1	IN THE SUPREME C	OURT (OF THE STAT	E OF NEVADA
2				-
3	MELVYN SPROWSON,)	No. 73674	
4 5	Appellant,)))		Electronically Filed May 02 2018 04:31 p.m Elizabeth A. Brown
6	v.)		Clerk of Supreme Court
7	THE STATE OF NEVADA,)		
8	Respondent.)		
9	APPELLANT'S APPENDIX VOLUME VII PAGES 1404-1645			
10	ATTECHNIC SATTE	(DIZX V	<u> JECNIE VII I I</u>	10LS 1404-1045
11 12	PHILIP J. KOHN Clark County Public Defender		STEVE WOI Clark County	LFSON District Attorney venue, 3 rd Floor
13	Clark County Public Defender 309 South Third Street Las Vegas, Nevada 89155-2610		200 Lewis Av Las Vegas, N	venue, 3 rd Floor evada 89155
14	Attorney for Appellant		ADAM LAX Attorney Gen	ALT eral
15			Attorney Gen 100 North Ca Carson City, (702) 687-353	Nevada 89701-4717
16			Counsel for R	
17			Counsel for I	respondent
18 19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				
26				
27				
28				

INDEX MELVYN SPROWSON Case No. 73674

1

2	MELVYN SPROWSON Case No. 73674
3	Affidavit of Defense's Investigator filed 03/21/17
4	Affidavit of The Honorable Stefany A. Miley filed 01/23/17
5	Affidavit to Disqualify Judge Stefany A. Miley for Bias and Misconduct filed 01/31/17
7	Affidavit to Disqualify Judge Stefany A. Miley for Bias and Misconduct filed 02/07/17
8	Affidavit to Reconsider Disqualifying Judge Stefany A. Miley for Bias and Misconduct Date of Hrg: 02/24/17
10	Affidavit to Reconsider Disqualifying Judge Stefany A. Miley for Bias and Misconduct filed 02/28/17
11	Amended Criminal Complaint filed 12/09/13
12	Application for Ex Parte Order to Extend Time in which to File the Pre-Trial Writ of Habeas Corpus filed 02/18/14
13	Bail Bond filed 05/05/14
14	Clerk's Certificate and Order Dismissing Appeal filed 12/02/15
15	Criminal Complaint filed 11/05/13
16	Decision and Order filed 08/28/15
17 18	Defendant's Motion to Continue Jury Trial Date of Hrg: 06/02/14
19	Defendant's Motion to Continue Trial Date filed 09/08/14
20	Defendant's Motion to Continue Trial Date filed 07/06/15
21	Defendant's Motion to Continue Trial Date Date of Hrg:: 06/06/16
22	Defendant's Proposed Jury Instructions Not Used at Trial filed 03/30/17 1124-1127
2324	Defendant's Second Pro Se Motion to Continue Trial Date of Hrg: 04/10/17
25	District Court Minutes from 01/15/14 through 06/26/17
26	Ex Parte Application for Court Approval of Payment of
27	Specific Categories of Ancillary Defense Costs Date of Hrg: 06/01/15
28	

1	Ex Parte Application for Expert Witness and Investigator And Funding Therefor filed 12/09/16	964a-964f
2	Ex Parte Motion and Order for Release of Records filed 05/22/14	381-383
3	Ex Parte Motion and Order for Release of Records filed 05/22/14	384-386
4	Ex Parte Motion and Order for Release of Records filed 09/10/14	519-520
5	Ex Parte Motion and Order for Release of Records filed 09/10/14	521-522
6 7	Ex Parte Motion and Order for Release of Records filed 11/17/14	525-526
8	Ex Parte Motion and Order for Release of Records filed 11/17/14	527-528
9	Ex Parte Motion and Order for Release of Records filed 11/17/14	529-530
10	Ex Parte Motion and Order for Release of Records filed 11/17/14	531-532
11	Ex Parte Motion and Order for Release of Records filed 11/17/14	533-534
12	Ex Parte Motion and Order for Release of Records filed 09/17/15	663-664
13	Fifth Supplemental Notice of Witnesses and/or Expert Witnesses filed 02/27	7/17 1081-1086
14	Fourth Supplemental Notice of Witnesses and/or Expert Witnesses filed 05/	09/16 831-843
15	Information filed 01/13/14	251-254
16	Instructions to the Jury filed 03/31/17	1130-1161
17	Judgment of Conviction (Jury Trial) filed 07/05/17	1167-1169
18	Jury List filed 03/23/17	1123
19	Jury List filed 03/30/17	1129
20	Justice Court Minutes from 11/06/13 through 01/08/14	9-20
21	Media Request & Order Allowing Camera Access to Court Proceedings filed 11/05/13	21-35
22	Media Request & Order Allowing Camera	255 256
23	Access to Court Proceedings filed 01/30/14	255-256
24	Media Request & Order Allowing Camera Access to Court Proceedings filed 02/18/14	264-266
25	Media Request & Order Allowing Camera Access to Court Proceedings filed 02/18/14	267-269
2627	Media Request & Order Allowing Camera Access to Court Proceedings filed 08/13/15	627-628
28		

1 2	Media Request & Order Allowing Camera Access to Court Proceedings filed 10/07/15	701-702
3	Media Request & Order Allowing Camera Access to Court Proceedings filed 03/21/17	1103-1104
4	Minute Order filed 05/27/15	576-577
5	Motion for Bail Reduction Date of Hrg: 11/14/13	48-54
67	Motion for Bail Reduction Date of Hrg: 04/14/14	322-344
8	Motion for Disclosure of Non-Public Information filed 11/05/13	36-39
9	Motion for Disclosure of Non-Public Information filed 11/08/13	40-43
10	Motion for Disclosure of Non-Public Information filed 11/14/13	44-45
11	Motion for Disclosure of Non-Public Information filed 12/06/13	59-60
12	Motion for Disclosure of Non-Public Information filed 12/09/13	92-95
13	Motion for Disclosure of Non-Public Information filed 12/23/13	96-97
14	Motion for Discovery filed 12/12/13	62-91
	M-4: f D: 6:1- 1.00/26/14	201 120
15	Motion for Discovery filed 08/26/14	391-420
15 16	Motion for Discovery filed 08/20/14	
16 17		859-871
16	Motion for Discovery filed 09/20/16 Motion to Dismiss Misdemeanor Charges for Lack of Original Jurisdiction	859-871 896-903
16 17 18	Motion for Discovery filed 09/20/16 Motion to Dismiss Misdemeanor Charges for Lack of Original Jurisdiction Date of Hrg: 11/28/16 Motion to Proceed on Appeal in Forma Pauperis	
16 17 18 19 20 21	Motion for Discovery filed 09/20/16 Motion to Dismiss Misdemeanor Charges for Lack of Original Jurisdiction Date of Hrg: 11/28/16 Motion to Proceed on Appeal in Forma Pauperis Date of Hrg: 10/12/15	
16 17 18 19 20	Motion for Discovery filed 09/20/16 Motion to Dismiss Misdemeanor Charges for Lack of Original Jurisdiction Date of Hrg: 11/28/16 Motion to Proceed on Appeal in Forma Pauperis Date of Hrg: 10/12/15 Motion to Proceed Pro Se filed 08/19/15 Motion to Suppress Evidence	
16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Motion for Discovery filed 09/20/16	
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	Motion for Discovery filed 09/20/16	
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26	Motion for Discovery filed 09/20/16	
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	Motion for Discovery filed 09/20/16	

1	Notice of Change of Hearing filed 04/07/14	321
2	Notice of Change of Hearing filed 09/05/14	491
3	Notice of Change of Hearing filed 09/18/14	523
4	Notice of Change of Hearing filed 10/14/14	524
5	Notice of Change of Hearing filed 10/02/15	700
6	Notice of Change of Hearing filed 10/11/16	895
7	Notice of Contempt of Court and Brady Violation filed 03/21/17	1105-1117
8 9 10	Notice of Motion and Motion for Clarification Regarding State's Previously Filed Motion in Limine to Preclude Evidence of Victim's Prior Sexual Abuse at Trial Date of Hrg: 10/05/15	671-699
10 11 12	Notice of Motion and Motion for Independent Psychological/Psychiatric Examination of the Complaining Witness Date of Hrg: 09/08/14	438-460
13 14	Notice of Motion and Motion in Limine to Preclude Evidence of Victim's Prior Sexual Abuse at Trial Date of Hrg: 09/15/14	492-506
15	Notice of Motion and Motion to Admit Evidence of Other Bad Acts Date of Hrg: 10/26/15	
16	Notice of Motion and Motion to Continue Date of Hrg: 11/21/13	55-58
17 18 19	Notice of Motion and Motion to Set Conditions of Defendant's Release Upon Defendant Posting Bail Date of Hrg; 05/12/14	365-380
20	Notice of Motion and State's Motion to Revoke Defendant's Bail Date of Hrg: 02/04/15	535-543
21	Notice of Request to Withdraw Original Record of Search and Seizure Warrants filed 12/09/16	909-911
22	Notice of Witnesses and/or Expert Witnesses filed 10/08/15	703-714
23	Notice Resetting Date and Time of Hearing filed 05/19/17	1165
24	Notice Resetting Time of Hearing filed 03/27/14	320
25 26	Opposition to Defendant's Motion for Defendant's Motion for Bail Reduction Date of Hrg: 04/14/14	345-359
27 28	Opposition to State's Motion in Limine to Preclude Evidence of Victim's Prior Sexual Abuse at Trial filed 10/14/14	507-514

1	Order filed 03/13/14
2	Order filed 03/22/17
3	Order filed 06/19/17
4	Order filed 07/05/17
5	Order Denying Defendant's Third Motion to Suppress Evidence Date of Hrg: 04/13/16
6	Order Denying Motion to Disqualify filed 01/24/17
7 8	Order Granting State's Motion to Admit Evidence of Other Bad Acts Date of Hrg: 12/10/15
9	Order Scheduling Status Check RE: Trial Readiness filed 11/23/16908
10 11	Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus, Motion to Dismiss, and Memorandum of Points and Authorities Date of Hrg: 03/24/14
12	Receipt of Copy of Documents Pertaining to Protected Information and Records from Wells Fargo Bank filed 12/11/15
13 14	Receipt of Copy of Protected Information and Records from Montevista Hospital, Willow Springs Center, Hope Counseling, Desert Behavioral Health, Doctor Robin Donaldson, and Doctor Eugene Ronsenman filed 07/13/15
15 16	Receipt of Copy of Protected Information and Records from Montevista Hospital, Willow Springs Center, Hope Counseling, Desert Behavioral Health, Doctor Robin Donaldson, and Doctor Eugene Ronsenman filed 07/14/15
17 18	Receipt of Copy of Protected Information and Records from Montevista Hospital, Willow Springs Center, Hope Counseling, Desert Behavioral Health, Doctor Robin Donaldson, and Doctor Eugene Ronsenman (Amended) filed 07/17/15
19 20	Receipt of Copy of Protected Information and Records from Vena M. Davis, Mojave Adult, Child & Family Services filed 11/05/15
21	Remittitur filed 12/02/15
22	Reply to Return to Writ of Habeas Corpus
23	and Opposition to Motion to Dismiss Date of Hrg: 04/30/14
2425	Reply to State's Opposition to Defendant's Motion for Independent Psychological/Psychiatric Examination of the Complaining Witness and Discovery Request for Her Medical/Mental Health Treatment Records filed 10/13/14
2627	Response to State's Motion to Revoke Defendant's Bail Date of Hrg: 02/04/15
28	

1 2	Response to State's Opposition to Defendant's Motion for Discovery Date of Hrg: 11/02/16
3	Response to State's Opposition to Defendant's Motion to Withdraw the Original Record of Search and Seizure Warrants in the District Court Darte of Hrg: 01/04/17
5	Response to State's Opposition to Defendant's Third Motion to Suppress Evidence Date of Hrg: 04/13/16
6	Request for Rough Draft Transcript filed 09/23/15
7	Second Amended Criminal Complaint filed 12/19/13
8	Second Request for Rough Draft Transcript filed 02/26/16
9	Second Supplemental Notice of Witnesses and/or Expert Witnesses filed 10/26/15 735-742
10	State's Opposition to Defendant's Motion for Discovery Date of Hrg: 09/22/14
11 12	State's Opposition to Defendant's Motion for Discovery Date of Hrg: 11/02/16
13 14	State's Opposition to Defendant's Motion for Independent Psychological/Psychiatric Examination of the Complaining Witness Date of Hrg: 09/10/14
15 16	State's Opposition to Defendant's Motion to Dismiss Midemeanor Charges for Lack of Jurisdiction Date of Hrg: 11/28/16
17 18	State's Opposition to Defendant's Motion to Suppress Evidence Date of Hrg: 07/01/15
19	State's Opposition to Defendant's Notice of Request to Withdraw Original Record of Search and Seizure Warrants and Defendant's Ex-Parte Application for Expert Witness and Funding Therefor
20	Ex-Parte Application for Expert Witness and Funding Therefor Date of Hrg: 01/04/17965-971
21	State's Opposition to Defendant's Second Motion to Suppress Evidence Date of Hrg: 10/05/15
22	State's Opposition to Defendant's Sixth Motion to Continue Trial Pote of Hrs: 05/16/16
2324	Date of Hrg: 05/16/16
25	Date of Hrg: 03/21/17
26	State's Opposition to Defendant's Third Motion to Suppress Evidence Date of Hrg: 04/06/16828a-828h
27	State's Proposed Jury Instructions Not Used at Trial filed 03/30/17 1127-1128
28	

1	Stipulation and Order Regarding Discovery of Child Pornographic Materials filed 09/21/15
2	Substitution of Attorneys filed 11/08/13
3	Supplemental Affidavit of The Honorable Stefany A. Miley filed 02/17/17 1070-1080
5	Supplemental Motion to Affidavit to Reconsider Disqualifying Judge Stefany A. Miley for Bias and Misconduct filed 03/06/17
6	Supplemental Notice of Witnesses and/or Expert Witnesses filed 10/19/15
7	Third Motion to Suppress Evidence Date of Hrg: 04/06/16
8	Third Supplemental Notice of Witnesses and/or Expert Witnesses filed 10/23/15 743-748
9	Verdict filed 03/31/17
10	Writ of Habeas Corpus filed 03/14/14
11 12	Writ of Habeas Corpus filed 03/17/14308
13	<u>TRANSCRIPTS</u>
14 15	Recorder's Transcript JURY TRIAL DAY 1 Date of Hrg: 03/21/17
16 17	Recorder's Transcript JURY TRIAL DAY 2 Date of Hrg: 03/22/17
18 19	Recorder's Transcript JURY TRIAL DAY 3 Date of Hrg:03/23/17
20 21	Recorder's Transcript JURY TRIAL DAY 4 Date of Hrg: 03/24/17
22 23	Recorder's Transcript JURY TRIAL DAY 5 Date of Hrg: 03/27/17
24 25	Recorder's Transcript JURY TRIAL DAY 6 Date of Hrg: 03/28/17
26 27	Recorder's Transcript JURY TRIAL DAY 7 Date of Hrg: 03/29/17
28	21/1-2/01

1	Recorder's Transcript JURY TRIAL DAY 8
2	Date of Hrg: 03/30/17
3	Recorder's Transcript JURY TRIAL DAY 9
4	Date of Hrg: 03/31/17
5	Recorder's Transcript Arraignment Continued
6	Date of Hrg: 01/29/14
7	Recorder's Transcript Calendar Call
8	Date of Hrg: 03/19/14
9	Recorder's Transcript Calendar Call
10	Date of Hrg: 10/28/15
11	Recorder's Transcript Calendar Call
12	Date of Hrg: 03/08/17
13	Recorder's Transcript Calendar Call
14	Date of Hrg: 03/15/17
15	Recorder's Transcript Defendant's Motion for DiscoveryDefendant's Motion for Independent
16	Psychological/Psychiatric Examination of the Complaining Witness Date of Hrg: 09/10/14
17	Recorder's Transcript
18	Defendant's Motion to Continue Jury Trial Date of Hrg: 05/28/14
19	Recorder's Transcript
20	Defendant's Motion to Continue Jury Trial Date Date of Hrg: 07/20/15
21	Recorder's Transcript
22	Defendant's Proper Person Motion for Discovery Date of Hrg: 11/16/16
23	Recorder's Transcript
24	Defendant's Pro Per Motion to Withdraw the Original Record of Search and Seizure Warrants on File with the District Court
25	Date of Hrg: 01/04/17
26	Recorder's Transcript Defordent's Pro So Metion for Discovery
27	Defendant's Pro Se Motion for Discovery Date of Hrg: 11/02/16
28	

1	Recorder's Transcript Defendant's Pro Se Motion to Proceed on Appeal in Forma Pauperis
2	Defendant's Pro Se Motion to Suppress Evidence State's Motion for Clarification Regarding State's Previously Filed Motion in Limine to
3	Preclude Evidence of Victim's Prior Sexual Abuse at Trial Status Check Date of Hrg: 10/12/15
4	Recorder's Transcript
5	Defendant's Pro Se Motion to Proceed on Appeal in Forma Pauperis
6	Defendant's Pro Se Motion to Suppress Evidence State's Motion for Clarification Regarding State's Previously Filed Motion in Limine to
7	Preclude Evidence of Victim's Prior Sexual Abuse at Trial Status Check Date of Hrg: 10/19/151404-1427
8	Recorder's Transcript
9	Defendant's Second Pro Se Motion to Continue Trial Date of Hrg: 03/21/171613-1645
10	Recorder's Transcript
11	Evidentiary Hearing; Defendant's Motion to Suppress Evidence Date of Hrg: 07/01/15
12	Recorder's Transcript
13	Initial Arraignment Date of Hrg: 01/15/141251-1252
14	Recorder's Transcript
15	Motion Date of Hrg: 04/13/16
16	Recorder's Transcript
17	Motion for Bail Reduction Date of Hrg: 04/14/141261-1263
18	Recorder's Transcript
19	Motion for Bail Reduction Date of Hrg: 04/21/14
20	Recorder's Transcript
21	Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus Date of Hrg: 04/30/14
22	Recorder's Transcript Petrocelli Hearing
23	State's Motion to Admit Evidence of Other Bad Acts Date of Hrg: 12/10/15
24	Recorder's Transcript
25	Sentencing Date of Hrg: 05/24/17
26	Recorder's Transcript
27	Sentencing Date of Hrg: 06/26/17
28	Date of firg. 00/20/17

1	Recorder's Transcript State's Motion in Limine to Preclude Evidence of Victim's Prior Sexual Abuse at Trial;
2	Defendant's Motion for Discovery; Defendant's Motion for Independent
3	Psychological/Psychiatric Examination of the Complaining Witness Date of Hrg: 11/05/14
4	Recorder's Transcript State's Motion to Revoke Defendant's Bail
5	Date of Hrg: 02/04/15
6	Recorder's Transcript State's Motion to Set Conditions of Defendant's
7	Release upon Defendant Posting Bail Date of Hrg: 05/12/14
8	Recorder's Transcript
9	State's Opposition to Defendant's Sixth Motion to Continue Trial Date of Hrg: 05/16/16
10	Recorder's Transcript
11	Status Check: Discovery Date of Hrg: 08/31/15
12	Recorder's Transcript
13	Status Check: Discovery Date of Hrg: 09/21/15
14	Recorder's Transcript
15	Status Check: Faretta Canvass, Resetting of Trial and Defendant's Motion to Proceed Pro Se
16	Date of Hrg: 08/24/15
17	Recorder's Transcript Status Check: New Counsel/Resetting of Trial Date of Hrg: 08/19/15
18	
19	Recorder's Transcript Status Check: PSI Corrections
20	Date of Hrg: 05/31/17
21	Recorder's Transcript Status Check: Resetting of Trial Date of Hrg: 07/22/15
22	
23	Recorder's Transcript Status Check: Resetting of Trial
24	Status Check: Resetting of Trial Date of Hrg: 11/02/15
25	Recorder's Transcript Status Check: Trial Readiness
26	Date of Hrg: 11/28/16
27	Recorder's Transcript Status Check: Trial Readiness
28	Date of Hrg: 02/06/17

1 2	Recorder's Transcript Status Check: Trial Readiness Status Check: Investigator
3	Defendant's Pro Per Motion to Withdraw the Original Record of Search and Seizure Warrants on File with District Court
	Date of Hrg: 01/09/17
4	Reporter's Transcript
5	Motion to Continue Preliminary Hearing Date of Hrg: 11/21/1398-107
6	Reporter's Transcript
7	Preliminary Hearing
8	Date of Hrg: 12/30/13
9	Reporter's Transcript Preliminary Hearing Volume II
10	Date of Hrg: 01/08/14
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
20	

Electronically Filed 1/2/2018 10:26 AM Steven D. Grierson CLERK OF THE COURT

RTRAN 1 2 3 DISTRICT COURT 4 CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA 5 6 CASE #: C-14-295158-1 THE STATE OF NEVADA, 7 DEPT. XXIII Plaintiff, 8 VS. 9 10 MELVYN PERRY SPROWSON, JR., 11 Defendant. 12 13 BEFORE THE HONORABLE STEFANY MILEY, DISTRICT COURT JUDGE 14 MONDAY, OCTOBER 19, 2015 RECORDER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS 15 DEFENDANT'S PRO SE MOTION TO PROCEED ON APPEAL IN FORMA PAUPERIS; DEFENDANT'S PRO SE MOTION TO SUPPRESS EVIDENCE; 16 STATE'S MOTION FOR CLARIFICATION REGARDING STATE'S PREVIOUS 17 FILED MOTION IN LIMINE TO PRECLUDE EVIDENCE OF VICTIM'S SEXUAL ABUSE AT TRIAL: STATUS CHECK 18 19 APPEARANCES: For the State: JACQUELINE M. BLUTH, ESQ. 20 JAMES R. SWEETIN, ESQ. **Chief Deputies District Attorney** 21 22 For the Defendant: In Pro Person ALSO PRESENT: MICHAEL R. YOHAY, ESQ. 23 Deputy Public Defender Standby Counsel 24 25 RECORDED BY: MARIA GARIBAY, COURT RECORDER

Page 1

MONDAY, OCTOBER 19, 2015 AT 9:43 A.M.

THE COURT: Hi; Good morning.

MS. BLUTH: Good morning, Your Honor. Jacqueline Bluth and Jim Sweetin on behalf on the State.

THE COURT: Okay. We have a couple motions on calendar today.

Let's start with a motion to suppress. So, Mr. Sprowson filed a motion to suppress, and essentially your position was when you looked at the Court record there was no indication there was ever a warrant in your particular case.

THE DEFENDANT: Well -- yeah, go ahead. Sorry.

THE COURT: Yes, that's basically it. And I kind of want to make a record of everything that transpired.

The State did provide us with a copy of the warrant and the warrant did clearly indicate the warrant had been filed. The question was why wasn't -- it's showing in our Court system in your case. What we determined had happened is there was a warrant, the warrant was filed like it was supposed to be, but due to an error in the clerk's office it was filed in a different case. So, the error was entirely in the clerk's office. It had nothing to do with anything the State may or may not have done. They're pretty much done once they file that warrant.

So, now though the warrant has been properly filed in this case, and I believe a copy has also been provided to you, Mr. Sprowson.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor. And if I may, if I could have the Court's indulgence. According to 179.085, number one at the bottom, it says the judge shall receive evidence on any issue of fact necessary to the decision of the motion.

4

8 9

10

11

7

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

21

23 24

25

Now I understand that the issue -- the main issue that I had with the search warrant -- there are actually two, not one. There's a misstatement of facts and I have evidence to show that there's a misstatement of facts in relation to the State's response, and I'd like to show that evidence today when I argue my motion.

THE COURT: I don't understand. A statement of facts as to what issue? THE DEFENDANT: Well let me quote the State.

Okay. It says on December 5th 2013 CCSPD Detective Jeff Schell was contacted by Chief Deputy District Jacqueline Bluth who informed him that JT's mother had contacted her and advised that JT had recently disclosed to her that Defendant asked her to send him nude photos and told her how to pose in the photos. DDA Bluth spoke to JT who confirmed all the information. JT further stated that the photos could be found on Defendant's computer. Based upon the fact that JT had told CCSPD that she had met Defendant on line through Craig's List.com which would be access via computer and Smartphone and the fact that the victim had already disclosed to her mother the existence of new photos on her -- of her on Defendant's computer, and the fact that only she and Defendant were the only two occupants of the apartment prior to her being recovered and his arrest, a search warrant was applied for and obtained for Defendant's residence to recover any and all computers or devices capable of accessing the internet or sending and receiving messages or downloading and storing data; any articles of personal property which would tend to establish the identify of persons in control of said premises -- bear with me, Your Honor -- which items of property which consist and include but not limit to papers, documents, and effects which would tend to show possession and dominion control over said premises including but not limited to keys, cancelled mail, and rental agreements received to utility, telephone bills, prescription bottles, vehicle

Page 3 1406

registration, vehicle repairs, gas receipts, items which tend to show evidence of motive and identity of the perpetrator such as photographs, [indiscernible] insurance policies, letters of address, telephone records, diaries, governmental notices, whether such items are written, typed or stored on computer disk objects which bear a person's name, phone number, address. That was number two. Number three. Any and all female clothing or personal hygiene products.

Now I'd like to point out, Your Honor, I have marked Exhibit A and Exhibit B, the documents in question. It has, as you say, the Court's stamps on here, it has a certification on here, but there's nothing in here that indicates to me anything about photographs. Not only that, Your Honor --

THE COURT: What are you holding in your hand, sir? I can't see that far.

THE DEFENDANT: Oh -- let me, if I may, present to the Court, I have a copy. Let me give you copies of everything I have. I have made copies for the Court. I have actually four exhibits, Your Honor, two of them I would like to have the State verify for me so I could lay a foundation for my argument, if I may, Exhibit A and Exhibit B.

MS. BLUTH: I'm not going to be verifying anything.

THE COURT: I don't know what they are and may I see? Can I see them, please? Does the State have a copy to look at?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Exhibit A and Exhibit B. I'd like to have the State verify that these are the documents they gave me, this is what they gave me.

THE COURT: Well was this in your discovery packet?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: And it would have come from the State.

THE DEFENDANT: Right; exactly.

THE COURT: So, what you've handed me is Exhibit A, is application and affidavit for search warrant and I have a search warrant, and then I have search and seizure return. Exhibit B is application affidavit for search warrant. Application Exhibit C is a Clark County School District Police Department property report. Exhibit C, number three, is a property report, and Exhibit D is Clark County School District Police Department statement report.

All right. So, how do these tie into the motion you filed?

THE DEFENDANT: Well the issue is the validity of the search -- well the State is claiming a valid search warrant. I'm not sure how they're spinning this, but there's actually two search warrants, one for the phone and one for what I've just read. Okay.

THE COURT: Okay.

THE DEFENDANT: Now I have a couple of issues with the first one even though it's on file, Your Honor, the Constitution of the United States Fourth Amendment clearly says, clearly says that no warrant shall issue but upon probable cause supported by oath or affirmative and any items to be seized or searched or property to be searched must be described with particularity -- and I've kind of just quoted --

THE COURT: Here's the thing. Let me stop you for a second.

Your motion regarding the search warrant was pretty narrow. Okay. Your issue was that pursuant to statute that was no search warrant and the search warrant was not properly filed like the statute requires. And that's really the entirety of what's in your motion. What you're getting in now it sounds like --

THE DEFENDANT: Well it's the validity. I actually questioned the validity of the search warrant itself. I still question the validity of the search warrant itself, Your

Honor.

2 3

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17 18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

MS. BLUTH: And so pursuant to statute I just ask that those -- that be done in writing, Your Honor, because I haven't had a --

THE COURT: What I was getting to --

MS. BLUTH: I know you were.

THE COURT: -- the reason --

THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor --

THE COURT: Okay. Hold on a second.

THE DEFENDANT: -- I have a statutory, statutory search warrant --

THE COURT: Hold on --

THE DEFENDANT: -- this search warrant is not valid.

THE COURT: Okay. Hold on. Okay. The reason I'm telling you this.

We're real limited what we can do in any given Court proceeding because the other side has to have notice of what's going to happen during the Court proceedings -- hold. Your motion to suppress again was a very narrow issue and that's been basically ruled upon. It's going to -- the narrow issue set forth in your motion to suppress filed on September 11, 2015, that's going to be denied, and the reason is is that dealt with whether or not the State complied with the requirements to file -- to have a search warrant, number one, and to file the search warrant. And as I previously I indicated, the search warrant was filed, but due to a clerical error not of any doing by the State but by -- down in the clerk's office it was filed in the incorrect case. That has since been rectified.

Now it sounds like you're challenging the probable cause in the search warrant and you got to put that in writing. The reason is is they have to have a chance to sit down and go through their file and respond because these arguments

> Page 6 1409

are new that you're making today. They're not what you previously filed. I mean, I understand you're saying I challenge the validity but you got to give a little bit more. You're challenging it on other bases.

THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, if I may. 179.085, the Judge shall receive evidence on any issue of fact necessary to the decision of the motion. I have necessary evidence in regards to the validity of the search warrant. That was my main concern. The filing -- when I said it wasn't on file --

THE COURT: But you got to put that --

THE DEFENDANT: It wasn't on file was part of the fact that the search warrant wasn't valid. That's what made part of it invalid.

THE COURT: But you got to put all of this information in writing. That's what I'm trying to tell you. I'm not saying that I'm not going to hear it. You just have to do it procedurally correct which means you have to put it in writing. Again, the only issue you raised previously which the State responded to that's been ruled upon, and I gave you the reason for that. Now this, you got to put this, if you're challenging the validity of the probable cause in the search warrant, you got to put that in writing because --

THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor --

THE COURT: -- they -- I understand you're representing yourself, but they have a right --

THE DEFENDANT: -- they're withholding facts.

THE COURT: -- to be able to get the information and prepare for the hearing. So, all you have to do is put all this writing.

THE DEFENDANT: May I comment on that, Your Honor? I understand that and I will do that with your permission.

Page 7 1410

THE COURT: Okay.

THE DEFENDANT: Because I have not -- this trial is coming up and I don't want to push a trial -- I could write it up tonight and I could have it filed by tomorrow.

THE COURT: Okay.

THE DEFENDANT: But my question is, Your Honor, is the fact that the State intentionally misquoted facts because they're trying to charge me with four felonies. They actually got the search warrant, Your Honor, which I can argue effectively but

THE COURT: And this is all important. It just needs to be in writing which is the procedural vehicle, and Mr. Yohay can help you out if you have a question regarding the procedure. I mean, he's standby counsel.

THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor. Okay.

THE COURT: But --

THE DEFENDANT: One last thing, Your Honor, in regards to the search warrant. If you go by the Eighth District Court rules --

THE COURT: Mm-hmm.

THE DEFENDANT: -- okay. I filed the motion on September 11. Eighth District Court Rule 3.20 specifically says they have seven days, seven days to file opposition. Now I actually sent them a copy. They had a copy on the 4th. It wasn't filed for some reason until the 11th. Okay. They didn't file their motion until ten days later. Now if the question is well they have ten days. That is in a civil matter. Criminal matter is seven days. That specifically is what Eighth District Court rule says. Now -- but that's an issue I can bring into here as far as when things were filed. They're already three days. So, according to that, my motion should have been granted based upon the fact that they were three days late filing the motion

itself. According to Eighth District Judicial Court Rules 3.20 --

THE COURT: All right. So, sir, you can bring that up but I don't know that it's going to have much merit. I mean, I do recognize the rules need to be followed, however, I don't believe --

THE DEFENDANT: See, that's my problem is I'm being held to the rules but they're not.

THE COURT: Look, here's the thing. Your other motion had no merit. Okay. And I really don't see where the prejudice is to you. I am not saying that what you're bringing up in Court today does not have merit; I'm not saying that the Court is not going to entertain it. You just have to put it in writing so, number one, that I can go back and look at everything to prepare and, number two, the State can go ahead and prepare as well. That is all I'm telling you. So, if you file it immediately we can get it on calendar quickly, probably it would be this -- when is he set to start trial?

THE DEFENDANT: Monday. I have another motion to be heard this Monday. [Colloquy between the Court and the Court Clerk]

THE COURT: So, it would probably be heard next week.

MS. BLUTH: And, Your Honor, I do have a motion on Monday, the motion to admit evidence of other bad acts. I was hoping that we could hear those all on Wednesday because my capital case that I'm currently in is supposed to wrap up hopefully Tuesday, and that way I will not be shuffling in between two courtrooms in the morning and being subject to be somewhere else by 10 a.m.

THE COURT: We can do everything on the 20th. That would give us time before the trial date of November 2nd. And that would give Mr. Sprowson time to get everything in writing and the State to give me a response.

THE DEFENDANT: Can you give me that date again? What was it?

THE COURT: The 28th is when she's asking that we move it. In fact, that's your calendar call date.

THE DEFENDANT: Calendar call; right?

THE COURT: Mm-hmm. And I want to give you these copies back. I don't know how to send copies in the jail. This way you have them for your motion. Can you give this back to Mr. Sprowson, please. Okay. So, just make the same arguments; just put it in writing, please. And we'll make sure that we get it on calendar. Okay. So, as soon as you file the motion it will prompt a date, and we'll be on the look for it so we can make sure that we get it on calendar on the 28th.

THE DEFENDANT: And see that's the other thing too, Your Honor, is that my stuff is getting held up like six days. I mean, I put in -- and I have given it to the officer, the CO, and for some reason it goes to the mailroom and I have proof that the mailroom it gets mailed out the very next day, but for some reason when it comes to getting filed and stuff, it takes a total of six days turnaround time, not coming back, it's six days to actually get filed. I'm having problems with that. And not only that, I don't know if the Court is aware as far as I -- because we're getting ready to hear two other motions. Your Honor, the past two weeks I've gone through some serious issues with being shuffled around from location to location and I don't know why.

THE COURT: You mean in the jail?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes. And the apparent reason is because I'm diabetic.

Now my numbers -- my -- I don't know if you know about diabetes --

THE COURT: I'm going to cut you off right here. It's not that I'm not interested. I know nothing to do with the housing decisions.

THE DEFENDANT: Well the reason I think it's relevant to my situation, Your

Honor, is because the fact of the matter is if I'm being moving around and if I'm having issues with mail, getting things filed on time and things like that for the Court -- I'm already restricted, Your Honor, and I don't mind that. I understand the disadvantages of being a pro se Defendant. But when I'm being unfairly, you know, kept further back, you know, and things are being held up and I'm being shuffled around which makes it much more difficult to file things and write things and respond, according to the rules which I'm trying to abide by --

THE COURT: So, what is it that you're asking that I do, sir, because I cannot do anything with respect to the housing.

THE DEFENDANT: I just want to bring it to the Court's attention. I just want to bring it to the Court's attention just so that you are aware of these things. I think these -- and you make decisions of you think I'm being negligent. I'm not. I'm just trying to show you that there's certain factors that are out of my control --

THE COURT: Okay.

THE DEFENDANT: -- that I can't control that have stopped me from doing certain things properly.

THE COURT: Okay.

THE DEFENDANT: And the other issue is, you know, there's an issue of -- last time in Court Judge Barker was here and I believe he made an order about me having access to the law library. Now this is also relevant because I know for a fact that the other location NBC has access to the law library. Where I'm located and housed now there is an issue with a prescription not being paid or something like that and I have no access to the law library. So, for the past four weeks I've had no access to the law library, and I understand the law says that I have at least access at a certain part of the day to have access to the law library so I can respond to --

Page 11 1414

just like the State has an opportunity to respond, I feel I'm not given an opportunity to respond even in my limited capacity because of the fact that I don't have access to a law library and things are being held up.

THE COURT: You think you will be ready --

THE DEFENDANT: I just want it to be fair.

THE COURT: Do you think you're going to be able to get ready for trial by November 2nd?

THE DEFENDANT: And you know what? I'm going to trial either way. I will be ready, I'll be ready, but my point is is the motions that have been filed which pretty much is going to put me in a bad position if they are granted and I'm sure that maybe you will grant them because the fact that I haven't been able to file a response. This is my issue.

THE COURT: Just get your response done as quickly as you can and even if it's late I'm going to read it. Okay. I recognize that there are some more limitations being at the jail. I cannot do anything about your housing situation. I do honest not know anything about any limitations you may have at the law library. You are entitled to go the law library to prepare your defense, however.

THE DEFENDANT: Well the way that it works, I'm not sure you know, you have a kiosk and the kiosk you access the law library, the law library you're able to do research. Okay. When you do that now where I'm housed right now it says subscription not paid. Now clearly, I guess, Clark County just hasn't paid their bill on that particular thing because it says subscription not paid. Now I find that kind of ironic since I actually need access to the law library.

THE COURT: Do you know who would know about --

THE DEFENDANT: And another location actually has access to the law

library.

THE COURT: I don't know. We'll ask around.

[Colloquy between the Court and the Corrections Officer]

All right. Mr. Sprowson -- anything that -- anything else on this particular issue?

THE DEFENDANT: The search warrant issue. So, you are going to allow me

THE COURT: Yeah. So, you're clear what you're going to do. Yeah, you just need to get it filed as soon as possible so both the State has a chance to respond and I have a chance to look at it. Okay.

THE DEFENDANT: That's fair, Your Honor, and I appreciate that.

THE COURT: Okay. And what I was just asking the officer about was the accessibility to the law library, the computers for the legal information. He says he's not aware of any issues, but we can ask, we can ask further.

Does the State have anything to respond to this particular issue?

MS. BLUTH: I would just ask that it be put in writing like Your Honor ordered.

THE COURT: Okay. So, let's just skip on to the next motion. It's the State's motion for clarification, and this dealt with the issue of the victim in this case as far as prior medical records. And I think you're asking for clarification.

What I had ordered is the State has charged the Defendant with child abuse and neglect with substantial mental harm. So, obviously the mental condition of the victim is directly at issue, and it is relevant in this Court's opinion because the State is claiming that all the mental harm occurred as a result of the incidents involving the Defendant. So, it is relevant in this Court's opinion as to what her mental condition was prior to these events; you know, whether or not that perhaps

some of the mental harm she's claiming from this incident predated this incident.

So, I was going to allow to get into that because it's directly at issue with the charges. What I did not find relevant is the fact that she may have had other cases in the system. I just don't see any exception where that would come in.

MS. BLUTH: And, Judge, for clarification purposes just so -- because I want to be clear about my motion to clarify.

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. BLUTH: It wasn't just the medical records and the psych records; it was the fact that she had been victimized before. And so my understanding in the previous ruling which is what I think Your Honor is saying this morning was that because the Defendant is charged with child abuse and neglect with substantial mental harm and because her mental, you know, capacity or what she was suffering from at the time is at issue, that the parties -- and I think it was even mentioned in the minutes -- could perhaps stipulate or agree on a type of jury instruction that stated that she -- and I don't want to be tied into the language I'm using right now -- but that she had gone through something before, she had been through two and a half years of therapy, et cetera. So, then the jury is on notice that she had gone through something previously, she had been seeking mental health care for about two and a half years before this incident. But the fact that she was victimized before by another adult male is not relevant and it is not probative.

The only thing that's probative is that she did have mental health issues for a period of two and a half years before this incident but, I mean, if someone is raped in 2007 and then someone is raped in 2009 -- and the trial in 2009 we don't get to talk about the victim being raped in 2007 -- and I think that that logic is still relevant in this type of situation as well. We have a minor while the previous case

Page 14 1417

 was sexual assault, this case is first degree kidnapping, and under no circumstances per the statute can she consent to that behavior.

So, I just been asking the Court -- and I would be happy to work with Mr Sprowson and Mr. Yohay on if Your Honor thinks a jury instruction is proper. I recognize the Court's ruling that you think it is relevant but she had previous mental medical health history, and the State agrees with that. It's just how we inform the jury of that fact is what the State was concerned about and that's why I did the motion to clarify.

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Sprowson, do you want to respond? This is just -- we've already talked about this before. The State just didn't fully understand.

THE DEFENDANT: Yeah, I read the minutes. And I just want to clarify some things. The State has me attending that particular hearing. I was out of state. It was Mr. Momot that represented me.

THE COURT: Okay.

THE DEFENDANT: I just wanted -- if we could have the record show that I was not present during that, and just for administrative purposes --

THE COURT: The attorney can appear on your behalf. Whether or not you choose to appear with him is a different issue.

THE DEFENDANT: Just in case it comes up later on during appeal or something like that, if it becomes an issue, I just want to make sure it's clear because I know how things are done as far as the record --

THE COURT: It indicates in Court minutes who is present.

THE DEFENDANT: Right. I just want to -- okay. So, anyways, in response to what the State is saying, I really don't have an issue with what they're saying, but there are certain things that do need to be said in relation to the David Schlomann

Page 15 1418

case because there's a confrontation -- and this is a matter the States argument versus our argument, defense's argument. There's a confrontation between the mother and the daughter as a direct result of the David Schlomann incident. Okay.

Now when I was reading their response, if I'm not mistaken, I could be mistaken, a couple of things that they're trying to limit is the issue of sexual conduct, and I don't know how far they want to limit that because here we have an individual that is, first of all, sixteen, of legal age in relation to me. Okay. The situation prior to that was illegal which the State has an issue of bringing that up because of the rape shield law and things like that. I don't have a problem with that. The issue is for me because kidnapping is a very serious charge and it's a specific intent on the mental or the Mens rea. Specific intent has to be proven.

So, what I've read and what the State's argument is, is they're trying to tie in, they're trying to tie in some kind of sexual conduct into this whole intent thing, it was my intent to kidnap which is somehow commit these sexual acts which, to me, is not even the situation. But the reason I'm bringing this up is because I would like to -- and not only that because part of my argument I can't bring it into discussion right now -- the issues with the sexual activity of this person, I should be able to get into that to a limited sense because here you have a person who is sexually active. Okay. And we're not just talking about David Schlomann. Okay. We're talking about other individuals which I think is very pertinent to my case because otherwise what you're doing is with the Mens Rea on the kidnapping, you are laying it all at my doorstep which is unfair and highly prejudicial to me, okay, especially when it comes to kidnapping.

MS. BLUTH: May I clarify something to Mr. Sprowson, Your Honor, or to Your Honor so we can -- this isn't going to be an issue.

Page 16 1419

1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | i | 4 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 6 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1

Under the first degree kidnapping statute, the State can prove kidnapping in many ways. One of those ways is if someone, you know, keeps, inveigles, [indiscernible], all of those words, takes a child with the intent to keep them away from their parents. Okay. The second element, the second cause of kidnapping under the statute, is if someone does those things with the intention to commit sexual assault. That is not the way that that was pled in this case. It is only under the first element or the first statutory requirement that Mr. Sprowson took her with the intent to keep her away from her parents. So, there is no -- nothing about Mens Rea, nothing about intent to commit sexual assault.

So, I just want to be clear about that because I understand where the confusion is with Mr. Sprowson. That's not part of the element that I have to prove and that's the theory of the State's case. And, again, it doesn't matter if she has sex willingly or was raped by Mr. Schlomann or anybody else who Mr. Sprowson is referring to because rape shield protects her from any of that. So, that evidence wouldn't come in under rape shield or -- and because the State isn't pursuing the theory that Mr. Sprowson is talking about. We just wanted to make sure he was on the same page so there wasn't confusion in regards to that.

THE DEFENDANT: Okay. In response to that, when I say -- the thing is because there's the issue of the photographs. I'm being charged with four felonies as you're aware of 200.710, okay, which are very serious charges. Okay. Now what I read in the State's response, okay, that the kidnapping was with the intention to do this -- the 200.710 which is the direction of child pornography which is, again, something else that we're going to argue at trial. But the point is, again, that right there ties into the sexual aspect of what I'm getting at, okay, because here's they're saying that I kidnapped with the intent to -- how can I say -- take photographs of her

Page 17 1420

or whatever the State is going to try to claim. It still has some sexual aspect involved in this. Again, my only thing as far as the State's response is I just want to able to be bring up the issue just in case it comes into their argument with the aspect of the sexual conduct. I don't have to get into the David Schlomann stuff, but in a limited sense going back to the confrontation between the mother and the daughter, because of the David Schlomann stuff, this is the reason why she, again, clearly states ran away from home.

THE COURT: Why do you need to get into the prior case? I mean, --

THE DEFENDANT: I don't need to get into the prior case. I just --

THE COURT: -- I don't think any dispute that there was a wacky relationship for a period of time between the victim and the mother in this case and that may have led to some of the acts that occurred. I don't think the State's ever disputed that. I just don't see why you need to get into the fact that she had another case where she was a victim and there was a criminal case filed.

THE DEFENDANT: I don't need to get into the aspect of the victim. What I'm saying is there was a prior situation that actually occurred. Because here's the thing. Okay. If I'm a juror, right, and I'm hearing the State argue -- if I'm hearing the State argue certain aspects -- what I'm trying to avoid, Your Honor, I'm guess let me just kind of cut to the chase on this --

THE COURT: Please.

THE DEFENDANT: What I'm trying to avoid is everything being laid at my doorstep. Okay. What I'm trying to avoid is the mischaracterization that the State has already done on me in the past and is continuing to do as far as like trying to present me as this predator, okay, and this is where I'm trying to bring up the whole sexual aspect of it because it is trying to make me -- they are trying to make me out

Page 18 1421

to be this predator --

THE COURT: Hold on. I need for you to focus. What does this have to do with the fact that she was a victim in a prior criminal case?

THE DEFENDANT: The fact that that being a victim in a prior case led to the confrontation between the mother and the daughter which also led to the fact that she wanted to run away from home and that comes into my -- that's what actually blends into my case.

THE COURT: You know, we've really already argued this motion.

THE DEFENDANT: Like I said, I wasn't here. So, I didn't get to hear what happened. So, I'm just trying to make sure --

THE COURT: Then you should have shown up for the hearing with Mr. Momot. You always have that option. You obviously chose not to --

THE DEFENDANT: I was in Oklahoma so I couldn't. And I wasn't informed, I wasn't informed by Mr. Momot.

THE COURT: Well that's a totally different issue.

THE DEFENDANT: I understand that.

THE COURT: Obviously you have the right and ability to be present.

Look. Again, I think that the mental health issues are relevant given the -- what the State's pled in this particular case. I don't think it's relevant that she was a victim in another criminal case. I don't have any objection to you bringing up the fact that there was a conflict between the mother and daughter which led to the mother -- I mean the daughter leaving the house, however, I don't think that you need to get into the prior criminal case. You can simply -- there can simply be --

THE DEFENDANT: I don't think I disagree with that.

THE COURT: -- the fact that there was a conflict.

Page 19 1422

THE DEFENDANT: I don't think I disagree with that. I don't want to limit myself because I know that once you rule on this motion it's kind of final and I'm going to be limited. I'm just trying to make sure that I understand everything -- excuse me, Your Honor. You know, I'm representing myself so I am kind of fairly new at this. Excuse me for kind of hopping around on this. I just want to make sure that I'm covering everything so that I don't get trapped in a corner, you understand, so I get pushed in a corner to where something that may have been relevant as a result of this motion that I could have brought up but now I can't bring up. That's all I'm trying to make sure I cover everything and make sure I understand what the State is trying to get at and what they're trying to prohibit, you know. It's a motion a limine and they are trying to prohibit everything. But just the fact that she was a victim, I have no problem with that.

THE COURT: You don't need to bring -- I'm not going to let you bring up the prior criminal case. I'm not going to let you bring up the Defendant in the prior criminal case. I don't think that it's relevant. Because if you start bringing up this individual's name, the question for jury is going to be who is this individual. The fact that there was mental health counseling prior, the fact that there was a conflict between the mother, I think that's relevant as well because it leads you into why she left the residence.

THE DEFENDANT: Absolutely.

THE COURT: But I don't think anything else regarding the prior case is relevant. So, are we clear?

THE DEFENDANT: That's fine, that's fine. That's what I want.

MS. BLUTH: Okay. And just so we're all clear though. I had also mentioned in the motion the rape shield. So, the things that Mr. Sprowson is discussing about

Page 20 1423

 -- I believe the words he uses is that she had had sexual contact with Mr.

Schlomann and a host of other people. That's rape shield. I mean, if I need to do a motion in limine to clearly spell everything out I will.

THE COURT: Well he disputes it's rape shield. And I don't think there's any of those cases that would be an exception to bringing in a prior act.

MS. BLUTH: I know. But because he wants things so clear, I just want him to be aware that that's not something that I believe -- you're saying that that is inadmissible. I just want to make sure he's aware of that. But I can do a motion in limine about all these things to make it more clear so we have a clean trial.

THE COURT: I don't -- I think it's clear but I don't know what the State wants to do.

THE DEFENDANT: Well let me just kind of ask the question. Okay. I just want to -- because the issue of the sexual conduct, I know that rape shield allegedly takes care of covering that. The fact of the matter is there is certain things in my defense that I may have to bring up in regards to sexual conduct. I'm not necessarily getting into the victim --

THE COURT: With you or with other people?

THE DEFENDANT: Excuse me?

THE COURT: With you other people?

THE DEFENDANT: With other individuals. And it is relevant to my case.

THE COURT: You better look at that statute closely because there's very limited circumstances when you can bring up the victim's prior sexual history.

THE DEFENDANT: Well see this is why I want to have clarification on what the State's trying to get clarification because, again, I'm trying to avoid everything being laid at my doorstep. Okay. It's unfair and highly prejudicial to me to have to

take the brunt for something that has been a result of someone else's activity. And the reason why I keep coming back to the sexual conduct because this is what I'm afraid of, I'll be quite frank and honest with you, Your Honor. I'm afraid that the State is going to try to present her as this pristine virgin that has never been touched by anybody and somehow this predator came along and took advantage of her. That's what I'm trying to avoid.

THE COURT: Sir -- okay. I can't -- I'm not your lawyer and we've got to move on; okay. We can't try the case right now.

THE DEFENDANT: I understand that, Your Honor.

THE COURT: The bottom is the State's going to have to prove certain elements of the defense. Whether they prove them or not that's up to the State. Okay. That's it.

THE DEFENDANT: So, I'm just --

THE COURT: If I were you I would go back and look at the elements of the crime. I would probably look at the rape shield statute because it is going to become relevant it sounds like during the course of the trial. But I'm not your lawyer. I cannot give you this information. And everything that you've put on calendar today has already been ruled upon with the exception of your motion to proceed in forma pauperis which will be granted because you obviously are indigent giving your status in the detention center.

So, as it stands now, Mr. Sprowson, I don't think there's anything else on my calendar for today. Your motion, get it on file soon, and the State will get their response on file, and we'll see you back next Wednesday for calendar call. Okay. And we'll be on the lookout for your motion so we can make sure it's on calendar next Wednesday.

Page 22 1425

THE DEFENDANT: Okay. Your Honor, I have one other thing --

THE COURT: Yes.

THE DEFENDANT: -- because you had me sit down in regards to the in forma pauperis.

THE COURT: Yes.

THE DEFENDANT: Okay. Now I filed also request for transcripts. I was denied that request for transcripts based upon the fact that I was not indigent and there was no order for in forma pauperis. Can you please direct Ms. Garabay if I could have that request granted. I requested for three transcripts for the motions to suppress evidence hearing, the actual transcripts.

THE COURT: I don't know if there's going to be a basis.

THE COURT RECORDER: What happened is I don't have anything to direct me to type the transcripts because I don't show anything in Odyssey that says that he's indigent.

THE COURT: So now there's a ruling.

THE COURT RECORDER: I need a ruling.

THE COURT: Okay. So, the motion's granted. You've been indigent enough for several months and I don't believe you have any other source of income. So, now Maria has what she needs. And some of this is just kind of technical proceedings. Anything else?

THE DEFENDANT: Well I just want to clarify and just make sure so that you are directing Ms. Garabay to provide me with the transcripts and file it with the Court, for the motion to suppress --

THE COURT RECORDER: Yes.

THE DEFENDANT: Okay. Thank you. And how soon can -- does that take;

Page 23 1426

1	may I ask? It's a rough draft, actually, it's a rough draft.
2	THE COURT: She'll try to get it as fast as she can with the understanding
3	that she's also in Court all day long. So, she has to do it in the other times.
4	THE DEFENDANT: No, I understand, I understand. It will be filed with the
5	Court and I will provide a copy.
6	THE COURT: Yeah. Okay. Thank you.
7	THE DEFENDANT: Okay. Thank you, Your Honor.
8	THE COURT: Thank you. Anything else? All right.
9	
10	[Proceedings concluded at 10:18 a.m.]
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	ATTEST: Pursuant to Rule 3(c)(d) of the Nevada Rules of Appellate Procedure,
22	acknowledge that this is a rough draft transcript, expeditiously prepared, not proofread, corrected, or certified to be an accurate transcript.
23	Patricia Slattery
24	PATRICIA SLATTERY
25	Court Transcriber

Electronically Filed 1/2/2018 10:26 AM Steven D. Grierson CLERK OF THE COURT

RTRAN 1 2 3 DISTRICT COURT 4 CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA 5 6 THE STATE OF NEVADA 7 CASE NO. C-295158-1 Plaintiff, 8 DEPT. XXIII 9 VS. 10 MELVYN PERRY SPROWSON JR., 11 Defendant. 12 13 BEFORE THE HONORABLE STEFANY MILEY, DISTRICT COURT JUDGE 14 WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 28, 2015 15 RECORDER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDING: 16 CALENDAR CALL 17 APPEARANCES: 18 19 For the Plaintiff: JACQUELINE M. BLUTH, ESQ. JAMES SWEETIN, ESQ. 20 Chief Deputy District Attorneys 21 22 For the Defendant: MICHAEL R. YOHAY, ESQ. Deputy Public Defender 23 24

RECORDED BY: MARIA GARIBAY, COURT RECORDER

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 28, 2015 AT 9:34 A.M.

THE MARSHAL: Okay. Sprowson.

THE COURT: Is Mr. Sprowson over there? I didn't recognize you, sir, good morning.

MS. BLUTH: Good morning, Your Honor, Jacqueline Bluth and James Sweetin on behalf of the State.

THE COURT: Okay. So we need to address a matter. My law clerk was indicating -- Mr. Yohay, maybe this came by way of you, that Mr. Sprowson [radio talk heard] was discussing continuing the trial?

THE DEFENDANT: Yeah. No, I have several -- if I may, Your Honor, discuss. There's a couple things with the State's late edition of these last two motions. And one was clarified, obviously, but this last motion to include bad acts, it's going to -- I'm going to need some time to address that. Also, there's some additional discovery that I actually need. Now there's -- we've been addressing the search warrant issue.

Now in the search warrants that I have, there's an issue of a forensics report for the I-phone 4 and my computer. Now I still need those forensics reports because I'm being charged with four counts -- or four felonies based upon that, so I would like to have that discovery from the State. I do have evidence in a preliminary hearing record that they do have a forensics report.

In addition to that, any emails -- emails. I have absolutely no emails in regards to conversations between the alleged victim and myself, so I would need that as well. Let's see, what else do I have on here. Oh, and also --

MS. BLUTH: Just, just -- just so we can be clear, Judge, all of that information -- all of those documents, emails – everything that he's talking about are on the CDs that I provided over 30 days ago.

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Yohay was going to make arrangements for him to be able to view the CDs, is that right?

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

THE COURT: You haven't had a chance to do that?

MR. YOHAY: We – we've met a couple different times for him to be able to review, basically all the discovery, all of the, I guess, psychological records, basically everything that we've gotten. So I can't speak specifically to everything he's gone through. I mean, it looks like it's an awful lot of stuff, I'll say that much, but I don't know specifically what's going on, to, or why.

THE DEFENDANT: We were only able to meet twice, Your Honor. And I just want to make a side note here. I've been moved six times in the past month which has made it very difficult for Mr. Yohi -- Yohay, excuse me, and I to actually meet together to actually go over the discovery, and it's a pile of stuff. I don't even know what's there.

But I do know, going back to that forensics report for the computer and the I-phone, that's not stuff you would have on a cd. That's stuff that should be attached to the search warrants that I have. And I would like a certified copy of both those forensic report, if I may.

MS. BLUTH: Okay. Well, I can tell you that that is on the cd because I'm the one who provided the CDs, and that information does go on a cd. There's not a printed format from it because on the front there's a report there's attachments, so you have to click on attachments that then open up.

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. BLUTH: So I don't have certified copies of those, they're on a cd.

THE COURT: And the entirety of the emails between the defendant and the victim if they do, in fact, exist, would those be on the CDs as well?

MS. BLUTH: As well as the text messages, yes.

THE COURT: All right. So have you turned over everything in the State's possession?

MS. BLUTH: Yes. And I've done a file review with the Clark County -yeah, the Clark County Police Department and turned over all of their file as
well.

THE COURT: Okay. So you made sure that you had everything the police had?

MS. BLUTH: Correct.

THE COURT: All right. So it sounds like you need more time to go through the CDs.

THE DEFENDANT: Yeah, I, I haven't had a chance. We've only been able to meet twice, Your Honor. And again, like I said, the circumstances -- I don't know why I've been moved six times.

THE COURT: I don't know.

THE DEFENDANT: It's made it difficult for Mr. Yohay's schedule. And, you know, I'm available because I'm there – I'm here incarcerated but, you know, like I said, "We haven't had the time to actually do what we need to do."

THE COURT: Okay. Well here's the thing. If you want to continue the trial. I mean, I understand it's more difficult when you're representing yourself. We went over that when we did the canvas, wherein you wanted to represent

1	yourself. The reality situation is, this is my last criminal stack of the year. We			
2	probably will not be able to get this case set for trial until when? Because we			
3	have a bunch of capital murder cases next year.			
4	COURT CLERK: Well, it'll be June 13th to do this one.			
5	THE COURT: June of 2016.			
6	THE DEFENDANT: I'm fine with that, Your Honor, that'll give me plenty			
7	of time to prepare.			
8	THE COURT: All right. And Ms. Bluth, you'd be back from maternity			
9	leave, wouldn't you?			
10	MS. BLUTH: I would, Judge.			
11	THE COURT: So would that work for the State?			
12	MS. BLUTH: I just have a two week capital case December in DC 20			
13	on June 6 th , but I can do it right after that.			
14	THE COURT: Put it on next year's calendar. So what would that be on			
15	dates?			
16	COURT CLERK: Actually I'm sorry, what week did you say you had th			
17	trial?			
18	MS. BLUTH: In June 6 th , but Mr. Sweetin is saying he has a firm set in			
19	here, Mr. Carl Gilford.			
20	MR. SWEETIN: The Carl Gilford case			
21	COURT CLERK: Oh, okay.			
22	MR. SWEETIN: I believe is June 16 th . I believe that is going to go.			
23	THE COURT: I think Gilford's older than Sprowson.			
24	MR. SWEETIN: I think it is.			
25	MS. BLUTH: Oh yeah.			

1	MR. SWEETIN: Yeah.
2	COURT CLERK: It is.
3	MS. BLUTH: What is what, what are the weeks of the June stack?
4	COURT CLERK: Actually it begins it begins 8/23rd for that stack. We
5	have a 250 murder trial that will take about three weeks.
6	THE COURT: Which one oh, is it Randolph?
7	COURT CLERK: Randolph.
8	THE COURT: Oh. That's old.
9	COURT CLERK: So that runs into our June stack, right into Gilford so,
10	it's looking more
11	[Colloquy between Court and Clerk]
12	COURT CLERK: We could do June 20 th .
13	[Colloquy between Counsel]
14	MR. SWEETIN: I believe Gilford's probably going to go two, two weeks
15	and maybe a little longer than that would be my guess for Gilford.
16	[Colloquy between Court and Clerk]
17	MS. BLUTH: Are you in civil or criminal in April?
18	COURT CLERK: One second.
19	MS. BLUTH: Okay. Sorry.
20	COURT CLERK: That's okay. Criminal.
21	MS. BLUTH: Oh, but that's when you have it?
22	COURT CLERK: And we also have a 250 as well.
23	THE COURT: Which one?
24	COURT CLERK: Williamson.
25	[Colloguy between Court and Clerk]

Monday for a trial setting; again, let me see what I can do. Mr. Sprowson, Ms.

provided to you. When you -- hold on, when you go through the documents if

Bluth is representing that everything you said you need has been previously

23

24

there's something that you believe you're entitled to that you don't have I would jot it down, and then, what you'll have to do is put it in a motion for discovery. That way I will have notice of what you need and Ms. Bluth would have notice as well so she can go and inquire whether or not it does, in fact, exist.

THE DEFENDANT: But the main thrust of the evidence that I need, Your Honor. Well there's, there's two parts. I want to come back to the search warrant issue because it's a search and seizure return states on there, "forensics report," it tells me absolutely nothing. Now I need -- now, according to the search warrant laws, it would be attached with the search warrant and it'd be certified by the clerk, this is what I need, otherwise, that forensic report is going to be very questionable; and it's very crucial to my case.

I am requesting from the State -- and if I have to do a motion I'll do a motion to have a certified copy of that forensics report, both for the iPhone 4 and my computers. The other thing is, I requested the motion to suppress evidence hearing -- the evidentiary hearing -- the first one we had in June. I also need that. It would be part of my evidence that I would need to present to the Court.

THE COURT: Are you talking about the transcript from that?

THE DEFENDANT: I'm -- I'm waiting for the transcript. Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. And we talked about that, that at the last hearing. Maria is going to try and get that done.

THE DEFENDANT: I just wanted to bring that to the Court's attention.

THE COURT: Yeah. We only talked about it a few days ago. Okay. So, Ms. Bluth, did you hear the last thing? Again, is that's what's on the cd?

7 8

9 10

11

12 13

14

15

16 17

18 19

20

21

22 23

24 25 MS. BLUTH: The --

THE COURT: He wants whatever should be attached to the search warrant, by law.

MS. BLUTH: Correct. Of the -- of the computer and the phone?

THE COURT: Correct.

MS. BLUTH: That [cough heard] forensic report has all the emails, all the text messages, all the digital images, et cetera.

THE COURT: Okay. So again, go through that and make note of what you believe you don't have so that we can do that in writing and the State can go ahead and look. As far as the Motion to Admit Evidence of other Bad Acts, how long are you going to need to file an opposition?

THE DEFENDANT: I didn't hear what you said, Your Honor.

THE COURT: How long do you need to file an opposition?

THE DEFENDANT: Probably at least a couple weeks.

THE COURT: Couple weeks? Are we going to need to set this for an evidentiary hearing? Or is it something that could be done by way of documentation? I know that there is documentation a long time ago when you filed a motion to remand Mr. Sprowson, without bail, which had the IP information.

MS. BLUTH: Right.

THE COURT: Were you anticipating utilizing any additional information?

MS. BLUTH: In, in regards to a hearing, Your Honor, or in regards to like if you let it in for trial?

THE COURT: Well, as far as, you know, the ability to prove it by clear and convincing evidence?

MS. BLUTH: Yeah, I, I -- we would -- we would have to have a hearing because the witnesses are all out of state, because they're in Oklahoma where he was residing at the time. So I would -- I would -- if, if Your Honor is going to ask for a hearing then I would just need some time in order to get them here.

THE COURT: Yeah. We probably would need an evidentiary hearing.

Okay. When do you leave on maternity leave?

MS. BLUTH: Not till after the first of the year.

THE COURT: Do we even have time this year to set a *Petrocelli* hearing?

[Colloquy between Court and Clerk]

THE COURT: When are you coming back from maternity leave?

MS. BLUTH: Last week of March.

THE COURT: We need to do it before then. The only day I have is December 10th in the morning.

MS. BLUTH: Okay.

THE COURT: Okay. So we'll set it for an evidentiary -- what is called a *Petrocelli* Hearing which is, you know, an evidentiary hearing so they can establish their burden of proof. That'll be December 10th at 9:30 in the morning. That'll probably take most of the morning. The State will have to fly in witnesses. When can you get me -- I need a deadline for you to get me the opposition. You think you can do it in two weeks, three weeks?

THE DEFENDANT: Give me two weeks, Your Honor. I -- we just -- THE COURT: Well --

THE DEFENDANT: -- I just got access to the library -- law library yesterday so.

THE COURT: All right. So today is the 28th. The 11th would be two

weeks and that's actually Nevada -- I'm sorry, Veteran's Day. So, can you have it to me by, I don't know, say November 13th which is a Friday?

THE DEFENDANT: November 13th.

THE COURT: That's a little over two weeks, two weeks and two days?

THE DEFENDANT: Yeah, that seems reasonable, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.

COURT CLERK: Okay. I was told it was a status check, correct?

THE COURT: Yeah we do, because we need to give him a trial date.

COURT CLERK: Okay. Status check on resetting the trial is

November 2nd, at 9:30. *Petrocelli* hearing and the Bad Acts Motion is December 10th at 9:30.

THE COURT: And that's an evidentiary hearing. And the Defendant will have his opposition to the Bad Acts Motion by November 20th.

THE DEFENDANT: I just had one question, Your Honor --

THE COURT: I'm sorry, 13th.

THE DEFENDANT: -- if I may --

THE COURT: Yeah.

THE DEFENDANT: -- in regards to that. I was reading the motion of the State, but I just need clarification. When they're referring to bad acts, are we referring to just the remand stuff? Are they talking about bringing it to this whole issue of California stuff that, that I already been investigated for and I've already been cleared from? I understand how you guys define bad acts here but I'm, I'm just -- I need clarification on what I'm actually defending against. Is it just the remand stuff, or are they planning on including the stuff from California?

THE COURT: I thought it was just the stuff that occurred in Oklahoma. MS. BLUTH: The Bad Acts Motion is specifically for the, the stuff that had occurred in Oklahoma. As we get closer to trial, I mean, the State does have a position if the Defendant takes the stand and opens the door to the California previous incidents, then that would be a different issue. But this OBA is specifically just for the remand O/R revocation issue. THE COURT: Okay. So that's what you need to focus on, sir. THE DEFENDANT: Okay. Just the remand? THE COURT: Uh-huh. THE DEFENDANT: Okay. Thank you, Your Honor. THE COURT: Uh-huh. All right. Thank you. See you on Monday. MS. BLUTH: Thank you, Judge. [Proceeding concluded at 9:47 a.m.] ATTEST: I do hereby certify that I have truly and correctly transcribed the audio/visual recording in the above entitled case to the best of my ability.

Kerry Esparza Court Recorder/Transcriber District Court, Department XXVI

Electronically Filed 1/2/2018 10:26 AM Steven D. Grierson CLERK OF THE COURT

1	RTRAN	Deven s. 2	
2			
3			
4	DISTRIC	T COURT	
5	CLARK COUI	NTY, NEVADA	
6			
7	STATE OF NEVADA,		
8	Plaintiff,) CASE NO. C295158-1	
9)) DEPT.NO.XXIII	
10	VS.		
11	MELVYN PERRY SPROWSON, JR.,	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS	
12	Defendant.		
13			
14		/	
15	BEFORE THE HONORABLE STEFANY	A. MILEY, DISTRICT COURT JUDGE	
16	MONDAY, NOVEMBER 2, 2015		
17	STATUS CHECK: RESETTING OF TRIAL		
18			
19	APPEARANCES:		
20	For the Plaintiff:	JACQUELINE M. BLUTH, ESQ. Chief Deputy District Attorney	
21	For the Defendant:	MICHAEL D VOHAV ESO	
22	For the Derendant.	MICHAEL R. YOHAY, ESQ. Deputy Public Defender	
23			
24			
25	RECORDED BY: MARIA L. GARIBAY, C	COURT RECORDER	

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 2, 2015, 9:39 A.M.

THE MARSHAL: Top of page 8, C295158, Sprowson.

[The Court and Court Clerk confer]

THE COURT: I'm sorry; we still don't know if we're going to be able to put you soon. Do you want me to just give you a date in the summer that we had talked about and we'll work on the April date?

MS. BLUTH: Yeah. And just for the record, Jacqueline Bluth on behalf of the State. I did spoke to -- I did speak to Mr. Pesci who has the -- is it Williams on April 4th? I can't remember the last name of it.

THE COURT: Is it Williams?

THE CLERK: Yes, Williams.

MS. BLUTH: Yeah, against Mr. Ericsson. And he was like it's the only the second setting so I'm not positive, but Mr. Ericsson's been in the Mark Harris strip shooting, the capital case for like three or four weeks, so no one's really been able to get ahold of him, so I've tried but there wasn't really a --

THE COURT: And we'll continue the trial. We're on a murder trial right now so we haven't had that ability. But let's give you a date in the summer so you have it and we'll work on trying to get an earlier date.

THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, can I ask for something a little bit later than that? We were talking about a June date I think.

THE COURT: You want June instead?

THE DEFENDANT: I have some things that I need to get done. I don't think that that's going to be enough time to really do what I need to get done. June would be good for us.

1	THE COURT: It may not be June.
2	THE CLERK: Actually, June 13 th looks like it'd be okay.
3	THE COURT: How many weeks does that give him?
4	THE CLERK: You have a murder trial the following week but it's only
5	[indiscernible].
6	THE COURT: Who is it?
7	MS. BLUTH: Which is that mine? Which one is it?
8	THE CLERK: Fritz.
9	MS. BLUTH: Yeah, that's mine. It's not going to go.
10	THE CLERK: Okay.
11	THE COURT: So why don't we set them then?
12	THE CLERK: Okay. All right. So calendar call excuse me, June 8 th at
13	9:30; jury trial June 13 th at 1:00 p.m.
14	THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Mr. Sprowson.
15	MS. BLUTH: Thank you.
16	PROCEEDINGS CONCLUDED AT 9:40 A.M.
17	* * * *
18	ATTEST: I do hereby certify that I have truly and correctly transcribed the
19	audio/video recording in the above-entitled case to the best of my ability.
20	Jane of Garahau
21	Maria L. Garibay MARIA L. GARIBAY
22	Court Recorder/Transcriber
23	
24	
25	

Electronically Filed 1/2/2018 10:26 AM Steven D. Grierson CLERK OF THE COURT

RTRAN 1 2 3 4 DISTRICT COURT 5 CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA 6 7 8 THE STATE OF NEVADA, 9 Plaintiff, CASE NO. C-14-295158-1 10 DEPT. XXIII VS. 11 MELVYN PERRY SPROWSON, JR. 12 13 Defendant. 14 BEFORE THE HONORABLE STEFANY MILEY, DISTRICT COURT JUDGE 15 THURSDAY, DECEMBER 10, 2015 RECORDER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS 16 **PETROCELLI HEARING** 17 STATES MOTION TO ADMIT EVIDENCE OF OTHER BAD ACTS APPEARANCES: 18 19 For the State: JACQUELINE M. BLUTH, ESQ. JAMES SWEETIN, ESQ. 20 **Chief Deputies District Attorney** 21 For the Defendant: MELVYN PERRY SPROWSON, JR. 22 In Proper Person Standby Counsel: MICHAEL R. YOHAY, ESQ. 23 Deputy Public Defender 24 25 RECORDED BY: MARIA GARIBAY, COURT RECORDER

INDEX OF WITNESSES

2	STATE'S WITNESSES	PAGE
3 4	JAYSENIA TORRES Direct Examination by Ms. Bluth	9
5 6	MATTHEW CALDWELL Direct Examination by Ms. Bluth	27
7 8 9	BHARAT PATEL Direct Examination by Ms. Bluth Cross-Examination by the Defendant Redirect Examination by Ms. Bluth	40 48 48
10 11	MARCO RAFALOVICH Direct Examination by Mr. Sweetin	50
12		
13		
14		
15	****	
16		
17		
18		
19	<u>DEFENSE WITNESSES</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
20	[None presented.]	
21		
22		
23	* * * * *	
24		
25		

² 1444

INDEX OF EXHIBITS PAGE STATE'S EXHIBITS Exhibit 4 Exhibit 1 Exhibit 3 Exhibit 2 Exhibit 5 Exhibit 6 **DEFENSE EXHIBITS PAGE** [None offered.]

³ 1445

1	THURSDAY, DECEMBER 10, 2015 AT 10:00 A.M.
2	
3	THE COURT: All right. Good morning, everybody.
4	So this is the State's motion to admit evidence of other bad acts. The
5	State is present. Good morning.
6	MS. BLUTH: Good morning, Your Honor.
7	THE COURT: Mr. Sprowson's here along with his standby counsel, Mr.
8	Yohay.
9	THE MARSHAL: Judge, we're waiting [indiscernible].
10	THE COURT: Oh.
11	THE MARSHAL: She's making a copy.
12	THE COURT: Are we on the record at least, so I don't have to repeat it.
13	THE COURT RECORDER: Yes.
14	THE COURT: Okay.
15	So as soon as Kathy gets here we'll start.
16	MS. BLUTH: Judge, may I make a record about the media or do we need
17	Kathy here for that?
18	THE COURT: About the media?
19	MS. BLUTH: That's outside.
20	THE COURT: There's media outside?
21	THE MARSHAL: There is.
22	MS. BLUTH: There is. And so I just would like to talk to Your Honor about
23	that briefly
24	THE COURT: Okay.

MS. BLUTH: -- on the record.

THE COURT RECORDER: You have to wait for Kathy.

MS. BLUTH: Oh, we do have to wait. Okay. Sorry. I didn't know that.

THE COURT: Who's here?

THE MARSHAL: I believe it's Channel 8.

THE COURT: Are you ready?

THE COURT CLERK: Yeah.

THE COURT: Okay. So what were you going to say, Ms. Bluth?

MS. BLUTH: Oh, what I was going to say is, you know, at the inception of this case the victim was 16.

THE COURT: Uh-huh.

MS. BLUTH: She's now 18 which obviously makes her an adult for legal purposes; however she's still in high school. Her identity has always been protected throughout this case. Anytime anyone has taken video of her it's always been either they blurred out her face or it's been, you know, shoulders and down, and they've never been able to print or use her name in the media. I would just ask that that still be the case. I mean, these cases take a long time. I don't think that the news will be objecting to that anyways. They usually never do. I just want to make sure that I'm doing my due diligence in protecting her. I mean, it's not her fault, you know, that the case kind of takes until she gets to be an adult, so I still believe she's entitled to those same protections and I doubt anyone would be objecting to that. But I would just ask that when the media is let in that they be admonished, just like they normally are with minors, that her name not be printed and that her face either be blurred or that she be photographed from the neck down.

THE COURT: I think that's what we've done in other cases of this nature.

Anything from the defense?

THE DEFENDANT: I have no problem with that, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. So let's bring them in and give them their marching orders.

MS. BLUTH: And then the only other thing that I have is -- and this is in speaking with the family. Just because of the nature of this situation, the Defendant obviously has the right and is entitled to question the victim.

THE COURT: Uh-huh.

MS. BLUTH: I just -- is there -- can we develop some type of plan if he needs to approach? She's -- she's just very fearful today. This is very difficult for her. And if he needs to approach is that something that maybe Jay could do or Mr. Yohay with documents so that there -- just don't have to be so close, if that's okay with Your Honor.

THE COURT: I'm just thinking. Hold on. I'm just thinking kind of -- I'm thinking through this.

MS. BLUTH: Sure.

THE COURT: In a lot of these cases with the media, obviously they come in pretrial and they have photographs of the Defendant in custody. But I don't want it so obvious that he's in custody.

MS. BLUTH: And I recognize the concern. I'm just not sure that there's -- I think that that's just something we're going to have to deal with in voir dire, you know.

THE COURT: Well -- I mean, he's not going to have limitations at trial. He's going to -- as long as Mr. Sprowson behaves appropriately he's going to be treated like a lawyer. I mean, I can't prevent him because he's representing himself from approaching with documents and everything else.

MS. BLUTH: Well, it's -- I mean, it's within the Court's discretion. I just have to --

THE COURT: I understand that, but I also have to, you know, weigh the prejudice to the Defendant. And unless he gives me a reason to feel otherwise, I mean, he's going to be treated just like a lawyer because that's basically what he's acting -- well, it's not basically. It is what he is acting like in this regard. He's held to the other requirements for a lawyer. I'm not going to --

MS. BLUTH: Right. I mean, I've been in this --

THE COURT: -- make it so obvious he's in custody.

MS. BLUTH: No, and I don't think -- I don't know if it's necessarily -- well, first of all, I don't think we're prejudiced. I mean, there's no jury here. So I think --

THE COURT: No, no. Here's a --

MS. BLUTH: -- that that might be an issue down --

THE COURT: -- different thing of what -- is he still handcuffed?

THE MARSHAL: He is.

THE COURT: I just don't want him trying to get up here to the witness and falling and getting hurt or anything --

THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor --

THE COURT: -- and on the news.

THE DEFENDANT: -- I may not even ask any questions. I might not even object to this whole hearing. I might even just let them do what they got to do, to be honest with you. If they want to introduce this evidence I have no problem with it, to be honest with you. I don't even see it necessary for this hearing, but they feel that they have to do it. I think it's actually to my advantage for them to actually enter this because unless they can put me behind a computer or whatever device in regards

1	to this, you know, I think it's kind of unfair to me, but I'm willing to take that hit.		
2	THE COURT: Well, they're going to have to lay the foundation for it. They		
3	have to prove it by clear and convincing evidence.		
4	Well, I guess for purpose of this hearing there is no jury. I mean, I		
5	guess if you need documents up there Mr. Yohay can do it, Jason can do it,		
6	whatever. Again, at the trial, I mean, he's obviously not going to be handcuffed and		
7	he's going to be allowed to stand at the witness stand and approach the witness just		
8	like any other lawyer.		
9	Okay, media.		
10	THE MARSHAL: Okay.		
11	THE COURT: Is there anything else we need to address? Any opening		
12	statements before we begin?		
13	MS. BLUTH: Not on behalf of the State, Your Honor.		
14	THE MARSHAL: Judge, we don't have a problem with the media. I guess he		
15	got		
16	THE COURT: He left?		
17	THE MARSHAL: discouraged and left.		
18	THE COURT: Well, that's		
19	MS. BLUTH: Oh, okay.		
20	THE COURT: fine with me.		
21	THE MARSHAL: I told him it's going to be awhile.		
22	MS. BLUTH: That's good. Then the State's first witness is Jaysenia Torres.		
23	THE COURT: Okay.		
24	THE COURT RECORDER: Ms. Bluth		
25	MS. BLUTH: Yes.		

1	THE COURT RECORDER: do you want me to exclude her? You don't			
2	want her to be in the video?			
3	MS. BLUTH: Oh, I no, for JAVS purposes, yeah, that's fine. The public			
4	doesn't have access to JAVS; right? Like they couldn't pull the JAVS?			
5	THE COURT RECORDER: Yeah. Well, if somebody asks for the recording.			
6	MS. BLUTH: But they would still have to get Court's permission; correct?			
7	THE COURT RECORDER: No, it's not sealed.			
8	MS. BLUTH: I want her in the JAVS, so			
9	THE COURT RECORDER: You do?			
10	MS. BLUTH: Yes.			
11	THE COURT RECORDER: Okay.			
12	MS. BLUTH: Thank you for asking, Maria.			
13	THE MARSHAL: Remain standing. Please raise your right hand to be sworn			
14	in.			
15	JAYSENIA TORRES			
16	[having been called as a witness and being first duly sworn, testified as follows:]			
17	THE COURT CLERK: Please be seated. Would you please state and spell			
18	your first and last name for the record.			
19	THE WITNESS: J-A-Y-S-E-N-I-A T-O-R-R-E-S, Jaysenia Torres.			
20	THE COURT: All right. Whenever you're ready.			
21	MS. BLUTH: Thank you.			
22	DIRECT EXAMINATION			
23	BY MS. BLUTH:			
24	Q Good morning, Jaysenia. I have a few questions for you. First of all,			
25	what is your date of birth?			

1	A	·
2	Q	Okay. And so my questions are really going to be limited, Jaysenia, to
3	the timefra	me of January of 2015; okay? I just want to lay some background
4	information	n so we can speed up to January; all right?
5		So before January of 2015, because of, you know, the current case that
6	we're here	for today, had you been in a treatment facility in Reno?
7	A	Yes.
8	Q	Okay. And how long were you in that treatment facility?
9	A	About four, five months.
10	Q	And when was it that you were released from that treatment facility?
11	A	Around May.
12	Q	Of
13	A	Like May. No.
14	Q	I'm sorry. Did you say May?
15	A	Yeah.
16	Q	Okay.
17	A	May.
18	Q	So May of 2014?
19	A	Yeah. Before, yeah.
20	Q	Okay. And so from you know, during that time period, May through
21	January, were you still kind of emotionally working through these types of things an	
22	dealing wit	h that?
23	A	Yeah, I was still like transitioning back into school and stuff.
24	Q	Okay. And were you still going to therapy, et cetera?
25	A	Yeah.

1	Q	Okay. Now was it your understanding during that time period that there
2	was to be a	bsolutely no contact from the Defendant, Melvyn Sprowson, to you?
3	A	Yes.
4	Q	Okay. Do you see Mr. Sprowson in the courtroom today?
5	A	Yes.
6	Q	Okay. Can you please point to him and describe an article of clothing
7	that he's we	earing?
8	A	[Pointing] and orange socks.
9	MS. I	BLUTH: Okay.
10		Your Honor, may the record reflect identification of the Defendant?
11	THE	COURT: It will.
12	MS. BLUTH: Thank you.	
13	BY MS. BL	UTH:
14	Q	So now I'd like to go back to January early January of 2015 on
15	January 2 nd , if I could. During that time period, did you have a Instagram account?	
16	A	Yes.
17	Q	Okay. And what was your user name, if you know?
18	A	It was Jaysenia something.
19	Q	Okay. And just so we can all kind of understand what Instagram is. So
20	basically people have, what, is it user names? Am I using	
21	A	Yeah.
22	Q	the proper terminology?
23	A	Yeah.
24	Q	And so you have a user name that is attributed to your account?
25	A	Yeah.

1	A	Then I knew.
2	Q	keeps going, do you believe it's the Defendant
3	A	Yes.
4	Q	contacting you?
5	A	Yes.
6	Q	And so ultimately are the police contacted?
7	A	Yes.
8	Q	Okay. When the police come to your house, do they take what's called
9	kind of snapshots of your phone showing the messages that had been going on	
10	between you and this person Audrey?	
11	A	Yes.
12	Q	And not only did they take those photos, but did you also email them
13	screenshots?	
14	A	Yes.
15	Q	And if I showed you those would you recognize them?
16	A	Yes.
17	MS. BLUTH: May I approach, Judge?	
18	THE COURT: Yeah.	
19	BY MS. BLUTH:	
20	Q	I'm showing you what's been marked for purposes of identification as
21	State's proposed Exhibit Number 4. If you just want to thumb through those kind of	
22	to yourself and let me know if you recognize them and then I'll have some	
23	questions	
24	A	Yeah.
25	Q	for you; okay?

¹⁵ 1457

1	A	Yeah.
2	Q	Okay. So these it looks like there is okay. It looks like there's 11
3	pages of me	essages and then three pictures of screen names and pictures
4	Α	Yeah, changing.
5	Q	is that right?
6	Α	Yeah.
7	Q	Okay. Now are these are these a fair and accurate copy of not only
8	the screensh	nots that you provided, but of the conversation that you were having wit
9	this individua	al on January 2 nd ?
0	А	Yes.
1	MS. B	LUTH: Okay.
2		Your Honor, at this time I move to admit evidence State's proposed
3	Exhibit 4.	
4	THE (COURT: All right. Was the Defendant showed the copies?
5	MS. B	LUTH: Yes. These were provided via a disc about 60 days ago.
6	THE (COURT: All right.
7	MS. B	LUTH: And he I also have a hard copy that I gave this morning too.
8	THE (COURT: Any objections, Mr. Sprowson?
9	THE	DEFENDANT: No, go ahead.
20	THE (COURT: It will be admitted.
21	MS. B	LUTH: Okay.
2		[STATE'S EXHIBIT 4 ADMITTED]
3	BY MS. BLU	JTH:
24	Q	And so, Jaysenia, I'm going to ask you some questions regarding these

messages.

1	MS. BLUTH: May I have permission to publish, Your Honor?		
2	THE COURT: Yes.		
3	MS. BLUTH: Thank you.		
4	BY MS. BLUTH:		
5	Q Okay. So is that computer on in front of you or that TV screen?		
6	A It's white. Oh, yeah.		
7	Q Okay.		
8	A Yeah.		
9	Q So if I put this it says Jaysenia dash Malik; is that correct?		
10	A Malik.		
11	Q Malik.		
12	A Yeah.		
13	Q Okay. And is that the screen name you were using for your Instagram		
14	account during that time period?		
15	A Yes.		
16	Q Okay. Now the individual who contacted you and I'm just going		
17	these are part of the record now, Jaysenia, so I'm just going to read the first one.		
18	You so you received this friend request. And then how does the conversation		
19	say friend request, but you correct me. It's not a friend request. It's like they		
20	A It's like follow.		
21	Q they request to follow?		
22	A Yeah.		
23	Q You accept that, and then you start a conversation with that individual:		
24	is that correct?		
25	A Yeah		

to tell anyone.

1	conversation has been going on; is that right?		
2	A	Yeah.	
3	Q	And here it says two hours. And at the two hour's mark Audrey	
4	tells you that they will always love you?		
5	A	Yes.	
6	Q	That he or she will always love you.	
7	A	Yes.	
8	Q	At any point in the conversation does Audrey ask you, you know	
9	if you are you going to tell your mom?		
10	A	I don't remember.	
11	Q	Okay. If you look at the two hour mark again under Audrey	
12	the		
13	A	Yes.	
14	Q	are you going to tell your mom? I don't mean any harm, just want	
15	you to be happy; do you remember that?		
16	A	Yes.	
17	Q	Then somewhere along the lines the Audrey dash keeps the	
18	same picture, but then changes the user name; is that right?		
19	A	Yes.	
20	Q	And that user name is then changed to Lisa dash Thomas04?	
21	A	Yes.	
22	Q	And one of the first things Lisa Thomas asks you is whether or not you	
23	have a phone?		
24	A	Yes.	
25	Q	And after she asked you if you have a phone, or the individual from	

1	Q	And after telling your mom are the police ultimately called?
2	A	Yes.
3	Q	Okay. I already asked you the questions about, you know, turning over
4	the photogr	raphs of the snapshots
5	A	To the police and stuff, yeah.
6	Q	and emailing them as well.
7	A	Yes.
8	Q	Did you also turnover your iPod?
9	A	Yes.
10	Q	Now can you explain to me because I'm a little bit unclear on it. Now
11	are you able to have Instagram conversations on an iPod?	
12	A	Yes.
13	Q	So
14	A	Because it's an app.
15	Q	It's an app; okay.
16	A	Yeah.
17	Q	So your iPod is almost like it's almost like a phone, but you don't have
18	phone privileges from it?	
19	A	Yes, you just can't text and call on it.
20	Q	Okay. But you could have Facebook, or Instagram, things like that?
21	A	Yes.
22	Q	Anything with an app you can have?
23	A	Yes.
24	Q	Okay. The originally and I just want to go back to, you know, how
25	this this v	whole case started. And we're only going to talk about that for a split

to --

1	A	The iPod?
2	Q	The iPod.
3	A	Okay.
4	Q	Did you also hand that over to the detectives?
5	A	Yes.
6	Q	Okay. So after this whole thing transpires, how did that affect you from
7	kind of that	point forward?
8	A	Like emotionally or
9	Q	Yeah. Mm-hmm.
10	A	I was more paranoid after that because I didn't think it could happen in
11	the first pla	ce. So afterwards I kind of like had a little adjusting to do again.
12	Q	When you say you were paranoid, what were you paranoid about?
13	A	Like that he'd contact me again somehow or like come see me
14	somehow.	
15	Q	All right.
16	A	Yeah.
17	Q	And you were still seeing a therapist back then; right? So did you work
18	did you k	ind of talk to your therapist about that
19	A	Yes.
20	Q	and work through that? And I should be clear. To this day are you
21	still seeing a therapist?	
22	A	Yes.
23	MS.	BLUTH: Okay.
24		Could I have the Court's indulgence for a second, Your Honor?
25	THE	COURT: Mm-hmm.

1	MS.	BLUTH: Thank you, Jaysenia. I don't have any further questions and I'll
2	pass the witness, Your Honor.	
3	THE	COURT: Mr. Sprowson, do you have any questions of Ms. Torres?
4	THE	DEFENDANT: No, I don't.
5	THE	COURT: All right. Ms. Torres, if you'd like to step down. Thank you.
6		Next witness.
7	MS.	BLUTH: Detective Matt Caldwell.
8	THE	MARSHAL: Detective, please remain standing. Raise your right hand to
9	be sworn ir	by our clerk.
10		MATTHEW CALDWELL
11	[having been called as a witness and being first duly sworn, testified as follows:]	
12	THE COURT CLERK: Please be seated. Would you please state and spell	
13	your first and last name for the record.	
14	THE DEFENDANT: First name is Matthew, M-A-T-T-H-E-W, last of Caldwell,	
15	C-A-L-D-W-E-L-L.	
16	THE COURT: Whenever you're ready.	
17	MS. BLUTH: Thank you.	
18	DIRECT EXAMINATION	
19	BY MS. BLUTH:	
20	Q	Detective Caldwell, how are you employed?
21	Α	I work for the Clark County School District Police Department as a
22	detective.	
23	Q	And how long have you been with the police department?
24	А	Approximately nine years.
25	Q	Were you one of the detectives on the original investigation involving

1	the first degree kidnapping case involving Defendant Sprowson and the victim,	
2	Jaysenia Torres?	
3	A	Yes, ma'am.
4	Q	Okay. Do you see Mr. Sprowson in the courtroom today?
5	A	I do.
6	Q	Okay. Can you please point to him and describe an article of clothing
7	that he's w	earing.
8	A	He's sitting right down behind that computer monitor wearing a blue
9	shirt and glasses.	
10	MS.	BLUTH: Okay. Thank you.
11		Your Honor, may the record reflect identification of the Defendant?
12	THE COURT: It will.	
13	MS. BLUTH: Okay.	
14	BY MS. BLUTH:	
15	Q	And in fact did your investigation continue, you know, throughout the
16	course really from the time period of the inception of the case to even today has i	
17	been a continuing investigation?	
18	A	Yes, ma'am.
19	Q	Okay. Sometime after this case had gone to the district court level,
20	were you made aware of the fact that the Defendant was no longer in custody?	
21	A	Yes, I was.
22	Q	And were you also made aware of the fact that there would still be a no
23	contact order between the Defendant and the victim and her family, Jaysenia	
24	Torres?	
25	A	Yes, ma'am, I was.

Α

Yes, ma'am.

Α

actually for the sequence email address to find out who registered that email

address and also the IP address associated with the account.

24

25

34 1476

and

1	State's proposed Exhibit 3.
2	THE COURT: Any objection, Mr. Sprowson?
3	THE DEFENDANT: No.
4	THE COURT: All right.
5	[STATE'S EXHIBIT 3 ADMITTED]
6	MS. BLUTH: And permission to publish, Your Honor.
7	THE COURT: Yes.
8	BY MS. BLUTH:
9	Q Okay. And from the records from MSN slash Hotmail slash Microsoft,
10	the there are the records show the login information of sequence
11	580@hotmail.com. The first and last name appear to be Melvin Sprowson, the zip
12	code 73505, and then that same IP address of 24.49.210.230; correct?
13	A Yes, ma'am.
14	Q And also the date registered on that account, July 25 th of 2014?
15	A Yes.
16	Q Lastly, you also stated that you sent a you researched that the IP
17	address was coming back to a company named Fidelity. Can you explain how that
18	worked and what you did with that information?
19	A Yes, we took the IP address and we checked it through an application
20	or website called WHOIS. And it tells you who the provider of that IP address is,
21	and it came back to Fidelity Communications which is I think based in Oklahoma.
22	From there we did an administrative subpoena to Fidelity Communications. The
23	information returned to a Deluxe Inn in Lawton, Oklahoma
24	Q Okay. And so
25	A as a registered owner of the IP address.

³⁶ 1478

1	Q	I'm approaching you with what's been marked for purposes of	
2	identification as State's proposed Exhibit 2. The first page of this is an affidavit		
3	showing th	showing these to be certified business records. And then the second page is a cop	
4	of your adr	min subpoena; is that correct?	
5	A	Yes, ma'am.	
6	Q	And then the third page is the records provided to you by Chantel	
7	Leeser [ph	onetic] with Fidelity, which provides the address of where that IP address	
8	is associated with; is that correct?		
9	A	Yes, ma'am.	
10	Q	And are these fair and accurate copies	
11	A	Yes, they are.	
12	Q	of what you provided to my office?	
13	A	Yes.	
14	MS.	BLUTH: Your Honor, at this time I move to admit into evidence State's	
15	proposed Exhibit 2.		
16	THE COURT: Objections?		
17	THE	DEFENDANT: No.	
18	THE	COURT: Admitted.	
19		[STATE'S EXHIBIT 2 ADMITTED]	
20	BY MS. BL	UTH:	
21	Q	And you said you talked about the Deluxe Inn. That IP address was	
22	then attach	ned to this Deluxe Inn which is located at 1709 NW, I think it's Cache	
23	Road, or	Cache Road, Lawton, Oklahoma 73507. And then it has associated	
24	telephone numbers; is that correct?		
25	A	Yes, ma'am.	

Q And then the authorize users for that account are Bharat Patel and Usha Patel; is that correct?

A I think that's how you say that, yes.

Q Okay. All right. Now after you received the information about that IP address going back to a certain hotel -- I mean, obviously you're in Las Vegas, those individuals are in Oklahoma, so what do you do from there?

A I called the hotel and I spoke with one of the Patels. I couldn't tell you what the first name was, but it was somebody that identified themselves as a Patel and said that they were manager slash owner of the business. I asked if their -- if they had an open Wi-Fi which would mean you could just log on without a password. And they were unsure and not able to answer the question very clearly. So we actually made contact with a detective in Lawton, Oklahoma who went to the hotel and actually spoke with the owners of the hotel because she's familiar with them, I believe.

Q Okay.

A And --

Q Did you do any further research in regards to the physical location of that hotel within Lawton -- Lawton, Oklahoma in regards to distance of the address where you had the Defendant located living at?

A Yes, I did. I just -- I mapped his address to that address and I think it was like 3.8 miles away or something in that ballpark. It was fairly close.

MS. BLUTH: Okay.

That concludes my questioning for Detective Caldwell, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Sprowson, do you have any questions of the detective?

THE DEFENDANT: No, I don't.

1	THE COURT: Thank you, Detective, for your time.
2	THE WITNESS: Thank you.
3	THE COURT: Have a nice day.
4	Next witness.
5	MS. BLUTH: Mr. Patel.
6	THE MARSHAL: Sir, can you please remain standing. Raise your right hand
7	to be sworn in by our clerk.
8	BHARAT PATEL
9	[having been called as a witness and being first duly sworn, testified as follows:]
10	THE COURT CLERK: Please be seated. Would you please state and spell
11	your first and last name for the record.
12	THE WITNESS: Well, first name is Bharat Patel, last name Patel.
13	THE COURT: First name is
14	THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. First name is Bharat, last name Patel.
15	THE COURT: How do you spell that, sir?
16	THE WITNESS: The first name is B-H-A-R-A-T.
17	THE COURT: B-H-A-R-A-T.
18	THE WITNESS: Yes.
19	THE COURT: Okay. Patel is how do you spell your last name, sir?
20	THE WITNESS: P-A-T-E-L.
21	THE COURT: P-A-T-E-L.
22	THE WITNESS: Mm-hmm.
23	THE COURT: Thank you.
24	All right. Whenever you're ready.
25	MS BLUTH: Thank you

³⁹ 1481

DIRECT EXAMINATION

2	BY MS. BLUTH:	
3	Q	Mr. Patel, thank you so much for coming in today.
4	A	Oh, you're welcome.
5	Q	In front of you is a little black microphone.
6	A	Mm-hmm.
7	Q	If you could just scoot in just a little bit because you are so
8	A	Okay.
9	Q	quiet when you speak.
10	A	Okay.
11	Q	And I just have a few questions for you; okay?
12	A	Okay.
13	Q	All right. Thank you. First of all, you don't live in Las Vegas; right?
14	A	No.
15	Q	You flew in here?
16	A	Yes.
17	Q	Where do you live?
18	A	Lawton, Oklahoma.
19	Q	And in Lawton, Oklahoma are you the owner of a hotel or a motel?
20	A	Yes, ma'am.
21	Q	And you own that with your wife?
22	A	Yes.
23	Q	And what is your wife's name for the record.
24	A	Usha.
25	Q	How do I spell that?

1	A	U-S-H-A.
2	Q	Okay. And you can I have the name of the hotel in which you own?
3	A	Deluxe Inn.
4	Q	Okay. And what's the physical address of the Deluxe Inn?
5	A	1709 NW Cache Road, Lawton, Oklahoma
6	Q	Okay.
7	A	73507.
8	Q	And when you say Cache is that C-A-C-H-E?
9	A	Yes.
10	Q	Okay. Now within your hotel do you have Wi-Fi so that if someone
11	coming staying at your hotel they can access the internet?	
12	A	Yes.
13	Q	When someone comes in to stay at your hotel, do they have to hand
14	over certaii	n information so you know that they are who they say they are?
15	A	Yes.
16	Q	And what do they do? Walk me through that process of registration if
17	you can.	
18	A	When you walk in I give the registration card, fill out. They fill it out. I
19	ask them the driver's license. [Indiscernible] driver's license numbers.	
20	Q	Okay. So you give the person what's called a registration card?
21	A	Yes.
22	Q	And then they have to fill out that information?
23	A	Yes.
24	Q	And the information on that would be what? Their name I assume.
25	Α	Yeah.

1	Q	And then you said that they have to do they write down their driver's
2	license number or	
3	Α	No, I do.
4	Q	do you do?
5	A	I do.
6	Q	Okay. So in the process of registering that individual, do they have to
7	show you a	photo ID?
8	A	Yes, ma'am.
9	Q	Or a driver's license?
10	A	A driver's license, yes.
11	Q	A driver's license. And then you write down that individual's driver's
12	license nur	nber?
13	A	Yes.
14	Q	Okay. So I'd like to turn your attention to sometime in January of 2015.
15	Do you ren	nember receiving a phone call from a detective here in Las Vegas?
16	A	Yes.
17	Q	And was there kind of some issues with communicating between the
18	two of you?	
19	A	Yes.
20	Q	Okay. So after that, did a detective from your town come and meet with
21	you?	
22	A	Yes.
23	Q	And in speaking with them, did you provide them with registration
24	records for an individual named Melvin Sprowson?	
25	A	Oh, they the detective come to ask me the person [indiscernible]. I

1	said, yes, they stay here.	
2	Q	Okay.
	A	
3		And do you have a record? I say, yes, I have records. So I show him
4	the registra	
5	Q	Okay. So you keep those registration records
6	A	Yes.
7	Q	in a matter of ordinary course of your business as the owner of the
8	hotel?	
9	A	Yes, ma'am.
10	Q	And you still had possession of those records?
11	A	Yes.
12	Q	Okay. I'm approaching you with what's been marked as State's
13	proposed Exhibit Number 5. The first page of this is a registration card.	
14	A	Mm-hmm.
15	Q	And then the second page of this is a registration card and a receipt.
16	Do you recognize these?	
17	A	Yes.
18	Q	Okay. And were these provided by you, not only to my office, but by
19	the detective?	
20	A	Okay.
21	Q	Is that true?
22	A	The detective at the Lawton Police Department they don't get this
23	information.	
24	Q	Okay.
25	A	They just come to check this and just tell us me to the Las Vegas

1	Police Depa	Police Department call you to find out this guy stay.	
2	Q	Okay. And did you show these records	
3	A	Yes.	
4	Q	to the police officer?	
5	A	Yes, ma'am.	
6	Q	And did you then provide myself, my office, a copy?	
7	A	No. That she didn't say nothing.	
8	Q	At some point though did you	
9	A	Yeah.	
10	Q	did you turn	
11	A	Yeah.	
12	Q	this over?	
13	A	Yes.	
14	Q	That's how I got a copy of it?	
15	A	Yes.	
16	Q	Okay. And these are the copy of the records we were just talking	
17	about. The registration records that you keep in the normal and ordinary		
18	A	Yes.	
19	Q	course of your business?	
20	A	Yes, ma'am.	
21	Q	And are these a fair and accurate copy of what you provided?	
22	Α	The credit card.	
23	Q	Okay. And is this a fair copy is this an exact copy	
24	A	Yes.	
25	Q	of what you provided my office?	

1	A	Yes, ma'am.	
2	MS.	BLUTH: Okay.	
3		Your Honor, at this time I move to admit into evidence State's proposed	
4	Exhibit 5.		
5	THE	COURT: Objections?	
6	THE	DEFENDANT: No.	
7	THE	COURT: All right. Admitted. And you can publish.	
8		[STATE'S EXHIBIT 5 ADMITTED]	
9	BY MS. BL	UTH:	
10	Q	And so, Mr. Patel, I just have you wanted to ask some questions	
11	regarding the	ne information. So right now, is this what the registration card looks like	
12	that		
13	A	Yes.	
14	Q	that someone who stays at your hotel will come in and fill out?	
15	A	Yes, ma'am.	
16	Q	Okay. Now you said that the detective when she showed up it was a	
17	female detective; is that right?		
18	A	Yes, female.	
19	Q	When she showed up in January of 2015, she was asking you	
20	questions about a specific individual; right?		
21	A	Yes.	
22	Q	If a specific	
23	Α	Mm-hmm.	
24	Q	person	
25	A	Yes.	

1	Q	was there. And that person she was asking you questions of is	
2	Melvin Sprowson?		
3	A	No.	
4	Q	I'm sorry?	
5	A	No.	
6	Q	No what?	
7	A	The person the they asked me this guy just stay here; I said, yes.	
8	Q	Okay. And that's how you provided them these records?	
9	A	Yes.	
10	Q	Okay. So they asked you did this specific person stay there?	
11	A	Yes.	
12	Q	And you checked your records and got this?	
13	A	Yes.	
14	Q	Okay. So on here it has Mel Sprowson with an address of	
15			
16	A	Mm-hmm.	
17	Q		
18	A	Mm-hmm.	
19	Q	And then we have a driver's license number right here. Is this your	
20	writing, sir?	?	
21	A	Yes. W	
22	Q	And	
23	A		
24	Q	Okay. And then you also have a car make the make of the car is a	
25	Mustand	ear license, and the state of Oklahoma?	

1	A	Yes.	
2	Q	And the amount of people registered to that room is just one?	
3	A	One.	
4	Q	And then you have the individual sign the document; is that right?	
5	A	Yes.	
6	Q	Okay. Now to the right of this card it shows the room number	
7	A	Yes.	
8	Q	that Mr. Sprowson was staying in to be 107?	
9	A	Yes.	
10	Q	And the date that he checked in would've been December 28 th of 2014	
11	A	Yes.	
12	Q	And then he it shows he stayed a total of seven days?	
13	A	Yes.	
14	Q	And then on the back it's just another copy or the second page is	
15	it's a copy of that same document, but also a copy of the receipt		
16	A	Yes.	
17	Q	is that correct?	
18	A	Yes, ma'am.	
19	MS. BLUTH: Okay. Thank you so much, Mr. Patel. I appreciate it.		
20	THE WITNESS: You're welcome.		
21	MS. BLUTH: That concludes my direct examination, Your Honor.		
22	THE	COURT: All right. Do you have any questions for Mr. Patel, Mr.	
23	Sprowson?		
24	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do. May I stand, Your Honor.?		
25	THE COURT: Yes.		

CROSS-EXAMINATION 1 BY THE DEFENDANT: 2 Q Hi. How are you? 3 Α Fine. How you doing? 4 Q I know you recognize me from the hotel. I just have one question from 5 you. When I was staying there at the hotel, did you ever see me on a computer or 6 anything like that? 7 No. Well --Α 8 Q Okay. 9 Α We had -- we had internet. There's --10 Q The question is, did you ever see me personally --11 12 Α No, no. Q 13 -- on a computer? Α No, I never see you. 14 THE DEFENDANT: That's all, Your Honor. 15 THE WITNESS: We check --16 THE COURT: That's all. 17 THE WITNESS: You check in --18 THE COURT: Okay. 19 THE DEFENDANT: That's all the questions I have. 20 THE COURT: Any other questions by the State? 21 MS. BLUTH: I do, Your Honor. 22

REDIRECT EXAMINATION

|| BY MS. BLUTH:

23

24

25

Q Do you have computers that people actually sit at or --

1	A	No.	
2	Q	Okay. So you don't have a it's not like you have a lobby where	
3	A	No, no, no.	
4	Q	there's computers	
5	A	No.	
6	Q	that people sit at?	
7	A	No, it's not lobby.	
8	Q	Okay.	
9	A	There's a small small office.	
10	Q	Okay. So if someone has a computer or something in their room then	
11	you wouldn't see that?		
12	A	No, I don't see that what you log in on at all.	
13	MS. BLUTH: Okay. All right. Thank you so much, Mr. Patel. Appreciate it.		
14	THE WITNESS: You're welcome.		
15	THE	COURT: All right. Mr. Patel, thank you for your time. You're free to go,	
16	sir. Have a wonderful day.		
17	THE WITNESS: You too.		
18	MS. BLUTH: And we just have one final witness, Your Honor.		
19	MR. SWEETIN: Marco Rafalovich.		
20	THE COURT: You know what? I'm sorry. I didn't get down the exact date in		
21	January of these Instagram messages.		
22	MS. BLUTH: January 2 nd .		
23	THE COURT: January 2 nd . Thank you.		
24	MR.	SWEETIN: The State would call Marco Rafalovich.	
25	THE	MARSHAL: Please remain standing. Raise your right hand to be sworn	

1	in by our c	lerk.	
2		MARCO RAFALOVICH	
3	[having	been called as a witness and being first duly sworn, testified as follows:]	
4	THE COURT CLERK: Please be seated. Would you please state and spell		
5	your first and last name for the record.		
6	THE WITNESS: Marco Rafalovich, M-A-R-C-O R-A-F-A-L-O-V-I-C-H.		
7	THE COURT: Whenever you're ready.		
8		DIRECT EXAMINATION	
9	BY MR. SWEETIN:		
10	Q	How are you currently employed?	
11	A	I'm a criminal investigator with the Clark County District Attorney's	
12	Office.		
13	Q	In your duties in the Clark County Clark County DA's Office as an	
14	investigator, would it be fair to say that you access to various investigative tools?		
15	A	Yes, sir.	
16	Q	And some of those investigative tools relate to information not only in	
17	this jurisdiction but in other jurisdictions, would that be accurate?		
18	A	Yes, sir.	
19	Q	Some of that information would relate to driver's license, would that	
20	would you agree with me?		
21	A	Yes, sir.	
22	Q	Does Nevada have a database as other states do of driver's license	
23	information	1?	
24	A	Yes, we do.	
25	Q	Were you asked to retrieve any information relevant to this case today?	

1	A	Yes, sir, I was.	
2	Q	And what were you asked to retrieve?	
3	A	A Oklahoma driver's license for Melvin Sprowson or Sprowson, Jr.	
4	Q	And were you able to search for that driver's license in the databases	
5	that we've been referring to?		
6	A	Yes, I was.	
7	Q	And are those the same databases that are used by law enforcement,	
8	both in the state of Nevada and in other states, to track drivers information across		
9	the nation	?	
10	A	Yes, sir, they are.	
11	Q	Were you able to find information relating to Melvin Sprowson and an	
12	Oklahoma driver's license?		
13	A	Yes, I was.	
14	Q	I'm showing you what's marked as State's proposed Exhibit Number 6	
15	and ask you if you recognize this?		
16	A	Yes, I do recognize it.	
17	Q	And what is that?	
18	A	It is a printout of the driver's license for Melvin Sprows [sic].	
19	Q	Okay. And is that a clear and accurate depiction of the information tha	
20	you observed on the law enforcement database relating to a driver's license in		
21	Oklahoma	?	
22	A	Yes, it's identical.	
23	MR.	SWEETIN: State would move for the admission of what's been marked	
24	as State's proposed Exhibit Number 6.		
25	THE	COURT: Any objection, Mr. Sprowson?	

1	THE DEFENDANT: No, I don't.	
2	[STATE'S EXHIBIT 6 ADMITTED]	
3	MR. SWEETIN: Permission to publish.	
4	THE COURT: Yes.	
5	BY MR. SWEETIN:	
6	Q Now as we're looking at the information that you retrieved in regards to	
7	this Oklahoma driver's license, does it include the driver's license number?	
8	A Yes, sir, it does.	
9	Q And if you could, for the record, could you read that driver's license	
10	number?	
11	A It is	
12	Q Thank you.	
13	THE COURT: I'm sorry. What was the source of that printout?	
14	THE WITNESS: J-Link.	
15	THE COURT: J J-Lig?	
16	THE WITNESS: Link.	
17	THE COURT: J-Link; okay.	
18	THE WITNESS: J hypen Link.	
19	THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.	
20	THE WITNESS: Yes.	
21	MR. SWEETIN: Thanks. Nothing further.	
22	THE COURT: Hold on.	
23	Mr. Sprowson, do you have any questions of Mr. Rafalovich?	
24	THE DEFENDANT: No, I don't have any questions, Your Honor.	
25	THE COURT: All right, sir. Thank you for your time. You're free to go.	

1		
2		
3	l۷	
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11	l۷	
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
	11	

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE WITNESS: Thank you.

MS. BLUTH: Your Honor, that concludes the questioning of the State's witnesses, so the State would rest for purposes of this hearing at this time.

THE COURT: Hold on. Hold on one second. I'm just taking notes.

MS. BLUTH: Yeah, of course.

THE COURT CLERK: Mr. Sweetin, I need Exhibit Number 6.

THE COURT: All right. Is there any argument by the State?

MS. BLUTH: In regards to the motion in itself, Your Honor?

THE COURT: Correct.

MS. BLUTH: Yes. I'm sorry, Your Honor. I just didn't know if the Defendant wanted to present any evidence on his behalf --

THE COURT: I'm sorry.

MS. BLUTH: -- before I got started.

THE COURT: Did you have any witnesses, Mr. Sprowson?

THE DEFENDANT: No, go ahead.

MS. BLUTH: Oh. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right.

MS. BLUTH: Thank you.

Judge, I know that obviously the Court recognizes, you know, the three prongs that the State needs to discuss when making this type of argument. It has to be relevant, it has to be proven by clear and convincing evidence, and then there's also the prong where we need to talk about the probative value versus the prejudice.

If we could, I'd just like to start with clear and convincing. You know, if you look at the evidence we presented today, really what this comes down to, you know, is this the Defendant sending these messages to her; have we proven that by

clear and convincing evidence. And so I ask you first to consider the testimony from 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Jaysenia and the personal content of the information that is before Your Honor. I didn't go through every single message between the two of them, but I would ask the Court, before the Court makes a ruling, to be able to go through each of those. This is personal info, like Jaysenia said, that only the two of them know. Especially she had stated that she had never told anybody that they wanted to name their daughter Audrey. Additionally, if you look at the screen name it's Audrey dash which is Jaysenia's birthdate. And they also -- the Defendant identifies himself as -- well, he says that it's him, says where he is staying, and also says his birthdate to prove to her.

I submit to the Court that there is a reason why the Defendant continued to change vanity names and continued to change photos because he did not want to get caught because he recognized there were -- would be consequences if he got caught. He even says to her multiple times, please do not tell anybody. Asks her, have you told your mom; have you told anybody?

In regards to the subsequent investigation. The IP address goes back, you know -- we have IP addresses that go to the hotel, IP addresses that go to his personal email. The MSN email shows it registered to his name. And that was used -- that was registered six months previous, so it's not like someone just created that email that day. We also have him staying at that hotel. And we have the number of people staying at that hotel as one person. I know in previous hearings when the Defendant discussed -- he stated that a girlfriend was live -- was with him at the hotel and did this. But the hotel records show that only one individual checked in and only one individual was staying at the room. Also on those records it has the physical address where he is staying. It has the vehicle that is registered to him.

Those were things that the detective also talked about that he knew to be only personal to the Defendant.

Obviously we would never be able to put someone behind -- it's not like you ever have a photograph of someone behind a computer. But I think if you look at all of these factors, the information in the records, the information that the individual was sending to Jaysenia, as well as the IP addresses, the email, the hotel he was staying at, that's far beyond clear and convincing evidence, so I believe the State has met the prong in that regard.

So basically what we're left with is probative value versus the prejudicial affect and relevance. In going to the probative value, I think this is incredibly probative which is also why it's relevant. But if you look at the facts of this case -- I mean, the State has to prove that for first degree kidnapping that the Defendant, I believe the words are, you know, leads, takes, entices, inveigles, those types of things. There has to be an intent here that he was doing those things on purpose and that's why this becomes probative. It's probative because it shows his mindset. It shows what he was trying to do, even knowing that she had been in a long-term mental health facility. That there was no-contact order. That he was to have absolutely no-contact order [sic] with her, yet he's still trying to talk to her, tell her he loves her, asking her not to tell anybody. I mean, nothing could be more clear of why this is motive and why this is intent.

But really if you want to talk about the prejudicial affect. You know, a lot of the times when I come in here and I ask for this type of evidence to be admitted it's, you know, previous sex acts with other children, or previous physical or sexual abuse, that has a, you know, a certain likelihood of a prejudicial affect. We don't have that here. That's just him contacting her when he wasn't supposed to. So I

⁵⁵ 1497

2
 3
 4

don't believe that we have anywhere near the prejudice that we normally have when we come in here and we discuss these things. So I think that because it's so relevant in regards to his motive and his intent, and because of the way the statute is charged that the State has to prove that he enticed, inveigled, took, lead away from her, that becomes so relevant and becomes so probative.

Every time we've had a hearing with Mr. Sprowson, you know, he's discussed the fact that he was just trying to be a good guy. That she hated her mom. She had to get away from her mom, so he just kind of allowed her to stay. This shows that that's not the case. He is driving this bus and she's merely a participant, which is what the State has to prove, which is why it makes it's relevant and why it makes it probative. So I'd submit it on those three prongs, but obviously if the Court has any additional questions I'm happy to answer.

THE COURT: No.

Mr. Sprowson, anything you want to say?

THE DEFENDANT: May I stand, Your Honor?

THE COURT: Of course you may.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes. Well, the first thing I want to say is, yes, circumstantially, yes, it does look highly probable that I was the person behind there, and I want to start off by saying that. But again, the first thing that I've stated is -- first of all, they can't prove that I was behind a computer. And I've already stated to this Court in writing that I didn't have someone there registered with me at the hotel. I had somebody visiting me that I had met previously at a lounge. And I was already venting that week because --

MS. BLUTH: Okay. Your Honor, I apologize. I'm going to object because we have to be kept within the confines of the evidence presented. So if we have that

 female, but without her being able -- here to testify, and the Defendant did not testify himself, that's not something that can be argued in an argument.

THE COURT: She's right actually. I mean, unless you want to testify.

THE DEFENDANT: Well, all I'm gonna say is that I didn't communicate with Jaysenia; I'll tell you that. And number two, I don't really care if the State admits this because I think it's in my favor. What motive? What motive? I was reading through this, what motive? What motive? I'm looking at this; you have somebody talking with somebody trying to -- it seems to me make them feel better. I'm accused of some awful things. And reading this I -- I can see in this -- is not somebody that is trying to inveigle, entice. Where does it say anywhere in here, hey, let me come pick you up, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera. There's none of that in here.

I see -- yes, there's some information in here that's personal to me that -- like I've stated already, that I've relayed to another person. And this whole conversation -- I don't even know if I have the entire conversation. Simply it's not somebody who's trying to entice anybody to do anything. It seems to me that what this person is trying to do is to relieve some stress of this person feeling it. They put me in jail, okay. And that this person -- or actually that I hate -- that I hate her and -- and et cetera. Quite frankly, Your Honor, I don't see any of that in here as far as like me trying to entice her or anything like that in this conversation. Like I've already stated, this was not me in this conversation. I've already denied that. I've already submitted in writing what actually I believe happened. I can't prove that either, but it's just my speculation.

But again, as far as the State's claim, try to prove motive and intent.

Again, this is a problem that I think that I'm having with -- with their argument is simply in this whole conversation you don't find anybody asking anybody to do

anything. And quite frankly, again, like I said, it seems to me this is a person who is trying to maybe relieve this person of stress and again guilt.

And I don't know what else to really say, Your Honor. I mean, this whole process is really, really just coming down at my doorstep and that's fine. If I have to take responsibility for these things, that's fine. I don't really care at this point. I've already been in jail for over a year and it seems like I'll probably be in jail a lot longer until I get to the court of appeals. But anyways, that's another story. But anyways, that's all I really have to say about it. Thank you.

THE COURT: Okay. Is there anything else?

MS. BLUTH: Not on behalf of the State, Your Honor.

THE COURT: So I am going to grant the Defendant's [sic] motion to admit evidence of other bad acts. The Court does find that the State has demonstrated by clear and convincing evidence that the events were done by the Defendant in this particular case.

First, the Court found Detective Caldwell credible. There was an email; there was three different Instagram names which were sent to the victim's iPod or phone. And both of those three Instagram names were ultimately registered to an email which listed Melvin Sprowser [sic] as the owner of that email.

Also, the evidence indicates that the IP address utilized in this case was utilized from a location where Melvin Sprowson was registered as a hotel guest during the time the victim was receiving the Instagram messages. So the Instagram messages were coming from a hotel registered in Lawton, Oklahoma which happened to be 3.8 miles from where the Defendant was listed as to be living. Those messages from the IP address were also during the time that Jaysenia was receiving the messages. There's also other indicia that it was Mr. Sprowson who

was sending those messages and that he was the only registered individual in the room.

There was a driver's license number that Mr. Patel wrote down who the Court found credible. That driver's license number was given to him by Mr. Sprowson whom he identified. It was the same driver's license number that Mr. Rafalovich was able to look up on J-Link and it came back to belonging to Mr. Sprowson.

The Court also found that the victim was credible and that the Instagram messages contained information only she and the Defendant would be aware of. Specifically, one of the user names was Audrey, the name that the Defendant and the victim had intended to give their first born daughter. Also, the user name contained the victim's date of birth. Also when the victim attempted to confirm who was sending her the Instagram messages, one of the responses back was a date of birth which happens to be the same date of birth as Mr. Sprowson.

So the Court does find all this shows the activities did occur by Mr.

Sprowson by clear and convincing evidence. The Court does find that the evidence is relevant to show motive and intent. It shows Defendant's intent that the victim and the Defendant be together notwithstanding the court order and the current criminal case pending against him.

And lastly, the Court does find that the probative value outweighs any prejudicial effect. Again, it does show that Defendant continued in his attempts to be with the victim, again, despite his own representations in court and the Court's own admonishment that there be no contact between the victim and the Defendant. Also, it also showed -- and again, the Court finds the messages indicate that the Defendant wanted to be with the victim and that the messages indicate that the

1	person sending the messages loved the victim and asked it they were breaking
2	Any other questions?
3	MS. BLUTH: Not on behalf of the State, Your Honor.
4	THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
5	Do we have any future hearings for Mr. Sprowson on this case?
6	THE COURT CLERK: Just the trial date.
7	MS. BLUTH: I don't believe at this
8	THE COURT: Just the trial date.
9	So, Mr. Sprowson, again, the trial is in June.
0	THE DEFENDANT: Thank you, Your Honor.
1	THE COURT: See you then.
2	MS. BLUTH: Judge Your Honor, does the State prepare the order? I
3	always get confused on how that
4	THE COURT CLERK: Prevailing party.
5	MS. BLUTH: Okay.
6	THE COURT: The prevailing party, yeah.
7	MS. BLUTH: All right.
8	THE COURT: Usually I do it, but I did it in court today.
9	MS. BLUTH: Yeah. I will
20	THE COURT: I only do it when I issue a written decision.
21	MS. BLUTH: Yes, ma'am.
22	THE COURT: Do you have any questions on the decision?
23	MS. BLUTH: I do not.
24	THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
,	MS BLUTH: Thank you

1	THE COURT: Have a wonderful day to everybody.
2	[Proceedings concluded at 11:11 a.m.]
3	* * * * * *
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	ATTEST: I do hereby certify that I have truly and correctly transcribed the
22	audio/video proceedings in the above-entitled case to the best of my ability.
23	A Parchania
24	Sandra A Pruchnic SANDRA PRUCHNIC

Court Transcriber

Electronically Filed 1/2/2018 10:45 AM Steven D. Grierson CLERK OF THE COURT

RTRAN 1 2 3 DISTRICT COURT 4 CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA 5 6 THE STATE OF NEVADA, 7 CASE NO. C-295158-1 Plaintiff, 8 DEPT. XXIII 9 ٧. 10 MELVYN PERRY SPROWSON JR., 11 Defendant. 12 13 BEFORE THE HONORABLE STEFANY MILEY, DISTRICT COURT JUDGE 14 WEDNESDAY, APRIL 13, 2016 15 RECORDER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDING: 16 **MOTION** 17 18 APPEARANCES: 19 20 For the Plaintiff: JACQUELINE M. BLUTH, ESQ. Chief Deputy District Attorney 21 For the Defendant: MICHAEL R. YOHAY, ESQ. 22 Deputy Public Defender 23 24

RECORDED BY: MARIA GARIBAY, COURT RECORDER

MONDAY, APRIL 13, 2016 AT 10:42 A.M.

THE COURT: Morning. Hi, Ms. Bluth, good morning.

MS. BLUTH: Good morning, Judge.

THE COURT: All right.

MS. BLUTH: So this is Defendant's Motion to Suppress. I have an opposition by the State as well as a Reply by the Defendant.

THE COURT: So Mr. Sprowson, is there anything you'd like to add?

THE DEFENDANT: Well, I just kind of wanted to point -- excuse me, Your

Honor, let me take my glasses off. I just wanted to point out, as far as the affidavits in regard to the search warrants.

THE COURT: Uh-huh.

THE DEFENDANT: That both of the affidavits excluded absolute necessary exculpatory evidence that the officers had available to them. And I believe that if that exculpatory evidence would have been included in that affidavit, both those affidavits, it would have been a different decision. And I do believe that since the exculpatory evidence was -- I don't want to say purposely left out, but it seems that way, that it does invalidate both of those affidavits; therefore, it would be an unlawful search and seizure.

THE COURT: What exculpatory evidence particularly?

THE DEFENDANT: The exculpatory evidence in my response. I referred to the fact that they had in their possession the alleged victim's phone and computer, already, prior to seizing my phone. And I should say the defense's phone and the defense's computers. And what my argument basically is is -- well, if we start with the, the phone itself.

My argument is simply this, that they already had in their possession that the most reliable source of what they were looking for, the alleged victim's phone and computer. And it, it didn't produce any evidence. And -- matter of fact you can, you can assume that because there was nothing in the affidavits. There's nothing in the police reports that indicated that there was anything found on the alleged victim's phone or computer.

Now if we go to Exhibit A and B, again, that's the Exhibit A is in reference to searching the phone itself, and then Exhibit B is -- okay now, let me just verify it a second, Your Honor. Indulgence of the Court.

THE COURT: Uh-huh.

THE DEFENDANT: Exhibit A is actually for the computers.

THE COURT: Uh-huh.

THE DEFENDANT: Exhibit B is for the phone. What I'm referring to as far as the affidavit, the exculpatory evidence, again, like I said is the actual devices of the alleged victim herself, that's number one. Number two, is a testimony to Michelle Fisher [phonetic], in regards to the intent of the Defense and why he went to go pick her up.

And what I'm getting at with that, is that, the intent was not to — and she repeated — well, let me, let me put it this way. The State's argument is basically this: Based upon the above information, probable cause existed that there would be emails and other electronic evidence showing conversations between the Defendant and the alleged victim in regards to their relationship, illustrating their planning or enticing of the alleged victim to leave her home.

Now this is the problem that I have that -- this is why I believe it to be exculpatory, is the fact that the testimony at the preliminary hearing, not

only that, but the testimony to Michelle Fisher of Child Haven where Officer Abbott did witness this -- according to the police report -- did witness this conversation that the alleged victim explicitly says that she was the one that goated the defense to pick her up. She was the one that was -- I don't want to use the word enticing, but it is actually the one that actually -- after repeated attempts, until finally she gets to the last statement like I already said is, "I'm going to kill myself." Okay.

And the Judge in the Justice Court, actually in his summation of the whole ordeal confirms that, and so, I believe that to be exculpatory evidence. And this was left out of the affidavits. And if you look at that and you really think about that because I'm -- the Defense is being charged with First Degree Kidnapping, which is a specific intent crime. Well, intent, we're talking about intent. What was the Defense's intent?

Now I know that the State is probably going to argue a different story, but if you look at the record, if you look at the preliminary hearing testimony. If you look at her own statement to Michelle Fisher of Child Haven, it's the exact opposite of what the State is claiming, and that's why I believe it to be exculpatory and in the Defense's favor.

THE COURT: Well, it sounds like we're getting a couple of things intermingled which is really the issue that, at least my notes indicate from what you raised was, whether or not there's probable cause for the, the warrant and --

THE DEFENDANT: Exactly. Well, and that --

THE COURT: -- you know and --

THE DEFENDANT: -- that's part of it.

THE COURT: -- you've raised some things that sound like they may be defenses at the time of trial. But, you know, as far as the probable cause, what the State indicates that gave rise to the probable cause for the warrant by the judge who ultimately signed off on the warrant, was that you had a victim that's undisputed that had been missing for a number of weeks. The mother to that victim did not know where she was. I mean, she's still a minor so the mom has the --

THE DEFENDANT: Well, Your Honor --

THE COURT: -- hold on - control over her because she's not either emancipated or an adult. She was found at your apartment and she indicated to police that she had communicated and started some kind of relationship with you via cell phone and computer, and that she had communicated with you on the day you picked her up and took her over to your residence.

So that's all the reasons for them searching the phone and the computer is, because she told them she was utilizing that type of contact with you.

THE DEFENDANT: They already had the best source of that information in their possession, so here's what I -- let a reasonable person -- anybody in this Court, if there were two people communicating, and you already had one of the devices that -- and again you're alleging there's some kind of leading or enticing to leave your home. And again, let me just kind of correct something here that, at this point she's not a victim, she's a runaway, Your Honor. And I -- you want to --

THE COURT: And that would --

THE DEFENDANT: -- characterize her as a victim --

THE COURT: -- go to

THE DEFENDANT: -- I mean the Court.

THE COURT: -- your defense, I'm sure.

THE DEFENDANT: You know she's, she's – she's a runaway, and she's a runaway having a life crisis. Okay. And so, I mean, without having to get into aspects of what will come up in the trial, basically what I'm trying to argue is that, if you look at those affidavits there's nothing in -- well, there's nothing in there that -- what could I say? If you look at say, if you say text messages. How is a text message -- just because two people have communication between each other, how is that indicative of a crime?

You know, yes, the fact is, the Defense was being charged with kidnapping, okay. Yes, the fact is that she was found there. Okay. And yes, and the fact is that the alleged victim and the Defense communicated, but that's all you can really conclude from that. You can't really jump from Point A to Point B and say, "Well, this is evidence of Kidnapping." I think that's a far stretch, Your Honor. That's a way far stretch.

THE COURT: Well, but in that – but that's a different issue whether or not there was probable cause for the warrant versus whether or not they'll be able to meet their burden of proof at trial. Because it sounds like you do have some defenses you, you may want to raise at the time of trial.

THE DEFENDANT: And the other issue, Your Honor, I, I -- what I really raised in this whole thing was the issue of. Okay. Total -- okay we're talking about probable cause, which is defined by the Court as the totality of circumstances or the factual content. Okay. The four corners of the affidavit, okay. Or what is fenced in by the affidavit. Okay. What is actually in the

affidavit? I'm being charged for items that were -- that were seized off my computer without a search warrant. And according to the State, they also searched my phone, and again, absent a search warrant for these particular items.

Constitution -- the Nevada constitute -- both the U.S. and Nevada Constitution describe what is probable cause supported by oath or affirmation. Okay, this is the first part of it. Probable cause supported by oath or affirmation, particularly describing the items to be seized and the place to be searched. Okay. So the items to be seized, I guess in question, would be the text messages. But again, Your Honor, how were those indicative of, of what the State is trying to claim of, of, of leading or enticing what is in direct contradiction to what the alleged victim said herself? That it was she who was the one who prodded the Defendant to do what he did.

THE COURT: But again, some of these are mixing apples and oranges.

And some of these may be defenses at the time of trial but they're not necessarily, you know, going to contest that there was probable cause to issue the warrant.

THE DEFENDANT: Well, I still feel --

THE COURT: I mean, you have to focus on everything. I mean, what were the facts known to the detectives or the officers when they presented the warrant to the judge? What was contained in there to make them believe that those items could have some evidence in this case?

THE DEFENDANT: Exactly my point.

THE COURT: You got to look at those. Hold on though, but it's different than doing a whole analysis of potential exculpatory or arguments back and

forth that you may have at trial.

THE DEFENDANT: Well, see this is my point though.

THE COURT: You're kind of comparing apples and oranges.

THE DEFENDANT: But you may say that Your Honor and I know you're the Judge, but again, may I just reiterate. When I talk about exculpatory evidence, if you've got the best source of what you're seeking already in your possession and you look in that phone, you look in that computer and you don't find anything, what reasonable person in this Court -- I dare ask, what reasonable person in this Court would say, "Hey, we're going to find that on the alleged -- on the Defendant's phone or on the Defendant's computer." This is my argument, Your Honor, and it's a good argument.

Because if you don't find it on the best source of that information, what would lead a reasonable person to believe it would be on the other devices? And this is why I say it lacked probable cause based on that, that common sense approach.

THE COURT: Okay. Is there anything else, Mr. Sprowson, before the State responds, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: I mean I have some other things that — well, in regards to the exculpatory evidence but, you know, like I said, I believe if that — if you put that into the mix — if you put that into the mix that it was not the Defendant that, that led or enticed the alleged victim to run away from home, but it was the exact opposite. And matter of fact the Defendant, and again, I know this is — you're saying is a trial issue, but we're talking about facts that should have been included in the affidavit. This is what I'm trying to get at.

THE COURT: Such as?

THE DEFENDANT: The judge would not have made that same decision if she'd have known that this was the facts.

THE COURT: If she had known that they had already looked at the victim's devices?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, yes.

THE COURT: Okay.

THE DEFENDANT: If -- that's what I'm trying to get at, is that you already have the best source of the information in front of you. What reasonable person would believe that it would be on the Defendant's or the Defense's computer? Or I should say cell phone. That's, that's the whole argument. If you don't have it on the, the best source of that evidence that you see – that you're seeking – remember you're seeking evidence of a crime, and so you had the best source already in your possession. Why would you need to get the Defendant's computer? Why would you need to get the Defendant's phone if you already have the best source in your possession, and it proved to have no criminal evidence on it at all?

THE COURT: Okay. Is there anything else, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: Well, that's my argument, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. By the State?

MS. BLUTH: Thank you, Judge. Judge, what the police needed to do is put in their affidavit the facts that they believed led to the probable cause to show that they could potentially find incriminating evidence on Mr. Sprowson's phone or his computer? I think the victim telling her mother and then ultimately telling the District Attorney, "Hey, this is how we met, we met on Craig's List. We communicated. We came up with a plan. He has nude pictures of me in

1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

various positions that he told me to get into. All of those things will be on his devices." I mean, that is more than probable cause that the police had. I know Mr. Sprowson keeps talking about exculpatory evidence. I -- I just don't think that that's the proper argument for a PC search warrant. I mean, I'm sure that that's something he will bring up at trial.

But, in regards to the information that the police had that they contained in their application for search warrant that the judge read, I think that they had more than enough and they contained the proper information that the judge needed on whether or not to make that judgment call. And I think that that was done and I'll submit it on my pleadings. I think that we argued enough in those.

THE COURT: All right. Is there anything else, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor, again, what's in question, again, I asked for a certain charge to be dismissed. Charges to be dismissed based upon some evidence that they said that that was before the detectives. Now I argue, and if you can see from the record that that evidence was not before the detectives. And I'm referring to photographs, certain photographs that they allege came off of the Defense's cell phone and allegedly came off the Defense's computer.

What I'm getting at in that regard is: Where in the affidavit is there a charge in relation to these items? Where in the affidavit – again, which is defense of the totality of circumstances before the judge, where does it say anything about photographs? Where does it say anything about any charges in relation to those photographs?

From my understanding, if you're going to search for items -- again,

according to the Constitution, particular description of items to be seized.

Okay. The items that were seized, did they have a search warrant for it? This is my problem. Did they have a search warrant for those particular items that they seized? And that's the problem that I have with both of the affidavits that it's lacking, that those items that they said that the alleged victim said would be there.

Again, if you look at the record, Your Honor, she specifically says that how did you – question by Judge Kephart -- if she knows how, how the police found out about these pictures. And Judge Kephart, when he asked her this, she explicitly replied, "They had his computer." Okay. So this is my problem is that they, they have the computer already and they obviously had to have searched it and obviously had to have seized those items, otherwise how would they have found those alleged pictures? And I say it that way just because of the trial issues.

Again, coming back to the phone, the same issue I already brought up in my, my motion and my response. Again, we have also issues of what we call forensics reports. If you look at the search and seizure return the, the -- what is it 179.095 requires that it be returned to the judge. And on the search and seizure return there's a 10 day period. Okay. So we're talking about a forensics report.

So again, the next issue that I have with this whole ordeal is there's absent a forensics report which would say that, "Hey, we found -- this one has to go before the judge." Look we found these items on the computer, okay. These are the items we have. The words forensics report doesn't say anything. And if that were to go before you, Your Honor, if it said "forensic report," what

would be the first thing that comes to your mind? What's in the -- forensics report? And this must be attached to the, the paperwork, and it must be sent back to the judge within 10 days and filed with the Clerk of the Court.

And so, again, that's my -- again, the other issue that I'm having is that -- if you're going to have a search warrant you need to include all the items that you're looking for, you know. And again, I think that's really all I have to say about the, the items.

THE COURT: Okay. Anything else? All right. I do agree with the judge. I think again there's some combining of apples and oranges. I think that there's some things you brought up today that clearly might be your argument at the time of trial as far as defenses to the State's claims; however, the issue is very precise what we're looking at today. And it's whether there was probable cause for the -- for the warrant for the, the phone and the computer.

I do agree that the lower court judge that signed the warrant, that there was, in fact, probable cause. Again, as I previously indicated, they did have information. They had a minor that was missing for several weeks. The minor did not have the permission of the adult parent to be gone. The minor was found at your residence and she told police that in the months leading up to her disappearance she had commuted and started a relationship with you via cell phone and computer.

She had also communicated to you on other dates via cell phone and computer. There was information from the victim in this case that there was photographs that were taken, and those photographs could be contained on your cell phone or computer so.

THE DEFENDANT: There's not any affidavit, Your Honor. This is my, my

whole point, none of that information was in the affidavit. So why am I going to be stuck with charges that they seized items that they were not entitled to seize --

THE COURT: But --

THE DEFENDANT: -- based upon the affidavit in front of them?

THE COURT: It's more general than that. They have to give their reasons as to why they believed that there was evidence, and those were all reasons why they would believe the evidence. I mean, frankly they don't know what's actually going to be on there until they get the warrant.

THE DEFENDANT: That's like putting the horse before the cart, Your Honor. But here's the other argument, and I don't know if you looked at my, my paperwork.

THE COURT: Uh-huh. I did.

THE DEFENDANT: But what I submitted to you, Your Honor. Another issue that I have is, the items that they're actually looking for are text messages and emails --

THE COURT: Uh-huh.

THE DEFENDANT: -- and particularly in reference to the computers.

THE COURT: Okay.

THE DEFENDANT: Now I, I have two computers. I also have a associate of applied science degree in electronic engineering technology --

THE COURT: Uh-huh.

THE DEFENDANT: -- so I know a little bit about this stuff, okay. They're referring to the items that they're seeking are emails. Okay. Emails are not kept on a personal computer unless actually saved. Okay. And this is what I'm

getting at, is that the items that they're seeking on the Defense's computers are on a database.

Now if you -- if you were so, so convinced that you have some kind of evidence in the form of emails, the best way to remedy that -- and this what's happened in my remand case as well, when I got remanded, is that, you would get a subpoena when you say, "Hey, look, you know what, let's get this, this -- get the email -- get the email records or let's get the text records from the subpoena." Why would you need the devices when you can actually just get a subpoena, get the actual text records and say, "Hey, look here's the items that we're looking for."

The same with the emails. The emails aren't kept on the computer, the emails are kept by the email service provider. So the best way to get the information that you're seeking – this is another problem that I'm having with it, is that they didn't have a problem. You're looking for items that are not even on the device that you're seeking to seize. Those items are --

THE COURT: Sir, okay.

THE DEFENDANT: -- are kept on a database.

THE COURT: At some point this hearing needs to end, okay. I, I understand that you disagree with my ruling, all right, but my ruling is what he is. And I've given you like five more minutes to sit there and talk a little bit more. So I disagree with your position. I do agree with the fact that the lower court judge found probable cause; I agree with that finding. So, at this point, it's over for the day. And we'll see you back at the next hearing or the next trial, or whenever the trial is, which is in June.

Is there anything else?

1	MS. BLUTH: No, Your Honor.
2	THE COURT: Thank you.
3	**********
4	[Proceeding concluded at 11:01 a.m.]
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	ATTEST: I do hereby certify that I have truly and correctly transcribed the
22	audio/visual recording in the above entitled case to the best of my ability.
23	Karry Sparry
24	Kerry Esparza, Court Recorder/Transcriber District Court, Department XXVI
25	District Court, Department 42/(V)

Electronically Filed 1/2/2018 10:45 AM Steven D. Grierson CLERK OF THE COURT

RTRAN 1 2 3 DISTRICT COURT 4 5 CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA 6 7 STATE OF NEVADA. 8 CASE NO. C295158-1 Plaintiff, 9 DEPT. NO. XXIII VS. 10 TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS MELVYN PERRY SPROWSON, JR., 11 12 Defendant. 13 14 BEFORE THE HONORABLE STEFANY A. MILEY, DISTRICT COURT JUDGE 15 MONDAY, MAY 16, 2016 16 17 STATE'S OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANT'S SIXTH MOTION TO CONTINUE TRIAL 18 19 APPEARANCES: 20 For the Plaintiff: JACQUELINE M. BLUTH, ESQ. Chief Deputy District Attorney 21 22 For the Defendant: MICHAEL R. YOHAY, ESQ. Deputy Public Defender 23 24 25 RECORDED BY: MARIA L. GARIBAY, COURT RECORDER

3

4

5

6

7

8 9

10

11 12

13

14

15 16

17

18 19

20

22

21

23 24

25

THE MARSHAL: Page 15, C295158.

THE COURT: There's Mr. Sprowson. Good morning.

THE MARSHAL: Sprowson.

THE DEFENDANT: Good morning, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. So this is -- good morning, Mr. Sprowson. So this is your motion to continue the trial and the State's opposition thereto.

MS. BLUTH: Good morning, Judge, Jacqueline Bluth on behalf of the State.

THE COURT: Okay. So how far did you want to continue it?

THE DEFENDANT: I'm looking anywhere from 6 to 8 months. And I have three points if I'm allowed. I just wanted to kind of reiterate in addition to what I've already stated in the motion. My biggest issue, Your Honor, is trying to get together with Mr. Yohay and go over the majority of this discovery. I know the State has said that they've given the discovery to me, but Mr. Yohay has the majority of the discovery. And what I'm talking about is the psychological evaluations. Not only that, but the State has also stated they have discovery on a CD. Well, Mr. Yohay has a CD, I don't. So the biggest problem that I'm having is getting the discovery so that I can actually develop more of a defense.

Secondly, Your Honor, in regards to the expert witnesses, I would like to have one for psychological evaluations and also for the forensics evidence.

THE COURT: Okay.

THE DEFENDANT: Now, I've been trying to save the Court cost and

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

having to fund that, and I've been trying to find the resources myself. This has been the biggest burden and I've been unsuccessful in that. And probably what I'm going to have to do is petition the Court for funding for that as well. Now, obviously it's going to take some time to do that. I'm incarcerated, I don't have computers. I don't have access to the courts like everybody else. So, you know, I'm not asking for any favors. You know, I'm at a disadvantage, but obviously I should have a little bit slack since I have to submit my mail to guards and it takes time to go through their process and then to get back to me. I'm -- you know, it's a really long process and it takes a long time. So I'm at a snail's pace. I'm happy to do it the old-fashion way.

Third, Your Honor, my last point is that in January, as far as -- well, I just want to back up, sorry. The State in their opposition states that I don't want to go to trial. Your Honor, I do want to go to trial, but I want to have a fair trial. And obviously, I'm defending myself. I'm not a professional. But I would like to at least to have the same opportunities that any professional would have. And that is memory having the discovery. Now, I've tried to negotiate with the State back in January. I haven't even received a counter offer. Now, I sent a copy to this Court, and also I sent a letter to Mr. Sweeting and it got to Ms. Bluth.

Now, if the State is trying to imply that I'm having a party in jail enjoying myself, I -- and it's absolutely absurd. I would like nothing more than to go to trial, but my bottom line is I want to be prepared and I want to be adequately prepared and I want it to be fair. And that's the only thing I'm asking. That's the main reason I'm asking for a continuance. I just barely picked up my own defense back in August. Now, considering that I'm having

to move out of snail's pace, and I've been in contact with Mr. Yohay. I've tried scheduling meetings with him, but that's also another difficulty for me trying to get my discovery and go through. And this was a Court ordered process, not mine. This was not my idea. So I'm going according to what the Court has ordered to go through Mr. Yohay. And I've been trying to meet with him when he's available, and that's been the biggest hurdle for me as well.

THE COURT: Okay.

THE DEFENDANT: Now, I submit to the Court, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. And by the State. I mean there were some continuances obviously, that because of your own personal situation.

MS. BLUTH: No, Judge, there wasn't. If you --

THE COURT: Well, no, he wanted to try this case a while ago and you were having the baby. I mean, okay, look here's the --

MS. BLUTH: No, he -- wait, if I can make a clear record though. He wanted to try it and Your Honor was going to continue it and I said I'll do it 9 months pregnant. We set it when I was 9 months pregnant and he asked for a continuance.

THE COURT: Okay, so hold on a second. Here's the reality. It probably is a lot more difficult being in jail and trying to get a case ready for trial than being out. So tell me why we cannot move it 6 months?

MS. BLUTH: Well, because the time before in November when he said he didn't want to continue it and I was willing to try it, we tried it. In November, he said he needed 6 months, the Court gave him 7. The time before that, he said he needed 6 months, we gave him 11 months. At some point, I have to quit calling the victim's family and saying this is going to get continued again. I

mean she was a minor when this case started. She's now graduated from high school and is an adult. I mean it is his choice to represent himself, I respect that. It's part of the process, but he can't keep using that as a crutch. I'm in constant communication with Mr. Yohay, who I believe is doing more than he needs to as standby counsel in order to effectuate some type of assistance to Mr. Sprowson, but at some point there has to be a firm set and that's what this was. And he has done nothing. The same thing he's asking for continuance now is the same thing he was asking 7 months ago.

So I feel like I understand what you're saying about my condition, but that actually wasn't true. I had been willing -- I've announced ready every single time and it's still never enough. So I'm just asking -- I mean I can tell Your Honor is inclined to grant this continuance, but at some point it's got to go. And I'm just asking that if you are inclined to grant his continuance, which I'm obviously again in the opposing, the next time it's going. And I mean I'm looking at my calendar and I know that from setting cases in here with Your Honor that there aren't even any openings I don't think until 2017.

THE COURT: There's not.

MS. BLUTH: And so I don't know what -- I mean what else to say. At some point he has to be ready to go to trial. And to say he doesn't have experts, I don't know what the last 7 months he's been doing. We have made -- we have literally made no progress. We've made none. And so I don't know if we need to do every month status checks for trial readiness or every 60 days, but I would just like to get this case moving.

THE COURT: Okay.

THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, may I say one --

THE COURT: You realize that you will be next year?

THE DEFENDANT: That's fine, Your Honor. And can I make my response to the State? The next court date that we set, I will not have any excuses. I will be ready to go.

THE COURT: Okay.

THE DEFENDANT: And, again, I would like to say and ask the Court for one thing. If you can at least, since I have to go through Mr. Yohay and this has been my biggest hurdle, can you place an order that I have firm dates with Mr. Yohay to meet with him so that it's not something like I'm waiting, I'm waiting, I'm waiting to get my discovery?

THE COURT: I can't 'cause, you know, I don't know what his schedule is like.

THE DEFENDANT: I mean this has been the biggest problem. I can't go to trial if I don't have my discovery.

MR. YOHAY: And I admit, Judge, part of the problem has been being able to get over to Mr. Sprowson. I mean I have -- I mean obviously, I have a lot of cases. And quite honestly, with him not being an actual client, he falls lower on the priority order than my actual clients that have, you know, court dates with prelims and everything else, so. I do have a lot of his discovery. And I understand his frustration and I actually share his frustration. It's difficult to get over there with, you know, I basically have a full banker's box worth of documents for him to review. I will certainly make every effort to, you know, to ensure that he has ample time to review his discovery.

THE COURT: Can you like -- since you have him here today, can you set a date, an upcoming date to sit down with him?

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. YOHAY: Sure, I'll do that as soon as the hearing is over, Judge.

THE COURT: Okay. So at least there's one day set.

MR. YOHAY: Sure.

THE COURT: 'Cause this was kind of weird because of the nature of a lot of the records involved.

MR. YOHAY: Right.

THE COURT: All right. So I'll give you the continuance, but the State is right to a certain extent. The case does need to move forward.

THE DEFENDANT: I agree, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I think you're already aware if you're going -- if you believe that you need to have money appropriate for your case then you've got to file a motion. So if that's what's going to happen, please get those on file as soon as

THE DEFENDANT: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: You are going to be next year for trial. I'm full this year.

THE DEFENDANT: I understand that.

THE COURT: Okay.

THE DEFENDANT: But, you know, like I said, I need the timing. Like I said, I've already stated the things I need to do. And because I am incarcerated it doesn't -- I can't do it in a day's time. It takes me time. As you see, I have to handwrite.

THE COURT: I got it. You expressed that already.

THE DEFENDANT: I have to handwrite each motion.

THE COURT: I understand.

THE DEFENDANT: You know, it's a lot of work.

1	THE COURT: I understand, sir. You've got your motion granted. So let's
2	give you a date.
3	THE CLERK: They're looking at March. [Indiscernible].
4	THE COURT: Okay.
5	THE CLERK: Okay. Calendar call March 15 th at 9:30; jury trial
6	March 20 th at 1:00 p.m.
7	THE COURT: All right. See you then.
8	THE DEFENDANT: All right. Thank you, Your Honor.
9	THE COURT: Thank you.
10	THE DEFENDANT: And I'd like to thank the State for bearing with me.
11	PROCEEDINGS CONCLUDED AT 10:07 A.M.
12	* * * *
13	ATTEST: I do hereby certify that I have truly and correctly transcribed the
14	audio/video recording in the above-entitled case to the best of my ability.
15	Jane of Garahau
16	Maria L. Garibay MARIA L. GARIBAY
17	Court Recorder/Transcriber
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

Electronically Filed 1/2/2018 10:45 AM Steven D. Grierson CLERK OF THE COURT

RTRAN 1 2 3 DISTRICT COURT 4 CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA 5 6 THE STATE OF NEVADA 7 CASE NO. C-295158-1 Plaintiff, 8 DEPT. XXIII 9 VS. 10 MELVYN PERRY SPROWSON JR., 11 Defendant. 12 13 BEFORE THE HONORABLE STEFANY MILEY, DISTRICT COURT JUDGE 14 WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 2, 2016 15 RECORDER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDING: 16 DEFENDANT'S PRO PER MOTION FOR DISCOVERY 17 APPEARANCES: 18 19 For the Plaintiff: JAMES SWEETIN, ESQ. Chief Deputy District Attorney 20 21 For the Defendant: MICHAEL R. YOHAY, ESQ. 22 Deputy Public Defender 23 24

1

RECORDED BY: MARIA GARIBAY, COURT RECORDER

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 2, 2016 AT 10:27 A.M.

3 ||

3 ||

THE COURT: Hi.

MR. SWEETIN: Hi, James Sweetin for the State.

THE COURT: Hi, Mr. Sprowson, good morning.

MR. SPROWSON: Good morning, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Good morning. So this is Defendant's Pro Per Motion for Discovery. I do have an opposition by the State. All right. So let me -- it looks like Defendant requests his aide be required to permit first request. Defendant to inspect and copy the original search warrant applications and affidavits and the search warrants themselves. I don't know that the State would even have these. They should have been filed.

THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, I did -- I did submit a response --

THE COURT: Uh-huh.

THE DEFENDANT: -- to the State's opposition. It was mailed out yesterday because -- actually I mailed it out last Thursday, but because of the Nevada State -- I guess Nevada Day on Friday --

THE COURT: Yes.

THE DEFENDANT: -- it didn't get to the Court until Monday.

THE COURT: Okay.

THE DEFENDANT: Or actually it didn't get to the Court till Tuesday. So I did file a response. And in that response I quoted EDCR 7.28. And I did graciously thank the State for reminding me that the documents that I'm requesting should be in the District Court, but I have additional arguments in regards to that.

1	And I am actually actually requesting from since this Court has
2	the authority to pull up those.
3	[Colloquy between Court and Clerk]
4	THE COURT: How many search warrants were there?
5	MR. SWEETIN: I'm sorry, Judge.
6	THE COURT: Was there more than one search warrant?
7	MR. SWEETIN: I believe there were three search warrants.
8	THE COURT: Okay. So particular specifically, which search warrant
9	are you wanting?
10	THE DEFENDANT: All three.
11	THE COURT: All three? So they should all be in the file. Okay.
12	[Colloquy between Court and Clerk]
13	THE COURT: Did you double check, are all three filed?
14	MR. SWEETIN: No, I didn't double check but
15	THE COURT: I didn't double check either
16	MR. SWEETIN: I believe.
17	THE COURT: and I probably should have. I'm sorry.
18	MR. SWEETIN: Yeah.
19	THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, if I if I may just say something for a
20	moment.
21	MR. SWEETIN: Of course.
22	THE DEFENDANT: The Justice Court record reflects there were no search

warrants. Judge Saragosa certified, in the amended bindover, the record as

correct and true. There were no search warrants in that record. The State said

that it was lost in the bindover. In order for something to be lost, Your Honor,

it has to be there in the first place.

THE COURT: Okay. So tell me this, have you received -- it sounds like you've received them because you're claiming there's discrepancies.

THE DEFENDANT: I have not received official copies. And two -- I have a third search warrant that has no official markings on it. The first two --

THE COURT: Tell me what you want --

THE DEFENDANT: -- like I've already marked out.

THE COURT: -- specifically.

THE DEFENDANT: Excuse me.

THE COURT: You want the three copies of the three search warrants, right?

THE DEFENDANT: I want -- I, I would like to see the originals of all three.

THE COURT: Those are going to be --

THE DEFENDANT: The reason why I would like to see the originals is because there are questions of: How many papers in connection are actually of it? For example, there's supposed to be a forensics report. I have not seen a forensics report. There should be a chain of custody report attached to it. There's no chain of custody report.

Other things such as exactly -- well, we say -- we're saying that there's three search warrants. Okay. So I, I want to validate there were actually three search warrants. I want to validate they were actually filed with the Court as required by 179.095.

THE COURT: The State's not going to have the originals and we're not going to be able to give you the originals.

THE DEFENDANT: Well, what, there's no documents?

THE COURT: I'm not saying there's no documents. Can you see the search warrant?

COURT CLERK: I haven't been able to find anything yet.

THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, according to NRS 52.260, the custodian of records can certify, through a certificate of custodian of records, that the record was made. If I could have that and have that filed with the Court that the record was actually made on the dates that they were supposed to be made, I would be satisfied.

THE COURT: What do you mean that they were actually filed with the courts on the date they were filed?

THE DEFENDANT: Yeah. The actually -- that they were active filed with the Court. That they were actually issued is my question. I, I question that. The State, again, how can they -- if they're not -- if the State says that they were lost in a binder, that's an implication that they were in the Justice Court files. Well, the Justice Court files were certified as true and correct by Judge -- the Honorable Judge Saragosa, as true and correct, and there's nothing in those files in regards to search warrants. This is why I, I keep being so incessant about the actual --

THE COURT: Well, hold on.

THE DEFENDANT: -- search warrants themselves.

THE COURT: Did you ever receive -- okay. Let me just go back to my original question. Did you receive copies of any search warrants?

THE DEFENDANT: I, I received -- I -- well I'm not going to call them search warrants. I received copies -- documents of something. I'm not going to admit that they're search warrants because that's my, my issue is that, I

don't believe they're search warrants. I believe that they, they are so suspicious in nature, that I would actually rather see the originals to actually validate that the record was even made.

THE COURT: I don't know -- you're not going to see the originals.

MR. SWEETIN: And he --

THE DEFENDANT: Well, how are we going to --

MR. SWEETIN: -- and he previously attached copies --

THE DEFENDANT: -- how are we going to confirm -- how are we going to confirm that the actual record was made.

THE COURT: I don't even have access to the originals.

MR. SWEETIN: Yeah, I think he previously attached file stamp copies of the --

THE COURT: In this --

MR. SWEETIN: -- search warrants to his previous documents.

THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, there's no signatures on that.

THE COURT: Okay. Hold on.

THE DEFENDANT: There's no official --

THE COURT: Hold on, please.

THE DEFENDANT: -- put anything on that.

THE COURT: I can only listen to one at a time, okay. I don't even have access to the originals. So by the State, Mr. Sprowson is saying there's three search warrants, okay. Did you provide -- do you -- can you tell in your discovery that was provided, whether he was given the three search warrants?

MR. SWEETIN: My understanding is -- and I believe in our opposition we reference that, in fact, they were attached as exhibits to his Motion to

Suppress.

THE COURT: Well, I saw that and he's saying those are different, they've been modified in some way, correct? What do you --

THE DEFENDANT: That's my, my issue.

THE COURT: -- what do you think it -- what are you using to compare to say that they've been modified?

THE DEFENDANT: Well, I, I -- well, Mr. Momot is my attorney. I received some copies from him, and then later on I received some copies from the State. Then later on I received more copies from the State. Now these copies are -- the problems that I'm having -- Your Honor, it's so easy to forge a document. I don't want to straight out say it. I don't trust the, the integrity of those documents. That's the bottom line.

And I would just like some kind of way with this Court. I trust this Court to validate that the record was even made. This is my problem. If you have no record of it in Justice Court, if you have no record of it even in District Court, then how can you validate that the record was made? Shall we just believe the State?

I mean, anybody can make up a document. I can go home on my computer and make up any document I want -- sign anything I want to it and call it an original.

THE COURT: I guess you could, but I don't really know why they would, and there's nothing to indicate that they did. So can you give him -- I'm not sure if you -- did you give him a discovery packet separate and apart from what Mr. Momot may have handed over?

MR. SWEETIN: I, I know there has been ongoing discovery in this case.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. SWEETIN: And I know that he has everything that we have.

THE COURT: Did you provide it? Or, you know, I know defense counsel's supposed to give everything over, but sometimes things get lost when they get handed from person to person.

MR. SWEETIN: Uh-huh.

THE COURT: So, did you guys give it to him separately? Because if you haven't, can you give him copies of the three search warrants?

MR. SWEETIN: Sure, I can do that.

THE COURT: So we make sure that he has exactly what the State has?

MR. SWEETIN: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. So they're going to --

THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, that, that does not satisfy the fact that --

THE COURT: Well, here's the deal. Well, I'm sorry if it doesn't -- I don't even have access to the originals. And as far as them getting filed, the clerk could care less what happens with this case. They merely take it, they file it, they scan it into the system; that's all that happens with it.

THE DEFENDANT: How can you validate a search warrant, Your Honor?

That – that's my question. I can go home and make up a search warrant and search your home and legally do it according to the standard --

THE COURT: I agree with you --

THE DEFENDANT: -- that you just said before me.

THE COURT: -- you can make up anything. There is no evidence in this case to say that anything's been fraudulent. I understand that perhaps you don't have some --

THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, there -- when you issue an order --

THE COURT: Okay, sir. There's no evidence presented other than what your -- other than your conjecture that there's anything that's been --

THE DEFENDANT: Should I subpoena --

THE COURT: -- modified --

THE DEFENDANT: -- Judge Baucum --

THE COURT: -- in this case.

THE DEFENDANT: -- and have her come in here because she supposedly's the one that --

THE COURT: You can do whatever the heck you want, sir; but I can tell you that I don't even have access to the originals. The only thing I can do on -- to err on the side of caution is to make sure you have what the State has, which is, so they're going to provide you, maybe for the first time, maybe again, a copy of the three search warrants in this case. Okay. What else do you want besides the search warrants?

Let's see you've put: Order requiring the State to subpoen the custodian of records for the Las Vegas Justice Court to appear for Defendant's direct examination, to submit an affidavit so Defendant can verify that his documents were authentic and filed with the Justice Court's as they were supposed to be.

The obligation to do your discovery is on you.

THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, according to EDCR 7.28, you do have access to those originals. You could pull them from the record. You have the authority to do that. In my response which I filed --

THE COURT: Okay, so let's move on from this. The request for the

originals is denied, okay.

THE DEFENDANT: On what basis, Your Honor?

THE COURT: I don't have access to them. Sir, there's no evidence to indicate, other than your conjecture and your allegations without support, that anything's been modified in this case. There's nothing. Okay.

THE DEFENDANT: There is no --

THE COURT: I agree with you --

THE DEFENDANT: -- judge's stamp with a signature.

THE COURT: -- that for any document in existence, there could be a modification at some point. There's just no proof of it in this case. There's absolutely no evidence. I do think that you're entitled to receive them and --

THE DEFENDANT: And I'm going to get --

THE COURT: -- to make sure you have them.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We're going to write --

THE COURT: I'm going to make sure the State give them to you, again, but the request is denied, so let's move onto the next request because I've got other cases this morning than just yours. So the next one is you want to subpoena the custodian of records for the Justice Court.

In general, the discovery -- the obligations to conduct your discovery is on you. And we went over that when you wanted to represent yourself.

THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, can I make one request?

THE COURT: If it's on the --

THE DEFENDANT: I filed --

THE COURT: -- first thing we discussed, no. If it's on the second thing,

yes.

|, 0.

THE COURT, Okay

THE DEFENDANT: No. I -- this is new .

THE COURT: Okay.

THE DEFENDANT: I filed a response, which I think should be part of this hearing. I had filed a response and it was delayed by the mail. It was delayed by the officers that I gave it to. I mailed it out on Thursday. It should have been here by now in front of you. It has important issues in that response. Can we continue this to next week, only because my response has not been heard? Their -- their response was 31 days late to my -- to my original motion. I think I should be at least granted the opportunity to have my response heard --

THE COURT: Is your response --

THE DEFENDANT: -- and on file.

THE COURT: -- on the same issues that are in your original motion?

THE DEFENDANT: They, they add to it. It's not -- it adds to -- there's additional arguments that I have made --

THE COURT: Well, you can have additional argument, you just can't expand the scope or it's a new motion.

THE DEFENDANT: Well, I responded to their -- I responded to their opposition is what I did. It's a response to their opposition, and I think it should be heard.

THE COURT: All right. Did you guys have a chance to review it? Did you see it yet?

MR. SWEETIN: We haven't -- I haven't seen it.

THE COURT: Okay. So we can continue it out for the response. We've already addressed number one though. It's going to -- the State's going to have

1	a chance to respond to that as well. They obviously have to read it, digest it,		
2	review it, et cetera. So, could we have it a couple weeks out?		
3	THE DEFENDANT: Well, the the other thing as far as today's issue,		
4	Your Honor, if I may.		
5	THE COURT: What on what, sir?		
6	THE DEFENDANT: Just the certificate of custodian of records. If I could		
7	have that, minimally, I would be satisfied. That's all I'm really asking for is to		
8	certify that the record was actually made. That's, that's a custodian issue		
9	THE COURT: So you want to certify		
10	THE DEFENDANT: which would be the clerk of the court.		
11	THE COURT: that someone actually received the search warrant and		
12	filed it?		
13	THE DEFENDANT: It's well, according to 52 point		
14	THE COURT: What is just tell me what you want.		
15	THE DEFENDANT: The certificate of custodian of records. The custodian		
16	of records		
17	THE COURT: One would have to be generated		
18	THE DEFENDANT: for District Court would be the clerk.		
19	THE COURT: so that's what I need to know.		
20	THE DEFENDANT: Excuse me?		
21	THE COURT: What would have to be I'm not sure exactly what you		
22	want.		
23	THE DEFENDANT: What on NRS 52.260 it's an affidavit.		
24	THE COURT: Uh-huh.		
25	THE DEFENDANT: It's an affidavit and it has the legal format		

THE COURT: I understand --

THE DEFENDANT: -- on NRS --

THE COURT: -- what a custodian of record's affidavit is. Tell me what you want it with regards -- what document do you want it --

THE DEFENDANT: The documents that I'm requesting that that record was actually made; that's all I'm requesting. And, and --

THE COURT: You mean that an -- a search warrant was actually generated?

THE DEFENDANT: From the custodian of records. It was actually filed with the Court. This is the problem that -- there's no record with the Court that the search warrant was filed. If, if there's no record with the Court, then what comes into suspicion is that a judge actually authorized it. This is where you're saying I have no legal grounds. Well, if you're not on file with the Court, how are we going to know that the judge actually issued the warrant? How are we going to know the judge actually authorized the warrant? It has to be returned within 10 days so the judge can file it with the clerk of the court --

THE COURT: So --

THE DEFENDANT: -- 179.195.

THE COURT: -- hold on. You want to make sure it's been filed with -- and honestly sitting --

THE DEFENDANT: That's all I want, Your Honor, simply is just to validate that the record was actually made. I think I, at minimum, I'm at least entitled to that, that the clerk of the court which would be -- I mean, the clerk of the court which is the custodian of records. Allegedly, it's supposed to be in the District Court. I already know that it wasn't with the Justice Court, because

the Honorable Judge Saragosa certified that it wasn't. I have the record.

THE COURT: Okay, so --

THE DEFENDANT: I have the register of actions.

THE COURT: -- stop for a second. The one thing I can tell you is, sitting here, there's a bunch of stuff on file. I don't have time to go back through and look for it. I would have to sit there and look at it. And I can do --

THE DEFENDANT: Yeah, I know but I've already examined --

THE COURT: Can I finish a sentence --

THE DEFENDANT: -- I have the register of actions.

THE COURT: -- please? I, I try to give you that same respect, but we can't make a record when we only have bits and pieces of sentences. What I said is, "I don't have time right now in court because there's a lot of documents filed in your case, so I will have to go back and look for the search warrant. I know Kathy was quickly trying to go through it, but there's just too much for her to be able to do that in court," okay? So I can look at that between now and then. I just want to make sure that I'm clear on what you're asking for. You want a custodian of records affidavit -- something to verify that it was in fact, filed with the Court, correct?

THE DEFENDANT: Right. And in accordance with NRS 52.260. They give a affidavit format -- the legal format on how it should be -- and all it says is that the record was actually made on or in such and such a date, and so on so for [sic].

THE COURT: Okay. So then let's continue it out for the State to look at your reply, and also for the State to respond if they want.

COURT CLERK: That'll be November 16th, 9:30.

1	THE COURT: Okay. And then make a note we need to go back and look	
2	for those to see where they're in in the record. All right.	
3	COURT CLERK: Okay.	
4	THE COURT: And Mr. Sweetin, thank you.	
5	MR. SWEETIN: Thank you, Judge.	
6	THE DEFENDANT: And Your Honor, I have one.	
7	THE COURT: Yeah.	
8	THE DEFENDANT: I filed another motion and that should have been filed	
9	on Monday.	
10	THE COURT: It didn't make calendar yet, so I don't know what hear	
11	THE DEFENDANT: Right, but it was indeed filed, right?	
12	THE COURT: Can I finish a sentence?	
13	THE DEFENDANT: Right.	
14	THE COURT: The reason is is, again, you'll there'll be an inadequate	
15	record in this case. I can't see that you filed a motion yet. When you get a	
16	hearing date it'll come up on calendar, and I don't know what date it is unless	
17	Kathy can see it right now.	
18	COURT CLERK: Nothing else has been filed	
19	THE COURT: So she can't	
20	COURT CLERK: other than this motion.	
21	THE COURT: She can't see it right now either, so it hasn't it takes a	
22	little while between the time it's, it's filed, to when I can see it on the	
23	computer. It's not instantaneous.	
24	THE DEFENDANT: Okay. And so the actual court date that I have for t	
25	continuance here is November what was that?	

District Court, Department XXVI

Electronically Filed 1/2/2018 10:45 AM Steven D. Grierson CLERK OF THE COURT

RTRAN 1 2 3 4 5 DISTRICT COURT 6 CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA 7 8 9 CASE NO: C-14-295158-1 THE STATE OF NEVADA, 10 DEPT. NO.: XXIII Plaintiff, 11 12 VS. 13 MELVYN PERRY SPROWSON, JR., 14 Defendant. 15 16 BEFORE THE HONORABLE STEFANY MILEY, DISTRICT COURT JUDGE WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 16, 2016 17 RECORDER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS 18 DEFENDANT'S PROPER PERSON MOTION FOR DISCOVERY 19 APPEARANCES: For the State: JACQUELINE M. BLUTH 20 **Chief Deputy District Attorney** 21 MELVYN PERRY SPROWSON, JR. For the Defendant: 22 In Proper Person Stand-By Counsel: MICHAEL R. YOHAY 23 Deputy Public Defender 24

RECORDED BY: MARIA GARIBAY, COURT RECORDER

25

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 16, 2016, AT 10:12 A.M.

THE MARSHAL: Page 3, C295158, Sprowson.

THE COURT: Good morning, Mr. Sprowson.

THE DEFENDANT: Good morning, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Good morning, Mr. Sprowson.

All right; by the State. This is Mr. Sprowson's continued motion for discovery.

MS. BLUTH: I spoke to Mr. Sweetin, who was here last time, and he wanted to give Mr. Pop -- excuse me, Mr. Sprowson certified copies of search warrants, which I believe was his request, and so Mr. Sweetin went downstairs to the clerk's office and got those copies made, and they are certified, so I could give those to Mr. Yohay, and Mr. Sweetin just asked that they sign and acknowledge, but those are certified copies that Mr. Sweetin personally received from the clerk's office, Judge.

THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, I'd like to object, please, because I did not -- I asked for -- the statute is NRS 52.360 paragraph A. There is a statutory form that is actually required -- my initial complaint is because this is what I have issues with. Now, the thing is in my motion, I requested --

THE COURT: What exactly are you objecting to?

THE DEFENDANT: -- and I have it here for the Court the actual statute with an example of what I've actually requested, if I may give this to the bailiff to show you what I've actually requested in my motion. It's 52.260 -- 2-6-0, right.

THE COURT: Show Ms. Bluth first.

MS. BLUTH: You talking to me? Oh, yeah, the statute.

MR. YOHAY: Okay.

THE COURT: Where's Jason?

Okay. So you're showing me the statute. Why are you showing me the statute?

THE DEFENDANT: Because I'm asking for certificates of custodian of records which would be the clerk. Now, they keep giving me the certified copy thing, which is fine and dandy, but what I'm requesting is that the record was actually made, and this is the actual form -- statutory form that says certificate of custodian of records that the EDCR designates the clerk of the court as the custodian of records; so, simply what I'm asking for is in accordance to 52.260, I would like to have this affidavit filled out by the clerk stating that the record was actually made, attached to the actual document.

THE COURT: Have you read NRS 52.125, which indicates that certified copies of public records are admissible, substantively?

THE DEFENDANT: I'm asking for an affidavit --

THE COURT: I understand what you want, but I mean here's the thing. When we did the *Faretta* canvass, I understand there's certain limitations you have being in the detention center, and I understand that it makes it a lot more difficult to conduct discovery and everything else, but there's things that the State is required to do and things that perhaps the Court is required to do, but this, whether you want that custodian of records affidavit, that would be entirely up to you, and it's not required under the statutes, because it is in fact a certified copy, which means it would have -- be admissible on its own. So I don't understand what you want. It sounds like you want to have the State go out and do the discovery you think needs to be done, and that's just not going to happen; and so let me skip back. You know, I understand there's been a lot of stuff, and we've had multiple hearings about this, about the -- about the search warrants, and there's been three search

23

24

25

warrants, and you made some representations at the last hearing that, how do you know Ms. Bluth didn't go home on her home computer and type up these search warrants? I guess anything is possible in the world, but there's nothing to indicate that that happened. What does -- what it does indicate -- the court records indicate is that there was a search warrant, three search warrants that were issued. They were, in fact, filed with the court in a timely manner. I understand that you've made some concerns about the fact that at the very top right-hand corner in each of these where it says the date it was filed, as well as it was filed in the Justice Court of Las Vegas, Nevada, that there is no signature. In my experience and based upon talking to the clerk's office, there is no requirement, and there's -- and you've cited none in the statutes that indicate there has to be a corresponding signature on the upper right-hand corner; but what there is in each of the three -- in each of the three search warrants is all three of them are, in fact, signed by a judge. They're signed by Susan -- Susan Baucum, who is a justice court judge, okay. All three of them are certified. Albeit they may be copies of the original certified document, they are, in fact, certified documents; so I'm not really sure what you're looking for. You made representations that these are different than copies that you may have been provided by the state. However, you haven't provided any copies of what you say is different.

Well, we went back and looked. These are the only three search warrants, and they appear to be the same three search warrants that were provided to you by the State; and when I say the ones I'm holding up are ones that were obtained from the vault. The ones in the vault are the exact ones the State has provided to you; so quite frankly I don't know what you're talking about.

The only thing I can figure out, and all -- let me just say again, all these search

warrants are contained in the district court vault. Now where there may have been some confusion, and we can only speculate as to what happened is they're not contained in the justice court file, and the best I could figure is that perhaps they were filed because there is evidence that they were filed, and there's no evidence indicating this file stamp is fraudulent, and perhaps they were scanned into the wrong case; but, ultimately, they are in the district court case. They are -- we have copies in the vault, so I really don't know what you're talking about, honestly.

THE DEFENDANT: Well, I want to make two requests. First, Your Honor, I would like to object to your initial ruling not to allow me to view the originals.

THE COURT: I don't even have the originals, sir.

THE DEFENDANT: Well, I have -- on the grounds --

THE COURT: I mean the problem is is once those are taken --

THE DEFENDANT: I haven't stated the grounds, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Once -- I know, but once those are taken in, I have no ability -- I cannot give you original documents. I don't have access to the originals. You know what I have are copies of the originals.

THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, this is what -- and I need to object. I object on the grounds of EDCR 7.28, and I will go ahead and read it to you --

THE COURT: I don't need for you to read it to me. I need for you just to get to the point.

THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, this is an objection I'm making. I'm legally entitled, for the record, to make an objection and the grounds of my objection, and I would like to read it into the record.

THE COURT: I don't need for you to read the statute, okay?

THE DEFENDANT: But, Your Honor, I have a legal right to read it into the

record.

THE COURT: I understand, sir, but just tell me -- you don't have -- you don't need to read the statute into the record. I have the statute, and you've provided in your motions, okay; so tell me how the statutes apply to your argument, please.

THE DEFENDANT: Well, the bottom line is I'm requesting the originals, and I've stated several reasons on why, that there are questions about anticity [sic]. Now I've raised those issues. Now, obviously, under your discretion, you have reviewed them not -- there's questions --

THE COURT: You say there's questions as to authenticity, but I need specifics, because you keep saying that the copies the State are providing to you are different than copies you have. However, I don't have the copies you allegedly have that are different from the State; so as I sit here, you've given me nothing in order to be able to make an educated ruling, 'cause everything I have, the things that are in the vault, are the same as what the State as provided you. There's just nothing that you're giving as support for your arguments, other than just conjecture.

THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, if I may read EDCR 7.28 --

THE COURT: I don't need for you to read it.

THE DEFENDANT: -- paragraph C.

THE COURT: I need for you to get to the point.

THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, Your Honor, I have a right to --

THE COURT: I need -- no, stop --

THE DEFENDANT: -- state this.

THE COURT: You have a right to make a record.

THE DEFENDANT: By stipulation of the parties, I have stipulated and requested the originals, Your Honor. It says it right here. That's the --

THE COURT: Well, your request for the originals is going to be denied --

THE DEFENDANT: That's what EDCR 7.28 --

THE COURT: -- because of what you've given me. Again, let me go back. Your request for the original I'm assuming is premised on the fact that you believe that what's in the vault is different than what the State's given you, but you've provided nothing to indicate that there's two different documents, so if you have these warrants that are supposedly different, absolutely that is important, but where are they?

THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, --

THE COURT: Where are they?

THE DEFENDANT: -- my objection stands on EDCR 7.28 paragraph C, models, diagrams and exhibits of material forming part of the evidence taken in a case may be withdrawn by order of the court in the following manner: By stipulation of the parties, one. Number two, by motion made after notice to the adverse party. Now I've done both of those, and I'm also requested -- this is not based upon my initial argument of question about anticity [sic], I am questioning -- I want to see the originals. I have a legal right to see the originals. Your Honor, you're limiting your own power by not -- 'cause you have the -- like you stated, you have the authority to issue a special order to call up that record. I've asked -- actually asked to actually even directly examine the clerk of the court that the record was made. Now these are not -- these are not difficult things to do. All I want to do is validate, because the things that I have before me, sure the Court can say all they want about these, but I want to see the actual, original documents so that I can view them and then also have the affidavit which would attach -- the affidavit is supposed to be attached to these actual documents that that way I know the clerk of the court is saying that

these documents I actually --

THE COURT: Then that's discovery you need to conduct, sir.

THE DEFENDANT: -- pulled up and copied.

THE COURT: It's not discovery for me to conduct for you, nor is it discovery from the State, and where I keep going back to is --

THE DEFENDANT: I've requested --

THE COURT: Hold on. You're --

THE DEFENDANT: -- from the Court, and they keep telling me --

THE COURT: -- argument is of relevance to the extent of you say that the warrants are different in some way. The ones that are contained in the vault as originals versus what you've been given. That's what you've said at multiple hearings that they're different, and that is a valid argument for someone to make. However, it's nothing more than conjecture. You've given nothing to indicate that what you're saying is in fact the case. You supposedly have something that's different, so I don't understand where your inability is to provide what's different so that there can be a comparison made. That's all I'm asking for. You have to give more --

THE DEFENDANT: I understand that, Your Honor.

THE COURT: -- than just conjecture.

THE DEFENDANT: I understand that, Your Honor, but again, also, I'm still referring to EDCR 7.28, where if I request from the Court, which I've requested from the Court to view the documents based on EDCR, paragraph C, section 1 and 2, and -- I'm asking --

THE COURT: Okay.

THE DEFENDANT: -- based upon that, because you have the power to issue

8 9

a special order for me to actually view the originals, and it doesn't have to be based upon a question of authenticity in that case. This is EDCR 7.28. This is your own power to issue a special order is to do that, and that's my request. I've actually already filed a motion that I requested the originals to the State and this Court; so, you know, my request is not a very difficult one. I simply just want to have the clerk verify in an affidavit that one, that the document that that affidavit is attached to, that this is the record, and that it was made on such-and-such date, according to the statute, NRS 52.260. That is the request for a custodian of record.

THE COURT: And how -- how do you suppose --

THE DEFENDANT: This is my request based upon EDCR 7.28.

THE COURT: And how are you supposing to obtain the affidavit, 'cause remember, I'm not an arm of your case. I mean, I'm not going down -- go out there and do discovery.

THE DEFENDANT: I understand that, Your Honor. It says that it's done through subpoena. Now since I am incarcerated, I have requested this Court to subpoena the clerk on my behalf.

THE COURT: No, you have to issue the subpoena, sir.

THE DEFENDANT: Well the thing is I have to request through the district court to actually issue the subpoena, so.

THE COURT: Okay. So, there are several other things. So you've asked for the original. You've indicated why you want the original, but you've not really given - all right, and you've made a lot of other representations, so one of the things, again, you set forth in your motion was defendant has copies of the warrants which are different, and I've asked multiply different ways. Where are the copies that you indicate are different?

THE DEFENDANT: I have -- I have them in my files.

THE COURT: Okay, so we've had multiply hearings at this point --

THE DEFENDANT: This is the second one.

THE COURT: -- and the State has denied that there is -- the State's position is that there's three warrants. The warrants are what they are, and that there's no other differing warrants stemming from this case. You indicate something different, but today, no one's seen it; so I have no ability to compare anything to see if what you have is perhaps different than what's in the court record.

THE DEFENDANT: Okay, so, basically, you want me to subpoen to get the affidavit from the clerk. Now, I've tried that, and the clerk tells me -- keeps giving me a round-around on all of that issue, so, you know, --

THE COURT: Okay, but again, on the warrant issue --

THE DEFENDANT: -- I just keep going in circles here.

THE COURT: -- you say you have it in your housing, so you have the different one. Why haven't you just provided it, because it seems like it would be easy? Attach it to everything, and we could compare, and I absolutely would if I had the documents, but you haven't provided it.

THE DEFENDANT: Well, I'll probably have to follow up on that, Your Honor, because I was -- like I said, I'm trying to go step-by-step. You know, like I said, there's several reasons -- or several things that I actually stated in my motion in regards to that. You know, I simple wanted to -- I listed several things. I wanted to get -- first of all to be able to view the originals. According to the State, justice court didn't have it. Well, these copies that they're giving me strangely enough came from justice court. Now, when I originally asked for justice court, they said, well, it's in district court.

THE COURT: They didn't come from justice court. My guess is they were filed in the justice court, --

THE DEFENDANT: Right.

THE COURT: -- and I've already indicated to you what we've been able to see is they're not in the justice court record, but they are in the district court vault, which means they are in this case.

MS. BLUTH: May I explain something to Mr. Sprowson, on our jurament? THE COURT: Yeah, no; that's fine.

MS. BLUTH: So -- and I'm happy to give him this set, because I think the original that he received was a copy, but this actually has the embossment, and he can feel it. This is what the clerk did. This is how he knows it's actually from the clerk's office, and so, and we can explain to him, you know, the clerk's office, but they went; they got the copies from the vault; they embossed it; so he knows it's a certified copy from the exact clerk, and I'm happy to give him this original copy that I have, --

THE COURT: That would be great, because that's more than what I have.

MS. BLUTH: -- and then maybe we can put this to rest, and every -- every single one of the three, here's my -- my copy was the originals with the embossment, but I'm happy to give them over so he knows these are absolutely certified from the clerk herself.

THE COURT: They're certified copies?

MS. BLUTH: Yes; it's certified copy with the clerk's embossment, --

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. BLUTH: -- which is better than an affidavit. It's actually her signature and the embossment. He can check them.

THE COURT: Well that's more than what I have. I just have copies.

Okay, so let's go through the other things. So, again, on the copies that are different, you need to provide additional documentation. Now you have the certified ones, so the -- basically they're indicating those were -- came directly form the vault. The other thing we talked -- I talked about already, is you've represented there's no judge's stamp. There is. There is a signature by Judge Baucum on each of the three warrants. What additional issues are you having with that?

THE DEFENDANT: Okay, Your Honor, I'm satisfied for now, but I'm still -- THE COURT: Okay.

THE DEFENDANT: -- going to pursue this. I just want to say my original objection still stands. I still would like to see, you know, the actual originals.

THE COURT: Okay, well let's --

THE DEFENDANT: You know, I had this problem because of this. I mean, obviously, this is what you're going to provide to me, so I'll have to follow up on this.

THE COURT: All right. So you brought up a lot of sub-issues on this. Does that mean they're moot, or do we need to go through them, because it was the judge's stamp, which I -- as I indicated, if you look at those, on every single one of them, there's a signature from Judge Baucum. The lack of clerk's signature, as I indicated to you, that everyone of them does indicate that it was filed with the justice court where it needed to be filed, and all those file dates indicate that they are timely, so the only thing I can figure out is you're having an issue with the fact there's no clerk's signature on the upper right-hand corner on the stamp, and there's just not a requirement that they have to sign it, and ordinarily they don't. And then the other one it's the lack of papers in connection what you're saying that there's certain things were not contained within the warrant -- or contained within what was

6

7

9

12 13

11

15

14

16 17

18

20

19

2122

23

24

25

filed on the warrant. However, it looks like what you're saying should be there is not statutorily required to be there, which is the forensics report and a chain of custody form, because everything else indicates that the statutory requirements, which are the application, affidavit of warrant, and the page consisting of the warrant return and the inventory, it looks like those are all attached to the warrant, so what specifically are you looking for there?

THE DEFENDANT: Well, this says papers in connection -- papers in connection, -- forensics report, it says that it's supposed to be there. The forensics report is listed. This is -- if you look at a search and seizure return, you're the Judge, I just suggest a -- a scenario. You're the Judge; you issue a search warrant; you have a search and seizure return. It says these are the things that were actually obtained in the search warrant, okay. In the warrants, it says forensics report. Now that would tell you absolutely nothing, because if you look at the forensics report, it doesn't really tell you what was actually seized, and so when you have a forensic report, it is a paper in connection, and it should be attached to the search warrant, because it tells you exactly what was seized, and this is how you're able to -- the judge is able to say, okay, you know, this is what you requested; this is what you wanted to look for the search; the search and seizure return shows what was actually obtained, and a forensics report, that's why that should be attached to the papers in connection. The chain of custody, obviously, if you've got evidence, and you're saying, that look, I put it here, I put it here and to this person, I should also have a chain of custody form that says who it went to from this person to this, this person, and this person. See, the search issue of searching that they've actually seized evidence, this evidence -- I know from a forensics report, that custody -- the chain of custody I may -- I may not be correct about, but I would assume that that

would be something that would be included, simply because you have evidence involved; and what you're saying is, look, I'm putting the evidence here. This person handled it. This person handled it, and this person handled it, and in order to verify that, that document should be at least with the search and seizure return, because it's in regards to the evidence. Now, I may not be correct about that, but the forensic report still should be before the judge, so that -- where the judge can actually see what was actually seized.

THE COURT: Okay. So I'm going to let the State respond, because looking at it, I'm looking at NRS 179.095, and it does appear that everything that is statutorily required to be included is in fact included. Does the State have any additional information?

THE DEFENDANT: Well, as a general statement -- oh, I'm sorry.

MS. BLUTH: Well, I'm just kind of confused at what forensic report he would like attached, because at the time of the search warrant, there's obviously -- there is no forensics done, right, so they just grab the things; they search and then they seize; and then anything thereafter, they do forensic -- if they do like a cell phone dump or a computer dump, then a report is generated, which has been done in this case, and which was provided; but you would never be able to have a forensic report attached with the return or attached with a search warrant, because none would have even been able to have been done by that point.

THE COURT: I know that --

THE DEFENDANT: Well, it says forensics report.

THE COURT: It sounds like what you want's the inventory.

THE DEFENDANT: Well, it just -- I mean, let me go to the case so I can offer these --

THE COURT: Sure.

THE DEFENDANT: -- make my point. Okay, it says the following is an inventory of property taken pursuant to the warrant: I-Phone 4 forensics report. Okay, now if a forensic report is the inventory, I should be able to see the forensics report, because, look, if you're the judge, look, if I'm a judge, and I'm reading this: I-Phone forensics report, I still have no idea of what you actually seized. I mean, he says forensics report. It says the following is an inventory of property taken pursuant to the warrant: a forensics report. It just seems awful odd to me, Your Honor. You would at least have what is contained in a forensics report, because this -- and it's not -- a search warrant is issued -- is issued and executed one day. It's filed another, so there's a time period within that. You have enough time to actually get a forensic -- well, of course, the way this is indicated, that it is -- a forensic report was done and that's the inventory.

MS. BLUTH: No. So, I understand what the confusion is. So the search warrant says that you can -- so it can search and seize, so we can grab the phone, and then we can -- he doesn't have to do a piggy-back warrant to then search the phone. So, this paper gives them authority to take the phone and then later run a separate search on the phone and not have to do a second search warrant to search it, so later a report will be generated; and, of course, at this point, it's already been generated, and it's already been given to Mr. Sprowson, so I see what the confusion is, because it does say the inventory would be taken would be the, like, for instance, on the other one, which is the computer -- computer forensics reports. That's just so they don't have to do a separate search warrant. This includes the computer itself, seizing it, and then later searching it, and then we have an obligation to turn that over, which we've done, so maybe that will clarify.

THE DEFENDANT: What has been turned over, Your Honor? I have not received any forensic report at all. I have not received any chain of custody; and then I may have to follow up with a discovery motion in regards to those. My main issue is if I had the forensic report to begin with, I probably wouldn't have brought all this to the Court in the first place, and --

THE COURT: Okay, so --

THE DEFENDANT: -- that's what the initial question was.

THE COURT: -- I don't have the discovery the State gives you, so the state indicates that it was provided. Was it provided in the initial discovery that was given to him?

MS. BLUTH: Correct, and Mr. Sprowson said he needed an expert. That's why our trial was continued. He needed an expert to go through those reports with him.

THE COURT: Do you perhaps have it?

THE DEFENDANT: I've -- I never received a forensics report. I never received a chain of custody, either.

MS. BLUTH: Those are what's on those disks.

THE DEFENDANT: Yohay gave me nothing but pictures on it, and he said --

MS. BLUTH: So, because Mr. Sprowson is his own attorney, and because he's incarcerated, and because those reports have images of a child in sexual positions on them, he has to -- he can only do that with Mr. Yohay at the jail or wherever the Court deems fit for them to do, and so that's what he has. He can't give you those --

THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, I'd like to object when she said sexual positions.

MS. BLUTH: Those are the charges. I mean, he can't object to the charges.

THE DEFENDANT: I'm still objecting to her statement on sexual positions.

THE COURT: So is there -- other than --

THE DEFENDANT: That's -- that's for a trial -- a jury to decide.

THE COURT: Other than photographs -- okay; other than photographs that may have been obtained, is there a separate report discussing anything that was obtained off the computer and the phone that would be something that could be printed out for him, because the disk, I'm guessing, Mr. Yohay's taking them back and forth. He's not probably leaving them with the jail.

MS. BLUTH: Because it's so voluminous, it's on the disk. I can see how many pages, and if I could print it, I'd have to remove the images.

THE COURT: Can you -- Okay, so --

THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, the only thing indicated to me that's on that CD, and Mr. Yohay is here -- we can ask him -- are the -- are images that were taken of my apartment, and there are also some other images that are in regards to the charges that I'm being charged with, which is what the State is talking about. I'm talking about documentation, a forensics report --

THE COURT: I understand what you're talking about.

THE DEFENDANT: -- may I just say something for a second, Your Honor. I just need --

THE COURT: No, please. You're taking up like my whole calendar, and I think we can speed it along, --

THE DEFENDANT: I just have one other thing to say, Your Honor.

THE COURT: -- because you bring up the same thing at every hearing, sir.

Tell me exactly what you want. So there is photographs. I haven't seen the

discovery. There's photographs and it sounds like other items, or did you just see photographs?

THE DEFENDANT: Photographs are not a forensics report is my point.

THE COURT: Okay. I get that, so I get that; so, obviously, the photographs can't remain at the jail for a multitude of reasons, but it sounds like everything else that may be on there probably could be printed out and given to you. That way you can have custody of it at the jail, and you can look at it at your leisure. Is that what you want?

THE DEFENDANT: Mr. Yohay has already provided that, and it's only pictures.

THE COURT: Okay.

THE DEFENDANT: This is what I'm saying is I still do not have a forensic report. Forensic report is not going to be a set of photographs. A forensic report --

THE COURT: She's saying she has it. She's saying there is a separate -- if I'm hearing her correctly, she's saying there's photographs and there's a separate forensic report. She's saying, though, it's all on the CDs, or that whatever you gave him, zip drive. I don't know what you gave him.

MS. BLUTH: I'll print it. Let me see if I can print it. We're here on Monday.

THE COURT: Well, just print it.

MS. BLUTH: We're here on Monday, and I'll bring it.

THE COURT: How about -- would that work?

THE DEFENDANT: If I get -- if I get the forensics report, that will at least be able to tell me what was actually seized, and that would have to be done by an official forensic expert, obviously.

THE COURT: All I can say is at this point, 'cause I don't have the discovery,

is, Ms. Bluth --

MS. BLUTH: Yes, Judge.

THE COURT: -- is it possible to print everything separate and aside from the photographs so that he can have them at the jail and look at them at his convenience?

MS. BLUTH: I believe so. I just don't want to be caught in a statement when then I'm later unable to do so. I'm going to go back and do this right now. Normally, the forensics report, there's like a base to the report, and then there's all the supporting documents. I'll see if I can just print the base, which I don't see why I wouldn't be able to, and I'll bring that to Mr. --

THE COURT: Would the supporting documents be the photographs themselves?

MS. BLUTH: So it just shows like all incoming text messages, all outgoing text messages, all incoming pictures, all websites he ever searched. I mean it's like -- it can be thousands and thousands of pages. That's why they always do it on disks, but the actual report itself which talks about how extractions are done, that can be printed, what type of software they use, the expert's information, and we have noticed an experts in our expert notice, so I will get -- I will get that, and I'll be here on Monday.

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. BLUTH: I believe we have a motion for jurisdiction on Monday on calendar.

THE DEFENDANT: The 28th.

THE COURT: I don't think it's Monday.

MS. BLUTH: Oh, the 20th, okay, so two.

25 |

THE COURT: That's a holiday, mm-hmm. Okay, so do you want to start with that so she can print out whatever she can print out, separate and aside from those pictures?

THE DEFENDANT: Well, the State has said that they've already given this information to Mr. Yohay. Now, I've seen no -- she's stating -- I don't know if I'm correct -- that that report was not included in the CD?

THE COURT: I think she was saying it was on the CD --

THE DEFENDANT: That it's just the photographs? She's saying --

THE COURT: -- in addition to the photographs.

MR. YOHAY: And, Your Honor, if I could just make some representations. What I did is when I received the CD, I gave them to our IT department, basically told them print everything off the CD, and I took those; I went through; I separated out the pictures that I believed that the Court would find inappropriate for him to have at the jail. I separated those out, and I sent everything else to him, so I honest -- I can't remember exactly what everything was. I know the majority of it was pictures, but --

MS. BLUTH: In an effort to move it along, I'll be happy to do it.

THE COURT: Perfect. Okay, so can you get it to him? Well, you want to give it to him at the next hearing, or --

MS. BLUTH: Mr. Yohay, what's the easiest way to do it?

MR. YOHAY: You can send it to me.

MS. BLUTH: Okay.

MR. YOHAY: You can just email it to me if that's easier.

THE COURT: Because that way, he has over the next week to look at it, and

MS. BLUTH: Sure.

THE COURT: -- then the next hearing we know what you have.

THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, just because you're giving it to Mr. Yohay doesn't mean that I'm going to get it. If Mr. Yohay --

MR. YOHAY: I'm going to probably go over and meet with him on Friday, so.

MR. BLUTH: That would be great.

THE DEFENDANT: Well, I mean if that's going to be solid and firm, because I mean I have had representation that I'm going to meet -- I'm going to meet, going to meet him, and I never meet him. Obviously, I'm already at a disadvantage, Your Honor. I need this stuff so I can have my defense ready for trial.

THE COURT: I recognize that. I agree with you.

THE DEFENDANT: Okay, and I know this --

THE COURT: So, hold on. Get to the point. How would you like for it to be brought to you, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: Well, if she wants to produce it to me or give it to me, it's all right. Give it to me on the 28th, that would be fine, but --

THE COURT: Okay.

THE DEFENDANT: -- again, it may not be what I'm actually looking for, and again, it may be subject to certain things, because, you know, forensic report, I have some --

THE COURT: Got it. How do you want it? You want it delivered to you on the 28th versus Mr. Yohay bringing it? Is that --

THE DEFENDANT: In court, 28th, at that hearing would be fine for me at this point.

THE COURT: Okay, so she'll bring it to you then. Okay.

MS. BLUTH: Sounds good.

THE COURT: So, let's see, the last issue you brought up was the warrants do not indicate inappropriate photos, and the State's response's basically is they're kind of in a catchall in that they're searching everything on the computers and that the photographs would have been something that would have come up while executing the search warrant. So what exactly is your issue?

THE DEFENDANT: Well, is that the photographs?

THE COURT: Yeah. They're saying they were basically in plain view when they were looking for everything else on there.

THE DEFENDANT: I'm not sure what you're saying, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay, so -- oh, this is your motion. You say none of the warrants are for inappropriate pictures, specifically. Rather they are for data and computers.

THE DEFENDANT: I guess that's on the State's opposition. That's not what I did.

THE COURT: Well, we've had this a few times. Is there anything else? Let me just say it like this. Let's see, you said there's a question of how many warrants are on file. Is that still an issue? We show three.

THE DEFENDANT: Well, three; that's actually -- yeah, that satisfies that.

THE COURT: Okay. And then there was argument about the State's opposition was late, and I don't recall whether it was or wasn't. This has been on a few times, but assuming it was, where's the prejudice? We're trying to get you everything that you believe you need.

THE DEFENDANT: Well, EDC -- it was based on EDCR 3.20, and they filed their opposition 31 days after I filed -- I filed my motion September 20th.

THE COURT: Okay.

THE DEFENDANT: They filed their motion -- was it October 21st, if I recall correctly. I have the dates actually in the motion.

THE COURT: So what remedy are you asking for?

THE DEFENDANT: The point is is that there's supposed to be a seven-day return. That was the whole issue with my response, because they filed their opposition so late. This is why I asked for the continuance is because I filed a response. The response was delayed and I tried to get it to the Court in a timely fashion, 'cause I wrote my response in a timely fashion, as well, --

THE COURT: Uh huh.

THE DEFENDANT: -- and because it was 31 days late, you know, I really didn't have a turn-around, but you did give me a continuance, and I did receive some relief from filing that, but my -- the statute, and I should say the court rule says seven days, Your Honor. I just hope that they would respect -- would at least honor that so that I can file whatever I need to in a timely fashion. You know, I also requested several other things in that motion, Your Honor.

THE COURT: We're trying to go through everything.

THE DEFENDANT: I know, Your Honor.

THE COURT: So, really, what -- are you asking for any remedy?

THE DEFENDANT: As far as the -- well, you've already given me relief.

THE COURT: Okay.

THE DEFENDANT: I have my response before you. I'm hoping that you read it. I did direct my request towards you, instead of the State.

THE COURT: I've read it.

THE DEFENDANT: I still would like to have a direct examination of the clerk

just in regards to these documentations. That hasn't been done, obviously.

THE COURT: Okay. Then let's move on to the next thing you brought up. You said the district court docket does not list any search warrants, and as I started with, you're right, and I can only surmise why, or I can only guess why, but the bottom line is they are filed in the district court case. So is there anything else on that issue?

THE DEFENDANT: You're going to confirm that for the record?

THE COURT: I know from looking at the court system, that it's not showing up in the justice court case.

THE DEFENDANT: This is why I wanted --

THE COURT: It was filed -- you're right. It was filed in the justice court. We could not find it in the justice court, but it is in the district court, and they are in the vault.

THE DEFENDANT: And you're going to confirm that for the record?

THE COURT: I'm just telling you -- I'm not -- I'm just telling you what I could see. Maybe the State has more information.

THE DEFENDANT: Well, see, this is why I wanted the -- wanted to be able to talk to the clerk of the court custodian of records who directly examined them.

That's why I requested that and -- and pursuant to EDCR 7.28. That's why I requested the originals, so that I could actually look at the originals and then find that the record was actually made in that affidavit. This certified -- this certification on here, this is all great, but this is not actually what I asked for, and I asked for --

MS. BLUTH: And I'll take those back, 'cause those were my copies. If he doesn't want those, then I'll take them back, and he can sub the clerk. He does not have a legal right to any of this. I understand that Your Honor has so much

1 | p 2 | b 3 | a 4 | h 5 | ir 6 | b

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

patience, since we're trying so hard to work with him. I'm bending over beyond backwards to help him, but at this point, he is out of control. He keeps saying he's at a disadvantage. He chose that disadvantage. He chose to represent himself. If he doesn't think that he can get the job done, then maybe Mr. Yohay needs to step in, but we cannot continue to bend over backwards, over and over, and over again, because Mr. Sprowson isn't an attorney, and he's asking this Court to do things that I shouldn't be doing and that this Court shouldn't be doing.

THE COURT: All right.

THE DEFENDANT: I'm only asking for my rights, constitutional rights.

THE COURT: Okay, so here's the deal. Did you hand back the affidavits?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I did.

THE COURT: Most of -- okay, so --

MS. BLUTH: Thank you.

THE COURT: -- I think what we're leaving this hearing with is that the State, in order to accommodate you, and she's right, they are not required to do so. We went through all this when you desired to represent yourself. As they're going to -- it sounds like it's going to be duplicative, but so be it, of what Mr. Yohay's given you. They're going to give you whatever was on those -- I don't -- again, I don't know if it's a CD or a zip drive, but whatever was on those disks with the discovery, they're going to give you a printout of everything, other than the photographs, okay; and the photographs you should have been shown by Mr. Yohay or have had access to through Mr. Yohay. They just can't stay at the jail because they do depict someone who is still a minor, but they're going to provide you everything. At your request, you're going to wait until our court hearing on November 28th in order to receive those items from the State, so that the State can give them to you directly here in

court.

With respect to everything else that you've raised, the Court is going to deny any relief at this point. It is your responsibility to issue any subpoenas. It's not my responsibility, and it's not the State's. As far as your arguments again that the warrants that you have are different from the warrants that are in the vault, again, as we talked about ad nauseam, there's no evidence other than your own self-serving statements. Everything we have indicates what's in the vault is the same as the copies the State has provided you in the course of discovery. As I indicated, the allegations of no judge's stamp, that's just belied by the record, in that every -- every one of those three search warrants does have a signature from a judge, and that's Judge Susan Baucum in the Las Vegas Justice Court.

Again, as I indicated, you brought the issue of the lack of the clerk's signature on the stamp in the upper right-hand corner. There is no requirement either under local court rules or under the statutes, to indicate that has to be signed by the clerk. However, it does properly indicate that the warrants were filed in the appropriate court, which is the Las Vegas Justice Court, and they were timely filed pursuant to statute.

With respect to the lack of papers in connection, again the State is going to provide you some additional documents as far as the catchall within that statute, but as far as everything else that's required within the statute to be attached to the warrant and filed with the court, those are all there.

With respect to the inappropriate photo issue, that's been decided and discussed over and over again with the Court. It's been previously denied as having -- not having any merit.

As far as the question of how many warrants are on file, I don't think there's

any dispute today that there were three warrants on file. That is consistent with what the Court --

THE DEFENDANT: I'd like to object. I still --

THE COURT: Hold on, stop, 'cause I've got to wrap this up and move on.

That is consistent with everything that's in the court -- that's in the vault, that there was only three warrants in this case.

As far as the State's opposition being late, you've indicated that you did receive the relief you were requesting. You've received additional time to present whatever evidence you needed to the Court.

As far as the request to view the originals of the search warrants, at this time that's going to be denied. However, the State did offer to provide you certified copies of the originals which would indicate that they were in fact the actual documents that were coming from the vault.

As far as the justice court docket does not list any search warrants, as I've indicated, it appears that you're right, but really, there's no prejudice to you in that, again, the warrants were filed in the proper court. They were timely filed, and they are in the district court.

So, we'll see you for the next court date on the 28th. Thank you.

[Proceedings concluded at 10:48 a.m.]

* * * * * * * *

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

Yaula Walsh
Paula Walsh

Court Recorder/Transcriber

Electronically Filed 1/2/2018 10:45 AM Steven D. Grierson CLERK OF THE COURT

1	RTRAN	Blump.	
2			
3			
4	DISTRICT COURT		
5	CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA		
6			
7	STATE OF NEVADA,		
8	Plaintiff,	CASE NO. C295158-1	
9)) DEPT. NO. XXIII	
10	VS.		
11	MELVYN PERRY SPROWSON, JR.,	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS	
12	Defendant.		
13			
14			
15	BEFORE THE HONORABLE STEFANY A. MILEY, DISTRICT COURT JUDGE		
16	MONDAY, NOVEMBER 28, 2016		
17	STATUS CHECK: TRIAL READINESS		
18			
19	APPEARANCES:		
20	For the Plaintiff:	JACQUELINE M. BLUTH, ESQ. Chief Deputy District Attorney	
21	For the Defendant	MICHAEL D. VOLIAV. ECO	
22	For the Defendant:	MICHAEL R. YOHAY, ESQ. Deputy Public Defender	
23			
24			
25	RECORDED BY: MARIA L. GARIBAY, COURT RECORDER		

THE COURT: Anything else?

25

4 5

6 7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17 18

19

20 21

22

23

24 25

MS. BLUTH: Yes. This morning, if you remember last time we were here, Mr. Sprowson asked for the, I don't know, the summary of the report that was done on the forensic examination --

THE COURT: Mm-hmm.

MS. BLUTH: -- of the victim, so I provided this to Mr. Yohay. These are the first documents that can be found on the CD that I turned over to the defense on December 9th of 2015. So Mr. Sprowson should have access to these pages of the report as well as all of the database that goes along with the forensic dump that was done on it. It's my request, Your Honor, if you remember we were set for trial in December of last year and the defense said that he wouldn't be ready and he needed an expert, so we got a firm set for June of 2015.

THE COURT: Mm-hmm.

MS. BLUTH: The Defendant then said he still hadn't done anything and he needed to get an expert. And now we're getting close to December of 2016 and he's still saying the same thing. March was given to him as a firm set. The victim is now an adult. She's now in college. And I mean I don't know what else we can do. So at this point, I'm asking for 30-day or 45-day status checks because at some point this has to go to trial. And so he's been given a firm set for March and I don't see any reason why these things haven't been done up to this point.

THE COURT: Okay.

THE DEFENDANT: Well, one of the reasons is I'm in the medical unit right now. I'm actually restricted from accessing the law library, so I have to do everything in handwritten form. I've requested to meet with Mr. Yohay.

Mr. Yohay has a busy schedule and that hasn't happened. I'm doing everything I can to make things happen. March is a timeline that we have, and some of the things that I have to do I'm working on at the best that I have available to me. I am incarcerated and I understand the limitations of self-representation and all of that.

THE COURT: And you still want to represent yourself?

THE DEFENDANT: But I am doing everything that I can considering the factors that I am in the medical unit, that I am restricted from access to the law library. I am restricted in a lot of ways. A lot of times my legal mail is being held up. I don't get mail for two or three weeks when it was already -- for example, a law library, I have a request, it was fulfilled the next day. I don't get in for two weeks later. How can I file a motion when I need the case law that I don't have access to where in if -- when I was in another unit, I could simply go up to the kiosk, I can type it in and I can do my legal research, which I'm legally entitled to do.

Now, if you want to talk about me doing things slow. I am really, really restricted and I am doing the best I can. I think I'm actually doing pretty good considering the factors that I'm going through CCDC's process of handing in legal paperwork, waiting for the process to go through and then getting it back. And then because they don't want to pick up the mail, I get it two or three weeks later when it's fulfilled the next day.

THE COURT: Do you still feel it's in the best interest to represent yourself, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: Okay. So we'll just set it for a status check. It'll be the

beginning of January. As far as the motion to appoint an investigator, get that one in soon.

THE DEFENDANT: Yeah.

THE COURT: Because if it's granted --

THE DEFEFEDANT: 'Cause like I said, I'm working on --

THE COURT: -- it takes a period of time because I have to get funding authorized, okay?

THE DEFENDANT: Yeah, I understand that. 'Cause like I said, you know, I'm doing the best I can, Your Honor. I don't have access to information. And like I said --

THE COURT: That's fine.

THE DEFENDANT: -- the [indiscernible] resource I have is filling out those forms and I have to wait for CCDC to give it back to me and I'm waiting on them.

THE COURT: Okay. So --

THE DEFENDANT: So a lot of the problem is it's the system, not me.

THE COURT: -- we'll see you in the beginning of January unless you have a motion that prompts a court date before then, okay?

THE DEFENDANT: Okay. And I just have -- if I may make one comment about this, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Yeah.

THE DEFENDANT: This is not what I asked for. This has to do with when I was remanded, there was a forensic report supposedly done on that. I asked for the forensics report that was done on my phone and on my computer. That's what I asked for. This is -- this has nothing to do with what I asked for.

This has to do with the -- when I was remanded back in February of 2014.

They supposedly did -- and I don't know if they did, they supposedly did a forensics report on the alleged victim's equipment and my email. I'm asking for what's stipulated in the alleged or purported search warrants which is a forensics report and I'd like to have the chain of custody report as well.

There's other outstanding discovery and I'm still working through as I'm going through my files. And I may have to file another discovery motion in fact in regards to those things.

MS. BLUTH: In regards to the -- so the forensics that have been done were done on the victim's -- she had an iPod, so that pages -- or excuse me, that, the discovery on that is tons and tons of pictures which obviously we have said I can't bring to court.

THE COURT: Did you give Mr. Yohay copies?

MS. BLUTH: Yes, those are on a disk. And the Defendant, though, when Mr. Yohay meets with him, they will be able to view those, everything on that report including the pictures. I don't know where they can go to do that at the jail or at your office. But all of the information he's talking about is all on that disk and if you remember, we actually had a hearing about it with the Defendant and the detective. We had a hearing about some of the search warrants and some of the information found on that with the victim. And so the Defendant should have access to all of those. If he feels like something is missing, if he lets Mr. Yohay know. I just want to get this moving. I will provide him anything and everything that I can. I just want this to keep going forward.

THE COURT: Okay. When will you have a chance to bring the forensics

and the iPod to Mr. Sprowson?

MR. YOHAY: I have basically a banker's box full of everything. And I can certainly come over there at some point probably this week and we'll go through all of it together again.

THE COURT: Can you try and do it before the end of next week, please?

MR. YOHAY: Certainly.

THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, so am I correct, to understand, that the only forensic report that I'm going to be getting, and maybe she can correct this, is from just when I was remanded? There's supposedly a forensics done on my computer and a forensics report done on my phone when I was initially arrested. This is what I've been asking for, not the one that they're -- just to make sure that there's not a confusion, there's two different incidents. When I was remanded there was a forensics report done on the alleged victim's iPod because there was an issue of communication. What I'm asking for, again, of the State, any maybe the State can clear this up for me, I guess the State is saying it's on a CD. I don't know if that's what she's saying, but I'm asking for the forensics report and the chain of custody form that was done on my phone and my computer when it was initially booked into evidence and supposedly searched way back in December of 2013.

MS. BLUTH: I -- okay. So it's my understanding and I was speaking to Mr. Sweetin before court, the -- and I'm going to go back and double check 'cause I don't want to ever say something on the record that I'm not 100% sure about. It was my understanding that when we were trying to get -- so the stuff that we found on the victim's phone or iPod was part of a search warrant. And then when we tried to cross reference them, we couldn't get into the

1 | C | 2 | h | 3 | f | c | 5 | T | 6 | ir |

7

9

10 11

1213

14

15

1617

18

20

19

21

22

23

2425

Defendant's cellphone I believe because of a password. At that time, we didn't have the technology to break the code. And so I don't believe that there's a forensics dump done on the Defendant's cellphone or computer. I will double check. I don't believe so because I don't remember looking at a forensic report. The forensic report I looked at was of the victim's phone and images, the images that you know of.

THE DEFENDANT: Well, Your Honor, on the search warrant itself, purported search warrant, it says a forensics report was done.

MS. BLUTH: No, it does not say that. It says that they have reasonably --

THE DEFENDANT: I have it right here.

MS. BLUTH: They have probable cause to conduct. This is what I explained last time. They have probable cause to conduct a forensic dump on that, but it doesn't mean that it's always done. The search warrant says that I can take your computer and I can do a search on your computer.

THE COURT: Okay. So can you do this?

MS. BLUTH: Sure.

THE COURT: Let's just do a status check before Christmas. And then make it -- and go back and double check whether or not there was a forensics report done on Mr. Sprowson's phone, I believe is what he's saying.

THE DEFENDANT: And computer.

THE COURT: And the computer.

THE DEFENDANT: There's two of them, Your Honor, two computers, sorry.

THE COURT: And that way you can make a representation in court which

1	would become part of the record.
2	MS. BLUTH: Absolutely. If I could just if we could just do it in
3	January, Your Honor. Today I start a three-week capital trial in Judge Cadish
4	and we're going to be it's going to be hard for me to get done.
5	THE COURT: Okay. So why don't we do it the beginning of January
6	then?
7	MS. BLUTH: Yeah.
8	THE COURT: And so here's the deal. She's not making representation
9	today 'cause she wants to double check to make sure she's accurate, but if she
10	comes in here and makes representations one way or the other, she can be held
11	accountable for that representation. That's why she wants to make sure what
12	she's saying is true to the best of her knowledge, okay.
13	THE DEFENDANT: That's fine with me, Your Honor.
14	THE COURT: All right.
15	THE CLERK: January 9 th , 9:30.
16	MS. BLUTH: Thank you.
17	THE COURT: Thank you.
18	THE DEFENDANT: Thank you, Your Honor.
19	PROCEEDINGS CONCLUDED AT 11:12 A.M.
20	* * * *
21	ATTEST: I do hereby certify that I have truly and correctly transcribed the
22	audio/video recording in the above-entitled case to the best of my ability.
23	Van o de ola
24	Maria L. Garibay MARIA L. GARIBAY
25	Court Recorder/Transcriber

Electronically Filed 1/2/2018 11:13 AM Steven D. Grierson CLERK OF THE COURT

1	RTRAN	Chump. Dill
2		
3		
4	DISTRIC	T COURT
5	CLARK COUI	NTY, NEVADA
6		
7	STATE OF NEVADA,	
8	Plaintiff,)) CASE NO. C295158-1
9	Traintiti,)) DEPT. NO. XXIII
10	VS.	
11	MELVYN PERRY SPROWSON, JR.,	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
12	Defendant.	
13)
14		/ A
15	BEFORE THE HONORABLE STEFANY	A. MILEY, DISTRICT COURT JUDGE
16	WEDNESDAY, J	ANUARY 4, 2017
17		WITHDRAW THE ORIGINAL RECORD OF
18	SEARCH AND SEIZURE WARRANTS	ON FILE WITH THE DISTRICT COURT
19	APPEARANCES:	
20	For the Plaintiff:	JACQUELINE M. BLUTH, ESQ.
21		Chief Deputy District Attorney
22	For the Defendant:	PRO SE
23		
24		
25	RECORDED BY: MARIA L. GARIBAY, C	COURT RECORDER

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 4, 2017, 9:32 A.M.

THE MARSHAL: Page 13, C295158, Sprowson.

THE COURT: Hi, Mr. Sprowson. Good morning.

THE DEFENDANT: [Indiscernible].

THE COURT: Okay. All right. So, Mr. Sprowson, there's a couple things. You have a couple requests on calendar. The first one deals with the search warrant issue we talked about several times. The other one addresses your request for an investigator and your request for a forensics expert on the computer, cell phones, et cetera that were a part of the search warrant. I don't have time today. I've got a huge calendar to really spend the time necessary on the search warrant issue because as you're aware, that kind of goes a little bit longer. So what I'm going to do is just the search warrant issue, I'm going to move that to Monday. As far as the investigator and the other issue, we need to address that today.

THE DEFENDANT: All right.

THE COURT: So the State's indicated in their paperwork they don't have any objections. They really don't have a dog in that fight. Your request for an investigator is going to be granted. This is what I'm going to do: There is a person at the County who is the one responsible for paying investigators and everything else. I'm going to notify him that you've been granted an investigator. I'm going to set it for a status check. Well, I can do it next Monday. He'll have the investigator come to court and make contact with you, okay? And that will be your kind of a person to go to from that point forward.

The issue on the expert is a little bit more complex. I know what

you want in general, but I don't know if you've looked to see who you want or any particular qualifications you want, so one of the thought processes was when we get the investigator, that kind of gives you a liaison. Talk to the investigator, tell him specifically what you're wanting the expert to do and perhaps he can assist you in locating the names of a couple of individuals who may be that type of expert. And once we do that then we can look to see if we could get that paid for by the County, okay? I'm trying to stay out of it as much as possible, okay? So all that is going to be granted. We'll bring you back on Monday for the status check on those issues, okay? And then we'll do the search warrant issue at that time as well.

THE DEFENDANT: Okay. I just have one question, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Yeah.

THE DEFENDANT: I also filed a response to the State's opposition. Did you receive [indiscernible?

THE COURT: On the search warrant issue?

THE DEFENDANT: Well, they're different documents, but yeah, it's --

THE COURT: I received a lot of documents. I mean we've discussed the search warrant issues multiple times. I don't know if I received your response. I have your Pro Per motion; I have the State's response to the search warrant issue, but I'll double check again if you say there's a response to it.

THE DEFENDANT: There's a response. I sent it in on the 21st. I have a receipt here that I did send it in.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, then Adam will just double check to make sure that we have it before Monday when you come back. So okay, so on Monday we're moving the search warrant issue motion.

1	THE CLERK: Okay.	
2	THE COURT: And then it's a status check on the investigator.	
3	Adam, please make a notation to let Drew Christiansen know that	
4	those two requests have been granted. And we'll see you on Monday, okay?	
5	THE DEFENDANT: All right. Thank you, Your Honor.	
6	THE COURT: Thank you.	
7	MS. BLUTH: Thank you, Judge.	
8	THE CLERK: January 9 th , 9:30.	
9	PROCEEDINGS CONCLUDED AT 9:35 A.M.	
10	* * * *	
11	ATTEST: I do hereby certify that I have truly and correctly transcribed the	
12	audio/video recording in the above-entitled case to the best of my ability.	
13	mais of Garahau	
14	Maria L. Garibay MARIA L. GARIBAY	
15	Court Recorder/Transcriber	
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

Electronically Filed 1/2/2018 11:13 AM Steven D. Grierson CLERK OF THE COURT

RTRAN 1 2 3 DISTRICT COURT 4 CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA 5 6 THE STATE OF NEVADA 7 CASE NO. C-295158-1 8 Plaintiff, DEPT. XXIII 9 VS. 10 MELVYN PERRY SPROWSON JR., 11 Defendant. 12 13 BEFORE THE HONORABLE STEFANY MILEY, DISTRICT COURT JUDGE MONDAY, JANUARY 9, 2017 14 RECORDER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDING: 15 STATUS CHECK: TRIAL READINESS 16 STATUS CHECK: INVESTIGATOR DEFENDANT'S PRO PER MOTION TO WITHDRAW THE ORIGINAL RECORD OF 17 SEARCH AND SEIZURE WARRANTS ON FILE WITH DISTRICT COURT 18 APPEARANCES: 19 20 For the Plaintiff: JACQUELINE M. BLUTH, ESQ. Chief Deputy District Attorney 21 For the Defendant: MICHAEL R. YOHAY, ESQ. 22 Deputy Public Defender 23 ALSO APPEARING: RICHARD FRANKIE, INVESTIGATOR 24 25 RECORDED BY: MARIA GARIBAY, COURT RECORDER

1

MONDAY, JANUARY 9, 2017 AT 11:43 A.M.

2

1

3

THE COURT: Oh, do we have that investigator from --

4

THE MARSHAL: We do.

5

THE COURT: -- Sprowson?

6

THE MARSHAL: We do.

7

THE MARSHAL: Bottom of 3, C-295158, Sprowson.

8

THE COURT: Where's the investigator?

9

THE MARSHAL: He's out here.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: All right. So your investigator's here, sir. He's going to be appointed to represent you. We talked about this previously. So he's going to kind of be your liaison, because I can't get to -- I don't want to get too much involved in your case, obviously that's inappropriate. So the investigator's going to be your liaison both for investigation and experts and everything else.

Hi, good morning, sir.

THE DEFENDANT: Good morning, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I don't think I've had the pleasure.

And he'll be dealing with the County as far as payment and stuff.

THE INVESTIGATOR: Richard Frankie, Nevada State License Number 797, Private Investigator.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you so much. So Mr. Christensen said he has hired you to work with Mr. Sprowson, who's currently representing himself, so we've got to do a motion. I don't know if you want to take a second to introduce yourself to him in a moment.

THE INVESTIGATOR: I already did last night.

THE COURT: You already did?

THE INVESTIGATOR: Yes.

THE COURT: And does he -- you guys have a way to contact each other?

THE INVESTIGATOR: Yes, through Mr. Christensen. Basically he'll grant me permission to enter the facility and have legal contacts with him.

THE COURT: Okay. Is there anything else we need to do?

Mr. Sprowson, anything else you want from this gentleman before he leaves?

THE INVESTIGATOR: From Mr. Frankie, no.

THE COURT: Okay. So the ball's in your court, sir. So he's going to be working with you, okay? Thank you, sir.

MS. BLUTH: I was just explaining to Mr. Frankie that Mr. Sprowson was all -- would also like a forensic expert too, which I'm sure he already told him, so we could just get a move on that. Mr. Frankie and I --

THE COURT: And we talked about it a little bit last time. I only conveyed that general request to Mr. Christensen because he's -- he's the one at the County who approves the funding for all these things. So you talked to Mr. Sprowson and figure out, specifically, what he's looking at, whether he started to research individuals on his own. I mean, usually the -- I'm not going to dictate who he uses, but there's obviously some parameters as far as County funding.

So, I think, ordinarily they said what they do is, maybe you come up with three names, which would be acceptable, that meets your criteria and then they go from there but, you know, you're representing yourself, the ball's in your court, sir. Okay. So actually you might want to stay, because I don't know, from this hearing Mr. Sprowson might want something from you.

Okay, we're back on the search warrant issue. We kind of need to lay this to rest at some point.

MS. BLUTH: Your Honor, before we do that, may I make a representation while Mr. Frankie's here about some of that forensic stuff?

THE COURT: Sure.

MS. BLUTH: Because if you remember, the last time we were here, Mr. Sprowson had asked some questions in -- regarding search warrants that were done on various electronics in this case. And so, I went back and I, I made sure -- like I said I would -- I made those representations in court. I spoke to each of the detectives in this case to make sure I had search warrants, and the forensics included with each of those search warrants and I double checked, I do have it. And I also have given these to Mr. Sprowson. I believe it was in -- I checked the dates. I believe it was in December of 2015, but I can check again if you'd like a specific date.

And so, what I've done is, I made Mr. Sprowson another exact copy of all of the forensics, and so it is the victim's laptop, defendant's hard -- or not hard drive but -- well, it is a hard drive, of his bigger computer. And then the defendant's I-phone and then the victim's I-pod. So these I've already been provided but I'm making a whole other copy.

Because of the issues we've talked about -- spoken about earlier with the images on them, I have to hand them over to counsel, but I'm happy to also make a copy for Mr. Frankie, because he would probably have to provide them to the expert as well. So I can do that. So I'm going to hand these over to Mr. Yohay. And there is also a mini kind of report and -- that I have printed for Mr. Sprowson because he had requested those in regards to the I-phone and

1 2 3 4 5 6 Mr. Yohay in court]. And then these can actually go to him, Mr. Yohay. And 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the computer. So I have digital copies of those. There were some images on these -- not digital copies I said -- I meant paper copies. There were some images that I had to take out of one of them, so I'm providing those to Mr. Yohay. These have also all been provided. But Mr. Sprowson just wanted an idea of what was in the reports. And so these are all copies that I made off of those cds. So he made those requests that he wanted. [Hands documents to

so I just wanted to make a record but I --THE COURT: [Coughs].

MS. BLUTH: You okay? I just wanted to just make clear that these are a duplicate. I have already given to these -- to him about a year ago, and I know that he can have access to these when he meets with Mr. Yohay.

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. BLUTH: All right. Thank you.

THE DEFENDANT: May I respond to that, Your Honor? First of all, I have not seen anything, within a year, in regards to any documentation. She keeps saying that she's given me all these things and yet I never get 'em. This is a big problem. And Mr. Yohay is my stand-by counsel. I'm entitled to my discovery, it's supposed to come to me. And giving it on a cd, to Mr. Yohay, to what I never get to see it, is basically preventing me from having a fair trial. This is, again, the reason why I keep bringing this issue up, Your Honor, is because --

THE COURT: So what is it you want to see?

THE DEFENDANT: I want, I want --

THE COURT: And let's figure out how to do it.

THE DEFENDANT: -- I want printouts handed to me so that I can look at them. I don't want to have to keep trying to meet with Mr. Yohay, which I never get a chance to meet with him. And I keep getting these promises of getting documents that I never get.

MS. BLUTH: Judge, just to be --

THE DEFENDANT: You know, at some point we have to go to trial. At some point, I have to prepare. And if I don't have the documents in my hand I can't prepare, Your Honor. This has been my biggest beef the whole time. You know, and simply, you know, Ms. Bluth keeps saying, "Well, I'm giving it all to Mr. Yohay, Mr. Yohay, it doesn't do me any good.

MS. BLUTH: Just to be clear, Your Honor, these are what are referred to as forensic dumps. I can't print him copies of a forensic dump, you have to access it by using a computer. It's called an HTML report. You hit the HTML report and it's an image of the computer or the phone. I can't print those out, they only come in disc form. I also can't print them out because they are pictures of a minor.

MR. YOHAY: And Judge, if I can respond. What I did was with the discs that Ms. Bluth has previously given, given to me, I gave them to our IT people, they printed out everything that was on them. That's what they told me. It was a print-out, copy of everything. I went through that. What I believed Mr. Sprowson could have we mailed to him. The rest of it I've kept like, like the photos of – I've kept. I can tell you I have gone to meet with Mr. Sprowson. I went December 30th, he refused to meet with me.

So that also helps make it more difficult. It's hard for me to get over there. I set aside an entire afternoon, went over there, was informed by

the COs that he refused to meet with me, so I have not gone since then to meet with him. I'm happy -- I will go through -- I'll have my IT department print off everything they can off of these discs. I'm happy to go over there with a computer to let him view them as well, to make as many combinations as possible. But you -- he needs to agree to meet with me as well.

THE DEFENDANT: Well, I've, I've asked to meet with him several times and, and he never shows up, that's the problem. He says, "I'm going to meet with you this Friday," I'm waiting this Friday and nothing happens.

THE COURT: Okay. So when he -- when he's there, why don't you want to meet with him?

THE DEFENDANT: I was sick that Friday because he never even let me know he was coming. You know, professional courtesy, "Hey, you know, I'm going to stop by this Friday" and I show up. You know, I can't plan when I'm not going to be feeling well. He, he comes on a day that I don't even know when he's going to show up.

THE COURT: Okay. Hold on a second. Mr. Yohay, when can you come down there again so everyone knows?

MR. YOHAY: Let me check my schedule. The problem is, Judge, you know, I have other clients that, that take priority because they're actually the clients.

THE COURT: I understand.

MR. YOHAY: So -- I can go this Thursday afternoon. I have court in the morning but then I'm free this Thursday afternoon.

THE COURT: Okay. So what about Thursday afternoon, Mr. Yohay? THE DEFENDANT: And if it's firm, yes, if he will show up, yeah.

THE COURT: Okay. So Mr. Yohay will -

MR. YOHAY: I will.

THE COURT: -- print what he can print and he'll bring a computer so he can show you whatever he's not able to print. Okay. So anything else on this issue because we have to -- we've got to lay the search warrant issue to rest.

MS. BLUTH: And then on the big computer, on the Defendant's computer, Your Honor, they were not able to gather any information from that. So I just want to be clear in case they're looking for something from the defendant's, not a laptop, but like a regular computer, like a desktop. There was no information, they could not get anything from it, so don't go looking for anything because there was nothing there. We haven't used anything on it.

THE COURT: Okay. So what's the issue now with the search warrant, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: Well, I pretty much laid it out in both my motion and my response.

THE COURT: Okay.

THE DEFENDANT: I brought this --

THE COURT: Because we kind of go over the same thing over and over again.

THE DEFENDANT: No, we're not going over the same thing, Your Honor, these are about the documents that were handed to me on November 16th, 2016. You ordered the, the State to provide for me certified copies, okay, on November 2nd. November 16th I was handed, from Mr. Yohay, four copies of four search warrants. Okay. I looked at them and then when I brought them back to my cell and I examined them, I found them to be fraudulent. And that's

what I have in my motion.

Now, the thing is that, we argued previously in regards to where the originals were. I've been requesting the originals because I want to lay this to rest, Your Honor. Honestly. And seeing the originals for me would lay it to rest. But my argument simply was this. When I looked at those documentations, the State and this Court told me that Justice Court does not have the originals. The documents --

THE COURT: Hold on, let's, let's -- let's clarify for a second. We've spent more time on this issue, okay. So when they're filed they don't keep the hard copy originals anymore. I mean we're going paperless on pretty much everything. They get scanned into the system and then the digital certified or the, you know, file copy, that becomes the original. They don't have paper copies. And years ago they used to keep the paper copies but they don't anymore. So whatever's on the computer is the original.

And this is what we have found. I think we've talked about this before. When the – okay, so everything was properly done. The warrant was filed in Justice Court which you can see from the stamp, okay. When the warrant's originally filed there's not necessarily a case open, so it doesn't go into a case. What happens is the Justice Court files it, okay. The paper copy gets destroyed. The original becomes the digital image, then they're filed in the Justice Court computer system by the warrant number, which you now have and the date. Okay.

The only reason ——and so, again, there's no case to put them in, because when these warrants come into our, you know, the Justice Court, there's not often the case. The reason they're in the District Court vault is

because the State provided us with certified copies and my clerk had them put into the Justice Court vault, so there is a copy in the District Court vault. But as far as what comes up in the bindover packet which is usually everything that's down at the Justice Court when the case goes from Justice Court up to District Court, they wouldn't necessarily be in the bindover packet. Okay.

I, I know you keep saying they're fraudulent. There's nothing to indicate they're fraudulent. Everything, everything is how it should be according to the statute.

THE DEFENDANT: So you can, you can -- you have the original? This is, this is the beef that I have, Your Honor. I requested in my motion, in my discovery motion, I wanted to subpoen the Justice Court custodian of records to actually produce the original so that I could view it, okay.

THE COURT: The original would be whatever's in the computer system.

They would access it --

THE DEFENDANT: Yeah, I understand.

THE COURT: -- by warrant and date and they would print it out --

THE DEFENDANT: Can I finish what I --

THE COURT: -- and certify it. That would be an original.

THE DEFENDANT: I understand that. But what I'm saying is, okay, so what I'm getting at is that the Justice Court -- when I asked for that -- when I asked for that record or actually to see that record, the State argued that that record was no longer in Justice Court but in District Court. This is what was part of my argument, and this is the reason why I brought this motion to a head was because that the certified copy stamp that is on the documents indicates that it's an original in Justice Court.

Now I'm kind of confused here. If the State is telling me that the original record is no longer in Justice Court, how can Justice Court issue a certified copy? This is the point.

THE COURT: But sir, you're just -- I mean you're --

THE DEFENDANT: So either court can issue --

THE COURT: -- you're just fighting little -- you're nit picking this -- different things. You didn't want the copies, the State printed copies at one hearing and gave you certified copies. You turned them back to the State indicating you didn't want them.

THE DEFENDANT: Because I already have a set.

THE COURT: You have an investigator now. There's nothing -- you keep saying it's fraudulent, fraudulent. There's nothing that's -- there's no evidence that it's fraudulent. Okay. There perhaps is a misunderstanding or, or a lack of knowledge about how it was filed in the Justice Court and everything else, but we have spent so much time on this. I am telling you it should -- it's filed in the Justice Court, it's filed under the warrant number, it's filed under the date. You have an investigator. You can always ask your investigator to go down get copies if you don't trust the copies that the State has attempted to provide to you, but there's nothing else.

THE DEFENDANT: Well, how can you have two different certified copies from the same original? If you have a certified copy of an original you're going to have the same exact copy if it's a certified copy.

THE COURT: My suggestion again, sir, would be to do exactly what I indicated. Have your investigator get those copies on his -- he works with you. Have your investigator go get those documents from the Justice Court.

THE DEFENDANT: So if he had fraudulent documents --

THE COURT: It's not for me to do.

THE DEFENDANT: -- put into the District Court --

THE COURT: I'm sorry.

THE DEFENDANT: -- to back that up. So, so we have documents that were missing, put into the District Court that came from somewhere, but we don't know. But now we're in the District Court to validate a search warrant that never existed.

THE COURT: Sir, there's just no merit to what you're saying. All I can suggest at this point is, if you don't trust the copies the State gave you then have your investigator go and obtain copies for you. It's not for me to do, I don't, I'm not --

THE DEFENDANT: I understand that, Your Honor.

THE COURT: -- your investigator.

THE DEFENDANT: I will do that. I still believe that these documents are fraudulent and I'm going to pursue it.

THE COURT: Okay. That's fine, but as of now there's no evidence they're fraudulent. I've told you everything I know from how those documents were filed and categorized and ended up in the District Court vault. I've told you everything that I know, okay.

THE DEFENDANT: How can Justice Court issue a certified copy of an original no longer in their possession?

THE COURT: I'm not a witness, I don't know. All I can tell you is the representations that were made to us, again, how they're filed, how they're kept. How it ended up in the District Court vault, I have no information for you.

THE DEFENDANT: So the State gets to walk on a criminal act?

THE COURT: Again, you don't have any evidence that there's fraud --

THE DEFENDANT: I do, I have plenty of evidence --

THE COURT: -- or anything else?

THE DEFENDANT: -- I've submitted it to the court.

THE COURT: Okay, but you haven't provided it. So at this point, I would have your investigator do it; there's nothing else for us to do at this hearing.

MS. BLUTH: And Judge, if I could just supplement my argument with just two things and then I'll, I'll be quick, because I know Your Honor has a trial starting. Just for Ms. Sprowson's clarity, because I think at some point in his pleadings he thinks that I have been able to touch the search warrants or fraudulently do something with the search warrants? I don't have anything to do with search warrants. I don't touch them. I don't sign them. It's something that detectives do with judges. So nothing about me or Mr. Sweetin ever had anything to do with search warrants. It's really --

THE DEFENDANT: Her signature is on every last one of them.

MS. BLUTH: Okay. And in regards to the -- oh, I can go right now and Mr. Frankie can go right now and get certified copies form Justice Court. We can order a thousand of them. Anybody can go. If there's an original in the computer they are -- they print those out and they make them -- they emboss them with the Justice Court signia [sic] and then they sign them. So there can be more than one, there can be hundreds. I just think that I understand his right to represent himself, but because he's not an attorney he doesn't understand protocol and procedure that goes with this. And he thinks there's something nefarious about, about search warrants that no one has anything to do with.

1	And I don't know what the State can possibly do to prove that to him. We've	
2	tried everything.	
3	THE COURT: I think the better course of action would be for him, if he so	
4	desires, have his investigator obtain a copy.	
5	MS. BLUTH: Okay.	
6	THE COURT: The investigator works for him and that's all I can suggest.	
7	MS. BLUTH: Okay.	
8	THE COURT: All right. Bye.	
9	MS. BLUTH: And that so that motion is denied?	
10	THE COURT: It's denied. Thank you.	
11	MS. BLUTH: Thank you. And then, Your Honor, is our next date	
12	calendar call? Because I would just like a status check trial readiness in 30	
13	days if that was okay with the Court, so we can keep this trial moving. Or	
14	Court, yeah, trial moving.	
15	COURT CLERK: That's what it was on for today as well.	
16	THE COURT: How are you how are you going to get anything ready,	
17	Mr. Sprowson, sir?	
18	THE DEFENDANT: What was the question?	
19	THE COURT: How are you doing getting this case ready for trial? You	
20	have trial on the 20 th of March.	
21	THE DEFENDANT: Well, as soon as I'm, I'm given all the discovery that	
22	I'm entitled to, and things that I'm entitled to, I could move a little bit faster.	
23	We're looking at March, so I'm ready to go in March.	
24	THE COURT: Okay.	

MS. BLUTH: May I just have a status check in February, Your Honor, to

1	confirm?
2	THE COURT: Uh-huh.
3	MS. BLUTH: Thank you.
4	THE COURT: You guys are going to be able to try this in two weeks,
5	right? Because I'm gone the 3 rd of April.
6	MS. BLUTH: Oh yeah, easily.
7	THE COURT: Okay.
8	MS. BLUTH: Easily.
9	COURT CLERK: February 6 th , 9:30.
10	MS. BLUTH: Thank you.
11	THE COURT: Okay. We'll see you then, Mr. Sprowson.
12	
13	[Proceeding concluded at 12:00 p.m.]
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	ATTEST: I do hereby certify that I have truly and correctly transcribed the
22	audio/visual recording in the above entitled case to the best of my ability.
23	Vishin Sontal
24	Kerry Esparza, Court Recorder/Transcriber
25	District Court, Department 文文VI

Electronically Filed 1/2/2018 11:13 AM Steven D. Grierson CLERK OF THE COURT

1	RTRAN	Chump.
2		
3	DIOTRIO	-T 00UDT
4	DISTRIC	T COURT
5	CLARK COUI	NTY, NEVADA
6		
7	STATE OF NEVADA,	
8	Plaintiff,)) CASE NO. C295158-1
9	Tiamitiii,)) DEPT.NO.XXIII
10	vs.	
11	MELVYN PERRY SPROWSON, JR.,	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
12	Defendant.	
13		
14		
15	BEFORE THE HONORABLE STEFANY	A. MILEY, DISTRICT COURT JUDGE
16	MONDAY, FEB	RUARY 6, 2017
17	STATUS CHECK:	TRIAL READINESS
18		
19	APPEARANCES:	
20	For the Plaintiff:	JACQUELINE M. BLUTH, ESQ. Chief Deputy District Attorney
21		•
22	For the Defendant:	MAXWELL A. BERKLEY, ESQ. Deputy Public Defender
23		Doparty I abile Defended
24		
25	DECORDED DV. MARDIA I CARDIDAN C	
_	RECORDED BY: MARIA L. GARIBAY, C	JUUKI KEUUKDEK

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 6, 2017, 9:35 A.M.

THE MARSHAL: Top of page 2, C295158, Sprowson.

THE COURT: Hi, Mr. Sprowson. Good morning.

Hi, Ms. Bluth. Good morning.

MS. BLUTH: Good morning, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. So this is a status check on trial readiness and I know my staff reached out to you guys as far as scheduling issues for me. And I know Mr. Sprowson doesn't want to move the trial a week sooner. If we don't move the trial a week sooner, it's going to be way earlier because I simply -- I need to move it a week sooner.

MS. BLUTH: Yeah.

THE COURT: And it shouldn't really cause any undue prejudice to any of you guys because it's just a few days later, but I really with my schedule, I can't try it and get it tried unless we move it a week up, which would be -- let's see, we're scheduled for the 20th of March.

MS. BLUTH: I think it's the 7th; is it the 7th?

THE COURT: It'd be the 13th; wouldn't it?

THE CLERK: Yes.

THE COURT: So it would be March 13th we'd start.

THE DEFENDANT: I can't do it earlier, Your Honor. [Indiscernible].

THE COURT: Well, then you're going to be several months later because I cannot accommodate your trial.

THE DEFENDANT: It would have to be at this Court's discretion. That's fine with me. I just can't go a week earlier 'cause I'm working with my

24 investigator on certain things right now and --

THE COURT: Why can't you go one week earlier because we would have calendar call anyways on the 15th?

THE DEFENDANT: I'm looking on my expert witness list right now, I believe a psychologist. As we discussed before, I'm going to talk to my forensics expert, going through that as well. I also have other witnesses that I may be calling that are out of state. So I need time to do all this stuff and I have 21 days prior to the trial. So in order for me to get that witness list -- that's one of the things. There's other things as well, but in order --

THE COURT: Okay. Well, you don't have to tell me your theory of defense. I'm not necessarily entitled to know that. I just -- let me -- I'll tell you when our next setting is. I just can't try the number of cases I have unless I move the trial one week.

THE DEFENDANT: When is your next date after that, Your Honor? THE COURT: It's going to be a while. That's my concern.

THE DEFENDANT: Well, I'm already in custody, so I don't think the jail will have a problem or the Court will have a problem.

MS. BLUTH: But the State has a problem. And I understand the Court's scheduling, but I have literally been trying to try this case for --

THE COURT: I understand.

MS. BLUTH: -- three, four years. I mean the fact of the matter is Mr. Sprowson is never going to go. He's never going to go to trial.

THE COURT: Here's my reality. I understand that. So let's see what we have. Here's my reality: I can only do one trial at a time. I can't really just dump this on overflow.

earlier.

THE COURT: Well, then file a motion because I can't get it tried one week earlier. I'm sorry; I can only be at one place at one time.

THE DEFENDANT: I understand that. I'm willing --

THE COURT: And I've -- as many times as I've tried to [indiscernible] myself, I can't.

THE DEFENDANT: I'm willing to go the later date. That's why I'm saying, I'm not really compromising on it. We had already set a firm date for March 20th. This is what this Court nine months ago said, "Look, we're firm March 20th." I've been getting ready and gearing up for March 20th. You know, my timeline and my schedule, I'm on schedule for March 20th. I just can't go a week early.

THE COURT: Okay. This is what we're going to have to do. I understand that. But you know what, unfortunately for everyone, I have more cases than just yours. And, again, as I explained, I have been unsuccessful to trying being at two places at once.

THE DEFENDANT: I'm not ready to go a week earlier.

THE COURT: So I'm going to have to move it up one week sooner. If there's -- you want to file a motion that I've violated your constitutional rights, please do so. But I can't do it.

THE DEFENDANT: Can I have another judge?

THE COURT: Sir, I cannot find another judge to try this case.

THE DEFENDANT: [Indiscernible].

THE COURT: I cannot try two cases at once, which is my dilemma. I cannot send you to overflow. So short of God sending another me down here, I can't do it; I'm sorry. If there's something that you believe that is not -- you're

not going to have time to get done, let us know because if anything, the State could probably waive certain deadlines in order for you to get things done even if it's not entirely the timeframe in what you're supposed to have it. But I can only do so much, so we're going to have to move it back one week, which is going to be the March 13th date.

THE DEFENDANT: Well, make the record show that I object to that, Your Honor. And make sure [indiscernible].

THE COURT: And if you need to file a motion, we have an Appeals Court and the Supreme Court.

THE DEFENDANT: Yeah, I'm asking that you show in the record that I object to this [indiscernible].

THE COURT: Absolutely. This is all recorded. Absolutely. I understand that you object to it. And I'm sorry that I can't accommodate you, but there's only so much I can do.

THE DEFENDANT: It's not accommodating me, Your Honor, it's your calendar. I'm set for March 20th.

THE COURT: I understand.

THE DEFENDANT: I'm set for March 20th.

THE COURT: Okay. I have to move you back.

THE CLERK: So the new calendar call will be March 8th at 9:30.

THE DEFENDANT: I can't make it.

THE COURT: Well, that's the date it's going to be.

MS. BLUTH: He's in CCDC, where is he going to be?

THE DEFENDANT: Okay. That's fine, that's fine. There's other courts to actually deal with this.

		ĺ
1	THE MARSHAL: Stand up.	
2	THE DEFENDANT: Violating my rights.	
3	THE COURT: Sir, there's an Appellate Court and the Supreme Court.	
4	Please utilize them at your discretion.	
5	THE DEFENDANT: There is, there is. And you're violating my rights and I	
6	know why you're pushing this.	
7	THE COURT: Okay. So give them the dates.	
8	THE CLERK: Calendar call March 8 th at 9:30; jury trial March 13 th at	
9	1:00 p.m.	
10	THE COURT: Thank you.	
11	PROCEEDINGS CONCLUDED AT 9:40 A.M.	
12	* * * *	
13	ATTEST: I do hereby certify that I have truly and correctly transcribed the audio/video recording in the above-entitled case to the best of my ability.	
14	addio/video recording in the above-entitled case to the best of my ability.	
15	Maria L. Garibay MARIA L. GARIBAY	
16		
17	Court Recorder/Transcriber	
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

Electronically Filed 1/2/2018 11:13 AM Steven D. Grierson CLERK OF THE COURT

1	RTRAN	Denne.
2		
3		
4	DISTRIC	T COURT
5	CLARK COUI	NTY, NEVADA
6		
7	STATE OF NEVADA,)
8	Digintiff) CASE NO. C295158-1
9	Plaintiff,)) DEPT. NO. XXIII
10	VS.)
11	MELVYN PERRY SPROWSON, JR.,	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
12	Defendant.	
13		
14		/
15	BEFORE THE HONORABLE STEFANY	A. MILEY, DISTRICT COURT JUDGE
16	WEDNESDAY,	MARCH 8, 2017
17	CALEND	OAR CALL
18		
19	APPEARANCES:	
20	For the Plaintiff:	JAMES SWEETIN, ESQ.
21		Chief Deputy District Attorney
22	For the Defendant:	MICHAEL R. YOHAY, ESQ. Deputy Public Defender
23		Deputy Fublic Defender
24		
25	RECORDED BY: MARIA L. GARIBAY, C	COURT RECORDER
	I and the second	

THE MARSHAL: Bottom of page 1, C295158, Sprowson.

THE COURT: Hi, Mr. Sprowson. Good morning.

MR. SWEETIN: Good morning, Judge.

THE COURT: Hi. Good morning. So this is the time set for calendar call.

MR. SWEETIN: Judge, this is Ms. Bluth's case for our office. As the Court might be aware, Ms. Bluth is in another trial currently and it's expected that trial is going to go through next week. Another issue in regards to the case is that I know the Defendant has filed some motions to recuse the Court, which have been denied, but there was some stoppage in regards to serving some of the subpoenas in the course of those motions being filed. So we don't have returns on everybody yet. I don't know that we would receive those before Monday. But at any rate, that's the status of the case.

Ms. Bluth would be available to start. And I don't know that the Court can do this; I've talked with your Clerk in regards to maybe moving this to the 20th. And I don't know if that's possible or not. If we were to do that, Ms. Bluth would be available for that.

THE COURT: That was the original date but I had -- you know, the calendars are always rapidly changing. As of the time we moved it a week earlier, actually against Mr. Sprowson's objections, I had something else I had to try.

THE CLERK: I'm sorry; you said March 20th?

MR. SWEETIN: Yes.

THE COURT: Yeah, which was the original date. We've had some

changes on our calendar since then.

[The Court and Court Clerk confer]

THE COURT: Okay. So we've had some changes on our calendar. So we can actually move it for jury trial starting the week of the 20th. That means your calendar call would be next Wednesday. And I do have one other case that might go that week, but you guys would have priority because you're the lowest case number. Mr. Sprowson, how are you coming with your trial preparations?

THE DEFENDANT: Pretty good.

THE COURT: You're ready?

THE DEFENDANT: Yeah.

THE COURT: Okay. So here's the deal. I mean we have to try this case in two weeks because otherwise, I'll be gone for two weeks, the first two weeks of April.

MR. SWEETIN: Okay. And I think that's doable, Judge.

THE CLERK: Okay. So calendar call March 15^{th} at 9:30; jury trial March 20^{th} at 1:00 p.m.

THE COURT: Okay. Is there anything else we need to address at this time?

THE DEFENDANT: [Indiscernible].

MR. SWEETIN: And that's fine, Judge. And the subpoenas were originally issued for the 13th. Basically, we would just ask an order from the Court that the subpoenas be continuing.

THE COURT: Yes. Thank you.

MR. SWEETIN: Thank you.

1	THE COURT: Bye-bye.	
2	PROCEEDINGS CONCLUDED AT 9:54 A.M.	
3	* * * *	
4	ATTEST: I do hereby certify that I have truly and correctly transcribed th	
5	audio/video recording in the above-entitled case to the best of my ability.	
6	Jane of 6 ashare	
7	Maria L. Garibay MARIA L. GARIBAY	
8	Court Recorder/Transcriber	
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		

Electronically Filed 1/2/2018 11:13 AM Steven D. Grierson CLERK OF THE COURT

RTRAN 1 2 3 DISTRICT COURT 4 5 CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA 6 7 STATE OF NEVADA. 8 CASE NO. C295158-1 Plaintiff, 9 DEPT. NO. XXIII VS. 10 TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS MELVYN PERRY SPROWSON, JR., 11 12 Defendant. 13 14 BEFORE THE HONORABLE STEFANY A. MILEY, DISTRICT COURT JUDGE 15 WEDNESDAY, MARCH 15, 2017 16 17 **CALENDAR CALL** 18 APPEARANCES: 19 For the Plaintiff: JAMES SWEETIN, ESQ. 20 JACQUELINE M. BLUTH, ESQ. Chief Deputy District Attorneys 21 22 For the Defendant: PANDORA L. LEVEN, ESQ. Deputy Public Defender 23 24 25 RECORDED BY: MARIA L. GARIBAY, COURT RECORDER

be asking whatever judge is for a Tuesday start. Some of our witnesses are flying in from out of state. We'll still be able to get it tried within the two weeks. I'm just letting the Court know.

THE COURT: Okay.

And, Mr. Sprowson, we're going to have to find another judge to try your case, okay? It should be easily tried next week. I just have to find someone else to do it, and I wasn't able to talk to -- catch anyone before I went in court today. So should we set it on a status check or what should we do?

MS. BLUTH: If you -- you can just to email us.

THE COURT: You want us just email you?

MS. BLUTH: That's fine. And I'll let Mr. --

THE COURT: And we have to give notification to Mr. Sprowson, but we can get notification to you in the jail just so you know what judge and everything else and what times.

THE DEFENDANT: Okay. And will I have the guarantee, that way I can prepare?

THE COURT: Absolutely, 'cause you'll need to know what days the trial is going to be. So let me take care of that. And the -- and I'll tell whoever takes it that it needs to start next Tuesday, but it does have to go next week. And then we'll let each of you know. And we'll email you and we'll get notification to you at the jail so you can plan your witnesses accordingly, sir, okay?

THE DEFENDANT: Okay.

///

25 || ///

1	THE COURT: All right. See you. Well, I won't see you next week, but
2	someone will see you next week. Thank you.
3	PROCEEDINGS CONCLUDED AT 10:34 A.M.
4	* * * *
5	ATTEST: I do hereby certify that I have truly and correctly transcribed the
6	audio/video recording in the above-entitled case to the best of my ability.
7	maria of Gazibara
8	Maria L. Garibay MARIA L. GARIBAY
9	Court Recorder/Transcriber
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22 23	
23 24	
2 4 25	

Electronically Filed 1/2/2018 11:13 AM Steven D. Grierson CLERK OF THE COURT

1	RTRAN	Otenus. Late	
2			
3			
4			
5	DISTRICT COURT		
6	CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA		
7			
8	THE STATE OF NEVADA,		
9	Plaintiff,	CASE#: C-14-295158-1	
10	vs.	DEPT. XXIII	
11	MELVYN SPROWSON, JR.,		
12	Defendant.		
13			
14	BEFORE THE HONORABLE STEFANY MILEY, DISTRICT COURT JUDGE		
15	TUESDAY, MARCH 21, 2017 RECORDER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS		
16	DEFENDANT'S SECOND PRO SI		
17			
18	APPEARANCES:		
19	For the State:	JACQUELINE M. BLUTH, ESQ.	
20		Chief Deputy District Attorney JAMES R. SWEETIN, ESQ.	
21		Chief Deputy District Attorney	
22	For the Defendant:	MELVYN SPROWSON, JR. Defendant in Proper Person	
23	Standby Counsel:	MICHAEL R. YOHAY, ESQ.	
24		Deputy Public Defender	
25	RECORDED BY: MARIA GARIBAY COURT RECORDER		

TUESDAY, MARCH 21, 2017 AT 10:36 A.M.

THE COURT: Hi, Mr. Sprowson; good morning. Looks like you're back in

THE COURT MARSHAL: Well, Judge, this is Sprow --

THE COURT: -- do you want to call it.

here, sir. All right sir, so yesterday --

THE COURT MARSHAL: Page 1, on our 9:30 criminal C295158, Sprowson.

THE COURT: Hi, Mr. Sprowson; good morning.

THE DEFENDANT: Good morning.

THE COURT: Okay, so yesterday when we were getting ready for this trial it came to our attention that you had filed a second pro se motion to continue the trial. But it looks like it's the same thing you've been bringing up over and over again throughout the course of the proceedings with the warrant and the chain of custody.

THE DEFENDANT: Right, and I haven't received either one of them. As you know, Your Honor, the last time I -- first of all I just wanted to say that I anticipated that I'd have this stuff prior to trial and that's why I said I was ready to go because, as you know, I have an investigator, Mr. Franky and he issued subpoenas to the Justice Court.

THE COURT: Mm-hmm.

THE DEFENDANT: So, I was -- I was like thrilled. I'd say, hey, we're finally we're going to end this. I'll have those certified copies from the Justice Court and come to find out that he -- he said that they couldn't give him the subpoenas. As you know, they said that they were forwarded to you. Well, you also filed an affidavit stating that you never received them. So, you didn't receive them, Mr. Franky didn't receive them, ultimately I didn't receive them. And so, here we are at a standstill at

1 the same spot we were. And then of course, the issue of the chain of custody, I've 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

been requesting from the State the chain of custody. Their response is the same every time, it's on the CD. Well, Mr. Yohay and I looked at the CDs, I looked at the CDs with Mr. Franky as well and we didn't find any chain of custody forms. So, we're right back where I was, so the problem is I'm requesting this stuff because it's instrumental and it's material to my case. It's *Brady* material because if there's some issues with the chain of custody obviously I can challenge their evidence. If there's some issues with the search warrants, which I believe there is, I can also challenge their evidence and this is necessary because if I don't have this stuff prior to starting trial, obviously when we start jury selection the jury is going to be prejudiced by this material.

You know, and not only that, but if I do have this material I would also be able to file motions in limine and whatever else I'd have to do to actually limit their -- their exposure to the potential jury. I mean, I have other points that I wanted to go through today, if I'm allowed, but that's basically, you know, it was all anticipated that I would have this material prior to trial and I was ready to go, and, you know, like I said, I understand the State was in trial with War Machine. I was okay with that. The other issue, Your Honor, if I may, is we were set for March 20th, and again I was scheduled for March 20th, was getting ready to call my witnesses and get my witness list ready and then we had moved it back to March 13th. Okay, so March 13th.

THE COURT: But you said you wouldn't be ready for, but you would be ready for March 20th?

THE DEFENDANT: Right, well but March 20th but then March 13th -- March 13th, excuse me, March 13th came up and then that kind of caused me to forfeit a lot

__

 of time because, here's the bottom line, Your Honor, and I'd just like to quote a case here from the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals in 2010. The case is *United States versus Farias*, in this regards to just meaningful representation and in that case the Court of Appeals stated: a criminal defendant does not simply have a right to represent himself but rather he has a right to represent himself meaningfully and obviously meaningful representation requires time to prepare.

Now also, I have to be humble in this regards. You know, I'm incarcerated, I'm extremely limited, I'm not using that as an excuse but the bottom line is, you know, in my inexperience, you know, thinking that I would have this material I went ahead and said, you know what, let's go ahead and go to trial. I talked to my standby counsel. Mr. Yohay, said well, you know, really that's not advisable. I talked to my investigator, Mr. Franky. Mr. Franky said he -- no, hey we've only been working together for two months. I usually on these kinds of charges I usually spend six months and I said really? He said yeah, you know, there's still outstanding stuff that he would like to get from me and -- and honestly, you know, having a discussion with him and I'm realizing, like you know what, really am I prepared for trial? I actually would be cutting myself short.

I mean, and again, like I said, I have to be humble in this regards, you know. I mean the State thinks, you know, I read their opposition that I'm being proud in this, no, I mean, honestly I've been here a long time. I do want to go to trial but, you know, I have to be honest with myself. I have to be prepared for trial. This is serious business.

THE COURT: Okay.

THE DEFENDANT: And I don't have the advantages of the State.

THE COURT: So, let's talk about a few things. The same warrants we've

12 close to

13 14

15

16 17

18

19 20

21

22

24

24 25 talked about multiple hearings, okay and the State through discovery has offered or tried and they gave you in Court certified copies of those warrants, which you refused, and you gave back to the State. As far as your request for assistance in this case, I do agree with the Ninth Circuit, absolutely you're entitled to a meaningful defense and as far as possible the resources to have that meaningful defense. So, once you requested for the first time that you receive assistance you were granted funds for an investigator. You were likewise given the ability and the funds depending on the amount of those funds to get money for any and all experts you deemed appropriate for the case. So, you have been given the resources to represent yourself even though you're within the detention center. Now, you've been in custody for I don't remember how long but this case has been ongoing for close to what --

MS. BLUTH: Four years.

THE COURT: Twenty-fourteen?

MS. BLUTH: No, thirteen.

THE COURT: This is twenty-thirteen, so four years. You know, and you came in and there's been continuances, but I don't even know if there's been continuances in a long time by the State. A lot of the continuances were by you and you indicated that because of your limitations of being in custody it took you a longer time to get ready. I recognize that and I gave you the continuances.

THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, if I may --

THE COURT: But here's the problem.

THE DEFENDANT: -- let me finish this.

THE COURT: Is the reason we have calendar call is both sides get to come into Court and say am I ready or not ready. And, once the representations are

made that you're ready absent something unforeseeable happening, the parties rely upon that. The State as well as the defense if you so desire. They line up their witnesses, they hire, they pay their experts, they make travel arrangements. There's a lot of reliance that's gone into those representations made at calendar call and everything you bring up today it's not new. You've had the ability to get those warrants. They've been offered to you through discovery. The chains of custody I need to hear from Mr.Yohay real quick, but it's been represented and I don't look at the discovery ordinarily, but it's represented that they are in fact contained in the discovery at which I know that you have to access, I believe with a computer. I don't

THE DEFENDANT: Are we referring to the chain of custody or the search warrants?

THE COURT: The what?

remember whether or not the State --

MS. BLUTH: The chain of custody.

THE COURT: I'm talking about the chain of custody.

THE DEFENDANT: The chain of custody.

MS. BLUTH: I do need to make one correction, Your Honor, whenever you're done making your representations as to the chain of custody reports.

THE COURT: Well, let me ask Mr. Yohay. Did you go through the discovery?

MR. YOHAY: Here's what I can tell you. The first time we received the discs from the District Attorney's office I gave them to our IT people; said basically print out everything on them and then I sent them -- sent everything they provided over to Mr. Sprowson. Quite frankly, I didn't look through everything that there was, I just sent them to him. He -- and then in speaking to him since then he indicated that this chain of custody wasn't in there. I went through the discs that were -- I can tell you I

didn't see them. So, I brought my IT person a gentleman by the name of Peter Eliason along with a computer, along with the discs. All three of us, Mr. Sprowson, Mr. Eliason and myself went through them one afternoon. I'll tell you we didn't see them in there. So, I don't know whether they're on the disc or not. I haven't taken any independent time of my own volition to search through them. I can tell you everything that's been handed over from the State I've handed to Mr. Sprowson. I know, you know, he had brought up this chain of custody that's why -- first I had our people print everything off and give it to him and then I had Mr. Eliason come over with me and a computer with the discs and went, you know, the two of them basically went through it. I kind of just sat there. They knew what they were looking for and then it was my understanding that they didn't, you know, -- they didn't quite -- I can tell you I've never seen anything that is headlined chain of custody or anything.

MS. BLUTH: Right. They don't exist that's why I just didn't -- they -- there is no such thing as a chain of custody report which is why I keep trying to explain this and I've explained this before. There's a property impound report and then there's a search warrant return. On the search warrant return which I've given to Mr. Sprowson three times, the search warrant return shows everything that was taken from his apartment which included paper items, which included his laptop, the victim's laptop and his main computer like a desktop computer.

THE COURT: Uh-huh.

MS. BLUTH: Those are in the police reports that he has paper copies of. Not only are they listed in the police reports they are listed on the back page of the search warrants on the search warrant return and then there's property impound reports that show what property was impounded. Those were provided to Mr.

8

11 12

10

9

13 14

15 16

17

18

19

21

22

20

23

24

25

Momot before prelim. Those were provided to the Defendant pursuant to a discovery request and then those were also provided when I just handed him papers in Court. I provided them three separate times. What Mr. Sprowson is requesting does not exist. Chain of custody reports do not exist, that's not a thing whether it's Clark County School District Police Department, Henderson Police Department or Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department. The only things that exist are search warrant returns and property impound reports. Those have been provided to the Defendant.

If the Defendant would like me to give them to him a fourth time, I am happy to do so. But that does not change the posture of the case on either side. We both know what items were taken we both know what items were impounded. So, as far as Mr. Yohay's representations I completely agree they're not on the discs. I've never made representations that they were on the discs. The only things that are on the discs are the things that were taken off of the cell phones and the computer. That's what the discs are. The rest of the discovery is paper discovery and Mr. Sprowson can find those in his paper documents. But, I'm happy to give them -- him another copy at one o'clock.

As for the Justice Court search warrants I don't know what else to do. I've provided him with certified copies and he still thinks I've doctored the certified copies. So, there's nothing else I can do to prove to him, I mean, I can go down again and get another certified copy from the Justice Court which is not my job, but we've been willing to do, but he won't accept them. So, at this point he's the individual who's causing this. I completely disagree with everything he said today. He didn't think I was going to be able to do this case and now he sees that I am fine going right into this case even though I just got out yesterday. If I can be ready after

doing two back-to-back month-long trials I think that he can be ready after having this case for four years.

THE DEFENDANT: May I -- may I do a rebuttal? A couple of things, Your Honor, that I'd like to clarify for the Court. This Court seems to think that I've been representing myself for four years. I have not, Momots been handling my case --

THE COURT: I don't think that, sir.

THE DEFENDANT: -- for the majority --

THE COURT: I've been on this case a long time.

THE DEFENDANT: -- majority part of the case.

THE COURT: The long story short is -- you've --

THE DEFENDANT: Can -- can I --

THE COURT: -- been representing yourself for a long period of time and what you bring up today is nothing new.

THE DEFENDANT: -- well, can -- I still have to comment, please if I may, Your Honor, on the chain of custody issue. What I'm referring to -- they're talking about doesn't exist, does exist. Every police department when you handle property when they hand it to another person if I have, say for example, Your Honor, my glasses and I hand my glasses, let's say this is evidence, and I hand it to Mr. Dean, okay, and then Mr. Dean hands it to someone else who puts it in the property and then they put it in somewhere else or if they need to do a forensics on it and they take it out that is what you call a chain of custody.

THE COURT: Are you talking about like the label that's on the bags and stuff?

MS. BLUTH: He's not talking about that but that's what it is.

THE DEFENDANT: No, I'm talking about someone who has handled the

evidence it's -- so here's the problem that I have, Your Honor, and this is why I keep making this a big issue. It's not just a matter of what property was taken. It's a matter of who handled the property because as you know, Your Honor, in a defense if someone takes my computer and they take it home and they're doing stuff on it, you know, this -- this interrupts the chain of custody. And this is a very important issue. Now there is a form that I know for a fact, there is a form that states which officers handled the evidence from when it goes into the evidence vault -- say for example, evidence was seized from my home, okay, what officer sees that evidence. You have to say who it is. He signs the document. That document goes to the next person. That person whatever they do with it, say they do a forensic examination they say well we did this, they sign it, they date it, they put their officer number on there then that goes to -- if they put it into, say you have, an evidence what you call an evidence technician or whatever you want to call that title they handle it, they put it in the vault or wherever they put it.

All of these things are very important to my case, Your Honor, this is *Brady* material. Because what it does is if there's a break in that chain of custody, what I just defined, that is a legitimate form, it is a realistic form that police departments use; they have to, Your Honor. This is what when they talk about DNA. When you're talking about --

THE COURT: What do you believe that form looks like? Because -THE DEFENDANT: Well it would have the officer's names on it who -THE COURT: Mm-hmm.

THE DEFENDANT: -- handled my evidence or the evidence that they seized, mainly my computer and my phone. Because here's the issue, they seized pictures and obviously they're saying other things that might be on there as well. So, if I

come to trial and I say, well look, they're saying well we got all this evidence and blah-blah-blah, you know what I'm saying, I should be able to challenge that and say well who else handled this equipment because if I say that evidence wasn't offered. For example, what if there's like thousands of pornographic pictures all of a sudden on my phone. Thousands of pornographic pictures all of a sudden on my computer and I know for a fact that I didn't put those on there now all of a sudden we have a chain of custody issue because somebody who had handled my -- I'm not saying this is has happened, I'm just saying this is a scenario that I should be able to argue in open court.

MS. BLUTH: Well, I can alleviate --

THE DEFENDANT: And it is very important to my defense.

MS. BLUTH: I can alleviate your concerns Mr. Sprowson.

THE DEFENDANT: Well see, that's the thing you're the State, you're the opposition. I need this form. I need --

MS. BLUTH: Okay, and I'm going to get you the form if you just listen. When we bring the evidence into Court to be lodged with the Court there is a label on the front of the envelope. So, let's say the computer comes in and it comes in an envelope. On the front of that envelope it will say -- it won't say chain of -- I don't know the exact words but it's an evidence sheet and everyone who touched that piece of evidence or who looked at it signs their name and their P number, and then if it goes to the lab technician for forensics; that person. So, that's not a sheet that I can give you but when the evidence comes into Court on the first day of trial it will have every person's name who ever touched it or opened it. I think that that's what he's requesting and that will be here in Court on the first day of trial.

THE DEFENDANT: See, that's the second problem because what if I need to

8

9

10

13

14

15 16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23

24 25 file a motion in limine and there's an issue with it and I need to file a motion in limine. I don't have any time for preparation. So, what they're suggesting is that on the day of, I be excluded from having any preparation time.

See, this is the other problem that I was bringing up with wobbling the pingponging of the trial dates, Your Honor, is that, you know, you know, I was set for March 20th again anticipating certain evidence and I do want to comment on those search warrants, just real quick, and I'm not trying to drag it out, but sticking with this whole issue with the preparation time. Now, I've been robbed of preparation time to file any motions in limine, to file any motions to suppress; if need be. The other issue is, Your Honor, NRS 1.180, says that the search warrants have to have a seal on them. Now, --

THE COURT: Okay, so hold on --

THE DEFENDANT: -- they've given me -- they've given me

THE COURT: -- a second, let me stop -- I've got to stop you at something or we will go on about these search warrants forever. Right, wrong or otherwise, whether you agree, disagree whatever there's been rulings made on these search warrants, okay. And once a ruling is made it may be wrong but it is the -- you may believe it is just wrong; it is the ruling of the Court. And really at this stage of the game the only time you get to challenge those is if you get convicted and you seek some kind of relief in the Nevada Supreme Court. But you're stuck with the rulings. You don't get to bring them up over and over and over again, and on the search warrants you've got to lay that to rest. I mean, at this point, the State has offered to give you certified copies. I don't know what happened with your investigator but you had the ability to have an investigator to go and get those copies. I don't know what happened.

2

3

4

5

6 7

8

11

10

12 13

14 15

16

17

18 19

20 21

22

23

2425

THE DEFENDANT: But, the search warrants --

THE COURT: I don't know what happened.

THE DEFENDANT: -- were denied to me, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I don't know what happened, sir.

THE DEFENDANT: Not only that I --

THE COURT: The only -- hold on; at some point there's got to be finality. So, if you don't have the warrants, I don't know what happened with your investigator and why your investigator was unable to obtain those warrants. There's a couple of different ways that could happen. You've presented -- your argument is I don't want to take them from the State because I think they're doctoring the warrants; fine. Fair enough, you're entitled to have that defense or have that belief; okay. That's why you had the investigator. But if you needed the warrants there's only a few ways to get them at this point because we do have to go to trial. Everyone has relied upon the representations of both the State and the Defense that this case is ready for trial, and the warrant issue has gone on and on and on for years. So, the State has offered and you can accept or deny their offer to get you certified copies; okay. And the certification would have the seal of the Clerk of the Court saying that this is in fact a legitimate thing. I don't know if Mr. Yohay's office has the ability to go down to the Clerk's office and get a certified copy and frankly I don't know what's precluding your investigator from going down and getting a certified copy. Because usually it's not that hard to get certified copies from the Court. But if you need them, those are three different ways you could potentially get them.

THE DEFENDANT: But --

THE COURT: As far as, I agree with Ms. Bluth in that -- I understand what you're asking for and I think the State understands what you're asking for as far

those chain of custody but usually they are -- usually when evidence comes in it's usually in some kind of bag usually like a brown bag. And, on that bag, just as Ms. Bluth has represented there's information that would be what you would consider a chain of custody. Which basically says, on this date Joe Blow had the property and then their identification number of the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department and whether it's a detective, it's an officer, it's someone in the crime scene labs, every single person that's ever touched that should be represented on the bag.

Now, the State is going to be obligated and they always do, they're going to have to go through that piece of evidence, whatever it is, to sit there and go through and lay that whole foundation of everyone who had that property until it comes into possession of the person who's sitting on the stand. And, you will have the opportunity to do cross examination on that. But, what you're asking for does not exist in the form you believe it exits. So, I mean, at this point, I just honestly don't see any reason for this case not to go trial and again, you've been provided everything you've --

THE DEFENDANT: If I can just make two more points, Your Honor, please.

THE COURT: -- requested.

THE DEFENDANT: Please, if I can make two more points. Number one, as far as the search warrants the -- the tell all of that -- what I did and what I found out in my research was that -- what those documents --

THE COURT: Are we rearguing the search warrant issue because --

THE DEFENDANT: No, no this is something new -- this is new, Your Honor.

THE COURT: -- because I respect --

THE DEFENDANT: It's new, Your Honor.

THE COURT: -- the fact that you disagree, I respect that --

THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, it's new information.

THE COURT: -- you believe that the law was wrong.

THE DEFENDANT: Please, I beg of you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay, if it's new, if it's new.

THE DEFENDANT: It's new.

THE COURT: Only.

THE DEFENDANT: It's new.

THE COURT: Okay.

THE DEFENDANT: During my research, because one of the issues, like I said, they provided me what they called certified copies, la-di-da-di-da; whatever. The issue then, I did my research and I was looking at the Court rules on electronic filings, okay and I discussed this with my standby counsel, I discussed this with my investigator.

THE COURT: Okay.

THE DEFENDANT: So, on Friday what we did -- well let me just kind of give some background information. So, as I'm doing my research and I'm looking on the law library I realize it starts talking about scan dates and the scan dates are what happens when you get the document, you put a file stamp on it, and within a couple of days, no later than that, these documents are scanned into the system.

THE COURT: Okay.

THE DEFENDANT: So, what I did on Friday and this is another reason why I asked for this continuance because this was something that I just realized and learned. This is the tell-all, the end of all discussion in regards to the search warrants. That's why it's good for the State, it's good for me and it's good for the Court because it establishes the integrity issue. The scan dates establish when

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23

24

25

those documents were filed.

THE COURT: No, they don't.

THE DEFENDANT: And so -- well it has --

THE COURT: Filing and scanning are two different things.

THE DEFENDANT: -- well, I mean it has the scan --

THE COURT: And sometimes the day it's scanned depends on how backed up they are.

THE DEFENDANT: Right, but the bottom line is that the scanned date shows within a certain period of time. For example, if it's three or four months prior or three or four months afterwards there's obviously going to be a discrepancy there. So, the new information that I'm trying to present to the Court on this issue --

THE COURT: How can you scan it before it's filed? The scanning isn't going to be --

THE DEFENDANT: That's my point -- that's my point, see if you -- here's the argument.

THE COURT: You're not going to know really the scan date. I mean, the scan date is --

THE DEFENDANT: Well, I subpoenaed the scan dates, Your Honor. This is what I'm trying to get to is that on Friday --

THE COURT: Okay.

THE DEFENDANT: -- I -- what I did was I subpoenaed the custodian of records to be here at one o'clock so I could do a voir dire examination and to actually end this issue and to look at scan dates. I asked them to bring the scan dates on those documents. The reason why it's important, Your Honor, is cause, say for example, and this is why it's a very good point. If it's been scanned six

9

10

11

13

12

14 15

16

17

18 19

20 21

22

23

24

25

months prior to the documents being filed, will you agree that there's an issue with that document?

THE COURT: I'm just trying to figure out how they're going to scan in a document --

THE DEFENDANT: Well, exactly.

THE COURT: -- and not file it.

THE DEFENDANT: Exactly, it has a file stamp on it.

THE COURT: Unless it goes to like some kind of --

THE DEFENDANT: Exactly, that's my point. Is that you're going to have -definitely there's going to be an issue. How can -- that's what I'm trying to talk about. Is if -- if I have scan dates that are six months or if it's an antiquated scan date on this particular document and well -- actually what I'm getting at, it may not even be the very document because we're talking about document numbers. We're talking about, for example, search warrants --

THE COURT: Okay, stop for a second, okay I need some clarification. So, what do you think happens? Like, it gets scanned in and it sits in some abyss until they take it out of the abyss and they file it?

THE DEFENDANT: No, that's not what I'm saying. What I'm saying --

THE COURT: And I don't understand, sir because --

THE DEFENDANT: What I'm saying is, okay say for example, I'll use an example here, if I may --

THE COURT: Okay.

THE DEFENDANT: -- in my documentation. And by the way, I just want to say I did bring some evidence. I have an affidavit from Mr. Franky stating that he tried to get those and that they would not give them to him. If the Court would

indulge me just to even look at the affidavit.

THE COURT: Can I see that Jason? I don't know why he's unable to get these documents.

THE DEFENDANT: This is an affidavit from my investigator stating that --

THE COURT: Do you know why he's unable to get them?

MR. YOHAY: I can tell you Judge. I got a phone call from someone in Justice Court and they indicated to me -- I'm sorry I have their name back in the notes I've been keeping on this case. They indicated to me that they were unwilling to give them to Mr. Franky because he wasn't an attorney. They indicated they would send them to me because I was as an attorney and acting as a standby counsel. I told them that's fine send them to me and I'll --

THE COURT: Did you get them?

MR. YOHAY: No.

THE COURT: Obviously, I can't get them because I don't want to be able to be called in as a witness on any of this.

MR. YOHAY: Right.

THE COURT: So, --

MR. YOHAY: I can --

THE COURT: -- can you guys go down and get them today and get them to Mr. Sprowson.

THE DEFENDANT: Well, I subpoenaed the custodian of records to be here with the scan dates and that material. So, this is what I was trying -- if I may I'll let you look at that. I have some other stuff that I'd like to just present to the Court; if I may.

THE COURT: Well, wouldn't -- why can't -- just tell me why Mr. Yohay can't

send a representative of his office to go --

THE DEFENDANT: Well, I subpoenaed --

THE COURT: -- get these for you.

THE DEFENDANT: -- the custodian of records. He's going to be here at one o'clock. I have to be here at one anyways.

THE COURT: At one o'clock today the custodian of records -- we don't have time for him to testify. We have a jury that's coming up.

THE DEFENDANT: Well, Your Honor, it's very important that it be established when these documents -- what I'm getting at I have --

THE COURT: What do you -- hold on a sec, hold on please. So, you want them to just show up at one o'clock with the subpoenaed -- the scanned --

THE DEFENDANT: Well, it would -- it would be search warrants.

THE COURT: -- I'm sorry the certified documents?

THE DEFENDANT: They're supposed to bring the actual search warrants, certified copies; yes I requested that. Certified copies of the search warrants --

THE COURT: Okay.

THE DEFENDANT: -- and the scan dates. So, that, I mean, we don't even really have to go into any detail with this custodian of records. You're talking about having -- this would save him -- it's already on the way is what I'm getting at.

THE COURT: Assuming they come up with their search warrants -- the certified copies of the search warrants, that's all you want; right?

THE DEFENDANT: Well, I want the scan dates and this is -- I'm trying to present my argument here so you understand what I'm trying to say; all right.

THE COURT: Please.

THE DEFENDANT: If I may. Are you already done with the --

THE COURT: Yes, sir.

THE DEFENDANT: -- you done with the affidavit, or --

THE COURT: I'm looking at it but is this your copy; sir?

THE DEFENDANT: That's from Mr. Franky, yes.

THE COURT: Okay, I mean I believe you and I believe Mr. Franky. I don't understand why they're giving him so much difficulty but your counsel confirms this so that means there's -- I guess there's -- three ways; new ways we can get it. Mr. Yohay can get it, the State can get it or if they show up pursuant to your subpoena they can bring it with them when they come.

THE DEFENDANT: And if I may, just please indulge me this one last thing on this, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Yes, sir.

THE DEFENDANT: Okay, I have here two copies of the same exact document supposedly a certified copy; okay. Now, on one of these the stamp and I'm not nit picking on this because we know that when we say a file stamp we're talking about a file stamp. When they file stamp a document before it's scanned it should be in the same spot. In other words, if I scan a document and it's on my computer every time I print out a copy I should get the exact same copy. The issue that I'm having is is that I have two purported copies that are supposed to be from the same exact original. I've got one file stamp that is straight in relation to my name and another file stamp that is crooked and it's not just -- it's more predominant on the other two pages.

THE COURT: Okay, let me ask this. Is the substance of the document the same in both of the --

THE DEFENDANT: Well, this is what I was leading --

5

4

7

6

9

8

10 11

12 13

14 15

16

17 18

19

21

22

20

23 24

25

THE COURT: -- I can't see what they are.

THE DEFENDANT: -- to the scan dates. This is why I was leading to the scan dates on this. If I may, Your Honor.

THE COURT: In both of the items you're holding are the -- is the substance of the document, assuming it's the same document; is it the same exactly?

THE DEFENDANT: For the most part, yes. And that's not what I have an issue with.

THE COURT: When you say for the most part, what do you mean?

THE DEFENDANT: For the most part, yes I've got a label on this one. I've got a defense exhibit A on this one. As far as what you're talking about, --

THE COURT: For the content.

THE DEFENDANT: -- the content -- the content is relatively the same. But that's not the point that I'm trying to make, if I may, Your Honor, please, you know, I'm facing life sentences here. This is very important, as you know, I mean, there's a reason why I'm asking for this --

THE COURT: I agree that this is important but we need to -- it needs to be new.

THE DEFENDANT: I want -- I want to end it that's why I subpoenaed the scan dates.

THE COURT: Sure.

THE DEFENDANT: What -- this is what I'm trying to get at with -- okay, so say for example, let's just look at two different scans real quick. Okay, this is a legitimate document; it goes into the Court; they file it. We see that, all right. It's filed. At some point it has to be filed into the system. It has to be scanned into the system, that's what I'm talking about, that's the scan dates that I'm asking for; okay.

So, this date has December 20th, 1:37 p.m. thirteen. Now, they're backlogged with other -- within a relatively short period of time give or take; we'll give it a week.

THE COURT: Okay.

THE DEFENDANT: Okay. Variation it should be relatively the same date. Now, what I'm asking for on the scan dates, is if you have an antiquated scan date -- when I say antiquated, say this one says December 20th, 2013, and you've got a date on the scan date that -- and let's -- that's how are we -- first of all let's establish how are we even identifying this document.

THE COURT: What date is that warrant signed? I'm assuming that's a warrant?

THE DEFENDANT: This is a warrant but the document number is SW20132044. So, this is how we're identifying it. What I'm getting at when I say antiquated scan date if the -- if the clerk is looking for, okay so they go in there; they look for a search warrant 2013 the scan date for a 2044.

THE COURT: Yes.

THE DEFENDANT: So, the scan date gives a date of such and such I don't know whatever it gives. On here it has a file stamp that says December 20th, 1:37 p.m. at 2013. Okay, now if that scan date is very, very, very, very far off then we've definitely got a problem, cause we can see that this document --

THE COURT: What's the date of the warrant?

THE DEFENDANT: -- could be questionable, as far as even being filed.

THE COURT: What's the date of the warrant?

THE DEFENDANT: The date of this warrant is December 20th, 1:37 p.m. 2013.

THE COURT: Okay, and it's filed the same day?

MS. BLUTH: He's reading the file date, Judge.

THE DEFENDANT: I'm reading the file date --

THE COURT: Okay, go to the last page --

THE DEFENDANT: -- this is what I'm getting at.

THE COURT: -- the signature page and see when it's signed.

THE DEFENDANT: As far as the issue date. The issue date on this one -- let me give you the issue date cause we're talking about file date and we're talking about issue date. Okay. So, okay, the issue date on this one was the 10th of December.

THE COURT: Okay, so ten days later it's filed.

THE DEFENDANT: Okay, so that's not the issue that I'm having because, you know, we know that the ten days it has to be returned within ten days, that's not what I'm talking about.

THE COURT: Mm-hmm.

THE DEFENDANT: What I'm talking about as the scan date, the scan date -this obviously has to be put into the system. This is a hard copy. This has to be put
into the system and it's put under 2044 and then it has that file stamp. What I'm
getting at is the way that you can verify this document is the date on it -- that it's -that the actual physical file stamp compared to the actual scan date. The scan date
should be within approximately, like we already -- like I've already stated within a
week. I wouldn't see -- if it's a month earlier, or two months earlier, a year earlier
what if I look at this -- and we look at -- this is my argument. If you look at 20132044
and we got a date on it of say November 10th in 2008, wouldn't you find that kind of
a --

THE COURT: Well, I would but --

THE DEFENDANT: -- a suspicious issue?

THE COURT: -- I don't know that in 2008 they suspected that you would do something in 2013.

THE DEFENDANT: Well, that's my point is that these numbers on here 2044 if this is actually -- does this actually even belong to this document because -- this -- you can easily on a computer -- this is -- you know I'm not gonna go back to the same old argument that I've already argued about cut and paste stuff. I'm not going to repeat that.

THE COURT: Sure.

THE DEFENDANT: My argument is the scan dates. So, what is the scan date actually establish? It establishes that this was actually filed on the date it was or within approximately the same few days. That's what the scan date establishes.

THE COURT: Okay, let me just stop you for a second. Things should be scanned in relatively quick in time but quite honestly sometimes the scan -- things get scanned in a day or two after they're are filed. Sometimes they can be several days before their filed and that's talking about District Court. I have no idea what the backlog is as far as Justice Court. There was a period of time when it took, oh gosh, weeks and weeks for something to get scanned in. But hopefully, both Justice Court and District Court are beyond that. But, I don't really see the relevance in the scan date. I mean, I don't think in 2008 they were sitting around waiting for Melvyn Sprowson to commit some kind of crime in 2013.

THE DEFENDANT: That's my point. It's not under my name, it's under the -- it's under the search warrant number.

THE COURT: Sir, I think that your arguments are just so tenuous.

THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, but see this is the thing is it wouldn't be

it.

under my name. Your Honor, if you look in my -- we've already established this.

There's nothing in my Justice Court case. This is the problem I'm having. You can't look under my name. I have another subpoena -- not subpoena but affidavit --

THE COURT: What is it exactly -- what is it -- just spit it out.

THE DEFENDANT: -- stated there's nothing in my Justice Court case.

THE COURT: What exactly do you think? I mean because --

THE DEFENDANT: There are no search warrants. There are no search warrants and this is why I'm saying -- the State is saying well these are our search warrants, you know, you've got a stamp here that says certified copy. That's up -- that should have a seal there. NRS 1.180 establishes that as the law. You should have a seal there. How did I get this if this is a legitimate certified copy why doesn't it have a seal on it; Your Honor? That's all I'm saying. I have a legitimate argument. This is suspicious when you give me and I have on the record already in my motions that I filed in the past and in the present when you've got this right here without a seal and all of a sudden -- all of a sudden now I'm getting different copies where you've got one -- this was the one that was supposedly when we had the hearing in October 12th -- and then --

THE COURT: When you say it doesn't have a seal --

THE DEFENDANT: -- on October 21st --

THE COURT: -- are you talking about the raised portion?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: That's made with that little machine?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, that is the seal. 1.180 says it has to have a seal on

THE COURT: Okay, how -- because it's just a regular copy. If you didn't

certify --

THE DEFENDANT: That makes it authen -- excuse me, Your Honor, that authentis -- I can't even speak. That authenticates, excuse me, authenticates that it is an official copy.

THE COURT: Okay, so hold on --

THE DEFENDANT: That safeguards the system.

THE COURT: -- we've got to stop. At some point Mr. Sprowson you've got to stop. It's a photocopy; okay. Photocopies are made of things that's not going to have that seal unless it's the certified copy; okay. So, what you have is simply a photocopy. What the State offered to give you but you didn't want which is fair was the certified copy which would have had the raised seal.

THE DEFENDANT: This one has a photocopy seal on -- this is what I'm saying.

THE COURT: Of course, but not every time -- not every time that that document is reproduced is it going to have the certified copy simply because you usually have to pay or you've got to go through extra steps. But all you want right; is a certified copy?

THE DEFENDANT: I want the scan date so I can establish an argument and have an opportunity to file a motion in limine, Your Honor, I just -- your -- you know I'm not -- look it -- here's my -- my point with -- with the continuation, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Yes sir.

THE DEFENDANT: I'm not asking for a lot of time. I'm only asking for two months so that I can have time --

THE COURT: I can't give you two months, sir.

THE DEFENDANT: -- to get --

THE COURT: You're probably going to be --

THE DEFENDANT: I'm incarcerated. The State's not at a loss, the Court's not at a loss. I'm incarcerated, Your Honor, I'm the one that's at a loss. I'm the one that has to -- all I'm asking for is a fighting chance in this; Your Honor. You know, like I said, I understood the responsibility of representing myself; you know. This is only my second continuation. My other attorney Momot, he's the one that had all those other continuances. The Court had to continue it and I didn't mind when the State was pregnant, you know what I mean, and you know, why was it that Momot withdrew in the first place was because I said I wanted to go to trial.

MS. BLUTH: Your Honor, we've gone far past today, so --

THE COURT: Okay, so we do -- I agree with the State in that we just got to have some resolution on this issue. So, is there anything else? So, basically you have the Clerk's office coming up here at one o'clock with hopefully a certified copy and hopefully the scan dates which they can present to you, and if that's all they're doing that's fine, we can delay the jury a little bit coming in here. But we have a jury coming at one.

THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, I submit to you this affidavit from Mr. Franky that says there's nothing in my Justice Court case.

THE COURT: Didn't you just -- didn't you show one?

THE DEFENDANT: That's another --

THE COURT: Was it filed?

THE DEFENDANT: -- affidavit that we requested the search warrants that he didn't get the search warrants. See, this is another issue is --

THE COURT: Okay, stay on point, stay on point. What is that?

THE DEFENDANT: This is an affidavit that Mr. Franky signed stating that

when he went and he asked for the documents in Justice Court they did not have the documents, okay.

MS. BLUTH: I think that, Your Honor, already put that in evidence a long time ago.

THE DEFENDANT: No, not this -- this -- I'm the only one that has this -- she MS. BLUTH: No, we -- it's on the record that there wasn't anything in Justice Court.

THE COURT: Go ahead and file it. We'll make a copy for the State so it's in the record. Okay, so is there anything else -- so hopefully you'll get your certified copies when the person comes up today. Is there anything else?

MS. BLUTH: Not on behalf of the State.

[Colloquy between the Court and Court Clerk]

THE COURT: File it as affidavit of investigator.

THE COURT MARSHAL: Judge, do you want the subpoena too?

THE DEFENDANT: That's for -- we subpoenaed and asked for any search warrants under my name. That's under my name. There's nothing under my name either. They couldn't find anything in Justice Court under my name.

THE COURT: We've already talked about this. How they file these. We've had other hearings on this.

THE DEFENDANT: Well see, now we're going back that's why I asked for the scan dates because if --

THE COURT: Look, Sir, these are --

THE DEFENDANT: -- it's not under --

THE COURT: -- all issues we discussed --

THE DEFENDANT: -- my name it would be under the search warrant

number.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: -- before, okay. So, the affidavit of your investigator --

THE DEFENDANT: Thank you.

THE COURT: -- we're going to put a cover sheet on it and we're going to file it as defense's affidavit of investigator. We'll make a copy for the State.

THE DEFENDANT: The other thing -- just one more thing; Your Honor. I -- I here mailed into this Court a notice of contempt to the Justice Court because we couldn't get these documentations.

THE COURT: Okay.

THE DEFENDANT: All I'm saying is that I could not get these search warrants and the fact that I could not get these search warrants I did not have an opportunity to prepare, and I was -- I was -- the thing is because I have Mr. Franky my investigator, he's telling me they're on the way - they're on the way. So, I tell the Court, yes I'm ready to go in anticipation of having this because I'm getting ready to -- whatever I need to file any motions in limine. This is my argument, Your Honor, is that I have been robbed of preparation time. Not only that, but the wobbling back of the trial dates, you know, I mean it's not fair to me; Your Honor. Quite honestly, with -- even if I'm ready or not ready to go on March 20th and it's moved back to March 13th and it's moved back to March 20th and then it's moved to March 21st, how am I going to do my planning? I'm already restricted in the facility that I'm in. I only get two hours a day to access the law library. I have to order paper, I have to order envelopes and I understand all these things, but this is why I quoted the case that I did. Because I should be allowed meaningful preparation; and that's all I'm asking. It's the only reason I even asked for this because in anticipation of having that evidence that I was anticipating to be able to go ahead and file motions in limine and

2 3

4 5

6

7

8

10

9

11

12 13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20 21

22

24

23

25

challenge the State's evidence.

MS. BLUTH: Your Honor, may I make one point to Mr. Sprowson. At the last time when we continued this case nine months for him to be ready he said I will not, Your Honor, I promise you, I will not ask for another continuance. We gave him nine months and for him to say that these aren't his continuances; it's been continued seven times. He has all day every day for four years to prepare for this case. At some point, it is time to go and that time is today. So, we would ask that he be ready to go at one o'clock. We'll make sure, we'll go call the Clerk make sure that somebody is here at one o'clock to provide him with these things. But at this point in time there is no outstanding discovery.

THE COURT: Okay, and sir, at this point --

THE DEFENDANT: I disagree, Your Honor, and I object.

THE COURT: -- I understand but --

THE DEFENDANT: And for the record I just want to lay, okay --

THE COURT: -- there's got to be finality.

THE DEFENDANT: Obviously, if I'm going to trial, I have to object.

THE COURT MARSHAL: Hey, enough. Quit arguing with the Judge.

THE COURT: It's okay. Just one minute closing statement.

THE DEFENDANT: I just want to object for the record, Your Honor.

THE COURT: One minute to sum up what you want.

THE DEFENDANT: Okay.

THE COURT: And then I need to make a ruling; sir. Okay, at this point the motion to continue trial is going to be denied and I kind of indicated already, I believe that you've had adequate time to get ready and there has to be some reliance upon the representations made at calendar call which are that both sides

25

1

2

were ready to proceed. I do recognize that occasionally something comes up post calendar call which makes -- precludes a person from being ready for trial but in this particular case nothing new has come up. The search warrant issue has been ongoing for years. I understand that you don't want to take the search warrants proffered by the State notwithstanding the fact that they're certified copies; okay. But, we have also given you the resources notwithstanding the fact you're representing yourself and you're detained in the detention center. We have still given you resources so that you can represent yourself to the best of your ability. Again, those resources would be the ability to have an expert -- I'm sorry an investigator that you can utilize to do the leg work, which you've had for -- you've had maybe only for a short period of time but you've had it shortly after you made the first request for that investigator. We've also given you the ability, if you so desire, to have financial resources for the hiring of an expert, and again, we gave you that ability the first time you asked for it and shortly thereafter. Even if it may have been late in the case, we gave it to you the first time you've asked. None of these issues are new. As far as the search warrant if you don't want to take it from the State and you don't want Mr. Yohay to get it, you've subpoenaed the Clerk, hopefully the Clerk does in fact show up at one o'clock at that point you can get the requested documents and you can prepare. But, the bottom line -- and you can also have at that point a certified copy to compare with the photo copy that you keep referencing.

But, there is no basis to continue this trial. As far as the chain of custody, I understand what you want and I think the State understands what you want as well, but it doesn't seem to -- it doesn't exist in the format that you believe it exists in. However, there are going to be experts I'm assuming that will come in and they'll

testify regarding evidence that was taken as part of the investigation of this case and the State will have to, they're mandated, to lay that foundation for that expert and the introduction of that evidence, and you will have the opportunity, sir, if you want, to spend whatever time you deem appropriate cross-examining the person who's sitting on the stand about any chain of custody defects, but there quite simply is no basis to continue this trial out anymore. We'll see you -- we need him up a little sooner because we're having that person coming at one. So, Mr. Sprowson probably what -- can you bring him up around twelve forty-five.

THE DEFENDANT: Well --

THE CORRECTIONS OFFICER: Twelve forty-five?

THE COURT: Yeah. Does he have clothing down there? Does he have clothing?

THE DEFENDANT: I'm going to come like this. I'm not going to change I'm going to be just like this.

THE COURT: That choice is up to you; sir.

THE DEFENDANT: That's what I'm saying.

THE COURT: You have a right to be dressed in civilian clothing if you so desire. And if you want to be seen by the jury like this we'll have to make a record because --

THE DEFENDANT: That's fine.

THE COURT: -- most people would --

THE DEFENDANT: I mean it's --

THE COURT: -- prefer to be in civilian clothing.

THE DEFENDANT: -- it's -- if I just may for the record, Your Honor, just make a closing statement, I just -- again, Your Honor, I do believe that I have just cause

for this continuation, you know, the chain of custody -- what I'm talking about. I understand what the State has represented. I understand what you have represented --

THE COURT: Yes, sir.

THE DEFENDANT: -- as far as the chain of custody I have seen other documents that list the police officers and I understand it's an issue that I can address during the trial but see -- what that does is it again --

THE COURT: I know, sir, but we've brought all this up before. We have -THE DEFENDANT: I know it shorts the preparation time. All I'm arguing for,
Your Honor, is that I've been -- because of the wobbling of the trial dates it really
has --

THE COURT: I understand we've brought --

THE DEFENDANT: -- forfeit. I have forfeited preparation time.

THE COURT: -- this up. I respect that you disagree with me, I do, and but if anything with the wobbling you've gotten that extra week you desire, but I do have other cases, and sir, you need to go back down, get dressed in whatever you want to wear and get ready for the trial because the jury will be here at one which is an hour forty-five minutes approximately. Thank you, sir, we will see you soon.

[Proceedings concluded at 11:17 a.m.]

* * * * * * * *

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

Gail M. Reiger

Court Recorder/Transcriber

1 2	IN THE SUPREME COUR	RT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA	
3 4	MELVYN SPROWSON,	No. 73674	
5	Appellant,		
6	V)	
7	THE STATE OF NEVADA,		
8 9	Respondent.))	
10	APPELLANT'S APPENDIX VOLUME VII PAGES 1404-1645		
11	PHILIP J. KOHN	STEVE WOLFSON	
12	Clark County Public Defender 309 South Third Street	Clark County District Attorney 200 Lewis Avenue, 3 rd Floor	
13	Las Vegas, Nevada 89155-2610	Las Vegas, Nevada 89155	
14 15	Attorney for Appellant	ADAM LAXALT Attorney General 100 North Carson Street Carson City, Nevada 89701-4717	
16		(702) 687-3538	
17	Counsel for Respondent <u>CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE</u>		
18	I hereby certify that this document was filed electronically with the Nevada		
19	Supreme Court on the 2 day of May, 2018. Electronic Service of the foregoing document		
20	shall be made in accordance with the Master Service List as follows:		
21	ADAM LAXALT	DEBORAH L. WESTBROOK	
22	STEVEN S. OWENS I further certify that I served	HOWARD S. BROOKS I a copy of this document by mailing a true and	
23	correct copy thereof, postage pre-paid, addressed to:		
24	MELVYN SPROWSON, #1180740		
25 26	HIGH DESERT STATE PRISON P.O. BOX 650		
27	INDIAN SPRINGS, NV 89070		
28		see. Clark County Public Defender's Office	