1	IN THE SUPREME CO	URT OF	THE	STATE	OF NEVADA
2					
3	GUSTAVO GUNERA-PASTRANA,)	No. 79	9861	Flootropically Filed
4	Appellant,)			Electronically Filed May 19 2020 10:51 a.m Elizabeth A. Brown
5	v.)			Elizabeth A. Brown Clerk of Supreme Court
6)			•
7	THE STATE OF NEVADA,)			
8	Respondent.)			
9	APPELLANT'S APPEN	_) NDIX V(HILIG	E III PA	AGES 501-729
10	MI EBEMIT STRIES	MDI2X V	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	IGES 301 12)
11	DARIN IMLAY		STEVE	E WOL	FSON
12	Clark County Public Defender 309 South Third Street		200 Le	wis Ave	District Attorney enue, 3 rd Floor vada 89155
13	Las Vegas, Nevada 89155-2610 Attorney for Appellant			gas, Ne N FOR	
14	Attorney for Appenant				eral son Street
15			Carson (702) 6	City, N 87-353	Son Steet Jevada 89701-4717 8
16 17					espondent
18					1
19					
20					
21					
22					
23					
24					
25					
26					
27					
28					

INDEX GUSTAVO GUNERA-PASTRANA Case No. 79861

2	Case No. 79861	
3	Amended Certificate of Mailing filed 01/17/19	<u>PAGE NO</u> 342-346
4	Amended Information filed 06/12/19	387-388
5	Amended Jury List filed 06/14/19	396
6	Amended Motion to Quash Subpoena-Criminal Duces Tecum filed 01/17/19 Date of Hrg: 01/23/19	332-341
7	Audiovisual Transmission Equipment Appearance Request filed 06/04/19	381-383
8	Certificate of Mailing filed 01/03/19	306-307
9	Certificate of Mailing filed 03/15/19	
10	Court's Exhibit 16 dated 06/12/19	
11	Court's Exhibit 32 dated 06/17/19	
12	Criminal Complaint filed 07/14/16	
13	Defendant's Notice of Witnesses filed 05/24/19	
1415	Defendant's Proposed Jury Instructions & Verdict Form Not Used At Trial filed 06/13/19	
16 17	Defendant's Opposition to the Immigrant Home Foundation's Procedurally and Substantively Infirm Motion to Quash Subpoena-Criminal Duces Tecum filed 01 Date of Hrg: 01/23/19	/11/19 308-331
18	District Court Minutes from 10/04/16 through 09/25/19	468-514
19	Ex Parte Motion and Order for Release of CPS/DFS Records filed 05/31/17	269-270
20 21	Ex Parte Request for Hearing on an Order Shortening Time and Order filed 12/20/16	49-50
22	Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Order filed 08/16/19 Date of Hrg: 08/07/19	454-460
23	Information filed 09/30/16	9-11
24	Instruction to the Jury filed 06/17/19	399-426
25	Judgment of Conviction (Jury Trial) filed 09/26/19	461-463
26	Jury List filed 06/10/19	386
27	Justice Court Minutes from 07/14/16 through 09/30/16	3-8
28		

1	Motion for Discovery filed 12/16/16 Date of Hrg: 01/18/17	39-47
2 3	Motion for Judgment of Acquittal After a Verdict of Guilty or in the Alternative, Motion for New Trial Based Upon Per Se Jury Misconduct filed 07/08/19 Date of Hrg: 08/07/19	420 420
4		429-439
5	Motion in Limine filed 12/20/17 Date of Hrg: 01/08/18	271-277
6	Motion in Limine to Exclude Impermissible Evidence of Prior Incidents	
7	Where the Defendant Pleaded Nolo Contendere filed 05/22/19 Date of Hrg: 05/29/19	354-361
8	Motion to Continue Trial Date filed 12/20/16	51-53
9	Motion to Quash Subpoena-Criminal Duces Tecum filed 12/26/18 Date of Hrg: 01/23/19	304-305
10	Motion to Suppress All Oral and Written Statements Made by the	
11	Defendant to Detectives D. Huth and L. Samples filed 01/12/17 Date of Hrg: 01/23/17	71-251
12	Notice of Appeal filed 10/16/19	464-467
13	Notice of Hearing filed 07/08/19	440
14	Notice of Witnesses and/or Expert Witnesses filed 11/23/16	30-38
15	Order filed 12/20/16	48
16	Order filed 03/10/17	266-268
17 18	Order for Release of Confidential Records to the Eighth Judicial District Court-Clark County filed 03/10/17	264-265
19	Order Granting the Immigrant Home Foundation's Motion to	247 249
20	Quash Subpoena-Criminal Duces Tecum filed 02/20/19	347-348
21	Order Scheduling Status Hearing: At Request of Court filed 06/18/19 Date of Hrg: 06/18/19	427-428
22	Receipt of Copy for Discovery Provided filed 05/28/19	365-367
23	Receipt of Copy for Discovery Provided filed 05/29/19	380
24	Receipt of Copy for Discovery Provided filed 06/04/19	384-385
25	State's Fourth Supplemental Notice of Witnesses and/or Expert Witnesses filed 05/28/19	376-379
26	State's Opposition in Part to Defendant's Motion for Discovery filed 12/21/16	.
27	Date of Hrg: 01/18/17	54-70
28		

1	State's Opposition to Defendant's Motion for Judgment of Acquittal After a Verdict of Guilty, or in the Alternative, Motion for New Trial Based
2	Upon Per Se Jury Misconduct filed 07/22/19 Date of Hrg: 08/07/19
3	Date of Fig. 08/07/19441-433
4	State's Opposition to Defendant's Motion in Limine to Exclude Impermissible Evidence of Prior Incidents Where the Defendant Pleaded Nolo Contendere filed 05/28/19 Date of Hrg: 05/29/19
5	
6	State's Opposition to Defendant's Motion to Suppress All Oral and Written Statements Made by the Defendant to Detectives D. Huth and L. Samples filed 01/19/17 Date of Hrg: 01/23/17
7	
8	State's Second Supplemental Notice of Witnesses and/or Expert Witnesses filed 12/18/18
9	State's Supplemental Notice of Witnesses and/or
	Expert Witnesses filed 12/14/18
10	State's Third Supplemental Notice of Witnesses and/or
11	State's Third Supplemental Notice of Witnesses and/or Expert Witnesses filed 05/20/19
12	Verdict filed 06/17/19
13	
	<u>TRANSCRIPTS</u>
14	Recorder's Transcript
15	JURY TRIAL DAŶ 1
16	Date of Hrg: 06/04/19
	Recorder's Transcript
17	JURY TRIAL DAŶ 2 Date of Hrg: 06/05/19843-972
18	
19	Recorder's Transcript JURY TRIAL DAY 3
	Date of Hrg: 06/06/19
20	Recorder's Transcript
21	JURY TRIAL DAŸ 4
22	Date of Hrg: 06/07/19
	Recorder's Transcript
23	Addendum Jury Trial Day 4 Date of Hrg: 06/07/191454A-1454PP
24	
25	Recorder's Transcript JURY TRIAL DAY 5
	Date of Hrg: 06/10/19
26	Recorder's Transcript
27	JURY TRIAL DAY 6
28	Date of Hrg: 06/11/19

1 2	Recorder's Transcript JURY TRIAL DAY 7 Date of Hrg: 06/12/19
3	Recorder's Transcript
4	JURY TRIAL DAY 8 Date of Hrg: 06/13/19
5	Recorder's Transcript JURY TRIAL DAY 9
6	Date of Hrg: 06/14/19
7 8	Recorder's Transcript JURY TRIAL DAY 10 Date of Hrg: 06/17/19
9	Recorder's Transcript
10	Argument: Defense Motion for New Trial; Defendant's Motion for Judgment of Acquittal After a Verdict of Guilty, or in the Alternative, Motion for New Trial Based Upon Per Se Jury Misconduct; Status Check: Reset Sentencing Date
11	Date of Hrg: 08/07/19
12	Recorder's Transcript Arraignment
13	Date of Hrg: 10/12/16
14	Recorder's Transcript At Request of the Court
15	Date of Hrg: 06/18/19
16 17	Recorder's Transcript At Request of the Court: Evidentiary Hearing Date of Hrg: 06/21/19
18	Recorder's Transcript
19	Calendar Call Date of Hrg: 03/01/17
20	Recorder's Transcript Calendar Call
21	Date of Hrg: 05/31/17
22	Recorder's Transcript Calendar Call
23	Date of Hrg: 01/02/19
24	Recorder's Transcript Calendar Call
25	Date of Hrg: 03/11/19
26	Recorder's Transcript Defendant's Motion for Discovery
27	Date of Hrg: 01/18/17
28	

1 2	Recorder's Transcript Defendant's Motion in Limine for an Order Excluding Impermissible Evidence Date of Hrg: 01/08/19
3	Recorder's Transcript
4	Defendant's Motion in Limine to Exclude Impermissible Evidence of Prior Incidents Where the Defendant Pleaded Nolo Contendere; Calendar Call Date of Hrg: 05/29/19
5	
6	Recorder's Transcript Defendant's Motion to Suppress All Oral and Written Statements Made by the
7	Defendant to Detective D. Huth and L. Samples Date of Hrg: 01/23/17
8	Recorder's Transcript
9	Hearing on Defendant's Motion to Continue Trial Date of Hrg: 12/21/16
10	Recorder's Transcript
11	Jackson v. Denno Hearing Date of Hrg: 02/23/17
12	Recorder's Transcript
13	Motion to Quash Subpoena Criminal Duces Tecum Date of Hrg: 01/23/19
14	Recorder's Transcript
15	Sentencing Date of Hrg: 09/25/19
16	Recorder's Transcript
17	Status Check Date of Hrg: 11/30/16
18	Recorder's Transcript Status Check: Records
19	Date of Hrg: 01/22/18
20	Recorder's Transcript Status Check: Reset Trial Date
21	Date of Hrg: 01/17/18
22	Recorder's Transcript Status Check: Trial Readiness
23	Date of Hrg: 02/08/17
24	Reporter's Transcript Preliminary Hearing
25	Date of Hrg: 09/30/16
26	
27	
28	

break the victim was sent to the back room and the State went in with the victim. State noted they did not talk about testimony only comforting the victim. Arguments by Counsel. COURT ORDERED, Deft's Motion to Dismiss, DENIED.

JURY PRESENT: Counsel acknowledged the presence of the jury. Further testimony of the victim presented. (See worksheets).

OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY: State objected to Counsel reading from the transcript for impeachment of the victim. Arguments by Counsel. Court noted under NRS 50.135 regarding bring the witness in and will allow the Deft's cross. State noted if they are bringing this in, they should be able to read the entire document. Colloquy regarding cited cases. Court noted the transcript would not come into evidence, However the State may be allowed to rehabilitate and introduce the statement and read the transcript However it will not be admitted to go to the jury. At the request of Ms. Machnich, Court reminded the victim not to talk about her testimony.

Evening recess.

CUSTODY

06/11/19 10:30 AM JURY TRIAL

Felony/Gross Misdemeanor

COURT MINUTES

June 12, 2019

C-16-318461-1

State of Nevada

vs

Gustavo Gunera-Pastrana

June 12, 2019

8:30 AM

Jury Trial

HEARD BY: Israel, Ronald J.

COURTROOM: RJC Courtroom 15C

COURT CLERK: Phyllis Irby

RECORDER: Judy Chappell

REPORTER:

PARTIES

PRESENT: Digiacomo, Sandra K.

Attorney for the State

Gunera-Pastrana, Gustavo Adonay

Defendant

Machnich, Tegan Atto SPEED, KEVIN Atto

Attorney for the Deft Attorney for the Deft

State of Nevada

Plaintiff

Sudano, Michelle L.

Attorney for the State

JOURNAL ENTRIES

- OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY. The State has an AMENDED INFORMATION that they would like to admit COUNTS 2, 3 & 4.

Defense counsel objects to the late admittance of the AMENDED INFORMATION. The Court stated it will allow the AMENDED INFORMATION TO BE ADMITTED.

The State requested to admit the transcript and redacted video from FAMILY COURT. The Defense counsel objects to the video being admitted.

The Court will allow the State to bring in consistent statements. The Court WILL NOT ALLOW the transcript to go back with the jury. Both sides agreed that the transcript with redactions can be admitted as Court's exhibits.

JURY PRESENT. Testimony and exhibits presented (see worksheets)

OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY. The Court gives Deft his rights to testify.

PRINT DATE: 06/27/2019 Page 1 of 2 Minutes Date: June 12, 2019

C-16-318461-1

JURY PRESENT. Testimony and exhibits presented (see worksheets).

CONFERENCE AT THE BENCH

OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY. Arguments by counsel regarding the HEARSAY RULE.,

JURY PRESENT. Testimony and exhibits presented (see worksheets).

COURT ORDERED, TRIAL CONTINUED. The Court recessed the Jury for the evening.

CUSTODY

6-13-19 9:00 AM JURY TRIAL

PRINT DATE: 06/27/2019 Page 2 of 2 Minutes Date: June 12, 2019

Felony/Gross Misdemeanor COURT MINUTES June 13, 2019

C-16-318461-1 State of Nevada

٧S

Gustavo Gunera-Pastrana

June 13, 2019 09:00 AM Jury Trial

HEARD BY: Israel, Ronald J. COURTROOM: RJC Courtroom 15C

COURT CLERK: Jacobson, Alice; Thomas, Kathy

RECORDER: Chappell, Judy

REPORTER:

PARTIES PRESENT:

Gustavo Adonay Gunera-Pastrana Defendant

KEVIN SPEED Attorney for Defendant
Michelle L. Sudano Attorney for Plaintiff
Sandra K. Digiacomo Attorney for Plaintiff

State of Nevada Plaintiff

Tegan Machnich Attorney for Defendant

JOURNAL ENTRIES

OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY: Kathy Thomas, Court Clerk Present. Deft. GUNERA-PASTRANA present, in custody. Spanish Interpreters for the Deft.; Soledad Garcia & Elissa Mendoza. State noted they had provided the Court and counsel a copy of their proposed jury instructions with sites. Ms. Machnich stated they would have their proposed jury instructions later today after the State rests.

JURY PRESENT: Parties acknowledge the presence of the jury. Testimony and exhibits presented. (See worksheets). State read the CPS Hearing Transcript.

Alice Jacobson, Court Clerk (Present from 10:45 AM- Noon). Further testimony, CPS video played and exhibits presented. (See worksheets). Amended Information, filed 06/12/19, read by the Clerk of the Court.

Kathy Thomas, Court Clerk (Present from 1:00 PM to 5:00 PM). OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY: Ms. Machnich noted the Defense will not be calling the Deft. and will rest. Upon Court's inquiry, Defendant confirmed he understood his right not to testify and had discussed the issues with his counsel.

JURY PRESENT: Defendant Rested. Jury to return tomorrow at 9:00 AM for instructions and closing arguments.

OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY: Oral arguments regarding proposed jury instructions and verdict forms. Court signed instructions and verdict proposed and not signed and FILED IN OPEN COURT. Counsel to complete the changes of the instructions and return tomorrow at 8:30 AM to finalize the jury instructions.

Evening recess.

Printed Date: 6/20/2019 Page 1 of 2 Minutes Date: June 13, 2019

06/14/19 9:00 AM JURY TRIAL

Printed Date: 6/20/2019 Page 2 of 2 Minutes Date: June 13, 2019

Felony/Gross Misdemeanor COURT MINUTES June 14, 2019

C-16-318461-1 State of Nevada

vs

Gustavo Gunera-Pastrana

June 14, 2019 09:00 AM Jury Trial

HEARD BY: Israel, Ronald J. COURTROOM: RJC Courtroom 15C

COURT CLERK: Thomas, Kathy RECORDER: Chappell, Judy

REPORTER:

PARTIES PRESENT:

Gustavo Adonay Gunera-Pastrana Defendant

KEVIN SPEED Attorney for Defendant
Michelle L. Sudano Attorney for Plaintiff
Sandra K. Digiacomo Attorney for Plaintiff

State of Nevada Plaintiff

Tegan Machnich Attorney for Defendant

JOURNAL ENTRIES

Deft. GUNERA-PASTRANA present, in custody. Spanish Interpreters: Maria Peters & Elissa Mendoza for Deft.

OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY: Instructions settled.

JURY PRESENT: Court instructed the jury. Closing arguments.

Marshal and Judicial Executive Assistant sworn and given charge of the jury. Court Thanked and released the 3 secret alternate jurors. Amended Jury List FILED IN OPEN COURT.

At the hour of 12:21 PM the jury retired to deliberate.

OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY: Jury Question discussed regarding a playback of the CPS. Court will recess the jury to return Monday to watch the playback and continue deliberations.

Weekend recess.

CUSTODY

06/17/19 10:30 AM JURY TRIAL

Felony/Gross Misdemeanor COURT MINUTES June 17, 2019

C-16-318461-1 State of Nevada

vs

Gustavo Gunera-Pastrana

June 17, 2019 10:30 AM Jury Trial

HEARD BY: Israel, Ronald J. COURTROOM: RJC Courtroom 15C

COURT CLERK: Thomas, Kathy RECORDER: Chappell, Judy

REPORTER:

PARTIES PRESENT:

Gustavo Adonay Gunera-Pastrana Defendant

KEVIN SPEED Attorney for Defendant
Michelle L. Sudano Attorney for Plaintiff
Sandra K. Digiacomo Attorney for Plaintiff

State of Nevada Plaintiff

Tegan Machnich Attorney for Defendant

JOURNAL ENTRIES

Deft. GUNERA-PASTRANA present, in custody. Spanish Interpreters for the Deft.: Yul Haasmann, Mariella Lopez and Ricardo Pico.

OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY: Court noted they will be able to show the playback of the State playing the CPS video hearing. Counsel agreed.

JURY PRESENT: Counsel acknowledged the presence of the jury. Court advised the Jury, they had received the jury request to playback the trial where the video of the CPS hearing was shown. Playback was conducted. Jury returned to deliberations.

OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY: Court received another note from the Jury. Upon Court's inquiry, Counsel agreed to answer the question; "continue deliberating". Jury note and answer returned to the jury.

At the hour of 5:05 P.M. Verdict returned;

COUNT 1 - GUILTY OF LEWDNESS WITH A CHILD UNDER THE AGE OF 14

COUNT 2 - GUILTY OF SEXUAL ASSAULT WITH A MINOR UNDER FOURTEEN YEARS OF AGE

COUNT 3 - GUILTY OF SEXUAL ASSAULT WITH A MINOR UNDER FOURTEEN YEARS OF AGE

COUNT 4 - GUILTY OF LEWDNESS WITH A CHILD UNDER THE AGE OF 14

Jury polled.

Court Thanked and excused the Jury. Jury Instructions and Verdict Form, FILED IN OPEN COURT.

COURT ORDERED, Deft REMANED into custody and matter SET for sentencing and referred to Parole and Probation (P & P) for and Pre-Sentence Investigation (PSI) Report and Psychosexual Evaluation.

CUSTODY

09/18/19 9:00 AM SENTENCING

Felony/Gross Misdemeanor COURT MINUTES June 18, 2019

C-16-318461-1 State of Nevada

٧S

Gustavo Gunera-Pastrana

June 18, 2019 01:30 PM At Request of Court: Evidentiary Hearing

HEARD BY: Israel, Ronald J. COURTROOM: RJC Courtroom 15C

COURT CLERK: Thomas, Kathy RECORDER: Chappell, Judy

REPORTER:

PARTIES PRESENT:

Gustavo Adonay Gunera-Pastrana Defendant

KEVIN SPEED Attorney for Defendant
Michelle L. Sudano Attorney for Plaintiff
Sandra K. Digiacomo Attorney for Plaintiff

State of Nevada Plaintiff

Tyler Gaston Attorney for Defendant

JOURNAL ENTRIES

Deft. GUNERA-PASTRANA present, in custody. Spanish Interpreter Ricardo Pico for Deft. Court noted the Marshal has advised the Court, the foreperson stated he googled "common sense". Mr. Speed inquired of when did it occur, if during deliberations, if he shared it with the entire jury panel and if it was used for their verdict. State agreed. COURT ORDERED, Matter SET for a hearing. Court directed Counsel to research this issue. Mr. Speed requested the hearing within 7 days. Colloquy regarding bringing one juror or all and if a subpoena would be needed. Court Clerk called the Juror- Coleman and was unable to leave a message due to his voicemail being full. Court to reach out to the Juror to request his presence for Friday.

CUSTODY

06/21/19 10:00 AM AT THE REQUEST OF THE COURT: EVIDENTIARY HEARING

CLERK'S NOTE: Following court the Judicial Executive Assistant (JEA) was able to reach Mr. Coleman and he was willing to appear on Friday.

Felony/Gross Misdemeanor COURT MINUTES June 21, 2019

C-16-318461-1 State of Nevada

vs

Gustavo Gunera-Pastrana

June 21, 2019 10:00 AM At Request of Court: Evidentiary Hearing

HEARD BY: Israel, Ronald J. COURTROOM: RJC Courtroom 15C

COURT CLERK: Natali, Andrea RECORDER: Chappell, Judy

REPORTER:

PARTIES PRESENT:

Gustavo Adonay Gunera-Pastrana Defendant

KEVIN SPEED Attorney for Defendant Sandra K. Digiacomo Attorney for Plaintiff

State of Nevada Plaintiff

Tegan Machnich Attorney for Defendant

JOURNAL ENTRIES

APPEARANCES CONTINUED: Deft. present in custody with the assistance of Spanish Interpreter Yule Haasman.

OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY.

COURT ADVISED, it was able to contact all of the jurors to come in, staggering their time, and the foreperson will be brought in first. FURTHER, it had researched this matter and ADVISED NRS 50.065 limited its inquiry. Mr. Speed argued that Marshal Moody be required to testify as to when the alleged incident occurred and when it was reported to the court. COURT NOTED, that was the reason the jury was here. Ms. DiGiacomo argued the Marshal's testimony was not necessary at this point unless the juror denied making the comment; noting she needed to know whether the foreperson researched "common sense" and whether that was conveyed to the other jurors. COURT FURTHER ADVISED as to what the jurors would be asked about. FURTHER, counsel could provide written briefs about using a dictionary and regarding what the foreperson said to the other jurors, if at all anything, whether the foreperson communicated with his fellow jurors; NOTED it would determine whether it was prejudicial.

OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY / IN THE PRESENCE OF FOREPERSON / JUROR NO. 7 BADGE 050.

Sworn testimony by Juror no. 7 regarding googling the term "common sense", the timeframe in which the term was researched, the timeframe that the verdicts were reached on each count with respect to when the term was researched.

OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY.

COURT ADVISED, the foreperson testified that it had happened and NOTED when the juror told the Court was outside the scope. Argument by Mr. Speed that the information about when the juror had notified the court, was important, as he may have had the opportunity to move for a mistrial. Colloquy regarding when counsel was notified of this matter and what had been conveyed to them. COURT ADVISED it happened after the jurors were leaving. Ms.

Prepared by: Andrea Natali

DiGiacomo stated she did not think the rest of the jurors needed to stay her. Counsel concurred there was no need to recall Juror no. 7. Mr. Speed regarding questioning the officers of the court as he now knew there was juror misconduct. Sworn testimony by Marshal Moody regarding it being after the verdict was read and he was taking the jurors into the jury room; additionally, that he had conveyed that information to the Judge after the jurors were already walking out. Upon Courts' inquiry on whether counsel wanted to hear from the rest of the jurors, Mr. Speed stated he believed the record was clear and Ms. DiGiacomo so agreed. COURT ORDERED, the jurors are ALLOWED TO LEAVE. Upon Mr. Speeds request, COURT FURTHER ORDERED the timeframe to file a motion for a new trial EXPANDED, matter SET for argument, and the parties were notified of the following briefing schedule: Defendant's motion DUE BY 7/8/19, State's response DUE BY 7/22/19, Defendant's reply DUE BY 8/2/19.

At the request of Ms. DiGiacomo, COURT FURTHER ORDERED, sentencing date VACATED and RESET for Status Check. FURTHER ORDERED, Deft. to REMAIN IN CUSTODY.

CUSTODY

8/7/19 - 9:00 AM - ARGUMENT: DEFENSE MOTION FOR NEW TRIAL ... STATUS CHECK: RESET SENTENCING DATE

Prepared by: Andrea Natali

Felony/Gross Misdemeanor COURT MINUTES August 07, 2019

C-16-318461-1 State of Nevada

vs

Gustavo Gunera-Pastrana

August 07, 2019 09:00 AM All Pending Motions

HEARD BY: Israel, Ronald J. COURTROOM: RJC Courtroom 15C

COURT CLERK: Trujillo, Athena RECORDER: Chappell, Judy

REPORTER:

PARTIES PRESENT:

Gustavo Adonay Gunera-Pastrana Defendant

KEVIN SPEED Attorney for Defendant
Michelle L. Sudano Attorney for Plaintiff

State of Nevada Plaintiff

JOURNAL ENTRIES

ARGUMENT: DEFENSE MOTION FOR NEW TRIAL COURT ORDERED, motion DENIED.

DEFENDANT'S MOTION FOR A JUDGEMENT OF ACQUITTAL AFTER A VERDICT OF GUILTY, OR IN THE ALTERNATIVE, MOTION FOR NEW TRIAL BASED UPON PER SE JURY MISCONDUCT

Counsel submitted. COURT STATED its findings and ORDERED, motion DENIED. State to prepare the order and findings of fact and conclusions of law and submit to opposing counsel before final submission to the Court. State requested a copy of JAVS. COURT SO ORDERED.

STATUS CHECK: RESET SENTENCING DATE COURT ORDERED, matter SET for sentencing.

CUSTODY

9/25/19 9:00 AM SENTENCING

Printed Date: 8/8/2019 Page 1 of 1 Minutes Date: August 07, 2019

Prepared by: Athena Trujillo

Felony/Gross Misdemeanor COURT MINUTES September 25, 2019

C-16-318461-1 State of Nevada

vs

Gustavo Gunera-Pastrana

September 25, 2019 09:00 AM Sentencing

HEARD BY: Israel, Ronald J. COURTROOM: RJC Courtroom 15C

COURT CLERK: Thomas, Kathy RECORDER: Chappell, Judy

REPORTER:

PARTIES PRESENT:

Gustavo Adonay Gunera-Pastrana Defendant

KEVIN SPEED Attorney for Defendant Sandra K. Digiacomo Attorney for Plaintiff

State of Nevada Plaintiff

JOURNAL ENTRIES

Deft. GUNERA-PASTRANA present, in custody. Spanish Interpreter, Elissa Mendoza present for Deft. State noted the Pre-Sentence Investigation (PSI) Report recommended running counts consecutive. Argument by Mr. Speed. Pursuant to Verdict, DEFT GUNERA-PASTRANA ADJUDGED GUILTY of COUNTS 1 & 4- LEWDNESS WITH A CHILD UNDER THE AGE OF 14 (F) and COUNTS 2 & 3 - SEXUAL ASSAULT WITH A MINOR UNDER FOURTEEN YEARS OF AGE (F). COURT ORDERED, in addition to the \$25.00 Administrative Assessment fee, a \$150.00 DNA Analysis fee including testing to determine genetic markers, \$3.00 DNA Collection fee and Restitution in the amounts of \$600.00 payable to Clark County Social Services and \$240.00 payable to Victims of Crime. (Total Restitution of \$840.00); Deft. SENTENCED to

COUNT 1- LIFE with parole eligibility after serving a MINIMUM of TEN (10) YEARS, in the Nevada Department of Corrections (NDC), CONCURRENT with COUNT 2; and as to,

COUNT 2 - LIFE with parole eligibility after serving a MINIMUM of THIRTY-FIVE (35) YEARS, in the Nevada Department of Corrections (NDC), and as to,

COUNT 3 - LIFE with parole eligibility after serving a MINIMUM of THIRTY-FIVE (35) YEARS, in the Nevada Department of Corrections (NDC), CONCURRENT with COUNT 2; and as to,

COUNT 4 - LIFE with parole eligibility after serving a MINIMUM of TEN (10) YEARS, in the Nevada Department of Corrections (NDC), CONCURRENT with COUNT 2; with 1,171 DAYS credit for time served.

AGGREGATE TOTAL sentence is LIFE with parole eligibility after serving a MINIMUM of THIRTY-FIVE (35) YEARS.

FURTHER ORDERED, a SPECIAL SENTENCE of LIFETIME SUPERVISION is imposed to commence upon release from any term of imprisonment, probation or parole. In addition,

Printed Date: 9/26/2019 Page 1 of 2 Minutes Date: September 25, 2019

before the Defendant is eligible for parole, a panel consisting of the Administrator of the Mental Health and Development Services of the Department of Human Resources or his designee; the Director of the Department of Corrections or his designee; and a psychologist licensed to practice in this state; or a psychiatrist licensed to practice medicine in Nevada must certify that the Defendant does not represent a high risk to re-offend based on current accepted standards of assessment.

ADDITIONALLY, the Defendant is ORDERED to REGISTER as a sex offender in accordance with NRS 179D.460 within FORTY-EIGHT (48) HOURS after any release from custody. Bond, if any, EXONERATED.

NDC

Printed Date: 9/26/2019 Page 2 of 2 Minutes Date: September 25, 2019

Electronically Filed 12/5/2019 11:26 AM Steven D. Grierson CLERK OF THE COURT

TRAN 1 2 3 4 5 DISTRICT COURT 6 CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA 7 THE STATE OF NEVADA, CASE NO. C-16-318461-1 8 Plaintiff, VS. 9 DEPT. ΧI GUSTAVO GUNERA-PASTRANA, 10 Transcript of Proceedings Defendant. 11 12 13 BEFORE THE HONORABLE ELIZABETH GONZALEZ, DISTRICT COURT JUDGE 14 ARRAIGNMENT 15 WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 12, 2016 16 17 APPEARANCES: 18 FOR THE STATE: AMY L. FERREIRA Chief Deputy District Attorney 19 FOR DEFENDANT: KEVIN C. SPEED 20 Deputy Public Defender 21 ALSO PRESENT: ALEXANDRA ANDRADE 22 Court Certified Spanish Interpreter 23 24

RECORDED BY: JILL HAWKINS, COURT RECORDER

25

Page - 1

1	LAS VEGAS, NEVADA, WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 12, 2016, 9:07 A.M.
2	(Court was called to order)
3	THE COURT: Gustavo Gunera-Pastrana.
4	MR. SPEED: Good morning, Your Honor. Kevin Speed for
5	Mr. Gunera-Pastrana who is present in custody with the
6	assistance of the Spanish interpreter.
7	MS. FERREIRA: Good morning, Your Honor. Amy Ferreira
8	on behalf of the State.
9	THE COURT: It's my understanding this is the
10	continued arraignment.
11	MR. SPEED: That is correct, Your Honor.
12	THE COURT: How far did you get?
13	MR. SPEED: Not very. I don't think we made the stop
14	in lower-level arraignment court.
15	MS. FERREIRA: We did. I think the defendant was
16	actually taken back
17	MR. SPEED: That's what happened.
18	MS. FERREIRA: before Mr. Speed arrived.
19	MR. SPEED: That is what happened.
20	THE COURT: Okay. So let me get to the right document
21	here.
22	Good morning, sir. How are you today?
23	THE DEFENDANT: Very well.
24	THE COURT: Is your true name Gustavo Adonay Gunera-
25	Pastrana?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 1 THE COURT: Do you understand that if that is not your 2 true name you must disclose your true name to me today or all 3 proceedings in this matter will be under the name of Gustavo 4 5 Adonay Gunera-Pastrana? THE DEFENDANT: Yes. That's my name. 6 7 THE COURT: How old are you, sir? THE DEFENDANT: Thirty-five years old. 8 9 THE COURT: Are you able to understand me with the assistance of the court interpreter? 10 11 THE DEFENDANT: Of course. Yes. 12 THE COURT: Have you previously had the opportunity to 13 review the Information filed on September 30th, 2016, charging 14 you with lewdness with a child under the age of 14 and sexual 15 assault with a minor under 14 years of age, both felonies? 16 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 17 THE COURT: Do you waive the formal reading of that 18 Information here in court? 19 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 20 THE COURT: You've had a chance to discuss it with 21 your attorney? 22 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 23 THE COURT: You feel like you understand the nature of 24 the charges? 25 THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: How do you plead to the charges? 1 THE DEFENDANT: Not guilty. 2 THE COURT: Sir, you have a right to a trial within 60 3 4 days. Would you like to invoke that right? 5 THE DEFENDANT: Of course. Yes. THE COURT: Okay. So, Mr. Speed, that takes me to --6 7 my January stack is the quickest I can get you. That would be 8 January 3rd. THE CLERK: Status check trial readiness November 30 9 at 9:00 a.m., calendar call December 28th at 9:00 a.m., jury 10 11 trial January 3rd at 1:00 p.m.. 12 MR. SPEED: Your Honor, in all likelihood I will not 13 be in the jurisdiction that close to the holiday. What is the Court's next stack after this? 14 THE COURT: Well, I have January 3rd, January 9th, 15 16 January 17th, January 23rd, January 30th, and then I go to 17 March. 18 MR. SPEED: Can we have the January 30th stack? Is that all right with you? 19 20 MS. FERREIRA: I leave --- Court's indulgence. 21 MR. SPEED: The 30th will be fine. We'll set it. And 22 if issues arise, we'll take them up with Your Honor. 23 THE COURT: Sir, your counsel has asked that instead of going on January 3rd that I set the trial for January 30th. 24

25

Is that okay with you?

1	THE DEFENDANT: No.
2	THE COURT: Okay. So it's January 3rd, Mr. Speed.
3	MR. SPEED: We'll be here that day.
4	THE COURT: All right. Thanks.
5	MR. SPEED: May I have those dates again, Madam Clerk
6	calendar call and trial date, please.
7	THE CLERK: Calendar call is December 28th at 9:00
8	a.m., trial date is January 3rd at 1:00 p.m., status check
9	November 30th, 9:00 a.m
10	THE PROCEEDINGS CONCLUDED AT 9:11 A.M.
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	ATTEST: I do hereby certify that I have truly and correctly transcribed the audio/video proceedings in the above-entitled
21	case to the best of my ability.
22	Jul Hawkins
23	V
24	JILL HAWKINS, Court Recorder

Electronically Filed 12/5/2019 11:26 AM Steven D. Grierson CLERK OF THE COURT

TRAN 1 2 3 4 5 DISTRICT COURT 6 CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA 7 THE STATE OF NEVADA, CASE NO. C-16-318461-1 8 Plaintiff, VS. 9 DEPT. ΧI GUSTAVO GUNERA-PASTRANA, 10 Transcript of Proceedings Defendant. 11 12 13 BEFORE THE HONORABLE ELIZABETH GONZALEZ, DISTRICT COURT JUDGE 14 STATUS CHECK 15 WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 30, 2016 16 17 APPEARANCES: 18 FOR THE STATE: AMY L. FERREIRA Chief Deputy District Attorney 19 FOR DEFENDANT: KEVIN C. SPEED 20 Deputy Public Defender 21 ALSO PRESENT: MARIA PETERS 22 Court Certified Spanish Interpreter 23 24 25 RECORDED BY: JILL HAWKINS, COURT RECORDER

Page - 1

LAS VEGAS, NEVADA, WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 30, 2016, 9:20 A.M.

(Court was called to order)

THE COURT: I need an interpreter. I've got an interpreter. Good morning, ma'am.

THE INTERPRETER: Good morning.

THE COURT: Good morning, sir. This is the time set for us to discuss whether we're going to be ready for trial.

Mr. Speed, how are we doing on being ready?

MR. SPEED: Your Honor, we -- we're about a month away from calendar call. Kevin Speed for Mr. Gunera-Pastrana who is present in custody. We are about a month away from calendar call. I don't think we're going to be ready. I have a couple of other trials scheduled for that same slot in early January.

And this is a case where Mr. Gunera-Pastrana invoked his right to a speedy trial. Now, I'm not sure whether my client understands fully that invoking your right to a speedy trial doesn't necessarily mean you're going to achieve the best result or you're helping your counsel achieve the best result by rushing into a jury trial, but I will explain those things to him as we get closer and closer to our trial date.

THE COURT: Well, right now he's invoked.

MR. SPEED: Right.

THE COURT: So I'm going to leave the trial where it is. If something happens or he decides to waive, then we can certainly have a discussion about rescheduling the trial.

1	MR. SPEED: He has not indicated that he's changed his
2	mind on that with me; but, again, we'll discuss it as the time
3	draws closer.
4	THE COURT: All right. Anything else?
5	MS. FERREIRA: Good morning, Your Honor. Amy Ferreira
6	on behalf of the State. No, Your Honor.
7	THE COURT: If it goes, how long's it going to take?
8	MR. SPEED: One week.
9	THE COURT: All right.
10	MR. SPEED: It's a one-week trial.
11	THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Have a nice day.
12	MS. FERREIRA: Thank you, Your Honor.
13	MR. SPEED: Thank you.
14	THE PROCEEDINGS CONCLUDED AT 9:22 A.M.
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	ATTEST: I do hereby certify that I have truly and correctly transcribed the audio/video proceedings in the above-entitled
21	case to the best of my ability.
22	Jul Hawkins
23	Jul Murkers
24	JILL HAWKINS, Court Recorder

Electronically Filed 12/5/2019 11:26 AM Steven D. Grierson CLERK OF THE COURT

TRAN 1 2 3 4 5 DISTRICT COURT 6 CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA 7 THE STATE OF NEVADA, CASE NO. C-16-318461-1 8 Plaintiff, VS. 9 DEPT. ΧI GUSTAVO GUNERA-PASTRANA, 10 Transcript of Proceedings Defendant. 11 12 13 BEFORE THE HONORABLE ELIZABETH GONZALEZ, DISTRICT COURT JUDGE 14 HEARING ON DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO CONTINUE TRIAL 15 WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 21, 2016 16

17 | APPEARANCES:

FOR THE STATE: NOREEN C. DEMONTE

Chief Deputy District Attorney

FOR DEFENDANT: KEVIN C. SPEED

Deputy Public Defender

21

22

23

18

19

20

ALSO PRESENT: JEFFREY HANKS

Court Certified Spanish Interpreter

24

25

RECORDED BY: JILL HAWKINS, COURT RECORDER

Page - 1

LAS VEGAS, NEVADA, WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 21, 2016, 9:23 A.M.

(Court was called to order)

THE COURT: This is my add on. Page 21.

MR. SPEED: Kevin Speed for Mr. Gunera-Pastrana who is present in custody. This is my motion to continue the trial date on an order shortening time. And I appreciate the Court accommodating us in this fashion.

THE COURT: Absolutely.

MS. DEMONTE: State has no opposition. We just request any date other than February.

MR. SPEED: We have a motion for discovery that I believe was calendared for January 18th. If the Court has reviewed that, we are asking for quite a bit of information that will take some time for us to obtain. If February is not good for the State, it certainly -- I don't anticipate it being good for us, either. So --

THE COURT: How about March 13th.

MR. SPEED: That's fine for now. And if we run into problems, we'll address them with the Court.

THE COURT: Mr. Gunera-Pastrana, is March 13th a good trial date for you?

MR. SPEED: Mr. Gunera-Pastrana has indicated to me that he will never waive his right to a speedy trial. That was part of the disagreement that we've had as attorney and client. That's not a good date for him. I can tell the Court that now,

but it's the best that we can do. 1 Does the Court have any idea who is going to be taking 2 Your Honor's cases? 3 4 THE COURT: Yeah. My question, though, is -- that's 5 not my question. My question is when is the earliest you can be 6 ready? 7 MR. SPEED: Give me the March date now if that's the 8 first --9 THE COURT: No. I can give you earlier dates. That's 10 why I'm asking --11 MR. SPEED: I won't be ready earlier. I'm thinking probably later, if anything. But if March --12 13 THE COURT: I'm not inclined --14 MR. SPEED: -- is the first date --15 THE COURT: -- to give you later than the first week of the March stack. That's the latest I'm inclined to give you, 16 17 given his invocation. I certainly understand the discovery 18 issues which are complicating this issue and making it hard for vou to be effective without that information --19 20 MR. SPEED: Right. 21 THE COURT: -- but I'm not willing to go further than 22 that date. I would have set it earlier if you had available

MR. SPEED: And there's no way I can make a

dates where you thought you could be ready based on the

discovery that needs to be provided to you.

23

24

representation like that to the Court. 1 2 Then we'll go with the March 13th. THE COURT: Okay. 3 I understand the defendant is maintaining his right to a speedy 4 trial, and we will do our best to make sure that you go on that March 13th date. So you all need to make your best efforts to 5 6 be ready. 7 THE CLERK: Status check trial readiness February 8 at 8 9:00 a.m., calendar call March 8th at 9:00 a.m., jury trial 9 March 13 at 1:00 p.m.. 10 THE DEFENDANT: Thank you. 11 THE COURT: Thank you. 12 THE PROCEEDINGS CONCLUDED AT 9:26 A.M. 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 I do hereby certify that I have truly and correctly transcribed the audio/video proceedings in the above-entitled 21 case to the best of my ability. 22 23 24 JILL HAWKINS, Court Recorder

Electronically Filed 11/26/2019 11:10 AM Steven D. Grierson CLERK OF THE COURT

1 **RTRAN** 2 3 4 DISTRICT COURT 5 CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA 6 7 THE STATE OF NEVADA, 8 Plaintiff, CASE NO. C318461-1 DEPT. NO. 1 9 VS. 10 GUSTAVO GUNERA-PASTRANA, 11 Defendant. 12 13 BEFORE THE HONORABLE KENNETH C. CORY, DISTRICT JUDGE 14 WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 18, 2017 AT 10:36 A.M. 15 **RECORDER'S CERTIFIED TRANSCRIPT RE:** 16 **DEFENDANTS MOTION FOR DISCOVERY** 17 APPEARANCES: 18 FOR THE STATE: AMY L. FERREIRA 19 Chief Deputy District Attorney 20 FOR THE DEFENDANT: KEVIN C. SPEED 21 Deputy Public Defender 22 ALSO PRESENT: **ALBERT VALENCIA** Spanish Interpreter 23 24

Recorded by: LISA A. LIZOTTE, COURT RECORDER

(WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 18, 2017 AT 10:36 A.M.)

THE CLERK: Page 36, the State of Nevada versus Gustavo Pastrana, Case Number C318461. Defendant is present in custody.

MS. FERREIRA: Good morning, Your Honor. Amy Ferreira on behalf of the State.

MR. SPEED: Good morning, Your Honor. Kevin Speed for Mr. Gunera-Pastrana. He will require the assistance of the Spanish Interpreter.

THE COURT: Of a Spanish Interpreter?

MR. SPEED: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. We don't have one, right?

MS. FERREIRA: He's here.

THE COURT: We do.

MR. SPEED: We do have one. All right.

THE INTERPRETER: Present, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. This is the defense motion for discovery.

MR. SPEED: That is correct, Your Honor. We have itemized,

beginning at Page 7 of the motion, eight items of discovery, and I call those items using that term loosely. Some of them will be packets of information that we're seeking from the State at this time. The easiest, I guess, procedure to follow here would be to start with Number 1 on Page 7. We're asking the State to turn over the Clark County School District files for the complaining witness in the case. Her initials are M.M. and I have her date of birth listed at Line 13. This is a mistake on my part. I direct the Court's attention to Line 15. I've mistyped the initials of the complaining witness. That J.B. should be M.M.

THE COURT: Should be M.M.?

MR. SPEED: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. And what's the State's position on that?

MS. FERREIRA: And, Your Honor, certainly the State has no control over the Clark County School District. That's not a law enforcement agency, so certainly if Mr. Speed would like to attempt to get records he's more than welcome to send a subpoena and see how much compliance he gets, but I am under no obligation according to NRS 174 and the *Brady* case law to obtain those records.

THE COURT: Would that not be something you could get by subpoena?

MR. SPEED: We will try to subpoen the school district, Your Honor, but in my experience in dealing in these kinds of cases when we send our subpoenas to the school district we're usually met with a strongly worded letter saying to do all sorts of things.

THE COURT: Pound sand?

MR. SPEED: Judge Bell used to talk about something up a rope, but we won't use that language here this morning. It's easier to get the –

THE COURT: Did the State's -

MR. SPEED: -- information when the State issues their subpoenas.

THE COURT: Does the State have any objection to the Defendant obtaining these records by subpoena?

MS. FERREIRA: Well, certainly not. If they send a valid subpoena I mean I think that that's appropriate.

THE COURT: All right. Then we may have to go through whatever we have to go through.

MR. SPEED: We'll go through the process, we'll do what we have to do, what's directed by statute. If we receive one of those sternly worded letters can we return to court for settlement of the issue?

THE COURT: Yeah. Who issues the letter if you've had this experience before? What office?

MR. SPEED: Typically DA Civil.

THE COURT: DA Civil?

MR. SPEED: Yes. As counsel for the Clark County School District.

THE COURT: That will not happen here, is that correct?

MS. FERREIRA: That's beyond my realm of knowledge at this point. I've never heard that before. With CPS records certainly that's the case but with Clark County School District records I don't know why that would be.

THE COURT: Yeah. Well, so we can short circuit all the fun and games later on down the road, the Court will deny that as far as requiring the State to provide it but indicate that if they're sought by virtue of a subpoena duces tecum I do not want to hear an objection raised from the DA Civil division.

MS. FERREIRA: Well, and, Your Honor, I think some of that has to do with what is appropriate to be disclosed. Certainly you can't just say, hey, I want a subpoena for all this child's personal information.

THE COURT: Well, yeah. But you see, we can't – we can't – what are we going to do, say, okay, yeah, but, see, I wear the other hat. I'm not DA Criminal, I'm DA Civil. You have no objection to it. You're the attorney on the case.

MS. FERREIRA: Well, I don't have an objection if there are records that are proper to be turned over, but I don't expect the school district to turn over

It takes a Court order to be able to get medical records. Same thing with CPS records. It's not just everything gets turned over. So what I'm saying is I don't have an opposition to him filing his own subpoena and trying to obtain records. I'm just not going to send a subpoena because I have no use for those records.

THE COURT: Well I don't know. Liust – the thing that bothers me

every personal identifying piece of information. Same with like medical records.

THE COURT: Well, I don't know. I just – the thing that bothers me is if we have the attorney on the case says, I don't have any objection, and then they go through this and they run into a brick wall because DA Civil says no.

MS. FERREIRA: Well, I just want the record to be -

MR. SPEED: Or counsel – or, Your Honor, counsel from the Clark County School District and the State views these bodies differently from you or I apparently. The State is making a distinction between law enforcement agencies and the Clark County School District. We view them all as state actors or government actors, agents of Clark County, so either it will be DA Civil who represents the school district or counsel for the Clark County School District. Either way these are attorneys who are employed by the County of Clark, this jurisdiction.

THE COURT: All right. Well, we'll have to – we'll have to take it as it comes but you'll have to issue your subpoenas and see what happens. All right. Number 2.

MR. SPEED: Any information from the Department of Family Services. These are the CPS records, and Ms. Ferreira did state that the information that we received from the party to whom – upon whom we served these subpoenas is usually telling us that they will ignore the subpoena or will not obey the commands therein and those are DA Civil attorneys.

THE COURT: Well, you know, I'm going to issue the order that you can – you can by way of subpoena seek these records, and if anybody is going to step up and say you can't get them they better not just refuse to give them.

MS. FERREIRA: And, Your Honor, I think -

THE COURT: I would expect them -- if a DA Civil thinks that it is not appropriate I would expect them to file a motion for a protective order.

MS. FERREIRA: And I think so long as Mr. Speed submits an order to the Court and Your Honor signs off that the CPS records should be turned over only in camera review for Your Honor to decide what's appropriate --

MR. SPEED: Well, the State can't -

MS. FERREIRA: -- that's the normal course of action.

MR. SPEED: Hold on, hold on, Ms. Ferreira. The State can't determine how I submit an order. Now, we believe that these CPS records are material and relevant to our defense, and if the State is in possession of those they're obligated to turn those over to us. If this Court is saying that it will require an order to compel the Department of Family Services to turn those orders then certainly we'll submit one, and whatever language the Court sees necessary in that —

THE COURT: That's the way - that's the way it typically -

MR. SPEED: -- we'll take that up with Your Honor.

THE COURT: That – as far as I'm aware that's what you have to do -- before you can create the duty you have to file the subpoena or get an order from the Court, and if somebody doesn't want to comply then it would behoove them to file a motion for a protective order rather than come in on a motion to be held in contempt of Court.

 MR. SPEED: So as for Item Number 2, Your Honor, I will prepare a subpoena and also draft a copy of an order to the Department of Family Services and I'll run a copy of that order by Ms. Ferreira.

THE COURT: Let me ask you, Ms. Ferreira, the – is there – you began to say that there's a limit to what would be appropriate to be handed over under this one.

MS. FERREIRA: I'm sorry, I didn't hear what Your Honor said.

THE COURT: Huh?

MS. FERREIRA: I didn't hear what you said. I'm sorry.

THE COURT: You began to say that as long as it was limited in some fashion on Number 2 here.

MS. FERREIRA: Yes.

THE COURT: What is the limitation that would be appropriate?

MS. FERREIRA: Normally the records are turned over to the Court so that neither Mr. Speed nor myself sees the entirety of the records. The Court decides what is appropriate to be turned over in terms of what's relevant to this case, then the Court takes out those pages, gives them to both the defense and the State so that we have possession of them.

THE COURT: All right. Well, as much as I am not fond of getting in that position we'll do what we have to do, so if that's how they're going to comply then that's what they can do. Number 3, LVMPD records, photographs, investigative notes, audio recordings.

MR. SPEED: I believe we're going down the continuum from difficult to easy. This one should be easy for the State. If the police department is in possession of records, photographs, investigative notes, audio recordings,

video recordings for this particular event number, and that 1162 event number is the number associated with this case, then I believe that we are entitled to those.

THE COURT: Okay. Any objection to those?

MS. FERREIRA: I do because the defense can send a subpoena to the laboratory to get photographs. We have an agreement with them that they will comply with a Public Defender's subpoena to get those photographs, so Mr. Speed can certainly do that. I don't recall there being any photographs, but certainly if we need a definitive answer he can send a subpoena.

THE COURT: This is – the lab is a separate entity?

MS. FERREIRA: Yes.

THE COURT: That you contract with to provide their services,

right?

MS. FERREIRA: No, it's through Metro.

MR. SPEED: This is news to me, Your Honor. I haven't heard -

THE COURT: Is it – is it – are the people that work in the lab, are they Metro employees?

MS. FERREIRA: Yes. They work for Metro is my understanding. I don't know what their contract specifically says.

THE COURT: Well, then, why wouldn't this fit within that class of matters or documents which is under the control of the State, of the District Attorney's office?

MS. FERREIRA: Well, Your Honor, I just certainly think that, you know, according to NRS 174 the State doesn't have to turn over everything in its possession, it has to turn over very specific items. I don't believe that this falls under those items. There's been a lot of kind of research into this particular area

by the administration in the DA's office. The position we take is that they will honor a subpoena by the defense when it comes to getting photographs, so that's the State's position.

THE COURT: So -

MR. SPEED: But under *Brady* and *Kyles*, and these are U.S. Supreme Court cases, the State has an affirmative duty to turn over material and relevant exculpatory evidence in a criminal case. Certainly the notes, the investigative materials that were obtained created by the police department in the investigation of the charges against my client would fall under that umbrella. I believe the Court agrees with that.

THE COURT: I tend to agree with you, but, you know, I think what the problem is is the specificity. If they have something – if you subpoena everything they've got and they come back and say, well, we'll give you this but we won't give you something else we've got then we can litigate over whether they have to turn it over or not, and I will tell you that from what I'm reading in Line 3 I would be likely to require it probably, but I'm not going to – I can't – I don't think we can just in the dark say, oh, sure, if you've got anything at all turn it over because it may be that there's some exception to what they have to turn over notwithstanding *Brady* and other cases.

MR. SPEED: Well, we know that there exists – there are extant audio recordings, video recordings and transcripts of those recordings from the complaining witness in the case, M.M., as well as her mother and perhaps another minor child who lived in the house with my client and the complaining witness's mother. Under this event number is how those items are stored in the police department's file and that file is then given to the District Attorney in

preparation for the prosecution of its case. We don't have any of that right now except –

THE COURT: Well, if you're talking about stuff -

MR. SPEED: -- except what's been turned over to us in pretrial -

THE COURT: -- that's in the possession -

MR. SPEED: -- discovery.

THE COURT: If you're talking about stuff that's in the possession of the DA then I haven't heard any objection to any specific thing that you may have in your possession.

MS. FERREIRA: And I may have misunderstood. I thought you were talking about photographs. If you're talking about recorded statements or transcripts certainly he's entitled to get recordings of interviews —

THE COURT: Well, he did -

MS. FERREIRA: -- that were conducted.

THE COURT: -- he did -

MR. SPEED: Specifically I did ask for photographs in this item in the motion.

THE COURT: Yeah. He did ask for photographs.

MS. FERREIRA: Oh, okay.

MR. SPEED: So, for example, when my client was arrested if there were photographs taken of him at the police station, if there were photographs taken of the complaining witness at the time she was being interviewed, all of those things are part of Metro's file under this event number and should be either in the possession of the District Attorney or still in the possession of the police

 department. We're asking for this Court to issue an order commanding the District Attorney to turn that over to us under *Brady* and *Kyles*.

THE COURT: I would do that with the proviso that if the DA determines that there's something that's not appropriate within what they have they have to file a motion for a protective order or do something to bring it back before the Court so we can make a determination.

MS. FERREIRA: So you're ordering me to get the photos, is that right?

THE COURT: Yes. Unless you – unless you determine that it's not appropriate in which event – because as I sit here today, you know, I'm a little rusty, guys. I need an opportunity to look at the authorities again, so if you think there's an issue there then bring it to the Court's attention with some authorities from both sides and we'll – we'll hash it out.

MR. SPEED: So as for – let me – because I'll be preparing the order on the motion, Your Honor, for Item Number 3 the Court is granting the motion insofar as it pertains to those items –

THE COURT: That are in the possession -

MR. SPEED: -- created by the police department under this particular event number that are in the possession of the District Attorney?

THE COURT: That are in the possession of the District Attorney, that's correct.

MR. SPEED: All right.

THE COURT: Number 4, information, financial benefits, reimbursement, travel expenses, payments for rent or other expenses provided to Ortiz and M.M. by the DA's office.

MR. SPEED: Again, Your Honor, we have learned through our experience that very often in cases like this where a family is being torn asunder the DA's office and other agencies under the DA's umbrella, particularly the Victim/Witness Advocacy Center, will provide benefits, certain financial benefits to witnesses in their prosecutions.

We want to be advised of any benefits that have been provided to the family in this case in the way of cell phone payments or rent for their apartment, help in applying for a U visa to possibly help this family remain in the United States if their citizenship or residency is in issue. We believe that all of those benefits are relevant, they are material, they speak to the credibility and the bias of their witnesses and we should be entitled to learn of that information.

THE COURT: And the State's position on that was – well, I'm not sure. What's the State's position on those items?

MS. FERREIRA: Well, Your Honor, certainly if the State were to have agreed to give a benefit for a witness it would have to be turned over as potential impeachment information, so if the State were paying the rent of somebody or something of that nature absolutely, I think that would need to be disclosed. Counsel is aware that there's a statutory requirement that witnesses be paid in the normal course of having to come to court, so certainly he is aware of that. If something becomes – or comes to my attention I will certainly let him know, but I can say, you know, right now that there has been no additional benefits in that regard such as rent or U visas or anything of that nature.

THE COURT: All right. That's the answer, then. Number 5, evidence to include DNA analyses, medical reports, forensic examinations by LVMPD --

MR. SPEED: I'm sorry to interrupt, Your Honor. Let me go back to Number 4 for just second. Number 4 is granted insofar as if the State becomes aware of any benefit or if the State is aware of any benefit then they will provide that information to us, make us aware of that?

THE COURT: That's correct, right? You don't have any problem with that?

MS. FERREIRA: Insofar as the things that he's mentioned, absolutely. I mean I can tell the Court that sometimes there are referrals for counseling agencies that the State doesn't provide. We provide a referral and whatever happens after that happens, so certainly I don't think I need to turn that over because it's not in my possession.

MR. SPEED: Well, but hold on now. It is in your possession if referrals for counseling are being provided to these witnesses, and these counseling services may or may not have a contract with either the Victim/Witness Advocacy Center or with the District Attorney's office.

THE COURT: Well, the only way it would become discoverable it seems to me is if the State is paying for it, right? The fact they give them a referral to somebody without more doesn't mean that the – that the witness is getting some financial benefit out of it. If the State is paying for it then it does.

MR. SPEED: Well, the witness is receiving the benefit of the service being provided by the particular provider. The way that the State benefits here is that they have witnesses who are satisfied with whatever service or referral that the DA provides to them in exchange for testimony that will be favorable to their prosecution. Now, if the DA's office –

THE COURT: What I hear you -

MR. SPEED: -- is in the business of referring out clients or witnesses –

THE COURT: What I hear you assuming in that is that the State is paying for it. I mean if the State gives somebody a referral and they say, gee, I need counseling and say, well, here's three people –

MR. SPEED: Right.

THE COURT: -- and that's it, they don't confer any benefit, I don't consider that to be – to reach the level of conferring a benefit that *Brady* or *Giglio* or 173 is it – 173 is reaching for.

MR. SPEED: These are subcontractors, if the Court would imagine them that way, subcontractors who have a relationship with the State. You send – speaking to the DA's office, for example, you send us clients, we'll have our services available to you when you need them. Well, we'll always need your kinds of services because we'll always have victims of crime, people who need battered women's counseling or abused children's counseling or things like that, services like that, so –

THE COURT: If you think that it's conferring a benefit if the State is not paying for it then you're going to have to show me some authority. If you think it falls under the discovery, the ambit of discoverable stuff I think you're going to have to show me that the mere referral without more is enough to trigger that, otherwise I'm – it seems to me the more rational approach is to say, if the State is actually conferring a benefit then yes, but the mere referral does not – does that – do you know if the State pays for any of those services?

MS. FERREIRA: I don't know the specifics of the payment, but I can tell the Court that witnesses or victims are allowed to participate in

have -

counseling whether they are for the State, so to speak, or against the State, so to speak, so there are multiple cases where – and I'm just going to throw out as an example domestic violence victims who may not want to have anything to do with the prosecution who partake in counseling, so I think the courts have kind of taken the approach that, well, that can't be perceived as a benefit, then, if people who are anti – you know, the State of Nevada are also partaking in these services.

THE COURT: Yeah. All right. Well, without more I think where I draw the line is still you have to be able to show that they're conferring a benefit, and I'm not aware – as I said I'm pretty rusty at this stuff now, but I'm not aware of any case law or statute that says that the mere referral without more is conferring a benefit which is discoverable.

MR. SPEED: I anticipate that line of inquiry, then, making the contracts, the agreements between the State and these agencies to which they refer their potential clients discoverable, and if I come before Your Honor asking about information pertaining to those kinds of agreements, contractual agreements, a gentlemen's handshakes between Steve Wolfson and service providers, counseling providers, I think we're going to have a —

THE COURT: What's a handshake? What's in a handshake?

MR. SPEED: An agreement to provide these services for us. You'll

THE COURT: You mean provide it – in other words, what I hear you saying is provide them for us, we will pay you.

MR. SPEED: We will send you the client. We will send you a book of business. If we're not paying for it we'll send you – we'll refer you clients who will use your service and they can pay for them themselves with –

THE COURT: You're going to have to show me more authority to reach that level.

MR. SPEED: Well, I won't be able to show the Court authority unless I can establish that these relationships exist –

THE COURT: All right. So –

MR. SPEED: -- and this isn't me making this kind of thing up, Your Honor.

THE COURT: No, I understand that.

MR. SPEED: The – counsel for the government said we refer out our witnesses to different counseling services. As of today I don't know if that's taken place, but if they are –

THE COURT: Well, then, in order -

MR. SPEED: -- taking place we'll let the defense know.

THE COURT: In order to reach that it sounds like you may have to do some further discovery, you know, whether it's by subpoena or other things so that you can show to the Court that there's an actual benefit being conferred upon.

MR. SPEED: Will counsel for the government concede, then, that their witnesses have received counseling services either through the Victim/Witness Advocacy Center or through one of these referrals from the DA's office?

MS. FERREIRA: And I can't concede to something I don't know. I have no idea which particular victims go to counseling until I call their parents, since we're dealing with minor children, and say, hey, have you taken your kid to counseling. That's the only way I find out about it.

MR. SPEED: Can the State do that, then, at least inquire if the complaining witness has received some counseling and let us know that and if so through what service?

MS. FERREIRA: I will be glad to inquire whether the child in this case has received counseling because I don't have a problem with it. I don't think that the law requires me to do that but to be fair to defense at this point I will ask that question. As far as getting information about when she goes, the therapist she sees, if she's going at all is a different story, but I will inquire at this point whether she has gone to counseling.

MR. SPEED: And we can come back to court for the answers to those questions because if she is going to counseling then that raises a whole other basket of discoverable issues, but moving on to Number 6 I believe the Court did read that one, evidence to include DNA analyses reports, things of that nature. I don't know – and I'll be honest with the Court here. I don't know if any DNA tests were performed in this particular case, but if there were we would like copies of those reports as well as the Metro Forensic Lab Standard Operating Procedures Manual so that if there are questions about the results that they obtained we can show those to our experts.

MS. FERREIRA: I don't have any opposition, as I set forth in my response, to getting any results of testing that was done because I believe that that's appropriate under NRS. In terms of policy and procedure manuals that's

something different, so I don't have an opposition to getting the results of any testing that was done and turning it over to the defense.

THE COURT: So I'm not sure I quite understood. You're willing to go to a certain length but what is the limit?

MS. FERREIRA: The law requires that if there is any kind of medical or forensic testing done the results of such medical or forensic testing are required to be turned over to the defense. The State absolutely agrees with that. So the State will turn over the results of the test. Mr. Speed is making an argument that he wants something outside the realm of the results of the tests. He wants operating procedures of the lab that does the testing. That's not something that is required under NRS 174, so the State –

THE COURT: You're referring there to this request for forensic examinations conducted?

MS. FERREIRA: No, that's fine. The results of forensic examinations is fine, no opposition to that.

THE COURT: All right. SANE exam reports?

MS. FERREIRA: Right. No opposition.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, that seems to be everything, then. All right. So that one is granted to that extent at least. Number 6, recordings, intercepted telephone communication, jail calls between the Defendant and any party where Mr. Pastrana is speaking on the telephones in the Clark County Detention Center.

MS. FERREIRA: And, Your Honor, I don't have any calls at this point. I haven't been listening to the Defendant's jail calls. Certainly I'm not going to start listening to them for the defense. He can certainly inquire of those

himself. Certainly if I happen upon something I will certainly turn them over, but at this point I have nothing because I've listened to nothing.

THE COURT: Okay. Number 7, copies of intercepted written communications alleged to be made by the Defendant during his incarceration at CCDC.

MS. FERREIRA: And the same, Your Honor. I haven't looked at his mail. I haven't intercepted any of his communications. I don't intend to use anything at trial since it's not in my possession or in my knowledge. If something changes and something comes to my attention and I intend to use it and/or it's exculpatory in any way certainly I will turn it over to Mr. Speed, but at this point as with the phone calls I have no written communication.

THE COURT: All right. Number 8, he wants the Court to issue a certificate of materiality. I guess I'm pretty rusty. I've never heard of a Court issuing a certificate of materiality on something --

MR. SPEED: Sure. It was Judge Gonzalez who I'll say blazed the trail in this area of the law. When we deal in these kinds of cases that may or may not have witnesses or evidence that is not contained within our jurisdiction, then what is required -- because most of our 50 states – I believe all of the 50 states at this point are all signatories on the Uniform Act to Secure the Attendance of Witnesses from out of state in criminal proceedings. Each state has a different statute –

THE COURT: So that's what you're aiming at is out of state?

MR. SPEED: That's correct. If there's any evidence that exists on this – on those bases, and I'll list those in the order just like Item Number 6 and Item Number 7 granted insomuch as if there is evidence that exists outside of the

state and the State is using it in its prosecution, we expect to be informed of that information and its existence.

THE COURT: Now we passed from something in another state that may or may not be connected to this to actual evidence that the State is going to introduce –

MR. SPEED: No, no, no. If it's – I wouldn't ask for information in another state that's not connected to our case. That's why it's a certificate of materiality. The mere fact that the Court would be executing something like that means that –

THE COURT: Doesn't that require somebody to at their peril decide whether – whether some piece of evidence fits?

MR. SPEED: Not at their peril. That's why we continue to investigate the cases, Your Honor. If we find out that there was a cousin or a nephew or a counseling service, jumping back to our earlier item, in Texas or in New Mexico or Arizona that the complaining witness took -- went to or her mother took her to then we would be entitled to those notes, that counseling service's records.

THE COURT: So long as the State has it?

MR. SPEED: Right.

THE COURT: Okay. If the State has it -

MR. SPEED: What happens – what happens if we serve a subpoena or issue a subpoena on an out of state agency they're going to tell us, we don't have to comply with this subpoena because it's not issued by a Court of competent jurisdiction within our state.

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

LISA A. LIZOTTE Court Recorder

Susi a Lizatto

Electronically Filed 11/26/2019 11:15 AM Steven D. Grierson CLERK OF THE COURT

1 RTRAN 2 3 4 DISTRICT COURT 5 CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA 6 7 THE STATE OF NEVADA, 8 Plaintiff, CASE NO. C318461-1 DEPT. NO. 1 9 VS. 10 GUSTAVO GUNERA-PASTRANA. 11 Defendant. 12 13 BEFORE THE HONORABLE KENNETH C. CORY, DISTRICT JUDGE 14 MONDAY, JANUARY 23, 2017 AT 10:15 A.M. 15 RECORDER'S CERTIFIED TRANSCRIPT RE: 16 **DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO SUPPRESS ALL ORAL AND WRITTEN** STATEMENTS MADE BY THE DEFENDANT TO DETECTIVES D. HUTH AND 17 L. SAMPLES 18 APPEARANCES: 19 FOR THE STATE: JENNIFER CLEMONS 20 Chief Deputy District Attorney 21 FOR THE DEFENDANT: KEVIN C. SPEED Deputy Public Defender 22 23 MARIA GOMEZ ALSO PRESENT: Spanish Interpreter 24 Recorded by: LISA A. LIZOTTE, COURT RECORDER 25

9

10 11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24

25

(MONDAY, JANUARY 23, 2017 AT 10:15 A.M.)

THE CLERK: Page 20, the State of Nevada versus Gustavo Pastrana, Case Number C318461.

THE COURT: There's our motion to suppress.

MR. SPEED: Good morning, Your Honor. Kevin Speed for Mr. Gunera-Pastrana who is present in custody with the assistance of the Spanish Interpreter.

MS. CLEMONS: Jennifer Clemons for the State.

THE COURT: Good morning.

MS. CLEMONS: Good morning.

THE COURT: All right. This is on for Defendant's motion to suppress all oral and written statements. Do you want to capsulize what your argument is?

MR. SPEED: Very briefly, Your Honor. We believe that Mr. Gunera-Pastrana is entitled to have the statement given to Detectives Huth and Samples suppressed because of case law that says that in addition to having his amendment – or his constitutional rights read to him there must be something in the record that shows that the suspect or the interrogee understood his rights, and there is nothing in the record to indicate that he understood the rights as they were read to him.

After reading the department issued *Miranda* card to Mr. Gunera-Pastrana and then having a – it looked like – it appeared to be another Officer from the transcripts of the interview repeat what was being read in Spanish they just dived headlong into questioning without any consideration as to whether or not the person that they were interrogating understood his rights.

THE COURT: Okay. What say -

MR. SPEED: I'm not sure – also this. I made an additional copy of the two interviews or two interrogations to Detectives Huth and Samples. I don't know if the Court got a copy of those. I'm not sure what was filed with our original motion but I do know I have in excess of 100 pages.

THE COURT: We don't have them. I – so far I've just gone off of what was provided.

MR. SPEED: The Court just has the motion? It does not have the exhibits?

THE COURT: That's correct.

MR. SPEED: May I approach? I did make a courtesy copy.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. All right. What says the State?

MS. CLEMONS: Your Honor, Jennifer Clemons for the State. I'm covering this for Ms. Ferreira, so I'm basically going off of what her opposition states. I think that the – she included a portion of the waiver of the *Miranda Rights* and it looks like an interpreter began to interpret what was being said and the Defendant jumped in and said yes. There was also an interpreter present throughout the entire interview, and it appeared the Defendant understood English and wanted to proceed in English.

That's kind of the only representations I can make because I have not read the actual interview. I don't know if Your Honor wants to pass this to read the interview, but based upon Amy Ferreira's briefing, you know, the State doesn't have any concerns with the confession being involuntary.

THE COURT: I'm actually – I am inclined to do that because whatever is in the transcript is all important here --

MS. CLEMONS: I agree.

THE COURT: -- to the argument. Mr. Speed, do you have any problem with that?

MR. SPEED: I don't have a problem with that at all, Your Honor. As a matter of fact we were about to ask the Court to set it down for a *Jackson v Denno* hearing –

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. SPEED: -- and that would give – obviously would give Your Honor more time to review the transcript of the interviews.

THE COURT: Yeah. All right. That's what we'll do. We'll continue this for a *Jackson v Denno* hearing. How long would you anticipate it will take us to conduct that?

MR. SPEED: It would depend on how long it would take for us to get the two Detectives in, and I know that this is a very busy time of the year for the Special Victim's Unit Detectives. I'm not sure if we can get both Detectives Huth and Samples in at the same time or if we'd have to bifurcate or how that would work.

THE COURT: Well, I would hope we don't drag this thing out so long that – I hope we don't have to. You wouldn't have any notion of how quickly we could get the Officers in?

MS. CLEMONS: No. I mean we could – I mean I think we could set a date as early as two weeks and see who's available when. We couldn't do it sooner than two weeks but that would be the quickest.

THE COURT: All right. Let's do that.

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

LISA A. LIZOTTE Court Recorder

Susi a Lizatto

Electronically Filed 11/26/2019 11:17 AM Steven D. Grierson CLERK OF THE COURT

1 **RTRAN** 2 3 4 DISTRICT COURT 5 CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA 6 7 THE STATE OF NEVADA, 8 Plaintiff, CASE NO. C318461-1 DEPT. NO. 1 9 VS. 10 GUSTAVO GUNERA-PASTRANA. 11 Defendant. 12 13 BEFORE THE HONORABLE KENNETH C. CORY, DISTRICT JUDGE 14 WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 2017 AT 9:06 A.M. 15 RECORDER'S CERTIFIED TRANSCRIPT RE: 16 STATUS CHECK: TRIAL READINESS 17 18 APPEARANCES: 19 FOR THE STATE: MICHELLE Y. JOBE Chief Deputy District Attorney 20 21 FOR THE DEFENDANT: KEVIN C. SPEED Deputy Public Defender 22 ALSO PRESENT: **CARLOS CALVO** 23 Spanish Interpreter

Recorded by: LISA A. LIZOTTE, COURT RECORDER

24

1	(WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 2017 AT 9:06 A.M.)
2	THE CLERK: Page 4, the State of Nevada versus Gustavo
3	Pastrana, Case Number C318461.
4	MR. LISK: Your Honor, we need to trail this. This is a specialty
5	teams case and they should be on their way.
6	THE COURT: All right. We'll recall it.
7	(Whereupon, the case was trailed and then recalled at 9:59 a.m.)
8	THE CLERK: Page 4, the State of Nevada versus Gustavo
9	Pastrana, Case Number C318461. Defendant is present in custody with the
10	Interpreter.
11	MR. SPEED: Good morning, Your Honor. Kevin Speed for Mr.
12	Gunera-Pastrana who is present in custody. This was a status check for trial
13	readiness that was set by Judge Gonzalez before the case was transferred to
14	this department. I would remind the Court that we have a Jackson versus Denno
15	hearing scheduled for the 16 th and both sides are ready to proceed with that, so
16	we're – we're good to go as far as scheduling is concerned. We'll be back on the
17	16 th .
18	MS. JOBE: That is correct, and for the record Michelle Jobe
19	standing in for Amy Ferreira.
20	THE COURT: All right. So we'll see you on the 16 th you said?
21	MR. SPEED: Yes, sir. Thank you.
22	MS. JOBE: Thank you.
23	THE COURT: We'll see you then. Thank you.
24	(Whereupon, the proceedings concluded.)

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

LISA A. LIZOTTE Court Recorder

Susi a Lizatto

Electronically Filed 11/26/2019 11:19 AM Steven D. Grierson CLERK OF THE COURT

		Otem A. L		
1	RTRAN			
2				
3				
4	DIST	TRICT COURT		
5	CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA			
6				
7	THE STATE OF NEVADA,)		
8	Plaintiff,) CASE NO. C318461-1		
9	VS.) DEPT. NO. 1		
10)		
11	GUSTAVO GUNERA-PASTRANA,)		
12	Defendant.			
13	BEFORE THE HONORABLE K	KENNETH C. CORY, DISTRICT JUDGE		
14		RUARY 23, 2017 AT 1:35 P.M.		
15		ERTIFIED TRANSCRIPT RE:		
16		V DENNO HEARING		
17	ADDEADANOEO			
18	APPEARANCES:			
19	FOR THE STATE:	JENNIFER CLEMONS Chief Deputy District Attorney		
20	FOR THE DEFENDANT	, ,		
21	FOR THE DEFENDANT	Deputy Public Defender		
22	ALSO PRESENT:	NOELLE TATTON		
23		Spanish Interpreter		
24				
25				

Recorded by: LISA A. LIZOTTE, COURT RECORDER

INDEX OF WITNESSES

STATE'S WITNESSES		<u>DIRECT</u>	<u>CROSS</u>	REDIRECT	RECROSS
	Maria Jimenez	5	10		
	Denise Huth	18	21	24	25
I	Lawrence Samples	28	42	45, 47	

MS. CLEMONS: Correct.

THE COURT: Who would the witness be?

MR. SPEED: One is Detective Huth, I think Detective Samples and the Spanish Interpreter who assisted the officers with their interrogation of Mr. Gunera-Pastrana.

MS. CLEMONS: That's correct.

THE COURT: Well, I leave it to you. If you think that it's necessary or that it helps or adds to the – your arguments in relation to the voluntariness –

MR. SPEED: Well, the focus of our motion is in trying to determine whether Mr. Gunera-Pastrana actually understood the very vague, in my opinion, admonition of his rights before the detectives started with their questioning, so I've asked the State to bring in both detectives as well as the Spanish Interpreter, and when we sat down this afternoon I fielded a question from our interpreter here today asking whether or not the interpreter who assisted in the interview was certified.

I'm not sure what that means or if that confers upon a person any additional qualifications that would make them better suited for that kind of business. I don't even know if this person is certified or not and whether that was – that information was shared with Mr. Gunera-Pastrana on the night of his interview and in helping him to understand what his rights were. I think that's the key issue that we'll be trying to drill down and figure out this afternoon.

THE COURT: All right. What is probably a silly question, but before we go through all of this does the State intend to use the statements?

MS. CLEMONS: Your Honor, this isn't my case. I'm covering this for Ms. Ferreira. I mean he doesn't make any admission, so this is kind of a unique situation. What can happen, though, during trial is certain statements that

he did say during these interviews may become relevant and the State may want to use them, so – and I can't predict, you know, what's going to happen and I don't want to limit Ms. Ferreira in any way during her trial.

THE COURT: All right. Well, then, it sounds like we need to do the hearing. I still leave it to either of you, if you feel that it's helpful to put on a witness we can do that, otherwise you can argue based off of the transcripts. What's your pleasure?

MR. SPEED: Court's indulgence.

THE COURT: Sure.

MR. SPEED: After conferring with my client and the interpreter here furnished for us by the Court, Your Honor, I think it would be best if we have the translator or the interpreter who assisted the detectives with their interview come and see whether or not Mr. Gunera-Pastrana recognizes her as the person who helped him out or helped the detectives in this case on the evening in question.

THE COURT: All right.

MS. CLEMONS: That's fine.

THE COURT: All right. Let's have the interpreter come in. Are we going to swear her as a witness, then? Are you going to inquire of her?

MR. SPEED: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right.

MARIA JIMENEZ,

having been called as a witness, was duly sworn and testified as follows:

THE CLERK: Please be seated. Please state your name and spell it for the record.

THE WITNESS: Maria Jimenez, M-a-r-i-a, J-i-m-e-n-e-z.

1		THE COURT: Thank you. You may proceed.		
2		DIRECT EXAMINATION		
3	BY MR. SF	PEED:		
4	Q	Ms. Jimenez, I represent – I'm Kevin Speed. I represent Mr.		
5	Gunera-Pa	astrana who is seated to my left. Do you recognize Mr. Gunera-		
6	Pastrana?			
7	Α	I think so.		
8	Q	Do you recall –		
9	Α	I would have to look at him closer with my glasses. He's kind of		
10	blurry. Do you –			
11		THE COURT: Go ahead. You may use your glasses.		
12	Q	(By Mr. Speed) He's much nicer looking than I am. I can say that.		
13	A	Yes.		
14		THE COURT: I believe your eyes must be worse than mine. All		
15	right. So you do recognize the Defendant here?			
16		THE WITNESS: Yes.		
17		THE COURT: All right. Go ahead, Mr. Speed.		
18	Q	(By Mr. Speed) And, Ms. Jimenez, on the evening of January 12 th ,		
19	2016 at approximately 3:00 o'clock in the – I'm sorry, the afternoon of January			
20	12 th at approximately 3:00 o'clock did you conduct an interview with Detectives			
21	D. Huth and –			
22	A	Larry.		
23	Q	L. Samples with Mr. Gunera-Pastrana?		
24	A	Yes, sir, I did.		
25	Q	And that interview was conducted in Spanish?		

acknowledged that he understood his rights?

1	A	Yes. I think it either said yes or yeah.		
2	Q	At any time did he ask you after being advised of his rights if you		
3	could repeat Detective Huth's question?			
4	A	Not that I remember, sir.		
5	Q	And do you remember him ever asking for a lawyer?		
6	A	No, sir.		
7	Q	Did he express an interest to remain silent or an intention to remain		
8	silent?			
9	A	Not that I remember, sir.		
10	Q	And you were the only interpreter or translator who was present with		
11	the detectives?			
12	A	Yes, sir.		
13	Q	About Detectives Huth and Samples, were they wearing plain clothes		
14	or were the	ey in their uniforms, police uniforms?		
15	A	Plain clothes.		
16	Q	And where was the interview conducted, if you remember?		
17	A	At 701 North Pecos.		
18	Q	And what building is that?		
19	A	Building K.		
20	Q	I'm sorry, what agency –		
21	A	It's the Southern –		
22	Q	or business is occupied –		
23	A	Nevada Children's Assessment Center.		
24	Q	Okay. Was my client in custody or was he in handcuffs at the time?		
25	A	I don't remember that, sir.		
I	i I			

is issued by the Supreme Court of the State of Nevada?

1	A	Yes, sir.
2	Q	Do you possess that certification as well?
3	A	No, sir.
4	Q	On the evening of – the afternoon of January 16 th of last year did you
5	have your	Metropolitan Police Department certification?
6	A	Yes, sir.
7		THE COURT: January 12 th was it?
8		MR. SPEED: January 12 th , I'm sorry, of 2016.
9		Court's indulgence. May I have the Court's indulgence for just
10	a few moments, Your Honor? There's some confusion.	
11		THE COURT: All right.
12		MR. SPEED: We don't have anything further from Ms. Jimenez,
13	Your Honor.	
14		THE COURT: Any questions from Ms. Clemons?
15		MS. CLEMONS: Briefly, Your Honor.
16		CROSS-EXAMINATION
17	BY MS. CL	LEMONS:
18	Q	Do you recall when this interview was conducted if it was wintertime
19	or summer	time?
20	A	No, I'm sorry.
21	Q	The interview with Detective Huth, who was present in the room
22	during that interview?	
23	A	I think it was just the three of us.
24	Q	So who –
25	A	Detective Huth, myself and him.

Defendant's rights as Detective Huth read them.

And 701 North Pecos, you mentioned that's the CAC?

25

Q

	1	
1	A	It's good once you get it.
2	Q	Do you ever have any kind of peer reviews to make sure your
3	translations	s are accurate?
4	Α	Yes.
5	Q	And how often does that occur?
6	A	They're random.
7	Q	Random, okay. Are you familiar with how Metro generates event
8	numbers?	
9	A	Yes.
10	Q	If the event number in this case indicated a 160712 starting date
11	what would	that mean to you?
12	A	That would be the year, month and day.
13	Q	So 16 would be 2016?
14	A	Yes.
15	Q	07 would be July?
16	A	Yes.
17	Q	And 12 would be the 12 th of July?
18	A	Yes.
19	Q	If this case had an event number 160712 would that indicate that this
20	event occurred on July 12 th , 2016?	
21	A	Yes.
22	Q	So if a transcript indicated that the interview happened in January do
23	you have re	eason to believe that that would be correct or incorrect?
24		THE COURT: You have solved our dilemma.
25		THE WITNESS: I don't understand.

Okay.

1	MS. CLEMONS: I don't have any further questions.	
2	THE COURT: All right. Does that prompt any questions for you, Mr	
3	Speed?	
4	MR. SPEED: Nothing further, Your Honor.	
5	THE COURT: I have a couple of questions. You did both of the	
6	interviews?	
7	THE WITNESS: Yes.	
8	THE COURT: For Huth and for Samples?	
9	THE WITNESS: Yes.	
10	THE COURT: Were they back-to-back?	
11	THE WITNESS: From what I remember, yes.	
12	THE COURT: Do they have any kind of a system - I've seen	
13	people translating before where they can only do it for a while and then they	
14	need a break and they bring – they keep circulating in more translators. Do they	
15	ever do that in your job?	
16	THE WITNESS: It's never happened to me unless I was being	
17	relieved. It's never gone so many hours -	
18	THE COURT: It doesn't go that long?	
19	THE WITNESS: that we needed a break.	
20	THE COURT: Do you happen to recall about how long these two	
21	interviews took?	
22	THE WITNESS: It didn't seem very long.	
23	THE COURT: Okay. All right. Does that prompt any other	
24	questions?	
25	MR. SPEED: No, Your Honor.	

1		MS. CLEMONS: Nothing from the State.
2		THE COURT: Thank you, ma'am. You may step down.
3		THE WITNESS: Thank you.
4		THE COURT: Is this witness excused?
5		MS. CLEMONS: Yes.
6		MR. SPEED: Yes, Your Honor.
7		THE COURT: Thank you, ma'am. You're excused.
8		MR. SPEED: Court's indulgence for just a minute.
9		Your Honor, we call Detective Huth to the stand, please.
10		THE COURT: Very good.
11		DENISE HUTH,
12	having be	en called as a witness, was duly sworn and testified as follows:
13		THE CLERK: Please be seated. Please state your name and spel
14	it for the re	ecord.
15		THE WITNESS: It's Detective Denise Huth, D-e-n-i-s-e, H-u-t-h.
16		THE COURT: You may proceed.
17		DIRECT EXAMINATION
18	BY MR. S	PEED:
19	Q	Detective Huth, do you recognize my client seated to my left?
20	A	Yes.
21	Q	And do you recall conducting an interview with him, interrogating
22	him, as it v	vere, on July 12 th of 2016?
23	A	Yes.
24	Q	And where was that interview conducted?
25		

that?

1	А	Similar to that.
2	Q	Okay.
3		MR. SPEED: That's all I have, Your Honor. Nothing further.
4		THE COURT: Any questions?
5		MS. CLEMONS: Just briefly, Your Honor.
6		CROSS-EXAMINATION
7	BY MS. CL	EMONS:
8	Q	So this interview occurred July 12 th , 2016?
9	Α	Yes.
10	Q	And you went over his Miranda rights with him?
11	Α	Yes, I did.
12	Q	Is that from memory or from a form?
13	A	That's from a card.
14	Q	From a card. Okay. That's your Metro issued card?
15	A	Yes.
16	Q	And there was obviously an interpreter there as well and she
17	interpreted what you said –	
18	A	Yes.
19	Q	to the Defendant? And then in converse she would interpret what
20	he said to you?	
21	A	That's correct.
22	Q	And was the – the interview was audio and video recorded; is that
23	right?	
24	A	That's correct.
25	Q	Who was present in the interview?
	I	

asked him? Was he able to follow along what you were saying?

THE COURT: May this officer be excused, then?

25

when the case comes out and then I, you know, respond at least or have them

come to the office and start the interviews in that case.

Q And to your knowledge was Gustavo arrested immediately after

Detective Samples finished his interview – arrested and charged with what he's in court for?

A Well, I was doing the paperwork to arrest him, yes.

MR. SPEED: That's all. Nothing further, Your Honor.

MS. CLEMONS: Let me just clarify real quick.

RECROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MS. CLEMONS:

Q So you get the call – when you say the case comes out what do you mean by that?

A Sometimes we get reports through the Child Protective Services hotline which is into our — what we call our inbox in the computer, so we're notified that way. Sometimes we get a call from patrol and they notify us. If I'm what's called in the bucket for that day, which means I'm taking the reports, then I would get the call from patrol and then work out, you know, the semantics of, you know, who comes to the office, who gets interviewed, if the detective has to go to the scene, that type of thing.

Q Do you recall how you got assigned this case?

THE INTERPRETER: The Interpreter because of repetition, Your Honor, I'm sorry, was not able to hear that.

THE COURT: All right.

- Q (By Ms. Clemons) Do you recall how you were assigned this case?
- A I don't recall exactly. I believe patrol was called, so I believe patrol responded to the scene.

I'm not sure. Usually we have them transported by patrol to the

- So fair to say he likely did not drive himself there, he was likely
 - That's correct.
- And so you mentioned that your interview with the Defendant didn't really change anything in your opinion about the case? Is that fair?
- He didn't provide any he didn't confess to the allegations, but he didn't provide anything really that was – to explain, you know, why these allegations would have been made. For instance, I think I asked him several times in the interview, you know, why would somebody, you know, make these allegations against you, if he had any problems, and he didn't come up with
- Okay. Are those questions that you would ask in cases like this because fair to say sometimes there's motives for kids to lie?
 - Yeah. I mean in some cases. Depending on the cases, but, yes.
- Okay. And so you in addition to asking questions trying to get him to admit to the crime you also gave him an opportunity to explain any motives or misunderstandings? Is that fair?
 - That's correct.
 - MS. CLEMONS: Nothing further.
 - THE COURT: Anything else?
 - MR. SPEED: No, Your Honor.
 - THE COURT: Thank you, ma'am.
 - May this witness be excused?

1	MR. SPEED: Yes, Your Honor.
2	MS. CLEMONS: Yes.
3	THE COURT: Thank you. You may be excused.
4	MR. SPEED: Your Honor, we'd call Detective Samples to the stand
5	please.
6	THE COURT: All right.
7	LAWRENCE SAMPLES,
8	having been called as a witness, was duly sworn and testified as follows:
9	THE CLERK: Please be seated. Please state your name and spell
10	it for the record.
11	THE WITNESS: It's Lawrence, L-a-w-r-e-n-c-e, Samples, S-a-m-p-l
12	e-s.
13	THE COURT: You may proceed.
14	DIRECT EXAMINATION
15	BY MR. SPEED:
16	Q Detective Samples, good afternoon. Do you recognize Mr. Gunera-
17	Pastrana seated to my left?
18	A I do.
19	Q And in July of last year did you conduct an interview at the Children's
20	Assessment Center with him?
21	A I did.
22	Q Were you a witness or did you have the opportunity to observe Mr.
23	Gunera-Pastrana being interviewed by Detective Huth before your interview
24	commenced?
25	A A portion of it.

1	Q	Did you wear one that evening, a backup weapon?
2	A	No.
3	Q	And you said that your weapon was covered by a jacket or a shirt or
4	which?	
5	A	A shirt.
6	Q	This interview took place in July; yes?
7	A	Yes.
8	Q	That would have been a short sleeve shirt?
9	A	I don't remember.
10	Q	Is there a video recording that's burned to a CD-ROM or – I'm dating
11	myself a little bit here – a VHS tape that's available for viewing later on?	
12	A	Should – to my belief there should be a DVD.
13	Q	A DVD. So the interviews are audio recorded and video recorded;
14	yes?	
15	A	Yes.
16	Q	And that would be a DVD of both Detective Huth's interview as well
17	as yours?	
18	A	Detective Huth could answer it better, but I believe so, yes.
19	Q	Have you had an opportunity to review any DVD that was recorded
20	from your portion of the interview?	
21	A	No.
22	Q	And you had a Spanish Interpreter present with you when you were
23	speaking w	vith Gustavo; yes?
24	A	Yes.
25	Q	Ms. Jimenez, if you remember her name?

1	Q	(By Mr. Speed) Did you touch him during your interview or not,
2	Detective?	
3	Α	I do not remember without viewing the video to be honest.
4	Q	And, Detective Samples, how tall are you?
5	A	Approximately 5-10.
6	Q	About 5-10. And are you from the Las Vegas area?
7	Α	I am not.
8	Q	Where are you from originally?
9	Α	New Jersey.
10	Q	From New Jersey. Did you participate in sports as a high school
11	student?	
12	A	I did.
13	Q	What sports did you play?
14	A	Baseball.
15		THE COURT: What position?
16		THE WITNESS: I was a pitcher.
17	Q	(By Mr. Speed) Any other sports?
18	A	No, sir.
19	Q	Did you play any college baseball?
20	A	I did.
21	Q	Where?
22	Α	Rider University.
23	Q	Rider you said?
24	A	R-i-d-e-r. I also played at Middlesex Community College and a short
25	period at Richard Stockton College.	

You never stood up during your interview?

25

Q

1	A	Coming in and out of the room, I believe.	
2	Q	Coming in and out of the room you were able to observe that you're	
3	a clearly larger man than Mr. Gunera-Pastrana; yes?		
4	A	I can't say yes or no.	
5	Q	But you were armed; yes?	
6	A	Yes.	
7	Q	And you've just testified that you have experience as a Division I	
8	scholarship athlete; yes?		
9	A	Yes.	
10	Q	Consider yourself an athletic person?	
11	A	Yes.	
12	Q	And you did not advise Mr. Gunera-Pastrana of his right to remain	
13	silent or his right to consult with an attorney before you began questioning him?		
14	A	I did not.	
15	Q	You think it's fair to say that your presence was intimidating to Mr.	
16	Gunera-Pastrana?		
17	A	No.	
18	Q	You don't think that's fair?	
19	A	I'm not an intimidating person. I didn't go in there as if I was being	
20	intimidating to him.		
21	Q	You had a gun on you, didn't you?	
22	A	That was not visible.	
23	Q	To whom?	
24	A	To whom? The people in the room.	
25	Q	Did you ask Mr. Gunera-Pastrana if he could see your gun?	

and then it actually extends out past the camera view you can't see where it's

I can't even say I could have.

So you could have, you just don't remember if you did without

23

24

25

Q

Α

looking at the video?

say that.

instructor.

or -

1	Q	Did he appear to be under the influence of anything?
2	A	No.
3	Q	Did you make any promises to him about what would happen in this
4	case?	
5	A	No.
6	Q	And did you offer him water during the interview?
7	A	I believe at the end of the interview. I'd have to check the transcript.
8	Q	If the transcript indicated you offered him water then that would be
9	accurate?	
10	A	Yes.
11		MS. CLEMONS: Nothing further.
12		THE COURT: Anything further?
13		REDIRECT EXAMINATION
14	BY MR. SP	EED:
15	Q	You don't know how long he had been detained before Detective
16	Huth started speaking with him, do you?	
17	A	No.
18		MR. SPEED: That's all, Your Honor.
19		THE COURT: Did you have any understanding of approximately
20	when he might have been arrested?	
21		THE WITNESS: I did not. I was conducting – I had my own case
22	going on ar	nd I was just asked to aid when this came up.
23		THE COURT: I see. Would you tell me again where are these
24	nlaces whe	re you would touch somebody? The heart and what else?

beginning and ending?

1		THE WITNESS: I don't.
2		THE COURT: Would that – this is the only – there is no other repor
3	or anything	g by you, then?
4		THE WITNESS: By me?
5		THE COURT: Yeah. Just this voluntary statement transcript?
6		THE WITNESS: Yes, sir, just that.
7		THE COURT: That's the only one?
8		THE WITNESS: Yes.
9		THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Any other questions?
10		FURTHER REDIRECT EXAMINATION
11	BY MR. SI	PEED:
12	Q	When you say you touch, Detective, is that open hand?
13		Let me back up a little bit. When I said jab earlier you said you
14	don't jab.	
15	A	Yes.
16	Q	I'm assuming here, and I could be wrong, that your understanding
17	when I said	d jab was with a closed fist like a prize fighter might jab an opponent.
18	You don't	do that certainly; right?
19	A	No.
20	Q	But you just testified with the Court that you have in your experience
21	touched interview subjects; yes?	
22	A	Yes.
23	Q	On their shoulder, in the area above their knee and on their heart;
24	yes?	
25	A	Yes.

THE COURT: You may – is this Officer excused, then?

2

MR. SPEED: Yes, Your Honor.

3

THE COURT: You're excused. Thank you.

4

THE WITNESS: Thank you.

5

THE COURT: Comments?

6

MR. SPEED: Your Honor, I believe that's everybody. Court's

7

indulgence.

8

THE COURT: Okay.

9

MR. SPEED: Your Honor, as we laid out in our motion, I think it's

Detective Samples testified that he is a former Division I

10

very clear here -- and we've learned some things have been made even more

11

clear after hearing the testimony of our three witnesses this afternoon -- that my

12

client's will was completely overborne if not most apparently during the interview

13

with the female detective, Detective Huth, then most certainly it was with the

scholarship athlete. He was the pitcher on his baseball team in college and in

high school. In my experience the pitcher is probably the best athlete on the

and the presence of his service weapon on his hip, I believe that he carries a

Glock 19 pistol, to interview and try to elicit responses to questions from my

team. He used that experience, his athletic build, the Court was able to see him,

14

male detective, we'll call it the bad cop part of the team here.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

client, Gustavo Gunera-Pastrana.

THE COURT: He was the bad cop?

MR. SPEED: I think he was. He's the bigger one, he's the one who

admitted that he couldn't remember necessarily using his hands or using any

kind of physical force to build rapport, and I'll put that in air quotes, with Gustavo,

but typically in his experience that is one of the techniques that he uses in order to get interview subjects to confess to crimes which was borrowed directly from his testimony a few minutes ago. We also learned that Detective Samples neglected to advise Mr. Gunera-Pastrana of his constitutional rights under *Miranda*. We know that he did not see the entire interview that had taken place between my client and Detective Huth, the good cop, so he doesn't know and he couldn't testify with any certainty whether he remembers the interview subject being advised of his right to remain silent, his right to consult with an attorney before questioning or whether Mr. Gunera-Pastrana acknowledged that he understood those rights if they were read to him by Detective Huth or not.

Only – the only thing that we heard this afternoon from Detective Samples, the larger more athletic more intimidating physical presence when compared to Detective Huth, who, again, was a female detective who was rather soft spoken in her testimony this afternoon, and I wouldn't imagine that her demeanor, her attitude, her – the tenor of her interview would have been too much different on the afternoon that she interviewed my client, we do hear that – or we did hear this afternoon that Detective Samples did not advise my client of his constitutional rights.

That goes directly to the point that we raised in our motion in that his will was overborne. Any statements that were made certainly to Detective Samples must be suppressed because there's no way for us to know whether Gustavo understood that he had the right to remain silent before Detective Samples came into the room and started questioning him using this Carl Stincelli technique.

THE COURT: When – at what point would you say your client's will was completely overborne?

MR. SPEED: That's difficult to say because we didn't hear any testimony about how long Gustavo had been in custody. I have it on information and belief that he was arrested the mid-day or the afternoon prior to July 12th, so sometime on July 11th. Detective Huth testified that she remembers asking if he had had anything – if Gustavo had had anything to eat. Detective Samples, if I remember correctly, testified that he asked if Gustavo wanted something to drink, but neither Detective could give the Court any clear testimony about whether he had had any sleep, about whether he was employed, if he had had a long day at work the day before he was questioned by two English speaking police officers about an issue as serious as this and having been advised, at least in Detective Huth's memory, of his *Miranda* rights and whether he acknowledged an understanding of those or if he acknowledged – or if he understood them in any event.

So I think it's important here for the purposes of our motion for the Court to keep in mind that we don't know, we can't necessarily say at what point his will was overborne. My argument is that his will was overborne the minute he was taken to the Children's Advocacy Center or the Children's Assessment Center and interviewed by two detectives who had their service weapons with them, who were asking him questions about whether he sexually molested a step-child of his without giving any consideration to how long he'd been awake the night before, his level of education, if he'd had anything to eat necessarily or anything to drink. It seemed that those questions pertaining to

those subjects particularly, whether he had had something to eat or something to drink, were perfunctory questions at best.

THE COURT: Maybe – maybe I'm missing something, but is there at any point in either of these transcripts that because – you could say that because your client's will was overborne that he said something incriminating?

MR. SPEED: That's going to be tough for me to say too, Your Honor. I don't know how the State will excise pieces from these two transcripts and say, see here, ladies and gentlemen, this is where he clearly shows that he is conscious of his guilt or Detective Samples, in his experience, his ten and a half years as a problem solving and children's sex detective with the Metropolitan Police Department can say that he recalls observing my client's demeanor and it was at this point or this point or after I asked this particular question where I observed someone who was conscious of the fact that he had done something wrong and wanted to confess it to me.

So I can't give the Court that kind of information without knowing – without being clairvoyant and knowing how the State intends on using these transcripts that we're seeking to suppress.

THE COURT: Okay. Ms. Clemons?

MS. CLEMONS: Thank you, Your Honor. I'll just be brief. I mean basically the test is the totality of circumstances test. These interviews were conducted one officer at a time. They both weren't in the room at the same time. The first interview we have times on it. It's one hour in length. While we don't have a time on the second interview I believe it's about the same – a little bit longer length in transcription pages, so it's probably under two hours, you know, roughly around the same time. We're not talking about a six hour interview.

do?

The Defendant was offered water with both interviews. Neither of the officers physically threatened him, used physical – violent physical force. The Defendant wasn't under the influence of anything. He was able to follow what was going on. He wasn't promised anything, and, in fact, Detective Samples told him the opposite. I mean at one point the Defendant says, well, if I just basically -- says, if I just confess to this can I go. And Detective Samples says no. He doesn't try to say, well, maybe, we'll see, you know. No. You're not – even if you tell me what I want to hear in theory you're not leaving.

THE COURT: Do you have any indication of whether the Defendant was arrested that day on the 12th or the previous day?

MS. CLEMONS: From the police report I have reason to believe that he was arrested on July 12th because the mother of the victim didn't call the police until July 12th after he had left for work, so I can't tell you how long he had been in custody, it might have been a couple hours, I don't know for sure, but because the event number is generated on July 12th and the police report is indicating the mom contacted the police on July 12th it would be virtually impossible for him to be arrested on the 11th.

In terms of Detective Samples not reading him his *Miranda* rights, there isn't a requirement that says each officer has to individually read him his rights. The fact is he was read his rights. He did indicate he wanted to speak. Now, whether or not that was smart of Officer Samples to do an interview without guaranteeing he knew his rights is a different question. He kind of proceeds at his own peril at that point, but –

THE COURT: So are you saying that that's what baseball players

MS. CLEMONS: I don't know anything about baseball players, though, but, you know, he wasn't required to re-read him his rights, and Detective Samples testified he was doing a second – kind of the second half of an interview. I'm sure he assumed the rights were read, not – again, not smart, but he proceeds at his own peril. That doesn't make what the Defendant said not admissible because of that fact. And regardless of all these techniques or whatever the defense is trying to say Detective Samples used, the Defendant was pretty adamant the entire time, I didn't do this, I didn't do this, nothing overbore his will because he didn't say anything incriminating.

We just want to reserve the option of if in trial it becomes necessary to use portions of the Defendant's statement because of however testimony comes out or if the Defendant takes the stand, that this Court finds a ruling that his statements were voluntary.

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Speed, you're going tell me what position you played?

MR. SPEED: My eyesight isn't very good, Your Honor, so I only saw colors. As a Mike linebacker I only hit what was in front of me. That was the easiest way to instruct me as a teenager. We do have – in all seriousness, though, we do have a copy of an arrest report, and if I may approach. This is not part of the record, I did not attach it to my motion but I have a copy of an arrest report –

THE COURT: Show it to Ms. Clemons there too, will you?

MR. SPEED: We do have a copy of a police report that shows the occurred date or the date that's in a field marked occurred is July 11th.

MS. CLEMONS: Well, and that would be the date the last time the victim stated she was molested because she indicated that the last incident was the day before.

THE COURT: And there's nothing else on here that gives us any further clue?

MS. CLEMONS: If you look on Page 6 on the bottom it says, on July 12th, approximately 900 hours, Gustavo left for work. Meili, which is the mother, contacted law enforcement.

THE COURT: I've got June 12th.

MR. SPEED: And these J months, days -

MS. CLEMONS: Yeah, give everybody trouble.

MR. SPEED: -- gave the Detectives a lot of trouble. And, again, Your Honor, I believe I mentioned this earlier. I have it on information and belief that my client was arrested, detained, held in custody for a number of hours. I can't say with any certainty here. I certainly can't make any representations as to a definite amount of time that he was detained, but I can say that when Detective Huth commenced her interview at approximately 3:05 in the afternoon of July 12th my client had been in custody for at least 12 hours before that time.

THE COURT: All right. Here's what I think that brings me to, then. As we know the State does bear the burden by a preponderance to establish -- I think both as to the *Miranda* and as to the voluntariness test it's difficult for me to do that and weigh all the factors. If there's one of the many factors you could consider which is unknown and if it were, shall we say, at its worst it would mean you have to account for not being deprived of food and water, et cetera, et

4

5

7

6

9

8

10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

24

25

23

cetera, so is it possible for the State to delve into that even if we had to reconvene?

MS. CLEMONS: About when he was taken into custody?

THE COURT: Yes.

MS. CLEMONS: I've actually just located the CAD report, so if I could just review that real quick and see -

MR. SPEED: And if this has some bearing, some impact on the Court's decision my suggestion would be for the Court to compartmentalize and view these two interviews with the detectives separately. We do know that Detective Huth did at least read from her *Miranda* – her department issued Miranda card but we do not have that and we did not have any testimony about Detective Samples.

THE COURT: Well, if it was back-to-back then absent any authority that says contrary I wouldn't – I wouldn't find that to be deficient, but you're correct, we really don't know when Samples' was done.

MR. SPEED: And we certainly can't tell whether it was back-to-back either, Your Honor, because Detective Samples didn't know how long his interview was. I know that very often when there is a break in the interview the transcription will not show – or the Court won't have an accurate idea of how long an interview actually was from looking at the page length of the transcription because when there's a break for however long the interview picks back up and the translation or the transcription picks back up on the same page.

So we could have a four hour interview that only takes up 60 or 70 pages of text whereas we have a one hour interview that takes up the same amount of space, and Detective Samples testified that he was working on his

own case. We didn't hear any testimony about whether that was this case or whether that was an unrelated matter during the time Detective Huth was speaking with my client.

THE COURT: Well, I really still don't have a big problem supposing that there was some break in the middle of Samples' interview that means that hours went by, but I still think that it would make a difference to me if, in fact, the Defendant was arrested, for example, on the 11th and then held, as Mr. Speed would say, chained to a – some sort of a device. Let's do this. Let's go off the record for just a minute. You look at yours and see if you find anything.

MS. CLEMONS: I have the CAD and the date and time.

THE COURT: Okay. We'll come back on the record shortly. We're off the record.

(Whereupon, a brief recess was had from 3:13 p.m. to 3:17 p.m.)

THE COURT: All right. We're on the record. Ms. Clemons, did you find something there?

MS. CLEMONS: I did find the CAD report and I gave a copy to – or let Mr. Speed look at it because I don't think he had a copy of it, so this would be the report that was generated when the call came in. The date on it is 7-12-2016, they identify to coming in contact with the Defendant and they take him into custody at 11:13:34, so 11:13 a.m.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Any reason we need to make that part of the record? I mean it frankly satisfies me that we don't have a factor that if it were otherwise might have some real impact on my decision, but –

MS. CLEMONS: It's up to the defense. If he'd like us to make a copy and admit it as an exhibit or –

MR. SPEED: My only concern here, Your Honor, is, again, I have it on information and belief that my client was arrested on the 11th of July and was held in custody for well over 12 hours by 3:00 o'clock. If the interview with Detective Huth, the initial interview where he was, in fact, advised of his rights correctly, at least from the testimony that we've received today occurred at 3:00 o'clock in the afternoon, we know that he was in custody for well over 12 hours if my information is correct.

Attorney that is in their file, included in their file right now. If the Court is satisfied with the representations that are contained in that document I will be to but I just want it to be clear, and I think it is at this point, that we believe that he was in custody for a much longer time than what appears to be indicated in the evidence that we've seen so far.

THE COURT: Here's my thinking. It would make a big difference to me -- I'm not saying that I would rule a particular way, but it would be something I would need to really take into account as I'm required to in doing a totality of the circumstances test, and the State bears the burden here. Perhaps we could do this. I will tell you what my ruling would be unless it turned out that you were correct, that he was in custody some 12 hours or any appreciable period during which the State could not show that he was fed, and, you know, allowed bathroom privileges or –

MR. SPEED: Deprived of sleep, et cetera.

THE COURT: Anything short of that – or in other words, if that were – if what the State has represented in what documents we have so far is correct then I would find from a totality of the circumstances that it was a voluntary

1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7

statement. That is particularly so – or maybe not particularly but it is – that conclusion is buttressed by the fact that when we make the argument that his will was overborne I see no evidence that his will was overborne. As far as I can tell he didn't really make any incriminating statement, he maintained his innocence throughout, so it's hard for me to see that there is some point at which -- really regardless of when he was taken into custody there was some point at which his will was entirely overborne and he began to make incriminating statements.

I understand it is true that any statement could under the right circumstances turn out to be incriminating, but I can only make these decisions based on the factors that we know, the factors at hand, the evidence that we know and the considerations that we know, so what I'm saying is that this is the conclusion I would come to if the State – so long as the State can show that he was not arrested some many hours before this interview took place. I think it does fall to the State, however, to put enough evidence in the record so that that – that's not – we're not guessing around at that.

MS. CLEMONS: Right. Other than the CAD report. I mean this is when the event number is generated. This is when he's taken into custody in this case. I can't go find something that doesn't exist. Obviously Mr. Speed has some information that he feels like this exists, so to put the burden on me to find something I don't even know what he's talking about and there's nothing in the record or my reports to indicate that --

THE COURT: The only reason I say the burden is on you is I think that under the totality of circumstances test it is for the State to show by a preponderance of the evidence, is it not?

MS. CLEMONS: Right. And I have a CAD report saying when he was taken into custody on this case, so that is the only evidence that I can present because in all –

THE COURT: There's no other evidence anywhere?

MS. CLEMONS: -- honestly that is my – that is the only evidence that exists.

MR. SPEED: Might there be – and I would pose this question to the Court in hopes that Your Honor would pose it to the State. Might there be a video recording? These events were said to have taken place in the summer of last year. We understand that the Metropolitan Police Department has begun to use body cameras, video cameras that record the actions of their officers when they are making arrests or effectuating arrests. Might there be video footage of the actual time that Gustavo was arrested that would correspond to the times that are represented in the CAD logs that neither of us have been able to obtain at this point?

MS. CLEMONS: I mean I can certainly inquire as to whether there's body cam available, but just so everyone is clear that's going to be under this event number which was generated on July 12th, so it's not going to show anything that happens on July 11th because if this incident began on July 11th the event number would be July 11th. But I have no problem contacting our body cam people to see if there is body cam available, but my inclination is that it's going to support what the CAD already says. It's a certified copy.

MR. SPEED: Then would the Court withhold its ruling until we can have – and give us one week to research that particular issue, exactly when my

client was arrested, taken into custody and detained and place that evidence in a – confirmatory evidence into the record in this hearing?

THE COURT: Yeah. Let's do that, then, I really say out of an abundance of caution.

MS. CLEMONS: That's fine.

THE COURT: With the report you have there and the event number that's given that probably satisfies preponderance of the evidence, but these things are – this is an important consideration. If you don't mind I would have you look around and see what else you can get to establish –

MS. CLEMONS: My understanding about body cam footage is that we can – if it exists I can provide the Defendant with – or the defense attorney with a link to view it, and I believe if you order it I can give you a hard copy in camera but we are not permitted to give hard copies to the defense attorneys for – that's the policy as I understand it right now.

MR. SPEED: We'd move for an order directing the Metropolitan Police Department to turn over any body cam footage from this arrest, and I won't confine that to this particular event number but from this arrest to the Court.

THE COURT: Why would it not serve the purpose for me to make that order but have it in chambers as opposed to turning it over to the defense?

MR. SPEED: That's fine. That will do for us.

MS. CLEMONS: Yeah. I don't think that's a problem. I just wanted to make it clear that everybody knows I can't give a hard copy to the Defendant – defense at this point. He can get a link to view it himself but I can give a hard copy to you just for in camera review.

THE COURT: Okay. And I think with that surely those – whatever they have the body cams must have a date and time on them showing –

MS. CLEMONS: We'll see if it exists. I don't know if it does or not.

MR. SPEED: I'll prepare that order, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Now, rather than have us reconvene and commence anew it seems to me if I get – if I get – once I see that body cam one way or the other I should be in a position to make a ruling on whether the – by the preponderance of the evidence. I really don't see any need to reconvene. Do you, Mr. Speed? Do you want the Court to –

MR. SPEED: We've got – I know that our calendar call is coming close and I've received a memorandum, I believe – or an email from chambers saying that we've moved the date up on that calendar call. I think we were originally scheduled for March 3rd and now we're –

THE COURT: March 13th, I think, or for the trial I mean.

MR. SPEED: March 1st.

THE CLERK: We had to move the calendar call because of the dark week.

THE COURT: Yeah. Yeah. The week before our trial we'll be dark, so that's why we moved the calendar call forward but the trial still isn't until the 13th, right? Yeah.

MR. SPEED: Calendar call, March 1st. I will have an order in the Court's chambers by Wednesday of next week. What date is that?

THE CLERK: That's March 1st.

MR. SPEED: Wednesday is March 1st. I'll have an order in the 1 2 Court's chambers by Monday of next week so that when we appear at calendar call I'll be able to make some representations about my readiness at that point. 3 4 THE COURT: All right. 5 MR. SPEED: Is that acceptable? 6 MS. CLEMONS: That's fine. 7 THE COURT: Works for me. 8 MR. SPEED: And an order for the transcript of today's proceedings, 9 Your Honor, how guickly can we have that produced? How about the JAVS 10 recording? That will do. 11 THE COURT: Yeah. Okay. 12 MR. SPEED: An order for the JAVS, I can provide the Court with a 13 CD or the Court's staff with a CD or can you make one for us? I'll pick that up 14 tomorrow afternoon. 15 THE COURT: All right. Anything else? 16 MS. CLEMONS: I don't think so. 17 MR. SPEED: That is all, Your Honor. Thank you very much. 18 (Whereupon, the proceedings concluded.) 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

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

LISA A. LIZOTTE Court Recorder

Susi a Lizatto

Electronically Filed 11/26/2019 11:25 AM Steven D. Grierson CLERK OF THE COURT

1 **RTRAN** 2 3 4 DISTRICT COURT 5 CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA 6 7 THE STATE OF NEVADA, 8 Plaintiff, CASE NO. C318461-1 DEPT. NO. 1 9 VS. 10 GUSTAVO GUNERA-PASTRANA, 11 Defendant. 12 13 BEFORE THE HONORABLE KENNETH C. CORY, DISTRICT JUDGE 14 WEDNESDAY, MARCH 1, 2017 AT 9:51 A.M. 15 **RECORDER'S CERTIFIED TRANSCRIPT RE:** 16 **CALENDAR CALL** 17 18 APPEARANCES: 19 FOR THE STATE: AMY L. FERREIRA Chief Deputy District Attorney 20 21 FOR THE DEFENDANT: KEVIN C. SPEED Deputy Public Defender 22 RICARDO PICO ALSO PRESENT: 23 Spanish Interpreter 24

Recorded by: LISA A. LIZOTTE, COURT RECORDER

8 9

10

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21 22

23

24

25

(WEDNESDAY, MARCH 1, 2017 AT 9:51 A.M.)

THE CLERK: Page 9, the State of Nevada versus Gustavo Gunera-Pastrana, Case Number C318461.

THE COURT: Good morning.

MR. SPEED: Kevin Speed for Mr. Gunera-Pastrana who is present in custody, and he is appearing with the assistance of the Spanish Interpreter. If the Court could trail our calendar call for a few minutes, Mr. Gunera-Pastrana does need the Spanish Interpreter's assistance and there has been a final offer of negotiation conveyed by the State. I need to communicate that with him.

MS. FERREIRA: Good morning, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Good morning.

MS. FERREIRA: Amy Ferreira on behalf of the State. That's all correct, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. We'll recall it.

MS. FERREIRA: Thank you, Your Honor.

(Whereupon, the matter was trailed and then recalled at 10:11 a.m.)

THE CLERK: Recalling Page 9, the State of Nevada versus Gustavo Gunera-Pastrana, Case Number C318461.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. SPEED: Turning to the record in this case, Your Honor, Kevin Speed for Mr. Gunera-Pastrana who is present in custody. I did have a chance to convey the offer to him and Mr. Gunera-Pastrana is rejecting that, however, at this time I hesitate to announce ready. The Court is aware that we still have a number of issues, housekeeping issues still pending before Your Honor. We have the *Jackson v Denno* hearing and the motion for the discovery of the body

warn camera footage by the Metropolitan Police Officers. Now, I have had a chance to review the footage that was obtained by the DA's office from Metro, and I don't know if the Court has seen that footage or not or if a copy was given to Your Honor in chambers but that body cam footage also does not have a date stamp, so we're still in, I guess, the same situation that we were in last week.

Also I submitted an order for discovery from our January motion for a discovery hearing where the Court issued rulings on a number of the items that we were asking for and I don't know if the Court received those yet or not either.

(Court conferring with Law Clerk.)

THE COURT: It's possible, always possible that we have it but we don't think we do, so if you wouldn't mind submit another one and we'll --

MR. SPEED: I'll submit those again.

THE COURT: And have you – there's no problem with the wording of the order? The State is okay with it?

MR. SPEED: With the order for the body cam footage there was no problem with that. With the order for discovery I did have to recall what the Court's rulings were on each of the items that we asked for and I did submit those in the motion. The DA's office indicated that it could not give us approval on those because there were no minutes in the Odyssey system that would reflect what the Court's rulings actually were. As an Officer of the Court, I'll represent here that I wrote down everything that Your Honor announced when we were asking for the different items and I tried to memorialize that in my proposed order as directly as I could, but —

24

25

THE COURT: If you have to get a transcript – well, no. You might be able to get it done by then.

June 5th at 1:30 p.m.

1	MS. FERREIRA: Thank you, Your Honor.	
2	THE COURT: All right. Thank you.	
3	MR. SPEED: And I'll resubmit those – I'll bring the two orders to the	
4	Department 1 drop off box.	
5	THE COURT: Okay. Excellent. Thank you.	
6	(Whereupon, the proceedings concluded.)	
7	* * * *	
8	ATTEST: I do hereby certify that I have truly and correctly transcribed the	
9	audio/visual proceedings in the above-entitled case to the best of my ability.	
10	,	
11	Jusi a Lizatto -	
12	LISA A. LIZOTTE	
13	Court Recorder	
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		

Electronically Filed 11/26/2019 11:27 AM Steven D. Grierson CLERK OF THE COURT

1 **RTRAN** 2 3 4 DISTRICT COURT 5 CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA 6 7 THE STATE OF NEVADA, 8 Plaintiff, CASE NO. C318461-1 DEPT. NO. 1 9 VS. 10 GUSTAVO GUNERA-PASTRANA, 11 Defendant. 12 13 BEFORE THE HONORABLE KENNETH C. CORY, DISTRICT JUDGE 14 WEDNESDAY, MAY 31, 2017 AT 9:45 A.M. 15 **RECORDER'S CERTIFIED TRANSCRIPT RE:** 16 **CALENDAR CALL** 17 18 APPEARANCES: 19 FOR THE STATE: MICHELLE Y. JOBE Chief Deputy District Attorney 20 21 FOR THE DEFENDANT: KEVIN C. SPEED Deputy Public Defender 22 ALSO PRESENT: **CARLOS CALVO** 23 Spanish Interpreter 24 25

Recorded by: LISA A. LIZOTTE, COURT RECORDER

(WEDNESDAY, MAY 31, 2017 AT 9:45 A.M.)

THE CLERK: Page 5, the State of Nevada versus Gustavo Gunera-Pastrana, Case Number C318461.

THE COURT: We have our Spanish Interpreter. Thank you.

MR. SPEED: Good morning, Your Honor. Kevin Speed for Mr. Gunera-Pastrana who is present in custody.

THE COURT: Good morning.

MS. JOBE: Good morning, Your Honor. Michelle Jobe standing in for Amy Ferreira for the DA's office.

THE COURT: Good morning.

MR. SPEED: This was the time set for our calendar call, Your Honor. I was not prepared to announce ready. We're still waiting for the delivery of some outstanding discovery. We're also waiting for the Court to execute an order to the Department of Family Services, CPS, for their notes in relation to the case, but before we drill down into all of that I believe Mr. Gunera-Pastrana has some representations that he wants to make with the Court.

THE COURT: Mr. Gunera-Pastrana, is there something that you want to address with the Court?

THE DEFENDANT: Of course. This counsel told me last time that I was not going to go to trial. What is – what is the issue? He – he – he stated that he talked to the District Attorney and there was a misdemeanor case.

MR. SPEED: Let me say for the record, Your Honor, before he continues I've never received a misdemeanor offer in this case. The Court is familiar with what kind of cases I represent clients on and a misdemeanor offer was not forthcoming.

THE DEFENDANT: I have one question.

1	THE COURT: You need to communicate through your Interpreter.
2	THE DEFENDANT: I would like to know if – I don't know if the video
3	- if the video from the Detective was seen or not and I would like to know that.
4	THE COURT: Was seen by whom?
5	THE DEFENDANT: By you, by the Judge.
6	THE COURT: By me? No. That would be at trial.
7	THE DEFENDANT: Oh, okay.
8	THE COURT: He'll speak to you about it.
9	THE DEFENDANT: Could I discuss that with my attorney, then,
10	please?
11	THE COURT: Yes, certainly. You may discuss it with your attorney.
12	If he feels the need to put anything back on calendar he can.
13	MR. SPEED: Thank you, Your Honor.
14	MS. JOBE: Thank you, Your Honor.
15	(Whereupon, the proceedings concluded.)
16	* * * *
17	ATTEST: I do hereby certify that I have truly and correctly transcribed the
18	audio/visual proceedings in the above-entitled case to the best of my ability.
19	
20	Lusi a Lizatto -
21	LISA A. LIZOTTE
22	Court Recorder
23	
	l l

Electronically Filed 11/26/2019 11:31 AM Steven D. Grierson CLERK OF THE COURT

1 **RTRAN** 2 3 4 DISTRICT COURT 5 CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA 6 7 THE STATE OF NEVADA, 8 Plaintiff, CASE NO. C318461-1 DEPT. NO. 1 9 VS. 10 GUSTAVO GUNERA-PASTRANA, 11 Defendant. 12 13 BEFORE THE HONORABLE KENNETH C. CORY, DISTRICT JUDGE 14 MONDAY, JANUARY 8, 2018 AT 9:25 A.M. 15 **RECORDER'S CERTIFIED TRANSCRIPT RE:** 16 **DEFENDANT'S MOTION IN LIMINE FOR AN ORDER EXCLUDING** IMPERMISSIBLE EVIDENCE 17 18 APPEARANCES: 19 FOR THE STATE: AMY L. FERREIRA Chief Deputy District Attorney 20 21 FOR THE DEFENDANT: KEVIN C. SPEED Deputy Public Defender 22 ALSO PRESENT: MARIA GOMEZ 23 Spanish Interpreter 24

1

Recorded by: LISA A. LIZOTTE, COURT RECORDER

(MONDAY, JANUARY 8, 2018 AT 9:25 A.M.)

THE CLERK: Page 22, the State of Nevada versus Gustavo Gunera-Pastrana, Case Number C318461.

MS. FERREIRA: Good morning, Your Honor. Amy Ferreira on behalf of the State.

THE COURT: Good morning.

MR. SPEED: Good morning, Your Honor. Kevin Speed for Mr. Gunera-Pastrana who is present in custody.

THE COURT: Good morning. I don't have an opposition.

MS. FERREIRA: That's correct, Your Honor. I don't have an opposition to Mr. Speed's motion because certainly that's what the law requires, that I file a motion if I want to get into a bad act. The only thing I would say about that is certainly if Mr. –

THE INTERPRETER: I'm sorry. I'm sorry, Your Honor. The Interpreter is unable to hear.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. We'll clear out everybody in between and then you can hear better. Go ahead.

MS. FERREIRA: The State does not have an opposition. I believe that Mr. Speed's motion comports with the state of the law. The only thing that I would say is if for some reason Mr. Speed were to open the door to any of those factors that I would, of course, want to bring them in, so the State is not offering them in its Case in Chief. The State has no intention of presenting that to the jury. I would just caution obviously defense counsel who knows better than anyone that if he were to open the door to it then I'd be able to get into it.

THE COURT: Correct statement, Mr. Speed?

MR. SPEED: That is correct, Your Honor, and we understand that by – or my understanding of opening the door would be if Mr. Gunera-Pastrana were to take the witness stand and testify in his own defense and bring up issues of prior domestic violence or anything that we consider to be a bad act that we address in our motion.

My only concern with that, however, is we understand that the complaining witness in this case, her mother is also an undocumented resident of the United States and that is an important part – I won't say critical at this point but an important part of our defense. We believe that her status as a resident, an illegal resident is part of the basis of her motivation to coach her daughter to fabricate the allegations against my client.

THE COURT: So I assume that you would be – what you're saying is you want to be able to get into that with the mother?

MR. SPEED: That's right.

THE COURT: I don't think that -

MS. FERREIRA: I think he's entitled to get into her immigration status insomuch as it could be fabrication to motivate, however, I think that there's, you know, so far you can go without crossing the line into what would open the door.

THE COURT: It is possible to cross the line and open the door.

That's something we'll just have to resolve at trial, I think.

MR. SPEED: Also, Your Honor, we've seen that back in May of 2017, last year, that the Court signed off on an ex-parte order for the release of Department of Family Services and Child Protective Services records. Has the

Court received those at this point? We're getting close to calendar call and I need to have seen everything that the Court has seen.

THE COURT: I do not know the answer to that question as we sit here. Those records were coming to us? We'll have to check.

We can check that today and let him know.

We'll let you know today if we have received anything.

MR. SPEED: And after that, Your Honor, I understand after speaking with my client that there are records in the custody of the Family Court that we will need to see. The Court will have to sign an order directing the – I guess the custodian of records or the Clerk of the Family Court, if that's the County Clerk, to release those records to us.

THE COURT: Has your client waived the 60 days?

MR. SPEED: Yes. He's been in custody for almost 18 months, so,

THE COURT: All right. Well, then the effect is we're going to wind up continuing this trial, then, and I would prefer to do it today if you're prepared to set a new trial date rather than wait for the calendar call to do it because I can cycle you back in quicker that way.

MR. SPEED: Right.

THE COURT: So those things considered we'll vacate the trial date, and how soon do you think you could be ready to go?

MR. SPEED: All of that depends on when we are able to obtain the records that we need that we're seeking with our motions.

THE COURT: Mr. Gunera – is it Gunera?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: I would advise you that you share those with your attorney who will know what to do with them. It does you no good to show them to me. The State has objected and I think they're correct. I'm not supposed to review any papers like that at this point in the case. Okay?

THE DEFENDANT: I'm having a lot of issues with my attorney.

THE COURT: That's interesting. You happen to have a very fine attorney helping you, so I'm having a lot of trouble thinking that your attorney is not doing what he's supposed to do. In any event you need to cooperate with your attorney and do what you can through him. If you're not happy with him you can talk to him and he'll know what to do about it.

THE DEFENDANT: I'm the one who has to do something about it. I already expressed one time that I have issues with him.

THE COURT: Mr. Speed, do you know – are you aware of what he's talking about?

MR. SPEED: I am, Your Honor, and my client has also advised that he attended the university in Honduras, so he is capable of representing himself if it comes down to that. I would prefer that it did not because of issues that I won't delve into right now but he has expressed that he has problems with me personally.

THE COURT: And I assume that if he talks to you and says the things that you deem appropriate you would file a motion to deal with that situation.

MR. SPEED: That is correct.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Gunera, you're going to need to talk to your attorney including about whatever problems you have with him, and he will know what to do, then, to deal with that problem.

THE DEFENDANT: Okay.

THE COURT: All right.

MS. FERREIRA: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you. So just for the record, you're not going to give those papers to your attorney?

THE DEFENDANT: No.

THE COURT: Even though it hurts you in your defense?

THE DEFENDANT: It's not going to hurt me. They're signed.

THE INTERPRETER: Your Honor, for the Interpreter what was the date, please?

THE COURT: On the 17th we will – that's our calendar call date but on that date we will – it's vacated as a calendar call. It's a date for a status check regarding whether Mr. Speed has obtained those other documents that he spoke of, and at that time we'll reset the trial as well.

MR. SPEED: And, again, those are records from the Family Court. I have had my investigator subpoena those. I anticipate that either the Clerk or the Chief Judge of the Family Court will reply to our subpoena with a letter saying to obtain a Court order from Your Honor, and we'll be here later this week trying to secure that.

THE COURT: We'll be happy to sign the order.

MR. SPEED: Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	ı

25

(Whereupon,	the proceeding	s concluded.)

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

LISA A. LIZOTTE Court Recorder

Electronically Filed 11/26/2019 11:37 AM Steven D. Grierson CLERK OF THE COURT

1 **RTRAN** 2 3 4 DISTRICT COURT 5 CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA 6 7 THE STATE OF NEVADA, 8 Plaintiff, CASE NO. C318461-1 DEPT. NO. 1 9 VS. 10 GUSTAVO GUNERA-PASTRANA, 11 Defendant. 12 13 BEFORE THE HONORABLE KENNETH C. CORY, DISTRICT JUDGE 14 WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 17, 2018 AT 9:55 A.M. 15 **RECORDER'S CERTIFIED TRANSCRIPT RE:** 16 STATUS CHECK: RESET TRIAL DATE 17 APPEARANCES: 18 FOR THE STATE: AMY L. FERREIRA 19 **Chief Deputy District Attorney** 20 FOR THE DEFENDANT: KEVIN C. SPEED 21 Deputy Public Defender 22 ALSO PRESENT: **MARIO TORRES** Spanish Interpreter 23

Recorded by: LISA A. LIZOTTE, COURT RECORDER

24

25

possession that he wanted the Court to review that Mr. Gunera-Pastrana refused

to turn over to me. I don't know if today is a good day for him to share those things or not.

MS. FERREIRA: And, Your Honor, I would object as I did at the last court hearing. That's not the appropriate process. He's supposed to give it to his attorney. I haven't had the opportunity to review it. It would be completely inappropriate for the Court to review information provided by the Defendant.

MR. SPEED: The problem that we have with that, Your Honor, is when we were last here in court Your Honor asked Mr. Gunera-Pastrana to share that information with me and he flat out refused to do that. Now we're in a situation where his trial date has moved into the next year, and it's difficult for me to prepare for his trial without my client sharing that information with me, he says information that could prove exculpatory.

THE COURT: Mr. Gunera, do you go by Gunera or Gunera-Pastrana?

THE DEFENDANT: Gunera.

THE COURT: Mr. Gunera, is it still your desire to turn over some records to the Court?

THE DEFENDANT: No. I'm given trial, either be tomorrow or the day after. Yeah. What I want is trial a month – within a month, two months. It's the same to me. I've been in custody for 18 months.

THE COURT: I'm speaking of the papers now. Are there papers that you had a desire –

THE DEFENDANT: That's his job. I understand, I do, but that's his job.

THE COURT: You know what, I can't – I can't – I can't make it out. You're going to have to – you speak a little softer, Mr. Gunera, and let the translator speak a little louder and let's see if we can get it.

THE DEFENDANT: Perfect. The issue is that I don't have an understanding with him. Let's say he makes his own decisions. He doesn't talk to me regarding the trial.

THE COURT: All right. So you don't have some documents that you want to turn over to the Court, is that correct?

THE DEFENDANT: Of course I do.

THE COURT: You do?

THE DEFENDANT: Not now.

THE COURT: All right. Well, here's what you need to understand. I cannot accept documents from you that are not shared with both of the attorneys. That would be an ex-parte communication since I'm the trial Judge. I cannot take it. You're supposed to give anything you have that will help in your defense to your attorney.

THE DEFENDANT: The issue is that he's against me, he did so -- and if he tries to beat me up again I'm not going to raise my hands.

THE COURT: Wait, wait, wait, wait. I'm not sure I'm understanding this. Are you saying that your attorney is going to beat you up? Is that what you're' saying?

THE DEFENDANT: Exactly. He hit the table. He almost hit me. I told him I wanted the minutes from the Court and I have the documents from the Family Court, so I wonder what's the problem. I just need him to be switched

1	MR. SPEED: I believe that is all, Your Honor. I'll see you on the
2	22 nd .
3	THE COURT: All right. I'll see you on the 22 nd .
4	MS. FERREIRA: Thank you, Your Honor.
5	(Whereupon, the proceedings concluded.)
6	* * * *
7	ATTEST: I do hereby certify that I have truly and correctly transcribed the audio/visual proceedings in the above-entitled case to the best of my
8	ability.
9	
10	Jusi a Lizatto -
11	LISA A. LIZOTTE
12	Court Recorder
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

Electronically Filed 11/26/2019 11:43 AM Steven D. Grierson CLERK OF THE COURT

		Otem A.
1	RTRAN	
2		
3		
4	DIST	RICT COURT
5	CLARK C	OUNTY, NEVADA
6		
7	THE STATE OF NEVADA,)
8	Plaintiff,) CASE NO. C318461-1
9	VS.) DEPT. NO. 1
10		
11	GUSTAVO GUNERA-PASTRANA,))
12	Defendant.	_)
13	BEFORE THE HONOBABLE K	(ENNETH C. CORY, DISTRICT JUDGE
14		ARY 22, 2018 AT 9:27 A.M.
15		RTIFIED TRANSCRIPT RE:
16		HECK: RECORDS
17		
18	APPEARANCES:	
19	FOR THE STATE:	BRYAN S. SCHWARTZ Deputy District Attorney
20	FOR THE DECEMBANT	
21	FOR THE DEFENDANT	: KEVIN C. SPEED Deputy Public Defender
22	ALSO PRESENT:	XIMENA FIENE
23		Spanish Interpreter
24		

Recorded by: LISA A. LIZOTTE, COURT RECORDER

1	(MONDAY, JANUARY 22, 2018 AT 9:27 A.M.)
2	THE CLERK: Page 4, the State of Nevada versus Gustavo Gunera
3	Pastrana, Case Number C318461.
4	MS. FERREIRA: Good morning, Your Honor. Amy Ferreira on
5	behalf of the State.
6	MR. SPEED: Good morning, Your Honor. Kevin Speed for Mr.
7	Gunera-Pastrana. He will need the assistance of an Interpreter.
8	THE COURT: Do we have an Interpreter present?
9	(Judge speaking Spanish to the Defendant.)
10	THE COURT: We're going to wait for the Interpreter.
11	MR. SPEED: Thank you, Your Honor.
12	THE COURT: We'll recall it.
13	(Whereupon, the matter was trailed and then recalled at 9:56 a.m.)
14	THE CLERK: Page 4, the State of Nevada versus Gustavo Gunera
15	Pastrana, Case Number C318461.
16	THE COURT: Okay.
17	MR. SCHWARTZ: Your Honor, I'm going to go see if Ms. Ferreira is
18	out here.
19	THE COURT: Yes. And, for the record, the name of our Interpreter
20	is –
21	THE INTERPRETER: Ximena Fiene, Certified Court Interpreter,
22	Spanish.
23	THE COURT: Thank you.
24	MR. SCHWARTZ: Your Honor, Ms. Ferreira must have stepped our
25	if I could text her real quickly.

documents from Family Court would be found to be material taking into account

also that the material includes whether they may be useful as impeachment evidence. The Court – now, we need to clear up our record here. Previously the Court had ordered it back in June. It appears that the record that's been – now been presented to the Court shows that that was complied with and that, in fact, the documents were -- apparently they may have been delivered to my court.

I am somewhat guessing here at what happened, but the date that it shows that that came in would have coincided with the changing of the guards, so to speak, with my Law Clerks. What I believe happened, though I can't confirm it, is my previous Law Clerk received it and it was not handed off to the new Law Clerk so that we didn't know that we had it. In any event the Court has received a complete copy. It's over a hundred pages long. I have gone through the pages. I can show you – if Ms. Ferreira was here I would have shown her everything that has a paperclip or a yellow Post-it is a page that I would – that I found to be material.

It turns out that most of the remaining pages are simply – they don't communicate anything, they're kind of filler, so I am going to turn over a copy of the entire file. Some of the pages are material because they simply provide evidence that might be – might be useful on impeachment. There are other pages that are clearly material because of the – they discuss directly the events that we are dealing with, therefore, I am going to turn over a copy of the entire file that I've received that does also include a CD of some of these hearings. I will make those available. I will make a copy each for the State and for the defense and I should have those ready by tomorrow.

MR. SPEED: Outstanding. Thank you, Your Honor.

1	THE COURT: And that – as far as I know that's all we're doing here
2	
	today, is that correct?
3	MR. SPEED: That is all.
4	MR. SCHWARTZ: Thank you.
5	THE COURT: All right. That will be the order.
6	MR. SPEED: Thank you.
7	(Whereupon, the proceedings concluded.)
8	* * * *
9	ATTEST: I do hereby certify that I have truly and correctly transcribed the
10	audio/visual proceedings in the above-entitled case to the best of my ability.
11	
12	Lusi a Lizatto _
13	LISA A. LIZOTTE
14	Court Recorder
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

Electronically Filed 11/27/2019 2:08 PM Steven D. Grierson CLERK OF THE COURT

RTRAN 1 2 3 4 **DISTRICT COURT** 5 **CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA** 6 7 8 STATE OF NEVADA, CASE#: C-16-318461-1 9 Plaintiff, DEPT. XXVIII 10 VS. 11 **GUSTAVO ADONAY** GUNERA-PASTRANA, 12 Defendant. 13 14 BEFORE THE HONORABLE RONALD J. ISRAEL, DISTRICT COURT JUDGE 15 WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 2, 2019 16 RECORDER'S TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING **CALENDAR CALL** 17 18 APPEARANCES: 19 For the State: SANDRA K. DIGIACOMO, ESQ. 20 Chief Deputy District Attorney 21 For the Defendant: KEVIN C. SPEED, ESQ. 22 Deputy Public Defender 23 Also Present: RICARDO PICO 24 Spanish Interpreter

RECORDED BY: JUDY CHAPPELL, COURT RECORDER

1	Las Vegas, Nevada, Wednesday, January 2, 2019
2	
3	[Case called at 9:21 a.m.]
4	
5	THE COURT: I have that we need an interpreter.
6	THE CLERK: He's present.
7	MR. SPEED: We do, Your Honor. Good morning.
8	Kevin Speed for the defendant, Gustavo Gunera-Pastrana, who is
9	present, in custody.
10	THE COURT: All right.
11	MS. DIGIACOMO: Sandra DiGiacomo on behalf of the State
12	THE COURT: 318461.
13	THE CLERK: And the agent.
14	THE COURT: What's that?
15	Sir, what's your name?
16	THE DEFENDANT: Gunera.
17	THE COURT: No, the interpreter.
18	THE INTERPRETER: Ricardo Pico, Spanish interpreter.
19	THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
20	This is on for the calendar call.
21	MR. SPEED: It is, Your Honor. Again, Kevin Speed for
22	Mr. Gunera-Pastrana, who is present, in custody. This was the time set
23	for calendar call. I was preparing to announce ready this morning, but
24	was surprised in returning from the holiday vacation with a motion to
25	squash a subpoena duces tecum that was issued by our office by, I

Page 2 657

1	guess it was about to be a party in the case now, the Immigrant Home
2	Foundation. We were asking Immigrant Home for information pertaining
3	to efforts to remain in the United States by the complaining witness's
4	family in this case. I understand that the hearing on their motion is set for
5	January 23 rd . Because it appears that they have information that will be
6	crucial to our defense, I cannot announce ready this morning. And – and
7	the fact that they're undertaking to keep that information secret from us.
8	THE COURT: State.
9	MS. DIGIACOMO: Well State's ready to go, again, this
10	morning. And there is information in the reports about the mom. I
11	believe the kids are citizens, but I'm not positive. But the mom's trying to
12	get a U-Visa to be able to stay here. So I presume that's what
13	Mr. Speed is looking for.
14	THE COURT: And the mom is a witness?
15	MS. DIGIACOMO: That is correct.
16	MR. SPEED: That is correct.
17	MS. DIGIACOMO: Mom of the victim. The defendant's
18	former partner.
19	THE COURT: And so you want to ask her if she's seeking
20	whatever the –
21	MS. DIGIACOMO: The U-Visa? Yes, I had intended to ask
22	her that.
23	MR. SPEED: And because she is not in the best position to
24	cooperate with us, she's accusing my client of abusing the child –
25	THE COURT: I get that.

Page 3 **658**

1	MR. SPEED: that she does not share with him. They have
2	other children in common. She's not –
3	THE COURT: Well if you're asking that – to divulge to use his
4	impeachment that she's seeking a, this UV, and she's going to tell, she's
5	going to, she's willing to admit that, what else –
6	MR. SPEED: We don't know what she's willing to admit, Your
7	Honor. I haven't questioned her about it and she hasn't been friendly
8	with us or cooperative with us thus far. That's why we subpoenaed the
9	Immigrant Home Foundation in the first place. Because we haven't been
10	able to get the information that we're looking for –
11	THE COURT: What would the Immi
12	MR. SPEED: out of the mother of the victim.
13	THE COURT: What would the Immigrant Home Foundation,
14	what evidence would they have other than maybe they helped her with
15	processing this.
16	MR. SPEED: It's a basis for –
17	THE COURT: Which is hearsay.
18	MR. SPEED: It describes her motivation to make the
19	allegation, her motive to fabricate the allegation against my client.
20	THE COURT: All right. Is she going to admit that she -
21	MS. DIGIACOMO: Your Honor, I have her coming in
22	tomorrow, to meet with her. I've never spoken to her because I picked
23	up this case from another deputy. But it's in the reports that she was
24	seeking it and so it's my information and belief that, yeah, she's going to

say that she is trying to get this Visa status.

Page 4 **659**

MR. SPEED: But there's no way for us to know that for sure, Your Honor. We don't know what she's going to admit to. Especially if making a claim of sexual abuse against my client is being used as a reason to remain in the United States particularly –

THE COURT: And what is - I'm --

MR. SPEED: -- in this political climate.

THE COURT: -- still not understanding. What is it you could get out the Immigrant Home Foundation?

MR. SPEED: Her information. Her information.

THE COURT: They're not the federal government, are they? So if she applied, how would this Immigrant Home Foundation, which I assume allows, I guess, I have no idea, but your – is that where she's staying?

MR. SPEED: There could – well I don't know that either. There could very well be documents that we can use as impeachment evidence, as extrinsic evidence of her statements, her efforts to remain in the United States. If we call her to the witness stand or within the State's pretrial interview with this witness, she says, no, I haven't done anything with the Immigrant Home Foundation, then we're stuck with that unless we have documents that can impeach that testimony.

MS. DIGIACOMO: And, Your Honor, just – I've never seen what his subpoena was requesting so I'm not even sure what he's requesting, but it sounds to me that there could be attorney-client privilege as well with the home found – Immigration [sic] Home Foundation. If –

Page 5 **660**

1	MR. SPEED: That seems to be -
2	MS. DIGIACOMO: they're the ones -
3	THE COURT: All right. You're talking to her tomorrow –
4	MS. DIGIACOMO: Correct.
5	THE COURT: and you're going to inquire if she's seeking
6	the – is it U2? Whatever –
7	MS. DIGIACOMO: U-Visa, yes.
8	MR. SPEED: U-Visa.
9	THE COURT: the immigr – the Visa. And if she's going to
10	testify that she is, that's what you want to inquire in, I don't see any
11	reason for a delay. I'm not sure what – well, without even going into this
12	and we could hear this on Wednesday, the motion to quash, but what
13	information they may or may not have, if they're not – they're not a
14	government entity, correct?
15	MR. SPEED: They work very closely with a government
16	entity, Your Honor, and the argument would be analogous to the State.
17	And I realize that the District Attorney's office is a government entity. But
18	it would be analogous to this body having possession, custody and
19	control of documents that are prepared by, submitted to the federal
20	government for these kinds of immigrants to obtain the Visa that they're
21	seeking.
22	MS. DIGIACOMO: But it seems to me -
23	THE COURT: All right.
24	MS. DIGIACOMO: they're like a Legal Aid office. They're -
25	THE COURT: Yeah, exactly.

Page 6

1	MS. DIGIACOMO: an attorney's office.
2	THE COURT: All right. I'm -
3	MR. SPEED: But that would be –
4	THE COURT: much more
5	MR. SPEED: the argument for –
6	THE COURT: skeptical.
7	MR. SPEED: the Immigrant Home Foundation to make.
8	THE COURT: All right. I'm – is this going to take a week?
9	MS. DIGIACOMO: It's going probably go over a week.
10	MR. SPEED: I'm certain that it will, Your Honor.
11	THE COURT: All right. Well, then, we're going to have a
12	status check on Wednesday. Right now, we're going to, it's going to
13	be – I have one that's invoked.
14	THE CLERK: Yeah, well, Wednesday would be after this -
15	THE COURT: We'll find out what –
16	MS. DIGIACOMO: Yeah, today is Wednesday, Your Honor.
17	THE COURT: Oh, right, because of the -
18	MR. SPEED: Right.
19	MS. DIGIACOMO: The holiday.
20	MR. SPEED: And, also, Your Honor, I understand that this
21	motion to squash has been filed and we haven't heard from counsel from
22	the Immigrant Home Foundation. So I don't want to make any
23	representations that we are arguing on their behalf or allow another party
24	in the case to say what should or should not occur when this intervening
25	party has filed a motion.

Page 7 **662**

1	THE COURT: Well, they're not a party to the case.
2	MR. SPEED: I understand.
3	THE COURT: But – and I certainly understand that. All right.
4	So the –
5	MR. SPEED: Again, this is set for the 23 rd .
6	THE COURT: the one – oh, it's, oh I thought it was next
7	week. Wait – oh,
8	MS. DIGIACOMO: No, no, the trial's next week.
9	THE COURT: the motion is set for the 23 rd .
10	MR. SPEED: Right.
11	MS. DIGIACOMO: Correct.
12	MR. SPEED: Our trial –
13	THE COURT: The trial is still
14	MR. SPEED: is set to begin Monday.
15	THE COURT: set.
16	MR. SPEED: That's why I'm having a difficult time
17	announcing ready, Your Honor.
18	THE COURT: I understand all of that. Again, tell me why, if
19	the witness is going to testify that she is seeking this Visa, what other
20	information you could possibly either acquire or that would be admissible
21	from the Immigrant Home Foundation?
22	MR. SPEED: Respectfully, Your Honor, the Court is
23	assuming that this witness is going to testify the way that –
24	THE COURT: If –
25	MR. SPEED: Your Honor imagines.

Page 8 **663**

1	
2	
3	,
4	
5	1
6	
7	
8	
9	,
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	

25

THE COURT: -- they represent that she is and somehow she testifies otherwise, then it would probably be a mistrial. And so, although we would be wasting some time, it's not likely that she's going to, if she represents to the State one thing that she changes her mind before she takes the stand. Correct?

MR. SPEED: Again, Your Honor, respectfully, I do not want to overstep my paygrade here and say that the Court is operating under the assumption that witnesses in these kinds of trials will always testify the way that they represent with the State in their pretrial meetings. And if the Court is saying that if she does happen to do that, which I've seen many, many times in my career that the Court will automatically grant a mistrial, then I believe Ms. DiGiacomo will have something to say about that.

THE COURT: I think – all right, this certainly seems like unnecessary spinning our wheels, but because I do –

We do have that one that's invoked, right?

THE CLERK: Yes, we do, uh-huh. That's page 12.

THE COURT: So we -

MS. DIGIACOMO: Do you want us --

THE COURT: -- and I don't know -

MS. DIGIACOMO: -- do you want us to just trail?

THE COURT: -- what's doing on that. But we'll have to, obviously that takes priority. I will bump this to the next stack and we'll deal with the motion on the 23rd.

THE CLERK: Well – oh you want the next stack?

Page 9 **664**

1	THE COURT: Next stack, yeah.
2	THE CLERK: Okay. So the next stack would be, trial would
3	be March 18 th , 10:30, with calendar call March 11 th at 9.
4	MS. DIGIACOMO: Court's indulgence.
5	THE COURT: All right. And this is a 2016 so it's going to go.
6	I don't think you've been present when I told you, my mandate in taking
7	over criminal was a year to trial. And this is way past that. So unless
8	barring something certainly unforeseen, we're going to go.
9	Did you have a conflict or something?
10	MS. DIGIACOMO: That's what I was trying to check, but I –
11	THE COURT: Go ahead and check because I just got
12	through saying barring –
13	MS. DIGIACOMO: Right.
14	THE COURT: any.
15	MS. DIGIACOMO: And actually that week I'm fine.
16	THE CLERK: Okay. You need dates again?
17	THE COURT: Is that okay with you? You checked your -
18	MR. SPEED: Your Honor, if the Court has a mandate we will
19	get this done as –
20	THE COURT: Well, but I'm
21	MR. SPEED: as quickly as we can.
22	THE COURT: saying if you check your calendar, if you
23	have something that's already, I don't, you know, I – I certainly and we
24	can give you another date on that stack. But once we do that, it's going
25	to go.

Page 10 **665**

1	Isn't it great everybody can just check their phones now to.
2	MR. SPEED: It appears that I'll be going back-to-back, I have
3	a trial set to begin on 4 March, but we'll do what we have to do. So that
4	date seems fine.
5	THE CLERK: Okay. March 18 th , 10:30, is trial.
6	THE COURT: Okay.
7	MS. DIGIACOMO: 10:30?
8	THE CLERK: Yes.
9	MS. DIGIACOMO: Thank you. Trial date vacated?
10	THE CLERK: Yes.
11	THE COURT: Yes, in the – yeah.
12	MR. SPEED: Now because we're in -
13	Hold on, Sandy, before you leave.
14	Because we're in an odd position with intervenors in this case,
15	Your Honor, does the Court expect for defense counsel to respond to
16	Immigrant Home Foundation's motion to quash?
17	THE COURT: In this case, yes, because – well, first of all,
18	they're not, I haven't seen anything that they're intervening.
19	MR. SPEED: Right.
20	THE COURT: They filed a motion to quash the subpoena,
21	which they can do as a third party, and you're the one that is saying you
22	want the subpoena. You issued the subpoena.
23	MR. SPEED: Right.
24	
25	l

Page 11 **666**

1	THE COURT: So, yes, you need to oppose it. The same as
2	in a civil case.
3	[Hearing concluded at 9:34 a.m.]
4	* * * * *
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	ATTEST: I do hereby certify that I have truly and correctly transcribed the
21	audio/video proceedings in the above-entitled case to the best of my ability.
22	Judy Chappell Judy Chappell
23	Judy Chappell Court Recorder/Transcriber
24	Court Recorder/ Hanschber
25	

Page 12 **667**

Electronically Filed 1/24/2019 3:39 PM Steven D. Grierson CLERK OF THE COURT

RTRAN 1 2 DISTRICT COURT 3 CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA 4 5 6 THE STATE OF NEVADA, CASE NO. C-16-318461-1 7 DEPT. XXVIII Plaintiff, 8 VS. 9 GUSTAVO GUNERA-PASTRANA, 10 Defendant. 11 BEFORE THE HONORABLE RONALD J. ISRAEL, DISTRICT COURT JUDGE 12 13 WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 23, 2019 14 RECORDER'S TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING: 15 MOTION TO QUASH SUBPOENA CRIMINAL DUCES TECUM 16 17 APPEARANCES: For the State: GENEVIEVE CRAGGS, ESQ. 18 **Deputy District Attorney** 19 For the Defendant: KEVIN C. SPEED, ESQ. 20 Deputy Public Defender 21 Kathia I. Pereira, Esq. Also present: 22 **Immigration Home Foundation** 23 Jeff Hanks Certified Spanish Interpreter 24

RECORDED BY: JUDY CHAPPELL, COURT RECORDER

1	Las Vegas, Nevada, Wednesday, January 23, 2019
2	[Hearing began at 10:13 a.m.]
3	
4	THE COURT: C318461. The PD is representing him it says.
5	MS. CRAGGS: Yes, Your Honor. And Genevieve Craggs for
6	the State, Your Honor. The State's just an interested party in this action
7	but I believe Ms. Pereira from the Immigration Home Foundation is here.
8	THE COURT: Oh.
9	MS. CRAGGS: She filed the oppositions.
10	MS. PEREIRA: Your Honor, Kathia Pereira for the Immigrant
11	Home Foundation.
12	THE COURT: All right. And let's get your name again for the
13	record.
14	THE INTERPRETER: Jeff Hanks.
15	THE COURT: Thank you. Spanish Interpreter.
16	This is
17	MR. SPEED: And good morning, Your Honor, I'm sorry, Kevir
18	Speed for the Public Defender's Office. We represented Mr. Gunera-
19	Pastrana.
20	THE COURT: Thank you.
21	And this is on for a motion to quash the subpoena. Do you
22	have anything else to add? Sorry. I didn't it's your motion. Oh, that's
23	right.
24	MS. PEREIRA: It's my motion.
25	THE COURT: It's your motion. You have anything else to

Page 2 667B

add? I've read this.

MS. PEREIRA: No, Your Honor. I actually want to ask that you take the amended -- the amended motion that I filed as my reply 'cause it should have been a reply. And just ask this Court to please allow me not to turn the file to the -- to the -- to the other party because I'm trying to protect the rights of my client. I am bound to keep this information confidential.

But most importantly as a victim, I ask that you please look into the amendment of the Nevada Constitution that specifically bolster the rights of victims to prevent the Defendant from having any information about the whereabouts of my client.

THE COURT: This is your file?

MS. PEREIRA: Well, the Immigrant Home Foundation is a non-profit that I -- for which I work pro bono for the past ten years. And so it's an accredited organization that has the same duties of confidentiality to their clients. They are recognized with the Board of Immigration Appeals to represent clients in immigration court and the immigration office.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Defendant -- defense counsel.

MR. SPEED: Well, Your Honor, our position on this intervening third party's motion or I guess it's kind to call it a motion, but their request to have our valid subpoena quashed I believe it should fail on four key colors.

First, in the original filing by Ms. Pereira and her office, there

667C

was not a single citation to any applicable law, statute or case law that would compel or convince the Court that it's appropriate in this case to quash our valid subpoena.

Second, turning to or relying on the law that has already been made in the case, Judge Cory granted our motion for discovery where we specifically asked for the U visa information that is in the custody and control of the Immigrant Home Foundation which by their own admission makes them a state actor. And if they are a state actor or a government agent, then the DA's office is deemed to have constructive possession of all the --

THE COURT: How are they a state actor?

MR. SPEED: They admitted in the new filing that they are accredited by the Immigration and Customs Enforcement Office, the Department of Homeland Security and the -- I believe it's the Bureau of Immigration, the agencies or another government organization.

THE COURT: Well, they said that they were accredited to practice in front of those agencies. That doesn't mean they're -- and I think they would strongly disagree that somehow, you know, they -- they're the Public Defender of -- of individuals applying for immigration status. In other words --

MR. SPEED: And the Court would agree then --

THE COURT: -- they're on the other side.

MR. SPEED: -- the Court would agree then that the Public Defender's Office is a government agency. We are an agency under the auspices of Clark County. If the Court views the Immigrant Home

Page 4 **667D**

Foundation as an organization akin to the Public Defender's Office, then our argument exceeds on that point. They are a state actor, a government agency. And even if they aren't, the point of our discovery motion -- our motion for discovery, our request to see what information is going to be used against Mr. Gunera-Pastrana is to point out to the Court that the District Attorney's Office and the Immigrant Home Foundation pointed this out in their motion as well, the District Attorney's Office is the opposing party in this case. And it is their obligation to make sure that all material evidence is disclosed to us under *Brady*.

The third key point is that the DA's Office, again, must comply with their obligations under *Brady*.

And the final is that discoverability and admissibility are two different things. It appears that the Court may harbor some concerns about confidential information being disclosed or shared with the Defendant in this case. The Immigrant Home Foundation has raised several times that they're interested in protecting their client's or their service seekers identity, their location to prevent harassment or intimidation on the part of our client.

However, the District Attorney's Office, the Courts have a responsibility to a criminal Defendant to ensure that he receives a fair trial. And discovery in a criminal proceeding is a key host of that. We're asking the Court at minimum to order the Immigrant Home Foundation to turn over their file to the Court for an in-camera review so that the interested parties in the case can determine whether we will be allowed to use them in trial.

Page 5 **667E**

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

But again, discoverability and admissibility are two different things. The Immigrant Home Foundation shouldn't be allowed to withhold that information from the Court in a criminal proceeding of which they are not a principle party.

THE COURT: Anything else?

MS. PEREIRA: Your Honor, we are not a state party in any way, shape or form. We have not had -- and my client who is not a party to this action has not had any kind of contact in regards to the U visa with the District Attorney's Office. So the District Attorney's Office has no information about my file. They have never seen my file. And I will never provide them my file.

And so I understand the opposing party is trying to do the best to get information, but if they really want information, they can ask for it to the Office of Immigration -- through Department of Homeland Security. They are a government agency. They will probably give it to them. And if they -- if not, during -- during discovery, they can -- they can subpoena my client and they can ask her whatever questions they want. But that has nothing to do with my duty to protect the information of my client.

MS. CRAGGS: Your Honor, if I could briefly respond as well. Thank you.

THE COURT: You filed a more or less a joinder. Go on.

MS. CRAGGS: Thank you, Your Honor. I was essentially going to say what Ms. Pereira already said.

MR. SPEED: I'm sorry, Your Honor. There has been a

25

Page 6 **667F**

1	joinder filed by the State of Nevada.
2	MS. CRAGGS: I don't think we were a part of the filing, Your
3	Honor. I just took this case over, but that was my understanding.
4	THE COURT: I thought there and I saw something.
5	MR. SPEED: My understanding from the prior Chief Deputy
6	who was prosecuting the case was that the State was willing to comply
7	with the law of the case. And that was what I pointed to Your Honor as
8	my second point in opposition to the Immigrant Home Foundation's
9	motion to quash.
10	Judge Cory has already
11	THE COURT: All right. So
12	MR. SPEED: granted our discovery request on this
13	particular point and the DA's Office has indicated that it's willing to
14	comply with those orders from the Court.
15	MS. CRAGGS: And, Your Honor, the only thing I wanted to
16	say was just that yes, we don't have any information about this
17	individual's U visa in our files. And I believe we would potentially run
18	into the same issues trying to subpoena those that information as well
19	from the Immigrant Home Foundation 'cause our understanding
20	THE COURT: Yeah.
21	MS. CRAGGS: is they're not a state actor.
22	THE COURT: Sorry. The State didn't file anything. I was
23	looking at the
24	MR. SPEED: Right.
25	THE COURT: amended motion.

Page 7 667G

MS. CRAGGS: For the record, I just wanted to make sure that was clear, that we don't have anything in our files currently.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

MR. SPEED: And the State is -- in response to that, Your Honor, the State --

THE COURT: Right.

MR. SPEED: -- is also aware that it's their obligation under *Brady and Kyle*'s to seek out material discoverable information and provide it to the defense.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. SPEED: So if they don't have it in their file, that's not an excuse for not providing it to us under the rules that have been given to us by the Supreme Court in generations of case law.

THE COURT: Well -- okay. I disagree with your characterization that the Immigrant Home Foundation is in any way a state agency. And I certainly don't see how a *Brady* motion would in any way cover or require or allow for that matter the District Attorney to obtain this information any other than the way you are trying to obtaining it through a subpoena.

And as we discussed in the last hearing, it's my understanding you want to use the fact that the individual may have applied for a U visa, I think that's what it is, to impeach her testimony and you haven't at this point even asked her if she's applied for a U visa. And I know it's rare, but I don't see why it's allowed for you to take the deposition and ask her that question. And if she says yes, then all of this is candidly a

Page 8 **667H**

waste of time because now then she would have said exactly what you were afraid she wouldn't admit to if, in fact, that was your I guess purpose.

So at this point, I think it's premature to even do an in-camera inspection which would be by the Court and not by the parties as you indicated. But again take her deposition and ask her that question. And if, in fact, somehow she, you know, we can go after that. But for --

MR. SPEED: Your Honor --

THE COURT: -- the record -- I'm not done -- for the record,
Judge Cory's order which allows for discovery as appropriate by *Brady*certainly in my mind doesn't include that -- include this an extend to the
Immigrant -- Immigrant Home Foundation.

So I'm denying the motion at this time based on all of that.

And you need to prepare an order commensurate with all of that and pass it by the Defendant so assuming he wants to file something he can.

MR. SPEED: Your Honor, there is -- and I apologize for interrupting the Court earlier, but there is going to be some confusion now. Is the Court saying that it is allowing us permission, this is a criminal case I would point out respectfully, the Court is allowing the Defendant to depose the complaining witness' mother in this case with the understanding now that there is an attorney appearing saying --

THE COURT: The complaining witness --

MR. SPEED: -- that they represent that person?

THE COURT: -- the complaining witness' mother is the one who's asking for a U visa?

Page 9 **667I**

1	MR. SPEED: Yes.
2	MS. PEREIRA: Now, Your Honor, the complaining this
3	person, my client
4	THE COURT: I thought it was the victim. It's not
5	MR. SPEED: The victim
6	THE COURT: the victim?
7	MR. SPEED: is a minor
8	MS. CRAGGS: It's a child.
9	MR. SPEED: Your Honor. She has to be represented by
10	her parent in this process.
11	THE COURT: Oh.
12	MR. SPEED: And the Court has just been made aware that
13	the person that Your Honor is ordering us to depose or recommending
14	that we depose is is responded is represented by counsel. I can't
15	contact her now without running a file of
16	THE COURT: Right. But you can still as far as I know there's
17	no provision to prevent you from taking her deposition.
18	MR. SPEED: In criminal cases, Your Honor, there is. The
19	Court has to give us expressed permission to do that.
20	MS. CRAGGS: Your Honor, my understanding is that a
21	motion has to be filed. I'm not sure the specifics of what needs to
22	happen before a criminal deposition is taken, but it's not there's
23	certainly hoops that have to be jumped through that are different than a
24	civil deposition.

MR. SPEED: Right.

Page 10 **667J**

1	THE COURT: I understand. But still as a so this is the			
2	mother. You want to ask if the mother on behalf of the child is			
3	requesting a U visa?			
4	MR. SPEED: Your Honor, this U visa information is important			
5	because because it could provide a trove of impeachment evidence.			
6	We don't know what Ms the complainant's mother has told her			
7	counsel or the federal government agency			
8	THE COURT: Well, your			
9	MR. SPEED: responsible for the issuance of these U visas.			
10	THE COURT: Okay.			
11	MR. SPEED: But if that information is different somehow from			
12	the information that she provided to the police in the investigation of the			
13	charges against my client, we're entitled to know those things.			
14	THE COURT: All right.			
15	MR. SPEED: And that's the point of our motion.			
16	MS. CRAGGS: Your Honor			
17	THE COURT: I understand that. And there's no way you're			
18	going to get attorney-client privilege, so you just said what she told her			
19	counsel and you've got nothing to waive the attorney-client privilege on			
20	that.			
21	MR. SPEED: In addition to those other agencies, Your Honor.			
22	MS. PEREIRA: Your Honor			
23	THE COURT: If you're asking regarding what she has filed			
24	with the Immigration and Naturalization, I think that could be appropriate.			
25	But again, not attorney-client privilege.			

Page 11 667K

1	MR. SPEED: And we understand that. But Ms. Pereira has
2	represented that now that she represents the complainant's mother. So
3	any effort on our part to depose this person, I'm sure would be met with
4	opposition from her office.
5	MS. PEREIRA: Your Honor
6	THE COURT: Well
7	MR. SPEED: And she's nodding in agreement with that.
8	MS. PEREIRA: Your Honor, if you don't mind. I'm not a
9	criminal lawyer. I'm an
10	THE COURT: Yeah.
11	MS. PEREIRA: immigration lawyer. So can I explain to you
12	how these U visa process works?
13	THE COURT: Go ahead 'cause I have no idea how
14	MS. PEREIRA: Okay.
15	THE COURT: U visa works.
16	MS. PEREIRA: So the U visa, it's a visa for victims of crimes.
17	THE COURT: I get that.
18	MS. PEREIRA: And these victims could be direct or indirect
19	victim. A direct victim is somebody who takes the the attack and an
20	indirect victim could be a father or a mother or a sibling who is subjected
21	to these psychological or physical abuse because it's related to the
22	direct victim, okay?
23	THE COURT: Okay.
24	MS. PEREIRA: My client has you can file for a U visa when
25	you are an indirect or direct victim of sexual assault, rape. Domestic

Page 12 **667L**

 violence is one of those. Felonious assault, kidnapping. There is a list of crimes.

So when you are a direct or indirect victim, you have to first obtain certification from that police department. The police department has to, based on their records, not based on what any client may say, the police department based on their records has to sign certified that this person has been a victim and that this person has cooperated with the authorities.

And then with that certification that the applicant for the U visa has to establish that they were a victim, direct or indirect, that they cooperated with authorities and that they have suffered a substantial physical or psychological abuse or injury. You file this application with the Department -- with the USCIS which is the Department of Homeland Security, the Office of Immigration. It takes four to five years for this victim to find out if their case will be approved or not.

In the process, we -- there is no -- if the person who's been the abuser or the attacker has a Court proceeding, that we have absolutely nothing to do, neither the Office of Immigration nor my agency has nothing to do with those Court proceedings. The only -- what they are -- the U visa was created to promote the victims would come out of the shadows and -- and help authorities so we could stop, you know, crimes in -- in our cities. So that's how the U visa process works.

Now my client in this specific case could apply for a U visa as a victim of domestic violence because she has her own case of domestic violence or as the mother of the child in this case. She has her -- her

Page 13 **667 M**

opportunity to do it on her own or as an indirect victim. Now all of these has nothing to do with this case.

MR. SPEED: Well it does, Your Honor, if she's applying and we don't know how she's applied because the Immigrant Home Foundation has refused to turn over its file even to the Court for an incamera review. I heard a couple of words that made my ears rise if you will, certification by the police department is one, these people are applying an applicant for a visa that is issued by a government agency, that's two.

Now I think it's impossible for Ms. Pereira to argue then that there is no connection, there is no nexus between the services that her office provides and a law enforcement function carried out by the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department. She just stated that one of the things than an applicant has to receive is certification from the police department showing that the person is a victim of crime either direct or indirect. And as indirect victim it sounds as if their client will be relying on the allegations made by her daughter against my client in this criminal case. Obviously he's not guilty of those because he hasn't been to trial.

So for the Immigrant Home Foundation and whatever Federal Government agency they argue their case or plead their case in front of to say that this person applying for the U visa is a victim based on the proceedings in the Court below here in the State of Nevada would be unreliable first and flying against everything that we hold dear in criminal proceedings in this jurisdiction.

Page 14 **667**N

Second, they have to show that this person has cooperated with the police to, in Ms. Pereira's word, keep crime off of our streets.

And three, they have to show that they are a substantial victim or they sustained a substantial injury or been the recipient of significant abuse.

All three of those things combined show a compelling need for us, defense counsel and Mr. Gunera-Pastrana the Defendant in this case, to be apprised of whatever information the Immigrant Home Foundation through their client is providing to these law enforcement agencies. It's the --

MS. PEREIRA: You need to go ask the law enforcement --

MR. SPEED: -- it's the --

THE COURT: Wait. Wait.

MR. SPEED: I'm sorry, Ms. Pereira. It's the District Attorney's --- it's the District Attorney's Office's job then to provide that information to us under the auspices of *Brady* and *Kyle* and the discovery case law.

THE COURT: All right. I already addressed that.

MR. SPEED: That's understood then. The point where I'm confused then is, Your Honor, is that the Court denied a motion and then ordered the Defendant to depose certain witnesses.

THE COURT: If she says that their applying for a U visa, that's it. That's all you're going to get, okay?

MR. SPEED: After this --

THE COURT: Because you can impeach him or impeach the mother or the child that they're applying for a U visa and that's why they

Page 15 **6670**

did it. But that's the only information I'm going to allow.

MR. SPEED: So that I'm clear then, Your Honor, the Court is permitting the Defendant to depose the complaining witness and her mother in this case?

MS. CRAGGS: And, Your Honor, there is a statute on point that talks about the specific things that have to happen in order for a witness to be deposed.

THE COURT: Okay. What's the statute?

MS. CRAGGS: It's 174.175, Your Honor. And it's my understanding that it has to be an [indiscernible] or an older person or a vulnerable person who isn't able or potentially isn't going to be able to attend the trial itself.

THE COURT: So that's unavailable, but --

MR. SPEED: But the Court can issue orders that it deems appropriate in this kind of a situation and it appeared as if the Court was in the process of granting --

THE COURT: To --

MR. SPEED: -- the Defendant permission to depose these witnesses in this case, these key witnesses in a criminal prosecution.

THE COURT: On that one issue regarding whether or not they're applying, it's really -- and I -- I'm under the impression they're willing to admit that they applied for a U visa. And in the last hearing, you said and certainly I said that that's it. If that's what you get, you're done.

MR. SPEED: And does the Court understand how accusing

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	

25

someone in my client's position of very serious criminal acts, criminal offenses, puts the Immigrant Home Foundation's client in the position of receiving a very substantial, very significant benefit from the government

THE COURT: And you can make that argument.

MR. SPEED: -- in exchange for their cooperation to the law.

THE COURT: That's the argument you'll make at time of trial. But the only thing you need is did she apply. And if they're willing to say they applied for a U, we're done. And you said last time they weren't willing at that point to admit because they could come to trial and get on the stand and say no I haven't. But if they're going to do that and admit that they applied for a U visa, then we're done with all of this.

MR. SPEED: Just so --

THE COURT: Are you willing to somehow get a affidavit that they've applied for a U visa?

MR. SPEED: Well no I'm --

THE COURT: I'm asking Ms. -- and I forgot your name --

MS. PEREIRA: Pereira.

THE COURT: -- whether or not your client's willing to provide an affidavit that they've applied for a U visa?

MS. PEREIRA: Yes. I can provide them an affidavit saying the truth that we applied for a U visa, but I will not give a specifics about.

THE COURT: I get that. And that's what we talked about last time.

MR. SPEED: And that's why I'm looking forward to deposing

Page 17 667Q

1	the Immigrant Home Foundation client
2	THE COURT: She's willing to give you an affidavit, we're
3	done, saying that they've applied for a U visa. And you can impeach
4	them on basis and make the argument, oh their the whole reason
5	behind this is they're applying for U visa sobeit.
6	MR. SPEED: So now the Court
7	THE COURT: As far as the technicalities of what they put on
8	their request, all of that is irrelevant.
9	MR. SPEED: It's not irrelevant, Your Honor.
10	THE COURT: It's irrelevant. We're done. We're done.
11	They're getting you an affidavit. You made your record.
12	MR. SPEED: I have not made the record, Your Honor.
13	THE COURT: What else?
14	MR. SPEED: So the Court is now withdrawing it's
15	THE COURT: Yes.
16	MR. SPEED: permission for
17	THE COURT: Yes.
18	MR. SPEED: Defendant to depose
19	THE COURT: They're going to provide you
20	MR. SPEED: the key witness?
21	THE COURT: they're going to provide you with an affidavit
22	How long will it take you to do that?
23	MS. PEREIRA: A couple of days.
24	THE COURT: So within two weeks an affidavit that they have
25	applied for a U visa.

Page 18 **667R**

•	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	ı

MR	SPEED:	That we	will be	allowed	to	use at tri	al
1711 .	OI LLD.	THAL WC		allowcu	w	use at th	αı.

THE COURT: To impeach her if she says no. I assume she's going to say yes. And we said that last time. But you said well what if she says no, then I've got nothing to impeach her with. Now you do.

MR. SPEED: And any inconsistencies in the representations that she's made to these various Federal agencies from whom she's applying for this U visa, the Court is not allowing us to reach and cross examination?

THE COURT: No. I think that's totally irrelevant to the proceedings that we have here. And so you've got your impeachment information that's all you asked for originally. And so that's what they're going to provide you. And I'm sure the record is because I remember specifically you wanted to be able to say no, you applied for a U visa. And we had nothing to give you to show that. Now we do.

MR. SPEED: Well the record today is that the Court has denied the Immigrant Home Foundation's motion to quash?

THE COURT: Correct. That's correct. On the condition they provide an affidavit that you have applied that.

MR. SPEED: Understood.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. SPEED: And one final thing, Your Honor, we before finish. Would the Court enter an order providing the transcript of this morning's hearing to the Public Defender's Office?

THE COURT: Absolutely.

MR. SPEED: Thank you.

1	MS. CRAGGS: Your Honor, just to be clear. You're granting		
2	the motion to quash the subpoena		
3	THE COURT: Yes.		
4	MS. CRAGGS: as long as they provide the affidavit?		
5	THE COURT: Yes.		
6	MS. CRAGGS: Okay.		
7	THE COURT: As long as they provide the affidavit verifying		
8	that both of them have applied for a U visa.		
9	MS. CRAGGS: And you would like the order prepared by the		
10	Immigrant Home Foundation?		
11	THE COURT: Yes.		
12	MS. CRAGGS: Okay. Thank you.		
13	THE COURT: And pass it. Make sure it's correct. Pass it by		
14	the defense counsel and I'll review it also.		
15	MS. PEREIRA: Thank you, Your Honor.		
16	THE COURT: All right. Thank you.		
17	MS. CRAGGS: Thank you.		
18	[Hearing concluded at 10:40 a.m.]		
19	* * * * *		
20	ATTECT. I do because a contitue that I have to truck and a consective transpositional		
21	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		
22	ability.		
23			
24	Michelle Ramsey		
25	Michelle Ramsey Court Transcriber		

Court Transcriber

25

Electronically Filed 11/27/2019 2:11 PM Steven D. Grierson CLERK OF THE COURT

RTRAN 1 2 3 4 **DISTRICT COURT** 5 **CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA** 6 7 8 STATE OF NEVADA, CASE#: C-16-318461-1 9 Plaintiff, DEPT. XXVIII 10 VS. 11 **GUSTAVO ADONAY** GUNERA-PASTRANA, 12 Defendant. 13 14 BEFORE THE HONORABLE RONALD J. ISRAEL, DISTRICT COURT JUDGE 15 MONDAY, MARCH 11, 2019 16 RECORDER'S TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING **CALENDAR CALL** 17 18 APPEARANCES: 19 For the State: GENEVIEVE CRAGGS, ESQ. 20 **Deputy District Attorney** 21 For the Defendant: KEVIN C. SPEED, ESQ. 22 Deputy Public Defender

25

23

24

Also Present:

RECORDED BY: JUDY CHAPPELL, COURT RECORDER

IRMA SANCHEZ-GASTON

Spanish Interpreter

1	Las Vegas, Nevada, Monday, March 11, 2019
2	
3	[Case called at 9:57 a.m.]
4	
5	THE COURT: Gunera-Pastrana, 318461.
6	MR. SPEED: Good morning, Your Honor. Kevin Speed for
7	Mr. Gunera-Pastrana, who is present, in custody.
8	MS. CRAGGS: Genevieve Craggs for the State, Your Honor.
9	MR. SPEED: This was the time set for calendar call in this
10	case, Your Honor. But unfortunately I cannot announce ready. This
11	morning I learned this past Friday that we've experienced a death in our
12	family and I'll be traveling to Atlanta on Thursday night. And I'm not sure
13	when we'll be returning. The trial was set to begin on the 18 th of this
14	month and I will be out of the jurisdiction then for sure.
15	MS. CRAGGS: The State doesn't have an objection, Your
16	Honor.
17	THE COURT: All right. You have my condolences. This is a
18	really – does he have, it says here he needs an interpreter.
19	MR. SPEED: I just saw Mr. Hanks. I just saw Jeff.
20	THE MARSHAL: You have an interpreter right here, Your
21	Honor.
22	MR. SPEED: I just saw Jeff.
23	THE COURT: Okay.
24	All right. This is on for the calendar call. I guess we need
25	your name too.

Page 2 **669**

1	THE INTERPRETER: Irma Sanchez-Gaston, court certified
2	interpreter in Spanish.
3	THE COURT: Thank you.
4	So your Counsel has advised that he has a death in his family
5	so he will not be able to make this trial date.
6	This is two years old so we're going to give you the next stack
7	And how long do you – a week for trial?
8	MR. SPEED: Probably. It depends on how the Court
9	schedules its trial days. If the Court has a morning calendar, for
10	example, and then we –
11	THE COURT: Well we
12	MR. SPEED: might lead into a second week.
13	THE COURT: All right. We'll see. So we'll – June. When?
14	THE CLERK: June 3 rd and that's at 10:30 with the calendar
15	call May 29 th and that's at 9 a.m.
16	THE COURT: All right. Other than that, are you ready to go?
17	MR. SPEED: We'll be ready by then.
18	THE COURT: Okay.
19	MR. SPEED: We'll announce ready by then.
20	THE COURT: All right. Because it's, like I said, it'll be, whoa,
21	close to three years. I don't know why. But it will be going. Okay.
22	MR. SPEED: Thank you, Your Honor.
23	
24	
25	

Page 3 **670**

1	THE COURT: Thank you.
2	MS. CRAGGS: Thank you.
3	
4	[Hearing concluded at 10:00 a.m.]
5	* * * * *
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	ATTEST: I do hereby certify that I have truly and correctly transcribed the
21	audio/video proceedings in the above-entitled case to the best of my ability.
22	Judy Chappell Judy Chappell
23	Judy Chappell Court Recorder/Transcriber
24	Court Necorder/ Hariscriber

Page 4 **671**

Electronically Filed 11/27/2019 2:14 PM Steven D. Grierson CLERK OF THE COURT

RTRAN 1 2 3 4 **DISTRICT COURT** 5 **CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA** 6 7 8 STATE OF NEVADA, CASE#: C-16-318461-1 9 Plaintiff, DEPT. XXVIII 10 VS. 11 **GUSTAVO ADONAY** GUNERA-PASTRANA. 12 Defendant. 13 14 BEFORE THE HONORABLE RONALD J. ISRAEL, DISTRICT COURT JUDGE 15 WEDNESDAY, MAY 29, 2019 16 RECORDER'S TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING **DEFENDANT'S MOTION IN LIMINE TO EXCLUDE** 17 IMPERMISSIBLE EVIDENCE OF PRIOR INCIDENTS 18 WHERE THE DEFENDANT PLEADED NOLO CONTENDERE 19 **CALENDAR CALL** 20 21 APPEARANCES (See Page 2): 22 23 24 RECORDED BY: TRISHA GARCIA, COURT RECORDER 25 TRANSCRIBED BY: JUDY CHAPPELL, COURT RECORDER

672

1	APPEARANCES:	
2	For the State:	SANDRA K. DIGIACOMO, ESQ. Chief Deputy District Attorney
4	For the Defendant:	KEVIN C. SPEED, ESQ. Deputy Public Defender
5 6	Also Present:	SOLEDAD GARCIA Spanish Interpreter
7		
8		
9		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16 17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
2324		
25		

Page 2 **673**

1		Las Vegas, Nevada, Wednesday, May 29, 2019		
2		[Case called at 9:27 a.m.]		
3		MS. DIGIACOMO: Good morning, Your Honor.		
4		THE CLERK: And this another PD case. Oh, okay. This is		
5	first up for	the –		
6		THE COURT: 318461.		
7		THE CLERK: calendar call.		
8		THE COURT: Are you stepping in for the PD?		
9		THE CLERK: He is the PD.		
10		MS. DIGIACOMO: He is the PD, Your Honor.		
11		THE COURT: Oh, –		
12		MR. SPEED: Good morning, Your Honor, Kevin Speed		
13		THE COURT: I didn't know he was the -		
14		MR. SPEED: for Mr. Gunera-Pastrana, who is present, in		
15	custody.			
16		THE CLERK: He's not on our track.		
17		THE COURT: He's only been here a couple of times and I		
18	thought yo	u were private. Oh, okay.		
19		There's an interpreter on this?		
20		THE INTERPRETER: Yes, Your Honor.		
21		MR. SPEED: There is.		
22		THE COURT: Your name for the record.		
23		THE INTERPRETER: Soledad Garcia		
24		THE COURT: Thank you.		
25		Okay, this is on for a motion in limine and calendar call.		

Page 3 **674**

1	MS. DIGIACOMO: Correct, Your Honor.	
2	THE COURT: We have – I have this one as the oldest and	
3	certainly there's been seven different trial dates. You ready to go next	
4	week?	
5	MR. SPEED: We are ready to proceed, Your Honor. I	
6	understand that we are first on the Court's stack.	
7	THE COURT: Yes.	
8	MR. SPEED: But we do have some housekeeping matters,	
9	particularly with the Motion in Limine that we need to have resolved and	
10	a clear understanding before we tread forward.	
11	THE COURT: Right. We're going to get to that in a second. I	
12	don't recall, is this over a week or?	
13	MS. DIGIACOMO: Yes, Your Honor.	
14	MR. SPEED: Should be.	
15	MS. DIGIACOMO: Yes.	
16	THE COURT: Okay.	
17	MS. DIGIACOMO: The State has between 10 and 18	
18	witnesses, 4 of them are out of state. So I would estimate a good 6 to 7	
19	days.	
20	THE COURT: Okay. Motion in Limine. Defense.	
21	MR. SPEED: Your Honor, this motion comes on the heels of	
22	another motion that we filed, a Motion in Limine to exclude any testimony	
23	by the State or any evidence by the State pertaining to domestic violence	
24	allegations or convictions, adjudications in Justice Court against our	
25	client. We did not receive an opposition to that motion and back in, I	

Page 4 **675**

believe it was January of last year, the District Attorney's office said that 1 2 they would not introduce any evidence pertaining to the domestic violence if we did not open the door. I received the State's opposition to 3 the instant Motion in Limine and essentially their opposition was the same as it was back when we filed that original motion that they would 5 not introduce any evidence pertaining to the 16M domestic violence 6 7 conviction where my client pleaded no contest if we don't open the door. 8 The problem that both Ms. DiGiacomo and I anticipate occurring in our trial is that we are asserting – 9 THE COURT: The U – the U status. 10 MS. DIGIACOMO: Correct. 11 MR. SPEED: I'm sorry. 12

MS. DIGIACOMO: Correct.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: The U-Visa status.

MR. SPEED: Right. Right. And --

THE COURT: Is it U? U.

MR. SPEED: -- the issue pertaining with – to the U-Visa is that, and the Court heard testimony from Ms. Pereira, who both of us have as witnesses in our cases in chief. The Court heard that a person can apply for and obtain the U-Visa by being a direct or indirect victim of crime. Our theory of defense is that the mother, the daughter, a combination of the two, concocted these allegations against Mr. Gunera-Pastrana in order to obtain the U-Visa and allow to remain in the United States. The State believes that we can't ask her questions about that or cross-examine Ms. Casillas-Ortiz about her obtaining the

Page 5 **676**

U-Visa without opening the door to the prior domestic violence allegations. And that goes to the point that we're raising in our motion in limine here that those convictions, they were convictions in Justice Court but they were convictions that were brought about because of a no contest plea. Either way, the State shouldn't be allowed to delve into that information.

THE COURT: Okay. I should have prefaced by I read this. The question that they bring up, basically, we're not going to bring in the conviction, but if you ask about the U-Visa and the witness then I guess we may have to have an evidentiary hearing. The witness may say the basis of the U-Visa is the prior in addition to the current. So how do you get around that?

MR. SPEED: That was the State's point. I believe that we are able to ask her questions about her obtaining the U-Visa as it relates to Meily, the alleged victim being a victim of sexual abuse by our client without the State being freely allowed to delve into the other portion or the other facet of obtaining a U-Visa or a way that a person can obtain a U-Visa by being a victim of domestic violence. I believe we have case law that says the State is not allowed to delve into prior bad acts when the circumstances pertaining to the offenses are able to be described with one being deleted from the other, or being separated from the other.

THE COURT: Okay. My question is how are you going to do that? Assuming, and I don't know, but assuming that on her application, I wouldn't doubt that it says, you know, what are you alleging and she alleges all – all prior and current acts. So –

Page 6 **677**

1	MR. SPEED: We asked for the -
2	THE COURT: how do you keep -
3	MR. SPEED: We asked for that information and the Court
4	made very clear rulings that we weren't allowed to -
5	THE COURT: Well
6	MR. SPEED: explore that. We weren't allowed to broach
7	that subject. Ms. Casillas-Ortiz has provided the Court and defense
8	counsel with an affidavit that just says very basically that they have
9	applied for the U-Visa. Now –
10	THE COURT: All right. I do remember that because it was a
11	first impression, if you will, the -
12	MR. SPEED: I think a lot of the Court's questions could have
13	been answered then –
14	THE COURT: the fact –
15	MR. SPEED: but now we're at this point where -
16	THE COURT: Well that was attorney-client privilege. That's
17	different than asking her how or what she put on the application. And
18	we'll have to do that outside the presence.
19	MR. SPEED: That's fine with us –
20	THE COURT: But –
21	MR. SPEED: because we are certain that she has applied
22	for the U-Visa as an indirect victim of crime naming her daughter as the
23	alleged victim of abuse by our client.
24	THE COURT: All right. Let's – go ahead.
25	MS. DIGIACOMO: Well, Your Honor, I did speak with

Page 7 **678**

Ms. Casillas when I met with her last Friday, and I asked her if she applied for the U-Visa. She stated she did. And I asked well, on what basis? And the basis was the domestic violence against her and the secondary was the abuse against her daughter. Now the U-Visa has been pending for a couple of years, since she's completed it. And I don't see how you can't make the domestic violence relevant because that is her primary basis for applying for the U-Visa and he has already been convicted of that. So that's stronger, you know, than here we are three years later and her daughter still is a, you know, a victim of crime but there's been no adjudication or conviction. So it's the State's position, he can't pick and choose to go after her and say she's making something up and us not explaining the entire picture.

THE COURT: Yeah, I - I got --

MR. SPEED: She has a much larger –

THE COURT: -- that.

MR. SPEED: Oh, I'm sorry.

THE COURT: How – how do you propose to, if in fact, and especially, I didn't know and assume you didn't know, that the U-Visa's been pending for several years. How do you – how do you get around the fact that it clearly was done on the basis of the prior? And I assume, basically you want to just keep all that out but how –

MR. SPEED: Because –

THE COURT: -- and why?

MR. SPEED: -- because the first time that the U-Visa was mentioned by a state agency or a government agency was in conjunction

Page 8 **679**

1	with Meily, the alleged victim, being visited by a specialist with the	
2	Department of Family Services or CPS. In order to have her rent paid, in	
3	order to have school supplies and school clothes given to her children by	
4	various charitable institutions that are run by government agencies, the	
5	topic of the U-Visa was brought up by one of the specialists. So for the	
6	Court to, I guess, assume and believe at this point that the U-Visa has	
7	been pending for years before the sexual abuse allegations arose, that's	
8	incorrect. And I have to disabuse Your Honor of that. The -	
9	MS. DIGIACOMO: And -	
10	THE COURT: Well –	
11	MR. SPEED: U-Visa only came up after the disclosure of	
12	sexual abuse was made by our complaining witness.	
13	MS. DIGIACOMO: No, that is -	
14	THE COURT: All right. Now we -	
15	MS. DIGIACOMO: correct. I was just saying it's been - this	
16	case is three years old. It's been pending –	
17	MR. SPEED: Oh, right, well	
18	MS. DIGIACOMO: a couple of years –	
19	MR. SPEED: Right.	
20	THE COURT: All right.	
21	MS. DIGIACOMO: since this case.	
22	MR. SPEED: Right.	
23	THE COURT: So we can have a hearing with her outside the	
24	presence but I don't see if – if her basis for applying for the U-Visa is both	
25	I'm not going to basically have her or somehow I don't believe in and I	

Page 9 **680**

know the Supreme Court doesn't – we're not going to, if you will, lie to 1 2 the jury that, oh, this is the only basis. MR. SPEED: We're not – 3 THE COURT: And I don't know how you're going – 4 MR. SPEED: -- Your Honor, I wouldn't be lying to the jury. 5 THE COURT: -- to keep that out. That's what -6 MR. SPEED: My argument in defense -7 THE COURT: -- I'm saying. 8 MR. SPEED: -- wouldn't be that disingenuous. We wouldn't 9 suggest that this is the only basis. We heard from one of the attorneys at 10 11 the Immigrant Home Foundation that this was but one way. Ms. Casillas-Ortiz chose both. And that's her right to do. She's allowed 12 13 to do that. We're saying in defending Mr. Gunera-Pastrana, we should be allowed to ask her. It goes to our theory of defense that she – 14 THE COURT: You're trying to --15 16 MR. SPEED: -- had her daughter concoct the --THE COURT: -- impeach her. 17 MR. SPEED: -- allegations in order to remain in the United 18 States. One of the ways that she could do that was by obtaining the 19 20 U-Visa. And to obtain the U-Visa, she had to show that she was a victim of a very serious crime. 21 THE COURT: All right. I am going to, we're going to do an 22 23 evidentiary hearing outside the presence. But preliminarily, I don't see 24 excluding her from explaining. I mean, you're going to try to impeach

her. I get that and you're certainly entitled. But she's entitled, I think

25

Page 10 **681**

1	certainly to explain her actions, not be accused of concocting something.	
2	Because that can be used later on in her application or her decision, or	
3	that is the federal government's decision –	
4	MR. SPEED: Right.	
5	THE COURT: to give her a U-Visa. Oh, well you –	
6	MR. SPEED: And certainly –	
7	THE COURT: testified under oath that this was the only	
8	reason. I think that –	
9	MR. SPEED: But that issue isn't right for us, Your Honor, and	
10	certainly –	
11	THE COURT: Well –	
12	MR. SPEED: I wouldn't – I wouldn't –	
13	THE COURT: all right, I'm not –	
14	MR. SPEED: presume to tell	
15	THE COURT: at this point, not -	
16	MR. SPEED: the federal government how to try their	
17	immigration cases.	
18	THE COURT: I understand but at this point I'm not granting	
19	the Motion in Limine. Pending the questioning and how it's done, it	
20	certainly sounds like it is going to open the door, not for the conviction,	
21	but for her basis for applying for the U-Visa. And that could be, again,	
22	pending her testimony,	
23	MR. SPEED: Your Honor –	
24	THE COURT: these prior acts.	
25	MR_SPEED: Your Honor respectfully the problem that -	

Page 11 **682**

THE COURT: That's my decision, Counsel. I'm done.

MR. SPEED: I understand that, Your Honor, --

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. SPEED: -- but the problem that we run into there is that then if she's allowed to explain the facts and circumstances, tangential facts and circumstances, surrounding her obtaining the U-Visa, that concern, domestic violence or allegations of domestic violence against our client, then the jury sees him while we're defending him at trial as a bad man. That makes them more likely to convict him because they think he's a bad person and not because the State has proven their case beyond a reasonable doubt. That's the entire purpose for our Motion in Limine here. And I believe the *Bellen* case is very clear. The State does not have to describe these ancillary facts and circumstances in telling the jury what they call the complete story of crime. There is no complete story of crime doctrine after the *Bellen* decision.

So certainly we can ask her questions about obtaining the U-Visa that don't relate to anything having to do with domestic violence.

Ms. Casillas-Ortiz isn't the primary victim in the case before Your Honor. It's the daughter.

THE COURT: Thank you. We're done. We've done it back and forth three times now.

MR. SPEED: So the Court's –

MS. DIGIACOMO: And, Your Honor, --

MR. SPEED: -- so the Court -

THE COURT: We're done, -

Page 12 **683**

1	MR. SPEED: the Court's ruling is -
2	THE COURT: Counsel.
3	MR. SPEED: Your Honor, the Court's ruling is the Motion in
4	Limine, the ruling or the decision on the Motion in Limine is being held in
5	abeyance until after we have this evidentiary hearing?
6	THE COURT: Yes.
7	MR. SPEED: That's what I'm asking.
8	THE COURT: And that I'm inclined to deny it because I don't
9	see how you're going to be able to ask the questions. We're going to
10	give it a go, but without opening the door. And I was worried about this
11	before. We've gone through this several times regarding the
12	attorney-client privilege. We'll have the hearing and see what happens.
13	MR. SPEED: So there is no ruling. The Court's inclination is
14	to deny –
15	THE COURT: Yes.
16	MR. SPEED: but all rulings are held in abeyance -
17	THE COURT: Yes.
18	MR. SPEED: until after our hearing.
19	THE COURT: Yes, Counsel.
20	MR. SPEED: I will prepare the order if that's okay with
21	Your Honor.
22	THE COURT: Sure. Pass it by –
23	THE CLERK: And when do you want the hearing?
24	THE COURT: It'll be before the trial. So –
25	MS. DIGIACOMO: Your Honor –

Page 13 **684**

1	THE COURT: Yeah.		
2	MS. DIGIACOMO: if I may address that. The victim and		
3	her mom live out of state now so I would ask that we do it right before -		
4	THE COURT: Yeah.		
5	MS. DIGIACOMO: she testifies.		
6	THE COURT: That's not a problem.		
7	MS. DIGIACOMO: And also, Your Honor, the State would be		
8	requesting a Tuesday start instead of a Monday start. And if you'd like		
9	me to approach, I can explain why.		
10	THE COURT: Do you have any problem with that? It would		
11	be –		
12	MR. SPEED: No. No problem with that		
13	THE COURT: it would be Monday -		
14	MR. SPEED: at all, Your Honor. That gives us		
15	THE COURT: it would be -		
16	MR. SPEED: a little bit more time. Is she going to be the		
17	first witness in the State's case-in-chief?		
18	MS. DIGIACOMO: I don't know. It depends how long		
19	it – well, it depends when we start and how long –		
20	THE COURT: All right. Approach.		
21	MS. DIGIACOMO: Okay.		
22	THE CLERK: Tuesday we could start at 10:30.		
23	[Bench conference begins at 9:42 a.m.]		
24	MS. DIGIACOMO: My daughter is graduating from 8 th grade		
25	on Monday afternoon.		

Page 14 **685**

1	THE COURT: I don't have a problem. We don't start until		
2	1:30 picking a jury anyway because we have morning criminal.		
3	MS. DIGIACOMO: Okay.		
4	THE COURT: And –		
5	MS. DIGIACOMO: So on – on Tuesday, we'd start at 10:30?		
6	THE COURT: Yeah.		
7	MS. DIGIACOMO: And then Wednesday?		
8	THE COURT: Wednesday's another criminal day.		
9	MS. DIGIACOMO: So -		
10	THE COURT: Hopefully 11.		
11	MS. DIGIACOMO: Okay.		
12	THE COURT: And Thursday and Friday are full days.		
13	MS. DIGIACOMO: So like 9?		
14	THE COURT: Yeah.		
15	MS. DIGIACOMO: Okay. Okay.		
16	[Colloquy between the Judge and the Court Clerk]		
17	MS. DIGIACOMO: Okay. So I appreciate the accommodation.		
18	MR. SPEED: That's fine. And we don't have any objection to		
19	that.		
20	THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Okay.		
21	MS. DIGIACOMO: Thank you, Your Honor.		
22	[Bench conference ends at 9:43 a.m.]		
23	THE CLERK: Okay. So trial is June 4 th , 10:30.		
24	THE COURT: Okay.		
25	MS. DIGIACOMO: And –		

Page 15 **686**

1	THE COURT: It'll be before the testimony.
2	MS. DIGIACOMO: And, Your Honor, just one last –
3	THE COURT: Yeah.
4	MS. DIGIACOMO: housekeeping matter. The Dr. Cetl, who
5	we need to testify, needs to do by way of video conference from Texas.
6	And so we can –
7	THE COURT: You need to
8	MS. DIGIACOMO: work that out with the Court.
9	THE COURT: arrange that -
10	MS. DIGIACOMO: Okay. It has to be after 3 p.m. our time
11	probably Friday or the following Monday.
12	THE COURT: I don't think it's a problem.
13	MS. DIGIACOMO: Okay. Thank you, Your Honor.
14	THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
15	THE CLERK: Just call the IT Department.
16	MS. DIGIACOMO: Call IT?
17	THE CLERK: Yeah.
18	MS. DIGIACOMO: Okay. Thank you.
19	[Hearing concluded at 9:44 a.m.]
20	* * * * *
21	ATTEST: I do hereby certify that I have truly and correctly transcribed the
22	audio/video proceedings in the above-entitled case to the best of my ability.
23	Judy Chappell Judy Chappell
24	Judy Chappell Court Recorder/Transcriber
25	Journ Moderation Transcription

Electronically Filed 12/2/2019 11:31 AM Steven D. Grierson CLERK OF THE COURT

1	RTRAN	Dew 1.	
2			
3			
4			
5	DISTRICT COURT		
6	CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA		
7	STATE OF NEVADA,) CASE#: C-16-318461-1	
8	Plaintiff,) DEPT. XXVIII	
9	vs.		
10 11	GUSTAVO ADONAY GUNER PASTRANA,	A-	
12	Defendant.	\ \	
13 14	DISTR	NORABLE RONALD J. ISRAEL ICT COURT JUDGE DAY, JUNE 4, 2019	
15 16	RECORDER'S TRAN	SCRIPT OF JURY TRIAL - DAY 1	
17	APPEARANCES:		
18	For the Plaintiff:	SANDRA DIGIACOMO, ESQ.	
19		MICHELLE SUDANO, ÉSQ.	
20	For the Defendant:	KEVIN SPEED, ESQ. TEGAN MACHNICH, ESQ.	
21			
22			
23			
24	RECORDED BY: JUDY CHAP	PELL COLIRT RECORDER	
25	TECONDED DT. JODT CHAP	I LLL, COONT NECONDEN	

- 1 -

1	Las Vegas, Nevada, Tuesday, June 4, 2019		
2			
3	[Case called at 10:43 a.m.]		
4	THE COURT: because I want to we probably should have		
5	told you we only have, what, an hour to start picking a jury. We should		
6	have made it at one and, Cathy, you're the one that said 10:30.		
7	THE CLERK: I did.		
8	THE COURT: No. 1:00.		
9	THE CLERK: Okay.		
10	THE COURT: It makes no sense to but there's stuff we can		
11	talk about before go ahead and call the case.		
12	THE CLERK: Case number C-318461, State of Nevada v.		
13	Gustavo is it Gunera-Pastrana.		
14	THE COURT: Okay. Counsel, state your yeah, bring him		
15	out.		
16	MS. DIGIACOMO: Sandra DiGiacomo and Michelle Sudano		
17	for the State.		
18	MR. SPEED: Kevin Speed with the Public Defender's Office		
19	for Mr. Gunera-Pastrana, who we believe is present in custody. We're		
20	waiting.		
21	MS. MACHNICH: Yeah.		
22	THE COURT: Okay.		
23	MR. SPEED: All right.		
24	MS. MACHNICH: And Tegan Machnich, Public Defender's		
25	Office as well for the Defense. We do have an interpreter present and		

present.

our client will be using the aide of an interpreter.

MR. SPEED: Yield your name for the record, please, sir.

MR. HAASMANN: My name is Yul Haasmann, court-certified interpreter.

THE COURT: Okay. Is the Defendant standing there?

MS. DIGIACOMO: He's coming out, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. Now, the Defendant is

So I should have said 1:00 because it makes no sense to spend 20 minutes getting a jury up here and asking them a few questions. They haven't been to lunch. They're entitled to go to lunch. Is there anything we can deal with now?

You want me to talk about -- and we can talk about how I do picking a jury.

MS. DIGIACOMO: Yes, Your Honor. And also, we should probably make a record about the fact there's no negotiations that have been pending for about a year, just so that the record is clear.

THE COURT: Go ahead.

MS. DIGIACOMO: The last offer -- and Mr. Speed can correct me if I have it correct -- the last offer that was pending before I took over the case in May of 2018, I believe was a child abuse with substantial bodily harm, which was an 8 to 20, but I think it was stip 3 to 9 years, or something to that effect, but that was rejected a long time ago. And since that time, there's really been no talk of negotiation between the parties because I deferred pretty far apart.

1	THE COURT: Is that correct?
2	MR. SPEED: The last offer that I received when Chief Deputy
3	District Attorney Amy Ferreira was prosecuting the case, was Ms.
4	DiGiacomo is correct for one count of child abuse. The stipulated term
5	of years was two to five years.
6	There was a subsequent offer after that, if I may the Court's
7	indulgence?
8	THE COURT: Go ahead.
9	[State and Defense confer]
10	MS. DIGIACOMO: Oh, yeah. I'm going to go with what Mr.
11	Speed says, because I had totally forgotten about our text during, so
12	MR. SPEED: There was a subsequent offer of two counts at
13	attempt sexual assault with a child under 14. The State would retain the
14	right to argue at sentencing.
15	My last in-depth conversation with Mr. Gunera-Pastrana
16	were I conveyed those offers, he did reject both of those.
17	THE COURT: Okay.
18	MS. DIGIACOMO: And that last offer apparently was mine,
19	Your Honor, and I did not recall it from December.
20	THE COURT: All right. And so at this point, we are going to
21	trial. I assume all prior offers are no longer valid; is that
22	MS. DIGIACOMO: That's correct, Your Honor.
23	THE COURT: You want to
24	MR. SPEED: Just a moment, Your Honor.
25	THE COURT: Go ahead. And for the record wait. Mr.

Speed, before you --

MR. SPEED: Yeah.

I think we are clear, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. And before we finish with that, I don't want to know your conversations, but you have had a chance to discuss with your client the potential sentences for the charges that are in place?

MR. SPEED: We have, Your Honor. And I need to probably make a record here. I've tried to contact the court interpreter's office for Clark County and have another visit -- another few visits with my client before today's trial date. We have not been able to visit with Mr. Gunera-Pastrana recently because, according to the interpreter's office they do not have available interpreters to go with me to the North Valley Complex to visit with Mr. Gunera-Pastrana, but because his position on the prior plea bargain offers was very clear -- made crystal clear to me and to co-counsel, I didn't think there was a need to continue beating those kinds of forces and I had spent the time preparing for today's trial.

THE COURT: I understand. I just -- I think I need to clarify for the record, you certainly did explain the potential sentences if he is convicted?

MR. SPEED: Absolutely.

THE COURT: Okay. Are you saying you need to -- this would be a good chance to talk to your client. We will have some time after I finish now, so you can talk to your client with the interpreter present. Is that what you would like to do?

MR. SPEED: I think that would be helpful.

1	THE COURT: Okay.	
2	MR. SPEED: I appreciate that, Your Honor.	
3	THE COURT: We'll do that.	
4	Let me go ahead with picking a jury real quick. I generally	
5	ask the minimal questions. If you want me to ask some specific	
6	questions regarding sexual assault case, history, et cetera, I'll do that, or	
7	that's up to you guys.	
8	We will go through the entire and there's like, what, 85, are	
9	we, Steve, bringing up? Something like that?	
10	THE MARSHAL: 82.	
11	THE CLERK: 82.	
12	THE COURT: Okay. I'll give them my speech why they	
13	should want to serve. Then I'll ask them if they can serve. This is eight	
14	days probably	
15	MR. SPEED: Perhaps.	
16	THE COURT: Counsel?	
17	MR. SPEED: Yes.	
18	THE COURT: Well, so I'll tell them through Friday of next	
19	week, maybe a little bit shorter. Maybe.	
20	They will give us all of the reasons that they don't want to	
21	serve.	
22	Yeah, you can go ahead and sit down.	
23	MS. DIGIACOMO: Thank you, Your Honor.	
24	THE COURT: They'll give us all the reasons they don't. Right	
25	down what they say and then I'll bring you up and we'll go through all	

1	the excusal requests and discuss them at the bench. Then I'll	
2	excuse and you know for two weeks and given this there's going to be	
3	a lot. And so then I'll excuse them.	
4	Then we'll go ahead and fill in the box and you'll question	
5	the people in the box. There's how many preempts on this?	
6	MS. DIGIACOMO: Nine.	
7	THE CLERK: This one has eight, because it's a life	
8	MS. DIGIACOMO: Yeah, plus one alternate, so nine.	
9	THE COURT: For the alternate.	
10	THE CLERK: And yes. And you want two alternates on this?	
11	MR. SPEED: We probably should	
12	MS. MACHNICH: Yes.	
13	MS. DIGIACOMO: Yes.	
14	MR. SPEED: because the trial is going to extend over two	
15	calendar weeks.	
16	THE COURT: Yeah.	
17	MR. SPEED: The possibility for something happening is	
18	much greater in that circumstance.	
19	THE COURT: You want three?	
20	THE CLERK: So but you only one pick for the two alternates?	
21	MS. DIGIACOMO: That's correct. We get one peremptory.	
22	THE COURT: Yeah. And do you want are you saying you	
23	want three? I mean, I would hope not, but given the graphic allegations,	
24	et cetera, the two weeks	
25	MR. SPEED: Right.	

1	THE COURT: you could lose somebody over the weekend.
2	MS. MACHNICH: Yeah.
3	MR. SPEED: More is always better, Your Honor.
4	THE COURT: I mean, I hate to, you know because they're
5	going to have to sit through two weeks and then be told they're
6	alternates, but you're right.
7	What do you think?
8	MS. DIGIACOMO: I would agree. I have gone
9	through burned through our alternates.
10	THE COURT: Oh, I've gone through where we've had to try a
11	case
12	MR. SPEED: Right.
13	THE COURT: with
14	MS. MACHNICH: Yep.
15	THE COURT: on a civil case with seven instead of eight.
16	All right. We'll do three alternates. Still
17	THE CLERK: You want three alternates, so do you get two
18	picks on that?
19	MS. DIGIACOMO: No, we only we still only get one
20	THE COURT: No, you still only get one on the alternate.
21	THE CLERK: One for three.
22	MS. DIGIACOMO: peremptory for the three.
23	THE CLERK: Okay. So I need to add one more seat for the
24	THE COURT: Yeah.
25	MS. DIGIACOMO: Yeah, so it should be 33.

1	THE CLERK: yes.
2	THE COURT: All right. Any
3	MS. MACHNICH: Your Honor, would it be possible if we do
4	all we just do instead of eight plus one, we do nine? Both parties are
5	in agreement on this
6	THE COURT: If you both agreement to that, yes.
7	MS. MACHNICH: Yes. And I think we are.
8	MS. DIGIACOMO: And the State is
9	MR. SPEED: Yes.
10	MS. DIGIACOMO: fine with using the nine peremptories
11	for seat.
12	THE COURT: For any seat. Okay. And that's clear. And
13	Defense Counsel, that's clear?
14	MS. MACHNICH: Yes. Thank you.
15	THE COURT: Okay. So it won't be eight plus one. It'll be
16	nine to be used however they see fit.
17	And again, although I haven't done it on a civil excuse me
18	on a criminal, because the statute is pretty clear, the last two in this
19	case, the last three will be alternates.
20	MS. MACHNICH: Okay.
21	THE COURT: Any questions?
22	MS. DIGIACOMO: No.
23	MS. SUDANO: I do have one, Your Honor.
24	THE COURT: You've done a trial with me.
25	MS. SUDANO: I know. And I just wanted to clarify for Ms.

1	DiGiacomo. When we're questioning, we can question the entire panel	
2	as a group?	
3	THE COURT: Correct.	
4	MS. DIGIACOMO: And then you're okay, in a case like this,	
5	there are certain questions we will want to ask each one, because	
6	otherwise they	
7	THE COURT: I understand.	
8	MS. DIGIACOMO: Okay.	
9	THE COURT: Yes. This is I've had several sexual assault	
10	cases. They're	
11	MS. DIGIACOMO: It's just people don't volunteer	
12	MR. SPEED: Right.	
13	THE COURT: Right. I get that.	
14	MS. DIGIACOMO: information.	
15	THE COURT: What about as to questions some of the	
16	standard and criminal cases: Have you ever been the victim; do you	
17	want to ask those, or do you want	
18	MS. DIGIACOMO: No, I would appreciate if the Court did all	
19	the general served as a juror, victim	
20	THE COURT: Well	
21	MS. DIGIACOMO: law enforcement, those kind of things.	
22	THE COURT: Okay. They're general to some people. I don't	
23	generally do it. I just	
24	MS. DIGIACOMO: Okay.	
25	THE COURT: let you guys, but I will, if you guys want me	

1	to ask. Okay. So what do you want me to ask? If they're law
2	enforcement.
3	MS. DIGIACOMO: Or anyone close to them is law
4	enforcement.
5	THE COURT: Right.
6	MR. SPEED: Served on a jury.
7	THE COURT: What's that?
8	MR. SPEED: Served on a jury.
9	THE COURT: Oh, that I always yeah.
10	MS. DIGIACOMO: Okay.
11	MS. MACHNICH: Okay. Victim of a crime.
12	THE COURT: Have you guys ever seen the actual book they
13	give us?
14	MS. DIGIACOMO: No.
15	MS. MACHNICH: No.
16	THE COURT: Oh, I don't know why.
17	MS. DIGIACOMO: In 20 years, no.
18	MS. MACHNICH: No.
19	THE COURT: Well, okay. Well, that's one of the questions
20	MS. DIGIACOMO: Okay.
21	THE COURT: but it basically in a criminal it leaves it to
22	whatever.
23	Okay. So
24	MS. MACHNICH: Victim of crime and anyone close to them
25	been a victim of crime. And we would also request a specific sexual

	1
	2
	3
	4
	5
	6
	7
	8
	9
1	0
1	1
1	2
1	3
1	4
1	5
1	6
1	7
1	8
1	9
2	0
2	1
2	2
2	3
2	4

assault, or sexual -- like, however Your Honor feels comfortable asking that question a victim of any kind of sexual encounter or offense, or anything -- anyone close to them as well. Just because of the nature of the case and we'd like to do that earlier, rather than later because we are likely to lose people with that question.

MS. DIGIACOMO: That's correct.

MS. MACHNICH: And it'd be easier to do that earlier than have less people drop out of the panel subsequently.

THE COURT: So you want victim, or familiar, or --

MS. MACHNICH: Direct victim or someone close to them.

Same as victim of crime.

THE COURT: Right.

MS. MACHNICH: Just more specific.

MS. DIGIACOMO: Yeah, I would ask to spell it out, because you'd be surprised how many don't think of it when you ask about, you know, victim of a crime and they're thinking burglaries.

The State would also ask whether or not they've either, themselves, been arrested or convicted of a crime. And then also whether or not someone close to them has been arrested or convicted of a crime, or accused, you know. It's probably better to say accused. If they've ever been accused of a crime.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. SPEED: And if the Court would, can we tighten that up a little bit? Accused I don't have too much of a problem with, but arrested I think --

1	MS. DIGIACOMO: That's fine. Accused.
2	THE COURT: So just accused.
3	MS. DIGIACOMO: Accused.
4	MR. SPEED: Accused is
5	THE COURT: Okay.
6	MR. SPEED: probably safer for us.
7	THE COURT: Okay.
8	MS. DIGIACOMO: And, Your Honor, I would also ask if you
9	could ask them it kind of cuts to the chase too regarding law
10	enforcement background if any of them have served in the military
11	since they do the military police thing.
12	MS. MACHNICH: Yeah.
13	THE COURT: Okay. Anything else?
14	All right. So anything we can do to speed this up, or resolve
15	it, just tell me?
16	MS. MACHNICH: Your Honor, in the vein of speeding things
17	up, our new marching orders are really to do an analysis of the venire
18	prior to us beginning the questioning or prior to Your Honor beginning
19	the questioning. I know that they prepare those packets for us that
20	include the racial breakdown of the jury. Usually, we have those
21	awkward few minutes of silence while we're doing our calculations and
22	the jury is in the room. If we could potentially do that now and we'd be
23	able to handle those matters and that argument prior, since we have a
24	little extra time now, that would be extremely helpful.

THE COURT: If we -- I don't think -- you're talking about the

25

1	list of prospective jurors? We don't have it.
2	MS. MACHNICH: We usually get it about when they're
3	brought up, but if the panel is already assembled, they'll have the packet
4	that has the names and the basic
5	THE COURT: I can send Steve down after we take a break to
6	get it.
7	MR. SPEED: Perfect.
8	MS. MACHNICH: That would be great, because then we
9	could do that ahead of time.
10	MR. SPEED: Yes. If we already are aware that there's 82
11	people in this venire panel, then I believe the packets are already
12	assembled. So they should be ready for dissemination to us.
13	THE COURT: That's correct.
14	MS. MACHNICH: And therefore, we wouldn't have to request
15	that they be removed from the courtroom after entering in order to make
16	our
17	THE COURT: Right.
18	MS. MACHNICH: venire argument, if it's an issue.
19	THE COURT: All right. So anything else?
20	MS. MACHNICH: Is Your Honor all right with us splitting jury
21	selection between the attorneys on both sides if that's what we intend to
22	do, or is Your Honor not inclined to do that?
23	THE COURT: I'm not inclined to. I think that just takes longer
24	and, you know
25	MS. MACHNICH: Okay. I mean, we'll defer to what

1	THE COURT: two shots
2	MS. MACHNICH: Your Honor wants.
3	THE COURT: unless you guys both agree to that.
4	MS. DIGIACOMO: The State only intended for one of us to
5	THE COURT: Yeah.
6	MS. DIGIACOMO: question the panel as a whole.
7	THE COURT: I am not it's go ahead and then you can ask
8	if you need time to ask the other one of your co-counsel did I get
9	everything. Okay. That's fine. But to just start again, no.
10	MS. MACHNICH: Okay. We just wanted to be clear ahead of
11	time
12	THE COURT: Okay.
13	MS. MACHNICH: so we're prepared. Thank you.
14	THE COURT: All right. Anything else?
15	MS. DIGIACOMO: Just if we could just scheduling, since we
16	need to line up our witnesses and
17	THE COURT: You're talking about the rest of the week?
18	MS. DIGIACOMO: Yes.
19	THE COURT: So
20	MS. DIGIACOMO: And what time you take your lunch break
21	and how long?
22	THE COURT: Generally, around noon.
23	MS. DIGIACOMO: Okay.
24	THE COURT: You know, if there's a witness on the stand,
25	we're going to finish the witness, unless it's an expert that's going to

1	take all day, that's usually more civil than here. So tomorrow is
2	criminal
3	THE CLERK: I put it for 11. We have 8 sentencings, 2 revos,
4	and 12 other sentence or criminal.
5	THE COURT: We can try for 11 tomorrow. Thursday and
6	Friday
7	THE CLERK: I put 9:30 Thursday. And you do have the
8	discovery you do have motions in limine, but I don't know if you've
9	moving them.
10	THE COURT: We're going to we'll have to move them. I
11	want to get you know, hopefully
12	THE CLERK: So I put it for 9:30
13	THE COURT: get this done.
14	THE CLERK: for the two discovery conferences are at 9.
15	MR. SPEED: If we could interrupt, Your Honor?
16	THE COURT: Sure.
17	MR. SPEED: Not so fast before the Court moves those
18	motions on Thursday. We have both of us have two other matters in
19	other district courts for Thursday morning. Mine is a probation
20	revocation. I probably can get Judge Johnson to agree Judge
21	Johnson to agree to continue that one for a few days if we let him know
22	that we're in trial in this department.
23	And I believe Ms. Machnich has an issue also.
24	MS. MACHNICH: I also have a sentencing and I believe

there's a victim speaker; however, if we can get the schedule nailed

1	down today, I'm happy to email the District Attorney and the Departmen	
2	and let them know we need to move it. Just if you're inclined to start us	
3	later on Thursday, that would be great. If you're not, just knowing that	
4	for sure so we can make correct representations.	
5	THE COURT: Well, I forgot we're definitely going into	
6	majority of next week.	
7	Are we going to be done in two weeks?	
8	MS. DIGIACOMO: Yes.	
9	MR. SPEED: Yes.	
10	MS. MACHNICH: Yeah.	
11	THE COURT: Okay. So Friday of next week is in other	
12	words, do we have the time to start late tomorrow or Thursday?	
13	MS. DIGIACOMO: Thursday with witnesses?	
14	THE COURT: Yeah.	
15	MS. DIGIACOMO: Yes.	
16	MR. SPEED: Sure.	
17	MS. DIGIACOMO: We're having our out-of-state ones drive	
18	in Wednesday night, so	
19	THE COURT: Okay. All right, then, we'll leave	
20	MS. DIGIACOMO: Oh, yeah. And	
21	THE COURT: the Thursday the MILs I think would take	
22	hours. Is that the	
23	THE CLERK: That's not the Barajas [phonetic] one. That is a	
24	different.	
25	THE COURT: Which	

1	THE CLERK: They're not set for trial until 2020.
2	THE COURT: Oh, well, then forget it. We'll move those
3	anyway, but we'll start at we'll start at 10:00 on Thursday.
4	MS. DIGIACOMO: 10:00. So do your schedules.
5	THE CLERK: Thursday 10. And then Friday is all day.
6	MS. DIGIACOMO: And, Your Honor, on Friday the State
7	would be requesting a 10:00 start, if that's possible.
8	THE COURT: That's fine with me.
9	THE CLERK: 10 a.m. You still have that motion pending for
10	the witness. What day is that witness?
11	MS. DIGIACOMO: What we intend to we were thinking if
12	we could put her on first thing Thursday morning, but it just to it has
13	to be done outside the presence.
14	MR. SPEED: Right.
15	THE CLERK: Right.
16	MS. DIGIACOMO: Because I
17	THE COURT: So we could
18	THE CLERK: We could do her at 10.
19	THE COURT: either depending on the time.
20	THE CLERK: And then bring the jury in at 1.
21	THE COURT: All right. What else?
22	MS. DIGIACOMO: I have one last hiccup. If we're still in trial
23	next Wednesday afternoon, I have a Nevada Supreme Court argument at
24	2:00 that I'm going to have to break for and run over and do and come
25	back.

1	THE COURT: Well, the other thing is let me look at	
2	the where are we.	
3	THE CLERK: We're on the 12th, she's talking about.	
4	MS. DIGIACOMO: Correct.	
5	THE COURT: I have that I've waited oh, shoot, let me pull	
6	up my calendar. I think before that a doctor's slip. I've been waiting for	
7	so it's not that long, a couple of hours, but hold on.	
8	THE MARSHAL: Judge	
9	THE COURT: Yeah.	
10	THE MARSHAL: they don't have those packets ready until I	
11	go pick them up. They're not ready before.	
12	THE COURT: I see. Go ask Sandy and call Myra and see	
13	what we can do.	
14	All right. Anything else before l'll let you guys talk to your	
15	client and that's it?	
16	MS. MACHNICH: Okay.	
17	THE CLERK: Did you want the rest of the proposed	
18	schedule?	
19	MR. SPEED: Yes.	
20	MS. MACHNICH: Yes.	
21	MS. DIGIACOMO: Yes, please.	
22	MR. SPEED: Yes, the rundown.	
23	THE COURT: You mean for next week the week after?	
24	THE CLERK: Uh-huh.	
25	MR. SPEED: While we're here and I'm writing everything	

1	down right now so tomorrow 11:00, yes? 11 Wednesday?
2	THE COURT: Hopefully.
3	MR. SPEED: Okay.
4	THE CLERK: 11 Wednesday.
5	MR. SPEED: And then 10:30 Thursday.
6	MS. MACHNICH: 10.
7	MR. SPEED: 10 Thursday. Okay.
8	THE CLERK: 10 a.m. Thursday. And then Friday at 9.
9	MS. DIGIACOMO: Friday at 10, please.
10	THE CLERK: Friday at 10.
11	MR. SPEED: 10 Friday. All right.
12	THE CLERK: And then the following week Monday the 10th
13	at 1 p.m. Tuesday I have set at 10:30, because it's a civil 14 matters. I'm
14	guessing 10:30.
15	MS. MACHNICH: Okay.
16	THE CLERK: And then Wednesday we're looking at 1 p.m.,
17	but maybe I don't know depending on
18	MS. DIGIACOMO: Well, yeah, and that would my
19	argument is at from 2 to 2:30.
20	THE CLERK: The morning is already booked, so
21	THE COURT: And I believe that's the day give me another
22	minute
23	THE CLERK: Okay.
24	THE COURT: to pull this up
25	THE CLERK: Yeah. We might just have to be dark then.

1	MS. DIGIACOMO: Dark that day.	
2	THE COURT: Yes.	
3	THE CLERK: And then Thursday we can start at 9:30, that's	
4	the 13th. And then Friday, again, would be a 9 a.m. if you want that.	
5	That would be the 14th.	
6	THE COURT: Jury instructions.	
7	MS. DIGIACOMO: I have started them.	
8	THE COURT: Good. I'd like to see both sets. When I say	
9	both sets, agreed upon and you're not agreed upon	
10	MS. DIGIACOMO: Okay. Yep.	
11	THE COURT: sets. I think let's say Thursday.	
12	This is taking forever. All right. Just hold on let me get my	
13	other computer.	
14	[Pause]	
15	THE COURT: Another 3 p.m. on the 7th, which means I have	
16	to leave here by 2:30. I've waited three weeks for this.	
17	MS. DIGIACOMO: So the 7th is Friday.	
18	THE COURT: It is.	
19	MS. DIGIACOMO: Oh, okay. So we had our expert that was	
20	going to be teleconferenced Friday at 3:30, so we'll have to move that.	
21	Yeah. So we'll finish on Friday you said at 2:30, Your Honor?	
22	THE COURT: Yeah.	
23	MS. MACHNICH: Have the jury take an abbreviated lunch	
24	that day, or	
25	THE CLERK: That's the day you wanted to start at 10 a.m.	

1	MS. DIGIACOMO: Yes.
2	MS. MACHNICH: Yes.
3	THE COURT: Let's just tell them to
4	MR. SPEED: Have a big breakfast and we'll work straight
5	through.
6	THE COURT: Yeah.
7	MR. SPEED: That's what we've done in the past.
8	THE COURT: Yeah. Except I don't want to tell you the story
9	about we did something similar and they took one after picking a jury.
10	They took one of the jurors away in an ambulance because he had
11	some you know, he had to eat, and he didn't eat.
12	MS. MACHNICH: They can bring snacks.
13	MS. DIGIACOMO: And actually
14	THE COURT: I get that. I'm just I think I
15	MR. SPEED: I have a bag of apples that I bring with me.
16	MS. MACHNICH: Yeah, we'll bring some snacks.
17	THE COURT: I have an actual war story. You know, we
18	said, oh, and we went through lunch to pick the jury. Got them all done.
19	And they're going back. I don't remember what I think to eat.
20	THE CLERK: Delivery.
21	THE COURT: We had gotten them lunch or something.
22	THE CLERK: Yeah.
23	THE COURT: Anyway, we had held them too long, and he
24	just had some sort of a medical, and they took him out of here in a
25	MS. MACHNICH: I had one of those and it may have actually

1	been the same trial, where I had a juror fall out, but it was after it was
2	during deliberation. They went back and immediately when they got to,
3	like, the buffet table for lunch he fell out at the lunch.
4	THE COURT: Yeah.
5	MS. MACHNICH: So that might have been the same case.
6	THE COURT: All right. Let's hope yeah.
7	Okay. Anything else?
8	MS. DIGIACOMO: No. Just for next Wednesday, I guess,
9	we'll see how we're going, but my argument is from 2 to 2:30, so to start
10	at 1, I need to leave here by 1:30. It'd kind of be a waste.
11	THE COURT: Absolutely. I get all that. I mean, I'd rather tell
12	them longer. Are we still going to be done by next Friday?
13	MS. DIGIACOMO: I think so, Your Honor.
14	MR. SPEED: I think so.
15	THE COURT: I certainly hope so. But I forgot to I knew I
16	had that, and
17	THE CLERK: Well, we could do Wednesday, we could start
18	after the criminal calendar and go through lunch and then break early,
19	but
20	MS. MACHNICH: Oh, yeah.
21	MS. DIGIACOMO: Okay. Well, let
22	THE COURT: All right. So
23	MS. DIGIACOMO: why don't we see how far we get
24	THE COURT: Yeah.
25	MS. DIGIACOMO: by next Tuesday.

1	THE COURT: So anyway. You guys weren't here for my two-
2	month civil case coming up where I waited three months for an
3	appointment in Arizona and I told them and that was so it's two
4	months in one week.
5	Oh, well. All right. So we'll leave. Talk to your client.
6	MS. MACHNICH: Thank you.
7	MR. SPEED: Thank you, Your Honor.
8	THE COURT: Sandy is going to try to she's going
9	downstairs to try to get the list. If she does, she'll hand it to you guys.
10	MR. SPEED: Okay.
11	MS. MACHNICH: Thank you, Your Honor.
12	MR. SPEED: We'll be here. We'll hang out, Your Honor.
13	Thank you.
14	[Recess taken from 11:11 a.m. to 1:02 p.m.]
15	MS. MACHNICH: Yes, Your Honor.
16	THE COURT: C-318461. Let the record reflect Defendant is
17	present with an interpreter, and we already got your name.
18	Before you make your record, I want to just make sure it's
19	Mr. Gunera-Pastrana? Did I say that right?
20	THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
21	THE COURT: And I don't want to know what you discussed
22	with your attorney, but your attorney explained the possible sentences
23	should you be convicted?
24	THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
25	THE COURT: And did you understand everything he

1	explained he or she, I don't know which explained to you?
2	THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
3	THE COURT: And do you have any additional questions
4	you'd like to ask him or me and we can do that outside the presence of
5	the State if you'd like?
6	THE DEFENDANT: No.
7	MR. SPEED: Well, Court's indulgence.
8	THE COURT: Okay.
9	[Pause]
10	MR. SPEED: Your Honor, Kevin Speed for Mr. Gunera-
11	Pastrana. We did have an issue and there are some things that I won't
12	delve into them too far, because it touches and concerns a privileged
13	communication, but there is a procedural question of law that doesn't
14	require the Court to act or behave as a person giving legal advice that
15	Mr. Gunera-Pastrana has a question on that neither myself nor Ms.
16	Machnich has been able to answer, so if the Court would excuse the
17	District Attorney's Office from the courtroom for just a few minutes, I
18	think we can clear up a lot of things that will help Mr. Gunera-Pastrana
19	make his decisions going forward.
20	THE COURT: Okay. Do we need to go off the record for that
21	or seal it?
22	MS. MACHNICH: Seal it.
23	MR. SPEED: Probably seal it.
24	THE COURT: Seal it. Okay.
25	All right.

MR. SPEED: Hold on.

THE COURT: Hold on.

MR. SPEED: Go ahead.

[Record sealed from 1:05 p.m. to 1:11 p.m.]

THE COURT: All right. And you need to start translating.

Anything else we need to go over before we bring -- oh, you had something outside the presence you wanted to make a record on?

MS. MACHNICH: Yes, Your Honor. Prior to our break we had briefly discussed getting a list of the jurors who would be sent up as part of our venire, so that we could consider and review what has been provided by them regarding their race. There is a reporting section on the bio form attorney's list that is provided as part of the jury selection process that does have race as one of the questions.

The other option for doing this is, how my co-counsel would refer to as the eyeball test of when everyone comes up you try to put people into categories based upon what race they appear. This seems to be a little more straightforward, because everyone has put down something for the race category, although I will acknowledge that there were quite a few individuals who put other race as the option there.

One of the things that we do when we receive these lists, or when we do eyeball the jury when they do -- when they are brought in, with regard to a fair cross section challenge, is to see if we have a representative makeup of the community.

And our basis for the numbers is the U.S. Census Clark

County from -- there we go -- we have one from July 1st, 2018. That's

	I
	2
	3
	4
	5
	6
	7
	8
	9
1	0
1	1
1	2
1	3
1	4
1	5
1	6
1	7
1	8
1	9
2	0
2	1
2	2
2	3

25

U.S. Census Bureau Quick Facts in Clark County, which put the breakdown of Clark County with 70.3 percent white, 12.5 percent black or African American, 1.2 percent American Indian or Alaskan Native alone, 10.5 percent Asian alone, .9 percent Native Hawaiian and other Pacific Islander alone, two or more races would be 4.7 percent, Hispanic or Latino percent would be at 31.3, and white alone, not Hispanic -- yeah -- oh, okay, so we're getting --

THE COURT: In order to expedite, if you want to attach that as a part of the court record, I'm okay with that.

MS. MACHNICH: We would love to do that. And we would ask that you take judicial notice of those census figures.

I showing it to the State, so that they've -- it's the -- and I'll go on while they're reviewing that.

So we took the numbers and the legal basis for this and the legal basis for a fair cost action challenge comes from the 6th and 14th amendments of the US Constitution, which guarantee a venire selection from a fair cross section of the community. And we would cite specifically to *Morgan v. State*, which is 134 Nev. Adv. Op. 27 from 2018, and *Duren v. Missouri*, US 357, which is from 1979.

To demonstrate a prima facie case, the fair cross section requirement, we must show that a group alleged to be excluded is a distinctive group in the community; that the representation of this group in venires from which juries are selected is not fair and reasonable in relation to the number of such persons in the community; and that there's under representations due to systemic exclusion of the group in

2

4 5

7

6

8 9

10

11

13

12

15

14

16

17

18 19

20 21

22

23

24

25

the jury selection process. Again, citing to *Morgan*, quoting *Williams v*. State, 121 Nev. 934 from 2005.

So to -- specifically with relation to this case, we went through the bio form attorney's list that was provided. There were 82 people on our panel. And we got our tally numbers at 50 of those individuals having identified -- self-identified as white; 4 as African American; 1 as American Indian; 9 as Asian; 1 as Native Hawaiian -- sorry, I should have not written all initials; 17 as other, which we'll address in just one moment; and no people identified on the forms as two or more races, or Hispanic or Latino.

We acknowledge that we're not going to argue to Your Honor that there are zero people of Hispanic or Latino descent on this jury. We went through, on further basis, and based upon what we have right now, took everyone, who identified as other and looked for any indication of Hispanic or a Latino origin in their names. That is what we could do at this point.

Obviously, for this analysis, we could certainly bring up the jury, but if we took that amount, we got it to, I believe 7 that would -- or maybe Hispanic would be 10 of the others, so of the 17, we thought potentially 10 could be Hispanic or Latino. So our challenge is based primarily on the number of African Americans; and secondarily, potentially on the number of Hispanic or Latinos in the panel that's been provided before this Court.

So to determine whether members of a distinct group are fairly represented, you look at the absolute and comparative disparities

between the actual percentage in the venire and the percentage of the group in the community. Comparative disparities over 50 percent indicate that the representation of the group is likely not fair and reasonable. Again, citing to *Williams v. State*.

We ran those numbers and saw that we had a 61 percent comparative disparity on both the African Americans and potentially even with our 10 going towards the Hispanic, Latino count, a 61 percent comparative disparity with the community from Hispanic or Latina members of the community.

Given that we do not have solid numbers on the second, I will primarily argue the first. It is a distinct group in the community.

African Americans or black individuals in Clark County are a distinct group, as counted by the US Census. And in Clark County it's a specific number that is provided.

We ran, with respect to this panel, that number and the -- given that the comparative disparity is 61 percent, we would challenge the makeup of the jury panel that is coming up before Your Honor. There are four African Americans out of 82 people. And we are way off a fair representation of the community, based upon the numbers.

I can certainly go into the third prong as well at this point, but I would --

THE COURT: Well, that's the -- I believe, if I'm understanding you right, that's the -- how the panel is acquired and whether that's done with bias, which is the biggest issue?

MS. MACHNICH: Sure is, Your Honor. And our --

2

3

4

5

6

7

8 9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22 23

24

25

THE COURT: And I've had, by the way, the Jury Commissioner testify several times regarding this, both before and after the addition of the latest group, and I don't know if that was how they did it, but they added another means of acquiring potential jurors, so go ahead and address that.

MS. MACHNICH: Well, Your Honor, you are absolutely correct. That that Nevada Revised Statutes were added, I believe it was three years ago now -- or it was implemented -- passed four years ago, implemented three years ago. NRS 6.0453, which states that the Jury Commissioner shall, for the purpose of selecting trial jurors, compile and maintain a list of qualified electors from information provided by -- and this was preexisting -- a list of persons who are registered to vote in the county, in the Department of Motor Vehicles, and a public utility. Those three were preexisting.

The new one that Your Honor is referring to is the Employment Security Division of the Department of Employment Training and Rehabilitation, pursuant to NRS 612.265; however, our understanding -- and I'm guessing that if you've spoken to the Jury Commissioner in the recent past, you're also aware of the fact that the Jury Commissioner is not complying with the statute, so she is not complying with Nevada law to obtain a fair cross section of the community, as specified by Nevada Law and Nevada Revised Statutes, and are assembly, and state senate.

She is not currently pulling data from the Employment

Security Division. Our understanding is that if she were to testify and be allowed to testify in the case, she would testify that they have not worked out a mechanism for that to happen at this point; however, we believe that that is not a justification for violating our client's right to a fair cross section of the community, based on the 6th and 14th amendments of the United States Constitution.

So at the point, Your Honor, we would ask for a new jury panel: one that is a fair cross section of the community. And obviously, the question before that posed to the Court would be, would Your Honor allow us to question the Jury Commissioner further. And I believe Your Honor is disinclined to do that; however, we would like to make that formal request.

THE COURT: Well, she's done it so many times. I think the record is very clear from her testimony on other cases. I don't see why it would have to be done yet again in this particular case, unless you know something I don't.

MS. MACHNICH: It depends --

THE COURT: I know she's testified in front of me two or three times and I know she's testified multiple times in other courts.

MS. MACHNICH: And is Your Honor aware of and understanding that her recent testimony is that they are not in compliance with NRS 6.045 (3) for a variety of reasons?

THE COURT: I was made aware of that.

MS. MACHNICH: Yeah.

THE COURT: All right. Anything else?

- 31 -

Let's hear from the State. Well, before you do that, so really what you're asking is, to continue the trial because even if we got another panel, it wouldn't comply, according to you, with that last requirement?

MS. MACHNICH: Your Honor, we only make these challenges when there are comparative disparities above 50 percent. I think that, as attorneys, we've all had representative panels, despite the current mechanism. We are not asking for a continuance of this trial. We are asking for a new panel and hopefully that panel will be a more fair representation and cross section of the community.

It is theoretically possible, because we have seen it happen; however, based upon the panel that we have been provided specifically in this case. We have comparative disparity issues, so I'm not asking to continue the trial at all; just for a new --

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. MACHNICH: -- pool.

THE COURT: All right. State.

MS. SUDANO: Thank you, Your Honor. So what we're looking at is not whether this particular 80 people in front of us for this proceeding are a fair cross section of the community. What we're looking at is whether the jury selection process, as a whole, pulls from a fair cross section of the community.

As Your Honor has indicated, we've had testimony in a number of different departments in this courtroom, including Your Honor, on a number of different occasions from the Jury Commissioner

for how it is that they currently pull people in from the community as far as who is actually being summoned for jury duty. So it's my understanding that that currently comes DMV, voter rolls, and from NV Energy or from Power.

Just because they send out jury summons to everybody, the Jury Commissioner cannot mandate that people come in. It's whoever receives a summons and comes back in front of the Court. So I don't see any reason to go back and have the Jury Commissioner testify when there hasn't been anything that's presented that would change this Court's understanding, or change the State's understanding, change the Nevada Supreme Court's understanding of where we are, as far as the jury selection process in general and how it is that the jury pool county wide is selected.

As far as the particular numbers that the Defense attorneys have posed in this particular case, that's all coming from what these individuals have included on their forms. I just want it to be incredibly clear at this point, on the record, that we have not seen these jurors. They have not been in our courtroom at this point.

So whether our Hispanic or Latino jurors are identifying as white, or whether they're identifying as other, this number that we have -- this ten may be Hispanic or Latino journals -- or jurors is completely speculative at best. And again, because we have nothing to indicate that there's some issue with the way that the jury panel county wide is compiled, I don't think that there's anything that we need to do further at this point.

I would also note for the Court that what counsel wants is for this panel to be excused and for another panel to be brought up, even though they're challenging the process for the jury pool county wide. So there is a case --

THE COURT: I thought I said that.

MS. SUDANO: Well, and I do just want to point this out, though that there is a case -- and I don't have the name, and I can get it in just a second and send it to Your Honor -- where there was a jury that was not representative for the pool that was in front of particular judge for a particular trial. And I believe the issue there was there were not enough African Americans, so the Jury Commissioner excused -- or they excused the first panel.

Jury Commissioner went down specifically selected a jury panel from the pool that was there in the court on that particular day. Brought them back up and decided that's our jury pool. So that was also determined to be inappropriate when the Jury Commissioner and the judge are specifically cherry picking individuals to match whatever community makeup.

So for us to excuse this particular panel, to go back down and get another panel, and potentially excuse that one until the Defense attorneys are satisfied with that panel being a representative makeup of the community is totally inappropriate, given that we don't have anything to suggest that the county-wide process is problematic.

THE COURT: Thank you.

I do have one other -- and again, this was an issue, where we

went through some of the jurors and a particular juror -- or venire person self-identified as white and when he was questioned he said he was African American. So the, if you will, guesswork, on this, or assumptions aren't always correct.

Go ahead.

MS. MACHNICH: Your Honor, I don't believe they're assumptions. They're actual people self-reporting and I believe our -- it would be our assumptions if we were looking at them saying the color -- we're going to assume the color of your skin means X; however, these are what people self-identify as. So taking apart and aside the --

THE COURT: And then they changed it when questioned, so that's my only comment.

MS. MACHNICH: You know, Your Honor, we're --

THE COURT: There's not a lot we can do.

MS. MACHNICH: Well, people generally self-identify correctly, or they don't -- most people do not incorrectly self-identify themselves as something they are not. I don't know what would motivate someone to do that.

THE COURT: Just tell you exactly what happened. And I don't remember the exact case, but it's on the record.

MS. MACHNICH: Your Honor, I can't speak to that, but what I can speak to is the data we have in front of us here today.

THE COURT: Yeah.

MS. MACHNICH: Our client is entitled to a fair cross section of the community. And I would state that, as the State has said, we have

it -- the State stated in their argument that we haven't established that there is any problem with the process, but we have, because the process -- our legislators, which is the process this is supposed to go through, the process that the Nevada Supreme Court specifically stated for them to go through. This is something that should be legislatively.

The legislature took it up. The legislature passed a law and now the Jury Commissioner is ignoring it. So at this point, and there can be all the excuses --

THE COURT: Well, correct me --

MS. MACHNICH: -- but there are years that now this has not occurred. So at this point, the Jury Commissioner is not in compliance with the law and it's a due process violation for my client, but, Your Honor, we will submit to your discussion on the issue.

THE COURT: And I appreciate it. I think this is a very interesting area. Maybe I shouldn't, you know, waste time saying that, but there is a problem, but the law is that under case law, et cetera, that we take a fair cross section of the community by using these means.

Now, the one that you speak of, the commissioner has said that -- and I know you're easily as informed as I am -- that could not -- cannot comply with that particular statute that the legislature passed; in other words, if you legislate that you will -- I don't know,

I don't want to give a crazy example, but if you legislate to do -- that the federal government has to provide you -- a good example, the gun issue that was from before, where the state passed a thing saying we'll check backgrounds, but the feds said we can't do that. And

that was -- if you can't do it -- if there's no means to do it, then the law certainly is invalid, in that regard. And my understanding is that's exactly what's taking place regarding the fourth criterion.

What is that again? The --

MS. MACHNICH: It was specifically in the statute the Employment Security Division of the Department of Employment Training and Rehabilitation, pursuant to NRS 612.265.

THE COURT: Right. And they -- my understanding -- and again, correct me -- they can't comply by giving everybody's information out.

In any event, this isn't perfect. No doubt. I don't think anybody would say otherwise, but in selecting a cross section that does not discriminate in any manner, and is random, is what is required, and that's what the commissioner is complying with.

The fact that it doesn't meet the exact -- or even, in this case, less than your goal -- what would that -- less than the optimal standard, you know, criteria 80 percent this, whatever, is unfortunate, but I doubt that ever could take place. And even selecting from every, somehow, pulling everybody off the street would still not get a statistical cross section and that has to do with survey research and polling, et cetera, et cetera, which I had to say was my major in college. It's very, very hard to get the reality to comply with that.

So based on what testimony I have previously heard from the commissioner, I don't think that certainly any -- bringing her in again to reiterate what she does, since we're all aware of what criteria she

takes, and the fact that this doesn't -- it doesn't statistically meet it, but on the other hand, the most serious criteria is that we draw from a population, if you will, using a cross section that doesn't discriminate in any manner, and that's what we certainly want to do, and do our best to do. So I'm denying the motion for a new panel.

And again, just for the record, a new panel we could be doing this all day, because the next panel, even though that may be closer, would still have the flaw, if you will, regarding the statute passed by the legislature, and so -- okay.

MR. SPEED: Kevin Speed for the record, Your Honor. Or the Jury Commissioner's refusal to comply with those statutes?

THE COURT: Well, I think it's her -- you can say refusal. I think it's inability in, not just inability that there's no way to comply, but that you certainly, I would imagine, have had plenty of time to take up, so --

MR. SPEED: And in the Court's ruling, it is acknowledging that the Jury Commissioner -- in deciding that her testimony is unnecessary for this particular motion, the Court is acknowledging that the Jury Commissioner is not incompliance with the statute?

THE COURT: Well --

MR. SPEED: It is aware of that?

THE COURT: -- it's my understanding, she's not using that fourth -- what is it called? The -- again, that long -- yes.

MS. MACHNICH: The Employment Security Division of the Department of Employment Training and Rehabilitation, pursuant to

1	NRS 612.265.
2	THE COURT: Thank you. She is not using that, because she
3	is unable to do so.
4	Okay.
5	THE CLERK: I need a copy of that for Court's exhibit.
6	MS. MACHNICH: For the oh, the census?
7	THE CLERK: Is that what you were referring to when you
8	said you wanted to make a record?
9	THE COURT: Yeah, the I think there's
10	MS. MACHNICH: Yes.
11	THE COURT: a census. And as long as that's published,
12	and documented
13	MS. MACHNICH: Yeah, we'd ask that the Court take judicial
14	notice, but we'll make an exhibit of the copy that we have
15	THE COURT: That's fine.
16	MS. MACHNICH: pulled yesterday
17	THE CLERK: Okay.
18	MS. MACHNICH: and it's from July 2018, which is the
19	most recent version.
20	THE COURT: Okay. Anything else?
21	MS. MACHNICH: I don't believe so, Your Honor.
22	THE COURT: State.
23	MS. DIGIACOMO: No, Your Honor.
24	MS. SUDANO: No, Your Honor.
25	THE COURT: All right. Bring them in.

1	THE MARSHAL: I've got to go get them, Judge.
2	THE COURT: Oh, okay. Right. All right. So it's going to
3	be that seat, because
4	THE CLERK: Steve, can you put 34 in Number 15 seat. Here,
5	I'll give you my list.
6	THE COURT: Up here, because she was in the box.
7	THE CLERK: Oh, yeah.
8	MS. DIGIACOMO: Well, just
9	THE MARSHAL: 34 and 15 seat.
10	THE COURT: Well, because
11	MS. DIGIACOMO: In other words
12	THE COURT: because she did this. She already did this, so
13	did you guys
14	THE CLERK: Yeah.
15	THE COURT: probably.
16	THE MARSHAL: Uh-huh Okay. Give me a moment to try to
17	figure this out.
18	MS. DIGIACOMO: Can you just put a paper or something on
19	seat 15, and he knows to skip over it.
20	THE CLERK: That's, that's true.
21	MS. DIGIACOMO: Yeah. If you put like
22	THE CLERK: I could do that.
23	MS. DIGIACOMO: or something on
24	THE CLERK: Never mind
25	MS. DIGIACOMO: on seat 15.

1	THE CLERK: I'll take care of it.
2	THE MARSHAL: Okay, yeah. That would be easier. Give me
3	that
4	THE COURT: All right. Yeah.
5	THE MARSHAL: Give me a post-it.
6	THE CLERK: Just a post-it?
7	THE MARSHAL: Yeah.
8	THE COURT: Yeah.
9	THE MARSHAL: And we'll just put that there.
10	MS. DIGIACOMO: And then I will
11	THE COURT: That's what happens when we do it early.
12	THE MARSHAL: Yeah.
13	MS. DIGIACOMO: Yeah.
14	THE MARSHAL: Now which seat?
15	MS. DIGIACOMO: It's going to be the fifth one from here.
16	THE CLERK: From the middle row.
17	THE MARSHAL: The second row, in the box.
18	MS. DIGIACOMO: No
19	THE COURT: Yeah.
20	MS. DIGIACOMO: one more.
21	THE COURT: In the box.
22	MS. DIGIACOMO: In the box. The fifth seat down.
23	THE CLERK: The front row.
24	THE COURT: The front row.
25	[Counsel and clerk confer confer]

THE CLERK: Perfect.
THE MARSHAL: Yes, sir.
THE CLERK: Yeah. I'll tell them to skip that seat.
THE MARSHAL: Okay.
THE COURT: Okay.
THE CLERK: And then we'll
THE COURT: Thank you.
MS. DIGIACOMO: plug the person in after. So the first
person that comes in, after you give me this group will stay up here, and
the others you can load back.
THE COURT: I think you know not to do that next time.
[Court and clerk confer]
THE COURT: All right.
[Pause]
THE MARSHAL: Please rise for the jurors.
THE COURT: Okay. We are going to be full.
[Prospective jurors in at 2:07 p.m.]
[Inside the presence of the prospective jurors]
THE COURT: Okay. Please be seated everyone.
Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen.
GROUP RESPONSE: Good afternoon, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Well, that was pretty good for an afternoon.
Now usually you're asleep. I understand you're sitting there

1	IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA
2	
3	GUSTAVO GUNERA-PASTRANA,) No. 79861
4	Appellant,)
5	
6	V.)
7	THE STATE OF NEVADA,)
8	Respondent.
9	
10	APPELLANT'S APPENDIX VOLUME III PAGES 501-729
11	DARIN IMLAY STEVE WOLFSON Clark County Public Defender Clark County District Attorney
12	Clark County Public Defender 309 South Third Street Las Vegas, Nevada 89155-2610 Clark County District Attorney 200 Lewis Avenue, 3 rd Floor Las Vegas, Nevada 89155
13	Attorney for Appellant AARON FORD Attorney General
1415	Attorney General 100 North Carson Street Carson City, Nevada 89701-4717 (702) 687-3538
16	Counsel for Respondent
17	<u>CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE</u>
18	I hereby certify that this document was filed electronically with the Nevada
19	Supreme Court on the 19 day of May, 2020. Electronic Service of the foregoing document
20	shall be made in accordance with the Master Service List as follows:
21	AARON FORD DEBORAH L. WESTBROOK STEVEN S. OWENS HOWARD S. BROOKS
22	I further certify that I served a copy of this document by mailing a true and
23	correct copy thereof, postage pre-paid, addressed to:
24	GUSTAVO GUNERA-PASTRANA, #1223501
25	HIGH DESERT STATE PRISON P.O. BOX 650
26	INDIAN SPRINGS, NV 89070
27	BY/s/ Carrie M. Connolly
28	Employee, Clark County Public Defender's Office