## DISTRICT COURT

|| $\begin{gathered}\text { Electronically Filed } \\ 10 / 08 / 201401: 43: 38 \mathrm{PM}\end{gathered}$


CASE NO. C294266-1
DEPT. NO. XXI

JONATHAN QUISANO
\#5991702
Defendant.

JUDGMENT OF CONVICTION
(PLEA OF GUILTY)

The Defendant previously appeared before the Court with counsel and entered a plea of guilty to the crimes of COUNT 1 - VOLUNTARY MANSLAUGHTER (Category B Felony) in violation of NRS 200.040, 200.050, 200.080, and COUNT 2 - CHILD ABUSE, NEGLECT OR ENDANGERMENT WITH SUBSTANTIAL BODILY HARM (Category B Felony) in violation of NRS 200.508(1); thereafter, on the $7^{\text {th }}$ day of October, 2014, the Defendant was present in court for sentencing with his counsels, NANCY LEMCKE AND NORMAN REED, Deputy Public Defenders, and good cause appearing,

THE DEFENDANT IS HEREBY ADJUDGED guilty of said offenses and, in addition to the $\$ 25.00$ Administrative Assessment Fee and $\$ 150.00$ DNA Analysis Fee including testing to determine genetic markers, the Defendant is sentenced to the Nevada Department of Corrections (NDC) as follows: COUNT 1 - to a MAXIMUM of ONE HUNDRED TWENTY (120) MONTHS with a MINIMUM Parole Eligibility of FORTY-EIGHT (48) MONTHS; and COUNT 2 - to a MAXIMUM of TWO HUNDRED THIRTY (230) MONTHS with a MINIMUM Parole Eligibility of SEVENTY -TWO (72) MONTHS, CONSECUTIVE to COUNT 1; with FOUR HUNDRED EIGHTY-EIGHT (488) DAYS credit for time served.

DATED this $8^{\text {th }}$ day of October, 2014


VALERIE P. ADAR DISTRICT COURT JUDGE

ORDR<br>STEVEN B. WOLFSON<br>Clark County District Attorney<br>Nevada Bar \#001565<br>MICHAEL V. STAUDAHER<br>Chiéf Deputy District Attorney<br>Nevada Bar \#008273<br>200 Lewis Avenue<br>Las Vegas, NV 89155-2212<br>(702) 671-2500<br>Attorney for Plaintiff
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LAS VEGAS, CLARK COUNTY, NV., TUES., OCT. 7, 2014
(Excerpt of proceedings.)
THE COURT: Please remain standing for a moment facing this lady right here who will administer the oath to you.
(Speaker sworn.)
THE CLERK: Please be seated, and would you please state and spell your first and last name for the record.

THE SPEAKER: Christina, C-h-r-i-s-t-i-n-a, Rodrigues, R-o-d-ri-i-g-u-e-s.
THE COURT: What would you like to say today?
THE SPEAKER: I, Christina Rodrigues, has been traumatized emotion (sic) by the tragedy at our place back in June 2013. A permanent picture in my heart and mind will never leave me about -- will never leave me about the last moments ! had as a family. I not only lost one but two very special people who I loved dearly.

I have days where I cry, days where I'm sad and nights I can't sleep. It's very heartbreaking to hear my younger son out of the blue say, I want daddy to play with me, or when is daddy coming home, or I love my daddy. It just tears my heart into pieces. Jonathan was a kind, loving, caring, responsible father who showed love and affection to his children every day.

Whatever the outcome, Jonathan was a good citizen. Sending him to prison will harm more than it will help. Time will not heal these wounds but perhaps ease the pain.

THE COURT: Thank you for being here.
MR. STAUDAHER: Your Honor, I'd like to actually inquire if I may.
THE COURT: Oh, okay.
Ma'am, come on back, and Mr. Staudaher, the DA, has some questions
he would like to ask you.

## EXAMINATION

## BY MR. STAUDAHER:

Q Ma'am, I've read your letter that you -- that counsel provided and that you talked about some of the things mentioned in your letter. Is it my understanding that you do not want him to go to prison?

A He -- just don't take him away from us, I mean --
MS. LEMCKE: Judge, just for the record, I'm going to have to interpose an objection because in terms of mitigation evidence or aggravation evidence that's allowed to be presented, no witness is ever allowed to offer their opinion as to what a particular sentence should be. So just to the - to that end I would object.

MR. STAUDAHER: Actually, this is a victim impact.
THE COURT: Yeah, it's a victim impact so she is allowed to say whether she thinks probation or prison or what she would like to see happen.

BY MR. STAUDAHER:
Q Do you think he should go to prison?
THE COURT: And she is here as the mother of the victim, the child. So pursuant to statute she's one of the people who's allowed to speak.

THE SPEAKER: I would like to see him get probation if possible. If he does end up going to prison, just please don't take him away from us. BY MR. STAUDAHER:

Q You said that you would be willing to provide him with shelter for him to stay and transportation and support him emotionally and to keep him on track --

A Yes.
Q So how are you going to provide him with shelter? Is he going to come
live with you?
A Well, it all depends on the circumstances of what we have to do in order for him, you know, to get back with us. I mean --

Q And that's ultimately what you want?
A Yes. You know, it's -- it's very hard to hear upset, out of the blue asking for his dad or wanting his dad to play with him or he just starts jumping up and down, you know, I love daddy, I love daddy.

Q I totally get that, but the two questions that I had that I want to make sure I'm clear on is it is your desire for him to come -- if the Court was to grant him probation, for him to come live with you, and that's what you want?

A If it's at all possible, yes.
Q Okay. And also that you do not want him to go to prison; you want him to get probation, right?

A Yes.
Q Do you remember going down to family -- first of all, do you have -- do you believe that he committed abuse against your son that died, Khayden?

MR. REED: I'm going to object to the nature of that question. That's outside the scope of victim impact.

MR. STAUDAHER: Actually it goes all to it.
THE COURT: Well, I think she can answer it.
THE SPEAKER: I didn't think he committed the crime.
BY MR. STAUDAHER:
Q So you don't think that he committed any abuse --
A It think before --
Q -- against Khayden?

A I haven't seen any abuse when we were together.
Q But you know the circumstances of this case and all the facts of it, correct?

A I understand, yes.
Q And do you believe based on your knowledge of the facts of this case that your husband caused physical abuse to Khayden?

MR. REED: Again, I object, Your Honor. The statute's very specific. It's you can talk about the impact of the facts but not her speculation --

THE COURT: I mean, as you sit here today, it's your feeling that this was an accident; is that true?

THE SPEAKER: Yes.
BY MR. STAUDAHER:
Q Do you recall going to family court about this same issue?
A Yes.
Q Do you remember talking to the Judge there and telling the Judge certain things like you're talking about today?

THE COURT: Mr. Staudaher, $\mid$ am going to limit your cross-examination on whether or not she thinks it's an accident or at one point felt that he committed the offense. I mean, the bottom line is whether it's pursuant to Alford or a direct guilty plea, he has pleaded guilty to these offenses.

MR. STAUDAHER: True, but if I could have just a little leeway, Your Honor, and the reason, and l'll try to wrap it even into one question. BY MR. STAUDAHER:

Q At that family court proceeding, you said that you believed he had committed abuse against your son Khayden, that he should be punished for his
crime and that he should go to prison. That's what you told the Court in family court.
A That didn't come out of my mouth though.
Q Well, maybe not in exactly that, but that's what you asked the Court then. And so what l'm trying to get at is since this has been the -- this is how this has impacted you, you went to court one time and asked for one thing, and you're coming to court now and asking for the complete opposite.

MS. LEMCKE: Well, Your Honor, I'm going to object to that. First of --
THE COURT: That's sustained. It was a different forum.
MS. LEMCKE: And who knows when that was. He's been in custody now for a year and a half, I mean, maybe he's -- after a year and half -- okay.

MR. STAUDAHER: June of this year. So just a couple of months ago.
THE SPEAKER: I don't recall putting it in that words at all.
BY MR. STAUDAHER:
Q Did you tell the Court then that you planned on having him come to live with you and your still-living son?

A Well, I haven't talked to them about that. I mean, I know that we were apart and I had to get my child back and work with my child and make sure I get him back personally and have custody of him.

THE COURT: Okay. So the point of that hearing was so that you could get custody of your other son; is that correct?

THE SPEAKER: Yes.
THE COURT: And now you have custody?
THE SPEAKER: I have custody, and, you know, he's doing wonderful and well.

MR. STAUDAHER: I have nothing further.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Do you have anything, Ms. Lemcke?

MS. LEMCKE: Court's indulgence.
Can I see the document. I just would like to see what it is because I don't have a copy of this.

Yeah, Judge, just for the record, I'm going to represent to the Court I have not seen this document that I recall, and let me just say what it is because when Mr. Staudaher first approached the witness, I thought he actually had a transcript of the proceedings; it's not. What it is is an affidavit signed by someone saying that they had a conversation with Christina in which Christina imparted the information that Mr. Staudaher tried to represent to her.

THE COURT: So it was a document based on hearsay that was presented in the family court.

MS. LEMCKE: Right. And can I see the document also again because --
MR. REED: It was never provided in discovery, Your Honor.
MR. STAUDAHER: It's not part of discovery. This is a victim-impact statement.

THE COURT: Well, I think we've heard from the victim --
MS. LEMCKE: I'm just saying, it's hard to put that in context, and I think he tries to draw some very insidious inferences from it and imply to the Court certain things that we just don't know to be true. In any event --

MR. STAUDAHER: Actually, they closed the case because of those representations.

MR. REED: Judge, it's a document that's in the possession of the prosecution, and all the way up to including sentencing is to be provided to the
defense in discovery. That's anything in aggravation or mitigation. I'm going to ask that that document be marked and made a court exhibit so we have record of the fact that that was not provided to us in discovery --

THE COURT: That's fine. And for the record --
MR. REED: -- discoverable piece of evidence.
THE COURT: We'll make it a court's exhibit, and for the record, the Court has not seen that document.

MR. REED: I understand, Your Honor.
MR. STAUDAHER: Also make it a part of the record that this witness who testified today as a victim-impact speaker was not noticed to the Court or to the State --

THE COURT: That's true.
MR. STAUDAHER: -- until she just got on the witness stand.
THE COURT: That's true.
MR. STAUDAHER: So therefore, up to this point and including -- I think I didn't object to this collage of photographs that were never provided to us. I allowed that to come in. The fact that she's being a victim-impact speaker today I think she statutorily has a right to do that, and I did not object to it.

But as far as anything provided to the defense that would have been used, I didn't even know she was actually going to hit the stand until this morning when she showed up.

THE COURT: I think Mr. Staudaher makes a good point. How would he know he was going to be possibly using that statement if he didn't know that she was going to be a speaker?

MR. REED: Because use has nothing to do with discovery.

THE COURT: Well, except, Mr. Reed, to be fair to the State, she wasn't in contact with victim witness, a speaker notification did not go out. While he may have possession of the things from the family court case, I don't think reasonably, you know, he knew that he was going to be using them.

Now, he probably has it all nice and highlighted in his file because he may have anticipated that she would just show up.

MR. REED: I understand, Your Honor, it has nothing to do with discovery from our perspective, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Well, it's not part of this case, l'll just say that, number one. And number two, in the State's defense, they didn't know that they would be using it because they didn't know she was going to be a speaker. Although as I said, he has it here, it's all nicely highlighted. I suspect they thought maybe she would be showing up to speak.

Ma'am, l'm sorry for all of that interruption and discourse. Is there anything else you would like to say today? And I understand all the way around this is just a horrible tragedy for you and your family regardless of what happens today.

THE SPEAKER: That's all.
THE COURT: All right. Thank you very much for being here.
(Remainder of the sentencing not transcribed.)
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CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA
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CASE NO. C-13-294266-1
DEPT. NO. XXI.

NOTTCE OF APPEAL

TO: THE STATE OF NEVADA
STEVEN B. WOLFSON, DISTRICT ATTORNEY, CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA and DEPARTMENT NO. XXI OF THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT' COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA, IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF CLARK.

NOTICE is hereby given that Defendant, Jonathan Quisano, presently incarcerated in the Nevada state Prison, appeals to the Supreme Court of the state of Nevada from the judgment entered against. said Defendant on the $g^{\text {th }}$ day of October, 2014, whereby he was convicted of Ct. 1 - Voluntary Manslaughter and Ct. 2. - Child Abuse, Neglect or Endangerment with Substantial Bodily Harm and sentenced to $\$ 25$ Admin. fee; $\$ 150$ DNA analysis fee; genetic testing; Ct. 1-48-120 months in prison; Ct. $2-72-230$ months in prison consecutive to ct. I; 488 days CTS.

DATED this $30^{\text {th }}$ day of October, 2014.
PHILIP J, KOHN
CLARK COUNTY PUBLIC DEFENDER
By; $\quad$ /s/ Nancy L. Lemeke
NANCY L, LEMCKE, \#5416
Deputy Public Defender

## DECLARATION OF MAILING

Carrie Connolly, an employee with the Clark County Public Defender's Office, hereby declares that she is, and was when the herein described mailing took place, a citizen of the United States, over 21 years of age, and not a party to, nor interested in, the within action; that on the $30^{\text {th }}$ day of october, 2014, declarant deposited in the United States mail at Las Vegas, Nevada, a copy of the Notice of Appeal In the case of the State of Nevada v. Jonathan Quisano, Case No, C-13-294266-1, enclosed in a sealed envelope upon which first class postage was fully prepaid, addressed to Jonathan Quisano, c/o High Degert state Prison, P:O. Box 650, Indian Springs, NV 89018. That there is a regular communication by mail between the place of mailing and the place so addressed.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing jis true and correct.

EXECUTED on the $30^{\text {th }}$ day of October, 2014.
/g/ Carrie M. Connolly
An employee of the Clark county Public Defender's Office

I hereby certify that service of the above and foregolng was made this $30^{\text {th }}$ day of october, 2014, by Electronto Filing to: District Attorneys Office E-Mail Address:

PDMotions@clarkcountyda.com
Iemiter. Garciagclarkcountyda.com
Eileen, Dav1s@clarkcountyda.com

Ls/Carrie M. Comolly
Secretary for the
Public Defender's Office

# DISTRICT COURT CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA 

Felony/Gross Misdemeanor COURT MINUTES

C-13-294266-1 State of Nevada
vs
Jonathan Quisano
December 03, 2013 9:30 AM Initial Arraignment

HEARD BY: De La Garza, Melisa

COURT CLERK: Roshonda Mayfield
RECORDER: Kiara Schmidt

## REPORTER:

PARTIES
PRESENT: Quisano,Jonathan
Reed, Norman Joseph
Staudaher, Michael V.

COURTROOM: RJC Lower Level Arraignment

JOURNAL ENTRIES

- Information FILED IN OPEN COURT, DEFT, QUISANO ARRAIGNED, PLED NOT CUIL.TY, and WAIVED the 60-DAY RULE. COURT ORDERED, matter set for status check regarding the setting of trial.

CUSTODY
12/10/13 9:30 A.M. STATUS CHECK: TRIAL SETTING (DEPT. 21)


- Ms. Lemke stated that the defendant previously waived his speedy trial rights. She requested a trial setting in June. Ms. Edwards informed the Court that an Amended Information was filed in the lower court. COURT ORDERED, trial date SET.

CUSTODY
6/5/13 9:30 AM CALENDAR CALL
6/9/13 9:30 AM JURY TRIAL

# DISTRICT COURT CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA 



## JOURNAL ENTRIES

- Ms. Edwards requested an additional four weeks to file a return. COURT ORDERED, CONTINUED.

CUSTODY

CONTINUED TO: 3/6/14 9:30 AM

## DISTRICT COURT CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

Felony/Gross Misdemeanor
COURT MINUTES
March 06, 2014

| C-13-294266-1 | State of Nevada <br> vs <br> Jonathan Quisano |
| :--- | :--- |

March 06, 2014 9:30 AM Defendant's Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus

HEARD BY: Adair, Valerie
COURTROOM: RJC Courtroom 11C

COURT CLERK: Tia Everett
RECORDER: Janie Olsen
PARTIES Michael Stadauher and Michelle Edwards, Deputy District Attorneys, present on PRESENT: behalf of the State. Defendant present in custody and represented by Nancy Lemcke and Norm Reed, Deputy Public Defenders.

## JOURNAL ENTRIES

- Michael Stadauher and Michelle Edwards, Deputy District Attorneys, present on behalf of the State. Defendant present in custody and represented by Nancy Lemcke and Norm Reed, Deputy Public Defenders.

Parties submitted on the pleadings. Court stated she would like to review the record further and ORDERED, matter UNDER ADVISEMENT and matter SET for Decision.

## CUSTODY

3/10/2014 CHAMBERS - DECISION RE: DEFENDANT'S PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS

## DISTRICT COURT CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

C-13-294266-1 State of Nevada

March 10,2014 3:00 AM Decision

HEARD BY: Adair, Valerie
COURTROOM:

COURT CLERK: Denise Husted

RECORDER:

## REPORTER:

PARTIES
PRESENT:
JOURNAL ENTRIES

- MATTER CONTINUED, for Court to revjew Grand Jury Transcript.

NDC

## DISTRICT COURT

CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

Felony/Gross Misdemeanor
COURT MINUTES
March 31, 2014

| C-13-294266-1 | State of Nevada |
| :--- | :--- |
| vs |  |

March 31, 2014 3:00 AM Decision

HEARD BY: Adair, Valerie

## COURTROOM:

COURT CLERK: Denise Husted
RECORDER: Janie Olsen
REPORTER:
PARTIES
PRESENT:

## JOURNAL ENTRIES

- COURT ORDERED Defendant's Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus is DENIED.

CLERK'S NOTE: A copy of this minute order placed in the attorney folder of: Nancy Lemcke (PUBLIC DEFENDER'S OFFICE)

# DISTRICT COURT <br> CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA 

Felony/Gross Misdemeanor
COURT MINUTES
June 03, 2014

C-13-294266-1 State of Nevada
vs
Jonathan Quisano
June 03, $2014 \quad$ 9:30 AM All Pending Motions
HEARD BY: Adair, Valerie
COURTROOM: RJC Courtroom 11C
COURT CLERK: Denise Husted
RECORDER: Janie Olsen

## REPORTER:

PARTIES
PRESENT: Edwards, Michelle
Lemcke, Nancy L.
Quisano, Jonathan
Reed, Nomman Joseph
State of Nevada
Staudaher, Michael V.

## Attorney for the State

Attomey for the Defendant Defendant
Attorney for the Defendant Plaintiff
Attorney for the State

## JOURNAL ENTRIES

- DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO SUPPRESS DEFENDANT'S STATEMENTS, COURT FINDS, in reading it suggest that it was a non-custodial matter. An Evidentiary Hearing will be set at the time of calendar call.

DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO COMPEL PRODUCT OF DISCOVERY. Following statements by counsel, COURT ORDERED, motion is GRANTED IN PART and DENIED IN PART.

STATE'S MOTION TO ADMIT EVIDENCE OF OTHER CRIMES, WRONGS OR ACTS. The Court stated its concern as to the discrepancy of what happened in Hawaii. Arguments by Mr. Staudaher regarding his motion and that the defendant has a pattern of not caring for his children. COURT FINDS, the incident of the first child will not come in unless defense opens the door. The second case; the Court will consider a Petrocelli Hearing.

## C-13-294266-1

DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO STRIKE JURY VENIRE BASED UPON THE AUTOMATIC EXCLUSION OF CONVICTED FELONS. Ms. Staudaher provided opposition to the Court. The Court noted that it always asks jurors if any of them have felonies. The Court informed counsel it will review the matter further, but is inclined to deny to motion.

DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO LIMIT EXPERT TESTIMONY. The Court stated that the witnesses in this case are percipient witnesses and not compensated by the State. The State has limited ability to control what they provide. The State does have a duty to tell the defense what they are going to testify about. Mr. Staudaher stated his belief that he has done that. Further arguments by counsel regarding expert witnesses. The Court instructed counsel to contact Chow to see his CV and to determine if he ever testified in a Civil or Criminal case.

DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO EXCLUDE EXPERT WITNESSES COURT ORDERED, this motion is TABLED.

DEFENDANT'S MOTION IN LIMINE TO EXCLUDE TESTIMONY REGARDING TRAUMA DESTINATION FALL CRITERIA PROTOCAL. The Court stated he is not to opine that anything is inconsistent to what the tather told him. Need a determination was sent to trauma; can't opine to distinction of fall.

STATES REQUEST FOR WITNESSES TO APEAR BY SIMULTANEOUS AUDIOVISUAL TRANSMISSION EQUIPMENT. COURT ORDERED, it will be allowed.

CUSTODY

# DISTRICT COURT CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA 

Felony/Gross Misdemeanor
COURT MINUTES
June 05, 2014
C-13-294266-1 State of Nevada
vs
Jonathan Quisano
June 05, 2014 9:30 AM All Pending Motions
HEARD BY: Adair, Valerie
COURTROOM: RJC Courtroom 11C
COURT CLERK: Shelly Landwehr
RECORDER: Janie Olsen

## REPORTER:

| PARTIES | Lemcke, Nancy L. | Attorney |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| PRESENT: | Quisano, Jonathan | Defendant |
|  | Reed, Norman Joseph | Attorney |
|  | State of Nevada | Plaintiff |
|  | Staudaher, Michael V. | Attorney |

## JOURNAL ENTRIES

## CALENDAR CALL...STATE'S MOTION IN LIMINE TO STRIKE OR LIMTT THE TESTIMONY OF DEFT'S EXPERTS JOHN FARLEY AND ROBERT ROTHFEDER OR IN THE ALTERNATIVE A REQUEST FOR EVIDENTIARY HEARING

- Mr. Staudaher argued regarding of the expert's testing and argued there are no reports by either expert or any information $y$ concerning the results of any testing that was performed by either of the experts. With respect to Mr. Farley, there is no information as to what information he was provided with to determine which method of testing was used. Mr. Staudaher stated the methodology is an issue and requested the same information that was provided to the expert that helped him make the determination that the testing shown in the video was the appropriate way to test. There has been no disclosure by the defense as to what was given to the expert to rely on to formulate his a nalysis

Mr. Reed argued the expert did site two references upon which he relied on however; the doctor did not receive any discovery. Defense asked the expert to test as many ways of falling from the couch as he could.

$$
\text { PRINT DATE: } \quad 06 / 05 / 2014 \quad \text { Page } 1 \text { of } 2 \quad \text { Minutes Date: } \quad \text { June 05, } 2014
$$

Further, Mr. Staudaher has cross-examined this witness before, in another case, and didn't make this objection there and the situations are very similar.

Arguments by Mr. Staudaher. Court stated it could schedule a hearing with the expert based on the State's challenge. As to Doctor Rothfeder, Mr. Staudaher argued he has the same issues and argued he only has curriculum vitae from Dr. Rothfeder regarding head injuries. Mr. Staudaher stated he plans to talk to him and get an idea of what his area of expertise is.

Mr. Reed argued the State has all the medical records. Court stated Mr. Reed must disclose, in writing, what was given to the doctor. Mr. Reed inquired if the State would do the same with their retained experts, because he does not have reports. Court noted those experts were not retained for purposes of trial but it should be in their report.

Colloquy regarding trial schedule. Colloquy regarding pre-trial motions. Court inquired if a video conference can be set up for the Hawaii witnesses by Monday.

COURT ORDERED, evidentiary hearing SET for $6 / 09 / 14$ at 1:30 PM. Trial VACATED and RESET for 6/11/14 at 10:00 AM.

## DISTRICT COURT <br> CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

Felony/Gross Misdemeanor
COURT MINUTES
June 09, 2014
C-13-294266-1 State of Nevada
vs
Jonathan Quisano
June 09, $2014 \quad$ 9:30 AM Evidentiary Hearing
HEARD BY: Adair, Valerie
COURTROOM: RJC Courtroom 11C
COURT CLERK: Denise Husted
RECORDER: Janie Olsen
REPORTER:
PARTIES

| PRESENT: | Edwards, Michelle |
| :--- | :--- |
| Lemcke, Nancy L. | Attorney for the State |
| Reed, Norman Joseph | Attorney for the Defendant |
|  | State of Nevada |
|  | Attorney for the Defendant |

## JOURNAL ENTRIES

- The Court noted that this is at the point where the detective confronted the defendant that his story and Cat Scan don't match. Mr. Staudaher advised that the Rolf and Bucheat won't be here because of the death of the LVMPD officers over the week-end. Colloquy regarding scheduling. Testimony per worksheet. Ms. Staudaher stated that this suspends this portion of the hearing.


# DISTRICT COURT CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA 

Felony/Gross Misdemeanor COURT MINUTES June 10, 2014

| C-13-294266-1 | State of Nevada vs <br> Jonathan Quisano |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| June 10, 2014 | 9:30 AM | Entry of Plea |
| HEARD BY: | Adair, Valerie | COURTROOM: RJC Courtroom 11C |
| COURT CLERK: Denise Husted |  |  |
| RECORDER: Janie Olsen |  |  |
| REPORTER: |  |  |
| PARTIES |  |  |
| PRESENT: | Edwards, Michelle | Attorney for the State |
|  | Lemcke, Nancy L. | Attorney for the Defendant |
|  | Quisano, Jonathan | Defendant |
|  | Reed, Norman Joseph | Attorney for the Defendant |
|  | State of Nevada | Plaintiff |
|  | Staudaher, Michael V. | Attorney for the State |

## JOURNAL ENTRIES

- Negotiations are as contained in the Guilty Plea Agreement FILED IN OPEN COURT. Second Amended Information FILED IN OPEN COURT. Defendant Quisano ARRAIGNED and PLED GUILTY pursuant to the Alford Decision as follows:

Count 1 - Voluntary Manslaughter (F);
Count 2 - Child Abuse Neglect or Endangerment with Substantial Bodily Farm (F).
Offer of proof by the State. Court ACCEPTED PLEA and ORDERED the matter referred to the Division of Parole and Probation for a presentence investigation report and SET for sentencing.

## CUSTODY

9/9/14 9:30 AM SENTENCING

# DISTRICT COURT <br> CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA 

Felony/Gross Misdemeanor
COURT MINUTES
September 09, 2014

C-13-294266-1 $\quad \begin{aligned} & \text { State of Nevada } \\ & \\ & \text { vs }\end{aligned}$
Jonathan Quisano
September 09,2014 9:30 AM Sentencing
HEARD BY: Adair, Valerie
COURTROOM: RJC Courtroom 11C
COURT CLERK: Denise Husted
RECORDER: Janie Olsen

## REPORTER:

PARTIES

PRESENT: Quisano, Jonathan
Reed, Norman Joseph
State of Nevada
Staudaher, Michael V.

Defendant
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## 11:50 AM, Andrea Natali, Court Clerk present.

Arguments by Mr. Frizzell. Statement by Deft. Christina Rodrigues, victim speaker, sworn and testified. Arguments by counsel regarding the victim speaker's testimony related to the Deft's sentence. Exhibits ADMITTED (per worksheet). Further, arguments by counsel regarding the family court affidavit. DEFT. QUISANO ADJUDGED GUILTY of COUNT 1 - VOLUNTARY MANSLAUGHTER (F) and COUNT 2 - CHILD ABUSE, NEGLECT, OR ENDANGERMENT WITH SUBSTANTIAL BODILY HARM (F). COURT ORDERED, in addition to the $\$ 25.00$ Administrative Assessment fee and a $\$ 150.00$ DNA Analysis fee including testing to determine genetic markers, Defendant SENTENCED to the Nevada Department of Corrections as follows:

COUNT 1 - to a MAXIMUM of ONE HUNDRED TWENTY (120) MONTHS and a MINIMUM of FORTY-EIGHT (48) MONTHS;
COUNT 2 - to a MAXIMUM of TWO HUNDRED THIRTY (230) MONTHS and a MINIMUM of SEVENTY-TWO (72) MONTHS; CONSECUTIVE with COUNT 1; with FOUR HUNDRED EIGHTYEIGHT (488) DAYS credit for time served.

Following a CONFERENCE AT BENCH, Court clarified what the State had stipulated to in regards to the term.
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## TUESDAY, DECEMBER 03, 2013

## PROCEEDINGS

THE COURT: State of Nevada versus Jonathan Quisano, C294266-1. He --
MR. REED: This is my case, but I don't know if MVU is coming down and they didn't leave the file.

MS. BENEDICT: Do you have the Information?
MR. REED: I do not have the Information because it wasn't filed as of yesterday. So --

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Well you let me know when you're ready.
MS. BENEDICT: l'Il send an email.
MR. REED: Thank you, Judge. I appreciate it.
MS. BENEDICT: Who is your deputy?
MR. REED: Staudaher. Michael Staudaher.
THE COURT: Okay. The State will send him a quick email, see if he's --
MR. REED: Thanks. I appreciate it.
THE COURT: -- around.
(Whereupon, the matter was trailed and then recalled.)
THE COURT: State of Nevada versus Jonathan Quisano, C294266-1. He is present in custody. Mr. Reed is here on behalf of the defendant, and Mr. Staudaher is here on behalf of the State.

Sir, did you receive a copy of the Information stating the charges against you?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.

THE COURT: Did you read through it and understand it?
THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.
THE COURT: Do want to waive a formal reading of the charges?
THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.
THE COURT: How do you plead?
THE DEFENDANT: Not guilty.
THE COURT: You do have a right to a trial within 60 days. Do you want to waive or invoke that right?

THE DEFENDANT: Waive.
THE COURT: Waive it? All right. I'm going to set it in front of the department in one week for trial setting.

MR. REED: That's fine, your Honor. And just for the record, this was just a clerical error. There's some language that still remains in the Information that was stricken in the Justice Court, but l'm sure Mr. Staudaher will file an amended Information fixing language.

MR. STAUDAHER: That is correct.
THE COURT: You might want to do that and have it prepared for this one-week date. Okay?

MR. STAUDAHER: Very well.
THE CLERK: One week, December $10^{\text {th }}, ~ 9: 30$ a.m., Department 21.
THE COURT: Does that work?
MR. REED: That works. Thank you.
MR. STAUDAHER: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you, all.
(Whereupon, the proceedings concluded.)

ATTEST: Pursuant to Rule 3C(d) of the Nevada Rules of Appellate Procedure, 1 certify that this is a rough draft transcript, expeditiously prepared, not proofread, corrected, or certified to be an accurate transcript.
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LAS VEGAS, NEVADA, TUESDAY, DECEMBER 10, 2013 at 9:43 A.M.

THE COURT: And that was Jonathan Quisano --
MR. STAUDAHER: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: -- who is present, in custody, and does he need an interpreter?

MS. LEMCKE: He does not.
THE COURT: Okay.
All right, this is on for status check regarding trial setting.
MS. LEMCKE: Right, Your Honor. We have spoken about it. My client is prepared to waive his right to a speedy trial this morning to the extent that he didn't do it already. I wasn't actually with him at lower level arraignment.

THE COURT: Okay.
MS. LEMCKE: Mr. Reed, my co- counsel --
MR. STAUDAHER: He did --
MS. LEMCKE: -- was.
MR. STAUDAHER: -- waive --
THE COURT: And just to confirm, Mr. Quisano, that's your desire to waive your right to a trial within 60 days?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: All right.
MS. LEMCKE: So, we would -- I don't know what the Court's calendar is like. June would probably be a good date for all of us.

THE COURT: We'll get the JEA and that way we can give you a better idea.
MS. LEMCKE: Sure.

$$
\begin{gathered}
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THE COURT: June is realistic.
THE RECORDER: Can I have counsel's name, Mr. Staudaher?
MS. EDWARDS: Michelle --
MR. STAUDAHER: Mike --
MS. EDWARDS: -- Edwards.
MR. STAUDAHER: Oh.
THE RECORDER: I'm sorry?
MS. EDWARDS: Michelle Edwards.
THE RECORDER: Thank you.
MS. EDWARDS: You're welcome.
THE COURT: How long do we anticipate for trial, about a week?
MS. LEMCKE: Yeah. It could run a little longer.
THE COURT: Do we have a --
MR. STAUDAHER: Well, it depends -- if Ms. Lemcke is actually --
THE COURT: I'm sorry?
MR. STAUDAHER: -- doing the -- it depends on whether Ms. Lemcke is actually doing the majority of the questioning and I think she takes a -- she is very thorough is what 1 --

THE COURT: Okay.
MS. LEMCKE: That's a word for it, yes.
THE COURT: I've actually -- I don't think l've ever seen Ms. Lemcke in trial
MS. LEMCKE: I don't know that --
THE COURT: -- remarkably.
MS. LEMCKE: I know. I can't believe as many years as --
THE COURT: We've both --

MS. LEMCKE: -- we've been in practice --
THE COURT: -- been around.
MS. LEMCKE: -- about the same time -- yeah, of course.
MR. STAUDAHER: Your Honor, just for the record, down in lower level the -Amended Information was filed. There -- it did not reflect exactly the language that was, you know, part of the bindover so we filed an Amended. I don't know if counsel received that but did you get it in time?

MS. LEMCKE: I did, and I have --
MR. STAUDAHER: All right.
MS. LEMCKE: -- had a chance to look at it. What happened, Judge, at the end of the preliminary hearing the judge, at my request, struck some of the language that was articulated in the --

THE COURT: Complaint.
MS. LEMCKE: -- criminal complaint, the original charging document. I need to get a copy of the preliminary hearing transcript just to make sure that the Amended Information that's currently on file comports with the Court's ruling, --

THE COURT: Okay.
MS. LEMCKE: -- so I don't want to waive any issues where that's concerned.
THE COURT: Okay.
MS. LEMCKE: To the extent that it does, then l'il take -- l'll bring it some -- a motion back before --

THE COURT: Sure.
MS. LEMCKE: -- Your Honor or litigate it --
THE COURT: Or maybe --
MS. LEMCKE: -- by way of writ.

> Rough Draft
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THE COURT: -- you can even just resolve it if --
MR. STAUDAHER: Yeah, that's --
MS. LEMCKE: Yeah.
THE COURT: -- there was like a --
MR. STAUDAHER: -- fine
MS. LEMCKE: I'm sure.
THE COURT: -- clerical error or something --
MR. STAUDAHER: Right.
THE COURT: -- like that.
MR. STAUDAHER: And we believe it reflects -- it currently reflects that, but if there's some dispute and we agree --

THE COURT: Right, if you --
MR. STAUDAHER: -- with it, we'll --
THE COURT: -- can't --
MR. STAUDAHER: -- do it.
THE COURT: -- resolve it between the two of you, bring it before the Court --
MS. LEMCKE: I will.
THE COURT: -- and then I'II --
MS. LEMCKE: | will, and -- while we're waiting too, just for the record if | could have 21 days from the filing of the --

THE COURT: Of --
MS. LEMCKE: -- preliminary hearing transcript to --
THE COURT: Yes, to --
MS. LEMCKE: -- file a writ?
THE COURT: -- file the writ; absolutely.

## Rough Draft
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MS. LEMCKE: Thank you, Judge.
THE COURT: Sharry, do we --
THE JEA: June the $9^{\text {th }}$.
THE COURT: June $9^{\text {th }}$; does that work for everyone?
MS. LEMCKE: Perfect.
MR. STAUDAHER: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay.
THE JEA: Okay, jury trial on June 9, 2014 at 9:30 and calendar call on June 5, 2014 at 9:30.

MR. STAUDAHER: Thank you, Your Honor.
THE COURT: All right, thank you.
MS. LEMCKE: Thank you, Your Honor.
[Proceedings concluded at 9:48 a.m.]

ATTEST: I do hereby certify that I have truly and correctly transcribed the audio/video recording in the above-entitled case to the best of my ability.
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## LAS VEGAS, NEVADA, THURSDAY, MARCH 10, 2014 at 9:57 A.M.

THE COURT: All right, the State versus Jonathan Quisano who is present in custody with Ms. Lemcke and Mr. Reed. We've got Mr. Staudaher for the State and Ms. --

MR. STAUDAHER: And Ms. Edwards.
THE COURT: All right.
This is on for the Defendant's petition. l've reviewed everything. Does the defense have anything they'd like to add to what's already --

MS. LEMCKE: | --
THE COURT: -- been provided to the Court?
MS. LEMCKE: I do not, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Anything --
MR. STAUDAHER: We will --
THE COURT: -- for the State?
MR. STAUDAHER: -- submit it then, Your Honor.
THE COURT: All right.
I just want to review the record a little bit more fully and so l'm going to pass this to chambers for decision, all right?

MS. LEMCKE: Okay, thank you, Judge.
THE COURT: Thank you.
MR. STAUDAHER: Thank you, Your Honor.
THE COURT: That means you don't have to come back since there's --
THE CLERK: Next chambers; on the $10^{\text {th }}$ ?
THE COURT: Yeah.
THE CLERK: March $10^{\text {th }}$.

THE COURT: All right, thank you.
MS. LEMCKE: But we don't need to be --
MR. STAUDAHER: Thank you, Your Honor.
MS. LEMCKE: -- present on that date? You'll just --
THE COURT: No, no. Basically --
MS. LEMCKE: -- issue a minute order --
THE COURT: -- I just issue a ruling; that's it.
MS. LEMCKE: -- a court order? Oh -- okay, perfect.
THE COURT: Okay?
MS. LEMCKE: Thank you, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Thank you -- since there's no argument -- the argument would have been today and so --

MS. LEMCKE: Right.
THE COURT: -- there's nothing else.
All right, thank you.
MR. STAUDAHER: Thank you, Your Honor.
MS. LEMCKE: Thank you.
[Proceedings concluded at 9:58 a.m.]
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TUESDAY, JUNE 3, 2014 AT 9:52 A.M.

THE COURT: All right. State versus Jonathan Quisano who is present in custody.

All right. This is on for various motions. And what I am going to do is go through each motion and sort of state my preliminary findings or ruling and then anyone who would like to add something or ask me to consider something else, I will. All right.

MR. REED: Sounds good.
THE COURT: Starting with the motion to suppress. My reading of everything including the grand jury transcript suggests -- or the transcript -- suggests to me that it was non-custodial. However, if you would like to have an evidentiary hearing on the issue, we can certainly set it for an evidentiary hearing.

MS. LEMCKE: I would like that, Judge.
THE COURT: All right. Now --
MR. STAUDAHER: Your Honor, I think the case is clear. If they ask for it, I think we have to.

THE COURT: Right. So, scheduling. This is set for calendar call on Thursday. So, if it's going forward for trial I guess we'll do the hearing on Monday or we could do the hearing on Friday.

MR. STAUDAHER: Either way, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay. I guess we'll talk about that at the calendar call then.
MR. REED: That's fine, Judge. I have hearings early Friday morning, but | would have Friday afternoon open, schedule wise, for myself. Monday, obviously, I'm open.

MS. LEMCKE: I'm open, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay.
MR. STAUDAHER: And, Your Honor, to facilitate that, I anticipated the Court would probably rule in that way, and I talked to counsel about this before. To facilitate that hearing, it's probably important to the Court that we hear the interview that was actually done to see if it was coercive or what the nature of it was and how the Defendant reacted. I've got a copy of that here that I can provide to the Court if the Court would like to review that in advance of the hearing on Monday or whenever --

THE COURT: Or I can make you all sit in here while we listen to it together.
MR. STAUDAHER: That's true. We can do that, we can do that. That sounds like fun. Either way, l've got it available for the Court now if the Court would like it.

THE COURT: All right. In other words, I will try to listen to it ahead of time, time permitting.

MR. STAUDAHER: May I approach, Your Honor?
THE COURT: You may.
MR. REED: Judge, I think it's like 40 minutes too --
THE COURT: Okay.
MR. REED: -- just so the Court knows. It's not an exceeding long interrogation.

THE COURT: All right. I'm going to pass for a moment, just for a moment, the motion to compel and the motion to admit evidence of other crimes.

I'm moving to the motion to strike the jury veneer based on the automatic exclusion of convicted felons. That's an interesting one. I believe it's the
first time we've had that motion in here. I'm curious as to whether or not that's been filed in other cases.

MR. REED: You're the first, Judge.
THE COURT: I am?
MR. REED: You're the first --
THE COURT: Are you asking me to make new law?
MR. REED: Yes; I think that would be the case.
THE COURT: All right. We didn't get an opposition on this one.
MR. STAUDAHER: Actually we do, Your Honor. It was filed on the $30^{\text {th }}$, I believe.

MR. REED: I received a copy of it.
THE COURT: Okay.
MR. STAUDAHER: I've got a copy here if the Court would like to see it.
THE COURT: All right. You can approach with that.
Just so you folks know on this, felons get through all the time.
Whenever -- I mean, because I -- we were getting convicted felons. So, I know have started asking the question, has anyone been convicted of a felony. And then we ask them what it is and we check and see, you know, were they discharged, did they go to prison, what have you. So, that's how we do it in here. But obviously jury services is automatically excluding felons; $a$, some of are still getting through and, $b$, we need to address that issue. So -- notwithstanding any practice the Court has.

MR. REED: Right. And I understand, Your Honor, and I think the Court is spot on. There is probably some that are getting through, but my understanding of looking at the website in which prospective jurors personally being requested to serve on a jury, you fill out an application and if you are a convicted felon you
answer yes to convicted felon, you are immediately removed from the system at that point.

THE COURT: Okay. So, we're getting the ones who are making it through are the convicted felons who aren't smart enough to check the box.

MR. REED: They are either misrepresenting or unwittingly answering.
THE COURT: Well no because -- they don't misrepresent. We get people who aren't convicted felons representing to be felons so that they can get excused which is why we always verify whatever information to the extent we can to $9: 56.44$ [indiscernible] the bailiff or marshal does that.

All right. I'm looking at the -- I'm reading, it's quite short -- State's two page opposition that basically -- they're not a distinctive group and that there's not a constitutional right to be tried by a jury or a jury composed in part by convicted felons like you have for other protected groups or distinct groups in the community based on race, religion and other things.

MS. JOBE: If I could point something out, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Yes.
MS. JOBE: The statute that counsel raises in their motion refer to felons being able to restore their civil rights, and that is actually explicitly provided for in NRS 6.010 which I cited in the opposition articulating those who are qualified to serve as jurors. I'll spare Your Honor the entire paragraph, but at the end it says a person who has been convicted of a felony is not a qualified juror of the county in which the person resides until the person's civil rights to serve as a juror has been restored pursuant to the statute that counsel cited. So, they're not automatically excluded as an entire group and exactly what counsel referred to as being impermissible is what is provided for and articulated in the statute. So, the State
would ask Your Honor to dismiss their motion.
MR. REED: That's a very narrow reading, Your Honor.
Actually what the statute says is that there's two avenues actually in which a convicted felon can serve on a jury; one, in which they have had their civil rights restored and the other is when they're civil rights are restored by operation of law which is the other section of the statute that I refer to in my motion that says if a convicted felon has had six years that have passed since the completion of their parole or probation, they are automatically --

THE COURT: Unless it's an A or a B felony.
MR. REED: Unless A or B they are automatically reinstored to the civil rights. So, actually these statutes are in harmony. What's happening is that the jury commissioner is reading just the statute that says are you a convicted felon and people are checking off yes and actually based on personal experience, they are not asking have you have had your civil rights restored. They are just automatically taking you out of the system and putting the burden on the prospective juror to indicate to the jury services that they have had their civil rights restored.

But in addition to that, by operation of law, we have unwitting felons in this very community that have successfully completed parole and probation that are not in the jury panel because they are being misinformed about the law and frankly even the State of Nevada is misinformed about the law because these statutes do go in harmony. They work together. There's two ways that it happens and it makes sense, right, Your Honor. You have your civil rights restored by a request of the Court or you have 'em done automatically by operation of law under the statute. There's no conflict there and that's why the legislature has deemed fit to allow these people who have gone through the pains of serving their time to be able
to go back to the community and serve as jurors and that's just not happened.
MS. JOBE: And, Your Honor, I believe pursuant to the argument that counsel is making, if he wants to go down that road we need to serve the Attorney General's office and have them come in and respond to this.

THE COURT: Well he's not trying to strike down the statute. He's saying that the way we're selecting jurors in Clark County is impermissible. So, I don't know that the Attorney General's office would need to be served because he's not saying -- he's saying the practice is wrong. The practice is not implemented by the Attorney General's office. The practice of the way we do it here is implemented by the District Court judges. For example, it used to be voter registration. There was an informal, I believe, it was an informal complaint made by the ACLU that we weren't getting an adequate cross section of the community. The judges agreed that we would broaden the pool using, I guess, power records and other things to hopefully get a great cross section racially, ethnically, what have you of the community, economically of the community. So, it's actually not the State that sets the policies. It's the Court that sets the policy, meaning the judges in aggregate that sets the policy. So, I don't know that the Attomey General's office would need to be involved with that because they don't have a say in the policy. It's the law which would be up to me how to read that whether you read them as one taking precedence over the other or whether you read them that, no, they both pertain in different ways as Mr. Reed asserts.

So, you know, I'm inclined to say no but I think you've raised an interesting issue here. So, l'm going to think about it further but l'm inclined to say no we're not going to have a whole hearing and then what would that mean for purposes of this case that they'd have to send out -- you'd have to get a different
pool because when people check that off it's ahead of time so it would delay the tria by definition; do you see what l'm saying? Because the people who are coming in next Monday, I believe, have already gone through that process

MR. REED: They have.
THE COURT: So, that would by necessity if I were to say no our practice is incorrect, then that would delay the trial by definition of the way you would need to do it. I'm inclined to deny the motion. l'll just tell you right now.

All right. The next one is the motion to limit expert testimony. I have a few preliminary comments on the law regarding expert witnesses. First of all, the duty to supplement does not, in part two, does not obviate the State or a plaintiff or a Defendant or anybody else of their initial duty to disclose. So, you can't say oh well have an ongoing duty. That means we can file the report really late. You have an initial duty to disclose and then a duty to supplement. For example, if somebody's medical condition changes, quick frequently the physician will have to supplement the expert report to say, you know, this person wasn't a surgical candidate. Now they are a surgical candidate. Or we had additional evidence, there's an additional CT scan or whatever and now my opinion is this that or the other thing or I had new data, a new deposition or something like that. I revised my opinion in this way. So, you have an initial duty and an ongoing duty.

I just want to say that the ongoing duty to supplement does not obviate the State or anyone else of their initial duty. The rule, I think, was designed for retained experts over which the parties have some contro; meaning, if you have a retained expert you can direct them. I need your $\mathrm{CV} ;$ I need this, that or the other thing. The experts we're talking about in this case are really percipient witnesses. They're not retained experts although they will be testifying within the ambit of their
expertise. For that reason, the State has limited control over them in terms of telling them you need to provide a CV , you need to do this, that or the other thing because, again, they're not retained by the State, they're not compensated by the State. My understanding is they're coming in as treating physicians or percipient witnesses --

MR. STAUDAHER: Predominantly, right,
THE COURT: -- to the treat; correct?
MR. STAUDAHER: Right.
THE COURT: And they're not being retained by the State to provide expert opinions. They're opinions are going to be within the ambit of the treatment they provide; is that true?

MR. STAUDAHER: That's correct.
THE COURT: Okay. So, for that reason --
MR. STAUDAHER: With the exception of like the medical examiner and the people who did the post --

THE COURT: The Metro people are different.
MR. STAUDAHER: Yes.
THE COURT: You have a little more control over those people. I'm talking mainly about the people in Hawaii, some of the early treating physicians.

So, I just want to comment that, you know, the State has limited ability to control what these witnesses provide because they're not retained by them.

Thirdly, I will say that even though they are treating physicians and you cannot, because you're compensating them differently, you cannot make them generate a report the way you would make a retained expert generate a report. | still think the State has a duty to disclose what the substance of their testimony is going to be and not just hand the defense a pile of records and a list of doctors and
say you folks figure it out. For example, Diane Mazzu, the radiologist; you know, the State should designate Diane Mazzu may testify that she reviewed the CT scan -it's just hypothetical. I don't know what she would testify to, you know, the CT scans taken on this date at this hospital and that she prepared a report saying that they showed $\mathrm{A}, \mathrm{B}$ or C . So, I do think even though you're talking about treating physicians when they are going to be testifying within the ambit of their treatment, I way say in a prosecution, you know, it's different than a civil case, that you do have more of a duty to say what are these treating physicians going to be testifying about, again, not just handing them a big stack of records and telling them, defense, you figure out what -- I use Diane Mazzu because I went to school with her and I know her name. You know, you figure out what these people are going to testify about.

So, State, have you done that to the best of your ability?
MR. STAUDAHER: We believe we have, Your Honor. This is what we've done as far as the disclosure.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. STAUDAHER: First of all, as the Court knows, the medical records as the Court's referred to have been provided in advance. Within that group of documents, there are typically like a consult or a doctor who did an operation who does a formal operative report or a consultation note. All of those things directly have the name of the person and have been provided to them. And actually we met with counsel last week. We went out to the vault and had them to go through not on the vault materials but as well as the detectives files in anticipation of trial. We, at that time, basically reiterated the fact that although all of those individuals are noticed, it's really the handful of people who had direct hands on contact and that their direct reports, meaning their consult notes and sort forth, are the materials that
we would be relying upon and that's the scope of what they would be primarily testifying about.

In addition, we told counsel that there were specific individuals that they wanted to know whether they were going to come in or not come in or what their issues were, how they related to the case. We certainly can provide that to them to the best of our knowledge. We told them in general who the people were that we believe would be coming in most likely, but we have to notice all of the people who touched in case there was an issue with oh well, you know, we have a nurse who finally says, no, that was Joanne so and so who did that. Then we have to go get Joanne so and so and as long as she's noticed we could bring her in a witness. To the best of our ability we believe we've done that.

THE COURT: Okay. Two things. On the CVs. Although, you know, a treating physician is not a retained expert. You have less ability to direct them. You know, your office, maybe not you directly but your investigator or victim witness is in contact with these people. I would ask that they at least request a CV because, you know, many of these physicians will have a CV. Some of them, honestly, that just work as treating physicians that don't work ever as expert witnesses, retained experts, they may not have CV .

MR. STAUDAHER: Well to the extent related to that issue, the CV portion, this is what was provided for those witnesses that we don't actually have a CV for.

THE COURT: Right. I read that. You got some things from licensing and whatnot.

MR. STAUDAHER: Right. So, it indicates where their training was, where they currently work, where they went to school.

THE COURT: Did you ask -- my question is -- did you ask those doctors for

CVs and they said we don't have a CV?
MR. STAUDAHER: I have not asked specifically. There's about three doctors that we told them about that came in. We have not asked them specifically for CVs.

THE COURT: I mean, I would say they may have CVs. If they don't testify normally as expert witnesses, they may, you know, if it's just a doctor who works in his office, he's not going to have a CV, frankly.

MR. STAUDAHER: We can certainly ask those individuals.
THE COURT: And we're not going to tell a treating physician, you know, that's just a witness that he has to prepare one because --

MR. STAUDAHER: If the Court would like and counsel would like, we can certainly go beyond what we've done and ask them if they want -- if they have a CV .

THE COURT: If they have it to send it to you and then immediately forward that to the defense.

MR. STAUDAHER: We will do that.
THE COURT: All right.
MS. LEMCKE: Your Honor, can I just respond very briefly on this?
THE COURT: Sure
MS. LEMCKE: And I understand what the Court is saying. Here's the problem is that they've noticed no less than 48 experts, 48.

THE COURT: Can I interrupt you because I was going to say, look, you know, trial may be starting Monday. Of these 48 people, I get it. You noticed people saying oh well you know if Barbara comes in and she says, oh no, I was the charge nurse but Sue really did that, then you may need to call Sue. I get that. But I think at this point in time, I mean, you know, it's close to starting. You need to tell
them of these 48 people here's who we're intending on calling in our case in chief. And then if a witness gets up there and says oh well wait a minute. It says my name but that was wrong. It was really somebody else. Okay. You've listed the person. You can still call them. But I think you should at least give them a list of here's really who is going to be testifying either from Hawaii or here in Court.

MR. STAUDAHER: And we've actually done that, Your Honor. We told them the three people that we believe would testify from Hawaii; we've told them the doctors that we believe will testify who were the treating type doctors, clearly the CSA individuals and the medical examiner and the Stanford consultants who consulted on the brain and the eyeballs that were sent over for further evaluation. Those individuals they know about. I think the vast majority of those secondary parties we have the CVs for and they have the information about them. Those we've disclosed last week and today when we told them about the specific Hawaii people that we believe we can have come in.

THE COURT: Okay. So, three people from Hawaii and how many local medical people, whether it's treating physicians or nurses --

MR. STAUDAHER: Probably less than a half dozen.
THE COURT: -- or whatever.
MR. STAUDAHER: Probably around half dozen, I would think, if that.
THE COURT: How many?
MR. STAUDAHER: Less than a half dozen, I would think. I know there are three doctors at the hospital specifically. We haven't gone through all the nurses yet to see if there's a nurse that has any specific information, but we do know that Dr. Cetl, the medical examiner who is in case Dr. Gavin, Dr. Vogel, who is the Stanford referral person for the brain, Dr. -- | think it was -- what was his name -- Egbert.

Those are the primary individuals we're talking about in the case.
THE COURT: Now let me just say this. Once you've, whether it's Metro sent things on for forensic evaluation as to cause of death, like Dr. Vogel and things like that, now you really do have the obligation for reporting and a CV --

MR. STAUDAHER: And those -- we have those.
THE COURT: -- which is different from hospital personnel or people who were just there by virtue of their jobs and provided treatment or couldn't provide treatment because of the condition. That's different.

MR. STAUDAHER: Right.
THE COURT: So, those are not treating --
MR. STAUDAHER: That has been provided not only the CVs of those individuals but the reports that they did generate, meaning the medical examiner and Dr. Vogel and then Dr. Egbert. Their reports had been in the possession of counsel since the beginning of the case, essentially.

THE COURT: All right. Ms. Lemcke.
MS. LEMCKE: Okay. I understand the predicament that the State's in relative to -- you know, we all have large case loads. Sometimes it's just not easy to sit down and sift through everything that you have and figure out what experts that you're going to call and which ones you're not. But the statute doesn't say you notice everyone that you find a name for in your file. The statute specifically says you notice those experts that you intend to call at trial. So, by noticing 40 experts, only of a fraction of whom they intend to call at trial, they're not following the plain letter of the statute. What they're doing is beginning to encroach on my client's due process rights because now what's happening is l've got to go chance my tail trying to figure out which doctors they're actually going to call.

Now I understand that Mr. Staudaher has said to Your Honor well we've told them very generally we intend on calling some of the treating doctors. There are still several doctors that are noticed as having touched this file in some way at UMC. I mean, I can think of five --

THE COURT: Okay. What Mr. Staudaher has said he's calling three witnesses from Hawaii --

MS. LEMCKE: Right.
THE COURT: -- and he gave those names.
MS. LEMCKE: That's correct.
THE COURT: Is that true? So, you've got the three people from Hawaii. He said he's calling the Stanford expert who did the --

MR. STAUDAHER: Experts. Two.
THE COURT: -- so has he given you those names?
MS. LEMCKE: Yes.
THE COURT: Okay. And then from UMC who are you calling? This may be where the rubber hits the road.

MS. LEMCKE: Correct.
MR. STAUDAHER: The people from UMC that we believe will be coming in, the physicians, are doctors --

MS. JOBE: Steward Kaplan.
MR. STAUDAHER: Yeah, Kaplan.
MS. JOBE: Dr. Chow and Dr. Casey.
MR. STAUDAHER: Casey. Those two.
THE COURT: And they were all ER physicians?
MR. STAUDAHER: No. Dr. Kaplan is the neuro individual. Dr. Casey and

Dr. Chow are both individuals who treated initially the child when the child came. There's not a huge number of medical records in this case because the child did not survive.

THE COURT: Right.
MR. STAUDAHER: He came in and was essentially dead at the hospital when they arrived. So, there was not a huge amount of material generated from that although those three individuals are primarily the individuals that would come in; maybe not even all of them but those three would be the ones we intend to call at trial.

THE COURT: I mean, are they all going to testify -- here's the other thing. Are they all going to testify to the same thing?

MR. STAUDAHER: No.
THE COURT: Okay.
MR. STAUDAHER: They have some differences. Actually there's the possibility we could narrow it even to two of those individuals. But Dr. -- | believe it's Dr. Kaplan probably will testify because he stands in a different position than the other two. So, Dr. Kaplan, Dr. Chow and/or Dr. Casey would testify from UMC. They all have consult notes that have been provided to counsel. The -- again I don't really even anticipate any of the nurses but should it come out that we need a triage nurse or something, they have the information related to those. I can work with them and told them that we would work with them.

THE COURT: So, it's unlikely at this point that there will be nursing professionals called today.

MR. STAUDAHER: I don't believe so at this point.
THE COURT: Okay.

MR. STAUDAHER: But they're noticed in case we've got changes.
THE COURT: Right. I get that. I get that. I mean, going forward practically, you know, are we starting the trial Monday. Who are going to be allowed at least to call in your case in chief? Three people from Hawaii, the four possibly physicians that you -- well five possible physicians -- the two from Stanford you're definitely calling.

MR. STAUDAHER: Right.
THE COURT: You're definitely calling two physicians from UMC and possibly three physicians from UMC.

MR. STAUDAHER: Right. The medical examiner, Dr. Sandra Cetl, Dr. Arthur Montes who is a pediatric radiologist who consulted on the case as well and reviewed the radiology films from Hawaii and testified at the prelim. So, I mean, they know about the those individuals and I believe that those are the - in a nutshell, if you take those apart from the CSAs and so forth, that's what we're talking about as far as the bulk of the witnesses who would testify in the State's case.

THE COURT: Okay. Now a lot of the CSA, I'm assuming, as just going to testify about general evidence collection or where are we getting into expert testimony on these CSAs?

MR. STAUDAHER: Well what I have -- the reason that we do it this way, at least in my experience, is that l've run into the situation where l've had even a person like a CSA who goes out and has been trained to take photographs and latent prints and all those different things and had a person come in and if you don't notice them, the argument is typically well this person is going to be offering. testimony that is over and above that which the average person --

THE COURT: Right. As to how --
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MR. STAUDAHER: -- in the street would have.
THE COURT: -- as to how do you find a fingerprint or what --
MR. STAUDAHER: Correct. So, we noticed them. They do have CVs related to them. They have the actual reports related to whatever they did at the crime scene. That's what we have done and we intend to bring those people in for that purpose.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. STAUDAHER: There isn't a huge amount - - there's not DNA evidence and things in this case. It's not one of those. It would be photographs primarily, diagrams, things like that.

THE COURT: Okay. Ms. Lemcke.
MS. LEMCKE: Okay. So, just to pick up, Judge, and I understand. The traffic reality of the situation is that they should have really disclosed that information to us at an earlier time. They shouldn't have noticed a -- they shouldn't have filed a witness list, an expert witness notice, that contained 48 experts and then expected us -- what Mr. Staudaher would say, that's true. He would say well, you know if you ask me about some of these people, you know, we can probably narrow it down a little bit. That's not the way the statute works. The statute doesn't say you file every expert that's in the phone book and then defense counsel is incumbent on you to call the DA and ask the DA which of these 48 experts you're really going to call. That's not what the statute says. It says intend to call case in chief.

THE COURT: Yeah. Can I just interrupt? One issue, I think, is when you've got treating people who are going to provide expert testimony as opposed to retained experts because when you have retained experts you know exactly who your retained experts are going to be and who you're going to call. When you're
talking about treating experts, it is what it is. And so, you know, they don't really have any control over what these people did and what these people are going to say.

And so I think that's -- it's a little bit different and why they have to list so many people because, again, with retained experts it's different. You have, you know, each party has total control of their retained experts, who they're going to call, how many they're going to use, and whatnot. With treating people who happen to be experts, you don't really have any control over that. And so I think, you know, the rule was really designed for retained experts and, you know, we're trying -- I mean, clearly you get to have notice, you need to know who they're going to call, but I just say in the State's defense they have less control of that. I think, like I said, you know, the time is now --

MS. LEMCKE: Right.
THE COURT: -- to say who is it really going to be, you know, the time is now.
MS. LEMCKE: Correct. And I think the Court makes a very valid point. My concern is this. They've had the UMC records for almost a year now. They could have gone through and figured out -- it's not hard really to discern who did exactly -which radiologist took the CT scan of the head, which one did the CT scan of the abdomen; which neurosurgeon came in and evaluated for clinical brain death. They could have done that well in advance of this and made these determinations because the records, as Mr. Staudaher alludes to, are not exceedingly voluminous. This is not something that could not have been done or was completely outside the purview of their control.

Now that having been said, my concern with respect to the absence of the CVs for those -- and now that they've actually given the list, it could be the CV
issue is not an issue. l'm going to have to go back and check the individuals for whom we have actually have CVs. But here's the problem is that they have indicated in their expert witness notice that some of the treating doctors they're also going to opine as to mechanism of injury. It's one thing to say this child presented with $X, Y$ and $Z$ symptoms. Here's what I took of the history and here's what I did to treat the child. That's one thing and I think that's fair game for any of these freating physicians. But that's not all they noticed them to testify to. In the expected testimony summaries, they go one step further and they say we also expect this individual to talk-about mechanism of injury. That is the one of the many reason that we think the CVs are crucial. Number one, we obviously, in a separate motion, have contended that some of those experts don't have the expertise to do that which is a separate issue.

THE COURT: Well that's really to the -- that's separate. And that's not the physicians. That's the --

MS. LEMCKE: But they noticed the physicians for mechanism of injury, Your Honor, and the problem is this. Pretend l'm cross-examining an expert, a treating doctor, not one of their retained guys.

THE COURT: Right. Maybe he's testified in other case --
MS. LEMCKE: And he's saying, you know, I think mechanism of injury was this and it's inconsistent with what your client said happened, this that and the other, and I want to stand up in cross-examination -- cross-examine him on the basis --

THE COURT: Didn't you testify in this other case, the civil case, whatever.
MS. LEMCKE: I have no idea. And I'll say well but I have and the Nevada State Medical Board Examiner's print out that the prosecutor gave me, it says that you only get $X, Y$ and $Z$. And they're going to say but I published on this or I have
lectured on this.
THE COURT: Okay. Let me interrupt you. Maybe we can kind of cut to the chase here. Mr. Staudaher --

MR. STAUDAHER: Yes.
THE COURT: -- as to -- obviously the Hawaii physicians are not going to be opining as to the mechanism.

MR. STAUDAHER: This is the extent of --
THE COURT: The only ones I'm assuming who would be opining are the three -- well let's set aside the Stanford experts because we already -- you've got CVs. That's not an issue. The three or four -- the three UMC physicians. Those would be the only ones opining is, you know, was this injury consistent with the mechanism.

MR. STAUDAHER: That is correct with regard to the injuries that occurred here. As far as Dr. Ninomiya or the investigation that took place in Hawaii, there were different injuries related to this child. So, he would --

THE COURT: Well you're going to get to that.
MR. STAUDAHER: I know. But that's what he would be talking about.
THE COURT: Right. But as to the -- I'm really concerned with the UMC physicians.

MR. STAUDAHER: Yes.
THE COURT: Did you provide CVs for those UMC physicians?
MR. STAUDAHER: We believe we have except for Dr. Chow which we will ask him if he's got one.

THE COURT: Here's what you need to do with Dr. Chow then. If he's going to go beyond, you know, simply treating and they told me this, you know, I would
say though within treating -- obviously these issues come up in civil cases all the time -- within treating, you know, if they say it was reported to me that the child fell off a chair and hit his head, his facial area or whatever, they can say were the injuries consistent with that. No. I mean, I think that's within the ambit of treating. But I will say this. If Dr. Chow is going to opine as to the mechanism, what your office needs to do is contact Dr. Chow once you leave here and find out if he has a CV . If he has ever testified as an expert, I would almost guarantee you the man has a CV. If he doesn't, find out if he's ever testified as an expert in a civil or criminal case so at least then they can find out who he testified for and, you know, and whatnot. There may or may not be transcripts of that but if there are, you know, maybe you can get those.

So, this should have been done sooner, but at a minimum when you leave today you need to find all that out for Dr. Chow. Okay. Or if he's published anything. Like I said, if he's a physician who's publishing and testifying as an expert he's got a CV.

All right. Let's then, you know, I think that with the CSIs most of them -I'm not concerned with the facts that they don't have CVs or what --

MR. STAUDAHER: They do.
MS. LEMCKE: They provided all those. We're good on that.
THE COURT: The coroner, you've got that. That's all good. So, really, the big issue is at this point the UMC physicians. I think it's only an issue as to one. You're going to take care of that when you leave Court today. You're going to immediately communicate with the defense and let them know what you found out about Dr. Chow. Now obviously Dr. Chow isn't sitting at his desk printing out his CVs at a moment's notice. So, there may be a little delay here. But like I said, if
he's testified as an expert before he probably has someone on his staff that can coordinate that for you.

MR. STAUDAHER: Sure.
THE COURT: So -- okay. That issue.
Now let's move on -- | think that's everything except for the outstanding issue of whether or not the Hawaii people are going to be testifying at all.

MS. LEMCKE: Right. And, Your Honor, just before we move on. So, my understanding -- because the State actually noticed three retained experts, maybe more, but by my count three. One was Sandra Cetl. The other one was Arthur Montes, and the last one was Marietta Nelson. Am I to understand correctly that you're not calling Dr. Nelson?

MS. JOBE: Nelson was the ophthalmologist in the medical records that saw the child at UMC.

MR. STAUDAHER: And we do not anticipate calling her at this moment. The other two individuals, they're not -- nobody is retained in this case thus far. And so to the extent that we have a retained expert, we would provide clearly whatever information pertaining to that witness, but we don't have retained experts in this case.

THE COURT: But the Stanford people were specifically contacted to determine the mechanism of injury and cause, manner --

MR. STAUDAHER: Yes, not by us. The coroner's office has a --
THE COURT: Right. But that's still within the ambit; not of the prosecutor's office but of the State, so to speak. But your office has not retained any additional experts.

MR. STAUDAHER: No, we have not retained any experts.

MR. REED: What about Dr. Cetl?
MR. STAUDAHER: She's not retained. She is not a retained expert in our case.

THE COURT: Is she going to testify?
MR. STAUDAHER: We anticipate, yes, she will testify,
MR. LEMCKE: She didn't examine the child. I mean, they're going to hand her documents, have her review them, and then give opinions based on them. I mean, it's a functional equivalent of retained. I don't know what their definition of retained is.

MR. STAUDAHER: Well they have her CV so that's not --
MS. LEMCKE: I know. But I don't have a report from her and that was going to be my next question. I don't have a report from Cetl or Montes. Maybe they said we don't want one but l'd like to know that on the record if there is no such thing.

MR. STAUDAHER: They have not generated reports in this case.
THE COURT: Okay. Did you ask them to generate reports? They were sent by the --

MR. STAUDAHER: With the exception of -- when the initial investigation took place, the medical -- the coroner's office actually consulted with Dr. Montes. He provided them with some report which was contained in the autopsy report which counsel actually has. So, with the exception of that --

THE COURT: So, that's the only report he's generated. That's fine because that was part of the -- all then he's going to testify to is what he's already done. You know, he can't testify about new stuff. Obviously that's not in the report.

MR. STAUDAHER: Well he actually reviewed medical records from Hawaii as well.

THE COURT: Okay. If he was going to testify about a records view -- let me just tell you this.

MR. STAUDAHER: And he testified at prelim about those things.
THE COURT: Okay. He can't testify to anything beyond what he's already testified to if you know, he's done a subsequent records review. But he already testified at the prelim as to what his records review was, then they've had notice. He can testify to the same thing. Okay. But he can't review new records and have a new opinion or anything like that. It's too late in the game for that. Okay.

MR. STAUDAHER: Okay.
THE COURT: All right. Does that deal with all of the expert issues on the witness?

MS. LEMCKE: So, there's no report from Dr. Cetl either then?
MR. STAUDAHER: No, there's no report.
MS. LEMCKE: Okay, okay, that's it.
MR. REED: So, we won't know what documents she relied on in forming her opinion whether she's testified in the past or anything like that?

THE COURT: Well that you have the CV.
MR. REED: Okay. We're going to get to talk to her so there you go.
THE COURT: Okay.
MR. REED: I didn't know that.
THE COURT: All right.
MR. REED: We're good.
THE COURT: Okay. All right. The next issue is the motion in limine to exclude the testimony regarding the trauma destination fall criteria protocol. Here is my initial ruling.

I don't think the EMT personnel should be offering opinions as to the mechanism of injury because we have so much medical testimony. That's the pivotal issue in this case. And really an EMT is less equipped to testify about that than a trained physician. So, I would say, no, he can't opine as to the mechanism of injury. What he can say because it would just be confusing and you have experts with fair more training who are going to be offering opinions on that. So, I don't think a EMT with minimal medical training should be opining and sort of mudding the waters.

Now what he can say is based on the purported height of the fall, I normally wouldn't transport to trauma. However, in this case based on what I observed as a patient, the lifeless condition, you know, whatever, I determined that this was a trauma transport and I took the patient to UMC. He can testify to that but he is not to opine that, oh, well this was inconsistent with what was told to me by the father because -- or the Defendant, same person -- because I think that that's really going to be what this trial is about. We have numerous medical experts who are going to be testifying and I think it doesn't add anything for an EMT with less training. But like you said, he can say normally when a fall is reported at two feet or three feet or whatever, I wouldn't be transporting here, but I also evaluate the patient and this is what I saw; you know, unconsciousness, listlessness, whatever, and based on that I made a determination it was a trauma transport to UMC. Okay.

MR. STAUDAHER: I think that's essentially the extent of that kind of thing.
Actually that information came out on cross-examination.
THE COURT: Yeah. I think the defense was more concerned that he would be opining that the condition of the child was inconsistent with what was described as the mechanism of the fall. So, I don't think he should be opining as to that
because, again, we have experts with more training who are going to be opining on that and it would just be confusing. Does that satisfy the defense's concerns?

MS. LEMCKE: Well not entirely and let me explain why.
My concern is, is that the way that the protocol was described at preliminary hearing was this. As they come in and there's a reported fall injury, if the patient is showing obvious signs of trauma, they're going to transport to UMC Trauma. It's just a given. If the patient is not showing any outward manifestations of trauma and is asymptomatic, then the fall criteria comes into play. But it doesn't come into play if they are symptomatic. And the problem is what they're doing is they're kind of backdooring this fall criteria upon which we have no ability to crossexamine because you've got an EMT guy who didn't write the fall criteria and probably hasn't studied the fall criteria.

THE COURT: Well the fall criteria really isn't -- I mean, like I said, he could say this is why I transported to UMC because the patient was this that. Now if he also evaluated the fall criteria, he can testify about that. But, again, he can't, you know, his opinion is irrelevant in this case. I mean, is the decision he transported, I mean, because the patient was unconscious; right?

MS. JOBE: Yes, Your Honor, based on the presentation of the child.
THE COURT: So, that's the question. Why did you transport to UMC? Because of the presentation of the child. Now he can also get into the Defendant's statements made to him. That's different. But he can't then opine on the statements. He can say, you know, what was told to you, that the child fell off the back of this chair. What did you observe? I observed a child was unconscious and blah, blah, blah. What decision did you make as to transport based on the condition of the child? I transported to UMC. That's really what he should be testifying about.

MS. LEMCKE: Agreed, agreed. Because the other part of that fall criteria and protocol thing doesn't even -- it's not even applicable here because the kid was symptomatic. It's just a very clever kind of backdoorish way for the prosecution to suggest to the jury that --

THE COURT: Well if they try to do that make a contemporaneous objection at trial.

MS. LEMCKE: I will do that.
THE COURT: You can discuss this adequately. All right.
The next issue is the motion -- let's do the motion to admit the evidence of other crimes. Why the huge discrepancy in what happened in Hawaii between the State's version of what happened in Hawaii and the defense's version of what happened in Hawaii?

MS. JOBE: State cited to the records from Hawaii, the statements in the Hawaii records. The parents were found to be at fault. It's in the records, it's in writing from Hawaii. That's the basis of the State's facts, the State's statements with respect to the Defendant's responsibility, all the services received in Hawaii as a result of the injuries to Khaylen.

THE COURT: Here is what I would say initially. If this were also a case for failure to obtain appropriate medical treatment then I would say the Hawaii --

MR. STAUDAHER: But that is a component of what happens in this case.
THE COURT: Yeah. But that's not what he's charged with. He's charged with the act itself, correct, not with failure to obtain. If this were a failure to obtain case then I would say definitely that comes in as previous failures to obtain and he had notice that you need prompt medical treatment.

MR. STAUDAHER: That is a component of this case in part because of that.

I mean, we've got a situation where when he -- when the event occurs, whatever it is, -- he doesn't call.

THE COURT: Right. He waits. He calls the wife at work.
MR. STAUDAHER: Right. And then he doesn't even divulge to her the details of what took place. He waits then again another period of time. Then he calls her back 15 minutes later or so. After he talks to her a second time and finally gets out information pertaining to the status of the kid, she hangs up the phone and calls 9-1-1. 9-1-1 respond to the location. And so he delays initially. He delays after he talks to his wife. He then, you know, he's not the one who calls 9-1-1. When the police -- when the first responders arrive on scene, they don't even get a straight -- they get like three different stories about what happened to this kid at the scene. So, then he, you know, the child gets transported to UMC. He never clarifies any of that stuff.

So, the fact that the information was withheld and the severity of the situation was downplayed not only to the first responders but even to his wife is a factor here because it goes in part to why the kid actually dies. If there's a delay in treatment from the injury it goes to the actual cause of death potentially. You have essentially no way of getting --

THE COURT: Yeah. But then if that was your theory I think you need to notice them that that's your theory of the case, failure to obtain medical treatment. I mean, if anything, if you -- it kind of bolsters their story of why he didn't call and get treatment right away because this is how he acts, this what he's done in the past. He doesn't, for whatever reason, he doesn't call 9-1-1 promptly. I mean you have the pneumonia situation with the first child that passed away --

MR. STAUDAHER: That was the first child, correct.

THE COURT: -- where they wait. So, I mean, that's actually consistent with the defense.

MR. STAUDAHER: And then even our own -- but even our child here, the one who dies, there was a delay in treatment in Hawaii related to that child. So, he comes into the doctor after the doctor's, again -- this is prior to CPS involvement -the doctor has brought both of them in has described for them how important it is to get medical care immediately especially if they have any symptoms like the previous child. The child essentially has those same symptoms. They delay again. He comes back to the doctor. The doctor finds out that they've delayed once again. That's when he orders them to go over and have a chest x-ray done. That's where the rib fractures and the femur fracture are located and found. After that, CPS gets involved.

So, there is two separate events, including the same child that dies in this case, where there's been this pattern of him not getting treatment for the child.

THE COURT: Yeah. But is it to say -- I mean, it's not really a contested fact in this case; right? They're saying he -- I mean, is that being contested that he failed to get treatment right way? I mean, isn't it just the spin of it. You're saying he failed to get treatment right away because he hurt this child and he didn't know what to do and he doesn't want to get in trouble.

MR. STAUDAHER: Right.
THE COURT: They're kind of -- I mean, is that contested that he failed to get treatment right away?

MS. LEMCKE: Well I mean in terms of Jonathan and Christina's accounting of how it went down, the phone call exchange, that's not in dispute. But that's not -Your Honor's exactly correct. They didn't plead this as a failure to promptly get
medical attention.
THE COURT: Right. And then you would need an expert opinion that had he gotten medical treatment sooner or had the child received medical treatment sooner the result would have or could have been different. So, if you don't have that opinion which would have been disclosed you can't do that anyway. So, I mean, here's the thing. I don't really know that it adds anything and it's incredibly prejudicial especially not so much with the child with pneumonia but with the, you know, failure to thrive and the, you know, what looks like prior abuse, frankly.

MR. STAUDAHER: Well there no question there's prior abuse. That was the finding by CPS and the reason they went through all the psych evaluations and the treatment for two plus years that extended beyond what they normally do because of the reactions and interactions with both the mother and the father in case, and it's the same child.

THE COURT: Right. So, is that what you want to admit? You want to show he abused the kid in the past so he probably abused the kid again?

MR. STAUDAHER: It's not that the --
THE COURT: I know because that's really what you want to do and you're couching this in a failure to receive medical treatment.

MR. STAUDAHER: It's not an accident. I mean, the whole mimic version of why things like that come in or why we want it to come in. I mean, you could try to say it's for propensity purposes but that's not what it's being offered for. It's being offered to show that this -- what he's claiming is an accident. That's what he says. This is an accident, not a mistake, but it is an accident, and he describes in detail how it occurs with the detectives and with the first responders and so forth which is inconsistent with an accident. And the findings thereafter about his medical
condition is not consistent with the fall from where he said it occurred on the surface that he said it occurred and so forth; the fact that he then tells the people in Hawaii the very same thing. We don't know. We think it was the babysitter or it was not -we don't know what happened. We have no idea. He's claiming the same kinds of things. He is not acknowledging that he was involved in any way with that back in Hawaii yet we're talking about both a femur fracture and rib fractures that are completely consistent with the child being grabbed with his hands bilaterally, fractures the ribs on both sides. This kid was actually abused because the two different injuries that we had in Hawaii have two different mechanisms, one in the femur is the shearing force. The other of the ribs is a compressive or grabbing squeezing type force. Two different separate injuries that were never disclosed to medical providers that come incidentally based on the fact that they delay treatment in a pneumonia type situation which was similar to what happened to the first child that ends up dying initially. That's why that information is important is show that his pattern of saying, look, I don't know what's going on. It's an accident, whatever, but it wasn't an accident.

THE COURT: Yeah, but he didn't cause the pneumonia.
MR. STAUDAHER: No; but his failure to -- well you're talking about the first child.

THE COURT: I'm talking about the first child. I mean, you want to get it all in. MR. STAUDAHER: The reason that the first child comes in is because that's what they gave him. You have the pediatrician who deals with --

THE COURT: Wait. Oh, you got to call the doctor right away which, again, that would be relevant to me if your theory was a failure to -- was a failure to obtain prompt medical. Then notice and knowledge is relevant that he knew, but that's not
your theory of the case.
MR. STAUDAHER: That is part of the theory.
THE COURT: Your theory is not -- well I know but that's not what you -m I mean, to me, you know, Mr. Staudaher, you got to give 'em notice and you -- then you would need an expert that that's relevant.

So, here's where l'm inclined to go. You know, the relevance of the baby with the pneumonia, the only relevance there is, a , he didn't call the doctor right away and he acted consistently with that in this case which I think is undisputed that he acted consistently. Notice that he should have called the doctor sooner, I guess you're saying well he knew that so it's knowledge of guilt because knowing that he should call the doctor sooner, even though in a pneumonia situation, which clearly wasn't caused by him directly. I mean maybe they didn't get the baby up enough or you know, you could have some really remote serious to how he caused the pneumonia through neglect. But the bottom line is he didn't cause the pneumonia.

So, your theory essentially is this that he had knowledge that when a baby's sick you need to call the doctor right away and the fact that he had that knowledge based on what happened in Hawaii and in this situation didn't call the doctor right away, shows knowledge of guilt; is that your theory?

MR. STAUDAHER: That's part of what we're getting into, yes, or we intend to get into.

THE COURT: Ms. Lemcke.
MS. LEMCKE: Well, Judge, they are just wholesale misrepresenting the facts surrounding the death of the first child. What they are trying to tell this Court is that somehow or another my client and his wife, Christina, were -- I guess they had
some kind of pneumatic magic eight ball and were able to [indiscernible] that the child had pneumonia because the child asymptomatic. By virtue of their own witness, that is Christina Rodriquez, if they had talked to her about this she would have told them the child was asymptomatic. She gets up -- the child was very young, only like three months old. She gets up for the baby's early morning feeding, the baby's fine; feeds the baby, puts the baby back to bed. She gets up a couple hours later. Now we're getting in the very early morning hours of that same morning and now the child is unresponsive. She immediately wakes Jonathan up and they go to the hospital. There's no delay in getting treatment. So, that's just simply factually not true.

That particular death has absolutely zero to do with this case and Your Honor is exactly correct that they are kind of couching this as what we want to show that he knew better argument when it really is just propensity because the pneumonia death really has nothing to do with anything. You know, what they really want to do is they really want to kind of -- they want to the jury to draw this kind of insidious inference from the presentation of the pneumonia evidence that, wow, maybe something did happen to that kid that we don't know about that was really not pneumonia because look at child number two, at age three months, presents with these fractures for which the treating doctors, I might add, suspected that there might be some other reason for it such as a metabolic disorder, Vitamin D deficiency.

THE COURT: Yeah but now there's been no evidence of any metabolic disorder or rickets or anything like that. So, I mean, I think it was probably was

MR. STAUDAHER: I mean, l looked at that as well.
THE COURT: -- excluded, you know, when they did the autopsy. There's no
evidence; oh, wow, there's advanced rickets here or you know something that could have been causally related. You know what I'm saying? And they said there could be something else going on. They didn't test further. I think now it's pretty clear that none of those other things were a factor.

MS. LEMCKE: But here's the other thing. Even if you accept their position that it was abusive conduct that caused those injuries, the problem is is that when CPS came in and did their investigation, the way that they couch their -- they don't actually find somebody or adjudicate them guilty. They say that the allegations of abuse and neglect are --

THE COURT: Are substantiated.
MS. LEMCKE: Are substantiated or sustained or however. The verbiage they use in Hawaii is a little bit different than what we use here. But here's what's interesting. They did not substantiate any abuse allegations as to my client. They did as to mom but not as to my client. So, again, the evidence on that issue is tenuous and then the purpose for which they want to use it is really bad because ultimately Your Honor hit on exactly what is correct; number one, they haven't alleged a failure to adequately get medical -- prompt medical care.

THE COURT: Yeah. I mean, that's clearly relevant as to knowledge of guilt in this case. I mean, his failure to get prompt medical care obviously they're going to argue that goes to knowledge of guilt and that's fine. The question is whether or not he didn't get medical care in the past somehow is relevant.

MR. STAUDAHER: Well the only reason that the Hawaii first death is relevant at all is because it sets the stage for what does not happen related to the same child when the incident occurs that is similar to the first child that dies. I know that's convoluted but we have a child that dies --
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THE COURT: No -- but, I mean, I don't know that pneumonia --
MR. STAUDAHER: It's not pneumonia. It's the fact that once that happens and the go into the doctor and he -- that child ends up dying, they are counseling and told and given information and about the fact that this is what you watch out for and this is what you need to do and this is how you -- you need to get treatment, And they go through that process in that depth. Then when the next child comes up, that is reiterated to them. And then the pediatrician that has them come in finds out that, gosh, they've got a second child who has similar symptoms and they didn't do -- they did the delay and that's why he sends them over to the hospital for the x-ray and that's when all of this stuff is determined. So, the delay for the first child is just showing that they were put on notice, they were counseling, they were schooled. They did it again with the child that dies but not from a death and then they do it -- then he does it again here. It's just a continuance.

THE COURT: Here's what I'm inclined to say about the first child. I'm inclined to say that I think it's overly prejudicial and the theory is somewhat too attenuated although I understand it. Balancing it, I'm inclined to say no, the first child doesn't come in unless they open the door in some way in their defense either through cross-examination or in their case in chief as to he didn't know better, blah, blah, blah. Then I think the fact that, yes, you were told about this before but we'd have to make it quite clear that pneumonia, whether it was viral or bacterial or whatever, is a disease process over which the Defendant and his wife would have had no control or something like to minimize the prejudice there, only if they open the door on the first case.

On the second case, the child -- the previous incidents involving the same child who passed away, in this case l'm going to consider whether or not to
have a Petrocelli hearing on that case. And as I said the first case would only come in if somehow the door is opened. So, you probably if we have the hearing would want to also present the evidence as to the first case.

All right. And so I will issue a decision on that from chambers. And those are obviously different witnesses from who you would you be having on our first evidentiary hearing. So, there's no need to schedule those at the same time. And there would be, at least for the first child -- well for both children -- that would have to be coordinated because they were in Hawaii.

MR. STAUDAHER: Right. And I know that we have to work with the Court system for that and I will do that, but I hadn't had a ruling from the Court on whether that would be allowed for those witnesses.

THE COURT: For the video conferencing?
MR. STAUDAHER: Yes.
THE COURT: Did we have an objection to allowing the Hawaii witnesses? Certainly for the hearing they can appear by video conference. Do we have an objection to them appearing by video conference for the trial or shall we just deal with that after the hearing?

MS. LEMCKE: I would suggest that we deal with that after the hearing because I may have an objection for trial purposes.

THE COURT: Okay. I mean, certainly for purposes of an evidentiary hearing they can appear by video.

MR. STAUDAHER: We do know that Dr. Ninomiya for sure is the singular one that -- that the State even at trial would need to do that with because of the scheduling issues with him and his practice. The others, we can bring them in but it's the reason that we don't want to do that is because it's a three day deal for them
to come from Hawaii.
THE COURT: Right. It's expensive to fly to Hawaii and back.
MR. STAUDAHER: And we decided, I think, the appropriate venue and I think the Supreme Court encourages this even in criminal cases. There's a whole section that just relates to that [indiscernible].

THE COURT: I'm inclined to allow it, but certainly the defense has a right to be heard on it. You know, sometimes video conferencing cannot work. If there's exhibits and things you have to show the witness, that's one area where it doesn't work because obviously there's nobody there to show 'em the exhibits and so that can make it difficult.

MR. STAUDAHER: They will have in this case --
THE COURT: But, again, they get to be heard on it. So, for right now for purposes of any evidentiary hearing and just the Court, they will be allowed to testify via video conferencing. Okay.

MS. LEMCKE: For purposes of the hearing. I'm sorry, Judge.
THE COURT: All right. And then this defense can be heard on why it would be prejudicial to them to allow the witnesses, if they testify, to testify via video conferencing in front of the jury.

All right. The next issue is the discovery and -- I'm sorry. Was there something else?

MR. STAUDAHER: We're trying to coordinate which one you're about ready to do, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I think that's the only one that's left.
MS. JOBE: There's the motion to limit expert testimony based on their -asking that the Court require a biomechanical expert. You kind of touched on it.

THE COURT: I thought I pretty much dealt with both of those together.
MS. LEMCKE: We kind of did. Will you clarify your ruling just so I make sure I know where we're going.

THE COURT: Well what's your question.
MS. LEMCKE: Well I think -- the motion to exclude the experts, I think they've now narrowed it down --

THE COURT: Right.
MS. LEMCKE: -- and the idea is they're given us CVs for the people that they're going to have testify.

THE COURT: Okay. Based on all of that, what do you -- do you still want a limit as to their testimony?

MS. LEMCKE: Well, Judge, once I get the CVs maybe this would be better taken up at a later date.

THE COURT: Let's just table this then.
MS. LEMCKE: Okay.
THE COURT: I think | pretty much dealt with everything. If you think there's something that's still hanging out there then bring it up again.

MS. LEMCKE: Okay, Perfect.
THE COURT: The next issue is the discovery. Can we just go through what's just outstanding on the discovery.

MS. LEMCKE: And, Judge, just so that you know. I want to say at the outset these prosecutors have been very forthcoming when it comes to getting discovery. They've been very gracious. I even lost a disk at one point and they provided me a second copy. They've been great about getting everything to me.

With the discovery motions, it's my position on my cases, I just want the
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On April 25,2014 , anmer of lests were corducted in the tantity tom at he house if 4720
 was dopped Homa coveh whosethek is 32 incties high.


 sumpeof the Earth.

 Aptendix 1.
 hem back of tho had struck the floor, and whide rim the the struck the hoor
 negative. The detwetor doss not recore nagative sigudx, wo he sigmal in rom th should be quite smoll. Thus we expected the signal in wim to be mueh larger than the sigmal hon mint And
 Phis provided reasurane thatheexperment working comecty.

|  |  |  | Tasto 2 aractic: | 119 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4in rumber | atier (cropis) | betore crope | dumene (9) | Tint whatof arcestortion | comment: |
| 1 | 294.1 | 225 | 271.6 | 2510 | impact on back of head |
| 2 | 40.1 | 24.5 | 15.6 | 14.4 | impact on tace |



## 


 of 1706 g Tidele 3 is displayed in Appotdix 2.

Second set of rons (runs \#2-22): the damay was droppof fom diffrext heights
 acelertion was unumally low, thedy bearase the dumy fid nef strike the beck of the head on
 low of 572 g toa high of 1405 g . The verage (mem) was 98 g:
 severa reasons. Drops from larger heights ace expected to preduce buger acelenation upon impact with the foor It ts dificula to drog the dumby precisely the sume way every lime.
 mensure par of the acceleration maeaning that the wxpermendal necsuremen will be les than he trae value.

## Weight of the dumany

 W), by a hotor of $156(-3623)$. Experimemts wert performed to sea if the wetght diflrence had
 weigh diflercoce did no have a significant somsisteat eftect on the acecleration of the head.

## 



$\mathrm{HC}=\mathrm{ag}^{9} \mathrm{AH}_{4}$






 70.2


## Probabilty ofsoull fracture

The Natuxal Highway Trathe Safoy Abministaton (NTTSA cites a formula give the
 For the data points in Table 12 above, the probability of skall lacture is listed in the righ hand
 sus to ove 00\% at lac or 3000 or higher.


## 



$$
p(\text { fractare }) \times N\left(\frac{\ln (H) O-1}{0}\right)
$$



## Conctusion





## Appendix 1: Bxpenmentaldetals


 secteronedss are oriented atong the $X$-, $Y$, med Zases. The positive Xraxs poins out from the fron of the cate of the dumay the positive Y axis points oft of the hat side of the haxd, and the posithe Zaxis point out fom the tof of the leme
 acompanying the dumy inchded an acceteroneter embration repot The seasidivity is fomb


|  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $4$ | "3y |  |
| X-ams | 11762 | 0.000 |
| Yaxis | 197648: | 0191 |
| Z-axis | 11765 | 0.2000 |

 of hapact yas the back of the liead of the child.
 electrone box wheh ss "caphe and hold" or "peat detector". The ixstrument measates the
 (and disolay) that peak whe whil the Seasotec fs resea matally.
 sensinvities in tha bove fable apply if the excitation woltage frot the Semoter vere exacluy
 whol aises the wadur of the senstivity by $19 \%$. To cotrect for this we have fe tectrase the accemation fom the value disistayed by the Sensotec by L. $9 \%$.
 was the Xexis. The semitivity of he Sensote peak detecter was coltheted $100.91 \mathrm{mv} / \mathrm{g}$ a
 02020. This requaves a corection by tedneing the ececteraton from the vatues displayed by bo Smance by $5.7 \%$
 correction is mphed to the dethe In the tables, the beashed acederation, afer this correction कs mphed, is takers "trat whe of acelertifen*

Apmendix 2: Firse 20 funs


|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | atter $4 \%$ (y) | betme "505 (g) | uiter 10e( 9$)$ | That vateo asenteration | कumsent |
| 12 | 942 | $23: 8$ | 70.4 | 650 | fall from stltug position on tack ot couch, mit on top of head |
| 13 | 187.7 | 292 | 1585 | 146:5 | fall from standing position like ruis 1,3 . 11 |
| 14 | 124.5 | 23.2 | 98.3 | 90.8 | fall tom silting pasition om back of couch, hit on top of head |
| 95 | 120.1 | 23 | 97.1 | 89.7 | didn't hit ground wh back of head |
| 16 | 1650 | 23 | 143.0 | 132.1 | sitirg postion |
| 17 | 142,5 | 23 | 179.5 | 110.4 | sitting position |
| 18 | 85,4 | 23.5 | 81.9 | 57.2 | drop win head at height ot couch, mit top af head |
| 19 | 138 | 23.5 | 114.5 | 105.8 | drop from initial horizontal position at top of couch |
| 20 | 1197 | 22.6 | 97.1 | 89.7 | shat prone, fall beckwards. hil back of head |
| 21 | 142.7 | 23 | 1987 | 110.6 | start prone |
| 22 | 111.4 | 25 | 86.4 | 79.8 | start prone |
| meara. |  |  | 1060 | 98.0 |  |

## Apendix 3 : weght of the dimmy and wegelf of the child


 the chomy hightes but we conld make it heokter. An eightpond bag of and beans wes


 29. 34 (Table 7), the dimmy fell foma standigy position on the am of we couch.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| in number | atict cion (9) | betere rigen (9) | cifitersios <br> (9) | 4isaly 140 3 20ce bistion | comment |
| 23 | 137.5 | 22.0 | 115.5 | 106.7 | lall backwards from prone position on couch |
| 24 | 1887 | 23.0 | 155.7 | 108.8 | dita |
| 25 | 1303 | 24,7 | 105.6 | 97.8 | dito |
| mean |  |  |  | 103.7 |  |


|  | Tabie os. 1 | ightedidu | my 5 en fion | sitiog 80 st10 | on on comen |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| rim aupider | $\begin{gathered} \text { infer} \\ \text { ing } \end{gathered}$ | te tores. tron ( 0 | ilfference (9) | fram yetue ot zaceteration | comment |
| 26 | 199.0 | 24.0 | 175 | 461.7 | fall from siting position back of couch |
| 27. | 1918 | 24.0 | 167.8 | 1550 | ditto |
| 28 | 191.6 | 23.4 | 188.2 | 155.4 | ditio |
| mean |  |  |  | 157.4 |  |


|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ation: tions) | berem y:013 8 | traterte 91. |  74cempation | comment |
| 29 | 2392 | 23.6 | 2156 | 109.2 | fall from standing on back of sola |
| 30 | 2300 | 23.9 | 206. 1 | 190.4 | dito |
| 31 | 233.9 | 24.7 | 2092 | 193.3 | ditto |
| maan |  |  |  | 184.3 |  |

Experiments with unweighted dunmy
 repeated. The resuls with an growehted dumy are reported in Tables 8 through 10 (nuts (432-41).

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| number | $\begin{aligned} & \text { gifor } \\ & \text { g) } \end{aligned}$ | betote Stomeg |  (9) | 4iat yemos. seerieration | commant |
| 82 | 1902 | 220 | 108.2 | 1000 | tall backwands from counh |
| 33 | 119.9 | 24,3 | 95.6 | 88.3 | dito |
| 34 | 1323 | 24.7 | 107.6 | 99.4 | ditto |
| 35 | 126.8 | 24.0 | 102.8 | 95.0 | ditio |
| mean |  |  |  | 95.7 |  |


|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| run number | siter drep (9) | betore cifer (9) | 0ifereme 4 ) |  3everation | connterl |
| 36 | 209.0 | 20.2 | 1858 | 174.7 | fall from silting position back of couch |
| 37 | 1902 | 23.7 | 1665 | 153.8 | dito |
| 38 | 2014 | 24.6 | 1768 | 163.4 | ditto |
| mean |  |  |  | 163.0 |  |


|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ant number | $\begin{aligned} & \text { anger: } \\ & \text { drog } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { evore } \\ & \text { ing in } \end{aligned}$ | pticence $\%$ | tian saterol aceremation. | cominemt |
| 39 | 261.3 | 27.3 | 23400 | 2 c 22 | tall from standing on back of sola |
| 40 | 2495 | 24.7 | 2248 | 207.7 | ditio |
| 41 | 2507 | 248 | 2259 | 2087 | dto |
| mean. |  |  |  | 210.9 |  |



 weight sfraped to the abotomen, for a lotal of 44 Ib . The fight dtrmy has the 8 pound weight remoyed, mind a weigh of 36 lb .
 duntry has latges aceeleation than the fight dummy.
But th the next the of Table 11, comparing ants 26.28 with ruas 36.38 , we see hat he hehter danmy has later acceteration.
 acceleration than the heavy dimmy.
 light dumaty experiones the fager acceleration npors inpact with the foor. The eftect of the weigh of the dumy is too smath to deted in flese experinachts.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| runs, welghter | weighted dumny, mean aecel ( 9 ) | runs $_{i}$ umwolghed | unveighted dumby mean accel (g) | note |
| 23.25 | 103.7 | 0236 | 957 | fell backwards from prone position |
| 26.28 | 157.4 | 36-38 | 163.0 | tell from siting position back of sola |
| 20.31 | 194.3 | 39.43 | 210.9 | foll from <br> standing back of sofa |

## Appendix 4: calculation of $\Delta t$ and IIIC from a/g and height H

According to the Impulsc-Momentum Theorem, the impulse is equal to the change of monentum, The impulse is
$\Delta t F_{a k t}=\Delta t F_{\text {anad }} / 2$,
where $\Delta 1$ is the time interval, $F_{a t e}$ is the average force and $F_{\text {nase }}$ is the maximum force, exered on the head by the foor. The change in tnomertumis M ( $\mathrm{V}_{\text {falal }}$. $\mathrm{V}_{\text {initita }}$ ), where the initial velocity $V_{\text {inilial }}=-\sqrt{ }(2 \mathrm{gH})$. H is the beight from which the head falls. The final velocity $\mathrm{V}_{\text {final }}$ is zero, because the head makes an inelastic collision with the floor, and the head does not bounce.

Henee the change in monentum is $\mathrm{M} \sqrt{ }(2 \mathrm{gH})$. The impulse monentum theoren is then
$\Delta \mathrm{I} \quad \mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{max}} / 2=\mathrm{M} \downarrow(2 \mathrm{gH})$,
Which can be solved to find the fime interval $\Delta t_{\text {, }}$

$$
A t=\left(\mathrm{M} / \mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{mas}}\right) \cup(8 \mathrm{gFL})
$$

According to Newton's Second Law, $F_{\text {max }}=M \mathrm{amax}$, so M cancels and $\Delta 1$ can be expressed as

$$
\Delta t=\frac{\sqrt{(8 H / g})}{(\mathrm{a} / \mathrm{g})_{\mathrm{max}}}
$$

In the experiments at Thimpater court, $H$ is at least 0.8 meters ( 31.5 inehes) because the height of the back of the couch is 32 inches. To be conservative, we'll assume $\mathrm{H}=0.8$ Numerically the time interval $\Delta t$ (in seconds) is given ( $C o r \mathrm{H}=0.8$ meters) by
0.807
$A t=$ (a/g)

For various values of (a/g) wax, this yields the following values, where the time is now in milliseconds. (Assume that $\mathrm{H}=0.8$ meters.)

| $(a / g)_{\text {nax }}$ | $\Delta t$ (millisec) |
| :--- | :--- |
| 50 | 16.1 |
| 53.8 | 15.0 |
| 79.2 | 10.2 |
| 100 | 8.1 |
| 150 | 5.4 |
| 200 | 4.0 |
| 250 | 3.2 |

The fime intervals are more than 15 uns for accelerations less than 53.8 g , and less than 15 ms for accelerations higher than 53.8 g .

Knowing the time $\Delta t$, we can calculate ile Head Injury Criterion (IIC),
$\mathrm{HIC}=(\mathrm{ag})^{2 .} \quad \Delta$
The HC can also be calculated directly, without first computing the time interval, using the equation
$\mathrm{HIC}=(\mathrm{a} / \mathrm{g})^{1.5} \quad \sqrt{(8 \mathrm{FE} / \mathrm{g})}$, or $0.808(\mathrm{a} / \mathrm{g})^{2.5}$ for $\mathrm{H}=0.8$ meter.

## References

Eippinger er al., Supplement: Developinent of Inproved Injury Critcria for lac Assessment of Advanced Automotive Restraint Systems - II (2000).
Available at website of National Highway TraMie Safely Administration (NHTSA)
http:/www,nhtsa.gov/Research/Biomechanics $+\&+$ Trauma/Biomechanics + Soflware $\cdot$ \& : Reports

Humanclics, Inc., 47460 Gallcon Dr,, Plymouth Mi 48170.

## EXHIBIT "L"

##  CRIME SCENE INVESTGATION REPORT



Retatid Reports and Events (See narratfuo for futhor dotals.)
x
Evidence fimpuri Report
Acditiona! Reporte:
$\square$ Fireartin Report
$\square$ Ontirer Rew
Reberedicuent ks
Q Digam

## 1. PHoroandary

Q ombe stent plothyaphy
$\square$ compariby photography
2. LATENT PRETT PROCESSINE
[] Fatent frecessing conducted
1 fingerpatm printis recouvery
elforzations recoveredargative resyts
$\qquad$
3. FiREARMS EVIDENCE
(7) bubltis) 7 fragmentis) trowersd
[i] catiofge casests rucoverid
(T) watridgels) nopversd
[] werponfly recowesed
$\square$ $\qquad$

## 4. FOOTWEAR OR FIR WPRESSHONS

] botwear
F... wsthe
an photrographed
tife impressionts\}
[] aigina surfece racowters
[. $\qquad$

## 8. POSSIELE BODY FLUDS

|  | apparent blowd | [.] apparant |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| W | persiotevas | [1] urkowe stibi |
| m | abs recoyered | 0 |
|  | uceat |  |

6. TOOL WARK EVDONCE


Prea rug Cotrixat Back Scratcion: Ely

## VEHELE:




## GENERA WFORTMTION:








$\qquad$

## THE SGENE



















Gym: The foor to the gym opensd along the enst wall the sontheast comer the rom. The fom was filled with

























Dinha Roomi: The dining foom was open to the twing rown and was dwow by bre couch. A targe out shaped
 ras on top of the table. The roon was ohtrwise umemarkable,


Payem


 can. The room was whatise unrenatroble
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 Phenolynthation.

 posidve with Thenetiohthalemt

Hem Hos one th wace of poper lowe with withnorown

(10) boodsmins on ane end. Staln tested porstive with Planolphitarien.

## Factrage

Hem Hos; One (t) pal of gray colored weat pants; Starks brand: she m (303)


 brand size tro.
 satdass size unknowf.

## 

On the floor af the liviny foom, in froyt of form of the osech.

Cuf tomowed from beth the penter of the ater rug (ilem m01).

 area of he resideroot.


 bextroura.

On the foo of the bed, inside the northeast bertoom

 tastdence.

Same asty


## 

Packugs mat contmued
 samplis：sha wherown．


Same as hamy

## Fack


 sodeth side of the residence．

## Package 和0
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Packegs
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fem WSHAR20，FOC IO A3LSCHR20C．
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##  AUTOPSY REPORT

SCANNED

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Farmas endielwight Dragmin |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Yne 0775 |  |
| Sombs <br> Male | menticy Asian | Dabt of Winti OP13/2009 | Mge 3 3 | $\begin{gathered} \text { Amegh (fichest) } \\ 38^{\prime \prime} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Watgin yo. } \\ 2 \text { 2low } \end{gathered}$ | Wals Coly bay | Wacrem Erown |

Sarf Leb side forwhand and tof ghow
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## Forensic Advantage Discovery Packet

Released Information
Regarding: 13-042031
Requested: 6/3/2014 FA 8:15:00 AM
Packet: Report Only
Report
Table of Contents:
LAB Rcport-Released-(10223).pdr
LAB Report-Released-(10223).pdf

## Additional Files:

The following files were included separately from the packet document:

## EXHIBIT " M "




| 4at lem \% | Inpogind Phyy | impound Itam | Doscription | \$umamay |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \|tam | 093326-2. | 2 |  4 4 | 4. Majalive prasumplive theod testis) <br> * Nixfere profla |
| Item | $4 \times 363$ | 3 |  |  |
|  |  |  | - Paptr tover | $*$ Nogstrve prestationiqe blow tentis) <br> - Na hrther fasting of Nos thate |
|  |  |  | m Patper tows | $\rightarrow$ Fositive prevambave brod lesha; <br> * Gum mole pofies |
| Stmen |  |  | - Praper hiver | - Fosilive presumplive blyon hasts) <br> - Ferl mole potie |
| Hemot |  |  | - Papar mwe | - Positive puestriplive 0liood tesig 9 ) <br> * Falimala grofis |
| Hent 3.5 |  |  |  | * Nogative prestranpthe blowa testa) <br> * No lisitere testing at bis gma |
| \%60936 |  |  | - Friopotyer losuels |  |
| Sam |  | 4 |  near andry way |  |
| fomb |  | 5 |  |  |
| heatis |  |  | $\cdots$ |  <br> - Fill maje profila |
| Hamb 2 |  |  | - 8 main |  <br> - Full mates potis |
| \|terms3 |  |  | - 2 gab | - Fowlle grasinplite boost kstis) <br> - Fiti malo profile |
| hang 6 |  | \% |  |  |
| 9tam6 6 |  |  | - Statat | - Posityo mresumpha boce test(s) <br> * Fuymeg profle |
| Hmbe |  |  | - Thtay stains | * Neyative plesumptive tombertis) <br>  |
| Stan? |  |  | Tolof peper longe trast cen fr the beit ow |  |
| liam 7.3 |  |  | $\cdots$ - \% 3in |  <br> - Fill inalo mopifiz |
| Itare 1 |  | 1 | Eucoil Weas forl Khayden Quisumu | - Forly mite pachle |

## Ressilts and Gortutions:





Lebithan




Page:

canta

## Eablteme 32


 (idemity assumed).

## Lathtem 3




## 1abltan 3.4


 (dentity assamat

## Lebltosis.





## Lath Hemms.


 in 7eotellen tidently sesumbex):

## 





## 


 forentiy assamed

## Lablonis 7
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## THE ATTACHED EXHIBIT "N" HAS BEEN

 INTENTIONALLY OMITTED \& CAN BE FOUND ON PGS 747-791
## EXHIBIT "O"

PHLLP COLOSHMO, Wh

Pwowlogeci Evaluation
Commantiat
Nome MWMAHAN QGBAMO
Case No: C $13-2942661$
Mate of Evalution: 09/2/2014
Dato of Repors: $00 / 23 / 2014$
 Lenzke, Deputy Puble Defender, Homicide Unit to detemine withbo the limits at pyehologiteal cerainty:

1. Whether this ndividuats tohavior is a low rist to re oflend for clsid nbusencelech. Aso, io
 fonctoring in society.
2. Whether this individual isste in the commanty (fo not re-offend).




 The defordant was hiformed regarding the himits of contidcatiality b mepard to this consuhtation and
 repor is suablote br rease to the thid pary grator per the priten consent of he patient.



 W, Equey, Wh. D, Profeser of Physics;

# Ny whomgan Evabation 

Re: Gouman, Jomaryas
Pagez

## Assembtent Mcavares:

1. Gharw masyly

2. Ohacematan
3. SYR-20
4. STATOC 99
5. Vernimi Asessment ol Sex Ohtender
6. Firo-8
7. Beok Deprescicar laveatoty.

8. Shindey listitate of Lifug Scate.
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 Vegms, Nerada

## Psehoograt Eratwation

Wer Mameno lemathan
Pitue 3


 dearesest averms sent death.






 velence.













## Prycholegical Tess Kesmer:

## WESWESULTS

## STATLC901






## VASOR







Fsychological Gubluaton

Page
scorcs require facarcematon.
prior mint corvintions, adress changed duche pist 2 year).
 the Defendens i L OW Revik.
swan




 chideren whea asked abere his fanily)
The resultis for this test \$howed a low risk for future whone


 own best interest In eddition, he was givem the SABgy (Substance Abuse Screwing lwentory) This cest is heyptri on swessing a patient prochrity for substane use or sbese.




 complesed the Eirou. This is an hatepersonal test that revots the detudan to heing futroverted. We
 being controlted.

 and eduminem of medival eonerns.

Tha defendant can be cufemely stressed or preasured when he camol resotve conificted situations. However, he strugeles to deal with his sewelelosess. Gn the festhe he demod any thoughts of seftham. He feels muth gent and shate for the complimathors associated with his betavion, He apmars




Psychological Evaluation
Re: Quisano, Jonathan
Page 5
of previous behavioral disorders or substance abuse/dependency proclivities.
His social responsibility, judgment, itu nurse control and social functioning appear normal. There appears to be no risk to re-dfend.

## Diagnosis: DSM-IV TK

AXIS I: $\quad 296.33$ Major Depressive Disorder
300.02 Generalized Anxiety Disorder V68.82 Bereavement

Axis 1I: Mixed Personality Traits
AKIS III; No diagnosis noted
AXIS IV Psychosocial Stressors: Legal a 4
AXIS Y CGAF-55, HGFP-55

## Recommendations:

This individual appears to be a low risk to re offend. As part of his reatmentrelease or probation, the undersigned would recommend the defendant be involved in individual and family therapy to focus un bereavement. Also, cognitive betbavional changes for managing stress and pressure (loss of their 2 children). The Defendant appears to be maturing, and concerned about his behavior during the tragedy with his child. He is working on making better judgments and decision making in interpersonal and emergent situations.

The defendant should be considered for psychotropic medications to ensure his psychological recovery.
Thank you for this constitution. Please do not hesitate to contact me with any questions or concerns.


Charles P Colosimo, PHD
Licensed $\mathrm{P}_{\text {sychologist-Nevada }}$
PY0236

## EXHIBIT "P"

# Turgrsa ILP Seero <br>  <br> (848) 342.275 

Sptember 1. 2014
The Hnambe Vatere teain
Bighth Judehammen Come
Depambuide 21

Las Wega Mexada 89101
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Guriona Powigum

The Honorable Valeric Adit
Eight Judicial District Court
Department 21
200 Lewis Avenue
Las Vegas, Nevada 89101

## Regarding: Jonathan Quisano

This letter is being submitted by myself Clara Rodrigues and my husband william Rodigiges. My husband and I met Jonathan in goon, we known Jonathan for 8 years. Jonathan had a very kind, caring and gentle personality, Jonathan is also on the quiet side and yet enjoyed being with families and friends.

Jonathan Quisano and my granddaughter Christina resided in Honoluh, Hawaii and later moved to Ias Vegas in $8 / 201$ ga . Back in September of 20 Io I went to Hawaii to help take care of Khayden and Khaysen for six months, at that time Jonathan was a yer good father to his children. Jonathan would always go to work to support his family. After a long day of work he would come home and bath the children and play with thess. Jonathan lowed to cook, he loved to go fishing and diving, he helps with house chores like taming, cooking and laundry.

We are happy to help with the needs of Jonathan as they arise. We are here to help if he needs shelter, clothing, and food. I Clara Rodrigues is a house wife, and my husband William Redrigues works full time at the Camry Hotel and Casino in North Las Vegas.

1 wish you consider this information to be helpful when sentencing Jonathan, for he has good characteristics, kindness, and is a hard worker:. The charges he is facing is hard to believe that he had done this. Sending him to prison for a long time will break our hearts even more. Thank you for taking the time to hear my thoughts.

Sincerely,
Clara x $f\left(a+L_{0}\right.$
wilton Romaine

The Honorable Valerie Adar
Eight Judicial District Court
Department 21
200 / iwis Armure
Las Vegas, Nevada 89101

## Regarding: Jonathan Qaisano

We Mr. and Mrs Bill and tern San Nicolas herby represent our nephew Jonathan Quisano. Over the six years that I known Jonathan, I found hint to be a man of gentle wisdom and kindness. I always found him to be patient and compassionate. He was always a lowing man of diverse interests and talents.

His strong lies to lis children"s a father, spouse, family and community suggest a depilh of character that should encourage compassion. Its very heat breaking hearing my nephew whom is Jonathan child saying "I love my daddy".
1, Vera San Nicolas is a Security Officer at the Palazzo Resort and Casio she e January 2008. My husband Bill San Nicolas works for Souther Nevada Pest Control since January 2011.

This unfortunate situation we find ourselves in as a family calls for sympathy. We sincerely hope responding in a like man er. As a family; who is facing this tragedy, we continue to come together to support . counsel, and nature each older as be would upon his rejoining our family, That k you for your anealion in this manner. laver Blessed Day.


Lester Rodrigues 6432 Plumcrest Rd. Las Vegas, NV 89108

## Honorable Valerie Adair

Eighth Judicial District Court, Dept. 21, 200 Lewis Ave.
Las Vegas No 89101

## You Honor,

I have known Jonathan Quisano since he has been in a relationship with my niece, Christina Rodrigues, in 2006.

In 2006, he has been in residence at 92535 Ualehei St , Makakilo, Hawaii 96707.

We all live at that residence as there are different housing sections on the lot. My parents own that lot and my brother has taken over the residence.

Jonathan has always been helpful, polite, and friendly. He helps me or offers help whenever I am doing something. It can be cleaning the yard to fixing cars.

Jonathan has always been a hard worker, Back home (Hawaii), he had a construction job. He also tike to cook, clean and draw.

Jonathan loves kids. Al the time my son, Pono, was 3 years old. Jonathan would finish work, stop by the front house (our house), ask if Pono can come out to play, and they would go into the main house. They would play games, watch cartoons, or play video games. Pono always had a great time. Pono would wait at the door around the time that Jonathan finish work so that they could play.
Tina and Jonathan would take my son everywhere. They even had a car seat for him in their car.

When Tina and Jon found ont that fhey were expecting they were very happy. When layden was bom he was so loved. They were prond parents. gayden bad everything, toys, clothing and 2 parents who loved him so much.

In 2008 we noved to Washngton state. Jonathan and Tha helped us pack as much as they could.
About two weeks later, my wife got a call from Thasaying that Jayder had passed away. She was very distraght. I citled a close friend of mine to go check on Tina and lonathan. ( also called ny son, Mistin to find out what was going on. Jayden passed away from SIDS. We could not attend the fureral because of on financtal situation. It was very hard for hem, losing a child.

Later on Kheyden came along. Tina and Jonathan was very happy, they aetually started to heal from the lost of Jayden. Khayden was a happy baby, he looked so much tike his Dad. They were complete, they were a family, Tina would mention to me that Khayden would cry when taking a bath or changing his cliaper. Tina would meation that to the Doctor when Khayden would go for hir well-checks. The Doctor said that eyeything looked okay. At this hme Tina went back to work. She found a babysiter in Ewa Beach to take care of Nhayden. One day Tha was off and she noticed that Khayden wasn't feeling well. She called Jon (he was at work) to tell him that she was going to take Khayden to the hospital. The hospital told her that they will not tem the baby over to her because it looked like the baby had been abused. Tita was m shock, she called fon and told him what happen. Now it semed that they would lose anoher baby. They wan through everything that CPS told them to do to get their son back.
Whele geing through the process Tina became pregnant amain. When Khaysen was bom he was taken away. They were so sad, they had another son, but he too was taken away.

My mom, Clara Rodigues went back home to Hawail to take care of the kids. Ste was there for aboat 6 months. With my Mom's holp the children were reunted with their parents. Tina and Jonathan got their childrea back

In the mean time, we moved to Vegas. We had to go home because my mother-in-law was dying. As we boarded the plane she had passed sway. We found ont when we landed. So we stayed with niy sister-in-law to help make arangements. Because we were so busy, Jonathan said that we could leave Pono with them so we didn't have to worry about him. That was so helphit becase flese was so much to do at the mother-in-laws.
We had to fly back in May for the funeral, this time we stayed with Tha and Jonathan at the Makaklo house.
We laid my mother-indaw to test. It was a sad, yet lappy day, because she finally rested with her husbend.
We spent time with Tina, Jonathan and the boys. We went to the beach and made dinners, the gays and boys played RC cars. It was nice That is when we noticed how Jonathan took care of his boys. Tha would make breakfast, make the plates and Jonatian wonld sit the boys in front of him and feed them, than they would play games or play outside. Lunch would be the same, dimer and bath time, than sleep.
If was mice to spend ine with them.
Tha and Jomathan decided to move to Vegas since all the family were here. Jonathan decided to stay in Hawail for a white to work to make some money before joining Tina and the boys in Vegas. Tina stayed with her Dad, Patrick in Henderson. She decided it would be safer to move with her Mom, Lynelle in the northwest because if was a single story, Tina was already woking and soon so was Jonathan, Whife they worked my Momand Dat would watch the boys, Jonathan would pick them up or my parents would drop them off:
fonathan would go to work early in the moning and finish aboul 1 or 2 .
Tha would finish at 5 or 6 . Thas was fhe moufine untl now.

Here we are today. Jonathan accused of manslaughter.

1 know Jonathan Quisano to be a trustworthy, nice, polite, helpful, responsible person. He is well liked by everyone. He took good care of his children, even mine.

I hope that this information will help you to know Jonathan as I do.

Thank yous.
 4 A lm


Lester Rodrigues
(7724739493)

Augus 29, 2014

## To whom li may concern:
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DISTRICT COURT
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

THE STATE OF NEVADA,
Plaintiff,
-vs-
JONATHAN QUISANO, \#5991702

Defendant.

CASE NO: C-13-294266-1
DEPT NO: XXI

## GUILTY PLEA AGREEMENT

I hereby agree to plead guilty, pursuant to North Carolina v. Alford, 400 U.S. 25 (1970), to: COUNT 1: VOLUNTARY MANSLAUGHTER (Category B Felony - NRS 200.040, 200.050, 200.080 - 50020) and COUNT 2: CHILD ABUSE, NEGLECT, OR ENDANGERMENT WITH SUBSTANTIAL BODILY HARM (Category B Felony NRS 200.508(1) - 55222), as more fully alleged in the charging document attached hereto as Exhibit " 1 ".

My decision to plead guilty by way of the Alford decision is based upon the plea agreement in this case which is as follows:

The State retains the right to argue at rendition of sentence, but agrees not to argue for more than ten (10) years on the botom end of the sentencing range.
$I$ agree to the forfeiture of any and all weapons or any interest in any weapons seized and/or impounded in connection with the instant case and/or any other case negotiated in whole or in part in conjunction with this plea agreement.

I understand and agree that, if I fail to interview with the Department of Parole and Probation (P\&P), fail to appear at any subsequent hearings in this case, or an independent magistrate, by affidavit review, confirms probable cause against me for new criminal charges including reckless driving or DUI, but excluding minor traffic violations, the State will have the unqualified right to argue for any legal sentence and term of confinement allowable for the crime(s) to which I am pleading guilty, including the use of any prior convictions I may have to increase my sentence as an habitual criminal to five (5) to twenty (20) years, Life without the possibility of parole, Life with the possibility of parole after ten (10) years, or a definite twenty-five (25) year term with the possibility of parole after ten (10) years.

Otherwise I am entitled to receive the benefits of these negotiations as stated in this plea agreement.

## CONSEQUENCES OF THE PLEA

By pleading guilty pursuant to the Alford decision, it is my desire to avoid the possibility of being convicted of more offenses or of a greater offense if I were to proceed to trial on the original charge(s) and of also receiving a greater penalty. I understand that my decision to plead guilty by way of the Alford decision does not require me to admit guilt, but is based upon my belief that the State would present sufficient evidence at trial that a jury would return a verdict of guilty of a greater offense or of more offenses than that to which I am pleading guilty.

1 understand that by pleading guilty $I$ admit the facts which support all the elements of the offense(s) to which I now plead as set forth in Exhibit "1".

AS TO COUNT 1: I understand that as a consequence of my plea of guilty by way of the Alford decision the Court must sentence me to imprisonment in the Nevada Department of Corrections for a minimum term of not less than one (1) year and a maximum term of not more than ten (10) year. The minimum term of imprisonment may not exceed forty percent ( $40 \%$ ) of the maximum term of imprisonment. I understand that I may also be fined up to $\$ 10,000,00$. I understand that the law requires me to pay an Administrative Assessment Fee. /I

AS TO COUNT 2: I understand that as a consequence of my plea of guilty by way of the Alford decision the Court must sentence me to imprisonment in the Nevada Department of Corrections for a minimum term of not less than two (2) years and a maximum term of not more than twenty (20) years. The rinimum term of imprisonment may not exceed forty percent $(40 \%)$ of the maximum term of imprisonment.

I understand that, if appropriate, I will be ordered to make restitution to the victim of the offense(s) to which I am pleading guilty and to the victim of any related offense which is being dismissed or not prosecuted pursuant to this agreement. I will also be ordered to reimburse the State of Nevada for any e related to my extradition, if any.

AS TO COUNT 1:: I understand that I am eligible for probation for the offense to which I am pleading guilty. I understand that, except as otherwise provided by statute, the question of whether I receive probation is in the discretion of the sentencing judge.

AS TO COUNT 2: I understand that pursuant to NRS 176 a .110 and my plea of guilty to an offense for which the suspension of sentence or the granting of probation is permitted, I shall arrange for my own psychiatric/psychological evaluation as part of the division's presentence investigative report to the Court.

I understand that I am not eligible for probation unless that psychiatric/psychological evaluation certifies that I do not represent a high risk to reoffend. I understand that, except as otherwise provided by statute, the question of whether I receive probation is in the discretion of the sentencing judge.

I understand that I must submit to blood and/or saliva tests under the Direction of the Division of Parole and Probation to determine genetic markers and/or secretor status.

I understand that if I am pleading guilty to charges of Burglary, Invasion of the Home, Possession of a Controlled Substance with Intent to Sell, Sale of a Controlled Substance, or Gaming Crimes, for which I have prior felony conviction(s), I will not be eligible for probation and may receive a higher sentencing range.
// //

I understand that if more than one sentence of imprisonment is imposed and I am eligible to serve the sentences concurrently, the sentencing judge has the discretion to order the sentences served concurrently or consecutively,

I understand that information regarding charges not filed, dismissed charges, or charges to be dismissed pursuant to this agreement may be considered by the judge at sentencing.

I have not been promised or guaranteed any particular sentence by anyone. I know that my sentence is to be determined by the Court within the limits prescribed by statute.

I understand that if my attorney or the State of Nevada or both recommend any specific punishment to the Court, the Court is not obligated to accept the recommendation,

I understand that if the offense(s) to which I am pleading guilty was committed while I was incarcerated on another charge or while I was on probation or parole that I am not eligible for credit for time served toward the instant offense(s).

I understand that if I am not a United States citizen, any criminal conviction will likely result in serious negative immigration consequences including but not limited to:

1. The removal from the United States through deportation;
2. An inability to reenter the United States;
3. The inability to gain United States citizenship or legal residency;
4. An inability to renew and/or retain any legal residency status; and/or
5. An indeterminate term of confinement, with the United States Federal Government based on my conviction and immigration status.

Regardless of what I have been told by any attorney, no one can promise me that this conviction will not result in negative immigration consequences and/or impact my ability to become a United States citizen and/or a legal resident.

I understand that $P \& P$ will prepare a report for the sentencing judge prior to sentencing. This report will include matters relevant to the issue of sentencing, including my criminal history. This report may contain hearsay information regarding my background and criminal history. My attorney and I will each have the opportunity to comment on the information
contained in the report at the time of sentencing. Unless the District Attorney has specifically agreed otherwise, then the District Attorney may also comment on this report.

## WAIVER OF RIGHTS

By entering my plea of guilty, I understand that I am waiving and forever giving up the following rights and privileges:

1. The constitutional privilege against self-incrimination, including the right to refuse to testify at trial, in which event the prosecution would not be allowed to comment to the jury about my refusal to testify.
2. The constitutional right to a speedy and public trial by an impartial jury, free of excessive pretrial publicity prejudicial to the defense, at which trial I would be entitled to the assistance of an attorney, either appointed or retained. At trial the State would bear the burden of proving beyond a reasonable doubt each element of the offense(s) charged.
3. The constitutional right to confront and cross-examine any witnesses who would testify against me.
4. The constitutional right to subpoena witnesses to testify on my behalf.
5. The constitutional right to testify in my own defense.
6. The right to appeal the conviction with the assistance of an attorney, either appointed or retained, unless specifically reserved in writing and agreed upon as provided in NRS 174.035(3). I understand this means I am unconditionally waiving my right to a direct appeal of this conviction, including any challenge based upon reasonable constitutional, jurisdictional or other grounds that challenge the legality of the proceedings as stated in NRS 177.015(4). However, I remain free to challenge my conviction through other post-conviction remedies including a habeas corpus petition pursuant to NRS Chapter 34.

## VOLUNTARINESS OF PLEA

I have discussed the elements of all of the original charge(s) against me with my attorney and I understand the nature of the charge(s) against me.

I understand that the State would have to prove each element of the charge(s) against me at trial.

I have discussed with my attorney any possible defenses, defense strategies and circumstances which might be in my favor.

All of the foregoing elements, consequences, rights, and waiver of rights have been thoroughly explained to me by my attorney.

I believe that pleading guilty and accepting this plea bargain is in my best interest, and that a trial would be contrary to my best interest.

I am signing this agreement voluntarily, after consultation with my attorney, and I am not acting under duress or coercion or by virtue of any promises of leniency, except for those set forth in this agreement.

I am not now under the influence of any intoxicating liquor, a controlled substance or other drug which would in any manner impair my ability to comprehend or understand this agreement or the proceedings surrounding my entry of this plea.

My attorney has answered all my questions regarding this guilty plea agreement and its consequences to my satisfaction and I am satisfied with the services provided by my attorney. DATED this $10^{\tau}$ day of June, 2014.

## AGREED TO BY:



MICHAEL V. STAGDAHER
Chief Deputy District Attorney
Nevada Bar \#008273

## CERTIFICATE OF COUNSEL:

I , the undersigned, as the attomey for the Defendant named herein and as an officer of the court hereby certify that:

1. I have fully explained to the Defendant the allegations contained in the charge(s) to which Alford pleas are being entered.
2. I have advised the Defendant of the penalties for each charge and the restitution that the Defendant may be ordered to pay,
3. I have inquired of Defendant facts concerning Defendant's immigration status and explained to Defendant that if Defendant is not a United States citizen any criminal conviction will most likely result in serious negative immigration consequences including but not limited to:
a. The removal from the United States through deportation;
b. An inability to reenter the United States;
c. The inability to gain United States citizenship or legal residency;
d. An inability to renew and/or retain any legal residency status; and/or
e. An indeterminate term of confinement, by with United States Federal Govermment based on the conviction and immigration status.

Moreover, I have explained that regardless of what Defendant may have been told by any attorney, no one can promise Defendant that this conviction will not result in negative immigration consequences and/or impact Defendant's ability to become a United States citizen and/or legal resident.
4. All pleas of Alford offered by the Defendant pursuant to this agreement are consistent with the facts known to me and are made with my advice to the Defendant.
5. To the best of my knowledge and belief, the Defendant:
a. Is competent and understands the charges and the consequences of pleading Alford as provided in this agreement,
b. Executed this agreement and will enter all Alford pleas pursuant hereto voluntarily, and
c. Was not under the influence of intoxicating liquor, a controlled substance or other drug at the time I consulted with the Defendant as certified in paragraphs 1 and 2 above.


AINF
STEVEN B. WOLFSON
Clark County District Attorney
Nevada Bar \#001565
MICHAEL V. STAUDAHER
Chief Deputy District Attorney
Nevada Bar \#00008273
200 Lewis Avenue
Las Vegas, Nevada 89155-2212
(702) 671-2500

Attorney for Plaintiff
DISTRICT COURT CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

THE STATE OF NEVADA, Plaintiff,
-vs-
JONATHAN QUISANO, \#5991702

Defendant.
CASE NO. C-13-294266-1
DEPT NO. XXI

SECOND AMENDED
INFORMATION

STATE OF NEVADA COUNTY OF CLARK

STEVEN B. WOLFSON, District Attorney within and for the County of Clark, State of Nevada, in the name and by the authority of the State of Nevada, informs the Court:

That JONATHAN QUISANO, the Defendant(s) above named, having committed the crimes of VOLUNTARY MANSLAUGHTER (Category B Felony - NRS 200.040, 200.050, 200.080-50020) and CHMLD ABUSE, NEGLECT, OR ENDANGERMENT WITH SUBSTANTIAL BODILY HARM (Category B Felony - NRS 200.508(1) - 55222), on or about the 6th day of June, 2013, within the County of Clark, State of Nevada, contrary to the form, force and effect of statutes in such cases made and provided, and against the peace and dignity of the State of Nevada,

## COUNT 1 - VOLUNTARY MANSLAUGHTER

did then and there wilfully, unlawfully, feloniously, without malice and without deliberation, kill KHAYDEN QUISANO, a human being, by striking the head and/or body of the said KHAYDEN QUISANO and/or by shaking him and/or by throwing him against a hard surface and/or by other manner or means unknown, all of which resulted in the death of the said KHAYDEN QUISANO,

## COUNT 2 - CHILD ABUSE, NEGLECT, OR ENDANGERMENT WITH SUBSTANTIAL BODILY HARM

did wilfully, unlawfully, and feloniously cause a child under the age of 18 years, towit: KHAYDEN QUISANO, being approximately three (3) year(s) of age, to suffer unjustifiable physical pain or mental suffering as a result of abuse or neglect, to wit: severe head trauma resulting in brain injury and/or lung contusions, and/or cause the said KHAYDEN QUISANO to be placed in a situation where he might have suffered unjustifiable physical pain or mental suffering as a result of abuse or neglect, to wit: severe head trauma resulting in brain injury and/or lung contusions causing the death of the said KHAYDEN QUISANO, by the Defendant striking the head and/or body of the said KHA YDEN QUISANO and/or by shaking him and/or by throwing him against a hard surface and/or by other manner or means unknown, resulting in substantial bodily harm or mental harm and causing death to the said KHAYDEN QUISANO.

STEVEN B. WOLFSON
DISTRICT ATTORNEY
Nevada Bar \#001565

DA\#13F09094X/jr
LVMPD EV\#1306063235
(TK12)
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CLERK OF THE COURT

THESTATR OF NEVADA.

## CARE CODKTY MESAMA

IONATHAYOUSANO,
Defgndens.

## EXPRKE ORDER WOR TRANCCRTM

Upen the ex parte sppication of the abovensmed Demedamt, IONAMHAN QuSANO, by mad hoouh NANCE L MEMCKE Dquy Puble Defender and good caxe mpearing hertore:

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED Bat the cethled Cour Recorder JAWB OLSEN,
 2014 in District Cout Depmanem 21.

DATED Wis 10 day of Jut 2014.


Submitted by:
DTLIME KOHN
CARK COUNTY PUBI 1 DFRENDER

B


$-1$
TRAN


STATE OF NEVADA,
Plaintiff,
vs.
JONATHAN QUISANO, Defendant. CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

BEFORE THE HONORABLE VALERIE ADAIR, DISTRICT COURT JUDGE TUESDAY, JUNE 10, 2014 TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS RE: EXTRADITION HEARING

APPEARANCES:
FOR THE STATE:
MICHAEL V. STAUDAHER, ESQ. Chief Deputy District Attorney MICHELLE JUBE, ESQ. Deputy District Attorney

FOR THE DEFENDANT:
NANCY L. LEMCKE, ESQ.
NORMAN J. REED, ESQ.
Deputy Public Defenders

RECORDED BY: JANIE L. OLSEN, COURT RECORDER/TRANSCRIBER

LAS VEGAS, CLARK COUNTY, NV., TUES., JUNE 10, 2014

THE COURT: It appears this matter has been resolved; is that correct?
MS. LEMCKE: That is correct, Your Honor. They filed a guilty plea agreement in open court just now. The terms of the negotiation are such that Mr . Quisano is going to enter a plea of guilty pursuant to the Alford decision to a count of voluntary manslaughter, which is a 1 to 10 and a count of child abuse, neglect, and endangerment with substantial bodily harm, which is a 2 to 20 . The State has agreed not to argue under any mathematical formula or computation for more than 10 years on the minimum end of the sentence, and otherwise the parties would retain the right to argue.

THE COURT: Okay. And this is going to be an Alford plea, correct?
MS. LEMCKE: That is correct.
MR. STAUDAHER: That is correct, Your Honor.
THE COURT: All right. And you've also filed here in open court, the State has filed actually, a Second Amended Information; is that right?

MR, STAUDAHER: That's correct, Your Honor.
THE COURT: All right. Mr. Quisano, I need you to stand up.
The Court is in possession of a written plea of guilty signed by you. Before I may accept your written plea of guilty, I must be satisfied that your plea is freely -- plea pursuant to the Alford decision is freely and voluntarily given.

Are you doing this freely and voluntarily?
THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: All right. Other than what's contained in the written plea of guilty and what has been stated here in open court by your attorney Ms. Lemcke,
have any promises or threats been made to induce you to enter your plea?
THE DEFENDANT: No, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay. Before you signed the written plea of guilty did you read

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Did you understand everything contained in the written plea of guilty?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: And did you also read the Second Amended Information charging you with a felony, a Category $B$ felony crimes of voluntary manslaughter and child abuse, neglect or endangerment with substantial bodily harm?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: And did you understand everything contained in that Second Amended Information?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: All right. And did you have a full and ample opportunity to discuss your plea of guilty as well as the charges to which you're pleading guilty with your attorneys Mr. Reed and Ms. Lemcke?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Did you also go over and discuss with them the valuable constitutional rights that you are waiving and giving up by virtue of pleading guilty pursuant to the Alford decision in this case?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay. And did Ms. Lemcke and Mr. Reed address any questions or concerns you have about your plea or the charges to your satisfaction
at this point?
THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay. So you don't have any questions that you want to ask the Court, or if you do, the time to ask them is right now?

THE DEFENDANT: No, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay. And is it your desire today to enter a plea of guilty pursuant to the Alford decision?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay. Now, you understand that that means that you are denying the facts constituting the offense; therefore, I must make a determination that there was a factual basis for the plea.

The Deputy District Attorney will now state for the record what facts the State would be able to prove if this matter were to proceed to trial.

Mr. Staudaher.
MR. STAUDAHER: Thank you, Your Honor.
The State would, if the case had gone to trial, would be able to prove that on or about June $6^{\text {th }}$ of 2013, Jonathan Quisano had started to care for his son Khayden Quisano around 4:30 in the afternoon after Khayden had been deposited in the home by his grandparents. Prior to that time Khayden had exhibited no injuries or iltnesses or any problems whatsoever; however, within an hour of -.. a period of about an hour and a half, a window of time that is between the time that Khayden came into the home and 9-1-1 was called, the State believes we would have been able to prove that Jonathan Quisano perpetrated child abuse upon the child such that he eventually died.

Now, the other facts based on what took place that the State would
intend to provide evidence for to the jury would be this, that Jonathan Quisano was in the care and custody of Jonathan -- or excuse me, Khayden Quisano was in the care and custody of Jonathan Quisano.

No one else was in the home at the time with the exception of a younger child which apparently Khayden may or may not have been playing with at the time, that at some point during the time that Jonathan, excuse me, I keep saying Jonathan, that Khayden gets injured, he does not call 9-1-1. He waits for a period of time until his wife gets off work or about there, and then there is a series of calls between himself and his wife; the first one initiated by his wife. The second couple are initiated by him to his wife basically asking her to come home, not giving her details about what has taken place in the home.

The second call to his wife is more urgent, and then the third call is from his wife to him in which he finally tells her that Khayden is in trouble, that Khayden's eyes were closed, that he's not responding and so forth.

Now, we know that in the interim between the calls that took place and between the actual arrival of Jonathan -- excuse me, of Khayden at the house that evening that after the injury to Khayden that there was some blood associated with that because we found, and the evidence would show, that there were at least attempts to clean up blood off of Khayden that were located in two different bathrooms and in the kitchen area as well as the main living area.

In addition, there appears -- although the medical evidence later on would show that there was some sort of lung contusions that were sustained by Khayden when he was in the home that night, the evidence on the carpet in front of where supposedly these events took place showed not just blood dripping on the carpet but showed an expectoration of blood, meaning a coughing of blood with
micro droplets spraying over a period of -- over a space. That was later elucidated by crime scene analysts when they came in and used Leucocrystal Violet to bring that up so it was visible. That clearly is an injury which was not consistent with any form of a fall off a couch and a head injury. It was a lung injury in addition to the head injury that he sustained.

Now, initially after the calling between the wife and Jonathan, she hangs up the phone. She calls $9-1-1$. After she calls $9-1-1$, she's on the phone with the 9-1-1 operator, and she's not at home. They query her as to what's going on because the person who has care and custody of the child isn't calling them, doesn't indicate that there's a problem, and she is.

She implores them to go to the house; they do. They don't really know what they're going to see when they get there. They don't know that there's a serious problem, but when they arrive on scene, they knock on the door. He opens the door and basically hands them Khayden in essentially an arrested state. He's not breathing at the time: He is lifeless. They immediately take the child, put the child down in the entryway -- entry hallway area.

In the area of where the child was at the time you could not see because of the -- sort of the way the hallway was into the full extent of the great room where the furniture was; however, you could see two recliners, kind of rocker chairs that were in the living room at least from the perspective of where the first responder was that dealt with Khayden initially.

In asking what had happened, Khayden -- about what happened to Khayden, Jonathan says that he fell off of a recliner, rocker. They turn around and they see the rockers. They point to those rockers, and they say, Those chairs, and he says, yes.

They work on the child. They actually start to perform two finger CPR and scoop the child and go out to the ambulance. That was a very brief window of time that CPR was initiated during that period. When he gets to the ambulance, they determine that he has a pulse; he's just not breathing. They put pads on him. He's got a rhythm, and they transport him to the hospital.

Now, a couple of things related to that. Once he gives that information to the first responders, there is another first responder who goes in afterward to try and get more detail about what happened so that they can provide that information to the police -- or not to the police but to the medical people when they get to the hospital. At that point, Jonathan changes his story. Jonathan says that in fact -- he doesn't say anything about a chair at this point or a couch. He says that Khayden was on a bar counter and fell off of the counter or bar. That was the story that at least they had at the time.

Now, when they get Khayden into the ambulance and they transport him to the hospital, they do two sort of chemistry analyses of his blood. They stick him to get blood glucose to see where he's at. His blood glucose is in the 400 range, which means he's been suffering trauma for quite some time. This is not something that happens in a very short period of time. There would have been evidence to come in to that effect. So it shows that he was down for a period before help was summoned to the house.

Once he, Jonathan is at the house, they transport. He goes to the hospital. He later comes back to the home at the request of the police to tell them what had happened. He then changes his story again. And now the story is that he has fallen off of the sofa. He shows the police officers the sofa. He actually -- they have a doll, and he actually demonstrates exactly how the child Khayden fell or
slipped off, and he describes it as -- he may not use those words, but his actions are that Khayden was not jumping on the couch, was not doing anything like that, but he slipped over the couch and fell to the floor.

He describes Khayden's position on the other side of the couch as not perpendicular away from the couch but parallel to the couch. They looked on the floor around where Khayden would have been. There is no evidence of any blood at that point or any sort of residue or anything along those lines despite the fact that at some point Jonathan states that Khayden vomits and spits up. They don't find evidence of that kind of thing around the house just the sort of coughing up of blood that's on the carpet and evidence of that in the trash cans from the rags and so forth that were there; so three different stories at that point and a demonstration of what took place at the house.

When they get to the hospital, essentially Khayden is dead. He was pronounced within a couple of hours of his arrival to the hospital. He never regained consciousness, no resuscitative efforts were successful in any way, shape or form for him. He didn't respond in any way. He had no gag reflex. He had no reaction to painful stimuli. His reflexes were nonexistent, and he was -- he was gone. His pupils were fixed and dilated, the whole works.

From that point, we know that the child's injuries are very catastrophic. There were CT scans done. Later in the autopsy, the autopsy revealed that there was a complex stellate fracture to the left posterior parietal occipital area that extended across the back of the skull and along the right side of the skull as well. There was also an area of not abrasion but an area of injury that was noted by the ER physicians in the front left of the scalp, and underlying that at autopsy there was hemorrhage in the tissues above that; although there wasn't a bony damage -- there
wasn't bony damage, the subdural hematomas that were present on Khayden's brain essentially covered the entirety of the brain, actually more on the left side, up and down from the front to the back than on the right side, although the right side had extensive hemorrhage as well.

The complexity of the fracture, the nature of the hemorrhages and even grossly at the time of autopsy, the optic nerves specifically on the right-hand side had subdural hematoma present in it that was indicative of severe injury that was not at least consistent with the story that had been provided by Mr. Quisano regarding what had happened to the child.

The brain was subsequently sent out as were the eyes to Stanford University. Those eyes and brain were examined. The neuropathologist determined that there was evidence of deep axonal injury both to -- there was a mixed etiology. There was some evidence that there was some sort of hypoxic component which would not have anything to do with trauma; however, there was a significant component of traumatic axonal injury which certainly was a component of nonaccidental head trauma, especially in this particular setting.

Typically you would have heard -- the jury would have heard that deep axonal injury in this case is due to more of a rotational sort of injury, severe rotational injury as well as the -- that could be accompanied through shaking or other things along those lines; certainly not consistent with the type of fall that's described by Mr. Quisano.

That information combined with the remaining information of the fact that at post there was also evidence of blood in both the alveolar and bronchial area further corroborated the fact that Jonathan (sic) had a traumatic injury to his lungs and that the blood at the scene was evident from that.

None of those, that constellation of injuries was consistent with a single simple fall from a short distance on the back of the couch, and no evidence of any trauma or evidence of trauma to the back -- or on the floor around the couch.

We believe that at the time of trial that evidence as well as all the medical people who would have come forward to testify that those injuries were not consistent with the actual story would prove that Jonathan in fact is guilty of child abuse and neglect with substantial bodily harm that ultimately resulted in his death and hence the charge of murder.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
Mr. Quisano, you understand that the Court is just going to rely upon the facts just stated by the Deputy District Attorney in determining whether or not there is a factual basis for your plea. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: All right. And have you made a determination that it is in your best interests to accept the plea negotiation offered by the State and enter your plea of guilty pursuant to the Alford decision here today?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: And is one of the reasons that you've decided to do this to avoid the possible harsher penalty if you were convicted of the original charges against you?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: All right. The Court finds that there's a sufficient factual basis for the plea as stated by Mr. Staudaher. The Court further finds that Mr. Quisano is doing this freely and voluntarily, and so the plea pursuant to the Alford decision as to both counts is accepted.

We'll set it over for rendition of sentence and --
MS. LEMCKE: I would ask Your Honor if we could set it a little bit later just to give us more time to prepare, and I don't know if Your Honor would be so inclined because I haven't done any sentencings in front of Your Honor, but if you would consider putting us on a special setting maybe a little bit later at the end of the calendar, something of that nature just in case there are some speakers that might want to be heard relative to the sentence imposed here.

MR. STAUDAHER: No objection, Your Honor.
THE COURT: All right. Ms. Husted will give you the date.
THE CLERK: The in custody --
THE COURT: You can set it for 10:30.
MS. LEMCKE: Yeah, that's fine.
THE CLERK: The in-custody --
THE COURT: I mean, they're going to bring him over at 9:30 but --
MS. LEMCKE: Yeah, that's fine. I just would hate to have it disrupt the calendar. I'd rather have an understanding that --

THE COURT: Normally we do those at the end anyway, I mean after all the cases have been pulled and everything then we would do that kind of thing so that other people who have status checks don't have to sit through --

MS. LEMCKE: That would be great.
THE COURT: -- all the family and all that. That's how I do the calendar anyway.

MS. LEMCKE: Okay. That's perfect. So then 10:30 on?
THE CLERK: Well, I was going to say the in-custody date is August $12^{\text {th }}$, and you want it later?

MS. LEMCKE: Yes, please.
THE CLERK: How much?
MR. STAUDAHER: I'm going to be out of town --
THE COURT: She can't do it the $12^{\text {th }}$ anyway. Is September fine for the -MS. LEMCKE: Yeah, September would be good if that's all right.

THE CLERK: September $9^{\text {th }}$.
MS. LEMCKE: Yeah, September $9^{\text {th }}$, that's fine.
THE CLERK: September $9^{\text {th }}$ at 10:30.
THE COURT: Let's actually put it on for 9:30 for him so they bring him over, and you guys just understand we'll do it at the end of the calendar because what I don't want to have happen is the jail bring everybody and then we all sit here and wait when they switch it out. I don't think that would happen but just to make sure he's transported with the morning crowd.

MS. LEMCKE; That's perfect.
MR. REED: Fine.
MR. STAUDAHER: Thank you, Your Honor.
MS. LEMCKE: Thank you, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Thank you.
MR. REED: Thank you for your patience and everything, Your Honor, appreciate it.
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