1	IN THE SUPREME C	OURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA
2		
3	EDWARD MICHAEL ADAMS,) No. 55494
4	Appellant,	Electronically Filed Feb 22 2011 01:48 p.m
5	v.	Tracie K. Lindeman
6	THE STATE OF NEVADA,))
7		
8	Respondent.))
9	<u>APPELLANT'S APPEN</u>	DIX - VOLUME IV - PAGES 711-903
10		
11	PHILIP J. KOHN Clark County Public Defender	DAVID ROGER Clark County District Attorney
12	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	CATHERINE CORTEZ MASTO
14		Attorney General 100 North Carson Street
15		Carson City, Nevada 89701-4717 (702) 687-3538
16		Counsel for Respondent
17		•
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

INDEX

1

Adams, Edward 2 3 4 PAGE NO. 5 Amended Criminal Complaint 6 7 Amended Information 8 filed 10/28/09..... 096-101 9 10 Defendant's Motion to Dismiss Based Upon the State's Failure to 11 Preserve Exculpatory Evidence, and Motion to Dismiss Due to the State's Failure to Provide Brady Material 12 13 Defendant's Notice of Witnesses 14 15 16 Instructions to the Jury (Instruction No. 1) filed 11/4/09..... 102-136 17 18 Judgment of Conviction filed 2/2/10..... 141-144 19 20 21 Minutes through 1/13/10..... 148-157 22 Motion to Continue Trial Date 23 24 Notice of Appeal filed 2/22/10......145-147 25 Notice of Witnesses and/or Expert Witnesses filed 4/16/08..... 063-078 26 27 Supplemental Notice of Witnesses and/or Expert Witnesses filed 10/21/09..... 089-093 28

i

1	Verdict	filed	11/4/09	 • • • • • • • • • •		 137-140
2						
3						
4					•	
5						
6						
7						
8						
9						
10						
11						
12						į
13						
14						
15						
16						
17						
18						
19 20						
21						
22						
23						
24						
25						
26						
27						
28						
- 11						1

TRANSCRIPTS:

1	TRANSCRIPTS:
2	
3	Transcript: All Pending Motions
4	(DOH 10/27/09) filed 3/25/10
5	Transcript: Arraignment
6	(DOH 2/19/08) filed 3/25/10
7	Transcript: Calendar Call (DOH 6/10/08) filed 3/17/10
8	
9	Transcript: Calendar Call (DOH 10/7/08) filed 3/17/10
10	Transcript: Calendar Call
11	(DOH 3/31/09) filed 3/25/10
12	Transcript: Jury Trial - Day 1 (Split Transcript)
13	(DOH 11/2/09) filed 4/14/10
14	Second Part, Page 250-431, Volume II
15	Transcript: Jury Trial - Day 2 (Split Transcript)
16	(DOH 11/3/09) filed 4/14/10
17	Second Part, Page 463-710, Volume III
18	Transcript: Jury Trial - Day 3 (DOH 11/4/09) filed 4/14/10
19	
20	Transcript: Preliminary Hearing (DOH 1/30/08) filed 2/8/08
21	Transcript: Sentencing
22	(DOH 1/13/10) filed 4/13/10892-903
23	Transcript: Status Check: Negotiations and/or Trial Setting
24	(DOH 10/28/08) filed 3/17/10
26	
27	
28	
4.0	

DISTRICT COURT CLARK COUNTY, NEVALTA

THE STATE OF NEVADA,

· CLER CASE NOT C-241003

Plaintiff, VS.

DEPT. NO. 18

EDWARD MICHAEL ADAMS,

Transcript of

Defendant.

Proceedings

BEFORE THE HONORABLE DAVID BARKER, DISTRICT COURT JUDGE

JURY TRIAL - DAY 3

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 4, 2009

APPEARANCES:

FOR THE PLAINTIFF:

CRAIG L. HENDRICKS, ESQ.

Chief Deputy District Attorney

RICHARD H. SCOW, ESQ. Deputy District Attorney

FOR THE DEFENDANT:

JEFFREY S. MANINGO, ESQ.

Deputy Public Defender

COURT RECORDER:

TRANSCRIPTION BY:

RICHARD KANGAS District Court VERBATIM DIGITAL REPORTING, LLC

Littleton, CO 80120

(303) 798-0890

Proceedings recorded by audio-visual recording, transcript produced by transcription service.

LAS VEGAS, NEVADA, WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 4, 2009, 10:34 A.M. 1 2 (In the presence of the jury). 3 THE MARSHAL: Panel's present, your Honor. THE COURT: Thank you. This is C-241003, State of 4 Nevada, plaintiff versus Edward Michael Adams. Record should 5 reflect the presence of representatives of the State, defense. All members of the jury panel appear to be present. Parties 8 stipulate to the presence of the entire panel? Mr. Scow? 9 MR. SCOW: Yes, Judge. 10 THE COURT: Mr. Maningo? 11 MR. MANINGO: Yes, sir. 12 THE COURT: All right. Ladies and gentlemen, I want 13 to apologize for the late start. It's on me. My responsibilities this morning ran a little long, so I apologize 14 for that. We remain in State's case in chief. Call your next 15 16 witness. 17 MR. SCOW: Kelly Gauthier. 18 (Off-record colloguy). THE COURT: Mr. Maningo, if you could approach while 19 20 the witness is approaching. 21 (Off-record bench conference). 22 THE COURT: Record should reflect we received a question for Juror No. 4. Question is, "Can we have a printed 23 24 copy of the charges at this point for reference?" The

procedure in all criminal cases is to provide that information

25

when I instruct you on the -- on the case, not a point before that. And -- and that's -- so that's exact -- that's when 2 you'll receive that information. Okay. So that's the answer 3 4 to that question. Let's swear the witness. 5 KELLIE GAUTHIER, STATE'S WITNESS, SWORN 6 THE CLERK: Thank you. Please be seated. 7 state your full name and spell your name for the record. 8 THE WITNESS: Kelly Gauthier, K-e-l-l-i-e, 9 G-a-u-t-h-i-e-r. 10 THE COURT: Counsel. 11 MR. SCOW: Thank you, Judge. 12 DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. SCOW: 13 Good morning. How are you currently employed? 14 With the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department in 15 the forensic lab as a DNA analyst. 16 17 How long have you been a DNA analyst with the forensic lab? 18 19 Four and a half years. Do you have any experience prior to working with the 20 21 Las Vegas Metro Lab? 22 Α Prior to working here, I worked for the Florida Department of Law Enforcement in the same capacity for about 23 24 two years. 25 What kind of training, experience goes into becoming

a -- or education goes into becoming a forensic scientist, and specifically, with regards to DNA?

A I have a bachelors degree from the University of West Florida in biology. As well as when I was hired by Florida Department of Law Enforcement, I went through about an eight month rigorous raining program. As well as when I was hired here at Metro I went through another year of training. Plus, we do continuing education every year to keep up on the field.

- Q Have you previously testified as an expert witness in the field of DNA analysis?
 - A Yes, I have.

- Q Can you tell the jury generally what DNA is?
- A DNA's simply what makes us all individuals. And no one with has the same DNA profile except identical twins.
- Q Now, with regards to where we can get DNA from our bodies, can you examples of the different types of DNA?
- A The three pain types that most people talk about are blood, semen and saliva. All those contain DNA within the cells. But as well, the newest one is touch DNA, where people touch an item rigorously or even somewhat and you can get a partial or a full profile or sometimes no profile at all.
- Q So in what you just testified about touch DNA, it's possible to touch something and leave DNA, it's possible to touch something and not leave any DNA?
 - A Yeah, depending on the surface which is touched. If

it's a rigid surface, you're going to leave more cells versus a smooth surface or just in general how much you touch the item. And plus, we all shed cells individually differently, so depending on if you're a high shedder or a low shedder will depend on how much DNA you leave.

- Q Depending on all the circumstances combined?
- A Exactly, and that's why it's is hard to do reference testing on touch DNAs because each individual's so different.
- Q Now, the -- the samples you get in a touch DNA versus the other types you described, the bodily fluids, is one going to give a richer or a more source of DNA?

A For sure, I would assume that if someone spit on something, left a blood sample or left sperm, which is where DNA's found, you're going to get a profile. Versus touch DNA, you might end up with multiple people touching an item, so you might end up a -- with a mixture of tons of people or you might not get anything.

Q So have you had any examples of items that you know have been touched or owned where you get no DNA results, no profile at all?

A Yes, actually, we did a study with guns in the DNA lab to see, you know, how good guns are for DNA. People own them, people touch them, they clean them, they do all these things. And we did about 35 guns, I believe, and swabbed different areas of the gun. And on several of them we got no

profiles, even though we knew people had touched the items.

And then sometimes we'd get great profiles.

A lot just depends on several circumstances all working together to get a profile.

Q Now, how do you use DNA and DNA technology to make identifications?

A We look at unknown items from crime scene samples and we compare them to standards, which are taken from individuals and are known to be from those individuals. So we'll end up with a profile from an unknown, say anything, a vaginal swab, a blood sample, and we'll compare it to known individuals in any case, a victim or a suspect.

Q And those known samples, are those common -- what's commonly used a buccal swab?

A Yeah. They're commonly buccal swabs, which are just swabbings of the inner cheek. And that's why they're called buccal swabs, because you have buccal cells in your cheeks. So those are taken from individuals and submitted. In the old days it used to be blood drawn, but now it's buccal swabs most of the time.

Q Were you, in this specific case, asked to examine items of evidence?

A I was.

Q And you had some known samples to compare that evidence with?

1 Α I did. 2 And what were the known samples you had? I had one from Amber, that was contained within the 3 sexual assault kit that was taken. And you I also had one from 4 Edward Adams, and that was buccal swabs in a separate 5 container. 6 7 Okay. Now let's turn first to the sexual assault kit 0 that you mentioned you examined. Showing you State's Proposed 8 Exhibit 3. Do you recognize this? 9 10 Α I do. 11 What is it? 12 It is a sexual assault collection kit taken from Amber Valles, and it has my signature on it on the chain of 13 custody as well as my seal that is still intact. 14 And this sexual kit is done by a nurse, an examining 15 16 nurse? 17 That's correct, and submitted to our vault. Okay. And you -- your blue tape here indicates 18 Q you've opened this and examined the -- the items inside? 19 20 That's correct. 21 MR. SCOW: (Indiscernible) at this point I'll move to admit State's Proposed 3. We could wait for the next witness, 22 but I'll see if the defense (indiscernible). 23 THE COURT: Offering 3. Any objection? 24

MR. MANINGO: No objection.

25

THE COURT: 3's admitted.

(Exhibit 3 admitted).

BY MR. SCOW:

A I looked at everything within the sexual kit, the vaginal swabs, the cervical swabs. There were no underpants collected. Swabs from the inner thigh, pubic hair brushing, rectal swabs, anus swabs, oral swabs with floss was not collected. There was a slide that was not examined by me and there was paperwork which was used for informational purposes only.

Q Okay. So first turning to the vaginal swabs and the cervical swabs. What results did you obtain from those?

A For vaginal swabs and cervical swabs, they were both sperm positive meaning there was sperm present. And the epithelial fraction of both the vaginal swab and cervical swabs matched Amber.

Q Okay. Now explain the difference between the epithelial fraction and sperm fraction.

A With a sexual assault case, or any type where there is semen and epithelials, meaning epithelials from the victim, semen, sperm from the suspect, we actually can do a really neat process in DNA where we actually spin the sample down in a tube, and sperm cells are more dense, so they go to the bottom of the tube versus the epithelial cells, which will float at

the top. So we can actually take off the top layer of liquid and try to get a good separation of victim from the sperm cells that are there.

Sometimes you will end up with a mixture where you get cross over where you don't get all the epithelial cells out, or the sperm will go over to the epithelial fraction, but it gives us a way better differential separation of the two.

- Q The different types?
- A So the epithelial would typically be the female. And the sperm fraction would typically be the male.
- Q So examples of epithelial would be like skin cells, blood, those types of --
 - A That's correct.

2.2

- Q Okay. So again, just to make sure we're clear, the -- the sperm fraction of the cervical and vaginal swabs was identified to Edward Adams' profile?
- A Those -- the sperm fractions of the vaginal swabs and the cervical swabs were a mixture, and Amber could not be excluded as the minor contributor. Meaning that some of the epithelials probably got over in the sperm fraction. And E. Adams, Edward Adams, cannot be excluded as the major contributor to the sperm fraction.

And the estimate of the major profile in the population is rarer than 1 in 650,000,000,000, meaning identity is assumed.

Can you explain that statistic and where you come up with those items?

The actual number is much greater than 650,000,000,000. Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department DNA unit set that number at a hundred times the world's population to identify someone as being the contributor of the DNA profile. The FBI, I believe, uses the U.S. population as their threshold. We use a hundred times the world's population. Meaning if you're had a hundred worlds, the random possibility of finding this profile again is rarer than 1 in 650,000,000,000. So we identify the person.

So that you indicate identity is assumed based on that very rare statistic?

That's correct.

1

2

3

4

5

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Α

Now, with regards to you examined rectal swab and anal swab, what results did you have there?

Α The epithelial fraction, once again, is consistent with Amber, the victim. And the partial DNA profile obtained from the rectal swabs and the full DNA profile obtained from the anus swabs of both the sperm fractions are consistent with a mixture of two individuals. Both Amber and Edward Adams cannot be excluded as contributors to this mixture.

Greater than 99.9 percent of the population are excluded as contributors. But I could not exclude those two.

But 99.99 percent of the population can be excluded?

1 Α Greater than that, yes. Now, with regards to there was a (indiscernible) swab 2 3 in there as well? 4 Α That's correct. 5 Q And what were your results from that swab? Presumptive tests for blood were negative on that 6 Α 7 swab as long with presumptive tests for semen. But from that swab, I did get a mixture of two individuals. Both Amber and 9 Edward Adams could not be excluded as contributors to that mixture. And greater than 99.99 percent of the population are 10 11 excluded. 12 Q Okay. Let's move to State's Exhibit 6 and the 13 contents. Do you recognize this? 14 I do. Once again, I it has my signature on the chain of custody, my blue seal still intact with my initials and P 15 16 number. 17 0 And this contains item that -- items that you 18 examined as well? 19 That's correct. Now, specifically with regards to a pair of pants --20 21 or actually, this was the towel, the white/yellowish towel. 22 Did you do any examination of -- of that towel? 23 Α I did. 24 What did you do specifically with that towel? you collect samples? How do you go about your testing there? 25

1 We screen the towel. Of course, I was looking for semen. And alternate light source is great for that. 2 actually, which most people have seen on CSI, but it's just an 3 alternate light source that actually fluoresces sperm and 4 semen. So we turn off the lights, we use it, and it will 5 actually fluoresce in areas that appear to have stains on them. 6 7 Now, other things that fluoresce or saliva and stuff like that. So after we find those stains, we actually have to do more testing on them to make sure that we do confirm sperm 10 is there. So I did that with this towel. 11 Q Okay. 12 And I'll approach to show you State's MR. SCOW: Proposed Exhibits 52 to 56. 13 14 BY MR. SCOW: 15 Do you recognize these? Q 16 Α I do. 17 0 What are they? They're pictures of took of each stain that I looked 18 Α 19 at that was positive. So these are pictures you took of the towel and the 20 different stains that you observed in -- and your markings of 21 22 those stains? 23 Α That's correct. 24 Q Okay. 25 MR. SCOW: At this time I'd move to admit State's

1 Proposed Exhibits 52 through 56. THE COURT: Any objection? Any objection to 52 2 3 through 56 offered? 4 MR. MANINGO: Oh, no, sir. 5 THE COURT: Hearing no objection, they'll be 6 admitted. 7 (Exhibits 52 through 56 admitted). 8 BY MR. SCOW: Just showing 52 first as an example of what you're 0 doing. You said you use a light source into looking for 10 11 stains, and you do presumptive testing for semen? 12 Α That's correct. And what on this towel any markings that you can let 13 14 the jury know what you're doing? 15 Α Tested this stain right here. Sorry, there's arrows everywhere. And as you can he see, I marked acid phosphatase, 16 AP, the AP you see there, right here, that's a presumptive test 17 for semen. It does not mean that sperm are present. It just 18 means that semen is possibly there. It's a presumptive test. 19 And I marked it as positive, so that stain was positive. 20 21 And then in these other photographs, 53, 54, 55 and Q -- and 56, these are different areas that you're testing to 22 determine whether or not further analysis needs to be done? 23 24 Α That's correct. 25 And with regards to the towel and the different areas Q

you tested, what results did you have?

A There were five stains total that had positive presumptive testing for semen. And of those I took two onto the DNA and actually got profiles from they will. The other ones I did not take cuttings from.

Q And what were the results of the two samples that you did test?

A The DNA profile obtained from the epithelial fraction of stain five on the white/yellow bath towel is consistent with a mixture of two individuals. Both Amber and Edward could not be excluded as contributors to this mixture. Greater than 99.99 percent of the population and individuals are excluded as contributors to this mixture.

The DNA profile obtained from sperm fraction of both stains five and seven, those are the two I took cuttings from, on the white/yellow bath towel are consistent with Edward Adams. The estimate of the DNA profile in the population is rarer than 1 in 650,000,000,000 meaning identity's assumed. And -- sorry, that's it with -- that's it with the towel.

- O Clare General Court of the Cower.
- Q Okay. So you -- you identified Edward Adams' sperm on that towel?
- A That's correct.
- Q Now showing you State's Proposed 57 through 66 -
 (Off-record colloquy).

25 BY MR. SCOW:

	1
1	Q Again, 57 through 66, do you recognize these?
2	A The rest of the pictures I took.
3	Q Of your documenting your analysis in this case?
4	A That's correct.
5	MR. SCOW: 62 and 63 are already in. Other than
6	those, at this time I'd move to admit admit States Proposed
7	57 through 66.
8	THE COURT: Any objection?
9	MR. MANINGO: No objection.
10	THE COURT: 57 through 66 are admitted.
11	(Exhibits 57 through 66 admitted).
12	BY MR. SCOW:
13	Q I believe you were about to move on to a white wash
14	cloth?
15	A That's correct.
16	Q That's depicted in State's 57. And you did a couple
17	of presumptive tests?
18	A Yes. Both of those were positive, and I took the
19	cutting from this one right here.
20	Q Okay. Now, with regards to this, what was the
21	results of your examination?
22	A The DNA profile obtained from the epithelial and
23	sperm fraction of the wash cloth is consistent with an unknown
24	male number one.
25	Q Okay. So you didn't have a known sample to compare

1 with that particular result? That's correct. But I can say that Edward Adams is 2 excluded as the contributor for unknown male number one. 3 4 Okay. And whether this wash cloth was found in the Q closet or wherever, you don't know that, this is just the test 5 result you got? 6 7 A That's correct. Now, with regards to State's 59, do you recognize 8 this? 9 10 Α I do. 11 And what is it? 0 12 Α It's blue masking tape. 13 Q And showing --14 Α Painter's tape. Showing you State's Exhibit 2, do you also recognize 15 16 this? 17 Once again, it has my signature, the blue tape Α Yes. sealed capacity with my initials and P number on it. 18 And what's depicted in the photograph 59 is what's 19 contained within State's Exhibit 2? 20 21 Α Yes, that's correct. What -- what did you do with this tape in your 22 Q 23 analysis? I again, used alternate light source to look at it 24 underneath the light to see if there was any semen stains on 25

it. There was one spot that fluoresced, and I did a swabbing on it and it was semen negative. As well as, I swabbed the edges around where the tape would appear to be maybe ripped with the mouth or ripped with the hands to get a DNA profile from touch DNA or from saliva, and I received no DNA profile on this item.

- Q Okay. And so you said you checked like the edges?
- A That's correct.
 - Q You didn't check the adhesive portions?
- A No.

Q And just for purposes of -- of the jury understanding, why didn't you test the adhesive parts?

A Normally, when we get tape in it's usually from being wrapped around a victim's mouth or being cut off at scene. We don't have all the details from all the cases when we get them in. So typically we would avoid the mouth area where it was placed around the victim because we would expect the victim to be there. We're not looking for the person that was actually bound with it. We're looking for the person that actually did the binding. So we look more at the edges and stuff where someone would, like I said, be ripping it off with their mouth to put it over someone's mouth or something like that.

- Q And again, you did not obtain any DNA from the swabs you took?
 - A That's correct.

1 From the edges of the tape. Now, with regards to State's Exhibit 1 and contents, do you recognize this? 2 3 Α I do. And what is it? 5 Α These are white pants and a white and pink t-shirt. Once again, my chain of custody I signed and blue seal still 7 intact. 8 And you examined contents of that bag? 9 I did. Α Now I'm showing you State's 62. Is this a photograph 10 Q you took of the -- the pants contained within that bag? 11 12 Α That's correct. You did some testing there? 13 Q 14 Α I did. 15 And there's a -- is circle in here. Is that an area 16 that you swabbed or cut out? 17 That's an area that was positive for semen. Α 18 took a small cutting from that area. 19 What were your results from that? 20 The epithelial fraction obtained from the white pants Α 21 is consistent with Amber. The DNA profile obtained from the 22 sperm fraction of the white pants is consistent with Edward Adams. And the estimate of the DNA profile in the population 23 is greater than 1 in 650,000,000,000, identity's assumed it's 25 him.

1	Q Okay. For the sperm fraction of that DNA sample?			
2	A For the white pants, that's correct.			
3	Q Now, 63, the shirt that's contained within that bag?			
4	A Yes.			
5	Q And what's going on there?			
6	A As you can see, again, ran the same processes I			
7	always do. These three spots were AP positive. I took my			
8	cutting from this one right here.			
9	Q AP positive, again, is presumptive (indiscernible)			
10	A For semen.			
11	Q What were your are results for testing that cut out?			
12	A The epithelial fraction from the white t-shirt is			
13	consistent with a mixture of two individuals. Amber could not			
14	be excluded as the minor contributor to the mixture. Edward			
15	Adams could not be excluded as the major contributor to the			
16	mixture.			
17	The major DNA profile in the population is rarer than			
18	1 in 650,000,000,000. Again, identity's assumed it is him.			
19	The sperm fraction from this t-shirt is consistent with Edward			
20	Adams. The estimate again is greater than 1 in			
21	650,000,000,000, identity is assumed.			
22	Q Now, the last thing that you examined this			
23	suffering bag. Do you recognize this?			
24	A I do. It has my name on the chain of custody. My			
25	seal is down here and it's no longer intact.			
1				

Q It has been damaged.

THE COURT: What's the exhibit number for the record?

MR. SCOW: This is Exhibit 7 with contents.

BY MR. SCOW:

Q And now showing you photographs State's Exhibit 65 and 66. First 65, is this one of the cushions, seat cushion covers that you examined?

A Yes, this is the east seat cushion of the couch. And once again, ran the same process for semen. It's again, phosphatase positive, meaning presumptively it's positive for semen. And I took my cutting from right in here.

- O In that dotted area?
- 13 A Yes.
 - Q What were the results from in seat cushion?

A This is 7-A. The DNA profile obtained from the epithelial fraction of the east seat cushion is consistent with a mixture of three individuals. Amber and Edward and the unknown male, same male that was found on the wash cloth, cannot be excluded as contributors to this mixture. Greater than 98.87 percent of individuals are excluded as contributors to this mixture.

Q So the number there, the 98.87, is lower than the -the 99.99 percent that you had with other mixtures. Is that a
result of not having as much DNA source or what's the result -the reason for that?

A May I refer to my notes?

Q Sure.

A It's due to the fact that the mixture, when you get up with three or four people involved, you've got a lot more profiles you're dealing with. And I probably just did not obtain enough information at every place we look at on the DNA to give a good enough number. But still 98.87 percent of the population is excluded.

Q And with DNA, when you're looking at a mixture like this, you can't tell dates or time that any of this was left there through your testing procedures?

A No, not at all. And the sperm fraction from that east seat cushion is consistent with unknown male number one.

Q Oh, okay. Now, with State's 66, this is another seat cushion cover that you examined?

- A Yes. This is the center seat cushion.
- Q What results did you have from that?

A Again, it was sperm positive, and I took my cutting

-- this whole area was positive, so there wasn't a smaller area

I had to take from. And the profile obtained, the DNA profile

obtained from the epithelial fraction is consistent with a

mixture of two individuals. Unknown male number one could not

be excluded as the major contributor. Amber could not be

excluded as the minor contributor. Edward Adams was excluded

as a contributor to this mixture.

1 0 Okay. And the sperm fraction from that -- sorry, I'm just 2 trying to find it -- is again, consistent with unknown male 3 number one, I think. Hold on, sorry. 5 If you need to refer to your report, that's fine. 0 6 Α Yes, I do. Yes, the sperm fraction from 7-B is 7 consistent with unknown male number one. 8 That was the sperm fraction? 9 Α That's correct. 10 MR. SCOW: Court's indulgence. I'll pass the 11 witness, Judge. THE COURT: Cross-examination. 12 13 CROSS-EXAMINATION 14 BY MR. MANINGO: 15 Good morning. 16 Α Good morning. Would it be fair to say that the primary purpose of a 17 DNA analysis is to help identify whether a certain individual 18 has been at a specific location or in contact with another 19 individual? 20 21 Α Definitely. 22 0 Okay. And so when you look at a DNA analysis, you're able to -- let's say if it's a sample including semen or sperm, 23 you'd be able to tell that that individual may have had sexual 24 contact with another individual? 25

1 Α Yes, we can. 2 Okay. You can't tell from your analysis whether or not the sexual contact is consensual or forced or the nature of 3 the actual contact, correct? 5 Α No, we cannot. Okay. You're just identifying whether an individual 6 7 was -- was with another person? That's correct. 8 Α 9 Q Okay. You -- you've already gone through all the -the items that you tested. I just want to hit on a couple very 10 11 quickly. The blue tape. 12 Α Yes. 13 You said it was negative for any semen or -- or 14 sperm? 15 Α That's correct. And one -- one spot that fluoresced under the ALS I checked for semen, and it was negative. 16 17 Okay. And then you checked around the -- the edges 0 of the tape, and you did not find any -- it says no DNA profile 18 19 obtained. That's correct. I swabbed around the edges, took 20 21 that swab for DNA, and I received no profile. 22 Okay. You also -- did you also test a gray hooded 23 sweat shirt? 24 Α I did. Okay. So you had a gray hoody? 25

```
I did, and the results for that were negative for
  1
          Α
  2
     semen.
               Okay. And then lastly, there were a couple of things
  3
     that you tested that showed profiles for an unknown individual?
  4
  5
          Α
               That's correct.
               Okay. And that was on one of the couch samples?
  6
                                                                   The
     seat cushion samples?
  8
          Α
               Both of the seat cushion.
 9
          Q
               Both of them, okay.
10
               And the wash cloth.
          Α
11
          Q
               And the wash cloth you found a profile for an unknown
    individual?
12
13
               It's the same person.
14
         Q
              Right.
15
         Ά
              Yes.
              Correct. I mean, when you say it's the sperm person,
16
         Q
    it's the same person that's on the wash cloth as on the seat
17
18
    cushions?
19
              That's correct.
20
              Okay. But you don't know who that is? You don't
21
    have a comparison?
22
              I don't. I just know the profiles are identical.
23
         0
              Okay.
24
              So unless it's two identical twins, it's the same
         Α
25
   person.
```

	1		
1	Q Right, okay. But it's not Edward Adams on those.		
2	It's someone else?		
3	A That's correct.		
4	Q Okay. That's all. Thank you.		
5	THE COURT: Redirect.		
6	MR. SCOW: Just one question.		
7	REDIRECT EXAMINATION		
8	BY MR. SCOW:		
9	Q The gray hooded sweat shirt was the sweat shirt		
10	obtained from the victim by the sex assault detective, correct?		
11	A It was included with the victim's bra and white and		
12	pink tank top, so I would assume it was victim's.		
13	Q Okay.		
14	MR. SCOW: Nothing else.		
15	THE COURT: Anything else for this witness? Thank		
16	you for your testimony. Please step down.		
17	THE WITNESS: Thank you.		
18	THE COURT: Call your next witness.		
19	MR. HENDRICKS: Thanks, Judge. The State calls Andre		
20	Randle.		
21	THE CLERK: And once you arrive in the witness stand,		
22	please remain standing, and I'll swear you in. Raise your		
23	right hand.		
24	ANDRE RANDLE, STATE'S WITNESS, SWORN		
25	THE CLERK: Thank you. You may be seated. And		

```
loudly state your name for us, spelling both your first and
  1
  2
     last name.
  3
               THE WITNESS: Andre Randle. Andre Randle.
               THE CLERK: Spell your first and last name for me.
  4
  5
               THE WITNESS: A-n-d-r-e, R-a-n-d-l-e.
  6
               THE COURT: Counsel.
  7
               THE CLERK: Thank you.
  8
               MR. HENDRICKS: Thanks, Judge.
  9
                           DIRECT EXAMINATION
 10
    BY MR. HENDRICKS:
11
          0
               Andre, how old you?
12
         Α
               18.
13
               What's your birth date?
14
         Α
              8/16/91.
15
              Now, going back to December 14th and 15th of 2007,
    how old were you?
16
17
              17. 16, 17, something --
18
              Somewhere around there?
19
         Α
              Yeah, yeah.
              Okay. Now, back on that date where did you live?
20
         Q
21
         Α
              At 1111 Warbonnet Way.
              What are the major cross streets over there?
22
         0
23
         Α
              Buffalo and Charleston.
24
              And who did you live with back then?
         Q
25
         Α
              Me and my mom.
```

1 Now, at some point during that time period, I think on the -- the 15th of December, 2007, did anyone come to talk 2 3 with you? Yes, some officers came and knocked on the door, told 4 Α me to come outside, and they -- they -- what is them things 5 called? A little recorder. They did one of those. 7 So they did a taped interview with you? 8 Α Yeah. 9 Okay. What did you tell them? Told them I seen two people walking into a vacant 10 Α apartment. 11 12 Now, when you say vacant apartment, how were you aware that there was a vacant apartment? 13 14 Because it was a fire not too long ago, and they cleared out everything, everybody out of those apartment 15 16 buildings. 17 Do you remember what number it was? 18 I don't. How many vacant apartments were cleared out because 19 20 of the fire? All of them in that building. They almost got our 21 Α 22 building in the fire. 23 0 Okay. 24 And almost got our building, but they cleared out 25 everybody out of there.

```
So a lot of different apartments were vacant --
  1
          Q
  2
          Α
               Yeah.
  3
               -- because of fire damage?
          0
  4
          Α
               Yep.
  5
          Q
               Okay.
                      Now, where did you see these two people?
  6
               I was walking home from school, and I was going up my
    hill, it's like some stairs and stuff to come in my house, and
 8
     they were coming down the hill going into upstairs.
 9
          0
               Okay. So right near stairs going towards that
10
    apartment?
11
         Α
               Yeah.
12
               Okay. Tell -- tell me about what the girl looked
13
    like.
              Just a little girl, backpack on. I didn't really see
14
         Α
    her that much. Like a purplish/pinkish backpack.
15
16
         Q
              You said little girl.
17
         Α
              Yeah, little.
18
         Q
              About how old?
19
         Α
              8, 10, couldn't be more than that.
20
         Q
              8 or 10 years old?
21
         Α
              Yep.
22
         Q
              Okay. What about -- what about the guy?
23
         Α
              He looked around 30, 40 years old.
24
              Old like me?
         0
25
         Α
              Yeah.
```

Okay. Now, can you tell me what he looked like? 1 2 I didn't see his face like that. I don't really 3 remember. 4 Q Can you tell me anything about him? 5 A No, I can't, I'm sorry. Well, what did you think when you saw this little 8 6 7 or 10-year-old girl with this -- this man? 8 I didn't know what they were doing. I just was Α coming home from school. I went right in my house. 9 10 Q Did you have a conversation with them? 11 Nope, they didn't say nothing. Α 12 Okay. But you thought it was a little strange that these two people were going to this vacant apartment? 13 14 Α Yes. Did you call the cops? 15 Q 16 Α No, I didn't. 17 0 Why not? I -- I didn't know. I didn't know. I had no idea. 18 19 Do you remember anything else about this little 8 or 20 10-year-old girl? 21 Α Nope. Nope. She didn't even look mad or nothing or 22 nothing. 23 Did you know anything about her? 0 Okay. 24 Α Nope. 25 Had you seen her before?

	1	:	
1	. A	Nope, never.	
2	e Q	Had you seen him before?	
3	A	Never.	
4	Q	Had you ever seen other people going in and out of	
5	that vac	cant apartment?	
6	A	Nope, that was the first time.	
7	Q	Now, you were going to school at	
8	A	Bonanza.	
9	Q	at what place? Bonanza back then?	
10	A	High school, yeah.	
11	Q	Okay. And did you when you say you spoke with	
12	police of	fficers, do you know if they were officers or	
13	detective	e?	
14	A	I think they were detectives.	
15	Q	Okay. Now, you said it was males, females or	
16	A	Male and a female.	
17	Q	Do you remember what they looked like?	
18	A	I think it was a white female officer and a like	
19	an Asianish I don't know, kind of Asian looking detective		
20	guy, I don't know.		
21	Q	Asian looking guy?	
22	A	Yeah.	
23	Q	Okay. Thank you.	
24		MR. HENDRICKS: I have nothing further.	
25		THE COURT: Cross-examination.	
l			

```
1
                             CROSS-EXAMINATION
  2
     BY MR. MANINGO:
  3
          Q
               Hi, Andre.
  4
          Α
               Hello.
               We're asking you about two people that you'd never
  5
          Q
  6
     seen before two years ago --
  7
          Α
               Yeah.
  8
          Q
               -- right?
 9
          Α
               Yeah.
               Is it fair to say that it's -- it's a little bit
10
          Q
    difficult to remember --
11
12
          Α
               Yeah.
13
          0
               -- the details?
              Yes, it is a lot.
14
         Α
15
              Now, when you were doing the interview with the
         Q
16
    detective, did you write everything down?
              I don't -- I think they did tell me to write
17
    everything down, but they did a voice recorder and so they got
18
19
    my voice.
20
         Q
              Okay. So you didn't write the stuff down and --
21
              No, I think they wrote it and I just signed it.
         Α
22
         Q
              Okay.
23
         Α
              Yeah.
24
              So then the detective, though, they were taking notes
25
    and stuff like that?
```

```
1
          Α
               Yes.
  2
               Okay. Do you remember telling the detective that the
     two people that you saw, the man and the girl, that they were
  3
     not touching one another?
  4
  5
               No, they weren't.
  6
               They were not?
               I don't -- no, no, they weren't touching each other.
  7
  8
     They were walking side by side.
  9
               Okay. So the man wasn't dragging the girl or pulling
          Q
10
     her along or anything like that?
11
          Α
               No.
12
               Okay. And -- and you said that the -- the girl
    didn't look mad.
13
14
         Α
              No, nope.
15
         0
              Okay. So she wasn't crying?
16
         Α
              Nope.
17
         0
              She wasn't screaming?
18
         Α
              Nope.
19
              She wasn't shaking or anything?
         Q
20
         Α
              Uh-uh, not at all.
21
         Q
              Okay.
              Just walking -- walking along. I thought it was
22
         Α
   normal day, you know, coming home from school.
23
              Okay. If -- if you had seen -- now, you knew that
24
25
    those apartments were vacant?
```

```
1
          Α
               Yes.
               If you had seen a man dragging a girl up those stairs
  2
  3
     who was crying and shaking --
  4
          Α
               Yeah.
  5
               -- and -- and seemed to be afraid, would you have
  6
     told anyone?
  7
          Α
               Yes.
  8
          Q
               Okay. What would you have done?
 9
               I would have called the cops.
          Α
10
               Okay. Okay.
          Q
11
         Α
               Yeah.
              What if you saw a man going up to that apartment with
12
    a young girl and you saw that he had a gun with him?
13
              I would have definitely called the cops.
14
         Α
15
         0
              Okay. That wasn't the situation?
16
         Α
              No. They was just walking normal.
17
         Q
              Okay. Thank you.
18
         Α
              Um-h'm.
19
              THE COURT: Redirect.
20
              MR. HENDRICKS: Thanks.
21
                         REDIRECT EXAMINATION
    BY MR. HENDRICKS:
22
              Andre, if -- if someone would have had had a gun
23
   inside of their shirt and pointing at this little girl, would
24
25
   you have seen that or no?
```

1	A No.
2	Q You wouldn't have seen it?
3	A No.
4	Q Did you hear any conversation between them? Did you
5	ever hear this guy say, "Hey, listen, shut up, I've got a gun,
6	I'm going to kill you?"
7	A No, not at all.
8	Q You present when that happened, right?
9	A Nope, nope.
10	Q Okay. Yet, you say that you would have called the
11	cops if you thought that he was dragging her up there, right?
12	A Yeah.
13	Q Yet, you didn't call the cops even though you thought
14	it was strange because they were going to an apartment where no
15	one lived.
16	A Yeah, I didn't think of nothing about it, though, you
17	know. I was just coming home from school, a normal day.
18	Q Well, let me ask you, when you said you weren't
19	thinking anything about it, what did you think this guy was
20	going to do with this little 8 or 10-year-old girl once they
21	got to the vacant apartment?
22	A I have no idea.
23	Q You have no idea. But you didn't call the cops, did
24	you?
25	A No, I didn't.

```
1
               Do you know what happened to that little 8 or
  2
     10-year-old little girl inside that apartment?
               Nope. Didn't -- nobody ever told me.
  3
          Α
  4
          Q
               No one ever told you?
  5
          Α
               Nope.
  6
               Okay.
                      Thanks.
  7
          Α
               Yep.
  8
               THE COURT: Recross.
  9
              MR. MANINGO: Nothing further.
              THE COURT: Is this witness free to go? Thank you
 10
11
    for your testimony.
12
              THE WITNESS: All right.
              THE COURT: Please step down. Call your next
13
    witness.
14
15
              MR. SCOW: Vicki Farnham. Vicki Farnham.
              THE CLERK: Once you arrive in the witness stand, if
16
    you'll remain standing, please, and I'll swear you in.
17
18
                 VICKI FARNHAM, STATE'S WITNESS, SWORN
              THE CLERK: Thank you. You may be seated. Can you
19
   please state your name again for us, spelling both first and
20
21
    last name.
22
              THE WITNESS: My name is Vicki Farnham.
23
              THE CLERK: And spell your first and last name for
24
   me.
25
              THE WITNESS: Vicki, V-i-c-k-i. Farnham,
```

1 F-a-r-n-h-a-m. 2 THE CLERK: Thank you. 3 DIRECT EXAMINATION 4 BY MR. SCOW: 5 How are you currently employed? 6 I'm a forensic scientist two with Las Vegas 7 Metropolitan Police Department. 8 What's your assignment or your capacity in the forensic lab? 10 Α I work in the latent print detail as a certified 11 latent print examiner. 12 How long have you been doing that? Since 1988. 13 Α 14 So a little while. 15 Just a little bit. Aside from the long career you've had, what -- what 16 0 training and education did you have leading up to becoming the 17 forensic scientist with latent prints examination? 18 Well, I went to -- went to school and I got an 19 associate in science degree plus 38 hours in criminal justice 20 evidence technology. While I was in school I studied the 21 science of fingerprints, and I also did my internship at the 22 San Diego County morgue fingerprinting and photographing the 23 24 deceased. 25 After school, I went to work for the San Diego County Sheriff's Department where I entered fingerprints into AFIS.

AFIS is a database that is it stands for the Automated

Fingerprint Identification System. I did that for eight

months.

And I also trained police officers how to process property crimes for latent prints with powder. I moved to Virginia. Worked there for nine and a half years doing both crime scene and latent prints. And during that time I joined the International Association of Identification which is the professional organization that governs our science.

In '96 I tested to become a certified latent print examiner, and every year I test -- excuse me, every five years I test to keep my certification. I also hold two offices with your local body of the International Association of Identification. Each year that I've been employed, I go to different schools and seminars and conferences to make sure that I'll remain current. And every year I'm tested by the -- by the Metro to make sure that I am proficient.

- Q And have you previously testified as an expert witness in the area of latent print examination?
 - A Yes, sir.

- Q What are latent prints?
- A Well, on the palms of your hands and the soles of your feet you have raised portions of skin that we call friction ridge, and they're made of sweat pours and they're

connective tissues. So between what we exude out of our hands and feet and what we pick up from what we touch, when we touch an item, we leave behind that residue.

We call it latent, meaning latent meaning hidden. It usually has to be processed with powders or chemicals, and that's what a latent print is.

- Q Now, do any two individuals have the same fingerprints, latent prints as far as we know?
- A No, we've not found any two to have -- any two people to have the same fingerprints.
- Q So part of your science is identifying who those prints belong to?
 - A That's the primary responsibility.
- Q Now, with regards to this case specifically, were you asked to possibly identify latent fingerprints?
- A As a result of an AFIS search and later a request from the district attorney, I have compared all the latent prints that were submitted in your case to both the victim and the defendant.
- Q Now, AFIS, this is a general -- it could be for work card, it could be any -- any reason that somebody needs to be printed to work or -- or whatever, generally speaking?
- 23 A Yes.

Q Okay. Now, you said there were two different -initially through an AFIS search you were able to identify some

prints and then later you were asked to identify the remaining prints; is that accurate?

A I was asked to review the case and go through all the latent prints so that I could testify here today.

Q Okay. Now, the initial examination that you did, were you able to make any identifications?

A Yes, sir.

Q What identifications did you make, and what prints were you examining to -- to make identifications?

A May I refer to my notes, sir?

Q Yes, if it helps you to remember.

A Yes.

Q I assume this was a while ago.

A January of '04. Excuse me, of '08.

Q Okay.

A There were four latent prints that were of AFIS quality. They have to meet certain criteria before they're good enough to actually be put into the machine. Four of them were searched by a technician, and of that, one of them generated the source of one of these latent prints. At that time the technician turns it over to me. Actually, at this particular time I was training her, so we were kind of side by side.

I compared all of those $\operatorname{\mathsf{--}}$ those four initially to $\operatorname{\mathsf{Mr}}$. Adams and three of them belonged to $\operatorname{\mathsf{him}}$. And the fourth

one wasn't really AFIS quality and I didn't compare it. But at that time they were called 301, 302 and 303.

- Q Okay. So at that point you didn't have like a known case -- major case file prints that were taken from his hands at that point?
 - A No, we just had the ones from the AFIS system.
- Q Okay. And on the -- the prints that you were examining, were those prints that were impounded and collected by Jonathan Freid --
 - A They were --
- 11 Q -- CSA?

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- 12 A Yes, sir.
- Q Okay. I'm going to approach and show you State's Proposed Exhibit 82. Do you recognize this?
- 15 A Yes.
- 16 Q What is it?
 - A That is electronic copy of known prints of the person named Edward Adams bearing on ID number of 1969904. These particular set of -- this particular set of known prints was captured digitally, not with ink, and then stored into a database, and we just print -- we just put in the ID number and they -- it prints out a copy of the prints for us. So this is the known prints.
 - Q Okay.
 - MR. SCOW: At this time I'd move to admit State's

```
1
     Proposed 82.
  2
               THE COURT: Any objection?
  3
               MR. MANINGO: No objection.
               THE COURT: 82's admitted.
 5
                         (Exhibit 82 admitted).
    BY MR. SCOW::
 6
 7
              Now showing you State's Exhibit 78-3. Do you
    recognize this?
 8
 9
         Α
              Yes, sir.
10
              And what is this card here?
11
              This is one of latent prints that was submitted by
    Mr. Freid. It is -- if you'll see right here where it says
12
13
    303, that is the latent print that was searched in AFIS that
    helped to identify the source of the latent prints in this
14
    case. So it was one of the four that were searched.
15
16
         0
              And this is one of the ones that you were able to
17
    identify to Edward Adams?
18
         Α
              Yes, sir.
              And is that indicated by the writing up here, his
19
   name in blue?
21
         Α
              Yes.
22
              And the numbers at the end here, what does that
23
   indicate?
24
              That's my initials on each side and my personnel
25
   number in between.
```

```
Okay. So that's -- you wrote that?
 1
          0
 2
               Yes, sir.
               Now I'm going to show you State's Proposed Exhibit
 3
         Q
 4
         Do you recognize this?
 5
               Yes, sir.
         Α
 6
               What is it?
 7
               It's -- well, we call it court chart. It's a -- it's
    a charting of the identification of that particular latent
 8
    print that I prepared for court today.
10
         Q
              Okay. This is something that you prepared yourself?
         Α
              Yes, sir.
11
              MR. SCOW: At this time I'd move to admit State's
12
    Proposed Exhibit 81.
13
14
              THE COURT: Any objection?
              MR. MANINGO: No, sir.
15
16
              THE COURT: 81's admitted.
                         (Exhibit 81 admitted).
17
    BY MR. SCOW:
18
19
              Now showing you 81 with 78-3 right on top of it.
    This card, you said was print 303?
20
              Yes, sir.
21
         Α
22
              Latent print 303?
23
         Α
              Um-h'm.
24
              And what -- what we have blown up here is a blowup of
   that latent print?
25
```

	ļ		4
1	A	Yes, sir.	
2	Q	Which one is it?	
3	А	Right here.	
4	Q	Okay. The one on the left-hand side?	
5	A	Yes, sir.	
6	Q	And the one on the right-hand side, what is that?	
7	A	That is the known print of the right ring finger of	
8	Edward Ad	.ams.	
9	Q	Okay. Now, when you say known print, you were able	
10	to obtain	known prints of Edward Adams?	
11	A	They were submitted to the laboratory for us, yes.	
12	Q	Okay. And showing you State's Proposed Exhibit 79	
13	and 80. I	Do you recognize these?	
14	A	Yes, sir.	
15	Q	What are they?	
16	A	Those are are latent prints that were collected by	r
17	crime scer	ne analyst of the victim and of Mr. Adams.	
18	Q	Okay. So for the victim it was CSA Joseph?	
19	A	Yes, sir.	
20	Q	And for the victim it was CSA Fletcher?	
21	A	Yes, sir.	
22	Q	And these are the some of the prints you relied	
23	onto to	o do your analysis?	
24	A	Yes, sir.	
25		MR. SCOW: At this time I'd move to admit State's	

2 THE COURT: Any objection? 3 MR. MANINGO: No, sir. THE COURT: 79 and 80 are admitted. 4 5 (Exhibits 79 and 80 admitted). BY MR. SCOW: So in 81 here, the one on the right was one of the 7 8 known ink prints of Edward Adams? Yes, sir. Α 10 So what you've done here is you've marked -- I guess just tell us what you have here so we can understand. 11 If you would, would you move it over so we can see 12 just this one alone for a little bit? 13 14 Okay. I'll clear that. All right. I'm not sure if this is -- if you can see 15 16

Proposed Exhibits 79 and 80.

1

17

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

A All right. I'm not sure if this is -- if you can see pretty good, but how we compare latent prints, we have to, of course, look at them under magnification and we compare them side by side. What you -- we compare three different levels of detail. The first being the pattern type or the flow or the ridges. If both of these prints, both the latent and the known, you'll see that they're -- they're a circular pattern which we call a whirl. And they're about the same size and shape. And therefore, that would lead us to go onto the second level of detail.

When we're looking at the second level of detail, we

follow each ridge path. And whatever happens in one print,

should happen in the other print. So if a print comes -- if

you can see the -- the red ridge right there. If it -- if it

begins and ends, you have an ending ridge on each side, that

must happen both the latent print and the known print. If you

look -- at the yellow line right here, it goes -- just for that

portion of the print, it goes straight through and there really

are no events.

And then if you'll look here at the -- at the blue line, you'll see that there's a -- let's see here. Come on.

- Q I'll get it.
- A There's one ridge here that divides into two. Then this one ends and this one -- the other one continues on. I can't make it stop. Can you --
- Q Yes.

- 16 A Thank you.
 - Q And that's a closer up shot now? You can see the lines better?
 - A Right. So what I have done here, I've just showed you a continuous ridge, a ridge that bifurcates or forks into two, and -- or one that has -- or a couple that have ending ridges. The rest of the green dots are these type of events where ridges have either divided or stopped, and where there are none, of course, the ridges continue on continuously.

You'll see some of the areas have been kind of

highlighted in -- in a yellowish or orange. We tend to stay away from the areas that aren't clear enough for us to see, and that would be areas that were avoided. We don't look at the parts of print that we cannot see.

- Q Now turning to the -- the known print on the other side. Are the characteristics, you notice that they're on the other print present here?
 - A Yes, sir, they are.

- Q Okay. And you -- and you've indicated by lines in the same color as well?
- A Yes, sir. The third level of detail that we look at are the pore placements and with -- if the ridges are thicker or thinner and the shapes that they have. We look at occasional features like scars and creases that a person may have. However, it's very seldom that we have the third level detail that we're looking for because latent prints are left by chance and not in an ideal situation like they are in the known print.

They're -- and then they're processed with powders or chemicals. A lot of times it covers you up that fine detail.

So when we don't have third level detail to speak of, then we have to rely on -- we need to rely on more of the second level detail, which is what was done in this case.

Q Okay. Now, with -- with all the cards that were impounded by CSA Jonathan Freid, you were able to examine all

those cards?

- A Yes.
- Q And based on those cards and the locations described or the item that latents were lifted from, can you tell the jury other -- other locations, other identifications you made on this particular case?
 - A The different locations and who?
- O Yes.
 - A May I again refer to my notes, please?
- Q If that helps you to remember, you may do that.
- A Thank you. There were latent prints from the interior front door that belonged to the victim. There were latent prints from a open lotion packet that belonged to Mr. Adams.
- Q And again, that was the ones -- the exhibits we just looked at?
 - A Yes, that -- that was the 303 that was put into AFIS.
- Q For the record, that was Exhibit 81 and Exhibit 78-3. Okay, go ahead.
- A There was a glass candle jar on the floor of the south bedroom, was identified to Mr. Adams. There was a glass candle jar from the breakfast bar above the sink that was identified to Mr. Adams. There was a latent prints from the interior sliding glass door to the west patio that was identified to Mr. Adams. And that is all.

There are other locations where we had latent prints, 1 but they weren't of good enough quality for comparison. And in 2 3 those cases, of course, no identifications were made. Q Okay. So how many usable prints did you have here? 5 Α Fingerprints? 6 Latent? 0 7 Α The latent prints --8 Yes. 9 Α -- there -- there were, let me see, 17 in all. 10 that belonged to Amber and 15 that belonged to Mr. Adams. So any identifiable latent print you were able to 11 12 identify to either Adams or the victim Amber Valles? 13 They were all identified to one or the other or deemed not a value for comparison. 14 15 So there were some not of value, either a smudge 16 which can be caused by like a touch and the finger moves along the surface? 17 18 There are many, many contributing factors, but yes, 19 that would be one. 20 Could be one of them? So again, just to make sure Q we're clear, the locations you described were on the counter at the sink, the breakfast bar in the kitchen --22 No, sir. These glass jars or candle jars were on 23 24 those areas, but they were on jars or -- or candles. 25 At those locations?

```
1
               Candle jars. Right, at those locations --
          Α
  2
          Q
               Okay.
               -- right. And then, of course, two of the doors.
  3
          Α
 4
          Q
               Okay. I just wanted to -- to make sure it was clear.
 5
    Glass candle jars on the kitchen counter --
 6
          Α
               Um-h'm.
 7
               -- by the sink --
          0
 8
         Α
               Um-h'm.
               -- on the breakfast bar, which is above the sink?
10
         Α
              Right.
               The south bedroom, a glass candle jar there?
11
         Q
              Um-h'm.
12
         Α
13
              And then you -- you indicated the sliding glass door,
    the front door and then the -- the lotion pack, the open lotion
14
15
    pack.
         Α
              Yes, sir.
16
17
              MR. SCOW: Pass the witness.
              THE COURT: Cross-examination.
18
19
                           CROSS-EXAMINATION
   BY MR. MANINGO:
20
21
              Hello, Ms. Farnham.
22
         Α
              Hello.
23
              Just -- just very briefly. Did you receive any blue
    tape or masking tape to test prints from?
24
              I did not.
25
         Α
```

Okay. Did you -- did you receive any prints from CSA 2 that were lifted from any kind of blue painter's tape? 3 None of the latent prints that were submitted were 4 from tape. 5 0 Okay. So you -- and you never received any of the tape yourself in order it to try and lift any prints or analyze 6 7 it or anything like that? 8 Α No. For the most part usually the processing is done by the crime scene analysts themselves. They can bring things 10 into their lab and do -- process them chemically. 11 sometimes do some processing, of course. We all do it, but for 12 the most part, processing is done by the crime scene analyst. 13 Okay. Okay. And -- and the purpose of -- of 14 fingerprinting analysis or -- or pulling latent fingerprints is to show that someone had been at a certain location, correct? 15 16 Is that fair to say? Well, I mean, the science of fingerprints is -- is 17 based on the ownership of a touch, an identity. And of course, 18 it's used in many, many different areas today. Biometrics, 19 20 anything like that. But we do use it to find out where someone has touched. It's not necessarily where he's been, unless it's 21 22 a stationary object --23 0 Okay. 24 Α -- so like a --25 0 And you --

```
1
              -- candle can be moved around, but a door is a
 2
    stationary object. But it does show where people have touched.
 3
              But you said -- you said -- you used the word
    identity. That's --
 4
 5
         Α
              Yes, absolutely.
 6
              That's what it's about?
         Α
              Yes, sir.
 8
              Okay. Thank you.
 9
              THE COURT: Redirect?
10
              MR. SCOW: Nothing else, Judge.
11
              THE COURT: Is this witness free to go? Thank you
12
    for your testimony. Please step down.
13
              THE WITNESS: Thank you, sir.
14
              THE COURT: Call your next witness.
15
              MR. HENDRICKS: Thank you, Judge. State calls Amy
16
    Coe.
17
              THE CLERK: Ma'am, once you arrive at the witness
    stand, remain standing for me, and rise your right hand, I'll
18
19
    swear you in.
20
                    AMY COE, STATE'S WITNESS, SWORN
              THE CLERK:
                          Thank you. Please be seated. And please
21
    state your name for the record, spelling both first and last
22
   name for us.
23
24
              THE WITNESS: My name is Amy Coe, A-m-y, C-o-e.
25
              THE CLERK: Thank you.
```

1 DIRECT EXAMINATION 2 BY MR. HENDRICKS: 3 Ms. Coe, how are you employed? I am a contracted employee with University Medical 5 Center --6 0 Contracted --7 Α -- as a --8 -- employee. What does that mean? That means that I'm not immediately employed by UMC. 9 I have a contract with UMC as a sexual assault nurse examiner. 10 11 Q Okay. So you're not an employee of UMC. Are you an 12 employee of Metro? No, I'm not. 13 Α 14 Not them either? 15 Α No. 16 Q So would it be fair to say you're kind of an 17 independent contractor? 18 Α That's correct. 19 Okay. Now, what exactly do you do? 20 I'm a sexual assault nurse examiner. 21 0 And how is it that you become a sexual assault nurse 22 examiner? 23 Α I first am a nurse, a registered nurse. 24 How did you become a nurse? What type of training, 25 experience do you have?

```
I have a bachelors degree in nursing, and I practiced
  1
     as a nurse for almost ten years now. And I also have a master
  2
     degree in nursing, and I'm also a advanced nurse practitioner.
  3
  4
               Do you have any type of specific training in regards
          Q
  5
     to being a sexual assault nurse examiner?
  6
               I have post-certification in sexual assault exams.
     Basically, it's a nationally certified license to practice as a
  7
     sexual assault examiner.
 9
          Q
               How long have you been a SANE nurse?
10
          Α
               Almost four years.
11
               Now, during those four years, approximately how many
          Q
12
    exams like this have you performed?
13
               What do you mean by like this, specifically?
         Α
14
         0
               SANE exams.
15
               SANE exams, approximately 3 to 400 exams.
         Α
16
         0
               3 or 400?
17
         Α
              Um-h'm.
18
         0
              Yes?
19
         Α
              Yes.
20
         Q
              Okay.
21
         Α
              Correct.
              Now, going back to December 14th of -- of 2007, you
22
    were employed in that same capacity, correct?
23
24
         Α
              Yes.
25
              And did you, in fact, perform an examination and
         Q
```

evidence retrieval on an individual that presented to you as being a Amber Valles?

A Yes.

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

22

- Q Do you recall approximately how old she was?
- 5 A She was 13.
 - Q Now, when she first comes in and is presented to you, what do you do?
 - A When she first comes in, she's usually attended by the triage nurse. The triage nurse calls me, and I respond.

 And from that point on I'm the primary care provider for Amber from the time of her visit to when she's discharged.
 - Q Now, we'll eventually get to the examination in regards to some of her private areas. But for now, do you do other things that a regular nurse would do in regards to a patient?
 - A Yes. Do -- we do physical examinations. We obtain history, based on her medical history or social history. We provide medications or treatments, if she needs to be treated, if there's any medical attention needed.
- Q Okay. History. Did you ask about whether or not she had been sexually active?
 - A Yes.
- Q And what did she indicate to you?
- 24 A She told me no.
 - Q And is that something that would have been important

to know prior to your examination? 2 Α Yes. 3 How so? It affects -- it's a factor in whether or not I will 4 Α find evidence or any -- any objective findings that I would 5 6 have based on her history. 7 And did you ask her if she -- well, let me ask you, 8 do you do a drug screen? 9 Α Yes. 10 Why do you do that? We do a drug screen to see if there is any elicit 11 Α drugs in her system. Sometimes that can affect memory. It can 12 affect other behaviors. I also do a urine exam, which is part 13 of the drug screening, which is how we find the drug screen is 14 through a urine exam. We examine the urine if she's pregnant. 15 And that's to confirm if she is pregnant, then there's certain 16 medications that we are not allowed to give. 17 And so if she is not pregnant, then we're able to 18 give her certain antibiotics. 19 Okay. Now, she said she hadn't been sexually active, 20 0 21 correct? 22 Α Correct. 23 So it would have been a little surprising if she was 0 24 pregnant, right? 25 Α Correct.

```
1
               Okay. She wasn't pregnant, was she?
          Q
  2
          Α
               No, she was not.
  3
               Let's talk about the drug screen. You did a drug
     screen in this particular case, didn't you?
  5
          Α
               Yes.
               You find any drugs in her system?
  6
          0
 7
         Α
               No.
 8
         0
               Nothing?
 9
         Α
              Negative.
10
         0
              Now, you said that there were certain things that you
    would treat her with as far as medications?
11
12
              Correct.
              And some things you couldn't, of course, if she was
13
         Q
14
    pregnant, but she was not, right?
15
         Α
              Yes.
16
              Okay. Did you give her any medications?
17
         Α
              Yes.
18
              And if so, why?
19
         Α
              I gave her antibiotics to prevent sexual transmitted
   diseases. And I also gave her what's called plan B.
20
21
    morning after pill to prevent pregnancy.
              Now, did she indicate to you whether or not he --
22
    this individual had worn a condom?
23
24
              She did not. She did not tell me if he wore a
25
   condom.
```

Okay. Let me ask you this. Now antibiotics don't 1 clear up certain sexual -- sexually transmitted diseases, do they? Not all of them. It's not a hundred percent guarantee. We give it as a prophylactic. There still required to get an STD test after my examination and after we're given treatment to confirm that it's negative or if she has any STDs. Okay. So not -- not only is she tested then, but --Q 8 but you advise her she needs to be tested for how long? In one week and repeat the -- the test again in 45 10 days. 11 Okay. What about for HIV? Q 12 HIV can show up up to six months after a first 13 14 contact. So did you advise her that she now gets to go get 15 tested for HIV after six months and sometime after that also? 16 Yes, if they -- on the initial follow-up of 45 days, Α 17 if they found there to be reason for HIV, then they would have 18 her follow up again. 19 Now, what about with the herpes? Does antibiotics 20 clean that up? 21 For herpes, herpes is viral, so it doesn't cure the 22 disease, but it can recur. So what we give is medication to 23 treat the symptoms versus herpes, the virus itself. 24 Okay. So are these some of the things that -- that

```
you were aware of and some of the things that she now has to be
1
   informed of because of what had happened?
2
3
         Α
              Yes.
                    And you did inform her of those testing
              Okay.
4
   procedures that she's going to now go through?
5
              Correct.
         Α
6
              Now, before you conduct a exam, do you get kind of a
7
    -- a background of the events that took place?
8
         Α
              Yes.
9
              Why?
10
              It gives me an idea of what her -- her history.
11
    Basically if it corroborates with the evidence that I will find
12
    or should find.
13
              And you did that, didn't you?
14
         Α
              Yes.
15
              Did you ask her about this person that had done these
16
    things to her?
17
              Yes.
         Α
18
              Do you remember her giving you a description as to
19
    what this person looked like or what they were wearing?
20
              Yes.
         Α
21
              Do you recall what that was?
22
              She -- I have my sheet, can I -- I wrote it down on a
23
         Α
    document or --
24
              Just did she give you a general description?
25
```

- 1		
1	Α	General description, yes.
2	Q	Okay. Now, did she also give you a description as to
3	to what h	ad happened to her?
4	A	Yes.
5	Q	And and we'll go into that a little bit. What did
6	she tell	you about what took place?
7	А	She told me that a unknown male approached her as she
8	was walki	ng. And she told me that she was forced to go with
9	him. And	she told me that he sexually assaulted her.
10	Q	Did she describe in regards to the sexual assault,
11	any speci	fic acts that were performed on her?
12	A	Yes.
13	Q	What did she tell you?
14	A	She told me that the suspect penetrated her vaginally
15	with his	penis and his fingers and also anally penetrated her.
16	Q	Did was she able to describe who you how she was
17	anally p	enetrated and with what or do you recall?
18	A	She was able to describe to me that he penetrated her
19	anally w	ith his fingers. She was not sure if his penis
20	penetrat	ed her anally.
21	Q	Did she describe any type of oral sex?
22	A	No, she did not.
23	Q	None at all?
24	A	No.
25	Q	Did she ever describe any type of kissing?
	1	

No. Α 1 None at all? 2 No. Α 3 Now, based upon that information, do you then begin 0 4 conducting your exam? 5 Α Yes. 6 And tell us what you did in that particular case. 7 In this case I have her admit into my office, which Α 8 is a private exam room. I have her remove all her clothing, and I have her place on a patient gown. I then take 10 photographs of her as I see her. And I examine her from head 11 to toe all the way down for any physical injuries on her body. 12 And then I do a vaginal examination where I do 13 examine her genitalia and her -- her anus to -- for any 14 I also swab any potential areas that may have DNA, 15 and I also take photographs of those areas. 16 Now, as far as injuries are concerned, we're not 17 going to talk about her vagina or anus for now, okay. Did you 18 notice any glaring injuries on her body, on the external part 19 of her body? 20 No, I did not. Α 21 And that's something you noted, correct? 22 Correct. Α 23 Okay. Now, did she describe to you whether or not 0 24 she fought with this guy or struggled with guy?

She told me there was no physical fighting or 1 struggling. 2 Okay. So that would make sense that you didn't find 3 any bruises or gashes on her body, right? 4 Right. Α 5 Now, you said that you took photos, correct? 6 Yes. Α 7 Did you take a photo of just about every every part 8 of her body or --Just the parts of her body that I find or that she Α 10 explains to me that would be relevant to her -- her situation. 11 Now, you took a photograph of her face at the time of 0 12 the exam, correct? 13 Yes. Α 14 MR. HENDRICKS: May I approach, your Honor? 15 THE COURT: You may. 16 MR. HENDRICKS: Having previously shown defense 17 counsel what's been marked for identification purposes State's 18 Proposed Exhibit 84. 19 BY MR. SCOW: 20 Ms. Coe, I now have showed you. Do you recognize 21 what is depicted in that photograph, and how do you recognize it? 23 It is Amber Valles. And it is on our documentation Α 24 form, Rose Heart, Inc. 25

```
Okay. And that is photo of her that you took, excuse
        Q
1
   me, back on December 14th of 2007?
2
             Yes.
        Α
3
             And why do you take a picture of the face?
4
             To identify who she is.
        Α
5
             Okay. Does that help you recall the individual when
6
        Q
   you eventually testify?
7
              Yes.
        Α
8
                     Do you definitely recall her?
              Okay.
9
         Α
              Yes.
10
              Okay.
         Q
11
              MR. HENDRICKS: Judge, at this point I'd move for the
12
    admission of State's Proposed Exhibit 84.
13
              THE COURT: Any objection?
14
              MR. MANINGO: No objection.
15
              THE COURT: 84's admitted.
16
                         (Exhibit 84 admitted).
17
              MR. HENDRICKS: Thank you, Counsel.
                                                    Thank you,
18
            In addition, Judge, I'm -- I'm going to go through some
19
    of these photos. And I've already spoken with -- with Mr.
20
    Maningo about this. We're going to discuss them, I'm going to
21
    eventually move for the admission. But because of the
22
    sensitive nature of the photos, I'm not going to put them up on
23
    the big screen.
24
              And then when Mr. Maningo is done questioning Ms.
25
```

```
Coe, then I will have the jury then look through those.
             THE COURT: All right, has that been discussed with
2
   you, Mr. Maningo? Do you object to that process at all?
3
             MR. MANINGO: No, I -- I agree with it, actually,
4
   Judge.
5
             THE COURT: All right.
6
             MR. HENDRICKS: Okay. Thanks, Counsel.
7
   BY MR. HENDRICKS:
8
              Like you said, there was other parts of the body that
 9
   you took photos of, correct?
10
              Yes.
         Α
11
              Would that include both the genital area or vaginal
         Q
12
    area and also the -- the anal area?
13
              Yes.
         Α
14
              And you've had a chance to review all those, correct?
         0
15
              Yes.
         Α
16
              Okay. Now, let's talk about the exam.
17
              MR. HENDRICKS: And what I'm going to do, as long as
18
    Counsel's okay with it, if you could -- Judge, it's just going
19
    to be for demonstrative purposes. I guess I would mark, but
20
    I'm not going to move to admit it. And I don't know Ms. Clerk
21
    what's next in line.
22
              THE CLERK: It would be 93.
23
              MR. HENDRICKS:
                               93.
24
              THE COURT: Any objection to it being marked as 93
25
```

```
for demonstrative purposes?
1
              MR. MANINGO: No, Judge.
2
             THE COURT: Okay. So 93 for the record.
3
                         (Exhibit 93 admitted).
4
              MR. HENDRICKS: Thanks, Judge. Thanks, Counsel.
5
   Thank you, Richard.
6
   BY MR. HENDRICKS::
              Okay. Now, in regards to your exam to the vaginal
         Q
8
   area Amber, tell us about that.
              The photograph here -- can you flip it over?
10
    the next one.
11
              Do you mind if we use --
         0
12
              It's the one --
         Α
13
              -- the one that has --
         Q
14
              -- next to it.
         Α
15
              Okay.
16
              That, yeah.
         Α
17
              This one?
         Q
18
              That would depict --
         Α
19
              Okay.
         Q
20
              (Indiscernible) a little bit better.
         Α
21
              All right, now -- now, you realize you can touch that
22
    and -- and it will bring up a particular color on there?
23
              Okay.
24
         Α
              Okay. Now, tell us what you did in regards to the
25
```

exam -- well, first describe what we see --1 Α Okay. 2 -- up here and go through the different parts. 3 then describe the examination and what your findings were. This is what I see when I'm doing the vaginal Α Okay. 5 exam on the patient. She is -- her legs are on stirrups, and 6 you're looking at -- this is -- these are her legs and this is her vagina. In terms of description, what I like to describe is 12:00 o'clock would be up here. You can touch it. 0 10 Okay. And then 6:00 o'clock would be down here and 11 3:00 and 9:00. So she's placed on the stirrups. I initially 12 take a photograph of what I see. I don't touch anything. I 13 take a first picture. And then I collect swabs, DNA. How do you do that? 15 0 Use Q-tips and just swab just around the outside, the 16 external genitalia. 17 Did you do that in this case? Q 18 Yes. Α 19 What do you do with those swabs? 20 Initially they're put in a drying mechanism so that Α 21 the secretions would be dried and fixed on the Q-tip, and then 22 they are placed in a box, which is put together as a kit, 23 sexual assault kit. 24

Okay. Since we're there --

```
Yes.
              -- I'm going to stop you for a second.
 2
             MR. HENDRICKS: I've previously shown defense
 3
   counsel, and I believe it's already been admitted, State's
   Exhibit 3. May I approach, Judge?
 5
              THE COURT: You may.
 6
   BY MR. HENDRICKS:
 7
             Ms. Coe, do you recognize State's Exhibit 3? And if
 8
   so, how do you?
 9
              Yes, I recognize. This is a sexual assault kit for
10
   Amber Valles, as it's written, and it's got my name and
11
   signature on it.
12
              And is there a particular date reflected on there?
13
              Yes. December 14, 2007.
14
              Okay. So now that we're talking about this sexual
15
    assault kit, is that something that's contained inside of
16
17
    there?
              Yes.
         Α
18
              And is it sealed with evidence tape?
19
              Yes.
20
         Α
              Now, is -- did you seal it with tape?
         Q
21
              Yes.
22
         Α
              What color tape did you use?
         0
23
              We use this red tape.
         Α
24
              You use the red.
25
         0
```

```
Um-h'm.
        Α
1
             How about the blue tape, what's that for?
 2
              That I -- we don't use the blue tape. I don't know
 3
   what that's for.
              Okay. That's for someone else's --
         O
 5
         Α
              Yes.
 6
              -- analysis of this item?
         Q
 7
              Correct.
         Α
 8
              Okay. But the package appears to be intact, right?
 9
              Yes.
         Α
10
              This is the same package that you put all these swabs
11
    and everything else inside of, right?
12
         Α
              Yes.
13
              Okay. Now, back to the swabs. You said that you
         0
14
    used the swabs on her genitalia, correct?
15
              Yes.
         Α
16
              And you put the swabs inside that kit?
17
         0
         Α
              Yes.
18
              What else do you do?
19
              I take photographs of the outside part to see if
         Α
20
    there's any injuries. And then I use what's called toluidine
21
    blue dye, and I apply it right in this area where we generally
22
    would see injuries due to sexual assault.
23
              In which area, you apply --
         Q
24
              Right here, 6:00 o'clock. This area right here.
25
```

Now, when you say that generally that would be where 1 injuries would occur, why -- why is that? 2 Because based on her history of the way she described 3 she was sexually assaulted in the position laying on her back, you would generally find the injuries at the 6:00 o'clock position. Okay. Now in regard to someone who -- who had never 7 had sexual intercourse before, could they possibly be more 8 susceptible to injuries? And if so, to what part of the genitalia? 10 For someone who has never had sexual encounter 11 before, yes, you would -- they would -- it is possible for them 12 to have injuries. And they would generally find injuries in 13 the same area as well. 14 Now, in regards to these injuries located at 6:00 15 o'clock, I mean, would -- would these types of injuries cause 16 any type of pain while they're being done to the victim? 17 Generally, they would have -- they would express Α 18 discomfort or some pain during the examination if these 19 injuries are present. 20 Okay, did -- did you speak with Amber about whether 21 or not she experienced pain when this stuff was taking place? 22 I did. Α 23 And what was her response? Q She told me that it hurt. 25 Α

Did she also tell you anything in regards to what she 1 told her assailant? 2 She told him that it hurt as well. 3 In regards to your examination, you said that you --4 you looked at that area, that 6:00 o'clock area. Did you make 5 any note or any findings of anything in that particular area? 6 I noted an abrasion at 6:00 o'clock. 7 What does that mean? 8 An abrasion is a scratch just on the outside of the 9 -- just on the outside of the vagina, which is on the genitalia 10 right in this area here. 11 Okay. Anything else in regards to that genitalia 12 area? 13 As far as injuries? 14 A Yes, and any other findings. 15 Yes, I found that her hymen, which is a tissue that Α 16 surrounds the vaginal canal, was lacerated. 17 What does that mean? 18 Torn. It was a tear. 19 Now, when you say hymen, what exactly is that? 20 It's a skin that -- it's a flap of skin, depending on 21 the size or -- or it's different for each individual, but it's 22 generally a flap of skin that surrounds the -- the vagina, the 23 entrance of the vagina. 24 Okay. Now, given the fact that she had never had 25 0

sexual intercourse before and she indicated that to you, did -did it surprise you that that hymenal tissue was present? It was not -- no, if she's never had intercourse Α 3 before, you -- I would -- would be -- it's common to have that hymenal tissue there intact, yes. Now, on the flip side, now you've probably had an 0 6 examination where someone says that they were sexually active and there may still be hymenal tissue present, correct? 8 Correct. Α 9 That's possible? 10 That's possible. 11 But in this case, you said that there was a 0 12 laceration. 13 Yes. Α 14 So it was damaged? 15 0 Yes. Α 16 And is that something you noted? 17 Α Yes. 18 Okay. Now, when you're conducting your exam on her, Q 19 are there certain tools or utensils that you use? 20 In this case I used what's called a balloon method. 21 And what that is is the tip of a catheter, there is a balloon 22 that's attached to it that we inflate, and when we insert the 2.3 catheter into the vagina, because she is small and tiny --24

Now, when you say small and tiny --

25

```
Α
              Her --
1
              -- are you talking about --
2
              The --
3
         Α
              -- her height --
4
              -- vaginal opening.
         Α
5
              -- height and weight or what?
6
              The vaginal opening is small. I use what's called a
 7
         Α
   balloon method, and the catheter is inserted. First it's
    deflated, the balloon is deflated, and then once it's inserted,
    the balloon is inflated, and it's retracted. Meaning I the
10
   balloon back. And what that does is it -- you are able to
11
    visualize the hymen where the tear is a little better, so --
12
              And -- and you did that in this particular case?
13
              Yes.
         Α
14
              Do you use that balloon method -- do you use that on
         0
15
    everyone?
16
              Not everyone, no.
         Α
17
              Why not?
         Q
18
              Because not everyone has hymenal tears. Not everyone
         Α
19
    has this type of injury, so it doesn't always require you to do
20
    a balloon method, if you don't have these types of injuries.
21
              All right. What's a speculum?
22
              A speculum is a tool that we use to visualize the
         Α
23
    cervix.
24
              Did you use that in this case?
         0
25
```

```
I did not.
         Α
 1
              Well, wouldn't that have been helpful?
2
              Yes, but at this point, based on her history and the
         Α
 3
    injury that she has, using a speculum would further traumatize
    the vaginal opening, so I did not do a speculum.
5
              Okay. So you didn't use the speculum because you
 6
    thought that that would probably cause more injury?
7
         Α
              Correct.
 8
              You chose not to?
 9
              No.
10
         Α
              Okay. Now, in regards to the cervix, were you able
11
    it to access that with swabs?
12
              Yes.
         Α
13
              And you did that in this case, didn't you?
14
              I did.
         Α
15
              And you took vaginal swabs, right?
         Q
16
              Yes.
         Α
17
              And any other swabs?
18
         Q
              In terms of the genitalia?
         Α
19
              Yes.
         0
20
              I took anal swabs as well.
21
         Α
              Okay. And why did you do that?
         0
22
              Because she told me that there was anal penetration.
         A
23
              Now, you didn't have any DNA results at that point,
24
    right?
25
```

```
No.
         Α
1
              You don't know. She said it was just some unknown
         Q
   guy, someone that she did not know at all?
 3
              Yes.
         Α
 4
              So you don't have any identification at that point,
         0
 5
   do you?
 6
              No.
 7
         Α
              But you're just retrieving evidence in the hopes of
         Q
 8
    maybe getting an identification?
 9
         Α
              Yes.
10
              And you did that, didn't you?
         0
11
         Α
              Yes.
12
              Okay. Now, if lotion or lubrication was used, would
13
    that potentially lessen an injury that may occur to this -- to
14
    this area of the body?
15
              Yes.
         Α
16
         0
              How so?
17
              With lubrication you're able to penetrate with ease
18
    and you're not going to cause as much damage or trauma and it
19
    wouldn't cause as much pain to someone if --
20
              Now, did she indicate to you whether lubrication or
21
    lotion was used?
22
              Yes.
         Α
23
              And she told you it had been, correct?
24
         Q
         Α
              Yes.
25
```

```
And yet, she's still damaged?
1
             Yes.
        Α
2
             Did that indicate anything to you?
3
              The fact that --
        Α
4
              Let me strike that. Let me ask you something else.
5
   Now, you don't know what caused the damage to her vagina
   because you weren't present, correct?
              No, I don't.
        Α
8
              You can just go on what she described as what was
9
    forced inside of her --
10
         Α
              Yes.
11
              -- right? Okay. Did she ever indicate to you
         Q
12
    anything about being restrained or bound or anything like that?
13
              Yes.
         Α
14
              How so?
         Q
15
              She told me that he had taped her arms and her mouth.
16
    Her hands, her wrists.
17
              And what was she taped with, do you -- do you
18
    remember --
19
              She --
         Α
20
              -- particulars?
         Q
21
              She described to me as a blue tape.
         Α
22
              And that's something she told you on that day?
23
         0
              Yes.
         Α
24
              Now let's go to the inner thigh area. Did you make
25
         0
```

```
any notation in regards to that?
                    I noted a brown substance that was on her left
2
        Α
   inner thigh.
                     And what did you do with that?
        Q
              Okay.
4
              I took a photograph, and I also swabbed the area.
5
              You didn't know what it was, did you?
6
              No, I did not.
7
        Α
             Now, in regards to her clothes, do you remember what
8
   she was wearing when she presented to you?
              Not at this moment. I can review -- can I review my
        Α
10
   notes?
11
              Now, you prepared a report, correct?
12
              Yes, I did.
         Α
13
              Would that help you refresh your recollection --
14
              Yes.
         A
15
              -- if you reviewed that? Please do.
16
              She said she was wearing a white t-shirt, what capri
17
   pants and tennis shoes.
18
              Now, did you retrieve those items from her or did
19
    someone else?
20
              I retrieved it from her.
21
              Okay. Now, let me ask you about -- this is State's
22
   Exhibit 62. Let me ask you if you recognize that particular
23
   item?
24
              Yes.
         Α
25
```

What is it? Q 1 That's the crotch area of her pants. 2 Α And those are the pants that you retrieved from her? 3 Α Yes. 4 Anything noticeable or notable about the crotch area 5 of her pants? 6 There's bleeding. Α 7 Now, did that surprise you, based upon the injuries 0 8 that you -- you saw? No. 10 Α In fact, you saw bleeding on her, didn't you? 11 0 12 Α Yes. What parts of her body were bleeding? 13 O Α Her vagina. 14 Anything else? 15 Q Her anus wasn't bleeding, but it was oozing a little Α 16 17 bit. What does that mean? 18 Oozing -- there -- when -- when you get a scratch, Α 19 sometimes the skin is broken, so there's some white cells that 20 come out and they -- they ooze. 21 Was there damage to that particular area? 22 Α Yes. 23 Well, before I get there, let me ask you, do you 24 recognize State's 63? I know there's a bunch of different 25

```
markings on there, so it may be a little difficult?
 1
              Yes, her t-shirt.
         Α
 2
              Okay. Those are items you retrieved from her,
 3
         Q
    correct?
         Α
              Yes.
 5
              Did you turn those over to the detective?
 6
         0
         Α
              Yes.
 7
              Okay. Back to the -- the anal findings. What type
 8
         0
   of exam did you conduct on her in regards to that area?
              I just visualized the anus by retracting her
10
         Α
   buttocks, and again, I apply the toluidine blue dye, which is
11
    enhancement, it enhances the injuries, and I was able to find
12
    injuries on her anus.
13
              Now, when you first looked at her, did -- and these
14
    particular areas, could you recognize that there were injuries
15
   present without using the dye?
16
         Α
              Yes.
17
              Then why did you use the dye?
18
              Usually for documentation purposes. It enhances it
19
         Α
    on the photographs.
20
              And that eventually helps you to explain it and point
21
    that out to juries --
22
23
         Α
              Yes.
              -- right?
         0
24
         Α
              Yes.
25
```

```
Okay. Now, in regards to the injuries in that anal
1
   area, did you make particular notes as to what locations,
2
   injuries --
3
             Yes.
        Α
4
             -- that were present? And where were those?
5
             The injuries was at 6:00 o'clock, and there was an
6
   injury -- two injuries at, I believe, 11:00 o'clock and 1:00
7
   o'clock.
8
             And that's something that you noted on those
        0
9
   photographs that you took, correct?
10
              Yes.
        Α
11
              Okay.
         Q
12
              MR. HENDRICKS: And as I stated earlier, I'm not
13
   going to blow these up, but I've shown defense counsel these
14
             He's got a copy of those. Can I approach, Judge?
15
              THE COURT: Yes.
16
              MR. HENDRICKS:
                              Thanks.
17
              THE COURT: Can you identify them for the record,
18
    please?
19
              MR. HENDRICKS: Yes.
20
    BY MR. HENDRICKS:
21
              Ms. Coe, I'm showing you for identification purposes
22
    State's Proposed Exhibit 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92.
23
    you could look through those quickly, and tell me if those are
    photos that you took, and if they accurately and truly depict
25
```

```
Amber Valles back on December 14th of 2007?
1
              Yes.
        Α
2
             Are those photos you recognize?
3
              Yes.
        Α
4
              Did you take those photos?
        0
5
        Α
              Yes.
6
              And is that Amber Valles?
7
              Yes.
         Α
8
              And are those the particular areas that you've
9
         0
   already testified about in regards to the inner thigh, the
10
   vaginal area and also the anal area?
11
              Yes.
12
              Okay.
         Q
13
              MR. HENDRICKS: At this point, Judge, I'd move for
14
    the admission of State's Proposed Exhibit 85 through 92.
15
              THE COURT: 85 through 92 are offered.
16
    objection?
17
              MR. MANINGO: No objection.
18
              THE COURT: Hearing no objection, they'll be
19
    admitted.
20
                   (Exhibits 85 through 92 admitted).
21
              MR. HENDRICKS: And I'm going to have her briefly
22
    describe these. But once again, I'm not going to publish these
23
    until later.
24
    BY MR. HENDRICKS:
25
```

```
Okay. In regards to State's 85, what's reflected in
1
   there?
2
             That is her left inner thigh.
3
              Okay. 86?
4
              That is the vagina.
5
              Okay. And is there anything noted on that
        0
6
   photograph?
7
              There is a scratch at 6:00 o'clock.
 8
              Okay. And is there anything else in regards to
         Q
9
   details or description or notes located on there?
10
              No.
11
              What's a posterior fourchette?
12
              That is the area where -- just below the opening of
         Α
13
    the vagina.
14
              87?
         Q
15
              Yes, this is the enhancement of the abrasion with the
16
    toluidine blue dye.
17
              88?
         0
18
              This is the balloon method that I used to visualize
19
         Α
    the hymenal tear.
20
              And in regards to that photo, is there -- is there
21
    pretty apparent bleeding?
22
         Α
              Yes.
23
              Okay.
                      89?
24
         Q
              This is a traction method that we -- I use to further
         Α
25
```

```
visualize any other injuries surrounding the vagina.
 1
              And on to 90?
 2
              This is the anal examination. This is the anal
 3
   laceration that I saw initially when I first examined her --
 4
 5
   her anus.
        0
              Okay. 91?
 6
              And I applied toluidine blue dye so it would be
 7
    enhanced further in my documentation.
 8
        Q
              Same area?
 9
              Same area.
10
              Okay. And 92?
11
              And 92 are the other two lacerations at 11:00 and
12
    1:00 o'clock of the anus --
13
              Okay.
         Q
14
             -- with the dye enhancement.
15
              Okay, what color's the dye?
16
              Blue.
17
         Α
              Okay. But that blue dye indicates where injuries had
         0
18
    taken place?
19
         Α
              Yes.
20
         Q
              Okay.
21
              MR. HENDRICKS: Court's indulgence. At this point I
22
   don't have any additional questions. Like I said, I'm going to
23
    hold off on these exhibits.
24
              THE COURT: Cross.
25
```

```
MR. MANINGO: Thank you, Judge.
1
                           CROSS-EXAMINATION
2
   BY MR. MANINGO:
3
             Hello, Ms. Coe?
              Hello.
5
                         (Off-record colloquy).
 6
   BY MR. MANINGO::
 7
              Now, you had stated that as a SANE nurse you -- you
         Q
 8
   work with the sexual assault detectives?
              Yes.
10
              And the sexual assault detectives will come and bring
11
    a case to you and oftentimes bring an individual to you?
12
              Yes.
         Α
13
              And when they -- when they do this, before you setoff
         0
14
    on your physical examination, they will typically give you some
15
    kind of background or summary of what the case is about?
16
         Α
              Yes.
17
              They'll talk to you about what the allegations are?
18
              Yes.
         Α
19
              Okay. So you have that already going into your
20
    examination?
21
              In -- not necessarily, but in this particular case, I
22
    can't recall if I spoke to the detective before I saw -- did my
23
    examination on Amber.
24
              Okay. You did talk to Amber beforehand?
         0
25
```

```
Yes.
        A
             Okay. And so you did -- you were able to receive
2
   some kind of information about what the allegations were in
3
   this case?
4
              Yes.
5
        Α
                     And you did have that information going into
6
   your examination?
7
              Yes.
        Α
              Okay. And that is the reason why you took some of
 9
         Q
   the photographs that you did, correct?
10
              Yes.
         Α
11
              Okay. Now, Mr. Hendricks give you some of the
12
   photographs that you took, correct?
13
              Yes.
         Α
14
              There are others that you took as well?
15
         Α
              Yes.
16
              You took photographs of -- of Amber's forearms and
         0
17
    wrists, correct?
18
         Α
              Yes.
19
              Both on the outside?
         Q
20
              Yes.
         Α
21
              And on the inside?
         Q
22
              Yes.
         Α
23
              Okay. And do you remember what you indicated on
24
    those pictures?
25
```

1	A	I indicated that there were no injuries on those
		- · · - ·
2	pictures.	That there were no signs of injury or marks to the
3	Q	That there were no signs of injury of marks to the
4	wrists?	
5	А	Yes.
6	Q	Okay. And you took those photos because of the
7	informati	on you had heard about possibly being bound or taped?
8	A	Yes.
9	Q	Okay. You also didn't find any visible injuries on
10	her face,	correct?
11	A	No, I did not.
12	Q	Okay. Now, based on your experience, you're aware
13	that inju	ries can occur from consensual sex as well
14	A	Yes.
15	Q	correct? And I think you indicated to Mr.
16	1	earlier that it's quite possible that someone who had
17	never had	l sex before, they may be more susceptible to injury.
18	A	Yes.
19	Q	Okay. Whether that's consensual or not, those
20	injuries	can still occur?
21	А	Yes.
22	Q	Okay. Thank you, Ms. Coe.
23		THE COURT: Redirect.
24		MR. HENDRICKS: No thank you, Judge.
25		THE COURT: Is this anything else for this

```
witness? Is this witness free to go? Thank you for your
2
   testimony.
             THE WITNESS: Thank you.
3
             THE COURT: Please step down. Ladies and gentlemen,
4
   we're going to take our lunch and recess at this time.
5
             MR. HENDRICKS:
                             Judge --
6
             MR. MANINGO: Do you want to --
7
             THE COURT: Yes?
8
             MR. HENDRICKS: -- just a few minutes so that they
9
   could review those. Because I don't want to come back after
10
   lunch and then hand those photos to them.
11
             THE COURT: Oh, so you want to publish?
12
             MR. HENDRICKS: Yeah, I wanted to wait until -- until
13
   Mr. Maningo was done with his -- his cross before I published.
14
             THE COURT: Okay. We need to have them marked by the
15
   clerk. Looks like we're ready for that. Mr. Maningo.
16
              MR. MANINGO: Yes.
17
                    (Off-record bench conference).
18
              THE COURT: All right, Mr. Hendricks, you --
19
              MR. HENDRICKS: I'll just --
20
              THE COURT: Okay.
21
              MR. SCOW: Just before we're asked whether we rest or
22
    not, one photograph that somehow slipped through, it's marked
23
    as State's Proposed 83. Just clean up all the -- make sure we
24
    have everything admitted. We're going to move to admit 83 at
25
```

```
this point.
1
             THE COURT: 83's offered at this time. Any
2
   objection?
3
             MR. MANINGO: Judge, it appears that 83 is just a
 4
   different angle of a photograph that is already in evidence.
5
   Mr. Scow discussed this with me. It doesn't seem to be
 6
   anything new, and there was already testimony regarding the
 7
   foundation of -- of this area of the doorway, so I would have
   no objection.
9
             THE COURT: Okay.
10
             THE CLERK: (Indiscernible).
11
             THE COURT: Just checking my notes here. So hearing
12
   no objection, 83 offered at this time. 83's admitted.
13
                        (Exhibit 83 admitted).
14
                        (Off-record colloquy).
15
             MR. HENDRICKS: Thank you, Judge.
16
              THE COURT: State.
17
             MR. HENDRICKS: Judge, I believe everything's been
18
    admitted. At this point we are going to rest.
19
              THE COURT: State rests at this point. As soon as
20
   the jury's finished with the previous exhibits that have been
21
   published to them, then we'll take our lunch and recess.
22
   we're going to stay here until that process is complete.
              MR. HENDRICKS: Thanks, Judge.
24
                        (Pause in proceedings).
25
```

THE COURT: All right, it appears the process of publication of the photographs is complete. It is your duty not to converse among yourselves or with anyone else on any subject connected with this trial. You may not -- further, you may not read, watch or listen to any report of or commentary on this trial by any medium of information, including without limitation, newspaper, television or radio.

You may not form or express any opinion on any subject connected with this case until it's finally submitted to you. We'll be in recess hour and 15 minutes, ladies and gentlemen, about an hour and 20 minutes, so we'll be back here at a quarter of 1:00 -- excuse me, quarter of 2:00, 1:45, quarter of 2:00. We'll be in recess. Follow Officer Reichert, please.

(Outside the presence of the jury).

THE COURT: Record should reflect we're outside the presence of the jury. You haven't formally rested yet or at least that was my impression. I do need to settle up jury instructions, so I'd like to do that right now, if we can.

MR. MANINGO: Oh, Judge, I have gone through them. I have been able to go through them. I received a hard copy and -- and it seems that everything is -- is in order.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. MANINGO: They have put the statutory in. I anticipate my client will not testify. I would be asking for

```
that instruction.
1
             THE COURT: Did you include the Carter instruction or
2
   -- we have it.
3
             MR. MANINGO: Okay.
             MR. SCOW: I didn't include it in. I didn't know
5
   which way he --
6
             MR. HENDRICKS: We'll do that. We forgot, sorry.
7
             THE COURT: No, I've got it here.
8
             MR. MANINGO: So I would be asking for that to be
9
   included. I notice in the packet right now we have both a play
10
   back and a read back instruction.
11
             THE COURT: We always pull the play back.
12
             MR. MANINGO: We'll yank --
13
              THE COURT: Or excuse me, the read back.
14
             MR. MANINGO: Yank that one.
15
             THE COURT: Right.
16
              MR. MANINGO: And then on the verdict form --
17
              MR. SCOW: I messed up.
18
              MR. MANINGO: Well, it -- it looks okay, except for
19
   Count 12 which is open and gross lewdness, which gives options
20
   for --
21
              MR. SCOW: Convicting of sex assault.
22
              MR. MANINGO: And statutory and other things.
23
              MR. SCOW: I just -- was a cut and paste --
24
              THE COURT: We can change that. Mr. Maningo, do you
25
```

need to prepare for your case in chief? Is that what you're 1 concerned about? MR. MANINGO: Yes. That's why I -- because, you 3 know, typically, I would have a second chair, and they would be doing instructions while I'm taking care of the rest of this --5 THE COURT: Right. 6 MR. MANINGO: -- but I'm trying to juggle both right 7 now. 8 THE COURT: Okay. Get your case ready. Could you be 9 back here say at like 20 after, 25 after, and since it doesn't 10 sound like we're going to be arguing about instructions to a 11 great degree, we can probably --MR. MANINGO: Right. 13 THE COURT: -- settle them up, number them up and put 14 them on the record then. 15 MR. MANINGO: Sure, that's -- that sounds fine. 16 THE COURT: That will work for you? 17 MR. MANINGO: Yeah, so 25 after? 18 THE COURT: Yeah. 19 MR. MANINGO: Great. 20 MR. HENDRICKS: Just --21 THE COURT: Anything else? 22 MR. HENDRICKS: Just one question that we need you to 23 determine. 24 THE COURT: Okay. 25

MR. HENDRICKS: He's probably -- I don't know if I'm 1 speaking that all right. I think he's going to present some 2 witnesses that may say that he has good character. 3 THE COURT: Okay. He opens the door. He's permitted 4 to present character evidence. 5 MR. HENDRICKS: We're going to ask, would it change 6 your opinion if you knew that he had been convicted of two 7 prior felonies, both being theft of a vehicle, taking a vehicle without owner --THE COURT: I don't think that's appropriate. 10 MR. HENDRICKS: Why? That wasn't really my question 11 because absolutely that's appropriate. 12 THE COURT: All right. 13 MR. HENDRICKS: The -- the question was more, would 14 it change your opinion -- my second question --15 THE COURT: I thought -- I thought you were going to 16 say -- okay, go ahead. Go ahead. I'm not stepping on you. 17 MR. HENDRICKS: Would it change your -- your opinion 18 if you found out that he, in fact, had sexual activity -- I'm 19 not going to call it consensual or a sexual assault -- sex with 20 a 13-year-old child? 21 THE COURT: Okay. 22 MR. HENDRICKS: That's the question I had. 23 regards to, I guess, I could bring back some case law in 24 regards to whether or not we can ask about his --25

THE COURT: All right.

MR. HENDRICKS: -- his felonies. I thought we could even ask about arrests, which I'm not going to do. It was just --

THE COURT: No, I don't -- I -- and I think it's the Daniels (phonetic) decision. However, questions asking whether or not someone has been arrested do not relate to specific instance of the conduct. The arrest alone is not an adequate basis to cross-examine the witness about reputation or opinion testimony. As distinguishes from questions regarding arrest (indiscernible) questions about a specific acts and circumstances that culminated an arrest may be proper for such questions regards specific acts and circumstances that culminate arrests to be proper, the trial court must first determine outside the presence of the jury before allowing inquiry into the facts harmful to the defendant's character that are not otherwise evidence whether the prosecution has a reasonable good faith belief, basis for its belief that the defendant committed the acts and the inquiry.

So all right, the Daniels decision say probably arrests alone, no. But if -- if you've got certified copies of a felony conviction --

MR. HENDRICKS: Well, we certainly have a good faith belief that he was convicted of that.

THE COURT: Well, I mean --

```
MR. HENDRICKS: I mean, he's actually confirmed that.
1
             THE COURT: -- that would be my burden. I'd have to
2
   make that finding.
3
             MR. HENDRICKS: Okay.
4
                         Okay?
             THE COURT:
5
                             Okay.
             MR. HENDRICKS:
6
             THE COURT: But under that decision, okay.
7
   else?
8
             MR. HENDRICKS: That's it.
9
             MR. MANINGO: Well, but you --
10
                         The second part.
             MR. SCOW:
11
             MR. MANINGO: Yeah, the second part is what you were
12
   most concerned about, which --
13
             MR. HENDRICKS: It's -- if I can ask would it change
14
   your opinion about his character if you found out that he had
15
    had sexual activity with a 13-year-old girl?
16
              MR. MANINGO: Because now we're talking about this
17
    case.
18
              MR. HENDRICKS: Because I don't know if they're aware
19
    of it or not. And the reason being is because my investigator
20
    spoke with some of his witnesses that we didn't know whether
21
    they were going to be character or alibi witnesses.
22
              And when I heard alibi -- and Mr. Maningo kind of
23
    explained that to me, that that may be presenting an alibi in
24
    regards to a date in which he was arrested and not the day of
25
```

the crime. But there's still a little confusing to me. 1 they're presenting -- and I don't care if there's notice filed 2 or not. 3 If they want to present an alibi witness, I'll 4 certainly fine with that for --5 MR. MANINGO: We're not. 6 MR. HENDRICKS: -- for obvious reasons. 7 MR. MANINGO: We're not, so --MR. HENDRICKS: But that's what my concern was. 9 investigator actually prepared an investigator's report stating 10 that the mother and one of the sisters were -- were going to 11 indicate that they knew --12 THE COURT: All right, let's --13 MR. HENDRICKS: -- he was somewhere else. 14 THE COURT: -- let's listen to this. Foster versus 15 "Admission of evidence of previous crimes when 16 defendant raises affirmative defense of entrapment. Defendant 17 here has raised the defense of consensual sex off an allegation 18 of sexual assault." So I don't know how close that is. "Where a defendant raises an affirmative defense of 20 entrapment, he thereby places his character directly in issue, 21 pursuant to 055. The State is entitled to prove the 22 predisposition of such a defendant to commit a crime by 23

offering evidence of a specific instance of the defendant's

conduct. Requires relevant evidence be excluded where danger

24

25

of unfair prejudice or confusion of the issue or misleading the 1 jury substantially outweighs its probative value. Thus, when a 2 defendant raises entrapment defense at trial, evidence of prior 3 crime may be admitted (indiscernible)." 4 Bring me the law when we settle up instructions and, 5 all right, tell me again, and I'm going to chew on it. You 6 know, because frankly, I'm inclined to let you ask the question 7 because the issue that this trier of fact must decide in 8 balancing the character testimony or character witness' 9 testimony is the basis of knowledge and their understanding. 10 He's admitting, based upon the defense, that he 11 engaged in sex with a 13-year-old being girl, right? 12 MR. SCOW: Yes. 13 THE COURT: And so --14 MR. HENDRICKS: Well --15 THE COURT: And your question is --16 MR. HENDRICKS: -- technically, he's not admitting. 17 I guess, Jeff is --18 THE COURT: Well, the fact the defense's consent --19 MR. HENDRICKS: Right. 20 THE COURT: -- so would that consent -- consensual 21 activity change the opinion of the witness in terms of their 22 perception of his -- their opinion as to his character? 23 MR. HENDRICKS: The other thing that -- and I'll 24 bring something back for you, Judge. I think you're right.

```
The other thing is is I need to make sure that there's a clear
 1
    record in regards to, I guess, conversations or consent from
    the defendant to Mr. Maningo saying it's okay for you to number
 3
    one, argue that this was consensual.
              THE COURT: Well, that -- that is true in terms of --
 5
             MR. HENDRICKS: And --
 6
              THE COURT: -- processes that we -- is it moved
 7
    through depending on what this jury does. Mr. Maningo, we do
 8
   need to make a record with that.
 9
             MR. MANINGO: That's correct. I agree with that.
10
             THE COURT: And we want to -- when do you want to do
11
12
    that?
             MR. MANINGO: Well, we can do it right now if you'd
13
    like.
14
              THE COURT: Let's do it right now.
15
              MR. MANINGO: Go ahead. Well, for the record, and
16
    I'll allow the judge -- allow your Honor or counsel to ask any
17
    questions to supplement it. However, I have had discussions
18
    over the last two years with Mr. Adams regarding --
19
             MR. HENDRICKS: And Judge, I don't -- I don't know if
20
    we need to be present for this or not. I don't know if it'd be
21
   better that we're not --
22
             MR. MANINGO: Actually, you know what, I think that
23
   you're not supposed to be.
24
             MR. HENDRICKS: And yeah, and --
25
```

```
MR. MANINGO: Okay.
 1
              MR. HENDRICKS: And I wasn't paying attention to
 2
    anything you said so far.
 3
             MR. MANINGO: Well, I haven't said anything yet,
 5
    so --
              MR. HENDRICKS: Actually, someone was communicating
 6
   with me and said, yeah, we should probably get out of here, and
 7
    I think he's right.
              MR. MANINGO: Yeah, that's a good point. And I
 9
   haven't said anything yet anyways, so.
10
             MR. HENDRICKS: All right.
11
              THE COURT: All right. Record should reflect the
12
   prosecution's leaving.
13
              (Outside the presence of the prosecution).
             MR. MANINGO: Judge, to continue the record, I've had
15
    conversations with Mr. Adams over the last two years regarding
16
    the -- this case.
17
             THE COURT RECORDER: Do you want this
18
    (indiscernible)?
19
             THE COURT: Yes, absolutely, it needs to be on the
20
   record.
21
             THE COURT RECORDER: Okay.
22
             THE COURT: That we can seal it.
23
             MR. MANINGO: Okay. For two years now between Mr.
24
   Adams and I, and we have -- we had agreed a long time ago when
25
```

```
we were ready for trial that we would be arguing consent, which
    thereby concedes the point that there was sexual contact
 2
    between himself and an underaged girl, which is Amber. And
    anything --
              THE COURT: Is that correct, Mr. Adams, in that --
 5
   basically by making that argument to the jury he's conceding
 6
    that you committed a crime. Do you understand that?
 7
              THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.
 8
              THE COURT: And is that the trial strategy that
 9
   you've discussed with Counsel and approve of?
10
             THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.
11
             THE COURT: Okay.
12
             THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
13
             THE COURT: Anything else, Mr. Maningo?
14
             MR. MANINGO: No, I think that's it.
15
             THE COURT: All right. So the only remaining issue
16
   right now is the -- whether or not I'm going to let -- well,
17
18
   we're not going to talk about that right now.
             MR. MANINGO: Well, yeah --
19
             THE COURT: Those gentlemen are gone.
20
             MR. MANINGO: -- certain questions, yeah. But we can
21
   come back and talk about that.
22
             THE COURT: All right. We'll see you about 20 after.
23
             MR. MANINGO: Great, thanks.
24
            (Court recessed at 12:33 p.m. until 1:30 p.m.).
25
```

THE COURT: This is C-241003, State of Nevada versus Edward Michael Adams. Record should reflect presence of representative of State, defense, outside the presence of the jury. Mr. Adams is also not present. We've asked -- I've asked parties to participate in the settlement of jury instructions, and we're discussing potential issue of character, a character instruction as a consequence of a proffer of the defense.

Character witnesses are about to be called -character witnesses are about to called in defense case in
chief. So brought to everybody's attention that if character
evidence is going to be presented, then the jury needs to be
appropriately instructed on what that means, if anything. I
found the Barren (phonetic) decision. I asked the DA -- asked
everybody to discuss what, if any, instruction wants to be
tendered.

So then we jumped into well, what character trait are the witnesses going to testify to. Mr. Maningo, what is your kind of impression, because you said you were going to -- is it a family member?

MR. MANINGO: Yes, it's -- it's -- it's his -- his two sisters and one of their friends.

THE COURT: Two sisters and one of their friends, and they're going to testify to his sexual proclivity or his sexual --

```
MR. MANINGO: No. Here's what the questions would
 1
    be. Mr. Hendricks makes it a little bit more difficult. I'm
    going to ask them first how -- how they know Mr. Adams, how
 3
    long they've known Mr. Adams, and they've had an opportunity to
    be around him on a regular basis. Basically foundational --
<sub>2</sub> 5
              THE COURT: Right.
 6
              MR. MANINGO: -- so that they would be able --
 7
              THE COURT: The basic knowledge for opinion and
 8
 9
    reputation.
              MR. MANINGO: Exactly. To show that they would be
1.0
    able to have an opinion as to his repetition. Then I'm going
11
    to ask if -- if they have ever seen Mr. Adams act inappropriate
12
    in a sexual manner towards them or -- or anyone else that they
13
    is have seen him around.
14
              THE COURT: So that's a specific -- you're asking for
15
    on a collateral matter and referencing -- attempting to
16
    reference specific instances of conduct saying, "Have you ever
17
    seen my client act out sexually or inappropriately with
18
    others?" So what --
19
              MR. MANINGO: But -- but I --
20
              THE COURT: -- that is a --
21
              MR. MANINGO: -- I can reword that, then.
22
              THE COURT: Where's the character trait, though?
23
    mean, I wasn't being flip when I said sexual proclivity
24
25
    because --
```

```
MR. MANINGO: Right.
 1
              THE COURT: -- that's what it kind of sounded like.
 2
             MR. MANINGO: Right.
 3
             THE COURT: I never --
 5
             MR. MANINGO: Right.
              THE COURT: I don't know of any -- the character
 6
    traits I've seen addressed are, as I stated, violence, lack of
 7
    -- a propensity for violence or non-violence, truth and
    veracity. A truthful -- a truthful individual or not,
    depending on the nature of the charges. Those are really where
10
    I've seen character evidence focused on.
11
             Now, I'm not saying that the statute necessarily
12
    limits to that, because should -- and show me a -- do you have
13
    any cases that say I can put sister and her female friend up to
14
    say this guy never acted out with me sexually?
15
             MR. MANINGO: Well, what I can do, I mean, obviously
16
    the goal of putting on a character evidence is to demonstrate
17
    that the individual does not have -- is not of the character of
18
    someone who would commit this offense.
19
             THE COURT: Did he ever sexual assault you?
20
             MR. MANINGO: So -- so, I guess, we could go with
2.1
   violence because what we're saying is --
22
             THE COURT: I think that would be the only way,
23
   frankly, that I will -- I think you -- I would let you go in,
24
    "Do you have an opinion based upon your contact with the
25
```

defendant as to his, whether he's violent or non-violent?" "I have an opinion as -- that he's non-violent."

MR. MANINGO: Okay.

1.3

THE COURT: I -- that seems to be the appropriate character trait at issue. And I would limit -- really, that's where I think the focus needs to be.

MR. HENDRICKS: And Judge --

MR. MANINGO: (Indiscernible).

MR. HENDRICKS: -- I -- I think you're right on on everything you've stated. And I would not be asking anything about his prior felony convictions, if that were the case. And I think you're right on about that.

In regards to the aforementioned proposed questions in regards to, have you ever seen him act in appropriate around younger girls, I think that that would cause a huge problem because I think I would be able to ask at that point, if you're talking about that specific character trait, then I could ask, "Well, do you think it would be appropriate for a 25 or 26-year-old to have sex with a 13-year-old?" I'm sure the witness would say, "Of course, it's not appropriate."

And so would it then change your opinion if you found out, because defense has conceded that he had sex with this 13-year-old, that if you found out that Mr. Adams did, in fact, have sexual intercourse or anal intercourse with a 13-year-old, would that change your opinion in your regards to him acting

```
appropriate or inappropriate around young girls?"
 1
              I think that would certainly be relevant, based upon
 2
    that specific character trait, so that --
 3
              MR. MANINGO: But now we're -- we're not using that
    character trait, though, now.
 5
             MR. HENDRICKS: No, and I agree. I was just --
 6
             MR. MANINGO: (Indiscernible).
 7
             MR. HENDRICKS: -- I was --
 8
              THE COURT: So if we're limiting -- what I'm hearing
 9
   both sides say is that Mr. Maningo's intent now is to present
10
    character witnesses and limit their testimony to opinion or
11
    reputation. Do you have an opinion as to the defendant's
12
    whether he's violent or not violent, peaceful or not?
13
             MR. MANINGO: Right.
14
             MR. HENDRICKS: If --
15
             THE COURT: Yes, I do. And the basis for that -- for
16
                  "I've known him for X number of years. I have a
    that opinion.
17
    -- this is my relationship with him --
18
             MR. MANINGO: Right.
19
             THE COURT: -- based upon that contact with him, this
20
   is my opinion, bang, bang (indiscernible)."
21
             MR. MANINGO: That is my direct.
22
             MR. HENDRICKS: If -- if his client is okay with
23
   that, I'm certainly okay with that. And I'm not going to ask
24
   about priors. I think that would probably be inappropriate
25
```

unless, of course, they start going into, "Yeah, his just overall opinion, he's just a swell, great guy and nothing could 2 ever change by opinion about him." 3 THE COURT: Because I was going to -- under -- I 4 reread Daniels again, and there are different issues in 5 allowing you to impeach a witness with that prior felony conviction because this is a character issue. It's not a 8 specific instance of misconduct. It's a collateral matter, so 9 I'm --10 MR. HENDRICKS: Right. THE COURT: -- uncomfortable with letting you do that 11 under what we have right here, the instruction we have right 12 13 now. MR. HENDRICKS: And I wasn't disagreeing with you, 14 Judge. I -- I just wasn't sure what specifically was going to 15 be asked. And like I said, so long as his client says, "That's 16 what I want out." Because I don't want him to come back later 17 on under say, "I wanted that specific question about would I 18 ever be inappropriate around a young girl." I wanted to make a 19 record to say this is what I would then be able to ask. And I 20 think that would be horrible for Mr. Maningo's case. 21 22 THE COURT: I -- I think we're all clear. Talk to your -- talk to your client, Mr. Adams, when he gets here --23

-- make sure --

Yep.

MR. MANINGO:

THE COURT:

24

25

```
1
               MR. MANINGO: He'll be --
  2
               THE COURT: -- he understands.
  3
               MR. MANINGO: He'll be fine --
  4
               THE COURT: All right.
               MR. MANINGO: -- with whatever I decide to do.
  5
  6
               THE COURT: All right.
  7
              MR. MANINGO: I mean --
 8
              THE COURT: Well, that's good.
 9
              MR. HENDRICKS: That issue's good.
                                                   I have one
10
    additional --
11
              THE COURT: Now let me -- and -- let me carry the
12
    ball to its end and then you can --
13
              MR. HENDRICKS: Okay.
              THE COURT: -- step up.
14
              MR. HENDRICKS: Perfect.
15
16
              THE COURT: Since character evidence is going to be
    presented, I believe under the Barren decision a jury needs to
17
    be instructed on it. The instruction that I propose is "Have
18
    you heard of -- you've heard evidence of defendant's character.
19
    That is opinion evidence about the character trait for -- for
20
   peacefulness or violence, non-violence," how do you want to put
21
22
   that? Violence or non-violence? Peacefulness, quietness?
   don't -- I never liked quietness. I don't even know what that
23
   is. Peacefulness or --
24
25
             MR. MANINGO: I think non-violence.
```

THE COURT: For violence --1 2 MR. HENDRICKS: Whatever Jeff sends over, whatever you're comfortable with, Judge, I'm comfortable with. 3 THE COURT: "For violence or non-violence. You 4 should consider character evidence together with -- with and in 5 the same manner as all other evidence in the case." Now, 7 there's an argument to be made, and in fact, in the Barren decision as you read it, it's all part of the credibility, believability of witnesses to be determined (indiscernible) upon the stand instruction. But it doesn't -- that instruction 10 doesn't necessarily include this language, and so I would be 11 inclined to make this its own instruction if that's your 12 13 request. MR. MANINGO: That -- that would be our request. 14 15 THE COURT: All right. All right. Good. Now, Mr. Hendricks, that clears that up. 16 MR. HENDRICKS: Yeah. It does. Thank you, Judge. 17 18 THE COURT: Now what do you have? 19 MR. HENDRICKS: The -- the other question, and I'll have you read through this also, but it's an investigator's 20 report prepared by my investigator who spoke with these 21 22 potential witnesses. And I'm not sure which ones are going to 23 testify. 24 MR. MANINGO: I can tell you right now, if you want,

25

and I can tell you order even.

MR. HENDRICKS: Okay. Just -- I'll just put it on the record and then you'll let me know.

MR. MANINGO: Okay.

MR. HENDRICKS: I have a Lori Galloway, that I believe is his mother. There was a Breanna Galloway, a Samantha and possibly a Jamie. And these are some of the witnesses that were interviewed by any investigator. And most of which stated that they were going to be alibi witnesses. And that causes me concern about whether or not I can ask them questions like, "You spoke with my investigator and you actually said that you knew he was out painting a shed on that day because you were with him, so he couldn't have done this," which, of course, I would love to have them come in and state that.

And if they deny it on the stand, I want to present in rebuttal my investigator's say, "I spoke with them, and they said they were going to be alibi witnesses, and they knew he couldn't have done it because he was out painting a shed that day." Which we know is impossible because his sperm or whatever is found inside this girl's body, and now he's conceded that he did it.

But I don't think those witnesses were informe by the defendant that yeah, I had sex with 13-year-old. So I want to be able to ask them, "Didn't you tell me investigator you were going to provide an alibi?"

MR. MANINGO: Okay.

THE COURT: But they're not -- okay, your response.

MR. MANINGO: I -- I -- I believe I can address this. When the investigator came over to speak with the witnesses, the witnesses were referring to the day when -- when Mr. Adams was arrested. And so that's where the confusion came in. They were not presenting any kind of an alibi, and -- and I doubt that any of them even understand or know what the word alibi means.

What they told the investigator was -- and this were referring to the day that he was arrested -- was that he was at work at Tree Amigos, which is a tree removing company. He was with his co-worker. And -- and that's all true, when the police came and -- and arrested him and picked him up.

And that's what they were referring to. They were not referring to --

THE COURT: Is that -- is that -- I guess is that fair examination of the witness, whether there's a misunderstanding or not. I many, if it were -- if the shoe were on the other foot, I -- I'd let you get into that because the basis of the witness' information -- I mean, we even had that to some degree with the detective. You -- you both going back and forth on the detective and whether there's a complete understanding of the questions asked and all.

MR. MANINGO: And I think as far as that second part

of -- of the issue that Mr. Hendricks is bringing up, I don't 1 2 -- I'm not sure how he wants to get into it because now that we've basically structured what my direct is going to be, it 3 doesn't really have anything to do --5 THE COURT: With that. 6 MR. MANINGO: -- with that at all. It -- it -- my 7 direct is going to be about three questions of, "How long have 8 you known your brother, your whole life, " and --9 THE COURT: I think Mr. Hendricks, if we're going to limit it to the questions on character, at this point I'm going 10 to -- I'm going to keep the focus on the character issue alone. 11 12 I'm not going to let you get into that collateral. 13 MR. HENDRICKS: And Judge, I'm fine with that. 14 THE COURT: Okay. 15 MR. HENDRICKS: I think that's the appropriate --16 THE COURT: All right. MR. HENDRICKS: -- ruling. I -- I just wanted to 17 make my record --18 19 THE COURT: Okay. MR. HENDRICKS: -- later on, you know, when they're 20 21 calling witnesses and said I wish my witnesses could have testified -- you know, if we get a conviction -- if my 22 witnesses would have testified an alibi or this, this, and 23 this, I wanted to make sure the record is clear that we had 24 25 some potential witness or witness testimony from the defense

```
witnesses that would not have helped him out much.
  2
               THE COURT: Okay. All right.
  3
              MR. HENDRICKS: That's all.
              THE COURT: Well, I think I'll -- I think based upon
 5
    what we're doing here so far, the -- my decision is to not let
    you get into those -- that collateral issue or that information
 6
    at this point, all right?
 7
 8
              MR. MANINGO: And that's fine. And I will --
 9
              THE COURT: And you're limiting it --
10
              MR. MANINGO: -- keep --
11
              THE COURT: -- to reputation or opinion.
12
              MR. MANINGO: -- it tight and clean.
13
              THE COURT: Yes.
14
              MR. MANINGO: Yes.
15
              THE COURT: Tight and clean. All right.
16
    obviously don't have time to settle up instructions. Although,
    we don't have Mr. Adams back yet. So what we'll do is let you
17
18
    present your case. State's going to formally rest.
19
    present your case. Then we'll give them an extended lunch --
20
    or extended afternoon break for half hour or so, settle up,
21
    number up, and then head into arguments this afternoon. Good
22
   enough?
             MR. HENDRICKS: Yeah. Yeah --
23
24
             MR. MANINGO: Great.
25
             MR. HENDRICKS: -- I definitely want to finish today.
```

```
THE COURT: Good. I agree. I'll go robe up and
  1
  2
     we'll wait for Mr. Adams to show up.
          (Court went off record at 1:43 p.m. until 1:49 p.m.).
  3
  4
                     (In the presence of the jury).
               THE MARSHAL: Panel's present, your Honor.
  5
  6
               THE COURT: Thank you. This is C-241003, State of
    Nevada, plaintiff versus Edward Adams. Record should reflect
    the presence of representatives of State, defense. All members
 8
    of the jury panel appear to be present. Parties stipulate to
10
    the presence of the entire panel?
11
              MR. SCOW: Yes, Judge.
12
              MR. MANINGO: Yes, sir.
              THE COURT: State.
13
              MR. SCOW: Yes, Judge, the State rests its case in
14
15
    chief.
16
              THE COURT: State officially rests. Mr. Maningo.
              MR. MANINGO: Your Honor, the defense would call as
17
18
    its first witness Breanna Galloway.
19
              BREANNA GALLOWAY, DEFENSE'S WITNESS, SWORN
20
              THE CLERK: Thank you. You may be seated. And then
21
   please loudly state your name.
22
              THE WITNESS: Breanna Galloway.
              THE CLERK: Can you spell both your first and last
23
   name for me.
24
25
              THE WITNESS: B-r-e-a-n-n-a, G-a-l-l-o-w-a-y.
```

```
1
               THE CLERK: Thank you.
  2
               THE COURT: Counsel.
  3
               MR. MANINGO: Thank you.
  4
                           DIRECT EXAMINATION
  5
     BY MR. MANINGO:
  6
          Q
               Hello, Breanna.
  7
          Α
               Hello.
 8
          Q
               How old are you?
 9
         А
               16.
10
               I'm sorry, you gotta speak up.
11
         Α
               16.
12
               Okay. And do you know Ed Adams?
         Q
13
         Α
              Yes.
14
         Q
              And how do you know Ed?
15
         Α
              He's my brother.
16
         Q
              Have you ever lived in the same household as Ed?
17
         Α
              Yes.
              Have you had had an opportunity to spend much time
18
         Q
    with Ed as you -- as you were growing up?
19
20
         Α
              Yes.
21
              And has that always been in the same household or --
22
         Α
              No, not really. Like we'd live -- like when he
    wasn't living with us I'd visit him -- we visited him.
24
         Q
              Okay. There was a time when Ed moved out and --
25
              When he was 16, yeah.
```

```
1
          Q
              Okay.
               And he lived with his dad.
  2
  3
              Okay. But you still spent time with -- with Ed?
          Q
    have to answer out loud for the record.
  5
         Α
              Yes.
 6
                     Then I really only have two questions for you,
    okay. Number one is, do you have an opinion as to your
    brother's character for non-violence?
 8
 9
         Α
              Yes, I do.
10
              Okay. What is that opinion?
11
         Α
              He's not a very violent person. He's not very
    forceful at all. He's like a Teddy bear.
12
              Okay. Okay. That's all I wanted to ask you.
13
14
    you.
15
              THE COURT: Cross-examination.
16
              MR. HENDRICKS: Can we approach first?
17
              THE COURT: Yes.
                    (Off-record bench conference).
18
19
              MR. HENDRICKS: We have no questions. Thank you,
20
    Judge.
              THE COURT: All right. Thank you for your testimony.
21
   Please step down. Call your next witness.
23
             MR. MANINGO: Daneil Irish.
24
             THE CLERK: Will you please remain standing once you
25
   arrive in the witness stand, and I'll swear you in. Raise your
```

```
1
     right hand for me.
  2
                 DANEIL IRISH, DEFENSE'S WITNESS, SWORN
  3
               THE CLERK:
                           Thank you. You may be seated.
    state your name loudly for us and spelling both first and last
  4
  5
    name.
  6
               THE WITNESS: Daneil Irish.
  7
               THE CLERK: Spell your first and last name for us.
 8
               THE WITNESS: D-a-n-e-i-l, I-r-i-s-h.
 9
              THE CLERK: Thank you.
10
              THE COURT: Counsel.
11
              MR. MANINGO: Thank you.
12
                           DIRECT EXAMINATION
13
    BY MR. MANINGO:
14
         Q
              Hi Daneil. How old are you?
15
         Α
              18.
16
         Q
              18. Do you know Edward Adams?
17
         Α
              I do.
18
              Okay. How do you know Ed?
         Α
              Through his sisters.
19
20
         Q
              Okay.
              I --
21
         Α
22
              Which sisters?
         Q
23
              Breanna and Jamie.
              Okay. In your friendship with his sisters, have you
24
25
   had a friendship with the entire family?
```

1	A Yes, I have.
2	Q Okay. Have you had an opportunity to spend time
3	around Ed as you were growing up?
4	A Yes, I have.
5	Q Okay. And how long have you known Ed?
6	A About two and a half years.
7	Q Okay. Now, I just want to ask you two quick
8	questions, and we've talked about how we're keeping this
9	A Um-h'm.
10	Q very tight, right? Okay. Do you have an opinion
11	regarding Ed's character for non-violence?
12	A I do.
13	Q Okay. And what is your opinion?
14	A I've never seen him get outrageously mean with
15	anybody, an argument, as well as violent with anybody at all.
16	He's just not known for that.
17	Q Okay. Thank you.
18	THE COURT: Cross-examination.
19	MR. HENDRICKS: No thank you, Judge.
20	THE COURT: Thank you for your testimony. Please
21	step down. Call your next witness.
22	MR. MANINGO: Jamie Galloway.
23	THE CLERK: And I'll swear you in once you arrive in
24	the witness stand. Please remain standing.
25	JAMIE GALLOWAY, DEFENSE'S WITNESS, SWORN
	· ·

```
1
               THE CLERK: Thank you. You may be seated.
     state your name loudly for us and spelling your first and last
  2
  3
     name.
               THE WITNESS: Jamie Galloway, J-a-m-i-e,
  5
    G-a-l-l-o-w-a-y.
  6
               THE CLERK:
                          Thank you.
 7
                           DIRECT EXAMINATION
    BY MR. MANINGO:
 8
 9
         Q
              Hello, Jamie.
10
              Hi.
         Α
11
         0
              How old are you?
12
         Α
              I'm 22.
13
              Okay. And do you know Ed Adams?
14
         Α
              Yes.
15
              And how do you know Ed?
         Q
16
         Α
              He's my brother.
              Okay. Growing up did you spend much time with your
17
         O
    brother?
18
19
         A
              Yeah, a lot of time with my brother.
20
         0
              Okay. Did you ever share a room?
21
         Α
              Yes.
22
              Okay. How many years did you share a room?
23
         Α
              I think for --
24
              MR. HENDRICKS: And Judge, can we approach at this
25
   point?
```

	11
1	THE COURT: Yes.
2	(Off-record bench conference).
3	THE COURT: Counsel, your witness.
4	MR. MANINGO: Thank you.
5	BY MR. MANINGO:
6	Q Jamie, I just need to ask you two questions that I've
7	asked everyone else.
8	A Yes.
9	Q Do do you have an opinion regarding Ed's
10	regarding your brother's character for non-violence?
11	A Yes, I do have an opinion. He's not he's never
12	been a violent person, you know what I mean? He's always been
13	like just protective. You know, never violent. Never like
14	forceful or anything like that. He's just, you know, normal or
15	whatever, like nice
16	Q Okay.
17	A you know. Never never mean.
18	Q Okay. Okay. Thank you.
19	THE COURT: Cross-examination?
20	MR. HENDRICKS: No thank you, Judge.
21	THE COURT: Thank you for your testimony. Please
22	step down. Call your next witness.
23	MR. MANINGO: Defense rests.
24	THE COURT: Defense rests. Rebuttal, State?
25	MR. HENDRICKS: No thank you, Judge.
	Ĭ

THE COURT: No rebuttal.

Ladies and gentlemen, that concludes the evidence portion of the jury trial. As I explained to you when we began with jury selection, that's how it goes. We're going to move onto -- next onto the instruction phase. In order to do that, I need some time outside your presence to prepare those instructions. So we're going to take a break for approximately one half hour at this time, and then we'll reconvene and read those instructions to you.

In the meantime, it is your duty not to converse among yourselves or with anyone else on any subject connected with this trial. Further, you may not read, watch or listen to any report of or commentary on the trial by any medium of information, including without limitation, newspaper, television or radio. You may not form or express any opinion on any subject connected with this case until it's finally submitted to you.

Based upon the -- as we're moving through the process and my understanding of it, this case will be submitted it to you today for your deliberations. So on this break you might want to make calls, whatever calls you need to adjust your schedule accordingly because again, you will be charged with the case and begin your deliberations after argument is complete this evening. Follow Officer Reichert, please.

(Outside the presence of the jury).

1

THE COURT: Record should reflect we're outside the presence of the jury. Any additional record need to be made as a consequence of the testimony in defense case in chief, State?

MR. HENDRICKS: Just real quick. Just based on the conversations at the bench, Judge, my only concern -- and I thought we had already hashed out that there was just going to be a couple questions. And I know Mr. Maningo kind of stuck to that.

My only concern was when there was some foundational questions as far as how long they had been around him, when he eventually left the house, because I have information that he was, in fact, you know in another state. I think he was certified up as a juvenile. I think he did some time in prison. So he was certainly away from them during that time period. And he's also been in custody for the last two years.

I did not want to go there, and -- and I got the look from you, Judge, and you told me when we approached the bench, "Mr. Hendricks, you're not going anywhere near there so don't even think about it," and I agree with you. I was not going to. That was my only concern.

THE COURT: All right. Well, we -- we've noted for the record. You know, the presentation of opinion reputation testimony or character evidence. You know, these are -- these are lay witnesses. They do the best they can. They offered that opinion. They did elaborate more than -- to some extent

more than normal. I don't believe it was an intentional act, 1 and I don't believe the jury's been misinformed on that -- any 2 3 facts. You're not requesting a mistrial as a --4 MR. HENDRICKS: No, absolutely not, Judge. 5 THE COURT: Okay. 6 MR. HENDRICKS: And I -- I think what Mr. Maningo did 7 was absolutely proper. I -- I saw him out there instructing 8 and admonishing them to --9 THE COURT: All right. 10 MR. HENDRICKS: -- to keep it tight. And he even did 11 that on the record. I appreciate that. 12 THE COURT: Everybody here is a seasoned litigator. You understand that the dynamics of taking testimony can be 13 somewhat different when you actually get them on the stand. 14 15 MR. HENDRICKS: No doubt about it. That's why I'm not complaining about anything he's done. Everything was fine. 16 The -- the only thing I wanted to add is the last witness that 17 was called spoke with my investigator. My investigator did, in 18 fact, speak with her about an alibi. She specifically stated 19 to my investigator that she would be providing an alibi for the 20 21 day of the crime for her brother. 22 And that's a prior ruling you made. You said I could not go there. 23 I respect that decision, and I just wanted to put that on the record. 24

THE COURT: And that's true. Since the proffer was

25

```
limited to character in a general sense and opinion as to
  1
     character evidence, I did not allow the State to -- to approach
  2
  3
     the witness with that specific instance or what -- I don't know
     that it's necessarily even collateral, because it's related
  4
     obviously to this event. But since that evidence wasn't
  5
  6
     proffered, I didn't let the State impeach with that, so --
  7
               MR. HENDRICKS: Right.
  8
              THE COURT: All right.
 9
              MR. HENDRICKS: I appreciate that.
 10
              THE COURT: That said, let's settle instructions.
    I'll see you in my office. Grab what you've got.
11
                                                        Bring your
12
    law. Everybody else, Mr. Adams, Officer Hams (phonetic) stay
    -- keep him where he's at because we're going to number up and
13
    get to argument.
14
15
             (Court recessed at 2:05 p.m. until 2:17 p.m.).
16
                         (Off-record colloquy).
              THE COURT: Officer Ham, I need Mr. Adams back in
17
18
    here, please.
19
                         (Off-record colloquy).
              THE COURT: All right, this is C-241003, State of
20
21
    Nevada, plaintiff versus Edward Michael Adams. Record should
    reflect the presence of representatives of the State, defense.
22
23
              THE MARSHAL: All right, counsel, we're on the
24
   record.
25
              THE COURT: Outside the presence of the -- outside
```

```
the presence of the jury. Minutes should further reflect the
  1
     parties participated in settlement of jury instructions.
  2
     as a consequence, instructions 1 through 32 have been marked.
  3
     Is the State familiar with instructions 1 through 32?
  4
  5
               MR. SCOW: Yes, Judge.
               THE COURT: Does the State object to the giving of
  6
  7
    any of these instructions?
 8
              MR. SCOW: No, Judge.
 9
              THE COURT: Does the state have any additional
    instructions it wishes to offer that the court has refused to
10
    qive?
11
12
              MR. SCOW: No.
              THE COURT: Is the State familiar with the verdict
13
14
    form?
15
              MR. SCOW: Yes, Judge.
              THE COURT: Any objection to the verdict form?
16
17
              MR. SCOW:
                        None.
18
              THE COURT: Mr. Maningo, is the defense familiar with
    instructions 1 through 32.
19
20
              MR. MANINGO: Yes, sir.
21
              THE COURT: Does the defense object to the giving of
    any of these instructions?
22
23
              MR. MANINGO: No, we do not.
24
              THE COURT: Does the defense have any additional
25
    instructions it wishes to offer that the court's refused to
```

1 give? MR. MANINGO: No, Judge. We have offered two 2 instructions, and I believe they were one dealing with 3 character, which is number -- well, one -- one involving the 4 5 statutory sexual seduction that we asked for --6 THE COURT: Right. MR. MANINGO: -- number 19, and that is being given. 7 One involving the Honeycut (phonetic) case, which is --8 THE COURT: Isn't it like 20, 19, no. 10 MR. MANINGO: No, I think we -- no, we put that one 11 in right before the no corroboration, wherever that one is. 12 THE COURT: We did include the Honeycut. MR. MANINGO: Yes. 13 THE COURT: And the character is 22. So these are 14 the -- all the instructions that you wish to have given have 15 16 been given? 17 MR. MANINGO: That's correct, Judge. 18 19 MR. SCOW: 16. THE COURT: It's included in the package. 20 21 have no additional instructions that the court's refused? 22 that --23 MR. MANINGO: No. sir. THE COURT: All right. And is the defense familiar 24 25 with the verdict form?

MR. MANINGO: We are. 1 THE COURT: Any objection to the verdict form? 2 3 MR. MANINGO: No, sir. THE COURT: All right. We've settled instructions. 4 We're making copies of them right now. We'll hand out those 5 instructions to every member of the jury. We'll get to the 6 reading of those instructions. Everybody set up for closing, 7 please. Stand easy for a few minutes while we finish up those 8 9 copies. 10 (Pause in proceedings) 11 (Court went off record at 2:21 p.m. until 2:37 p.m.) 12 (In the presence of the jury). 13 THE MARSHAL: Panel's present, your Honor. 14 THE COURT: Thank you. This is C-241003, State of Nevada, plaintiff versus Michael -- Edward Michael Adams. 15 Record should reflect the presence of representative of State, 16 defense. All members of the jury panel appear to be present. 17 Do parties stipulate to the presence of the entire jury? 18 19 MR. SCOW: Yes, Judge. 20 MR. MANINGO: Yes, sir. 21 THE COURT: All right, ladies and gentlemen, you should have all in your seats copies of the jury instructions 22 that apply to this case. As much as -- and as I explained to 23 you when we began jury selection, as much as I'd like to sit 24 down and go through with you verbally the instructions and the 25

law, they are of such importance, I've reduced them to writing.

It's my intention to read those instructions to you in a moment. The instruction packages you have you keep. You can make notes on them as you wish as we head into argument.

And take them back with you to jury deliberation. These instructions are as follows.

(Jury instructions were read but not transcribed).

THE COURT: Counsel?

STATE'S CLOSING ARGUMENT

MR. SCOW: Thank you, Judge. State of Nevada versus Edward Adams. You've heard the case, you've heard the evidence. Now it's your decision -- it's your time to make the determination what the evidence really is. Here's a summary.

Defendant, a stranger, picks up Amber Valles on the street. He takes Amber to the 1111 apartments. When he takes there, he sexually assaults her, both vaginal and anal sexual assault. She reports this immediately to her mother. And the DNA fingerprints identified the defendant as the perpetrator.

Now, keep in mind that in every criminal case the State of Nevada has to prove two things. One that crimes are committed. And two, just as important, that the defendant committed these crimes.

We have to present evidence of identification. A defense attorney standing up and say in opening statement he's the guy, that's not evidence. We have to present evidence that

this defendant committed these crimes.

What are the crimes? First degree kidnapping with use of a deadly weapon, one count. Battery with intent to commit a crime, in this case, sexual assault, one count.

Sexual assault victim under 14, with use of a deadly weapon.

There are nine counts charged. And open or gross lewdness.

This case boils down to the defendant's intent to commit sexual assault or the defendant actually committing sexual assault. That's basically what each crime, except for the last one, open or gross lewdness, is based on, the defendant intending to or actually committing sexual assault.

So as I go through the kidnapping and describe some of the elements, what it really boils down to is did he take her to that apartment to sexually assault her or was this a thrill seeking.

Amber Valles. We'll talked about that. The defense in their opening called her a thrill seeker. Why? Because it's easier. First degree kidnapping. Every person who seizes, confines, inveigles, decoys, entices, abducts, kidnaps, which that doesn't really help you because how do you define the word by using the word itself? So I didn't underline that. Or carries away any person. For what purpose? To commit sexual assault. That person is guilty of first degree kidnapping.

So let's look at some of these words, seize.

confines, inveigle. Oh, I did include kidnap here. I was trying to be real helpful there. What do some of these words mean? Inveigle, acquire or obtain by lure or flattery, artful talk or false representations. Here "I've got a gun" would be clue number one. Or two, "Help me take care of my crying babies." Each of these reasons the defendant gave to the victim was decoy, entice and he carried her away. It doesn't mean he has to pick her up over his shoulder and start walking or "We're going to this apartment because I'm going to sexually assault you." It means take her somewhere. And that's what happened in this case.

He took her, Amber Valles. Again, the purpose to commit sex assault, he took her from this area, Buffalo and Alta, down to 1111 Warbonnet Way to the 1111 apartments. Alta to Charleston, it's a pretty long walk. A full city block. She testified about 15 minutes. She wasn't sitting there with her watch counting down every minute. But about a 15 minute walk. That's probably accurate or close to it. But that's a long ways to carry somebody away to entice them.

When I get to the sex assault, there's an instruction that says you can convict of kidnapping and sexual assault certain requirements need to be met. One is that the carrying away or the movement was more than required to commit sexual assault. Well, obviously, walking her that far was more than necessary to stick his penis in her vagina.

He tells her again he's got a gun. This is the threat he uses to get her to not act crazy on the street. Is she going to test that? Well, let me try something to see if I stay alive or not. But he does that because it's broad daylight, doesn't want to make a scene. And he gives her some story about needing help with child care.

He takes her to a concealed location, an abandoned apartment that hadn't been leased for seven months. How did he know about that? There's the apartment. There's inside.

Again, exactly how she described it. There's the door, and looking there, we've got the stuff wadded in the bottom part or the receiving end of the door handle. But it can still be locked from the inside. The top bolt.

And once inside, he orders her to take off her clothes and he begins shoving his penis and fingers every where inside of her body. Does he have intent to sexual assault her when he carries her away? Of course he does. So we have seize, confine, inveigle, carry away any person, Amber Valles, purpose to commit sexual assault. Again, I'm going to talk about that more later. But all those elements are met for first degree kidnapping.

Deadly weapon. In order to use a deadly weapon, he doesn't have to shoot her with it. And according to this instruction, he doesn't even need to pull it out of his pocket. But only conduct which produces fear. Did he do that here? Of

course. She was terrified. Produces fear by means or display.

It could be displayed or other means. He had it in his pocket.

Even a passerby that, you know, it seems like he had a gun.

Maybe he was just joking with his friend Angela, but it was the thought that crossed his mind.

And you're instructed that a firearm is a deadly weapon. We're not required to, right here, recover the deadly weapon. We don't have to present it as Exhibit No. -- what are we at 101 or something? It doesn't need to be here in court in order for you to find that a deadly weapon was used.

Now, this is your call. You're the fact finders.

You're the ones that decide whether a deadly weapon was used.

He may have had a weapon. He may not. Nobody saw it, okay.

We're not trying to hide anything from you. This is your call, whether he had one or not. But he did tell her that he had one. And he did frighten her into submission. Keep that in mind.

Didn't want to struggle. Didn't want to make a scene. This again was broad daylight. So when we're looking at first degree kidnapping, all the elements are met. With use of a deadly weapon.

Turn to battery with intent to commit a crime.

Battery is any willful or unlawful use of force or violence upon the person of another. Now, battery can be spitting on somebody. It's not like you have to walk up and smack them

down and tear off their shirt and then start sexually assaulting them for battery with intent to commit sex assault. How about grabbing Amber by the hand or the wrist, leading her along the sidewalk.

And the nurse testified that Amber told her once they got to the apartment he -- he put her hand on her neck (sic). This is the evidence you consider on the battery with intent. And then he proceeds to sexually assault her. Again, everything hinges on this sexual assault and his intent. So when we look at battery with intent, those elements are satisfied.

So I told you I'd come to this instruction regarding kidnapping and sexual assault. You can find him guilty of both, but in order for you to do that you must find that one of these -- as you see there's the or there -- not all, but one of these has been met. And looking at this case, we have at least four. Physically restrained. There was an attempt, but the tape was pretty weak and she broke it right off. It's there, but is it a sufficient tying to -- to fit within the kidnapping statute? Probably, but who knows. But the other four are met. So it doesn't even matter.

The movement was not incidental. It's a sexual assault. He took her the whole city block, again, to get her to this apartment. Increased risk of harm. If she started to bolt from him, she could have been hit by a car. Any number of

things could have happened. He could have panicked and done something to her. It was substantially exceeded that required to complete the sex assault.

I mean, if he wanted to sexually assault her, why not just take her down where he finds her and start doing it?

Well, there's also independent significance for purpose to the movement. Take her to a secluded place where it can't be seen. So here there's more than enough for you to convict of both first degree kidnapping and sexual assault.

So we turn now to sexual assault with a minor under 14. Now, I've broken this down in this next slide. This is the same language of the instruction, but it's kind of breaking it down by element. First, a minor being under 14, which she was -- just barely turned 13. So that element's satisfied. To sexual penetration against the minor's will. Or that the perpetrator knew or should have known that she was mentally or physically incapable of giving the consent.

First of all, consider that she's 13 years old. That person who does those things is guilty of sexual assault on a minor under is 14. So first of all, sexual penetration. Any intrusion, however slight -- it's like a football game. When they're going to the end zone if the ball just barely crosses that end zone, it's a touchdown. Any intrusion into her vagina or her anal opening is penetration. And it spells out into the genital or anal opening of the body of another. Whether it's

his finger, fingers, his penis or anything he used. Well, you know what he used here because Amber testified to it, and there's DNA evidence proving what he used.

So the crucial question's not whether the person's physically forced. She doesn't need to be taken into that room and beaten until she's unconscious for it to be against her will. It's whether it's without her consent. If she says no -- and she testified she said no multiple times, stop, it hurts -- or under conditions in which she's mentally or physically incapable of giving consent or even understanding the nature. Again, she was 13. She'd never even kissed a boy.

Amber Valles doesn't understand the nature of this conduct. She submitted to everything he said. Even "Don't call until you get to McDonalds." And a consent of a child is a less degree than of a person of more mature years. It's different because they're children. Children are not supposed to be taken to apartments and sexual assaulted, have penises and fingers shoved into their crevasses.

The fact that the defendant may not have employed violence or expressed threats, which you have here, the fact that no violence is used upon her, that he's a Teddy bear, that doesn't matter. The fact that he gained her submission through threats or -- or looking like a 40-year-old man with nasty teeth, that's enough. This was against her will.

And she got to do more than her age or circumstances

required. She didn't have to fight him. It's a manifest opposition. Now, the reason that there are multiple counts of sexual assault is because in any single criminal encounter where multiple sexual acts take place, the perpetrator can be convicted of each act of penetration. Each time he stuck his fingers inside of her. Each time his penis went inside of her, front and back. These are different acts of sexual -- sexual acts, sex penetration in this single encounter, and that's why there are multiple charges.

Again, what does that mean? May be charged and convicted of every act of penetration, finger versus penis, vagina versus her rectum. And again, he broke it up by putting her in different positions. Taking her from the -- the ground to the couch, from the couch to the ground, leaning over the couch so he can get her from behind.

So there's nine counts that you have. And you have them in the instructions. It's instruction 3, and it's like three or four pages. Four finger and vagina, four penis and vagina, one finger or penis -- that should say "anal opening". And based on the evidence presented, you can find the defendant not guilty of counts nine and ten because she only testified three times that the finger went inside of her and three times that his penis went inside of her vagina. But she did testify about the anal penetration. So that will make counts nine and ten easy for you. Check the box "not guilty" there, and think

about the other charges.

So Amber Valles, she had just turned -- just turned 13 years old. She was a minor. Two months into being 13 years old. She testified that she did not know the defendant. He randomly selected her off the street. There's no evidence to contradict that. He was a stranger. Now think about this, he was waiting around on a wall right by a school right at the time that school gets out. Now, you know what he was waiting for, right? Some thrill seeking girl to stop by and say, "Hey, let's have sex, that sounds great." Because doesn't that happen everyday?

I mean, things like that happen, right? Little girls walk up to some grown strangers on the street and say, "What's up, dude. Let's go have sex." And then she testified about him taking her to the abandoned apartment. And she'd never been there before, and isn't that pretty obvious? Because when the detectives wanted to find where it was and she took them back, she pointed to the wrong one. She wasn't paying perfect attention to where they were going when the defendant's taking her. She probably thinking more about "I hope I get home".

So it's obvious she hadn't been there before, and we know who had. And he proceeded to subject Amber to vaginal and anal penetration again and again. And in spite of her saying, "Stop it, it hurts," and you know it hurt her because you -- you saw the pictures of the tearing inside of her vagina.

"Stop, it hurts." Whatever else is said, the minute she says that, he's crossing any line, which he crossed already because she's 13.

Counts three and four. "He told me to get on the ground," remember when they first got in? Remove her clothes. "He stuck his fingers and then his penis into my vagina." And immediately she was saying "Stop, this hurts. And it was very painful. Then he told me to sit on the couch," different position, and he did it again. Fingers and penis in her vagina, counts five and six.

Counts seven and eight, "He told me to get on the ground again." Fingers and penis in vagina. At this point she's kept saying stop, it hurts. He decided he didn't want to hear anymore, so he tried to tape her mouth with some weak tape and her wrists. It didn't hold her long as masking tape. That wasn't her decision, though. That was his.

He tried to use the tape. "And then he had me lean over the arm of the couch," count 11, "where he stuck his hand or something into my rectum." Obviously that wasn't the word she used, but subjecting her to anal penetration to top it all off.

Her testimony is alone is sufficient to find that man guilty of sexual assault. That's it. Her testimony alone. He was a stranger, she did not know him, she did not want to have sex with him. She didn't know what sex was because she'd never

had it before. She obeyed because he threatened her. She was only 13 and unable to understand the nature of defendant's conduct. That's it. Because there's in requirement that the testimony of the victim of a sexual assault be corroborated. No other evidence needs to be presented.

Her testimony alone is enough for a verdict of guilty. But here there is mountains of corroboration, what the defense wants to try to downplay and call a waste of time. Why did the State show all those slides of DNA? With him standing up and saying he's the guy. That's not evidence. And the evidence that we presented corroborates Amber Valles and what she said. DNA, fingerprints, sex assault exam, Jonathan, Angela, the scene itself, her mom.

First her mom. Amber was a good student. She never ditched school. She slept in our room for six months afterwards. She never goes anywhere alone anymore. She panics in the car and makes sure the windows are up and the doors are locked. And the 911 call, go listen to it. You can hear Amber in the background sobbing. You can hear her. It's very telling.

And then Amber keeps to herself. She keeps her body private. And I'll talk more about this later. But you heard her mom say, "If she's changing and I accidentally walk in the room, she immediately covers up and mom, get out of here." It pretty significant, and we'll talk about that.

The crime scene, corroboration. He describes a black couch. Check. Candles. Check, check. Black and white Nikes, they were there. May not have been his, but they're in the place where he took her. She assumed they were his. White towel. Check. Blue tape. Now, let's look at this blue tape. Look at the shape when the detectives found it. As if it had been wrapped a couple times around her wrists. And then broken apart. And it's still in that same shape. Do you need fingerprints on there to tell you what it was used for?

1.3

And then the one on the mouth. There's just a single strand. This one is multiple layers. Just as she described, and in the exact spot where she described it, right in that room in front of the couch on the floor. Right where she finished wiping herself off with that dirty towel.

And the defense, some of the questioning, throughout that there was tape all over that apartment. And this is one of the pictures that maybe is unclear from that overhead projector. But when you take a closer look, oh, there's some (indiscernible). There's not tape just flying everywhere. The only other place that there was tape is on a table on the patio, the -- the leaves are taped down.

The only other tape is right where Amber was sexually assaulted. He just walked in, pushed the door open and you saw the picture of the stuff jammed in the door frame. We'll throw that up again.

Angela saw Amber with a guy, not her father. Usually says hi or hugs me, and it was different that day. I'd never seen the guy before. He was holding her by the hand or wrist. Walked around the yard to avoid them on the sidewalk. He was wearing a hoody and tennis shoes. I was going to call, but didn't want to be blamed if we were wrong. That's pretty serious.

Jonathan. Gives very, very similar testimony. Guy holding her by the right arm. His hand was in his pocket like he had a gun. They walked through a yard as we pass each other. At the time we thought we should call. He was bald but had hair around his head. Something hanging over his left eyebrow. And this is all consistent with how Amber described. And again, at times where they had spoken with each other.

Amber was having her body examined by a nurse while Jonathan was at home about to eat dinner and the cops come over. He was like, "Yeah, this guy had this Band-Aid over his eye." Described him exactly as Amber did. Thought he might have had a gun. Between 190, 200 pounds. And Amber had a scared look on her face. They didn't call right away. Does that mean they didn't see what they saw?

The sex assault exam. Amy Coe took swabs, and I'm not going to put the pictures up. You have them in evidence. Her vaginal injuries and abrasion to the posterior fourchette, 6:00 o'clock. It's in the picture. You can see that. The

hymenal laceration, and this was a pretty significant tear, she said. Required some force to -- to penetrate and to tear her hymen. And again, stop, it hurts.

And then she had anal injuries. Tears at 1:00 o'clock, 11:00 o'clock and 6:00 o'clock. And there's her pants. Bleeding in her pants. She didn't even know.

Fingerprints. His prints were identified. Candles in the bedroom. Candles in the kitchen by the sink. Kitchen -- on the breakfast bar. On the sliding glass door. On the lotion packet. His prints all over there. It wasn't a one time let's find the first random apartment we can go to. He knew where this was. He'd been there. He's lighting candles in different areas in that apartment to give him light, to sleep over, maybe. He knew it was there.

There you go, different areas. Prints were lifted. The lotion pack that he used to lubricate himself and masturbate his penis in front of her. And there's the latent lifts. You have all the cards that you can go through and review.

Now, the DNA results. His sperm was on her cervix. That's the very end of the vagina. His sperm was all over her shirt, her pants. Sperm was on the white towel. Sperm was on the rectal swab. What does that mean, just that this is the guy? Is that all it means? There it is, all of it. It's all over. It means one thing, he's having his way with her. It

means the defendant's penis was going in and out of Amber's 13-year-old body.

It means a grown man, twice her age, ejaculated into not only her vagina, but also her rectum, her anal opening. It means that this little girl's first sexual encounter was with a strange man who plucked her off the street when she's on her way home from school. And it means the defendant didn't stop until he got what he wanted. Different positions, lubricated himself. It means that all these circumstances combined, the defendant sexual assaulted Amber Valles, an innocent girl who just wanted to go home.

So now sexual assault victim under 14, seven counts because she -- she didn't testify about any other penetration than the seven counts. Open or gross lewdness, masturbating penis in the direct view of a minor in an offensive manner. She testified about that, so you can check those and that one, too.

So you go back to the -- the theme of the defense opening. Thrill seeker or innocent victim? And he talked about meeting up with Cierra beforehand. So her thrill goes from I'm going to spend the night with my 13-year-old girlfriend to even better yet, let me go find some guy and have sex with him, some strange man without a condom. She may not have known exactly what that meant, but you do. So did he.

And the statement in opening that lying is easier.

Then he talked about inconsistencies. That the water's off in the apartment, but the towel was damp. A lot of questions about that. Couldn't have been run through the sink because the water was turned off. Well, would it also follow that it's impossible for there to be water in the toilet because the water had been shut off for at least seven months. Any water there would have either evaporated or turned green because there's nasty bacteria in there.

But look, there's water, clear water in the toilet.

Obviously somebody's bringing water in there. There was soap in the bathtub. Is it impossible to damp that towel? No.

Another statement in opening was we need to get in the mind of the victim, which we do. She'd just turned 13. She never had a boyfriend. She'd never even kissed a boy, let alone have sex. Wouldn't even let her mother see her undressed, let alone some strange man sitting on the corner. That's the last thing she would have wanted.

Does that mean some random twice her age and within minutes, let's go have sex (indiscernible). There was no conversation. He took her, said let's go (indiscernible). She was sexually assaulted by a strange man with nasty teeth. There's the real thrill seeker, the defendant, Edward Adams, whose DNA is all over inside of Amber Valles' vagina, her anus.

This man sexually assaulted her. Make no mistake about that. Hold him responsible for his actions what he did

to Amber. The pain he caused her. And find him guilty of the charges as I've outlined for you. Thank you very much.

THE COURT: Counsel.

DEFENSE CLOSING ARGUMENT

MR. MANINGO: Bad decisions, a very bad situation.

That's what this case is about. But it's not about bad people.

And the people we're talking about in this case are both Amber and Ed Adams. Now, talking about Amber first. No one at any time has ever tried to convince you that Amber is a horrible, evil conniving little girl. Instead, it's that she's a teenager.

The thing about teenagers is they don't understand consequences, whether it's for actions taken on a specific day or for something that happens down the road. That's why we make them take a test before they can drive, we don't let them vote until a certain age, we don't let them drink alcohol. It's because we know as a community that teenagers don't understand consequences.

Now, when it's on that day in December of 2007 where she ended up getting wrapped up into a situation, not understanding the consequences of what she may have said or did or whether we flash forward to just a few days ago and it's her it telling a story about no doubt what she wants to believe the way it happened, but didn't. We don't expect Amber to understand those consequences.

The other person involved, of course, is Edward

Adams. He was 25 years old at the time. He told you right

from the beginning that his decision was bad to be involved in
this.

And now, at the end of this trial you're given a charge. And you'll see it when you go back and look at your packet. And it's in instruction number 19, and it's on your verdict form, but it's called statutory sexual seduction. And it means ordinary sexual intercourse, anal intercourse or any other sex you mean penetrated -- penetration committed by a person 21 years of age or older with a consenting person under the age of 16 years old. That is the instruction and it's -- like I said, it's on your verdict form now as another option.

We told you that that was the charge and that Mr. Adams was guilty of that from the very beginning. Never hid the ball on that. What happens throughout the trial, then, is that the real issue, the issue of consent, gets buried under a mountain of evidence that goes to identification. Do you need to have fingerprints from every square inch of that room when you already know that Ed Adams was there, when you already know that Amber was there?

Do you need to see a photo line up over and over and over to tell you yeah, that guy number five, that's Ed Adams when three days ago we already told you that guy, Ed Adams, was there? Do you need experts to come in and talk about how they

lifted fingerprints, how they analyzed fingerprints, how they took swabs for DNA, and then we send them to labs? And all of it goes to show one great big point that it's Ed Adams. Big surprise. We already knew all of that.

So when it comes to the issue of consent, the only real issue in this trial, were left with very little. But we have to look at the surrounding circumstances of what was going on on that day. Now, it's probably safe to imagine that the first time you heard anyone, and it was probably me, mention the word consent in this case, you probably cringed. A natural reaction.

Let's talk about consent just for a few minutes.

This is not so some TV show or some movie where I'm standing up yelling at a 13-year-old saying, "You know you wanted it, you got what you deserved." That's -- that's not this situation.

That's not this case. That's not what's happening. Consent is nothing more than an agreement. It doesn't have to be a smart agreement, an educated agreement. It can be a can dumb decision. It can be something that you regret later on. But that's the thing, later on.

Consent comes before an encounter. Consent comes during the encounter. Now, after the encounter when you're walking home and your mom calls and you feel shame or you feel guilt or you feel regret or you realize you've done something that if you go back in time you would take back, that doesn't

go and get reasserted to the beginning of the encounter. It doesn't become non-consensual then.

We know now that this is something that Amber didn't want. And we're not trying to say she did want it. In fact, it's -- it's more likely she had no idea what she was agreeing to, what she was getting into. But we know that what she really doesn't want is this regret and this shame that she probably feels now. And it's two years later. She's looking back at when she's 13.

It's -- it's likely that Amber really wants to believe that it was forced. It's easier to believe that it was forced. If you think about something long enough and hard enough, you can just about convince yourself that it's true.

Now, when it comes to consent, you have another instruction, which is instruction number 16. And it reads that, "It is a defense to the charge of sexual assault that the defendant entertained a reasonable and good faith belief that the female person voluntarily consented to engage in sexual intercourse. If from all the evidence you have a reasonable doubt whether the -- whether the defendant reasonably and in good faith believed she voluntarily consented to engage in sexual intercourse, you must give the defendant the benefit of the doubt and find him not guilty of said charge."

Well, that's the issue in this trial. I told you from the beginning and Mr. Scow has quoted a number of things

that I said in the beginning and one of them was that this is not a who done it. That's the issue for this -- for this case. And you've heard now that a 25-year-old man engaged in sexual intercourse with a 13-year-old. Do you like that idea? Are you comfortable with it? Does it feel right to you? Of course not.

But this is the not a court of ethics. This is not a court of morality. This is a court of law. This is a special place and it has special rules. One of those rules is that you must maintain the fact that Mr. Adams is innocent unless the State can prove beyond a reasonable doubt the contrary. Another one of those special rules is that if you're going to do the accusing, you have to do the proving in these cases. That means the State, Mr. Hendricks and Mr. Scow, they have to prove each and every element of each and every charge in this case. And they have to do is beyond a reasonable doubt. You can't have any reasonable doubts.

Well, think about the case. Think about the evidence that you heard. And then you ask yourself if you have any questions, anything that makes you sort of scratch your head and wonder about.

Well, we can start with Andre Randle. Here we have a young man who's an independent witness in this case. He's not tied to anybody in this case. He doesn't know anyone. But he lives in the area. He lives in the 1111 Apartments. We

referred to him for the first half of the trial as the -- the young black male adult because that's all we knew about him because that's an all that was placed in the police report.

Detective Lebario, for whatever reason, decided to exclude his name in the report, didn't list who it was.

1.8

But we found out what he did say and things that were taken down -- notes taken down by Detective Lebario at the time. And what did Andre Randle tell you? He saw two people, they were walking together. They weren't touching. She wasn't being dragged. She didn't look mad. She wasn't in distress. They looked normal. And what did he say? He didn't make anything of it.

We also asked him, if you saw somebody dragging a girl crying into an apartment that you know is vacant, what would you do? He said he'd call the police. But he didn't. Compare that to Amber's testimony that from the very beginning of this situation she was crying, she was shaking and she was very emotional.

Let's talk about that for a minute and see if it makes sense. A man is going to abduct a young girl. So the first thing he does is make sure he doesn't have a car. He's going to grab her in the middle of the day at 2:30 in the afternoon in broad daylight, and he's going to walk her a mile, which takes 15 to 20 minutes, in a part of town, if you've ever been there, Charleston, Alta, Buffalo, where there is a lot of

traffic, a lot of pedestrians, a lot of businesses. So he takes her, he's dragging her and this just goes on for 15, 20 minutes, and the whole time he's dragging her, he's doing one of these with -- with this mystery gun that we never see. And she's emotional this whole time.

And not a single person in the area, not a single business sees anything wrong. No one with walks up to them, say, "Hey, what's happening, what's going on?" No one makes a phone call? A crowd doesn't gather, nothing? I guess you have a couple of choices of what you can believe. You can believe that number one, that that is complete nonsense as to what happened. Or you can believe that our community is completely heartless and thoughtless and is willing to just watch a young girl be abducted and have this go on for 20 minutes.

This isn't all set up by Mr. Adams. Think about the horrible planning. You grab someone that far away from where you're going to go. Now, I mentioned that there's a number much businesses, busy locations all along the way. Amber never, you know, yells out to anyone for help or anything like that. No one volunteers any help. You heard Detective Lebario say there were no 911 calls recorded during that time in reference to anything going on in that area.

But they also -- there's -- there's video cameras on a number of these businesses. At the Sinclair's gas station, at the 7-Eleven, at the McDonalds. And Detective Lebario went

out to do his job and check out these videos. And there's nothing that he came across that identifies Mr. Adams and -- and Amber together, nothing. At least nothing that shows or backs up Amber's story of being grabbed, crying and shaking down the street.

There's -- talking about the people ignoring what's going on. We also have Angela, the young girl who testified, who said she's a friend of Amber's. And her testimony was a little bit different from what she had originally told Detective Lebario. According to it Detective Lebario when he interviewed Angela, she said, Well, it seemed that he was -- the man was walking fast and Amber was actually trying to keep up with him and was behind him and that they weren't touching and he wasn't grabbing her. That's what appears in his report.

Now, when she testifies she says, "Well, he -- he did have her by the hand or the wrist and they -- they walked up into this other property. But I didn't make anything of it."

Those were her words. Didn't make anything of it. She had a cell phone. This was a friend of hers in school. She sees her, knows it's not her dad. Never does anything? Doesn't go back to the school and tell a teacher? Doesn't call 911?

Doesn't call her own mom and say I think there's something weird going on, just nothing at all.

The guy with her, Jonathan Cerboni, you heard him testify also. And he says, oh, Amber looked scared. Amber

looked scared. And -- and I think maybe the guy had a gun. This is what he says, of course, after the police show up at his house and informed him as to why they're there and what they're looking into and investigating. And now all of a sudden, his story is, oh, she was scared and I think he had a gun. Well, you know what, if she was really looking that scared and -- and he really believed that Mr. Adams had a gun, then why didn't he do anything?

What was his answer? What was his response? I forgot. Is that just something you for get if it's really that serious? If that's really what you're witnessing, do you like, no exaggeration, within a minute, just forget it, forget about it and then keep messing around with your friends and head on home? That doesn't make any sense either.

If the scene was happening and developing the way that Amber told it, someone would have said something. Someone would have noticed something. Someone would have done something.

We have the gun issue. Despite the hundreds of slides and pictures you've seen, you never saw anything about a gun. He's charged with using a gun. No gun was ever found at the scene. No gun was ever found on his person. No gun, no gun, no gun, no gun. There was no gun.

We received the very insightful question from somewhere in the jury about was anything tested for gun

residue. Maybe the couch where supposedly he hid something under a cushion. Maybe clothing. Was anything tested to see if there was any kind of residue or -- or gunpowder or anything like that? No. No. They just want you to take their word for it. That's not how to works, though. You gotta have proof.

The tape issue is another one. This is what the State relies on to -- to really sort of drive home the point that force was used. But think about this situation. First of all, even the detective makes mention of the fact when he finds this tape, he looks at it and it seems very weak, very frail. It's painter's tape. It's not duct tape or electrical tape. It tears very easily. And then Amber's story is that this man's abducting her, wraps up her hands with tape, wraps her mouth with tape. Amber's response is, she pulls her hands apart, breaks the tape, takes the tape off her mouth.

And then, I guess, this person who's forcibly trying to tie her down just says, nah, I gave it a shot and just forgets about it? Doesn't take any of the clothing that's laying around to wrap her up that way. Doesn't take any of the clothing that's laying around or that towel or anything else and try and gag her or -- or -- or put something in her mouth. None of those things done. Just I'll give it a shot one time with some tape. It didn't work. That doesn't make any sense. That's not what really happened.

And then this tape that they rely on, what's even

more interesting about it is, wow, they did DNA and they did fingerprints and all of that on pretty much everything in that entire apartment, even these old shoes and everything else, except for the tape. Except for the tape. There must have been at least three or four questions from the jury about was the tape tested, was any skin or hair found on the tape? They didn't even check it other than they did check it for the DNA, but they found nothing. No DNA profile. Negative for semen. Didn't check the adhesive part. Proof beyond a reasonable doubt. That's the standard. And yet, you're left with these question marks.

Amber's mother testified and, you know, wow, that's -- that's a compelling witness and a disturbing and a sad witness. That's completely honest. This woman was terrified.

No doubt. No doubt. She was terrified. She -- she was worried about her daughter. But all we know as far as evidentiary value, the only thing she can really provide -- I mean, she can talk about lots of things that happened afterwards. But the only thing we really know from her is that when this event concluded, she's the one who called Amber.

This encounter ends in this apartment and Amber leaves. Amber walks down the stairs. Mr. Adams is still in the apartment. She's got her cell phone with the battery in it. Well, that right there doesn't seem to make a lot of sense. Why would someone kidnap a person by force, commit

these kinds of acts on this person and then at the end of it say, "Here you go, here's your cell phone and the battery and leave? Go ahead, you leave. I'll stay here at the scene."

But according to Amber that's what happened. So Amber leaves. She walks down the stairs, doesn't call her mom, doesn't call 911. She gets out on the street, doesn't call her mom, doesn't call 911. She begins walking to McDonalds. She's halfway there, still hasn't called her mom or called 911. It's her mom that has to call her and get ahold of her. And her mom was panicked. Her mom's upset. Amber herself had said at a prior hearing and again here at trial and to the detective that yes, she thought her mom was mad. Can you blame her mom? She's frightened.

These are the points -- these are the things you look at when trying to make sense of this. And you say, well, did this happen the way Amber says it did, or do I have a reasonable doubt? Are any of these things reasonable to think about? Do any of these questions, you know, make you uneasy about this? And when I'm finished, Mr. Hendricks will get a chance to stand up, and no matter how angry or how loud or how many times the word rape is used, or how many times the word virgin is used, it doesn't excuse those doubts. It doesn't fill in those missing pieces.

This -- this is a -- a difficult case. And you have the hardest job in the building. It's -- you know, the bottom

line is, you hold a real person's fate in your hands. We've heard for three days, you know, reference to defendant, and we've got a little name plate on there on our table. But Ed Adams is a real human being. And you -- you saw some of that when you saw two of his sisters and -- and a friend of the family get up on the stand. And it was very limited as to what they talked about. But they basically told you that they are people who know Ed Adams and have known him. And he's not the monster that the State is trying to paint him out to be.

MR. HENDRICKS: And Judge, I'm going to object. I -I -- the State has never stated that he's a monster.

THE COURT: Sustained.

MR. HENDRICKS: I'd move to strike it.

THE COURT: Sustained.

MR. MANINGO: You heard from these people about his character. And that's whose decision, or decisions that you have control of now. It's been said many times that rarely is doing the right thing the same as doing the easy thing. And this is a very good example of that.

It's very easy to get swept up with emotion, to get swept up with sympathy, to get swept up with -- with outrage. But you can't just do the easy thing. You have to do the right thing and you have to look at all this evidence that you've spent all this time and all this attention on.

You have to see whether or not you have reasonable

doubts in there. And then when you do, we ask you to do the right thing. And we're not asking you to go through that verdict form and just mark not guilty on everything, not at all. We're asking you to mark guilty on all seven counts there of sexual assault. You have the option of the statutory sexual seduction, and we ask that you mark those.

But there was no kidnap. There was no gun involved or any deadly weapon for that matter. And there was no sexual assault. We trust what you will do the right thing. And we thank you for your time. And we thank you for your attention.

THE COURT: Rebuttal.

STATE'S REBUTTAL CLOSING ARGUMENT

MR. HENDRICKS: Thank you, Judge. My first time.

Most adults have a story to tell about their first time, their first sexual experience. For 13-year-old Amber Valles her first time story gets to start out with a kidnapping, an abduction, taken to a vacant apartment and raped vaginally and anally. How about that for a first time.

What do we know about her? She's 13 years old, she's a virgin. I've never even kissed a boy. Complete and total stranger, this man, Mr. Adams, who she described as being dirty looking, older and unattractive to her. Her dream date, her first time, that's what she wanted.

Now, that's what defense counsel would have you believe, that Amber walking out of school that day, December

14th, decided that her first time was going to be with this guy, someone she had never even met. That's what you have to believe in order to go along with what defense counsel is proposing to you. And I'd suggest to you that that's not how it happened.

Now, if we're looking at this first time, what are we looking at? We're looking at setting. First time for this 13-year-old is a stranger's apartment. Sounds like a romantic place. How about a vacant burned out water damaged apartment? Sounds nice. No furniture inside of there. Of course, no bed. But he did light some candles just to add to the mood. She's thrown down on a dirty floor and on a dirty couch. And this was all Amber's idea because she wanted this to be her first time in this setting. It was her bad decision. She's the one who was a thrill seeker.

How about the timing? It's easy to throw out that this was all consensual. Real easy to say that, but let's start asking some questions. She's headed home from school, my mom's expecting right now. She had just spoken with her father, Joseph Valles, said, yeah, I'm going to head home. Think about it, how long is this going to take, this wonderful first time sexual experience? Ever think about that? Amber didn't. Why? Because she wasn't consenting to anything. She wasn't part of this guy's plans.

How about where are we going to walk? To this vacant

apartment? Did she have any idea in hell where she was going?

Of course not. She was being led there and dragged there, as
the other witnesses told you. How am I going to get home? Was
that conversation ever had between Amber Valles and this guy?

Of course it wasn't.

Now, in regards to evidence of consent. And before we get to these non-consensual acts, let's talk about that for a minute. Now, I was going to put up a slide in regards to evidence of consent in this case. But there wasn't any. What piece of evidence did you hear --

MR. MANINGO: I'm going to object. It's starting to sound a little bit like burden shifting at this point, Judge.

THE COURT: Objection's noted.

MR. HENDRICKS: And Judge --

THE COURT: Counsel, argument.

MR. HENDRICKS: -- absolutely. The burden's going to be on the State beyond a reasonable doubt on each and every charge. But what piece of evidence was presented in this courtroom that said that this was consensual sex? I would submit to you there was nothing. Look through all of these exhibits, the hundred exhibits, and try and find one piece of evidence that says this was consensual. Go back and think about everyone that's testified. Did any of those witnesses --

MR. MANINGO: I'm going to object, and I'm sorry, Mr. Hendricks. And ask to approach, please.

THE COURT: Approach.

(Off-record bench conference).

THE COURT: Objection's noted. Closing argument, Counsel.

MR. HENDRICKS: Zero. Zero. Now, Mr. Maningo is a very talented attorney, and you saw that in this courtroom. He's a very experienced attorney. But what he says to you and what he suggest to you in regards to consent is not evidence. The evidence you are to consider is what you heard as far as testimony and what you saw as far as exhibits. And the Judge reminded you of that.

Now, Mr. Maningo also said that Mr. Adams is a real human being. He is a real human being. He's a real human being who made some real bad decisions. Now, of course, Mr. Maningo says Amber made some bad decisions. I would submit to you there was only one person who was allowed to make decisions that day, and that was Mr. Adams.

When did Amber have a decision in what was going to happen to her? When she was threatened? When she was grabbed? When she was told, "I've got a gun and I'll kill you if you talk?" What 13-year-old thinks they have a decision to make when they're approached with that circumstance? One person made bad decisions, and that's the man that sits before you here today. "I'll kill you, shut up," and the rapes began.

When did this consensual agreement that they were

going to head off and have sex take place? Must have taken place in 10 to 15 minutes and they agreed to go somewhere to this place where she knew nothing about, but you know who did. And we'll get to that later.

Mr. Maningo talked about no evidence -- well, in regards to a car. If he was making such a great plan, why didn't he have a car? Well, there was no evidence to suggest he either had a car or did not have a car, right? What we need -- what we do know is evidence that he told her that he had a gun. Why do you need a car when you got a gun? Just walk up and tell a child, "I've got a gun, if you scream, I'm going to kill you."

What else do we know about his planning? Think about it, where is he at? He's sitting outside a junior high school. What in the hell is doing there during the day? He's not at work. He's not at school. He's not at home. He's sitting outside a junior high school. That's part of his plan. Why do you sit outside a junior high school? Because that's where kids come out. And it's a hell of lot easier to kidnap a kid, tell her you're going it kill her and then rape her. That's why the law says different circumstances for children when you look at sexual assault victims. That's his plan.

Think about it, he's waiting outside a junior high school, threatens her with a gun and goes to this apartment.

And what do we know about this apartment? He's been there

before. And how do you know he's been there before? Because he knew exactly where it was. He didn't just drag her around all afternoon long looking for a place to sexually assault her. He headed right to a vacant apartment where he did not live, but he had been there before. He had been all over that apartment because the fingerprints told you. The DNA was left all over there too, wasn't it?

Let's talk about these non-consensual acts, these things that this 13-year-old just couldn't wait to have happen to her. Mr. Maningo suggested it was all consensual. Please jam your fingers inside of me so that it causes pain, abrasions and tearing. Please don't stop. Put your penis in me. Don't do it once. Please do it twice. How about a third time with your fingers and please three times with your penis, too. Does that that sound like consent? No.

What did you hear from Amber Valles? It hurt. It caused me pain. Stop, please, stop, you're hurting me. Does that sound like consensual sex? That bad decision, this romantic meeting, she was going to have this -- with this guy she had just met a few minutes earlier.

But the topper, when you're done with my vagina, could you go ahead and put your fingers or your penis in my anus, please? That sounds like consensual sex from a 13-year-old. And if I'm fighting back, you know what, there's some S and M fantasy that I've got going here, could you go

ahead and put tape over my mouth and go ahead and put some tape around my wrists?

This is what defense counsel is suggesting to you, that all of this was a consensual act. Consensual sex is not supposed to be painful.

When we talk about this consent, what did Amber have to endure once she told her mother exactly what happened? She had to tell mom, obviously, and she did immediately. She told her friends because they wondered what had happened to her. She's interrogated by a detective. She's questioned by a nurse. She has a medical exam of her entire body, including some glamour shots of her vagina and her anus. It sounds like a fun consensual time. That's what she had to endure because of this man's actions.

She had to testify at a preliminary hearing. She was subjected to cross-examination. She had to testify in front of you folks about everything that took place to her. And you never heard once from that young lady that it was consensual. And you know what? Had she come in at any point, this was all consensual, I made it all up, we're not here. That didn't happen.

In regards to deadly weapon, Mr. Maningo brought up up this weapon, this mysterious weapon or whatever he called it. You hear Mr. Scow talk about the jury instruction that talks about a deadly weapon, and I'll repeat it. In order to

use, in quotes, a deadly weapon, there need not be conduct which actually produces harm. That means you don't have to shoot it. You don't have to beat her with it. But only, only conduct which produces a fear of harm or force.

What did he do? "I've got a gun inside of his hoody pocket, and if you scream or run I'm going to kill you. I've got a gun." He said those words. The defendant said those words, and they worked pretty good, didn't they? She didn't run because she was in fear of something happening to her, and she told you that from the witness stand. Yes, a firearm was used, according to the evidence, according to the law, and it should be according to your verdict, a firearm was used.

It also says the State is not required to have recovered the deadly weapon. In this particular case, he was not arrested until January 12th, almost a month later. The only place that was processed was that crime scene. The gun was not located there. So you don't know whether the gun was — well, it obviously was removed from there. You don't know where the gun was. But it doesn't matter because the State is not obligated with our burden to produce the gun, recover the gun or bring it in here. You can still find him guilty of using a deadly weapon. That's what the law tells you and at the end of this argument, that's what I'm going to ask you to do.

Physical force. Mr. Maningo suggested on a number of

occasions, well, Amber, you weren't beat up, you didn't have marks to your face. Why would he have had to done that? He didn't because he threatened her with a gun. And that was enough for a kid, and he knew that. It's awful easy to kidnap and rape a kid and threaten her, which is why he was waiting outside a junior high school for a 13-year-old.

Physical force is not, is not, according to the law, a necessary ingredient in the commission of sexual assault. The crucial question is not whether the victim was physically forced to engage in sexual assault, but whether the act was exhibited without her consent. Once again, where's the slide that shows any evidence of consent? Mr. Maningo suggests to you there must have been consent because she wasn't beaten up, there weren't any marks on her or anything like that. There doesn't have it be physical force.

The instruction goes on to tell you, there is no consent where the victim is induced to submit to the sexual act through fear or death or serious bodily injury. And isn't that what we have in this case, fear? "I've got a gun, I'll kill you, don't say anything, shut up." Right here, that's what the law says.

She was induced to do these things through threats and through fear. He didn't have to beat her up, once again, because she was a 13-year-old.

He also in instruction 16, is the defense to a charge

of sexual assault the defendant entertained a reasonable and good faith belief that the female person voluntarily consented. How could anyone in their right mind think that it was a reasonable and good faith belief that you're having consensual sex when it starts out with a stranger that you grab by the arm, tell her you got a gun, tell her you you're going to kill her if she says anything, force her into a vacant apartment and then rape her over and over again? What reasonable person would believe that that was consensual?

The first time she says, no, don't do it, don't do it, stop, please, you're hurting me, wasn't consensual then neither. Stop, please you're hurting me. The second time when he's sticking something in her butt, stop hurting me. When he's trying to put tape over her mouth. What part of that is consensual? How could any reasonable person believe that that was a consensual act?

Think about these bad decisions, this thrill seeker thing when she is picked up from the McDonalds or the Sinclair. What did mom tell you? She didn't have on her bra, and I noticed that immediately. She didn't have on her t-shirt, and she always wore a t-shirt under her clothes, and I noticed that immediately.

She's a smart kid, her mom told you that. If she thought she was going to be in trouble for being an hour late, why not just say, I'm sorry, I lost track of time. Mom, please

for give me. I went over to Cierra's house, I hung out with my friend Jonathan, I hung out with someone? I went over to the 7-Eleven, I went over to the McDonalds. One hour she has to account for. I'm sorry, mom, my phone wasn't working, the battery went dead, and it's done. That's it. But what doesn't make sense -- I mean, she could have done that.

If she really had this consensual sexual encounter with this guy, why would she tell anyone? If it was really consensual, don't you think that she would have put other bra back on before seeing mom? Putting her t-shirt back on before seeing her mom? If it's consensual and no one wants to know about it, no one is going to find out about it, don't you put your clothes back on? No. She grabbed her clothes, threw them in her backpack and got out of there thankfully because this man said, you can go, but don't use your phone until you reach at least McDonalds.

Why would Mr. Adams care about letting her go? How is he associated with that apartment? How she's going to be able to identify him? Didn't know his name. Didn't know anything about him, except for he had a yucky mouth, bald head, 25 to 45 years of age. Didn't know the name. He obviously didn't live there. There aren't going to go to the apartment records and say Apartment 204, this guy, Ed Adams. Why would he care? He didn't. Go, I'm not associated with this apartment. You don't know what the hell I am. That's why she

was allowed to leave.

Unfortunately for him she told. And unfortunately for him his fingerprints were left there. Unfortunately for him his DNA was left there. They did find out where it took place and he was apprehended. And think about this, about all the people, if she, as Mr. Maningo stated, lied about this whole thing, think about all the people that she had to have fooled.

Won't even mention all of them, but think about the two most important people that she must have fooled. Mom and dad. She must have fooled them if she was really lying. And boy, this lie continued on for six months when she dragged heir mattress and slept at the foot of their bed for six months. She should win some sort of award for that if, according to Mr. Maningo's words, she was lying. Boy did it last for a long time. It's continued onto this day, hasn't it?

Or, it really happened to her. You're the judges of that. And as Mr. Scow pointed out to you, you can convict him based upon her testimony alone, if you believe her beyond a reasonable doubt. But of course, you don't have to just rely on her testimony alone.

One jury instruction, I believe it's 28. Common sense tells you that a 13-year-old virgin does not agree to have sex with a complete stranger in a vacant apartment what she is due home from middle school. One of the instructions

says use your common sense. This isn't mysterious. These are facts presented to you and you're the trier of fact.

So which version of events makes sense? That this was agreed upon, put into place, a plan between these two, that somehow that they were going to go off to this vacant apartment and have a romantic good sexual time or that she was kidnapped and raped? Which one makes sense? Use your common sense.

Amber's version of events is all corroborated. And Mr. Scow went through all of that with you, every bit, down to the DNA, down to the fingerprints, down to the tape, and actually how the tape looks, the two pieces of tape. One this long to go over the mouth and one that was bound up and then torn. Even down to those little simple details. All of Amber's testimony is corroborated, every bit it.

Now, defendant was left with no option but to claim that it was consensual.

MR. MANINGO: I'm going to object to as to counsel commenting on my client's right to a defense.

THE COURT: Sustained.

MR. HENDRICKS: He talked about consistencies and corroboration. Angela and Jonathan said that he was held by arm or wrists being dragged, scared look on her face, taken up into a yard to avoid them, his hand was in his pocket. Why, if this was consensual, Amber's idea, why did this man, according to two separate witnesses, nope, three, including Amber, have

to take Amber up into a yard to avoid them? Does that sound like a consensual agreement? Hey, we're just strolling along headed off to have a fun time. Independent witnesses that saw what happened that day.

The apartment. Black couch, the blue tape. I've talked about that. The dirty towels, the candles, the lotion. Do you think she, Amber, as a 13-year-old had any idea about fingerprints, DNA, sexual assault exams or anything else? When she went in and gave her first statement that day, we didn't have any of it. But amazingly everything she said was corroborated by all of the evidence, everything.

The medical exam showed damages to the exact areas that she described, or were those self-inflicted wounds or were those wounds inflicted by this man? Mother described how her child was crying, sobbing, and upset. If she was lying, she must have once again, fooled mom.

As I've talked about, the fingerprints matched up, the DNA matched up to her testimony. Now, Mr. Maningo stood up in opening statement and said, Mr. Scow and I are going to be wasting our time. He said that, not me. Keep in mind the bottom line there, the burden is on the State to prove all charges beyond a reasonable doubt. That's our burden. We have it. Just us. They don't have to do a thing.

Now, think about this, if we don't call any witnesses in regards to identifying this man, what option does the

defense now have? It was not the defendant, right? 1 fingerprints evidence was not presented, what option does 2 defense counsel have? Well, the defendant was never inside of 3 4 that apartment, right? 5 If we don't put on the DNA evidence, if that's not presented, then what option is left with defense counsel? 6 could say the defendant never had vaginal or anal intercourse 7 with the victim. It's our burden and we proved this case 8 beyond a reasonable doubt. We proved with the identifications. 10 We proved with the fingerprint. We proved it with the DNA, 11 each and every one of those counts. 12 Now, what -- what was the only option left to defense 13 counsel in this particular case? 14 MR. MANINGO: I'm going to object. This is -- we're getting into the same thing regarding commentary on the 15 16 defense. 17 THE COURT: No commentary on the defense, Counsel. 18 MR. HENDRICKS: It's a defense they presented, Judge, 19 based upon the evidence. 20 THE COURT: No burden shifting. 21 MR. HENDRICKS: But I'm saying -- I'm not. 22 THE COURT: Okay. 23 MR. HENDRICKS: I've clearly stated --24 THE COURT: The objection's noted for the record. 25 MR. HENDRICKS: Okay.

THE COURT: This is closing argument.

MR. HENDRICKS: I've clearly stated to the jury that they didn't have to present anything. But Mr. Maningo suggested to you there was no evidence of it, zero evidence of it. But he suggested to you that this was all consensual, which then results in, please find my client guilty of the statutory sexual seductions and not the sexual assaults. That's what Mr. Maningo suggested to you because his client's DNA was inside of the this little girl, this 13-year-old girl. That's the option that was left available to defense counsel.

Now, in this particular case there was overwhelming evidence, and we had gone through this, in regards to Amber's description and identification, Jonathan's description,

Angela's description and identification. And in regards to Angela, you heard Mr. Maningo talk about the detective saying, oh, yeah, Angela that -- that Amber was following trying to keep up. I showed Angela her statement, her written statement.

And I said, "Please, Angela, look on your statement and find the one spot that says Amber was following the defendant." She said, "It's not in there because I never said it." And she testified that she was being held -- Amber was being held by the wrist, her arm and being dragged off with the defendant.

The fingerprints at the crime scene, the DNA on the shirt, DNA on the pants, vaginal swabs, cervical swab, rectal and anus swab.

Now, I'm almost done. Defense counsel had asked Amber when she was on the stand, "Amber, let me ask you, did this defendant take anything from you?" She said no. Really? The defendant took nothing from this 13-year-old girl? I would submit to you that he took this child's innocence. Took this young girl's special gift. Took this young girl's ability to sleep in her own room at night. Took this young girl's ability to go anywhere alone.

This man that sits before you today took those things. They were not given to him. This was not consensual. There is zero evidence that this was consensual. He took these things from that young girl. I would ask you to tell him that, that he took these things. They were not given to him. And I would ask that that be reflected in your verdict. Guilty verdicts in regards to the kidnapping with deadly weapon, the counts of sexual assault with a minor under 14 years of age with a deadly weapon, battery with intent to commit sexual assault with a deadly weapon, and also open or gross lewdness. Thank you.

THE COURT: The clerk will now swear officers to take charge of the jury. Ladies and gentlemen, in this case, as in all cases, there's alternate jurors. Ms. Laba and Mr. Carter, you are the alternate jurors in this case. You'll meet Diane, my JEA. She's going to have some specific instructions for you.

The balance of the panel will retire to consider your verdict after we've sworn Officer Reichert to take charge.

(Swearing the officer).

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, follow Officer Reichert.

(Jurors retire to deliberate at 4:31 p.m.)

(Outside the presence of the jury).

THE COURT: Record should reflect we're outside the presence of the jury. Any additional record need to be made as a consequence of closing argument, State?

MR. HENDRICKS: Judge, I've got a few comments. In regards to defense counsel, in State's opinion, inappropriate objections. Some of my closing argument was in response to Mr. Maningo's statement in opening statement stating that the State is just wasting their time. In the State's opinion, that would clearly be disparaging us, disparaging our strategy, and I think that I had a right to respond to that, and I did in rebuttal argument.

We have to explain to a jury why we are presenting evidence of evidence of fingerprints, why we are presenting evidence of identification, why we are presenting evidence of DNA evidence in this particular case. And once again, defense counsel said we're just wasting everyone's time. I certainly didn't suggest that Mr. Maningo when he stood up and started talking he was wasting everyone's time. He did that to the State.

Had I not explained that we have the burden of proof to prove every count beyond a reasonable doubt, had I not gone through and proved up our counts beyond a reasonable doubt, then, of course, what would have happened? Mr. Maningo would have stood up and said, you know what, they didn't even prove identification, they didn't even prove anything about fingerprints, they didn't prove anything about DNA evidence, they didn't prove my client did anything, and now I'm entitled to a verdict of not guilty on each and every count.

I think the State has a -- a right to respond to disparaging comments by defense counsel, and I clearly did that. He was left with one defense, and it's not like I was doing anything mysterious or making it up. He presented that defense, that it was consent. He chose that based upon the evidence that he had presented to him, and that's all I suggested to the jury.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Maningo, any response?

MR. MANINGO: No.

THE COURT: Any additional record need to be made on your side as a consequence of closing argument?

MR. MANINGO: No.

THE COURT: All right. Gentlemen, provide your numbers to the clerk. As soon as we hear something back from the jury -- I was sitting here rereading the McGuire (phonetic) decision, which is kind of the -- and all its progeny. It's

dozen of cases that the supreme court has addressed issue on.

I heard attorneys argue forcefully on both sides the law and the facts of this case, as presented by the witnesses. No motion for mistrial as a consequence of that. So the record is what it is. So give your numbers to the clerk, and we'll be in touch.

MR. HENDRICKS: Do you know how long you're going to keep them, Judge?

THE COURT: Yeah, they're going to work. They're going to work as long as they want to work. Does any -- is there any concern on either side that Exhibit 6 and 7 might pose or should not, for some reason, go back to the jury? Do you care?

THE CLERK: If they open it, then (indiscernible).

THE COURT: We'll they're marked -- frankly, they're marked as exhibits, they're admitted as exhibits. There's no biohazard indication on the outside of the envelope, so I think they should all go back as evidence. It goes back. All right.

(Court recessed at 4:37 p.m. until 6:35 p.m.)

(In the presence of the jury)

THE MARSHAL: Jury's present, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you. This is C-241003, State of Nevada, Plaintiff, v. Edward Michael Adams. The record should reflect the presence of representatives of the State, defense, all members of the jury panel appear to be present. Do the

parties stipulate to the presence of the entire panel? 1 2 MR. SCOW: Yes, Judge. 3 MR. MANINGO: Yes, sir. THE COURT: Ms. Clayton, I saw you walk in with the 4 Verdict form. Are you the foreperson of this jury? 5 6 JUROR NO. 7: Yes, sir. 7 THE COURT: Has this jury reached a verdict? 8 JUROR NO. 7: Yes, sir. THE COURT: Would you hand the verdict form to the 9 10 Bailiff, please? 11 The Clerk will now read the Verdict. 12 THE CLERK: Okay. In the matter of District Court --13 THE COURT: Please rise, Mr. Adams. 14 THE CLERK: -- Clark County, Nevada, the State of Nevada, Plaintiff, vs. Edward Michael Adams, Defendant, Case 15 No. 241003, in Department 18. Verdict. 16 17 We, the jury in the above entitled case, find the defendant, Edward Michael Adams, as follows: 18 Count 1, first degree kidnapping with use of a deadly 19 weapon, Guilty of first degree kidnapping. 20 21 Count 2, battery with intent to commit sexual assault with use of a deadly weapon; guilty of battery with intent to 22 23 commit sexual assault. 24 Count 3, sexual assault with a minor under 14 years of age with use of a deadly weapon; guilty of sexual assault. 25

1 Count 4, sexual assault with a minor under 14 years of age with use of a deadly weapon; Guilty of sexual assault. 2 3 Count 5, sexual assault with a minor under 14 years of age with use of a deadly weapon; Guilty of sexual assault. 4 5 Count 6, sexual assault with a minor under 14 years 6 of age with use of a deadly weapon; Guilty of sexual assault. 7 Count 7, sexual assault with a minor under 14 years of age with use of a deadly weapon; Guilty of sexual assault. 9 Count 8, sexual assault with a minor under 14 years of age with use of a deadly weapon, Guilty of sexual assault. 10 11 Count 9, sexual assault with a minor under 14 years of age with use of a deadly weapon; Not Guilty. 12 13 Count 10, sexual assault with a minor under 14 years of age with use of a deadly weapon; Not Guilty. 15 Count 11, sexual assault with a minor under 14 years of age with use of a deadly weapon; Guilty of sexual assault. 16 Count 12, open or gross lewdness; Guilty of open or 17 gross lewdness. 18 Dated this 4th day of November, the year 2009, by the 19 20 foreperson, Margaret Clayton. Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, is that your verdict as read, so say you one, so say you 21 22 all? 23 THE JURY: Yes. 24 THE COURT: Does either side wish to have the jury 25 polled? State?

```
1
               MR. SCOW: No, Judge.
  2
               THE COURT: Defense?
  3
               MR. MANINGO: Yes, please.
               THE CLERK: All right. Juror No. 1, is that your
  4
  5
     verdict as read?
  6
               JUROR NO. 1: Yes.
  7
               THE CLERK: Number 2, is that your verdict as read?
  8
               JUROR NO. 2: Yes.
              THE CLERK: Number three, is that your verdict as
  9
10
    read?
11
              JUROR NO. 3: Yes.
              THE CLERK: Number four, is that your verdict as
12
13 l
    read?
14
              JUROR NO. 4: Yes.
              THE CLERK: Number five, is that your verdict as
15
16
    read?
17
              JUROR NO. 5: Yes.
              THE CLERK: Number six, is that your verdict as read?
18
              JUROR NO. 6: Yes.
19
20
              THE CLERK: Number seven, is that your verdict as
21
    read?
              JUROR NO. 7: Yes.
22
23
              THE CLERK: Number eight, is that your verdict as
24
   read?
25
             JUROR NO. 8: Yes.
```

1 THE CLERK: Number nine, is that your verdict as 2 read? 3 JUROR NO. 9: Yes. THE CLERK: Number ten, is that your verdict as read? 4 JUROR NO. 10: 5 Yes. THE CLERK: Number 11, is that your verdict as read? 6 7 JUROR NO. 11: Yes. THE CLERK: Number 12, is that your verdict as read? 8 JUROR NO. 12: Yes. 9 10 THE CLERK: Thank you. 11 THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, I want to thank you on behalf of the Eighth Judicial District Court for your time 12 and service to the community. I say this with all sincerity. 13 If we didn't have people like you in our community who are 14 willing to sacrifice their time, their lives to make these 15 important decisions, decisions of this type, of this magnitude 16 and that are required by our Constitution, we couldn't meet 17 that responsibility without people like you. 18 So on behalf of the Eighth Judicial District, I want 19 to thank you for your service. The admonition I've been 20 reading to you for the last few days that you can't speak with 21 anybody about this case, you're with -- you're released from 22 that admonition. You can speak to anybody you wish about this 23 case. Conversely, if somebody should attempt to speak with you 24 against your wishes, about this case, just bring that to

25

Officer Reichert's attention and I'll deal with it appropriately.

Sometimes the parties, the attorneys specifically like to speak with jurors about the decision, anything at all that frankly they're allowed to. Some like to talk about what you liked, or didn't like about their presentation, to improve their craft, their talents and their energies as lawyers. So like to know what you think. You're free to talk with them about that. But they shouldn't and probably -- and they wouldn't persist in talking if you didn't want to.

I like to speak with juries just for a few minutes in the jury room; not about the facts of the case, but about how you were treated from the time you received the jury summons, to the point where I'm releasing you today, see if there are things that have annoyed you that we might be able to better as a system. That only takes a very few minutes, then I'll let the attorneys speak with you, or not. It's up to you.

I know due to the late hour you've already been taken down to the Jury Commissioner so you've got your voucher, so we'll get you on your way in just a few minutes.

Again, thank you very much for your service. Follow Officer Reichert, please. We'll stand at ease.

(Jury excused at 6:41 p.m.)

(Outside the presence of the jury)

THE COURT: Record should reflect we're outside the

presence of the jury. The Court directs the Clerk to lodge the 1 verdict in the minutes of the Court. This matter is referred 2 -- based upon the verdict, this matter is referred to the 3 Department of Parole and Probation for the preparation of a 4 presentence investigation report. The matter is passed for 5 6 sentencing. 7 THE COURT: That would be January the 13th at 8:15, please. 9 THE COURT: Anything else to come before the Court? 10 MR. SCOW: Judge, can we have the defendant remanded without bail? 11 12 THE COURT: The defendant's remanded without bail, pending sentencing. Anything on the defense side, Mr. Maningo? 13 14 MR. MANINGO: No, sir. 15 THE COURT: All right. We're in recess. Gentlemen, if you'd like to talk to the jury, I'll have -- I'll be done 16 with them in just a few minutes and you can speak with them in 17 18 the back room. 19 (Proceedings concluded at 6:42 p.m.) 20 21 22 23 24 25

STATE'S CLOSING ARGUMENT	124
WITNESSES	154
NAME DIRECT CROSS REDIRECT	recross
PLAINTIFF'S WITNESSES:	
Kellie Gauthier 3 22 25 Andre Randle 26 31 33 Vicki Farnham 36 49 Amy Coe 52 82	
DEFENDANT'S WITNESSES:	
Brianna Galloway 111 Daneil Irish 113 Jamie Galloway 115	
<u>EXHIBITS</u>	
DESCRIPTION:	ADMITTED
Exhibit 3 - Sexual Assault Kit	15 41 42 44 62 64

Verbatim Digital Reporting, LLC ♦ 303-915-1677

CERTIFICATION

I CERTIFY THAT THE FOREGOING IS A CORRECT TRANSCRIPT FROM THE AUDIO-VISUAL RECORDING OF THE PROCEEDINGS IN THE ABOVE-ENTITLED MATTER.

AFFIRMATION

I AFFIRM THAT THIS TRANSCRIPT DOES NOT CONTAIN THE SOCIAL SECURITY OR TAX IDENTIFICATION NUMBER OF ANY PERSON OR ENTITY.

Verbatim Digital Reporting, LLC Littleton, CO 80120 (303) 798-0890

JULIE LOBD, TRANSCRIBER

4-12-10

DATE

FMED

COPAPR 13 2 5, PN '10 1 **TRAN** 2 DISTRICT COURT CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA 3 STATE OF NEVADA,) CASE NO. C227324 Plaintiff,) DEPT. NO. XVIII 6 VS. 7 EDWARD MICHAEL ADAMS, 8 Defendant. 9 10 BEFORE THE HONORABLE DAVID B. BARKER, DISTRICT COURT JUDGE 11 12 RECORDER'S TRANSCRIPT RE: SENTENCING 13 WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 13, 2010 14 15 16 17 18 APPEARANCES: 19 20 FOR THE STATE: CRAIG L. HENDRICKS, ESQ. Chief Deputy District Atty. FOR THE DEFENDANT: JEFFREY S. MANINGO, ESQ. Deputy Public Defender RECORDER/TRANSCRIBER: RICHARD L. KANGAS

21

22

23

24

25

LAS VEGAS, CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 13, 2010, 9:09 A.M.

,

THE BAILIFF: Bottom of 3, Adams.

THE COURT: C241003, State of Nevada versus Edward Adams. The record should reflect the presence of Mr. Adams in custody with counsel, a representative of the State. This is the time set for sentencing and status check dismissal of Counts 9 and 10.

Any legal cause or reason why judgment should not be entered?

MR. MANINGO: May we approach?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. MANINGO: Thank you.

(Off-record bench conference)

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Adams, we're going to trail your matter to the end.

(At 9:10 a.m. matter trailed on calendar until 10:30 a.m.)

THE COURT: All right. The bottom of page 3 is C241003, State of Nevada versus Edward Michael Adams. The record should reflect the presence of Mr. Adams in custody with counsel, a representative of the State. This is the time set for sentencing.

Any legal cause or reason why judgment should not be entered?

MR. MANINGO: No, sir.

THE COURT: By virtue of your plea - or by virtue of the jury verdict in this case, Mr. Adams, you're adjudicated guilty of Counts 1 through 8 and 11 and 12. Those counts respectively are: Count 1, first degree kidnapping; Count 2, battery with intent to commit sexual assault; Counts 3 through 8 and 11, sexual assault; you were found not guilty on Counts 9 and 10, so those counts are dismissed pursuant to the verdict of the jury; and Count 12, open or gross lewdness, a gross misdemeanor offense.

State's position regarding sentencing.

MR. HENDRICKS: Judge, I'll be very brief.

Obviously you heard the trial, you saw what the jury did in regards to the verdict. I'd just simply point out a couple things.

I know how thorough you are in regards to your preparation. I know that you've had a chance — and I apologize for getting these to you this morning, but it's a statement from the victim in this case, and also from the victim's mother. We did not provide notice in time in regards to having them speak today, and it's my understanding that the defendant is opposed to having them speak this morning. I spoke with the victim and her mother; they understand that, and they want to go forward today. And hopefully, like I said, I'm sure you've already read through

those statements, and they just wanted you to hear from them in regards to that -

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. HENDRICKS: - and how this has impacted their lives.

Judge, you've seen that this isn't the guy that this is his first time in the system; he's got priors, and according to P and P's report, he's got at least three priors. He's been to prison before; obviously he didn't learn. But those crimes in comparison to this were basically nothing, in my opinion. What he did on that particular day by kidnapping a thirteen-year-old girl, taking her to a vacant apartment and doing what he did to her on that day is just absolutely unbelievable.

In regards to this young girl, it is certainly the worst nightmare that she could ever face, the worst nightmare that these parents could've ever had to face; yet they did, and they got through it. And as the letter points out, they're going to be stronger because of it. But that's in regards to that family.

Now in regards to the defendant, certainly what he did on that day, he explained that the reason he did it was probably methamphetamine, but if that were the case then we'd have a ton of different individuals out there raping children all the time, because the methamphetamine problem

here in Las Vegas is so bad. So that he provides an excuse, and it's ridiculous, and I'm sure that the Court's gonna ignore that.

And once again, Judge, this isn't his first time in the system. But what he did on that day was - qualifies him to be, in my opinion, one of the worst of the worst. To kidnap a young child off the street, like I said, is the worst thing that could possibly happen to a kid. I guess the one good thing he did do is allow her to leave and did not take her life; that's what he didn't take. There's some other things he did take on that day, and those are some of the things that actually came out during trial, and I'm sure you remember that, Judge.

Parole and Probation went through, did a thorough interview, and I think came back with the perfect recommendation, and that is: every one of these counts, except for the final gross misdemeanor count, to run consecutive. And I think that's appropriate, because this is an individual that does not need to be back out in our society. And I would ask that the Court make sure, ensure that he never returns back to society so that he cannot ever do this again to another family.

And with that, Judge, I'd submit it.

THE COURT: Mr. Adams, this is your opportunity to present any information in mitigation of sentence.

Counsel?

MR. MANINGO: Judge, I'll also be brief, because this is the courtroom where the trial took place and you've already heard the different theories and possible explanations and results of what had happened in this case.

Just a few things I would like to point out, is Mr. Adams did supply a very brief written statement in the P and P report -

THE COURT: Right.

MR. MANINGO: - where he does explain his regret and remorse over the way things happened and took place. He also mentions verbally, which is stated in the P and P report, his remorse. And I don't think he offers the use of methamphetamine as an excuse, but only as more of an explanation of an additional factor of what took place. And I really do think that methamphetamine is an absolute monster. And while Mr. Hendricks had pointed out that, you know, thank God we do not have daily kidnaps of children because of methamphetamine, there are daily crimes committed because of methamphetamine, and it really does change a person's character, and I believe that especially in this case.

I've known Mr. Adams for over two years now that he's been in custody, and the entire two years he has been nothing but respectful and appreciative and helpful. I look

at the charges and I hear the testimony at trial, and I just - it blows my mind as to how this man that I've spoken to and that I've known could have participated in anything like this; it - it's absolutely shocking to me.

And I know that it's a tragedy for everybody involved. For Amber and her family, I know that is a nightmare that will continue on.

But it really - it is so far out of character I think that it really must take some kind of catalyst, and the only thing that I can come to grips with, and - and as the Court knows, these are the only kind of cases I do. I deal with these every single day, and every time I look at these files I try and figure out why, why did this happen, what's going on. There must be something because this is not normal behavior; this is not, you know, this is not something with an easy motivation.

I mean, you can understand why someone might steal some money, because they need it, you know, for food or something like that. But the motivations behind something like this are so mind-blowing and so far out on another plane that I think we really grasp and seek explanations, and may never find them, but I think it's one of the difficulties with these cases.

Mr. Hendricks mentioned the priors. He does have the priors, but they are for car thefts; they're nothing

related to this kind of behavior or this kind of conduct.

And I understand the recommendation made by P and P, however what we - what we really are talking about - and I know it's charged differently, and I understand the law and the rationale behind it, but what we're really talking about is a single incident, a single incident with different acts that took place during this incident. This isn't a case where there is an ongoing pattern of abuse that we see many times over an extended period of time. These are all charges stemming from what took place over approximately an hour or so, and that's why I think it would be excessive to run all of these consecutively.

On a single count of ten-to-life you're talking about the Parole Board having the ability to keep Mr. Adams in custody for as long as they deem fit, whether it's ten years — and we know that on these cases they never parole after ten; they're always gonna have to come back again, and they're lucky if it's fifteen years or something like that when the Parole Board would consider release. But because of these types of charges and the number of them, the Parole Board would be able to do their job and say, look, okay, he shouldn't be out, you know, we're the ones who have been reviewing his progress, reviewing whether he's been going through therapy or anything else, the length of his punishment, now is the appropriate time, or not. And they

can keep him in because of that life tail.

1

2

3

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I think that it would - I know - I understand, I understand Amber and her family wanting all the big numbers stacked together. I can understand where they would come from, and I think that's fair. But I don't think it really achieves anything more than if you run them concurrently and allow the Parole Board to do their job.

The jury has found that on all charges that no weapon was used, which is why I think Mr. Adams had explained the case and the events happening the way they did. I already mentioned that Mr. Adams has been in custody for over seven hundred days; the exact number is in the P and P report, so I'd ask for credit for that amount of time. And I would be asking the Court to run the counts concurrently with one another, with the first ten-to-life.

THE COURT: All right. I did hear the trial. facts are self-evident, and have been stated and argued effectively by both sides. A thirteen-year-old girl on her way home from school when the defendant took her from the street and repeatedly sexually assaulted her. He - and as she testified before this jury, indicated that the defendant claimed a weapon, and that's why she went initially, and resulted in being victimized in the manner that we've talked about.

At the time the defendant committed this terrible

act he was on parole out of California from an '03 conviction, in fact was a fugitive from that parole. No stranger to the system because before that he'd managed to sustain two additional felony convictions, and was in fact a three-time ex-felon at the time he victimized this young girl.

Mr. Adams, as a consequence of that history and the terrible things you did to this girl, you are and remain a continuing threat to this community, in my opinion. And as a consequence, I think the sentence here needs to reflect that.

In accordance with the law of the State of Nevada:
Count 1, first degree kidnapping, 60 months on the bottom,
life on the top; restitution ordered under Count 1, twentynine hundred and thirty-two dollars and zero cents
(\$2932.60). Count 2, 60 months on the bottom, life on the
top, consecutive to Count 1. Count 3 for the sexual assault
120 months Nevada Department of Corrections on the bottom,
life on the top, consecutive to Count 2. Count 4, 120
months on the bottom, life on the top, consecutive to Count
3. Count 5, 120 months to life, consecutive. Count 6, also
120 months to life, consecutive. Count 7, 120 to life,
consecutive. Count 8, 120 months to life, consecutive.
Count 11, 120 months to life, consecutive as well. Twentyfive-dollar (\$25) administrative assessment fee, hundred-

and-fifty-dollar (\$15) DNA fee - if I didn't sentence on Count 12, that's a gross misdemeanor conviction, it will run concurrent with the balance of the counts, as recommended by P and P. Twenty-five-dollar (\$25) administrative, hundred-and-fifty-dollar (\$150) DNA, five-hundred-dollar (\$500) indigent defense fund fee.

I also would note that pursuant to statute, before the defendant is eligible for parole, a panel consisting of the administrator of the mental health and development services for the Department of Health - or Human Resources, or his designee, and the Director of the Department of Corrections or his designee, and a psychologist licensed to practice in the state, or a psychiatrist licensed to practice medicine in Nevada, must certify that the defendant does not present or represent a high risk to reoffend on current accepted standards of assessment. The Court also orders special lifetime sentence - or lifetime supervision as a special sentence upon any release on the terms as outlined herein.

 $731~{
m days}~{
m CTS}$ against that sentence appears to be the recommendation of P and P.

Anything else, gentlemen?

MR. HENDRICKS: No, thank you, Judge.

THE CLERK: Yes, Your Honor. What was the sentence for the gross misdemeanor?

	1	THE CO
	2	balance of the
	3	Anythi
	4	recess.
:	5	PR
6	3	
7	7	
8	3	
9)	ATTEST: I do here
10	·	video recording o
11		the best of my ab
12	\parallel	
13		
14		
15	$\ $	
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

THE COURT: 12 months CCDC concurrent with the of the counts.

Anything else on the calendar, Danny? We're in ecess.

PROCEEDING CONCLUDED AT 10:45 A.M.

* * * * * * * * * *

ATTEST: I do hereby certify that I have transcribed the audio-video recording of this proceeding in the above-entitled case to the best of my ability.

RICHARD L. KANGAS,

Court Recorder/Transcriber

1	IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA				
2					
3	EDWARD MICHAEL ADAMS,) No. 55494				
4	Appellant,)				
5) vs.)				
6	THE STATE OF NEVADA,				
7)				
8	Respondent.))				
9	APPELLANT'S APPENDIX - VOLUME IV - PAGES 711-903				
10	PHILIP J. KOHN DAVID ROGER				
11	Clark County Public Defender 309 South Third Street Las Vegas, Nevada 89155-2610 Clark County District Attorney 200 Lewis Avenue, 3 rd Floor Las Vegas, Nevada 89155				
12	Attorney for Appellant CATHERINE CORTEZ MASTO				
13	Attorney General 100 North Carson Street				
14	Carson City, Nevada 89701-4717 (702) 687-3538				
15	Counsel for Respondent				
16	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE				
17	I hereby certify that this document was filed electronically with the Nevada				
18	Supreme Court on the day of February, 2010. Electronic Service of the foregoing				
19	document shall be made in accordance with the Master Service List as follows:				
20	CATHERINE CORTEZ MASTO P. DAVID WESTBROOK STEVEN S. OWENS PHILIP JAY KOHN				
21					
22	I further certify that I served a copy of this document by mailing a true and correct				
23	copy thereof, postage pre-paid, addressed to:				
24	EDWARD MICHAEL ADAMS NDOC No. 1046775				
25	c/o High Desert State Prison				
26	P.O. Box 650 Indian Springs, NV 89018				
27	By Chenyl Tisuraca				
28	Employee, Clark County Public				
	Defender's Office				