### MICHAEL LASHER, ESQ.

Michael Lasher LLC Nevada Bar No. 13805 827 Kenny Way Las Vegas, Nevada 89107 (510) 507-2869 Michaellasher2@gmail.com Attorney for Appellant

Electronically Filed Mar 16 2020 05:21 p.m. Elizabeth A. Brown Clerk of Supreme Court

### IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

RAMON MURIL DORADO,

Petitioner,

vs.

THE STATE OF NEVADA,

Respondent.

) Supreme Court Case No.: 79556
) Dist. Ct. Case No.: C-17-323098-1

### APPELLANT'S APPENDIX

)

Volume 6

MICHAEL LASHER, ESQ. Michael Lasher LLC Nevada Bar No. 13805 827 Kenny Way Las Vegas, Nevada 89107 (510) 507-2869 Michaellasher2@gmail.com Attorney for Appellant

## IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

RAMON MURIL DORADO,	)
Petitioner, vs.	)
THE STATE OF NEVADA,	)
Respondent.	)

Supreme Court Case No.: 79556 Dist. Ct. No.: C-17-323098-1

# APPELLANT'S APPENDIX

Alphabetical Index

Description	<u>Vol.</u>	<u>Page</u>
Judgment of Conviction, 8/19/19	2	181
Minutes, 6/20/19	2	180
Motion to Dismiss for Failure to Preserve Evidence, 6/20/17	1	1
Motion to Dismiss for Pre-Indictment Delay and Lack of Jurisdiction, 10/19/18	1	61
Recorder's Transcript of Hearing: Defendant's Motion to Dismiss for Failure to Preserve Evidence, 7/6/17	2	142
Recorder's Transcript of Hearing: Jury Trial – Day 1, 6/17/19 <sup>1</sup>	2	183
Recorder's Transcript of Hearing: Jury Trial – Day 2, 6/18/19 <sup>2</sup>	5	422
Recorder's Transcript of Hearing: Jury Trial – Day 3, 6/19/19	8	715
Recorder's Transcript of Hearing: Jury Trial – Day 4, 6/20/19	9	882
Recorder's Transcript of Hearing: Sentencing, 8/13/19	10	966
Reply to State's Opposition to Defendant's Motion to Dismiss for Failure to Preserve Evidence, 8/14/17	s 1	54

State's Opposition to Defendant's Motion to Dismiss for

 <sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> N.B. Volumes 3 and 4 of the Appellant's Appendix are comprised of Recorder's Transcript of Hearing: Jury Trial – Day 1, 6/17/19
 <sup>2</sup> N.B. Volumes 6 and 7 of the Appellant's Appendix are comprised of Recorder's Transcript of Hearing: Jury Trial – Day 2, 6/18/19

Failure to Preserve Evidence, 6/29/17	1	14
State's Opposition to Defendant's Motion to Dismiss Indictment, 10/29/18	1	74

1	lot of tourists that go there for sex tourism.
2	MR. SCHWARTZ: I see. Okay.
3	MR. YAMPOLSKY: And apparently, that was one of
4	them. He was one of them.
5	MR. SCHWARTZ: Right.
6	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1174: And, yeah. You know,
7	it's
8	MR. SCHWARTZ: Okay. I'm very sorry to hear that.
9	Thank you for sharing with us.
10	I take it that there was you know, it sounds like you
11	tried to tell people, but there would have been no police
12	investigation into the subject?
13	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1174: No. If my older cousins
14	were there, they would have done something, but
15	MR. SCHWARTZ: Sure.
16	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1174: they weren't.
17	MR. SCHWARTZ: Okay. And then, I guess, with
18	regards to this case, do you think that you know, I know,
19	given what happened to you, but would you be able to kind of
20	set that aside and view this case view the evidence kind of
21	aside from your experiences and judge this case based on the
22	evidence you hear and, at the end, make a decision based on
23	this evidence?
24	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1174: I think I can.

1	MR. SCHWARTZ: Okay.
2	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1174: I think I can.
3	MR. SCHWARTZ: Okay. Thank you, sir. I appreciate
4	your time.
5	THE COURT: Counsel?
6	MR. YAMPOLSKY: And I'm sorry if you said, but
7	approximately how old were you
8	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1174: I think I was about 12 or
9	13.
10	MR. YAMPOLSKY: Okay. And you recognize well,
11	you've heard some. You haven't heard the evidence, but you
12	recognize that these allegations are an adult male who
13	allegedly sexually assaulted an adult female; right? Correct?
14	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1174: That's
15	MR. YAMPOLSKY: So you don't think what happened
16	would have any bearing on your ability to determine the
17	evidence.
18	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1174: I don't think so, sir.
19	MR. YAMPOLSKY: Okay. Thank you.
20	THE COURT: Thank you, sir. We'll have you come
21	back at 1:00 o'clock. You can go on lunch break at this time.
22	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1174: Copy that. Thank you.
23	THE COURT: Counsel, your next witness or next
24	voir dire.

1 [JUROR NO. 1124]. MR. SCHWARTZ: 2 THE COURT: [JUROR NO. 1124], just go ahead --3 Schwartz is gonna hand you the microphone and you can just sit in any of those seats that you feel comfortable in. 4 5 Ma'am, when we talked about -- basically we're gonna ask 6 questions to continue with the process. We're gonna do it in 7 private. Understand by "private" we mean without the rest of 8 the potential jurors. Of course, my staff and the officers of 9 the court are here and the attorneys are here. Understand, everything that's said in these proceedings stays right here 10 11 in these proceedings; okay? 12 Thank you. 13 Counsel? 14 MR. SCHWARTZ: Thank you. 15 And, [JUROR NO. 1124], I think you actually were one that said you could talk about in front of everybody. But since we 16 17 were doing this, figure we could just do it in private as well. 18 19 PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1124: [Indiscernible]. MR. SCHWARTZ: Could you tell us a little bit about 20 21 what had happened to you when you were the victim of sexual 22 assault? 23 PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1124: All right. So it kind of 24 happened two times. And I'm not gonna like, exaggerate it.

'Cause, honestly, it wasn't, like, the worst thing that could happen.

So the first time was, I think I was about 16. So I think it was eight years ago.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

1

2

3

4

MR. SCHWARTZ: Okay.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1124: I was at this guy's house that I was, like, kind of with. And he was pretty much -- he was a few years older than me. And he was pretty much one of those guys that was, like -- they didn't want a relationship, but I did. So I kind of forced him into one. I didn't force him into one. But I was kind of just, like, "I'm not gonna do anything with you unless we're dating." And so we started dating.

And then I went to his house and then -- oh, my God. I'm gonna sound like such a bad person. I was only, like, 16 or 17, but --

THE COURT: Ma'am, please understand, there's absolutely no judgment being done. All we're gonna do is ask you facts and how it may affect you as a potential juror.

20 PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1124: Okay. He did get me high 21 on weed. And -- but I was like, still, like, 100 percent --22 like, I knew what was happening. My mind wasn't clouded or 23 anything like that. Like, I knew what was happening. And I 24 knew what I was saying and everything. And so he pretty much started to touch me. And I was like, "No, stop." Like, "Don't do that. I don't want to do anything." And he literally would not stop. And I just kept telling him, "No, stop." Like, "Don't do it." And he just kept touching me and I just let it happen after, like, five minutes of telling him to stop. 'Cause he just wouldn't listen to me.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

He only did things with his hands. So I'm glad about that. But I didn't really know much about anything about that stuff back then. So I kind of didn't think it was a big deal. I thought it was kind of normal.

But after, like, a few years, I was, like, thinking about it and I was like, "Wait. I was telling him to stop and he didn't stop. That's molestation." Like what is wrong -like, what -- and so I just -- what -- like, I didn't do anything. Like, what can you do?

And then the second time actually happened this year. I was having consensual sex with somebody that I met. And I told him firmly, don't -- don't finish inside of me. And he did. And -- and I was, like -- I was like, "Why would you do that?"

And so pretty much all I did was make him pay for the Plan B and I blocked him out of my life forever. And that's pretty much it.

1 THE COURT: Counsel, any questions? 2 MR. SCHWARTZ: Just quickly about -- I believe you 3 had mentioned that your best friend had also been the victim. 4 Do you know much about what happened to her? 5 PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1124: I don't know too much. 6 She hasn't said that much about it. What she has said, it was 7 -- I think it was her sophomore year. It was when she first 8 came to Vegas. I met her in high school. 9 MR. SCHWARTZ: Okay. 10 PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1124: And she started dating a 11 guy named Billy. He was a few years older than her, too. I 12 think he was a senior at the time. And she -- what -- based 13 off what she was telling me, she kept telling him that she 14 doesn't want to. She doesn't feel comfortable. But he 15 actually proceeded to have sex with her. 16 MR. SCHWARTZ: Was there any type of -- that you're 17 aware of, any type of criminal investigation or police 18 involvement or anything --19 PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1124: No, I don't think she did anything. 'Cause I think she was so young at that time, I 20 21 don't think she really, like, understood -- the same as me, 22 too. MR. SCHWARTZ: Kind of like you? Yeah. 23 24 PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1124: Yeah.

MR. SCHWARTZ: Okay. I don't have any further questions.

THE COURT: Counsel for the Defense, any questions? MR. YAMPOLSKY: When you said you were having consensual sex and then you told him not to finish inside of you, would you agree that you had -- had agreed to actually have the consensual sex?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1124: Yeah, we agreed to it. But I told him prior to that that I don't want him to finish inside of me.

MR. YAMPOLSKY: I understand that. But if somebody asks you the question -- and I'm asking you the question, in that scenario, even though you told him not to finish and he did, if somebody said, did you -- did you consent to consensual sex, what was your answer?

16 |

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1124: Yes.

MR. YAMPOLSKY: Okay. And we were -- yesterday, you were talking and you -- and if I'm paraphrasing or if I have it wrong, please correct me -- is something like, "I have strong feelings," or I -- basically, "I go with my feelings," or something like that. Do you remember saying that?

22 PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1124: Yes, I go with my gut
23 instinct.

24

MR. YAMPOLSKY: Okay. So my question is that you

heard the Prosecution's witness testify; okay? And in your head, you're thinking, "Gee, I don't think they met their burden." But your gut says, "Something happened. I know he did something." If that were the case, what would your verdict be?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1124: Well, because of the whole evidence thing, if I do hear what she says but my gut instinct tells me otherwise, but there's no evidence to prove my gut instinct, then there's really nothing I can do.

MR. YAMPOLSKY: Well, would you go with your feelings or would you go what you think the evidence was?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1124: In that case, I would have to go with what the evidence shows.

MR. YAMPOLSKY: Okay. And yesterday, I believe you said something like, "Well, I would want to hear from the Defendant." Remember, you said that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1124: Mm-hmm.

18 MR. YAMPOLSKY: Can you explain a little about that? 19 PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1124: Yes. It would -- in every 20 case scenario, it would be nice to hear both sides of the 21 story, even though, now, I do realize that I don't have to 22 hear your side of the story. And I've become okay with that. 23 So pretty much, I would just have to go off her story, if it 24 makes sense, and any evidence and any questions, anything that

you guys have to say.

2 MR. YAMPOLSKY: So even though -- let me give you this scenario: My client doesn't testify. I don't ask any 3 questions of anybody. Would you hold that against him? 4 5 PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1124: I wouldn't -- I can't. So 6 I wouldn't let myself. 7 MR. YAMPOLSKY: So you're okay with that? 8 PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1124: Yeah. 9 MR. YAMPOLSKY: Okay. 10 THE COURT: Any follow up to that, Counsel? 11 Thank you, ma'am. We'll see you back here at 12 1:00 o'clock. Okay. Go on lunch break. Thank you. 13 Counsel, next venire. 14 MR. SCHWARTZ: [JUROR NO. 1229]. 15 THE COURT: [JUROR NO. 1229]. 16 [DISCUSSION OFF THE RECORD] 17 [JUROR NO. 1229], if you'll just come up THE COURT: here and take one of the seats in the box, please. Yeah, any 18 19 one that you want. That's fine. 20 [JUROR NO. 1229], badge number 229. Please understand 21 what we're doing now is the continuation of the voir dire 22 process. However, we're doing it in private due to request made by certain juror members, prospective juror members. 23 24 By "private," it means the rest of the prospective jurors

1 are not here. Of course, all my staff is here, the officers 2 of the court and members of the court and the bar are here. But please understand that everything that's said in this 3 courtroom basically stays in this courtroom. All the 4 individuals in here are either under an oath not to convey any 5 6 of this material to anyone else or, basically, they know by 7 penalty of law they can't. So it is technically in private. Counsel? 8 9 MR. SCHWARTZ: [JUROR NO. 1229], you mentioned --10 did you have a question? 11 PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1229: Actually, it was, like, 12 correction. Your Honor, I think you said 229. It's 1229. 13 THE COURT: Yeah, I just did the last three. 14 PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1229: Oh, okay. 15 THE COURT: It's okay. 1229. 16 PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1229: You got it. 17 MR. SCHWARTZ: Good catch, though. Good catch. You had mentioned yesterday that you had a friend who was 18 19 the victim of, I believe, a sexual assault. 20 PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1229: Yes, sir. 21 MR. SCHWARTZ: Could you tell us, like, whatever you 22 know about it that you're comfortable telling us. 23 PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1229: I actually found out about 24 it yesterday.

1	MR. SCHWARTZ: Okay.
2	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1229: Because as I mentioned, it
3	was [JUROR NO. 1191], who is currently not here, I believe
4	MR. SCHWARTZ: Oh, okay.
5	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1229: It was her sister. And I
б	actually had only just found about it yesterday.
7	MR. SCHWARTZ: When [JUROR NO. 1191] said it out
8	loud?
9	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1229: Yes.
10	MR. SCHWARTZ: Okay. So you don't know any other
11	details, other than what we heard yesterday, huh?
12	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1229: No, I had only just found
13	out about it, like, literally, right then.
14	MR. SCHWARTZ: And that was the connection between
15	you two. You know her sister.
16	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1229: Yes. She was a friend of
17	mine in middle school and then we reconnected in high school.
18	MR. SCHWARTZ: Okay. Okay. Did you also I wrote
19	it down, so it could have been wrong. But you did you also
20	say you had a friend that was a victim of a violent crime?
21	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1229: Yes.
22	MR. SCHWARTZ: Okay. Could you tell us a little bit
23	more about that?
24	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1229: He doesn't like to

1 disclose it. But he is a citizen of the United States, but he 2 was not born in the United States. He was born in 3 Sierra Leone during the time that the civil war was happened -- the civil war was going on. And he doesn't 4 5 remember it. But according to his uncle, he witnessed his 6 whole family get killed in front of him. 7 MR. SCHWARTZ: Oh, wow. Okay. 8 PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1229: He doesn't like to talk 9 about it and I don't know anything other than beyond that. MR. SCHWARTZ: Okay. Okay. I have no further 10 11 questions. Thank you, sir. 12 THE COURT: Counsel, any questions at all? 13 MR. YAMPOLSKY: Just, based on what you know, 14 [JUROR NO. 1191], whatever her name is --15 PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1229: [JUROR NO. 1191]. 16 MR. YAMPOLSKY: I'm sorry. What? 17 PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1229: [JUROR NO. 1191]. MR. YAMPOLSKY: [JUROR NO. 1191], her sister and 18 19 your friend, that wouldn't have any affect on your ability to 20 determine what -- to determine whether the government met their burden or not? 21 22 PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1229: Oh, no, not at all. In fact, because I had only found out about it after this court 23 24 case had gotten, is that I'm going to ask her about it,

afterwards, of course.

2 MR. YAMPOLSKY: Okay. I have nothing further. 3 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, sir. We'll see you back here at 1:00 o'clock. Go on lunch break; okay? 4 5 PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1229: Thank you. 6 THE COURT: Thank you, sir. MR. SCHWARTZ: 7 [JUROR NO. 1238]. 8 MR. YAMPOLSKY: Badge number? 9 She's a new one. MR. SCHWARTZ: She's --10 MS. CRAGGS: 1238. 11 MR. SCHWARTZ: -- 1238. 12 MR. YAMPOLSKY: 1238? [JUROR NO. 1238]? 13 MS. CRAGGS: Yes, correct. 1238. 14 [DISCUSSION OFF THE RECORD] 15 THE COURT: Go ahead, ma'am. And if you'll just 16 have a seat. And Mr. Schwartz will hand you the microphone. 17 Ma'am, I want you to understand that, basically, what we're doing here is a continuation of the voir dire process. 18 19 The question's going to be asked, but they're being done in 20 private, meaning there's no other members of the potential 21 jury pool in front of you. Of course, there's individuals 22 here from my department, law enforcement, and officers of the 23 court and attorneys. Please understand that everything that 24 is said in this room basically stays absolutely in this room;

okay?

1

2 PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1240: Okay. 3 THE COURT: Go ahead, Counsel. 4 MR. SCHWARTZ: Okay. Ma'am, you had mentioned 5 that -- I think you said maybe not technically, you didn't 6 think it was, technically, a sexual assault. Could you just 7 kind of maybe elaborate a little bit for us? PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1240: Like --8 9 MR. YAMPOLSKY: Your Honor, could the Court have [JUROR NO. 1238] hold the mic closer to --10 11 THE COURT: Oh, yeah. [JUROR NO. 1238], a little 12 bit louder. Outside voice. And hold that microphone like 13 you're auditioning for one of those song shows; all right? 14 PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1240: Okay. 15 THE COURT: Thank you. 16 PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1240: He told me to do stuff, 17 but like nothing actually happened. 18 MR. SCHWARTZ: Okay. 19 PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1240: And my mom called the 20 cops. 21 MR. SCHWARTZ: Okay. So when you had mentioned that 22 your mom and you, I quess, was it a home invasion or burglary 23 situation? 24 PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1240: They came in and they just

1	alashed the southes. It was an en
1	slashed the couches. It was an ex.
2	MR. SCHWARTZ: Okay. And you and your mom were
3	home?
4	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1240: No.
5	MR. SCHWARTZ: Were not.
б	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1240: No.
7	MR. SCHWARTZ: When was this? Like, how many years
8	ago, approximately?
9	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1240: Thirteen.
10	MR. SCHWARTZ: Thirteen years ago?
11	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1240: Yeah.
12	MR. SCHWARTZ: So how old would you have been at
13	that time?
14	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1240: Like six.
15	MR. SCHWARTZ: Six?
16	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1240: Yeah.
17	MR. SCHWARTZ: So they came in and slashed the
18	couches and then did you guy were you and your mom coming
19	home when they were there?
20	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1240: No, we came home and,
21	like, we just saw the couches
22	MR. SCHWARTZ: Okay.
23	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1240: but, like, we knew who
24	it was because something happened after that too.

1	MR. SCHWARTZ: Okay. So let me make sure I get it
2	in order. I think I'm I thought it was all the same
3	incident. So the first thing that happens is the couch
4	slashing?
5	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1240: I think so, yeah.
6	MR. SCHWARTZ: Okay. So then what happens next?
7	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1240: I don't think my mom I
8	don't remember if she called the cops for that one.
9	MR. SCHWARTZ: Okay.
10	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1240: But then it's, like,
11	all in the same, like, time, not the same day.
12	MR. SCHWARTZ: Not the same day?
13	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1240: Yeah.
14	MR. SCHWARTZ: Okay. So maybe like a couple days
15	later, something else happened?
16	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1240: Yeah.
17	MR. SCHWARTZ: Okay. Who were the people that did
18	it?
19	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1240: It was one of my mom's
20	exes.
21	MR. SCHWARTZ: Oh, okay.
22	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1240: Yeah.
23	MR. SCHWARTZ: So what was the next thing that
24	happened after the couch slashing that you remember?

1 PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1240: There were two things, but 2 I don't know which one came first. 3 MR. SCHWARTZ: Okay. Let's -- tell me about one of 4 'em. 5 PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1240: I was outside playing with 6 my cousin. And then, like, a big rock just, like, flew by 7 right here and it hit the house. 8 MR. SCHWARTZ: A rock? 9 PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1240: Yeah. 10 MR. SCHWARTZ: Okay. Did you see who threw it? 11 PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1240: My mom's ex. 12 MR. SCHWARTZ: Okay. 13 PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1240: I know 'cause of the 14 truck. It was kind of hard to miss. It was red with white 15 polka dots. 16 MR. SCHWARTZ: Red with white polka dots? 17 PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1240: Yeah. MR. SCHWARTZ: That's kind of an interesting 18 19 truck --20 PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1240: Yeah. 21 MR. SCHWARTZ: -- color. 22 Okay. So did anything happen as a result of that, the 23 rock hit the window? Did anyone get hurt or anything? 24 PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1240: No. We lived in a

1	trailer, so it hit, like, the bottom part of it.
2	MR. SCHWARTZ: Okay. And you just told your mom
3	what happened?
4	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1240: Yeah. She called the cops
5	and they came and that's it.
6	MR. SCHWARTZ: Okay. So then what's the other thing
7	that happened?
8	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1240: The technically not
9	the yeah. It was at school.
10	MR. SCHWARTZ: Okay. You were at school?
11	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1240: Mm-hmm.
12	MR. SCHWARTZ: You said you're about six, maybe?
13	And it is it the same ex-boyfriend?
14	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1240: No, it was
15	MR. SCHWARTZ: Oh, okay.
16	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1240: a stranger, actually.
17	MR. SCHWARTZ: Were you walking home? At recess or
18	where were you?
19	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1240: I had asked to go to the
20	bathroom.
21	MR. SCHWARTZ: Okay.
22	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1240: And it was like it was
23	like the bathroom and then it was my classroom. But I guess
24	they had a soft lockdown when I was in the bathroom or

something.

2	MR. SCHWARTZ: A what lockdown?
3	THE COURT: Soft lockdown.
4	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1240: A soft lockdown.
5	MR. SCHWARTZ: A soft lockdown. Okay.
6	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1240: And I didn't know what
7	that was. So I was just in the bathroom. And he he held
8	the door open for me. I thought it was a teacher, honestly.
9	Then I went in; he came in after and he locked the door.
10	MR. SCHWARTZ: Okay. And I know you said it
11	sounded like he told you to do stuff to him?
12	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1240: Mm-hmm.
13	MR. SCHWARTZ: And you didn't?
14	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1240: No, I started crying.
15	MR. SCHWARTZ: Okay.
16	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1240: And I think he got scared
17	or something 'cause
18	MR. SCHWARTZ: And then
19	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1240: he left.
20	MR. SCHWARTZ: He just left.
21	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1240: Yeah.
22	MR. SCHWARTZ: And then you told, like, your mom
23	what happened
24	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1240: Yeah.

1	MR. SCHWARTZ: or did you tell the teachers?
2	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1240: No. I
3	MR. SCHWARTZ: Okay.
4	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1240: I was confused. So I just
5	told my teacher I missed my brother. Because he had passed
б	away recently.
7	MR. SCHWARTZ: Okay. I'm sorry.
8	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1240: Yeah. So then, like, when
9	I got home, I told my mom.
10	MR. SCHWARTZ: I see. And were they ever able to
11	find this guy?
12	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1240: No, they they took me
13	in a police car and they showed me suspects.
14	MR. SCHWARTZ: Uh-huh.
15	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1240: But, no.
16	MR. SCHWARTZ: Didn't recognize him?
17	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1240: No.
18	MR. SCHWARTZ: Okay. Thank you.
19	THE COURT: Counsel for Defense, any questions?
20	MR. YAMPOLSKY: [JUROR NO. 1238], just based on
21	those incidents, would you have a problem determining whether
22	or not you thought the evidence was credible on the witness
23	stand or whatever's admitted?
24	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1240: No, I'm

1	MR. YAMPOLSKY: I have nothing further.
2	THE COURT: Thank you, ma'am. We'll see you back
3	here at 1:00 o'clock. Go ahead and go on lunch break.
4	State, next prospective juror member.
5	MR. SCHWARTZ: [JUROR NO. 1239], please.
6	THE COURT: [JUROR NO. 1239], we'll just go ahead
7	and have you sit in one of these black chairs over here,
8	whichever's more comfortable for you.
9	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1239: Okay.
10	THE COURT: Those seem to be the most comfy chairs I
11	have.
12	And, [JUROR NO. 1239], 1239, I want you to understand
13	that we're basically continuing the process of questioning,
14	the voir dire process, but we're gonna do these in private.
15	And by "private," I mean the rest of the prospective jurors
16	are not here.
17	Of course my staff and the officers of the court and
18	police officers still in the courtroom. Please understand
19	that everything that's being said in this room basically stays
20	in this room. It's private; okay?
21	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1239: Mm-hmm.
22	THE COURT: Go ahead, Counsel.
23	MR. SCHWARTZ: [JUROR NO. 1239], you had mentioned
24	that your daughter was the victim of a sexual assault?

1 PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1239: Yes. 2 MR. SCHWARTZ: How old was she at that time? 3 PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1239: Either three or four. I 4 can't remember. 5 THE COURT: Ma'am, if you talk a little bit louder. 6 Outside voice. 7 PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1239: About three or four. 8 MR. SCHWARTZ: And who was the assaulter? 9 PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1239: My co-worker's 15-year-old 10 son. 11 MR. SCHWARTZ: How did you end up finding out about 12 that? 13 PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1239: She told her dad a few 14 months later that Brian looked at her pee pee when she came 15 out of the bathroom. So --16 MR. SCHWARTZ: Okay. 17 PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1239: It's like, I don't know if 18 it was more than one incident or a little bit. 'Cause he 19 wasn't usually with her alone. But one week he was. 20 MR. SCHWARTZ: The kid? 21 PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1239: The 15-year-old, yeah. 22 MR. SCHWARTZ: What did you guys do once you found 23 out about it? 24 PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1239: I went -- I called

Child Haven or Child Safe Nest, I don't know, whatever the --MR. SCHWARTZ: CPS or --PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1239: Yeah, I don't know. The child place is in -- and they went over to do an investigation. But they already had a lawyer and kind of blocked it. And I didn't want to put her through court. So I

And she didn't -- she didn't really bring it up that many times. I mean, he had a lot of issues with my ex-husband. And seemed like the therapy mostly was about how annoying he was rather than how she was affected by the --

sent her to therapy and stopped talking to my co-worker.

MR. SCHWARTZ: Okay.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1239: -- thing, so --MR. SCHWARTZ: Well, I guess that's good --PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1239: Yeah.

MR. SCHWARTZ: -- in the sense -- okay.

Were you disappointed that there -- I guess you didn't want there to be more of an investigation at that point; right? Because you didn't want her to have to go court --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1239: Right. Yeah.

21 MR. SCHWARTZ: -- and stuff like that 22 [indiscernible].

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1239: Yeah, I was sort of
 disappointed. More of my co-worker because she just kept

1	sending me e-mails that kids make up stuff. I go, "She's
2	three. She didn't know anything. She couldn't make this up."
3	MR. SCHWARTZ: Yeah.
4	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1239: I mean, they showed her on
5	I doll, "Show what happened."
б	MR. SCHWARTZ: Okay. So they did do like a little
7	interview with her?
8	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1239: Yeah.
9	MR. SCHWARTZ: Like a forensic interview, I think
10	they might call it?
11	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1239: Yeah.
12	MR. SCHWARTZ: Okay. I guess, would anything about
13	that experience in your life affect you from being able to
14	kind of be fair in this case and listen to the evidence and
15	judge it for what you hear in this case?
16	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1239: I don't think so.
17	MR. SCHWARTZ: Okay. Thank you, ma'am.
18	THE COURT: Counsel, any questions?
19	MR. YAMPOLSKY: Just, you don't think that that
20	those experience would keep you from evaluating the evidence,
21	do you?
22	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1239: No.
23	MR. YAMPOLSKY: Nothing further.
24	THE COURT: Thank you, ma'am. We'll see you back

1	here at 1:00 o'clock. Go ahead and have a lunch break.
2	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1239: Thank you.
3	THE COURT: State?
4	MR. SCHWARTZ: Your Honor, this is our last one.
5	[JUROR NO. 1246]. The Marshal didn't say whether he got proof
6	from her yet right about the
7	THE COURT: No, we're I have her back in.
8	[JUROR NO. 1246], if you would just come and take one of
9	the cushy black chairs there in the box.
10	THE MARSHAL: Your Honor, [JUROR NO. 1246] did show
11	me the e-mail that her plane ticket leaving Friday
12	THE COURT: Okay.
13	THE MARSHAL: at [indiscernible] o'clock.
14	THE COURT: All right, Counsel. That maybe can
15	solve that problem right away.
16	MR. SCHWARTZ: Yes.
17	THE COURT: [JUROR NO. 12:46], due to the fact that
18	you have flight arrangements for Mexico that I'm sure were
19	made months and months ago and probably quite expensive and
20	they're family trips and the fact that we could not assure you
21	this case would be done before that period, we're gonna excuse
22	you. Okay? Thank you, ma'am. You may be excused.
23	Counsel, what we'll do is, after lunch, we'll replace
24	that one seat. I'll do the general questions and then we'll

1 follow up with the State's questions. And then, Counsel, be 2 ready to go. And once we're done picking the jury, make sure 3 you're ready to do opening arguments today. 4 MR. YAMPOLSKY: Your Honor, before we break, can I 5 do one challenge for cause? 6 THE COURT: You may. Okay. On [JUROR NO. 1164] -- and 7 MR. YAMPOLSKY: the Court saw what she's like and she hesitated this and that. 8 9 But the one question was -- the last question I asked and 10 it's, like, well, if you believe -- essentially, if you 11 believe it could have happened or couldn't happen and it's 12 like even, you know, what would your verdict be? 13 She goes, "I can't answer that." 14 And, Your Honor, even though we didn't go into it and I 15 know what the law says, it sounds like that's reasonable and 16 she couldn't determine whether or not she would have a verdict 17 of not quilty. And based on that, I think that she should be excused for cause. 18 19 THE COURT: Counsel? 20 MR. SCHWARTZ: First, to be clear, you're talking 21 about [JUROR NO. 1087] --22 THE COURT: [JUROR NO. 1087], not [JUROR NO. 1164]. MR. SCHWARTZ: -- you said [JUROR NO. 1164]. 23 24 MR. YAMPOLSKY: Oh, I'm sorry.

> Kennedy Court Reporters, Inc. 800.231.2682

1	THE COURT: It's 1087, [JUROR NO. 1087].
2	MR. YAMPOLSKY: Right.
3	MR. SCHWARTZ: And so I would object. I think at
4	this time she said several times that she would be fair,
5	listen to the evidence. If there was no evidence, she would
6	find not guilty.
7	At that one question that Mr. Yampolsky asked her, didn't
8	feel like she was saying she couldn't be fair but maybe she
9	just was confused about the question. Maybe you can follow up
10	with her and
11	THE COURT: No, Counsel, I went through it. And
12	basically, the hypothetical that was posed to her was
13	confusing to this Court. Once it was clarified by a direct
14	question, she basically said, no, she could be fair. She
15	could understand it. If the State couldn't prove its burden,
16	that she'd come back with a not guilty. Therefore,
17	[JUROR NO. 1087] will stay.
18	We'll see you back here at 1:00 o'clock.
19	[RECESS AT 12:03 P.M.; PROCEEDINGS RESUMED AT
20	1:02 P.M.]
21	[OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE PROSPECTIVE JURY]
22	[DISCUSSION OFF THE RECORD]
23	THE COURT: Counsel, anything that needs to come
24	before the Court before we get the jury in here?

1	MS. CRAGGS: Would you like us to talk about that
2	motion now, Your Honor?
3	THE COURT: I've looked through it and we're gonna
4	do it at the break time because I got a jury sitting out
5	there.
6	MS. CRAGGS: Okay. Thank you.
7	MR. SCHWARTZ: We're ready.
8	THE COURT: Okay. Let's go. Let's go ahead and get
9	my jury in. Officers, can you alert my Marshal, let her know
10	we're ready?
11	COURT OFFICER: Yes, sir.
12	THE COURT: Thank you, sir.
13	[DISCUSSION OFF THE RECORD]
14	THE MARSHAL: All rise for the jury.
15	[IN THE PRESENCE OF THE PROSPECTIVE JURY]
16	THE MARSHAL: Your Honor, we're missing one juror.
17	He had to run to the restroom after we lined up.
18	THE COURT: Okay. Is he an individual that's in the
19	gallery or in the box?
20	THE MARSHAL: He was back here.
21	THE COURT: Okay. We'll begin without him.
22	Welcome back, everyone. Madam Clerk, if you would please
23	fill the vacancies.
24	THE CLERK: In seat number five will be

1	[JUROR NO. 1254], badge 254. And seat number 28 will be
2	[JUROR NO. 1255], badge 255.
3	THE COURT: All right. Marshal, if you can get that
4	microphone up there to [JUROR NO. 1254] in the background,
5	badge 1254.
6	[JUROR NO. 1254], how you doing today?
7	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1254: Doing good.
8	THE COURT: Okay. Let's see how good your memory
9	is. How long you been here in Clark County?
10	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1254: About 16 years.
11	THE COURT: All right. Are you currently employed?
12	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1254: Yes, sir.
13	THE COURT: What do you do?
14	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1254: I'm a cashier, the
15	Harbor Freight Tools.
16	THE COURT: Okay. Another one of my favor stores.
17	I wish you guys would stop sending me all those coupons,
18	though. Actually, my wife would prefer that you stop sending
19	me all those coupons.
20	All right. Are you currently married?
21	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1254: No.
22	THE COURT: Okay. How far did you go in school?
23	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1254: High school.
24	THE COURT: Okay. Do you have any close family

1	members or close family friends who have ever been a victim of
2	a violent crime?
3	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1254: No.
4	THE COURT: What about a victim of a sexual assault?
5	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1254: No.
6	THE COURT: Any close family members or friends of
7	the family that have been accused of committing a sexual
8	assault?
9	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1254: No.
10	THE COURT: Any close family members or close family
11	friends that are in law enforcement?
12	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1254: No.
13	THE COURT: That was easy. All right.
14	All right. You know the drill. How long you been here
15	in Clark County?
16	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1255: Eighteen years.
17	THE COURT: Eighteen years?
18	All right. I noticed a little accent there. What's your
19	native language?
20	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1255: Excuse me?
21	THE COURT: What's your native language?
22	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1255: Spanish
23	THE COURT: Spanish? Okay.
24	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1255: my language. Spanish.

Mm-hmm.

1

2 THE COURT: Okay. How well do you read, write, and 3 understand the English language? 4 PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1255: Like maybe 60 percent 5 listen. 6 THE COURT: Okay. In listening. PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1255: Mm-hmm. 7 8 THE COURT: Okay. 9 PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1255: Maybe 60 percent. THE COURT: Are you better -- is it better or easier 10 11 for you to listen to the English language or to read it? 12 PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1255: Listen. 13 THE COURT: Okay. Listen to it. Okay. 14 And are you currently employed? PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1255: Yes, I work --15 16 THE COURT: What do you --17 PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1255: -- for Bellagio. 18 Okay. And what do you do for them? THE COURT: 19 PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1255: Housekeeping. 20 THE COURT: Okay. And are you currently married? 21 PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1255: No. 22 THE COURT: Okay. Any grown children here in 23 Clark County? 24 PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1255: Yes.

1	THE COURT: Okay. How old's the oldest?
2	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1255: Twenty-seven.
3	THE COURT: Okay.
4	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1255: And 22.
5	THE COURT: Okay. What does the 27-year-old do?
6	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1255: She's a she work for
7	Hoover Dam.
8	THE COURT: Okay.
9	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1255: She do she does
10	contracts.
11	THE COURT: Okay. Contracts for Hoover Dam?
12	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1255: Mm-hmm.
13	THE COURT: Okay. And the younger one, what does he
14	or she do?
15	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1255: The youngest, he work for
16	BJ's Restaurant.
17	THE COURT: Okay. All right. And have you or any
18	close family member of your friends or tight-knit group like
19	friends, family, close associates ever been the victim of a
20	violent crime?
21	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1255: My daughter.
22	THE COURT: Okay. Approximately how long ago was
23	that?
24	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1255: I believe when she was

Г

13	years	old	or	14.
	100110	0 - 0	<u> </u>	·

2	THE COURT: Okay.
3	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1255: I'm not really remember.
4	THE COURT: Okay. And where did that take place?
5	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1255: Here, in America.
6	THE COURT: Here in Las Vegas?
7	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1255: Las Vegas, mm-hmm.
8	THE COURT: Okay. And what type of crime was
9	committed against her?
10	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1255: She have sex with a guy
11	19 years old.
12	THE COURT: Okay. So it was an act of sex between
13	her and a 19-year-old?
14	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1255: Nineteen years old.
15	THE COURT: Okay. To your understanding or
16	recollection, was there any prosecution or was the law ever
17	involved in that?
18	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1255: Excuse me?
19	THE COURT: Did the law get involved, the police
20	department get involved
21	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1255: Yes.
22	THE COURT: [indiscernible] attorney?
23	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1255: Yes. Yes.
24	THE COURT: Okay. Were you an individual who had to

1	come to court on behalf of your daughter?
2	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1255: I came to court.
3	THE COURT: Okay.
4	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1255: Mm-hmm.
5	THE COURT: Other than that act that was committed
6	against your daughter, any other violent acts against family
7	members, close family friends?
8	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1255: Only I was victim
9	violence, domestic.
10	THE COURT: Okay. Domestic violence.
11	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1255: Yeah, for my ex-husband.
12	THE COURT: Okay. And how long ago was that?
13	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1255: Like maybe eight years
14	ago.
15	THE COURT: Okay.
16	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1255: Or nine. I don't really
17	remember.
18	THE COURT: About eight or nine years ago?
19	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1255: Yeah.
20	THE COURT: Okay. Was there any legal action taken
21	against your ex-husband?
22	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1255: Uh, yes.
23	THE COURT: Okay. Did you have to go to trial in
24	regards to that domestic violence?

1 PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1255: No, but he went to jail 2 for my daughter. 3 THE COURT: Okay. He went to jail based upon the crime he committed against your daughter? 4 5 PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1255: Mm-hmm. 6 THE COURT: Is that a "yes"? 7 PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1255: Yes. 8 THE COURT: Okay. Any members of your family or 9 close friends that were victims of a sexual assault? PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1255: No. 10 11 THE COURT: Okay. Any members of your family or 12 close family friends that are in law enforcement? 13 PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1255: No. 14 THE COURT: Okay. Have either of the two of you 15 been a juror before? 16 PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1255: Excuse me? 17 THE COURT: Have you ever been a juror before? 18 PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1255: No, I got called once, but 19 they let me go. 20 THE COURT: Okay. You got called but you weren't 21 chosen as a juror. Okay. 22 PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1255: Mm-hmm. 23 THE COURT: State, your panel. 24 MR. SCHWARTZ: Thank you, Your Honor.

1	JURY VOIR DIRE (resumed)
2	MR. SCHWARTZ: You can keep ma'am, if you don't
3	mind keeping the microphone for a second. [JUROR NO. 1255]?
4	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1255: [JUROR NO. 1255].
5	MR. SCHWARTZ: Just a couple questions. Do you mind
6	if I ask you a couple questions about your daughter?
7	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1255: Yes.
8	MR. SCHWARTZ: Okay. You remember, like we talked
9	about, if you wanted to talk in private, we can also do that
10	as well.
11	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1255: I'd rather talk to him in
12	private.
13	MR. SCHWARTZ: Okay.
14	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1255: Yes.
15	MR. SCHWARTZ: Do you have were you able to
16	listen to some of the questions that I was asking yesterday to
17	most of these people?
18	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1255: Like pretty much, but not
19	really.
20	MR. SCHWARTZ: Okay.
21	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1255: I understand maybe the
22	60 percent or 80 percent.
23	MR. SCHWARTZ: Okay. Did you have any feelings
24	about opinions about no means no or the #MeToo movement?

1	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1255: Yes. My opinion is when
2	you say no, that means no.
3	MR. SCHWARTZ: Okay.
4	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1255: Right?
5	MR. SCHWARTZ: Yes. That will work. Yes.
6	Okay. Anything else that you thought maybe I or the
7	defense attorney would like to know about you so we can decide
8	if you'd be a good juror?
9	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1255: I don't know what to say.
10	MR. SCHWARTZ: Okay.
11	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1255: I don't know what to say.
12	MR. SCHWARTZ: Okay. No, that's fine.
13	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1255: I don't feel, like,
14	comfortable because for that situation I had before. So
15	MR. SCHWARTZ: Okay. We'll talk more about that in
16	private.
17	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1255: Okay.
18	MR. SCHWARTZ: Does that sound good?
19	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1255: Okay. Thank you.
20	MR. SCHWARTZ: Okay. Grab that microphone from ya.
21	And [JUROR NO. 1254], pass this over to you.
22	[JUROR NO. 1254], your number's 1254?
23	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1254: Yes.
24	MS. CRAGGS: Okay. Did you listen to most of the

1 questions I asked yesterday? 2 PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1254: Yes. 3 MR. SCHWARTZ: Okay. Anything that kind of stood 4 out that you thought, "I wish I was in here so I could talk 5 about it." 6 PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1254: Just the time frame. 7 Twenty years is a long time. 8 MR. SCHWARTZ: Okay. Do you think that -- I mean, 9 what about it is kind of -- what about that? PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1254: Why'd it take so long? 10 11 MR. SCHWARTZ: Okay. And there will be some 12 information about that in the trial. Do you think, you know, 13 if there's a reason that it took a little while, do you think 14 it's appropriate that we go forward with the prosecution --15 PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1254: Oh, yeah --16 MR. SCHWARTZ: -- still? 17 PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1254: -- it's justice. 18 MR. SCHWARTZ: Okay. 19 PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1254: Right? 20 MR. SCHWARTZ: Okay. Any other thoughts about, kind 21 of, questions? 22 PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1254: No, no questions. 23 MR. SCHWARTZ: Anything --24 PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1254: No.

1	MR. SCHWARTZ: Anything that you think I should know
2	about you just before I kind of we decide
3	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1254: No.
4	MR. SCHWARTZ: No?
5	Okay. Your Honor, if we could approach?
6	THE COURT: Approach.
7	[BENCH CONFERENCE]
8	MR. SCHWARTZ: Your Honor, we'll pass for cause.
9	THE COURT: Thank you, State.
10	At this time, Defense.
11	MR. YAMPOLSKY: Thank you, Your Honor.
12	Finally I get a chance to talk. Not saying Mr. Schwartz
13	talks a lot, but it takes him a half an hour to tell you he's
14	gonna add a few words. Be that as it may
15	THE COURT: Counsel, questions, please.
16	MR. YAMPOLSKY: And what I want to get into first
17	and I know we've talked about it. I know Mr. Schwartz talked
18	about it, but it's the burden of proof. Now, you'll be
19	instructed by the Court at the end of after all of evidence
20	has been presented. And you'll talk about the Prosecution,
21	which has the burden of proof.
22	And the burden of proof in a criminal case is different
23	than a civil case. Now, I know a couple of you have been
24	civil jurors. And the burden of proof there is by a

preponderance of the evidence, which is more likely than not. However, the burden of proof here is beyond a reasonable doubt. And the Prosecution has to prove each and every element beyond a reasonable doubt. And once again, you'll be instructed as to what reasonable doubt is.

But one of the things -- and my concern is that many times I don't ask a lot of questions. And there'll be many witnesses I won't even ask any questions. And what I'm concerned about is that, you know, some of the jurors might say, "Oh, well, he had nothing to say." You know, "The guy must be guilty," or something like that.

And I know we had one juror talk about it. But does anyone feel that it's not fair if I don't say anything? That the Defense doesn't put on any evidence?

No one.

And, I mean, we've talked about the right to remain silent and everyone's heard it. And Mr. Schwartz talked about it. And that means that Mr. Dorado does not need to testify. And once again, my concern is if I have Mr. Dorado not testify, that someone may hold that against him.

And I know the law says you can't or you shouldn't. But also, I know some people have very strong opinions. And in the back of their mind, they may think, "You know, I know there's a right to remain silent. But I really think that

1

1	after what was said, he should say something."
2	Does anyone feel that way?
3	No?
4	All right. And, also, there's times and just because
5	of the sensitive area that I might need to ask questions,
6	embarrassing questions which, you know, might embarrass a
7	witness on the stand. And I'm concerned that some of you
8	might hold that against my client.
9	So does anyone feel that that may affect their the way
10	they look at the witnesses to decide whether or not your
11	verdict is guilty or innocent?
12	No one?
13	All right. I I want to question some of you. Where's
14	the microphone?
15	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1066: Right here.
16	MR. YAMPOLSKY: Okay. [JUROR NO. 1124]? Okay.
17	THE COURT: Go ahead and pass the mic down.
18	MR. YAMPOLSKY: I know we've talked about the burden
19	of proof and innocence. And I know you you're gonna follow
20	the law. But can you think of any reasons why an innocent
21	person may not want to take the stand?
22	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1124: Like a witness?
23	MR. YAMPOLSKY: Well, no, like a Defendant.
24	Somebody that has the right to remain silent and also has a

1 right to testify. Can you think of reasons how someone who's 2 innocent just doesn't want to take the stand? 3 PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1124: Uh --MR. YAMPOLSKY: How about if they had a speech 4 5 impediment? Do you think maybe that might be a reason why 6 someone wouldn't want to talk in public? 7 PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1124: Could be, yeah. And like 8 social anxiety. Things like that. 9 MR. YAMPOLSKY: Social anxiety. That's a good thing. Absolutely. And I mean, how many people in the jury, 10 11 you know, have to speak publicly for their job? 12 A couple. But all the rest of you don't. And I forget 13 the exact order, but public speaking is one of the three 14 biggest fears, after death or snakes. So it's a big deal. 15 Now, we do it all the time. So we're used to it. You 16 know, just like someone drove a truck. I couldn't drive a 17 truck, but they do it all the time. And that's -- you know, that's why -- could you pass that to [JUROR NO. 1088]? 18 That's 19 how you pronounce it; right? 20 PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1124: I had one more reason. 21 MR. YAMPOLSKY: Oh, you have something? Please. 22 PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1124: Just, well, personally, 23 there are, like, situations where people know for a fact that 24 they're innocent. And that's the only reason why they don't

say anything.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

18

1

MR. YAMPOLSKY: Okay.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1124: You know?

MR. YAMPOLSKY: So you think that there may be reason, someone who's totally innocent just doesn't want to say anything.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1124: Yeah. They like -- I don't know. That's like a personal thing. A lot of -- they probably think that, you know, "Why should I? I'm innocent. I know I'm innocent."

MR. YAMPOLSKY: And could they be, you know, afraid that some tricky lawyer's gonna twist their words or something?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1124: That is a definite thing that probably happens in court, yeah.

16 MR. YAMPOLSKY: Okay. Can anyone think of any other 17 reasons?

[JUROR NO. 1229]. Yes.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1229: I believe that it could be out of just general fear. Like she said, that the words could be twisted. That it could be -- they're meaning to say one thing and it comes out a different way that they're not meaning to say it.

24

MR. YAMPOLSKY: Maybe because they're not, you know,

that articulate when speaking in public?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1229: Yes. Like they're trying to say one thing and they are -- and they can't really get the words out.

MR. YAMPOLSKY: Okay. And sometimes it may be difficult to express themselves.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1229: Yeah.

MR. YAMPOLSKY: All right. And I mean, speaking on the witness stand with all these people watching, that's got to be a stressful situation; right?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1229: Oh, most definitely. Especially when it comes to judgment of one -- of other person, one would be afraid to speak.

MR. YAMPOLSKY: Could you please hold the microphone closer to your mouth.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1229: Yeah. Yeah, sorry.

It could be that -- they could be afraid that -- if someone was defending themself (sic), that is, they could be afraid that -- of the judgment that other people might say. So like an example would be, oh, if someone says they're innocent but then everybody thinks their guilty. Well, then, no matter what they say, it could just --

23 24

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. YAMPOLSKY: You think that maybe --PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1229: -- they wouldn't care.

1 MR. YAMPOLSKY: -- they might think it's futile and 2 it doesn't matter what they say. 3 PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1229: Yes. 4 MR. YAMPOLSKY: Okay. Anyone else? 5 All right. [JUROR NO. 1088]. I didn't forget about you. 6 When Mr. Schwartz was asking you questions yesterday, I 7 believe he asked you about the #MeToo movement. Remember? 8 PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1088: Yes. 9 MR. YAMPOLSKY: And if I'm right, you said that, you 10 know, some people may be telling the truth but some people may 11 Do you believe that happens? not. 12 PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1088: Yes. 13 MR. YAMPOLSKY: And do you have any thoughts on why 14 that may happen? PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1088: I think there's times --15 16 well, and you look in particularly in political situations. 17 If they've got a bias against somebody and, you know, like I said yesterday, all you have to do is make an accusation and 18 19 now that stigma is on them, whether it's truth or not. 20 MR. YAMPOLSKY: Whether it's true or not, if someone 21 makes an accusation, that might follow you for a long time. 22 PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1088: Yeah. Exactly. Exactly. MR. YAMPOLSKY: And when -- would you agree that --23 24 well, that sometimes people do things that they feel like she

1	shouldn't have done?
2	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1088: Yes.
3	MR. YAMPOLSKY: Okay. And if they're discussing
4	that, don't they usually, like, try and put themselves in,
5	like, the best light?
6	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1088: Oh, yes.
7	MR. YAMPOLSKY: And we also talked and I don't
8	mean to pick on you, but you said a lot. We also talked about
9	someone who's consumed alcohol. And I understand you don't.
10	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1088: Correct.
11	MR. YAMPOLSKY: But, I mean, do you believe that
12	that could affect somebody's judgment?
13	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1088: Definitely.
14	MR. YAMPOLSKY: Okay.
15	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1088: Yes.
16	MR. YAMPOLSKY: And, you know, after the alcohol has
17	worn off, they may look at it and think, "Gee, that really
18	wasn't a good idea." Right?
19	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1088: Correct.
20	MR. YAMPOLSKY: Okay. So, you know, everyone's
21	imperfect. And I think everyone's done things that, in
22	retrospect, they wish they hadn't. But have you ever heard
23	the expression "hindsight's 20/20"?
24	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1088: Many.

1	MR. YAMPOLSKY: What does that mean to you?
2	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1088: Well, if you could look
3	if you had your crystal ball and could look into it and see
4	what was gonna happen, you'd do things differently. So,
5	obviously, being able to look back on it, there's many
6	instances where you'd would have done things differently
7	had you you know
8	MR. YAMPOLSKY: And you'd agree with me, that
9	probably happens to everyone.
10	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1088: Oh, yeah.
11	MR. YAMPOLSKY: All right. We'll let you off the
12	hook for now.
13	[JUROR NO. 1111]. Got it?
14	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1111: Yeah, I got it.
15	MR. YAMPOLSKY: All right. Now, you said you work
16	for the school district?
17	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1111: Yeah.
18	MR. YAMPOLSKY: Right now, you're a custodian?
19	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1111: I'm a custodian now.
20	MR. YAMPOLSKY: All right. And in your job,
21	sometimes you encounter students that are doing things they
22	probably shouldn't
23	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1111: Yeah.
24	MR. YAMPOLSKY: right?

Г

1	Now, have you ever been in a situation where there's been
2	a couple of students fighting?
3	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1111: No, just 'cause when I
4	work, there's no kids there.
5	MR. YAMPOLSKY: I'm sorry. Say it again.
6	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1111: Like, when I'm working
7	MR. YAMPOLSKY: Yeah.
8	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1111: I'm not really
9	interacting with the kids just 'cause they should already be
10	out of school by the time I'm there.
11	MR. YAMPOLSKY: Okay. So you come afterwards. But
12	you're a you're training to be a security guard; isn't that
13	right?
14	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1111: Well, I took the training,
15	just the pay wasn't there. So I'm kind of content being a
16	custodian.
17	MR. YAMPOLSKY: Okay. Now, how long was the
18	training to be a security guard?
19	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1111: It was only a day's worth.
20	MR. YAMPOLSKY: Okay. Did you talk about how to
21	let me take a step back. When there's a dispute, were you
22	instructed on how you should examine a dispute?
23	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1111: Well, it was actually
24	so it's a day's worth of training. Literally, 90 percent of

1	it was just defense tactics. And then maybe, like, like the
2	last segment was like a role play. But they didn't really
3	teach you on how to interact with, like, a student.
4	So it was kind of like, "Hey, we're gonna teach you all
5	the defense tactics at the very end. And now someone's gonna
6	role play and you got to break it up." But it was all off,
7	like, your own instinct. Nobody taught you exactly what to
8	say.
9	MR. YAMPOLSKY: Okay. So if I defense tactics is
10	like
11	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1111: It was like fighting.
12	MR. YAMPOLSKY: how to defend yourself?
13	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1111: Yeah.
14	MR. YAMPOLSKY: And how to break up a fight?
15	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1111: Well, it was more like
16	someone coming at you.
17	MR. YAMPOLSKY: Right.
18	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1111: It wasn't like me
19	defending a kid or me defending anybody in general.
20	MR. YAMPOLSKY: And you said that there was role
21	playing. Role playing about what?
22	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1111: That's like when the
23	fighting came in. Like, "Hey, so-and-so's fighting. I need
24	to go break it up." But it wasn't only off my it was off

1	my instinct. It wasn't nobody came in there and taught me
2	how to do it.
3	MR. YAMPOLSKY: Right.
4	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1111: It was just me purely
5	going in there, looking at the situation, and breaking it up.
6	MR. YAMPOLSKY: And as a security guard, would some
7	of the things you have to do, if there was a fight, determine
8	who was responsible?
9	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1111: Yeah, absolutely.
10	MR. YAMPOLSKY: Okay. And in doing that, you would
11	talk to both parties
12	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1111: Yeah.
13	MR. YAMPOLSKY: correct?
14	And if someone one of the parties said something that,
15	you know, just didn't make any sense, you would take that into
16	account in making a decision
17	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1111: Yeah, of course.
18	MR. YAMPOLSKY: right?
19	And usually when you have two people fighting, they point
20	fingers at each other. "No, he caused it." "He caused it."
21	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1111: Yeah.
22	MR. YAMPOLSKY: Right? Correct?
23	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1111: Yeah. Correct.
24	MR. YAMPOLSKY: And if someone, you know, made a

1	statement I know this is ridiculous "Oh, I've been
2	abducted by aliens." Obviously, that would put their
3	credibility into, you know, into question; right?
4	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1111: Yeah.
5	MR. YAMPOLSKY: And if two students were about the
б	same size and one said, "Oh, he carried me for 50 yards," you
7	know, "and I was struggling." That probably wouldn't make
8	sense; right?
9	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1111: Yeah.
10	MR. YAMPOLSKY: Okay. [JUROR NO. 1224]? Yes? No?
11	Did I miss someone?
12	Court's indulgence.
13	THE COURT: Go ahead.
14	[DISCUSSION OFF THE RECORD]
15	MR. YAMPOLSKY: [JUROR NO. 1218].
16	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1218: Yes.
17	MR. YAMPOLSKY: I want and was it you that talked
18	about how do you have the mic? Great how drivers may be
19	affected by alcohol? Was that you?
20	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1218: No.
21	MR. YAMPOLSKY: No. Do you have any opinions on
22	drivers maybe affected by alcohol?
23	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1218: Opinion as it's not a good
24	thing. But, yeah, I mean, probably my age all did it. So

1	MR. YAMPOLSKY: Wouldn't you agree that alcohol
2	affects people differently?
3	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1218: Correct.
4	MR. YAMPOLSKY: And would you agree that some people
5	may be more affected than others?
6	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1218: I guess by how much they
7	actually consume, yes.
8	MR. YAMPOLSKY: Exactly. And my question is
9	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1218: And the physiology
10	MR. YAMPOLSKY: Say that again.
11	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1218: physiological aspects
12	of it, yes.
13	MR. YAMPOLSKY: Right. And by the same token, if
14	someone if there are two people and they drink the same
15	amount of alcohol, they could be affected differently;
16	correct?
17	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1218: Height, body weight, male,
18	female it all
19	MR. YAMPOLSKY: Right.
20	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1218: it works differently,
21	yes.
22	MR. YAMPOLSKY: Okay. Court's indulgence.
23	THE COURT: Go ahead.
24	MR. YAMPOLSKY: And if I pronounce your name wrong,

1	please for give me. [JUROR NO. 1255], is that how you
2	pronounce it?
3	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1255: Yes.
4	MR. YAMPOLSKY: Could someone pass the mic to her.
5	Well, you're the one and you've heard all the
6	questions; correct? Now, how do you feel that someone maybe
7	wouldn't take the stand?
8	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1255: Excuse me?
9	MR. YAMPOLSKY: Somebody who like my client, how
10	would you feel if, after the Government's case, that he
11	doesn't get up on the stand and testify, how do you feel about
12	that?
13	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1255: Well, I feel, like,
14	uncomfortable because
15	MR. YAMPOLSKY: He's not comfortable.
16	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1255: I don't know the
17	situation. I don't know the evidence.
18	MR. YAMPOLSKY: Okay. But what I'm saying this
19	is hypothetical. You're in the jury box
20	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1255: Uh-huh.
21	MR. YAMPOLSKY: okay? And the Government's put
22	on their case. Let's say they have all these witnesses. They
23	have these exhibits for two or three days. And then it's our
24	turn, the Defense side. And I decide that I don't want to put

1	any evidence on. And I'm not gonna have my client testify.
2	How would that make you feel if he didn't get up there and
3	say, "Hey, I didn't do it."
4	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1255: Disappointed.
5	MR. YAMPOLSKY: You'd be disappointed. Would you
б	hold that against him?
7	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1255: I don't understand the
8	question.
9	MR. YAMPOLSKY: Well, you said you'd be
10	disappointed.
11	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1255: Mm-hmm.
12	MR. YAMPOLSKY: So in other words, you wish that he
13	would have got up and testified; right?
14	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1255: Mm-hmm.
15	MR. YAMPOLSKY: Is that a "yes"?
16	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1255: Yes.
17	MR. YAMPOLSKY: Okay. But of course you would
18	follow the law; right?
19	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1255: Right.
20	MR. YAMPOLSKY: And according to the law, he doesn't
21	need to get up there and testify. You understand that.
22	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1255: Yes.
23	MR. YAMPOLSKY: But I'm asking for your opinion.
24	You said you'd be disappointed. If you were disappointed,

1	would you hold that against him? Do you understand what I'm
2	saying?
3	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1255: No.
4	MR. YAMPOLSKY: Okay.
5	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1255: I don't understood that
б	question.
7	MR. YAMPOLSKY: All right. You you'll hear all
8	these witnesses that will testify.
9	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1255: Yeah.
10	MR. YAMPOLSKY: And as a juror, you have to decide,
11	"Gee, are they telling the truth or not?" "Do I believe
12	them?" That kind of stuff; right? No?
13	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1255: No.
14	MR. YAMPOLSKY: All right. Let me see if I can
15	break this down.
16	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1255: I don't understand what
17	you say.
18	MR. YAMPOLSKY: No problem. No problem. It's me.
19	I'm not asking the right questions.
20	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1255: Mm-hmm.
21	MR. YAMPOLSKY: So in the trial, there's going to be
22	people, witnesses that will get up in this box. They'll swear
23	to tell the truth, the whole truth, nothing but the truth.
24	And then the DA will question them and I'll question them.

1	So what are you comfortable in deciding, you know,
2	whether their testimony makes sense or not, something like
3	that?
4	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1255: No.
5	MR. YAMPOLSKY: You're not comfortable?
6	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1255: No.
7	MR. YAMPOLSKY: Because you don't think you'd really
8	understand what they're saying?
9	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1255: Right.
10	MR. YAMPOLSKY: Okay.
11	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1255: I wish I can understand
12	more.
13	MR. YAMPOLSKY: Say that again.
14	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1255: I wish I can understand
15	more.
16	MR. YAMPOLSKY: Okay.
17	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1255: And I can I make a
18	decision.
19	MR. YAMPOLSKY: All right. I understand.
20	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1255: Thank you.
21	MR. YAMPOLSKY: Who was who else did we have
22	that's new?
23	Ah, yes. [JUROR NO. 1254]. Wait, [JUROR NO. 1254].
24	[JUROR NO. 1254]'s your last name.

Г

1	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1254: Yes.
2	MR. YAMPOLSKY: [JUROR NO. 1254]'s your first name.
3	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1254: Yes.
4	MR. YAMPOLSKY: Do you have any relatives in Texas?
5	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1254: No.
б	MR. YAMPOLSKY: Okay. I was just wondering because
7	it's [JUROR NO. 1254].
8	So I mean, you sat here for since yesterday and you've
9	heard all these questions; right?
10	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1254: Yes.
11	MR. YAMPOLSKY: And do you have any problem because
12	the nature of this is a sexual assault?
13	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1254: No, no problem.
14	MR. YAMPOLSKY: I mean, even with the sensitive
15	subject area, you would have no problem in being a juror in
16	this case.
17	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1254: No problem.
18	MR. YAMPOLSKY: And can you think of any reason why
19	you wouldn't be a good juror?
20	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1254: Nope.
21	MR. YAMPOLSKY: Court's indulgence.
22	THE COURT: Go ahead.
23	MR. YAMPOLSKY: All right. I'll pass the panel,
24	Your Honor.

1	THE COURT: Okay. Counsels, approach.
2	[BENCH CONFERENCE]
3	THE COURT: At this time we will be replacing juror
4	number 1255, [JUROR NO. 1255]. You're excused. Thank you.
5	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1255: Thank you, sir.
6	THE COURT: Thank you.
7	Madam Clerk?
8	THE CLERK: Replacing her will be [JUROR NO. 1257],
9	badge 257.
10	THE COURT: Good afternoon, ma'am.
11	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1257: Good afternoon.
12	THE COURT: Is it [JUROR NO. 1257] or Miss
13	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1257: [JUROR NO. 1257].
14	THE COURT: [JUROR NO. 1257]?
15	Okay. Want to make sure.
16	All right. Ma'am, how long you been here in
17	Clark County?
18	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1257: Eleven years now.
19	THE COURT: Okay. And are you currently employed?
20	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1257: Yes, I am.
21	THE COURT: What do you do, ma'am?
22	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1257: Office manager.
23	THE COURT: What do you do for?
24	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1257: It's a laundry company.

1	THE COURT: Oh.
2	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1257: We wash linen for, like,
3	all the casinos here.
4	THE COURT: Okay. Is it like a Mission Linen or
5	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1257: It's Brady, actually.
6	THE COURT: Brady? Okay.
7	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1257: Mm-hmm.
8	THE COURT: See, I'm so old, I can tell you the
9	original Mission Linen people.
10	Okay. And are you currently married?
11	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1257: No, I'm not.
12	THE COURT: Okay. How far did you go in school,
13	ma'am?
14	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1257: Graduated as an MA.
15	THE COURT: Okay.
16	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1257: Mm-hmm.
17	THE COURT: And any family members and/or close
18	friends of the family ever been a victim of a violent crime?
19	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1257: No.
20	THE COURT: Okay. Any close family members or
21	members of the family that you know of been a victim of a
22	sexual assault?
23	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1257: No, but a report was filed
24	for myself.

1	THE COURT: Okay. When was that report filed, give
2	or take a year?
3	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1257: Ten years ago.
4	THE COURT: Ten years ago? And was that here in
5	Clark County?
б	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1257: Yes, it was.
7	THE COURT: Okay. And was that a sexual assault
8	that was perpetrated on you?
9	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1257: Yes.
10	THE COURT: Okay.
11	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1257: But it was because of the
12	age difference.
13	THE COURT: Okay.
14	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1257: I was a minor and this
15	person was 30-something years old.
16	THE COURT: Okay. So basically you were a minor and
17	the other individual was an adult.
18	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1257: Correct.
19	THE COURT: Okay. To your understanding, was there
20	actually a criminal prosecution done in that case?
21	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1257: Uh-huh, no.
22	THE COURT: You don't know or
23	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1257: [Indiscernible] huh-uh, I
24	don't know.

1	THE COURT: Okay. To your understanding, was that
2	handled by your parents?
3	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1257: Yes.
4	THE COURT: Okay. You remember having to testify in
5	a courtroom?
6	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1257: No, I didn't testify.
7	THE COURT: Okay. In regards to any family members
8	or close family friends that are ever been accused of
9	committing a sexual assault?
10	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1257: No.
11	THE COURT: Okay. Any close family members or close
12	family friends that are in law enforcement?
13	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1257: No.
14	THE COURT: Have you ever been a member of a jury
15	before, ma'am?
16	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1257: No.
17	THE COURT: Counsel for the State, your panel
18	member.
19	MR. SCHWARTZ: Thank you, Your Honor.
20	[JUROR NO. 1257], how you doing, ma'am?
21	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1257: Good. Doing good.
22	MR. SCHWARTZ: Just ask you a couple questions about
23	what you were just bringing up. Is that okay to talk about?
24	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1257: Mm-hmm. That's okay.

1	MR. SCHWARTZ: Who was that person to you at the
2	time that this all happened?
3	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1257: It was a roommate.
4	MR. SCHWARTZ: A roommate?
5	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1257: Mm-hmm.
6	MR. SCHWARTZ: About how old were you?
7	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1257: I was 15, 16 years old.
8	MR. SCHWARTZ: And was he living at your parent's
9	house with you guys?
10	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1257: Mm-hmm. Yes.
11	MR. SCHWARTZ: How did your parents get involved?
12	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1257: They found out because of
13	my sister. My little sister. And my mom found out and then
14	she went and filed a report.
15	MR. SCHWARTZ: Okay.
16	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1257: And that's all I know.
17	MR. SCHWARTZ: Did you want a report to be filed
18	about it?
19	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1257: Not really. 'Cause it was
20	consensual. But
21	MR. SCHWARTZ: So the issue was really just the age
22	difference
23	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1257: Mm-hmm.
24	MR. SCHWARTZ: statutorily.

1	
1	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1257: Yes. Mm-hmm.
2	MR. SCHWARTZ: And do you know if he was prosecuted
3	or I thought you said you didn't know.
4	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1257: No, I don't know. Yeah.
5	I don't know.
б	MR. SCHWARTZ: Did he was he moved out of the
7	house after this happened?
8	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1257: Yeah, we moved out of the
9	house.
10	MR. SCHWARTZ: Okay.
11	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1257: Mm-hmm.
12	MR. SCHWARTZ: I guess, any negative feelings
13	towards law enforcement or DA's for prosecuting
14	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1257: No, at all.
15	MR. SCHWARTZ: based on that?
16	Okay. Your Honor, we'll pass for cause.
17	THE COURT: Defense.
18	MR. YAMPOLSKY: Thank you.
19	But this [indiscernible] situation, so this person didn't
20	force you to have sex.
21	PROSPECTIVE JUROR #1257: No.
22	MR. YAMPOLSKY: I have nothing further, Your Honor.
23	THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, Counsels. Approach.
24	[BENCH CONFERENCE]

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, at this time period what we have now is what we call a qualified pool. What that means is there are 32 individuals who the members of the State Prosecution team and the Defense team believe that they can now select a jury from.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

So what's gonna happen is my 32 people that are, quote, "In the box," these individuals here and that first row right there, you are to remain with us. The rest of the individuals, you are free to go as soon as I'm done.

What I'm gonna ask you is this, understanding the next question that always comes out is, "Can we talk about the case now?" Those individuals who are being released, you can. I don't know what you're gonna say because you really don't know anything. But if you want to say or say some great complementary words about the judge, go ahead and do it.

Besides that, the next question always is, "Your Honor, do I have to go back and report on the third floor?" No, you are done with jury duty on this term period.

The last question they always ask me is, "Judge, how long do I have before the next jury that I can be possibly called on?" One is the statute says two years. But we have a whole lot of different courts in this jurisdiction. You could go tomorrow and get a summons from the federal courthouse. And the one you did here doesn't qualify as jury duty.

> Kennedy Court Reporters, Inc. 800.231.2682

1 But like I asked you at the very beginning, the next time someone says, "Yes, I got a jury summons. It's the worst 2 3 experience of my life." Ask them if they actually got a jury summons and it was the worst experience of their life. 4 5 Because I don't understand what they could possible saying is 6 the worst experience. 7 If this is the worst thing you've ever gone through in 8 your life, come see me. I'd really like you to adopt me. 9 Okay? And if you could, just out of respect for the court 10 system itself, make sure those individuals know they're 11 totally wrong; okay? 12 I thank you from the bottom of my heart, appreciation of 13 Clark County and all the judges. I know it is an 14 inconvenience to be part of a jury pool. I understand that. 15 But please understand, it is truly the last great right you 16 have as a citizen. It's one of those few things that, if we 17 ever get to that point where they decide that they're going to do away with the jury system, I -- I'll hang up my robe. 18 19 Thank you from the bottom of my heart. Safe travels. 20

The rest of you remain here. I'll wait to -- give 'em about 30 seconds, I'm gonna kind of walk you through the process.

21

22

Okay. I'm gonna -- I understand, sir. What I'm gonna
have you do, sir, is I'm gonna have my Marshal give you a

piece of paper so you can write. 'Cause I need to have a record of any of those statements.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Ladies and gentlemen, what's gonna happen for the rest of you is this is -- I have had this described in so many different ways, I don't know if I've ever come up with a great thing. I've heard the thing -- the term "speed dating." I've heard the term "fish bowl." I've heard the term "bachelorette, bachelor contest." I don't watch those shows. But apparently they're pretty popular.

What happens now is the attorneys have the ability to do what's called a preemptory strike. Okay? And what they get to do, basically, is they go through their notes and through the stuff that they just heard over the last two days and what they believe is who are the best individuals -- because you got to understand, there are only a few group of individuals who really, really know this case backwards and forward. And they're sitting at these tables; okay? They know these cases because they've living with this case since basically the inception of this case.

Sir Marshal, if you could give this gentleman, [JUROR NO. 1237] a piece of paper for me. The gentleman right here in the purple shirt.

So they know in their minds which people they believe, based upon the questions and some of the stuff you filled out previously, who would be the best juror for this case in their opinion.

I can tell you this: If this same exact jury pool came in front of 20 different attorneys, I would have 20 different juries. Okay? That's obvious to say. Kind of like those individuals that believe lawyers. You put five lawyers in one room, you will get five different opinions. You put five older lawyers in a room, you'll get 20 different opinions; okay?

It has nothing to do with your quality as a person or anything else. What it basically has to do with is their personal belief as to who they believe, based upon very few answers, very few questions, who would fit the facts for this case the best. Okay?

So what's funny is, I have a lot of people who sit there and say, "Well, I can't believe I didn't get picked." And they almost act as if it's some type of personality contest or some type of, like I said, the bachelorette, bachelor contest. It is not. It has absolutely nothing to do with that.

I can guarantee you, there are a lot of people -- as a practicing attorney, and I tried hundreds and hundreds of trials -- that I would love to have as good friends that I struck on prospective jurors; okay?

Perfect example was, I tried the Hells Angels case that

1

were here in Laughlin and Clark County for years on the civil side. Judge Kephart and Judge Johnson tried it on the criminal side. What is amazing is, one of the individuals who I took his deposition multiple, multiple, multiple times, just taking his deposition, he was a very likeable person. You read his criminal scope or his criminal history and you would think, "Oh, my goodness, this's an evil human being." But in person, he didn't appear that way. Okay?

Now, if I had a jury and we were talking about a motorcycle defect case, for example a motorcycle that fell apart for some reason and caused someone's injury, would I want this individual with the Hells Angels on my jury? Absolutely. The guy knows the motorcycle in and out.

Do I want him on a criminal conviction against a drug trafficker who rides a motorcycle? No. Same person. Two completely different cases. He'd be on one; he'd be stricken on the other. And that's what this case is about.

Once they go through and do those selections, they will then choose from four potential alternates. Each of the sides will get to strike one individual, leaving two alternates. What that does is that gives us 12 jurors. This is a criminal case. We must have 12 jurors. And the jury must come back with a verdict that is unanimous. That is completely different than in a civil side, when it does not have to be

1

unanimous. It's a simple majority. But in a criminal setting, it must be a unanimous decision.

I always put a minimum of two jurors as potentials. Therefore, there'll be 14 people sitting in the box. If during this trial one of the 12 main jurors, I'll call them the main jurors, should happen to have a family emergency or a sickness or an illness or death and is unable to fulfill their role, the alternate, number one, steps in that person's shoes.

9 Now, the next question always comes about is, 10 "Your Honor, do we get to know who the alternates are?" Yes. At the end of the case. Okay? So that means 14 people will 11 12 listen to all of the facts. And you can quite simply 13 understand it. If you're an alternate and I told you day one 14 you're an alternate, you might have a tendency to kind of zone 15 out some of the trial. Not a good idea. Therefore, the 14 16 people in the box are treated exactly the same. They are the 17 14 jurors.

Once you are chosen, you will get a blue fancy ID badge that identifies you as a juror in this department. If you think you were alienated wearing the little white badges, you haven't seen anything yet. You put on the blue official badge and no one, other than people in uniform, are going to speak to you.

24

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

The reason why is they see that badge that says "juror,"

court employees, even the postman is instructed, basically, not to have contact with jurors. Okay? The reason why is the last thing someone would want to have happen is say something about a case that you happen to be a juror on.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

For example, for some reason the Court staff wanted all of us to know that Wayne Newton is in the building. Okay. He's in the building. Well, if one of the security officers or one of the attorneys walked by and said, "Oh, I cannot believe Wayne Newton's in the building. He's a terrible man. This's what he did." And you happen to be a juror on his case, that case is now a mistrial because you got information about Mr. Newton that was not part of the case. You just heard it in the courtroom or out in the hallways or in the bathroom. And it would basically taint that case. Okay?

That's why when you are a member of the jury, all of the -- you can tell the attorneys. They see the blue badge, their heads go down and they just walk past you. Okay?

Understand this: I'm going to give you specific instructions. You cannot, as a juror, talk to anyone about the case, including your fellow jurors, until the case is finally submitted to you; okay? So in other words, when we take a break, if you're one of the 14, you cannot go out in the hallway and compare notes. You can't go, "Well, hey, witness one was on the stand, what do you think about he or

You don't do that. Because to do that would bring in she?" other influences. 'Cause what will happen is someone will walk by and they'll get in on your conversation and now we've tainted the jury.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Now, the process is really simple. It's probably the only thing that TV ever gets correct. What happens in a criminal case is the State has the burden to prove the case. They must prove the elements of the crime committed and they must prove to you beyond a reasonable doubt that the Defendant committed that crime.

Therefore, they have the burden of proof. Therefore, they get to start the case off. They will do what is known as an opening argument.

Now, notice I labeled that as "argument." That's all it is. Unfortunately, for attorneys, every attorney, whether it be one of the practicing attorneys here or someone fresh-out-of-law-school or someone as old as me who's been doing it a long time, our opinion, our statements, our argument, they're not evidence.

So when a lawyer says the sky is blue and he's in a trial, that's his argument. That's not a piece of evidence 22 before you. That's that attorney's personal belief. Because 23 if you listen to my son, who happens to be the nuclear 24 engineer, he'll tell you that the sky is actually not blue,

it's a split prism. And, therefore, depending on what portion of the earth you're standing on, it can be a variation of different colors.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

He's a nerd. That's why he says that. All the rest of us know that it's actually the reflection of the ocean and not the sky itself; okay? Therefore, when an attorney makes an argument or an attorney makes a question, it is not evidence. It's purely argument.

So the State will present its opening argument. The Defense then has the opportunity, but is not required, to do their own argument. They do not have to present an argument They can reserve it until the time they do at that time. their Defense or they can waive it completely.

14 And you'll be instructed at the end of the case that that's immaterial. The Defense has no burden in this matter. Therefore, they are not obligated to do anything. Okay? As one of the counsels once said, they can actually sit there like a bump on a log and actually sleep. Yes, they could for about two seconds in my courtroom. But theoretically, they don't have to do a thing because they have absolutely no burden in this case; okay?

If they decide to do an opening argument, they will do their opening argument. Again, it's purely argument. It's really a road map. "Ladies and gentlemen, this is what we

believe the evidence we're gonna present to you means. We're gonna present witness A, B, and C and this is what we believe their evidence that they're gonna produce to you on the stand is going to say."

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

It's just a road map. It's a way of getting that fancy little brochure before you go on your trip when you see that hotel and it looks like a five-star hotel and you get there and it's a one-star. Okay? It's a road map.

Once those opening arguments are then done, the State has the obligation to put on its case-in-chief. That means they will call witnesses, introduce evidence. The only evidence that comes before the jury is the testimony you hear from that stand and the evidence that I allow to be admitted, such as a document or a paragraph.

One side or the other may say, "Your Honor, we'd like to present Exhibit A and move it into evidence." If I move it into evidence, I accept it, it is evidence in this case. If during the case -- and you will hear this. It happens in every case. One side or the other will make an objection. The objection is not evidence. It's an argument by counsel.

They'll make an objection. I will rule on it. For example, if I rule on a photograph and they say, "Your Honor, we object to the introduction of that photograph." And I sustain that objection. I agree to it. That photograph does not become evidence. You can't go, then, back in the jury room and say, "You know, I wish we could have seen that photograph." You're not allowed to even consider it because it's not before you. If I agree to it and allow it in, then it is part of the evidence.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

21

22

23

24

If I have to, during the case, admonish the attorneys, I may say something to an attorney -- and a lot of times you'll hear it from me. You'll hear me say, "Counsel, move it along," or "Counsel, next question," or "Counsel, move on." Okay? That's not my way of, quote, unquote, "punishing" one side or the other. That is my way as the, quote, "referee" in here to keep the case moving correctly.

13 When I make rulings from the bench, periodically I may 14 instruct you to disregard something. Now, every time you hear 15 that, that sounds really, really hard. For example, if I told 16 you this morning to disregard the fact that I'm wearing a 17 black robe. Okay. Who cares? If I ask you to disregard a 18 photograph that you saw of me pointing a gun at you, that's 19 hard to do, but you have to do it. Okay? You must disregard 20 something that I instruct you to disregard.

I heard one of the counsels earlier talk about ringing the bell and unringing a bell. Okay. We all talk about that in law school. It's a fancy way of saying, once you hear a bell ring, you can't say, "Oh, let me erase that from my mind." And sometimes in a courtroom you have to do that. It would be a violation of your oath if you went back in the jury room and said, "Even though I know the judge told us we have to disregard it, I think that's why I'm gonna base my decision one way or the other." Okay?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

That would be a violation of your oath. So when you hear those things and I say, "You're instructed to disregard it," disregard it.

During the trial, you will receive a steno notebook and a writing utensil. Fancy word to say pen or pencil. I don't know what the budget is right now. So I couldn't tell you which one we're gonna give you. Hopefully it's not a Crayola Crayon.

During the trial, you can take notes. The only kind of statement I make about that is, make sure while you're taking notes that you don't spend so much attention to your notes that you don't listen to the questions and the answers being given to you on the stand.

Some people are very meticulous at taking notes. They like to draw lines and squirrel points and all that sort of stuff. If you are missing the next two or three questions and answers because you're taking such detailed notes, you need to caution yourself; okay? You want to be able to hear all of the evidence; okay? But you're allowed to take notes. In the State of Nevada, the jury is also allowed to ask questions of a juror -- excuse me -- of a witness. I caution you at this time, I can tell you this: Between the counsel sitting here, there's probably 120 years of legal experience; okay? There's probably a question that you think, "Oh, boy, I can't believe those attorneys. They're so stupid. They didn't ask this question. This is obvious."

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Well, the reason they didn't ask that question is, it's not a proper question to ask. Okay? That happens all the time. For example, a police officer comes up to an automobile accident. He writes up a report. A lot of times the police officer and/or trooper will be asked to make a determination as to who caused the accident.

That officer, that trooper, wasn't there. What they're basing that decision on is their training, what they observed when they got there, the demeanor of the people, and what they physically know happens in car accidents. But for that person to come in front of a jury -- and I have this all the time -when a cop is on the stand, someone will write out, "Officer, who's at fault?"

Okay. That's an improper question. Because if that officer was to say, "Well, it's Mr. Jones that's at fault," what are you guys doing here? There would be no reason for a jury to be here. It would be the officer making a determination.

Believe it or not, every officer I know -- and I know most of them since I represented the police department for 25 years -- they will all tell you, they are not perfect. They make mistakes. To ask a police officer to come up to a scene and in 60 seconds determine who's at fault is not legitimate. It's not fair to either party; okay?

Believe it or not, I've had rear-end car collisions where the person in front's the one who caused the accident. It's called backing up. Okay? It happens.

So just because someone in authority who has a badge says "this is the person at fault," that would be an improper question. So if you have a question that you believe a witness should be asked, write it down. You'll give it to the Marshal. The Marshal will present it to me. I will bring the counsels up here and we will discuss whether or not we can ask that question. Okay?

Ninety-nine percent of the time, the question cannot be asked; okay? And, therefore, it's not asked. Sometimes it is asked. Once in a while I'll get a question and the four or five attorneys at the front desk will look at me and I'll go, "You guys didn't even think about that, did ya?"

And the attorneys will go, "That's a good question." And we'll ask that question.

1

2

3

4

But the same time, you don't get to go and put in points, "My question, 100 points; attorney's question, 1 point, 1 point, 1 point." That's not how you score things; okay? You score things based upon the perception of the evidence you received, all of the evidence.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

After the entire case is put on by the State, the Defense has the opportunity to call witnesses. But they're not obligated to do that. Okay? So they may put on their defense of a case; they may have absolutely no witnesses and put on zero witnesses and zero case.

At the end of that, if they do put on a case, they then -- the State then has an opportunity to do what's called rebuttal witnesses. That means, they can put someone on that says, "Yeah, whatever that person said is not correct and here's why."

At the end of that, what'll happen is I read, read verbatim what's called jury instructions. That's known as the law. I will read those to you. You will actually have copies of them in front of you. You'll actually get to follow along and see what the law is. That law is what you apply to the facts of the case.

22 Once the law is read to you, each side will then have the 23 opportunity to do what's called summation or closing 24 arguments. Again, arguments of counsel. That's all it is. Instead of it being a road map, this is the summation. "Ladies and gentlemen, you remember witness A. He told you this. You remember witness B. She told you that. You remember witness C from the other side, don't even worry about them. They're not trustworthy."

That's just argument. That's not the facts. But they have the ability to, quote, unquote, come in here and argue. The State goes first; Defense has the right to go. Because the State has the burden, they can then do rebuttal close, which is basically to rebut what you just heard from the other side.

After that, the case is submitted to you. It's not like in Hollywood. We don't close you in a dark dungeon and you can't leave, you can't breath, you can't do anything else. But you are, what we call, sequestered. You are by yourself and you are going to then deliberate. Okay?

In everyday cases you'll see what we refer to as direct evidence and circumstantial evidence. For lawyers, it's kind of -- they actually write books about that, the argument of what is direct evidence and what is circumstantial evidence.

Simple, simple story. Six to eight years ago, if you were in Las Vegas and you walked out one night, especially up here in this end of town and up in Summerlin, and it's really, really cold and it was really, really cloudy and all of a

1

sudden stuff came out of the sky and it was white and it was solid and it looked like snow. You could actually say it was snowing outside.

That's direct evidence. I'm standing there and it's coming down. I can see it. I can feel it. I know what it is. Even if I've never ever seen it anywhere else. Direct evidence.

If you're like me, you went to sleep, outside was nice and dry, little bit of clouds up there, it was cold but no big deal. You woke up the next morning and there were two inches of that funny white stuff on your car. You can deduct from circumstantial evidence it must have snowed last night. Okay?

Circumstantial and direct evidence are evidence. They have the same weight. It's up to you as to what weight you place upon them. Just because it's just, quote, unquote, "circumstantial evidence" doesn't mean it's any different than direct evidence. It's what weight you place upon that.

Counsel, approach.

19 20

21

22

23

24

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

[BENCH CONFERENCE]

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, at this time what we're gonna do is we're gonna take a brief recess just because I have to go through some housekeeping matters before we tell you who's gonna be the individuals that are gonna remain with us. What we're gonna do is we're gonna take a break until 25

Kennedy Court Reporters, Inc. 800.231.2682

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

after the hour.

During this recess, you are admonished not to talk or converse among yourselves or with anyone else on any subject connected to this trial or read, watch, or listen to any report of or commentary on the trial or any person connected with this trial by any medium of information, including without limitation: Newspapers, television, radio, the Internet, or form or express any opinion on any subject connected with the trial until the case is finally submitted to you.

You're not to do any experiments or investigation regarding any matters raised in this trial, nor are you to post on any social media forums about the trial or attempt to investigate anything you've heard in this trial using any form of social media or the Internet.

We'll see you back here at 25 after the hour.

THE MARSHAL: All rise for the jury.

[OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE PROSPECTIVE JURY]

THE COURT: All right. Counsel, at this time, it's my understanding that Counsel for the Defense has a Batson challenge; is that correct?

22 MR. YAMPOLSKY: Yes, Your Honor. And --23 THE COURT: Okay. Hold on a second. Let me get my 24 notes. I also have a note from my Marshal. I'm sure it's

> Kennedy Court Reporters, Inc. 800.231.2682

from [JUROR NO. 1237].

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Is that from [JUROR NO. 1237]?

THE MARSHAL: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Let's deal with this matter first, just because it is one of those ones where it'll be separate by itself.

I have received from my Marshal a handwritten note from the potential juror, [JUROR NO. 1237]. And this's [JUROR NO. 1237]'s statement now -- he's tried the work. He's tried the inconvenience. He's tried the money. Quote, "I won't be able to hand down a guilty verdict."

MR. YAMPOLSKY: And there's a problem with that, Your Honor?

THE DEFENDANT: Yeah, we think that's swell.

THE COURT: Okay. Here's the problem with it. This Court believes that [JUROR NO. 1237] is trying desperately to get off this jury duty. We're going to deal with the Batson challenge. And if this remains, then I'm going to call [JUROR NO. 1237] in here and basically ask him questions directly from the bench in regards to his now fine philosophical choice.

> MR. YAMPOLSKY: Didn't you [indiscernible] him? MS. CRAGGS: Yeah.

THE COURT: He was stricken but, Counsel, if you

1	have a Batson issue, he may be another issue
2	MR. YAMPOLSKY: Okay.
3	THE COURT: okay? You can't go through and
4	strike him when you're dealing with a Batson matter.
5	Okay. Counsel, we have a Batson challenge from the
6	Defense; correct?
7	MR. YAMPOLSKY: Yes, Your Honor.
8	THE COURT: Let's articulate it.
9	MR. YAMPOLSKY: On the first five strikes of the
10	State, four were Hispanic. [JUROR NO. 1229] was not. But
11	[JUROR NO. 1084], [JUROR NO. 7698], [JUROR NO. 1180], and the
12	fifth one, Your Honor, it's
13	THE COURT: [JUROR NO. 1257]?
14	MR. YAMPOLSKY: it's Hispanic woman, I believe.
15	THE COURT: [JUROR NO. 1257].
16	MR. MARGOLIS: [JUROR NO. 1226], I believe.
17	THE COURT: Okay.
18	MR. YAMPOLSKY: Yeah. And based on that
19	MR. SCHWARTZ: That's a male.
20	MR. YAMPOLSKY: What was that?
21	THE COURT: Here we go. Let's make sure we get the
22	record clear, Counsel. The first strike by the State was
23	[JUROR NO. 1084]. You believe that's a Batson issue; correct?
24	MR. YAMPOLSKY: Yes.

1	THE COURT: Okay. Second strike is
2	[JUROR NO. 1229]. You do not believe that's a Batson
3	challenge; correct?
4	MR. YAMPOLSKY: Correct.
5	THE COURT: The third strike was [JUROR NO. 1180].
6	Do you believe that is a Batson issue?
7	MR. YAMPOLSKY: Yes.
8	THE COURT: Okay. The fourth strike was
9	[JUROR NO. 1257], you believe that is a Hispanic issue?
10	MR. YAMPOLSKY: Yes.
11	THE COURT: Okay. The fifth strike was
12	[JUROR NO. 1123]. Do you believe that is a Batson issue?
13	MR. YAMPOLSKY: Yes.
14	THE COURT: Okay. Now, Counsel for the State, let's
15	articulate, if possible, your reasoning for the nonracial
16	striking.
17	MR. SCHWARTZ: Can I clarify, number three, the
18	third person you're Batsoning me on, who is that?
19	THE COURT: [JUROR NO. 1180] is what
20	MR. YAMPOLSKY: [JUROR NO. 1180].
21	THE COURT: number 24.
22	MR. SCHWARTZ: I had I'm sorry. Then number
23	four. 'Cause whatever he's
24	THE COURT: The number four is [JUROR NO. 1257].

1 [JUROR NO. 1257]. Okay. MR. SCHWARTZ: Excellent. 2 THE COURT: Okay. Go ahead and let's deal with 3 number one, [JUROR NO. 1084]. MR. SCHWARTZ: And, Your Honor, just to -- the way 4 5 that we usually like to do it, are you finding that there was 6 a pattern? Because this first step --7 THE COURT: No, the very first step -- this is the 8 way I do it, Counsel --9 MR. SCHWARTZ: Okay. 10 THE COURT: -- the way that I read Batson is there 11 has to be a systematic striking of individuals based upon 12 something other than the answers that they gave you, i.e., a 13 gender and/or racial and/or preference matter. Okay? 14 At this time, from a general finding, what I see is a 15 pure Batson based only on surname; okay? That's usually why I 16 see Batson challenges. Because everybody automatically infers 17 because they have a Hispanic or Latino surname that those individuals are somehow Hispanic or Latino actually. 18 19 I never judge race and/or gender or gender neutrality at all because the fact is, I have a lot of people that come in 20 21 here, including my family members, who happen to be last name 22 Miranda and they are Hispanic only by Miranda. They're actually Asian. So the fact that they have a surname that 23 24 happens to be Latino or Hispanic based does not influence this

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

19

20

21

Court as to a pattern. Okav?

But what I do see, in my recollection of those individuals, is they are Hispanic in appearance. And by looking over what they told the Court system, they -- at least two of them claim to be of Hispanic origin. Okay? So I am not finding at this time that there is a pattern, but I am finding purely on the, quote, surface, the Hispanic names and or appearances that they have individuals of Hispanic or Latin base that were stricken. Along with individuals who were stricken that were not Hispanic and Latino.

So I want you to address, Counsel, a reasonable explanation to this Court dealing down with number one, [JUROR NO. 1084].

14 [JUROR NO. 1084], Your Honor, couple MR. SCHWARTZ: things with him. For most of my questioning, he was sitting in the back row with his head against the wall looking up at 17 the ceiling. When I asked if everyone agrees no means no, everyone shook their head, except for him. And that's when I 18 said, "Uh, sir, behind [JUROR NO. 7698], do you disagree and shake your head?" And then he's like, "Oh, no. Yeah, I agree."

22 I felt like he wasn't paying attention, was disinterested. And also, when I was talking about the sexual 23 24 assault, no means no, did not nod in the affirmative when

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

everyone was [indiscernible].

So those were my -- he was also, I guess, one of the ones that -- I guess probably should have started with this. This is a great point. He said he would need more.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. SCHWARTZ: He would need more than just the victim saying something.

THE COURT: Okay. I can tell you, Counsel, from my notes, that was one of the major issues that I had with him is his basic statements with -- and Mr. Schwartz did it in detail -- if the only thing is out here is this individual testifying and it's the victim, and it's the victim, and he specifically said, "I would need more."

I was actually, Counsel, expecting a challenge on him for that reason, outside of the preemptory. He basically was acknowledged that he would need more than just a victim's statement. Okay?

And for the record, [JUROR NO. 1084] refers to himself not as Hispanic but "other race." So that means to the court that he is not purely of Hispanic or Latin race, but he is a mixture of races and, therefore, does not consider himself of Hispanic race; okay?

> Let's go down to the next one, [JUROR NO. 1180]. MS. CRAGGS: Your Honor, I can take that one.

3

4

5

6

7

8

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. CRAGGS: The reason that I suggested striking [JUROR NO. 1180] is because I have watched his body language when Mr. Schwartz was asking the questions about sexual assault, about the no means no, and kind of was going down the line and asking people different things. To me, he appeared disinterested -- him and [JUROR NO. 1183]. Those are two people that we struck.

9 [JUROR NO. 1183] was not part of this challenge because I 10 believe he identifies as "white/Caucasian." But those two 11 individuals, throughout the entire time he was asking the 12 other people, were disinterested. I believe they both rolled 13 their eyes at one point. And so those are the two individuals 14 that I suggested that we struck, which was why I wanted to be 15 the one to tell the Court.

16

17

18

20

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. SCHWARTZ: [JUROR NO. 1180] also identifies as "other race."

19

THE COURT: Correct.

Okay. Let's deal with [JUROR NO. 1257].

MR. SCHWARTZ: [JUROR NO. 1257], Your Honor -- and
that was -- that's the female who was sitting behind me.
THE COURT: Correct.
MR. SCHWARTZ: Let me just make sure -- I don't

1	think I believe she was identifies as "white/Caucasian,"
2	to start. But correct. "White/Caucasian."
3	THE COURT: Correct.
4	MR. SCHWARTZ: My issue with her, Your Honor, is
5	that my understanding is that the Defense is gonna probably go
6	with the consent route here. And she had an issue where she
7	was consenting to a sexual assault age issue that was later
8	charged or addressed as a sexual assault.
9	My concern was that, essentially, that she would be more
10	favorable to the Defense in the sense that she was in a
11	relationship that was consensual, but ultimately charges were
12	filed against him.
13	THE COURT: Okay. Basically, you had an individual
14	who said that she consented even though, legally, she could
15	not consent to that relationship. And she basically had
16	sexual relations with a man who clearly could have been
17	charged with a statutory rape because of her age here in
18	Clark County.
19	MR. SCHWARTZ: Correct.
20	THE COURT: Okay. And she does identify herself as
21	"white/Caucasian."
22	Okay. The next one to be [JUROR NO. 1123].
23	MR. SCHWARTZ: Your Honor, [JUROR NO. 7698]
24	identifies "other race." My main issue with him was,

yesterday, when we were discussing no means no, he made that comment, "Well, women who dress provocatively" -- I think the quote was, "That their butt hanging out" or "their boobs hanging out should kind of expect something to happen.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

And he clarified what he was talking about, which I think was -- he didn't mean what it came off, but the way that he said it kind of rubbed me the wrong way. So that was the reason. I didn't really like that he kind of was indicating that some women maybe had it coming, so to speak.

THE COURT: Okay. And, Counsel, in regards to the Batson challenge, here's my other issue that I have: We basically have gone over a little bit extensively in removing two individuals who were Hispanic speaking solely because of the fact that they were Hispanic speaking.

Both parties agreed to stipulate to remove those individuals that, based solely upon their native tongue, is not a valid reason to strike them. An inability to comprehend is one. But just because they have a tendency to speak one language over the other is purely picking on an individual race because of that.

Based upon all of the arguments here today on regard to [JUROR NO. 1084], [JUROR NO. 1180], [JUROR NO. 1257], and [JUROR NO. 1123] the request for Batson challenge is hereby denied. I do not find a systematic approach.

1 We had gone through -- one, two, three, four, five, six, seven -- eight other people of Hispanic or Latin gender 2 3 names -- or excuse me -- surnames and individuals -- one, two, three, four -- five that identify themselves as Hispanic in 4 5 nature that were not stricken by the State. I do not see a 6 systematic attempt to strike only individuals of Hispanic. 7 The State has articulated a very valid basis for each and 8 every one of their strikes. Therefore, we are going to stick 9 with the jury we have. 10 We're going to come back here in about two minutes. 11 We're gonna sit this jury and we're gonna do opening. 12 MS. CRAGGS: And, Your Honor, can we address the 13 motion before we --14 THE COURT: Oh, absolutely. 15 MS. CRAGGS: -- deal with openings? 16 THE COURT: I was hoping to use the restroom, but go 17 ahead. 18 MS. CRAGGS: Oh, I --19 THE COURT: No, let's go ahead. MS. CRAGGS: I am, as well. 20 21 We'll have to tell my jury to sit a THE COURT: 22 little bit longer. 23 MR. YAMPOLSKY: Yes, we'll stipulate to a restroom 24 break.

1	MS. CRAGGS: Okay. Your Honor received our motion?
2	THE COURT: I received the motion and I received the
3	opposition. I read through both of 'em. I actually had the
4	ability to pull up Mr. Bub's CV, because it was not supplied
5	to the Court, and reviewed through his CV. He has 33 years of
6	law enforcement in the Los Angeles Police Department, of which
7	22 were investigating homicide, suicides, and political
8	deaths.
9	And then he mentions that he all he does mention is
10	that he does work or did work on sexual assault cases, also
11	RICO and homicides.
12	So go ahead, Counsel.
13	MS. CRAGGS: Thank you, Your Honor.
14	I mean, Your Honor, our main issue, which is what we put
15	in our motion, is that there's not a lot of factual
15 16	in our motion, is that there's not a lot of factual conclusions in this expert report. I mean, our basically
16	conclusions in this expert report. I mean, our basically
16 17	conclusions in this expert report. I mean, our basically what we're saying to Your Honor is that he's coming to
16 17 18	conclusions in this expert report. I mean, our basically what we're saying to Your Honor is that he's coming to conclusions that, one, are common sense. Because it's, "Well,
16 17 18 19	conclusions in this expert report. I mean, our basically what we're saying to Your Honor is that he's coming to conclusions that, one, are common sense. Because it's, "Well, if there was a witness that they could have found that they
16 17 18 19 20	conclusions in this expert report. I mean, our basically what we're saying to Your Honor is that he's coming to conclusions that, one, are common sense. Because it's, "Well, if there was a witness that they could have found that they could have talked to, then maybe it would be helpful for the
16 17 18 19 20 21	conclusions in this expert report. I mean, our basically what we're saying to Your Honor is that he's coming to conclusions that, one, are common sense. Because it's, "Well, if there was a witness that they could have found that they could have talked to, then maybe it would be helpful for the State, maybe it would have been helpful for the Defense. We

states in the case law that, if there's going to be expert testimony on something, it should not be conjecture. It should not be assumption or generalization. It should be based on particularized facts.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

And so, Your Honor, going through the report that we received, I didn't really see any conclusions that were actually drawn, other than sort of, "Well, this would have been great if it was done, but it wasn't done. So it could have been good for this side or it could have been good for this side. We don't really know."

That's not an expert opinion that's going to help the jury come to a conclusion. Those are arguments that can be made on closing. And when we call an officer, those are things that that officer can be crossed on.

So with that, Your Honor, unless you had other questions, I would submit it to you.

17 THE COURT: So if I understand correctly, do you believe that this seasoned, lengthy officer doesn't have the 18 19 ability to come in and say, "Officer, the detective violated 20 Metro's specific detective handbook by not doing A, B, and C. 21 And as a result therein, may have caused the delay or may have 22 caused this case to go one way or the other." Can't an expert come in and say, "Look, this individual didn't even follow 23 24 their own code, their own law, their own books, their own

procedures." And as a result of that, not come up with a summation.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

22

23

24

I never allow an expert to basically take the position of the jury and say, "Now, you can't trust this individual," or "this person's testimony should be stricken." But -- and I agree, this individual goes well beyond what an expert's requested to do. There's more "mays" in this report then there is in a honeymoon; okay?

But there's a problem here. You have an individual who clearly has some points where he's very critical of other detectives, i.e., to the point where he says too much. He basically goes too far. "Well, that's the reason why the detective didn't go forward." He doesn't know that. That's the biggest guess I've ever heard.

Or the one I thought was the best one, "That these two females would have clearly been the best witnesses for the Defense." Really? That they're independent? How does he know that? How does he know they're not the parent of one of the individuals? How does he know they're not the girlfriend of one of the individuals? How does he know they're not the mother of one of these individuals?

For an expert to come in and say, "These witnesses would have been the best thing," that's the most conjecture I've ever heard. But how do we not allow an individual with specialized training, based upon Hallmark, to come in and tell a jury, beyond just, "Hey, this is cross-examination." And you can always argue to the detective, "Detective, here's your handbook. Shouldn't he have done this?"

Can't an expert come in and say, "Look, the failure to do that causes these problems."

MS. CRAGGS: And, Your Honor, I guess reading through his report, I don't know -- and maybe I didn't read it closely enough. But I didn't necessarily see -- I don't know how we can say that the failure, potentially, of a detective not to do X, Y, and Z, which frankly we have records that we've turned over, which are the records we've been able to get from 20 years ago, but we don't know -- I mean, this has been litigated in this Court --

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

THE COURT: Right.

MS. CRAGGS: -- which, you know, obviously.

We don't know if those are all those records. I didn't see that he said, you know, because this detective didn't do X, Y, and Z that that made the investigation go a certain way.

I mean, my impression of his conclusions, if you can call them conclusions, was it may have been, "It may have caused A; It may have caused B, but we don't really know."

And I guess my argument would be that that is better suited to ask the -- a detective that we call. You know, and

1 I don't know who we're going to call at this point. But, 2 obviously, depends on Your Honor's ruling. But it felt, to 3 me, reading through his report, that he was just kind of making these sort of generalizations based on what we were 4 able to get, not particularized facts, but just assumptions. 5 6 THE COURT: Okay. 7 MS. CRAGGS: Not saying that he doesn't have -- not 8 saying he doesn't have expertise, not saying that he doesn't 9 have experience --THE COURT: Well, he's clearly qualify --10 11 MS. CRAGGS: -- I get that. 12 THE COURT: He qualifies for the abilities and There's no doubt about it. Just because of his 13 experience. 14 background alone. For some reason people don't understand, 15 the best person to talk about car maintenance is not the 16 engineer for General Motors but the guy down here at the sweat 17 shop that does oil changes five times every minute. 18 MS. CRAGGS: Right. 19 THE COURT: That's the best guy. And that person may not have a sixth grade education, but he's still the best 20 21 witness when it comes to, "Why does my car leak oil?" Okay?

But in this situation, I get -- and I agree that he's qualified credentially, but how do I not allow him to come in and at least educate the jury, beyond the cross-examination

22

23

24

questions; okay? But come into the jury and say, "Look, a proper investigation should have entailed this, this, this, and that." Not allow him to make the next jump and say, "Had they done this, this could have happened." I'm not gonna allow that.

5 6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

24

1

2

3

4

MS. CRAGGS: Okay.

THE COURT: So any argument about "he gets to come in and say if they did this, this should have happened. This may have happened." That's nice for writing a book -- okay -this is not a book. I'm not gonna allow a detective to come in here and basically say, "They could have done this, this, and that and it could have changed everything." Okay. That's a nice crystal ball analysis, but it has no bearing in Hallmark nor does it have any bearing in this courtroom.

But to allow him to come in and be critical of the way that the detectives handled it -- now, I -- reading over this report -- and I take an hour -- I only took about ten minutes to read over his report because I read the arguments more. I would love to cross-examine this guy.

20MS. CRAGGS:So will Mr. Schwartz.21THE COURT:Okay.22MS. CRAGGS:-- I'm sure.23THE COURT:-- a blast to cross-examine this guy on

his theories of how things could have gone. Because he

Kennedy Court Reporters, Inc. 800.231.2682

1 switches from, "I thought at first whodunit and this isn't the 2 right guy to, oh, it's consensual." Okay. If -- you know, if 3 he wants to go both ends of the spectrum, as an expert, I say 4 earn your money. 5 But how do I not allow him to get on the stand? Because 6 our criteria is much lower than across the street. And our 7 criteria is, can he assist a jury? Can he not come in and 8 say, "The reason why we have these rules is because this." 9 Because I can tell you, a detective from this department at Metro, if you ask 'em, "Why do we have these guidelines?" 10 11 He's gonna probably say, "Because my superiors tell me we have 12 these quidelines." How or why they came up may be beyond his 13 pay grade. 14 He may say, "I don't know," or he may respond, "I think 15 they're stupid and I wouldn't do 'em, but they're still 16 quidelines." 17 MS. CRAGGS: And, Your Honor, if it's limited to that, you know, I'd submit it to the Court. And my 18 19 recollection of the report was that was about a half of a page of it. And the rest of it --20 21 It took me till page 9 to realize where THE COURT: 22 he was going, yes. 23 MS. CRAGGS: And so that was the main concern that 24 the State had, was all of these --

1 Mays, would haves, could haves. THE COURT: 2 MS. CRAGGS: Yes. 3 THE COURT: Okay. 4 MS. CRAGGS: And so if Your Honor is limiting it to 5 that specifically --6 THE COURT: Well, let me hear from the other side. MS. CRAGGS: -- then I'll submit it to you. 7 THE COURT: Counsel? 8 9 MR. MARGOLIS: I understand Counsel's concern about the expert per, you know, invading the province of the jury so 10 11 to speak, but I think if he ultimately --12 Well, I don't care about her -- what's THE COURT: 13 my -- about my concerns. It's the same thing. 14 MR. MARGOLIS: I understand Your Honor wants to 15 limit him to being critical of police work. And as far as the 16 mays and the should haves and could haves and hypotheses on 17 steroids, that's not allowed. And to that extent, we have no issue with that. 18 19 But clearly, Mr. Bub is gualified. And clearly, he can 20 illuminate some issues of material fact for this jury about 21 this investigation about what ordinarily happens, about what 22 happened here. Okay? I understand the State's concern about 23 him providing the conclusions for the jurors as to what that 24 information means. But I think that he's certainly more

qualified than even anyone in this room to opine about a sexual assault investigation and the way that it plays out and the actors involved and whom is responsible for what.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

Do I, as a layperson who watched Law and Order from 1991 until I went to law school and beyond, do I have the same ability to describe a sexual assault investigation as Robert Bub does? I do not.

THE COURT: Counsel, do we actually need an expert to say that taking one hour versus 20 years could probably have an adverse affect?

MR. MARGOLIS: I believe that Mr. Bub goes beyond that, though, Your Honor. I mean, I would agree that any old person can say that, "Hey, a case is probably gonna be easier to prosecute and defend and witnesses are gonna be easier to find if we do it inside of one, two, five years as opposed to twenty." But he can also opine, specifically, about what these investigations entail.

And I don't think you or I, or certainly the 12 people in the jury box, are gonna know exactly what those steps are. Okay. We might know what we've seen in an episode of Law and Order, but I kind of feel like they want to ride both horses here. Wants to exalt DNA and exalt the CSI effect, while at the same time diminishing it when it suites their purposes and saying here --