop, refused to comply with what was clearly the officer trying to stop him, he resisted with use of firearm.

He continued to run, he continued to obstruct. There's no question that he knew that what he -- was expected of him at that point was to stop. He avoided being put into cust -- well he didn't avoid it, but he delayed it. He delayed being put into custody with the use of that firearm, by running and by not complying with officer's lights, sirens, and clear expectation that he stop.

Altered or obliterated serial number. We know from the testimony of Anya Lester that the firearm, the .25 that was -- caliber that was in the vehicle had the serial number obliterated. How do we know that he knew that it was obliterated? Well there was the question from the jurors, was this firearm was registered. As we know there has to be a serial number to register a firearm. Reasonably speaking he was in possession of the firearm. It was the magazine that went to the rifle. There's plenty to show that he knew that this was in the vehicle and to know that he possessed it.

Going to the issue of possession. The gun does not belong to Eufrasia. You heard her testimony, she's got kiddos in the house, she doesn't want guns in the house, she doesn't like guns. She doesn't have them in the car. She didn't own guns. She also told us that the Defendant was in her vehicle, that she had given her vehicle to the Defendant, that he had been looking a few days earlier to find a place to put these guns and she said no, not in my apartment.

MS. NGUYEN: Objection, Your Honor, stating facts not in evidence.

THE COURT: Just remember Jury Instruction Number 7 and 37, I think -- or 36, tells you that what the attorneys say is not evidence.

MS. THOMSON: Thank you.

THE COURT: Go ahead.

BY MS. THOMSON:

We know that the gun is loaded which means obviously it's been handled, it's not a brand new weapon as we can say by its condition in the photographs provided by Anya Lester when she did the examination. And we know that he's had it for a while. The testimony from Ms. Nazaroff was that it had been years since she'd seen him with it, but we also have her statement to the detective

that it'd been just a few days.

The credibility or believability of a witness is determined by you. You judge the reasonableness of what they're saying, their opportunity to have seen it, how they respond on the stand, and questions, how they react. And you get to decide what they are being truthful about, what they're accurate on, and what they're not being truthful and what they're not accurate about. If you believe that someone has lied, you may disregard any of their testimony if it is not basically corroborated by other evidence.

Now there's a difference between a lie and a mistake. We make mistakes as human beings often, some people lie often, and you get to decide if it's a lie or a mistake. The difference is lie is that malicious kind of misleading. And mistake is generally speaking honest. We had several situations in which we had differing evidence that you'll have to decide if the people were telling the truth, if they were lying, if they were mistaken.

For example, the testimony regarding shots fired at the front of the white Nissan. We had Jose and Norayama testify that they heard, they saw the Defendant fire the shots, I believe the testimony was three, at the front of the white Nissan. We had Ricardo say no, he just pointed, he didn't fire any shots. Physical evidence would tend to suggest that he did not fire shots at the front of the Nissan.

Does this mean that Norayama and Jose are lying? Well first, there's no indication that they know each other so there wouldn't have been an opportunity to get together and say hey, what are you going to say; I'll say this; let's make this up. So, what can we reasonably deduce from the facts as we know them? Officer McNabb comes up to the end of Dolly, he fires three shots at the silhouette that he sees at the end of El Tovar.

IS it possible, particularly given what we know about the timeline in the body cam that the memories are mistaken? They hear the three shots, that they see him at the front of the car, and whether he's already at the front of the car when those three shots are fired and they misassociate it, or it all smushes together in their mind when they're retelling it later and they associate those three shots to the man that they see with the gun, which is reasonable. Are they lying or did the just misperceive what was going on?

David Wagner, another example of is he lying or does he misperceive or misremember? He indicated that he heard several shots from the .45. We know that only one shot was fired from the .45 that would have made any sound at the corner of Dolly and Carey. Does he misremember? Is he bolstering himself, oh, I know a lot about guns? We know that there is a sound that is associated to a .45 that would have occurred at the corner of Dolly and Carey. Is he lying to you or does he misremember?

Eufrasia Nazaroff talking about the bullet-proof vest, she testified here that she didn't say anything about a bullet-proof vest. I believe that her statements were she knew nothing about the bullet-proof vest. You heard from Detective Hodson that in fact she had made statements about seeing him wearing it over his shirt the night before.

You get to judge the reasons someone might state what they're stating. With the exception of Eufrasia and arguable Officer McNabb, no one else who testified has any interest in what happens. They're people who live on a street. They're CSAs who go out to every crime scene that they're called to. They have no particular interest in this case, they have no dog in the fight. The reasons that she might have -- for testifying in a certain way, what she might think is helpful to one

side or another, you can consider that.

Another example is Officer Ferranti who indicated that he had trained Officer McNabb in the body cam. Officer McNabb, being the one who actually got the body cam, it's reasonable that he would remember having been trained. Officer Ferranti who trains all of the people who have body cam -- and I think the testimony was there's nearly 175 on the streets.

The idea that he has filled in that gap in his memory, I train everyone who has body cam and therefore I trained Officer McNabb, versus Officer McNabb who says no, I was there, I didn't get trained. Is he wrong? Is he lying? Reasonably speaking we can use totality of circumstances to help determine when there is a maliciousness in the statement that's made; an intent to mislead.

There are two different kinds of witnesses in this case. There are the law enforcement witnesses and there are the citizen witnesses. Quite a few witnesses all together. But all of those witnesses ultimately corroborate what Officer McNabb said happened that night. McNabb's description of the event is corroborated by the physical evidence. We have the casings along Walnut, along Carey. We have the cartridges that are found at Dolly and Carey. The cartridges that would be associated to his manipulation -- not Officer McNabb's -- the Defense manipulation of the firearm when something's not just going right.

We have the body cam that supports his rendition of events. And consider the things that he says on that body cam when he's talking to dispatch. He doesn't know how this is going to end. He would not be in the position, nor did he really have the time to come up with some sort of story or event, to tell lies about what was going on at that moment.

Maurine Palmer, the Wagners, the video that they have, the testimony

1 | fr 2 | he 3 | pe 4 | hi 5 | al 6 | tc 7 | tc

9

10

11

12 13 14

16

17

15

18 19

2122

20

23

25

24

from Ms. Palmer who has no relationship to any of the parties all corroborate what he says happened. The Quezadas who have had the interesting and unique perspective of being able to watch the Defendant when no one else could see him -- Norayama could see him, but they had the virtually directly across the street ability to watch what he was doing as he's setting up and waiting for Officer McNabb to come around the corner, to take him out; the last and final attempt that turned out to not work out because he was out of bullets. Gloria Guillen who testified that the man was in the back; he looked scary, he looked desperate. And Norayama, I already did.

Additionally, there are quite a few pieces of evidence that support Officer McNabb's identification of the Defendant as the individual who was involved in this. The fact that the Defendant had Ms. Nazaroff's car, that she had seen him with the gun before; specifically the one that was used to shoot at Officer McNabb. The fact that he's wearing -- that he describes the Defendant's wearing the bullet-proof vest, that he describes, more specifically, the Defendant as wearing all white. He sees white, he calls out white.

In fact what we end up finding out is that he did have what appeared to be a full white outfit. The khakis in the dark would look white. The white bullet-proof vest is the to -- the majority of his body. The fact that you have this lime or highlighter color on the arms, what's going to stick is the white that is called out by Officer McNabb. The fact that we have the Defendant hiding in the backyard with no one else and the ID's by Ricardo and Norayama. Officer McNabb's version of events is corroborated over and over along that path where the Defendant attempted to kill him.

To believe the Defendant did not commit these crimes you have to

1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

believe that someone, either he gave or they stole the car that he had just been given by his children's mother, that they took the keys, and that they had his guns in the car, and you have to believe, at least with regard to the shooting weapon that it is believe the thumbprint that is on the magazine, or they separately stole the magazine and put it into the gun.

That he happened to be approximately ten miles from where he got that car when this person took the car, started this altercation with Officer McNabb, that that individual then hid the tools of the crime, being the vest and the gun, feet from where the Defendant happened to end being -- hiding. That he was hiding from some introduce reason unassociated to these crimes; that he either didn't hear or this innocent reason was enough for him not to respond to the police officers who are there saying we will bite you with our dog.

And you heard quite a few questions that sort of elicited that's not a pleasant experience. I don't think any of us would think that being bitten by a dog is a pleasant experience. And that this person who either stole his car, set him up with the bullet-proof vest and the gun also just happened to match his pretty unique description. It's unreasonable.

I told you, you can watch the body camera in the back and I'll have you watch just the period of time as Officer McNabb comes up to the corner and as he goes down the corner to El Tovar.

[Colloquy between Counsel]
[Body cam video playing]

BY MS. THOMSON:

And I have the sound off because it sounds really quite strange on the slower speed.

Rough Draft Transcript, Volume III - Page 183

1	[Body cam video continues playing]
2	BY MS. THOMSON:
3	But looking at the time, it'll be about 1:11 that he stops the vehicle up at
4	the corner of Dolly.
5	[Body cam video continues playing]
6	BY MS. THOMSON:
7	And as you watch the corner of Dolly, watch the Defendant's vehicle,
8	and you can see as he is by his vehicle, Officer McNabb is getting out of the car and
9	preparing to pull his firearm as the Defendant is walk running across the street.
10	So we can't see him run across the street but then we do see him again on the
11	corner of Dolly and Carey and we see the front of him as we saw in the stills earlier.
12	[Body cam video continues playing]
13	BY MS. THOMSON:
14	Coming up where the car is stopped.
15	[Body cam video continues playing]
16	BY MS. THOMSON:
17	The lime colored shirt.
18	[Body cam video continues playing]
19	BY MS. THOMSON:
20	Officer McNabb is now getting out of his vehicle and we lose sight of
21	the corner as he does so. But as he turns, gets out his weapon, he sees the
22	Defendant. As the officer is shooting we can see him running down the street.
23	You will have the ability to watch this play slowly in the back. Right
24	click and there is a banner that comes up and it is video speed and you can set it
25	back to I think at this point we're at .25, instead full speed.

[Body cam video continues playing]

BY MS. THOMSON:

To further corroborate that the Defendant was staying at the car, waiting for Officer McNabb to arrive, we actually have the time that's spent here. And we know that Officer McNabb is not running full speed as he's coming up to that corner because it would not be wise, he's coming into a blind corner. Even with that, it takes him 10, 15 seconds to go the distance of his car to this corner and that's I think it over estimate -- estimation you'll have the timeline and the video in the back to look more specifically.

But the distance from his car to the corner is certainly shorter than the distance from the Intrepid across the street to Dolly -- or across the street on Dolly [Body cam video continues playing]

BY MS. THOMSON:

We see the brights that are the cause for this stop and the car as he looks at it -- as he checks and ensures that there's not someone else in the car; the fact that we really only have one person in that car. Only one person who's guilty of all these crimes.

[Body cam video continues playing]

BY MS. THOMSON:

We also at the slower speed have the benefit of seeing that there is in fact a street light at the corner of El Tovar and Dolly. And while it is dark on El Tovar, it is not pitch black; that there are street lights working both on the apartments and street lights on the street.

[Body cam video continues playing]

BY MS. THOMSON:

Rough Draft Transcript, Volume III - Page 185

And as he comes around the corner -- as he's inching around the corner as he described in his testimony so that he has an opportunity to get back behind cover if the Defendant's waiting on the other side.

[Body cam video continues playing]

BY MS. THOMSON:

We also know that this camera is a night vision. It's not completely [indiscernible] -- we can see -- it seems a lot darker when it's moving at full speed, but as we go into the slower speeds we can see that he can actually see the officer.

[Body cam video continues playing]

BY MS. THOMSON:

As he's checking and then waiting for backup. As you're watching the video also note as it goes further down the line of the video, how many patrol cars are actually on scene. There are several sets of light and they're hard to see when you pause the video, but you can see that there are innumerous different vehicles actually just on El Tovar and we know that El Tovar is a cul-de-sac, meaning that those vehicles had to have come in off of Dolly.

You're instructed that you must your everyday common sense in your consideration of this case. And this sort of brings in the need when we talk about direct evidence and circumstantial evidence. Circumstantial evidence being that evidence where you use your common sense; A, plus B, must equal C. However, common sense isn't speculation or a guess. You don't get to guess if this or guess if that. You can make reasonable deductions based on what we already know.

For example, situations where you will need to use your common sense. There are three casings Officer McNabb talked about, six shots. We know that there were more than six shots fired from the surrounding testimony, what other

5

7 8

6

10

11

9

12 13

14 15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

individuals heard, and from what Officer McNabb is saying as he's following the Defendant's car down the street. Reasonably speaking what does common sense tell us? These are busy roads, we know that only is there the traditional traffic on these roads but also the influx of police cars to respond to this incredibly during emergency.

The Defendant's intent, as I said, not something where you have him saying this is my plan. You get to use your common sense, looking at his behaviors, looking at his preparation, looking at what he did that night to be able to deduce that his intent was to kill Officer McNabb.

The fact that the shots are aimed at the officer. Officer McNabb testified he couldn't see the muzzle flash from the gun, other than the one that was fired up directly into the air and the one that was fired at him at the corner of Carey and Dolly; that that one was just a circle. But we know, because of the circumstantial evidence that those shots were fired at Officer McNabb from the vehicle. They fact of the trajectory, the fact that he heard the bullet go by his ear, you can use your common sense and make the deduction that the gun is in fact aimed back at Officer McNabb.

The totality of the evidence, after your consideration and deliberation will show and has shown beyond a reasonable doubt that the Defendant is guilty of all 13 counts charged against him; of the attempt murder with use of a deadly weapon, all five of the discharging from the vehicle, all five of the assault with deadly weapon, resisting with firearm, and possession of firearm with alterated [sic] -altered or obliterated serial number. And we'd ask that you find him guilty of all 13 counts. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you. Counsel.

MS. NGUYEN: I'm ready.

2

[Rubbing hands together], sorry. I'm a little cold.

3

CLOSING ARGUMENT FOR THE DEFENSE

4

BY MS. NGUYEN:

5

6

You heard the State talk about kind of the long standing principle of our country, of our system of justice that all citizens accused of a crime are guilty until

7

proven innocent. When I thought was interesting is when the State --

8

THE COURT: Wait.

9

MS. NGUYEN: Oh.

10

THE COURT: They're all innocent until proven guilty.

11

MS. NGUYEN: I'm sorry. Innocent until proven guilty. Sorry. Everyone

12

caught me. See, everyone knows.

13

BY MS. NGUYEN:

14

One of the things that I thought was interesting is the State indicated if

15

you find him guilty of this, you find him guilty of everything and that is exactly what

16

you will not be able to do. Your job is to look at each one of these counts

17

individually. It's your job not to just blanket over everything with either a guilt or

18

innocence. You must look at each one of these charges individually to determine

19

whether or not the evidence, the testimony, and everything that you heard today

20

gave you enough to show -- the State gave you enough to show each one of those

21

elements of each one of those crimes

22

23

beyond a reasonable doubt someone's guilt, they also have in their discretion what

In this case, the State has a lot of power. With that burden to prove

24

charges they are going to bring against every individual. In this case they've chose

25

to bring the charges that were brought on here and I encourage you to look at each

Rough Draft Transcript, Volume III - Page 188

one of those individually during your deliberation.

You saw there was a lot of focus on forensic testimony and I think that's important and I think that it's important to corroborate human testimony and human observance. You saw right away that humans are human. They are nervous, they are excited, there's adrenaline rushing, and especially in a circumstance like this there is excitement, there's lots of things that could cloud your memory or your perception of an event.

I think of even Officer McNabb, at one point, he had thought he had fired so many rounds off of his gun that he actually unloaded his clip and reloaded his clip when it turns out he didn't need to do that but he thought he had shot so many rounds out of his gun that that was his perception at the time. He had fired so much that he had to reload and shoot some more.

Was he lying about that? No. I don't think it was intentional. Just like had the State had mentioned, you know, are these misunderstandings? Are these misconceptions? Are they exaggerated? Are people bolstering to make themselves seem braver or strong? You know, there are a lot of different circumstances and I don't think they're malicious.

We heard testimony, like the State had mentioned from several lay witnesses that had indicated that there were shots fired on El Tovar behind the Nissan -- the truck -- the white truck. Even the State contends that there were no shots fired in that area and we know that there was no shell casings or anything from a Colt .45, the gun that was located under that car, anywhere in and around that neighborhood.

But obviously that was the testimony and that was the perception of those individuals that said they were watching that. Were they lying? No, I don't 1 2 3

think that they intentionally lying or intentionally being misleading. But that's just the nature of being human beings I think is that sometimes we're fallible to, you know, the excitement, the adrenaline, the fear, the excitement of a circumstance or a situation that we find our self in.

I think that's important because in this case we're very lucky because we have other forensic evidence that isn't fallible to some of those same problems like fear, and emotions, and adrenaline. We have shell casings, we have a body camera video, we have a video from a -- surveillance from a citizen's house. We have some other things that can help corroborate and come help like explain the story and fill in those gaps, clarify people's human perception, and I think that's important.

A lot of times we heard things about how the camera on a body camera isn't necessarily as clear as like the human eye and that may be true, you may have more than eight megapixels in your own eyes when you're observing things and you might have not as much glare or you might have more glare if you're wearing glasses like Officer McNabb. Or you might have some other things like the adrenaline, the fear, the excitement of a situation. So in that respect the body camera might actually be a better indication of what actually occurred.

What I would encourage everyone to do is to watch that body camera because I think it is important. And I think it's important not just to watch it from the end where you see they come to a stop there at Carey and Dolly, but also from the beginning when that first -- he first taps on the camera, including the 30 seconds before that when you don't hear any audio, but that's the back capture. I don't know if you recall that, they said on the body camera, it'll capture the 30 seconds before he actually turned it on. I think it's important to listen to that and watch that with your

own eyes because that's going to corroborate his thing.

In combination with that, we heard testimony of the extensive police response to this situation. We had swing shift police officers, we had graveyard officers that all responded to this unit. We had administrators, we had a sergeant from the body cam, we had someone from -- a FIT detective, we had lots of individuals that all came to this scene. Quarantined -- blocked off this entire like mile and a half period. Didn't allow cars in and out when they finally were able to block off that area. Canvassed and scoured that area.

We heard from the CSA Rebecca, she indicated that she -- or Brenda who had gone through herself and had walked from Walnut all the way down to the Lamb location herself and scoured that area. You heard the detective talk about how he actually walked that entire area with a team, I think he said of four people, and they covered that whole area at night when it first occurred and also during the daylight hours so they could see better. He had indicated that in all the areas they went to look for strike shots where bullets may have landed and they weren't able to find anything.

What they were able to find though was three casings and then they were able to find all of the casings that Officer McNabb made. So in all of this the State indicates that there were cars traveling through and they probably got into a car tread and drove away. Well it's interesting that the only ones that didn't drive away were all of the ones that were shot by Officer McNabb and I think that's important because like I said, we can't just paint a, you know, paintbrush over the entire thing and say well, if we found guilty on one, we're going to find guilty on all of these charges. I think it's important to find where things are corroborated.

I'm going to start with Count 1 and just -- not to belabor and go over all

1 | 0°
2 | a°
3 | Ir
4 | S
5 | m

of the elements, and of all of the cases, and of all of the charges, but I think looking at Count 1, the attempt murder with the use of a deadly weapon, if you go to Instruction Number 10, I think it's important to look at that instruction because as the State pointed out they have to show intention. And as of yet we can't get in people's minds and determine what their intent was or what's going on in their mind and we do look at the circumstances.

But in this case I believe that the State has not shown you beyond a reasonable doubt that Joshua intended to kill Ryan McNabb. I don't believe that this is a case that we have someone, as they portrayed him, lying in wait. I don't think this is a situation where we had someone who was acting as a sniper, attempting to kill an individual. If anything it sounds like the shooting or discharging the firearm was done, at best, in a reckless manner.

We heard that there was testimony that a shot went up into the air and we heard testimony from Officer McNabb and you can see from the video that he never actually saw any weapon being pointed out of a car at him. And I encourage you to review that video, along with your memory and your notes of the testimony of Officer McNabb regarding any shots that were fired along Walnut, on to Carey, and then ultimately where it ended.

I think it's also important to look at the assault with use of a deadly weapon charges. You'll see for the first shot that the State alleges occurred on Walnut, they don't charge an assault with a deadly weapon. And as you heard the District Attorney said the reason they didn't was because there was no reasonable apprehension of fear, the shot was up in the air, you know, Officer McNabb didn't think it was going to come down and fall on him and so they did not charge that charge.

However, they did charge for several other charges that they are alleging occurred along with a discharge of a firearm, even though there isn't any evidence that any firearm was pointed at them. And if anything it was -- I think you heard testimony that one shot -- he heard shots and one shot he felt or heard -- or felt something go by the side of his car. And so I don't think the State has been able to show that.

With respect to the Counts 8, 9, 10 and 11, if you look at Jury Instruction, I think it's 2 -- 3. 3 -- Instruction 3. You'll see all of the listed charges on Instruction 3, which is those three -- four pages there. And if you look at Counts 8, 9, and 10, these are the shots that Officer McNabb indicated occurred in the area of Carey and Lamb.

And if you recall that is also the same area and the same place where Officer McNabb said that he actually lose the suspect vehicle because the vehicle went through the red stop sign there and he was forced to slow down to make sure that there were no cars that were impeding his ability. And that probably accounts for the 30 second or so delay you see towards the end of this where Officer McNabb comes into the picture later.

In that case, again, there are no shell casings in that area that were ever recovered regarding any shots that were fired at that time. Again, there's -- there was some testimony by Officer McNabb and I would say that his memory is a little bit similar to the lay witnesses that testified that there were shots fired on El Tovar.

I think the State conceded that there were no shots fired at El Tovar and Dolly and I think that Officer McNabb is mistaken that there was any shots fired right here on Dolly and Carey. And that's where the vehicle came to a stop. That's

where we were able to see three bullets that had been possibly expended from a firearm but were not actually shot and I think that's important.

And again, I don't think that has anything to do with anyone intentionally lying or anything. I just think that it's important to match up the human testimony and the human experience and combine that with the forensic science that doesn't have that emotional involvement in a case.

THE COURT: Counsel, just cautionary. What we think doesn't matter.

MS. NGUYEN: Okay.

THE COURT: You're saying I think, I think and I haven't stopped you, I let you go, but what you think doesn't matter.

MS. NGUYEN: What you think matters.

THE COURT: Stick to the evidence. Thanks.

BY MS. NGUYEN:

With respect to the last charge, the possession of a firearm with an altered or obliterated serial number, this is related to the Colt .25. This isn't related to the Colt .45 that was located under the Nissan truck. This is related to the gun that was located in a vehicle owned by Eufrasia Nazaroff.

We heard testimony that that firearm was located inside a black bag within that vehicle. We heard testimony that there was no positive fingerprints on that firearm. We heard that there was DNA that came back to put my client or anyone with that firearm. So I don't believe the State -- I don't believe. The State has not proved beyond a reasonable doubt that charge in this case.

Again, we're all human beings. We are all influenced in our perception and our memories are all influence by real human behavior, real human emotions, both biologically and emotionally, and I think -- and that is what happened in this

case and that is what you have heard in this case and that is what you have heard through the human testimony.

Please review the forensic testimony that was presented to you in this case. Please review the forensic evidence that was collected at the scene so thoroughly. Please review those videos and after you do that I believe you will come back with not guilty verdicts.

REBUTTAL CLOSING ARGUMENT BY THE STATE

BY MR. FATTIG:

Good afternoon. I know it's been a long three days. It's kind of chilly in here. Normally I like it cold.

Judge Smith, the other day, on Monday when we were doing the voir dire said something I fully agree with. He talked about the jury system and the American criminal justice system and how it's the best on earth. And I think the reason for that is the jury system. We take 12 individuals, 12 people who indicate they can be fair, who all take an oath to follow the law, and we ask you to work as a team.

And when we do that we recognize in the law there's a series of stock instructions. They're given to every criminal jury. And one of those stock instructions, we -- the lawyers call a common sense instruction and it's Instruction Number 32 and I think it basically recognizes --

THE COURT: I'd just remind you, it doesn't matter what you think.

MR. FATTIG: I apologize.

THE COURT: It's all right.

BY MR. FATTIG:

It recognizes that each one of you has lived a full life. Each one of you

comes into this room on Monday with a lot of intelligence, a lot of common experiences in life. And the system doesn't tell you to forget about that. In fact the system says you must bring to the consideration your everyday common sense when you came into this room on Monday. You draw reasonable inferences from the evidence using that common sense.

So when you do that, what do you find? Well let's take a look at a couple pieces of evidence. First of all, State's 203. It's a *Facebook*, granted I think it's less than eight megapixels on this particular camera. Not a great picture, but it's a picture of a gun posted on a *Facebook* account belonging I would submit, using your common sense, to Joshua Bacharach.

The evidence was that Joshua Bacharach had photos of himself on the this same account and Joshua Bacharach made a posting, I would submit, on June 21st of 2013, .45, big bro, next to this picture of a firearm. State's 109 shows the -- I would submit, that same firearm; the weapon used by Joshua Bacharach in his attempt to murder Officer Ryan McNabb.

Is this not the same gun? Well, maybe not, right? We don't know that serial number on it. Who would have the motivation though to place -- to set up Joshua Bacharach the year before? Joshua Bacharach made that posting. That was his gun, ladies and gentlemen. Fingerprint on the magazine, left thumbprint, corroborative, additional evidence, along with everything else.

Ms. Nguyen commented about some of Ms. Thomson's argument when she said -- and she certainly wasn't trying to suggest if he's guilty of one, he's automatically guilty of all. What she was arguing was, this is not an ID case in that. There aren't multiple suspects here. You find that Joshua Bacharach was that person, then that person is responsible for each of these. This isn't two different

people. Clearly by the timeline, by the other evidence, the body camera, there's only one person responsible.

And I would certainly suggest that this is not an identity case. That his case involves around intent. This case, Joshua Bacharach was driving that car.

Joshua Bacharach was in that vest. Joshua Bacharach had that gun, fired it. The issues you need to consider, I would to submit to you, involve around what he was trying to do with his actions.

Defense Counsel indicates he's not lying in wait. Okay. What is he trying to do? Let's consider these questions in light of Instruction Number 5, defines for you reasonable doubt: Reasonable doubt is one based on reason. It is not mere possible doubt.

And then at the bottom of that same paragraph: Doubt, to be reasonable, must be actual, not mere possibility or speculation.

Is there a reasonable doubt that Joshua Bacharach was trying to kill Officer Ryan McNabb? Or did we prove beyond a reasonable doubt that that was his intent? We have a shot as Officer McNabb goes around the corner on Walnut on to Carey. We have the first shot around the corner, buzzes past his ear. You can in the body came video he keeps his -- he kept his window halfway down and he testified about that.

This is the summer but he wants -- he's been trained to keep the windows down so he can be more aware of his surroundings. The bullet flies right past his left ear. There's a second shot right after that. And I know you -- everyone here has been very observant of the courtroom. I'm sure you've observed Joshua Bacharach this week. There's been various times he's been writing. I would submit the same hand he's uses to right was the same hand --

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

16

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. NGUYEN: Objection, Your Honor.

MR. FATTIG: -- he shot.

THE COURT: I -- okay. I just remind you what you remember the evidence to be, Jury Instruction 7 and I think 36 tell you that what the lawyers in arguments are not evidence.

MS. NGUYEN: And Your Honor, I would just say that it's a comment on his constitutional rights.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. FATTIG: His constitutional right to write? They can observe on that. BY MR. FATTIG:

The right hand, I would submit, using your common sense, was used by Joshua Bacharach to shoot out the driver's side window of his car at Officer McNabb.

Okay. Is he successful? No, obviously, right? We have Officer McNabb with no wounds, thankfully. But look at the intent, okay? Do you acquit Joshua Bacharach because he's a bad shot? I would submit, no when the evidence proves intent, intent to kill when Joshua Bacharach is repeatedly firing a gun out that driver's side window behind him towards Officer McNabb he is attempting to kill Officer McNabb. And we know four shots went down that driver's side, from front to back. And we know from the video Officer McNabb is following him.

These aren't shots up in the air like Walnut. And I know Counsel comments that, you know, the first Walnut shot we don't fire -- we don't charge assault with a deadly weapon. It's true. But we do charge it on the other shots because there's corroborative evidence. Officer McNabb is close enough on Walnut to see the shot going up into the air, okay? Later on there's some distance there. In fact, after -- when he's over on Lamb he has to stop because there's citizens in cars.

So, obviously, Joshua Bacharach who didn't stop, who sailed right through a solid right light of our community, Joshua Bacharach gets some space on him. He doesn't see where those shots are coming. We have to look at the corroborative physical evidence. And there is four different ones on the side of that car; four different sets of markings. That's assault with a deadly weapon.

Officer McNabb of course is in reasonable apprehension of bodily harm at that point. He's just had moments before a bullet whizz by his left ear. He knows this guy is shooting at him and he hears more shots. He doesn't have to see the gun pointed out at him during that time period in order to not be placed in reasonable apprehension of bodily harm. And the side damage to Joshua Bacharach's vehicle that he was -- Eufrasia's vehicle but Joshua was driving it shows that the bullets were coming out, towards Officer McNabb, not into the air at that point.

Counsel talks about the body camera and of course it corroborates

Officer McNabb, but of course it doesn't corroborates Officer McNabb in its entirety.

You've heard that and your common sense tells you that. The human ear is better
than the microphone on top of the camera as it's pointed to the top of the patrol car's
ceiling. The human eyes are better than an eight megapixel tiny little camera. The
human head -- the range of motion can move and observe, as opposed to a little
camera that is affixed via magnet to his shirt collar.

And as Officer McNabb pulls up on the corner of Dolly and Carey,
Defense suggests that he is mistaken about what happened there because we don't
have a casing. I would submit when Joshua Bacharach is pointing that gun
gangster style, as described by Ryan McNabb, the casing can fly up and back and

end up we don't know where. Does that indicate that Officer McNabb didn't see what he saw?

Officer McNabb is pulling up to a situation, a car that is gaining on him, now suddenly has pulled over, the guy has gotten out, and Officer McNabb comes up and he sees the man, gangster style pointed at him and he sees a muzzle flash and he notes it's pointed at him. Do you think that's a memory that Officer McNabb would be mistaken about? Do you think that might just be a little bit engrained in his memory? In his soul?

Life changing, even if he wasn't struck by the bullet. He's not mistaken about that. Look through your instructions. If there's an instruction in there that says if a count isn't supported by forensic evidence, if you don't find the casing, then you must acquit, then go back there and talk about that, come out here and tell him he's innocent. But guess what? When you look at all those instructions, you're not going to find that instruction, because it doesn't exist. That's not the law.

Use the law that actually exists and apply it to the evidence. There's no fingerprints, there's no DNA on the gun in the car in that black bag. So clearly he's not in possession of an obliterated serial number with a firearm. Acquit him. That's what they want. How does the gun into that bag? What does the evidence show? Is that Eufrasia's gun? Doesn't she have every incentive to come in here and take the fall? What are her motivations? She doesn't do that. They're not her guns. They're Joshua Bacharach's guns.

When Joshua Bacharach repeatedly fired that gun, his intent when he shot was to kill. He pulled his car over at Dolly and Carey. He made that decision. I would note when he made that decision he's gaining ground on Officer McNabb because of the stoplight. He could have continued to flee, right?

6

7

17 18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

He could have done a lot of things. He could have driven in a side neighborhood, park the car, ditched it, gone into a backyard. He could have attempted to just continue driving. He was gaining distance. What did he do? I would certainly submit that he lied in wait and it was because of his intent. His intent to kill.

It's a conscious decision. You see the Wagner video -- the surveillance video. He's applying his brakes. He immediately hops out of that car, around the back with the same weapon he had been using and now there's certainly some issues going on. There's two cartridges that end up on the floorboard, there's two cartridges that end up in the desert, right by the car, but he gets off a sixth shot.

Officer McNabb sees him, he testifies he believed it was about 35 to 40 yards away. Now when you look at the crime scene diagram I think you're going to see maybe it was a little bit farther, about 45 yards, give or take. McNabb sees at him -- shoot at him. And what does the Defendant do? He then moves towards the -- behind the white pole. He's facing Officer McNabb.

At this point Officer McNabb is able to get out of the car and react. And the Defendant hightails it out of there, dropping another casing -- not a casing, a full cartridge, unfired. Running to the corner at El Tovar, getting behind the white truck, and we have multiple witnesses indicating he posted up yet again. Yet again lying in wait. Attempted murder. Of course he's got a problem at this point. There's no llammunition.

I have an item here that's going to link me to the attempted murder of a police officer. I'm wearing a white bullet-proof vest, I'm on a darkened cul-de-sac with no weapons. Get rid of it. This doesn't serve me any good anymore. This incriminates me to extremely serious crimes. So does the vest, I would submit.

4

5

6

7 8 10

12 13

11

15

14

16 17

18 19

20 21

22

23

24

25

Change your description, change your clothing. Dump the vest, dump the gun right where you are, tuck it underneath, I got to get out of here. You go where you can. The darkened backyard. And you lay there and you hope to God you're not found. Because if you are one day you just might be held accountable.

I would submit, ladies and gentlemen, there's overwhelming evidence he was trying to kill Officer Ryan McNabb. Beyond a reasonable doubt. Doubt must be actual. Is there reasonable doubt? I would submit to you, ladies and gentlemen, this is the same standard. It is not an unreachable burden. It's the same standard used in every criminal case here in Nevada. It doesn't matter if the case is as minor as operating a car with high beams on it or as serious as the attempted murder of a police officer. Judges and juries find it's satisfied all the time.

I want to talk a little bit about the calls you heard and I certainly recognize that at times it sounds like a Peanuts episode. So I ask that you listen to them more carefully in a better environment in the deliberation room when you can hear them. But the July 12th call to Eufrasia, the Defendant talks with her about if she's going to show up to testify and she says, you know, I've been subpoenaed to testify.

And the Defendant makes some statements if she shows up to testify that she would be incriminating it. And the Defendant of course knows in his mind that if he's found in the car that means he is the guy that ran from the police at high speeds while shooting at the officer. So the Defendant in that call I would submit -- and listen to it -- tried to deny something that Eufrasia knows is true. And that is that he was driving the Dodge Intrepid on June 26th.

> Defendant at one point says, quote: I don't know who had my car. And he calls it my car.

Eufrasia responds, quote: You had my car, you asshole, end quote.

Defendant responds: No, I didn't.

Eufrasia: You didn't have any car?

Defendant: Somebody, I don't know -- somebody else must have been driving it.

And how does Eufrasia respond to that?

Oh, my God. She knows. She knows he knows.

But the Defendant says well, quote: Because they didn't find me in no car, stupid ass. You're supposed to be innocent until you're proven guilty.

He wasn't found in that car. Does that mean he wasn't driving that car?

There's a tremendous responsibility being in my position. The person speaking last. Speaking last for the State, for the community, and trying to convince you to find the Defendant guilty beyond a reasonable doubt and trying to convince you. It's a tremendous responsibility and weight until you realize that each one of you has taken an oath to do equal and exact justice between the State, between the community, and the Defendant.

Each one of you wants to do the right thing and that relieves a great amount of responsibility on me because I trust in you. And I trust in you partly because during voir dire we had a packed house and not everyone made it up here, but everyone that made it up here, all of you, were asked ad nauseam by myself and my co-counsel some pretty much standard questions. We want to know if you can be fair and each one of you said you would be.

We want to know if you'd follow the law. Each one of you said you would, even if you personally disagreed with it. It was hypothetical because you didn't know the law at the time. Now you do. You have it. And we wanted to know

1	whether or not, if we proved our case beyond a reasonable doubt you would be able
2	to find Joshua Bacharach guilty of these crimes. Each one of you assured us that
3	you could fulfill those duties. And if you didn't, you wouldn't have been on this jury.
4	And now you're going to be asked to go into that back room and
5	deliberate. As we've been sitting here for the last three days, I would submit to you
6	that one person in this room has known he's guilty of all these crimes.
7	MS. NGUYEN: Objection, Your Honor.
8	MR. FATTIG: I ask that you
9	THE COURT: I'll sustain the objection. Disregard that comment.
10	BY MR. FATTIG:
11	I ask that you go back into that room and you deliberate and you come
12	out here and you tell the Defendant you know he's guilty.
13	THE COURT: All right. Swear the officers in, please.
14	[The Clerk swore in the officers to take charge of jury during deliberations]
15	THE COURT: All right. Ms. Sankovich, you're the alternate and that doesn't
16	mean you've wasted your time, I want you to know. We need you but we need
17	you within 15 or 20 minutes of the courthouse. If you'll go with Susanne. Take all of
18	your personal belongings.
19	MS. NGUYEN: Your Honor, may we approach?
20	THE COURT: Yeah.
21	[Bench Conference Begins]
22	MS. NGUYEN: I just wanted to remind you if they convict of anything we still
23	have the ex-felon charges that
24	THE COURT: Yeah.
25	MS. NGUYEN: So I don't know if they want to deliberate for a little while or

1	just have them come back tomorrow.
2	THE COURT: Just a minute
3	[Bench Conference Concludes]
4	THE COURT: Okay. The rest of you will go with Tom and he'll take you back
5	to the jury room.
6	[The jury retired to deliberate at 4:58 p.m.]
7	[Outside the presence of they jury]
8	THE COURT: Maybe we'll go an hour.
9	MS. THOMSON: And then back tomorrow or just
10	THE COURT: Yeah.
11	MS. THOMSON: Okay.
12	THE COURT: Maybe I'll give them the option once they pick a jury
13	foreperson. Do you want to deliberate tonight or do you want to come back
14	tomorrow? It was a long day.
15	MR. FATTIG: I know.
16	MS. THOMSON: [Indiscernible].
17	THE COURT: Yeah should we just have them come tomorrow?
18	MS. THOMSON: I don't know that the second part's going to take all that
19	long, but
20	MS. NGUYEN: Yeah.
21	THE COURT: You'll be ready in the morning to we won't go tonight.
22	MS. THOMSON: Yeah.
23	MS. NGUYEN: I've seen enough
24	THE COURT: Let me go talk to Tom.
25	MS. NGUYEN: I've seen enough jury's
1	1

Rough Draft Transcript, Volume III - Page 205

1	MR. FATTIG: Let them pick a foreperson.
2	THE COURT: I'll have them pick a foreperson and come back tomorrow.
3	MR. FATTIG: Okay.
4	MS. THOMSON: Thank you.
5	MS. NGUYEN: I'm fine waiting. I just wanted to throw that out there.
6	THE COURT: Just wait. Everybody just stand at ease for a minute.
7	[Pause in proceedings]
8	THE COURT: Apparently they have three people that need a ride and their
9	ride's coming for them. So they will pick the foreperson and then go home. So you
10	guys can go.
11	MS. NGUYEN: Okay.
12	MR. FATTIG: Okay.
13	MS. THOMSON: Thank you.
14	THE COURT: See you in the morning at 9:00.
15	Have him dressed out and be downstairs. We'll call you when we need
16	you.
17	[Evening recess at 5:00 p.m.]
18	
19	
20	
21	ATTEST: Pursuant to Rule 3C(d) of the Nevada Rules of Appellate Procedure, I
22	acknowledge that this is a rough draft transcript, expeditiously prepared, not proofread, corrected, or certified to be an accurate transcript.
23	PATIMA-
~	

Rough Draft Transcript, Volume III - Page 206

Brittany Mangelson Independent Transcriber

24

25

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTRONIC TRANSMISSION

The undersigned hereby declares that on June 08, 2016, an electronic copy of the foregoing APPELLANT'S FAST TRACK APPENDIX VOLUME VI was sent via the master transmission list with the Nevada Supreme Court to the following:

STEPHEN B. WOLFSON Clark County District Attorney

ADAM PAUL LAXALT Nevada Attorney General

Rochelle I Nguyen

ROCHELLE T. NGUYEN, ESQ. Nevada Bar Identification No. 8205 Nguyen & Lay 732 S. Sixth Street, Suite 102 Las Vegas, Nevada 89101 Telephone: (702) 383-3200