1	IN THE SUPREME C	OURT (	OF THE STAT	E OF NEVADA
2				_
3	SHAWN GLOVER,	)	No. 77425	
4	Appellant,	)		Electronically Filed Apr 17 2019 04:57 p.m.
5	v.	)		Elizabeth A. Brown Clerk of Supreme Court
6		)		
7	THE STATE OF NEVADA,	)		
8	Respondent.	, )		
9	APPELLANT'S APP	) ENDIX '	VOLUME IV P	PAGES 685-925
10		<u> LINDIX</u>	VOLUME IV I	110LS 003 723
11	DARIN F. IMLAY		STEVE WOI	LFSON
12	Clark County Public Defender 309 South Third Street		200 Lewis A	District Attorney venue, 3 <sup>rd</sup> Floor
13	Las Vegas, Nevada 89155-2610		Las Vegas, N AARON D. I	
14	Attorney for Appellant		Attorney Ger 100 North Ca	
15 16			Carson City, (702) 687-35	Nevada 89701-4717 38
17			Counsel for F	
18				-
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				
26				
27				
28				

## INDEX SHAWN GLOVER Case No. 77425

Case No. 77425	PAGE NO
Amended Indictment filed 07/31/18	
Defendant's Notice of Witnesses filed 07/24/18	211-213
Defendant's Sentencing Memorandum Date of Hrg: 10/10/18	261-304
District Court Minutes from 02/04/16 through 10/10/18	311-335
Indictment filed 02/04/16	1-3
Indictment Warrant filed 02/04/16	4-5
Indictment Warrant Return filed 02/08/16	6-8
Judgment of Conviction (Jury Trial) filed 10/15/18	305-306
Jury List filed 07/31/18	217
Instructions to the Jury filed 08/03/18	218-256
Media Request and Order Allowing Camera Access to Court Proceedings filed 02/17/16	103-104
Motion to Compel Production of Discovery & Brady Material Date of Hrg: 06/07/17	120-155
Motion to Continue Trial Date Date of Hrg: 11/02/16	117-119
Motion for Setting of Reasonable Bail Date of Hrg: 05/23/16	111-113
Motion to Bifurcate Count 3 Date of Hrg: 05/15/18	203-207
Motion to Strike Expert Witnesses filed 05/04/18	198-202
Motion to Withdraw as Counsel filed 04/07/16	107-110
Notice of Appeal filed 11/08/18	307-310
Notice of Department Reassignment filed 07/12/17	172-173
Order filed 09/13/17	176-188
Order for Production and Release of CPS/DFS Records filed 08/22/17	174-175
State's Notice of Expert Witnesses filed 11/09/17	189-195
State's Notice of Witnesses filed 07/20/18	208-210
	Case No. 77425  Amended Indictment filed 07/31/18

1	State's Notice to Place on Calendar filed 05/03/18
2	State's Opposition to Defendant's Motion to Compel Production of Discovery & Brady Material
3	Date of Hrg: 05/31/17
4	State's Opposition to Defendant's Motion for Setting of Reasonable Bail Date of Hrg: 05/23/16114-116
5	Stipulation and Order filed 08/30/18
6	Substitution of Counsel filed 03/04/16
7	Verdict filed 08/03/18
8	
9	<u>TRANSCRIPTS</u>
10	Recorder's Transcript JURY TRIAL DAY 1
11	Date of Hrg: 07/30/18
12	Recorder's Transcript JURY TRIAL DAY 2
13	Date of Hrg: 07/31/18
14	Recorder's Transcript JURY TRIAL DAY 3
15	Date of Hrg: 08/01/18
16	Recorder's Transcript JURY TRIAL DAY 4
17	Date of Hrg: 08/02/18
18	Recorder's Transcript
19	JURY TRIAL DAY 5 Date of Hrg: 08/03/18
20	Recorder's Transcript
21	Calendar Call   Date of Hrg: 05/10/18
22	Recorder's Transcript
23	Calendar Call; Defendant's Motion to Bifurcate Count 3; Defendant's Motion to Strike Expert Witness
24	Date of Hrg: 06/28/18
25	Recorder's Transcript Defendant's Motion to Strike Expert Witnesses; Calendar Call
26	Date of Hrg: 07/19/18
27	Recorder's Transcript Defendant's Motion to Strike Expert Witnesses; Calendar Call
28	Date of Hrg: 07/26/18

1 2	Recorder's Transcript Defendant's Motion for Setting of Reasonable Bail Date of Hrg: 05/23/16
3	Recorder's Transcript Defendant's Motion to Compel Production of Discovery & Brady Material
4	Date of Hrg: 05/31/17
5	Recorder's Transcript Defendant's Motion to Compel Production of Discovery &
6	Brady Material and Status Check: Murder Team Assignment Date of Hrg: 07/11/17359-361
7	Recorder's Transcript
8	Defendant's Motion to Compel Production of Discovery & Brady Material; Status Check: Trial Setting
9	Date of Hrg: 07/18/17
10	Recorder's Transcript
11	Defendant's Motion to Compel Production of Discovery & Brady Material; Status Check: Trial Readiness
12	Date of Hrg: 08/29/17
12	Recorder's Transcript
13	Defendant's Motion to Continue Trial Date of Hrg: 11/02/16
14	
15	Recorder's Transcript Grand Jury Indictment Date of Hrg: 02/04/16
16	Date of Firg. 02/04/10
17	Recorder's Transcript
17	Initial Arraignment Date of Hrg: 02/08/16340-342
18	
19	Recorder's Transcript Jess R. Marchese, Esq.'s Motion to Withdraw as Counsel
	Date of Hrg: 04/18/16
20	Recorder's Transcript
21	Sentencing
22	Date of Hrg: 10/10/18
22	Recorder's Transcript
23	Status Check: Trial Readiness Date of Hrg: 04/25/16
24	
25	Recorder's Transcript Status Check: Trial Readiness
26	Date of Hrg: 10/10/17
27	Recorder's Transcript Status Check: Trial Readiness/Record of Offer
28	Date of Hrg: 11/09/17

1	Recorder's Transcript Status Chack: Trial Pandings / Pacord of Offer
2	Recorder's Transcript Status Check: Trial Readiness/Record of Offer Date of Hrg: 11/14/17
3	Reporter's Transcript Grand Jury Date of Hrg: 02/03/16
4	Date of Hrg: 02/03/16
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	

describe yourself as kind of shy?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 000: Yeah.

MR. BASHOR: But still one of the younger folks. Would you agree?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 000: Yeah.

MR. BASHOR: Did you hear my questions I asked Mr. Jones?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 000: Yeah.

MR. BASHOR: So, if you're the young guy, and you're back there with people who have had far more life experience than you, would you be able to express your opinion among strangers?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 000: Probably.

MR. BASHOR: Even if those 11 strangers believed one way, and you were the only one that believed the other way?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 000: Yeah.

MR. BASHOR: Anybody here just a follower? That just -- they're not going to be able to speak up? Anybody here just -- they don't care about the opinions of others? No hands.

You're going to hear testimony from police officers and listen to their testimony and assess their credibility. And we've already heard from the Judge about, just by virtue of the fact, a police officer is a police officer, would you find them more or less credible. That's not what this question is about. But you are going to have to assess the credibility of police officers. And to assess the quality of their investigation.

I have a five-year-old son who loves to dress up as a police officer, arrest his little buddies, throw them in jail, with no investigation whatsoever.

That's great on the playground. Kind of hilarious to watch. But everyone agrees that this is a courtroom. Yes?

PROSPECTIVE JURORS: Yes.

MR. BASHOR: And that even though these individuals are police officers, you're going to have to be able to assess their credibility and assess the quality of their investigation. Does everybody agree?

PROSPECTIVE JURORS: Yes.

MR. BASHOR: Does anybody think that they can't do that? No hands. Mr. Harris, you probably can guess why I'm picking on you. We're talking about police officers, and you were a military police officer, right?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 947: Yes.

MR. BASHOR: And is there anything about your experience of being a police officer and having to assess the credibility and quality of an investigation of the officers in this case. Is there going to be anything about your experience where you go back there and say, they over did it, or they didn't do enough? That kind of thing, based on your experience?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 947? No, based off the facts of the case, they either did their job or they didn't.

MR. BASHOR: Right. And they have different protocols and policies than, say military policemen.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 947: Absolutely.

MR. BASHOR: I've, to be 100 percent honest with you, gone back and forth about asking about this, all night, but I think to be fair, I got to ask about it. And the 32 of you, with the exception of one, don't look like him, right. Mr. Glover's African American. Is there anything about the fact that he's an African American that's going to cloud your judgment, or have some kind of assumption or pre- conceived notion about his behavior? Anything like that

at all? Anyone?

UNIDENTIFIED PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Absolutely not.

MR. BASHOR: Now's the time to say it. I mean you're under oath. I don't relish in asking about this, but, unfortunately, I think in this day and age, it's still relevant. No hands. Thank you.

I don't know this to be a fact, but in murder cases, in my experience, and again, I don't want to speak necessarily for Mr. Stanton, but I'm sure in his experience, sometimes there are quite a few individuals in the gallery during a murder case. People who are relatives, friends, of either side.

Is there anything about their presence that would you find intimidating? Is anybody going to be intimidated by the gallery? Anyone going to say well, the Defense has 20 people in support and the State has 10, therefore, the Defense is right? Anybody going to do that? No, right? And vise-versa? No hands. Will you pass the microphone to Ms. Mazzei? Are all killings the same?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 004: No.

MR. BASHOR: And you might imagine why I'm picking on you.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 004: I've got an idea.

MR. BASHOR: And so -- but you would agree that there's a spectrum of killings, anything from a pure accident all the way to a premeditated deliberate first degree count?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 004: Yes.

MR. BASHOR: And as Mr. Stanton discussed you're going to get a packet of instructions that come from the Judge that may or may not define different kinds of killings on that spectrum. Does anybody say a killing is a

MR. BASHOR: Is there anything about the fact that you're friends with this individual that's going to affect your ability to assess his credibility in this case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 923: I just know him well and know who he is and his credibility.

MR. BASHOR: Okay.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 923: Just probably his character of who he

MR. BASHOR: But what I'm saying is your friends with the guy, right?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 923: Correct.

MR. BASHOR: Presumably, that means he's got a good credibility, and he's a nice guy, and that kind of thing.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 923: Correct.

MR. BASHOR: Okay. Is the fact that you have those beliefs going to affect your ability to assess his testimony on the stand?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 923: No.

MR. BASHOR: All right. I know that Mr. Barnes served on a grand jury. Anybody else, grand jury? No hands. This is a weird and complicated question. Anybody, not counting yesterday and today, anybody in this 32 know another member of the jury panel, outside of the last two days?

PROSPECTIVE JURORS: No.

MR. BASHOR: Neighbors, coworkers, former coworkers, friends?

All shaking their head. Is there anything that we need to know, that you haven't said? Anyone? Anything that, for whatever reason, our exhaustive list

MR. BASHOR: And did it go to trial or --

because we got the call at 2:00 something in the morning. So, that -- honestly,

1	MR. STANTON: Yes.
2	THE COURT: So, you can collect your thoughts and chit-chat to
3	speed up the
4	MR. STANTON: Are you going to bring them in and then we pass
5	the sheet back and forth?
6	THE COURT: If you need me to, I will. I was just thinking we could,
7	you know, give them a little break
8	MR. STANTON: Yeah, we can
9	THE COURT: and do some of preliminary thoughts.
10	MR. STANTON: Yeah, yeah.
11	THE COURT: I assume you wanted them in the room, so you can
12	look at them?
13	MR. BASHOR: Yes, I'd prefer yeah.
14	MR. STANTON: Yeah, I don't have a preference.
15	MR. BASHOR: I would prefer, because that's how I
16	THE COURT: Okay.
17	MR. BASHOR: Okay.
18	THE COURT: So, I'll give them a short break.
19	MR. BASHOR: Yes.
20	[Sidebar ends at 12:44 p.m.]
21	THE COURT: Okay. Ladies and gentlemen, we're going to take a
22	short recess. I'm going to ask that you come back at 1:00 and then we're going
23	to finish the jury selection process. And those of you that will be selected to
24	serve should know probably by 1:30 at the latest.

Okay. So, yesterday I neglected to mention to you that the lawyers

and the -- all persons involved in this case, it doesn't matter whether it's court staff, lawyers, witnesses, you know, they cannot speak to the ladies and gentlemen of the jury because to do so might contaminate your verdict.

So, if you're in the hallway, and you see a lawyer and they are scurrying away from you, or avoiding eye contact, it's not because they're being rude or anti-social, they are bound by ethics and the law, not to speak to you. And mostly also because I would rock their world.

So, during this recess you can talk about anything you want, but you can't talk about the case or anyone who has anything to do with this case. If you could meet back up with my Marshal, Ramsey, at 1:00 in the predesignated area, we're going to bring you back in and then finish the selection part of the jury selection. Okay.

THE MARSHAL: All rise. The jury is exiting.

[Outside the presence of the jury.]

THE COURT: The record should reflect we're outside the presence of the prospective jury panel. Is there anything you'd like to address outside the presence of the jury? The plan would be to bring them back in at 1:00. I'll let you collect your notes and thoughts. Do your exercise or waive peremptory challenges on the form, when you get it. Back and forth while they're in the room. And then cross reference the list with your notes before I call out the names of the jurors who will be seated in the case.

Then I was thinking I would read the introduction to the trial of the case and then excuse them, because it has like all the preliminary nuggets of, you know, you have to do parking, you know, this is how the trial is going to work. Blah, blah, blah.

record should reflect that this is the time for the State and the Defense to

1 MR. STANTON: It's the waive, but I don't know where you want to 2 put it. 3 THE COURT: Just remember that one is State waived or whatever. 4 MR. STANTON: Okay. 5 [Sidebar ends at 1:11 p.m.] 6 [Pause] 7 THE COURT: So, State, I believe your eighth? 8 MR. STANTON: Yes. 9 [Pause] 10 THE COURT: The parties' ninth and final preemptory challenge. 11 [Pause] 12 THE COURT: Thank you. Can I see counsel at the bench? Actually, 13 just in the hallway just for this -- with your list. Be right back. 14 [Off the record at 1:18 p.m.] 15 THE COURT: Okay. Ladies and gentlemen, we're going to call out 16 -- I'm going to -- we, being me, call out the names of the jurors who are going 17 to be seated in this case. Before I do so, I want to extend my gratitude on 18 behalf of the attorneys, and the parties, and the Court. It's been a long jury 19 selection, two days long. And so, I appreciate that, you know, this isn't easy to 20 answer all of these personal questions, and I appreciate your professionalism 21 and courtesy. 22 If I call out your name, you have to stay. You're going to be sworn 23 and seated in the case, okay? So, Madrigal, Graber, Dwinell, Stettler, Cardoza, 24 Vinluan, Farfan, Mazzei, Morgan, Gevers, Chiesi, Williams, Rayna, and Jones.

The rest of you are excused, with the thanks of the Court.

[Excused jurors exit the courtroom at 1:20 p.m.]

THE COURT: Okay. So, here's how this works now. Now that you're recovering from the surprise, you're going to be rearranged and given different names. So, Ms. Madrigal, you're going to sit in that first seat. Your new name is Juror Number 1 for the entire trial. Graber, you sit in the next seat. You're Juror Number 2. Morgan, just move down, then Morgan -- I mean, Ms. Dwinell, excuse me, you're Juror Number 3.

JUROR NUMBER 9: Okay.

THE COURT: No, Dwinell.

JUROR NUMBER 9: Oh, I thought you said Morgan.

THE COURT: I did.

JUROR NUMBER 9: Oh, okay.

THE COURT: I just called her by her fast name --

JUROR NUMBER 9: Okay.

THE COURT: -- by mistake.

JUROR NUMBER 9: Okay.

THE COURT: I meant Dwinell, but I was looking at Morgan at the time. Stettler. Sir, you are Juror Number 4 in seat number 4.

JUROR NUMBER 4: Okay.

THE COURT: Ms. Cardoza, you are Juror Number 5 in seat number 5. Mr. Vinluan, you are Juror Number 6 in seat number 6. Farfan, you are Juror Number 7 in seat -- in that first seat right behind you. Ms. Mazzei, you are Juror Number 8. Ms. Morgan, you are Juror Number 9. Gevers is Juror Number 10. Chiesi is 11. Williams is 12. Mr. Reyna, you're right here in this first seat, 13. Mr. Jones, come on over.

Okay. So, all the peremptory challenges, having been exercised or waived, I'm going to now have you stand up, raise your right hand, and take the juror's oath.

## [The jury was sworn]

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. Please be seated. Is there any juror that was unable to take the juror's oath for any reason? Okay. I saw you all took the oath. Thank you.

Okay. So, here's how this is going to work. I'm going to read you an introduction to the trial of the case. It basically tells you how this is going to work, give you some practical information, that kind of thing. It'll take me about -- I don't know -- 20 minutes or so, and then I'm going to let you go for the day because we have some matters to attend to outside of your presence.

I'm going to read to you the introduction to the trial of the case. If there's anything you don't understand, or you want an explanation for, when I'm done reading it, just feel free to ask. Okay.

All right. Ladies and gentlemen, you are admonished that no juror may state to a fellow juror any fact related to this case as of his or her own knowledge, and if you discover during the course of this trial or after you retire to go to the deliberation room that any other juror has personal knowledge of the facts of this case, you have to disclose such situation to myself in the absence of the other jurors. This means that if you learn, during the course of the trial, that you were acquainted with any of the facts or witnesses, and you didn't know it at the time or you didn't previously disclose that relationship to me, you have to tell me.

Now, the jurors are always going to communicate to the Court

8

12

11

14

13

15 16

17 18

19

20

21

22

23

24 25 through the Marshal. During the course of this trial, I told you before, the attorneys, court personnel, and any -- any court personnel or attorneys are not permitted to converse with the ladies and gentlemen of the jury, because to do so might contaminate your verdict. They're not being antisocial, but really the only person that can speak to a juror is the Marshal, and that's why jurors tend to hang together outside as they're in a trial, in a group, because they're not supposed to be talking to anybody but each other. And even when they do talk to each other, they can't talk about the case.

So, you are admonished that you are not to do any independent investigation of the law or the facts on your own. So, what does that mean, practically speaking? That means you can't visit the scene. Okay. You can't go like on Sunday and go to the scene. You can't Google Earth it, okay? You can't use the internet and do independent research of the law or the facts.

Everything that I'm about to read to you, if you think about it in context of what we're trying to do here and why this is so important, these rules exist to provide these people a level playing field, right? The evidence in this case, which is the testimony of the witnesses and the exhibits introduced into evidence are what a jury has to decide the case on. The jury doesn't decide the case based upon one juror on the internet, or somebody out on a smoker's patio, or some witness on a cell phone talking to somebody, you don't even know who it is, that says something, right, because that's outside our level playing field.

And so, these people just spent two days picking the jurors out of the entire group of 75 people, plus 30 I had waiting in the wings today, because they think you are going to follow your oath, you're going to take this

as serious as they need you to take it, right, and do what you promised to do just now when you took the oath.

And so, that's -- you know, while it may not feel like it right now, a very big honor and responsibility, okay. That's a compliment to you. And because I know you're going to follow these rules, I lay them out very carefully and slowly, and then if you have any questions, I'll answer them.

So, the introduction to the trial in the case that I'm giving you right now is not a substitute for the detailed instructions on the law, which I will give you at the close of the case before you retire to consider your verdict.

Now, this is a criminal case commenced by the State of Nevada, which you already hear me refer to them as State versus Shawn Glover, the Defendant. The case is based on an indictment or amended indictment. The Clerk will now read the charges in the indictment to the ladies and gentlemen of the jury and state the plea of the Defendant to the charges in the inditement.

THE CLERK: District Court, Clark County, Nevada, the State of Nevada, Plaintiff versus Shawn Glover, aka Shawn Lynn Glover, Jr., case number C-16-312448-1, Department 9, amended indictment.

State of Nevada, County of Clark. The Defendant above named, Shawn Glover, aka Shawn Lynn Glover, Jr., accused by the Clark County grand jury of the crimes of murder with use of a deadly weapon, felony NRS 200.010, 200.030, 193.165-NOC 50001; assault with a deadly weapon, felony NRS 200.471-NOC 50201; discharge of a firearm from or within a structure or vehicle, felony NRS 202.287-NOC 51445, committed at and within the County of Clark, State of Nevada, on or about the 1st day of January 2016, as follows:

Count 1. Murder with use of a deadly weapon, did willfully,

unlawfully, feloniously, and with malice aforethought, kill Patrick Fleming, a human being, with use of a deadly weapon, to-wit: a handgun, by shooting at and into the body of the said, Patrick Fleming, the said killing having been willful, deliberate, and premediated.

Count 2. Assault with a deadly weapon, did willfully, unlawfully, feloniously, and intentionally place another person in reasonable apprehension of immediate bodily harm, and/or did willfully and unlawfully attempt to use physical force against another person, to-wit: Miranda Sutton with the use of a deadly weapon, to-wit: a handgun, by pointing said handgun at the said, Miranda Sutton.

Count 3. Discharge of firearm from or within a structure or vehicle, did willfully, unlawfully, maliciously, and feloniously, while in or under a structure located at 4032 Smokey Fog, apartment number 201, North Las Vegas, discharge a firearm within or from the structure while being within an area designated by the city or county ordinance as a populated area for the purpose of prohibiting the discharge of weapons.

Dated this 31st day of July 2018, Steven B. Wolfson, Clark County
District Attorney by David Stanton, Chief Deputy District Attorney, to which the
Defendant has entered pleas of not guilty.

THE COURT: All right. This case is based on that charging document, which has been read to you by the Clerk. You should distinctly understand that that charging document is simply a list of charges, and it is not in itself any evidence of the allegations it contains. The Defendant has plead not guilty to the charges. The State, therefore, has the burden of proving each of the essential elements of each charge beyond a reasonable

doubt. As the Defendant sits there now, he is not guilty. The purpose of this trial is to determine whether the State will meet that burden.

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

Now, the parties may sometimes present objections to certain testimony or other exhibits. It is the duty of a lawyer to object to evidence that he believes is not being properly offered, and you should not be prejudice in any way against a party who makes objections on behalf of the party he represents.

Now, at times, I may sustain certain objections or instruct you to disregard certain testimony or exhibits. You must not consider any evidence to which an objection has been sustained or which I have instructed you to disregard.

So, how does that work practically speaking? Well, a lawyer asked a question of the witness. Questions are not evidence in the case. Questions are to be considered only as they supply the meaning to the answer of the witness, which is the evidence in the case. The testimony of the witness under oath is the evidence in the case.

So, if there's a question and the witness blurts out an answer because there's an objection going, and the question, and the answer, and the person doesn't, you know, do this for a living or whatever, they just answer the question. If I sustain the objection, that means that you cannot consider the testimony or the question, because I've sustained it. If I overrule it, you

can consider the testimony and, obviously, the question because that gives meaning to the testimony. If I instruct you to disregard certain testimony or exhibits, you cannot consider that in your deliberation.

Additionally, anything you may see or hear outside the courtroom is not evidence in the case and must be disregarded. Additionally, if you see or hear anything about this case outside the courtroom, it's your responsibility, and you took an oath and promised all of us that you would let my Marshal know.

Now, you're not to be influenced in any degree by any personal feeling of sympathy for or prejudice against either the State or the Defendant. Both sides are entitled to the same fair and impartial consideration. In considering the weight and value of the testimony of any witness, you may take into consideration the appearance, attitude, and behavior of the witness; the interest in the witness in the outcome of the case, if any; the inclination of the witness to speak truthfully or not; and the probability or improbability of the witness's statements; and all of the facts and circumstances in evidence. Thus, you may give the testimony of any witness just such weight and value as you believe the testimony is entitled to receive.

Now, there are two kinds of evidence, direct and circumstantial. Direct evidence is testimony by a witness about what that witness personally saw, heard, or did. Circumstantial evidence is testimony or exhibits which are proof of a particular fact from which, if proven, you may infer the existence of a second fact, which sounds all complicated and legal-like but, really, it's simple.

Same example in every case I always give. If it's cold tonight, and

cloudy, and you go out to lock up, and you're on your porch, and you can see your own breath in the air and there's big, fat, white flakes falling from the sky, and you reach out your hand and a big, fat, white flake falls on your fingertips and it's wet and cold to the touch, that is direct evidence that it is snowing. You can see it, you can feel it, you could probably even smell it.

If, however, it's a balmy 57 when you go out tonight, which we know isn't going to happen, but let's just pretend. It's 57 degrees and everything is fine. You lock up at 6:00 at night. You go to bed. Twelve hours later, you go out to the porch and there is three feet of snow on the ground as far as the eye can see all the way across the valley on your commute to work. That is circumstantial evidence that it snowed overnight. The law permits you to give equal weight to both kinds of evidence, but it is for you to decide how much weight to give to any evidence.

Now, just like questions of the attorneys are not evidence in the case, opening statements and closing arguments of the attorneys are not evidence in the case. The arguments are intended to help you in understanding the evidence and applying the law to the evidence, but the statements themselves are not evidence in the case.

Additionally, any ruling, remark, or comment which I may make during the course of this trial is not intended in any way to indicate my opinion as to the facts of the case or to indicate my opinion as to what weight you should give to the testimony of any witness.

I may even find it necessary to ask a question of a witness, and if I do, it is for the purpose of bringing information to be brought -- that I think should be brought out and not in any way to give my opinion or indicate any

opinion about the weight that you should give to the testimony of any witness. I may also find it necessary to admonish a lawyer. And if I do, you should not so prejudice against a lawyer or their client because I have found it necessary to admonish him.

Additionally, you should understand that you will be given a limited opportunity to ask questions of any witness called to testify in this case. A question may be asked only in the following manner. Once the witness is done testifying and the examination by the parties is done, I will look to you and I will say, do any of the jurors have any questions you wish the Court to ask the witness. If you do, you have to take your juror notebook on a clean sheet of juror notebook paper, which isn't even full size as it is, but it must be a full-size juror notebook paper, you have to write your juror number on it -- 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and so on -- and you write the question as if I'm asking the witness the question.

Once I've determined that anybody has a question, I will step outside into the hallway, and I will discuss the procedural and substantive propriety of the question, which is a fancy way of saying if I think it's properly asked, I'll ask it. And if I don't, I won't. And if I don't, you can't speculate as to what the answer would have been, and you can't discuss the question in the jury deliberation room. Additionally, jurors should not give undue weight to questions -- to answers to questions that they ask, but they should consider that evidence as they do all other evidence in the case.

Also, I've had to kind of draw some lines here. So, here's the lines I've drawn on juror questions.

Number one. If it's not a full sheet of paper, I'm not going to take

it. If I get the equivalent of a Chicklet wrapper with a question on it, then I'm not taking it. Number two. When I cross the threshold of the room, we're done. You're not firing off papers to me in the back while I'm still dealing with the other papers. I just -- it makes me nuts. So, I get to do little things -- little things I can do and that's one of them. I will, however, wait until you're done writing it out. I'll walk out in the hallway ,and then we'll go forward. The attorneys are given the opportunity should they see fit to do any follow-up strictly to juror questions.

Now, until this case is submitted to you, it's of crucial importance that you not discuss it with anyone, even your fellow jurors. That ensures the level playing field that I keep talking about. When you're in the hallway if you want to talk about the weather or talk about your families, talk about whatever you want, but just don't talk about the case or anyone who has anything to do with the case or anything that has anything to do with the case until you're in the jury deliberation room. It's important that you keep an open mind and not decide any issue in the case until you know what the law is, and you've heard the whole case.

Now, we're going to take -- now, that we have the jury selected, tomorrow, for example, I'm going to tell you to come back at 9:00. And we're going to have a regular schedule. We're going to take restroom breaks. We're going to take a lunch break. But if you need a break before we were planning to take one, it's not a problem. Just raise your hand and tell me you need a break, a restroom break or whatever, and I'll take one. If you can't see an exhibit or hear a witness, please raise your hand as an indication.

I don't have any problem with you bringing a beverage with a lid

or a cap or if you want to bring coffee in the morning and whatever. I just can't have you bring in food, okay.

You are welcome during the course of this trial as far as your lunch, we usually -- I try to wait a little bit -- the rush in downtown Las Vegas starts at about 11:30 because lower court -- some of the lower courts start really early. So, I try to push to 12:30 or 1:00 if I can go that far depending on where we're at. If -- and I usually take an hour. You can do a couple of things. My Marshal will give you places that you could go if you don't want to bring something.

If you want to bring something, you hand it to my marshal in the morning, whether it's frozen, and you want to put it in a microwave, there's microwaves in the juror lounge where you could nuke a lunch. Or if you have some, you know, refrigerated lunch bag, he'll put it in the fridge and then at lunch, he'll give it back to you and you can go to the juror lounge. There's a lounge there, I believe you know, with soda machines and, you know, you can just chill out there if you want to. You can go off campus, as I call it, off the RJC and just go sit somewhere else and take a break from this whole thing. That's up to you as long as you don't talk about the case.

So, during this trial, you're going to see people coming in and out handing me things, you're going to see me on the computer, you're going to see me talking to my staff. You're not to draw any inference from that action. I guarantee you 99.99999 percent of the time it has nothing to do with this case. I have thousands of cases, okay, and I can't just disappear from them. So, you're not to draw any inference from that.

It is incredibly important you've been given notebooks, or you will

1 be if you haven't yet, to take notes as you see fit of the trial testimony. The 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

reason for that is you're not going to have a transcript to consult at the close of the case, okay. If the jury were to be go back in the jury deliberation room and require to hear testimony again, first of all, in the playback department I record, the jury would have to very carefully describe what's to be played back. The court recorder would have to go in and find the location and cue up her notes. I have to bring everybody in here. Then I have to bring the jury in and do the playback of testimony.

Because those playbacks of testimony are very time-consuming, I encourage you to listen carefully to the testimony the first time around and for that reason, we've given you notebooks. Your notebooks cannot leave the courtroom. So, what happens is you get the notebook in the morning, you have it, you take notes. You leave it in your chair. Nobody sees the juror notebooks even after the verdict is done. After the verdict is done, my Marshall rips out the notes and throws them away. I have never seen the notes from a juror notebook in over 200 trials, okay. They're private to you, but you can't take them out of the room.

You are -- I believe I mentioned yesterday and if you didn't hear it, I don't recall which group or who I mentioned it to, the whole group possibly, your parking just got upgraded. My Marshal is going to give you a map. You are going to park somewhere closer now. We just don't have enough room there for everybody. But once you get seated as a juror, you go to a new parking place that's right across the street much closer. You must -- this is so crucial. Is everyone listening? There is no, I lost my ticket from the parking garage fund, from the county. You've got to save that ticket. You have to

 bring it in here so that we can validate it, so you can park for free. Do you understand? Yes. Okay.

So, the trial is going to proceed in the following manner. One of the Deputy District Attorneys will make an opening statement which is an outline that helps you understand what the State expects to prove. Please remember that the opening statements are not evidence in the case. They're simply -- they serve as an introduction to the evidence which the party making the statement intends to prove. Then the Defense may present an opening statement, but they do not have to.

Then the State will present its evidence in its case-in-chief. Any witnesses that are called for the State, the counsel for the Defendant, one of them, may cross-examine the witnesses. Following the State's case, the Defendant may present evidence. And if so, the Deputy District Attorneys, one of them, may cross-examine any Defense witness. However, as I've said, repeatedly, and you've heard during voir dire, the Defendant is not obligated to present any evidence.

After all the evidence has been presented, I will instruct you on the applicable law. After the instructions have been read to you, the lawyers will have the opportunity to present their closing arguments. Closing arguments are not evidence, just as what is said in opening statements by the attorneys are not evidence. The arguments are designed to summarize and interpret the evidence. Since the State has the burden of proving the Defendant guilty beyond a reasonable doubt, they have the right to open and close the final arguments. After the arguments have been completed, then the jury will retire to deliberate on the verdict.

So, do you have any practical questions about how this is going to proceed? We're going to go 9:00 to 5:00 tomorrow. We'll take a morning recess. It's the only day I can start at 9:00 because I don't have any other cases set. Other days I can't, and I'll start a little later. And I apologize to you for that. Yes?

UNIDENTIFIED JUROR: On Monday, do you know what time approximately you're starting if it goes --

THE COURT: We wouldn't start -- 10:30.

UNIDENTIFIED JUROR: Okay. Thank you.

THE COURT: Anybody else have any questions? Okay. So, here's how this works. My Marshal has information on you from Jury Services. He will give you a number for any emergencies. I would just point out that tomorrow morning at 9:00, if you're not here, we're all sitting here staring at your empty seat. So fun. So, please be mindful of that.

I'm about to read to you an admonishment. Nevada law requires that I read this to you at every overnight recess and every restroom break. The first few times I'm going to sit -- I'm going to talk slowly, you know, compared to my usual. And then I'm going to pick up the pace. I'm picking up the pace not because I don't think you're taking it seriously. The opposite, because I know you're taking it seriously, I know you heard it, I know you promise to follow it. And so, I don't need to belabor the whole thing.

One thing I didn't mention is in addition to not doing any independent investigation of the law or the facts, you cannot engage in social media about this case or anything to do with this case. You can't tweet, you can't Snapchat, you can't Twitter, you can't do anything. Not tweeting,

snapping, Instagramming, Facebooking, I don't know. I know there's a million other ones, GroupMeeting, WhatsApping. I could list it forever. You can't do any of it until you're done as a juror. When I discharge you as a juror, you'll be free to say or not say whatever you want, but until then, you made a promise, and we expect you to stick to it.

So, I'm going to read the admonishment which is really me just saying it because I know it by heart. And then I'm going to see you tomorrow at 9:00. You are admonished not to talk or converse among yourselves or with anyone else on any subject connected with this trial. You're not to read, watch, or listen to any report of or commentary on the trial by any person connected with this case or any medium of information, including without limitation, newspapers, television, the internet, or radio. You're not to form or express any opinion on any subject connected with this trial until the case is finally submitted to you.

Mr. Jones, you don't have to stress about this. It's going to be okay. I promise. And if you're worried, you just let me know about anything, and we'll deal with it, okay? So, relax. You're excused.

THE MARSHAL: All rise. The jurors are exiting.

[Outside the presence of the jury.]

THE COURT: The record should reflect we're outside the presence of the jury. Before I let you go for a lunch break and come back to argue whatever you want to argue about, I'm going to take -- first of all, the record should reflect on the peremptory challenge form which will be marked as Court's exhibit first in order number --

THE CLERK: 1.

THE COURT: Yeah. Can you send it to my law clerk?

25

MR. STANTON: Sure. It's by the California Supreme Court. So, it's one of those really long opinions, but the section that's relevant is only like two pages. So, I didn't want to print out just the relevant sections and everybody goes, well, where's the rest of it. So, it's actually better I'll email it to you, because I think it's like 60 pages long.

THE COURT: Oh, okay. That's fine.

MR. BASHER: Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you. 3:00 then, yes?

MR. BASHER: Yeah.

MR. O'BRIEN: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you.

[Recess at 1:50 p.m., recommencing at 3:04 p.m.]

THE MARSHAL: Remain seated. Come to order. Court is back in session.

[Outside the presence of the jury.]

THE COURT: Okay. This is the time set for -- to continue the hearing outside the presence of the jury on Glover, excuse me, C312448-1. So, same attorneys and the Defendant are present. Do you wish to be heard?

MR. STANTON: Yes, Your Honor. If I could kind of set the table and frame the issue. So, in talking to Mr. Bashor prior to today's proceeding, I inquired of him if he -- if it was his intent to elicit from the two main State's witnesses -- and for the record, that would be Miranda Sutton who is the victim's wife, and Akira Veasley, V-E-A-S-L-E-Y, I believe, who is the stepdaughter of the victim and daughter of Ms. Sutton. They are present at the time of the shooting.

All parties to include Mr. Fleming know the Defendant for some period of time. He was at the home at their -- with their permission. And they had known the Defendant for some period of years. That knowledge includes knowledge of Mr. Glover's past to include, from their perspective, that he was and may still be involved in gang activity, that he's committed more than one murder, and that he has an extensive record and criminal conduct involving acts of violence.

The predicate to all of that is on January 1, where this shooting takes place, initial responding officers and investigating detectives get a statement from both of those witnesses. As I mentioned to the Court earlier, that statement, what I'll call 1.0, gives a generalized, but non-specific description of the events that took place. As I understand --

THE COURT: What do you mean generalized but non-specific? MR. STANTON: For example, they use a nickname by the name of Hatch to describe to detectives who the person that they see inside their home at the time of the shots being fired. Hatch is a nickname of the Defendant. So, they don't use his actual name.

And so, at this juncture, the police aren't told of the actual names as the witnesses have it. And they talk about that one of the reasons the shooting took place had to do with Mr. Fleming selling narcotics and somebody was over there to purchase them, to wit, Hatch, and they heard shots. In both 1.0 and 2.0 -- and I anticipate their trial testimony -- they are not watching Mr. Fleming or the Defendant literally as the shots are being fired. They are feet away. They are very focused to the argument that's escalating that involves everybody in the home, the four principal adult occupants of the

structure, the Defendant, the victim, and these two female witnesses.

The argument begins or at least comes to its crescendo when the Defendant, from Mr. Fleming's perspective, interjects himself to both his wife and to his stepdaughter on what he perceives to be strictly a family issue and family business. That begins a dialogue between Mr. Fleming and the Defendant, ultimately culminating, as the witnesses I believe will testify, in Mr. Fleming saying, well why don't you and me go outside to discuss it.

And as they start walking down the stairs, Ms. Veasley and Ms. Sutton break eye contact from the situation and proceed to walk in a different direction. Almost instantaneously, they hear three gunshots. They both come rushing back to -- all this occurs on a staircase. At the bottom of the staircase is Mr. Fleming with an obvious significant gunshot wound to the head and other parts of his body. He is not moving. And he is deceased there upon officers and other responders first coming to the scene.

Supporting the count of assault with a deadly weapon is their testimony that as they're looking down at the bottom of the stairs, they see Mr. Glover turn the firearm in their direction and tell them in kind of a direct manner not to talk about what just happened with anybody. I'm paraphrasing, obviously.

THE COURT: I doubt they describe something so polite.

MR. STANTON: And so, after that happens and within minutes of first responders primarily because of the nature of the call, North Las Vegas uniformed police officers soon followed up by detectives, these two witnesses give a version of 1.0, which is that a shooting took place, that they're there, but it's -- they're relatively vague on details and they talk about some aspect to

narcotics activity.

THE COURT: Is there -- so there's a difference between vague and false or, you know, stating one thing and then later stating another. Meaning -- I have no idea what was said, but let's just say like hypothetically, oh, the shots were at the top of the stairs in 1.0 and they were down the bottom of the stairs at 2.0. Like differences, you know, differences as opposed to vague or omission. There's false or mistaken and then there's omitted, two different things.

MR. STANTON: Okay. Well, there's certainly omissions.

THE COURT: Right. That I --

MR. STANTON: There's no questions about that.

THE COURT: That I got.

MR. STANTON: And there are aspects of what they tell the detectives that are directly false to when you compared it to 2.0.

THE COURT: Like? Can you give me some examples of the more material things, arguably?

MR. STANTON: What is going to be clearly different from their trial testimony in 2.0 is the extent of they knew the person inside the home.

THE COURT: The extent that they knew the person?

MR. STANTON: Right.

THE COURT: Oh.

MR. STANTON: They tell the detectives that they don't know who it is, they didn't -- you know, don't know the person very well. And that's clearly false from their what I believe is 2.0 in their trial testimony.

THE COURT: Okay. Anything else?

MR. STANTON: Once again, the aspect of narcotics, I think they're going to tell you that this had nothing to do with narcotics.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. STANTON: Those are two that jump off to -- at the top of my head. So ,the next day, the 2nd of January, they contact detectives. Oh, let me back up. They express to the detectives their concern for their safety.

THE COURT: In 1.0?

MR. STANTON: One -- well, when they interact with the detectives, I don't know that it's in part of the recorded interview, but their testimony is -- is that they had expressly stated on more than one occasions especially to uniformed officers, so this is prior to the recorded statement or at least not to detectives that they were fearful for their lives and they were hopeful that police officers would remain at the scene until -- if and until someone was caught.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. STANTON: So, their level of concern expressed from them, I believe if asked, they would tell you that it was immediate, and it was expressed to law enforcement.

THE COURT: Is that the same day as 1.0?

MR. STANTON: Yes. That's on the 1st of January.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. STANTON: That's within minutes if not hours of the 911 call that they placed to authorities.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. STANTON: So, on the 2nd of January, Ms. Sutton and Ms.

Veasley contact the police and agree to a second interview now for purposes of this discussion 2.0. And in 2.0, they tell what --

THE COURT: They contact the police or the police contact -- the detectives or the detectives contact them?

MR. STANTON: They contact police.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. STANTON: There is -- in that second interview is what I believe from talking to them prior to this trial, their testimony is going to be consistent with 2.0. And in that version of events, they say they know the Defendant, they've known him for a long period of time. They describe the argument about what the argument was about. It starts with Mr. Fleming first and his stepdaughter who is 21 years of age. He is not her biological father. Ms. Sutton kind of intervenes on her daughter's behalf in the argument, and the argument kind of morphs into Mr. Fleming now arguing with both Ms. Veasley and Ms. Sutton.

And through a series of events that are both visually observed and are verbally stated, the Defendant interjects himself by talking to the daughter, talking to the wife one-on-one, and they will describe what their conversation with the Defendant was. In essence, he was offering to insert himself into this issue. Mr. Fleming sees this, and that's when he begins to say, hey, what are you doing? This is none of your business, the invitation to go outside, and then they describe him as they last see him, Mr. Fleming walking first down the stairs, the Defendant following him, and then within seconds, the gunshots, and then they observe the threat.

It is the State's belief -- now kind of coming full circle to frame the

issue -- it's the State's belief that if the defense seeks to introduce inconsistent statements, the State is entitled to address the rationale and the explanation, if one exists, about why those explanations are different. And the explanation coming from this family from the person who's the author of the statement is going to be their fear of the Defendant based upon concrete facts as they understood them to be. And I believe that there's in some areas of their belief, overwhelming evidence to prove what they suspect to be true about the Defendant's background and the basis of their fear and thus an explanation of why the statements would be inconsistent.

THE COURT: So, if you had one of these witnesses on the witness stand, my guess is they're not going to say gang activity, felonies and acts of violence, and more than one murder. They have, I assume, an entire long laundry list of specific things. What is that going to be? How, as an offer of proof?

MR. STANTON: As an offer of proof, they're going to -- they believe that the Defendant has committed multiple acts of murder and that he has committed multiple acts of violent conduct against others. I'll leave it in that frame as opposed to addressing specific crimes. That he is a member of --

THE COURT: Well, what would they say? What have they said?

MR. STANTON: Right. That he is -- that and in addition, that he -they believe him to be a member of a gang, a known gang.

THE COURT: What gang?

UNIDENTIFIED ATTORNEY: Gerson.

MR. STANTON: Gerson Park, GPK.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. STANTON: And, thus, kind of the -- that specific comment address their concern then and even further from the time that the statements were made that whether the Defendant was in custody or not, they had concerns. And that's why they said 1.0.

So, under 50.135, I believe Nevada law (2)(b): A witness is afforded an opportunity to explain or deny -- this is all presuming under (2) that extrinsic evidence of prior contradictory statement is inadmissible unless they're afforded an opportunity to explain to deny the statement and the opposite party is afforded an opportunity to interrogate the witness therein.

It's clearly designed to be argued to this jury that their statements are unreliable. Therefore, the evidence against the Defendant does not satisfy the State's burden. And I think it is contemplated by the statute both here and in the federal system that you cannot be permitted to do that without an ability to completely and fully explain why the inconsistencies exist.

My reading of the statute or the case law is that to the extent that I find cases on point, and there's not many, they leave it to the discretion of the trial judge to the extent of the -- of what the Court feels is appropriate to meet the definition of the ability to explain their inconsistencies and the motivation between statements 1 and 2 in this particular case.

And as such, if it goes to the weight that is going to be argued by Defense counsel to this jury, either in the form of its not credible or that there's an alternative suspect, then it becomes as probative as you could possibly get in a case like this as to why there would be a distinction between a witness' statement 1.0 versus 2.0. And without the ability for them to explain it, I think arrests the jury's ability to attach the weight that they deem to it after hearing

the explanation and the demeanor and the tenure of the witnesses in a threedimensional format.

So, I think that's as best I think I can do to frame it as I see the issues right now.

THE COURT: Did you want to address the case that you gave the defense and the Court?

MR. STANTON: Yes. The case is -- it's kind of a lengthy thing, but what I thought was of note was that even in a case where there's not evidence directly attributable to a defendant making the threats. Their -- the fact of their threats and the details of the threats was admissible to show the nature of their testimony and the inconsistencies that the defense claimed that there were. And I think procedurally the trial judge warned defense counsel on several different occasions relative to this issue and to a warrant that was outstanding as to another -- or one of these testifying witnesses.

THE COURT: Why she left town and didn't handle her warrant --MR. STANTON: Correct.

THE COURT: -- was because she would say I was getting threats versus, you know, she's just a dishonest person running from the justice system.

MR. STANTON: Correct. And so, to me, the issue is, look, if you're going to go down the road of introducing inconsistent statement and you have full knowledge as you do here that there is a history between these witnesses and the Defendant and that they've known each other for a protracted period of time, that they have this perspective of your -- of the Defendant's background, that they're -- you can't have it both ways. You can't seek to elicit

the inconsistencies to try and blow up the State's case and impeach their credibility while handcuffing them and not giving them the ability to explain and to let the jury assess whether or not those are inconstancies that have any weight or meaning.

THE COURT: By the way, before we hear from the defense on that issue, did you and Mr. Bashor talk about the expert issues that you were having?

MR. STANTON: Yes. We're going to address that kind of when it gets a little closer to Detective Wilson's testimony, but the concern that Mr. Bashor has about testimony regarding no evidence at the scene supports self-defense, as I see this case, I mean I haven't heard their opening argument yet, but I don't see that I would be asking that question of Detective Wilson. I think that's just a matter more of argument than a Q&A in this case.

THE COURT: So, I haven't heard an opening statement yet and I haven't heard any argument from them, but if it's a self-defense case and not a whodunnit, then why does it matter? I mean as long as they say I was scared -- you know, since it's self-defense, there's no question as to who did it. We know who did it, and it's just a matter of why it was done -- than thinking that's pretty scary. I'm just curious, if it's self-defense and not a whodunnit.

Because your argument is more compelling if it's a whodunnit and less compelling if it's a self-defense case.

MR. STANTON: Well, and --

THE COURT: Which means you may not get a ruling before your opening statement.

MR. STANTON: Well, I don't know, Your Honor.

self-defense and the evidence that she observed at the scene, but I can't

23

24

25

to why she did what she did and when she did it may speak to the issues of

MR. STANTON: Right. Right. That she might -- her answer

predict that now and that's not the issue that I'm raising to the Court. I agree with the Court that if this is purely a self-defense case, then maybe the scope of the explanation need not be as in-depth or as broad, but if -- I don't see that happening if you're looking at alternative suspects, which is what I think they're going to proffer.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, and part of your response to Mr. Stanton, I would suggest you address that. There's nothing that says I have to rule on this until the time that I've -- until the time comes. And, quite frankly, I'm not going to allow a tactical advantage to either side and then have it taken advantage of.

MR. BASHER: Right.

THE COURT: If it's left to my discretion as to what's admissible, let's face it. If it's a whodunnit, not why it was done, then it's -- it can be probative. It's certainly prejudicial, but it's also probative, and then it becomes a weighing analysis on all of these things, each one and how far it goes if at all versus why it happened, in which case it becomes less of a weighing analysis because it's not as probative, quite frankly, but it sure is prejudicial.

So, I appreciate you might want a ruling in advance, but I don't think I have to do that. And I'll hear from you, and you can certainly comment on that as part of your -- because, quite frankly, if I don't know what your defense is, I'm not going to rule on it.

MR. BASHER: I understand, Judge. Could I have the Court's indulgence?

THE COURT: Because if it's a whodunnit, it's one thing. If it's a self-defense case --

MR. STANTON: Well, Judge, just -- and I understand that, and I think defense counsel does. But when we talked about this yesterday and the reason why we're requesting it to be put in front of Your Honor now is counsel wanted to know the answer before they did their opening, which I think is probably an important thing for them to know. But I understand the Court that, you know, until the issue is ripe in front of you, then you're not compelled to give any evidentiary ruling, but --

THE COURT: Yeah. I don't give an advisory --

MR. STANTON: -- I'm not here to --

THE COURT: -- decision so that, you know -- you know, there's nothing that -- because it depends on what the defense is as to how probative it is. I mean you're sitting here arguing to me how devastating to the State it can be and how it limits -- handcuffs you and blah-blah-blah. It doesn't handcuff you if it's a self-defense case. It just allows a boatload of bad acts in.

MR. STANTON: Well, I wouldn't get --

THE COURT: So --

MR. STANTON: Your Honor, if it's a pure self-defense case, I'm not asking for a boatload of bad acts to come in because then the inconsistency isn't that probative.

THE COURT: Correct. So, that's what I'm saying. So, perhaps they should address that in part of their -- not only do they persuade me that you're wrong, but they also persuade me that the time is right for the ruling in advance.

MR. BASHER: Can I have the Court's indulgence for like a minute? THE COURT: Sure.

[Pause]

MR. O'BRIEN: Thank you, Your Honor. Your Honor, let me start --knowing the Court's inclination, let me start by saying it is likely a whodunnit
case or at least the opening will be on a whodunnit theory. As the evidence
comes out, of course, there's a possibility of pivoting.

THE COURT: One moment. I need to take notes. You know, I wish I could remember all the -- every single thing that everybody says in all my 120 murder cases, but I want to make sure I don't miss anything. So, if you'd just give me one moment.

MR. O'BRIEN: Sure.

[Pause]

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. O'BRIEN: Let me start by saying I do want to express some appreciation to the State for having this conversation ahead of trial. It infuriates the Defense to constantly be surprised. It's obviously a competitive endeavor trial. We're not cooperating in doing it. But on something this big, we do appreciate having this conversation ahead of time.

THE COURT: Me too.

MR. O'BRIEN: So, I agree with most of what the State has laid out in terms of the difference between what's being called Statement 1.0 and 2.0, but it's -- I would say it's not simply vaguery in 1.0. In fact, it's misleading information provided by the two women to the police. First, Ms. Sutton provides information to the police that she saw nothing, didn't hear from anyone, someone knocked at the door and shot her husband. That's the first statement provided. The second statement --

residence. No name is provided. She didn't really interact with him. The suspect tried to talk to her. That's all she knows. This was probably a drug deal gone wrong. There was some issues in the past on drug -- on drug dealing and some anger on the deceased's part about drug dealing in the last 24 hours.

So then within 24 hours, the two women then talk to the police again. And --

THE COURT: You disagree it was at their behest?

MR. O'BRIEN: Well, I have not pre-trialed them, but I will say the police -- from the information I have from North Las Vegas Police, the police are not contacted by Ms. Veasley or Ms. Sutton. They're contacted by a relative of the deceased, his brother. The deceased's brother tells the police these women are lying. They know who killed my brother. You need to interview them again.

Now, what happens from there, there is no discussion in the report whether the women subsequently called detectives or whether the detectives called the women. But that is the first intervention is a call from the brother of the deceased.

So, to take a step back into the -- I think that lays out the factual allegations, Your Honor. Towards the statute of 15.135, starting with just a plain reading of the statute, (2)(b) giving the witness an opportunity to explain, the question becomes how broad that opportunity is going to be, how broad the Court will allow that opportunity to be because you're correct in terms of the statements in 1.0 and the statements in 2.0, they're very similar. The man

6

7 8

10

11

9

12 13

14 15

16 17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24 25 at the bottom of the stairs says: Don't f'ing rat on me. It's on you and your children. It is a death threat to the women and the small children that are in the house.

In terms of an opportunity to explain, that's also Count 2 in this case, Assault With A Deadly Weapon. The suspect points a firearm at the two women and threatens to kill them if they talk and their children if they talk. Discussions of gang activity, allegations or rumors of prior murders, and a prior conviction veer us into prior bad act territory, which is why I'm saying the question of how much will the Court allow the witness to explain becomes -- I think the Court's correct. It is the balancing test of 403 or 48.0452.

And I don't -- not to lay it out too much, but I think the Court's very aware how much the Supreme Court has warned both prosecutors and judges. And in at least one case Griffith v. State has warned the defense as well do not veer into prior bad act territory. It is very discouraged. The default is that it is not admissible. And that's the territory that we are in. And I want to suggest it was possible if the State believed that we were going down this route, it was possible to file a motion to admit prior bad acts or a motion in limine to preserve the issue. Because we are now on day 2 of trial and figuring it out in the afternoon -- and I do appreciate the heads up on the opportunity before the opening, but I also think it's a little late in the game for us to be having the conversation.

So, I think under the balancing test, the question of -- we turn into the question of other relevant non-propensity purpose exception and whether this is fitting underneath that, what the relevance would be. I think the stated relevance, if I understand it correctly, is to explain why the witness lied to the

police the first time around or why the witnesses lied to the police the first time around. But once we get to that balancing test of probative value versus prejudicial nature of the testimony, I think prejudicial nature of saying there is a person that has previously been killed by Shawn Glover tips prejudicial nature. The scales are essentially way out of balance, especially when we realize that this becomes cumulative evidence.

The women according to both of their statements 1.0 and 2.0 see a man above the deceased body of their father -- or their husband and their stepfather, and he makes a verbal threat to kill them and their children if they talk. That is sufficient explanation. Going beyond that tips us into cumulative evidence and prior bad acts. Thank you, Your Honor.

MR. STANTON: First of all, it kind of disheartens me to hear arguments which blend terms, but have no relevance to the argument.

Counsel suggests that this could have been raised pretrial in two forms, one by the State filing a prior bad act motion

THE COURT: You're not offering it for motive, intent, opportunity, lapse, some mistake, or accident, so I get it.

MR. STANTON: Yeah. I mean that's --

THE COURT: I get it.

MR. STANTON: And the analysis they're in is --

THE COURT: But a motion in limine is what he was also referring to, which is you could say, hey, there's two different inconsistent statements, just doing this earlier. What we're doing right now could have been done earlier is the point of what his argument was.

MR. STANTON: Yeah, but the State's belief is the statute speaks

for itself. The statute says the plain reading of the statute says that if the			
State's position is this. We had no intention in opening or in direct			
examination of Ms. Veasley or Ms. Sutton to address 1.0 at all, zero. We were			
going directly to their statement for the sole and direct purpose of avoiding the			
issue of getting into a full explanation because in this case, for those two			
witnesses, the answer is significantly addressed by their knowledge of the			
Defendant's background. So			
THE COURT: By the way, is that in 2.0?			

MR. STANTON: The explanation?

THE COURT: Yeah.

MR. STANTON: No, not in the detail of what I've described.

THE COURT: What's in 2.0?

MR. STANTON: Pardon me?

THE COURT: What's in 2.0 as the detailed explanation for why yesterday we didn't know them and today we do?

MR. STANTON: That they were afraid.

THE COURT: No other details?

MR. STANTON: Not on the recording. They go into detail with the detectives --

THE COURT: Well, yeah. That's what I'm getting at.

MR. STANTON: Yes.

THE COURT: What do they tell the -- what do you, as an offer of proof, believe the evidence would show they told the detective was the reason 2.0 is different than 1.0?

MR. STANTON: Everything I just outlined.

THE COURT: So, all this stuff?

MR. STANTON: The gang, the murder. And, in fact, their belief that the Defendant had committed multiple murders.

THE COURT: And they purport their basis of knowledge to be?

MR. STANTON: Their knowledge of the Defendant, his associates, the length of time they'd known him, and what they --

THE COURT: And how long did they say they've known him?

[State counsel confer.]

MR. STANTON: I would say a few years, for sure. And Mr. Fleming, the decedent, knows the Defendant very well. And part of what they know came from Mr. Fleming, in part.

THE COURT: Okay. I'm sorry. I interrupted you with your blending of --

MR. STANTON: So, I mean --

THE COURT: I didn't mean to cut you off.

MR. STANTON: -- if the Court is comfortable because it is -- it is not 4804 --

THE COURT: Right.

MR. STANTON: -- subsection 2. The State's not moving to admit it under those grounds. And, thus, the pretrial raising this issue is, look, you're at your peril if you're seeking to admit an inconsistent statement knowing what the law permits that witness to say as an explanation for the inconsistencies. It also goes without, I think any reasonable dispute, that the defense knows what the underlying facts that these witnesses are going to say about the threats and how that impugns their client's credibility and the

potential that that evidence might be admissible.

So, it's the strategy of the defense to admit the inconsistent statements. So, if there's anybody that needs to do a motion in limine, it would seem to me it's the party that's pursuing that defense and that evidentiary strategy of introducing an inconsistent statement. I mean I can't open the door myself. And, thus, I'm not offering 1.0, and then turning around and say, guess what, it's an inconsistent statement. And I think under the statute, I might be able to. But the State has no intention to doing that.

So, while I think it's certainly my argument is more for the record than it is to Your Honor about the timing of this, I think there can be no further explanation of their -- the explanation absolutely is necessary and pursuant to the law.

I agree with the Defense counsel is what's the scope. What I didn't hear is the answer to the Court's primary question: Is this a self-defense case or is this case of whodunnit? And I would agree with the Court that the probative value attached to that threat and the change of it is directly linked to that.

Now, maybe they don't want to disclose it at this point, and we wait until that happens, and then we rule on the evidence and the admissibility of the first statement and the basis and the explanation attended to therein when that card is played or when in real time as it goes. It --

THE COURT: So, because that's basically what I'm being asked to do, is give an anticipatory -- everything that I would rule on this depends on what questions are asked and how the defense is framed because some kind of claim of prejudice to the State and the 51.35, the whole public policy reason

 driving 51.35(2)(b) is so that we don't have a complete bastardization of justice, so that we don't pretend like there's just a special world of facts where we just keep out things that are ugly for the Defendant that leave kind of a false impression about someone's motive when they're giving a statement. That's what this is about.

And that's hard to weigh when I don't know what you're going to say.

MR. O'BRIEN: Your Honor, I apologize for interrupting, but didn't I start my argument by saying what we were --

THE COURT: This is a whodunnit. Yes, you did. And you said we reserve the right to, how did you say, inversely lean to something else? You had a very interesting phrase that I liked because I've never heard it before.

MR. O'BRIEN: Pivot.

THE COURT: Pivot. I heard pivot. I never heard pivot before. And so, can you give me an example of pivot before I chisel a ruling into Moses' tablet and you all carry it to the mountain, because I'm subject to revisiting anything if I hear questioning, and I think there's extreme prejudice on either side, quite frankly.

MR. O'BRIEN: Your Honor --

THE COURT: For example --

MR. O'BRIEN: -- here --

THE COURT: -- let me just give you an example so you can address it. Let's say I make a ruling, and I allow some generically coded version of what they want to do in in the event that the witness is significantly pursued on cross-examination about truthfulness and voracity related to the

first statement versus the second. Because let's face it, I guess that's an important part and there'll be some motive I guess to make up something within 24 hours of your husband being shot on a stairway. I guess I'll know it when I see it.

If it's not that significant, then, you know, Count 2 and, yeah, I knew him to be a violent person, would probably be allowed as much as I allow it to go. If the entire trial is, she's a big fat liar because, you know, they were in with the mob, and that's who had to do it, and she has a motive to fabricate for my client because of X, Y, and Z, and I hear this big elaborate version of whatever, then I guess, you know, I would take a different approach in my ruling. And it's hard to do that in advance.

MR. O'BRIEN: Your Honor, I apologize if I said it sloppily. I said that our theory is whodunnit.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. O'BRIEN: It's the first time that I've really ever revealed a theory on the record, but I went out on that ledge.

THE COURT: Right. I know that.

MR. O'BRIEN: And so, I've said that it's whodunnit. However, Your Honor, to give you an example of what a pivot would be, when I told -- when essentially in ex parte communication one time told Judge Herndon what our theory of defense was, and he said, I'm telling you ahead of time I'm not allowing that testimony in, it pushed me into changing the defense based on the Court's ruling.

So, I am saying this is a whodunnit. If the Court rules in a way that leaves that to be a straightforward guilty finding, and we have no other option,

then I think the defense would reserve the right to pivot. However, that said, this case has been prepped as a whodunnit. This opening has been prepped as a whodunnit. It is a whodunnit case.

MR. STANTON: Well, then, Your Honor, I guess the probative value is from the State's perspective could not be higher to explain 1.0 versus 2.0, especially in light of the fact of their knowledge of the Defendant, the failure to give descriptive -- his name, his description, and all the other attended facts that they give in 2.0 is now couldn't be highlighted as more probative.

MR. O'BRIEN: Just the last thing I'll say, Your Honor, and I appreciate the Court's time and letting us talk multiple times. Every other statute that talks about admitting the prior conviction employs a balancing test. Even when the defendant takes the stand and the State is presumptively allowed to impeach, the balancing act exists. And it exists for this reason.

You talked about creating a fair trial for both sides so that the scales aren't tipped on one way or the other so that we're not hiding information from the jury. But in doing that, to create a fair trial, we do hide information from the jury. We make sure that the unfairly prejudicial information is kept out of the jurors' hands. That's what we're asking for here is if your ruling is under a whodunnit that the prior statement of witnesses would be open to these women's discussion of their hearsay or their hearing of rumors about Shawn Glover, Your Honor, we would ask that you keep out any information about any prior conviction and anything we would characterize as a prior bad act. Thank you.

THE COURT: Anything else?

1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

MR. STANTON: Your Honor, the comment, and I wrote it down when counsel said it, he goes: The count of assault with a deadly weapon when a man at the bottom of the stairs is pointing a gun at them and saying, the language that he used from -- quoting from the witness's statement, that's sufficient to explain 1.0 from 2.0. Well, that may be Counsel's view of it, but what he's saying is, look, that's sufficient because that should be sufficient for the trier of fact, the twelve, to make that determination. Well, he can't make that claim.

And, thus, when your case is hinged as it is that these people are describing an alternative suspect and in conjunction with that, I'm going to be presenting photographs and testimony through cross-examination that the State or the detectives did an incomplete investigation, then it begs for that evidence to be introduced so that the jury can put it into proper context.

And we're not seeking to admit a prior conviction as the case law from the Nevada Supreme Court that I believe counsel is citing without quotation to the name, is a reference to a conviction, a felony conviction. The type of conviction has such a prejudicial impact, it was certainly admissible for impeachment purposes, but that there was a weighing between the type of conviction and its relevance for the fact that someone has been a prior convicted felon of which that felony conviction was irrelevant for the testimony, but substantially prejudicial. There is no, in my opinion, analytical framework where that is the same thing as what's being addressed here.

THE COURT: Anything else because I'm not cutting you short?

MR. STANTON: Not on behalf of the State.

THE COURT: Anything else?

 MR. O'BRIEN: Your Honor, we'll submit.

THE COURT: By the way, did we ever make a record with the case that you gave to the defense and to the Court to look at to draw a brief analogy to?

MR. STANTON: No, we didn't, Your Honor. It was *People v. Williams*, found at 315 P.2d 1.

MR. O'BRIEN: I apologize, Your Honor. P.3d.

MR. STANTON: P.3d. Sorry.

THE COURT: Okay. A couple of things. Knowing very little about the examination of the witnesses in advance, exactly how cross will go, and how direct will go, I am just making a ruling anticipatorily that the -- that there will be pursuit of these witnesses with 1.0 and 2.0 impeachment because this is an identity case. And, you know, I appreciate that *People v. Williams* -- I mean it's kind of demonstrative of the underlying problem, but it's not exactly on point. But the gist of it is exactly what I already talked about with 50.135, which is like (2)(b), which is the whole public policy behind allowing someone to explain themselves.

The problem I have here, is I'm not going to allow someone to explain themselves with a couple of murders. So, I am going to allow -- and, you know, this is where witness prep is going to be so crucial. So crucial. And I might require a quick evidentiary hearing outside the presence with each witness, because I am going to allow the State to inquire if they have a knowledge of his history of -- that he had a history of violence in his past. And I may allow gang membership, no GPK in Gerson Park this or that. Just gang membership generically once I hear their basis for that understanding. I need

to have some understanding of the context of what they think before I can decide.

I'm on a -- I feel like I'm on a tight rope balancing. But at some point, there's just no you can't say anything about the fact that you know he's a violent person, and your opinion, and that he's a gang member, and that he made a threat to you because the two go hand in hand. And so -- but I'm not going to allow prior murders. It's over the top, and I'll get reversed even though you make a good argument and, you know, it is what it is.

So, I don't know what you want to do with that, but I'm on the cusp on gang membership and leaning towards allowing it in generic terms. And that they're familiar that he has a history of violence against persons. And I would do a little evidentiary hearing, maybe talk to them myself once I hear what they would say outside the jury about their parameters and cross my fingers that -- and I'm going to allow the State to lead.

MR. STANTON: And, Judge, I think we are in agreement, full agreement with that procedure, because I think it's clear then from the record and doesn't need to delve into have any evidentiary hearing about what we did or didn't prep them on. They're both very receptive. They know that there is a danger zone, and we told them be very careful about what you answer and listen to the directions of the Court. So, I think that --

THE COURT: Did you hear about Barker's trial?

MR. STANTON: Pardon me.

THE COURT: Did you hear about Barker's trial?

MR. STANTON: I did.

THE COURT: With the cop that was told that --

 MR. STANTON: I did.

THE COURT: -- there's a parameter.

MR. STANTON: Yeah.

THE COURT: And the cop just ignored the parameter. You know, sometimes it's just they get caught up in whatever, and they're not thinking, and it slips out. So --

MR. STANTON: I don't think that person had testified before, so -but in our discussion with these two witnesses -- and I can't say this in all my
cases -- but these two witnesses are cognitive, understand the principles, are -will take advice and directive from the Court. So, I think that is an excellent
thing.

Now, they're our first two witnesses. So, after openings when we open this case, we start with them.

THE COURT: Okay. So, that was the first part of my ruling. The second part of my ruling is that if the Defense requests -- because this is clearly being -- this is not evidence that the Defendant committed a bad act. And the jury has to be -- well, doesn't have to be, but will be instructed at your request. This is evidence of the mindset of the witness to possibly explain in her own words why she might change her story. It's not evidence that the Defendant did anything. It's just what evidence she thinks in her head, and that's it.

And so, a jury gets told those things at the time that it's admitted. You've heard evidence that this witness had certain beliefs about the Defendant's past. That evidence was not offered and may not be considered by you to find that he is a person of bad character or had a propensity to, you

know, commit crimes. That evidence was offered to you for your consideration as to how that understanding might have affected the witness' -- you know, might affect the witness or might affect the witness' recollection or statements, or may or may not affect the witness' statements, or may have or may have not affected the witness' statements, something to that effect.

Now, clearly, that's a strategic thing. You know, *Williams* talks about it in that case that the State -- but that's just generic 101. Every time you're going to let something in, you give an instruction, especially when it's a nuanced purpose of admission under 50.135(2)(b). And so, especially you got a lawyer on the panel, she'll get it right away. That's just what this lady thinks, and because she thinks it, that may have had an impact on her statements. Maybe it did, maybe it didn't. That's for you to determine, but it doesn't mean he did anything.

Come up with an instruction if you want, and I will give it. If you don't want, we'll make a great record about strategically you don't want it. I can't imagine it, though. I think you want it.

MR. O'BRIEN: And, Your Honor, I think our instructions are due tomorrow morning. Is that what we agreed to?

MR. STANTON: Mr. Bashor --

MR. BASHER: Yeah.

MR. STANTON: -- agreed to it.

MR. O'BRIEN: Okay. We'll have that in the packet, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. And then, you know, I'll look at it while your -- I don't know, they're the first witnesses. So, maybe I need to look at it like first thing in the morning.

MR. O'BRIEN: Okay.

THE COURT: Because I might make suggestions you like. If you don't, believe me, I have no -- but, you know, if you think about it, I think you can come up with something that specifically tells the jury this is how you're to consider this, blah-blah-blah. It's kind of a -- what's the name of that case that we do the instructions all the time? *Tavares*?

MR. STANTON: Yes, Tavares the --

THE COURT: The hybrid. Because it really is --

MR. STANTON: It's a hybrid of Tavares is what --

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. STANTON: -- I was thinking as you were making that.

THE COURT: It's only because it relates to the witness' state of mine and nothing to do with anything about the Defendant. So, you can even -- you know, just because a witness may have heard things doesn't mean the Defendant committed any crime, and it cannot be considered by you that he committed any crime. The real issue is how it may or may not impact the mindset of the witness. That's what the relevance is, and if you come up with something, you know I'll give it.

MR. O'BRIEN: Understood, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Anything else?

MR. STANTON: Not on behalf of the State, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.

/////

/////

/////

1	MR. BASHER: 9:00 tomorrow, correct, Judge?			
2	THE COURT: 9:00 tomorrow.			
3	[Proceedings concluded at 3:57 p.m.]			
4				
5				
6				
7				
8				
9				
10				
11				
12				
13				
14				
15				
16	ATTEST: I do hereby certify that I have truly and correctly transcribed the			
17	audio/visual proceedings in the above-entitled case to the best of my ability.			
18	best of my domey.			
19				
20	Oxinin Po Cabill			
21	Jusia B. Cahill			
22				

-118-

Maukele Transcribers, LLC

Jessica B. Cahill, Transcriber, CER/CET-708

23

24

25

Electronically Filed 12/31/2018 10:22 AM Steven D. Grierson CLERK OF THE COURT

1	RTRAN	Alumb, Louis	
2			
3			
4			
5	DISTRICT COURT		
6	CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA		
7	· ·		
8	STATE OF NEVADA,	) CASE NO. C-16-312448-1	
9	Plaintiff,	) ) DEPT. IX	
10	vs.		
11	SHAMNI CLOVED aka SHAMNI I VNIN		
12	SHAWN GLOVER, aka SHAWN LYNN () GLOVER, JR.,		
13	Defendant.		
14		)	
15	BEFORE THE HONORABLE JENNIFER P. TOGLIATTI, DISTRICT COURT JUDG		
16	WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 1, 2018		
17	RECORDER'S TRANSCRIP	T OF JURY TRIAL - DAY 3	
18	APPEARANCES:		
19			
20	For Plaintiff:	DAVID STANTON, ESQ. WILLIAM FLINN, ESQ.	
21	Fau Dafau danti		
22	For Defendant:	ROBERT E. O'BRIEN, ESQ. RYAN J. BASHOR, ESQ.	
23			
24			
25	RECORDED BY YVETTE G. SISON, COU	IKT RECORDER	

1	<u>INDEX</u>		
2			
3	Testimony26		
4			
5	WITNESSES FOR THE PLAINTIFF:		
6	Miranda Sutton		
7	Direct Examination by Mr. Flinn26		
8	Akira Veasley		
9	Direct Examination by Mr. Flinn31		
10	Miranda Sutton		
11	Direct Examination by Mr. Flinn41		
12	Cross-Examination by Mr. Bashor64 Redirect Examination by Mr. Flinn87		
14	Akira Veasley		
15	Direct Examination by Mr. Flinn90		
16	Cross-Examination by Mr. Bashor97 Redirect Examination by Mr. Flinn108		
17	Melvin A. Givens, III		
18	Direct Examination by Mr. Stanton115		
19			
20	Dr. Jennifer Corneal		
21	Direct Examination by Mr. Stanton118 Cross-Examination by Mr. Bashor131		
22	Renee Harder		
23			
24	Direct Examination by Mr. Stanton134 Cross-Examination by Mr. O'Brien148		
25	Redirect Examination by Mr. Flinn167		

## **INDEX OF EXHIBITS**

FOR THE PLAINTIFF:	<u>MARKED</u>	RECEIVED
4, 5, 6, 7, 10, 11		58
36 to 48		121
1 to 35		137

**FOR THE DEFENDANT:** 

MARKED RECEIVED A to K .......152

24

suggested.

23

MR. STANTON: Yes.

perhaps calls your first witnesses and do the little mini hearing that I

THE COURT: Oh, yeah. Yeah.

25

1	MR. O'BRIEN: Okay.
2	THE COURT: Can I have whatever you're looking at?
3	MR. O'BRIEN: Sure. I emailed it to
4	THE COURT: So, I can look at it while you're doing your opening?
5	MR. STANTON: I actually thought it was pretty good.
6	MR. O'BRIEN: Well, thanks.
7	MR. STANTON: The hybrid Tavares [phonetic] I think is what it's
8	now going to be called.
9	THE COURT: We're going to call it the Togliatti.
10	MR. STANTON: The Tog.
11	THE COURT: The Tog.
12	[Pause]
13	THE COURT: Do you have a problem on line 4 with saying instead
14	of these beliefs, either the witnesses' beliefs or any beliefs by the witnesses?
15	MR. O'BRIEN: Not at all. That's fine.
16	THE COURT: You see, I'm just being really specific.
17	MR. O'BRIEN: I appreciate it. I told you it was poorly worded.
18	THE COURT: Can you send this to
19	MR. O'BRIEN: I did. To Diane.
20	THE COURT: Oh. Is she here today?
21	THE CLERK: She'll be in later.
22	MR. O'BRIEN: I can
23	THE COURT: She'll be in later.
24	MR. O'BRIEN: I have it on my phone Dropbox, I believe. I can
25	email it to anybody.

# [OPENING STATEMENT BY THE STATE]

24

25

Ladies and gentlemen, this case begins factually in the time of the

murder itself, which is January 1st, 2016. And this is the location where Patrick Fleming was murdered. In this home during this day are four adults. There are some minor children, but the four adults inside the home are Miranda Sutton. She is Patrick Fleming's, the victim in this case, wife. Also present in the home is Akira Veasley. She is the stepdaughter to Mr. Fleming and the daughter to Ms. Sutton. She's in her early twenties. There is Patrick Fleming, as I just mentioned. And there's the Defendant.

In this case, you will hear that on January 1st, the beginning of a series of dominoes that falls leading up to Mr. Fleming's murder is an argument -- a verbal argument between Mr. Fleming and his stepdaughter. You'll hear briefly about the nature of that argument, that Mr. Fleming was upset about his stepdaughter seeing another young man under circumstances that he and Akira did not agree.

During that verbal argument, you'll hear from Miranda Sutton and from Akira that Ms. Sutton intervenes on her daughter's behalf on the side of the argument -- the verbal argument. You will also hear, and I ask, as I'm sure you will, to pay special attention to the facts as they describe it about the Defendant's behavior as this argument is ongoing in the home.

You will hear that the Defendant gets involved in the argument, and he gets involved in a couple of different ways. And you'll hear that from Ms. Sutton and Ms. Veasley about how that occurs, and when that occurs, and with whom.

Suffice it to say, that just prior to the critical events and the murder itself, there is a time where the Defendant speaks to Ms. Sutton alone. And the victim, Mr. Fleming, sees that, and he's not happy about it. And so, he and the

Defendant are engaged in now a verbal argument about the Defendant's ongoing interjection into a family dispute that he has no standing to. Once again, this is from Mr. Fleming's perspective.

And right at a critical moment, you will see several photographs in this case of a portion of that interior of the home. So, if you go back and recall in the first photograph, there's a garage door open. And at the back of that garage doors, there's a door that leads into the home itself. And immediately upon entering that door is a stairwell up into the general residence where the rooms, the kitchen, and everything else is located.

So, after this final confrontation occurs, you will hear that the Defendant makes some comments to Miranda prior to them being seen coming out of the bedroom or from a room. She will describe to you what the Defendant tells her and the words that she remembers him uttering to her about what he is willing to do and get involved in in this case.

Then, ladies and gentlemen, there is a discussion between the Defendant and Mr. Fleming about going outside of the home to talk this out. And what happens is that Ms. Sutton and Ms. Veasley are at the top of the stairs. They're observing the argument and what's occurring. And then there's the interjection of let's go outside.

And to go outside, Mr. Fleming makes a fatal error. And what he does, ladies and gentlemen, is he walks down the stairs first with the Defendant behind him. Ms. Veasley and Ms. Sutton who -- have known the Defendant for a period of time, he is a friend or an acquaintance of Mr. Fleming, and Ms. Sutton and Ms. Veasley know him and have seen him repeatedly in the past.

12

11

14 15

13

16

18

17

20

19

22

23

21

24 25

So, Mr. Fleming walks down the stairwell. You can see the width and the length of the stairwell in the photos and you're about to see that in a photo that I'm going to show you. Behind him, as I mentioned, Mr. Glover was walking. Unbeknownst to anybody, Mr. Glover is armed. He's armed with a .40 caliber semi-automatic handgun.

Ms. Sutton and Ms. Veasley will tell you that after they see them walking down the stairs after that discussion, they turn their attention to what they're going to do next. And almost immediately, they hear three gunshots ring out. They run to the stairs -- the top of the stairs and they look down the stairs and this is what they see. That is Mr. Fleming. He is dead. He's been murdered.

You're going to hear testimony about his wounds that are critical in this case. And, ladies and gentlemen, the door that you see down there is the door that I mentioned earlier. One is the exit to the garage and to outside. And as I mentioned to you, there's wounds to Mr. Fleming. Mr. Fleming, you will hear from a witness I believe today -- this afternoon, a doctor, -- a specialized doctor. Her name is Jennifer Corneal.

She is a physician, and she deals as a medical examiner at the coroner's office with a medical procedure called an autopsy. And she's dealing with a subspecialization called pathology and forensic pathology. It's, as she will describe to you, the study of injuries, the cause and manner of death and the injuries that cause death. You will hear from her some very specific aspects of the wounds to Mr. Fleming because while Mr. Fleming will not be here to testify, the wounds and evidence on his body is telling, compelling evidence to tell you how he was killed and by whom.

First of all, Dr. Corneal will tell you that he died from multiple gunshot wounds, one in particular. And I'll get to that in just a moment. She will describe the locations of the wounds. And, ladies and gentlemen, you will hear that Mr. Fleming was shot in three areas of his body, generally his leg, his torso, and the fatal gunshot wound, a massive injury, a headshot with a .40 caliber semi-automatic handgun.

She will also talk about the directionality. And by that, in an autopsy, the observations both externally to show, in a gunshot wound, what wound is the entrance and whether or not there is a corresponding exit. In this case, Mr. Fleming suffered three gunshot wounds. Two were what's called penetrating gunshot wounds, meaning that the bullet went in but did not exit. Those bullets or fragments thereof were removed as evidence during the autopsy procedure. And one wound was what's referred to as a perforated gunshot wound with a recognized entrance and a recognized exit. And you will hear Dr. Corneal, and through photographs of those injuries, describe how she can determine what are entrance and what are exit gunshot wounds.

But in addition to that examination, there is an internal examination. And in the internal examination, it is noted and marked about what damage is done internally. And you will hear that. And you will also hear the directionality, the directionality of how that bullet passed through Mr. Fleming. And that is important, ladies and gentlemen, because it absolutely corroborates Ms. Veasley and Ms. Sutton about what they observed just before the gunshots. And that is the Defendant, Mr. Glover, following right behind Mr. Fleming as he's walking down the stairs because you will see, in especially the head wound, the trajectory is downward.

In addition, you will hear the doctor testify about in her medical opinion which of these gunshot wounds are lethal and those that are not, independently of one another. And certainly, when you hear the testimony regarding the head wound, you will hear testimony from Dr. Corneal that that is an instantaneously incapacitating wound and a fatal wound.

In addition, ladies and gentlemen, you're going to see that there is a shot from behind multiple -- that there are two bullets recovered from both Mr. Fleming's head as well as his arm, that there is from the crime scene evidence of one round that strikes ultimately directly under Mr. Fleming's body. And so, let me show you that.

So, what you're looking at here is the close-up at the bottom of the stairs. Mr. Fleming has now been taken from the scene. The carpet in the left-hand photograph has been pulled back. You will see closer photographs of a bullet hole in that carpeting. And in the center is the tile with distinct marks showing a bullet impact at that site. And what that means from a homicide detective's perspective as to how Mr. Fleming is positioned, the number of wounds, and the exiting of wounds, that tells you where Mr. Fleming was when that shot entered and exited his body.

Immediately adjacent to Mr. Fleming's body at the bottom of the stairs are two expended cartridge cases. They're both .40 caliber. They are semi-automatic rounds. And you will hear from the primary homicide detective in this case, Detective Wilson, that as of today or her testimony tomorrow, there's been no weapon recovered by their investigation associated with those two and ultimately three rounds.

You will also hear testimony that when they examined the scene,

1 once again, which include Mr. Fleming's body, right at his waist band is a gun. 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Mr. Fleming was carrying a semi-automatic handgun on his person as you see it there, not withdrawn, but literally that's the condition at the scene. And, ladies and gentlemen, you're going to hear evidence in this case about that weapon because as you can imagine, this weapon is part of a crime scene. And you're going to hear from a crime scene analyst and from the detective about the condition of this weapon and how a weapon like this is handled and processed at the scene.

You're going to hear that it is photographed both in its natural condition as you see here, but that after the scene is processed, and you see in that photograph the yellow, what we call, evidence tents, with the numbers on them, have a very specific purpose and design, that they are to mark evidence in a crime scene and that they have a corollary cognition to the crime scene diagram.

So, there's a crime scene diagram that will be introduced as evidence in this case. And certain items of evidence are denoted in the index by a number, and those numbers on the index correspond to the evidence tents that you see actually at the crime scene.

So, what you see here at the scene in the photographs and in all the photographs that will be admitted, you will see numbers. It will tell you, number one, that the scene has been processed, and it's towards the end of the process, but, also, that it will tell you, and you can use as reference when you look at the crime scene diagram where those items are located and a reminder what each one of those items are.

So, in this particular case, that weapon was discovered and as you

will hear from the crime scene analyst, after it is collected physically as evidence, it is examined by crime scene investigators in a methodical patterned way. And one of the things that they do in the methodical manner is that they photograph it, and they note the condition of the weapon as they find it.

So, what you see here are two photographs in that progression of processing the weapon Mr. Fleming had. And there's two very important things about it. Number one, it's in the condition on his body as you see on the left. Number two, ladies and gentlemen, it's a 9 millimeter. It's a 9 millimeter semi-automatic handgun. And on the right, you will see the depiction of it now in a what's referred to as a render-safe condition. The slide is ejected and locked back. And you will hear testimony that it had ammunition in the magazine which is on the far-right upper portion, that's in the handle portion of the semi-automatic handgun.

So, it had ammunition in it, but it had no round in the barrel of the weapon. And, thus, this weapon is -- has ammunition, but it's not ready to fire. So, anybody that pulled the trigger, as you will hear from witnesses, this weapon would not have fired. It physically has to be loaded by sliding back the handle that you see in the condition it is, and the handle has to come forward to then load the weapon.

So, ladies and gentlemen, the facts of this case as I've just outlined is that there is a three-shot close -- or at least relatively close range firing once into the head, into the body, and into the central area of the pelvic region, actually the leg. And those wounds are fatal to Mr. Fleming. And as I mentioned to you in the last part of this story and what the evidence will show

you, is that Ms. Sutton and Ms. Veasley are staring down the stairs at a scene that they know -- is becoming real to them. That from Ms. Sutton's perspective, her husband is lying dying on the floor. And Ms. Veasley observes her stepdad in the same condition.

But Ms. Sutton will tell you that when she's staring down the stairwell and what leads to Count 2 of this case, the assault with a deadly weapon, because as she's staring down and absorbing what she's seen, after she heard the gunshots, went to the stairwell and looked down, at the bottom of that stairwell is Shawn Glover. And what does Mr. Glover do? He points the gun at Ms. Sutton, and he utters these words: If you and your kids don't want to -- or want to make it, shut the fuck up. And then he flees from the home.

Ladies and gentlemen, at the end of this case, Mr. Flinn and myself are going to ask you to find the Defendant guilty of first-degree murder with the use of a deadly weapon, assault with a deadly weapon, and discharging a firearm in a structure. And that is going to be based upon the evidence in this case. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. At this time does the Defense wish -- does the Defense wish to make an opening statement?

MR. O'BRIEN: Yes, Your Honor. If we can just clear the screen.

[OPENING STATEMENT BY THE DEFENSE]

MR. O'BRIEN: Shawn Glover did not kill Patrick Fleming and yet he was put in handcuffs, arrested, and charged with a crime he -- crimes he did not commit. Now, he sits at a table with Mr. Bashor and is forced to defend himself against a crime he didn't commit. This is exactly why there's a

 presumption of innocence in this country.

Now, the question for you in this case is going to be does the prosecution have enough evidence to show that Shawn Glover committed these crimes beyond a reasonable doubt. The judge has already told you, as the jury, you are the people in this trial who find the facts. You'll sit through the evidence, you'll sit through the testimony. And at the end, you'll weigh out who is credible, what to rely on, and to evaluate whether the prosecution has met its burden of proving that Shawn Glover committed these crimes beyond a reasonable doubt.

Now, in order to try to figure out what happened, you might look to physical evidence. But in this trial, you will hear that there are no fingerprints, no DNA, no gunshot residue, no video surveillance, none of those things to tie Shawn Glover to these crimes. What you will be relying on is the testimony of Ms. Veasley and Ms. Sutton. They're the two adults who were at the property at the time, as the prosecution said. The problem is going to be that they gave three versions of what happened that day to police.

On New Year's Day when Ms. Sutton is at the bottom of the stairs, she calls 911. And the version she tells the police is that she doesn't know who shot her husband. Someone knocked on the door, shot her husband. She didn't see anything. She doesn't know anything.

A couple of hours later the police arrive or a couple of hours later into the investigation, police talk to Ms. Veasley. And she says, actually the suspect is a man named Hatch, my father deals marijuana. Patrick Fleming deals marijuana. And Hatch is a customer of my father's. He was sitting on the couch for a while. I was having an argument with my dad down in the

garage. And then Hatch talked to my mom, Miranda, for a minute, and then he ultimately shot Patrick. She'll explain Miranda doesn't know this person. She -- Ms. Sutton has never met this person, and Akira does not know this person either. Ms. Veasley does not know this person.

She'll explain to police at that time that when Ms. Sutton and her hear three gunshots, they run over to the stairwell to look down. And what they see is the body of Patrick Fleming. He is dying, or he is dead due to multiple gunshot wounds. Ms. Veasley tells the police she sees no one else. The suspect must have run out the door, but she does know that Patrick Fleming's Dodge Durango was missing. They keep the keys on the counter. They always keep them on the counter, and the keys aren't there, and the Dodge Durango's gone.

The same day, New Year's Day 2016, the police interview Miranda Sutton. They want to find out what she saw, what she knows. She explains to police at that time, I think there was a guy here. He's a customer of my husband's. He's a customer of Patrick Fleming's. He was sitting on the couch. My daughter, Akira Veasley, and my husband were arguing down in the garage. I went down to check on what happened with them.

I don't really know this guy. I've seen him maybe one time before at a previous house that we had. And she'll explain to police that she does not know information about who this person is. But if they give her until 6:00 p.m. that night, she will come back and give them the name of the person who shot her husband.

The very next day, January 2nd, Akira Veasley and Miranda Sutton will tell police we lied yesterday. It was Shawn Glover who shot Patrick

1 | F | 2 | \( \) 3 | t | t | 5 | \( \) 6 | t | 7 | 6 |

Fleming. We were scared because he threatened us. With these three versions of what happened on January 1st, 2016, and you trying to sort through what is true and what is not, you would usually want to rely on some type of evidence beyond the statements, but you will not have that here. You will not have the fingerprints of the man who ran out the door of the townhome from the door. You will not see evidence about fingerprints on the door of the Dodge Durango or inside the Dodge Durango that the suspect stole.

You will not hear if there's any DNA evidence tying Mr. Glover to that townhome. You will not hear that there's any DNA evidence tying Mr. Glover to the Dodge Durango. You will not see any video surveillance of the suspect running out of the townhome into a townhome community, a gated townhome community. You will not hear about gunshot residue testing on Mr. Glover or anyone else.

At the end of this trial, you'll be left with the word of these two women to determine is there enough evidence to find a man guilty of murder. And at the conclusion of this trial, we are going to say we are going to ask you to find Shawn Glover not guilty of these crimes because there's simply not enough evidence. Thank you.

THE COURT: Okay. Ladies and gentlemen, we're going to take a brief recess for you to use the restroom and us to address a couple of matters. During this recess, you're admonished not to talk or converse among yourselves or with anyone else on any subject connected with this trial. You're not to read, watch, or listen to any report of or commentary on the trial by any person connected with this case or any medium of information,

THE COURT: You mean those ladies?

MR. STANTON: Yes.

THE COURT: One at a time. I wanted to hear exactly what they were going to say about the gang membership, specifically. If you could like run through that real quick before I go and say -- also, I want it made very clear, and I'll say this on the record, that this was what they heard, not who they heard it from or anything else, but that's what they heard. I mean I'll assume they didn't watch anybody -- they didn't watch him shoot somebody other than allegedly, you know -- didn't see him in a gang or --

MR. STANTON: They heard it from him.

MR. BASHOR: He's told them, and he sat there showing them videos of these are my homies in New York and stuff doing, you know, this and that with their guns.

THE COURT: It's still --

MR. BASHOR: And they know he couldn't have killed somebody because he just got out of prison for --

THE COURT: It's still --

MR. BASHOR: -- manslaughter.

THE COURT: It's still a hearing. Sorry.

MR. STANTON: From a reliable source.

THE COURT: No elaboration, just hearing. I heard.

MR. STANTON: And he's the father of her grandchildren. It's not like they're strangers. That's the scenario.

THE COURT: Well, that would explain why we hang out with people who we think more than other people. Okay. Well, that makes more sense to me. None of that made any sense. I have no pride of ownership or

instruction that's a little less specific, too, that's usually given at the end. It

25

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Oh, no. He's --

THE CLERK: We just had him in there.

THE COURT: Okay. So, we're back on the record. We had a brief bench conference so that I could give the defense a slightly amended version of a cautionary instruction, which I think is, you know, better. Nothing personal to you. I think yours is great. I just think this is better, but I have no pride of authorship, and I told you if you don't want to use it, don't use it.

MR. O'BRIEN: I would like to use it.

THE COURT: And you would like to use it?

MR. O'BRIEN: Yes.

THE COURT: So, I'll read it into the record: Now I'm going to caution the ladies and gentlemen of the jury that the testimony that the witness believed the Defendant was gang-affiliated and/or had a history of violence against persons is being offered and may only be considered by you solely for the purpose of explaining the state of mind of the witness at the time she made her statement to police on January 1st, 2016. The testimony, if believed, was not to be -- excuse me -- is not to be considered as substantive evidence that the Defendant is in fact gang-affiliated, and/or has a history of violence against persons, or that he is a person of bad character.

So, what I think I didn't mention yesterday, but I will when the witnesses come in here, is that I'm allowing -- aware of a history of violence against persons and general, vague gang affiliation potentially depending on what I hear with the understanding that the witness can say she heard it. She can't say she heard it from the Defendant. She can't say anything else. Let's

just keep it contained. And I will give you some latitude to lead the witness so that there is no -- while I know the district attorney's position, the State, is that the source of information that she has that would give her this state of mind was, fill in the blank.

MR. STANTON: From the Defendant.

THE COURT: And unless you want me to allow such a thing?

MR. O'BRIEN: No.

THE COURT: I didn't think so. I think it's enough to show her state of mind, and why she might change her story over time to show that he -- that she believed he was -- had been violent against people in the past, that he was a gang member, and that's what she heard and believed, and that's it.

So, if we could bring --

MR. STANTON: Judge, is it proper for us within your ruling to ask the witness that they heard it, and they believed it to be true? That they personally believed it to be true?

THE COURT: Yes. That's kind of the point.

MR. STANTON: I think so, too.

MR. FLINN: And I did, in speaking with them, advise them because I've obviously been talking to them about -- that there's going to be limitations, but that the purpose of this is that the Court would advise them --

MR. STANTON: What those limitations are --

THE COURT: I will advise them.

MR. FLINN: -- so they're prepared for that.

THE COURT: I will advise them.

MR. STANTON: Miranda Sutton, Your Honor.

THE COURT: So, the record should reflect we've been outside the presence of the jury since they've been excused. And we're calling in the first witness.

THE MARSHAL: Follow me, please.

THE COURT: Ma'am, if you could approach the witness stand.

Once you're there and you're ready, if you could face my clerk. Raise your right hand and be sworn.

MIRANDA SUTTON, PLAINTIFF'S WITNESS, SWORN

THE MARSHAL: Please be seated.

THE COURT: Okay. I'm sorry about this. One second. We're outside the presence of the jury right now. The district attorney is going to ask you some questions. The defense counsel may also ask you some questions. And then we're going to talk about your testimony before the jury. Regardless of what is asked of you in front of the jury, we're not going to discuss this little hearing right here in front of the jury. We might say things like, you said before, or you've said in the past, but we're not going -- you know, your answer shouldn't be, yeah, in the little mini hearing five minutes ago, right, because this is off -- outside of their consideration.

THE WITNESS: Okay.

THE COURT: Okay.

#### **DIRECT EXAMINATION**

BY MR. FLINN:

Q So, Ms. Sutton, you've testified in this case before, correct? You remember that?

A Yes.

Q	And you testified about giving statements about what happened
on January	1st, 2016 to police, correct?

A Yes.

Q And I know that on the day of the murder of your husband, you told police one version of what happened that day, correct?

A Yes.

Q Yes. And then on the next day, January 2nd, you and your family reached out to police and you told them a different version or a more detailed version of what happened the previous day, and that included who shot your husband?

A Correct.

Q What I'd like for you to tell the Court, because you previously testified that you -- the second statement was truthful and that the first version was not because you were afraid --

A Exactly.

Q -- is that correct?

A Yes.

Q So, what I'd like, if you could tell the Court, please, the reasons, whatever they may be, however many or how few there are, that you were afraid at that particular time that you gave the statement and what about it made you change your mind the following day?

A During the interview, I felt intimidated because once I asked the officers if they could stay there with us, because I was in fear of my life, they told me, no, they could not. There was not enough police officers to stay. All I could see was my husband on the ground. That's all I could see. I was in fear

of my life. I had already been threatened. And I was not okay until my family came in.

- Q Did you also previously explain, and I believe in that second statement to police, that there were things that in addition to having just been threatened the day before by the Defendant, that you knew about him that made you believe those threats to be true; is that correct?
  - A Yes.
  - O Could you explain what what those are to the Judge, please?
- A I know that he has a violent past, that my husband is laying on the floor, that he had just been murdered, and that I had been threatened. And I still had my kids and myself inside of the apartment there in the townhouse. And my biggest fear was getting out alive.
- Q You, in that second statement to police also talked to them about the Defendant, his family and friends, and, for example, videos he had shown you, things of that nature, correct?
  - A Yes.
- Q What were you talking about when you explained that to the detectives?
  - A The nature of -- I know who he is.
  - Q What do you mean by that, who he is?
- A That he was an active gang member. That -- you know, that he was sitting there watching the videos that morning of different instances that had happened the night before, New Year's Eve. The simple fact that my husband was laying on the floor was the biggest part of everything.
  - MR. FLINN: No more questions, Your Honor.

25

THE COURT: So, when you say I know he had a violent past, you know that how; all the possible ways you know that? THE WITNESS: Because I knew that he had been in prison before. THE COURT: I mean how did you know that? THE WITNESS: From my daughter --THE COURT: So, someone told you? THE WITNESS: Yes. She had told me that -- of his past that he -- you know, I knew that myself, that he had been in prison THE COURT: So, what you knew about the Defendant's past you THE WITNESS: I knew from the Defendant, his self, because I knew that he had gotten out of prison. I knew that him and my daughter had dated before when they were in high school. And I knew that she told me that he had went to prison, you know, when he disappeared for a long period of time. I knew that he had just murdered my husband, and he was laying on the THE COURT: Do you have any questions for the witness on this THE COURT: Okay. So, because --

MR. BASHOR: Your Honor, I would like to be heard --

1	THE COURT: Yes. Do you want to
2	MR. BASHOR: outside the presence of the witness.
3	THE COURT: Can you step out just for one second in the hallway
4	I mean in the little room there?
5	THE MARSHALL: Follow me, please.
6	[Outside the presence of the witness]
7	MR. BASHOR: I guess, Judge, you know, yesterday it was
8	proffered that
9	THE COURT: Why don't we hear from both of them and then you
10	can argue?
11	MR. BASHOR: Okay.
12	THE COURT: Because otherwise we're going to we're going to
13	have
14	MR. BASHOR: That makes sense, Your Honor.
15	THE COURT: Does that make sense?
16	MR. BASHOR: Yes, it does.
17	THE COURT: Okay. Let's call the other witness in.
18	MR. FLINN: It's Akira Veasley.
19	THE MARSHAL: Akira Veasley. Follow me, please. Watch your
20	step.
21	THE COURT: If you could face my Clerk, raise you right hand and
22	be sworn.
23	AKIRA VEASLEY, STATE'S WITNESS, SWORN
24	THE CLERK: Please be seated.
25	THE COURT: Okay. Before the District Attorney and possibly the

Defense Attorney or myself ask you any questions, we're doing this hearing outside the presence of the jury. And later when you testify before the jury, we're not going to reference this hearing. They're not even going to know what happened.

THE WITNESS: Okay.

THE COURT: And so, if you say something today in this hearing and one of the attorneys asks you about it, they may say something like you testified before or you testified in the past, such and such.

THE WITNESS: Okay.

THE COURT: It would be helpful if you didn't say oh, you mean in the little mini hearing when no jury was here? Do you see what I'm getting at?

THE WITNESS: Uh-huh.

THE COURT: Is that a yes?

THE WITNESS: Yeah.

THE COURT: Okay. So, at this time, State, if you want to ask questions about our narrowed topic for the purpose of this hearing?

MR. FLINN: Thank you, Your Honor.

### **DIRECT EXAMINATION**

#### BY MR. FLINN:

Q So, Ms. Veasley, I'm just going to ask you a few questions about statements you gave to police on January 1st, 2016 and January 2nd, 2016, okay?

A Okay.

Q And so, January 1st, was the day your stepdad, Patrick Fleming, of course, was killed in the home, right?

A Yes.

Q So, that day you told police that the man that shot your dad was somebody by the name of Hatch, right?

A Yes.

O The following day you and your mom, Miranda Sutton, went to the police and told them what you explained was the truth and that it was actually Shawn Glover, correct?

A Correct.

O Now, what I want you to tell the Court is the reasons that you have for telling one thing on the 1st, and then telling something else on the 2nd. So, what about the events that day, what you know about Shawn Glover, and anything else that was in your head made you do that course action?

A I was just scared. After the events that happened, I didn't know what to do. I just never been in that predicament before. And just the events that happened that day I was scared. I looked in my mom's eyes, and she just looked at me, and I was scared. I didn't know what else to do.

Q What, in particular, made you scared?

A Shawn, the way -- you know, what happened right there, you know. Just everything that happened that day made me scared, you know. The prior things before made me scared.

Q What prior things?

A As far as like behavior, you know, the way he acted towards people, the things that were happening that day, the event that happened. And, again, I was just scared. I didn't know what else to do. I didn't know what I should do being in this predicament.

Q	Did you testified about when your dad was shot
Α	Yes.

Q -- and that you heard the Defendant make threats to you and your mom, correct?

A Correct.

Q Did you have reasons, based on your knowledge of Shawn, and anything you knew about him, and his relationship with your family, did you have any reason that you thought he was serious about that threat?

A Yeah, just due to the threats and what happened in the past, what he had stated that day, you know, as far as if -- if you, you know, do this, I'm going to do that. So, that did make me scared. It made me, you know, feel in fear of my life, so I didn't know what else I should do. I -- I didn't know.

Q Were -- at the -- were you aware at that time about Shawn Glover's past and having been in prison?

A Yes.

Q How were you -- how did you know about that?

A Just through people, you know, he say, she say. As far as social media, as far as things I looked up, as far as things, you know, what has been said. Again, with those prior events I was in fear.

Q Did you know or believe you knew why he had been in prison?

A Yeah. For -- for I think it was, if I'm not mistaken, a murder. I'm not sure.

Q And --

THE COURT: What prior events are you talking about? Are you talking about that or something else?

2

3

5

6 7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

2425

THE WITNESS: No. The events that happened that day.

THE COURT: Okay.

THE WITNESS: As far as him, you know, doing what he did, as far as what was said that day, as far as me being scared, as far as me, you know, knowing that the kids were in the house and, you know, trying to defend them, as well.

## BY MR. FLINN:

- Q Now, this house was your sister, Angela's, right?
- A Correct.
- Q And Angela and Shawn Glover had a relationship, right?
- A Correct.
- Q Did Angela talk to you about Shawn Glover and things that went on with them?
  - A No, she did not.
  - Ω She left that out?
- A She didn't really mention like the full extent, but she did mention that, you know, that they did have arguments, that they did have their own problems, as well.
- Q So, when the -- when you said that you knew that the Defendant had been in prison, you believed it was for a murder, are you talking about -- you're not talking about what happened that day, right; you're talking about a murder from before, and he was in prison and then released for that?
  - A That's correct.
  - Q Were you familiar with the Defendant's gang affiliations?
  - A I was not, but I was aware of it, but I -- I didn't know.

Q

about your own safety?

25

Did you have -- that day, the following day, did you have concerns

A Yeah. That night -- the following night after I was receiving random friend requests, after, you know, certain threats were made, I was in danger and scared for my life, so I did feel that way. I -- I felt like I was in danger, and I was -- I was scared.

THE COURT: I'm sorry, could you repeat, random friend requests and then you said something else, something about threats; is that what you said?

THE WITNESS: Yeah. Yes. I -- I'm not completely sure, but I heard that there was a threat about me and my mom if we told, we were going to be killed next or something to that stipulation.

MR. FLINN: No other questions, Your Honor.

MR. BASHOR: No questions.

THE COURT: Okay. Could you step outside for a second, please?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

THE COURT: I'd appreciate it.

THE BAILIFF: Watch your step, follow me.

[Outside the presence of the witness]

THE COURT: Well, before I hear from you, I would -- do you have your -- can you give me your proposed instructions, please, the ones I just gave you?

MR. BASHOR: Yes.

THE COURT: Could you approach? Okay. Can you approach again? I'm sure Mr. Stanton appreciates you getting his paper for him. This is what you're arguing about?

MR. BASHOR: Yes, Your Honor. I think you read my mind.

THE COURT: Okay. So, based upon the testimony of the witnesses, balancing -- all the balancing in the world, I appreciate that there's some evidence of knowledge of gang affiliation, but the gist of this is that these women both believed he went to prison before for some kind of death of another, at the hands of another, and the mother -- I mean the wife of the decedent testified that she knew he had a violent past. And so, that's where I'm going to leave it. I'm going to allow the District Attorney to talk about the witness' beliefs of the history of violence, but I'm going to exclude gang affiliation because it's not really the impetus of this. It's mostly a deceased relative, a very serious threat, and a history of violence.

MR. BASHOR: And, Your Honor, just in case an appellate tribunal were to think that I've acquiesced, obviously, our objections from yesterday as to any of this I would renew. You've ruled, but I don't want someone to say --

THE COURT: Well, that's fine.

MR. BASHOR: -- well, he was okay with the instruction later on.

THE COURT: No, I know. The record should reflect that you've objected to any history of violence or any testimony about any history of violence. And, honestly, you know, the problem I have is I don't know what those videos -- you know, once I open the door a little bit, I don't know what it's all about, and we could have a collateral trial on how that message of violence was communicated to these witnesses. And I don't want to get -- I don't want to get into it that far. I will tell you, though, depending on what questions you ask, if you open the door to how they knew this information --

MR. BASHOR: Yeah, I'm not --

THE COURT: -- the fact that the Defendant is the one they know it

8

10 11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18 19

20 21

22

23

24 25 from is, you know -- I'm not going to thought to exclude it if you ask.

MR. BASHOR: I'm going to put a deadbolt on that door, Judge.

THE COURT: All right. Just checking. Okay. So, what I'm inclined to do now is bring in the witnesses, tell them about the Court's ruling. I would -- on one hand I want to encourage leading. On the other -- you know, just to confine them. On the other hand, which one of you is examining these witnesses in front of the jury? Because if it's you, you're going to have to change your style a little bit. Leading is to keep the deadbolt on what I've allowed, not to spoon feed the witness your words.

MR. FLINN: No, I understand.

THE COURT: So, like I just heard some of those leading questions. So, do you understand what I'm getting at?

MR. FLINN: I do, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. FLINN: I was trying to direct them just to get through the short hearing versus what I would ask in front of a jury.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. FLINN: Based on all of their conversations with us previously.

THE COURT: Okay. I understand. I'm just saying I don't know what you're going to do.

MR. FLINN: No, I understand.

THE COURT: I'm just trying to give you a head's up --

MR. FLINN: No, I understand.

THE COURT: -- that if there's an objection to leading questions like that, I'm going to sustain them. Okay. So, could you bring in the ladies,

please?

[In the presence of the witnesses]

THE COURT: Okay. If you could just stand right there by the District Attorneys. Okay. So, here's the thing. You're both going to testify in this trial. I know testifying can be very stressful. And I've made a few rulings based upon arguments of the attorneys and some testimony that you gave here today. And the rulings relate to what the District Attorneys can have you say on the witness stand, okay?

And so, what I'm going to do is I'm going to give them some latitude to ask you specific questions when it gets to the area of Mr. Glover's history, meaning they'll ask you questions like then what happened, then what happened; open-ended questions. When we get to things that you know about his history, they're going to be very specific, because I'm not allowing you to testify about his gang membership, okay? What I'm allowing you to testify about is that you have a belief about his violent past. You can't say murder, you can't say prison; violent past. That's what I heard from both of you here today. It's a more general phrase for the prison case, okay?

So please don't reference prison. The District Attorney's not going to ask you about prison. Please don't reference the gang membership. The District Attorney's not going to ask you about the gang membership. And then if, you know, the Defense were to ask you, I'll cross that bridge when I come to it, okay?

And so, when they're getting to the point of what you know about Mr. Glover, they're really just talking about did you understand -- you know, had you heard he had a violent past? We're not going to talk about videos or

things that he said or told you, just did you hear that he had a violent past and, you know, whatever you believed about him having a violent past as far as I believed he was violent, you can say that, but no gang membership, okay?

Okay. Any questions?

And here's the thing. If I - I'm going to be listening really carefully. So, if I interrupt you, if I say oh, excuse me, just stop and the District Attorney will re-guide you. I know it's awkward and I'm sorry. Okay?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Okay.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you very much. Anything else?

MR. BASHOR: Not from the Defense, Your Honor.

MR. FLINN: Nothing.

THE COURT: Okay. I'm going to look to you, Mr. Bashor or whoever's witness this is.

MR. BASHOR: It will be me, Your Honor.

THE COURT: To when you want me to read this? You know, look at me because there's a time usually before, or in the middle, or during or at the -- you know, I'll be looking for you to, you know, right after she says it.

MR. BASHOR: Right.

THE COURT: If you could just give me the --

MR. BASHOR: Okay.

THE COURT: -- you know, some kind of sign --

MR. BASHOR: All right.

THE COURT: -- when you'd like that done.

MR. BASHOR: You know, the --

THE COURT: Yeah. Not the sign of the cross or the sign for a

1	strike, but.
2	MR. BASHOR: Okay.
3	THE COURT: All right. Perfect. Anything else?
4	MR. FLINN: No, Your Honor.
5	THE COURT: Okay.
6	[Pause]
7	THE MARSHAL: All rise. The jury is entering. The jury is all
8	present, Your Honor.
9	[In the presence of the jury.]
10	THE COURT: Counsel, will you stipulate to the presence of the
11	jury?
12	MR. FLINN: Yes, Your Honor.
13	MR. BASHOR: Yes, Your Honor.
14	THE COURT: All right. At this time, State, call your first witness.
15	MR. FLINN: The State calls Miranda Sutton, Your Honor.
16	THE MARSHAL: Follow me, please.
17	THE COURT: Ma'am, if you could face my Clerk, raise your right
18	hand, and be sworn.
19	MIRANDA SUTTON, STATE'S WITNESS, SWORN
20	THE MARSHAL: Please be seated. State and spell your name for
21	the record.
22	THE WITNESS: Miranda Sutton, M-I-R-A-N-D-A S-U-T-T-O-N.
23	THE COURT: State, when you're ready.
24	MR. FLINN: Thank you, Your Honor. Can I kind of drag this back a
25	little bit

1		THE COURT: Sure.
2		MR. FLINN: so I'm out of the way?
3		DIRECT EXAMINATION
4	BY MR. FL	INN:
5	Q	Good morning, Ms. Sutton.
6	A	Good morning.
7	Q	Is it all right if I call you Miranda?
8	A	Yes.
9	Q	Miranda, I want to talk to you about January 1st, 2016, specifically,
10	okay?	
11	A	Okay.
12	Q	At that time, back then on January 1st, a little over two years ago,
13	where wer	re you living?
14	A	With my daughter at 38 it was Foggy Smock Smokey Fog
15	Avenue. I	remember that.
16	Q	Okay. You're not sure of the number, but Smokey Fog Avenue?
17	A	Right.
18	Q	And when and that's in North Las Vegas?
19	A	Yes.
20	Q	City of North Las Vegas, correct?
21	A	Yes.
22	Q	Here in the county. You said you lived with your daughter; who is
23	that?	
24	A	Angela. It was my goddaughter, Angela.
25	Q	Your goddaughter, Angela. The house itself, what I want you to do

is explain to the jury how the house is situated; does that make sense? So --

- It's a townhouse.
- It's a townhouse. Is there another unit attached to it?
- Yes, with a townhouse.
- Okay. So, where the townhouse, is the -- how are the living arrangements? Are there multiple levels? What are the basics of that?

It's a two-story level. When you come in, you have the entrance and a garage on the lower floor. You go up a flight of stairs, which is -- you'll see in the pictures how the stairs go. And you're up in the second part of the

- So, let me just backtrack a little bit. So, on the ground floor -- I'm on the ground floor and you said there's a garage?
  - And there's also a front door?
  - If I go in through the front door, where am I standing?
- On the landing. There's a landing right there in front of the front
- Right in front of the door you said a landing. And by landing I assume you mean the bottom of a stairway?
  - Are there any other doors in that landing?
  - There's a front door and there's a garage door. Α
  - Q So, a door that leads outside and a door that leads into a garage?
  - Α Right.

23

24

25

Q And then so if you're standing there, the only places you could go at that point are out the front door, out to the garage, or up the stairs?

A Up the stairs, right.

O Okay. So, if you start to go up the stairs, what do you see or where do you go in the house?

A You go right into the dining room from the steps. And right off from there is the kitchen. And then you had Angela's room right in front of the kitchen almost and the boys room was off to the side.

Q Now, I'm going to ask you a little bit more about who the people are that you're talking about.

A Okay.

Q So, if you walk up the stairs, you're in the dining room. There's a living room straight through--

A Right.

Q -- do I have that right?

A Right.

Q The boys' room, and you said Angela's room?

A Yes.

Q Are too?

A Angela's room -- if I'm standing here and this is the front door, Angela's room was off over here, and the boys room is off over here to the right-hand side. Right here you have the dining room going into the living room.

Q If you could, I know you said this is Angela's house, your goddaughter. Would you please tell the jury who all was living in this

Could you please tell the Court where that person is sitting and just

-45-

24

25

Α

Q

Yes.

- Q So, he drove Angela. Approximately at the time how old was Angela? If you know.
  - A Thirty something.
- Q Thirty something. Fair enough. So, he took her to work. And did he use his own vehicle or was there some other vehicle there?
- A Yes, he used his own vehicle. He had just taken both of them to work the day before.
  - O So, he took her to work on the morning of the 1st?
  - A Uh-huh.
  - Q And you thought maybe he stopped by his job to pick up a check?
  - A Right.
- O Did there come a point that morning where he arrived back at the house?
  - A Yes.
  - Q What happened when Patrick came back to the house?
- A When Patrick came back to the house, he came in and he was discussing something about the night before when my daughter was -- had went out. And he said that he was going to look at something on his phone and went to go check out his phone, or what the video was, or whatever. And he said that he wanted to talk to Akira, my 21-year-old. And they went downstairs to talk, and I went with them. And it was a lot of arguing and a lot of discussion down there about her being -- of her age and her being a responsible 21-year-old at the time. And --
- Q Let me stop you for just a second. So, you said Patrick came back and you said with your daughter, and you, obviously, just mentioned Akira,

25

handclapping, you know, when you talk with your hands. But other than that,

no, it was a typical argument that we were having.

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q So, while this is going on, does anyone else come down to the garage while you're having this argument?

Α Yes. Shawn came down to the garage, and he had the house phone in his hand. It was a phone. I don't know if it was the house phone or cell phone. I knew he had a phone. And he said that Angela's on the phone. And I said yes? And she -- I was talking to Angela on the phone, and she said mommy, are you okay?

MR. BASHOR: Objection, Your Honor, hearsay.

THE COURT: Okay. Counsel --

MR. FLINN: It's not offered for the truth, Your Honor. She's --

THE COURT: Okay. Then it's not relevant, so it's sustained.

## BY MR. FLINN:

Q So, he -- the Defendant, told you someone's on the phone and handed you the phone?

Yes. And I told Angela I was okay, everything was fine. And he left back out.

- Q So, at that point the Defendant leaves the garage?
- Α Right.
- Q Did he go outside or through the door to the stairway?
- Α He went back up into the townhouse.
- So, what did you, Patrick, and Akira do at that point? Q

Α Nothing. We were still standing there discussing everything and actually calming down. It wasn't a big discussion after all - after, you know, so long. It was like everything had gotten out, everybody had said what they had to say. And Shawn came back downstairs.

MR. BASHOR: Objection, Your Honor. It calls for speculation.

bedroom, and they're coming up the stairs. And they're smiling, talking, and

25

9

11

12

13

14

16

15

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

everything is okay.

Q When they get up there, what happens next?

A It's like a whole different vibe. Patrick asked Shawn what does he want to talk to his wife about. And Shawn said well, you're down there tripping with them and fighting them. And Patrick said, no, I'm not. And Patrick went to touch Shawn on his shoulders to say man, no, I'm not. And Shawn did some move like this, like man, get off me, you're too close to me.

MR. FLINN: And, for the record, Your Honor, she kind of put her hands out, palms up, away from her body.

THE COURT: The record shall so reflect.

THE WITNESS: And that's when Patrick looked at Shawn and said, do we have a problem, do we need to talk? He said well let's -- let's go down here, let's go -- we talk.

## BY MR. FLINN:

- Q You said he said let's go down there. Who's he?
- A Patrick looked at Shawn and said, let's go downstairs so we can talk.
- Q So, now when he says that, you and Akira are still standing up there toward the top of the stairs, correct?
  - A Yes.
  - Q What happens after Patrick says let's go downstairs?
- A Patrick looked right at me, and I said no, you don't need to talk to him. And Patrick pushed me to the side and went right on downstairs first.
  - O So, you see Patrick start walking down the stairs?
  - A Yes.

21

22 23 24

25

Q Where is the Defendant at that point?

Α Coming right behind him.

Q So, when you say coming behind him, is he also going downstairs?

Yes, he's going downstairs also.

Q As they start walking down the stairs, what do you do?

Α I'm going back up toward Angela's room to get the stuff for the baby, and I hear the shots.

 $\mathbf{O}$ You say you hear the shots. Can you just -- just back up. You're going toward Angela's room. What do you hear?

Three loud shots.

Q When you heard those three shots, can you say how long had it been since you saw the Defendant and Patrick start walking down the stairs?

Α It couldn't have been a couple seconds. Patrick is tall. He went downstairs first. Shawn came right after him. I had already turned around to go to the bedroom and I heard -- before I even got in the bedroom, I heard the shots.

O When you heard the shots, what did you do next?

Α Looked straight at Akira to make sure, because I know I don't have hearing problems that bad, I said did you hear that? And we ran to the stairs.

Q So, you and Akira ran toward the stairs?

Α Yes. The stairs, the way the stairs are, there's -- when you come off of the -- from upstairs there's a little landing. There's a little stairwell, a little staircase, and then there's a landing. And then there's another set of staircases down below that that goes all the way to the front door.

Q	So, you came over to the stairs?
Α	Yes. And we were like on the top on the top of the of the
landing.	I was looking straight down at him and Akira was right behind me.
Q	So, just so I have this clear, you're on that couple steps down, then
a landing	<b>j</b> ?
Α	Yes.
Q	And you're looking down the rest of the stairs?
Α	Yes.
Q	What do you see as you look down those stairs?
Α	I see Patrick laying on the floor, and I see Shawn standing over
him.	
Q	How did how did Patrick look to you at that point laying there?
Was he r	moving, was he saying anything?
Α	No, not at all. Not at all. He looked like he was slumped over on
his side.	And I could see Shawn standing down there with the gun, and I could
see him	standing over Patrick, and he's standing there looking at me with the
gun in hi	s hand. When I looked down, I could see he looks up at me with the
gun in hi	s hand.
Q	So, as you're looking down the Defendant lifts the gun and points
it in your	direction?

A Yes.

Q Did you or the Defendant say anything at that point?

A I raised my hands, and he said don't tell on me. He said something like don't tell on me, don't say anything. And all I could do was raise my hands and say okay. I really thought that I was going to be shot next.

Q When he said that and that's what you're thinking, what did you do next?

A I panicked. All I could do was stand there. He was trying to get out of the garage door trying to move Patrick's body with the door to get out of the garage door. That's the only way you could get out of the door because Patrick's body was in front of the garage door and the front door.

Q Did you see whether the Defendant made it out one of those doors at that point?

A You could hear the garage door going up. You could -- you knew that he was - all I know is that I was trying to get to Patrick. By then Akira had called 911 and I was on the -- the phone, and she asked me to try and do CPR.

Q So, as you were coming down the stairs, and saw all of this, and the Defendant pointed the gun at you, where was Akira; if you know?

A I -- I knew she was behind me and then when I raised my arms, I don't know what -- you know, all I could say was okay to her.

Q You said that Akira called 911, but you talked to them?

A Yeah. She had to call 911. I know that I had the phone somehow because I had to do -- try to do CPR.

Q So, at some point you're listening to the phone and being told to try to do CPR?

A Yes.

Q So, did you go down the stairs to where Patrick was laying and try to do that?

A Yes. Shawn had already went down to Patrick. I don't know where the phone came from, but I knew that I was doing the CPR on him. I had to

That's when you stopped?

Yes. And they took over.

Q

Α

Q

24

25

Where did you go after the officers arrived and took over the

19

20

18

21

22 23

24

25

THE COURT: Yes. Can I see you in the hallway for a minute? I'm going to step outside in the hallway. If you can remain seated and not talk to anyone, I'm going to be right back.

> [Court and counsel exit courtroom at 10:43 a.m., not recorded] [Court and counsel return to courtroom at 10:44 a.m.]

THE COURT: Okay. So, State you had a motion?

MR. FLINN: Yes, Your Honor. The State moves to admit State's proposed Exhibits 4, 5, 6, 7, 10, and 11 by stipulation of the parties.

THE COURT: Okay. So, any time the lawyers enter a stipulation, whether it's to admit something or they admit -- they stipulate to the existence of a particular fact, that means they've agreed, and you have to regard that fact as proved. And the stipulation to admit these means that the Defense and the State have agreed to their admission. 4, 5, 6, 7,10, and 11 are admitted.

[STATE'S EXHIBITS 4, 5, 6, 7, 10, AND 11 RECEIVED]

MR. FLINN: Thank you, Your Honor.

BY MR. FLINN:

O So, Miranda, I'm going to show you some photographs of the house on Smokey Fog and ask you to explain to the jury what they're looking at, okay?

Α Okay.

Q I'm going to show you State's Exhibit 4, and I'm going to put that up on the screen. Can you see that picture on the screen in front of you, Miranda?

Α Yes.

Okay. So, as we're looking at that building there, what is the jury O

21

22

23

24

25

A That's the garage. Right there is the door. Right in front of that door is where Patrick was laying at. And this is the door that Shawn exited out of, the garage door. That's the garage door. It opens up.

Q When you say the door, we're obviously -- we're looking inside the garage?

A Yes.

Q And would it be fair to say toward the top right section of that picture is the door you're talking about?

A Yes.

Q Just past what looks like a mattress?

A Yes.

Q And Patrick's body is on the other side of that door?

A Of that door, yes.

Q I'm showing you State's Exhibit 7. Is that just a little bit closer up of that door?

A Yes.

O That's the same door?

A Yes.

Q I'll show you Exhibit 10.

A That's the -- that's the stairwell.

Q I'm going to zoom out real quick before you -- okay. What are we looking at there?

A That's the stairwell. At the bottom -- down here, at the bottom is where Patrick was laying at. The steps that go up -- and then up where you see the plant at, there's a landing right there. So, it's like a little -- you could

peek around the corner to see down into the stairwell.

Q So that landing, if you walk up the stairs to where you described that plant, the rest of the stairs, the couple more stairs you talked about, that's to the right?

A Yes. And it goes straight up into the townhouse.

Q So, when you came down and saw Patrick's body and the Defendant pointed the gun at you, where were you standing in the picture?

A I was standing right up here at the top where you see there's another little banister that's hanging out, right there. All you had to do is look around the corner to just look down. That's as far as I went. When I looked down, I look around that corner.

Q So, you looked around the corner toward the bottom of the stairs?

A Yes.

Q I'm going to show you exhibit -- State's Exhibit 11.

A Yes. That's the top of the stairs. That leads into the townhouse. This is the landing that I was telling you about, the second -- the first landing right here that leads down.

Q In the lower right corner? I'm sorry. In the lower right corner of the screen is the landing?

A Yes. That's the landing right there. There's a set of stairs about three or four steps that goes down. And then that's the landing, the first landing. And then it goes down into the stairwell and there's a second landing at the bottom of the steps.

Q So, when -- as you described Patrick started to walk down the

1	stairs	
2	A Yes.	
3	Q and then the Defendant started to walk behind him, are you	
4	standing near this area?	
5	A No.	
6	Q So, where are you in relation to this part?	
7	A I'm all the way over here by Angela's room when they start to go	
8	downstairs.	
9	Q So, you saw them start to go down and that's when you're	
10	walking away from this spot?	
11	A Yes. I was over here near the stairs. I was blocking Patrick's	
12	way. That's why he pushed me to the side.	
13	Q Okay.	
14	A And as soon as he walked downstairs, I started walking toward	
15	the bedroom because I figured he had it. You know, he's just going to go	
16	down there and talk to him like he talked to us.	
17	Q So, as we're looking at this picture, you they start going down	
18	the stairs, and you turn just as we're looking at it to the left?	
19	A Uh-huh.	
20	Q Okay.	
21	THE COURT: Is that a yes?	
22	THE WITNESS: Yes.	
23	THE COURT: Thank you.	
24	BY MR. FLINN:	
25	Q When you testified that the Defendant pointed a gun at you and	

1	spoke to you	
2	A Yes.	
3	Q do you recall, at the moment, the precise words that the	
4	Defendant said to you?	
5	A All I know is he said something like don't snitch on me, don't tel	
6	I seen his mouth moving. All I could do was put my hands up and say okay. I	
7	knew that I I could see my husband laying right there on the ground. I just	
8	felt like all he all he had to do was just I don't even know why I'm sitting	
9	here right now.	
10	Q The day after this happened you talked to the police. And do	
11	you recall telling them the precise words that the Defendant said to you at tha	
12	point?	
13	A It was fresher then, yes.	
14	Q Would reviewing a transcript just of that statement refresh your	
15	memory about what the Defendant said to you?	
16	A Yes, it could.	
17	MR. FLINN: May I approach, Your Honor?	
18	THE COURT: Yes.	
19	BY MR. FLINN:	
20	Q I'm going to show you a page of that and if you could just read this	
21	paragraph to yourself and then tell me when you're done.	
22	[Witness reviews document]	
23	A Yes.	
24	Q Does that refresh your memory?	
25	A Yes.	

1	Q	Would you please tell the jury	
2	A	To the	
3	Q	specifically what he said?	
4	А	He said, if you and your kids want to live, you'll shut the fuck up.	
5		MR. FLINN: No further questions, Your Honor.	
6		THE COURT: Cross-examination.	
7		MR. BASHOR: Thank you, Your Honor.	
8		CROSS-EXAMINATION	
9	BY MR. BA	SHOR:	
10	Q	Good morning.	
11	А	Good morning.	
12	Q	I'd like to talk to you a little bit about some events leading up to	
13	this day. It	's my understanding that you, and your husband, and your	
14	daughter, <i>i</i>	Akira, were living at a different location, and then moved in with	
15	Angela; is	that correct?	
16	А	Yes.	
17	Q	And that was about two weeks before this occurred?	
18	А	Yes, about two weeks.	
19	Q	So, it would be fair to say you were kind of transitioning from one	
20	residence		
21	А	To another.	
22	Q	to another?	
23	А	Yes.	
24	Q	Okay. And by happenstance it was the holiday season, so you got	
25	to spend it	together?	

close quarters for 11 people?

Α

No.

1	Q	to call 911?	
2	A	No.	
3	Q	You wanted to get your husband some help?	
4	A	Right.	
5	Q	As soon as possible?	
6	A	Exactly.	
7	Q	And I would think it would be safe to assume Akira would want the	
8	same thing		
9	A	Yes.	
10	Q	When you're on the 911 call would it be fair to say that call	
11	occurred around 12:05?		
12	A	It could, yes, about that time.	
13	Q	Okay. And you're in shock?	
14	A	Yes.	
15	Q	And you're hysterical?	
16	A	Yes.	
17	Q	You're crying?	
18	A	Yes.	
19	Q	You want to do whatever you can to help your husband?	
20	А	Yes.	
21	Q	And the 911 operator wants to know what kind of services are	
22	needed, right?		
23	А	Yes.	
24	Q	And you indicate that someone had shot your husband?	
25	A	Yes.	

1	Q	And you had stated that your husband had answered the door and	
2	he had been shot, correct?		
3	Α	Yes, I think I did state that.	
4	Q	And when asked if you knew who shot your husband, you stated I	
5	don't knov	v, I don't know?	
6	A	I did say that.	
7	Q	When asked if you saw anything at all, you indicated that no,	
8	correct?		
9	A	That I had just been threatened, and I see my husband laying there	
10	Yes, I did say that.		
11	Q	Okay. And that you stated all you knew he was on the phone, and	
12	someone v	was supposed to come over, I don't know who it was?	
13	A	Yes, I did say that. Now	
14		MR. BASHOR: I have no idea why my cell phone is in the bag.	
15		[Court recorder and counsel confer]	
16	MR. BASH	OR:	
17	Q	Let's talk about obviously, the first responders come in, right?	
18	A	Yes.	
19	Q	They secure the scene, right?	
20	A	Yes.	
21	Q	You are because of where Patrick's located, you're upstairs?	
22	A	Yes.	
23	Q	And eventually detectives come?	
24	A	Yes.	
25	0	And the first responders and the detectives the first responders	

Okay. And we'll get to that, okay?

25

O

A Okay.

Q What I'm asking you is at the beginning of the interview you had told the officers that your husband, Patrick, was looking for a re-up?

A I may have said that.

Q Would looking at your statement to the police on September 1st refresh your recollection?

A No, it wouldn't, really.

Q It would not?

A No, because I was so out of it that day that it happened that I never, ever, made a statement to -- well, I never signed a statement or did a written statement because I was still in fear. And I asked the officers that day if they could stay with me and my kids, and they said that they did not have enough manpower to do that.

MR. BASHOR: The Court's indulgence.

[Pause]

## BY MR. BASHOR:

Q You don't recall telling the detectives that the deal didn't go through, I know this morning he kept saying he had to recop or get some weed?

A I do believe I said that after they stated that no, they could not stay there with me and provide safety for me and my -- my kids. I do believe that that was said after that.

O The answer to my question, ma'am --

A At the beginning, I did not know what to say to the officers or the policemen there because I felt like I was still in danger.

	1		
1	Q	The answer is yes?	
2	Α	And I did not I'm sorry.	
3	Q	The answer is yes, correct?	
4	А	Say it again. What was the question?	
5	Q	Do you you don't recall?	
6	A	I don't recall.	
7	Q	You don't recall	
8	A	I don't.	
9	Q	saying to the police that the deal didn't go through	
10	A	I could have said that, yes.	
11	Q	Ma'am, I'm not done with my question.	
12	A	I'm sorry.	
13	Q	That the deal didn't go through, and I know this morning he kept	
14	saying tha	t he had to recop or get some weed; you don't recall saying that?	
15	A	I could have said that to the police officers. I'm not sure what I said	
16	after that.	I was still distraught, I was still shaking, and I was still asking for	
17	services that they could not provide. So, I'm not exactly sure. I didn't even		
18	want to give out his name because I was so scared.		
19	Q	Okay. Maybe because it's a lie, right?	
20	A	No, it couldn't have been a lie.	
21		MR. FLINN: Objection. Argumentative.	
22		THE COURT: Sustained.	
23	BY MR. BASHOR:		
24	Q	Now	
25	A	I stayed there, Shawn did not. I'm sorry, sir.	

THE COURT: It's okay. I'm sorry, one second. If I sustain the objection, that means that the question is not proper, I'm not allowing it --

THE WITNESS: Oh, I'm sorry.

THE COURT: -- and he has to move on, so don't answer, okay?

THE WITNESS: Okay.

THE COURT: Thank you.

MR. BASHOR: The Court's indulgence.

[Pause]

## BY MR. BASHOR:

O Do you recall telling the detectives that your husband had to make a run, and it was something to do with weed, and he kept talking about it the night before?

A You keep asking me these questions, but I'm not familiar with them. I'm not exactly sure what I told them. I do know that I said can you guys stay here with us. And when they told us there was no additional protection, I'm not sure what I said because the police couldn't help me at that time, and I knew that he was still in the vicinity. There was nothing that no one could do. The only thing that I wanted to do was get my kids and get out of there.

- O Okay. Let's talk about the argument.
- A Okay.
- O Do you have a recollection of that?
- A Yes, I do.
- Q Okay. Do you recall telling -- so, as I understand it, Patrick was arguing with Akira, right?

22

23

24

25

A Yes. He was --

Q And the argument with --

A -- actually, he was arguing with me and Akira.

Okay, good. We'll get to that.

A Okay.

O The argument started with Akira, correct?

A Yes.

O Okay. And that was because Patrick had her followed the night before?

A Yes. Yes.

Q Because he didn't want a boy in his car, right?

A Something to that. We -- I never exactly knew exactly what it was. All I knew we were arguing about her age and her being responsible and not the typical average 21-year-old.

Q Patrick had someone following her and spying on her, right?

A One of his friends. One of his so-called friends had videotaped or something of the -- the event from that night before.

O So, Patrick had his friend videotape his daughter on a date?

A Yes.

O That was upsetting to Akira?

A It was upsetting to us all. That's why we were discussing it and there was an argument. And it turned from a simple hold on, she's 21 years old, you know, and she's being responsible. You told her you wanted her back by 11:30, and it was a decent time because of his traditions of New Year's Eve, and she did that. So, he had her followed to say that no, she wasn't with a boy

25

around that time because I know that it -- about the time that she got off, and I

thought I was looking at the time because of the situation that we were in

going to get started with our day.

- O In your statement to police on January 1st, you indicated to them that you didn't get a good look at the suspect; is that correct?
  - A I'm not exactly sure.
  - Q All right.
- A Like I told you previously, we just -- and I just stated that, that when the officers told me that there was no one that could stay there with me and my kids, that I feared -- I was in fear. All I could see was the gun pointed up at me. And I'm not sure why he didn't shoot me that day myself.
  - Q And, again, there'd be no point to show you the transcript?
  - A No.
- Q All right. Now, do you remember telling the police that your memory was off since your last surgery?
- A No. I told them that I had a lot of things going on since my last surgery, but my memory wasn't off that -- not to know what had had happened to my husband. Me and my husband had been together for all these years. I would know exactly what happened to him.
- Q And that's why you told the police you didn't know who shot your husband on January 1st?
- A No. I told the police that when they told me that they could not stay there with me and my kids in the house that my husband was laying on the floor of that had just been shot and murdered.
  - Q Okay.
- THE COURT: Ms. Sutton, because the recording equipment can't get two people talking at once, I need you to let him finish his question before

you start your answer, okay?

THE WITNESS: Okay.

THE COURT: Thank you.

### BY MR. BASHOR:

Q So when asked if you could describe the individual on that day, you don't recall telling the police no, my memory is kind of off since my last surgery?

A I can tell you this right here. I could describe him pointing that gun up at me. That's the only thing I could see. When the officers was talking to me, that's the only thing I could see. That since they could not stay with me, that he was going to run back up, and he'll shoot us all up.

- Okay. So, it's fair you're really adamant today, right?
- A I'm sorry?
- Q You're really adamant about what happened today, right?
- A Yes.
- Q Yeah. You can't answer a yes or no question. So when -- you want the killer of your husband brought to justice, right?
  - A Yes.
  - Q And so then you decide on January 1st, to lie to the police?
- A No. What I did was on January 1st, not tell the exact same story that they wanted to know and hear, because I was in fear of my -- my life and then my kids were still there, and my husband's body had not even gotten up off the floor yet. But he had been killed and murdered. That's the only thing I was thinking of that day. Now, when my family got to me that night and took me out of that, like the surrounding that it had happened in, I calmed down,

and we went to the police station the next morning to tell them exactly who it was, what had happened, everything.

- O Do you recall stating that the individual came into the front door on January 1st?
- A I'm not sure. What I -- that -- that's my whole point to you. I'm not exactly sure what I said to the officers January 1st, because I was scared and alone with my husband still laying down there and my kids in a room somewhere that I don't even know about.
  - Q You were alone, yes?
  - A Alone in that situation, yes.
- Q Right. And there were how many responding officers with handguns?
  - A But how many stayed with me and my kids is the question.
- Q Okay. I'm asking you a question, ma'am. How many responding officers were in the apartment when you were home alone?
- A I'm not exactly sure. All I know is they were there. I'm not -- I'm not even sure if I looked up at them that day.
  - Q How many detectives? How many detectives?
- A There could have -- there was quite a few detectives that day, but then they didn't threaten me with their gun that day, either.
  - Q You'd agree that their guns were protecting you?
- A They was protecting me, yes, as long as they were there in that -- in that townhouse with us --
  - Q And when you were in the --
  - A -- but when they told me that they could not stay with us, there

While that was happening, the argument between Akira and Patrick

25

Q

ends?

A No. They were finishing up. It was -- it wasn't -- the argument in the ending was not between Patrick and Akira. He looked at her and said something -- it was directed to me and him. Me and him was arguing, because I was telling him of her age and as I was doing it, I was like this and as you see, I have had surgeries on my ears, so I'm louder than what I really think I am. I think I'm loud -- not loud now, but I'm louder than what I really think I am. So, downstairs in the garage it was amplified and we're down there screaming, and my voice is getting loud, and I'm clapping, this is nothing unusual. This is a conversation I'm having with my husband.

- Q Okay.
- A This is an argument conversation that we all -- that, you know, that I'm having with my husband concerning my daughter just standing right there.
- Q You testified on direct examination that when Akira and Patrick came out from the garage and started heading upstairs, the argument between the two of them seemed to be over; is that fair?
  - A Yes.
  - Q And that they were smiling?
  - A Yes.
  - Q And talking?
- A I think that Patrick's whole thing that day was to scare Akira and -- and that was it. Her being her age, just turning 21 almost, you know, and being with a new boyfriend and everything, it was a scare tactic for her. It wasn't for anyone else. And I was trying to tell him to calm down. And that's all it was. It wasn't anything serious that, you know --

1	Q	So the argument wasn't all that serious?	
2	A	No, not to	
3	Q	It was normal?	
4	A	It wasn't it was not normal, but it wasn't anything to, you know,	
5	get your fe	eathers ruffled about.	
6	Q	Uh-huh. Nothing to kill over, right?	
7	A	I'm sorry?	
8	Q	Nothing to kill over?	
9	A	Not that my no, not that I could see.	
10		MR. BASHOR: The Court's indulgence.	
11		[Defense counsel confer]	
12	BY MR. BASHOR:		
13	Q	Towards the end of the interview you don't remember do you	
14	recall tellir	ng the police that they should go and check the facility for cameras?	
15	A	The facility for cameras, yes.	
16	Q	You remember that part?	
17	A	That they should have cameras outside of the townhouses.	
18	Q	And that you give them an approximate time, 11:45, for them to go	
19	and look at the cameras?		
20	A	It had not happened that long before that. An approximate time,	
21	yes.		
22	Q	Okay. An approximate time, you recall that part?	
23	A	No. I recall me telling them that he did I know of him having a 50	
24	round dru	m, that my husband was there on the ground, and that he could not	

have gotten out of the townhouses not by foot, and he did not have a vehicle.

25

So, where is he? He has to still be here in the vicinity.

Q Okay.

MR. BASHOR: Your Honor, may I approach? First of all, I have no further questions, and can I approach?

THE COURT: Sure. Can I see counsel in the hallway? Can you remain seated and not talk to anyone again?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

THE COURT: Thank you.

[Court and Counsel exit the courtroom at 11:17 a.m., not recorded]

[Court and Counsel return to courtroom at 11:21 a.m.]

THE COURT: Okay. Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, we're going to take a short restroom break. During this recess you are -- and you're going to follow my Marshal. During this recess you are admonished not to talk or converse among yourselves or with anyone else on any subject connected with the trial, not to read, watch, or listen to any report of, or commentary on the trial by any person connected with this case or any medium of information including, without limitation, newspaper, television, the internet, or radio. Do not to form or express any opinion on any subject connected with this trial until the case is finally submitted to you. No social media, no tweeting, no Facebooking, no twitting, no snapchatting, none of that. See you in a few.

THE MARSHAL: All rise. Jury exiting.

[Outside the presence of the jury.]

THE COURT: The record should reflect we're outside the presence of the jury. In the back hallway there I discussed with you a scheduling problem that the Court has that has nothing to do with this case, but that

Justice Hardesty would like my attendance tomorrow at the meeting that we talked about at the calendar call. I told you about the email I sent to him. I think I can get out of the meeting early, but I can't take a pass on the whole meeting. I mean he wants me to attend, it's his commission, I committed to it, so we're going to rediscuss the schedule for tomorrow. And so, I just want to put you on notice to the extent you have to make plans or whatever, you can do that.

Okay. You wished -- the witness needed to use the restroom, so it seemed like a good time to give the jury a break, and we can make a record of whatever you want to make. You can sit down. Thank you. Whatever you want to make a record of. I would note that no one asked me to give any admonishment and --

MR. BASHOR: Well, I don't think it would have been appropriate at that time anyway because the logical -- excuse me -- the logical progression would be yes, I lied. And then on redirect examination it would be let's explore those reasons.

THE COURT: Right. Which they haven't done.

MR. BASHOR: Right. And my point is, since she won't admit or doesn't recall lying, then there's no need to explain under the statute.

THE COURT: Well, here's the thing. There's two witnesses, right? MR. BASHOR: Right.

THE COURT: And so, so far there's this witness who's very clear about everything, and I don't know that it needs to be redirected. I don't quite frankly -- well, I think she's very clear on her feelings. And so, for this witness I don't necessarily disagree, but I'll hear from the State.

4

7 8

9

11

10

12 13

14 15

16

17 18

19

20 21

22

24

23 25

MR. STANTON: Well, first of all, she doesn't -- first of all, the way counsel phrased her testimony the State will disagree. Number one, that she -- her statement is that she doesn't remember lying. No. She remembers the statement, she remembers that she gave it, she remembers that she didn't give complete accurate details. Whether or not you want to say it's a lie, I don't think she's going to concede it is or at least to the extent that it's a conditional lie. She just doesn't remember -- because counsel's asking the question, do you remember telling the detectives this?

THE COURT: Right.

MR. STANTON: So, she's not denying that the statement was made and that the statement has things that are different from her current testimony or version the next day. So, is it --

THE COURT: Yeah, but she already testified why didn't you tell -- why didn't you tell. I mean that's already been covered, and she answered the question with all kinds of things that didn't have anything to do with past violent history. And so, I don't know that there's something to go back on in redirect. I don't -- I mean I get from the Defense perspective you want to call it a lie. She's explained her statement. And so, I guess I don't know what we're pre-arguing about.

MR. BASHOR: Okay. That's fair.

THE COURT: She couldn't be any more clearer like, you know.

MR. STANTON: But that answer is not -- is in response to, do you remember saying this to the detectives. It's, I believe, a substantively and qualitative different concept to ask her what -- and as we planned to do, in a leading fashion, were you also concerned about information that you knew

that the Defendant had committed other acts of violence. In a leading question specifically within the framework of the instruction and that would be the sole question to her to explain what occurred.

And just so the record is abundantly clear, that the strategy of the State as it relates to this issue is, as I stated before, we were not going to touch the inconsistent statements. So, that it is abundantly clear that that is a strategic choice by the Defense to do that under the law in the State of Nevada at the cost to the State's case of not eliciting obviously an inconsistent statement, which I think there is a cost for us to bear in that regard, but pursuant to the Court's directive, and I believe consistent with what the law permits, she is entitled to explain the differences in her inconsistent statements, and I believe within the parameters of the Court's ruling she's entitled to fully explain.

THE COURT: Which I just listened to for 20 minutes, but. So, I understand the nature of your objection. I heard her testimony prior to the hearing. I'm relying on that testimony, I'm standing by my previous ruling, but I'm not allowing gang membership, I'm not allowing any specifics, and that's it. Anything else?

MR. BASHOR: No, Your Honor.

MR. STANTON: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. So, is she out there? Can we -- can we --

[Plaintiff and Defense counsel confer]

MR. BASHOR: Your Honor, how do I go about ordering a JAVS of her testimony?

THE COURT: Ask her, and she'll give it to you. You don't have to

specific autopsy photographs.

## 1 REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. FLINN: 2 3 Q Miranda, when you talked to the police on January 1st, 2016, right 4 after Patrick had been shot --5 Uh-huh. 6 Q -- and you told them what happened --7 THE COURT: One second. All I can hear is around you talking. 8 One second. 9 MR. BASHOR: And just while we're doing that, I apologize. Can 10 we approach really quickly? 11 THE COURT: Yes. 12 [Sidebar begins at 11:34 a.m.] 13 THE COURT: I'm sorry, but everybody is like just full on talking on 14 the way in here. The people, I can't even blame the people. It's my staff, as 15 well. 16 MR. BASHOR: I don't think this has been a problem so far, but I 17 neglected to invoke the exclusionary rule at the beginning of the witnesses 18 being called. Like I said, I don't think it's been a problem. And I think the other 19 witnesses have been outside, it's just --20 THE COURT: But they cannot be for (indiscernible). 21 MR. BASHOR: And I don't know who these people are, either, and

THE COURT: Can you tell Mr. Stanton, please?

22

23

24

25

that's the reason why --

MR. FLINN: I can tell you none of these people are witnesses. The only other lay witness we are calling at this point is Akira, who's already been

1 in the courtroom, so the Court knows. 2 THE COURT: Okay. I can accept that. 3 MR. FLINN: And anybody else --4 THE COURT: Will you accept that? I'll make a record that you 5 invoked it up here at the bench. 6 MR. BASHOR: And I've already been in the courtroom. She was in 7 the courtroom earlier. She's not in the courtroom. 8 MR. FLINN: Correct. For the evidentiary. 9 MR. BASHOR: Right. 10 THE COURT: Okay. 11 MR. BASHOR: Thank you. 12 THE COURT: Okay. 13 [Sidebar ending at 11:35 a.m.] 14 THE COURT: Okay. Now that we can hear you, State, go ahead. 15 MR. FLINN: Thank you, Your Honor. 16 BY MR. FLINN: 17  $\mathbf{O}$ Okay. I'm just going to repeat that. Miranda, when you, on 18 January 1st, after -- right after Patrick had been shot, and you told police what 19 was going on and left out that it was the Defendant who shot Patrick, did you 20 believe -- did you believe that the Defendant had committed other acts of 21 violence against other people in the past? 22 Α

I know he had, yes.

23

24

25

MR. FLINN: Nothing further, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Anything else? Ladies and gentlemen, I'm going to caution you now, ladies and gentlemen of the jury, that the testimony that the

Α

Uh-huh.

Α

Yes.

20

21

22

23

24

25

O Could you please tell the jury where that person is sitting and the clothing he's wearing?

A A suit, sitting right there. He has a tie on with a white shirt, the long dreads.

MR. FLINN: Would the record reflect she identified the Defendant, Your Honor?

THE COURT: The record shall so reflect.

#### BY MR. FLINN:

- O So, the Defendant was also staying there at the time, right?
- A Correct.
- O So, on the morning of January 1st, what were you doing?
- A We had got up. Everything was okay. And that's when Patrick, he was talking on the phone with, I don't know, I think one of his friends or something, and he started getting mad at me because I went out the prior night, and I wasn't supposed to have my boyfriend in the car. So, he was saying like he was mad at me over that. And he was mad at my mom's friend over gift presents. So, we started to argue in the garage, like we went downstairs to the garage area and started to argue.
  - Q Just you and Patrick?
  - A Just me and Patrick.
  - Q Was anyone else in there at the time?
  - A Not at the time.
  - O And those were the primary things you were arguing about?
  - A Yeah.
  - Q While you were arguing about that did anyone else come to the

24

25

garage?

A Yeah. So, my mom came to the garage. She came to the garage first, and she joined the argument, and then that's when Shawn came down there and gave my mom the phone.

- Q So while you, your mom, and Patrick are arguing, at some point the Defendant comes in and hands your mom the phone?
  - A That's correct.
- Q Did the Defendant stay for the rest of the argument or did he leave the room?
- A No. He gave my mom the phone real quick. She talked on the phone for about like a minute or two, and then he left. And then we continued to argue, and then he came back down.
- Q What happened when the Defendant came back down to the garage?
- A So, that's when he told my mom that he wanted to talk to her, and they went out of the garage up the stairs.
  - O So, at that point it's just you and Patrick in the garage?
  - A Correct.
  - Q Miranda, your mom, and the Defendant are now --
  - A Gone upstairs.
  - O -- have gone in towards the stairway?
  - A Uh-huh. Uh-huh.

THE COURT: Is that a yes?

THE WITNESS: Yes. Sorry.

THE COURT: Thank you.

2

4

5 6

7

8

10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

2021

23

22

24

25

BY MR. FLINN:

O At some point, do you and Patrick stop arguing?

A Yeah. So, shortly after Shawn and my mom go upstairs, we stop arguing. He was like I'm sorry, you know, you're grown, blah, blah, blah. And we exited out the garage and started going upstairs.

- O So, you said he said he was sorry --
- A Yeah.
- O -- you're grown. So, would it be fair to describe the argument at that point as it's now calm?

A Yeah. So, everything -- it was okay. Everything was done. Everything is fine at this point.

Q So, you two started to walk up the stairs. Where did you go when you got up the stairs?

A I went and sat on the couch. And Shawn and Patrick they were standing up arguing. And then my mom, she was like kind of close to the -- to Angela's door -- to Angela's bedroom door.

- Q So, when you're sitting on the couch --
- A Uh-huh.
- O -- can you hear this argument between Patrick and the Defendant?
- A Yes. They're right there in front of me.
- Q What did you hear them arguing about?

A Basically, Shawn was saying something like Patrick was trying to beat on me and my mom. He heard us crying. And this is his house. And Patrick was like I'm not beating on them, you know, I'm just having a conversation. And I think that's when it was like Shawn got even more mad,

and then Patrick like grabbed him by his elbows, and he was like, you know, it's not like that, I'm just trying to have a conversation, you know. And then Shawn's like no, get off me. So, at that point, I'm not sure -- I don't recall who said, you know, let's go downstairs, but someone said let's go downstairs and let's talk. So, at that point, Patrick starts going down the stairs, and then Shawn, and then that's when I heard the -- the gunshots.

- O So, from -- just sort of backing up. From where you're sitting on the couch you heard all this happen. And then did you personally see Patrick start going toward the stairs?
  - A Yes.
  - Q And you saw him walking down the stairs?
  - A Yeah. I seen him going down the stairs first.
  - Q You say first, meaning ahead of the Defendant?
  - A Correct.
- Q So, the Defendant is behind Patrick. And does he also go down the stairs?
  - A Yes.
- Q Based on where you're sitting at some point they now are out of your line of sight?
- A Yeah. So, where I'm sitting, as soon as they start going down the stairs, they are out of sight.
- Q Approximately how -- you said you heard -- well, after they started going down the stairs, what exactly did you hear?
- A So, I heard the footsteps at first because there's stairs right here and then there's some more stairs going this way. So, you can hear them

16

19

20 21

22

23

24 25 going down these stairs, but once they're turning, you hear about like one or two more steps, and then you hear the three gunshots.

- Q So, you heard three gunshots?
- Α Yes.
- Could you describe hearing those three gunshots? You know, Q were they -- was it, you know, one right after the other, was there any timing lapse? Can you just describe that?
- Α So, the first one went, and then there was a pause, and then the other two let off. So, it was like the first one, pause, boom, boom.
- O When you heard those gunshots, approximately how much time had gone by since you -- since you had -- since you watched the Defendant follow Patrick down the stairs; if you could estimate?
  - Α About like ten to 15 seconds. It was real -- it was really quick.
  - Q When you heard those gunshots, what did you do?
  - Α I looked up at my mom, and then we ran to the stairs.
  - Q When you got to the stairs, did you start going down the stairs?
- Α No. So, my mom started to go down the stairs first, and then I was right behind her.
  - Q So, you stayed behind your mom?
  - Α Uh-huh.
  - Q What did you hear or see as the two of you went down the stairs?
- So, I seen Patrick laying on the floor, and I seen Shawn there. And Α he was just yelling out threats. And my mom's just like why did you do this, why did you do this? And I was just behind her, you know, just scared. And then at that point I started to run back up the stairs.

-- you're there for a little while, ten days, a couple weeks, right?

25

Q

1	А	Exactly.
2	Q	And then Shawn moves in approximately two days before
3	Christmas,	right?
4	A	Yes.
5	Q	And so during that seven or eight days between Christmas
6	Eve-ish an	d New Year's Day, Shawn's around a lot?
7	А	Yes, that's correct. Yeah.
8	Q	Okay. All right. And so, you, during that period of time, obviously
9	given it's a	two bedroom townhouse and there are 11 or 12 of you, you're
10	going to interact with one another, right?	
11	A	Yeah. Yeah.
12	a	And in your observations of Patrick and Shawn, they seemed to be
13	getting alo	ng?
14	А	Exactly.
15	Q	Okay. And, you know, during that time it happened to be the
16	family got	to be together around the holidays, right?
17	A	Yes.
18	Q	Is that fair? Yes?
19	A	Yes.
20	Q	Because in addition to Angela, one of the children in the home was
21	the daughter of Shawn and Angela?	
22	A	Correct.
23	Q	Now, I'm going to draw your attention to the argument in the
24	garage, ok	ay?
25	Ι Λ	l lh-huh

1	А	Yes.
2	Q	You're an adult?
3	А	Yes.
4	Q	You don't want to be followed?
5	А	Yes.
6	Q	Right. You want to be able to interact with your friend your
7	boyfriend, however you wish?	
8	А	Yes.
9	Q	It's not like you're 14, right?
10	А	Yes.
11	a	Okay. And because the argument is so loud, Miranda comes down
12	and enters into the argument, as well, right?	
13	Α	Yes.
14	Q	And she kind of comes to your defense, right?
15	Α	Yes.
16	Q	For that very reason we just discussed, that that you're a woman,
17	right?	
18	Α	Yes.
19	Q	And at age 21 you should be able to do whatever you want without
20	being followed?	
21	Α	Yes.
22	Q	But at the end of the the time at some point Miranda goes
23	upstairs, right?	
24	А	Correct.
25	Q	And you and Patrick are left alone in the garage?

	1	
1	Α	Uh-huh. Yes.
2	Q	Yes? And you wrap up the argument, right?
3	Α	Yes.
4	Q	And as you exit the garage and enter the residence, again, as
5	you're hea	iding up the stairs, the argument is over?
6	A	Yes, that's correct.
7	Q	Okay. You had I think you stated on direct examination that
8	Patrick had	d apologized where he kind of came to your senses like you're right
9	you're 21	years old?
10	A	Yes.
11	Q	Now, I'm going to ask you questions specifically about the
12	statement you gave to police on January 1st, 2016, okay?	
13	A	Okay.
14	Q	And you would agree that that's the day of the incident, correct?
15	A	Yes.
16	Q	And that your statement to police occurred a couple hours after
17	this had happened?	
18	A	Yes.
19	Q	Just to set the scene, obviously, you had called 911, right?
20	A	No.
21	Q	You didn't call and then hand the phone to your mother?
22	A	Yes, I dialed. Sorry. Yes.
23	Q	Yeah, sorry. If I'm confusing, please correct me if it's confusing,
24	okay? All	right. So, you actually physically dialed 911, yes?
25	Α	Yes.

1	Q	And you hand the phone to your mom, right?
2	A	Yes.
3	Q	And you do that right away?
4	А	Yes.
5	Q	As soon as it's as soon as the suspect has left the residence, you
6	called?	
7	А	Yeah. So, he left, we locked the garage door, and we ran back
8	upstairs.	And that's when we I'm sorry. My mom ran back upstairs and
9	that's wh	en we had called 911.
10	Q	So, about a matter of seconds after the suspect had fled?
11	А	Yeah. About like ten, 30 seconds.
12	Q	Right. Because you want to get medical attention to your dad as
13	soon as possible?	
14	A	Yes.
15	Q	All right. Now, just talking about your statement to police on
16	January 1	st, 2016, they ask you what happened that day, right?
17	A	Yes.
18	Q	And you tell them that there was a man named Hatch in the house?
19	A	Yes.
20	Q	And that Hatch was a customer of your father, Patrick?
21	A	Yes.
22	Q	And that Patrick would average two to three customers a day
23	selling m	arijuana?
24	A	Yes.
25	Ω	That Hatch was one of those customers?

1	A	Yes.
2	Q	You weren't sure how Hatch had arrived?
3	А	Yes.
4	Q	You knew that during the argument Hatch was waiting upstairs?
5	А	Yes.
6	Q	At some point during the argument Hatch comes down the stairs,
7	interrupts,	and asks to speak with your mom?
8	А	Yes.
9	Q	And so, your mom follows?
10	Α	Uh-huh.
11	Q	Is that a yes?
12	А	Yes.
13	Q	And then that's Patrick and you leave the garage a few moments
14	later?	
15	А	Yes.
16	Q	And Patrick is upset with Hatch for talking to Miranda?
17	А	Yes.
18	Q	Okay. And that Hatch shouldn't be being nosey into what was a
19	family argument?	
20	А	Exactly.
21	Q	Now, in that statement you told the police you'd never seen Hatch
22	before, right?	
23	A	Yes.
24	Q	And that you told the police as far as you knew, your mom didn't
25	know Hatel	h?

1	A	Yes.
2	Q	You were asked if Hatch went by any other names. You said you
3	didn't thin	k so?
4	A	Right. Correct.
5	Q	That you didn't know whether or not Hatch had any tattoos?
6	A	No.
7	Q	And towards the end of the statement with police on January 1st,
8	2016, the s	subject of your dad's car comes up, right?
9	A	Yes.
10	Q	The Dodge Durango?
11	A	Yes.
12	Q	And the people that are allowed to drive the Dodge Durango, are
13	you?	
14	A	Yes.
15	Q	Miranda?
16	A	Yes.
17	Q	Patrick?
18	A	Yes.
19	Q	And probably Angela, right?
20	A	Yeah.
21	Q	Okay. And Patrick had a habit of leaving the keys to that car on the
22	countertop?	
23	A	Correct.
24	Q	And you had noticed sometime between after 911 was called and
25	when you spoke to the police that the keys were missing?	

1	Α	Yes.
2	Q	And because you noticed this, you told the police?
3	А	Yes.
4	Q	Okay. Now, I'm going to ask you questions about your second
5	statement,	okay, the next day; do you understand?
6	Α	Yes.
7	Q	All right. At that point you tell the police Hatch
8	Α	Yes.
9	Q	is Shawn Glover?
10	Α	Yes.
11	Q	Now, on the day in question this was very shocking, right?
12	А	Yes.
13	Q	It was very emotional I would assume?
14	A	Yes.
15	Q	That you were scared?
16	A	Yes.
17	Q	Based on what you said on direct examination you were afraid?
18	А	Yes.
19	Q	Okay. And for those reasons you told the police that the individua
20	was Hatch?	
21	A	Yes.
22	Q	And it was your statement the next day and your testimony today
23	that Hatch is Shawn Glover?	
24	A	Yes, that's correct.
25	Q	So, before on January 1, when you told the police you had never

1	A	Yeah, exactly.
2	Q	You've got it all wrong?
3	А	Exactly.
4	Q	All right. Now, when you called 911, would it be fair to say that the
5	police arriv	ved fairly quickly?
6	A	Yes.
7	Q	It probably felt like an eternity, right?
8	A	Yeah.
9	Q	But upon reflection you would agree it was only a matter of a
10	couple of minutes?	
11	A	Yeah.
12		MR. BASHOR: The Court's indulgence.
13		[Defense counsel confer]
14	BY MR. BASHOR:	
15	Q	My co-counsel reminded me about the Dodge Durango. In
16	addition to noticing the keys weren't there	
17	A	Uh-huh.
18	Q	where Patrick had routinely parked the vehicle, the vehicle wasn't
19	there, right?	
20	A	Correct.
21	Q	We'll hear later that the vehicle was recovered, but as far as you
22	knew, the i	regular spot where Patrick, you, and Miranda would park, the Dodge
23	Durango w	vas missing?
24	A	Exactly.
25	Q	Along with the keys?

2

4

5

7

6

8 9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

Α Yes.

MR. BASHOR: Nothing further.

THE COURT: Redirect?

## REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. FLINN:

Q Akira, when you told the police that it was -- that it was Hatch and didn't use the Defendant's real name at that time, did you personally believe that the Defendant had been violent toward other people in the past?

Α Yes.

MR. FLINN: Nothing further, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Again, Ladies and Gentlemen of the jury, the testimony that the witness believed the Defendant has a history of violence against persons is being offered and may only be considered by you solely for the purpose of explaining the state of mind of the witness at the time she made her statement to police on January 1st, 2016. The testimony, if believed, is not to be considered as substantive evidence that the Defendant has a history of violence against persons or that he is a person of bad character. With that, thank you very much.

I'm sorry, do any of the ladies and gentlemen of the jury have any questions you wish the Court to ask the witness? There being no questions, thank you very much for your testimony. You're excused. Can I see counsel about scheduling?

[Sidebar begins at 12:02 a.m.]

THE COURT: So, we break now, and I tell them 1:15?

MR. FLINN: Yeah.

upstairs after lunch.

So, during this recess you're admonished not to talk or converse among yourselves or with anyone else on any subject connected with the trial. Do not to read, watch, or listen to an report of, or commentary on, the trial by any person connected with this case or any medium of information, including without limitation, newspaper, television, the internet or radio. You're not to form or express any opinion on any subject connected with this trial until the case is finally submitted to you. You've got about an hour and 12 minutes.

THE MARSHAL: All rise. The jury is exiting.

[Outside the presence of the jury.]

THE COURT: Is that door shut? I can't see. Is that door shut? UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. The record -- thank you. The record should reflect we're outside the presence of the jury. So, I just wanted to make a record that there was one time when the Defense asked to approach. In the record it was at 11:35 a.m. And we had a bench conference where the Defense brought to the Court's attention that while the exclusionary rule had not been previously invoked that the Defense wished to invoke it at that time. The State made it clear that other than the two female witnesses who just testified today, there have been no witnesses present in the courtroom for today's proceedings whatsoever and that besides these two ladies, everyone else is a non-related witness, correct?

MR. STANTON: Correct, Your Honor. Yes.

THE COURT: So even though it hadn't been invoked before, it was of no import because no one was here.

MR. STANTON: I assumed that they -- it had been invoked. I don't

recall that it was, but I assume in every case it has, so that's where the State rolls.

THE COURT: Okay. So, the way the State rolls. Good to know. So, anything else on that exclusionary rule being invoked at 11:35 a.m.?

MR. BASHOR: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. So, Defendant gets his lunch break. You all get your lunch break. Can you tell Ramsey that -- to ask him to meet the D.A. here at 1:05?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I will.

THE COURT: Okay. You don't have to tell him right now, just, you know, when he's done with those people.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay.

THE COURT: Okay, thanks. Okay.

MR. STANTON: Thank you, Your Honor.

MR. BASHOR: Thank you.

[Recess at 12:06 p.m., recommencing at 1:15 p.m.]

THE COURT: We're back on the record in State v. Shawn Glover.

Outside the presence of the jury. All attorneys and the Defendant are present.

[Outside the presence of the jury.]

MR. STANTON: Your Honor, the next witness is Dr. Corneal. Mr. Bashor informed me that -- there are two areas of concern from the State. Mr. Bashor informed me that he is going to seek to inquire as to one of those areas of concern. So ,the first area is at autopsy, a projectile was removed from Mr. Fleming that was unrelated to this case. It was from an obvious and apparent older injury. It was noted both in photograph form and in Dr. Dutra's autopsy

report. Both Dr. Dutra and Dr. Corneal would, I believe, testify that that implement, and the injury, and artifact had nothing to do with the cause and manner of death. And as such I believe the inquiry in that is wholly irrelevant.

THE COURT: Okay. Is that it?

MR. STANTON: Yes.

THE COURT: What's the relevance?

MR. BASHOR: Judge, I would just submit that the old projectile could go to prior enemies, alternate suspects. I don't plan to harp too terribly into it, it's just that the fact that it exists. And I think that that's --

THE COURT: Prior enemies and alternate suspects.

MR. BASHOR: Correct.

THE COURT: Okay. So, what, if any, additional information do you have about the time or evidence would you be able to -- because if this becomes an issue, even though you might not have noticed witnesses, I might allow you to get into it if I allow it. I'm not saying I'm allowing it, I'm just curious. Do you have a witness that says that was 30 years ago, two years ago, six minutes ago; how -- what do you know?

MR. STANTON: For me?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. STANTON: I have -- other than it is a completely healed injury with no evidence of its tracking and no signs of that it be of recent vintage. As far as --

THE COURT: So, have you asked his family, hey -- I mean usually when someone gets shot, someone besides that person knows or has an idea of when that happened.

THE WITNESS: Melvin A. Givens, III. G-I-V-E-N-S.

25

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: And can you move your chair up a little? Okay. The District Attorney is going to ask you about your relationship with the named victim in this case and some other questions about the topic that we've been discussing, okay?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

#### **DIRECT EXAMINATION**

### BY MR. STANTON:

- Q Sir, how are you related to Patrick Fleming?
- A I'm his father.
- O And do you have personal knowledge of when Patrick suffered the injury that you heard raised in court that is some sort of a projectile, some part or portion of a bullet that was inside his body?
  - A Yes, I do.
  - Q And when did that event occur?
  - A November 11, 1993, right after his birthday.
  - Q And was that here in Las Vegas or some other location?
  - A Yes. Yes.
- O Okay. And did it have anything to do with either the Defendant or the case that we're here on trial this week for?
  - A No.
- O Do you know anything about who the author of the injury to your son was?
- A Well, he was walking down the street off of McWilliams [phonetic], and he was over in the project area off of Washington. And he was walking with another guy and some guy came around the corner and asked him a

question. It was like a drive-by shooting. And they asked him a question, do he know such and such and such, and he said, no. So, he turned to walk away, and they shot him in the back three times.

- Q Okay.
- A And they shot his friend, also.
- Q Thank you very much. I have no further questions.

MR. BASHOR: I don't have any questions, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you very much, sir, for your testimony.

THE WITNESS: All right.

THE COURT: Okay. Is there anything else?

MR. BASHOR: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Anything else?

MR. STANTON: Not any other evidence or argument from me on this issue.

THE COURT: All right. Based upon the only reliable evidence, which is testimony under oath of the named victim's father that this projectile was at or around 25 years ago, I won't allow the inquiry. It is significantly more prejudicial than probative to somehow paint him as I don't know what and the idea that somehow retribution is happening 25 hour -- 25 years later is a stretch, at best. Anything else?

MR. STANTON: And, Your Honor, the other -- just for the record, the other matter was the toxicology report of Mr. Fleming, as well.

THE COURT: One second, one second.

[Court and Marshal confer]

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. STANTON: Mr. Bashor indicated to me that they are not going to go into that area of inquiry. I would have had the same objection for the same reasons, but since he's not going into it, I appreciate that, so that's not an issue, but I just wanted to put it on the record that that issue was discussed between me and Defense counsel prior to this.

MR. BASHOR: And, Judge, if we were pursuing a different line of defense, obviously, I would have a different position, but I don't think that a small amount of marijuana in Mr. Fleming's system has anything to do with this case.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

MR. STANTON: That's it. Nothing further on behalf of the State.

THE COURT: Okay. Bring in the jury. Doctor? By the way, do you have any objection to the named victim's father remaining in the courtroom?

MR. BASHOR: No.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. BASHOR: He's not on our witness list.

THE COURT: No. Okay.

MR. BASHOR: That's fine.

THE COURT: But technically he testified.

MR. BASHOR: Oh, I understand, but, no, that's fine, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.

[State counsel and Court Recorder confer]

THE MARSHAL: All rise. The jury is entering. The jury is all present, ma'am.

[In the presence of the jury.]

1	THE COURT: Counsel, will you stipulate to the presence of the		
2	jury?		
3	MR. STANTON: Yes, Your Honor.		
4	MR. BASHOR: Yes, Your Honor.		
5	THE COURT: Doctor, if you could please face my Clerk, raise you		
6	right hand, and be sworn.		
7	DR. JENNIFER CORNEAL, PLAINTIFF'S WITNESS, SWORN		
8	THE CLERK: Please be seated. Would you state and spell your		
9	name for the record?		
10	THE WITNESS: Jennifer Corneal, J-E-N-N-I-F-E-R C-O-R-N-E-A-L.		
11	MR. STANTON: May I proceed, Your Honor?		
12	THE COURT: Yes. Thank you.		
13	DIRECT EXAMINATION		
14	BY MR. STANTON:		
15	Q Ma'am, how are you employed?		
16	A I'm a medical examiner at the Clark County Office of the Coroner		
17	Medical Examiner.		
18	Q And I'd like to talk to you about, in kind of general terms, your		
19	background both from an educational perspective, as well as your profession		
20	experience. Do you have an educational background that allows you and		
21	assists you in performing your functions at the Coroner's office?		
22	A I do.		
23	Q And what is your educational background?		
24	A I'm a doctor. I completed medical school. I then completed four		
25	years of a pathology residency. I'm a board certified anatomic pathologist. I		

then completed a year of subspecialty training in forensic pathology, and I'm a board certified forensic pathologist.

- Q And the -- I'll get into the area of pathology and the subcategories that you just mentioned, but you are a licensed physician here in the State of Nevada?
  - A lam.
- Q And you perform functions to include a medical procedure as part of your duties called an autopsy?
  - A Correct.
- Q How many autopsies have you been involved in as -- either as the primary physician or an assisting capacity in your career?
  - A Over 1,000.
  - Q And does that also include injuries involving gunshot wounds?
  - A Yes.
- Q Is there a significant number of those thousands that gunshot wounds are part of your examination?
  - A Yes.
- O Doctor, let me ask you some questions about the area of pathology. And once again in general terms can you explain what pathology means?
- A Pathology is a study of disease processes. They consider the pathologist the doctor's doctor. So, if you have a biopsy or specimens taken from you, the pathologist looks at that and gives a diagnosis.
- Q So, that could be say skin tissue involving some sort of suspected disease, and they're looking for a specialized assessment from a physician

focused in that field?

A Yes.

Q And then you mentioned there's something called anatomical pathology; what is that?

A Pathology is divided into anatomical pathology and clinical pathology. Anatomical pathology includes forensic pathology, which is what I do. Surgical pathology, which is what I was talking about when you get a biopsy, or an organ taken out, and they look at it and give a diagnosis to the doctor. Clinical pathology, on the other hand, has to do with microbiology, chemistry. Pathologists are the ones who run the labs in the hospitals, so clinical pathologists tend to do that.

Q And the final field is forensic pathology. Can you explain what that sub-specialization is in?

A Forensic pathology is the subspecialty of anatomic pathology that looks at medical legal death. And my job, as part of that, is to perform autopsies and determine cause and manner of death.

Q And could you describe what cause of death means to you in the medical legal context?

- A Cause of death is the immediate reason somebody has died.
- Q And how many categorizations are used in your field as coroners both here and across the country?
  - A For manner of death?
  - Q Well, cause of death can be a wide range. Manner of death.
- A For manner of death, there are five categories; there's natural, accident, suicide, homicide, and then when the death doesn't fit into either of

25

THE COURT: 36 through 48 are admitted by stipulation.

MR. BASHOR: Your Honor, we have a stipulation. No objection.

# 

# 

# 

## 

### 

### 

# 

# 

## 

# 

# 

## 

## 

### 

# 

# 

# 

### [STATE'S EXHIBITS 36 THROUGH 48 RECEIVED]

#### BY MR. STANTON:

- Q In addition, Dr. Corneal, I asked you prior to your testimony to select via file numbers out of a large number of photographs, photographs that you believe might assist the jury in understanding your testimony and the findings in this case; is that accurate?
  - A Yes.
  - Q And they are depicted in the photographs that I just mentioned?
  - A Yes.
- O Doctor, let me first ask some background questions about the autopsy proceeding and that medical procedure. Could you explain kind of what the examination entails, in particular, the external and internal exam?
- A Yes. The autopsy, as he stated, consists of an external examination, which is just looking at the outside of the body, documenting hair color, eye color, tattoos, scars, and any injuries that might be seen. And then we open the body, we examine the organs, we examine the inside tissues to look for again more injuries and also any natural disease processes which might contribute or cause death.
- Q And during that process there are a number of items of evidence that are memorialized, both by the physician, as well as a photographer?
  - A Yes.
- Q So, let me begin now in addressing your assessment of the injuries that were noted on Mr. Fleming. And if -- I plan on going through the order that they're listed in the autopsy report. Are you comfortable with that order?
  - A Yes.

22

23

24

25

Q Okay. So, how many gunshot wounds were observed and documented on Mr. Fleming? Α Three. Q And I'd like to begin with gunshot number one. Could you tell us anatomically where that gunshot wound was located? Α The gunshot wound was on the back of the head on the left side. Q And could you tell whether or not that wound was an entrance or exit gunshot wound? Α It was an entrance gunshot wound. Q I'd like to show Exhibit 39 to you. Let me ask you a couple questions first. Obviously, anatomically, we're looking at Mr. Fleming's back of his head? Α Yes. And the condition around the wound in his hair, is that something Q that's done as part of the autopsy procedure? Α It is. Q And why is that? Α Prior to shaving the head we photograph the wound as it is. But then in order to better visualize the wound, we shave around it, so we can see the wound edges, determine if there's abrasions, determine if there's soot in that area.

Q Okay. And we'll get into a little bit of each one of those, but I want to go to Exhibit 40. Is that a close-up photograph of the same anatomical area and wound that we saw in the previous photograph?

A It is.

Q And could you kind of contrast what an exit wound would look like versus what we see here?

A Sure. So, an exit wound on the other hand is more of a tearing of the skin. It actually can be pushed back together. We call it a laceration. And there can be abrasion, but usually there's not abrasion and there's no soot or stippling around the wound.

Q So, now what I'd like to do, Doctor, is go back to the previous photograph and ask you some questions about the internal assessment of the injuries of that wound. Is it -- what do you do or what is normal about determining, from an internal examination, where --

MR. STANTON: -- that's still frozen on the previous photograph.

Oh, I think you have to --

THE WITNESS: What did I do?

THE COURT: Wait. Just go ahead and say it.

THE CLERK: You click the other arrow down.

MR. STANTON: I think if she -- oh, no, there you go. You got it.

Sorry.

### BY MR. STANTON:

Q So, let me go back to Exhibit 39. Doctor, what is done to determine the path or trajectory of that bullet?

A The scalp is reflected, and a portion of the skull was removed. The brain is also removed and dissected. And as we radiograph everyone, we knew the projectile was in his right jaw area, so that was dissected out from below.

Q And could you tell me what path, anatomically, to your frame of

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

2425

reference that you use in all wounds that this bullet -- gunshot injury, took inside his head?

A Sure. First, just to explain anatomic paths, when we're talking about the body, front is the front of your body with your hands, with your palms, facing forward. The tops of your feet would be forward. The soles would be back. Top, bottom, just like you would think. So, this went back to front, left to right, and downward.

- O So, the trajectory as we see it is left to right and downward?
- A Yes.
- Q You indicated that through x-rays you determined that there was a bullet still in Mr. Fleming associated with this entrance gunshot wound?
  - A Yes.
- Q Before we get to where the bullet came to rest, where did it go through anatomically before it came to rest?
- A It went through his brain. It transected his brain stem. And then it went down into his oral cavity fracturing his jaw.
  - Q So, the skull is fractured?
  - A Yes.
- Q And then you said it dissected the brain stem. Is that an important organ when you're examining injuries in that region of the body to note?
  - A Yes.
- Q We'll get back to that in just a second, but let me go to the mandible; what was the condition of the mandible?
  - A The mandible was fractured.
  - Q As a result of the bullet striking that bone?

Q

And that process leaves physical evidence that you see on a

25

Α

Q

Yes.

Doctor, let me ask you now about wound number two. Can you

describe the general area where wound number two was involved?

- A Wound number two it was in the right upper arm.
- Q And I'm going to show you State's Exhibit 38. And could, number one, you orient us anatomically on Mr. Fleming where we're looking at now?
- A His back is up in the photo. This is the gunshot entrance wound on his inner right upper arm.
  - Q And is that an entrance or exit gunshot wound?
  - A An entrance wound.
- Q And let me show you Exhibit Number 43. Is that a closer up photograph of that same wound?
  - A It is.
- O Now, let me go to Exhibit 44. It, I believe, is self-explanatory in that photograph anatomically, but is there a corresponding exit wound depicted in that photograph?
  - A Yes. The exit wound on the outer right upper arm.
- O Now, Doctor, let me talk to you about this wound. Let me ask you about the track that was observed by the internal examination in this area.

What were you able to determine?

- A The bullet entered the inner upper arm. It broke his humerus, which is the bone in your upper arm, and then exited the outer upper arm.
- Q So this had a corresponding entrance and an exit with no bullet found associated with this gunshot wound?
- A There were fragments of a bullet, but the fragments broke off in the broken arm, and then the later exited, yes.
  - Q Now, Doctor, let me ask you a couple questions about that wound.

1	Was it, in your opinion, from a medical degree of certainty, an incapacitating		
2	one?		
3	А	No.	
4	Q	Was it a fatal one?	
5	А	No.	
6	Q	And the final wound gunshot wound number three,	
7	anatomically, where was that wound observed?		
8	А	That was in the right groin area.	
9	Q	I'm going to show you Exhibit Number 45. Is this the upper right	
10	thigh area	?	
11	А	Yes.	
12	Q	And is that rod there for a reason?	
13	A	It's yes.	
14	Q	And what is that reason?	
15	A	It's showing trajectory.	
16	Q	So, the same thing about a location or the trajectory path that you	
17	previously described from an internal, this wound can be shown by an		
18	external demonstration which is depicted in this photograph?		
19	А	Yes.	
20	Q	Doctor, was this wound incapacitating?	
21	А	No.	
22	Q	Was this wound in and of itself fatal?	
23	A	No.	
24	Q	There was no bullet or projectile associated with this wound?	
25	Α	Correct.	

1	Q	And the track pattern was what, anatomically, to the description of	
2	Mr. Fleming's body as you describe wounds?		
3	A Right to left, front to back, and downward.		
4	Q	Doctor, what was the cause of Mr. Fleming's death?	
5	А	Gunshot wound to the head.	
6	Q	And what is the manner of death?	
7	А	Homicide.	
8	Q	At the hands of another?	
9	А	Yes.	
10		MR. STANTON: Pass the witness.	
11		THE COURT: Cross-examination.	
12		MR. BASHOR: Thank you, Your Honor.	
13		CROSS-EXAMINATION	
14	BY MR. BASHOR:		
15	Q	Good afternoon, Doctor.	
16	А	Good afternoon.	
17	Q	I'm going to start where Mr. Stanton left off. We heard that you	
18	have classifications for the manner of death, correct?		
19	А	Yes.	
20	Q	And part of your responsibility as a forensic pathologist,	
21	particularly when you are working for the county, is that you report your data		
22	to the Bureau of Vital Statistics?		
23	А	Yes.	
24	Q	And we do that because we want to know how our populations are	
25	passing away, right?		

There's usually charring, soot, sometime an abrasion ring, sometimes you can

25

which I successfully completed. Since then, over the last 14 years, I have

25

completed hundreds of hours of different forensic discipline classes.

- Q And I know this might be for you a difficult figure to come up with some degree of precision, but I'm looking to an area of what you are comfortable in approximating. How many crime scenes have you been involved in in a professional capacity either as the principal crime scene analyst assigned to that scene or in an assistant capacity?
  - A All kinds of crimes?
  - Q Yes.
  - A Thousands.
- Q And there is a crime scene analyst in your department, as well as the Metropolitan Police Department, kind of a seniority aspect when you have a more serious scene; is that true?
  - A Yes.
- O And could you describe kind of how that works if you're brand new versus someone with your experience about what type of scenes you would go to?
- A Entry level crime scene investigators will not be primary on things like homicides or officer involved shootings. The senior or level two CSI's would take primary on those kinds of calls.
- Q Okay. There are a group of crime scene analysts that respond to some scenes?
  - A Yes.
- Q Can you describe how -- and my first part of my question is, within crime scene analysts themselves and then I'll get to detectives as a byproduct of your answer, but could you describe to the jury how in a scene such as this,

a serious scene, crime scene analysts work together and how those responsibilities are broken down?

A In a scene such as this, usually at least two crime scene analysts would arrive -- would go to the scene. We would then discuss the scene and we would split up the duties so that one person isn't in charge of the entire investigation.

- Q And is there kind of a communication process that exists between the analysts about their jobs and functions as you go through scenes?
  - A Yes.
- Q Can you kind of once again, in a general fashion, kind of explain how that works?
- A Usually one CSI will be in charge of photographs and collecting evidence. Another CSI might handle the diagram portion. If there are other scenes associated, like search warrants or vehicles, someone -- we would split those up, so that one person doesn't have to handle all aspects of the scene.
- Q And now I'd ask you about how that works in the interaction with law enforcement and, in this particular case, at a homicide scene how you interact and what that interaction is with homicide detectives.
- A When the detectives arrive on scene, they let us know what they need from us above and beyond what we might already have decided to complete. And like I said, that would have to do with search warrants and what they might be looking for on warrants and situations like that.
- Q And then prior to your testimony today I had you review Exhibits 1 through 35 marked for this trial. Are you familiar with those photographs and crime scene diagram that are marked accordingly?

1	A	Yes.	
2	Q	And do they accurately depict the crime scene document diagram	
3	prepared i	n this case, as well as photographs at various different stages at this	
4	primary scene as the scene was processed?		
5	Α	Yes.	
6		MR. STANTON: Your Honor, I move for 1 through 35 into	
7	evidence.		
8		THE COURT: Stipulated?	
9		MR. BASHOR: We stipulate.	
10		THE COURT: 1 through 35 are admitted by stipulation.	
11		[STATE'S EXHIBIT 1-35 RECEIVED]	
12		MR. STANTON: Thank you, counsel.	
13	BY MR. STANTON:		
14	Q	So, let me talk to you about kind of when you arrive at a scene	
15	after you've been briefed some kind of in this case involving a structure;		
16	what is kind of the first step in photographing or documenting the location th		
17	you're at?		
18	A	We would first document the exterior of the residence showing the	
19	address, showing the basic condition of the exterior.		
20	Q	I'm showing you State's Exhibit 4. Is this the exterior photograph	
21	of the scene that you responded to on January 1st, 2016?		
22	Α	Yes.	
23	Q	Let me go to Exhibit Number 5. Is that kind of a reference with a	
24	number that's important to you; why is that photograph		
25	Α	Correct. This shows the front door of the specific unit involved in	

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

this incident.

- O Now, there's been previous testimony that I won't belabor about certain aspects inside the garage, but fair to say that that is a photograph taken by crime scene analysts upon their arrival and processing of the scene?
  - A Correct.
  - O Then let me go to State's Exhibit 1 and what is that?
  - A This is a diagram of the residence.
  - O Commonly referred to as a crime scene diagram?
  - A Correct.
  - Q And there's a couple things that I want to talk to you about.
- Number one here is a staircase?
  - A Yes.
  - Q And then a figure of a body here?
  - A Correct.
- Q And that's once again to demonstrate -- kind of to orient us, with some of the pictures that are also used to document these areas?
  - A Yes.
- Q We have a reference of north and the physical address and the apartment number?
  - A Correct.
- Q Now, in the next document I'm going to show you, Grand Jury Exhibit Number 2, or not Grand Jury, Trial Exhibit Number 2, there's a series of numbers that are depicted. And I'll focus first around the body figure. Can you tell me what those are designed to depict?
  - A Yes. The numbers that you see here all are associated with pieces

of evidence that were -- that were collected at the scene.

- Q And then is there an index that's associated with that?
- A Yes.
- Q And let me show you Exhibit Number 3. Is that the index for the numbers that are depicted on the crime scene?
  - A Yes.
- Q So, the description is by the crime scene analyst of the item that we see here, and those numbers reference the diagram itself?
  - A Correct.
- Q I gotcha. So, now let me go to Exhibit Number 8. Can you tell us where inside the home that is and what we're looking at?
- A This is at the top of the first set of stairs looking down into the entryway. The doorway straight in front of you is that front door. And then the doorway to your left is the garage.
- Q Now, Ms. Harder, in this photograph we do not see any yellow evidence tents. Does that tell you something about when this photograph was taken in comparison to some others?
- A This would be taken prior to any investigation, any locating of evidence. This was our initial photographs.
- Q Okay. Now, let me go with Exhibit 9. Can you tell us what that is and how it compares and contrasts with the previous photo?
- A Right. This is the same view, except in this photo you can see evidence tents in the middle under his arm showing where some evidence had been located.
  - Q And so if I could, going back to Exhibit Number 1, this is the raw

 diagram without any evidence depicted on it, and this Exhibit 2 is the same diagram, but with it processed and memorialized as to specific evidentiary items?

A Correct.

Q I want to now ask you about Grand Jury Exhibit Number 12. And can you tell us where we are in this photograph?

A This is at the bottom of that same stairway, a closer photo of the deceased in that entryway.

Q And the doors that are around his person, is one of those the garage door?

A Correct. The door near his right hand would be the door to the garage. The door near his head is the door to -- that's the front door.

Q Now, I want to draw your attention to a couple of items here.

Number one is this area under Mr. Fleming's head, this carpeting I'm pointing to. Do you recall that in some subsequent photos we have closer up photographs of that area?

A Yes.

Q Can you describe kind of how the processing works from the overall photographs here to when evidence tents are applied and then when Mr. Fleming is removed from the scene? Can you explain how that process works?

A When we arrive on the scene, we take overall photos before anything is disturbed, or touched, or moved. It's just to show the condition when we first arrived. We will then locate any evidence, photograph it. We will then place those evidence markers down and re-photograph the scene

again showing all those evidence markers. Once the victim was removed, we then continue to look for evidence under where his body was. And in this case, we did locate additional evidence on and under that carpet.

- Q And there is a particular agency within Clark County that has a very prominent role when it comes to a deceased person at the scene; is that correct?
  - A Yes.
  - Q Who is that?
  - A The Clark County Coroner's Office.
- Q And is there a kind of a mandated procedure about how the processing of the body and areas around the body work in conjunction with the Coroner's office?
- A Yes. The Coroner's office has jurisdiction over the body. We are not to touch it or move it until they are on scene, and they are able to do their concurrent investigation.
- Q And there's actually an investigator from the Coroner's office that comes to the scene working with you and the detectives?
  - A Correct.
- Q So, I want to go to Exhibit 13. Do you recognize that as you got a closer picture of Mr. Fleming?
  - A Yes.
- Q I want to point in kind of an orientation fashion in this broader photograph to a couple items that aren't as well seen in it. For the record, above Mr. Fleming's left arm against the wall, do you see the item that I'm pointing to there?

1	Α	Yes, sir.	
2	Q	Is that item something that is photographed, tagged, and	
3	impounded in the closer set of photographs in this case?		
4	Α	Yes, it is.	
5	Q	And what was that item?	
6	A	That's a .40 caliber cartridge case.	
7	Q	And let me direct your attention to Mr. Fleming's right elbow here,	
8	almost in the middle bottom third of the photograph; are there a number of		
9	evidentiary items located against, near, and underneath his body in that area		
10	A	Yes.	
11	Q	And, finally, in the waistband area that I'm pointing to now on Mr.	
12	Fleming's front stomach area, do you recognize that item?		
13	A	Yes.	
14	Q	And what was it?	
15	A	Later to be determined a nine millimeter Glock, Model 19 handgun	
16	Q	Going to Exhibit 16, is that something we've seen before in the	
17	photographs that I presented to you?		
18	A	Yes. That's the .40 caliber cartridge case.	
19	Q	And that's now a closer picture?	
20	A	Correct.	
21	Q	And this is prior to the processing from tagging and identifying	
22	evidentiary items by number?		
23	A	Correct.	
24	Q	Okay. Now, let me go to Exhibit 17. What has happened from a	
25	crime scer	ne analyst's processing perspective that you now clearly see in this	

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

photograph?

This is that second round of photos that I described where we now go through and mark our items of evidence and then re-photograph everything with its numerical marker.

- So, let me go to the index, Exhibit Number 3, and if I go to this index and go to number one, let me zoom in. What is the description of item number one?
  - One Winchester Smith & Wesson 40 cartridge casing.
- So, the item numbers once again here correspond to the visual yellow tags we would see in any photograph?
  - Α Correct.
  - Q Let me go to Exhibit 18. What is that a photograph of?
- Α This is that same cartridge case, now numerically marked and a close-up of it.
- Why is that particular type of evidence tag put next to this item, the  $\mathbf{O}$ ruler aspects of it?
  - To show size. Α
- So, there's kind of an identification, as well as a scale, that's Q inserted for size?
  - Α Correct.
  - Q Exhibit 20, what are we looking at there?
- This is the deceased's midsection showing again item number two Α and three and then the firearm in his waistband.
  - O Exhibit 19?
  - Α This shows item number two and three closer, item number two

Now, was there a process in which this area, the area I've just

O

shown depicted by tag number ten and that matte type carpeting adjacent to the garage door that it's processed further. Can you explain what you do and how it was done in this case?

A In this case, these fragments were collected after being photographed. The carpet is then removed and we're photographing the underside of the carpet, as well as the tile floor underneath.

- Q I'm showing you Exhibit Number 28. Is that kind of the process that you just described in the photograph as we're going through them.
  - A Yes.
  - Q And Exhibit 29, what are we looking at there?
- A That's the underside of that mat, showing the defect on the underside of the mat.
- Q And on the top side of that would have been the bullet fragment that was impounded?
  - A Correct.
- Q And let me go to Exhibit 30 and tag 11. What are we looking at there?
- A This is additional bullet fragments and the broken tile underneath that defect in the carpet.
  - Q Exhibit 32, what is that?
- A That's a photograph, stepped back just a little bit so you can see the entire defect in the tile.
- Q And once again, 31, is that a sequential photograph now up close of the previous?
  - A Correct.

Q	That was	tile und	derneath	the	carpeting?

- A Yes.
- Q Now, I want to show you Exhibit 33. Can you tell us what we're looking at there and where is that in the scene?
- A This is the handgun in a leather holster that is in the waistband of the victim.
- Q Now, is there a procedure, kind of a strict line about how handguns such as this found in a scene is processed?
  - A Yes.
  - Q Can you describe that for me?
- A The handgun was removed from the holster, then you drop the magazine out and lock the slide back to make it safe, noting whether or not any live ammunition or cartridge cases come out of the slide when we rack it back. We then count all the live ammunition that's in the magazine, photograph the gun and all of its make, model, serial number, all of its designators.
  - Q And this particular gun was processed in that fashion?
  - A Yes.
- Q I would like to show you next in order State's Exhibit 34. What are we looking at there and where in the process are, we seeing this weapon?
- A This would be the first photograph taken after removing it off of this person. It's still in the holster.
  - Q And Exhibit 35?
- A This would be after it's removed from the holster, the magazine has been dropped and the slide has been locked back. The ammunition is still

21

22

23

24

25

in the magazine.

Q What was the condition of this weapon at the time that it was processed, as you just described?

A There are 15 live 9 millimeter cartridges in the magazine and there was nothing in the chamber.

- Q Are you familiar with semi-automatic handguns?
- A Yes.
- O Do you also qualify, in your capacity as a Crime Scene Analyst, to carry a firearm with the North Las Vegas Police Department?
  - A Yes, I do.
  - O How often do you qualify with a weapon?
  - A Four times a year.
  - Q And that's every year since you've been employed in that capacity?
  - A Correct.
  - Q What kind of weapon, revolver or semi-automatic do you carry?
  - A I carry a 9 millimeter Glock Model 26.
  - Q Semi-automatic handgun?
  - A Correct.
- Q So, would it be fair to say that you're familiar with how to load it, operate, and fire that weapon?
  - A Yes.
- Q So, let me ask you this question, in the condition that the gun was in, that is, as you testified, the magazine had live rounds in it, but none in the pipe or in the barrel end. If I pulled out that Glock and squeezed the trigger would the gun go off?

1	A	No.		
2	Q What would be required in order to make this Glock operationa			
3	that if I pulled the trigger the gun would fire?			
4	A The slide would have had to have been racked back to put a rou			
5	into the chamber.			
6	Q	Thank you.		
7		MR. STANTON: Your Honor, I don't believe I have any further		
8	questions.	I pass the witness.		
9		CROSS-EXAMINATION		
10	BY MR. O'BRIEN:			
11	Q	Good afternoon, Ms. Harder.		
12	A	Good afternoon.		
13	Q	I want to start with a few general questions. I know you talked a		
14	little bit about your background and your training to become a CSA.			
15	A	Uh-huh.		
16	Q	Let's talk a little bit about the responsibilities of a CSA. You just		
17	basically respond to crime scenes to document the crime?			
18	A	Document and collect evidence, yes.		
19	Q	And by collecting evidence, recovering physical evidence and		
20	fingerprints?			
21	A	Correct.		
22	Q	And also performing a variety of investigative tasks, potentially?		
23	A	Yes.		
24	Q	Okay. And to accomplish that, you carry test kits and evidence		
25	collection materials with you?			

1	А	Yes.
2	Q	Okay. Obviously, you're in North Las Vegas official uniform right
3	now?	
4	А	Yes.
5	Q	You're not driving around in your personal vehicle?
6	A	No.
7	Q	Okay. When you're on the job, you're on the job?
8	А	Correct.
9	Q	Okay. So, you're using a North Las Vegas police vehicle?
10	А	Yes.
11	Q	And I assume the vehicle is stocked with those kits?
12	А	Yes.
13	Q	Okay. Do you personally stock the vehicle when you begin your
14	shift?	
15	А	Yes.
16	Q	Okay. And the test kits, just some of the materials that you could
17	collect inc	lude DNA?
18	A	Yes.
19	Q	Fingerprints?
20	A	Yes.
21	Q	Gunshot residue?
22	A	Yes.
23	Q	Blood?
24	А	Yes.
25	Q	And there's a kit to actually test if something is blood?

	1		
1	А	Presumptively, yes.	
2	Q	Okay. And, also, a collection of firearms, as in this case, you did?	
3	А	Yes.	
4	Q	Okay. And then part of your job an important part of your job is	
5	also protec	ting the integrity of the evidence?	
6	А	Yes.	
7	Q	Specifically, part of your training, I imagine, with the Metro	
8	Academy,	was making sure there's no pollution?	
9	А	Yes.	
10	Q	And by or by pollution, I guess, a better phrase might be	
11	contamination?		
12	А	Yes.	
13	Q	Okay. And that, in part, that's why you wear gloves?	
14	А	Yes.	
15	Q	When you're on the scene?	
16	А	Correct.	
17	Q	Okay. So and you talked a little bit about when you arrive on the	
18	scene talkii	ng to detectives about what they might want investigated?	
19	А	Correct.	
20	Q	All right. And when we say detectives, essentially the lead officer	
21	on the case	e; is that correct?	
22	А	In this case, it's I mean the detectives. There are patrol officers	
23	there, but v	when detectives and CSI are called out, they become the lead	
24	investigato	rs.	

Okay. And I think you also said you would ask the detective what

25

Q

Α

1	Q	And by the residence, we're referring to the townhome at 4032	
2	Smokey Fog?		
3	А	Yes.	
4	Q	Okay. Smokey Fog Avenue in North Las Vegas?	
5	А	Yes.	
6	Q	Okay. Just to give a sense to the jury of what we're talking about	
7	you're fan	niliar with this area of North Las Vegas?	
8	А	Yes.	
9	Q	Okay. I'm showing you what's been marked as Defendant's	
10	Proposed	Exhibit I. And	
11		MR. STANTON: Well, Judge, just for the record, counsel showed	
12	me Defens	se A through K. I have no objection to them being admitted. I think	
13	that needs	s to be on the record before they publish it.	
14		THE COURT: Okay.	
15		MR. STANTON: Thank you.	
16		THE COURT: I didn't pay attention to that part. Sorry about that.	
17		MR. O'BRIEN: My apologies. Thank you, counsel.	
18		THE COURT: So, do you move to admit by stipulation?	
19		MR. STANTON: Yes.	
20		THE COURT: A through K?	
21		MR. STANTON: Those are the ones I've reviewed, Your Honor.	
22		MR. O'BRIEN: I believe that's all I have.	
23		THE COURT: Okay. A through K are admitted by stipulation.	
24		[DEFENDANT'S EXHIBIT A-K RECEIVED]	
25		MR. O'BRIEN: Thank you again, counsel.	

1	А	Uh-huh.
2	Q	and the tape then is removed to collect the fingerprint?
3	Α	Correct.
4	Q	So that it can later be tested?
5	А	It can later be compared, yes.
6	Q	Okay. And in this case, there were some fingerprints taken from
7	4032 Smol	key Fog; is that correct?
8	А	By CSI Fischer, yes.
9	Q	Yes. In fact, there were two lifts that CSI Fischer did?
10	A	Yes.
11	Q	The first one
12		MR. O'BRIEN: The Court's indulgence.
13	BY MR. O'	BRIEN:
14	Q	The first lift CSI Fischer took for was from the front door of the
15	property?	
16	А	I believe both of them were from the exterior of the front door.
17	Q	Okay. Exterior, essentially outside, the outside section?
18	A	Yes.
19	Q	Okay. And Lift 1, CSI Fischer refers to as good comparable quality?
20	А	Yes.
21	Q	And to explain that a little bit to the jury, there's a comparison
22	phase once a fingerprint's collected?	
23	А	Yes.
24	Q	And if it's of comparison quality, essentially the fingerprint can be
25	compared to an elimination print?	

1	Q	3:30 p.m.?
2	А	Yes.
3	Q	Okay. I'm showing you Defense Exhibit D. This is a photo that you
4	took?	
5	А	Yes.
6	Q	And it's essentially just the interior, front interior of the Durango?
7	A	Correct.
8	Q	Okay. Going back to Defense Exhibit C. When you arrived at the
9	scene, doe	es the detective does the detective tell you the importance of the
10	vehicle?	
11	А	I usually get a small briefing, yes.
12	Q	Okay. And in this case, there was concern that the suspect had
13	stolen this	vehicle?
14		MR. STANTON: Object to any answer that deals with Detective
15	Wilson or	any other person's opinion. That's hearsay.
16		THE COURT: Counsel, you want to rephrase?
17		MR. O'BRIEN: Yes, Your Honor.
18	BY MR. O'	BRIEN:
19	Q	In this instance, you were asked to investigate this vehicle well,
20	let's just le	eave it there. You were asked to investigate the vehicle, correct?
21	А	Yes.
22	Q	Okay. The detective did not ask you to take fingerprints of the
23	vehicle?	
24	А	No.
25	Q	Okay. And you ultimately did not take fingerprints of the vehicle?

1	Α	No.
2	Q	Okay. Did not take fingerprints of the door exterior?
3	A	No.
4	Q	Okay. And obviously going along with that, there were no
5	fingerprin	ts in the interior of the vehicle, as well?
6	A	No, sir.
7	Q	Okay. I would like to take a step back from fingerprints for a
8	second an	d talk to you a little bit about gunshot residue.
9	A	Okay.
10	Q	One of the kits that your that you carry with you when you're
11	working is	a gunshot residue test?
12	A	Yes.
13	Q	Essentially, it's a kit?
14	A	Yes.
15	Q	Okay. And the testing involves, in this particular gunshot residue
16	testing is	testing for lead, barium, and antimony, always difficult to say?
17	A	Yes.
18	Q	And the reason, the reason those particles in particular are being
19	tested is that those are in the residue produced from the firing of a weapon?	
20	A	Correct.
21	Q	A handgun, essentially. Once a handgun is fired, that those
22	particles are in the residue produced?	
23	A	Yes.
24	Q	And part of the reason for that is that they are present in the prime
25	of a cartric	dge?

1	А	Yes.
2	Q	So, the primer of essentially the bullet or the cartridge inside the
3	gun contai	ns these particles?
4	A	Yes.
5	Q	And then when fired, that's why they are present?
6	A	Yes.
7	Q	All right. To and this part of the science behind it is that these
8	particles ar	e ejected from the barrel of the gun when fired?
9	A	Yes.
10	Q	And it leaves a residue in the area around the gun at the time of
11	the firing?	
12	A	Correct.
13	Q	And that residue can be tested?
14	A	Yes.
15	Q	If requested, a person's hands can be swabbed?
16	A	Yes.
17	Q	And a gun residue test run off of that swab?
18	A	Correct.
19	Q	And part of the reason we might test hands, or we might be
20	requested ·	to test hands is the residue if a gun was in someone's hand and
21	that gun w	as fired, the residue would fall onto that hand?
22	A	Correct.
23	Q	All right. You could also swab clothing, correct?
24	Α	Yes.
25	Q	And in this case, while you did not go to the property, are you

aware of any gunshot residue testing that was done?

- A I did respond to the property, I just wasn't dispatched there. So, I wanted to correct myself on that one. I did later respond to the property, I was dispatched to the vehicle. Sorry.
  - Q Okay.
  - A But not to my knowledge, no.
- Q And I want to talk to you a little bit about DNA collection and testing. I'm showing you Defense Exhibit E. I know we're bouncing back and forth, but what is pictured in Defense Exhibit E?
- A This is the driver's side of the Durango, where I've marked with evidence markers the areas that I want to swab for DNA.
- Q Okay. And we talked a little bit -- the Prosecution talked to you a little bit about markers. Essentially, it is marking the, as you just said, the spots in a photo where you're going to test?
  - A Correct.
- Q I'm showing Defense Exhibit F. Are we looking at your hand in the bottom left corner?
  - A Yes, sir.
  - O Okay. And that is you swabbing an area for DNA?
  - A Yes.
- Q All right. And I'm showing you Defense Exhibit G. Similarly, this is your hand swabbing the steering wheel for DNA?
  - A Correct.
- Q And Defense Exhibit H, you're hand swabbing the, I assume the gear shift?

1	А	Yes.
2	Q	Okay. I want to talk to you a little bit about DNA and why you
3	would swa	ıb an area.
4	А	Okay.
5	Q	Touch DNA, in particular, it's a forensic method for analyzing DNA
6	that might	be left at the scene of a crime?
7	А	Correct.
8	Q	And it's called, specifically, touch DNA because the testing require
9	very small	samples in order to be tested?
10	А	Yes, it's an area where someone has touched and left epithelial
11	DNA.	
12	Q	Okay. And when you're swabbing these areas, you're looking for
13	touch DNA	λ?
14	A	Yes.
15	Q	Okay. In this instance, the detectives did not ask you to test this
16	DNA?	
17	A	I don't test DNA.
18	Q	Okay. I thought that. As far as you know, the detective did not
19	send the DNA to be tested?	
20	А	I wouldn't know.
21	Q	Okay. All right. So, as we said earlier, you did your job of
22	collecting?	
23	A	Correct.
24	Q	At that point, it's the lead investigator's job to decide what to do?
25	A	Yes, sir.

1	Q	Thank you.
2		MR. O'BRIEN: The Court's indulgence.
3	BY MR. O'	BRIEN:
4	Q	And Ms. Harder, just you mentioned epithelial DNA, just so the
5	jury knows	s, epithelial DNA is essentially skin cells?
6	A	Skin cells, yes.
7	Q	Okay. And that was part of when we were discussing touch DNA
8	and what i	might be collected and ultimately tested?
9	A	Correct.
10	Q	Okay. A few more questions about the investigation inside of the
11	inside of th	ne property at 4032 Smokey Fog. We talked a little bit about
12	fingerprint	s, and to the best of your knowledge, there was no DNA taken insid
13	of 4032 Sn	nokey Fog?
14	А	Not to my knowledge.
15	Q	Okay. And by taken, essentially collected with the swab method as
16	we saw in	the photos?
17	А	Right.
18	Q	All right. But actually, let me be more particular. There was a
19	swab take	n of Mr. Fleming's mouth, a buccal swab?
20	Α	That was probably done at the autopsy.
21	Q	Okay. Okay. So not done inside the house, as far as you know?
22	А	I wouldn't assume so.
23	Q	Okay. So, in that vein, there was no DNA taken from the any
24	counter in	the property?
25	Δ	Not to my knowledge, no

	1	
1	Q	Okay. And no DNA taken from the couch?
2		MR. STANTON: Objection, asked and answered. The bannister
3	going dow	n the stairs, the couch, the counter, all have been asked and
4	answered.	
5		THE COURT: Is this the last area?
6		MR. O'BRIEN: This is the last area and, Your Honor, I did ask abou
7	fingerprint	s, but not about DNA. This is the very last area.
8		THE COURT: Okay.
9	BY MR. O'I	BRIEN:
10	Q	So, no DNA was collected from the couch, as far as you know?
11	A	Not to my knowledge.
12	Q	And no DNA was collected from the railing on the way down the
13	stairs?	
14	A	Not to my knowledge.
15	Q	Or from the wall along the way down the stairs?
16	A	Not to my knowledge.
17	Q	And no DNA was collected from the .40 caliber shells that were
18	found?	
19	A	Not to my knowledge, no.
20	Q	Okay. Thank you very much.
21		THE COURT: Redirect?
22		MR. STANTON: Thank you, Your Honor.
23		REDIRECT EXAMINATION
24	BY MR. ST	ANTON:
25	0	And counsel just asked you about three areas of forensic items tha

25

Α

Q

No.

Will it tell you what circumstances I left the DNA, at least touch

DNA as opposed to blood or some other DNA rich fluid?

- A No.
- Q Let me talk about gunshot residue. You, on several questions asked by Defense counsel, asked about the collection of gunshot residue. Are you familiar with the limitations on gunshot residue as far as what it will tell you?
- A It will basically tell you whether someone was around a gun being fired.
- Okay. Will it tell you whether or not I held a gun in my hand and fired it?
  - A No.
- O So, if we had four people in a room and let's assume this is a normal size bedroom, 10 by 13, or thereabouts, and a gun is fired. Would you expect, if you were to take a gunshot residue test soon in time without anybody putting their hands in clothing, washing their hands, or an appreciable lapse of time, would you expect all four people to test positive?
  - A It's very possible, yes.
- Q And there's no gradiation of the testing of gunshot reside. In other words, you can't tell by the results of it that you're the shooter, you're three feet, you're closer than person number two or three, or anybody else in the room. Is that accurate?
- A I don't know exactly how it measures. From what I understand, it's just it's either present or it's not.
  - Q Okay. Are you --

THE COURT: And you said -- I'm sorry to interrupt. You said

1	gradiation.	
2		MR. STANTON: I did.
3		THE COURT: Spell that for the record.
4		MR. STANTON: Okay. Thank you, Your Honor.
5		THE COURT: G-R-A
6	BY MR. ST.	ANTON:
7	Q	Do you know where
8		THE COURT: It's the first time I ever heard it, so I wanted to make
9	sure I got it	t right.
10	BY MR. ST.	ANTON:
11	Q	Are you familiar where gunshot residue testing is performed?
12	A	It's sent off to a lab somewhere back east, I believe.
13	Q	How about Bear County, Texas? Does that sound familiar?
14	A	East of here.
15	Q	Okay, but it's not by the way right, it's not by the crime lab?
16	A	No, sir.
17	Q	And, in fact, North Las Vegas, getting back to DNA and
18	fingerprints	s, doesn't have their own crime lab, you ship it to Metro. Is that
19	A	We do our own fingerprints.
20	Q	But the DNA
21	A	But we DNA, we do not, it gets sent to Metro, the County Lab.
22	Q	Okay. Thank you, ma'am.
23		MR. STANTON: Nothing further.
24		THE COURT: Re-cross?
25		MR. O'BRIEN: No, thank you.

would expect the detective to be a couple hours, and my person would be five

25

minutes, from my perspective.

THE COURT: Okay. So, if I went ahead (indiscernible) it would be 2:20, I was asking to be excused.

MR. O'BRIEN: Okay.

THE COURT: We had a full discussion of whether he's the boss, but I feel like he's possibly self-fulfilling.

MR. STANTON: So, whenever you want to, to tomorrow, and then we'll argue your thing Friday morning.

MR. O'BRIEN: That seems to be the plan.

THE COURT: I have a hearing on an in capita without probability, blah, blah. I might just move it so that we can finish this on time.

MR. O'BRIEN: That would be great, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. I have to move it. I have to move it. Thanks. So, I'm going to give them this thrill about being done a little early today.

MR. STANTON: Right. And then I'll send -- I have two specials on the other murder counts that I'll send over.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. STANTON: Okay?

[Sidebar ends at 2:38 p.m.]

THE COURT: Well, ladies and gentlemen, the testimony that we had anticipated would take the rest of the day is done, and so we're done a little early. And so, we do our best to plan and schedule. We have some witnesses that are out of State that are not available until tomorrow. So, you are done for today.

So, we're going to break now. I have a Nevada Supreme Court

Commission that I am appointed to, with a particular Justice who would like my attendance tomorrow. I'm being excused early from the Commission, but we're not -- and the lawyers knew this in advance and there's at least one of you that understands that when the Supreme Court speaks, those of us in the business listen, including me. So, I have to do that, and we're not going to start this trial until 2:30. So, we're just going to compress, 2:30 to 5. Okay? And so, we'll take a break in there and we're going to -- the way things are going along, we are still on time, no problem.

So, during this overnight recess until 2:30, you can work tomorrow, you can go about your business as long as you're at the meeting place that my Marshall designates to you at 2:30 tomorrow afternoon, okay? As long as you don't talk about the case and you follow my admonishment. Okay. Just put it out of your mind and come back at 2:30 tomorrow.

So, during this recess, you're admonished not to talk or converse among yourselves or anyone else on any subject connected with the trial. You are not to read, watch or listen to any report of or commentary on the trial by any person connected with this case, or any media of information, including, without limitation, newspaper, television, the internet or radio. You're not to form or express any opinion on any subject connected with the trial until the case is finally submitted to you. Tomorrow at 2:30.

THE MARSHAL: All rise. The jury is exiting.

[Outside the presence of the jury.]

THE COURT: The record shall reflect we're outside the presence of the jury. I would like to take a short restroom break, come back and admonish your client, because I have to do that when the State rests, and I hear that

then I'll admonish your client, and you can all be about your day. Okay? Two

25

minutes.

MR. O'BRIEN: Very good.

[Recess at 2:42 p.m., recommencing at 2:45 p.m.]

THE COURT: Are you ready?

MR. O'BRIEN: We're ready, Your Honor. I believe Mr. Stanton has left responsibility to Mr. Flinn.

[Outside the presence of the jury.]

THE COURT: Okay. We're back on the record in State v. Shawn Glover outside the presence of the jury. Both Defense counsel are present, Mr. Flinn for the State.

Mr. Glover, in every criminal trial, the Judge has to read an admonishment that is important, and I read it verbatim to make sure I don't, you know, screw it up. So, I'm going to read it to you verbatim here. If you have any -- I usually read it at or around when the District Attorney is going to rest, but since you're going to, at some point, start a case tomorrow, I'll read it to you tonight so that you have been admonished, and you can certainly discuss it to the extent you need to with your attorneys.

THE DEFENDANT: Okay.

THE COURT: So, under the Constitution of the United States and under the Constitution of the State of Nevada, you cannot be compelled to testify in this case. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.

THE COURT: You may, at your own request, give up this right and take the witness stand and testify. If you do, you will be the subject to cross-examination by one of the Deputy District Attorneys, and anything that you

may say, be it on direct or cross-examination, will be the subject of fair comment when the Deputy District Attorneys speak to the jury in their final arguments. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.

THE COURT: If you choose not to testify, the Court will not permit the Deputy District Attorneys, either of them, to make any comments to the jury because you have not testified. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.

THE COURT: If you elect not to testify, the Court will instruct the jury, but only if your attorney requests, specifically as follows:

The law does not compel a Defendant in a criminal case to take the stand and testify, and no presumption may be raised, and no inference of any kind may be drawn from the failure of a Defendant to testify. Do you have any questions about these rights?

THE DEFENDANT: No, ma'am.

THE COURT: You are further advised if you have a felony conviction more than ten years that has not elapsed from the date that you have been convicted or discharged from prison, parole, or probation, whichever is later, and the Defense has not sought to preclude that coming before the jury, and you take the stand and testify, the Deputy District Attorneys, one of them, in the presence of the jury, would be permitted to ask you the following: One, have you been convicted of a felony; two, what was the felony; and, three, when did it happen? However, no other details could be gone into. You discussed these rights with your client?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.

\*|||||* 

1	THE COURT: Thanks.
2	MR. O'BRIEN: Yep.
3	[Proceedings concluded at 2:49 p.m.]
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	ATTEST: I do hereby certify that I have truly and correctly transcribed the
17	audio/visual proceedings in the above-entitled case to the best of my ability.
18	best of my ability.
19	
20	Oxin Po Cabill
21	Justia B. Cahill
22	

Maukele Transcribers, LLC

Jessica B. Cahill, Transcriber, CER/CET-708

23

24

25

1	IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA		
2			<del></del>
3	SHAWN GLOVER,	)	No. 77425
4	Appellant,	)	
5		)	
6	V.	)	
7	THE STATE OF NEVADA,	)	
8	Respondent.	)	
9		)	
10	APPELLANT'S APPENDIX VOLUME IV PAGES 685-925		
11	DARIN IMLAY Clark County Public Defender 309 South Third Street		STEVE WOLFSON Clark County District Attorney 200 Lewis Avenue, 3 <sup>rd</sup> Floor
12	Las Vegas, Nevada 89155-2610		Las Vegas, Nevada 89155
13	Attorney for Appellant		AARON FORD Attorney General
14			Attorney General 100 North Carson Street Carson City, Nevada 89701-4717
15			(702) 687-3538
16	Counsel for Respondent CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE		
17	I hereby certify that this document was filed electronically with the Nevad		
18			2018. Electronic Service of the foregoing
19	document shall be made in accordance		
20		e with th	
21	AARON D. FORD STEVEN S. OWENS		KEDRIC A. BASSETT HOWARD S. BROOKS
22	I further certify that I served a copy of this document by mailing a true and		
23	correct copy thereof, postage pre-paid, addressed to:		
24	SHAWN GLOVER, #1085475		
	HIGH DESERT STATE PRISON P.O. BOX 650		
25	INDIAN SPRINGS, NV 89070		
26			
27	BY/s/Rachel Howard		
28	Employee, Clark County Public Defender's Office		