1	IN THE SUPREME C	OURT (OF THE STAT	E OF NEVADA
2				_
3	RONNEKA GUIDRY,)	No. 80156	
4 5	Appellant,))		Electronically Filed Mar 23 2021 10:44 a.m. Elizabeth A. Brown
6	v.)		Clerk of Supreme Court
7	THE STATE OF NEVADA,)		
8	Respondent.)		
9	A DDELL A NITIC A DDEL)	OLUME VII D	A CIEC 1472 1721
10	APPELLANT'S APPE	NDIA V	OLUME VII PA	AGES 14/2-1/21
11	DARIN IMLAY		STEVE WOI	LFSON
12	Clark County Public Defender 309 South Third Street Las Vegas, Nevada 89155-2610		Clark County 200 Lewis Av Las Vegas, N	District Attorney venue, 3 rd Floor eyada 89155
13	Attorney for Appellant		AARON FOI	
14	Tittorney for Appendin		Attorney Gen	eral rson Street
15 16			Carson City, (702) 687-35.	Nevada 89701-4717 38
17			Counsel for F	Respondent
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				
26				
27				
28				

INDEX RONNEKA GUIDRY Case No. 80156

1

		<u>PAGE NO</u>
3	Affidavit in Support of Motion for Authorization of Employment of Expert Assistance filed 10/19/18	97-104
4	Amended Jury List filed 08/16/19	334
5	Appellant's Supplemental Request for Certified Transcripts filed 07/23/20	431-433
6	Case Appeal Statement filed 11/29/19	419-422
7	Court's Exhibit 1 dated 08/08/19	1735-1742
8	Court's Exhibit 2 dated 08/08/19	1743
9	Court's Exhibit 3 dated 08/14/19	1744
10	Court's Exhibit 4 dated 08/14/19	1745
11	Court's Exhibit 5 dated 08/14/19	1746
12	Court's Exhibit 6 dated 08/14/19	1747
13	Court's Exhibit 7 dated 08/14/19	1748
14	Court's Exhibit 8 dated 08/14/19	1749
15	Court's Exhibit 9 dated 08/14/19	
16	Court's Exhibit 10 dated 0814/19	1751
17	Court's Exhibit 11 dated 08/14/19	
18	Court's Exhibit 12 dated 08/15/19	
19	Court's Exhibit 13 dated 08/15/19	
20	Court's Exhibit 14 dated 08/16/19	
21	Court's Exhibit 15 dated 08/16/19	
22	Court's Exhibit 16 dated 08/16/19	
23	Court's Exhibit 17 dated 08/16/19	
24	Court's Exhibit 18 dated 08/19/19	
25	Court's Exhibit 19 dated 08/19/19	
26	Court's Exhibit 22	
27	Court's Exhibit 23	
28	Court & Exhibit 25	2001-2140

1	Defendant's Motion for Return of Property filed 12/14/18	
2	Date of Hrg: 01/08/19	156-159
3	Defendant's Notice of Witness List filed 08/09/19	325-327
4	Defendant's Proposed Jury Instructions Not Used at Trial filed 08/16/19	331-333
5	District Court Minutes from 02/09/18 through 06/17/20	434-485
6	Ex Parte Motion to Declare Appellant Indigent for Purposes of Transcript Costs filed 04/23/20	426-429
7	Exhibits in Support of Defendant at Sentencing filed 10/17/19	388-412
8	Indictment filed 02/09/18	1-4
9	Indictment Warrant Return filed 03/09/18	5-8
10	Instructions to the Jury filed 08/13/19	337-386
11	Judgment of Conviction (Plea of Guilty) filed 10/29/19	413-414
12	Jury List filed 08/13/19	330
13	LVMPD's Opposition to Motion for Return of Property filed 12/21/18	160-165
14	LVMPD Telephonic Transcription	2141-2166
15	Motion and Notice of Motion in Limine to Exclude Evidence filed 08/06/19 Date of Hrg: 08/19/19	315-322
1 /		
	Motion for Authorization of Employment of Expert Assistance filed 09/20/18 Date of Hrg: 10/02/18	92-96
16 17 18 19	Motion for Authorization of Employment of Expert Assistance filed 09/20/18 Date of Hrg: 10/02/18 Motion for Leave to File Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus Due to Ineffective Assistance of Prior counsel filed 07/25/18 Date of Hrg: 08/07/18	
17 18 19 20	Date of Hrg: 10/02/18 Motion for Leave to File Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus Due to Ineffective Assistance of Prior counsel filed 07/25/18	48-79
17 18 19	Date of Hrg: 10/02/18	48-79 40-47
17 18 19 20 21	Date of Hrg: 10/02/18	48-79 40-47 88-90
17 18 19 20 21 22	Date of Hrg: 10/02/18	48-79 40-47 88-90 193-286
117 118 119 220 221 222 23	Date of Hrg: 10/02/18	
117 118 119 220 221 222 223 224	Date of Hrg: 10/02/18	
117 118 119 220 221 222 223 224 225	Date of Hrg: 10/02/18	

1	Notice of Department Reassignment filed 08//06/19	324
2	Notice of Hearing filed 06/27/19	287
3	Notice of Hearing filed 08/06/19	323
4	Notice of Motion and Motion to Suppress filed 03/08/19	182-186
5	Notice of Motion and Motion to Withdraw as Attorney of Record filed 02/22/19 Date of Hrg: 03/05/19	177-181
6	Order Granting Employment of Expert Assistance filed 10/25/18	105
7 8	Order Granting Motion to Reconstruct the District Court Record filed 01/28/21	2049-2053
9	Order Regarding Costs of Transcripts on Appeal filed 04/27/20	430
10	Receipt of Copy filed 03/23/18	9
11	Receipt of Copy filed 11/29/18	155
12	Receipt of Copy filed 12/27/18	166
13	Receipt of Copy filed 07/31/19	310
14	Receipt of Copy filed 08/29/19	387
15	Request for Transcripts filed 02/10/20	423-425
16	State's Amended Notice of Witnesses and/or Expert Witnesses filed 02/20/19	167-176
17	State's Exhibit 4 dated 08/14/19	1975-1976
18	State's Exhibit 5 dated 08/14/19	1923-1924
19	State's Exhibit 9 dated 08/14/19	1945-1946
20	State's Exhibit 11 dated 08/14/19	1947-1948
21	State's Exhibit 12 dated 08/14/19	1949-1950
22	State's Exhibit 13 dated 08/14/19	1951-1952
23	State's Exhibit 14 dated 08/14/19	1953-1954
24	State's Exhibit 15 dated 08/14/19	1955-1956
25	State's Exhibit 16 dated 08/14/19	1957-1958
26	State's Exhibit 21 dated 08/14/19	1931-1932
27 28	State's Exhibit 23 dated 08/14/19	1933-1934
/X		

1	State's Exhibit 25 dated 08/14/19	. 1935-1936
2	State's Exhibit 26 dated 08/14/19	. 1937-1938
3	State's Exhibit 27 dated 08/14/19	. 1939-1940
4	State's Exhibit 29 dated 08/14/19	. 1959-1960
5	State's Exhibit 30 dated 08/14/19	. 1961-1962
6	State's Exhibit 31 dated 08/14/19	. 1963-1964
7	State's Exhibit 32 dated 08/14/19	. 1965-1966
8	State's Exhibit 33 dated 08/14/19	. 1967-1968
9	State's Exhibit 34 dated 08/14/19	. 1969-1970
10	State's Exhibit 35 dated 08/14/19	. 1971-1972
11	State's Exhibit 36 dated 08/14/19	. 1973-1974
12	State's Exhibit 37 dated 08/15/19	. 1941-1942
13	State's Exhibit 38 dated 08/15/19	. 1943-1944
14	State's Exhibit 41 dated 08/14/19	. 1975-1976
15	State's Exhibit 42 dated 08/14/19	. 1977-1978
16	State's Exhibit 48 dated 08/14/19	. 1985-1986
17	State's Exhibit 49 dated 08/14/19	. 1987-1988
18	State's Exhibit 51 dated 08/14/19	. 1979-1980
19	State's Exhibit 52 dated 08/14/19	. 1981-1982
20	State's Exhibit 54 dated 08/14/19	. 1983-1984
21	State's Exhibit 59 dated 08/14/19	. 1907-1908
22	State's Exhibit 64 dated 08/14/19	. 1909-1910
23	State's Exhibit 65 dated 08/14/19	. 1911-1912
24	State's Exhibit 68 dated 08/14/19	. 1913-1914
25	State's Exhibit 69 dated 08/14/19	. 1915-1916
26	State's Exhibit 70 dated 08/14/19	. 1917-1918
27	State's Exhibit 71 dated 08/14/19	. 1919-1920
28	State's Exhibit 72 dated 08/14/19	. 1977-1978

1	State's Exhibit 74 dated 08/14/19	. 1921-1922
2		. 1989-1990
3		. 1991-1992
4		. 1993-1994
5		. 1995-1996
6		. 1997-1998
7		. 1999-2000
8		. 2001-2002
9		. 2003-2004
10		. 1925-1926
11		
12		. 1929-1930
13		. 2005-2006
14		. 2007-2009
15	State's Exhibit 91 dated 08/15/19	. 2010-2012
16	State's Exhibit 92 dated 08/15/19	. 2013-2014
17	State's Exhibit 93 dated 08/15/19	. 2015-2025
18	State's Exhibit 94 dated 08/15/19	. 2026-2027
19	State's Exhibit 95 dated 08/15/19	. 2028-2029
20	State's Exhibit 96 dated 08/15/19	. 2030-2031
21	State's Exhibit 97 dated 08/15/19	. 2032-2033
22	State's Exhibit 98 dated 08/15/19	. 2034-2035
23	State's Exhibit 99 dated 08/15/19	. 2036-2037
24	State's Exhibit 100 dated 08/15/19	. 2038-2039
25	State's Exhibit 101 dated 08/15/19	. 2040-2041
26	State's Exhibit 102 dated 08/15/19	. 2042-2043
27	State's Exhibit 103 dated 08/15/19	. 2044-2046
28	State's Exhibit 104 dated 08/15/19	. 2047-2048

1	State's Notice of Witnesses field 03/12/19	. 187-190
2	State's Notice of Witnesses and/or Expert Witnesses filed 04/17/18	10-39
3	State's Opposition to Defendant's Motion for Leave to File Petition for Writ of Habea	s
4	Corpus Due to Ineffective Assistance of Prior Counsel filed 07/26/18 Date of Hrg: 08/07/18	80-84
5	State's Opposition to Defendant's Motion to Dismiss Based Upon State's Failure to Present Exculpatory Evidence at the Grand Jury filed 07/26/18	
6	Date of Hrg: 08/15/18	84-87
7	State's Opposition to Defendant's Motion to Suppress filed 11/09/18 Date of Hrg: 11/20/18	. 111-154
8 9	State's Opposition to Defendant's Third Motion to Suppress Evidence filed 07/08/19 Date of Hrg: 07/10/19	. 294-309
10	State's Supplemental Notice of Expert Witnesses filed 07/03/19	. 288-293
11	State's Supplemental Notice of Witnesses filed 08/05/9	. 311-314
12	Stipulation and Order Waiving Separate Penalty Hearing filed 08/12/19	. 328-329
13	Substitution of Attorney filed 096/14/18	91
14	Verdict filed 08/13/19	. 335-336
15	TD A NCCDIDTC	
16	<u>TRANSCRIPTS</u>	
17	Recorder's Transcript	
	HIDS TOLAI	
18	JURY TRIAL Date of Hrg: 03/19/19	. 697-699
	JURY TRIAL Date of Hrg: 03/19/19 Recorder's Transcript	. 697-699
19	JURY TRIAL Date of Hrg: 03/19/19	
19 20	JURY TRIAL Date of Hrg: 03/19/19 Recorder's Transcript JURY TRIAL DAY 1 Date of Hrg: 08/12/19 Recorder's Transcript	
19 20 21	JURY TRIAL Date of Hrg: 03/19/19 Recorder's Transcript JURY TRIAL DAY 1 Date of Hrg: 08/12/19	. 745-971
19 20 21 22	JURY TRIAL Date of Hrg: 03/19/19	. 745-971
19 20 21 22 23	JURY TRIAL Date of Hrg: 03/19/19 Recorder's Transcript JURY TRIAL DAY 1 Date of Hrg: 08/12/19 Recorder's Transcript JURY TRIAL DAY 2 Date of Hrg: 08/13/19	. 745-971 972-1159
19 20 21 22 23 24	JURY TRIAL Date of Hrg: 03/19/19 Recorder's Transcript JURY TRIAL DAY 1 Date of Hrg: 08/12/19 Recorder's Transcript JURY TRIAL DAY 2 Date of Hrg: 08/13/19 Recorder's Transcript JURY TRIAL DAY 3 Date of Hrg: 08/14/19 Recorder's Transcript	. 745-971 972-1159
18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26	JURY TRIAL Date of Hrg: 03/19/19 Recorder's Transcript JURY TRIAL DAY 1 Date of Hrg: 08/12/19 Recorder's Transcript JURY TRIAL DAY 2 Date of Hrg: 08/13/19 Recorder's Transcript JURY TRIAL DAY 3 Date of Hrg: 08/14/19 1	. 745-971 972-1159 160-1394
19 20 21 22 23 24 25	JURY TRIAL Date of Hrg: 03/19/19 Recorder's Transcript JURY TRIAL DAY 1 Date of Hrg: 08/12/19 Recorder's Transcript JURY TRIAL DAY 2 Date of Hrg: 08/13/19 Recorder's Transcript JURY TRIAL DAY 3 Date of Hrg: 08/14/19 Recorder's Transcript JURY TRIAL DAY 4 Date of Hrg: 08/15/19 Recorder's Transcript	. 745-971 972-1159 160-1394
19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26	JURY TRIAL Date of Hrg: 03/19/19 Recorder's Transcript JURY TRIAL DAY 1 Date of Hrg: 08/12/19 Recorder's Transcript JURY TRIAL DAY 2 Date of Hrg: 08/13/19 Recorder's Transcript JURY TRIAL DAY 3 Date of Hrg: 08/14/19 1 Recorder's Transcript JURY TRIAL DAY 4 Date of Hrg: 08/15/19	. 745-971 972-1159 160-1394 395-1553

1	Recorder's Transcript JURY TRIAL DAY 6	
2	Date of Hrg: 08/19/19	1686-1699
3	Recorder's Transcript All Pending Motions	
4	Date of Hrg: 07/10/19	712-721
5	Recorder's Transcript All Pending Motions: Status Check: Trial Readiness	
6	All Pending Motions: Status Check: Trial Readiness Date of Hrg: 03/12/19	692-696
7	Recorder's Transcript Calendar Call	
8	Date of Hrg: 05/03/18	580-586
9	Recorder's Transcript Calendar Call	
10	Date of Hrg: 03/07/19	686-691
11	Recorder's Transcript Calendar Call	
12	Date of Hrg: 07/25/19	722-724
13	Recorder's Transcript Defendant's Motion for Authorization of Employment of Expert Assistance	
14	Date of Hrg: 10/02/1/8	635-636
15	Recorder's Transcript Defendant's Motion for Authorization of Employment of Expert Assistance	
16	Date of Hrg: 10/11/18	637-639
17	Recorder's Transcript Defendant's Motion for Return of Property	
18	Date of Hrg: 01/08/19	665-669
19	Recorder's Transcript Defendant's Motion for Authorization of Employment of Expert Assistance;	
20	Status Check Readiness Date of Hrg: 10/24/18	640-642
21	Recorder's Transcript	
22	Defendant's Motion to Dismiss Based on State's Failure to Present Exculpatory Evidence at the Grand Jury; Defendant's Motion for Leave to File Petition for	
23	Writ of Habeas Corpus Due to Ineffective Assistance of Prior Counsel; Defendant's Motion for Setting of Reasonable Bail	
24	Date of Hrg; 08/15/18	618-620
25	Recorder's Transcript Defendant's Motion to Dismiss Based on State's Failure to Present Exculpatory	
26	Evidence at the Grand Jury; Defendant's Motion for Leave to File Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus Due to Ineffective Assistance of Prior Counsel;	
27	Defendant's Motion for Setting of Reasonable Bail Date of Hrg; 08/21/18	621-631
28	8, 55, -2, -2	

1	Recorder's Transcript	
2	Defendant's Motion to Place on Calendar for Attorney to Substitute in as Attorney of Record and Request Discovery	
3	Date of Hrg: 09/25/18	4
4	Recorder's Transcript Defendant's Motion to Set Reasonable Bail	
5	Date of Hrg: 04/05/18	i7
	Recorder's Transcript	
6	Defendant's Motion to Set Reasonable Bail; Status Check: Trial Readiness Date of Hrg: 04/17/18	9
7	Recorder's Transcript	
8	Defendant's Motion to Suppress; Notice Date of Hrg: 11/20/18	6
9		_
10	Recorder's Transcript Defendant's Motion to Suppress; Notice	
11	Date of Hrg: 12/05/18	4
12	Recorder's Transcript Defendant's Notice of Motion and Motion to Withdraw as Attorney of Record	
13	Date of Hrg: 03/05/19	5
14	Recorder's Transcript Indictment Warrant Return	
	Date of Hrg: 03/20/18	5
15	Recorder's Transcript Sentencing	
16	Date of Hrg: 10/18/19	2
17	Recorder's Transcript	
18	Status Check: Negotiations Date of Hrg: 06/14/18	13
19	Recorder's Transcript	
20	Status Check: Negotiations Date of Hrg: 06/26/18	18
21		
	Recorder's Transcript Status Check: Negotiations Date of Hrg: 07/05/18	
22	Date of Hrg: 07/05/18	1
23	Recorder's Transcript Status Check: Trial Readiness	
24	Date of Hrg: 01/23/19	4
25	Recorder's Transcript	
26	Status Check: Trial Readiness Date of Hrg: 02/20/19	9
27	Recorder's Transcript	
28	Status Check: Trial Setting Date of Hrg: 05/09/18	39
20	307-30	.,

1 2	Recorder's Transcript Status Check: Trial Setting Date of Hrg: 05/17/18
3	Recorder's Transcript
4	Status Check: Trial Setting Date of Hrg: 05/23/18
5	Recorder's Transcript
6	Status Check: Trial Setting Date of Hrg: 05/31/18
7	Recorder's Transcript
8	Status Check: Trial Setting Date of Hrg: 08/01/18
9	Recorder's Transcript
10	Status Check: Trial Setting Date of Hrg: 03/20/19
11	Recorder's Transcript
12	Status Check: Trial Setting Date of Hrg: 05/15/19704-706
13	Recorder's Transcript
14	Status Check: Trial Setting Date of Hrg: 06/12/19707-711
15	Recorder's Transcript Status Chaely Trial Satting
16	Status Check: Trial Setting Date of Hrg: 08/08/19
17	Recorder's Transcript Supreme Court Remand to Secure Appellate Counsel
18	Date of Hrg: 06/17/20
19	Reporter's Transcript Grand Jury
20	Date of Hrg: 02/08/18
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	

1	continuir	ng to accelerate.
2		MR. MUELLER: Objection oh, never mind. I'll withdrawn.
3		THE COURT: Okay.
4	BY MR.	DIGIACOMO:
5	Q	Now, did you do any calculations as it relates to the speed of
6	the vehic	cle, the force applied to Eduardo from the acceleration of the
7	vehicle?	
8	А	I did.
9	Q	And do you have that marked out in two different well, one's
10	just the z	zoomed in version, but you have some diagrams associated with
11	that as v	vell?
12	А	Correct.
13	Q	Showing you what's been marked as State's Proposed Exhibits
14	87 and 8	88, do you recognize those?
15	Α	I do.
16	Q	And what are they?
17	Α	They're the scaled diagrams I created based on the roadway
18	evidence	e we identified while we're out there on scene and physically
19	looking a	at the asphalt and the markings on the roadway for evidence
20	locations	S.
21	Q	And do they fairly and accurately depict, not only the scene but
22	your cor	nclusions, as they relate to the evidence found at the scene?
23	А	Correct.
24		MR. DIGIACOMO: Move to admit 87 and 88.
25		THE COURT: Any objection?

1		MR. MUELLER: No objection.
2		THE COURT: They will be admitted.
3		[STATE'S EXHIBITS 87 AND 88]
4	BY MR.	DIGIACOMO:
5	Q	And I'm actually going to use 88 because it's zoomed in from
6	87.	
7		You identify first a variety of evidentiary items that were found
8	on the ro	padway and I'm just going to go through each one of those.
9		Describe for me what AIC stands or area of contact stands
10	for?	
11	Α	Area of initial contact, in the context and definition we use in
12	reconstr	uction, is the first damage or injury producing event. That's not
13	necessa	rily where the first contact is made but the area where we can say
14	that som	nebody was injured at this location or something was damaged at
15	this loca	tion.
16	Q	And in this particular case, the first area of contact that had
17	showed	any evidence on the roadway, what type of evidence was it?
18	Α	So there were two irregular lines that spanned west and they
19	were t	hey were faint but white in color. And what that looked and
20	appeare	d to be was shoe scuff marks, so the markings of a shoe as it's
21	dragged	across the asphalt surface.
22	Q	Now, eventually you go to the hospital?
23	Α	I did.
24	Q	And were you also at the autopsy as well?
25	Α	I was.

Page 79 1473

Q And did you, in fact, see the crime scene analyst recover the shoes?

A So the crime scene analyst Strumillo responded to the hospital, this was later that same morning after Eduardo had passed, and collected all his belongings. That was at about 3:17 in the morning. So, I guess, it was before he passed but.

When I'm looking for a vehicle involved, I want any and all evidence I can from that vehicle. So, typically, when I have a pedestrian who's transported to the hospital, I'll send a crime scene analyst to go and collect all their clothing. In case there's glass, paint fragments, anything I can tie this vehicle to this person.

So crime scene analyst Strumillo went down to the hospital and collected all his belongings.

Q Does there come a point in time when you are able to view these particular shoes?

A Correct.

Q And, first of all, they have a biohazard, so Courts don't love us to open these, so I have some photographs as well, but looking at those, they've been previously admitted as State's 85.

What type of shoes were they?

A They -- I don't even -- I'm not familiar with the brand, it's from Italy, but Bottega Veneta, if I'm saying that correctly.

Q Did you do any research as to -- are they cheap shoes or are they expensive shoes?

A No, they're high end Italian shoes.

When you say, high end, what kind of price point are we More than I can afford. They were about \$750 for shoes of that Were there evidence on those shoes suggesting that they had, There -- there was. So much of what I do is a cause and effect relationship. And when I have markings on the roadway that looks like shoe scuffs, I expect to see a similar type abrasion or scuff on the shoe And in that case we have a consistency and characteristics So then, after the shoe scuff marks, you now have a void of some distance, and do you know approximately what the distance is between the shoe scuff marks and the beginning of the body scuff marks? I do. The shortest shoe scuff was 9 feet; the longest shoe scuff was 12 feet. There's an absence of about 30 feet before the onset of that Body scuff mark is almost self-evident, but it's essentially what a mark looks like as a pedestrian slides laterally and parallel across the And then you have a mark, that's maybe self-explanatory, but Α That's, in that area of the body scuff marks, people don't always

> 1475 Page 81

have to start bleeding immediately; right, their clothing or their skin can leave a transfer and deposit on the roadway. But actually in that area you start to see evidence of apparent blood until its completion.

Q And then Mr. Osorio's final resting point, what is that?

A That's where Eduardo finally came to rest. We don't have any evidence after the fact but we have a large pool of apparent blood and I believe there was a chained necklace with a pendant in that area.

And the pooling of the blood was so thick and coagulated it starts to runoff the super elevation of the roadway. And when you get that much blood in one area, you're -- it's a real good indicator that that's where the pedestrian finally came to rest.

Q Now, in this particular case, you had a pooling where you make that mark where the final resting place of Mr. Osorio and that's in -- do I get this right -- is that in T2?

A It is.

Q Okay. Explain to us what the travel lanes are?

A So in traffic some people call this the fast lane, the left lane, the one closest to the median. In traffic we call that travel lane one. The middle travel lane is travel lane two. And then it proceeds on until you reach the curbing. And so the right lane, the slow lane, would be travel lane three.

Q Did you also have a large pooling of blood within travel lane three?

A It extended to and into the southernmost portion of three.

Q Did you learn during the course of your investigation that one of

Page 82 1476

the people had pulled him, pulled Mr. Osorio from travel lane two into travel lane three before medical arrived?

A Correct.

Q So once you have this information, what else do you need to do calculations as do speed of vehicle, acceleration of vehicle, those type of things?

A Okay. Here we go. So as I described earlier, there's a cause and effect relationship between everything that happens and we use physics, like I explained earlier, to establish the speeds of units involved.

Now, the law of conservation of momentum states that the total sum of forces before the action equals the total sum of forces after the action in a closed system.

In this system we have an Eduardo and ground system. We only have two objects that are interacting with each other.

So if we know what happened after, based on the law of conservation and momentum, we can determine what happened before.

Simply put, if I know a friction value, a weight, and a distance that this body slid laterally across the asphalt, I can solve for the total force, the total energy that was required for that body to be displaced over that distance.

Now, what that ultimately means is --

- Q Let me stop you just a second --
- A Sure.
- Q -- because you just used three really big terms with us.
 But you said a friction value?

 A Correct.

Q What is a friction value?

A So a friction value is the force resisting motion relative to a body. So Newton's laws of motion; right, a body at rest or uniform acceleration will remain at rest or uniform acceleration at the same speed and direction unless acted upon by an unbalanced force.

Well, in this case Eduardo, if absence of any friction, he can just keep going in that direction, in that space; right. But we have an unbalanced force. And the unbalanced force is the asphalt as there's transfer, as he's sliding across.

So that unbalanced force is a friction, it's a resisting motion, deceleration, a negative acceleration rate, the opposite negative force that's causing him to slow down.

Q And is there studies that will tell you basically what the friction rate is between a human body and asphalt?

A Absolutely. So I -- most of my trainings been done through Northwestern University. And Northwestern University as well as many other entities have all conducted testing to determine the friction value, that negative acceleration rate for bodies sliding across asphalt.

Now, that's a range and that range is a decimal percentage relative to gravity. So a .5 is about half gravity. It's slowing down at half a G.

Now, these tests have been repeated continually with recurring results. And what those results are, is that friction value for a human body, sliding across asphalt, is somewhere between .45, a little less than

Page 84 1478

half a G, to a .6.

Q So generally average around .5?

A Correct.

Q Now, hopefully nobody in this room has had to slide across asphalt before -- well, maybe you have, but, I mean, ultimately that's not a very fun experience. But are there something that we could utilize to -- analogize with, for example, a baseball player sliding into a plate?

A Right. So you're -- if you have a baseball player run at full speed into second base and he needs to slide, if he's walking to second base and starts to slide, how far is he going to slide. Not very far at all; right, because he doesn't have enough force. He doesn't have enough momentum to slide for very far.

Now, you get your fastest athlete in the major league baseball and he's running as fast as he can and now he goes into a slide, he's going to slide agreeably further because he has more force. He has more momentum that his body of mass is attained before the start of slide so he can go a greater distance.

Q And what is the sliding on dirt, which is probably a lot easier than sliding on asphalt, what is the coefficient of friction for that?

A That's published data as well -- I don't know that off the top of my head -- but it's probably somewhere around a .3.

Q So you fast -- do you stop, start -- stop faster or slower on asphalt?

A You stop sooner because the friction value, the reduction of your forces is -- it's higher. It's countering more of your force.

1	Q	How far does the body scuff show that Mr. Osorio slid?
2	Α	42 feet.
3	Q	And once you know how far he slid with the coefficient, what
4	else do	you need to know to figure out how much force was applied to him
5	to cause	him to do that?
6	А	The only three variables you need, and it's simple Algebra, it
7	that frict	ion value, Eduardo's weight, and the distance he traveled or was
8	displaced.	
9	Q	And so did you have Eduardo's weight from the autopsy?
10	Α	I did.
11	Q	And so were you able to make a determination as to how much
12	force ha	d to be applied to Mr. Osorio to get him to slide 42 feet?
13		MR. MUELLER: Objection, there's no evidence any force was
14	applied.	Mr. Osorio was holding onto the car, not being hit by it.
15		THE COURT: I'm sorry, Mr. Mueller, could you restate your
16	objection	٦.
17		MR. MUELLER: Mr. Osorio was not hit by the car. He was
18	holding	onto it. No force was applied to him. He was holding on as the
19	video ve	ry clearly shows.
20		THE COURT: Yes, but the video also shows the vehicle was
21	moving.	
22		MR. MUELLER: The vehicle was moving but
23		THE COURT: So that would be force.
24		MR. MUELLER: my colleague asked, the force applied to
25	him, as	in, him getting hit by the car.

THE COURT: That wasn't his question. I'm going to overrule that objection. The form of the question was not improper.

MR. DIGIACOMO: Thank you.

BY MR. DIGIACOMO:

- Q How much force was applied to the body of Mr. Osorio to get him to slide 42 feet?
 - A Roughly 56,000 foot pounds of force.
- Q And to somebody just standing around, what the heck does 56,000 foot pounds of force mean, like, to a lay person, what does that mean?

A It's a lot. You're -- it's not easy to slide across asphalt; right, none of us would go and run as fast as we can and slide across asphalt. If you did, you're not going to slide for very far because it's rough. You're going to have transfer, you're going to lose skin, material, clothing. And for a distance of 42 feet, that's a substantial amount of force and it's enough, as we see in this case, to cause fatalities.

Q Now, once you know how much force was applied to Mr. Osorio, do you have the ability to calculate the acceleration of the vehicle or do you need other information?

A No. We can use that same friction value because the acceleration rate of a vehicle is just your friction value times gravity.

So the acceleration is just the change of velocity. If I'm stopped here, and I go this distance with a continual acceleration rate, we can solve for the speed of the vehicle at any increment along that distance.

Q And so do you have to know which vehicle it is to make the

determination as to how fast it was accelerating at the time?

A If -- can you say that question one more time. I'm trying to understand what you're asking.

Q Do you have to have the vehicle itself to make the determination how fast it's accelerating?

A No, not based on evidence like this. Again, in the closed system of Eduardo ground, if he falls from the vehicle, while he's on top of the vehicle he's been accelerated to a certain acceleration rate. Once he separates and falls from the vehicle that is a closed system independent of the car. I don't need to know how fast -- I don't need to have a car present to know what kind of force was necessary to displace Eduardo over this distance.

Q So based upon that, can you determine the speed that Eduardo was going?

A I can. And that speed is about 38 feet per second, at the start of him sliding.

So in order for that cause and effect relationship to occur, in order to dissipate 56,000 foot pounds of force over this 42 feet, I had to -- his body had to have been accelerated to at least 38 feet per second.

- Q And I know it's simple math, but you don't probably have a calculator up there, any idea of 32 feet per second, what that is in miles per hour?
 - A 21, 23 miles per hour, right around there.
- Q Now, did you calculate the distance from area of initial contact to where it is Osorio's body scuff first starts?

Boulevard, and the last time it was seen was at Spring Mountain?

1	Α	Correct.
2	Q	Did you also have some still photographs I know they're here
3	somewhe	ere, that's what I'm looking for oh, here we go some still
4	photogra	phs pulled from a parking garage of this vehicle?
5	Α	I did.
6	Q	I'm showing you what's been marked as State's Proposed
7	Exhibits	37, 38, and 39. 37 and 38 are actually the stills of the complete
8	video and	d 39 is zoomed in of 38; is that correct?
9	Α	Correct.
10	Q	And are they fair and accurate depictions of stills from that
11	video?	
12	Α	Correct; from the Westin parking garage.
13	Q	Correct; parking garage.
14		MR. DIGIACOMO: Move to admit 37 through 39.
15		THE COURT: Any objection?
16		MR. MUELLER: May I take a take a quick look at them, Judge?
17		THE COURT: Counsel wants to take a look at them.
18		MR. MUELLER: No objection.
19		THE COURT: All right. They will be admitted.
20		[STATE'S EXHIBITS 37 THROUGH 39 ADMITTED]
21		MR. DIGIACOMO: And I'm only going to display 39.
22	BY MR. [DIGIACOMO:
23	Q	Did you attempt to try and get a license plate from this particular
24	vehicle?	
25	Α	I did.

Page 92 1486

1	that, Th	ne witness statements by Timothy Landale, he's in Jay's parking lot
2	saying t	this guy dove on the hood, is pounding on the windshield, these
3	people	are yelling at each other, none of that's typical. And then when I
4	go and	look at the Westin and the vehicles parked in seven minutes. I just
5	start to	infer what could possibly be something more.
6	Q	Eventually do vice detectives contact Lucas Siomes?
7	А	They do.
8	Q	And based upon the information that he provides, do you realize
9	that the	Caesars Palace Casino may be relevant to this investigation?
10	А	Correct; and has a better timeline.
11	Q	Once do you eventually receive the video and review the
12	video from the Caesars Palace?	
13	А	l did.
14	Q	And I want to talk before Mr. Osorio goes into the Omnia, were
15	you w	vell, let me ask you this, I apologize, after Lucas Siomes is
16	contacted, eventually do you have contact with the family of Mr. Osorio, in	
17	particular the mother and father?	
18	А	I did, on the 4th.
19	Q	And when you had the conversation with the family on the 4th,
20	did they raise a concern with you over a particular item?	
21	А	They did.
22	Q	And what was that?
23	А	His father, Nuno, said, Did you find Eduardo's watch?
24	Q	And then at the time is that the first you had heard that there
25	may be	a watch in play?

Page 93

Detective Freeman, and the two of us drove over to Costa Mesa to follow

1

2

5

6

8

9

10

11

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

1	up with the business owner.	
2	Q	And once you had contact with the business owner, what were
3	you aski	ing?
4	А	If he remembered anything related to selling a vehicle to
5	anybody	in Las Vegas that would have had this paper plate.
6	Q	And were you able to identify a suspect from that information?
7	А	I was.
8	Q	And what was who was the suspect you identified?
9	А	Ronneka Ann Guidry.
10	Q	What information you have information that Ronneka Guidry
11	may hav	ve purchased a black 250 CLA Mercedes?
12	А	Correct.
13	Q	Did you have did he have any other paperwork that identified
14	for you t	hat potentially Ms. Guidry was your suspect?
15	А	Everything. He had pictures of the car. He had the date of
16	Septem	ber 17th that he had sold her sold it to her. He had the shipping
17	informat	ion of it being shipped to Las Vegas. He had a picture
18		MR. MUELLER: Objection, hearsay.
19		THE WITNESS: he had a picture of
20		MR. MUELLER: Objection.
21		THE COURT: Hold on.
22		MR. MUELLER: Objection, hearsay. He's
23		MR. DIGIACOMO: It's not being offered for the truth of the
24	matter a	sserted, only the offer as to where he goes and why he does it.
25		MR. MUELLER: But he's also testifying as to well beyond

Page 97 1491

1	that is th	ne hearsay documents that are not in evidence or provided in
2	discove	ry.
3		MR. DIGIACOMO: I'm happy to rephrase.
4		THE COURT: Yes. So that will be sustained. Rephrase the
5	question	n.
6	BY MR.	DIGIACOMO:
7	Q	Did you see a driver's license picture of Ms. Guidry when you're
8	at OC C	ars and Credit?
9	А	I did.
10	Q	And did it appear to be consistent with you to the photograph
11	from the elevator of or the video from the elevator of Ms. Guidry?	
12	Α	It did.
13	Q	Did you get address information for Ms. Guidry from OC Cars
14	and Cre	dit?
15	А	I did, from a license.
16	Q	And once you saw the address on the license, did you make a
17	request	of anybody?
18	Α	I did.
19	Q	Now, you're in Costa Mesa, California?
20	Α	Correct.
21	Q	What do you do?
22	Α	I relay the information back to Las Vegas and the detectives I've
23	been wo	orking with that we had identified a possible suspect with her
24	name, d	ate of birth, and address.
25		And do you ask them to do anything?

Page 98 1492

1	А	I did. I asked them to follow up with the said address, that 5086
2	Echo Sh	nire, and see if they find the vehicle.
3	Q	And on your way back do you learn that Detective Gatus and
4	her part	ner, William VanCleef, had come into contact with both your
5	suspect	vehicle and your suspect?
6	А	Correct.
7	Q	And at that time did you learn that Ms. Guidry was in custody?
8	А	I did.
9	Q	Once you learned she was in custody, and I think there was
10	testimor	ny yesterday, that there was a warrant for Ms. Guidry, do you
11	know what that warrant was?	
12		MR. MUELLER: Objection.
13		THE COURT: As to what?
14		MR. MUELLER: May we approach?
15		THE COURT: Yes.
16		[Bench conference begins]
17		MR. MUELLER: Why are we bringing up other crimes?
18		MR. DIGIACOMO: Because you brought it up yesterday with
19	Detectiv	e Gatus that there was a warrant for her. It's a traffic warrant. So
20	I wanted	d to bring
21		MR. MUELLER: All right. Then I will
22		MR. DIGIACOMO: out to fix the prejudice.
23		MR. MUELLER: if it's a traffic ticket, then I'll withdraw it.
24	That's fi	ne.
25		THE COURT: All right.

Page 99

[Bench conference ends]

THE COURT: All right. The objection is withdrawn. You may proceed.

BY MR. DIGIACOMO:

- Q The warrant was for a traffic related offense, a traffic warrant?
- A It was.
- Q Based upon the fact that they had a warrant, did you ask them to hold her and do anything with Ms. Guidry?

A I asked that they would meet me down at headquarters. We were still driving back from California and -- but we were getting closer.

So I asked them to transport her to headquarters to an interview room so I could speak with her.

Q Approximately what date and time was this?

A This is January 8th. I got information just after 9:00 p.m. that they located the vehicle and pulled it over and she was placed under arrest for the warrant. And I believe it was around 10:45, 11:00 p.m. that same night that I'm coming into town and meeting her at -- meeting them at headquarters.

- Q Do you -- once you get to headquarters, do you meet somebody that you see here in court today?
 - A I do.
- Q And can you point her out and describe something she's wearing?
- A Ronneka Ann Guidry with a white collared shirt under a gray longer shirt.

1		MR. DIGIACOMO: May the record reflect identification of the
2	defenda	nt.
3		THE COURT: It will so reflect.
4	BY MR.	DIGIACOMO:
5	Q	Now, because Ms. Guidry's in custody is there certain
6	procedu	res you have to go through before you speak to her?
7	Α	There are.
8	Q	And what do you do?
9	А	I read her her Miranda warning.
10	Q	Do you do it from memory or did you do it from a card?
11	А	From a card.
12	Q	And after you read her her Miranda warnings, does she speak
13	with you)?
14	А	She did. She agreed and consented to speak with me.
15	Q	And from that point did you well, let me ask you this, how was
16	that inte	rview documented?
17	Α	Video and audio recording.
18		MR. DIGIACOMO: Judge, I have marked here State's
19	Propose	ed Exhibit Number 11, which is the redacted version of the
20	interviev	v of Ms. Guidry, based upon the agreement of counsel, I move to
21	admit.	
22		THE COURT: All right. And, Mr. Mueller, any objection?
23		MR. MUELLER: No, Your Honor.
24		THE COURT: All right. It will be admitted.
25		[STATE'S EXHIBIT 11 ADMITTED]

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

24

25

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, during the course of the witness's testimony you're going to hear a videotape or watch a videotaped statement of the defendant. Portions of the statement have been redacted based upon agreement of the parties and order of the Court. You are not to speculate as to the content of the redacted portions or draw any inference from the fact that the statement has been redacted.

You may proceed.

MR. DIGIACOMO: The statement is fairly lengthy, so if the Court still wants to, I can stop it about 12:30, if that's the time you want to stop.

THE COURT: I think that's a good idea. I was able -- good news, I just got an update to move my 2 o'clocks to 1:30 and they will take less than 30 minutes. So we would be able to come back at 2:00.

So I think if we end at 12:30, that would give everyone enough time to get -- at least a good break and a solid lunch without everyone --

MR. DIGIACOMO: Perfect.

THE COURT: -- having a backup downstairs at Capriotti's. All right.

[Playing video]

MR. MUELLER: Your Honor, it's 12:30.

THE COURT: All right. Okay.

All right. Ladies and gentlemen, we're going to break for our lunch break.

During this lunch break, you're not to talk or converse amongst yourselves or with anyone else on any subject connected to this trial or

1	read, watch, or listen to any report of or commentary on the trial or any
2	person connected with this trial by any medium of information, including,
3	without limitation, newspapers, television, radio, or Internet. Or form or
4	express any opinion on any subject connected with this trial until the case
5	is finally submitted to you.
6	We will be back at 2 o'clock this afternoon. We'll see you then.
7	Thank you.
8	[Outside the presence of the jury panel]
9	THE COURT: All right. Let the record reflect that the jury has
10	left the courtroom.
11	Is there anything we need to address outside the presence of
12	the jury?
13	MR. DIGIACOMO: No.
14	MR. MUELLER: No, Your Honor.
15	THE COURT: All right. We will see everyone at 2 o'clock.
16	Thank you.
17	[Recess taken at 12:31 p.m.]
18	[Jury trial resumed at 1:58 p.m.]
19	[Outside the presence of the jury panel]
20	THE COURT: All right. We're back on the record in Case
21	C-18-329810-1, the jury is the jury ready?
22	THE MARSHAL: No, Your Honor.
23	THE COURT: No?
24	THE MARSHAL: We're still missing one.
25	THE COURT: Okay. All right. What I want to address while

1	we're on the record now is jury instructions.
2	Mr. Mueller, you indicated that you had instructions, additional
3	proposed instructions, and I asked yesterday to have them to the Court by
4	12:00 and I still haven't received them.
5	What's the status?
6	MR. MUELLER: Oh, they were I'm sorry, Judge, they were
7	sitting sitting right here. I tried to give them to you before lunch, I
8	apologize.
9	THE COURT: Okay. If you can pass them to me, I'd appreciate
10	it.
11	MR. MUELLER: Sure.
12	And as I was sitting there
13	THE COURT: Thank you.
14	MR. MUELLER: as I was sitting there this morning I thought
15	of an additional one that we really need to cover. Let me get it. So I
16	wrote it in hand.
17	MR. DIGIACOMO: Did you bring us a packet?
18	MR. MUELLER: What's that?
19	MR. DIGIACOMO: Did you bring us a packet?
20	MR. MUELLER: No, Marc, it's sort of like the discovery with
21	you, I get it's always much better when you're surprised.
22	THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
23	MR. MUELLER: That's just the statute.
24	[Pause in proceeding]
25	[In the presence of the jury panel]

1	THE COURT: Please be seated. Welcome back, ladies and		
2	gentlemen.		
3	Do the parties stipulate to the presence of the jury?		
4	MR. DIGIACOMO: Yes, Your Honor.		
5	MR. MUELLER: Yes, Your Honor.		
6	THE COURT: All right. You may resume playing the video and		
7	examination of the witness.		
8	MR. DIGIACOMO: And for the record we stopped it at 27		
9	minutes and 35 seconds. And I'm going to start it there.		
10	THE COURT: Thank you.		
11	[Playing video]		
12	MR. MUELLER: Your Honor, may we approach?		
13	THE COURT: Yes.		
14	[Bench conference begins]		
15	MR. MUELLER: Your Honor, this videotape is wandering past		
16	a post-Miranda interview, which defense unfortunately has no standing to		
17	object to to a Judge Jones surveillance video of her sitting in a jail cell		
18	and random conversations. I don't see the relevance of it. And I think		
19	they're just knowing police officers, there's a very high probability there's		
20	some random comment that might actually provoke a mistrial.		
21	I object to unless counsel has something probative that he		
22	wants to get to with the rest of this video. We've got another 20 minutes.		
23	We're sitting in the room doing nothing.		
24	THE COURT: Well, a couple different issues, one, I specifically		
25	asked if there's anything else you wanted to redact and you told me no.		

1	My second issue is let me ask the State this looks like
2	there's about 20 minutes of video-ish left.
3	How much of it is just her just sitting there?
4	MR. DIGIACOMO: I don't know. I redacted from the
5	transcript
6	THE COURT: Okay.
7	MR. DIGIACOMO: and my guy did it. But how much more of
8	the transcript is there? I can tell you from that.
9	THE COURT: It looks like it's about 20 more pages so.
10	MR. DIGIACOMO: Usually it's a minute a page.
11	THE COURT: Yeah.
12	MR. DIGIACOMO: So for the most part we took out
13	everything
14	THE COURT: And start talking
15	MR. DIGIACOMO: where's it's blank
16	THE COURT: Yeah.
17	MR. DIGIACOMO: and just where they're talking to her.
18	THE COURT: Did you look at the
19	MR. MUELLER: I read the transcript. I did not watch the video.
20	THE COURT: Okay. So.
21	MR. MUELLER: My concern is
22	[Colloquy between the Court and the Marshal]
23	THE COURT: Oh, why don't we just go ahead and take a break
24	now.
25	MR. DIGIACOMO: That would be great because I could use

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

the restroom also. I was going to wait 20 minutes.

THE COURT: Okay. Yeah, let's do that. Okay. All right. Let's do that.

[Bench conference ends]

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, it looks like it's a good time to take a break. So we're going to take a break. We're going to take an afternoon break.

During this break, you're not to talk or converse amongst yourselves or with anyone else on any subject connected to this trial or read, watch, or listen to any report of or commentary on the trial or any person connected with this trial by any medium of information, including, without limitation, newspapers, television, radio, or Internet. Or form or express any opinion on any subject connected with this trial until the case is finally submitted to you.

It is 3:21. We'll see everybody at -- in 15 minutes. So about 3:40, give you a little extra, 3:40.

[Outside the presence of the jury panel]

THE COURT: Let the record reflect the jury has left the room for the afternoon break.

I understand do you need a comfort break as well?

THE WITNESS: Yes, please.

THE COURT: All right. If you don't mind taking him to the back, I'd appreciate it. Let me talk to counsel here for a minute.

THE MARSHAL: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Everyone can be seated.

All right. We stopped the recording at about 1 hour, 42 minutes, and 43 seconds, give or take a few, and there was an objection regarding the continuation of the video. It appears there's less 20 minutes left and we were just at the equivalent of page 125 of the transcript.

MR. MUELLER: Where -- respectfully, Judge, I'm not following you, how did you find that 125?

MR. DIGIACOMO: Because she's been following with the transcript.

MR. MUELLER: Okay.

THE COURT: As you were approaching the bench the detective said, It's important that I try and be as low key as possible. I don't want to scare the kids.

And then shortly thereafter it was paused.

So I'm looking at page 125 in the middle of the page.

MR. MUELLER: All right. Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. MUELLER: I concluded that because the officer had gotten up and walked out that that was the end of the interview and this last 20 minutes was nothing but ministerial functions beyond the transcript.

I was concerned that they were going -- officers were going to come and saying something that would provoke a mistrial trial or prejudice Ms. Guidry.

If we're still on the transcript, and we're following along, then I guess I have to withdraw my objection.

1	THE COURT: All right. The objection will be withdrawn.
2	I will note there it does appear to be a about a minute or so of
3	additional ministerial conversation talking about the dogs and the kids.
4	But then it picks backup, the equivalent would be starting on page 128 of
5	the statement where then questioning resumes.
6	MR. MUELLER: All right. Thank you, Judge.
7	THE COURT: All right. So we'll take a break. We'll see
8	everyone at 3:40.
9	The we do need to end no later actually no later than 4:30
10	today.
11	MR. DIGIACOMO: What I was going to suggest was finishing
12	my direct, which I think it'll probably about 4:00, 4:15, based upon what we
13	have left here.
14	THE COURT: Okay.
15	MR. DIGIACOMO: And then maybe allowing Mr. Mueller to do
16	cross. I'm sure Detective Salisbury would come back tomorrow morning.
17	It wouldn't be a problem.
18	THE COURT: I'm okay with that, if counsel's okay with that.
19	MR. MUELLER: That's fine, Judge.
20	THE COURT: All right.
21	MR. MUELLER: I'd rather be fresh doing cross anyway.
22	THE COURT: Then we'll do that.
23	I do have some hearings in the morning that I'm going to try and
24	work with that. And we also still have to do our charge conference. So le
25	me ponder that.

1	In the meantime, please take a comfort break. I don't want
2	anyone to be uncomfortable towards the end of the day.
3	MR. DIGIACOMO: Is there anyway, I know your clerk has to
4	leave, but is there any way we could off the record discuss jury
5	instructions, at the very least?
6	THE COURT: I don't discuss things off the record.
7	MR. DIGIACOMO: You don't do those.
8	THE COURT: Okay.
9	MR. MUELLER: That's that good federal training. I understand.
10	MR. DIGIACOMO: It's the federal training.
11	MR. MUELLER: We used to do it the old
12	THE COURT: I know we're such sticklers.
13	MR. MUELLER: we used to do it old school back in
14	chambers.
15	THE COURT: Yes, I remember those days. I too used to do
16	them off the record but I've changed my ways.
17	So, no.
18	[Colloquy between the Court and the Court Clerk]
19	THE COURT: All right. During this break, we'll see if there's
20	anyone who can come in and fill in.
21	MR. DIGIACOMO: Okay.
22	THE COURT: Because it will make it more
23	THE CLERK: Will you be done by 5:00?
24	THE COURT: At least start the conversation.
25	THE CLERK: Because that's the problem getting someone to

1	stay past 5:00.
2	MR. DIGIACOMO: Well, at the very least we could always
3	agree to end by 5:00. I just want to make sure that you don't miss your
4	flight.
5	THE COURT: Right.
6	MR. DIGIACOMO: And so, I mean, if we have to do it
7	tomorrow, it's just Mr. Mueller's handed me about 15 jury instructions and
8	I think we should have some discussion of those before.
9	THE COURT: Some of them were standard and some of them
10	were not, based on my quick review.
11	MR. DIGIACOMO: I didn't see any that were standard, but
12	okay.
13	THE COURT: Some well, standard in terms of the request fo
14	an instruction on the crime. So I should say that's a very general and
15	broad standard statement.
16	So, okay, let's go ahead and take a comfort break. Why don't
17	we all come back in about ten minutes.
18	[Recess taken at 3:26 p.m.]
19	[Jury trial resumed at 3:40 p.m.]
20	[Outside the presence of the jury panel]
21	THE COURT: All right. I have the you know what I'm going
22	do, before we bring the jury in, is make a copy of what Mr. Mueller
23	provided to us.

25

for me.

1505

MR. DIGIACOMO: Oh, he just -- he had a packet brought over

1	MR. MUELLER: I had
2	THE COURT: Oh, perfect. Okay, great. Easy enough.
3	MR. MUELLER: my in all fairness, Judge, I'm working, I've
4	got a great staff and I've hired some very good people. I've got basically a
5	new law firm. But they're civil lawyers, they weren't used to doing criminal
6	jury instructions.
7	THE COURT: Oh.
8	MR. MUELLER: So I brought over two more copies.
9	THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
10	All right. So it looks like we're going to be able to have some
11	coverage so we can go until 5 o'clock, which is good news.
12	MR. DIGIACOMO: Okay.
13	THE COURT: So if we want to end, and then do jury
14	instructions, we can do that.
15	MR. DIGIACOMO: Okay.
16	THE COURT: All right. Ready, everyone's here.
17	THE MARSHAL: Yes, ma'am.
18	THE COURT: Let's bring the jury in.
19	[In the presence of the jury panel]
20	THE COURT: Please be seated. Welcome back.
21	Do the parties stipulate to the presence of the jury?
22	MR. DIGIACOMO: Yes, Your Honor.
23	THE COURT: All right. You may resume playing the video and
24	examination.
25	[Playing video]

1		MR. DIGIACOMO: May I resume questioning, Judge?
2		THE COURT: Yes. Thank you.
3	BY MR.	DIGIACOMO:
4	Q	At the conclusion of this interview, there's a lot of discussion
5	about ch	arges, do you decide that night that you're going to arrest
6	Ronneka	a Guidry for any crimes associated with the event involving the
7	loss of Eduardo Osorio?	
8	Α	Absolutely.
9	Q	Do you actually book her in the Clark County Detention Center
10	on any c	rimes associated with the death of Eduardo Osorio?
11	Α	I did not.
12	Q	Why not?
13	А	I had enough probable cause for some charges, but as we're
14	putting tl	nat puzzle together there's still some missing pieces, and I
15	decided to wait until I have more of those pieces so I can come up with	
16	more applicable charge to the circumstances connected to the offense.	
17	Q	Was there a major piece missing?
18	А	Absolutely.
19	Q	What's the major piece?
20	Α	The watch.
21	Q	At the conclusion of this interview, do you go to the Echo Shire
22	address during the execution of the search warrant?	
23	Α	I did.
24	Q	And we heard previously from your sergeant, Paul McCullough,
25	that duri	ng that search there's \$3100 in cash found?

1	А	Correct.
2	Q	Do you see that money?
3	А	I did.
4	Q	Do you decide to impound it or not?
5	Α	I did not.
6	Q	Why not?
7	А	While it's 31, \$100 bills in a pink purse, I couldn't conclusively
8	say that	this was the exact same purse or that this currency is directly
9	related to	those crimes. So I photographed it to document what we found
10	but I didr	't impound it.
11	Q	Now, subsequent well, before that search warrant, before
12	Ms. Guid	ry winds up at the police department, you learned that her car
13	has beer	recovered, sealed, and towed to the Las Vegas Metropolitan
14	Police De	epartment?
15	Α	Correct; that's what I directed them to do.
16	Q	And sometimes well, let me back up, do you receive
17	information that her phone is in plain view during the course of	
18	Α	I did, from Detective Gatus. I learned that the phone was in the
19	car and that she was under arrest. So I told them to seal it and take it to	
20	our tow yard so I can do a search warrant on it later.	
21	Q	And in watching this video do you learn during the course of
22	your interview that there's a lock code on that iPhone?	
23	Α	I did.
24	Q	And do you relay that information to Sergeant McCullough?
25	Α	I did.

1	Q	At some point are you present with crime scene analyst when
2	the vehic	le was processed?
3	Α	I was.
4	Q	And do you know how long after the 8th it was?
5	Α	I'd have to refer to the report. I don't think I have that from
6	memory.	But I believe it was the 9th or 10th.
7	Q	Somewhere in that time period, it wasn't like it sat in the garage
8	for weeks on end?	
9	Α	Correct.
10	[Co	olloquy between the District Attorney and Defense Counsel]
11		MR. DIGIACOMO: May I approach, Judge?
12		THE COURT: Yes. Thank you.
13	BY MR. DIGIACOMO:	
14	Q	I'm showing you what's been marked as State's Proposed
15	Exhibits -	- unfortunately, two of these have been admitted, so I've got to
16	do these	individually 76, 77, 79, and 80, ask you if those photographs
17	that were	taken by the crime scene analyst while you guys were
18	processin	ng that vehicle?
19	Α	That is correct.
20	Q	Well, flip through all four them to make sure I'm not trying to
21	trick you.	
22	Α	Sure.
23		And that's at the crime scene lab.
24	Q	And those are true, fair, and accurate depictions of the vehicle?
25	Α	They are.

1		MR. DIGIACOMO: Move to admit the numbers that I just read
2	out, whic	ch are 76, 77, and 79 and 80.
3		THE COURT: Any objection?
4		MR. MUELLER: No objection.
5		THE COURT: They will be admitted.
6		[STATE'S EXHIBITS 76, 77, 79, AND 80 ADMITTED]
7	BY MR.	DIGIACOMO:
8	Q	When you arrived at the crime lab, were the seals still in place
9	that were	e placed there at the night it was taken into custody?
10	Α	They were.
11	Q	And then showing you 82 and 83, are those photographs that
12	the crime	e scene analyst took of the cell phone that was recovered?
13	Α	Correct.
14	Q	And they're true, fair, and accurate depictions?
15	Α	They are.
16		MR. DIGIACOMO: Move to admit 82 and 83.
17		THE COURT: Any objection?
18		MR. MUELLER: No objection.
19		THE COURT: They will be admitted.
20		[STATE'S EXHIBITS 82 AND 83 ADMITTED]
21	BY MR.	DIGIACOMO:
22	Q	Well, first I'm going to start with State's 76, that's Ms. Guidry's
23	vehicle,	the Mercedes CLA 250?
24	А	Correct.
25	Q	And I'm just going to briefly go around the car to show that the

1	seals were in place.		
2		That's State's 77.	
3		This is State's 79.	
4		And this is State's 78.	
5		Now, when you saw this vehicle, was there any damage to the	
6	windshie	eld?	
7	Α	There was not.	
8	Q	And when you looked at this vehicle were you looking to see if	
9	there we	ere any marks consistent with somebody having been on the hood	
10	of the ve	ehicle?	
11	Α	I was.	
12	Q	And were you able to see any?	
13	Α	I was.	
14	Q	Did you try to have those photographed?	
15	Α	I did.	
16	Q	And describe well, were they easily photographed?	
17	Α	Not at all.	
18	Q	Explain that to the ladies and gentlemen of the jury.	
19	Α	On the hood I saw, for the best, correct term, what appeared to	
20	be a sm	be a smear on the hood of the vehicle. It was faint. It was light. I couldn't	
21	definitively say it was hand marks or attributed to anything. But I saw		
22	smearing	smearing on the hood of the vehicle that I tried to get it to capture,	
23	memoria	memorialize, via imagery but it just on the black paint it just wouldn't	
24	show up	show up.	
25	Q	And I think Detective Gatus would have testified to this, but	

Page 117 1511

> 20 21

22

23

24

25

17

18

19

do you recall there being some weather in the area between January 3rd and January 8th, the day the search warrant was executed -- or the day the search warrant on the house was executed?

- Α There was. It was raining that night.
- Q Now, when you saw this vehicle, State's 81, Ms. Guidry's cell phone was still sealed inside that vehicle?
 - Α Correct.
 - Q And then -- I don't think I need to show the pictures of this.

Now, previously, I want to go back to the crime scene, previously we talked about determining the amount of force that had applied to the body of Eduardo Osorio to cause him to go that 42 feet, and I was asking you questions about the acceleration of the vehicle and you told me, I don't need the vehicle to determine what the acceleration was.

So is that fair?

- Α Correct.
- Q Did you need to know the vehicle, or at the very least, the vehicle type, in order to determine how much throttle was given to the vehicle to cause it to accelerate at that speed?
- Α Correct. Different makes, models of vehicles have different positive acceleration rates on what they're capable of. Like, we all know, an '84 Honda isn't going to match a Ferrari as far as how fast they can accelerate and take off.
- Q I'm going to put up 86, ask a couple of questions, first of all about the path, during the course of the statement Ms. Guidry said something to the effect of, Why would I have gone back down south on

1	Koval in the area where Mr. Osorio was if I had taken his watch.		
2		Do you remember her making statements similar to that?	
3	А	I do.	
4	Q	Did you check the curbing of the path of travel to determine	
5	whether	or not she could go any way other than south on Koval?	
6	А	I did. And I had it photographed.	
7	Q	And what was the result of looking at that?	
8	А	Unless she traverses a curb that is the route she has to take.	
9		MR. MUELLER: No, it's not.	
10		THE WITNESS: When she's exiting the Westin parking garage	
11	here, because of this curbing, she can't make a left here unless she's		
12	going le	going left of center. She has to make a right turn to come southbound	
13	back towards the intersection.		
14	BY MR.	DIGIACOMO:	
15	Q	Now, let's talk about vehicle acceleration, first of all, if we were	
16	to go to	State's Exhibit 105, and jump to that 2:20:13 to 2:20:20,	
17	essentially, were you able to essentially calculate the speed of that black		
18	vehicle as it exited the screen?		
19	А	I was.	
20	Q	And what speed were you able to calculate?	
21		MR. MUELLER: Objection, lack of foundation, what technique	
22	was use	ed to calculate that speed.	
23		THE COURT: Can you restate the question.	
24		MR. DIGIACOMO: Sure. I asked him, did he calculate it. There	
25	I asked	him what the calculation was.	

1		He's free to ask him on cross how he calculated it.
2		THE COURT: Okay. That I'm going to overrule that
3	objection	٦.
4	BY MR.	DIGIACOMO:
5	Q	Were you able to calculate the speed as that traversed outside
6	the pictu	ire?
7	Α	I was.
8	Q	And what conclusions did you draw as to the speed of the
9	vehicle?	
10	Α	Approximately 59 miles per hour.
11	Q	And did you then, or maybe before you did that, but did you
12	determine how far that distance was from the point of area of initial	
13	contact t	to where that vehicle was?
14	А	Approximately 300 feet.
15	Q	So this went zero to 60, essentially or zero to 59 in 300 feet?
16	А	Correct.
17	Q	Now, in looking at the acceleration capability of the Mercedes
18	250, tha	t you had in custody at the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police
19	Departm	nent, could you make a determination as to what type of throttle
20	had to b	e produced on that vehicle to get it to go from zero to 59 miles an
21	hour within the 300 feet?	
22	Α	I did.
23	Q	And what is that?
24	А	It's achieving maximum velocity for the published data for that
25	year, make, model vehicle based on that VIN.	

Page 120 1514

1	Q	And, in layman's terms, does that mean the accelerator had to
2	be fully f	loored in order to get it to accelerate that way?
3	Α	From a stop to 59 miles per hour in 300 feet, it has to achieve
4	an accel	eration rate of about 12.4 feet per second. That vehicles capable
5	of 12.4 fe	eet per second.
6	Q	And the conclusion you can draw from that is, what, as it relates
7	to the ac	celeration of the pedal?
8	А	That it's at maximum acceleration. There's 100 percent throttle
9	applied o	over that fixed distance.
10	Q	Now, at some point did you get a subsequent search warrant to
11	actually	get into Ms. Guidry's phone?
12	А	I did.
13	Q	And were you provided the data back from Detective Beatty
14	after he	was able to download well, first some of the information, and
15	then ultimately all the information from the phone?	
16	Α	Correct.
17	Q	Once you receive that information, what did you do?
18	Α	I followed up with a couple of additional puzzle pieces that I got.
19	Q	Like what?
20	Α	One was there was a picture of a FedEx receipt with an address
21	and a date and timestamp from January 3rd at approximately 12:30 p.m.	
22	Q	And did you go to that FedEx store and see if there was video
23	for that particular transaction?	
24	А	I had Detective Solomon go and he retrieved the video, which I
25	viewed.	

1	Q	After viewing that video, did you see what appeared to be
2	Ms. Guidry conducting a transaction at FedEx?	
3	Α	I did.
4	Q	What else did you do?
5	Α	I also forgive me, there's a lot of information. I received the
6	FedEx in	nformation and I received pictures of the watch with a text thread.
7	Q	And based upon the pictures of the watch and the text thread,
8	did you	have an address and/or location that you felt the watch might be?
9	Α	I did.
10	Q	And based upon that, what did you do?
11	Α	I contacted a detective in Miami, Florida and had him follow up
12	with the	suspected address.
13	Q	At some point do you learn that the watch that you were looking
14	for was	recovered in Miami, Florida?
15	Α	On January 30th.
16	Q	And let me before I get that. Now, on January 18th or so, did
17	you hav	e contact by telephone with Ms. Guidry?
18	Α	l did.
19	Q	And what was the nature of that contact?
20	Α	She called my desk phone, asked what was happening with the
21	case, and what was the status of her vehicle.	
22	Q	And what was her request as it relates to that vehicle?
23	Α	That it would be released to her.
24	Q	So you told her you would release her vehicle to her?
25	Α	I said that no charges were being filed and that she could meet

1	Q	Did they include grand larceny?	
2	А	They did.	
3	Q	Did they include leaving the scene of a collision?	
4	А	Correct.	
5	Q	So now you have your warrant in hand and you're supposed to	
6	meet Ms	. Guidry on Friday afternoon?	
7	Α	Correct.	
8	Q	Did Ms. Guidry show?	
9	А	She did not.	
10	Q	Did you make any efforts to find Ms. Guidry that afternoon?	
11	А	I did.	
12	Q	What did you do?	
13	Α	I did a couple of things. First, Child Protective Services was	
14	suppose	d to go out and have a meeting with her. So I contacted the Child	
15	Protectiv	ve Services rep and tried to get ahold of them so when they went	
16	out to the	e house, if they knocked on the door and established that she	
17	was ther	e, I had a team of officers that was ready to surround the house	
18	so we kr	new where she was at.	
19	Q	And when officers went to the house, was Ms. Guidry or her	
20	children there?		
21	Α	They were not.	
22	Q	Eventually do you have to reach out to another	
23	multi-jurisdictional agency to try and effectuate the arrest of Ms. Guidry?		
24	Α	I did.	
25	Q	And what agency is that?	

1	А	Our Criminal Apprehension Team.
2	Q	What is the Criminal Apprehension Team?
3	Α	They specifically
4		MR. MUELLER: Objection, can we approach?
5		THE COURT: Yes.
6		[Bench conference begins]
7		MR. MUELLER: Is there any relevance to this testimony or is
8	this just	prejudicial for no good particular purpose?
9		THE COURT: Well, this
10		MR. DIGIACOMO: Well, she fled the jurisdiction for the better
11	part of fou	ur weeks and then was taken into custody in Mobile
12		MR. MUELLER: And that's not a bad acts motion. That has not
13	been cha	rged
14		MR. DIGIACOMO: It's flight.
15		MR. MUELLER: No. Your Honor, I object. It's nowhere in the
16	discussio	n.
17		THE COURT: Are you seeking to introduce this for purposes of
18	conscious	sness of guilt?
19		MR. DIGIACOMO: Correct.
20		MR. MUELLER: It's the first I've heard of it. I object. That's
21		MR. DIGIACOMO: What do you mean first you've heard of it?
22	She was	arrested and extradited from Mobile, Alabama.
23		MR. MUELLER: So I wasn't attorney of record. The first I've
24	heard of i	t. You need to make a motion on this and you didn't.
25		MR. DIGIACOMO: Absolutely do not

1	THE COURT: How is it possible that this is the first you've
2	heard of this when your
3	MR. MUELLER: I was not the attorney
4	THE COURT: Mr. Mueller, your colleague argued in the bad
5	acts motion that she was arrested in another state with another watch on
6	her arm.
7	MR. MUELLER: Yes, Judge.
8	THE COURT: And that there was there was a conversation
9	about not seeking to introduce the other watch, which your colleague
10	claimed to be hers that she purchased with lawful funds.
11	So I take issue with representation that you didn't hear about
12	this was the first you've heard about this.
13	MR. MUELLER: Your office may have heard of it; first I've
14	heard of it.
15	Okay. That's fine. All right. I
16	THE COURT: Well, I don't want to have a situation where
17	we're be attempting to set an error in the record.
18	Do you need to take a moment to address this issue? Because
19	I'll break for the day now. I'm not going to create error on the record,
20	based on your representation that you didn't know about this.
21	MR. MUELLER: Your Honor, what is his I mean, the case
22	has been presented, all he's just what would be the purpose of bringing
23	the fact that she out of town?
24	MR. DIGIACOMO: Consciousness of guilt. She fled the
25	jurisdiction when charges were arrested or charges were filed.

1	MR. MUELLER: I'll withdraw the objection.
2	THE COURT: The objection will be withdrawn, Mr Mueller.
3	And for the record I want to make sure that there aren't any
4	misunderstandings regarding what you do and do not know about your
5	client's case.
6	Are there any other questions you have about the
7	circumstances of her arrest?
8	MR. MUELLER: No, Your Honor.
9	[Bench conference ends]
10	[Colloquy between the Court and the Marshal]
11	MR. DIGIACOMO: May I proceed, Judge?
12	THE COURT: Yes.
13	The objection has been withdrawn.
14	You may proceed.
15	BY MR. DIGIACOMO:
16	Q What is the Criminal Apprehension Team?
17	A They're a team that specifically deals with apprehending
18	criminals that have either an outstanding charge or an active warrant and
19	they have different tools and resources available to them that I don't to
20	locate and take people into custody.
21	Q And is this a just a Metro or, well, it's a Metro team, the
22	CAT team, but are they is it a multi-jurisdictional team?
23	A Correct. They work with different entities depending upon the
24	circumstances surrounding the case, the FBI, the DEA, Marshals, if the
25	person flees to Mexico, things like that.

1	Q	And do you maintain contact with them over the course of their	
2	time sea	time searching for and trying to apprehend Ms. Guidry?	
3	А	I did.	
4	Q	And during that time period, how many different states was	
5	there effe	orts made in, if you recall?	
6	А	I just remember it being a lot. I don't remember an exact	
7	number.		
8	Q	Eventually is Ms. Guidry captured somewhere other than the	
9	State of	Nevada?	
10	А	She was.	
11	Q	Where was she captured?	
12	А	Mobile, Alabama.	
13	Q	And approximately how long after January 19th was it that she	
14	ultimatel	y was taken into custody?	
15	Α	I'm trying to remember dates back then. I believe it was	
16	February 2nd or February 9th.		
17	Q	Now, on January 30th, did you learn that the watch had been	
18	recovered in Miami, Florida?		
19	Α	I did.	
20	Q	And at some point did the Miami-Dade Police Department	
21	FedEx to the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department a box that when		
22	you opened it you found something?		
23	А	I did, on May 29th.	
24	Q	May 29th of 2018?	
25	Α	Correct.	

1	Q	What did you do with well, first of all, when you opened the
2	box, wha	at was in there?
3	А	A Rolex watch.
4	Q	And did you compare the serial number of that Rolex watch to
5	the watc	h you were looking for?
6	Α	I did.
7	Q	And did it match?
8	Α	It did.
9	Q	And once you found or once you learned that this was, in fact,
10	the watc	h you were looking for, what did you do with it?
11	Α	Impounded it as evidence.
12	Q	I'm showing you what's been marked as State's Proposed
13	Exhibit Number 84, do you recognize that?	
14	А	I do.
15	Q	What is it?
16	А	The can I sealed the watch in on May 29th.
17	Q	And is that substantially the same or similar condition as when
18	you impounded it then?	
19	А	It is.
20	Q	It doesn't look like anybody's broken any seals on this?
21	А	Correct.
22	Q	I'm going to ask you to break the seals and open it.
23	Α	[Witness complies.]
24		MR. DIGIACOMO: And, Judge, we're going to have this
25	marked as 84A. It's been previously listed.	

1		THE COURT: Okay.	
2	BY MR. DIGIACOMO:		
3	Q	Is that, in fact, the watch you determined that belonged to	
4	Eduardo	Osorio?	
5	Α	It is.	
6	Q	And can you see a serial number on it?	
7	Α	I can.	
8	Q	And where is that?	
9	Α	It's located on this lower rim in the six o'clock position on the	
10	watch w	ith an inverted serial number.	
11	Q	Can you read to us what that serial number is?	
12	А	6KE22544.	
13		MR. DIGIACOMO: Thank you, Detective.	
14		Judge, that completes my questions for the witness.	
15		THE COURT: All right.	
16		MR. DIGIACOMO: Oh, I guess, I move to admit 84 and 84A.	
17		THE COURT: I was going to ask the question. Thank you.	
18		Mr. Mueller, do you have any objection to 84 and 84A?	
19		MR. MUELLER: No, Your Honor.	
20		THE COURT: All right. They will be admitted.	
21		[STATE'S EXHIBITS 84 AND 84A ADMITTED]	
22		THE COURT: All right. Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, we	
23	have fin	ished the direct examination of this witness. And for ease of	
24	schedule	e, I think it makes sense for us to stop for the day, so Mr. Mueller	

can cross-examine the witness starting tomorrow.

1	So you will need to come back. So I apologize for that.
2	If I could see counsel at the bench to discuss scheduling for
3	tomorrow morning.
4	Feel free to stand and stretch, we're almost done for the day.
5	[Bench conference begins]
6	THE COURT: All right. So I have a 10 o'clock hearing and
7	potentially I need to do a change of plea, which will probably take about
8	30 minutes, given my interactions with this particular defendant.
9	Do we want to come in and do our charge conference at 8:30
10	and then take a break and then have the jury come back at 10:30?
11	MR. DIGIACOMO: Sure.
12	MR. MUELLER: Sure. That'll work.
13	THE COURT: Does that work for you all?
14	MR. DIGIACOMO: That's fine with us, yeah.
15	THE COURT: Okay. We'll take the next 20 minutes to discuss
16	some of the ones that I've reviewed that have been proposed by
17	Mr. Mueller.
18	MR. MUELLER: Okay.
19	THE COURT: And then we can finish the charge conference
20	tomorrow morning.
21	Does that work?
22	MR. DIGIACOMO: Works for me.
23	MR. MUELLER: Sure.
24	THE COURT: All right. So 10:30 for the jury.
25	MR. DIGIACOMO: Perfect.

1	I
2	2
3	
4	1
5	5
6	6
7	7
٤	3

THE COURT: Thank you.

[Bench conference ends]

THE COURT: All right. Ladies and gentlemen, here's what we're going to do, I have a couple of hearings I have to take care of in the morning and some additional things with just the parties.

So I am going to ask you to come back tomorrow morning at 10:30, you get a late start. We don't, you do.

During this overnight break, I'm going to go ahead and read you this admonishment, which I'm sure by the end of this trial you'll be able to recite back to me, but you're not to talk or converse amongst yourselves or with anyone else on any subject connected with this trial or read, watch, or listen to any report of or commentary on the trial or any person connected with this trial by any medium of information, including, without limitation, newspapers, television, radio, or Internet. Or form or express any opinion on any subject connected with this trial until the case is finally submitted to you for deliberation.

And, with that, thank you very much for your attention this afternoon and we'll see you tomorrow morning at 10:30.

Thank you.

[Outside the presence of the jury]

THE COURT: All right. Let the record reflect that the jury has left the room.

I believe we're done with this witness for today; right?

MR. DIGIACOMO: We are. And he doesn't need to here until

10:30.

1	THE COURT: 10:30 tomorrow morning.
2	THE WITNESS: Thank you.
3	THE COURT: Thank you very much. I appreciate that. Oh,
4	good you got your coffee. All right.
5	All right. State, have you had an opportunity to look at all at
6	any of Mr. Mueller's proposed instructions?
7	MR. DIGIACOMO: I briefly looked at them and sort of I think I
8	can probably address each one of them, without sort of being final, but
9	there's some case law I would like to look at. But I imagine I know the
0	answer to most of this though.
1	THE COURT: All right. Well, I don't know what order you have
2	them in. I'm just going to go through them in the order I got them.
3	Mr. Mueller, do you have a copy of the instructions in front of
4	you?
5	MR. MUELLER: Yes, I do, Judge.
6	THE COURT: All right.
7	MR. MUELLER: And to the extent that I could get it done
8	through the trial, I think they're mostly all three sets are in order.
9	THE COURT: Okay. So you all know how I'm going to
20	reference there's actually just one instruction that matters for this
21	particular one I numbered the proposed instructions I gave to each of
22	you, page 1 being instruction 1, making page 2 instruction 2, going
23	forward. All right.
24	So I had a proposed instruction from Mr. Mueller, the driver of
25	any vehicle involved in any accident on a highway or premise, to which

Page 133 1527

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

25

the public has access resulting in bodily injury or death to a person, shall immediately stop his or her vehicle at the scene of the accident of as close there to as possible and shall forthwith return to and in the event remain at the scene of the accident.

That seems to match, for the most part, which would be marked in the proposed instructions, instruction number 17.

The only difference is the State had an additional sentence of, Any person who knowingly fails to comply, is guilty of the offense of leaving the scene of the accident.

So I am inclined to give this instruction as proposed by the State.

MR. MUELLER: There's actually a 2010 case, Judge, Hoagland versus State that --

MR. DIGIACOMO: Judge, I can't find that. So hold on one second.

THE COURT: Sure.

I have a copy of it here, if you wanted to grab it.

MR. DIGIACOMO: Actually I read that so.

Craig, I think she's talking about a different one than you're talking about.

MR. MUELLER: Okay.

THE COURT: So I'm going to grant -- I'm going to give this instruction as proposed by the State. It matches yours, Mr. Mueller, with the exception of the additional sentence.

And that additional sentence is, Any person who knowingly fails

1	to comply, is guilty of the offense of leaving the scene of an accident.
2	MR. DIGIACOMO: Okay. Well, I don't object to that obviously.
3	THE COURT: Right.
4	So, Mr, Mueller, is there any objection to that instruction?
5	MR. MUELLER: No, Your Honor.
6	THE COURT: Okay.
7	All right. The next instruction that I have from Mr. Mueller is, it
8	starts, Robbery is a general intent crime, in order to find the defendant
9	guilty of robbery the State must prove the defendant intended to do that,
10	which the law prohibits by taking property from the person of another,
11	physical force or threats of physical force.
12	I think that's I think there's a missing word there.
13	Anyway, you cite to four cases, Winnerford H. versus State,
14	Honeycutt versus State, Crawford versus State, and Brooks versus State.
15	I'm going to start by saying I have read the State's proposed
16	instruction on robbery and I'm inclined to give it.
17	So I will ask, Mr. Mueller, why I should give your instruction
18	instead?
19	MR. MUELLER: No, Your Honor, I give my staff general lot
20	or latitude to go through. I laid out what I wanted them to do. To the
21	extent that mine duplicates the State, I don't have any objection using the
22	State. It's
23	THE COURT: It does not duplicate the State.
24	MR. MUELLER: All right. Then what specifically
25	THE COURT: it's quite different from the State actually. So in

Page 135

the instructions that I gave you, it would be instruction number 9, number 10 -- number 9 and 10.

So take a look at the proposed instructions that the State sent and let me know if you have an objection to them. I'm inclined to give those instructions.

MR. MUELLER: No, Your Honor. The custom and practice in the jurisdiction has always been to use the -- there's a pattern instructions that State -- acts as the custodian of them. And usually defense only provides amplifying instructions.

THE COURT: Okay. So you don't have an objection to the proposed 9 and 10?

MR. MUELLER: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. I'm a going to move on, there is a request to include an instruction on vehicular manslaughter.

MR. DIGIACOMO: Correct.

THE COURT: I'm going to actually hear from the State on this.

MR. DIGIACOMO: Judge, the definition of vehicular manslaughter, the elements are not lesser included, theoretically it's lesser related or maybe even factually we could have charged it in the first place. But since *Peck* came out, I think in 2008, you no longer give lesser related. We're entitled to preclude any less or related be given to the jury.

And so to the extent that Mr. Mueller wants a lesser related, unfortunately he didn't get to make the charging decisions here.

So we object to the giving of the instruction.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. MUELLER: All right. I couldn't disagree with my colleague. Nevada law is actually very well established. The defense is entitled to its theory of the case.

The practical facts as they've been adduced here is that the car was stopped, Mr. Osorio charged in traffic. Ms. Guidry stopped.

Mr. Osorio, on his own initiative, hopped himself onto the hood of the car and started pounding on the windshield. By the eyewitnesses account he -- the car suffered at least ten blows. We have a fractured windshield to verify that.

The law does not require you to stay and suffer harm under any circumstances.

So her underlying misdemeanor felony traffic -- or misdemeanor offense would have been an unsafe stop from start, which is she took off when it was not safe to do so.

The underlying -- the resulting acts or neglect of duty here would have been the death of Mr. Osorio who fell off the car. Therefore, she's entitled to both the unsafe start from stop instruction and a vehicular manslaughter instruction.

THE COURT: So address for me the fact that the vehicular manslaughter is a lesser related offense as opposed to a lesser included offense.

MR. MUELLER: It is a lesser included by --

THE COURT: How is it a lesser included offense? Let me ask that question.

MR. MUELLER: This -- well, the -- the State has made it

several bizarre charging decisions here, instead of charging felony reckless driving, to wit, by driving off in a wanton, willful disregard with Mr. Osorio handing -- holding to the car, in which case we would have had a properly charged case. We are now defending an improperly charge charge of murder.

Now, you don't get to make wildly inaccurate charge and then deprive the defendant of getting the proper instruction on the case.

Now, specifically the facts --

THE COURT: Well, that's a matter of opinion, not a matter of law. So talk to me again how vehicular manslaughter is or is not a lesser included or a lesser related? I need you to distinct --

MR. MUELLER: Okay. Very specifically --

THE COURT: -- distinguish those for me.

MR. MUELLER: -- this is a lesser included from the charge of duty to stop or failure to crash involving death or personal injury.

Now, the State -- that's -- specifically has a duty to stop, means that someone's been injured, you knew about it, and you didn't stop.

Here, vehicular manslaughter would be, I have a duty to drive safely and someone died because I neglected my duty to stop safely -- or drive safely.

THE COURT: I think that duty to stop at a scene of a crash, or involving death or personal injury, would be the lesser included of vehicular manslaughter. If I'm going to follow your logic, it seems to be inverse.

I'll hear from the State on that argument.

MR. DIGIACOMO: Correct. And Mr. Mueller's confusing. Had we filed a felony reckless driving charge, theoretically the vehicular manslaughter would have been, because the reckless driving would have been the violation of the traffic law, and then negligence is a lesser included of recklessness.

That charge isn't in the Indictment. The Indictment is a duty to stop. The duty to stop has nothing to do with vehicular manslaughter.

The vehicular manslaughter happens first, then you have the duty to stop, or you commit the felony crime of duty to stop when you've caused the death of somebody else.

Vehicular manslaughter is not a lesser included of duty to stop. He's trying to argue that vehicular manslaughter is a lesser included of murder and murder is the unlawful killing of a human being with malice aforethought, either expressed or implied and -- well, actually it's just the unlawful killing of a human being; right.

That is not -- these are not included. Violation of a traffic law, negligently causing the death of a person is not -- there's an element in both that is not included in the other.

MR. MUELLER: I would point out to the Court, respectfully and my colleague, as much as I enjoy the banter of a good intellectual argument, we are still very -- have a significant amount of evidence to be heard yet, specifically, the cross-examination of the detective.

And I'm going to ask -- and I'll pose it to the Court and my colleague, a very simple proposition, how many more times was that windshield going to be hit before it gave way and did she have any

1	obligation to sit there and be punched in the face.	
2	And now	
3	THE COURT: That's a well, that's a whole different line of	
4	argument	
5	MR. MUELLER: Well, that's	
6	THE COURT: that goes to potentially self-defense. Or I	
7	understand that you have a what appears to be a proposed necessity	
8	instruction.	
9	So I want to focus specifically on this instruction.	
0	MR. MUELLER: All right.	
1	THE COURT: And I agree with you that we still have additional	
2	evidence to consider. So I am going to defer on this ruling at this time.	
3	But I will ask Mr. Mueller to provide me a case that specifically	
4	provides that vehicular manslaughter is the lesser included of murder with	
5	a deadly weapon. All right.	
6	MR. MUELLER: All right. Thank you, Your Honor.	
7	Then my colleagues okay.	
8	THE COURT: Okay. So I'm going to defer ruling on that one.	
9	MR. MUELLER: All right.	
20	THE COURT: All right. The next proposed instruction reads, o	
21	starts as, The State has the burden of proving beyond and to the	
22	exclusion of every reasonable doubt that the defendant had a general	
23	intent to commit the offense of robbery.	
24	So we already are giving instruction proposed instructions 9	

and 10 that define robbery. And then there is the proposed reasonable

Page 140 1534

doubt instruction, which is the stock instruction.

I'm inclined to give those in place of this proposed instruction.

MR. MUELLER: That's fine, Judge. We'll stick with the stock, the State's stock instruction. I don't have any objection.

THE COURT: All right. Then there's the next instruction that reads, Robbery is a combination of the crime of assault with that of larceny. As a result of larceny -- as a result, larceny can be a lesser included offense of robbery. If you decide that the facts do not support a conviction of robbery, you may consider the charge of larceny.

All right. I'm going to hear from State first regarding it's -- do -- I'm assuming you have an opposition to his defense?

MR. DIGIACOMO: Yeah, I don't believe that assault or battery, and I think there's now case law, his case law seems to end in 2008, that specifically says, neither assault nor battery -- although battery might be very well. But battery might be the -- a lesser included of robbery. But assault certainly isn't a lesser included of battery. I'd have to go look to see if battery is. I don't know if the Supreme Court has ruled on that. But I can get you some case law. And I know for a fact that assault is not because they changed the statute for assault to add a whole bunch of elements.

THE COURT: So here's my -- your proposed instruction 14 seems more appropriate and I think it's what Mr. Mueller's trying to get -- Mr. Mueller's trying to get to. It reads, Any person who steals, takes and carries away, leads away or drives away from person goods or property of another, having a value of \$3500 or more, with the specific intent to

permanently deprive the owner thereof is guilty of grand larceny of more than \$3500.

I think that's what you were trying to propose. And I'm more inclined to give that instruction.

MR. MUELLER: That'll be fine, Judge.

THE COURT: And then it continues to read, \$650 to -- \$3,500 or less than 650.

All right. Any objection to that proposed instruction?

MR. MUELLER: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.

All right. Then the next proposed instruction is kind of along the lines of what you were talking about, Mr. DiGiacomo, Nevada law prohibits assault, assault is deliberately making another person feel that she is about to be physically harmed. The statute defines assault as.

And then it gives two examples.

So assault isn't charged in the Indictment. So I'll hear from Mr. Mueller as to why we should include this instruction.

MR. MUELLER: Well, here's the practicable problem, and my colleague -- I kind of really wish we were done with -- the evidence was closed before we settled some of these because I'm going to have to tip my cards on a couple things here.

Specific --

THE COURT: Well, do you want -- do you want to reserve on that? I'm not going to force you to tip your hand early.

MR. MUELLER: There are a couple of things that have not

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

on.

come out yet that I think might change the Court's view on a couple issues in this case. And I would like to reserve having to play my cards at the moment.

THE COURT: Okay. So that's probably going to be applicable to this instruction, the instruction related to your proposed instruction regarding legal necessity or self-defense.

MR. MUELLER: No, Your Honor, that's a little -- that's a little different argument than the one. I believe, that's absolutely -- we can talk about that now, if you want to review it.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. MUELLER: The practical problem here is --

THE COURT: All right. Hold on one second, before we jump

So I'm going to defer on this assault question. Just so you know where the Court's going with this, Mr. Mueller, I'm not inclined to give this instruction. Assault isn't charged. And I'm just not sure how it's relevant at this time. But, you know, again, I'm not going to force you to tip your hand early. All right.

MR. MUELLER: Okay.

THE COURT: All right. So let's talk about the necessity, proposed necessity instruction.

MR. MUELLER: Thank you, Your Honor.

Let me see if I can find it here.

THE COURT: It starts at the top of the page, it says, The defendant is not guilty of failure to stop at the scene of a crash involving

Page 143

you.

death or personal injury if she acted because of legal necessity or self-defense.

MR. MUELLER: Oh, here it is. It's right at the bottom. Thank

THE COURT: No problem.

MR. MUELLER: All right. Thank you, Your Honor.

Here's the practical, and I come back to the point I just made a moment ago, the eyewitness testimony, and I don't want to vouch for Mr. Landale, but I found him very credible, was that the windshield was hit at least ten times. You can see from the photograph there's at least four impact sites on the windshield, that it was on the verge of or was going to give way under a few additional blows is not meaningful in doubt.

So the question becomes, there was a moment in time where Mr. Osorio and Ms. Guidry were separated, they were separated by a very large concrete building and they were out of each other's sight. Where the watch was and where -- how it was, if he, in fact, been the guilty of larceny, the larceny is now complete. He now is in the process of doing exactly what O.J. Simpson did, and found himself in prison for, which is going back to try to retrieve his property and runs into the traffic to do so.

Now, he's assaulting Ms. Guidry, there's apparently a language barrier, and an alcohol barrier, very tall alcohol barrier, and the windshield is starting to give way.

Now, had she sat there for --

THE COURT: I'm going to stop you right there, really quickly, and I'm sorry to interrupt you, but tell me what evidence I've heard that

Page 144 1538

1	suggest that his pounding is what broke the windshield, as opposed to his	
2	head getting hit during the course of the accident?	
3	MR. MUELLER: Very simple, Mr, Landale	
4	THE COURT: I understand there was testimony that he was	
5	hitting it. I understand that. But what testimony or evidence do I have that	
6	his hitting the windshield caused it to break?	
7	MR. MUELLER: Mr. Landale was very clear, the car	
8	Ms. Guidry came to a very a complete stop. He ran out. She stopped	
9	the car. The car was stopped. He then hit the windshield repeatedly, ten	
10	times. There is no other	
11	THE COURT: But there was a did he testify that that caused	
12	the windshield to break?	
13	MR. MUELLER: He was	
14	MR. DIGIACOMO: He did not. But to help mister not to help	
15	Mr. Mueller out. Ms. Guidry claims that it was the fist that caused the	
16	breaking so.	
17	THE COURT: I realize that. So I understand that's her	
18	statement.	
19	MR. DIGIACOMO: There's some evidence of that.	
20	THE COURT: Sure.	
21	MR. DIGIACOMO: Although I would submit	
22	THE COURT: Sure.	
23	MR. DIGIACOMO: to the Court.	
24	But, that being said, that misstates the law particularly since	
25	we're talking about the <i>Leonard</i> instruction. First of all, a person has the	

Page 145 1539

right to use force to resist the taking of their property. And if the defendant chooses, she says it in her own statement, if I just handed him the watch and then he continues the force, yeah, then she has the right to defend herself. But while she's holding that property --

MR. MUELLER: That's --

MR. DIGIACOMO: -- that is her resistance -- or his resistance is lawful and she cannot accelerate that vehicle and kill him.

MR. MUELLER: The answer -- that's absolutely, fundamentally, absolutely 100 percent wrong. O.J. Simpson got a better part of a decade in prison for doing just this.

THE COURT: No, that's a different situation, Mr. Mueller, he planned --

MR. MUELLER: Respectfully --

THE COURT: -- to go in to commit a robbery. There's a different -- there's a -- completely different facts and circumstances.

MR. MUELLER: Respectfully, Judge, and this will come out tomorrow on cross-examination, A, number one, I went out there Sunday, the detective is incorrect, you can turn left and right. And I went out there. I'll go get a picture tonight to show you.

Having said that, there came a time, and you saw it, she doesn't speed off. She doesn't squeal, peel out, she just drives off. There's a minute, minute and a half, they're not talking to each other. There's nobody around. They have -- don't know each other's names. Done. Elevator music. Crickets.

Now, Mr. Osorio is the one who assaults Ms. Guidry by running

into traffic, steps in front of her car, hops on the windshield, and starts pounding it, and there's four fist impact sites consistent with his attack.

Now's he's the assaulter. This is his crime. Not hers. She sits there patiently, they're yelling -- or is patiently -- or yelling as patient as you can be with someone sitting on the hood of your car pounding out.

What you have not heard, and you're going to hear it tomorrow, is you're going to hear about five or six more eyewitness 9-1-1 calls who verify Mr. Landale's recollection is pretty much spot on.

So the fact that he was on the windshield -- hood of the car, pounding windshield is not meaningful in doubt. In fact, Mr. DiGiacomo actually showed a very grainy, but a pixilated view, of him holding onto the car, pounding on it. It was -- it was -- granted it was a small -- or a swatch of video but it very clearly confirms exactly what the eyewitnesses said.

So, now, he's using force in a unlawful replevin action. He isn't resisting the taking of his property. We still haven't -- it's not even established yet in his record whether the property was actually taken or inadvertently left.

He takes it on his own initiative to run into traffic, at a very busy intersection, and hops on a car and starts pounding on the windshield, under the influence of a lot of alcohol.

So the answer is, is he is the wrong doer at that particular moment, not Ms. Guidry. Ms. Guidry has the right to defend herself. And I don't know any doctrine of law, ever, in law school, here, prosecuting, defense, that requires you to sustain injury.

Now, she has the right to drive off. The fact that he held onto

6

7 8

9

11

10

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23 24

25

the car, it was a very poor alcohol fueled decision, but it was his decision, not hers. She stopped. He didn't get off the car. He didn't stop and have her roll down the window and say, Hey, can you check to see if my watch is in there?

Now, none of that happened.

THE COURT: Well, there wasn't an opportunity for that to happen, was there?

MR. MUELLER: If the car -- no, and we won't know and that's a wonderful point.

But, having said that, I was very clear, and stood in the well of this courtroom, there was a moment in time when he's standing directly in front of her car, she's not moving, and at that moment he doesn't walk around to the window and tap, Hey, can you check for my watch. He hops onto the hood of her car. That makes him the aggressor in that time.

Now, you cannot use force and violence to recover property. That's black letter law.

Now, if she had turned left on Koval, these people would have never seen each other again. She turned right on Koval, not squealing, not speeding, nothing. The drunk, young man, God bless him, but ran out and hopped on the hood of a car and started pounding on a windshield. That's not appropriate behavior, even if she did steal the wallet -- or steal the watch.

THE COURT: All right. So I'm going to disagree with you on a couple of different points and I feel like we've kind of gotten off track here.

First, your argument seems to be based on the fact that there's

no testimony that the watch was stolen and therefore it can't be proven that a robbery occurred. The *Leonard* case specifically disagrees with that argument. It provides that a jury may not be instructed that a robbery be taken from a living person. It does allow for a person to be charged with robbery from a person who is deceased.

So let's start there and then work our way backwards.

MR. MUELLER: Well --

THE COURT: The case law that you provided in support of your necessity instruction, one, the case of *Jorgensen v State* involves an escape, and, two, *Hoagland v State* involves a necessity for a DUI, which actually in the end the Supreme Court determined that there was no error for not providing the necessity defense and we'll get to that in a minute.

But before I do that, let me ask the State this question, do you have an objection to a necessity defense?

MR. DIGIACOMO: I do. Because there's an element, and it's their burden to establish, that upon getting out of fear, in any necessity defense, they must immediately report. And that's *Lovercamp* that says that. I don't have the -- it directly in --

THE COURT: The citation. I read that one. I didn't write it down.

MR. DIGIACOMO: -- directly in front of me.

THE COURT: Yeah.

MR. DIGIACOMO: But they're missing an element for an affirmative defense, which is she immediately reports. It is the same thing as it relates to his instruction on the, if you're in fear for your life, you don't

have a duty to stop. You do once you're out of danger, then you do have a duty to stop, and you must report. Their affirmative defense they cannot meet because we can all stipulate she does not report.

MR. MUELLER: The answer is -- okay. And my colleagues going to have to answer a very tough question then, Was she obligated to have that windshield collapse on her car?

MR. DIGIACOMO: And why --

MR. MUELLER: And was obligated --

THE COURT: Well --

MR. MUELLER: -- was she --

MR. DIGIACOMO: -- she was holding the watch.

THE COURT: -- hold on, we're -- we're --

MR. MUELLER: -- if I could -- the floors mine.

THE COURT: -- we're interrupt -- though where you're starting the conversation about the evidence and it's presented midstream, because by the time that happens the evidence, even if you disagree with it, circumstantially supports that the watch was stolen and there was a robbery.

So I think there's a couple of different failures, one, I agree with Mr. DiGiacomo, there's a requirement to a duty to report. And, two, the case that you cited, *Hoagland v State*, 126 Nevada 381, discusses, in this instance, a necessity defense in terms of a DUI, there it discusses reasoning from foreign jurisdiction. But one of the cases that it talks about is that supporting element of a necessity defense is whether the defendant is blameless for creating the situation.

Page 150

And at this point, understanding that you haven't put on your full defense. So I'm not going to make this decision tonight. I'm going to still defer on this case. Based on the evidence that's been presented thus far, I don't think you have that element or that situation on your side candidly, Mr. Mueller.

But -- but --

MR. MUELLER: Respectfully, Judge, and I --

THE COURT: Continue.

MR. MUELLER: Okay. Thank you.

I have -- made the practice of always going to crime scenes before I do trials. So I've been out there. I went out there Sunday afternoon before we started.

This case -- this -- if there was a robbery or a -- sorry, if there was a larceny, let's start at the predicate fact, if she actually took the watch and he didn't just leave it in the car or he bribed her for sexual favorites with it, if the car -- once they parked, whatever circumstances, it's over with. She's on the other side of a building. She's gone away. He's standing there, look -- standing there, and you can see him in the videotape, he's standing there. The case is over with. The larceny has occurred.

Now, he takes it upon himself to recover his property, not resist the taking of it. If it's been taken, it's taken. It's gone. And had she turned left there at the intersection, where I know she can do because I did it Sunday afternoon, is, the case is over with.

The problem with this case, and my colleague never seems to --

hasn't seemed to recognize this yet, is this is a replevin action. He is going on to the car, not to resist the taking because it's been taken. It's gone.

THE COURT: So --

MR. MUELLER: He assaults her car. He hops on a car, nobody in a right mind thinks hopping on a car and pounding on a windshield until it breaks, is a good idea. And she sits there and let's him breaks the windshield. Yelling at him, get off the car, get off the car, whatever she's yelling at him. It's not until the windshield looks like it's about ready to give way and she's going to get punched in the face that she take off. And then he makes the very poorly calculated decision to try to hold on.

Now, there's two -- there's a break in the action here. This isn't -- this isn't a continuous action. There's a break.

THE COURT: Where's the break?

MR. MUELLER: There's a -- the break is when the --

THE COURT: Because she continues to flee the scene.

MR. MUELLER: He doesn't. My -- my -- detective -- the detective -- the detective -- the detective has a fairly creative -- or Salisbury has creative eyesight. Watch the video, Judge, the kids standing there, got his hand in his pocket, he's kind of looking around like this, he's not particularly doing anything. He starts walking this way --

THE COURT: Other than realizing his watch is missing perhaps?

MR. MUELLER: No, actually not. If the watch had been taken.

It doesn't matter. She's gone. He goes out and sees her on the other side about a minute and a half or 45 minutes -- 45 seconds later. And then he attacks her. That is unlawful.

If he ran out in the street and got a license plate or if he stood in front of her car and called the police, okay, he'd been rightfully with his actions. That's not what happened.

He's feloniously assaulting -- or maliciously destroying her vehicle on the assumption, presumably, and I no -- I don't want to put words into his head because I don't know what he was thinking -- but presumably under the assumption that the watch was in the car. But since he didn't knock on the window and ask we don't know.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. MUELLER: There's a break in the action here. Everyone seems to forget this. There's two separate theaters of operation.

Whatever happened in the car, whether it was sexual, whether the car -- the watch was taken, whether there was an exchange of the watch for sexual services, we don't know yet, they haven't established.

THE COURT: Tell me where in that video we see an opportunity for the victim to walk up to the victim's car, knock, knock, knock, and, say, Hey, can I have my watch back?

MR. MUELLER: Look at -- he got out voluntarily. Everyone seems to forget this. She's sitting in the car. He gets out of the car, grabs his coat, and starts walking away. She pulls off. She doesn't squeal away. She pulls off.

MR. DIGIACOMO: The instruction would violate the instruction

he already agreed to, which is, Robbery is not confined to a fixed locus, but may spread over considerable and varying --

THE COURT: That's correct.

MR. DIGIACOMO: -- periods of time. All matters immediately antecedent to and having direct causal connection with the robbery are deemed so closely connected with it as to form in reality a part of the occurrence. Thus, although acts of violence or intimidation preceded or followed the actual taking of the property and may have been primarily intended for another purpose, -- i.e., to get out there because I'm scared of him -- it is enough to support the charge of robbery when a person takes the property by taking advantage of the terrifying situation she created.

He is in the effort to resist her escape with the property and she uses force. As a matter of law --

MR. MUELLER: I --

MR. DIGIACOMO: -- it's a robbery.

MR. MUELLER: It is a matter of law. It is not. He's in the wrong. She's gone. The car is gone.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. MUELLER: I've asked every witness, can --

THE COURT: Mr. Mueller, at this point I'm going to respectfully disagree with you. I think that -- and -- that's that's the great thing about our system we can respectfully disagree with each other.

Now, I'm going to defer ruling on that to let you complete the presentation of your case and we can finish the charge conference as to

that tomorrow at the conclusion of your presentation of the defense, whatever that defense might be, whether it's just cross-examination or you decide to put on a case, that's fine.

So let's defer ruling on that one.

I am going to end by 5:00. So we've got five minutes left.

The other ones -- the other one that's going to be, I think, an issue or there's going to be a question about, is related, we already have the voluntary manslaughter question. He also proposed an involuntary manslaughter question.

So why don't we answer those both tomorrow together, the involuntary and the voluntary.

MR. DIGIACOMO: Judge, I actually think that -- I don't object to the involuntary but his definition is not the complete statute.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. DIGIACOMO: And so I intend to give you --

THE COURT: I did see the proposed one.

MR. DIGIACOMO: -- in the morning. I didn't give you an involuntary, but I plan to give you an involuntary that essentially says, the involuntary statute, and then said, if you find there was a grand larceny, it cannot be involuntary.

THE COURT: Let's see here, involuntary. There's a couple of -- well, I have -- I think that's going to require you to also define manslaughter so.

MR. DIGIACOMO: Correct. Then there's two instructions in involuntary manslaughter. But basically manslaughter is the killing -- the

unintentional --

THE COURT: The unlawful killing of a human being without -MR. DIGIACOMO: -- or the killing of another without the
manner they intended to use so.

THE COURT: -- malice, express, or implied, yeah.

MR. DIGIACOMO: Yeah.

THE COURT: Okay. All right.

MR. DIGIACOMO: So I will get those to you in the morning before we start. Or I'll get them to you tonight. But I'll send them to Jaye and so she can give them to you in the morning.

THE COURT: Thank you.

All right. So then with -- the question will just remain regarding the vehicular manslaughter.

Then there is a proposed instruction regarding the reasonable doubt instruction. I'm going to give the, like I already said, the standard reasonable doubt instruction. So this one I'm going to deny.

There was also a proposed instruction regarding the burden of proof, but that is confusing, it would conflict with the proposed reasonable doubt instruction, so I'm not inclined to give that one. And it also discusses general intent, criminal intent, and it says that robbery is a general intent crime. So I'm not going to give that one.

Just so we're clear for the record the has the cases State v Bolden, Sharma v State, Crawford v State, and Brooks v State at the bottom.

Then there's a proposed instruction regarding larceny. We

already agreed to the instruction regarding larceny, which is instruction 14, so I'll be giving that instruction as opposed to this one.

And the last one is an alternate, kind of combined definition of robbery with a deadly weapon, the reasonable doubt instruction, and the term in the commission of an assault. I'm not going to give this instruction. I believe the intent or purpose of this instruction is covered by proposed instructions 9, 10, 12, and 13. I am inclined to give those instructions in its place, those are the stock instructions.

MR. MUELLER: I understand, Judge.

THE COURT: All right. Any questions or objections to those instructions?

MR. MUELLER: I think final settling is a tad premature. I appreciate the need for judicial economy. And --

THE COURT: Well, we're -- we're, yeah.

MR. MUELLER: I'm cooperating, Judge, I'm not upset.

THE COURT: Yeah.

MR. MUELLER: I'm just -- it's a tad premature and I reserve the right to supplement my proposed instructions depending on tomorrow's testimony.

THE COURT: Absolutely. And there's -- I would expect you to. So that's no problem.

MR. MUELLER: And if I could impose on my colleagues, tomorrow, on defense, if they could bring their laptop so I don't have to load up everything, videos, and the 9-1-1 calls.

MR. DIGIACOMO: My -- you're free to tell me. I didn't offer it

and you used it the whole time.

MR. MUELLER: No, you're -- you've been very -- no, my colleagues been very professional. I just want to make sure that we have the 9-1-1 calls tomorrow morning.

MR. DIGIACOMO: Yeah, they're loaded so.

MR. MUELLER: Okay. That's fine.

MR. DIGIACOMO: They'll be here.

MR. MUELLER: All right. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. So, actually, since we've done this, I don't think I need you-all to come back early, which is you guys are lucky tomorrow, unless you wanted to discuss anything else outside the presence of the jury before 10:30.

MR. MUELLER: I -- that's fine, Judge.

THE COURT: Are you sure?

MR. MUELLER: Yeah, I'm fine. I just -- I'm going to go back and do some research tonight. That's fine.

THE COURT: Okay. I'm happy to come back at 9:00. We can talk.

MR. MUELLER: I'll call your JEA if I think we need some more time. I've been doing this awhile. We can get through it.

THE COURT: Well, I've got to set another -- I've got to set that change of plea. So sets that going to be dictated by this. I can either set that plea at 8:30 and then have time available for you all to talk or we can just resume at 10:30 and finish the charge conference, for example, over lunch.

1	MR. MUELLER: All right. That'll be fine. Let's just we can
2	come back at 10:30.
3	THE COURT: Okay. All right. So let's everyone be back by
4	10:20 that way we're ready to roll right at 10:30.
5	MR. MUELLER: All right. Thank you.
6	THE COURT: All right. Thank you very much. I appreciate it.
7	Have a good night everyone.
8	MR. DIGIACOMO: Thank you, Judge.
9	
10	[Jury trial, Day 4, concluded at 5:00 p.m.]
11	* * * * *
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	ATTEST: I do hereby certify that I have truly and correctly transcribed the
21	audio/video proceedings in the above-entitled case to the best of my ability.
22	, Dina Vullani
23	Gina Villani
24	Court Recorder/Transcriber District Court Dept. IX
∠+	

Electronically Filed 4/29/2020 4:54 PM Steven D. Grierson CLERK OF THE COURT

RTRAN 1 2 3 4 DISTRICT COURT 5 CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA 6 7 8 THE STATE OF NEVADA, CASE#: C-18-329810-1 9 Plaintiff, DEPT. IX 10 VS. 11 RONNEKA ANN GUIDRY, 12 Defendant. 13 BEFORE THE HONORABLE CRISTINA D. SILVA, DISTRICT COURT JUDGE 14 FRIDAY, AUGUST 16, 2019 15 RECORDER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS: 16 JURY TRIAL - DAY 5 17 18 APPEARANCES: 19 MARC DIGIACOMO, ESQ. For the State: 20 Chief Deputy District Attorney MICHAEL J. SCARBOROUGH, ESQ. 21 **Deputy District Attorney** 22 23 CRAIG A. MUELLER, ESQ. For the Defendant: 24 RECORDED BY: GINA VILLANI, COURT RECORDER 25

1554

1	Las Vegas, Nevada, Friday, August 16, 2019	
2		
3	[Jury trial began at 10:35 a.m.]	
4	[Outside the presence of the jury]	
5	THE COURT: We're back on the record in Case	
6	C-18-329810-10, State of Nevada versus Ronneka Guidry.	
7	Anything we need to address outside the presence of the jury?	
8	MR. MUELLER: No, Your Honor.	
9	THE COURT: All right.	
10	MR. DIGIACOMO: No.	
11	THE COURT: Then let's go ahead and bring the jury in.	
12	THE MARSHAL: Your Honor, do you want me to bring the	
13	witness in?	
14	THE COURT: Yeah, let's go ahead and actually put the witness	
15	on the stand.	
16	And are we all set up with audio, et cetera?	
17	MR. DIGIACOMO: Yeah, Mr. Mueller's told me what he's	
18	looking for so.	
19	THE COURT: Great.	
20	MR. MUELLER: And thank my colleague for cooperating, make	
21	it a lot easier for all of us.	
22	THE COURT: Great.	
23	[In the presence of the jury panel]	
24	THE COURT: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. Welcome	
25	back.	

Page 2 1555

1		Do the parties stipulate to the presence of the jury?
2		MR. DIGIACOMO: Yes, Your Honor.
3		MR. MUELLER: Yes, Your Honor.
4		THE COURT: All right. Please be seated and I'll remind you
5	that you'	re still under oath.
6		And when you're ready, Mr. Mueller, you can resume or you
7	can begi	n cross-examination.
8		MR. MUELLER: All right. Thank you.
9		CROSS-EXAMINATION
10	BY MR.	MUELLER:
11	Q	Good morning, detective, how are you?
12	Α	Good morning. I'm doing well. Thank you.
13	Q	All right. Thank you.
14		Sir, I want to go back and just touch a couple points on your
15	resume a	and then I'll get right to the case.
16	Α	Sure.
17	Q	How long have you been with the Metropolitan Police
18	Departm	ent?
19	А	15 years.
20	Q	15 years.
21		All right. So put it, you know, in the colloquial terms, this isn't
22	your first	rodeo?
23	А	Sure.
24	Q	Okay. So you've been doing this you've been doing this quite
25	some tim	ne; correct?

Page 3 1556

1	А	Yes.
2	Q	Now, being a detective has a few things that you kind of need to
3	pick up over the years; correct?	
4	А	Sure.
5	Q	All right. One of the things that a good detective knows is,
6	never to	be too hasty in forming a conclusion; correct?
7	А	Correct.
8	Q	All right. And a good detective examines all of the available
9	evidence	e before he reaches a conclusion or follow figure out what the
10	next step	o of an investigation should be?
11		Would you agree with that?
12	А	Roughly, yes.
13	Q	Yes, sir.
14		Now, there were a number of 9-1-1 calls that came in regarding
15	the incid	ent with Mr. Osorio in the street; correct?
16	Α	There were.
17	Q	All right. And did you listen to all, and I do mean all of the 9-1-1
18	calls?	
19	Α	I believe I listened to all of them, yes.
20	Q	All right. Thank you.
21		MR. MUELLER: And with the help of my colleague, sir, will you
22	go ahead and	
23	BY MR.	MUELLER:
24	Q	I'm going to ask you to listen to the rest of the 9-1-1 calls that
25	have be	en provided to me by the State. And if you just listen to them and

Page 4 1557

1	I have a few questions for you.		
2	A Sure.		
3	MR. DIGIACOMO: And for the record it's 110B, Judge.		
4	THE COURT: Thank you.		
5	MR. MUELLER: Thank you.		
6	We'll stipulate it's 110B.		
7	[Playing audio]		
8	THE COURT: Can I have a brief are those all the calls?		
9	MR. DIGIACOMO: Those are all the calls.		
10	THE COURT: May I have a brief bench conference with		
11	counsel, please.		
12	[Bench conference begins]		
13	THE COURT: All right. Yesterday we discussed these calls, I		
14	had not heard them, and I do believe that the first two qualifies an ongoing		
15	emergency report, but the last two don't seem to meet that qualification.		
16	But I want to make sure we state for the record you have you		
17	want it isn't your intention to introduce these calls?		
18	MR. MULLER: No, it is my understanding that none of these		
19	witnesses were local and to save them the inconvenience, since they		
20	didn't have but a minor part, we just went ahead and played them. And I		
21	waive an objection of that.		
22	THE COURT: All right. Thank you.		
23	And you have no objection to that?		
24	MR. DIGIACOMO: Correct.		
25	THE COURT: All right. Thank you.		

Page 5 1558

1	[Bench conference ends]	
2	BY MR. MUELLER:	
3	Q	All right. Detective
4	Α	Yes.
5	Q	now to put too fine a point on it, everyone's got a job and you
6	go to wo	ork every day and listen to those calls and have to sort out what
7	happene	ed?
8	Α	Correct.
9	Q	All right. And, frequently, well intention, well-meaning people
10	are confused, in fact, if you listen very carefully you would have thought	
11	the guy	had been run over by a white minivan; correct?
12	Α	That's not the conclusion I drew, but if you did, okay.
13	Q	Yes, sir.
14		But my point is, is dealing with and sifting through conflicting
15	reports,	sometimes emotional, is what you do for a living?
16	Α	It's
17	Q	At least part of what you do?
18	А	Separating what I determine to be relevant information and
19	irrelevar	nt information, if that's what you're asking, then yes.
20	Q	Okay. Now, the other thing that a detective has to be careful of
21	is frame of reference. If you start investigating a case with this theory, you	
22	got to ke	eep open or keep an open mind that maybe your theories not quite
23	right or i	maybe you should be investigating something different; correct?
24	А	Correct.
25	Q	All right. Now, I want to go through some basics here, did you

Page 7

1	А	No, I believe that's disturbed dust, sure. But whether that's from
2	somebo	dy on the hood of the car, I don't think I drew that conclusion
3	anywhe	re from that photograph.
4	Q	All right. Now, there was a report also that there was a man on
5	the car I	banging on the windshield; correct?
6	А	Correct.
7	Q	And you, in fact, were able to get downloaded photographs from
8	a cell ph	none showing a smashed in windshield?
9	А	Correct.
10	Q	Okay. So you were confronted with two pieces of physical
11	evidenc	e and three eyewitnesses account before you even started your
12	investigation, or merely early in your investigation, that shows someone	
13	was up	on the hood of a car banging on a windshield, agree?
14	А	So your question is, whether I got that information after I started
15	my inve	stigation?
16	Q	Yes, sir.
17	А	No, I mean, my investigation started when I got called out;
18	right?	
19	Q	Yes, sir.
20		But early in the course of the investigation, i.e., before you
21	made ai	ny arrests, you knew that there was reports there was a smashed
22	windshie	eld and someone on the hood of a car?
23	А	That timeframe you mean. Oh, yes, I agree.
24	Q	Okay. Now, I want to go through some of your practical
25	day-to-c	lay experience. It is an unfortunate fact of life in the 20th Century

Page 8 1561

1	and the 21st Century people occasionally get hit by cars?	
2	A Correct.	
3	Q All right. And that's just unfortunate consequence of us all	
4	driving automobiles and crosswalks and pedestrians; correct?	
5	A I don't know with what I do, I can't consider it unfortunate	
6	coincidence. There's neglect there in 99 percent of what I did do.	
7	Q All right. When people get hit by cars, especially a car in fatal	
8	accidents, that generally leaves damage on the car; correct?	
9	A It depends on the characteristics and dynamics of the	
10	engagement. But frequently, yes.	
11	Q All right. And based and I'm talking, you know, I'm talking	
12	about your day-to-day working day world, sir, we all know there's always	
13	freak cases everywhere, but I want to get through what you do every day.	
14	A Right. And even I still stand the same, even with what I've	
15	seen, it doesn't take very much speed for a vehicle engaging a pedestrian	
16	for there to be fatal type injuries, where there's simply transfer or, for lack	
17	of a better term, lack of dynamic collapses, what we all, essentially just	
18	crushed damage to the car.	
19	Q All right. So the reality is, and I don't think it's any going out	
20	on a limb here, that when pedestrian and cars tangle at any speed, the	
21	pedestrian is always on the short end of the stick?	
22	A Right. We call that the law of the lug nuts.	
23	Q I'm sorry, the law of what?	
24	A The lug nuts.	
25	Q Law of the lug nuts, as opposed to law of gross tonnage, same	

Page 9 1562

1	idea with boats?	
2	Α	Right.
3	Q	All right. Sir, showing you what's been marked as State's 76,
4	that's th	e car that you believe Ms. Guidry was driving; correct?
5	А	Correct.
6	Q	And you would agree that you had physical control and time to
7	examine	e that car in detail, the police department did?
8	А	I did.
9	Q	You would agree that there's no damage at all to indicate that
10	Ms. Guidry hit a pedestrian?	
11		THE COURT: Before you hold on.
12		Counsel, has this been admitted into evidence?
13		MR. DIGIACOMO: It is.
14		THE COURT: Okay. So it's actually State's Exhibit 76.
15		MR. MUELLER: State's exhibit, yes.
16		THE COURT: Okay. Just want to make sure.
17		THE WITNESS: Correct.
18	BY MR.	MUELLER:
19	Q	All right. So there's no evidence at all that she hit anybody?
20	А	Correct.
21	Q	All right. Now, sir, you, as the investigator, went to the scene of
22	Mr. Osorio's death; correct?	
23	А	I did.
24	Q	You prepared presumably, prepared State's 86
25	[0	Colloquy between the District Attorney and Defense Counsel]

1	BY MR. MUELLER:	
2	Q	You prepared State's 86; correct?
3	Α	I did.
4	Q	All right. And are you proficient with computer graphics that put
5	the arrows on?	
6	А	I believe so.
7	Q	Okay. So you're you can do that. All right.
8		Showing you what has been marked and admitted as State's
9	86; my colleague has an electronic copy up on the screen.	
10		Now, I want to go through a few basics here, this line in was
11	yellow ar	d you base that on what you observed on the videotape;
12	correct?	
13	Α	Correct.
14	Q	All right. And to the best of your recollection, with a few feet
15	one way	or the other, parking space one way or the other, that's yellow
16	and that's	s what the videotape shows?
17	Α	Correct.
18	Q	Okay. And she backed that car in because we know that the
19	headlight	s were facing through a tree and they didn't move? We can see
20	the head	lights never were turned off?
21	Α	Correct.
22	Q	Okay. Now, I want to understand, again, the red line the red
23	dots, are the course of path that you believe she took?	
24	А	Correct.
25	Q	And you believe that that's the course of path she took based

1	on snipp	ets of videos in the garage and on the streets; correct?
2	А	Correct.
3	Q	All right. So, now, I want to go through and clear up a few
4	things, y	esterday you testified that it was impossible for her to turn left at
5	the Westin parking garage.	
6		Do you remember that?
7	А	I don't remember saying impossible.
8	Q	You said, and I think I don't want to paraphrase. I'll try to
9	quote you at least paraphrase it, the phrase you used was, she would	
10	have to cross over the island.	
11		Do you remember that?
12	А	The curbing?
13	Q	Yes, sir.
14	А	Yes.
15	Q	That's not true is it?
16	А	I
17	Q	You can actually make a left turn out of that Westin parking lot?
18	А	You can make a left turn out of that Westin parking lot.
19	Q	All right. So if Ms. Guidry came out of the parking lot, out of the
20	garage, and decided to turn left, she could do so?	
21	А	She could.
22	Q	Now, you've been to the scene, have you not?
23	Α	I have.
24	Q	Okay. I want to understand and help the jury understand
25	because the Westin's garage is kind of laid out a little unusually.	

1	Α	It is.
2	Q	Correct?
3	А	It is.
4	Q	All right. To get out of the front parking lot you actually have to
5	drive through the garage; correct?	
6	Α	Correct.
7	Q	All right. Showing you a couple of photographs here.
8	[C	olloquy between the District Attorney and Defense Counsel]
9	BY MR. MUELLER:	
10	Q	All right. Now, that's picture is State's evidence 23, that
11	picture fairly and accurately represent the general conditions of the	
12	parking	lot?
13	Α	Correct.
14	Q	Okay. Now, I can't see the far side of that garage through the
15	photograph, can I?	
16	Α	You cannot.
17	Q	All right. I can't even see daylight, can I?
18	А	Correct.
19	Q	So if I were in from out of town, another country perhaps, and I
20	was star	nding in that parking lot, there would be no reason for me to
21	suspect	that I could go through that garage? It's a solid building from that
22	angle; co	orrect?
23		MR. DIGIACOMO: Objection, speculation.
24		MR. MUELLER: I'll rephrase.

Page 13 1566

1	BY MR. MUELLER:	
2	Q There's no reason a pedestrian can see through that light,	
3	there'd be no light coming through the other side, no reason to see that	
4	that's nothing other than concrete solid building?	
5	A Correct.	
6	Q Okay. Now, I wanted to understand a few things, standing	
7	about where you are or moving yourself a little further to the right, about	
8	where Mr. Osorio is seen to be getting out of the car.	
9	MR. MUELLER: Let me see if we got a better, slightly better	
10	photo.	
11	State's 25, if you can.	
12	MR. DIGIACOMO: Yeah, I'll put it up for you.	
13	BY MR. MUELLER:	
14	Q All right. This is a slightly closer view, even a little closer to the	
15	garage that the car is that you're supposed to drive-thru the garage to	
16	get out, is not immediately obvious?	
17	A Correct.	
18	Q All right. So it's a little unusual layout; you would agree?	
19	A Yes.	
20	Q All right. Now, you watched the videotape from the Westin	
21	parking lot; correct?	
22	A I did.	
23	Q All right. Now, I want to understand establish a few things,	
24	that's a wide screen photograph and you would agree that the video was	
25	kind of far from ideal for this case?	

1	Α	Sure.
2	Q	All right. So we could have had better video but we got what we
3	have, tha	at's what a case is; okay.
4	Α	Correct.
5	Q	So the car comes in and it backs into a spot; you would agree?
6	Α	I do.
7	Q	All right. Now, Mr. Osorio and Ms. Guidry sit there for how
8	long?	
9	А	Seven minutes.
10	Q	Seven minutes.
11		Now, what time in the video did you see or does Mr. Osorio get
12	out of the	e car?
13	А	I believe the timestamp on the video was about 2:19 and 58
14	seconds.	
15	Q	So about how long before he gets out?
16	Α	What's your question?
17	Q	Well, I want to
18		MR. MUELLER: Your Honor, with a little Court's indulgence, a
19	little demonstrative exhibit; if I could?	
20		THE COURT: Well
21		MR. MUELLER: I just want to try to clarify.
22		THE COURT: Go ahead. Let's see where you're going with
23	this.	
24	BY MR. MUELLER:	
25	0	All right. Now Mr. Osorio is sitting in and it's your videotane

Page 15

1	he's sittir	ng in the passenger seat; correct?
2	А	Correct.
3	Q	All right. You see him get out, per your video, that he gets out
4	of the pa	ssenger seat voluntarily?
5	Α	Correct.
6	Q	Nobody forces him out?
7	А	That I can see from the video?
8	Q	There's no security pulling him out of a car, anything like that,
9	he gets out of the car voluntarily; correct?	
10	Α	As far as what I can see from the video, sure.
11	Q	Okay. Now, the car, the black car that Ms. Guidry's driving, it
12	goes out, turns to the right, and goes through the parking garage?	
13	А	Correct.
14	Q	All right. From the time that Ms. Guidry's car drives away, till
15	the time that Mr. Osorio runs over into the through the Jake's [sic]	
16	parking lot, about how much time elapses?	
17	А	Seconds.
18	Q	All right. Sir, did you do the investigation or do we need to
19	count it?	
20	А	If we could do the counter, I don't know off the top of my head
21	how many seconds.	
22	Q	All right. Thank you.
23		MR. MUELLER: Mr. DiGiacomo, could you
24		MR. DIGIACOMO: Sure.
25		MR. MUELLER: get us back to the video.

1	Thank you for your courtesy.	
2	[Playing video]	
3	MR. MUELLER: Thank you. If we could back up right the	e.
4	[Playing video]	
5	MR. MUELLER: All right. It appears if we could just free	ze
6	frame it for a moment.	
7	The timestamp is 01 I'm sorry, 03, 3rd of January, 18, 2:	19 in
8	the morning at 51 seconds.	
9	And if we could just play it forward slowly.	
10	[Playing video]	
11	MR. MUELLER: Okay. And it starts moving at 2:58, 2:57	and a
12	half, 2:58 seconds, and the car starts to move out.	
13	[Playing video]	
14	MR. MUELLER: All right. If we could stop it right about the	ere.
15	The cars just about ready to enter exit surveillance video on the lef	t
16	frame.	
17	BY MR. MUELLER:	
18	Q Now, I want to understand a few things, sir, at this moment	į
19	Mr. Osorio is out of the car voluntarily, wasn't forced out of the car by	!
20	security, he got out of the car and is standing there; correct?	
21	A As far as I know.	
22	Q Okay. Now, did you see Mr. Osorio run after that car?	
23	A I did.	
24	Q At this moment?	
25	A Not at this moment.	

1	Q	Not at this moment. Okay.
2		So we're at 02:20:01, you would agree that in a few seconds, if
3	not imme	ediately, the car will disappear from sight? It has to go through
4	the gara	ge; correct?
5	А	From sight of this camera, yes.
6	Q	Okay. But you'll also go out of sight for Mr. Osorio?
7	А	Within a matter of a few seconds, yes.
8	Q	Okay. So I want to stop you at that moment in time, Mr. Osorio
9	has beer	n drinking, he's standing by himself in Las Vegas, with nobody
10	around h	im; correct, he's standing there by himself?
11	А	Correct.
12	Q	Okay. Now, he makes no effort to chase after the car, at this
13	moment,	doesn't run after her?
14	Α	Correct.
15	Q	All right. Now, she's literally gone from sight; correct?
16	А	From his sight, I can't speculate what he can or can't see from
17	his vanta	age point.
18	Q	We know from the geometry of the parking lot, sir, it's not
19	meaning	fully in doubt, she's gone, he can't see her? Do I need to show
20	you the a	aerial view?
21		MR. MUELLER: Sir, if we can go back to the
22		MR. DIGIACOMO: You want to go back to
23		MR. MUELLER: 86.
24		MR. DIGIACOMO: 86.

Page 18 1571

1	BY MR. I	MULLER:
2	Q	All right. By your own work product, Detective, if the arrow is
3	about wh	ere Mr. Osorio was standing, give or take a few feet, following
4	the red li	ne, he clearly cannot see Ms. Guidry?
5	А	If I can sorry, the mouse is upside down. So if he's here and
6	she's pul	ling in, where you're talking about right now in the video and
7	she's her	e, I do believe there's a path.
8		But I do agree with what you're I think what you're getting at,
9	that wher	n he's over here there's line of sight issues. He cannot see her.
10	Q	Okay. So we know he's not from around here; correct?
11	А	Correct.
12	Q	We can reasonably expect he's not familiar with the area?
13	А	You can reasonably conclude that.
14	Q	Well, reasonably expect that he's not familiar with the area?
15	А	How do I know whether or not he's been there before?
16	Q	Fair enough, sir.
17		He's not a local; correct?
18	Α	Correct.
19	Q	All right. Now
20		MR. MUELLER: If we could back to the video again and play it
21	forward.	
22		[Playing video]
23		MR. MUELLER: Now, if we can stop right there.
24	BY MR. I	MUELLER:
25	O	Mr. Osorio doesn't run after the Mercedes, he instead starts

Page 19 1572

1	walking	over towards Jake's Market; agree?
2	А	I believe I see him running in the video. But if you think it's
3	walking,	okay.
4		MR. MUELLER: All right. If we can play it forward,
5	Mr. DiGi	acomo.
6		Thank you.
7		[Playing video]
8		MR. MUELLER: And there we can just stop right there.
9	BY MR.	MUELLER:
10	Q	So we can see him now in the Jake's Market parking lot. It is at
11	about 20	0 27, about seven, eight, ten seconds later, probably about
12	seven se	econds; correct?
13	Α	Correct.
14	Q	All right. Now, at that moment in time it is the State's theory of
15	case tha	at the watch is in her car; correct?
16	Α	Correct.
17	Q	All right. Mr. Osorio got out of the car and didn't chase it;
18	correct?	
19	Α	From that seconds you're talking about?
20	Q	Yeah.
21	Α	Correct.
22	Q	All right. So I want to understand, he got out of the car, for
23	seven, eight seconds, does not run in the direction that the car went, he	
24	starts walking over to Jake's Market, then he starts running towards the	
25	car through the parking lot; agree?	

Page 20 1573

1	Α	Correct.
2	Q	Now, you put in a search warrant to get the car that you thought
3	Mr. Oso	rio did a personal inventory in this video?
4		MR. DIGIACOMO: Objection, assumes a fact not in evidence.
5		THE COURT: Sustained.
6	BY MR.	MUELLER:
7	Q	All right. Did you, in fact, request a search warrant?
8	А	I did.
9	Q	Okay. And did you ask for a search warrant of Ms. Guidry's
10	residenc	ce and her house; correct?
11	А	I did not.
12	Q	Who did?
13	А	Detective Freeman.
14	Q	Detective Freeman.
15		MR. MUELLER: All right. Mr. DiGiacomo, if you could back this
16	up for al	oout to about 20:20:10.
17		[Playing video]
18	BY MR.	MUELLER:
19	Q	All right. And, sir, I know it's not a great video, but can you see
20	in that v	ideo if you see Mr. Osorio, you personally see Mr. Osorio, do any
21	persona	I inventory as it plays forward?
22	Α	I do not.
23	Q	You do not; okay.
24		Now, yesterday you opined on several facts that about the
25	accident	t; correct?

1	Α	Correct.
2	Q	Now, this wasn't a traditional fatal accident workup was it?
3	Α	Do I consider these dynamics similar to a typical fatal traffic
4	crash, no).
5	Q	Okay. Did you go out and get the total station and measure and
6	create a	line diagram?
7	Α	I did create the diaphragm from the points that Sergeant
8	McCullou	ugh recorded with the tools.
9	Q	This diagram or did you actually produce an accident diagram?
10	Α	The
11	Q	Like
12	Α	for
13	Q	you know what I'm talking about, the line drawings with the
14	showing	all the marks and proper scale?
15	Α	That's what I believe we have; right? The three diagrams.
16	Q	You created a graphic here on but not the scale?
17	Α	With it's a computer assisted drafting program that is a scale
18	diagram.	
19	Q	All right. I understand, sir.
20		But how many Detective, you've done a number of fatal
21	cases; co	orrect?
22	Α	Correct.
23	Q	You and I've done a couple at least a half dozen fatal cases
24	together;	correct?
25	А	Maybe.

Page 22 1575

1	Q	Somewhere; okay.	
2		We'd agree this isn't our first rodeo; right?	
3	А	Correct.	
4	Q	Now, where is the line diagram with the total station with the	
5	measure	ments put on it? Did you make one of those?	
6	А	I did. And that's what this is.	
7	Q	You put it back on the over the graphic?	
8	А	When you say, graphic, are you referring to the aerial?	
9	Q	Yes.	
10	А	Correct. So what we used to do is just have a white sheet of	
11	paper an	d we would mark in black lines the curbing and stuff like that. As	
12	technology progresses and we can take satellite imagery from a scene,		
13	we overla	ay that into the diagram and we place that evidence to scale on	
14	top of the	e aerial so you get a better depiction of the surrounding area and	
15	curbing.		
16	Q	All right. So this is computerized and to scale?	
17	А	Correct.	
18	Q	All right. So you would of see the shoe scuff is the first mark	
19	here?		
20		MR. DIGIACOMO: Do you want me back to 86, Counsel?	
21		MR. MUELLER: Yes, please.	
22	BY MR. I	MUELLER:	
23	Q	Showing you back 86. The shoe scuff	
24		MR. MUELLER: And it's possible could we explode up along	
25	Flamingo	9?	

Page 23 1576

1		MR. DIGIACOMO: That's basically the area that you can
2		MR. MUELLER: Yes, sir.
3		Thank you.
4	BY MR.	MUELLER:
5	Q	Now, shoe scuff. Now if someone's hit by a car, frequently it
6	would kr	nock their shoes off the them, you've seen that before, haven't
7	you?	
8	A	I have seen that but I wouldn't say it's frequent.
9	Q	It's not a frequent; agreed.
10		The shoes that were impounded actually don't even have heels
11	on them	, they're actually more like sandal sort of things?
12	А	They're a flat sole.
13	Q	All right. Now, a shoe scuff, you agree that we've got a
14	videotap	e, or at least a poor or pixilated poorly pixilated tape that kind
15	of shows	s Mr. Osorio hanging onto the side of the car?
16	А	I what I see in that video is him on top of the hood.
17	Q	Okay. He's on top of the hood.
18		Now, if he's on top of the hood, then the shoe scuffs are created
19	how?	
20	Α	As his legs are across that left front quarter panel.
21	Q	Okay. So he's actually holding on to the car getting drugged?
22	А	Dragged, yes.
23	Q	Okay, dragged.
24		Now, you would agree that the Mercedes was actually, in fact,
25	stopped'	?

Page 24

1	А	Before that. If the Mercedes is stopped, he can't be dragged;
2	right?	
3	Q	Correct.
4		But at one point, despite that being a lane of travel, the
5	Mercede	s was completely stopped?
6	А	That's what I believe, yes.
7	Q	Okay. And the eyewitnesses seem to confirm that as well;
8	correct?	
9	А	Correct.
10	Q	All right. So there's a time when the car is stopped?
11	А	Correct.
12	Q	Did you receive a report that Mr. Osorio went over and just
13	knocked	politely on the window of the car?
14	А	I did not.
15	Q	All right. Did you see a report that there from any witness, or
16	have any	reason to believe that there was a less draconian form of
17	commun	ication attempted, other than hopping on the hood of the car?
18		MR. DIGIACOMO: Objection to the phraseology draconian.
19		MR. MUELLER: Draconian? I'll rephrase.
20		THE WITNESS: I don't know what it means either.
21		THE COURT: That's sustained. Please, rephrase.
22		MR. MUELLER: I can use smaller words.
23	BY MR. I	MUELLER:
24	Q	Did you see a report that there was any attempt to have a
25	normal ro	oom level conversation between Ms. Guidry and Mr. Osorio?

Page 25 1578

1	А	I did not.
2	Q	Okay. And that was after they're interviewing all the
3	witnesse	s?
4	А	Correct.
5	Q	Okay. Now, if Mr. Osorio had simply let go of the car, would he
6	have bee	en drugged?
7	А	Well, we know at some point he does let go of the car; right,
8	because	he doesn't remain attached to it.
9	Q	Yes, sir.
10		But over here at the far right, where the scuff, the shoe scuff
11	marks be	egin, if he simply let go, he'd fallen to the ground and that would
12	have bee	en it?
13		MR. DIGIACOMO: Well, objection as to calls for speculation.
14		THE COURT: Sustained.
15	BY MR. I	MUELLER:
16	Q	All right. From a standing start, and the car starts to move, if he
17	simply le	t go, he wouldn't have gone anywhere?
18	Α	I believe how the sequence of events occurs is the vehicle
19	stopped,	and that he is on the hood, the vehicle starts to accelerate, he,
20	because	of the displacement of the vehicle, starts to come off the side and
21	is clinging	g to it. Once the forces are so great that he cannot anymore, he
22	releases.	And that's when he touched down on the asphalt and slides to a
23	stop.	
24	Q	All right. Sir, showing you State's Exhibit 92, you've done a

number of automobile accidents with shattered windshields; correct?

25

Page 26 1579

1	Α	Correct.
2	Q	And if they are struck hard enough, often enough, they will, in
3	fact, give	e way; correct?
4	Α	They the pedestrian?
5	Q	The windshield?
6	А	They can if they're acted upon by an unbalanced force, yes.
7	Q	Yes, sir.
8		And the unbalanced force in this instance would be a fist?
9	А	I believe the fracturing of this windshield was created
10	Q	Sir, if you could answer my question.
11		THE COURT: Counsel, let
12		MR. DIGIACOMO: Well, I apologize, can you allow him to
13	answer	the question.
14	BY MR.	MUELLER:
15	Q	Sir, if I hit that windshield often enough, will it eventually break
16	out of its	frame and allow me access through the windshield?
17	Α	I would have a lot of trouble seeing you breaking through a
18	windshie	eld with your fist. It's safety glass. It's meant to fracture and
19	Q	How many more hits would that safety glass have withstood
20	before it	either broke the window or more likely broke the windshield out
21	of its fra	me?
22	Α	I'd be speculating. I've only seen two or three pedestrians
23	that or	actually hit hard enough that they go completely through the
24	windshie	eld into the interior compartment of the vehicle. And that's when a
25	pedestri	an is standing still and speeds are greater than 50, 55 miles an

Page 27 1580

1	hour.	
2	Q	You would agree, sir, that hitting a windshield with your hand, to
3	break it,	you'd have to hit it pretty hard?
4	А	Absolutely.
5	Q	Okay. And you would agree that that impact, the impact on the
6	windshie	ld reflects a number of strikes?
7	А	At least a couple, sure.
8	Q	All right. And you agree the eyewitnesses indicated at least up
9	to ten str	ikes according to Mr. Landale?
10	А	The Mr. Landale said ten strikes?
11	Q	Yes, sir.
12	Α	I if you're saying so. I don't remember reading that or hearing
13	him say	that.
14	Q	Now, do you have your speed calculations there on the witness
15	stand with you?	
16	А	I do not.
17	Q	Okay. Now, you opine, Mr. DiGiacomo asked you a question
18	and I thir	nk we need to clarify, it was your opinion that the vehicle might
19	have bee	en going 59 miles an hour as it exited the right frame of that video
20	yesterday?	
21	А	Correct.
22	Q	Okay. You said that towards the end of the day. That's not
23	even ren	notely close to how fast the car was going when he fell off;
24	correct?	
25	А	Correct.

Q

25

Page 29 1582

Detective Salisbury, calculating the speed of the vehicle as it

left the frame is utterly irrelevant to the case; correct?

- A I disagree. With --
- Q How about if we ask a couple questions here?
- A Sure.
- Q The car --

MR. DIGIACOMO: I apologize. Can the detective finish his -- BY MR. MUELLER:

Q Go ahead. Go ahead.

MR. DIGIACOMO: -- can the detective please finish his question.

THE COURT: He can finish his question.

Counsel, please make sure you let the witness answer completely before move onto the next question.

THE WITNESS: So why I believe this is relevant in this case is because of the acceleration. Acceleration is extremely important. We're talking about force. And the amount of force is done by -- by the work that's created. And we talked a little bit yesterday about the speed the vehicle was going based on the kinetic energy Eduardo had to have when he touched down on the ground and slid to a stop.

Well, if we have an initial velocity of -- or initial speed of zero and now we have a fixed distance where we know Eduardo touched down on the ground and slid to a stop, we now have a final velocity here over this distance and an initial velocity here over this distance.

Now, knowing a distance between two points and two speeds, we can calculate the acceleration rate and that's what I did in this case.

1	BY MR.	MUELLER:
2	Q	Thank you.
3		Now, if we go back to the important part where Mr. Osorio was
4	actually	dragging on the ground.
5		MR. DIGIACOMO: I object to the form of the question.
6		THE COURT: That's sustained.
7	BY MR.	MUELLER:
8	Q	Sir
9		THE COURT: Counsel, please don't testify, please ask the
10	question	ı.
11	BY MR.	MUELLER:
12	Q	Mr. Osorio was on the hood of the car; correct?
13	Α	Correct.
14	Q	And the car was stopped at one point in time, we all agree with
15	that, that's all that's the evidence in the case; correct?	
16	А	Correct.
17	Q	At some point did you ever go out and try to figure out where
18	the car v	vas when it was stopped?
19	Α	I did.
20	Q	Okay. And from the distance where the car was stopped at to
21	the first	scuff mark, or his feet are touching the ground, how far is that
22	distance	?
23	Α	So that we can't determine. I can't say
24	Q	I'm sorry, can or cannot?
25	А	Cannot deter

1	Q	You cannot determine.
2	А	The we can't say 100 percent that the left front tire was on
3	this spot	of the asphalt. But we can say a general area of what we see in
4	the video	with relation to where the intersection is and how it rounds the
5	corner a	bout in this circumference of 30 feet or so where the vehicle was
6	at.	
7	Q	Sir, in the distance between the beginning of the shoe mark to
8	the begin	nning of the body scuff, how far is that?
9	А	42 feet.
10	Q	42 feet.
11		From the beginning of the scuff mark from where the car was
12	when it f	irst started moving?
13		MR. DIGIACOMO: Well, I object, that misstates the testimony.
14		MR. MUELLER: Well, the question is, is
15		THE COURT: That's overruled.
16		Clarify the question.
17	BY MR.	MUELLER:
18	Q	Sir, the car was stopped; correct?
19	Α	Correct.
20	Q	To get a realistic estimation of a cars speed and relative or
21	accelera	tion, you need to know from where it started from at rest; correct?
22	Α	Where it started from at rest?
23	Q	The car was at rest, we all agree?
24	Α	Correct.
25	Q	And that was the travel lane somewhere on West Flamingo?

Page 32

11

17

18

19

20

21

1	Α	I don't think I said that.
2	Q	All right. Drawing your attention, sir, you would agree let's
3	see wha	t we can agree on at least the car that Mr. Osorio was still in
4	front of c	Jake's Market when he was on the ground?
5	А	I'm sorry? The car was still?
6	Q	He was Mr. Osorio, where he finally came to rest at, he was
7	still in fro	ont of Jake's Market?
8	А	I
9	Q	Per your diagram?
10	А	Of the diagram? You're saying in front of Jake's Market?
11	Q	Yes. Osorio's final resting place, blue
12		MR. MUELLER: Counsel, if you could I'm sorry, I see the
13	problem here.	
14		MR. DIGIACOMO: 86?
15		MR. MUELLER: If you could go to 86 again.
16		THE WITNESS: Correct, south of there towards the west hand
17	side, sur	re.
18	BY MR.	MUELLER:
19	Q	Okay. So you would agree that he got drugged about, say, two
20	thirds of	the way across the parking lot of a gas station, give or take?
21	Α	I I don't believe he was dragged.
22	Q	Okay. Sir, did you go down to the coroner's office?
23	Α	I did.
24	Q	All right. And you were aware
25		MR. MUELLER: Counsel, if you could show 46.

1	BY MR.	MUELLER:
2	Q	All right. You would agree that Mr. Osorio's wallet did not have
3	any cash	in it?
4	А	Correct.
5	Q	Okay. Did you ask any questions about Mr. Osorio, as in, how
6	long he'c	been in town, who he was staying with.
7		Did you do any of that as part of your investigation?
8	А	To Mr. Osorio, no.
9	Q	Or any of his family or connections or friends?
10	Α	Yes, to his parents. And Detectives Charaska and Santiago
11	spoke to	Lucas Siomes.
12	Q	Okay. Now, didn't it strike you as usual or a little odd about
13	somethir	ng, part of times of criminal investigation is trying to understand
14	people's	frame of mind; correct, what they're thinking at a moment of
15	time?	
16	Α	Sometimes.
17	Q	All right. You can kind of tell what's in somebody's mind by
18	what the	ir action
19		MR. MUELLER: Counsel, if we could return to 86 again,
20	please.	
21	BY MR.	MUELLER:
22	Q	Now, if someone's committed a crime, you would agree, sir,
23	based or	your experience, that they generally want to get away from the
24	scene of the crime?	
25	Δ	Sometimes

1	Q	Yes, sir.
2		Hanging around the scene of a crime generally is a pretty good
3	way of g	etting caught; do you agree?
4	Α	Absolutely.
5	Q	Now, it struck me as a little unusual, and I just want to get your
6	take on	this, the car your theory is Ms. Guidry came out and turned right
7	to drive	right past Mr. Osorio; correct?
8	А	I don't think I said that.
9	Q	Well, a moment ago yesterday you said that she couldn't turn
10	left but,	in fact, she could have?
11	А	She could have.
12	Q	Okay. Now, if she committed a crime, how come she just didn't
13	turn left	and drive away?
14		MR. DIGIACOMO: Objection, speculation.
15	BY MR.	MUELLER:
16	Q	If you know?
17	А	I don't. That's a good question.
18	Q	All right. In fact, she came back to the right?
19	Α	Correct.
20	Q	And in your training and experience, Detective, have you ever
21	done or	got any class or training as exactly how much force has to hit a
22	windshie	eld to break it?
23	Α	No, not not specific data with numerical values, no.
24	Q	Okay.
25		MR. MUELLER: Can I get the Court's indulgence for just a

1	moment	?
2		THE COURT: Sure.
3	BY MR.	MUELLER:
4	Q	Now, sir did you bring your calculations? Do you actually have
5	your nu	merical calculations that I can review? Do you have them on the
6	witness	stand?
7	Α	I don't.
8	Q	Did you give them to Mr. DiGiacomo?
9	А	I did.
10	Q	And when did you give them to him?
11	А	They're included in my supplemental report.
12		MR. MUELLER: Okay. Nothing further.
13		THE COURT: Redirect examination?
14		MR. DIGIACOMO: All due respect, Mr. Mueller has that
15	supplem	nental report. So the look he just gave me was completely
16	inappropriate.	
17		THE COURT: All right. Let's just make, for purposes of the
18	record, Mr. Mueller, do you have that report?	
19		MR. MUELLER: Let me check.
20		[Colloquy]
21		MR. MUELLER: No, I do not have and have not seen any
22	speed c	alculation workup.
23		THE COURT: All right. Is that you don't have in here in court or
24	you don	't have it? There's a difference.
25		MR. MUELLER: Do not have it.

Page 37 1590

1	MR. DIGIACOMO: We can address that at the break. We have
2	a receipt of copy.
3	MR. MUELLER: Okay.
4	THE COURT: Okay. We can address outside the presence of
5	the jury, yes.
6	Go ahead and continue with your redirect examination.
7	REDIRECT EXAMINATION
8	BY MR. DIGIACOMO:
9	Q Detective, I'm going to start with State's Exhibit Number 92,
10	Mr. Mueller asked you a number of questions about this the impacts
11	that caused the damage to this windshield.
12	Do you remember those questions?
13	A I do.
14	Q And at one point you were going to say something about a fist
15	and these this damage.
16	Do you know whether or not the fists caused this damage to this
17	windshield?
18	A That's what I believe. With that type of fracturing and then
19	going down to autopsy and seeing the lacerations on his hand, I believe
20	those to have been caused by his fist.
21	If when the vehicle accelerates, he's falling into the windshield,
22	that's absolutely a possibility. Just not something I can definitively say.
23	Q Right.
24	You don't know exactly how those cracks occurred to that
25	windshield?

1	Α	Correct.
2	Q	Okay. The only person who told you that the cracks from the
3	windshie	eld came from the hands itself was Ms. Guidry; correct?
4	А	Correct.
5		MR. MUELLER: Actually, that misstates the evidence.
6		THE COURT: That's overruled.
7	BY MR.	DIGIACOMO:
8	Q	Now, the only other area I'm going to go is I'll put up 86.
9		Actually maybe we'll use 87 to get the lines out of there.
10		Or 88 gets us a little closer.
11		Mr. Mueller was asking you questions about the place where
12	the vehi	cle was at rest.
13		Do you remember those questions?
14	А	I do.
15	Q	And then he suggested to you that the vehicle was at rest
16	where th	ne shoe scuff starts.
17		Do you remember those?
18	Α	I did.
19	Q	All right. Is it your opinion that the vehicle was at rest where the
20	shoe sc	uffs start?
21	А	Start, no.
22	Q	Okay. Why not?
23	А	Like I described yesterday, the area of initial contact is the
24	damage	or first injury producing event. Because I have trace transfer
25	evidence	e on the asphalt, I know that's where the damage, or first injury, at

Page 39 1592

least maybe not to the vehicle or to the person, but at least to the shoes.

If I have evidence there, something has definitely transferred, there's movement, something has happened. That's why -- that's marked that area. I believe the start of the vehicle moving is prior to that or east of that area.

Q So then how did you -- you said you basically got a 30 foot area where the vehicle had sort of a start area from, how did you determine that location?

A That's all -- if we know she's coming south and she rounds this corner, and we see in that video that she does round the corner before coming to a stop, we know she is somewhere in this area. And we have a scale on our diagram. So we do have a known location with a known, approximate location of where the vehicle is.

I now have a start point, while it's a 30 foot range of a start point, I do have a start point.

Q And then Mr. Mueller was ask -- well, was asking you questions about why it is that you utilized 59 miles an hour when the vehicle leaves the screen of the videotape.

Why is it that you calculated the full distance for the 300 to 315 feet or whatever it was?

A So from 300 to 330 feet, which is that start area we described to it leaving the area where it exits the video surveillance, we know if its -- if we have a distance and we have a time, we can solve for an acceleration rate.

Well, that acceleration rate becomes completely relevant and

1	importar	nt over the entire distance because if it goes from zero to 59 miles
2	an hour	and it's reaching an acceleration rate of that .38 of a G, the
3	publishe	d data for that vehicle is about that point .38 of a G. That means
4	not only	did it go from a stop up to 59 miles an hour, it achieved maximum
5	accelera	tion over that entire distance.
6	Q	And that's relevant to the investigation because that explains
7	what the	driver had to do to get the vehicle to get up to that speed?
8	А	Correct.
9	Q	Meaning that the driver had to fully depress the accelerator to
10	get the v	rehicle to accelerate?
11	А	From a stop through the entire sequence.
12		MR. DIGIACOMO: Thank you.
13		Nothing further.
14		RECROSS-EXAMINATION
15		MR. MUELLER: Mr. DiGiacomo, if you could there's a video
16	of the blo	owup showing the car passing by Jake's from the surveillance, it's
17	grainy, li	kely why the number eludes me.
18		MR. DIGIACOMO: The one where he's on top or the one where
19	he runs	and the car turns the corner?
20		MR. MUELLER: The one where he's on top.
21		MR. DIGIACOMO: Okay. And do you want it full speed or
22	slow?	
23		MR. MUELLER: Slow.
24		MR. DIGIACOMO: 106C, Judge, for the record.
25		THE COURT: Thank you.

1		[Playing video]
2		MR. MUELLER: If we could stop right there, sir.
3	BY MR.	MUELLER:
4	Q	All right. Now, we would all agree that that's far from ideal
5	video; a	gree?
6	А	Correct.
7	Q	Okay. And
8		THE COURT: And do you mean image quality, Mr. Mueller, just
9	for the re	ecord?
10		MR. MUELLER: Just for the quality of the video, yes.
11		THE COURT: Okay.
12	BY MR.	MUELLER:
13	Q	It's a pixilated photograph but in context you can very clearly
14	see Mr.	Osorio holding onto the side of the car; correct?
15	Α	That's where I believe he's coming off the side; correct.
16	Q	Okay. So he's very clearly there on the side.
17		Now, this spot, if he'd let go of the car right there, he'd fallen
18	down ar	nd walked back to the hotel; correct?
19	Α	I don't think you can say that.
20	Q	All right. Sir, do you know or did you make any effort to find out
21	how long	g Mr. Osorio was on the hood of the car before the car started
22	moving?	
23	Α	You're saying how long of a timeframe he's
24	Q	How long was he on the car, beating the windshield, before
25	Ms. Guid	dry started driving?

1	Α	Based on the video and how long he's
2	Q	The question is what I asked, did you make an effort to find out
3	how long	g he'd been on the car before she drove off?
4	А	I did by analyzing the video.
5	Q	All right. Did you talk to Mr. Langsdale (phonetic) and ask him
6	how long	g he witnessed him on the hood of the car beating on the
7	windshie	eld?
8	А	I did not.
9		MR. MUELLER: All right. Nothing further.
10		FURTHER DIRECT EXAMINATION
11	BY MR.	DIGIACOMO:
12	Q	Based upon your analysis, how long do you believe he was on
13	the vehic	cle beating the window?
14	А	A matter of just a couple seconds.
15		MR. DIGIACOMO: Thank you.
16		Nothing further.
17		THE COURT: Thank you.
18		Any recross-examination, Mr. Mueller?
19		MR. MUELLER: No, Your Honor.
20		THE COURT: All right. Do the jurors have any questions? All
21	right. Go	ahead and write those questions down and pass it to the
22	marshal.	
23		And I'll see counsel at the bench, please.
24		[Bench conference begins]
25		THE COURT: While we're waiting for the jury questions that

1	are coming my way, did you find that supplemental report, Mr. Mueller?
2	MR. MUELLER: I'm sorry?
3	THE COURT: Did you find that supplemental report?
4	MR. DIGIACOMO: Are you telling me you don't have an
5	investigative report
6	MR. MUELLER: No.
7	MR. DIGIACOMO: associated with this?
8	MR. MUELLER: No, speed up.
9	MR. DIGIACOMO: How do you go to trial without that?
10	MR. MUELLER: I know speed workup.
11	MR. DIGIACOMO: No, no.
12	MR. MUELLER: It's not a speed workup case.
13	MR. DIGIACOMO: There's a speed workup in the investigative
14	supplement that has all the witnesses and everything you've been talking
15	about.
16	THE COURT: I'm not going to allow that kind of misleading in
17	front of the jury. So if you have that supplemental report
18	MR. MUELLER: I'll sit and go through it with him.
19	THE COURT: we're going to clarify that for the record.
20	MR. MUELLER: Oh, absolutely. I don't have a speed
21	supplement, I promise.
22	THE COURT: All right. Okay. So first question, Was the drive
23	side door window damaged.
24	Any objection to asking that question?
25	MR. DIGIACOMO: No.

Page 44 1597

1	MR. MUELLER: No.									
2	THE COURT: Next question, Was the windshield pierced or									
3	was it just cracked still in one piece, and then in parenthesis, it says, at									
4	least in the photo.									
5	So I think they're trying to get as much information about the									
6	windshield as possible.									
7	Any objection?									
8	MR. DIGIACOMO: To the extent he can answer it, yeah.									
9	MR. MUELLER: Sure, no objection.									
10	THE COURT: Okay. Last one, How does the clasp lock work									
11	on the Rolex watch.									
12	Any objection?									
13	MR. MUELLER: We didn't really cover it, but if you'd like to you									
14	can									
15	MR. DIGIACOMO: I can give him the exhibit.									
16	MR. MUELLER: you can publish the									
17	THE COURT: Yeah.									
18	MR. MUELLER: you can publish the watch. I don't care.									
19	THE COURT: Okay. All right. Then we'll ask these questions.									
20	Thank you.									
21	MR. MUELLER: It's my witness, so I'll do it.									
22	MR. DIGIACOMO: It's my witness.									
23	MR. MUELLER: It's my cross. All right.									
24	[Bench conference ends]									
25	THE COURT: All right. We do have a few questions from the									

Page 45 1598

1	jury. I want to clarify something that was left unanswered previously.
2	Mr. Mueller, it's my understanding that you do, in fact, have that
3	supplemental report that was mentioned regarding the speed; is that
4	correct?
5	MR. MUELLER: No, actually, Judge, I don't necessarily have it.
6	I don't believe I have it. I've done a lot of car wreck cases. I know what
7	they look like. I don't have it.
8	THE COURT: All right. We're going to then, when we take our
9	lunch break, I'm going to order you to look for that report and then we'll
10	clarify that on the record when we come back.
11	MR. MUELLER: Certainly.
12	EXAMINATION BY THE COURT [JURY QUESTIONS]
13	THE COURT: Let's move forward regarding the driver's first
14	question, the juries allowed to ask some questions. So the first one is,
15	Was the driver side door window damaged?
16	THE WITNESS: It was not.
17	THE COURT: And how do you know that?
18	THE WITNESS: On that vehicle inspection, it's still intact.
19	THE COURT: Any follow-up questions from the State or from
20	the defense based on that question?
21	MR. DIGIACOMO: No.
22	THE COURT: Mr. Mueller?
23	MR. MUELLER: The question was regarding the
24	THE COURT: Was the driver's side door window damaged.
25	THE WITNESS: The driver's door, the window that rolls up and

Page 46 1599

1	down, was not damaged during my inspection.
2	THE COURT: Any questions?
3	MR. MUELLER: No question regarding that.
4	THE COURT: The Court has a question, again, when did that
5	inspection take place?
6	THE WITNESS: The day after we impounded it, so
7	January 9th, in the morning.
8	THE COURT: Okay. Would you have known whether it was
9	damaged following the incident? If it had been fixed, would you be able to
10	tell that?
11	THE WITNESS: I because I knew the windshield to be had
12	been fixed, I looked at the window to see if it'd been fixed and it did not. It
13	looked to be the original manufacturer's window.
14	THE COURT: And that's something you can tell by inspection?
15	THE WITNESS: They're serialized.
16	THE COURT: They're serialized. Okay. Thank you.
17	Any additional questions based on the Court's questions?
18	MR. DIGIACOMO: No.
19	MR. MUELLER: Yes.
20	THE COURT: Yes?
21	MR. MUELLER: Yes, I do.
22	THE COURT: Okay. Go ahead.
23	MR. DIGIACOMO: What number?
24	MR. MUELLER: This would be State's 77.

I	FI	J	R	T	Н	FI	R	E	X	Δ	N	11	١	1	Δ	Т	I	O	١	J
1		_	17			_	•	_	/\	_	ıv			•	_		•	v		ч

BY MR. MUELLER:

Q Sir, a few moments ago the juror had a question regarding was there any damage to the driver's side window.

Do you remember that?

- A I do.
- Q Okay. And you said you inspected it, no damage.

Now, on the 77 there appears to be, I don't know, there's a series of scuff marks along the left side of the car.

Do you see that on the door?

- A Are you talking about that --
- Q Yes, sir.
- A -- the white --
- Q There appears to be a series of scallops, about a foot and a half apart from each other -- one, two, three, four, five maybe, depending on the length?
 - A I think what you're seeing is reflection.
- Q These marks here, sir, I want to make sure we all understand each other, is your testimony that these marks here, recurring, repeating, are, in fact, reflections and not someone getting drugged down the side of the car?
 - A That's not typically what that looks like or what I concluded.
- Q Okay. Would you agree -- did you document those marks as actually being there?
 - A They're documented by this imagery, sure.

1	MR. MUELLER: Okay.
2	FURTHER EXAMINATION
3	BY MR. DIGIACOMO:
4	Q Your opinion is those four lights up there are creating the four
5	flashes on the side of the car from the picture?
6	A Correct.
7	MR. DIGIACOMO: Thank you.
8	THE COURT: All right. Any additional questions on that one?
9	MR. MUELLER: No, Your Honor.
10	THE COURT: All right. Next question, Was the windshield
11	pierced or was it just cracked still in one piece, and then in parenthesis, it
12	says, at least in the photo?
13	THE WITNESS: So it has to be in the photo because I never
14	got to examine that windshield for myself. But based on what I've seen in
15	the past and what I've seen from that photo, is that it's not pierced.
16	It takes a lot, this is safety glass that's meant to fracture and
17	bow and displace and actually spread. So it doesn't actually pierce, so
18	things don't actually come through it, and that's just for driver safety.
19	THE COURT: Any additional questions for the witness based
20	on that question or answer?
21	MR. DIGIACOMO: No.
22	FURTHER EXAMINATION
23	BY MR. MUELLER:
24	Q Sir, the windshield clearly had been replaced by the time you

guys got the car?

25

1	А	Correct.
2	Q	Did you check and see if the driver side passenger or driver's
3	side glas	s has been replaced as well?
4	Α	I did.
5	Q	Okay. Did you call a glass shop?
6	А	No. Like I told Your Honor, I inspected the window out, those
7	windows	are serialized. It didn't look like it'd been replaced.
8		MR. MUELLER: All right. Thank you.
9		THE COURT: All right. And the next question, How does the
10	clasp/loc	k on the Rolex watch work?
11		So I believe you have the watch in front of you.
12		Could you tell me what exhibit number that is marked with?
13		THE WITNESS: 84A, Your Honor.
14		THE COURT: 84A.
15		All right. So 84A is in front of the witness.
16		MR. MUELLER: Your Honor, as the jury has a question about
17	it, I have	no objection if we publish it to the jury, inspect the watch.
18		THE COURT: Okay. Perhaps it would be helpful if you could
19	step dow	n and show the jury.
20		Any objection to that?
21		MR. DIGIACOMO: No.
22		THE COURT: Okay. So for the record the witness has
23	approach	ned the jury box and is showing the clasp to the jury.
24		THE WITNESS: And you'll have to forgive me, I've never
25	unclasp	this or know because I don't have a Rolex.

1	Does anybody have a Rolex?
2	THE COURT: Do you want to try, Mr. DiGiacomo?
3	MR. DIGIACOMO: I don't own a Rolex either, Judge. But if he
4	doesn't know, he doesn't know.
5	THE COURT: Sure.
6	MR. DIGIACOMO: They'll have this back there and hopefully
7	someone back there would know how to do it.
8	Sounds like someone over there does but. I have no idea how
9	it unclasps.
10	It was unclasped when you opened it out of that
11	THE COURT: Okay. So it was unclasped but now it is clasped
12	and Detective Salisbury, so you don't know how it works; is that fair to
13	say?
14	THE WITNESS: Yeah, I've never had a Rolex.
15	THE COURT: Okay. All right. And just for the record, jury, you
16	will have that watch back there and you will be able to manipulate the
17	watch and the clasp when you're deliberating. Okay.
18	Any follow-up questions for this witness from either the State or
19	defense based on that question?
20	MR. MUELLER: No, Your Honor.
21	THE COURT: All right.
22	All right. Anything further from the State or from the defense
23	before I release this witness?
24	MR. MUELLER: No, Your Honor.
25	MR DIGIACOMO: No Your Honor

1	THE COURT: All right. Thank you very much, Detective. You
2	may step down.
3	THE WITNESS: Thank you, Your Honor.
4	THE COURT: State, do you have any additional witnesses to
5	call?
6	MR. DIGIACOMO: No.
7	Reserving the right to make sure that the clerk and I are in
8	agreement on the exhibits, we would rest.
9	THE COURT: That request will be granted.
10	All right. It is 11:50.
11	May I have counsel approach the bench.
12	[Bench conference begins]
13	THE COURT: Okay. The State has rested.
14	Mr. Mueller, obviously I want to canvass your client outside the
15	presence of the jury regarding testifying.
16	MR. MUELLER: Yeah.
17	THE COURT: Do you have any additional or do you
18	anticipate putting on a defense case?
19	MR. MUELLER: No, Your Honor, I don't believe I'm going to.
20	THE COURT: Okay. So should we break for lunch, we can
21	can canvass her and then we can all go get something to eat and then
22	come back to settle jury instructions.
23	Does that work?
24	MR. MUELLER: Yes.
25	MR. DIGIACOMO: Do you want to give them a pretty long

1	lunch?
2	THE COURT:
3	Probably what do you t
4	half hours? What do you
5	MR. MUELLEF
6	THE COURT:
7	that we're done.
8	MR. DIGIACOI
9	THE COURT:
10	manslaughter instructions
11	MR. DIGIACOI
12	additional instructions.
13	THE COURT:
14	that
15	MR. DIGIACOI
16	THE COURT:
17	All right. So yo
18	them for lunch and then
19	MR DIGIACON
20	
21	THE COURT:
22	of the case. And I think a

24

25

Yeah, we're going to give them a long lunch. think two hours, that's enough time, two and a guys think?

R: Yeah.

Why don't we do two and a half just to be safe so

MO: Okay.

Have you sent over those involuntary s?

MO: Last night I sent over a whole bunch of

Okay. I didn't see them. So I want to make sure

MO: And I sent them to Mr. Mueller too.

Yeah, okay. All right. Fair enough.

ou have rested on the record. I'm going to break we'll canvass her. All right.

ЛО: Thank you.

[Bench conference ends]

All right. The State has finished its presentation a couple of things need to happen procedurally with the Court outside the presence of the jury. So to get that done, I'm going to go ahead and break for lunch now and give you a little bit of a longer lunch that way we can finish, hopefully, what needs to be

completed this afternoon.

It is 11:52. We're going to take our lunch recess.

And during this recess, you're not to talk or converse amongst yourselves or with anyone else on any subject connected with trial or read, watch, or listen to any report of or commentary on the trial or any person connected with this trial by any medium of information, including, without limitation, newspapers, television, radio, or Internet. Or form or express any opinion on any subject connected with the trial until the case is finally submitted to you for deliberations.

We're going to take a little bit of a longer lunch, and so I apologize, but I want to make sure that you're not waiting around for the Court so we can start right at -- we're going to break for two and a half hours, so 2:30 p.m., please be back and we will start right at 2:30.

With that, you're free to go to lunch.

Thank you.

[Outside the presence of the jury panel]

THE COURT: Let the record reflect that the jury has left the courtroom. Everyone may be seated.

All right. At the bench conference I talked to the counsel about what's going to happen next.

It's my understanding that the defense does not intend to put on a case --

MR. MUELLER: I -- the State has called --

THE COURT: -- or call any witnesses?

MR. MUELLER: -- I believe the State has called all of the

1	witnesses who had any first-hand knowledge. Judge, I don't believe
2	there's anybody left to call.
3	Ms. Guidry has been advised of her right to testify. Based on
4	my advice, she is not going to testify.
5	THE COURT: All right. I have a few questions.
6	I was going to say good morning, but we're so close, I'll say
7	good afternoon.
8	How are you?
9	THE DEFENDANT: Fine. How are you?
10	THE COURT: We're going to put you under oath.
11	[The Defendant was duly sworn]
12	THE CLERK: Please state your full name for the record.
13	THE DEFENDANT: Ronneka Ann Guidry.
14	THE COURT: All right. Good afternoon, again.
15	Ms. Guidry, under the Constitution of the United States and the
16	Constitution of the State of Nevada, you cannot be compelled to testify in
17	this case.
18	Do you understand that?
19	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.
20	THE COURT: You may at your own request give up this right
21	and take the witness stand and testify. If you do you'll be subject to cross
22	examination by the deputy district attorney and anything you say, be it on
23	direct or cross-examination, would be subject to fair comment by the
24	deputy district attorney, and they may talk to the jury about it in their final
25	closing arguments.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: I understand that you do not want to testify, if you choose not to testify, the Court will not permit the deputy district attorney to make any comments to the jury because you elected not to testify.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: All right. If you elect not to testify, the Court will instruct the jury, but only if your attorney specifically requests, as follows, the law does not compel a defendant in any criminal case to take the stand and testify, and no presumption will be raised and no inference of any kind may be drawn from the failure of a defendant to testify.

Do you have any questions --

THE DEFENDANT: No, I don't.

THE COURT: -- about these rights? All right.

You're further advised that if you have a felony conviction and not more than ten years has lapsed from that conviction or discharge from prison, parole, or probation, whichever is later, and the defense has not sought to preclude that from coming in front of the jury and you ultimately elect to take the stand and testify, the deputy district attorney in the presence of the jury would be permitted to ask you whether or not you've been convicted of a felony, what was the felony, when did it happen, but no details about that felony conviction could come before the jury.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: All right. And it's my understanding you still are electing not to testify?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you very much. You may be seated.

All right. So when we come back, I'll have you rest on the record in the presence of the jury.

Have we resolved the missing supplemental -- or report?

MR. DIGIACOMO: We have. And I have Mr. Mueller's discs, I'm looking at them. Unfortunately these aren't our original discs because that is not my discovery persons writing. We ROC'd all of these and I actually check because they don't go in our electronic file unless they get turned over.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. DIGIACOMO: But it may be that he's missing a disc. I don't know. I'm going through a 750 page PDF right not trying to see if it's in there.

THE COURT: All right. We can resolve that during the lunch hour as well. So when you come back you can update the Court as to where we are as to that issue.

I certainly would want all the original discs in --

MR. MUELLER: Your Honor, it would my suggestion, since there has been a voluminously large number for a state court criminal case of proposed jury instructions, including several late additions by the

Page 57

1	State and a couple late additions to me by me, it would be my
2	suggestion that Mr. DiGiacomo and I, before lunch, get-together and at
3	least put them in working order so we can go through them and pursue
4	we're all on the same page. Otherwise we're going to spend a couple
5	hours, where's this one, where's that one. And
6	MR. DIGIACOMO: Did you bring more today?
7	MR. MUELLER: Yes.
8	THE COURT: Do you have more
9	MR. DIGIACOMO: Oh, well, I've received anything more today.
10	MR. MUELLER: Okay. That's why I thought we should sit
11	THE COURT: Other than well, I thought well, the
12	involuntary manslaughter; right?
13	MR. DIGIACOMO: I sent more
14	THE COURT: Yeah.
15	MR. DIGIACOMO: sorry, I sent more to the Court, but
16	Mr. Mueller's suggesting he's got more.
17	THE COURT: Right.
18	MR. MUELLER: I haven't seen anything from Mr. Mueller.
19	THE COURT: No, I haven't got anything additional than what
20	we had last night. And so where we left last night was regarding your
21	request instruction for legal necessity or self-defense.
22	MR. MUELLER: Yes, Judge, I would
23	THE COURT: And
24	MR. MUELLER: I would suggest a brief recess for he and I to
25	pow-wow so we at least have them in all presentable order. So we're at

Page 58 **1611**

1	least all on the same page and we can go through them together.
2	THE COURT: Okay. I don't have a problem with that.
3	Do you still have a copy of the State's the proposed
4	instructions I provided to both sides yesterday?
5	MR. MUELLER: I've got them right here, Judge.
6	THE COURT: All right. So if you just want to add those in
7	where you think they're appropriate.
8	MR. MUELLER: Oh, I
9	THE COURT: I'm sure we're going to have additional argument
10	regarding the necessity instruction.
11	MR. MUELLER: All right. Thank you.
12	THE COURT: All right. So why don't we break, how about we
13	come back at 1:15, will that work for everybody?
14	MR. DIGIACOMO: That's fine with me.
15	THE COURT: Is that enough of a break for everybody? Or
16	1:30? That will give us an hour to work through jury instructions.
17	MR. MUELLER: 1:30 works.
18	THE COURT: All right.
19	MR. MUELLER: We're done with the jury instructions. We'll
20	close the case today.
21	THE COURT: Okay. And, Mr. Mueller, do you have any
22	additional argument regarding your request to include a necessity
23	instruction?
24	MR. MUELLER: Yes, Judge, I do. Specifically I
25	MR. DIGIACOMO: And I apologize, Judge, I don't want to cut

Page 59

1612

Mr. Mueller off, but I -- maybe I should tell you what I did because you haven't seen the email.

So I sent an email last night, I take Mr. Mueller's request for necessity as actually self-defense essentially.

THE COURT: It actually reads, legal necessity or self-defense so.

MR. DIGIACOMO: So I've provided self-defense instructions. I also supplemented them with the victim's right to resist, as well as, you know, in the case of a felony murder she doesn't have a right to self-defense.

So I've provided the Court some of those. I also provided the Court transition instructions to an involuntary instruction.

And I tried to cover what I believe Mr. Mueller was saying by -- I think he was just not articulating it really well. But really what he's claiming is she had the right to drive away because she was in fear for her life. And the only question then becomes is, one, was she ever actually in fear, but, two, whether or not she had the legal right to use force.

THE COURT: Sure.

MR. DIGIACOMO: So I've supplied those to the Court.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. DIGIACOMO: And I think maybe once Mr. Mueller reads those, he might be happy with those, or the Court might have a better understanding of what the issue --

THE COURT: Do you have an objection to the ones that you have sent the Court?

MR. DIGIACOMO: I don't. The ones I sent to the Court I do no object to.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. So I will take a look at that and then we can resolve that in a --

MR. MUELLER: All right. Thank you.

THE COURT: -- if you can read them and see what your issue is with -- if you have any issues with those and we'll go from there.

MR. MUELLER: All right. And I thought I had printed out everything Marc had given me. This is literally it. So apparently I didn't get all of it printed out.

So if there anyway I could get a second copy of the ones that you just proposed?

MR. DIGIACOMO: I emailed them to you.

MR. MUELLER: Yes, you did. You emailed me a ton of stuff and I printed it all out. Except apparently that one so.

THE COURT: Sure. We'll printout a copy for you so you'll have it over the lunch break. Okay.

MR. MUELLER: All right. Thank you.

THE COURT: And then, just to be clear also, last night there was a request for inclusion of vehicular manslaughter in the instructions. I want to be clear that I am not going to include that instruction. It is not a lesser included of the charged offenses. And to the degree I wasn't clear last night, I'm going to be clear now, I'm not including it is a -- I'm not even sure if it's a lesser related, but certainly it isn't a lesser included and so will not be included in the instructions.

1	MR. MUELLER: All right. Thank you, Your Honor. I object
2	and but when we settle these, I'll make a full record.
3	THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
4	Anything further?
5	MR. DIGIACOMO: Not from the State.
6	THE COURT: All right. Thank you very much.
7	[Recess taken at 12:01 p.m.]
8	[Jury trial resumed at 1:37 p.m.]
9	[Outside the presence of the jury panel]
10	THE COURT: All right. Good afternoon. Everyone get some
11	lunch?
12	MR. MUELLER: Yes, Judge.
13	MR. DIGIACOMO: We did. Thank you.
14	MR. SCARBOROUGH: Yes, Your Honor.
15	THE COURT: All right. We're back on the record in
16	C-18-329810-1, State of Nevada versus Ronneka Guidry. The defendant
17	is present, as well as the State, and counsel for the defendant.
18	I have reviewed the additional instructions that were sent to the
19	Court and to defense counsel last night from the State.
20	Did you all agree on the instructions or are there disagreements
21	on the instructions, where are we?
22	MR. MUELLER: I will give my colleague credit for having a little
23	clearer thought process on the subject than I had previously had. He's
24	correct, the self-defense instruction seem to clarify or bring my thinking
25	into focus, which is my assertion and Ms. Guidry, in fact, was lawfully

acting in a right to speed away from the scene for fear of her safety.

Having said that, the only -- two things that I did think we should add over and above this is a definition of accident from the statute, which in NRS 616A.030, and a definition of injury, which is found at 428.165.

And with that I believe we've covered everything.

THE COURT: State, what is your position on including a definition of accident? As written, or provided to by Mr. Mueller yesterday, accident means an unexpected or unforeseen event happened suddenly and violently or without human fault and producing at the time --

MR. MUELLER: -- objective symptoms of an injury.

THE COURT: Okay. Objective symptoms of an injury, sorry. I can't read my own chicken scratch sometimes so.

MR. MUELLER: I've got it typed up.

MR. DIGIACOMO: Well, my question is, is why are we defining a traffic accident?

THE COURT: Yeah, I'm not sure either, which is why I'm asking you.

MR. DIGIACOMO: Because the --

MR. MUELLER: Well, it's actually -- if I --

MR. DIGIACOMO: -- the statute says collision.

MR. MUELLER: Well, and defense would contest, and it's defense's theory of the case, and the evidence is strongly supports

Ms. Guidry, is that Mr. Osorio didn't collide with anything. He was actually the one who jumped up on the hood of the car and was beating the windshield. That's not a collision in any traditional sense of the word.

Page 63 **1616**

And there was no two -- in fact, I went so far as to show the detective the front of the car. And he said do you have any injuries there was -- any indication there was a collision. The answer is no.

So the -- this is not a collision. It's not a duty to stop kind of case. There was no collision.

Now, if Ms. Guidry -- if Mr. Osorio had imposed himself in the lane of travel, Ms. Guidry had run him straight over, clean, and then not stopped, then the State would have a legitimate case here for duty of stop. But that's not this case.

This case is there's a crazed man, a drunken crazed man beating a windshield and it appears to be with -- and I don't say this with any exaggerated hyperbole, just a hammer -- or hand blow or two away from knocking the windshield in and hitting her in the face.

So I think we need to define what an accident is because he's -- and personal injury because that's what they've charged, duty to stop at scene of crash involved with death or personal injury.

MR. DIGIACOMO: Okay. I actually -- reading these they're a proper statement of the law.

I don't know that Mr. Mueller's reasons are correct. But if you want to add these definitions during the duty to stop section, I don't necessarily oppose that.

THE COURT: Well, I'll -- going to double check them.

Thank you.

MR. MUELLER: Thank you.

They are just literally copied straight out of the statute.

THE COURT: All right. The other instruction requested is, injury in a motor vehicle accident means any personal injury accidentally caused in, by or the proximate result of the movement of motor vehicle on a public street or highway, whether the injured person was the operator of the vehicle or another vehicle, a passenger in the vehicle or another vehicle, a pedestrian, or had some other relationship to the movement of a vehicle.

All right. Give me one second here.

[Pause in proceeding]

THE COURT: I did have one question, Mr. DiGiacomo, regarding the instruction on the driver of any vehicle involved in a collision resulting in bodily injury or death. The last sentence of that instruction says, if no police officer is present, the driver of any vehicle involved in such accident shall forthwith report such accident to the nearest office or of a police authority or of the Nevada Highway Patrol.

Is that drawn specifically from a statute?

MR. DIGIACOMO: It is.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. DIGIACOMO: I think it's 484E.

THE COURT: .080.

MR. DIGIACOMO: Correct.

THE COURT: Oh, it is. I was reading the one underneath it. I was accidentally reading .404.

MR. DIGIACOMO: And I got these from the vehicular crimes unit.

1	THE COURT: .040.
2	Yes.
3	MR. DIGIACOMO: So they tell me that anyway.
4	THE COURT: Yes, no, thank you. I was reading the wrong
5	the one underneath it. All right.
6	[Pause in proceeding]
7	THE COURT: All right. If the State doesn't have an objection
8	to these two instructions, I will include them. And I want to make sure
9	that's correct, you all have no objection?
10	MR. DIGIACOMO: That is correct, Judge.
11	THE COURT: All right. Any other disagreements?
12	MR. MUELLER: No, Your Honor.
13	I just need to make a quick record on a couple of things.
14	THE COURT: Okay. One second.
15	MR. MUELLER: Sure.
16	THE COURT: My inclination is to give the definition of let me
17	see where I want to stick these in in order.
18	So my inclination is to give the instruction about, injury in a
19	motor vehicle accident means any personal injury accidentally caused in,
20	et cetera, et cetera, after, the driver of any vehicle involved in a collision
21	resulting in injury to any person shall immediately stop
22	MR. MUELLER: There's an element
23	THE COURT: such vehicle at the scene.
24	MR. MUELLER: there is an element, and I want to make
25	sure we've got it in the instructions, there is a the duty to stop also

1	requires an element of knowing. You have to know that someone's been
2	injured or reasonably
3	MR. DIGIACOMO: And it's in our instructions.
4	MR. MUELLER: it's just
5	MR. DIGIACOMO: You don't have to know someone's injured
6	you just have to know someone was struck.
7	MR. MUELLER: No reasonably someone knew or
8	reasonably should have known
9	MR. SCARBOROUGH: That they're struck.
10	MR. MUELLER: That they're struck.
11	MR. SCARBOROUGH: Yeah, not injury.
12	MR. MUELLER: Not injury.
13	MR. SCARBOROUGH: Yeah.
14	MR. DIGIACOMO: That's in there.
15	MR. MUELLER: Okay. All right.
16	MR. SCARBOROUGH: Yeah.
17	MR. MUELLER: Now, make sure we got that in there.
18	THE COURT: Okay. So where I was going was I intend to pu
19	the instruction regarding, injury in a motor vehicle accident means any
20	personal injury accidentally caused in, by or as a proximate result of, et
21	cetera, after the instruction that ends, any person who knowingly fails to
22	comply is guilty of the scene of leaving the scene of an accident.
23	MR. DIGIACOMO: Okay.
24	THE COURT: And then following that instruction with, acciden
25	means an unexpected or unforeseen event happening suddenly violently

Page 67 1620

or without human fault.

And that will be followed then by, the driver of any vehicle involved in a collision resulting in bodily injury to or death of any person, et cetera.

Any objection to that?

MR. DIGIACOMO: No.

MR. MUELLER: No, Your Honor, that works.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Anything further in regards to the jury instructions?

MR. MUELLER: Yes, Judge. I want to -- I'm going to make one last effort to -- or ask for an -- vehicle manslaughter. I know the Court's inclined to rule against that position, but I would like to at least get one more hearing on this.

Specifically the crime of -- or manslaughter is the wrongful act -- a wrongful, unlawful act that ends up in a death that was not intended. That's manslaughter.

Vehicular manslaughter is a lesser included by definition because it requires negligence instead of intent and it has a violation of duty.

In this instance, it's defense's contention that if there is any criminal liability here, at least for the acceleration of the automobile, it would be vehicular manslaughter. Specifically the underlying misdemeanor would be unlawful start from stop. Specifically she started a car knowing that someone was on the hood of the car that was unsafe and that when he fell off that breach of duty caused her to cause his

Page 68 1621

death.

The elements are -- it's a reduced -- it is the same basic legal theory, the elements are, in fact, reduced from the element of intent to simple negligence and the breach of duty is still a -- is a misdemeanor breach of duty as opposed to a felonious breach of duty but using and reasoning by analogy I believe vehicular manslaughter should, in fact, be given, as should be the unlawful start from stop instruction, which I believe is lesser included in the State's theory of liability, which is that her speeding off from the car was, in fact, the instrumentality of death and therefore if that -- speeding off is a lesser included by definition goes from -- down to second, then down to voluntary, then down to vehicular manslaughter, and I believe the Court should give it.

THE COURT: All right. The State shared a case with both the Court and the defense yesterday evening following your first argument requesting this lesser related instruction. You're defining it as a lesser included instruction but I disagree.

I'm looking at *Barton v State of Nevada*, the citation is 117 Nevada 686, a decision from 2001.

Now, it was overruled but it looks like it was overruled on other grounds. And this case discusses how you take a look at lesser included offenses on -- starting at -- what looks like pincite 694 it states, under the federal rules of criminal procedure 31C, which contains language identical to that of NRS 175.501, an offense is not a lesser included offense unless the elements of the lesser offense are entirely included subsect of the elements of the charged offense.

Page 69 **1622**

It goes on and discusses that essentially it's pulling from the Blockburger test and making a determination as to whether or not an offense is the lesser included offense.

In looking at the elements of the offense for the charge -- the murder charge and the proposed charge, the defendant wishes to include as a lesser included and it does not meet the test set forth in *Barton*, nor does it meet the test set forth in *Blockburger v United States*. And therefore I'm going to decline to include the -- what you're defining as a lesser included. I think it's even a stretch to say is a lesser related offense at this time.

MR. MUELLER: Thank you, Your Honor.

I understand and obviously respectfully disagree. And I just want to make sure that my proposed vehicular manslaughter and two -- the two vehicular manslaughter instructions and my unlawful stop from start instruction are included in the -- well, marked and included.

THE COURT: Okay. Let's go ahead and make those Court -let's make them Court's exhibits that way we can make sure they're in the
record.

MR. MUELLER: All right. Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: If you could provide copies -- I might have an extra copy here. One second.

Your vehicular manslaughter reads, a vehicular manslaughter occurs when -- and it has one next to it -- 1, a person.

MR. MUELLER: Yes, Judge.

THE COURT: Okay. And then you want -- what was the other

1	instruction you wanted?
2	MR. MUELLER: In Nevada vehicle manslaughter may I
3	approach?
4	THE COURT: Yes, yeah, I have an extra copy so I'm providing
5	it to the clerk.
6	MR. MUELLER: This is the one I was
7	THE COURT: All right. I have an extra copy of that too. Let's
8	see.
9	All right. I've provided the clerk with a copy of that proposed
10	instruction.
11	All right. Anything further in regards to the jury instructions?
12	MR. DIGIACOMO: Not from the State.
13	THE COURT: Okay.
14	MR. MUELLER: No, Your Honor.
15	THE COURT: All right. And anything further the jury won't
16	be back for another 35 minutes or so, anything else that we need to
17	address outside the presence of the jury?
18	MR. MUELLER: Yes, Judge, I
19	MR. DIGIACOMO: Hold on, one thing on instructions.
20	THE COURT: Yes.
21	MR. DIGIACOMO: I just looked at my verdict form, the
22	involuntary is not on the verdict form. So we'll have to get that
23	THE COURT: I think we fixed that.
24	MR. DIGIACOMO: If you fixed it, then great.
25	THE COURT: I think we did. We have an extra copy but

Page 71 1624

we'll -- I'll make sure that -- and you-all will get a copy of these before we give them so.

MR. DIGIACOMO: Okay. Perfect.

MR. SCARBOROUGH: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Yes, thank you.

MR. SCARBOROUGH: No, I was just saying thank you.

THE COURT: Oh, sorry, yeah, yeah, sorry.

MR. MUELLER: Your Honor, Mr. DiGiacomo and I have been doing this a long time and handled a number of cases against each other and this is -- I'm in my six figures as jury trials go. So I'm not particularly -- or particular formal about discovery. I know usually what to expect and I usually get everything.

Over the lunch hour Mr. DiGiacomo, did, in fact, give me a 63 page document titled, Homicide Investigative Supplement.

Now, the document is well and thoroughly prepared, the vast majority, on casual examination, has already been provided to us by other disclosures and I'm not complaining of not getting the report in total.

What I do however complain about and complain about fairly bitterly is page 55 or so has a document called, Speed Calculations and Speed Workup.

Now, I want to put this in a little context, respectfully, Judge, I used to be on the DUI team. I've probably done 10 or 15 DUI trials. I don't think anybody in here is going to question that I know how to put one of those cases together. I have the mathematical training to actually independently review those calculations and have access to at least half

Page 72 1625

dozen investigators on a moment's notice who could review those calculations.

I heard it, very first time yesterday, this 59 mile per hour number. It is wrong factually, it is wrong logically, and it is wrong in an assumption.

And as you saw in cross-examination, it is the number of the car exiting the speed and the assumption that, A -- I don't know how he even gets there because there is no starting point -- but it is the assumption of speeding -- calculation of a speed of this vehicle leaving the frame under the assumption that there's been uniform acceleration from a spot that's unknown. That's wrong legally, it's wrong factually, and it's wrong intellectually, and it's wrong scientifically, it's wrong mathematically.

And I got caught completely by surprise about it. That is wasn't disclosed. Mr. DiGiacomo came in here and unfettered access. He looked through my file. He looked through my discs. He looked through my investigator's discs. We never got that document.

I'm not complaining that I didn't get the document. I've got almost everything else in there. The few pictures I didn't get, I don't care about. Nothing's changed the trial.

What I do complain about specifically is that speed calculation. It was created unfairly and incorrectly in the jury's mind that this man was flung off this car at 60 miles an hour or 59 miles an hour, which simply is not true. We have two eyewitness testimonies. He went 20 feet and one said 30 feet. That man probably was thrown off somewhere between 15

Page 73 1626

and 17 miles an hour and would be alive to this day but for an unfortunate bounce on the pavement.

Now, this idea that the speed is going closer to 60 miles an hour is unfair. It's prejudicial. And I have been completely surprised by it. And at this point I'm going to have to ask to move for a mistrial on it.

We either ask that the speed calculation be stricken and I get a curative instruction or I'm going to have to ask for a mistrial on the case.

And I don't want to. I would like -- I'm happy with the way the case has gone for the most part.

THE COURT: State, what is your response to not -- or the accusation that this was not provided in discovery?

MR. DIGIACOMO: Yeah, I don't have an -- when I went back at lunch my discovery person wasn't there so I grabbed a copy of the report. I gave it to him.

I will tell the Court that this detective was noticed as an expert in reconstruction from Mr. Mueller saying he didn't have the speed calculations for somebody that was noticed as an expert.

I will tell you two days ago he said, hey, what were the numbers on the speed calculation?

And I said to him, it's in the main officer's report.

Which is what that is, the main officer's report associated with this particular case. I heard nothing about it.

Yesterday, the detective did not testify that the victim fell off the car at 59 miles an hour. Mr. Mueller keeps saying that. But the detective testified the victim fell off the car when the car was going 23 miles an

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24 25

hour; that the car was going 59 miles an hour when it left the screen on the videotape.

And to the extent that Mr. Mueller is saying that he needs till tomorrow to start -- or till Monday to start his case in order to have somebody review that, I have no objection to that happening with him. But to suggest that somehow he's prejudiced in a situation where the expert was noticed, and if he didn't have the underlying data to the expert's opinion, he should have told us sometime before right now.

MR. MUELLER: A couple of things, Judge, if you'll see the cover sheet on that document it is not the main officer's report. It says, supplemental.

Number 2, specifically, I think, and I'm -- I would like a curative instruction. There's -- to the words of, there's been testimony that the vehicle is seen leaving the scene at 59 miles an hour.

THE COURT: That's not what the testimony was though.

MR. MUELLER: Actually, respectfully, that's the way I recollect the testimony.

THE COURT: No, the testimony was that the car got up to 59 -- we can go back and replay it. But if I recall correctly, the testimony was, the vehicle got up to 59 miles an hour and the way that it would get to that speed would be from the driver accelerating to get to that point.

MR. MUELLER: Long -- additional acceleration long after young Mr. Osorio has fallen off of the car.

THE COURT: But that's not what the testimony was.

MR. DIGIACOMO: No, that's true. The car continues to

accelerate after Mr. Osorio fell off the car.

THE COURT: Well, sure, but that --

MR. DIGIACOMO: But, I mean, why that's relevant.

THE COURT: -- but the way -- the way it's being presented was not the way that the testimony came out.

MR. MUELLER: The -- okay. The way I recollect it and -- was that they brought out the fact that the car was going 59 miles an hour as it was exiting screen right.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. MUELLER: Long before the car got to screen right the -young Osorio was off of the car and in the middle of the road. The car
continued to accelerate. Not -- it was -- I'm fairly created the impression in
the jury's mind that she was going 50 or 60 miles -- 59, 60 miles an hour
when this kid was flung off the car. That's simply not the case.

The car, and you saw from the diagram, the guy had only gone about 20 or 30 feet. They hadn't even covered the length of a corner service stations parking lot when he was off of the car. You can see that from his diagram.

I'm concerned that we've unfairly created that impression on the speed and I'd ask -- well, I think we can cure -- I'm not asking to delay the proceedings. I'm not particularly concerned about any of the other material that's in the discovery. But I am concerned that we've created a false impression.

I think maybe we should have a curative instruction, something like, the parties have stipulated that the car -- Mr. Osorio was off of the car

Page 76

by X number feet from the corner but was not going 59 miles an hour at the time.

MR. DIGIACOMO: The testimony that's in front of this jury, and I'm not creating any stipulation, the testimony to the jury was that the victim was -- when he fell off the car was going 23 miles an hour and that the car continued to accelerate to its maximum speed of 59 miles an hour when it left videotape.

MR. MUELLER: If that's --

MR. DIGIACOMO: That is the testimony.

MR. MUELLER: If my colleague wants that in the -- I'll stip to that testimony. We just write it up as a jury instruction, that's fine.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. DIGIACOMO: That was the testimony.

MR. MUELLER: Okay.

THE COURT: I'm looking at a notice of expert witnesses filed by the State on April 17th of 2018, on page 3 of that notice it provides that, K. Salisbury of LVMPD, with his P number, is employed by LVMPD. He is an expert in accident reconstruction. He is expected to testify to the methodologies generally used in accident reconstruction and he's expected to testify as to the details and conclusions of the accident reconstruction done in this case.

MR. MUELLER: Yes, I'll agree and I'll stipulate it's all correct.

My complaint is not that he's not qualified or that he's not entitled to have his opinion. My complaint is only I found about his speed estimate and calculation on the witness stand.

Page 77 1630

THE COURT: Is there a secondary police report or additional police reports in this case, Mr. DiGiacomo --

MR. DIGIACOMO: There is --

THE COURT: -- that would talk about the conclusions of Detective Salisbury?

MR. DIGIACOMO: No, I believe there's an incident report and then that is the main officer's report written by Detective Salisbury.

MR. MUELLER: Marked as supplement.

MR. DIGIACOMO: He calls it a supplement, that's what I would call the main officer's report. The way this works is the CAD -- not the CAD system but the report system --

PremierOne?

-- PremierOne the night of would have a report generated.

After that, the next police report that is generated, it's not, you know, that has a description of the investigation, is the main officer's report. That is the main officer's report.

And I imagine that that notice also said the report has been provided in discovery. So he didn't have that report way back then, I would be somewhat surprised because the notice says that it's been provided in discovery.

It's probably the very last line.

THE COURT: The substance of each expert witness's testimony and copies of all reports made by or at the direction of each expert witness has been provided in discovery. And a copy of each expert witness's Curriculum Vitae is available -- or is attached hereto.

Page 78 1631

1	All right. So it appears though Ms. Guidry was previously
2	represented by Mr. Pandullo.
3	When did you take over this case, Mr. Mueller?
4	MR. MUELLER: I'm going to trust my memory, about seven
5	months ago.
6	THE DEFENDANT: Last August.
7	MR. MUELLER: Last August she says. I have no reason to
8	dispute
9	THE COURT: So a year ago?
10	MR. MUELLER: Thereabouts.
11	Your Honor, it's and I want to draw I'm drawing my
12	critique or my concerns is a rifle shot here. I'm not even concerned
13	that I didn't get all the paperwork. I'm a big boy and I read everything. I'm
14	prepared for this trial. The only thing that causes me deep concern is
15	twofold, the accident and speed calculation I just fundamentally disagree
16	with scientifically.
17	And number two
18	THE COURT: Well, you're not an expert in this case. So you
19	were on notice that they were going to call an expert
20	MR. MUELLER: Then
21	THE COURT: to testify to the conclusions about the
22	accident. You too could have noticed an expert to testify or to rebut that
23	testimony; correct?
24	MR. MUELLER: Yes. And if I'd known the young man was
25	going to come in here and say 59 miles an hour, I would have. Because

Page 79

1632

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

my calculations was just about what came out of testimony, which is about 15 to 17 -- 17 to 20 miles an hour is what I figured the speed was.

So that -- why we brought out that 59 number is gratuitous and potentially misleading.

Now, if the calculation is -- agrees with mine, which is 17 to 20 miles an hour, you know, give or take a mile or two, okay, that's fine.

THE COURT: Mr. Mueller, are you going to make yourself a witness in this case?

MR. MUELLER: No. The problem is I can do this stuff myself, which is what I know when I something's not right. And I know 59 miles an hour is gratuitous and designed to mislead the jury.

Why are we talking about a speed down the road? The speed at the time would have been the irrelevant speed at when he got -- he fell off the car.

THE COURT: All right. Here's the secondary issue, the State renoticed its expert witnesses on July 3rd of 2019, naming the same expert witnesses, to include Mr. Salisbury, with the notification of what he is expected to testify to, including --

MR. MUELLER: You may recall I asked him, do you have your calculations on the stand with you?

And he said, no.

Now --

THE COURT: I don't know what that has to do with this argument.

MR. MUELLER: Okay.

1	THE COURT: So you were on notice not just once but twice of
2	what this expert was going to testify to.
3	Hold on one second.
4	Then I look at your list of witnesses and you include Kenneth
5	Salisbury as a potential defense witness.
6	MR. MUELLER: No, I don't
7	THE COURT: Would you like to recall the detective to the
8	stand to conduct additional cross- examination?
9	MR. MUELLER: I accept. That's a good cure. I'll do that.
10	MR. DIGIACOMO: You haven't rested yet.
11	MR. MUELLER: I haven't rested yet.
12	THE COURT: You haven't rested yet.
13	MR. DIGIACOMO: Detective Salisbury, he's here.
14	THE COURT: All right.
15	MR. MUELLER: All right. Detective, you've heard the whole
16	argument, so if you'll step outside now that you're a witness again. I'll get
17	two, three questions. Okay.
18	All right. Thank you, Your Honor. I think addresses everyone's
19	concern.
20	THE COURT: All right. So here you go, perhaps you'll need to
21	use this.
22	MR. MUELLER: Thank you.
23	THE COURT: All right. So so we'll bring the jury in, we
24	will I'll allow you to call Detective Salisbury, and then we will
25	MR. SCARBOROUGH: Have you canvassed on the record or

Page 81 1634

1	have you canvassed on the record yet?
2	MR. DIGIACOMO: Did we do that before lunch?
3	MR. MUELLER: Yes.
4	THE COURT: I canvassed her, yeah, yeah.
5	MR. SCARBOROUGH: Sorry, Your Honor, just making sure.
6	THE COURT: No, that's okay. No, no, I canvassed her before
7	lunch. And so then after we're done with your do you want to continue
8	cross-examination or do you just want to call her as a defense call
9	excuse me, call him as a
10	MR. MUELLER: I'll just call him a defense witness.
11	THE COURT: Okay. A defense witness.
12	MR. MUELLER: Just make two or three questions.
13	THE COURT: So when you finish your examination of the
14	detective, then you can rest on the record and we'll roll right into jury
15	instructions.
16	MR. MUELLER: All I all right. Thank you, Your Honor
17	The only purpose is to establish the speed at the time the kid
18	fell off the car.
19	THE COURT: Okay. All right. So we will take a break until
20	2:25. We'll come back here so we can bring the jury right in.
21	THE MARSHAL: Yes, Your Honor.
22	THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
23	MR. DIGIACOMO: Thank you, Judge.
24	[Recess taken at 2:06 p.m.]
25	[Jury trial resumed at 2:32 p.m.]

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

20

21

22

23

24

25

[Outside the presence of the jury]

THE COURT: Go back on the record in Case C-18-329810-1, State of Nevada versus Ronneka Guidry.

I do have a copy of the proposed verdict form. Do you all want to take a look at that?

We're cleaning up the last of the jury instructions and we'll bring out a copy for each of you to inspect before we read them.

And while you're taking a look at that, I'm just put on the record, prior to the -- to resuming this afternoon there was a motion from Mr. Mueller regarding a report he contends was not provided to him in discovery. As I noted on the record, there were -- this witness was noticed twice in the course of the case, to include most recently in July of this year. It noticed what he was going to be testifying to.

I proposed to alleviate any concerns Mr. Mueller had about the witness in his prior testimony to call him in the defense's case in chief. He accepted that. And that is what we're going to do once we bring the jury back in.

MR. MUELLER: All right. Thank you, Your Honor.

And I've only got several questions I believe will address Ms. Guidry's concerns.

THE COURT: All right. Do you have any edits to that? Yeah, it's okay.

MR. DIGIACOMO: I had one issue.

THE COURT: Go for it.

MR. DIGIACOMO: That involuntary manslaughter doesn't say

1636

1	guilty of. Other than that, the verdict form looks fine to me, Judge.
2	THE COURT: Oh, yes. All right. I see what you're saying.
3	Sorry. Thank you.
4	Any additional edits to this, Mr. Mueller?
5	MR. MUELLER: None that I saw, Your Honor.
6	THE COURT: Thank you. All right.
7	Okay. All right. Well, let's go ahead and bring the jury in.
8	[In the presence of the jury panel]
9	THE COURT: Please be seated. Welcome back, ladies and
10	gentlemen.
11	Mr. Mueller, do you have any witnesses to call or you may
12	call your first witness?
13	MR. MUELLER: Thank you, Your Honor.
14	Defense will call, as its first witness, recalling
15	Detective Salisbury.
16	And I promise the jury and the Court I will be brief.
17	KENNETH SALISBURY
18	[Having been called as a witness and being first duly sworn, testified as
19	follow:]
20	MR. MUELLER: Thank you, Your Honor.
21	DIRECT EXAMINATION
22	BY MR. MUELLER:
23	Q Detective, as you know, I had just a couple of questions that
24	came up over the lunch hour and wanted to ask you before we rest the
25	case.

1		Sir, the concept of area of initial contact; do you remember
2	that?	
3	Α	I do.
4	Q	What is the area of initial contact?
5	А	The first damage or injury producing event.
6	Q	All right. You remember, and on our diagram here, it is marked
7	as Defe	nse or State's 88, I've got the diagram here. I'm going to zoom
8	in here for clarity.	
9		Now, you've got area of initial contact marked as the first
10	addition of the on the right-hand side of the aerial view; correct?	
11	Α	Correct.
12	Q	Sir, what did you define, in this particular investigation what did
13	you define as area of initial contact?	
14	Α	The area of initial contact was the area of the first damage or
15	injury producing event.	
16	Q	All right.
17	А	Which was the onset of the shoe scuff marks.
18	Q	Are you quite certain of that?
19		And would it refresh your recollection if I were to show you page
20	9 of your supplemental officer's report.	
21		And how did you define area of initial contact in the report?
22	А	At the area of initial contact would be before he started
23	poundin	g on the windshield with his fist.
24	Q	Okay. So that's where basically that's where the car was
25	when he	e was on the windshield pounding with his fist?

1	А	Witnesses said that's what you're referring to	
2	Q	Yes, sir.	
3	А	what witnesses said?	
4		Witnesses said the decedent was on the hood of the Mercedes	
5	Benz at	the area of initial contact before he started pounding on the	
6	windshield with his fist.		
7	Q	Okay. So that's where we're at, that's what your AIC is here,	
8	that's where he's at, on the car before he starts pounding?		
9	Α	That's where witnesses said the vehicle was.	
10	Q	Okay. So that's not where he's actually she starts driving off	
11	initially,	there's where he's on the hood beating it and then she eventually	
12	pulls away?		
13	А	Right.	
14	Q	Okay. The next thing, sir, there was a moment in time where	
15	you seemed a little confused as to whether the damage to the windshield		
16	was actually caused by Mr. Osorio beating it with his hand.		
17		Do you remember that?	
18	А	I don't remember being confused. But I said I couldn't prove	
19	one way or the other.		
20	Q	All right. Well, you weren't quite so confused when you wrote	
21	your report.		
22		Would it refresh your recollection if you	
23	А	Sure.	
24	Q	would review it?	
25		THE COURT: Counsel, will you reframe from commentary. If	

Page 86

1	you have a question to pose, please pose the question.			
2		MR. MUELLER: Certainly, Judge.		
3	BY MR.	BY MR. MUELLER:		
4	Q	Sir, would it refresh your recollection to review page 45 of your		
5	report?			
6	Α	Okay. This image was recovered from Guidry's phone. It was		
7	taken mi	inutes after the incident occurred. The damage on the front		
8	windshield was caused by Osorio pounding with his fist.			
9	Q	Okay. So in your report you had no ambiguity about it?		
10	Α	Correct.		
11	Q	All right. Now, I also want to ask about two speed calculations.		
12	One of the things an investigator or traffic investigator has to do is			
13	estimate	the coefficient of friction across the ground; correct?		
14	Α	We don't really estimate it. We do that by conducting a sliding		
15	test.			
16	Q	Did you use a slide here to get the friction measurement?		
17	Α	I can't hear you.		
18	Q	Did you use the sled to get the friction measurement here or did		
19	you just use the tables?			
20	Α	No, we did not. In this case, with the pedestrian, we used		
21	publishe	d data because we're not going to re-slide a pedestrian on the		
22	asphalt of	asphalt out at the scene.		
23	Q	Okay. So you calculated two speeds, you said it was 59 miles		
24	an hour,	but that was as the car was leaving the scene, that's not the		
25	speed when Mr. Osorio fell off?			

Page 87 1640

A To be perfectly clear, the speed of 59 miles per hour is the speed the vehicle is leaving that video surveillance footage off to the right after Mr. Osorio has already fallen from the vehicle.

Q All right. And, in fact, Mr. Osorio was off the -- fell off the car not even the length of the gas station --

A Incorrect.

Q -- Jake's Market?

A And I think that's where you may be confused. When -- this area here is the onset of the body scuff mark.

Now, when a body is carried upon a vehicle, that body will be accelerated to the same speed of the vehicle, they're two, two move something as one unit.

When the body falls from that vehicle, or removes from that vehicle, is now independent of that vehicle, it's at the same speed of the vehicle until it's acted upon by that unbalanced force. That unbalanced force is the asphalt and is all the kinetic energy calculation we talked about yesterday and how much kinetic energy it takes to slow that body of mass to a stop.

Q And the speed that Mrs. Osorio either fell off or let go of the car, by your calculation was what?

- A 23 miles per hour.
- Q 23 miles on hour.

And that is an approximation; correct, it could be a few miles per hour lower or a few miles per hours faster?

A I don't know if I would say a few. But is it possible one or two,

1	possibly.
2	MR. MUELLER: Okay. And with that, Judge, I don't have any
3	further questions.
4	THE COURT: Any cross-examination?
5	MR. DIGIACOMO: No.
6	THE COURT: All right. Any additional questions from the jury?
7	I am seeing none. All right.
8	Thank you. You may step down from the witness stand.
9	THE WITNESS: Thank you.
10	MR. MUELLER: All right. Thank you, Your Honor.
11	And with that the defense rests.
12	THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
13	Well, ladies and gentlemen, that's the conclusion of the
14	presentation of evidence. I do need to see counsel at the bench.
15	[Bench conference begins]
16	THE COURT: Any motions that we need to make outside the
17	presence of the jury? I don't really feel like sending them out of the room
18	again, I'd just rather keep them here.
19	MR. MUELLER: No.
20	MR. DIGIACOMO: No.
21	THE COURT: No? Okay.
22	All right. We're going to print these instructions. I'll give you-al
23	a minute to take a look at them and then we'll read them. I'm going to let
24	the jury be at ease so.
25	MR. MUELLER: Okay.

1	MR. DIGIACOMO: Thank you. Perfect.
2	THE COURT: All right.
3	[Bench conference ends]
4	THE COURT: All right. Ladies and gentlemen, we are going to
5	be reading the jury instructions next and after jury instructions will be
6	closing arguments from both the State and the defense.
7	Want to give both attorneys an opportunity just to make sure the
8	jury instructions are in order. Because we just came from back from
9	lunch, we are I'm going to ask that you not leave the courtroom, unless
10	you need to use the facilities, but you are free to stand and stretch while
11	we finish this process and then we'll sit down and go through the
12	instructions together.
13	All right. So it'll just be a few moments. Please be at ease.
14	And I'll remind you of the admonition about not talking about the case
15	during this break.
16	All right.
17	And also here's a copy of the verdict form. Do you-all want to
18	inspect the updated version?
19	MR. DIGIACOMO: It's fine, Judge.
20	[Pause in proceeding]
21	THE COURT: You-all must be tired after that long lunch
22	because you are all still seated. Or it's so hot outside you're just tired,
23	maybe a combination of both.
24	UNIDENTIFIED JUROR: It's hot.
25	THE COURT: It is really hot outside. I fooled myself into

1	thinking it was August and we would be done with the heat.
2	[Pause in proceeding]
3	THE COURT: The joys of technology, as soon as we need to
4	print something, something goes wrong. That's what's happening here.
5	So I apologize for the delay. But they're on their way.
6	[Pause in proceeding]
7	[Bench conference begins]
8	THE COURT: All right. I found one error and it says that she
9	was charged by Information instead of Indictment. I have already
10	changed that. Yours say Information, but I changed it to Indictment.
11	MR. DIGIACOMO: Oh, that's fine.
12	THE COURT: Okay. That's the only error I saw, but let me
13	know if you see anymore.
14	MR. DIGIACOMO: Sure.
15	THE COURT: Take your time.
16	[Bench conference ends]
17	THE COURT: All right. We got the printer working. They're
18	going to take a moment, take a look at these, and then we'll read them.
19	MR. DIGIACOMO: Judge, instruction number 4.
20	THE COURT: Yeah, instruction number 4.
21	MR. DIGIACOMO: That's the one?
22	THE COURT: That's the one.
23	MR. DIGIACOMO: Okay.
24	THE COURT: So yours are incorrect but I corrected it.
25	MR. DIGIACOMO: Oh, okay.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

THE COURT: Right.

[Pause in proceeding]

THE COURT: While they're reviewing these, I'll let you know, what we're going to do is we're going to -- my judicial assistant is going to stand at the Elmo and put the instructions on there. They'll be displayed on the screens so you guys can read along with them as we go through them. And then you'll have a paper copy in the back to take with you to refer to.

I used to printout copies for each of the jurors, but in my attempt to contribute to -- or reducing waste just a little bit, I'm -- we're -- we switched to doing it this way to -- can't surprise anybody that this a very paper intensive process in general, as evidenced by this.

[Pause in proceeding]

MR. DIGIACOMO: Can we approach on one issue?

THE COURT: Yes, please.

[Bench conference begins]

MR. DIGIACOMO: Are these recorded?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. DIGIACOMO: Okay. Just -- the only thing that struck me is the defense didn't specifically request the constitutional right of the defendant not to testify and that has to be done on the record.

So I'm assuming he wanted it.

MR. MUELLER: That's fine. No, I don't -- which, the instruction says she's got the right to testify?

THE COURT: No, it just says --

1	MR. DIGIACOMO: Constitutional right, you can't draw any
2	inference.
3	Do you want it or not want it?
4	MR. MUELLER: Nah, that's fine. I don't want to call any
5	attention to it.
6	MR. DIGIACOMO: So then we have to take it.
7	THE COURT: We have to take it out.
8	MR. MUELLER: Okay. Then leave it in. Just leave it in. I've
9	never been all that fired up with that instruction one way or the other. It
10	doesn't seem to change any
11	THE COURT: Okay. So you don't have any objection to
12	leaving it in?
13	MR. MUELLER: I don't have any objection leaving it in.
14	THE COURT: Okay.
15	MR. DIGIACOMO: You're affirmatively requesting it
16	THE COURT: You're affirmatively requesting it?
17	MR. MUELLER: I yes
18	MR. DIGIACOMO: Okay.
19	THE COURT: Because the law requires you to.
20	MR. MUELLER: I am affirmatively requesting the instruction
21	to be included.
22	MR. DIGIACOMO: The statute says, I'm sorry, dude.
23	MR. MUELLER: Okay.
24	THE COURT: Okay.
25	MR. MUELLER: I've never noticed any difference one way or

1	the other with that instruction.
2	THE COURT: Okay. All right. Any other issues with the
3	instructions?
4	MR. DIGIACOMO: No, everything else looked fine to me.
5	That's the only thing that struck me.
6	THE COURT: All right. And from the defense, anything, any
7	edits or anything else that needs to be changed with the instructions?
8	MR. MUELLER: No, Your Honor. I think we've done a pretty
9	good job with the jury instructions.
10	THE COURT: Okay. All right. Then we will get started here in
11	a moment.
12	Thank you, both.
13	MR. DIGIACOMO: Thank you.
14	[Bench conference ends]
15	[Pause in proceeding]
16	THE COURT: And State and defense, for your records, this is
17	the corrected number 4, for your records.
18	All right. One for you and one for him. It says, the Information.
19	[Bench conference begins]
20	MR. DIGIACOMO: It does but
21	THE COURT: Oh, wait, hold on, let me show you mine.
22	MR. DIGIACOMO: I don't know if it makes a difference. But
23	when I added, involuntary, it should be murder of the first degree, murder
24	of the second degree, and involuntary.
25	THE COURT: So I changed it to Indictment oh, well, yeah,

1	we didn't catch that.
2	MR. DIGIACOMO: It should be first degree murder, second
3	degree murder, and involuntary.
4	THE COURT: Okay. Hold on.
5	MR. DIGIACOMO: Manslaughter.
6	THE COURT: Is that the only edit on that one?
7	MR. DIGIACOMO: Yes.
8	THE COURT: It doesn't affect any of the other ones?
9	MR. DIGIACOMO: It no, because the transition instructions
10	are all there.
11	MR. MUELLER: Who's going to be the next DA?
12	MR. DIGIACOMO: Not me.
13	MR. MUELLER: Well, how much longer does Steve got an
14	office this term. He's got four more years?
15	MR. DIGIACOMO: If he doesn't run for something else in 2020,
16	it's 2022.
17	[Colloquy between the Court and the Law Clerk]
18	MR. DIGIACOMO: I apologize, Judge, I should have seen that
19	last night.
20	THE COURT: No, that's okay. I missed it too. That's why we
21	do this though.
22	[Colloquy between the Court and the Law Clerk]
23	MR. DIGIACOMO: Okay. Should we step back?
24	THE COURT: Yep. Thank you.
25	MR. DIGIACOMO: Perfect.

1	[Bench conference ends]
2	[Pause in proceeding]
3	THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, can you read
4	that or does it need to be a little closer? I'm seeing some nods and some
5	a little. You can read them okay. All right.
6	[Colloquy between the Court and the Marshal]
7	THE COURT: Usually all this finalization takes place behind the
8	scene. You're so lucky you get the front row view to it.
9	[Pause in proceeding]
10	THE COURT: Ray, could you pass one to each of them to
11	make sure?
12	THE MARSHAL: Yes, ma'am.
13	THE COURT: Thank you.
14	Mr. DiGiacomo, okay?
15	MR. DIGIACOMO: Yes, Judge.
16	THE COURT: All right. Any objection, Mr. Mueller?
17	MR. MUELLER: No, Your Honor.
18	THE COURT: All right. Then let's go ahead and get started.
19	[The Court read the instructions to the jury]
20	THE COURT: All right. With that, State, are you ready to
21	present your closing arguments?
22	MR. SCARBOROUGH: Yes, Your Honor.
23	If I can have the WePresent, please.
24	THE COURT: Yes.
25	Whenever you're ready.

 MR. SCARBOROUGH: Thank you, Your Honor.

CLOSING ARGUMENT BY THE STATE

MR. SCARBOROUGH: Well, here we are. Ladies and gentlemen in the State of Nevada versus Ronneka Guidry there is absolutely no doubt that Eduardo Osorio was killed by the crimes committed by that woman sitting over there Ronneka Guidry.

Now, in every criminal case the State has to prove two things and once we prove identity, which we have. We have to prove the crimes that are committed.

So let's walk you through the crimes. Now, the charges are murder with use of a deadly weapon, robbery with use of a deadly weapon, grand larceny of value over \$3500, and duty to stop at the scene of a crash involving death or personal injury.

Now, when you look at these charges and you contemplate them you're going to look at what's called the verdict form. And on the verdict form there's going to be a series of options for count.

For example, on Count 1, for first degree murder with use of a deadly, first degree murder without the deadly, and so on and so forth.

So for the next counts it's Count 2, robbery with use of a deadly weapon.

Count 3, grand larceny, as you see all the options.

Finally bringing you to Count 4, the duty to stop.

Now, when I go through lists like this, and deal with issues, I like to do a process of elimination; right, you want to eliminate the things that don't have really any debate. So you can cross them off the list.

And while we're here at Count 4, the duty to stop, well, let's move right into it. I don't need to spend much time discussing whether or not Ronneka Guidry stopped at that scene and rendered aid to Eduardo Osorio. The law will tell you that any person involved in a collision resulting in injury shall immediately stop such vehicle at the scene of collision. Below are the requirements that you have to do, you give your name, info, you render aid.

Now, what triggers the duty to stop is whether or not the driver knew or should have known that she had been involved in a collision.

And more importantly you also need not find that the driver knew that she injured somebody.

But, ladies and gentlemen, Ronneka knew she had hit somebody. Ronneka knew that she was in a collision. And there's absolutely no doubt that she didn't stop at the scene.

Now, related to that is whether or not you have to immediately stop. And the law will tell you that a stop is possible, even though if it's not immediate, if it's at a safe enough distance not to fear for your own safety.

So if you believe she was fearing for her own safety when Eduardo Osorio was pounding on that windshield to get the watch back that was just stolen from him, she didn't have to stop. But at some point, when she got away, she had to stop and render aid.

Well, obviously, based on, and this is the diagram, you, again, you heard the evidence, Ronneka didn't stop. She didn't come back to see Eduardo Osorio take his last breath. She left.

Page 98 1651

And, furthermore, you know she got to a safe place because you heard in the testimony of the cell phone expert, James Beatty, when we saw this picture, that minutes later she's getting her windshield repaired or trying to make arrangements to do so. Not calling the police. Not calling an ambulance for the man she just ran down dying on the road.

So when you look at your verdict form and you go to Count 4, obviously, you can eliminate the not guilty.

Ladies and gentlemen, at minimum, at minimum we have a duty to stop, that she is guilty. She didn't stop.

Now, because she didn't stop and because Eduardo Osorio laid down in the road ultimately he died. Well, that brings us to Count 1, because when there's a dead body, ladies and gentlemen, that triggers a murder.

And as we go forward, again, we're going to eliminate what doesn't apply. Well, right off the bat let's eliminate that not guilty.

Now, the Judge read you a litany of instructions, a lot of instructions on self-defense. I'm not going to waste your time on going through every one of them because it's quite simple. Whether or not it's a justified killing depends on whether or not the person here is engaged in a criminal activity and that person must either retreat instead of using deadly force when they're engaged in criminal activity.

It's whether or not someone who's stealing someone's watch and then when Eduardo Osorio was trying to stop her from doing, so can you then claim self-defense. No. Not at all.

Page 99 1652

So I'm not going to spend a bunch of time on the self-defense instructions.

The law tells you, and you were also read, that the victim of a larceny has a right to use force to resist the taking. So Eduardo, under the law, he had a right to go stop Ronneka from taking the watch. He had a right to go do so.

And, like I said before, you can't be Ronneka in the driver's seat and when someone's trying to stop you from taking the \$8,000 Rolex that you had, well, then you can't say, oh, I'm in danger, no, you can't stop me from taking your watch unlawfully. That's not how self-defense works.

Well, let's talk about taking the watch. Ladies and gentlemen, there's a grand larceny and a robbery and a taking of the watch. Well, this picture right here, I mean, you know the defendant took the watch, that's the cell phone picture. You've got all the text messages of her arranging conversations to fence the watch to the Miami-Dade Dade pawn store.

Well -- and there's the receipt right there.

You saw the FedEx footage and the FedEx packaging showing that she shipped the watch.

Now, what's more important is this, You got an all gold, sending to one of her friends is at 2:51 a.m. that same night. Right around when Eduardo Osorio was drawing his last breath of life, that's when she's fencing that watch. So you know she took the watch.

Well, you know she drove off with the victim's watch, I mean, because she's gone. She didn't return. She's at home. That pictures there.

You're looking at the defendant's actions were -- the victims trying to bang on the window to stop her. Well, again, that's not self-defense when he's trying to stop you from taking the \$8,000 watch. You can't claim it.

So when he gets on top of the hood, according to Mr. Landale, the car stopped, if you remember that.

Now, defendant floors it.

Detective Salisbury says, well, it's opened up full throttle. And that victim is still on the hood.

[Playing video]

MR. SCARBOROUGH: That's not self-defense.

So, as you'll notice, the not guilties gone. Self-defense is out the window, folks. You can't steal someone's stuff and then claim self-defense when they try to stop you from doing it.

So, next, what you eliminate would be the involuntary manslaughter. And involuntary manslaughter, generally, is the killing of a human without any intent to do so in the commission of an unlawful act.

Well, there are limits to involuntary manslaughter. When the involuntary killing occurs in the commission of an unlawful act, which in its consequences naturally tends to destroy the life of a human being, an example of an act that naturally tends to destroy the life of a human being. Like, opening up your car full throttle when someone's on it. When they're trying to stop you from stealing their watch. That'll tend to destroy the life of a human being and it did.

Well, the offense is murder. It's not involuntary manslaughter.

It's murder.

So, again, you look at the defendant's actions. She drives off with the victim's watch. He tries to stop her from leaving by banging on her window. He gets on top of her car while it's stopped. She floors it, goes full throttle and the victim's on the hood. These facts apply to everything.

Not only is it not self-defense but this also makes it not involuntary manslaughter either. Because that naturally tends to destroy the life of a human being when you floor it and someone's on your hood. It's not involuntary manslaughter, folks.

And while we're here another limit to involuntary manslaughter, that we'll get to, has to do with the deadly weapon.

So as we talk about eliminating, you know, easier concepts, a deadly weapon, as you're instructed, is an any instrument under the circumstances in which it's used is readily capable of causing substantial bodily harm.

I think at this point, folks, you can say it with me, when you floor the car with someone on it, a 3,500 pound car, traveling at full throttle, folks, that can be a deadly weapon. And, in fact, it was.

Now, why that's related to involuntary manslaughter is because the law tells you that involuntary manslaughter does not involve the conscious use of a deadly weapon in the commission of the crime.

Well, we have a robbery with deadly here, and we'll get to that, but she floored that deadly weapon full throttle to get away with the watch. You can't do that and still be found responsible only for involuntary

manslaughter. The law doesn't allow it.

So when you're on your verdict form, you can cross off involuntary manslaughter.

And related, you could also cross off the options without the deadly weapon; right. The deadly weapons present here, that vehicle when she floors it, that's the deadly weapon.

So now we have murder left, second degree and first.

Well, let's walk through in terms, before we get to degrees, let's talk about what murder is. Murder is the unlawful killing of a human being with malice aforethought, malice aforethought either expressed or implied.

Now, on the bottom it says, the unlawful killing may be affected by any of the various means by which death may be occasion. That's just saying that there's not a specific way you have to kill someone in order to murder them. It's anyway death can be occasion. So don't let that trip you up.

Well, let's talk about what malice aforethought is. It's an intentional doing of a wrongful act, a killing. And that killing is done without legal cause or excuse, without reason. Or what the law considers adequate provocation. So without legal cause, aka, self-defense, which is not present here, and without legal reason. You can't kill someone when you're stealing their watch and they try to stop it.

The law also tells you certain -- it defines and it allows you to glean where malice aforethought may arise from, and when you look at the list, anger, hatred, revenge, ill will. But if you go down, it also may arise from an unjustifiable or an unlawful motive. Stealing the watch, I'll

Page 103 1656

 say every time.

And it's also done with a reckless disregard of consequences and social duty. Flooring it when he's on your hood. Opening it up full throttle until he careens off and ultimately dies. That's a reckless disregard of consequences and social duty. Not only are you committing the crime, you're -- it's reckless to just floor it to get him off your car. That's -- that's malice aforethought, folks.

Now, when we're talking about malice aforethought, you can ignore all that what I just said if you want to. You could. Because under the law, under the felony murder law, there's a kind of murder which carries with it conclusive evidence of premeditation and malice aforethought.

What does that mean? There's a class of murder committed in the perpetration or attempted perpetration of a robbery. And that perpetration of a robbery, which results in a killing, if the killing was intentional, unintentional, or accidental it doesn't matter because, ladies and gentlemen, that's a first degree murder.

When you rob someone and they die trying to stop you, it doesn't matter if it was an accident, it doesn't matter if it was unintentional or intentional, that is a first degree murder, ladies and gentlemen.

Robbery, plus a death during a robbery, equals first degree.

Well, now, in this case the felony murder applies. Why? We know Eduardo Osorio is dead. But is it the result of a robbery?

Now, before we get to the robbery, the grand larceny is alleged. So when you personally steals, takes and carries away the property of

another, with the intent to permanently deprive, is guilty of the grand larceny.

Again, you know Ronneka took the watch. She took it. She tried to fence it, arguably, minutes later. She had the watch, there's the grand larceny. There's value to it. It's a Rolex watch, folks. You heard multiple people come up and testify to the value of it, Eduardo's father, Nuno. And you also realize that she fenced it for \$4500. That meets the limit. I'm not going to spend any more time on that.

But, ladies and gentlemen, the grand larceny that Ronneka committed upon Eduardo Osorio evolved -- I apologize, so you can cross those off now on Count 3.

Well, that evolved into a robbery with a deadly weapon when he tried to stop her and she floored it.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, the watch that she took, that she was driving away with, that he, Eduardo, tried to stop her from taking it, died doing so. That's a robbery now.

Well, what's a robbery? Well, the elements of a robbery are the unlawful taking of a property against his will by means of force or violence. Now, that force or violence must be used to obtain or retain the possession to prevent or overcome resistance to the taking.

Now, there's another instruction that has to do with the location and the timing of the robbery. Now, all matters immediately antecedent to and having direct causal connection with a robbery, are deemed so closely connected with it as to form a reality apart of the occurrence.

Ladies and gentlemen, that's telling you that robberies just don't

take place in one area. They can take place over a distance, over a time. They're not confined to a fixed locus. They can spread over considerable and varying periods of time.

Like, when Eduardo gets out of the vehicle, realizes his watch is no longer in his possession, sees her come around, and even though she's driving away, she's not getting away yet. Him going to try to stop her and then her flooring the vehicle when he's on it, that's still all a part of the robbery. The robbery isn't just completed where she takes the watch and leaves. That's all still a part of it.

Now, although acts of violence and intimidations preceded or followed the actual taking, or even if they were primarily intended for another purpose. Like, just trying to get away or anything like that. It's enough to support the robbery.

So it doesn't matter the timing of it or how long he spent in the parking lot searching himself and looking and finding out that his watch was taken by Ronneka, because he goes to stop her and when she floors it that's all a part of the robbery.

And using that vehicle to get away with that watch is the deadly weapon and that's all the robbery with the deadly weapon.

You see over on the Jay's Market and where he was over here. He ran all the way out there to try to stop her.

Ladies and gentlemen, the distance running and how far she got before he got a chance to try to stop her for the robbery, doesn't matter. It's all a part of it.

Well, let's return to force. We heard a lot of testimony about

whether the vehicle and who struck who. And, well, ladies and gentlemen, 56,000 square foot pounds and opening up full throttle, the vehicle, and having Eduardo slide 42 feet on the asphalt, that's absolutely force. That's absolutely force for a robbery. And more importantly that force was to prevent the overcome -- or prevent or overcome the resistance to the taking.

So, ladies and gentlemen, you cross off the not guilty on the robbery too.

And now that we've gone through everything, I mean, you do one final recap. At 2:01 a.m., Eduardo Osorio meets Ronneka Guidry in front of that Omnia bar.

2:06 they're in the elevator going towards the car.

Minutes later they're in the car leaving the area.

And after seven minutes in the vehicle, where she backed in, looking for the quick escape, she commits the grand larceny by taking his watch. And when Eduardo Osorio notices that the watch is taken, he goes to try to stop her. And when he ends up on the hood trying to stop her, she commits robbery with a deadly weapon by flooring the vehicle with him on the hood.

And by leaving him in that road and not rendering aid, she committed the duty, the failure to stop.

And later on, as a result of this event, when Eduardo Osorio drew his last breath, Ronneka Guidry committed first degree felony murder.

Now, we've gone through all of the options, ladies and

1	gentlemen, on all of the counts in the verdict form to leave you with only
2	one real choice, guilty on all counts.
3	Thank you.
4	THE COURT: Thank you.
5	MR. MUELLER: Judge, do have an extra copy of the do you
6	have a copy of the verdict form?
7	Can I get a copy?
8	THE COURT: Sure. That's the actual verdict though,
9	Mr. Mueller.
10	MR. MUELLER: Yeah, I need a photocopy.
11	THE COURT: We don't have a copy here but you can use that
12	one, you're going to write on it?
13	MR. MUELLER: I was going to actually write on it.
14	THE COURT: Go ahead and write on it. We'll print a new one.
15	Go ahead and write on that one.
16	MR. MUELLER: Thank you. I appreciate it.
17	THE COURT: No problem.
18	MR. MUELLER: And with Court's permission may I proceed?
19	THE COURT: Yes. Thank you.
20	CLOSING ARGUMENT BY THE DEFENSE
21	MR. MUELLER: Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, this is
22	actually a very case and what you'll find is the analysis of this case is
23	much simpler if you start and analyze it the proper way.
24	But, first, a couple points, thank you for your jury service. This
25	is a very old system and it works a lot better than it's given credit for. The

reason we have juries is that 12 of you collectively have 20 or 30 years of life experience, and the 12 of you together have 400 something years of life experience. That hopefully means always, and almost means, that collectively you will all bring some insights to the jury that you individually may not have. You know how people behave. You know how people think. You know how people see the world. You know how people become when they've been drinking. And you know how young men behave when they're on vacation. Things that aren't necessarily found in law books. Things that are from the school of hard knocks.

So, a couple of the jury instructions, and you're going have these, so I'm not going to sit here and have to tell them to you. All right.

But what you heard from the State's opening analysis is very light on the facts. I'm going to advocate a very different way of analyzing this case. I would ask to you look specifically at the facts and draw reasonable conclusions.

The heart of this case happens very simply in the seven minutes that the car is parked at Jake's Market or backed up at Jake's Market in front of the Westin.

Now, there are several things that are there that are obvious but not really commented upon. You, with your commonsense and your everyday commonsense and experience, which is actually found at jury instruction, in this particular case, I think it was 46. It says use your everyday commonsense and experience.

A man and woman who just met are sitting unintended, for no obvious reasons, in a parking lot at 2:00 in the morning.

Page 109 1662

Now, is there any doubt why they're there? All right. I told you in opening instructions Ms. Guidry occasionally works as a prostitute. There's no meaningful doubt about that.

What has been established that they are in the car, they're in the car and don't even turn off the lights. The car is there for seven and a half minutes, seven and a pair of seconds, minutes. The door opens up, Mr. Osorio gets out on his own, on his own, no sign of force, no scuffle, no hubbub. He gets out of the door; closes the door.

Ms. Guidry drives off. Doesn't peel out. Doesn't speed away. She goes through a garage that is on the far side of the garage and they are physically separated, they are geographically separated, and there's absolutely no indication of trouble.

Now, one of three things would appear to suggest themselves, number one, the watch fell off. Well, we kind of know that didn't happen. Actually, Mr. DiGiacomo proved the point this morning in court. The clasp on this watch is pretty strong. It is nearly, unlikely that the watch fell off accidentally in the car. Mr. DiGiacomo was having trouble even getting the clasp to unlock in the car.

However, comma, this clasp also tells us something else very important. The State has yet to and cannot explain, and I want you to understand this, and the State has the burden to prove this beyond a reasonable doubt, the State has to prove the case beyond a reasonable doubt. They haven't even proved the watch was stolen.

The watch is in the car; the watch changes hands. What are the circumstances around that? The watch changes hands when the

young man's wallet contains no money. Young man had been in town on vacation in Las Vegas for almost a week. He's getting ready to leave tomorrow. What does he have? He's out of money. It's 2:00 in the morning. He's been drinking for how long? This is the State's case. How long has this young man been drinking? By his friends own admission he had a couple of drinks before he went in the club and he went in the club and was in the club for three hours. You saw him come out of the club and he's actually kind of woozy on his feet. He's drunk. And that's not meaningfully in doubt. His blood level is a .168 or -- almost twice the legal limit. So that he's drunk at that point is also not meaningful in doubt.

Now, here's where your everyday commonsense and experience comes in. He walks out of the club. He's been drinking. He's been Vegas'd. He'd been drinking, raising hell, he's in the club, and he meets a woman whose company might be had. A few minutes later they drive out of the house -- or drive to a far away or relatively small -- or close location, where they park, and guess what we find out? Mr. Osorio has no money.

Now, young man drinking on vacation, looking for a little romance, a little sexual services, has no money. The watch was given as a gift or traded. The watch doesn't have to be stolen. The watch doesn't come off. The watch doesn't fall off. And here it is.

Now, how do we know that this was given away voluntarily by a drunk, young man? He gets out of the car, closes the door, gets out, starts walking over to Jake's Market, and off Ms. Guidry drives.

Now, whether he has buyer's remorse or he suddenly realizes

as the blood supply comes back to his head that maybe he's done something foolish. He becomes the aggressor. At this point, the watch has been transacted. There is no disturbance. There is no complaint.

And if Ms. Guidry had turned left, instead of right, you guys wouldn't be sitting here and that young man would have been alive today.

But what happens? At that moment, that's the nugget of this case, what happened in that car? And the State can't tell you because they don't know. That's the evidence of this case. What happened in the car? The State has to prove beyond a reasonable doubt.

Now, there are three suggestions. One of which is this watch fell off and -- actually, you're right, it didn't fall off. I assure you. You'll have this watch back in there and you can see how good this clasp works.

Number two, this clasp also tells us something else because that means in seven minutes Ms. Guidry, who's sitting in the driver's seat -- if I could, grab a chair here.

Mr. Osorio does not get out of the car. He's sitting in car seat, on the passenger side, Ms. Guidry's here, this watch is on his left hand. She has to figure out how to unclasp this watch, take it from him, secrete it away without him noticing, and then have him get out and discover it's gone all the while she's doing something else.

Now, how does that happen? The State can't explain it and they won't. They want you to pay -- not pay attention to what happened in the car because what happened in the car is the case.

How did that happen? The answer is very simple, he took it off and gave it to her. Whether he gave it to her as payment in services or

 whether he gave it to her as a pledge for money back at the Monte Carlo, which is what she said they were going -- he wanted to go. The watch changes hands. She drives away. And interestingly enough -- and people act at the moment based on what they are thinking.

If he turned around and got out and says, wait a minute, she's got my watch. He reaches back in. If he got out and said, that, she stole my watch. He chases after her. That's what happens when you realize your watch is gone. This is a nice heavy watch. If you don't have it on, and you're used to having it on, you would notice it's gone quickly.

But he doesn't runoff after her. What does he do? She drives off. He goes the other way. Goes over to Jake's Market, thinks about things for a second, like, wait a minute, I just gave away an expensive watch, here comes the car, and now he's got a separate idea, buyer's remorse.

So, number one, the State has not established a grand larceny and they can't establish a grand larceny. They can't do it.

Now, the idea of robbery, now we focus in narrowly, like a laser beam, because what transacted in the car is the heart of this case. Then there's a second moment that's almost as equally as important and that is Mr. Osorio. Who in their right mind runs into traffic and steps in front of a moving car? Nobody in their right mind does it. Who does that? A drunk person does that. So Mr. Osorio runs in front of a car.

Now, if Ms. Guidry was malignantly vent on malice, as the State would have you believe -- or as my colleague here wants you to believe, there it is, run him over. Okay.

Oh, I asked the detective, Detective, did you look at the car? Yeah.

See any evidence at all, collision on the front of the car? No.

Mr. Langsdale, (phonentic) who probably was the most credible witness here because he had no -- no emotion and no ties to the case, says Ms. Guidry stops. And after Osorio stopped, does he walk around the car and said, excuse me, I think I might have made a bad deal, can I get my watch back? Or, excuse me, I need my wallet and my watch back, I left it in the cup holder. Or, excuse me, can I get my watch back? Does he do any of those things? The answer is no. What does our drunk young man do? He leaps on the hood of a car.

Now, you're on this planet for a long time, how many times you've somebody leap on the hood of a car in traffic? It's not an everyday occurrence. It is not the actions of someone who's using good judgment or in their right mind.

Now, this is the most -- functional equivalent of actually being the victim of an armed robbery by telling the guy to pull out his gun and shoot -- point it at him. He goes in front of the car. The cars not used as an instrumentality of the crime. It's Mr. Osorio who introduces himself to the element of danger. And even then Ms. Guidry holds back, shows remarkable restraint. He's on the hood of that car, by, according to Langsdale -- or what was the young man's name? Landale -- he's on the hood the car for about ten seconds.

Now, ten seconds doesn't sound like a lot if you're watching TV

or a commercial or if you're watching a football game or you got to get to the bathroom and get between half times. But ten seconds is forever when someone's pounding on your car and you're scared to death.

One thousand one, one thousand two, one thousand three, one thousand four, one thousand five, one thousand six, one thousand seven, one thousand eight, one thousand nine, one thousand ten. She's sitting there and he's pounding the windshield in.

Now, you're going to have this photograph, the photograph is back there in evidence.

I think it was 92. I'm sorry, madam clerk, I'm going to get these out of order on you again.

THE CLERK: No worries.

MR. MUELLER: Now, we've all been on this planet for a while, I don't know that everyone of us hasn't had a rock hit a windshield, occasionally cracking it or chipping it. Most of you guys have a feel for exactly what force that kind of represents. You don't get that kind of damage to a windshield unless you are really pounding on it.

Look at that, at least four, at least three, perhaps four separate areas of repeated impacts.

Now, how many more times could he hit that before the windshield gave way? How many more times she should she sat there and let him hit it before it gave way? At a certain point she has a reasonable fear that the windshields going to come in and she's going to receive the very next blow.

When she drives off Mr. Osorio makes a remarkably bad

decision to hold onto the car. Mr. Osorio, God bless him, is dead today because of his actions. He ran into the street. He hopped on the hood of a car. And after more, and sufficient provocation to make someone fear for their safety, he continued to hold onto the car. And when he fell off, he took a remarkably unfortunate bounce and landed on his head.

Mr. Osorio would be alive today, having filed an insurance claim on his watch, and back in college if he hadn't gotten drunk and run into the street. That is his fault. God rest his soul. He's a young man, sounded like he had a lot of promise. But we are not here for feelings or for prejudice or for sentimentality. We are here to get to the facts of a case.

There's two key moments in this case inside the car, there's no indication that a crime has been committed, none. He doesn't act like one's been committed. She doesn't act like she's getting away from one. She doubles back and drives right past him. Does that sound like someone's trying to get away? No.

Second bad fact, second bad decision, Mr. Osorio, angry, frustrated, intoxicated, hops on the hood a car, okay, take a second to calm off, calm down, you roll off the hood of the car, get the license plate, hey, if you're a victim of a crime, you drive off, and you get the plate number and you give a description,

That's not what happened here. He's twice the legal limit. He has no money. It is unfortunate but there's no crime here. It is unfortunate but there is no crime here. The watch wasn't stolen. The State hasn't proved. And when they come up for rebuttal, you know, maybe they can explain how the watch was stolen because there's no

proof of it.

Then how is there a robbery? A robbery is the elements of crime of taking, carrying away personal property of another by force or threat of force. It could be, if it immediate -- immediate consequence you use force to retain the property when challenged, that force could be sufficient to commit a robbery. But that's not this case. The cars gone. Guidry's gone. Watch is gone. There's no force. He then introduces the element of danger himself. He actually pulls the car on himself. He jumps on the hood of the car in traffic. He doesn't call for police. He doesn't call for assistance. He jumps on the hood of a car.

Now, O.J. Simpson went to prison for trying to get his property back. This young man goes out and tries to get his property back in the middle of traffic. You can't do that. You can't go and use force and commit crimes to get your property back. You've got to call the police and use legal process.

Now, when you go back there you'll have a large number of instructions. They can be a bit overwhelming. There are two that I want to draw your attention to. Number one is the commonsense instruction, in this particular case, it's found in page 46.

And then number 21, evidence of self-defense. The law does not require you to suffer injury.

Now, there's a couple things and we can kind of expand and work backwards a little bit because you know what people are thinking by their actions. Ms. Guidry is standing there confronted by this man in the middle of the road. She sits there for ten seconds while he's pounding the

25 middle of the

Page 117

windshield.

I want you to understand a few things that didn't happen. She didn't run him over. He was standing there. She could have said, oh, oh no, boom, and squealed off on him. She could have gone up over the curb and try to go around him. She could have backed up. None of that happened. She sat there and he was the attacker.

Now, the duty to stop. Ms. Guidry gave a long statement, much could be said about it, but the reality was, as you all saw her reaction when she found out that he was dead.

Now, there's a couple things, the State is using this failure to stop at the scene of an accident as a Hail Mary theory of liability. The reality is, is you have a duty to stop when there's an accident and a collision. Neither one of those were activated here. She didn't run into anything. She didn't hit anybody. She didn't run into them. She had an attacker on her car. She drove a short distance and he fell off. That's not an accident. If she did it intentionally, then that's not a collision because she didn't run into anything. That doesn't activate that felony theory of liability.

When you get back there you can read this law very clearly and it's very simple. We've included in the pack -- the jury instruction package, you have it, what an accident is and what a collision is. And in either case it does not apply.

She was the victim of a crime. This is the -- she was -- what Mr. Osorio was doing is exactly the sort of stuff that got O.J. sent back -- sent to prison for trying to get his property back.

Page 118 1671

MR. DIGIACOMO: I object, Judge.

THE COURT: That is sustained.

MR. MUELLER: All right.

THE COURT: The Court is to disregard the commentary regarding an unrelated matter.

MR. MUELLER: You're going to go back there with the jury instruction and instructions in how to check this off. It's actually very simple.

There's no murder here. Not at all. There's no knife. There's no gun. There's no malice. These people barely know each other. Not guilty of any sort of murder. Just not guilty. Doesn't happen. It's not there. They haven't proved -- if you can't prove that the watch was stolen, which it's not. In fact, in all likely -- to a near certainty, it wasn't given away. It's wasn't stolen.

Number 2, robbery with use of a deadly weapon. There's no use of force. Not guilty. You can't have a robbery. Who introduced the element of danger to the case? Osorio did. He's the one who ran into traffic. He's in danger because of his actions. If you just stands there, there's no robbery. You can't impose criminal liability by jumping in front of a car.

Finally, grand larceny, how do we know the watch was stolen? Osorio is sure not acting like his watch was taken. He doesn't get out of the car and start wrestling with her. He doesn't -- he's not fighting with her. The car drives off to the north; he walks away to the south.

Where's the element of the crime? And we get that clasp, get

that clasp and look at it, because you're going to ask yourself two questions, when you feel that clasp you're going to ask, could this watch have just fallen off? The almost is almost certainly nothing. It was on all night. He's had it for four yours. It didn't fall off. And feel it. When you see how tight that clasp is. Mr. DiGiacomo couldn't get it done. And I was trying to do it right here in front of you, I couldn't get it done.

So how did Ms. Guidry get it undone and how did Osorio not notice it in seven minutes in a car in close, intimate contact? Didn't happen. He gave it to her. That's the only way that watch could have come off.

And then, finally, duty to stop at scene of accident involving death or personal injury. You will find that there's an exception for knowing. You have to know that somebody or reasonably should have known that somebody was hurt or killed. You'll see the definition and statues of collision or accident. Neither of which apply to escaping someone who's attacking you. All right. So the reality is this is also a not guilty.

Grand larceny, not guilty.

Now, these are tough -- this is a tough case. There's absolutely no one happy that this young man is dead. It brings absolutely nobody any joy. It is not one of the higher uplifting cases I've been involved in. But the reality was he was in town, Las Vegas, for a week over the holidays, he'd been partying like a rock star, out drinking, he's at 2:30 in the morning, he's spent all his money, and he falls in with a woman, they're in a car going together, and the watch changes hands.

Page 120

What evidence do you have that it was a theft? The answer is none. Not a scintilla of evidence. In fact, all the surrounding circumstances kind of indicated it was a gift or some other sort of exchange was worked out in the car. You're all adults, you can figure out what happened in there for those seven minutes.

But when he gets out he's not looking for his watch and he's not chasing after the car.

So, tough case, folks, but respectfully the law and the facts lead you to the conclusion that you have to find Ms. Guidry not guilty of all four charges. Okay.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Mueller.

Rebuttal.

MR. DIGIACOMO: Thank you.

REBUTTAL CLOSING ARGUMENT BY THE STATE

MR. DIGIACOMO: In any given trial, criminal or civil, it doesn't really matter, any time 12 people are sitting here at the end of the day there's only one question that really has to be answered by 12 jurors during deliberation, it's our system of justice and the answer is always, it's a search for the truth.

What is the truth? And Mr. Mueller says, there is absolutely no way the State established that the watch was taken, although he's ignoring a really large piece of evidence, which would be the pain staking two hours we sat here with Ronneka Guidry denying that the watch fell off, denying that the watch was given to her, denying that the watch was accidentally left in her car.

Page 121

And if you say to yourself, why would people lie? Watch what Ms. Guidry does during her interview, people only lie for a reason, it's to benefit them.

So if the answer was, because she clearly admits at the very end there, she's a prostitute; right? So if the answer is, hey, he gave me the watch so that I can have -- so he could have fellatio performed on me, although there's zero evidence that fellatio or any sexual conduct happened in that vehicle, that would have been her answer.

And if it was, it was accidentally fell off in the car and I found it later when I was taking the picture of my windshield, that would have been a defense to her. She wouldn't have lied about that particular fact. Why is she lying if she didn't steal the watch?

But that's not the only thing you have here to establish she's the perpetrator of this particular crime. And I agree with Mr. Mueller that the really -- this case comes down to the vehicle and what happened in that vehicle for that seven minutes.

Because as a matter of law, no way you can look at this, if she has the watch in her possession unlawfully at 12 -- or 2:20 and 12 seconds, when she hits the accelerator, she's guilty of first degree murder, robbery with use of a deadly weapon, grand larceny over \$3500.

And to be honest with you, the count that matters probably the least is the duty to stop. But Mr. Mueller suggested it was a Hail Mary. Who cares one way or the other. But she did have a duty to stop. Read the definition of an accident.

First of all, was there a collision? Well, I would think that

Edward Osorio would suggest to you, if he was here, Eduardo would suggest to you, that when his head hit that cement or that asphalt, that was what he would consider a collision. And a vehicle that is involved in causing a collision is something that if the driver's involved, they have the duty to stop. But I'll leave you guys to the jury instructions there.

What I want you to do is actually go back there and do your job. Don't go back there, huddle in the hall, and make some sort of decision. Look at this evidence. Because this is what the evidence is going to show you. And I'm going to use things that Ms. Guidry said during her statement to tie into other pieces of evidence. And this is what a jury is supposed to do in that back room, figure out what the truth is.

You know that Edward Osorio is here, Eduardo Osorio is here, you know that he has no money, as far as anybody can determine whatsoever, but he has a credit card and he has a debit card. His friend went upstairs to go to sleep and he went into the Omnia nightclub and when he got out of the Omnia nightclub he was pretty darn drunk. You see him sort of walk and sit on a wall and sit there next to another girl who looks really drunk because she keeps going to like this, and pushing her nose up. And eventually she gets -- he gets up and he walks towards the bar area.

And Ms. Guidry is right, Mr. Osorio is the first one to make any communication between him and Ms. Guidry. He says to her, according to her, Hey, where are the taxi stands? And her response is, Hey, I got a car, I can drive you.

That is the predator and the prey. And Mr. Osorio is the prey.

Page 123

He is the drunk young \$500 or \$750 shoe wearing kid, who is highly drunk, who comes upon a pro, who says, Hey, come get into my vehicle, I can drive you to the Monte Carlo. And that conversation had to occur because Mr. Osorio is at the Monte Carlo. How does she know that fact unless that conversation occurred?

But back yourself up and watch Ms. Guidry as she's on the phone with Amber. Remember from the call logs that we showed you? She's on the phone with Amber. Amber's the woman who she is proud to tell she got an all gold from.

Watch what she does, she's talking to a man, he's like in a T-shirt or something, and she's talking to him and she doesn't really touch him. But then she walks up to a man in a suit and she comes onto him, and it looks just like a prostitute coming onto to a john, and what is the first thing Ms. Guidry does? She slides her hand right down his arm sleeve. What do you think Ms. Guidry is checking for when she does that?

And then when she has contact with Osorio and they're sitting there talking and she plays with his little silver necklace, notice her hand slides right down his arm, on his left arm. What is Ms. Guidry checking for? This is the pro. The predator and he is the prey. He don't know better. And he gets into that vehicle.

Mr. Mueller suggests to you that there's some sort of sexual activity in that vehicle. And there's no evidence of sexual activity. There's evidence of some sort of distraction. But I would suggest to you, probably not even that.

The odds are Mr. Osorio falls asleep; right? Because how do you get this watch off somebody? Well, it's one of two things, either she did start to play with his genitals and he was distracted or he just fell asleep because he's so drunk.

Well, what else do you know? She says, Oh, the reason I'm going this way to Koval. For those of you who's lived in town talk about it. If you're in the Caesars garage and you come out of that garage, what do you have to do? You make a quick left, you're right on Martin Street there, and you are -- or sorry, Frank Sinatra, and you go straight down and you pull into the Monte Carlo. There are no police officers behind the casinos. So if you want to avoid your plate, that's the way you go.

That's not what she does. She drives out of the Caesars, she waits at a light to turn left onto Flamingo, she drives down Flamingo, she drives into a parking lot, and she backs her car in. Why is she backing her car in? Because she's a pro and she knows she has to getaway.

And then what does she do? She tells you exactly what she did. Hey, get out of the car, your taxis over there.

A disoriented, drunk Mr. Osorio, what is he doing? Okay, okay, okay. She gets him out of the car. Whether or not it's voluntary or she pushes, whatever he does, he gets out of the car and she drives off.

And the suggestion that this is not an ongoing crime when 17 seconds elapsed between the time she pulls away and her car door shuts. And if you even look, she uses the momentum of the car to close that car door. She pulls out and turns right. That's what causes the door to close. She doesn't even wait for him to be fully out of the vehicle. She drives off

to the right, the curbing forces her to go through that way. You don't think she knows exactly where she is and exactly where she's going?

And for those of you who live in Las Vegas, sure you can make a left on Koval, but then you're going to be in the middle of the Linq, those parking garages, and you're going to have to get through a bunch of lights to get to Sands.

You don't have an escape route. And so if he has a phone and calls 9-1-1 and reports that, she's likely to get caught. So what's the easiest way out there? Right on Koval, right on the street.

She doesn't think, first of all, he's behind that building. She doesn't think that he's going to see her coming down Koval and can make a bee line to her car in time.

Ask yourself, how is it possible she did not steal this watch?

She tells people she's going to work. The immediate thing that she tells people, on all those text messages, isn't, Hey, some guy attacked me and it's really weird because he gave me a watch.

No. It's, I'm reporting to my friend, I got an all gold. And, Oh, she's sending it to the fence. And, Oh -- you saw in one of those text messages -- send it to the same address you sent before. So it's a friend she already had lined up for the watch.

And you're suggesting to me that we didn't establish?

Mr. Mueller told you to use your commonsense and tells you this isn't a grand larceny. And once it becomes a grand larceny, as a matter of law, every other crime falls into place. Because once she takes the watch, he has the right to stop.

 Now, I know the detective says that all those injuries on that windshield are from -- or at least he believes are from the hand pushing.

But I ask you to do me something else, and I'm not going to pull out the picture, but pull out the autopsy picture where Mr. Osorio is laying on that slab, that slab that she put him on, and look at his injuries. Ask yourself, you can look at the photograph within the hospital too if you're worried somehow he had been cleaned up. But ask yourself, how it is the mark on the left side of his face has those little circular marks that are on there. Does that look like asphalt to you? And he has an injury right here.

So when she hit the pedal, whether or not he had cracked that windshield before with that fist or not, because he doesn't have a broken hand. So, I, you know, potentially -- there's no doubt he's punching the windshield or hitting the windshield. But not all of that damage is necessarily from the fist because he has that injury on his face and an injury on his shoulder consistent with hitting, then falling off, the back of his head, look at that injury, it's got this big rip on the back of his skull, and then he slides for 42 feet.

And the suggestion is there's no force? There's 52 or 56,000 pounds of force that's applied to his body in an effort to escape with his property. That's a robbery.

And once you get to the robbery, well, someone died, intentional, unintentional, or even accidental.

Nobody's suggesting to you that Ms. Guidry went out that night and decided, I'm going to kill somebody for their watch. Nobody is suggesting to you that when she decided to hit the accelerator on the car,

she reasonably perceived that he necessarily was going to die, but she certainly didn't really care about him. And that's the one thing you can take from her statement. The absolute one thing you can take from her statement that there is absolutely no empathy within Ms. Guidry for the fact that Mr. Osorio died.

But she does tell you that she knows exactly why he's banging on her window. She says it before the detective even says it. She says, If a guy's acting like that, I would have given him back the property if I had the property.

Now, he's already told you, Mr. Mueller, that the evidence establishes she has the property. So why is it if she's not stealing that property, she doesn't just hand him the watch. And the answer is really simple, because she cared more about the watch than she did his life. It really wasn't that serious to her. It really wasn't.

Unfortunately for Mr. Osorio he made some bad choices. And you're instructed here, you're not here to decide whether or not Mr. Osorio did or didn't do something wrong that night. He made horrible choices. He got the death penalty for his choices that night.

The question for you, as a jury is, what are the facts and then apply it to the law?

In this particular case, if you're doing your duty, which is apply the facts, make a determination, and apply it to the law, you can't come up to any other conclusion than guilty of all four counts.

There's at least one person in this room who knows beyond any doubt that she took Eduardo Osorio's watch.

And I suggest to you, if you're doing your job, you'll go back to that room, you'll talk about it, you'll look at the evidence, and you will make a determination and come back to this room and tell Ms. Guidry you know exactly what happened in that car.

Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. Ladies and gentlemen, that concludes the argument. I will tell you at this time who are alternate jurors are. And I'm going to ask that you stay behind so I can talk to you and give you some additional instructions. You will not be excused from jury service until the jury reaches a verdict but we'll talk about that.

So our alternates for this jury are juror 13, Jeffrey Wang, and, juror 14, Tiffany Johnson. So you will not be going back to deliberate.

The rest of the jurors, you'll please go with the marshal to the jury room. He will bring in all of the exhibits, which were admitted together with the verdict form, and you will have a copy of those instructions -- of the instructions I read to you also brought to you.

Let's see here. Now, the exception to the exhibits that I'm going to allow to go back to the jury room are the shoes. The shoes were not cut open in open court so they're still sealed in the package. If for some reason someone wants to see the shoes, I'm going to have to talk to counsel about that and we will decide that presence -- or that decision before you'll be allowed to see that exhibit, if you so deem necessary.

So with that we can -- yes, thank you, swear them in.

[The Court Clerk swears in the officers to take charge of the jury and the alternates]

[Jury panel exits the courtroom to deliberate]
[In the presence of juror number 13 and 14]

THE COURT: All right. Let the record reflect that the jury has left the room. We still have our two alternate jurors present.

You may be seated. Yes, thank you.

All right. Mr. Yang and Ms. Johnson, thank you so much. I know you were diligently paying attention during the course of the trial to the evidence. As I mentioned earlier, you are not released as jurors because should anything come up during deliberations, somebody gets sick, something else happens, we may need to call one or both of you back to begin deliberations again in order to reach a verdict in this case.

I know that the marshal has your contact information. I ask that you do not discuss the facts of this case with -- amongst yourselves or with anybody else until you receive a phone call that either, A, we're bringing you back in to help deliberate, or, B, that a verdict has been reached and the case has concluded. That being because of that admonition that I gave you over and over and over again, you're not to talk about the facts of the case or consider it until you deliberate with your fellow jurors. And because you're not in there with them, you're not doing that.

Do both of you understand that?

[Alternate Jurors in Unison: Nods head.]

THE COURT: All right. So you are free to leave, you're also free to stay. So my -- we need to -- right we need to give you guys your payments for being jurors.

1	I thank you so much for your patience during the course of the
2	presentation of evidence. The wheels of justice are never quick. This
3	moved along relatively quickly. But I appreciate your service.
4	All right. We have these for you. And why don't we actually
5	take them out this way.
6	THE JUDICIAL EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT: Okay.
7	THE COURT: Okay. So you follow my judicial assistant,
8	Ms. Beltran, out.
9	And thank you again.
10	[Outside the presence of the jury panel]
11	THE COURT: Let the record reflect the alternate jurors have
12	left the room.
13	We can all be seated again.
14	Counsel, do we have your contact information?
15	MR. DIGIACOMO: You don't yet, but you will shortly.
16	MR. MUELLER: We will.
17	What's the Court's pleasure? We used to we used to let them
18	sit out until 1:00, 2:00, 3:00 in the morning as long as they're deliberating.
19	THE COURT: Well
20	MR. MUELLER: But the budget crisis changed all that.
21	THE COURT: in full disclosure, at least one juror said they
22	would have difficulties coming back on Monday. So my intention is to let
23	them go we'll do a check in about 6 o'clock, if we don't have a verdict, to

see where they are. My inclination is to stay until about 7:00 or 8:00, if

they're not back with their verdict. And then we'll see where we are.

24

4	
1	[Colloquy]
2	THE COURT: Anything further we need to put on the record?
3	MR. DIGIACOMO: No, Your Honor.
4	MR. MUELLER: No, Your Honor.
5	THE COURT: Okay. We can go off the record.
6	Thank you.
7	
8	[Jury trial, Day 5, concluded at 4:29 p.m.]
9	* * * * *
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	ATTEST: I do hereby certify that I have truly and correctly transcribed the
21	audio/video proceedings in the above-entitled case to the best of my ability.
22	Mina Vullani
23	Gina Villani
24	Court Recorder/Transcriber District Court Dept. IX

Electronically Filed 4/29/2020 4:54 PM Steven D. Grierson CLERK OF THE COURT

RTRAN 1 2 3 4 DISTRICT COURT 5 CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA 6 7 8 THE STATE OF NEVADA, CASE#: C-18-329810-1 9 Plaintiff, DEPT. IX 10 VS. 11 RONNEKA ANN GUIDRY, 12 Defendant. 13 BEFORE THE HONORABLE CRISTINA D. SILVA, DISTRICT COURT JUDGE 14 MONDAY, AUGUST 19, 2019 15 RECORDER'S TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING: 16 DAY 6 - JURY TRIAL 17 18 **APPEARANCES:** 19 MARC DIGIACOMO, ESQ. For the State: 20 Chief Deputy District Attorney MICHAEL J. SCARBOROUGH, ESQ. 21 **Deputy District Attorney** 22 23 CRAIG A. MUELLER, ESQ. For the Defendant: 24 RECORDED BY: GINA VILLANI, COURT RECORDER 25

1	Las Vegas, Nevada, Monday, August 19, 2019
2	
3	[Jury Trial began at 1:18 p.m.]
4	[Outside the presence of the jury panel]
5	THE COURT: All right. We are back on the record in Case
6	C-18-329810-1, State of Nevada versus Ronneka Guidry.
7	The record will reflect the presence of the State, as well as
8	counsel for the defendant, and the defendant.
9	Good afternoon.
10	THE DEFENDANT: Good afternoon.
11	THE COURT: All right. So the jury has a question, it reads, If
12	we find defendant guilty of robbery, can involuntary manslaughter be the
13	accompanying verdict, question mark, or, comma, does by definition,
14	comma, turn into first degree murder.
15	So before I came in here I looked at the instructions we sent
16	back with them, my inclination is to refer them back to the instructions.
17	Specifically, or not, it's up to you-all, the specific instructions
18	that I thought were appropriate based on the question would be instruction
19	number 8, which defines the felony murder rule.
20	Instruction number 11, which talks about all murder that isn't
21	first degree is second degree.
22	Instruction 12 which goes on about that.
23	Instruction 13 is involuntary manslaughter.
24	And instruction 14 talks about if you find the State has

established the defendant has committed murder, you shall select the

appropriate degree as your verdict.

So it'll be 11 through 14 -- oh, sorry, 8 and 11 through 14. Or we can just refer them back to the instructions in general.

State, I'll hear from you first.

MR. DIGIACOMO: Normally it's better to identify the instructions that cover it. I don't know if we necessarily needed all of them.

But if the Court wants to, I don't necessarily have an objection to 8, 11 through 14. I would think it's -- I'm now knowing them off the top of my head, but it would basically be the felony murder and the involuntary instruction. Because I believe the involuntary instruction specifically says that if the felonious intent is robbery, than the crime is first degree murder.

I guess there is one of that in the second degree murder too.

THE COURT: Correct.

MR. DIGIACOMO: So, yeah, all right, 8, 11 through 14 is fine with the State.

THE COURT: Mr. Mueller.

MR. MUELLER: Defense -- Your Honor, this is a unique, as the Court's seen now, this isn't your run of the mill, hey, you ripped me off my drug deal and I -- and shot the guy dead in broad daylight kind of murder.

The theories are kind of complex and they interplay with each other and I am deeply concerned that if we draw any intention to the jury instructions that we will be simply directing them to reach a verdict.

And upon consideration and reflection, on a moment's notice, I actually decline. I think we should just tell them they've got to read the

instructions as they exist.

THE COURT: Oh, I see. Okay. That's a little different than your initial statement.

So you're worried about directing them to an instruction?

MR. MUELLER: I think what we would be doing is we don't have a particularly learned jury, as I recollect, we don't have a lot of advanced degrees on there.

And I believe that if you draw any attention to any jury instructions at this point, you're simply going to be suddenly signaling them what the verdict should be and I think we should just send them back and they've got to live with the rules as we've given 'em to them.

THE COURT: I appreciate your position, I'm going to -- I am going to direct them to some of the instructions.

Based specifically on the question that is, Can involuntary manslaughter be the accompanying verdict, or if by definition, does it turn to first degree murder.

I am going to write down -- and I'll let you-all take a look at it after I write it down -- instruction 8, which defines the felony murder rule, and then instructions 11 through 14, which talk about the different degrees of murder.

And specifically if first degree -- if -- all murder that's not first degree is second degree and then it goes down from there to involuntary manslaughter.

So let me write this down.

Actually -- I'm actually going to direct them to rule number 2

Page 4

also, instruction number 2, which says, If in these instructions any rule, direction, idea is repeated or stated to you in different ways there's no emphasis thereon intended by me.

And so it directs them not to single out any single instruction.

Any objection to that one?

MR. DIGIACOMO: No.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. MUELLER: I'm going to have to lodge an objection, Judge, you've heard me politely, I thank you, but I think we are at peril and we're engaging in a perilous activity. I think --

THE COURT: And what's the peril?

MR. MUELLER: That we're going to suggest a verdict to them.

They have so many conflict -- there's so many jury instructions, for a criminal case it's extraordinarily large number, at least for a state court criminal case, there's 54 jury instructions, that's almost twice the normal.

And I'd ask the Court to just read number 2 to them and be done with it. Or give them number 2 and tell them to go back and reread it.

THE COURT: All right. I'm going to note your -- I'll call it an objection for the record.

It's my duty to help the jury and the instructions are designed to help them. So I'm going to direct their attention to the applicable instructions.

[Pause in proceeding]

1	THE COURT: Let me ask what term you-all would like to use,
2	please refer no instructions 2, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14 to resolve, to? Any word
3	in particular?
4	MR. MUELLER: For just for guidance.
5	MR. DIGIACOMO: For guidance.
6	THE COURT: All right. I like that.
7	MR. DIGIACOMO: That's fair.
8	MR. MUELLER: And remember that and then
9	THE COURT: Well, 2 tells them that they can't take any
10	instruction
11	MR. MUELLER: Right.
12	THE COURT: more.
13	MR. MUELLER: Okay.
14	THE COURT: That's why I included 2 in that instruction.
15	Okay.
16	MR. MUELLER: All right.
17	THE COURT: All right. It reads, Please refer to the instruction
18	numbers for guidance.
19	And I said, thank you and I signed it. And I will date it today
20	also and the time.
21	All right. That's the only question we have received. You-all
22	going to be in the area?
23	MR. MUELLER: I've got to be down in the basement.
24	I've actually got four minutes. I've got to take an arraignment.
25	THE COURT: Okay. All right. No problem.

Page 6 1691

1	Do you get service down there, Mr. Mueller?
2	MR. MUELLER: No.
3	Actually actually, fortunately I had a few minutes to kill, so I
4	walked upstairs just to see if I got any cell phone messages and that's
5	how I got the message to be here.
6	THE COURT: Oh, okay, good. All right.
7	Well, if we need you, we'll attempt to call you or find you.
8	[Pause in proceeding]
9	THE COURT: Anything further?
10	MR. MUELLER: No, thank you, Your Honor.
11	THE COURT: Okay. We'll see you in a little bit.
12	MR. SCARBOROUGH: Not from the State, Your Honor.
13	THE COURT: Thank you.
14	[Recess at 1:26 p.m.]
15	[Jury trial resumed at 3:31 p.m.]
16	[Outside the presence of the jury panel]
17	THE COURT: All right. We're back on the record in
18	Case C-18-329810-1, State of Nevada versus Ronneka Guidry.
19	I understand that there is a verdict.
20	My marshal is currently lining the jurors up to bring them in.
21	Anything we need to address before we bring the jury in?
22	MR. DIGIACOMO: No, Your Honor.
23	MR. MUELLER: No, Your Honor.
24	THE COURT: All right. Please be seated.
25	We'll wait for them to come in.

Page 7

1	[Pause in proceeding]
2	[In the presence of the jury panel]
3	THE COURT: Welcome back, ladies and gentlemen. It's my
4	understanding that we have a verdict.
5	Have we chosen a foreperson, and if so, who is that person?
6	JUROR NUMBER 4: [Raises hand.]
7	THE COURT: All right.
8	Good afternoon.
9	Has the jury reached a unanimous verdict as to each count in
10	the Indictment?
11	JUROR NUMBER 4: Yes.
12	THE COURT: All right. If you could please hand the verdict
13	form to Marshal Enriquez.
14	Okay. All right. I have reviewed the verdict form. It appears to
15	be properly completed.
16	The clerk will now read the verdict of the jury.
17	THE CLERK: District Court, Clark County, Nevada, The State
18	of Nevada, Plaintiff, versus Ronneka Ann Guidry, Defendant, Case
19	Number C329810, Department Number 9.
20	Verdict, we the jury in the above entitled case, find the
21	defendant Ronneka Ann Guidry as follows:
22	Count 1, murder with use of a deadly weapon, guilty, of second
23	degree murder.
24	Count 2, robbery with use of a deadly weapon, guilty of robbery.
25	Count 3, grand larceny, guilty of grand larceny \$3500 or more.

Page 8

1	Count 4, duty to stop at a scene of crash involving death or
2	personal injury, guilty of duty to stop at scene of crash involving death or
3	personal injury.
4	Dated this 19th day of August 2019, Justin Jackson, foreperson
5	Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, is this your verdict as read so
6	you say you one so say you all.
7	[The Jury Panel in Unison: Yes]
8	THE COURT: All right. Does either party wish to have the jury
9	individually polled?
10	MR. MUELLER: Yes, defense would ask that the jury be polled
11	THE COURT: Okay.
12	THE CLERK: Juror Number 1, are these your verdicts as read?
13	JUROR NUMBER 1: Yes.
14	THE CLERK: Juror Number 2, are these your verdicts as read?
15	JUROR NUMBER 2: Yes.
16	THE CLERK: Juror Number 3, are these your verdicts as read?
17	JUROR NUMBER 3: Yes.
18	THE CLERK: Juror Number 4, are these your verdicts as read?
19	JUROR NUMBER 4: Yes.
20	THE CLERK: Juror Number 5, are these your verdicts as read?
21	JUROR NUMBER 5: Yes.
22	THE CLERK: Juror Number 7, are these your verdicts as read?
23	JUROR NUMBER 7: Yes.
24	THE CLERK: Juror Number 8, are these your verdicts as read?
25	JUROR NUMBER 8: Yes.

Page 9 1694

1	THE CLERK: Juror Number 9, are these your verdicts as read?
2	JUROR NUMBER 9: Yes.
3	THE CLERK: Juror Number 10, are these your verdicts as
4	read?
5	JUROR NUMBER 10: Yes.
6	THE CLERK: Juror Number 11, are these your verdicts as
7	read?
8	JUROR NUMBER 11: Yes.
9	THE CLERK: Juror Number 12, are these your verdicts as
10	read?
11	JUROR NUMBER 12: Yes.
12	MR. MUELLER: You skipped juror six.
13	MR. DIGIACOMO: We skipped number six, madam clerk.
14	THE COURT: 6, yes.
15	THE CLERK: Oh.
16	Juror number 6, is this your verdict as read?
17	JUROR NUMBER 6: Yes.
18	THE CLERK: Thank you.
19	Sorry.
20	THE COURT: Thank you.
21	That's okay.
22	All right. Ladies and gentlemen, thank you, on behalf of the
23	Court and the parties for your service here as jurors. I know it was a long
24	week and a lot of complicated subjects to deal with. So I really appreciate
25	all the time and effort you put into your service here.

Page 10 1695

I hope that you would look forward to being a juror again.

Although, you will now be free of service here in Clark County, at least in the county level, for approximately two to three years. It depends on when they call you again.

You know, I think I said this at the beginning, but, you know, we all get to play a role in electing all kinds of officials. But in the end, as citizens, jury service is one of the only ways you can play a direct role in our government. And so it's so important and so we're so grateful for your service.

I am going to let you know that -- I'm going to meet you in the back, just to give my individual thanks to each of you.

Now, the case is over you can talk to the parties, if you so wish, but you do not have to. It's possible that the attorneys will want to speak with you outside the courtroom when you're done here.

Again, I ask that you respect your fellow jurors in having those conversations, if you choose to talk to them. And they will understand completely if you ultimately decide not to talk to them.

So, with that, thank you again.

If you could follow Marshal Enriquez to the jury room, I'll be right with you.

MR. MUELLER: Your Honor --

THE COURT: Hold on, let's let the jury leave the room.

[Outside the presence of the jury panel]

THE COURT: All right. Let the record reflect that the jury has left the room.

Page 11 1696

1	Yes, sir.
2	Please be seated.
3	MR. MUELLER: Just when Judge Johnson was on his first
4	year on the bench from the U.S. Attorney's Office I did by happenstance
5	ended up doing three of his first four trials so. And in each one of those
6	occasions the jury disappeared in the room and I never got a chance to
7	talk to any of my jurors, which obviously, as you know, is a good way for,
8	even if you lose, to get some feedback on a case.
9	So I just want to sure that I understand where they're going to
10	be and when they're going to be. Because I'd like to debrief them for or
11	at least listen to what they had to say.
12	THE COURT: Well, they will come out this side door here, once
13	I finish talking to them.
14	MR. MUELLER: Okay.
15	THE COURT: And then if they want to talk to you, they can. As
16	I instructed them, they don't have to but they can talk to you so.
17	MR. MUELLER: That's fine.
18	THE COURT: They might they might opt out of that.
19	MR. MUELLER: All right. Thank you.
20	THE COURT: Anything further?
21	MR. DIGIACOMO: Just a sentencing date.
22	THE COURT: All right. The defendant will be remanded
23	pending sentencing.
24	THE CLERK: October 7th, 8:30.
25	MR. MUELLER: All right. Thank you.

1	THE COURT: Hold on.
2	Actually, October 7th give me one second. I might need to
3	change that sentencing date.
4	I'm going to be at judicial college that week.
5	Are the parties available for a sentencing on Friday the 18th?
6	MR. MUELLER: That will work.
7	THE COURT: Mr. DiGiacomo.
8	MR. DIGIACOMO: Just checking my calendar right now.
9	We'll make it work.
10	THE COURT: Make it work, okay.
11	MR. DIGIACOMO: Either myself or Mr. Scarborough will be
12	here.
13	THE COURT: Let's set sentencing for this at 11 o'clock in the
14	morning because I have another contested sentencing at 9:30.
15	THE CLERK: Okay. So that will be October 18, at 11:00 a.m.
16	THE COURT: Do we anticipate the victim's family being
17	present for that?
18	MR. DIGIACOMO: I don't think they'll come back
19	THE COURT: Okay.
20	MR. DIGIACOMO: knowing the mandatory nature of the
21	sentencing, at least on one count.
22	So I will confirm and let you know. But I don't think so.
23	THE COURT: Okay. Yes, obviously just file something so I'm
24	prepared and set enough time aside to allow for them to address.
25	MR. DIGIACOMO: Yeah, certainly, we'll file the file the witness

Page 13

1	notice, if necessary.
2	THE COURT: All right. Anything further from the State or from
3	the defense?
4	MR. MUELLER: No, Your Honor.
5	MR. DIGIACOMO: No, Your Honor.
6	THE COURT: Thank you.
7	MR. DIGIACOMO: Thank you, Judge.
8	THE COURT: Thank you, both.
9	[Jury Trial, Day 6, concluded at 3:39 p.m.]
10	[July Thai, Day 0, Concluded at 3.39 p.m.]
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	ATTEST: I do hereby certify that I have truly and correctly transcribed the audio/video proceedings in the above-entitled case to the best of my ability.
21	addio/video proceedings in the above critical case to the best of my ability.
22	Uma Vullani
23	Gina Villani Court Recorder/Transcriber
24	District Court Dept. IX

Electronically Filed 4/29/2020 4:54 PM Steven D. Grierson CLERK OF THE COURT

RTRAN 1 2 3 4 DISTRICT COURT 5 CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA 6 7 8 THE STATE OF NEVADA, CASE#: C-18-329810-1 9 Plaintiff, DEPT. IX 10 VS. 11 RONNEKA ANN GUIDRY, 12 Defendant. 13 BEFORE THE HONORABLE CRISTINA D. SILVA, DISTRICT COURT JUDGE 14 FRIDAY, OCTOBER 18, 2019 15 RECORDER'S TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING: 16 **SENTENCING** 17 18 **APPEARANCES:** 19 MARC DIGIACOMO, ESQ. For the State: 20 Chief Deputy District Attorney MICHAEL J. SCARBOROUGH, ESQ. 21 **Deputy District Attorney** 22 23 CRAIG A. MUELLER, ESQ. For the Defendant: 24 RECORDED BY: TRISHA GARCIA, COURT RECORDER 25

1	Las Vegas, Nevada, Friday, October 18, 2019
2	
3	[Hearing began at 11:56 a.m.]
4	THE COURT: Calling Case C-18-329810-1, State of Nevada
5	versus Ronneka Guidry.
6	I always say that did I say that right, Ms. Guidry?
7	THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
8	THE COURT: Good morning.
9	THE DEFENDANT: You too.
10	THE COURT: All right. This is the date and time set for
11	sentencing. Are the parties ready to proceed?
12	MR. DIGIACOMO: Yes, Your Honor.
13	MR. MUELLER: We are, Your Honor.
14	May I before we proceed, may I have Ms. Guidry stand out at
15	the defense table with me?
16	THE COURT: Are there any victim speakers?
17	MR. DIGIACOMO: There will be at least one.
18	THE COURT: Okay. So not at this time. We can we can
19	move her over after after the victim speakers, if you'd like. Just let me
20	know if you want to do that. All right.
21	MR. MUELLER: Never mind, Judge, I'll just stand next to her.
22	THE COURT: Okay. All right. So we are here for sentencing,
23	jury returned a verdict on August 19th of 2019, finding her finding
24	Ms. Guidry guilty of second degree murder, robbery, grand larceny, and
25	duty to stop at the scene of a crash involving death or personal injury.

Page 2

1	I have reviewed the presentence investigation report dated		
2	October 1st, 2019.		
3	I'll start with defense counsel, have you had a chance to review		
4	that PSI?		
5	MR. MUELLER: Yes, I have, Your Honor.		
6	THE COURT: Anything in there that needs to be changed or		
7	brought to my attention?		
8	MR. MUELLER: No, Your Honor.		
9	THE COURT: All right. Ms. Guidry, have you reviewed the PSI		
10	from October 1st of 2019?		
11	THE DEFENDANT: I have seen it.		
12	THE COURT: Anything in there that needs to changed or		
13	brought to my attention?		
14	THE DEFENDANT: No.		
15	THE COURT: All right. So I'm going to start with the State and		
16	if you could let me know your position regarding sentencing and why you		
17	are seeking that sentence. When you're ready.		
18	MR. DIGIACOMO: I am. I just have a question for the Court.		
19	Yesterday we sent over four jail calls with transcripts that have been		
20	previously provided to Mr. Mueller as well. I brought them with me, if the		
21	Court didn't have a chance to review them. Otherwise I'll just make them		
22	a court exhibit.		
23	MR. MUELLER: I object to these exhibits. I learned about		
24	them about five minutes ago in the hallway. They're if taking my		
25	colleague at his word, they're completely superfluous and after the fact		

Page 3 1702

1	and they're inappropriate for argument.	
2	THE COURT: I'm going to overrule the objection on that basis.	
3	Do you need additional time to review those transcripts or calls	
4	with your client before we proceed with sentencing here today?	
5	MR. MUELLER: Yes, Judge, I do.	
6	THE COURT: Okay. We will take a brief recess to allow him to	
7	go over those calls because I will consider them. I will make them a court	
8	exhibit. It'll be a composite exhibit. It will be one disc. It has four	
9	recorded calls and four transcripts.	
10	And for the record, I did review them before sentencing here	
11	today.	
12	MR. DIGIACOMO: Okay. I'll play them for Mr. Mueller.	
13	THE COURT: Oh, all right. So I'll step out, you play it, let him	
14	talk to his client for a moment, and I'll be right back.	
15	MR. DIGIACOMO: Sure.	
16	THE COURT: All right. Thank you.	
17	MR. DIGIACOMO: Thank you.	
18	[Recess taken at 11:58 a.m.]	
19	[Hearing resumed at 12:07 p.m.]	
20	THE COURT: Back on the record in Case C-18-329810-1,	
21	State of Nevada versus Ronneka Guidry.	
22	Everyone may be seated.	
23	All right. Are we ready to proceed?	
24	MR. MUELLER: Yes, Judge. I want to renew my objection to	
25	these conversations. These apparently are a series of conversations	

Page 4 1703

immediately and promptly after Ms. Guidry was convicted. Having been around in litigation for a long time on both sides, sometimes people vent and say things that they don't mean. I don't see that there's anything dispositive or evidentiary value on these phone calls. And they seem to be designed to simply inflame the Court's passion without getting us to the sentencing result that is appropriate here. And I object to their admission.

THE COURT: All right. I'm going to overrule the objection. I do believe they are relevant to things I should consider when it comes to sentencing, including acceptance of responsibility, and therefore I will overrule the objection.

So the four phone calls and the transcripts will be admitted as Court Exhibit 1, as a composite exhibit.

MR. DIGIACOMO: Thank you, Judge.

THE COURT: All right. When you're ready.

MR. DIGIACOMO: And I do not intend to speak at length. I would ask that the mother, Isabel, get to speak late pursuant to the statute.

THE COURT: Yes, she will.

MR. DIGIACOMO: I just have a few comments. And my first would be as it relates to the Department of Parole and Probation's recommendation. I actually don't -- I guess this is the reason why they're going to no longer be making recommendations because I don't really understand the scoresheet that indicates that these should be a medium-high sentence and then any recommendation that deviates suggested sentence must include justification, there's no justification. But

Page 5 1704

when I read their actual recommendation, it's the minimum possible sentence for the defendant for the charges -- the crimes that were found by the jury.

So to me the Department of Parole and Probation's recommendation is meaningless and often is in cases, but it certainly doesn't have an understanding, the Department didn't apparently have an understanding of the nature of both the way the justice system should work and the way that sentencing should work.

And I would start with in this case you have sort of three separate events in my mind, you have, what would you sentence Ms. Guidry for had she just stolen the watch? If that had been the only crime she committed, what, you, as a sentencing judge, would have decided her sentence should be.

And that, in my mind, mostly goes back to her criminal history.

And when you look at that criminal history she is a professional thief.

She's who has received probation before and one who's violated her probation, and even after being paroled, committed another subsequent.

Essentially, her crimes are all sort of the same thing. She's preying upon people, much like she preyed upon the victim in this particular case.

And from my standpoint she, for this crime, taking that watch, with this criminal history, would get a 48 to 120 on the grand larceny conviction.

And so from my mind that's sort of the starting point and so where do you go from? Well, from there you go to the murder charge. In my mind, and I would suggest to the Court that the murder and the

Page 6 1705

robbery should run concurrent. Because in my mind the murder and the robbery are sort of this same court of conduct that, you know, I don't think she should be doubly convicted of.

If the jury had not rejected the felony murder rule, the Court would be required to give 20. And in my mind since the jury did not find the felony murder rule, that the Court should be somewhat constrained in your sentence. And so ultimately, I can tell the Court, I'm going to ask for an 18 to life sentence. Because I don't believe that you should correct whatever the jury ultimately decided. I think that she should get less than what the first degree murder charge would have carried with her.

But as it relates to the murder charge, once they rejected the felony murder rule, then you have to think of, what did they find in the second degree murder? And at the very least they found a reckless disregard for human life. By hitting that accelerator and accelerating away at the speed that she accelerated away, that certainly buys her a life sentence. And so for the murder charge I'm going to ask the Court to give her the 10 to life.

One, I don't believe someone with this criminal history deserves the minimum sentence on any charge and that would be the minimum sentence, if you give her anything other than the 10 to life.

But her actions in this case, actions that, and I will talk about that, clearly she does not believe is that big a deal, based upon those phone calls, that, to me, she earns a life sentence for. And I believe that, you know, because she could have just gotten away with the watch and she didn't have to hit that accelerator that she deserves consecutive time

Page 7 1706

from the grand larceny and the murder.

The robbery, whatever sentence you choose on to me should be concurrent.

And then you actually have the leaving the scene. And, you know, no matter what else happens, what do you know about her leaving the scene? Not only does she flee the scene when she has no need to flee the scene. Had she stopped, yes, she might have been liable and maybe we can accept that, in the mind of a defendant, oh, my God, I've just done something horrible and I don't want to get caught.

But that's not Ms. Guidry's actions. The first thing she does is stop, she takes a picture of her windshield because she needs to get it fixed, and she's contacting the fence. Because to her this is just a business transaction. She has absolutely and completely no concern for the damage done by her to this particular victim. And the law requires her to be held accountable for that leaving the scene and I'm going to ask for a 48 to 120 and I'm going to ask that one to be consecutive. Ultimately resulting in an 18 to life sentence for Ms. Guidry.

The last thing I would say -- and I'm not going to speak to the pain that it has caused this family. I'm sure Isabel will explain that to the Court -- that these phone calls, I do not want the Court to sentence Ms. Guidry for her behavior as a mother in speaking to her children. That wasn't the purpose I sent this to the Court. That's something she has to deal with on her own and somebody else should judge her for that conduct.

But the statements made in those recordings, things, like, I

Page 8 1707

wouldn't have even gotten caught if my ten year old daughter hadn't given -- opened up her mouth, that the ten year old daughter deserves to get punched in the face for giving up that number, that Derrontae, you should have stopped her.

Her suggestion is, is basically this wouldn't have been any big deal but for my daughter. And so she's shifting responsibility for where she is right now, and what she's about to face in front of this Court, to her children because she's unwilling and unable to accept the responsibility.

And the Court can also consider that in the context of the sentencing letters that were provided by Promise and Derrontae. And ask yourself, is that actually mitigation or is that something that the Court should not consider as mitigation? That the behavior of Ms. Guidry in this case is something she clearly has no concept of either the damage she's done to herself, to her children, and most importantly to the victim and the victim's family in this particular case.

And I believe that a sentence of 18 to life is an appropriate sentence for her and I'd ask the Court to impose it. And I would submit it.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. DiGiacomo, let me ask you, just for clarification, so for Count 1 you're asking for 10 to life, Count 2, you're asking for whatever I give to run concurrent.

MR. DIGIACOMO: Correct.

THE COURT: Count 3, 48 to 120?

MR. DIGIACOMO: Correct, consecutive.

THE COURT: Consecutive; right.

And Count 4, 48 to 120 consecutive also?

Page 9 1708

1	MR. DIGIACOMO: Correct.	
2	THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.	
3	All right. Mr. Mueller, do you I for the record, I did receive	
4	the letters that were submitted and I have reviewed them prior to	
5	sentencing here today here.	
6	I'll hear from you regarding sentencing.	
7	MR. MUELLER: Thank you, Your Honor.	
8	The recommendation from the Department of Parole and	
9	Probation is appropriate and properly calibrated sentence here.	
10	Ms. Guidry has	
11	THE COURT: Which which recommendation?	
12	MR. MUELLER: The 10 to 25 with the other counts running	
13	concurrent.	
14	THE COURT: Okay.	
15	MR. MUELLER: Which is by statute, I've double checked the	
16	statute. 10 to 20.	
17	Ms. Guidry's a mother of three. And despite what	
18	Mr. DiGiacomo thinks of her the reality is she does have a loving and	
19	supportive family in the back of the courtroom. In from Portland is her	
20	father. She's got additional family members here, despite the fact that	
21	they don't have any real local ties, came here to support her. She does	
22	have a lot of people who are loved and concerned about her, as you saw	
23	in those letters.	
24	The practical problem with the case, the reality is this case has	

always caused me some concern, is the nature of the transaction that

25

Page 10 1709

happened in the car. Whether there was a quid pro quo sexual services for a watch, which is a prob -- the probability here that I was -- always deeply concerned about, was happening here.

Given the totality of the circumstances and the fact that unfortunately the State has not adduced any evidence, and you saw the trial, so I don't need to re-litigate it. The State adduced no evidence of exactly what happened in that car and how that watch was transferred.

THE COURT: What's the evidence that you are saying supports your position that it was a consensual or --

MR. MUELLER: Your Honor, the --

THE COURT: -- sexual act for a watch? Because the evidence that I saw suggest otherwise.

MR. MUELLER: There was two people in that car at night, for about seven or eight minutes, and neither of them testified as to what transpired inside of the car. Now, that's the practical problem with this case and always has been.

Now, having said that, on the totality of the circumstances the jury didn't see Ms. Guidry's way of understand. But having said that, I see no legal or logical conclusion to run a concurrent sentence on this case.

And I believe the Department of Parole and Probation, which is also charged with managing the State's prison load and try to get some consistency between our 34 different departments, has recommended that -- this particular sentence.

Now, the others thing that's going to happen in the next 10 years is Ms. Guidry's going to be become older. She's going to become

Page 11 1710

more insightful. And she's going to become more retrospective, which despite everyone's best efforts, is something that usually happens to almost all of us.

In 10 years she's not going to be the same person she is now. That will be long after you've forgotten about this case. It will be the Department of Parole and Probations and the Parole Boards decision to see if she's gained maturity and insight into her actions as a younger woman.

Now, she's cost herself and her family and the family of the victim dearly by her actions. There's no argument here on that point. But I do not see any compelling, moral, or legal reason to give her anything other than 10 to 25 and let her personal growth and development in prison be monitored by the Department of Parole and Probation.

Mr. DiGiacomo's recommendation is inappropriate and does not reflect the nature of human condition, which is that we all get older and wiser with the passage of time, which is why we have parole because frequently young people do things that older people wouldn't do.

So, Your Honor, given the totality of circumstance and the horrific sadness of this case, and it brings me no pleasure to bring -- be involved with this case. It's a tough case across the board. But the reality is is a 10 to 25 is the appropriate sentence.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

MR. MUELLER: And, Your Honor, miss --

THE COURT: And you're asking for 10 to 25 on --

MR. MUELLER: The minimum sentence recommended,

Page 12 1711

1	concurrent, for the	
2	THE COURT: Everything else run current?	
3	MR. MUELLER: Yes, ma'am.	
4	THE COURT: Okay.	
5	MR. MUELLER: I'm asking the Court to follow the	
6	recommendation.	
7	I'm also going to ask Ms. Guidry's asked to read a statement	
8	to the Court. In 25 years, I've almost never allowed a client to read it.	
9	This letter I felt was sincerely and she did it by herself, I'll serve as the	
10	officer of the court, this was composed independent of any input from me.	
11	I want the Court to hear the letter and believes and I believe	
12	you'll see why so.	
13	THE COURT: All right. Fair enough.	
14	And just for a clean record, I understand you want to make a	
15	statement this morning; is that correct?	
16	THE DEFENDANT: Yes.	
17	MR. MUELLER: She's very emotional, Judge	
18	THE COURT: All right. When you're ready.	
19	MR. MUELLER: and she	
20	THE DEFENDANT: Can I begin?	
21	THE COURT: Yes.	
22	THE DEFENDANT: Okay. First, I want to thank you, Your	
23	Honor, for your time and presence. It has been an honor to be in your	
24	courtroom.	

I want to thank my attorney for his patience and for his

Page 13 1712

1	assistance. My attorney's hard work, effort on my case is greatly			
2	appreciated.			
3	I also give my gratitude to the district attorney in my case			
4	because the outcome of this case has turned out to be a blessing to my			
5	life in ways no one can understand but me and my God.			
6	MR. MUELLER: Take a deep breath.			
7	THE COURT: If you need to take a break, it's okay.			
8	MR. MUELLER: Do you want some water?			
9	THE DEFENDANT: Uh-uh.			
10	I would like to direct the remainder of my words towards the			
11	victim's family.			
12	MR. MUELLER: Take your time.			
13	THE DEFENDANT: All right.			
14	towards the victim's family.			
15	I would like to start by not expressing my innocence but by			
16	expressing the honest truth. I am truly sympathetic and apologetic for			
17	your loss. As a mother myself of three kids, I can never imagine the			
18	heartbreak that comes with losing a child. Yet this is the			
19	MR. MUELLER: Take a deep breath.			
20	THE COURT: Take a deep breath and take your time.			
21	MR. MUELLER: Take your time. No rush.			
22	THE DEFENDANT: I never have malice intentions or malice			
23	towards harming your son, hurting him never crossed my mind nor was it			
24	ever my intention to do.			
25	I often think if given the chance to rewind the hands of time			

Page 14 1713

what would I have done differently? What could I have done differently? The answer is that it was a moment that I was afraid and I do not know what I could have do to overcome that fear I felt in that particular moment.

That night between Eldorado [sic] and I occurred because of a misunderstanding between the two of us. I know closure and honest explanations which you wish to seek. The only explanation I can give you is that night ended as a result of misunderstanding that went unresolved.

Although there are no words I can say to aid or account for such a reason for your loss. I ask that you find in your hearts to forgive me for being a part of this misunderstanding that took your son from you.

And though I cannot undue what has been done, I still pray that his soul may now rest in peace.

And I also want to say because at trial Mr. DiGiacomo said that I had no -- in my video as recorded that I had no sympathy when I got recorded. I actually was like thrown back. I was shocked. I've never been through that like this in my life. I didn't believe it. And until I got released on my traffic ticket, before they put a warrant out for my arrest, and they told me and I went to go look it up myself. I would never ever in life have any intentions of harming anybody. I am a mother of three kids. I can never just take -- life ever. And I'm truly, truly sorry and my condolences. I'm -- I'm so sorry.

THE COURT: Anything else you would like to say?

MR. MUELLER: Just in passing, it's a minor, relatively minor point, but Mr. DiGiacomo's -- seems to forget that she didn't know that he had died for several days after the fact. Those initial pictures were not

Page 15 1714

1	taken with knowledge that he had died or for that matter was even		
2	seriously injured. He was talking about the windshield photograph.		
3	THE COURT: Oh, understood. And that's how I recall the		
4	evidence coming in at trial.		
5	MR. MUELLER: Okay.		
6	THE COURT: Okay. Anything further?		
7	MR. MUELLER: No, Your Honor.		
8	THE COURT: Thank you very much.		
9	I understand we have victim speakers.		
10	MR. DIGIACOMO: Yes.		
11	Where are you are you going to put her		
12	THE COURT: She's welcome you know what, would you like		
13	to sit? Yes.		
14	MR. DIGIACOMO: And we have a standby interpreter here as		
15	well.		
16	THE COURT: No problem.		
17	Good morning. Good to see you again.		
18	What is your name for the record?		
19	THE INTERPRETER: Thirawat Apichonrattanakorn,		
20	A-p-i-c-h-o-n-r-a-t-t-a-n-a-k-o-r-n,		
21	THE COURT: Thank you very much. I appreciate that.		
22	THE INTERPRETER: You're welcome, Your Honor.		
23	THE COURT: We're going to go ahead and put you under oath		
24	first and then we'll put her under oath next.		
25	THE INTERPRETER: Okay.		

Page 16 1715

1	THIRAWAT APICHONRATTANAKORN		
2	[having been called an interpreter and being first duly sworn to interpret		
3	from Portuguese into English and from English into Portuguese]		
4	THE COURT: This is part of the court record, so we're going to		
5	put you under oath.		
6	Okay?		
7	THE SPEAKER: Yes.		
8	THE COURT: All right. And if you don't mind she yeah,		
9	she can remain seated, that's fine, if you could raise your right hand.		
10	ISABEL GAIOLLI		
11	[having been called as a speaker and being first duly sworn, testified		
12	through the interpreter as follows:]		
13	THE COURT: All right. Thank you.		
14	And you're welcome to proceed in English or in Portuguese, or		
15	if you want to go back and forth, that's fine with me also.		
16	THE SPEAKER: [In English] I'm going to read in Portuguese.		
17	THE COURT: Okay. And have him interpret, sure.		
18	[Colloquy between the Interpreter and the Speaker]		
19	THE SPEAKER: Dudu is my		
20	[Colloquy between the Interpreter and the Speaker]		
21	THE SPEAKER: Dudu is my older child. We love him so		
22	much that's before because I had lost one child before that.		
23	Yeah, because of the only six months with the problem,		
24	genetic problem.		
25	He's beautiful with blue eyes and his face that really catch all		

Page 17

the eyes.

Always have a nice life, full of friends. He loved practice sports and studied a lot. And he's a boy -- I mean, a very family boy type.

Always like to be at home, around his siblings and family. And he's very respectful person, you know, with his grandparents.

Our holidays is always with the family all together and that's why it left us a very, you know, strong memory about it.

Dudu studied in very particular and very famous school in San Paulo and that's one of the best university. He decided to study finance and law. For six months and he want to be, you know, proficient in his English in order that he can put it in his resume and try to construct his future.

I'm the mother and I have a lot of -- I'm very proud him. But on the other hand, it's very tough for us and very suffering moment that I had to leave my son outside a house. But always, you know, participating in his life.

I suffer quite a lot. The first six months that he was outside the family, I visited him, you know, on his 21st birthday. 40 day -- 40 days after he left the house. Maybe it was premature, but I'm thankful for this -- all this moments. And we never have any idea about the next birthday.

He went to Brazil during the Christmas time and that was our last get-together. Very happy because he seems like in his best part of his life at that moment. He was able to achieve all his personal goal and things in that nature.

Yeah, with -- our plan to visit Las Vegas, you know, and spend

New Year's together with friends and visit other family as well, members, and we say goodbye to each other.

In -- soon enough, in -- on the 3rd of January and the messages that we used to receive did not arrive anymore. And we in search of his state of his being and we did not find anything in the messages. And we was very, very worried and very, very strange with the situation. He always communicated with us but once in a while he might have missed but we never be pessimistic about it, the situation. And we spent some time in search. And with his father and we receive the message by phone that he was -- had an accident and die.

THE SPEAKER: [In English] And we never going to see Dudu again.

THE INTERPRETER: And we never going to see him, Dudu, again.

THE SPEAKER: This is -- this moment my world had come down. No, no that's not true at all. And what happened now. And I receive and try to deal with it. Soon enough I try not to be very sad person and I want to try to find my time and proceed. I want to live. I want to live on and I have so much to live on but I don't know how anymore. And without doubt it got to be something else, some other person.

And we had -- and I had to learn again how to live under different conditions. Literally, I have to start to learn how to live all over again. I -- I went through many, many months hearing something in my -- in my brain, in my memory, the repetition of, Dudu had an accident and

Page 19 1718

die, he was -- he had an accident and died. This is my thinking daily and I did not have enough room for anything else. And now I understand that something that very suffering deep from my heart, you know, it's -- that when I start to experience that and know that it's very painful.

And all this I hope that there's a solution and another alternative. But in this situation, that nothing I could do is impossible to reverse everything, mainly with the death. Everything with just coming out from the past. He was -- he was and he was a being. And this is so hard for a heart of a mother. And this is -- I try to learn how to be resilient.

I have two more children that needing me. And at this moment I believe I need them more than they need me. My middle son is about to enter a university in Colorado and supposed to have -- study in September. And he plan to volunteer in some kinds of work in a short period of time. And all this was kind of like impeded and the time with the family, and et cetera.

We all -- we all would show up and been through this situation and we were very confused and I believe we will be needing some professional help in this -- in this sense. And approaching September another son of mine had to go away as well. But my condition, my head was much worse than before. And I'm so afraid now to leave again, the repeating story, and feel being distance away and fear of unable to control the situation. I think I need to be able to in control daily because of the fear of not able to control and something like this will happen. And I'll be in panic if that were the case. I learn and try to accept it that things can happen.

My youngest daughter is finishing her high school and getting ready to go to university. She has a pass -- exam, interim exam, you know, in the nutrition. She's having headache and also she's getting overweight due to this stress. And -- and final -- there's another person --

[Colloquy between the Interpreter and the Speaker]

THE INTERPRETER: Oh, okay.

THE SPEAKER: She was diagnosed that there was some, a problem in her cranial, in her brain. Something that had to been swollen in her brain that causes all this mishap. And that has kind of like disturbed the -- one of the nerves. And hopefully that this process can -- will not be -- interfere with something else, that she should have some good nutrition and things like that. And could lead her to some, you know --

THE SPEAKER: [In English] To get blind.

THE INTERPRETER: Yeah, blind.

THE COURT: Affects the optical nerve; right, the optical nerve?

THE INTERPETER: H'm?

THE COURT: The pressures affecting the optical nerve?

THE SPEAKER: [In English] Yeah, the brain got --

THE COURT: The pressure?

THE SPEAKER: [In English] Yeah.

THE COURT: Right. Okay.

THE SPEAKER: And this is a signal of some disequilibrium and stress. I tried to take care of myself because I know that in totality seems like I'm afraid of -- unable to control. And I had to go through a lot of therapy weekly. Therapy of trauma and medication, some mourning type

Page 21 1720

of situation that I have to go through, and other -- and many other therapeutic treatment that I try to search for in order to take control of my situation again.

And physical symptom and everything else like pain in my body, hard to sleep, difficulty sleeping. I never could go back to the environment that I used to in my professional career, my work. I had to work from distant or from remote distance.

And after the mourning, I -- just to be clear, that I had been mourning for my parents and now my own son. But nothing, nothing can be compared to mourning for your own child. So the spiritual -- spiritual reason would be I hope is my final alternative.

And there's a question, how? We live in Brazil, which is the country of some violence, there's a lot of ammo cars. And my son went to another country in order to -- for his own safety and become a victim of a crime. Why?

How many people that face an accident, you know, in the air.

And Dudu seemed to have no chance at all and had died. He could have, you know, his whole body broken. No, but he lost all that chances to live again. Why?

And all these questions I would never find an answer for it. And we had to go through all this, a trial, jury trial, and all those steps. And change my -- my children, you know, had to go through all this days of torturing. Very profound sadness and anxiety. Fear and pain had just started and follow me around.

I had a stable life before. My health and everything else seems

Page 22 1721

1	IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA		
2			
3	RONNEKA GUIDRY,)	No. 80156
4	Appellant,)	
5	TT · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	j	
6	V.)	
7	THE STATE OF NEVADA,)	
8	Respondent.)	
9		_) ´	
10	APPELLANT'S APPEN	DIX V	OLUME VII PAGES 1472-1721
11	DARIN IMLAY Clark County Public Defender 309 South Third Street		STEVE WOLFSON Clark County District Attorney 200 Lewis Avenue, 3 rd Floor
12	Las Vegas, Nevada 89155-2610		Las Vegas, Nevada 89155
13	Attorney for Appellant		AARON FORD Attorney General 100 North Carson Street
14 15			Carson City, Nevada 89701-4717 (702) 687-3538
16			Counsel for Respondent
17	<u>CERTIF</u>	ICAT	E OF SERVICE
18	I hereby certify that this	docun	nent was filed electronically with the Nevada
19	Supreme Court on the 23 day of Mar	<u>ch</u> 202	21. Electronic Service of the foregoing
20	document shall be made in accordance	with th	he Master Service List as follows:
21	AARON FORD ALEXANDER CHEN		SHARON G. DICKINSON WILLIAM M. WATERS
22		ved a c	copy of this document by mailing a true and
23	correct copy thereof, postage pre-paid,	addres	ssed to:
24	RONNEKA GUIDRY, #113838		
25	FLORENCE MCCLURE WON 4370 SMILEY RD, LAS VEGA		
26			
27	BY		Rachel Howard
28	Emp	oloyee,	Clark County Public Defender's Office