1 IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA 2 3 **Electronically Filed** No. 75282 CEASAR SANCHEZ VALENCIA, 4 Jul 20 2018 09:21 a.m. Elizabeth A. Brown 5 Appellant, Clerk of Supreme Court 6 v. 7 THE STATE OF NEVADA, 8 9 Respondent. 10 11 12 13 **APPELLANT'S APPENDIX "AA"** 14 **AA0001 – AA0941** 15 16 VOLUME 2 17 AA0250 - AA048218 19 20 21 22 ATTORNEY FOR APPELLANT ATTORNEY FOR RESPONDENT 23 GREGORY E. COYER, ESO. STEVEN B. WOLFSON, ESQ. 24 Clark County District Attorney Nevada Bar No. 10013 200 Lewis Avenue, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor 600 S. Tonopah Drive, Suite 220 25 Las Vegas, Nevada 89101 Las Vegas, Nevada 89106 26 Telephone: 702.802.3088 Telephone: 702.617.2700 Facsimile: 702.802.3157 Facsimile: 702.868.2415 27

## APPELLANT'S APPENDIX INDEX (Alphabetical)

3	Document	Volume & Page No.
5	Information (filed 06/09/16)	Vol. 1, AA0001
6	Instructions to the Jury (filed 12/01/17)	Vol. 4, AA0778
7 8	Judgment Of Conviction (filed 02/06/18)	Vol. 4, AA0935
9	Motion To Dismiss Counsel (filed 12/28/16)	Vol. 1, AA0082
10	Notice Of Appeal (filed 03/01/18)	Vol. 4, AA0938
11 12	Notice of Intent to Seek Punishment as a	
13	Habitual Criminal (filed 02/03/17)	Vol. 1, AA0103
14	Second Amended Information (filed 11/27/17)	Vol. 1, AA0122
15	Third Amended Information (filed 12/01/17)	Vol. 4, AA0776
16 17	Transcript – JURY TRIAL, DAY 1 (11/27/17)	Vol. 1, AA0125
18	Transcript – JURY TRIAL, DAY 2 (11/28/17)	Vol. 2, AA0322
19 20	Transcript – JURY TRIAL, DAY 3 (11/29/17)	Vol. 3, AA0483
21	Transcript- JURY TRIAL, DAY 4 (11/30/17)	Vol. 3, AA0649
22	Transcript– JURY TRIAL, DAY 5 (12/01/17)	Vol. 4, AA0808
<ul><li>23</li><li>24</li></ul>	Transcript – Calendar Call (07/19/16)	Vol. 1, AA0004
25	Transcript – Calendar Call (02/07/17)	Vol. 1, AA0106
26	Transcript – Confirmation of Counsel (08/09/16)	Vol. 1, AA0021
27 28	Transcript – Defendant's Discovery Motion (07/26/16)	Vol. 1, AA0009

1	Transcript – Defendant's Pro Per Discovery Motion (10/18/16)Vol. 1, AA0054	
2	Transcript – Defendant's Pro Per Motion to Dismiss Counsel; Defendant's Pro	
3	Per Motion for Right of Access to the Courts (11/08/16)Vol. 1, AA0097	
4	Transcript – Defendant's Pro Per Motion for Right of Access to the	
5 6	Courts and to Dismiss Counsel (02/28/17)Vol. 1, AA0112	
7	Transcript – Defendant's Pro Per Motion to Right of Access	
8	To the Courts (11/01/16)	
9		
10	Transcript – Defendant's Pro Per Motion to Right of Access to the	
11	Courts; Confirmation of Counsel (11/08/16)	
12	Transcript – Status Check Negotiations/Trial Setting (08/23/16)Vol. 1, AA0024	
13 14	Transcript – Status Check Negotiations/Trial Setting; Status Check Motion to	
15		
16	Dismiss Counsel; Faretta Canvass (08/25/16)Vol. 1, AA0031	
17	Transcript – Sentencing (01/25/18)	
18	Verdict – Phase I (filed 12/01/17)	
19	Verdict – Phase II (filed 12/01/17)	
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1058: No.

THE COURT: Besides anything you may have already told us, do you have any close relatives or friends who have ever been engaged in law enforcement?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1058: Yes. My brother is a retired police officer from Arizona.

THE COURT: And do you ever speak about -- with him about his work?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1058: No.

THE COURT: Okay. So does your knowledge about this person's job affect your ability to be fair and impartial in this case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1058: No.

THE COURT: It is anticipated that certain law enforcement officers will testify in this case; will you be -- will you give more credibility to their testimony by the mere fact that they are law enforcement officers?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1058: No.

THE COURT: Do you agree that if you are chosen to serve as a juror in this case, that you will honor your duty to be completely fair and impartial and to listen carefully to all of the evidence?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1058: Yes.

THE COURT: Could you pass the microphone, please?

Sir, you're Badge No. 1063?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1063: Yes.

THE COURT: And it's Mr. Lopez?

any have you or close family member ever been convicted of a crime?
Have anybody that you know that's close to you been convicted of a
crime, charged with a crime and convicted?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1063: I have a nephew was in a -- in a -- in the jail.

THE COURT: Okay. Was that here in Clark County, Nevada? Was that here in Clark County, Nevada?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1063: In here, yeah. Nevada.

THE COURT: Okay.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1063: Yeah.

THE COURT: Do you believe that experience would make it difficult for you to be fair and impartial to both sides in this case? The fact that your niece was convicted, would that make it difficult for you to be fair and impartial to both sides in this case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1063: No.

THE COURT: Okay.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1063: I don't know really, sir.

You know, the -- oh, okay. Maybe I -- what I understand is they -- they
was -- but because she -- she -- he was try to -- what he was girlfriend
was living together was [indiscernible].

THE COURT: Okay. But can you be fair and impartial to both sides?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1063: No.

THE COURT: Do you understand what the word impartial means?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1082: No.

THE COURT: Besides anything you may have already told us, do you have any close relatives or close friends who have ever been engaged in law enforcement?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1082: Yes.

THE COURT: And who is that, sir?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1082: So I've got -- there's actually two family friends at -- my family has. And we all get together actually on Monday nights and have dinner with all the family.

THE COURT: Okay. And do you talk to them about their job? PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1082: Yes.

THE COURT: And what do you talk about?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1082: So usually they'll talk about cases and stuff that's gone on at work. And then I've also talked about going on a ride-along, because becoming a police officer was something I -- I don't know if I'm so much looking into it now, but it's something that I wanted to do. It's just these days it seems like an accountant is a safer job than being a police officer.

THE COURT: Okay. But it's something that you thought about doing?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1082: Yeah.

THE COURT: All right. As to your friends, do you believe your knowledge about these persons' job affects your ability to be fair and impartial in this case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1082: I want to say no, but -- so

I've lived in Alabama for a couple of years. And the police officers I met there, I know that there's definitely cops out there that aren't as good as they should be, but the police officers that I've met in Clark County, I've never met a bad police officer. So --

THE COURT: Okay.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1082: -- I want to say I won't be partial to one or the other, but from my --

THE COURT: Well, who would you be -- if you -- you're kind of hesitating here. You're straddling the fence.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1082: Yeah.

THE COURT: If you were going to be impartial -- or if you're going to be partial, would you be partial towards a police officer or against the police officer?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1082: Towards the police officer.

THE COURT: All right. You understand it is anticipated that certain law enforcement officers will testify in this case; will you give more credibility to their testimony by the mere fact that they are law enforcement officers?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1082: Yes. But I won't just be -- THE COURT: Okay.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1082: It -- if what they say is not necessarily going to be what I believe. If there's stuff going against it, I'm not just going to be a blind follower.

THE COURT: Okay. So you're willing to listen to the

25

THE COURT: And what does your spouse do for a living?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1083: He works at Lenox Hill
Hospital in medical records.

THE COURT: Okay. Do you have any children?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1083: I --

THE COURT: Do you have any children?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1083: No.

THE COURT: Have you ever served as a juror before?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1083: No.

THE COURT: Have you ever testified as a witness in a criminal case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1083: No.

THE COURT: Have you or close family member ever been convicted of a crime?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1083: No.

THE COURT: Have you or close family member ever been the victim of a crime?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1083: No.

THE COURT: Besides anything you may have already told us, do you have any close relatives or friends who have ever been engaged in law enforcement?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1083: No.

THE COURT: It is anticipated that certain law enforcement officers will testify in this case; will you give more credibility to their testimony by the mere fact that they are law enforcement officers?

make it difficult for your to be fair and impartial to both sides in this case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1086: No.

THE COURT: Have you or close family member ever been the victim of a crime?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1086: No.

THE COURT: Besides anything you may have already told us, do you have any close relatives or friends who have ever been engaged in law enforcement?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1086: We have some church friends here that are police officers. And I have a handful of patients that are officers. So.

THE COURT: Okay. And do you ever talk with those persons about their job?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1086: Yeah. The people I work -- my patients, it's a good conversation goer. So we talk about schedules, work -- where they're working. They like -- they know that I like to hear fun stories, so --

THE COURT: So sometimes they tell you stuff that happens --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1086: Yeah.

THE COURT: -- during the course of their day?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1086: At their job, yeah.

THE COURT: Okay. Their job. Does your knowledge about this person's job affect your ability to be fair and impartial in this case?

11 12

14 15

13

16

17 18

19 20

21

22

23 24

25

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1086: No, I don't think so.

THE COURT: All right. It is anticipated that certain law enforcement officers will testify in this case; will you give more credibility to their testimony by the mere fact that they are law enforcement officers?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1086: It depends on, like the other people were saying, the evidence. But if it's a he said/she said, honestly, I'd have to lean towards the officer. But that --

THE COURT: Okay.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1086: -- doesn't mean I'm not willing to hear --

THE COURT: Okay.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1086: -- everything. But if it's my word against your word, honestly, I would tend to lean towards the officer.

THE COURT: Okay. Are you willing to listen to all the witnesses testify in this case --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1086: Yes.

THE COURT: -- and all the evidence before you make a determination of credibility in this matter?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1086: Yes.

THE COURT: And do you agree that if you are chosen to serve as a juror in this case, that you will honor your duty to be completely fair and impartial and to listen carefully to all of the evidence in the case?

THE COURT: So you really don't talk about his -- his job then?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1089: [No audible response.]

THE COURT: Okay. Does your knowledge about this person affect your ability to be fair and impartial in this case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1089: Does it affect --

THE COURT: In other words, could you be -- even though you know this person's in law enforcement, could you still be fair and impartial to both sides in this case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1089: Yes. Yes.

THE COURT: It is anticipated that certain law enforcement officers will testify in this case; will you give more credibility to their testimony by the mere fact that they are law enforcement officers?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1089: No.

THE COURT: Okay. Do you agree that if you are chosen to serve as a juror in this case, that you will honor your duty to be completely fair and impartial and to listen carefully to all of the evidence in the case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1089: Yes.

THE COURT: If you can pass the microphone, please.

And sir, your badge number is 1090?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1090: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Could you pronounce your last name?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1090: You want to try?

THE COURT: I'll try. Mr. Baborian?

22

23

24

25

case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1090: I mean, I was quite bitter when I was a victim of identity theft at the holiday time.

THE COURT: Yeah.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1090: So yeah, I mean, I do -- I do find it a little annoying that crimes happen against good people.

THE COURT: Okay. But do you think you can still be fair and impartial to both sides?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1090: I'll try my best in that circumstance.

THE COURT: Okay. Besides anything you have -- may have already told us, do you have any close relatives or friends who have ever been engaged in law enforcement?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1090: Yes. My uncle, my mom's brother, was a NYPD police officer that died on duty.

THE COURT: Okay. Before that, did you ever talk to him about his job?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1090: No.

THE COURT: I'm sorry?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1090: No. He was --

THE COURT: Okay.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1090: He was -- he was the uncle -- a close uncle, my hero. And just pretty much uncle, and he died on a rough, rainy day chasing a perp.

THE COURT: Okay. Does your knowledge about your

25

but I'm human. And it -- it really hit my family hard. So.

THE COURT: Okay. But you still would be willing to listen to all the witnesses before you determine credibility?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1090: Like I said, I'll listen, but I -- I am partial.

THE COURT: All right. Are you willing to agree that if you're chosen to serve as a juror in this case, that you will honor your duty to be completely fair and impartial to both sides and listen carefully to all the evidence?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1090: I'll listen, but I am partial to the defense -- or to the State.

THE COURT: Okay. But if, after you hear all the evidence, you'll base your decision on the evidence --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1090: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: -- is that correct? And you'll -- you'll be completely fair and impartial when you make that decision?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1090: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. And if you can pass it to the -- microphone to the gentleman on your left.

And sir, you're Badge No. 1091?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1091: Correct.

THE COURT: And it's Mr. Blazer?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1091: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. Sir, how long have you lived in Clark County, Nevada?

everybody's testimony --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1091: Yes.

THE COURT: -- and be fair and impartial, and make a determination of credibility after you've heard everybody -- all the witnesses' testimony; is that correct?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1091: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you agree that if you are chosen to serve as a juror in this case, that you will honor your duty to be completely fair and impartial and to listen carefully to all of the evidence?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1091: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. At this time we're going to take our afternoon recess. We'll be in recess for about 10 minutes.

During this recess, you are admonished not to talk or converse among yourselves or with anyone else on any subject connected with this trial, or read, watch or -- if you could just -- I need to admonish -- if you could just sit for just one second. I'm required to do it. That's okay. That's -- do an admonishment. All right.

During this recess, you're admonished not to talk or converse among yourselves or with anyone else on any subject matter connected with the trial, or read, watch, or listen to any report or any commentary on the trial, or any person connected with this trial by any medium of information including, without limitation, social media, text, newspapers, television, the Internet, and radio; do not -- you don't know where the scene is, but I'm still going to read it -- do no visit the scene of any of the events mentioned during the trial, undertake any investigation; do not do

any posting or communications on any social networking sites or do any independent research, including Internet searches of any kind, or form or express any opinion or any subject -- on any subject connected with trial until the case is finally submitted to you.

We'll be in recess for about 10 minutes. Okay. Thank you. Counsel, if you'll remain for a moment.

[Prospective jury panel recessed at 3:15 p.m.]

THE COURT: I'm going to go to 4:30 today. Obviously, you know, I don't think we'll have a jury by today. I don't have a heavy criminal calendar tomorrow. So I'm going to tell them to be back at 11:00 tomorrow, remain outside. And then I anticipate going to 5:00 tomorrow.

MR. DICKERSON: Okay. And do you anticipate the same lunch break time, about 12:30?

THE COURT: About 12:30.

MR. DICKERSON: Okay.

THE COURT: If we can get started -- we may get started a little after 11:00, but I'll go for about an hour, hour and a half. I may even tell them to maybe have a late breakfast --

MR. DICKERSON: Okay.

THE COURT: -- because we're going to have a late lunch.

And then we should be able to go to, I believe, 5:00 tomorrow -- 5:00 tomorrow. So hopefully we'll have a jury by tomorrow, do opening statements, and maybe even get the testimony of a few witnesses in.

MR. DICKERSON: Okay.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. DICKERSON: Absolutely.

THE COURT: Okay. So 10 minutes, be back. And then, obviously, you're going to have the opportunity to ask questions at this point.

MR. DICKERSON: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you.

MS. PLUNKETT: Thank you, Judge.

MR. COYER: Thank you.

[Court recessed at 3:17 p.m. until 3:27 p.m.]

[Outside the presence of the prospective jury panel.]

THE COURT: Back on the record. I had my law clerk over the break pull my calendar for tomorrow. It's 26 pages and he advises me I have four sentencings and four revocation proceedings. So I was hopeful the -- to be finished by 11:00, but depending on the revocations will depend on how long I go tomorrow. So I'm thinking instead, I'll have them come back at 11:30, just to be safe. And that way we'll go for at least an hour, to 12:30, and then take a lunch break and then go for the rest of the day. So I'm going to advise them to come back tomorrow at 11:30 if -- unless counsel has -- is not available.

MR. DICKERSON: That's fine with the State, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And Mr. Coyer?

MR. COYER: That's -- that's fine with us, Judge.

THE COURT: Matter of fact, I think one of the sentencings on tomorrow may be one of yours.

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

11 12

13 14

15

16 17

18

19 20

21

22

24

23 25

obviously now I'm going to open it up to voir dire to the attorneys. And then we'll go till 4:30 today.

[Prospective jury panel reconvened at 3:29 p.m.]

THE COURT: And this is continuation of Case No. C-16-315580, State of Nevada vs. Valencia. Let the record reflect the presence of counsel for the State and the defense, and the presence of the defendant.

Ladies and gentlemen, the attorneys now are going to proceed to ask you some questions. We're going to go to 4:30 today and take our afternoon recess. So we'll probably have to continue tomorrow. We're going to have you come back at 11:30. And then we're going to take our lunch break tomorrow between 1:30 and 2:30, so you might want to have a -- a snack or breakfast or something before you come to court tomorrow, because we're going to have a late lunch break. Then I anticipate going to 5:00 tomorrow.

So in any event, this is the time set where the attorneys are going to proceed to ask you questions.

State, you may proceed.

MR. LEXIS: Thank you, Your Honor.

Good afternoon folks. I'll try to be as brief as I can.

You can just randomly give it to anybody, the mic. Thank you.

Folks, as the judge told you earlier, the State has the burden of proof. We have to prove the case. Does anyone disagree with that notion? Let the record reflect no response. And you're going to hear my say that to myself repeatedly. It's because there's a record and it's

being recorded.

As the defendant sits there right now, he's not guilty. Does anyone disagree with that? Let the record reflect, no response.

After we pick a jury, the judge is going to say, State, do you want to do opening statements and ask the defense the same thing.

We'll get up and talk to you about the case. If the judge then says,

State, call your first witness, and we say, Judge, we rest, you would only have one option if you went back and deliberated. And it would be not guilty, because the State has not presented any evidence; does anyone disagree with that notion? Let the record reflect no response.

The evidence is going to come from right here, the witness stand. That's the evidence. Now, let's say there's -- first of all, does anyone believe that the District Attorney's Office can pick who becomes victims of crime? Let the record reflect no response.

Does anyone here think we can pick who becomes witnesses to crimes? Let the record reflect no response.

Let's say there's the same set of circumstances, same facts. The same set of circumstances and facts the victim is a doctor in Summerlin, and the same set of facts and circumstances is a victim and she's a homeless drug addict, former gang member, go on and on. Does anyone here believe that the District Attorney's Office should go after the person that committed the crime against the doctor more aggressively than the homeless drug addict? Let the record reflect no response.

Let's say -- and the judge is going to show you the law and

amount of resources that just, at a snap in the finger, happens like it does on TV? Let the record reflect no response.

Now, would you agree that -- pass -- pass the mic to your left or right or behind you, I don't care. Okay.

Juror 1091; is that correct?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1091: Yes, sir.

MR. LEXIS: Sir, do you believe that there are certain crimes where there is no forensic evidence left behind? There is no, let's say, fingerprint evidence, DNA evidence, cameras?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1091: There may be some left behind, yeah.

MR. LEXIS: And can you give me an example of some of those crimes?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1091: Not specific crime, no. But I would imagine there are things that are left behind. You know, by time, just by mistakes.

MR. LEXIS: Okay. Let's say somebody goes in some alley, sees some woman walk in an alley and grabs her purse and takes off.

There's no cameras behind there. Let's say there's no cameras. Okay?

And let's say there's no fingerprints or no DNA. And let's say he did leave behind something that --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1091: Uh-huh.

MR. LEXIS: -- he dropped or that was the victim's and he dropped. And it came back, there -- because there's no guarantee, there was no DNA or no fingerprint evidence. But do you think those

cases can be prosecuted?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1091: I don't know if they could or not. I mean, well, they may attempt, but all of the evidence may not come out.

MR. LEXIS: What happens if the only person to witness that crime was the actual victim?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1091: Well, there will probably still be an attempt to prosecute.

MR. LEXIS: Okay. Folks, let's say that the State just calls one person on the stand. And that's all the evidence in this case, one person. There is no forensic evidence. There's no DNA and there's no fingerprints, there's no video surveillance, there's no independent eyewitness. If all you have is just one person, and even though the law says that you can convict based on just one person if you believe that person beyond a reasonable doubt, is there anybody here that's going to say, you know what, I'm not going to be able to do that? Just one person saying what happened is not enough for me.

Go ahead. Can you pass this over?

Juror 1086?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1086: Sorry, yeah. I don't think -- I -- I would have a hard time with one person.

MR. LEXIS: Okay. Can you think of some other crimes, ma'am, that happen just where there's the defendant and the victim?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1086: Yeah. I'm sure there's a lot of crimes that happen with just two people there. But when it's a he

said/she said, and, like, from my perspective, if I don't know either of these people, it would be hard for me to say this person is telling the truth and this person isn't, when I -- I don't know them, I'm just listening to what they said happened. But if there happened to be multiple people who witnessed something and gave the same account, then that would be different.

MR. LEXIS: Okay. Does anyone feel the same way? And that's fine if you do. Pass it over, please.

1082?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1082: Yes.

MR. LEXIS: Go ahead, sir.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1082: So like she said, if it's just one person, it -- I'd be reluctant to make a decision. Well, I guess it depends on what the consequences are too. If it was just -- if it was something that was just a fine, then I'd be more willing to go off -- based off how I feel with that one. But if it was time in jail or whatever else might come, I'd be a little more reluctant to base it just off one decision.

MR. LEXIS: Okay. Let me stop you right there and let's get sidetracked for a second.

First of all, and you'll be instructed, sentencing is up to the judge. You are not to go back and consider any type of sentencing when you're deliberating whether or not somebody is guilty or not guilty. That is absolutely law. The judge is the trier of the law, you're the trier of the fact. He's also the sentencer. You are not to consider that.

However, sir, you're telling me if there's just one person, we

just call one person to the stand and, even though you're not to consider that, you -- your back of your mind that this person might be going to jail, you believe that you're not going to be able to find guilty?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1082: If it's just off someone saying this is what happened to me and there's no physical evidence, nothing else, I'd find it hard. Because it's kind of like any statistic; if you just have one person, it's not going to be -- the results aren't as definite.

MR. LEXIS: Okay. Let me ask you this, sir. You -- we can go with many examples. Let's go with a common one, battery, domestic violence. Do you agree that battery, domestic violence happens in homes all across this country?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1082: Yes.

MR. LEXIS: And do you believe there's times where there is no physical injuries?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1082: Yeah, I guess, like, verbal and --

MR. LEXIS: What was that, sir?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1082: -- well -- like, would that be, like, mental abuse and whatnot?

MR. LEXIS: No, sir. If you had --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1082: Verbal? Or all physical?

MR. LEXIS: If you got upset with your spouse, girlfriend, whatever, you grab her, you put her in a choke hold, you push her down. By the time the cops get there, there's no physical injuries. First of all, you would agree that's a battery, correct?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1082: Yes.

MR. LEXIS: All right. Now, if the only person -- let's say there is no cameras in the home, and there is no specific type of forensic evidence that would help determine whether or not this person battered her, do you believe that the District Attorney's Office should just deny prosecution?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1082: No.

MR. LEXIS: So you believe we should prosecute those cases?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1082: Yes.

MR. LEXIS: All right. Same thing with somebody in an alley, like I gave a previous example. Lady going back there, there's no video cameras. Maybe there's evidence left behind, but there's no forensics left behind. Maybe the prints weren't good enough or not enough DNA was left on it. Okay. And we just have this one person taking the stand. In that situation, do you believe that we should deny that case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1082: Can you repeat that?

MR. LEXIS: Okay. Do you believe that we should prosecute that case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1082: Yes.

MR. LEXIS: Okay. And let's say the only person we have to put forward on the stand for you in that case is the actual victim. You get what I'm saying?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1082: Yeah.

MR. LEXIS: Okay. Are you telling me that -- let's say you

believe that witness beyond a reasonable doubt. And as the law allows, if you believe that one witness beyond a reasonable doubt, the defendant did it, the State is entitled to a guilty verdict?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1082: Yes.

MR. LEXIS: Would you be able to find guilty?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1082: Yes.

MR. LEXIS: I think everyone gets what I'm getting at. Is there anybody here -- and it's okay if you do, one person on the stand, okay, homeless drug addict, crimes happen against those people too. And they come in here and tell you a person in the defense chair is the one that did it to me and you believe that person beyond a reasonable doubt; is there anybody in here that's going to say no? Even though the law allows if I believe that person beyond a reasonable doubt to find guilty, I'm not going to be able to do it, because my gut's not going to be right, I'm not having a feeling that, you know what, I need more. I need another witness. I need forensic evidence. Anybody?

Sir, 1004?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1004: Yeah.

MR. LEXIS: Could you pass the mic back, sir? Here I got it. Go ahead, sir.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1004: I'm sorry, I -- I mean, if you're just saying it's this one person's word against another, I mean, we can't decide on that. I couldn't.

MR. LEXIS: Okay. So same type of question, sir. On most crimes that happen against victims like that, okay, somebody goes out in

 the grocery store parking lot tonight, late at night, no cameras, nobody around, they don't leave any forensic evidence, cops come, get that person's statement, submit it to my office. And one of the district attorneys should say, you know what, this is only going to be -- have one witness to the stand, denied prosecution. I mean, it's all right if you believe that, I'm just --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1004: Yeah. Because I don't think you're going to get a -- get 12 people to say that that person was guilty. I mean, I could see maybe the majority of people think he's guilty, but I think a lot of people would not convict just on that.

MR. LEXIS: Okay. I'm not asking about everybody. I'm asking about you, sir. Do you -- is that your belief, that if that's -- on situations like that -- and again, assuming that you believe that person beyond a reasonable doubt, you're not going to be able to convict?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1004: Yeah. I will not be able to guess.

MR. LEXIS: Okay. And so just to be clear, on those type of cases that come in, and the -- the most common one would be domestic violence, you believe that we should deny prosecution every time that happens, when there's no forensic evidence, physical evidence and no independent eyewitnesses, because all we have is one person to take the stand?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1004: Yes.

MR. LEXIS: Okay. Does anybody else feel like that? Let the record reflect no response.

Judgment in general. At the end of this trial, you're going to be asked to cast judgment upon the defendant, whether it be guilty or not guilty. Does anybody have anything in their past, whether it's religious personal beliefs or something that's happened to them in the past, which is going to hinder their ability to cast judgment at the end of this trial? Let the record reflect no response.

Has anybody had any negative contact with law enforcement? Juror No. 977; is that correct, sir?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 977: Yeah. I've been pulled over. I've been arrested before. I've -- I've been -- plenty of negative growing up with law enforcement. But there's no question there. But I have been, yes.

MR. LEXIS: Okay. And you -- and you categorized that -- let's ask it this way. Do you believe that was justified or unjustified, how you were treated by law enforcement?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 977: Both. Sometimes justified, sometimes not. Sometimes it's kind of like a -- I don't want to say targeting, but kind of like targeting, I mean, I guess. Coming out of a bowling alley, I was put on -- put in handcuffs, because they thought I looked like somebody. Stuff like that. Put in the back of the car, waited for hours in the back of a car and then find out it wasn't me. So stuff like that. But then there's stuff I've justifully done wrong.

MR. LEXIS: Like what, sir?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 977: Speeding. I stole before. Stuff like that.

MR. LEXIS: Anybody else have any negative contact with law enforcement?

Has anybody had any positive contact with law enforcement? Ma'am, Juror 1058?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1058: I have. Yes, I have.

MR. LEXIS: One second, ma'am. We need the mic so they can hear it for the record.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1058: You said positive, right? MR. LEXIS: Yes, ma'am.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1058: Yes, I have. Because I live alone. And twice I've thought that there was somebody outside. You know, my dog was barking and all that. And I called and -- and they're -- they come really fast and check everything out. I'm -- you know, I'm happy -- I'm happy about that.

MR. LEXIS: Okay.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1058: Makes me feel better.

MR. LEXIS: Anybody else?

Pass it behind you, ma'am.

Juror 961?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 961: I work as a security officer. And there's been maybe five or six times since 2000 where I've had to call police about something, like, usually somebody breaking into a car in a parking lot at my post or someone coming into a retail store that I was posted at and attempting to steal or create a disturbance. And the police arrived. They were prompt. They listened to what I had to say

3

4

5

6

7 8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20 21

22

23 24

25

and what everybody else had to say and took it from there. I -- I think they did a -- they made a favorable impression on me in --

MR. LEXIS: Anybody else? Pass it down the row.

Ma'am, No. 990; is that correct?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 990: Yes. Correct. I've had lots -- I'm a nurse by profession. I don't treat patients now. But, you know, I come in contact with law enforcement in certain situations and EMS and had very positive experiences. I live in a high-rise on the Strip. Couple weeks ago there was a disturbance. I heard loud music playing in an abandoned parking lot. And I called the police. They responded what I thought was very timely. And they even called me back to let me know that, you know, they checked on it and that they were thankful. And it was just a very positive experience. I was surprised that they called me back.

MR. LEXIS: Okay. Sir, No. 992?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 992: Yes, sir.

MR. LEXIS: Or excuse me, 993.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 993: Oh, yep. Nope, 993. Correct. Just work, like I say, as an administrator here and deal with

district police often. Specifically in the last seven years and just dealing with their day-to-day duties. We have students on campus, teenagers

on campus that don't always make the best decisions. And they've

always been, you know, positive with customer service, positive in

dealing with the -- you know, any and all infractions and do a great job in

upholding a safe and secure campus.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. LEXIS: Anybody in the second row?

Number 1048?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1048: Yes.

MR. DICKERSON: Is that correct, ma'am?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1048: Yes.

MR. DICKERSON: Yes.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1048: When my purse was stolen, I didn't know that it was stolen at first. It was about midnight and my phone rang and I heard a woman telling me that she found my card and she wanted me to come pick it up. And I thought that was going to be an ambush. I was nervous. Why do you want me, a stranger, to come -- you know, that's a stranger. I'm going to drive my car to your house. I didn't know this person.

And I called the police and asked them to escort me to go get my belongings, and they did. And that actually solved who took it. It was actually the woman who took it. And you know, I -- I never thought that they would accompany me, but they handled it and made me feel more secure.

MR. LEXIS: Okay. Anyone else in the second row?

Anybody else in the first row?

Can you pass it forward, then.

1091?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1091: I'm the point of contact for any security-related incidents at the Water Reclamation District. And numerous times when we've had incidents happen, I mean, been good

MR. LEXIS: Your uncle. Do you know the facts of that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1090: He was chasing a notorious pickpocketer and it was a rainy day and he got hit by a bus.

The guy got free. And I don't know if the weather condition -- but he had the guy in sight and he died the next day in the -- the hospital.

MR. LEXIS: Okay. About using force, I'm going to ask this to everybody, because there's been a lot of that going on in the news, use of force. Does anybody here have an issue with how Metro uses force? Let the record reflect no response.

Is there anyone here that believes that before Metro uses force, force needs to be used on them? For example, if somebody has a knife, a knife should be -- a cop should wait until that knife is deployed on them or somebody else before they use force? Let the record reflect no response.

And sir, I know you were previously asked this question, but you understand these facts have nothing to do with your situation, and you understand that what we're ultimately looking here is for fair and impartial jurors for both sides?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1090: Yes.

MR. LEXIS: And do you understand your duty, if you're picked as a juror, to be fair and impartial to both sides?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1090: Yes.

MR. LEXIS: And with that, I want to talk about another question that the judge asked to everyone. And it was giving more weight. I believe he asked about you add more weight to law

enforcement officers. Folks, do you understand whether or not we bring a firefighter in here, a rocket scientist, some other type of expert, a cop, you are the ones that are to weigh their credibility, you're the triers of fact. Okay. You're not to automatically presume what is coming out of their mouth is the truth just by State calls rocket scientist so-and-so to the stand. Though you could use your common sense, and you'll be instructed to use your common sense, you are to hold off on judgment until you hear what's coming out of their mouth. Does anyone here disagree with that notion? And I believe -- first of all, does anyone here disagree with that notion? Let the record reflect no response.

Can you please pass the mic back to Juror 993.

Sir, do you remember that question being asked of you?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 993: Yes, sir.

MR. LEXIS: And do you remember your response?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 993: Yes, sir.

MR. LEXIS: Do you remember you saying it depends on the evidence?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 993: Correct.

MR. LEXIS: Which is a very good way of putting it. Does anyone here disagree with that? That's essentially what we're getting at. You are to -- evidence is going to come from up there. It's not going to come from anybody's title. You're to weigh their evidence and their credibility from what's on the stand. Does anybody disagree with that?

And sir, was that what -- what you were trying to convey when you said depends on the evidence?

 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 993: Correct.

MR. LEXIS: Can anybody think of any other reasons on why they would not be fair and impartial? Let the record reflect no response.

Court's indulgence.

Can you please pass the mic over to Juror 980.

I know you've been dying to talk, ma'am, too, because I saw you raise your hand earlier when somebody else --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 980: Oh. No, I just -- I -- I'm still a little worried about my feelings. I just don't want them to get in the way of me making the right decision. I've -- I've been feeling like I didn't get any justice. So therefore I feel like it may, you know, change the way I -- I should -- I don't want to say vote or decide on -- on what it is I should do. You don't know how hard I pray that I wouldn't get a case like this. I wanted a civil case, something that wasn't going to tug at my heartstrings. But this one does because of, you know, people getting hurt. There's so much of that right now that it overwhelms me. And I'm just nervous. I want to do the right thing, mind you, but I don't know if I can. Do you understand?

MR. LEXIS: Well, first of all, I appreciate what -- where you're coming from. No, I can't speak on your behalf, because I don't have the full set of circumstances I'm faced with. But I think what you just reiterated, you said that it's important for justice to be served, correct?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 980: Yes.

MR. LEXIS: Okay. And if picked as a juror, you're the one ultimately going to be serving the justice as far as whether somebody is

guilty or not guilty. And you're going to be the one judging the people that take the stand on whether or not they're credible or not.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 980: Are you okay with that? I mean, are you okay with the way that I feel about it? I --

MR. LEXIS: Ma'am, everyone comes in with their own set of circumstances and background. The most important things to both sides of us is whether you could intelligently give a fair and impartial verdict.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 980: Okay. I'll really try.

MR. LEXIS: We're not doing anything really that would be -- wouldn't -- wouldn't make you to be a fair and impartial juror, ma'am.

Unless you want to tell me some other reason that I'm not hearing.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 980: No. No. That's just -- I just had a big loss, is all. I just, you know -- things like that, you just don't get over.

MR. LEXIS: Okay. But would you be able to sit here and listen to the evidence?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 980: I think so.

MR. LEXIS: Okay. Anybody else have anything that would affect their ability to be fair and impartial?

Court's indulgence.

We'll reserve our for-cause challenges at the end, Judge.

THE COURT: Okay. Defense, you may proceed.

MR. COYER: Good afternoon everyone. Again, my name is Gregory Coyer. So does everybody understand that there's no right or wrong answers during this process? Does anybody feel like there's a

right or a wrong answer when somebody asks you a question? Seeing no hands.

Mr. Locke, if you could -- Ms. Ramos, could you just pass the mic down to Mr. Locke, please?

Can you hear me?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1004: Yes.

MR. COYER: Okay. Previously, when Mr. Lexis was asking you some questions, you said that it would be difficult if it was just one person's word against another person's word, right?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1004: Yes.

MR. COYER: Would it be easier if that one person was a police officer?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1004: Well, there's got to be more evidence than just one person's word against the other. I -- I mean, you -- it's -- I mean, I would probably lean towards the police officer. But, I mean, there's got to be something else, I would think. I mean, I -- I know you're talking about an ideal case, but there has to be something else involved, I guess, other than just the word of the two parties there.

MR. COYER: Okay. But would it be easier to believe a police officer if that was the only witness?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1004: Well, if you're saying I -- would I vote for guilty if it was only on the word of a police officer?

Probably not.

MR. COYER: Okay. And I'm not trying to ask you how you'd

vote. I'm not going to ask anybody that question. Okay. So part of the reason why we go through this process is to make sure that we get a group of people who are the best situated to make a fair and impartial determination based on the evidence, whether or not the State's met their burden of proof.

Does everybody understand that? Does anybody need any clarification on that?

So Mr. Locke, for example, there -- there's no right or wrong answers. Okay? Do you understand that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1004: Yes.

MR. COYER: All right. Do you recall when the charges were read this morning?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1004: A little bit.

MR. COYER: I thought I saw you shaking your head when the charges were read.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1004: I don't remember. I could have. I thought they, you know, seemed pretty serious, attacking -- I thought it was attacking a -- the police officer and -- and drug dealing or whatever.

MR. COYER: Sure. So one of the charges is assault on a police officer with a deadly weapon. Do you -- you recall that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1004: Yes.

MR. COYER: Okay.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1004: Okay.

MR. COYER: That charge, just hearing that charge, does that

cause anyone to feel any strong feelings toward or in favor of law enforcement? Okay. For the record, I'm seeing three hands.

Could you pass it back down to Ms. Ramos.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 980: Sorry. Well --

MR. COYER: Sorry to keep picking on you, Ms. Ramos.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 980: Well, yeah. I -- I feel that, yeah, I'm really partial to the -- the police officer if he's being attacked by -- by I guess with a gun, wasn't it? And just that statement right there sounds really one-sided. I mean, true, I haven't heard the other side totally, but that -- that kind of sums it up for me, anyway.

MR. COYER: What if you never heard the other side?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 980: Never heard the other side?

MR. COYER: Yeah. What if Mr. Valencia just sat there and never took the stand at any point during this trial; would you have a problem with that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 980: Would I? Well, that's not a very smart thing to do, I wouldn't think. But I probably would have a -- I would like to hear what he had to say. Because just that statement -- just that statement alone kind of puts a nail in his coffin. If he doesn't say anything, then definitely he's, you know, headed in the wrong direction.

MR. COYER: I don't want to put words in your mouth.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 980: Okay.

MR. COYER: Is it fair to say that if Mr. Valencia doesn't

 testify, it would be very difficult for you to vote not guilty?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 980: Yeah. I think it would be very difficult. I need to hear something.

MR. COYER: And I know you talked a lot about the feelings that you're having during this process.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 980: Yeah.

MR. COYER: And I don't even know where to -- how to begin saying I'm sorry to hear about your son. You mentioned that one of the things you struggle with is you felt that you didn't get justice?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 980: Right.

MR. COYER: So would that -- I was trying to understand what you meant by that. Did you mean that it would be hard for you to vote not guilty in any criminal trial, just because you want to make sure justice is done?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 980: Well, see, that's what I was afraid of, because it's something that haunts me. Because they never found who did it. I'm always kind of thinking, well, maybe he's already in jail by -- because I don't know who this -- who this man -- or maybe it was even a woman, I don't know. But I don't know. I -- I -- that's why I didn't want to do one of these, because I wasn't sure how it would make me feel or how I would react. I mean, part of me, I think, to be honest, wants a conviction somewhere, but that's not the right way to think, because --

MR. COYER: Sure.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 980: -- you know, you got to

hear both sides. That's why if he doesn't say anything, that's not a good thing. But I don't know.

I -- I remember when I was going through that process of trying to piece together what had happened to my son and there was people that came and told us that, hey, you know, we overheard this when we were at this party. And then we give that information to the police officers and they say, well, we can't use it, because that's just hearsay; they didn't tell it to this guy, they just overheard it. And -- and that made me angry, because I figured, well, it's something. Can't you go, you know, investigate something? But they just gave me the kind of a blank look and that was the end of that.

So for me, I -- I want to do the right thing. I -- I don't want somebody to, you know, just because they look the part or -- or whatever. But I need -- I think I need more than just that one little line that you said, just his word and the statement that he was, you know, attacked with a, you know, with a gun kind of thing just seals it for me.

MR. COYER: Right. Given your circumstances -- PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 980: Uh-huh.

MR. COYER: -- if you were on trial, would you want someone like you on your jury?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 980: Oh, I don't know. I'm kind of wishy washy right now. I don't know. I -- I really can't say. I really can't.

MR. COYER: And so you know, I'll go back to where I started, which is, you -- you just mentioned that's the wrong way to think.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 980: Yeah, I know. But -- MR. COYER: That's not -- that's not what we're here to -- to

tell you. What -- there's no right or wrong way to think. What we're trying to figure out is how you do think so that we can make a decision about whether or not we want you on our jury, right?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 980: Yeah. Well --

MR. COYER: So.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 980: -- I want to -- I want to do the right thing. And for me, I need to hear more than -- I think, like, my friend at the end, more than one person. I need evidence of some kind.

MR. COYER: Do you recall the questions about the State's burden of proof?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 980: Pardon?

MR. COYER: Do you recall the questions that were being asked about the State's burden of proof?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 980: No.

MR. COYER: Okay. Well, like Mr. Lexis pointed out, if they just came out here and made an argument and didn't present -- didn't present a single witness and said the State rests, that wouldn't be enough to -- to -- for anybody to convict, right?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 980: Right.

MR. COYER: Okay. And he gave -- he gave you that example because he was emphasizing that the State carries the burden of proof in a criminal case; do you understand that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 980: Yeah.

MR. COYER: Okay. So going back to the example I gave you about Mr. Valencia not testifying, for example -PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 980: Uh-huh.

MR. COYER: -- do you understand that you're not here to weigh one story versus the other; you're here to weigh all the evidence and evaluate whether or not the burden of proof has been met?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 980: Okay.

MR. COYER: Okay. Do you think you could do that if you -- if Ms. Plunkett and I sat there and played poker the whole -- throughout the trial and Mr. Valencia took a nap on the table, do you think you'd be able to evaluate all the evidence and see if you held the State to their burden or do you expect something from us? Do you expect us to put on some kind of a case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 980: Oh, I would like that. But, you know, I -- I guess I can -- yeah. I think I could do it. I think I would be able to weigh all the evidence and put it through my little pea brain and hopefully I'll come up with a verdict of one way or another.

MR. COYER: Okay. Can you pass the mic forward here to Mr. Sanders.

So you had -- you had raised your hand when I asked the question about feeling in favor of law enforcement when you heard the charges, right?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1082: Yes.

MR. COYER: Okay. Would you elaborate on that, please?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1082: To augment, when I first

10

11 12

13

14 15

16 17

18 19

20 21

23

22 24 25 heard the charges, I started coming to conclusions of -- so when I first heard the charges, I started jumping to conclusions. And so that's why I guess when I'd fill in the blanks, what I don't know, if it was what I was thinking, I'd be in favor of law enforcement. But as evidence came out, I wouldn't respond the same, depending on what happens.

MR. COYER: Okay. And I'll ask you, Mr. Sanders, the same question I asked Ms. Ramos, about whether or not you hear from the defendant in the case; does it matter to you whether or not you hear from the defendant in the case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1082: So I know the defendant has no -- they don't have to prove themselves innocent. But to me, I don't think, unless the evidence that is being provided by the plaintiff just was a crap shot, I'd expect the defendant to at least, I guess, put forth something. But I also know that technically, with the Constitution, you guys don't have to put forth any evidence. They have to prove their side of the story. But for me personally, kind of like she said, I'd -- it would help me with my decision if you guys put forth, I guess, some resistance and gave your side of the story as well.

MR. COYER: Would you say that those sentiments that you just described are increased if the person saying that a crime was committed is a police officer?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1082: Yes. If -- it depends on the evidence. Like, I don't know what exactly the -- I know what the charges are, but I don't know the story behind it, what happened. Is there footage of it? Is -- or is it just going to be his word? But it depends

what they're claiming. If they're claiming that something big went down, but there's no proof other than their word, I'd expect there'd be more proof than just this is what happened, I can't show it, I have no marks on my body, but this is what happened. But it depends on what -- I guess what they're saying happened.

MR. COYER: Okay. You can go ahead and pass the mic down to Mr. Baborian -- yes?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1090: You got it.

MR. COYER: All right. I didn't want to leave you out. I saw that you raised your hand when I asked the question about positive feelings for law enforcement when you heard the charges read.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1090: Oh, yeah.

MR. COYER: Right?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1090: Yeah.

MR. COYER: Okay. Would you elaborate on -- on your feelings in that respect?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1090: Just in the fact that, you know, based on, like, egregious charges and seems like the State has enough prosecution to prosecute, so automatically you're in favor of that they went that route. So you're automatically kind of on the side that -- you're siding with the prosecution, in my mind.

MR. COYER: And part of that goes back to what happened with your -- your uncle, right?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1090: Yeah.

MR. COYER: Okay. Now, if we were here on like, you know,

possession of stolen vehicle case or something that's totally unlike what happened to your uncle --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1090: Uh-huh.

MR. COYER: -- would it be easier for you to --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1090: Yeah. I'm going to tell you straight out, yeah.

MR. COYER: Yeah. So if the evidence comes out and it to you, starts to kind of be similar to what happened with your uncle --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1090: Uh-huh.

MR. COYER: -- do you think that you would be able to sit as an impartial juror?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1090: But was there multiple witnesses? Did they say that in the beginning?

MR. COYER: I can't answer that for you. But the evidence -- PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1090: That's what I thought I heard.

MR. COYER: We have to wait for the evidence portion -- PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1090: Okay.

MR. COYER: -- to -- to answer that question.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1090: I just -- I -- you asked somebody this question, I believe, a little bit ago. And if -- it -- if I was in his shoes, I don't know if I'd want somebody like a few -- me or a few of the other people on this -- I'd want the fairest, most bipartisan -- partial -- no, I wouldn't want me on the -- I'm not trying to get out of jury duty. If I was these guys, I'd want me on it.

24

25

answer. I don't know.

MR. COYER: Would you feel it would be difficult to -- to -- would you feel like if you voted not guilty, you were voting against law enforcement?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1011: No.

MR. COYER: Okay. Are you more likely to believe someone if they are a law enforcement officer?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1011: I think so.

MR. COYER: Okay. Would you like someone that feels that way to be a juror if it was you that was on trial?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1011: Maybe. Maybe. I'm not so sure about it.

MR. COYER: Okay. I'm going to ask this question to the entire group here now. And again, no right or wrong answers. We're just trying to see how some of you think. Okay?

Is there anybody here who under no circumstances could accept that a police officer was not telling the truth? Not seeing any hands.

Go ahead and slide it down to Ms. Iaconi there.

Can you hear me?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1048: Yes.

MR. COYER: Okay. You -- you had mentioned you had been victimized several times?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1048: Yes.

MR. COYER: Right? I'm sorry to hear that. And I know that

some of your experiences with law enforcement you described as very positive, right?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1048: Yes.

MR. COYER: Okay. So would you say that you're more likely to side with or believe law enforcement because of your experiences?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1048: We're almost programmed that they're an authority and a higher -- they're held to a higher standard. But you -- you have to look at everything. I understand that.

MR. COYER: Based on your experiences, do you see law enforcement as the good guys?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1048: For the most part, I'd like to think that.

MR. COYER: Okay. If you were on trial, do you think you would be the kind of person you'd want on your jury?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1048: That I would want someone like me on my jury? Absolutely.

MR. COYER: Okay. So I'm going to ask another panel question here. Has anybody ever been falsely accused of anything? Okay.

Let's see, Mr. Sanders, right?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 977: Yeah.

MR. COYER: Raised his hand.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 977: Like I talked about earlier, coming out of that bowling alley, I was accused of being the wrong

person and stuff like that. And that's not the only time. I've been accused of stealing before, even though I have in the past. This is, like, recently that I got stopped, had to go in the back. And it was just somebody that looks like me. It wasn't me. So I sat there for a couple hours and they let me go when they found out the real guy wasn't --

MR. COYER: So in -- in that experience, if you had had to prove your own innocence, would you have been able to do it?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 977: Yeah. Because they had cameras.

MR. COYER: Okay. Do you think that someone accused should have to prove their own innocence or do you think that the accusers should have to prove what they've accused?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 977: Both, in a sense. Like, if I'm getting accused, I should be -- they have to prove that I'm doing something wrong and I should be able to prove that I didn't do it wrong.

MR. COYER: Based on that, would you expect to see something from the defense?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 977: Yes.

MR. COYER: Okay. Would you be able to vote not guilty if we didn't do anything, but the State didn't prove their case either?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 977: Probably not.

MR. COYER: Okay.

THE COURT: Counsel, I'm going to stop you at this point.

MR. COYER: Is it 4:30? Okay.

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, we're going to take our

evening recess.

During this recess you're admonished not to talk or converse among yourselves or with anyone else on any subject matter connected with this trial, or read, watch, or listen to any report or -- of or commentary on the trial or any person connected with this trial by any medium of information, including, without limitation, through social media, text, newspapers, television, the Internet, and radio. At this point, you haven't heard any testimony, but do not visit the scene of any of the events mentioned during the trial or undertake any investigation. Do not do any posting or communications on any social networking sites or do any independent research, including Internet searches, or form or express any opinion on any subject connected with the trial until the case is finally submitted.

If you could return tomorrow at 11:30 and remain in the hallway until the marshal brings you into the courtroom. As I advised you, I anticipate taking our lunch break at approximately 1:30 tomorrow. So we're going to have a little bit of a late lunch because we're having a late start. So at this time we'll -- I'll excuse you and we're taking our evening recess.

[Prospective jury panel recessed at 4:28 p.m.]

THE COURT: What I anticipate, we'll finish attorney voir dire. I may ask some follow-up questions based on the attorney voir dire. I don't know how much longer you have, Mr. Coyer.

MR. COYER: Very little, if any.

THE COURT: Okay. And then I'll just ask some -- may

follow-up questions. Then I'll take a recess and you can argue challenges for cause. And, obviously, if any are removed for cause, then I'll re-seat those vacant seats, go back through and ask the individual voir dire. Then you'll be allowed to do attorney voir dire. And then we'll do the same process again until we get 24 people that -- that pass cause. And then we'll do the peremptory challenges.

MR. DICKERSON: From our end, I think that we'll plan on trying to have a witness here by 12:30.

THE COURT: You're very optimistic.

MR. DICKERSON: Luckily, if I can make it happen. They're police officers and we can have them wait around.

THE COURT: I'm hopeful to take testimony tomorrow afternoon.

MR. DICKERSON: But other --

THE COURT: I'm not going to hold it against you --

MR. DICKERSON: Okay.

THE COURT: -- if we have to wait a little bit for a witness, but I am hopeful to have a jury by the lunch hour.

MR. DICKERSON: Okay.

THE COURT: And then hopefully start taking some testimony. I mean, I'm assuming, you know, the opening statements aren't going to be lengthy. And then we'll start taking some testimony tomorrow afternoon.

MR. DICKERSON: Okay. Great. I appreciate it, Your Honor. THE COURT: Thank you. So if there's any -- I mean, both of

you are probably going to be here during my 9:00 calendar. You can kind of gauge, if there's anything that needs to be brought to my attention, please let my law clerk know before I bring the jury back in.

MR. DICKERSON: Absolutely.

MR. COYER: Will do.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. We're in recess until 11:30 tomorrow.

MR. DICKERSON: Thank you.

MR. COYER: Thank you, Your Honor.

MS. PLUNKETT: Thank you, Judge.

[Proceedings concluded at 4:31 p.m. until November 28, 2017, at 11:30 a.m.]

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

Sharuna Ortega

Shawna Ortega, CET\*562

Electronically Filed 4/19/2018 9:17 AM Steven D. Grierson CLERK OF THE COURT

**RTRAN** 

2

1

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

DISTRICT COURT
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

THE STATE OF NEVADA,

Plaintiff,

VS.

CEASAR SANCHAZ VALENCIA,

Defendant.

Case No. C-16-315580-1

DEPT. XVIII

BEFORE THE HONORABLE MARK B. BAILUS, DISTRICT COURT JUDGE

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 28, 2017

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS RE: JURY TRIAL - PHASE I - DAY 2

APPEARANCES:

For the Plaintiff: MICHAEL DICKERSON, ESQ.

(Deputy District Attorney) CHAD N. LEXIS, ESQ. (Deputy District Attorney)

For the Defendant: GREGORY E. COYER, ESQ.

ALEXIS ANNE PLUNKETT, ESQ.

RECORDED BY: ROBIN PAGE, COURT RECORDER

1

Shawna Ortega • CET-562 • Certified Electronic Transcriber • 602.412.7667

Case Number: C-16-315580-1

1	INDEX	
2		Page No.
3	Jury impaneled	83
4	Preliminary jury admonishment read Opening statement by Plaintiff	83 95
5		
6	<u>WITNESSES</u>	
7	PLAINTIFF'S WITNESSES:	
8	CHRISTOPHER HOUSTON	100
9	Direct Examination Cross-Examination	103 125
10	Redirect Examination Recross-Examination	146 149
11	Troorese Examination	
12		
13	<u>EXHIBITS</u>	
14	DESCRIPTION	ADMITTED
15		
16	State's Exhibit Nos. 9 through 11 State's Exhibit Nos. 17 and 26	107 115
17	State's Exhibit No. 8	123
18	Defense Exhibit No. A	138
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
	Shawna Ortega • CET-562 • Certified Electronic Transcriber •	602.412.7667

## LAS VEGAS, NEVADA, TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 28, 2017

[Proceedings commenced at 11:34 a.m.]

[Outside the presence of the prospective jury panel.]

THE COURT: Please be seated. This continuation of *State vs. Sanchaz*, Case No. C-315580. Apparently, over the evening recess, one of the potential jurors, Mr. Sanders, is claiming undue hardship. He e-mailed the court. I'm going to provide counsel with a copy of the e-mail.

MR. DICKERSON: Thanks.

[Pause in proceedings.]

THE COURT: And this can be a -- a court exhibit. I'm also going to make this e-mail a court exhibit. Okay.

MR. DICKERSON: Judge --

THE COURT: What I was going to do, we're missing a couple of potential jurors. I think a -- a couple haven't arrived yet. I was going to bring Mr. Sanders in, advise him I got the e-mail, let you ask him a couple questions, then excuse him and then we'll discuss whether he qualifies for undue hardship, if he should be excused.

MR. LEXIS: State's going to object to that.

MR. COYER: Just to complete that record, Mr. Sanders, I was told this morning, also approached my co-counsel, Ms. Plunkett. And I'll let her make the representations as to what he said to her. We just wanted the court to be aware of that since it was a communication from a juror.

THE COURT: Why don't you put it on the record.

MS. PLUNKETT: And, Judge, Mr. Sanders approached me outside in the hallway. He indicated that he had a hardship. He had already sent an e-mail, and if I could alert the marshal so he did not disrupt the proceedings. I said yes, and walked away.

THE COURT: Okay. I'm going bring him in, tell him that we received the e-mail, and I was going to let counsel ask him some questions. And then we'll excuse him. We'll discuss whether he qualifies as an undue hardship.

So why don't you bring -- is Mr. Sanders out there?

THE MARSHAL: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Why don't you bring him in.

[Prospective Juror No. 1082 entered courtroom.]

THE COURT: Mr. Sanders, why don't you -- come forward, just come forward to the podium. Okay. No, to the podium.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1082: Sorry.

THE COURT: That's okay. Two things. You have -- you e-mailed the court this morning and I provided a copy of your e-mail to both the prosecution and defense counsel. Also one of defense counsel told me that you approached her this morning. Again, I'm going to admonish you, do not attempt to speak with any counsel in this case outside the presence of the court.

I have provided a copy of your request to be excused due to an undue hardship. I'm going to allow counsel to ask you some questions at this time.

Would it be easier, counsel, if I had him sit in the front row of the -- the jury box?

MR. DICKERSON: Court's pleasure.

MR. COYER: I think so because there's a microphone that will pick him up.

THE COURT: Why don't you sit in one of the chairs in the front row. Thank you.

And for the record, this is Rex Sanders, Badge No. 1082. State?

MR. LEXIS: State has no questions.

THE COURT: Mr. Coyer?

MR. COYER: I don't belive we have any questions for Mr. Sanders either, Judge.

THE COURT: Okay. I do have a couple of questions. You say you're a part-time student at CSN and you're taking online classes, so you have a little bit of freedom with that. Why can't you complete your classes -- I mean, your assignments at night? We're only going to go -- so just you know, Mr. Sanders, because of the court's calendar, I probably will never start before 11:30 in the morning and we'll never go beyond 5:00. So we're only talking of that type of window. So you would have sufficient time in the morning and in the evening to complete your assignments, just so you're aware. And it's only going to probably go to the end of the week, at most.

So it seems like you would have sufficient time to complete your assignments, either in the morning -- and there may be some

paycheck.

23

24

25

THE COURT: Right.

MR. DICKERSON: And so based on that --

THE COURT: I'm just -- I just not going to excuse him at this time for undue hardship. Okay?

MR. DICKERSON: Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you.

[End of bench conference.]

THE COURT: Mr. Sanders, based on your representations and response to my questions, I'm not going to excuse you --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1082: All right.

THE COURT: -- for an undue hardship.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1082: All right.

THE COURT: All right. But thank you for notifying the court. And again, I'm going to admonish you, do not approach counsel. If -- if you are selected as a juror, do not approach counsel. They cannot talk to you. It would be improper for them to have what's called an ex parte communication with you. So if you are selected as a juror, please adhere to my admonishments.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1082: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1082: Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. And we'll call the -- I believe we're still waiting for a couple of people. We're still waiting for -- so if you could just wait outside, I appreciate it.

[Pause in proceedings.]

THE COURT: Mr. Coyer, how much longer do you think you have on voir dire?

MR. COYER: Your Honor, I don't believe that we have much longer. But I -- I was going to ask the court if the court had any objection to Ms. Plunkett finishing it up?

THE COURT: I have no problem with that.

State, are you going to have any follow-up questions on voir dire?

MR. LEXIS: No. Well, likely not.

THE COURT: Okay. What I was going to do, quite frankly, is once Mr. -- or Ms. Bianca [sic] finishes the voir dire examination, I was going to take a break, have you make your arguments if you're going to make any challenges for cause. I was going to take a short recess, review my notes, come back, make my determination. Depending on whether I excuse anybody, then we'll have to re-seat whoever, go over the same procedure during -- for court voir dire and then attorney voir dire. Hopefully we'll have a jury before the lunch break.

MR. DICKERSON: Understood.

THE COURT: And I don't know if you have any witnesses available today available or not.

MR. DICKERSON: We will, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. LEXIS: Oh, we got several.

THE COURT: Okay. So again, to accommodate counsel, I'm going to take the lunch break at 1 -- from 1:30 to 2:30 and we're going to

23

24

25

go to 5:00 today.

MR. DICKERSON: Great. Thank you very much.

THE COURT: Thank you.

MS. PLUNKETT: Thank you.

THE COURT: We'll be a short recess. As soon as the --

THE MARSHAL: They're here.

THE COURT: Oh, they're here? Then can you bring them in?

[Prospective jury panel reconvened at 11:44 a.m.]

THE COURT: All right. Let the record reflect that counsel for the State and defense and the defendant are all present, and members of the jury panel are also present.

Counsel, this is the continuation of attorney voir dire by the defense. Are you prepared to go forward?

MS. PLUNKETT: Yes, Judge.

THE COURT: Okay. Proceed.

MS. PLUNKETT: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen.

Thank you for coming back today. Just as a reminder, my name is

Alexis Plunkett, and along with Gregory Coyer, we -- we represent

Ceasar Valencia.

I also want to remind everyone that we're just here today to find 12 people with no bias who will listen to the evidence and decide guilty or not guilty. We're not here to judge you. Okay. There's no right or wrong answers.

I see that a lot of people somewhat work in the same industry and this wasn't asked; does anyone in this courtroom know anyone else,

1	by a show of hands? Can I pass the microphone to Mr. Sanders.	
2	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1082: Hey.	
3	MS. PLUNKETT: Tell me who you know	
4	THE COURT: Sir, state your name and your badge number,	
5	please.	
6	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 977: Christopher Sanders,	
7	Badge No. 977.	
8	THE COURT: Thank you.	
9	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 977: And I know	
10	Mr. Antheaume.	
11	MS. PLUNKETT: And how is it that you know	
12	Mr. Antheaume?	
13	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 977: He is my boss.	
14	MS. PLUNKETT: He's your boss. Okay. Is he your current	
15	boss?	
16	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 977: Yes.	
17	MS. PLUNKETT: And how long have you worked under him?	
18	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 977: Four years.	
19	MS. PLUNKETT: Four years?	
20	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 977: Maybe three.	
21	MS. PLUNKETT: In in what capacity do you work under	
22	him? Is that as an administrator or substitute teacher?	
23	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 977: I'm a a long-term sub,	
24	and then I coach for him also.	
25	MS. PLUNKETT: Sure. Can you pass the microphone down	
	10	

Ms. Iaconi?

MS. PLUNKETT: In a work capacity?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1091: Yes.

MS. PLUNKETT: And when she said you issued her badge, what -- can you describe what that means?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1091: Right. I work in security. I do all the badge access. And so I do the badges for all -- everybody who comes through.

MS. PLUNKETT: How long did you and Ms. Iaconi work together?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1091: I don't remember. A short time.

MS. PLUNKETT: Did you ever socialize --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 993: No.

MS. PLUNKETT: -- outside of work? Do you know anyone else in this courtroom?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1091: No, I don't.

MS. PLUNKETT: Thank you.

Does anyone else here know any of the other prospective jurors who are not seated in the box right now? Let the record reflect no one is raising their hand.

Thank you for that.

Let's see, Mr. Coyer asked you yesterday if anyone had been accused of something that they felt they did not do. The only response was Mr. Sanders in the back row, who described an event in a criminal context with the police. Is there anyone else here who has been

accused of something that you believe you did not do? That does not include a criminal context, it's not limited to a criminal context; that can be an accusation from a parent, spouse, a brother, a sister, a boss, any time that you feel as though you were accused of something you did not do. Can I have a show of hands?

Can I pass the microphone back to Ms. Ramos, please? I also -- I also have the names in front of me, so that helps.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 980: Esther Ramos, 0980.

MS. PLUNKETT: And in -- and can you tell me -- elaborate on that a little bit?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 980: I was a housekeeper working at Nellis Air Force Base in the hospital. And I was cleaning a room. And somebody had left a drawer out. And I went to push it shut, and I noticed that there was a lot of money in an envelope. So I went to get a superior to tell him that the envelope with money was there and I didn't want to be blamed if anything happened to it. He said, okay, that he would take care of it. Well, the envelope was gone. And I was accused of taking the money, because I cleaned the room. You know, they had a little meeting. I told them my side of the story. And, well, I -- they -- you know, I was okay, obviously.

And, of course, he said he didn't take it either, that he had closed it and -- it was a dental office. And when they asked the dental technician who put it there, his explanation for leaving it there was, well, if it's closed, people will open it to see what's in it. And if I leave it open, nobody will bother with it. I don't know, but that's what he said. But

anyway, I -- I came out all right in the deal, but the money was still gone.

MS. PLUNKETT: Was that situation your word against the word of another person?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 980: Yeah, I guess you would say. I truly thought that I was going to be out of a job, because it's always the housekeeper, you know what I mean?

MS. PLUNKETT: Sure.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 980: Uh-huh.

MS. PLUNKETT: Let's pass the mic, front row, Mr. Sanders.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1082: Rex Sanders,

Badge No. 1082.

MS. PLUNKETT: Can you tell me a little bit about your situation?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1082: So I was in an accident. And it was my word against their word, because there was no witnesses that could say I went through an intersection and a lady turned left out in front of me. And she said she had a green light and I said I had a green light. And no witnesses could say who had a green light. And the police officer, based off the light cycle and then the two words, issued me a ticket for running a red light.

The ticket was dismissed. I think I had to pay the \$95 fee, but I was happy to get the ticket gone. But because of the report, I took the blame on the accident.

MS. PLUNKETT: Were you civilly sued for that accident? PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1082: Yes. Well, it stayed

within the insurance, but there -- I did have an attorney and all that.

MS. PLUNKETT: Did you testify in front of a judge --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1082: No.

MS. PLUNKETT: -- regarding that accident?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1082: No.

MS. PLUNKETT: It settled out of court?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1082: I believe so.

MS. PLUNKETT: How did it make you feel that you were essentially blamed for something that you were saying that you did not do?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1082: At first I was upset. But then I just accepted it. The lady claimed she had some injuries. I came out all right. My car was totaled, but I had no -- I broke my hand, but that was it. So at first I was upset. But then it helped that it stayed in the insurance policy that I had, so I didn't have to pay any out-of-hand other than my rate going up. But I was just happy that she was getting the treatment she needed.

MS. PLUNKETT: Would you feel different if you could have possibly gone to jail over that accident?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1082: Yeah. I would have -there's some stuff that I tried to look into, but they said that the evidence
was -- like, some video footage, but the file was corrupted. I would have
definitely gone back and looked for another copy of that if it was more
than just money on the line.

MS. PLUNKETT: Sure.

And who else raised their hand to that question?
Will you pass the mic over to, is it Ms. Penrod?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1089: Yes. Susan
Penrod, 1089.

MS. PLUNKETT: And what was your situation?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1089: As a training consultant with NV Energy, I was training six employees. And one of the employees complained that I wasn't treating her fair, that I was picking on her. And in a sense, I guess I was, because she wasn't doing very well, so she felt like she was being profiled. It wasn't my intention to pick on her. It was my intention to show her what she was doing incorrectly.

MS. PLUNKETT: So you believe that what she stated may have been her belief, but not necessarily the full truth?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1089: Yes.

MS. PLUNKETT: Thank you.

Who else raised their hand to that one? Is that all? I apologize, but can we pass it back to Ms. Ramos?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 980: Oh, goodness. Esther Ramos. Number 0980.

MS. PLUNKETT: Yesterday to Mr. Coyer, you described the reading of the charges against Mr. Valencia, simply the reading of the charges as "the nail in the coffin."

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 980: Uh-huh.

MS. PLUNKETT: What would Ceasar have to do in your eyes to get out of that coffin.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 980: Prove his innocence.

MS. PLUNKETT: You also said that it would be difficult to vote not guilty if Ceasar does not testify himself; is that true?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 980: Yes, I think so.

MS. PLUNKETT: So even with the understanding that he has a right to remain silent, that the State has to prove the case against Mr. Valencia, you would still have a problem voting anything other than guilty if you do not hear from Ceasar himself?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 980: Well, it would be better if he spoke for himself.

MS. PLUNKETT: Does anyone else here agree with

Ms. Ramos; you would find it difficult to vote not guilty if you do not hear
from Ceasar himself?

And will you pass the mic to Mr. Sanders.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 977: Christopher Sanders, 977.

MS. PLUNKETT: Can you elaborate on that a little bit?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 977: I just feel like if I was in his shoes, I would want to let my word out, let what -- my experiences, you know, my side. You know, like, if I was about to go to jail, I would want to -- everybody to know my side of it, not just their side. You know, I want to prove the I'm guilty. I don't want to give a chance for them to make sure I'm guilty.

MS. PLUNKETT: So you are looking for Mr. Valencia to prove his innocence here?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 977: In a way.

MS. PLUNKETT: And I know yesterday when you described an incident where you believe you were falsely accused of, I believe, some type of theft --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 977: Uh-huh.

MS. PLUNKETT: -- and you mentioned a video to prove your innocence; what if there is no video? What if you would have been arrested on the word of a witness?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 977: I probably would have went to jail. I mean, without the video, I was guilty. My word.

MS. PLUNKETT: And it's absolutely fine if you feel this way, but would anyone else here find it difficult to find Ceasar not guilty if you don't hear directly from him?

Will you pass the mic forward to Mr. Sanders.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1082: Rex Sanders, Badge 1082.

MS. PLUNKETT: And can you elaborate on that a little bit?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1082: So I guess with my
accident, I -- I feel like I annoyed my lawyer at first, because I was trying
to do everything that I figured they -- they're going to try, but I figured if I
tried, then there's two chances of finding something. So for me
personally, I was -- not necessarily that I had to prove my innocence, but
I was going at it that if I'm going to go to court, then I'm going to make
sure I share everything that I can about it to put myself in the best
situation.

So to me, I guess my way of thinking is I've got to prove my

innocence, because if I don't say anything and someone else says something and I just keep quiet, then to me it makes sense that they would win because they're the only ones that shared any evidence.

MS. PLUNKETT: Would you feel differently if you were subject to a cross-examination by someone who is there to destroy your story?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1082: I would definitely want to take my time with my answers. Because me, personally, I start going with something and then I just kind of keep going. And then there's times that I'm, like, that's not what I actually meant. Like the -- the accident, at first I told the police officer I was not running a yellow light. And then I had the thought, like, he's going to think I was -- I ran a red light or something. So I said to him, Just so you know, I meant I had a green light, but then I got the running a red light. So I don't know if that had anything to do with it. But after that incident, I realized I need to really pick my words.

So I'm not sure with the cross-examination, I guess if it's -- if I were to put myself up in a spot to be cross-examined, I'd still do it, but I would make sure I definitely know what I want to say and take my time with my answers.

MS. PLUNKETT: You mentioned how you changed some details of that story. If someone tells you a story and re-tells the story and some details have changed, how do you feel about that story?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1082: I guess even with my own -- if you change the story, that leaves doors open for -- you're

changing the story. How credible is it? So, I guess, depending on the details, I guess even with my own, I would see the details changing as a problem.

MS. PLUNKETT: It's a problem in the sense that your credibility was called into question?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1082: Yeah. I can see why, with what I said and how I changed things, that I was found at fault for my thing. So I could see why for other people it would have that same effect.

MS. PLUNKETT: Thank you.

Does anyone else agree with Mr. Sanders, that if you hear a story and you hear the story again and details have changed, that that person's credibility is called into question? Does anyone agree with that by a show of hands?

Will you pass the mic back to Ms. Higgs.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1034: Dee Higgs, Badge 1034.

MS. PLUNKETT: Thank you. Can you elaborate on that a little bit?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1034: Well, if someone is telling a story, they're the one, obviously, that's -- that has experienced it, they're telling the story, there shouldn't be a reason why they would change the details in it. And yeah, I would question their credibility.

MS. PLUNKETT: Thank you.

Can you pass the mic to Ms. Johnson.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1045: Sonya Johnson, 1045.

MS. PLUNKETT: Do you agree with Ms. Higgs' sentiment? PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1045: Yeah, to an extent. I feel like the truth is the truth and your story, in detail, should be the same, no matter what. But I can understand if, in the moment, you're trying to say one thing but your words get jumbled and you try to correct it also. In your mind, you're just correcting what happened. But to the other person, it can seem like your credibility is shot.

MS. PLUNKETT: And you would be able to listen to multiple stories and determine what you believe is correct?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1045: Yes.

MS. PLUNKETT: Okay. Who else raised their hand to that? Will you pass the mic to Mr. Bucsit?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1043: Leonard Bucsit, Badge No. 1043.

MS. PLUNKETT: Thank you. Would you agree with Ms. Johnson, that if details of a story have changed, that you would be able to determine on your own, based on other evidence, what you believe happened?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1043: Well, if he's telling the truth, then it would be okay. But after if everybody else would change the story, then now would have to have evidence, you know. So he would have to come up and let us know what was the real truth. Because story changes, so you be listening to one story for the longest time, and all of a sudden a different story would change.

MS. PLUNKETT: If the complaining witness tells multiple

Any additional questions by counsel --

MR. LEXIS: Yes.

THE COURT: -- of this jury panel?

MR. LEXIS: I just want to clarify some stuff, folks. As you heard the judge say, as you heard me say earlier, the State has the burden of proof; does anyone disagree with that?

As defense counsel came up here and brought out, some of you want the defendant to testify. Well, that's not the law. Okay. All of you -- is there anyone here that will not follow the law that is given to you by the judge? Let the record reflect no response.

The State has the burden of proof. If we call up a witness, one witness, and they say, Oh, I think it might be that guy, I'm not -- 50/50, the State hasn't met their burden of proof. The defendant does not need to testify. They don't need to come up here and say oh, yeah, and prove that I wasn't the guy. We have not met our burden, so he's not guilty. Wanting him to testify is not the standard; us proving our case is the standard. Does anybody have a problem with that? Let the record reflect, no response.

Defense counsel also brought up stories and how they -- somebody reflects them when they change them.

Can you please pass the mic to 1045, ma'am.

And I believe you stated something to the effect that it's going to depend maybe on the moment?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1045: Yes.

MR. LEXIS: All right. If somebody came in this room right

now and start attacking one of the COs and we took voluntary statements from everybody, do you think everyone is going to say the exact same thing?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1045: No, not at all.

MR. LEXIS: Okay. Do you think maybe sometimes somebody might think that they came from the right-hand side, or maybe it was a left punch instead of a right punch or et cetera, et cetera?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1045: Yes.

MR. LEXIS: Okay. Does anyone disagree with that? Does anyone think, oh, yeah, it's -- even when the -- when you're in the moment, and then afterwards everything needs to line up perfectly and everybody is going to have to say the same story every time, per detail, for them to be credible? Let the record reflect, no response.

Nothing further, Your Honor.

THE COURT: At this time, ladies and gentlemen, there's some housekeeping matters that the court and counsel need to take care of. I'm going to have a -- a short recess.

So during the recess you're admonished not to talk or converse among yourselves or with anyone else on any subject connected with this trial, read, watch, or listen to any report or commentary on the trial or any person connected with this trial by any medium of information, including, without limitation, social media, text, newspapers, television, the Internet, and radio; do not do any posting or communications on any social network sites or do any independent research, including Internet searches, or form or express any opinion on

MR. LEXIS: 1063.

THE COURT: Okay. Any other challenges for cause, counsel?

MR. LEXIS: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Defense?

MR. COYER: Your Honor, we do not object to the removal of 1018, Ms. Khuu, and 1063, Mr. Lopez.

THE COURT: Does the defense have any other challenges for cause?

MR. COYER: Yes, Your Honor. We have five. The first one is Ms. Esther Ramos, Badge 0980. This is the woman who, if you will recall, mentioned that her son was murdered and the case remained unsolved. She -- we all spent, I think, a little bit of time focused on her. And she was very equivocal in her answers about whether or not her feelings with respect to what happened with her son would -- would cause her to be able to sit as a fair and impartial juror. She specifically said at one point she felt she didn't get justice. That's -- that's troubling, I think, for obvious reasons. She also stated at one point that Mr. Valencia should have to prove his innocence, those were her words.

Given all of those factors, Judge, I think that she meets the criteria to be stricken for cause. And I would cite to the *Preciado v. State* case in support of that motion, 318 P.3rd 176. Supreme court said a prospective juror who is anything less than unequivocal about her impartiality should be excused for cause. So that's our first challenge, Judge.

THE COURT: Any others, counsel?

MR. COYER: Yes, Your Honor. Our second one is for John Baborian, Badge No. 1090. This is the gentleman you may recall who stated that his -- he had a very close uncle who was chasing a suspect through the streets of New York City and was killed in that pursuit. Those facts are, in some ways, similar to the facts of this case, in the sense that there's a -- there's a chase from the police to, you know, engaged him with a suspect. And that's when the alleged assault occurs, is during this foot pursuit.

At one point yesterday when I pressed him, he did say that he was, "I am partial." That was specifically with respect to a bias toward law enforcement. So I think given that, he also meets the criteria to be -- to be stricken for cause, Judge.

Third, if I may continue, is Glenn Locke, Badge 1004. He was kind of all over the map. But at one point he did state that he had a bias in favor of law enforcement. And I would also -- I have some concerns that he was one of the individuals who saw my co-counsel in the news. We approached the bench, he said that it wouldn't affect him, as I recall. But nonetheless, I think in an abundance of caution, he should be stricken for cause.

Fourth is Marissa Buncio -- Buncio, Badge No. 1011. When asked about a bias toward law enforcement, her answer was, "It depends." That was her first answer that she was -- that she gave.

And then finally, Christopher Sanders, Badge No. 0977. He clearly stated just recently that he needs to hear from the defendant. He wants to hear him speak up for himself. He wants to hear the defendant

25

testify. It would be very difficult for him to vote in our favor if he doesn't hear that.

I also have a concern with him being subordinate to Mr. Antheaume. We don't have a basis to strike Mr. Antheaume for cause at this time, so he may end up on the jury. And I -- I don't think it would be proper for Mr. Sanders to be under the pressure of potentially trying to vote against his boss. I think he clearly indicated that would make him feel uncomfortable.

So those are our five challenges, Judge.

MR. LEXIS: What was the fourth one?

MR. COYER: Marissa Buncio --

MR. LEXIS: What's --

MR. COYER: -- 1011.

THE COURT: State, do you want to be heard in opposition of the defense challenges for cause?

MR. LEXIS: Yes. As far as 977, we have no objection to kicking that person.

THE COURT: To excusing him?

MR. LEXIS: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. LEXIS: As far as 1045 --

MR. COYER: Wait, I didn't -- I didn't mention a 1045.

MR. LEXIS: Sorry. 1090 --

MR. COYER: Okay.

MR. LEXIS: -- I mean, Judge, that's not the standard, as far

as having similar facts as the case at hand. This individual said, pressed, when asked the group the question and individual questions, he could be fair and impartial. And once it was explained to them that the defendant does not need to testify and the State has the burden of proof, same for several of his other challenges, once they were -- they just don't know the law. But once they were instructed that State has the burden of proof, he doesn't need to prove his innocence, he doesn't need to take the stand, they all unequivocally did not have any opposition to the fact that they're going to follow the law and not hold that against him.

As far as objections related to police, they -- they all have their own common sense and background and experience. And once again, when pressed and say -- and given the example, can they be fair and impartial? Yes. Will you not give automatically, just say oh, yeah, they're automatically telling the truth, whether it's a doctor, firefighter, officer, they all unequivocally stated no, as well. So we would object to the other four for-cause challenges.

THE COURT: Thank you, counsel. I'm going to take a brief recess.

[Court recessed at 12:19 p.m. until 12:31 p.m.]

[Outside the presence of the prospective jury panel.]

THE COURT: I'm going to excuse the following jurors -potential jurors for cause. Badge No. 1018; Badge No. 1063;

Badge No. 0977; Badge No. 0980; and Badge No. 1090.

Randy, I'm going to bring them in, excuse those individuals,

THE COURT: -- Badge No. 1101?

years ago.

THE COURT: And was that you, sir?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1101: That was me, yes.

THE COURT: Okay. Is there anything about that experience that would make it difficult for you to be fair and impartial to both sides in this case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1101: No. My memory is not that good.

THE COURT: Have you or close family member ever been the victim of a crime?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1101: We had a burglary in the house. My wife was doing an in-home drug test for an insurance policy. While she was in the bathroom giving a specimen, the woman stole the jewelry off the island. She insisted that that had happened, and I said, oh, you're -- but she called Metro and they came and investigated. Ultimately recovered the stuff, so --

THE COURT: Okay. And so you were satisfied how Metro -- PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1101: Oh, absolutely. Yeah.

THE COURT: -- handled the situation?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1101: Yeah.

THE COURT: Okay. Was there anything about that experience -- well, was there anything about that experience that would make it difficult for you to be fair and impartial to both sides?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1101: No.

THE COURT: Besides anything you've already told us, do

you have any close relatives or friends who have ever been engaged in law enforcement? Do you have any friends or family members who are or police officers, federal agents, anything in law enforcement?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1104: Nothing, sir. No.

THE COURT: Okay. Are you picking him up?

THE COURT RECORDER: Yeah.

THE COURT: If you could just speak up just a little bit so my court recorder can -- can record this, I'd appreciate it.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1104: Sorry, Your Honor. I'm not really speak English.

THE COURT: All right. You don't really have anybody in law enforcement? You don't know anybody in law enforcement?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1104: No, sir.

THE COURT: Okay. It is anticipated that certain law enforcement officers will testify in this case; will you give more credibility to their testimony by the mere fact that they are law enforcement officers?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1104: [No audible response.]

THE COURT: Some law enforcement officers may testify in this case; are you going to believe them more so than anybody else just because of the mere fact that they're a law enforcement officer?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1104: I didn't understand, sir.

THE COURT: I'm sorry, sir?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1104: I'm not -- I'm not understand, sir.

THE COURT: Okay. Are -- are you having difficulty understanding what I'm telling you, sir?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1104: I understand a little bit, you know.

THE COURT: Okay. Is there anything that you haven't understood that I've asked you previously? Have you understood everything I've asked you?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1104: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Okay. And my question is, it's anticipated that certain law enforcement officers may testify in this case. Are you going to believe them over somebody else who's not a law enforcement officer just because they're a law enforcement officer? Are you willing to listen to all the witnesses before you make a decision?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1104: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: You're willing to listen to all the witnesses before you make a decision?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1104: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. And do you agree that if you are chosen to serve as a juror in this case that you will honor your duty to be completely fair and impartial and listen to all of the evidence; do you agree that -- that, sir?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1104: Yeah, I agree, sir.

THE COURT: Okay. If you could, pass the microphone to Mr. Eldridge -- Ms. Eldridge, I'm sorry.

And your badge number is 10 -- 1105; is that correct?

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Have you or close family member ever been convicted of a crime?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1105: No.

THE COURT: I'm sorry. Have you or close family member ever been the victim of a crime?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1105: Yes.

THE COURT: And could you explain, please?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1105: About 10 years ago, my sister got robbed and the guy grab her bag from behind, so her arm got dislocated.

THE COURT: Was that here in Clark County, Nevada?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1105: No. It was in California.

THE COURT: Okay. Do you believe that experience by your sister would make it difficult for you to be fair and impartial to both sides in this case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1105: I believe no.

THE COURT: So you could be fair and impartial?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1105: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. Besides anything you have already told us, do you have any close relatives or friends who have ever been engaged in law enforcement?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1105: No.

THE COURT: Okay. And it's anticipated that certain law enforcement officers will testify in this case; will you give more credibility to their testimony by the mere fact that they are law enforcement

20

21

22

23

24

25

officers?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1105: No.

THE COURT: And do you agree that if you are chosen to serve as a juror in this case, that you will honor your duty to be completely fair and impartial and to listen carefully to all of the evidence in this case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1105: Yes, I will. But I got to state something. My English level actually is not that good. My understanding is a little worse than my speaking, so --

THE COURT: Okay. Have you not understood anything I've said to you today?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1105: I understand.

THE COURT: Okay.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1105: But I have to say that, because I don't want to cause any misunderstanding.

THE COURT: No, I understand. And is English a second language?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1105: Yes.

THE COURT: And what's your first language?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1105: Chinese.

THE COURT: Okay. If you don't understand anything that is said, raise your hand. Okay.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1105: Okay.

THE COURT: Let me know that you don't understand something.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1110: I was an alternate juror one time.

THE COURT: And was that in a civil matter or criminal matter?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1110: Criminal, DWI.

THE COURT: Okay. And without telling me what the verdict was, did the jury reach a verdict in that case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1110: No, they didn't.

THE COURT: Okay. And you weren't the foreperson; you were an alternate, correct?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1110: I was an alternate, didn't vote.

THE COURT: Okay. Is there anything about that experience that would affect your ability to be fair and impartial in this case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1110: No.

THE COURT: And have you ever testified as a witness in a criminal matter?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1110: Yes.

THE COURT: And could you explain, please?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1110: The defendant was somebody who I had worked with. And the prosecution said that he was a making devices to help drug smuggling and he was saying that it was to -- as an invention for aircraft collision avoidance. And my testimony was the -- was the capabilities and limitations of the electronic equipment that he was using.

That was all.

THE COURT: Okay. Were you -- was it Metro that did the investigation?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1110: Yes, it was.

THE COURT: Were you satisfied with how Metro handled the situation?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1110: No, I wasn't.

THE COURT: Okay. Do you believe that experience would make it difficult for you to be fair and impartial to both sides in this case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1110: No.

THE COURT: Why not, sir?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1110: It was an experience long ago and I thought the Metro tried very well, but apparently it was juveniles involved. And I think they knew who it was, but they wouldn't tell me, of course, which was probably a smart thing to do. So -- but nonetheless, after it was broken into the first time, apparently they did the same thing a second time. And that's what I was dissatisfied with.

THE COURT: Okay. But you're not going to hold that against Metro? I mean, that occurred a long --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1110: Oh, no.

THE COURT: -- time ago and you could still be fair and impartial in this case, couldn't you?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1110: Oh, absolutely.

THE COURT: Okay. And besides anything you may have already told us, do you have any close relatives or friends who have

ever been engaged in law enforcement?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1110: My wife has a nephew who is a deputy sheriff in Washington state. I don't think he's still serving now though.

THE COURT: Okay. Are you close with him?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1110: No. I haven't spoken with him for many years.

THE COURT: All right. So you don't talk to him about his job or anything related to his job when he was in law enforcement?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1110: No.

THE COURT: All right. And it's anticipated that certain law enforcement officers will testify in this case; will you give more credibility to their testimony by the mere fact they are law enforcement officers?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1110: No.

THE COURT: And do you agree that if you are chosen to serve as a juror in this case, that you will honor your duty to be completely fair and impartial and to listen carefully to all of the evidence in this case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1110: Yes.

THE COURT: Thank you, sir. If you can pass down to Mr. McTeir, if I pronounced that correctly -- or Ms. McTeir.

See, there's no -- there's no designation in front of the name. I only have last name on my chart, so I apologize.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1126: You did the name good. THE COURT: Yeah.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1126: I have a cousin that was convicted for embezzlement back East.

THE COURT: Are you close with your cousin?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1126: Yes and no. We don't really talk much.

THE COURT: Okay.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1126: And when we see each other, it's all we talk.

THE COURT: Is there anything about that experience that would make it difficult you -- difficult for you to be fair and impartial to both sides?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1126: No, not at all.

THE COURT: Have you or close family member ever been the victim of a crime?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1126: Something small here, our windows were shot out in our vehicles. It was a community where a bunch of kids went out and were just shooting out windows of cars.

THE COURT: Okay. An you weren't present when that occurred?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1126: We were sleeping.

THE COURT: All right.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1126: It happened at night.

THE COURT: And did you report it to law enforcement?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1126: They actually came to our house, knocking on the door at 4:00 in the morning.

24

25

1

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1126: He's a patrolman back East also, in Pittsburgh.

THE COURT: Okay. And do you speak to your cousin regularly?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1126: No, not that often.

THE COURT: Okay. Does your knowledge about your brother and cousin's job affect your ability to be fair and impartial in this case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1126: No.

THE COURT: All right. It's anticipated that certain law enforcement officers will testify in this case. Will you give more credibility to their testimony by the mere fact that they are law enforcement officers?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1126: No, I didn't think so.

THE COURT: Okay. And do you agree that if you are chosen to serve as a juror in this case, that you will honor your duty to be completely fair and impartial and to listen carefully to all the evidence?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1126: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. State, do you have any questions for the panel?

MR. LEXIS: I'll be quick folks.

Can you please pass the mic back to Mr. Domingo, 1104.

Percentage-wise, sir, how much are you understanding?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1104: I mean, a little bit English,

you know.

the business for a few years. And then I used to be a bartender too, and then waitress.

MR. LEXIS: Okay. So you were a bartender too? You need --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1104: But you know what? I -- where I work is mostly people from Hong Kong, from -- I mean, the -- the customer, they're Chinese, so that's why. And anyway, at that time, my English is really worse than now.

MR. LEXIS: And you seem to understand me just fine; is that correct?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1104: Yes.

MR. LEXIS: And if you are picked as a juror and you are having a hard time communicating with the other jurors, will you let them know that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1104: I believe I can communicate. But just, I don't mean -- I don't mean I don't understand. But just to communicate, probably not really fluent.

MR. LEXIS: That's fine, ma'am. You don't need to be fluent. PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1104: Okay. I -- I don't -- I don't -- I mean, I -- I'm not avoiding anything, but I have to tell the truth that I -- my listening, the understanding is just not as good as I talk, because when you talk, you have more -- more, how to say it, you easy to handle what you want to tell than -- than you passively listening. So that's -- that's my question.

MR. LEXIS: You're --

PROSPECT	IVE JUROR NO. 1104	. That's my problem.
MR. LEXIS:	giving a pretty good	explanation, so it seems

like you're understanding what I'm saying and the judge; is that correct?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1104: Yes.

MR. LEXIS: Okay. Just directing the questions to the five people, the new people. For the most -- pass it up to -- take you off the hot seat, ma'am.

1110, sir, is there anything in your past that would affect your ability to cast judgment upon the defendant at the end of this trial?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1110: No.

MR. LEXIS: Any of the new people who would have any hindrance of casting judgment at the end? Let the record reflect, no response.

Sir, do you understand that you are not to be concerned with sentencing when you're deliberating?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1110: What is that again?

MR. LEXIS: You are not to be concerned with sentencing in your deliberations?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1110: Yes, I am.

MR. LEXIS: Okay. And you understand that is 100 percent up to the judge?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1110: Yes.

MR. LEXIS: You are only to decide -- you're the trier of fact, whether or not the defendant is guilty or not guilty?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1110: Yes.

MR. LEXIS: Does any of the new people disagree with that notion? Let the record reflect, no response.

Sir, do you know my questions previously -- first of all, you would agree that the State has a burden of proof?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1110: Yes.

MR. LEXIS: The defendant does not need to testify?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1110: Yes.

MR. LEXIS: And if he does not testify, that doesn't change the fact the State has the burden of proof?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1110: That's correct, yes.

MR. LEXIS: Does any of the new people disagree with that notion? Let the record reflect, no response.

Sir, same type of questions previously as well; if just one person took that stand and you believe that person beyond a reasonable doubt, would you be able to find guilty or are you somebody that says no, if it's just one person, I am going to need something more, I'm going to need another independent witness, I'm going to need some type of forensic evidence?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1110: I would have -- have to judge that one person's credibility.

MR. LEXIS: Okay. Any of the new people disagree with that notion; you would need something more? Let the record reflect no response.

Do any of you have anything in your past or any question that wasn't asked that would affect your ability to be fair and impartial? The

11 12

13

14

15

jury?

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

record reflect no response.

Sir, last question. I'll just pose it to all the new people. If the same crime is committed against a homeless drug addict gang member, and the same crime is committed against a doctor in Summerlin, do you believe the District Attorney's Office should prosecute the crime against the doctor more aggressively than the homeless drug addict, sir,

Number 1110?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1110: No.

MR. LEXIS: Should prosecute them both equally?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1110: Yes.

MR. LEXIS: Does anybody disagree with that notion? Let the record reflect no response.

No further questions, Judge.

THE COURT: Defense, do you have any guestions of the

MS. PLUNKETT: Very -- very briefly --

THE COURT: Of the new panel members?

MS. PLUNKETT: -- Judge. Good afternoon. Mr. Keith?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1110: Yes.

MS. PLUNKETT: Give your name and badge number.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1110: My name is Edward Keith and I'm 1110.

MS. PLUNKETT: Thank you. The case where you testified for the defense, was that here in Clark County?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1110: No. It was in California.

MS. PLUNKETT: And what year was that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1110: 1982.

MS. PLUNKETT: Thank you. Will you pass the microphone to the back row, Mr. Layne.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1101: Wes Layne, 1101.

MS. PLUNKETT: Thank you. What did you discuss today with your friend who is a Metro police officer?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1101: A case that he had been on just last week where a woman was so intoxicated or high that she had inadvertently stabbed her boyfriend to death thinking that she was killing herself. He thought that I had probably seen about it on the news, but I'm not a news person. I don't watch the news. But we talked a little bit about that. And we also talked about the fact that -- how burdensome this whole process is.

MS. PLUNKETT: Burdensome in what way?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1101: In just the repetition and asking the same questions over and over again.

MS. PLUNKETT: Did you both agree that it was a burdensome process?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1101: Absolutely.

MS. PLUNKETT: Did you discuss who the defendant was in this case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1101: No.

MS. PLUNKETT: Did you discuss who the attorneys were in this case?

9

10 11

12 13

14

15 16

17

18 19

20 21

22

24

23 25 anyone has an opinion on Mr. Valencia's guilt or innocence simply because we are here because the State has brought charges against him; does anyone have an opinion on that? Let the record reflect no hands.

That's all I have, Judge.

THE COURT: Counsel approach.

[Bench conference transcribed as follows:]

THE COURT: I assume there's going to be a couple of challenges for cause. Let's go -- let them go for five minutes, do a -- I mean, let you make your record. I'll make my determination. Depending on how many -- go do our lunch break at 1:30. So it's about 10 after. I think we could probably handle the challenges for cause, so maybe depending on how many, seat the new panel --

MR. LEXIS: Can we just go until we get the jury, Judge? We're almost there.

THE COURT: Well, it's -- it's -- I'll -- I'll leave it up -- again, my staff hasn't had a break. We've been on the bench since 9:00. We had a short break between my law and motion calendar, so let's take care of the challenges for cause first. So we'll excuse them real quick, just tell them to stick around. And then you can make your record and then we'll go from there.

MR. LEXIS: Do you have more than just that guy, the Spanish --

THE COURT: Well, you know what, let's give -- let's get it on the record and we'll go from there.

[End of bench conference.]

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, there's some housekeeping matters that we need to take care of. So this should only be about 5, 10 minutes. So I'm going to take a recess right now. I have to admonish you.

So during this recess, you're admonished not to talk or converse among yourselves or with anyone else on any subject connected with this trial, or read, watch, or listen to any report or commentary on the trial or any person connected with this trial by any medium of information, including without limitation, social media, text, newspapers, television, the Internet, and radio; do not do any posting or communications on any social networking sites or do any independent research, including Internet searches, or form or express any opinion on any subject connected with the trial and the case is finally submitted to you.

If -- we're going to take about 5, 10-minute recess. So don't wander too far off. And as soon as we finish, we'll have you come back in. Thank you.

[Prospective jury panel recessed at 1:09 p.m.]

THE COURT: Let the record reflect the jury is not present.

Does the State have any challenges for cause of the new panel

members?

MR. DICKERSON: Your Honor, yes. State is challenging for cause Badge No. 1104, Ronquillo Domingo, based on the fact that he doesn't understand English. It was pretty clear from the questioning that

he didn't understand English, that from the court, that from the State, that from the defense. Then he confirmed it with his assessment of his own ability to understand, being about 15 percent. I think that probably squares with exactly what we saw, is about 15 percent of what we were saying he understood. Based on that, Your Honor, we're moving to excuse that juror, Badge No. 1104.

THE COURT: Defense, what's your position on Mr. Domingo?

MR. COYER: We don't object to him being excused.

THE COURT: Okay. So we're -- State -- any other challenges for cause of the new panel members?

MR. DICKERSON: No further challenges for cause.

THE COURT: Defense?

MR. COYER: Judge, I guess I would just note for the record that if we're excusing people for language barriers in general, I'm not sure what percentage it becomes sufficient to leave someone on. I have some concerns about Ms. Eldridge, Badge No. 1105, because I anticipate some of the evidence will be audio dispatch, which can be, even for -- if you're a 100 percent English, it can be difficult to hear those sometimes. So given that, I think maybe in an abundance of caution, she should be removed for cause as well, due to language.

THE COURT: State, what's your position on Ms. Eldridge?

MR. DICKERSON: We oppose her removal, Your Honor. I
think that it was extremely clear from the way she was answering
questions, her demeanor here in court, and I would ask Your Honor to
find the same thing, that she understood what was going on. She's had

3

9 10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17

18 19

20

21

23

22

24

25

several businesses that she's owned and different jobs that are much higher level and interactive with the public than we've seen some -- from some of the other folks that had lesser ability to understand English. I think her estimate of maybe not understanding 5 percent was -- it was what it was. But at the end of the day, I think that probably half the people on there that speak English as their first language might not understand 5 percent of what happens during the day.

THE COURT: And I would note for the record, counsel, that when asked certain questions about her ability to understand, I know this is a cold record when it goes up on appeal, so I want to note for the record, before she asked, she kind of smiled, and then indicated that she can understand, I believe, 95 percent. So I think, again, this is a cold record. But she seemed to be able to understand. And when pressed, she would kind of just smile and give an answer that she did understand. I just want to note that for the record.

Any other challenges for cause?

MR. COYER: Not from the defense, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. I'm just going to take two seconds. Just remain seated.

[Court recessed at 1:13 p.m. until 1:15 p.m.]

[Outside the presence of the prospective jury panel.]

THE COURT: Back on the record. I am going to excuse for cause Mr. Domingo. And so you can bring the -- is there any other argument, counsel?

MR. LEXIS: No, Your Honor.

23

24

25

make it difficult for you to be fair and impartial in this case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1127: No.

THE COURT: Besides anything you've already told us, do you have any close relatives or friends who have ever been engaged in law enforcement?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1127: Most of them. All -- practically all the male in my in-laws are former or now police officers.

THE COURT: And how many males in your family that you're speaking of?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1127: My father-in-law was LAPD; my brother-in-law just retired San Bernardino PD; my nephew is a detective for LAPD. That's all I can think of right now.

THE COURT: Okay. And do you ever speak to them about their job?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1127: Not voluntarily.

THE COURT: All right. So mainly, your interaction with your in-laws is just socially?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1127: Correct.

THE COURT: Okay. And it's -- does your knowledge about your in-laws' occupation, them being police officers, does that your -- affect your ability to be fair and impartial in this case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1127: To a lot of things.

THE COURT: Such as?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1127: Well, being married to that side of the family for 45 years, you're kind of conditioned to believe

the cops are right.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, that's somewhat my next question. It's anticipated that certain law enforcement officers are going to testify in this case; will you give more credibility to their testimony by the mere fact that they are law enforcement officers, or are you willing to hear all the testimony from all of the witnesses before you make a determination of credibility?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1127: Honestly, I -- I hope to be fair, but I have to lean toward the cops. It's just in me.

THE COURT: Okay. But if other witnesses contradict the officers and you believe those witnesses over the law enforcement, can you be fair and impartial and do that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1127: My best.

THE COURT: Have an open mind?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1127: Open mind.

THE COURT: Okay. Do you agree that if you are chosen to serve as a juror in this case, that you will honor your duty to be completely fair and impartial and to listen carefully to all of the evidence before you make a decision?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1127: Oh, yeah.

THE COURT: Okay. State, any questions?

MR. LEXIS: Ma'am, I'm sure you know where I'm going. Just because a doctor or a firefighter come in here, or a cop, what they say is -- you can't -- you got -- first need to wait and see what comes out of their mouth; will you do that?

 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1127: Oh, yeah.

MR. LEXIS: As far as sentencing, you know that's up to the judge?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1127: Yes.

MR. LEXIS: Are you going to put that aside during deliberations if you're picked?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1127: What we're told to do.

MR. LEXIS: Okay. Are you going to -- do you have anything in your past that's going to affect your ability to cast judgment at the end of this case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1127: No.

MR. LEXIS: And if just one person takes the stand and you believe that person beyond a reasonable doubt, could you be able to convict or are you someone that needs another witness or other forensic evidence?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1127: I need more info than just a one-sided deal.

MR. LEXIS: Okay. So a older woman goes out to her mailbox tonight and a guy comes up to her, mugs her, and takes off with her stuff. Couple weeks go by and she sees somebody in a neighborhood and she says, That's the guy. She calls the cops. First of all, do you believe the cops should come and arrest that guy, if she's telling police that's the man that mugged me two weeks ago?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1127: They would investigate it, wouldn't they?

MR. LEXIS: Okay.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1127: I don't know.

MR. LEXIS: Okay. Yes. There would be an investigation. But let's say that's the only thing they can could up with. I mean, the property is gone. He's not wearing the same clothing, et cetera, et cetera.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1127: They'd have to prove it.

MR. LEXIS: Okay. If that -- if that lady comes on the stand and you judge her credibility and you believe she's telling you the truth beyond a reasonable doubt, would that be enough to convict?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1127: No.

MR. LEXIS: Okay. And explain why.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1127: Because that's her side.

That's her thought process. She believes in what she's saying. You know, I can say you robbed me, and I believe that. But I -- I -- you know, someone would say well -- you know, couldn't you have more proof?

MR. LEXIS: Okay. Do you believe that those cases happen every day --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1127: Oh, yeah.

MR. LEXIS: -- where -- where there's just one person and there is no other forensic evidence, there is no --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1127: I'm sure there is.

MR. LEXIS: -- camera following people around, there's no fingerprints, no guarantee, DNA is no guarantee; so you would agree those cases happen all the time?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1127: I would imagine they would.

MR. LEXIS: Okay. And do you believe our office should prosecute those cases or say, you know what, since we only have one person that's going to testify, we should deny the case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1127: Oh, no. You should -- you should investigate it, you know.

MR. LEXIS: Okay. Let's say we do investigate it and there is no other witnesses, and there is no forensic evidence. We search for cameras, there's no cameras that captured the crime, there's no independent witnesses that captured the crime. It comes back to this lady telling us that's the man that did it. Should our office dismiss the case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1127: No, I don't think so.

MR. LEXIS: So we should prosecute that case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1127: Again, you would need to hear his side; where was he that day?

MR. LEXIS: The defendant has a right not to testify.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1127: That's true.

MR. LEXIS: State has a burden of proof. The law allows the State to just put up one witness, and evidence is testimony. And if you believe that testimony beyond a reasonable doubt --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1127: Beyond a reasonable doubt.

MR. LEXIS: -- the State is entitled for a guilty verdict; do you

Shawna Ortega • CET-562 • Certified Electronic Transcriber • 602.412.7667

10 11

12 13

14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24

25

MR. COYER: Yep.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

[End of bench conference.]

THE COURT: At this time, ladies and gentlemen, we're going to take a one-hour lunch break. So if you could come back by 2:30. Just stay out in the hallway until the marshal brings you into the courtroom.

And during this recess, you're admonished not to talk or converse among yourselves or with anyone else on any subject matter connected with this trial, read, watch, or listen to any report of or any commentary on the trial or any person connected with this trial by any medium of information, including without limitation, social media, text, newspapers, television, the Internet, and radio; do not do any posting or communications on any social networking sites or do any independent research, including Internet searches, or form or express any opinion on any subject connected with the trial until the case is submitted to you.

So we'll be in recess for one hour. Thank you.

[Prospective jury panel recessed at 1:31 p.m.]

THE COURT: Court is in recess for one hour.

MR. DICKERSON: Thank you, Judge.

MS. PLUNKETT: Thank you, Judge.

[Court recessed from 1:33 p.m. until 2:39 p.m.]

[Outside the presence of the prospective jury panel.]

THE COURT: Please be seated. This is the continuation of Case No. C-16-315580. Let the record reflect counsel for the State,

counsel for the defendant and Defendant are present outside the presence of the jury.

MR. LEXIS: Your Honor, just so you know, some of the officers that were present during this incident are here in the courtroom. We brought them in in order to bring in the evidence and open it up in front of defense counsel in order to pre-mark it, save time, and for chain-of-custody purposes.

THE COURT: Okay. Do you want -- is -- has that been done?

MR. LEXIS: It -- yes. The gun, the bag with the three drugs are all other there.

THE COURT: Is that correct, counsel?

MR. COYER: I assume so. I didn't -- we did not open the bags, but that's what they were represented to me to be. I have no reason to doubt that.

THE COURT: Okay. But I thought what he represented was they're going to pre-open the bag in your presence so there's not a chain-of-custody issue or to save time. Is that --

MR. LEXIS: Well, Your Honor, we opened up a main bag which had then separate bags in there.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. LEXIS: We will at a break then open up the individual bags too, after they're marked.

THE COURT: You know what, you can do it from the witness stand. I don't care.

MR. LEXIS: Yeah. We were just trying to -- for

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. DICKERSON: They are paper-clipped together just for our reference as to kind of keep them organized. But each page would be individually marked, unless it's -- has a staple through it, which I don't think any do.

THE COURT: Okay. And, Mr. Lexis, when did you anticipate having the evidence bags opened, at what point?

MR. LEXIS: Whenever we break, Judge.

THE COURT: Okay. After opening statements?

MR. LEXIS: Just throughout this trial whenever you break.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. DICKERSON: Or we can just do them from the stand, whatever the court --

THE COURT: Yeah.

MR. DICKERSON: -- prefers.

THE COURT: This doesn't seem like it's going to be a lengthy trial, so.

MR. LEXIS: Today is only going to be the gun, Judge.

THE COURT: Okay. It's time where we're going to do the peremptory challenges. As you're aware, you're each entitled to exercise four -- I'm sorry, that's correct, four peremptory challenges towards the proposed regular jurors and one peremptory challenge towards the alternate juror.

I was going to bring the jury panel in and have them seated, and then you can pass the -- you're going to be -- you will alternate writing your challenges down on the clerk's form, passing the form back

and forth. Any given turn, you are allowed to waive your right to challenge. We will do this process first for the proposed regular jurors. So once you do a total of eight peremptory challenges, that's going to be the first -- that will be the jury. Then you're going to each get one peremptory challenge for the alternate jurors.

So the first 12 will be the jury, and the last two, for a total of 14, will be the alternates; is that agreeable to the parties?

MR. LEXIS: Yes.

MR. DICKERSON: Yes.

MR. COYER: It is, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Then I'll review the form and ask counsel to approach before any of the challenged jurors are released. That is the time to assert any challenges under *Batson v. Kentucky* or *JVK vs. Alabama*. Any *Batson* challenges not asserted at the time will be deemed waived. So once I release the panel, if you haven't asserted your *Batson* challenge, it's waived. It has to be done before I release the -- the challenged jurors.

After resolving any *Batson* challenge, I will release any persons that will not be on the final jury panel and that's the final jury panel. Is there any questions at this time?

MR. DICKERSON: None from the State, Your Honor.

MR. COYER: None, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. So I'm going to bring the -- the jury panel in at this time and have them seated.

[Prospective jury panel reconvened at 2:45 p.m.]

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23 24

25

THE COURT: Let the record reflect that the jury panel has been seated.

Ladies and gentlemen, we're at the point in the trial where the attorneys are going to exercise what's called peremptory challenges. This will take a few minutes. If you could just have a seat quietly, converse among yourselves, and as soon as the peremptory challenge process is completed, I will announce the jury panel. So if you give us the -- take a few moments.

Do you have the form? Give it to him.

MR. DICKERSON: Thank you very much.

[Pause in proceedings.]

THE COURT: Counsel approach.

[Bench conference transcribed as follows:]

THE COURT: Is there any objection to the court accepting the peremptory challenges?

MR. LEXIS: No objection, Your Honor.

MR. DICKERSON: No.

THE COURT: Defense?

MR. COYER: No.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

[End of bench conference.]

THE COURT: It appearing to the court that all peremptory challenges have either been exercised or waived, the clerk will now call the names of the persons who will comprise the jury.

THE CLERK: Anna Dunegan, Kimberly Wasden, Wesley

21

22

23

24

25

Adams [sic], Jennifer Fighera, Xavier Antheaume, Thomas McAuley, Deatrice Higgs, Sonya Johnson, Sharon Iaconi, Leticia Morales, Shawna Perez, Susan Penrod, Amy McTeir, Edwin Blazer.

THE COURT: If your name was not called, you're going to be excused at this time. I'd like to thank everybody whose name was not called far -- for participating in the jury selection process. As you've heard your entire life, if -- it's the juries that make the system work. And I know it may seem burdensome at the time, but it's the foundation of the American justice system.

So if your name was not called, I'd like to thank and excuse each of those individuals at that time -- at this time. Thank you.

[Balance of prospective jury panel excused at 2:56 p.m.]

MS. PLUNKETT: Wesley Layne.

MR. COYER: He's on our jury.

MS. PLUNKETT: Isn't his name Wesley Layne?

THE COURT: Okay. I just got to say I'm counting 13 and I'm going -- okay. Okay.

Marshal, if you'll seat them in order, please.

[Pause in proceedings.]

THE COURT: Okay. The clerk will now administer the oath to the jurors.

## [Jury sworn.]

THE COURT: You may be seated. The jury is now fully impaneled.

At this point in the trial, I'm going to give you some preliminary

instructions. They're quite lengthy and I'm going to use a script to make sure I fully explain everything to you. The print is very small on this script, so I have to go a little bit slow. I -- because, like I said, the print is very small. So if you could just listen carefully, and I'm going to give you some preliminary instructions before the parties do their opening statements.

Ladies and gentlemen, you are admonished that no juror may declare to a fellow juror any fact relating to this case of his own knowledge. And if -- if any juror discovers during the trial or after the jury has retired that he or any other juror has personal knowledge of it -- that he or she or any other juror has personal knowledge of any fact or controversy in this case, he or she shall disclose the situation to me in the absence of the other jurors.

This means that if you learn during the course of the trial that you are acquainted with the facts of this case or the witnesses and you have not previously told us of that relationship, you must then declare that fact to me.

The way that you communicate with the court throughout our trial is through our marshal. Our marshal is Randy Stevenson. He is present at all times while we are in session. And you previously met Randy. He's the one who's been escorting you in and out during the breaks.

During the course of this trial, the attorneys for both sides, court personnel other than the marshal, are not permitted to talk with you. It's not that we are antisocial, it's simply that we are bound by

ethics and the law not to speak with you because to do so might contaminate your verdict. We are not even allowed to say hi to you if we should pass you in the hall or be in the elevator together.

If you should recognize a witness or be familiar with the facts of the case when the witness is testifying, please make a little note on your jury pad that you will -- that you recognize such-and-such witness, and how it is that you recognize that witness. At the next break in the trial, please hand that note to the marshal and he will present it to the court and counsel.

Frequently people do not recognize witnesses by name, but may recognize them when they come into the courtroom to testify. If that should happen in this case, please make a note of that as the witness is testifying, and the next break, give that note to the marshal.

You are admonished additionally that you are not to visit the scene of any of the acts or occurrences made mention of during trial unless specifically directed to do so by the court. The reason that we do not want you going out to any particular scene or location referenced during the trial is not because we don't want you to know everything there is to know about the location, but simply that there is no guarantee that the intersection, street, apartment complex, the restaurant, whatever looks the same as it did at the time of the incident. Usually photos are taken at the time of the incident or shortly thereafter, and we will use those photographs during the trial rather than going to the site to look at first hand.

This case is a criminal case commenced by the State of

 Nevada. Sometimes I may refer to it as the *State vs. Ceasar Sanchaz Valencia*. This case is based upon a second amended information. The clerk will now read the second information to you and state the plea of the defendant.

## [Information read.]

THE COURT: Thank you. This case is based upon that second amended information which has just been read to you by the clerk. You should distinctly understand that the second amended information is simply a charge and that it is not in any sense evidence of the allegations that it contains.

The defendant has pled not guilty to the charges. The State therefore has the burden of proving each of the essential elements of the second amended information beyond a reasonable doubt. The purpose of this trial is to determine whether the State will meet that burden.

It is your primary responsibility as jurors to find and determine the facts. Under our system of criminal procedure, you are the sole judge of the facts. You are to determine the facts from the testimony you hear and the other evidence, including exhibits introduced in court. It is up to you to determine the inferences which you may feel may properly be drawn from the evidence.

If during the examination of witnesses some questions occur to you, be patient. The answers will probably be given before the witness is excused. If not, write your questions on a full sheet of paper and hand it to the marshal. He will then give it to me and if the question is a proper one under the law, I will see that it is answered. Any

questions must be factual in nature and designed to clarify information already presented. If your question is asked, you may not place undue weight on the question to the -- undue weight on the answer to the question.

The parties may sometime present objections to some of the testimony or other evidence. At times I may sustain those objections or direct that you disregard certain testimony and exhibits. You must not consider any evidence to which an objection has been sustained or which I have instructed you to disregard.

It is the duty of the -- of a lawyer to object to evidence which he or she believes may not properly be offered. And you should not be prejudiced in any way against a lawyer who makes objections on behalf of the party which he or she represents.

I may also find it necessary to admonish the lawyers. If I do, you should not show prejudice towards the lawyer or his or her clients because I found it necessary to admonish him or her.

Throughout the trial, if you cannot hear a question asked by the attorney or the answer given by a witness, please raise your hands as an indication. If I don't see your hand, please say excuse me, I didn't hear that, and we will ask that question be repeated or the answer -- or the answer be repeated.

If you wish, you may take notes to help you remember what any witness has said. If you do take notes, please keep those notes to yourself until you and your fellow jurors go to the jury room to decide the case. Do not let note taking distract you so that while you are writing

down the answers to question, three or four questions are asked and answered and go right past you and you have no recollection of those answers. Notepads will be provided to you and kept in the courtroom. You can't take them with you and the marshal will collect them at the end of each day. You should rely upon your own memory of what was said and not to be overly influenced by the notes of other jurors when you go back to deliberate.

This case will proceed in the following order. First, the State will make an opening statement outlining its case. The opening statement is like roadmap or an outline. During the opening statement, the State will be telling you what they expect the evidence will be. After the State opens, the defendant has a right to make an opening statement if he or she wishes to do so. Neither party is to -- is required to make opening statements.

After the opening statements, the State will first introduce evidence. At the conclusion of the State's evidence, the defendant has a right to introduce evidence. However, please remember, the defendant is not obligated to present any evidence or to prove -- or to prove his evidence. The law never imposes upon the defendant in a criminal case the burden of calling any evidence or introducing any evidence. The defendant and his attorneys can sit through the trial and do nothing, not ask any questions, not call any witnesses, do nothing at all, because the defendant has no burden of proof in a criminal trial.

As we already discussed, the State has to prove two things to you. First, the State has to prove to you beyond a reasonable doubt that

a crime occurred. And second, the State has to prove to you, also beyond a reasonable doubt, that the defendant did it.

At the close of the defendant's case, if any, the State may introduce rebuttal evidence. At the conclusion of all the evidence, I will instruct you on the law. You must not be concerned with the wisdom of any rule of law stated in these instructions or the instructions which I will read to you after the evidence is in. Regardless of any opinion you may have as to what the law ought to be, it would be a violation of the oath to base a verdict upon any other view of the law than that given to you by the court.

Now, please understand, ladies and gentlemen, the court does not make up the law. Law in each state is created by the state legislature.

After the instructions on the law are read to you, each party has the opportunity to argue orally in support of his or her case. This is called the closing argument or summation. What is said in closing is not evidence. The arguments are designed to summarize and interpret the evidence for you and show you how the evidence and law relate to one another. Since the State has the burden of proving the defendant guilty beyond a reasonable doubt, the State has the right to both open and close the arguments, which means at the end of the trial, the State gets to argue to you twice and Defendant gets to argue to you once.

After the attorneys have presented their arguments, you will retire to select a foreperson to deliberate and arrive at your verdict.

Faithful performance by you of your duties is vital to the administration of

justice. It is your duty to determine the facts and determine -- and determine them from the evidence and reasonable inferences arising from such evidence. And in so doing, you must not indulge in guesswork or speculation.

The evidence which you are to consider consists of testimony of witnesses and the exhibits admitted in evidence. The term witness means anyone who testifies in person or by way of deposition and may include the parties to the lawsuit. A deposition is simply an examination of the witness at a prior date under oath with the attorneys present where the testimony is taken down in written form and those written questions and answers will be read to you during the trial.

Admission of evidence in court is governed by rules of law. From time to time, there -- it may be the duty of the attorney to make objections and my duty as the judge to rule on those objections, and decide whether a certain question may be answered or whether certain evidence may be admitted. You must not concern yourself with any objections made by the attorneys or with the court's reasons for its rulings.

You must not consider testimony, exhibits -- exhibits to which an objection has been sustained or which has been ordered stricken. Further, you must not consider anything which you may have seen or heard when the court is not in session, even -- even if what you see or hear is said or done by one of the parties or by one of the witnesses.

While you are in the courthouse, please always wear the badge the marshal just gave you or you will be given -- or which the

marshal has just given you. When you come in in the morning, during the breaks, during the daytime, or during the noon recess, when you are in the elevator or walk -- walking around in the hallway, I always tell my jury panels, please only talk with people wearing a badge that indicates they are jurors.

The witness in this -- the witnesses in this trial and all the rest of the trials that are going on today in this building are not identified in any way. You will not know if you are carrying on a conversation with a witness in this trial until it's too late and they come and they take the witness stand and they're sworn to testify. Therefore, I would urge you not to talk to anyone in this building unless they're identified as a juror, because if they're identified as a juror, you know that they're not going to have anything to do with this case.

In every case there are two types of evidence; direct evidence and circumstantial evidence. Direct evidence is testimony by witnesses about what they saw, heard, or did. Circumstantial evidence is testimony or exhibits which are proof of a particular fact from which, if that fact is proven, you can infer the existence of a second fact. You may consider both direct and circumstantial evidence in deciding this case.

The law permits you to give equal weight to both types of evidence, but it is up to you to decide how much weight to give to any particular piece of evidence. Opening statements and closing arguments are intended to help you in understanding the evidence and in applying the law. But please understand, the attorneys tell -- please

understand, what the attorneys tell you is not evidence. They are not witnesses. They have no firsthand information, and therefore, what they tell you is not evidence.

You are not to concern yourself in any way with the sentence which the defendant might receive if you should find him guilty. Your function is solely to decide whether the State has proven to you beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant is guilty of the crimes charged. If, and only if, you find him guilty, then it becomes the duty of the court at a later date to process sentence.

You must not be influenced in any degree by any personal feeling or sympathy for or prejudice against any party to the lawsuit, for each party is entitled to the same fair and impartial consideration. No statement, ruling, remark or facial expression -- expression which I may make during the course of the trial is intended to indicate my opinion as to what the facts are. I don't get to decide the facts. You are the ones who determine the facts.

In this determination, you alone must decide upon the believability of the evidence and its weight and value. In considering the weight and value of the testimony of any witness, you may take into consideration the appearance, attitude, and behavior of the witness, the interest of the witness in the outcome of the lawsuit, the relationship of the witness to any party to the lawsuit, the inclination of the witness to speak truthfully or not, the probability or improbability of the witness statements, and all other facts and circumstances in evidence. Thus, you may give the testimony of any witness just such weight and value as

you believe that witness is entitled to receive.

I may, during the trial, take notes of what the witnesses are saying. Do not make any inference from this action on my part, because I'm required to be prepared for legal arguments of the attorneys during the trial. For that reason, I may take extensive notes.

Again, let me remind you that until this case is submitted to you, do not talk to each other about it or about anyone who has anything to do with it until the end of the -- of the case when you get -- when you go to the jury room to decide your verdict. Do not talk with anyone else about this case or about anyone who has anything to do with it until the trial has ended and you've been discharged as jurors. Anyone else includes members of your family and your friends.

Those of you who are employed obviously need to call their boss today at one of the breaks and tell him or her you have been chosen as a juror in a criminal case and the judge has told you the trial is going to last three to five days. You may also tell him that -- that if the trial is over earlier than that, you will be back to work sooner. That's all you can tell your workplace until after you have been discharged by the court.

Do not let anyone talk to you about this case or about anyone who has anything to do with this case. If someone should try to talk to you about this case while you are serving as a juror, please report that to me immediately by contacting my bailiff -- my marshal.

Do not read any news stories or articles or listen to any radio or television reports about the case or about anyone that has anything to

do with it. Do not research or make any investigation about this case on your own. Now, this is a very simple instruction, so simple that people frequently ignore it, overlook it, or do not comprehend it. So let me amplify the instruction.

That means if something happens during the trial and there is some testimony or some witness that you do not understand what they are talking about and you know that your best friend may be an expert in this area, you cannot call him and say, Hey, in the trial today, the witness are talking about this and that, and next thing, and can you explain to me. It also means that you cannot go on the Internet or social media or anything such as that and look up anything about the -- anything to do about this trial.

Do not make up your mind about what the verdict should be until after you have gone to the jury room to decide the case and you and your fellow jurors have discussed the evidence. It is important throughout the trial to keep an open mind.

At the end of this trial, you will have to make your decision based on what you recall of the evidence. You will not have a written transcript to consult. Even though we have a court recorder who takes down the testimony, it is not typed into a readable format and is difficult and time consuming for the court recorder to read back lengthy testimony. Therefore, I would urge you to pay close attention to the testimony as it is given.

We will now hear opening statements. But before that, does either party invoke the exclusionary rule regarding witnesses?

MR. COYER: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: The exclusionary rule having been invoked, is there anybody present who expects to be called as a witness in this matter? And if so, you are directed to please leave the courtroom. There appears to be nobody present in the courtroom who may be a witness in this case.

State of Nevada, are you prepared to present your opening statement?

MR. DICKERSON: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Please proceed.

MR. DICKERSON: Thank you very much.

Ladies and gentlemen, Thursday, May 19th, 2016, began pretty much normal for our two Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department officers, Officer Christopher Houston and Officer Jeremy Jacobitz. They had attended a church barbecue at the Downtown Area Command and were just leaving around 7:45 p.m.

They were pulling out of this area here, the Downtown Area Command, which is the police station for the downtown area, just like it sounds. And as they're pulling out, they see through the houses across 9th Street a moped speeding down the alley, speeding northbound down that alley that runs between 9th Street and 10th Street.

Now, Officer Jacobitz, he's driving. Officer Houston, he's riding passenger, working the radio. You'll hear that they don't always work together, but when they do, that's generally how they do it, is

 Officer Jacobitz will drive and Officer Houston will work the radio and the computer.

They see this. They decide to go check out that moped that's racing through the alleyway. As they do that, they see that moped come down Wilson Avenue and blow through the stop sign in the area of 10th and Wilson. They get behind it, ready to light it up to do a traffic stop, you'll hear that's going to be putting on their lights and sirens.

As they get into the apartment complex right here -- there's an apartment complex at 11th and Wilson. You'll hear that there's a parking lot right there. And that's where the moped pulled in. There, that moped pulls up to a gate that's located right towards the -- the front of the apartment complex. The rider, still on the moped, is fumbling with the gate. That's when they hit the air horn.

Officer Houston, Officer Jacobitz immediately see this individual turn around, Ceasar Valencia. At that point in time, they see his face. It's very clear, he's wide-eyed like a deer in headlights. He just had an air horn hit on him in this parking lot. And that's when he takes the opportunity to turn back around and drive that moped right back up 9th Street -- or back Wilson.

So he goes westbound on Wilson and then makes a left. And as he makes that left, he comes down 10th Street. Coming down 10th Street, southbound, he goes into another parking lot, this time the parking lot of 610 10th Street. Here in the parking lot of 610 10th Street, the defendant, Ceasar Valencia, dumps that moped that he's on and starts running.

He runs into an alleyway that's located right here at 610

North 10th Street. You'll see it highlighted right there. That alleyway, it's a pretty thin entryway. And you'll hear that Officer Jacobitz is the first out. As Officer Jacobitz pulls in, his driver's side is closer to the entryway of this alley. Officer Jacobitz, out of the vehicle, running, Officer Houston coming around from the passenger side.

So Officer Jacobitz gets right about to this point, looking down the alleyway, as he notices the defendant, Ceasar Valencia, turning with a gun in his hand. It's right there where Ceasar Valencia was standing, right near that yellow cone and that fence post. The firearm that he pulled out was a .38 Special Taurus revolver.

As he turns, Mr. Valencia pointing the gun at Officer

Jacobitz -- Officer Jacobitz will tell you at this point in time, he has his
service weapon out, he's putting the gun up and his finger is getting on
that trigger. He's thinking, I'm going to be shot, I'm going to shoot. It's a
split second, and maybe the luckiest split second of his life.

Next thing that happens, the defendant, Ceasar Valencia's arm, as he's turning around, hits that metal fence post that had been stuck there that -- apparently from an old fence, that they didn't pull the fence post out, but they took the fence post down. By the grace of God, that gun dropped right there on the ground.

Ceasar Valencia keeps running. The gun is on the ground.

Officer Jacobitz, holstering his weapon, realizing, I almost just got shot, I almost just shot somebody, stands by the gun as his partner, Officer Houston runs past following Ceasar Valencia.

You'll hear that that gun's on the ground. This is in a neighborhood, as you saw. Officer Jacobitz knows right then his focus is staying with that gun. He doesn't want to move it. He's going to stay right where it is and not touch it, but this means that he has to separate from his partner. Well, it is what it is. He can't leave the gun there and he wants to preserve the evidence. So he stays there. Officer Houston keeps running after Ceasar Valencia.

Officer Houston, chasing the defendant, Ceasar Valencia, gets into the area of 623-625 North 10th Street. It's in this area where he ends up losing the defendant, Ceasar Valencia. You'll hear that the address of 625 North 10th Street is Ceasar Valencia's address. That's where he lives.

In the meantime, back there at 610 North 10th -- excuse me, 610 North 10th Street, Officer Jacobitz is standing by with the gun. This is extremely dynamic. Now we have officers coming in from around the area command, hearing that they're in a foot pursuit. What goes on at this point in time is you're going to hear that radio goes on a Code Red, which means than only emergency traffic can come out. They cleared everything for these two officers who are in the middle of a very dynamic situation.

As Officer Jacobitz is standing back there in the alley at 610 North 10th Street just making sure that nobody comes and grabs this gun, somebody comes and grabs that moped, two individuals. You'll hear that it's an individual by the name of Eric Gilbert and another individual -- individual by the name of Anibal Rivera.

They see a moped on the ground and they go and they pick it up. Now, I don't know what it is, if they're just really good citizens or just really dumb, but that's what they decided to do that night. You'll hear that both of them end up going to jail. But this is just the next thing that Officer Jacobitz has to react to.

Officer Jacobitz now seeing that these two individuals are picking up that moped that Ceasar Valencia dropped on the ground, goes and confronts these two. Again, he takes these two at gunpoint, realizing they're stealing the moped and taking a potential piece of in evidence the -- a crime that is possibly occurring here. And as he has them there, his partner, Officer Houston, still on the other side of the neighborhood. The situation is even more dynamic than it was before.

You'll hear that Officer Jacobitz gets on the radio, is asking for other people to come down. Ultimately, other people -- other officers come down to assist him and he takes those two individuals into custody. There, they still have the moped. These two are there. They end up going to jail that night.

But in the meantime, the officers set up what they call a perimeter. Pretty obvious what a perimeter is, but a perimeter is just where officers set up around the neighborhood at the corners and watch to see if anybody is trying to exit the perimeter. That way they can contain the area, bring a K-9 in and search for whoever was running from them. That's exactly what they do here.

So that perimeter is set up. And while this perimeter is set up, people -- officers that are involved in this are hearing the description of

this individual and hearing that address, 625 North 10th Street, realizing it's -- hey, that's Ceasar Valencia. A picture is ultimately sent to Officer Jacobitz of Ceasar Valencia. He confirms, Yeah, that's the guy. That's 100 percent the guy.

And at that point in time, K-9 hasn't found anything. The officers on scene haven't been able to find anybody running out of the perimeter or hiding under a bush or a trash can or anywhere else that you might find somebody hiding. And because of that, they end up breaking the perimeter down. But they know who the guy is. So that's something that they can take solace in, and they do. They know that they have the opportunity to still catch him.

So it's approximately 11:18 p.m. on Friday, May 20th, 2016. Then that's when detectives have started their surveillance operation of Mr. Ceasar Valencia's home, 625 North 10th Street. There, officers stake out the area. You'll hear that there's officers on a balcony or a rooftop and they're watching and officers around the neighborhood, all plainclothes, just staking it out to see if they can find the guy who they've identified as being the one who pulled a gun on a police officer just the night before.

Couple hours go by into the next morning, Saturday,
May 21st, 2016, approximately 1:30 a.m. they see movement from 625
North 10th Street. That movement is in the form of individuals leaving in
a vehicle. It's a Ford Mustang with -- with Florida plates. Officers that
are on the surveillance operation, once again, in plainclothes, tail the
vehicle.

They tail the vehicle over here from 625 North 10th Street up into the West Monroe Avenue area. In the process of tailing the vehicle, they know that there's an individual in that vehicle matching the description of Ceasar Valencia. It appears to be him. Ultimately, in the area of that West Monroe address, that vehicle stops. That vehicle is there for some time. Officers have contained that area, trying to stake it out. And they're setting up stuff back at 625 North 10th Street, having officers go into that area just in case somehow the vehicle gets back there without them seeing it.

Well, the vehicle doesn't get back there without them seeing it.

Ultimately, they pick that vehicle back up in the west side area and they stop it right here in the area of Main and Washington. That vehicle's taken down in what's called a felony stop. It's multiple officers on scene pulling the occupants out at gunpoint. That's what happens.

You'll hear that the driver of that vehicle is an individual by the name of Nicholas Harris. That's his car. He's the one driving it.

Passenger, Ceasar Valencia. So Ceasar Valencia is brought out of that vehicle. They search Ceasar Valencia.

At that point in time, you'll hear that he has on him 11.6 grams of heroin, 2.67 grams of methamphetamine, and 2.4 grams of cocaine.

That's it, ladies and gentlemen. It's very straightforward. And because of that, at the end of this case, I'm going to ask you to find the defendant guilty of all counts. Thank you.

THE COURT: Counsel approach, please.

[Bench conference transcribed as follows:]

time?

- Q So are you very familiar with the area and where this incident took place?
  - A I am.
- Q On May 19th, 2016, were you in -- working in the capacity as a police officer?
  - A I was.
  - Q And were you working around 7:45 p.m.?
  - A I was.
- Q Did something happen around that time which caused you to be in court today?
  - A It did.
  - Q What happened, sir?
- A About that time I was riding as a directed patrol unit with another officer. And a directed patrol unit is just a -- a unit that's set apart that day to do proactive work in the area to suppress crime in the Downtown Area Command, geographic boundaries. So we were just out looking for stops to enforce.

At that time, approximately, there was a -- a moped driving at what appeared to be -- okay. Sorry about that. There was a moped that appeared to be going at a pretty high rate of speed through the alley between 9th and 10th Street, which is actually just straight east of our station.

- Q Let me stop you there. Did you guys come from a barbecue?
- A We did.

Area Command?

A Would you like me to show you on the screen here?

Q Yes.

A So we pulled out of the exit gate, which I believe is right here on the -- anyways, right around the address. I don't know if I can show you there, about right there. We went northbound on 9th Street, following the direction of the moped that I had told you I saw. We saw the driver turn eastbound on Wilson, so we followed him.

As we were getting close to the moped, at approximately -- when he -- when he arrived at Wilson and 11th Street, he -- he had a stop sign there and he failed to stop. So at that point, we --

Q Let me stop you right there, sir. Let me get a closer view.

Showing you State's Exhibit 10; do you recognize this photograph, sir?

A Yes.

Q Is that pretty much just a closer view of this area?

A Yes.

Q Okay. Can you tell us, again, where is this moped blowing through the -- the stop sign?

A All right. So okay, about -- about right there. So the moped was headed eastbound on Wilson and there's a stop sign right there to prevent it from crossing 11th street without stopping.

Q After you saw that, what did you and your fellow officer decide to do?

A At that time, we were going to initiate a vehicle stop on the moped. We were going to turn on our lights and sirens and conduct a

stop.

Q Did you do that right away or did you wait until you came up close?

A It -- you know, it would have been all about the same moment, because mopeds typically don't go that fast. So we were gaining on him pretty good. And right about the corner of Wilson 11th, we were starting to catch up to him to try to initiate the stop as he kind of headed south on 11th Street.

- Q So right when you were gaining up to him?
- A Yeah.
- Q And you activated your lights and sirens?
- A Yes.
- Q And what did he do?

A He turned into this parking lot over here. See if I can get my bearings here from your map. So he went down and kind of turned to this parking lot right here and proceeded to what appeared to be, like, a gate into a courtyard or a row of apartments right there. Kind of pulled up next to the gate sideways with -- while he was still on the moped.

- Q And what did you and Officer Jacobitz do?
- A As I said, we had already initiated the stop with lights and sirens. So at that point, we felt like he was probably going to run or flee. That's why he was trying to open the door. So we started to exit the vehicle and we're yelling commands to stop. At that time --
- Q And let me ask you this, so might be common sense, but describe your demeanor, your attention to detail, et cetera, as you and

6

7

8

9

11 12

13

14 15

16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23

2425

Jacobitz are getting out of this vehicle.

A Anytime you're going to get behind --

MR. COYER: Objection to the form --

THE WITNESS: -- a vehicle --

MR. COYER: -- of the question, Judge.

THE COURT: I'm sorry?

MR. COYER: Objection to the form of the question.

THE COURT: Restate the question.

## BY MR. LEXIS:

Q Describe your demeanor as you're getting out of this vehicle.

A Any time you go to stop a vehicle that doesn't stop or makes an unusual movement, like, pulls up to the gate of an apartment complex, immediately you're going to be at a higher state of awareness, looking -- watching hands, trying to decide if this person is going to run, what's their route going to be, what action is it going to take beginning right then to either flee or evade you. So my -- my demeanor was of attentiveness and getting ready for action.

- Q And did Jacobitz -- did he appear to be under the same awareness?
  - A Yes.
- Q And when you guys got out of the vehicle, approximately how far were you from the -- the suspect?
  - A I would say between 5 and 8 feet.
- Q Were you able to get a description of what items of clothing he was wearing?

Α	Yeah. Because it's off by a little ways. He started to head
north thro	ugh the parking lot towards Wilson again and taking off from
us. So we	e we both got back in the vehicle. I jumped back in my side
and Office	er Jacobitz got back in the driver's seat and we proceeded to
follow him	

- Q Let me stop you there. When you say taking off from you, is he on the moped?
- A Correct. Yeah. He -- he was still on the moped. And then he rode it away northbound towards Wilson from the parking lot we were in.
- Q And what kind of commands are you shouting out at the suspect?
  - A To stop.
  - Q Is Officer Jacobitz doing the same thing?
- A You know, I don't -- I don't recall exactly what he was saying. It was pretty loud with the sirens and myself yelling, so I'm not sure exactly what he was yelling.
  - Q Okay. And he takes off on the moped?
  - A Correct.
  - Q And go ahead and draw on there where --
- A So he headed north to Wilson, and then back west, and then cut down the alley here between 10th and 11th Street to about -- right to this -- I can't get to it, this spot over here, 610 North 10th Street in the --
  - Q And --
  - A -- on the east side of the alley.
  - Q Are you guys on him pretty good?

	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
2	3
2	4
2	5

Α	Yeah.	We were catching up to him pretty well, because, like
said, mop	eds are	en't very fast. So we were able to get pretty good
ground or	n him.	

- Q Still lights and sirens?
- A Correct.
- Q What happens next?
- A At -- at that address on the east alley behind 610 North 10th Street, there's a parking area. As he reached the parking area, he -- he threw the moped down and took off on foot.
  - Q Will you circle that parking lot area?
- A I don't know if your map is going to comply with me here. So about right there.
  - Q And you and Jacobitz are obviously in the vehicle?
  - A We were in our -- we were in our vehicle.
  - Q Okay. And what do you guys do?
- A So as he's throwing the moped down and taking off on foot, we're pulling up into the parking lot near where he dropped the moped and kind of at an angle in the rear parking area. At that time, we both get out of the vehicle and we're going to proceed to chase him on foot.

Officer Jacobitz happened to be closer to where this gentleman was at when he dropped the moped, just because he was driving. And so he was on him first, as I was coming around the door of my side of the vehicle and the front of the vehicle. We were towards the south side of the building, 610 North 10th. And on the south side of the building, there is like a -- a narrow passageway for the apartments and

the residents to get in and out.

The subject ran up the -- the passageway and Officer Jacobitz was close to him. As I was getting out of the car, I heard Officer Jacobitz yell, Gun. Loud. As I was coming around the front of the car and running down the east side of the building, I came around the corner and Officer Jacobitz is standing there. And I could see our -- our subject that we had been chasing running westbound through the -- the passageway out towards 10th Street.

Q Okay. Let me stop you right there. What is Officer Jacobitz's demeanor when you hear him yell, Gun?

A He sounded stressed. I mean, he was yelling -- he yelled, Gun, really loud.

Q And when you guys stopped the vehicle, Metro police vehicle, did he immediately start giving chase to the -- to the suspect?

A Yes. We -- we were both getting out of the vehicle as fast as we could.

Q Okay. Why did you have to go around to the other side to give chase?

A Just the way that -- that we end up parked in the parking space, just due to the way that -- where the location of the moped was laid down and they way we had to park in the parking area and kind of how we came in from the alley. We were at an angle, so that took me a little bit to get around.

Q When Officer Jacobitz yelled, Gun, was there anything obstructing your view of Officer Jacobitz?

A I could see Officer Jacobitz standing at the -- kind of at the entry to the walkway, but I couldn't see the subject we were chasing at all. There was a building and a -- in my way. 610 North 10th was in my way. Or 620 -- yeah, 610 North 10th.

MR. LEXIS: May I approach, Your Honor?

THE COURT: Yes.

## BY MR. LEXIS:

Q Officer, I'm showing you what has been marked as State's Proposed Exhibits 17 and 26; do you recognize these photographs?

A Yes. This would have been the -- the alley -- the passageway I was describing on the south side of 610 North 10th.

Q True and accurate representation of what the -- that alley looked like on that day?

A Yes. At the time it was -- it was lighter, but yes, it's the same -- same location.

MR. LEXIS: Your Honor, I move to admit.

THE COURT: Any objection from the defense?

MS. PLUNKETT: No, Judge.

MR. COYER: No, Your Honor.

MS. PLUNKETT: Sorry.

THE COURT: Exhibits 17 and 26 will be admitted.

[State's Exhibit Nos. 17 and 26 was admitted.]

## BY MR. LEXIS:

23

24

25

Q Sir, I'm showing you State's Proposed -- excuse me, State's Exhibit 17; do you recognize this photograph?

he took off from me again, ran under some clotheslines in the yard, and went out into the alley west of the residence, about -- about right there. He went around a building. I'm not sure what the exact address was. It was within two -- two or three buildings of where he came out of. And I didn't see him again.

- Q And you lost contact at that point?
- A I lost visual contact and I didn't see him again while I was chasing him.
  - Q And at some point is a Code Red called as well?
- A Yes. As -- as I was running through the alley, I called out that I was in a foot pursuit and that was immediately given the channel. The dispatcher automatically gives you Code Red.
- Q And explain to the ladies and gentlemen of the jury what a Code Red is.
- A When you are in a volatile incident that's dynamic and the dispatcher knows that you're going to need any radio space to give out traffic, they will give you a Code Red. That means that the channel is secure for you. So only you and maybe another officer that's involved in the incident can give out radio traffic and everybody else has to hold their traffic for the meantime.
- Q Is it safe to say other officers are trying to race to the scene as soon as possible as well?
  - A Yes.
- Q But at the time, were you the only officer in a foot pursuit with this individual?

Q	Can you please point to him and identify for me the color shirt
he's wear	ing?

A He's sitting right there wearing a dark-colored shirt. I can't tell if it's kind of gray or purple.

MR. LEXIS: Your Honor, let the record reflect the officer's identified the defendant.

THE COURT: The record will so reflect.

## BY MR. LEXIS:

Q Okay. And sir, you stated that when you were shown that picture, you were immediately identifying that man as the man who you gave chase to?

A 100 percent.

Q You were aware of a surveillance operation that eventually took place the following day, and the day after that?

A There was a lot of detective work done. I'm not sure of the specifics. I know they were running an operation to potentially catch the Ceasar Valencia suspect that we had identified.

Q Was the defendant eventually apprehended on May 21st, 2016?

A He was.

Q And were you able to make facial contact with Ceasar Valencia on that day?

A I was. The operation ended up finishing in Downtown Area Command again, and near my location. And we went to make visual confirmation again.

this trial, or read, watch, or listen to any report of or any commentary on -- on the trial or any person connected with this trial by any medium of information, including, without limitation, social media, text, newspapers, televisions, the Internet, and radio; do not visit the scene of any of the events mentioned during the trial or undertake any investigation. Do not do any posting or communications on any social networking sites or do any independent research, including Internet searches, or form or express any opinion on any subject connected with the trial until the case is finally submitted to you.

We'll be in recess.

[Court recessed at 4:00 p.m. until 4:14 p.m.]

[Outside the presence of the jury.]

THE COURT: Please be seated. Let the record reflect the presence of counsel for the State, counsel for the defense, and the defendant. This is a continuation of *State vs. Valencia*.

Bring the jury in, please.

[Jury reconvened at 4:15 p.m.]

THE COURT: Let the record -- let the record reflect the presence of the jury.

Defense, are you prepared to go forward with cross-examination at this time?

MR. COYER: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: You may proceed.

MR. COYER: May I approach the podium, Judge?

THE COURT: Yes.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

23

24

25

Is it fair to say that you were not calling things out over the -- the secure dispatch that's only reserved for Code Red?

A No. At that point, sir, we're still trying to conduct the stop. And we couldn't be on the radio and issuing commands at the same time.

- Q Okay. So you try to initiate the stop there and the rider doesn't stop, correct?
  - A Correct.
- Q Okay. Proceeds out up here west on Wilson, and then south -- sorry, south down this alley, right?
  - A Yes.
- Q Okay. I just want to make sure that we're oriented -- we're on the same page here. So we get down here, you and Officer Jacobitz, you get down here to the -- the alley at approximately 610 North 10th Street, correct?
  - A Correct.
  - Q And that's where you said the rider dumps the moped?
  - A Yes.
  - Q Okay. And proceeds to flee on foot, right?
- A Yes.
- Q Okay. At that point, did you also get a look at the suspect's face?
- A You know, I don't know -- I don't recall if I saw his face directly when he was running right there at that particular moment. I was on the opposite side of the car from where he had parked.

Q	Okay.	Now, when	you first	got your	look at th	e suspect,	okay,
Jacobitz	was driv	ving, correct	?				

- A Yes.
- Q Okay. And he was, you know, presumably not crashing the vehicle he was driving, you know, intentionally, correct?
  - A Yes.
- Q Okay. Do you recall whether or not Officer Jacobitz got a view of the suspect or said anything to suggest to you that he got a view of the suspect when you're -- and specifically up here, at Wilson and 11th?
- A We didn't really have a conversation about it at the time. I would suppose that his view was just as good as mine.
- Q Okay. And I don't want you to speculate. I'm just curious if he maybe said something that caused you to think he saw him as well.
- A At the time, we're more concerned with radio traffic and direction of travel and those type of things, sir.
- Q Okay. So now, we've established the moped flees down this alley and dumps the moped -- the rider dumps the moped here in this area, 610 North 10th, right?
  - A Correct.
- Q Now, Officer Jacobitz was the first person out of the vehicle, correct?
- A I don't know if he was the first person out, but he was definitely the first person to engage, once again, with the -- the subject we were chasing.
  - Q Okay. You had to go around the vehicle?

- A That was while I was still running around the car.
- Q Okay. And your knowledge of -- of -- your belief that that happened comes from Officer Jacobitz?
  - A That and some of the things I saw at the scene.
  - Q Okay. Like the gun, you mean?
- A The gun itself would corroborate that there was a gun present. Yes, sir.
- Q Okay. But you didn't see how the gun got to the ground; is that fair to say?
  - A I didn't, no.
- Q Okay. How was it determined who would stay with the gun and who would continue the foot pursuit?
- A To be honest, sir, it was just one of those organic things that happen. Officer Jacobitz ended up staying and I ended up running. I don't know that we had a real conversation about it.
  - Q Okay.
- A I was running up the -- that -- whatever you want to call this, the passageway here. And he was already at the firearm. I saw it on the ground and I don't know -- even know if I waited for him to tell me to stay or go. I just went. I went running. I went chasing after the subject.
  - Q You never stopped along with Jacobitz?
- A Not for any lengthy period of time to make a plan or discuss anything.
- Q Okay. So you don't have a good memory of exactly where the gun was located at this point in time; is that fair to say?

Α	If I had to go back here and point to the exact spot in the dirt,
l I woul	dn't be able to do it, sir. I just know it was in this alleyway, an
approxim	ation of where it was at.

- Q Sure. And you continued on chasing the suspect?
- A That's correct.
- Q Okay. And then eventually, the suspect is lost and in some area nearby, right?
- A The last place I saw him was in the alleyway between 9th and 10th Street.
- Q And at that point, once you lost visual, you -- you stopped chasing the suspect?
- A At that point, was -- a perimeter set up and we were trying to do containment to hopefully catch up to the subject that got away from us.
- Q Okay. Now, we talked about -- or rather you answered some questions about, on direct examination, these photographs that you looked at to try to identify the suspect?
  - A That's correct, sir.
- Q Do you recall that? How many pictures were you shown on the evening of May 19th, 2016?
- A I would have to estimate now, but I'd say probably three pictures.
  - Q Okay. And how did those pictures come to you?
- A To be honest, I'm not sure. Other officers brought them to me through their own detective work. I'm not -- I don't know the details

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

we get the CAD; is that right?

MR. LEXIS: We're not -- we're not going to put up [indiscernible.] I mean, if we want to redact it afterwards, I mean, they pretty much want the warrants lined out. I have no objection to that, Judge.

THE COURT: Okay. So your objection based on that the -- that the exhibit either contains not relevant information or it's -- it's prejudicial --

MS. PLUNKETT: Prejudicial.

THE COURT: -- and effects substantially outweighs any probative value. He wants to admit it at this point without your redactions.

MR. LEXIS: No, Judge --

MR. DICKERSON: Also, I think it's fair to note that already in evidence is the audio that they've admitted, which contains all the same information --

THE COURT: Okay. Here's my concern.

MR. COYER: That's fair.

THE COURT: If there is redactions you want to make and he's moving to admit, I'm not going to let him publish until the redactions are made. He can question from it --

MR. COYER: Yeah.

THE COURT: And I -- but I'm not going to let him publish it to the jury if you're objecting to it. I need to see what the redactions are.

MR. LEXIS: Then you know what I'll do, Judge --

MR. DICKERSON: That's fine.

24

25

MR. LEXIS: -- we'll bring this in through Jacobitz.

MR. DICKERSON: You're fine. He can admit it right now. That's fine. You can talk to him about it, just don't publish it.

THE COURT: Okay. So problem is, I don't know what his redactions are. He's just telling me there's going to be redactions, make an objection. Before I can admit it, I have to rule on his objections. So did you know this was going to be admitted?

MR. COYER: I didn't know that the CAD -- I mean, you can always assume --

THE COURT: Right.

MR. COYER: -- that it might be, but I did, in fairness --

THE COURT: So --

MR. COYER: -- admit the audio.

MR. LEXIS: To be honest with you, he had an -- we had an agreement among ourselves too that we're going to allow them to redact the prejudicial stuff off the audio, and it's already admitted.

MR. DICKERSON: Now it's already admitted.

MR. COYER: Yeah, so I --

MR. LEXIS: So -- but we want -- we have no objection -- I mean, we do that all the time.

THE COURT: All right. But he's made an objection. I have to rule on the objection. So --

MR. COYER: I think --

THE COURT: -- are you objecting to it coming in as it is?

MR. COYER: No. I'm objecting the publishing. I wasn't going

24

25

to publish the prejudicial stuff in the audio. I'm fine with it coming in and we can redact it later. I just don't want to publish the prejudicial part.

THE COURT: That's why I said, I can admit it, but you can't publish it to the jury at this time.

MR. LEXIS: No problem.

THE COURT: You can ask questions from it. He can look at it. But until it's redacted, I won't let -- I'm not going to let you publish it. Is that --

MR. LEXIS: No problem.

THE COURT: -- is that agreeable?

MS. PLUNKETT: Yeah.

MR. DICKERSON: Yeah. Absolutely.

MS. PLUNKETT: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. So I'm going to admit it -- admit it, but -- and he can ask questions from it and the witness can review it.

MR. DICKERSON: Sure.

THE COURT: But at this point, until you do your redactions, we're not going to publish. When are you going to redact -- when are you going to provide a redacted copy to be -- because he may want to publish it at some point.

MR. COYER: Well, whenever you -- I mean, you guys have Wite-Out tape.

MR. LEXIS: Judge, we could do it after we --

MR. COYER: Yeah.

MR. LEXIS: -- finish --

THE COURT: Restate the question.

MR. LEXIS: Sure.

BY MR. LEXIS:

Q You said that there was also a delay in certain aspects of this investigation due to other individuals taking the moped?

A The investigation was delayed by two subjects that went and picked up the moped and proceeded to walk away with it during the -- while we were still trying to contain the scene with a perimeter and while Officer Jacobitz was still trying to hang on to the primary evidence, the firearm.

MR. COYER: Your Honor, this witness doesn't have personal knowledge of that. That's why I objected to foundation.

THE COURT: It sounds like this is a -- counsel, was that a foundational question or were you asking for personal knowledge?

MR. LEXIS: It foundation and affect on the listener, Your Honor. And it goes to --

THE COURT: I'm going -- it was a foundational question regarding timeframes. So I'm going to allow to -- the answer to stand.

MR. LEXIS: No clue.

THE COURT: I'm going to overrule your objection.

MR. LEXIS: No further questions, Judge.

THE COURT: Any -- any redirect? I'm sorry, any -- any additional questions by the defense?

MR. COYER: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Can this -- and again, Exhibit 53 is

 Judge.

conditionally admitted subject to the limitations discussed at the bench conference.

Can this witness be excused?

MR. LEXIS: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Defense?

MR. COYER: Yes. We have nothing else for this witness,

THE COURT: Okay. Ladies and gentlemen, at this time we're going to take our evening recess.

During this recess you're admonished not to talk or converse among yourselves or with anyone else on any subject matter connected with this trial, read, watch, or listen to any report or commentary on the trial or any person connected with this trial by any medium of information, including without limitation, to social media, text, newspapers, television, the Internet, and radio; do not visit the scene of any of the events mentioned during the trial or undertake any investigation; do not do any posting or communications on any social networking sites or do any independent research, including Internet searches, or form or express any opinion on any subject connected with the trial until the case is finally submitted to you.

We'll reconvene tomorrow at 11:30.

Officer, you are excused.

THE WITNESS: Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you.

And for the jury's edification, I intend to go to 5:00 o'clock

tomorrow. Thank you. 1 [Jury recessed at 4:59 p.m.] 2 THE COURT: Is there any housekeeping matters? 3 MR. LEXIS: Not from us, Your Honor. 4 THE COURT: Okay. The court's in recess until 11:30 5 6 tomorrow. 7 MR. COYER: Thank you. 8 MS. PLUNKETT: Thank you, Judge. MR. LEXIS: Thank you. 9 [Proceedings concluded at 5:00 p.m. until November 29, 2017, 10 at 11:30 a.m.] 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 ATTEST: I do hereby certify that I have truly and correctly 19 transcribed the audio/video proceedings in the above-entitled case to the 20 best of my ability. 21 22 Shawra Ortega 23 Shawna Ortega, CET\*562 24 25 161