1	IN THE SUPREME C	OURT (OF THE STAT	E OF NEVADA
2				-
3	JOSE AZUCENA)	No. 74071	
4	Appellant,)		Electronically Filed Apr 10 2018 04:45 p.m.
5)		Elizabeth A. Brown Clerk of Supreme Court
6	V.)		Clork of Captorno Court
7	THE STATE OF NEVADA,)		
8	Respondent.	,)		
9	APPELLANT'S APPEN) NDIX V(LUME XIII P	AGES 2242-2491
10		VDIZI V		
11	PHILIP J. KOHN		STEVE WOI	
12	Clark County Public Defender 309 South Third Street Las Vegas, Nevada 89155-2610		200 Lewis Av Las Vegas, N	District Attorney Venue, 3 rd Floor
13	Attorney for Appellant		ADAM LAX	
14 15	Theomey for rippenant		Attorney Gen	eral rson Street
16			Carson City, (702) 687-353	Nevada 89701-4717 38
17			Counsel for F	
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				
26				
27				
28				

INDEX JOSE AZUCENA Case No. 74071

1

2	Case No. 74071	
3	Amended Indictment filed 04/27/17	<u>PAGE NO</u> 500-510
4	Court's Exhibit 4 dated 05/01/17	2988
5	Court's Exhibit 31 dated 05/08/17	2983-2987
6	Court's Exhibit 34 dated 05/08/17	2957-2982
7 8	Defendant's Motion in Limine to Preclude Lay Opinion Testimony that the Accusers' Behavior is Consistent with that of a Victim of Sexual Abuse Date of Hrg: 04/11/17	383-386
9 10	Defendant's Motion in Limine to Preclude Use of the Prejudicial Term "Victim" Date of Hrg: 04/11/17	336-348
11	Defendant's Notice of Expert Witnesses filed 03/27/17	287-332
12	Defendant's Notice of Witnesses filed 04/10/17	398-399
13	Defendant's Second Supplemental Notice of Witnesses filed 04/18/17	469-471
14	Defendant's Supplemental Notice of Witnesses filed 04/12/17	406-408
15	District Court Minutes from 02/02/17 through 08/17/17	605-649
16	Ex Parte Application for an Order Shortening Time Date of Hrg: 04/04/17	333-335
17	Ex Parte Order for Transcript filed 03/31/17	392
18	Fifth Supplemental Notice of Witnesses and/or Expert Witnesses filed 04/20/17	475-477
19 20	Fourth Supplemental Notice of Witnesses and/or Expert Witnesses filed 04/19/17	' 472-474
20	Indictment filed 02/02/17	003-014
	Indictment Warrant filed 02/02/17	001-002
2223	Indictment Warrant Return filed 02/03/17	015
24	Instructions to the Jury filed 05/10/17	542-586
25	Judgment of Conviction (Jury Trial) filed 08/24/17	596-600
26	Jury List filed 04/25/17	499
27	Jury List filed 05/08/17	534
28	Jury Notes	2955-2956

1 2	Media Request and Order for Camera Access to Court Proceedings filed 02/06/17	016-021
3	Media Request and Order for Camera Access to Court Proceedings filed 02/14/17	022
4	Memorandum Regarding the Use of NRS 51.385 to Admit Hearsay Testimony filed 05/08/17	522-533
56	Motion in Limine to Admit Scholarly Treatise on Immigration Law Date of Hrg: 04/11/17	355-369
7	Motion to Compel Production of Discovery & Brady Material filed 04/18/17	217-255
8 9 10	Motion to Dismiss for Repeated and Ongoing Discovery/Brady Violations and Motion for an Evidentiary Hearing Date of Hrg: 04/24/17	478-496
11	Motion to Reconsider Defendant's Motion to Compel Production of Discovery & Brady Material—Redacted filed 04/18/17	411-437
12	Notice of Appeal filed 09/18/17	601-604
13	Notice of Witnesses and/or Expert Witnesses filed 02/27/17	197-215
14	Plaintiff's Proposed Jury Instructions Not Used at Trial filed 05/08/17	535-541
15	Receipt of Copy filed 03/31/17	393
15 16	Receipt of Copy filed 03/31/17	
		397
16	Receipt of Copy filed 04/07/17	397 409-410
16 17	Receipt of Copy filed 04/07/17	397 409-410 511-521
16 17 18	Receipt of Copy filed 04/07/17	397 409-410 511-521 400-402
16 17 18 19	Receipt of Copy filed 04/07/17	397 409-410 511-521 400-402 497-498
16 17 18 19 20 21	Receipt of Copy filed 04/07/17	397 409-410 511-521 400-402 497-498 370-382
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Receipt of Copy filed 04/07/17	397 409-410 511-521 400-402 497-498 370-382 349-354

1 2	State's Opposition to Defendant's Motion to Reconsider Defendant's Motion to Compel Production of Discovery and Brady Material Date of Hrg: 04/04/17
3	Supplemental Notice of Witnesses and/or Expert Witnesses filed 04/05/17 394-396
4	Third Supplemental Notice of Witnesses and/or Expert Witnesses filed 04/11/17 403-405
5	Verdict filed 05/10/17
6	<u>TRANSCRIPTS</u>
7	Recorder's Transcript
8	JURY TRIAL DAY 1 Date of Hrg: 04/24/17
9	Recorder's Transcript
10	JURY TRIAL DAY 2 Date of Hrg: 04/25/17
11	Recorder's Transcript
12	JURY TRIAL DAY 3 Date of Hrg: 04/27/17
13	Recorder's Transcript JURY TRIAL DAY 4
14	Date of Hrg: 04/28/17
15	Recorder's Transcript JURY TRIAL DAY 5
16	Date of Hrg: 05/01/17
17	Recorder's Transcript
18	JURY TRIAL DAŶ 6 Date of Hrg: 05/02/17
19	Recorder's Transcript
20	JURY TRIAL DAY 7 Date of Hrg: 05/03/17
21	Recorder's Transcript
22	JURY TRIAL DAY 8 Date of Hrg: 05/04/17
23	Recorder's Transcript
24	JURY TRIAL DAÝ 9 Date of Hrg: 05/05/27
25	Recorder's Transcript
26	JURY TRIAL DAY 10 Date of Hrg: 05/08/17
27	Recorder's Transcript
28	JURY TRIAL DAY 11 Date of Hrg: 05/09/17

1 2	Recorder's Transcript JURY TRIAL DAY 12 Date of Hrg: 05/10/17
3	Recorder's Transcript
$\begin{bmatrix} 3 \\ 4 \end{bmatrix}$	Calendar Call; Defendant's Motion in Limine to Preclude Use of the Prejudicial Term "Victim"; Defendant's Motion in Limine to Preclude Lay Opinion Testimony
5	that the Accusers' Behavior is Consistent with that of a Victim of Sexual Abuse; Motion in Limine to Admit Scholarly Treatise on Immigration Law
6	Date of Hrg: 04/11/17
7	Recorder's Transcript Defendant's Motion to Compel Production of Discovery and Brady Material
8	Date of Hrg: 03/23/17
9	Recorder's Transcript Defendant's Motion to Reconsider Defendant's Motion to
	Compel Production of Discovery & Brady Materials
10	Date of Hrg: 04/04/17
11	Recorder's Transcript Grand Jury Return
12	Date of Hrg: 02/02/17
13	Recorder's Transcript Hearing
14	Date of Hrg: 04/26/17
15	Recorder's Transcript
16	Initial Arraignment Date of Hrg: 02/14/17
17	Recorder's Transcript
18	Initial Arraignment; Indictment Warrant Return Date of Hrg: 02/09/17
19	Recorder's Transcript Sentencing
20	Date of Hrg: 06/22/17
21	Recorder's Transcript
22	Sentencing Date of Hrg: 08/17/17
23	Reporter's Transcript
24	Grand Jury Date of Hrg: 02/01/17
25	
26	
27	
28	

Electronically Filed 12/11/2017 7:47 AM Steven D. Grierson **CLERK OF THE COURT**

RTRAN

DISTRICT COURT

CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

4

6

7

8

9

1

2

3

5 THE STATE OF NEVADA.

Plaintiff,

JOSE AZUCENA.

Defendant.

VS.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

DEPT. NO. II

CASE NO. C-17-321044-1

BEFORE THE HONORABLE RICHARD SCOTTI, DISTRICT COURT JUDGE

THURSDAY, MAY 4, 2017

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS RE: **JURY TRIAL - DAY 8** *****

APPEARANCES:

For the Plaintiff: STACEY L. KOLLINS, ESQ.

Chief Deputy District Attorney

CHRISTOPHER S. HAMNER, ESQ.

Deputy District Attorney

For the Defendant: P. DAVID WESTBROOK, ESQ.

> Deputy Public Defender CARLÍ L. KIERNY, ESQ. Deputy Public Defender

DALYNE EASLEY, COURT RECORDER RECORDED BY:

SHAWNA ORTEGA, CET-562 TRANSCRIBED BY:

1	<u>INDEX</u>	
2	<u>WITNESSES</u>	
3	PLAINTIFF'S WITNESSES:	
4	JOHN SEBASTIAN PACULT	
5	Direct Examination by Ms. Kollins	6
6	Cross-Examination by Mr. Westbrook Redirect Examination by Ms. Kollins	27 37
7	Recross-Examination by Mr. Westbrook Further Recross Examination by Mr. Westbrook	40 47
8	ELIZABETH ESPINOZA	
9	Direct Examination by Ms. Kollins	53
10	Direct Examination (cont.) by Ms. Kollins Cross-Examination by Ms. Kierny	67 86
11	Redirect Examination by Ms. Kollins Recross-Examination by Ms. Kierny	133 144
12		
13		
-		
14	<u>EXHIBITS</u>	
	<u>EXHIBITS</u> <u>DESCRIPTION</u>	ADMITTED
14		ADMITTED
14 15	DESCRIPTION	ADMITTED
14 15 16	DESCRIPTION	ADMITTED
14 15 16 17	DESCRIPTION	ADMITTED
14 15 16 17 18	DESCRIPTION	ADMITTED
14 15 16 17 18 19	DESCRIPTION	ADMITTED
14 15 16 17 18 19 20	DESCRIPTION	ADMITTED
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	DESCRIPTION	ADMITTED
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	DESCRIPTION	ADMITTED
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	DESCRIPTION	ADMITTED

1	LAS VEGAS, NEVADA, THURSDAY, MAY 4, 2017
2	[Proceedings commenced at 1:35 p.m.]
3	
4	[Outside the presence of the jury.]
5	THE COURT: State vs. Azucena, C-231044. What have we got
6	planned for today, guys?
7	MS. KOLLINS: Your Honor, we have Mr. John Pacult, who is going to
8	discuss the topic of grooming.
9	THE COURT: Oh. Okay. Right.
10	MS. KOLLINS: And I printed out a copy of the statute. I'm going to
11	have to locate it. Just so the court knows, it's a new statute.
12	THE COURT: I'm you know what, I'm familiar with it.
13	MS. KOLLINS: Okay. Great.
14	MR. WESTBROOK: Which statute?
15	MS: KOLLINS: Grooming.
16	MR. WESTBROOK: Okay.
17	MS. KOLLINS: And then we have Ms. Elizabeth Espinoza, the forensic
18	interviewer, and then we have Detective Matt Campbell.
19	THE COURT: Oh.
20	MR. WESTBROOK: That's it.
21	MR. HAMNER: That's it.
22	MS. KOLLINS: After that the State anticipates we will rest.
23	THE COURT: You think we'll get through well, we're not going to get
24	through all that today. No.
25	MR. HAMNER: It depends on the cross
	3

1	MS. KOLLINS: We have them lined up.
2	MR. HAMNER: Yeah, we have them all lined up ready to go. Worst
3	case scenario, Mr Detective Campbell will come back on Friday to finish up, but
4	we're done after that.
5	MS. KIERNY: We have
6	THE COURT: You've had a chance now to get through your all that
7	material that was late, so.
8	MR. WESTBROOK: I've
9	THE COURT: I know you I'm not asking for purposes of getting
10	trying to trick you to waive your objection or something. But your objection's
11	noted. But, I mean, you have you probably have some cross based on that.
12	MR. WESTBROOK: I don't have any cross based on the new stuff. I
13	do have some cross
14	THE COURT: Oh.
15	MR. WESTBROOK: based on some other notes.
16	THE COURT: All right. It's your choice.
17	MS. KIERNEY: You asked me to try to line up at least one witness.
18	We have two witnesses for tomorrow.
19	THE COURT: Yay.
20	MS. KIERNEY: And maybe three. So we're trying our investigator's
21	still working on that
22	MR. HAMNER: We're we're in
23	MS. KIERNY: and and we anticipate with this point, we have
24	Professor Kagan and Litzi lined up for the morning.
25	MR. WESTBROOK: Yeah. We scheduled Mr. Kagan for 10:00 in

1	anticipation of maybe Detective Campbell going a little bit long. He's scheduled
2	pretty tight tomorrow, but he can get in in the morning, as long as he's out of here
3	by 1:30, he's okay.
4	MS. KIERNY: That's not that tight compared to
5	MR. WESTBROOK: Well, yeah, I know.
6	MS. KIERNY: Yeah.
7	MR. WESTBROOK: But
8	THE COURT: All right, cool. Well, thanks for the update. Appreciate
9	it. Let's so can I bring the jury in now? Let's bring them in. Let's get going.
10	[Jury reconvened at 1:38 p.m.]
11	THE COURT: All jurors accounted for?
12	THE MARSHAL: Yes, sir.
13	THE COURT: All right, please be seated.
14	Ms. Hudson, I like your shirt. Is it Friday yet? It's a good one. Al
15	right.
16	Are we ready to get going? All right. I think we're ready to call
17	our next witness. So the State may call its next witness.
18	MS. KOLLINS: Mr. John Pacult, please.
19	THE COURT: We think we have three witnesses to get through today.
20	Two are going to the first two are probably going to be a little bit faster than the
21	third one. The third witness, we if you know, if we stick to that order, we may o
22	may not finish with that witness today. We'll see. We're planning to go till 5:00,
23	guys; is that the plan?
24	MR. HAMNER: Yes, Your Honor.
25	THE COURT: Okay.

•	A	1 do. 1 was the first contracted evaluator here in southern nevada to
2	conduct ps	sychosexual evaluations.
3	Q	How many sex offenders, both juvenile and adult, do you imagine
4	you've trea	ated over the course of your career?
5	Α	Treated, assessed, or both?
6	Q	Both.
7	Α	Probably over 6,000.
8	Q	Okay. In terms of the psychosexual evaluations that are submitted to
9	the courts	here for purposes of sentencing, how many of those have you done?
0	Α	Thousands. It's within that within that general range. Yeah.
1	Q	Have you testified for both prosecutors and defense attorneys in this
2	jurisdiction	?
3	Α	I have.
4	Q	Okay. On what topics?
5	Α	I have testified primarily as an expert in victim dynamics and
6	perpetrato	r grooming dynamics, high-risk behaviors, things of that nature.
7	Q	Okay. What education qualifies you to perform your job?
8	Α	I have a bachelor's and master's degree from UNLV. I completed
9	a 3,000-hc	our internship, State examination, and then going into private practice.
0	Because o	f the area of specialization that I started in in 1991, once I opened my
1	practice in	1998, I was basically one of two providers here in southern Nevada who
2	were cond	ucting this type of work.

And as I've continued in this course of working with adult and juvenile sex offenders, various trainings over the years, I've been a chairperson for juvenile sex offender task forces, adult sex offender task forces, participated in all

different types of committees and trainings and all different things of that nature.
And I've provided various trainings over the last 20 years to juvenile parole and
probation, adult parole and probation, professional conferences, provided trainings
half day, full day, hour. Just kind of depends on what the what the focus of the
training is.
O Observ Desfeet, Welco be not to device to the devict the took of our and on

Q Okay. Perfect. We're here today to talk about the topic of grooming. Could you give the ladies and gentlemen just a brief definition of what grooming is in the sex offender world?

A Certainly. So grooming --

MR. WESTBROOK: Your Honor, I have an objection. May we approach?

THE COURT: Yes, you may.

[Bench conference transcribed as follows:]

THE COURT: Let me try to cover up a little bit of -- block a little bit of noise.

Okay. Yes, sir?

MR. WESTBROOK: I just wanting to object on this topic as more prejudicial than probative. And the idea that he's testifying about, you know, as to the sex offender world and what grooming is.

My second objection --

THE COURT: Nood.

MR. WESTBROOK: -- and this is more to preface that I don't think Ms. Kollins is going to go here, but just in case she does, I want to avoid an argument. You upheld an objection when we're talking about this many people, particularly in this case, and making any analysis what conclusions as to the

2	these kids were victims of grooming, I believe the defendant was grooming.
3	He can talk about what it is, but he can't draw an outline to the
4	ultimate question in the case.
5	MS. KOLLINS: Well, what the grooming grooming is not an ultimate
6	issue. Grooming is not a legal issue in the case. So it's circumstantial evidence,
7	first of all. And he's an expert in that realm. And he can analyze a case file and
8	render an opinion about what conduct is grooming. What conduct construes
9	grooming.
0	THE COURT: So did he did he analyze these pursuant facts in this
1	case?
2	MS. KOLLINS: Yes, he did.
3	THE COURT: All right. So I think what we need is
4	MS. KOLLINS: And he was noticed as an expert long ago.
5	THE COURT: I think he was properly noticed. He he certainly has
6	the qualifications under <i>Hallmark</i> to testify. Grooming is a recognized behavioral
7	science. And I think that I have to hear from what his methodology and stuff was
8	and what he actually reviewed. But if he actually studied the facts in this case and
9	has the qualifications, I think it would be of some assistance to the jury.
20	MR. WESTBROOK: Well, I can
21	THE COURT: Which
22	MR. WESTBROOK: here's the issue.
23	THE COURT: prong of Hallmark do you think fails?
24	MR. WESTBROOK: He says that grooming exists within the

[indiscernible] or the sex offender realm. Okay.

ultimate issues in this case. Like, I believe he's just [indiscernible]. I believe that

1	THE COURT: Yeah.
2	MR. WESTBROOK: And in order to say the defendant is not
3	[indiscernible]
4	THE COURT: I'm sorry.
5	MR. WESTBROOK: I was going to say that the defendant in this case
6	he's [indiscernible], he would have to say that the defendant fits within the sex
7	offender realm.
8	MS. KOLLINS: I can rephrase that question. I was just trying to point
9	him to I mean just to see what his
10	THE COURT: Yeah.
11	MS. KOLLINS: grooming. Grooming could be grooming your dog.
12	And wanted grooming in within this venue
13	MR. WESTBROOK: But, if he
14	MS. KOLLINS: this subject matter.
15	MR. WESTBROOK: She's not incorrect. Grooming in this capacity
16	only exists when a sex offender [indiscernible] testify that my client's [indiscernible]
17	MS. KOLLINS: No, that's not true.
18	MR. WESTBROOK: He can't cross that line.
19	MS. KOLLINS: He will not say that.
20	THE COURT: Well, let's see if there's enough foundation. I, you
21	know, I I mean, I need to hear more about his methodology and the specific facts
22	in this case to see if he's qualified to reach an opinion.
23	MS. KOLLINS: Well, and and I can tell the court it's going to be
24	anything empirical, if that's what you're looking for. I mean
25	THE COURT: It doesn't have to be empirical.

1	MS. KOLLINS: Okay.
2	THE COURT: It can be based upon his educational experience and
3	study.
4	MS. KOLLINS: Okay.
5	THE COURT: And in the treatises that he's reviewed, read, and other
6	peer reviewed articles on the topic. I mean, I just need to know a little bit more
7	about
8	MS. KOLLINS: Sure.
9	THE COURT: his particular experience and applying facts to
10	MS. KOLLINS: Sure.
11	THE COURT: this behavior to reach a conclusion that this behavior
12	is consistent with
13	MS. KOLLINS: Sure.
14	THE COURT: the conclusion of grooming.
15	MS. KOLLINS: Okay.
16	MR. WESTBROOK: And this creates
17	THE COURT: But we just got started. I haven't heard any or very little
18	out of this guy yet. So but grooming is recognized behavioral science. I am
19	going to allow him to testify as a
20	MR. WESTBROOK: Okay.
21	THE COURT: Now, I'm not going to tell the jury [indiscernible] and
22	expert, because
23	MR. WESTBROOK: Of course.
24	THE COURT: I don't I don't qualify people
25	MS. KOLLINS: We don't do that.

1		THE COURT: as expert in front of the jury. But I will allow him to
2	continue.	
3		MR. WESTBROOK: Your last question just reminded me of this, too.
4	He said tha	t he's analyzed this case. But he didn't write a report?
5		MS. KOLLINS: No.
6		THE COURT: That's what she said.
7		MS. KOLLINS: No.
8		THE COURT: I'm sorry?
9		MR. WESTBROOK: I said if he generated a report?
10		MS. KOLLINS: No.
11		THE COURT: Okay. Yeah, if there was a report, we'd have to
12		MS. KOLLINS: No.
13		THE COURT: Okay. Okay.
14		MS. KOLLINS: I would have we would have given that to you.
15		THE COURT: Thank you.
16		MR. WESTBROOK: So no notes on a report?
17		THE COURT: That's what she said. Yeah.
18		MS. KOLLINS: No. None other than my phone conversation notes,
19	my pretrial	notes.
20		MR. WESTBROOK: Okay.
21		THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
22		[End bench conference.]
23		THE COURT: Counsel. All right. Very good. Let's we're going to
24	BY MS. KO	LLINS:
25	Q	Mr. Pacult, let me repeat my question.

	THE COURT:	Law gets so	complicated	sometimes.	All right.	Let's
take						

MS. KOLLINS: You'd think -- think we got paid by the word, wouldn't you?

BY MS. KOLLINS:

Q Sir, I asked you to give the ladies and the gentlemen of the jury a brief definition of grooming as it applies to sex offenders.

A Certainly. So grooming is the -- the preparation of a child to engage in sexual activity. So, essentially, grooming are -- can fall under a lot of different behaviors, but it can be gift giving, attention, compliments, things of that nature. The individual is trying to establish a relationship with that child, a bond with that child. It can be done through positive means. I just gave you some examples of gift giving, attention, affection, hugs, handholds, things of that nature. It's testing boundaries, breaking down boundaries.

The individual ultimately is hoping to engage in sexual behavior with that child. And also because of the -- the bond that's created with that child, they're hoping to reduce the likelihood of disclosure. They're hoping for no disclosure, at least a delayed disclosure, and/or they're also hoping that because the child now has this relationship, whether it be positive or negative, that the child feels responsible for the behavior as well, so they're not going to report. And they feel guilty, and that's, of course, again, that's the -- the grooming process.

And, generally, I talk about positive or nice grooming, and then there can be negative or mean grooming. So I've given you some examples of the -- the positive, nice grooming. Mean grooming can be lowering of a child's self-esteem, putting them down. They can threaten them. They can threaten to

harm their animal, their sibling, their parent. Threaten to kill them, take them away, do all kinds of -- of, essentially, bad things. So when the -- when the child is vulnerable like that, it's a -- it's kind of a double vulnerability. They're either vulnerable to the good, because then they're going to get gifts, attention, affection, et cetera, or to negative; They're in fear, they want attention, they need attention, their self-esteem is lowered, they're vulnerable, They feel like, if I don't do this, I'm going to be harmed, somebody else is going to be harmed, et cetera.

So grooming is a -- it's a really huge aspect of -- of sexual abuse dynamics, unless it's a very high-risk type of a case. Because the -- the individual is trying to establish this relationship. And it's not only done of the child, it's also done with the parents or the -- the guardian. It's also done of the environment, because, obviously, sexual abuse usually doesn't occur out in a public setting, so to speak. It's done in private, it's done in secrecy. So how can I get that child alone? What are the dynamics that I can do to gain access to that child?

And, obviously, when you're talking children, you're -- you're involving the -- the parent or the guardian. How can I gain access to that child? Be alone with that child? Et cetera.

The treatment component of grooming, also, when -- when we do treatment is really critical, because, obviously, with somebody convicted of a sex offense, we want them to understand how they groomed their victim, because those are all early signs, the red flags, the warning behaviors that they're -- they've identified a victim and are engaging in behavior.

So grooming's been a focus -- obviously, I've been doing treatment for 20-plus years. So that's -- that's one of the first things that -- that I look for and that's one of the first things that's just established in sex offender

treatment, helping that individual understand how they groomed their victim or victims.

- Q So part of your treatment component, if you will, is having an offender identify their grooming behaviors, because those may be some kind of trigger for them to offend; is that kind of what you're saying?
 - A Yes. Absolutely.
- Q Okay. And the term grooming, and the kind of -- I'll say science behind it, is that something that permeates your type of practice?
 - A Absolutely.
- Q Okay. And is that something that you review in articles and journals and treatment journals and things of that nature?
- A I -- I do, but clearly my -- my job almost every day is reading victim statements. So, I'm -- I'm dealing with sexual abuse cases, child abuse/neglect cases, things of that nature. So, again, juvenile and adult. So I'm -- I'm reading victim statements literally almost every day in preparation for doing these evaluations.
- So that's -- that's really my -- my focus is very -- it's very clinical. I'm -- I -- I work with people every single day in -- in some capacity, whether it's doing this type of work or general therapy as well. But, obviously, this doesn't involve grooming, but -- so that's -- that's my primary focus. I'm -- I'm a clinician and that's -- that's what I do.
- Q Okay. So the vast majority of your experience with grooming, then, is based on your clinical observations, as well as your treatment of offenders?
- A Absolutely. And then, obviously, again, participation over the years in -- in various conferences, talking with colleagues, just -- this is -- I mean, this concept

is -- it's -- it's rather in stone, so it's -- it's hard to -- there -- if you will, there's not much else to -- to learn about it or do with it or read about it. It's -- we know what grooming is.

We know why it's done and then it's our job in this arena to identify it, if I'm working -- if I'm doing treatment, help the offender understand what their grooming behaviors are. If I'm doing a risk assessment it's to identify what those behaviors were in the assessment, so that the -- the court, all the involved parties understand how this individual gained access and it -- it helps us to really take a look at what type of risk factors this individual presents. How we use the terms low, moderate, or high risk when we're doing these types of evaluations.

So the type of grooming will also help determine whether it's a low, moderate, or high risk, how much grooming was involved, how extensive was it, that sort of thing.

- Q Okay. You were requested by the State in this case to review some documents; is that correct?
 - A Yes.
- Q And those documents consisted of some police reports and some statements of the alleged victims in this case?
 - A That is correct.
- Q Okay. I had you -- and we paid you to do that, right, because you don't work in my office, correct?
 - A That is correct.
- Q Okay. I want to talk to you about some of the behaviors that you reviewed in this case and what your professional opinion is of those behaviors.

 You mentioned --

MR. WESTBROOK: Your Honor, I would object, based on what we talked about at the bench.

THE COURT: Yeah. Your objection is -- is noted and preserved, but overruled.

MR. WESTBROOK: Thank you.

BY MS. KOLLINS:

- Q One of the things that you said that grooming, whether by design or just because the offender figures out that that's a way to get to the kid, that they're trying to do is test the barriers with that child, right? Test that kid's kind of safety zone, if you will?
 - A Correct.
 - Q Is that accurate?
 - A That -- that's a piece of it. That's a piece of it, absolutely.
- Q One of the things that I asked you to look at in this case was the showing of pornography; do you recall that?
 - A Absolutely.
- Q Okay. What do you recall about what you reviewed regarding the showing of pornography in this case?
- A So what was in the -- in the documentation was that four of the -- four of the children expressed that the defendant had showed pornography to them on their phone, consisting of naked I think they used the terms boys and girls of either essentially what would have been fellatio, oral sex to a man, cunnilingus, oral sex to a woman. And that -- that was the -- the primary -- the primary gist of the pornographic material that was reportedly shown.
 - Q In your experience, is pornography or the use of pornography a

 grooming technique that you've seen before?

A Absolutely.

Q And why is that?

A So when you're dealing with -- with children, and especially this day and age with technology and cameras and television and movies, what the individual is essentially trying to do is -- is normalize this behavior. There -- oftentimes you can probably understand and appreciate a child has never seen fellatio. So how do you get that child to possibly want to engage in that behavior? Well, here it is on a phone with -- they're seeing it, so it's normalizing it. It's -- it's starting to expose them to adult information that they've never had access to before.

So the normal hope for the offender is that that child will then engage in that behavior, become curious. Children are curious, so they want to understand what -- what is that? Oh. And then maybe the opportunity is there to engage in that behavior. But now they've been exposed to it, they've seen it, so now it's -- it's real. It's something that the offender doesn't have to, so to speak, do themselves. And often it can be adult pornography, it can be child pornography, because they want that child to be exposed to it.

And then again, obviously, a crime has been committed if an adult shows a child pornography, but they haven't committed a hands-on crime yet. And again, they're testing that boundary. They're testing that barrier. What's that child's reaction? Does that child show interest or do they -- oh, that's gross, or I'm going to tell my mom. You know, if they say something like that, now the offender knows this is maybe not a child I'm able to engage in this behavior in. But if the child expresses maybe some interest, potentially, then, obviously, they're -- they're able to move forward in whatever they are planning to do.

But pornography is -- I've seen that in numerous, numerous cases over the years where a child will report that's how I was a part of the grooming process.

- Q So it -- it visually normalizes sex acts, basically?
- A Yes.
- Q Desensitizes them to a certain degree?
- A Yes.
- Q Okay. I also asked you to look at the component of handing out candy.
- A Yes.
- Q Do you recall that?
- A Absolutely.
- Q And you mentioned, in your explanation of grooming, that gift giving, you know, giving of items and such, that that was a pretty typical grooming behavior. Explain, kind of, the affect of -- of the gift-giving grooming behavior on a kid. Not necessarily in this case because I'm not asking you to speak in specifics, but the gift giving on a kid; how is that groom them for some type of sexual conduct?

A Sure. So it's -- it's -- when that child is -- they're -- they're being rewarded for -- for sexual behavior or for -- for contact. They're going to want to be around that person more. They're going to expect certain things. They're going to -- again, this is developing that -- that bond, that relationship, that special -- we -- we have something special. And that child is looking forward to receiving that gift.

And again, based on the age of the child, I've seen as simplistic as candy, which, obviously, with younger children, and then, obviously, with older children there's -- there's -- I've seen cell phones and trips and money, cars. All

kinds of different things that are given to this child.

And that -- and then it kind of go

And that -- and then it kind of goes back to the -- the grooming of the parent. How -- how is that child able to receive these things? Well, the parent thinks, wow, what a great -- what a great person. They're super friendly, they're nice, they're, you know, handing out candy. They're -- they're -- you know, they really have an interest in my child. They're taking them to California. They're -- they're buying them these certain things, they're paying for their -- for their soccer season for the year, registration, all kinds of different things.

And, again, on -- on surface it looks fairly innocent, innocuous. But, you know, the individual oftentimes will have ulterior motives.

- Q Can the impact of that grooming have a different effect based on the socioeconomic status of the kid that's receiving it?
 - A Oh, most -- most definitely.
- Q There was some other gift-giving things in this case I asked you to look at; do you recall what those were?
- A There was -- there was -- well, there was fruit, I believe, those other things that were given to the children reportedly at the defendant's apartment.

 There were promises to take them to Chuck E. Cheese.
- Q And just kind of consistent with behaviors that you recognize as positive grooming, if you will?
 - A Yes.
- Q Okay. And I probably should've asked you this question when I asked you about the pornography, but you know, you said the pornography essentially desensitizes these kids; what about exposure of body parts without touching? Just exposure of body parts without touching; is that a grooming behavior or can it be?

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

A It	it can be. I	But, obviously, we	we generally use	e the term grooming
for more of th	e the behav	viors that haven't cle	arly crossed a	a sexual line.
Obviously, ex	posing onese	elf is indecent expos	ure, open and gro	oss lewdness, et
cetera. So	but again, a h	nands-off behavior to	o test boundaries	, to determine if,
can can I g	o further? Do	es that child have a	n interest in toucl	ning my penis?
Does that chi	ld want to do	does that child i	f they've seen or	al sex, would you
like to try this	? So definitel	ly a hands-off behav	rior that could lea	d to hands on.

But more so typical grooming, again, the hand holding. There's a -- a term called furtage, which is purposeful, made to seem accidental, touching. In other words, a -- a brush up against of a breast or a buttocks or a penis and, you know, guiding -- gauging that child's reaction through tickling or roughhousing or wrestling or things along those lines to test boundaries. And that -- that would be a little bit more along the lines of a physical type. That's non -- it's sexual but it's nonsexual.

And I've read statements where children will say, the first time I thought it was an accident, but when he did it again I knew it was on purpose. Again, children know their -- essentially -- their private parts to, you know, a degree and -- and have some element of -- of boundaries and they know when that space is being invaded.

- Q What about the act of placing candy at or near a private part and having the child retrieve it; would that be kind of the furtage thing that you spoke about? So it's kind of --
 - Α It's close --
 - Q -- not overtly sexual?
 - Yeah. It's -- it's -- I mean it's clearly in -- in my estimation, if -- if an Α

individual is placing candy, whether it be back pockets or front pockets, the -- the opportunity for possible genital contact or contact of the buttocks is -- is obviously there. And you're now having that child go into that space. Again, if that child's not willing to do that, then that's telling the offender something. That child's got better boundaries than I thought. That child's not going to be willing to do that. Or if the child dives right in, is excited, and gets that -- that piece of candy, they've just been rewarded, again, for quasi sexual behavior. They don't -- they have probably little to no idea, based on the child's age, that that's a sexual act or for sexual gratification for -- for the offender.

- Q So is that kind of a -- a quasi grooming behavior then? My word, I don't know that that's a term of art.
 - A Yeah. Yeah. I -- I -- yeah, absolutely.
- Q You mentioned that there was grooming of parents, as well; what did you mean by that?
 - A In general or to this case?
 - Q In general.
 - A Okay.
 - Q Just very briefly.
- A So -- so again, grooming is -- to be able to take somebody's child, have -- into a car, take them somewhere, into your residence, be alone with them, that -- that parent has to be groomed for that parent to trust that individual. So it's about developing this -- this trusting relationship. I trust you with my child. I don't believe you're going to harm my child. You've done these nice things. You seem innocent. You seem genuine. You seem whatever, you know, that parent's perceptions are.

And clearly if the parents don't have if if they're if if they
don't know, so to speak, maybe the things that I know or that they haven't learned
in in some other way, shape, or form, or have that level of intuition and/or I
think you had mentioned earlier, if I can bring in kind of socioeconomic elements to
that, when when parents have lesser than they are going to be potentially more
receptive to somebody doing something for their child, because it's something that
they can't do. So the so the offender's almost playing off of their own parental
guilt. The parent's parental guilt, that they can't offer these certain things. They
can't do these certain things for the child.

So, I'm kind of that knight and shining armor. I'm going to come in and really help out and help you and help your child and we -- I see these dynamics. Oftentimes single-parent households, things of that nature, or where both parents are working, where that child is more vulnerable, more access to that child. So that's a -- that's a critical component in the grooming process, as well.

Q And I had you review the case file in this case. What evidence, if any, did you see of grooming the parents in this case?

A So the -- I believe it was Maria, who is the -- the mother of the -- the twins and the older sister. The --

MR. WESTBROOK: Your Honor, I object to this line of questioning.

THE COURT: Well, is -- on -- based upon what you -- what we discussed on the stand or is this lack of foundation, do you want more foundation?

MR. WESTBROOK: It's foundation, qualifications, and also what we discussed at the stand.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, all right. So --

MS. KOLLINS: Well, so may we --

	THE COURT: let's just add we already covered what was on the
stand or	I mean, what was up here at the bench. Can you see if there's more
foundation	for any opinions with respect to grooming of the parents? I want to
know I'd	like to hear what he reviewed before he reached an opinion. Was it just
the statem	ents of the children or was it something else?
BY MS. KO	DLLINS:
Q	Mr. Pacult, could you articulate for the court, please, what items you
were given	to review for this case?
Α	Certainly.
Q	And what you reviewed.
Α	So it was the the grand jury testimony, a police report that included
statements	from four of the alleged victims, their parents, a neighbor, an adult
female nei	ghbor, and very brief comments from the defendant and his wife, and
there was	a secondary statement from another alleged victim and her parents.
Q	So, essentially, everything that we have except for the statements
verbatim.	I did not give you a copy of each individual statement. You read the
synopses;	is that correct?
A	I I would obviously, can only attest to what you gave me. So
that's if th	hat's what you gave if that's all you that's what you gave me. Yes.
	THE COURT: So I'll overrule the objection and allow the question to be
asked, but	leave it up to to the jury to decide what weight to give to this
testimony.	
	MS. KOLLINS: Okay.

THE COURT: All right.

BY MS. KOLLINS:

Q	You spoke about the woman with the three children	າ, I believe you
called her I	Maria; is it a possibility that you have those names tr	ansposed?

A I -- I may. It was either Amanda, I believe, or Maria were the mothers' names.

Q Okay. And we're just focusing on the parents right now so it doesn't really matter --

A Okay.

Q -- which mother of which kid they are. But in terms of things that spoke to you as being parental grooming, what did you see in this case?

A So, again, more specific, though, to the -- the two twin girls, Maradel, Mirabel, and their older sister, they referred to the defendant as Grandfather. So that's a -- and he lived in the apartment complex and I believe he'd known them essentially since -- at least the twins, potentially, from -- from birth or very close, around seven to eight years, and I believe the girls were approximately seven, eight during this -- this time, and this was just last year.

So I'm -- I'm not exactly sure how that individual garnered that title. That I don't know. That wasn't clearly stated. But he was clearly referenced as that. The girls referenced him as that. And there was reference to the mother indicating that she saw him giving candy, saw the girls going in and out of the -- the apartment to get candy and/or I believe fruit. So those were the -- those were the primary elements.

The statements weren't terribly detailed from -- from the -- the mother and -- of those children the other child, Yezline, and her younger sister.

Their -- I believe their relationship was much shorter, so I -- I didn't indicate -- I couldn't establish any parental grooming in that sense. All I know is that they

were -- they were all friends in that complex and they all kind of ran together. And so I -- I don't know what that other mother's belief system was or if -- if she was or was not groomed.

But I genuinely have a belief system that to be in this position of -- of a grandfather and to be able to have these children come in and out freely of somebody's home, that would involve some -- in some, way, shape, or form grooming.

- Q Of the parents?
- A Of -- of the parents, correct.
- Q Okay. Great. Now we spoke about nice grooming a little bit and we talked, kind of, infiltration into the parent's lives, if you will. I want to talk about I think what you expressed to be earlier as bad grooming or negative grooming.

Just very briefly, what is that again? Because you gave that explanation at the beginning.

A Certainly. So again, the negative grooming, the mean grooming is threats, lowering of self-esteem, isolating that child. Essentially, just being mean to them, breaking down their -- their barriers and their boundaries, lowering their self-esteem. Can be direct threats to them, family members, pets. That -- that's the short, general version of what mean or negative grooming would look like.

- Q Would that include, and correct me if I'm wrong, instilling fear into them?
 - A Absolutely.
- Q Okay. Based on the documents that you reviewed that you just expressed, did you see any evidence in this case of negative grooming?
 - A Yes.

	2
	3
	4
	5
	6
	7
	8
	9
1	0
1	1
1	2
1	3
1	4
1	5
1	6
1	7
1	8
1	9
2	0
2	1
2	2

25

Q	What did yo	ou see,	sir?
_			•

Α So when the defendant reportedly told the children that he would take them far away, never see their mothers again, that allegedly stated that he would have somebody go to I believe it was Yezline's father's work and have him killed. Threatening to kill the mothers. The children indicated that, obviously, they were in fear for their parent's lives. Potentially had a belief system, I believe, one child, I think it was Yezline at the end said she didn't believe that the defendant was capable of that, but the other children reported definite fear that this could occur and -- and that was one of the -- one of the reasons that they were -- that they didn't disclose or report these alleged behaviors.

Is that delay in disclosure a frequent consequence of negative grooming?

Α Absolutely.

MS. KOLLINS: Court's indulgence.

Your Honor, I'm going to pass the witness.

THE COURT: Okay. Cross-examination.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. WESTBROOK:

Q Sounds like we can't trust anybody, right?

MS. KOLLINS: Objection. Argumentative.

THE COURT: Well, he's -- he can answer. Overruled.

THE WITNESS: Well, it's -- it's a challenge based on the statistics of who can potentially harm a child.

BY MR. WESTBROOK:

Who can potentially harm a child; that's anybody, right? O.

Α	That is	s anyb	ody, o	correct.
---	---------	--------	--------	----------

- Q So if anybody can do it, then we can't trust anybody; is that what you're saying?
 - A Not necessarily saying that.
- Q Okay. Let me be more specific. If you're a parent, you can't trust someone being nice to your child, because they might be grooming them for some kind of sexual assault, right?

A One of the -- one of the things that I encourage parents to do in -- in general is to -- you have to educate your children. You have to have good communication with your children, you have to know your children, you have to explain to them literally what some of these concepts are and -- and do your very, very, very best to have as much communication, contact, oversight. But at the end of the day we have to leave our children with professionals, with adults, with coaches, with teachers, with family members, with babysitters. So it's a -- it -- it is a challenge.

- Q Coaches, teachers, babysitters; I mean they could all be committing sexual acts with children, right?
 - A I've had the misfortune of evaluating everybody in that category.
 - Q Okay. So if you're a parent, you can't trust them, right?
 - A I -- I would say you should have tempered trust.
- Q All right. Well, let's talk about kids. If you're a kid, you can't trust if an adult's being nice to you, because they might be grooming you, right?
- A Children are naturally trusting. So I believe that that's where, I think -- unfortunately, there was a special last night on -- on Fox 5 about stranger danger and children, you know, being told by the parent this. And then an individual comes

up and I believe the example is actually offering candy to a young lady, a little girl probably about four or five years old. Mom just ran to the house, the park, and she watched her little girl walk off with -- with this stranger.

- Q Sure. Stranger danger. But you're not talking about stranger danger necessarily. You're talking about neighbor next door, uncle, grandfather, maybe even stepfather, mother or father. I mean it's -- any adult can be the danger, right?
 - A Including strangers, certainly.
- Q Okay. So if you're a kid and an adult's giving you a candy bar or says, you know, here's a Matchbox car, that could be grooming.
 - A Could be.
- Q Okay. Now if you're just a -- a regular adult, not a parent or a kid, you can't do something nice for a kid, because it might be misconstrued as grooming, right?
- A I think it all depends on that individual's comfort and safety level of how their behaviors could be perceived. But, obviously, there are still well-intentioned individuals in the community. There's philanthropic individuals and, you know, the not -- I -- I -- not everybody's intention is to molest a child because they've given them something.
- Q Okay. I mean not -- it's not just not everybody, it's almost nobody, right?
- A Well, the -- the statistics are essentially about one in four children experience some form of abuse in their lifetime. So that's a pretty large number.
 - Q So you statistic is that 25 percent of adults are sexually molesting kids?
 - A That's the -- that's the national average, certainly.
 - Q Okay.

1	THE COURT: What?
2	MS. KOLLINS: I'm going to object. He mischaracterized the
3	testimony.
4	MR. WESTBROOK: He just agreed that 25 percent
5	THE COURT: Well, he's
6	MR. WESTBROOK: of adults are molesting kids. He said that.
7	MS. KOLLINS: He said one out of four children and he said 25 percent
8	of adults. Those are two different numbers.
9	THE COURT: He was trying to clarify an answer that that was
10	somewhat ambiguous. And and he's asking it in a in a way that was trying to
11	elicit further information
12	MS. KOLLINS: Sure.
13	THE COURT: to help the jury. So overruled.
14	BY MR. WESTBROOK:
15	Q All right. What you're talking about here and what you reviewed in this
16	case are allegations, right?
17	A Correct.
18	Q And the behaviors you're reviewing and you're classifying as grooming
19	are grooming because of those allegations, right?
20	A Again, it's difficult to establish at this moment in time, but it certainly
21	appears to be grooming for sexual gratification.
22	Q If the accusations are true, right?
23	A Correct.
24	Q Okay. If they're false accusations, then it wasn't grooming?
25	A If they are false accusations then, correct, it would not be grooming.

1	Q	Well, I haven't ask you that.
2	A	Okay.
3	Q	I just asked you the definition of the word exhibit
4	A	Okay.
5	Q	or exhibitionist. To show, right?
6	A	Certainly.
7	Q	You want to be in public. You want to be seen if you're an exhibitionist
8	right?	
9	A	Correct.
10	Q	Okay. If you're trying to keep a secret through grooming or any other
11	technique,	that's the opposite impulse of an exhibitionist; wouldn't you agree?
12	A	Again, depending upon each case dynamic. And that's where that's
13	where, aga	in, I'll kind of refer back to my job doing psychosexual evaluations, is to
14	really brea	k down all the different moving parts. It's not as simplistic as, well, if the
15	individual is exposing themselves, they don't want to they don't want to get	
16	caught.	
17		I mean, obviously, again, there there's there's a lot of
18	different re	asons why people do certain things, but they usually are still at the end
19	of the day	trying to not get caught.
20	Q	Okay. They're trying not to get caught. So doing these things outside
21	in a busy a	partment complex, does that sound like a good way to get caught
22		THE COURT: So
23	BY MR. W	ESTBROOK:
24	Q	or a good way to keep a secret?
25		THE COURT: So are you you're are you trying to get my attention

1	or were you
2	MS. KOLLINS: Well, I was going to object, but then you pointed at me,
3	so I decided not to.
4	THE COURT: No, I thought you were I I wasn't trying to inhibit. I
5	just I was pointing that way so he would know that there is something going on
6	behind him. That's all I was trying to do.
7	MS. KOLLINS: Well, he's asking him to speculate.
8	MR. WESTBROOK: Right.
9	MS. KOLLINS: That's what I'm saying.
10	MR. WESTBROOK: I am.
11	THE COURT: Well, I I think that the question does cause call for
12	speculation, because of the way you phrased it. You said, these things. And I'm
13	trying to understand I want my jury to understand, when you say these things, are
14	you talking about the non-illegal grooming activities or were you talking about the
15	the improper alleged improper sexual conduct? When you say these things, if
16	you want to get a clear answer from him, you've got to be precise as to what you
17	mean.
18	MR. WESTBROOK: Okay. Well
19	THE COURT: All right. So sustained.
20	MR. WESTBROOK: I will I'll be more precise.
21	THE COURT: Thank you.
22	MR. WESTBROOK: Okay.

BY MR. WESTBROOK:

23

24

25

Doing these things, and I'll be very specific, showing your penis to a Q group of children, not just one child, but four or five or six or maybe seven children

- 1		
1	at the sam	e time, is that a good way to maintain a secret?
2	A	I would have to answer no.
3	Q	And doing something outside, whether it's night or day, doing it outside
4	in an apart	ment complex where other people live, is that a good way to maintain a
5	secret?	
6	A	I would have to answer no again.
7	Q	You said children are naturally curious, right?
8	A	Yes.
9	Q	Being naturally curious, sometimes they're drawn to adult things, right?
10	A	Absolutely.
11	Q	Okay. They don't need an adult to draw them to these things; they
12	could draw	into them on their own, right?
13		MS. KOLLINS: Well, objection. Vague and calls for speculation. I
14	think that's	probably child-specific.
15		THE COURT: Yes. That's sustained.
16		You need to rephrase that.
17		MR. WESTBROOK: Okay.
18		THE COURT: It's it's too unclear what you're asking.
19		MR. WESTBROOK: All right.
20	BY MR. W	ESTBROOK:
21	Q	Can children develop curiosity about adult things on their own?
22	A	I believe so.
23	Q	Is that fairly common?
24	A	In terms of looking at child development and interest, depending upon
25	the age, ce	ertainly.

1	Q	Do you have the notes with you today?
2	A	On my computer.
3	Q	On your computer; do you have your computer with you today?
4	A	I do.
5	Q	Okay. I was just checking with that.
6		MR. WESTBROOK: Court's indulgence.
7		THE COURT: Yes, sir.
8		MR. WESTBROOK: Pass the witness. Thank you.
9		THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Westbrook.
10		MS. KOLLINS: Court's indulgence, please. Just one moment, Your
11	Honor.	
12		THE COURT: Yes.
13		REDIRECT EXAMINATION
14	BY MS. KO	DLLINS:
15	Q	Just a few more questions, Mr. Pacult. Thank you.
16	A	You're very welcome.
17	Q	Do you think, sir, that the level of negative grooming could affect the
18	venue an o	offender might choose, i.e., inside/outside?
19	A	I believe so.
20	Q	And how might that happen?
21	A	I think when you're looking at from a a child's perspective, when
22	you're looking at a positive reward of a hug or an attaboy or a a piece of candy o	
23	buying something on iTunes versus I'm going to kill your dog, I'm going to kill your	
24	parents, I'm going to kill your brother, I'm going to take you far away and you're	
25	never goin	g to see your family again, probably on that scale of impact, okay, if I

don't get any more iTunes or any more candy, not a big deal. I'll never see my mother or father again or I'll be killed or my brother or sister will be killed or my pet, my -- my favorite pet will be killed, I think that would certainly outweigh and have a much more potential impact as to, then, what that child would or wouldn't be receptive to.

Q Okay. So if I understand what you're saying, and please correct me if I'm wrong, would that mean the offender had more control over that child with negative grooming, maybe, than positive grooming?

A Yes.

Q Would -- could that contribute to an offender's higher level of risk behavior, if you will?

A I think what -- what I've seen over the years is that as abuse continues, offenders get more brazen. They continue to take more risks, because they believe I'm going to get away with this, I'm not going to get caught, these children haven't reported, there really is nothing that's happening. And oftentimes we'll see an escalation in the behavior, because again, it starts off rather innocuous, rather innocent, and then it progresses to the hands-off variety.

We've talked about the showing of pornography to sexual comments to you're cute, this, that, the other thing, to again, exhibitionism. And then it can certainly lead to hands-on behaviors, sexual -- full sexual intercourse, and -- and, obviously, we -- we know across this -- this country that children are raped and murdered and --

MR. WESTBROOK: Objection, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Yeah, well --

MR. WESTBROOK: He's gone way beyond the scope of the question

1	and and that's improper testimony.
2	THE COURT: It is. It's let's try to refocus. I'm going to ask the jurors
3	to strike his answer.
4	Please please have him refocus to your specific question, all
5	right.
6	MS. KOLLINS: His answer in its entirety or just the last portion?
7	THE COURT: The last portion of his answer, please.
8	MS. KOLLINS: Thank you, sir.
9	THE COURT: Thank you.
0	BY MS. KOLLINS:
1	Q And and my question was, sir, as an offender feels more control over
2	a kid by saying negative grooming, could he be willing to engage in more risky
3	behaviors, i.e., doing things outside, where he knows the kids aren't going to tell,
4	but he's not really worried; does it, you know kind of just focused on that venue.
5	A Yes. I again, there there's I I would have to maybe get into
6	more offender thinking and offender dynamics to explain that, because it's not
7	just it's not just the grooming. There's a a concept called thinking errors and
8	how an offender rationalizes, minimizes, justifies, excuse, excuses, denies
9	THE COURT: Did you do any any work in that area in this particular
20	case?
21	THE WITNESS: In this
22	THE COURT: Analyzing analyze thinking errors in this case?
23	THE WITNESS: No. I
24	THE COURT: Was that part of your research here? Okay.
25	THE WITNESS: No.

1		THE COURT: I think we should avoid that topic.
2		MS. KOLLINS: Okay.
3		THE WITNESS: Okay.
4		THE COURT: All right.
5	BY MS. K	OLLINS:
6	Q	Mr. Westbrook started out with a really broad statement, you can't trust
7	anybody;	do you remember that?
8	A	I do.
9	Q	Okay. And he narrated a whole a group of individuals, can't trust
10	coaches,	teachers, doctors, nurses. I don't know if he said nurses, I'm sorry.
11	Babysitters, stepfathers I think he said. Have you, in fact, had offenders in all those	
12	categories	s?
13	A	I have.
14	Q	Okay.
15		MS. KOLLINS: Nothing further, Judge.
16		THE COURT: All right. Any recross? Anything?
17		MR. WESTBROOK: Just briefly.
18		THE COURT: Okay.
19		RECROSS-EXAMINATION
20	BY MR. WESTBROOK:	
21	Q	You were talking about negative grooming; do parents use negative
22	grooming on their own kids?	
23	A	Well, grooming can have a a broad definition. Obviously, for the
24	purposes of my testimony, I'm talking about grooming for the the plan to	
25	victimize, to sexually victimize a child.	

1	MR. WESTBROOK: If we could approach?	
2	THE COURT: Yeah.	
3	[Bench conference transcribed as follows.]	
4	THE COURT: I'll check with you guys before I ask it.	
5	MS. KOLLINS: Okay.	
6	THE COURT: So. If my question, I was wondering, I think it has	
7	some application to this case. Should should society encourage adults not to	
8	engage in grooming behavior or or behavior that could be construed or	
9	misconstrued as grooming behavior?	
10	MR. WESTBROOK: I think and I agree that's a little philosophical for	
11	this.	
12	THE COURT: Well, I think it's well, okay. I	
13	MS. KOLLINS: I mean I I think there's all	
14	THE COURT: If you want me if anyone doesn't want me to ask it, I	
15	won't as it.	
16	MS. KOLLINS: I don't.	
17	THE COURT: Okay.	
18	MS. KOLLINS: And and John would probably love to talk your ear of	
19	about it later.	
20	THE COURT: I would love to hear that.	
21	MR. WESTBROOK: Actually, I was going to say that. Yeah.	
22	THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.	
23	MS. KOLLINS: Okay.	
24	THE COURT: Appreciate it.	
25	MS. KOLLINS: Thank you.	
	42	

1	THE COURT: All right.
2	[End of bench conference.]
3	THE COURT: The judge doesn't have any questions.
4	Does the the jury have any questions? All right. Thank you.
5	MR. WESTBROOK: Okay. A question.
6	THE COURT: That's okay, we'll yeah, well, I always give the parties
7	a chance to follow up.
8	[Bench conference transcribed as follows.]
9	MS. KOLLINS: Are you writing all this down?
10	MR. WESTBROOK: I'm not. I should've been doing it the whole time.
11	THE COURT: Okay. There you go.
12	MS. KOLLINS: That's I think that's fair.
13	MS. KIERNY: That's fine.
14	MS. KOLLINS: [Indiscernible.]
15	MR. WESTBROOK: It's it's fine if he has a specific foundation basis
16	for it.
17	MS. KIERNY: I think it's fine.
18	THE COURT: We'll let
19	MR. WESTBROOK: Yeah.
20	THE COURT: let him know.
21	MR. WESTBROOK: Yeah. Absolutely.
22	THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
23	MS. KIERNY: Oh, so sorry.
24	[End of bench conference.]
25	THE COURT: All right. So I'm going to ask you this question

The State of Nevada, Plaintiff, vs. Jose Azucena, Defendant.

Case No. C-17-321044-1 [Jury Trial Day 8]

1	THE WITNESS: Certainly, Your Honor.	
2	THE COURT: and you can respond to the jurors	
3	THE WITNESS: Absolutely.	
4	THE COURT: to the extent to extent you can, to extent you have	
5	proper foundation to answer.	
6	THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.	
7	THE COURT: All right. In your line of work, how many times have you	
8	come across a person who would groom more than one child with other children	
9	around watching, or all children in a group?	
10	THE WITNESS: Certainly. Just recently. I had a a case that was	
11	rather similar, where an individual had brought children into his apartment with	
12	the the	
13	MR. WESTBROOK: Your Honor, I have an objection. Can we	
14	approach?	
15	THE COURT: Well	
16	MR. WESTBROOK: I'll you'll I think you'll agree. If I could	
17	approach before this gets	
18	THE COURT: Hold on. Let me look at the question again. Just	
19	MR. WESTBROOK: All right.	
20	THE COURT: maybe I could figure this out.	
21	So let me just stop you and and before you give an anecdote of	
22	what what happened recently	
23	THE WITNESS: Certainly.	
24	THE COURT: the question was, in your line of work, how many	
25	times have you come across. And then I'm not going to read the rest of it, all right.	

21

22

23

24

25

THE WITNESS: Okay.

THE COURT: So focus on that part of the guestion. How many times?

THE WITNESS: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. And then I'll let the parties see if they want to ask any follow up, okay?

THE WITNESS: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you. Go ahead.

THE WITNESS: Okay. You're welcome.

THE COURT: Does that allay your question -- your --

MR. WESTBROOK: That's right.

THE COURT: Okay.

THE WITNESS: Okay. I need to ponder for a second, if I may, because the -- the most recent case just came to mind with that question. There -- there have been -- there have been a few cases, definitely, over the years that have involved multiple victims in -- in dynamics of -- if -- if I -- may I, Your Honor, elaborate?

THE COURT: To some extent, yes.

THE WITNESS: Okay. So a case for somebody that fell into the category of a boy-lover pedophile who would -- was engaging groups of young men in -- at -- at their home at the same time, paying them to do different things, yard work and exposing them to pornography in the residence, taking them -- doing all kinds of different things along those lines, that was -- that was a group. The most recent case, again --

THE COURT: So why don't you not -- not discuss the specifics of any one case.

THE WITNESS: Okay.

THE COURT: Just --

THE WITNESS: So -- so --

THE COURT: I just wanted you to define the --

THE WITNESS: Certainly.

THE COURT: -- parameters of your answer that fit within quantifying the number of times.

THE WITNESS: Certainly, Your Honor. I -- I wish I could give an exact number of -- like I said, I -- it's -- I've conducted thousands of adult risk assessments. So there -- there's a few that -- that come to mind. And then, obviously, just understanding some -- based on each individual case and that dynamic and that type of offender, then there's -- there can be all kinds of different variables that -- that kind of come into play.

And that's kind of what I was explaining a little bit earlier, about each case kind of has its own merit, but because each offender is -- is different. There's no -- we have that -- that label, sex offender is a -- is a large label. And underneath it, there's categories, and underneath -- underneath each category, there's sub-categories. And -- and that's, if you will, that's my job to help break that down for the court, for the DA's office, for parole and probation. And ultimately for the community as a -- doing contracted work with the -- with the Department of Public Safety. That's -- that's my -- my primary focus and job is community safety.

THE COURT: Thank you. I appreciate you responding to the juror's question.

THE WITNESS: You're welcome, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Anything further from the parties?

1		MS. KOLLINS: Not not from the State, Your Honor.
2		THE COURT: All right.
3		MS. KOLLINS: Thank you.
4		MR. WESTBROOK: I've got a few things, Your Honor.
5		THE COURT: All right. Can you limit it? You're you're limiting your
6	follow up -	-
7		MR. WESTBROOK: Just wait a second.
8		THE COURT: to to the question or his remarks.
9		MR. WESTBROOK: Exactly, Your Honor. Just questioning his
10	remarks.	
11		FURTHER RECROSS-EXAMINATION
12	BY MR. WESTBROOK:	
13	Q	You said you've worked thousands of cases, correct?
14	Α	That's correct.
15	Q	Over how many years?
16	А	20-plus.
17	Q	20-plus years, thousands of cases. And your response is a few cases
18	out of all th	nose thousands of cases involved public acts with groups of children?
19	Α	That that came to mind off the top. Yes, sir.
20	Q	Okay. So if it was a hundred cases and there was one, that would be
21	one percent, right?	
22	Α	I believe so.
23	Q	But it's thousands of cases, and you could think of two off the top of
24	your head,	right?
25		MS. KOLLINS: Objection. Mischaracterizes the testimony.

The State of Nevada, Plaintiff, vs. Jose Azucena, Defendant. Case No. C-17-321044-1 [Jury Trial Day 8]

1	sub-categories of sub-categories.
2	THE COURT: Well, I know. But
3	MR. WESTBROOK: I have about two questions.
4	THE COURT: but we but the only purpose for the follow-up is just
5	to try and clarify the response to the jury question.
6	MR. WESTBROOK: Okay.
7	THE COURT: And I think we we have thoroughly covered, you know
8	the answer that the jury was looking for.
9	MR. WESTBROOK: Okay.
10	THE COURT: All right.
11	MR. WESTBROOK: In that case
12	THE COURT: And now you're trying to now you're trying to get into,
13	you know, new topics that could've been covered on cross or recross.
14	MR. WESTBROOK: Well, I I certainly don't want to get into a new
15	topics. So my only question is
16	THE COURT: Well, let's hear it before he answers.
17	MR. WESTBROOK: does the would the inclusion of both boys and
18	girls in a very public setting all at the same time make this even more rare?
19	THE COURT: Well, I'll go ahead and allow that, because, yeah, we're
20	still trying we're trying to quantify how many times this type of, like, sexual
21	predator-type behavior following grooming has taken place. And that that was
22	the point of the question.
23	MS. KOLLINS: Absolutely, Your Honor. I would just ask that you
24	THE COURT: Yeah.
25	MS. KOLLINS: strike the boy-lover pedophile questions from the

1	record. Because if you recall, Mr. Pacult wasn't allowed to finish his story about
2	that. So Mr. Westbrook
3	THE COURT: Yeah.
4	MS. KOLLINS: took that phraseology and threw it into a question.
5	And we stopped him from giving that factual scenario.
6	MR. WESTBROOK: To be fair, Your Honor
7	MS. KOLLINS: So I just ask that that be stricken.
8	THE COURT: Yeah, I think that's I think that's fair. Because
9	MR. WESTBROOK: The entire boy-lover pedophile story actually was
10	told here in court. I think we all heard it. But if you want to strike everything about
11	that story
12	MS. KOLLINS: Oh, jeez.
13	MR. WESTBROOK: then I'm fine with that.
14	THE COURT: I I think I think we've covered this. And so I'm goin
15	to say that we've we've answered the jury question, all right?
16	MR. WESTBROOK: All right. Thank you, Your Honor.
17	THE COURT: So no, thank you. I appreciate that.
18	Did I see any other any other hands? No? All right. So I'm
19	going to let you leave. You're excused. Thank you for your time.
20	THE WITNESS: Thank you, Your Honor.
21	THE COURT: All right. Watch your step.
22	THE WITNESS: Absolutely.
23	THE COURT: All right. Can we call the next witness?
24	MS. KOLLINS: Could we take a minute before we call Ms. Ochoa?
25	THE COURT: A minute? Or do you need, like, just to go look outside

1	or you want, like, a break?
2	MS. KOLLINS: I I would like to look outside and see if she's here.
3	THE COURT: Yeah. Go ahead.
4	MS. KOLLINS: She's going to be a long witness. That's why I said
5	THE COURT: Okay. Let's let's find the person and then maybe get
6	started for about 15 minutes or so.
7	[Pause in proceedings.]
8	MS. KOLLINS: Okay. The State would call Elizabeth Espinoza.
9	THE COURT: Elizabeth Espinoza. All right. That's the next person.
10	And if my math is correct, is that witness 19? I'm trying to keep
11	MS. KOLLINS: Your Honor, I
12	MR. WESTBROOK: Don't ask me about math, I clearly can't do it.
13	MS. KOLLINS: if you'd give me a moment I will count for you. I'm
14	not I
15	THE COURT: That's okay.
16	MS. KOLLINS: Sounds about right.
17	THE COURT: I don't know. You guys might
18	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I have 18. She would be 18 according to
19	my notes.
20	THE COURT: Okay. We have one person that came back twice, so I
21	counted I gave that person an an extra number. So remember we they
22	they finished and then they recalled, so. So maybe that's why I'm up to
23	Hi. The court clerk will administer your oath.
24	ELIZABETH ESPINOZA,
25	[having been called as a witness and being first duly sworn, testified as follows.]

Q Okay. Now -- excuse me. I apologize.

When children are forensically interviewed, it's common for these kind of one-stop shop advocacy centers to have a protocol that they use to interview those kids?

- A Correct.
- Q Does the Southern Nevada Child Assessment Center have a protocol that it employs to interview children?
 - A Yes. It is the National Children's Advocacy Center protocol.
- Q Okay. Just very briefly for the ladies and gentlemen of the jury, just kind of tell them what the stages of that are and how that works.

A Okay. There are two stages. The initial, the first stage, is for rapport building with the child. You allow them to talk to you about their likes and dislikes. It's a manner in which we try to get the child to feel comfortable. We break the ice, so to speak. We talk about family and we gauge where they're at with their cognitive abilities. We ask them to give us a narrative episodic memory.

And then we transition to the second phase which is the substantive phase. And that's where we transition to tell me why you're here. And use open-ended questions, non-leading, so that they can give us information in their own words.

- Q Now, you do these interviews for all types of purposes, correct?
- A Yes.
- Q Okay. So if a kid is a witness to a crime, you might forensically interview them?
 - A Yes.
 - Q If they are alleged to be the victim of either physical or sexual abuse, it

1	might be your job to interview them, correct?		
2	A	Yes.	
3	Q	And those kids come to you a bunch of different ways, right?	
4	A	Yes.	
5	Q	They can come to you from all the law enforcement in this county,	
6	North Las Vegas, Henderson, Metro, right?		
7	А	Yes.	
8	Q	Also Child Protective Services?	
9	А	Yes.	
10	Q	Sometimes at the request of the district attorney's office, you may	
11	interview a child, correct?		
12	А	Yes.	
13	Q	So all different ways. I want to talk to you about a set of interviews	
14	back on	let's talk about November 2nd, first of all, of four little girls. Really similar	
15	in age. Do you recall that set of interviews?		
16	Α	I do. It was five little girls.	
17	Q	Okay. Almost look like paper dolls if you lined them all up, right? They	
18	all look a lot alike?		
19	Α	Right.	
20	Q	Which child did you interview first?	
21	Α	Maradel.	
22	Q	Maradel. Okay. And I don't know I know we just kind of did a hearing	
23	on this, I'm	forgetting which questions I asked when. Tell me the environment of	
24	the forensic interview room at the Child Assessment Center.		
25	A	We interview them in a private room. It's only myself and the child in	

1	similar and they look almost identical, right?		
2	A	Yes.	
3	Q	Okay. And, in fact, just so I think we shared this with everyone, but	
4	there was some misspellings of names in this case, right?		
5	A	Correct.	
6	Q	Okay. Did she tell you where Don David or abuelo lived?	
7	A	Yes. She told me he lived she said she and her sister lived in the	
8	front and abuelo lived in the back near her friend Litzi, which is where they would		
9	see him.		
10	Q	Okay. Did she tell you anything about candy?	
11	A	She did. She stated that he would give them KitKat or chocolates to	
12	get them to	come over.	
13	Q	Now I I asked you how old she was and I think you indicated she was	
14	seven. Do	you recall whether or not and just if you recall that she said she was	
15	eight but th	ese things happened when she was seven?	
16	A	Yes, she did.	
17	Q	Okay. Did she talk to you about seeing a telephone?	
18	A	She talked about her sister seeing a telephone or telling her about a	
19	telephone.		
20	Q	Okay. Did she say and maybe I have it incorrect he shows us	
21	videos?		
22	A	Yes, she did.	
23	Q	Did she say where the videos were?	
24	A	She stated they were on his phone. And she clarified at some point	
25	that it was her sister who saw them.		

Ladies and gentlemen, we're going to take a 15-minute recess.
Don't communicate among yourselves or with anybody else about this trial or the
subject matter of this trial; do not communicate with parties, attorneys, or witnesses
involved in the case; don't seek or obtain any information or comments about the
case from any source; do not read, watch, or listen to any report or commentary
about the case; do not form or express any opinion; and don't do any research or
investigations. All right. See you back here in 15 minutes. That would be 3:25.
Thank you.

You can just stand right here, ma'am, Ms. Espinoza. Thank you.

THE WITNESS: Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you.

[Jury recessed at 3:10 p.m.]

THE COURT: All right, Ms. Espinoza, you're still under oath when you come back. Please do not discuss your testimony with anybody while you're off the stand, but you're free to look at the -- the statement there you were going to look at to refresh your recollection.

THE WITNESS: Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you. And -- and counsel can direct you to what portion to look at. All right. Off the record.

[Court recessed at 3:10 p.m., until 3:30 p.m.]

[Outside the presence of the jury.]

THE COURT: You ready to bring the jury back?

MR. WESTBROOK: We're ready.

THE COURT: Ready for the jury? All right.

Go ahead, marshal.

1	MR. WESTBROOK: I think we all just started fading for a second.	
2	THE COURT: That's okay.	
3	MR. WESTBROOK: But we're back.	
4	[Pause in proceedings.]	
5	THE COURT: By the way, tomorrow 9:00 or 9:30? What did we	
6	decide? Is it 9:00?	
7	MR. WESTBROOK: 9:00. That's it.	
8	MS. KIERNY: Let's do you	
9	THE COURT: Or 10:00?	
10	MS. KIERNY: Let's see how	
11	THE COURT: Was there there was something about a witness.	
12	MR. WESTBROOK: It depends on who we on who we get through.	
13	MS. KIERNY: If we get through Campbell, then 10:00 would be fine. If	
14	we don't, then probably 9:00.	
15	THE COURT: Okay.	
16	MR. WESTBROOK: Our first witness is scheduled for 10:00.	
17	THE COURT: I got it, yeah.	
18	MS. KIERNY: And I don't know that we'll get through that, but having it	
19	close, at least, is better than	
20	MR. WESTBROOK: Yeah.	
21	MS. KOLLINS: I probably have another half hour.	
22	MR. WESTBROOK: And that, by the way, is our is our expert,	
23	Professor Kagan.	
24	MS. KOLLINS: Great. Yeah. I'm looking forward to that.	
25	[Jury reconvened at 3:31 p.m.]	

1		THE COURT: All right. Please be seated.
2		Ms. Espinoza, you're still under oath. You're still required to
3	testify truth	ıfully; do you understand?
4		THE WITNESS: I do, Your Honor.
5		THE COURT: All right, thank you.
6		Ms. Kollins, you may continue.
7		MS. KOLLINS: Thank you, sir.
8		DIRECT EXAMINATION (CONT.)
9	BY MS. KO	DLLINS:
10	Q	Ms. Espinoza, when we left off, I had asked you a question about what
11	Maradel re	membered about friends being present; do you do you recall that?
12	А	I I do. I believe we were talking about Mirabel, the second one.
13	Q	I'm sorry. You're correct. In any event, I was refreshing your
14	recollection with page 19 of her statement, and I asked you to review that to	
15	yourself. A	and I believe you did so as everybody left. And the did the review of
16	that help re	emind you who was outside?
17	Α	Yes, it did. She stated it was her siblings and a friend who were who
18	observed v	vhat happened.
19	Q	Okay. Did she name the friend?
20	Α	Yezline.
21	Q	Okay. Did she also mention Elexi?
22	Α	She did.
23	Q	Okay. And that was who was outside when Yezline was grabbed,
24	correct?	
25	Α	Correct.
	1.1	

1	MS. KIERNY: Your Honor, may we approach just really quickly?
2	[Bench conference transcribed as follows.]
3	THE COURT: Okay.
4	MS. KIERNY: It's more a comment to Stacey.
5	There is a when we were going through, you know, there's the
6	transcription error with Lexi and Litzi. To avoid confusion, do do we want to just
7	say Litzi?
8	MS. KOLLINS: I don't know well, I don't she did the interviews of
9	those kids, so I don't want to talk about those interviews with her
10	MS. KIERNY: Okay.
11	MS. KOLLINS: right now. I don't want
12	MS. KIERNY: No. I'm I'm just saying you're using the name, but
13	Lexi, then we're going to just from Campbell
14	MR. WESTBROOK: Please do not [indiscernible] the jury.
15	MS. KIERNY: get that it's the wrong name?
16	MS. KOLLINS: Sure.
17	MS. KIERNY: Okay. But you want to continue using Lexi?
18	MS. KOLLINS: Well, that's the only time
19	MS. KIERNY: I think it would be less confusion.
20	MS. KOLLINS: that's the only time I'm going to use it.
21	MS. KIERNY: Oh, okay. Okay.
22	THE COURT: Okay. I'm going to let her call
23	MS. KOLLINS: Because at the time it came out
24	THE COURT: whatever she wants to call them.
25	MS. KOLLINS: in the interview and the way she reread it, I don't

1	know that	she's got the proper foundation to testify about that, that she knew that
2	that	
3		MS. KIERNY: I understand.
4		MS. KOLLINS: was a transcription error when she reheard it or read
5	it.	
6		MS. KIERNY: Okay.
7		MS. KOLLINS: Does that make sense?
8		MR. WESTBROOK: [Indiscernible.]
9		MS. KIERNY: I can clarify it, too.
10		THE COURT: Okay. I'll leave you guys
11		MS. KIERNY: I just didn't know if
12		THE COURT: to handle that. Thank you.
13		MS. KIERNY: Okay. Sorry.
14		[End bench conference.]
15	BY MS. K	OLLINS:
16	Q	Okay. And I don't know if I asked you this, Ms. Espinoza, I apologize.
17	kind of los	t my place while we were on our break. So if I repeat myself, apologies.
18		Did she talk to you about Don David or Grandpa showing his
19	thing?	
20	А	Yes, she did.
21	Q	Okay. Did she say what he did with it?
22	Α	She said that he moved it up and down. She described it as being big
23	and browr	1.
24	Q	Okay. Did I and did she describe anything being on the phone?
25	A	She stated that there were naked people on the phone and that they

1	private are	as.
2		And she also talked about how he touched her kola, which is
3	translated	to butt, and she was referring to her vagina. And that he used his hands
4	specifically	, his fingers, over and under her clothes. She described that the fingers
5	would mov	e in a circular motion on her <i>kola</i> .
6	Q	Okay. I'm going to back you up just a little bit, because that's a lot of
7	information	1.
8		You said that her usage of the word kola meant her vagina.
9	How do yo	u know that that's what she meant? What did she say to you?
10	A	Because she provided, I believe, the function of it.
11	Q	Which would be to urinate or pee?
12	A	Yes.
13	Q	Okay. And she you said that the the man would use his hand or
14	his fingers	?
15	A	His she said it was his fingers.
16	Q	Okay. And you said in a circular motion; did she use any other word to
17	describe h	ow he would move his fingers when he would touch her kola?
18	A	That he would move them desperately.
19	Q	I want to back you up a little bit earlier in the interview. Did she give
20	this persor	n a name?
21	A	She did. She called him abuelo Don Don David.
22	Q	Abuelo being grandfather in Spanish, right?
23	A	Yes.
24	Q	And Don David?
25	A	Yes.

1	part of the	conversation?
2	A	I understood it to be herself and the girls.
3	Q	Okay. The girls being the twins?
4	A	Correct.
5	Q	Okay. Was Yezline in that group, do you know?
6	A	She mentioned Yezline, but I don't remember if she referenced her
7	during the	giving of the items.
8	Q	Would it refresh your recollection to review a transcript of the translated
9	interview?	
10	A	Yes, please.
11	Q	Do you have a copy of that in front of you?
12	A	I yes, I do.
13	Q	Okay. I would refer you to page 40. And see if her reference there is
14	to	
15	A	I don't have page 40.
16	Q	Oh, that's right. You don't have the answers. I apologize.
17		MS. KOLLINS: Court's indulgence.
18	Q	Of course you don't, because I do. And maybe this would be a good
19	time to clar	ify this.
20		Two of these girls' statements appear in one transcript; is that
21	correct?	
22	A	Correct. That's Mirabel and Jatziri.
23	Q	But they were never in the same room at the same time?
24	A	Correct.
25	Q	Okay. The transcriptionist just to put them all in one big long thing?

1	him paying	g for colors, what I assume are crayons?
2	А	Yes, she did.
3	Q	Okay. And does she also talk about at that same time David showed
4	his thing o	r Grandpa showed his thing?
5	А	Yes, she did.
6	Q	Okay. Now Lexi is the name in translation as it was transcribed by the
7	transcription	onist, right?
8	Α	Yes.
9	Q	Okay. Is it your belief that that's actually a different name than Lexi?
10	Α	Yes. It's Litzi Paredes.
11	Q	Okay. Did she use a word to describe what his thing looked like?
12	Α	She did. She stated it looked like a weenie and that it was brown.
13	Q	Did she tell you how old she was when these things happened?
14	А	She stated she was eight and that the last time was around when she
15	was nine y	rears old.
16	Q	Okay. Did she talk to you about candy?
17	А	Repeat the question, please?
18	Q	Did Jatziri talk to you about chocolate or candy?
19	Α	Yes, she did. She
20	Q	What did she tell you about that?
21	А	She stated that he would offer or give them chocolate.
22	Q	Did she indicate to you whether or not she was also touched inside
23	David's ap	artment?
24	Α	Yes. She she stated the touching happened inside the house, in the
25	kitchen.	

1	Q	So both.
2		MS. KOLLINS: Court's indulgence.
3	Q	Did she talk about a specific kind of candy that David would give?
4	А	She stated it was KitKat chocolate.
5	Q	And did she speak to you at all about kissing?
6	A	Yes. She stated that he kissed her on the mouth.
7	Q	Did she talk about what David would do with the chocolate?
8	A	Yes. She described an incident where she said Yezline told her that
9	Don David	had placed a chocolate inside what I understood to be the vagina,
10	Yezline's v	agina, and that it smelled.
11	Q	Did she tell you where David was when he showed the phone?
12	A	She stated the touching happened inside in the kitchen. I can't recall
13	what she s	tated about the exact location.
14	Q	And and what I'm asking you is, did she tell you where David was
15	when he sh	nowed the videos on the phone?
16	A	In his house.
17	Q	In his house. Okay. Did Jatziri tell you what David relayed to her about
18	telling Grar	ndmother; do you remember that?
19	A	I I don't recall.
20	Q	Would it refresh your recollection to review page 63?
21	A	Yes, please.
22		She stated that he told them to not tell Grandmother, because
23	he would g	o to jail, to not tell the grandmother or their moms.
24	Q	So you concluded your interviews with those four girls on that day,
25	correct?	

A She used *kola* and then -- no, she used the word *kosa*, thing, and then later on she used *kola*, which is butt and also referring to her vagina.

- Q Now, did Yezline tell you about a particular incident where she was touched?
 - A Yes, she did.
 - Q Okay. Where did that happen?

A She stated it happened in his house, in his bedroom. And she described that he grabbed her from outside and pushed her in his room, took off her pants, took off her underwear, threw them on the ground, and that he placed tape on her mouth, on her hands, and on her feet. And that he lifted her shirt up a little bit and touched her -- she called them *chi-chis*, referring to breast, over her clothes. And she stated that he touched her *kola* with his hand and that when he touched it, it was outside of where she pees.

She stated he also -- what she described was hitting of her buttocks and then placing his hand in her buttocks and that she felt it warm. When he used it on her *kola*, her vagina, she described that she felt tickles.

- Q Okay. Did she say how he was moving his hand?
- A I believe she used the word circular.
- Q She told you the tape went on her hands and her feet; anywhere else?
- A Her mouth.
- Q Okay. Did she tell you how she got inside David's bedroom?
- A She stated that he grabbed her and pushed her in the room.
- Q Now, she described -- she was able to describe to you some physical sensations about what it felt like when David was touching her; is that right?
 - A Correct.

1	A	Yes.
2	Q	Okay.
3		MS. KOLLINS: Court's indulgence.
4		THE COURT: Uh-huh.
5		MS. KOLLINS: All right. At this time I'm going to pass the witness.
6		May I approach Ms. Espinoza, and I'll [indiscernible].
7		THE COURT: You may.
8		MS. KOLLINS: Do you need those statements up there or?
9		MS. KIERNY: Do you does she have all of them?
10		MS. KOLLINS: No.
11		MS. KIERNY: Okay. I can just provide her with mine if I need.
12		MS. KOLLINS: Okay.
13		THE COURT: All right, Ms. Kierny, it's your witness.
14		MS. KIERNY: Thank you.
15		CROSS-EXAMINATION
16	BY MS. KII	ERNY:
17	Q	Good afternoon, Elizabeth.
18	А	Good afternoon.
19	Q	I wanted to ask you some questions about forensic interviews in
20	general; is	that okay?
21	А	Yes.
22	Q	All right. Forensic interviews are designed to discover information from
23	kids; is tha	t an accurate way of putting it?
24	A	It's to gather factual information
25	Q	Okay.
		86

1	don't confr	ont with them with that during a forensic interview?
2	A	Correct.
3	Q	An improperly done interview of a child could fail to elicit a disclosure
4	from a kid	that was actually abused, right?
5	A	Rephrase, please.
6	Q	Sure. If you don't do an interview right, you could perhaps fail to elicit a
7	disclosure	from a kid who might have actually been abused?
8		MS. KOLLINS: I'm going to object. That calls for speculation, because
9	there's a w	hole gamut of ways you could inappropriately conduct an interview. So
10	it's	
11		THE COURT: I do you understand the question?
12		THE WITNESS: I I don't understand.
13		THE COURT: You don't understand?
14		THE WITNESS: No. If she could just repeat it again.
15		THE COURT: All right. Why don't you repeat it one more time. We'll
16	see if she	understands it and then then I want to know if
17		MS. KIERNY: Let me think about a way to do this better, then.
18		THE COURT: All right.
19		MS. KIERNY: Okay.
20	BY MS. KI	ERNY:
21	Q	If you don't do if you don't interview a child properly, that child might
22	not disclos	e something that actually happened to them, right?
23	A	Correct.
24	Q	Okay. That would be kind of a false negative, right?
25	Α	Correct.

1	necessaril	y be forensic interviewing, right?
2	Α	Repeat, please.
3		MS. KOLLINS: I'm going to object. That calls for speculation as to
4	what other	questions were asked
5		THE COURT: Well, this is the forensic interview specialist. I mean,
6	let's leave	it up to her to tell us if she can't answer the question. And if it's
7	speculativ	e, tell us. We don't want you to speculate. We just want, you know, in
8	your line o	f work, based on your background and experience, and if you can
9	answer the	e question, we want to hear your your answer. Okay. If you can't, let
10	us know.	
11		THE WITNESS: I will.
12		THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
13		THE WITNESS: Repeat the question, please.
14	BY MS. K	ERNY:
15	Q	Sure. Questioning from parents, friends, teachers isn't usually forension
16	interviewing, correct?	
17	Α	Correct.
18	Q	All right. And unless the parent has some special training, they usually
19	don't follow	w the same protocols that you would?
20	Α	Correct.
21	Q	And when you interview a child, you don't know you generally don't
22	know if a prior interviewer has engaged in any sort of suggestive interviewing	
23	techniques	s?
24	Α	Correct.
25	Q	Okay. On this case in general actually, are you briefed on cases

Okay. She told you that Don David touched her private part, correct?

25

Q

1	A	Yes, in her own terms.
2	Q	In her own terms, which would've been kola?
3	A	Kola. Uh-huh.
4	Q	All right. And generally kola refers to butt in your experience?
5	A	Butt or tail.
6	Q	But in this context all the children were using it to refer to the front, the
7	vaginal v	agina?
8	A	Yes. Yes.
9	Q	Okay. Now, Maradel told you that when this happened Mirabel, Jatziri,
10	and Yezline	e were there, correct?
11	A	Yes.
12	Q	And also Litzi?
13	A	I can't remember about Litzi being there.
14	Q	Okay. Would reviewing who are we on Maradel's statement
15	refresh you	r recollection?
16	A	Yes, please.
17	Q	Okay. Let me find that.
18		MS. KIERNY: May I approach?
19		THE WITNESS: Yes, I I remember.
20	BY MS. KIE	ERNY:
21	Q	Oh, sure.
22	A	Yes, Litzi was there.
23	Q	Okay. Litzi did not tell you she ever witnessed Don David touch
24	Maradel?	
25		MS. KOLLINS: Objection. Hearsay.

I	
1	MS. KIERNY: Your Honor, it's
2	THE COURT: Well
3	MS. KIERNY: impeachment. It contradicts the kids' other statement.
4	It's not to prove or it could be offered not to prove the truth. It could be for
5	completeness of investigation, state of mind of interviewer.
6	THE COURT: I think it comes in on several grounds, so overruled.
7	MS. KIERNY: Thank you.
8	MS. KOLLINS: It's an out-of-court statement from somebody that's no
9	testifying here.
10	THE COURT: Well
11	MS. KOLLINS: Not another child that was interviewed.
12	THE COURT: But it's why don't you approach.
13	[Bench conference transcribed as follows.]
14	THE COURT: So this is an out-of-court statement by another child
15	MS. KIERNY: Uh-huh.
16	THE COURT: that you're offering to rebut what one of the other
17	children told her?
18	MS. KIERNY: Yes.
19	THE COURT: What she says one of the other children told her.
20	MS. KIERNY: Correct.
21	MR. WESTBROOK: It's it's grounds.
22	MS. KOLLINS: So it's not it's not a prior consistent. It's not a prior
23	inconsistent. It's an out-of-court they're going to if they want to call this child to
24	say David didn't do this, then they can call that child to testify. This this child has
25	not testified here.

1	MS. KOLLINS: They haven't testified. This person hasn't testified,
2	though.
3	THE COURT: No. That is coming in to as a or hold on. Oh, I see
4	what you're saying. It's inconsistent with what Mirabel said
5	MS. KOLLINS: Correct.
6	THE COURT: but this person didn't testify.
7	MS. KOLLINS: Correct.
8	MS. KIERNY: It's inconsistent
9	MS. KOLLINS: It's not
10	THE COURT: Hold on. I'm still trying to break it down.
11	MS. KOLLINS: It's not crossable. You can't cross it.
12	THE COURT: Yeah. How would you get it in there? How do you get
13	in? You have to put
14	MS. KOLLINS: You have to put that
15	THE COURT: child on the stand or somebody
16	MS. KOLLINS: Or a 51.385
17	THE COURT: who testified to what
18	MS. KOLLINS: that kid.
19	THE COURT: Wait. If someone testified to what the child said, this is
20	inconsistent with that.
21	MS. KOLLINS: I I agree. It takes an opposite position. But it's not
22	inconsistent with the testifying it's an inconsistent statement of the testifying
23	witness.
24	THE COURT: Let me just double check. Okay. This is an important
25	issue.

1	MS. KOLLINS: I have my cheat sheet in my
2	THE COURT: 58 or 50.
3	MS. KOLLINS: Hold on.
4	THE COURT: It's an important issue.
5	MS. KIERNY: I think he's got a he's got his bench book.
6	MS. KOLLINS: And, Your Honor, I believe it's
7	THE COURT: I don't know where my hearsay is, but I'll find it.
8	MS. KOLLINS: Oh, okay.
9	THE COURT: Hearsay is it's 50-something, right?
10	MS. KOLLINS: 51.
11	THE COURT: Oh, the presence is all right.
12	Okay. So so you can't bring in subpart 2, let me see about
13	subpart 3. Because subpart 2 would be inconsistent with the declarant's statement.
14	MS. KIERNY: Okay.
15	THE COURT: Now
16	MS. KIERNY: Well, it is inconsistent
17	THE COURT: the declarant would be
18	MS. KIERNY: Elizbeth is currently the declarant. It's inconsistent
19	THE COURT: It would be
20	MS. KIERNY: with what she said Maradel said.
21	THE COURT: I get it.
22	MS. KOLLINS: She's not the declarant, though, Your Honor, she's
23	MS. KIERNY: She
24	THE COURT: But Maradel was a declarant.
25	MS. KOLLINS: Correct. But she's saying Elizabeth is the declarant,

1	the person who's on the stand right now.
2	THE COURT: Okay. Give me a second here.
3	So this is reversed. It's talking about the statement has to be
4	made by a witness, too. That she's not a witness.
5	MS. KIERNY: She is a witness. She's a named witness.
6	MS. KOLLINS: She has to testify, though, first before you can get it in
7	a prior
8	THE COURT: Does she have to testify first? Now, what did you
9	want to see? Come come over here a little bit closer. Come a little bit closer.
10	MR. HAMNER: Come closer. Just with respect to if you have a the
11	way it works is this. If a witness like Maradel makes a statement, we can bring on
12	another witness and cross examine them about something Maradel told them. So,
13	for example, if Maradel told this witness something inconsistent, it would come in.
14	What they want to bring on a witness that hasn't yet testified. And that's improper.
15	And the method to touch on the subject is we would ask Maradel, number one, did
16	you ever say to Lexi X, and then we call
17	MS. KIERNY: She didn't say it to Litzi. Litzi said percipient witness to
18	it.
19	MR. HAMNER: Right.
20	MS. KIERNY: Now
21	MR. HAMNER: And that's not a prior inconsistency. But if they want to
22	just bring out the fact Litzi says X indeed occurred, that's not a prior inconsistent
23	statement. It's two witnesses saying two different things.
24	MS. KIERNY: They did.
25	THE COURT: See what this is here. This isn't prior inconsistent

1	statement. It's it's good cross-examination material. It's material that tends to
2	offer alternative
3	MS. KIERNY: Uh-huh.
4	THE COURT: point of view. It it goes to the credibility, but it's
5	technically not this isn't a prior inconsistent statement of
6	MS. KIERNY: That was my first ground.
7	THE COURT: This witness is my prior inconsistent statement of
8	Mirabel's statement, all right?
9	MS. KIERNY: Okay.
10	THE COURT: So it doesn't come in as a prior inconsistency.
11	MS. KIERNY: Okay.
12	THE COURT: I you're going to disagree with that.
13	MS. KIERNY: Now, I believe it does come in under, as you indicated,
14	credibility. As you indicated to the completeness of the investigation, state of min-
15	of interviewer, [indiscernible] interviewer, bias and motive, it also contradicts the
16	kids' stories.
17	THE COURT: Well, we can keep
18	MS. KIERNY: I'm sorry.
19	THE COURT: we've got to deal with those one at a time.
20	MS. KIERNY: Okay. Sure.
21	THE COURT: Okay. So
22	MS. KIERNY: So credibility is your first one.
23	THE COURT: the state of mind of this witness is not an issue.
24	MS. KIERNY: Okay.
25	THE COURT: Because she was purely collecting the information. So

1	take that one out. What was the next one?
2	MS. KIERNY: Okay. Credibility.
3	THE COURT: Well, credibility of this witness she doesn't get
4	MS. KIERNY: Credibility of the witness. She's testifying to
5	through 51.385. Because she's offering these as substantive evidence under
6	the 51.385 standard.
7	THE COURT: Okay. How does how does that statement tend to
8	impeachment her credibility here?
9	MS. KIERNY: Elizabeth's or Maradel's?
10	THE COURT: Pardon.
11	MS. KIERNY: Elizabeth's or Maradel's? I'm not trying to impeach
12	Elizabeth's. She's just reciting what Maradel told her.
13	MR. WESTBROOK: She was going to impeach her.
14	MS. KIERNY: It impeaches what Maradel said. She's already reciting
15	hearsay.
16	MS. KOLLINS: None of this cures the hearsay problem, though.
17	THE COURT: So, well, I think
18	MS. KIERNY: This child is interviewed by her under the same
19	THE COURT: The fact it goes to credibility is is explained in
20	relevance of the information. It doesn't it doesn't solve the infirmity of the fact tha
21	it's hearsay. So there is no credibility of hearsay exceptions. You've got to come
22	up with another hearsay exception.
23	MS. KIERNY: All right.
24	THE COURT: What else do you have?
25	MS. KIERNY: Not offered for the truth. Offered to show

The State of Nevada, Plaintiff, vs. Jose Azucena, Defendant.

Case No. C-17-321044-1 [Jury Trial Day 8]

THE COURT: Well, you weren't offering it for the truth, right?

MS. KIERNY: No. Completeness of investigation, that they investigated the -
THE COURT: Completeness.

MS. KIERNY: -- of the investigation that was done in this case.

MR. WESTBROOK: They've gotten [indiscernible] in a correct --

THE COURT: Well, completeness is -- is -- shows relevance. Is that a hearsay exception?

MS. KIERNY: Yes.

THE COURT: I don't think that's a hearsay exception. It's a relevance argument.

MR. WESTBROOK: And we -- we -- [indiscernible] completeness [indiscernible] liability of the investigation and possible bias on behalf of the investigators. They have information given to them by Maradel that she says Litzi was there. And they also have information [indiscernible] where she said to that investigator that she was not there and Maradel saying it's not true. The fact that they rely on the [indiscernible] shows that they are biased. And it's nothing to complete investigation [indiscernible] that exception? No.

In fact, what complicates this from an intellectual standpoint is the fact that everything she has testified to is hearsay. There's also an exception [indiscernible] none of the statements of Litzi taken by Elizabeth [indiscernible] have -- - are any -- are inherently reliable. That's the [indiscernible]. You've already found that all the statements she took [indiscernible] were sufficiently [indiscernible].

You could also find that [indiscernible]. And there's no way

1	[indiscernible].
2	MS. KOLLINS: But there's been no hearing.
3	MR. WESTBROOK: So it's reliable.
4	MS. KOLLINS: You need the hearing and you need notice.
5	That 51.385 hearing is just as available
6	MR. WESTBROOK: I've got the catch-all exception [indiscernible].
7	MS. KOLLINS: It's not inherently reliable.
8	THE COURT: So we've got kind of a I don't know, a fairness issue.
9	MR. WESTBROOK: Of course.
10	THE COURT: We let in we let her testify to some of the children's
11	statements; why can't she testify with other children said?
12	MR. HAMNER: Because the procedure is 51.385.
13	THE COURT: So because they didn't have a 51.385 hearing?
14	MR. HAMNER: Because they because they didn't file a notice that
15	they wanted to have this witness talk about this hearsay.
16	MS. KOLLINS: You didn't ask for that.
17	MR. HAMNER: You [indiscernible] a hearsay.
18	THE COURT: The witness has already been qualified [indiscernible] so
19	I can incorporate everything she said [indiscernible].
20	MR. HAMNER: But the part of but as you mentioned the factors, the
21	factors are you evaluate the spontaneity of when Litzi talked to Ms. Espinoza.
22	MS. KOLLINS: It's a child, not a parent.
23	THE COURT: It's the exact same credibility. I mean, you could have
24	a 51.385 hearing right now and and come out with the spontaneous
25	[indiscernible].

1	THE COURT: So you're worried that she may they may not call her.
2	MS. KOLLINS: It's not cross-examinable as it stands.
3	THE COURT: The jurors came in before
4	MS. KIERNY: But it still would be under fundamental fairness
5	standpoint.
6	THE COURT: And when you had Mr. Rangel come in and testify
7	before the kids testified.
8	MS. KOLLINS: And all the kids were here subject to cross and all the
9	parents were subject to cross about what they said. This child this this
10	imputed
11	THE COURT: So how about I let you get into it as long as you call the
12	witness so she'll be subject to cross-examination.
13	MS. KIERNY: Ultimately, they're I mean, I'm planning on calling her.
14	I think, ultimately, there is a fundamental fairness issue that we know that these
15	statements were said were said to her. And I think I should be able to cross her
16	about that, because she knows of it, and there's the same indicia of the liability as
17	for their hearsay statements.
18	MS. KOLLINS: This is error. I don't want to this is
19	THE COURT: I'm going to split the baby on this one. All right. I'm
20	going to let you get into this topic if if you're if you're representing you're going
21	to call her as a witness
22	MS. KIERNY: I'm representing that she is noticed
23	THE COURT: and so she can be subject to cross-examination by the
24	State.
25	MS. KIERNY: Our investigator

1	MR. HAMNER: Is she coming?
2	MS. KIERNY: Our investigator
3	MS. KOLLINS: Is she coming?
4	MS. KIERNY: talked to her and he's bringing her here at 10:00.
5	That's all I know. I can't tell you that if she doesn't show up.
6	THE COURT: Do you have her under subpoena or?
7	MS. KIERNY: Yes. She's under subpoena.
8	MR. HAMNER: Oh. Okay.
9	MS. KIERNY: And we're going to be asking her
10	THE COURT: You have the right to call her and cross-examine her on
11	this statement. I'm going to let them question her.
12	MS. KOLLINS: Well, here's
13	MS. KIERNY: Okay.
14	MS. KOLLINS: They've represented to you that they're having her here
15	tomorrow. We're going to ask that it's stricken if they don't have her here.
16	THE COURT: I
17	MS. KOLLINS: Because, I mean it's still our position with all
18	THE COURT: I may or may not do that, but raise the question or raise
19	the issue tomorrow.
20	MS. KOLLINS: With all due respect, I just think it's
21	MS. KIERNY: I'm making every effort I can to get her here. I have
22	THE COURT: And I may very well grant it. I just don't want to get a
23	MS. KIERNY: I have her under subpoena.
24	MS. KOLLINS: So how much of this Litzi statement are we going to ge
25	into in the middle of her cross-examination? Are we going through the whole thing

1		THE COURT: Anything that's inconsistent with anything Mirabel said or
2	you think is	s inconsistent with what she said comes in.
3		MS. KIERNY: Any of the children said it, so that would include Jatziri.
4		THE COURT: Any of the children, if it's inconsistent
5		MS. KOLLINS: And it's admissible under hearsay pursuant to the prior
6	inconsister	nt
7		THE COURT: Pursuant to 51.035, subpart 2.
8		MS. KOLLINS: Okay.
9		THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
10		MS. KIERNY: Thank you.
11		[End of bench conference.]
12		THE COURT: All right.
13		MS. KIERNY: All right, Elizabeth, where were we?
14		THE COURT: Sorry that was so long. We're just going to continue
15	right now for	or the moment.
16	BY MS. KII	ERNY:
17	Q	We're on Maradel. Okay.
18		Maradel told you that Litzi was there
19		THE COURT: Oh, and 51.385, Ms. Kollins, is also the basis of for my
20	ruling. Oka	ay.
21	BY MS. KII	ERNY:
22	Q	Maradel told you that Litzi was present when she was touched on her
23	private par	t, correct?
24	A	Yes.
25	Q	When you interviewed Litzi she did not tell you that she ever witnessed

1	Don David	touch Maradel?
2	A	Correct.
3	Q	Maradel said she was standing while Don David was sitting in a chair
4	by a plant	when this happened?
5	A	Are we on Maradel or Mirabel?
6	Q	We are on Maradel.
7	A	Mirabel. M-I-R-A-B-E-L?
8	Q	M-A-R-I del. Maradel.
9	A	Okay.
10	Q	Sure.
11	A	I remember she stated she was playing outside.
12	Q	Okay. So you remember it was outside. Would looking at her
13	statement	refresh your recollection as to whether she said she was standing and
14	Don David	was sitting near a plant?
15	A	Yes, please.
16	Q	Okay.
17		MS. KIERNY: May I approach?
18		THE COURT: Yes.
19	BY MS. KI	ERNY:
20	Q	Did you finish reading?
21	A	Yes.
22	Q	Okay. Did that refresh your recollection?
23	A	Yes, it did.
24	Q	And so did Maradel tell you she was standing and Don David was
25	sitting in a	chair by a plant outside?

1	A	Yes.
2	Q	And this was over her clothes?
3	A	Yes.
4	Q	And she told you he only touched her over the clothes?
5	A	Yes.
6	Q	She also told you she only goes in Don David's house with Grandma,
7	correct?	
8	A	I don't recall who she goes with individually or as a group.
9	Q	Okay. Would well, did she ever say she she did not say she did
10	she wou	ld sorry. I'm out of words today. All right.
11		Did she tell you that there was a time that she went to the
12	bathroom	with Grandma and her, Mirabel, and Litzi were all there?
13	Α	Yes.
14	Q	Okay. And that Don David pulled the door open on them?
15	Α	I don't recall that part.
16	Q	Would looking at page 26 of your of the statement refresh your
17	recollection	n?
18	Α	Yes, please.
19	Q	Did that refresh your recollection?
20	Α	Yes, it did.
21	Q	There was a time when when Mirabel, Maradel, and Litzi used the
22	bathroom	n Don David's house and Don David pulled the door open on them?
23	A	Yes.
24	Q	Okay.
25	Α	To the bathroom.

1	looking at a	anything that you have with you refresh your recollection?
2	A	No, not on here specific to McDonald's.
3	Q	Okay. So there's nothing in your notes specific to McDonald's?
4	A	No.
5	Q	All right. Maradel did not mention ever being in Don David's car to you?
6	A	No.
7	Q	Okay. Maradel didn't mention to you anything about Don David taking
8	them to Ch	uck E. Cheese?
9	A	Somebody mentioned Chuck E. Cheese out of the girls. I can't
10	remember	who
11	Q	Okay.
12	A	out of the five.
13	Q	Okay. And you don't remember if it was Maradel or someone else?
14	A	Somebody mentioned Chuck E. Cheese, but I can't remember which
15	one of the	five.
16	Q	Okay. Did Maradel ever Maradel mentioned that Don David gave
17	them candy	y, right?
18	A	Yes.
19	Q	Did she she didn't mention to you that he ever put it on his parts or
20	penis befor	re giving it to them?
21	A	Correct.
22	Q	Maradel didn't mention that he ever put fruit on his penis and then gave
23	it to them?	
24	A	Correct.
25	Q	And Maradel didn't say to you that Don David kissed her on the mouth?

1	A	Correct.
2	Q	And then next the next one interviewed was Mirabel, correct?
3	A	Yes.
4	Q	Okay. Trying to stay in your order here.
5	A	Thank you.
6	Q	Okay. Mirabel told you that Don David touched her one time, right?
7	A	I can't recall how many times she stated it happened.
8	Q	Would reviewing your or the transcript at page 28 refresh your
9	recollection	1?
10	A	Yes, please. I don't see where she
11		MS. KIERNY: Court's indulgence. Or could I approach really quick? I
12	want to see	e her reference. [Indiscernible] wrong location. I apologize.
13		THE WITNESS: Okay.
14	BY MS. KII	ERNY:
15	Q	I can't find it at this minute. I apologize.
16		Maradel did say that he touched her thing with his thing?
17	A	Yes.
18	Q	And you took his thing to mean his penis?
19	A	Yes.
20	Q	And this was when Don David's clothes were on, correct?
21	A	Yes.
22	Q	Okay. And she said she told you that she told her mom what
23	happened	right away?
24	A	I can't remember the sequence of when she told.
25	Q	Okay. I'm sorry, I gave you the wrong transcript earlier. Because of the

1	error with t	the Mirabel and Maradel, I was having you review Maradel's statement
2	when we a	re on Mirabel. I am so sorry. Okay.
3		THE COURT: Does that change any of your testimony?
4		THE WITNESS: No, Your Honor.
5		THE COURT: Okay.
6		THE WITNESS: I thought we had just done Maradel and now we were
7	moving on	to Mirabel.
8	BY MS. KI	ERNY:
9	Q	Okay. And I was asking you about Mirabel, but I gave you Maradel's
10	transcript t	o review. Okay. So that was where the error happened. So my
11	question e	arlier.
12	Α	Maradel stated he touched her other times.
13	Q	Okay. We're on Mirabel or Maradel?
14	Α	Maradel.
15	Q	Okay.
16	Α	And as far as Mirabel, it only happened one time.
17	А	Okay. So Mirabel only had touched one one time?
18	Α	One time.
19	Q	And Don David she said that Don David would also showed her his
20	thing?	
21	Α	Yes.
22	Q	And her sisters and Yezline were here for that?
23	А	Yes.
24	Q	Were around for that. She mentioned boys being around when Don
25	David would pull out his thing, correct?	

1	A	Yes.
2	Q	Those boys were Leo, Orlando, and Juan?
3	A	Yes.
4	Q	When you interviewed Leo, he did not say that there was ever a time he
5	saw Don D	avid's thing?
6	A	Correct.
7	Q	She said it looked very big?
8	A	She said big and brown.
9	Q	And brown. Okay. You asked her what else did she see when she saw
10	the thing?	
11	A	I can't remember if I asked her for more specific details.
12	Q	Would looking at your statement refresh your recollection?
13	A	Yes, please.
14		MS. KIERNY: May I approach?
15	Q	We are on page eight at the top.
16	A	Thank you. She stated that that was all she saw. That it was big and
17	brown.	
18	Q	Okay. So she didn't mention seeing a catheter or any tubes or anything
19	like that?	
20	A	Correct.
21	Q	Okay. During Mirabel's interview she didn't mention anything about
22	Don David	taking her to McDonald's?
23	A	I I don't recall that part.
24	Q	She didn't say anything about Don David taking her to Chuck E.
25	Cheese; do	you recall?
		113

1	home and saw Yezline taped up	
2	A	Yes.
3	Q	according to Mirabel?
4	A	Yes.
5	Q	And then Mirabel told Yezline's mom what she saw and Yezline's mom
6	was crying) ?
7	A	Yes.
8	Q	Okay. When you interviewed Litzi, she did not tell you about a time that
9	she saw Y	ezline be pulled into Don David's apartment?
10	A	Correct.
11	Q	When you interviewed Jatziri, she did not tell you about a time that she
12	saw Mirab	el Yezline dragged into Don David's apartment?
13	Α	I don't remember about Jatziri mentioning it. I don't recall.
14	Q	Okay. Would reviewing your notes or is there anything that would
15	possibly re	efresh your recollection short of reading through the entire transcript?
16	Α	If you just give me a second, I'll look through my notes and see if I find
17	it.	
18	Q	Sure.
19	A	She stated that Don David touched Yezline.
20	Q	Okay. But she didn't say that she saw Don David drag Yezline into his
21	apartment	or tape up her mouth? Didn't personally witness it?
22	A	According to my notes, no.
23	Q	Okay. And Maradel, similarly, did not say anything about seeing
24	Yezline dr	agged into the apartment and taped up?
25	Α	Maradel? The first one?
	1	115

1	Q	Maradel, the first one. Yes.
2	A	Correct.
3	Q	Okay. When Mirabel was telling you that she saw Don David grab
4	Yezline \	Yezline, sorry, she said that happened this Friday, right?
5	A	Yes.
6	Q	Okay. And you were interviewing her on November 2nd?
7	A	Correct.
8	Q	And so last Friday would've been on October 28th, if you know?
9	A	Approximately.
10	Q	I think we went through the dates at a previous hearing.
11	A	Yes. Uh-huh.
12	Q	Okay. And you did you also mentioned that you interviewed
13	Yezline \	/ezline?
14	Α	Yes.
15	Q	And she did mention a tape incident?
16	Α	Yes.
17	Q	But she said that it was in Don David's bedroom?
18	Α	Yes.
19	Q	And she said the tape was white?
20	Α	Yes.
21	Q	And she did not say that Jatziri, Maradel, Mirabel, or Litzi were around
22	when she v	went into Don David's apartment?
23	A	Correct?
24	Q	In fact, she said she was alone when Don David pulled her in?
25	А	Yes.

1	Q	And Yezline did not say that Don David's wife showed up and saw her
2	taped up?	
3	A	Correct.
4	Q	Okay. All right. The next one in your order was Jatziri, correct?
5	A	Yes.
6	Q	Okay. Let me get to that one.
7		And you testified earlier that Jatziri said Don David was touching
8	her on her	front part, but that's not the term she used, right?
9	A	She used <i>kola</i> .
10	Q	Okay.
11	A	Uh-huh.
12	Q	And a lot of the other girls used that word too?
13	A	Some used kola, some used kosa. Scarlett was the only one who
14	identified it	as [speaking in Spanish], vagina.
15	Q	Okay. She never used the word, paparucha, with you did she?
16	A	Who are we talking?
17	Q	l'm Jatziri.
18	A	Did she ever word, papa
19	Q	Paparucha? I'm butchering it, but.
20	A	I don't know.
21	Q	Okay. Would reviewing your notes refresh your recollection?
22	A	Yes, please.
23	Q	Okay. Go ahead.
24	A	The only term she used that I recall was [speaking in Spanish], and she
25	explained t	hat was naked people.

1	Q	Okay. And that was referring to what she saw on the phone, correct?
2	A	Yes. Uh-huh.
3	Q	Jatziri told you about two incidents when Don David touched her in his
4	house, righ	nt?
5	A	Yes.
6	Q	And she told you the touchings only happened in his house?
7	A	In the house, in the kitchen.
8	Q	Always in the kitchen?
9	A	Yes.
10	Q	Okay. She did not tell you that Don David touched her at someone
11	named Est	her's house?
12	A	No.
13	Q	Okay. And she indicated the first incident in the kitchen started when
14	she was playing at Litzi's house?	
15	A	Yes.
16	Q	And then they went outside and Don David offered chocolate?
17	A	Yes.
18	Q	They went in the house to get the chocolate?
19	A	Yes.
20	Q	When I'm saying they, that would refer to Yezline, Maradel, Mirabel,
21	and Litzi, c	orrect?
22	A	Yes.
23	Q	And Litzi did not corroborate that she ever went into the house with
24	without Gra	andma being there?
25	A	Correct.

1	Q	Okay. And she told you, in fact, that she never went in Don David's
2	house?	
3	Α	Unless it was with Grandma
4	Q	Okay.
5	Α	is what I recall.
6	Q	All right. Jatziri told you that Don David then touched her on her part
7	over her cl	othes and on her belly, right?
8	Α	Yes. Over and under her clothes.
9	Q	Okay.
10		MS. KIERNY: Court's brief indulgence.
11		THE COURT: Uh-huh.
12	BY MS. KI	ERNY:
13	Q	Now, are you certain that she said it was over and under her clothes
14	or are you are you certain about that?	
15	А	Let me review my notes; is that okay?
16	Q	Okay.
17	А	According to my notes she said [speaking in Spanish], and that's
18	translated	to on top and under my clothing.
19	Q	Okay. On page and I guess I'm asking, do you know what he
20	touched he	er belly with? And that was over her clothes, right?
21	А	I don't recall. And I just I made a note but it was just the stomach.
22	Q	Would refresh would reviewing your voluntary statement on page 48
23	refresh you	ur recollection?
24	А	Yes, please.
25	Q	Okay. Let me trade out transcribes

1		THE COURT: Can you show Ms. Kollins first?
2		MS. KIERNY: Oh, page 48.
3		THE COURT: I think she wants to see it.
4		MS. KOLLINS: I have that.
5		THE COURT: Oh.
6		MS. KOLLINS: If we could just have some clarification what the
7	question is.	Is the question, was she touched over her or under her clothes, on
8	her belly?	
9		MS. KIERNY: Yes.
10		MS. KOLLINS: Is that what we're trying to get to? Okay.
11		THE COURT: Over the clothes, but on the belly area?
12		MS. KIERNY: Yes.
13		THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
14		THE WITNESS: She stated that he touched her over the clothes, on
15	the belly.	
16	BY MS. KIE	ERNY:
17	Q	Okay. And while he was touching her, his other hand was in the trash
18	can?	
19	A	Yes.
20	Q	Okay. And you testified earlier that he she also told you that he
21	touched Mi	rabel and Maradel that day at the same time?
22	A	Yes.
23	Q	You interviewed Maradel Mirabel and she did not disclose to you a
24	time when	she was touched at the in Don David's kitchen, correct?
25	A	Correct.
		120

1		And at that on that second time, Jatziri told you that Don David
2	touched he	er?
3	A	Yes.
4	Q	And Litzi was present?
5	A	Yes.
6	Q	When you interviewed Litzi, she did not disclose at that time she did
7	not disclos	se to you that she saw Jatziri be touched in the kitchen at that time?
8	A	Correct.
9	Q	Jatziri did not mention to you that Don David took her to McDonald's?
10	A	There was a mention of McDonald's, like Chuck E. Cheese, but again, I
11	don't remember which child.	
12	Q	Okay. Do you have my Jatziri statement?
13	Α	Yes, I do.
14		MS. KIERNY: May I approach, Judge? May I approach?
15		THE COURT: Yes.
16		MS. KIERNY: Okay.
17	BY MS. KI	ERNY:
18	Q	I believe the reference that Jatziri did refer to McDonald's, she said that
19	When we	get out of here, we are going to McDonald's to eat.
20	Α	Getting out of where?
21	Q	The interview.
22	A	Yes, I believe she said that.
23	Q	So that is the reference to McDonald's?
24	Α	Yes.
25	Q	Okay. Jatziri did not mention Don David taking them to Chuck E.

1	Cheese?	
2	A	I don't recall which child spoke
3	Q	Would reviewing your notes
4	A	Yes, please.
5	Q	refresh your recollection?
6	A	I don't have it in my notes.
7	Q	Okay.
8	A	But I remember somebody somewhere saying something about
9	Chuck E. C	Cheese.
10	Q	Okay. And like you said, one of the four girls one of the five girls said
11	that, correc	et?
12	A	I believe it was one, yeah.
13	Q	Jatziri told you Don David would show her videos on a phone.
14	A	Yes.
15	Q	And that was when she said something about being the people were
16	[speaking i	n Spanish]?
17	A	Yes.
18	Q	And you don't know what that word means?
19	A	She explained it that it was people were not wearing clothes.
20	Q	Okay. But you're that's not, like, a word you're familiar with?
21	A	No. No.
22	Q	Okay. And she said that it was on a pink phone that she saw these
23	videos?	
24	A	Yes.
25	Q	And it was Grandmother's phone?

1	A	Yes.
2	Q	And her sisters, Yezline and Litzi, were there when this happened?
3	А	Correct.
4	Q	When Maradel spoke to you about a phone, she said the phone was
5	black, corre	ect?
6	А	Yes.
7	Q	And when Yezline talked to you about a phone, she said the phone was
8	black, corre	ect?
9	А	Yes.
10	Q	And Litzi did not say that she ever saw a video on Don David's phone?
11	A	Correct.
12	Q	Okay. Jatziri said that the man showed her his part?
13	A	Yes. His kosa I believe is how she
14	Q	His kosa is how she referred to it?
15	A	Yeah.
16	Q	Okay. So his was a kosa, hers was a kola?
17	A	Kola. Uh-huh.
18	Q	Okay. Thank you. And Litzi was there?
19	A	Yes.
20	Q	Litzi did not tell you she ever saw the man's part?
21	A	Correct.
22	Q	Don David was in his house when this happened?
23	A	Yes.
24	Q	And Jatziri described it as brown.
25	Α	She described it as looking like a weenie and she said it was brown.

	1	
1	А	Mirabel, yes.
2	Q	Mirabel. Mirabel, according to Jatziri, asked how the chocolate
3	smelled?	
4	A	One of the girls asked, but I don't remember who.
5	Q	Okay. Would reviewing Jatziri's statement on page 56 refresh your
6	recollection	1?
7	A	Yes, please.
8	Q	Okay.
9	А	Thank you. The transcript says Mirabel is the one who asked how it
10	smelled.	
11	Q	Okay. You also interviewed Yezline about it and Yezline did not tell you
12	a time ab	oout a time that Don David put chocolate in her in her private part?
13	A	Correct.
14	Q	And when you interviewed Mirabel, she did not mention a time that Don
15	David put o	chocolate in Yezline's private?
16	A	Correct.
17	Q	The next one interviewed was Scarlett in your order?
18	A	I believe was Yezline.
19	Q	Okay. There was something that you you talked to about regarding,
20	like, a tape	incident, so I'm trying to orient to that.
21		Yezline said that Don David grabbed her actually, strike that
22	entire intro	about the tape incident.
23		Yezline told you that one time Don David grabbed her, pulled her
24	into his apa	artment, and showed her a movie on his phone?
25	A	Yes.

1	MS. KIERNY: Maybe 10?
2	[Bench conference transcribed as follows:]
3	THE COURT: I want to hear what Ms. Kollins wants to do.
4	MS. KOLLINS: Ms. Espinoza is leaving the jurisdiction tomorrow, so
5	they have to finish her. And they opened the door for quite a bit of material, so I'm
6	going to have about 15 minutes, too.
7	THE COURT: [Indiscernible.]
8]MS. KOLLINS: Okay.
9	THE COURT: [Indiscernible] So I'll give you 10 more minutes and
10	then and then you get 10 and you get five.
11	MS. KIERNY: All right.
12	THE COURT: Well, we'll see. I
13	MS. KIERNY: I'll see what I can do.
14	THE COURT: See what you can do
15	MS. KIERNY: All right.
16	[End bench conference.]
17	BY MS. KIERNY:
18	Q What were we on? I'm sorry.
19	A Yezline and the children that were either present or not.
20	Q Okay. Thank you. I don't know, would reviewing your voluntary
21	statement on Yezline's Yezline's voluntary statement on page 19 refresh your
22	recollection?
23	A Please.
24	MS. KIERNY: May I approach. Good thing I wore comfy shoes today
25	THE WITNESS: Yes. She used the word, the friends who are there.

1	Q	And he then kissed her on the mouth.
2	A	Yes.
3	Q	And she said something about her pants being dirty from being on the
4	ground?	
5	A	Yes.
6	Q	Okay. And then after that, she later put on the pants herself.
7	A	Yes.
8	Q	And took off the tape by herself.
9	Α	Yes.
10	Q	And Yezline did not tell you that she told her mom what happened that
11	day.	
12	A	Correct.
13	Q	Okay. Yezline did not tell you about a time when Don David touched
14	her in his car.	
15	A	Correct.
16	Q	Okay. He described a time where Don David showed her his thing
17	behind his	car, right?
18	A	Yes.
19	Q	Okay. And said the thing looked brown and a little bit black and a little
20	bit darker b	prown.
21	A	Yes.
22	Q	Didn't describe a catheter.
23	A	No.
24	Q	I think at some point you asked her to draw it?
25	Α	Yes.
		130

1	Q	Did she mention her sister Nicole at all to you?
2	A	I can't remember a Nicole.
3	Q	Would reviewing your notes refresh your recollection?
4	A	No. I know that's not in my notes.
5	Q	Nothing about Nicole is in your notes?
6	A	No.
7	Q	Okay. And Yezline didn't mention that Don David would put candy on
8	his penis a	nd then give it to her.
9	A	Correct.
10	Q	You also interviewed Scarlett Rangel?
11	A	Yes.
12	Q	And before speaking to you, Scarlett had talked to her mom, dad, and
13	maybe the other girls, correct?	
14	A	I can't remember who she spoke to or who she talked to.
15	Q	Okay. That's fine. And like you said she called him the old little
16	little old man?	
17	A	[Speaking in Spanish.] Yes.
18	Q	Didn't know the name.
19	A	No.
20	Q	Didn't refer to him as abuelo.
21	A	No. She just described what she remembers he looked like.
22	Q	Sure. And she said that the man showed her his part.
23	A	Yes.
24	Q	She described it as black and a circle.
25	A	Yes.
		132

1	Q	And she told you the man showed her his part one time.
2	A	Yes.
3	Q	She told you that she saw Don David show his part to Yezline.
4	A	Yes.
5	Q	And that Yezline was with her when Don David showed her his part.
6	A	Yes.
7	Q	Okay. Yezline did not mention Scarlett's name at all during your
8	interview w	vith her.
9	A	Correct.
10		MS. KIERNY: Court's brief indulgence.
11		I'll pass the witness.
12		THE COURT: Ms. Kollins?
13		REDIRECT EXAMINATION
14	BY MS. KOLLINS:	
15	Q	Ms. Espinoza, when you speak to children that you may or may not
16	have inforr	nation are involved in the same incident, you don't introduce information
17	from one interview with one child to the interview with the next child, do you?	
18	A	Correct.
19	Q	Because that would be inappropriate questioning, right?
20	A	Correct. That would be introducing information that the child I'm talking
21	to at the tir	me hasn't mentioned.
22	Q	Okay. And and that would not be consistent with protocol?
23	A	Correct.
24	Q	And that could potentially contaminate the information you're getting,
25	correct?	
		1.00

1	A	Correct.
2	Q	Okay. So if one kid tells you one thing happened and certain people
3	were there,	you don't go into the next interview and say, well, person A told me B,
4	C, D.	
5	A	Correct.
6	Q	You don't ever do that with a kid, right?
7	A	Correct. Because that would be confronting the child.
8	Q	Okay. We had some extended conversation about a interview you did
9	with a Litzi	Paredes; do you remember that?
10	A	Yes.
11	Q	Where and when did you do that interview?
12	A	At the same location where I interviewed all the other children.
13	Q	And when was that interview conducted?
14	A	I don't recall the date. And, again, I didn't review the transcript,
15	because I v	vasn't aware that she would be brought up.
16	Q	Okay.
17		MS. KOLLINS: I am going to since she didn't review for today and
18	we're trying	to move this along, I'm going to give her a copy of the transcription, so
19	she can giv	re me some answers. Do you have any problem?
20		MS. KIERNY: If she says it will refresh her
21		THE COURT: Well, if it needs to refresh her recollection
22		MS. KOLLINS: Well
23		THE COURT: you can show it to her.
24		MS. KOLLINS: she she didn't review for today, so I'd assumed
25	she's not	

1		MR. WESTBROOK: Right. That's fine.
2		MS. KOLLINS: going to have any memory of it.
3		THE COURT: Yeah, so show it to her. I've given you permission to
4	show it to h	er.
5	BY MS. KC	DLLINS:
6	Q	I'm showing you a it has not been marked, so it's not anything that's
7	going to be	admitted, but it is a translation transcription of an interview with Litzi
8	Paredes. (Could you read a couple paragraphs just at the inception of that and see
9	if that refre	shes your memory?
10		MS. KIERNY: I'm sorry. What page are we on?
11		MS. KOLLINS: First page.
12		MS. KIERNY: First page.
13		MS. KOLLINS: Just seeing if she recognizes the interview.
14		MS. KIERNY: Sure.
15		THE WITNESS: Yes, I do I do recognize it.
16	BY MS. KC	DLLINS:
17	Q	Okay. Ms. Espinoza, for now, I'm just going to leave that up there since
18	you didn't r	eview that for today so we can just try to move through this.
19		How old was Litzi when you interviewed her; do you know?
20	A	I don't recall.
21	Q	Okay. Did you go through the same protocol we talked about before?
22	A	Yes.
23	Q	Okay. Did she tell you who her mom and dad were, things like that?
24	A	Yes.
25	Q	Okay. Was there a point in the interview when she started speaking to

1	you and she told you she was scared and she started crying?	
2	A	Yes.
3	Q	Okay. Were you able to get out of her what she was scared of?
4	A	She said she didn't want to be in trouble, something to that effect.
5	Q	And you went through a little more exchange with her and she did a
6	drawing for you of a rose; do you recall that?	
7	A	I don't recall that.
8	Q	Okay. Do you recall her saying to you:
9		There is a man over there where we live that and always there
10	were three girls that went in with him and they would tell me that, that he called	
11	them, but I never went out with them. I just went out just once.	
12		Do you remember her saying that?
13	A	Yes, I do.
14	Q	Do you remember her emotional state when she said that?
15	A	She was upset and I believe I believe she was tearful.
16	Q	That she would say or that she said to you, he never called them,
17	they went in; do you recall that?	
18	A	Yes.
19	Q	And just a moment. I'm not really geared up for this. Just a second.
20		She spoke to you about candy?
21	A	Yes.
22	Q	She said he would give them candy; he, being the man?
23	A	Yes.
24	Q	And he said to me to take it, being the candy?
25	A	Yes.
		136

1	Q	Okay. And he said to Litzi, don't you want candy?
2	A	Yes.
3	Q	Okay. And she refused the candy. She said she had candy at home?
4	A	Yes.
5	Q	Do you recall that?
6	A	Yes, I remember.
7	Q	Okay. And then she said the man that offered me candy, his name is
8	David?	
9	Α	Yes.
10	Q	And I saw that he would give them candy; she also said that?
11	A	Yes.
12	Q	And she named the children that were getting candy, Jatziri, Mirabel,
13	and Yezline, and that she didn't know the names of the other two?	
14	Α	Yes.
15	Q	And she commented that she would go that those kids would go in
16	his house?	
17	A	Yes.
18	Q	Okay. She was with them outside coloring when he would offer candy
19	on at least one occasion?	
20	A	Yes.
21	Q	Okay. And she let you know that her mom had warned her not to go
22	into the man's house, right?	
23	A	Yes.
24	Q	And that she could only go in there if Grandma was there?
25	А	Yes.
	I	137

1	Q	And my mom said, Don't go in there when the guy is there without your	
2	grandmother?		
3	A	Yes.	
4	Q	Okay. And she said Donna Elena is the grandmother?	
5	A	Yes.	
6	Q	When he is alone in there, I cannot go inside; that's what her mom told	
7	her, right?		
8	A	Correct.	
9	Q	Okay. And that Elena would leave him alone in there; do you	
10	remember that?		
11	A	And that Elena would leave him alone in there. I believe it's Lorena, the	
12	babysitter.		
13	Q	Elena, the grandmother, would leave David alone in there?	
14	A	Yes.	
15	Q	That she had learned from the girls that he called them into the	
16	apartment?		
17	A	Yes.	
18	Q	That she learned from the girls that they were grabbed by him by his	
19	hands?		
20	A	Yes.	
21	Q	She saw the girls go in the man's house more than one time?	
22	A	Yes.	
23	Q	And told by Mirabel that Mirabel was	
24		MS. KIERNY: I'm going to object as to what Mirabel told Litzi told	
25	Elizabeth as triple hearsay.		

1		MS. KOLLINS: Well, we've opened the door to the statement of Litzi.	
2		THE COURT: I'll I'll overrule it. I'll allow it.	
3	BY MS. KOLLINS:		
4	Q	Mirabel told Litzi she was grabbed inside the house?	
5	A	Yes.	
6	Q	That David would always have his door open and offer the kids candy?	
7	Α	Yes.	
8	Q	Told you she was scared of Don David because he asked her for candy	
9	and she	because he never asked me for candy; do you remember that?	
10	Α	I don't.	
11	Q	Okay. Did she tell you that Don David lived right next door to her?	
12	Α	Yes.	
13	Q	Okay. She told you he's about 50 and he has black and white hair?	
14	Α	I don't remember what description she gave.	
15	Q	And at the end she reiterated to you that she was not allowed to go in	
16	his house?	?	
17	Α	Correct.	
18	Q	She said that sometimes he gave her watermelon?	
19	A	Yes.	
20	Q	All right. You had some questions about your interview with Leo, Leo	
21	De Santiago Garcia?		
22	Α	Yes.	
23	Q	Do you recall how old Leo is?	
24	Α	I don't.	
25	Q	Does he live in the same Charleston Garden Apartments that we've	

1	been talking about?			
2	Α	Yes.		
3	Q	Okay. Did you interviewed him in the Child Advocacy Center, same		
4	protocol, s	same parameters we discussed earlier?		
5	Α	Yes.		
6	Q	Okay. And in his statement did Leo tell you that the guy gives him		
7	candy and	I he did that to the three girls, gave them candy; do you recall?		
8	Α	I did not review this the transcript, because I did not know this would		
9	be a part of	of the		
10	Q	[Indiscernible] I apologize.		
11	MS. KOLLINS: May I approach the witness, Your Honor?			
12		THE COURT: Yes.		
13	BY MS. K	OLLINS:		
14	Q	Showing you a copy of what purports to be the interview of Leonardo		
15	De Santiago Garcia. It looks like it was taken on March 7th. If you could just read			
16	the first few lines of that and see if that refreshes your recollection as to Leo's			
17	statement	or taking Leo's statement?		
18	Α	Yes, it does.		
19	Q	Okay. The question I had asked you is whether Leo told you and		
20	these questions were first posed by Ms. Kierny, but just in the interest of			
21	completeness as to what's in that statement, Leo did tell you that the guy gives us			
22	candy and he did that to the three girls?			
23	Α	Yes.		
24	Q	If it would refresh your recollection to review page 13 of that, because		
25	know you said you didn't prepare that statement for today.			

1	A Yes. He stated that the guy gives him candy and also gives them to the					
2	three girls.					
3	Q And he told you he doesn't know the guy's name, right?					
4	A	A He forgot his name is what the transcript says.				
5	Q	Okay. He only heard about the touching stuff, right?				
6	A	I don't recall.				
7		MS. KIERNY: I'm going to object as to where he heard it.				
8		MS. KOLLINS: I didn't say I didn't say where he heard it, I just				
9		THE COURT: I don't think that was her question.				
10		MS. KIERNY: Okay.				
11		THE COURT: Or you want to know where he heard it? I				
12		MS. KOLLINS: No. I said, he only indicated				
13	THE COURT: Okay.					
14	MS. KOLLINS: he heard about the touching stuff.					
15	THE COURT: Okay.					
16		THE WITNESS: I don't remember.				
17	BY MS. KC	DLLINS:				
18	Q	If you would review page 14.				
19	A	Correct. They told him that there was touching.				
20	Q	Okay. And he told you that the man lives at the at the bottom of the				
21	apartments	?				
22	A	Yes.				
23	Q	Apartment 15? He tells you that he remembers that the man used to				
24	give us can	dy, right?				
25	A	Yes.				

1	Q	And that he gave candy to Leo?		
2	A	Yes.		
3	Q	He gave candy to the three girls and he forgot who else?		
4	A	Yes.		
5	Q	Is Leo pretty tiny or is he about the same age?		
6	A	I I can't remember what he looks like. I'm sorry.		
7	Q	That's okay.		
8	A	There's so many that		
9	Q	Right. And he knew about Mirabel, Maradel, and Jatziri?		
10	A	Yes.		
11	Q	And he specifically told you that the man would give him KitKats?		
12	A	Yes.		
13		MR. WESTBROOK: I'm sorry. I have an objection maybe as to		
14	clarification	n. He knew about Maradel, Mirabel, and Jatziri. He just knew who they		
15	were? Tha	at was the question?		
16		MS. KOLLINS: Well, I I can clarify from the transcript. He knew the		
17	girls that were touched were Maradel, Mirabel, and Jatziri.			
18		MR. WESTBROOK: Objection.		
19	MS. KIERNY: Assumes they were touched.			
20		MS. KOLLINS: Well, these these are the statement that they opened		
21	on cross-examination.			
22		MR. WESTBROOK: Yeah, but the		
23		THE COURT: I		
24		MS. KOLLINS: These statements were deemed admissible pursuant		
25	to 51.385 a	and the prior consistent statement or inconsistent statement. So.		

1		MR. WESTBROOK: My objection's not hearsay.			
2		MS. KOLLINS: May I finish, please?			
3		MR. WESTBROOK: My objection is it misstates the testimony. The			
4	testimony	s that Leo was told that they were touched, not that he knew that they			
5	were touch	ned. That's extremely different. That's all.			
6		THE COURT: I I don't know what kind of objection that is.			
7		MR. WESTBROOK: It misstates the evidence. That's the objection.			
8		THE COURT: All right. Well, the jury is listening to the evidence,			
9	they'll figur	e it out. All right. So overruled.			
10		Go ahead.			
11		And that's all right.			
12	MS. KOLLINS: And I				
13	THE COURT: Keep going.				
14		MS. KOLLINS: Go on.			
15		THE COURT: You you only have two more minutes and then I need			
16	to				
17		MS. KOLLINS: I			
18		THE COURT: the court needs to			
19		MS. KOLLINS: Understood.			
20		THE COURT: break for the evening.			
21		MS. KOLLINS: Understood.			
22		THE COURT: All right.			
23	BY MS. KO	DLLINS:			
24	Q	And he said that the candy that he was giving was KitKats and that was			
25	more than	one time, correct?			

1	A	Yes.		
2	Q	And that was given by the man at his house near his door, correct?		
3	A	Yes.		
4		MS. KOLLINS: I have no more questions for Ms. Espinoza.		
5		THE COURT: All right. You can have a few minutes.		
6		MS. KIERNY: I have, like, two minutes.		
7		THE COURT: All right. Go ahead. Take		
8		MS. KIERNY: You gave me five, so I'll see if I can do that.		
9		THE COURT: All right. I'll give you five.		
10		RECROSS-EXAMINATION		
11	BY MS. KI	ERNY:		
12	Q	You said you told Ms. Kollins you didn't review these transcripts of		
13	Litzi and Leo, right?			
14	A	Correct.		
15	Q	You actually don't have transcripts of these?		
16	A	I don't believe I do.		
17	Q	Your office never didn't transcribe these statements?		
18	Α	I don't know who, if any, transcribed		
19	Q	Okay. And these		
20	Α	those specific kids.		
21	Q	look like a different format than what are transcribed from your office		
22	А	What I'm looking at, yes. It's a different format.		
23	Q	Okay. When I had asked you earlier about the times that Jatziri said		
24	Litzi, Marad	del, Mirabel, and Yezline were in Don David's kitchen, no one mentioned		
25	that Grandma was present at that time, correct?			
	I	1.4.4		

1	MS. KOLLINS: This is beyond the scope of my redirect.		
2	MS. KIERNY: It goes into what she was talking about with Leo.		
3	THE COURT: Well, I don't remember if you got into that. So what do		
4	you want to do about that?		
5	MS. KOLLINS: Well, I'm I'm telling you my objection was beyond		
6	the scope, so I'm making that in good faith. I don't remember asking any questions		
7	about anybody being in the kitchen.		
8	THE COURT: The kitchen, did anybody ask any questions about what		
9	happened in the kitchen?		
10	MS. KOLLINS: My only question to her for all of Ms. Kierny's		
11	questions were, would you ever introduce a topic from what one kid told you into		
12	the next interview? I didn't talk about any of these specifics, except for Leo and		
13	Litzi.		
14	THE COURT: Yeah, Leo and Litzi. Yeah, I don't think she discussed		
15	Mirabel, Maradel		
16	MS. KIERNY: Okay.		
17	THE COURT: in the kitchen and whether Grandma was there. I		
18	don't remember that topic coming up.		
19	MS. KIERNY: Okay. I will move on.		
20	THE COURT: All right. So I'm going to sustain that objection.		
21	MS. KIERNY: Sure.		
22	BY MS. KIERNY:		
23	Q Now, Ms. Kollins was asking you about things that Litzi told you about		
24	Don David doing to the girls, right?		
25	A Yes.		

1	Q	Litzi didn't witness any of these things, correct?			
2	A Litzi repeat, please.				
3	Q Litzi did not witness Don David touching the girls?				
4	A Correct.				
5	Q	She just heard it from the girls?			
6	A	Correct.			
7	Q	Ms. Kollins also asked you about things that Leo had heard about the			
8	girls?				
9	A	Correct.			
10	Q	And Leo, himself, did not witness touching of the girls?			
11	A	Correct.			
12	Q	He did not witness Don David showing them showing the girls videos			
13	on his phone?				
14	A	Correct.			
15	Q	He did not witness Don David exposing himself to the girls?			
16	A	Correct.			
17	Q	Anything that he might have said about that was something that he was			
18	told by the	girls?			
19	A	Correct.			
20	Q	Okay.			
21		MS. KIERNY: No further questions.			
22		THE COURT: All right. Anything from the jurors? Questions from the			
23	jurors? Ev	erybody's thinking right now. All right.			
24		Ms. Espinoza, you are excused. Thank you very much for your			
25	time.				

25

THE WITNESS: Thank you.

THE COURT: You can go ahead and step down.

THE WITNESS: Thank you.

THE COURT: Go ahead and grab all your things. You can give the -you can leave that there.

THE WITNESS: I'll leave those there.

THE COURT: You can go ahead and step down. Thank you.

THE WITNESS: Thank you.

THE COURT: Watch your step. Careful.

THE WITNESS: I will.

THE COURT: So ladies and gentlemen of the jury, I'm going to excuse you. We're going to need you at 9:00 tomorrow. And the admonishment that I gave you before still applies. I'm going to go ahead and read it now.

During this overnight recess you're admonished to not communicate among yourselves or with anybody else about the trial or the subject matter of the trial; do not communicate at all with any of the parties, attorneys, or witnesses involved in the trial; do not seek or obtain any information or comments about the case from any source, including, without limitation, newspapers, television, radio, internet, cell phones, or any other electronic device; do not read, watch, or listen to any report or commentary about the case; and do not form or express any opinion on any subject connected with the trial until the case is finally submitted to you for deliberations. Finally, do not perform any research or investigations.

Please leave your notes here and have a safe drive home, and we'll see you all back here at 9:00 a.m., okay. Thank you. Thank you very much.

The State of Nevada, Plaintiff, vs. Jose Azucena, Defendant. Case No. C-17-321044-1 [Jury Trial Day 8]

[Jury recessed at 5:26 p.m.]

THE COURT: Let's have a seat, everybody.

I just wanted the record to be clear on something. When -- you know, I allowed a few minutes of hearsay testimony from -- of statements of Litzi and Leo that came in on the cross here of Ms. Espinoza. And I wanted to make sure -- I think I said on the record here at the bench that I agreed with Mr. Hamner that this was not an instance of a -- a prior inconsistent statement. I think he was right on that and I agreed with him here at the bench. And then -- and then when -- when Ms. --

MR. WESTBROOK: Kierny? I'm still unnamed today, too.

THE COURT: No.

MS. KIERNY: Kollins.

MR. WESTBROOK: Oh, Ms. Kollins.

THE COURT: Ms. Kollins. Ms Kollins. Then when you asked what's the -- what's the statue I'm relying on, and I -- I think I told you 51.035. That's -- I mean that's -- that's obviously a mistake, because that's the prior inconsistent statement. And then I corrected it to say -- I meant, you know, 51.385, which is the one dealing with hearsay of children.

And then also it kind of comes in under 51.075, which is the general exception that Mr. Westbrook said. And then there's this other one, which kind of applies, I just -- to just credibility of declarant 51.069. But that -- that really only applies when -- when the person who's providing the hearsay is testifying to information that came from someone else who is the declarant of the hearsay statement and -- and if that hearsay declarant, in this case it would've been Mirabel, Maradel, were on the stand, then the hearsay comes in under 51.069 only to the

22

23

24

25

extent that it would have been able to come in with Mirabel or Maradel on the stand. Obviously, it would only come in with them on the stand if it's admissible under 51.385.

So I think it all ties back to 51.385 and as -- let me finish -- and as you know when you were all here at the bench, what I said was I -- it should only come in if -- if the declarant's testifying.

MR. WESTBROOK: And we said --

THE COURT: Right?

MR. WESTBROOK: -- that in good faith we expect to bring them --

THE COURT: And you said that in good faith that you're bringing them

1.

MR. WESTBROOK: Yeah.

THE COURT: And then Ms. Kollins said that, well, she's going to move to strike if they don't testify. And I said, well, we'll cross that bridge when we get there. I just want to reiterate I think Ms. Kollins is right on there that they have to testify. If they don't, it's probably subject to a Motion to Strike, because 51.385 contemplates that they're -- they testify unless you give 10-days' notice that they wouldn't testify. That's how I understand the rule.

MR. WESTBROOK: I have some arguments about that rule, but they're not important right now because we're not at that point.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. WESTBROOK: I will say this, though, and it's kind of interesting if you think about it.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. WESTBROOK: Ms. Kierny didn't actually -- it wasn't any hearsay

1	statements. She simply confirmed that the other people she testified, Litzi and Leo,
2	did not agree with what Mirabel and Maradel said. My co-counsel didn't actually
3	get any hearsay out. The State did. They actually read from the transcripts, which
4	we never did.
5	THE COURT: Okay.
6	MR. WESTBROOK: Both transcripts.
7	THE COURT: Interesting point.
8	MR. WESTBROOK: So when thinking about whether to strike
9	something, the fact that we never actually elicited hearsay
10	THE COURT: Yeah.
11	MR. WESTBROOK: should be kind of important.
12	THE COURT: And and you know what, that is very important. But
13	that's kind of why I said I don't want to address that now. I'm just letting you know
14	that that's an issue, that I think Ms. Kollins makes a good point there that that it
15	may be some a ripe Motion to Strike. But I'll consider it when we have to.
16	MS. KOLLINS: And if I could just make a brief
17	MS. KIERNY: I anticipate they're going to be here at 10:00.
18	THE COURT: Okay.
19	MS. KOLLINS: If I could just make a very brief
20	THE COURT: Ms. Kollins, yeah.
21	MS. KOLLINS: Just a very brief record.
22	The State understands the court's analysis. I respectfully
23	disagree. They did use hearsay statements, otherwise I wouldn't have jumped up.
24	THE COURT: Right.
25	MS. KOLLINS: That testimony as it came in is not cross examinable if

those people don't arrive. The State was in a position where we had to go through Leo's statement, because this witness that was on today leaves the jurisdiction and will not be available for the remainder of this trial.

THE COURT: Right. Right.

MS. KOLLINS: So, the court ruled it was admissible pursuant to 51.385. I assume the court's making a ruling that those factors under 51.385 have been met.

THE COURT: That's kind of what I did at the bench. I -- I think this -- it's the same -- all the same factors that -- that all this -- you know, everything that she said in your hearing kind of applies. So it's kind of like a mini hearing we did at the bench.

MS. KOLLINS: I -- I don't disagree that the factors would be something the court would have to find, but that's usually done pursuant to a hearing, and at least reviewing the statements to discern whether, you know, the -- the statements were spontaneous, whether they were subject to repeated questioning, all those kinds of things, the factors that we went through when we held our hearing. So we probably, in an abundance of caution --

THE COURT: Well, you kind of -- kind of qualified her, because you got her to admit that's how she does all of her -- all of her examinations.

MS. KOLLINS: No. And I understand that. But the 51.385 admissibility is speaker specific. It's not the interviewer, it's the speaker. So each kid has to be in that particular setting if those findings have to be made. So I guess --

THE COURT: I understand your point.

MS. KOLLINS: To cure that, perhaps, the defense wants to give you

1	copies of those statements, so that the court can at least have something in the
2	record
3	MR. WESTBROOK: Oh, I've
4	MS. KOLLINS: that they've made
5	THE COURT: That's a good point. I'll take a look at that and and if
6	I'll look at the statement and if there's anything in there that would cause me to
7	believe there's lack of reliability then we can strike the testimony.
8	MR. WESTBROOK: And, Your Honor, obviously, I had about five other
9	exceptions it would come under and a complete explanation, so that wouldn't close
10	the argument
11	THE COURT: Yeah. But I've got to I got to leave now
12	MR. WESTBROOK: Yeah.
13	THE COURT: because it's 5:35. Can you guys let me go, please?
14	MS. KIERNY: All right. Bye.
15	MR. WESTBROOK: Yes.
16	MS. KIERNY: I will give those to your clerk.
17	MR. WESTBROOK: Run. Save yourself.
18	THE COURT: Yeah, please. Thank you.
19	[Court recessed at 5:32 p.m., until the following day, May 5, 2017, at 9:07 a.m.]
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	ATTEST: I do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct transcript, to th
2	best of my ability, from the audio/visual recording of the proceedings in the above-
3	entitled case.
4	
5	
6	ShawraOrteg
7	Shawna Ortega, CET*562
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

Electronically Filed 12/11/2017 7:49 AM Steven D. Grierson CLERK OF THE COURT

1 **RTRAN** 2 DISTRICT COURT 3 CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA 4 5 THE STATE OF NEVADA. 6 Plaintiff, CASE NO. C-17-321044-1 7 VS. DEPT. NO. II 8 JOSE AZUCENA. 9 Defendant. 10 11 BEFORE THE HONORABLE RICHARD SCOTTI, DISTRICT COURT JUDGE 12 **FRIDAY, MAY 5, 2017** 13 TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS RE: 14 **JURY TRIAL - DAY 9** ***** 15 16 **APPEARANCES:** 17 For the Plaintiff: STACEY L. KOLLINS, ESQ. 18 Chief Deputy District Attorney

CHRISTOPHER S. HAMNER, ESQ.

Deputy District Attorney

For the Defendant: P. DAVID WESTBROOK, ESQ.

Deputy Public Defender CARLI L. KIERNY, ESQ. Deputy Public Defender

RECORDED BY: DALYNE EASLEY, COURT RECORDER

TRANSCRIBED BY: SHAWNA ORTEGA, CET-562

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1	<u>INDEX</u>	
2	<u>WITNESSES</u>	
3	PLAINTIFF'S WITNESSES:	
4	MATT CAMPBELL	
5	Direct Examination by Mr. Hamner Direct Examination (cont.) by Mr. Hamner	80 112
6	Cross-Examination by Mr. Westbrook	115
7	Cross-Examination (cont.) by Mr. Westbrook Redirect Examination by Mr. Hamner	170 194
8	DEFENSE WITNESSES:	
9	LITZI PAREDES-GARCIA	
10	Direct Examination by Ms. Kierny	37
11	Cross-Examination by Mr. Hamner Redirect Examination by Ms. Kierny	44 66
12	LEONARDO DE SANTIAGO	
13	Direct Examination by Ms. Kierny	233
14	Cross-Examination by Mr. Hamner Redirect Examination by Ms. Kierny	239 247
15	Recross-Examination by Mr. Hamner	248
16	MICHAEL KAGAN Direct Examination by Mr. Westbrook	252
17	Direct Examination (cont.) by Mr. Westbrook	272
18	Cross-Examination by Ms. Kollins Redirect Examination by Mr. Westbrook	273 281
19	Recross-Examinatin by Ms. Kollins	284
20	Defendant Canvassed	166
21		
22	<u>EXHIBITS</u>	
23	DESCRIPTION	ADMITTED
24	No exhibits offered.	
25		
	The Chate of Nevede Plaintiff we Isse Assess P	o fondort
	The State of Nevada, Plaintiff, vs. Jose Azucena, Document Case No. C-17-321044-1 [Jury Trial Day 9]	

Shawna Ortega CET-562 • 602.412.7667

•	1	
	•	

ready or --

LAS VEGAS, NEVADA, FRIDAY, MAY 5, 2017

[Proceeding commenced at 9:07 a.m.]

[Outside the presence of the jury.]

THE COURT: So we are on the record now. I had a couple of things.

MR. HAMNER: Okay. And I -- I just want to make a brief record just on the ruling yesterday, if I could, on one matter. But I can wait until the court's

THE COURT: Why don't you --

MR. HAMNER: Okay.

THE COURT: I'll make my record, then you can make your record.

Okay. Well, I'll make my record first.

MR. HAMNER: Okay.

THE COURT: Okay. So yesterday, you guys gave me the transcripts at the end of the day of Litzi and -- that's Litzi Paredes and it was Leo Garcia. As we all know, earlier in the day we had the sidebar up here and defense counsel made a request to use hearsay statements from Leo and Litzi pursuant to 51.385.

We are obviously very short on time. I couldn't stop everything to hold a 51.385 hearing, although I think the State did say that that was the proper protocol. So I deviated from proper protocol there and conditionally permitted the use of the hearsay, subject to a Motion to Strike. I would have preferred to handle it the very same that I allowed the State to handle it, which was in the middle of trial, to wit, after the jury had been sworn. The State asked for a 51.385 hearing and to get in statements of children, I just didn't, you know, in the middle of cross-examination, we -- we really didn't have the time to do that. We all know the

time constraints we were in with the witness, anyway.

So what I did under the circumstances, I gave defense permission to use hearsay. At the end of the day, the parties then gave me these transcripts. So thank you. I have reviewed the transcripts of Litzi and Leo. And I -- I can see what anyone else reading these transcripts can see, that Ms. Espinoza conducted the interviews in the exact same manner and used the same protocols as the other persons that -- that she interviewed.

As far as the actual substance, Ms. Kollins is correct, that you've got to actually look at the substance in what was said, not just the matter of the interview. It seems that these children had less relevant information, obviously, and maybe -- maybe because they witnessed less. In any event, I didn't see any motive to fabricate here.

They use the exact type of terminology -- they use the same exact terminology as the other witness -- the other children. They, you know, appropriate terminology. Their -- their statements were just as spontaneous as the other children. There are no contamination errors.

I checked for all the different types of contamination errors.

They mentioned some of the same details that the other children mentioned, such as -- such as the defendant, you know, kind of being around these children and giving them candy and specifically mentioned KitKats and -- and some of the other details.

So -- so even though their memories are more vague, I still think there is sufficient corroboration to -- to give trustworthiness to what he said.

So -- so I think, you know, I don't, you know, I'm not -- I'm not inclined to change what I said yesterday, allowing the testimony in. Still subject to a

Motion to Strike, because the rule -- I think -- my view is the rule requires the actual children witnesses to just show up in court. Hopefully, they'll show up in court. I know that defense counsel takes a different view that maybe they don't have to show up. But, hopefully, we don't have to cross that bridge. And so it's still subject to a potential Motion to Strike. I'm still granting that right to the State.

And the only other thing I need to say is I guess, I think -- I think when defense was making a statement -- an argument yesterday that technically Ms. Kierny didn't use any hearsay, and I -- I think the argument -- part of your argument was, you know, having a witness say what someone didn't say out of court is -- is not hearsay. I don't think I need to reach that issue, so I'm not making any ruling on that.

MR. WESTBROOK: Sure.

THE COURT: So --

MR. WESTBROOK: And to be -- clear, I wanted to get --

THE COURT: So maybe it was hearsay. I don't need to rule on that.

MR. WESTBROOK: Right.

THE COURT: So -- but what I do need to know, basically, why I'm prefacing all this, I need to know from the defense if you're planning to introduce any other hearsay statements from these transcripts, the -- the State is entitled to better notice than what you gave. And -- and we would need to -- to actually do a more searching analysis of that.

MR. WESTBROOK: If I could be very clear.

THE COURT: Yeah.

MR. WESTBROOK: We did not submit --

THE COURT: Well, I think he was next. Let's --

1		MR. WESTBROOK: All right.
2		THE COURT: Let's he wanted to make a statement, and he actually
3	said it first.	So.
4		MR. WESTBROOK: As long as I also get a chance to talk
5		THE COURT: Okay.
6		MR. WESTBROOK: uninterrupted, like Mr. Hamner does
7		THE COURT: All right.
8		MR. WESTBROOK: then I'm fine with that.
9		THE COURT: Because I don't want to I don't like this last-minute
10	stuff when	we don't have enough time to do exactly what we're supposed to do.
11		MR. WESTBROOK: Right. Fortunately, we're waiting for a juror, so we
12	got a little ti	ime.
13		THE COURT: Okay.
14		MS. KIERNY: Which juror are we waiting for?
15		MR. WESTBROOK: 6.
16		MS. KIERNY: She's here.
17		MR. HAMNER: I want I want to preface this with a couple of things.
18		THE COURT: Okay.
19		MR. HAMNER: Just to make the record abundantly clear, we were
20	very presse	ed for time yesterday. And so I know from the State's
21		THE COURT: So who who gets these?
22		MR. HAMNER: perspective, some of the things we wanted to put on
23	the record,	we didn't really get a full opportunity to do so.
24		THE COURT: Of course.
25		MR. HAMNER: First of all. Liust want to just touch first briefly on the

1	threshold issue of what the statute actually says. 51.385 states expressly as
2	follows:
3	(1) In addition to any other provision for the admissibility made by
4	statute or rule of a court. A statement made by a child under the age of 10
5	years describing any act of sexual conduct performed with or on the child, the
6	child
7	And the rest talks about physical abuse.
8	where any act of physical abuse of the child is admissible in a
9	criminal proceeding regarding the act of sexual conduct or physical abuse
10	if
11	And they talk about the provisions in the hearing.
12	Neither Litzi nor Leo ever described sexual conduct performed or
13	themselves. This hearsay statute was carved out for the legislature for alleged
14	child victims of sexual or physical abuse. And neither Litzi or Leo have ever been a
15	victim of child sexual abuse.
16	This statue does not allow you to bring in hearsay statements
17	from lay child witnesses that observed things in relation to a child sexual assault
18	case.
19	Now, we didn't get a chance to bring that
20	THE COURT: That's a good point.
21	MR. HAMNER: Yeah.
22	THE COURT: That's a very good point.
23	MR. HAMNER: And I and and it
24	MR. WESTBROOK: I have two that I want to go to.
25	MR. HAMNER: Well, I I need an opportunity to fully make my record.
	7

1	Okay.
2	THE COURT: Yeah, please. Yeah, make your record.
3	MR. HAMNER: So number one, as a threshold matter, this that
4	testimony should have never have come in. And it's
5	THE COURT: Which which testimony are you referring specifically
6	anything specific?
7	MR. HAMNER: Any question that they asked Elizabeth Espinoza about
8	statements or observations that Litzi or Leo made to Elizabeth Espinoza during
9	their forensic interview. And that's precisely what those questions are.
10	And and when they get into these statements of we didn't offer
11	any hearsay, yes, they did. They asked Ms. Espinoza, Isn't it true that Litzi didn't
12	see X? Isn't it true Leo didn't X? And they went through a couple of things. And
13	they were comparing it and contrasting it to things that the alleged victims told
14	Elizabeth Espinoza. Those are hearsay statements.
15	When you are having a conversation and a child denies to a
16	forensic interview that they did not observe some particular event, they are offering
17	that for the truth of the matter asserted.
18	THE COURT: Yeah.
19	MR. HAMNER: But
20	THE COURT: And this is regarding what what they saw with respect
21	to sexual acts of others, not themselves. So the statute doesn't apply?
22	MR. HAMNER: It doesn't apply to them. It only applies to alleged
23	victims, but but I
24	THE COURT: I veah.

MR. HAMNER: -- I want to just touch on a couple other things.

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: It's a very good point.

MR. HAMNER: I want to talk about the notice issue. I brought that up. And I -- and I say it for this reason. Prior to us starting this trial, we had turned over the statements of Leo and Litzi and we talked about it at the discovery hearing about we have these two people and they intended to call them as witnesses.

THE COURT: Uh-huh.

MR. HAMNER: The defense noticed Leo and Litzi as witnesses. What did they not do? They never filed a notice of 51.385.

That is a very telling sort of thing, because they knew about them. They knew what they wanted to use Litzi and Leo for and they don't file a notice.

Now, here's the other interesting --

THE COURT: I don't -- the statute doesn't require pretrial notice.

MR. HAMNER: And I --

THE COURT: And sometimes the defense doesn't know who they're going to call until they see the State's case.

MR. HAMNER: But they -- but they do when they actually told you at a discovery hearing, We intend to call them potentially as witnesses. And they told this court by filing a Notice of Witness that they're going to call Leo and Litzi.

But let's just flash --

THE COURT: Yeah, they did tell us that.

MR. HAMNER: And then let's flash forward to the 51.380 hearing that we actually held.

THE COURT: Yeah.

MR. HAMNER: At that point, neither the State nor -- the defense did

1	guys, too. We had you know we had limited time.
2	MR. HAMNER: I no, and I understand. And I preface everything with
3	that at the beginning of my statement. So I just want to make a record on those
4	three things.
5	THE COURT: All right.
6	MR. HAMNER: And we understand. And Litzi's here today and I'll get
7	an opportunity to cross-examine her. Sounds like Leo will be coming. I'm going to
8	get an opportunity to cross-examine him. So.
9	THE COURT: Okay. You made a good record.
10	MR. HAMNER: Thank you, Your Honor.
11	THE COURT: Let's let's they get to make their record now.
12	MR. WESTBROOK: First of all and
13	THE COURT: I think he's kind of right I think he's right about the
14	MR. WESTBROOK: Okay.
15	THE COURT: the statute not not applying in this particular case.
16	So.
17	MR. WESTBROOK: I understand his entire argument, Your Honor.
18	THE COURT: Yeah.
19	MR. WESTBROOK: And what's happening is he's using 51.385 as a
20	sword and shield, but I don't even care, Your Honor, because
21	THE COURT: Okay.
22	MR. WESTBROOK: we didn't submit this under 51.385.
23	THE COURT: Well, you did. You stood right there and said
24	MR. WESTBROOK: Your Honor, please don't interrupt me. I heard
25	him talk for five direct minutes without being interrupted once

THE COURT: Yes, sir. Go ahead.

MR. WESTBROOK: That's never happened with me in this courtroom.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. WESTBROOK: Never.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. WESTBROOK: I'd like to not be interrupted. Thank you.

51.385 --

THE COURT: Well, I -- I -- okay.

MR. WESTBROOK: -- is not what we submitted it under. What we pointed out at the bench was six different exceptions that we submitted the -- we intended to submit hearsay under. And remember, we didn't actually submit hearsay.

What Mr. Hamner is saying is incorrect. If we say, Did the witness confirm this and they say, No, that is not hearsay. It goes to a lot of other things; It is not hearsay. We have not solicited the hearsay statement. We did not say, Isn't it true that Litzi said none of this ever happened to you? That would be soliciting hearsay. Did Litzi confirm what Maradel said? That is not soliciting hearsay. That is not hearsay at all and it's admissible. That's number one.

Number two, the 51.385 was brought up because every single question that was asked by my co-counsel was part of the 51.385 hearing that the State brought on in order to get hearsay. There was never a specific ruling, which I asked for, as to what specific statements from the 51.385 hearing were going to be admitted at trial and what was not. I asked for it. There was nothing specific.

We also asked for a transcript from the 51.385 hearing before certain witnesses were presented. We were told the State can present their case

any way they want, they don't have to change the order of their witnesses, so we didn't get that either.

Please recall that these witnesses themselves, Litzi and Leo, weren't even turned over to us until April 7th, 2016. We didn't know their addresses. We didn't know that they were interviewed. We didn't have the interviews. We didn't even know their last names.

Mr. Hamner according to the 41-page record turned over by Detective Campbell a few days ago in the middle of this trial had this information -- not the interviews because that wasn't until March 1st and March 7th, respectively -- had this information back in January and it wasn't given to us. That has been a subject of other arguments.

51.385, however, is irrelevant to this conversation for two reasons. Number one, we have five other reasons why we could have asked for hearsay and gotten it. And Ms. Kierny didn't actually elicit any hearsay.

The State not only elicited hearsay, but triple hearsay. What they did was they actually had her answer a question about what one witness said another witness said. We objected, it was overruled. They got hearsay, we didn't.

All we asked about what was not said and what was not confirmed. That is vital not just to show the truth of the matter asserted, but it goes to the investigation in this case.

One of our arguments, and this is definitely going to be something you'll see when I talk to Detective Campbell today, is that the State got all the interview transcripts of all the witnesses that helped their case and they buried the stuff that didn't help their case. Litzi and Leo directly contradict witnesses in this case, and yet that stuff wasn't even transcribed or translated,

much less turned over in a timely fashion.

That goes to the investigation that the police officers and the CAC investigators put together. They were sloppy and they were biased. We are always allowed to talk about bias and credibility. We are always allowed to impeach. *Davis v. Alaska* is the case, the Sixth Amendment, the Fourteenth and Fifth Amendments are the amendments. We get to do that. Nothing that came out on the stand, nothing that we asked was inadmissible ever.

There are five different ways it's come in. And, Your Honor, you already said that it also comes in under 51.075, you said that yesterday. And you said it arguably comes in under 51.069, that we had a little argument about declarants and you said it was still arguable. But it definitely comes under 51.075.

The State cannot sit here and say that there is not an indicia of reliability from the interview that the CAC witness, the forensic interview specialist did who is their witness in their case and who they spent an entire day in a 51.385 hearing arguing to the court is incredibly reliable and is following the process so that the statement she gets are reliable. Now they're going to turn around and say she's not reliable? If she's reliable, then she comes in under 51 -- 75, the general exception, because it's -- it got indicia of truth and therefore it can be admitted.

If she's not reliable, then this is a mistrial, because every single thing that she said shouldn't have come in. That's the only way to go in this.

But if the State --

THE COURT: So --

MR. WESTBROOK: -- wants to describe how this doesn't go to the investigation, because every time they have an officer and they want to get a hearsay statement on, they say, Well, in your training and experience, and then

1	they get their hearsay on. Okay. That's how it works.
2	If if it goes to the investigation, it is not by definition hearsay,
3	it's an exception, and it comes in. That is vital to this case. That is our argument.
4	THE COURT: Did I give you a full chance to make your record now?
5	MR. WESTBROOK: Yes, you did. Thank you, Your Honor.
6	THE COURT: Okay. Sorry for interrupting you too much before. I'm
7	so I don't know that there's anything more that I need to say. I I just wanted to
8	make sure that both sides had a chance to make their record now. Because, again
9	we were pretty rushed yesterday. And and so you both made your record now
10	for in case there's an appeal and and to help you remind yourselves of what we
11	did here on this day.
12	Is there anything more that anyone needs to say? I don't I
13	don't no one's asking me to to make any kind of ruling right now, right, on
14	anything?
15	MR. WESTBROOK: I just have one thing.
16	THE COURT: Okay. Okay.
17	MR. WESTBROOK: We said in good faith for preventing
18	representing Litzi and Leo.
19	THE COURT: Yes, sir.
20	MR. WESTBROOK: We Ms. Kierny just talked to Litzi for the very
21	first time in this case.
22	THE COURT: Okay.
23	MR. WESTBROOK: Because when discovery is turned over as late as
24	the State turned theirs over
25	THE COLIDT: Wall

MR. WESTBROOK: -- we didn't get a chance to pretrial this witness.

We will make a decision, Your Honor, after, you know, before we present her as to whether or not we think it's in our state -- our case's best interest or our defendant's best interest to present her.

Our intention. I believe is to present her. However, having never

Our intention, I believe, is to present her. However, having never talked to the witness personally, we can't truly make that decision and still protect my client's Sixth Amendment rights without actually talking to her. We think we're going to. Just like yesterday. Nothing has changed.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. WESTBROOK: However, we never pretrialed them.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. WESTBROOK: But let me -- but let me say this --

THE COURT: I'm letting you speak.

MR. WESTBROOK: Even if we don't bring them, if we -- if we decide not to bring them as a trial decision, nothing in this case changes. Ms. Kierny never got any hearsay out. There's nothing to suppress. The only thing that should be suppressed is the hearsay the State got out. And we can't be restricted to making a trial strategy decision the next day that might be different than the former day by a decision on 51.385, which was not the true basis of our motion.

THE COURT: Wow. You -- you have -- you started off very jovial and then you have all this -- this frustration and -- and emotion. But, okay. Is there anything else we need to put on the record?

MR. HAMNER: I -- I unfortunately need to make a couple brief comments about --

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. HAMNER: -- defense counsel's representations.

THE COURT: Okay. You can.

MR. HAMNER: The -- the claim that defense did not offer hearsay testimony from a forensic interviewer about her interactions with the child defies logic. When you ask a question of a forensic interviewer, Did Litzi or Leo confirm this? The only possible way the forensic interviewer could give an answer about whether the person they are interviewing confirms or denies something is through hearsay. Why? Because the interviewer had to have a conversation with the person to find out the answer to the question.

The idea that he can sit here and say, Well, because we phrased the question in a particular way, we somehow avoided hearsay is -- is nonsensical.

THE COURT: Yeah.

MR. HAMNER: That -- that's -- it's an illogical argument and he's trying to circumvent it. Let's just be clear. He thought it came in through hearsay. He threw up 51.385. And he did bring up the 51.075. But I want to touch on that just briefly. I never touched on that --

THE COURT: Do you mind if I interrupt you for --

MR. HAMNER: Sure.

THE COURT: -- a very quick second?

MR. HAMNER: Sure.

THE COURT: Remember, I prefaced -- when I referenced those three different provisions, I prefaced it by saying in fairness to the State, they needed to have the witnesses here subject to cross-examination. And I also prefaced it by saying, you know, even though I think it comes in under 075 and I think it was 069, it -- it was all tied back to admissibility under 51.385. I think it ties back that one.

MR. HAMNER:	No.	And	l and	I get that.
-------------	-----	-----	-------	-------------

THE COURT: And so -- so I wish I'd had that other argument on 51.385. But go ahead.

MR. HAMNER: And -- I just -- the 075 argument, what Mr. -- what defense counsel did was conflate what happens under 51.385 and the general reliability statute. He gets up here and says he can't -- the State can't get up here and say, Oh, these children, when they talked to the forensic interviewer, were so reliable. That's when an alleged victim is speaking to a forensic interviewer and whether it meets the criteria under 51.385. That is a different analysis under 51.075.

THE COURT: I understand that.

MR. HAMNER: And -- and I just want to be -- because when he throws a barb to the State saying, We take a position on -- under that exception, that's not accurate and -- and, you know, the State respects the court's ruling. It disagrees that it would be under general liability. I think we need a witness to testify.

But I do want to note one thing, and this was the real reason why I stood up.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. HAMNER: Defense counsel got up at the very end and now has intimated to some extent that they reserve the right not to call these people for strategic reasons.

THE COURT: Didn't give notice --

MS. KIERNY: All right.

THE COURT: -- get notice or not.

MS. KIERNY: I'm going to cut that short right now.

1	Do you mind if I interrupt you with that?
2	MR. HAMNER: Okay.
3	MS. KIERNY: On that matter?
4	MR. HAMNER: Okay.
5	THE COURT: Okay.
6	MS. KIERNY: I have here her. I intend to call her.
7	THE COURT: Okay.
8	MR. HAMNER: Okay.
9	MS. KIERNY: She's waiting in the hallway.
10	MR. WESTBROOK: If we'd like to call her
11	MS. KIERNY: What I was going to ask is
12	THE COURT: Do you need a few more minutes to talk to her?
13	MS. KIERNY: I'm ready to talk I'm ready to call her.
14	THE COURT: Okay.
15	MS. KIERNY: She's here with her parents
16	THE COURT: Well, that's good. That simplifies everything.
17	MS. KIERNY: Yes.
18	THE COURT: Thank you.
19	MS. KIERNY: So I was trying to help. And that's why
20	THE COURT: No, well, that's a big help. That's a big
21	MS. KIERNY: And that's why I cut you off.
22	THE COURT: Because we don't need to
23	MS. KIERNY: Is that
24	THE COURT: I mean, we don't need to
25	MR. HAMNER: That's fine.

1	THE COURT: If you need to make a record, you can. But I think
2	MR. HAMNER: I just it'll be a very it'll just be a very brief record.
3	THE COURT: Okay.
4	MR. HAMNER: And I respect that they're going to call her.
5	THE COURT: Okay.
6	MR. HAMNER: And I anticipate when I spoke to Ms. Kierny they were
7	going to do so.
8	THE COURT: Okay.
9	MR. HAMNER: I'm just saying it is it is problematic for the not Ms.
10	Kierny, but Mr. Westbrook to get up and say, You know what, we reserve the right
11	to not call this person, when they purported to this court yesterday, at the very kind
12	of late hours yesterday, We're gonna call them, don't worry, we're going to do it.
13	And then kind of walk back from that statement.
14	THE COURT: I I think
15	MR. HAMNER: And that's trouble.
16	THE COURT: It was a little walking back. But I think Mr. Westbrook
17	was just he hadn't yet had a chance yet to talk to Ms. Kierny about her talks with
18	the witness and they hadn't talked to the witness before.
19	MR. HAMNER: That's fine. And I anticipate
20	THE COURT: And so he's just
21	MR. HAMNER: No problem.
22	THE COURT: being a
23	MS. KIERNY: He's just protecting me.
24	THE COURT: very advocate, protecting his record.
25	MS. KIERNY: Yeah.
	21

1	THE COURT: I think they're going to call her, so I think we're we're
2	good.
3	MR. HAMNER: Thank you, Your Honor.
4	THE COURT: Let's hope they call her.
5	MS. KIERNY: With that being
6	THE COURT: But thank you guys for both making a record. I look,
7	wish we'd had handled I wish we had had more time to have a to handle thing:
8	a little bit differently yesterday. But you both made your record and
9	MR. HAMNER: Thank you very much.
10	THE COURT: let's I hope no one's been prejudiced. But we don't
11	need to decide that now.
12	MS. KIERNY: I have one request. And, obviously, the State can say
13	no. That's fine.
14	THE COURT: Yeah.
15	MS. KIERNY: Litzi is here. She's missing school.
16	THE COURT: Oh, shoot.
17	MS. KIERNY: I said we'd try to get her on and off. Do you mind if we
18	call her do you mind if we call her
19	THE COURT: I never mind
20	MS. KIERNY: and then I'll ask the State.
21	THE COURT: if the parties agree. So.
22	MS. KIERNY: Okay. It's up to you.
23	MR. HAMNER: If you want to call
24	MS. KIERNY: If you want to do Campbell first
25	MR. HAMNER: No.

1	MS. KIERNY: I know that's a lengthy witness.
2	MR. HAMNER: No. No, no, no. We can call if you if the defense
3	wants to get her in and out of here
4	THE COURT: Is this your witness, Ms. Kollins?
5	MS. KOLLINS: No.
6	MR. WESTBROOK: It's mine.
7	THE COURT: No? Okay.
8	MS. KIERNY: Is that okay with you?
9	MR. HAMNER: I don't have a problem with the defense calling this
10	witness if they'd like to, to get her on and off the stand.
11	MS. KIERNY: Okay. And then I anticipate one issue with her
12	THE COURT: Uh-oh.
13	MS. KIERNY: being up there.
14	THE COURT: Okay.
15	MS. KIERNY: And I I'm pretty sure Mr. Hamner's going to agree with
16	this.
17	THE COURT: Yeah.
18	MS. KIERNY: It obviously, it is not it's not Litzi has not been
19	subject to a 51.385 hearing, so any statements that the girls might have told her
20	would not be fair game.
21	THE COURT: We're true. I
22	MS. KIERNY: Because that would be double hearsay on a witness
23	THE COURT: I I
24	MS. KIERNY: that has not been 51.385 called
25	THE COURT: agree with that. That would be my ruling.

1	MS. KIERNY: Unless
2	MR. HAMNER: Unless it's a prior consistent statement.
3	THE COURT: Well, if it's prior
4	MS. KIERNY: Well
5	MR. HAMNER: No.
6	THE COURT: then we need to discuss
7	MR. WESTBROOK: Prior consistent does not come in.
8	THE COURT: when the statement was made. Was it before a
9	motive to fabricate? You guys would briefly mention that to me and I make a ruling
10	on that. So yeah.
11	MS. KIERNY: Okay.
12	THE COURT: If it is a prior consistent statement, there's that's a
13	valid exception to the hearsay rule.
14	MR. WESTBROOK: And and, Your Honor, that's an easy one. U
15	visas were known by Amanda, according to her testimony, prior to 10/16. Nothing
16	happened prior to 10/16. Therefore, there can be
17	THE COURT: Do you guys want to argue that now?
18	MR. WESTBROOK: no prior consistent statement.
19	THE COURT: What's the statement that's going to be inconsistent
20	with or what's the statement that's going to trigger the
21	MS. KIERNY: I think
22	THE COURT: hearsay objection from Mr. Hamner.
23	MS. KIERNY: the the State might
24	MR. WESTBROOK: We I mean, we can cross that bridge when we
25	come to it, but that's our argument, and it's infallible.

1	THE COURT: Yeah. Well, but I think
2	MR. WESTBROOK: It can't be beat.
3	THE COURT: I I don't know that
4	MR. HAMNER: It's funny he mentioned
5	THE COURT: it's infallible. I think there was disputed evidence as to
6	when and how much she knew about the U visas.
7	MR. HAMNER: And and not only that, because it is not it's it is a
8	fallible argument and here's the reason why. Because the prior consistent
9	statement wouldn't be coming from Amanda, it would be coming from a completely
10	different declarant. So the defense has not established from any one of these
11	children on cross-examination that they know what a U visa is or that their mom
12	talked to them about a U visa. So for him to project the knowledge of a mother onto
13	the children I think is improper.
14	THE COURT: The question is when did the child have the motive to
15	fabricate.
16	MS. KIERNY: So it's
17	MR. HAMNER: That would be correct.
18	THE COURT: So you need to prove
19	MR. WESTBROOK: She's got it.
20	THE COURT: that there was some influence by the mother
21	MR. WESTBROOK: We have, but she's got it. The the kids say the
22	mom spanks them and they're scared of her. I mean, there's and they've
23	changed their stories a million times and it's time it's gotten more sophisticated.
24	There's a million reasons that's
25	MR. HAMNER: I see.

1	MR. WESTBROOK: that's obvious that the parents have been
2	manipulating.
3	THE COURT: When when was the this purported consistent
4	statement that's
5	MS. KIERNY: All right.
6	THE COURT: going to come up?
7	MS. KIERNY: So what the consistent statement is, my issue with it is
8	THE COURT: The September 16
9	MS. KIERNY: that it's not directly
10	THE COURT: that's pretty early, you know.
11	MS. KIERNY: It would have been made March in March.
12	THE COURT: Are you talking about the
13	MS. KIERNY: Oh.
14	THE COURT: interview?
15	MS. KIERNY: It's first of all, it's unclear as to when the girls might
16	have told Litzi anything that happened.
17	THE COURT: Oh.
18	MS. KIERNY: Also, it's very unclear as to where Litzi really got the
19	knowledge from. She said they sometimes, sometimes she says she heard it from
20	her mother. So I think that would be just a quagmire of hearsay.
21	MR. WESTBROOK: And it's the State's burden to prove that it came
22	from before bias. It's not our burden to prove that it didn't.
23	THE COURT: All right. What can you guys hold on one second?
24	MS. KIERNY: Sure.
25	THE COURT: Let me just pull out the rule. All right. We have a lot

MR. WESTBROOK: And this is fair in the case that I sent to you, Your

THE COURT: Well, give me a moment. Give me a moment. Give me

[Pause in proceedings.]

MR. HAMNER: And, Your Honor, I can turn to a particular subsection,

THE COURT: Well, no. I'm -- I'm looking at the head notes of 51.035. Looking at the -- the case annotations on prior consistent statements right now.

THE COURT: This issue comes up a lot. And it's always, you know, the court has to make a determination the spur of the moment whether there's a -when -- when there a motive to fabricate and put everything in the timeline.

MR. HAMNER: Yeah. I -- and, Your Honor, if you look at 51.035(2)(B).

The declarant testifies at trial or hears -- or hearing and is subject to cross-examination concerning the statement, and the statement is (B) consistent with the declarant's testimony and offered to rebut an express or implied charge against the declarant of recent fabrication or improper

And -- and I bring that up, because in the plain expressed language of that subsection, the entire purpose of bringing up a prior consistent

statement is to rebut the very defense that they have. You're lying because your
mom beat you. You're lying because of a U visa. You're lying I mean, that's
this is why you bring in prior consistent
THE COURT: And so and so you've got to show here's what she
said before that influenced the

MR. HAMNER: There's --

THE COURT: -- gave her the motive to lie.

MR. HAMNER: There no before in this language. There is no before. It is -- there is no before. And I would also say that in this trial --

THE COURT: Well, no, but that's -- I mean, you know that. That's what all the cases say, look, to be admissible, prior consistent hearsay statements must have been made before the witness had motive to lie. *Pierson vs. State, 87.*

MR. HAMNER: Right. And --

THE COURT: I think that's the seminal case that I'm familiar with.

MR. HAMNER: And there's no --

THE COURT: So -- so you have --

MR. HAMNER: There's no testimony right now that establishes that these children had a motive to fabricate. Nothing in their questioning came out to establish that. And I -- I'm not -- I'm not seeing it.

MS. KIERNY: I think that would been established by the fact that when they gave these statements they were so inconsistent with each other, so inconsistent within their own statements they later gave. And then the hearsay that they told to Litzi in this example was after they had given those statements to police or to their mothers, all of these statements that contradict and go every different way.

1	THE COURT: So I think
2	MS. KIERNY: The statements are both
3	THE COURT: I think the evidence
4	MS. KIERNY: consistent oh.
5	THE COURT: Your evidence is tend to to ask the jury to draw an
6	inference that when the police got involved, then somehow there was collusion and
7	there was a motive to fabricate.
8	MS. KIERNY: Sure.
9	THE COURT: And and maybe your theory is that the motive began
10	sometime before then.
11	MS. KIERNY: Right.
12	THE COURT: But you haven't actually introduced evidence to to
13	pinpoint the date.
14	MS. KIERNY: There is no way to do that, Your Honor.
15	THE COURT: So I think at this point, if at this point, if if
16	Mr. Hamner were to offer evidence to try to rebut your charge of motive to fabricate
17	and his evidence shows a prior consistent statement going back in early in time -
18	early enough in time, then I I'm probably would be inclined to le that in. Because
19	he's got to have a chance to to say these children well, he's going to have a
20	chance to rebut your theory that that they were influenced to lie. He's got to have
21	a fair opportunity to rebut that.
22	MS. KIERNY: Well, I guess let's see what the questions come out,
23	then. I think
24	THE COURT: All right.
25	MS. KIERNY: we'll see how that's asked.

1	THE COURT: All right.
2	MS. KIERNY: I don't know that there's enough in here to really
3	establish a
4	MR. WESTBROOK: Because it's important to note
5	MS. KIERNY: consistent statement.
6	MR. WESTBROOK: the State has never presented any evidence as
7	to when any of this was said. That's a huge weakness in their case. They admit it.
8	THE COURT: Okay. And you really haven't introduced a date as to
9	when this motivation to lie began.
0	MS. KIERNY: And I would state, Your Honor, in the history of my
1	cases, I've never actually had real proof.
2	THE COURT: Yeah.
3	MS. KIERNY: It's always intimations that there is some collaboration o
4	fabrication. You very rarely have people tell you, Yes, I made this up on
5	January 1st in order to get a U visa.
6	THE COURT: Well, sure.
7	MS. KIERNY: So I mean
8	MR. WESTBROOK: But we do know she knew about it.
9	MS. KIERNY: asking you to prove that is almost impossible.
20	MS. WESTBROOK: I do know from her testimony that she knew about
21	U visas prior to October 16th. That's her testimony. There was no direct by the
22	State as to how much she knew. It's their burden of proof, this is their case. We
23	know she knew about it October 16th.
24	THE COURT: All right. Well, I'm going to have to see how this plays

25 out, but you guys kind of know --

1	MR. HAMNER: Understood, Your Honor.
2	THE COURT: that I look
3	MS. KIERNY: Okay.
4	THE COURT: I would certainly like her to come in, give everyone a
5	fair chance to present their theory of case to the jury at closing argument.
6	MS. KIERNY: Okay.
7	THE COURT: So.
8	MS. KIERNY: So I will then present Litzi out of order once we get the
9	jury in here.
10	THE COURT: Yeah. Let's bring the
11	MS. KIERNY: Perfect. Let's do that and see what happens.
12	MR. HAMNER: That's fine and I'll let the
13	THE COURT: Anything else? Boy, we've had a lot to say this morning
14	MR. HAMNER: No, no. No, Your Honor. We're ready to go and I'll let
15	the
16	THE COURT: Thanks for I appreciate getting the heads up on on
17	several of these issues.
18	MR. HAMNER: Thank you, Your Honor. I apologize to take your time
19	on that, but I wanted to make the record.
20	I'm going to let Detective Campbell know we're going to call
21	someone else out of order.
22	THE COURT: Great.
23	MR. HAMNER: Thank you.
24	THE COURT: Okay. And where's my marshal?
25	THE CLERK: He just stepped out.

1	THE COURT: Okay.
2	MS. KIERNY: And I it should be fairly short. That's why I'm asking to
3	do it out of order.
4	MS. KOLLINS: And the court will instruct the jury that this is out of
5	order, defense witness?
6	THE COURT: I will.
7	MS. KOLLINS: Thank you.
8	[Pause in proceedings.]
9	[Jury reconvened at 9:41 a.m.]
10	THE COURT: All right. Thanks. Welcome back everybody. Good
11	morning.
12	We had hopefully we had we had some issues to discuss, so
13	hopefully, some things will move a little bit faster. Glad you're here. Hope you
14	enjoyed your morning so far. Please be seated, everybody.
15	We're we're still in the State's case in chief. I think they have
16	one more witness. But we're actually going to call a witness out of order due to
17	scheduling issues. I'm now going to allow the defense to call one of their witnesses
18	out of order. Okay.
19	Ms. Kierny, you may call your first witness.
20	MS. KIERNY: Okay. The defense would call Litzi Paredes.
21	THE COURT: Litzi Paredes, please.
22	Hello, Ms. Interpreter. Welcome back.
23	THE COURT INTERPRETER: Thank you.
24	THE COURT: Why don't you sit on the left side.
25	THE COURT INTERPRETER: I was going to ask, because normally,

1	do it on the other side so the jury can see the witness. But if the witness is going to
2	turn to me, then yes. It makes more sense.
3	THE COURT: I would prefer you to be on that side, closest to the jury
4	side, yeah. Thank you.
5	THE COURT INTERPRETER: You're welcome.
6	THE COURT: Scoot that over to to be closer. Thank you. All right.
7	How old is Litzi? Anybody? Okay.
8	MR. HAMNER: I I think she's around eight, Your Honor.
9	THE COURT: Okay.
10	MR. HAMNER: I'm not sure.
11	THE COURT: All right. Very good. Okay.
12	MS. KIERNY: Your Honor, may I approach?
13	THE COURT: Yes, you may.
14	[Bench conference transcribed as follows.]
15	THE COURT: Did she go on break?
16	MS. KIERNY: I think so. Mr. Hamner said he saw her by the
17	elevators.
18	MR. HAMNER: I heard your investigator talking with someone and
19	maybe I didn't see that.
20	MS. KIERNY: And maybe our investigator took them to, like, for
21	parking. They had parking issue.
22	THE COURT: Oh.
23	MS. KIERNY: So I guess we'll just do Campbell. I'm sorry for that.
24	THE COURT: No, no. That's okay.
25	MS. KIERNY: I thought maybe
	33

The State of Nevada, Plaintiff, vs. Jose Azucena, Defendant.

Case No. C-17-321044-1 [Jury Trial Day 9]

1	THE COURT: Because she's one [indiscernible].
2	MR. HAMNER: No. He's here.
3	THE COURT: Do you want to start Campbell and then we can go to
4	go to her when she's available? Or or what do you want to finish Campbell?
5	What what
6	MS. KIERNY: We'll just go with their
7	MR. HAMNER: I guess, how how long do you think it'll be?
8	MS. KIERNY: I would my cross of her oh, of Campbell or of
9	MR. HAMNER: No, no. I'm saying how long do you think she might be
10	gone, Litzi? I mean my preference would be let the kid go, because Campbell's
11	going to be far longer.
12	MS. KIERNY: Absolutely.
13	MR. HAMNER: If you wanted to him out of here.
14	MS. KIERNY: Let me do you want me to call my investigator and
15	see
16	THE COURT: Yeah. Why don't you call? We'll just sit here and see.
17	[End bench conference.]
18	THE COURT: Okay. All right.
19	MS. KIERNY: Sorry.
20	THE COURT: Yeah. We're we're just waiting. Just give us a few
21	couple of minutes, I think, to see what's what's up.
22	You can have a seat if you want.
23	THE COURT INTERPRETER: I'm I'm okay, Thank you.
24	THE COURT: Yeah, Juror No. 2 has a question.
25	Mr. Mergener. Did I say that right?

JUROR NO. 2: Yes.

THE COURT: Yeah. What's up, sir?

JUROR NO. 2: Just curiosity. Is this trial open to the public?

THE COURT: Trials are open to the public. These are -- you know, this is the public's courtroom. So.

JUROR NO. 2: And who is not allowed, in general, to be in the courtroom?

THE COURT: It's -- witnesses are not allowed to -- witnesses that haven't been called. Sometimes if they've already been called and the parties know they're not going to be recalled, I'll let them stay. It's up to me to decide. But generally -- generally people that are going to provide testimony are not allowed to be in here. Anyone else, you could have family members come. You know, if you want to have somebody come and watch closing arguments, you can have them -- I think. Well, wait a minute. I should check with the party, but I -- but it's open to the public.

So just my admonishment would still apply. You can't talk to anybody that you invite to come watch. You can't tell them what they're going to see. You can't talk about the case. You can say, Hey, I'm a juror in this case. You can come watch. You know, that's -- that's harmless enough, right? You can't talk about the case or any substance. But -- but it's open to the public. This is the public's courtroom. All right. Did that answer your question?

JUROR NO. 2: Yes.

THE COURT: All right.

JUROR NO. 2: Thank you.

[Pause in proceedings.]

1	THE COURT: We have another question. It's Ms. Hudson.
2	JUROR NO. 6: Yeah, hi. Today is Friday.
3	THE COURT: Yes. Happy Friday.
4	JUROR NO. 6: Happy Friday. But just for my work schedule
5	purpose
6	THE COURT: We'll be here all day Monday and then Tuesday, I think
7	we start at 1:00. All right.
8	JUROR NO. 6: Okay. Thank you.
9	THE COURT: I'm hoping we're done Tuesday.
10	JUROR NO. 6: We should be able to wrap okay.
11	THE COURT: Allowing that depends on, you know, once you guys
12	start deliberating, It's up to you to take as long as you think is appropriate.
13	JUROR NO. 6: Oh, okay.
14	THE COURT: All right?
15	JUROR NO. 8: And today is till 5:00?
16	THE COURT: Today's I think we have a total of four witnesses. A
17	couple are going to be pretty quick. I'm hoping we finish a little early. But We'll
18	see. We don't know. You never know. We never know.
19	JUROR NO. 8: You said that yesterday.
20	THE COURT: Yeah, I know. All right.
21	[Pause in proceedings.]
22	THE COURT: Hi, Ms. Kierny.
23	MS. KIERNY: Hi.
24	THE COURT: Is this Litzi?
25	MS. KIERNY: It is.

1

THE COURT: Hi, Litzi.

MS. KIERNY: We're going to go up to that stand.

THE COURT: This is your -- your place to sit right up here. Okay? Do you speak a little English?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

THE COURT: Yeah? But would you feel more comfortable speaking in Spanish today?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

THE COURT: Great. We'll speak in Spanish -- in Spanish. All right.

So you can have a seat. So I'm the judge and these are people that are here watching, because they -- they're going to help us decide some things. Okay? Say hi to the people.

THE WITNESS: Hi.

THE COURT: Okay. Ms. Kierny, before we get started, while you were out, just -- just to let you know, the jurors had a couple questions. They wanted to know how long we were going to go today, and I said, Well, you know, we got, like, a total of four witnesses, a couple might be quick.

MS. KIERNY: Sure.

THE COURT: We're hoping maybe we end a little sooner, but I can't say for sure.

And then wanted to know -- someone wanted to know the schedule for next week, and I said, Well, I know we're going to be here all day Monday and then Tuesday start at 1:00, and then, hopefully, we can get the case submitted to the jury Tuesday is what I said is my hope.

MS. KIERNY: Yes. I think that's --

1	THE COURT: And that's just up to them on how long we take. And
2	and another juror wanted to know who's allowed in the courtroom and I and who's
3	not allowed. And I said, Well, witnesses testifying aren't allowed. And I I
4	surmised that maybe they wanted to invite somebody. And I said, You can it's a
5	public courtroom.
6	MS. KIERNY: Sure.
7	THE COURT: Anybody's welcome. You could invite someone to come
8	watch, as long as you in inviting someone, you don't talk about the case.
9	MS. KIERNY: Right.
10	THE COURT: And just wanted you to know I had those conversations
11	with the jurors while you were out.
12	MS. KIERNY: I thought maybe you'd do some stand-up or something.
13	So. All right.
14	THE COURT: All right. Anyway, you can qualify the witness and and
15	begin. Thank you.
16	LITZI PAREDES-GARCIA,
17	[having first been qualified by the judge, testified through the interpreter as follows.]
18	DIRECT EXAMINATION
19	BY MS. KIERNY:
20	Q Hi, Litzi. How are you doing?
21	A Good.
22	Q Do you know the difference between a truth and a lie?
23	A Yes.
24	Q Okay. Well, If I told you that I was wearing a purple shirt today, would
25	that be the truth or a lie?

1	A	A lie.
2	Q	Okay. If I said that it's raining in this courtroom right now, fat drops of
3	water fallir	ng on our heads, is that the truth or a lie?
4	A	A lie.
5	Q	What if I said you were wearing a Hello Kitty shirt; is that the truth or a
6	lie?	
7	A	It's truth.
8	Q	Okay. You promise to only tell the truth in here?
9		THE COURT: She has to answer out loud.
10	BY MS. KI	ERNY:
11	Q	And that microphone is picking up everything you say and creating a
12	record, so	I know you're nodding your head to me, but you have to say yes or no
13	out loud.	
14	A	Okay.
15	Q	So you promise to only tell the truth in here, correct?
16	A	Yes.
17		MS. KIERNY: Are you satisfied, Judge?
18		THE COURT: Did she state her full name?
19		MS. KIERNY: Oh, I apologize.
20	BY MS. KIERNY:	
21	Q	Could you please state your full name for the record.
22	A	Litzi Paredes-Garcia.
23		THE COURT: All right. That is fine. We need her spell why don't
24	you spell i	t and ask her if that's correct.
25		MS. KIERNY: Okay.

1	BY MS. KI	ERNY:
2	Q	Okay. Is your first name spelled L-I-T-Z-I?
3	A	Yes.
4	Q	And your last name, Paredes, is that spelled P-A-R-E-D-E-S?
5	A	Yes.
6	Q	All right.
7		THE COURT: All right. The court is satisfied. You may continue.
8		MS. KIERNY: Thank you.
9	BY MS. KI	ERNY:
10	Q	How old are you, Litzi?
11	A	Nine.
12	Q	Okay. And where do you live?
13	A	[No audible response.]
14	Q	Is it an apartment complex?
15	A	Yes.
16	Q	Do you know if it's called Charleston Gardens?
17	A	Yes.
18	Q	And do you live in the front of the complex or the back of the apartment
19	complex?	
20	A	In the front.
21	Q	Okay. And who do you live with?
22	A	My mommy, my daddy, and my brother.
23	Q	Okay. And your mommy and daddy brought you to court today, right?
24	A	Yes.
25	Q	Okay. Do you know three girls named Maradel, Mirabel, and Jatziri?

The State of Nevada, Plaintiff, vs. Jose Azucena, Defendant.

Case No. C-17-321044-1 [Jury Trial Day 9]

1	A	Yes.
2	Q	Did they live in the same apartment complex as you do?
3	A	No.
4	Q	They live in the same are as you live in?
5	A	Yes.
6	Q	But a different building, right?
7	A	Yes.
8	Q	Okay. Do you also know a girl named Yezline?
9	A	Yes.
10	Q	And did she used to live in the same area as you live?
11	A	Yes.
12	Q	And did she live in your same building?
13	A	Yes.
14	Q	Okay. Would you sometimes play with these four girls in your
15	apartment?	
16	A	No.
17	Q	You did not play with them?
18	A	No.
19	Q	Do you have do did you have a neighbor named David?
20	A	Yes.
21	Q	Do you see David in court today?
22	A	No.
23	Q	Okay. If I direct you over to that table, do you recognize the man in the
24	blue shirt?	
25	Α	Yes.

1	Q	Was that your neighbor?
2	А	Yes.
3	Q	You didn't know did you know him that well?
4	А	[No audible response.]
5	Q	Is that a no?
6	А	No.
7	Q	When he lived next door to you, did you see him every day?
8	А	No.
9	Q	Was he at work a lot?
10	А	Yes.
11	Q	Okay. Did you know his wife Elena?
12	A	Yes.
13	Q	And you saw her more than you saw David, right?
14	A	Yes.
15	Q	Did you call Elena Grandma?
16	A	Yes.
17	Q	Would you ever go into Grandma's apartment with her?
18	A	Only one time.
19	Q	Okay. And that was with Grandma, right?
20	A	Yes.
21	Q	Okay. Was there ever a time that you went in that apartment without
22	Grandma?	
23	A	No.
24	Q	Okay. Was there ever a time that you went in that apartment with
25	Maradel, M	irabel, Jatziri, and Yezline?

1	A	No.
2	Q	Did David ever offer you candy?
3	A	No. Only one time.
4	Q	So he offered you one time; did you take the candy?
5	Α	No.
6	Q	Did you have candy at home? Is that why you didn't take it?
7	А	Yes.
8	Q	Okay. Do you ever remember a time that David showed you something
9	on his phor	ne?
10	A	No.
11	Q	Was there ever a time that you saw David pull his pants down?
12	A	No.
13	Q	Was there ever a time that you saw Jatziri, Maradel, Mirabel, and
14	Yezline go	into David's apartment?
15	A	Yes.
16	Q	But you did not go in?
17	A	No.
18	Q	Okay. Now, did you see David call those four girls into his apartment or
19	did they go	in there on their own?
20	A	They went in.
21	Q	On their own?
22	A	Yes.
23		MS. KIERNY: Court's brief indulgence.
24		THE COURT: Sure.
25		MS. KIERNY: One second.
	1	// -

1		We will pass the witness.
2		THE COURT: All right. Cross-examine.
3		MR. HAMNER: Thank you very much.
4		CROSS-EXAMINATION
5	BY MR. HA	AMNER:
6	Q	Hi there, Litzi.
7	A	Hi.
8	Q	My name's Chris and I'm just going to ask you a couple questions.
9	Okay? All	right.
10	A	Okay.
11	Q	Let me before we get started, what what grade are you in?
12	A	Third.
13	Q	Do you have a favorite subject?
14	A	Yes.
15	Q	What is it?
16	A	Math.
17	Q	Math. Why do you like math so much?
18	A	Because it's easy for me.
19	Q	It's a good reason. It's a real good reason.
20		Let me ask you a couple questions about about David. Okay?
21	A	Yes.
22	Q	Now, you said that David offered you candy before; isn't that right?
23	A	Yes.
24	Q	And and you told us today that he only offered you candy one time; is
25	that right?	

1	A	Yes.
2	Q	Do you remember a couple weeks back meeting with a lady named
3	Elizabeth?	
4	A	No.
5	Q	No? Do do you remember going to a room and sitting with a lady and
6	she asked	you, kind of, questions similar to stuff about David; do you remember
7	that?	
8	A	Oh, yes.
9	Q	I think you were a little scared at the beginning of the interview; do you
10	remember that?	
11	A	Yes.
12	Q	Do you remember telling Elizabeth that he actually do you remember
13	telling Elizabeth that David actually offered you candy twice?	
14	A	Oh, yes.
15	Q	Okay. But you didn't take the candy, did you?
16	A	No.
17	Q	And I think they want you to wait. I know you know English, but I think
18	you need to	wait till she says it in Spanish, and then just answer it in Spanish.
19	Okay?	
20	A	Okay.
21	Q	Cool. So you remember seeing David give Jatziri candy, right?
22	A	Yes.
23	Q	And you remember seeing him give the twins candy, right?
24	A	Yes.
25	Q	And you remember seeing David give Yezline candy, right?

1	A	Yes.
2	Q	And do you remember at the beginning of the interview with Elizabeth,
3	her asking	you what you were scared of, because you had said you were scared;
4	do you ren	nember telling her that?
5	Α	Yes.
6	Q	And you were crying at that time, weren't you?
7	Α	Yes.
8	Q	And you and isn't it true you said that there was a man over that that
9	we live at t	that and that there's always three girls that went
10		THE COURT INTERPRETER: Not so fast
11		MR. HAMNER: I'm sorry.
12		THE COURT INTERPRETER: counsel. I didn't hear
13		MR. HAMNER: I know.
14		THE COURT INTERPRETER: part of your
15	BY MR. HAMNER:	
16	Q	Do you remember telling them when asked when Elizabeth asked
17	you why yo	ou were scared, the first thing you said is that there was a man over
18	where you	lived at, right?
19	Α	Yes.
20	Q	And that the three girls went in with him, right?
21	Α	Yes.
22	Q	And they would tell you that they did that, right?
23	Α	Yes.
24	Q	But that you never went in that house, right?
25	Α	Yes.
	i	

1	Q	So let me show you this picture again; is that David's door?
2	A	Yes.
3	Q	Is that your door?
4	A	Yes.
5	Q	Is that around Christmastime or something?
6	A	Yes.
7	Q	Looks good.
8		MR. HAMNER: This is State's 25. And let the record reflect the
9	witness has	s indicated that the white door in the center of the picture is David's
10	house, and	the door just to the left with Christmas decorations is her house.
11		Publishing 24 for a second.
12	Q	Now, isn't it true when when David would would offer you candy,
13	you'd be outside coloring sometimes?	
14	A	Yes.
15	Q	And he would say to you, Do you want candy? To come here. Would
16	he say things like that to you?	
17		THE COURT INTERPRETER: Can you repeat the question, counsel?
18	BY MR. HA	MNER:
19	Q	He would say
20		THE COURT INTERPRETER: Louder, please.
21		MR. HAMNER: Yes.
22	BY MR. HA	MNER:
23	Q	Isn't it true David would say to you, Do you want candy, come here?
24		MS. KIERNY: I'm going to object. It is unclear as to what time he's
25	referring to	. He's she said there were two times.

1		MR. HAMNER: I can
2		THE COURT: Well, yeah. If if she recalls. It's
3	BY MR. H	AMNER:
4	Q	Do you recall during one of those times that he offered you candy, one
5	of those to	vo times, that he asked you to come here to get the candy; do you
6	remembe	saying that before?
7	A	No.
8	Q	Okay. Do you remember telling Elizabeth that he told us, Do you want
9	candy and	to come here; do you remember telling Elizabeth that?
10		MS. KIERNY: I'm sorry, what page are you on, Chris?
11		THE WITNESS: No.
12		MR. HAMNER: Page 12.
13		MS. KIERNY: Thought so.
14	BY MR. H	AMNER:
15	Q	I'm sorry.
16	Α	No.
17	Q	You don't remember that? And that's okay.
18		Do you see in this picture places where you might have been
19	when he v	vas asking if you wanted candy? Where were you? Do you see that here
20	in the pict	ure somewhere? Okay.
21		MR. HAMNER: We'll take a different pen.
22	Q	Why don't you circle an area where you remember being when he
23	asked you	ı if you wanted candy.
24		Okay. And when you were when you were there, were you by
25	yourself o	r were there other people standing there, too?

1	A	I was with other people around.
2	Q	Okay. Was that people like Jatziri?
3	A	Yes.
4	Q	The twins?
5	A	Yes.
6	Q	And Yezline? How about Yezline?
7	A	Yes.
8	Q	Now, you told us that you did not go into that house; isn't that right?
9		MS. KIERNY: Objection. Mischaracterizes her testimony. She said
10	she went ir	n once with Grandma.
11	BY MR. HA	AMNER:
12	Q	Oh. You never went in with the group?
13		THE COURT: Sustained.
14	BY MR. HA	AMNER:
15	Q	Okay. You never went in let me rephrase.
16		You never in with the girls, did you?
17	A	No.
18	Q	Okay. And I want to talk about that reason why.
19		Isn't it true the reason why you didn't go alone in the house with
20	the girls is	because your mother told you not to go?
21	A	Yes.
22	Q	And isn't it true the reason why you didn't go in alone was your mom
23	said you're	not allowed to go in when David is there by himself; isn't that correct?
24		THE COURT: So
25		MS. KIERNY: What her mom told her is hearsay.

1	<u> </u>	MR. HAMNER: It's it's not being offered the truth. It's being offered
2	for the effect	on the listener.
3	7	THE COURT: That's all right. I'll I'll accept that. I was going to say
4	something el	se. For an eight-year-old, the phrase isn't it true might be kind of hard
5	to understan	d, don't you think?
6	N	MR. HAMNER: I mean, I was trying to lead on cross, but
7	1	THE COURT: But you've been saying isn't it true.
8	N	MR. HAMNER: I can rephrase it. Okay. Sure.
9	1	THE COURT: Isn't it true, I mean, might be a little bit
10	N	MR. HAMNER: Sure.
11	7	THE COURT: I think it just adds a little bit of complexity. I want to
12	make sure that	
13	N	MR. HAMNER: I can rephrase. Let me rephrase.
14	1	THE COURT: the child really understands what you're asking. Okay
15	BY MR. HAN	INER:
16	Q Y	ou didn't go inside that house alone
17	1	THE COURT: Didn't. Okay.
18	BY MR. HAN	INER:
19	Q -	- because your mom said you cannot be in there when David's by
20	himself, right	?
21	Α \	es.
22	Q A	And you listened to your mother's rule; is that right?
23	Α \	es.
24	QI	sn't it true that the girls, meaning Jatziri and the twins, and Yezline, tolo
25	you that David grabbed them?	

	I	
1	Α	Yes.
2	Q	And that David grabbed them by their hands; is that right?
3	A	Yes.
4		MS. KIERNY: I'm going to object as to hearsay.
5		MR. HAMNER: It's it's what we talked about before. It's a prior
6	consistent	statement.
7		MR. WESTBROOK: It's also cumulative, Your Honor.
8		MR. HAMNER: It's certainly not in this case.
9		THE COURT: I don't think it's cumulative and
10		MS. KIERNY: It's
11		THE COURT: wait what you said
12		MS. KIERNY: It's also not a prior consistent statement
13		MR. HAMNER: Why don't we
14		MS. KIERNY: because they never
15		MR. HAMNER: approach. Why don't we approach. Let's approach
16		[Bench conference transcribed as follows:]
17		THE COURT: I just go ahead and say all your grounds at once. You
18	say everyth	ning is cumulative. But okay. What else did you just say?
19		MS. KIERNY: Okay. It is not a prior consistent statement because of
20	his witness	. Because the girls never said that he grabbed them by their hands.
21		MR. HAMNER: I can refer to the [indiscernible].
22		THE COURT: Well, is
23		MS. KIERNY: Well, there wouldn't be a page. It would be in court.
24		MR. HAMNER: All right.
25		THE COURT: You said prior
		52

1	MS. KIERNY: They did not say in court
2	THE COURT: inconsistent or consistent
3	MS. KIERNY: that he grabbed them by the hand.
4	THE COURT: what did you say?
5	MR. HAMNER: This is a prior consistent statement being offered to
6	rebut a claim of fabrication. We are they are challenging the fact that Yezline
7	was grabbed or any of these children were grabbed. Jatziri said that she was
8	grabbed.
9	THE COURT: Right.
10	MR. HAMNER: And they're challenging that, saying that they are not
11	credible, that they're lying, that they're making this up, and this is
12	THE COURT: When did she make the consistent statement
13	[indiscernible].
14	MR. HAMNER: When she spoke with this child.
15	THE COURT: Okay. That was with
16	MR. HAMNER: When she spoke when these girls spoke to Litzi.
17	THE COURT: Which was when?
18	MR. HAMNER: I would imagine it would be prior to him disappearing
19	from the apartment complex.
20	THE COURT: Yeah.
21	MR. HAMNER: I mean, I could try to establish that with an
22	eight-year-old, but I'm imagining that I can ask, Did they tell you this after Don
23	David left the property? After that?
24	MS. KIERNY: I think it would be better to ask after, thought before I
25	mean, obviously, it's before after happened before Jatziri left, or Yezline left.

1	THE COURT: What are you trying to say? Say it again.	
2	MS. KIERNY: I don't think it's proper to try to intimate with this witness	
3	that Don David left at some point. I don't think [indiscernible] should know.	
4	MR. HAMNER: Well, I didn't I didn't	
5	THE COURT: No. I just look, guys, all I want is you need to make an	
6	offer of proof or get from something from this witness as to when what period of	
7	time this consistent statement happened.	
8	MR. HAMNER: Well, I'll I'll ask.	
9	MS. KIERNY: I don't	
10	THE COURT: For it to be a prior consistent statement.	
11	MR. WESTBROOK: And, Your Honor	
12	THE COURT: It's prior to today, I know that.	
13	MS. KOLLINS: Well, it's it's	
14	MS. KIERNY: What child is he asking about?	
15	THE COURT: I can't hear you, I'm sorry.	
16	MS. KOLLINS: It's a statement that was made prior to the time they	
17	testified after a charge of fabrication. The charge of fabrication is the entire	
18	defense cross-examination and implication that the children are lying.	
19	THE COURT: Yeah.	
20	MR. HAMNER: That's true.	
21	MS. KOLLINS: So that's, I mean, but	
22	THE COURT: But the the point here is is did the consistent	
23	statement get made or alleged motive to fabricate? Is there a theory that you have	
24	that it was before?	
25	MS. KOLLINS: Well, the the motive the implied motive to fabricate	

is their cross-examination. There's been no testimony that these children absorbed the purported Mom's U visa motive. There's been no testimony or evidence of that.

THE COURT: Well, first of all --

MS. KIERNY: Okay.

THE COURT: -- I guess we're -- we're all -- we're all not on the same page here. And a consistent statement only comes -- don't say anything yet. I'm iust --

MS. KIERNY: I'm not.

THE COURT: Okay. The consistent statement can only come in if you're rebutting motive to fabricate. So it's part of your burden to prove that they're asking the jury to draw an inference of a motive to fabricate. They argued it. Right. Now -- now, the next question is timing. Right? So you're not going to be finishing --

MS. KOLLINS: No.

THE COURT: -- I can see you're starting to speak.

MS. KOLLINS: No. I've not -- I'm -- I wasn't speaking.

THE COURT: So it's your burden to prove, right, that a consistent statement was made before the date that they -- that -- the date that you're saying is what they say was the motivation to fabricate. So I'm looking to you to just offer something that this consistent statement was before what everyone had. You understand there are [indiscernible] motive to fabricate.

MS. KOLLINS: I don't think --

THE COURT: You do that, you get it in.

MS. KOLLINS: I -- I understand. I just don't think their motive -- they're suggesting the child's motive to fabricate, all of these children, are their parents

1	that that's what they're saying, that the U visa is the child's motive to fabricate.
2	THE COURT: That's their theory, right.
3	MS. KOLLINS: That's their theory. As we sit right now, they have not
4	attached that motive to fabricate to these kids.
5	MR. HAMNER: That's correct.
6	THE COURT: Then you can't then there's then you can't introduce
7	it a prior consistent statement.
8	MS. KOLLINS: But
9	THE COURT: It only comes in if it's
10	MS. KOLLINS: But what they
11	THE COURT: to rebut a motive to fabricate, there's no motive to
12	fabricate in this case.
13	MS. KOLLINS: That's that's not the only relevant reason to admit a
14	prior consistent statement.
15	THE COURT: It is.
16	MS. KOLLINS: No, it also comes in for an implied charge of fabrication,
17	which is what we have here. We get it's it there a motive to fabricate is one
18	avenue, and I would agree with that if that motive were attached to these kids.
19	THE COURT: If there's no charge that the kids are fabricating, then the
20	prior consistent statement goes in doesn't comes in, because that's inappropriate
21	bolstering.
22	MS. KOLLINS: There has been there has been nothing but
23	suggestion that these children are lying. Okay. There's been no tying the mother's
24	motivation to the children. They still say the kids are lying, however, but they have
25	not attached that motive.

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	

24

25

But what they have done is cross-examined and cross-examined
to elicit what they believe to be to evidence that makes them incredible. So that
charge here in court, causing them to make them look incredible, permits us to go
pack and admit a prior consistent statement.

THE COURT: I -- I understand that part. I understand that part. But -but doesn't the rule say it has to be before like they had a motive to -- to fabricate? And I -- I'm having trouble finding the before.

MR. HAMNER: And I think -- and I think what Ms. Kollins is saying, and I agree with her, there's two avenues here.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. HAMNER: One avenue is there's [indiscernible] to clear up their lying through the U visa. That's one theory. The other one is exploiting. I get that these witnesses are not credible, that they been inconsistent in what they've said [indiscernible] cross these children [indiscernible]. I said X to this person and Y at another -- another -- Z at another point in time.

Pursuant to the prior statements [indiscernible] admissible to rebut that. That is in there. And that's very clearly attached to these declarants.

THE COURT: How come I -- I just read two of -- two of the cases and -- and all the cases --

MR. HAMNER: Look, I'll do my best to elicit it. If you want me to, I'll try to lay some foundation as to timing of [indiscernible], I'll do my best. I'll do my best.

THE COURT: All of the cases I've looked at say the judge has to make a decision -- has to decide if it's a prior consistent statement at the floor. So [indiscernible].

MS. KOLLINS: Okay.

1	THE COURT: And so and how do I I don't know how I can find the
2	one [indiscernible].
3	MR. HAMNER: Let me let me just ask
4	THE COURT: Because it's, like, there's this is reversible error.
5	MR. HAMNER: Well, let me just try to lay some foundation on timing.
6	MR. WESTBROOK: [Indiscernible] lay a foundation [indiscernible]
7	should not be happening [indiscernible] Don David [indiscernible].
8	MS. KOLLINS: I can't hear you, David.
9	MR. WESTBROOK: In laying his foundation, he shouldn't be asking
10	questions about what is before or after
11	THE COURT: Why can't he ask that?
12	MR. WESTBROOK: Don David left. [Indiscernible.]
13	MR. HAMNER: Well, we don't know.
14	THE COURT: We don't know. He can he can ask her. I mean,
15	you're saying don't ask a question because
16	MS. KOLLINS: We don't say that she was she left.
17	THE COURT: she may not know the answer?
18	MS. KOLLINS: We don't say she left. We
19	THE COURT: We don't know if she
20	MR. WESTBROOK: [Indiscernible.]
21	THE COURT: Well, he was gone for a while, right?
22	MS. KIERNY: According to Amanda.
23	THE COURT: What?
24	MS. KIERNY: According to Amanda and Maria, but not according to
25	THE COURT: He can ask if
	58

1	MS. KIERNY: Okay.
2	THE COURT: if he disappeared for a while.
3	MS. KIERNY: You're I am not I don't believe that this is a prior
4	consistent statement. Her statement is they told me he grabbed their hands.
5	They
6	THE COURT: Yeah. But I think
7	MS. KIERNY: would all include all four kids hang on.
8	THE COURT: Yeah.
9	MS. KIERNY: All four kids did not say that. Yezline or Yezline is
10	maybe the only one who said he might have grabbed her hands. So that is not a
11	prior consistent statement to those girls. So that is my main objection. I don't even
12	think we get to the analysis of whether it's a consistent prior consistent statement,
13	because it's not consistent.
14	THE COURT: Caught me on that. That's my trick.
15	MS. KOLLINS: I think, well, I think all of these children have been
16	impeached as to what they said to different parties. I concur with Mr. Hamner. So I
17	think this is not bolstering, I think it's a prior consistent statement and should come
18	in.
19	MR. HAMNER: I'll lay some foundation on the time, Your Honor.
20	THE COURT: I think it's a prior consistent statement provided we get a
21	foundation on timing. Let me hear let me hear where he goes with that.
22	MS. KIERNY: Okay.
23	THE COURT: Thank you. All right.
24	[End bench conference.]
25	THE COURT: We're going to we're going to see where this goes.

1		MR. HAMNER: Okay.
2		THE COURT: All right. Thanks thanks for your patience.
3	BY MR. H	AMNER:
4	Q	I want to talk to you about do you remember Christmas last year?
5	A	Yes.
6	Q	And do you remember Halloween from last year?
7	Α	Yes.
8	Q	When the girls were talking to you about David touching their hands,
9	was that b	efore Halloween?
10	А	No.
11	Q	Okay. Do you remember when it was?
12	Α	No.
13	Q	Okay. Was it was it earlier than Halloween? Was it later than
14	Halloweer	1?
15		MS. KIERNY: Asked and answered.
16		MR. HAMNER: I'm just trying to get some clarification.
17		THE COURT: Overruled.
18		THE WITNESS: It was before Halloween.
19	BY MR. H	AMNER:
20	Q	It was before Halloween? Okay.
21	Α	Okay.
22		MR. HAMNER: Your Honor, may we proceed?
23		THE COURT: Antes means before?
24		THE COURT INTERPRETER: Antes means before, Your Honor.
25		THE COURT: Okay.

1		MR. HAMNER: May I proceed at this point, Your Honor?
2		MR. WESTBROOK: Your Honor, Halloween is not the correct date.
3		THE COURT: Well
4		MR. HAMNER: I can ask some more questions.
5		THE COURT: Wait, Halloween is October 31st? That's close enough
6	for the cou	rt's purposes. I'm I'm going to allow it.
7		MR. WESTBROOK: Two
8		THE COURT: I
9		MR. WESTBROOK: Two solid weeks, Your Honor.
10		THE COURT: I know.
11		MR. HAMNER: I can ask
12		THE COURT: Well, go ahead, if you want to
13		MR. HAMNER: Let me ask a couple more questions. Okay?
14	BY MR. H	AMNER:
15	Q	Do you remember them talking about that during the summer?
16	Α	No.
17	Q	Okay. So was it sometime between the summer and Halloween?
18	A	Yes.
19	Q	Were you in school at the time? Had school started yet or was it before
20	school sta	rted?
21	Α	Before school started.
22	Q	Okay.
23		THE COURT: Before school started. When does school start?
24	BY MR. H	AMNER:
25	Q	Does school school start in August?

1	A	Yes.
2		MR. WESTBROOK: Now, Your Honor, may we approach?
3		THE COURT: No. I think we've we've talked this to death.
4		MR. WESTBROOK: What's happened is four she doesn't she said
5	she didn't l	know, then she was questioned in a leading manner
6		MR. HAMNER: Need to approach. We can't
7		THE COURT: You know, I I
8		MS. KIERNY: He just said we couldn't.
9		MR. WESTBROOK: and, of course, she's still and it's still clear she
10	doesn't kno	OW.
11		THE COURT: I think he just want need to move on. Okay? You
12	can the j	ury will have to decide whether she's credible and what weight to give to
13	her testimo	ony. All right.
14		MR. HAMNER: All right. So let me
15		THE COURT: So objection overruled.
16		MR. HAMNER: Thank you, Your Honor.
17	BY MR. HA	AMNER:
18	Q	So the girls told you that he grabbed by their hands, right?
19		MS. KIERNY: Objection as to girls.
20	BY MR. H	AMNER:
21	Q	Okay. Jatziri told you
22		THE COURT: Sustained.
23	BY MR. H	AMNER:
24	Q	the girl
25		THE COURT: Please be specific.
	I	62

1	BY MR. H	AMNER:
2	Q	Jatziri told you the girls grabbed their hands, right?
3		THE COURT INTERPRETER: Could you repeat the question?
4	BY MR. H	AMNER:
5	Q	Jatziri told you I'm sorry. That was a terrible question.
6		Jatziri told you that David grabbed their hands, right?
7	A	Yes.
8	Q	Did Mirabel tell you that David grabbed their hands?
9	A	No.
10	Q	Okay. Did Yezline say that?
11	A	No.
12	Q	Okay. So just Jatziri?
13	A	Yes.
14	Q	And there were times when the girls would go into the apartment and
15	then the do	oor would be locked, right?
16	A	Yes.
17	Q	You saw the girls go into David's house more than one time, right?
18	A	No.
19	Q	Okay. Do you remember telling Elizabeth that you saw them go into
20	into the ha	nd's house more than one time?
21	A	Yes, a couple of times.
22	Q	And David would have his door open always, right?
23		MS. KIERNY: Objection as to the word always.
24		MR. HAMNER: It's her word.
25		THE COURT: Well.

1		MR. HAMNER: It's not it's it's a leading question and I'm entitled
2	it's	
3		THE COURT: All right. Overruled.
4	BY MR. H	AMNER:
5	Q	David would always have his door open, right?
6	Α	Yes.
7	Q	And when that door would be open, he would offer candy from that
8	open door	, right?
9		MS. KIERNY: Objection. That implies it's like a open-all-the-time
10	candy sho	p. It doesn't have any timing attached to it.
11		MR. HAMNER: Referring to page
12		THE COURT: Let's but but he's allowed to lead in a
13	cross-exar	mination and and the witness can explain it. No. So overruled.
14	BY MR. H	AMNER:
15	Q	And you I want to just re-ask again.
16		You remember always having his door open, right?
17	Α	Yes.
18	Q	And you remember when he'd be when David would be at that door,
19	he would o	offer kids candy from that open door, right?
20	Α	No.
21	Q	No? Okay. Where would he offer you the candy if not from the open
22	well, let me	e let's stop.
23		Who would he offer the candy to at the open door?
24	Α	To the girls, to the twins.
25	Q	Okay. So you can remember those girls being near that open door and

1	him offerin	g them candy, right?
2	А	Yes.
3	Q	And he would offer you candy here, right? I think that's what you told
4	us before;	is that right?
5	Α	Yes.
6	Q	Okay. And he'd offer you Tootsie Rolls, right?
7	Α	Yes.
8	Q	Skittles?
9	Α	Yes.
10	Q	And his candies would be in his room, right?
11	Α	Yes.
12	Q	And Elena Elena sometimes would give out candy and melon; is that
13	right?	
14		THE COURT INTERPRETER: I'm sorry, candy and?
15	BY MR. H	AMNER:
16	Q	Elena would offer candy and melon, too, right?
17	Α	Yes, to me and my brother.
18	Q	Okay. And you had said before that you got scared when David asked
19	you if you	wanted candy. You told us that before; is that right?
20		MS. KIERNY: Misstates her testimony. She never said scared.
21		MR. HAMNER: Well, then I'll I don't think it misstates, but I can
22	rephrase.	
23		THE COURT: All right. Well, rephrase, then.
24	BY MR. H	AMNER:
25	Q	You were scared when David asked if you wanted candy, right?

The State of Nevada, Plaintiff, vs. Jose Azucena, Defendant.

Case No. C-17-321044-1 [Jury Trial Day 9]

1	A	Yes.
2	Q	And it was scary to you, because he had never done it before.
3	A	Yes.
4	Q	You'd seen him give it to the girls, right?
5	A	Yes.
6	Q	Now he was asking you.
7	A	Yes.
8	Q	But you said no.
9	A	Yes.
10		MR. HAMNER: No further questions.
11		THE COURT: All right. Redirect.
12		Ms. Kierny has some questions for you now.
13		MS. KIERNY: I have three questions for you.
14		THE COURT: More more questions. Okay.
15		REDIRECT EXAMINATION
16	BY MS. KIE	ERNY:
17	Q	You never saw David grab the girls, right?
18	А	No.
19	Q	You only know what the girls told you.
20	А	Yes.
21	Q	And Chris asked you about the girls going into the apartment and the
22	door would	be locked; do you remember that question?
23	A	Yes.
24	Q	Was it the girls who locked the door?
25		MR. HAMNER: Objection. Calls for speculation.

1		MS. KIERNY: It's in her statement.
2		THE COURT: Well, it's it's
3	BY MS. KIE	ERNY:
4	Q	If you know.
5		MR. HAMNER: The witness is not inside the apartment. How would
6	they be abl	e to see how it's locked?
7		THE COURT: There's there's no way she could possibly know that.
8	Right?	
9		MS. KIERNY: It's in her statement.
10		THE COURT: Just there's no way she could know. It lacks
11	foundation.	So I will sustain.
12		MS. KIERNY: All right.
13	BY MS. KIE	ERNY:
14	Q	Did did you see who locked the door?
15		MR. HAMNER: Objection. Calls for speculation.
16		MS. KIERNY: I'm asking her
17		THE COURT: Who locked the door when she's outside and the door's
18	being locke	ed from people inside, Is that what you're saying?
19		MS. KIERNY: I'll follow up.
20		THE COURT: Well, there's no. There's no way there's no way she
21	could the	court takes judicial notice is it a glass door?
22		MS. KIERNY: There's a window right next door.
23		THE COURT: Show me the picture. Show me the picture. I I
24	you	
25		MS. KIERNY: What picture do you want?

1	THE COURT: Well, picture that shows the door with the window, how
2	close the window was to the door. Please. Thank you.
3	MR. HAMNER: Can I at least approach to see what she
4	THE COURT: All right. I let me see that. Could I can I hold it?
5	MR. HAMNER: That's the that's
6	[Bench conference transcribed as follows:]
7	MR. HAMNER: That's not the right door.
8	THE COURT: That's not the right that's that's her door.
9	MS. KIERNY: They're all
10	MR. HAMNER: That's Moreno.
11	THE COURT: That's or, I mean, that's
12	MS. KIERNY: So this is the end?
13	MR. HAMNER: No, no, no.
14	THE COURT: One moment.
15	Okay. Let me see here, which we're talking about.
16	MS. KIERNY: It is basically the same.
17	THE COURT: No. I'm not going to allow that question.
18	MS. KIERNY: Okay.
19	[End bench conference.]
20	THE COURT: All right.
21	BY MS. KIERNY:
22	Q Litzi, did the girls tell you they locked the door?
23	MR. HAMNER: Objection. Calls for hearsay.
24	THE COURT: So hold on. What exception to the hearsay rule would
25	vou say applies here?

1	MR. WESTBROOK: Present sense impression.
2	THE COURT: Overruled. Please move on. All right.
3	MS. KIERNY: Overruled?
4	THE COURT. Yes. Overruled.
5	MS. KIERNY: Okay. So I can ask?
6	MR. WESTBROOK: Yes.
7	THE COURT: Oh, wait
8	MR. WESTBROOK: It was their objection. It's overruled.
9	MR. HAMNER: Are you overruling the objection or are you sustaining
10	it?
11	THE COURT: Wait a minute. No. I'm overruling your exception.
12	MR. HAMNER: Sustain you're sustaining my objection.
13	THE COURT: I'm sustaining the objection. Well, see, here's the thing.
14	MS. KIERNY: I can
15	THE COURT: Why don't you approach.
16	MS. KIERNY: I can move on. I won't ask it.
17	THE COURT: Okay. That's fine. I'm I'm just because you haven't
18	explained what the relevance of her impression was, you know. I mean, are you
19	leaning towards what she did next? Why would that be relevant?
20	MR. WESTBROOK: Your Honor, we could approach on that.
21	THE COURT: All right.
22	MR. HAMNER: If we want to do it, we can
23	THE COURT: All right. If you want to move on, that's fine.
24	MS. KIERNY: That's okay.
25	[Bench conference transcribed as follows:]

1	MS. KIERNY: How would she know the door is locked?
2	THE COURT: inventing it or the girls telling her that.
3	MS. KIERNY: How would she know if the door is locked? Chris asked
4	that and she got that question out.
5	MR. WESTBROOK: [Indiscernible.]
6	MR. HAMNER: I'd like to address. There's a great way you can figure
7	out a door is locked, you can try and open it.
8	THE COURT: Of course. So the girl's innocent or
9	MR. HAMNER: Right. You wouldn't know who did it, but you'd know
10	the door, in fact, was locked.
11	But I want to address the present tense impression response,
12	because that was their exception to hearsay. And they
13	THE COURT: And they haven't tied up why the present tense would be
14	relevant, too.
15	MR. HAMNER: Right. And it and it's not the present tense
16	impression of the witness, it's the present tense impression of the child who said,
17	Yes, the door is locked. And there's no event that would cause one of those
18	children to spontaneously
19	MS. KIERNY: Then why did
20	MR. HAMNER: turn around
21	MS. KIERNY: Why did the State
22	MR. HAMNER: the door was locked.
23	MS. KIERNY: Ask if the door was locked?
24	MR. HAMNER: That's not that's not a response to hearsay.
25	THE COURT: So this would have been sometime

1	MS. KIERNY: Because that would be	
2	THE COURT: long after, I mean, this isn't present tense, because	
3	it's, like, after it's after the fact of discussion of hearsay.	
4	MS. KIERNY: Okay.	
5	THE COURT: I just you know what, I just don't see you leading	
6	your your	
7	MS. KIERNY: Well, I think that it's a prior inconsistent statement of of	
8	the children.	
9	THE COURT: What?	
10	MS. KIERNY: Because of he's saying that they're what the girls	
11	said was that he would take them into the room, or into the apartment, and lock the	
12	door. I'm saying that the girls actually told her they would lock the door. So that's a	
13	prior inconsistent statement of the girls.	
14	THE COURT: It's creative.	
15	MR. WESTBROOK: So [indiscernible].	
16	THE COURT: Hold on. Hold on. We can't have 10 million people	
17	talking.	
18	Mr. Hamner, she's saying that the girls the girls suggested or	
19	stated that that Mr. Azucena locked the door and now she's saying that, you	
20	know, the girls admitted that they locked the door. Is that inconsistent?	
21	MR. HAMNER: A couple of things.	
22	THE COURT: Okay.	
23	MR. HAMNER: You had this [indiscernible] indicated that a door was	
24	locked and one person indicated the door was locked. And now we have and	
25	who's the declarant? Do we have a declarant?	

1	THE COURT: Well, that's important, because the same it has to be	
2	the same person	
3	MR. HAMNER: Correct.	
4	THE COURT: to be inconsistent.	
5	MR. HAMNER: I don't	
6	THE COURT: So if she doesn't know who told her, you know, then we	
7	can't I can't let hearsay in under an exception when I don't know who the	
8	declarant is.	
9	MR. HAMNER: Right.	
10	THE COURT: All right.	
11	MR. HAMNER: Well, they can't be leading and	
12	THE COURT: You can't lead. You've got to ask	
13	MS. KIERNY: Okay.	
14	THE COURT: You can't suggest to her	
15	MS. KIERNY: I'll say, Did one of the girls	
16	THE COURT: it was Yezline. You've got to ask	
17	MS. KIERNY: did one of the girls ask you	
18	THE COURT: You've got to ask which one.	
19	MS. KIERNY: Did one of the girls ask tell you the door was locked?	
20	And then which one?	
21	THE COURT: If she can say Yezline	
22	MS. KIERNY: Because, otherwise, it's leading.	
23	THE COURT: Right. You can't lead.	
24	MS. KIERNY: Right. And I won't.	
25	MR. HAMNER: Well	

1	can't get into the hearsay statement when there's not foundation about who the	
2	declarant is for you to rely on an exception.	
3	MS. KIERNY: I tried	
4	MR. HAMNER: That's the problem we have right now.	
5	THE COURT: Mr. Hamner, I agreed with you already on that point. I	
6	understand your point. We need to know but if it was Yezline who said it, that	
7	would be important.	
8	MR. HAMNER: Right.	
9	THE COURT: For the cross-examination.	
10	MS. KOLLINS: How about, Did you have a conversation with Yezline	
11	about the door? Yes, I did. No, I didn't. Then it stops right there.	
12	MS. KIERNY: Okay. I can do that.	
13	MR. HAMNER: That's a good one.	
14	THE COURT: Of course, you're allowing her to to use the word	
15	Yezline. Well, okay. I'm okay with that.	
16	MR. HAMNER: Well, it's not specific about the lock. Just maybe	
17	THE COURT: Right. So either don't don't be specific about the lock.	
18	She has to volunteer it.	
19	MS. KIERNY: I will ask this	
20	THE COURT: I don't want you to go there unless she has to do it. If	
21	she mentions it, you know.	
22	MS. KIERNY: So you want her to spontaneously say, Yes, Yezline said	
23	she locked the door?	
24	THE COURT: Ask the question the way Ms. Kollins suggested.	
25	MS. KIERNY: Can I follow up with it?	

1		THE COURT: If she gives the right answer.
2		MS. KOLLINS: Did you have a conversation with Yezline about the
3	door.	
4		MS. KIERNY: Okay.
5		MS. KOLLINS: If she says yes, what did Yezline tell you about the
6	door?	
7		THE COURT: What did Yezline say? All right. That's how I'll allow you
8	to do it. T	hank you.
9		[End bench conference.]
10		THE COURT: All right.
11	BY MS. K	ERNY:
12	Q	Did you have a conversation with Yezline about the door?
13	Α	No.
14	Q	Chris asked you about David keeping candy in his room; do you
15	remember	that?
16	A	Yes.
17	Q	Did you know that the candy was in Grandpa was in the Don in
18	David's ro	om, where Grandma showed you?
19	A	Yes.
20		MS. KIERNY: Okay. No further questions.
21		THE COURT: All right. And recross?
22		MR. HAMNER: No, Your Honor. State's got no questions. Thank you.
23	We're goo	d.
24		Thank you, Litzi.
25		MS. KIERNY: You're excused, Litzi.
		76

.

1	THE COURT: All right. So well, we've got to see if the jurors have	
2	any questions.	
3	MS. KIERNY: Oh, I'm sorry.	
4	MR. HAMNER: Oh, sorry about that.	
5	THE COURT: The jurors might have some questions. They had a lot	
6	of time to think. Okay. All right. Very good. No questions.	
7	Thank you very much for coming here today.	
8	Oh, wait, was that a hand? Oh, okay.	
9	THE MARSHAL: Yeah, she wanted to one question.	
10	THE COURT: Okay.	
11	[Pause in proceedings.]	
12	THE COURT: Make sure your name and your number is on there,	
13	please. All right. Let's take a look.	
14	Thank you, marshal.	
15	All right. Let me take a look.	
16	[Bench conference transcribed as follows:]	
17	MS. KOLLINS: It says it says, Who's Amanda? If she knows.	
18	MS. KIERNY: [Indiscernible] is for the bad act of the it might	
19	[indiscernible] bad act.	
20	THE COURT: Oh, jeez. Yeah.	
21	MS. KOLLINS: Well, the mom's here. Call the mom.	
22	MS. KIERNY: Un witness notice, just call her that after she's already	
23	testified.	
24	THE COURT: Taking notice	
25	MS. KOLLINS: Did you not notice the guardian of the child?	

1	MS. KIERNY: I would object to being asked by
2	MR. HAMNER: I think it's [indiscernible].
3	MS. KOLLINS: All right. That's fine.
4	THE COURT: What did he say?
5	MR. HAMNER: I wouldn't I wouldn't ask.
6	MS. KOLLINS: Yeah, we don't know what she's going to say.
7	MR. HAMNER: We don't know [indiscernible] jury at this point.
8	THE COURT: I I don't think she will.
9	MR. HAMNER: I think it's not important.
10	MS. KOLLINS: And who knows what
11	THE COURT: Causing a problem. All right.
12	MS. KIERNY: Thank you.
13	[End bench conference.]
14	THE COURT: Thank you very much for the question. But I am not
15	going to ask that. Okay. But thank you.
16	And I'm going to have the court clerk mark that as a court
17	exhibit.
18	Litzi, we're all done with you. You can go home now or go to
19	school. Do you have school now? Yep? Have a nice day.
20	THE WITNESS: Yes. I'm not going to go to school today.
21	THE COURT: Okay. Well, have a nice well, maybe you should. Bu
22	have a nice day, okay?
23	THE WITNESS: Okay.
24	THE COURT: You still have time.
25	Next witness, please.

1	MR. HAMNER: State's going to call Detective Campbell to the stand.
2	THE COURT: Detective Campbell.
3	Yeah, you can approach. They need they need to approach.
4	[Bench conference transcribed as follows:]
5	THE COURT: Yeah, what's up?
6	MR. WESTBROOK: Please make it clear that that was the defense
7	case, just so the jury's not confused.
8	THE COURT: Oh, yeah, yeah. That's
9	MR. WESTBROOK: Thanks. We want to make it clear that we're
10	defense.
11	THE COURT: All right.
12	[End bench conference.]
13	THE COURT: So just to remind you, that was part of the defense case
14	and now we're back to the State's case. The State's first or the State's last
15	witness probably.
16	MR. HAMNER: Probably.
17	THE COURT: All right. We're waiting for Detective Campbell.
18	[Pause in proceedings.]
19	THE COURT: You must be Detective Campbell?
20	MR. CAMPBELL: Yes, sir.
21	THE COURT: All right. Welcome. Remain standing. The court clerk
22	will administer your oath.
23	MATT CAMPBELL,
24	[having been called as a witness and being first duly sworn, testified as follows.]
25	THE CLERK: Please be seated. State and spell your first and last

The State of Nevada, Plaintiff, vs. Jose Azucena, Defendant.

Case No. C-17-321044-1 [Jury Trial Day 9]

1	name.	
2		THE WITNESS: Matt Campbell, M-A-T-T C-A-M-P-B-E-L-L.
3		MR. HAMNER: May I proceed, Your Honor?
4		THE COURT: Yes.
5		MR. HAMNER: Thank you very much.
6		DIRECT EXAMINATION
7	BY MR. HA	AMNER:
8	Q	Sir, why don't you tell the ladies and gentleman of the jury what you do
9	for a living	?
10	A	I'm a detective with Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department.
11	Q	How long have you been with Metro, sir?
12	A	16-1/2 years.
13	Q	And what detail are you currently assigned to?
14	A	Sexual Assault Detail.
15	Q	And how long have you been in this particular detail?
16	A	Almost five years.
17	Q	Before you were on sexual assault, where were you?
18	A	I worked in the Child Abuse Section.
19	Q	For how many years?
20	A	Four.
21	Q	And before that?
22	A	Patrol for eight.
23	Q	Okay. Tell us about your responsibilities as a sexual assault detective;
24	what are	what are your job responsibilities?
25	Α	I get calls that once patrol responds to either a sexual assault or a sex

1	Q	So it's does it include things like dusting for fingerprints?
2	A	Yes.
3	Q	Taking samples for DNA collection?
4	A	Yes.
5	Q	Maybe retrieving physical objects
6	A	Yes, sometimes.
7	Q	that might be of relevance.
8	A	Uh-huh.
9	Q	And then you also said taking photos, things of that nature?
10	A	Yes.
11	Q	Okay. So you mentioned that this was a delayed response.
12	A	Yes.
13	Q	In this case, did you actually send a CSA out to dust for fingerprints?
14	A	No, we did not.
15	Q	Why not?
16	A	Because the time was beyond the 72 hours.
17	Q	Okay. And when does that what does that mean? Why is it not
18	useful to do	o it with a delayed disclosure?
19	A	Well, the scene would have been contaminated multiple times and we
20	may have -	may or may not have been the their fingerprints there at that time.
21	Q	Could
22	A	Things could have been they could have been dusted, could have
23	been clean	ed a hundred times between then.
24	Q	Let me ask you this, Detective. Can can fingerprints, you know,
25	getting a fir	ngerprint, can that tell you the time in which it's left?

1	A	No.
2	Q	How about if you get a DNA hit or a DNA sample; is that going to tell
3	you the tim	ne in which it's left?
4	A	No.
5	Q	Okay. So you don't process for fingerprints or DNA?
6	A	No, sir.
7	Q	Okay. If it had been acute, would you have done those things?
8	A	Definitely.
9	Q	Okay. Would you have potentially looked inside the defendant's home?
10	Got a warr	ant in process for that area?
11	A	Definitely.
12	Q	How about the children's residences?
13	A	Yes.
14	Q	How about any other locations, cars, I don't know, buildings, areas;
15	Would you	have done it in that situation?
16	A	Anything that the victims would have said, we would have processed.
17	Q	All right. I want to turn your attention to October 20, 2016. At that time,
18	do let m	e just say, the are the children, Jatziri, Mirabel, and Maradel Moreno at
19	this point,	Are those some of the children that are tied to this initial report?
20	A	Yes.
21	Q	And is Yezline Estrella Barajas, is that the fourth child?
22	A	Yes.
23	Q	Okay. Do those four kids, on October 20th, go in to get a a medical
24	exam by a Dr. Sandra Cetl?	
25	A	Yes.

1	Q	Are you present for that?
2	A	No, I'm not.
3	Q	Okay. Are you typically present for those things?
4	A	No, I'm not.
5	Q	All right. On November 2nd, 2016, do those four children come in for
6	forensic int	erviews at the CAC with Elizabeth Espinoza?
7	А	Yes, they do.
8	Q	All right. When those interviews take place, are you sitting physically
9	inside the room with the child and Ms. Espinoza?	
10	A	No, I'm not.
11	Q	Okay. Where are you present, though, to listen to the interview?
12	A	Yes, I am.
13	Q	Okay. Where are you?
14	A	I'm in a viewing room where through the cameras. You see it on TV.
15	Q	Okay. So you sat and you listened to these kids as they talked to
16	Elizabeth?	
17	A	Yes.
18	Q	All right. And why is that important for your investigation to just sit back
19	and kind of	f sit in another room and listen?
20	A	It's important for me to hear what the children are saying. Also, I watch
21	their deme	anor to see if there's anything that I see.
22	Q	Four days later, do you conduct a series of interviews yourself?
23	A	I do.
24	Q	Who do you interview?
25	A	The mothers of the children.
	1	85

1		Okay Sa that's Amanda Maiza and Maria Estralla Paraisa?
	Q	Okay. So that's Amanda Moiza and Maria Estrella Barajas?
2	A	Yes.
3	Q	Do you also interview an individual by the name of Yusnay Rodriguez?
4	Α	Yes.
5	Q	And who is she?
6	Α	She was a friend of one of the mothers.
7	Q	Okay. Is that one of the neighbors?
8	Α	Yes. Uh-huh.
9	Q	All right.
10	А	She lived in the complex.
11	Q	And you conducted those interviews?
12	A	I did.
13	Q	Did you conduct those interviews and let me just jump back.
14		Was the interviews that you observed conducted in Spanish with
15	the kids?	
16	А	Yes.
17	Q	And did you have an interpreting sitting with you interpreting in that kind
18	of back roo	m?
19	Α	Yes, I did.
20	Q	All right. When you did the interviews with the parents and and Ms.
21	Rodriguez,	were you doing those interviews with an interpreter?
22	Α	Yes, I was.
23	Q	And why did you why is it important to kind of talk to these people for
24		es of an investigation?
25	A	Because the information was relayed to them first and I needed to get
		86

1		MR. WESTBROOK: It will be very brief.		
2		THE COURT: Just for a second. All right. What's up?		
3	MR. WESTBROOK: [Indiscernible.]			
4	MR. HAMNER: I apologize. It was a slip of the tongue. I will rephrase			
5	THE COURT: Thank you. All right.			
6		[End of bench conference.]		
7	BY MR. HA	AMNER:		
8	Q	And I and I misspoke. I meant I meant alleged victim. And I'll		
9	and I'll so	orry. It's been a long couple of weeks.		
10		What was the child's name in relation to the November 8th, 2016		
11	report that	was taken?		
12	A	Scarlett Rangel.		
13	Q	Okay. What was her father's name?		
14	A	Ricardo.		
15	Q	Okay. When Mr. Rangel came in, was that interview in English or		
16	Spanish?			
17	A	Spanish.		
18	Q	All right. And at that time, does Mr. Rangel give have any talk just		
19	start talking	g about U visas to you?		
20	A	No, sir.		
21	Q	Okay. Did that come up at any point in the interview?		
22	A	No, sir.		
23	Q	All right. What's his mood like?		
24	A	He was very upset.		
25	Q	Okay.		
	I	88		

1	A	Emotional, yeah.	
2	Q	And let's just jump back to a couple days. What's Amanda's mood like	
3	when you spoke with her?		
4	А	Distraught. Very emotional.	
5	Q	What about Maria's mood when you spoke to her?	
6	A	The same. Very emotional.	
7	Q	What was Yusnay's mood like; do you remember?	
8	A	A Yusnay's had a little bit of mix of shock and anger, also, that this the	
9	kids report	ted this to her.	
10	Q	Okay. I want to turn your attention to three days later,	
11	November	12th, 2016. What happens on that day?	
12	A	I was contacted by my lieutenant and he stated that Henderson	
13		MR. WESTBROOK: Objection. Calls it's hearsay.	
14		MR. HAMNER: That's being offered for the truth of the effect on the	
15	listener. A	and I can	
16		THE COURT: He's not going to get into any substance of what	
17	MR. HAMNER: I mean, I can		
18	THE COURT: of the allegations, is he?		
19	MR. HAMNER: I mean, I can rephrase, it if you want.		
20	THE COURT: I I don't know that the effect on the listener's that		
21		MR. WESTBROOK: I will say, Your Honor, if it goes to the	
22	investigati	on, then it can come in.	
23		MR. HAMNER: I mean, it I can let me.	
24	THE COURT: All right.		
25		MR. HAMNER: I'll just rephrase. How about that?	

1	A	Yes.		
2	Q	Okay. And what's her name? Do you remember?		
3	A Maria			
4	Q Is it Marta Garcia-Sanchez?			
5	A	Marta yes. Yes. I'm sorry. Yes.		
6	Q	Does that sound about right?		
7	A	Yes.		
8	Q	Okay. Three days later, on November 16th, is Scarlett interviewed by		
9	Elizabeth E	spinoza?		
10	A	Yes.		
11	Q	Are you present at that time for that interview?		
12	A	I am not in the room.		
13	Q Okay. Are you present in the building?			
14	A	Yes, I am.		
15	Q	Are you present inside that room?		
16	A	No, I'm not.		
17	Q	Are you in the side room?		
18	A	Yes, sir.		
19	Q	Okay. On November 22, six days after Scarlett is interviewed, what		
20	happens; d	lo you remember?		
21	A	We my squad put together a photo lineup. And I'm not allowed to		
22	present the	photo lineup, so I had my partner, Detective Katowich, present it for me		
23	Q	Okay.		
24		MR. HAMNER: Court's indulgence.		
25		May I approach the witness?		
		91		

1		THE COURT: Yes.
2		MR. HAMNER: Thank you very much.
3		I'm showing and counsel, I'm just referring to State's 49
4	and 49A.	
5		MR. WESTBROOK: Sounds good.
6	BY MR. H	AMNER:
7	Q	Okay. Showing the witness State's 49 and 49A; what are we looking at
8	here? Wh	y don't you flip through it and tell me what we're looking at.
9	Α	This is the photo lineup, witness instructions, and the six individual
10	photos.	
11	Q	Okay. And what are looking at in 49A.
12	Α	This is basically called the six pack.
13	Q	So it's the key that relates to the photos
14	Α	Yes.
15	Q	that's in there?
16	Α	Uh-huh.
17	Q	Okay. And and Mr. Azucena appears to be the No. 2 position; is that
18	right?	
19	A	Yes. Yes, sir.
20	Q	Okay. The publishing 49A, which is the key, Mr. Azucena is in the 2
21	position. I	m publishing 49; is that Katowich's signature?
22	Α	It is. Yes.
23	Q	So that's the first picture. And the second picture, that's that's the
24	signature of	of Scarlett?
25	A	Yes.

1	Q Okay. And did he provide these to you on the 22nd?		
2	A He did. He came right upstairs.		
3	Q And by he, I mean Detective Katowich.		
4	Α	A Yes, sir.	
5	Q	Q Okay. And when did you get it?	
6	A	A Direct afterward. He came right that was conducted on our first floo	
7	We're on the second floor. He came right up and gave me the package.		
8	Q	Okay. After that, are you are you advised that there may be other	
9	potential children that may have a connection to the case?		
10	A	Later on, yes.	
11	Q	Okay. Is that sometime after the new year? Would it help refresh your	
12	recollection to see your notes?		
13	A	It would. I apologize.	
14	Q	Okay.	
15	MR. HAMNER: I'm just referring to case notes.		
16		MR. WESTBROOK: This is the case notes yeah, I from Tuesday,	
17	May 2nd?		
18		MR. HAMNER: A clean copy that I gave mine to the court. Do you	
19	have an issue? It's just matching up		
20	MR. WESTBROOK: Oh, you can show him mine.		
21	MS. KIERNY: Oh, no. Yours are highlighted.		
22		MR. WESTBROOK: Oh, I guess that's right. I thought I had a clean	
23	copy. That	t's fine. Go ahead.	
24		MR. HAMNER: Okay.	
25		MR. WESTBROOK: That's fine. It's not being introduced, obviously.	

1	MR. HAMNER: No, it's not.				
2	MR. WESTBROOK: That's fine.				
3		MR. HAMNER: All right.			
4	BY MR. HAMNER:				
5	Q	Q All right. I want you to look at page do you I'm showing you some			
6	case notes of yours. Okay?				
7	A	Uh-huh.			
8	Q	And I'm showing you an entry at this date, but I'm also showing you			
9	here.				
10	A	Yes.			
11	Q	Can you let me know approximate does this help refresh your			
12	memory a	ound what time you may have been advised of possibly maybe some			
13	other kids	that might know something in relation to this?			
14	А	Yes, it does.			
15	Q	Okay. What's that date?			
16	A	January.			
17	Q	January what?			
18	A	24th, I'm sorry. I didn't look			
19	Q	Of 2017?			
20	A	Yes.			
21	Q	Okay. And and were you advised of a child by the name of Lexi?			
22	A	Yes.			
23	Q	And were you also advised of of a name that was Leo?			
24	Α	Yes.			
25	Q	Okay. Do do are you able to immediately secure interviews with			

1	those families and those kids?				
2	A	I was not.			
3	Q	Why not?			
4	A	We have quite an exhaustive and extensive caseload. There's four of			
5	us. We were just number one, we couldn't find them particular in making				
6	contacts attempting to make contacts with them, Weren't able to locate them,				
7	either by phone or by visits at the time.				
8	Q	Okay. But you were provided potential phone numbers and addresses			
9	is that right?				
10	A	Yes, we were.			
11	Q	Okay. But you were having trouble getting them on the phone? Is			
12	that				
13	A	Yes.			
14	Q	what you're saying?			
15	A	Yes.			
16	Q	Okay. So does it take how long does it take to actually get an			
17	interview d	own?			
18	A	This one almost took almost a couple months.			
19	Q	Okay. Do do you actually conduct interviews with the person who			
20	you initially	knew as Lexi in March of 2017?			
21	A	Yeah. At the CAC.			
22	Q	Okay. Is the same day that Leo is interviewed or a different day?			
23	A	I'm sorry. I I don't remember, to be honest.			
24	Q	You don't remember?			
25	A	No.			
		95			

1	Q Okay.			
2	MR. HAMNER: Court's indulgence.			
3		MR. WESTBROOK: Your Honor, we can stipulate that it's a different		
4	day.			
5		MR. HAMNER: Okay. Can we make it a stipulation?		
6	MR. WESTBROOK: Absolutely.			
7		MS. KIERNY: The parties would stipulate that Litzi was interviewed on		
8	March 1st	and Leo was interviewed on March 7th of 2017.		
9		THE COURT: All right. Litzi March 1st, Leo March		
10		MS. KIERNY: 7th.		
11		THE COURT: 7th of 2017 were the dates by stipulation of parties.		
12	All right. Proceed.			
13		MR. HAMNER: Okay. Thank you.		
14	BY MR. H	AMNER:		
15	Q	So and when those interviews are conducted, are you in the side room		
16	again?			
17	A	Yes, I am.		
18	Q	And you're taking notes?		
19	A	Yes.		
20	Q	And, ultimately, those interviews are conducted; is that correct?		
21	A	Correct.		
22	Q	Okay. And well, we'll just we'll just go back. I want to go back to		
23	well, let me	e ask you this.		
24		Why do even if you had you mentioned you had your what		
25	you believe	e to be the suspect in custody, but you still went forward and followed		

1	through to conduct these interviews even after; is that right?			
2	A	Yes.		
3	Q	All right. Now, let's talk about the defendant. Okay.		
4	A	A Yes.		
5	Q	As a as a as kind of a precursor to this, what, you know, as far as		
6	background information for your interview, from what you could recall, what was the			
7	first name t	hat the children referred to the defendant as?		
8	A	Don David.		
9	Q	Okay. What was the name Amanda referred to him as?		
10	A	Don David.		
11	Q	How about Maria?		
12	A	Don David.		
13	Q	How about Ricardo?		
14	A	Don David.		
15	Q	And it sounded like Scarlett may not have known the name at the time.		
16	A	Correct.		
17	Q	Okay. And everybody knows him as Don David?		
18	A	Yes.		
19	Q	Okay. But, ultimately, you determine his name first name is Jose; is		
20	that right?			
21	A	Correct.		
22	Q	Okay. Let's talk about this interview. It's on November 12, 2016.		
23		When you do this interview, do you read his Miranda rights?		
24	A	Yes, I do.		
25	Q	Now, when you conducted this interview, is in English or Spanish?		
		7 /		

1	IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA				
2					
3	JOSE AZUCENA) No	. 74071		
4	Appellant,)			
5)			
6	V.)			
7	THE STATE OF NEVADA,)			
8	Respondent.)			
9		_)			
10			ME XIII PAGES 2242-2491		
11	PHILIP J. KOHN Clark County Public Defender 309 South Third Street		EVE WOLFSON ark County District Attorney O Lewis Avenue, 3 rd Floor		
12	Las Vegas, Nevada 89155-2610	Las	s Vegas, Nevada 89155		
13	Attorney for Appellant		DAM LAXALT torney General		
14		100 Ca:	0 North Carson Street rson City, Nevada 89701-4717		
15		(70	02) 687-3538		
16	Counsel for Respondent CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE				
17	I hereby certify that this	document w	vas filed electronically with the Nevada		
18	Supreme Court on the 10 day of A	April, 2018.	Electronic Service of the foregoing		
19	document shall be made in accordance	with the Ma	ster Service List as follows:		
20	ADAM LAXALT	DE	EBORAH L. WESTBROOK		
21	STEVEN S. OWENS		OWARD S. BROOKS		
22			f this document by mailing a true and		
23	correct copy thereof, postage pre-paid, addressed to:				
24	JOSE AZUCENA, #1183653 HIGH DESERT STATE PRISC	N			
25	P.O. BOX 650 INDIAN SPRINGS, NV 89070				
26	1121111 511111105,117 07070				
27	BY/s/ Carrie M. Connolly Employee, Clark County Public Defender's Office				
28	Emp	noyee, Clark (County I done Detended 8 Office		