(Discussion at the bench.)

THE COURT: All right. Ladies and gentlemen, before we begin the cross-examination, I'm going to give you your afternoon break. It's 2:20 now. Let's come back at about 2:35. I want to read you the admonishment. We are going to take the afternoon recess.

During this recess, it is your duty not to converse amongst yourselves or with anyone else on any subject connected with the trial, or to read, watch, or listen to any report of or commentary on the trial by any person connected with the trial, or by any medium of information, including, without limitation, newspaper, television, Internet, smart phones, radio, and you are not to form or express an opinion on any subject connected with this case until it is finally submitted to you.

We'll see you at about 25 of. Thank you.

All stand for the jury.

(The jury left the courtroom.)

THE COURT: Thank you. We are outside the presence; the jury has been excused for the afternoon recess.

At one point during the State's presentation with Sergeant Rowe, counsel for the defense asked to approach and had indicated to the Court the defense interest in a Tavares instruction.

Tavares indicates — and the question is whether, number one, I would give a Tavares instruction and when I would give it. Tavares seems to indicate that the instruction should be given prior to the admission of the evidence; however, I made a decision based on the cumulative nature and the different subject matters related to the videos and the testimony of the officer that I wanted the evidence to come in first to glean its probative value versus the utilization of a Tavares limiting instruction.

The instruction was requested by the defense; although, Tavares indicates that the Court may do so sua sponte or at the request of the prosecutor.

That being said for the background of the record, Ms. Hickman.

MS. HICKMAN: Thank you, Judge.

I would ask the Court to give the Tavares instruction not only to the suspected narcotics that were used, but also as to the proceedings in the Sixth Judicial District Court.

Although the crime that he was charged with that he pled guilty to was not included in that, it's obvious that he's in court at one point. There was testimony that he was in custody. He appeared in jail clothes. He was given an OR release. They go over his guilty plea. He pleads guilty to a

crime, whatever that is. While that is not on the record, it is a prior bad act. It indicates to the jury that he has been in trouble before, that he has appeared in front of a court before.

I think it would be appropriate to give the Tavares instruction to the jury indicating they cannot consider the fact that he was in court for a criminal charge.

THE COURT: Well, the criminal charge, not that he's in court for a criminal charge.

MS. HICKMAN: As evidence of his guilt in this crime. They can only use it for what it was presented for, which is there was a request for Mental Health Court and so on and so forth.

THE COURT: Any objection, Mr. Prengaman?

MR. PRENGAMAN: I don't, Your Honor. I'm not going to object to that. In fact, I just was checking. I thought I included -- I might have included a proposed instruction.

THE COURT: Tavares says I need to give it, I'm going to say, contemporaneously for the record, at the time the evidence is admitted and then at the conclusion — when we do formal jury instructions at the end of the case.

So if you have one, that's fine. Do you have one?

MR. PRENGAMAN: I do. I think I included one in my
packet that was intended to be read or contemporaneous with

1	the evidence.
2	MS. HICKMAN: Judge, I also included one in my
3	packet. It's a little bit different than the State's.
4	MR. PRENGAMAN: The only difference is I haven't
5	seen hers yet.
6	THE COURT: The State's is very close to what I was
7	going to give.
8	I would give the defense's.
9	Take a look at it, Mr. Prengaman.
10	It is a correct statement of the law?
11	Do you waive any defect, Ms. Hickman, on giving it
12	after the evidence is given introduced?
13	MS. HICKMAN: Yes, that's fine. I'll waive.
14	THE COURT: For the reason that I stated?
15	MS. HICKMAN: I just wanted to think about it for a
16	minute.
17	MR. PRENGAMAN: That's fine.
18	THE COURT: That's the one I'll give. I'll give
19	what the defense proposed.
20	MS. HICKMAN: Thank you.
21	THE COURT: And I'll also give an instruction
22	similar, if not identical, at the conclusion, as the Defense
23	requests.
24	MS. HICKMAN: Thank you.

THE COURT: Anything else? MS. HICKMAN: No. Thank you. THE COURT: I'll see you back here in ten minutes. (A recess was taken.) -000-

RENO, NEVADA, TUESDAY, DECEMBER 13, 2016, 2:42 P.M.

-000-

THE COURT: We are back on the record in CR16-1457, State versus Ian Andre Hager.

All right. Ladies and gentlemen, during the State's presentation of evidence, you heard a lot of different things and you saw a lot of different things. Some are related to your weighing the evidence of the case and some are not. I'm going to read you the following instruction:

"You heard evidence regarding prior court proceedings involving the Defendant before the Sixth Judicial District Court and in the Second Judicial District Court's Mental Health Court.

"Evidence of other crimes, wrongs, or acts is not admissible to prove the character of a person in order to show that he acted in conformity therewith.

"It may, however, be admissible for other purposes such as proof of motive, opportunity, intent, preparation, plan, knowledge, identity, or absence of mistake or accident.

"In this case you should consider the evidence for the limited purpose of deciding whether the Defendant was adjudicated mentally ill by a court of this state and any other state or the United States as alleged in Counts I to

```
1
     III, whether the Defendant was an unlawful user of any
     controlled substance as alleged in Count IV to VI, and whether
 2
     the Defendant was addicted to any controlled substance as
 3
 4
     alleged in Counts IV to VI.
 5
               "For the limited purpose for which you may consider
 6
     such evidence, you must weigh it in the same manner as you do
 7
     all other evidence in the case. You're not permitted to
 8
     consider such evidence for any other purpose; specifically,
 9
     you're not to use this evidence to conclude that because the
10
     Defendant may have committed the act alleged in his prior
11
     case, he must also have committed the acts charged in the
     Information."
12
13
               Did I read that instruction correctly for the
14
     Defense?
15
               MS. HICKMAN: Yes.
                                   Thank you.
16
               THE COURT: Did I read that instruction correctly
     for the State?
17
18
               MR. PRENGAMAN:
                              Yes, Your Honor.
               THE COURT: Thank you very much.
19
20
               Please proceed with your cross-examination.
21
               MS. HICKMAN: Thank you.
22
     ///
23
     ///
```

CROSS-EXAMINATION 1 BY MS. HICKMAN: 2 Detective Rowe, you have been employed with the 3 0 Sparks Police Department for -- I'm sorry. Did you say 4 11 years? 5 Yes, ma'am. 6 Α And when you started with the Sparks Police 7 Department, you started on patrol? 8 Yes. Α And that was after you had gone through the POST 10 0 11 Academy; is that correct? 12 Α Yes. And when you testified on direct, you talked a 13 14 little bit about your training and experience, mostly, I quess, about your training to become a police officer, right? 15 Uh-huh. 16 Α Was that a "yes"? 17 0 Yes. Excuse me. 18 Α And that training as you testified was how to 19 20 recognize certain controlled substances, correct? 21 Α Yes. And how were you trained to recognize a controlled 22 0 23 substance? There was multiple levels of training. They talked 24

about controlled substances in the police academy, and then when you go into the field training/officer training program or when I was in it was called The Police Officer Training Program, that's where you have a senior officer with you that kind of shows you not only just policy and procedures of the department, but also shows you things that a police officer needs to know. During that time, narcotics was brought up. Okay. And so if you were to see a substance and you were going to attempt to recognize that as a controlled substance, how would you do that? What would you look for? 10 You would look at how it was packaged? 12 Α Yes. You would look at visually what it looks like? 13 0 Α That's correct. 14 You would look at the weight? 15 Yes. Α 16 Or what it appears to be, correct? 17 0 Uh-huh. 18 A The amount, like you would look to see how much of 19 20 it there is? Okay, yes. 21 Α

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

22

23

24

Q

A

Q

Yes.

What else?

Some of it has a certain smell, correct?

The consistency, the way it looks, you know, compared to other narcotics, or if it's even narcotics. 2 You would look -- anything else that would be around 3 it we would consider drug paraphernalia. 4 You would look for items that people would use to 5 ingest the narcotic, that kind of thing. ð Okay. And then you were also trained on how to 7 recognize somebody who's under the influence of a controlled 8 substance, correct? 9 Yes. 10 Α As part of your duties in patrol, did you ever do 11 0 DUI cases --12 Α Yes. 13 -- driving under the influence? 14 0 15 Α Yes. And one of the -- or I guess multiple ways a person 16 Q could be under the influence for those kinds of cases are 17 under the influence of a controlled substance, correct? 18 Α Yes. 19 And were you ever a drug recognition expert? 20 0 I was not. Α 21 And a drug recognition expert is somebody who has 22 0 extra training in order to recognize the effects that certain 23

1

24

controlled substances would have on people, correct?

1	A	Yes.
2	Q	But you were trained to recognize somebody who is
3	potential	ly under the influence of a controlled substance,
4	correct?	
5	A	Yes.
6	Q	You would look to see if they were sweaty, correct?
7	A	Well, there's a lot of different things depending on
8	what narcotic they are using.	
9	Q	Okay. So let's talk about overall. Okay?
10	A	Okay.
11	Q	So if they are sweating, correct?
12	A	If you're talking like overall narcotics, the reason
13	I'm kind	of stopping on that is say if they are using
14	marijuana, sweat necessarily wouldn't be an issue there.	
15	Q	Okay. Would it be an issue for any other controlled
16	substances, like methamphetamine, heroin, cocaine, OxyContin?	
17	A	It's an issue in some of those, but it's important
18	to know that doesn't happen every time someone uses that	
19	narcotic.	
20	Q	Okay. You would be able to observe their eyes; is
21	that corr	ect? They have dilated pupils?
22	A	Yes.
23	Q	Their speech may be elevated?
24	A	That's not every time.

- 1
- But is it something you would look for? Q
- 2
- Α It's a clue, yes.
- 3

- Why don't I do this? Why don't you tell me the things you would look for to determine whether or not you think they had been using a controlled substance?
- 5 6
- I would look for, beginning with, the paraphernalia Α to see if there's any other paraphernalia around, specifically
- 7 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24

- needles, straws, pipes.
- I would look for the packaging, what kind of packaging it was in, you know, whether it was in a baggy or in a balloon.
- I would look for -- after I got and I looked at the packaging and any other paraphernalia that was around, then I would look for how the person was able to communicate and how they were conducting themselves, would be a good way to describe it.
 - 0 Would you look at their pupils?
- Α If I had the opportunity, potentially. But depending on lighting conditions, whether it's dark outside or bright inside, pupils haven't always been able to say affirmatively, at least for me, that this person is under the influence of drugs.
- Okay. Would you look at how they were walking, if they were steady on their feet or not?

A I guess that could be something that I would consider, but again, that's not something that I would say was a definite, because if you deal with people that have used drugs over a long period of time, they will be able to ingest the narcotics differently and handle themselves differently. Similar to someone who was used to using alcohol, they have a different tolerance level, so they may be able to better control themselves than other people.

Q So, Detective Rowe, if you were to approach somebody and you were trying to determine whether they were under the influence of, let's say, methamphetamine and there wasn't a balloon. And there wasn't packaging, there wasn't a pipe, there wasn't some way that they ingested it, the only thing you would look at would be their ability to communicate?

A No.

Q Okay. What would you look at?

A To determine if they were under the influence or if they had it in their possession?

O Under the influence.

A Under the influence. I would also look at -- well, you could -- like you said, you could look to see if they are perspiring. If they are not perspiring, you can look for -- their perception of time would be different. That's one of the things you can look for is if someone is on a drug that's

a stimulant, 30 seconds, for example, will go by a lot quicker 1 in their mind than for someone who's sober. That's another 2 thing you can look for. Okay. Anything else? 4 0 Not off the top of my head. 5 Α Have you heard of the term "tweaking" in reference 6 to methamphetamine use? 7 8 Α Yes. What does that mean? 0 10 Α I'm sorry? Sorry. What does that mean to you? 11 0 I guess it would be a street slang term for someone 12 Α that would be under the influence. 13 Usually it references their behavior? 14 0 Α Yes. 15 Okay. It can reference a methamphetamine user will 16 0 often grind their teeth? 17 That's one of the indicators or clues. But again, 18 19 that doesn't happen in everyone. They'll sometimes be speaking very rapidly? 20 0 Again, that's a -- a possibility or an indicator or 21 Α

So those are all things you are trained to recognize

a clue, but it's not with every person.

when someone is under the influence, right?

22

23

24

- A Those are some of the things.
- Q Okay. And we talked about how you would recognize something that you may suspect as methamphetamine, right?
 - A Yes.
- Q If you were to see a package of what you suspected to be methamphetamine, commonly you would collect that, correct?
 - A Yes.
- Q And if you were in the field, you may try to get a presumptive test as to what that substance is, correct?
 - A Yes.
- Q And a presumptive test is a test that either you carry around as an officer or is at the police station that you can put a little substance into that test, and it will change colors to let you know presumptively if it is or is not a controlled substance, correct?
- A Yes. It will change colors if there's a presence of some kind of a chemical that would be associated with a narcotic inside of the substance.
- Q And once you have done that presumptive test, you would then take that suspected narcotics to the Washoe County Crime Lab, right?
- A Directly by me, no. It would go through our evidence section and then go from there, depending on where it

1 | had to go next.

4

5

6

10

11

14

15

16

17

- 2 Q And where it had to go next generally is the Washoe 3 County Crime Lab, correct?
 - A Potentially. It doesn't happen in every case.
 - Q So if you wanted a confirmation that that was, in fact, narcotics, it would go to the crime lab?
- 7 A That's one of the ways you confirm it was narcotics, 8 yes.
- 9 Q What's the other way?
 - A Asking the person.
 - Q Would a person know necessarily that it is or isn't?
- 12 A Generally, yes.
- 13 Q Yeah, but not always, right?
 - A Generally, if the person has it, like you described, they know what they have in their possession.
 - Q And at the Washoe County Crime Lab, they test those substances for whether or not they are actually controlled substances, correct?
- 19 A I'm not familiar with what test they do, but you can 20 get reports back from the crime lab of what the substance is, 21 yes.
- 22 | Q And they'll tell you that it is or isn't, correct?
- 23 A Yes.
- Q And they also tell you the weight?

1	A The weight you can get yourself. They will weigh it	
2	after their again, I don't know if they do it before their	
3	test or after their test, but they will come back with a	
4	weighted sample of their own, yes.	
5	Q And in this case, you viewed the video that has been	
6	admitted as Exhibit 18, correct?	
7	A I'll trust you that it was 18. I don't remember	
8	what item number it was.	
9	Q It's a Facebook video from February 26th, 2016?	
10	A Yes.	
11	Q And you just watched it today?	
12	A Yes.	
13	Q That's the video that you testified that you thought	
14	Mr. Hager was consuming a controlled substance, correct?	
15	A Yes.	
16	Q And you testified that in seeing that video, he held	
17	up a plastic bag of what appeared to be a white crystal	
18	substance, correct?	
19	A Yes.	
20	Q Okay. So that means you described the color of it	
21	as being white, correct?	
22	A I said white or a crystal substance.	
23	Q White or	

A

24

Yes.

So you described it as being white. And when you 1 say "crystal," do you mean it's like see-through? 2 No. It's more of a -- I guess more of a -- the Α 3 color of it and the word is escaping me. 4 Like opaque? 5 The shape of it, I quess, if that makes sense. 6 Okay. And from that video, it's difficult to really 7 see what the consistency of that material is, correct? 8 Α Yes. 9 You can't see anything about any individual 10 11 crystal-like substance, correct? 12 Α Correct. You can only see, for lack of a better word, a mass 13 within the bag, correct? 14 15 Α Correct. And when you're testifying as to -- that it is a 16 white, crystal substance, that's just based on you looking at 17 it, right? 18 Yes. 19 Α You never saw that substance that was in that baggy 20 later when you spoke to Mr. Hager, correct? 21 22 Correct. And your opinion when you testified on direct is 23

that that appeared to be narcotics, correct?

1	А	Yes.
2	Q	When you looked at it, were you able to say that it
3	appeared t	to be methamphetamine or cocaine or any other white,
4	crystal s	ubstance?
5	А	Can you ask it again?
6	Q	Were you able to identify which controlled substance
7	you though	nt it was?
8	А	Just by looking at it?
9	Q	Uh-huh.
10	A	It appeared to me that it looked more like
11	methamphetamine. But definitively, no.	
12	Q	Okay. It looked more like methamphetamine than
13	what?	
14	А	Than say a cocaine substance or something like that.
15	Q	Okay. Because is cocaine also a white crystal
16	substance?	
17	A	It's white. Sometimes it's a powdery substance.
18	Q	And again, you couldn't see the size of the crystals
19	in there;	is that correct?
20	А	That's correct.
21	Q	And based on viewing that, you can't say whether or
22	not that w	was a narcotic, correct, just by looking at that
23	baggy?	
24	A	Just by looking at the baggy, no. That would have

come in later with the interview with Mr. Hager. 1 So when he holds that up and he says, "I'm going to 2 have breakfast like I used to," you couldn't look at that 3 4 baggy and say, "Yeah, I think that" -- "I know that's methamphetamine"? 5 To me it appeared to be methamphetamine. But again, 6 7 I couldn't definitively say it was methamphetamine. Okay. I'm going to play what's been admitted as 8 Exhibit 18. And this is that video that you were testifying 9 10 about where it appears that he has suspected what might be 11 methamphetamine, correct? 12 Α Yes. 13 (A DVD was played.) BY MS. HICKMAN: 14 I'm going to pause this at about 3 minutes 30 15 seconds in the video. 16 17 And you see Mr. Hager sitting at essentially what looks like a bench, correct? 18 19 A bench or a table, yes. And it's hard to see in this video, but it appears 20 0 21 as though there's a table right here, correct? 22 A Yes. And, Detective Rowe, are you familiar with 23 Mr. Hager's home at all? Did you ever go into it? 24

1	А	I did not.
2	Q	Did you ever see any photos of it?
3	А	Not that I recall.
4	Q	Okay. And in this video, you see what appears to be
5	a box righ	ht here?
6	А	Correct.
7	Q	Somewhat coffin shaped?
8	А	Yeah. It's hard to see what shape it is, but
9	there's a box right there, yes.	
10	Q	Okay. And if I play this video, you see Mr. Hager
11	reach into that box that I just indicated?	
12		(A DVD was played.)
13		THE WITNESS: Yes.
14	BY MS. HICKMAN:	
15	Q	And he pulls something out, correct? Did you see
16	that?	
17	A	Yes.
18	Q	And it appeared to maybe be shiny?
19	A	Well, he pulled two things out. Which one are you
20	talking about?	
21	Q	The thing that he has in his hand right now.
22	A	Okay.
23	Q	Did that appear to be shiny to you?
24	А	Yes.
	0.1	

1	Q	And from here, it appears as though he is cutting,
2	or for lack of a better word, whatever that is that he has pu	
3	onto that	table, correct?
4	А	It looks like he is arranging it into lines.
5	Q	Okay. But you can't see that, correct?
6	А	No.
7		You asked what it looks like, and that's what it
8	looks like to me.	
9	Q	You can't see him touching anything that might be
10	there?	
11	А	Correct.
12	Q	So whatever he's doing is off camera; is that
13	correct?	You can't see the actual substance?
14	А	It's on camera. It's just concealed behind objects
15	on the table.	
16	Q	I want to talk a little bit about this video because
17	you were able to view this right on his Facebook page,	
18	correct?	
19	А	Correct.
20	Q	There was no effort made to hide this from anyone,
21	correct?	
22	A	It didn't appear so.
23	Q	Because it was in public?
24	А	That's right.

1	Q And it was out in the open for anybody to use or	
2	I'm sorry, not to use, to look at. And when we were talking	
3	about this video, you spoke to Mr. Hager about some of your	
4	concerns about what you saw in this video when you interviewed	
5	him, right?	
6	A Yes.	
7	Q You talked to him about the large amount of	
8	methamphetamine that looks to be, correct?	
9	A Yes.	
10	Q And that somebody ingesting that much	
11	methamphetamine could easily kill themselves, correct?	
12	A Yes.	
13	Q Okay. When you first saw this video, was it that	
14	same day you made contact with Detective Johnson?	
15	A I don't recall what day I saw the video because it	
16	was a span of two days when I viewed them. So it was within	
17	that two-day time frame.	
18	Q Regardless whenever you viewed the video, did you d	
19	any sort of welfare check to see how Mr. Hager was?	
20	A No.	
21	Q Any checking up to see if he had in fact overdosed?	
22	A No.	
23	Q And you obviously had plenty of time to look at	

Mr. Hager's Facebook page, correct?

Correct. 1 Α And, in fact, when we are looking at this video, you 2 can see that some of his friends comment on this, right? 3 I don't know if they are his friends, but Α 4 people posted on this. 5 When I say "friend," I mean Facebook friends, 6 somebody he may know on Facebook. Right? 7 Potentially, yes. 8 Α Because you were talking about your knowledge of 9 0 Facebook, right? 10 11 Α Yes. And on Facebook, people are able to request somebody 12 13 to be their friend, correct? 14 Α Correct. And if they are friends with somebody on Facebook, 15 16 they can comment on the Facebook post, correct? Yes. 17 So if this person is commenting on Mr. Hager's 18 Facebook post, that's an indication that this person is 19 friends with Mr. Hager through Facebook, correct? 20 I don't know if that's necessarily true. 21 tried it. But because the page was public, it's a possibility 22 that somebody who weren't his friends could put a post on that 23

24

section.

1	Q	Okay. You also had access to his friend section on
2	Facebook,	so you could see everyone that had friended him or
3	he had fr	iended, correct?
4	A	Not people who had friended him. I could see people
5	who he ha	d listed as his friends, yes.
6	Q	That's what I meant, the friends list.
7	A	Yes, ma'am.
8	Q	And you didn't contact any of those people to ask
9	any questions about Mr. Hager's drug use, correct?	
10	A	No.
11	Q	And you didn't contact any of those people to see if
12	there was	an overdose with Mr. Hager back in February when he
13	posted th	is photo, correct?
14	А	Correct.
15	Q	And as part of your evolving investigation, you
16	didn't co	ntact any of those people to see if Mr. Hager
17	routinely	used methamphetamine, correct?
18	А	You mean people on his Facebook?
19	Q	Uh-huh.
20	А	Correct.
21	Q	And you didn't contact any of those people to find
22	out if Mr	. Hager potentially bought methamphetamine from any
23	of them, correct?	

A Correct.

1	Q	And you viewed this Facebook video before you
2	applied for the search warrant for Mr. Hager's home, correct?	
3	A	Correct.
4	Q	And you personally authorized that search warrant,
5	correct?	
6	А	No, ma'am. I don't have the authority to authorize
7	a search	warrant.
8	Q	Search warrant application. Excuse me.
9	A	Yes.
10	Q	So when I say you authored it, you wrote into the
11	search warrant application what you wanted to look for,	
12	correct?	
13	A	That's correct.
14	Q	And in that search warrant information, you did not
15	include any information that you wanted to look for	
16	methamphetamine use, correct?	
17	А	That's correct.
18	Q	Or narcotics use, correct?
19	A	Correct.
20	Q	And then you authored a search warrant for
21	Mr. Hager	's cell phone, correct?
22	А	That's correct.
23	Q	And you did that in November of this year, correct?
24	А	Yes.

And in that search warrant, you didn't put anything 1 about looking for indicia of drug use, correct? 2 That's correct. 3 Α Indicia of buying drugs, correct? 4 5 Α Correct. Indicia of drug paraphernalia? 6 0 Correct. 7 Α That search warrant has nothing referencing 8 0 narcotics, correct? 9 That's right. 10 Α MS. HICKMAN: And if I could have just one moment. 11 12 I'm sorry. BY MS. HICKMAN: 13 Sergeant Rowe, you testified that you viewed his 14 Facebook photos through this period of time, which was 15 November 2015 to March of 2016, correct? 16 Are you asking me if that's how -- the date of the 17 photos or how long I was viewing them, because that was a 18 little confusing? I apologize. 19 Not how long you were reviewing them. But if I 20 wrote down correctly what your answer was, is that the videos 21 that were posted on his Facebook page were only from November 22 of 2015 to March of 2016. Is that true or is that what you 23

were looking at?

- A That's the range I was looking at.
 - Q Okay. So it's safe to say his Facebook page was in existence long before November of 2015, correct?
 - A I don't know when it was created.
 - O Or before that at least?
 - A Yes.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

- Q And there were videos that were posted on that Facebook page that maybe don't have any relevance to this case, correct?
- 10 A That's correct.
 - Q And, Detective Rowe I'm sorry. Sergeant Rowe, when you watched this Facebook video of February 26th, you're unable to tell how much time elapses while Mr. Hager appears to snort this alleged narcotic, correct?
 - A Just off the indication of what it the time that's reading across the bottom of the movie that's playing or the video that's playing.
 - Q Nine minutes and 47 seconds?
- 19 A Yes.
- Q And it's not necessarily a continuous video,
 Correct? It's edited in some ways?
- 22 A It appeared to be edited, yes.
- Q It's got the words that come across the screen, correct?

1	A Yes	•
2	Q And	in some parts, there are still photos that are
3	kind of put in	nto it for right?
4	A Yes	
5	Q And	at the end of this video, Mr. Hager begins
6	talking again	?
7		(A DVD was played.)
8	BY MS. HICKMA	N:
9	Q So	at about 8 minutes and 57 seconds in, he walks
10	back towards	the camera, correct?
11	A Yes	
12	Q And	then you hear him speaking again?
13	A Yes	
14		(A DVD was played.)
15	BY MS. HICKMA	N:
16	Q And	to the best of your knowledge, Mr. Hager did not
17	overdose on t	hat day, correct?
18	A App	arently not because he's here with us today.
19	Q And	I'm sorry. I meant to ask you this before when
20	we were talki	ng about your training and experience. Do you
21	have experien	ce with people who have recently used
22	methamphetami	ne, but it was in the last few days?
23	A Is	suppose that has happened, but a specific incident
24	doesn't come	to my mind right now.

Q Within a 48-hour period?	
A I am sure I have.	
Q Because it can have effects on somebody for longer	
than maybe 10, 20, 30 minutes, correct?	
A I don't know that a single dose I don't know how	
much a single dose would have an effect on somebody. That has	
to do with that person's tolerance for the drug they are	
using. So if they are a regular drug user, their tolerance	
would be different, so they would react differently to what	
they had taken and how long ago they had taken it.	
Q And when we talk about a single dose you worked	
patrol, correct?	
A Yes.	
Q So you're familiar with what is commonly known as a	
one-time use, which is sometimes a gram or two grams, correct?	
MR. PRENGAMAN: Objection. Relevance.	
THE COURT: What's the relevance?	
MS. HICKMAN: Judge, I think it's relevant because	
he's talking about a single dose, and we are talking about an	
extremely large amount of methamphetamine.	
THE COURT: I'll allow the question.	
Can you ask it one more time?	

BY MS. HICKMAN:

Q So when you're talking about a single dose -- and when you were on patrol, you, I'm sure, knew that a common use for someone is between one gram to two grams for just one hit of methamphetamine?

A That's — that's not entirely accurate. When I'm talking about a dose, I guess it would be more of what that person decides they are going to take at that time. It doesn't come out of a pharmacy with a doctor and pharmacist saying, "Your dose is this." So I've seen people that will snort just a little line. And I've seen people that can smoke a large bowl. So when I'm saying "dose," I mean that's what that person is ingesting at that time, if that makes sense.

- Q And this bag that Mr. Hager held up -- which was a large amount of methamphetamine, correct?
 - A Correct.
- Q Enough that you said it could potentially kill somebody, correct?
 - A Correct.
- Q That's much larger than an average dose would be, correct?
- A Depends on that person. If that person uses a lot of narcotics, they can use quite a bit before they get high. They chase the high because their tolerance increases.

1 I'm going to stop you right there because my Q question wasn't necessarily about everyone in general. My 2 question is with that large amount of narcotics, would you 3 expect that to be -- actually, you probably don't know that. 4 And, Sergeant Rowe, you were not present to search 5 Mr. Hager's home, correct? 6 7 Α That's correct. So you didn't see what was actually in the home? 8 0 9 Α That's correct. 10 MS. HICKMAN: Judge, I have no further questions. 11 THE COURT: Thank you. Anything on redirect? 12 MR. PRENGAMAN: Thank you, Your Honor. 13 14 REDIRECT EXAMINATION 15 BY MR. PRENGAMAN: 16 Sergeant, regarding the questions about performing 17 0 the welfare check, or did you perform a welfare check, what 18 was the date that that video was posted on, the exhibit that 19 20 you just reviewed that was posted on Facebook? 21 Α Was it February 20th -- 20th? Let me grab it if you would. And if you don't 22

Do you recognize it by sight? This is the video you

recognize it by sight, let me know. I'll put it in.

23

were just asked about. 1 2 Α Yes. Exhibit 18. 0 3 That's correct. Α 4 So what was the date that this was posted on 5 0 6 Facebook? February 26th. 7 Α Okay. So February 26th. 8 0 And when you were looking at the videos you've 9 testified about in the course of your investigation, what day 10 were you doing that? 11 Over the course --Α 12 Day or days? 13 0 Sorry. It was over the course of two days, so it 14 Α was April 5th and April 6th. 15 And based on your testimony today, you saw a number 16 of videos posted in March that depicted -- up until the end of 17 March, in fact, that depicted the Defendant talking on the 18 video, correct? 19 That's correct. 20 So did you assess that from watching a February 26th 21 video there was any need to conduct a welfare check on him at 22 that point? 23

Not at that point, no.

30

A That's correct.

Q In your interview with Mr. Hager, when he told you the substance he had ingested was methamphetamine, did you get to a point where you were explaining to him what he was being charged with?

A I did.

Q And I just want to focus in on that part of your interview. Did you explain to Mr. Hager that he was being arrested or was in custody for being a prohibited person because he was — he was being accused of being a user or addict of methamphetamine or any controlled substance?

A Yes.

Q And did you also tell him that additionally, there was the -- having been adjudicated mentally ill was one of the reasons he was being arrested?

A Yes, I did.

Q So you recall that section of your interview with Mr. Hager?

A I do.

Q And that was after he had already told you -- or was that after he had already told you that the substance he used on that video was meth?

2 3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

It was after. Α

Okay. And when you told him that the use of methamphetamine in that video was one of the reasons that he was being arrested, how did he respond to you?

If I remember correctly, he said something along the Α lines of like, "Prove it," or, "You can't prove it," or something like that.

Okay. And how did you respond to that?

I told him, "Well, you just told me that that's what it was and that's what you did."

Okay. And did he have some kind of response to that 0 statement that you made?

He said something to the effect of, "The truth gets me again."

Okay. So -- and would you say that again?

He said something along the lines of, "Well, telling Α the truth gets me again."

And do you -- did he use any swear language?

I believe there -- there was an F word in there.

I don't want you to alter what he said just because we are in court. Would you just tell us the best you remember exactly what he said as you recall?

The best I recall is he said something like, "The truth fucks me again."

Q	Did he say that wasn't methamphetamine?
A	He did not.
Q	He didn't deny it was methamphetamine?
A	No.
Q	He just said, "The truth" "The truth Fs me
again"?	
A	That's correct.
	MR. PRENGAMAN: Thank you, Sergeant.
	No further questions, Your Honor.
	THE COURT: Anything?
	MS. HICKMAN: Just briefly.
	RECROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MS. HI	CKMAN:
Q	Briefly, Sergeant Rowe, that interview of Mr. Hager
took place on April 8th of 2016, correct?	
A	That's correct.
Q	And that was down at the Sparks Police Department?
А	Yes.
Q	And during that time that you interviewed Mr. Hager,
there was	no indication that he was under the influence of
methamphe	tamine, correct?
А	Not at that time, no.
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	A Q A Q again"? A BY MS. HI Q took place A Q A Q there was methamphe

24

THE WITNESS: First name is Brian. Orr. Last name

1	is O-R-R.	
2		THE COURT: Thank you.
3		Mr. Prengaman.
4		MR. PRENGAMAN: Thank you, Your Honor.
5		
6		BRIAN ORR,
7		having been first duly sworn, was examined
8		and testified as follows:
9		
10		DIRECT EXAMINATION
11	BY MR. PR	ENGAMAN:
12	Q	Could you tell us how you're employed?
13	А	I work for the Sparks Police Department.
14	Q	You're a sworn peace officer?
15	А	I am.
16	Q	What's your current assignment?
17	А	I'm assigned to the detective division as a general
18	assigned	detective.
19	Q	How long have you been employed with Sparks PD in
20	any capac	city, Officer Detective?
21	А	Approximately ten years.
22	Q	And what was your assignment back in April of 2016?
23	A	I was assigned to the detective division at that
	l	

1	Q	Okay. Detective, taking you back to April 8th, on
2	that day,	did you receive an assignment to assist in the
3	service o	f a search warrant at 2460 Anqua Drive in Sparks?
4	A	I was.
5	Q	And just sort of big picture, what was the first
6	task or a	ssignment that you had in that goal?
7	A	Was to establish surveillance of the residence.
8	Q	Okay. And did you you were one of the people who
9	was assign	ned to watch the residence?
10	A	Yes, I was.
11	Q	And was that because the goal was to serve the
12	warrant w	hen the occupant was not at the residence?
13	А	Yes, it was.
14	Q	So is it accurate that one of your tasks was to
15	watch and	alert the other detectives involved when the
16	occupant 1	left the residence?
17	A	Yes, it was.
18	Q	Where were you conducting your surveillance from?
19	А	From a house to the south of the residence.
20	Q	Okay. And were you actually in the house?
21	A	Yes.
22	Q	Okay. I'm going to show you what we've admitted as
23	Exhibit 39	9.

Is this 2460 Angua?

1	А	Yes, it is.
2	Q	As we look at the residence, how far I know we
3	can't see	the other houses, but roughly how many houses away,
4	in which	direction would you be?
5	А	I was directly across the street and 50 to 75 yards.
6	Q	Okay. And at some point, did you see movement or
7	somebody	leaving the house?
8	A	Yes, I did.
9	Q	And could you briefly describe what you saw?
10	A	While studying on the house, the double car garage
11	opened up	. I observed the Defendant step out. He got inside
12	a 2012 Ch	evy Camaro, into the driver's seat.
13	Q	And when you say "the Defendant," do you recognize
14	the indiv	idual? Did you see a man leave the residence?
15	А	Yes, I did.
16	Q	And do you see that man in the courtroom today?
17	А	I do.
18	Q	Could you tell us where he's located and describe
19	his cloth	es?
20	A	He's over there wearing a white shirt and red tie.
21		MR. PRENGAMAN: Your Honor, may the record reflect
22	identific	ation of the Defendant?
23		THE COURT: It will.
24		MR. PRENGAMAN: Thank you.

23

24

Q

Α

Okay. And what was the first thing that happened?

First three that arrived on scene initially cleared

the house for safety.

Q Okay. And who, if you can recall, or generally, who were those folks?

A It was Detective Gallop, Detective Congdon, and Lieutenant Triplett.

- Q All of the Sparks Police Department?
- A Yes.
 - Q And did you stay outside?

A At that point, I start to come back around to get to the front of the house.

Q And in the course of -- when you talk about -- use the word "clear," what does that mean?

A They're searching the residence to make sure no one else was inside, make sure there was no threats inside the house.

- Q And was anybody located?
- A No.
 - Q So then what happened after that, after the house was cleared?

A After the house was cleared, they turned the house back over to me. I was already standing out front waiting for them. I then started gathering other detectives and our evidence tech, Linda Brown, to start the search of the residence.

Q And did you -- that group or team, if you will, did you proceed to search the house?

A Yep.

Q Okay. So just to give us an idea so that I don't have to ask you every time, was there sort of a plan as to how you would search the house?

A Yes. At the beginning, before we entered the house, when Linda Brown showed up -- she was going to be collecting the evidence and photographing -- I made a plan with everybody that we were going to search one room at a time systematically, stay together. As people located items inside the house, they would contact me. I would walk over with Linda Brown. I would log the item, and then she would photograph and collect the item.

- Q And then Linda Brown would was it also her job to then book it into evidence back at the police department?
 - A Yes, it was.
- Q And who were the members of that group who were going to do the search?
- A There was Detective Condon, Thelin, and I believe Pagni, an initial search of it in the beginning.
- Q And so if I'm clear, as the search would be conducted, let's say someone -- and you were searching for -- we've heard some testimony already, but you were searching for

firearms and ammunition and indicia --1 Yes. 2 Α -- of occupancy or ownership. 0 3 Α Yes. 4 Let's say somebody found something relevant to the 5 0 search warrant. What would they do? A detective finds, let's 6 say, a gun. What would they do? 7 They would leave it in place, call me over. 8 Α come over, look at what it was, give it an evidence number, 9 and Linda Brown would photograph, and she would collect it. 10 So, essentially, nothing would get moved until it 11 had been photographed and logged? 12 Α Yes. 13 And is that, in fact, how the search proceeded? 14 Yes. Α 15 Can you give us an idea generally the -- well, look 16 at some of the interior photos momentarily, but just the big 17 picture of what is the layout of the house? Single story? 18 Two story? 19 Two story. 20 Α And bedrooms downstairs or upstairs? 21 Q Upstairs. 22 Α And then what was just generally the lower floor 23 like? 24

It was the two living areas, kitchen, and laundry 1 2 room. Okay. Showing you what's been admitted as Exhibit 3 Number 40, the first photo by way of orientation, what are we 4 looking at? This is the interior of the residence? 5 Yes. That's immediately inside the front door. 6 That's got at little pony wall there to the left, but that's 7 kind of the first living area. 8 Okay. And then as we look directly dead center in 9 through the photo, what are we looking at? 10 We are looking at what I would call the main living 11 room. That's where most of the furniture was. 12 And so if I might just point to -- what do we see 13 here on the left side, Detective? 14 The TV. Α 15 So that's like a television flat screen sitting on 16 the pony wall? 17 Α Yes. 18 Showing you 41, what area is shown here? 19 0 That's what I refer to as the main living room area. 20 Α And 42? 21 0 That's also the main living area. 22 A And are we sort of moving the vantage of how much of 23

it we can see?

Α Yes. 1 And now Exhibit 43, what areas do we see here? 2 0 That's the living area and part of the kitchen. Α 3 And what side of the photo do we see the part of the 4 0 kitchen in? 5 The very back part of the photo on the right-hand 6 7 side. And, Detective, you have to press firmly, but if you 8 press that screen, you can actually mark on it. 9 (The witness complies.) 10 Showing you 44, is this moving into the kitchen from 11 the living room? 12 Sort of a little dining area between the 13 Α kitchen and the living room. 14 And then Exhibit 45? 15 That is the kitchen area heading obviously back into 16 the laundry area. 17 So looking at the left side of the photo -- I'll 18 0 point you here -- what is back through that doorway? 19 I believe that was a small bathroom back there. 20 Α Okay. And is that also the way you would go to get 21 to the -- what you said the laundry room? 22 No. It's the other door to the left is where you go 23

to the laundry area, I believe.

1	Q	Are you able to roughly indicate where you would go
2	to the law	undry area on that?
3	А	Right in here (indicating).
4	Q	So you make a left right at that wall?
5	А	Yes.
6	Q	So, now, in the course of the search, was there some
7	evidence (of ownership and occupancy
8	A	Yes.
9	Q	found?
10		Okay. And in 46 Exhibit 46, is this one of the
11	items tha	t you found?
12	A	Yes.
13	Q	And this is an item in the mail from the DMV
14	addressed	to that residence?
15	A	Yes.
16	Q	Detective, in the kitchen area, were any of the
17	items tha	t you were looking for in the search warrant,
18	firearms	or ammunition, located?
19	A	Yes. There was a several different rounds of
20	ammunitio	n, different calibers, and then a holster, which
21	would ind	icate there's firearms inside the residence.
22	Q	And so showing you Exhibit 47, do we see one of
23	those ite	ms showing somewhere here?

Yes. The box of ammunition.

1	Q	Okay. And now what are we looking at here? What
2	part of t	he kitchen?
3	A	This is the island
4	Q	Okay.
5	А	in the kitchen.
6	Q	And could you circle for us where you see the
7	ammunitio	n?
8	А	(The witness complies.)
9	Q	And then Exhibit 48, do we see the holster that you
10	previousl	y mentioned?
11	A	Yes.
12	Q	And again, where is this located in the kitchen?
13	А	I believe this is also the island.
14	Q	And could you circle the holster?
15	А	(The witness complies.)
16	Q	Was there anything you were searching for located in
17	the livin	ng room or dining room area?
18	А	Yes. There was ammunition located there.
19	Q	Are we able to say where in this photograph?
20	А	Yes.
21	Q	Could you point out where that would be?
22	A	It was on this vest, right here.
23	Q	Okay. And do we see a closer-up of that item in
24	Exhibit 5	50?
	î	

Î		
1	A	Yes.
2	Q	And is the ammunition there tipped in red?
3	А	Yes.
4	Q	Showing you now 51, can you tell us what we are
5	looking a	t here, what part of the house?
6	А	We are looking inside the laundry room at this
7	point.	
8	Q	Now, is anything identified in the search warrant
9	located i	n the laundry room?
10	А	Yes.
11	Q	And what was that?
12	A	There was a Bushmaster AR15 assault rifle.
13	Q	And are you able to see that in this photograph?
14	A	Yes.
15	Q	And could you please circle where you see it for the
16	jury?	
17	А	(The witness complies.)
18	Q	And showing you Exhibit 53 what do you see there?
19	А	That's the same Bushmaster rifle.
20	Q	Closer up?
21	А	Yes.
22	Q	And showing you Exhibit 54, what do we see there?
23	A	That was the two magazines that were actually inside
24	the firea	arm when we recovered it.

Okay. So these were in the firearm when it was 1 2 found? Yes. 3 Α Can you show us, going back to 53, can you show us 4 in 53 where the magazines are? 5 Here is one here, and then the other one is on the 6 backside, actually inside the firearm (indicating). 7 Now, as to that rifle, the Bushmaster, it was 8 Q located -- who located it? 9 Officer -- Detective Congdon. 10 And before it was moved, was the procedure you 11 outlined followed? 12 13 Yes. Α 14 0 So you were called in --15 Α Yes. -- to document its location and who found it? 16 Q 17 Α Yes. Okay. And was that rifle collected? 18 0 Α Yes. 19 And ultimately booked into evidence? 20 Yes, it was. 21 Α Let me show you what we have marked as Exhibit 88. 22 What I would like you to do -- so I don't want you to take it 23

out at this point. I want you to look inside the box, and if

1 you need to pull out the inside enough just to see what it is, 2 tell me if you recognize the contents. 3 Yes. It's the AR15. 4 And is that the same AR15 Bushmaster that we see in 5 Exhibit 52 that was located in the laundry room at 426 -- I'm sorry -- 4260 [sic] Angua? 6 7 Α Yes. MR. PRENGAMAN: I move for the admission of 8 9 Exhibit 88. 10 No objection. MS. HICKMAN: 11 THE COURT: It's admitted. (Exhibit 88 admitted into evidence.) 12 13 MR. PRENGAMAN: Thank you, Your Honor. 14 BY MR. PRENGAMAN: And then additionally, Detective, I'm going to show 15 16 you now Exhibit 55. 17 What area of the residence do we see here? 18 That is just inside the front door area, a little 19 hallway next to the pony wall. 20 And so could you show us where the front door is? 21 Which door is the front door in this photograph? 22 Α (The witness complies.) 23 And so the door immediately behind it, what was back 24 there?

1	А	It was a smaller closet.
2	Q	Was anything of significance to the search warrant
3	found in	there?
4	A	Yes. A safe was located in there.
5	Q	Showing you Exhibit 56, what are we looking at in
6	this photo	0?
7	А	That's the inside of the safe as it was opened.
8	Q	And what of significance on the search warrant was
9	located i	nside the safe?
10	А	Several firearms and obviously a lot of ammunition.
11	Q	Showing you Exhibit 57, what do we see in this
12	exhibit?	
13	A	That's a Remington 12 gauge shotgun.
14	Q	And who was the detective that searched the safe?
15	A	Detective Condon.
16	Q	Now, was the procedure that you previously outlined
17	followed?	
18	A	Yes.
19	Q	So he located things in the safe, called you to
20	document	it, and then they were photographed and collected?
21	A	Yes.
22	Q	And ultimately booked into evidence?
23	A	Yes.
24	Q	Okay. So is this rifle one of the things collected

1	by Detect	ive Condon?
2		Sorry if I just asked you that.
3		Detective Condon found this gun in the safe?
4	А	Yes.
5	Q	What are the yellow items just below the gun in the
6	picture?	
7	А	They are shotgun ammunition.
8	Q	I'm going to show you now, Detective, Exhibit 89 for
9	identific	cation. Again, I would like you, if you would I
10	don't war	at you to remove the contents, but just look at it,
11	and tell	me if you were able to identify it.
12	А	Yes.
13	Q	Do you recognize it?
14	А	Yes.
15	Q	What's in the box?
16	A	I misspoke a minute ago. It's actually a Winchester
17	shotgun.	
18	Q	And does that Exhibit 89 contain the same shotgun
19	that we	see depicted in Exhibit 57?
20	A	It does.
21		MR. PRENGAMAN: I'd move for the admission of
22	Exhibit	89 into evidence.
23		MS. HICKMAN: No objection.
24		THE COURT: It's admitted.

1		(Exhibit 89 admitted into evidence.)
2	BY MR. PRE	ENGAMAN:
3,	Q	Now, going back to the Bushmaster assault rifle
4	momentaril	ly, I would like to show you also what we've marked
5	as Exhibit	88A, and could you please open that bag? And
6	again, we	don't need to take the contents out, unless you need
7	to to reco	ognize it. But tell me if you recognize what is in
8	there.	
9	А	Those are the two magazines that were inside of the
10	firearm.	
11	Q	Inside the Bushmaster rifle?
12	А	Yes.
13	Q	And are those the same contents that we see shown
14	here	
15	A	Yes.
16	Q	in Exhibit 54?
17	А	Yes.
18		MR. PRENGAMAN: I move for the admission of 89A.
19		MS. HICKMAN: No objection.
20		THE COURT CLERK: I believe that was 88.
21		MR. PRENGAMAN: Oh, I'm sorry. Oh, yes. Thank you,
22	Ms. Clerk.	
23		88A, Your Honor. Thank you.
24		(Exhibit 88A admitted into evidence.)
		•

1	BY MR. PR	ENGAMAN:
2	Q	Detective, showing you Exhibit 87, what do you see
3	there?	
4	A	It's a Navy Arms black powder pistol.
5	Q	And where was this located?
6	A	That was also located in the safe.
7	Q	Also by Detective Condon?
8	А	Yes, it was.
9	Q	Detective, I'm going to show you what we've marked
10	for ident	ification as Exhibit 87. Again, could you please
11	just look	inside the box, and tell me if you recognize what's
12	inside?	
13	A	Yes.
14	Q	What does that exhibit contain?
15	А	That is the Navy firearm that was located.
16	Q	Is that the same gun we see depicted in Exhibit 58?
17	А	Yes, it is.
18		MR. PRENGAMAN: I move for admission of Exhibit 87,
19	Your Hono	r.
20		THE COURT: Any objection?
21		MS. HICKMAN: What exhibit?
22		MR. PRENGAMAN: Exhibit 87.
23		MS. HICKMAN: 87, no objection.
24		THE COURT: It's admitted.
		22

1		(Exhibit 87 admitted into evidence.)
2	BY MR. PRI	ENGAMAN:
3	Q	Detective, showing you Exhibit 59, what do you see
4	here?	
5	A	It's another handgun we had located, a Colt 1911.
6	Q	Was that also inside the safe?
7	А	Yes, it was.
8	Q	Located by Detective Condon?
9	A	Yes, it was.
10	Q	Okay. Showing you Exhibit 60, is this a closer view
11	of that g	un?
12	A	Yes, it is.
13	Q	Was that collected and booked into evidence by Linda
14	Brown?	
15	А	Yes, it was.
16	Q	Showing you 86, would you, again, please examine the
17	contents,	and tell me if you recognize it?
18	А	That's the same firearm.
19	Q	The same one that was shown here in Exhibit 86?
20	А	Yes.
21		MR. PRENGAMAN: I move for the admission of
22	Exhibit 8	6.
23		MS. HICKMAN: No objection.
24		THE COURT: It's admitted.

- 1		
1		(Exhibit 86 admitted into evidence.)
2	BY MR. PR	ENGAMAN:
3	Q	Detective, showing you Exhibit 61, what do you see
4	here?	
5	А	That's a double-barreled shotgun.
6	Q	And is it in two parts?
7	A	It is.
8	Q	And what parts are we looking at?
9	A	The shorter part is the stock of the firearm and the
10	larger po	ortion is the barrels.
11	Q	Okay. And are you familiar with shotguns like this?
12	A	Semi-familiar with them.
13	Q	Is it some shotguns like this are designed to
14	break	not break, but disassemble into two pieces like this?
15	A	These shotguns, yes.
16	Q	So when we see it here, based on what you saw in
17	person,	it's not broken. It's simply disassembled?
18	A	It appears to be functional.
19	Q	Okay. I'm going to show you now Exhibit 90. Would
20	you pleas	se examine the exhibit, and tell me if you recognize
21	it?	
22	А	That is a different firearm than the one you're
23	asking al	oout.
24	0	Oh. I'm sorry.

1		Let me show you Exhibit 91.
2	А	That's the firearm also located in the safe.
3	Q	And is that the same shotgun that we see depicted
4	here in E	xhibit 61?
5	А	Yes.
6		MR. PRENGAMAN: Your Honor, I move for the admission
7	of Exhibi	t 91.
8		MS. HICKMAN: No objection.
9		THE COURT: 91 is admitted.
10		(Exhibit 91 admitted into evidence.)
11		MR. PRENGAMAN: Thank you.
12	BY MR. PR	ENGAMAN:
13	Q	Detective, showing you Exhibit 62, what is shown
14	there?	
15	A	It depicts the rounds of ammunition that was located
16	in the sa	fe and also has part of the firearms we had collected
17	in there.	
18	Q	And were these items also found by Detective Condon?
19	А	Yes, they were.
20	Q	Detective, I'm showing you now Exhibit 63. Can you
21	tell us w	hat area of the residence we are looking at?
22	A	That's the stairwell going upstairs to the second
23	floor.	
24	Q	And going back to what area of the house, where is
	U.	

the stairwell located? How do you get up to the second floor? 1 If you were walking in from the front door going 2 into the main living room, it would be exactly to your right 3 going backwards. 4 So going back to Exhibit 40, are you able to show us 5 here where the stairwell would be? 6 It would be right along this wall. You make a right 7 and walk back toward the front of the house. 8 And in Exhibit 64, is this looking up to the second 0 9 floor? 10 11 Α Yes. So showing you now Exhibit 65, what area of the 12 residence are we looking at there? 13 That is at the top of the stairs. To the right is a 14 Α loft area. 15 And so as you -- there's, again, like a little pony 16 wall there as you come up? 17 A Yes. 18 And so the area we are looking directly into over 19 the pony wall is the loft? 20 Α Yes. 21 And what's on the -- if you were to turn left, where 22 23 would you go?

24

Α

It's a little -- I don't know if you call it an

office space or a craft area. 1 And can you show us where you would go in this photo 2 to get to where that area is? 3 It would be to the left. 4 So --5 0 So along this wall would be a little craft area. 6 Α So it's indented, and you go into like an area 7 Q 8 there? Yes. 9 Α Showing you now Exhibit 66, what do we see in that 10 11 photo? That is the entrance to the master bedroom. 12 Α And right here, this sort of exposed wood, what's 0 13 14 that? I believe it was where a pony wall used to be. 15 16 to have two pony walls coming up the stairs. And so is this area right here on the immediate 17 other side of the stairs from the photo we were looking at? 18 Α Yes. 19 The photo we were just looking at before? 20 0 Yes. 21 Α Showing you Exhibit 67, what do we see there? 22 Q That's a picture of the loft. 23 Α And the stairway is over here on the immediate right 24 Q

or the far right-hand side?

A On the right-hand side. And then the missing pony wall is to the far right.

- Q Were any of the items that you were looking for in the search warrant located in the loft area?
 - A Yes, there were.
 - O What was located there?
 - A There was a .22 Ruger rifle.
- Q Showing you Exhibit 68, is this a little bit closer view of the loft area?
 - A Yes.
- Q And are you able to see generally I can show you the photo. It might be a little hard to see displayed, so tell me if you need to see the actual photo.
- But are you able to see the general area where the rifle was found?
 - A Not in the photo. I believe it was located --
- Q Okay. Let me do this. Would it help for you to see the photo in person?
 - A Yes. Okay.
- Q Going back to 68, can you show us the general area where the rifle was located?
 - A It was on this wooden coffee table.
 - Q Showing you Exhibit 70, what do we see there?

1	A	That's the Remington .22-caliber rifle.
2	Q	And showing you Exhibit 71, what do we see there?
3	A	That's the same rifle that was depicted, and the
4	butt stoc	k the rear-end of the firearm was missing.
5	Q	Detective, showing you now Exhibit 90, would you
6	please lo	ok at the contents, and tell me if you recognize it?
7	А	That's the same rifle that was located
8	Q	That's the rifle we just looked at in Exhibit 70 and
9	71?	
10	A	Yes.
11	Q	Collected and booked into evidence by Linda Brown?
12	A	Yes.
13		MR. PRENGAMAN: Your Honor, I move for the admission
14	of Exhibi	t 90.
15		THE COURT: It's admitted.
16		MR. PRENGAMAN: Thank you.
17		(Exhibit 90 admitted into evidence.)
18	BY MR. PR	ENGAMAN:
19	Q	Was any ammunition located in the loft area?
20	А	I believe there was some ammunition.
21	Q	Showing you Exhibit 72, do you recognize what you
22	see there	??
23	A	Yes.
24	Q	What is this?
	1	

1	А	Shotgun shells that were located in the loft.
2	Q	And then showing you Exhibit 73, what is that?
3	А	That's a passport that was located there, too.
4	Q	And in the loft area?
5	А	Yes.
6	Q	And is this an item that would be considered an
7	item that	would be considered indicia of ownership or
8	occupancy	?
9	А	Yes.
10	Q	Detective, going back to Exhibit 66, what room is
11	this?	
12	A	That's the master bedroom.
13	Q	Was anything significant to the search warrant
14	located i	n the master bedroom?
15	A	There was a firearm located inside there along with
16	some more	e ammunition.
17	Q	Showing you Exhibit 74, are we looking at the master
18	bedroom i	n this photo?
19	A	Parts of it, yes.
20	Q	Okay. And are you able not the gun itself, but
21	are you a	able to see the general area where the firearm was
22	located i	n the master bedroom?
23	A	Yes.
24	Q	And can you indicate that for the jury by circling
	1	

the area?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

A I believe it was located in this area, but it was located right on the bed (indicating).

Q And I'm going to show you Exhibit 78 in evidence, but it might be kind of hard to see, so let me show it to you in person and just ask you if you're able to see, is the firearm in that photo?

A Just the handle portion of it.

Q Okay. And we'll look at that in a second. But is that how the gun was found?

A Yes.

Q Okay. And would you be able to circle it on the monitor?

A Yes.

Q So showing you Exhibit 78, are we looking on top of the bed here?

A Yes.

Q And can you show us where the firearm was found?

A (The witness complies.)

Q And what type of firearm was that?

A It was a SIG Sauer, .40-caliber.

O And is that the gun depicted in Exhibit 79?

23 A Yes.

Q And is this -- obviously, it's been pulled out of

- 1		
1	where it	was found; is that right?
2	А	Yes.
3	Q	As far as its condition otherwise, is that how it
4	was found	d?
5	А	Yes.
6	Q	Showing you Exhibit 82, what do we see there?
7	А	That is the magazine that was inside that weapon.
8	Q	Inside that SIG Sauer pistol?
9	А	Yes.
10	Q	Detective, I'm going to show you Exhibit 85. Please
11	examine	the contents, and tell me if you recognize it.
12	A	That's the firearm located on the bed.
13	Q	I'm going to also show you Exhibit 58A. Would you
14	please t	ake a look at that and tell me if you recognize it?
15	A	That's the magazine that was also located inside the
16	firearm.	
17	Q	So is it accurate that Exhibit 85 is the same
18	handgun	that we see in Exhibit 79?
19	А	Yes.
20	Q	And the magazine in 85A is the same one we see in
21	Exhibit	82?
22	A	Yes.
23	Q	Both collected and booked into evidence by Linda
24	Brown?	

- 1		
1	А	Yes.
2		MR. PRENGAMAN: Your Honor, move for the admission
3	of 85 and	85A.
4		MS. HICKMAN: No objection.
5		THE COURT: They are both admitted.
6	(Exhibits 85 and 85A admitted into evidence.)
7		MR. PRENGAMAN: Thank you.
8	BY MR. PR	ENGAMAN:
9	Q	Detective, once and apart from the weapons that
10	we've loo	ked at in the photos in the exhibits, any other
11	firearms	located?
12	A	No.
13	Q	Once the search was concluded, did you have any
14	other ass	ignments in the case?
15	A	I completed the search warrant with the items we had
16	located.	
17	Q	Just so you could go back to the Court and say, this
18	is what w	e found; this is what we seized?
19	A	Then we also leave a copy for the occupant of the
20	residence	so they know what we took from the house.
21	Q	Once that was done, did that conclude your work in
22	this case	?
23	А	Yes.
24		MR. PRENGAMAN: Thank you, Detective. No further

surveillance of Mr. Hager's home to know that he was out of it 1 before you went in, correct? 2 Yes. 3 Ά And so when he left -- between when he left and when 4 you went in, nobody else went into the house, correct? 5 Α Yes. 6 When I say "nobody else," I mean nobody other than 7 Sparks Police Department. 8 9 Α Yes. And you had as much time as you would have needed to 10 look through that house and find anything of significance, 11 12 correct? 13 Α Yes. And one of the places that you were able to look at 14 15 was the kitchen, right? 16 Α Yes. And that kitchen was, fair to say, in some sort of 17 Q 18 disarray? 19 Α Yes. But you had time to go through the drawers if 20 0 necessary, open the cabinets, anything you wanted to do to 21 look through that home, correct? 22 23 Α Yes.

24

Q

And in that kitchen you never found a long straw,

correct, t	hat you took a photo of?
A	Not that I recall.
Q	And you definitely didn't collect one, correct?
А	No.
Q	And you also had the opportunity to search I think
what has b	een called the guitar loft.
	And I'm showing you what's been admitted as
Exhibit 67	You do recognize that, correct?
А	Yes.
Q	And like I said before, you had as much time as you
wanted to	search this area, correct?
А	Yes.
Q	And if you look here, you see this bench and a
little tak	ole, correct?
A	Yes.
Q	And in fact, you spent some time looking at that
table beca	ause you found a firearm there, correct?
A	Detective Vasquez found the firearm, yes.
Q	And you took a photograph of that?
A	Linda Brown did, yes
Q	That's what's been admitted as Exhibit 70, correct?
A	Yes.
Q	So when you were going through this guitar loft, you
were able	to look at everything that was there, right?
	A Q what has b Exhibit 67 A Q wanted to A Q little tak A Q table beca A Q A Q A Q A

1	A	Yes.
2	Q	Because there was quite a bit, right?
3	A	Yes, ma'am.
4	Q	And as you searched that guitar loft, you never
5	collected	a Bible, correct?
6	А	A Bible?
7	Q	Uh-huh.
8	А	No, ma'am.
9	Q	You didn't photograph a Bible, correct?
10	A	No, ma'am.
11	Q	You never collected any small plastic baggies,
12	correct?	
13	A	No.
14	Q	When we're looking at what's been admitted as 70.
15	When you	look it might be hard to see here, so let me know
16	if you can	n't see it. Do you see that there are small plastic
17	baggies or	n that bench there? Would it be easier for me to
18	bring it	up to you and you can look at it there?
19	А	I can see it. I believe they are the ones in the
20	back.	
21	Q	Okay. Do you see them sitting on that bench?
22	А	Yes.
23	Q	Is it fair to say those weren't collected? Correct?
24	А	No.

1	Q And if you look at what's been admitted as 67,
2	there's a number of things on the floor here, correct?
3	A Yes.
4	Q And it looks like it's just somewhat miscellaneous?
5	A Yes.
6	Q I'm going to zoom in just a little bit, see if this
7	becomes a little bit clearer for you. Okay.
8	So I've zoomed in on that area. Can you see it a
9	little more clearly now?
10	A Yes.
11	Q And do you see sitting on the floor this wooden box
12	that's sitting there?
13	A Yes.
14	Q That wasn't collected, correct?
15	A No.
16	Q And nothing inside that was collected, correct?
17	A No.
18	Q And this guitar loft, you can see actually if I zoom
19	out in this picture, it's up above that general like the
20	larger living area that you had described earlier on direct,
21	right?
22	A Yes. The living area, yes.
23	Q And you can see that there are a number of windows
24	here, correct?

1	A Yes.
2	Q And none of those windows have blinds or shades of
3	any sort, right?
4	A No.
5	Q And in this guitar loft you look at Exhibit 65
6	I'll zoom in, too, so it's a little bit easier to see in this
7	back corner. Back over here, there's some equipment back
8	there, correct (indicating)?
9	A Yes.
10	Q Do you have any recollection of what that equipment
11	was?
12	A I don't recall, ma'am.
13	MS. HICKMAN: Okay. I'm going to look to see if
14	there's a better picture. Give me one moment.
15	If I could have this marked.
16	THE COURT CLERK: Exhibit 94.
17	(Exhibit 94 marked for identification.)
18	BY MS. HICKMAN:
19	Q Detective, I'm showing you what has been marked as
20	Exhibit 94. Do you recognize that?
21	A Yes.
22	Q And how do you recognize it?
23	A I recall it being in there, and I walked to that
24	exact area.
	I I

1	Q	And is that a fair and accurate representation of
2	how that	area looked when you took the photos on April 8th of
3	2016?	
4	A	I did not take the photos.
5	Q	Or of what you saw.
6		I apologize.
7	А	Yes.
8		MS. HICKMAN: I move for the admission of
9	Exhibit 9	94.
10		MR. PRENGAMAN: No objection.
11		THE COURT: It's admitted.
12		(Exhibit 94 admitted into evidence.)
13	BY MS. HI	CKMAN:
14	Q	So if I show you what's admitted as Exhibit 94,
15	that's a	close-up of that area, correct?
16	A	Yes.
17	Q	And you can see there's equipment back there?
18	A	Yes.
19	Q	Do you know what that would be used for?
20	A	It looks like camera equipment. Maybe possibly
21	photograp	phy.
22	Q	Photography, camera, something along those lines?
23	A	Yes.
24	Q	This white umbrella looks like it might be used to

1	amplify light or something.
2	A Yes.
3	Q Okay. And Detective Condon I'm sorry. Detective
4	Orr, when you searched this home, you did not find narcotics
5	in the home, correct? Or suspected narcotics?
6	A I don't believe so, no.
7	Q Okay.
8	And with that, I have no further questions.
9	THE COURT: Thank you.
10	Anything on redirect?
11	MR. PRENGAMAN: Just briefly, Your Honor.
12	
13	REDIRECT EXAMINATION
14	BY MR. PRENGAMAN:
15	Q Detective, as far as the questions about what you
16	found or things that you didn't find, what were you searching
17	for when you were searching this residence?
18	A We were searching for indicia of ownership, guns,
19	and ammunition.
20	Q That's what was listed in the warrant?
21	A Yes.
22	Q Were you you were you looking for a Bible?
23	A Was I? No.
24	Q So if $-$ if $-$ in answer to the questions that the

Î		
1	Defendant	's lawyer just asked you, are you telling us that
2	there was	no Bible in the residence?
3	A	As far as I saw, there was none. I didn't do much
4	searching	•
5	Q	Okay.
6	A	I was the scribe. Other detectives searched.
7	Q	So could have been one there you did not see? Maybe
8	not?	
9	А	Yes.
10	Q	You don't know?
11	А	I don't know.
12	Q	Same thing with the straw that you were asked about?
13	А	Yes.
14	Q	Same thing with the box you were asked about?
15	А	Yes.
16		MR. PRENGAMAN: Thank you.
17	1	No further questions.
18		MS. HICKMAN: Just briefly to follow up on that.
19		
20		RECROSS-EXAMINATION
21	BY MS. HI	CKMAN:
22	Q	You were just asked about specifically what you were
23	searching	for, correct?
24	A	Yes.

1	Q	And that was firearms, ammunition, and indicia of
2	occupancy	, correct?
3	A	Yes.
4	Q	And those are the things that were in the
5	applicati	on for the search warrant and the actual search
6	warrant y	ou were serving, correct?
7	A	Yes.
8	Q	So if there had been something in the search warrant
9	regarding	narcotics, you would have been looking for that,
10	correct?	
11	A	Yes.
12	Q	And on April 8th of 2016, a number of detectives
13	from the	Sparks Police Department were acting sort of as a
14	group, co	rrect?
15	A	Yes.
16	Q	Sharing intelligence?
17	A	Yes.
18	Q	Letting each other know what was important?
19	А	Yes.
20	Q	Letting each other know what you were looking for in
21	the home?	
22	А	Yes.
23	Q	And when it was found, correct?
24	А	Yes.

1	Q And no one ever told to you look for narcotics,
2	correct?
3	A No.
4	Q No one ever told you to look for a Bible, correct?
5	A No.
6	Q No one ever told you to look for a straw, correct?
7	A No.
8	Q No one ever told you to look for a plastic baggy,
9	correct?
10	A No.
11	Q No one ever told you to look for anything that would
12	indicate someone was using narcotics in that home, correct?
13	A No.
14	Q And that's why you weren't searching for those
15	things, right?
16	A Yes.
17	MS. HICKMAN: Thank you.
18	I have no further questions.
19	THE COURT: You're excused. You may step down.
20	Thank you very much.
21	Call your next witness.
22	Ladies and gentlemen, you can stretch if you want.
23	I saw some people moving arms around. You can stand up and
24	move around if you want.

1	Call your next witness.
2	MR. PRENGAMAN: State will call Detective Kevin
3	Dach.
4	THE COURT: Thank you. Please step forward and be
5	sworn, wherever he might be.
6	Please step forward and be sworn.
7	(The witness was sworn.)
8	THE COURT: Please take the witness stand. Make
9	yourself comfortable. We'll know you're comfortable because
10	you're going to tell us your first and last name, spelling
11	your last name for the record.
12	THE WITNESS: My name is Kevin Dach, spelled
13	D-A-C-H.
14	THE COURT: Thank you.
15	Mr. Prengaman.
16	MR. PRENGAMAN: Thank you, Your Honor.
17	
18	KEVIN DACH,
19	having been first duly sworn, was examined
20	and testified as follows:
21	
22	DIRECT EXAMINATION
23	BY MR. PRENGAMAN:
24	Q Could you please tell us how you're employed?

I'm employed at the Sparks Police Department. Α 1 And in what capacity at this time? 2 0 As a detective. 3 Α You're a sworn peace officer? 4 0 Yes, sir. 5 Α And how long have you served the City of Sparks in 6 any capacity, detective or officer? 7 8 Α 13 years. And how long have you been assigned to detectives? 9 0 10 Α Eight years. Detective, I'm going to take you back to April 8th 11 0 of this year, 2016. Back on that day, did you receive an 12 assignment to assist in the service of a search warrant and 13 14 take an individual into custody? Yes, I did. 15 Α And in terms of that, what was your first 16 0 assignment? 17 Surveillance. 18 Α And what were you assigned to surveil? 19 0 I was assigned to surveil Mr. Hager leaving the area 20 Α and basically following him to a destination location. 21 So you've heard some prior testimony about the 22 service of the warrant. Is it true that there were some 23

detectives that were watching -- Detective Orr, detectives

1	watching the residence that was the target of the search		
2	warrant?		
3	A Yes, that's correct.		
4	Q And was that 2460 Anqua Drive in Sparks?		
5	A Yes, sir.		
6	Q And you were not one of the detectives that was		
7	actually watching the house?		
8	A Correct.		
9	Q Where just generally speaking, where were you		
10	positioned?		
11	A At the very beginning of the surveillance, I was		
12	actually at the Mendive parking lot.		
13	Q And were you tasked with continuing to surveil the		
14	occupant of the residence of 2460 when he left?		
15	A Yes.		
16	Q And at some point, were you notified and had you		
17	been a did you know who you were supposed to be looking		
18	for?		
19	A Yes. We were given a description a description		
20	of vehicles.		
21	Q Okay. And so at some point, were you notified that		
22	an individual had left 2460 Anqua?		
23	A Yes, I was.		
24	Q And in a particular vehicle?		

1	А	Yes. I was told he left in a Camaro, a blue Camaro.
2	Q	And then at some point were you able, from where you
3	were, to s	see that vehicle?
4	A	I was.
5	Q	Okay. And were you able to see did it pass by
6	you?	
7	А	It did eventually when it turned onto Vista.
8	Q	And could you see the driver?
9	А	I did not at that time.
10	Q	So you were just going off the information you've
11	been provi	Lded?
12	А	Yes.
13	Q	Did you follow that Camaro until it stopped?
14	А	Yes.
15	Q	And ultimately where did that Camaro stop?
16	А	On Salomen. 125 Salomen Circle. It's the Quik Stop
17	minimart.	
18	Q	That's also in Sparks?
19	А	Yes, sir.
20	Q	And based on your assignment, did you ultimately
21	contact th	ne driver of that vehicle?
22	А	Yes. He was taken into custody by other officers,
23	and I had	contacted him right after that.
24	Q	And when you say "right after," was it right there

1	in the vicinity of the Camaro at the location you just		
2	described?		
3	А	Yes, it was.	
4	Q	Do you recognize the individual that was taken into	
5	custody r	ight there?	
6	A	I do.	
7	Q	And do you see him in the courtroom?	
8	A	Yes, sir.	
9	Q	And could you please for the record, so it's clear	
10	who you're talking about, tell us where you see him and		
11	describe his clothing?		
12	A	Yes, sir. He's at the front table with a white	
13	shirt, red tie.		
14		MR. PRENGAMAN: Your Honor, may the record reflect	
15	identification of the Defendant?		
16		THE COURT: It will.	
17	BY MR. PR	ENGAMAN:	
18	Q	Thank you, Detective.	
19		Did you speak to the Defendant?	
20	A	I did.	
21	Q	Okay. And was one of the things that you spoke to	
22	him about	whether he would condone having you search his car?	
23	A	Yes, sir.	
24	Q	Did he consent to have you search his car?	

4	70	II. III. III. marra ma unitton concent to soarch the
1	A	He did. He gave me written consent to search the
2	vehicle.	
3	Q	Okay. And did you, in fact, search it?
4	А	I did.
5	Q	And were you looking for firearms or ammunition?
6	А	I was.
7	Q	Did you find either in the car?
8	А	Ammunition.
9	Q	And just very generally I don't need numbers or
10	anything,	but what type of ammunition did you find?
11	A	Three different caliber types. So a Winchester
12	.45calibe	r; it's called a 9 millimeter, kind of an off brand;
13	and some	.40 caliber as well, also off brand.
14	Q	Okay. In the course of that search, did you locate
15	an iPhone	?
16	A	I did. He actually had told me, "The iPhone is in
17	there."	
18	Q	When you say "he," the Defendant told you that?
19	А	Mr. Hager, yes.
20	Q	And did Mr. Hager have a request as to what would
21	happen to	the vehicle?
22	А	Yes. He asked if I would release the vehicle to a
23	friend of	his instead of towing it.
24	Q	Okay. And did you do that?

I did. 1 Okay. In the course of doing that, did you use or 2 0 access Mr. Hager's iPhone in some fashion? 3 Yes. He asked me to get the number out of the phone Α 4 and gave me the security code into the phone to get the phone 5 number. 6 And did you get the number and call so that his 7 friend could come pick up the car? 8 Α Yes, at his request. 9 And then was that iPhone retained? 10 0 Α Yes, sir. 11 Now, once -- and did that -- after you -- and you 12 actually searched the Camaro? 13 Α 14 Yes. So after you had completed that, did you have 15 another assignment? 16 Yes. After shuffling the cars -- basically, I 17 helped his friend get the vehicle back -- I assisted with the 18 search at his residence. 19 And just to sort of explain that, the shuffle was 20 what? 21 Basically, as far as she showed up in her own 22

vehicle. And obviously she couldn't drive both vehicles, so

she asked if I could follow her to the residence to drop one

23

vehicle off, bring her back to the scene of the Camaro to get 1 the Camaro. 2 So you did all that? 3 Α Yes. So once she had taken Mr. Hager's Camaro, what was 5 your next task or assignment? 6 I went to the residence, and other detectives were 7 already searching the residence. I asked if I could be of 8 assistance, and they stated I could search the master bedroom, 9 10 which I searched. The photos are a little out of order, so bear with 11 12 me, please. So starting with Exhibit 39, is this the house that 13 14 you assisted searching? It is. 15 Α When they said you could search the master bedroom, 16 is that, indeed, what you did? 17 Yes, sir. 18 Α 19 And did they apprise you or did you know what was listed in the search warrant as far as what you were looking 20

They told me we were looking for firearms.

And was indicia of occupancy or ownership also one

21

22

23

24

for?

of the items?

1	A Y	des, sir.
2	Q P	And did you search the master bedroom?
3	A Y	des, sir.
4	Q 5	Showing you Exhibit 74, can you tell us what we are
5	looking at	here?
6	A T	That is the master bedroom.
7	Q F	And what are we when we look at you see the
8	bed in this	s photograph?
9	A Y	Yes. This is a view from the doorway area. It
10	shows the b	ped, nightstand, dresser, lamp, and then artwork.
11	Q F	And with regard to the bed and specifically the
12	items liste	ed in the search warrant, did you locate anything
13	you were lo	poking for there?
14	A 3	Yes. On top of the bed was a firearm.
15	Q V	What kind of firearm?
16	A]	It's a SIG Sauer 9 millimeter.
17	Q F	And we've heard some previous testimony from
18	Detective (Orr. He was involved in assisting in the search; is
19	that right?	?
20	A 3	Yes, sir. He was being scribe, basically
21	documenting	g what was collected, what was found, who found it.
22	Q F	And can you show us just the general area where that
23	gun was loo	cated?
24	A (Can I point to it?

You have to press firmly, but if you press on the 1 2 screen, you can draw. Okay. (The witness complies.) 3 Α So it was on the bed? 0 It was on the bed on the far side from where 5 Α we're looking. 6 And showing you Exhibit 79, is that the gun that you 7 8 found? That is. 9 Α And I'll show you Exhibit 78. It's kind of hard to 10 0 see, but does this photo depict the gun as it was originally 11 12 found in place? 13 Α Correct. And if you would, showing you Exhibit 78, can you 14 0 circle the area where the firearm is located in place? 15 Sorry. Hard to write on the screen. 16 Α 17 (The witness complies.) Now, showing you Exhibit 75, can you tell us what we 18 19 see here? That's the nightstand. That's on the -- if you're 20 Α standing at the foot of the bed facing the front of the bed, 21 22 it's on the left-hand side. And going back to Exhibit 74, are we able to see 23

24

that same nightstand here?

Α Yes. 1 And could you circle it for us? 2 0 (The witness complies.) 3 Α Now, Detective, when you became a police officer --4 0 and you attended the academy; is that true? 5 Yes, sir. 6 Α And in the academy, did you receive training in the 7 investigation of controlled substance cases? 8 Yes, sir. 9 Α Okay. And did that training include -- a number of 10 0 things -- but recognition of controlled substances and 11 controlled substance paraphernalia? 12 13 Α Yes, sir. And in your time as a police officer and detective 14 with the City of Sparks, would it be fair to say that you've 15 investigated numerous controlled substance cases, be it use, 16 17 possession, even trafficking, sales? Yes, sir. Α 18 And would it -- is it also accurate to say that in 19 the course of those investigations, you've had the opportunity 20 to interact with and view -- interact with people who are 21 involved in the world of using and selling controlled 22

23

24

substances?

Α

That's correct.

Have you become familiar, by virtue of that 1 experience as well as your training, with the common methods 2 that people use to ingest a controlled substance? 3 Yes, sir. Α And does that include snorting, smoking, injecting 5 0 controlled substances? 6 7 All of those, yes. Α Okay. And so based on that experience, you are able 8 0 to recognize drug paraphernalia; is that fair? 9 That is fair to say. 10 Α And are there certain items in your experience that 11 you have found people commonly use to ingest certain 12 controlled substance? 13 Α Yes, sir. 14 For instance with methamphetamine, are there 15 certain -- not that there's only one, but are there certain 16 ways that people commonly ingest that controlled substance? 17 Yes, sir. 18 Α So -- what are some of those ways? 19 Either smoking or injecting. Smoking would be with 20 Α Injecting with a needle. 21 a pipe. I'm going to show you what we have admitted as 22 Exhibit -- let me first -- so on the other side of the bed, 23

was there also another end table or table, so to speak?

It was a table, like a round table, yes, sir. 1 Let me show you what's admitted as 77. Do you 2 0 recognize that? 3 Yes, sir. Α 4 Okay. Was that also in the master bedroom? 5 Α Yes, sir. 6 Where was that located in reference to the table 7 Q that we just saw looking in from the doorway? 8 Α On the other side. 9 Other side of the bed? 10 Yeah. 11 So now going back to the end table that we see 12 closest to the door, so Exhibit 75. 13 In the course of the search -- I'm looking at 14 Exhibit 76 -- was the drawer -- contents of the drawer looked 15 at or examined? 16 If the drawer was opened, we were looking for, like 17 we said, firearms, ammunition-type things, indicia. 18 Now, did you find any firearms in the drawer? 19 0 Negative. 20 Α Did you find anything in the drawer based on your 21 experience and training you recognized as drug paraphernalia 22 or controlled substance paraphernalia? 23

24

Α

There was a glass pipe commonly used to smoke

1	methamphetamine.	
2	Q	Can you see that in this photograph?
3	A	I can.
4	Q	So if you can, would you circle it for us?
5	A	(The witness complies.)
6	Q	And I'm going to see if I can get a little closer.
7	_	Are we able to see it better here?
8	A	Yes, sir.
9	Q	And could you circle it again for us, please?
10	A	(The witness complies.)
11	Q	And based on your training and experience, what did
12	you recognize that as?	
13	A	It's a glass pipe, with residue, commonly used to
14	smoke metl	hamphetamine.
15	Q	And is there anything else in that drawer that you
16	recognize	as paraphernalia?
17	A	The baggies that are in there are commonly used to
18	store methamphetamine.	
19	Q	And if you could, could you show us where those
20	baggies a	re located in the photograph?
21	A	There's a couple different spots.
22		Am I allowed to circle multiple spots?
23	Q	Please. Yes.
24	А	(The witness complies.)
	10	

1 The handgun that you located, that was collected by Linda Brown; is that right? 2 3 Yes, sir. 4 Did you locate -- so is it fair to say that the only 0 area of the house that you searched when you got there, sort 5 of joining them already in the course of searching, was that 6 7 master bedroom? That's correct. 8 Α Now, later on, down the road, so to speak, did you 9 0 10 receive another assignment in the case? 11 Yes, sir, I did. Α Okay. And was that a request made of you by 12 Q 13 Detective Rowe, or then Sergeant Rowe? Yes, it was. 14 Α Okay. And what did he ask you to do? 15 0 He asked me to assist him in serving a search 16 warrant on a cell phone that belonged to Mr. Hager. 17 And was that the same iPhone that you had collected 18 19 during your search of Mr. Hager's vehicle that you've 20 previously testified about? 21 Α Yes, it was. And do you have some specialized training and 22 experience in conducting searches of electronic devices? 23

Α

24

I do.

Q And when you search an electronic device like a cell phone, do you just log on — get on the phone and start looking through the folders and looking at the e-mails and stuff? Is that how you do it?

A No. We use a special forensic program to prevent the phone -- prevent us from deleting anything that would be on the phone.

Q Can you just give us — first let me ask you this:
Could you outline for us your relevant education and training
that qualifies you to conduct those forensic searches?

A Yes. I've been to numerous classes. I think it started back in 2012 or something of that nature where I started attending classes on cell phones, on mapping, looking at digital forensics, knowing how to collect evidence when it comes to electronic evidence.

In 2014, I attended the Computer Forensics Institute in Alabama and looked at computer forensics, which kind of went hand in hand with cell phones. Some of the things are very similar now with smart phones being very similar to computers.

Also in 2014, I attended classes for what are considered programs for Lancer and Cellebrite. They are forensic programs we use to download phones. The reason we do that is to verify results. If I'm going to download this

phone in Cellebrite, I want to verify everything in there I got is correct. So then I run another program, Lancer, and compare the results and see that they're correct.

Q When you talk about downloading, can you give us an idea of the mechanics? So when you're going to search a phone like an iPhone, a smart phone, what is the -- what are the mechanics of how you go about doing that, when you talk about downloading or copying?

A We have some procedures we like to do. For example, I also photograph the phone. I, you know, look at the phone and make sure that what type of phone it is. And then when we — you say "downloading it," you're basically taking an image of that phone and putting it onto a computer that we can now analyze that data.

As you had said earlier, we are not looking through the suspect or whatever phone it might be by hand, because that's going to alter a lot of the data. I could accidentally delete something, and I don't want to do that.

So after the acquisition has brought the download of the phone to the computer, now I can look through files and folders and figure out what's on the phone without worrying about deleting any of it.

Q So it sounds like you're downloading a copy of the phone and searching the copy instead of the phone?

16

17

18

21

22

23

- A Correct.
- Q And by doing that, you ensure that you don't tamper with or alter any of the evidence that might be on the phone?
 - A Correct.
- Q Now, in this case, did you conduct a forensic search of the Defendant's iPhone?
 - A I did.
- Q And in the course of your search, did you locate any of the items that you were looking for; pictures, videos depicting firearms or the Defendant in possession of firearms?
 - A Yes, both of those.
- Q Okay. I like to look at some of those items with you. Before I do, I want to ask you about -- generally about how a cell phone stores images like pictures or videos.
- When you create a video or photo on a cellular phone, does the phone record some data about that video or picture?
 - A Generally, yes.
- Q Okay. And when you say "generally," what do you mean by that?
 - A A lot of times there is settings that the user of the phone can turn off or on, depending on their preferences.
 - Q Okay. And so, for instance, if I have an iPhone, is it -- I can set the iPhone so it wouldn't record any data

about the video or photos I take?

A Limited data. You still have some on there but less than others.

Q If I don't do that, I take pictures or make videos with my phone, it would be recording what type of data about those videos and pictures?

A You could get a variety of the data. You could get the date, time, or location of when a video or photograph is taken, for example.

Q With regard to the Defendant's iPhone, was his phone configured to not record that data or record that data?

A His phone allowed that data to be collected.

Q Okay. Detective, I'm going to show you — first I want to show you Exhibit 9. Detective, I'm going to show you what we have marked as Exhibit Number 9. Could you please take a look at that exhibit and tell me if you recognize it?

A Yes, sir.

Q Does that exhibit contain images and data that you located on Mr. Hager's -- the Defendant's iPhone?

A Yes, it does.

Q Okay. And does the data that is -- that was associated with those photographs allow you to tell when and even where those photos were taken?

A It does.

1	MR. PRENGAMAN: Your Honor, I move for the admission
2	of Exhibit 9.
3	MS. HICKMAN: No objection.
4	THE COURT: Is there any stipulations related to
5	this exhibit?
6	MS. HICKMAN: Your Honor, if I could take a look at
7	what they are.
8	THE COURT: 9 will be admitted. But if you could
9	take a look.
10	(Exhibit 9 admitted into evidence.)
11	MS. HICKMAN: I stipulate to all of those.
12	THE COURT: There's a stipulation. Would you please
13	list those numbers for the record?
14	Thank you very much, Counsel. Go ahead.
15	MR. PRENGAMAN: Exhibit 11. Exhibit 15.
16	Exhibit 16. Exhibit 21. Exhibit 23. And Exhibit 24.
17	THE COURT: Thank you. They are admitted by
18	stipulation.
19	You may proceed.
20	(Exhibits 11, 15, 16, 21, 23 and 24 admitted into evidence.)
21	MR. PRENGAMAN: Thank you, Your Honor.
22	BY MR. PRENGAMAN:
23	Q Detective, showing you Exhibit 9, so this exhibit
24	has three images; is that right?

- 1
- Α Yes, sir.
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24

- Okay. And are they images that -- on the left side of the exhibit, those are photographs that you found on Mr. Hager's phone?
 - That's correct. Α
- And on the left, what is the text that we are 0 looking at?
 - Α The left?
- I'm sorry. On the right -- to the right of the Q photos, what is the box that has test in it?
- Α The right of the box is basically what we consider metadata or data about the picture to the left.
- Was that data that was actually associated with the corresponding photograph on the phone?
 - That is correct. Α
- So let me zoom in with the top image and look at 0 that. So can you please look at that top box of data, explain to us what we see there, the significance of it?
- Sure. It starts with the file and file name, if you Α It's named IMG, underscore, 3714.DJPG. That's just every time you take a picture, it gives a name to it. So as you take more pictures, it would be 3714, 3715, 3716, and so forth.
 - Below that is the file time. This could change

depending on when this file was accessed or if things were changed on that file.

- Q So let me stop you there, Detective. So does the file time -- does that tell you when that image was created?
 - A No.

- O It could, but not necessarily?
- A That's correct. If it wasn't relooked at later or, you know, manipulated later, it might change. But if it wasn't, it would not change.
- Q So it's not necessarily a reliable indicator as to when it was created?
 - A Correct. In this case, it looks like it.
 - Q What's the next -- the GPS time?
 - A GPS time is the time the picture was taken but with relation to GPS coordinates or location coordinates.
- Q And in terms of reliability as to the creation of the image with the file, what is GPS time?
- A It is very reliable. It shows when the picture was taken. In this particular case, though, this time is based on Greenwich Mean Time. That's what they do GPS coordinates in, or UTC time, depending on how you look at it. It's not the Pacific Standard Time that we are used to here.
- Q So in order to determine what our time would be here, what type of corrections do you need to make?

23

24

is that right?

So it's what I would characterize as military time;

The 24-hour time. 2 0 And looking at the second photograph, do you 3 recognize -- or what is the creation date and time of that 4 5 photograph? It's -- again, looking at the EXIF time, it's 1-24 6 2016 at 19:31 hours and 10 seconds. So it would be 7 --7 8 7:31 at night. And the last photograph, what's the time relation to 9 0 that photograph? 10 1-24 2016 at 23:33 hours. 11 Α Did you want me to finish going with all the dates 12 that are there, or is that enough? 13 Please, if would you, Detective. Let me go back to 14 0 15 the top. Okay. The only -- the only part we didn't finish 16 A here is on the camera. It shows it was taken by an Apple 17 iPhone 6. The software version at the time this picture was 18 taken is software session 8.4.1. That will change as updates 19 come and the person updates the software. 20 The next is the coordinates. We talked about GPS 21 That's related to GPS coordinates. So those 22 coordinates are the location of where this picture was taken. 23

That's correct.

Α

1

24

And then the source on the bottom is the file

structure, so where that file is stored on the phone. 1 2 And with regard to those GPS coordinates, did you 3 look those up? I did. 4 Α And where do they correspond? 5 0 Mr. Hager's home at 2460 Angua. 6 A 7 And is that true of all the GPS coordinates for 0 these particular images? 8 9 Α Yes, sir. Now, Detective, if you had -- looking at the photos, 10 0 11 the still images, from your time in Mr. Hager's residence when you were assisting in the search, do you recognize any of 12 those areas that we see in the photos? 13 14 Yes. It appears to be in the master bedroom. Ι Α recognize the lamp. I also recognize the nightstand. 15 16 Did you also locate videos on the phone? 0 17 Yes, sir. Α THE COURT: Mr. Prengaman, were you planning on 18 playing those videos at this time? 19 20 MR. PRENGAMAN: I was hoping to. THE COURT: I'm thinking -- it's quarter to 5:00. 21 Great way to have a seque before you move there, so I think 22 23 we'll stick that up tomorrow morning.

24

Ladies and gentlemen, we'll take our evening recess

because this is a good time to break, and we don't have to break in the middle of the videos at 5:00.

We'll start tomorrow at 10:30. I have a calendar to take care of in the morning. That's what I have to do, then we'll start at 10:30 tomorrow and have a full day of trial.

So our evening recess reads as follows: We are going to take an evening recess. It is your duty not to converse among yourselves or with anyone else on any subject connected with the trial or to read, watch, or listen to any report of or commentary on the trial by any person connected with the trial or by any medium of information, including, without limitation, newspaper, television, Internet, smart phones, radio, and you are not to form or express an opinion on any subject connected with this case until it is finally submitted to you.

Thank you for your attention today. Sorry, again, about the delay. Hopefully we won't be delayed tomorrow. We'll start at 10:30.

Thank you for your time.

All rise for the jury.

We'll see you tomorrow.

(The jury left the courtroom.)

THE COURT: We are outside the presence.

Anything we have to discuss this evening from the

defense?

MS. HICKMAN: Judge, it's my understanding that the State was going to have Ms. Okuma here with the questionnaire. That's the only thing.

MR. PRENGAMAN: Yes, Judge. If I may just take a moment in order to facilitate the obtaining of those P & P notes, I should have Ms. Okuma here outside the courtroom. So if I can take a moment, I think I can get them. My only concern is that I haven't had a chance to talk to her personally, and my investigator was the go-between to facilitate getting the notes. I'm not sure — it might be she needs to come into court and have the Court make the order for her to give them up because I'm not sure she's going to feel comfortable giving them to me. I want to make sure you have the opportunity to verify that so we can get it to the defense tonight. So if I may take a minute?

THE COURT: You can.

Be seated.

And you can be excused, Officer. See you tomorrow.

THE WITNESS: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you for your testimony so far.

22 See you tomorrow at 10:30.

23 THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.

MR. PRENGAMAN: So, Your Honor, I have it. I'll

```
make a copy and give it to the defense.
 1
               THE COURT: Thank the witness for complying with my
 2
     Order.
 3
               See you tomorrow at 10:30. We'll be in recess until
 4
     then.
 5
              (Proceedings continued to December 14, 2016.)
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
```

1 STATE OF NEVADA SS. COUNTY OF WASHOE 2 3 I, SUSAN KIGER, an Official Reporter of the 4 Second Judicial District Court of the State of Nevada, in and 5 6 for the County of Washoe, State of Nevada, DO HEREBY CERTIFY: 7 That I am not a relative, employee or 8 independent contractor of counsel to any of the parties, or a 9 relative, employee or independent contractor of the parties 10 involved in the proceeding, or a person financially interested in the proceedings; 11 12 That I was present in Department No. 9 of the above-entitled Court on December 13, 2016, and took verbatim 13 stenotype notes of the proceedings had upon the matter 14 15 captioned within, and thereafter transcribed them into typewriting as herein appears; 16 That the foregoing transcript, consisting of 17 18 pages 1 through 205, is a full, true and correct transcription 19 of my stenotype notes of said proceedings. DATED: At Reno, Nevada, this 14th day of 20 21 April, 2017. /s/ Susan Kiger 22 SUSAN KIGER, CCR No. 343 23 24

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that this document was filed electronically with the Nevada Supreme Court on the 16th day of August 2017. Electronic Service of the foregoing document shall be made in accordance with the Master Service List as follows:

> Terrence P. McCarthy, Chief Appellate Deputy, Washoe County District Attorney

I further certify that I served a copy of this document by mailing a true and correct copy thereof, postage pre-paid, addressed to:

Ian Andre Hager (#1172948) Tonopah Conservation Camp HC 76 Box 8045 Tonopah, Nevada 89049

> John Reese Petty Washoe County Public Defender's Office

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

IAN ANDRE HAGER,

Electronically Filed Aug 16 2017 12:57 p.m. No. 7261 Elizabeth A. Brown Clerk of Supreme Court

Appellant,

VS.

THE STATE OF NEVADA,

Respondent.

Appeal from a Judgment of Conviction in Case Number CR16-1457 The Second Judicial District Court of the State of Nevada Honorable Scott N. Freeman, District Judge

JOINT APPENDIX VOLUME TWO

JEREMY T. BOSLER Washoe County Public Defender CHRISTOPHER J. HICKS Washoe County District Attorney

JOHN REESE PETTY Chief Deputy 350 South Center Street, 5th Floor P.O. Box 11130 Reno, Nevada 89520-0027 TERRENCE P. McCARTHY Chief Appellate Deputy One South Sierra, 7th Floor P.O. Box 11130 Reno, Nevada 89520

Attorneys for Appellant

Attorneys for Respondent

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	Defendant's Jury Instruction No. 2 <u>rejected</u> on December 16, 2016
2.	Defendant's Jury Instruction No. 3 <u>rejected</u> on December 16, 2016
3.	Information <u>filed</u> on October 5, 2016
4.	Judgment <u>filed</u> on February 9, 2017 1JA 185
5.	Jury Instructions (1-28) <u>filed</u> on December 16, 2016 1JA 143
6.	Motion In Limine to Preclude Irrelevant Testimony filed on November 21, 2016
7.	Notice of Appeal <u>filed</u> on March 10, 2017 1JA 187
8,,	Opposition to Defendant's "Motion in Limine to Preclude Irrelevant Testimony <u>filed</u> on December 1, 2016 1JA 10
9.	Transcript of Proceedings: Motion in Limine <i>held</i> on December 5, 2016, <u>filed</u> on December 6, 2016 1JA 18
10.	Transcript of Proceedings: Trial <i>held</i> on December 12, 2016
11.	Transcript of Proceedings: Trial <i>held</i> on December 13, 2016
12.	Transcript of Proceedings: Trial <i>held</i> on December 14, 2016
13.	Transcript of Proceedings: Trial <i>held</i> on December 15, 2016

14.	Transcript of Proceedings: Trial <i>held</i> on December 16, 2016	5JA 899
15.	Trial Exhibit 36 <u>admitted</u> on December 13, 2016	1JA 104
16.	Trial Exhibit 38 <u>admitted</u> on December 14, 2016	1JA 110
17.	Trial Exhibit 98 <u>admitted</u> on December 15, 2016	1JA 129
18.	Trial Exhibit 99 <u>admitted</u> on December 15, 2016	1JA 137
19.	Trial Exhibit 100-A <u>admitted</u> on December 15, 2016	1JA 141
20.	Verdict (Count I) <u>filed</u> on December 19, 2016	1JA 179
21.	Verdict (Count II) <u>filed</u> on December 19, 2016	1JA 180
22.	Verdict (Count III) <u>filed</u> on December 19, 2016	1JA 181
23.	Verdict (Count IV) <u>filed</u> on December 19, 2016	1JA 182
24.	Verdict (Count V) <u>filed</u> on December 19, 2016	1JA 183
25.	Verdict (Count VI) <u>filed</u> on December 19, 2016	1JA 184

1	4185
2	
3	
4	
5	IN THE SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA
6	IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF WASHOE
7	THE HONORABLE SCOTT N. FREEMAN, DISTRICT JUDGE
8	000
9	THE STATE OF NEVADA,
10	Plaintiff, Case No. CR16-1457
11	vs. Dept. No. 9
12	IAN ANDRE HAGER,
13	Defendant.
14	
15	Volume I - Pages 1-35
16	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
17	JURY TRIAL
18	Monday, December 12, 2016
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	Reported by: EVELYN J. STUBBS, CCR #356
	1

	1	
1		APPEARANCES
2		
3	For the State:	LUKE PRENGAMAN, ESQ.
4		Deputy District Attorney P.O. BOX 11030 Reno, Nevada
5		Nello, Nevada
6	For the Defendant:	KATHERYN HICKMAN, ESQ. N. ERICA FLAVIN, ESQ.
7		Deputy Public Defender P.O. Box 11130
8		Reno, Nevada
9		
10	The Defendant:	IAN ANDRE HAGER
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		

1	RENO, NEVADA; MONDAY, DECEMBER 12, 2016; 9:49 A.M.
2	000
3	
4	THE COURT: Good morning. Please be seated. We're on
5	the record in CR16-1457, State versus Ian Andre Hager. Thank you
6	both for being present.
7	MR. PRENGAMAN: Luke Prengaman for the State.
8	MS. HICKMAN: Kate Hickman and Erica Flavin on behalf
9	of Mr. Hager.
10	THE COURT: Thank you. The reason I asked you to be a
11	little bit earlier is because I have to do a Frye/Lafler canvass
12	before we go forward.
13	Would you please stand, Mr. Hager.
14	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.
15	THE COURT: The law requires me to inquire of you
16	whether or not you've been offered a plea bargain in this case,
17	whether you had the opportunity to discuss that plea bargain,
18	whether all the questions were answered to your satisfaction
19	related to that plea bargain, as you have selected to go to
20	trial. And so I have to go through that dialogue with you.
21	So first I'm going to ask Mr. Prengaman, was a plea
22	bargain offered in this case?
23	MR. PRENGAMAN: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: What was that plea bargain?

1	MR. PRENGAMAN: It was to plead guilty to one count of	
2	Category C prohibited person in possession of a firearm, the	
3	State would not oppose Mental Health Court, if he were accepted	
4	into the program.	
5	THE COURT: All right. Thank you.	
6	You heard Mr. Prengaman's recitation of the plea	
7	bargain. Was that communicated to you?	
8	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, it was.	
9	THE COURT: All right. Did you have an opportunity to	
10	discuss that with your lawyers?	
11	THE DEFENDANT: Yes.	
12	THE COURT: Did they answer all your questions related	
13	to that plea bargain to your satisfaction?	
14	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.	
15	THE COURT: And who was the one who communicated to	
16	you?	
17	THE DEFENDANT: Both Kate Hickman and Erica Flavin.	
18	THE COURT: So I'll ask you first, Ms. Hickman. Did	
19	you have an opportunity to communicate that plea bargain to your	
20	client?	
21	MS. HICKMAN: I did.	
22	THE COURT: And did you answer all his questions to the	
23	best of your ability that he had?	
24	MS. HICKMAN: I believe I did.	

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

Ms. Flavin, I'll ask you the same questions. Did you have a chance to review that plea bargain with your client?

MS. FLAVIN: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And did you answer all the questions to the best of your ability that had?

MS. FLAVIN: I believe so.

THE COURT: Okay. With that in mind, Mr. Hager, it's still your decision to go to trial?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you very much. That's the canvass. You may be seated.

Are there any housekeeping matters?

MS. HICKMAN: Judge, just briefly. We did issue a subpoena to the Division of Parole and Probation for Mr. Hager's parole and probation history related to Mental Health Court and the CR13 case out of Humboldt County. The Division, through the AG's office, did file a motion to quash. I just wanted to give the Court a little bit of information about that before we go forward.

THE COURT: All right.

MS. HICKMAN: Obviously the Division filed a motion to quash arguing that that information is confidential, that it's private, and that it should not be released.

THE COURT: Isn't it private to the defendant?

2

MS. HICKMAN: That's their argument.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0 21

22 2.3

24

THE COURT: Go ahead.

MS. HICKMAN: They did release such private and confidential information to law enforcement. It is being used against Mr. Hager in this case, through the PSI. However, I did speak with the attorney who filed the motion to quash from the AG's office. She did review the file with me. She let me know what's in it. The thing that they were looking for mostly was whether or not Mr. Hager had any dirty drug tests, whether or not he had any violations of probation or whether or not he was ever placed into treatment with a residential or outpatient.

She indicated that none of those things happened; he had no violations during the time that he was on probation; he had no dirty drug tests; and he was never placed in any sort of drug or alcohol treatment. So with that, we will withdraw our subpoena, and we are ready to go forward.

THE COURT: All right. Very good. Thank you for that. And I'll take that out of my folder at this time. Very good.

All right. Is there anything else?

I'll give you a quick schedule, and I'll share this with the venire panel. A quick schedule is I have to speak at a seminar tomorrow, so we'll start at 11:00. Other than that, we go today until 3:45. I have Youth Offender Court at 4:00. Other than that, that's all I can share with you right now from a scheduling perspective. I have some crims on Wednesday. I don't know how many yet, so we'll see what I do there, but we'll do it on a day-by-day basis in that regard.

And that's all I can think of. Oh, Joanna Roberts is one of the venire panel people. I assume you would have a stipulation to dismiss her.

MS. HICKMAN: I would, Judge. She actually represented Mr. Hager in this case for a period of time.

THE COURT: I was going to say that would be kind of a conflict, to have a member of the Public Defender's office on the venire panel. So we will let them know downstairs that she doesn't have to come up, if we can do that. Other than that, that's all I really saw from a venire panel issue.

Anything else from you, Mr. Prengaman?

MR. PRENGAMAN: No, Your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: Anything else Ms. Hickman?

MS. HICKMAN: No, Your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: And Ms. Flavin?

MS. FLAVIN: No. Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you. We'll see you back here in just a few moments when they bring the venire panel up, and I'll let the jury commissioner know that they can release Ms. Roberts by stipulation.

All right. Thank you. 1 (Recess taken.) 2 THE COURT: All right. We're on the record in 3 4 CR16-1457, State versus Ian Andre Hager. Welcome, ladies and gentlemen, to Department 9 of the 5 Second Judicial District Court here in Washoe County. I've just 6 announced a criminal case that we're State of Nevada versus Ian 7 Andre Hager. The record will reflect the presence of the 8 defendant, his attorney team, and the prosecution as well. 9 Please call the juror roll. 10 THE CLERK: Yes, Your Honor. 11 (Roll call taken of the entire jury venire panel.) 12 (Initial venire panel called.) 13 14 (Jury panel sworn.) 15 THE COURT: Please be seated. All right. Ms. Clerk, 16 would you now read the Information. 17 18 THE CLERK: Yes, Your Honor. Filed October 5th, 2016, Jacqueline Bryant, Clerk of 19 the Court, in the Second Judicial District Court of the State of 20 Nevada, in and for the County of Washoe. 21 The State of Nevada, Plaintiff, versus Ian Andre Hager, 22 Defendant. Case number CR16-1457, Department No. 9. 23 Information: Christopher J. Hicks, District Attorney 24

within and for the County of Washoe, State of Nevada, in the name and by the authority of the State of Nevada informs the above-entitled court that Ian Andre Hager, the defendant above-named, has committed the crimes of:

Count I, Possession of a Firearm by a Prohibited

Person, a violation of NRS 202.360.2.A, in the manner following,
to wit: That the said Defendant, Ian Andre Hager, on, about and
between November 6, 2015, and April 8, 2016, within the County of
Washoe, State of Nevada, did willfully and unlawfully, having
been previously adjudicated as mentally ill in the Sixth and/or
Second Judicial District Court of Nevada and committed to Mental
Health Court or after having been committed to any mental health
facility, did own or have in his actual or constructive
possession or under his dominion and control, a firearm, which
was a Bushmaster .223 caliber assault rifle, and another firearm,
which was a Winchester 20-gauge shotgun.

Count II, Possession of a Firearm by a Prohibited Person, a violation of NRS 202.360.2.A, in the manner following, to wit: That the said Defendant, Ian Andre Hager, on, about and between November 6th, 2015, and April 8, 2016, within the County of Washoe, State of Nevada, did willfully and unlawfully, having been previously adjudicated as mentally ill in the Six and/or Second Judicial District Courts of Nevada and committed to Mental Health Court or after having been committed to any mental health

facility, did own or have in his actual or constructive possession or under his dominion and control a firearm, which was a Navy Arms handgun, and another handgun, which was a Colt 1911 handgun.

Count III, Possession of a Firearm by a Prohibited Person, a violation of NRS 202.360.2.A, in the manner following, to wit: That the said Defendant, Ian Andre Hager, on, about and in between November 6th, 2015, and April 8th, 2016, within the County of Washoe, State of Nevada, did willfully and unlawfully, having been previously adjudicated as mentally ill in the Sixth and/or Second Judicial District Court of Nevada, and committed to Mental Health Court or having been committed to any mental health facility, did own or have in his actual or constructive possession or under his dominion and control a firearm, which was a Sears and Roebuck shotgun, another firearm, which was a Ruger .40 caliber handgun, and another firearm, which was a Ruger .22 caliber rifle.

Count IV, Possession of a Firearm by a Prohibited Person, a violation of NRS 202.360.1.C, in the manner following, to wit: That the said Defendant, Ian Andre Hager, on, about and between November 6th, 2015, and April 8th, 2016, within the County of Washoe, State of Nevada, did willfully and unlawfully own or have in his actual or constructive possession or under his dominion and control a firearm, which was a Bushmaster .223

caliber assault rifle, and another firearm, which was a Winchester 20-gauge shotgun, while being an unlawfully user of or addicted to any controlled substance.

2.2

Count V, Possession of a Firearm by a Prohibited Person, a violation of NRS 202.360.1.C, in the manner following, to wit: That the said Defendant, Ian Andre Hager, on, about and between November 6, 2015, and April 8th, 2016, within the County of Washoe, State of Nevada, did willfully and unlawfully own or have in his actual other constructive possession or under his dominion and control a firearm, which was a Navy Arms handgun, and another handgun, which was a Colt 1911 handgun, while being an unlawful user of or addicted to any controlled substance.

Count VI, Possession of a Firearm by a Prohibited Person, a violation of NRS 202.360.1.C, in the manner following, to wit: That the said Defendant, Ian Andre Hager, on, about, and between November 6th, 2015, and April 8th, 2016, within the County of Washoe, State of Nevada, did willfully and unlawfully own or have in his actual or constructive possession or under his dominion and control a firearm, which was a Sears and Roebuck shotgun, another firearm which was a SIG Sauer .40 caliber handgun, and another firearm, which was a Ruger .22 rifle, while being an unlawful user of or addicted to any controlled substance.

All of which is contrary to the form of the statute in

such case made and provided and against the peace and dignity of the State of Nevada.

Christopher J. Hicks, District Attorney, Washoe County, Nevada, by Luke Prengaman, Chief Deputy District Attorney.

To which Information the Defendant entered a plea of not guilty as charged.

THE COURT: Thank you, Miss Clerk.

I'm going to read you some instructions that will help guide through the trial. At the conclusion of reading the instructions, I'm going to recess the Court so you can have lunch. And we're going to take an hour off. And when we come back the lawyers will present their opening statements.

The opening statements are the part of the trial where the lawyers attempt to give you a roadmap of what you can anticipate the evidence will be from their perspective.

So that being said, please listen carefully to the instructions. They are all very important. Please excuse the fact that I will be reading these to you, because they all have special meaning and importance.

(Instructions read to the Jury.)

THE COURT: All right, Ladies and gentlemen, the next phase of the trial will be opening statements. As a consequence, you didn't know you would be selected as a juror in today's case,

5

6 7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

so you might have to make some phone calls to tell people quess what, I'm a juror in a criminal case for the next five days. And I'm going to give you that time to do so. We're going to take an hour for lunch at this time. So be back at 2:30, please.

I'm going to read a recess admonishment that I want you to pay attention to. And I'll do that recess -- every time we recess during the case. And it reads as follows:

Ladies and gentlemen, we're going to take our lunch During this recess it is your duty not to converse amongst yourselves or with anyone else on a subject connected with the trial or to read, watch or listen to any report of or commentary on the trial by any person connected with the trial or by any medium of information, including and without limitation newspapers, television, Internet, smart phones, Facebook, radio, Instagram, all the other the social networks, as well as the traditional newspaper, television, Internet, radios and so forth.

You're not to form or express an opinion on any subject connected with this case until it is finally submitted to you after closing arguments at the end of the case.

So with that recess admonishment, I'll see you all back here at 2:30. And Mr. Lemus, take care of that cold.

All rise for the jury.

(The following proceeding was held outside the presence of the jury.)

THE COURT: We're still on the record outside the presence.

I made that comment to Mr. Lemus on purpose. It was the Court's observation that Mr. Lemus was coughing during the entire voir dire process. He looked as though he has a cold, and I want to bring that to everybody's attention. Nobody inquired of Mr. Lemus as to that. It wasn't my place to do so. Mr. Lemus has now been selected as a juror. And as I said on the record, I hope he takes care of his cold, because he has been selected and he'll be in the entire five days, so we'll keep an eye on that.

Anything else, Mr. Prengaman?

MR. PRENGAMAN: No, Your Honor. I do intend -- there is a number of exhibits that I have to offered by way of affidavit. I intend to make some appropriate -- we'll move for the admission of those before we start.

THE COURT: Sure. The easiest thing for me is if you can obviously get together with Ms. Hickman, stipulate to any exhibits that you can stipulate to, without the need to go through the authenticity issues.

If you can stipulate to those, the way I usually do it is you continue with the flow of your examination of a particular witness, you'll identify the exhibit, say it has been stipulated to, I'll admit it on the record, and you continue with the flow of your examination, if you can make that stipulation. I won't

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

make you stop and do an authentication if there's a stipulation.

You can let me know there's a stipulation, I'll admit the exhibit, and you can continue with the flow of your examination. All right?

Any question on that procedure, Ms. Hickman.

MS. HICKMAN: No.

THE COURT: Mr. Prengaman, you've tried a case here before, so you know.

Anything else?

MS. HICKMAN: Judge, speaking of stipulations, before we do opening statements, we would offer to stipulate to the element of the possession of the firearms in this case.

We would stipulate that Mr. Hager was in possession of all of the charged firearms during the time that it's charged. We would also agree to a jury instruction that says that if the State proves all of the elements other than possession beyond a reasonable doubt the jury must convict him, because we would agree that -- we would stipulate to the fact that he would have possession.

With that stipulation, we would ask the Court, then, to exclude the Facebook videos that the State intends to introduce to show that he had possession during that time, because we would agree that he possessed them and that he was in continuous possession of those firearms during the time that the Facebook

videos were made, but more importantly during the time that he was charged in the information.

THE COURT: Did you want to think about that?

MR. PRENGAMAN: I'll think about it, yeah.

THE COURT: All right. Why don't you let me know before we bring the jury in. I'll give you the lunch hour to think about it. You might speak with counsel and further define that, if you need to further define it as you analyze your case.

But an offer of a stipulation doesn't mean that it is. So it will be up to Mr. Prengaman whether he wants to take that or not.

So that being said, I'll look forward to hearing from you both at 2:30 before we bring the jury in as to what you decided.

Anything else?

MS. HICKMAN: Judge, on that, there is case law that says is there is a stipulation, the parties do stipulate, it doesn't necessarily have to be with the State's permission. The Court can then decide whether or not the State can introduce that evidence.

Well, I'll talk with Mr. Prengaman, and we can decide what we do when we come back from lunch.

THE COURT: Just so you know for the record, a stipulation by definition is an agreement.

MS. HICKMAN: Right.

THE COURT: You're in a position where you can concede certain evidence without the State's need to agree to it. I want the record to be clear that obviously the most -- the easiest way to handle this -- the word came to mind -- is if there is a stipulation from the State, but for whatever strategy reason Mr. Prengaman doesn't chose to do, so you can make certain concessions for the record that you will then make it incumbent upon me as to whether I make certain rulings, based upon the concessions that you've made.

> MS. HICKMAN: Perfect. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you. See you back here at 2:30.

1	RENO, NEVADA; MONDAY, DECEMBER 12, 2016; 2:30 p.m.
2	AFTERNOON SESSION
3	
4	THE COURT: All right. We're back on the record in
5	CR16-1457, State versus Ian Andre Hager. We're outside the
6	presence of the jury. I had asked to convene outside the
7	presence prior to starting, because the defense had made a
8	proffer for and a stipulation.
9	Where are we that, Mr. Prengaman?
L 0	MR. PRENGAMAN: Your Honor, I'm not going to accept it.
L1	I don't believe the law requires me to, and additionally, it
L2	smacks to me, at least to me, of sort of sandbagging at this late
13	hour, right before opening statements; to have to try to
4	rearrange my presentation based on that. So for kind of two
15	reasons, but State will not accept the stipulation.
.6	THE COURT: Very good. Thank you. All right.
.7	Is everybody prepared to proceed with their opening
. 8	statement?
.9	MS. HICKMAN: Yes.
20	MR. PRENGAMAN: Yes, Your Honor.
21	THE COURT: All right, please. Anything else we need
22	to discuss before we bring the jury in?
23	MS. HICKMAN: No.
2.4	THE COURT: Thank you. All right. We're still waiting

on just one juror? Do you want to just check on that.

2.2

What juror number is that, Deputy?

THE BAILIFF: Juror number five.

THE COURT: I guess I'll get off the bench, and buzz me when the jury shows up. If you have to deal with some other things related to it, let me know. We'll be in recess until then.

(Recess taken.)

(The following proceedings were held in the presence of the jury.)

THE COURT: Back on the record in CR16-1457, State versus Ian Andre Hager. I note the presence of the defendant, the defense team, the prosecution. I see all of our jurors.

I thank you for all being here. What I just try to do is, there's only a certain set time, if you could just try be here just a little bit early, that way we get started at that time. Your time is most valuable, I don't like to waste it. So try to do your best.

Sometimes we do things outside your presence in a trial to make things go more smoothly. Sometimes I'll excuse in the middle of trial and say, "There's some things that the lawyers and I need to talk to about," to make the trial go smoothly. Sometimes I'll excuse you for that purpose and then bring you back. It just depends on what occurs in the trial.

But just do you best to try to be here when we come back at the break, and then we can proceed and move forward with the trial days, and see if it will take all five days or less.

That being said, now is the time for opening statements. As I told you before, what we do at opening statements is the lawyers have the opportunity, and the State will have the opportunity, to make an opening statement related to what they think the evidence will show. And then the defense, if they so choose, can make an opening statement as well.

That being said, Mr. Prengaman.

MR. PRENGAMAN: Thank you, Your Honor.

Good afternoon, Ladies and gentlemen. This is a case of a defendant in possession of firearms he wasn't supposed to. The evidence you'll hear in this case will show that between November 6th of 2015, and April 8th of 2016, this defendant was in possession of a number of firearms — seven — rifles and handguns, after he was previously adjudicated mentally ill and ordered into the Washoe County Mental Health Court, and while he was a user, an addict of a controlled substance.

Now the evidence you'll hear will start in the beginning of April of 2016. You'll hear that detective — then detective, now sergeant, Christopher Rowe of the Sparks Police Department was investigating the defendant as to whether he was in fact a prohibited person in possession of firearms.

He has a residence in Sparks. That's where he lives on Anqua, Anqua Drive in Sparks. And part of the information that Detective Rowe, then Detective Rowe received was from Detective Scott Johnson, who's a Reno Police Department detective. Now Scott Johnson interacted with the defendant beginning in mid February. He's assigned to the Robbery/Homicide Unit of the Reno Police Department.

2.1

And on February 19th, the defendant, Ian Andre Hager, presented himself at the Reno Police Department and wanted to talk about his brother's case. This trial is not about his brother's case. It's not about the details of what happened there or that investigation. But there are some things that transpired between Detective Johnson and the defendant that are relevant to some things that happened later.

So on February 19th, Detective Johnson, who was not the original investigating the detective went out and spoke to Mr. Hager. Mr. Hager was somewhat dissatisfied with where his brother's investigation was, and Detective Johnson told him he would look into it, because the previous detective had retired.

So that was in person, in person at the Reno Police
Department they spoke. About a week later, Detective Johnson had
telephone contact. They spoke, he and Mr. Hager, spoke on the
telephone about his brother's case. In the interim Detective
Johnson had looked into it. And during that conversation he told

the defendant that -- again as relevant here, that the original conclusions he concurred with; that the cause of his brother's death was methamphetamine intoxication in combination with an accident at his own hands.

2.2

Now Mr. Hager — Detective Johnson will tell you Mr. Hager was unhappy/unsatisfied with that communication, with that conclusion. And over the course of the next several weeks, roughly, but not perfectly, but roughly every week, usually on a Friday, the defendant and Detective Johnson would speak about the case. Ultimately — and sometimes that was by email, but often that was on the phone. There was probably one more in-person contact where they discussed the case.

Now on March 31st, the defendant emailed Detective

Johnson a link to his Facebook account or page. Now you'll hear
that Facebook is a social media website are where people can sign
up to have a page or an account. And that is essentially like a
digital bulletin board or billboard on the Internet. People can
post or upload videos, pictures, they can write texts, they can
send messages, they can post messages. And the person who holds
the account decides how much of that they want to make public or
not. They can make it like a private club, where only certain
people have access, depending on what they want, or they can make
it like a public billboard; anybody that comes by can see what is
presented.

And You'll hear from Detective Johnson and Detective Rowe that the defendant's Facebook account, which was under the name Ian Andre, was largely public. Meaning that anybody that came upon his page could view what he had posted. And so again, it's relevant here, Detective Johnson looked at the — the link was to one of the videos on the defendant's Facebook page.

Defendant Johnson looked at it. And it was the defendant just — he was talking about sort of his discussions with the detective. But all of his other videos were also public. And so Detective Johnson had seen them posted, noted that a number of them depicted the defendant — you could see him, you could see his face — in possession of firearms. The Sparks Police Department got that information. So as part of his investigation Detective Rowe followed the — went to the Web address, went to the defendants's Facebook page. And because of his particular investigation he was perusing/looking at the videos, specifically to see if he saw the defendant in possession of firearms.

And he will describe for you what he saw, and you will see the videos. And what he saw was that, in fact, the defendant from November up to the April period had posted a number of videos, which show him typically in a home what is clearly a house, handling, holding, manipulating, at times simply — the firearms. And at times he would, for instance, be sitting on the

couch with a firearm right there next to him.

You'll hear that the firearms that the detective could see — and you'll see in the videos — there's a black handgun that makes a number of appearances in those videos, there is a black assault rifle that makes a number of appearances, and there's a shotgun, and a silver-colored, silver-gray colored semiautomatic handgun that also appears in those videos.

So having seen that, and you'll hear the detective, he preserved what he saw. He used, basically, a capture program, very similar to if you were to hold up a video camera on the screen and just watch as the video plays. It essentially does the same thing. It captures in real time exactly what the detective was watching when he logged on to the defendant's page. So he preserved those videos that he watched.

He also looked into, as part of his investigation of the defendant, and he learned that the defendant had had a prior case in Winnemucca in 2013, the Sixth Judicial District Court. And he learned that the defendant, as part of those proceedings, had been ordered into the Washoe County Mental Health Court.

Now, you'll see the court records from that, but what you will see is a couple of things that Detective Rowe saw. One of the which was the when the defendant was first sort of presented to the Court, he was requesting that part of his sentence that happened be that he be ordered into drug court,

which is a specialty court program. Not the same as Mental Health Court, but they're both specialty court programs. And you will see his application that his lawyer filed on his behalf requesting that assignment.

In the course of the proceedings, he was interviewed, and he related some information about his use of controlled substances. He related to the — what you might hear the witnesses refer to as P&P, or the Parole and Probation, which is an individual that, as part of the proceedings, interviews individuals and presents that information to the Court.

You'll hear that he talked about his substance abuse history. That he began using methamphetamine and cocaine at a young age; at the age of 26 became addicted to Oxycontin; that he had been using methamphetamine since a young age, but that he had last used it, he reported at the time, which would have been March, the March/April time frame of 2013, he said that he had last used it in January of 2013. And he said that controlled substances were an issue for him, that he didn't have positive direction.

You will also that see that when he came — when the time came for his sentencing, he no longer requested the drug court, but that he did request to be sent to the Mental Health Court.

You'll hear about Mental Health Court. It is a

specialty court. And you'll hear Mr. Popovich and René Biondo.
Mr. Popovich is the manager of the specialty courts here in
Washoe County, and René Biondo is the specialty court officer.
And she is assigned to Mental Health Court specifically.

2.0

What you'll hear about that program is it's a program, Mental Health Court is a program for the supervision of individuals who are mentally ill and become involved in the criminal justice system.

There is a statute that provides the way, the criteria for getting into Mental Health Court. It requires either a mental illness or intellectual disability. And you will see the proceedings. The defendant had a diagnosis of PTSD, which you'll hear from Mr. Biondo -- I'm sorry, Ms. Biondo -- Mr. Popovich -- which is a qualifying diagnosis of mental illness that qualifies someone to Mental Health Court.

The judge considered that at the sentencing. And you'll see that he ordered the defendant into Mental Health Court as part of that sentence.

Now because the Sixth Judicial District Court in Winnemucca doesn't have its own program, he ordered him into the Washoe County Mental Health Court. And what that meant, as you'll see, is that he ordered him to apply, and the Washoe County, because it's here in Washoe County, had to determine that he was eligible and accept him. And you'll hear and you'll see

the documentation, he was. Mr. Popovich and Ms. Biondo will tell you that he was -- basically the process.

Ultimately, the judge who is assigned to Mental Health Court makes a determination about whether somebody is qualified, and found this defendant qualified. He was admitted into Mental Health Court. So you'll hear the two judges consider his application and placed him into Mental Health Court.

Now, Detective Rowe, based on the information that he had come up with in his investigation, went to the Sparks Justice of the Peace and applied for a search warrant for Mr. Hager's residence. And that search warrant was granted. And on April 8th the Sparks Police Department went to serve that warrant. And they will describe what they did. They set up some surveillance on Mr. Hager's residence. They wanted to make sure that when they went to serve the warrant he wasn't home. And in fact, he left the residence and ultimately was contacted by the police.

In the meantime, a number of detectives and an officer and evidence custodian went to Mr. Hager's house, and they served the warrant. They took pictures as they did that. You will see those. And the guns that were alleged in the Information, that you heard read, were all located inside the residence.

You'll hear the testimony, but essentially the house is like a two-story house. There's an upstairs loft area where the

bedrooms are, and then downstairs it's open, sort of like a great room, open kitchen, living room, there's a small office, there's a closet by the door, and then there's a laundry room in the back.

And in the laundry room they found the Bushmaster assault rifle sort of laying on the top of some clothing in there. In the master bedroom they found the Sig Sauer pistol. And they found, in the loft area, that Ruger rifle that you've heard read. And then the other guns were found in the area of the downstairs where there's a gun safe. And a couple of the guns were located there.

Now, additionally in the course of their search, in the upstairs master bedroom, where that black SIG Sauer pistol was found on the bed — during the search there was a nightstand next to the bed, and in the top drawer they found a glass pipe, sort of a tube with a round end, and a number of small plastic square little Ziploc baggies. And you'll hear from Detective Dach, who was present when those were found, that based on his experience and training, which you'll hear about in terms of controlled substance use, that that is the type of pipe that people use to smoke methamphetamine, and those baggies are the way that it's commonly sold, in those little plastic baggies.

So those weapons are found in the cupboard in the search. And as you will see from the videos and the photos that

they located on his account, the black assault rifle that appears, based on its appearance and its configuration, to be the same one that appears in all the videos, likewise with the black Sig Sauer pistol, and then that silver-colored semiautomatic handgun. And the shotgun, which has a pistol grip, again, is fairly distinctive. And you will see that depicted in what he put on the Facebook.

When Mr. Hager was contacted, he was arrested, and he was asked if he would — to be interviewed. He was read his Miranda rights. He ultimately agreed to do that, to be interviewed. And the detective talked to him.

And the detective, when he was watching the videos posted, came across a video that was posted on February 26th of 2016. And in that video Mr. Hager presents himself to the camera, and he is talking about his brother's case, and he is talking about the fact that the police gave more than one cause of death for his brother, and that he is unhappy about — unsatisfied with what the police have told him in that regard.

And he produces a plastic baggie, a larger plastic baggie of white powder. And he says that he's going to -- he represents, as he is filming himself, "That this is more than my brother had in his system when he died," and that he was going to disprove the police's theory.

He takes the bag. And then as you will see when you

2.3

see the photos of the search, you can see the background, so you know that he's on the loft area of his residence. And he goes over to a small table, where he sits, and he starts making the motions of cutting up the powder. And then he proceeds to snort it through a large tube or straw that methamphetamine.

When -- Detective Johnson, you'll hear when he followed that lead and went to the defendant's Facebook page and was looking at the video, he saw that same video of the 26th. And he will tell you that that first conversation that he had, about a week after the February 19th, when he related what he determined and discovered in his review was the cause of death, he will tell you that when he watched that video posted on February 26th, it was exactly the conversation that Mr. Hager was talking about in that video, exactly the conversation they had had on the phone that day.

So when Detective Rowe interviews the defendant, he talks to him about that video. And the defendant tells Detective Rowe that, in fact, that was methamphetamine, and that he did that to disprove the police theory.

Additionally, in that interview the defendant acknowledges to Detective Rowe that he, yes indeed, was ordered into Mental Health Court based on the diagnosis of PTSD.

And it is based on that evidence; the defendant's history, with controlled substances, his admitted use of the

controlled substances in that video that he posted on the 26th, and his commitment to Mental Health Court, based on his diagnosis of a mental illness and the judges' orders, at the conclusion of this case, based on that, I will ask you to find this defendant guilty as charged of being a prohibited person, for having been adjudicated mentally ill and sent to Mental Health Court and for being an addict and observed using an illegal substance.

Thank you, ladies and gentlemen.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Prengaman.

Ms. Hickman, do you wish to give an opening statement?

MS. HICKMAN: Thank you, Judge. At this time we would ask to reserve our opening statement until the close of the State's evidence.

THE COURT: All right. Very good.

Well, ladies and gentlemen, we have a little bit of a short day today. Today, in terms of trying to put together our cases, it's never like TV. I think somebody mentioned they were familiar with Law and Order. I can tell you that trials are not like the first half hour, where they get ready for trial, and the second half-hour you have a verdict. This is the real world and this is the way it really happens.

So what I told the lawyers today was that we would —
we didn't know how long it would take to select you fine citizens
to be our jury. So I indicated to them that they had the ability

to do opening statements. And as I said, the defense has the ability to reserve their opening statement, if they so choose to give one, for a later time at the close of the State's case. And they have chosen that option.

So the only information you have before you today —

I'm going to let you go for the day — is the State's opening

statement so far. And again, remember I told you that statements

by the lawyers are not evidence. You haven't heard any evidence

in the case yet.

So I'm going to let you go home. We're going to start tomorrow at 11:00 o'clock. It's a little bit of a late start, just because of scheduling. We will have a full day tomorrow of evidence for your consideration.

I'm going to suggest that you have something to eat before you come in at 11:00, because I'd like to go through lunch. We're kind of going to power through tomorrow, because it's a shorter day, because of the scheduling conflicts. So as a consequence, please have something to eat, be comfortable. We'll see you back here at 11:00 o'clock tomorrow to begin the first day of evidence. That's why my recess admonition is so important. And I'm going to read it to you now.

We're going to take our evening recess at this time.

During this recess it is your duty not to converse

amongst yourselves or with anyone else on any subject connected

1 | W 2 | C 3 | b 4 | N 5 | I 6 | f 7 | C 7

with the trial or to read, watch or listen to any report of or commentary on the trial by any person connected with the trial or by any medium of information, including without limitation:

Newspaper, television, Internet, smart phones, radio, Facebook,

Instagram, all kinds of form of social media. And you're not to form or express an opinion on any subject connected with this case, until it's finally submitted to you.

Thank you for your answers today. Thank you for being on our jury here in Department 9. We look forward to seeing you all here at 11:00 o'clock. And we'll hear the beginning of the evidence tomorrow.

Thank you very much. All rise for the jury.

(The following proceedings were held outside the presence of the jury.)

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

Tomorrow I plan on starting at 11:00 and power through. I'll

probably do a break maybe 3:00, 3:30. So if you could have your

witnesses ready and go through in that regard; just to give you a

heads-up. There's no conflict, so I think we can go right until

5:00 tomorrow afternoon and start at 11:00.

Anything else before we reconvene tomorrow at 11:00? From the State?

MR. PRENGAMAN: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: From the defense?

MS. HICKMAN: No, Your Honor. Thank you. THE COURT: Very good. We'll see you tomorrow at 11:00 o'clock. Thank you. We'll see you then. We'll be in recess. (Proceedings continued to 12-13-16 at 11:00 a.m.) --000--

1	STATE OF NEVADA)
2	COUNTY OF WASHOE)
3	
4	I, EVELYN J. STUBBS, official reporter of the
5	Second Judicial District Court of the State of Nevada, in and for
6	the County of Washoe, do hereby certify:
7	That as such reporter I was present in Department No. 9
8	of the above court on MONDAY, DECEMBER 12, 2016, at the hour of
9	9:49 a.m. of said day, and I then and there took stenotype notes
10	of the proceedings had and testimony given therein upon the JURY
11	TRIAL of the case of THE STATE OF NEVADA, Plaintiff, vs. IAN
12	ANDRE HAGER, Defendant, Case No. CR16-1457.
13	That the foregoing transcript, consisting of pages
14	numbered 1 to 34, inclusive, is a full, true and correct
15	transcript of my said stenotype notes, so taken as aforesaid, and
16	is a full, true and correct statement of the proceedings had and
17	testimony given therein upon the above-entitled action to the
18	best of my knowledge, skill and ability.
19	DATED: At Reno, Nevada, this 10th day of May, 2017.
20	
21	/s/ Evelyn Stubbs
22	EVELYN J. STUBBS, CCR #356
23	
24	

1	Code No. 4185				
2					
3	IN THE SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA				
4	IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF WASHOE				
5	THE HONORABLE SCOTT N. FREEMAN, DISTRICT Judge				
6	-000-				
7	STATE OF NEVADA,) Case No. CR16-1457				
8	Plaintiff,) Dept. No. 9				
9	vs.				
10	IAN ANDRE HAGER,				
11	Defendant.)				
12)				
13					
14	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS				
15	Jury Trial - Day 2				
16	Pages 1- 205				
17	Tuesday, December 13, 2016				
18	Reno, Nevada				
19					
20	×:				
21					
22					
23					
24	Reported By: SUSAN KIGER, CCR No. 343, RPR				

		¥
1		APPEARANCES
2		
3	For the Plaintiff:	LUKE PRENGAMAN, ESQ. Deputy District Attorney
4		One South Sierra Street Reno, Nevada 89520
5		
6	For the Defendant:	KATHERYN HICKMAN, ESQ. ERICA FLAVIN, ESQ.
7		Deputies Public Defender 350 South Center Street, 5th Floor
8		Reno, Nevada 89520
9	The Defendant:	IAN ANDRE HAGER
10	The Defendant.	
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		

1		INDEX	
2	WITNESS		PAGE
3		OPHER ROWE EXAMINATION BY MR. PRENGAMAN	50
4	CROSS- REDIRE	107 131	
5	RECROS BRIAN	135	
6	DIRECT CROSS-	137 166	
7	REDIRE RECROS	173 174	
8	KEVIN DIRECT	177	
9			
10		EXHIBITS	
11	NO.	DESCRIPTION	PAGE
12	33-37 31A &	ADMITTED INTO EVIDENCE PREVIOUSLY ADMITTED INTO EVIDENCE	59 61
13	31B 12	ADMITTED INTO EVIDENCE	64
14	13 17	ADMITTED INTO EVIDENCE ADMITTED INTO EVIDENCE ADMITTED INTO EVIDENCE	68 70
15	18 93	ADMITTED INTO EVIDENCE ADMITTED INTO EVIDENCE	72 90
16	88 89	ADMITTED INTO EVIDENCE ADMITTED INTO EVIDENCE	150 153
17	88A	ADMITTED INTO EVIDENCE ADMITTED INTO EVIDENCE	153 155
18	87 86	ADMITTED INTO EVIDENCE	156 157
19	91 90	ADMITTED INTO EVIDENCE ADMITTED INTO EVIDENCE	161 165
20	85 & 85A	ADMITTED INTO EVIDENCE	
21	94	MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION ADMITTED INTO EVIDENCE	171 172 196
22		ADMITTED INTO EVIDENCE ADMITTED INTO EVIDENCE	196
23	16,21, 23 &		
24	24		

RENO, NEVADA, TUESDAY, DECEMBER 13, 2016, 11:19 A.M. 1 -000-2 3 THE COURT: We are on the record in CR16-1457, State 4 versus Ian Andre Hager. 5 We are outside the presence of the jury. I see the 6 presence of the Prosecution, the Defense, the Defense team. 7 Is everybody ready to proceed? 8 MR. PRENGAMAN: Your Honor, we are. We do have 9 some, hopefully brief, issues about the exhibits. 10 THE COURT: All right. 11 MR. PRENGAMAN: As to the photographs that are in 12 evidence, with, I believe, the exception of Exhibit 13 Number 3 --14 MS. HICKMAN: And 81. 15 MR. PRENGAMAN: -- and 81, the Defense would 16 stipulate to -- not all of those in serial, but all of the 17 photographs that are contained within that series. 18 THE COURT: We'll make a note of that. 19 MR. PRENGAMAN: The State -- there is a --20 hopefully -- I know this is taking time, and we are going to 21 start, but hopefully to avoid a skirmish in front of the jury, 22 the State has proposed two redacted recordings of the 23

Arraignment and Sentencing of the Defendant in the Sixth

24

Judicial District. I intend to offer those. I have a custodian's affidavit for those.

Likewise, the exhibits from that proceeding, they've been redacted to take out the charge, but I do intend to move those in and request the addition of those based on the custodian's affidavit.

So we have the original with the custodian's record marked for the record, and I've got the redacted versions.

I'm going to move for them. I think the Defense will have, based on our discussions, some objections to the contents of those. I do intend to play them with my first witness.

That's why I'm bringing this to the Court's attention.

THE COURT: You've done it very appropriately. What's your objection?

MS. HICKMAN: Thank you, Judge. I actually have a couple of objections to the materials that came out in the CR13 case.

The first is that the State intends to introduce those materials through an affidavit of the custodian of records through Humboldt County. My issue with that is obviously that's being introduced under a business records exception.

THE COURT: Are they from a court file?

MS. HICKMAN: They are.

THE COURT: Have they been certified?

MS. HICKMAN: They are not.

MR. PRENGAMAN: She did a custodial -- Your Honor, because it was digital, so she did a -- like a certification for the documents. There's a -- two different custodians. But there's a certification on the front of the -- which I can provide to the Court, but it's essentially similar, certifying their authenticity for the documents.

And then there's — the digital came on a disk, and so she did a custodian of records affidavit representing those were accurate records of the court.

THE COURT: Understood.

MR. PRENGAMAN: It's based on that. But I seek the — additionally, I would argue by the contents, that's one way of getting them in. Another way would be by their content, they are what they purport to be. I would submit they all do. They are file stamped, the documents. The proceedings have the Judge, the Defendant, he represents the case number, et cetera, so . . .

THE COURT: Sorry. Go ahead.

MS. HICKMAN: Thank you.

So one of the issues is those materials obviously are prepared for the purposes of litigation. I would object that they are not a business record under that exact statute

because the trial proceedings, plea hearings, sentencings, those are all done under courts of record, done for complete appellate review.

My other objection, Judge, is --

THE COURT: Wait a minute. I want to make sure I get that first.

So you're saying that from a technical perspective, from an authenticity standpoint, you're objecting to the business records exception to court records as you just articulated them?

MS. HICKMAN: These specific court records, yes.

THE COURT: But you're conceding they came from the court file. You're just challenging the authenticity without the custodian of records being physically present?

MS. HICKMAN: Correct.

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. HICKMAN: The other issue, Judge, is as to what is on the recordings of the plea and the sentencing. I would object to that under Crawford. There is a confrontation issue as to the statements that are in that hearing. Those statements are testimonial in nature.

Crawford specifically talks about plea elocutions being testimonial in nature. So we have not just Mr. Hager talking; we have the District Attorney. We have the Judge.

We have the P & P officer. So there are a bunch of statements that come out that are not subject to cross-examination, that are not subject to any of the Crawford exceptions.

THE COURT: How would they be subject to confrontation pursuant to Crawford as it relates to this case? In other words, they are what they are.

MS. HICKMAN: Uh-huh.

THE COURT: That's not my understanding how Crawford applies.

MS. HICKMAN: Well, Judge, they are being introduced against Mr. Hager to show what the Judge's ruling was for, right?

THE COURT: Right.

MS. HICKMAN: And so everyone is arguing about whether or not Mental Health Court is the most appropriate place for Mr. Hager to be. That is coming in for the truth of that argument; that they think Mr. Hager should be in Mental Health Court, right?

THE COURT: Uh-huh.

MS. HICKMAN: So if our argument is as to those statements, those aren't just they are what they are, right? They aren't subject to cross-examination.

THE COURT: Well, what -- forgive me for interrupting.

MS. HICKMAN: That's okay.

THE COURT: I want to make sure I'm intellectually with you.

What would be subject to cross-examination if you were challenging X number of years ago whether he should be in Mental Health Court because in December of 2016, you anticipated that this would be an issue at trial, and that would allow you to cross-examine those people then, so to speak, because it's an issue now at trial.

My comment for the record is, it is what it is because those are the facts, it seems to me, you have to live with because of what Mr. Hager is being alleged to have occurred in 2016. And it just happens to be the facts of the case.

MS. HICKMAN: Right.

THE COURT: Where a Crawford analysis would be, is if you're challenging an element of the offense in 2016, and you have the ability to say — forgive me. What year was the —

MS. HICKMAN: 2013.

THE COURT: You would be able to challenge the 2013 determination in anticipation of what might happen in 2016 and go, "Wait a minute. You know, I want to make sure you don't adjudicate him as mentally ill because in 2016 we are going to

have a prohibited firearm case." That's where Crawford applies.

MS. HICKMAN: Okay. I get what you're saying. But I think the behavior was actually different than what you are saying. Okay?

THE COURT: All right.

MS. HICKMAN: As to whether or not he's been adjudicated mentally ill, that is the issue. Is did the Judge adjudicate him mentally ill? Not was he placed in Mental Health Court, not do we want to come back and cross-examine him as to whether or not that's appropriate, because quite frankly, no one is ever charged this way. So in 2013, they wouldn't have known to go into it.

But here, the statements that people are making that he is appropriate for Mental Health Court, and those are the statements that the State wants to say the Court is then relying on in sending him to Mental Health Court. Right?

THE COURT: I understand, yes.

MS. HICKMAN: And so what it comes down to is what is said in court is not the basis of an adjudication, right? Because what is said here and what is said from the bench is not a final judgment. It's not what the Court has actually ruled. It's just statements. And so those statements would be subject to cross-examination if they are coming in against

Mr. Hager.

THE COURT: I understand your point.

MS. HICKMAN: Otherwise, what should come in is just the Court's order as to whether or not he was placed in Mental Health Court. The arguments at sentencing, the plea, none of that becomes relevant if the only thing that matters is he was placed in Mental Health Court, because that's true.

Does that make sense?

THE COURT: Absolutely.

But I anticipate in about three seconds

Mr. Prengaman is going to say that he's entitled to present
that to prove his case beyond a reasonable doubt as it relates
to that element, and that's part of his case.

He's going to say in a minute that it's not irrelevant, that the surrounding circumstances is part of his case to prove beyond a reasonable doubt. Adjudication is a question for the jury.

MS. HTCKMAN: Uh-huh.

THE COURT: And you're both going to make arguments what adjudication is.

Part of Mr. Prengaman's burden of proof is to show everything he can that is relevant within the legal definition of relevance that's not -- prejudicial impact doesn't outweigh its probative value. And he's entitled to do that.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

minute.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MS. HICKMAN: Right.

THE COURT: I mean, he's entitled to do that.

MS. HICKMAN: Right.

THE COURT: So, anyway. Do you want to respond?

MS. HICKMAN: Do you want him to make that argument, or do you want me to assume that's what he's going to say?

THE COURT: He's going to make that argument in a

Do you concur, Mr. Prengaman?

MR. PRENGAMAN: I do, Your Honor. And I have additional grounds why it's relevant.

It's not just the adjudication, the Court is absolutely pressing into, I quess. What my argument is, it's relevant. It all goes to -- it's the Defendant's representations that go to everything the Judge considered in making that adjudication.

Additionally, it's not just the adjudication mentally ill, but it's the drug use. There are representations. There are representations that he comes in at arraignment and says, "I want" -- "we want Drug Court." His lawyer files on his behalf -- his agent files an application for drug diversion.

He then -- at the Sentencing, there's a discussion about that. "We are going to withdraw that. We want the 176A Mental Health Court."

There are — the content of both proceedings is relevant to his controlled substance use and him being an addict. Because what he represents to the Parole and Probation officer in the — in preparation for sentencing — she will testify he makes representations both about the mental health and the PTSD, as well as the drug use. So it's got relevance to both — all of the State's counts.

So for those reasons — and I believe as to

Crawford, I agree with what the Court articulated. That's

what I would argue. These people did not anticipate — these

statements were not made in anticipation of. It's not a

police interview. It's not something they were forced to be

the subject of litigation or being called to testify about.

Crawford doesn't apply. It's non-testimonial. The question

is a matter of hearsay and relevant to the Judge's decision.

THE COURT: I understand.

You get the last word.

MS. HICKMAN: Thank you, Judge.

I have a couple of things to follow up on that. The arguments of what is said in court, Mr. Hager's statements in court, there's a difference between what he says as to drugs and what is said as to mental health, right? Because there's the adjudicated with the mental health. So that has to

just -- my argument, obviously, is that has to be based on just what the Judge finds. It's not based on what counsel argues. It's not based on what the Judge pronounces from the bench. It's not based on what the clerk puts in her minutes. It's based on what is in the Judge's ultimate final order because that is what an adjudication is.

When we talk about somebody being adjudicated, right, under the State's definition, even though it's submitted, it is a Judge resolving a disputed fact. And I know that the Court knows that when the Court makes rulings, you have to make findings of fact, and then you have to lay out the law, right? So if the Judge says, "I find that you are mentally ill. I find this. I find this," that's an adjudication. A discussion with counsel as to, "Judge, he has a mental health disorder," is that relevant to the Judge's ultimate findings if they don't end up into that order?

And part of the support for that, I think, comes from the statute. I think the Court can look at NRS 176.105, right, and that's the statute that talks about when a judgment becomes final. It's signed by a Judge, entered by the clerk. That's when it becomes final. If it's something that has been adjudicated, it is something that is reviewable by a higher Court.

If the Court looks at Miller versus Hayes which is

95 Nevada 927 -- that's a criminal case -- it says that a District Judge's pronouncement of judgment and sentence from the bench is not a final judgment.

And then Rust versus Clark County School District, which is 103 Nevada 686, says that an oral pronouncement of judgment — and this obviously is civil. It's not criminal. But an oral pronouncement of judgment is not valid for any purpose. Therefore, only a written judgment has any effect, and only a written judgment may be appealed.

So only what the Judge says is the adjudication, right? It's not what counsel argues. It's not what an evaluation says. It's not what P & P says. It's what the Judge actually finds.

So if that's the issue, not whether he is or isn't mentally ill, but the adjudication. Nothing about anybody's statements about mental health matters because that's not part of the law. And then it becomes more prejudicial because it's just going to say, "Well, yeah, he is mentally ill." And the Judge kind of talks about it, so maybe that's enough. Right? So it comes down to what the Judge actually finds.

THE COURT: Anything else?

MS. HICKMAN: Not on that point.

THE COURT: All right. Submitted?

MS. HICKMAN: Yes.

THE COURT: The State will be allowed to present the evidence based upon the fact that I don't believe it's a Crawford violation.

And, number two, I believe the evidence is what it is as stated, and the State is entitled to prove their elements that they need to prove beyond a reasonable doubt consistent with what I previously ruled as long as the evidence is not prejudicial. I don't find it to be prejudicial. I find that it's part of the State's case to make presentation for you to argue later, whether that's an adjudication before the jury.

I believe that although it's a mixed question of law and fact what adjudication is, in this particular case, based upon the posture of it being a strict liability crime, that's where your case lies, whether the jury believes he's been adjudicated for those counts or not. I'll let you put on your defenses as to why you think it isn't, and I'll let the State put on their prosecution as to why they think it is. It's a very interesting point because the jurors said in voir dire—and I'll say this for the record—they were confused during voir dire. Has he been adjudicated mentally ill? Has he not been adjudicated mentally ill? You appropriately said during voir dire—said, "I can't answer that." The reason you couldn't answer that is because that's a question for trial.

So I'll give you leeway to present the things you need to do to say why it's not an adjudication, as you just so eloquently argued to me. And I'll give the State the opportunity to put their case on the way they want to put it on.

I deny your request to have the evidence not admitted from an authenticity standpoint.

Traditionally speaking, court files, if they are certified, relieve the proponent of authenticity. In this particular case we have a custodian of records as I understand the proffer on all of that information, and I would have let it in if it was a certified record from a court file.

Mr. Prengaman didn't have a certification. He has file-stamped copies. He also has certificates from the custodian of records. So I'm allowing that evidence in, and it will be authenticated in the way Mr. Prengaman is intending to do so.

Anything else on that issue?

MR. PRENGAMAN: Not on that issue.

THE COURT: All right. Go ahead.

MS. HICKMAN: Judge, I'm just going to sort of lodge all my objections now, because if I don't do it, we will run the jury in and out. Because I think if there are things that you rule upon, I won't need to object and mess up that flow.

THE COURT: That's fine.

MS. HICKMAN: I have one more objection to the record from the CR13 and the Mental Health Court case. And that comes directly from the statutes that deal with specialty courts and deal with diversion in specialty courts and deal with what happens to those records once a case is dismissed and that conviction is set aside.

If you look at NRS 176A.260, that's the statute that talks about when a case should be dismissed after somebody has been placed into Mental Health Court. And what that statute says under Subsection 4 is that upon the fulfillment of the terms and conditions, the Court shall discharge the Defendant and dismiss the proceedings. The discharge and dismissal pursuant to this section is without adjudication of guilt, which is different. Obviously, there would be adjudication to Mental Health Court. And on a conviction — but then it goes on to say that discharge and dismissal restores the Defendant in the contemplation of the law to the status occupied before the arrest, Indictment, or Information.

So what that statute essentially says is once a person has successfully completed Mental Health Court, they go back to where they were before they were arrested, in their status.

And my argument is that would include a status as

somebody who has been adjudicated mentally ill. They have completed that program. They have done what they need to do. There is not an exception under that at all to say, except for this Mental Health Court exception. So that person would go back to the place they were when arrested.

That becomes especially significant when you look at NRS 176A.265 because that's the statute that deals with the sealing of records. And what that statute says is the Court shall seal the records. These records should have been sealed. They should have been sealed back in 2013, and there should be no record of this.

And what that includes, that includes the documents. So that would include the filings by his attorney. It would include the Court's order. It would include his Mental Health Court diagnosis. It would include his PSI. All of those things would be sealed, and the State would not have access to those unless they received a court order.

The reason that that is important is that if the Court would have done what the statute mandates it to do, shall seal the records, in 2013, we wouldn't be here today because there would be no record of that having happened, and the State would not have access to those things.

So given that mandatory language, the simple fact that it wasn't sealed has nothing to do with Mr. Hager. It is

administerial failure of Humboldt County and the Washoe County Specialty Courts that the State is able to get a certified copy of those and bring a certified copy in and introduce them against somebody when in all reality they should not have access to those records. And to let them come in is really letting the State take advantage of the Court's failure to comply with that statute. The Court failed to do it through no fault of Mr. Hager's. But now the State gets to take advantage of that in an attempt to convict him of felonies based on what happened in those hearings that should have been sealed.

So my argument is the Court should apply the language of the statute and treat those documents as if they should have been sealed, as they should have been, and make them inadmissible.

THE COURT: Couple of questions before I hear from you, Mr. Prengaman.

Didn't you — isn't what you just said a defense?

Isn't that one of your defenses, just the way you articulated it? In other words, what you're asking me to do is something that wasn't done in the facts of this case.

MS. HICKMAN: Right.

THE COURT: You know, for the record, Department 9 had nothing to do with records not being sealed. Department 9

and your trial Judge had nothing to do with that.

MS. HICKMAN: I'm not blaming you, to be clear.

THE COURT: Just so you know, the record is an unfeeling transcript. So I need to say that, number one.

But number two, it seems to me that you just articulated a defense. In other words, that might be a defense that you might have to establish affirmatively. Not having the burden shift to you, but that's a defense that you might want to promote in this case, the way it sounds.

What you're asking me to do is to find as a matter of law that that defense works. And I need to find, without any other information, that the Courts in Humboldt County and Washoe County failed to do what they were supposed to do and it put your client at a disadvantage. And I don't have that evidence before me. I appreciate your argument, but in my view, that is a triable fact that I'm assuming you develop with various witnesses to put forth. You're hoping I'm going to sustain your objection; you won't have to do it. But that's a trial issue, because that's not the state of the facts of your case. The state of the facts of your case, giving you the side most favorable to you, is that all the things you just said are true. Well, I have no control over that. That's the State of the case.

MS. HICKMAN: Judge, I think that it goes further

1 2

than a defense, though. I think it goes to the admissibility of the records is that the Court can say this should have been done.

THE COURT: I don't know why it wasn't done.

MS. HICKMAN: It doesn't matter. The mandatory language in the statute says "shall."

THE COURT: There could be a reason why it wasn't done. I don't know the answer.

You see, I'm not fencing with you. I'm just saying what my difficult position is, is that I don't have the answer to sustain your objection. You may be completely right, but I don't know what the answer is to tell you why it wasn't done. Maybe that's to be further developed by the defense. But I can't answer it.

I don't want to stop you, Ms. Hickman. I was just having an intellectual dialogue with you. Anything else you want to say?

MS. HICKMAN: No. Thank you.

THE COURT: Mr. Prengaman, your response.

MR. PRENGAMAN: In that vein, I see it as — I see it actually as a — as we talk, so just sort of in the nature of that discussion, I would tend to see that objection there procedurally and substantively — procedurally I've got an issue with them raising it in this posture at this time. But

I tend to see it as it's been articulated as more of like a suppression issue. A suppression issue has to do with a legal application: Was evidence illegally obtained? Was the constitution violated? That's not a question for the jury. That's a question for the Court to resolve.

So the idea that, at least to me, in listening to it and analyzing it, I see it more in the line of suppression; that if they have law that says there's some legal remedy for that, if they could establish it, they could have maybe brought that forward to the Court, 21 days after Arraignment and argued to the Court that there is a legal remedy much like a suppression remedy, some kind of statutory remedy if something is supposed to happen and then doesn't.

I don't see that as a factual issue for this jury because that's essentially asking the jury to resolve a legal question which is — well, two legal questions. One legal question is what is the legal impact of the failure to seal these documents? So in other words, factually, how is that a defense to present that? In other words, I would object to the defense presenting evidence, for instance, this wasn't sealed, because what is the jury supposed to do with that? They don't make a determination about what the consequences are or aren't. There's not a legal — in fact, I doubt Ms. Hickman has legal authority that says what a Court should

do with that if this is brought up pretrial? What should the Court do if there's an instance where stuff was supposed to be sealed and it wasn't? Let alone with a jury, what are they supposed to do with that evidence? How does it factor in? How does it weigh?

And then, likewise, the impact of the statute that means returned, well, I've arguments legally about that. I see that the same way. That's an issue that what is the jury supposed to do with that? That's asking them to resolve a legal issue much like a suppression issue.

So my perspective is those are issues that should have been raised long ago. They've been waived at this point, if there is even authority for any remedy for them, which I don't believe there is. That's it.

THE COURT: You get the last word.

MS. HICKMAN: Judge, I believe the authority is the statute. Right?

The State is taking advantage of the fact that it wasn't done when it should have been done. So the authority is that the Court should treat them as though they are sealed documents, because that's what should have been done. There's no -- there is no reason that it wasn't done.

The statute is clear. It's hard to then argue, "Well, if people don't follow the statute, there's no remedy."

THE COURT: Don't you agree -- I'll let you finish. But don't you agree the state of the case is, for whatever reason, they weren't? That's the state of the facts of our case.

MS. HICKMAN: Right.

THE COURT: So you're asking me to make a legal leap that, following your argument, without any other evidence, they should have sealed. I'm sealing them. Objection sustained. That's not how it works. But I appreciate your argument, and we've all made our record.

MS. HICKMAN: Okay. Appreciate you appreciating it.

THE COURT: It's interesting. It's an interesting case.

Anything else you want to add?

MS. HICKMAN: Not to that, no.

THE COURT: All right. I'm denying your -- I'm overruling your objection and denying your motion to, I guess, suppress the evidence based upon your analysis, and I'm going to allow it.

Go ahead.

MS. HICKMAN: The other thing, Judge, is
Mr. Prengaman and I talked about some redactions in the
videos. I don't know where we are on those. I don't know if
we are in agreement as to what should and shouldn't be

_

redacted. I don't know if you want to deal with that now.

I don't know when you want to play them.

MR. PRENGAMAN: First.

MS. HICKMAN: I can do it when you play them, or we can do it now.

MR. PRENGAMAN: I intend to play them with my first witness, who's the detective, now sergeant.

THE COURT: Have there been some disagreements as to the redactions, or you just haven't seen them?

MS. HICKMAN: I've seen them, and I told him what my disagreements are. And so if he agrees with my disagreement, then we won't have an issue.

MR. PRENGAMAN: After our hearing — some of them I won't play based on the Court's order. I can't. A number of them I redacted based on what the Court's — not that you told me specifically what to redact, but you gave some direction about it. So I did a number of redactions and provided those to the defense. So we do have a disagreement about — on I think three or four of them.

I think Ms. Hickman is objecting to certain portions of videos as being -- now, the ones we are talking about are now pretty short because --

THE COURT: There's no alternative but to play them now if you're going to play them to the first witness, and you

have an objection. 1 MR. PRENGAMAN: That's what I think. 2 THE COURT: I wish we would have done it last week 3 4 without the jury waiting, for the record. Go ahead. 5 MR. PRENGAMAN: I believe -- is it 11 is the first 6 one or 12? 7 THE COURT: Please tell me the nature of the 8 objection so I can know that in advance of reviewing the DVD. 9 MS. HICKMAN: Which one are you playing first? 10 MR. PRENGAMAN: 12. 11 MS. HICKMAN: So in this one, Judge, I would object 12 to the first 30 seconds of the video as being irrelevant. And 13 then at 2 minutes and 24 seconds in, there is an overlay onto 14 the video where there's an emoji and the words "Itchy trigger 15 fingers" is up on the video, and I would object to that 16 portion, 2:24 on, as to relevance. 17 THE COURT: As to relevance? 18 MS. HICKMAN: Yes. I have no objection as to the 19 actual portion where it shows a firearm. 20 THE COURT: Understood. 21 MS. HICKMAN: Or the timing of the video. 22 THE COURT: All right. So this is the beginning, 23

Mr. Prengaman?

24

MR. PRENGAMAN: It is, Your Honor. 1 THE COURT: This is the first 30 seconds you object 2 to? 3 Yes. MS. HICKMAN: 4 (A DVD was played.) 5 MS. HICKMAN: "It's about to get serious and dark, 6 so close your everything." 7 There is -- you can see the firearms. I have no 8 objection to that portion. I understand the relevance of 9 10 that. Freeze that, Mr. Prengaman. THE COURT: 11 Do you have an objection to the beginning of that 12 before they showed the firearms. 13 I would object to it when it talks MS. HICKMAN: 14 about it's about to get so serious and dark and close your 15 16 everything. THE COURT: Got it. That's the piece you're 17 objecting to? 18 I think that it doesn't make sense, 19 MS. HICKMAN: given the Court's ruling that the threats to the police 20 officers -- those things don't come in, because that's, I 21 think, in the same vein as that. 22 But this part, no. 23 THE COURT: Got it. So on that piece, I'll rule

24

that I'll allow that in. I don't have any inclination from my review of the case it has anything to do with the piece related to Mr. Hager's brother's demise. It says what it says, and Mr. Hager put it up there. So that's what -- I'm allowing that.

Go ahead. What's the other piece at 2:46?

MS. HICKMAN: 2:24.

THE COURT: 2:24. And tell me what that's going to be.

MS. HICKMAN: It has an emoji that pops up.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. You said that.

MS. HICKMAN: And it says, "Itchy trigger fingers."

MR. PRENGAMAN: So — and, Judge, I won't play it all or submit it. It essentially shows Mr. Hager going and getting the assault rifle out of the closet by the front door, manipulating it. He's also got a handgun tucked in the back of his waist, and he's placing things in the bag. And that leads up to.

THE COURT: And so your point is with all the video of guns and what he's doing, that it's irrelevant that he said that he has an itchy trigger finger and an emoji?

MS. HICKMAN: Judge, I think viewing the videos individually, it's a little bit different. When you look at them all together, the portions I object to make him look so

mentally unstable. And that's not the issue for the jury today. It's not whether or not he's unstable when he's doing this. It's whether or not in 2013 he was adjudicated mentally ill. So the evidence presented as it is now as to the mental instability and how these videos paint him is unfair to him and prejudicial to him because it has nothing to do with his actual mental state today. That is not an issue for the jury.

And I think when you see all the objectionable —
parts I object to as a whole, you'll see that when you put
them all together, the mental instability is really
highlighted.

THE COURT: What's the purpose of you introducing the objected-to points for the record, Mr. Prengaman?

MR. PRENGAMAN: Well, Your Honor, this is just the handling of the guns. Obviously, he's in ownership, possession of these guns, and that's a representation about his ownership and possession of the guns.

It's not — I don't think it's unfairly prejudicial. It doesn't — I mean, he's not doing anything. It's simply him manipulating these two guns and then a representation made about the guns. I mean, it doesn't say whether — it's not like — again, we can't get into the threats. The jury is not going to hear a link-up about threats to the police or say he's going to go out and shoot some police officers. For all

they know, he's going out to shoot at a range somewhere. He's putting stuff in a black, essentially, tactical bag.

So I would submit that there's not — it's not unfairly prejudicial because it relates to the ownership and possession of firearms.

THE COURT: Anything you want to add?

MS. HICKMAN: I don't object to the parts where he owns and possesses the firearms, right. It's as to what is depicted above and beyond the firearms.

THE COURT: I see.

What my -- my awareness was heightened by you saying that the collection of the DVDs shows him to be mentally unstable. So I am having a high awareness of that.

But in this particular video, I don't see that. He produced it. I agree with Mr. Prengaman to this degree, that he could be just as easily going to a shooting range. I'm not allowing the threats in, so I find that it's relevant, and I'm going to allow it.

What's the next DVD, and what's the next objection?

For the record, these are Facebook videos your

client produced and made available to the public on Facebook.

MS. HICKMAN: Some were from his iPhone that were obtained pursuant to a warrant.

THE COURT: So do you have an objection as to 14?

MS. HICKMAN: Yes.

THE COURT: For the record, Deputy, would you let the jury know we are dealing with legal issues and please be patient, and thank you for their patience?

THE BAILIFF: Yes.

MS. HICKMAN: So, Judge, this one is a very similar objection. There's a significant portion of it that is irrelevant. And given that mental instability is a concern that I have, there is about a minute where in February he's dressed up like Santa Claus.

And then he has the iPhone where he's talking to himself into it, and then he switched the position and answers himself. So he goes back and forth essentially talking to himself.

THE COURT: All right.

MS. HICKMAN: My concern is that for a minute, there is a significant highlight about what looks fairly mentally unstable.

THE COURT: Understood.

MS. HICKMAN: One minute and about 13 seconds in he does have a firearm. I don't object to that part on.

THE COURT: Got that.

What do you need the talking-to-himself piece for, Mr. Prengaman?

MR. PRENGAMAN: Can I play this so I remember? It's hard to keep track of all what they are.

(A DVD was played.)

THE COURT: He's talking about the SIG gun?

MR. PRENGAMAN: So there's a couple of things. One, Judge, when he walks around — so he's on the couch. It shows the background of the couch. It's evidence of where it's taking place, which is in his residence. And this portion, too, again, over time, it is showing this is clearly taking place in his house.

I have a -- you know, the photographs and at least one witness who will testify that the background we see here is clearly -- now moving into the front area where he's got guns kept in the safe behind. So it has relevance showing that these were produced inside his home where he's possessing guns.

THE COURT: All right.

(A DVD was played.)

MR. PRENGAMAN: And just on that subject,
Your Honor, and so this one is posted February 2nd, which
is -- precedes the 26th. So the video of the 26th, the one
that states there is -- that the Defendant is in actual
possession of firearms when he ingests the methamphetamine we
see on the video. So this is a video that occurs

February 2nd, so prior to that, which is in evidence, that's in his home where he's got the drugs, has the guns.

THE COURT: I got that.

Are you going to show the guns in just a minute?

MR. PRENGAMAN: Well, he's looking for it. He's

going to find it. And then he's going to display the black

SIG Sauer handgun that he finds, and then the silver, he's

going to have that in a tactical vest on his chest.

THE COURT: Play it.

(A DVD was played.)

THE COURT: Okay. Stop it there.

I'm sustaining the objection up to the point where he shows the gun. His behavior is irrelevant in the beginning. Although, for the record, I agree with your analysis, Ms. Hickman. He is showing somebody who's mentally unstable.

But I'm sustaining based on the relevance piece at this time based on the allegations. I'm sustaining your objection on the piece where he offers the gun.

That doesn't affect your proffer, Mr. Prengaman.

You can still call whatever witnesses you want to talk about
the property, but the beginning is troubling for the Court and
very prejudicial.

MR. PRENGAMAN: Would I be allowed to have the

witnesses say they viewed this video without showing that 1 2 footage? THE COURT: You may. 3 MR. PRENGAMAN: And then for -- so that would be up 4 5 to --THE COURT: When he goes, finds it, pulls it out, 6 that's all relevant. That all comes in. 7 MR. PRENGAMAN: So about from here to approximately 8 9 1:11 in. THE COURT: Uniquely, for the record, he actually 10 split screens at one point, talks to himself, and then his 11 character changes to somebody in a Santa Claus outfit where he 12 answers his question. I'm not going to allow that in. For 13 the record, I just wanted it to be clear. 14 Anyway, so that's my ruling on that. 15 What's the next? Is there another objection, 16 17 Ms. Hickman? MS. HICKMAN: Yes, Your Honor. 18 What's the next one in order, Luke? 19 MR. PRENGAMAN: The next one is, I believe, 22. 20 MS. HICKMAN: Judge, this is similar. It's a little 21 There's a significant portion where he's in his car; 22 it's beeping. There's not a lot that's really happening in 23 it. He's sitting in the car.

24

At 2 minutes 22 seconds in, there's a firearm that's shown. Beyond that, I wouldn't object when they show the firearm.

Then there is a portion that says the time. It says like the day and the time. I don't have an objection to that.

THE COURT: So the first one, I should look at the first 2 minutes 22 seconds when the car is beeping?

MS. HICKMAN: Yes.

THE COURT: And before you play it, Mr. Prengaman, is there a reason why you needed that?

MR. PRENGAMAN: Your Honor, I believe that he — I believe in this video he goes into his — so he's sitting in the car. I don't think there's anything unfairly prejudicial about it. He's just in his car. And he goes into his house, and I believe he starts going — he makes — "I'm home" or "home again," so he makes reference to being at his home, going into the house. So it was simply like a — I mean, a continuation of, you know, it would look weird if you didn't show him in the car going into the house is what I believe.

THE COURT: You didn't mean look weird. You mean from a total story doctrine perspective.

MR. PRENGAMAN: Yes, Your Honor. Not that it would look like he's mentally unstable. It would look disjointed to say, "Honey, I am home," without showing him in the car.

But there's nothing unfairly prejudicial about him 1 being in the car. I don't think he says anything, either. 2 THE COURT: And your objection is surplusage? 3 MS. HICKMAN: It's more relevance, Judge. This 4 starts out with this saying. This is on a couple of the 5 6 videos. I don't know what the point of it is. It's about him being followed. It's lot of the same police-type things we're 7 talking about. 8 THE COURT: All right. 9 MS. HICKMAN: And the video ends. But it talks 10 about a chopper, right? Like that talks about a chopper, and 11 he's talking about the same chopper following him later. 12 (A DVD was played.) 13 THE COURT: For the record, not only is there 14 beeping, but there's some ominous music playing in the 15 background, that I characterize as ominous. 16 So I was wrong about the beginning. 17 MR. PRENGAMAN: Is that his sawed-off shotgun? 18 THE COURT: That's the pistol-grip shotgun. 19 MR. PRENGAMAN: THE COURT: Sustained up to that point. The rest 20 21 can be played; So, Mr. Prengaman, when -- after the

22

23

24

unusual-sounding people talking, you may start playing where

the pistol-grip shotgun is displayed, and you may play the

rest of the tape thereafter. 1 MS. HICKMAN: I think it's about 2 minutes 2 3 20 seconds in. (A DVD was played.) 4 THE COURT: So you may play sort of the scene before 5 that, Mr. Prengaman, you know, that -- I don't know what that 6 7 is. MS. HICKMAN: Surveillance. 8 THE COURT: But it looks like closed circuit or 9 surveillance. You may play that. That leads to the shotgun, 10 and you may play the rest. 11 MR. PRENGAMAN: Okay. 12 THE COURT: Any other objections, Ms. Hickman? 13 MS. HICKMAN: Judge, there's two more videos I have 14 15 objections to. MR. PRENGAMAN: I was wrong about the transition. I 16 think it's a different video where he comes in from the car. 17 MS. HICKMAN: Is the next one 19? 18 MR. PRENGAMAN: I think the next one is 25, at least 19 that I have. 20 MS. HICKMAN: 25. Okay. That's fine. 21 THE COURT: So what's your objection? Similar? 22 MS. HICKMAN: This is a similar objection. I think 23

you can probably watch it and see.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

(A DVD was played.)

So this is where it cuts from him. MR. PRENGAMAN: So briefly, Judge, what will happen is -- so he's got this post that says, "I've had too many Tuesdays nights like this." This is the video where he transitions from the car to going in and saying, "Honey, I'm home."

THE COURT: All right.

MS. HICKMAN: I think, Luke, this is the hinge one. (A DVD was played.)

MS. HICKMAN: Maybe I'm wrong.

THE COURT: Hold on. Do you object to this forward?

MS. HICKMAN: No.

THE COURT: Okay. So the issue is the walking in and playing -- and saying, "Honey, I'm home," and then he's got guns. You can play the whole tape. I'm going to overrule the objection.

MS. HICKMAN: Judge, if this is the video I'm thinking of, though --

Is this the one -- the hinge?

It does go to that. MR. PRENGAMAN:

That's my objection, not this part. MS. HICKMAN:

THE COURT: Okay. So far it's not objectionable.

MS. HICKMAN: From this part.

(A DVD was played.)

THE COURT: Is he armed, Mr. Prengaman?

MR. PRENGAMAN: He still has the gun that was previously displayed.

THE COURT: Okay.

(A DVD was played.)

MR. PRENGAMAN: So -- And, Judge, stop it there. On his -- so he's got -- you saw the text up there that says when it was, so he's got like the date on there, which the detective will testify is consistent, the day, the Tuesday night. The timeframe is consistent.

Also on his cell phone — the reason that I believe that's relevant is that on his cell phone he's got a picture of the hinge that was taken on the 29th — or I believe the 29th. But there's exit data, so there's data on the phone that shows the photograph of the hinge was taken on a — created on a particular day which is consistent with when this was posted, which from memory, it may be the same day or a day or two. But based on what's represented there, that tends to show he's obviously interested in the hinge. There's a photograph on the cell phone that says it was created the same day it was posted.

THE COURT: Did you want to respond?

MS. HICKMAN: I don't have an objection to the time.

March 2nd is a Wednesday. He says, "I've had too many Tuesday nights like this." I don't want to — like, I would stipulate to that time period. But when he's talking about touching a hinge and it's electrocuting him and he goes on to talk about the house is haunted and he's clearing the house. Possession, yeah, I don't object to that at the time. I don't object to that. I object to the rest of it.

THE COURT: It is close to what you're arguing, that it shows some mental instability. But in this particular video, based on the time match up, I'm going to allow it, and your objection is overruled.

This is not, in my opinion, the same type of outrageous behavior as the Santa Claus video. This has a direct link to the timing that would be matched up with the cell phone as the proffer made by the State, so I'm allowing it.

Any other objections?

MS. HICKMAN: The last one is the February 28th court copy. I think that's number 19.

MR. PRENGAMAN: Is there any -- the rest of it shows --

MS. HICKMAN: The rest is the same stuff. He's clearing his house. He talks about how it's haunted, and so my objection would be to the rest of it.

1 MR. PRENGAMAN: If I may play it, Judge. I don't
2 want to put in anything that's —
3 (A DVD was played.)
4 THE COURT: For the record, as he's working with the
5 door, he's armed. He put the gun in his vest.
6 MS. HICKMAN: Uh-huh.
7 THE COURT: Is that correct, Mr. Prengaman?

MR. PRENGAMAN: It is, Your Honor. That's the continuation. The whole thing is one continuous — he puts it in the vest and goes to the back door.

THE COURT: Just have to make the record that he's carrying, as we speak, in the video.

MR. PRENGAMAN: And you can see the -- as it continues, he's got the barrel of the gun in his hand.

THE COURT: All right. I'm sustaining the objection as it relates to after the door issue. I don't see any relevance to him walking around and stalking his house and filling in for the purposes of these charges — the allegations of these charges. So that's my ruling.

I'm sustaining the objection post door hinge when he gets up from the door hinge and starts walking around the house. I'm sustaining the objection.

I think the jury can understand that he's packing as he's working with the door hinge. That's my ruling.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Any other objection, Ms. Hickman?

MS. HICKMAN: There's one more video.

Which one? MR. PRENGAMAN:

MS. HICKMAN: I think it's 19. It's the one with the dog.

THE COURT: And what's the nature of the objection to give me the heads-up, please?

MS. HICKMAN: Judge, very similar as to the mental instability up until the firearms are displayed.

THE COURT: And why -- just let me know its relevance.

MR. PRENGAMAN: Judge, if this is the one, there is a -- the dog. There's a dog. Two things. If it's the dog video, it shows the dog -- so it starts out with the dog on the carpet, which shows the loft. So there's distinctive carpet in the loft area, which, again, is relevant to show where it's being shot.

He makes reference, if I recall correctly, to there being guns everywhere. And after the camera is on the dog, he flashes over, and you can see two gun barrels on the floor. So it's relevant for that. It shows where, again, inside the residence. The photos are to show that that distinctive carpet is on the floor.

And the dog that runs downstairs -- I did cut it off

because it continued on for some time. But the stairs have a sign on the left-hand side that shows, again, that's his residence.

MS. HICKMAN: Luke, it sounds like you cut it off from where my objection is.

MR. PRENGAMAN: It should be just at 3:30.

MS. HICKMAN: Well, let me see.

(A DVD was played.)

THE COURT: So what are you using that video for?

MR. PRENGAMAN: So the dog — shows the carpet. The carpet is — there's — that's — that dog video appears on his phone, and there's EXIF data that shows that that was taken — again, it's either on or very close to the day that this was posted. And then it shows the interior of the house, that distinctive carpet that flashes over to the gun barrels which appears to be the long guns. It quickly flashes. He says there's guns everywhere, so the two guns on the floor of the house.

THE COURT: I know what I'm going to do. I'm going to sustain the objection to the video. It's cumulative. And that is some bizarre behavior. That is a video that I believe will confuse the jury.

I'm sustaining the objection on the video.

MR. PRENGAMAN: Now for that, can I have the

detective testify that -- to the -- that there was footage that indicates that that was posted on the day?

THE COURT: Yes, you may.

MR. PRENGAMAN: And that he appeared in this video with two long guns and the black pistol, which he does?

THE COURT: And you can even -- I'll allow you to do that, and you can have the officer say from his review of the video, he was armed with a pistol and brandished it.

MR. PRENGAMAN: And if the Court might allow that,

I'll try to do it with some leading questions so we don't run

into any --

THE COURT: That's fine. That's fine.

For the record, that particular video's prejudicial impact outweighed the probative value.

Anything else?

MS. HICKMAN: My last issue -- I guess I have two more. The first one is I would ask for the rule of exclusion as we go forward.

THE COURT: All right. Rule of exclusion will be invoked.

MS. HICKMAN: And the final issue is as to one of the State's witnesses, Ms. Okuma. I can make my objection before he calls her, but I'm comfortable doing it now.

She is the PSI writer from the Division of Parole

and Probation. It's my understanding the State intends to call Ms. Okuma to talk about statements that Mr. Hager made that then got put in his PSI.

My concern with that is it's a discovery issue. Those statements are written by Mr. Hager in his PSI questionnaire that is given to that person.

So the statements in the PSI are not his actual statements. His actual statements are written in his questionnaire.

I did call the Deputy Attorney General who is sort of on this case. I did ask her if that questionnaire is in the file. She did confirm it is in the file. She did confirm it was filled out with Mr. Hager. She did confirm that he filled it out completely. She also told me she will not give it to me, and she will not tell me what's written on that. So without that, I don't think that she should be able to testify to what his statements are that she summarized without giving us the actual statements.

MR. PRENGAMAN: Well, Your Honor, the statements are in the PSI. I don't see it as any different than --

THE COURT: When are you planning on calling her?

MR. PRENGAMAN: Your Honor, she's toward the end of my case.

THE COURT: I'm ordering that the Attorney General

will provide you his questionnaire out of their file.

And you can prepare the order, and I'll sign it and make sure Mr. Prengaman gets a copy of it.

That will give you time to properly prepare for that cross-examination.

MS. HICKMAN: My only question is timing of that because I would have to go to my office.

THE COURT: No, you don't. You have a very big office. We'll take a break. You're going to communicate with some of your underlings that work for the public defender's office so they can prepare the order so you can maintain your trial work. I don't expect you to do it personally, but that's my order. I'm sorry if that's not the way it works at the public defender's office, but it is for this trial.

MS. HICKMAN: It is now apparently.

THE COURT: That's correct.

MS. HICKMAN: Thank you.

THE COURT: You're welcome.

Did you want to add anything, Mr. Prengaman?

MR. PRENGAMAN: No. I'll try to make some efforts to see if I can get it.

THE COURT: Yeah. I mean, it's fair to both sides for that questionnaire to be available, and that's fine. I mean, I'm anticipating how the examination is going to go, and

1	it's not going to preclude the examination of your witness.
2	And we'll have a discovery issue related to that piece, and
3	we'll get it for you.
4	MS. HICKMAN: Thank you.
5	THE COURT: Yes.
6	Anything else?
7	MR. PRENGAMAN: Your Honor, I just want to take a
8	second to talk to my investigator and see if I can expedite
9	THE COURT: I'll give you five minutes. But I'm not
10	getting off the bench.
11	We'll start at 12:30 to bring the jury back,
12	Mr. Bailiff.
13	(Off the record.)
14	THE COURT: Are you set, Mr. Prengaman?
15	MR. PRENGAMAN: Yes.
16	THE COURT: Are you set, Ms. Hickman?
17	MS. HICKMAN: Yes, Judge. Thank you.
18	THE COURT: Let's all rise for the jury, and bring
19	them in.
20	(The jury entered the courtroom.)
21	THE COURT: Please be seated. Thank you for your
22	patience. Ladies and gentlemen, it's always my fault if we
23	are late. So always blame me.
24	Let me tell you in the spirit of transparency what

occurred. So last week, we had a number of matters before me to have the case run smoothly so you wouldn't have to wait for an hour and a half to be called. And sometimes what happens as the trial evolves — again, not like TV — there are additional issues that come up to make the case go smoothly.

So I'm pleased to tell you that in the time that I had you wait, we resolved the issues to continue to make the trial move smoothly so you wouldn't be interrupted during the flow as we begin the trial.

So it might have been -- one might say it might have been a little bit of wasted time for you there, but it wasn't for us because we moved the trial.

So thank you all for your patience. Thank you for being on time.

And at this point, Mr. Prengaman is about to begin his case on behalf of the State.

Mr. Prengaman.

MR. PRENGAMAN: Thank you, Your Honor.

Your Honor, the State's first witness will be Sergeant Chris Rowe.

THE COURT: Please step forward and be sworn.

(The witness was sworn.)

THE COURT: Please take the witness stand. Make yourself comfortable. We'll know you're comfortable because

you're g	oing to tell us your first and last name, spelling
your las	t name for the record.
	THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.
	My name is Christopher Rowe. Rowe is spelled
R-O-W-E.	
	THE COURT: Thank you.
	Mr. Prengaman.
	MR. PRENGAMAN: Thank you, Your Honor.
	CHRISTOPHER ROWE,
	having been first duly sworn, was examined
	and testified as follows:
	DIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MR. E	PRENGAMAN:
Q	Can you please tell us what you do for a living?
A	I work for the Sparks Police Department.
Q	You're a sworn peace officer?
A	I am.
I .	
Q	First tell me, what is your present rank and
Q assignme	First tell me, what is your present rank and
	First tell me, what is your present rank and
assignme A	First tell me, what is your present rank and ent?
	your las R-O-W-E. BY MR. E Q A

1	Sparks Police Department as an officer in any capacity?
2	A Over 11 years.
3	Q Prior to being promoted to sergeant, what was your
4	assignment?
5	A I was assigned to the Detective Division as a
6	general assignment detective.
7	Q And was that your assignment back in March, April,
8	May of this year?
9	A Yes, it was.
10	Q Sergeant, let me take you back specifically to
11	April 5, 2016. Beginning on that day did it come to your
12	attention on or about that day that a man named Ian Hager
13	might be a prohibited person in possession of firearms?
14	A Yes.
15	Q And were you looking into that matter?
16	A I was.
17	Q Okay. And did you determine that Ian Hager was
18	living in Sparks at the time?
19	A Yes.
20	Q And did you learn of the address that he was
21	presently living at on or about that day?
22	A Yes.
23	Q And what was the address?
24	A 2460 Angua.

1	Q	And just generally, where is that located in Sparks?	
2	А	Just off Vista Boulevard. If you know where the	
3	Safeway i	s, just a little bit south of the Safeway.	
4	Q	That's in Sparks, Washoe County, Nevada?	
5	А	That's correct.	
6	Q	As part of your investigation, did you receive some	
7	information from a Reno detective about some videos that had		
8	been posted on Facebook by Ian Hager?		
9	A	Yes.	
10	Q	Just for purposes of explaining what you did next in	
11	the course of your investigation, did Detective Johnson		
12	provide you with an actual Internet address to where the		
13	videos were posted?		
14	A	Yes, he did.	
15	Q	And did you taking that address did you follow	
16	the address and see where it took you?		
17	A	Yes.	
18	Q	Where did it take you?	
19	А	It took me to Facebook.	
20	Q	Okay. And was it to a specific area, location, or	
21	profile	on Facebook?	
22	А	Yes, it was.	
23	Q	Specifically where?	
24	A	It was under the Facebook profile name of Ian Andre.	
	T. Company		

- Okay. And just to sort of -- for the record and by 1 way of explanation, what is Facebook? You're familiar with 2 3 it, correct? Α I am. 4 It's something you used before, before this case? 5 0 Α Yes, sir. 6 Okay. What is it, generally? 7 Q
 - A It's a social media, social networking website where people can create their own pages.
 - Q And in terms of creating their own pages, what might they do or what do they put things on their pages?
 - A They can post comments. They can post photographs, videos, pictures.
 - Q And is it is it something that is private or public?
 - A That's up to the owner of the page.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

- Q Okay. And, well -- could you explain that a little further?
- A So the person that creates the page, they have the capability of either selecting their Facebook page be a public profile, meaning anybody can see it that has a Facebook page themself, or a private page where only friends of theirs can see it.
 - Q And the Ian Andre page, was that public or private?

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

- A It was public.
- Q You didn't have to request to be friends; you didn't have to do anything but just show up at the page, and you could see everything that's posted?
 - A That's correct.
 - Q When -- did you look at the content?
 - A Yes, I did.
- Q And what did you initially at this point, what did you find?
- A I found that there were several well, there was numerous videos posted on the Facebook page along with several photographs.
- Q Okay. And when you talk about being posted, like a video being posted on a page, can you explain what that would look like to somebody that goes and accesses this page?
- A The person that has the page can upload videos to that social media site, and once the videos are uploaded, the videos are contained on the page so people can see it.
- Q And so over the next couple of days, what did you do?
- A I looked through the videos that were posted on the page.
- Q So generally speaking -- I'm not going to ask you for specific numbers, but were there like a couple of videos

posted, or were there a lot of videos posted? 1 There was a lot. 2 And did many of them depict an individual? 3 Α Yes. And can you describe that? Not what -- not the 5 content of the videos, but just the individual that was shown 6 in the videos. 7 The individual that was shown on the videos is the 9 Defendant. Okay. And so for the record, many of the videos 10 showed a man? 11 12 Α Yes. Okay. And did it appear he was filming himself? 13 Q 14 Α Yes. Okay. And was it consistently the same person, 15 looked the same, spoke the same? 16 17 Α Yes. And you were able to recognize the person that you 18 saw in the videos in the courtroom today? 19 20 Α That's correct. And for the record, could you indicate -- when you 21 say "the Defendant," where is the person you're talking about 22 and describe the clothes? 23

24

He's seated at the table there wearing a white shirt

	MR. PRENGAMAN: Your Honor, may the record reflect
identifi	cation of the Defendant?
	THE COURT: It will.
	MR. PRENGAMAN: Thank you.
BY MR. PI	RENGAMAN:
Q	Now, in the videos that you watched, did the
Defendant	t, when he was depicted did he ever say in any of
the video	os what his address was?
А	Yes, he did.
Q	What did he say?
А	He said that he lived at 2460 Anqua.
Q	Did he ever say his name in any of the videos that
you obser	rved?
А	Yes, he did.
Q	And describe that. What did he say?
А	He said, "This is Ian Hager alias Ian Andre."
Q	Ian Andre being the alias of the Facebook account or
page?	
A	That's correct.
Q	Did you find any at this point in the case, did
you find	any videos that you believed were relevant to your
investiga	tion?
А	Yes, I did.
	BY MR. PR Q Defendant the video A Q you obser A Q page? A Q you find investiga

Q And again, before we get into some of the specific videos, as a general matter, what did you see that you considered relevant to your investigation?

A I saw a video of the Defendant possessing multiple firearms.

Q Were there any that appeared more than once or appeared sort of consistently in the videos?

A Yes, sir.

Q And what were those?

A There was -- continually there was a black-colored assault rifle that would appear and a black-colored semi-automatic handgun.

Q When you saw them, how were they depicted? In other words, like sitting somewhere, or how were they depicted?

A There was really in a couple of different ways — excuse me. There were times that the assault rifle would be sitting out like on the kitchen counter. There were other times he would be holding the assault rifle.

Same thing with the handgun. There were videos and images where the handgun — he would be holding the handgun, and it would be placed into a vest, or he had it tucked into his pants.

Q Now, as you are reviewing these videos, did you take any steps to preserve the content that you were seeing?

- A I did.
- O And what was that?
- A There's a software program called Camtasia that we have up there in the detective division.
- Q And would you explain to the -- explain what -- how you use that. What does it do?
- A Essentially it's a software program that allows you to take and record a computer screen, and whatever you're seeing on the computer screen, you're able to record that image.
- Q And so just to just by way of explanation, would it be sort of similar to just better quality than sort of holding a video camera up to the screen and filming what you're watching as you're watching it?
 - A That's correct.
- Q So you're recording exactly what you're watching as you're watching it?
 - A That's correct.
- Q So you're able to tell us everything you record is something you saw on Mr. Hager's web page -- Facebook page?
 - A Yes.
- Q Now, I don't want to get into a ton of details here.

 Just, again, to explain how things progressed in your

 investigation, at some point, did it come to your attention

that Mr. Hager, the person that you saw depicted in these 1 videos, had attended Washoe County's Mental Health Court? 2 3 Α Yes. And did you learn where -- where that had occurred; 4 0 in other words, which court or where had that originated? 5 Yes. 6 Α Where was that? 7 Out of the Sixth Judicial District Court. That's in 8 Humboldt County near Winnemucca. 9 And were you able to obtain some documentation from 10 that court to assist your investigation? 11 12 Α Yes. MR. PRENGAMAN: For the record, it's been previously 13 supplied, but I'm showing counsel for the defense what's 14 marked 33 through 37 for identification. 15 Thank you. MS. HICKMAN: 16 MR. PRENGAMAN: Your Honor, at this time I move for 17 admission of Exhibits 33 through 37 into evidence. 18 THE COURT: They are admitted. 19 (Exhibits 33 through 37 admitted into evidence.) 20 MR. PRENGAMAN: Thank you, Your Honor. 21 BY MR. PRENGAMAN: 22 Sergeant, I'm going to show you what we have marked 23 as 33 through 37 for identification. I'm going to ask you to

take a look at those, each document, if you would, and just 1 let me know when you're done. 2 Α Okay. 3 Sir, did you recognize the documents? 4 Yes. Α 5 And what are they? 0 6 They are the court documents from the Sixth Judicial 7 Α District Court. 8 Okay. And in terms of your investigation -- again, 9 0 your investigation, did any of those documents have relevance 10 11 for you? Yes, they did. 12 Is that because they reflected that Ian Hager had 13 been ordered into Mental Health Court? 14 Α Yes, sir. 15 And, Sergeant, what was the year of those -- the 16 proceedings that relate to the documents that you just looked 17 at from Humboldt County? 18 2013. 19 Α Okay. Was there additional relevance in the sense 20 that in the course of the proceedings, there was discussion 21 about Mr. Hager's use of controlled substances? 22 Yes. 23 Α

And did that also inform your investigation?

1	
1	A Yes.
2	MR. PRENGAMAN: Your Honor, I'm going to now now
3	I would like to play for members of the jury 31A and B, which
4	have been previously admitted into evidence.
5	THE COURT: They are admitted.
6	(Exhibits 31A and 31B previously admitted into evidence.)
7	BY MR. PRENGAMAN:
8	Q First, I will play Exhibit 31A which is the Sixth
9	Judicial District Court proceedings, March 11, 2013, Case
10	CR13-6258.
11	THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, we have two
12	screens, one there and one there, for your viewing pleasure.
13	JUROR COWEN: What about popcorn?
14	THE COURT: Not today.
15	JUROR COWEN: Okay.
16	THE WITNESS: That screen is not working, sir.
17	THE COURT: Neither of them are. The one above you,
18	either.
19	THE WITNESS: Oh, I apologize.
20	THE COURT: Is it working on your screen?
21	THE WITNESS: It is.
22	THE COURT: Make sure the one behind you, too.
23	There you go.
24	(A DVD was played.)

MR. PRENGAMAN: Exhibit 31B from the Sixth Judicial 1 District Court, April 29, 2013, CR13-6258. 2 (A DVD was played.) 3 4 BY MR. PRENGAMAN: Just stopping it there, Sergeant, briefly, I believe 5 0 that's at 3 minutes 25 seconds in. Is that 176A, Application 6 for Mental Health Court -- is that one of the documents that 7 you reviewed --8 Yes, sir. 9 Α -- in your investigation? 10 Yes, sir. Α 11 (A DVD was played.) 12 13 BY MR. PRENGAMAN: And, Sergeant, showing you, again, Exhibit 36, was 14 the Order that the Judge talked about that we just saw, the 15 Order for Mr. Hager to go into Washoe County Mental Health 16 Court program. Is that one of the documents that you 17 reviewed? 18 Yes, it is. 19 Α And is Exhibit 36 that Order? 20 21 Α Yes. Sergeant, going back to the content of Mr. Hager's 22 Facebook page, the Ian Andre page, again, I'm not going to ask 23 each and every day, but can you give us an idea of the videos

1	that you observed where you observed firearms either by	
2	themselves or with Mr. Hager holding them, what was the	
3	approximate span of time across which those videos had been	
4	posted?	
5	A I believe they began in November of 2015 through	
6	March of 2016.	
7	Q Sergeant, I'm going to show you first what we've	
8	marked as Exhibit 12 for identification.	
9	MS. HICKMAN: Judge, before we do that, may we	
10	briefly approach?	
11	THE COURT: Sure.	
12	(Discussion at the bench.)	
13	BY MR. PRENGAMAN:	
14	Q Sergeant, I'm showing you what we've marked for	
15	identification as Exhibit 12.	
16	MS. HICKMAN: Okay.	
17	BY MR. PRENGAMAN:	
18	Q Could you please take a look at that disk, and let	
19	me know if you recognize it.	
20	A I do.	
21	Q And you've previously viewed the contents of that	
22	disk before?	
23	A That's right.	
24	And you placed your signature on the disk to	

indicate that you've previously seen it? 1 Α Yes, sir. 2 Is this one of the videos -- does that disk contain 3 one of the videos that you observed on Mr. Hager's Facebook 4 5 page? Α Yes, it does. 6 MR. PRENGAMAN: Your Honor, I move for the admission 7 of Exhibit 12 into evidence. 8 MS. HICKMAN: No objection. 9 THE COURT: It's admitted. 10 (Exhibit 12 admitted into evidence.) 11 MR. PRENGAMAN: Thank you, Your Honor. 12 (A DVD was played.) 13 BY MR. PRENGAMAN: 14 Now, Sergeant, just -- first, so I have -- just let 15 this play for about two seconds. Can you just sort of -- if 16 you touch that monitor, you can draw on the screen. 17 Α Okay. 18 Can you just give us an idea of what we are looking 19 at here in this video? 20 So this is a video that I recorded from the Facebook 21 page. Up here at the top it shows the name of the person that 22 posted the video. It says Ian Andre. I apologize. I covered 23

it up. Just underneath the name it has a date there. I'll

draw a line right below it. So right there you can see it 1 says January 25th. 2 And on that -- Sergeant, this was posted on 3 January 25th, 2016? That's correct. Α 5 And how do you know that if it doesn't say 2016? 6 How Facebook works is if the year has already passed 7 beyond the numbers there, you would see an actual -- the year. 8 So it would say 2012, 20- -- whatever that year was. 9 fact that it hadn't posted a year on there yet means that it 10 11 was this year. So that's the date that the video was posted on the 12 13 site or placed onto the site? Yes, sir. 14 Α Let me stop it there. Now, do you know -- you 15 0 recognize the individual we just saw in the video? 16 17 Α Yes. Who is that? 18 The Defendant. 19 Α (A DVD was played.) 20 21 BY MR. PRENGAMAN: I'm stopping it here at about 36 seconds into the 22 0 video. 23

Can you describe for us what you see?

Lying on the table, there is a silver-colored 1 Α semi-automatic handqun, and next to it is a black-colored 2 semi-automatic handgun. And by both of the guns, it looks 3 like there's pistol ammunition. And if you can see right here, just above that line, 5 that's an assault rifle, ammunition for a .222 caliber. 6 And then did you see anything that you considered 7 significant at this point in the video? 8 Yes, sir. 9 Α 10 And what was that? If you look in his back waistline area, you can see 11 Α there's a handoun tucked into his pants. 12 13 0 Are you able to see the color? It looks like it's a black-colored semi-automatic 14 Α 15 handgun. (A DVD was played.) 16 BY MR. PRENGAMAN: 17 How about now? 18 A black-colored assault rifle. 19 (A DVD was played.) 20 BY MR. PRENGAMAN: 21 And how about now, Sergeant? 22 The silver object that he's holding that's more gray 23 is a magazine for an assault rifle.

	80	
1		MR. PRENGAMAN: Showing defense counsel Exhibit 13
2	for ident	ification.
3		MS. HICKMAN: Okay.
4	BY MR. PR	ENGAMAN:
5	Q	Sergeant, I'm showing you Exhibit 13. Could you
6	look at t	hat disk and tell me if you recognize it?
7	A	I didn't hear you.
8	Q	I'm sorry. Could you look at that disk and tell me
9	if you recognize it?	
10	A	I do.
11	Q	Have you viewed the contents before?
12	А	Yes.
13	Q	Does that disk contain one of the videos that you
14	observed	on Mr. Hager's website that you recorded?
15	A	It does.
16	Q	What was the date that that video was posted?
17	A	January 27th, 2016.
18	Q	Okay. Now, Sergeant, when we looked at the last
19	video and	you showed us where the date appears, you indicated
20	that that	was the date that the video was posted, correct?
21	A	Yes, sir.
22	Q	Can you tell from looking at the videos the exact
23	day they	were created or filmed?
24	А	No.

1	Q Okay. Does the content of a number of the videos
2	give you some indication when the videos were filmed?
3	A Yes.
4	Q Okay. And just by way of some examples, like what
5	are some of the things, indicators that you observed in the
6	videos that gave some indication when the videos were filmed?
7	A On one of the videos, there's actually a beer can in
8	the shot with Mr. Hager sitting behind it. And the beer can
9	has a Super Bowl 50 emblem on it. And it was posted right
10	around the time of the Super Bowl which happened in February
11	of 2016.
12	And there was another video where Mr. Hager is in a
13	car, and he says references along the line of, "It's
14	February 27th ish," and the video was posted on, I believe,
15	February 28th.
16	Q And that's not just some of the things that you
17	saw that indicated the timeframe of when they were made?
18	A That's correct.
19	MR. PRENGAMAN: Your Honor, I'm going to move for
20	the admission of Exhibit 13 into evidence.
21	MS. HICKMAN: No objection.
22	THE COURT: It's admitted.
23	(Exhibit 13 admitted into evidence.)
24	MR. PRENGAMAN: Thank you.

BY MR. PRENGAMAN:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

19

22

- Q Okay. I'm stopping the exhibit 13 seconds in.
- Can you tell us what you see in this photograph or this part of the video?

A In the video, you can see the — there's a black-colored assault rifle sitting on the couch. And this is the video I was speaking about with — I think it's a Budweiser beer can. From this angle, you can see it looks like the bottom of a zero, and then "Bowl" underneath it. But after the video continues, he turns it and you can see where it says the number 50 for Super Bowl 50.

(A DVD was played.)

BY MR. PRENGAMAN:

- Q Sergeant, the text to the -- as we are looking at this, the right says, "Part one of Hump Day." Did you look into what day of the week January 27, 2016, was?
- A Yes, sir.
- 18 Q And what day was that?
 - A If I remember correctly -- I forget. I apologize.
- Q Did you recognize the individual that we saw in that video, Exhibit 13?
 - A Yes, sir.
- 23 And who was that?
- 24 A The Defendant.

1		
1	Q	Showing you Exhibit 17 for identification.
2		Sergeant, showing you again Exhibit 17, could you
3	please ta	ke a look at the disk and tell me if you recognize
4	it?	
5	А	Yes.
6	Q	Does that disk contain one of the Facebook videos
7	you recor	ded from Mr. Hager's site?
8	A	It does.
9	Q	Facebook page?
10	A	It does.
11	Q	And what was the date that video was posted?
12	А	February 20th, 2016.
13	Q	What do we see in the first couple seconds of the
14	video?	
15	А	Looks like the camera is oriented looking down the
16	sight of	the barrel of an assault rifle.
17	Q	That's essentially what this short video contains;
18	is that r	right?
19	А	Yes, sir.
20		MR. PRENGAMAN: And I'm sorry if I didn't move for
21	the admis	ssion, Your Honor. I move for the admission.
22		MS. HICKMAN: I have no objection.
23		THE COURT: It's admitted.
24		(Exhibit 17 admitted into evidence.)

```
1
               MR. PRENGAMAN: Thank you, Your Honor.
 2
     BY MR. PRENGAMAN:
 3
                Is it accurate that the individual -- you never see
 4
     a person in this clip; is that right?
                I don't believe so.
 5
          Α
               But the individual does speak?
 6
          0
 7
          Α
               Yes.
 8
               Did you recognize the voice from watching the
          Q
 9
     videos?
10
          Α
               I did.
               And whose voice did you recognize?
11
          0
12
          Α
               It sounded like the Defendant.
               MR. PRENGAMAN: Showing defense counsel Exhibit 18
13
14
     for identification.
15
               MS. HICKMAN: That's fine.
16
     BY MR. PRENGAMAN:
               Sergeant, showing you now Exhibit 18. Can you
17
18
     please take a look at that disk and tell me if you recognize
19
     it?
          Α
               Yes.
20
               Is that one of the videos that you viewed on
21
22
     Mr. Hager's Facebook page that you recorded?
23
          A
               Yes.
24
               Okay.
          0
```

1		MR. PRENGAMAN: Okay. I'm going to move for the
2	admission	of Exhibit 18.
3	ni	MS. HICKMAN: No objection.
4		THE COURT: It's admitted.
5	K	(Exhibit 18 admitted into evidence.)
6	BY MR. PRI	ENGAMAN:
7	Q	Did that particular video have significant for you?
8	А	It did.
9	Q	Different than the ones we've seen?
10	А	Yes.
11	Q	And what was the significance of this video to you
12	in terms o	of your investigation?
13	А	Is it possible to see first the beginning opening?
14	There was	so many videos I viewed, I want to look at the
15	beginning	•
16	Q	Sure.
17		(A DVD was played.)
18		THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.
19	BY MR. PRI	ENGAMAN:
20	Q	And what was the significance of this video to you
21	in terms o	of your investigation?
22	А	This video shows the Defendant he displays a
23	baggy of r	narcotics and takes out the narcotics and sniffs
24	them.	

1		MS. HICKMAN: I'm going to object to him using the	
2	term "nar	cotics."	
3	BY MR. PR	ENGAMAN:	
4	Q	Did it appear to you to be narcotics?	
5	А	Yes.	
6	Q	The only	
7		THE COURT: Overruled.	
8		MR. PRENGAMAN: Sorry, Your Honor.	
9		THE COURT: That's okay.	
10		The objection was foundation. You asked him if he	
11	recognized it. I'm going to have you ask a couple of		
12	questions	based on his training and experience relating to	
13	narcotics.		
14		The objection is overruled, but I want you to lay a	
15	little bit better foundation.		
16		MR. PRENGAMAN: Thank you, Your Honor.	
17	BY MR. PR	ENGAMAN:	
18	Q	You told us you've been a detective, now sergeant,	
19	over 11 y	ears; is that correct?	
20	А	That's correct.	
21	Q	When you first became a police officer, you attended	
22	the acade	my?	
23	А	Yes.	
24	Q	Did you receive training was part of your	

training to become a police officer, did that involve training 1 in the recognition of controlled substances? 2 Α Yes. 3 And did that include substances like heroin, 0 4 cocaine, methamphetamine? 5 Yes. 6 Α Did you also receive training in the common ways 7 that people ingest controlled substances like heroin, 8 methamphetamine, cocaine? Yes. 10 Α The various, just, paraphernalia devices they use to 11 ingest those substances? 12 Α 13 Yes. Once you became a police officer, did you start out 14 0 15 in patrol? 16 Α Yes. And then at some point you became a detective? 17 0 That's correct. 18 Α And about how long were you in the detective 19 division prior to your promotion? 20 Approximately a year and a half. 21 Α Now, in your time as a -- significant time as a 22 patrol officer, did you have occasion to investigate numerous 23

controlled substance cases?

1 Α Yes. And did that include cases involving the possession, 2 use, sales of a controlled substance? 3 Α Yes. 4 And did those include methamphetamine, cocaine, 5 0 heroin, as well as other controlled substances? 6 7 Α Yes. So is it fair to say that by virtue of your training 8 0 as well as your on-the-job training and the cases that you 9 were involved in investigating that you were not only trained, 10 but you became familiar in real life with how controlled 11 substances appeared? 12 Α Yes. 13 Like cocaine, methamphetamine, and heroin? 14 Q 15 Α Yes. Did you, again, in the course of investigating those 16 cases become familiar in real life with the ways that people 17 who use and sell controlled substances package them and ingest 18 19 them? 20 Α Yes. With the types of devices they would use to either 21 smoke or snort or inject controlled substance like 22 methamphetamine, cocaine, and heroin? 23

24

Α

Yes.

And so when you say that it appears to you that 1 Mr. Hager in this video is using narcotics, is it based on 2 that training and that experience that you make that statement 3 or give that opinion? 4 That's correct. Α 5 0 Okay. 6 (A DVD was played.) 7 BY MR. PRENGAMAN: 8 Do you recognize this individual? 9 0 Yes, sir. 10 Α Who is that? 11 0 The Defendant. 12 Now, I'll go back to recapture this segment, but, 13 Q Sergeant, what do we see in this portion of the video? And I 14 stopped it about 1 minute 33 seconds in. 15 You see the Defendant holding a plastic bag of a 16 white -- or a crystal substance. 17 And based on your training and experience, what type 18 of controlled -- are you able to say what type of controlled 19 substance that would be consistent with in your opinion? 20 In my opinion it would be consistent with 21 methamphetamine. 22 So I'm going to go back briefly to recapture that 23

24

scene.

1		(A DVD was played.)
2	BY MR. PI	RENGAMAN:
3	Q	Now, Sergeant, again, based on your training and
4	experience	ce investigating controlled substance cases, up to the
5	point tha	at we've just observed and the video stopped at
6	4 minutes	s 33 seconds in is what we observed consistent with
7	how some	user of controlled substances would ingest
8	methamphe	etamine as well as possibly cocaine?
9	A	Yes.
10	Q	By snorting it?
11	A	That's correct.
12		(A DVD was played.)
13	BY MR. PI	RENGAMAN:
14	Q	Sergeant, I'm stopping the video at 8 minutes, 54
15	seconds i	in. Do you see any significance in this frame or at
16	this poir	nt in the video?
17	А	Yes, sir.
18	Q	What is that?
19	А	The Defendant is holding the Holy Bible and walking
20	toward th	ne camera. And if you can see on top of the Bible,
21	there's]	left-over methamphetamine sitting on top of it.
22	Q	Let me go back.
23		When he lifts up the book, does something happen?
24	A	Yes, sir.

1		(A DVD was played.)
2	BY MR. PR	ENGAMAN:
3	Q	Let me play it forward.
4		(A DVD was played.)
5	BY MR. PR	ENGAMAN:
6	Q	To avoid that distortion, what is significant when
7	he lifts	up the book?
8	A	When he lifts up the Bible toward the camera, if you
9	look clos	ely, you can see the narcotics slide off the Bible.
10		(A DVD was played.)
11		MR. PRENGAMAN: I'll show defense counsel Exhibit 19
12	for ident	ification.
13	BY MR. PR	ENGAMAN:
14	Q	Sergeant, I'm going to show you Exhibit 19. Could
15	you pleas	e look at that disk and tell me if you recognize it?
16	A	I do.
17	Q	You previously viewed the content?
18	А	Yes.
19	Q	Is that a disk, Exhibit 19, containing one of the
20	videos th	at you observed, and recorded, on Mr. Hager's
21	Facebook	page?
22	A	Yes.
23	Q	And what is the date that that video was posted?
24	A	February 28th, 2016.

1	MR. PRENGAMAN: Your Honor, as to Exhibit 19, I
2	would like to play 2 minutes and 10 seconds to the end.
3	THE COURT: Please do.
4	MR. PRENGAMAN: So beginning at 2:10.
5	MS. HICKMAN: Judge, if there is a motion to admit
6	it, I don't object.
7	THE COURT: I believe we had that out of the
8	presence, but I appreciate you doing that now for the record.
9	(A DVD was played.)
10	BY MR. PRENGAMAN:
11	Q And I'm going to stop it there, Sergeant; 2 minutes
12	14 seconds in. What did we just see?
13	A We saw the Defendant holding a black-colored
14	semi-automatic handgun.
15	(A DVD was played.)
16	BY MR. PRENGAMAN:
17	Q What did we see there?
18	A Again, the Defendant is holding a black vest and is
19	holding a black handgun.
20	Q I'll now show you what we've marked Exhibit 20
21	sorry Exhibit 22.
22	MS. HICKMAN: I'm sorry. Did you say Exhibit 22
23	instead?
24	MR. PRENGAMAN: 22, yes.

- [
1	BY MR. PR	RENGAMAN:
2	Q	I'm going to show you Exhibit 22, Sergeant. Could
3	you pleas	se take a look at that disk and tell me if you
4	recognize	the contents?
5	А	Yes.
6	Q	And what is that?
7	А	A Facebook video from February 28th, 2016.
8	Q	And that's one of the ones that you observed and
9	recorded?	?
10	А	That's correct.
11	Q	From Mr. Hager's Facebook page?
12	A	Yes.
13		MR. PRENGAMAN: For the record, this will begin at
14	2:19; 2 r	minutes 19 seconds into the video.
15	BY MR. PI	RENGAMAN:
16	Q	And at 2.22, Sergeant, what do you see depicted in
17	that par	t of the video?
18	A	A pistol-gripped shotgun.
19	Q	And the photograph not the photograph, but the
20	individu	al, who do you see depicted there?
21	А	The Defendant.
22	Q	Now, I'm going to stop it at 2 minutes 32 seconds
23	in. Wha	t is the text that's placed over the where the
24	video is	playing?

1	А	It says, "Approximately 20 to 30 minutes ago,
2	Saturday	night, February 27th-ish."
3	Q	And you told us this particular video was posted on
4	February	28th?
5	А	That's correct.
6	Q	And is this one of the indicators you were talking
7	about tha	at about when the video was made as opposed to
8	posted or	the site?
9	А	Yes.
10	Q	What day of the week was February 27th?
11	А	Saturday.
12	Q	And who do we see there?
13	А	The Defendant.
14		MR. PRENGAMAN: Showing counsel Exhibit 25 for
15	identific	cation.
16	BY MR. PF	RENGAMAN:
17	Q	Sergeant, showing you Exhibit 25, do you recognize
18	that disk	·?
19	А	Yes.
20	Q	Does that contain a video that you viewed and
21	recorded	from Mr. Hager's Facebook page?
22	А	It does.
23	Q	And what was the date that video was posted?
24	A	March 2nd, 2016.

1		(A DVD was played.)
2	BY MR. PRE	INGAMAN:
3	Q	Who do we see there?
4	A	The Defendant.
5	Q	Sergeant, what did we see just before 1 minute
6	8 seconds	into the video?
7	A	You can see the Defendant. He's wearing what I
8	would desc	cribe as a black tact vest and holding a
9	black-colo	ored handgun.
10	Q	Sergeant, there is the under the name of the
11	page, the	Ian Andre heading, and the date March 2nd, it says,
12	"I've had	too many Tuesday nights like this." Do you see
13	that?	
14	A	Yes, sir.
15	Q	Can you tell us what day of the week March 2nd was?
16	A	I believe March 2nd was actually a Wednesday.
17	Q	And so March 1st would have been a Tuesday?
18	A	That's correct.
19		(A DVD was played.)
20	BY MR. PR	ENGAMAN:
21	Q	Did you see the gun again in his hand?
22	A	Yes.
23	Q	Sergeant, in the videos that we have just seen that
24	you recor	ded, what did you note generally about the setting or

the background? 1 All of it -- excuse me. They either appeared to be 2 inside of a residence or inside of a vehicle. 3 Now, in the course of your investigation and after 4 0 you viewed the videos on Mr. Hager's Facebook page, did you 5 take another investigative step? 6 I did. Α 7 Was that to apply for a search warrant for 0 8 Mr. Hager's residence? 9 10 Α Yes. Okay. And what was the date that that occurred, 11 0 that you made the application for the search warrant? 12 I believe I applied on April 8th. Α 13 And which -- you applied to a Court for a warrant? 14 0 That's correct. Α 15 Was it granted? 16 0 Yes, it was. Α 17 And what were you authorized to search for? 18 0 We were authorized to search for firearms, 19 Α ammunition, and indicia of occupancy, meaning to show who 20 lived in the residence. 21 Things like bills; utility bills, things like that? 22 0 23 Α Correct.

24

Was there a -- and speaking generally -- I don't

want to get into detail or talk about specifics of 1 conversations, but once the warrant had been authorized, was 2 there a plan as to how to serve it? Α Yes. 4 Okay. And then could you just generally outline 5 what that -- what that plan was? 6 The general plan was to have some detectives go out 7 to the Defendant's address, establish surveillance, and then 8 after he left the address, contact him and place him under arrest. 10 And in terms of -- was part of that plan that you 11 wanted to search the residence when he was not there? 12 Yes. Α 13 Okay. So in essence, the plan was to surveil, wait, 14 0 and once he left the residence to then contact him separately? 15 That's correct. 16 Now -- and did that occur? 17 0 It did. Α 18 Okay. Were you part of that; meaning, were you on 0 19 the scene, so to speak? 20 I was not. 21 Α Okay. Did you go participate in the search of 22 Mr. Hager's residence? 23

I did not.

Α

1	Q	And were you involved in contacting him separately?
2	Were you	let me ask it a better way.
3		You didn't follow him or approach him out in the
4	field, so	to speak?
5	А	I did not.
6	Q	Okay. When this was happening, where were you?
7	A	I was still at the police department.
8	Q	Okay. Were you did you have some way of knowing
9	what was	going on as it was happening?
10	A	Yes. I was monitoring the radio so I could hear
11	what they	were doing and what was happening.
12	Q	And then to explain what happened next, did you
13	learn in	the course of monitoring that Mr. Hager at some point
14	had in fa	ct been taken into custody?
15	А	Yes.
16	Q	And did you learn that the search warrant was being
17	served, m	meaning detectives were searching Mr. Hager's
18	residence?	
19	A	Yes.
20	Q	Okay. And this was all occurring on April 8th?
21	А	That's correct.
22	Q	At some point after Mr. Hager was taken into custody
23	was he br	rought to the Sparks Police Department?

A Yes, he was.

1	Q	At that point, do you have contact with him?
2	А	I do.
3	Q	Was that your first in-person contact with
4	Mr. Hager	?
5	А	Yes.
6	Q	When you first meet him, where does that happen?
7	A	It's in the detective division inside an interview
8	room.	
9	Q	And he's in custody, correct?
10	A	That's correct.
11	Q	When you met him, was he handcuffed?
12	A	Initially, yes, he was.
13	Q	Okay. And then did you ask or did you arrange to
14	have those handcuffs removed while you were speaking to him?	
15	A	Yes.
16	Q	Because he's in custody, did you provide him with
17	his Miran	da warning?
18	A	Yes, I did.
19	Q	And ultimately, did he agree to speak to you?
20	A	Yes.
21	Q	Sergeant, I would like to ask you about some of the
22	subjects	that you spoke with Mr. Hager about in that
23	interview	<i>.</i>
24		During your interview, did you ask him how long he

1	had been I	Living at the 2460 Anqua address?
2	А	I did.
3	Q	What did he tell you?
4	А	Since 2012.
5	Q	Did you ask him whether anyone else was or had been
6	living wit	th him at that address?
7	A	I did.
8	Q	And what did he tell you?
9	A	He told me that no one else was living there.
10	Q	Okay. And did he give you a timeframe, in other
11	words, son	me point in time after which nobody had lived with
12	him at th	at residence?
13	A	If I remember correctly, I believe he said it was
14	September	or October of 2012.
15	Q	And since then, no one had lived there with him?
16	A	That's correct.
17	Q	During the during your interview with Mr. Hager,
18	did he ac	knowledge that he had a Facebook account?
19	А	Yes.
20	Q	Facebook page or Facebook account?
21	A	Yes.
22	Q	Okay. And did you in fact mention one or more of
23	the video	s that you had seen on his page?
24	A	I did.
	I .	

Did he make reference to whether the things that he 1 had posted on there was public or private? 2 He told me that his page was public, so anybody 3 4 could see it. During the interview, did you ask him what firearms 5 0 he owned or possessed in his house? 6 7 Α Yes. And did he tell you about that? 8 0 9 Α He did. And what did he tell you? 10 He told me that he had a Bushmaster assault rifle, a 11 Α 12 .20 gauge shotgun, a .40 caliber pistol, and a 1911 pistol. 13 And as to that, the assault rifle, did he reference -- did he tell you as to that particular gun -- or 14 did he make mention to you how long he might have had that 15 16 qun? He told me he's had the assault rifle since 2007. 17 I'm sorry, Sergeant. You mentioned a rifle. A 18 Ruger, did you mention that? 19 I -- no, I did not mention that. 20 Α 21 Let me back up. 0 Did he at some point mention having a Ruger rifle? 22

And did he make some reference to the condition of

Yes, he did.

23

24

Α

Q

that gun?

A If I remember, we spoke about it, and he said it was either broken or inoperable or something like that.

Q And when you spoke to him, did he tell you where some of those guns were located presently; in other words, on that day in the house?

A Yes.

Q And as -- if you could, what did he tell you about that? Which guns did he locate in the house, so to speak?

A Yes. He said that the SIG Sauer handgun was on his bed in the bedroom. He said that the .22 was in a guitar loft. And he said the other one should be around his gun safe.

Q During the interview, did you bring up the subject of the video he posted where he appears to -- where he produced that baggy of crystal or substance and snorted it?

A Yes, I did.

Q How did you introduce or how did you bring it up to him?

A I talked to him. I said that I looked at a few videos, that one video kind of jumped out to me, that there was a video of him snorting some stuff.

Q Okay. And what did he tell you about that?

A I asked him -- I said, "What was it?" And he said

1	it was met	ch.
2	Q	Did he tell you did he tell you why he why he
3	had used t	the meth?
4	А	Yes, sir.
5	Q	And what did he tell you?
6	А	He said that he used it to disprove the overdose
7	theory.	
8		MR. PRENGAMAN: Showing defense counsel 93.
9	BY MR. PRI	ENGAMAN:
10	Q	Sergeant, I'm going to show you what we've marked as
11	Exhibit 93. Do you recognize that?	
12	А	I do.
13	Q	Have you previously viewed the content of that disk?
14	A	I have.
15	Q	Does that disk contain the segment of your interview
16	with the 1	Defendant where he talks to you about his use of
17	methamphe	tamine on that video?
18	A	I believe so.
19		MR. PRENGAMAN: Your Honor, I'm going to move for
20	admission	of Exhibit 93 into evidence.
21		MS. HICKMAN: No objection.
22		THE COURT: It's admitted.
23		(Exhibit 93 admitted into evidence.)
24		MR. PRENGAMAN: Thank you, Your Honor.

1 BY MR. PRENGAMAN: Sergeant, first, just looking at -- what are we 2 looking at here at the very beginning? 3 So these -- the interview was taking place inside 4 Α one of the interview rooms at the police department, and the 5 two images are two different camera angles of cameras that are 6 established inside the interview room. 7 As we are looking at it, in the upper left corner or 8 0 square, who do we see in that photograph -- or that portion of 10 the screen? The Defendant. 11 Α 12 Then in the upper -- as we are looking at the 0 upper right-hand quadrant or corner, what do we see there? 13 That's -- that's me sitting at the other end of the Α 14 table having a conversation with the Defendant. 15 Could you indicate on the screen where you are and 16 0 where the Defendant is? 17 So I'm here, and the Defendant is here (indicating). 18 And then in terms of the date and time stamped on 19 0 the video, that's generally accurate? 20 21 Α Yes. (A DVD was played.) 22

BY MR. PRENGAMAN:

Let me back it up.

23

1 Sergeant, when he -- when Mr. Hager in the interview 2 used that phrase "the overdose theory," did he talk to you 3 about what he meant by that or expand on what he meant by that? 5 THE COURT: You may lead. 6 MR. PRENGAMAN: Oh, thank you. 7 BY MR. PRENGAMAN: Sergeant, when the Defendant talked to you and used 8 0 9 that phrase, "the overdose theory," at some point did he tell 10 you that he had been given three different causes of death for 11 his brother -- causes of death for his brother who had passed 12 away? 13 Α Yes. 14 And when he talked to you about that, did he give 15 asphyxiation and methamphetamine intoxication as reasons that 16 he had been given by the Reno Police Department for his 17 brother's death? 18 Α Yes. 19 During your interview with the Defendant, did you 20 ask him about his having been in Washoe County Mental Health 21 Court? I have -- I did.F. 22 Α 23 Excuse me.

24

Q

And did he tell you what his diagnosis was that got

him into Mental Health Court? 1 2 Α Yes. And what was that? 3 0 He told me it was PTSD or post-traumatic stress 4 Α 5 disorder. And did he indicate to you in that interview that he 6 0 was ordered into Mental Health Court? 7 8 Α Yes. Sergeant, at some point after you spoke to the 9 Q Defendant, did you learn -- I'm not going to ask you to detail 10 11 it or list it, but did you learn or were you informed what had been found in the course of the search of Mr. Hager's 12 13 residence? 14 Α Yes. And you were informed -- to explain what you did 15 next, you were informed that there were a number of firearms 16 17 that had been found and recovered? That's correct. 18 Α And after that day, did you continue to do so, look 19 0 20 at what was the public parts of Mr. Hager's Facebook page? I did. 21 Α And what were you looking for? 22 I went into a different line. It's the same area of 23

Facebook which was the Defendant's Facebook page, but I looked

- 1 under where his photographs were.
- Q Okay. And in doing that, did you locate any photographs that you considered relevant to your investigation?
 - A I did.

5

6

7

8

- Q I'm going to show you what we've had admitted into evidence, first, as Exhibit 1. Are you able to see that,

 Sergeant? Do you recognize this photograph?
- 9 A Yes, sir.
- 10 Q And is this a photograph found and recorded from 11 Mr. Hager's Facebook page?
- 12 A Yes.
- Q And are you able to tell us the date that he posted this on his Facebook page?
 - A Would it be possible to refresh my memory?
- 16 Q Is there something that would refresh your recollection?
- 18 A Yes, sir.
- 19 Q And what would that be?
- 20 A I had some notes I had taken in preparation for 21 testifying that I have with me.
- Q Is it difficult to remember the particular dates
 that you -- the dates of the photos that you saw?
- 24 A Yes, sir, because there was so many photographs and

videos that the dates kind of get jumbled. 1 And subject to any objection, if it would help you 2 refresh your recollection just to tell us the date, would you 3 please do so. 4 MS. HICKMAN: Judge, if they are his personal notes, 5 6 I'm not sure that I've seen this. BY MR. PRENGAMAN: 7 Did you make that just to help jog your memory 8 0 9 today? Α I did. 10 I'll mark it as an exhibit. 11 MR. PRENGAMAN: 12 THE COURT: You may refer to them. And I'll make sure you're able to see a copy of 13 14 those before your cross-examination. 15 MS. HICKMAN: Thank you. 16 THE WITNESS: Okay. 17 BY MR. PRENGAMAN: And so as to Exhibit 1, what was the date that that 18 0 19 was posted? 20 That was August 28th, 2015. A And, now, do you recognize the -- where it appears 21 that the -- first of all, what do we see in the photo? 22 We can see the black-colored assault rifle laying 23

next to the black semi-automatic handgun. And I know it's

- hard to see, but I believe it has the defendant's name on the name tag that's kind of across the sling. Q Okay. And do you recognize the -- what they are
 - A It appears to be the couch cushion.

sitting on or resting on from any of the videos?

- Q Okay. And in one of the videos, did we previously see Mr. Hager sitting on the couch?
 - A Yes.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

- Q Showing you what we've admitted as Exhibit 2, is this -- what day was this posted?
 - A Same day, August 28, 2015.
- Q And does this appear to be a similar subject to the last photo but just a different vantage or consideration or how it's photographed?
- A Yes.
- Q Showing you what we have admitted as Exhibit

 Number 4, is this one of the photos that you found posted on

 Mr. Hager's Facebook page?
 - A Yes, it is.
- 20 Q And what was the date that this video -- I'm 21 sorry -- this photograph was posted?
- 22 A This would have been October 29th, 2015.
- Q Okay. And what is significant about this photograph?

A If you look behind the Defendant -- I'll touch the screen -- but the black assault rifle is here with the -- it looks like a Santa Claus hat sitting on top of it.

- Q Showing you what we've admitted as Exhibit 5, is this one of the photos you located on Mr. Hager's Facebook page?
 - A Yes.

- Q And what do we see here?
- A On the left side of the screen, you can see a rifle. Then in the center part of the screen here, you can see the black assault rifle. Underneath the black assault rifle, there appears to be two and I know the arrow is pointing the opposite way, but if you look to the left of the arrow, it looks like assault rifle magazines, and if you look toward right here, just underneath this line, it looks like a handgun magazine with ammunition in it.
 - Q And I'm sorry. What day was this posted?
 - A This was November 3rd, 2015.
- Q Showing you what we've admitted as Exhibit 26, do you recognize this picture?
- A Yes.
- 22 Q And is this one of the pictures that you found 23 posted on Mr. Hager's -- the Defendant's Facebook page?
 - A It is.

- Q And what do you see -- why did you consider this photograph significant to your investigation?
- A If you look beyond the clock that's kind of in the center, beyond it you can see what appears to be the barrel or at least a portion of two long guns just underneath it.
 - Q And the day that this Exhibit 26 was posted?
 - A March 21st, 2016.
- Q In terms of, again, information that you received about April 8th, the day that the search warrant was served, did you learn at some point that a Sparks detective, Detective Kevin Dach, had obtained the Defendant's iPhone?
- 12 A Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

15

17

18

19

20

22

23

- 13 Q During the search of his car?
- 14 A Yes.
 - Q Or in some fashion from him?
- 16 A That's correct.
 - Q Okay. And we'll hear from Detective Dach later.

 But in terms of your knowledge that that device was in police possession, did you at some point want apply for a search warrant to search it?
- 21 A Yes, I did.
 - Q And was that -- what were you seeking to search for?
 - A Any additional photographs or videos that were contained inside of the phone.

1	Q	And specifically, were you looking for the content
2	of firearms or ammunition?	
3	А	Yes.
4	Q	And did you apply to a Court for the search warrant?
5	А	I did.
6	Q	Was it granted?
7	А	It was.
8	Q	And in terms of serving that warrant, did you
9	personally search the Defendant's iPhone?	
10	A	I did not.
11	Q	How did once you had that were you the actual
12	person that applied for the warrant?	
13	A	I was.
14	Q	So what did you do with it once it was granted?
15	А	Once the search warrant was granted, I brought it
16	back, and I met with Detective Dach and asked Detective Dach	
17	to serve the warrant for me.	
18	Q	Is that because he has specialized experience and
19	training in conducting forensic searches?	
20	А	That's correct.
21		MR. PRENGAMAN: Thank you, Sergeant. I have no
22	further questions at this time.	
23		THE COURT: Thank you.
24		Could you both approach, please?