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INST
FILED IN OPEN COURT EDWARD A. FRIEDLAND CLERK OF THE COURT

## ORIGINAL

## DISTRICT COURT

 CLARK COUNTY, NEVADATHE STATE OF NEVADA,
Plaintiff,
-VS-
NORMAN KEITH FLOWERS,
Defendant.
INSTRUCTIONS TO THE JURY (INSTRUCTION NO. I) MEMBERS OF THE JURY:

It is now my duty as judge to instruct you in the law that applies to this case. It is your duty as jurors to follow these instructions and to apply the rules of law to the facts as you find them from the evidence.

You must not be concerned with the wisdom of any rule of law stated in these instructions. Regardless of any opinion you may have as to what the law ought to be, it would be a violation of your oath to base a verdict upon any other view of the law than that given in the instructions of the Court.

If, in these instructions, any rule, direction or idea is repeated or stated in different ways, no emphasis thereon is intended by me and none may be inferred by you. For that reason, you are not to single out any certain sentence or any individual point or instruction and ignore the others, but you are to consider all the instructions as a whole and regard each in the light of all the others.

The order in which the instructions are given has no significance as to their relative importance.

An Indictment is but a formal method of accusing a person of a crime and is not of itself any evidence of his guilt.

In this case, it is charged in an Amended Indictment that on or about the $24^{\text {th }}$ day of March, 2005, the Defendant committed the offenses of BURGLARY, MURDER, SEXUAL ASSAULT, and ROBBERY 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 - BURGLARY

did then and there wilfully, unlawfully, and feloniously enter, with intent to commit assault or battery and/or a felony, to-wit: murder and/or robbery and/or sexual assault, that certain building occupied by SHEILA QUARLES, located at 1001 North Pecos \#H-63, Las Vegas, Clark County, Nevada.

## COUNT 2 - MURDER

did then and there wilfully, unlawfully, feloniously, without authority of law, and with malice aforethought, kill SHEILA QUARLES, a human being, by manual strangulation and/or drowning, with his hands and/or an unknown object, said killing having been (1) wailful, deliberate and premeditated; and/or (2) committed during the perpetration or attempted perpetration of sexual assault as set forth in Count 3 and/or burglary as set forth in Count 1 and/or robbery as set forth in Count 4, said acts being incorporated herein by this reference as though fully set forth.

## COUNT 3 - SEXUAL ASSAULT

did then and there wilfully, unlawfully, and feloniously sexually assault and subject SHEILA QUARLES, a female person, to sexual penetration, to-wit: sexual intercourse, by the said Defendant placing his penis and/or an unknown object into the genital opening of the said SHEILA QUARLES, against her will.

## COUNT 4 - ROBBERY

did then and there wilfully, unlawfully, and feloniously take personal property: to-wit: a stereo and speakers, cell phone, and/or other personal property from the person of SHEILA QUARLES or in her presence, by means of force or violence, or fear of injury to, and without the consent and against the will of the said SHEILA QUARLES.

It is the duty of the jury to apply the rules of law contained in these instructions to the facts of the case and determine whether or not the defendant is guilty of the offense charged.

Each charge and the evidence pertaining to it should be considered separately. The fact that you find a defendant guilty or not guilty as to one of the offenses charged should not control your verdict as to any other offense charged.

Every person who, by day or night, enters any residence or structure with the intent to commit a larceny and/or an assault and/or a battery and/or a felony, such as sexual assault and/or robbery, therein is guilty of Burglary.

Consent to enter is not a defense to the crime of burglary so long as it is proven beyond a reasonable doubt that entry was made with the specific intent to commit a larceny and/or an assault and/or a battery and/or a felony therein.

Every person who, in the commission of a burglary, commits any other crime, may be prosecuted for each crime separately.

In this case the defendant is accused in an Indictment alleging an open charge of murder. This charge may include murder of the first degree and murder of the second degree.

The jury must decide if the defendant is guilty of any offense and, if so, of which offense.

Murder is the unlawful killing of a human being with malice aforethought, either express or implied. The unlawful killing may be effected by any of the various means by which death may be occasioned.

Malice aforethought means the intentional doing of a wrongful act without legal cause or excuse or what the law considers adequate provocation. The condition of mind described as malice aforethought may arise, from anger, hatred, revenge, or from particular ill will, spite or grudge toward the person killed. It may also arise from any unjustifiable or unlawful motive or purpose to injure another, proceeding from a heart fatally bent on mischief or with reckless disregard of consequences and social duty. Malice aforethought does not imply deliberation or the lapse of any considerable time between the malicious intention to injure another and the actual execution of the intent but denotes an unlawful purpose and design as opposed to accident and mischance.

Express malice is that deliberate intention unlawfully to take away the life of a human being, which is manifested by external circumstances capable of proof.

Malice may be implied when no considerable provocation appears, or when all the circumstances of the killing show an abandoned and malignant heart.

Murder of the First Degree is murder which is (a) committed in the perpetration or attempted perpetration of a burglary, sexual assault, or robbery or (b) perpetrated by any kind of willful, deliberate and premeditated killing.

Murder of the first degree is murder which is perpetrated by means of any kind of willful, deliberate, and premeditated killing. All three elements -- willfulness, deliberation, and premeditation -- must be proven beyond a reasonable doubt before an accused can be convicted of first-degree murder.

Willfulness is the intent to kill. There need be no appreciable space of time between formation of the intent to kill and the act of killing.

Deliberation is the process of determining upon a course of action to kill as a result of thought, including weighing the reasons for and against the action and considering the consequences of the actions.

A deliberate determination may be arrived at in a short period of time. But in all cases the determination must not be formed in passion, or if formed in passion, it must be carried out after there has been time for the passion to subside and deliberation to occur. A mere unconsidered and rash impulse is not deliberate, even though it includes the intent to kill.

Premeditation is a design, a determination to kill, distinctly formed in the mind by the time of the killing.

Premeditation need not be for a day, an hour, or even a minute. It may be as instantaneous as successive thoughts of the mind. For if the jury believes from the evidence that the act constituting the killing has been preceded by and has been the result of premeditation, no matter how rapidly the act follows the premeditation, it is premeditated.

The law does not undertake to measure in units of time the length of the period during which the thought must be pondered before it can ripen into an intent to kill which is truly deliberate and premeditated. The time will vary with different individuals and under varying circumstances.

The true test is not the duration of time, but rather the extent of the reflection. A cold, calculated judgment and decision may be arrived at in a short period of time, but a mere unconsidered and rash impulse, even though it includes an intent to kill, is not deliberation and premeditation as will fix an unlawful killing as murder of the first degree.

There are kinds of murder which carry with them conclusive evidence of malice aforethought. One of these classes of murder is murder committed in the perpetration or attempted perpetration of a burglary, sexual assault, or robbery. Therefore, a killing which is committed in the perpetration of a burglary, sexual assault, or robbery is deemed to be murder of the first degree, whether the killing was intentional or unintentional or accidental. This is called the Felony Murder Rule.

The intent to perpetrate or attempt to perpetrate the burglary, sexual assault, or robbery must be proven beyond a reasonable doubt.

For the purposes of the Felony Murder Rule, the intent to commit the robbery must have arisen before or during the conduct resulting in death. However, in determining whether the defendant had the requisite intent to commit robbery before or during the killing, you may infer that intent from the defendant's actions during and immediately after the killing. There is no Felony Murder where robbery occurs as an afterthought of the killing.

Although your verdict must be unanimous as to the charge, you do not have to agree on the theory of guilt. Therefore, even if you cannot agree on whether the facts establish premeditated murder or felony murder, so long as all of you agree that the evidence establishes the defendant's guilt of murder in the first degree, your verdict shall be Murder of the First Degree.
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All murder which is not Murder of the First Degree is Murder of the Second Degree. Murder of the Second Degree is Murder with malice aforethought, but without the admixture of premeditation and deliberation.

If you find that the State has established that the defendant has committed murder of the first degree, you shall select murder of the first degree as your verdict.

The crime of murder of the first degree includes the crime of murder of the second degree. You may find the Defendant guilty of the lesser-included offense of murder of the second degree if:

1. after first fully and carefully considering the charge of murder of the first degree, you either (a) find the defendant not guilty of that charge, or (b) are unable to agree whether to acquit or convict on that charge; and
2. all twelve of you are convinced beyond a reasonable doubt the defendant is guilty of murder of the second degree.

If you are convinced beyond a reasonable doubt that the crime of murder has been committed by the defendant, but you have a reasonable doubt whether such murder was of the first or of the second degree, you must give the defendant the benefit of that doubt and return a verdict of murder of the second degree.

A person who subjects another person to sexual penetration against the victim's will or under conditions in which the perpetrator knows or should know that the victim is mentally or physically incapable of resisting or understanding the nature of his conduct is guilty of sexual assault.

As used in these instructions, "sexual penetration" means any intrusion, however slight, of any part of a person's body or any object manipulated or inserted by a person into the genital or anal openings of the body of another, including sexual intercourse.

Sexual intercourse is the placing of the penis of the perpetrator into the vagina of the victim.

If a female yields to the sexual acts of a male aggressor because she reasonably believes that resistance would result in her death or serious bodily injury, her conduct does not constitute consent.

Physical force is not a necessary ingredient in the commission of sexual assault. The crucial question is not whether the victim was physically forced to engage in a sexual assault but whether the act was committed without her consent. There is no consent where the victim is induced to submit to the sexual act through fear of death or serious bodily injury. INSTRUCTION NO.

Robbery is the unlawful taking of personal property from the person of another, or in his presence, against his will, by means of force or violence or fear of injury, immediate or future, to his person or property, or the person or property of a member of his family, or of anyone in his company at the time of the robbery. Such force or fear must be used to obtain or retain possession of the property, to prevent or overcome resistance to the taking, or to facilitate escape, in either of which cases the degree of force is immaterial if used to compel acquiescence to the taking of or escaping with the property.

To constitute the crime charged, there must exist a union or joint operation of an act forbidden by law and an intent to do the act.

The intent with which an act is done is shown by the facts and circumstances surrounding the case.

Do not confuse intent with motive. Motive is what prompts a person to act. Intent refers only to the state of mind with which the act is done.

Motive is not an element of the crime charged and the State is not required to prove a motive on the part of the Defendant in order to convict. However, you may consider evidence of motive or lack of motive as a circumstance in the case.

The Defendant is presumed innocent until the contrary is proved. This presumption places upon the State the burden of proving beyond a reasonable doubt every material element of the crime charged and that the Defendant is the person who committed the offense.

A reasonable doubt is one based on reason. It is not mere possible doubt but is such a doubt as would govern or control a person in the more weighty affairs of life. If the minds of the jurors, after the entire comparison and consideration of all the evidence, are in such a condition that they can say they feel an abiding conviction of the truth of the charge, there is not a reasonable doubt. Doubt to be reasonable must be actual, not mere possibility or speculation.

If you have a reasonable doubt as to the guilt of the Defendant, he is entitled to a verdict of not guilty.


The evidence which you are to consider in this case consists of the testimony of the witnesses, the exhibits, and any facts admitted or agreed to by counsel.

There are two types of evidence; direct and circumstantial. Direct evidence is the testimony of a person who claims to have personal knowledge of the commission of the crime which has been charged, such as an eyewitness. Circumstantial evidence is the proof of a chain of facts and circumstances which tend to show whether the Defendant is guilty or not guilty. The law makes no distinction between the weight to be given either direct or circumstantial evidence. Therefore, all of the evidence in the case, including the circumstantial evidence, should be considered by you in arriving at your verdict.

Statements, arguments and opinions of counsel are not evidence in the case. However, if the attorneys stipulate to the existence of a fact, you must accept the stipulation as evidence and regard that fact as proved.

You must not speculate to be true any insinuations suggested by a question asked a witness. A question is not evidence and may be considered only as it supplies meaning to the answer.

You must disregard any evidence to which an objection was sustained by the court and any evidence ordered stricken by the court.

Anything you may have seen or heard outside the courtroom is not evidence and must also be disregarded.

Evidence that the Defendant committed offenses other than that for which he is on trial, if proven to be clear and convincing, is not admitted and may not be considered by you to prove that the Defendant is a person of bad character or to prove that he has a disposition to commit crimes. Such evidence is admitted, and may be considered by you, only for the limited purpose of proving the defendant's identity, intent, lack of consent on the part of the victim, a common scheme, plan or motive, or the absence of mistake or accident, as it relates to the charges before you. If you find the evidence to be clear and convincing, you must weigh this evidence in the same manner as you do all other evidence in the case.

A witness who has special knowledge, skill, experience, training or education in a particular science, profession or occupation is an expert witness. An expert witness may give his opinion as to any matter in which he is skilled.

You should consider such expert opinion and weigh the reasons, if any, given for it. You are not bound, however, by such an opinion. Give it the weight to which you deem it entitled, whether that be great or slight, and you may reject it, if, in your judgment, the reasons given for it are unsound.

The credibility or believability of a witness should be determined by his manner upon the stand, his relationship to the parties, his fears, motives, interests or feelings, his opportunity to have observed the matter to which he testified, the reasonableness of his statements and the strength or weakness of his recollections.

If you believe that a witness has lied about any material fact in the case, you may disregard the entire testimony of that witness or any portion of his testimony which is not proved by other evidence.
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Although you are to consider only the evidence in the case in reaching a verdict, you must bring to the consideration of the evidence your everyday common sense and judgment as reasonable men and women. Thus, you are not limited solely to what you see and hear as the witnesses testify. You may draw reasonable inferences from the evidence which you feel are justified in the light of common experience, keeping in mind that such inferences should not be based on speculation or guess.

A verdict may never be influenced by sympathy, prejudice or public opinion. Your decision should be the product of sincere judgment and sound discretion in accordance with these rules of law.

You are here to determine whether the State has proven the guilty of the Defendant beyond a reasonable doubt from the evidence in this case. You are not called upon to return a verdict as to the guilt of any other person. So, if you believe the State has proven the guilt of the Defendant beyond a reasonable doubt, you should so find, even though you may believe one or more other persons are also guilty.

In your deliberation, you may not discuss or consider the subject of punishment. At this time, your duty is confined to the determination of the guilt or innocence of the defendant.

When you retire to consider your verdict, you must select one of your number to act as foreperson who will preside over your deliberation and will be your spokesperson here in court.

During your deliberation, you will have all the exhibits which were admitted into evidence, these written instructions and forms of verdict which have been prepared for your convenience.

Your verdict must be unanimous. As soon as you have agreed upon a verdict, have it signed and dated by your foreperson and then return with it to this room.

The verdict must represent the considered judgment of each juror. In order to return a verdict, your verdict must be unanimous.

It is your duty, as jurors, to consult with one another and to deliberate with a view to reaching an agreement, if you can do so without violence to individual judgment. Each of you must decide the case for yourself, but do so only after an impartial consideration of the evidence with your fellow jurors.

In the course of your deliberations, do not hesitate to reexamine your own views and change your opinion if convinced it is erroneous. But do not surrender your honest conviction as to the weight or effect of evidence solely because of the opinion of your fellow jurors, or for the mere purpose of returning a verdict.

If, during your deliberation, you should desire to be further informed on any point of law or hear again portions of the testimony, you must reduce your request to writing signed by the foreperson. The officer will then return you to court where the information sought will be given you in the presence of, and after notice to, the district attorney and the Defendant and his/her counsel.

Readbacks of testimony are time-consuming and are not encouraged unless you deem it a necessity. Should you require a readback, you must carefully describe the testimony to be played back so that the court reporter can arrange her notes. Remember, the court is not at liberty to supplement the evidence.

Now you will listen to the arguments of counsel who will endeavor to aid you to reach a proper verdict by refreshing in your minds the evidence and by showing the application thereof to the law; but, whatever counsel may say, you will bear in mind that it is your duty to be governed in your deliberation by the evidence as you understand it and remember it to be and by the law as given to you in these instructions, with the sole, fixed and steadfast purpose of doing equal and exact justice between the Defendant and the State of Nevada.
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the opening statements and the Nimesses. We'tl probably be done 5:30-ish I'm guessing, but I could be off 45 minutes.

MR. PIKE: We have one witness that is not available until Friday morning.

THE COURT: That happens just like we had happen the other day. If we have one short witness Friday, it'll be fine. I'm sure we can get a good, early start Friday morning and we'll still get them the case by noon and that's the way it goes.

Okay. Moon, you want to take them down?

OFFICER MOON: Yes, sir.
THE COURT: If you go with Officer Moon, he' 11 take you down and out and escort you down. We'11 see you tomorrow. We're gonna start at 10:00 sharp.

Yeah, just kind of like we're in the middle of trial because we are in the middle of trial and we're going to finish consistent with the original schedule that we had.
(Whereupon, the jury exited the courtroom.)
THE COURT: Okay. The record should reflect the jury has exited. It would seem to me in 25
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light of the jury's verdict that the sexual assault and robbery aggravators are out now.

Would you agree?
MS. WECKERLY: (Positive nod of the
head.)
MS. LUZAICH: (Positive nod of the head.)
THE COURT: So those we'd have to strike and we're left with whatever the others are.

MS. WECKERLY: He has prior violent
felonies. He was under sentence of imprisonment and --

THE COURT: There was one more though.
MS. WECKERLY: Yeah.
MS. LUZAICH: Well, the other murder, but he wasn't convicted of that.

MS. WECKERLY: Right.
MR. PIKE: He wasn't convicted so I don't think we're gonna talk about those.

THE COURT: So it's just prior violent felonies. Because I -- oh, I thought I had them in here.

MS. GORD: They're on my desk.
THE COURT: Okay. Well, I left that in the potential jury instructions.

MS. WECKERLY: Right.

THE RT: I've got to strike that. MS. WECKERLY: Okay.
THE COURT: Okay. Let me advise Mr.

## Flowers. I know you've been advised by your

 counsel, because this is what they do for a living and they know this better than $I$ do, but when this penalty phase occurs, you have the right to take the stand and express remorse, pleas for leniency or hopes for the future.It's an unsworn statement, you won't be subject to cross-examination, but you can kind of tell them why they should give you a break if you believe that's fair. I'm sure Mr. Patrick and Mr. Pike will go over that with you.

You're not allowed to go beyond the scope of that. You're not allowed to say you were wrong, I'm innocent of any of that. In theory if you do that, the State can cross-examine. I don't go there. I just stop you if you go beyond it. I just say okay, you're not allowed to do that.

So it's usually brief. You don't have to do it if you don't want to, but that will be between you and Mr. Pike and Mr. Patrick.

Are we clear on that, Mr. Flowers?
THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
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THE COURT: Do you have any questions about that?

THE DEFENDANT: No.
THE COURT: Anything else?
MR. PIKE: Yes, Your Honor. I've got
a - just very briefly. I forgot at the close of
the trial to make a record on the side bar that we had when Detective Long was testifying and he discussed the conversations, and during the course of his testimony about conversations that he had with Mr. Kinsey.

I went to the, approached the bench indicating that $I$ believe because that testimony was elicited and specifically because he made reference of people giving names and assisting and cooperating that that would have opened the door for me to have asked questions that would have elicited the hearsay testimony regarding what Mr. Kinsey had told my investigators about the individual or about the relationship that the deceased was having with Keith.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. PIKE: The court, the court overheard arguments from both sides, determined that that door had not been opened.

THE COURT: Well, it's so much that. It's not so much that. I'm not sure that it had. really didn't get there.

I mean, the idea of the door being opened is there is an area of substance about which testimony is not allowed, but if one side goes into it inadvertently or intentionally, the other side is entitled to sort of even the playing field. But that doesn't nonetheless make evidence that would be otherwise inadmissible under the rules of evidence admissible.

So I didn't really get to opening the door. If they had opened the door, I would have let you put in admissible evidence.

But the truth is I would have let you put in admissible evidence through Mr. Kinsey whether Long said that or not. If Kinsey in fact had personal knowledge of any of these things that would have arguably been helpful to your client, he could have testified to that before they put on the rebuttal.

The point was it doesn't make
inadmissible evidence admissible. It just gives the other side the right to sort of even the playing field on an issue.
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But it wasn't an opening the door
issue. It was -- it still doesn't make any hearsay information he has admissible.

I would have let you ask Kinsey if Kinsey had known, but Kinsey couldn't have known any of this because he'd been in jail since five months before this incident. So that was the basis of the rule.

But let me say this: You did timely approach, you did timely make that issue. The record you have made is a fair recitation of the position that you asserted and I think the record's preserved.

MR. PIKE: Thank you very much.
THE COURT: Ms. Weckerly, anything you want to say on that?

MS. WECKERLY: Well, no, just -. I mean, he's talking about two levels of hearsay at this point, that something that Sheila told Kinsey that Kinsey said to their investigator and me asking the question about Detective Long about Kinsey not providing information --

THE COURT: No.
MS. WECKERLY: -- couldn't open the door.
THE COURT: I think, I think -- I don't
see it as opening the door issue. I think what he wanted to do is how can I recall Kinsey and ask him were you aware of this.

But again, it's, it's two different things. It's areas that you can go into and it's what evidence is admissible to prove those things and this hearsay information is not admissible, regardless of what the State has proven.

Do you have anything else?
MR. PIKE: Yes. In order to save some time for tomorrow, the State is going to bring in the custodian of records and to bring forth the records of any violations of conduct that Mr .
Flowers may have at the Nevada Department of Corrections.

I'd object to those as being
hearsay. It's a standard objection that's made, but we have to have a judge grant it.

THE COURT: Well, the general proposition is hearsay is admissible to these things, but I understand how you and your office does your job which is very thorough, and that is we have to not only comply with today's law, we have to anticipate that there may be a change of the law and we have to protect the record, so if there's a change in the
law, we don't lose the benefit of that change for our client because we didn't anticipate it.

MR. PIKE: Right, And so for the record, a non .-

THE COURT: Your objection --
MR. PIKE: -- confrontation clause, I'd
make that objection both as to the record from the
Nevada Department of Corrections and the Clark
County Detention Center.
THE COURT: And that objection will be overruled. And we made our record right now and then you can make that argument -- well, there's gonna be an appeal regardless.

MR. PIKE: Right. And in reference to the due-process issues on the aggravators that they're looking, that the State has evidenced in their notice of intent to seek the death penalty, the allegations of a prior, priant, prior .- excuse me. It's been a rough couple of days. Prior violent felony.

THE COURT: I mean, obviously the defense is disappointed with the verdict, but I thought you guys did a terrific job for your client. And obviously the jury struggled with this case. They'd been out for more than 24 hours.

MR. PIKE: Thank you. appreciate those kind words.

THE COURT: Go ahead.
MR. PIKE: In reference to the prior violent felonies, they are alleging both a first degree arson and a robbery with the use of a deadly weapon.

I'd object to those in reference to
due process and the narrowing requirements of Witherspoon in particular with the robbery with use of a deadly weapon.

The facts indicate that Mr. Flowers did not have the weapon, but he participated as a principal involved in that offense.

THE COURT: How is that not a crime of violence then?

MR. PIKE: The crime is a crime of violence. His acts weren't the violent acts of producing the weapon and demanding that.

And so as it .- the statute fails to distinguish between a major participant and then a principal under liability for purposes similar.

And I draw the analogy to in the
event that the State was seeking the death penalty against Mr. Flowers and there had been a shooting
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and he had not been the actual shooter, then they'd --

THE COURT: Is there a case law that distinguishes those?

MR. PIKE: And I apply that analogously to the situation for the aggravators. I think that to just allow the fact that he was convicted and was a participant or principal as it ultimately happened to be, that that does not provide for a sufficient narrowing of the offenses.

THE COURT: Let me ask you this: I mean, I think that in the case of the getaway driver, at least in most instances, $I$ think it's jurisdiction. You can't -- he is just not eligible for the death penalty. And there may be exceptions of that, but I think generally it's jurisdictional.

In the case of a prior and the issue of that prior, if it is allowable, are you not still free to point out his limited participation just like the State would be free to point out his major participation?

I mean, isn't it, isn't it matter that the jury can give that weight rather than being jurisdictional? It comes in, it is a crime of violence and yet if he's a secondary or teshiary
(phonetic) pla, maybe you're not gonna give it the same weight as if he'd put the gun to the baby's head and says I'm gonna blow your kid's head off if you don't hand over your purse.

MR. PIKE: And the court's accurately stated the current law that that is exactly what the State would be able to do and then what we could do is we can argue for the .-

THE COURT: I understand what you're saying.

MR. PIKE: It's not yet jurisdictional.
I think it should be.
THE COURT: And you know, me, I don't
have the real legal authority to say well, I think the supreme court should do this or that. I have to follow the law as it is. And if I follow the law as it is, sometimes later they tell me 1 shouldn't have.

But nonetheless, I'm gonna let that
in. And of course you're free to point out in
whatever fashion you want through whatever admissible evidence you have what you think is exculpatory in the sense of his total participation and how should, that should be a make weight in their decision, you know, tomorrow.
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MR. PIKE: Thank you. And finally in reference to the items that I believe they're going to bring into evidence of some arrests or misdemeanors that are involved and his other bad acts, I think it's improper to bring in anything other than, than prior violent felonies.

THE COURT: Well, the law says pretty much the whole record can come in, but I don't know that people place much weight on anything. But just an arrest that doesn't amount to anything or misdemeanors, who cares if he has a trespass or a DUI .

MR. PIKE: Thank you.
THE COURT: But I think they can just come it, put his rap sheet in.

MR. PIKE: Thank you. And the situation with the, the older felonies in his record and the rest of that is that, that because he is a prior felon, an ex-felon, that whole aggravator almost creates a status aggravator.

It's not articulated that way, it's never put on there, but those are brought forward and they become, they become in the juror's mind an aggravating factor.

THE COURT: What does?

MR. PIKE: The fact tha it occurred -well, that he has these prior felonies.

THE COURT: Well, I mean, I hope that it doesn't in this sense: I mean, I'm going to instruct them that there's only these aggravators, the specifically listed aggravators and those are the only things they can consider in determining aggravating circumstances and those are the only things that they can weigh against any of the mitigators that they have and they can't consider .-
I mean, they're gonna get instructed on that hopefully clearly enough that they understand and all this other stuff can come into play after they have determined whether they're making a decision amongst four possibilities or three. Then they weigh everything they want.

But I hope the instructions are gonna be clear to say you cannot do that. And I've taken what you've got, I've taken what Ms.
Weckerly's got. I've kind of put a package together, but if you have some even better language that you think makes that clear, I mean we don't have any disagreement on the law and I have to presume that they're gonna follow the law.

And the law says they cannot
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consider that until they have decided whether the aggravators outweigh the mitigators and then it comes in as a make way.

So I don't disagree with you. If
you've got better language that makes it more clear than what was already put in, I'll certainly be glad to consider that because you're right.

MR. PIKE: Thank you. And it's obvious from the time that they spent deliberating the verdict that this is a thorough jury.

It seems as though that they are following the instructions to the best of their ability. So we, again we talked about trust throughout that.

The final --
THE COURT: You know, you never know what goes on in the jury room and hopefully we're never gonna be in a position to know. Hopefully the sanctity of that has some value.

I think not only the fact that they
spent time, but they did find the defendant not guilty of one of these charges.

So they went through their mind. mean, they have some kind of scenario of what happened and what the burden of proof is. And, you
guilty of one of the charges and guilty of other of the charges indicates to me they really thought this through and they discussed it and they, you know, they weighed everything. I don't know that's the case. It just makes sense to me.

MR. PIKE: Thank you.
THE COURT: You know, sometimes it's all one way or all the other way. You wonder if the baby got thrown out with the bath water, but clearly that didn't happen.

MR. PIKE: Thank you. And the final matter, just to preserve it for the record in case this does become an issue at some time, I know that then raising in other cases that $I$ haven't finished litigating it yet is the equal protection argument that -- it's because of the luxury of the financing that Clark County has that the death penaity is sought in Clark County, Nevada as opposed to many of the other counties within the state.

There, I believe there's been one death penalty in the last five years than any other county except for Clark County.

So there's a, there's almost a de facto aggravator by having the crime committed here
in Clark County, Nevada.
The supreme court has not ruled on it, and I don't expect you to create or generate this argument, but I think to preserve it .-

THE COURT: Let me point out two things: One is, I mean Clark County is the engine that drives the train. I mean, Clark County is 70 percent of the population in the state. You're gonna have more murders, you're gonna have more murders prosecuted, you're gonna have more death penalties sought. And whatever percentage of those actually come about, it's gonna be -- Clark County is gonna dominate just because of that number.

Number two, while it is the case that the Clark County District Attorney's Office is better funded and better capable of doing those things, at least $I$ can say from my experience during the eight years I was district attorney, I loaned deputies from our major violators unit to people in Ely, to people in Lovelock, to -- DiGiacomo is here, he went up someplace. Abby went someplace, Vicky Monroe and Theresa Lowry went someplace.

When they were incapable of doing that. I gave them our deputies for free to put them on an even scale.

And thirdly, the d ense in those counties isn't nearly as well funded and capable as the defense here. I mean, you have a terrific office. David does a great job. I was very impressed with the way you guys handled yourself. You obviously know the rule. You're very experienced and capable.

And so while the State may be a little bit more capable in Clark County, the defense is also equally more capable in Clark County.

And usually it's the case that people are sort of on equal footing that justice will out. So I'm not sure that's going too much of anywhere.

MR. PIKE: Thank you very much. And I appreciate you letting me make the record on that.

THE COURT: Listen. This is a death case. It may not come to that. If I had to bet my house, I don't expect it is, but it is potentially that.

You can make a record of anything you want, any time you want. And you know, if we're not inconvenienced and if you come and approach the bench as you then want to do, if we forget it, you $\frac{k n o w, ~ y o u ~ c a n ~ c o m e ~ i n ~ t w o ~ w e e k s ~ f r o m ~ n o w ~ a n d ~ s a y ~}{26}$
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judge, by the way I forgot to make a record on that, do you remember when we approached the bench, and as long as that's the case, we'll make a record because that's the only fair way to do it to protect everybody's rights.

MR. PIKE: And by way of appreciation, the State has been -- they fulfilled their responsibility in letting me make a record and approaching the bench.

THE COURT: Yeah.
MR. PIKE: And making sure -- and we've spent, we've spent an inordinate amount of time appropriately before and after the jury has come in making these records.

THE COURT: Well, not an inappropriate amount. I mean, you guys, I've commented before, all of you have done a nice job and you've all been professional. A lot of times you get these lawyers harping at one another instead of just doing their job and being pleasant. It makes things a lot better.

Obviously this is round one on this case with this guy. I mean, there's more, a lot more rounds to go. There's the appellate round, there's the other trial round. I mean, this is just
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COUNT 2 - MURDER
(please check the appropriate box, select only one)
X Guilty of First Degree Murder
SPECIAL VERDICT
(please check the appropriate box or boxes)
$\square$ The jury unanimously finds the murder willful, deliberate, and premeditated. © The jury unanimously finds the murder was committed during the perpetration of a burglary, sexual assault, or robbery.

The jury does not unanimously find the defendant guilty under a single theory of murder of the first degree.

Guilty of 2nd Degree MurderNot Guilty

COUNT 3 - SEXUAL ASSAULT
(please check the appropriate box, select only one)
$\boxtimes$ Guilty of Sexual Assault
$\square$ Not Guilty

COUNT 4 - ROBBERY
(please check the appropriate box, select only one)
Guilty of Robbery
区 Not Guilty

DATED this 22 day of October, 2008
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```
the court recorder.
THE WITNESS: Debra, D-e-b-r-a; last name Quartes,
Q-u-a-r-l-e-s.
THE COURT: All right. Miss Luzaich.
MS. LUZAICH: Thank you.
```


## DEBRA QUARLES

```
called as a witness on behalf of the State, having been first duly sworn,
was examined and testified as follows:
```


## DIRECT EXAMINATION

```
BY MS. LUZAICH:
Q Good afternoon, Debra. Are you okay?
A Yes.
Q Okay. We talked in the last hearing about how you are
Sheila's mom.
A Yes.
Q And you are the one who found her the day that she was
killed?
A Yes.
Q Did you bring some pictures with you that you would like to show the jury?
A Yes.
THE COURT: Miss Quarles, you can have that.
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THE WITNESS: Thanks.
MR. PIKE: For the record, Your Honor, we've had a chance
to review the photographs. They will not be admitted into
evidence because they're family keepsakes. We'll just describe
them for the record and they will be able to be released with this witness.
MS. LUZAICH: Okay. Thank you.
THE COURT: If you want, I would let the jury take them
and look at them, if they want, and release them back to you;
however you want to do it. But I will let them stay with her.
MR. PIKE: Either way is fine.
THE COURT: Okay.
BY MS. LUZAICH:
Q Debra, tell me what you brought for us.
A I brought my family pictures when she was really young.
This is her and this is my oldest son and my son next to
him and their younger brother. This is her picture when she was, I think, seventh grade. (Indicating)
And the other photo is she was the Easter star at the
Easter program in church.
Q Do you know what? I'm going to put the three smaller ones over here and let you talk about them. Is that okay?
Tell me about this picture.
A That's when she was the Easter star at our church and she had to go up and give a program.
```

Q And here?
A That's when me and her was practicing doing e: ch other's
hair one day.
Q Did you guys do that a lot?
A Yeah.
Q Did you do that for her hair?
A Yeah.
Q What did she do for your hair that day?
A Something like I got now.
Q And then here? (Indicating)
A We were at the park and she was tired -- and sl e didn't
Jike taking pictures. So when I called her name, she look sd and I
took her picture reatly quick so she wouldn't turn away.
Q Did she do that a lot, turn away?
A Uh-huh.
Q Tell me about Sheila.
A She was funny. She kept you laughing. If you isere around her and you was down, she would bring you up al d she would bring a smile to your face. She was reatly -- me and her ivere like best friends. I'm really close with all my kids like the $\mathbf{t}$.

My youngest baby Derrick, she named him DJ, and st e just wanted him to go to school and be good in school. For each $A$, the would say tell your momma to give you a hundred dollars. And she went and got all As, so she kept her word with him. She was really good.
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And then one time, I had got laid off from my job anc I
was just so depressed because the unemployment people say it wasn't in accord. I didn't have enough hours to get unemploym ent.

That day, when she came home, she knew somethinc was wrong, but I didn't want to tell her. After a while, I told her.

She told me: Don't worry about it. She said: I'm here. She
said: Whatever you need, I will be able to do it. Don't worry.
Q Sounds like your family is very close.
A Yes.
Q Can you tell us how Sheila's loss has impacted, our family?

A Due to the ill fate that was brought upon my far ily and myself, the murder of Pooka, my daughter and my best friend, my children's only sister, $\mathbf{I}$ have been hospitalized several tir res. I'm on various types of medicine. I have suicidal thought s. Each day, I think about my baby that was taken away from me forever.

Her life meant nothing to him, but she meant everything to me. It's hard for me to keep any type of employment liecause of my condition.

You came into our life as someone we put our tiust in and, with that trust, we were decelved, my family and $m$ self and my kids.

My kids find it hard now to trust my character 0 :
judgment because I trusted this man. For that, they are lind of distant from me, but not really, but we don't have the clo ieness
that wed once had. But I want Norman Flowers to know that he was not able to take the memories and the love we have in our hearts
for our Pooka.
MS. LUZAICH: Thank you, Debra.
THE COURT: Any questions, Mr. Pike?
MR. PIKE: No, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Thank you, Miss Quarles.
THE WITNESS: Okay.
(Witness excused.)

THE COURT: The State.
MS. WECKERLY: Your Honor, we would just move the
certified copies of the Judgments of Conviction, which are 156,
157 and 158 , into evidence.
THE COURT: Any objection?
MR. PIKE: Subject to the Court's review of the aggravators, no objection.

THE COURT: Well, I think they can come into evidence.
It's just in what way can they come into evidence?
MR. PIKE: Okay. So as long as the Court -- we'll
address that later.
THE COURT: I think they're all admissible; they will be
admitted. But, understand, they're probably going to argue on the issue and we'll take care of that.
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(State's Exhibits 156, 157, 158 admitted into evidence.)

MS. LUZAICH: Additionally, Judge, I have proposed
Exhibits 160 and 159, that I just did not -- I forgot to show
Detective Tremmel. I think they'll stipulate to their admission.
MR. PIKE: Yes.
THE COURT: That's great. Admitted.
(State's Exhibits 159, 160 admitted into evidence.)

THE COURT: The State.
MS. WECKERLY: With that, we'd rest, Your Honor.
THE COURT: The defense.
MR. PIKE: Thank you.
The defense would call Eleanor Flowers.
THE COURT: Eleanor Flowers.
(Witness sworn.)

THE CLERK: Thank you. You may be seated.
THE COURT: Ma'am, please state your name and spell your name for the record.

THE WITNESS: Eleanor Flowers; E-je-a-n-o-r,
F-l-o-w-e-r-s.
Page 10 of 125
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                                    Page 13 of 125
                                    (Witness excused.)
THE COURT: Next witness.
MR. PIKE: Court's indulgence so I can see if the
witnesses are here.
Tami Bass.
THE COURT: Come on up, Miss Bass.
MS. BASS: Good afternoon.
THE COURT: How are you?
MS. BASS: Good. Thank you, Judge.
THE COURT: Many years ago, Miss Bass used to work for
me, so we go way back.
MS. BASS: Many years ago.
(Witness sworn.)
THE CLERK: Thank you. You may be seated.
THE WITNESS: Thank you.
THE COURT: No opinions, but any facts.
MR. PIKE: Thanks, Judge.
THE COURT: We need to get the spelling of your name,
please.
MR. PIKE: Would you please state your name and spell your last name for the record.
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THE WITNESS: Tami Bass. The name is spelled T-a-m-i;
Bass, like a fish, B-a-s-s.
IAMI BASS
called as a witness on behalf of the defendant, having been first duly sworn,
was examined and testified as follows:
DIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MR. PIKE:
Q Miss Bass, you've been employed with the State of Nevada and the Department of Corrections?
A Actually, no.
Q Okay.
A I am employed by the governor and it's just with the State of Nevada Parole Board. That's what I did for eight years.
Q And that's an independent organization or division of the state government, instead of the prison system?
A Totaliy autonomous, yes.
Q And what are the duties of an individual that's employed in that position?
A There are seven of us across the state. We are charged with -- when someone would become eligible for parole, due to the statutory time frame of their various sentences, we were the ones who review their files and conducted the hearings and made the
```

decision and handed that decision down as to whether 0 not someone would be granted parole or not.

Q And can you describe what parole is and what it means.
A Parole is the earty release of someone who is in prison.
So if a sentence was, say, two to ten, we would not see 1 hem until they have done the minimum two years; but then after $\mathbf{t}$ rat two years, their parole dates would start being triggered automatically.

So we would see them to see if, after that two rear period, we thought the interest of public safety would be served by them going out.

We make that decision in the state of Nevada. It takes four of us to agree on that decision. So that's what we co. We did it close to $\mathbf{1 0 , 0 0 0}$ times every year. That's how man, hearings we conducted.

Q Okay. And what types of things would you con sider before you would recommend someone for parole?

A Well, the statute in Nevada is clear. Thank Goc our legislature has been quite insightfuf. But we must consi ler victim impact; we must consider the violence of the crime; we must consider write ups in prison; we must consider any prog amming the inmate had done; we have to look at the sentencing guic elines; we have to look at, of course, would public safety be served

So we have a whole list of things that we must consider when coming to our determination as to whether or not oo grant
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parole.
Q And if there is a component of that offense, the $t$
involves a sexual component, such as a sexual assaut, a re there
additional requirements that must be met before a persc $n$ could be considered eligible for parole?

A Well, there is a whote separate section for sext al
assault, because there is a certain type of program work that has to have been accomplished before we can even consider them.

And just because of, you know, budgets or whe tever, all sexual assautt inmates cannot necessarily get into the $p$ ogramming in a timely fashion when tt 's coming up for their parole.

So, you know, you simply have to deny them uitil they can get into that sexual training; and that's a whole separat! unit of the unit up at the prison. It's separate because, you knc w, all of the specialists say that there is a special kind of progy amming that needs to happen. And they have a great unit up the re, but everybody can't fit into it at onoe.

So to answer your question, yes, there is a whc le separate kind of process that we have to go through bec zuse of what's required for a sexual person -- a person who has been convicted of a sexual crime.

Q And part of that is an indication that the indivic ual who is before the pardions board at that time has completed isychiatric treatment and, based upon the expert testimony of the a eviewing psychologist or psychiatrist, that he would not present a danger

```
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to the dommunity?
A Absolutely. That's exactly what happens.
Q Okay. And that's something that you have to consider; and in this case, because there was a conviction of sexuai assault, that would be a component part if Mr. Flowers was ever to come before the board for consideration for parole?

A Absolutely.
Q Now, under a sentence of \(\mathbf{2 0}\) years to \(\mathbf{5 0}\) years or \(\mathbf{2 0}\) years to life, which are two of the potential sentences in this case, when is the first time that Mr. Fiowers would be even scheduled to come before the pardons board?

A It has to be that minimum -THE COURT: Parole board.
BY MR. PIKE:
Q I'm sorry. Parole board.
A Has to do that minlmum 20 before he's even elligible; and
so, probably, from the time he starts his sentence, none of those parole board commissioners would even be around.

But It won't be until that \(\mathbf{2 0}\) is served before he's even
first eligible.
Q And based upon your experience, if there is a \(\mathbf{5 0}\) year sentence or if there Is a life sentence, that may - and that doesn't mean that an indliddual would ever be paroled?

A Absolutely, I've seen that. Absolutely.
Q And so a sentence of \(\mathbf{2 0}\) years to life could mean that the
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inmate would serve the rest of his natural life in prison?
A Yes, sir.
Q There is another potential sentence, which is called life
without the possibility of parofe.

\section*{Could you tell me what that means?}

A Well, those are people that we never see because they
become never eligible for parole. Life without in Nevada means
Iffe without, so when the door closes, that means that he pretty much done.

Q That means they die in prison?
A Absolutely.
Q And 1 think we understand that a sentence of death by execution means that that Individual will be put - will be executed?

A That's my understanding, yes.
Q All right. There was some conversation about the parole
board releasing an Individual as he was approaching an expiration
time, and rather than allowing a prisoner to just explre his sentence, sometimes the parole board may place him on parole.

Can you describe that process and why that might happen.
A Well, I think what you have to understand is that we sit there with our first charge being public safety and we collectively bellieve that it's better for someone to be released under supervision than not.

And so we have released folk fust to give them time on
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\section*{BY MS. WECKERLY:}

Q You sald the parole board is made up of seven people?
A Yes, ma'am.
Q And are all seven appointed by the governor?
A Yes, ma'am.
Q Do you serve for a certain term?
supervision so that the Department of Parole and Probat on can
work with them, make sure that their reentry is successt al and
their transition is successful. And that was very rare, bu: when
you have a unique case, we have to conslder those kinds of things,
because public safety is our first charge and so It's almort
better to have them watched than to Just have them reie ised and we
call it with no tail.
We prefer to have them with a tail, because, at the very least, what it would do is if Parole and Probation determ nes that they're slipping, then they're going to bring them back \(b\) :fore us and then we have a whole slate of options to be abte to \(\varepsilon\) et them back on track or, in fact, put them back in and then let tt em expire.

But, sometimes, it's just best to let them come ret with that supervision to assist them in that transition, rather i han having them not being watched at all.

Q And as you sit at every hearing, you indicated t bat there was victim impact or that is part of what you would cons der?

A Absofutely.
Q So you would have a chance to listen to the lov: ad ones of the deceased, again and again, encouraging whatever th yy thought Is the appropriate action?

A There are only two people that must, by statute, by allowed to speak at our hearings and that's the inmate's and the victin's family, the med family.
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We take that very seriously. We understand th it there
has been some type of a loss. We provide them whth a \(n\) in-hostile, nor-adversartal environment. They can come to us befor e the hearing. They certalnly have an opportunity to speak du ing the hearing and they have an opportunity to speak to us after the hearing.

We are very conscious of the fact that there is: situation where victims need to be validated and need to understand that they are part of the process.

So that's considered tremendously and, in fact, that's one of the statutory requirements, that we do consider tire victim Impact and that's taken very serlously.

MR. PIKE: Thank you.
I have no further questions.
THE COURT: Miss Weckerly.
MS. WECKERLY: Good afternoon, ma'am.
THE WITNESS: Mi.

\section*{cross-EXAMINATION}
(20.
■



A ' Yes, ma'am. We serve staggered times of four years.
Q So your term ends and someone else's maybe ends two years
later?
A Yes. That changed about ten years ago because, before, all seven used to be up and so the legislature thought that that was too unstable. That's when they went to staggered times. So four years each time you get appointed.

Q The staggered is to give it a little bit more continuity?
A Right; absolutely.
Q And could the governor unilaterally remove someone?
A No, ma'am. Our statute is clear.
\(Q\) Okay.
A Not even the governor can remove us.
Q And how long have you been on the board?
A I actually stopped serving June of last year.
Q okay.
A I had served eight years. I was the longest sitting the youngest and the longest sitting commissioner on the board when I left.

Q Okay. And, obviously, then you will likely not be on the parole board 20 years from now?

A Gosh, that means I would be 66 . I would still be young and kicking. It's possible.

Q Sure.
A But probably not, absolutely.
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Q And \(\mathbf{2 0}\) years ago, you were not on the board?
A Absolutely.
Q I understand the staggered terms, but, obviously, the
composition of whoever is on the board changes with the governor over time?

A Absolutely.
Q Okay. I'd like to ask you just a couple questions about
the sexual assault offenders. Those people, \(I\) think you indicated to Mr. Pike, they're examined and get treatment up at the prisons?

A Yes.
Q And I assume if they've completed some sort of treatment, you are informed of that by a doctor or someone who has evaiuated them?

A We call them the psyche panel.
Q Okay.
A There is a whole hospital of doctors across the state
that are employed by the state and that's what they do; they do nothing but go to all of the facilities where there are sexual offenders. There is only a few in the state that have sexual offenders and that's what they do. They are responsible for the treatrment and the evaluation.

In fact, we can't even see them until we get that evaluation and it's always a report.

Q Okay. And the evaluation that they do, is it -- is the releesse premised on any sort of threshoid, like - tike the level
of risk to re-offend? Do you understand what I'm sayingi
A There is several - there is several things on the psyche panel's report that they have considered.

Q Uh-huh.
A One of them is the Inmate's thoughts about his I rime, the inmate's thoughts about his victim. There is all of these \(t\) ings that they consider and then they come collectively, as a \(g\) oup of doctors, together on all of the cases and then they make their determination or their recommendation to the parole boald as to whether or not we should release them or not.

Q Does the doctor inform the board or members of the board: In my opinion, this person is a high risk to re-offend, low isk, something like that?

A That's all on the reports.
Q And, obviously, you review the reports in that pa:riod?
A We get stacks of them each month because we lave so many
hundreds that we see a month. So we get those stacks ei ch month and they're disseminated to the various commissioners w rose case it is.

Q Okay.
A And then, when we sit in a hearing, \(I\) brief the 0 :her commissioners on my cases; tell them what the psyche pinel said and what their recommendation is and that kind of thing.

Q And there is so many that it sounds like you divi te the work amongst the board and you report on a certain num jer of
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people; someone else reports about others?
A Yes. On the 20th of every month, you can see a yy of our credenzas and they are stacked this high. We do almost 10,000
hearings a year. And there is only seven of us.
Q Right.
A One of us is our chair and she pretty much just , uns the
hearing, So there is really just six of us doing the hearing :.
So, each day, I would have a stack of files that I have to f repare myself. I prepared our risk assessment. I prepared any tools that we need and that we use for that particular file.

I was responsible for reading every piece of
correspondence, every document. We have the PSIs in there, the presentence investigation reports. Everything about that particular inmate, it was my responsibility to know. All tf e victim letters, everything, I knew. So when someone call id about that case, it was fittered to me so I could answer it. I wat. the one who did that?

Q So you know everything about this case; someore else may know everything about another case?

A Right yes.
Q And isn't the rule that a doctor has to certify thet the sex offender isn't a high risk to re-offend before the persc \(n\) could be granted parole?

A Before he could -- well, he just needs to have be en seen before we can even consider him.
\(Q^{\prime}\) Okay.
A Now, the recommendation from the doctor, it has some
weight, of course, but above that, our first charge is public
safety and the doctor's say he is high, medium or low risk to re-offend.

Q Okay.
A And so we were not above calling the doctors in to say:
You need to explain this even further because this doesn't make sense to me.

Q Okay.
A And so it would be high, medium or low risk.
Q Okay. I understand that your charge is public safety,
but it is possible that someone could be paroled if they were deemed a moderate risk to re-offend or a medium risk to re-offend?

A We can say that exclusively over here, but all of these other things would have to line up in order for that to happen.

Q Right.
A But if you are asking have we ever paroled someone who is
a medium risk, we absolutely have, but there were a whole lot of other things that have to have been in place for that to happen, because that's one of those types of crimes that the paroie board is quite conscious of. Society would probably never want them to be paroled. We're very conscious of that.

Q And I understand you are not looking at that one question and making a decision. You are looking at it in totatity.
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But it certalnly has occurred where a moderate risk has
been paroled?
A Yes, ma'am.
Q And have you encountered situations where someone is
paroied for a particular offense, they're vioiated, meaning
brought back to prison, and then they're reinstated again on parole?

A Well, that has happened.
But what I need to tell you is that it depends on the
violation.
Q Sure.
A It's different than you turning in a dirty UA versus you doing domestic violence.

Q Yes. And by UA, you mean?
A Urinalysis.
Q A drug test?
A Adrug test.
Q Okay.
A Then we use some of our options and put them in an
in-house facility or something like that, versus somebody coming back to us. And we consider a whole host of things as violent.

You know, if you are a parolee, we expect you to dot
every \(I\) and cross every \(\boldsymbol{T}\) every day; you don't have any lapses of judgment or anything.

So if you are caught in a vehicle that's not even your

> A Weil, the strange - well, you know, the pardons is made up of the governor and our Supreme Court.
> Q Uh-huh.
> A Now, we have a clerical position in our office who prepares alf of the pardons board agendas. That position receives all pardon applications and that position then reviews those pardon applications and sends out that initial correspondence as to whether or not we're going to entertain your application or not.

Then, you know, the Supreme Court and the governor, they have a whole staff, but, you know, the statute says that our person handles that part for the pardons board.

Q But the pardons board is another means or another vehicle for adjusting someone's sentence?

A Absolutely; totally separate from the parole board.
Q You are the parole board, which is a different body?
A Absolutely.
Q And then my last question is: You were speaking to Mr. Pike and you said that victims have a statutory entitiement to speak to the parole board?

A Yes, ma'am.
Q And I certainly don't doubt that you take what they -what they express to you into consideration, but is it possible for the board to release, even over a victim's objections?

A You know, in the grand scheme of things, that does
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happen.
Q Sure. Okay.
A But I thought it was important that everybody understands that it's not taken lightly and we encourage victim participation.

Q Right. And I have no doubt that the board wants to hear from the victims.

A Absoiutely, We consider it very highly.
Q But they obviously don't controi -
A No, ma'am.
MS. WECKERLY: Thank you.
THE COURT: Anything else?
MR. PIKE: Very briefly, Your Honor.

\section*{REDIRECT EXAMINATION}

BY MR. PIKE:
Q In distinguishing a possible sentence of \(\mathbf{2 0}\) to \(\mathbf{5 0}\) years and a life sentence with an eligibility of parole or an option that would be seen by the parole board after \(\mathbf{2 0}\) years, at some point in time, a \(\mathbf{5 0}\) year sentence may expire?

A Uh-hut.
Q Is that yes?
A Yeah. I'm sorry. Yeah. I thought you were going to keep continuing, but absolutely, a 50 year sentence does expire.

Q And then that individual no longer would be under supervision?

A Absolutely.
Q And opposed to that, a life sentence, life with the possibility of parole, that individual remains on and und ar supervision of the Department of Parole for the rest of \(t\) is life?

A Absolutely; provided that the judge says that at sentencing.

And we don't hardly have a judge in this state that doesn't say that when a sentence calls for a life sentenc \(e\).

Then what happens is if he ever gets out on parole, then
he's under supervision until the day he dies. So that me ans reporting, having to do all the things like that for foreve r .

Q And that means even if they're released at 60 'rears old --

A It doesn't matter.
Q - the rest of their life and they can go back to prison
for any of the violations you've talked about?
A Absolutely.
Q A dirty urine?
A Absolutely.
Q Being in a car that has a gun?
A Absolutely.
Q Anything like that?
A Absolutely.
Q And that individual can be put back to prison - put back
in prison and have a hold put on him immediately by an', officer?
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A Immediately.
Q For the rest of his life?
A Right.
MR. PIKE: Thank you. I have nothing further.
MS. WECKERLY: Thanks.
THE COURT: Thanks. Good to see you.
THE WITNESS: Good to see you.
(Witness excused.)

THE COURT: Next.
MR. PIKE: Thank you, Your Monor. Left me see wh ) is out
there.
Katrina McKenna, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay.
(Witness sworn.)

THE CLERK: Thank you. You may be seated.
THE COURT: Please state your name, ma'am, and spell your
name for the court reporter.
THE WITNESS: Katrina McKenna; K-a-t-r-i-n-a,
M-c-K-e-n-n-a.
THE COURT: Okay. Miss McKenna, you have a nice soft voice. They need to hear you, so speak up and speak in that
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(Video played.)

THE COURT: Mr. Patrick, if you would like to start over,
I'll let you.
MR. PATRICK: Yeah. I don't know if the jury can hear
that, Judge. If we could, that would be great.
THE COURT: See, what I will do, Mr. Patrick, If they've
seen Gabriel -- obviously, the audio is a problem. She was there.
I'll let you ask Miss McKenna generally what was discussed and generally what Gabrtel said.

MR. PATRICK: That's fine.
THE COURT: That's about as fair as we can be. It
doesn't look like we can get more audio.
BY MR. PATRICK:
Q Okay. Trina, you were present when Maribel took that
video?
A Yes.
Q And you've seen it and the pictures -- first of all, that
Is Gabe?
A Yes.
Q That's Norman and your son?
A Uh-huk.
Q And the pictures he was looking at were plctures of him and his father?
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A Yes.
Q And I don't know if the jury heard, but Maribel would ask who was In the pictures and he knew who his father was?

A Yes.
Q And he was able to point out this is my daddy and this is me?

A Uh-huh.
Q At one point during your relationship with Norman, you went down and got a temporary restraining order.

A Yes.
Q And that was the reason why Norman was revoked on his parole at one point?

A Yes.
Q Because he was caught with you?
A Yes.
Q Or the two of you were together?
A Yes.
Q Could you kind of explain that whole situation for us.
A What? The TPO or the -
Q Why you and Norman were together then that caused him to

\section*{get revoked?}

A I filed the TPO because of an argument that he and I was
having that seemed to escalate. We got in a verbal altercation at my home and what he had sald to me, I took as a threat at that time. And, essentially, I didn't feel as though -- you know, my
safety was negotiable. I filed the TPO and I filed the TPO with the understanding that, you know, I could modify, extend or resolve it after the \(\mathbf{3 0}\) days, but that I could have no conte ct with him.

I had to submit coples to Gabriel's day care, my ob; and he wasn't allowed, you know, at my home. But, during th, it time, \(I\) was also told that he would be served, you know, as well, and he never was.

One time, Gabriel was sick and had to be taken to the hospital. He took him to the hospital and I had to meet them there. We went in separate cars, but I had to meet him there and I knew, all the while, that I have the order, you know, on ilm, but I didn't want to tell thim, you know, I have this order tecause I'm sure he would have been upset and so I didn't.

We had had an argument and I reaily can't reme mber, maybe a few days later, where he told me he was going to come iny and pick up the baby. And I said: Well, no, because he's in sc rool; you know, I want to take him to school.

And we got In another argument then and he shawed up. And I was leaving early for work and I put the -- you knov, my things -- It was actually my father's car and I was bringina the baby outside. He had pulled up and the argument started from there. We were kind of arguing back and forth and I just 'vent Inside and I closed the door and locked it and he walted ir his car. And that's when I had called Metro and I notified the n that,
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you know, I have the TPO on him and he had not been ser red with It.

So they send a couple units, I think, out and tha: is
when -- he was still in his car when they came and, you kı ow, I guess told him that he had this order.

Q So, to your knowledge, until that point when Me ro came, he had no idea that there was a TPO between the two of \(y\) ru?

A I know he didn't know.
Q Okay. And when Gabriel was sick then, you neerled his beip to get him to the hospltal and take care of Gabriel?

A Yeah. Well, actually, the school called him to ple k him up because he had a fever, he needed to go to the hosplta. And I can't remember If he notified me or the school called me as well, to say that his father was picking him up. But I know thal I did talk to him upon leaving that he was bringing him to Suntise, to take him, but I had to meet him there.

Q Okay. Now, you sald that the TPO was for \(\mathbf{3 0} \mathrm{da} / \mathrm{s}\) and that that \(-\infty\) at the end of that \(\mathbf{3 0}\) days, you had your choic: of what to do with it?

A Yeah.
Q Had you given any thought about what you were golng to do at the end of that 30 days, In regards to the TPO?

A Yes. Well, I knew -- with he and I, I wanted to see -- I
felt, at that time, we needed a break from each other to, \(y\) ou
know, decide what we were going to do, that was going ts be
beneficial to Gabriel.
If it wasn't working with us as a couple, then we needed to find a better way to argue or talk or something because it wasn't good for him.

I knew, even when we had went to court - because I had to go to court on it. I can't remember how many days after it was filed, he was brought in as well - that I was going to resolve you know, or dissolve the TPO after the \(\mathbf{3 0}\) days.

Q So, basically, what are your feelings about Norman as a father to your son?

A I know he loves my son. I think he was a good father when he was with him. He was an excellent father. I knew he would let nothing happen to him.

I didn't worry about Gabriel at all when he was with him.
I didn't have to worry about him at all.
Q Would you like to see Gabriel and Norman continue to have a relationship?

A Yes, I would.
Q Even if it meant -- even if Norman was in jail the rest of his life?

A Yes, I would.
Q He would still have value to your life and to Gabriel's
Ife?
A To all of my children because it affected all of my chlidren.
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MR. PATRICK: Thank you. That's all I have.
THE COURT: Questions?
MS. LUZAICH: Briefly.

\section*{CROSS-EXAMINATION}

BY MS. LUZAICH:
Q Good afternoon, Miss McKenna.
A You've met me before. I've seen you.
Q But you've never met me?
A Right.
Q What is Gabrie's date of birth?
A August 9th, 2004.
Q When did you meet the defendant?
A November of '03.
Q Was he in - oh, he was just released from prison?
A I believe so.
Q Did you know that he had been in prison?
A Yes.
Q Are you and his sister frtendiy?
A I wouldn't say friendly. Well, I haven't talked to them in a very long time, but at the time of meeting him, I would say we were pretty friendly.

Q You were friendly with his sister and, therefore, you met him?

A Well, no. Where I worked at the time, she was a client
and he had come up there with her.
Q Okay. At the time that you met and were dating him, were you aware that he was dating somebody else?

A No.
Q When Gabriel was born, actually probably while i jabriel was being born, were you aware he was dating someone else?

A No.
Q When you said when things were good, they wer \(\geq\) good, when they were bad, they were bad, what did you mean by whe! they were bad, they were bad?

A When we argued and fought, we argued and fout iht. It was, you know, to the point where it's like get out of my house, you know. I don't want to see you over here, you know, it's over type of thing, you know, I don't want anything to do with you, iou know. It had got bad. It was never physical, but it was be d, I'm saying, as far as the arguing between he and \(\mathbf{I}\).

Q Did that happen often?
A Not often, but enough.
Q It happened enough so that you got a protective order, you said?

A I got the protective order, yes.
Q Because of something he said to you?
A Yeah.
Q That you took as a threat?
A During an argument, yes.

Q What did he say?
A Well, when we were arguing, I had told him why doesn't the
just leave Gabriel alone and let a real man raise him; and lie took offense to that and he had told me if I talk to him like that he would break my neck.

Q Okay. Cause for concern, right?
A Uh-huh. He never had ever said nothing like tha' .
Q Okay. So you got a TPO.
Do you remember when that was that you actual y got it?
A I don't remember when I got it.
Q If 1 told you that the day that he violated the TP(I was
November 22nd of 2004, does that help you any?
A Yeah. I know when it was violated, when he wa: back In custody. I believe it was the week of or the week before

Thanksgiving, so, yeah.
Q Was when he violated the TPO?
A Right.
Q But do you remember if that's when it was - do rou
remember when you got it?
A No. It hadn't been the \(\mathbf{3 0}\) days. I'm pretty sure in that.

Q Less than \(\mathbf{3 0}\) days. Okay.
Well, the police came out to you twice that day, eidn't
they, the day he violated it?
A Yes.

Q* And do you remember writing a voluntary statement for them?

A Yes.
Q Id like you to read it.
Does this look familiar? is that your handwriting?
A Yes.
Q Can you read what you wrote that day?
A I was leaving for work this morning and as I got to my
back door and went outside, I saw that Norman was there. I asked
him why he didn't call me first. He replies: I told you I was coming to pick the baby up yesterday. I then went inside and called 911.

When the officer got there, he gave Norman a copy that I provided - I gave him the copy of the TPO and he was asked to leave.

I brought my son Gabriel to day care, spent a few minutes there with him, gave them a copy and I left -- gave them a copy.

Q Gave them?
A And I left.
I pulled out of the parking lot and - I can't even read my own writing. And I don't know if this is I heard -- oh, I heard him blow his horn and he was flagging me down, telling me repeatedly to pulf over, he only wanted to talk to me for a few minutes.

I kept yelling no from my window and he kept getting in
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fromt of my car -
Q Wait. Yelling no from my window?
A I was yelling no from my window. He then cut me off so that I could not drive and appeared kept on getting in front of my car with his.

I was terrified and puiled into -- pulled into a nearby gas station and he pulled over as well. He was yelling at me and someone called 911.

Continue?
Q Keep going, please.
A I was unaware that the polioe had been called. Norman asked me to roll my window down and I repeatedly told him no.

He kept trying to reassure me that he wasn't going to do anything to me, but I was scared and began to cry, yelling no, no.

He kept asking me to open the car door and I again kept yelling no, please, no.

I'm not going to hurt you, he said.
He opened the car door and started yelling at me,
saying - why didn't I tell him he had a TPO on him? He said he would have not come to my house.

I knew he would - or something - I don't know. It's --
I knew - I'm very afraid at this point.
I just told him please let me go to work. I guess from the yelling and me crying, someone was concerned and called Metro.

When they arrived, they arrested Norman for violating the

тро.
MS. LUZAICH: Thank you. Nothing further.
THE COURT: Anything else?
MR. PATRICK: Briefly.

\section*{REDIRECT EXAMINATION}

BY MR. PATRICK:
Q So, Trina, that day, you are not the one who ac: ually called the police about Norman?

A From my home, I did. From the gas station, no.
Q Okay.
A I was told someone there notified the manager or

\section*{something.}

Q Okay. When you wrote that statement, were tiose all your own words or did you have help writing that?

A I wrote it, but I was told to write it over and over. I wrote it once and the officer saw it and he asked me to -- I guess elaborate more on what had happened. So I wrote it ag: in.

This is what I wrote, but I think this is the tast one that I wrote.

Q Okay. And you wrote one and then the police c ficer was telling you what more to write or to write more or how did that work?

A Well, in his words, he said that a judge would te pissed, upset, that we were in contact with one another and tha: our Page 48 of 125
stories had to match each other's were his words.
And I'm saying I'm telling you what happened.
And he was like, but I need you to tell me mork in detail
what went on, how you ended up here essentially at the gas station.

Q And did that police officer give you any idea wt at that detail should be?

A If so, I don't remember really; just that, you kr ow, what had happened more or less. I guess because it wa ; very short the first time and I don't remember what I wrote, but it Nas really short. So I had - I rewrote it.

MR. PATRICK: Court's indulgence.
THE COURT: Do you need a five minute break after this witness?

A JUROR: Yeah.
THE COURT: Are you all done?
MR. PIKE: We just need to have her identify the
photographs that were in the video so they can be admitted inio
evidence.
THE COURT: Okay. Do you have them?
MR. PATRICK: No, Judge.
MR. PIKE: Oh, I'll bring them in through another
witness.
THE COURT: Okay. Next.
MS. LUZAICH: I just have a question, one question.


A * was 18 , so about 22 years or 23 years.
Q Okay. On your screen, you can kind of come along with me, but this would be you here? (Indicating)

A No.
Q No?
A The bottom here.
Q Okay. Down here, that's you? (Indicating)
A Yes.
Q And then who is the next ofdest in the family?
A Flona. (Indicating)
Q This one?
A Yes, sir.
Q Okay. And then -
A Then Warren.
Q Warren.
A Then Norma and Norman, Charmaine, Dahlia and Colone.
Q Okay. Norma and Norman are twins.
A Yes.
Q I'm going to show you what's been marked as Defense M.
Do you recognize the people there?
A Yes. That's Norman. It looks like Charmaine and Norma. (Indicating)

Q Okay. And do you know who the minister is?
A I can't see her.
Q Yeah, it's kind of a bad picture, isn't it?
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And then Defense \(L\) do you recognize who they are?
A That's Norma; that's Norman; and that is Dahlia.
(Indicating)
Q Okay. Being the oldest, were you ever put in charge of watching all the rest of the kids?

A Yes.
Q How did that come about?
A My parents would leave and I would have to stay with all the kids and take care of them.

Q Can you speak up a little bit for us?
A When they would leave, I would have to stay at home and take care of the kids.

Q Okay. What was the relationship like between your mom and step dad?

A Volatile most of the time.
Q Could you explain that?
A They were always arguing. It's - it's different things.
He woukd -- my stepfather would make me lie to my mom about certain things, trying to find out where she's at. And she would make me to lie to him to find out where he's at. You know, they would play games with each other.

Q What kind of things would they make you lie about?
A Where she's at. If I knew, I wasn't supposed to tell
him. He would put me on the phone to talk to her and ask
questions to find out where she's at. Sometimes, she would make
me tell her that he's not at home or -- or if he was, he wisn't there.

Q And where would they be that they wouldn't \(w\) ant the other one to know? Why woutd they make you lie for them?

A I don't know.
Q Can you kind of describe your step dad as a fat rer.
A He paid the bills. He was never emotional tow rots the
kids, never a hug, a pat; very mean, very bad tempered, violent and very temperamental; anything could set him off.

Q Okay. Do you remember telling a story about r ot being able to play outside?

A Yes.
Q Could you tell the jury that story and what hap rened.
A Me and my sister Fiona just had gotten here frr m Belize. We didn't know anything about America. They left us in the house. We weren't allowed to go outside. I believe it was from morning until dusk. It was night. We were playing in the house. We had hit the balf. We knew we weren't allowed to play in the rouse. He walked in, went straight to his room, came back out i vith a big brown belt, leather beft, and proceeded to whip us. He l eat me until my back was swolten and blood was running down my back.

Q Now, is it just you and Fiona that he treated lika this or did the treat the rest of the kids like this also?

A He was very mean to the rest of the kids also, tiut not as intense.
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Q When you saw Norman, Senior and Norman, Junior's
interaction between each other, did you ever see your st ep dad give Norman any words of encouragement?

A Never.
Q Did he ever go to any of his football games?
A No, that I know of.
Q How did your stepfather treat Norman?
A Like the rest of us basicaliy, never hugged, nev ar took him anywhere, never did anything with him, embarrassed him in front of friends, girlfriends.

You know, he was always in trouble, so he alwirys was on punlshment or getting a whipping or being a punching \(\mathbf{b}\) ig.

Q Okay. Do you remember telling me a story abo ut your step dad and Norman involving a branch?

A I was toid by my other brothers and sisters that he strung him up in the garage, naked, and whipped him fo something he did.

Q You are stepfather did that to Norman?
A Yes.
Q Do you remember about how old Norman was imen that happened?

A No, I can't remember, but he was a young teen ager.
Q Okay. Do you remember telling me a story involving your stepfather and Norman and the stairs?

A Could you elaborate?

A No.
Q No. At some point, did you come to find out that, as a child, Norman had been molested?

A Yes.
Q Could yous tell us about that.
A After he was incarcerated for, \(\mathbf{I}\) guess, 12 years, on a visit, he told me that he was molested by a neighbor when he was five years old. He was missing for some hours and we were fooking for him and we were calling him and calling him. He toid me that our neighbor Terrence had him in the bedroom, in the back bedroom, and he could hear us, but Terrance was on top of him, had his hands around hils mouth so he couldn't scream or anything.

Q And you understood, from Norman's conversation, that Terrance had sexually molested him?

A Yes, several occasions.
Q That's what I was going to say. Was it just the once?
A No.
Q No.
Do you know if Norman ever toid your mom or dad?
A Yes, he did.
Q And what happened?
A I didn't find out until I was grown that they did go to the pollce station, found out that he had a rap sheet on
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molestation. I don't think he got therapy untll he was older. My father never acknowledged the fact that he was molested and reaily didn't want to have anything -- no personal contact or Intimacy with Norman.

Q So then, after your parents found out about thls sexual molestation, they stopped sending Norman over to Terrance's?

A Yes.
Q Did Norman ever tell you how that experlence made him feel?

A He sald that he felt like my mom and dad knew what was golng on and they allowed it to happen, because they kept sending him over there. And this was before, I guess, he told them that he thought that they knew already and they allowed him to do it.

Q And then you noticed, after that Incldent came to light, a difference in the way your stepfather would treat Nomman?

A Yes.
Q What was the difference?
A He never was close to him and he never hugged him, picked him up, took him anywhere with him; never did anything with him. He stayed at work to avoid being In the house with the family.

Q Now, at some polnt during your childhood, did your mom pack up some of the kids or all of the klds and move back to Belize?

A The five that belong to him and Norman -- her and Norman rather, yeah, they packed up. My mom was seelng someone at the
time; broke It off. That person was constantly coming ar sund. He threatened them, I was told. I never saw the guy and th sy packed up and went to Belize in the middle of the night. When I woke up, they were gone.

Q At some point, did your mother come back?
A Yes, she came back about a month fater.
Q Did she bilig all the kids back with her?
A Everyone except for Norman.
Q And what happened to Norman?
A They left him there because - I guess he was causing too much trouble for them, so they left him out there.

Q In Belize?
A In Belize, yes.
Q Now, you sald your mom was having problems ntth a man. Was she still married to your stepfather at the time?

A Yes.
Q Did Norman ever taik to you about how being H ft in Bellize, when all the rest of the family came home, how titat made him feel?

A He feit abandoned and they didn't want him.
Q If you could use one word to describe the chlldinood that you and Norman had as children, what would it be?

A Terrified.
Q Why is that?
A I was constantly afraid of my stepfather and th it, in
turn, made me afraid of everything around me because I was responsible for all of the chlidren, from the age of eight, for a
long period of time during the day, from morning until ni jht,
babies included. I had to change dlapers, cook, clean, mike bottles. I was responsible for their iffe, so I was terrifienl of everything, even as an adult.

Q Okay. As an adult, do you have problems becal se of your chlldhood?

A Yes, I do.
Q Do you mind explaining those for us.
A I was diagnosed with bipolar disorder. I take n nedication for It. It's hard for me to have a relationship with anyon : t , sometimes even my children. It's hard to get intimate with my children.

I know I love them, but it's hard to show It. It' ; hard for me to feel compassion sometimes. It's hard for me tu deal with other peopie on a personal level; never Intimate - I ardly any Intimacy.

Q Okay. And during your childhood, the punishm: \(n\), beatings that you would get, that was only for major thir gs or what kind of things would you and Norman and the rest of the kids be punished for?

A Any Iftle thing, him not having his shoes on on the cold floor, you know, he would get smacked for it. And then we would get cussed out for allowing him to do it.

```

Q "That photograph shows Norman interacting with his son?
A Yes, it looks like he's feeding him.
Q Okay. Another photograph?
A Yes.
Q And that is, again, Norman interacting with his son?
A Correct.
Q I'm taying these out this way because, in the
photograph -- or in the video tape that was shown, you were
interviewing his son.
A Correct.
Q And you were video taping him and you laid out these
pictures and these are the pictures that he was pointing at?
A Yes.
Q And he recognized his father?
A Yes. He calis him daddy.
Q Okay. And he recognized that photograph?
A Yes.
Q Dld he say amything in particular about that photograph?
A I asked him what they were doing and he said he was
sleeping.
Q Okay. And, again, they're playing there?
A Uh-huh.
Q That's a photograph of what?
A It appears to be Norman and his son when his son Gabriel
was born in the hospital.
Q That photograph shows Norman interacting with his son?
A Yes, it looks like he's feeding him.
Q Okay. Another photograph?
A Yes.
Q And that is, again, Norman interacting with his son?
A Correct.
Q I'm laying these out this way because, in the
photograph -- or in the video tape that was shown, you were interviewing his son.
A Correct.
Q And you were video taping him and you laid out these pictures and these are the pictures that he was pointing at?
A Yes.
Q And he recognized his father?
A Yes. He calls him daddy.
Q Okay. And he recognized that photograph?
A Yes.
Q Dld he say anything in particular about that photograph?
A I asked him what they were doing and he said he was
sleeping.
Q Okay. And, again, they're playing there?
A Uh-huh.
Q That's a photograph of what?
A It appears to be Norman and his son when his son Gabriel was born in the hospital.

```
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Q Okay. And approximately how old was Norman when that happened?

A I belleve he was eleven.
Q Oikay. During the course of your investigation, you
traveled to Compton, California; is that correct?
A Correct, yes.
Q Can you describe what Compton is like, as far as an area, and what you saw.

A Well, we travel during the day and it's not very well kept up. And according to what, you know, we know with the interviews that we've done with several of our witnesses, it's a very dangerous area.

Q And it's right next to an area called Watts also?
A Correct.
Q And does that look similar to Compton?
A Yes.
Q The dangerous place to be?
A Yes.
Q As part of your training, you've actually worked at prisons?

A Yes.
Q And Compton and Watts is not a place you travel in at
night?
A No.
Q In going through this, you were able to visit the
locations that have been provided to you by the family.
Were you able to find the home in which they ivere
residing at the time that Norman Flowers was sexually inolested as
a chifd?
A Yes.
Q And you were able to determine that in that ap artment or
the home that they were living, the perpetrator Ilved in that same building?

A Absolutely.
Q How close was the perpetrator's door to Norm in's door?
A I think if you open the doors outwards, they'd probably
touch. I'm talking probably within two, three feet of ea th other.
Q And the other family members recounted for \(y\). 4 their visited recollections of that individual?

A Yes.
Q And did that create a frightening condition for Norman

\section*{Flowers?}

A I would say so, yes.
Q The area, besides looking like a dangerous are i, you
actually have gone through and interviewed or attemptisd to
interview a number of family members that are related :o Norman?
A Yes.
Q Is that correct?
And could you kind of outline the dynamics of the family.
How many children are there; how many fathe \(s\) and their
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approximate age spread.
A Eleanor, before coming to the United States, hird
conceived two children, Cherret and Fiona, with a gentle man in
Belize. She came to Los Angeles with her two daughter: and she met another gentteman here. Together, they conceived Warren.

She then went back to Belize, left the two oider girts with grandparents, came back only with Warren.

Then she met Norman Flowers, Senior. They got married, brought the two girls from Belize, Cherret and Fiona, and then conceived - or had five other children with Norman, No man Flowers. So there was a total of eight siblings.

Q And Norman had a twin sister or has a twin sis ter, Norma?
A Yes; ub-huh.
Q The dynamics of the family, how would you de icribe them?
A I would say it's a dysfunctional family.
Q Would you say it was a violent family?
A There was violenca perpetrated on the childreu, yes.
Q And the recounts of the violence that you received from Cherret and others is consistent?

A Absolutely.
Q It's a consistent theme throughout this family:
A Yes; uh-huh.
Q Specifically, I'm going to ask you some questic ns about
Norman's step brother.

Q Did you go and meet with his step brother?
A Yes.
Q What is his name?
A Warren Rankin.
Q And can you identify Warren in this photograph?
A Yes. (Indicating)
Q Okay. Now, he's quite a bit older than Norman?
A Four years, yes.
Q And he felt that during the conversations Norman looked up to his older brother?

A Yes.
Q His older brother, however, chose a very different
iffestyife?
A correct.
Q He was Involved in gangs in compton; fsn't that correct?
A Yes.
Q In fact, he introduced gangs and violence into the home of Norman Flowers while he was growing up?

A Yes. That's what he told me, yes.
Q And he's unable to come in to court today and testify;
isn't that correct?
A Yes.
Q And why is he unable to come in?
A When Warren was 18 years old -- Norman would have been 14 years old -- Warren was involved in a gang related shoot out.
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Warren was shot and is a paraplegic and has been wheelchair bound ever since. His health is deteriorating and, as a result of that, it is a hardship for him to travel anywhere at this point.

Q In the course of the intervlew that you had with Warren, did he express to you what he felt bringing that violence Into his home did to Norman?

A Well, it had a very negative Impact on Norman as Norman looked up to his brother and instead of, you know, being a role modef for him, Warren was teaching him out to steal cars. So he feets that he had a negative Impact on his younger brother.

Q And did he express to you his remorse about what he had taught his brother?

A Yes.
Q Did he express to you that he felt that he was, in part, to blame as to the turns his younger brother's life had taken?

A Yes, he feels really bad for what is goling on; and he says he loves his brother and doesn't want to see him in this situation.

Q By the same token, Warren now has been in a wheelchalr most of his life?

A Correct.
Q And did he express to you the fact that he iearned from that?

A Yes. He says that he didn't have anybody to blame where he was at except himself.

Q And he understands he's going to spend every da for the rest of his life In that wheelchair?

A Yes.
Q And it took him time to accept what had happene 1 and to mature and to understand and belleve that those conseque rees were of his own actions?

A Yes. That's what he expressed to me.
Q Did he express to you that he did not want his brither to die?

A Yes. He said it very clearly: I don't want my brother to dle.

Q But he doesn't have any problem with Norman being punished every day for what he has been convicted of?

A According to what he told me, like he said that he would take -- says he has nobody to blame for him being in the wheeichair, he should take responslibility, and if that's the punishment that -- whatever is appropiate, then he should deal with that every day.

Q And did he tell you that he thought that he could relp his brother understand this?

A Yes. Ke still loves his brother very much.
Q And he felt that he, Warren, would have value to ils brother in prison?

A Yes, absolutely.
Q And his brother would have value to him?

A Yes. MR. PIKE: Court's indulgence.
Thank you very much. I don't have any further questic ns. THE COURT: The State.

CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MS. WECKERLY:
Q Good afternoon.
A Good afternoon.
Q You work exclusively for the Special Pubilc Defen Ier's Office?

A Yes.
Q How long have you worked as a mitigation specia list?
A Three and a half years.
Q And can you explain to the members of the Jury w hat a mitdgation specialist does?

A Sure. Basically, I will gather the social history of our dient, via interviews with our client, his family, teachers, neighbors, et cetera. I aiso gather records. I compile all \(\sigma^{\prime}\) this information, give it to the attorneys, and later thls Information is used primarily for the penalty phase of a capital murder case.

Q And I would assume you call each individual pers in vour client?

A Yes.
```

    Q*Okay. How many clients do you have?
    A Currently, probably }12
    Q Okay. And for each of them, you've done the same thing
    that you have spoken of this aftemoon?
A Yes.
Q You try to find out family history, school history, that
sort of thing?
A Absolutely; uh-huh.
Q Okay. In terms of thls particular case, were you able to get school records of Mr. Flowers?
A Yes.
Q And were you able to get IQ tests of Mr. Flowers?
A Yes.
Q And the school records that you got for him, did they indicate any kind of deficit in terms of intellectual ability?
A If I recall correctly, no.
Q Okay. And, certainly, Mr. Flowers doesn't have any kind of physlcal disability?
A No.
Q You visited Compton this year or -
A Juty of thls year.
Q July of thls year?
A Yes.
Q And when Mr. Flowers was Ifving there, what year was it?
A It would have been the early '90s, I belleve.

```
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Q Okay. Maybe a littie blt before that or --
A Okay. He was born in '74. It would be the '70s and '80s, yes.

Q So we're talking decades ago when he lived there, so conditions are probably not identical, 2008 versus then?

A True.
Q Maybe \(\mathbf{2 0}\) years ago or maybe a iltte less than that about 18 years ago?

A Sure; true.
Q When you said you Interviewed family members, I may have it wrong, bext my understanding is you interviewed the brother who still lives in LA?

A Uh-huh; yes.
Q Okay. And Cherret, the sister, the young lady that testified?

A Yes; uh-huh.
Q And his mother?
A Yes.
Q Any other famliy members?
A Father and -I made every attempt to interview the rest of the siblings and they dld not want to talk to us.

Q Okay. With regard to Miss Ramos --
A Yes.
Q - she's Ilves in Las Vegas?
A Correct.

25

Q And she has children?
A Yes.
Q And she raises her children bere?
A Yes; uh-huh.
Q And, I guess, besides the family members that rou Just listed for us, did you ever interview teachers or friends or other associates of Mr. Flowers?

A No. We get that information from Mr. Flowers and he did not give us the names of any of his friends.

Q Okay. The brother who you spoke of, who still ives in Los Angeles, the man who is disabled --

A Yes.
Q - I think you indicated, if I heard you correctly that
he started getting Into the gang iffestyle at a time when
Mr. Flowers was about 14 years old.
A At that age is when he got shot.
Q Okay.
A Yeah.
Q And that's about 20 years ago.
A Yes.
Q Okay. When Mr. Flowers was living here In 1993, his brother was still in LA?

A Correct, yes.
Q And so his brother was there when he dld the \(s\) aries of residential burglaries?
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A Correct.
Q His brother was in LA when he did the robbery and the attempt robbery?

A Yes; yes.
Q And his brother was certainly there when he co nmitted the crime that we're here for today?

A Yes.
MS. WECKERLY: Thank you.
THE COURT: Anything else, Mr. Pike?
MR. PIKE: Yes, Your Honor.

\section*{REDIRECT EXAMINATION}

BY MR. PIKE:
Q As part of your training, the question was askerl: Did
Norman have any physlcal disabilities?
A Correct.
Q He has emotlonal disabilities?
A I would gather, yes.
Q And that's what you are looking for. You are lo sking for the dynamics within the family. You are looking for the ivarts in the family?

A Right.
Q You are looking for the things that people want to keep hidden?

A Yes.
```

    Q *Because those are the things that would explain, not --
    not forgive, but --
THE COURT: Ask a question.
MR. PIKE: Okay. Thank you.
BY MR. PIKE:
Q Just fike you weren't asked about any physical scars, are
you looking for emotional scars?
A Yes.
Q When the State asked you about looking for his friends,
In going through this case, in preparing for it, you became aware
that Norman went to prison when he was 18?
A Correct.
Q And up until today, a short period of time, the only
acquaintances he would have would be in prison?
A Yes.
Q Except for Katrina?
A That's his wife, yes.
Q And you met with Katrina?
A Yes.
Q And you've tried to meet with everybody that would have
been important to him --
A Absolutely.
Q -- within the last 20 years that he's been in prison?
A Yes.
Q Would that be a fair assessment?

```
        A Yes.
        MR. PIKE: No further questions.
        THE COURT: Anything else, Miss Weckerly?
        MS. WECKERLY: Just one question.
            RECROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MS. WECKERLY:
    Q You haven't made a medical diagnosis of him, have you?
    A No.
    MS. WECKERLY: Thank you.
    THE COURT: Thank you, Miss Rosales. Appreciate it.
    (WItness excused.)

THE COURT: Now, are we still -MR. PIKE: Let me see if the one last witness is here.
May we approach, Your Honor?
THE COURT: Yes.
(Sidebar conference at bench, not reported.)

THE COURT: Okay. Here's what we got: We have got one witness left for the defense this
afternoon, who will be here at three o'clock. It's a local
psychologist, who is in a deposition. He has called and he's been
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called as a witness on behalf of the State,
having been first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION
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BY MR. PATRICK:
Q Good afternoon, Doctor.
A Good afternoon.
Q What do you do for a living, sir?
A I'm a licensed psychologist.
Q And being a psychologist, was there any education and
training required to be able to do that?
A Yes, I had to get a Ph.D., pass a licensure exam and an oral exam.
Q Okay. And do you have any specialized training in your area?
A Yes. Clinical counseling, psychoiogy, neuropsychoiogy, family psychology, forensic psychology.
Q Okay. And you are licensed to practice in Nevada?
A Yes, I am.
Q You've practiced for how long?
A I've been in Nevada since 1971. When I came, there was two psychologists at the juvenile court; been here a long time.
Q And have you published any articles?
A Yes.
Q And what jourmals have you published in?
A Different peer fournals.
Q Do you belong to any professional organizations?
A Yes, all the typical ones, American Psychological

``` Association, Nevada State Psychological Association;
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Neuropsychological Association.
Q Have you previously testified as an expert in
Clark County?
A Yes.
Q Can you give us an idea of approximately how many times?
A Oh, geez, numerous times. When I was chief psychoiogist
at juvenile court, we had a judge named Judge John Mendoza and I
testified about every week in his court.
Probably well over three, 400 times, I would Imagine, over the course of my career.

Q Okay. And you were hired by our office to evaluate Norman flowers?

A Yes.
Q And you performed a neuropsychological exam on him?
A Yes.
Q And coutd you kind of explain to the jury what that is.
A A neuropsychological evaluation measures what we call functional ability in areas such as attention, concentration, memory, eye/hand coordination, motor skilis, sensory perception, executive functioning of decision making, problem solving and also emotional functioning.

Q And as part of this, Norman was administered some tests?
A Yes, a number of tests, yes.
Q Okay. And you interviewed Norm?
A Yes.

Q And compiled some raw data?
A Yes.
Q But you did not do an actual report on this?
A No. I have work product, but not an actual rep ort.
Q Okay. Now, one of the tests that you administa red to Norman is an MMPI-II?

A Yes.
Q Could you explain to the Jury what that is.
A Yes. The Minnesota Multiphasic Personality In'entory II is probably the most widely used personality test in the world. It's been normed on thousands of people and it's used fir child custody evaluations, for criminal evaluations, for workeis comp evaluations, personal injury, just general psychological
functions. It measures levels of anxiety, depression, ami-social personality disorders, paranoia, schizophrenia, a person s response to pain, alcohal, drug, substance abuse. It me isures a number of different variables.

Q And from giving this test to Norman, what did ou find out about Norman? What was your diagnosis of Normar from that test?

A Well, there were a number of aspects to this pe rticular test. He had some puzzling patterns of physical symptoins, a number of physical complaints, but what came through ivere a large number of anti-social personality factors. It looks like a so there was suicidal thoughts, a vague - well, he thought that life
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was unrewarding, hard to settie down. He viewed the world as a threatening place.

Q Kind of fow moral type things?
A Yeah, low morale; some addiction proneness, although he didn't acknowledge the problem with addictive substanc \(3 s\); tendency to engage in irresponsible, immature, anti-social type of behavior; rebellious attitude toward adult authority figu es; stormy family relationships; turbulent relationships; imp uisivity; low frustration tolerance; just a number of issues that k!!pt coming up.

Q Okay. And then you also administered a Beck / nxiety Inventory?

A Yes. That's a 21 question measure of anxiety, . Ind he has a raw score of 41 which placed him in the severe range of anxiety.

Q Okay. And then there was also a Beck Depress on Inventory?

A Yes. His raw score of 36 placed him in the severe range of depression.

Q When you interviewed Norman, did he report ti, you any sexual molestation as a child?

A Yes. He did indicate that when he was younger, between the ages of five and eight, he said his mother took him a rd his sister to a lady next door, who was his babysitter, and thie lady's son, who was in his mid 20s, groped him when he was n iked and rubbed his penis on Mr. Flowers' penis.


He can't remember if there was anal sex. He says the doesn't recall engaging in oral sex or having oral sex performed on him.

He said he thought his mother knew what was goling on and this was his punishment for his acting out behavior in the home.

Finally, at age 12, he said he told his mother, a police report was filed. And he sald the man had been previously arrested because of complalnts for the same behavior. He said the man did not \(\mathbf{g o}\) to court over It and Noman did recelve some brief counseling for this abuse.

Q Okay. Dld you talk to Norman about the relationship he had with hls father?

A Yes. It was very problematic. He did not have a good relationship with his dad.

Q Did he report any abuse, verbally or physical?
A Yes. His dad was both physically and verbally abusive to him. He sald his dad would constantly call him incompetent and so he didn't have a very good -- It was not very good bonding, emotional bonding, with Norman and his father.

Q Okay. Now, with that, the history of physical viotence and verbal abuse and molestation, would that cause somebody to have low self esteem?

A Yes.
Q Would that possibly cause a feeling of worthlessness on a person?
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A Yes.
Q Now, looking over all the tests that were given Norman and your Interview, did you come to a diagnosis on what Norman's neuropsychological issues were?

A Yes. I dlagnosed him with what I call a major depressive dlsorder. He had a lot of depression and a generalized anxiety
disorder, a lot of anxiety; and also he has an antl-social personality disorder.

Q Now, would these be consistent with the abuse he faced as a child?

A Yes.
Q It's something you would expect from somebody who grows up like that?

A Yes, especially with the lack of bonding and attachment to his father and those kinds of things, yes.

Q Okay. Would this be consistent with somebody who has been depressed for a very long time?

A Yes.
Q In your professional opinion, do you think Norman has had those feelings since he was a child?

A Ves.
Q Can you kind of explain that to us a inttle bit.
A Well, what happens when a child is treated like Norman
was, from a young man on, with the molestation and the lack of
good positive role models and male attachments, there would be a
tendency for him to have an emotional disconnect; and \(\mathbf{s}\) nce he's not connected emotionally to anybody, he would have a iendency to, you know, be more focused on himself and the meeting if his meeds rather than meeting the needs of others. So over time, te has had some problems as a juvenile and has also had, you know some problems as an adutt.

So his anti-social personality disorder is sometiting that's probably a long term difficuity arising out of early childhood, early adolescence and continuing on as an adift.

Q The disorders you were talking about you diagr osed him with, would those be disorders that would be treatable by medications?

A Anxiety and depression, yes; the anti-social peisonality disorder, no. The anti-social personality disorder is best treated by a lot of structure.

And, in fact, in the criminal justice field, the researct
says that most of your inmates in prisons have an anti-social
personality disorder. So they need to be highly structured, you know, in an environment where they can't harm themselves or really harm others.

A little structure, a lot of discipline works for people with that kind of personality disorder.

Q And so the medications for the major depression, are
those readily available by doctors in the prison system?
A Oh, yes. In fact, the doctors, in my evaluating 1 hem in
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major prisons, yes, there are anti-anxiety and anti-depressive medications are available and used.

Q Okay. And so after all you know about Norman and the testing, in your professional opinion, is he someone that can be safely housed in prison for a long period of time?

A Yes.
Q And, in fact, I think you just testified that most of the people In prison kind of fit the pattern of most of the pecple that are in prison for long periods of time?

A Yes.
Q And he could be housed safely without creating a danger to others?

A I would think so, yes.
MR. PATRICK: Thank you. That's all I have.
THE COURT: Cross?
MS. LUZAICH: Thank you.

\section*{CROSS-EXAMINATION}

BY MS. LUZAICH:
Q When you say safely housed in prison, what do you mean by that?

A Safely housed means being part of the structur: of a
prison setting. I think that the chances for him to act ou: are a
lot less in a prison setting like that than they would be in a
community.

Q 'Well, why is that? If he's in prison, he's with other dangerous peopie. Isn't ft more of a chance that he wouid act out?

A No, because in prison there is a hierarchy of individuais in terms of how they interact with one another and they all -- the guards are very careful and very solicitous about these kinds of people. And so you don't see, especially in Nevada prisons, a lot of, you know, riots or bad things happening there.

There is a structure there that the inmates, you know, reasonably follow; otherwise, you would have chaos.

Q So people never get hurt in prison?
A No, I didn't say that.
Q People never get killed in prison?
A No.
Q Shanked?
A I'm not saying that.
Q Happens often, doesn't it?
A I don't think it's happened often. I mean, it does happen, but I don't think it happens often.

Q Anyway, you talked about no chaos, no riots. Obviously, that would be all over the news.

A Right.
Q But when somebody gets shanked in prison, that doesn't necessarily make the news, does it?

A No. But from statistics that I have read at the Nevada

State Prison, whenever you can get the statistics, I think they have a pretty good record of supervision. They're careful and they have a classification system for their inmates. He would be Initlaily evaluated and then classified and placed in the appropriate institution with the appropriate safeguards.

Q Okay. Are you an expert on the Nevada prison system?
A No, but I've been up there enough doing evaluations that I have had a chance to be actually physically in a number of these prisons doing examinations to have a certain sense of the security that they do offer.

Q But people still do slip through the cracks as it seems to be?

A Yes.
Q Now, how much time did you actually spend with the defendant?

A Let's see, we did testing with him three days -actually, five days. Then I did an extensive interview. So I probably spent a couple hours with him and then we had other people in my office do the testing with him. So I spent a couple hours with him.

Q So when you say we did the testing, you don't personally do that; somebody else sits with him in a room, gives him a pencil and he fills stuff out?

A That was part of the psychological testing; that's one-on-one with the test examiner. So we spent quite a bit of
time with her on those.
Q Right, her, but not you?
A Her, but not me.
Q How much time did you personally spend?
A A couple hours.
Q And you did not prepare a report in this case, you said,
correct?
A That's correct. I just had work product. I we sn't asked
to prepare a report.
Q Were you asked not to prepare a report?
A Yes.
Q You talked about him being depressed.
A Yes.
Q Is he the only person that you treat that's dejressed?
A No.
Q Of the other people that you treat that are de pressed, do
they all kill peopie?
A No.
Q Do they all rape peopie?
A No.
Q You talked about him, I guess, feeling -- wort hiess, \(\mathbf{I}\)
guess you said. Do you treat other people that feel wr rthless?
A Yes.
Q Do they all kill people?
A No.
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Q Do they all rape people?
A No.
Q Do you treat other people that have not bond sd or been
attached to their father?
A Yes.
Q Do they all kill people?
A No.
MR. PIKE: Objection, Your Honor; argumentative.
THE COURT: Overruled. She can ask that.
Go ahead.
BY MS. LUZAICH:
Q Do they all kill people?
A No.
Q Do they all the rape people?
A No.
Q You talked about him being verbally and phys ically
abused.
Do you treat other people that have been verbally and
physically abused?
A Yes.
Q And do they all kill people?
A No.
Q Do they all rape people?
A No.
Q There are a lot of people out there that have !reen abused
\[
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or don't bond with their parents. They can lead productive,
normail Jives, can they not?
A Yes.
\(\mathbf{Q}\) When you do these tests, are there people that fake the
tests or don't answer truthfully?
A Yes.
\(\mathbf{Q}\) Can you always tell?
A Not always, no.
\(\mathbf{Q}\) So it's possible that somebody can flub the test or give the answers that they want you to have as opposed to the true answers?

A Possible, yes.
Q Do people malinger?
A Yes.
Q In your opinion?
A Yes, they do.
Q Often?
A I'm sorry?
Q Often?
A The base rates for malingering aren't high in the criminal population; they're higher than they would be in the, you know, regular population; no doubt about that.

Q So when it benefits them, often, they will malinger?
A Yes.
Q People in general, I should say?
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A Yes.
Q One of the things you said that was interesting, that he
is more focused on himself and the meeting of his needs.
Did I get this right?
A Yes.
Q So if he wants sex, he's going to take it whether the person wants to give it to him or not.

That's consistent, correct?
A Welk, \(I\) really didn't talk to him about any of those
kinds of issues. So I can only answer that hypothetically, I would not know that realistically.

Q But that's consistent with that diagnosis?
A It could be, yes, uh-huh.
Q Did you ever interview any of the people he discussed,
his father or family members?
A No.
Q Just him?
A Yes.
Q Did you ever make any effort to confirm the victimization
that he described for you?
A No.
Q So you just take his word?
A At this point, yes.
Q For everything?
A But I also had objective data for other aspects that I
was measuring, yes.
Q Other aspects?
A Yes.
Q When did you perform your evaluation of the defendant?
A It was in April, May and August of 2006. So it's been a
couple years.
Q Okay. So it was after he had been arrested; is that correct?

A I don't remember when he was arrested.
Q Was he in custody?
A Yes, he was in custody.
Q So he was in custody when you performed yc ur evaluation --

A Yes.
Q -- your personal interviews.
All the tests that were conducted, were they aiso
conducted when he was in custody?
A Yes, at the detention center.
Q So your diagnosis of depression and things 0 : that nature were while he was in custody?

A I mean, there was a lot of variables, yes, but I believe he's had long term of feelings of depression and anxif ty, not only situational but long-term anxiety.

Q You mentioned that you dealt with a lot of people in the system.
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The people that you interview in the system, are r lost of
them depressed?
A Yes.
Q Being in custody?
A Yes.
MS. LUZAICH: Thank you. I have nothing furthel. THE COURT: Anything else. MR. PATRICK: Just briefly.

\section*{REDIRECT EXAMINATION}

BY MR. PATRICK:
Q Dr. Mortillaro, the tests that you administere i to
Norman, they all have bullt in safeguards to detect mi lingering or faking?

A Yes.
Q Could you kind of explain how that works?
A Yes. A lot of these tests have validity indicat ors, especialify the MMPI-2; and the MMPI-2 is valid, in that there is a lot of, as I said, indicators that would indicate If some one is faking it, trying to make themselves look bad or make themselves look better and he didn't.

So at least he gave good responses on that \(p\) articular
test; and some of these other tests, like the neuropsyi:hological test, there was no indication that he attempted to malse himself look worse, because, oftentimes, what they will do is :ry to make
themselves look like they have brain damage. He didn't make that
attempt.
We have, on my test, different batteries that are
sensitive to organic impairment of brain functioning and different
scales and so these scales indicated that he cooperated and he
gave a good effort.
So I'm reasonably confident that on the personality test
and the other tests that he took, he's giving us his best effort
and wasn't making an attempt to look worse or look better.
\(\mathbf{Q}\) So in your professional opinion, he was not malingering?
A Not when he was doing our test, no.
\(\mathbf{Q}\) Now, my office hired you to evaluate Norman, not to give
him therapy?
A Yes, that's correct.
\(\boldsymbol{Q}\) So do you feel that the time you spent on the test and
the interviews that you did were enough to properly evaluate
Norman?
A Yes, I think they were sufficient.
\(\mathbf{Q}\) You were not retained by my office or paid to evaluate
any of his family members?
A That's correct.
in and testified to pretty much everything that Norman had told
you about his childhood?
A No, it wouldn't.
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MR. PATRICK: Thank you. That's all I have.
THE COURT: Anything else?
MS. LUZAICH: No.
THE COURT: Thanks, Doc.
THE WITNESS: Thank you.
(Witness excused.)

THE COURT: Anything else.
MR. PIKE: If we've got time, I think we have the video
set up. We can play it and we can close for today.
THE COURT: Two minutes?
MR. PIKE: Yeah.
THE COURT: Go ahead.
MR. PIKE: Thank you.
THE COURT: Are you just kidding about having it set up?
MR. PIKE: No. Apparently, I had it going here.
Judge, while we're waiting for that --
THE COURT: They have seen it, and although they didn't
hear word-for-word, you had both Miss Rosales and MIss Ramos explain what was on there. I think they've got it.

You put in the pictures they looked at.
MR. PIKE: We put in the pictures, Judge. I also marked a copy of the video and I would move to admit that.

THE COURT: All right. Fine. It will be admitted.
(Defense Exhibit GG admitted into evidence.)

MR. PIKE: That's it, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay. Are you done?
MR. PIKE: Yes.
THE COURT: 9:10 work for everybody?
(Affirmative response.)

THE COURT: Okay. Come at nine o'clock. They'l take a lunch order because we're going to have funch in again tomurrow.

We'll start at 9:10. I'm guessing we will have you the case with the argument and everything around 11:30. You zan eat lunch.

I will go over the process in some detail with you about how this works tomorrow and, you know, all substantial dec sions. I think you will find the process quite a by bit easier than th: first process. I don't expect it will take the same kind of tir e and we'll be done sometime tomorrow aftemoon.

Okay. Have a good evening.
(Jury admonished by the Court.)

THE COURT: We got the Journal here, so very likely, there is going to be an article tomorrow.
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We also had one of the TV media; and the way thi:y work is
If one TV channel comes in and televises anything, they will have to share it with all of them. So I'm guessing this will be on the
five or six or maybe eleven o'clock news, so you may want to take a pass on it until tomorrow or Tivo it, but don't watch it.

Okay. Have a nice night. We'll see you tomorrow.
(The following proceedings were had in open court outside the presence of the jury panel:)

THE COURT: Okay. Let the record reflect the jun has exited. Let's do a little bit of work here.

Have a seat, Mr. Flowers.
I've read the Reveker case. It reads just the way my common sense would guess; and that is, to me, the arson is situational, whether it's a dangerous felony, and sometimes you can have an arson In any degree and it isn't and sometimes it is.

I mean, it seems like the language is Involving the use of threat or violence to the person of another.

And so it seems to me if you set a fire with people in a house and you know they're in there, whether you intend to hurt them or not, you have sort of created a potential second de!ree murder; and even if you set an apartment on fire and there is other apartments in the bullding, that's the case.

In this particular case, it seems to me the facts ar: he
went in, did a burglary; he was all over the house; he was
perfectly aware that there were no people in the house. He
intended to kill the dog. But it says violence to the person of
another. It doesn't say living creature.
So it seems to me that when he set fire, he didn't --
now, i know fires can spread and he could be -- it could be
O'Leary's cow, but it seems to me if there is not persons in the
structure or a structure that is annexed by a common law, I find
it to meet that situatton.
Miss Weckerly.
MS. WECKERLY: That's fine.
THE COURT: Well, with that in mind --
MS. WECKERLY: Well, I mean, for this case, I'm not
conceding that.
THE COURT: You are not conceding that's necessarily the
case.
MS. WECKERLY: I understend the ruling.
strike the first degree arson as an aggravator.
And so the only ones are under sentence of imprisonment
Well, then, Mr. Pike, I'm going to grant your motion to
Do you want that to read robbery with use of a weapon?
MS. WECKERLY: Yes, please.
THE COURT: Okay. All right. Well, I will change the
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special verdict form accordingly.
Now, let's look at the verdicts. The special verdict form on the aggravator has changed.

Does either side have any objection to either the special verdict forms or the general verdict forms?

I'm taking out number two; and the other will read: A person has been convicted of a murder of a victim, to-wit, robbery with use of a deadly weapon --

MR. PIKE: No, we have no objection to that.
THE COURT: And the other one you put in, so I'm sure you don't have any objection.

MR. PIKE: No, I don't have any objection.
THE COURT: All right. Now, then let's move on to the instructions themselves.

I got a lot from the defense. I got a lot from the
State. Many of them were the same; some of them were different.
I used the number from each and I think I wrote one or two myself. But I provided you with a packet, so fet's start with that as a starting point.

Miss Weckeny, have you had a chance to read them all?
MS. WECKERLY: No, but I'm pretty familiar with them.
THE COURT: Well, I know some of them came from the
defense; some of them I wrote.
Do you want ten minutes to look at them?
MS. WECKERLY: Yes, that would be great.
the defense ones. We'll have that done.

THE COURT: Why don't we just -- you guys sta / here and look at them, because I want to get this right, and we wil pick up in about ten minutes. And we'll be done settling instr ctions by \(4: 15\) and \(I^{\prime} \| l\) go home and watch the ball game.

\section*{(Recess in proceedings.)}

THE COURT: Back on the record in Case Number C228755, State of Nevada versus Norman Kelth Flowers.

Flowers, present with his counsel, counsel for tha State, absence of the jury.

Mr. Pike, have you now had a chance to review he packet of instructions proposed by the Court?

MR. PIKE: Yes, I have, Your Honor.
THE COURT: I've indicated that we're going to llelete the line items involving disciplinary issues or misdemeanor ar ests because there has been no evidence of those.

But other that deletion and that one instruction, do you have any objection to the packet?

MR. PIKE: No, I do not, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Any additional Instructions you wa nt to propose?
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MR. PIKE: No.
THE COURT: Miss Weckerly, any objections you have to any of the items in the packet?

MS. WECKERLY: Well, there is two -- three that I think are repetitive.

THE COURT: Go ahead.
MS. WECKERLY: It looks like you have the in de termining whether mitigating circumstances exist, jurors have an of ligation to find their own mitigating clrcumstances.

THE COURT: Let me find it.
Yes.
MR. PIKE: What's the first line on It?
MS. WECKERLY: It's in determining whether.
THE COURT: And what is the --
MS. WECKERLY: I think that is -- I just want to make
sure. I think it is in there twice. It just is literally in
there twice.
THE COURT: Okay. Where is it also?
MR. PIKE: It is.
THE COURT: The same instruction is in there tv ice?
MS. WECKERLY: Yes.
THE COURT: Okay.
MS. WECKERLY: Okay. So that's my one.
THE COURT: We'll take the second one out.
MS. WECKERLY: Okay. The one right directly behind the
second time that instruction appears.
THE COURT: Yes, uh-huh, in balancing the aggravating circumstances?

MS. WECKERLY: Yeah. That is covered in a prior
instruction, I think.
THE COURT: Okay. Which one?
Okay. It is.
MS. WECKERLY: Yes.
THE COURT: It's the third paragraph in the one that begins mitigating circumstances.

MS. WECKERLY: Rtght.
THE COURT: Okay. I'll take that one out and leave the other one in.

MS. WECKERLY: Okay.
THE COURT: That is already there.
MS. WECKERLY: And then the one that begins you have evidence about the impact of this homicide on the family of the decedent.

I think that instruction -- there is one that's very long where it talks about what they can consider before he becomes death eligible.

THE COURT: Uh-huh.
MS. WECKERLY: And that they're not to consider any other evidence against the defendant besides, you know, the existence of the aggravating circumstance.
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THE COURT: Uh-huh.
MS. WECKERLY: So I thinik that concept is actually
covered at least in the long instruction and then certalnly in
other instructions that explain the aggravating and mitigating concept.

THE COURT: Okay. I don't think it hurts and I'm going to -- I'm going to explain it to them. I mean, besides reading the instruction when I give them the verdict, I'm going to explain it to them exactiy how to do it.

And what I'm going to tell them, unless there is a serious objection, is you've got four pleces of paper there; you've got two special verdicts and you've got two verdict forms.

And you start by taking the special verdict that's on top as aggravating circumstances. You have to decide whether these have been proved; they have to be decided unanimously beyond a reasonable doubt.

If you decide beyond a reasonable doubt unanimously, put a check in the box. Don't leave it blank.

If there are no -- neither of these boxes are checked, go to a piece of paper, number four, and we're right there.

If elther one of these boxes or both of them are checked, set it aside and go to the mitigating circumstances.

Mitigating circumstances are: One, you believe it is proved; and, number two, you believe it is mitigation.

I mean, the defense might assert that being red headed is
a mitigating circumstance and you might feel that's pro'ed, but you don't feel it's mitigating. If one person at least thinks that any of these or any others that you can list were proved and are mitigating, then you check that.

Once that's done, you set that aside.
Now without anything else, you put these two on the scale of justice. If the aggravators outweigh the mitigators, ; ou go to form three, which has four alternatives.

If the mitigators outweigh the aggravators, yo 190 to form four, which has three. And at that point, and at tt at point only, you consider everything and you decide which am ong the eligible on your paper Is the appropriate verdict for this case, all things considered. That's what I tell them.

Any problem with that, Mr. Pike?
MR. PIKE: No, Your Honor.
MS. WECKERLY: Could I just put on one more objection? THE COURT: Sure. That's fine.
MS. WECKERLY: There is an instruction that begins the jury must find the existence of the aggravating clrcurns ances, if any, unanimously, and must find the State of Nevada e: tablished the existence of the aggravating circumstances beyond 9 reasonable doubt.

It's probably like the fifth or sixth -- it's the se renth instruction.

THE COURT: Okay.
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MS. WECKERLY: At the bottom of that instruc ion, it says they're never required to impose death.

THE COURT: Uh-huh.
MS. WECKERLY: In the big long instruction, it says, again in the fifth paragraph, you still have discretion to mpose a sentence less than death.

And then on the instruction directly behind that one, it says, again, you are not required to impose the death penalty.

I understand that that is the law. I just think ihat it's repetitive in like three instructions.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, actually, the first tuo paragraphs are in the one right above it.

MS. WECKERLY: Right.
THE COURT: How about if we take the one in Front of it and take the third paragraph that says each juror is ent tled to individually determine the weight of each aggravating circumstance
and stick that in the one in front of it; and then we'll tat e out the last line in the first two paragraphs. That way, we've got every concept without duplication.

MS. WECKERLY: Okay.
THE COURT: Any objections to that?
Randy, okay with that?
MR. PIKE: No problem.
THE COURT: That's what we'll do.
Now, with those corrections in mind, is the Ste te okay
with the packet?
MS. WECKERLY: Yes.
THE COURT: Any additional to oppose, to suggest?
MS. WECKERLY: No, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay. Charmaine will make up the instructions. You will have them ready on your desk when you get here in the morning.

We'll take the witness or witnesses, as the case may be; read them, argue the case, and we'll give them the case on time after eleven.

Okay. Anything else?
MR. PIKE: No.
THE COURT: Have a good evening.
(Proceedings concluded.)

ATTEST: Full, true and accurate transcript of proceedings.
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THE COURT: It's a right that he has, but the implication could be that somehow, by exercising that right, he has something to hide. So by doing that, I'm trying to protect the defendant is all.

MR. PIKE: I understand that. That was a decision I had made. The Court issued the ruling and we argued. I'm not re-arguing the ruling or anything.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. PIKE: To make the record complete, since we only had part of the statement in, I'd like to indicate those were the objections; that was the ruling. And in the event of a conviction, that a copy of the transcript of that statement be made a Court exhibit for appeal.

THE COURT: Okay. Sure.
MR. PIKE: That's atl.
THE COURT: Anything to put on the record, Miss Luzaich?
MS. LUZAICH: Just as far as that goes, when I was questioning Detective Sherwood regarding the statement, I stopped on page five with his, the defendant's, answer: I have my own case to deal with. The next question and answer was where the defendant said: If I do anything, I have to talk to my lawyer first before. I do anything.

The rest of the statement, he continually says something about his lawyer and maybe his lawyer would let him talk or something along those lines.

ACCUSCRIPTS (702) 391-0379
Page 6 of 187
THE COURT: I think that there is -- there is a
potentlally negative inference that can be drawn against the
defendant for doing something he's absolutely entitled to do. And
I think that it's in the defendant's best interest to let it in
and that's why I said you couldn't bring it in.
What else, issues on the evidence?
MS. LUZAICH: Well, what's already been or what's coming this afternoon?

THE COURT: Is there something that's already been that you have a concem about?

MS. LUZAICH: No, I don't.
THE COURT: Well, then, let's get to what's coming.
MS. LUZAICH: As far as what's coming this afternoon, we received an e-mail from Mr. Pike on Friday at 4:37, where he lays out the witnesses he intends to call this afternoon and sort of what they're going to say.

The one that jumps out at us is Will Kinsey. And, in
fact, Mr. Pike made a comment in opening statement that William Kinsey would say that he was aware that Sheila was dating someone named Keith. That is absolutely, positively hearsay. There is no way that that would be admissible.

So to call Mr. Kinsey, I would ask for an offer of proof.
He was in custody at the time of these events, so he couldn't have possibly seen anything.

THE COURT: Mr. Pike?
ACCUSCRIPTS (702) 391-0379

MR. PIKE: Thank you, Your Honor.
In reference to that, I am allowed to call Mr. Kir sey to
the stand, to indicate that he had a boyfriend/girffriend relationship with the deceased. It establishes the fact thit they were, in fact, boyfriend and girlfriend.

I have a right to say: Have you seen her with \(c\) ther boyfriends? Do you know that she had other boyfriends, of your own personat knowledge? Are you aware that she had a coyfriend by the name of Keith?

THE COURT: Now, how is that hearsay?
MS. LUZAICH: Well, one, it's leading; and, two, it's hearsay.

THE COURT: Well, forget about it. This is not your first rodeo. The only way he would know is if she told hins.

MR, PIKE: Or if he has seen Keith or if he had fersonal knowledge.

Now, when I talked with him, he did, in fact, tel me: Yes, I know that she had a boyfriend named Keith and sh \(\geq\) was seeing a guy named Keith.

And I made that as an officer of the Court. I hal a witness present when he told us that. He went up there ind visited him in prison. He didn't cooperate with the police and we just had to deal with that.

THE COURT: You are entitled to put on everyth ng except this last assertion, because she had to tell him.
ACCUSCRIPTS (702) 391-0379

Page 8 of 187
,

THE COURT: Does Kinsey even know your client? MR. PIKE: No.

MS. LUZAICH: No. And he's been --
THE COURT: So if Kinsey hasn't seen your client with Sheila Quaries, then --

MS. LUZAICH: He's been in custody since December 2004, so four months prior to Sheila's death.

MR. PIKE: If he recognizes him, if he can do this --
THE COURT: So at what point in time is he going to be aware, by his own personal knowledge, that she has a boyfriend named Keith?

I mean, he couldn't be aware, of his own personal
knowledge, at or about the time of this crime, because he's been in jail or prison long, long before that. I mean, if she had a boyfriend named Keith in '02, it would be irrelevant.

MR. LUZAICH: Even in '04, it's irrelevant.
THE COURT: Right. I understand.
MR. PIKE: I understand. Respectfully, I disagree --
THE COURT: Well, you disagree because you think that he can say what she told him?

MR. PIKE: One, yes. I think that he can say what she told him. I know it's hearsay. I think that, number one, it's almost like a statement against interest. She's telling an old boyfriend, who hopes to get back together with her, that she has another boyfriend.

ACCUSCRIPTS (702) 391-0379
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THE COURT: It's not a statement against interest. There may be a lot of purposes why one would do that, but it's not a statement against interest.

MR. PIKE: Okay. And so in going with that, we're dealing with the fact that did he know that she was seeing other men while he was in custody? And how did he know that?

THE COURT: Well, he couldn't know it of personal knowledge because he couldn't see it -- unless somebody told him. And when you are in custody, the only way you can find that out is if somebody tells you.

MR. PIKE: Or if they bring him up to the visit and they see him.

THE COURT: You can ask him that. You can ask him if Sheila Quartes brought up another man to visit you in custody.

MS. LUZAICH: We have the visitation logs and she did not.

MR. PIKE: I understand. I understand that. I
understand that.
THE COURT: Well, you can't --
MR. PIKE: So the record is clear then, what I can ask him is you were a boyfriend --

THE COURT: Yes.
MR. PIKE: -- and do you have any personal knowledge -of your own visual or your own viewing, your own knowledge, did you ever see her with somebody else that you knew that she was
dating?
THE COURT: At what point in time?
MR. PIKE: During 2005.
If he says no --
THE COURT: Well, of course, it's no, because \(h\) ? was in

MR. PIKE: I understand that. I understand tha:. I'm making the record so I know what I can ask.

But I am not going to be allowed to ask him .-.
THE COURT: What somebody told him.
MR. PIKE: -- what she told him.
THE COURT: Sure.
MS. LUZAICH: But he also can't back door that
THE COURT: Oh, he can, but this isn't my first odeo either.

I mean, the point is he's not going to add anyth ng to the defense because he was in custody the entire 2005, 50 at about the relevant time --

\section*{MS. LUZAICH: Right.}

THE COURT: - he could have never seen anyb sdy with her. I mean, unless they came to the jail, which they didn't. Unless he got out, he couldn't see it.

What may have happened a year or two earlier s irrelevant. I'm letting you put him on, but the only thing you are going to be able to say is, you know, within a couple nonths ACCUSCRIPTS (702) 391-0379
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one way or the other of March 2005, did you ever see he, 'with another individual? And he's going to say no.

MR. PIKE: And so the record is clear, I'm not \(\mathrm{e}^{\prime}\) 'en allowed to ask him did you know that she had another bcyfriend because that would be hearsay.

THE COURT: That would be hearsay.
MR. PIKE: I understand that. I'm just making the record.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. PIKE: I'm just making this proffer so I kno v not to ask the question, because if I don't make a record, then i can, in good faith, ask that question, you're going to object --

THE COURT: I very much appreciate your vast <nowledge of Rule 250 and exactly how to go about it. You did a good quality job representing your defendant. Please make any reconl you want, because I think that's not only your obligation, but your r ght.

MR. PIKE: I appreciate that.
THE COURT: I think we've made it, haven't we '
MR. PIKE: We have. I just know I won't be able to ask that question and I won't ask it.

THE COURT: Do you still want to call him?
MR. PIKE: I do. I'H just put him up to show the \(t\) he exists. I may ask him: You were cooperative with the \(p\) lice; you are upset that she died. We'll go there.

MS. LUZAICH: This is the guy that can't be her. until ACCUSCRIPTS (702) 391-0379

\section*{tomorrow.}

THE COURT: I know, but tomorrow is going to take five minutes.

MS. LUZAICH: Right. I'm just saying --
THE COURT: Mr. Pike said that he is willing to stipulate that we go through with the instructions tonight, put him on for five minutes tomorrow, argue the case.

I mean, given the fact that he's been in custody for the entire time, four months before her death until after, he's going to have nothing to add. I mean, it really is going to be two or three minutes of direct and zero cross.

So your objection as to hearsay, in terms of his assertion about Keith, is sustained. But that doesn't mean that Mr. Patrick and Mr. Pike can't put him on the stand for whatever they think they can glean from him.

You know, maybe just having him in a prison uniform, as another sort of suspect out there in the netherland, maybe that's helpful to him. I don't know. I'm not trying to tell them how to present the case. I'm just ruling on hearsay.

MS. LUZAICH: And the last one, they're offering somebody from Easy Pawn with a boatload of records for Robert Lewis pawning things. They've provided us with records, I would submit, one -.

THE COURT: Did he pawn a stereo?
MS. LUZAICH: No, he did not; lots of jewelry.
THE COURT: What did what he pawned have to do with ACCUSCRIPTS (702) 391-0379
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anything?
MS. LUZAICH: Furthemore, the fact that he's repeatedly
pawning ladies' jewelry, ladies' jewelry, ladies' jewelry,
demonstrates -- that's another bad act. It's collateral evidence of another bad act.

THE COURT: It may be and it may not be, but what is the relevance?

MS. LUZAICH: There is no relevance.
MR. PIKE: Well, number one, he was a person of interest. We think he should have been a suspect. He's a relative of George Brass.

THE COURT: Why do you think he is suspect?
He goes up there with the mother; he's carrying the bags.
The mother discovers the body. He's helping her come out. What about what he did would give anybody any reason to believe that he was a suspect?

MR. PIKE: Well, you remember we were disallowed from bring in the Crime Stoppers report where it was said she was afraid of Robert Lewis. He had been trying to have sex with Sheila Quarles and that --

THE COURT: Well, that's somebody's opinion.
MS. LUZAICH: Well, we believe it was Norman Flowers who made that call.

THE COURT: It could be.
MR. PIKE: But if this --
ACCUSCRIPTS (702) 391-0379

THE COURT: The fact that he pawns things, wlat is the relevance of that to this case?

MR. PIKE: Number one, it shows that a persor of interest was pawning items during that period of time. It establi hes him as around that period of time. It shows that he pawns vomen's jewelry. They have said that items of personal property were stolen. They don't list all of them.

THE COURT: He pulls out a bank card, a telepl one and a stereo.

MR. PIKE; And other personal items. We don'1 know what the other personal items were. There is not a list of a ring or the rest of those things.

But to show that he had that, number one, tho se records are, in fact, available, and we've talked with them, the police, about that, it completes that loop.

Number two, that Robert Lewis does have a ha jit of doing that at a pawn shop that is nearby and where that is locited.

And, number three, that these are the records sept in the normal course and they certainly could have investigater! any of these other suspects that have been developed.

MS. LUZAICH: The records that they provided are not around the relevant time frame.

THE COURT: When are they?
MS. LUZAICH: They're from September 27, 2035 through \(8 / 31 / 2008\), six months past the relevant time frame.
ACCUSCRIPTS (702) 391-0379
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THE COURT: I don't see how this has any rele'ance.
You've made your record. I don't see that it his any relevance. The police admitted that they have a pawn d stail that they go to. In fact, they won't even go to the pawn sho!. They go to their computer system at the pawn detail and pull ip any name they want to, but if they pull up a name of Robert Lewis at or about the time of death, it shows nothing.

MR. PIKE: We don't know that. We just know from that pawn shop.

THE COURT: All right. I think it's very remote I think it's a matter of materiality.

MR. PIKE: Our Easy Pawn guy is out. We're lis nited to
Kinsey. Okay.
THE COURT: Anything else?
MS. LUZAICH: No.
THE COURT: All right. Let's do the instruction:. then.
Is the State familiar with the proposed packet of
instructions?
MS. WECKERLY: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Does the State have any objectio is to any of those instructions?

MS. WECKERLY: No, Judge.
THE COURT: Does the State have any additional
instructions to offer?
MS. WECKERLY: No. ACCUSCRIPTS (702) 391-0379

THE COURT: Mr. Pike has submitted a number of instructions, most of which I don't agree with; one of which I thought we'd probably give.

Well, let's go through these, Mr. Pike, one by one and give you a chance to make your pitch.

You submitted an instruction: A finding of guilt as to any crime may not be based on circumstantial evidence unless the proof circumstances are not consistent with the theory but cannot be reconciled with any other rational conclusion.

This is sort of a rehash of the two reasonable theories instruction, which we don't have to give here, and I never have given, but it's also the case that I think it's a slight misstatement in Nevada law, in that we give an instruction that say evidence may be circumstantial and direct, we define what each is and we tell them that they're to be given equal weight.

So I don't think there is a distinction between direct and cincumstantial evidence and this would be a misstatement of the law.

But put anything in the record you want and I'll make this whole packet that I am not going to give part of the record.

Anything you want to say on that?
MR. PIKE: No. I agree with the Court. I think it's an
issue that the Supreme Court may address; and as the Court has noted under 250 cases, we have to look out towards this.

THE COURT: I agree. And you do quite a good job. ACCUSCRIPTS (702) 391-0379
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You are instructed, because the State failed to test the speaker wires that were found at the scene, the speaker wires irrefutably presumed to be held by Jesse Navaro.

That's sort of bending the Sanborne case to fit your need, but I understand your evidence in relation to Navaro. I don't see that it applies to this case.

The State has to present circumstances surrounding the commission of a crime and evidence of pending allegations of a crime of which Mr. Flowers has not been convicted. If you believe beyond a reasonable doubt that the other alleged crimes also must be so interconnected to the act in question that the witness cannot describe the act or controversy without referring to the other alleged crime.

I don't think that's the law, for a couple reasons.
One is I think the standard is clear and convincing evidence; and, number two, it doesn't have to be part of the full story. There are a whole bunch -- or half a dozen different things under NRS 48.045 that it can come in for, including identity, lack of accident or mistake. So I think that --

MR. PIKE: That is correct, Your Honor.
As you describe it, I think that the clear and convincing
standard should be reconsidered by the Supreme Court and I'm using this as a vehicle to do that.

THE COURT: Fair enough.
Then there is the two reasonable theories, which the law
says we don't have to give and I don't give.
MR. PIKE: Thank you.
THE COURT: The prosecutor re/TPRAEUP /TPH , KPWROP are murders /-RS calculated to produce a wrongful /KWEUB as it is to use every legitimate to bring about a just warrant.

That's true. I just don't know what applicability it
has. I'm guessing this came from a case where prosecuturial misconduct was the subject of what the case was talking ibout.

What applicability does it have here?
MR. PIKE: Actually, in reference to that, it just indicates -- I think it's an instruction that we can bring to /HRAOET the efforts on behalf of officers as a -- as a hancl or as the instrument of the prosecution to do their full job, to \(u\) ie the means that are available to them.

THE COURT: Well, you have the right to argue that.
MR. PIKE: Right.
THE COURT: And you've been arguing it as you went with your cross-examination, very effectively. I don't think it's something that the jury gets instructed on.

MR. PIKE: Okay.
THE COURT: Corroborating evidence must indeprendently connect the defendant with the offense.

Evidence corroborating what?
I mean, as a general proposition, the only thing I know
that has to be corroborated under the law is accomplice testimony. ACCUSCRIPTS (702) 391-0379

I don't think DNA has to be corroborated or fingerprints \(0 \cdot a\) single eyewitness or any of that. I think the law says tha : evidence, if believed, in and of itself may not be corroborited.

What is it that you are suggesting that they sho Ild be instructed needs to be corroborated?

MR. PIKE: I am sorry, Your Honor. In referenci: to the accomplice's testimony --

THE COURT: We don't have an accomplice.
MR. PIKE: I know. I know.
That was meant to be redone, indicating corrobr rating evidence independently connecting the defendant to the c ffense, with burglary being in.

There has been no testimony required or indicat ng that any sort of sexual connection between Mr. Flowers and the deceased occurred at the apartment to warrant the burglary; that \(t\) iere is -- that connects him with the house itself. There is no JNA in there; there is no fingerprints there; there is no eye witnt sses there.

We've got simply the DNA that is present inside of the deceased and a 72 hour window, based upon the testimony of their experts.

THE COURT: And you think that somehow the l.iw is that DNA needs to be corroborated before a jury by somethinc else before a jury can convict based on that?

MR. PIKE: No. I'm just -- what I am saying is tinat
there is nothing -- I think that something has to identify -corroborate the offense of burglary; something needs to corroborate the robbery. And they have not placed any property with him. They haven't placed him there. The DNA, in and of itself, is not sufficient to do that.

THE COURT: The flight of Jesus Navaro after the crime, the flight instruction that relates to one of your other suspects that you are holding out there.

MR. PIKE: Right.
THE COURT: Is there any evidence that he fled after this crime?

MR. PIKE: We've got -- we'll have the testimony of Martha Valdez, who will say that she didn't see him again shortly after this burglary; and Natalia, who'll say that he left, went to California.

THE COURT: And do you have any cases or anything that says that flight instruction Is applicable to anybody other than the defendant?

MR. PIKE: I do not.
THE COURT: Okay. Lesser included offenses, 1 certainly am going to give a lesser included and say -- of second degree murder at least, and say that if the jury has a reasonable doubt as to whether it's first or second, they have to give the defendant the benefit of the doubt and find him guilty of the lesser one.

ACCUSCRIPTS (702) 391-0379
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The only issue is, I think, whether manslaughter should be put in.

Now, for manslaughter to be in, you need an adequate provocation.

I mean, is there any evidence that whoever killed here, there was provocation?

MR. PIKE: The only evidence that would indicate that it was acting or may have acted on provocation is based upon the number of injuries to the neck and that they were going around that.

That may physically present sufficient evidence necessary to allow him --

THE COURT: So if I shot Lisa once and killed her, you wouldn't get a manslaughter instruction, but if I shot her 20 times, the mere shooting of her 20 times might get you a manslaughter instruction? Is that what you are saying?

MR. PIKE: No.
What I'm saying is --
THE COURT: It sounds like it.
Go ahead.
MR. PIKE: Well, you know, I hate having her as a target for anything, but what I'm looking at is saying that if you are talking about state of mind that's involved in this, I think that the physical evidence may support an interpretation of that beyond simply first or second degree murder.

THE COURT: I don't see it.
Then you've got one where you kind of do robtery and you say the specific intent to take property from another. Robbery is not a specific intent crime. It's a general intent crime.

MR. PIKE: Right.
THE COURT: But then you put these -- it says, in
essence, that if they didn't form the intent to commit the robbery until after the killing, then they can't be guilty under the felony murder rule. And you cited Thomas. I looked up Thomas and It holds just the opposite.

MR. PIKE: Well, it's good from --
THE COURT: Thomas says: Thomas asserts tr e instruction
should have stated that the intent to rob was not formec until after the murders and then robbery did not occur and th \(\geqslant\) felony murder rule did not apply.

The facts clearly show that the intent to rob dic precede the murders; moreover, in robbery cases, it is irrelevant when the intent to steal the property is formed.

MR. PIKE: I think that that was subsequently inodified in the Nay case.

THE COURT: Well, you cited Thomas, so I go r ead Thomas, and now you tell me I'm reading the wrong cases that yıu gave me.

Go ahead.
MS. WECKERLY: But that is covered in the instruction hat we submitted, that the intent to commit the robben' has to be ACCUSCRIPTS (702) 391-0379
before. I'm just trying to find that in the packet.
THE COURT: Now, then, you submitted one th it says:
Verdict must represent individual judgment; consult witt one
another, you know, but don't give up your honestly held
conviction. I think that's okay one to give.
I wouldn't -- we already have an instruction thit says the verdict must be -- you wrote twice the verdict must se unanimous -- so that's a typo -- but it says you are the judge of the facts.

The last sentence, I don't think, adds anything. You are the judge of the facts so as to ascertain the truth. But tie idea that you got to talk, but don't give up a firmly held opini on, I
think that's a fair statement of the law and I think you a e entitled to that and I plan to give it unless the State can convince me otherwise.

MS. WECKERLY: This is the one that's entitled failure to reach a verdict.

THE COURT: Yeah.
MR. PIKE: Yes.
THE COURT: Scratch the last sentence. And I think -it's not in our stock stuff, but I have used it before through the years, something like that. It says: Do not hesitate to re-examine your own views and change your opinion if it's erroneous.

I think that's a fair statement of the law. I've seen it ACCUSCRIPTS (702) 391-0379
in cases before. And I'll put that third from the last.
MR. PIKE: Thank you.
THE COURT: Did you find that instruction?
MS. WECKERLY: Yes.
THE COURT: Which one?
MS. WECKERLY: Well, the instruction is the felony murder
instruction. There are kinds of munder which carry with them conclusive evidence of malice aforethought. And then it says:
For the purpose of the felony murder rule, the intent to commit
the robbery must have arisen before or during the conduct resulting in death.

THE COURT: I think that comports with Nay.
Okay. I'm going to add that one.
MR. PIKE: On the stock ones, I have objections to make.
THE COURT: Okay. Okay. Excuse me.
MR. PIKE: The objections I'm making are based upon
federal constitutional rights to due process.
THE COURT: This packet will be Court exhibits, and all those that the Court didn't give will be available to the Supreme Court at the appellate process.

Go ahead.
MR. PIKE: Thank you.
In reference to the instruction about consent to enter, it's not a defense of the crime of burglary, it misstates the jury decision is so long as the State proves beyond a reasonable doubt, ACCUSCRIPTS (702) 391-0379
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instead of so long as it is shown.
It's about the second instruction --
THE COURT: So long as it is proven beyond a reasonable
doubt. That's fine.
MR. PIKE: So long as the State proves beyond a
reasonable doubt, okay.
THE COURT: As long as it's proved beyond a reasonable doubt, that's fine.

MR. PIKE: Thank you.
Two, I think, three sentences after that, it says: In
this case the defendant is accused in an Indictment.
THE COURT: Okay.
MR. PIKE: Instead of the jury must decide if the
defendant is guilty of any offense, we believe that that should read the jury must decide if the State has proven any offense or proven beyond a reasonable doubt any offense.

THE COURT: You know, sometimes -- the way it used to say it is you are here to decide the guilt or innocence of the defendant, not of any other persons, I'm willing to take that out and put, you know, whether the State has proven beyond a reasonable doubt, take the word innocence out, but I don't think there is anything in here that's misleading, so I don't care to change it.

MR. PIKE: On the instruction of malice aforethought, I object to that as being vague and ambiguous. And I know that the ACCUSCRIPTS (702) 391-0379

Nevada Supreme Court approved this, but --
THE COURT: You got to talk to them.
MR. PIKE: The next one is express malice.
THE COURT: Okay.
MR. PIKE: In reference to the implied intent on :he
murder of the first degree is murder which is caused by the perpetration of robbery, an after thought robbery, I don't :hink, would elevate it to or should be allowed to provide the express basis for a felony murder conviction.

THE COURT: Well, that's the one you pointed ol \(t\), the instruction that says the intent must be formed before, dlring, not after, so I think you are covered there.

MR. PIKE: Okay. The next one, the last paragri ph, premeditation need not be for a day, an hour, or even a minute.

THE COURT: The Supreme Court has approved his.
MR. PIKE: Yes, they have. That's a correct stat ement under Byford, but it muddles the distinction between first and second and I think that should be separated and clarified.

Two more instructions past that, the State has the burden of proving specific intent should be required and committing any of the underlying felonies allowed for that.

THE COURT: Burglary is a specific intent crime; robbery isn't.

MR. PIKE: Right. Also, I'm saying for the purpcse of future discussion with the Court.
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THE COURT: Okay. The objection is noted.
MR. PIKE: Okay.
On the next one, robbery is not defined or fixed, but may be spread over significant periods of time. That doesn't a sply to this case.

THE COURT: Why does it apply, Miss Weckerly?
MS. WECKERLY: We don't know when -- I gues: we can take it out because it's covered in the other instructions, but I Ion't think it's a misstatement of the law.

THE COURT: I don't think it's a misstatement of the law. I just don't think it fits the facts.

Your objection is sustained. I'll take it out.
MR. PIKE: Let's see. On the next one, althougt your verdict must be unanimous, the Court has approved that.

THE COURT: Yep.
MR. PIKE: And those are the objections.
(Off the record.)

THE CLERK: Changing that one to a standard Pi one.
THE COURT: No, I don't think that one is in her: :.
No, I already have that.
What else? Are we done?
MR. PIKE: That's it.
THE COURT: Bring them in.
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(The following proceedings were had in open court in the presence of the jury panel:)

THE COURT: Back on the record in Case Number C228755,
State of Nevada versus Norman Keith Flowers.
Let the record reflect the presence of Mr. Flowers, his
counsel, counsel for the State; the ladies and gentlemen of the jury are in the box.

Sorry. We're running a little late.
Miss Weckerly, your next witness.
MS. WECKERLY: Kristina Paulette.
THE COURT: What we were doing while we were holding you
up a little bit is what we call settling instructions; and that
is, I've prepared the instructions as we went along, as I told you, but the lawyers have a right to argue with me and try to convince me to change them. We've got that all done. So we're getting it prepared in final form today. We expect to have all the testimony in and get the instructions read to you today. That's kind of our stopping point. And then, tomorrow, we'll come in and hear the final argument and deliberate tomorrow afternoon. That's kind of where we're at.

Where is Paulette?
(Witness sworn.)
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A I received a Bachelor's degree in biology from ti e
University of Texas. I then went on to the University of \(A\) abama at Birmingham, where I earned a Master's degree in forer sics with a concentration in DNA studies.

Q In your capacity in working as a DNA analyst for Celmark and also for Metro, are you called upon and do you complite continuing education in the area of DNA analysis and com sarison?

A Ido.
Q And is that done yearly or is there any kind of predictability in how often you are updated with your trai ing?

A It's required that we have eight hours per year, but we typically have a full week at least once a year.

Q Have you testified as an expert before in the are a of DNA analysis and comparison?

A I have.
Q Do you have any idea about how many times?
A Approximately 20.
Q Okay. I'd like to talk to you specifically about so me analysis that you did with regard to two cases, but before we got that, can you explain, just generally, for the members of the jury what DNA is.

A DNA is a substance found in the body that allow : genetic information to be passed down from generation to generation, so, essentially, it's a genetic blueprint.

Hatf of our DNA Comes from our moms; half comes from our
ACCUSCRIPTS (702) 391-0379
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dads. And, except for identical twins, each of us has a un que DNA profile.

Q And in a forensic setting, how is DNA used?
A We develop DNA profiles from items of evidence and compare those to DNA profiles of known individuals.

Q So it's just a comparison. You generate a profilt off of a piece of questioned evidence and compare it to a known profile to see if it's consistent or inconsistent?

A Yes.
Q And then, at a point after that, is there a calcula ion made by yourself as to how rare the particular profile is within the poputation?

A Yes, there is.
Q Now, is someone's DNA -- does everyone have tite same DNA profile or how does that work?

A Each person has a unique DNA profile and this \(p\) ofile remains the same over time.

So if I were to take your DNA today, it would be the same as if I were to take your DNA 20 to \(\mathbf{3 0}\) years from now.

Q What if you take a blood sample of someone to !ienerate their DNA profile, as opposed to maybe a cutting from an srgan; would they still have the same DNA profile or semen even regardiess of the origin of the source of the DNA?

A Yes.
Q It's always the same?
1

A Yes.
Q Okay. And in the situation with victims of murder, is their DNA typically acquired as a result of a buccal swab or an organ?

A A buckle swab or an organ, yes.
Q Can you explain to the members of the jury what a buccal swab is?

A A buccal swab is simply a swab that is scraped on the inside of the cheek, just to obtain cheek cells, and we process. that for DNA and it's used as a known standard.

Q In regard to this particular case or cases, you worked on a case involving a victim by the name of Sheila Quarles?

A I did.
Q And did you also perform an analysis on evidence of a victim by the name of Merilee Koot?

A I did.
THE COURT: Let me stop again. She's going to testify to
both. Again, ladies and gentlemen, every time they testify about
the Merilee Koot case, I have to tell you that that evidence can come in only to show identity, motive, knowledge, intent, absence of mistake, and not to show disposition to commit crimes or bad character.

Go ahead.
MS. WECKERLY: Thank you.
///
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BY MS. WECKERLY:
Q Miss Paulette, I'm showing you what's been marked as State's proposed Exhibits 137, 133 and 134, not in order.

Did you prepare these charts In preparation for today's

\section*{testimony?}

A I did.
Q And do they reflect the DNA results in this case, as well as the one in the Merilee Koot case?

A They do.
MS. WECKERLY: And I belleve, Your Honor, Mr. Pike will
stipulate to the admission.
MR. PIKE: That's correct.
THE COURT: They will be admitted.
(State's Exhibits 133, 134, 137 admitted into evidence.)

BY MS. WECKERLY:
Q For the record, I'm putting on the overhead what's been admitted as State's 137.

Can you see that, Miss Paulette?
A I can.
THE COURT: Do you want a laser pointer? Would that help
you?
THE WITNESS: That would help, actually.
MS. WECKERLY: Okay. Good. ACCUSCRIPTS (702) 391-0379

THE COURT: There you go. THE WITNESS: Thank you.
BY MS. WECKERLY:
Q Now, looking at State's Exhibit 137, the first column
there is a color coded column.
What does that represent?
A Those are actually the DNA markers that we're ooking at.
Q Okay. So when wa're talking about a strand of 3NA, each
one of those markers represents a segment or a location on the DNA strand, correct?

A It.
Q And on each one of those markers, someone will have genetic information from their mother and their biological father?

A Correct. Which is, if you see on the far left whe e we have Mr. Flowers' DNA profile, there are two numbers in 'sach particular location and, one of them, he inherited from hi : mom and the other he inherited from his dad; and, basically, the number represents the times that the DNA repeats at that particular fragment. He has 13 repeats right there and \(t /\) ien 16.

And any time you see just one number at a loca :ion, it means he inherited a 12 from both the mom and the dad.

Q And it's these markers that -- I mean, mathema tically, that make people unique? I mean, if someone could be like in the top column, you could be a 12 or even a lower number, correct?

A Correct.
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Q And so that's how the huge genetic -- or the fre fuency is sort of generated by the exponential power of these num sers?

A It is, because if you took at it, we have \(\mathbf{3 0}\) piece 5 of information looking at \(\mathbf{1 5}\) different DNA locations, and the in a different aliele or number - or two different allele numbirs at each location.

Q Okay. Now, I want to talk -- you actually issuen several reports in this case; would that be correct?

A Yes.
Q Let me ask you this: You first got a vaginal swe b collected from the victim Sheila Quarles at autopsy?

A Yes.
Q And were you able to generate a DNA profile frc \(m\) the vaginal swab of Sheila Quarles?

A I was.
Q And the initial generation or the initial results titat you got, what did it indicate?

A It indicated that it was a mixture of at least thrise individuals and Miss Quarles could not be excluded as a contributor to that mixture, but we aiso knew we had unlinown males involved.

Q Now, when we talk about Miss Quarles couldn't be excluded, that middle column that we see, with the red \(n\) ambers and the black numbers, that is the results that you generated from the vaginal swab itself, correct?

\section*{A Correct.}

Q Okay. And when you initially generated the sample, all you had was the known profile of Miss Quarles?

A Correct.
Q Okay, And can you kind of point out for the members of the jury how you know that she was a component of that vaginal swab?

A Sure. If you look at the first marker, what is called D8 for short, you see a \(12,13,15\) and 16 there. Miss Quaries is a 12/15, so you see the 12 there and the 15 there. She can't be excluded.

And if you move on to the next marker, D21, she is a 30
and a 35; there you see there is the 30 and there is the 35 . It
continues all the way down. She can't be excluded from every single location that we're looking at.

Q And probably not too surprising that her DNA would be found in a vaginal swab taken if her?

A Correct.
Q At the time you did that very first report, did you have known samples of DNA from an individual identified as Robert Lewis?

A I did.
Q And were you able to exclude him as being a source of any of the DNA collected from Miss Quarles?

A I was.
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Q And we don't have his profite up there, but can you explain how you would be able to do that by looking at the swab results?

A Certainly. Again, using D8, he could have easily had a profile, maybe his profile was 11, 13, and because I don't see an 11 here, that's an exclusion; and, obviousiy, you woutd have to be excluded at more than one location for me to exclude you all the way down, but he was, in fact, excluded from this profile.

Q And when you use the phrase can't be excluded, can you explain for non-sclentists what that means?

A It's just a more conservative way of saying a person is actually included, we just use word our reports and findings as cannot be excluded.

Q So you concluded, based on the scientific evidence, that Robert Lewis is not the source of the DNA from the vaginal swab?

A Correct.
Q What about an Individual by the name of Quinese Toney, did you have her DNA sample at the time you first generated the DNA results from the vaginal swab?

A I did.
Q And was she eliminated as a contributor to the vaginal swab as well?

A She was.
Q Okay. At some point, did you enter the results or the profiles that you obtained from the vaginal swab into a data base ACCUSCRIPTS (702) 391-0379
that stores DNA information?

A \(I\) did.
Q And is that called CODIS?
A It is.
Q CODIS stores information of various people's IDNA
profiles?
A It does.
Q And is that at a local, state and national level?
A Yes.
Q When you say you entered the profile that you got from the vaginal swab of Sheila Quarles into CODIS, can you explain literally what do you do? Do you just type those numb, rss in or how does that work?

A Yes. I would type this entire profile into the program; and any time it has a profile that's very similar or can't be excluded from being a contributor to this profile, it will give me that individual or that case that it connects to.

Q Okay. And as a result of putting the informati in in CODIS, did CODIS identify a potential contributor of thit DNA?

A It did.
Q Was that individual Norman Flowers?
A Yes.
Q Now, his profile is depicted on the chart in the second

\section*{column?}

A Yes.

\section*{ACCUSCRIPTS (702) 391-0379}
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Q Okay. And his profile was collected as a resul: of a buccal swab by a detective, correct?

A It was.
Q And once you had the CODIS information, did fou
re-examine the evidence or did you just take the inforn ataion from CODIS and move on from there?

A The sample was reworked.
Q What does that mean when you say it's rewor ced?
A It means we already had the sample in-house We had a DNA extract that had previously been extracted. Any o: our DNA that we keep in storage is kept in a tube to go back to \(\mathbf{t} \mathbf{t}\) a later point in time. So I took that tube and developed a DNA profile from that and it was consistent with the vaginal swab.

Q And can you show us how he is included as a s ource of the DNA in the vaginal swab?

A Sure. If you look at our first markers, we hav i a 13, 16 here and you can see the 13 and the 16 there. There is a 30, 33.2; and there is a 30; there is a 33.2; 8, 10, there is an 8 and a 10. There is a 12 here, a 12 there, and all the way down.

Q All the way down that column, where this was depicted as a column in terms of the DNA strand, where people have varying numbers, he is consistent with -- his known profile is a insistent with all of the numbers or it's depicted in all of the nur bers from the vaginal swab?

A Yes.
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being a source of the DNA from the vaginal swab?
A 99.99 percent of the population can be exciuded as contributing to the DNA found on that vaginal swab.

Q But not Mr. Flowers?
A Correct.
Q I want to leave that up there.
In March of 2007, did you generate another DNA report
with respect to this murder investigation?
A I did.
Q And was that based on the fingernail clippings of Miss Quarles?

A It was.
Q And why is it that DNA analysts took at fingernail
clippings as a possible source of DNA evidence?
A Often, in homicide cases, there can be a struggle and victims can scratch their assailant and so we test fingernail clippings to see whether or not there could be foreign DNA under the fingernails.

Q And when you looked at Miss Quarles' fingernails, were you able to debect any foreign DNA?

A I was not.
Q So you weren't able to even generate a profile to compare with anybody else?

A I obtained DNA from the fingernail clippings; they were existent with Miss Quarles.
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Q So her own DNA is under her fingernails?
A Correct.
Q What about in October of 2007; did you also tes additional iterns of evidence that were collected from the zrime scene?

A I did.
Q And I'm putting on the overhead right now what's been admitted as State's 20. I don't know if you can see that. It's a Gatorade bottle and some packages of snack food.

Do you recognize those items?
A Yes.
Q Did you test those for the presence of DNA?
A I did.
Q What were your findings?
A I obtained a partial DNA profile from the Gatora le bottle that was consistent with Sheila Quarles.

I was unable to obtain a DNA profile from the bs ef and cheese snack.

Q And did one of the crime scene analysts actually swab a beef stick for the presence of DNA for you to later fook at:

A Yes.
Q Was any DNA material coliected that you could setect?
A I wasn't able to obtain a profile from that either
Q Okay, So in terms of these items, the only DNA that was recoverable was taken from that Gatorade bottle and that was
ACCUSCRIPTS (702) 391-0379
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consistent with Miss Quarles?
A Correct.
Q In May of '08, did you issue another report with regard
to this incident?
A I did.
Q And was that based on an analysis of the bra an 1 thong
panties collected from the victim -- or the victim's ciothin!!
essentially?
A Yes.
Q I'm putting on the overhead State's 37. That's a photograph of the thong panties that you examined?

A Yes.
Q I actually think we can see the bra on the toilet ieat
there.
In terms of the bra, what were your findings with reg. ird to the examination of that item?

A I looked at it with an alternative light source to see if there was any semen on the bra and I didn't see any. Anv1, again, I did another presumptive test to see if there was semen 'here, but I didn't detect any.

So, because I didn't find any semen, I didn't go shead and do DNA on this item.

Q And why would that mean you wouldn't do DNA testing on an ftem when you don't detect semen?

A Because we are looking for semen in this particı lar case ACCUSCRIPTS (702) 391-0379
and since there was none, there was no need to do DNA, because, most likely, it would come back to the victim, who obviously was wearing a bra at some point in time.

Q Her own skin cells would be likely to be on there and if there was no foreign DNA, there would be no need to test?

A Correct.
Q Okay. In terms of the thong panties, what were your findings with regard to that item?

A I was able to obtain a DNA profile from those and I found mixtures.

Q And when you say you find mixtures, that's a mixture of what kind of cells?

A Both epithelial and sperm cells.
Q What are epithelial cells?
A Essentially skin cells.
Q And the sperm cells are what you are able to generate a male DNA profile from, obviously?

A Correct.
Q And that's the finding we see reflected in 137 -- or, no, actually not. That's the vaginal swab.

I'm putting on the overhead State's 133, is that the chart that you made with regard to your findings from the thong panties?

A Itis.
Q And at the time that you generated the report with regard ACCUSCRIPTS (702) 391-0379
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to the panties, you only had the known profile of Mr. Howers, correct?

A I did.
Q Okay. And it's the same type of comparison that you have
explained to us before, where he's a 13/16 and the profile generated from that under garment, his DNA is reflected as a possible source?

A True, yes.
Q And is there any kind of statistical frequency with regard to this item of evidence, in terms of how many people in the population you could exclude as being a source of the DNA profile from that item of evidence versus Mr. flowers?

A Again, 99.99 percent of individuais can be excluded as contributing DNA to the panties.

Q 99.99?
A Yes.
Q But not Mr. Flowers?
A Correct.
Q At some point in 2008, did Detective Long impound a buccal swab from an individual identified as George Brass?

A Yes.
Q And from his buccal swab, were you able to generate his genetic profile?

A I was.
Q And that's reflected on the right side of the chart? ACCUSCRIPTS (702) 391-0379
\(\square\)

A Yes.
Q And so at the first marker he's a 13/14; and tiven he's a 31 and a 31.27

A correct.
Q Once you had Mr. Brass' profile, were you able to compare that to the DNA results that you got from the panties?

A Yes.
Q And can he also not be excluded as a contribu or to that DNA?

A That's true.
Q And similar to Mr. Flowers, there is no, I gues: ; points on the DNA strand where he's inconsistent with the fin: lings?

A No.
Q How about the same type of number -- you te!l us that 99.99 percent of the population can be excluded as a sturce of the DNA prints of Mr. Flowers.

Would that same number or a different number be ipplied to the percentage with regard to Mr. Brass?

A It's the same number because you are doing tie statistic on the DNA found in the panties. So it's overall of all th ose alleles included, it's the statistic we get, and since they both cannot be excluded from that, the statistic still remains 99.99 percent.

Q And I'm putting back on the overhead State's 137. Obviously, you also did a comparison of Mr. Brass is a ACCUSCRIPTS (702) 391-0379
source of the DNA from the vaginal swab?
A I did.
Q And he cannot be eliminated as a source of thit DNA as
well?
A That's true.
Q And is it the same statistic, the 99.99?
A Yes.
Q In terms of testing that you did in this case, a you
familiar with a victim by the name of Merilee Koot?
A I am.
Q And have you reviewed reports generated by inother DNA analyst, who used to work at Metro's lab, by the name if Thomas Wahl?

A I have.
Q And in terms of Merilee Koot's vaginal swabs iaken from her at autopsy, what were Mr. Wahl's findings?

MR. PIKE: Objection; hearsay, for the record. For the record, may I just ask a question?

\section*{VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION}

BY MR. PIKE:
Q The records you are reading are records kept in the course of business with your lab?

A Yes.
Q Are you qualified, as a custodian of records, tr • review ACCUSCRIPTS (702) 391-0379
those and bring those forward?
A Yes
MR. PIKE: Thank you.
THE COURT: Go ahead.

\section*{DIRECLEXAMINATION (Resumed)}

BY MS. WECKERLY:
Q What were Mr. Wahl's findings from the vaginal swab taken from Merilee Koot at autopsy?

A The source of the semen is Norman Flowers.
Q And in terms of --
MR. PIKE: Objection.

\section*{VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION}

BY MR. PIKE:
Q You've been saying cannot be excluded.
A Correct.
Q And that you would not use that language in this case; is it more correct to say that?

A This is a different statistic because it was a single source profile.

Q Neverthefess, can that be the appropriate term? What is the most appropriate term?

A For a single source profile or a major profile, it is
the -- in this particular case there was identity, so we assume ACCUSCRIPTS (702) 391-0379

Page 50 of 187
identity. But in a mixture where I cannot pull out the major profile, we say cannot be excluded.

THE COURT: You can ask this in cross-examination. MR. PIKE: Thank you. I'm sorry.

\section*{DIRECT EXAMINATION (Resumed)}

BY MS. WECKERLY:
Q What were the findings with regard to the vaginal swab taken from Merilee Koot at autopsy?

A The source of the semen is Norman Fiowers.
Q And the findings in terms of that particular swab taken from that victim, there was only single source of semen in her, correct?

A Yes.
Q And that single source of semen that was a genetic profile was amplified or generated in those swabs?

A Yes.
Q And that was compared to the known sample of Mr. Flowers?
A Correct.
Q And there was no indication of a third source of DNA?
A That is correct.
Q And when you have a single source of DNA at a particular location, are the numbers or the frequency of that DNA more discriminating?

A They are.

Q And why would that be?
A Because you are only dealing with an exact prof le,
because in this particular instance, I would enter the 13/ 6 as opposed to the \(12,13,14,15,16\).

So the more you can narrow it down, the more a stronomical your number becomes.

Q And in terms of the frequency or how many people in the population would have that genetic profile with regard to the vaginal swabs taken from Merilee Koot, what was that fre fuency?

A It's rarer than one in \(\mathbf{6 5 0}\) billion.
Q So one person, then you would have to go throu jh another 650 billion people before you got that profile again or mol e than that actually?

A Greater than that, yes.
Q And what is the earth's population?
A It's approximately six and a haff billion.
Q And when you say there is an identity statement made, explain what that means in terms of the numbers or why that is made in this particular case?

A Once our numbers exceed a hundred times the vorld population, we assume identity at that point in time.

Q So if the profile is rarer than a hundred times th : earth's population, the lab issues what's called an identit' statement, because they feel like it's, I guess, conservativ e enough to make that type of conclusion?

ACCUSCRIPTS (702) 391-0379
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A Yes.
Q But in the case of mixtures, the numbers can't \(g\) at that astronomical because of the varying combinations?

A Yes.
Q In terms of Mr. Wahl's examination, did he atso sxamine the rectal swabs collected from Merilee Koot at autopsy?

A He did.
Q And what were his findings with regard to that e vidence?
A The source of the semen was also Norman Flowirs.
Q And was he able to generate a numeric frequen \(y\) as to those swabs or that item of evidence?

A He was. Again, it was rarer than one in \(\mathbf{6 5 0}\) billi \(\boldsymbol{y}\).
Q So is that the same type of situation, where the \(\mathbf{a b}\) would conclude that it is him; he is the source of that DN: ?

A Yes.
Q In terms of Mr. Wahl's initial findings in this cas \(\geqslant\) did he also examine a carpet stain taken from the apartment of Merilee Koot?

A He did.
Q And what were his findings with regard to that \(i\) em of evidence?

A He found a mixture of DNA, in which Merilee Korit could not be excluded and the DNA profile of Norman Flowers a so could not be excluded.

Q And when he examined that evidence, was he alile to ACCUSCRIPTS (702) 391-0379
generate that same numeric frequency as to the likelihood of someone else having that DNA profile as opposed to Mr. Flowers?

A He was because the major DNA profile was able to be pulled out of that mixture. He also found a statistic of rarer than one in 650 billion.

Q And sometime after Mr. Wahl examined the evidence, did you actually retest or look at the carpet stain yourself taken from Merilee Koot's apartment?

A I did.
Q And getting off the statistics for a second, when you actually were examining the carpet for the presence of DNA, can you describe how it is that you go about getting DNA off of a particular piece of evidence?

A In this particular instance, I actually took a cutting of the carpet fibers for analysis.

Q And when you examined the carpet, did you notice anything unusual about it?

A Yes. When I was performing my presumptive testing, which is how we locate semen stains, if they are on an item of evidence, I was using an overlay method, which you lay down a plece of filter paper and then wet it, and then a chemical is applied to see if there is any coloration to determine semen. And when I did this, I noticed that everything was bubbly, as if there was some sort of detergent on the carpeting.

Q I'm putting on the overhead what has been admitted as ACCUSCRIPTS (702) 391-0379
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\section*{State's 134.}

Does that chart reflect your findings with regard to the carpet stain?

A It does.
Q And the middie column is the known profile of
Mr. Flowers?
A correct.
Q And the carpet stain is reflected on the right-hand side?
A Correct.
Q And that would be - the source of that DNA was sperm or semen?

A It was.
Q And he is consistent with all of those genetic areas of the DNA strand, the genetic markers?

A Yes.
Q There is no indication of a mbxture with regard to this item of evidence?

A That's correct.
Q Based on that, are you able to tell the members of the jury how rare that particular profile is?

A It's also rarer than one in \(\mathbf{6 5 0}\) bllition.
Q And with that statistic, are you -similar to Mr. Wahl, is the lab still rendering an identity statement where the lab concludes he is the source of the DNA from that plece of carpet, you know, based on that threshold of rarer than one in 650
billlon?
A Yes.
MS. WECKERLY: Thank you.
I'll pass the witness.
THE COURT: Thank you.

\section*{CROSS-EXAMINATION}

BY MR. PIKE:

\section*{Q Good afternoon.}

Your function within this process is to just take the Items that you are given and perform the scientific testir \(g\) on them; is that correct?

A It is.
Q You couldn't make an opinion as to when that [NA got there, how it got there; your expertise is just basically conducting the examination to determine whether or noi it meets that criteria to where you can elther give an oplnion of ic entity or you cannot exclude?

A True.
Q So that's kind of a falr statement of where we'r a at, so It wouldn't be proper for me to ask you questions about leakage or about how the carpet -- or how the stain may have gotte 1 on the carpet at a location. We're just going to be deal with DNA.

A Okay.
Q In reference to the Quaries case, your testing rim over a ACCUSCRIPTS (702) 391-0379
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pertod of time?
A It did.
Q And why wasn't everything done all at the sam: time?
A Because different items of evidence were reque sted at
different periods of time.
Q When were the panties examined?
A They were examined on March 12th of 2008.
Q So about six months ago?
A Yes.
Q All right. And the event occurred back in 2005.
The panties were associated with the body. We re you requested to examine any other items of clothing beside: ; the pantles and the bra?

A I was not.
Q Were you requested to perform a DNA testing in the water that was retrieved from the tub?

A I was not.
Q During the course of the profiles and the testin!। that you have done, you've indicated and testified that it is pr ssible that the DNA could have come from more than three indi viduals?

A Any time we have DNA profiles that have five a leles or more, that indicates possibly three contributors or more.

Any time you recelve two contributors, you have to be very careful about the assumptions you make with that \(ן\) articular mixture because you have a lot of sharing going on; and so we say ACCUSCRIPTS (702) 391-0379
at least two or at least three individuals.
Q It could be more?
A Yes. Especially when we don't have reference standards
to compare in the beginning.
Q And then you go through and you indicated that you submitted the ltems for - or to CODIS?

A Yes.
Q There are different levels of CODIS; is that correct?
A Yes.
Q What is the lowest level, the CODIS level, I guess?
That's a community?
A The lowest level is our local DNA index system and it is all the profiles from southern Nevada.

Q Okay. The next level would be what?
A Would be the state level; both southern and northern Nevada are included in those.

Q Okay. And the next level?
A Is the national level.
Q When you have a mixed profile like this, did you submit this for consideration under the national?

A It was first submitted under the local and then it's submitted based on our state administrator and national level, up to national.

Q So was it submitted by you, in this case, to that level?
A I submitted it to local; and then beyond that, I didn't ACCUSCRIPTS (702) 391-0379
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have any control over that.
Q And going through the CODIS levels, how many hits did you get?

A Just one.
Q Just one. Was there a partial match that was also made?
A May I refer to my notes?
Q Oh, absofutely. What you are referring to, to refresh your recollection,
are the notes that you keep that pertain to this case?
A Yes. There was a partial match found and it's to a
person who was deceased in 1979.
Q And that's an exampie of a false hit?
A It is. And the reason this profile actuatly hits on
almost everything we enter is because we only have three loci of information, but we can immediately look at it and know that it's not included.

Q Okay. And going through - you are talking about foci. There is allele loci and what else that you are looking at?

A Loci are the locations and the alleles are the numbers at the bottom.

Q If you lay that out on a chart, it's kind of like a line
with litte bumps in it?
A Yes.
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Q And you want those to match as much as possib'e? } \\
& \text { A Yes. } \\
& \text { Q Sometimes there is contaminants that may caus a a false } \\
& \text { hit? }
\end{aligned}
\]

A No. Contaminants aren't put into CODIS.
Q I understand. I'm not talking about in CODIS. But if you have something and there is a contarr inant, it may give you the basis to have them if you submit it to CCIDIS; then it may make a false hit to a known CODIS provider?

A It could.
Q Okay. All right. In going through the determine tion on this, did you examine any other individuals than those inc ividuats that have been brought up to you by the District Attorney s Office or by my questioning?

A No.
MR. PIKE: I have no further questions.

\section*{REDIRECT_EXAMINATION}

BY MS. WECKERLY:
Q Does the timing of the request for you to examit e a piece of evidence change the results?

A It does not.
Q Okay. So if we, ten years from now, said we wa it you to look at a piece of evidence, the DNA is either there or not:'

A That's true.
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Q Okay. Mr. Pike asked you about getting DNA from a bathtub of water. He asked you that on cross-examinatio 1.

A From a sampling of water, yes.
Q Would that be something that would happen fre juently in your experience?

A Not typically, because if it's a large amount of water, although we can develop DNA profiles from very small arrounts of DNA, water is a huge diluent, you know, and so it's really difficult for us to be able to take a sample of water and concentrate it down enough to even detect any sort of ser nen or other DNA.

Q Okay. So that wouldn't be something you woulc expect, scientificaliy, to get any reliable or informative results fro \(n\) ?

A No.
Q Mr. Pike asked you about mixtures versus single source DNA.

Do you recall being asked about this?
A I do.
Q I'm putting on the overhead again State's 133.
The findings that you got from the panties indicate a mixture, correct?

A Yes.
Q And when we look at the middle column, the ree son we know it's a mixture is because basically there are more than tw, numbers there?

A Yes.
Q Okay. And the presence of that other number indicates
that there is at least one other person who is the source of the DNA?

A Correct.
Q And that's how you know that's a mixture?
A Yes.
Q When your results oniy have two numbers at each of those
loci, that's how you know it's single source DNA, because they get one number from mom and one number from dad?

A Correct.
Q I'm putting on the overhead State's 134.
The carpet stain is clearly a single source stain.
A Yes?
Q Because if it were a mixture, you would expect to see at least one other number in this column, at one of the loci?

A Yes.
Q Now, going back to 134, when we're dealing with a mixture situation, can you explain for members of the jury why you use the terminology can't be excluded, versus the one in \(\mathbf{6 0 0}\) billion number?

A Right. Well, in a potential mixture, you have so many different combinations. Just by looking at the first area, we have the 13, 14, 16. We know that each person thas two alleles. So a person could be a 13/13; they could be a 13/14, 13/15 and it ACCUSCRIPTS (702) 391-0379
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goes on.
So there is so many different combinations that that
person could be at that location. So we have to put all of those possibilltles into our statistics to know how often that occurs in the population.

Q That is just sort of a fact of mixtures. When you have mixture DNA, there is no way to separate out who is the \(13 / 14\) versus who is the 14/16 or something like that.

A Yes.
Q Because, in the mixture, it is all together in the sample.

A Yes.
Q Then by contrast with a singte source, it's just going to be - It's either going to match the person's profile or not, because there is only going to be two of each of the loci?

A Rigit. And so you know exactly what the profile is at that location. Instead of having a 13/14, we know there is a 13/16. And that is what I would enter into our statistics.

And we know, obviously, that because it is so limited the percentage of people with 13 and then the percentage of people with 16, we can get our final stat on those together.

Q And when we talk about the final statistic of the greater than one in \(\mathbf{6 0 0}\) billion, it moves sort of exponentially, right? I mean, what are the odds of having someone as a 13/14 at the first marker and a 30/32 at the second one and so on and so on, that
would be the odds of it matching at each one of these lo ations?
A Right. It would be like if \(I\) were asked to find somebody in the room with brown hair, it's not too hard to do. But if I were to say find me somebody with brown hair, freckles, wearing green socks and a purple hat, you know, that narrows it down.

Of each piece of information that I add to it makes if that more rare.

Q And these are the pieces of information?
A Each of the alleles. Like I said before, we have \(\mathbf{3 0}\) pieces of information.

Q Okay. And in your work, do you sometimes ge1, from a particular item of evidence, incomplete information at tr e various loci?

A Yes, it's possible.
Q So sometimes you can get no results, whether t's here or one of the other loci?

A Yes.
Q And in that type of situation, the number of poi ential contributors is even greater, right, because you can't discriminate then at that loci because there is no informition?

A Right. So then your number would be less astr momical. So rather than one in \(\mathbf{6 5 0}\) billion, it may be one in \(\mathbf{2 8 0}\) biltion.

Q So when Mr. Pike asked you about you got anot her CODIS hit and you said it was a partial match, and you said it was only three loci, explain what happened there.
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A Well, what happened is -- in a particular instan se, so maybe I have D8 and I get the 13/16 and at D2, I get the 16/20 and then I had the sex determining marker and the logenin. So the only thing that I would be able to put in the statistic is tie \(13 / 16\) and the \(16 / 20\).

Basically what you would end up with is maybe one in every six people could be a contributor to that particulat sample.

Q So there is somebody - when you got this hit \(\mathrm{c} f\) this other individual who died in, I think you said --

A '79.
Q Okay. -- the profile was only represented at thee points on the DNA strand?

A Yes. And we're talking with the mixture. It we sn't the single source stain that we found. It was the big mixtur z with lots of different possibilities.

Q Okay, And so, obviously, you were able to exd sde that person, obviousiy, based on their death, but also becaus a the information isn't too informative if you only had the three segments of their DNA profile?

A Yes. Working with the data base as much as I to, this profile continually hit against other samples too, so we i new that it continualfy came up and eventually deleted it from the data base.

Q And with regard to the samples that we are talling about, in the Quarles case and in the Merilee Koot case, I mean
 5

THE COURT: The State rests?
MS. WECKERLY: Subject to just checking with stuff we've admitted, but I believe so.

THE COURT: Mr. Pike.
MR. PIKE: Thank you.
The defense would call George Schiro.
THE COURT: He's going to testify about some of this DNA
stuff?
MR. PIKE: Yes.
THE COURT: He was allowed to be in here for that purpose; and if you want to have Miss Paulette in here when he's testifying, you will be allowed to do that too.

MR. PIKE: Already made that arrangement.
(Witness sworn.)

THE CIERK: Please be seated.
Please state your name and spell your first and last name
for the record.
THE WITNESS: My name is George Schiro; first name
G-e-o-r-g-e; last name S-c-h-i-r-o.

GEORGE SCHIRQ
called as a witness on behalf of the State, having been first duly sworn, ACCUSCRIPTS (702) 391-0379
was examined and testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINAIION
BY MR. PIKE:
Q Mr. Schiro, how are you employed?
A I'm currently employed as the DNA technical leader at the
Adiana crime lab which is in New Iberia, Louisiana.
Q How tong have you been so employed?
A I've been employed there for nearly seven years now.
Q And in the capacity of your employment there, what are your duties?

A My duties as DNA technical leader are to oversee the technical operations of the DNA lab, make sure that we're meeting all the quality assurance standards, making sure that all the tests are run properly.

I also function in the capacity of a DNA analyst and also as part of my duties there, \(I\) do crime soene investigations as weil.

Q What sort of training have you received for that?
A I have a Bachelor of science degree in microbiology from Louisiana State University. I have a Master of science in industrial chemistry from the University of Central Fiorida. I began my training at the Jefferson Parish Sheriff's Office crime lab, which is just outside of New Orleans; started off in what was called general criminalistics area, which included things like
ACCUSCRIPTS (702) 391-0379

Q And also as the data bases increase, do you amicipate that there will be advances in technology that will allow for more locations for identity?

A Yes.

Q In going through the process that was done in this case then, would it be an accurate statement that you can say that the DNA that was provided just shows a person that may be a potential contributor and cannot be identified with certainty that that is the actual provider?

THE COURT: Are you talking about both cases or just --
MR. PIKE: Just the Quarles case.
THE COURT: Just the Quarles case.
MR. PIKE: Just this case.
TME COURT: Yes.
THE WITNESS: Yes. In this case, the most that can be
said when you are dealing with a mixture is that that person can't
be excluded.
BY MR. PIKE:
Q Based upon that description then, it is possible that the hit to Norman Flowers may be a false hit?

A That's a possibility, yes.
Q George Brass also cannot be excluded in reference to this; is that correct?

A Yes.
Q I'm going through -- are there other people who cannot be excluded as a potential candidate?

A Yes. The statistics that I noticed when I was going through the notes said that \(\mathbf{9 9 . 9 9 3 4}\) percent to the \(\mathbf{9 9 . 9 9 8}\) percent of the population could be excluded, but what that means is also ACCUSCRIPTS (702) 391-0379
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.002 percent of the population could be included or . 0066 percent of the population could be included.

Q So assuming that the population of Las Vegas is roughly about two million people at this time, what would that mean in numbers?

A In terins of numbers, if you have a population of two million and you have this exclusion frequency that we talked about and this inclusion frequency, then we're talking perhaps somewhere from \(\mathbf{4 0}\) to 130 individuals we would expect that could be a contributor to this mixture within that two milfion population.

True values, probably actualfy somewhere between four and -- four people and \(\mathbf{1 3 0 0}\) people, but we just can't make those determinations because what we do with the statistics is we make an estimate based on population groups.

Q And so if you move the population group up as to the poputation in the United States, what would the approximate numbers be?

A It would range from \(\mathbf{6 , 0 0 0}\) people to \(\mathbf{2 0 , 0 0 0}\) people that could possibly be included as part of this mixture.

A true value probably ranges somewhere from 60 people to 200,000 people.

Q Also, as the testimony was developed and the reports regarding the DNA came into evidence, there was a reference to the fact that the mixture was at least three persons.

Can you set a number as to actually how many people may ACCUSCRIPTS (702) 391-0379
have been contributors?
A No. The only thing you can do is give a minimuin number, as was done in this case, say at least three people.

Q In going through and in doing DNA analysis anc determining what the identifiers are, do you find that the re are similarities within families as to genetic makeup?

A There can be some of the same markers that ar: found within one individual that could be found in another individual.

For example, if you think of a father and son, a son is going to have half of the father's markers. One-half is gcing to come from the mother; one-half is going to come from the father, but they're going to have half their markers in common vith each other.

Q And is there a way to use that genetic similarity to actually conduct an investigation?

A Yes. You could sample people of that family me mber to see if they would be included or excluded as a possible contributor to that mixture.

Q And are you famillar with cases -- familiar with the cases in which that has been the nature of the investigation and the investigation subsequently revealed a suspect?

A Yes.
Q In going through and assuming that this is a the ee person mixture and that Sheila Quarles is a contributor to the mixture, how many possible two person allele combinations could be used for ACCUSCRIPTS (702) 391-0379
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this mixture using the peak values as the possible two person combinations?

A There are about 64,800,000 possible combinations that you could get from those markers that we saw in the mixed CNA profile from the vaginal swab.

Q And how many of these combinations would nor exclude Norman Flowers?

A About 192 out of that \(64,800,000\) would not exc lude Norman Flowers.

Q Since you have a background both as a CSA and then moved forward to the DNA analysis, during the course of your w rk as a CSA, did you collect evidence for sexual assault cases?

A Yes.
Q So based upon that experience and knowledge, do you have any way of telling how old the semen is or the DNA samp'e as the DNA examiner?

A No. We can't tell how long a DNA sample has \(b\) sen there. We can only tell if it's there and what markers are preser \(t\).

Q And, similariy, with the mixture of the DNA, is t tere any way for you to tell the order in which they were deposite \(f\), how soon it was done after the other? Is there any way to tell that?

A No.
Q And based upon your experience and your train ng then, is there any way to tell that information from either the vaç inal swabs or from the samples that were taken from the pan ies? ACCUSCRIPTS (702) 391-0379
\(\square\)
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A No. Again, you wouldn't be able to tell how long they were deposited or in what order.

Q And what is the importance of examining the panties?
A Well, the panties, given that they're found right there,
are going to be a key piece of evidence, so you are going to want to know whose DNA types those are.

Those, as well, could have been from, you know, previous consensual encounters where there was drainage that occurred in the panties.

Q And do you believe it may have been important to examine the bath water?

A The bath water, not so much, again, because as Miss Paulette pointed out, the dilutional factor would be pretty high when dealing with bath water.

Q However, working your way back, the panties would be important.

Would it be important to examine clothing that the
deceased may have worn from the night before or earlier in the day to try to establish a timeline as to when the semen was introduced into her?

A Yes. That would be an investigative tool that could be
used.
MR. PIKE: I have no further questions.
Thank you very much.
MS. WECKERLY: Your Honor, could I just have a five ACCUSCRIPTS (702) 391-0379
minute break?
THE COURT: Yeah. Why don't we take our aftemoon recess at this time. Then you can talk to Miss Paulette.
(Jury admonished by the Court.)

THE COURT: We'll. pick up at a quarter to and we'll move on.
(Recess in proceedings.)

THE COURT: Back on the record in Case Number C228755,
the State of Nevada versus Norman Keith Flowers.
Let the record reflect the presence of the defendant, his counsel, counsel for the State; ladies and gentlemen of the jury are back in the box.

Mr. Schiro, you are still under oath. Have a seat.
Miss Weckerly, go ahead.
MS. WECKERLY: Thank you.

CROSS-EXAMINAIION
BY MS. WECKERLY:
Q Good afternoon, sir.
A Good afternoon.
Q You work at a state crime lab right now, right?

A Well, it's a regional facility, but we service what we
call a parish area. We don't have counties; we have parishes. We service that parish area.

Q Is it a police agency lab or is it a private lab?
A It's a police agency lab.
Q Okay. And prior to that, you worked at the Jeflerson

\section*{County one?}

A Jefferson Parish Sheriff's Office crime lab. Prior to
that, I was working at the Louisiana State Police crime lib; and then prior to that was the Jefferson Parish office.

Q And when you worked at the Jefferson Parish Lib, from reading your CV, it looked like you handled all types of e idence, fingerprint evidence, you did DNA evidence, and maybe !hysical evidence on top of that.

A That's correct.
Q In terms of analysis of sexual assaults in murd :r cases, how many cases of that nature are you typically dealing with? THE COURT: You mean in the whole lab?
BY MS. WECKERLY:
Q You personally?
A Myself personally, about 50 percent of the cases that \(\mathbf{I}\)
deal with are sexual assault.
Q And how many would 50 percent be?
A Probably on the order of what I handle, it's probably somewhere in the neighborthood of between one and 201 cases. ACCUSCRIPTS (702) 391-0379
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Q One and \(\mathbf{2 0 0}\) cases of sexual assault/homicide per year?
A Well, sexual assaults and probably another 25 vercent you could tack on for homicides; then combinations of both. It's going to be somewhere in that cross-section.

Q Okay. And in that regional lab, how many case s of sexual assault and homicides would you say occur each year for your lab to handle?

A For our lab, we probably deal with - are you sk ying
sexual assault/homicides or the --
Q The combination?
A The combination, probably somewhere in the \(n\) sighborhood of 30 to 40.

Q Thirty to 40 a year?
A Yeah.
Q Okay. You've been a consultant before to Mr. Fike's office?

A Yes.
Q You were a consultant in the Ralph Goodman cire?
A That's correct.
Q I think it was represented by Mr. Pike's office?
A I'm sorry?
Q He was also represented by Mr. Pike's office?
A Yes.
Q And he was a murder defendant?
A Yes.
```

    Q And did you consult on the Kristin Laboto case?
    A Yes.
    Q And she was also a murder defendant?
    A Correct.
    Q Any other murder defendants where you served as a
    ```
consultant in Clark County?

A There has been numerous that I have served as a consultant. The only other one that I've actually testified on was the Scott Dozer -- I think it was Scott Dozer case.

Q Always on behalf of the defense?
A That's correct. They're the only ones who have called me.

Q And always for Mr. Pike's -- I know it's not his office exdusively, but attorneys that work with Mr. Pike?

A Yes, and there have been other -- others throughout Nevada, well, within Nevada, right.

Q You did not prepare any report in this case; is that correct?

A That's correct.
Q Is there amy written documentation anywhere of your findings?

A No.
Q So none of your calculations or conclusions have been subject to any kind of peer review?

A That's correct.
ACCUSCRIPTS (702) 391-0379
Page 82 of 187
Q You just did your own calculations?
A That's correct.
Q And then you reported them somehow to Mr. Pike and
Mr. Patrick?
A Yes.
Q How did you report them?
A Orally.
Q Just today or before today?
A Before today.
Q Have you ever been involved in a case where you did prepare a report?

A Yes.
Q And that wasn't requested of you in this case?
A That's correct.
Q Now, you reviewed the statistical data or underlying data of the DNA evidence in this case?

A Yes, for the vaginal swab, yes.
Q For the panties too?
A I was never provided with the information on the panties.
Q Okay. Did you request to be provided with that?
A I did request it and we did get the report, but I never
got any of the underiying data.
Q Alf right. You didn't actually examine any physical evidence in this case?

A No.

Q You could have done that, I assume, with yous background and experience, and actually analyzed the piece of evidince yourself?

A Yes.
Q But that wasn't requested of you?
A No.
Q Okay. In terms of the statistical data you recrived,
that was all generated and provided to you through Mr. Pike, but
it was generated by the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police I epartment?
A Yes.
Q And in that statistical data, that includes the graphs and, I guess, raw data from generating the various DN/ profiles in this case.

A Yes.
Q In your review of the data provided by the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department, you don't have any dis pute that their method of extracting DNA and generating a DNA profile from a particular sample is scientifically valid?

A I have no problem with thair work, if that's wh iat you are asking me.

Q That's what I was asking. That's sort of a lomi way of asking that.

How about with the statistical calculations ma te by Miss Paulette, any dispute with those?

A No.
ACCUSCRIPTS (702) 391-0379
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Q That looked correct to you scientifically and mathematically?

A Yes.
Q And population frequencies that miss Paulette referred
to, about how rare or how -- I guess how rare a particu ar profile would be in a population, you don't have any dispute with that, do you?

A That's correct.
Q And those are data bases that are widely used in the DNA field?

A Yes.
Q And so your - in a nutshell, your review of the data
provided indicates that what they did was sound scientifically?
A Yes.
Q And statistically?
A Yes.
Q Now, in regard to the vaginal swab taken from: Miss Quarles at autopsy, you don't dispute that Mr. Flowers san't be excluded as a source of that DNA, do you?

A As a possible contributor, I don't dispute that.
Q You don't dispute that?
A Right.
Q And you certainly don't dispute that George Br ass is a possible contributor to that - those vaginal swabs, corr ect?

A That's correct. ACCUSCRIPTS (702) 391-0379


Q You don't dispute that 99.99 percent of the population can be excluded, but not these two individuals?

A That's correct.
Q In regard to the vaginal swabs taken from the other
victim in this case, Merilee Koot, you don't dispute that that was a single source DNA?

Or maybe you didn't review that yet. I'm not sure.
A I have reviewed that data.
Q Okay. With regard to Merilee Koot then, you don't
dispute that the swabs taken from her at autopsy refiect single source DNA?

A I'm sorry. Repeat the question, please.
Q Okay. With regard to Merilee Koot, the vaginal swabs taken from her at autopsy refiect a single source of male DNA?

A That's correct.
Q And you don't dispute that in terms of that single source of DNA, that profile matches to Norman Flowers.

A That's correct.
Q And the likelihood or the potential frequency of that profile occurring in the population is rarer than one in 600 or 650 billion?

A I would agree with that, yes.
Q Okay. So given your knowledge of what the earth's poputation is and certainly your experience in the DNA field, would you have any problem with the conclusion that he is the ACCUSCRIPTS (702) 391-0379
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source of that DNA?
A Excluding an identical twin, yes.
Q Okay. And, in fact, does your lab have a similar type
threshold situation where you render what we would call an
identity statement?
A Yes, we do.
Q And what is that number?
A Our number is \(\mathbf{3 0 0}\) billion.
Q So lower?
A Yes.
Q So at just one in \(\mathbf{3 0 0}\) billion, your lab will say this is the source of that DNA?

A Yes. We use a thousand times the population of the United States.

Q Okay. So, certainiy, you would have no dispute with her conclusion that Mr. Flowers is the source of the DNA in the vaginai and rectal swabs of Merilee Koot?

A No.
Q And of the carpet stain found right underneath her?
A No.
Q Now, I want to talk you to specifically about this bath water situation, collecting DNA from that.

I think you said that that wouldn't be, in your
scientific opinion, necessarily too productive to try to generate
a DNA profile off of a sample of bath water?


\section*{A That's correct.}

Q In fact, have you ever done that in your lab?
A We have had requests to, for example, look at v rater
that's found in a pea trap or a drain trap to test that; and it's usually not successful whenever we're dealing with a lar!ie quantity of water.

Q And this is even bigger than a drain trap becaus e this is a whole bathtub of water, correct?

A Yes.
Q So the likelihood of getting anything scientifically usefut, I woutd assume, is pretty diminished by the amol nt of water?

A Yes.
Q Now, when you were discussing the DNA result ; with regard to the vaginal swabs collected from Miss Quarles, you anw I Mr. Pike used the term false hit.

> Do you recall saying that?

A Yes.
Q Okay. When you look at the vaginal swab resul \(s\), is
there anything indicating to you that Mr. Flowers can be raxcluded as a source of the vaginal swabs taken from Sheila Quarl us?

A He can't be excluded as the potential contributc \(r\).
Q As a potential contributor?
A To the mixture that's found in the vaginal swab i.
Q Okay. And so there is no indication that we have a false ACCUSCRIPTS (702) 391-0379
hit in this case, correct, because we have his known samıle and it was compared to the mixture recovered from autopsy an 1 there is --

A Well, we don't know essentially if it's a false hit or not. I mean, it could be -- just from the size of the data lase, it is a possibility that it could be a random match.

Q A random match.
- Now, do you take into account peak/hit ratios fil your analysis?

A Peak/height ratios. Yes, I did.
Q The peak/height ratios, do those suggest to yot that
Norman Flowers' DNA in the vaginal mixture or vaginal s vab mixture reflects a false hit situation or do the peak/height ratios actually reflect that there is actually DNA there that's consistent with him?

A Well, from the peak/height ratio, it's not really joing to tell you if there is a faise hit or not or a false possibilit \(/\). By false possibility, I should say a random match, just musaning that it could happen to match someone within the data birse and there is no way to tell just looking at the profile if that's i he case or not.

Q Well, based on the peak/height ratios and your review of them, those certainly refiected the presence of DNA that natched his profile, correct, or was consistent with it?

A That he cannot be excluded from, because in th s case much of the peak/heights were about the same for all of the ACCUSCRIPTS (702) 391-0379

\section*{contributors.} contributor?

A Yes. your tab report? potential contributors.

Q Okay.

So it's not like we can say that more of this person's DNA is present and less of this person's DNA is present. Trauma markers are about the same and because that's -- because that's the way it is, then it's hard to tell what sort of combinations you have in that mixture.

Q Well, iet me ask you this: In terms of this DNA sample, I woutd assume, from the vaginal swabs, that the major contributor to that is Sheila Quarles herseff.

A Well, even given that -- you can't even really say that given the mixture that I recall when I looked at the data, because like I had sald, most of the peaks were right around pretty much the same height. But what we can do is we can assume that Sheila Quarles is present because the swab came directly from her vagina.

Q Okay. And the presence of the other two - or the other alleles, those were at the same level, correct?

A That's correct.
Q One of those profiles happens to match to someone who we know had sex with Sheila Quarles that morning or we've heard?

A Well, again, you can't say that it matched him. What you can say is that he can't be excluded as a possible contributor.

Q And George Brass can't be excluded as a possible

A That's correct.
Q So if you take out all of the alleles that match to his ACCUSCRIPTS (702) 391-0379
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profile and you take out all the ones that match to Sheila
Quarles, you are left with just the alleles that are consistent with Norman Flowers, correct?

A To a certain extent, because when you took at the profile and you do subtract out Sheila Quarles, there is at least one area that -- well, you can't exclude Mr. Flowers. It doesn't necessarily include him either, because one of the alleles could be shared by Miss Quarles and Mr. Flowers.

Q Does your fab report out mixture results?

Q And what is the criteria for that?
A In terms of --
Q Well, if you had a mixture like we have here, what would

A Our lab probably would have reported very similariy, except in our report, we probably would have stated assuming that Sheila Quaries is a contributor to this mbxture, then the remaining profile, Mr. Brass and Mr. Fiowers cannot be excluded as

A And we give our statistic.
Q And would the statistic be the same, that 99.99 percent of the population can be exciuded, but not those two individuals?

A That's correct.
Q And there isn't any statistic -- I mean, when you give ACCUSCRIPTS (702) 391-0379
the - I think you gave an example of if you had a popula:ion of 64,800,000 --

A No, watt. That was something different.
Q Okay. Tell me what that was.
A 64,800,000 combinations are the number of cor ibinations of two person contributors that you could get based on thos e alteles that could be present after removing Sheila Quarles and issuming only a two person mixture.

It's kind of like you think of a telephone numbe: Okay?
There is seven digits to your telephone number, but beca sse there are ten possibilities for each number, that means in a sev en digit phone number, you could have ten million possible combi nations.

If you add an area code to that, it gives you a \(h\) indred billion possible combinations?

Q And if you took out the alleles that were consisi ent or matched George Brass, like if you removed Sheila Quarle: from that because it isn't shocking that her DNA is taken from her iwn vaginal swab, and you take out George Brass, his alleles, what would the number be?

A Oh, I don't know that.
Q You weren't asked to calculate that?
A Right. Well, no.
Q Okay. Let me ask you this: Are these results, as reported by Miss Paulette, completely explained by the riasoning that Mr. Flowers and Mr. Brass and Miss Quarles were the source of ACCUSCRIPTS (702) 391-0379
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A That's one possibie explanation, yes.
Q Okay. There is nothing at all in this data that suggests that it's anything other than that.

A Well, again, because you are dealing with a mix ture, there are other possible combinations.

Q I understand it is possible, but there is nothing in the science that would indicate that another possibility is pre sent?

A Well, that's why we always report out can't be excluded as a potential contributor because there are other possib lities.

Q Okay. But it is also completely explained by the se three individuals?

A Like I said, that is one possible exclamation, ye in
Q And that would be true of the panties that were checked as well, correct?

A Again, I didn't review the data from the panties. so I don't know specifically.

Q Okay.
- A But given the report, it was probably along the aame tines.

Q And you indicated, I think on direct examination with Mr. Pike, that there is no way to look at a particular mixtise of semen and tell which semen was deposited first?

A That's correct.
Q So there is nothing about the tails being on the sperm or
anything about visually looking at the sample that would tell you, oh, look, this is this profile that was put in, you know, that was deposited two hours before this other one?

A No.
Q No way to do that scientifically?
A That's correct.
Q Now, if someone was sexually assaulting another
individual and had pulfed her underwear to the side while the sexual assault was taking place, that could account for semen and DNA being on a pair of underwear, correct?

A Yes, that's a possible explanation.
Q And then another possible explanation for why DNA might be on a pair of underwear is prior sexual contact and then leakage once the person moves or starts walking around?

A Yes, that's another explanation.
MS. WECKERLY: Thank you.
THE COURT: Anything else, Mr. Pike?
MR. PIKE: Very briefly.

\section*{REDIRECT EXAMINATION}

BY MR. PIKE:
Q There are other items that you wouldn't disagree with on the reports from the State's witness, on the DNA profile obtained, that Norman Fiowers could not be exduded as a possible minor contributor.
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A Again, \(I\) didn't review the data in that particular instance. I believe that's from the panties. But I would have no reason to dispute that

Q Nor would you have any reason to dispute her statement that it could be a false hit, that matched what they know about Mr. Flowers DNA?

MS. WECKERLY: I'm going to object. I don't think she stated that. That was Mr. Schiro.

THE COURT: I'm sorry. I didn't hear the objection. MR. PIKE: I'll just ask it directly then.
BY MR. PIKE:
Q Then based upon the reports that were prepared, your examination of them, the testimony that you heard, can you offer an opinion that it is possible that that was a false hit or a random match to Mr. Flowers?

A That's a possibility.
Q And based upon the population base and information that you have been provided in reference to the DNA, CODIS and the rest of those items, approximately how many people would that possibly come back to?

THE COURT: People in what sample?
BY MR. PIKE:
Q In the sample within Nevada or within the United States.
A Within the population of Las Vegas, which is
approximately two million, it would be somewhere between \(\mathbf{4 0}\) and ACCUSCRIPTS (702) 391-0379

130 individuals, most likely; and for the United States, F : would
be somewhere between 6,000 and \(\mathbf{2 0 , 0 0 0}\) people nation wide, most likely.

MR. PIKE: No further questions.
THE COURT: Anything else?
MS. WECKERLY: No. Thank you.
THE COURT: Thanks, Mr. Schiro. Appreciate your
testimony. You are excused.
(Witness excused.)

THE COURT: Next.
MR. PATRICK: Susan Garriott.
(Witness swom.)

THE CLERK: Thank you. Please be seated.
Please state your full name and spell your first and last
name for the record.
THE WITNESS: Susan Marie Garriott. It's spelled
S-u-s-a-n, G-a-r-r-f-o-t-t.
THE COURT: GO ahead.
MR. PATRICK: Thank you.

SUSAN GARRIOTI ACCUSCRIPTS (702) 391-0379
called as a witness on behalf of the State,
having been first duly sworn,
was examined and testified as follows:

\section*{DIRECT EXAMINATION}

BY MR. PATRICK:
Q Good afternoon, Miss Garriott.
A Good afternoon.
Q How are you employed?
A I am employed with Children's Choice Learnin! Center. I am the center director.

Q And were you doing that job in March of 2005?
A No. I was with the school, but I was not the director.
Q Okay. And which location are you the director of?
A Boulder Station.
Q Okay. And where were you at in 2005 with the company?
A I was working at the Children's Choice at Suns at Station at a front desk.

Q Okay. But you are familiar with the company's operations?

A Yes.
Q And is there any way that the company keeps 1 rack of the children that come in and out every day?

A We do it through the computer. They clock in ind out. We also have them fill it out on paper. They sign in dail 1 and ACCUSCRIPTS (702) 391-0379
they also fill out a daily care sheet so we can keep track of all the kids, diaper changes and what they eat and what they do throughout the day.

Q And you are familiar with how this is entered in the computer every day for each child?

A Absolutely.
Q This is something you have done in the past?
A Yes.
Q Is there a way that you can go back in time and print out a report from those computer entries to find out if a child was at your day care during a specific day?

A Yes.
Q Are you familiar with how that's done?
A Yes.
Q And are you familiar with the form of the report as it would be printed out from that computer?

A Yes.
MR. PATRICK: Permission to approach, Judge.
THE COURT: Yes.
BY MR. PATRICK:
Q I'm going to show you what's been marked as defense proposed Exhibit 1.

Does that look familiar to you?
A It does.
Q And how does it took famillar to you? ACCUSCRIPTS (702) 391-0379
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A Well, actually, the one I have is just a small portion. I think it was just for March.

Q Okay.
A It just looks familiar because it says child detail
report and it actually says our company and our tax ID number.
Q And what does that represent?
A When the child was clocked in and clocked out and who dropped off and who picked up.

MR. PATRICK: Okay. Move move admission, Judge.
THE COURT: Any objection?
MS. LUZAICH: Well, foundation still.
THE COURT: I'll conditionally admit it.
Go ahead.
(Defense Exhibit A admitted into evidence.)

BY MR. PATRICK:
Q By looking at that, can you tell what child this report pertains to?

A The very left side, it's Gabriel Fiowers.
Q Okay. And if you iook, going across, it tells you when he was checked in and out each day?

A Yes.
Q And who did that?
A Right.
ACCUSCRIPTS (702) 391-0379

Q And looking through this, it looks like most of the -most of the time it was Katrina McKenna that was checking him in and out?

A Yes.
Q But it looks like several times that Keith Flowirs would do that?

A Yes.
Q Okay. And can you tell me what time Gabriel was checked in on March 24th, 2005?

A According to the records, he did not attend th 3 center.
Q Okay. So according to your records, he wasn't there all day?

A Right.
THE COURT: Okay.
MR. PATRICK: That's all I have, Judge.
THE COURT: Okay, Cross.
MS. LUZAICH: Thank you.

\section*{CROSS-EXAMINATION}

BY MS. LUZAICH:
Q Now, the record that you have does not indici te who actually has custody of this child?

A Correct.
Q So as far as you know, the only time the perseln, who on ACCUSCRIPTS (702) 391-0379

Fage 100 of 187
your plece of paper is named Keith Flowers, ever sees ;his child is the couple of days that he dropped him off at the cer ter?

A Right; right.
Q Now, the exhibit that the defense gave to you. defense Exhibit I, on the bottom, it says total hours, \(\mathbf{5 1 9}\) hours, is that correct?

A Yes.
Q And as you look at this single piece of paper \(t\) tat they provided you, does it appear that those hours add up ti) 519 ?

A Well, like really quickly, no.
Q Not even close, right?
A I think it may have totaled hours the whole ti! ne the child was there. I think just from March on is what's bsing shown.

Q Okay. Now, I have -- here is State's whatever' next in order. It is what I would represent to you was provided to me by defense counsel, which would be a whole other page \(p\) ior to that same date. And this is proposed Exhibit 138.

MR. PIKE: No objection.
THE COURT: Be admitted. Go ahead.
(State's Exhibit 138 admitted into evidence.)

BY MS. LUZAICH:
Q So as I show you State's Exhibit 138, does thit indicate ACCUSCRIPTS (702) 391-0379
also from November '04 through February '05?
A Yes.
Q And that would be that page; and then the top page is the same one that we've already looked at which just continues from February '05 to March?

A September.
Q Okay. Now, can you took at those two pieces of paper and tell me, of all of that period of time, how many times did Norman Flowers or Keith Flowers pick up or drop off?

A On here, not at all, but there are old team members that looked like they clocked in and clocked out the child because the child wasn't clocked in by the parent.

Q Okay.
A So we do have records that we save for three years.
Q But that's not before you. Before you, on the first
page, the one with most of the entries, how many entries are on that page, the earlier time frame? Sorry?

A None from Norman.
Q Right, but how many total entries are there, on the first page, the longer one, '04 through February '05?

A Thirty-four.
Q Thirty-four total entries on that page?
A Yes.
Q And zero of those were Norman Keth Flowers?
A Correct.
ACCUSCRIPTS (702) 391-0379
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Q Now, on the second page, how many total entries are there?

A Twenty-six.
Q And of those 26, how many involve Norman Keith Flowers?
A None, zero.
Q Well, he picked up at some point, didn't he?
A According do this, no.
Norman?
MR. PIKE: Keith Flowers.
THE WITNESS: Oh, Keith.
BY MS. LUZAICH:
Q Sorry.
A One, two, three -- one, two, three times between March of '05 and September of '05; and then the time before that, no Keith.

Q Okay. So of 26 and 34 , which is somewhere in the vicinity of \(\mathbf{6 0}\), three times?

A Three times.
Q And your record, like I said, doesn't indicate who had custody of him?

A Right.
Q You have absolutely no idea where that child was on
March 24th of 2005 ?
A No.
MS. LUZAICH: Thank you.
THE COURT: Anything else, Mr. Patrick?
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MR. PATRICK: Yeah. Thank you, Judge.

\section*{REDIRECT EXAMINATION}

BY MR. PATRICK:
Q If both parents come to pick up a child at yout day care, would they both have to check in and check out that th zy've picked him up or dropped him off?

A Just one.
Q So it is possible that a lot of these times wher ; Katrina actually signed in and signed out, Norman could have teen with her, Keith could have been with her?

A I guess it's possible.
MS. LUZAICH: Objection; speculation.
THE COURT: Sustained. Well, overruled.
MS. LUZAICH: Anything can happen.
THE COURT: I guess you can say it's possible, but Ne
don't have any evidence one way or the other.
BY MR. PATRICK:
Q So from iooking at the record, you have no way to tell if the times that Katrina dropped off or picked up Gabriel, whether or not Keith was with her?

A Correct.
MR. PATRICK: Thank you. That's all I have, Judge
THE COURT: Anything else? Okay.
Thanks. Appreciate your testimony,
ACCUSCRIPTS (702) 391-0379
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(Witness excused.)
THE COURT: Next.
MR. PATRICK: Next will be Natalia Sena.
THE CLERK: Please state your name and spell your first
and last name for the record.
(Witness sworn.)

THE WITNESS: Natalia Sena; N-a-t-a-l-i-a, S-e-n-i.

NATALIA SENA
called as a witness on behalf of the State,
having been first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

\section*{DIRECT EXAMINATION}

BY MR. PATRICK:
Q Good afternoon, Miss Sena.
Where did you live in March of 2005?
A At Palm Village Apartments.
Q And do you remember the address?
A No. I think 1001.
Q And what street?
A Pecos.
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\section*{happen to you or at the apartments? happen to you or at the apartments?}

A I think it was when the girl downstalrs dled.
Q Okay. And you say the girl downstairs.
In relation to that apartment, where was your apartment?
A Upstalrs, across.
Q Okay. I think we've heard it described as a little breezeway between the two buildings?

A Uh-huh.
Q Then there was a stalrway?
A Well, our apartment was upstairs and there was stairs right next to our door; they lived downstairs on the other side of the bullding. (Indicating)

Q Okay. From the bottom of the stalrs, how close would you say that that girl's apartment was from your staircase?

A From the bottom of the stairs?
Q Yeah.
A From right here to right to the desk. (Indicating)
Q So our desk or -
A Yeah.
MR. PATRICK: For the record, I'm guessing 15 feet.
THE COURT: Fifteen, 20.
BY MR. PATRICK:
Q Do you remember the day the girl died?
A Yeah.
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Q During the month of March of '05, did anything unusual
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Q And did anything else happen to you that day?
A I went to jall.
Q So it was a memorable day all the way around?
A Yeah.
Q Now, that day, on March 24th, after the police came and everything, you gave a statement to the police?

A Yeah; yes.
Q Ma'am?
A Yes. I'm sorry.
Q Okay. Did you go up to them or did they come up to you?
A They came up to us.
Q Were you In your apartment?
A Yes.
Q And what happened? They just knocked on the door?
A They knocked on the door and they asked if we had seen anything go on downstairs.

Q Okay. And do you remember If you had seen anything? Did you tell them if you saw anything?

A I told them that I had seen a guy downstalrs.
Q Okay. Do you remember how you described the guy to the polfce?

A That he was tall and skinny.
Q Anything else?
A I believe he was wearing like a flannel shirt or
something.

ACCUSCRIPTS (702) 391-0379

Q Okay. If you were to see a plcture of this guy, to you think you would be able to recognize him?

A Probably not.
Q Probably not. Okay. Have you been showed a picture recently?
A I've been showed quite a few pictures.
Q Okay. Did any of them jar your memory as to tho that guy might be?

A Possibly, but it was a long time ago.
Q Okay. Did you see anybody else around your a sartment that day?

A I seen a lot of people there that day. The guy that lived downstairs from me, I seen him.

Q Okay. Do you remember what his name was?
A Chicken.
Q Okay. Do you remember when it was that you saw Chicken?
A I know I seen him every day. I seen him befor 3 I went to go gamble and that was before 12 o'ciock and I thought I seen him when I came back, but I can't - I thought I seen him thin.

Q What time did you come back?
A Twelve o'clock.
Q So you think you saw him after 12 o'clock by wirr apartment?

A I thinik so, wh-huh.
Q When you saw Chicken, was he there with anylody?
ACCUSCRIPTS (702) 391-0379
rage 108 of 187
A Well, yeah. They were on the other stairs thou 3 , the apartments across from ours.

Q Okay.
A With some other guys.
Q All right. Was he with that same guy that you ilescribed?
A The one I had seen that day, yeah.
Q Okay. After you came back from gambling, the tall guy that you saw, with the fiannel shist on, did you see him sioing anything you thought was suspicious?

A I just seen him where her apartment was at.
Q Where whose apartment was?
A The giri who died.
Q Okay. I'm sorry. What did you see?
A I don't recall if I seen them right when I was ouming
home or if I heard something and I looked outside. I the rught I was in my apartment and I looked outside and seen som ebody. I looked down, just like right there, like he was probably linocking on her door or he had just come out of her house.

Q Okay. How was he acting, in your opinion?
A Like he was creeping around.
Q Would you expiain that?
A He was just looking around to see who was arc und, the same as I was looking around to see who was there.

THE COURT: Excuse me.
MS. LUZAICH: Bless you.
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BY MR. PATRICK:
Q Who lived whth you in your apartment?
A Affonso Sanchez lived with me; Jesus Navaro stayed with us; and two other people, they were staying there. They didn't Ilve there. They had just been in for fike less than a week.

Q Okay. I'm going to show you what's been marked as Defense B.

Do you recognize this individual?
A Yes.
Q Who is that?
A He's my kid's cousin.
Q And his name is?
A Jesse.
Q Or hls full name is Jesus?
A Yes.
Q Is thls the same gentleman that you were talking about
living with you at that time?
A Yeah.
Q Okay. I belleve you said that that day that THE COURT: Do you want to admit that, Mr. Patrick? MR. PATRICK: It's already admitted, Judge. THE COURT: Okay. MS. LUZAICH: Objection; same objection. It's
conditionally admitted.
THE COURT: It's in until it's out. ACCUSCRIPTS (702) 391-0379

\section*{Go ahead.}

BY MR. PATRICK:
Q I think you testified earlier that another reason you remembered that day is because you got arrested?

A Yeah.
Q How long were you in jail?
A I don't recall if it was three - two or three days.
Q Okay. And when you got out of jail, you came home?
A When I got out of jail, I went to my mom and dad's, where my kid's dad was at; and then - I think it was that night that I got out, earfy in the morning. It was that day, that morning, we went back to the apartment to get our stuff because everybody had got kicked out of the apartment that day.

Q Okay. And that day when you came back to your apartment, did you see Jesse?

A Yep.
Q And was Jesse hoiding anything?
A He wasn't holding -- there was four apartments upstairs and four apartments downstairs and there was like a patio in between flke all the apartments. He was outside and he had a radio with him.

Q Okay. I'm going to show you what's been marked as State's proposed Exhibit 136. It's fust a drawing, but the radio he's hoiding, is it slmilar to that?

A I don't recalf.
```

the apartments and helping sell drugs, were you using drugs as
well?
A Yes.
Q What kinds of drugs? What was your drug of choice at the
time?
A Crystal meth.
Q Okay. Now, today, in whatever month this is, October of
2008, are you clean and sober?
A Yes.
Q And have you been for quite some time?
A Yes.
Q So back in March of 2005 when you were using crystal
meth, how often?
MR. PIKE: Objection; assumes facts not in evidence.
MS. LUZAICH: She just sald that.
THE COURT: She just said that.
MR. PIKE: I'm sorry.
BY MS. LUZAICH:
Q How often did you use it?
A All day long.
Q Every day?
A Every day, all day long.
Q And you might find this hard to believe: I don't use

```
that. But does crystal méth, when you use it, affect your ability
to perceive things?
    ACCUSCRIPTS (702) 391-0379
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    A Like what do you mean?
    Q Well, does it affect your memory? Do you forget things?
    A Now I do. Back, then I remember everything.
    Q You thought you remembered everything?
    A Yeah, well, I guess.
    Q Okay. When you say that you would do crystal meth all
day every day, was that the only drug of choice at the time?
    A That's all I did.
    Q How about drinking, did you ever drink?
    A No.
    Q So when you would go gamble, for example, on the morning
of March 24th of 2005, when you went gambling, had you been
drinking at all?
    A No.
    Q No alcohol?
    A I don't drink.
    Q Had you used the crystal meth that day before you went
gambling?
    A Yes, ma'am.
    Q And when you got back from gambling?
    A Yes.
    Q Ofay. And now, as you are sitting here and you say you
think maybe you went or came back around noon, could you be
mistaken as to the time?

A I could be. I don't think so, because when I came back I ACCUSCRIPTS (702) 391-0379
was really sure it was \(\mathbf{1 2}\) o'clock.
Q You are really sure after having used crystal meth for quite some time?

A I guess as sure as I could have been, yes.
Q Okay. What does crystal meth do to you? Like what kind of high do you get?

A Makes you not go to sleep.
Q Does it make you paranoid?
A Yeah. It makes you think the cops are always around.
Q Okay. And were you always looking around to see if there were cops around, because, one, you were paranoid, rig ht, because you are using it, and, two, because you are selling it?

A Right.
Q And is that also why you are kind of looking oubside the apartment that day?

A That is exactly why I was tooking outside.
Q So you saw some tall, skinny guy. Didn't he tr' to sell you something that day?

A I tried to buy a weed from him that day.
Q You tried to buy weed from him. Okay. Didn't you say a minute ago you don't use weed?
A It wasn't for me.
Q Who was it for?
A It was more my kid's dad.
Q It was for Poncho? ACCUSCRIPTS (702) 391-0379
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A Yes.
Q Is that yes, it was for Poncho?
A Yes.
Q You have to answer out loud for our court repc rter.
A I'm sorry. Yes.
Q That's okay.
So Poncho uses weed.
Does he also use methamphetamine?
A Yes.
Q At what point was it that you tried to buy weer for him, before you gambled or after you gàmbied?

A Before.
Q Before. Do you know what time you went to gimble?
A No.
Q No. Didn't look at your watch?
A No.
Q And when you go to gamble, you go to a bar, if cal bar?
A At the Point After.
Q The Point After. Probably not a lot of clocks or the wall in there?

A Probably not.
Q So you have no idea what time you went?
A No.
Q Not really sure about what time you got back?
A I thought I got back at \(120^{\prime}\) clock.
ACCUSCRIPTS (702) 391-0379
not.

\section*{ACCUSCRIPTS (702) 391-0379}

Q You saw Chicken, you said, that morning, that moming before you went gamble?

A Uh-huh.
Q Is that a yes?
A Yes. I'm sorry.
Q In addition to having to answer out loud, we need a yes or no because she has a yes button and a no button, but no wh-huh button.

A Yes.
Q You saw Chicken, every day you said, because he lived there?

A Yes.
Q What about the girl who lived downstairs, Sheila Quarles, did you know her?

A I didn't know her, but I had seen her.
Q You had seen her, knew her by face?
A Yeah. I knew she lived downstairs, yes.
Q Okay. Did you see her that morning?
A I didn't see her that morning.
Q Did you see her that afternoon after you got home?
A I seen her when all that stuff had happened.
Q Okay. So before being deceased, did you see her alive at all that day?

A Oh, I didn't see her walking around or nothing, no, I did
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rtment? \({ }^{\text {- }}\)
A No. All I remernber is her mom outside. That's it.
Q What did you hear?
A I heard her mom screarning.
Q Upset, hysterically upset?
A Yes.
Q And because you are kind of paranoid and look for cops,
if there had been loud noises downstairs, you might have heard?
A Yes.
Q Do you know what time it was that you heard the mom?
A I don't. I wasn't home for very long, I don't think.
Q So you think that it was not long after you got home from gambling that you saw the mom?

A It wasn't very long.
Q Her mom?
A I hadn't been home very long when I heard her mom scream.
Q And less than an hour?
A About, about less than an hour, an hour or less.
Q Okay. Are you one of the ones who went downstairs and tried to help calling 911 and things of that nature?

A No. I went downstairs to see what the girl that was staying with us was doing.

Q Okay. So who was living in your apartment?
A Poncho, me, Jesse and two other people were staying with us, like off -
 ACCUSCRIPTS (702) 391-0379
-

A I seen him by her doorway.
Q Right, but her door was closed, right?
A I coufdn't even see her door from there. He could have,
for all I know, been coming out of the other apartment --
Q Because there was another apartment?
A There is two right side by side to each other.
Q Right next door. And he came in the other one? Is that yes?

A Yes, I'm sorry.
MS. LUZAICH: Okay. Thank you.
THE COURT: Anything else?
MR. PATRICK: Yes, Judge.

REDIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MR. PATRICK:
Q When you got arrested that day and they took you to jail, what's the daily ration of meth that the jail gives you?

A Huh?
Q How much meth does the Jail give you while you are in jail?

A None.
Q Okay. So the two or three days you are in jail, you had no access to meth?

A No.
Q So the day you got out and you came back and you saw ACCUSCRIPTS (702) 391-0379
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Jesse, you had been clean for two to three days?
A Yes.
Q Okay. Now, did you see Chicken after you got home from gambling, by your apartment?

A I thought I had seen him.
Q Olay. Do you remember talking to my investigator, Joe Perer?

A Yes.
Q Do you remember telling him that you saw Chicken after 12?

A Yes.
Q And do you remember telling him that you were certain it was after 12 ?

A Yes.
Q Why all of a sudden are you hedging that now?
A Because when I talked to the other people, she told me that he was at work, so maybe I didn't see him. I don't know.

Q So you are thinking yous didn't see him specifically
because of something somebody else toid you, not because of your memory?

A Yes.
Q Thank you.
Now, also you said that you saw the tall guy with the plaid shirt down near the girl's apartment?

A Yes.

Q But you said you could not see her actual apariment door?
A No.
Q So you have no idea whether it was open or cle sed?
A I have no idea.
MR. PATRICK: Court's indulgence.
BY MR. PATRICK:
Q The guy with the plaid shirt, had you ever seer him hanging out with Chicken?

A Yeah, I seen him hanging out with all of the glys downstairs.

Q On a daily basis?
A I didn't say that I seen him every day, but I had seen him before.

Q Okay. Several times?
A More than once, yeah.
MR. PATRICK: Okay. Thank you.
That's all I have, Judge.
THE COURT: Anything else?
MS. LUZAICH: Just briefly.

\section*{RECROSS-EXAMINATION}

BY MS. LUZAICH:
Q Were you told that it's possible that Chicken w as at work?

A Was I told that? It's possible.
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Q Possible that Chicken was at work?
A That he had punched in a time clock or something like that.

Q What makes you think that it was \(120^{\circ}\) clock?
A I just remember it being 12 o'clock. That's one: thing -a lot of things were blurry, but I remember that it was 12 o'clock when I came home.

Q But what causes you to remember that? I mez \(n\), did you look at a clock?

A I never tooked at a clock.
Q Take some medicine?
A I must have looked at a clock or might have be en waiting, but I don't remember. It was a long time ago, but out of everything that happened that day, the 12 o'clock thing is the only thing I'm certain about. 'I know it was \(\mathbf{1 2} 0^{\prime}\) clock.

Q Okay. But you think that you heard the mom vithin an hour of -- and maybe even less than an hour of your conaing home at \(120^{\circ}\) clock.

Okay. So if the mom was not home within an l our of 12 o'clock, could you be mistaken about that?

A I could be.
THE COURT: Anything else?
MR. PATRICK: Yes.
THE COURT: Sorry.
BY MS. LUZAICH:

during the time that you have worked there?
A No.
Q I want to talk to you a litile bit about March 24th,
2005.

A Okay.
Q Do you remember that day?
A March 2004?
Q Would it help recollect -- refresh your memory if I told you that was the day that the girl died in the apartment complex?

A Okay. Yes, uh-huh.
Q Okay.
A Uh-huh.
Q Do you remember that day when the gir! died?
A Yes.
Q Was there anything else unusual that happened earlier that day in the earty morning hours?

A No.
Q Were you ever notified of a burglary attempt that
happened that day?
MS. LUZAICH: Objection; hearsay.
THE COURT: Why would it be hearsay?
Sustained.
THE WITNESS: No.
BY MR. PATRICK:
Q I'm going to show you a picture and I want to ask you if ACCUSCRIPTS (702) 391-0379
you recognize this gentleman.
Do you recognize him?
A Yes.
Q How do you recognize him?
A He used to break into the apartments and break into
people's cars and --
MS. LUZAICH: Well, objection; foundation.
THE COURT: How did you know that? Did you see it
happen?
THE WITNESS: Yeah, I used to walk the property.
THE COURT: You saw him do it?
THE WITNESS: Yeah.
THE COURT: Okay.
MS. LUZAICH: Well, foundation as to time.
THE COURT: In relation to March 4th, Is this at or about
that same time?
THE WITNESS: Yes.
THE COURT: Okay. Overruled.
Go ahead.
BY MR. PATRICK:
Q Okay. And did he live in your apartment complex?
A No.
Q Okay. Do you know if he stayed with people in your apartment complex?

A Yes.

Q Besides the breaking into the cars, what did you see him

A Selling stuff, like car stereos.
MS. LUZAICH: Objection, foundation as to time ar. 4 place.
BY MR. PATRICK:
Q Around this time, March of 2005, did you ever see him threaten anybody?

A No.
MS. LUZAICH: Objection, leading.
THE COURT: What's the relevance of that?
MR. PATRICK: Propensity towards violence, Judge THE COURT: No. Sustained.

BY MR. PATRICK:
Q Do you know what apartment he was staying in?
A Like I said, he used to break into the vacant apartments and just stay there.

Q And this was around March of 2004?
A Yes.
MS. LUZAICH: FOUR?
MR. PATRICK: 2005. I'm sorry.
Court's Indulgence.
BY MR. PATRICK:
Q This would all be around the time that the fad \(f\) died in the apartments?

A Yes.
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THE COURT: Do you have any objection reading the
instructions tonight?
MR. PIKE: Absolutely. I think that would be a good use of the Court's time.

THE COURT: Here's what we got: There is one -- other than thls lady who Isn't going to be too long, there is one more witness the defense has. That witness is in prison and the prison has to bring him up, from whichever prison he's housed.

MR. PIKE: Indian Springs.
THE COURT: They have made arrangements to bring him first thing tomorrow morning. So, normally, we wouid put on that witness, it would be about 4:30; I would read you these instructions for about 20 minutes; you go home. We come back and just argue the case in the morning.

But to coordinate with the prison, just so we don't waste any time, we're going to take this witness -- they won't quite have rested. Everybody is going to agree I can give you the instructions so we will get a decent day's work in. Tomorrow, we will take that witness. It will be literally no more than ten minutes. And then we will hear argument from the State, the defense and the State.

We'll start at 9:30. I'm guessing we're going to be done by 12 or a little after, but the way we're going to do it is we're just going to start and go right through. So get a good breakfast and be ready to go.
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One little benefit is that you will then be dellberating
at the lunch hour and so the county buys you lunch. So what we're
going to do is we will have you come in about 9:15 and you can
place your lunch orders with Officer Moon. And when you get to deliberation, whether that be 12 or 12:45, your lunch will be there waiting for you and you can go ahead and do your work.

So that's kind of the schedule and that's kind of why
it's a little out of whack, but we deal with doctors,
professionals or people out of prison, who just can't walk up
whenever it's convenient for the lawyers to come up and we have to kind of work around it a little blt.

Let's see -- we'll get decent use of our time today and
tomorrow.
MR. PIKE: Thank you.
THE COURT: Okzy.
THE CLERK: Please be seated.
THE COURT: Ma'am, when you answer, you answer to her in
Spanish. Don't answer in English because if you answer in
English, she's golng to answer in Spanish. See?
THE CLERK: Please state your name for the record.
THE INTERPRETER: Martha Valdez.
THE COURT: She spelled it earlier.
Go ahead, counsel.

MARTHA VALDEZ
ACCUSCRIPTS (702) 391-0379
called as a witness on behalf of the State,
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having been first duly sworn,
was examined and testified as follows:

\section*{DIRECT EXAMINATION}

BY MR. PATRICK:
Q Good afternoon, Miss Valdez.
A Good afternoon.
Q Where were you living the end of March of \(\mathbf{2 0 0 : i}\) ?
A I was living around Pecos and Washington.
Q Do you remember the name of the apartments?
A I believe it was Palm Village, something like thit. THE COURT: Miss Valdez, don't listen to him. You jist listen to her. She's going to listen to him. You listen to her.
```

                                    Go ahead, Mr. Patrick.
    ```
                                    MR. PATRICK: Thank you.

BY MR. PATRICK:
Q Right after you moved into those apartments, did something unusual happen that night?

A Yes.
Q And could you explain what that was.
A I think it was efther on the first or second day that I had moved there, somebody came into my apartment.

Q Do you remember approximately what time of tay that was? ACCUSCRIPTS (702) 391-0379

Q Okay. So did you get a good look at this persor?
A Yes.
Q After you told him that you were going to call the
police, what did he do?
A He turned around and he took off running.
Q Did you ever see him again in the apartment complex?
A No.
Q In the day or two that you had moved in prior \(t\), that, had you seen him in the apartment complex?

A No, not that either.
Q Okay, Did you report that to the management if the
apartments?

A Yes. The next day when they opened the office.
Q Okay. Did you report it to the police?
A No.
Q Do you know if the apartment complex notified the police?
A No, I don't know.
Q Okay. If I was to show you a picture of the man that
broke into your apartment that night would you recognize him?
A Yes.
MR. PATRICK: I'm going to approach -- may I approach,
Judge?
THE COURT: Sure.
BY MR. PATRICK:
Q I'm going to show you what's been marked as Defense Exhibit 8.

Do you recognize this as the man that broke Into your apartment that night?

A Yes.
Q And can you tell me what his name is?
A I didn't know his name.
Q Okay. I mean, can you read what his name is for me now? MS. LUZAICH: Well, objection. She doesn't know that that's his actual name.

MR. PATRICK: All right. Withdrawn.
BY MR. PATRICK:
Q And this is the man that you saw break into your ACCUSCRIPTS (702) 391-0379
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```

apartment that night? (Indicating)

```

A Yes.
Q Now, did anything else unusual happen in your apartment compiex later that day?

A Yes. When I got up, I went to work. When I got back, I saw that the police were all around and \(I\) asked my boyfriend, who was living with me, what was going on.

MS. LUZAICH: Objection if it's going to be he told me. THE COURT: Sustained.

BY MR. PATRICK:
Q Did it ever come to your knowledge why the police were at your apartment complex?

A They were investigating the death of the girt.
MR. PATRICK: Thank you. That's all I have, Judge.
THE COURT: Questions?
MS. LUZAICH: Thank you.

\section*{CROSS-EXAMINATION}

BY MS. LUZAICH:
Q Miss Valdex, when he broke in or came into your apartment, how come you didn't call the police?

A I didn't think it was necessary because he didn't take anything and he just took off quickly.

Q Okay. So he didin't take anything from your apartment?
A No.

\section*{Q And when you told him to leave, he left?}

A Ves.
MS. LUZAICH: Thank you. THE COURT: Okay. Redirect.

\section*{REDIRECT EXAMINATION}

\section*{BY MR. PATRICK:}

Q How long was he in your apartment before you made verbal contact with him?

A I think less than two minutes.
MR. PATRICK: That's all I have, Judge.
THE COURT: Thanks, Miss Valdez. Okay. You are , ill
done. Appreciate your testimony.
Thanks, Miss interpreter.
(Witness excused.)

THE COURT: I think less than two minutes.
MR. PATRICK: That's all I have, Judge.
THE COURT: Thanks miss Valdez. Okay. You are ail done. /PRERT your testimony.

Thanks miss Interpreter interpret /SPWERT you are well kill.

ACCUSCRIPTS (702) 391-0379

RrTTHE COURT: You have one more witness that ycu are going to call tomorrow.

MR. PIKE: That's correct, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Both sides agree that we can go ahead and read them the instructions so we don't waste time?

MR. PIKE: Yes.
MS. LUZAICH: Yes.
THE COURT: Okay. Here is the way this works: It'; my job to instruct you on the law that would apply to any conceivi ible spin I can conceive that you could put on the facts.

You decide the facts, I give you the law, and then yus put the two together make a decision.

Understand this: I'm just the messenger. I don't \(n\) ake the law. I just go to these books and pull out each law that might apply to this situation and then give it to you.

What the law says is I have to read you each of the statutes that could be applicable.

What I have found after years and years of doing th \(\mathbf{s}\) is that the easiest way to do it is if I give you each a copy. Whe॥ I read it you don't have to try to take notes. It makes a lot more sense as we go along.

Tomorrow, when the lawyers argue they may say: ook at Instruction 10 or 29 or some number, you will have it right in front of you.

Most importantly, when you go back to deliberate in stead ACCUSCRIPTS (702) 391-0379
of just having this one set that's mine, you will each have your own set that speeds things up.

I know you can all read. My preference would be to say raise your hand when you are done, but they don't allowed to do that, so bear with me. There are 21.

It is now my duty as judge to instruct you in the law that applies to the case

It is your duty as jurors to follow these instructions and to apply the law to the facts as you find from the evidence.

You must not be concerned with the wisdom of any rule of law stated in these instructions.

Regardless of any opinion you may have as to what the law ought to be, it would be a violation of your oath to base a verdict upon any other view of the law than that given in the Instructions of the Court.

If, in these instructions, any rule, direction, or idea is repeated or stated in different ways, no emphasis thereon is intended by me and none may be inferred by you.

For that reason you are not single out any certain sentence or any individual point or instruction and ignore the others, but you are to consider all the instructions as a whole and regard each in the light of all the others.

The order in which the instructions are given has no significance as to their relatives important.

Instruction three: An Indictment is but a formal method ACCUSCRIPTS (702) 391-0379
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of accusing a person of a crime, and is not of itself any evidence of his guilt.

In this case, it is charged in an Amended Indictment that on or about the 24th day of March, 2005, the defendant committed the offenses of: Burglary, murder, sexual assault, and robbery 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 I, burglary:
Did then and there willfully, unlawfully, and feloniously enter, with the intent to commit assault or battery and/or a
felony, to-wit: Murder and/or robbery and/or sexual assault, that certain building occupied by Sheila Quarles, located at 1001 North Pecos, number H-63, Las Vegas, Clark County, Nevada.

Count II, murder:
Did then and there willfully, unlawfully without
authority of law and with malice aforethought, kill Sheila
Quarles, a human being, by manual strangulation and/or drowning, with his hands and/or an unknown object, said killing having been, one, wilful, deliberate and premeditated; and/or, two, committed during the perpetration or attempted perpetration of sexual assault as set forth in Count III and/or burglary as set forth in Count I and/or robbery as set forth in Count IV, sald acts beling incorporated herein by this reference as though fully set forth.

Count III, sexual assault.

Did then a there willfully, unlawfully and felonisusly sexually assault and subject Sheila Quarles, a female person, to sexual penetration, to-wit: Sexual intercourse, by the said defendant placing his penis and/or an unknown object into the genital opening of the said Sheila Quarles against her w II.

Count IV, robbery:
Did then and there willfully, unlawfully, and fel oniously take personal property, to-wit: A stereo and speakers, zell phone, and/or other personal property from the person of Sheila Quarles, or in her presence, by means of force or violence or fear of injury to and without the consent and against the will of said Sheila Quarles.

It's the duty of the jury to apply the rules of law contained in these instructions to the facts of the case and determined whether or not the defendant is guilty of the: offense charged.

Each charge and the evidence pertaining to it :hould be considered separately.

The fact that you find a defendant guilty to not guilty as to one of the offenses charged should not control you \(r\) verdict as to any other offense charged.

Four: Every person who, by day or night, enters any residence or structure with the intent to commit a larceny and/or an assault and/or a battery and/or a felony, such as se> ual assault and/or robbery, therein is guilty of burglary. ACCUSCRIPTS (702) 391-0379
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Five: Consent to enter is not a defense to the crime of burglary so long as it is proven beyond a reasonable do ibt that this entry was made with the specific intent to commit ; larceny and/or an assault and/or a battery and/or a felony thersin.

Six: Every person who, in the commission of a burglary, commits any other crime, may be prosecuted for each crime separately.

Seven: In this case the defendant is accused \(\cdot n\) an Indictment alleging an open charge of murder. This che rge may include murder of the first degree and murder of the se; ond diagnose.

The jury must decide if the defendant is guilty of any offense and, if so, of which offense.

Eight: Murder is the unlawful taking of a humitn being with malice aforethought, either express or impled.

The unlawful killing may be effectuated -- efferted by any of the various means by which death may be occas:oned.

Nine: Malice aforethought means the intention ial doing of a wrongful act without legal cause or excuse or what the: law considers adequate provocation.

The condition of mind described as mallce afor athought may arise from anger, hatred, revenge, or from a partic ular ill will, spite or grudge toward the person killed.

It may also arise from any unjustifiable or unie wful motive or purpose to injure another, proceeding from a heart ACCUSCRIPTS (702) 391-0379
fatally bent on mischief or with reckless disregard of consequences and social duty

Malice aforethought does not imply deliberation or the lapse of any considerable time between the malicious intention to injure another, and the actual execution of the intent, but denotes an unlawful purpose and design as opposed to accident and mischance

Ten: Express malice is that deliberate intention unlawfully to take away the life of a human being, which is manifested by external circumstances capable of proof.

Malice may be implied when no considerable provocation appears, or when all the circumstances of the killing show an abandoned and malignant heart.

Eleven: Murder of the first degree is murder which is, A, committed in the perpetration or attempted perpetration of a burglary, sexual assault, or robbery; or, B, perpetrated by any kind of willful, deliberate and premeditated killing.

Twelve: Murder of the first degree is murder which is perpetrated by means in any kind of willfull, deliberate and premeditated killing. All three elements -- wilfutness, deliberation, and premeditation -- must be proven beyond a reasonable doubt before an accused can be convicted of first degree murder.

Willfulness is the intent to kill. There need be no appreciable space in of time between the formation of the intent ACCUSCRIPTS (702) 391-0379
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to kill and the act of killing.
Deliberation is the process of determining upon a course of action to kill as a result of thought, including weighing the reasons for and against the action and considers the consequences of the actions.

A deliberate determination may be arrived at in a short period of time. But in all cases the determination must not be formed in passion; or formed in passion, it must be carried out after there has been time for the passion to subside and deliberation to occur.

A mere unconsidered and rash impulse is not deliberate, even though it includes the intent to kill

Premedication is a design and a determination to kill distinctly formed in the mind by the time of the killing

Premedication need not be for a day, an hour, or even a minute. It may be as instantaneous as suggestive thoughts of the mind. For if the jury believes from the evidence that the act constituting the killing has been preceded by and has been the result of premeditation, no matter how rapidly the act follows the premeditation, it is premeditated.

Thirteen: The law does not undertake to measure in units of time the length of the period during which the thought must be pondered before it can ripen into an intent to kill, which is truly deliberate and premeditated.

The time will vary with different individuals and under
varying circumstances.
The true test is not duration of time, but rather the extent of the reflection.

A cold, calculated judgment and decision may be arrived at in short period of time, but a mere unconsidered anc rash impulse, even though it includes an intent to kill, is not deliberation and premeditation as will fix the unlawful \(k\) illing as murder in the first degree.

Fourteen: There are kinds of murder which ce rries with them conclusive evidence of malice aforethought. One of these classes of murder is murder committed in the perpetration or attempted perpetration of a burgiary, sexual assault or robbery.

Therefore, a killing which is committed in the perpetration of a burglary, sexual assault, or robbery is deemed to be murder of the first degree, whether the killing wa; intentional or unintentional or accidental. This is called a felony murder rule.

The intent to perpetrate or attempt to perpetr.zte the burglary, sexual assault, or robbery must be proven be /ond a reasonable doubt.

For the purposes of the felony murder rule, th e intent to commit the robbery must have arisen before or during the conduct resulting in death. However, in determining whether th e defendant had a requisite intent to commit robbery before or during the killing, you may infer that intent from the defendant's a ctions ACCUSCRIPTS (702) 391-0379

I age 152 of 187
during and immediately after the kill.
There is no felony murder rule where robbery occurs as an afterthought of the killing.

Fifteen: Although your verdict must be unanimous as to the charge, you will not have to agree on the theory of guilt.

Therefore, even if you cannot agree on whethir the facts establish premeditated murder or felony murder, so lorg as all you of you agree that the evidence establishes the defendait's guilt of murder in the first degree, your verdict shall be munler of the first degree.

Sixteen: All murder which is not murder of the first degree is murder of the second degree.

Murder of the second degree is murder with ralice aforethought, but with the admixture of premeditation ind deliberation.

Seventeen: If you find the State has establisl ed that the defendant has committed a murder of the first degiee, you should select murder of the first degree as your verdict

The crime of murder of the first degree includis the crime of murder of the second degree.

You may find the defendant guilty of the lesse - included offense of murder of the second degree if:

One, after first fully and carefully considering the charge of murder of the first degree you either, \(A\), find the defendant not guilty of that charge; or, \(B\), are unable tu agree ACCUSCRIPTS (702) 391-0379
whether to acquit or convict on that charge;
And, two, all 12 of you are convinced beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant is guilty of murder of the second degree.

If you are convinced beyond a reasonable doubt that the crime of murder has been committed by the defendant, but you have a reasonable doubt whether such murder was of the first or second degree, you must give the defendant the benefit of the doubt and return a verdict of murder of the second degree.

Eighteen: A person who subjects another person to sexual penetration against the victim's will or under conditions which the perpetrator knows or should know that the victim is mentally or physically incapable of resisting or understanding the nature of this conduct is guilty of sexual assault.

As used in these instructions, sexual penetration means any intrusion, however slight, of any part of the person's body or any object manipulated or inserted by a person into the genital or anal openings of the body of another, including sexual intercourse.

Sexual intercourse is the placing of the penis of the perpetrator into the vagina of the victim.

Nineteen: If a female yields to the sexual act of a male aggressor because she reasonably believes that resistance would result in her death or serious bodily injury, her conduct does not constitute consent.

Twenty: Physical force is not a necessary ingredient in ACCUSCRIPTS (702) 391-0379
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the commission of a sexual assault. And the crucial question is not whether the victim was physically forced to engage in a sexual assault, but whether the act was committed without her consent.

This is there is no consent where the victim is induced to submit to the sexual act through fear of death or serious bodily injury.

Twenty-one: Robbery is the unlawful taking of personal property from the person of another, or in his presence, against his will, by means of force or violence or fear of injury, immediate or future, to his person or property, or the person or property of a member of his family, or of anyone in his company at the time of the robbery.

Such force or fear must be used to obtain on retain possession of the property, to prevent or overcome resistance to the taking, or to facilitate escape, in either of which cases the degree of force is immaterial if used to compel acquiescence to the taking of or escaping with the property.

Twenty-two: To constitute the crime charged there must exist a union or joint operation of an act forbidden by law and an intent to do the act.

The intent with which an act is done is shown by the facts and circumstances surrounding the case

Do not confuse intent with motive. Motive is what prompts the person to act. Intent refers to only the state of mind with which the act is done.

Motive is not an element of the crime charged and the State is not required to prove a motive on the part of th? defendant in order to convict

However, you may consider evidence of motive: or lack of motive as circumstance in the case.

Twenty-three: The defendant is presumed inn xent until the contrary is proved. This presumption placed upon tlie State the burden of proofing beyond a reasonable doubt even material element of the crime charged and that the defendant is :he person who committed the offense.

A reasonable doubt is one based on reason. It is not mere possible doubt, but is such a doubt as would govein or control a person in the more weighty affairs of life.

If the minds of the jurors, after the entire com zarison and consideration of all of the evidence, are in such a ce ndition that they can say they feel an abiding conviction of the ruth of the charge, there is not a reasonable doubt.

Doubt to be reasonable must be actual, not mere possibility or speculation.

If you have a reasonable doubt as to the guilt ,ff the defendant, he is entitled to a verdict of not guilty.

Twenty-four: There is a constitutional right of the defendant in a criminal trial that he may not be compellid to testify. Thus, the decision as to whether he should testify is left to the defendant on the advice and counsel of his at orney. ACCUSCRIPTS (702) 391-0379
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You must not draw any inference of guilt from :he fact that he does not testify, nor should this fact be discusse f by you or entered into your deliberations in any way.

Twenty-five: The evidence which you are to cunsider in this case consists of the testimony of the witnesses, the exhibits, and any facts admitted or agreed to by counse.

There are two types of evidence: Direct and circumstantial.

Direct evidence is the testimony of a person who claims to have personal knowledge of the commission of the cr me which has been charged, such as an eye witness.

Circumstantial evidence is the proof of a chain of facts and circumstances which tend to show whether the defe ndant is guilty or not guilty.

The law makes no distinction to the weight to lie given by either direct or circumstantial evidence. Therefore, all cif the evidence in this case, including the circumstantial evidence, should be considered by you in arriving at your verdict.

Statements, arguments and opinions of counsel are not evidence in the case. However, if the attorneys stipulat: to the existence of a fact you must accept that stipulation as e idence and regard that fact as proved.

You must not speculate to be true any insinuations suggested by a question asked a witness. A question is not evidence and may be considered,only as it supplies meaning to the ACCUSCRIPTS (702) 391-0379

You must disregard any evidence to which an objection was sustained by Court or any evidence ordered stricken by the Court.

Anything you may have seen or heard outside the coutroom is not evidence and must also be disregarded.

Twenty-six: Evidence that the defendant committed offenses other than that for which he is on trial, if proven to be clear and convincing, is not admitted and may not be considered by you to prove that the defendant is a person of bad character or to prove that he has a disposition to commit crimes.

Such evidence is admitted and may be considered by you only for the limited purpose of proving the defendant's identity, intent, lack of consent on the part of the victim, a common scheme, plan, or motive, or the absence of mistake or accident, as it relates to the charges before you.

If you find the evidence to be clear and convincing you must weigh this evidence in the same manner as you do all other evidence in the case.

Twenty-seven: A witness who has special acknowiedge, skill, experience, training, or education in a particular science, profession or occupation is an expert witness.

An expert witness may give his opinion as to any manner in which he is skilled.

You should consider such expert opinion and weigh the reasons, If any, given for it.
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You are not bound, however, by such opinion. Give it the welght to which you deem it entitied, whether that be great or slight; and you may reject it if, in your judgment, the reasons given for it are unsound.

Twenty-eight: The credibility or believability of a witness should be determined by his manner upon the stand, his relationship to the parties, his fears, motives, interests or feelings, his opportunity to have observed the matter to which he testified, and the reasonableness of his statements and the strength or weakness of his recollections.

If you believe the witness has lied about any materia! fact in the case, you may disregard the entire testimony of that witness or any portion of his testimony which is not proved by other evidence.

Twenty-nine: Although you are to consider only the evidence in the case in reaching a verdict, you must bring into the consideration of the evidence your everyday common sense and judgment as reasonable men and women.

Thus, you are not limited solely to what you see and hear as the witnesses testify. You may draw reasonable inferences from the evidence which you feel are justified in light of common experience, keeping in mind that such inferences should not be based on speculation or guess.

A verdict may never be influenced by sympathy, prejudice, or public opinion.

Your decision should be the product of sincere j ddgment and sound discretion in accordance with these rules of la'v.

Thirty: You are here to determine whether the State has proven the guilt of the defendant beyond a reasonable duubt from the evidence in the case.

You are not called upon to return a verdict as to the guilt of any other person.

So, if you belleve the State has proven the guill of the defendant beyond a reasonable doubt, you should so finc, even though you may believe one or more persons are also gr-ilty.

Thirty-one, in your deliberation you may not dis cuss or consider the subject of punishment.

At this time your duty is confined to the deterr ination of the guilt or innocence of the defendant.

Thirty-two: When you retire to consider your verdict you must select one of your number to act as foreperson, whu will preside over your deliberations and will be a spokesperse \(n\) here court.

During your deliberation you will have the exhil its which were admitted into evidence, these written instructions, ind forms of verdict which have been prepared for your convenience.

Your verdicts must be unanimous.
As soon as you have agreed upon a verdict, ha'e it signed and dated by your foreperson and return with it to this rom.

Thirty-three: The verdict must represent the cunsidered ACCUSCRIPTS (702) 391-0379
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Should you require a read back you must carefully describe the testimony to be played back so that the court reporter can arrange her notes.

Remember, the Court is not at liberty to supplement the evidence.

Thirty-five: Now you will listen to the arguments of counsel, who will endeavor to aid you to reach a proper verdict, by refreshing in your minds the evidence and by showing the application thereof to the law.

But whatever counsel may say, you will bear in mind it is your duty to be governed in your deliberation by the evidence as you understand it and remember it to be and by the law as given to you in these instructions, with sole, fixed and steadfast purpose of doing equal and exact justice between the defendant and the State of Nevada.

Okay. Take your instructions, put them with your clip board, and your badge, because they will be on your chair tomorrow. You don't take them home with you.

We'll be here about 9:15 time and Officer Moon and Charmain, our staff assistant, will be out there. They will take your lunch orders. We will come in. We will hear this one very short witness. We'll hear the arguments for the State, then the defense, then the State.

If it's running a little long, people are getting tired, we may take a five minute restroom break in the middle, but as a ACCUSCRIPTS (702) 391-0379
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general proposition, it's considered good practice not to split arguments.

In other words, don't hear one tonight and then two tomorrow. You hear them in the right and consecutive order.

So other than a five minute potty break, we'll go straight through.

We'll eat lunch somewhere between tweive and one.
Wear comfortable clothes, have a good breakfast, and we'll get you the case by -- before one o'clock tomorrow.

Do not talk about the case with anyone or anyone else. Please do not read, watch or listen to a report or any commentary on the trial.

I noticed someone here earlier from the paper, so there will be another article tonight in the Nevada section.

Please do not form or express any opinion on the case until it's submitted to you.

Have a nice night. We'll see you in Court at 9:30, or 9:15 out in the hall with the officer.

Just leave your stuff the on chair. It will been there when you get here in the morning.
(The following proceedings were had in open court outside the presence of the jury panel:)

THE COURT: The jury has exited. They're not here. ACCUSCRIPTS (702) 391-0379

\section*{Mr. Flowers, I take it that when Mr. Pike says h.s has one} more witness, that you have made a joint deciston that you are not going to testify in the case. Is that right?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
THE COURT: And that's your decision based or the advice of your counsel, but ultimately it's your decision and you are comfortable with that. Correct?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
THE COURT: All right. And it's been my obsen ation that your lawyers have been extremely well prepared, extrerr ely well versed on the legal rules of 250 , and really did a fine job

I don't know how the outcome is going to be, b it do you agree with me that your lawyers have done a good job a id presented all the witnesses that you felt you had?

THE DEFENDANT: Yeah.
THE COURT: Okay. All right. Thanks.
(Sotto voce at this time.)

THE COURT: One thing about admitting something that is actually irrelevant is it doesn't hurt anything. It's not
relevant, you know. Okay. Have a good night.
MR. PIKE: Thank you.
MS. LUZAICH: Good night, Judge.
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(Proceedings concluded.)
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\section*{Z}
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DEFENDANT'S PROPOSED JURY INSTRUCTIONS NOT USED AT TRIAL
Attached hereto are the proposed jury instructions which were offered to the Court, but not submitted to the jury in the above entitled action.

DATED: This \(20^{\text {TH }}\) day of October, 2008.

Edward A. Friedland, Clerk of the Court

By:

\(\qquad\)
A finding of guilt as to any crime may not be based on circumstantial evidence unless the proved circumstances are not only (1) consistent with the theory that the defendant is guilty of the crime, but (2) cannot be reconciled with any other rational conclusion.

Further, each fact which is essential to complete a set of circumstances necessary to establish the defendant's guilt must be proved beyond a reasonable doubt. In other words, before an inference essential to establish guilt may be found to have been proved beyond a reasonable doubt, each fact or circumstance on which the inference necessarily rests must be proved beyond a reasonable doubt.

Also, if the circumstantial evidence [as to any particular count] permits two reasonable interpretations, one of which points to the defendant's and the other to his innocence, you must adopt that interpretation that points to the defendant's innocence, and reject that interpretation that points to his guilt.

If, on the other hand, one interpretation of this evidence appears to you to be reasonable and the other interpretation to be unreasonable, you must accept the reasonable interpretation and reject the unreasonable.

CALJIC 2.01 Sufficiency of Circumstantial Evidence

Sanborn v. State, 107 Nev. 399, 812 P.2d 1279 (1991).

The State in an effort to present the circumstances surrounding the commission of a crime, has presented evidence of pending allegations of crimes for which Mr. Flowers has not been convicted. You may consider this circumstantial evidence if you believe beyond a reasonable doubt that theother alleged crime must be so interconnected to the act(s) in question that a witness cannot describe the act in controversy without referring to the other alleged crime.

Note: NRS 48.035 (3) requires the giving of a cautionary instruction explaining the reason for its admission at the request of an interested party.

Language taken from Bletcher v. State, \(111 \mathrm{Nev} .1477,1480,907\) P. 2 d 978 (1995).

If the evidence in this case is subject to two constructions of interpretations, each of which appears to you to be reasonable, and one of which points to the guilt of the defendant, and the other to innocence of the defendant and to the guilt of another, it is your duty, to adopt the interpretation which will admit of the defendant's innocence, and reject that which points to guilt.

You will notice the rule applies only when both of the two possible opposing conclusions appear to you to be reasonable. If, on the other hand, one of the possible conclusions should appear to you to be reasonable and the other to be unreasonable, it would be your duty to adhere to the reasonable deduction and to reject the unreasonable, bearing in mind, however, even if the reasonable deduction points to defendant's guilt, the entire proof must be beyond a reasonable doubt to support a verdict of guilty.

In Crane v. State, 88 Nev. 684, 687; 504 P.2d 12 (1972), the court said it was permissible to give this instruction when the evidence is circumstantial.

It is as much a prosecutor's duty to refrain from improper methods calculated to produce a wrongful conviction as it is to use every legitimate means to bring about a just one.

Mazzan v. State, 116 Nev. Adv. Op. No. 7, 30P.2d 1128, 1132 (September 17, 2000).
\(\qquad\)
Corroborating evidence must independently connect the defendant with the offense; evidence does not suffice as corroborative if it merely supports the accomplice's testimony. If there is no independent, inculpatory evidence - evidence tending to connect the defendant with the offense, "there is no corroboration, though the accomplice may be corroborated in regard to any number of facts sworn to him. Where the connecting evidence shows no more than an opportunity to commit a crime, simply proves suspicion, or is equally consonant with the reasonable explanation pointing toward innocent conduct on the part of the defendant, the evidence is to be deemed insufficient.

Austin v. State, 87 Nev. 578, 585, 491 P.2d 724, 728-29 (1971).
111 Nev. at 1250-51 (quoting State v. Dannels, 226 Mont. 80, 734 P.2d 188, 194 (Mont.
1987) Quoting State v. Mitchell, 192 Mont. 16, 625 P.2d 1155, 1158 (Mont. 1980).

The flight of Jesus Nava Jr. immediately after the commission of a crime, is not sufficient in itself to establish the guilt of Jesus Nava Jr., but is a fact which, if proved, may be considered by you in the light of all other proved facts in deciding whether Mr. Floers is guilty or not guilty.

\subsection*{1.05}

\section*{LESSER INCLUDED OFFENSES \({ }^{1}\)}

If the State proves a defendant guilty of the charged offense beyond a reasonable doubt the jury shall convict the defendant of that offense. However, if the jury is not convinced of the defendant's guilt of the charged offense, they may return a verdict of guilty on an offense, which was not charged, the commission of which is necessarily included in the offense charged, if the evidence is sufficient to establish the defendant's guilt of such offense beyond a reasonable doubt.
[In this case the defendant is accused in an [Information/Indictment] \({ }^{2}\) alleging an open charge of murder. This charge may include murder of the first degree, murder of the second degree, voluntary manslaughter and involuntary manslaughter.

The jury must decide if the defendant is guilty of any offense and, if so, of which offense \({ }^{3}\).



\footnotetext{
1 This instruction is the general instruction a specific instruction should be given for each potential lesser included.
\({ }^{2}\) Please select the appropriate language.
\({ }^{3}\) This language is for murder cases only.
}

INSTRUCTION NO. \(\qquad\)

\section*{MANSLAUGHTER DEFINED}
1. Manslaughter is the unlawful killing of a human being without malice express or implied and without any mixture of deliberation. It is not divided into degrees but is of two kinds, namely, voluntary manslaughter and involuntary manslaughter.

NRS 200.040.
\(\qquad\)

\section*{MANSLAUGHTER DEFINED}
1. Manslaughter is the unlawful killing of a human being without malice express or implied and without any mixture of deliberation. It is not divided into degrees but is of two kinds, namely, voluntary manslaughter and involuntary manslaughter.

INSTRUCTION NO. \(\qquad\)

\section*{MURDER AND VOLUNTARY MANSLAUGHTER DISTINGUISHED}

The distinction between murder and voluntary manslaughter is that murder requires malice while voluntary manslaughter does not.

When the act causing the death, though unlawful, is done upon a sudden heat of passion caused by a provocation apparently sufficient to make the passion irresistible, the offense is voluntary manslaughter. In such a case (even if an intent to kill exists) the law is that malice, which is an essential element of murder, is absent.

To establish that a killing is murder and not voluntary manslaughter, the burden is on the state to prove beyond a reasonable doubt each of the elements of murder and that the act which caused the death was not done in a heat of passion as defined in these instructions.

This instruction should only be used when the issue of killing in a heat of passion has been properly raised by the evidence presented either by the State or the defense.

A sudden heat of passion can occur without a direct physical assault. Roberts v. State, 102 Nev. 170, 717 P.2d 1115 (1986).
\(\qquad\)

\section*{MURDER AND VOLUNTARY MANSLAUGHTER DISTINGUISHED}

The distinction between murder and voluntary manslaughter is that murder requires malice while voluntary manslaughter does not.

When the act causing the death, though unlawful, is done upon a sudden heat of passion caused by a provocation apparently sufficient to make the passion irresistible, the offense is voluntary manslaughter. In such a case (even if an intent to kill exists) the law is that malice, which is an essential element of murder, is absent.

To establish that a killing is murder and not voluntary manslaughter, the burden is on the state to prove beyond a reasonable doubt each of the elements of murder and that the act which caused the death was not done in a heat of passion as defined in these instructions.
\(\qquad\)

\section*{MURDER AND VOLUNTARY MANSLAUGHTER DISTINGUISHED}

The distinction between murder and voluntary manslaughter is that murder requires malice while voluntary manslaughter does not.

The killing must be voluntary, upon a sudden heat of passion, and caused by a provocation apparently sufficient to make the passion irresistible. "Heat of passion" as the term is used in these instructions means such passion as naturally would be aroused in the mind of a reasonable person in the same or similar circumstances. The circumstances and facts must be such as would cause a reasonable person to act rashly, without reflection and deliberation, from passion rather than from judgment. If you determine that a reasonable person who was placed in the same position in which the defendant was found, and knew what the defendant then knew, would have been thrown into a heat of passion, then such a killing is voluntary manslaughter.

A sudden heat of passion can occur without a direct physical assault.
To establish that a killing is murder and not voluntary manslaughter, the burden is on the state to prove beyond a reasonable doubt each of the elements of murder and that the act which caused the death was not done in a heat of passion as defined in these instructions.

NRS 200.040, 200.050, 200.060. The crime of manslaughter does not require specific intent to kill. Hancock v. State, 80 Nev. 581, 397 P.2d 181 (1964)

A serious and highly provoking injury need not be a direct physical assault on the accused. Roberts v. State, 102. Nev. 170, 717 P.2d 1115 (1986.

This instruction should be used when the issue of killing in a heat of passion has been properly raised by the evidence presented either by the State or the defense.

A sudden heat of passion can occur without a direct physical assault. Roberts v. State, 102 Nev. 170, 717 P.2d 1115 (1986).
\(\qquad\)

\section*{MURDER AND VOLUNTARY MANSLAUGHTER DISTINGUISHED}

The distinction between murder and voluntary manslaughter is that murder requires malice while voluntary manslaughter does not.

The killing must be voluntary, upon a sudden heat of passion, and caused by a provocation apparently sufficient to make the passion irresistible. "Heat of passion" as the term is used in these instructions means such passion as naturally would be aroused in the mind of a reasonable person in the same or similar circumstances. The circumstances and facts must be such as would cause a reasonable person to act rashly, without reflection and deliberation, from passion rather than from judgment. If you determine that a reasonable person who was placed in the same position in which the defendant was found, and knew what the defendant then knew, would have been thrown into a heat of passion, then such a killing is voluntary manslaughter.

A sudden heat of passion can occur without a direct physical assault.
To establish that a killing is murder and not voluntary manslaughter, the burden is on the state to prove beyond a reasonable doubt each of the elements of murder and that the act which caused the death was not done in a heat of passion as defined in these instructions.

\subsection*{6.20 BENEFIT OF DOUBT (MANSLAUGHTER)}

If you are satisfied beyond a reasonable doubt that the killing was unlawful, but you have a reasonable doubt whether the crime is murder or manslaughter, you must give the defendant the benefit of such doubt and find it to be manslaughter rather than murder.

INSTRUCTION NO.

\subsection*{6.20 BENEFIT OF DOUBT (MANSLAUGHTER)}

If you are satisfied beyond a reasonable doubt that the killing was unlawful, but you have a reasonable doubt whether the crime is murder or manslaughter, you must give the defendant the benefit of such doubt and find it to be manslaughter rather than murder.

NRS 175.501.

Robbery is the unlawful taking of personal property from the person of another, or in his presence, against his will, by means of force or violence or fear of injury, immediate or future, to his person or property, with the specific intent to permanently deprive the owner of his property. Such force or fear must be used to obtain or retain possession of the property, or to prevent or overcome resisting to the taking, in either of which cases the degree of force is immaterial. Such taking constitutes Robbery whenever it appears that although the taking was fully completed without the knowledge of the person from whom taken, such knowledge was prevented by the use of force of fear.

If the specific intent to' take personal property from another was not formed until after the death of the victim a robbery has not been committed.


INSTRUCTION NO.
If the intent to steal arose after the use of force, then the taking is not robbery.
\(\qquad\)

A homicide committed while perpetrating or attempting to perpetrate a robbery is firstdegree murder. This is known as the felony-murder rule.

To support a finding of felony-murder the State must prove beyond a reasonable doubt that the intent to rob was formed prior to the killing of the victim and that the killing occurred in the course of the robbery. If the State does not prove beyond a reasonable doubt that the intent to commit the alleged robbery was formed in advance of the killing, the jury may not find the defendant guilty of first-degree murder under the felony-murder rule.

Thomas v. State, 120 Nev. 37, 83 P.3d 818 (2004).
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```

you went into custody?
THE WITNESS: Yeah, she came to visit me.
THE COURT: She came to visit you once?
Was she by herself?
THE WITNESS: Yeah.
THE COURT: Okay. I think they're just gonna ask you if you knew her, if you were her boyfriend, then blah, blah, blah, blah, blah and you haven't seen her since other than that.
MS. LUZAICH: Blah, blah, blah and then we're yada, yada, yada?
THE COURT: Whatever. Let's go.
(Whereupon, the jury entered the courtroom.)
THE COURT: Okay. Let's go on the record in Case No. C228755, State of Nevada versus Norman Keith Flowers.
Let the record reflect the presence of the defendant, his counsel, counsel for the State. All ladies and gentlemen of the jury are back in the box.
Pretty good. End of day five and we haven't lost a juror and nobody's got sick or had a family emergency. That only happens about 25 percent of the time we get to this without losing

```

\section*{6}
one.
Sir, will you stand and do your best to raise your right hand.
(Whereupon, William Kinsey was duly sworn to tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth.)
THE CLERK: Thank you. Please be seated. And could you please state your full name and spell your first and last name.

THE WITNESS: William Jermaine Kinsey. William, \(W\)-i-1-1-i-a-m. Kinsey, K-i-n-s-e-y.

THE COURT: Go ahead.
MR. PIKE: Thank you very much. DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. PIKE:
Q. Mr. Kinsey, you've been brought into court today to testify about a Sheila Quarles. Did you know Sheila Quarles before she passed away?
A. Yes, sir
Q. And how did you know her?
A. She was my girlfriend.
Q. And you have been in custody since

December of 2004; is that correct?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. You ded to speak up just a little bit.
A. Yes, sir.
Q. While you were in custody, did Sheila come to visit you?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. How long had you been her boyfriend before you went into custody in 2004 ?
A. Six months.
Q. Six months. During that period of time, you got to know her family, too?
A. Not really.
Q. Just her?
A. Just her.
Q. Okay. While you got to know her and she came to visit you while you were in custody, did she also write to you?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And on some of the letters that she wrote to you, did she in fact put your last name as her last name as though you were married?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. So you would considered the two of you very close?
A. Yes.
Q. If fact, before you went into custody,
were you intimate with her?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. During - after you were in custody and when you found out about her, her death, after that time, me and another inves -- or an investigator came in and spoke with you; is that correct?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. During our conversations, did you try to answer all of our questions?
A. To the best of my ability.
Q. Okay. And during, during that conversation, and up to that time that we met with you, you hadn't met with any police officers?
A. No, not until after you all.
Q. Okay. And some police officers came to talk with you afterwards?
A. Yeah.
Q. They came up to talk with you how long ago?
A. Probably like the next Friday after you all came. A week after you all came.
Q. All right. And you provided us with the names of individuals who you may be helpful and tried to give us any information that you thought might be helpful to us in our investigation?


1
1 \(\quad\) Q. And does that fairly fupesent the stereo 17 that was missing at the time of your sister's death?

18
A. Oh, not the little one, but the one with the CD loader, yes.
Q. Right. The big, new one you told them it was missing?
A. Yes. I was noticed it was missing.
Q. Did you ever tell the police later on
that the little boom box was missing?
A. No.

MS. LUZAICH: Thank you.
THE COURT: Okay. Thanks, Mr. Quarles.
Who's next?
MS. WECKERLY: Dan Long.
THE COURT: And is this it?
MS. WECKERLY: Yes.
(Whereupon, Detective Dan Long was duly sworn to tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth.)
THE CLERK: Thank you. Please be seated.
Please state your full name and spell your first and last name for the record.

THE WITNESS: Dan Long. D-a-n. L-o-n-g. DIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MS. WECKERLY:
Q. And Detective Long, you were present at 25
was sometime obviously after the-police cleared the scene, otherwise you wouldn't have these photos of them?
A. Yes, ma'am.
Q. Did Debra Quarles or any of her family members ever report to you that that boom box I showed you from the kitchen in State's 139 was missing?
A. No.
Q. Sometime in \(\rightarrow\) well, let me ask you this: At some point in the investigation, you took Ms. Luzaich and I with yourself and Detective Sherwood to go and see an inmate by the name of William Kinsey?
A. Yes, ma'am.
Q. And he was in prison at the time?
A. Yes, ma'am.
Q. Do you recall when it was that we went?
A. It was, I believe it was September of '07.
Q. Okay. When you and/or Detective Sherwood questioned Mr. Kinsey, was that done in a harsh and aggressive manner?
A. No.
Q. Why wouldn't you do that? went in there and again told him that he wasn't involved in this murder, he had nothing to worry about, we weren't gonna ask questions about anything else, and we were pleading with him to give us any information about anything that would help us in the Sheila Quarles' case. Any boyfriends, anything he might know about problems with her. Anything.
Q. And I guess would you describe him as cooperative?
A. No. He, he just, he was not gonna give us a statement, was not interested in talking to us and he told us.

MS. WECKERLY: Thank you. Nothing else, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Any questions?
MR. PIKE: May we approach the bench,
Your Honor?
(Whereupon, an off-the-record discussion was had at the bench.)
THE COURT: Anything else?
MS. WECKERLY: No, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Thanks Detective Long.
Appreciate your time. State rests.
MR. PIKE: Well, I have a question.
anything else ..

MR. PIKE: I'm sorry.
THE COURT: You turned around and walked
back. I thought you were done. Excuse me, Mr. Pike.

THE WITNESS: You got me all excited there.

\section*{CROSS-EXAMINATION}

BY MR. PIKE:
Q. When I use the term harsh, that's your interpretation, you don't feel that you were unduly harsh, and that's your testimony, correct?
A. That I wasn't harsh in any way, yeah.
Q. But that's your opinion. Now, it may be the opinion of another individual that your tactics to him were harsh and so you can't interpret how he took that?
A. There's no way he could have taken it as harsh.
Q. Again, you don't know him, he could have taken it as harsh and you can't interpret what his feelings were?

MS. WECKERLY: Objection, asked and
answered.
24
MR. PIKE: You may feel --
THE COURT: He can answer again, but I
mean --
BY MR. PIKE:
Q. You may feel that my cross-examination is harsh?

THE COURT: I don't think so.
THE WITNESS: I don't either.
BY MR. PIKE:
Q. Okay. But somebody else might?

THE COURT: Nah. I don't think so.
MR. PIKE: Okay. Thank you very much.
THE COURT: You're always a gentleman.
MR. PIKE: That's quite a compliment.
BY MR. PIKE:
Q. And you know from your experience as a detective that the sheer -- just the mirror presence of police officers talking to an inmate at a location in Nevada State Prison is an uncomfortable situation for the inmate?
A. We were, we made specific .. we were in the cafeteria. We weren't ..
Q. The common area, the cafeteria?
A. We weren't in uniform. I was as gentle as I could possibly about be. And I was sitting
down when he came in, I wasn't squnding up.
Q. I'm asking .-
A. We tried everything possible.
Q. Excuse me. I asked a yes or no question.

THE COURT: What's the relevance of this?
This gentleman's been in jail since December of \({ }^{+} 04\).
He didn't have anything to do with this case. Who cares what their various interpretations of their questioning of him was?

MR. PIKE: That he's giving information.
He's giving important information. He gave information to us, he didn't give information to them and that, and that's explained under the circumstances in which the investigation occurred. Who was talking to him.

MS. WECKERLY: Objection.
THE COURT: I'm positive that they
understand that point. I'm positive they do.
MR. PIKE: All right. Thank you.
THE COURT: Okay. Anything else?
MS. WECKERLY: No.
THE COURT: Thanks, detective.
Appreciate it.
THE WITNESS: Thank you.
THE COURT: Any sur-rebuttal?
26
MR. PIKE: No, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay. Case stands submitted?
MS. WECKERLY: Yes.
THE COURT: Okay. Well, we've already read the instructions last night. So you can pull out your instructions and you're ready to go.

Ms. Luzaich.
MS. LUZAICH: Good morning, Tadies and gentlemen. I'd first like to thank you all for your time, your attention and your patience in this case. Being jurors as you've all
discovered at this point is a difficult job. It calls for many sacrifices as well as some emotional well being issues. But without people like yourselves that are willing to take time out of your lives and sit as jurors, our system simply couldn't function. So for that we thank you.

The court told you yesterday while reading the instruction that's this is the time set for closing argument. And, you know, in all the years I've been doing this, I never understood why they call it closing argument. I'm not gonna stand here and argue with you. I'm not gonna stand here and argue with the defense.

What it is really is our opportunity
for the first me to explain to you how we perceive the evidence turned out because we know you've been sitting here and diligently listening for the last few days, how the evidence turned out and how it applies to the law that the court read you last night.

Remember please, one very important instruction the court read to you is that statements of counsel are not evidence. What I say up here, when Ms. Weckerly stands up, what she says up here is not evidence. What Mr. Pike said in opening last week, not evidence. What Mr. Patrick says when he gets up, not evidence.

The only evidence that you can consider in this case is what comes from here. People stood here, they raised their right hand, they swore to tell the truth and they told you things and they showed you things. And this is all that you can consider in deciding this case.

But also remember another very important instruction, the court told you last night that you must use your common sense. Just because we're in a courtroom and the judge is in a robe and there are flags doesn't mean you check your common sense at the door. Use your common sense. You have 28
all lived lives and have daily experiences. You don't forget about them. Use your common sense to draw inferences from the evidence and the testimony that you've heard.

Andrew Young once commented, It is a blessing to die for a cause because you can so easily die for nothing.

Often in cases of homicide, we are left with a question why. And many times as in this particular case, we will never know. What we do know is that a young 18 year old girl died in a completely senseless way. She had so much going for her. She did not deserve what happened to her on March 24th of 2005.

Today the State of Nevada is going to ask you for justice. Now, I'm going to apologize in advance, my comments to you this morning are going to be fairly lengthy. I know that you have sat diligently listening and taking notes over the last few days, but a lot of information was shared with you over the last few days.

This is a very serious case and I just want to make sure that we are on the same page when it comes to everything. So as you're sitting there if you're getting kind of bored and antsy and
you're kind of wondering when \(i\) manch coming, what am I gonna have for lunch, please bear with me. Sheila deserves this, the State of Nevada deserves it.

In this case, you have several charges to decide. The court read you the instructions, and I'm not gonna read through absolutely everything, I promise.

But Instruction No. 4 tells us first, burglary, every person who by day or night enters a house or building with the intent to commit a larceny or an assault and or battery or felony such as sexual assault or burglary -- or I'm sorry, robbery, is guilty of burglary.

Now, folks, burglary is a crime of
entry. The crime of burglary is technically complete when the person enters a building with some evil intent. Now the evil intent has to be the appropriate evil intent to steal, to commit a felony, to commit an assault or battery, but if he enters with that intent, it is a burglary.

Consent to enter is not a defense to the crime of burglary as long as it is shown that the entry was made with the specific intent to do that bad thing; to steal, to commit an assault or
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battery, to commit a felony.
So when on March 24th, 2005 the police went to the residence and they looked at the door and they saw no sign of forced entry, does that mean that there was no burglary? No, it does not.

So for example if Sheila knew her attacker and let him in, what is important is what was his intent when he entered the residence. And the facts that you have before you is that he had no reason to be there. He did not work in that complex. Veronica Sigala told you that. He never worked there. He wasn't dating Debra. Although he had been dating Debra, that was over months and months and months ago.

Sheila is an 18 -year-old girl. The defendant at the time was a 31 -year-old man. Sheila is seeing somebody, Chicken. In fact, she had had sex with him earlier.

So he had no reason to be there. What was his intent when he entered? To get what he wanted, whether she wanted to give it or not.

Instruction No. 8 starts talking about the murder instruction. Murder is the unlawful killing of a human being with malice \(\begin{array}{lll}\text { aforethought. Killing with malice is murder. So } & 25\end{array}\)

1 easier. Willin is another word for intentional.
2 Hands around the neck moving and squeezing, moving
3 and squeezing. 12 to 15 separate hemorrhages in the neck. Obviously intentional.

Deliberate. He could have stopped at any time. As he sat there with his hands around 7 the neck squeezing and squeezing and squeezing and 8 squeezing and rearranging, he could have stopped and 9 did not.
champion is at a restaurant with his girlfriend and somebody's ogling his girlfriend and he gets really angry and he gets up and he walks up to the guy and wham. Two shots; one to the head, head hits floor and the guy dies. Did he intend to kill the guy? No. Implied malice.

So once you decide that Sheila's killing was a murder, you have to decide was it murder of the first degree or, or murder of the second degree. Sorry about that.

In every case of murder in the State
of Nevada, that is the jury's decision. They have
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to decide is it first or is it second.

17 I'm sorry. First degree or second degree. Anything that is not first-degree murder is second-degree murder. First I'm gonna talk to you about willful, premeditated and deliberated murder.

Instruction No. 12 discusses for you
when a killing is willful, deliberate and premeditated.

And Instruction No. 12 is really
long and I'm gonna break it down for you much

Premeditated. Premeditation is basically the determination to kill. By the time he committed the intentional killing, the act of the killing, he had the determination to do so. He had decided to do so. It wasn't just a reflexive act, it wasn't his hands around her neck -- I'm sorry. know I keep saying this, but it is so telling the fact that the hands kept squeezing for so long.

Now, there's a misconception about premeditated and deliberated murder that people have had over all the years. Most people think that if you find your wife is having an affair, you decide you're gonna do something about it, and you spend the next six months planning, you're gonna follow them somewhere, you buy a gun, you buy duct tape, you do all those things and then six months later
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your plan takes effect, you follow them, you go to the hotel, you break in, you shoot them, you tie them up, obviously that would be premeditated and deliberate.

However, Instruction No. 12 also tells us that premeditation need not be for a day, for an hour or even for a minute. It can be as quick as successive thoughts of the mind.

So willful on purpose; deliberate, he thought about it; premeditated, he made a decision.

An easier example of premeditation and deliberation -- and they're both to so closely intertwined, they're almost the same, but they're not. You have to decide beyond a reasonable doubt that each of those elements were met. That it was willful, that it was deliberate and that it was premeditated.

So for example, something happens every day. You're driving down the street and you're coming up to a light. The light turns yellow. As you're driving, what goes through your mind when you see that light turn yellow? Well, you're thinking, how far away am I from the light. How fast am I going. Can I make it. How late am I
for work. Am I gonna get pulled.ver. Is there a police officer there. Is there somebody coming in the other direction that's gonna hit me as I go through and it's actually red.

These are all things that flip through your mind in a split second. So when you put your foot on the gas and you decide to go, you have premeditated and deliberated that you're gonna run that light.

Or if you put your foot on the brake and decide to stop, again, you have premeditated and deliberated that you're not going to run the light. It only took seconds, but it was successive thoughts of the mind.

With Instruction No. 12, we are
further told that deliberation is the process of determining upon a course of action to kill as a result of thought, including weighing the reasons for and against the action and considering the consequences. If I run the light am I gonna get a ticket. Can I cause an accident. If I don't run the light, no ticket, no accident, but I'm gonna be late for work. Deliberation.

In Sheila's case, the hands
rearranged so many times on her neck instead of
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merely removed and walked away, that is
deliberation. The State has proven beyond a reasonable doubt that the act was premeditated and deliberated.

However, you can also decide in this case first-degree murder by means of the felony murder rule.

Instruction No. 14 tells us there are certain kinds of murder that carry with them conclusive evidence of malice aforethought.

So where a killing occurs during the perpetration of one of these felonies, you go right to first-degree murder. Burglary, sexual assault, robbery, are those felonies.

Now, although the State submits that we have proven it by premeditation and deliberation, I still want to talk to you a little bit about first-degree murder by felony murder because you're also gonna decide the other counts anyway.

Just as an aside, when you are making your decision, you have to be unanimous only that it was first-degree murder. Six of you can say well, I believe it's first-degree murder because it was premeditated and deliberated. Six of you can say I believe it's first-degree murder because it
was felony muluer. You just all twelve have to say I believe it was first-degree murder.

Sexual assault. Instruction No. 18 tells us that a person who subjects another person to sexual penetration against the victim's will is guilty of sexual assault.

What is sexual assault? Basically it's penetration without consent. Now, generally in a sexual assault case, the victim will come in here and she'11 sit right there and she'll swear to tell the truth and she'll tell you he put his penis in my vagina, I didn't want to do it, I told him I didn't want to do it and there's your sexual assault.

Well, in this particular case,
obviously because he then killed her, she can't come in and say that. So what we do is we look to other circumstances or other evidence to determine was there penetration without consent.

Penetration is putting any part of a body, for example the penis, or an object, into the genital or anal opening of another; including sexual intercourse obviously.

Physical force is not a necessary
ingredient. So when you think of sexual assault of forced acts, somebody holding him down and beating
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him up and big old fight ensuing. That is not the case. There need not be anything like that. It just has to be without consent. That's all.

What evidence do we have that shows us that it was without consent?

First we heard from Dr. Simms. And Dr. Simms told you when he observed the photographs of the vagina that he believed that a violent sexual assault had occurred. He described for you the tears in the lining of Sheila's vagina. The type of which he only sees in forcible sex situations.

But remember, he also told you that he's not only been a pathologist, he's not only examined the vaginas of women who are no longer alive, but he had a general practice, that he did do internal examinations, that he has seen sexual assault victims alive, so he's seen what their vaginas looked like after having being been assaulted when he had told him, yeah, I didn't want to do that, it was done against my will. So he's got both experience.

He told you that based on what he saw, something was inserted into Sheila's vagina at a time that her vagina was not relaxed, and that is what caused those lacerations in her vagina.

Now, Linda Ebbert described for you the multiple lacerations in Sheila's vagina. And
\[
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But furthermore tumshow you it was not consensual, you heard about the blunt forced trauma to her head that was contemporaneous with her death, at the same time of her death, that was contemporaneous with the sexual assault at the same time as the sexual assault. You heard about the contusion to her abdomen, you heard about the abrasion on the back of the knee. All of these things that occurred at the same time.

But not only did you hear from Dr. Simms, you heard from Linda Ebbert. Linda Ebbert the sexual assault nurse examined her who has examined thousands of ladies who have been the victims of sexual assault or nonconsensual sex.

Remember how she talked to you about the human response, the human sexual response which prevents injury to the vaginal area. How if a woman is a willing participant, her vagina will lubricate, it enables the penis to slide in. How the pelvis will tilt, unknowingly the pelvis will tilt to actually accommodate the penis. None of that happened here and that is how those injuries occurred.
she was even more specific. She called them remember, jagged cuts. Not just a rubbing of the skin inside the vagina, not just a rubbing or bruising, a cut, a jagged cut. She describes one as significant, very significant because it was wide and deep. And in fact that there were multiple lacerations she told you means more force was used. All of what she saw she told you was consistent with nonconsensual sex.

In Sheila's case a penis was forced inside of her vagina and left evidence behind.

Now, Dr, Simms talked to you about the sexual assault being contemporaneous with her death. And how he knows that is there were hemorrhages there. Hemorrhages, the body bled and therefore she was still alive at the time of the assault.

So it's penetration of a live person's body. And because there was no swelling observed, we know that it was very close in time to her death.

Remember how he told you, Dr. Simms, that when something is inserted in the vagina and the lacerations involuntary, forcibly inserted in the vagina and it causes lacerations, they will
bleed immediatry and will essentially immediately begin to swell. You may not see the swelling at first, but he said you will see the swelling within 20 to 30 minutes. And he saw no swelling yet. No swelling. So the penis was forced inside her vagina within 20 to 30 minutes of her death.

And again, the blunt forced trauma to her head contemporaneous with her death, the contusion to her abdomen, the abrasion to the back of her knees, all of those things contemporaneous with her death, with the forceful insertion in her vagina. So not only was she sexually assaulted, but because she was sexually assaulted during the perpetration of .- or she was murdered, sorry, during the perpetration of the sexual assault, you further have first-degree murder by means of the felony murder rule.

Instruction No. 21 talks to us about robbery. And robbery is the unlawful taking of personal property from the person of another or in his or her presence against their will by means of force or fear or injury.

Now, you've heard a lot about the stereo that was stolen. The stereo that was just recently bought and placed in the house. You heard
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about the cell phones that was missing and never found, and you heard about the bank card that was missing and never found.

You heard about and saw pictures of the pillow cases on the bed. There were multiple pillows in the bedroom. Two of them did not have pillow cases. Pillow cases. What a way to take a large stereo out of the apartment without being noticed.

All of this we know happened after Sheila got home. We know that in the morning the stereo was there, Debra saw it before she left for work. We know that while Quince was on the phone, Quince Toney was on the phone with Sheila she heard music on the background. So the stereo was there. The stereo is only missing when Sheila is found dead. Robbery.

Now, because the evidence demonstrates beyond a reasonable doubt that these crimes have been committed, you also have to determine who committed the crimes. I would submit to you that the State has proven beyond a reasonable doubt that it was Norman Flowers, the defendant, who committed these crimes.

Now what do we know in this case?

Most of what we know, most factsure not at issue in this case. We know that Sheila Quarles, who her family and friends called Pooka, was 18 years old at the time. We know that on the date of her death on March 24th, 2005, she came home in the morning having spent the night at Quince's house. Quince her girlfriend.

We know that because one, Quince told you about how she had picked her up the night before, they spent the night, she took Sheila home in the morning. We know that because Debra told you that Sheila left the night before, went to Quince's and came home in the morning at or about the time that Debra was going to work. So we know that Sheila got home around 6:30 in the morning?

We know that she had been ill and had not been to work for a couple of days. We know that both because Debra told us about that and because Quince told us about that.

We know that Debra went to work and Quince went to work. We know that both Debra and Quince spoke with Sheila periodically through the day. And we know that because both Debra told us that and Quince told us that, but we know from Detective Vacarro that when he went into the home
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and he looked at the land line, the phone that was in the house, the caller ID showed Debra had called. We know that Quince had spoken to Sheila because Detective Wildman when he spoke to Quince looked at her cell phone and looked at the caller ID and it corroborated what Quince had said about talking to Sheila periodically throughout the day.

We know that the stereo was in the apartment that morning. As I indicated, Debra saw it that morning, Quince heard it while she spoke with Sheila at either 11:00 or at 12:30.

We know that although Sheila had a relationship had with Quince, she also had a relationship with George Brass who many people have affectionately refer to as Chicken.

We know that because Debra one, told us that George Brass and Sheila were very close, they were neighbors, they were very close, saw them together all the time.

We heard from Ameia Fuller who is Sheila's cousin and very close friend that she knew about Chicken from Sheila.

And we knew from George Brass
himself who came in here, sat there and told you
that he had been seeing Sheila for quite sometime.
friend, Ralph, Sheila's brother, and that Ralph
at the same time.

We know that they had a sexual relationship, and we know that for several reasons.
7 One, like I said, George Brass sat there and told us
8 about that, but we also know because Christina
9 Paulette, remember the DNA analyst. She had 10 analyzed swabs from Sheila's vagina and found on 11 those swabs obviously a mixture of DNA, but she 12 found Sheila's DNA and she found George Brass's DNA. 13 So we know that he was telling the truth because the 14 scientific evidence supported it.

We know that Debra talks to Sheila around 1 o'clock, 1:15. Remember Debra described for you how she was talking to Sheila on the land line and the phone went dead. Sheila was not heard from again after that.

Now, Debra thought the phone went dead because the battery had died which very possible or because something bad happened to Sheila right then.

So we know also that Debra came home and then 911 was called at \(2: 51,10\) to \(3: 00\). So we 48
1 know that Sheila was killed between 1:00 and a quarter to 3:00.

Basically Debra talks to Sheila at around 1 o'clock. The next thing we know for sure, Debra comes home, she's got bags of groceries, she honks thinking Pooka's gonna come out and help her, but she doesn't. Debra doesn't really think anything of it at that point because Robert Lewis looks out, sees, comes out and helps.

And we know that because Debra told us that he came down and helped and Robert Lewis also came in and he talked to us about it. He came, he helped, he brought Debra into the home with her bags.

And remember, when Debra came home, the door was not locked. It was closed, but it was not locked. It was Sheila practice to lock the door when she was home alone, but on this occasion, it was not locked.

Now, at that very moment in time, Debra didn't think anything of that. It wasn't until she went inside, sat her bags down, calling Pooka, Pooka, no answer. Then she looks here, then she looks there, she noticed the stereo's gone.

Well, she goes into the bathroom and

1 it's feeling kind of steamy, the ohower curtain is
closed, she opens the curtain and there is Sheila under water, hot water.

Remember Debra told you the water was hot to the touch, and the faucet, the knob was turned as hot as it could go.

She is so distraught at that point she has to get help from Robert. And when you look at the pictures, you can see in the picture there's a purse on the floor, contents spilled out. Robert drags Sheila out of the tub and somebody covers her for dignity purposes.

We know that Ebony and Marquita Carr hear Debra screaming hysterically and they come running. We know that one, Debra tells us, Robert Lewis tells us, but also Marquita Carr also came in and told us about that.

Now, remember, Marquita who had been there for a little while heard nothing in the apartment earlier. Quiet. As if Sheila knew her intruder.

So we know that Sheila is murdered between 1 o'clock and about a quarter to \(3: 00\). Why is that important? That is important because when Sheila is examined, there is DNA from two people in
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addition to herself, obviously; semen from two people found inside her vagina because remember the swabs go in and they swab the bath back of her vagina. So there's semen found inside her vagina and on her panties.

Now, we also all heard a lot about
DNA yesterday. Everybody has a unique DNA profile. There are no two that are the same.

When Christina Paulette tested the
swabs that were taken from Sheila's vagina and from her panties, whose DNA did she find? She found George Brass, the person who came in here, swore to tell the truth, and told you yeah, I had sex with Sheila that day. I had sex with her in the morning, and then I went to work. He didn't have to tell you that, but he did.

So she found Sheila's DNA on the swabs, she found George Brass's DNA on the swabs. And who else's DNA, the only unexplainable DNA is found on the swab and in the panties? His. The person who has no legitimate reason to be in the apartment.

Now, George Brass was spoken to by the police. He could have said no, I'm not talking, I have nothing to say. Remember he's in custody.

George Brass told you, he swipedmath at 12:04. He
told you that, Gabe Ubando told you that and showed you that. He swiped in at 12:04 and that's at Craig and MLK. MLK and Simmons-ish.

You can see on there that he swiped out for lunch at 4:04, that he came back from lunch at 5:03. Remember he told you he grandma lives in the area and he went to grandma's to lunch every day. Very close. So easy. An hour out, grandma makes him lunch he comes back, and he's in in an hour. And then at the end of the day he swipes out at 7:45.

Now Brass, George Brass mentioned to us that he had left work when he got a phone call about what happened to Sheila. Remember he told you that his mom called and then Ralph, Sheila's brother, his buddy, his best friend called and he left work a little early, but the manager knew that.

And then he tells you when he gets back to the apartments the police are there. Well, you know, you heard from the police they were there till at least 9 o'clock that night. So out at 7:45, home, police still there. It all fits.

George Brass had no reason to hurt
Sheila. He'd been having sex with her all along.
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His good friend Ralph, his buddy, it's his sister, can he didn't kill his best friend's sister. In fact, his bud is having sex and seeing his own sister. George Brass had no reason whatsoever to hurt Sheila.

The other part of the mixture
however did. She didn't want to have sex with him. He was her mother's boyfriend. Do you think she wants to have sex? 18 year old Sheila wants to have sex with her mother's old boyfriend and he's 31 ? George Brass obviously not 31. William Kinsey, somebody else that she was involved with, obviously not 31 .

She had just had sex a couple of hours ago with her own man. She didn't want to have sex with him. He is the only one that had a reason to hurt her, which brings us back to the DNA.

Can Christina Paulette tell you with a hundred percent certainty that the mixture -- and I'm sorry, just to go back. Remember the Wal-Mart all the way up here, Pecos right here, you've got the 15 and all that terrible area to drive through, no way he could have driven all the way there, had sex with her, strangled her, grabbed the stereo, run out, driven back and clocked in in less than an
hour.
So back to the DNA. Sorry. Can she tell you with a hundred percent certainty that the mixture on the swabs and the panties are both George Brass and the defendant? Well no, because it was a mixture. So a hundred percent certainty, no.
99.99 percent of the population is excluded from having been in Sheila's vagina and in Sheila Quarles's panties. 99.99 percent of the population.

The one that all of a sudden comes back into Sheila's life almost immediately before the murder is the one that is in her vagina.

Remember how Debra told you that a week or two before the murder she and her daughter Sheila were sitting outside the apartment on the power box and they ran into, or the defendant ran into them. And he was surprised to see them. Oh, you mean you live here now. Because remember, when he was dating Debra, they lived at this part of the apartment. Then after they stopped dating, they moved to a different part of the apartments. And when she's like well, yeah, we live here now, but what are you doing here. He tells her he's a maintenance man, he works for them.
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Well we know that's not true because the apartment manager came in here, Veronica Sigala and told you that. He never worked there.

So not only is it the one who coincidentally finds Sheila two weeks earlier, Sheila whose gotten a little older and you saw is beautiful, he's also the one that all of a sudden comes back into Debra's life after the murder.

Remember how she told you that shortly thereafter she's at her job one day and he comes up to her and says I heard what happened to your daughter. He didn't live there, he didn't work there. How's he know. I heard what happened to your daughter, that's messed up, she's a good kid, she didn't deserve that. He's the one who tells her that she needs go to a grief counselor and tells -and brings her to the grief counselor.

Now, this is a guy -- they haven't seen each other in eight months, not dating anymore, nothing like that. This is the guy who is poking around asking questions of Debra. Have they found a suspect, do they know anything about anyone who killed your daughter.

Now why do you think he's doing that? Because he wants to know if they're on to him
yet. This is also the reason tho you have heard
about the other murder.
Oh, I'm sorry. Not everybody is really technical logically advanced. I work at it, but it doesn't work very well.

The other murder, you have been instructed, I can't even remember how many times about the murder of Marilee Coote. And again, I'm gonna tell you, you absolutely can't, like the judge tells, you use the fact that he killed, strangled and raped Marilee Coote to say he's a bad guy, therefore he had to have done it to Sheila, too. You can't do that. Absolutely not.

But what you do is you take that evidence and you look at it to see, hum, can we use that information to figure out the identity of the killer and the rapist of Sheila? You use that information to say hum, what does it tell us about the motive of the person who rapes and kills Sheila.

Now, you heard about Marilee at that address and she's found dead in her apartment with no signs of forced entry and no obvious sign of a struggle. Hum, sound familiar?

You heard that she was violently
sexually assaulted. That there were lacerations in
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her vagina and her rectum. Sound familiar?
She was strangled to death as
evidenced by multiple hemorrhages both in her neck and in her eyes, the petechial hemorrhages. Sound familiar?

You heard that her vaginal area was burned, that a hot source was applied to her body, maybe in an effort to hide evidence.

You heard about all of those items that were found in her washing machine and in her bathtub. In the washing machine, all those items having been washed. Remember you heard that it had been through the cycle, that there was soap on \(i t\), appeared to be in the washing machine pretty much anything that he could have touched. I mean ice cubes. Ice cube trays, sorry. Touch it, leave fingerprints behind. Touch it, leave fingerprints behind. All sorts of items. The items in the bathtub as well.

You heard that although her apartment was exceptionally clean, it appeared to Jeff Smink, the crime scene analyst who was out there, who had been doing this for what, 20 some years, it had appeared to him that the scene had been wiped clean presumably in an effort to hide
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Remember all the stuff in the
bathtub? Well, when they went in, excuse me, the next day and they were swabbing for prints, remember the bath stub was where all those items were found, it looked as if it had been wiped clean. Cleaned off to get rid of fingerprints.

The washing machine, dryer, remember that's where all the crazy stuff was found. Again. look, streak marks, wiped clean.

The laundry detergent and things, who if you're cleaning your house, you know, you understand somebody cleans the tub, cleans the washing machine, who wipes clean laundry detergent unless you're trying to hide evidence.

Interestingly the one place where there was nothing that was touched, that the sink, was not wiped clean. So if somebody's cleaning the whole house you're gonna clean the kitchen sink, that's probably one of the first places you clean, the kitchen area, but that is one place that there was no streaking as if nobody tried to hide any evidence there. Only the places where the odd things were found.

The stain on the living room carpet.

Now why is that important in that case? I'11 go back. Sorry. Marilee Coote was found laying on the floor in her apartment. And immediately under her vagina is where the stain was found. Immediately under because after being raped, she was strangled and killed. That, the fact that it was right there shows she never got up. She never moved again.

Now, you heard about the DNA
evidence in this case. Not only was the carpet stain analyzed, but her vaginal and rectal swabs were.

And what did Christina Paulette tell you? 100 percent sure identity is presumed. Rarer than 106 -- one in 650 billion people, it was the defendant who left his semen not only in her vagina, but in her rectum and on the carpet.

And you can see. And you have the ones for Sheila as well. It matches all the way down the line. So we know that the person who raped and strangled Marilee Coote is the defendant.

We know that the defendant then went through and cleaned up the apartment, hid evidence, tried to hide evidence. Wiping down all the areas that were touched when he put all the stuff in the washing machine, in the bathtub. evidence. didn't work. she was not only staged the scene a little bit. Burned her vaginal area trying to get rid of the

And you heard about the carpet, that there was detergent used. He actually tried to get rid of the stain. Unfortunately, for him anyway, it

The crime scene analyst noticed it that day, smelled the floral detergent or whatever it was, but not only that, Chr tina Paulette, when she even years later went to reanalyze the stain told you about how when she did the overlay, it bubbled, foamed because of the detergent.

Then there's Sheila, Sheila is assaulted, she is placed in a tub of hot water, hot water, kind of like burning Marilee, trying to get rid of the evidence. Fortunately for us what he, the defendant didn't know, is that that does not get rid of the evidence that's inside the vagina. The one thing that points absolutely to him.

He staged the scene here, too, puts the clothes down as if she just got in the shower and was gonna relax, got undressed, got in the shower. Maybe fell and hit her head. She has bad
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asthma. Maybe she had an asthma attack. He's staging the scene. But what he didn't realize was that that makes no sense.

If Sheila was getting in the tub herself, gonna take a shower herself, her underwear are not gonna be on the outside of her jeans. She would not have done that herself. Somebody did that. Somebody. Him.

So ladies and gentlemen, over the last couple of days, you've heard a lot of evidence. You heard about Sheila, her horrible death. And it's time to hold the person accountable.

We have proven to you beyond a reasonable doubt that there's a killer in the courtroom, folks. He's sitting there right there and his name is Norman Flowers.

Thank you.
THE COURT: Thanks. Mr. Patrick. If anyone ever needs a rest room break, raise your hands. If I don't, I'll just good forward.

Go ahead, Mr. Patrick.
MR. PATRICK: From the words of victor
today, I will promise to be sincere, but I cannot promise to be impartial.

Now, when we started this trial last

Wednesday, a duple of couple of things came to light that it makes your job a lot harder than for most jurors.

The first thing that I said the first day of jury selection is that you were gonna hear about another murder. Wow. I mean, you didn't even really know what this case is about and bam, we have another murder out there.

Whether or not you believe Norman is guilty or not guilty in the Coote case, he's not been adjudged guilty by a jury, by a court in accordance with our laws. And the reason is because he's not had a fair and impartial trial on the Coote case.

If you disregard that, and you think he's guilty in the Coote case, you're tearing down the safeguards that are guaranteed to every one of us by our society and by our constitution.

MS. WECKERLY: I'm gonna object, Your Honor. That actually misstates the law.

THE COURT: Sustained. The law as I've given you says you first have to find by clear and convincing evidence that he has done that. And if you do, there's a limited purpose only for which you can consider the evidence and you're instructed to

\section*{64}
follow that instruction.
MR. PATRICK: Thank you. Now, I guess the witnesses aren't the only ones they are harsh to.

Okay. The judge has told you several times about the limited ways you can use the Coote case in deciding this case. And that's what you've got to do.

Norman has not been on trial for the Coote case and as such today, and when you're done deliberating this case, when you leave here at the end of this trial, he will still be not guilty in the Coote case.

For this case, this court, Randy, myself, the prosecutors, the constitution and our society trust this jury with deciding this case.

You have agreed not to find Norman guilty or innocent of the case involving Ms. Coote. You have given us your trust that you will only decide his guilt or innocence in this case.

And we trust you. We must trust you with that and that you will let another jury who will get the full facts and the full evidence of the Coote case to decide that case.

Now, the second thing you heard
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about in jury selection was a pendity phase. And you heard about the penalty phase before you even got a chance to hear any of the evidence on this case, before you had any idea of what you were going do or what was going on before you had any time or reflection to determine whether Norman was guilty or innocent. That's almost like the old subliminal, subliminal advertisements telling that you that Norman's guilt or innocence was a foregone conclusion before we ever started this trial. And that is simply not the case.

The reason why we had to tell you about that is because that's only time we have as attorneys to talk to you about what may come at the end of the trial.

We can't pick a jury for the first part and then go pick a new jury for the second part. So we have to talk about you at the very onset of this trial, so that we know that Norman will get a fair and impartial jury. Not only to adjudge whether he's guilty or innocent, but a jury that can fairly and impartially decide individually whether what penalty they believe ..

MS. WECKERLY: Objection, Your Honor.
MR. PATRICK: So as you go back and

\section*{66}
deliberate --
THE COURT: Hold on. I think that he's okay. They've been instructed they are not in this phase even to consider penalty, not to discuss it, not to do anything, but \(I\) think he has a fair right to say look, the only reason we discussed that is this and don't consider that in the concession on our part of anything about the guilt or innocence of our client.

So I think he hasn't gone over the line so objection's overruled. Go ahead, Mr. Patrick.

MR. PATRICK: Now, you heard several times from the judge this week that the only time you'tl even get to the penalty phase is if you find Norman guilty of first-degree murder. All other sentences and penalties will determine solely by our judge.

So you're presented here today, as you go back to deliberate right now only one thing, whether or not Norman is guilty or not guilty of the murder of Sheila Quarles.

And when you do that, when you come back today, tomorrow, whenever you come back after your full deliberations, I'm sure that you'll come
we know that tremen will stay in that vault for 2 at least those three days. What we don't know is 3 when the semen that was found in Sheila Quarles was 4 put in there.

The only other thing Dr. Simms told you about and you heard from Mr. Schiro, was that 7 after sex semen will leak out of the vaginal vault 8 and be deposited in the panties as we had here.

Dr. Simms talked about the bruise on Sheila head and Detective Vacarro talked about this mark on the wall of the tub.

Now, Detective Vacarro said it
looked like blood to him, but he didn't think it was
tested. And then CSA Horn and Detective Sherwood came in and said well, it didn't look like blood to us, but still wasn't tested.

Well, the thing to wonder is is there any connection between that mark and what happened to Sheila. Whether it's blood or not, it was, it looked obviously like it was something from her head. Did she slip in the tub and hit her head? Was that part of the drowning part of her autopsy report that Dr. Simms gave you?

We won't know because it was never tested. We don't know if it's blood like Detective
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Vacarro thought, we don't know if it wasn't like Detective Sherwood thought.

We heard from a Marquita Carr. Now she's related to the whole Lewis, Brass family that you heard so much about over the last week. Her Aunt Jannie Brass is cousins, Jasmine Brass, Ebony Lewis, Uncle Robert Lewis, Anthony Culverson's related, George Brass is related, they all live in that apartment complex.

And she, Marquita Carr was in that apartment complex around noon the day that Sheila died. She was present when Sheila found and she was actually in the bathroom before anybody else got there.

Then we heard from Debra Quarles,
Sheila's mom. And rightfully so, she's very upset about this. I mean, it was her 18 year old daughter that died.

Debra knew about Quince Toney. She thought Quince and Sheila were friends. Did not know about their sexual relationship.

Debra knew George Brass, Chicken.
She did not know that Chicken and Sheila had a sexual relationship.

Like Ms. Luzaich told you, George
was friends with Ralph and Georg was related to Robert Lewis. Debra knew Robert Lewis. Robert Lewis had spent the night with her the night before. She just knew the entire Brass, Lewis family, most of which were living in that very apartment complex that she was.

So Debra leaves the apartment for work that morning about 6:30. When she left, Sheila was wearing a white sleeveless shirt and some white pink pajama bottoms.

There was a new stereo in the apartment. Debra comes home around 3 o'clock, give or take, \(2: 51,2: 45\). We're not arguing what time she came home. It was around 3:00 in the afternoon. She had should groceries, beeps the horn trying to get somebody to help her with groceries. Robert comes out, helps her out with the groceries.

After going through the house, they discover Sheila in the tub. Well, between Debra and Robert, they are pull her out of the tub. It's not important which one does the actual lifting. They just get her out of the tub. And notice the stereo's gone.

What does Debra do next? Well, she gets in her car and she drives at least five minutes
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to her son Ralph's house. Ralph's not home. So she said she drove another three minutes to the 7-Eleven. Finds Ralph, gets him in the car, drives back to the apartment complex. Why?

The police come, Debra talks to the police. She tells them about Quince. She doesn't tell them about George or anybody else that she saw around that apartment complex. Why is that? Well, Debra knew the Lewis, Brass family.

Was she afraid of them? Was she suspicious of them? Did she feel the need to consult with Ralph before she talked to the police?

Debra knew Norman. At one point,
Debra and Norman had dated.
Now Debra did not know about a
sexual assault between Quince and Sheila. Debra did not know about a sexual assault between George Brass and Sheila.

Why would we think that if there was Sheila that Debra would know about it.

After Sheila's death, Norman offered support and sympathy to Debra. Where was George Brass? Where was Robert Lewis? Why weren't they offering support and sympathy to Debra Quarles?
sitting on a power box with Sheila and she told you that Norman came by, waived, talked, whatever they did, and she wanted you to believe that that power box is immediately in front of her front door.

We heard from Detective Vacarro that Debra's apartment was not on the exterior of the apartment complex. You heard from George Brass and several others that if you were to walk out of Debra Quarles' door, you were just a few feet from the next apartment building where George lived downstairs and Jessie Nava lived upstairs.

And we heard from Robert Lewis, he was socializing in Debra's apartment the night before, spent the night with Debra, saw Sheila the next morning as Sheila was coming home.

Robert knew that Sheila was alone. Robert saw George Brass come up to the apartment and go inside. Robert saw George Brass leave the apartment.

Now, the police talked to Robert this day. Robert refused to give the police a statement.

Now, Detective Long comes in here and he wants you to believe that Robert was
forthcoming, honest, cooperative for the hours or so that they talked, and that Robert was simply scared either by the other people who didn't want to talk to the cops, didn't want to be labeled a snitch. Whatever.

You saw Robert on the stand. You saw George Brass on the stand. You saw Anthony Culverson on the stand. Did any of them look scared to you?

Who would Robert be scared of? Most of the people who lived around him was his family. Either the Brasses or Lewises. If Robert were so forthcoming, honest and cooperative, why didn't he tell the police about George. He knew George was in the apartment that day. He knew George was in the apartment alone with Sheila that day. He knew that George and Sheila were having a relationship, but he told the police none of this.

Why is that? Well, he was
protecting George. He was protecting his family.
It wasn't because he was scared that somebody might label him a snitch for talking to the police.

The next thing Detective Long told you was that George -- Robert Lewis voluntarily gave them a buckle swab.

Okay. Well, with dat's the definition of voluntarily. Detective Long knows that if George .- if Robert does not give him that buckle swab, he can take him into custody, take him to jail, take him to the homicide office, make him sit there until he either gives him a buckle swab or until Detective Lewis (sic) gets a warrant to get that buckle swab.

Robert Lewis knows this. Refusing the buckle swab would have made Robert Lewis look suspicious. So that's why he gave to him.

What Robert Lewis didn't give the police was the fact was that George had been with Sheila earlier that day and he did not give up George to the police.

If he did not think George had done anything wrong, there would have been no reason to hide George from the police. Not just that day, but for three years George was hidden from the police by his family.

Detective Vacarro also talked a little bit about the high concentration of police in that area around 1001 North Pecos. When asked, he said that's simply because there's more people living there. More people equals more police.

\section*{78}

Well Detective Long got on the stand and he gave you the real reason why there's a high concentration of police in that area. Because it's a high crime and drug area. They need the police presence there.

Next, Detective Vacarro kind of told you about the apartment and how there was no visible signs as he walked through the apartment, except for in the bathroom which he characterized as a room that was much more active. Well, of course it was. You heard testimony about that.

You heard testimony how small that bathroom was. Debra Quarles said she could reach out and touch both walls with her hands.

And then think about the number of people that were in that room prior to the detectives and CSA coming and showing up. Debra was in there. Robert Lewis was in there. Marquita Carr was in there. Uniformed patrol officers were in there. Medical personnel were delivering aid in that room. Actually surprising, that room wasn't torn up a lot more than it was.

Now, you heard a lot of testimony about the lack of disservances (phonetic) in the apartments. But what does that really tell you?

Well, I think tells you one or two things. It tells you that Sheila knew her attacker, that Sheila left the door unlocked because she knew her mother was coming home with groceries. So that this was a crime of opportunity, a smash and grab burglary that went wrong and when the burgTar discovered there was someone else in the house.

Detective talked -- Detective
Vacarro talked about the letter that was addressed to William Kinsey found on the bed in the apartment.

At the time Mr. Kinsey was staying at the Clark County Detention Center. And you heard from Detective Sherwood and from Mr. Kinsey himself how Sheila would write those letters and put her last name -- his last name in association when hers as if they were married.

Detective Vacarro told you about a lot of people that were in the apartment that day. Debra Quarles, Jane Brass, Elizabeth Tolbers (phonetic), the police, fire.

But at the time of the incident, George Brass was not on that list. Why is that? There were witnesses around that apartment complex that whole day. Police talked to several of them. No one was asked did you see anybody going in and
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out of the apartment. No one came forth and said I saw these people come in and out of that apartment. No one came forward and said I had sex with Sheila that day in that apartment.

Again, the detectives are trying to pass this off to you that the people are afraid to talk to the police because of who they are and what they may have done in the past or because they don't want to be labeled as a snitch.

Well that explanation works for the police for everybody in this case except for Norman. When the police came and talked to him and Detective Sherwood came to talk to him at CCDC when he was already in there for something else, and he didn't want to talk to him, well, now it's not that because he didn't want to talk to the police because he's afraid of the police or because he didn't want to be labeled as a snitch, now all of a sudden he don't want to talk to the police because you're hiding something, because you're guilty.

How do you rectify that? In this case no one but Robert Lewis knew about George Brass, Chicken, until three years later.
Everybody's tried to tell you this was an ongoing investigation and they were just kind of going bam,

1 bam, bam, bam, bam, but the trutis George Brass's
name did not come to the police for three years.

Detective Sherwood told you that in part of the investigation he was at, George Brass's name never even came up. Why was that? Well, he was being protected. He was being hidden.

All the police were just not asking the right people about Chicken. The police didn't know who he was or if he was a viable suspect. The police didn't even look for George Brass until the district attornies told them he needed to.

The police had a suspect and they simply stopped there. They were just interested in getting this case off of their books. Right suspect, wrong suspect, it doesn't matter.

George Brass had no idea whether or not he was a suspect in this until the police talked to him. George Brass never came forward and said I have information about this.

It took detectives contacting Ameia
Fuller three years later who finally told them well,
I know about this guy Chicken that was having a relationship with Sheila for two months prior to her death.

Detective Long went and interviewed
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George on August 12th, 2008 was when they first talked to George Brass about this case. Detective Long recorded that interview but only part of it. He told George that hey, you know what, you're not a suspect. And that he hammered that home because he did not read George Brass his rights. Showing George, look, you're not a suspect.

Well, now was George Brass
forthcoming on this and cooperative? Well, he hadn't been for three years. He would have never talked to the police to this day had Ameia Fuller not told them about him, but yet he had valuable information about Sheila death. But still during that interview, he did not tell Detective Wildman about any of his friends or family that were around that apartment complex that day.

George told you and he testified that in March of ' 05 he was living with his mother in the same apartment complex, kind of across that next building and over to the right from Sheila.

He saw Sheila that day and he told you that she was wearing blue jeans and a red shirt. He told you they had sex on the living room floor. He told you they got, that she got dressed after they had sex and he left and he saw Robert, and he
saw his Uncle bert Lewis outside the apartment as he was leaving. And then he tells you he went to Wal-Mart and checked in, checked out.

And the assistant manager from Wal-Mart came back, came in and told you, yeah, George's time card showed you on the 24th he clocked in here, clocked out for lunch, clocked back in. But then he also told you about procedures where if an employee forgets to clock out, goes home, well, he can call them and they can go back in and access the computer, access his time and put it in for them.

He also told you that he knows of instances in that Wal-Mart store where one employee would clock in and out for the other employee. And he made it very clear that if he did that and you were caught that it ws grounds for immediate termination. Well, like everything else, it's only bad, it's only illegal if you get caught.

Chicken was at work and he received phone calls from his mother and Ralph Quarles. And he came back to the apartment complex. He was asked a few questions by the police officer, doesn't remember if he was uniform or not. The officer did not take his driver's license and say wait here, you
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know, the detectives may want to talk to you. And if you all remember, Detective Long kind of went through that whole procedure how you're at the crime scene, goes up to someone and says I want to talk, you know, say okay, you know, the detectives need to talk to you, let me have your driver's license, we'll get the detectives, they want to talk to you, whatever, and then hand the driver's license, like that.

That never happened with George.
And that day when he talked to that officer, he never said, I'm her boyfriend, I have a relationship with her, we had sex today.

The other thing is that George
recognized his upstairs neighbor Jessie Nava. So we go back to Detective Long and talking to
Detective -- or George Brass and he had, Detective Long found out that George had sex with Sheila that day. And then Detective Long did not go out and follow-up with any of Brass's relatives regarding what George had told him. He didn't go ask any of his acquaintances, his family well, was George with you that day, did you see him at the apartment complex that day.

Today you heard from William Kinsey.
the police did not think the two were connected. We know now they were connected. They were connected by Jessie Nava. He was the early-morning burglar. The person whose, whose apartment he broke into got a clear look at him. She knew that this was the guy that committed this burglary in her house that morning.

He's the guy that was seen with the stereo in Sheila's apartment. The stereo that he admitted he got from the girl downstairs. The stereo with detachable speakers. Not a boom box, not a Karaoke machine, not a DVD player, a stereo with detachable speakers.

The ties between the burglary and the homicide were almost impossible to find. The police just had to look for them. Just had to really put an effort into finding the real person that killed Sheila.

You heard from Natalia Sena. She
lived in the apartment above where -- in the building that George Brass lived in upstairs which would have been directly across from Sheila's
she lived there with Alfonso Sanchez.

And on the March 24th, she came home from gambling around noon. She saw Chicken, George Brass. She knew him as Chicken. And she saw Carl, skinny guy, black guy, wearing a long sleeved flannel shirt. She tried to buy weed from the guy in the flannel shirt. She saw him looking around like he was trying to check out the place, scope out the place, I forget the exact words she used. He looked like he was coming out of Sheila's apartment.

And she knew this was after 12:00 noon when she saw both this dark guy in the flannel shirt and George Brass. She was very sure about that time until after she talked to the district attornies. Then she started changing her story.

On that day, Natalia was arrested for whatever they found in her apartment. She went to jail for two days. When she got home, she noticed a couple of things. She noticed that Jessie had stolen some drugs that was hidden in a speaker in their apartment and she saw Jessie with this stereo. And again, Jessie told her where he got the stereo, from the girl downstairs.

88
We heard from Veronica Sigala, assistant manager for the Palm Village Apartments. She knew Jessie. She knew that Jessie had broken into several apartments. She'd seen him break into several apartments. She knew that's what he did. She also told you that unlike what Debra told you, that Norman was never an employee of the apartments, never worked maintenance for them.

We also heard from Quince Toney.
She told you how she had a sexual relationship with Deb .- with Sheila and that that had been going on for approximately several months. They would see each other nearly every day during this time period.

Sheila would spend the night at
Quince's house nearly every night during this time period, but Sheila did not stay with Quince the three nights prior to the night before her death. Three nights, three days, 72 hours.

As we heard, as we heard from nurse
Ebbert, we know that semen can stay in the vaginal vault for up to 72 hours.

Could Norman have had sex with
Sheila during that period? Well, of course he could. You've seen nothing this week that proves to you any different.

So Quince dropped reila off at home around 6:00 a.m., and Quince describes pretty much the same thing about George Brass did, that Sheila was wearing pajamas.

The two of them, Sheila and Quince, talked on the phone throughout the day. Quince remembers Sheila being happy, outgoing, remembers hearing the music in the background during some of the calls. And then she gets a call from Sheila with nobody on the line. She calls back. Nobody answers. Calls back again, still nobody answers.

So we heard about a lot of work this CSA was doing in this case. CSA Fletcher came in to Sheila's apartment, he impounded some items, dusted for prints. They found latent prints on Gatorade bottles, on a Gatorade bottle. Beef and cheese package, peanut package, \(C D\) cases. The entire bathroom was printed.

Now, Sheila's body and neck, they
didn't -- they never checked, never processed for prints on that. CSA Green told you that well, you know, latent prints may survive sometimes, even after being submerged in hot water. And she also testified that, that it would be very difficult but not impossible to at least check for prints on a
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body and not even recover them.

\section*{You heard from Fred Boyd. He}
examined most of the prints from Sheila's apartment. He was given 21 print cards that had been recovered by either CSA Horn or Fletcher. None of these told you it was the quality he needed to match with exemplars. And he was given exemplars of Sheila and Norman, Quince Toney, Robert Lewis and Debra Quarles. He was not given at the time, nor has he been given since, exemplars to check from George Brass or Jessie Nava.

Ed Guenther came in and told you about how he analyzed latent prints from Marilee Coote's apartment. There was 69 print cards given to him in that case. 36 of those were sufficient to compare with exemplars, but one thing that's really interesting about both the cases that all those prints, all those cards, both of those apartments, who's prints were never identified? Norman's. Not one. Out of all those cards in both those apartments did anybody ever find a print belonging to Norman.

And in the Coote case, Mr. Guenther actually had three prints that were nonidentified. And even though these prints will be kept forever,
because it's anomicide or at least until one is done with that case, the last time anybody looked at those prints or tried to compare them with anything was in August of 2005.

So you've heard, actually you've
heard from a lot of fingerprint experts in this case. You heard from two that did the processing, you heard from three, four, five that did the collections and, and went around the apartment looking for prints.

And again, the thing that strikes you most about the fingerprint evidence in this case is there is none. None that points to Norman as ever being in either one of those apartments.

In fact, if you look at the evidence that was shown to you, there is absolutely no evidence in this case whatsoever that shows you Norman was ever even in Sheila's apartment, let alone on the 24th of March.

What do they have? Well, they have his semen in her vaginal vault. Okay. They can't tell you when that was put there, they can't tell you where it was put there, they can't tell you whether or not it was consensually put there. All they can tell you is it's there. There's nothing 92
else that ties Norman to Sheila's apartment.
In Coote's apartment, they have a carpet stain, okay.

In the Quarles' case, they didn't even bother taking the ultimate light source that they have that's available to all the CSAs in Las Vegas. It's a common tool. I'm sure they all know how to use it. And look, is there a carpet stain? We don't know. Is there someplace else that they can pinpoint that Norman was ever in that apartment by his DNA evidence? Absolutely not.

So what wasn't done by the police and the CSAs in this case? Well, none of Sheila's previously worn clothing was impounded and checked. Those pink pajamas never checked. If she had underwear on under those pink pajamas, never checked. And we know what value that could have been.

If on those pajamas there was only one source of DNA, one source of semen, then we'd know when the sexual act occurred, or at least we'd know who was first and who was second. But we'll never know that.

The CSA was never directed to go
back and retest the apartment as more information
came about the case. The policemever showed photos or photo lineup around that apartment complex with Norman's picture, with Jesse's picture, with George's picture to ask the people, hey on March 24th did you see any of these people here.

Well, we know that a lot of them probably saw Jessie because he live there. We know a lot of them probably saw George because he lived there. But why not show them Norman's picture and say did you see him.

Like Ms. Luzaich said, he was the one out of place, but they didn't show a picture and nobody identified Norman as being in that apartment complex that day.

None of George Brass's family that came up here, none of Robert Lewis's family that came up here and testified ever said I saw Norman in the apartment that day.

Natalia Sena who saw Chicken, who saw the guy in the black flannel shirt, she didn't see Norman there that day. She knew who was coming and going, she knew who was around.

The police did not look at the pawn shops to see if anything had been pawned. You heard about they don't even have to go to the pawn shops.
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You heard about Metro's pawn patrol that has all the information there. They don't have to go to a hundred pawn shops. They've got to go to one place in their own police department and say hey, we need to see if anybody pawned something. We can give you a name of somebody and see if they pawned anything in the shops around where he shops anywhere.

Detective Sherwood told you, well, if we had a name, we can go do that. Well guess what? They have plenty of names. They had Robert Lewis, they had George Brass, they had Jessie Nava who has the stolen stereo from Sheila's apartment two days after the attack. How many names do they want to check?

They never followed up on Sheila's
stolen bank card. Was it ever used? Was it ever
tried to be used? Even though the account was closed, was there ever a point where somebody tried to use that card? I have no idea.

You heard about messages left, voice mail messages left on Sheila's phone. Quince Toney gave the police the access number to access those messages. Were those messages preserved? No. Why not? Did the police ever check to see if that phone had been reactivated or tried to be reactivated?
-

No.
You heard a lot about the speaker wire on the floor of the living room. You would, you would assume that that speaker wire was pulled out the back of the stereo that was stolen. If it was pulled out of the back, there may have been some skin cells left on that wire. Skin cells that would lead to DNA. DNA that would lead to identifying the person who took the stereo. Was any of that done? No.

The police recovered the one pair of Sheila jeans and panties that were actually in the bathroom. Like we said, the pajamas that at least two people say that she was wearing that morning were never recovered. We don't even know if they were ever looked for.

And again, the panties that she had worn the day before, two days before, had they not been washed could have led to very important DNA evidence to give us a time line of what happened prior to Sheila's death. Never even looked at.

Now, Ms. Ebbert told you about the importance of collecting panties for these very reasons: Biological fluids, DNA evidence. Things that can point us in the direction of who actually
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did this to Sheila.
Now, talking about nurse Ebbert for a minute, she came in and give us some very good testimony, told you a lot about sexual assault nurse, what she does, how she does it.

The thing to remember about nurse Ebbert is she never saw Sheila, she never saw Marilee Coote. Whether they were dead, whether they were alive, she never saw their actual bodies. But she was given some time after the fact through photographs taken during the autopsy, okay.

We don't know -- I mean we know that the person taking those photographs was probably a fairly good photographer, but we don't know what differences in lighting or differences in shadows or anomalies in the printing process that could have come up to disguise, to make look worse, whatever, the injuries that she was describing to you because she never saw those injuries in person.

> She couldn't even direct the
photographer and say well, these are the angles I would like, these are the pictures I would like to make my decision. She got what they had and she had to work with that.

She also told you that similarities

1 for what she saw could happen wid consensual sex.

Maybe not as likely, maybe not all the time, but it's possible. And she talked to you about the injuries. What it boils down to, the injuries that you saw and the injuries to vaginal walls and things like that, come from a lack of lubrication in the female. They come from improper position. That's not to say they come only from sexual assault. It's quite possible to have consensual assault .consensual sex if the girl's not properly lubricated yet, not in the proper position.

So these injuries don't just mean
sexual assault. All they mean is it wasn't the right time yet. It could have been in 30 seconds, but just not at the specific point of the sexual intercourse.

\section*{Nurse Ebbert talked a little bit}
about Sheila's injuries. She said there was several of them wide and deep, show more force and there were no anal injuries.

Then she talked about Marilee Coote.
Fewer in number, no anal injuries and she didn't use the wide and deep. So again, as with the strangulation, physical evidence would indicate two different people. One much more lateral than the
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other one, but still two separate people.
A lot of this case kind of goes, rests on the DNA evidence. Okay. The DNA shows that at a minimum Norman had sex with Sheila and Chicken had sex with Sheila within this three-day period, 72 hours as we talked about that.

Who else did? Well, Ms. Paulette said that this DNA mixture eliminates 99.98 percent of the population. Okay. Except, you know, except for Norman and Chicken. We know about them. But with the mixture, all it could be said is whether or not excluded. Not included as anywhere from another 40 to a hundred and 30 people in the Las Vegas Valley. Could not be excluded.

The mixture recovered from Sheila and her panties, as you heard from George Schiro, contained enough information to come up with over 64 billion possible combinations. Wow. Okay.

The mixture only tells us the minimum number of people. At least three. Because of the numbers on your little tables, we know there was at least, at least three. We have no idea if there was more than three. No idea. Never know. From the information that is in that mixture, we know at least three, but we will never know the
maximum numben
So there could be easily more than the two male deposits. And especially if you think about relatives whose DNA is gonna be closer to begin with. Father and son, half the DNA matches just right off the bat.

So you've got to look at not only the DNA for what it did tell you, but even more importantly what it can't tell you. It's not the magic bullet, it's not the end all of this whole case.

And we talked about this. The DNA cannot tell you what Sheila had sex. She can't tell you if she had sex first with Norman or first with George. She, it won't .- well, it probably could tell you, but we didn't do the investigation so we don't know if Sheila actually had sex with George on the floor of the living room, and we have absolutely no idea where Sheila had sex with Norman.

Did the police find a carpet stain in this case so they can say well, yeah, George is right, they had sex on the floor. They didn't find it. Hell, they didn't even look for it.

Sexual assault. That's a harsh term. I mean, there is an visceral gut reaction to
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the words sexual assault.
But again, you've got to look at the evidence and what was proved beyond a reasonable doubt. Sheila's clothes weren't torn. We made a big deal -- well, the State made a big deal about the panties over the legs of the jeans. They didn't explain how that would happen, just that it was weird. It's weird.

Does it prove sexual assault?
Absolutely not. They showed you the panties that Ms. Paulette looked at. And there was both Norman's and George's semen in it.

So what does that tell you? Well, that tells you that after she had sex with Norman, she put those panties on. After she had sex with George, she put those panties on? Again, not when, not where, not how. Just a simple fact that that happened.

There were no signs of struggle in the apartment. You heard that over and over and over, okay.

The bathroom was a mess. I told you why the bathroom was a mess. Does that indicate sexual assauft? No.

Christina Paulette told you that she

And I mean the biggest reason we're here this week of course is the murder. The motive. The State does not have to prove beyond a reasonable doubt a motive. It's not part of their job, it's not in the description of murder. They don't even have to show you one. But you know what, wouldn't that be kind of helpful?

What was Norman's motive? They didn't show you one. If they had one, they'd certainly show it to you.

As you sit here today, the death of Sheila Quarles, the investigation is not finished. This case several times during the last year three years should have been reopened. They should have started looking at it again. It needs to be reopened now. The real killer of Sheila Quarles needs to be found and prosecuted.

Now, the easy part is for all of us just to reconcile the fact, support their conclusion, but you can't bend facts. You can't mentally fill in all the huge gaps that are left in this case. To do so is just like finding Norman guilty just for the mere sake of convenience because we're here, but that's not what we're supposed to
do. That's nd hat we can do.
We trust for you to fulfill the
promise, fulfill your oath, fulfill your duty, make the correct decision in this case.

Sure, it may be a difficult decision because Sheila has a grieving mother and she has a grieving family. But what's more important? Convicting the first person that they put up on the stand or to find the real killer?

As we said before, there's another jury at some point in the future that will be charged with determining whether or not Norman's guilty in the Coote case on its full evidence and merits. Trust them and let them do their job in that case like we're trusting you to do your job in this case.

Now, you've heard this before, but the State has a full and complete burden of proving every element of every crime charged beyond a reasonable doubt.

Even if you think that Norman might have committed one of these crimes, that's not enough. You need to think about what the State has actually proven beyond a reasonable doubt in means of the case.

1 you that Norman was ever in tha partment complex on March 24th?

In Great Expectations, Charles
Dickens wrote, Take nothing on its looks. Take everything on evidence. There is no better rule. And that's what I want you to do in this case. Look at the evidence. Throughout the entire investigation, nobody identifies Norman as being at the apartment complex that day. Through the cross-examine by the defense, they interviewed several people. Some the police did not, some of the police did know about that were at the apartment complex that day. A lot of them were part of the Brass, Lewis family.

Look at the evidence surrounding the homicide and the sexual partners of Sheila and they offer the following: Evidence of sexual intercourse does not equal sexual assault. Evidence of sexual intercourse does not equal burglary. Evidence of sexual intercourse does not equal robbery. And finally, evidence of sexual intercourse certainly, certainly does not equal murder.

Now that all the evidence has been presented, there's one fact that is crystal clear. With all the people in that small area of the Palm
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Village Apartments, most of who are related to George Brass, on the day of March 24th, 2005, nobody tells you Norman was there.

So your obligation is to go back into the deliberation, break down each of the counts and determine if the State has proven each and every element contained in the amended indictment. Be detailed, be thorough.

You're the judges of the facts.
Make your own decisions and do like you told me at jury selection and stick by that decision. Examine each fact and each count and know that suspicion, suspicion is not a fact in which a verdict can be reached. And it will lead you, this all lead you unemotionally and logically to only one conclusion.

Take everything on evidence and you can come to only one conclusion in this case, Norman is not guilty of sexual assault, Norman is not guilty of robbery, Norman is not guilty of burglary, and above all, Norman is not guilty of murder.

THE COURT: Do you want a break? Okay.
Let's take a rest room break.
During this break, don't talk or
converse among yourselves or with anyone else on any subject connected with this trial.
report of or commentary on the trial or any person connected with this trial by any medium of information, including, without limitation, newspapers, television, internet and radio.

Don't form or express any opinion on any subject connected with the trial until the case is finally submitted to you.

Pick up with Ms. Weckerly in five minutes.

Whereupon, a recess was taken.)
THE COURT: Let's go back on the record in Case No. C228755, State of Nevada versus Norman Keith Flowers.

Let the record reflect the presence of the defendant with his counsel, counsel for the State. All ladies and gentlemen of the jury are back in the box.

Ms. Weckerly.
MS. WECKERLY: Thank you. It's still good morning. After the comments of Mr. Patrick and after hearing a little bit of the information over the last couple of days, I too feel it's important to emphasize and maybe echo the emphasis that Ms. Luzaich put on the two jury instructions that you've
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been provided by Judge Bell in this case.
The first one was highlighted by Ms. Luzaich and she explained to you in her closing argument that in evaluating the evidence in this case, in any criminal case, of course you are to apply your own common sense.

Each of you ever day makes decisions in your life, in your job, with your family and use your own common sense and intelligence as you make those decisions.

Certainly you're all capable of making all kinds of determinations in your life based on information that isn't established to some sort of metaphysical imaginary certainty. And of course you do this with logic and intelligence and your common sense which you're instructed to apply to your evaluation of the evidence in this case.

So what that instruction about
common sense is telling you is that your obligation as a juror is not to blindly take in information. Your obligation as a juror is to weigh it, is to evaluate it. It's to assess it, it's to decide what importance you assign to various pieces of evidence in this case.

Another instruction that I'd like to
highlight, and it was also highlighted by Ms. Luzaich, is that statements by counsel are not evidence and you are not to speculate in this case.

Now, how does that figure into your deliberations, the idea that you're not supposed to be speculating?

Well, recall what Mr. Pike said in opening statement. Certainly the defense has no burden in this case. The defense never has any burden in a criminal case. But what did he tell you in opening statement. He said that you will hear that people have reason to fear George Brass and his family, and that George Brass never returned to that apartment complex after the murder of Sheila Quarles.

Was that how the evidence turned out
in this case? George Brass is still friends with the Quarles family. In fact, the opposite was proven. George Brass is still friends with Ralph Fuller .- or with Ralph Quarles. He's still part of the family. That wasn't established by the defense in this case.

So when you're back in the
deliberation room, it's not your place to speculate well, maybe this could have happened or maybe that

\section*{110}

You can't speculate as to why Mr. Pike said that. You can't speculate that maybe there's something out there that we don't know about. You are to decide the case based on the evidence.

Mr. Pike and Mr. Patrick told you that the evidence in this case established that Sheila Quarles was getting ready to take a bath and that she left the front door unlocked for her mother because she knew her mom would be returning home from work.

What was the actual evidence you heard in this case? Debra Quarles testified that it was her daughter's habit to lock the door.
was the reason why this occurred. You're to decide a case based on the evidence presented and nothing else.

Mr. Pike also referenced William
Kinsey in his opening statement and he said to you that William Kinsey knew about the social life of Sheila Quarles. You heard from Mr. Kinsey he was in custody as of December of 2004. He had no idea what was going on, he had no personal knowledge of what was going on in Sheila's life at the time she was murdered. that morning, when the door is unlocked, that is something unusual. Sheila Quarles, I mean no one would know her better than her mother, would lock the door. So that tells you that she knew her intruder. And I'll get to more of that later, but certainly you can't speculate that maybe on the 24 th day of March in 2005, contrary to the evidence you heard which is uncontroverted from Debra Quarles, that maybe something was different on that day, maybe the planets were aligned in a certain way and maybe something occurred which Debra Quarles didn't testify to.

You decide cases based on evidence and evidence is testimony and of course the exhibits that you have.

In my opinion, and certainly you're all the true judges of the facts in this case, there are two scientific realities of this case or two salient facts that are the most important facts in this case in terms of how to look at the evidence.

The first salient fact is the uncontroverted testimony, absolutely uncontroverted testimony by Dr. Simms that Sheila Quarles was sexually assaulted within 30 minutes of her death.

That is a highly important fact, absolutely uncontradicted by the defense. That means she was sexually assaulted and murdered contemporaneously because there's no other time for anyone else to get there and murder her after she experiences the sexual assault.

How do we know this? Well, Ms. Luzaich explained to you of course that when -after Miss -- oops. At autopsy, Ms. Quarles had vaginal lacerations that bled, showing she was alive, but there was no swelling, and that the swelling would be visible and noticeable within 30 minutes. So she died within 30 minutes of being sexually assaulted.

The second most salient fact in this case was the time of her mother's 911 call which we know was at 2:51 p.m. in the afternoon.

Okay. What does that tell us? The mother of Debra -- or Debra Quarles explained to you that when she found her daughter, which would be right at about 2:51, her daughter was in a bathtub of hot water. A little before 3:00 that water is hot. Well, what does that tell you. At \(20^{\prime}\) clock if the murder occurred then, maybe it would be warm, it certainly wouldn't be hot. Earlier than that,
\(1: 30\), the water's not gonna be for by \(30^{\prime}\) clock
later on in the day.
And so what this does is makes for a very, very small, short time frame in which this murder and sexual assault could be committed. Probably about \(2 o^{\prime} \mathrm{clock}\), maybe past 2 o'clock, but I doubt much earlier. 2 o'clock. So Debra comes home at ten to \(3: 00\) is the time period that we're talking about for the murder.

And I would ask you to keep in mind that time frame as you analyze the facts and the evidence in this case, because they eliminate every other possibility besides Norman Flowers as the kilier.

Now, Mr. Patrick suggested to you that it was appropriate for you to disregard the information you heard about the Marilee Coote case. I have no doubt that Mr. Patrick would like you to completely ignore the fact of the Marilee Coote case, to completely ignore that his client sexually assaulted Marilee Coote in May of 2005, five weeks after Sheila's murder, that his client strangled Marilee Coote five weeks later after murdering Sheila Quarles in 2005.

But Judge Bell has given you the
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instruction that tells you why this information came into evidence. This wasn't presented as sort of an aside or something that may be you'd find interesting in jury, in your jury deliberations. It was evidence that you are to consider. And what you do is consider it for the purpose in which that instruction tells you it's offered. It is not to be considered in a generalized sense.

So you cannot use it in the sense of well, if Mr. Flowers committed this murder in May, he must be a violent guy, therefore he's the guy responsible for the Quarles' murder in March. That's an improper use of the evidence.

But what you can use the information for is it, is does it give you information regarding the identity of Sheila Quarles's murderer. Does it give you information regarding the intent of Sheila Quarles murderer. And does it give you information regarding whether Sheila Quarles consented to sex with Norman Flowers similar to gee, did Marilee Coote consent to that sex, too, with the anal tears and the vaginal lacerations? Does it help you to identify Sheila Quarles's murderer when you look at what you know happened in May of 2005.

You know that Mr. Flowers knew
someone at both of these apartment complexes. He knew Debra Quarles and he had a girlfriends named Mawoose Ragland at the Marilee Coote complex.

You know in both of these cases there was no sign of forced entry in either case. Sheila certainly would have recognized him and opened the door for him, Marilee Coote would have recognized him from hanging out with a girlfriend, wouldn't be afraid of him, would open the door for him.

You know that in both of these cases there was sorts of a minor low-grade type robbery that occurred associated with the sexual assault and the murder of the two victims.

In Marilee Coote's case, her car was moved a little bit, the keys were gone and of course we have the stereo and the cell phone that was taken in the Sheila Quarles's case.

Do those similarities help you identify who might be the killer in the Sheila Quarles's case? Of course it does.

What about the fact that they're both strangled? Does that give you information as to who might be responsible, who might be the killer of Sheila Quarles? Of course it does.
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How about the fact that they were both sexually assaulted? A sexually motivated murder.

Mr. Patrick says there's no motive in this case. It is a sexually motivated murder. How do we know this? Look what happened to the victim. Sheila Quarles is violently sexually assaulted. That might be a motive for the murder. And what happens five weeks later, oh, wow, Marilee Coote is violently sexually assaulted and then she's strangled as well.

Does the fact of the crime that occurred five weeks later give you information that is probative, that is clear and convincing and that is important and relevant in terms of your determination of just who might be responsible for Sheila Quarles's murder? Of course it does.

You're not to disregard the
evidence. If you believe it was proven by clear and convincing evidence, you're to apply it to your evaluation of the evidence in the Quarles case.

And incidentally, this doesn't
rocket science. I mean, there are very obvious similarities that occurred in both cases. Is that something you think is probative or not?

9 Should the police have identified him sooner by 9 do with it, do you think he might have been a little
10 more evasive about yes, I had sex with her and you're gonna find my DNA in her vaginal swabs as well because I had sex with her that day? He doesn't do any of that.

And you saw him testify. You're the judges of his demeanor. How did he appear to you? Did he appear evasive, did he appear like he just might be the real killer or was he some guy who didn't want to be here, who clearly said I had sex with her and then I went to work.

You are to evaluate his demeanor and you can certainly take that into account in the deliberation room.

Now, how about the suggestion that Brasses family kept him hidden for three years. It's a little more accurate to say that maybe the defense in this case is a little bit of a work in progress or sort of a varying well, maybe it's George Brass who did it and oh, no, it's Jessie Nava who's the one who's really responsible. Oh, wait. Maybe it was the guy who was dealing weed to Miss Sena. Maybe some combination of those people. Let's talk about George Brass. making those calls to the young ladies on Sheila Quarles' cell phone records? Absolutely. That is a fair valid criticism. Does it change any of the information that we know about the case, about how we discovered George Brass? No. George Brass will a sexual relationship with Sheila Quarles.

Now, defense told you in opening statement that Brass is the killer and that was alluded to a little bit by Mr. Patrick, but then it switched to Mr. Nava. But generally they said George Brass kept himself hidden for three years and his family kept him hidden, too, and everybody in that entire complex was afraid. Even Debra Quarles we'll hear. So no one, no one said that Sheila was having sex with George Brass.

Well, what happens when the police
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finally show up on George Brass's door step? He tells them, yeah, I've had a sexual assault with Sheila that's been going on a long time. He doesn't ask for a lawyer, he doesn't ask to remain silent. He's sitting in custody, but when the police come and ask him, he gives it up. He says \(I\) had this relationship. I mean, certainly by then, he knows she's been murdered. If he really had something to
police weren'tasking the right people the right questions, but certainly there's been no evidence in this case whatsoever that anyone has made any attempt to hide George Brass from the police. What happened to Mr. Lewis? He was cooperative with the police, he gave his own buckle swab up. He certainly wasn't trying to hide anything about his nephew.

And what was the suggestion that Mr. Patrick made? That people are frightened of George Brasses family. Just how was it then that the police learned of George Brass's existence. Well, they learned it from Ameia Fuller. The young lady who testified that she was Sheila's cousin and also, you know, they were certainly friends as well. He's the one that gives us George Brass's name.

Now, if people were so afraid of the Brass family, is Ameia just braver than anybody else or was it just not some big secret in a case where the police are miscommunicating with people that might know some information?

And to believe that George Brass is the killer or the one responsible in this case, you'd have to disregard his alibi. No one disputes that. No one can say he wasn't at Wal-Mart. His
card was swiped in at 12:04. Sheila was alive beyond that. He just cannot be the killer. If you engage in some sort of conspiracy theory, is it possible in this world that his card wasn't swiped on that day by himself? Is it possible that maybe his supervisor is some in twisted conspiracy with George Brass to help him get away with murder? I guess. But there's no evidence in this case to suggest that.

And certainly when you have Brass's demeanor and his willingness to cooperate with the police, you can pretty much disregard that as rank speculation, which you're not supposed to do in this case.

And just as a side note, compare
George Brass's reaction to the police with the
defendant's. The police asked him, did you have a sexual assault relationship with Sheila. Brass says yes, I did. Did you have sex with her that day, the day of the murder. Brass says yes, I did. In fact, the relationship has been going on for awhile. Do you know Sheila and her family. I'm friends with her brother, I know her mom, her mom knows my mom. No attempt to hide information. Were you there on the day of the crime, George. Yeah, I was there on
the day of the crime and then I went to Wal-Mart to go to work.

By contrast, what was Mr. Flowers' response to the police when they started asking him about Sheila Quarles' murder. Mr. Flowers, do you know someone by the name of Debra Quarles? No response. They show him a photo. Mr. Flowers, do you know Debra. Do you know this woman. I'm not saying.

MR. PIKE: Objection, Your Honor.
THE COURT: What's the objection?
MR. PIKE: Edwards versus State,
post-Miranda silence.
THE COURT: Well, he wasn't silent. He was cooperative with the police and he was discussing the matter with him. He just didn't say anything as to that particular question. If he exercised his right to remain silent, of course you would have that right. Go ahead.

MS. WECKERLY: Mr. Flowers, do you know
Debra. And they show him the photo. I'm not saying. Mr. Flowers, do you know someone named Sheila. No, doesn't know Sheila. This woman that he's supposed according to Mr. Patrick having a consensual sexual assault relationship, he doesn't
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know her real name. He only knows her nickname. That's odd.

George Brass knows her real name and he's having sex her. Quince Toney knows her real name, but all of a sudden it's Mr. Flowers who can't quite put together if he knows these people for the police, for the benefit of the investigation.

Why is he so evasive? And why was
he Mr. Helpful to Debra Quarles right after the murder? Why was he so willing and so concerned to talk to her about the extent of the investigation and how things were going and if she was getting grief counseling? Why was he willing to do that with Debra, but when the police show up to get information about the investigation, he can't even remember if he knows Debra. I wonder why that would be?

Now, certainly that type of evidence isn't like a mathematical calculation that you can make like the DNA evidence, but you can consider it and obviously should consider it in your evaluation of all the evidence in this case.

Let's talk about Mr. Lewis. He is and also helped pull Sheila Quarles out of the

1 bathtub.

3 Mr . Patrick is that well, maybe he was, maybe he was 4 the killer because we didn't check whether he pawned 5 anything. Or if you don't buy that, he's part of 6 the conspiracy to hide his nephew George Brass who 7 admitted to being with Sheila Quarles on the day of 8 the murder.

Now, Mr. Patrick reviewed with you his interpretation of George Brass or of Robert Lewis's testimony. He said that Robert Lewis saw Brass, that he pointed out to Chicken his nephew that Sheila was alone in the apartment. And Mr. Patrick also said that Robert Lewis sort of took note of the comings and goings of his nephew at Sheila Quarles's apartment on the day of the murder.

I trust you all took notes as to Robert Lewis's testimony, and I would ask you to rely on your own recollection of what his testimony was in terms of who and what he was aware of on the day of the murder and rely on that rather than Mr . Patrick's characterization of what Mr. Lewis said he saw with regard to his nephew.

And just aside from that, do you really think Robert Lewis is involved in some
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1 conspiracy to hide his nephew? His nephew said he had the sexual relationship with Sheila Quarles.
What's to hide at this point?
Now, let's talk about Jessie or Jesus Nava and Ms. Sena. And sort of mid-way through the defense's closing argument, it was alluded to you that this is the killer. It's now Jessie Nava. Let's forget Brass, forget Robert Lewis and concentrate on Jessie Nava because he's the killer or maybe the guy who was dealing me.

Now, I have no doubt that Ms. Sena who was the young lady who testified to you yesterday -- or for you yesterday is doing her absolute best to recall what she remembered on that day.

But by her own admission, she was doing methamphetamine 24 hours a day at that time. And by her own admission that made her a little paranoid. That alone should tell you that maybe this young lady is not the most reliable source of information as to times and who was there on the 24th.

And she, you know she's clearly off with her times because she testified that she heard Debra Quarles's screaming less than an hour after

1 she got home. She said she got rome at noon and within an hour she hears Debra Quarles screaming about the death of her daughter.

Does that fit with our time frame what I told you at the very beginning of that 911 call being at 2:51? No.

Ms. Sena is about two hours off at a minimum. She also says that she thought she saw George Brass there on the afternoon of the murder. That's what she said, I thought I saw him. This is someone she sees every day.

And she's someone who we know was under the, you know, was under the influence at the time she was observing all this and we also know she's someone, is someone that wasn't too accurate in terms of time.

So you as a jury have to decide which version of events do you trust. Do you trust George Brass saying I left and went to work which by the way is corroborated by his work card or do you trust Ms. Sena who is using methamphetamine at the time who you know provided, although certainly not in terms of a lie, but provided inaccurate information as to time.

I would submit to you that George
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Brass is the more likely source of information.
What about this mysterious man that she sees, the tall guy and the flannel shirt? Well, maybe he's the real killer says Mr. Patrick. He's the guy or this is the guy that she's trying to buy weed from for her boyfriend and in her paranoid admittedly meth induced state, well, I see him around the apartment. Not inside Sheila's apartment, not inside the doorway of Sheila's apartment, but between the two doors that face each other at the apartment complex.

And what did she say? Oh, for all I know, he could have been coming out of the other apartment.

And what do you know about Sheila Quarles? Her tox screen was clean. She wasn't using any drugs at the time. So this weed dealer did not have contact with her. She's home alone. What other purpose would he have to contact her?

And it's interesting to me that the defense is suggesting to you that you should consider this person as a potential killer who has no connection whatsoever to Sheila Quarles' body or her apartment, but you're to speculate which you're not supposed to do, that maybe somehow he's involved


in this.
Any evidence to support that? Zero. None whatsoever. So you're to ignore all the evidence and think oh, gosh, maybe it was this guy.

Let's talk about Jessie Nava and the radio. Now, Mr. Patrick went to great lengths to tell you that Jessie or that Ms. Sena saw Jessie Nava with the stereo. Really?

Was that her testimony? Didn't they show him or show Ms. Sena that picture of the stereo itself and say is this what you saw with Jessie Nava, is that what he was carrying? And what was her response to that? I don't know. I don't know what it looked like.

But he must have said 20 times, I mean conservatively 20 times that she saw Jessie Nava with that three CD stereo. Was that the evidence in this case? No. Absolutely not.

And what did you learn this morning? You learned that there was a boom box or, you know, a way to play music that was also stolen from the residence after the police did the investigation. And of course that makes sense, right?

You know that Debra Quarles was so distraught that she left that apartment and went to
her son's house and never went back. That apartment was vacant until they went back a day or two later and started packing up the stuff. And what's missing at that point, the boom box. Is this something that they reported to the police? No. Is that surprising? Probably not given what they've been through as a family when your daughter has been sexually assaulted and murdered, maybe you're not thinking, gosh, I really want to report that I lost my \(\$ 30\) boom box in connection with this.

What happened is Ms. Sena gets arrested on the night or the day of the murder. She comes back two days later and Jessie Nava says to her, as she explained to you, that he took a radio from the dead girl's apartment. Yeah, he took it after the police were there when the Quarles were all staying at the brother's house. He's not the killer.

Besides that, to reiterate, use your common sense. Do you think that this person who's sort of the local thief, the manager sees him 20 times in the apartment complex, he's trespassing here and there, the management's always telling him to leave, do you think this is the guy that all of a sudden was like I'm gonna steal a radio and while hot water.

Maybe the person used a condom, maybe they used an object, but you know, nurse Ebbert said that if they used an object to sexually assault, you'd see, you know, something different than the injuries that we saw.

Is it possible the person used a condom? Well what else would have to be true? You would have to believe that even though this person sexually assaulted Sheila Quarles and took steps to make sure that not a trace of DNA was left in her, that this phantom killer all of a sudden decided I'm gonna put her in the bathtub for no apparent reason.

Because truly the only reason to put
her in a tub of hot water is to destroy DNA evidence. If you haven't left any there because you used a condom or you used an object, there is absolutely no reason for her to be put in a tub of

But it doesn't just stop there. Our phantom killer according to the defense is pretty much the luckiest person who's ever been in Las Vegas because as luck would have it, right after this phantom killer kills Sheila Quarles, Norman Flowers commits a identical crime five weeks later
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trace of DNA.
leaving his DNA In that victim. In the exact same way, a manual strangulation, a robbery, a non-forced entry, and a sexual assault.

And what luck for this phantom
killer, right? Because now it looks like Norman Flowers did it instead of him.

But it doesn't just stop there.
This phantom killer gets even luckier because when the police go to talk to Norman Flowers, as luck would have it and for no apparent reason, he's uncooperative with the police. He's evasive, he's saying he doesn't know the family. He's not even sure of the fame of the woman he allegedly had the consensual sexual relationship with.

MR. PIKE: Objection, Your Honor.
Misstates the evidence. He said he had his other case when they talked with him. And the fact that there was no response, it doesn't mean that there wasn't an attempt to respond.

THE COURT: I'm not disagreeing with you. I mean, they can -- they heard exactly what was said. It was read verbatim.

What the lawyers say is not
evidence, but if there's a slight misstatement one way or the other by any of these people, they don't
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intend it, but me recollection is, you're right, Mr. Pike, my recollection is that wasn't exactly what was said, but go ahead.

MS. WECKERLY: My recollection of what he said when they said, when Detective Sherwood asked him, do you know Sheila, his response was no, no response. And then he said oh, I, I knew her only by her nickname. Like this woman he's having this consensual relationship with, boy, it's just a mystery what her real name is even though I know her mother and her family, but I don't know her real name.

The reality is there's no phantom killer in this case. And it's not Robert Lewis and it's not Jessie Brass and it's not Jessie Nava and it's not Kudos Who. It's Norman Flowers and it's no one else.

Now, Mr. Patrick kind of in my opinion stretched the boundaries of science and certainly what was testified to by a Dr. Simms in this case, he actually suggested to you that because the strangulation marks on each of these victims wasn't identical because they didn't have measurement equal petechial hemorrhages that somehow that told you they are strangled by two different Quarles. murdered. her.

Does that strike you as logical? Do you think they might have had a different level of fight in them?

Did Dr. Simms at all suggest that gosh, this might not be done by the same one. My goodness, look at this, the petechial hemorrhages aren't identical. That means that the same person couldn't have done both of these murders. It's illogical. It makes no sense.

Mr. Patrick said we don't know when the semen of Norman Flowers was put in Sheila

Well, what did you hear from
Christina Paulette? The level of semen for both George Brass and Norman Flowers was identical from this vaginal swab. You know George Brass had sex with her that day. What does that tell you? Norman Flowers had sex with her that day, too. The level of DNA is the same.

Besides that, you know that when she came home that morning, she was wearing pajamas and that her jeans and panties are the clothes that are founds on the bathroom floor once she's been
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I don't think it's a big assumption or a big leap in logic to suggest that maybe she changed her underwear as well as her other clothes. So when they find Norman Flowers' semen and George Brass's semen on her panties, it's because those were, that was the pair of underwear she was wearing that day. That tells you when he sexually assaulted

The mark on the bathtub, that, that mark that, you know, Detective Vacarro said well, it was a dark color, it looked like blood, but the crime scene analyst, Detective Sherwood and those who got a close look at it said it's not blood. It's sort of an irrelevant point in this case, but.

Let's talk about the fingerprints.
Mr. Patrick said that there's no fingerprints at
Marilee Coote's apartment and so that suggests that he wasn't even there on the day of her murder.

That's interesting. Remember
Juanita Curry? She was the lady who was disabled who sat here? She identified him in a photographic lineup. She saw him trying to come in her apartment as the police are upstairs trying to investigate the murder of her neighbor. He was there.

And the fact that his prints aren't
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in Marilee's ap, tment isn't a really big shock because the whole place was wiped down.

Let's talk about the carpet stains.
Now, Mr. Patrick spent time saying, you know, why didn't they test the carpet and find out if George Brass had sex with Sheila in the living room or in the bedroom. They had a two year sexual relationship. They could have found George Brass's semen on the couch, on the floor or on the bed.

It would tell them nothing in terms of timing because you can't time DNA out of the human body. It wouldn't tell them anything. There was no reason to do that type of a testing.

Then Mr. Patrick talks about the speaker wire. Why wasn't that tested for DNA. Oh, yes, by all means forget the DNA that's actually in the sexually assaulted victim, forget the DNA that's in the sexually assaulted strangled victim five weeks later. It's the speaker that's gonna break the case wide open. It's not logical.

Mr. Schiro -- I'm gonna talk just briefly about the DNA statistics. Mr. Schiro and Ms. Paulette essentially agreed on the statistical analysis in this case.

And Mr. Schiro even agreed that
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99.99 percent of the population can be excluded as a source of that DNA in Sheila Quarles's vagina, but not Norman Flowers.

Now, alone, is that, that piece of information, 99.9 percent can be excluded by him? Alone is that beyond a reasonable doubt? Some people may say it is. Some may say it isn't. You follow the instruction that Judge Bell gave you and make your own determination.

But you, unlike the DNA analyst, aren't analyzing this case in a vacuum. They look at the one piece of evidence, they make a calculation about that piece of evidence and they report that; 99.9 percent can be excluded, but not him.

They cannot factor into that
calculation that Debra Quarles knew Norman Flowers and saw him hanging out at the apartment complex two weeks before her daughter was murdered, but you can consider that.

They can't put in the calculation that there was no sign of forced entry into the apartment and that Sheila Quarles would likely have known her attacker which of course she would know Norman Flowers.

They can't put that into the calculation. They can't put into the calculation that Marilee Coote was strangled and sexually assaulted and killed the exact same way five weeks later when they make their calculation. But certainly you can consider that and you should consider that when you're deciding whether this defendant is guilty beyond a reasonable doubt.

Someone inexplicably, at least to me, Mr. Patrick suggested to you well, maybe this was all the result of rough sex. Maybe they actually consented to it.

Sheila Quarles is dead, okay. She didn't consent to anything that happened to her that day. She didn't consent to having her vagina lacerated, she didn't consent to getting strangled, she didn't consent to being thrown in a bathtub and drowned. Nothing that happened to that young lady was consensual on that day.

And I don't think it's too different for Marilee Coote either. Marilee Coote had lacerations anally and on her vagina. A violent sexual assault. There is no indication that she consented to any of that as well.

And just in sort of closing, the
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State is the only party with the burden in a criminal case, but let's be clear what that burden is. It is to prove that this defendant is guilty beyond a reasonable doubt.

Our burden is not to prove a
negative. It's not to prove that no one else on the planet that it's a metaphysical impossibility for anyone else to have possibly committed this murder.

It is our burden to prove that he did this. He did it beyond a reasonable doubt.

And you all know and you all live in
the real world. Crimes occur in the real world. That's the world that you all make decisions in.

And the defense would ask you to look at each piece of evidence and each fact you know about this case in a vacuum.

The DNA alone isn't beyond a reasonable doubt. The fact that there wasn't a forced entry alone isn't beyond a reasonable doubt.

What about the fact that Norman Flowers was hanging out and lying to Debra Quartes about being a maintenance guy, maybe explaining his presence at the apartment. Does that alone show that he's the killer beyond a reasonable doubt? No.

But you don't look at each piece of 25
evidence separaly. You're to look at it as a totality. What does it tell you all put together? Inexplicably his DNA is in the vaginal swabs of a young woman who's been strangled and murdered. He's that guy. 99 percent of the population can be excluded. He's the guy that can't. Beyond a reasonable doubt on its own? Maybe, maybe not.

The other guy. The other source of the DNA in this young lady's vaginal swab, that guy's got an alibi. He's at work.

When you couple that with the 99.9, are you getting a little higher to a hundred percent?

His DNA is in her underwear which suggests that he had sex with her that day, probably pulled her underwear to the side as he was sexually assaulting her.
99.9 percent of the population can be excluded. The other guy has an alibi, oh, and his DNA is also in the underwear she wore that day. Getting a little higher up to a hundred percent?

As you go through this, it's like that list or that column that Christina Paulette showed you of each of the points on the DNA strands. At a certain point, the evidence becomes

\section*{exponential.}

What else? Well, he's a guy who Sheila Quarles would open a door for. He's a guy that wouldn't have to make a forced entry. He's that guy. He's the guy that can't be excluded. He's the guy that's in, that's in the swabs from her underwear. The other guy has an alibi and he's someone she'd open the door for.

And of course, what else do you know? He's the guy that committed the crime, an identical crime five weeks later. Marilee Coote is strangled. She's sexually assaulted and property is taken from her, from her apartment.

I mean, what are the odds of that, all those facts being true? He can't be excluded, the other guy has an alibi, his DNA is present in his underwear and oh, wait, he committed an identical crime five weeks later in the exact same way. Manual strangulation, sexual assault and murder.

What are the odds of that? In what universe is any other conclusion other than him being the killer at all the product of rationale thought and no speculation?

Murder trials, this isn't a game. I

1 mean, this isn't supposed to be ar exercise in
creative possibilities, what scenario can I configure with the facts.

Verdicts and decisions are supposed to be based on evidence and rationale thought. It is Norman Flowers who got Sheila Quarles to open that door.

It is Norman Flowers who pulled her underwear to the side and sexually assaulted her within 30 minutes of her death.

It is Norman Flowers who
unsuccessfully tried to get her underwear back on her clothing, although be it not successfully.

It's Norman Flowers who would have known that Sheila Quarles could identify him as the perpetrator of the sexual assault without question. She knows who he is.

It is Norman Quarles (sic) who strangled her, who took minutes to get her unconscious and then minutes after that to kill her and then ultimately she actually dies of the drowning.

It's Norman Flowers who has a reason to put her in that bathtub to try to hide his DNA.

It's Norman Flowers who tried to
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hide his DNA five weeks later in Marilee Coote's apartments.

And it's Norman Flowers who was
responsible for this crime and the crime that occurred five weeks later.

This isn't about every conceivable possibility. This is about an honest consideration of the evidence in conjunction with the law that Judge Bell read you.

There is no question that he is the person who is responsible for this crime. The only question left is whether you will hold him accountable for it.

THE COURT: Thanks. Okay. The case goes to you now, ladies and gentlemen of the jury. You're gonna get a verdict form that of course as you know there four counts. Burglary, sexual assault, robbery or just up or down.

And the way you do it is you say to yourself has the State proven beyond a reasonable doubt that this defendant's guilty of burglary or sexual assault or robbery.

In the murder category, it's
slightly different. You have to at first ask
yourself has the State proven beyond a reasonable
doubt this defordant is guilty of murder in the first degree. If he is not, then you go and ask yourself has the State proven he's guilty or murder in the second degree. And if that's not, as with any charge, not guilty is always the default position.

So in the main column, you'll have one box checked and one box not checked in each these four. But if you do find the defendant guilty of murder in the first degree, then there are three possibilities in the special verdict form; whether it was willful and deliberate, whether it was felony murder or whether the jury didn't agree.

So it cold be that you could have the first two checked. It could be both willful and deliberate and felony murder or just one of the two, or it could be the third.

So if you find the defendant guilty of murder in the first degree, you need to sort of answer these three questions; what was our thinking, how did we get there.

Okay. With that in mind, Ms. Clerk, will you swear the officer to take charge of the jury and draw the alternates at random.

Now, we're gonna draw two
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alternates. Obviously we've used the five days with 14 people. That's great. This case may or may not go on. We may be done today, we may be done tomorrow. We might go on for another couple of days. And so the alternates are very important and they -- they'11 just stay and be part of the team. Whoever's drawn as the alternates are not allowed to talk with each other or anybody else about the case because we never know at what point in time you're going in as a pinch hitter. It happens all the time.

\section*{So Ms. Clerk?}
(Whereupon, the officer was sworn to take charge of the jury.)
THE COURT: Ms. Clerk, draw two
alternates at random and give us a number. Tina has numbers one through 14 in the cup. She just does a blind draw. What number?

THE CLERK: Juror No. 10, Niklos Novotny.
THE COURT: Okay. That's one.
THE CLERK: Juror No. 13, Miadora Nelson.
THE COURT: Okay. You two will be the
alternates. You'll kind of be together and the
other 12 will kind of be together. You're not allowed to talk about the case at all.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline 1 &  \\
\hline 2 & reassemble and we'll go on. And it is the case that \\
\hline 3 & sometimes we lose one at that juncture and we put \\
\hline 4 & people in, but you have to kind of approach the case \\
\hline 5 & as though the case is still in progress and we'll \\
\hline 6 & just see how it plays out \\
\hline 7 & So Officer Moon will take you all \\
\hline 8 & and take you where you need to go. The food is \\
\hline 9 & already there. He'll bring in all the evidence and \\
\hline 10 & the 12 deliberating jurors need to just tell us when \\
\hline 11 & they've reached a verdict and we will reassemble and \\
\hline 12 & take that verdict and we will decide what else if \\
\hline 3 & anything we have. \\
\hline 14 & Take all your stuff. Take your \\
\hline 15 & coats, take your purses, take anything you have. \\
\hline 16 & (Whereupon, the jury left the \\
\hline 17 & courtroom to deliberate.) \\
\hline 18 & THE COURT: Okay. The jury has exited. \\
\hline 19 & Anything else? \\
\hline 20 & MS. WECKERLY: No, Your Honor. \\
\hline 21 & THE COURT: Okay. Give your numbers to \\
\hline 22 & Tina. \\
\hline 23 & ATTEST: FULL, TRUE AND ACCURATE TRANSCRIPT OF THE \\
\hline & PROCEEDINGS. \\
\hline 24 & Goarn Onduna \\
\hline 25 & Jo ANN ORDUNA \\
\hline & CCR NO. 370 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
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