1	IN THE SUPREME C	OURT OF THE STAT	E OF NEVADA
2			_
3	CHRISTOPHER SENA,) No. 79036	Flectronically Filed
4 5	Appellant,)))	Electronically Filed May 20 2020 01:22 p.m. Elizabeth A. Brown
6	v.)	Clerk of Supreme Court
7	THE STATE OF NEVADA,))	
8	Respondent.)	
9 10	APPELLANT'S APPE	 NDIX VOLUME XIX P	AGES 4208-4455
11			
12	DARIN IMLAY Clark County Public Defender 309 South Third Street	STEVE WO Clark County 200 Lewis A	LFSON District Attorney venue, 3 rd Floor Jevada 89155
13	Las Vegas, Nevada 89155-2610	Las Vegas, N	Jevadá 89155
14	Attorney for Appellant	AARON FO Attorney Ger 100 North Ca	
15 16		Carson City, (702) 687-35	Nevada 89701-4717 38
17		Counsel for l	Respondent
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
2324			
25			
26			
27			
28			

INDEX CHRISTOPHER SENA Case No. 79036

1

Case No. 79036	DACE NO
Amended Criminal Complaint filed 10/22/14	<u>PAGE NC</u> 7-13
Amended Judgment of Conviction filed 07/08/19	2399-2407
Audiovisual Transmission Equipment Appearance Request filed 02/06/19	2162-2164
Criminal Complaint filed 09/19/14	1-6
Defendant's Bench Memorandum Regarding Child Pornography Charges filed 02/15/19	2236-2246
Defendant's Memorandum of Points and Authorities Opposing Bindover After Preliminary Hearing filed 09/19/15	917-933
Defendant's Motion for Juror Questionnaire Date of Hrg: 01/03/18	1679-1701
Defendant's Motion for Production of Co-Offenders' PSIs and Related Discovery Date of Hrg: 08/22/18	1941-1950
Defendant's Motion to Continue Trial Date of Hrg: 09/13/17	1529-1545
Defendant's Notice of Expert Witnesses filed 12/29/17	1731-1732
Defendant's Notice of Expert Witnesses filed 08/13/18	1891-1896
Defendant's Notice of Witnesses filed 01/08/18	1733-1735
Defendant's Proposed Jury Instructions Not Used At Trial filed 02/15/19	2214-2235
District Court Minutes from 01/05/16 through 05/28/19	2408-2486
Ex Parte Motion and Order to Remand Witness Into Custody filed 02/06/19	2167-2168
Ex Parte Motion and Order to Remand Witness Into Custody filed 02/06/19	2169-2170
Ex Parte Order for Transcript filed 11/03/17	1552-1553
Ex Parte Order for Transcript filed 03/09/18	1741-1742
Ex Parte Order for Transport filed 12/05/17	1675-1676
Findings of Fact, Conclusions, of Law and Order Date of Hrg: 10/12/16	1251-1301
Fourth Amended Information filed 02/13/19	2171-2213
	Amended Criminal Complaint filed 10/22/14

1	Information filed 12/16/15	1008-1052
2	Instructions to the Jury filed 02/21/19	2264-2358
3	Judgment of Conviction filed 05/31/19	2384-2392
4	Justice Court Minutes from 09/19/14 through 12/15/15	77-111
5	Motion for Stay Pending Resolution of Defendant's	
6	Petition for Writ of Mandamus/Prohibition Date of Hrg: 12/11/17	1634-1641
7	Motion to Compel Production of Discovery & Brady Material Date of Hrg: 08/23/17	1302-1354
8	Motion to Continue Trial Date	
9	Date of Hrg: 10/26/16	1247-1250
10	Motion to Continue Trial Date Date of Hrg: 01/10/18	1736-1739
11	Motion to Dismiss Counts for Violation of Statute of Limitations	
12	Date of Hrg: 08/23/17	1390-1454
13	Motion to Sever Date of Hrg: 12/04/17	1554-1583
14	Notice of Appeal filed 06/14/19	
15		2373 2370
16	Opposition to Motion to Strike Expert Witness Notice Date of Hrg: 08/22/18	1934-1938
17	Opposition to State's Motion to Amend Criminal Information filed 10/05/16	1195-1201
18	Opposition to State's Motion to Clarify and/or Motion to Reconsider Date of Hrg: 08/22/18	1849-1890
19	Order filed 03/31/16	1093-1094
20	Order Denying Defendant's Motions of December 12/11/17	
21	Date of Hrg: 12/11/17	1677-1678
22	Order for Production of Inmate filed 07/10/15	115-116
23	Order for Production of Inmate filed 08/22/17	1524-1525
24	Order for Production of Inmate filed 08/25/17	1526-1527
25	Order for Production of Inmate filed 02/01/19	2158-2159
26	Order for Production of Inmate filed 02/04/19	2160-2161
27	Order for Production of Inmate filed 02/06/19	2165-2166
28		

1 2	Order Granting State's Motion in Limine to Present the Complete Story of the Crime and Motion to Admit Evidence of Other Sexual Offenses and or Evidence of Other Crimes, Wrongs or Acts	
	Date of Hrg: 09/25/17	1522-1523
3	Order Granting State's Motion to Strike Expert Witness Date of Hrg: 08/22/18	1939-1940
5	Order to Show Cause RE: Contempt filed 09/06/18	2011-2039
6	Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus filed 03/18/16	1053-1092
7	Receipt of Copy filed 08/23/17	1528
8	Receipt of Copy filed 09/13/17	1551
9	Receipt of Copy filed 03/08/18	1740
10	Receipt of Copy filed 09/05/18	2010
11	Receipt of Copy filed 09/18/18	2040
12	Receipt of Copy filed 12/17/18	2045-2046
13	Receipt of Copy filed 01/23/19	2062
14	Reply to State's Opposition to Motion to Dismiss Counts for Violation of Statute of Limitations filed 08/28/17	1455-1461
1516	Return to Writ of Habeas Corpus Date of Hrg: 05/16/16	1095-1141
17	Second Amended Criminal Complaint filed 12/18/14	14-33
18	Second Amended Information filed 09/05/18	1959-2001
19	State's Amended Fourth Supplemental Notice of Witnesses and/or Expert Witnesses filed 01/22/19	2047-2061
2021	State's Fourth Supplemental Notice of Witnesses and/or Expert Witnesses filed 12/12/18	2041-2044
22	State's Memorandum of Points and Authorities in Support of	
23	Bindover After Preliminary Hearing Date of Hrg: 11/20/15	827-916
24	State's Motion for Clarification and Supplement to Prior Motion in Limine to	
25	Present the Complete Story of the Crime and Motion to Admit Evidence of Other Sexual Crimes and/or Evidence of Other Crimes, Wrongs or Acts	
26	Date of Hrg: 08/27/18	1/04-1848
27	State's Motion to Strike Defendant's Notice of Expert Witnesses Date of Hrg: 09/05/18	2002-2009
28		

1 2	State's Notice of Motion and Motion in Limine to Present the Complete Story of the Crime and Motion to Admit Evidence of Other Sexual Offenses and/or Evidence of Other Crimes, Wrongs or Acts	
3	Date of Hrg: 08/06/17	1462-1521
4	State's Notice of Motion and Motion to Strike Defendant's Notice of Expert Witnesses, on an Order Shortening Time Date of Hrg: 08/15/18	1907 1022
5	State's Notice of Witnesses and/or Expert Witnesses filed 08/08/17	
6	State's Opposition to Defendant's Motion for Directed Verdict	13/1 130/
7	Date of Hrg: 02/15/19	2247-2252
8 9	State's Opposition to Defendant's Motion for Juror Questionnaire Date of Hrg: 01/03/18	1702-1730
10	State's Opposition to Defendant's Motion for Stay Pending Resolution of Defendant's Petition for Writ of Mandamus/Prohibition Date of Hrg: 12/11/17	1642-1674
11 12	State's Opposition to Defendant's Motion to Compel Production of Discovery and Brady Material Date of Hrg: 08/16/17	1255 1270
13 14	State's Opposition to Defendant's Motion to Continue Trial Date of Hrg: 09/06/17	
15	State's Opposition to Defendant's Motion to Sever Date of Hrg: 12/04/17	
16 17	State's Second Supplemental Notice of Witnesses and/or Expert Witnesses filed 08/31/18	1951-1954
18 19	State's Supplemental Memorandum Points and Authorities Opposing Bindover After Preliminary Hearing Date of Hrg: 12/14/15	934-966
20	State's Supplemental Notice of Witnesses and/or Expert Witnesses filed 07/17/18	1743-1763
21 22	State's Third Supplemental Notice of Witnesses and/or Expert Witnesses filed 09/04/18	1955-1958
23	State's Trial Memorandum filed 02/15/19	2253-2263
24 25	Stipulation and Order Regarding Discovery of Child Pornographic Materials filed 02/19/15	112-114
26	Supplement to State's Return to Writ of Habeas Corpus and Motion to Amend Criminal Information Date of Hrg: 08/10/16	1142-1194
27 28	Third Amended Criminal Complaint filed 12/15/15	

1	Third Amended Information filed 01/23/19
2	Verdict filed 02/21/19
3	TD ANCCDIDEC
4	<u>TRANSCRIPTS</u>
5	Recorder's Transcript JURY TRIAL DAY 1
6	Date of Hrg: 09/05/18
7	Recorder's Transcript JURY TRIAL DAY 2
8	Date of Hrg: 09/06/18
9	Recorder's Transcript JURY TRIAL DAY 3
10	Date of Hrg: 09/07/18
11	Recorder's Transcript JURY TRIAL DAY 1
12	Date of Hrg: 01/28/19
13	Recorder's Transcript JURY TRIAL DAY 2
14	Date of Hrg: 01/29/19
15	Recorder's Transcript JURY TRIAL DAY 3
16	Date of Hrg: 01/30/19
17	Recorder's Transcript JURY TRIAL DAY 4
18	Date of Hrg: 01/31/19
19	Recorder's Transcript JURY TRIAL DAY 5
20	Date of Hrg: 02/01/19
21	Recorder's Transcript JURY TRIAL DAY 6
22	Date of Hrg: 02/04/19
23	Recorder's Transcript JURY TRIAL DAY 7
24	Date of Hrg: 02/05/19
25	Recorder's Transcript JURY TRIAL DAY 8
26	Date of Hrg: 02/06/19
27	Recorder's Transcript JURY TRIAL DAY 9
28	Date of Hrg: 02/07/19

1 2	Recorder's Transcript JURY TRIAL DAY 10 Date of Hrg: 02/08/19	5386_5600
		5560-5077
3	Recorder's Transcript JURY TRIAL DAY 11	
4	Date of Hrg: 02/11/19	5700-5979
5	Recorder's Transcript JURY TRIAL DAY 12	
6	Date of Hrg: 02/13/19	5980-6200
7	Recorder's Transcript	
8	JURY TRIAL DAY 13 Date of Hrg: 02/14/19	6201-6399
9	Recorder's Transcript JURY TRIAL DAY 14	
10	Date of Hrg: 02/15/19	6400-6432
11	Recorder's Transcript JURY TRIAL DAY 15	
12	Date of Hrg: 02/19/19	6433-6676
13	Recorder's Transcript JURY TRIAL DAY 16	
14	Date of Hrg: 02/20/19	6677-6682
15	Recorder's Transcript JURY TRIAL DAY 17	
16	Date of Hrg: 02/21/19	6683-6711
17	Recorder's Transcript	
18	All Pending Motions Date of Hrg: 08/22/18	2621-2690
19	Recorder's Transcript Arraignment	
20	Date of Hrg: 01/20/16	2490-2499
21	Recorder's Transcript Calendar Call	
22	Date of Hrg: 08/29/18	2691-2721
23	Recorder's Transcript Calendar Call	
24	Date of Hrg: 01/23/19	3240-3246
25	Recorder's Transcript Calendar Call and All Pending Motions	
26	Calendar Call and All Pending Motions Date of Hrg: 09/06/17	2549-2561
27	Recorder's Transcript Defendant's Motion for Jura Questionnaire	
28	Defendant's Motion for Juror Questionnaire Date of Hrg: 01/03/18	2569-2573

1 2	Recorder's Transcript Defendant's Motion to Compel Production of Discovery and Brady Material
3	Date of Hrg: 08/16/17
4	Recorder's Transcript Defendant's Motion to Dismiss Counts for
5	Violation of Statute of Limitations Date of Hrg: 08/23/17
6 7	Recorder's Transcript Defendant's Motion to Sever Date of Hrg: 12/04/17
8	Recorder's Transcript
9	Defendant's Motion to Stay Pending Resolution of Defendant's Petition for Writ of Mandamus/Prohibition;
10	Defendant's Motion to Sever Date of Hrg: 12/11/17
11	Recorder's Transcript
12	Defendant's Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus Date of Hrg: 04/04/16
13	Recorder's Transcript
14	Defendant's Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus Date of Hrg: 06/06/16
15	Recorder's Transcript
16	Defendant's Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus Date of Hrg: 07/13/16
17	Recorder's Transcript
	Further Proceedings: Defendant's Petition for
18	Writ of Habeas Corpus Date of Hrg: 10/12/162516-2524
19	
20	Recorder's Transcript Further Proceedings: Defendant's Petition for
	Writ of Habeas Corpus-Count 97
21	Date of Hrg: 08/29/16
22	Recorder's Transcript
23	Initial Arraignment Date of Hrg: 01/05/16
24	Recorder's Transcript
25	Pre-Trial Conference Date of Hrg: 08/09/17
26	Recorder's Transcript
27	Pre-Trial Conference Date of Hrg: 08/01/18
28	
20	

1 2	Recorder's Transcript Pre-Trial Conference Date of Hrg: 12/12/18
3	Recorder's Transcript
	Sentencing
4	Date of Hrg: 04/29/19
5	Recorder's Transcript Sentencing
6	Date of Hrg: 05/28/19
7	Recorder's Transcript
8	Show Cause Hearing Date of Hrg: 09/26/18
9	Recorder's Transcript
10	Status Check: Expert Issues Date of Hrg: 12/19/18
11	Recorder's Transcript
12	Status Check: Juror Questionnaire Date of Hrg: 01/31/18
13	Recorder's Transcript
	Status Check: Juror Ouestionnaire
14	Date of Hrg: 08/15/18
15	Recorder's Transcript Status Check: Outstanding Discover/Finalizing Jury Questionnaire
16	Date of Hrg: 03/07/18
17	Recorder's Transcript
18	Status Check: Trial Setting; Defendant's Motion for Juror Questionnaire
19	Date of Hrg: 01/24/18
	Recorder's Transcript
20	Status Check: Trial Setting; Defendant's Motion to Continue Trial Date
21	Date of Hrg: 10/26/16
22	Reporter's Transcript
23	Argument and Bindover Date of Hrg: 12/15/15
24	Reporter's Transcript
25	Motions Date of Hrg: 07/13/15
26	Reporter's Transcript
27	Preliminary Hearing Vol. I Date of Hrg: 08/27/15
28	

1	Reporter's Transcript
2	Preliminary Hearing Vol. II Date of Hrg: 08/28/15
3	Reporter's Transcript
4	Reporter's Transcript Preliminary Hearing Vol. III Date of Hrg: 09/03/15
5	
6	Reporter's Transcript Preliminary Hearing Vol. IV Date of Hrg: 09/18/15
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	

```
I can put together the story, because I guess it goes back to
 1
 2
    work, you know, if I'm investigating a situation, you know,
 3
    two people come back and they're saying the story and again,
    it sounds very rehearsed then I'm like, eh, you guys, what
 4
 5
    else is going on?
 6
              MS. RADOSTA:
                            Right.
 7
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 152: And I might ask some
 8
    other folks like just a relationship with the person, you
 9
    know, is there a vendetta --
10
              MS. RADOSTA: Okay.
11
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 152: -- against them, because
12
    I base that --
13
              MS. RADOSTA:
                            Okay.
                                         -- you know, in the --
14
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 152:
15
              MS. RADOSTA: All right.
16
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 152: -- [inaudible].
              MS. RADOSTA: So --
17
18
              THE COURT: Ms. Radosta?
19
              MS. RADOSTA:
                           Yes.
20
              THE COURT: Can you -- parties approach.
21
                     (Off-record bench conference)
22
              MS. RADOSTA: And I'm sorry, now I've lost -- sorry,
23
    let me get my train of thought back.
24
              You were -- you were relating a situation that you
25
    had had at work where you had had to try to figure out what
```

```
was going on between at least two employees and maybe more.
 1
 2
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 152: Right.
              MS. RADOSTA: And I think you had said something
 3
    along the lines of it seemed a little too rehearsed between
 4
 5
    the two people --
 6
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 152: Right.
 7
              MS. RADOSTA: -- like maybe they had gotten together
 8
    and gotten their stories straight before they came to you?
 9
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 152: Right.
10
              MS. RADOSTA: Is that a "yes"?
11
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 152: Yes, ma'am.
12
              MS. RADOSTA:
                            Okay. So are you in a position at
13
    work where you're in a supervisory position?
14
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 152: Yes, ma'am.
15
              MS. RADOSTA: Overseeing other -- other chefs or
16
    other wait staff?
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 152:
17
                                         Cooks.
18
              MS. RADOSTA: Other cooks?
19
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 152:
20
              MS. RADOSTA: Okay. So have you had to make
21
    decisions like that where you're kind of trying to figure it
    all out in more than one occasion?
22
23
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 152: Oh, yes.
24
              MS. RADOSTA: And so you've done your own
25
    investigation, I assume?
```

```
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 152: Yes, ma'am.
 1
 2
              MS. RADOSTA: As you just said, you then talk to
 3
    other people sometimes?
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 152: Yes, ma'am.
 4
 5
              MS. RADOSTA: And you are comfortable in that role
 6
    at work?
 7
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 152: Yes, ma'am.
 8
              MS. RADOSTA: I mean, I'm sure you don't love it,
 9
   but it is something that --
10
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 152: Oh, I love it.
11
              MS. RADOSTA: -- oh, you love it.
12
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 152: Yeah.
13
              MS. RADOSTA: Okay. What part of it do you love,
14
    just the -- the figuring it all out or just being able to like
15
    settle a dispute?
16
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 152: Just settling the
17
    dispute.
18
              MS. RADOSTA:
                            Okay. Okay. The fact that you have
19
    four sons --
20
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 152: Um-hum.
21
              MS. RADOSTA: -- leads me to ask if some of the
22
    alleged victims that are coming in here are boys, young men,
23
    some of them say things may have happened to them around the
24
    ages of your sons --
25
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 152: Um-hum.
```

```
MS. RADOSTA: -- do you think that that would be
 1
 2
    difficult for you to listen to just -- I mean, you're one of
 3
    the few people in here with all sons in your family, so.
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 152: Right.
 4
 5
              MS. RADOSTA: Do you think that that would be a
 6
   problem for you or --?
 7
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 152: No, ma'am.
 8
              MS. RADOSTA: It wouldn't enter -- you wouldn't be
9
    thinking about your boys when --
10
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 152:
                                          No.
11
              MS. RADOSTA: -- the testimony was happening?
12
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 152:
                                          No.
13
              MS. RADOSTA: All right. Thank you.
14
              Okay. I think that's all I have for your Mr. --
15
    thank you.
16
              Ms. Turner?
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 153: Yes.
17
18
              MS. RADOSTA: I just wanted to follow up with you a
19
    little bit. You said that you have a friend that was -- I
20
    think they still are --
21
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 153: Correct. He's still
    incarcerated.
22
23
              MS. RADOSTA: -- still incarcerated. And you do go
24
    up and visit him?
25
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 153: I do.
```

MS. RADOSTA: Okay. And but you do feel though that 1 that it was an appropriate sentence --2 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 153: Correct. 3 MS. RADOSTA: -- for your friend? Okay. Did you 4 5 participate at all in his -- in the court case? 6 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 153: No. 7 MS. RADOSTA: Did you speak on his behalf at 8 sentencing? PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 153: No. 10 MS. RADOSTA: Okay. Did you know what was going on 11 when it was going on or just after the fact? 12 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 153: No, I knew about it when 13 it was going on. I didn't know details, I only knew what was 14 on the news. 15 MS. RADOSTA: Okay. Okay. And that must have been a bit of a shock the first time you see something on the news 16 like that of a -- with a friend? 17 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 153: Yeah. 18 19 MS. RADOSTA: Yeah. I mean, it's just like wait a 20 minute, I know that name. That's not -- that's not where I 21 expected to hear his name. 22 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 153: Right. 23 MS. RADOSTA: Okay. Did you -- did -- how did you 24 get in touch with him in order to start going to visit; was it 25 when he was still down here locally or?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 153: Yeah, I reached out to 1 2 him. 3 Okay. And you also have a 17-year old MS. RADOSTA: 4 son. 5 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 153: Correct. 6 MS. RADOSTA: So same similar question to what I 7 just asked Mr. Wells-Thompson. We're going to have some young 8 men coming in here as some of the potential witnesses. Do you think that the age range of your son, if these young men are similarly aged, is that going to have an impact on you to 10 listen to them? 11 12 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 153: No, that won't have a 13 I do want to piggyback off of something that you guys 14 keep speaking on --15 MS. RADOSTA: Sure. 16 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 153: -- which is the video. 17 MS. RADOSTA: Okav. 18 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 153: I'm okay with watching 19 it the first time. I don't want to have to repeatedly watch 20 it because I figure if we're watching it the first time, we're 21 watching it for details and to find out what is going on. 22 I don't want to have to be put in the back to watch it three, 23 four, five times. 24 MS. RADOSTA: Okay. What if -- and I appreciate 25 your point, and thank you for sharing that. What if I point

out or make an argument or Mr. Lopez-Negrete makes a point about something that we say is in the video or something along those natures and you didn't see that; would you be inclined in that situation to go back and look and go, why --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 153: Yeah.

MS. RADOSTA: -- so I appreciate you don't want to just for, you know, just because I say, go watch it, you're not going to necessarily go watch it. But if I point out something and raise a question in your mind would you be open?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 153: I'm open to it. I will go back to it if we can fast forward to that detail, then yes, that's not a problem.

MS. RADOSTA: Okay.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 153: But to have to watch the whole long five minutes or 30 minutes, it's like, we just watched it.

MS. RADOSTA: Okay. And why are you hesitant to -to -- and I know this might sounds like a somewhat silly
question, but why would you be hesitant to want to watch it
more than one time?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 153: That's -- if it's kiddy porn I don't want to watch it multiple times.

MS. RADOSTA: Okay. Even if it is something as important as the State has to prove somebody guilty beyond a reasonable doubt and I'm standing up here and saying, but you

know what, I know that there's some stuff on that video but you've got to watch it again because there's more to it.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 153: If I was told like that, then I'll have to sit down and watch it again.

MS. RADOSTA: Okay. Is it possible, as well, that - and -- and is it -- is it possible that the first time that
you're watching something -- and we don't necessarily have to
talk specifically about the videos in this case -- but let's
say, you know, some movie that you've watched where there's a
surprise ending at the end, and then you watch the movie a
second time, and then you see all of these other things that
lead you right to the ending, but you didn't see them the
first time?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 153: It happens, but if it's a surprise ending that I didn't like I won't watch it all the way to the end.

MS. RADOSTA: Fair enough. Fair enough. I certainly understand that. But is it -- is it possible that the first time that you could watch something as graphic as -- as what this potentially could be, the -- you've read the synopsis, that you almost might be distracted the first time it's played, with just the fact that it's on and oh my goodness, I can't believe I'm on this jury trial and oh my word and not really paying as close attention to it as maybe you should be.

```
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 153: Me personally, no.
 1
 2
              MS. RADOSTA:
                            Right.
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 153: Because I know we're
 3
 4
    here to --
 5
              MS. RADOSTA:
                            Okay.
 6
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 153: -- watch for the facts.
 7
    We're not here for anything other than that, but the facts
 8
    and --
 9
              MS. RADOSTA:
                            Okay.
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 153: -- that to be fact.
10
11
              MS. RADOSTA: Do you think you might actually be
12
   paying even closer attention to it because of the possibility
13
    that I might stand up here and ask you to watch it a second
14
    time?
15
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 153: Yes.
16
              MS. RADOSTA: Okay. All right. And that's -- and
17
    that's fair. If you feel that you have watched it closely
18
    enough, you know, that that's your purview as a juror, it
19
    doesn't mean I'm -- I might not say it, but I appreciate your
20
    -- your honesty. Thank you, Ms. Turner.
21
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 153: You're welcome.
22
              MS. RADOSTA: Mr. Finn, Juror No. 154.
23
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 154: Yes, ma'am.
24
              MS. RADOSTA: You -- I'm curious. You say that
25
    you're working on the F22s.
```

```
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 154: Yes, ma'am.
 1
 2
              MS. RADOSTA: Did you ever fly the F-22s?
 3
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 154:
                                         No, ma'am.
              MS. RADOSTA: No?
                                Never?
 4
 5
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 154: Strictly a maintenance
 6
    guy.
 7
              MS. RADOSTA: Okay. And you are retired U.S. Air
 8
    Force and now working as a civil contractor?
 9
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 154: Retired active duty and
10
   basically doing similarly the same job --
11
              MS. RADOSTA: Okay.
12
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 154: -- just in a civil
    service matter.
13
14
              MS. RADOSTA: Okay. And you have adult daughters;
15
    correct?
16
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 154: Yes.
17
              MS. RADOSTA: Do you have any grandkids?
18
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 154: I do have two grandkids.
19
              MS. RADOSTA: Okay. And what are their ages?
20
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 154: One's two-and-a-half and
21
    one's almost one.
              MS. RADOSTA: Okay. And your daughter's ages again?
22
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 154: 28 and 29.
23
24
              MS. RADOSTA: Okay. Do you -- I mean, we've touched
25
    on this with a lot of people -- the fact that you have kids
```

```
and grandkids, and just the nature of this --
 1
 2
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 154: Right.
              MS. RADOSTA: -- the nature of this case and the --
 3
 4
    the synopsis that was in the Jury Questionnaire, do you think
 5
    it's something that you can set aside your -- your grandpa
 6
    feelings and your --
 7
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 154:
 8
              MS. RADOSTA: -- father feelings and be objective?
 9
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 154: Yes.
              MS. RADOSTA: Okay. Is there any situation that you
10
11
    could imagine hurting your child purposefully?
12
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 154:
13
              MS. RADOSTA: Or your grandchildren?
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 154:
14
                                         No.
15
              MS. RADOSTA: No. Even if it was a matter of you
16
    versus, you know, hurt -- hurt your child or hurt you, would
17
    you -- what choice would you make in that scenario?
18
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 154: I'd want them to hurt
19
    me --
20
              MS. RADOSTA: All right.
21
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 154: -- and protect the kids.
22
              MS. RADOSTA: Okay. Do you think that that's a
23
    normal reaction as a parent and grandparent?
24
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 154: I would hope so.
25
              MS. RADOSTA: Okay. All right. Thank you, Mr.
```

1 Finn. 2 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 154: Yes. MS. RADOSTA: Actually, I think it might be easiest 3 4 to just pass the mic down to Mr. Drosdahl. 5 Mr. Drosdahl, you -- you actually volunteered some 6 information yesterday, I believe, or maybe it was even the day 7 before, that when we were talking about witnesses and people 8 telling these stories and I think you had said, you know, some people might have -- you think -- you thought it was worth noting that some people might have an ulterior motive. 10 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 255: Yes. 11 12 MS. RADOSTA: Some witnesses might have an ulterior 13 motive. 14 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 255: That's correct. 15 MS. RADOSTA: Okay. What type of ulterior motives 16 could you imagine a witness having? 17 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 255: Having an axe to grind 18 for whatever reason. 19 MS. RADOSTA: Okay. 20 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 255: Holding a grudge, it 21 could be a million things. 22 MS. RADOSTA: Okay. How do you -- do you think 23 you'd be able to tell if a witness had an ulterior motive? 24 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 255: Probably not if it

wasn't brought up as evidence during the trial.

25

MS. RADOSTA: Okay. Do you think when you're -- if 1 2 you would be selected to be on this jury, when you were 3 watching people testify would it -- would you be kind of like tilting your head a little bit and going, hum, I wonder what 4 5 that's about, or would you just be listening and waiting for 6 us to ask questions? 7 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 255: The latter. 8 MS. RADOSTA: Okay. Waiting for us to bring out 9 things of that nature? 10 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 255: Yes. 11 MS. RADOSTA: Okay. But you did indicate on your Jury Questionnaire that you believe that my client is innocent 12 13 until proven guilty? 14 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 255: Yes. 15 MS. RADOSTA: Okay. And that the State has the 16 burden to prove him guilty; correct? 17 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 255: Yes. 18 MS. RADOSTA: As he sits there today, do you see --19 what do you see? 20 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 255: An innocent man. 21 MS. RADOSTA: Okay. And if I, as I asked a few 22 other people earlier, if I didn't ask any questions, if I 23 didn't bring any ulterior motives to light but stood up at the 24 end of it all and said, the State did not prove these charges

beyond a reasonable doubt, would you be comfortable with me

25

having done my job that way? 1 2 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 255: It would depend on the 3 strength of the State's evidence, I believe. 4 MS. RADOSTA: Okay. But you understand that I have 5 no obligation in the eyes of the Court to do anything more 6 than make the State prove their case? 7 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 255: Yes, I understand that. 8 MS. RADOSTA: Okay. If you were selected as a juror 9 in this case and we went back in the jury -- you were -- went 10 back in the jury deliberation room and somebody back there 11 said, oh my gosh, you know, Ms. Radosta, Mr. Negrete, they've 12 -- they really just didn't do anything, and you could tell that they didn't want to do anything; what would your response 13 14 to that be? PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 255: Consider the evidence. 15 16 MS. RADOSTA: Okay. Would you remind anybody that 17 it's not -- that it's the State's burden? 18 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 255: Absolutely. 19 MS. RADOSTA: Okay. Would you be comfortable 20 expressing that to other jurors if they were saying anything 21 that you might disagree with? 22 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 255: Yes. 23 MS. RADOSTA: Okay. All right. Thank you, Mr. 24 Drosdahl. 25 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 255: You're welcome.

MS. RADOSTA: And then I actually would like to 1 2 speak to Mr. Johnson-George, 252. 3 You've been very, very quiet. I almost forgot you were there. I think you learned from Ms. Cornwell earlier 4 5 that, you know, yeah, that you don't talk too much and you 6 kind of -- you can just kind of -- yeah. 7 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 252: Exactly. 8 MS. RADOSTA: You -- I saw you actually when she 9 kept getting called on you were like, why do you -- why do you 10 keep nodding your head? So you indicated that you did have a friend that had 11 12 a bad experience --13 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 252: Yes. 14 MS. RADOSTA: -- is that correct? 15 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 252: Yes. 16 MS. RADOSTA: That they -- was it a -- I believe 17 that you said that he or she was raped by their brother? PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 252: Yes. 18 19 MS. RADOSTA: Okay. How long ago did this incident 20 happen, if you know? 21 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 252: I mean, well, she's in 22 her 20s now and this happened probably like when she was --23 I'd say like maybe like 10 or younger maybe. 24 MS. RADOSTA: Okay. Okay. And it was a brother 25 that was living in the home with her, if you know?

1	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 252: I assume so.	
2	MS. RADOSTA: Okay.	
3	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 252: I think so.	
4	MS. RADOSTA: Did you hear the story directly from	
5	your friend	
6	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 252: Yes.	
7	MS. RADOSTA: or did you hear it through okay.	
8	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 252: Yeah, from her.	
9	MS. RADOSTA: Okay. How long ago did you hear the	
10	story?	
11	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 252: This was when we were in	
12	high school, so it had to be at least at least seven or so	
13	years ago.	
14	MS. RADOSTA: Okay. Are you still friends with her	
15	now?	
16	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 252: Yes.	
17	MS. RADOSTA: Okay. Is it something that she's ever	
18	talked about again with you?	
19	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 252: Not in any further	
2.0	detail, but I've heard it like multiple times.	
21	MS. RADOSTA: Okay. Since you're friends with her,	
22	did you know her brother?	
23	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 252: No.	
24	MS. RADOSTA: Okay. And when she when she told	
25	you the story was it just in passing or did was something	

```
-- did something happen and she's like, I need to share
 1
 2
    something with you?
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 252: I mean, it wasn't like
 3
    in a serious -- okay, well, okay, basically, we were kind of
 4
 5
    -- it was a discussion about like our first like sexual
 6
    experiences or whatever --
 7
              MS. RADOSTA:
                            Um-hum.
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 252: -- and then hers was
 8
 9
    just like oh, well, my first time I was raped and I was just
10
    like, oh.
11
              MS. RADOSTA:
                            Oh, yeah. Was it just --
12
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 252: [Inaudible].
              MS. RADOSTA: -- the two of you or was it a group?
13
14
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 252: It was like a group --
15
              MS. RADOSTA: Okay.
16
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 252: -- thing.
17
              MS. RADOSTA: Did -- I'm guessing that kind of
18
    stopped the conversation a little bit, or no?
19
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 252: No.
20
              MS. RADOSTA: No? Okay. Did you ever have a
21
    separate conversation with her just you and she alone?
22
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 252: Yes.
23
              MS. RADOSTA: Okay. That same night or another --
24
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 252: No, like later.
25
   been --
```

```
MS. RADOSTA: Later on?
 1
 2
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 252: -- yeah, it's come up
 3
    again.
                            Okay. Was there ever -- when she said
              MS. RADOSTA:
 4
 5
    it in that environment with other people around was there any
 6
   part of you that thought, I don't know if I believe her, or
 7
    did you automatically believe her?
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 252: I believed her.
 8
 9
              MS. RADOSTA: Okay. Even though that was kind of an
    odd way to reveal it, in public, in front of a bunch of
10
11
   people?
12
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 252: Yeah, even though -- I -
13
    - I -- I don't know if I would say that kind of made me --
14
    well, I won't say it made me believe her more, but it was just
15
    kind of like a -- I don't know, but it -- I didn't take that
16
    into account like oh, wow, you're saying this in front of
17
    other people or you're -- that's probably not true.
    didn't --
18
19
              MS. RADOSTA:
                            Well --
20
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 252: -- think about that.
21
              MS. RADOSTA: -- is it fair to say that there was
22
    just something in the way she told it that made her believable
23
    to you?
24
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 252: Yes.
25
              MS. RADOSTA: Okay. And she was a friend that you
```

```
knew well enough that you could tell if she was lying or not
 1
 2
    lying?
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 252:
 3
                                          Yes.
              MS. RADOSTA:
                            Okav.
 4
 5
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 252:
                                          Absolutely.
 6
              MS. RADOSTA: All right. That's fair enough.
 7
              THE COURT: Ms. Radosta, let's take a 15-minute
 8
   break; all right?
 9
              MS. RADOSTA:
                            Okay.
              THE COURT: Give everybody a chance to stretch.
10
11
    hear everybody moving around over there and --
12
              MS. RADOSTA:
                            Okay.
13
              THE COURT: -- I -- I think the jurors in the front,
14
    too, these chairs aren't as comfortable --
15
                                     They're not comfortable.
              UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:
16
              THE COURT: -- as the ones back there.
17
              UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Can we rotate?
18
              THE COURT: So once again, ladies and gentlemen,
19
    during this recess you're admonished not to talk or converse
20
    amongst yourselves with anyone else on any subject connected
21
    with this trial. You're not to read, watch or listen to any
22
    report or commentary on this trial or any person connected
23
    with this trial by any medium of information including without
24
    limitation to newspapers, television the Internet or radio, or
25
    form or express any opinion on subject connected with this
```

trial until it is finally submitted to you. 1 2 It's now -- let's say -- let's say be back and ready 3 to get going by 2:30; okay? All right. We'll be at ease while the jury exits the courtroom. 4 5 (Outside the presence of the prospective jurors) 6 THE COURT: Okay. We're outside the presence of the 7 Be ready to come back by -- by 2:30. Does anybody need jury. 8 to put anything on the record at this time? 9 MS. RADOSTA: No, Your Honor. 10 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. We're off the 11 record. 12 (Court recessed at 2:12 P.M., until 2:32 P.M.) 13 (Outside the presence of the prospective jurors) 14 THE COURT: All right. Do you want to go ahead and 15 get the jury back in? 16 THE MARSHAL: Yes. (Pause in the proceedings) 17 18 THE MARSHAL: All rise for the prospective jury. 19 (Inside the presence of the prospective jury) 20 THE COURT: Okay. Everybody go ahead and have a 21 seat. We're back on the record in the case of the State of 22 Nevada versus Christopher Sena in C-311453. I'd like the 23 record to reflect the presence of the defendant and his 24 counsel, as well as the State and their counsel, and all 25 members of the prospective jury panel.

```
Do the parties stipulate to the prospective jury
 1
 2
    panel?
 3
                            Yes, Judge.
              MR. SWEETIN:
              MS. RADOSTA:
                            Yes, Judge.
 4
 5
              THE COURT: Ms. Radosta, before you go any further,
 6
    I received a note from my Marshal with regards to Mr. Faller.
 7
              Mr. Faller, it indicates that you believe that you
 8
    -- you've remembered that you were once a victim of a crime.
    When I was speaking to you before you indicated that -- that
    your family was a victim of home burglary and -- your sister
10
11
    was a victim of a home burglary and car burglary.
12
    something additional?
13
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 521: Yes, sir.
14
              THE COURT:
                          Okay. What do you want to tell us?
15
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 521: I quess, I would have
16
    been the victim of, I guess it would be armed robbery.
17
              THE COURT: Okay. When did that happen?
18
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 521: In between probably 15
19
    and 20 years ago.
20
              THE COURT: Okay. Here in Las Vegas?
21
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 521:
                                          No.
              THE COURT: Where did it occur?
22
23
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 521: In Illinois.
24
              THE COURT: Okay.
                                 When we were talking about it
25
    yesterday, is -- can you think of any reason that you might
```

```
have not remembered it and -- and then remembered it today or?
 1
 2
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 521: Partly just because I
 3
    was going through that whole list of --
              THE COURT: Yeah.
 4
 5
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 521: -- things and it just
 6
    got lost.
 7
              THE COURT:
                          Okay.
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 521: And it wasn't that
 8
 9
    important --
10
              THE COURT:
                          Okay.
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 521: -- to me.
11
12
              THE COURT: Okay. All right. So -- so then that
13
    leads me to my next question that I've asked everyone; is
14
    there anything about that incident that you think would affect
15
    your ability to be fair and impartial in this matter?
16
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 521:
                                          No.
17
              THE COURT: Okay. Did they catch anybody?
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 521:
18
19
              THE COURT: All right. How old were you?
20
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 521: In between -- or roughly
21
    25.
                          Okay. So were you still in school?
22
              THE COURT:
23
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 521: No.
24
              THE COURT: All right. Okay. Somebody put a gun
25
    your face or what --
```

```
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 521: We had a poker game that
 1
 2
    was robbed.
 3
              THE COURT:
                                 So while you were involved in a
                          Okay.
   poker game somebody showed up there with a --
 4
 5
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 521: Yes, multiple
 6
    individuals with guns.
 7
              THE COURT: Okay.
 8
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 521: Held us up.
 9
              THE COURT: All right. And so you weren't the only
10
    one that was -- was involved in that as a victim of a robbery
11
    in that case?
12
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 521:
13
              THE COURT: Okay. And you're saying that -- that
    nothing about that particular case you think would affect your
14
15
    ability to be fair and impartial here?
16
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 521: No.
17
              THE COURT: Okay. All right.
18
              Ms. Radosta?
19
              MS. RADOSTA:
                            Thank you. Actually, as long as --
20
    Mr. Faller, as long as you have the mic, I wasn't quite up to
21
    you but I'm -- I'll just keep it there.
22
              I'm kind of curious -- I'm sorry, I don't have my
23
    note for you right in front of me right now -- you say you
24
    were working as an analyst and writer about Fantasy Football?
25
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 521: Yes.
                                                And the NFL.
```

```
MS. RADOSTA: And the NFL?
 1
 2
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 521: Yes.
 3
                            Okay. So -- and you also, I think,
              MS. RADOSTA:
   mentioned -- listed on your -- on your Jury Questionnaire
 4
 5
   professional gambler?
 6
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 521: I was at one time, yes.
 7
              MS. RADOSTA: Okay. What -- in poker, I'm assuming,
 8
    or --
 9
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 521: Yes.
10
              MS. RADOSTA: -- sports betting?
                                                Poker?
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 521: Poker.
11
12
                            Is that what brought you to Las Vegas?
              MS. RADOSTA:
13
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 521: Kind of. I was out of
14
    school --
15
              MS. RADOSTA:
                            Okay.
16
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 521: -- and I hadn't got a
              So we came for the World Series of Poker --
17
    job yet.
18
              MS. RADOSTA:
                            Um-hum.
19
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 521: -- in June, I believe it
20
    was June. But it was about like six months after I graduated.
21
              MS. RADOSTA: Okay.
22
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 521: And I hadn't yet had a
23
    job there so I figured I could stay here as well as where I
24
    was at --
25
              MS. RADOSTA:
                            Sure.
```

```
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 521: -- looking for a job.
 1
 2
              MS. RADOSTA: And, I'm sorry, you're from --
 3
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 521: Originally, Illinois.
              MS. RADOSTA: Okay. And you went to school in
 4
 5
    Illinois, or no?
 6
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 521: I did my bachelors in
 7
    Illinois, at the University of Illinois and I did my Masters
 8
    at the University of Oregon.
 9
              MS. RADOSTA: Okay. So when you said you came here
10
    to Vegas and you could just as easily stay here and look for a
11
    job as staying there, where is there?
12
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 521: Oregon at the time.
13
              MS. RADOSTA: At the time, Oregon. Vegas a little
14
   bit more fun than Oregon looking for a job?
15
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 521: Yeah, it's different.
16
              MS. RADOSTA: And so you decided to stay here. Did
17
    you play in the World Series of Poker that year or were you
18
    just here to watch?
19
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 521: I was playing.
20
              MS. RADOSTA: Okay. And so it sounds like
21
    obviously, as you just related the story of when you -- about
22
    15 years ago there was a home poker game. Have you been
23
    playing poker for a lot of years?
24
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 521: Yes.
25
              MS. RADOSTA: Okay. And the incident back when you
```

```
were -- I'm sorry, you were how old when the poker game was
 1
 2
    robbed, maybe --
 3
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 521: Approximately, 25.
              MS. RADOSTA: Okay. So did you guys -- six, seven
 4
 5
   people at the poker game, I'm assuming, maybe more?
 6
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 521: In that range.
 7
              MS. RADOSTA:
                            In that range. And was this a weekly
 8
   poker game, people in the neighborhood knew about or?
 9
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 521: Yes.
10
              MS. RADOSTA: Okay. Was it something where it was
11
    known that there was money, a lot of money being played or
12
    being passed around the table?
13
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 521: Yes, at least by the
14
    people who played.
15
              MS. RADOSTA: Okay. Do you think or do you know if
16
    the people that -- the people or person that came in and --
17
    and robbed the poker game, did you know them?
18
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 521: It was -- they had
19
    masks --
20
              MS. RADOSTA: Okay.
21
              MR. SAVAGE: -- so we didn't know who they were.
22
    But it was suspected that someone at the -- who played at the
23
    game related the information to them.
24
              MS. RADOSTA: Okay. Did you ever get any
25
    confirmation of that --
```

1	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 521: No.
2	MS. RADOSTA: suspicion? Okay. Did you continue
3	to have that weekly poker game after that incident?
4	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 521: No.
5	MS. RADOSTA: Okay. So there was some fallout to
6	the to the incident with the with the guns?
7	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 521: Yes.
8	MS. RADOSTA: About so I think I had said like
9	six, seven people at the poker game. How many people came in
10	with guns?
11	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 521: Three.
12	MS. RADOSTA: Three? So at any point in time, was a
13	gun actually pointed directly at you?
14	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 521: I do not believe so.
15	MS. RADOSTA: Okay. Were they, the three
16	individuals with guns, were they ever pointing guns at anybody
17	or were they just kind of waving them around to the group at
18	large?
19	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 521: I didn't ever or
20	excuse me I never saw them pointed at anyone.
21	MS. RADOSTA: Okay. Give an approximation how long
22	did the entire incident last, if you recall?
23	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 521: Less than 15 minutes.
24	MS. RADOSTA: Okay. After it was done, did you guys
25	think about calling the police or no?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 521: We did. 1 2 MS. RADOSTA: Okay. And did the police show up and 3 take -- take statements from everyone? PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 521: Yes. 4 5 MS. RADOSTA: Okay. And there was just no follow up 6 because -- I'm quessing because the people wore masks or? 7 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 521: Uh, I think it was 8 primarily because they suspected the people were from Chicago and where we were at at the time was approximately three-anda-half hours south of there. 10 11 MS. RADOSTA: Okay. What --12 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 521: So they were not able to 13 recover anything. 14 MS. RADOSTA: All right. Okay. Did you find that 15 to be frustrating? 16 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 521: No. 17 MS. RADOSTA: Okay. Did you -- okay, strike that 18 last "did you". And, I'm sorry, your Masters Degree was in 19 something that I didn't expect -- economics. 20 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 521: That is correct. 21 MS. RADOSTA: Okay. So how do you get from 22 economics -- and actually, I could maybe see the -- the line 23 to Fantasy Football, the like running the -- the scenarios and 24 things of that nature. Does economics play into it at all, or 25 am I completely off base?

```
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 521: Yes. A lot -- a lot of
 1
 2
    the course work in economics deals with statistical and data
 3
    analysis and that naturally lends itself to Fantasy Football.
              MS. RADOSTA: Okay. So you are actually using your
 4
 5
    economics degree?
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 521:
 6
                                          Yes.
 7
              MS. RADOSTA: Or we are --
 8
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 521: At least a portion of
    it.
10
              MS. RADOSTA: -- because your Masters in -- in
11
    economics. Did you foresee going in this direction when you
12
    were in school for the masters?
13
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 521: Absolutely not.
14
              MS. RADOSTA: Okay. Is it something though that
15
    you're enjoying?
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 521: It is enjoyable.
16
17
              MS. RADOSTA: Okay. I might want to talk to you
   before next season because I didn't do so well this season in
18
19
   my Fantasy Football. But -- and then you also write articles
20
    just for the NFL?
21
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 521:
                                          Yes.
22
              MS. RADOSTA:
                            Is it -- are they published in like
    the NFL magazine or published on the website or --
23
24
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 521: About the NFL.
25
              MS. RADOSTA: Oh, about the NFL.
```

```
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 521: Not for the NFL.
 1
 2
              MS. RADOSTA: Okay. So are you -- are you like on
 3
    spec for your articles or do you work for a specific --
 4
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 521: For a specific website.
 5
              MS. RADOSTA: Okay. And so are you by being here
 6
    this week, right before the Super Bowl, is it impacting your
 7
   ability to write anything or -- or earn any money?
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 521: No.
 8
 9
              MS. RADOSTA: Okay. Have you already made your
   are you making predictions for the Super Bowl?
10
11
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 521: I've already made them.
12
              MS. RADOSTA: Okay. All right. I will not ask.
13
   Let me see if I had anything else for you. My apologizes, as
14
    I said, your notes weren't right in front of me.
15
    that's all I had for you, Mr. Faller.
16
              Okay.
                     Thank you. Could you actually pass it down
17
    to -- back to Ms. Cornwell? Cornwell or Cornwell?
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 245: Cornwell.
18
19
              MS. RADOSTA: Cornwell. My apologies.
20
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 245: Oh, it's fine.
21
              MS. RADOSTA: You actually related a story about
22
   your -- and I apologize if it was stepbrother or stepsister.
23
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 245: Stepbrother.
24
              MS. RADOSTA: Stepbrother and his mom.
25
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 245: Yes.
```

```
MS. RADOSTA:
                            So it's not your stepmom but his --
 1
 2
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 245: No.
 3
                            -- mom -- oh my goodness -- that was a
              MS. RADOSTA:
    "no".
 4
 5
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 245:
 6
              MS. RADOSTA: And he was living in your home with
 7
    you and your mom and your dad, I am assuming?
 8
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 245: Yes. All -- all of us
9
    kids did 50 percent off so one week -- one week so --
10
              MS. RADOSTA:
                            Okay.
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 245: we would all be in the
11
12
    same household on the same week.
13
              MS. RADOSTA: Okay. And at some point in time there
14
    was -- there was -- I believe the way you were referring to it
15
    is the stories told about your mom that simply were not true.
16
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 245: Yes.
17
              MS. RADOSTA: By your stepbrother and his mother?
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 245: Yes.
18
19
              MS. RADOSTA: And the phrase that -- that I thought
20
    I heard you say is that they -- they -- well, they got in
21
    touch with CPS, Child Protective Services, and started an
22
    investigation against your mom.
23
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 245: Yeah. So basically how
24
    -- how it all started was -- and I could be a little messy
25
   because we were all like eight years old at the time.
```

MS. RADOSTA: Okay.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 245: But it was always a rough relationship between everybody just because he was a troubled child. But he never really liked my mom and his dad being together and he was angry about it. He had gone and told -- I don't know if he told my aunt and uncle first on his dad's side or if he told his mother first. I'm not quite positive.

But they had -- like he actually bruised himself and they created evidence --

MS. RADOSTA: Okay.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 245: $\mbox{--}$ and then one of those adults had gone to CPS.

MS. RADOSTA: Okay. And that was actually the part of the story that I was curious about because I believe you actually said "created" -- "creating" or "created" bruises.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 245: Um-hum.

MS. RADOSTA: How much older -- you said you were about eight; how much older than you was he?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 245: We're actually the same age. He's only a month older than I am.

MS. RADOSTA: Okay. So at that age, eight, nine years old, he was able to create bruises on himself to make your mother get in trouble?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 245: Yes. I believe it was

between him and another cousin we have on our stepfather's side who's about three years older than us.

MS. RADOSTA: Okay.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 245: Because he was over at my aunt's and uncle's house, I think that they -- I believe what ended up being found out as they were like the older cousin helped him --

MS. RADOSTA: Okay.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 245: -- do this.

MS. RADOSTA: Okay. And is this something that -I mean, I didn't realize that you were quite that -- that you
were quite that young when this was all going on. Did you
realize what was going on at the time or is it something as
you got a little bit older that you like remember back and
asked your mom about, what was all of that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 245: No, I knew, because I don't have a good relationship with my father.

MS. RADOSTA: Okay.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 245: And I -- we were actually -- well, I can't speak for my brother, my birth brother, but --

MS. RADOSTA: Um-hum.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 245: -- I was terrified to get taken out of my mother's and my stepfather's house to have to go to my father's house.

MS. RADOSTA: Okay. Okay. And I apologize, I think 1 2 I missed that part of the story. So of course you --3 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 245: Oh, no, yeah, I don't [inaudible]. 4 5 MS. RADOSTA: -- of course you realized it at the 6 time. 7 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 245: Um-hum. 8 MS. RADOSTA: Did they ever -- did Child Protective 9 Services ever come and ask you if their -- if you had 10 experience any violence? 11 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 245: Yeah. My brother and I 12 were actually at the turning point in the case because they had come and interviewed us in our home --13 MS. RADOSTA: Um-hum. 14 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 245: -- multiple times over 15 the course of several months. 16 17 MS. RADOSTA: Okay. And based on your and your 18 brother's statements you -- you were eventually able to go 19 back to your mom? 20 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 245: We never actually gotten 21 taken out of the home. 22 MS. RADOSTA: Okay. 23 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 245: Because my -- my mom and 24 my stepdad jumped on it pretty quick, got lawyers and it was 25 all figured out relatively soon. My stepbrother was actually

```
never even taken out of the home because it was figured out
 1
 2
    very quickly --
 3
              MS. RADOSTA:
                            Okay.
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 245: -- that it was
 4
 5
    fabricated.
 6
              MS. RADOSTA: And after everything settled down in
 7
    the home were here hard feelings towards your stepbrother from
 8
    your mom and -- his dad and your mom?
 9
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 245: Not between them, me and
10
   my stepbrother actually just recently began speaking again
11
    within the last two to three years but --
12
              MS. RADOSTA: Okay. And --
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 245: -- I had hard feelings
13
14
   towards him.
              MS. RADOSTA: -- all stemming from that?
15
16
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 245: Oh, yeah. I mean, if
17
    somebody's trying to take me from my mom, I don't care how old
18
    he is, it was --
19
              MS. RADOSTA:
                            Right.
20
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 245: -- personal.
21
              MS. RADOSTA: Absolutely. And you -- in your
22
    opinion he was not just lying but also trying to create
23
    evidence against your mom?
24
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 245: Um-hum. Yes.
25
              MS. RADOSTA: Even if they believed it for half a
```

```
second, that's your mom; right?
 1
 2
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 245: Yes.
              MS. RADOSTA: Okay. Well, I hope now that you have
 3
   made an effort with your -- with your stepbrother that I hope
 4
 5
    it works out since that seems to be what you want at this
 6
   point, so.
 7
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 245: It -- it's gotten
 8
   better, yeah.
 9
              MS. RADOSTA: That's good. The only other thing
    that I wanted to touch base with you about was it was awhile
10
11
    ago when I think Ms. Sudano asked the group at large if
12
    anybody would feel like describing their last consensual
13
    sexual experience and you were one of the few people that
14
    actually -- yeah -- but you -- you just -- you -- I think you
15
    visibly shook a little bit and was like, absolutely no.
16
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 245: I -- I didn't -- my body
17
    didn't shake but my head was --
18
              MS. RADOSTA: Your head was --
19
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 245: -- [inaudible].
20
              MS. RADOSTA: Okay. Fair enough. And -- but you --
21
    it's a consensual sexual experience.
22
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 245: Oh, yeah.
23
              MS. RADOSTA: You -- you did absolutely nothing
24
    wrong. Sex is something that, you know, all adults do.
25
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 245: Um-hum.
```

```
MS. RADOSTA: And yet that's not something that you
 1
 2
    would feel comfortable talking about in front of strangers.
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 245: Correct.
 3
              MS. RADOSTA: Probably not in front of your family
 4
 5
    either.
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 245: Correct.
 6
 7
              MS. RADOSTA: Okay. But the fact that there are
 8
    going to be witnesses coming in here and having to talk about
    some difficult topics and they are going to be subject to both
    questions from the State and questions from the defense, are
10
11
    you going to hold that against either one of us?
12
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 245:
                                         Oh, no, not at all.
13
              MS. RADOSTA: Okay.
14
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 245: I understand other
15
   people are able to, whether it's consensual or non-consensual,
16
    able to speak about it and I would be able if technically
17
    needed just --
18
              MS. RADOSTA:
                            Okay.
19
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 245: -- [inaudible] us to do.
20
              MS. RADOSTA: It's not something you want to sign up
21
    for.
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 245:
22
                                          No.
23
              MS. RADOSTA:
                            I get that.
24
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 245: No, I won't put my name
25
    on the list anytime soon.
```

```
MS. RADOSTA: What if, though, it seems that either
 1
 2
    the State's questions or my questions or Mr. Negrete's
 3
    questions are making the witness uncomfortable and yet we
    continue to push on; would you hold that against -- well, more
 4
 5
    specifically, myself and Mr. Negrete?
 6
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 245: Not at all, because you
 7
   have to be able to find evidence. So, I mean, for lack of a
 8
   better -- you've got to do what you gotta do and that's what
    you gotta do.
                            Okay. All right. Thank you.
10
              MS. RADOSTA:
11
              If you could pass the mic to Mr. -- Wohletz.
12
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 190: Wohletz.
              MS. RADOSTA: Wohletz. Thank you. Juror 190.
13
              Mr. -- well, how are (indecipherable)?
14
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 190: Wohletz.
15
16
              MS. RADOSTA: Wohletz.
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 190: Yes.
17
                           I know I'll get it. I don't know how
18
              MS. RADOSTA:
19
    I'm going to phonetically write it down but I think I got it.
20
    Wohletz.
21
              So you had a prior jury experience several years ago
    where it -- the -- the case actually started --
22
23
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 190: Yes.
24
              MS. RADOSTA: -- and the it -- they -- they called
25
    you back in and said everybody can go home?
```

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 190: Yes. We -- we -- well, 1 2 we went through jury selection and then a few -- that was -that was before lunch. 3 MS. RADOSTA: Um-hum. 4 5 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 190: After lunch there was 6 some testimony, a police officer came in, the -- there was a 7 -- a defendant -- an equivalent, you know, what am I trying to 8 explain -- someone who was involved in the crime as well who had already been convicted who came in and was testifying. 10 MS. RADOSTA: Okay. PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 190: And then that ended the 11 12 day and we were told to come the next day. The next day we came in and we were waiting outside and some long period of 13 14 time, I think it's been 20 years, I don't remember how long, 15 we were called back in and told that the trial was over, some 16 kind of bargain had been made. 17 MS. RADOSTA: Okav. PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 190: And I think there was 18 19 some explanation about one of the witnesses never showed up 20 and --21 MS. RADOSTA: Okay. 22 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 190: -- right. 23 MS. RADOSTA: All right.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 190: It's been a long time,

24

25

right.

```
MS. RADOSTA: I understand. Did you -- do you
 1
 2
    recall if you felt disappointed that you weren't going to be
 3
    able to finish the job that you had been -- that you'd signed
    up to start?
 4
 5
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 190: Oh, a little bit.
 6
              MS. RADOSTA: Okay.
 7
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 190: Yeah, I mean, it was --
 8
    it was --
              MS. RADOSTA: I mean --
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 190: -- going to be a very
10
11
    short trial so it was -- it's not like --
12
              MS. RADOSTA: How --
13
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 190: -- you know, I'm not
14
    I'm not saying I wouldn't -- I would be -- you know, what I
15
    mean.
16
              MS. RADOSTA: How long was jury selection in that
17
    one?
18
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 190: An hour or two, I think,
19
    at best.
20
              MS. RADOSTA: And then witnesses in the afternoon?
21
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 190: Yeah, it -- it was -- it
22
   was very different.
23
              MS. RADOSTA: Um, in that particular case, if -- if
24
    you recall --
25
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 190: Um-hum.
```

```
MS. RADOSTA: -- were the -- was it more than one
 1
 2
    charge that the person was facing?
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 190: I don't remember.
 3
              MS. RADOSTA: Okav.
 4
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 190: It was some kind of a
 5
 6
    robbery or theft and I don't know whether it was one charge or
 7
   multiple.
 8
              MS. RADOSTA:
                            Okay. If you -- I mean, I think from
    the synopsis and -- put forth in the Jury Questionnaire, I
10
    think you've maybe came to the conclusion that this is more
    than one count in this particular --
11
12
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 190:
                                         Well, they --
13
              MS. RADOSTA: -- case.
14
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 190:
                                         -- were read at the
15
    beginning so --
16
              MS. RADOSTA:
                            Yeah.
17
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 190: -- it was a long list,
18
    yes.
19
              MS. RADOSTA: Okay. And the fact that there are --
20
    there are many charges in this --
21
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 190:
                                         Right.
22
              MS. RADOSTA: -- particular case, does that leave
23
    any impression in your mind as to the strength or weakness of
24
    the State's case?
25
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 190: In my mind, I mean, I'm
```

assuming it's -- in their mind it is, but I don't have any 1 2 evidence yet so I can't make that determination. 3 MS. RADOSTA: Okay. PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 190: In my mind, it would 4 5 mean that whatever happened, or whoever was involved, it -from the sounds of it, I mean, I -- it's hard to explain. 6 7 like -- I certainly don't have any clue one way or the other 8 whether there's innocence or guilt at this point. 9 MS. RADOSTA: Okay. And the fact that it could be one count or ten counts or 20 or more than --10 11 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 190: Right. 12 MS. RADOSTA: -- that. 13 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 190: Right. 14 That -- that -- am I correct -- and MS. RADOSTA: 15 correct me if I'm wrong; that is not going to influence you in 16 listening to the quality of the evidence? 17 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 190: No. 18 MS. RADOSTA: You're still prepared to withhold your 19 decision until all the evidence has been --20 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 190: Absolutely. 21 MS. RADOSTA: Okay. Now, you did indicate, I 22 believe, on your -- and I just need to touch on this -- on 23 your Jury Questionnaire to the question about the -- the

graphic nature of the videotapes. You -- the question being,

can you promise to remain fair and impartial and objectively

24

25

evaluate all the evidence. 1 Your answer was, I believe so. 2 3 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 190: And it's just -- it's just the disturbing nature. I'm -- I think I can. 4 5 MS. RADOSTA: Okay. 6 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 190: I just -- it's hard not 7 knowing how -- as people have said, the graphic nature of the 8 videos, I don't think they couldn't -- I don't know how graphic they are but it's hard to not have an affect, but I would -- I would think that wouldn't affect my ability to 10 11 evaluate them. 12 MS. RADOSTA: And I don't think anybody here is 13 asking you to be unemotional or --14 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 190: Right. 15 MS. RADOSTA: -- stoic. It's just are you able to 16 watch something, whether it be a video, or maybe a witness 17 testifying who's -- who's struggling through their 18 testimony --19 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 190: Right. 20 MS. RADOSTA: -- and then still say, well, you know 21 what though, they're -- the State still has to prove the case 22 beyond a reasonable doubt. 23 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 190: Yeah. Absolutely, yes. 24 MS. RADOSTA: All right. Thank you --25 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 190: Um-hum.

```
MS. RADOSTA: -- Mr. Wohletz.
 1
 2
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 190: Yes. That was exactly
 3
    right.
              MS. RADOSTA: All right. Thank you. I won't ask
 4
 5
    you to try to pronounce mine.
 6
              Let's see here, Mr. -- Mr. Gall, I had a few
 7
    questions for Mr. Gall, Badge 180.
              So you -- I -- you said you had -- you -- did you
 8
9
    work out at the test site?
10
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 180: I currently work there,
11
    yes.
12
              MS. RADOSTA: All right. So is that where you
13
    literally -- do you drive out there every day or we've heard
14
    -- I've heard rumors of a plane that goes out there every day.
15
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 180: I don't get a plane, no.
16
              MS. RADOSTA: You don't get the plane? But some
17
   people do get the plane?
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 180: They're not me.
18
19
              MS. RADOSTA: Okay. So -- and you have a Ph.D. in
20
    electrical engineering so obviously very science based
21
   background.
22
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 180: Yes.
23
              MS. RADOSTA: Were your undergraduate degrees in
24
    similar --
25
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 180: Yeah, all -- everything
```

was in electrical engineering.

MS. RADOSTA: Everything was in electrical engineering. Okay. Do you feel that you have -- I'm guessing this is a silly question -- an analytical mind?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 180: I believe so.

MS. RADOSTA: Okay. So are you comfortable if we are saying, you know what, there are certain counts where this is — this is what you need to pay attention to and certain other counts where this is what you need to pay attention to; would you be comfortable kind of using some evidence for certain charges and other evidence for other charges?

I'm not -- that was not a good question. I'm sorry.

I did not -- that was not -- I was not doing my job well in that particular question. Let me try again.

If the -- well, let me phrase it to you this way.

There are -- you've read the jury -- the synopsis, obviously.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 180: Yes.

MS. RADOSTA: And the State listed various people, family members that potentially are going to come in here and testify. And there are going to be certain charges that apply to certain people and certain other charges that apply to others.

And if we say, here's the evidence for juror -- or witness number one and here's the evidence for witness number two, are you going to be able to just look at the charges for

```
the -- the one witness and then move on and go to the second
 1
 2
    witness?
                            Judge, can we approach very quickly?
 3
              MR. SWEETIN:
              THE COURT: Sure.
 4
 5
                     (Off-record bench conference)
 6
              MS. RADOSTA: Okay, Mr. Gall. I'm going to just
 7
    touch on something that we have -- that I've asked a few other
 8
   people, having the analytical mind, that you worked so hard
    for.
10
              There is going to be emotional testimony in this
11
   particular case. There's no doubt about that, there's going
12
    to be potentially emotional videos being shown during the
    course of this case.
13
14
              Do you think that that is going to in any way affect
15
    you to hear somebody tell an emotional story?
16
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 180: Do you mean, will it
17
    affect my state of mind or my impartiality?
18
              MS. RADOSTA: First and foremost, your state of
19
   mind.
20
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 180: I mean, I'm sure it
21
    could.
22
              MS. RADOSTA:
                            Okay.
23
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 180: I'm not going to say
24
    "yes" or "no". But it's certainly possible.
25
              MS. RADOSTA: Have -- have your emotions ever snuck
```

up on you when something you didn't think would affect you, 1 2 then you're all of a sudden crying at the -- at the silly 3 commercial on T.V., and you're like, where did that come from? PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 180: Yeah, you know, I can 4 5 get emotional if, I mean, Toy Story 3 is a pretty sad movie. 6 I don't know if anyone made it through that without crying. 7 But --8 MS. RADOSTA: UP was the one for me. PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 180: Yeah, so --9 That was the one for me. 10 MS. RADOSTA: 11 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 180: So yeah, I mean, I -- I can be affected by things like that. 12 13 MS. RADOSTA: Okay. But do you think that you will be able to -- because you -- you drew the distinction yourself 14 15 very well. Do you think you will be able to put it in a 16 pocket, if you will, and not let it affect your impartiality? 17 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 180: Right. Yeah. 18 impartiality will not be affected by -- by that. 19 MS. RADOSTA: Okay. If you were to be selected to 20 be a juror on this particular case and you go back into the 21 jury room, and somebody is in the back and they're just like 22 -- they're just all about their emotions and not really 23 analyzing the evidence, would you feel comfortable calling 24 them out on that and saying, no, no, that's not our job

25

here.

```
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 180: I would.
 1
 2
              MS. RADOSTA: Okay.
                                                I mean, maybe take
 3
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 180: Yes.
 4
    a break or talk through it. But yeah, I mean --
 5
              MS. RADOSTA:
                            Sure.
 6
              MS. RADOSTA: -- everyone needs to be focused on the
 7
   problem at hand which is to address the -- the nature and the,
 8
    you know, objective facts of what we're, you know, being
    shown.
10
              MS. RADOSTA:
                            Okay. All right. Thank you.
11
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 180: Yes.
12
              MS. RADOSTA: Let me see, Mr. -- Mr. Fragale?
13
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 561: Yes.
14
              MS. RADOSTA: Just quickly. I don't have -- I don't
15
    have as much for you because you sat down this morning and so
16
    I need to look back at my notes.
17
              So you -- okay, so you indicated that you like to
    watch the true life forensic shows?
18
19
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 561: Yes.
20
              MS. RADOSTA: Are you -- what -- what about them do
21
    you like?
22
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 561: It's just that I think
23
    it just takes a little piece of evidence and put something
24
    together and all of a sudden you've got a -- they've got a
25
    suspect and an arrest. That's -- it's just how, you know,
```

like one little -- one little hair could -- can define who --1 2 who someone is. Okay. Do you appreciate that in a lot 3 MS. RADOSTA: of cases that there is no physical evidence at all, there is 4 5 no hair or DNA or blood evidence? 6 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 561: Yeah. I quess, yeah. 7 MS. RADOSTA: In some -- in some criminal cases? PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 561: Yes. 8 9 MS. RADOSTA: It's just going to be testimony? PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 561: Yes. 10 11 MS. RADOSTA: Or just going to be there could be, in 12 this particular case, we've talked a lot about the videos. 13 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 561: Um-hum. 14 MS. RADOSTA: But beyond that, there may not be 15 anything such as DNA. 16 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 561: Yeah, I can understand that. 17 Yeah. Do you -- would it -- well, let me ask 18 MS. RADOSTA: 19 you this; how would you evaluate somebody's testimony if they 20 come into court and you've never met them before? I've asked 21 this question to a bunch of people, so. 22 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 561: Yeah. I guess that's 23 tough. You'd just have to -- have to see how sincere they 24 are, how consistent their testimony is of -- I'm sure's a

deposition somewhere that you can refer to.

25

```
MS. RADOSTA: Okay. So consistency between prior
 1
 2
    statements or prior testimonies would be important to you?
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 561: Yes.
 3
              MS. RADOSTA: And if they -- if their prior
 4
 5
    testimony did not match up would that also be important to
 6
    you?
 7
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 561: Yeah, it could be.
                                                               Yes.
 8
              MS. RADOSTA: Okay. The -- just the flip side of
 9
    that same point.
10
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 561:
                                          Um-hum.
11
              MS. RADOSTA: Do you -- can you see a situation
12
    though where somebody's prior testimony may not match up with
13
    what they say here today?
14
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 561:
                                          Um --
15
              MS. RADOSTA: Or tomorrow, or the next day?
16
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 561: Yeah, I can see.
17
    depends on how long it's been since they've made the first
18
    statement, how long it's been because you can't remember
19
    everything -- everything word for word.
20
              MS. RADOSTA: Would it make a difference as to what
21
    specifically the -- the topic was of -- of the inconsistency
22
    if there was one? In other words, is it something small, or
23
    is it something big?
24
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 561: Oh, yeah. Yeah, I guess
25
    it would be, it would make a difference, yeah.
```

```
MS. RADOSTA: Okay. All right.
 1
 2
              You also said that you like to watch like the
 3
   Netflix documentaries.
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 561: Yes.
 4
 5
              MS. RADOSTA: Were those specifically also crime
 6
    related that you were talking about?
 7
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 561: Yeah.
              MS. RADOSTA: Like the -- the --
 8
 9
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 561: The Making of a Murderer
10
    is --
                            The Making of a Murderer --
11
              MS. RADOSTA:
12
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 561: Yeah.
13
              MS. RADOSTA: -- was the one that came to my mind as
14
    well.
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 561: Yeah.
15
16
              MS. RADOSTA: Did you find that one interesting?
17
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 561: Yes, very interesting.
18
              MS. RADOSTA: Did you watch the follow up one as
19
   well?
20
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 561: I haven't watched the
21
    follow up one yet, no.
22
              MS. RADOSTA: Okay. Okay. Thank you.
23
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 561: Thank you.
24
             MS. RADOSTA: That's all -- that's all I have for
25
    you.
```

```
Ms. Johnson, 396. Just given your -- the type of
 1
 2
   books that you write --
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 396: Um-hum.
 3
              MS. RADOSTA: -- you said -- I believe you said the
 4
 5
    clean romance?
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 396: Um-hum.
 6
 7
              MS. RADOSTA: Do you think the topic of this
   particular case is going to be something that's going to
 8
   bother you at all or is that just the area of -- of --
10
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 396: That's the area --
11
              MS. RADOSTA: -- fiction that you --
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 396: -- I write.
12
13
              MS. RADOSTA: Um-hum.
14
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 396: I'm not 50 Shades of
15
    Gray.
16
              MS. RADOSTA:
                            Yeah.
17
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 396: I -- I have you know --
18
              MS. RADOSTA:
                            It's not for everybody, that's --
19
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 396:
                                          Right.
20
              MS. RADOSTA: -- for sure.
21
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 396: So that's what I write,
22
    yes.
23
                            Okay. Was it something -- did you
              MS. RADOSTA:
24
    ever attempt to write another -- any other type of fiction
25
   before you had success in this area?
```

```
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 396: No, I'm religious --
 1
 2
              MS. RADOSTA: Um-hum.
 3
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 396: -- and so my publisher
    is LDS.
 4
 5
              MS. RADOSTA:
                            Okay.
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 396: And so I have certain
 6
 7
    stipulations. Like if I wrote for Hallmark, they have certain
 8
    quidelines.
              MS. RADOSTA:
                            Um-hum.
10
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 396:
                                          And I really don't want
11
    to be writing a different genre.
12
              MS. RADOSTA:
                            Okay.
13
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 396: So that's where I fit
14
    in.
15
                            Okay. So just for an example, if you
              MS. RADOSTA:
16
    all of a sudden -- and I certainly don't wish this upon you --
17
   but if all of a sudden you were no longer being published, if
    your publisher said, I don't know what you used to have, but
18
19
    you don't have it anymore; would you -- it sounds like you
20
    wouldn't be inclined to try to change your style at all.
21
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 396: No. There's a lot more
22
    money in erotica.
23
              MS. RADOSTA:
                            Um-hum.
24
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 396: But that's not something
25
    I want to write.
```

```
MS. RADOSTA: Okay. Given -- given that and your
 1
 2
    personal opinions of -- of what you choose to do with your
 3
    career --
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 396: Yes.
 4
 5
              MS. RADOSTA: -- do you think that the topic and the
 6
    discussion of sex which is going to happen during this trial
 7
    is going to be something that you're comfortable with?
 8
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 396: Yes, because sex
    happens.
 9
10
              MS. RADOSTA:
                            Okay.
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 396: Yes.
11
                                                Yes.
12
              MS. RADOSTA: Okay. What if it is, you know, I mean
    you've read the synopsis. This is sex potentially you know
13
    that was not consensual, potentially that was potentially
14
15
    between family members, this is not, you know, something that
16
    you normally would read about or write about or anything like
17
           Is it something that you would be uncomfortable with?
18
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 396: My impression is that no
19
    one really wants to hear --
20
              MS. RADOSTA: Fair enough.
21
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 396: -- stories like this.
22
              MS. RADOSTA:
                            Um-hum.
23
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 396: But yes, I can hear the
24
    evidence and make decisions based on that.
```

MS. RADOSTA: Okay. You had answered some questions

25

yesterday, I believe, where you said -- there was some questions from Ms. Sudano about if CPS didn't fully investigate and -- the charge of abuse, would you hold it against the child if CPS did not fully investigate, and your response was, no, I'll hold it against the mother, I believe. You had said something to that effect. PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 396: No, I don't think I would hold it against the mother. MS. RADOSTA: Okay.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 396: I just think that if CPS investigated maybe the child, maybe all the details, the whole story isn't told --

MS. RADOSTA: Um-hum.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 396: -- because of fear or they don't want to be taken out of their home, I wouldn't hold it against the mom if CPS didn't get the whole story.

MS. RADOSTA: Okay. What if -- what if the mother was questioned and had information and didn't necessarily share it with CPS in an effort to protect somebody else?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 396: I don't think that is right.

MS. RADOSTA: Okay. Do you think that it kind of goes back the questions that I was asking some of the other jurors earlier about as a parent, do you agree with the fact that your primary role would -- is protecting your child?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 396: I do. 1 2 MS. RADOSTA: Even if the person potentially that's 3 hurting the child is somebody else in the family? PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 396: Yes. 4 5 MS. RADOSTA: Okay. It's -- and so if CPS is 6 investigating a case and mom has information and doesn't fully 7 share it in an effort to protect some other family member, in 8 that situation would you hold it against the mother? 9 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 396: I'm hesitating because if she's not protecting her child over her own needs to -- if 10 11 it benefits her to protect someone else over protecting her 12 child --13 MS. RADOSTA: Uh-huh. 14 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 396: -- I don't think that's 15 correct. 16 MS. RADOSTA: Okay. 17 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 396: I don't think that a 18 mother should do that. 19 MS. RADOSTA: Okay. Okay. Thank you. Okay. 20 just want to make sure I didn't have anything else for you. 21 Now, you know, it's -- I'm sorry, I -- I heard you 22 the other day when you were saying, I'm the child -- I'm the 23 child taxi driver but I didn't see your face when you were 24 saying that, and the description of that just made me laugh. 25 I'm just the taxi driver.

1	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 396: I am.
2	MS. RADOSTA: Thank you. Thank you, Ms. Johnson. I
3	appreciate all the information.
4	If you could just give the mic to Mr. Riggins.
5	So you've given us a lot of information about your
6	family over the past couple of days.
7	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 394: Yes.
8	MS. RADOSTA: And one of the things that I was
9	curious about is you said that and I apologize that I don't
10	remember the time frame exactly but your niece confided in
11	you about something that was happening to her in her home.
12	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 394: Yes, it was about I
13	think about a year-and-a-half ago, it may have been just a
14	month or two more than that.
15	MS. RADOSTA: Okay. So how and how old is your
16	niece?
17	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 394: She'll be 16 come this
18	March.
19	MS. RADOSTA: Okay. And when she confided in you,
20	did you understand it to be a situation that was currently
21	happening to her or something that had
22	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 394: It had happened a few
23	months prior.
24	MS. RADOSTA: Okay. Was she still
25	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 394: It was some holiday

```
event at my cousin's house. It happened in his basement.
 1
 2
              MS. RADOSTA: Okay. So was it a situation where you
 3
    felt that she could still be in -- still be in harm's way when
    she was confiding in you?
 4
 5
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 394: Potentially.
 6
              MS. RADOSTA: Okay.
 7
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 394:
 8
              MS. RADOSTA: Did she ask you to keep the
 9
    confidence? Did she say, I need to tell you something but I
    don't want you to tell anyone else?
10
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 394: I believe she did.
11
12
              MS. RADOSTA: Okay. And are you particularly close
   with this niece?
13
14
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 394:
                                         Yes.
15
              MS. RADOSTA: Okay. So this was not for --
16
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 394: She's the -- one of my
    -- I have two nieces and a nephew that I actually get along
17
18
    with.
19
              MS. RADOSTA:
                            Okay.
20
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 394: The other two, say rude
21
    things to me.
22
              MS. RADOSTA: Okay. Well, I --
23
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 394: So --
24
              MS. RADOSTA: -- I'm sorry to hear that. That's
25
    unfortunate. It's particularly when it's family and sadly
```

1 when it's children. PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 394: Well, one's a 13-year 2 3 old girl and then ten-year old boys. MS. RADOSTA: Okay. So -- so this niece, you're 4 5 lucky enough to be close with her. 6 So -- so this niece, you're lucky enough to be close 7 with her. 8 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 394: Um-hum. 9 MS. RADOSTA: Is -- is she -- do you have like daily contact, weekly contact with her, or at the time? 10 11 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 394: I would say at least 12 every two weeks. 13 MS. RADOSTA: Okay. And --14 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 394: We may like send a 15 Snapchat back and forth, but it's not like a direct 16 conversation. It's just like a picture or something, have a good day, type of -- so. 17 MS. RADOSTA: Okay. So did she pull you aside to 18 19 ask you -- or to confide in you? 20 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 394: No, she lives in Utah. 21 She told me over the phone. 22 MS. RADOSTA: Okay. And after she confided in you, 23 did you struggle with the decision to break the confident? 24 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 394: I'd say within a few 25 hours or by the next day is when I had -- I told my aunt --

MS. RADOSTA: Okay. 1 2 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 394: -- who is close with my 3 sister, my niece's mom. And she then in turn told my sister. Because I more so like it's -- I would have -- it would have 4 5 eaten me up worse to not say anything, because whether or not 6 it was true, I felt it was my responsibility to bring it to 7 light. 8 MS. RADOSTA: Okay. So there was, at least in your 9 mind, you weren't 100 percent sure if she was telling you the truth but you needed to error on the side of caution? 10 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 394: Yes. 11 12 MS. RADOSTA: Because if it had been true and you 13 hadn't said anything, you -- and something else happened --14 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 394: And then it could happen 15 to other family members or he could do it to other -- other 16 girls, yeah. 17 MS. RADOSTA: Did your niece, was she upset with you for -- for breaking the confidence? 18 19 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 394: Oh, yes. At first, yes. 20 MS. RADOSTA: Okay. Did she ultimately understand 21 why you made that decision? 22 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 394: Yeah, I talked with her 23 about that. 24 MS. RADOSTA: Okay. 25 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 394: I know she had to, while she was going through court, she had to go through counseling and stuff like that and I told her that basically I did it because I love you and I want to protect you. You shouldn't be subjected to that and I wanted you to be able to get counseling because people that go through stuff don't always get counseling.

Like for instance, when I've been raped, I never went through counseling after that --

MS. RADOSTA: Right.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 394: -- and I guess at times, I -- like I've tried to put it -- I like put it past me and there were a few events where I know that it affected me like I heard he'd gone to jail, but then when I heard he was getting out, for some reason I had this fear in me that he might come after me, even though I never said anything.

MS. RADOSTA: Okay.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 394: But yeah, I just wanted to let her know that I loved her and I wanted to make sure that it didn't continue with anyone else, and that they got to the bottom of it and found the truth in it.

MS. RADOSTA: Okay. After she confided in you, but before you talked to your aunt, during that conversation did you encourage her to tell her mom?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 394: I -- I asked her, I said, why haven't you told your mom? And she's like, I -- I

```
don't want her to know, no.
 1
 2
              MS. RADOSTA: Okay.
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 394: I don't want her to
 3
    know.
           So --
 4
 5
              MS. RADOSTA: All right.
 6
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 394:
                                          Yeah.
 7
              MS. RADOSTA: And you also mentioned yesterday about
 8
    a sister who you don't have the best closest relationship with
   because you say she's acting -- you've shared stories about
    your mom when you were younger and you said you have one
10
    sister that's acting just like your mom.
11
12
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 394: Yeah.
                                                 It's not
13
    necessarily that I'm not close to her, it just I see
14
    characteristics in her that she does act like my mom.
15
    love her to death. I mean, I spoke --
16
              MS. RADOSTA:
                            Okay.
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 394: -- with her last night.
17
18
              MS. RADOSTA:
                            Okay.
19
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 394:
20
              MS. RADOSTA: My apologies for misinterpreting that.
21
    Is that sister the mother of the niece?
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 394: Yes.
22
23
                            Okay. So it wasn't necessarily that
              MS. RADOSTA:
24
    you didn't have a good relationship with that sister, that you
25
    went through another family member, you just chose to go to
```

your aunt before --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 394: I talked with my aunt and we -- in our family we're known to talk a lot if you haven't already noticed, by characteristics.

All the women in my family including myself we just -- we just have the gift of gab.

MS. RADOSTA: Okay.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 394: So much more cursed, I guess. But yeah, so I -- my aunt just happened to be, I think, the first person I spoke to and I kind of brought it up a little bit and then decided to tell her.

MS. RADOSTA: Okay. And ultimately, was there any - did it go any further than that? Was the cousin ever charged with anything?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 394: Yes. I know he had probation and he had to do some sort of psychiatric like counseling --

MS. RADOSTA: Okay.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 394: -- for it, yeah. And then I had heard that there was some other girl that was non-related to him that he had supposedly done stuff to as well, so I don't know if that had ever got charges, but all -- they all I've in Salt Lake County so.

MS. RADOSTA: Okay.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 394: All the family that I

```
had spoken to about it and the victims involved, so --
 1
 2
              MS. RADOSTA:
                             All right.
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 394: -- and my --
 3
              MS. RADOSTA: Okay.
 4
 5
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 394: -- cousin that was the
 6
   perpetrator.
 7
              MS. RADOSTA: So the -- the cousin was -- this is
 8
    the juvenile --
 9
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 394: Yes.
              MS. RADOSTA: -- at the time? Okay.
10
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 394: I think he's like 17
11
12
    now.
13
              MS. RADOSTA: Okay. The only other question that I
14
    -- well, actually, I have one or two more for you. You
15
    you -- you had indicated on your Jury Questionnaire that --
16
    and I don't think you shared this in court, so I apologize if
17
    you didn't feel comfortable talking about this in --
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 394: The grandfather?
18
19
              MS. RADOSTA: -- open court. You said your father's
20
    stepfather.
21
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 394: Yes. My grandmother, my
22
    dad's mom, when she remarried, she remarried a guy named
    Robert. I don't -- I don't know his last name.
23
24
              MS. RADOSTA: Um-hum.
25
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 394: I called him Bob.
```

MS. RADOSTA: Okay. 1 2 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 394: He ended up -- I know he 3 died in prison. 4 MS. RADOSTA: Okay. 5 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 394: So he was convicted. 6 don't know if it was for those charges or others. But I had 7 heard that he molested all of his stepchildren and a lot of my 8 cousins, which were his grandchildren, I was born after he was already in prison. Okay. So this is your -- and this was 10 MS. RADOSTA: 11 the part that I was just slightly --12 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 394: Most of my cousins are 13 like ten years older --14 MS. RADOSTA: Okay. 15 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 394: -- so -- than me. 16 MS. RADOSTA: But you had said that this is your 17 father's stepfather and that he molested all of his stepchildren. Was your father one of the victims? 18 19 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 394: From what I've heard, 20 yes. But it's never something my father's confided me in or 21 mentioned to me about. 22 MS. RADOSTA: Okay. Okay. And you have never felt 23 comfortable asking him if he doesn't? 24 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 394: No, I didn't really want 25 to pry into the issue.

1	MS. RADOSTA: Okay.
2	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 394: But it did have after
3	effects between my cousins and then allegations from my
4	cousins touching their sister, and things like that.
5	MS. RADOSTA: Okay. All right. The the only
6	and I need to just go back a second to the issue with your
7	niece.
8	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 394: Um-hum.
9	MS. RADOSTA: There was a court case but you were
10	not you didn't participate at all
11	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 394: No, I was here
12	MS. RADOSTA: in the process?
13	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 394: in Nevada, the court
14	case was in Utah.
15	MS. RADOSTA: Was there ever any reach out to you as
16	you were the first person that she told that that you
17	needed to be part of the process, or not?
18	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 394: You mean by the courts
19	or
20	MS. RADOSTA: Yeah.
21	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 394: attorneys? No.
22	MS. RADOSTA: Or the attorney okay. Okay. I
23	think that's all I have for you, Mr. Riggins.
24	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 394: Okay.
25	MS. RADOSTA: Judge, could we approach for just a

quick second?

THE COURT: Sure.

(Off-record bench conference)

MS. RADOSTA: I'm going to now -- I might come back to a few of you individually, but I am going to try to just open it up to the panel at this point for some other questions. I've touched on some of these topics already so I'll try to remember that.

Obviously, this case -- there's some allegations of abuse. And the idea that -- well, let me ask you this; does anybody -- or who here agrees with the fact that men and women can be abusers; everybody? A show of hands with everybody for the "I believe" everybody.

Let me just ask it another way; is there anybody that doesn't agree with that particular statement? No hands are showing.

Now, my guess is though most people when they hear allegations of this sort, probably their head naturally goes to probably -- probably going to be a man; is that a fair statement? Probably going to be a man who is the -- the defendant. Is that -- I see Mr. -- Mr. Tonan, 479, nodding you head.

That's -- if you hear a story on the news and you don't know the gender of the person but you hear allegations of this sort, fair to say that you think naturally it's

probably going to be a -- a male that's accused of that?

But there are cases -- I -- would you agree, of where the woman is the -- is the person accused?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes.

MS. RADOSTA: We hear about every now and then the -- the one that comes -- the ones that come to mind to me are like school teacher cases.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah

MS. RADOSTA: Yeah. And Mr. Riggins is also agreeing with that, Juror 394.

So but when we start to get into a little bit more than that, and it's within the family, and you hear that it's a family situation, I know some of you on your Jury Questionnaire said, I have a problem with this type of a case because I have daughters, and you think naturally that the alleged victims are going to be female.

And that naturally the person accused is the man. Is there anybody out here that thinks that it's possible for a mother to be the sexual abuser in the -- in the home?

Okay. I have some people shaking their head. I am seeing Ms. Sanchez, who's been very quiet, so -- and I -- I - I am going to try to talk to a few people who haven't said too much.

Ms. Sanchez, you didn't really respond to that, the fact that a woman could be a sexual abuse?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 120: Yeah, I agree. 1 MS. RADOSTA: You do agree that that's something, 2 3 even if -- if to take it a step further and it's the mother, or a stepmother in the home; is that something that you can 4 5 see potentially as a -- as a possibility? PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 120: Yes. 6 7 MS. RADOSTA: Okay. Thank you. 8 Is there anybody that would be -- that -- is there 9 anybody here that would -- I'm trying to phrase the question in a different way, so I apologize for my stiltedness. 10 11 Everybody agrees with the idea that people are 12 responsible for their own behavior; is that a fair statement? 13 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah. 14 MS. RADOSTA: I see Mr. Faller shaking his head, I 15 see Mr. Rosenfield shaking -- everybody shaking their head. 16 People are responsible for their own behavior. And I think 17 the idea that I believe it was Ms. -- it was Ms. Ruelas --18 Ruelas -- that said earlier that her brother's ex-girlfriend 19 was quote/unquote "playing the victim card". Has anybody ever 20 heard that particular phrase before, "playing the victim 21 card"? 22 A lot of people are nodding their heads. 23 Mr. -- Mr. Kittredge, what does "playing the victim

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 572: Well, I mean -- it could

24

25

card" mean to you?

```
mean a lot of things, so --
 1
 2
              THE COURT RECORDER: I need a mic.
 3
              MS. RADOSTA: Oh, I am sorry. My apologies.
              THE COURT: Mr. Rosenfield, right behind you, just
 4
 5
   pass it behind you. Okay.
 6
              MS. RADOSTA: And, I'm sorry, Mr. Kittredge, Badge
 7
    572.
 8
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 572: So playing the victim
 9
    card; I don't know, somebody could be doing it out of
10
    attention --
11
              MS. RADOSTA:
                            Um-hum.
12
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 572: -- and so maybe they're
13
    just fabricating something or maybe something did occur but
14
    they're -- they just keep bringing it up for whatever sympathy
15
    reasons they may be trying to attract from other people.
16
              MS. RADOSTA: Okay.
17
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 572: I mean, that -- that can
18
   be an instance.
19
              MS. RADOSTA: Does it -- does it paint in your
20
    picture of somebody who is actually a victim or not actually a
21
    victim?
22
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 572: No, no, if -- if
23
    somebody -- well, again, you could take it back. So to answer
24
    your question, that -- it could be used that way, too.
25
              MS. RADOSTA: Okay.
```

```
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 572: In all fairness.
 1
 2
              MS. RADOSTA: Um-hum.
 3
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 572: Even if something, you
    know, horrific happened to somebody, I mean, granted, it's
 4
 5
    it's horrific. I'm sure a lot of people don't want to hear
 6
    about it, but if they keep bringing it up time after time
 7
    after time, maybe that term can be thrown around that way,
 8
    too.
 9
              MS. RADOSTA:
                            Okay.
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 572:
10
                                         Not to be --
11
              MS. RADOSTA: All right.
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 572: -- mean or anything, but
12
    that's -- that's a true assessment --
13
14
              MS. RADOSTA:
                            Okay.
15
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 572: -- on my part.
16
              MS. RADOSTA: All right. Mr. Albright, do you have
17
    you ever heard the term, Badge 375, have you ever heard the
    term or the phrase "playing the victim card"?
18
19
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 375: Yeah, I've heard the
20
    term before.
21
              MS. RADOSTA: Okay. Have you ever used it in
22
    reference to anybody that you know?
23
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 375: Not that I can think of.
24
              MS. RADOSTA: Okay. Is it -- does it give you a
25
   positive or a negative idea in your head?
```

```
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 375: Honestly, kind --
 1
 2
              MS. RADOSTA: Or --
 3
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 375: -- of negative.
              MS. RADOSTA: -- kind of negative?
 4
 5
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 375: Yeah.
 6
              MS. RADOSTA: Okay. In what sense?
 7
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 375: It's almost like in my
 8
    interpretation of "playing the victim card" it's either
 9
    overreacting or over -- basically overplaying what's happened,
    what happened to you, trying to get more out of it, trying to
10
11
    push the situation farther, or it's making something up to
12
   better yourself.
13
              MS. RADOSTA: Okay. And do you think that it is --
14
    why do you -- do think there could be a reason why somebody
15
    would, quote/unquote, "play the victim card"?
16
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 375: Hatred towards another
    person or just for attention, anything along those lines.
17
18
              MS. RADOSTA: Okay. Could it be also maybe to make
19
    themselves look better?
20
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 375: Yeah.
21
              MS. RADOSTA: Okay. Put themselves --
22
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 375: For self -- personal
23
    gain.
24
              MS. RADOSTA: -- in a better light?
25
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 375: Yeah.
```

```
MS. RADOSTA: Okay. Mr. Powers, Badge 514.
 1
 2
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 519: 519.
 3
              MS. RADOSTA: 519? Sorry, I wrote it down
    incorrectly. I got your last name right though.
 4
 5
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 519: Yeah.
 6
              MS. RADOSTA: The idea of playing the victim card;
 7
   have you ever heard it before?
 8
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 519: Yes.
 9
              MS. RADOSTA: Okay. Have you ever used it to
10
    describe someone?
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 519: Yes.
11
12
              MS. RADOSTA: Okay. Was that in your experience did
    you use it to describe somebody positively or negative or --
13
14
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 519: Well, it was --
15
              MS. RADOSTA: -- in between?
16
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 519: -- more negative.
17
              MS. RADOSTA: Okay. And the situation was -- if
18
    you're comfortable sharing it -- was it something where they
19
    were going to change the story of what happened or -- or make
20
    up a story entirely or?
21
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 519: Probably not hearing
22
    both sides, believing -- having a hard time believing the
23
    story.
24
              MS. RADOSTA:
                            Okay.
25
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 519: As opposed to hearing
```

both sides and knowing. 1 2 MS. RADOSTA: Okay. 3 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 519: So playing the victim 4 card, you know. 5 MS. RADOSTA: Did you ever --6 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 519: Or want sympathy, you 7 know. 8 MS. RADOSTA: What about like what Mr. Kittredge 9 said that maybe telling the story over and over and over again, to maybe draw attention to themselves --10 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 519: Yes. 11 12 MS. RADOSTA: Does that seem like a similar --PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 519: Yes. 13 14 MS. RADOSTA: -- scenario? Okav. 15 Do you -- is there anybody here that would disagree with the fact that -- that children -- and even teenagers --16 17 don't necessarily take responsibility for the things that they 18 do, but sometimes they'll -- something will happen and they 19 will be like, oh, it wasn't me, it was my friend, something of 20 that nature. 21 Is that a fair statement? Mr. Riggins is -- is 22 nodding his head. Could you pass the mic to Mr. Riggins, down 23 here in the front row? If you nod your head, that's what 24 happens. Talk to Ms. Cornwell. 25 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 245: Stop picking on Ms.

1	Cornwell.
2	MS. RADOSTA: Well, now you're just the example.
3	So the idea that that children and teenagers
4	don't necessarily always take responsibility for their own
5	actions.
6	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 394: Um-hum.
7	MS. RADOSTA: Are you you can agree with that?
8	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 394: Um-hum.
9	MS. RADOSTA: Have you had any personal experience
10	with that?
11	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 394: Unfortunately.
12	MS. RADOSTA: Unfortunately? Do you think that
13	there are also adults that don't always take responsibility
14	for their own action?
15	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 394: Absolutely.
16	MS. RADOSTA: And do you think that they could be
17	do what are some reasons why you think an adult might not
18	take responsibility for their own actions?
19	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 394: Um, maybe in their own
20	mind, to play a situation down, they don't really want to
21	believe they made a mistake, just move on, forget about it.
22	MS. RADOSTA: Okay. Minimize
23	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 394: Yeah.
24	MS. RADOSTA: their own involvement and and
25	try to make themselves look better?

```
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 394: Absolutely.
 1
 2
              MS. RADOSTA: Is that -- does that sound like -- am
 3
    I putting words in your mouth or is that what --
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 394: The -- the --
 4
 5
              MS. RADOSTA: -- you were saying?
 6
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 394: -- latter part,
 7
    absolutely, I agree with.
 8
              MS. RADOSTA: Trying to make themselves look better?
 9
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 394: Yeah.
              MS. RADOSTA: Is there anybody else here that
10
11
    disagrees with that idea, that some adults even can not take
12
    responsibility for their own actions in an effort to make
13
    themselves look better?
14
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 394: Well, like for instance
15
    if you make a mistake at work and you just ignore it so --
16
    hoping no one notices --
17
              MS. RADOSTA: Um-hum. And then if somebody does
    notice, maybe say, that wasn't me or --
18
19
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 394:
                                         I'm --
20
              MS. RADOSTA: Um-hum.
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 394: -- not that type of
21
22
   person.
23
              MS. RADOSTA: All right. Could you hand the mic to
24
   Mr. Rosenfield for a second, Badge 256?
25
              What was it that you just said?
```

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 256: I said they dodge and 1 2 deflect. 3 Dodge and deflect, hoping that they're MS. RADOSTA: not going to be held --4 5 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 256: Yeah. 6 MS. RADOSTA: -- responsible and then --7 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 256: Yeah, I worked with a 8 lady who made a career out of that. 9 MS. RADOSTA: Okay. Kind of -- kind of frustrating at times? 10 11 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 256: Oh, absolutely. 12 MS. RADOSTA: Okay. So -- sorry, as I said, I talked about some of these topics with people already so I'm 13 just trying to make sure I'm not missing anything. 14 15 I did touch on with several people the idea -- and 16 I'm going to just open this up to the panel again -- that 17 parents, I think there is nobody here that wouldn't agree with 18 the -- with the statement that parents are supposed to protect 19 their children. 20 And I did also follow up with, is there ever -- is 21 -- can anybody here think of a situation where they could be 22 coerced into hurting their own child or a -- or a -- not 23 necessarily if you don't have children, a younger family 24 member? And the entire panel is shaking their head "no". 25

Mr. Rosenfield, I'm sorry, I apologize, I don't have

all my notes in front of you -- you -- do you have children?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 256: I do, yes.

MS. RADOSTA: Okay. Is there anything that you could imagine that somebody could say to you, to get you to hurt your child?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 256: I mean, it's a -- no, I -- I mean, as -- you know, there's -- no.

MS. RADOSTA: Okay.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 256: No. There's the old joke of, you know, when your baby's months of teething and or the months of colicky or colicky and then teething --

MS. RADOSTA: Um-hum.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 256: -- and my wife and I used to make jokes, you know, you'd throw yourself in front of a bus in a blink of an eye at the same time you can see yourself, you know, throwing them against the wall watching them drop down.

MS. RADOSTA: Um-hum.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 256: You know, but no, no.

And, I mean, you'd give your life -- I mean, any -- any decent parent it's kind of -- you know, you'd give your life in a blink.

MS. RADOSTA: Okay. And I am assuming that everyone here with children feels the same way? Okay. And the panel is nodding universally.

Is there any -- Ms. Sudano touched on this yesterday when she was asking some questions and said, you know, does gender matter in -- in certain situations. Does your -- does your -- and interpretation or opinion about things turn on the fact of is a man doing it or a woman doing it.

And in this particular situation, could you imagine if a -- if a -- I apologize, I'm trying to phrase my question -- I'll come back to it in a second.

There has been some discussion among some people in the courtroom about domestic violence situations and in the home and as children.

Does anybody have an idea in their mind fo what a abused spouse like the stereotype of a -- I hate using that word -- the idea of an abused spouse, what they would be like? Does anybody have a picture in their mind? No one is -- no one is responding to that.

Is it --

MR. SWEETIN: Can we approach very quickly?

THE COURT: Sure.

(Off-record bench conference)

MS. RADOSTA: I'm sorry, Your Honor. Sorry, Your Honor. If you can just give me a second to look at my notes as well as the panel.

(Pause in the proceedings)

MS. RADOSTA: I'm not sure if we've ever really

touched on this before.

Has anyone here in the panel ever been falsely accused, not necessarily of a crime, but falsely accused of something at work that they didn't do or falsely accused by a family member of something that they didn't do?

And Ms. Dolan, back in the back, 338, raised their hand.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 338: Not anything major, I don't feel like. But my ex-husband, the one who killed himself --

MS. RADOSTA: Um-hum.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 338: -- he would always tend to push any blame onto me for anything that he had done or any problems he encountered, he would automatically blame me, not just to me, but to our children as well.

MS. RADOSTA: Okay. And was there -- how did that make you feel to be accused of something that you did not do?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 338: At the time, very frustrated and upset.

MS. RADOSTA: Okay.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 338: And for awhile I took in like must be something wrong with me. But now that I've had space and time, I realize that -- that that was something that he was burdened with and that's not on me.

MS. RADOSTA: Did your -- you said he brought your

children into it. Did they ever believe the things that he had said, the false things he said about you?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 338: I suppose when they were younger, but as time went on, they -- they -- they would come and tell me because they -- they didn't believe him anymore.

MS. RADOSTA: Okay. And did -- did you ever feel the need with your children to defend yourself against these false accusations?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 338: I really didn't need to. My children and I have always been very close and at the time that he -- he killed himself they weren't even really talking to him anymore. So I kind of didn't need to. They -- they -- they know me so well that they knew I wouldn't do anything. But if they asked, I would tell them my point of view.

MS. RADOSTA: Okay. Did -- has anybody else had an experience like that on the panel? Ms. Brand, Juror 111.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 111: Okay. This was a long time ago. I was a kid, and I had a classmate that accused me of stealing five dollars from her. I was probably in elementary school, I think. And I did not steal the five dollars.

And I was -- I remember I was very frustrated. I went home and told my mother about it and we went over to the house. And it turned out that I was in the room with a -- in her bedroom and with the classmate there and she said, she

kept accusing me, I know you took it, I know you took it. 1 2 then later then she said, well, I know you didn't take it. So it was -- she -- they were going to move and 3 everything. I don't know whether she was trying to get my 4 5 friendship --6 MS. RADOSTA: Um-hum. 7 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 111: -- I don't know what --8 what that was all about. But I just remember that I was, you know, I had to defend myself and I was afraid that I wasn't going to be believed and -- but then it just kind of -- just -10 11 - it was, you know, she accepted that she -- she had lied. 12 MS. RADOSTA: Okay. 13 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 111: So. 14 MS. RADOSTA: Did she make this accusation to 15 anybody other than you? Did she make it to adults --16 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 111: Um --17 MS. RADOSTA: -- if you remember? 18 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 111: -- oh, I think there 19 might have been my teacher at the time, and so that's why it 20 was kind of a big deal because, yeah. 21 MS. RADOSTA: Okay. 22 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 111: So. MS. RADOSTA: Do you remember -- and I certainly 23 24 appreciate that you said it was when you were in elementary 25 school.

```
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 111: Yeah.
 1
 2
              MS. RADOSTA: Do you remember feeling any
 3
    frustration and trying to prove that you did not do something?
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 111: Well, sure.
 4
 5
              MS. RADOSTA: How -- how did you go about trying to
 6
   prove that you did not do something?
 7
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 111: Well, just through my
 8
    verbal, you know, talk --
 9
              MS. RADOSTA: Okay.
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 111: -- to my mother and, you
10
11
    know, and going over there to her house and, you know, trying
12
    to -- you know, I told her straight -- straight up to her
    face, I didn't take that five dollars and I don't know why
13
14
    you're lying --
15
              MS. RADOSTA: Okay.
16
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 111: -- about that, so.
17
              MS. RADOSTA: Did she eventually come forward in
    front of the adults or just to you to --
18
19
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 111: I think --
20
              MS. RADOSTA: -- admit that she had lied?
21
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 111: I think that after -- I
    think that I had told the adults that she said that I didn't
22
23
             So I think, you know, like when we left, everybody
    take it.
24
    was, you know, like smiling.
25
              MS. RADOSTA: Okay.
```

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 111: So, from what I 1 2 remember. 3 MS. RADOSTA: Did you ever feel that your parents maybe believed her over you in the beginning when the 4 5 accusation was made? 6 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 111: No, I think my mother 7 believed me, but she wanted to make sure that, you know, yeah 8 so. MS. RADOSTA: Make -- at least give the girl a voice or something of that --10 11 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 111: Right. 12 MS. RADOSTA: Okay. Okay. Is there anybody else 13 that had had an experience like that? Mr. --14 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 256: As a -- as an adult. 15 MS. RADOSTA: Hang on. Hang on a second. If we can 16 get the mic down to you. 17 Mr. Rosenfield, Badge 256. As an adult, yeah? PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 256: As an adult, this was in 18 19 '88, I had just started my job in Las Vegas in -- in printing 20 sales --21 MS. RADOSTA: Okay. 22 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 256: -- and there was -- I 23 walked by the conference room and there was some film and we 24 were evidently printing a poster of a Waffen-SS soldier, kind 25 of Nazi memorabilia.

MS. RADOSTA: Um-hum.

 $\label{eq:prospective_juror_no.256:} \mbox{ I was a little surprised} \\ \mbox{by that.}$

MS. RADOSTA: For sure.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 256: I took some issues with that and went to my boss, asked him if -- if we were actually going to print that job, and I said we have standards, don't we? You know, we don't print porn.

MS. RADOSTA: Right.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 256: They said their -- they noted my concerns and I think they said they would just print it in the middle of the night or something like that, it would be covered. And it was a boss -- it was one of the two owner's accounts. He had the account.

About a couple weeks later, they went to -- I get called into the office and the owner of the account, the owner that account was ready to fire me he was so angry. And the press room -- or the pre-press forman was in there saying that he gave me that film, I went in there and checked out that film. And they -- they didn't have the film. He said he gave it to me.

MS. RADOSTA: Okay.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 256: And I did not -- and the guy -- the pressroom forman, pre-press forman had been there for a long time.

MS. RADOSTA: And you had just started.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 256: I had just started.

MS. RADOSTA: Okay.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 256: And I said that didn't -- I didn't do that. I didn't take it out. He goes, it's in the log. I put it in the log. You took it. I said, it didn't happen. The owner was really, really angry. When I said it again, I did not do this, the pre-press manager said, are you calling me a liar? Put you -- and he took a few steps toward me, said he'd put me in the hospital.

And I just turned to the two owners, and I said, this didn't happen. You are asking what did I do, and I said, I just looked him in the eye. I said, I'm looking you in the eye, I'm telling you this did not happen. I did not do that.

Are you calling me a liar? I said, I'm not calling you a liar. I said, you're mistaken. But I did not do this. I offered to take a lie detector test. I'd pay for it. It just -- they just let it go at that -- at that time.

And sometime later, about six months later, they found the film. It was -- the guy was wrong.

MS. RADOSTA: Okay.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 256: And that's -- they didn't so much apologize to me, but in answer to the -- in answer to your question, it was difficult. It was difficult knowing that I was innocent and being accused of something by

```
somebody who had credibility and put trust in that company.
 1
 2
              MS. RADOSTA: Okay.
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 256: And I had to tell them I
 3
    didn't do it.
 4
 5
              MS. RADOSTA: And all -- if I'm understanding your
 6
    story correctly, all you could do to defend yourself is just
 7
    say, I didn't do it.
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 256:
 8
 9
              MS. RADOSTA: You couldn't say --
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 256: I look him eye to eye.
10
11
              MS. RADOSTA: -- uh --
12
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 256: I couldn't prove -- I
13
    couldn't prove the negative.
14
              MS. RADOSTA: Right.
15
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 256: You know, all I could
16
    tell them -- you know, I could -- again, like I said, offer
17
    to, you know, take a lie detector test for what that was
    worth --
18
19
              MS. RADOSTA:
                            Right.
20
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 256: -- at the time and look
21
    eye to eye to him.
22
              MS. RADOSTA: Okay. And you said that -- so in the
23
    end did you feel that the other person truly -- the person
24
    that accused you --
25
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 256: At the time --
```

```
MS. RADOSTA: -- [inaudible] --
 1
 2
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 256: -- I think he -- I think
 3
    he believed he did it -- I didn't -- I mean, I -- I -- he --
 4
    in his mind he remembered giving it to me.
 5
              MS. RADOSTA:
                            Okay.
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 256: I don't think he was
 6
 7
    like just throwing me under the bus as a, you know,
    sacrificial lamb.
 8
              MS. RADOSTA: Okay.
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 256: I think he believed it
10
11
    at the time.
12
              MS. RADOSTA: Okay. And did you feel that the fact
13
    that they did not let you go from your job maybe they felt
14
    that there was some truth in what you were saying?
15
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 256: Evidently, I convinced
16
    them enough (indecipherable) I convinced them enough that,
17
    yeah, they didn't fire me on the spot.
18
              MS. RADOSTA: Okay. But as you said a second ago,
19
    if I heard you correctly, it's incredibly difficult to prove a
20
    negative --
21
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 256: Um-hum.
22
              MS. RADOSTA: -- it's actually --
23
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 256: Impossible.
24
              MS. RADOSTA: -- almost impossible --
25
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 256: Yeah.
```

MS. RADOSTA: -- to prove a negative. 1 2 Did you -- when that was happening to you, did you 3 kind of run through in your head like how am I going to prove this to them, and realize, I -- how do I do that? 4 5 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 256: Yes. 6 MS. RADOSTA: Okav. 7 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 256: 8 MS. RADOSTA: Is there -- does anybody else have a 9 similar situation? Mr. Wells-Thompson, Badge 152. Thank you, Mr. Rosenfield, for sharing that. 10 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 256: 11 Yes. 12 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 152: I remember a case in 13 high school for the finals for biology. I did the test. 14 got 100 percent. It was to move to the next grade. And I got 15 pulled in the office, they're like, it's impossible, your 16 score. You know, and I was like, well, I don't understand. They're like, you got 100. Like, nobody gets that. 17 18 And you know, it went back and forth. But they 19 ended up putting me back into a testing class to have me take 20 the test again. Little did they know, before that I 21 that's like kind of my thing --MS. RADOSTA: 22 Um-hum. 23 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 152: -- biology. 24 MS. RADOSTA: Okay. 25 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 152: Anything like that.

```
I -- a lot of National Geographics, before it was like
 1
 2
    encyclopedias, got the Internet so, you know, read -- a lot of
 3
    reading, reading. And so the opportunity came.
    instructor gave the test right off the bat. I aced it again.
 4
 5
   And they just let me sit in the class.
 6
              MS. RADOSTA: They just let you -- I'm sorry?
 7
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 152: Just sit in a class,
 8
   because they couldn't move me. Nobody really apologized or
    anything about it, just -- it's just like I can't do anything
   because they have -- you have to sit here.
10
11
              MS. RADOSTA: Okay. And I'm sorry if I'm not
12
    completely understanding. The test was to move you to the
13
   next level.
14
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 152:
                                         Yeah.
15
              MS. RADOSTA: And then you -- but they put you back
16
    anyway and you had to --
17
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 152:
                                         They --
18
              MS. RADOSTA: -- take the test again and then still
19
    didn't move --
20
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 152: It was like
21
    another --
22
              MS. RADOSTA: -- you?
23
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 152: -- a prep class.
24
              MS. RADOSTA:
                            Sure.
25
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 152: For -- to take the test
```

again, but the instructor wanted to see, so she gave me the 1 2 test at the beginning. And I passed it. Okay. 3 MS. RADOSTA: So --PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 152: Same results. 4 5 MS. RADOSTA: I apologize for -- for interrupting. 6 When -- was it the exact same exam or was it slightly 7 different if you remember? 8 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 152: It was slightly different. Okay. When you were first accused of 10 MS. RADOSTA: 11 -- not being able to have aced the -- got the 100 percent, 12 what did you -- what did you feel in that moment? 13 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 152: It was kind of 14 embarrassing. MS. RADOSTA: Okay. Did you -- did at any point 15 16 when they said we want -- well, the teacher apparently just 17 wanted you to take the exam because she was curious; is that a 18 fair statement, the second exam? 19 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 152: Yeah, the instructor, 20 because they were -- she was curious. 21 MS. RADOSTA: Um, did -- did you ever feel like, no, 22 you know what, I -- I passed that first one and I'm sticking 23 with that number rather than take a second exam? 24 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 152: I think in the 25 beginning.

1	MS. RADOSTA: Okay.
2	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 152: But then I was like you
3	know what, whatever. I can do it again, so.
4	MS. RADOSTA: Okay. Did your parents ever get
5	involved in all this? Because they were essentially accusing
6	you of cheating.
7	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 152: Right.
8	MS. RADOSTA: Did your parents ever get involved?
9	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 152: My see, my mom was
10	just, just take it again.
11	MS. RADOSTA: Okay.
12	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 152: You know, because they
13	knew that that was my thing.
14	MS. RADOSTA: Sure.
15	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 152: So
16	MS. RADOSTA: They said, take it again. You'll show
17	them, it'll all be fine.
18	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 152: Yeah.
19	MS. RADOSTA: And then in the end you were not able
20	to get out of the class that they put you in anyway?
21	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 152: No. I had to run its
22	course, but I didn't have to do any of the work.
23	MS. RADOSTA: Okay.
24	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 152: I just kind of
25	just

MS. RADOSTA: All right. 1 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 152: -- kind of just sat 2 3 there and did all -- read and -- artwork or whatever. MS. RADOSTA: Other than taking the exam a second 4 5 time, could you have thought of any way to prove that you 6 hadn't cheated? 7 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 152: Probably not. 8 MS. RADOSTA: Okay. Was it important to you, to 9 prove to them that you hadn't cheated? 10 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 152: Yeah. 11 MS. RADOSTA: To prove that you were not what they -12 you didn't do what they said you did? 13 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 152: Yeah. MS. RADOSTA: Okay. Thank you. 14 15 Is there anyone else that has had a similar 16 experience? Thank you. 17 The other thing that I wanted to touch on and I -- I 18 did talk about this with a few people. The idea of the 19 State's burden and -- and what they have to prove in the case. 20 And is there anybody here, if they were charged with a crime, 21 would think that they would want to testify? Yeah? There was 22 a lot of people? Okay. 23 Mr. Tonan, back -- could you hand the badge -- the 24 mic to him -- Badge 479. You're nodding your heard. 25 think you would want to testify?

```
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 479: Yeah.
 1
 2
              MS. RADOSTA: And why is that?
 3
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 479: To prove my innocence.
              MS. RADOSTA:
                            To -- you would want to -- you would
 4
 5
    actually want to prove your innocence?
 6
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 479: Sure, of course.
 7
              MS. RADOSTA: Even though you are aware that you
 8
    don't have to prove your innocence if you're charged with a
 9
    crime, you would still --
10
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 479: Well, I mean, it would
11
    depend on what my attorneys told me to do but I -- my first
12
    response would be to get up and say, I didn't do that, you
13
    know.
14
              MS. RADOSTA:
                            Okay. Can you think --
15
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 479: [Inaudible] wrong.
16
              MS. RADOSTA: -- of any reasons why somebody might
17
    not want to testify during a trial?
18
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 479: Afraid of saying the
19
    wrong thing, I guess, you know --
20
              MS. RADOSTA: Okay.
21
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 479: -- and be not -- and
22
    understood, you know, and getting their idea through possibly.
23
              MS. RADOSTA: Okay.
24
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 479: But if you're
25
    innocent --
```

```
MS. RADOSTA: Okay. You just shrugged your
 1
 2
    shoulders there. If you're innocent --
 3
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 479: No, I'm saying if you're
    innocent, I think, you know, you should -- you know you're
 4
 5
    innocent.
 6
              MS. RADOSTA:
                            Um-hum. Can you imagine -- I mean,
 7
    you did reference the fact that, you know, you would listen,
 8
    you know, presumably you would listen to your attorneys and if
 9
    they said don't --
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 479: Oh, sure.
10
                                                     Yeah.
                                                            Of
11
    course.
12
              MS. RADOSTA: -- you -- you would --
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 479: That's why you have
13
14
    them.
              MS. RADOSTA: But also, could you imagine -- I mean,
15
16
    is this experience for anybody here pleasant talking in front
    of a whole bunch of people? Would you do this if you didn't
17
18
    have to do it? No. The -- the panel is shaking their head in
19
    mass no.
20
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 479:
                                         [Inaudible].
21
              MS. RADOSTA: Oh, so could you imagine that maybe
22
    just -- I mean, you're just sitting here as jurors.
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 479: Yeah.
23
24
              MS. RADOSTA: You are not being accused of anything.
25
    You are not being charged with a crime. Could you imagine
```

```
that the person sitting -- the person charged is -- there's a
 1
 2
    lot riding on what they say on the stand. Could you imagine
 3
    that maybe they just might not feel comfortable?
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 479: Yeah, I suppose that's
 4
 5
   possible, yeah.
 6
              MS. RADOSTA:
                            That they could be nervous.
 7
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 479: Sure.
 8
              MS. RADOSTA: That they could be as you said
 9
    following the advice of their attorney. Would you -- Mr. --
    Mr. Tonan -- since -- sorry -- I -- it's in my head every
10
11
    time, Mr. Tonan.
12
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 479: It's happened for years.
13
              MS. RADOSTA: As -- you have the mic. Could --
14
    would you hold it against my client if he decided not to
15
    testify?
16
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 479:
                                          No.
17
              MS. RADOSTA: Okay. Even though you've said if you
18
    were --
19
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 479: When you asked me --
20
              MS. RADOSTA: -- charged with a crime.
21
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 479: -- what I would do.
22
              MS. RADOSTA: Okay. But you would not hold it
23
    against him?
24
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 479:
                                          No.
25
              MS. RADOSTA: Is there anybody in the -- and there
```

were a lot of people that were nodding along with the reasons
-- potential reasons why somebody may not want to testify. Is
there anybody here that would hold it against my client if he
decided not to testify?

And this is -- this is a big one. This is an important one that's very basic to the constitution, he has a right not to testify. But people are people, and people want to hear what people have to say.

So is there anybody here that would hold it against him if he did not testify? I'm not seeing -- I'm seeing a lot of head shakes.

Is there anybody here that thinks that we have to prove anything about our client? That we have to prove him innocent? Nobody? I'm going to ask that the mic be handed over to Ms. Brand, because we did have a brief conversation about this the other day. Juror No. 111.

We did talk about this a little bit the other day. PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 111: Yes.

MS. RADOSTA: The idea that you would -- I believe what you said the other day to us is that you would expect us to prove to you that our client didn't do what he is accused of. Am I misstating what you said? And if I am, please correct me.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 111: Well, what I tried to express was that I thought it would be fair for both sides to

present, you know, the evidence.

MS. RADOSTA: Okay.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 111: But I realized, you know, that he -- your side of it, the defendant's side, you say that he -- that you don't have to have testimony from that side, then I'll go with that. That's fine.

I understand what you said just one minute ago. So -- and you know, and as I did express to you the last time we talked, that I do understand the procedures of the court. So no, I -- I don't think that -- that you have to do anything more than what you have to do, so.

MS. RADOSTA: Could -- could you imagine if you were chosen to be a juror on this particular case and we'd sit here for however long, two days, five days, ten days, whatever it is, listening to evidence but you'd ever hear anything from my client.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 111: Right.

MS. RADOSTA: And you go back in the jury room to deliberate. Would you be satisfied with that as being the evidence that you're to consider?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 111: Yes.

MS. RADOSTA: Okay. You wouldn't be back there going, but you know what, if only he had testified, then I would be convinced that -- of whatever.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 111: No.

MS. RADOSTA: Okay. Let me ask you this; if you heard somebody else in the jury room saying, if only he had testified that I was so curious about what he would have to say about X, Y and Z, what would you do if you heard another juror saying that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 111: Well, would just reiterate that -- you know, it's the State's burden to prove guilt and that the evidence that's presented that, you know,

through the Court, is what we have to accept and use to make

our decision.

MS. RADOSTA: Okay. All right. One of the other jurors who was excused I believe there might have been one or two other people that had said this as well -- had referenced that just because he's sitting here in the courtroom, just because Mr. Sena is sitting there, next -- next to Mr. Lopez-Negrete, sitting at the defendant's table, that he must have done something in order to be sitting there.

Did anybody hear -- I think it was -- I think it was Ms. Huff that might have said that a few days ago. Did anybody else hear her say that?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I thought it was a guy that said it.

MS. RADOSTA: Might have been.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I heard [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: [Inaudible] not sure who said

1 it. 2 MS. RADOSTA: Okay. Well, Mr. Riggins, if you would 3 take the mic. Sorry. PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 394: That's all right. 4 5 MS. RADOSTA: When you -- when you heard the other 6 juror, whoever it was say that, what did you think? Did 7 you --PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 394: 8 Um --9 MS. RADOSTA: -- did -- did it -- you noticed it. PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 394: I'm not saying that's 10 11 true. 12 MS. RADOSTA: Okay. 13 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 394: But in a lot of cases, 14 most people from what my experience are found quilty. But so 15 there may be -- just because there's some truth doesn't mean 16 that's the truth. MS. RADOSTA: I'm not sure I understand what --17 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 394: That it doesn't mean 18 19 that he actually did. 20 MS. RADOSTA: Okay. 21 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 394: Because there are people that are -- are -- that are accused that are innocent. 22 23 MS. RADOSTA: Okay. So just because he's sitting 24 here in the courtroom at the defendant's table, that does not 25 mean to you that he must have done something in order to be

```
sitting there.
 1
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 394: No. Not necessarily.
 2
 3
              MS. RADOSTA: All right. And can you -- Mr.
   Rosenfield also had a comment, Badge 256.
 4
 5
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 256: If you're asking me what
    I thought at the time you said that --
 6
 7
              MS. RADOSTA: Yes.
 8
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 256: -- my mind went to the
 9
   people who were getting let out of prison when I think just
10
    received a million dollar reward for 36 years --
              MS. RADOSTA: Um-hum.
11
12
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 256: -- falsely imprisoned.
13
              MS. RADOSTA: Um-hum.
              UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:
                                     Oh, I see.
14
15
              MS. RADOSTA: Yeah.
16
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 256: You know, it wasn't such
17
    a good deal but --
18
              MS. RADOSTA:
                            Yeah.
19
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 256: -- no, I've thought
20
    about that, you know, there --
21
              MS. RADOSTA: So --
22
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 256: -- there's a lot of
23
   people who --
24
              MS. RADOSTA: -- okay -- falsely --
25
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 256: -- have been -- been
```

wrongly convicted. 1 2 MS. RADOSTA: Falsely accused, wrongly convicted. 3 So the fact that he is just even in the courtroom, that does not hold any weight with you? 4 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 256: No. 5 It. --6 MS. RADOSTA: Okay. Is there anybody here who would 7 disagree with that? And once again, we just -- we're really 8 just looking for people to be honest. I appreciated when -whoever the juror was that said that, that they said it, because those are things we need to know. 10 11 I'm quessing that Ms. Dolan probably does not feel 12 that way considering the fact that she teaches social studies. But did you hear that comment, Ms. Dolan, when it was made? 13 14 Could you pass the mic back to her? 15 Did -- did it stick out in your mind as -- when you 16 heard it? 17 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 338: It did, yeah. 18 MS. RADOSTA: That. --19 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 338: I did notice it. 20 MS. RADOSTA: -- were -- in any way were you 21 thinking, a little surprised that someone would say that given 22 your area of teaching or --23 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 338: Right. Well, people 24 just assume just because someone is accused of a crime that

they did the crime; that's unfair to all of the people who

25

have been falsely accused. 1 2 MS. RADOSTA: Okay. PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 338: You can't assume that. 3 MS. RADOSTA: Okav. 4 5 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 338: That's not fair. 6 MS. RADOSTA: Is there anybody here in the -- in the 7 courtroom -- and this is a slightly different version. 8 there anybody here that's heard a story on the news just heard a blurb on the news and thought, oh my goodness, that person Is there anybody here that's done that? 10 is quilty. 11 quessing most people have done that. Ms. Dolan, you have the mike and you're nodding your 12 13 head. But in this particular situation, would you agree that this is not just hearing something on the news? 14 15 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 338: No, this is different. 16 This is -- we're in court. 17 MS. RADOSTA: Okay. 18 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 338: There's evidence to be 19 presented. 20 MS. RADOSTA: Okay. 21 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 338: It's a different -- it's -- and it's he's innocent at this moment. 22 23 MS. RADOSTA: Okay. So -- and the fact that there 24 might be more than a few charges that the State has -- has 25 pled against my client, would that have any impact on you, one

versus ten versus twenty? 1 2 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 338: No. The number doesn't 3 It's still innocent until proven otherwise. matter. MS. RADOSTA: Okay. Is there anybody that would 4 5 disagree with that statement? I saw Mr. Gall nodding to that 6 -- to what Ms. Dolan was saying. 7 Is there anybody who disagrees with that, that if 8 it's a lot of charges, well, that has to mean something. 9 response to that. Okay. Thank you. 10 Court's indulgence. 11 (Pause in the proceedings) 12 MS. RADOSTA: There's been a fair amount of questioning primarily I think by me about the fact that there 13 14 is potential video evidence in this particular case. Is the -15 - is there anybody here that -- at that thought, if there's a 16 video, why is there a trial? Nobody thought, wow, okay, Mr. -- Mr. Fragale, Mr. -- Mr. Rosenfield. Could you pass the mic 17 down? 18 19 THE COURT RECORDER: Badge number? 20 Badge No. 561. MS. RADOSTA: 21 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 561: 561, yes. 22 MS. RADOSTA: So my question was, did you think if

there's video why is there a trial, and you raised your hand.

-- the video would be enough to prove something unless there's

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 561: Yes, I think that would

23

24

25

something in there that we haven't seen or --1 MS. RADOSTA: Okay. Would it -- would it change 2 3 your mind if there is -- that perhaps not all of the charges relate to potential video; would that change your mind as to 4 5 why there could be a trial? 6 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 561: Oh, sure. 7 MS. RADOSTA: Okay. Will you be able to judge the 8 charges that have to potentially do with video separate from the charges that don't have anything to do with video? PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 561: Yes. 10 11 MS. RADOSTA: Okay. And Mr. Rosenfield, you also 12 raised you hand when I said --13 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 256: Yeah, the same. I mean, 14 the --15 MS. RADOSTA: Okay. 16 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 256: -- knee jerk when, you 17 know, reading the synopsis knowing that there is videos and, you know, obviously, your knee jerk is to think, wow, and he 18 19 didn't take a plea. 20 MS. RADOSTA: Okay. 21 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 256: Perhaps a plea wasn't offered. 22 23 MS. RADOSTA: Okay. 24 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 256: But -- but then as you 25 discussed in your opening statement that there -- as you just

```
said it now -- that there could be other charges that --
 1
 2
              MS. RADOSTA:
                            Um-hum.
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 256: -- will be more
 3
 4
    vigorously contested.
 5
              MS. RADOSTA:
                            Okay.
 6
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 256: And it's -- frankly,
 7
    it's interesting with your questions -- with your questioning
 8
    you're encouraging watching the video as opposed to
    suppressing the video so that's interesting.
              MS. RADOSTA: Perhaps unexpected?
10
11
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 256: Unexpected, yes.
              MS. RADOSTA: Okay. Is there anybody else that felt
12
13
    that that was unexpected, that like Mr. Rosenfield, that I was
14
    -- that I have been encouraging watching of the video given
15
    the fact that I'm Mr. Sena's defense attorney? No?
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 394: So, I believe it was --
16
17
              THE COURT: This is Mr. Riggins.
18
              MS. RADOSTA:
                            Mr. Riggins.
19
              THE COURT:
                          Badge 394.
20
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 394: So, I believe you had
21
   mentioned before that you wanted us to look more closely.
              MS. RADOSTA:
22
                            Um-hum.
23
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 394: Because we may notice
24
    other things rather than what it looks like on the surface in
25
    the video, along those lines, I'm paraphrasing.
```

1	MS. RADOSTA: Um-hum.
2	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 394: So yes, of course, I
3	believe you have encouraged us. You do want us to watch the
4	video because there may be something there we notice that may
5	sway us one way or the other to believe whether he may be
6	guilty or innocent of certain charges.
7	MS. RADOSTA: Okay. Does anybody else does
8	anybody have a problem with that idea at all? Okay. I'm
9	going to just take a moment.
10	Thank you, Mr. Riggins.
11	(Pause in the proceedings)
12	MS. RADOSTA: Court's indulgence
13	THE COURT: Okay.
14	MS. RADOSTA: just for a moment. Thank you.
15	(Pause in the proceedings)
16	MS. RADOSTA: I just have a couple of quick follow
17	up questions. Mr. Kittredge, Badge 572. Who's got
18	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 572: Yeah.
19	MS. RADOSTA: if you could hand the mic down to
20	him.
21	You we had talked just briefly about your
22	father's contact with the system, that it was a bank robbery
23	that was caught on video.
24	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 572: Yes.
25	MS. RADOSTA: And you said no reason to fight it, it

was all caught on video. Is that essentially -- I'm sorry if
I'm [inaudible].

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 572: Yeah, you're right.

MS. RADOSTA: Okay. So let me ask you this question. If by chance if there had been other allegations before the video, somebody outside the bank said, oh my God, he pulled a gun on me, too, before he went into the bank, would the fact that there was video evidence of what other people said happened in the bank, which turned out to be true; would that cause you to think what happened with the person outside, out front, what they are saying was true as well?

MR. SWEETIN: Can we -- may we approach, Judge?
THE COURT: Yes.

(Off-record bench conference)

MS. RADOSTA: Mr. Kittredge, I'm going to try to rephrase the question because I don't think it was particularly clear.

I saw the look on your face. So you -- you said earlier that you watched the video and what your father was accused of you saw happen on the videotape.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 572: Yes.

MS. RADOSTA: Okay. Had there been a -- someone else that said something else happened prior to the incident in the bank, earlier, again, before he -- right before he walked into the bank or earlier in the day; would the fact

```
that what you saw on the videotape actually happened, and
 1
 2
    somebody accused him of that, would that impact your decision-
 3
    making on whether or not the other incident before, not on
    video, happened or didn't happen?
 4
 5
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 572: What you're asking me
 6
    though changes -- changes my dad's -- what he faced.
 7
              MS. RADOSTA:
                            Okay.
 8
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 572: Do you know what I mean?
 9
              MS. RADOSTA: Yes.
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 572: If he would have faced
10
11
    that, something --
12
              MS. RADOSTA:
                            Okay.
13
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 572: -- an altercation
14
    outside --
15
              MS. RADOSTA:
                            Right.
16
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 572: -- somebody saw him do
17
    something and then he went in --
18
              MS. RADOSTA:
                            Um-hum.
19
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 572: -- and that was part of
20
    it, you know --
21
              MS. RADOSTA:
                            Right.
22
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 572: -- joined, then --
23
    then --
24
              MS. RADOSTA: Um-hum.
25
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 572: -- it would totally
```

change my perception on a lot of things.

MS. RADOSTA: Okay.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 572: On what I saw in the video versus what I didn't see happen outside.

MS. RADOSTA: Okay.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 572: But since that didn't happen, and what he did do was accurate and true to form on the video, then yes, that was [inaudible].

MS. RADOSTA: So if I'm understanding you correctly, you're honestly telling me that you can't answer my -- my scenario because it's just simply not what happened in your dad's case.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 572: Exactly.

MS. RADOSTA: Okay. That's fair. I appreciate that. Let me -- and then Mr. Rosenfield, you mentioned in the past few minutes about cases where people are exonerated and are -- have gotten money for being wrongfully convicted.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 256: Um-hum.

MS. RADOSTA: If you recall in those situations, were the people ultimately exonerated because there was physical evidence that came -- that was retested or do you not know?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 256: Yeah, the one with the -- the specific one I just mentioned, the million dollars, I don't know anything about the case, I just know that it was 36

years and he got a million dollars. There's been other ones 1 2 where I know DNA testing has -- I can't quote the actual, you know, cases, but I know DNA, obviously has exonerated people, 3 possibly, probably, you know, some confessions, somebody 4 5 incarcerated or something. 6 MS. RADOSTA: Okay. So you -- you can picture the 7 scenario of where it's perhaps no physical evidence in the 8 case, but rather testimonial evidence --9 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 256: Um-hum. 10 MS. RADOSTA: -- that caused somebody to be 11 wrongfully convicted? 12 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 256: Oh, absolutely. 13 MS. RADOSTA: That's -- that's something that you 14 can see as possible -- you've heard of it happening? 15 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 256: Oh, of course. 16 MS. RADOSTA: Okay. Is there anybody else here 17 that's heard of a situation like that? Ms. Dolan? If you 18 could just pass the mic back to her. 19 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 338: Again, this is with 20 children, but when an authority figure listens at all to an 21 accusation against a student --MS. RADOSTA: 22 Um-hum. 23 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 338: -- once, maybe even 24 twice, other students tend to then start accusing them of

25

things --

MS. RADOSTA: Oh. 1 2 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 338: -- when they didn't do 3 I've just -- I've seen it a lot over the years. authority figure has to be very careful because children will 4 5 gang up on the person and accuse them of things. 6 MS. RADOSTA: Okav. 7 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 338: And constantly be the --8 well, I -- he did it, when clearly the evidence indicates the kid wasn't anywhere near. But that does happen. MS. RADOSTA: Okay. And I'm guessing in elementary 10 11 school there is not a lot of DNA evidence being taken or 12 fingerprint evidence or --13 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 338: Yeah, no, you have to 14 rely on -- on testimony really. 15 MS. RADOSTA: Okay. And --16 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 338: -- on [inaudible]. 17 MS. RADOSTA: -- so you -- have you ever been -- you 18 yourself been in that situation? 19 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 338: Oh yeah, as a classroom 20 teacher, especially with fifth graders, it --21 MS. RADOSTA: Have you ever --22 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 338: -- it happens all the 23 time. 24 MS. RADOSTA: Have you ever been in the situation 25 where you found out later that you made the wrong -- that you

made the wrong decision? 1 2 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 338: I'm -- I'm certain I 3 I don't have any examples in my mind. But early -- as a -- and as a newer teacher I made mistakes and I learned from 4 5 those mistakes so I'm more cautious now. 6 MS. RADOSTA: All right. Okay. And I assume you 7 mean cautious about --PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 338: Listen --8 9 MS. RADOSTA: -- accusing or -- or taking the word just of the kids without more? 10 11 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 338: Right. Exactly. 12 just automatically jumping to the conclusion just because this 13 many people said that this kid has done something, I'm not 14 going to assume that. I have to talk to the child, do some --15 find out as much as I can about it before coming to any 16 conclusions, just like I guess on a jury. I have -- I have to 17 wait until I've gathered more evidence. I can't just assume 18 oh, well, this kid gets in trouble so this kid is guilty. You 19 can't do that because they get falsely accused a lot. 20 MS. RADOSTA: Okay. All right. Thank you. 21 At this point, Judge, I think I'm done. I think we 22 can --23 Okay. State, do you pass for cause? THE COURT: 24 MS. SUDANO: Yes, Your Honor. 25 THE COURT: Ms. Radosta?

```
MS. RADOSTA: Just let me double check, Judge.
 1
 2
    Sorry.
 3
                      (Pause in the proceedings)
              MS. RADOSTA: Your Honor, we did make some prior
 4
 5
    challenges for cause --
 6
              THE COURT: Um-hum.
 7
              MS. RADOSTA: -- outside the presence. I'm not sure
 8
    if you want me to just for the record right now renew them.
 9
              THE COURT: What -- yeah, just --
              MS. RADOSTA: -- just -- I'm renewing --
10
11
              THE COURT: -- approach so --
12
              MS. RADOSTA: -- those --
              THE COURT: -- I want to --
13
              MS. RADOSTA:
14
                            Yeah.
15
              THE COURT: -- make sure I'm talking about the right
16
    one; okay?
17
              MS. RADOSTA: Okay.
                     (Off-record bench conference)
18
19
              THE COURT: Okay. So, ladies and gentlemen, at this
20
    time what we're going to be doing is -- is doing our
21
   peremptory challenges. And rather than have you sit here and
22
   have -- because what I do is I give the State a form and then
23
    they check theirs off and they pass it over to the defense and
24
    check theirs off, it goes back and forth.
25
              Rather than have you just sit here and watch that
```

happen I'm going to give you all a break. Before you do, though, the two that are here in the courtroom, you're going to be excused. The last two is Mr. Alco Cabani [phonetic], and Charles Barber.

All right. Thank you so much for being here. I'm going to excuse you and let you go back the Jury Commission room and let them know that you've been excused; okay?

We'll fill this out and -- ladies and gentlemen, it's probably -- it's got to probably take probably about a half hour to 45 minutes. So what I'm going to do is I'm going to -- I'm going to ask you to go ahead and take your break but be ready to come back in the courtroom in about a half hour, be out there (indecipherable) and we'll get you in as soon as we can.

You are admonished, once again, before you leave, not to talk to or converse amongst yourselves or with anyone else on any subject connected with this trial or read, watch or listen to any report or commentary on the trial or any person connected with this trial, by any medium of information, including without limitation to newspapers, television, the Internet or radio, or form or express any opinion on any subject connected with this trial until the case is finally submitted to you.

All right. We'll be at ease while you -- UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you, Judge.

```
THE COURT: Sure, sure. Hold on.
 1
 2
              Mr. Rosenfield?
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 256: Is it possible to take a
 3
   poll and see if everybody's willing to stay as long as it
 4
 5
    takes to --
              THE COURT: Well, you're going to stay.
 6
 7
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 256: Oh.
 8
              THE COURT: We're going to get the jury figured out
9
    tonight, okay? Not tomorrow. We're going to do it tonight.
           (Outside the presence of the prospective jurors)
10
11
              THE COURT: Okay. We're outside the presence of the
12
    jury.
13
              We're going to print out a list for you,
14
    understanding that there's -- right now there is six positions
15
    for alternates. I'm giving you two -- two strikes of those
16
    alternates.
              MS. RADOSTA: Six or four?
17
              THE COURT: I'm sorry, one per side. There's six.
18
19
    There'll be four alternates.
20
              MS. RADOSTA: Okay.
21
              THE COURT: Okay? So you'll be able to strike one
22
    of those six year. So there would be four when you're -- if
23
    -- if you -- if you exercise them; okay?
24
              MS. RADOSTA: Okay.
25
              THE COURT: When you read the form here you'll see
```

```
which ones are the alternates and those are the only ones you
 1
 2
    can exercise your challenges for, of the last six individuals
 3
    that came -- went into the box; okay?
              Do you understand Ms. -- I know Ms. Radosta hasn't
 4
 5
   been in here before but --
 6
              MS. RADOSTA: I -- the -- I think Tia mentioned that
 7
    to us the other day and we were just --
 8
              THE COURT: Okay.
 9
              MS. RADOSTA: -- but I thought it was going to be
    the last four not the last six. But I understand --
10
11
              THE COURT: No, it's --
12
              MS. RADOSTA: -- it has to be six --
              THE COURT: There's --
13
              MS. RADOSTA: -- because if we strike two then --
14
15
              THE COURT: Right. There's eight peremptory
16
    challenges each.
17
              MS. RADOSTA: Yeah.
18
              THE COURT: If you waive any it doesn't mean you
19
    waive them all; okay. So here's the form. Ed, do you want to
20
    give that to them?
21
              MS. SUDANO: If we waive, Your Honor, that doesn't
22
    affect the alternates; is that right?
23
              THE COURT: If you waive the alternate -- you only
   have one against the alternate.
24
25
              MS. SUDANO: Right. And if we waive one of our
```

```
1
    first eight --
 2
              THE COURT: No, it won't.
              MS. SUDANO: -- it doesn't affect --
 3
              THE COURT: No, you just take the --
 4
 5
              MS. SUDANO: Okay.
 6
              THE COURT: -- first 12 that are in order.
 7
              MS. SUDANO: Okay. Thank you, Your Honor.
 8
              THE COURT:
                          Okay? State, let's say you waive all 16
 9
    of your challenges. You take the first 12 that came into the
   box and then you still exercise your -- your challenges
10
11
    against the last six; okay?
              MS. SUDANO: Thank you.
12
13
              THE COURT: The last six will always be considered
14
    alternates.
15
              MS. SUDANO:
                          Okay.
16
              THE COURT:
                          Okay?
17
              MS. SUDANO: Thank you.
18
              THE COURT: All right. Is there anything that we
19
    need to put on the record before we take a break?
20
              MS. SUDANO: Just --
              MS. RADOSTA: Oh, the -- our -- our challenges for
21
22
    cause, Judge.
23
              THE COURT: Okay. Yeah, you -- you had requested a
24
    challenge for cause with regards to Juror 111, Janice --
25
    Janice Brand, and Juror 153, Tanisha Turner.
```

considerable argument with regards to both of those 1 2 previously. I didn't find that there was anything additional 3 that would warrant a challenge for either one of them, short of what was already recognized by the parties, or what was 4 5 expressed by the parties; okay? 6 All right. 7 THE COURT RECORDER: Going off. 8 THE COURT: Yeah. Okay. (Court recessed at 4:22 P.M., until 5:23 P.M.) 9 10 (Outside the presence of the prospective jurors) 11 THE COURT: All right. Do you want to go ahead and 12 get the jury in? 13 Yeah. Actually, Judge, before we do MS. RADOSTA: 14 that we need to put something on the record. 15 THE COURT: All right. Hold on, Ed. 16 Okay. We're on the record outside the presence of 17 the jury in Case No. C-311453, State of Nevada versus 18 Christopher Sena in the presence of the Defendant and his 19 counsel as well as the State and their counsel and we're 20 outside the presence of the jury. 21 Ms. Radosta indicated she wanted to put something on 22 the record. 23 Sorry, Your Honor. Our Clerk that was MS. RADOSTA: 24 with us had a list so give us one quick second.

We had made a motion to strike a bunch of jurors a

25

few days ago based on their answers on the Jury Questionnaire from -- based on <u>Preciado</u> [phonetic] that they had already indicated that they could not be fair and impartial on their questions on the questionnaire.

And the people that you denied me at that time and said that I would have an opportunity still to question them.

THE COURT: Um-hum.

MS. RADOSTA: After questioning today there -- we -for the record are renewing our for cause challenge because
based on <u>Preciado</u> they had previously answered they could not
be fair and impartial the jurors, to my recollection were
Juror 338, Ms. Dolan, Juror 560, Mr. Hoolapa -- I can't say
his name -- H-o-o-p-l-a-p-a, I believe is how it's spelled.

THE COURT: Um-hum.

MS. RADOSTA: And Mr. Wohletz, 190. Those three were part of my original motion and after even though we were given an opportunity to question them today, or yesterday, whenever it was, they still had originally answered on their Jury Questionnaire that they could not be fair and impartial. And based on the Preciado case, Your Honor, that that answer alone shows an -- it shows that the are not unequivocal in their impartiality which is --

THE COURT: So --

MS. RADOSTA: -- what is required.

THE COURT: So the concern that I have though is

that you were given an opportunity to question them further because I believe that that -- after the time frame, between the time that they put --MS. RADOSTA: Um-hum. THE COURT: -- put first through it until now, and 6 every one of those individuals that you talk about had indicated here, before me, inconsistent with their questionnaire, saying that they could be fair and impartial, they would consider the evidence independent, they would make the decision based on that. Every one of those individuals did that. You chose not to question them any further, had let me to believe that you had no further questions with regards 13 to that. So --MS. RADOSTA: I actually did question them all, 16 not --But you didn't challenge them any THE COURT: You didn't -- the only one you did was when we 19 ended, you said you had two of them, and that was Ms. Brand and Ms. Turner. MS. RADOSTA: I still believe though, Your Honor, based on the Preciado case -- because I did speak --

1

2

3

4

5

7

8

10

11

12

14

15

17

18

20

21

22

23

24

25

alone, initially, saying that they could not be fair and

MS. RADOSTA: -- to these jurors and their answers

THE COURT: Okay.

```
impartial, brings into question their ability to be
 1
 2
    unequivocal in their impartiality and that's --
 3
              THE COURT:
                          Okay.
              MS. RADOSTA: -- the record that we're making.
 4
 5
              THE COURT: All right.
 6
              MS. RADOSTA: Additional --
 7
              THE COURT: Do you want to make a record?
 8
              MS. RADOSTA:
                            Okay.
 9
              MS. SUDANO: Oh, go ahead.
                            No, no, go.
10
              MS. RADOSTA:
11
              THE COURT: Yeah.
12
                            I'm sorry, go ahead.
              MS. RADOSTA:
              MR. SWEETIN: That's fine.
13
              MS. SUDANO: Do you want to?
14
15
              MR. SWEETIN:
                            No, go ahead.
16
              MS. SUDANO:
                           Okay. Your Honor, I would note, one,
17
                        The defense did pass the panel for cause.
    this was untimely.
18
    And just so that we're clear on the record, we've spent the
19
    last hour or so exercising our peremptory challenges and
20
    that's been done prior to this motion being made.
21
              Furthermore, Mr. Sweetin made a record previously
    when Ms. Radosta made the initial motion to strike all of
22
23
    these individuals that they all said that they couldn't be
24
           That's not actually what was in the Jury
    Questionnaires, and I do want to make sure that that's on the
25
```

record for these people. 1 THE COURT: Well, the ones they're talking about is 2 3 Badge 338, Robyn Dolan. 4 MS. SUDANO: Yes. 5 THE COURT: Badge 560, Duayne Hoolapa, and then the 6 last one, I can't remember which number --7 MS. SUDANO: 190. 8 THE COURT: Um --9 MS. SUDANO: Mr. Wohletz. MS. RADOSTA: Mr. Wohletz. 10 11 MS. SUDANO: So, Mr. Wohletz --12 Brian Wohletz, okay. THE COURT: 13 MS. SUDANO: Mr. Wohletz is the one that I have in 14 front of me right now, Badge No. 190. On that question, 15 Question No. 20, he said, "I believe so, but the subject 16 matter is disturbing." 17 THE COURT: Okay. MR. SAVAGE: Furthermore, in front of Your Honor he 18 19 indicated that he could be fair and impartial, would consider 20 the video evidence, in response to Ms. Radosta's questions 21 about, hey, what if I ask you to watch this more than once, 22 what if I ask you to watch this for details, he did not 23 indicate that he would be unable to do so. 24 Ms. Dolan, Badge No. 338, indicated, "I would be 25 disgusted and disturbed, but my duty is to remain impartial,

so I would do my best." In front of Your Honor, she stressed her belief in the Constitution, the fact that everybody is presumed innocent until proven guilty and the fact that everyone is entitled to a jury trial.

She did indicate in front of Your Honor unequivocally that she would be able to watch the video evidence, would consider it, and would not have any issue with Ms. Radosta's question, could you watch this more than once, could you watch this for details.

Mr. Hoolapa is our second alternate at this point,
Badge No. 560. He indicated, no, my children -- my concern
would be the children. He, again, reiterated in front of all
of us, in front of Your Honor and in response to Ms. Radosta's
questions, that he could be fair, could remain impartial,
could watch the video, could consider it for details and watch
it more than once.

THE COURT: Okay. Is there anything in any of the -- of those documents where they say what the defense is saying, that they say that we cannot be fair and impartial?

MS. SUDANO: That was the -- my understanding was that Ms. Radosta was raising those because of their responses to Question 20. And I've read their complete responses to Question 20 into the record --

THE COURT: Well, is there anything --

MS. SUDANO: -- at this point.

```
THE COURT: -- in there that says they say, in their
 1
 2
    language, we cannot be fair and impartial? Or no, I can't --
 3
    we can't be fair, or I can't be fair.
              MS. RADOSTA: Yes.
 4
 5
              THE COURT: That's what was represented by Ms.
 6
    Radosta.
 7
              MS. RADOSTA: Yes, Your Honor. Every single one of
 8
    them, the question was --
 9
              THE COURT: Well, show me where, because I --
10
              MS. RADOSTA: Can you promise to be fair and
11
    impartial, and any equivocation on that answer is an
12
    indication that they cannot promise.
13
              THE COURT: Well, no, tell me what they've said.
14
              MS. RADOSTA: They said -- Mr. -- Mr. Wohletz said,
15
    I believe so.
16
              THE COURT: Okay. Can he --
              MS. RADOSTA: That's not -- that's --
17
              THE COURT: -- be fair and impartial? I believe so.
18
19
              MS. RADOSTA: I believe so.
20
              THE COURT: And you're saying now that that's
21
    equivocation?
22
              MS. RADOSTA: Yes.
23
              THE COURT: Okay.
24
              MS. RADOSTA: Because many people answered, "yes".
25
   Most people answered --
```

```
THE COURT: Okay.
 1
 2
              MS. RADOSTA: -- "yes".
 3
              THE COURT: Yes.
                            Mr. --
              MS. RADOSTA:
 4
 5
              THE COURT: I understand.
              MS. RADOSTA: -- look him up --
 6
 7
              THE COURT: Hoolapa.
 8
              MS. RADOSTA: And I even misspelled it when I
9
    spelled it earlier, H-O-O-L-A-P-A.
10
              THE COURT: Uh-huh.
11
              MS. RADOSTA: He indicates, no.
12
              THE COURT: He says --
13
              MS. RADOSTA: He cannot be fair and impartial.
              THE COURT: I cannot be fair and impartial.
14
15
              MS. RADOSTA: No. My concern would be the children.
16
              THE COURT:
                          Okay.
17
              MS. RADOSTA:
                           And I believe Ms. Dolan, I think I
    have hers in front of me --
18
19
              THE COURT: So his -- his language is "no, I cannot
20
   be fair and impartial."
21
              MS. RADOSTA: No.
22
              MS. SUDANO: His language is, "No, my concern would
   be the children."
23
24
              THE COURT:
                          Okay.
25
                            But the answer -- the question is, can
              MS. RADOSTA:
```

```
you promise to be fair and impartial --
 1
 2
              THE COURT: Okay.
              MS. RADOSTA: -- and his answer was "no."
 3
              THE COURT: Okay.
 4
 5
              MS. RADOSTA: And, I'm sorry, I don't have Ms.
 6
    Dolan --
 7
              THE COURT: But how --
 8
              MS. RADOSTA: -- in front of me.
 9
              THE COURT: -- do you reconcile the fact that he
10
    that he said it right here to us that, yes, I can.
11
              MS. RADOSTA:
                            Judge, my -- my point is the -- the
12
    language in Preciado says, they must -- I'm sorry, but the
    language in Preciado is they must be unequivocal in their
13
14
    ability -- in their impartiality.
15
              THE COURT: It sounds to me that they -- that he was
16
    here, when he spoke --
17
              MS. RADOSTA: But our -- but they were --
18
              THE COURT: -- to us --
19
              MS. RADOSTA: -- sworn in the -- in the Jury
20
    Questionnaire. So are we just discounting what they said in
21
    the Jury Questionnaire?
22
              THE COURT: No, no, no, no, no, no. I think
23
    that there was questions about it because it didn't -- it
24
    wasn't unequivocal. In my opinion when -- when you say --
25
    that's why I asked to explain what was said. That's not
```

unequivocal to me. And so you have additional times to 1 2 question him and you chose not to. Then you say, well, I'm just relying on what they 3 said before when they -- in here we spent three days with 4 5 them, one day with Mr. Hoolapa, multiple days -- the whole 6 time with Mr. Wohletz, the whole time with Ms. Dolan and we --7 MS. RADOSTA: I -- I -- you're saying that I did not 8 question them, Judge. I did --9 THE COURT: No, but they didn't say anything that was consistent with what you're saying they're saying in their 10 11 questionnaire. Not a single one of them agreed with what 12 you're saying just now that --13 MS. RADOSTA: But doesn't --14 THE COURT: -- they were unequivocal. It sounded to 15 me in here they were clearly unequivocal that they could be 16 fair. 17 Then what -- I mean, but what does MS. RADOSTA: 18 that mean about the answer in the Jury Questionnaire then? 19 It's just --20

THE COURT: That -- no, no --

21

22

23

24

25

MS. RADOSTA: -- disregard it so --

THE COURT: -- I'm not disregarding it, Ms. Radosta. Do not put words in my mouth.

MS. RADOSTA: I'm asking, Judge.

THE COURT: Now, listen to me. When you have a

question that doesn't sound that it's unequivocal that it could be equivocal --

MS. RADOSTA: Um-hum.

THE COURT: -- then you give them an opportunity, as I did, to address it.

MS. RADOSTA: Okay.

THE COURT: And you chose not to. But they answered the question anyhow that gives me the answer that they are unequivocal about the fact that they can be fair. That's what makes no sense to me.

MS. RADOSTA: I -- I --

THE COURT: They have a questionnaire that doesn't answer the question completely because you guys spent days on questioning in that area.

MS. RADOSTA: Yeah.

THE COURT: If -- if not, we just accept those and let -- and go from there. But no, there's questions there because they don't answer them completely. When that -- when they're saying certain things like they've said here was just read to me, leads me to believe that they're not answering the question -- well, you even asked many of them, it doesn't sound like you understood the question, and they were answering, yes.

But those ones there, you didn't even touch on.

25 But --

MS. RADOSTA: I did --

THE COURT: -- I know Dolan you spent a lot of time on her. She didn't waiver at all from the fact that she could be fair and impartial.

MS. RADOSTA: I -- my point is simply, the answer on the Jury Questionnaire is part of the consideration, Judge. It just is, in my opinion.

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. RADOSTA: And based on the case law that -- as soon as they answer that they're not sure if they can be fair and impartial that calls into question whether or not they're equivocal or unequivocal.

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. RADOSTA: So --

THE COURT: I --

MS. RADOSTA: -- that's my position.

THE COURT: I understand. But the reason why I left it -- left it, I didn't agree with your position at times --

MS. RADOSTA: Um-hum.

THE COURT: Because it -- it doesn't do that. It questions whether -- what -- what their -- it doesn't answer anything. And so you give them an opportunity to ask them the questions now, and no one -- and you didn't do anything. But I will tell you in that area, all three of them were very clear that they could consider the evidence, that they'd be

fair, some of it's disturbing; all this is disturbing. Every one of them was saying that.

But they would -- they would be fair. They would -- they would weigh the evidence, they would use only the evidence that was here. They would follow the instructions of the Court. That sounds unequivocal to me.

MS. RADOSTA: My only -- the -- my only other point, Your Honor, is you've said multiple times that I did not ask them, and that is incorrect. I asked -- for sure I brought out Ms. Dolan's and Mr. Wohletz's Jury Questionnaires and asked them about those answers.

THE COURT: I know, but they -- they never stayed with that answer. They never agreed with that answer, not any of them. They were all in -- and the answer --

MS. RADOSTA: Okay.

THE COURT: -- you're saying. The answer you're saying is that it says that they were -- they were -- they couldn't --

MS. RADOSTA: That's --

THE COURT: -- be fair and impartial is what you're saying. All three of them said, no, absolutely not. As a matter of fact, I remember -- I think Ms. Dolan was very direct about that and her answers were absolutely, I could consider all this and I would be fair and impartial.

And -- and then you didn't raise it again. And when

```
I asked for -- to -- to pass for cause that you -- you did.
 1
 2
    You passed these for cause except for two; Janice Brand --
              MS. RADOSTA: And when we --
 3
              THE COURT: -- and Tanisha Turner.
 4
 5
              MS. RADOSTA: And when --
 6
              THE COURT: So --
 7
              MS. RADOSTA: And when we realized that we did not
    raise them earlier --
 8
 9
              THE COURT: Um-hum.
              MS. RADOSTA: -- we felt we needed to make a
10
11
    record --
12
              THE COURT: Okay. You --
13
              MS. RADOSTA: -- now, Judge.
              THE COURT: You -- all right, well, you've made your
14
15
    record.
             So get the jury back in.
16
              MS. RADOSTA: Actually, Judge, no, we -- we need to
17
    make a Batson challenge as well, two different Batson
18
    challenges. The State struck 326, Ms. Dickens, and it's our
19
    opinion that she is a protected class. She's African-
20
    American.
21
              And given the fact that she barely spoke during the
    course of our -- of our three days here, Judge, we --
22
23
              THE COURT: Okay.
24
              MS. RADOSTA: -- can't really find any reason why
25
    the State would strike her other than for the fact that she is
```

African-American.

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. RADOSTA: Beyond that, Judge, we are also making a Batson challenge for the three women; three of the six peremptory challenges that the State made were for women. They did three of the six. And the three were Ms. Dickens, Badge 326, Ms. Brand, 111, and Ms. Desiree Sanchez, 120.

Beyond what I've already said with Ms. Dickens, Ms. Sanchez is similar. She really didn't speak up much at all. There is no obvious reason why she would not be a qualified member of the -- sorry, not qualified member -- but an adequate member of the jury.

And Ms. Brand, she's also of the protected class. She did talk a lot, but in the end, Your Honor, she said that she could be -- she would presume innocent until proven guilty. I don't know what the State could possibly have a reason for not wanting her on the jury when she says something like that.

And said that she would follow the Court's orders as well. Oh, and I apologize, Your Honor, I misspoke. They also struck another woman, Ms. Muro, was one of the alternates. So they had seven -- they used seven total challenges and four of them were women.

Beyond that, also, I believe Ms. Muro and Ms. Sanchez are also of another protected class being Hispanic, I

```
believe. I'm not 100 percent sure with Ms. Muro. And so,
 1
 2
    with that, Your Honor --
 3
              THE COURT: Okay. So your position is a Batson
    challenge is that they struck an African-American.
 4
 5
              MS. RADOSTA:
                            Um-hum.
 6
              THE COURT: That's your first one?
 7
              MS. RADOSTA:
                            Yes.
 8
              THE COURT: Can you tell me how in any regards
 9
    whatsoever that there is any showing of any systematic
    exclusion of any -- of this African-American, someone that's
10
11
    -- or anybody in that regard that's part of a protected
12
    class --
13
              MS. RADOSTA: There is --
14
              THE COURT: -- or we --
15
              MS. RADOSTA: -- we don't have to show systematic.
    We -- the excusal of even one member of a protected class,
16
17
    according to caw law, Judge, is essentially a -- you disagree,
18
    apparently? I -- I --
19
              THE COURT: I'm just -- I'm -- I just don't know it
20
    that way. I don't -- there's a standard you have to meet.
21
    You have to show that they're a protected class.
              MS. RADOSTA:
22
                            Um-hum.
23
              THE COURT: Would accept that African-American is a
24
   protected class.
25
              MS. RADOSTA:
                            Right.
```

```
THE COURT: Then you have to show that there's a
 1
 2
    systematic exclusion of that protected class. If you -- if
 3
    you do that then the State has to be able to explain, give me
    a race neutral reason for that.
 4
 5
              MS. RADOSTA: Um-hum. And, Your Honor, the case law
 6
    that I have in front of me is -- is Watson v. State, 130
 7
   Nevada, Advanced Opinion 76, that the defendant is not
 8
    required to show a pattern of discriminatory strikes because,
    quote, "The exclusion of even one venire member based on
10
    membership in a recognizable group is a Constitutional
11
    violation." That's Nevada case law.
12
              THE COURT: The striking of one --
13
              MS. RADOSTA: Yep. The exclusion of even one --
              THE COURT: Let me -- let me read -- do you have the
14
15
    case or is this something you've just written down?
16
              MS. RADOSTA: 130 Nevada --
17
              THE COURT: Let me -- let me see it.
18
              MS. RADOSTA: -- Advanced Opinion 76. This is just
19
    the -- actually, I might actually have the case. Give me a
20
    second, Judge.
21
              No, this is not -- this -- sorry, Judge, I did not
22
    grab the case. I just have the -- the cite.
23
              THE CLERK: What's the site, 130 --
24
              THE COURT:
                         130 Nevada --
25
              MS. RADOSTA: 130 Nevada Advanced Opinion 76.
```

is also 335 P.3d 157. That's a 2014 case.

THE COURT: Pacific 3rd what?

MS. RADOSTA: Pacific 3rd 157.

THE COURT: And what's the name of the case?

MS. RADOSTA: Watson v. State.

THE COURT: Okay.

(Pause in the proceedings)

THE COURT: All right. I'll read from the case, Ms. Radosta.

MS. RADOSTA: Um-hum.

THE COURT: It says that, Where there is no pattern of strikes against members of a targeted group to give rise to an inference of discrimination, the opponent of the strike must provide other evidence sufficient to permit an inference of discrimination based on membership in a targeted group. In other words, the mere fact that the State used a peremptory challenge to exclude a member of the cognizant group is not standing alone sufficient to establish a prima facie case of discrimination under Batson's first step. Something more is required. Brightline rule that peremptory challenge used against a member of a racially cognizant group is sufficient to establish a prima facie case under Batson because such a rule would be inconsistent with Batson as it would negate this part of the analysis and require a prosecutor to provide an explanation every time a member of a racially cognizant group

is peremptorily challenged and would be inconsistent with what Washington court and other courts have held.

The one fact -- this is the -- citing the <u>Valdez</u>

<u>Lopez</u> case -- the one fact supporting the -- and then this

Defendant's Batson claim was the juror status and sole black

perspective juror. Okay. More was required. Noting that a

defendant is not required to show a pattern in order to make

out a prima facie showing of discrimination but that the

absence of a pattern is significant where the defense provided

no other basis for inferring discriminatory intent. Aside

from a pattern of strikes against members of a targeted group,

circumstances that might support an inference of

discrimination include, but are not limited to, the

disproportionate effect of peremptory challenges, the nature

of the proponent's questions and statements during voir dire,

desperate treatment of members of the targeted group, and

whether the case itself is sensitive to bias.

Okay. All these relevant circumstances raise an inference of discrimination will depend on factors such as the attitude and behavior of the challenging attorney and the prospective juror's manifested -- manifested during voir dire. Impacted the government's challenge on a composition of jury and disparate treatment -- well, that's your Martinez case -- also observes that courts may also consider whether a cognizant group has been eliminated from the jury altogether,

was substantially unrepresented or in the case itself was sensitive to bias.

Watson suggests that the number of peremptory challenges that the State used -- and then it goes on -- to remove women constitutes a pattern of strikes and gives rise to an inference of gathered gender bias discrimination and therefore establishes a prima facie case of gender discrimination. However, he offers no support -- no supporting authority or analysis.

In a case involving a Batson claim, based on gender discrimination, this Court observed that when a significant proportion of peremptory challenges exercised by the State is used to remove members of a cognizant group it tends to support a finding of purposeful discrimination. That's the Libby [phonetic] case.

Although there is no magic number of challenging jurors which shifts the burden to the government to provide a neutral explanation of its actions, this Court has concluded that the use of seven of nine peremptory challenges to remove female venire members established a prima facie case of discrimination based on gender.

Their -- so then they had to given an explanation.

There are some flaws with the Libby's method of determining whether there was a pattern of strikes against members of a targeted group that gives rise to an inference of

discrimination. Libby tallies the number of peremptory challenges used against members of the targeted group to determine whether there is a pattern of strikes against members of that group. The first problem with the method is that the raw number of peremptory challenges used against targeted group members is meaningless, without some point of reference.

It says, Libby did provide one point of reference; the total number of peremptory challenges used by the State. That point of reference has little meaning, however, without additional information such as the number of targeted group members remaining in the venire after the for cause challenges, five peremptory challenges against targeted group members might be dispositive if only five such individuals had previously populated the jury venire — the venire. But they might be entirely unremarkable if virtually the entire venire had consisted of people in that same group.

Although two of the cases discussed in Libby included information about this additional point of reference, seven of defendant's eight strikes used against male jurors, and when -- when defendant sought to use final peremptory strike to remove another male juror, there were only two male jurors in the jury box, and one remaining in the venire. Strikes exercised against the only African-Americans on the panel, this Court did conclude -- include that information

with respect to Libby's venire. The second problem with the 1 2 method used in Libby is that it does not complete its task 3 because it does not tell us how many such peremptory challenges constitute a prima facie case. The flaw can lead 4 5 to inconsistent decisions. So --6 7 MS. RADOSTA: I am still maintaining our Batson 8 challenge, Judge. 9 THE COURT: Okay. 10 MS. RADOSTA: We've read the case differently. 11 THE COURT: So you challenge -- you challenge the 12 African-American. 13 MS. RADOSTA: Yes. 14 THE COURT: State, do you want to respond? 15 MS. SUDANO: Yes, Your Honor. We struck Ms. Dickens 16 who does identify as African-American. There are four African-Americans on the jury that self-identified, and then 17 18 there was Mr. Johnson-George who was also on the panel and 19 didn't make it onto the jury because the State had waived. 20 But as it sits, we have four African-Americans on the jury. 21 With that type of number, I don't believe that there 22 is any sort of pattern of discrimination that would warrant 23 moving on to Step 2 of the Batson analysis. 24 THE COURT: Okay. Now, address the --25 MS. RADOSTA: I'm sorry, I --

THE COURT: -- the female. 1 2 MS. RADOSTA: -- just -- oh yeah, sorry. 3 Okay. All right, with regards to that THE COURT: I'm going to deny your challenge. So now, move to the -- your 4 5 challenge with regards to the females. 6 MS. SUDANO: So the challenge is that we struck 7 three women, I believe, with our --8 MS. RADOSTA: Four. 9 MR. LOPEZ-NEGRETE: Four. 10 MS. SUDANO: -- four, including the alternate. 11 MS. RADOSTA: Yes. 12 MS. SUDANO: So, four out of seven; three from the 13 main panel and then one for the alternate. The defense, I 14 would note, struck five women, and four men, with their 15 challenges, so they actually did strike more women than we 16 The ultimate makeup of the jury at this point is five 17 women and seven men on the actual jury, one woman, three men, 18 as far as the alternates. 19 The strikes that the State used on women are 20 consistent with the numbers of women within the panel. It's 21 not as though we used all of our strikes on women. It's not 22 as though when we were striking women we ended up with a panel 23 that doesn't have any women left on it. 24 So I don't think that there is any pattern of

25

discrimination there.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. With regards to the 1 2 challenge as to gender based, I'm going to deny the Batson 3 challenge with that as well; okay? MS. RADOSTA: Uh --4 5 MS. SUDANO: And then they also challenged the 6 Hispanic strikes. 7 They challenged Hispanic. THE COURT: MS. SUDANO: So --8 9 THE COURT: I quess, Marilyn -- I quess -- Marilyn 10 Muro. 11 MS. RADOSTA: And Ms. Sanchez. 12 THE COURT: And Ms. Sanchez. 13 MS. RADOSTA: Desiree Sanchez. To be honest, Your Honor, just to put it out there, I did not double check if Ms. 14 15 Muro identified as Hispanic or not, but Ms. Desiree Sanchez 16 absolutely did. 17 MS. SUDANO: Ms. Sanchez actually identified as 18 Caucasian or White on her Jury Questionnaire, or on the 19 demographic information that we had within the list. 20 And then Ms. -- Ms. Muro was "other race". 21 THE COURT: Okay. All right. So with respect to that, we can't -- I can't make a determination that there was 22 23 -- it was even challenging Hispanic. 24 MS. SUDANO: And I would just also note that there

were potentially three other individuals that were Hispanic on

25

the panel. Those were other individuals that identified as 1 "other race" however in the demographic information that we 2 3 got. THE COURT: Okay. So with respect to that, I'm 4 5 going to deny the challenge as well. 6 Okay. All right. So we have -- anything further? 7 MS. RADOSTA: No. 8 THE COURT: All right. Bring the jury in. THE MARSHAL: All rise for the prospective jury. 9 10 (Inside the presence of the prospective jury) 11 THE COURT: All right. We're back in the presence 12 of the jury in Case No. C-311453, State of Nevada versus 13 Christopher Sena. I'd like the record to reflect the presence 14 of the defendant, his counsel, as well as the State and their counsel. 15 16 Will the parties stipulate to the presence of the 17 jury venire? 18 MR. SWEETIN: Yes, Judge. 19 Yes, Judge. MS. RADOSTA: 20 THE COURT: All right. Ladies and gentlemen, if you 21 hear your name called you will be part of my jury. And so you 22 need to stay. If you don't hear your name called, then you're

going to be excused. And I want to extend my thank you to you

now, and welcome you back, if you want to watch the

continuation of the trial.

23

24

25

And also, welcome you if you have any questions of the Court, if you're ever down in the courthouse and you need any assistance with navigation with the Court, my court is always open and you're always welcome to come and ask and if you need any -- I can't represent you or anything like that, but I can certainly help you get around the courthouse; okay?

So if you hear your name, you are part of my jury.

Juror No. 1 is Mauricio Molina.

Juror No. 2 is Siani Morris. Juror No. 3 is Gregory McGhee. Juror No. 4 is Michelle Howell. Juror No. 5 is Robyn Dolan. Juror No. 6 is April Ruelas. Juror No. 7 is Luis Lopez. Juror No. 8 is Cecilia Garcia. Juror No. 9 is Duayne Hoolapa.

JUROR NO. 9: Hoolapa.

THE COURT: Juror No. 10 is Edwards Wells-Thompson.

Juror No. 11 is Tanisha Turner. Juror No. 12 is Frank

Fragale. Juror No. 13 is Brady Gall. Juror No. 14 is Brian

Wohletz. Juror No. 15 is Chase Albright. Juror No. 16 is

Adonis Kittredge.

So all of you that your name wasn't called, you're excused. And you can discuss the case with whoever you want to talk to about it; okay? So we'll be at ease while you all exit the courtroom; okay?

Not everybody. Everybody's name that was called; stay. Aren't you Mr. Wohletz?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 256: No, Rosenfield. 1 2 THE COURT: Oh, I'm sorry. I'm sorry. 3 (Excused prospective jurors exit at 5:55 P.M.) (In the presence of the jury) 4 5 THE COURT: All right. Okay. I'm going to go ahead 6 and put you in the seats that you're going to be in, and then 7 we're going to take our evening break. I'll swear you in 8 tomorrow when you come in and then we'll -- we'll start the -the case; okay? 10 So, Mr. Molina, do you want to move down one seat to 11 your left? Ms. Morris, move one seat to your left. 12 McGhee, I guess it'd be two seats to your left. Ms. Howell, two seats to your left. Ms. Dolan, down next to Ms. Howell. 13 14 Then Ms. Ruelas, you're right -- you're right in the right 15 spot. Mr. Lopez, next to her. 16 And then one additional; Cecilia Garcia? 17 JUROR NO. 8: Yes. THE COURT: Right next to him; okay? 18 19 JUROR NO. 8: Um-hum. 20 THE COURT: Then down here to the far left will be 21 Mr. Hoolapa. And then Edwards Wells-Thompson, next to Mr. 22 Tanisha Turner next to Mr. Thompson. Frank Fragale, Hoolapa. right there next to Ms. Turner. Mr. Gall, next to Mr. 23 24 Fragale. Mr. Wohletz, next to Mr. Gall. Mr. Albright, next 25 to Mr. Wohletz. And Mr. Kittredge next to Mr. Albright.

Okay. All right. When we get started, what I'll probably do is have you all move down at least to the end here, just so you're closer to the witness stand. But you are my jury in this matter.

I am going to admonish you that you are not to discuss this matter or converse amongst yourselves or with anyone else on any subject connected with this trial or read, watch or listen to any report or commentary on the trial or any person connected with this case, by any medium of information, including without limitation to newspapers, television, the Internet or radio. You're further admonished not to form or express any opinion on any subject connected with this case until the case is finally submitted to you.

Ladies and gentlemen, if -- if for some reason during the case as it's going you are seeing reporters, either with the newspapers or with media, and they try to approach you and talk to you, please let me Marshal know. Do not talk to them. And I'm just -- that's my admonition.

And then do not watch anything that you think may have something to do with this. Do not read anything that you think may have -- do not do any investigation on your own. Do not look at any items of interest. Do not try to use a dictionary, your -- your phone or anything like that to look up terms. If you -- if we go throughout this process -- I'm going to charge you tomorrow. I'll give you a better

understanding of how the trial actually goes and what you are going to be given and what you're going to be able to do and what you can't do; okay?

Tomorrow, you might want to probably bring a pillow or a jacket or something for you, if you think that that's what you need for -- and you're my jury. Then what you're going to be seated in here. These chairs are all going to be gone. So if you -- I mean, some of you were sitting down here, so now you know how much more comfortable the seats are.

So bring something if you want to drink, bring it with you, as long as you have a lid on it. I've noticed some of you are doing that already. And if you have a snack or anything you can do that as well.

I will require you to turn your phones off though once we get started.

All right. We're going to get started tomorrow at 9:00 o'clock. Meet outside. My Marshal will collect you. Do not come in the courtroom, just like we are. My Marshals is also going to give you a badge that you'll be change -- you'll be changing out the one that you have now. Okay?

Do you have any questions about what I've just indicated to you?

UNIDENTIFIED JUROR: Do we change our parking?

THE COURT: My Marshal will talk to you about that.

UNIDENTIFIED JUROR: Okay.

```
THE COURT: I think there is a different spot for
 1
 2
    you; okay? Ms. -- Ms. Turner?
 3
              JUROR NO. 11: So it is four to six weeks that we're
 4
    here?
 5
              THE COURT: Well, that would include what just
 6
    happened. You've been here now a week.
 7
              JUROR NO. 11: Okay.
 8
              THE COURT: And -- and -- we'll see.
 9
              JUROR NO. 11: All right.
                          I mean, I anticipated roughly two weeks
10
              THE COURT:
11
    to get the jury. We got you within a week. And now it just
12
    depends on the -- on the extent of the evidence. And, you
    know, depending on who you talk to, it may vary on how much,
13
14
    you know, how much time it's going to really take.
15
              I try to move these pretty quick when we're doing
16
    these cases. I will tell you there's going to be some time
17
    that I need to take some breaks for some things that we're
    doing outside the courtroom, not necessarily with this case.
18
19
    I'll let you know. Like tomorrow, like I told you today, I
20
    had to go to an event at 11:00. Tomorrow, I have one at 2:00.
21
    And I imagine it will probably be about a -- about an hour, I
    mean, kind of like we'll get -- do you know what I'm talking
22
23
    about, Mr. Sweetin --
24
              MR. SWEETIN:
                            I'm sorry?
25
              THE COURT: -- the one for -- for -- it's for
```

```
Lynn --
 1
 2
              MS. SUDANO: Oh.
              THE COURT:
                         -- Robinson?
 3
                            Oh, yeah. Are you going to that?
 4
              MR. SWEETIN:
 5
    don't know?
 6
              MS. RADOSTA:
                            I --
 7
              THE COURT: Okay.
 8
              MS. RADOSTA: -- honestly, I -- I'm not sure.
 9
              THE COURT: Yeah.
                            So I hadn't really anticipated.
10
              MS. RADOSTA:
11
              THE COURT:
                          I know. Okay. So it's someone else
    that we -- it's been in our profession for 30 years or so.
12
    And so tomorrow at 2:00 they're doing a going away thing for
13
14
    her in the courthouse, so I don't have to go very far. So it
15
    will probably -- what I'll do is I'll give you all a lunch.
16
    I'll talk to you about that when we're moving along to see --
17
    see if you want to take a lunch before then. If not, maybe
18
    I'll try to get it around that time so you can take the lunch
19
    the same time we're gone.
20
              I'll give you breaks. Let me know if you need a
21
   break during these proceedings.
                                     I mean, some -- I try not to
22
   break when we have witnesses on the stand to -- to get through
23
    that. And so in the meantime, if we're in the middle of it
24
    and you guys need a break, let me know.
25
              If you need a break anytime, just let me know; okay?
```

1 I try to take them about every hour and a half. 2 All right. Mr. McGhee? JUROR NO. 3: Well, in regard to that, when I talked 3 to you about being a Type 2 diabetic --4 5 THE COURT: Uh-huh. JUROR NO. 3: -- would it be better if I was like 6 7 towards the end if I had to stand up, instead of standing up 8 right in the middle of everybody right now? 9 THE COURT: That's fine. That's fine with me. just -- you're just in the order that we've got you set up. 10 11 JUROR NO. 3: Oh, okay. 12 THE COURT: It's really up to you, whatever you think would be, you know, if you want to sit down here on the 13 14 end, that's fine, or on -- on that end --15 JUROR NO. 3: Okay. 16 THE COURT: -- that's -- that's fine. 17 JUROR NO. 3: Okay. 18 THE COURT: All right. Anyone else? 19 All right. You all have a good night. And thank 20 you for waiting. You gave me an extra hour here. I'll see 21 you all tomorrow at 9:00 o'clock; okay? All right. 22 (Jury exits at 6:02 P.M.) 23 (Outside the presence of the jury) 24 THE COURT: All right. We're outside the presence 25 of the jury. Before we leave for the evening, in a more

cursory reading of this Watson case, I'm going to give the State an opportunity, if they'd like. The -- there's the steps you make in Batson. And -- and it's incumbent upon the individual making the challenge, or the side making the challenge, to meet -- or have a threshold -- or meet a threshold.

And in Watson, they specifically addressed that the

-- in that case they weren't even considering anything further

because there was nothing made out to support that there was
- that it met the first step, which I had -- which I talked

about.

They also indicated, however, because the State chose to do a -- a -- make a -- a race neutral reasoning or a -- or a neutral reason that they accepted it, they say that it doesn't make it moot. They still look at the analysis. So they say out of an abundance of caution.

So it's really up to the State, if you wish to make any further representation as to a -- for the -- for the first one, a race neutral reason for the one with the female, a gender neutral reason. And I imagine you've already made the record clear with regards to the Hispanic.

So it's --

MS. SUDANO: Court's indulgence.

(Deputy District Attorneys conferring)

MR. SAVAGE: And, Your Honor, I think that the

record stands on its own. I don't know that we need to make 1 2 an additional record. However, if Your Honor is requesting 3 it, I am happy to do so. THE COURT: I'm -- I'm not. I'm just -- here it 4 5 says that -- here's what it says, "When the trial court 6 expressly states that it does not believe a prima facie case 7 has been made, and then invites the prosecution to justify its 8 challenges for the record on appeal, the question whether a prima facie case has been made is not mooted, nor is it -- nor 10 is a finding of a prima facie showing implied." 11 MS. SUDANO: Sure. 12 MR. SWEETIN: If you're not requesting, we -- we 13 would prefer not to volunteer, because we don't think -- we 14 feel comfortable that that first step was not met. 15 THE COURT: Okay. All right. Okay. 16 MR. SWEETIN: Thank you, Judge. THE COURT: We're off the record. 17 18 (Court recessed at 6:05 P.M., until Friday, 19 February 1, 2019, at 9:03 A.M.) 20 21 22 23 24 25

* * * * *

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

VERBATIM DIGITAL REPORTING, LLC

Electronically Filed 9/19/2019 10:57 AM Steven D. Grierson CLERK OF THE COURT

RTRAN

DISTRICT COURT
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA
* * * * *

THE STATE OF NEVADA,

Plaintiff,

DEPT. NO. XIX

V.

CHRISTOPHER SENA,

Defendant.

BEFORE THE HONORABLE WILLIAM D. KEPHART, DISTRICT COURT JUDGE

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 2019

RECORDER'S TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING JURY TRIAL - DAY 5

APPEARANCES:

FOR THE STATE: JAMES R. SWEETIN, ESQ.

Chief Deputy District Attorney

MICHELLE L. SUDANO, ESQ. Deputy District Attorney

FOR THE DEFENDANT: VIOLET R. RADOSTA, ESQ.

DAVID E. LOPEZ-NEGRETE, ESQ.

Deputy Public Defenders

RECORDED BY: CHRISTINE ERICKSON, COURT RECORDER TRANSCRIBED BY: VERBATIM DIGITAL REPORTING, LLC

Page 1

1 LAS VEGAS, NEVADA, FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 2019 2 [Case called at 9:03 A.M.] (Outside the presence of the jury.) 3 4 THE COURT: So, okay. We're on the record in the 5 case of State of Nevada versus Christopher Sena in C-311453. I'd like the record to reflect the presence of the 6 7 defendant, his counsel, as well as the State, and their 8 counsel. We're outside the presence of the jury. 9 Is there anything that needs to be put on the 10 record before we bring the jury in? 11 MR. LOPEZ-NEGRETE: Court's indulgence. 12 (Counsel conferring) 13 MS. RADOSTA: Your Honor, it's come to our 14 attention that in the State's opening, they have several 15 pieces of evidence built into their PowerPoint, photographs, 16 quotes from statements, things of that nature. 17 I don't know if they have any actual clips from the 18 videos, but I thought that that was a possibility that they 19 might show small parts of it. And we would be objecting to 20 any of those being part of their PowerPoint because none of 21 that evidence at this point has been admitted. 22 So any photographs, any statements, or quotes from 23 statements or anything of that nature, we would be objecting 24 to them as part of their PowerPoint. 25 THE COURT: Mr. Sweetin.

MR. SWEETIN: Yeah, and first of all, the State's not playing any of the pornography in their opening.

However, I just went through with Mr. Negrete exactly what the State is going to be showing and it's going to include some photos of the children when they were children, it's going to include photos of the defendant, as well as the co-defendants, Deborah and Terrie Sena. There's also photos of the house they lived in, a diagram of the house, as well as some photos of the interior of the house, a safe that a flash drive in which the pornography comes off of, that is going to be there as well.

The defendant gave a statement in this case, and there was also e-mails that the defendant sent to Deborah Sena. The State expects that -- has good faith belief that that is going to come in, and therefore, the State is going to make reference to things that were said in both statement and the e-mails and we'll quote some statements from the e-mails and the statement.

That's the State's intention. The State -- this is opening statement. It's not evidence. The State has a good faith belief that all that will come into evidence. The State submit it's all fair game.

MS. RADOSTA: Additionally, one other thing that I was told was in State's opening, are mug shots of Deborah,

Terrie, and my client, which we would be objecting to just

the suggestiveness of those particular photos. And additionally, that they have not been previously admitted.

Regarding the e-mails, I appreciate the State feels that they have a good faith belief this those are going to come in. I think there is an issue potentially that the admission of any e-mails in the State's case. But beyond that, we are at opening, Judge, and these -- while the State may have a good faith belief that these things are going to be admissible, they are not yet -- they have not yet been admitted.

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. RADOSTA: And it is entirely possible that any number of the things that the State puts up during their PowerPoint may not come to be admitted during the course of this trial, and then the jury will have been shown evidence that was never admitted during the trial.

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. RADOSTA: And I think that that's a potential issue down the road.

THE COURT: All right. With regards to the mug shots that they're saying, is it Exhibits 102, 103, and 104 that's going to be proposed? That's what these --

MR. SWEETIN: That's correct, Judge. And they're not mug shots.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. SWEETIN: They are pictures of the individuals. There's no way of telling from those pictures, the State submits, that they're mug shots.

THE COURT: Yeah. Okay. All right. I trust that the State understands the position that they are always facing when they're doing opening statements, much like the defense, is that if they do have a good faith belief that it will be admitted, and they can present it.

And if we get to the point where it's not admitted, then we'll deal with that at that point. That may cause some other action, maybe even to the point of a mistrial, I don't know.

I know that the defense is posing this because they want to avoid that.

MS. RADOSTA: Um-h'm.

THE COURT: But at this point in time, I don't believe, based on the representations of the State, that anything that they're going to be putting in their opening is going to be something that would be not admitted or something that they don't believe will be admitted.

So at this point in time, your objection's noted. Okay?

MR. SWEETIN: Thank you, Judge.

THE COURT: All right. Are we ready? Ms. Radosta, we ready?

MS. RADOSTA: Sorry, Your Honor. We were just debating a point.

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. RADOSTA: At this point, Judge, I think I'm satisfied with the record. There are -- as I stated earlier, I think there are going to be some issues with some of the pieces of evidence that the State has in their opening, but we've made our objection.

THE COURT: Well, your objection earlier was about photos or video of -- from this case. What's been represented to me, the photos don't necessarily have anything with regards to pornographic images, prejudicial images in that regard, and they're indicating they're not providing any of the video as part -- so --

MS. RADOSTA: Just for the record, he indicated that there was photos of the safe where the flash drive was located. That was based on a search warrant, which at this point in time has not been -- there's been no testimony as to whether or not that was a valid search warrant or not. So there could be a potential issue there.

Regarding any statements from my client, he was under -- in custody at the time of that statement being given. There has been no testimony thus far that he was properly and validly read his Miranda rights and waived those Miranda rights. So there could potentially be an issue

1 there. 2 Regarding the e-mails that purportedly are from my 3 client, there has been thus far no proof provided that those 4 e-mails directly came from my client. And so there could be an issue there. That's where we are --5 THE COURT: Okav. 6 7 MS. RADOSTA: That's kind of where we're at, Judge, 8 so --9 THE COURT: All right. I -- there always could be 10 an issue, I understand that. That's why I'm saying, I trust 11 the State as -- understands their obligation and whatever effect it may if we get to a point where it's not admitted. 12 13 MS. RADOSTA: Okay. 14 THE COURT: Okay? All right. So get the jury in. 15 (Pause in the proceedings) THE MARSHAL: All rise for the purpose the jury. 16 (Inside the presence of the jury.) 17 THE COURT: All right. Everybody go ahead and have 18 19 Good morning, everyone. a seat. 20 THE JURY: Good morning. 21 THE COURT: This is the continuation of the jury 22 trial in the case of State of Nevada versus Christopher Sena 23 in C311453. 24 I'd like the record to reflect the presence of the 25 defendant, his counsel, as well as State, and their counsel.

1	If you hear your name, answer by saying "here" or
2	"present." All right?
3	(COURT CALLS ROLL OF THE JURY)
4	THE COURT: All jurors have answered to the call.
5	Will the parties stipulate to their presence?
6	MS. RADOSTA: Yes, Your Honor. Sorry, I was
7	just
8	THE COURT: State?
9	MS. SUDANO: Yes, Your Honor.
10	MR. SWEETIN: Yes, Your Honor.
11	THE COURT: Okay. Mr. McGhee.
12	JUROR NO. 3: Yes.
13	THE COURT: Do you want to move now or are you okay
14	where you're at?
15	JUROR NO. 3: I'm actually fine.
16	THE COURT: Okay. If you need to, just let us
17	know. There's multiple seats that are open and all right?
18	Okay.
19	So ladies and gentlemen, at this time, since you
20	are my jury in this matter, you need you all to stand, raise
21	your right hand, and I'm going to have my Clerk administer
22	the oath.
23	(THE CLERK SWEARS THE JURY)
24	THE CLERK: Thank you. Please be seated.
25	THE COURT: All right. Okay. Ladies and
	Page 8

gentlemen, since you are my jury now, you've been sworn. I need to make some instructional remarks in this matter. I told you last night, I kind of explain to you how this proceed, give you some understanding of what you'll be doing and your role.

What I'm about to say now is intended to serve as a

what I'm about to say now is intended to serve as a general introduction to this trial. It's not a substitute for the detailed instructions that I'll give you on the law at the close of this case before you consider your verdict.

This is a criminal case commenced by the State of Nevada, which I have referred to as "the State", against Christopher Sena. The case is based on an Third Amended Information.

I'm going to at this time, have my Clerk read the Third Amended information to you. Ladies and gentlemen, usually she stands when she reads it. Out of no disrespect to you, I'm going to ask that she just sit and read it. Okay? All right. Okay.

THE JURY: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.

(THIRD AMENDED INFORMATION READ BY THE COURT CLERK)

THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Ladies and gentlemen, this case is based on that information that was just read to you by my Clerk.

You should distinctly understand that the

Page 9

Information is simply a charge, and is not in any sense 1 evidence of the allegation it contains. The defendant has 3 pled not guilty to the Information. The State, therefore, has burden of proving each of the essential elements of the charges beyond a reasonable doubt. And as the defendant sits 5 here, he is not guilty. 6 7 MS. RADOSTA: Your Honor, if we could just quickly 8 approach before you --9 THE COURT: Sure. 10 MS. RADOSTA: -- continue with your --THE COURT: Sure. 11 MS. RADOSTA: -- instructions. 12 (Off-record bench conference.) 13 14 THE COURT: All right. Ladies and gentlemen, the 15 purpose of this trial is to determine whether the State will 16 meet the burden that I just explained to you. 17 It is your primary responsibility as jurors to find and determine the facts. Under our system of criminal 18 19 procedure, you are the sole judge of the facts. You are to 20 determine the facts from the testimony you hear and the other 21 evidence, including exhibits introduced in court, and this is 22 up to you to determine the inferences which you may feel can 23 be drawn properly from that evidence. 24 The trial begins with opening statements. 25 District Attorneys will make an opening statement if they so

desire, which is an outline to help you understand what the State expects to prove.

Next, the defendant's attorneys may, if they so desire, make an opening statement, but they do not have to.

Opening Statements serve as an introduction to the evidence, which the party making the statement intends to prove, but they are not evidence.

Next, the State will commence with its case-in-chief. This is the State's opportunity to present its evidence. This consists of the calling of witnesses and the production of physical items of evidence, such as documents, photographs, and the like.

Counsel for the defendant may cross-examine the State's witnesses. Following State's case-in-chief, the defendant may present evidence, and the district attorneys may cross-examine the defense witnesses.

However, as I've said, the defendant is not obligated to do or present anything.

There are two types of evidence, direct and circumstantial. Direct evidence is testimony by a witness about what that witness personally saw or heard or did.

Circumstantial evidence is testimony or exhibits which are a proof of a particular fact from which, if proven, you may infer the existence of the second fact.

The best example I give of this is if the question

Page 11

that you're trying to answer is whether it's raining outside, you call a witness, you put the witness on the stand, and they ask the question, where did you come from? He says outside. What's the weather like? And the person says it's raining outside. That's direct testimony, direct evidence.

Circumstantial evidence would be the same question is, is it raining outside? They call a witness. When the witness comes in the back door, he's got a rain suit on, he's shaking out his umbrella, his rain jacket's wet, gets on the stand, and they say, where did you come from? He says, I just came from outside.

You could infer from those basic -- from those circumstances circumstantial evidence that it's raining outside. Okay?

You may consider both direct and circumstantial evidence in deciding the case. The law permits you to give equal weight to both, but it's for you to decide how much weight to give to any evidence.

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

Regarding the presentation of evidence. It is the duty of these attorneys to object to evidence which they believe should not be properly brought before the jury. At times I may sustain objections or direct you to disregard testimony or exhibits.

You may not consider any evidence in which an objection has been sustained or which I have instructed you to disregard.

In considering the weight and value of the testimony of any witness, you may take into consideration the appearance, attitude, and behavior of the witness, the interest of the witness in the outcome of the case, if any, the relation of the witness to the defendant or State, the inclination of the witness to speak truthfully or not, and the probability or improbability of the witnesses' statements, and all 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 of that witness is entitled to receive.

If the defendant presents evidence, the State will have the opportunity to present rebuttal evidence, and then the defendant may have the opportunity to present surrebuttal evidence.

After all the evidence has been presented, I will instruct you on the law. After the instructions on the law have been read to you, each side will have the opportunity to present closing arguments.

What is said in closing arguments is not evidence, just like opening statements is not evidence. The arguments are designed to summarize and interpret the evidence while

discussing with you how to apply the law to that particular -- to the particular facts in the case.

Since the State has the burden of proving the defendant beyond a reasonable doubt guilty, State has the right to open and close the arguments. This means the State will make a closing argument, followed by closing argument from the defense, and if the State chooses, they can make a rebuttal closing argument.

After the arguments have been completed, you will retire to deliberate on your verdict. I may during this trial take note of the witnesses' testimony. You are not to make or draw any inferences from my action.

I am required to prepare for legal arguments of counsel during this trial and for that reason, I may take notes. The jury will not have a transcript to consult at the close of this case. However, you have been furnished notepads for yourself to allow you to take notes of your own.

If any juror discovers during this trial or after the jury has retired to deliberate that he or she has personal knowledge of any fact in controversy in this case, you shall disclose that situation to myself in the absence of the other jurors.

This means that if you learn during the course of this trial that you were acquainted with the facts of this case or a witness that you had previous -- hadn't previously

told me about, the relationship with them, well, you must then declare that fact to me. You do that by letting my Marshal know, and then we bring you in and we discuss it outside the presence of everyone else. Okay?

Additionally, if that situation does arise, you are admonished that you may not relate it to any of your fellow jurors any of the facts relating to this case that are within your own personal knowledge.

Likewise, if you discover that any other juror has personal knowledge of any fact in controversy in this case, you shall also disclose that situation to myself in the absence of the or jurors.

Once again, you communicate that through my Marshal. And if the aforementioned situation does arise, you're admonished that you may not relate to any of your fellow jurors any of facts relating to this case that are within your knowledge or what you learned from the other juror. Okay?

You will also recall that during the course of this trial, as I indicated previously, the attorneys for both sides, the parties, the witnesses and the court personnel, other than my Marshal, are not permitted to converse with you. As I previously stated, these individuals are not being antisocial; rather, they're bound by ethics and the law not to talk to you. To do so could contaminate your verdict.

Moreover, you are admonished that you are not to visit the scene of any of acts or occurrences made mention of during this trial unless specifically directed to do so by the Court.

Please don't investigate this case or anyone who has anything to do with this case on your own. Do not undertake any legal or factual research on your own.

Finally, you must not be influenced to any degree by any personal feeling of sympathy for or prejudice against the State or the defendant. Both sides are entitled to the same fair and impartial consideration. Okay?

You will be given the opportunity to ask written questions of any of the witnesses called to testify in this matter. You are not encouraged to ask a large number of questions because that's the primary responsibilities of these attorneys.

Only a limited number of questions may be posed by jurors, and you will not be allowed to become the third attorney or to advocate a certain position with your questions.

I have the discretion to preclude individual jurors from asking an excessive number of questions. Questions may be asked after both lawyers have finished questioning the witnesses and only at that time.

For example, the State starts their case-in-chief,

Page 16

calls a witness, conducts direct examination. Defense then has an opportunity to conduct cross-examination. This process could go back and forth a number of times. When they both pass the witness and they have no further questions, then and only then, I will turn to you to see whether or not you have any questions.

If you do have a question, I'll ask that you write it down on a full sheet of your notebook paper, put your name and your juror number on that piece of paper. Understand that once you do, then you just hold it up, my Marshal will come pick it up, and then the parties will approach the bench, we will discuss that to determine whether or not it's admissible.

Now, understand you are bound by the same rules of evidence that the parties are in admissibility of your questions. Many times the questions I get from jurors are calling for inadmissible questions like hearsay questions or you're asking something of a witness that they may not be the individual that has the answer for that. It may be somebody else.

You guys -- when you say you guys, jurors are always ahead of it. Understand the case is presented in a certain manner. Oftentimes you're thinking way ahead in the case. And so you might ask questions of a juror -- of a witness that may be more appropriate for another witness.

Understand that after we discuss it at the bench here, if I find that it is an appropriate question, then I will ask it. All your questions are marked, they're made part of the record so maybe later down the road somebody could be looking at it to determine whether or not I made a mistake by not allowing the question.

However, understand this as well, if it is a proper question, it will be asked, and it will be asked exactly like you write it. I will not interject any words, I will not correct your pronunciation, I will not take words out. It will be asked exactly like you ask it.

So understand that when you ask the question, it has to be legible, it has to make sense, so when we're determining that.

Also understand that oftentimes your questions spark questions that the parties realize that maybe they want to ask those as well.

Now, ask the question directly of the witness. Don't say in your question, Judge, and then the question. The question is for the witness as if you were asking it. Okay? All right.

Now, once again, if your question is not asked, don't be upset about that. Oftentimes you'll see that the question is answered later or maybe even answered -- once you're done asking your questions, then I turn it over back

to the parties, and they're able to ask questions as a result of your questions. All right.

Your questions must be designed to elicit answers regarding information that has already been presented to basically verify what is being said. So that's where I say if you -- oftentimes if you're asking questions that are in nature probably better for a different witness that hasn't even been brought up at this point. Okay?

Until the case is submitted to you, you must not discuss it with anyone, even with your fellow jurors. After it's submitted to you, you must discuss it only in the jury room with your fellow jurors. It is important that you keep an open mind and not decide any issue in this case until the case has been submitted to you under the instructions from me.

If you cannot hear a witness, please raise your hand as an indication. If you need to use the restroom or if you feel ill, also please raise your hand as an indication.

I try to take a break about every 90 minutes, I'll give you an opportunity to use the restroom and take a break. And like I said, before, I have no objection to you bringing in drinks or snacks in this matter or anything that will help you be comfortable.

I do want you to understand, though, it's not your house, and we do have to clean up after you. And so far

jurors haven't abused it, so it's still going on. You've still got that opportunity.

Also, if you're eating some type of snack that's disruptive to the Court, I'll stop you from doing that. If I hear you over there, you know, crunching on something, I'm going to stop you. Okay?

Once again, let me remind you, until the case is submitted to you, do not talk to each other about it or about anyone who has anything to do with it until the end of the case when you go to the jury room to decide your verdict. Do not talk to anyone about the case or about anyone who has anything to do with it until the trial has ended and you have been discharged as jurors.

Anyone else includes members of your family and your friends. You may tell them that you are a juror in a criminal case, but don't tell them anything else about it until you have been discharged by me.

Do not let anyone talk to you about the case or anyone who has anything to do with it. If someone should try to talk to you, please report that immediately to my Marshal. Do not read any news stories or articles or listen to any radio or television reports about this case or about the case or about anyone who has anything to do with it.

I always say, if you think it has anything to do with it, do not read into it or wait to see -- to verify that

it is before you decide to stop. If it appears to have anything to do with it, go away from it. You can always look for it later, look to see what you missed in the news later. Okay?

if they're in my audience.

stand, my Marshal will stop you.

I'm going to -- I've told you, if you want to invite anybody down, they're more than -- this is an open court, they're more than likely -- or more than welcome to be here. But I will ask them as well to turn their phones off,

And what I'm going to do when I have a witness on the stand throughout this proceeding, I'm going to ask my Marshal to stand guard of the door and not let people move in and out of here. I think that's extremely rude, and if people are coming in and out while my witness is on the

So if my Marshal's back there, and there's a witness on the stand, and you're in my courtroom, don't even attempt to leave. Okay?

All right. So do you want to take a quick break before we get started? Do you guys want to take a break? Yeah, everyone's shaking their head, yes.

Okay. Ladies and gentlemen, once again, I need to read this admonition to you.

During this recess, you're admonished not to talk or converse amongst yourself or with anyone else on any

subject connected with this trial, or read, watch, or listen to any report or commentary on the trial or any person connected with trial by any medium of information, including without limitation, newspapers, television, Internet, or radio, or form or express any opinion on any subject connected with this trial until the case is finally submitted to you.

It's now 11:00 o'clock. 15 minutes enough? All right. 11:15. We'll be at ease while you exit. Okay? Thank you.

(Jury exits at 11:01 A.M.)

THE COURT: Okay. We're outside the presence of the jury. Before I finished charging the jury after the Information was read, counsel for the defense had asked to approach the bench and had indicated that there was -- I believe, it was two, Count 97 and Count 106 had some mistakes in the charging document.

In 97, what I saw was on line 13 it says, "to engage in sexual intercourse, RS." I imagine that would read -- and it's not my charging document, but I imagine it would read "with RS" and --

MR. SWEETIN: That's correct, Judge.

THE COURT: Okay. And then on -- in Count 106 on page 39, line 1, it says, "sexual acts with BS was forced to commit or have committed upon the said RS." And at the bench

the State had indicated that the "BS" should read "RS"? 1 2 MR. SWEETIN: And that is correct, Judge. The way 3 the wording goes, remember, this relates to the counts in 4 which RS, I guess, Terrie Sena, performed fellatio on RS. So 5 the way it's read is, let's see, the defendant would kill him and/or make his life a living hell if the said RS told anyone 6 7 of the sexual acts that said RS was forced to commit or had 8 committed upon the said RS. 9 THE COURT: Okay. 10 So that "BS" should be "RS". MR. SWEETIN: 11 THE COURT: Okay. So Ms. Radosta, do you want to 12 put on the record what your position was with regards to 13 the --MS. RADOSTA: With regard to Count 97, Your Honor, 14 15 it's our position that's a just a typographical error and --16 THE COURT: Okay. 17 MS. RADOSTA: -- so it didn't substantially change 18 the meaning of the charge. 19 THE COURT: Okay. 20 MS. RADOSTA: But Count 106 is alleging, as it was 21 currently read to the jury, impliedly that one of the minors, 22 BS, committed or -- committed -- if he told anyone of the 23 sexual acts that the said BS was forced commit or to have 24 committed upon RS.

Page 23

It reads as though one of the minors was forced to

25

commit acts or committed acts on one of the other alleged minors in this particular case, which is completely inaccurate of any evidence that's been presented -
THE COURT: Okay.

MS. RADOSTA: -- or any discovery that's been turned over to the defense --

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. RADOSTA: -- which is why it stuck out to me. I think it gave the jury a misconception that there was sexual activity, potentially, between two of the alleged minors in this case, which, as I said, was completely inaccurate in line with the discovery.

Based on that, Your Honor, we feel that a simple amendment or a simple fix at the end to comport with the meaning is not sufficient because it gives the impression of something that the State is not anticipating presenting evidence of.

It's our position that the State has two options here. It can file a Fourth Amended Information changing the language in Count 106 or at this point in time, they can just simply move to strike 106 and not submit it to the jury.

THE COURT: Mr. Sweetin.

MR. SWEETIN: And State's position was, it's a clear clerical error. As you read it, it's very clear, and especially as the whole Information has been read, if the

jurors were to listen to specifically what was alleged, the Counts work together.

And in this particular case, the group of Counts relates to the acts that were committed by Terrie Sena upon Ryan.

The similar charges were made on other groups relating to other victims. So it's the same general format.

I think that it's -- you know, in my hearing of it, if I had not been more connected to this Information, I probably wouldn't have noticed, and I would just have assumed. I think it's a typographical error. I think it's appropriate to amend it and at the point that proof has been submitted in this case. But we would leave it in the Court's discretion. We certainly can file an Amended if the Court wants.

THE COURT: Okay. With respect to --

MS. RADOSTA: If I could just make one further point, Your Honor. This is the Third Amended Information that's been filed. There was an Information, a First Amended, a Second Information, and a Third Amended Information, and the Third was filed about two weeks ago.

This is not the first time there have been -- the State has discovered typographical errors in their charging document. I believe only one was a Amended filed due to a ruling by the Court that one of the Counts that you ruled in

favor of the defense on one of our motions, which changed the language of one of the Counts. That was one of the Amended Informations.

But all of the others have been typographical or clerical errors that the State noticed. This will now be the third or the fourth time that they've noticed something.

This is their charging document, Your Honor, and I feel that it's their responsibility to present an accurate document to the jury.

MR. SWEETIN: Well, the -- and to be clear, Judge, this is the Third Amended. So there was one Amended that was filed based upon a ruling of the Court, and there was a prior. I would note this is a -- this is -- I've been practicing law for a long time. This is a large Information.

And while we're at it, I would note that there -and in the reading of this, I did notice two other areas, and
it has to do with dates. And one would be in regards to
Count, I believe -- I believe it's Count 1. Count 1 makes
reference to one of the Counts, which it makes reference to
in the -- this conspiracy Count, it's Count 52. The date
range for Count 52 actually begins May 22, 2004, and the date
range for the conspiracy count begins May 22, 2007. So we
would have to amend that as well to conform to the proof
that's going to be presented in this case.

And clearly, it's a clerical error because the

particular count makes reference to different counts and date ranges.

THE COURT: Anything further?

MR. SWEETIN: I believe on Count --

MS. SUDANO: 100 and 104.

MR. SWEETIN: Yeah, in Count 100, we charged possession of visual presentation of child porn essentially, and in that Count, as in all the other possession of child porn counts, September 18, 2014, that's the day when the search warrant was performed. In this particular case it says 2011. And it's the same situation on Count 104.

MS. RADOSTA: So now, Your Honor -- and I certainly appreciate the State's stepping forward with those additional amendments, but now I believe we have one, two, three, four, five different counts that have to be Amended for various date ranges and various initials and various sentences that have left out words.

We're dealing with Count 1, Count 52, Count 97, Count 100, and Count 106 are all inaccurate in this charging document.

The -- previously our motion was just regarding 106, and I neglected to mention, of course, that any error in the reading of an inaccurate Information to the jury presents my -- or puts my client in a light -- or prejudices as my client.

1 THE COURT: Okay. 2 MS. RADOSTA: Now we have five counts that have 3 been inaccurately read to -- and I'm sorry, not inaccurately 4 read; the court Clerk read them as they were written, but 5 inaccurately presented in this Information. THE COURT: Okay. 6 7 MS. RADOSTA: And based on that, it's the State's 8 obligation to present a document that is accurate and comports with the Information that was provided and testified 10 to at the preliminary hearing, Judge. And that was --11 THE COURT: Let me ask you about --MS. RADOSTA: -- the summer of 2015. 12 13 THE COURT: Let me ask you about this, Ms. Radosta, 14 just so you can kind of think about it. 15 MS. RADOSTA: Um-h'm. 16 THE COURT: The law also allows the State to amend 17 their Criminal Complaint or their Information all the way up to the point where it's submitted to the jury to conform with 18 19 the testimony, conform with the evidence that's being 20 presented. 21 So in light of this, in light of the fact that we 22 are in a notice pleading state, are you telling me that your 23 client is not put on notice at least of those charges that 24 they talk about on this document here? 25 We're put on notice of the nature of MS. RADOSTA:

the offense, Judge. 1 2 THE COURT: Okay. 3 MS. RADOSTA: But the details -- the whole purpose 4 of reading the Information to the jury is to make them aware 5 of the charges. We read it in its entirety and with all of the details so that the jury is made aware of the charges. 6 7 THE COURT: Okay. 8 MS. RADOSTA: And if inaccuracies are read to the jury -- and it's not that these are not surprises to the 10 State. These are not oh, my goodness, the testimony did not 11 come out as they expected it to and therefore, they're asking to amend --12 13 THE COURT: Okay. So what are you --MS. RADOSTA: -- to comport with the --14 15 THE COURT: -- asking me to do? Are you asking me 16 to strike them? 17 MS. RADOSTA: I'm asking you to either -- the State has options. They can either strike the counts that were 18 19 just read the jury with inaccurate Information --20 THE COURT: Okay. 21 MS. RADOSTA: -- or they can file a Fourth Amended 22 Information. 23 THE COURT: Okay. What is wrong with them just 24 asking to amend this now? 25 MS. RADOSTA: Because at this state, Your Honor,

Page 29

```
those charges have been read to the jury inaccurately. Once
 1
    again --
 3
              THE COURT: Okay. So what we can --
 4
              MS. RADOSTA: -- I'm not --
 5
              THE COURT: So what we can do is we can amend
 6
    them --
 7
              MS. RADOSTA: And that causes my client prejudice.
 8
              THE COURT: -- as they are, and then -- and I can
    read those counts to the client -- to the --
9
10
              MS. RADOSTA: I don't think you can read individual
11
    counts --
12
              THE COURT: Why not?
13
              MS. RADOSTA: -- at this point, Judge. Because
14
    then that puts --
15
              THE COURT: Why not? I've read every case that's
16
   been submitted to me, and all the information I can see under
17
    175.141 --
              MS. RADOSTA: But --
18
19
              THE COURT: -- and that specifically talks about
20
    how you charge the jury with regards to the charges.
21
    doesn't say that you have to read them in order, it doesn't
22
    say that you can't read them in a certain direction.
23
              It just says that the Information must be read to
24
    the jury and --
25
              MS. RADOSTA: But if you --
                                Page 30
```

1 THE COURT: -- what he's pled not -- how he's pled. MS. RADOSTA: But if you --2 That's what it says. 3 THE COURT: So --4 MS. RADOSTA: Sorry, Judge. 5 THE COURT: But no, yeah, I'm --I keep -- I keep stepping on you. 6 MS. RADOSTA: 7 THE COURT: -- asking you. I mean, you're -- tell 8 me where it says that there's a prejudice that your client would receive if at this point in time before we start with 10 the State's opening that they -- that we inform the jury 11 based on the purview and based on your position that you've 12 taken so far, is that there needs to be a correction to a 13 number of these counts. 14 MS. RADOSTA: Well, I'm sorry, I was going to 15 address the suggestion that you made, if I understood you, 16 Judge, that they could just correct them, and those five counts could be re-read to the jury in their corrected form. 17 18 I don't think that that is a proper resolution 19 because --20 THE COURT: Well, tell me why. 21 Because that is drawing attention to MS. RADOSTA: 22 five of the 120 counts. It's taking them out of context. It's taking them out of -- it's actually having the --23 24 THE COURT: So what you're suggesting is that they 25 file another -- a Fourth Amened Information --

1	MS. RADOSTA: Yes.
2	THE COURT: and then we re-read it again?
3	MS. RADOSTA: Or they can just strike those five
4	counts and
5	THE COURT: Well, that's
6	MS. RADOSTA: then those counts
7	THE COURT: That makes no sense, it makes no sense
8	at all, Ms. Radosta.
9	MS. RADOSTA: It's their
10	THE COURT: No, strike these counts or because
11	there's some clerical issues, you're not entitled to
12	prosecute under those clerical positions.
13	MS. RADOSTA: It's just a suggestion, Your Honor
14	THE COURT: Okay. All right.
15	MS. RADOSTA: that if they don't want to file a
16	Fourth Amened I'm not saying that it's legally that
17	there's any legal precedent for that. I'm just saying it's
18	an option for them.
19	If they don't want to file a Fourth Amened
20	Information, another option would be to just strike them.
21	It's merely a suggestion, Your Honor.
22	THE COURT: Wouldn't the other option be to amend
23	it and notify them now of a clerical mistake that was read to
24	them initially?
25	MS. RADOSTA: But if you single out any individual

counts and re-read them --1 2 THE COURT: How is that going to prejudice your 3 client --4 MS. RADOSTA: Because --THE COURT: -- when he's got 120 counts here, and 5 there's five of these being singled out because there's a 6 7 clerical mistake? 8 Oh, by the way, we didn't put the word "with" in here, by the way the term "RS" is actually -- "BS" is "RS". 9 10 MS. RADOSTA: Because it --THE COURT: It makes no sense to me. 11 MS. RADOSTA: It's very simple that you're drawing 12 13 attention to some counts over other counts, Your Honor. 14 THE COURT: All right. Okay. 15 MS. RADOSTA: And those then being read to the 16 jury --17 THE COURT: I'm willing --MS. RADOSTA: -- more than one time. 18 19 THE COURT: I'm willing to let -- if you'd like, 20 I'm willing to amend it now, read them to them to correct it 21 and we can give them a curative instruction at the close of 22 the case that they're not to consider -- or I'll do it now --23 you're not to consider any of these above any of the other --24 other instruction -- I mean, any of the other charges. 25 That's fine, Judge. The State would MR. SWEETIN:

1 move to amend to correct. 2 THE COURT: Okay. So we'll do that. All right. 3 So why don't we take a quick break, let Mr. Sena use the 4 restroom, you all take a restroom back. We'll be back as 5 soon as we get -- yeah. Don't go off Christine because --6 7 THE COURT RECORDER: Well, it will record 8 everything though, Judge. 9 THE MARSHAL: Court will be in short recess. 10 (Court recessed at 11:14 a.m. until 11:33 a.m.) 11 (Outside the presence of the jury.) (Off-record bench conference.) 12 13 THE COURT: All right. Ladies and gentlemen, we're 14 back on the record in case of C-311453, State of Nevada 15 versus Christopher Sena. 16 As I indicated, I'm going to go ahead and inform the jury of the corrections basically at this point of the --17 on the Information and -- on the Third Amended Information. 18 19 You've made your record, Ms. Radosta, I appreciate 20 That's the ruling I'm staying with. Also, I want it clear from the media, if it's not 21 22 already clear, is that I do want you showing any photographs of the jury or of any of the victims. Even though the 23

Page 34

victims at this point in time, I think, all of them are

adults now, I still don't want you showing them -- I mean,

24

25

you can show below their face, but I don't want their faces 1 on camera or anything. Okay? You guys abide by that? UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes, sir. 3 4 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes, sir. 5 THE COURT: I think my order has -- was written that way as well. 6 7 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah, it was on the request. 8 So they -- that's what they informed us of. 9 THE COURT: Okay. All right. 10 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So --THE COURT: So that will remain. 11 12 Also, I'll tell you that I know you guys want to 13 get your stories out, and so a lot of you leave in the middle 14 of statements or whatever. I'll allow you to leave in 15 between, like, when the State does their opening. When 16 they're done with their opening, I'll allow you to leave. 17 I'm not going to let people coming and going while somebody is addressing the jury. Okay? 18 19 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes, sir. 20 THE COURT: All right. You got a question? 21 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Can I ask a question? Yes. 22 I'm with the RJ. 23 THE COURT: Okay. 24 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I'm also waiting a verdict 25 in another case --

1 THE COURT: Okay. 2 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- that I may have to --THE COURT: Well, you might need to go now, then. 3 4 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Well --5 THE COURT: I'm telling you, I'm not going to let anyone come and go while we're in the middle of somebody 6 7 addressing this jury. And with all deference to the press, 8 that's been a big problem with me with the press when we've had cases like this. 10 Downstairs I had a door I could lock, and I would 11 do that. I had a couple cases that were live streaming and 12 they were moving in and out. Not you, but people moving in 13 and out. 14 If -- I'll give you -- if it comes in, just let me 15 Marshal know. He's going to be there, and we can deal with 16 it that way. But other than that, unless you have an 17 emergency, I would consider that an emergency, I would. But unless you have an emergency, I'm not going to 18 19 let you come and go. Okay? Can everybody abide by that. 20 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes, sir. 21 THE COURT: All right. 22 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes, sir. 23 THE COURT: Okay. So let's get the jury in, Ed, 24 and we'll get started. Okay. 25 (Pause in the proceedings)

1 THE MARSHAL: All rise for the jury. 2 (Jury enters at 11:37 A.M.) THE COURT: All right. Everybody go ahead and have 3 4 a seat. We're back on the record in the presence of the 5 jury in Case No. C311453. I'd like the record to reflect the 6 7 presence of the defendant, his counsel, as well as the State, 8 and their counsel, and all members of the jury. Will the parties stipulate to the presence of the 9 jury? 10 11 Yes, Your Honor. MR. SWEETIN: Yes, Your Honor. 12 MS. RADOSTA: 13 THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, before the State 14 does their openings, it's been brought it my attention that 15 there's a couple errors that were made in the charging 16 document. 17 Once again, I want you to understand that the charging document is merely that. It contains no -- I mean, 18 19 in and of itself, it is not evidence of the crime -- crimes that are being alleged. 20 21 And for that reason, I need to just make some quick 22 notes. At the close of the case, you will be given the 23 document that you will be working with and looking at to 24 determine whether or not the evidence is proven based on that 25 charging -- based on that document. This is just the

Information here. Okay?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

On Count 1, the allegation was, did on or between May 22, 2007 was the original, and it's between May 22, 2004 and June 30, 2014 by willfully and lawfully and feloniously conspiring with Deborah Sena and/or Terrie Sena and/or others unknown to commit a sexual assault by performing those acts described in Counts 46 through 52, 54 through 59, 61 through 77, 79 through 85, 95 through 99, 101 through 103, and 105.

Then on -- in Count 97, this is a count of incest, on line 13, the allegation reads, To engage in sexual intercourse RS, the word "with" needs to be inserted between intercourse and RS. So it would read, did on or between June 14, 2010 and June 13, 2014, willfully, unlawfully, and feloniously assist and/or cause Terrie Sena to commit fornication or adultery with or on RS, the son of Terrie Sena, Terrie Sena and RS being within the degree of consanguinity within which marriages are declared by law to be incestuous and void. The defendant committing the crime of assisting and/or causing Terrie Sena to engage in sexual intercourse with RS. Defendant being liable under one or more of the following principles of criminal liability. One, by defendant acting with Terrie Sena and/or others unknown pursuant to a conspiracy with Terrie Sena and/or others unknown to perform such acts and/or, two, by defendant aiding and abetting the performance of such acts by counseling,

encouraging, inducing, or otherwise preparing Terrie Sena to commit such acts.

Then on -- in Count 100, possession of visual presentation depicting sexual conduct of a child. On line 18 it reads, did on or about September 18, 2011. It should read 2014. So it will read in its entirety, Did on or about September 18, 2014 willful, unlawfully, feloniously, and knowingly have in his possession a film, photograph, or other visual presentation depicting RS, a child under the age of 16 years of age, as the subject of sexual portrayal or engaging in, simulating, or assisting others to engage in or simulate sexual conduct, to wit: A video showing Terrie Sena engaging in sexual intercourse with and performing fellatio on RS.

Then in Count 104, it's also entitled, Possession of visual presentation depicting sexual conduct of a child, and it reads on line 7, Did on or about September 18, 2011. It should read 2014. Did on or about September 18, 2014, willful, unlawfully, feloniously, and knowingly have in his possession a film, photograph, or other visual presentation depicted RS, a child under the age of 16 years age, as a subject of sexual portrayal or engaging in, simulating, or assisting others to engage in or simulate sexual conduct, to wit: A video showing Terrie Sena performing fellatio to RS.

Then in Count 106, on the next page on line 1, it reads, sexual acts, the said BS. It should read the said RS.

So it reads in its entirety, Did on or between June 14, 2010 1 and June 13, 2014, then and there willfully, unlawfully, and 3 feloniously by intimidation or threats prevent or dissuade or 4 hinder or delay RS from reporting a crime to anyone by said 5 defendant telling said RS that the said defendant would kill him and/or make his life a living hell if the said RS told 6 7 anyone of the sexual acts that said RS was forced to commit 8 or have committed upon the said RS. 9 Okay? Once again, I want to remind you that this 10 is a charging document, and in and of itself has nothing --11 has no -- does not show or does not have any evidence. It's just a charging document. Okay? Does everyone understand 12 13 that? 14 Do not consider the counts that I just read as 15 something that you need to consider greater or with less 16 degree just because I read them to you. Okay? 17 All right. With that being said, does the State wish to make an opening statement? 18 19 MR. SWEETIN: Yes, Your Honor. 20 THE COURT: All right. 21 STATE'S OPENING STATEMENT 22 MR. SWEETIN: May it please the Court, Counsel, 23 co-counsel, ladies and gentlemen of the jury. 24 "If you love me, you would let me do it." Ladies

and gentlemen, those are words spoken by none other than the

25

defendant, Christopher Sena, spoken to his then 11-year-old daughter, Anita Sena, as she returned home from a sixth grade school day.

Spoken as he removed Anita's clothing, as he touched her vaginal area and her breasts area and fondled them with his hands, as he exposed his penis to her, and placed it on her vaginal area.

"If you love me, you would let me do it," as the defendant raised Anita's legs, spit on his hand, put his hand on his penis, and inserted his penis in his 11-year-old daughter's anus.

Now, you're going to hear from Anita, this hurts. She told the defendant it hurt. How did the defendant respond? "It is going to hurt, but this is life."

As Anita struggled with the pain, just to breathe, the defendant told her why he did this. He was showing her how people love each other.

Ladies and gentlemen, this is one of the instances of sexual abuse suffered by Anita Sena, the State submits the evidence will show. Unfortunately, the evidence is going to show about many other incidences of sexual abuse committed upon Anita and you'll hear that evidence over the course of this trial.

Not only Anita, but you'll hear that the defendant's sexual abuse actually affected a total of seven

children, and you'll hear about each much those children in the course of this trial.

Now, the first question we have to ask is how did the defendant gain access to all these children. And who understand this, we have to understand that all of the victims in this case were connected to the defendant, either in his direct family or through his extended family.

And we have here a diagram that sort of details that family. At the very top we see Christopher Sena. Then we see Terrie Sena. Terrie Sena was Christopher Sena's first wife. With Terrie Sena the defendant had two children, Anita Sena and Terry Tails Sena. We'll refer to him throughout this case as Tails Sena.

Terrie also had another child with another man by the name of Ryan Sena. After Terrie, the defendant divorced Terrie and married Deborah Sena, and he had one child with Deborah Sena, Brandon Sena.

You're going to also hear that Terrie had sisters, Kimberly Grisham and Melissa Clark. You're going to hear that they had children who were Terrie's nieces; that would be Tamara Grisham and Erin Clark.

Now, the victims that you're going to hear about, the alleged victims in the court of this trial are going to be Anita Sena, Tails Sena, Ryan Sena, Brandon Sena, Tamara Grisham, Erin Clark, and Terrie's much younger sister, about

ten years younger than her, Melissa Clark.

Now, between these family members, some of the sexual abuse suffered was similar and some was different. The types of sexual abuse you'll hear about include acts committed by the defendant, and I'm going to call these acts one-on-one acts. It's just the defendant and the alleged victim.

And you're going to see those acts or hear about those acts in regards to the defendant placing his penis in or on the anus of Anita and Ryan, the defendant placing his penis in and on the vaginal opening of Anita, the defendant placing his penis on or in the mouth of Anita, the defendant placing his finger or hand on or in the vaginal opening of Anita and Erin, and the defendant fondling the breasts of Anita and Erin.

Now, besides this one-on-one sexual conduct, you're also going to hear about other sexual abuse, which included the defendant directing his wife, Deborah, or his ex-wife, Terrie, to perform sexual acts on given family members while the defendant watched or sometimes participated.

Now, this abuse included the sexual acts similar to the ones we just talked about on the one-on-one acts.

Some sexual acts and child nudity were recorded in videos, and in the course of this trial, you're going to see some of those videos.

So now, to summarize, Terrie and defendant committed sexual acts together on Anita, Brandon, Ryan, Erin, Tamara, and Melissa. And Deborah and the defendant committed sexual acts together on Anita, Tails, and Brandon.

Now, that's the summarization. We'll go through each of the acts in the course of this trial one by one and lay them out thoroughly.

You'll hear that the defendant specifically told many of the children not to say anything about what was going on or that if they did say something, something's going to happen to you. You'll hear particularly that was the case with Anita, Brandon, and Ryan.

Now, to understand how all of this kind of transitions and happens, we have to go back to the beginning, and it really starts with two individuals, and that is the defendant and Terrie Sena.

You're going to hear that Terrie met the defendant in about 1987, when she was 17, she was a senior in high school at the time, and he was about four years older than her at the time.

Terrie was living at home with their family at the time. And you're going to hear that as the defendant begins to date and get together with Terrie, that he meets her family, including her younger sister, Melissa, that we previously talked about, who was about seven or eight years

old at the time that defendant and Terrie met. She was about ten years younger. Melissa's ten years younger than Terrie.

Now, the defendant and Terrie began to live together, and Terrie gave birth to Anita, Anita Sena, who we've talked about in May of 1990.

The defendant and Terrie were ultimately married a short time later in September of 1990, and during that marriage, besides Anita, a second child was born, and that's Tails that we've talked about, who was born in 1994.

The marriage ended in about August of 1997. Now, during that marriage, you're going to hear that the defendant was violent with Terrie from time to time. The defendant wanted certain things to happen in the marriage, which Terrie ultimately agreed to do.

You'll hear that one of the things that the defendant wanted was for Terrie to set up times or opportunities when he could have contact with her much younger sister, Melissa.

You're going to hear about a time when the defendant was able to be alone with Melissa, and this would have been back when Melissa was about 10 or 11 years old, back in about 1991 or 1992.

And this is Melissa when she was about 11 years old. Defendant told Melissa that he loved her, and that they needed to have a special relationship. This is when he's

able to be alone with her, just him and her.

The defendant in the course of this conversation of how special their relationship was exposes his penis to Melissa, and he wanted her to touch it. Melissa's 11 years old. She's going to tell you about her just kind of not really understanding what's going on here. But he's telling her -- this is her sister's husband, she's telling him to touch her -- his penis, so what does she do? Well, she takes her hand, and she just touches his penis real quick and pulls it back.

What happens next? The defendant then tells
Melissa that she needed to show him something because he
showed her something, and then at that point, Melissa exposes
her breasts to the defendant after which he touches and
fondles her breasts, and he tells Melissa not to tell anybody
what happened. And that's how that incident ends.

Now, this conduct with Melissa, you're going to hear, which starts -- this is early on in the relationship between the defendant and Terrie, it progresses after this first incident that we've just discussed, progresses to him taking nude pictures of Melissa. Progresses to involving Terrie at some point in the conduct taking nude pictures of both Melissa and Terrie together.

Some of those photos were actually taken and will show the defendant, Terrie, and Melissa all nude together in

sexual situations as the conduct progresses.

You'll see some of those photos in the course of this trial. You're going to hear that the defendant began to sexually penetrate Melissa with anal intercourse when she was about 15 or 16.

Now, after Terrie and the defendant's marriage ended in about 1997, the defendant took custody of the two children, and we talked about them, Anita and Tails, who were born in the course of the marriage.

And at the time, in about 1997, Anita's seven and Tails is three. You're going to hear that Terrie, after separating from the defendant, later gets pregnant by another man, and has a third child, Ryan.

Ryan's born about June of 1998. Now, at the time that the defendant and Terrie's marriage is ending in about 1997, you're going to hear about a second woman who comes into this, and that's going to be Deborah, as the defendant begins to get involved with her romantically.

Deborah got pregnant with Brandon, which is the defendant's son, and gave birth in about August of 1998.

Now, remember, Brandon -- or Ryan was just born just a few months before that. There's just a few months that separate Brandon and Ryan.

You'll hear that about this time, the defendant sort of begins to rekindle his relationship with Terrie,

while this relationship is still going with Deborah.

He told Terrie that he wasn't happy with Deborah, that he still loved Terrie, that he wanted him and Terrie to be a family. And at some point, Deborah left Nevada for a period of time to go back east to spend time with her father, who had an illness, and was actually dying.

And about this time the defendant began to have sex with Terrie, and he told her that this is his plan; give him a couple years when Deborah's father passed away, she would get an inheritance, and then the defendant said that he could get that inheritance and he and Terrie would be together.

So Deborah returns to Nevada, and the defendant and Deborah ultimately are married in about February of 1998. At this point, the defendant moves into his trailer home located at 6012 Yellowstone here in Las Vegas. And you'll hear a lot about this trailer home because this is where many of the incidents that we're going to be talking about happened.

He moves into that residence initially with Deborah, Anita, Tails, and Brandon. And you'll see pictures of the inside and outside of this residence. It's a trailer home. There's a yard. There's actually a back building as well that they'll talk about.

Now, after Brandon's born in August of 1998,

Deborah was working and the defendant and Deborah couldn't

afford daycare for the children. So the idea came up and was

decided that Terrie would move into the residence with her new son, Ryan, to watch the kids during the day. And that's what happens. Terrie moves into the residence with Ryan.

Ryan and Brandon are infants at this time, remember. So now, at this point, we have living in that residence Christopher Sena, Deborah Sena, Terrie Sena, and four of the seven victims, Anita Sena, Terry Tails Sena, Ryan Sena, and Brandon Sena.

Now, the residence itself, you'll see pictures of it, and this is a diagram of it. When they originally move into this residence, this bedroom, front bedroom's not there, but they alter it to make this front bedroom.

And once that front bedroom is there, they put the boys there, which would be Tails, Ryan, and Brandon in this room.

In the bedroom back here toward the back of the house would be Anita's bedroom. In the master bedroom is going to be the defendant and Deborah's bedroom, his current wife.

When Terrie moved in with Ryan, she initially slept on a couch out in the living room. Now, I talked about this out building in back. In order to get to this building in the back, you have to go out of the residence, walk outside, and walk into this building.

Now, what the building is essentially, there's a

bathroom back there, sort of a little kitchenette. There's an area as it was fashioned for the -- all relevant times in this case of sort of an office area where there's a desk area with a computer and things of that sort.

There was also a little area here where there was a couch or little bed that was set up.

Now, when Terrie originally moved into the house, the defendant's father and later his brother was staying there for a short time. But ultimately, Terrie moved back to that particular area, and she stayed in back.

Now, you're going to hear that both the defendant and -- both from the -- from Deborah and Terrie in the course of this trial about the events leading up to moving into that residence and everything that happens after they move into that residence.

They have both pled guilty to sexual assault due to their conduct in this case, the conduct they're going to testify to you during the course of this trial, and they're currently serving a sentence of ten years to life in prison.

As a part of their negotiation, they agreed to testify truthfully in this case.

Now, everybody that I've discussed here as moving into that residence at this point, essentially, lived at this residence from about 1998 until the police became involved in 2014.

You're going to hear that Terrie and Ryan left the residence from time to time during this period, but they always returned.

Now, a lot happened in this residence over that approximately 16 years from 1998 to 2014. Over the years, both Deborah and Terrie were recognized sort of as the mothers to all of these children. There was some violence by the defendant in the household you'll hear about. All the kids knew that when the defendant said to do something, they had better do what he said.

There was also this progressive course of sexual conduct in the household that you're going to hear about.

Just a short time after Terrie moved into the residence, she began to have sex with the defendant. You're going to hear that Deborah found out about this and accepted it, but that's really just the beginning.

You're going to hear that the defendant began to have Deborah watch him have sex with Terrie, to have Terrie watch him have sex with Deborah. Then defendant began to have sex with Deborah and Terrie at the same time.

Beyond this conduct, on one occasion that you're going to hear about the defendant directed Deborah how to have sex with the dog. And in fact, the defendant brought a dog in and assisted her in performing sex acts with the dog while the defendant filmed this event. And that's going to

become important later in the case, as I discuss it.

Now, Deborah and Terrie will both tell you that when they did have sex with the defendant, that he would many times tell them to make sexual comments about their children, which excited the defendant. Now, this is from a very young age with the children.

He would have Deborah and Terrie talk about how they would love to have sex with the boys, Tails, Ryan, or Brandon. Or how the defendant would perform sexually with Anita or what a mother/daughter sex situation would be with Anita.

They also -- or he also wanted them to discuss sexual comments about Erin and Tamara. Now, I'm going to jump back to Erin and Tamara for a moment. Remember, that Tamara and Erin didn't live in the household, but they were part of the extended family. They were sort of the nieces of Terrie.

Now, the conduct with Tamara and Erin kind of happens a little later, but want to get into that first and then we'll go back.

Erin and Tamara both lived with Melissa and Melissa and Terrie's parents. So they weren't in the residence. And you're going to hear that Tamara visited the residence between the ages of about eight and 15, so about between 2004 and 2013, and that Erin visited the residence between the

ages of about nine and 13. That's about 2010 and 2014.

Now, remember, we started discussing this. We talked about defendant and Terrie having sexual contact with Melissa; remember? The defendant continued to have sexual contact with Melissa in that Yellowstone residence even after they moved into that Yellowstone residence for about a year. But you're going to hear that the sexual conduct stopped when Melissa turned 18 in about 1999, when Melissa basically stopped coming over to that residence and visiting on a regular basis.

And Melissa's going to tell you that she sort of realized what -- what was happening was wrong, and she didn't want to be part of it.

Now, Melissa's going to tell you that she did not stop Tamara and Erin from going over to defendant's residence because she thought the conduct she had suffered was personal and isolated to her.

Now, Tamara and Erin will both testify in this proceeding as to what happened to them when they visited the defendant's residence. And as they testify to you here, as many of the witnesses, they're going to be much older than they were when these incidents were happening. As they testify here, Tamara's going to be 22 and Erin's going to be 18.

This is a picture of Tamara when she was about 11

years old in the midst of this time period. And you're going to hear from Tamara. She'll tell you that she spent a number of weekends over at the defendant's house and she'll describe what she observed while she was there.

She's going to tell you that she was not sexually touched while she was there. However, she was on occasion called back to the back office, this back building that we talked about, by the defendant. And while in there, the defendant showed her pornographic videos. One of those videos, in fact, showed her Aunt Terrie performing oral sex upon the defendant.

Tamara remembers taking showers while she was visiting at that residence. A video was made of her, which you're going to see in the course of this trial, while she was taking a shower in the back office of that residence. Certainly, she did not know that there was a video made of her. And you'll see that video.

You're going to hear from Terrie. Terrie will testify that she assisted the defendant to record this video. And this is how she did it. We talked about that little room back there. There was a bathroom in that room. Now, the door to that bathroom is not the traditional kind of open door, it's called an accordion door. It sort of slides this way and slides back. And when it slides together the top is all tight. When it goes apart, there's little spaces at the

top so that you can look through and kind of see inside.

So what happened was that the defendant took a camera, he climbed up on a chair, and he put this camera over the top of that door so that he could film Tamara as she was taking a shower through those holes at the top of that door.

Now, Terrie's going to tell you that while he was doing this, she was performing oral sex on him to ejaculation. You're going to hear or see actually when you see that video that as a part of that video, the defendant pans down and shows Terrie giving the defendant oral sex.

Now, you're also going to hear from Erin. Erin will tell you that when she visited the defendant's residence, that defendant would also sometimes call her back to the same back building that we're talking about.

Erin's going to tell you that she was sexually touched. In fact, he would have her lift up her shirt, pull her pants down to her ankles, and at that point, he would fondle her breasts and vaginal areas.

This happened on a number of occasions, as she testifies to you, she'll tell you about. Erin also remembers taking showers while she was visiting this residence. A video was made of her while she was taking one of those showers in the back office. You'll see that video. Again, she did not know that that video was being made.

Terrie will testify on -- as to this incident as

well. She assisted the defendant in making this video recording. And it was basically done the same way, same location, that bathroom back in the back building, same accordion door, he climbs up on the chair, he's filming through the top of that accordion door, the holes in the accordion door. And you're going to hear that on this occasion, again, Terrie was performing oral sex on the defendant.

A little different on this occasion. The occasion stops and afterwards Terrie remembers that Erin leaves, and then the defendant has sex with Terrie. But while he's having sex with Terrie, he's playing back and watching the video that he has just made of Erin.

Now, the defendant was involved in sexual conduct with all the children living in the Yellowstone residence.

Remember, I says we're going to kind of go forward and then go back?

The sexual conduct involving Tamara and Erin kind of happens in the midst of all the other sexual conduct that's going on inside the house and we're going to talk about that a little bit right now.

So now, remember, in the house, living in the house we have Anita Sena, Tails Sena, Ryan Sena, and Brandon Sena.

All the conduct that happened, happened at that Yellowstone residence involving these victims. And you will

hear each of the children describe what happened to them in the course of this trial.

Deborah and Terrie will also testify to the sexual acts with their children in which they participated with the defendant.

You'll hear that up until 2014, none of the children knew their siblings were also being sexually abused. They thought it was just them.

As the children testify to you in this proceeding, again, like Tamara and Erin, they're going to be much older. Anita is now 28, Tails is 24, and Ryan and Brandon are 20 years old.

Now, now this is a photo in about the early 2000s. In this case, during this photo, Anita is 11 years old, Tails is about seven, and Ryan and Brandon are about three years of age. This is about the time that the sexual conduct starts.

When Ryan and Brandon were both between three and five years of age, you'll hear both Deborah and Terrie testify that the defendant directed each of them to have sexual contact with the boys.

You'll hear Deborah testify that when Brandon was three years of age, the defendant wanted him to perform sex acts on Brandon. You're going to hear about the discussion that was had in the course of this. Defendant tells her, you don't love me enough, Terrie loves me more.

He told her that he wanted her to prove his love for him. The defendant said, "if you love me, you'll have sex with Brandon." Deborah took Brandon's clothes off, she took her own clothes off, she then performed oral sex on Brandon. The defendant stood in the doorway holding a camera -- and that's important a little bit later -- at that time.

The defendant put Brandon -- beyond this, the defendant put Brandon on top of Deborah as she laid on her back. He also manipulated Brandon's penis into Deborah's vagina, you're going to hear. Defendant then sent Brandon out of the room, and he had sex with Deborah.

Now, Terrie will testify that she recalls the defendant bringing her and Deborah into a room with Brandon and Ryan when the boys were about five years of age, and she remembers that the defendant had both woman perform oral sex on the boys at that time while he filmed the event. Now, Deborah does not recall this event, you're going to hear.

Now, this is Anita when she was 11 years old. Now, remember, at the beginning of this, we talked about an incident involving Anita, and as she's going to testify to you, she suffered abuse over a very long period of time. And she's not sure she can remember the first time, but she remembers the first time being something as we've described and that she was about 11 years of age.

Similar incidents happened with great regularity,

and she's going to tell you that it was great regularity.

When Anita was about 14, we're going to hear that it changed
a little bit. Remember in that first incident, the defendant
was having anal intercourse. When she was about 14, that
changed a bit and included vaginal intercourse.

On one occasion, you're going to hear that the defendant had Deborah join in as the defendant was having sex with Anita. And on another occasion the defendant had Terrie join in as the defendant was having sex with Anita.

Anita was told never to tell anybody, and ladies and gentlemen, she didn't tell anyone about this abuse. Her abuse continued from the time she was about 11 in 2001 up until the time the police investigation began in 2014, when she was 24.

Of all the victims that you'll hear from in this case, she suffered abuse for the longest.

Over that time, you'll hear that she didn't feel as if she could leave. And Anita is going to tell you that she felt terrorized of what the defendant might do to her. She believed that he had connections or methods to find her and control her wherever she went.

And beyond that, she also wondered what would happen to her siblings if she did leave. Anita thought that her suffering was in some way protecting her siblings.

Remember, we discussed that there was violence going on in

the house over this period of time. And she will tell you that she saw what the defendant would do, and she saw that he would not be as violent with her siblings if he had sex with her. There was a connection that she saw between that.

After the abuse had gone on for years and the defendant had sex with Anita so many times, you're going to hear that she would sometimes just give herself to the defendant to make life easier in the house.

The evidence will show the defendant taught her that this was what was expected of her from the time that she was 11 years old. This was Anita's life.

Now, you're going to hear about Tails. This is a photo of Tails when he was about 11 years old in the course of this time in the house. You're going to hear about two incidents involving Tails. A portion of one incident and the entirety of the other incident are recorded in video form, and you'll see that here in the courtroom.

The first incident occurred when Tails was about 14 or 15 years old, and it happened just after Tails was outside the residence, he was assisting the defendant to paint the top of their trailer residence, along with Deborah and other family members who were out there.

Tails got some paint on himself, and defendant -- as a result of that, the defendant caused Tails and Deborah to come into the house and get into the shower. And we

talked about the shower in the back of that back building before.

There was another bathroom inside the main residence, and that's the shower that he had them get into on that occasion. They were both nude as they got into that shower. And the defendant can be seen in the video of this sort of setting up the video camera in the bathroom, and then subsequently you could hear on the video itself defendant directing Tails and Deborah how to touch each other and watch paint off of one another's face and bodies in the shower, and they follow his direction.

This is where that video ends. You're going to hear testimony from both Deborah and Tails that that's not the end of this encounter. That the defendant then tells Deborah to have oral sex with Tails, which she does. And the defendant then has Deborah bend over and has Tails put his penis on her vagina.

You're going to hear about another incident involving Tails also, happened when he was about 14 or 15 years old, and the entirety of this incident is recorded on video.

Defendant had Tails come into the master bedroom and lay on the bed. The defendant then says to Tails, let mama do her thing. Deborah began to perform oral sex on Tails as the defendant asked Tails, does that feel good? The

defendant directs additional acts of sexual intercourse in the course of this video. It ends with Deborah performing oral sex on Tails as the defendant has penile intercourse with Deborah both at the same time.

You're also going to hear about Ryan. And this is a picture of Ryan when he was about 11 years old in the course of living at that residence over this period of time.

When Ryan was approximately 12 or 13, you're going to hear that this an incident of the one-on-one sexual conduct that we've talked about. The defendant began penetrating Ryan's anus with his penis. And you're going to hear Ryan describe to you that this happened on number of occasions prior to Ryan turning 16.

When Ryan was about 15, you're also going to hear that the defendant involved Terrie in an incident of sexual abuse of Ryan.

The incident is also videotaped, which video you'll see in the course of this trial. The defendant has Ryan go into the master bedroom. The defendant is seen setting up the video camera to record the event. And in fact, prior to the event, the defendant is seen talking to Terrie about bringing Ryan into the room.

Once Ryan is in the bedroom, Terrie enters the bedroom, and removes her clothes. Terrie tells Ryan to remove his clothes, to which Ryan responds, no. Terrie then

removes Ryan's clothes. Terrie performs oral and vaginal sex with Ryan at that time, and the defendant then positions

Terrie and Ryan on the bed, such that Terrie performs oral sex on Ryan while the defendant has penile sex with Terrie at the same time, much the same way was accomplished in the video with Tails.

Now, Ryan can be seen in the video looking away while this is happening. You can also see in the video and hear in the video the defendant telling Ryan look at -- look at his mother.

Now, there was another occasion also captured on a video involving Ryan, which you're going to see. And you're going to hear from a forensic expert in regards to the recovery of some of these videos.

This particular video could not be recovered in video form, but it was recovered in still form. So each frame of the video is laid out, and there's literal hundreds or maybe thousands of frames.

You'll see some of those pictures in the course of this trial or those frames, you'll see all of those frames. It will be available to you.

Ryan is 15 at the time of this incident. Ryan's called back to the back building. The defendant and Terrie are present. And you're going to hear from both Terrie and Ryan as to what happens next. Terrie begins to remove her

and Ryan's clothes. Terrie performs oral sex on Ryan.

Then you're going to hear or see -- see and hear that the defendant can be seen exposing his penis, and that the defendant then has Terrie perform oral sex on him and Ryan alternating back and forth between the two.

You're also going to hear about Brandon. And this is a picture of Brandon when he was a bit younger in the course of living there. He's about eight or nine years old.

We'll be talking about three sexual incidents involving Brandon; two involved Terrie and the defendant.

One involved Deborah and the defendant. Only the incident with Deborah and the defendant is on video. We'll talk about that last.

First, in regards to Terrie and the defendant, both incidents with Terrie and the defendant occurred in the back building that we've been talk being where the office and the bathroom is back there when Brandon was about 14 years of age.

In one incident, Brandon was, you'll hear, expecting to be rewarded for doing well at school. He's called back to the office. He's expecting his reward. What happened was he saw defendant and Terrie in that back office. And instead of the reward, Terrie performed oral sex on him, and he was caused to vaginally penetrate Terrie.

In a second incident with Terrie and the defendant,

Brandon is walking into the back building. As he walks in, he walks in on the defendant having sex with Terrie. And what happens next? The defendant then had Brandon stay to perform sexual acts on Terrie, which included Brandon touching and vaginally penetrating Terrie.

Now, there was also an incident with Deborah and the defendant involving Brandon. And -- oops. And the majority of this incident is on video, and you'll be able to see it in the course of this trial.

It happened when Brandon was about 14 years of age. Brandon's first called out to the pool in the back of the house. And you remember from the diagram that there's sort of a yard around this house. And back by that back building there's sort of a doughboy swimming pool back there.

So Brandon gets called back to that pool by the defendant, and the defendant and Deborah were in the pool at the time. Brandon's caused to get in that pool, and he does get into the pool. After he gets into the pool, you're going to hear that Deborah and the defendant have sex in the pool in the presence of Brandon.

Next, the three of them go into the house. The defendant then calls Brandon back into the master bedroom. The defendant and Deborah are also in the room there naked. This incident is recorded on video, which you'll see.

Defendant can be heard on the video directing what

would occur. Brandon and Deborah are on the bed where Deborah gives Brandon oral sex and vaginal sex. At the conclusion of this incident, the defendant performed penile penetration on Deborah while Deborah performed oral sex on Brandon at the same time, much the same situation as we discussed with Ryan and Tails.

Now, as I indicated, you know, you're going to hear that the defendant was at times violent within this residence. And on one occasion of violence, in early 2004, who's 15 at this time, has a -- sort of a meltdown. Brandon said that he was either getting out of the house or he was going to commit suicide. He seeks out Anita, and he talks to her, and he tells her this is the way I feel. I got to get out of here or I'm going to kill myself.

And it's at that point that he tells Anita for the first time that he was being sexually abused.

Well, you're going to hear this crushed Anita.

Anita's 23 years old at this time. She's still living in that house. She's still suffering abuse. She realize the her brother, Brandon, is being sexual abused. Over all this time, she's efforts that she was making to protect other brothers from being physically abused they're for not, they're for nothing.

Not only are they being physically abused, but they're being sexually abused.

This turned into Anita's breaking point. She decided that she to get out of that house with Brandon.

Anita went to Deborah, Brandon's mother, and told her that they were leaving the residence one way or another.

And it's at this point that Deborah indicates that she will assist them. It's Anita who goes to Deborah,

Deborah then agrees to assist. Anita will tell you that she was scared to death. Why? You know, she's scared of the defendant, she felt that he had methods to find them if they left.

You'll hear that the house had cameras in some common areas. And Anita believed that this allowed the defendant to keep track of everyone in this house. She knew from experience that the defendant would be looking for them if they were not home, if they weren't at school or work. She knew that from experience.

Anita and Deborah decide that only Anita, Deborah, and Brandon could be allowed to know of the plan. You're going to hear why. They believed that Tails might tell the defendant if they told him. And they also believed that they couldn't trust Terrie. And if they told Ryan, Ryan might tell Terrie.

Anita gathered items. Anita rented a storage unit to put those items in. Deborah found a community safe house and got some type off work. In an early morning in June of

2014, Deborah got up for work, as she normally did, the defendant continued to sleep. He remained in bed. And it was at this point that Deborah, Anita, and Brandon snuck many of their things out of that residence, and they left the residence that morning.

Now, Deborah and Brandon left their cell phones at the residence, you're going to hear, because they understood the defendant had a tracker on their phones.

When the defendant got up, he immediately realized that they were gone. And you're going to hear about this because Terrie is still at the residence, remember? She's going to testify to you as to what happened. That the defendant began viewing the video, that we talked about, and she sees these individuals sneaking out of the residence.

The defendant then kicks Terrie and Ryan out of the residence indicating to them in any way that it might appease Deborah to come back.

At that time, only the defendant and Tails remained in that Yellowstone residence that we talked about. Deborah, Anita, and Brandon did not come back at that time. But the defendant did attempt to contact them. Tails saw the defendant drafting e-mails to Deborah. Deborah received e-mails addressed from the defendant after they left.

The e-mails asked her and the children to communicate with the defendant. In an August 14, 2014

e-mail, the defendant appears to reference who would get custody of the children. He points out that he got custody of the children when he got divorced from Terrie because he was not an abuser and the Court saw him fit to have custody of the children.

He further indicates that similarly he is not an abuser in the eyes of the law now either. The defendant continues, "I can also say that you will not find any bad things about me, not even a bad picture or bad videos to hold against me because it all requires proof. All I have is rumors, and you can't prove rumors."

Deborah does not return to the defendant at that time. You're going to hear that a few days later, September 11, 2014, Deborah worked for Cox Cable, and there was an e-mail received by many of her co-employees at Cox Cable. And the e-mail included four still photos, and those four still photos showed Deborah having sexual conduct with the dog.

Remember, earlier we talked about the defendant causing that to occur and actually standing in the doorway with a camera.

MR. LOPEZ-NEGRETE: Your Honor, could we approach briefly?

THE COURT: Sure.

(Off-record bench conference.)

THE COURT: Go ahead.

MR. SWEETIN: So on September 11, 2014, there was an e-mail that was sent to Deborah's workplace to many of her co-workers, and that e-mail had four still photos attached to it, and each of those photos or those two e-mails had two photos each attached to each of the e-mails, and those photos showed defendant -- or Deborah's sexual contact with a dog.

They're sent from an e-mail account set up on the phone Deborah left at her residence. And you'll hear from Cox Cable as to how the e-mails came in and what they did in response.

On September 14, 2014, a few days later, Deborah receives another e-mail addressed from the defendant. The defendant says in that e-mail, "I thought I would just check in and see how things were going with you. I just wanted to see how all this is working out for you." He continues, "How much of this can you have avoided just by communicating?"

He continues, "And we have not even started yet. Can you imagine how ugly things will get if we keep going this route?"

And he continues, "Well, instead of spending all that money for a divorce, all we had to do was send a small video clip of you and Brandon, and you would never be seeing me again, and it would be for free."

"You would have free room and board and medical,

but I don't know about your roommate, though. And if you thought I was bad, that place makes me look like a walk in the park."

He continues, "And at the poker run yesterday, there was some talk about a woman having bad pictures at work. And they said, she should go to jail for them. It sounded like they did not like that lady very much."

He continues, "I do believe the statute of limitations and having sex with a minor is longer than 20 years to file."

He continues, "Just because I have to do all of this does not mean that I don't love you. I do. I just think it is sad that I have to do this. I can prove everything. Can you?"

Now, Deborah's trying to figure out what to do next. How is she going to handle this? She decides to go to a local divorce attorney and ask for guidance.

She describes some of the sexual contact in the household in the context that she was forced to perform the conduct. And as a result, the attorney calls the police. It's her attorney that ends up calling the police. This is the first time the police are contacted by anyone.

And the police respond to the attorney's office and get Information from Deborah and her attorney, and as a result, Deborah, Anita, and Brandon are subsequently brought

in to speak with police detectives individually, and they're all interviewed individually.

After those interviews, you're going to hear that the police now have statements indicating that sexual abuse happened on Anita and Brandon, and that it was committed by the defendant.

You're going to hear that at this point the police are suspicious as to what Deborah's involvement might be in this, but their investigation was continuing.

During the interviews, they received Information indicating the potential of video evidence which documents the abuse, and that video evidence being in that residence, that Yellowstone residence. And just a few hours after receiving that Information, after those interviews, police obtain and exercise a search warrant at the defendant's residence.

The defendant and Tails are present at the residence, and you're going to hear about what happens. The police make contact with the defendant during that execution of the search warrant, and the defendant is told that there have been sexual abuse allegations made against him.

The defendant talks to police at this point, and he initially said that his wife is the only one he had sex with. He then says, maybe his ex-wife sometimes also. He then says, well, maybe a girlfriend or something.

The police tell the defendant that they are investigating family sexual abuse allegations. And the defendant denies having sex with children in the family.

The police confront the defendant with allegations that he had anal and vaginal intercourse with Anita and Deborah that was forced on them.

The defendant then states that when Anita was 22, he and Anita got a little drunk, and he had sex with Anita and Deborah. He then made a point to say that although, he was drunk, he remembered Deborah putting his penis in Anita's anus.

The defendant then admitted that he had sex with Anita on other occasions after he was an adult. And in fact, the defendant said that he started telling her no. The defendant initially denied having sex with Anita and Terrie. The defendant then indicated that he thinks he did have sex with Anita and Terrie when Anita was 23.

The defendant denied ever having sex with Brandon. The defendant said that he had never had sex with Deborah and Brandon. He then indicated that he did catch Deborah, when Brandon was about three years old, rubbing and massaging and stroking Brandon's penis.

The defendant said that is not cool. The defendant said, he told Deborah that he never wanted to see that again. The defendant then said that something else happened about a

year and a half ago. The defendant stated that Deborah and Brandon had total sex in the bedroom, and he said that he came into the bedroom and found them.

He said that he didn't say anything, and he watched. The defendant then described in this incident in some detail. He said that he believed Brandon ejaculated in Deborah's vagina. He was asked if he masturbated. He responded to that question by saying he physically had no sex with Brandon and he never forced nobody to do nothing.

The defendant did indicate, however, after the encounter between Brandon and Deborah that he did have sex with Deborah.

The defendant was asked if there were any pictures taken of this conduct, and he indicated that there was not. The defendant did indicate that there was a red flash drive in the safe in the office that he had. A flash drive is sort of like -- and you'll see it in the course of this trial -- just a little thumb drive that's used. It's a memory device that could be put into a computer.

He said that on that particular flash drive that there was naked pictures of Deborah doing bestiality with a dog, and he gave some detail of that. He also said that there was pictures of Terrie naked, and also pictures of Terrie and Deborah, as he indicated, quote, "sucking defendant's penis", end quote, he indicated, quote, "standard

stuff like that."

Police obtained various electronic storage devices from defendant's residence during the execution of this search warrant. And you're going to hear that among those items retrieved was a red flash drive that was in a large safe in the back of the building. And remember -- or the back office. This is the back office area, and this is the safe that we're talking about. And you'll see pictures of this in the areas police served a search warrant, and the flash drive that we're referring to is right here, which was within that safe.

Police gained access to that safe by getting the combination from the defendant. Now, you're going to hear that that flash drive was forensically analyzed. And as defendant indicated to police, all the flash drive was a video which depicted sexual conduct between Deborah and a dog. And you'll hear that the photos received by Cox Cable, and the employees at Cox Cable, coworkers of Deborah, in fact, came from this particular video or a video like this.

You will hear from a trained forensic analyst that there were a number of additional videos and pictures found on that device. And you're going to hear that many of those items were retrieved from unallocated space on the device. And that forensic expert is going to describe to you what that is, but in a nutshell, what that means is if you have a

particular item stored on an electronic device and saved to that device, and it's deleted, the -- what was previously saved is still on that device in unallocated space. It's not allocated, but it's unallocated until it's written over.

Now, many of the videos retrieved displayed children in sexual situations with defendant, Deborah, or Terrie. Now, remember at this point in the police investigation, police only have Information about two victims here, and that's Brandon and Anita.

Well, now, they get this electronic data. Now they see situations with other children that they can't identify. So what the police do is they ask Anita for assistance in identifying some of the faces that are depicted in these particular sexual recordings.

As a result of this review with Anita, they're able to determine the videos that we previously discussed.

There's a video of Tails in the shower involving Deborah and the defendant; a video of Tails in the bedroom involving Deborah and defendant; a video of Ryan in the bedroom involving Terrie and the defendant; still photos from a video of Ryan in the office involving Terrie and the defendant; a video of Brandon in the bedroom involving Deborah and the defendant; a video of Tamara in the shower involving Terrie and the defendant; a video of Erin in the shower involving Terrie and the defendant; and photos of Melissa involving

Terrie and the defendant.

Based upon the evidence collected, police now perform additional interviews with what appears to be additional victims, and that would be Tails, Ryan, Tamara, Erin, and Melissa.

Now, upon receiving and interview each of these witnesses, with the exception of Tails, disclose the sexual abuse as we have detailed. You're going to hear that Tails ultimately also discloses, but he only did that after being confronted with the videos themselves prior to another hearing in this proceeding.

Now, based upon police review of this video, police determined that Terrie and Deborah were both criminally culpable for their conduct, and they arrested both Terrie and Deborah and charged them with related crimes, for which they've entered into a plea agreement, as we've previously discussed.

The defendant was also charged with additional crimes determined through video evidence and witness statements. And you've heard those charges read here in open court. Defendant is charged now with 120 separate crimes for his conduct, which conduct spans more than a decade.

He stands charged with sexual acts committed upon Anita, Tails, Ryan, Brandon, Tamara, Erin, and Melissa.

Ladies and gentlemen, at the conclusion of the

evidence, the State will ask you to find the defendant guilty as charged. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Sweetin. Ms. Radosta?
Oh, Mr. Negrete?

MR. LOPEZ-NEGRETE: Your Honor, just one second to put this on.

THE COURT: Okay.

(Pause in the proceedings)

DEFENDANT'S OPENING STATEMENT

MR. LOPEZ-NEGRETE: All right. Good afternoon, everybody. I'll give you guys an overview of what we think the evidence will show, so we can kind of get to the chase of our defense.

What we're asking you to do is to check the tape because if you do, then you will see what did happen and what did not happen in this case.

What we have here is Chris, Terrie, Deborah creating child pornography, and his wives, Terrie and Deborah, willingly abusing their children. And once this disturbing, sick home life came to light, Terrie and Deborah claimed they were victims to save themselves.

The tapes speak for themselves. And they will show you what truly and horribly happened. There's no photoshopping in them. There's no inconsistencies. There's no contradictions. They are the objective, unbiased truth.

You will have witness testimony, however, in this case, and their testimony will be subjective. Of all the charges that you heard this morning, dozens and dozens are based just on words.

And you heard the State talk about these cameras that were supposedly also in the house. But you're not going to see any video evidence of this physical violence that everyone keeps talking about. You're going to hear from the witnesses inconsistencies in their own statements between each witness compared to another as well.

You're going to hear contradictions, and you're going to hear that these witnesses obviously have biases, and they do have grudges against our client, Chris.

You will hear about ulterior motives, coloring the way they testify what they say happened, and what he did.

Two of the main witnesses that you will hear from are Terrie and Deborah. They are completely compromised witnesses. Don't forget, they sexually abused their own children. They did so directly, actually having the sexual contact with their children. They did so willingly, and they did it on tape. Don't forget that when they're testifying.

Ultimately, they were investigated by police. They were charged, and what did they do? They cut deals with the State.

When we're talking about ulterior motives, you will

hear that they are serving a prison sentence, and along with the prison sentence comes the possibility of release. They have the possibility of parole after ten years. In 2024, they could be back in our community. They still have the possibility of having a relationship with their children. These are biases. These are things that they have at take when they're talking about what happened.

Deborah, she will describe herself as a victim. A victim of domestic violence. Is she really, though? She wasn't financially dependent on Chris. She actually had a job with Cox Communications for several, several years. She was actually the breadwinner in the household. She had her own transportation. She had her own way of coming and going.

And ultimately, there will be no physical objective evidence of these types of injuries that they keep referring to.

Also, when we're talking about the police investigation and all that that led up to it, she fled the house, right? But she didn't report any sexual abuse going on. She only talked about this domestic violence. And even though she fled the situation, she actually left behind a couple people, Ryan and Tails.

When she talks about the abuse, she files for a temporary protective order only describing prior domestic violence, which was ultimately denied and she never reapplied

for it because there was in physical evidence, there was no evidence to back that up.

She did consult with a divorce lawyer before the police got involved, and it was only afterwards that the sexual abuse came out where she described herself as a victim. Think about that.

She told police that she was coerced. And then she was arrested, charged, and pleaded not guilty to all these charges because, of course, she was a victim, she was force to do these things. She faced dozens of Counts, 28 Counts, various charges, including sexual assault, sexual assault on a minor, use of a minor in producing pornography, open and gross lewdness, child abuse and neglect, conspiracy sexual assault.

And on the eve of her own trial, she took a deal.

As part of that deal, she had to agree to testify against our client, Chris. And the benefit that she got was dismissing of all the other counts and just had to serve one sentence of ten to life.

When it came to her sentencing, what was her explanation? She was a victim. The video clearly shows that she is a perpetrator, not a victim. The video shows no threats, no violence, no hesitation, no protest, and no refusal to do any of these things.

In fact, not only through her conduct, but in her

words, you hear that she's doing this willingly. At one point, she can be heard telling Brandon, stick your dick in me.

Terrie, is she a victim? No. Also not financial dependent. Had her own job as a substitute teacher. She had family in town that she could get recourse from, get help from. And she even divorces Chris at one point. She even had the ability and did move out of the house completely freely.

She took Ryan with her out of this horrible situation; and then what? Moved back in, bringing Ryan with her. She again, like Deborah, told police that she was coerced, charged, arrested, charged. She faced dozens of counts or 16 counts; sexual assault, sexual assault with a minor, use of a minor in producing pornography, open and gross lewdness, child abuse and neglect, conspiracy sexual assault.

And she also took a deal offered by the State in exchange for the agreement to testify against Chris. And she also got the benefit of having all the other charges dismissed and just have one sentence of ten years to life.

Then later, she even tried to take back her deal.

At one point, she even, speaking to police, talks about enjoying this sexual activity that she was involved in, perpetrating herself. And that's what the video shows. No

threats, no violence, no hesitation, no protest, and no refusal.

Now, what does that show you? That they were getting different treatment than Chris. The women were getting different treatment than the man in this situation because they claimed victimhood. You see that in the amount of charges that Chris is facing, 120 counts versus how many charges Deborah and Terrie were facing.

And you see in a type of deal that they got, in order to then testify against Chris. We're not fighting with what's obvious in this case. The Sena children clearly, obviously, objectively, we can all say are victims. But ultimately, their testimony suffers because of this horrific trauma that they suffered by the very people who were meant to protect them.

This obviously will impact their testimony and gives them profound bias against our client. And it's completely understandable given what they've gone through, what the videos show, but it unavoidably affects their testimony.

We're asking you to base your decision on the evidence that proves the charges beyond a reasonable doubt, and only those, that shows exactly what did happen and did not happen in this case. Thank you very much.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Mr. Negrete.

You want to approach?

(Off-record bench conference.)

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, as I told you yesterday, I have to be some place at 2:00 o'clock. And I was hoping that that wouldn't last too long, but I figured by the time I get back, it would be close to 5:00. And State has indicated that their first witness will be a witness that will probably take a full day.

And so what I'm going to do at this time, is I'm going to let you guys start your weekend early, give you the weekend. You need to be back here Monday by 11:00 o'clock, and we'll get started by 11:00.

I'd like you to eat lunch before you come, though. And then I'll give you breaks throughout the day. We'll be done by 5:00, unless we go a little further. But I anticipate that that will be our day from 11:00 to 5:00, and I'll give you breaks, but I won't be sending you to lunch. Okay?

All right. Once again, ladies and gentlemen, you're admonished not to converse amongst yourself or with anyone else on any subject connected with this trial, or to read, watch, or listen to any report of or commentary on the trial by any person connected with this case, or by any medium of Information, including without limitation, newspapers, television, Internet, or radio.

You're further admonished not to form or express any opinion on any subject connected with this trial until the case is finally submitted to you.

Just meet outside the courtroom, as you have been always. My Marshal will collect you and bring you in. You all have a good weekend. Okay? All right. Thank you.

(Jury exits at 12:59 P.M.)

THE COURT: Okay. We're outside the presence of the jury. During the opening statement by the State, the defense approached the bench lodging an objection as to the statement represented by Mr. Sweetin involving the video evidence and the still photos of, I believe, it's either -- I think it was Deborah with an animal.

We had a previous motion that was filed by the State to admit that evidence, pursuant to 48.045, and on August 29, 2018, I issued an order and my opinion as to how we would proceed on it.

And the way it read was, the contents of the video, based on the testimony of Deborah Sena, would be admitted; however, it will not be allowed the actual video to be shown unless there's some type of defense or opposition denying that the defendant knew or had any Information regarding that.

The State had asked the Court in a subsequent proceeding to reconsider that as it wasn't clear to them

exactly what -- to what extent they were allowed or what they weren't allowed. And on September 25, 2017, after a hearing, I had issued another clarifying opinion where I granted their motion to admit evidence of the video and the still photos of the -- of Deborah having sex with a dog. However, I would not allow the actual video or the still photos to be presented unless, once again, the defendant challenged the content of the e-mails with regards to that Information.

And so, I felt that the -- that the video and the photos themselves were prejudicial, and the probative value of them themselves did not outweigh the prejudice. However, I felt that the content of the e-mails that contained those items was -- the probative value did outweigh the prejudice in light of the fact that it was directly sent by the defendant, his intent to the position to continue to coerce and attempt to require or try to get Deborah to come back to the relationship, and so it gave credibility to that, that she had left the relationship. And it was also an attempt by the defendant -- attempt to discredit her with her employer, and her credibility as to their relationship.

So for those reasons, that's why I've included it. If you need to make an additional record or anything, Ms. Radosta, you may.

MS. RADOSTA: Your Honor, I mean, our objection at the bench during -- just at the bench, which --

THE COURT: Uh-huh.

MS. RADOSTA: -- was during the course of the State's opening, but it was our recollection the ruling was different than as we later were able to check, at least the August 28th -- or I'm sorry, August 29, 2018 minutes. We have those in front of us. We don't have the other one, which was almost a year prior, September of 2017, I believe. Is that right or is that 2018?

I think the September one predates the August one, Judge.

THE COURT: Well, the --

MS. RADOSTA: Or the August one is the -- is the clarification.

THE COURT: Yeah, and I don't think what I've just indicated that there's any difference.

MS. RADOSTA: Anyway, I just don't have the date of the other one in front of me.

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. RADOSTA: It was our recollection that the Court's ruling was slightly different. So at this point in time, I think we can withdraw the objection that we had.

The only thing I would point out, though, is Your Honor made a -- if my understand is Your Honor's ruling is that the content of the video -- or I'm sorry, the content of the e-mail was admissible, but the only content of the e-mail

was the still photo itself. 1 2 THE COURT: Right. MS. RADOSTA: 3 There was no --4 THE COURT: Well, previously --5 MS. RADOSTA: There was no --THE COURT: -- previously during the discussion, 6 7 when I talked about the Information be received from Deborah, that that's how the State had indicated how it would be 8 presented. 10 MS. RADOSTA: Okay. 11 THE COURT: And my understanding is, is that Deborah will be testifying that -- to the circumstances of 12 13 which was just described by the State, and that there was a 14 -- some still photos or a video sent to her employer 15 involving her sexual acts with a dog. 16 I felt that the video itself, I mean, it --17 MS. RADOSTA: Well, the video was never --THE COURT: Or the photos of it themselves, I 18 19 thought was -- is too prejudicial. I -- but I did feel that 20 if your -- if based on the fact that Ms. Sena will be 21 indicated how it occurred, if your client takes the position 22 that he didn't send that, he had nothing to do with that, 23 then the fact that we were able to obtain that information 24 from the search warrant, that would be consistent with what 25 she's representing.

And my viewing of the video itself is it's being 1 2 directed by your client. So for that reason, I felt that it 3 would be admitted because he'd be -- it would show -- go 4 directly to his knowledge, and if he's saying that he had 5 nothing to do with it and didn't know what he was doing, this is something these making up. That's what I'm -- that's what 6 7 -- the position I took with that. 8 The video itself, I didn't think that it needed to 9 be introduced. 10 MS. RADOSTA: That was --11 THE COURT: Okay? 12 MS. RADOSTA: Based on the minutes, Judge, 13 that's --14 THE COURT: Okay. MS. RADOSTA: -- that's our recollection as well. 15 16 THE COURT: Okay. All right. Okay. 17 Thank you, Judge. MR. SWEETIN: THE COURT: All right. So officers, can you make a 18 19 note, we're going to call over as well, can you make a note 20 to have -- make sure that Mr. Sena's fed before you bring him 21 here on -- before they transport him here by 11:00 o'clock 22 Monday? 23 Additionally, Your Honor, Mr. Sena MS. RADOSTA: 24 was not allowed to shave this morning before court. If he's

not allowed to shave over the weekend or Monday, it's going

25

```
to be noticeable. So if we can --
 1
 2
              THE COURT: Is there something saying that he can't
 3
    shave? He got his hair cut.
 4
              THE CORRECTIONS OFFICER: They use razors on
 5
    Tuesday and Thursdays and Sundays --
              THE COURT: Okay.
 6
 7
              THE CORRECTIONS OFFICER: -- at the jail.
 8
    Otherwise, it has to be court ordered that --
 9
              THE COURT: So, Sunday?
10
              THE CORRECTIONS OFFICER: -- he has to shave.
11
              THE COURT: Okay. He can do it Sunday, then.
12
              MS. RADOSTA: Okay. Or if he -- could you just
13
    allow there to be a court order, Judge, that he's -- we're
14
    going to be in trial.
              THE COURT: Well, you just got to let me know.
15
                                                               Ι
16
    mean, if he's growing that fast -- he looks fine to me.
17
    mean, he's able to get his hair cut right now, but --
              MS. RADOSTA: My -- I thought today wasn't a
18
19
   problem, but my thought was --
20
              THE COURT: Okay.
21
              MS. RADOSTA: -- if he didn't -- can't shave by
22
    Monday --
23
              THE COURT: That's fine, just --
              MS. RADOSTA: -- then --
24
25
              THE COURT: -- just let me know.
```

```
1
              MS. RADOSTA: Yeah.
 2
              THE COURT: Is it Tuesdays?
 3
              THE CORRECTIONS OFFICER: Sunday, Tuesdays,
 4
    Thursdays they --
 5
              THE COURT: Okay.
              THE MARSHAL: -- use razors [inaudible].
 6
 7
              THE COURT: So he can get it done Sunday. Be here
 8
   Monday, he'll be here Tuesday, so I don't know if they let
   him do it afterwards, right?
              THE CORRECTIONS OFFICER: It's -- they do it at
10
11
    night.
12
              THE COURT: Oh, okay.
13
              THE CORRECTIONS OFFICER: So Sunday night --
14
              THE COURT:
                          So he can do it --
15
              THE CORRECTIONS OFFICER: -- Tuesday night,
16
    Thursday night.
17
              THE COURT: -- Tuesday night and then he can do it
18
    Thursday night.
19
              If you're growing faster than that, we'll take it
20
    look at it as it comes. Okay?
21
              MS. RADOSTA: I guess last night the problem was,
22
    Judge, we ran so late that he missed the opportunity --
23
              THE COURT:
                          Okay.
24
              MS. RADOSTA: -- last night.
25
              THE COURT: Well, if it's growing so fast, and, you
```

```
know, just keep me -- remind me that, you know, you don't
 1
    feel like you're looking fine or whatever, and I'll make sure
 3
    that we get it done. Okay? All right.
 4
              Okay. So you all have a good weekend. Be prepared
 5
    to probably -- I don't know how long your witness is going to
    go, but probably at least two, maybe. I don't know how
 6
 7
    long --
 8
                           We can do that, Judge. I was talking
              MR. SWEETIN:
 9
    to you before because I -- I don't know that we're going to
10
    get beyond one. I can --
11
              THE COURT: Okay.
12
              MR. SWEETIN: -- get another one and bring her
13
    down, but I don't --
14
              THE COURT: Well, you're going to have six hours.
15
              MS. SUDANO: Anita's very long.
16
              THE COURT: Okay. Well, it's up to you. I -- if
17
    there's somebody -- are you going to try to do it in the
    order in which you -- in which the allegations are with you
18
19
   have Anita and then, I think, it's --
20
              MR. SWEETIN:
                            Yeah.
              THE COURT: -- Brandon, and --
21
22
              MR. SWEETIN: We're going to start with Anita, but
23
    there's going to be some filler witnesses after Anita.
24
              THE COURT: Or, I'm sorry --
25
              MR. SWEETIN:
                            Yeah.
```

```
THE COURT: -- Tails then Brandon then Ryan.
 1
 2
    there something after Anita that -- before you go to Tails?
              MR. SWEETIN:
 3
                            Yeah.
 4
              MS. SUDANO: Yeah.
              THE COURT: Is there some short ones?
 5
              MS. SUDANO: Yeah.
 6
 7
              MR. SWEETIN: There's some shorter ones.
 8
              THE COURT: Okay.
 9
              MR. SWEETIN: Yeah. So I can --
10
              THE COURT: All right.
              MR. SWEETIN: -- I can have --
11
              THE COURT: Well --
12
              MR. SWEETIN: -- them on hold.
13
14
              THE COURT: -- maybe put them on notice that --
15
              MR. SWEETIN: Okay.
              THE COURT: -- so if we get through Anita a little
16
17
   bit quicker, I mean --
18
              MR. SWEETIN: Yeah.
19
              THE COURT: All right?
20
              MR. SWEETIN: All right. Sounds good.
              THE COURT: Okay. All right, guys you all have a
21
22
    good weekend, huh?
23
             (Court recessed at 1:08 P.M., until Monday,
24
                   February 4, 2019, at 11:41 A.M.)
```

INDEX

STATE'S	OPE	NING	STAI	CEMENT	BY	MR.	SWE	ETIN.	•	•	•			•	40
DEFENDAI	UT'S	OPEN	JTNG	STATEN	ME:MT	י RY	MR	LOPE 7	7. — NT	F.G	RF.	TE.			. / ⊱

* * * * *

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

Julie Hord

JULIE LORD, TRANSCRIBER VERBATIM DIGITAL REPORTING, LLC

1	IN THE SUPREME CO	OURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA
2		
3	CHRISTOPHER SENA,) No. 79036
4	Appellant,)
5	v.	
6)
7	THE STATE OF NEVADA,	
8	Respondent.)
9	A DDELL A NÆGC A DDEN	
10	APPELLANT'S APPEN DARIN IMLAY	DIX VOLUME XIX PAGES 4208-4455 STEVE WOLFSON
11	Clark County Public Defender 309 South Third Street Las Vegas, Nevada 89155-2610	Clark County District Attorney 200 Lewis Avenue, 3 rd Floor Las Vegas, Nevada 89155
12		AARON FORD
13 14	Attorney for Appellant	Attorney General 100 North Carson Street
15		Carson City, Nevada 89701-4717 (702) 687-3538
16		Counsel for Respondent
17	<u>CERTII</u>	FICATE OF SERVICE
18	I hereby certify that thi	s document was filed electronically with the Nevada
19	Supreme Court on the 20 day of May,	, 2020. Electronic Service of the foregoing document
20	shall be made in accordance with the	Master Service List as follows:
21	AARON FORD ALEXANDER CHEN	WILLIAM M. WATERS HOWARD S. BROOKS
22	I further certify that I s	erved a copy of this document by mailing a true and , addressed to:
23	correct copy thereof, postage pre-paid CHRISTOPHER SENA, #1217	, addressed to: 7884
24	HIGH DESERT STATE PRISO P.O. BOX 650	ON
25	INDIAN SPRINGS, NV 89070)
26	ВҮ	/s/ Carrie Connolly
27		ployee, Clark County Public Defender's Office
28		