

EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT CLERK OF THE COURT

REGIONAL JUSTICE CENTER 200 LEWIS AVENUE, 3rd FI. LAS VEGAS, NEVADA 89155-1160 (702) 671-4554 Electronically Filed Jan 23 2020 07:06 a.m. Elizabeth A. Brown Clerk of Supreme Court

Steven D. Grierson Clerk of the Court Anntoinette Naumec-Miller Court Division Administrator

January 23, 2020

Elizabeth A. Brown Clerk of the Court 201 South Carson Street, Suite 201 Carson City, Nevada 89701-4702

RE: STATE OF NEVADA vs. JOSHUA RAY HONEA
S.C. CASE: 76621
D.C. CASE: C-15-309548-1

Dear Ms. Brown:

Pursuant to your Order of Limited Remand, dated September 27, 2019 and Order, dated January 8, 2020, enclosed is a certified copy of the Amended Order Denying Motion for Acquittal or, in the Alternative, Motion for New Trial filed January 22, 2020 in the above referenced case. If you have any questions regarding this matter, please do not hesitate to contact me at (702) 671-0512.

Sincerely,

STEVEN D. GRIERSON, CLERK OF THE COURT

Liather Ungeria

Heather Ungermann, Deputy Clerk

| Electronically Filed | |
|----------------------|---|
| 1/22/2020 4:52 PM | |
| Steven D. Grierson | |
| CLERK OF THE COURT | |
| No. 1 Elin | _ |
| | - |

AMOR

2

1

3

4 5

6

7 8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23 24

25

26

27 28

DISTRICT COURT

| | CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA | | |
|-------------------------------------|----------------------|---|--|
| THE STATE OF NEV. | ADA, Plaintiff, |) Case No.: C-15-309548-1) Dept. No.: XXV | |
| vs. JOSHUA RAY HONE #3060176, | Α, |)))) | |
| | Defendant. |))) | |

AMENDED ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR ACQUITTAL OR, IN THE ALTERNATIVE, MOTION FOR NEW TRIAL

Defendant, Joshua Ray Honea ("Mr. Honea"), by and through his counsel of record, Jonathan E. MacArthur, Esq. and Monique A. McNeill, Esq. having filed a Motion for Acquittal or, in the Alternative, Motion for New Trial ("Motion") on December 28, 2017; the State of Nevada having filed an Opposition thereto on January 9, 2018 by and to Strike the Notice of Appeal filed by Appellant, State of Nevada, by and through its counsel of record, Stacey L. Kollins, Chief Deputy District Attorney; the Court having reviewed the pleadings and heard argument of counsel at the January 10, 2018 hearing of this matter; the Court having further conducted an evidentiary hearing on November 21, 2019 upon an Order of Limited Remand by the Nevada Supreme Court entered on September 27, 2019; the Court having heard and fully considered oral argument and witness testimony at the time of the evidentiary; and having reviewed the pleadings and papers on file herein; and good cause appearing:

The Court determination to deny Mr. Honea the requested relief of acquittal or, in the alternative a new trial, remains unchanged following the evidentiary hearing conducted

KATHLEEN E. DELANEY DISTRICT JUDGE DEPARTMENT XXV

on November 21, 2020.¹ Defendant's complaints of juror misconduct remain substantially unchanged. The complaints still consist of one purported extrinsic influence of a juror's review of a media report on the trial, and otherwise intrinsic influences that do not rise to the level necessary to impeach a verdict. Taking first the purported extrinsic influence occasioned by Juror 1 accessing a media report on the trial published on November 30, 2017, the media report in question was merely a factual accounting of what had occurred at trial on a specific day. *See* **Exhibit 1** to the Evidentiary Hearing. This report, consisting primarily of objective factual statements and commentary by Mr. MacArthur, counsel for the Mr. Honea, could in no way be viewed as prejudicial to the Defendant. *See Meyer v. State*, 119 Nev. 554, 563, 80 P.3d 447, 455 (2003) (citations omitted) (burden of proof requires showing juror misconduct was prejudicial).

Turning next to the purported intrinsic influences, this Court admittedly proceeded with the evidentiary hearing with some trepidation, in light of the necessity of eliciting statements concerning matters occurring during deliberations or calling into question the reasons upon which the verdict was based. *See, generally, Meyer v. State*, 119 Nev. at 562, 80 P.3d at 454 (2003) (holding intrinsic influences generally inadmissible to impeach a verdict). In the end, however, each juror who testified at the evidentiary hearing, in their own words, clearly stated that their verdict was not ultimately the product

As the Order of Limited Remand concerned only the issue of juror misconduct, this Court incorporates by reference the findings in its prior Order entered May 17, 2018, including but not limited to findings that: (1) Mr. Honea's request for acquittal based on alternative arguments of consent of the victim or the purported insufficiency of evidence of sexual penetration fail as a matter of law and fact; and (2) Defendant's request for a new trial based upon a conflict in the evidence also fails, where the Court found the evidence presented at trial sufficient to sustain the conviction, and although M.S.'s trial recant contests this evidence to a material degree, the Court's independent evaluation of the totality of the evidence was in accord with the jury's verdict.



200 Lewis Avenue Las Vegas, NV 89155-1160 (702) 671-4554 Clerk of the Courts Steven D. Grierson

January 23, 2020 Case No.: C-15-309548-1

CERTIFICATION OF COPY

Steven D. Grierson, the Clerk of the Court of the Eighth Judicial District Court, Clark County, State of Nevada, does hereby certify that the foregoing is a true, full, and correct copy of the hereinafter stated original document(s):

Amended Order Denying Motion for Acquittal or, in the Alternative, Motion for New Trial filed 01/22/2020



now on file and of

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the seal of the Eighth Judicial District Court at my office, Las Vegas, Nevada, at 7:00 AM on January 23, 2020.

STEVEN D. GRIERSON, CLERK OF THE COURT