IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

JASON JEROME BOLEN,

Electronically Filed Aug 10 2020 04:10 p.m. Elizabeth A. Brown Clerk of Supreme Court

Appellant,

vs.

THE STATE OF NEVADA,

Respondent.

Docket No. 79715

Appeal from a Judgment of Conviction Following a Jury Trial and Verdict Eighth Judicial District Court, Clark County The Honorable Richard F. Scotti, District Judge Case No. C-18-334635-1

APPELLANT'S APPENDIX Vol. 2 of 3

BEN NADIG Nevada Bar No. 9876 **LAW OFFICE OF BENJAMIN NADIG, CHTD.** 228 S. 4th St., Third Floor Las Vegas, NV 89101 (702) 545-7592

Counsel for Appellant

CHRONOLOGICAL INDEX

Description	Vol.	Pages	Date
Transcript: Preliminary Hearing	1	1-32	8/22/2018
Motion for Leave to Amend Information by Affidavit	1	33-67	9/5/2018
Information	1	68-72	12/6/2018
Amended Information	1	73-77	5/28/2019
Transcript: Jury Trial Day 1	1	78-224	5/28/2019
Second Amended Information	2	1-3	5/29/2019
Transcript: Jury Trial Day 2	2	4-175	5/29/2019
Jury Instructions	3	1–19	5/30/2019
Transcript: Jury Trial Day 3	3	20-86	5/30/2019
Verdict 1	3	87-90	5/30/2019
Verdict 2	3	91	5/30/2019
Third Amended Information	3	92-95	5/31/2019
Jury Instructions	3	96-125	5/31/2019
Transcript: Sentencing	3	126-34	7/23/2019
Judgment of Conviction	3	135-37	8/27/2019
Notice of Appeal	3	138-39	9/24/2019

ALPHABETICAL INDEX

Description	Vol.	Pages	Date
Amended Information	1	73-77	5/28/2019
Information	1	68-72	12/6/2018
Judgment of Conviction	3	135-37	8/27/2019
Jury Instructions	3	1–19	5/30/2019
Jury Instructions	3	96-125	5/31/2019
Motion for Leave to Amend Information by Affidavit	1	33-67	9/5/2018
Notice of Appeal	3	138-39	9/24/2019
Second Amended Information	2	1-3	5/29/2019
Third Amended Information	3	92-95	5/31/2019
Transcript: Jury Trial Day 1	1	78-224	5/28/2019
Transcript: Jury Trial Day 2	2	4-175	5/29/2019
Transcript: Jury Trial Day 3	3	20-86	5/30/2019
Transcript: Preliminary Hearing	1	1-32	8/22/2018
Transcript: Sentencing	3	126-34	7/23/2019
Verdict 1	3	87-90	5/30/2019
Verdict 2	3	91	5/30/2019

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on the 10 of August, 2020, I served this document on the following:

Name Address

Steven B. Wolfson, Esq. Clark County District Attorney's Office Via eFlex 200 Lewis Ave. Las Vegas, NV 89155

Aaron D. Ford, Esq. Nevada Attorney General's Office Via eFlex 100 N. Carson St. Carson City, NV 89701

/s/ Ben Nadig

BEN NADIG
Nevada Bar No. 9876
LAW OFFICE OF BENJAMIN NADIG, CHTD.
228 S. 4th St., Third Floor
Las Vegas, NV 89101
(702) 545-7592

Attorney for Appellant

AFFIRMATION

Pursuant to NRS 239B.030, this document contains no social security numbers.

 /s/ Ben Nadig
 8-10-20

 Ben Nadig
 Date

ORIGINAL

FILED IN OPEN COURT
STEVE GRIERSON
CLERIC COURT

AINF
STEVEN B. WOLFSON
Clark County District Attorney
Nevada Bar #001565
JORY SCARBOROUGH
Deputy District Attorney
Nevada Bar #014265

BY, E. Vaugas E. VARGAS, DEPUTY

4 Nevada Bar #014265 200 Lewis Avenue 5 Las Vegas, Nevada 8

1

2

3

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

Las Vegas, Nevada 89155-2212 (702) 671-2500

6 Attorney for Plaintiff

DISTRICT COURT CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

THE STATE OF NEVADA,

Plaintiff.

-VS-

JASON J. BOLDEN, aka Jason Jerome Bolen, #1891927

Defendant.

CASE NO:

C-18-334635-1

DEPT NO:

XXI

SECOND AMENDED INFORMATION

STATE OF NEVADA) ss.

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

That JASON J. BOLDEN, aka Jason Jerome Bolen, the Defendant(s) above named, having committed the crimes of OWNERSHIP OR POSSESSION OF FIREARM BY PROHIBITED PERSON (Category B Felony - NRS 202.360 - NOC 51460);, on or about the 1st day of July, 2018, within the County of Clark, State of Nevada, contrary to the form, force and effect of statutes in such cases made and provided, and against the peace and dignity of the State of Nevada, did willfully, unlawfully, and feloniously own, or have in his possession and/or under his custody or control, a firearm, to wit: firearm, the Defendant being a convicted felon, having in 2009, been convicted of Trafficking Controlled Substance, in Case

2728

C-18-334635-1 AINF Amended Information

//

//

W:\2018\2018F\122\17\18F12217-AINF-(GOLDEN__JASON)-002.DOCX

1	No. C228792A and/or having in 2009, been convicted of Battery with Substantial Bodily			
2	Harm, in Case No. C246243X, in the Las Vegas Municipal Court, Clack County, felonies			
3	under the laws of the State of Nevada.			
4		CTEVENID WAS EGON		
5		STEVEN B. WOLFSON Clark County District Attorney Nevada Bar #001565		
6		Nevaua Bar #001303		
7		BY JORY SCARBOROUGH		
8		Deputy District Attorney Nevada Bar #014265		
9		1964aua Dai #014203		
10				
11	Names of witnesses known to the Distri- Information are as follows:	ct Attorney's Office at the time of filing this		
12	NAME	ADDRESS		
13				
14	CAREY, KEVIN	LVMPD #8739		
15	CHARLTON, NOREEN	LVMPD #13572		
16	COLEMAN, BRANDI	2883 WHEELWRIGHT DR #6/A, LVN 89121		
17	CUSTODIAN OF RECORDS OR DESIGNEE	Clark County Detention Center, 330 S. Casino Center Blvd., Las Vegas, NV		
18 19	CUSTODIAN OF RECORDS OR DESIGNEE	Clark County Detention Center, Communications 330 S. Casino Center Blvd., Las Vegas, NV		
20	CUSTODIAN OF RECORDS OR DESIGNEE	LVMPD Communications, Las Vegas, NV		
21	CUSTODIAN OF RECORDS	LVMPD Records		
22	OR DESIGNEE	Las Vegas, NV		
23	GETER, SHAKIESHA	2883 WHEELWRIGHT DR #6/A, LVN 89121		
24	GROSS, KEITH OR DESIGNEE	INVESTIGATOR / C.C. DISTRICT ATTORNEY		
25	JACKSON, JERMAINE	LVMPD #16510		
26	KNOWLTEN, JOSHUA	4581 CARRIGAE PARK DR #22/A, LVN 89121		
27	KRMPOTICH, KENNETH	LVMPD #5809		
28				
		2		

MARTINEZ, BRENTON 5250 STEWART AVE #2095, LVN 89110 MARTINEZ, BRYSTON 2883 WHEELWRIGHT DR. #6/A, LVN 89121 SHAKEFORD, KEVIN LVMPD #15908 18F12217X/jr / L-1 LVMPD EV#1807011437 (TK12) W:\2018\2018F\122\17\18F12217-AINF-(GOLDEN__JASON)-002.DOCX

Electronically Filed 3/4/2020 3:32 PM Steven D. Grierson CLERK OF THE COURT 1 **RTRAN** 2 3 4 DISTRICT COURT 5 CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA 6 7 8 THE STATE OF NEVADA, CASE#: C-18-334635-1 9 DEPT. II Plaintiff, 10 VS. 11 JASON BOLDEN, aka Jason Jerome Bolen, 12 Defendant. 13 14 BEFORE THE HONORABLE RICHARD F. SCOTTI, DISTRICT COURT JUDGE 15 WEDNESDAY, MAY 29, 2019 16 RECORDER'S TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING **JURY TRIAL - DAY 2** 17 **APPEARANCES:** 18 19 For the Plaintiff: JORY SCARBOROUGH, ESQ. CHAD LEXUS, ESQ. 20 Chief Deputy District Attorneys 21 For the Defendant: BENJAMIN NADIG, ESQ. 22 23 RECORDED BY: DALYNE EASLEY, COURT RECORDER 24 25

Page 1

Case Number: C-18-334635-1

1					
2		<u>INI</u>	<u>DEX</u>		
3					
4	WITNESSES FOR PLTF. JOSHUA KNOWLTON	<u>Direct</u> 54	<u>Cross</u> 61	<u>Redirect</u>	<u>Recross</u>
5	KEITH GROSS ALEXANDER JEGGE	65 71	79	89	92
6	BRENTON MARTINEZ	96	108	114	115
7	KEN KRMPOTICH	117	137	153	155
8					
9	WITNESSES FOR DEFT.	<u>Direct</u>	<u>Cross</u>	Redirect	Recross
10	None				
11	EXHIBITS				
12			OFFERE	<u>D</u>	RECEIVED
13	Exhibit 116 Exhibit 124		11 13		11 13
14	Exhibit 125A		136		136
15					
16					
17					
18					
19					
20					
21					
22					
23					
24					
25					
		_	logo 2		

1 THE COURT: So State offers, Defendant objects. Okay. MR. NADIG: And then as to State 119, I believe --THE COURT: State 119. MR. NADIG: That the State is going to edit the photo. And just for the record, Your Honor, if you look at the photo and it's of my client, my objection is I don't want them to see these and to think that these are all separate arrests or separate citations. So for those reasons, I just object and the State is going to give us a photo without the numbers on the --THE COURT: That's good. We don't want the jury speculating extraneous material is in the photo? MR. SCARBOROUGH: Okay, if we can get -- so here's my only weird thing. So this is on the photo paper. So if make another copy, it's going to stand out as like some random newspaper. MR. NADIG: Why don't you just -- I would --THE COURT: Why don't you just cut and paste a white piece of paper covering that up? And -- oh, but then, how does it go back to the jury? MR. NADIG: I was going to say just cut out the photo. You know? I mean, just literally take scissors and go like that. THE COURT: Yeah, yeah. MR. SCARBOROUGH: Since it's an exhibit, do you want to the Court Clerk to handle me or me? THE COURT: It's up to her. MR. SCARBOROUGH: Okay. MR. NADIG: Whoever cuts straight.

THE COURT: Well, you know what? We -- you know what? You probably have to do it. I don't think the Court Clerk is at liberty to change proposed exhibits.

MR. SCARBOROUGH: That makes sense.

MR. NADIG: And I have no objection to the --

THE CLERK: I have --

MR. NADIG: What?

THE CLERK: Before you cut this, since it's already a proposed exhibit, I'm going to find out and let you know how they want me to handle it. Because I don't -- if you cut it --

THE COURT: Why don't I put it on the record that we decided to withdraw the proposed exhibit, but --

THE CLERK: Okay.

THE COURT: -- if you want, you can make a black and white copy if you can put in the record. Unless the parties stipulate that that exhibit's withdrawn, and there's no need to keep a black and white copy in the file. And then, you're going to cut it and resubmit it.

MR. SCARBOROUGH: Okay, let's see if we can just rework this.

[Counsel confer]

MR. NADIG: So, Your Honor, we'll stipulate that -- tell me if I'm wrong. We'll stipulate that they don't need a black and white copy. They'll be a resubmitted State's 119, which will simply be the cut-up version of State's 119.

THE COURT: Yes, is that stipulated to, counsel?

proposed 116 and State's proposed 124. Let me just take a look at these.

[Counsel confer]

MR. NADIG: And, Your Honor, the photo of the gentleman is the person whose transcript was read in yesterday. I would suggest, just based on his demeanor and things of that nature, that that photo serves no evidentiary purpose other than to be more prejudicial than probative and I'll submit to Your Honor.

MR. SCARBOROUGH: And --

THE COURT: Mr. Scarborough, what's the purpose of this photo?

MR. SCARBOROUGH: That purpose right there is to identify actually Bryson Martinez. I would have my officers testify and identify that man as Bryson Martinez.

THE COURT: Which is which?

MR. SCARBOROUGH: Bryson is the --

MR. NADIG: Bryson is the gentleman in the photo, yes.

MR. SCARBOROUGH: Yes.

THE COURT: All right, 116. So you're showing it to prove he was at the scene?

MR. SCARBOROUGH: Correct, yes.

THE COURT: Yeah.

MR. NADIG: There are other photos they could have used, Your Honor.

MR. SCARBOROUGH: I mean, to be fair, scanning through the bodycam, there are various scanned images of him walking by and

everything like that. So that's why I chose that one.

THE COURT: I mean, he's making a grimace. There's no indication that this -- that he's being arrested, or detained, or this is in connection with anyhow law enforcement other than this -- wait, this is a bodycam photo?

MR. SCARBOROUGH: Correct.

THE COURT: Are you going to introduce it as such?

MR. SCARBOROUGH: Just a photo of the -- yeah, I mean it's going to be through the detective, who's going to identify --

THE COURT: All right.

MR. SCARBOROUGH: -- everyone who's reviewed all the bodycam and is able to say that that's an accurate photo captured from the bodycam he's reviewed.

THE COURT: Did -- I guess Defense knew before today that this was marked as a proposed exhibit. You could have --

MR. NADIG: I was provided all of the photos. I was not told which photos would be used.

THE COURT: So 124 is just one of several in a group or something?

MR. NADIG: Theoretically, yeah. You provided the bodycams correct?

MR. SCARBOROUGH: I did. I provided him all the links to the bodycams. These are --

THE COURT: This is a still of the bodycam.

MR. SCARBOROUGH: Correct.

THE COURT: The bodycam is 124? MR. NADIG: The bodycam is not 124. MR. SCARBOROUGH: No. MR. NADIG: The still of the bodycam is 124. THE COURT: All right, so we're getting back to what I originally said is you received as a proposed Exhibit 124, which is the still that you're objecting to now? MR. NADIG: No, I received the entirety of the bodycam. I did not -- I was not told that they were going to take stills from the bodycam and then present them as exhibits. I was not provided that prior to. THE COURT: What was 124 before today? MR. SCARBOROUGH: Nothing. That was just a photo. MR. NADIG: Yes, I mean, I don't understand your question I guess, Your Honor. THE COURT: All right, let's start over. All right, Exhibit 124 yesterday was what? MR. NADIG: I had not reviewed the photos prior to yesterday because we were doing jury selection. I had not seen the proposed exhibits --THE COURT: Okay. MR. NADIG: -- until this morning. That's --THE COURT: When did the State first identify and produce to the Defense's proposed exhibits? MR. SCARBOROUGH: This bodycam, I can go to my file. I mean, this bodycam of this --25

MR. NADIG: Did I have before the prelim?

25

1 MR. SCARBOROUGH: I don't know. It was in August. 2 MR. NADIG: Yeah, the odds are pretty good I did, but --THE COURT: All right, I see nothing unduly prejudicial. 3 MR. NADIG: If you're saying it's not prejudicial, for purposes of 4 like discovery and things like that, I'm not challenging that. It's just for 5 purposes of prejudicial. So if you're saying it's not prejudicial, obviously, 6 7 my objection is noted and I'll leave it at that. 8 THE COURT: And part of my prejudice analysis was the timing of production, but I'm finding that it's unduly prejudicial. It has some 9 probative value. Probative value exceeds the prejudicial nature of this photo. The Court overrules the Defense objection to -- this is 116 and 116 is admitted into evidence, all right? [EXHIBIT 116 ADMITTED] MR. SCARBOROUGH: Okay. MR. NADIG: Yes, and then the --THE COURT: All right, now let's talk about Exhibit 124. MR. NADIG: And, Your Honor, I just need to put on the record that I was -- when I think we've been saying 124 for 116 the entire time. So just for record purposes, the one we've previously been discussing is 124 is actually Exhibit 116. THE COURT: You're correct. MR. NADIG: Okav. MR. SCARBOROUGH: That's --MR. NADIG: So now we're talking about the correct 124.

25

MR. SCARBOROUGH: That's correct.

THE COURT: All right, what do you guys want to say about it?

MR. NADIG: I -- my whole point is that if they're using this as identification of Sanyleh, I don't think that that would be the best representation of Sanyleh, who is the juvenile involved in the case. And based on her position, based on the law enforcement in the photo, I would say it's more prejudicial than probative.

It's not going to provide a correct ID. It shows it in a sympathetic fashion to the State. And for those reasons, I would object.

MR. SCARBOROUGH: And, Your Honor, again, the same purpose is for identification would be to show that Sanyleh was there at the scene and was actually in the back seat of the car.

And another exhibit that we had admitted, if I may approach, shows Sanyleh.

THE COURT: Who's going to authenticate this?

MR. SCARBOROUGH: That would, again, be the detective.

THE COURT: The detective?

MR. SCARBOROUGH: Yes.

THE COURT: All right. You can't really make out a face. We could see it is --

MR. SCARBOROUGH: The body.

THE COURT: -- a young person in the backseat.

MR. SCARBOROUGH: And more importantly, it's probative in the aspect that Sanyleh was three to four years old at the time. And it actually corroborates some of my other witness' testimony from what I

someone that can recognize the voice if you give me a brief indulgence.

Under -- and I know you'll want to hear the 911 call. I just had the 911 call in my computer.

THE COURT: Yeah, let's hear it.

MR. SCARBOROUGH: Chad is bringing it up. I'm sorry about

THE COURT: Is there an objection, Mr. Nadig, to statements within or other foundation --

MR. NADIG: There --

THE COURT: -- or prejudicial impact based on the statements?

MR. NADIG: There are a number of objections.

THE COURT: Let's hear them before I watch the video.

MR. NADIG: Specifically.

THE COURT: Before I listen to the call.

MR. NADIG: Yes, they are going to argue to that this comes in under the <u>Bryant versus Michigan</u> [sic] standard, which involves an analysis of the formality of the interview.

It involves whether this was to determine whether the individual was still outstanding and whether it was used for the purposes of future prosecution is my understanding of the test under Bryant.

MR. SCARBOROUGH: That's correct, Your Honor. And for the Court's edification, I've actually printed out a copy of <u>Bryant</u> if you'd like.

THE COURT: Right. Yeah, to be honest with you, I'm not familiar with this case.

MR. NADIG: To be fair, I just learned it myself.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. NADIG: Because I thought it was under the old <u>Crawford</u> standard. But they're using this. Obviously, I don't have the ability to cross-examine this woman. Obviously, she has not been provided for trial.

And in it, she identifies that her baby daddy was the one who's shot. Later on, she says that her baby daddy is Jason Bolden.

Obviously, I would argue that that is testimonial in nature. I would argue it's hearsay. The State would object and say it's an excited utterance.

My objection would be the confrontation clause, but under the analysis in <u>Bryant</u>, you're the person who decides whether it comes in for those purposes.

Now in addition to that, there's a statement made on that by Ms. Coleman, wherein she says that Mr. Bolden stole a gun from her. And there was no bad acts motion filed prior.

So it makes it problematic to say that we are now going to add an uncharged crime into the record as to this 911 call, which makes it doubly problematic for me.

THE COURT: And, interestingly enough, I had a murder trial some time ago where the State requested the introduction of a prior bad act.

And I considered it carefully and determined that three different exceptions applied. And the supreme court overruled, saying that they didn't apply and prejudicial impact exceeded the probative value. And that

case is set for re-trial actually.

And so, I just have -- I have to be very careful in these types of analysis is what the message was to me.

MR. SCARBOROUGH: And that's very fair, Your Honor.

May I --

MR. NADIG: Please do, sorry.

MR. SCARBOROUGH: And it's very fair. And to respond to Mr. Nadig's issue with the fact --

THE COURT: Well, it's [indiscernible] Mr. Jacimo [phonetic] in that case.

MR. SCARBOROUGH: Oh.

THE COURT: To respond to Mr. Nadig's concern about the statement of the stolen gun, I think that's appropriate. That can be fixed by an absolute redaction. We can redact that outright from the call.

But under the <u>Michigan v. Bryant</u> analysis, I want to turn Your Honor's attention. The primary purpose is the central focus of the admissibility of the call in terms of the analysis in terms -- in comparison to its testimonial value.

So the primary purpose would be to enable police assistance to meet an ongoing emergency. And forgive me, I've made my notes and I'm just looking down. I provided you the case.

So the primary purpose like in a case that is cited in <u>Michigan v.</u>

<u>Bryant Hannon [phonetic]</u>, they delineated testimonial statements to be deliberately recounted in response to questioning in order to prove past events for a future prosecution.

Here, the context, it is an ongoing emergency. And the case goes on to discuss explicitly an ongoing emergency. And I'm reading from the case.

"The existence of an ongoing emergency at the time of the encounter is among the most important circumstances informing the interrogation's primary purpose.

And emergency focus is the part focuses the participants not on proving past events potentially relevant later to criminal prosecution, but on ending a threatening situation."

And moving further down in the case, there's actually analysis and an analogy to a gun crime, such as this, and an ongoing emergency.

And I'm quoting again from the case. "The circumstances of the interrogation involved an armed shooter, who's motive for and location after the shooting were unknown."

Your Honor, in this exact case, it's particularly relevant, the location of the shooter, and the motive in terms of the shooter fleeing, the shooter getting into the car and going away and fleeing the scene.

And also continuing on reading from the case, and who had mortally wounded, and they were talking about the victim in their case, Covington [phonetic], within a few blocks and a few minutes of the location where police found the victim in that case.

I think that's exactly like this case. And Brandi Coleman's call with the exception of the fact that the stolen gun, as I conceded before I think is fair and we need to redact, this is in response to an ongoing emergency. The 911 dispatcher is not using this to prove future events

for prosecution.

In fact, in the 911 call when you hear it, and if I misquote small words, I apologize. That the dispatcher is saying, hey, we needed a description. We need to know what's going on, what happened?

In fact, also in the 911 call, the dispatcher is telling Ms.

Coleman how to dress and how to apply pressure to the wound. This is all in response to an ongoing emergency. It's nontestimonial under Bryant because it's not used to prove events for a prosecution.

More importantly, it's not -- and as I read before, a deliberately recounted in response to a police interrogation recounting of events.

It's Brandi Coleman calling immediately after the shooting saying, hey, this happened. This is who did it. This is a description of this person.

And that's to meet the ongoing emergency, so officers can assess the danger. Because I think what's important also is the focus of the primary emergency or the emergency and the ongoing emergency doesn't necessarily stop with just the victim, right? The Defendant in this case fled the scene after discharging multiple rounds, fled the scene with the firearm in a vehicle. So his location being unknown is very probative to this analysis as well.

So to address Your Honor's earlier concerns, too, for foundational issues, we have detectives who have spoken to Brandi Coleman, who recognize her voice, who's watched all the bodycam, would know her voice, and can authenticate her voice.

And I would also say that under NRS 52.252, it is a 911 system,

a recording from a 911 system that's admissible under the statute. So based on those arguments, Your Honor, we can get this in legally under multiple fronts. And based on that, I would submit.

THE COURT: Question, and I would ask Mr. Nadig to respond. So even though this is you said nontestimonial?

MR. SCARBOROUGH: Correct.

THE COURT: Do I need to balance the need to admit it under the ongoing emergency rule versus whether there's a violation of the confrontation clause? Am I supposed to balance those two things? Do I have discretion to do so?

MR. SCARBOROUGH: You do have --

THE COURT: What are the factors I should consider?

MR. SCARBOROUGH: You do have discretion to balance that test. And you do have discretion to admit that evidence. That evidence is always within the discretion of the trial court.

In terms of balancing whether or not the confrontation clause is violated, here under <u>Michigan v. Bryant</u>, they delineate what violates the confrontation clause because violations of the confrontation clause are responses or testimonial evidence under this.

THE COURT: Uh-huh.

MR. SCARBOROUGH: And the confrontation clause isn't violated <u>under Michigan v. Bryant</u>. And it's up to you to obviously weigh that, but again the fact --

THE COURT: What page is that? You were paraphrasing some of it.

MR. SCARBOROUGH: I had it marked, I apologize.

THE COURT: This is the first time I've seen this case, so I just want to -
MR. SCARBOROUGH: No, that's fair, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Make sure I read the right portion, so.

MR. SCARBOROUGH: Going, okay, so you have the packet that I provided the Court, correct?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. SCARBOROUGH: Okay.

MR. NADIG: And I apologize, Your Honor, I marked it on mine as well, but I left it at the office when I ran over here.

MR. SCARBOROUGH: So if you would turn to page 4, Your Honor, in the packet.

THE COURT: I'm there.

MR. SCARBOROUGH: And then if you go to that subsection (b) to make the primary purpose determination.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. SCARBOROUGH: The court must objectively evaluate the circumstances in which the encounter between the individual and the police occurs and the parties statements and actions.

And if you look at subsections, it analyzes that. So subsection (1), the primary purpose inquiry is objective. The circumstances in which an encounter occurs. And then it lists those factors.

And then it moves onto (2), the existence of the ongoing emergency.

And then, number (3), the statements and actions of both the declarant and interrogators also provide objective evidence of the interrogation's primary purpose.

And when you do to (c), that's when they do the factual analysis.

So Your Honor, I would turn your attention to those factors 1, 2, and 3 and really stress and place particular emphasis that the inquiry on your behalf is the primary purpose of this 911 call and the primary purpose in terms of testimonial evidence.

The primary purpose here is what defeats or overcomes the burden that we have to show that it's not testimonial. The testimonial would -- go ahead, sorry.

THE COURT: No, no, I thought you were done. I was just pointing to --

MR. SCARBOROUGH: Okay. So the testimonial evidence is what would violate the confront clause, Your Honor. These three factors are what Your Honor would look to and what the State would argue to overcome those testimonial -- to overcome that testimonial label of the testimony we're trying get into the 911 call.

THE COURT: Mr. Nadig?

MR. NADIG: And, Your Honor, here's the situation. It's, I believe, roughly five minutes. The initial two -- during the call, Ms. Coleman states three times my baby daddy's shot, my baby daddy's shot. We need medical, we need medical. Okay.

That is in the first, I'd say, 3 minutes, 30 seconds of the call. I

think that under the analysis in <u>Bryant versus Michigan</u> or <u>Michigan versus</u> <u>Bryant</u>, that that appears to satisfy the primary purpose test for the State.

I think the analysis changes when we get to the point after medical has been ordered and you hear the 911 call operator or somebody, because it might have been one of the Metro operators, I don't know. But somebody say we think we have him, what's his name?

And then she says Jason Bolden. And I think at that point in time, there's a change from medical get help for this individual, apply pressure, to testimonial in we think we have him. Now we have to start building the case. What's his name?

And so, I think there is a cutoff roughly at about 3:30. I may be wrong, but roughly around that page where it changes from, you know, proper under <u>Bryant versus Michigan</u> [sic] to testimonial in nature and violative of the confrontation clause. That would be my argument.

THE COURT: So certainly, it's going to come in, but in some redacted form. The question is what parts need to be redacted? And I do find that in a general sense, it does satisfy the <u>Michigan versus Bryant</u> test.

So let's discuss what -- first of all, what the State would agree is proper to redact and then, let's narrowly discuss what remains.

MR. SCARBOROUGH: I'll stick with my earlier position in terms of I think it's entirely appropriate to redact the part where there was a stolen gun, that the crime or the incident was committed with the stolen gun. I think that's absolutely fair to redact.

But, Your Honor, I don't think after that, I don't believe there's

THE MARSHAL: Okay.

THE COURT: All right, thanks.

MR. SCARBOROUGH: And Your Honor, if we --

THE COURT: What do you want me to look?

MR. SCARBOROUGH: Let me just flip through page. And just

to be --

THE COURT: He shot me and he was paid to do it. So I see that.

MR. SCARBOROUGH: Right, and this is -- I think there is a distinction. Here, there's a dying declaration contempt plated in <u>Harkins</u>. I don't think that's contemplated in this case.

What I'm using this case to illustrate and let me just --

THE COURT: Well, I mean, you said it's excited utterance, ongoing emergency.

MR. SCARBOROUGH: Yes, and I just -- as I'm searching for the page, what I made note of, Your Honor, and I apologize. I'm searching for the page, but in that case, the court held that statements are not testimonial when weighed in the course of a police interrogation under circumstances objectively indicating the primary purpose.

They are testimonial when the circumstances objectively indicate that there's no such ongoing emergency and that the primary purpose of the interrogation is to establish a proof.

And I understand that I've said that before. But what I want to just reiterate is again, the inquiry here is not saying Jason Bolden is the one who did it, please admit this into Court later.

That -- you look at the purpose of the 911 call. Now there are other statements that police officers in this case have. And that on bodycam, they have her calmly recounting, deliberately recounting the incident, who did it, what did he do, all this stuff. That is not the case in this 911 call. This --

THE COURT: So how about what if we admitted, if we gave a limiting instruction or cautionary instruction to the jury that it's not -- this particular statement in this particular 911 call is not admitted for the purposes of establishing identity?

MR. NADIG: But I mean, to be fair, Your Honor, that's exactly what they're using it for is to establish identity.

MR. SCARBOROUGH: Brief indulgence, Your Honor.

MR. NADIG: And, Your Honor, I do need to in speaking with --

THE COURT: Yeah, it's just that you guys are asking me to make a determination on cases that I haven't had a chance to fully read. And so I really wish that issues like this come up so I have overnight to look into them. I'm sure you appreciate that.

MR. NADIG: Yeah, no, and I do. And I apologize, Your Honor. That's partially my fault.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. NADIG: It's probably 70 me, 30 them. I will say though that as the objection as to prior bad acts, I am going to remove that objection and I'm going to ask that if you do deem it admissible, that it is played without a redaction as to the bad act. That is for a strategic purpose, Your Honor.

THE COURT: That's okay.

MR. NADIG: And I just need to put that on there.

THE COURT: All right, that's noted. Anything else anybody wants to say on this?

MR. NADIG: Briefly, Your Honor, what was I going to say?

THE COURT: All right. You were going to try to --

MR. NADIG: Okay.

THE COURT: -- distinguish the dying declaration case.

MR. NADIG: I -- well, what I was actually going to talk about is, Your Honor, in the first 3 minutes, 30 seconds, they get a description. They get baby daddy. They get what he's wearing. They get his ethnicity. They get his hair. They get all the identification purposes. Medical is called, but then, it switches hold on, I think we have what's his name. And then, it changes to Jason Bolden.

Before they had had his descriptors, so they had done the initial information and things of that nature. Then it's going to change once medical and everything's there to this is now gearing towards prosecution.

THE COURT: All right, so I'm going to listen to it. Tell me the point in time. Raise your hand when you think it's the point in time when it should not be submitted.

MR. LEXUS: One last thing.

THE COURT: Yes, sir.

MR. LEXUS: I ask you pay attention to the emergency doctor in this case as well. Just because they're getting a name, that goes to the ongoing emergency.

1	You just have a guy that is shot up apartment. Absolutely,
2	they're going to try to inquire the name in order to locate this individual,
3	which fits that case on an ongoing emergency. All these
4	THE COURT: Understood.
5	MR. LEXUS: statements.
6	THE COURT: Yeah, before you play it, just give me two more
7	minutes to finish reading the sections
8	MR. SCARBOROUGH: Yes, yes, Your Honor.
9	THE COURT: from the <u>Bryant</u> case.
10	MR. SCARBOROUGH: Okay.
11	[Pause]
12	THE COURT: Very well. Let's hear it.
13	MR. SCARBOROUGH: May I approach, Your Honor?
14	THE COURT: Yes.
15	MR. SCARBOROUGH: How I can just disclose I can just
16	give you the laptop if you'd like and press play.
17	THE COURT: I rather not have the technology. I'd rather just
18	listen. You can play it, right.
19	MR. SCARBOROUGH: Sure. I pressed play.
20	THE COURT: Okay. Where would that be right here? Okay.
21	[Playing of 911 recording, admitted as Exhibit 125]
22	THE COURT: That was it?
23	MR. SCARBOROUGH: I believe so, yes.
24	THE COURT: All right, so isn't it necessary to obtain a
25	description in order to determine if there's an ongoing threat and who's

4 5

7

8

6

10 11

12 13

14 15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22 23

24

25

posing that threat?

MR. NADIG: Potentially, that's I mean, the analysis you make, veah.

THE COURT: Well, I mean. I think the Bryant case indicates in circumstances like this where, you know, you're trying to get the information to neutralize the threat.

It hasn't switched over to, you know, a nonemergency situation where, you know, you're bringing the -- you have the person in custody or you -- everyone's calmed down and you're over to at the police station. I mean or, you know, everybody at the scene is secured and safe and medical treatment is being provided.

I mean, here, we don't even have the -- to be honest with you, I don't think at any point in this 911 call that the discussion turns from nontestimonial to testimonial. I think it all is appropriately admitted.

MR. NADIG: And, Your Honor, I actually thought -- one of the reasons I was going to ask that the gun part stay in is I thought she said it was a .9 millimeter but I didn't hear that. The basis was that the shooting was a .45. So I would ask that he stole my gun to be redacted?

MR. SCARBOROUGH: Okay, and that's totally fair. We would just need time for --

THE COURT: Yeah.

MR. SCARBOROUGH: -- to get that out.

THE COURT: I agree that's the proper thing to do.

MR. SCARBOROUGH: Fair. I --

THE COURT: So let's redact it. It is going to come in. I believe

MR. NADIG: Judge, one second.

[Counsel confer]

MR. SCARBOROUGH: Madam Clerk, here's the 911 call, thank you.

THE COURT: Do we need to -- Mr. Nadig, do we need to introduce the entire 911 call so it's part of the record without going to the jury to preserve it for review by the supreme court if it's --

MR. NADIG: I would request that, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Yes, we'll go ahead and mark it then as an exhibit not admitted for review by the supreme court so they can know the context in which this discussion occurred, all right?

MR. NADIG: And, Your Honor --

THE COURT: So it's a court exhibit. It's going to be a court Exhibit A, all right?

MR. SCARBOROUGH: Do you want us to make a copy of that?

THE COURT: Isn't that what you just handed her?

MR. SCARBOROUGH: Oh, yeah, I thought we were -- needed two copies. Do you want to go back and --

MR. NADIG: Well, that one would stay as 122A. The redacted one would be a new exhibit, correct? Because we're redacting the portion of the gun, so that would be a new exhibit.

THE COURT: Well, whatever was the original number for this CD.

MR. SCARBOROUGH: It's 122.

1 THE COURT: All right, why --2 MR. LEXUS: I'm sorry, I'm making this more complicated than I wanted. 3 MR. NADIG: 125. So 125 is the unredacted or are we saying 4 125A will be? 5 THE COURT: 125, the unredacted. Now the Court is ordering 6 7 that becomes a court exhibit. 8 MR. SCARBOROUGH: Thank you. THE COURT: All right, it's no longer an exhibit of record. MR. SCARBOROUGH: Yes. THE COURT: And 125A will now be submitted to the Court Clerk for admission over objection of defense counsel and it constitutes the redacted portion of the 911 call. MR. NADIG: And that's still subject to foundation, though, correct? THE COURT: Still subject to your objection as the foundation. I want to make sure the record's clear to preserve all of your arguments. MR. NADIG: Thank you, Your Honor. THE COURT: All right, let's bring the jury. MR. NADIG: Additionally, the only thing is we have four additional photos. These are the ones that are Facebook photos. The State intends to introduce them through their D.A. investigator to prove a relationship between Mr. Bolden and Ms. Coleman. The only photo that --THE COURT: I think we heard about that already, right, so.

MR. LEXUS: That there's an ongoing relationship, absolutely.

And that goes with our other document showing that he can -- she continues to make calls to him after the --

THE COURT: And what does that show? What element of your case does that relate to?

MR. LEXUS: Judge, this whole thing is based on the reason why she's not --

THE COURT: Just need to put it in the record.

MR. LEXUS: Yes, she's -- this case is based on these witnesses not showing up because they don't want to implicate the Defendant as being the shooter.

THE COURT: Goes to lack of cooperation, which you --

MR. LEXUS: What?

THE COURT: -- would argue at closing argument.

MR. LEXUS: Correct.

MR. NADIG: Correct. And, Your Honor, my response to that is there's allegations that Mr. Bolden dissuaded witnesses in any way, shape, or form, or influenced witnesses in any way, shape, or form.

It does not address issues with the actual elements of the case. This is just simply attempting to prejudice the jury as to Mr. Bolden showing that he has an ongoing relationship and suggesting that he has something to do with her not being here, which should that be the case, there should have been an added charge of dissuading a witness, which is there is not.

And the implication that they're providing through this testimony

is that Mr. Bolden is dissuading the witness and there's no evidence to show that.

MR. LEXUS: There's no reason to dissuade a witness. The fact that you're the mother of the man's child, you don't have to be on a phone call or listening to somebody saying, hey, don't know up to court because X, Y, Z. The very nature -- foundation of the relationship they have and having a kid together, that's what we're getting this out, an ongoing communication shows that -- why is she not here to testify? And why is we're not able to put her on the stand, and cross her, or ask her statements consistent with the 911 because of their ongoing family relationship.

THE COURT: What's the date of the incident again?

MR. SCARBOROUGH: The date of the incident happened July

1st. 2018.

THE COURT: All right, let me look at the Facebook photo.

[Counsel confer]

MR. LEXUS: This coincides with that as well, Your Honor, showing ongoing -- placing transferred money to him, which is after this incident. And of course, we wouldn't phrase that as putting money on the books. We would just characterized that as transferring money.

THE COURT: Well, that's -- so that's -- is this a separate exhibit that you're offering then?

MR. NADIG: No.

THE COURT: The transfer of monies?

MR. LEXUS: Yes, that's all separate.

MR. SCARBOROUGH: Yeah.

THE COURT: Is that what's subject to an objection? What exhibit number is that?

MR. NADIG: What I --

MR. SCARBOROUGH: Should be on the back, Your Honor.

THE COURT: 117 and 118.

MR. SCARBOROUGH: Well, the one that you're holding in 117, that certification just --

THE COURT: Oh.

MR. NADIG: -- the record certification accompanying the CCDC records.

THE COURT: So these are monies transferred into his account when he was locked up?

MR. SCARBOROUGH: Correct.

MR. NADIG: But Your Honor, how is that relevant to the case at large? How is an ongoing --

THE COURT: Well, it sounds like she gave a certain story that's favorable to the prosecution and now she's not -- now she doesn't want to do that.

MR. NADIG: Okay, but how is that relevant -- you know, the implication becomes that Mr. Bolden had something to do with that. You know, they said that she's not cooperative. And they're saying, well, the reason she's not cooperative is they have an ongoing relationship. Okay, which --

THE COURT: Do you have anything else that would --

MR. SCARBOROUGH: This is when he is in custody.

THE COURT: So how long -- how many months after the event?

MR. SCARBOROUGH: Not even a month.

THE COURT: Or not even a month. So --

MR. SCARBOROUGH: Yeah, it's like so the event

happened --

THE COURT: So July 1 and this is July --

MR. SCARBOROUGH: Correct. And this is just for the Court's edification. Mr. Bolden was not taken into custody immediately after the event. That's why we proposed a flight instruction.

THE COURT: Well, it says shortly after, he was in custody.

MR. SCARBOROUGH: Okay.

THE COURT: And there was a call. Let me hear the call?

MR. SCARBOROUGH: Sure. And, Your Honor, just to give you context, I've highlighted the minutes. We actually hear on the call Mr. Bolden say they're going to snatch you up. They're going -- they're probably going to snatch you up talking about a hearing. And conveniently enough, we had a material witness warrant before the preliminary hearing.

And also, Brandi Coleman, who will be identified by the detective based on her voice and that voice recognition, along with the number that she gave on that 911 call associated with this record.

She actually says at -- that close to the 1:22 mark that she's aware of the hearing and that she doesn't want to come.

MR. NADIG: Okay, Your Honor, how does that, once again, impact -- my client should have no influence in that offer of proof.

They're going to snatch you up is a statement of fact. There's a material witness warrant. You know, and then her saying something to the effect of I don't want to cooperate, he's not the one suggesting it.

She's the one saying it. He didn't offer it.

That's -- once again, what they're doing is they're creating this inference that Mr. Bolden has caused people to not be here.

THE COURT: Can't you introduce evidence to --

MR. NADIG: What?

THE COURT: -- allow the jury to draw a reasonable inference?

MR. NADIG: But is it a reasonable inference? Is it relevant to the case at hand? The case at hand has to do with shooting. If there's something about dissuading a witness, there's no charge. There's no dissuading a witness charge here.

MR. SCARBOROUGH: And, Your Honor, again, as what Mr. Lexus reiterated before, we're not sitting up here trying to say and I won't get up in closing nor will Mr. Lexus get up in rebuttal and say Jason Bolden did the shooting and then he told everyone not to come to Court. That's not what we're saying here.

The theme and what we're trying to prove and show, as we did in opening, is that Brandi Coleman's uncooperative. And we're going to argue to the jury, listen, use your common sense. Not everyone wants to cooperate. This is why, you know, the State doesn't have all the evidence that it does and that's why she's not on the stand.

We're not going to put them -- we're not going to have them in the box thinking, oh, we're going to parade Brandi Coleman and everyone up there.

We got to let them know that, hey, we have witnesses that aren't cooperative. This shows that she's not cooperative. This shows her state of mind, saying she doesn't want to come to the hearing, that she's aware of it. We're not saying that Jason Bolden did it.

THE COURT: But just because it's her state of mind doesn't mean he influenced her.

MR. SCARBOROUGH: We --

MR. NADIG: We're not --

THE COURT: It shows that she --

MR. SCARBOROUGH: We agree, we agree.

MR. LEXUS: We can argue 100 percent. We're not going to up here and try to say this man dissuaded her. We're trying to say --

THE COURT: Why she didn't show up?

MR. LEXUS: -- look at her relationship.

MR. SCARBOROUGH: Correct. Yes.

MR. LEXUS: She's got a baby with him. She's continuing to send him money. She's continuing to talk to him. She's continuing to post Facebook pictures with him on it. Therefore, that's the reason why she doesn't want to come, due to the relationship. We're not trying to say that he's dissuading her.

THE COURT: Anything else?

MR. NADIG: The problem is the implication, Your Honor,

because then, you know, why don't I get out there and say there's a jury instruction that says that I'm not allowed to comment on witnesses who didn't testify or the State didn't call. Now --

THE COURT: It's almost -- let me -- it's almost as if and I don't know what the law is on this to be honest with you. It's almost as if the State is saying the reason why we don't have more evidence is because she wouldn't testify and you should give more weight to us than the defense.

MR. NADIG: And but that's what that is.

THE COURT: And it kind of -- to me, it seems like it kind of, you know, makes it -- really doesn't it shift some of the burden to the Defense to say.

MR. LEXUS: And no.

THE COURT: You know, we -- but he -- how can he overcome the implication you create?

MR. LEXUS: Judge, if you want to instruct the jury when they testify, this evidence is not offered to show any type of dissuasion on the part of the Defendant. It's there to show the relationship. That's exactly what we're going to argue and that's exactly what it's offered for.

We'll go as far as doing that. But with these pictures and this evidence takes the stand. You are they -- this is to be -- I'll even say it when I'm introducing. This is to be offered for --

THE COURT: But I understand that, but how -- I mean, you're elements are, you know, he did the act, had the intent. What has that got to do with her intent and not showing up?

MR. SCARBOROUGH: Well, Your Honor, it goes to the entire culture of the case.

THE COURT: And I see you shaking your head. I need the -- I need to better understand this.

MR. LEXUS: Judge, it's the entire case. This -- they're going to have a 911 come in and then everyone's saying, you know, that this man's implicated, but then, no one's here because they -- the one guy is probably scared. This one -- this girl --

THE COURT: Probably is.

MR. LEXUS: -- we have evidence. Both the brothers are scared.

And this girl, we have ample evidence, the reason she's not here to implicate anybody or to take the stand is because she still loves the man or -- and at least has a relationship with him.

MR. SCARBOROUGH: And, Your Honor, it's the same case, too, also as a domestic violence -- it's the same type of case.

MR. NADIG: No, it's not.

MR. SCARBOROUGH: It's the same --

MR. NADIG: It's not charged as domestic violence.

THE COURT: Yeah.

MR. NADIG: And, Your Honor, I'm interrupting because they're both attacking me and they've cut me off repeatedly. I'm a little bit annoyed right now. So let me just get this out.

THE COURT: I'll give you the last word. Let's --

MR. NADIG: All right.

THE COURT: Let them finish. You get the last word because it's your objection.

MR. SCARBOROUGH: I apologize to Mr. Nadig. I don't mean to be rude.

THE COURT: That's all right.

MR. SCARBOROUGH: I'm sorry. I -- that's what the changes that we're alluding to. It is a domestic violence situation. And I understand that it's not charged as a domestic violence.

We're not sitting up here saying Jason Bolden abused Brandi.

He made her not come into Court because he threatened her and threatened their child. We're not saying that.

But, Your Honor, DV cases, gang-related cases with uncooperative witnesses alike, they wouldn't exist. They wouldn't exist without the State being able to come up and walk in front of the jury and say, listen, ladies and gentlemen, not every witness comes up to the stand and wants to point someone out.

And in opening, Mr. Nadig said no one's going to ID the shooter, that my -- the shooter wasn't there. My client wasn't there.

And a part of that in our case, our burden is to show, yeah, you know what? We don't have people here, but we are entitled to explain why, and the relationship and what we're trying to allude including this evidence, the Facebook postings, the posting money on his books, the jail call where she's aware of the hearing saying she's not going to come and all this stuff, we're presenting that to the jury to let them know, hey, listen, Brandi doesn't want to come.

Brandi doesn't want to come. This is an uncooperative witness. It's literally just like a DV case, but we're not charging him with DV. I understand that, but without evidence like that and evidence to show to the jury, hey, some people don't cooperate all the time.

Some people don't want to get on the stand, then we're left with no case. Then DV cases and gang cases alike, they would never exist, Your Honor.

Uncooperative witnesses would rule the -- would run the courthouse. We would never be able to elicit that, hey, you didn't want to identify someone, did you? You didn't want to point him out in court. Why didn't you want to point him out in court? There's something to be said that for the State's ability to allow to introduce that testimony. And that's what we're trying to do here.

To echo what Mr. Lexus said, we can -- you can issue an instruction saying, listen, we're not trying to like allude -- like allude to any way that he is the someone who caused her not to come. We're not saying that.

We're saying that the scope of their relationship is why she's not here and we're showing evidence to prove the scope of that relationship and why.

That's our case. He got up there and said no one can ID him.

And we don't have everyone to come and ID. And we have to explain why. It's our burden.

MR. NADIG: Your Honor, I got this charge dismissed at prelim, okay? They filed an Information by affidavit. What they're attempting to

do is they're attempting to go outside of the elements of the case.

Unless there is a -- an issue showing that Mr. Bolden had something to do with her not being here, that is irrelevant. They have a witness who they want to say, yes, she does all these things. That is irrelevant. You did not produce this person. There's was malfeasance on Mr. Bolden's part to not produce that individual.

We cannot then create this implication. You fell for the implication already that they're scared. No, they're not scared. In all likelihood, they probably want to get him on the streets and shoot him. He lives in North Dakota -- South Dakota now. He's nowhere in town. He does not exert any influence over these people.

So you yourself fell for the implication they want you to fall for, which is that they're scared to testify against this individual, who doesn't even live here.

And they're suggesting to you that all of this information is relevant, but it's not. This is a shooting. This is somebody got shot and these are the facts.

Whether somebody's here or not is not relevant to their case, but it is very persuasive to suggest that Mr. Bolden is a bad man, even though that's not the case.

And I don't have the ability to rebut anything that they're attempting to introduce regarding that relationship. Or in addition to that to rebut this idea that they're afraid other than cross-examination. And I don't have it. I do not have it.

So what you are doing is you're taking something outside the

scope and you're trying to introduce it, so that you can use it by implication in a manner that is improper.

THE COURT: I'm not going to let it in, all right, either the DVD or this evidence. To me, it creates a wholly -- it creates an inference that the Defendant did something wrong, that he had some unfair, undue influence over the witness.

The only way that Mr. Nadig would be able to rebut that would be call her on the stand. It forces him to put on testimony to defend against the charges --

MR. SCARBOROUGH: And, Your Honor --

THE COURT: But I mean, I don't see that it's relevant to any of the elements of your case in chief.

MR. SCARBOROUGH: And Your Honor, I --

THE COURT: Unless you had a case for me to read that would say otherwise, which you don't, we already take an hour and 10 minutes, I don't have any legal authority in front of me that would allow me to introduce this evidence.

And I do see how it's -- I mean, how can we not? It is prejudicial against the Defendant.

MR. SCARBOROUGH: In terms of just her and his relationship?

THE COURT: Yeah, it does. It creates the inference that, you know, they had -- she was scared, there was a shooting. After the fact, you know, they're still together. It creates the inference that he's still had influence over her and exercise that influence to keep her from testifying.

Honor?

I get that feeling from this. And that would put -MR. SCARBOROUGH: Even with a limiting instruction, Your

THE COURT: Yeah, even with a limiting instruction, because once they hear it, the limiting instruction, we all know that. Once it's in, you know, once it's in, they're going to convict him, all right? So --

MR. SCARBOROUGH: I mean, that's fair. I just -- for my record --

THE COURT: I -- yeah go ahead.

MR. SCARBOROUGH: -- I do think it's just like a DV case. I think along that line of logic, I mean, the DV cases and those alike, they wouldn't exist. I mean, we wouldn't be able to prosecute those cases.

And again, I understand that Your Honor's saying that there's -- there may be some perception of undue influence, but I think that's particularly --

THE COURT: It's not a perception. I think it leads to a strong circumstance or a strong -- it leads a jury to have strong feelings that there might have been that undue influence. So I think that would be unduly prejudicial here.

MR. SCARBOROUGH: Okay.

THE COURT: Maybe there's cases where it comes in. I'm just not feeling it here. I really think it's too prejudicial here.

MR. SCARBOROUGH: And would also --

THE COURT: I'm not going to change my mind, but please make your record.

MR. SCARBOROUGH: No, that's fair. And I would also disagree about being able to rebut it. I mean, if we're talking about undue influence on Brandi Coleman, he's sitting right there. He can take the stand.

MR. NADIG: Oh, Your Honor.

MR. SCARBOROUGH: We're not forcing him to take the stand.

MR. NADIG: You --

MR. SCARBOROUGH: We can introduce the evidence and he can decide whether or not he can put up a case to rebut it. We're not -- he's not -- his hands aren't tied behind his back. He can go up and he could take the stand and say --

THE COURT: Yeah.

MR. SCARBOROUGH: -- I have no influence over Brandi.

Brandi doesn't want to come because she doesn't want to come. Yeah,
we're together. She has my child. That's about it. I mean, see --

THE COURT: But it forces --

MR. SCARBOROUGH: I'm not forcing him.

THE COURT: It kind of -- it does force him to take the stand to rebut the inference you create by not having more evidence. That just didn't seem right.

MR. NADIG: Which is the textbook definition of burden shifting.

THE COURT: Yeah, that's what I thought kind of at the beginning. So, again, and again, guys, I -- this is last minute. I don't have a case in front of me, but --

MR. LEXUS: Okay, so Judge, you're eliminating the Facebook

found out about, oh, that's why we need the material witness warrant because she's refusing to come. She doesn't want to be served. It's impractical to serve her.

MR. LEXUS: So I'm just going to have him talk about all the things -- what he's done to secure and whether or not got a subpoena for them or not.

And I'll tell him to not talk about the jail calls, the putting the money on the books and the Facebook. Just with that said, if Mr. Nadig comes up there and starts grilling him on you should have done this, this, and this, I'll want to approach Your Honor --

THE COURT: That might open the door.

MR. NADIG: Your Honor, just for the record, I object to this testimony at all because it's not relevant. You know, how is it relevant that I mean, I -- how is it relevant that he's going to get out there and say I tried to get him? Like how is that relevant to the case?

MR. SCARBOROUGH: She's a named victim in the case.

THE COURT: I'm going to let that in, all right?

MR. NADIG: Okay.

THE COURT: I won't have any more discussion on that. I can see how that would be potentially relevant.

MR. SCARBOROUGH: Okay.

THE COURT: And that's not unduly prejudicial there. That will come in.

Look, maybe I'm not wrong on this. I'm not sure. I don't have the authority. That's what I think fairness dictates in this case, all right?

witnesses.

THE COURT: Can we go till 1? Let me ask my staff. Is that okay? If you have any reservations about it, I don't mind.

THE MARSHAL: That's fine with us, Judge.

MR. SCARBOROUGH: My apologies to the Court and the staff. I appreciate the patience. Thank you for hearing the arguments. I understand. I'm sorry.

THE COURT: Last minute arguments, you know, I do the best I can. Let's go ahead and bring the jurors in.

[The Judge confers with the Clerk]

THE COURT: So to the extent we can, I'd really like to minimize objections in this part. I mean, obviously, I'm not prohibiting you from doing it, but -- and remember, we always have the ability to do a motion to strike.

MR. NADIG: Your Honor, for the record, I think they're calling Officer Jegge next.

MR. SCARBOROUGH: Not right now. We're calling the independent witness Joshua Knowlton.

MR. NADIG: Okay.

MR. SCARBOROUGH: That's -- he lived in the apartment. I don't think you're going to have much cross. I [indiscernible].

THE COURT: Thank you, counsel.

MR. SCARBOROUGH: Yeah, and this witness will be relatively short. I believe our line-up will be Joshua Knowlton, then Investigator Keith Gross, and then possibly a break.

1	over her	over here?		
2	Α	Yes.		
3	Q	Okay, now if you could, you can actually mark on that screen		
4	kind of li	ke John Madden like on football.		
5	Α	Okay.		
6	Q	Kind of give us a direction of where your apartment is in relation		
7	to that pi	inpointed apartment?		
8	А	Okay, I am right over here. No, not that way.		
9	Q	So that's all still in the apartment complex area?		
10	А	Yeah.		
11	Q	And you're in that area where the first or the second dot was?		
12	А	Second dot.		
13	Q	The second square dot?		
14	А	Yeah.		
15		THE COURT: Sometimes the calibration is off a little bit.		
16		MR. SCARBOROUGH: Fair.		
17		THE WITNESS: That's my fault, I missed it.		
18		THE COURT: Okay.		
19	BY MR. S	SCARBOROUGH:		
20	Q	Okay, so to give a little bit of context, so you're out on your back		
21	porch?			
22	А	Yeah.		
23	Q	Where would you be facing? What street would you be faced		
24	on your	on your back porch?		
25	Α	Vegas Valley.		

1	Q	So you are looking this way?	
2	А	I'm looking at like Vegas or excuse me, am I no, looking	
3	Vegas Valley, right, this way.		
4	Q	This way?	
5	Α	Yeah.	
6	Q	Okay.	
7	Α	Yeah, so I'm looking straight.	
8	Q	Okay, so again, so on that map, can you please you talked	
9	about you heard gunshots, yes?		
10	Α	Yeah.	
11	Q	I mean, to be fair, I mean, how do you know they were	
12	gunshots?		
13	Α	I don't know for sure.	
14	Q	Were they loud, clapping sounds?	
15	А	Yeah.	
16	Q	Okay, do you recall the succession or the cadence of those	
17	sounds?		
18	А	Just you I would say about three or four quick pops.	
19	Q	Quick pops?	
20	Α	Yeah.	
21	Q	One right after the other?	
22	Α	Yeah.	
23	Q	All right, so after you heard those quick pops, remind the jury	
24	what time	e did you hear those in the morning?	
25	А	I would say around 8 or 9. I don't know.	

1	Q	In between that hour?		
2	Α	Yeah, somewhere around there.		
3	Q	So after you hear those quick pops, what do you do? Do you		
4	look ove	r to the direction where you believe they're coming from?		
5	А	Yeah, I notice a girl in the back of her trunk over in that way.		
6	And she	runs inside. And then, that's when I noticed, you know, the male		
7	coming across the apartment complex.			
8	Q	So can you draw a line on that screen where of the pathway		
9	where you see that male running, if you can?			
10	Α	Okay, so right there.		
11	Q	Okay, so do you see him running in the direction from where		
12	you star	you started or where you ended?		
13	Α	Right, where I ended at.		
14	Q	That's		
15	Α	So that's where I'm looking in that direction, that way.		
16	Q	Okay, so that's your vision path?		
17	Α	Yeah.		
18	Q	Draw the path where you see the person running?		
19	Α	Oh, running?		
20	Q	Where his path?		
21	Α	Okay, so it's just		
22	Q	Okay.		
23	Α	here and then there.		
24	Q	All right, so for the record, you drew that line and it was across		
25	Vegas V	'alley like you indicated before?		
- 1				

1	A	Yeah.		
2	Q	Can you recall any specific descriptors as best as you can		
3	about th	nat person?		
4	A	Specifically, no.		
5	Q	What race?		
6	A	He was a black male for sure.		
7	Q	Okay.		
8	A	He was wearing a big coat and jumped into a you want me to		
9	tell			
10	Q	Please?		
11	A	the name the car? Okay, it was a gold Cadillac CTS that he		
12	jumped into.			
13	Q	Okay, and where did that person that male, that African		
14	America	an male you described as running? Was the Cadillac located at		
15	the end	the end of the line that you just drew?		
16	A	Yes.		
17	Q	Okay, did you see that person get into what side of the		
18	vehicle did you see that person get into?			
19	A	Driver's side.		
20	Q	Okay, were you able to get close enough to make a plate out of		
21	that vehicle?			
22	A	No.		
23	Q	No? Were you able to get close enough to identify any facial		
24	features	s of that man?		
25	A	No.		
	1			

1		THE COURT: Uh-huh. Yeah.
2		MR. SCARBOROUGH: Nothing further from this witness.
3		THE COURT: All right, any cross-exam?
4		MR. NADIG: Yes, Your Honor.
5		CROSS-EXAMINATION
6	BY MR. N	NADIG:
7	Q	How you doing, Josh?
8	Α	Good, how's it going?
9	Q	Good. All right, so Josh, and I'm going to point and I cleared it
10	so that v	ve could draw because it's like my five-year old with her drawing
11	sometim	es. But you were located at this apartment, correct?
12	Α	Correct.
13	Q	Okay, now if we look, can you just put a put your thumb right
14	there so	everybody can see where it was. Mark it.
15	Α	Yeah.
16	Q	Right there. Okay, and you're outside on your deck, right?
17	Α	Correct.
18	Q	Is it a first story or second story deck?
19	Α	First story.
20	Q	Okay, so do you have like a pony wall? Do you have a big wall,
21	anything like that?	
22	Α	I got a little, you know, wall in front of me, probably.
23	Q	So like roughly the size of the witness stand?
24	А	Yeah, I had yeah.
25	Q	And you're a tall guy. You're not short, right?

1	A	Yeah.
2	Q	So you can see it?
3	A	Yeah.
4	Q	Okay, and so, you're looking in that direction. And if we look at
5	that, it lo	ooks like 2883 Wheelwright is marked. Can you put a dot there?
6	A	Yeah.
7	Q	Okay. Now it looks like, and tell me if I'm wrong, there's a bit of
8	a one	of the other apartments is in your way; is that true?
9	A	Correct, yeah.
10	Q	Okay, so did you see how many people were in front of that
11	2883 Wheelwright house?	
12	A	I did not know I didn't have a view behind the first view of
13	apartme	nts, no.
14	Q	Okay, so you didn't actually see that building at all?
15	A	No.
16	Q	Okay, but you did hear what you believe was three or four pops,
17	right?	
18	A	Correct.
19	Q	So like pop, pop, pop?
20	A	Yes.
21	Q	Okay, so the three or four pops are right there. And then you're
22	like, oh,	my God. So you look in that direction, right?
23	A	Right.
24	Q	Okay. And when you look in that direction, you said you saw
25	you belie	eved a female, right?

		Thatle in correct. No. a male	
1	A	That's incorrect. No, a male.	
2	Q	Okay, you saw a male, but you also said you saw a female run	
3		apartment?	
4	A	Yeah, yeah,	
5	Q	What apartment did that female run into, the 2883?	
6	A	I couldn't tell you for sure.	
7	Q	Okay, did you see any other gentlemen besides that one	
8	gentleman?		
9	Α	No.	
10	Q	Okay, so you just saw a female go into an apartment you don't	
11	know which one?		
12	Α	No.	
13	Q	Okay, and then you saw this gentleman in a big coat, right?	
14	Α	Correct.	
15	Q	Get was he wearing jeans?	
16	Α	I don't know for sure. I couldn't I didn't spend I didn't see	
17	any jean	s or shorts or anything like that.	
18	Q	Okay, but it was July?	
19	Α	Right.	
20	Q	Like the jacket had to be a little weird, right?	
21	А	That's right.	
22	Q	Okay, and then, you knew he was black, but beyond that, you	
23	didn't?		
24	А	Couldn't tell you anything else.	
25	Q	Okay. And then, even and it looks there's some trees in the	

1	park and	you said he ran over in this direction down here with the trees	
2	and the parks and everything. You could still see him running?		
3	А	Yes.	
4	Q	Okay. And I'm guessing you know cars, because you identified	
5	not only t	he make but the model as well?	
6	А	Uh-huh.	
7	Q	Okay, so that's is that a yes?	
8	А	Yes.	
9	Q	Okay, so you saw him get in a gold Cadillac CTS?	
10	А	Correct.	
11	Q	Okay, and then he took off in that gold Cadillac CTS?	
12	А	Yes.	
13	Q	Didn't see that gentleman with a gun?	
14	А	No.	
15	Q	Okay, and you just saw him running from the area where you	
16	believe th	nat the shots occurred?	
17	А	Correct.	
18	Q	Okay, and the only thing you notice is a black dude in the big	
19	jacket?		
20	А	That's correct.	
21	Q	All right, nothing further.	
22		THE COURT: Mr. Scarborough, any redirect?	
23		MR. SCARBOROUGH: No redirect, Your Honor.	
24		THE COURT: All right, Mr. Knowlton, you're excused.	
25		THE WITNESS: Okay, thank you.	

1	А	I was.
2	Q	Do you see that person in Court today?
3	Α	I do.
4	Q	Do you see that person in Court today?
5	Α	I do.
6	Q	Can you please point to him and identify for me the color shirt
7	he's wea	aring?
8	Α	Blue shirt over there.
9		MR. LEXUS: Your Honor, let the record reflect the witness
10	identified the Defendant.	
11		THE COURT: So noted.
12	BY MR. L	EXUS:
13	Q	Sir, did you eventually in our office try to effectuate subpoenas
14	for one E	Bryson Martinez, Brenton Martinez, Brandi Coleman, Shakiesha
15	Geter, and Sanyleh Coleman?	
16	Α	Yes, I have.
17	Q	Or Sanyleh Coleman, whichever one it was.
18	Α	That's correct.
19	Q	Okay. With regards to Bryson Martinez, was our office able to
20	secure a	a subpoena for him for a what's called a preliminary hearing
21	months ago?	
22	Α	Yes, our office did.
23	Q	Okay, how about for this trial?
24	A	I was not able to locate him.
25	Q	Okay, he's currently unable to be located?
	1	

1	A	That's correct.
2	Q	How about Brenton Martinez, was a subpoena secured for him
3	for prelin	minary hearing?
4	A	That it was.
5	Q	And for trial?
6	A	That's correct.
7	Q	And how was his demeanor?
8		MR. NADIG: Your Honor?
9		THE WITNESS: Some
10		MR. NADIG: Can we approach?
11		THE COURT: Yes.
12		[Bench conference]
13		MR. NADIG: I'm going to object to the demeanor his served the
14	subpoer	na. Mr. Martinez is going to come and testify. So his demeanor
15	would n	ot be relevant to, you know, anything.
16		If they need to rebut his testimony after the fact, that might be
17	one thin	g, but at this point, I would object as to the relevance of his
18	demean	or for receiving the subpoena.
19		THE COURT: He's going to be
20		MR. NADIG: What?
21		THE COURT: He's going to be here?
22		MR. NADIG: As far as I know he his.
23		MR. SCARBOROUGH: Brenton is, yeah.
24		MR. LEXUS: We're hoping he's going to be here, but you never
25	know. S	So that's why I said, yeah, it's really relevant as far as how he his

1	secure a	subpoena for her?
2	А	Yes, you did.
3	Q	And was one able to be obtained for preliminary hearing?
4	А	No.
5	Q	How about for this trial?
6	Α	For neither.
7	Q	Okay, in fact, did we then effectuate a material witness more for
8	her?	
9	А	We did further for the preliminary hearing and for this case.
10	Q	Which is currently outstanding?
11	А	That's correct.
12	Q	Describe for us, sir, what a material warrant is?
13	А	A material witness warrant is usually for someone that's not
14	cooperat	tive for our cases in that they're not wanting to either be located or
15	they're ju	ust refusing to come to court.
16	Q	And that warrant has been outstanding for some time?
17	Α	That is correct.
18	Q	Nothing further.
19		THE COURT: Cross-exam?
20		MR. NADIG: No questions, Your Honor.
21		THE COURT: All right, you're excused. Thank you.
22		Mr. Gross, thank you. Watch your step.
23		[Witness excused]
24		THE COURT: Any other witnesses at this time by the State?
25		MR. LEXUS: Let's can we approach, Judge?
- 1	1	

pretty chaotic. We had received notice that a subject had fled on foot and taken off in his vehicle. We attempted to locate the individual, which was negative. And I basically saw a black male with a gunshot to his abdomen, where officers were actually carrying the subject onto a stretcher.

Q And what do you do next?

A I see if I can help the individual. And I start talking to him, asking him what happened, who shot him, and I assist the officers when the individual's on the stretcher.

Q Now when you walk up and you see a situation like that, what's your purpose of asking them who shot them? Why are you doing that?

A To get more information, so that it could be relayed to our dispatcher, so we can get a better description of the subject and attempt to apprehend the subject.

Q When you went to go speak with the person that you saw that was shot, what was his condition?

A He looked in pretty dire straits. He had a gunshot wound to the lower abdomen, there was blood on his shirt, and it looked like medical was trying to treat his wounds.

Q Now at this point, when you're talking to someone with such a serious wound, what goals do you have in terms of speaking with that person?

A I try to get as much information as I can as to what happened, who did it, any information that would be helpful for the investigation going forward.

1	Q	Is that person in that photograph in this courtroom today?
2	A	Yes.
3	Q	Can you please point and identify that man and an article of
4	clothing	he's wearing for the record?
5	Α	The individual with a black button I'm sorry, blue button up
6	shirt.	
7		MR. SCARBOROUGH: The record would reflect identification
8	of the De	efendant.
9		THE COURT: So noted.
10		MR. SCARBOROUGH: Brief indulgence. Nothing further.
11		THE COURT: Cross-exam?
12		MR. NADIG: Thank you, Your Honor.
13		CROSS-EXAMINATION
14	BY MR. N	IADIG:
15	Q	Officer how are you doing?
16	А	Good and yourself?
17	Q	Good. Let me do a little house cleaning. One of the things is
18	you've te	estified earlier in this matter, correct?
19	А	Correct.
20	Q	And you testified at the preliminary hearing, right?
21	Α	Yes.
22	Q	Okay. And at that point in time, you did not mention that you
23	had conv	versation with Mr. Martinez, is that a fair statement? Had a
24	conversa	ation?

1	Q	Okay, and in fact, there was no mention of identifying a
2	gentlema	an with braids, correct?
3	А	I don't believe so.
4	Q	Okay. And so, is that something you forgot at the time of the
5	prelimina	ary hearing or
6	Α	It could be possible.
7	Q	Okay, and but you're saying today that you did have that
8	conversa	ation with Mr. Martinez?
9	Α	Yes.
10	Q	Okay, and he said it was an African American gentleman with
11	braids?	
12	А	Correct.
13	Q	Okay, now you said he was in dire straits, correct?
14	А	Correct.
15	Q	And you said he was shot?
16	А	Correct.
17	Q	And he had that through and through, right?
18	А	Yes.
19	Q	Okay, and so, medical came and got him, right?
20	А	Yes.
21	Q	Okay, and medical had to stabilize him, correct?
22	Α	Yes.
23	Q	Okay, and one of the things they have to stabilize and tell me if
24	you don'	t know. One of the things they have to do is administer pain
25	killing dru	ugs, correct?

1	Α	I'm not sure what they do to stabilize a victim.
2	Q	An individual who's shot?
3	А	Correct.
4	Q	Okay, and so, additionally, you had to wait for a little bit before
5	you cou	ld introduce that photo to Mr. Martinez, right?
6	А	Yes.
7	Q	And they had to treat them at the hospital, yes?
8	А	Yes.
9	Q	They had to stabilize him? Yes?
10	А	Yes.
11	Q	Okay. And so
12		MR. NADIG: Court's indulgence. For the record, I'm publishing
13	State's	106.
14	BY MR. I	NADIG:
15	Q	What we have here is we have something going into Mr.
16	Martine	z's arms, correct?
17	A	Yes.
18	Q	Okay. And was that in his arms at the time you talked to him?
19	A	Yes.
20	Q	Okay, and so, there were a number of things go in his arm,
21	right?	
22	A	I assume.
23	Q	Okay, you assume or you I'm asking if you saw it?
24	А	I saw the tube going into his arm, yes.
25	Q	Okay, and you said before he was in dire straits. When you

1	MR. SCARBOROUGH: and medical treatment and seeing	
2	whether or not he's under the influence and coherent.	
3	THE COURT: Well, let's see	
4	MR. SCARBOROUGH: because he's taking pain pills.	
5	THE COURT: well, let's	
6	MR. NADIG: He's not taking pills. He's been injected. It's a	
7	morphine drug.	
8	THE COURT: He doesn't know what that is. He doesn't know	
9	it's a [indiscernible].	
10	MR. NADIG: No, exactly, I know.	
11	THE COURT: But why don't you try to lay foundation	
12	MR. NADIG: Now [indiscernible].	
13	THE COURT: on whether he's competent in a	
14	nonspeculative matter to render an opinion on whether this	
15	MR. SCARBOROUGH: Exactly.	
16	THE COURT: he was under the influence or not.	
17	MR. NADIG: Okay.	
18	THE COURT: Objection, yeah, if there has to be appropriate	
19	foundation.	
20	MR. SCARBOROUGH: Thank you, Your Honor.	
21	THE COURT: Okay.	
22	[End bench conference]	
23	BY MR. NADIG:	
24	Q And so, you're trained under DUIs to develop this idea of	
25	reasonable suspicion via the test, right?	

4	A	Correct.
1		
2	Q	Again, so you look for objective clues of whether somebody's
3		e influence of specifically alcohol?
4	A	Correct.
5	Q	Okay, or specifically other substances?
6	А	Yes.
7	Q	And you're trained to identify those substances?
8	Α	Well, it depends. I mean
9	Q	In a general fashion? I mean, you're not an expert at this point
10	in time, correct?	
11		THE COURT: Was he done were you done with your
12	answer?	
13		THE WITNESS: Yes, I'm
14		THE COURT: Okay, go ahead.
15	BY MR. NADIG:	
16	Q	So you're not an expert in this area?
17	Α	Correct.
18	Q	But you've developed a basic knowledge as to how to identify
19	somebody under the influence?	
20	Α	Mainly alcohol through HGN, which is a Nystagmus of the eye
21	movemer	nts. You can see the eye stuttering.
22	Q	And there are relative field sobriety tests that you do, correct?
23	Α	Correct.
24	Q	Okay, but there are also objective signs that you look for, right,
25	the blood	shot eyes, things of that nature?

THE COURT: All right, officer, you may be excused. Thank you for your time.

THE WITNESS: Thank you.

[Witness excused]

THE COURT: Counsel, I think we should take lunch now.

MR. SCARBOROUGH: That is fair, yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right, ladies and gentlemen of the jury, I want you back here at 2:05. During this recess, you're admonished as soon as I find my admonishment. I don't have it.

So you're admonished not to form any opinions. Don't talk to anybody about the facts of this case. Don't talk to any witnesses, attorneys, or Defendant in any capacity.

Don't do any research or investigation, don't go take a view of the scene, and don't do any of the other things I told you before not to do, okay? Thank you very much. You are excused --

THE MARSHAL: All rise for the jury.

THE COURT: -- for one hour. See you at 2:05.

THE MARSHAL: All rise for the jury.

[Outside the presence of the jury]

THE COURT: Outside the presence of the jury. We can go off the record now?

MR. SCARBOROUGH: Yes, Your Honor. I missed the return time. I apologize. What time?

THE COURT: So 2:05 please. And just FYI, I don't know why this device is blinking on the bench here. Maybe we can get that fixed

1	THE COURT: All right, Marshal.
2	THE MARSHAL: Okay.
3	All rise for the jury. All jurors are present.
4	[In the presence of the jury]
5	THE COURT: Please be seated, everybody. The State may
6	call its next witness.
7	MR. SCARBOROUGH: The State calls Brenton Martinez.
8	May I approach, Your Honor?
9	THE COURT: Yes.
10	All right, Mr. Martinez?
11	MR. MARTINEZ: Yes.
12	THE COURT: Welcome. Please remain standing. The Clerk
13	will give you your oath.
14	BRENTON MARTINEZ
15	[having been called as a witness and being first duly sworn, testified as
16	follows:]
17	THE CLERK: You may be seated. And then can you please
18	state and spell your first and last name for the record?
19	THE WITNESS: Brenton Martinez, B-R-E-N-T-O-N M-A-R-T-I-
20	N-E-Z.
21	THE CLERK: Thank you.
22	THE COURT: You may proceed, counsel.
23	DIRECT EXAMINATION
24	BY MR. SCARBOROUGH:
25	Q Mr. Martinez, how are you today?

1	A	I'm fine and yourself?
2	Q	I'm doing well. All right, I want to get some stuff out right in the
3	open.	You have a couple felony convictions, correct?
4	А	Yes.
5	Q	Okay, and those felony convictions are in 2009 in California,
6	one fo	r possession or purchase of a cocaine-base substance for sale?
7	Α	Yes.
8	Q	And the same in 2009 for possession or sale of marijuana?
9	Α	Yes.
10	Q	And you were on probation for those?
11	Α	Yes.
12	Q	And you successfully completed probation on those?
13	Α	Yes.
14	Q	Okay. All right, I want to take you to July 1st, 2018. Were you
15	at the	address of 2883 Wheelwright Drive?
16	Α	Yes.
17	Q	Who are you with that day?
18	Α	With my brother.
19	Q	What's your brother's name?
20	Α	Bryson.
21	Q	Bryson what?
22	Α	Martinez.
23	Q	Who else was there that day?
24	Α	His girlfriend Brandi, her cousin, and Brandi's daughter.
25	Q	Okay, when you say his girlfriend, you mean your brother's

1	girlfriend	girlfriend Brandi?		
2	A	Right, yes.		
3	Q	Okay. And Brandi's daughter, do you remember the daughter's		
4	name?			
5	A	I can't remember her name.		
6	Q	Is it Sanyleh?		
7	A	It sound familiar, yes.		
8	Q	Yes. Okay. Now in terms of your brother and the dating		
9	relationship with Brandi, were you aware that Brandi was in another			
10	relationship on and off at the time?			
11	A	It seemed like that was I was aware that she had a baby		
12	father.			
13	Q	And were you aware of who that baby's father was?		
14	A	Yeah, I heard about him, yes.		
15	Q	Yeah. You didn't know his name?		
16	A	No.		
17	Q	Okay. And you had not seen him prior to that day, fair?		
18	A	Fair.		
19	Q	Okay, so I want to walk towards later on in the morning around		
20	the morr	ning time when you were with all those people. Where are you at		
21	at that a	ddress in terms of inside or outside?		
22	A	I was outside with my brother.		
23	Q	Your brother being Bryson?		
24	A	Right.		
25	Q	Now did something happen in that morning that caused you to		

Probably like talk it out, but what's going on? You know what I'm saying? But he just kept his hand behind his back.

Then, he like acts -- like some type of question, asks my brother something. I can't even remember what the reply was, but then, that's when the pistol got developed.

- Q All right. So let's talk about that man. The man pulls a pistol, you're testifying to, yes?
 - A Yes.
 - Q Where does he retrieve that from?
 - A From behind his back.
- Q So I got to make a record of the gestures that you're making.

 So you with your right arm made a gesture that he was pulling a gun from behind his back, yes?
 - A Yes.
 - Q All right, you didn't see that gun prior to that gesture, yes?
 - A No.
- Q Okay. Now what happens after that? Describe the man who has the gun? Describe his movements with the gun?
- A Well, just then he asked my brother, later my brother I said I can't remember the reply. He pulled a gun up and he pointed towards my brother well in or direction.
- So I pushed my brother away. And as -- and I'm looking at, you know, and I'm trying to protect my little brother. So he cocked it and there's like steel jam and he cocked it again.

Then, was finally able to fire. By then, my brother was in the house

A Yes.

Q All right. So now that the bullet struck you, what happened to you next? Did you eventually make it into the house?

A Yes, I made it into the house. I came here. I had locked the door and went -- I made it into the house and I made it like past the kitchen and laid on the floor.

Q What do you recall going on when you are laying on the floor? Are more shots ringing off?

A I can't recall. I know my brother and everybody else, they were going to the back room. Like I said, I just laid on the floor and just laid there. That's --

Q Okay, do you recall hearing any strikes to the house or any glass breaking or anything like that?

A No, sir.

Q All right. You indicated that you laid down in the front area of the house; is that correct or the apartment?

A Yes.

Q Okay. Publishing State's 9. Is that a picture of the front area where you were laying?

A Yes, just walked through the front door. I was like right where this next wall is like behind that wall right there. There's a couch right there, so I was laying right behind the couch and the wall.

Q Okay. When you went into the house, and you were laying down, what were you doing?

A I was just laying on the floor. I called my brother and then

1	or somet	hing for me while I was waiting for the ambulance.
2	Q	All right. So, eventually, does this kind of event come to an
3	end? Ye	s?
4	A	Yes.
5	Q	So, eventually, does medical personnel respond to you?
6	A	Yes.
7	Q	All right, and were you taken to the hospital?
8	A	Yes.
9	Q	Now when you were taken to the hospital, eventually, did you
10	come into	contact with the a police officer?
11	A	Yes.
12	Q	Okay, and did that police officer show you a photo of the
13	suspect t	hey developed as the shooter?
14	Α	Yes.
15	Q	Okay, publishing State's 119A. Is this the patient that you
16	showed y	ou?
17	A	Yes.
18	Q	Is that the man you identified as being the shooter?
19	Α	Yes.
20	Q	Is that man in the courtroom here today?
21	Α	Yes.
22	Q	Can you please to point to them and identify an article of
23	clothing?	
24	Α	Blue shirt.
25	Q	Record reflect identification of the Defendant.

	1		
1		THE COURT: It does.	
2	BY MR. SCARBOROUGH:		
3	Q	Now admittedly, after this, there was a another hearing at	
4	which ye	ou testified, correct?	
5	A	Correct.	
6	Q	And at that hearing, you did not point out the man you pointed	
7	out toda	y; is that correct?	
8	A	Correct.	
9	Q	Why?	
10	A	Really, that's just not how I was raised. So I figured really I	
11	figure everything would have been over and blown over, you know. And		
12	then it comes to the point I say I still got to work. Like I say, I fend my		
13	kids.		
14	Kee	p getting subpoenas, I can't work from the subpoenas. I can't just	
15	pick up	and run. I can't afford it. Ain't no need to pick up and run, so I just	
16	have to	deal with the situation at hand.	
17	If it	would have stayed died down the way it was in the beginning, it	
18	would h	ave stayed like that, but I said I got to live. I got to keep going to	
19	work, bu	ut I can't afford it. Just keep getting subpoenaed being bothered	
20	by the s	ituation that I thought I let go already.	
21		MR. SCARBOROUGH: Brief indulgence. That is all nothing	
22	further.		
23		THE COURT: Thank you. Cross?	
24		MR. NADIG: Thanks.	

CROSS-EXAMINATION

25

		1
1	BY MR. N	ADIG:
2	Q	Good afternoon, Mr. Martinez.
3	А	Good afternoon.
4	Q	How are you doing today?
5	А	Fine and yourself?
6	Q	Good. Now let's talk. You said in previous testimony that your
7	brother a	nd you were hanging out in front of the house, right?
8	А	Right.
9	Q	Okay, and you guys were drinking and smoking that morning,
10	right?	
11	А	Yes.
12	Q	Okay, would you have any reason to change your testimony
13	now?	
14	А	No.
15	Q	Okay, so you were drinking and smoking during that period of
16	time?	
17	А	Yes.
18	Q	And when I'm saying smoking, I'm talking about smoking weed,
19	correct?	
20	А	Yes.
21	Q	Okay, you don't remember the conversation, but somebody
22	came up	on you, right?
23	Α	Yes.
24	Q	Okay, and that individual shot you?
25	Α	Yes.

1	Q	Okay, and you didn't see the shot? You turned around when	
2	they sho	they shot you, right?	
3	A	Right.	
4	Q	Okay, and now the individual who shot you, do you remember	
5	what clot	thing they were wearing?	
6	A	No.	
7	Q	Okay, so you have no idea what T-shirt, jeans, any idea?	
8	A	No.	
9	Q	Okay. And so, that person shot you and you went in the	
10	house?		
11	A	Correct.	
12	Q	Okay, and you laid down and you wanted to watch fishing?	
13	A	Correct.	
14	Q	Okay, you go to the hospital, right?	
15	A	Right.	
16	Q	And on your way to the hospital, they start pumping you full of	
17	painkiller	rs, right?	
18	A	Right.	
19	Q	Okay, and they pump you full of painkillers	
20	A	Well, I really stated I really don't know what they did to me	
21	when I got to the hospital whether or not I was on painkillers or not.		
22	Q	But did you feel different?	
23	Α	I can't tell you whether it felt different or not. I was shot. All I	
24	know is I	was in pain.	
25	Q	Okay, earlier you had testified, and tell me if I'm wrong	

1	A	The courts.		
2	Q	Okay, and how much time did you spend with the District		
3	Attorney	ys before today?		
4	A	Not a lot.		
5	Q	Okay, but did you spend time with them?		
6	A	Yeah, not even 30 minutes.		
7	Q	Okay.		
8	A	Going over my he asked [indiscernible], yes.		
9	Q	Okay, on the preliminary hearing, the date of that, did you		
10	speak to	speak to them before that?		
11	A	No.		
12	Q	Okay, did you speak to them prior to going forward with the		
13	prelimin	ary hearing?		
14	A	No.		
15	Q	Okay, but then you spoke to them about 30 minutes this week?		
16	A	Yeah, when I finally decided to respond to everything, yeah.		
17	Q	Okay, and so you talked to him for 30 minutes?		
18	A	Yes.		
19	Q	Okay, and you talked about your testimony?		
20	A	Yes.		
21	Q	Okay, and earlier, you testified you couldn't identify the		
22	individu	al, but today, you're saying you can?		
23	A	Yes.		
24	Q	Okay, and that's based on had you seen Jason before the		
25	day in q	uestion?		
	1			

1	А	No.
2	Q	Have you seen Jason outside of court since the day in
3	question	1?
4	Α	No.
5	Q	Okay, and how much time did you spend seeing Jason on the
6	day in qu	uestion?
7	Α	Just that just the time we'll need any walk by to
8	glance -	when he came and stood in our face and I was asking him why
9	he had h	nis hand behind his back. And the whole time I seen him, he was
10	fumbling	with the gun.
11	Q	Okay, so you're talking roughly, 30, 40 seconds?
12	Α	More than that.
13	Q	About a minute?
14	А	About a minute and a half.
15	Q	Okay, a minute, minute and a half. We'll say minute and a half.
16	So you'v	ve seen Jason outside of court for a minute and a half?
17	Α	Correct.
18	Q	Okay, and that was one day, correct?
19	Α	Correct.
20	Q	And you were shot in the back on that day?
21	Α	Correct.
22	Q	And the only people outside during that day were yourself and
23	your bro	ther?
24	Α	Correct.
25	Q	Okay, everybody else was not outside?

life, so keep like I say keep avoiding stuff, I keep running. Just get it out

25

1	the way.	Just a big hassle right now, so listen to my sisters.
2	Q	And that's their relationships are important to you, yes?
3	Α	Yes.
4	Q	Okay. Now when you're talking about go you're talking about
5	you being	g at the hospital, right?
6	А	Yes.
7	Q	Now are you sitting here today if you were reflecting back in
8	your time	e in the hospital, were you so out of it, that you had no idea what
9	was goin	g on?
10	Α	No.
11	Q	Were you lucid? Could you understand what was being said to
12	you?	
13	Α	Yes.
14	Q	Could you understand what the officer was doing when he was
15	asking yo	ou the questions that he asked you?
16	Α	Yes.
17	Q	Okay. Nothing further.
18		THE COURT: Recross?
19		RECROSS-EXAMINATION
20	BY MR. N	ADIG:
21	Q	When you were in the apartment, did Brandi tell you who shot
22	you?	
23	Α	Say it again?
24	Q	Did Brandi tell you who shot you when you were in the
25	apartmer	nt?

1	A	When I got shot, she identified who he was. I knew
2	Q	Okay, what did she say?
3	Α	That was her baby daddy.
4	Q	Okay, and so, had you seen a picture of her baby daddy before
5	that day	?
6	А	No.
7	Q	Okay, and did you see a picture of her baby daddy after that
8	day?	
9	Α	No.
10	Q	Okay, nothing further.
11		THE COURT: Okay, jurors, I, you know, look over every time
12	when the testimony's over to see if there are any hands raised.	
13	Throughout this trial, I haven't seen any hands raised, which means you	
14	haven't had any questions. Just wanted to remind you, you do have that	
15	right to a	ask questions. So just remember that.
16		Okay, all right, sir, you are excused. Thank you for your time.
17		THE WITNESS: Thank you.
18		[Witness excused]
19		MR. LEXUS: The witness is on the fifth floor. Give me a few
20	minutes	and I'll
21		THE COURT: Thank you, sir.
22		[Pause]
23		MR. SCARBOROUGH: Your Honor, I may I approach?
24		THE COURT: Yes, you may.
25		[Counsel confers with the Clerk]

A This looks like the intersection where -- the intersection where the apartment complex is.

- Q Okay, and then on this pin right here, is that the 2883 Wheelwright Drive, Apartment A address you responded to?
 - A Yes, it is.
 - Q And that address was significant why?
 - A That is where the shooting had occurred.
- Q Okay. So when you responded to the scene as a lead detective, do you walk the scene?
 - A Yes, I do.
- Q Tell the ladies and gentlemen of the jury what that means? It may be obvious, but what does that mean?

A Okay, when I get there, I make sure that the crime scene is taped off, because at times when we do have a violent crime like this, people will show up and try to go look and see what's going on.

So we try to make sure the first thing I do is that everything's taped off, that no one can go in there, and I have officers posted to protect all the evidence.

After that, we go through and we basically walk the scene. We walk through to make sure that we could see the shell casings and blood and clothes and marks in the dirt.

We walk inside the residence and check for, you know, damage or any type of evidence that we could see in there.

Q Now when you walked up to the scene, can you just describe the lay out of the outside of the scene, please?

A Yes, when I walked up, we walked through the walkway to where the apartment was. There was dirt on it and a sidewalk that went through there. And that was the front of the apartment complex or the apartment that was shot up. I saw several bullet holes in the stucco and in the window.

- Q Okay, publishing State's 16. Now is that a depiction of the front of the apartment that you walked that scene?
 - A Yes.
- Q Okay, and the apartment would be the right, where my finger is over here, correct?
 - A Yes, sir.
- Q Now I'm going to zoom in a little bit. I think, vaguely, and this is always my fault because my technology skills are terrible, the yellow things in the picture --
 - A Yes.
 - Q -- they're obviously not just yellow things. What are those?
- A Those are marking evidence on the ground. In this particular case, it's marking either spent or unspent casings or bullets.
- Q Okay, you also indicated when you walked the scene you saw what you believe to be bullet holes?
 - A Yes.
 - Q Where were those bullet holes located?
- A There were several that were in the front of the apartment that there's a window. And it appeared to be in the window and lower part of the window and the stucco. And in the breezeway, there is a breezeway

between the two apartments.

And on the -- in the breezeway, the apartment next to that one had bullet holes in the stucco.

- Q Okay. Publishing State's 47, what are we looking at in that picture?
- A Those are the evidence markings of the bullet holes in the front of the apartment, where the window is and the stucco or --
- Q Okay, and so, what you could do, detective, is you can actually still circle those [indiscernible] ones. So these, where my fingers are those are the holes that were referred to, yes?
 - A Yes, those are the holes.
 - Q Okay, and another one down here, correct?
 - A Yes.
- Q All right. Publishing State's 44. Just zoomed in on the whole bottom of the stucco, yes?
 - A Yes.
- Q Okay, now those -- publishing State's 48, what are the green stickers that we're looking at here? What are those?
- A Those are marked A1, B1, C1 and so forth. The way the ID or crime scene analyst does that is that could be the first point that the bullet entered.
- So if it went through the window, the wall, a door, another window, you'd get A, B -- or I'm sorry, A1, A2, A3, A4. It's the projectile of that bullet.
 - Q So those stickers are to demarcate actually a pathway so to

A Yes.Q All right, what would the term stove piping mean?A What happens is when you have a stove pipe, eith

A What happens is when you have a stove pipe, either the bullet didn't go off, or it did go off. And when the firearm ejects the round, it slides back and the round is supposed to eject.

If it gets caught, the gun's dirty, it's just not ejecting right, it will jam.

And it looks like the top of the bullet is sticking straight up.

So if someone even doesn't fire a round, because we will have a lot of times where they come in and they rack the round to scare people, first of all, they'll do that and it will stove pipe with a live round. So it doesn't have to be fired.

And what happens is you have to clear that. And usually by clearing that is either swiping it and then racking another round. And at times, you could get two rounds that will eject out of the firearm and land being unfired or one fired, one not fired, just depends.

- Q As you indicated in this case, how many unspent rounds were collected?
 - A I had two.
 - Q Publishing State's 38. Is that one of the unspent rounds?
 - A Yes, sir.
- Q And publishing State's 41, is that one of the other unspent rounds?
 - A Yes, sir.
- Q Now just to give a -- the jurors a clear picture, you said how many spent shell casings were collected again?

1	A	8.
2	Q	Okay. Publishing State's 35. Is that depicted at is that an
3	unspent s	shell casing depicted?
4	Α	That is a spent casing.
5	Q	Sorry, spent?
6	Α	Spent shell casing.
7	Q	Okay. And again, you indicated that 8 were collected and I'm
8	just going	g to publish them rather quickly publishing State's 20. Is that one
9	of the spe	ent rounds?
10	A	Yes.
11	Q	Now we see it flipped up upside-down.
12	A	Uh-huh.
13	Q	Why is it flipped up upside-down in that picture?
14	A	The markings or I'm sorry, that showed that it the hammer of
15	the firear	m had been pulled back and went forward and struck the pin.
16	That little	pin right there ignites the gunpowder inside and shoots the
17	projectile	. So that is showing that it had been actually been fired.
18	Q	Okay, so publishing State's 22 just to go really quickly, that's
19	another -	-
20	A	Yes.
21	Q	unspent or spent cartridge, correct?
22	A	Yes.
23	Q	State's 23, another one?
24	A	Yes, sorry.
25	Q	State's 27?

1	A	Yes.
2	Q	Another spent one? State's 29?
3	А	Yes.
4	Q	State's 30?
5	A	Yes, sir.
6	Q	And this is I mixed that one in, State's 31, that's number 6
7	flipped u	p on its head?
8	А	Yes.
9	Q	State's 34?
10	А	Yes.
11	Q	And State's 36?
12	Α	Yes.
13	Q	Okay. You also indicated that there were you walked the
14	inside of	the residence, correct?
15	Α	Yes.
16	Q	And there were bullet strikes inside the residence?
17	Α	Yes.
18	Q	Where do you recall the bullet strikes inside the residence?
19	Α	The kitchen area, the window that was shot out that the big
20	window	that was shot out, there there's a kitchen there and the front door
21	and a sn	nall hallway. So it was in that area that follows all the bullet holes
22	were.	
23	Q	Publishing State's 57. Is that the area you were just talking
24	about?	
25	A	Yes, sir.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

those?

A I did not test -- well, I was told we couldn't test those because of where they fell. They fell in the dirt, were covered with the dirt, which kind of ruins --

- Q Publishing State's --
- A Yes.
- Q -- 32. That's the general area where all of the casings and the unspent casings were recovered, correct?
 - A Yes.
 - Q And that is for the record a dirt area?
 - A Yes.
- Q Okay. Now ultimately, in this investigation, was there ever a gun recovered?
 - A No, there was not.
- Q If there was a gun recovered, is there ballistics that could be done on the gun?
- A Yes, and actually, I did do ballistics on the bullets that were recovered. So if that gun is ever recovered, I will be able to get that gun.
- Q Okay, and just briefly for the jury, what do you mean by ballistics??
- A They test -- they had a -- they -- where the hammer hit, that is a certain mark. Where a bullet was recovered, the bullet -- the projectile that was shot out -- that was recovered. It has grooves on it from going through a gun.

Usually each gun is different, so they can match that up pretty close

where they could be high populate that [indiscernible]. I don't know the exact [indiscernible].

- Q Okay, now in terms of identification techniques, are you familiar with what a six-pack is?
 - A Yes, I am.
 - Q Okay, and what's a six-pack?
- A A six-pack is where you get individual pictures that look like your suspect. We usually have someone who's robbed and we get a suspect, we will get that guy's picture and then six other pictures -- or five other pictures that look like him. And we will show that to our victim. And the victim will pick out which person he thinks it is.
 - Q Okay, now, what is a show up?
- A A show up is basically when you have a suspect that might be in custody and you bring your victim by -- the police bring the victim. They read them the instructions saying, hey, this is, you know, we're going to show you this person.

They give them the instructions. They bring them to where the guy is. They show him. He says yes or no, that's that person.

- Q Now are you familiar with situations where a show up is more feasible than a six-pack photo arrangement?
 - A Yes.
- Q Okay. And as the lead detective in this case, were you familiar with basically the shill up photo that was done in this case?
 - A Yes.
 - Q Okay, and was that more feasible or less feasible to do, given

the circumstances?

- A At that time, it was more feasible.
- Q Why?
- A The officer and the doctors -- well, the officer was finding out that the subject that was shot, there was a good chance that he would not make it.

So what we did is you get a chance to do a dying declaration. A lot of times when someone gets shot, stabbed, hit by a car, the officer will jump in the ambulance with them.

And if the medics are working on them, they're like this isn't looking good, you can ask that guy questions. You can show him pictures because that's your last chance to get the evidence.

So a lot of times, we will, hey, is this the guy? Is it so and so? Yeah, that's him. Or who shot you? And they will be it's Johnson that shot me. And then, you can go on with your investigation from there.

- Q All right, as I alluded to earlier before, as the lead detective in a case, you're required -- well, it's your job to become familiar with all aspects of the case, including the people involved [indiscernible], correct?
 - A Yes.
- Q Now you became familiar with -- pardon me, may we approach? Just want to make sure.
- MR. SCARBOROUGH: Brief indulgence, Your Honor. I apologize.

BY MR. SCARBOROUGH:

Q Did you become involved or familiar with someone named

1	Bryson	Martinez in this case?
2	Α	Yes, I did.
3	Q	Okay, and why was he relevant?
4	А	Bryson is the boyfriend of Brandi Coleman or was the boyfriend
5	of Brand	di Coleman.
6	Q	And was he at the scene that day?
7	А	Yes, he was.
8	Q	Okay, did you also become familiar with Brandi Coleman?
9	Α	Yes.
10	Q	Why is she relevant?
11	А	She was there at the shooting and was had been dating the
12	shooter at one point and has a child and common and was currently	
13	dating B	ryson.
14	Q	Okay, and when you refer to the shooter, who are you referring
15	to?	
16	Α	Jason Bolden.
17	Q	Is he in Court today?
18	Α	Yes, he is.
19	Q	Can you please point and identify?
20	Α	Sure he is. He's sitting at the defendant table in a blue shirt, tie.
21	Q	Record reflect the identification of the Defendant?
22		THE COURT: It does.
23	MR. SCA	RBOROUGH:
24	Q	Publishing State's 115, who are we looking at in this
25	photogra	aph?

1	A	That is going to be Brandi Coleman.
2	Q	Did you also learn of the minor child that's present?
3	А	Yes, I did.
4	Q	Where was that minor where was that minor child during this
5	incident?	
6	Α	That minor child was in the apartment.
7	Q	What's the minor child's name?
8	Α	Sanyleh Bolen.
9	Q	Sanyleh Bolen?
10	А	Sanyleh Bolen.
11	Q	And who was that a minor child of?
12	А	It is a minor child of Brandi Coleman and Jason Bolden.
13	Q	Okay, now you've listened to all of the statements, correct?
14	А	Yes.
15	Q	And you have listened to specifically Brandi Coleman's
16	statemen	nt?
17	Α	Yes.
18	Q	And you would be able to would you be able to recognize
19	Brandi C	oleman's voice if you heard it?
20	Α	Yes.
21		MR. SCARBOROUGH: Your Honor, permission to publish
22	State's p	roposed
23		MR. NADIG: I don't remember the number.
24		MR. SCARBOROUGH: I apologize, Your Honor. I don't
25	remembe	er the number of the 911 call.

1	А	Yes, I have.	
2	Q	Is that a fair and accurate depiction of the 911 call placed by	
3	Brandi Coleman on July 1st?		
4	А	Yes, it is.	
5	Q	2018?	
6	А	Yes, it is.	
7		MR. SCARBOROUGH: Move to admit?	
8		THE COURT: Yes, it's admitted, again, subject to the	
9	discussions we had.		
0		[EXHIBIT 125A ADMITTED]	
1		MR. NADIG: Thank you, Your Honor.	
12		MR. SCARBOROUGH: And before I continue to play this, this	
3	was the photo-I was looking for. Publishing State's 116.		
4		THE COURT: One moment.	
15	BY MR. SCARBOROUGH:		
16	Q	Who is that man in the photograph?	
7	Α	That is going to be Bryson.	
8	Q	Okay. And I know the lighting is off. Who is that up in the top?	
19	А	That is Sanyleh.	
20	Q	Your Honor, may I publish to the jury?	
21		THE COURT: You may.	
22	BY MR. S	BY MR. SCARBOROUGH:	
23	Q	Up in the top? Sanyleh Bolen. I'm going to continue to play	
24	State's now admitted 125A at 20 seconds and counting.		
25		[Playing of 911 recording, admitted as Exhibit 125A]	

1		MR. SCARBOROUGH: Nothing further.	
2		THE COURT: All right, cross-exam?	
3		MR. NADIG: Thank you, Your Honor.	
4		CROSS-EXAMINATION	
5	BY MR. NADIG:		
6	Q	How are you doing, detective?	
7	А	How are you, sir?	
8	Q	I'm good.	
9	А	Good.	
10	Q	So let's go through a couple of things.	
11	А	Sure.	
12	Q	One, you've been doing this for a while?	
13	А	Yes, sir.	
14	Q	Okay.	
15		MR. SCARBOROUGH: I didn't know if you wanted	
16		MR. NADIG: No, I don't.	
17	BY MR. NADIG:		
18	Q	And so, you're not a first responder at this point? You're not the	
19	first person on the scene is what I mean to that?		
20	Α	No, I'm not.	
21	Q	Okay, and especially in a situation the way it works, and tell me	
22	if I'm wrong, is it's kind of like a pool situation where you guys rotate up,		
23	the detectives and your group, you rotate up to whoever's the lead		
24	detective, right?		
25	А	Yes.	
	1		

1	Q	Okay. And on the day in question, your you were out?
2	A	Yes.
3	Q	Okay. And so, typically, you guys go out there as a team, is
4	that fair a	statement?
5	A	Yes, it is true.
6	Q	Okay, now how many people are on your team?
7		THE COURT: Hold on. Yes, ma'am?
8		JUROR NO. 10: I just had a question.
9		THE COURT: Great. You know what? Save that to when all
10	the exam	ination is over, and then, we'll proceed with that.
11		JUROR NO. 10: Okay.
12		THE COURT: Thank you.
13	BY MR. N	ADIG:
14	Q	So how many guys were on your team or how many people?
15	A	We have a sergeant and including me, four detectives.
16	Q	Okay, and when you go out there, patrol's already out there?
17	A	Yes, sir.
18	Q	And patrol is providing you information?
19	Α	Yes.
20	Q	Okay, and so they give you a set of facts?
21	Α	Yes, sir.
22	Q	Okay, so by the time you arrived on the scene approximately
23	what time	e did you arrive?
24	Α	Approximately two hours to two and a half hours after the
25	shooting.	

1	Q	All right, because you arrived roughly 11, 11:30 give or take?	
2	А	I don't know the exact time.	
3	Q	If I represented it's a 9, you're arrived 11, 11:30?	
4	A	Could be.	
5	Q	All right.	
6	А	I don't want to I really don't	
7	Q	So and the officers are there and they provide you the	
8	information?		
9	А	Yes.	
10	Q	Okay, the patrol officers provide you that information. Now	
11	when you arrive also, the victim is not present, the shooting victim is not		
12	present?		
13	Α	Right, the shooting victim was at the hospital.	
14	Q	Okay. Had you known that an identification had been provided	
15	to the shooting detective prior to your arrival?		
16	Α	I'm sorry to the	
17	Q	Did you know that Mr. Martinez had identified the subject in the	
18	hospital prior your to arrival?		
19	Α	I did not.	
20	Q	Okay, but did that occur prior to your arrival?	
21	Α	Yes.	
22	Q	Okay, and in fact?	
23	Α	Excuse me, I don't know exactly what time was shown. I don't	
24	have the	exact time.	
25	Q	You didn't review that prior to coming here today?	

1	А	That I don't know exactly the exact time the officer gave
2	him sh	nowed him the picture.
3	Q	But it was you were not the one directing that portion of the
4	investiga	ation?
5	Α	No, sir, I was not.
6	Q	You did not say, hey, take this photo and do that?
7	Α	No, I did not.
8	Q	Do you know who said, hey, take this photo and do that?
9	Α	As far as I know, it was no one from the detective part of it.
10	Q	So it was probably patrol who did that?
11	Α	Yes, sir.
12	Q	Okay, and one of the things you guys do as detectives is
13	because	you said he was touch and go as to whether he made it, right?
14	Α	Yes.
15	Q	Okay, in your review of this case, one of the things you have to
16	review is	s you have to review medical records, right?
17	Α	Yes.
18	Q	Do you recall reviewing the medical records in this case?
19	Α	I do not.
20	Q	Okay. Court's indulgence. And I'm just using the first page.
21		MR. SCARBOROUGH: I understand.
22		MR. NADIG: May I approach, Your Honor?
23		THE COURT: You may.
24		MR. NADIG: Okay.
25	BY MR. N	NADIG:

1	Q	Okay, now obviously review this yourself. Don't say anything
2	out loud.	
3	Α	Yes, sir.
4	Q	In reviewing that document, do you know what you hold in your
5	hands?	
6	A	This is a release for medical records.
7	Q	Okay, and do you see and obviously, I don't want you to read
8	it off. So	turn it over, so no one can accuse me of you read a document?
9	A	Can I read this first?
10	Q	Please?
11	A	Okay, thank you.
12	Q	When you look up, I'm going to ask you a question.
13	Α	Thank you.
14	Q	Okay, actually, I'll just steal it from you. So does reviewing that
15	refresh yo	our recollection?
16	A	No, sir.
17	Q	Okay, so you don't remember when he was released from the
18	hospital?	
19	A	No, sir.
20	Q	Okay, so he went in on July 1st, and you don't recall when he
21	got out?	
22	A	No, sir.
23	Q	Did you go see him in the hospital?
24	A	I did not.
25	Q	Okay, so you never saw him in the hospital?
	1	

1	some ui	nspent shell casings, right?
2	A	Yes, sir.
3	Q	Okay. Now like you said, when you fire a weapon, the cartridge
4	ejects a	nd it heats up the casing, so the casing does not have DNA
5	evidenti	ary value?
6	A	Yes.
7	Q	Okay, however, potentially, the DNA can be recovered from an
8	unspent	round?
9	A	Yes.
10	Q	Okay, now you said that somebody told you that you couldn't
11	test them because they had fallen on the ground?	
12	A	The CSA crime scene analyst, they make the decision on if an it
13	can be	worth the time and the money to and test that.
14	Q	Because that's a factor?
15	A	It's a factor.
16	Q	The money?
17	A	Yes, the cost.
18	Q	Okay, now let's go through a couple things.
19	A	Yes.
20	Q	There are a number of CSAs, right?
21	A	Yes.
22	Q	There are CSAs that who do specific jobs? Fair to say some
23	can only	/ take photographs?
24	A	Yes.
25	Q	Some can take photographs and analyze DNA?

1	Q	And I'm not saying you're doing the analysis. I'm just saying
2	that's one	e of the things you do?
3	А	Yes, sir.
4	Q	Now, with the unspent rounds, they are picked up by somebody
5	right?	
6	Α	They were picked by our CSI [sic].
7	Q	Okay, so the CSAs are the ones who pick up the evidence.
8	Α	Right.
9	Q	Okay, and then they collect it and they document it?
10	Α	Yes.
11	Q	You are the person, however, who puts in to see if these things
12	should be	e tested for DNA, correct?
13	Α	Yes.
14	Q	That is your job as the lead detective?
15	Α	Yes.
16	Q	You decided this has evidentiary value?
17	Α	Yes.
18	Q	Do you believe that you put in for the testing of those unspent
19	rounds?	
20	Α	I did not put in the testing of the unspent rounds.
21	Q	Okay, and your belief is because somebody told you that they
22	may not h	nave significant evidentiarily significant value?
23	Α	Yes.
24	Q	Okay, well and you don't recall if you were told at the scene or
25	later on?	

1	А	I think it was at the scene, but I'm not sure.
2	Q	Okay, and do you remember the CSA at the scene?
3	Α	I do not.
4	Q	Okay, so you don't know what level of CSA they were?
5	А	I do not.
6	Q	Okay, now one of the things is you have an identification pretty
7	early, righ	nt?
8	А	Yes, sir.
9	Q	You had an identification on that 911 that you reviewed, right?
10	А	Yes, sir.
11	Q	Okay, now you heard Brandi say that this the person who did it,
12	correct?	
13	Α	Yes, sir.
14	Q	Okay, so at that point in time, you have the ability to tell if
15	somebod	ly is in a certain location, right? Okay, and what I mean by that is
16	you have	the ability to see if somebody's cell phone is in the area, right?
17	Α	Yes.
18	Q	Okay, you don't do it every investigation, right?
19	Α	No, sir.
20	Q	Okay, and the reason being is it's expensive?
21	А	Yes.
22	Q	Okay, but what you had here is the situation where potentially
23	you could	d have used that information to tie Mr. Bolden to the scene?
24	Α	Yes.
25	Q	But you felt based on cost and things of that nature, and once

1	question	?
2	A	Yes, I did.
3	Q	Okay, he was obviously distraught, right?
4	A	Yes, he was.
5	Q	Okay, did he give you his real name?
6	A	No, he did not.
7	Q	Why did he not give you his real name?
8	A	It was found out later that he was wanted. He had warrants out.
9		MR. SCARBOROUGH: May we approach?
10		THE COURT: Yes, you may.
11		[Bench conference]
12		MR. SCARBOROUGH: Brenton is on the stand.
13		MR. NADIG: No, Brenton was the one that [indiscernible].
14		MR. NADIG: No, Bryson.
15		THE COURT: You get the guys mixed up?
16		MR. SCARBOROUGH: Yeah, it was Bryson.
17		MR. NADIG: I apologize.
18		THE COURT: All right, why don't you fix that?
19		MR. NADIG: I will.
20		[End bench conference]
21	BY MR. N	IADIG:
22	Q	And I apologize because I confuse the Martinez brothers the
23	whole tin	ne.
24	A	Yeah.
25	Q	It was Bryson?
	1	

THE COURT: All right, ladies and gentlemen, we're going to take our 15-minute recess now. And so, let me go ahead and give you the admonishment.

Do not communicate among yourselves or with anybody else about this trial or the subject matter of this trial. Do not communicate at all with any of the parties, attorneys, or witnesses involved in this trial.

Do not seek or obtain any information or comments about the case. Do not read, watch, or listen to any report or commentary about the case.

Do not perform any research or investigation and do not form or express any opinion.

We'll see you back here in 15 minutes. Let's say -- let's say -- I guess that's 3:50. Okay thank you.

THE MARSHAL: Okay, all rise for the jury.

THE COURT: Leave your notepads.

[Outside the presence of the jury]

THE COURT: All right, looks like Mr. Lewis [sic] has stepped out. Why don't we take our break, come back a few minutes early, then -- well, during this break, you can check. Plaintiff can check with the Clerk about the exhibits.

MR. SCARBOROUGH: Thank you.

THE COURT: And, Mr. Nadig, talk to your client about whether

MR. NADIG: Yeah.

THE COURT: -- he's going to testify.

then we'll bring the jurors in.

MR. LEXUS: How are we doing with jury instructions?

MR. SCARBOROUGH: He wants to settle them today if you'd like.

MR. NADIG: Yeah, they're fine. Do you want to print out the jury instructions and number them?

THE COURT: Yeah, yeah.

MR. NADIG: We could do that.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. SCARBOROUGH: Sounds good.

THE COURT: Well, I think I have --

MR. SCARBOROUGH: I think we included the car instruction, veah?

MR. NADIG: Let me double check.

THE COURT: I have it in my office. That's why -- we'll get it in a moment. All right, we or on the record. Mr. Bolden is present with his counsel.

All right, Mr. Nadig, have you had an opportunity to consult with your client about whether he wishes to testify?

MR. NADIG: Your Honor, I've discussed he -- his 5th

Amendment right to testify. Additionally that anything he said on direct would be subject to fair comment and cross-examination.

And any previous felony convictions that are within the last 10 years or probation or parole expired within the last 10 years would be admissible. He has declined at this point to testify, obviously. And you

need to give instructions [indiscernible].

THE COURT: Right, I'm going to provide you with an admonishment, Mr. Bolden. Listen carefully to an explanation of your rights.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

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

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

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

And anything that you may say, be it on direct or cross-examination, will be the subject of fair comment when the Deputy District Attorney speaks to the jury in his final argument.

Do you understand that so far, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do, sir.

THE COURT: Thank you. If you chose not to testify, the Court will not permit the Deputy District Attorney to make any comments to the jury because you have not testified. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do, sir.

THE COURT: Thank you. If you elect not to testify, then if your attorney specifically requests, I will instruct the jury substantially as follows.

The law does not compel a defendant in a criminal case to take

the stand and testify. And no presumption may be raised and no inference of any kind may be drawn from the failure of a defendant to testify.

Do you know have any questions about these rights? THE DEFENDANT: No, sir.

THE COURT: All right. You are further advised that if you have a felony conviction, and more than 10 years has not elapsed from the date you have been convicted, or discharged from parole, or probation whichever's later, and the Defense had not sought to preclude that from coming before the jury.

THE DEFENDANT: Uh-huh.

THE COURT: Then if you take the stand and testify, the deputy District Attorney in the presence of the jury will be permitted to ask you the following.

Number one, have you been convicted of a felony? Number two, what was the felony? And number three, when did I happen? Do you understand that, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: All right, based upon that, sir, you have a choice.

Do you elect to exercise your constitutional right not to testify?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: All right, very well. The record will so reflect.

And at this point in time, let me ask defense counsel, do you have anything that you'd like to add to the record?

MR. NADIG: No, Your Honor, not at this point in time.

THE COURT: All right, very good.

Marshal, would you please bring the jurors in? Maybe he's outside.

THE MARSHAL: Oh, are we ready, Judge?

THE COURT: Yes, sir, bring them in.

THE MARSHAL: Okay. All rise for the jury. Great, all jurors are present.

[In the presence of the jury]

THE COURT: All right, please be seated, everybody. Does the State have any further witnesses to call?

MR. SCARBOROUGH: No, Your Honor, at this point, the State rests.

THE COURT: Very well. The Defense may now present its case in chief. Does the Defense have any witnesses that it would like to call?

MR. NADIG: No, Your Honor, at this point in time, Defense rests.

THE COURT: All right, the Defenses rests also.

Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, this concludes the evidence portion of this trial. We will proceed tomorrow with the reading of the jury instructions and then the closing arguments. And then, you will be directed to retire to begin your deliberations. Do you all understand?

All right, very good. What I'm going to do now is I'll excuse you for the evening and direct you to be lined up ready to go at 10:30.

We're going to have a stand out there. I'm going to provide you

25

1

with donuts and orange juice. So if you'd like to come at 10:30, feel free to do that, all right, and we ready to go like about 10:30. Okay, well, at 10:30. All right, so let me go ahead and read you the admonishment.

Do not communicate among yourselves or with anybody else about this trial or the subject matter of this trial. Do not communicate at all with any of the parties, attorneys, or witnesses involved in this case.

Do not seek or obtain any information or comments about the case from any source.

Do not read, watch, or listen to any report or commentary about the case. Do not perform any research or investigation. And do not form or express any opinion on any subject connected with this trial.

I do have a civil calendar tomorrow, some matters to handle. It's going to go till about 10:15. So just so you understand they'll be a few other people coming and going unrelated to this trial tomorrow morning. All right?

Thank you -- yes, sir.

JUROR NO. 13: Question, sir.

THE COURT: Go ahead. I'll take a look.

JUROR NO. 13: Before the last recess, sir.

THE COURT: Oh, right, let me take a look.

[Bench conference]

MR. SCARBOROUGH: Why don't we just --

THE COURT: Oh, sorry. I think that's something maybe they just deal with on cross.

MR. SCARBOROUGH: Can the jury be reminded of the closed

23

24

25

descriptions of the suspect who gave the description and when they gave them?

MR. NADIG: That can all be done via closing and deliberation.

MR. SCARBOROUGH: Yeah.

THE COURT: What should I -- I'll just say that I elected not to give that question, but the attorneys are permitted to remind the jurors of the evidence in the matter that they see appropriate.

MR. LEXUS: I would say I think most judges [indiscernible] would say disregard -- not ask the question and say the jury is to rely on their own memory, so.

MR. NADIG: And the evidence that will be provided in the back.

MR. SCARBOROUGH: Yeah.

THE COURT: And any?

MR. NADIG: Evidence that's provided in the --

THE COURT: Okay, so just say that right now?

MR. SCARBOROUGH: Yeah.

THE COURT: Okay. Very good.

MR. NADIG: Thank you.

[End bench conference]

THE COURT: Thank you for the question, Mr. Randolph. I'm electing not to give it, but I'm reminding the jurors that they will rely on their own memories as to what the evidence was that was presented and the evidence that would be provided to you back in the jury deliberation room. All right, very well.

Feel free to -- again, to show up early tomorrow. Other than

THE COURT: My Clerk is handing them back to me.

THE CLERK: No I thought you were asking for it.

THE COURT: Oh, no. All right, very good. Be back in about five minutes.

MR. SCARBOROUGH: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. NADIG: Thank you, Your Honor.

[Trial in recess at 4:01 p.m.]

[Trial resumed at 4:08 p.m.]

THE MARSHAL: Department 2 back on the record, come to order.

[Outside the presence of the jury]

THE COURT: All right, please be seated. I've reviewed both sets of jury instructions. We'll discuss them if we have to. I've seen all of these before. They seem standard, but I would like to hear any objections or anything that counsel might feel needs to be amended?

MR. NADIG: No, as long as the Carter instructions that we -- did you check and see if it was in?

MR. SCARBOROUGH: I have not checked in that instruction, but as long as the Carter instruction is in there, the State submitted their full set of what they intend -- what we intend to introduce as instructions.

THE COURT: So who's going to number them? We just -- just number them and then you got to make copies. And what we need is not one for every juror, but generally you ask the D.A. to prepare another copy.

MR. SCARBOROUGH: Fair enough.

THE COURT: Because we need one for me, one official copy for the Court Clerk, one to give the foreperson and I think that's it.

MR. SCARBOROUGH: We don't need copies for every juror? THE COURT: No, I don't need just set them back with one for

the forenerses

the foreperson.

That's all I do. That's what I've always done. I mean, if somebody wants to request that each of them gets a copy, it's your right to request that, but --

MR. LEXUS: That's fine.

MR. NADIG: I just -- once they're numbered, I just -- you know let me review them before you submit them. That's all.

THE COURT: All right, so you guys make the copies and make sure that the Court has enough and then, I'd like to know now if you intend -- if you want to request that each juror receive a copy?

MR. NADIG: Oh.

THE COURT: It's typically in all the cases that -- all the criminal cases that I've handled, it's never done that way. I've never had anybody request that, but it's up to you.

MR. NADIG: Your Honor, this is what I'll say. I've seen -- depends court to court. If you're with just the foreperson that is well within the norm of what I've seen.

MR. LEXUS: That's fine with me.

THE COURT: I say I think my Court Clerk blue backs it and sends it back.

1	MR. NADIG: I do know that some judges don't want them to all
2	have them, because then it just bogs down the entire process.
3	THE COURT: It's a waste of paper, too.
4	MR. NADIG: Yeah.
5	MR. LEXUS: I told them that number them as they're sent to
6	him in the email.
7	MR. NADIG: Just read email them and look at the number and
8	then we'll
9	MR. LEXUS: Okay.
10	THE COURT: Good for me.
11	MR. SCARBOROUGH: All right, thank you.
12	THE COURT: We'll just have you confirm in the record on the
13	record first thing tomorrow that this is what you all agree upon.
14	How about the verdict form? You all agree on that?
15	MR. LEXUS: Yeah.
16	MR. NADIG: Yeah.
17	MR. SCARBOROUGH: Did you?
18	MR. NADIG: Let me double check. I'm sorry. I closed it out.
19	MR. SCARBOROUGH: And Your Honor, for clarification, for
20	both sets of instructions
21	THE COURT: Yes.
22	MR. SCARBOROUGH: the prohibited and the
23	regular okay.
24	MR. NADIG: There it is. Sorry, Your Honor. Yeah, that's fine.
25	THE COURT: All right very good. Off the record. See you all

1	at 10:30. We're just going to have a cart out
2	[Trial Day 2 concluded at 4:11 p.m.]
3	* * * * *
4	
5	
6	ATTEST: I do hereby certify that I have truly and correctly transcribed the audio/video proceedings in the above-entitled case to the best of my ability.
7	
8	a 1
9	Chris Hwong
10	Chris Hwang Transcriber
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	