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| C-16-316382-1 | State of Nevada |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | vs |
|  | ARMANDO VASQUEZ-REYES |

May 22, $2018 \quad$ 08:30 AM All Pending Motions (5/22/2018)
HEARD BY: Leavitt, Michelle COURTROOM: RJC Courtroom 14D

COURT CLERK: Botzenhart, Susan
RECORDER: Santi, Kristine

## REPORTER:

PARTIES PRESENT:

## ARMANDO VASQUEZ-REYES

James R Sweetin
Jennifer M. Clemons

## Mike Feliciano

Public Defender
State of Nevada

## Defendant

Attorney for Plaintiff
Attorney for Plaintiff
Attorney for Defendant
Attorney for Defendant
Plaintiff

## JOURNAL ENTRIES

Deft. present in custody with assistance from Certified Spanish Court Interpreter, Maria Peralta De Gomez.

CALENDAR CALL...DEFT'S MOTION TO SUPPRESS DEFT'S STATEMENT...STATE'S MOTION TO STRIKE DEFT'S EXPERT DUE TO UNTIMELY NOTICE

CONFERENCE AT BENCH. COURT ORDERED, trial date VACATED; Deft's Motion CONTINUED; matter SET for status check; and State's Motion To Strike Deft's Expert Due To Untimely Notice is MOOT. State to file written Opposition to Deft's Motion to suppress, if not already done so.

## CUSTODY

6/05/18 8:30 A.M. DEFT'S MOTION TO SUPPRESS DEFT'S STATEMENT...STATUS CHECK: RESET TRIAL DATE

| C-16-316382-1 | State of Nevada |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | vs |
|  | ARMANDO VASQUEZ-REYES |


| June 05, 2018 | 08:30 AM | All Pending Motions (6/05/18) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| HEARD BY: | Leavitt, Michelle | COURTROOM: RJC Courtroom 14D |

COURT CLERK: Botzenhart, Susan
RECORDER: Santi, Kristine

## REPORTER:

PARTIES PRESENT:

## ARMANDO VASQUEZ-REYES

Jennifer M. Clemons

## Mike Feliciano

Public Defender
State of Nevada

## Defendant

Attorney for Plaintiff
Attorney for Defendant
Attorney for Defendant
Plaintiff
JOURNAL ENTRIES

## STATUS CHECK: RESET TRIAL DATE...DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO SUPPRESS DEFENDANT'S

 STATEMENTDefendant present in custody with assistance from Certified Spanish Court Interpreter, Michelle Roth. CONFERENCE AT BENCH. COURT ORDERED, trial date RESET; Defendant's Motion to suppress CONTINUED. Mr. Feliciano inquired if the trial will start July 23, 2018 with jury selection, and if this case is the first and only case set on calendar for trial that week. Court confirmed yes. Defendant made statements; and asked why the trial keeps getting delayed. Court noted for the record trial is set.

CUSTODY
6/19/18 8:30 A.M. STATE'S MOTION IN LIMINE TO PRECLUDE EVIDENCE THAT VICTIM G A TESTED POSITIVE FOR THE SEXUALLY TRANSMITTED DISEASE CHLAMYDIA...DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO SUPPRESS DEFENDANT'S STATEMENT

7/17/18 8:30 A.M. CALENDAR CALL
7/23/18 8:30 A.M. TRIAL BY JURY (START TIME SET AT REQUEST OF COURT)

## DISTRICT COURT CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

| C-16-316382-1 | State of Nevada <br> vs <br> ARMANDO VASQUEZ-REYES |
| :--- | :--- |
|  |  |
| June 19, 2018 |  | | All Pending Motions |
| :--- |
| $(\mathbf{6} / \mathbf{1 9} / \mathbf{2 0 1 8 )}$ |

HEARD BY: Leavitt, Michelle
COURTROOM: RJC Courtroom 14D
COURT CLERK: Susan Botzenhart

RECORDER: Kristine Santi

## REPORTER:

PARTIES
PRESENT: Clemons, Jennifer M. Deputy District Attorney
Feliciano, Mike
Deputy Public Defender
Public Defender
State of Nevada
Sweetin, James R.
VASQUEZ-REYES, ARMANDO
Plaintiff
Chief Deputy District Attorney
Defendant

## JOURNAL ENTRIES

Deft. present in custody with assistance from Certified Spanish Court Interpreter, Alicia Herrera.
STATE'S MOTION IN LIMINE TO PRECLUDE EVIDENCE THAT VICTIM G.A. TESTED POSITIVE FOR THE SEXUALLY TRANSMITTED DISEASE CHLAMYDIA

Court reviewed Deft's Opposition filed yesterday. COURT ORDERED, Motion GRANTED. State to prepare order.

## DEFT'S MOTION TO SUPPRESS DEFT'S STATEMENT

Arguments by parties regarding defense counsel's claim about unlawful arrest, Deft's statements to PRINT DATE: 06/19/2018 Page 1 of 2 Minutes Date: June 19, 2018
police, and detainer. Court stated it will allow defense counsel to explore on this issue further, and Court will handle this motion at time of trial. COURT ORDERED, Motion CONTINUED.

CUSTODY

7/17/18 8:30 A.M. CALENDAR CALL
7/23/18 8:30 A.M. TRIAL BY JURY....DEFT'S MOTION TO SUPPRESS DEFT'S STATEMENT

| C-16-316382-1 | State of Nevada |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | vs |
|  | ARMANDO VASQUEZ-REYES |


| July 17, 2018 | 08:30 AM | Calendar Call |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| HEARD BY: | Leavitt, Michelle | COURTROOM: |

COURT CLERK: Kearney, Madalyn
RECORDER: Santi, Kristine

## REPORTER:

## PARTIES PRESENT:

## ARMANDO VASQUEZ-REYES

```
James R Sweetin
```


## Mike Feliciano

## State of Nevada

## Defendant

Attorney for Plaintiff
Attorney for Defendant
Plaintiff
JOURNAL ENTRIES

Spanish Interpreter, Alex Avants, present.
Request for Competency Evaluation provided to the Court. Mr. Feliciano advised he has no choice other than referring Deft. to Competency Court. COURT ORDERED, matter REFERRED to Competency Court and all upcoming matters VACATED. Mr. Sweetin added the State would have been ready to proceed to trial.

8/10/18 9:00 AM FURTHER PROCEEDINGS: COMPETENCY

| C-16-316382-1 State of Nevada <br>  vs <br>  ARMANDO VASQUEZ-REYES |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| August 17, 2018 09:00 AM | Further Proceedings: Competency |
| HEARD BY: Togliatti, Jennifer | COURTROOM: RJC Courtroom 10C |
| COURT CLERK: Trujillo, Athena |  |
| RECORDER: Sison, Yvette G. |  |
| REPORTER: |  |
| PARTIES PRESENT: |  |
| ARMANDO VASQUEZ-REYES | Defendant |
| Glen O'Brien | Attorney for Plaintiff |
| Jessica W. Murphy | Attorney for Defendant |
| State of Nevada | Plaintiff |
|  | JOURNAL ENTRIES |

Also present: Spanish Interpreter Ximena Fiene.
Ms. Murphy advised this is Ms. Hojjat's case and requested it be trailed. Matter TRAILED.
Matter RECALLED. Ms. Murphy advised Ms. Hojjat is requesting a 30 day continuance to schedule a MRI, noting final approval was just received. COURT ORDERED, matter SET for status check.

CUSTODY
9/14/18 9:00 AM STATUS CHECK: MRI

| C-16-316382-1 | State of Nevada |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | vs |
|  | ARMANDO VASQUEZ-REYES |

September 14, 2018 09:00 AM Status Check: MRI
HEARD BY: Bell, Linda Marie COURTROOM: RJC Courtroom 10C
COURT CLERK: Tapia, Michaela
RECORDER: Sison, Yvette G.
REPORTER:
PARTIES PRESENT:

## ARMANDO VASQUEZ-REYES

Claudia Romney
Glen O'Brien
State of Nevada

## Defendant

Attorney for Defendant
Attorney for Plaintiff
Plaintiff

## JOURNAL ENTRIES

Appearances Continued: Kimberly Alexander of the Specialty Courts present. Spanish Interpreter, Yul Hassman, present.

Court NOTED Drs. Colosimo and Harder indicate not competent; therefore, pursuant to the doctors' reports and the Dusky Standard, FINDS Defendant NOT COMPETENT as he/she is not capable of understanding the charges against him/her and is unable to assist counsel in his/her defense. Pursuant to NRS 178.425, COURT ORDERED, Defendant is REMANDED to the custody of the Administrator of the Division of Mental Health Development Services for the Department of Human Resources for detention and treatment at a secure facility operated by that Division. Once competency has been established, Defendant will be returned to this court for findings and referred back to the originating department for further proceedings.

CUSTODY (L.C.)

| C-16-316382-1 | State of Nevada |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | vs |
|  | ARMANDO VASQUEZ-REYES |

November 16, 2018 09:00 AM Further Proceedings: Competency-Return From Stein
HEARD BY: Togliatti, Jennifer COURTROOM: RJC Courtroom 10C
COURT CLERK: Trujillo, Athena
RECORDER: Sison, Yvette G.

## REPORTER:

PARTIES PRESENT:

## ARMANDO VASQUEZ-REYES

Claudia Romney
Glen O'Brien
State of Nevada

## Defendant

Attorney for Defendant
Attorney for Plaintiff
Plaintiff

## JOURNAL ENTRIES

Also present: Kimberly Alexander of the Specialty Courts.
There being no challenge by Defense Counsel, COURT FINDS Defendant COMPETENT pursuant to the Dusky Standard as Defendant is capable of understanding the nature of the charges against him / her and is able to assist counsel in his / her defense and ORDERED, pursuant to 178.420, matter TRANSFERRED back to the originating court for further proceedings.

CUSTODY
11/27/18 8:30 am FURTHER PROCEEDINGS: RETURN FROM COMPETENCY COURT DEPT. 12

| C-16-316382-1 | State of Nevada <br> vs <br> ARMANDO VASQUEZ-REYES |
| :--- | :--- |
| November 27, 2018 | 08:30 AM $\quad$Further Proceedings: Competency - Return From Lakes <br> Crossing |

HEARD BY: Leavitt, Michelle COURTROOM: RJC Courtroom 14D
COURT CLERK: Botzenhart, Susan
RECORDER: Santi, Kristine
REPORTER:
PARTIES PRESENT:

ARMANDO VASQUEZ-REYES
James R Sweetin
Mike Feliciano
Public Defender
State of Nevada

## Defendant

Attorney for Plaintiff
Attorney for Defendant
Attorney for Defendant
Plaintiff

## JOURNAL ENTRIES

Deft. present in custody with assistance from Certified Spanish Court Interpreter, Jeff Hanks. COURT ORDERED, trial date SET. Mr. Sweetin noted for the record the Jackson vs. Denno hearing was initially going to be heard first day of trial. Court confirmed yes.

CUSTODY
3/12/19 8:30 A.M. CALENDAR CALL
3/19/19 1:30 P.M. TRIAL BY JURY...JACKSON VS. DENNO HEARING

| C-16-316382-1 | State of Nevada |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | vs |
|  | ARMANDO VASQUEZ-REYES |

March 12, $2019 \quad$ 08:30 AM All Pending Motions

HEARD BY: Leavitt, Michelle COURTROOM: RJC Courtroom 14D
COURT CLERK: Ortega, Natalie
RECORDER: Santi, Kristine

## REPORTER:

PARTIES PRESENT:

## ARMANDO VASQUEZ-REYES

James R Sweetin
Mike Feliciano
State of Nevada

## Defendant

Attorney for Plaintiff
Attorney for Defendant
Plaintiff

JOURNAL ENTRIES
STATE'S NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION TO STRIKE DEFENDANT'S NOTICE OF EXPERT WITNESSES PURSUANT TO NRS 174.234(2) CALENDAR CALL

Spanish Interpreter, Jeff Hanks present.
As to State's Notice of Motion and Motion to Strike Defendant's Notice of Expert Witnesses:
Arguments by counsel regarding the merits of the motion. COURT FINDS that cognitive function was not enough and Defense would have an opportunity to supplement the expert witness notice. COURT ORDERED, motion DENIED.

As to Calendar Call:
Mr. Feliciano announced ready noting that Defendant wished to proceed with trial even though the expert issue was outstanding. COURT NOTED due to a Court's schedule conflict, COURT ADDITIONALLY ORDERED, trial VACATED and RESET.

04/09/19 8:30 AM STATE'S NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION TO STRIKE DEFENDANT'S NOTICE OF EXPERT WITNESSES PURSUANT TO NRS 174.234(2)

05/14/19 8:30 AM CALENDAR CALL
05/28/19 1:30 PM JURY TRIAL

| C-16-316382-1 | State of Nevada |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | vs |
|  | ARMANDO VASQUEZ-REYES |

April 09, 2019
08:30 AM STATE'S NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION TO STRIKE DEFENDANT'S NOTICE OF EXPERT WITNESSES PURSUANT TO NRS 174.234(2)

HEARD BY: Leavitt, Michelle COURTROOM: RJC Courtroom 14D
COURT CLERK: Pannullo, Haly
RECORDER: Santi, Kristine

## REPORTER:

PARTIES PRESENT:

ARMANDO VASQUEZ-REYES
James R Sweetin
Mike Feliciano
State of Nevada

## Defendant

Attorney for Plaintiff
Attorney for Defendant
Plaintiff

## JOURNAL ENTRIES

Spanish Interpreter, Carlos Calvo, also present.
Mr. Feliciano noted the State may be seeking an examination of the Defendant and requested time to supplement the pleading in that regard. COURT ORDERED, State is to file a supplement; matter CONTINUED and SET for Hearing. Mr. Feliciano stated he will file a response within a week after the supplement is received.

CUSTODY
05/07/19 8:30 AM HEARING
CONTINUED TO: 05/07/19 8:30 AM

| C-16-316382-1 | State of Nevada |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | vs |
|  | ARMANDO VASQUEZ-REYES |

May 07, $2019 \quad$ 08:30 AM All Pending Motions

HEARD BY: Leavitt, Michelle COURTROOM: RJC Courtroom 14D
COURT CLERK: Pannullo, Haly
RECORDER: Santi, Kristine

## REPORTER:

## PARTIES PRESENT:

## ARMANDO VASQUEZ-REYES

## Mike Feliciano

Sandra K. Digiacomo
State of Nevada

## Defendant

Attorney for Defendant
Attorney for Plaintiff
Plaintiff

JOURNAL ENTRIES
STATE'S NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION TO STRIKE DEFENDANT'S NOTICE OF EXPERT WITNESSES PURSUANT TO NRS 174.234(2) ... HEARING

Spanish Interpreter, Ricardo Pico, also present.
Based upon a new notice by the Defense, Mr. Feliciano noted the State is not going to proceed on their Motion. State confirmed as long as the Defense agrees that their expert doctor will not due any further exams on the Defendant and will only be referring to the ones done 06/08/18 as well as $08 / 10 / 18$. Mr . Feliciano confirmed that there will be no further evaluations. COURT ORDERED, Motion OFF CALENDAR. Defendant requested all of the documents from the doctor that shows all of the medication that he is receiving due to receiving medication that is not good for his health. Defendant addressed a concern that someone is putting stuff in his food that is making him not feel well. Mr. Feliciano advised the records do not show that they are tainting the Defendant's food. Court stated Mr. Feliciano can provide the medical records to the Defendant. Defendant stated he needs names of all of the pills. Mr. Feliciano advised he will order all of the records. Defendant requested the Court not delay his trial any further. Court noted that this Court will do everything it can to move forward with trial.

## CUSTODY

| 6-316382-1 State of Nevada <br>  vs <br>  ARMANDO VASQUEZ-REYES |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| May 14, 2019 | 08:30 AM | All Pending Motions |
| HEARD BY: | Leavitt, Michelle | COURTROOM: RJC Courtroom 14D |
| COURT CLERK | Pannullo, Haly |  |
| RECORDER: | Santi, Kristine |  |
| REPORTER: |  |  |
| PARTIES PRES | ENT: |  |
| ARMANDO VAS | UEZ-REYES | Defendant |
| Jennifer M. Clem | ons | Attorney for Plaintiff |
| Mike Feliciano |  | Attorney for Defendant |
| State of Nevada |  | Plaintiff |
|  |  | JOURNAL ENTRIES |

Spanish Interpreter, Norma Caucas, also present.
CALENDAR CALL
CONFERENCE AT BENCH. MATTER TRAILED.
MATTER RECALLED. All parties present as before. Based upon what has been reviewed, COURT ORDERED, matter REFERRED and SET in Competency Court; trial dates VACATED; pending motions OFF CALENDAR.

STATE'S NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION IN LIMINE COURT ORDERED, Motion OFF CALENDAR.

DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO DISMISS FOR FAILURE TO PRESERVE EXCULPATORY EVIDENCE COURT ORDERED, Motion OFF CALENDAR.

DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO EXCLUDE IMPROPER EXPERT OPINION COURT ORDERED, Motion OFF CALENDAR.

DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO RECONSIDER ADMISSIBILITY OF EVIDENCE VICTIM G.A. TESTED POSITIVE FOR CHLAMYDIA COURT ORDERED, Motion OFF CALENDAR.

CUSTODY
06/07/19 10:00 AM FURTHER PROCEEDINGS: COMETENCY

| C-16-316382-1 | State of Nevada |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | vs |
|  | ARMANDO VASQUEZ-REYES |

June 07, 2019 10:00 AM Further Proceedings: Competency
HEARD BY: Bell, Linda Marie COURTROOM: RJC Courtroom 10C
COURT CLERK: Estala, Kimberly
RECORDER: Vincent, Renee
REPORTER:
PARTIES PRESENT:

## ARMANDO VASQUEZ-REYES

Glen O'Brien
Mike Feliciano
State of Nevada

## Defendant

Attorney for Plaintiff
Attorney for Defendant
Plaintiff

## JOURNAL ENTRIES

Appearances Continued: Ximena Chica, Spanish Interpreter, Denise Baker of the Specialty Courts also present.

Mr. Feliciano advised he has a challenge to the findings and requested the matter be SET for status check. COURT SO ORDERED.

## CUSTODY

06/21/19 10:00 AM STATUS CHECK: SET CHALLENGE HEARING

| C-16-316382-1 | State of Nevada |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | vs |
|  | ARMANDO VASQUEZ-REYES |

June 21, 2019 10:00 AM STATUS CHECK: SET CHALLENGE HEARING

HEARD BY: Bell, Linda Marie COURTROOM: RJC Courtroom 10C
COURT CLERK: Estala, Kimberly
RECORDER: Vincent, Renee
REPORTER:
PARTIES PRESENT:

## ARMANDO VASQUEZ-REYES

Claudia Romney
Glen O'Brien
State of Nevada

## Defendant

Attorney for Defendant
Attorney for Plaintiff
Plaintiff
JOURNAL ENTRIES

Also present: Denise Baker of the Specialty Courts, and Spanish Interpreter Jeffrey Hanks.
Ms. Romney advised Mr. Feliciano has had an independent evaluation completed and is waiting on the reports and requested a two week continuance. COURT SO ORDERED.

CUSTODY
CONTINUED TO: 07/12/19 10:00 AM

## DISTRICT COURT CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

C-15-306523-1 State of Nevada
vs
Joseph Frohlich
July 12, $2019 \quad$ 10:00 AM Status Check
HEARD BY: Bell, Linda Marie
COURTROOM: RJC Courtroom 15C
COURT CLERK: Michaela Tapia
RECORDER: Renee Vincent
PARTIES
PRESENT: Hojjat, Nadia
O'Brien, Glen
Romney, Claudia
State of Nevada
Attorney for Defendant
Attorney for Plaintiff
Attorney for Defendant
Plaintiff

## JOURNAL ENTRIES

- Appearances Continued: Danika Navar of the Specialty Courts also present. Deft. not present.

Court noted it would like additional information and while there was a good deal of testimony about Deft's mental health, there was not enough information regarding the options being pursued. COURT ORDERED, matter CONTINUED. MATTER RECALLED. Deputy District Attorney Nadia Hojjat now present. Upon Court's inquiry, Ms. Hojijat requested one week to submit a memo regarding the facility. COURT ORDERED, continued date STANDS.

## CUSTODY (L.C.)

CONTINUED TO: 7/19/19 10:00 AM

| C-16-316382-1 | State of Nevada |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | vs |
|  | ARMANDO VASQUEZ-REYES |

July 16, $2019 \quad$ 08:30 AM Further Proceedings: Return from Competency Court
HEARD BY: Leavitt, Michelle COURTROOM: RJC Courtroom 14D
COURT CLERK: Pannullo, Haly
RECORDER: Santi, Kristine
REPORTER:
PARTIES PRESENT:

ARMANDO VASQUEZ-REYES
Jennifer M. Clemons
Mike Feliciano
State of Nevada

## Defendant

Attorney for Plaintiff
Attorney for Defendant
Plaintiff
JOURNAL ENTRIES

Spanish Interpreter, Ricardo Pico, also present.
Court noted the Defendant was returned from Competency and there is not a finding. Colloquy regarding trial dates. COURT ORDERED, matter SET for trial. Statement by Defendant. Court noted trial has been set as soon as this Court can accommodate.

CUSTODY
10/01/19 8:30 AM CALENDAR CALL
10/08/19 1:30 PM JURY TRIAL

| C-16-316382-1 State of Nevada <br> vs <br>  <br> ARMANDO VASQUEZ-REYES |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| October 01, 2019 08:30 AM | Calendar Call |
| HEARD BY: Leavitt, Michelle | COURTROOM: RJC Courtroom 14D |
| COURT CLERK: Pannullo, Haly |  |
| RECORDER: Santi, Kristine |  |
| REPORTER: |  |
| PARTIES PRESENT: |  |
| ARMANDO VASQUEZ-REYES | Defendant |
| James R Sweetin | Attorney for Plaintiff |
| Mike Feliciano | Attorney for Defendant |
| Nadia Hojjat | Attorney for Defendant |
| State of Nevada | Plaintiff |
|  | JOURNAL ENTRIES |

State's Notice of Motion and Motion in Limine to Preclude or Permit Evidence of Specific Statements in Defendant's Statement to Police on April 26,2018 FILED IN OPEN COURT and SET to be heard.

Upon Court's inquiry, both parties announced ready for trial. Mr. Feliciano noted trial will last one and a half weeks. State advised they will have ten witnesses, the defense will also have witnesses and trial will last 6-7 days. COURT ORDERED, matter SET for trial. Court noted counsel will be contacted regarding trial start time. COURT FURTHER ORDERED, all motions taken off calendar 05/14/19 are now SET to be heard; Jackson v Denno hearing SET.

## CUSTODY

10/07/19 10:30 AM ALL PENDING MOTIONS

... JACKSON V DENNO

10/07/19 1:00 PM JURY TRIAL
CLERK'S NOTE: Counsel emailed and notified of trial start time. hvp/10/1/19


| C-16-316382-1 | State of Nevada |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | vs |
|  | ARMANDO VASQUEZ-REYES |

October 07, $2019 \quad$ 10:30 AM All Pending Motions
HEARD BY: Leavitt, Michelle COURTROOM: RJC Courtroom 14D
COURT CLERK: Pannullo, Haly
RECORDER: Santi, Kristine

## REPORTER:

## PARTIES PRESENT:

## ARMANDO VASQUEZ-REYES

James R Sweetin
Mike Feliciano
Nadia Hojjat
State of Nevada
William C. Rowles

## Defendant

Attorney for Plaintiff
Attorney for Defendant
Attorney for Defendant
Plaintiff
Attorney for Plaintiff

JOURNAL ENTRIES
Spanish Interpreter, Maria Peralta De Gomez, also present.
DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO SUPPRESS DEFENDANT'S STATEMENT ... JACKSON V DENNO HEARING
Maria Corral and Mark Pretti SWORN and TESTIFIED. Court canvassed the Defendant is to testifying in today's hearing. Defendant confirmed his understanding. Maria Peralta De Gomez SWORN and interpreted for witness/Defendant's testimony. Armando Vasquez-Reyes SWORN and TESTIFIED. Following arguments by Mr. Sweetin and Ms. Hojjat, COURT ORDERED, Defendant's Motion to Suppress DENIED.

## DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO DISMISS FOR FAILURE TO PRESERVE EXCULPATORY EVIDENCE <br> Ms. Hojjat argued and requested a hearing regarding the body cam. Mr. Sweetin stated an evidentiary hearing can be done and argued. Ms. Hojjat further argued the P\#'s 1200 and above all have body cameras. Following further argument, COURT ORDERED, Motion DENIED; however, the Defense can ask the witnesses anything they feel is appropriate.

## DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO EXCLUDE IMPROPER EXPERT OPINION

Ms. Hojjat argued regarding the expert's opinion and excluding that there wasn't an impression of probable abuse. COURT ORDERED, expert is not to testify as to a box that was checked; however, the doctor can testify as to the findings of the medical examination. Mr. Feliciano requested live testimony, even though it was agreed last Friday that she not be present. State argued. COURT directed counsel to ask the expert to be present and then inform the court in order to make a decision.

DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO RECONSIDER ADMISSIBILITY OF EVIDENCE VICTIM G.A. TESTED POSITIVE FOR CHLAMYDIA

At request of Mr. Feliciano and Ms. Hojjat, COURT STATED, the State can't just order someone to take an STD test on someone; further, Defense was allowed to test their client. Ms. Hojjat argued it is not the Defense's burden to test their client. COURT STATED a previous ruling was already made. Further arguments by counsel, COURT ORDERED, Motion to Reconsider DENIED. MATTER TRAILED.

MATTER RECALLED. Spanish Interpreter, Bette Brooks, now present. All parties present as before.

Notice of Motion and Motion to Present Propensity Evidence and/or Res Gestae Evidence FILED IN OPEN COURT.

STATE'S NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION IN LIMINE TO PRECLUDE OR PERMIT EVIDENCE OF SPECIFIC STATEMENTS IN DEFENDANT'S STATEMENT TO POLICE ON April 26,2018 ... STATE'S NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION IN LIMINE State argued as to the Defendant's statement not being brought in of drug and alcohol as well as allegations of someone else committing the offense. Mr. Feliciano argued the Statement regarding someone else committing the crime should not be redacted. As to the statement of drugs and alcohol, Mr. Feliciano argued it is not relevant as to the time of interview. COURT ORDERED, as to the allegations of the other boy, motion GRANTED as to drugs and alcohol matter DEFERRED to the time of trial as it could become relevant.

## NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION TO PRESENT PROPENSITY EVIDENCE AND/OR RES GESTAE EVIDENCE <br> Mr. Sweetin argued as to the conduct and it all being sexual conduct under the statute. Mr. Feliciano argued and objected to the State's Motion. COURT ORDERED, hearing GRANTED outside the presence of the jury.

CUSTODY

# DISTRICT COURT CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA 

C-16-316382-1 State of Nevada
vs
ARMANDO VASQUEZ-REYES
October 08, $2019 \quad$ 10:30 AM Jury Trial
HEARD BY: Leavitt, Michelle
COURTROOM: RJC Courtroom 14D
COURT CLERK: Haly Pannullo
RECORDER: Kristine Santi
REPORTER:

## PARTIES

PRESENT: Feliciano, Mike Attorney for Defendant
Hojjat, Nadia
Rowles, William C.
State of Nevada
Sweetin, James R
VASQUEZ-REYES, ARMANDO

Attorney for Defendant
Attorney for Plaintiff
Plaintiff
Attorney for Plaintiff
Defendant

## JOURNAL ENTRIES

## - OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE PROSPECTIVE JURORS:

Mr. Feliciano advised the prospective panel appears to the shy and requested the Court inquire that if any of the prospective jurors if any of them have been a victim of a crime or have anything they would like the attorneys to know which they are to embarrassed to speak about in front of everyone then they can speak with the attorneys at the bench. Court stated she inquired of the jurors on more than one time of they have been the victim of a crime; however, she will again inquire of the panel as a whole if there is anything they would like to raise with the attorneys at the bench.

PROSPECTIVE JURORS PRESENT:
PRINT DATE: 10/18/2019 Page 1 of $2 \quad$ Minutes Date: October 08, 2019

Voir dire. Jury selected and excused for the evening recess.
C-16-316382-1
State of Nevada
vs
ARMANDO VASQUEZ-REYES

October 09, 2019 10:00 AM Jury Trial
HEARD BY: Leavitt, Michelle COURTROOM: RJC Courtroom 14D
COURT CLERK: Pannullo, Haly
RECORDER: Santi, Kristine
REPORTER:
PARTIES PRESENT:

ARMANDO VASQUEZ-REYES
James R Sweetin
Mike Feliciano
Nadia Hojjat
State of Nevada
William C. Rowles

## Defendant

Attorney for Plaintiff
Attorney for Defendant
Attorney for Defendant
Plaintiff
Attorney for Plaintiff
JOURNAL ENTRIES

APPEARANCES CONTINUED: Solidad Garcia and Ximena Fiene, Spanish Court Interpreters, present with Defendant and witnesses.

OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY:
Mr. Feliciano requested an expedited transcript from the Denno hearing that took place on Monday. Upon Court's inquiry, Court Recorder advised she will send out the expedited request and try to have it completed. COURT ORDERED, the expedited transcript from the Denno hearing to be prepared and they will attempt to have it completed by tomorrow as requested. Further, Mr. Feliciano advised in reviewing some of the discovery there is a 10 page document titled Nevada initial assessment which appears to be from CPS and there is a reference to unity notes which CPS keeps and he previously requested them in both a discovery motion as well as requested them from Mr. Sweetin personally. Court stated her concern that the issue is just now being raised after a jury has been impaneled and before the twelfth trial setting. Mr. Sweetin advised he does not believe there are any other CPS records as this was what was provided from CPS when the records were requested. Court reviewed the documents provided by defense. Court instructed Mr. Sweetin to reach out to CPS to determine if there are any additional records and/or notes. Court Clerk informed the Court that there appears to be CPS records lodged with the vault from a hearing in January 2017. Court stated the Clerk will retrieve the records from the evidence vault and the Court will review them.

Mr. Sweetin advised he has three witnesses outside for the Court to hear testimony. Further, Mr. Sweetin provided the Court with a copy of the Franks case which specifically states a Petrocelli hearing is no longer required; although, the Court is required to make a determination prior to the propensity evidence is going to be admitted pursuant to the Franks case and that the State is required to put forth a proffer that the sexual offense occurred.

Further, Mr. Sweetin advised he does not believe that there is a need for the witness to be cross examined. Mr. Feliciano advised the State needs to meet the preponderance of the evidence standard as the only thing the defense has regarding these allegations are what is contained in the State's written motion. Court stated she previously noted her concern and she will not permit a lengthy cross examination and the cross examination will be limited as the State only has to make a proffer.

Testimony presented. (See worksheets). Arguments by counsel as to their respective positions regarding State's Motion to Present Propensity Evidence and/or Res Gestae Evidence. Court FINDS State has met their burden, jury could reasonable find by a preponderance of the evidence it is relevant as well as State has met their burden as to the LeMay factors; therefore, COURT ORDERED, State's Motion to Present Propensity Evidence and/or Res Gestae Evidence GRANTED and the testimony shall be permitted. Ms. Hojjat inquired if there was an investigator present with the District Attorney when the statements were made by the victim which are referenced in the State's Motion as she believes she would be able to call the investigator to impeach the witness. Mr. Sweetin advised an investigator was present; however, you cannot impeach with extrinsic evidence.

Court noted she has been provided the CPS records lodged with the Court and it appears the CPS records were erroneously lodged in the wrong case number. Court directed the Court Clerk to have the CPS records lodged in the correct case. Further, Court stated she has another sealed envelope which appears to be for this case and upon opening the envelope they are the same records reviewed in open court this morning. Additionally, Court stated Mr. Sweetin will follow up with CPS to determine if there are any additional records. Mr. Sweetin advised he has reached out and is awaiting a response.

Argument regarding State's objection to unconscious and/or implicit bias. Court stated she would like parties to provide additional briefing on this issue for her review prior to issuing her ruling.

## JURY PRESENT:

Conference at the bench.
OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY:
Court noted this is outside the presence of the jury panel with the exception of juror \# 10 Caroline Millsaps. Court inquired if the juror overheard any of the conversations between the attorneys. Ms. Millsaps advised she only heard them "shush" someone. Court so noted.

## JURY PRESENT:

Jury sworn. Clerk read the Information to the jury and stated the defendant s plea thereto. Opening statements by counsel. Testimony and exhibits presented (see worksheets).

OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY:
Ms. Hojjat invoked the exclusionary rule. Mr. Sweetin advised for the record there have been no witnesses in the courtroom. Court so noted.

Mr. Sweetin made a record of his objection to Mr. Feliciano's questioning of the victim. Court stated she has reviewed the transcript which does not appear to be a new incident; however, the witness can testify if it is a new incident or not.

Court recessed for the evening.
C-16-316382-1
State of Nevada
vs
ARMANDO VASQUEZ-REYES

October 10, $2019 \quad$ 01:00 PM Jury Trial
HEARD BY: Leavitt, Michelle COURTROOM: RJC Courtroom 14D
COURT CLERK: Pannullo, Haly
RECORDER: Santi, Kristine
REPORTER:
PARTIES PRESENT:

## ARMANDO VASQUEZ-REYES

James R Sweetin
Mike Feliciano
Nadia Hojjat
State of Nevada
William C. Rowles

## Defendant

Attorney for Plaintiff
Attorney for Defendant
Attorney for Defendant
Plaintiff
Attorney for Plaintiff

JOURNAL ENTRIES
APPEARANCES CONTINUED: Spanish Court Interpreters present with Defendant and witnesses.

## OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY:

Mr. Feliciano advised he learned yesterday that the defense expert Dr. Harder is only available Monday 2:45-4:15 PM and may request to testify remotely, unless he can testify the following week. Court stated she has objection with the doctor testifying remotely or if the doctor needs to be taken out of order. Mr. Sweetin stated no objection. Additionally, Mr. Feliciano advised during the bad acts hearing the victim talked about an act of cunnilingus coming out and that information did not come out during direct examination which would mean that defense would need to introduce bad acts against their own client and moved for a mistrial. Mr. Sweetin opposed. COURT ORDERED, defense Oral Motion for Mistrial DENIED.

Mr. Sweetin advised Dr. Cetel has indicated that she will be unavailable to testify in person and will need to testify remotely today at 4:00 PM; although, defense previously requested she testify in person. Colloquy regarding witness scheduling. Mr. Feliciano advised defense would request the doctor be present as the Defendant has the right to confront all witnesses in this case and based on the fact that Defendant could spend the rest of his life in prison if found guilty he believes the doctor should be present, COURT ORDERED, Dr. Cetel shall be permitted to testify remotely.

Mr. Sweetin advised a motion in limine was previously file to bring in portions of Defendant's statement which the Court deferred the ruling on the issue. Further, Mr. Sweetin advised based on the opening statements of defense they have clearly placed at issue the fact Defendant cannot remember things and the statements should be allowed in. Mr. Feliciano advised opening statements are not evidence and believes this issue is premature at this time.

Court agreed the issue is premature and she will rule on the issue if and when it becomes relevant.

## JURY PRESENT:

Testimony and exhibits presented. (See worksheets)

## OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY:

Mr. Sweetin advised the State is concerned with defense counsel's statements that the State in some way was manipulating evidence. Court stated without an objection the Court stated those statements would be stricken. Mr. Sweetin requested that there be an instruction that is not appropriate and will not happen again. Court stated they were instructed at the bench that such comments were not appropriate.

JURY PRESENT:
Testimony and exhibits presented. (See worksheets)
OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY:
Mr. Feliciano advised Dr. Harder will testify remotely. Court so noted.
Court recessed for the evening.

## C-16-316382-1 <br> State of Nevada <br> vs <br> ARMANDO VASQUEZ-REYES

## October 11, 2019 09:00 AM Jury Trial

HEARD BY: Leavitt, Michelle COURTROOM: RJC Courtroom 14D
COURT CLERK: Pannullo, Haly; Schlitz, Kory
RECORDER: Santi, Kristine
REPORTER:
PARTIES PRESENT:

ARMANDO VASQUEZ-REYES
James R Sweetin
Mike Feliciano
Nadia Hojjat
State of Nevada
William C. Rowles

## Defendant

Attorney for Plaintiff
Attorney for Defendant
Attorney for Defendant
Plaintiff
Attorney for Plaintiff

JOURNAL ENTRIES
APPEARANCES CONTINUED: Ricardo Pico, Spanish Court Interpreter present with Defendant.

OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY:
Mr. Sweetin advised there needs to be a decision regarding the redaction issue still pending with the Court. Court stated nothing has changed at this point and believes the redactions to the video and Defendant's statement should be made at this point. Mr. Sweetin advised his concern with defense counsel raising the issue that Defendant cannot remember. Court stated should it become relevant then it will be allowed in and State can possibly put a witness on the stand; however, we can address the issue if it becomes relevant. Additionally, Mr. Sweetin advised he has provided defense counsel a copy of the video which the State will be using that has the transcript in the video for the

Mr. Rowles advised he was at the gym last night and was discussing the trial with another attorney in the community when he discovered a juror \# 9 on the floor above him. Further there was discussion regarding witness testimony and he thoughts on the testimony; although, he did not acknowledge the juror nor make eye contact with her.

Ms. Hojjat confirmed there is a redacted portion of the video. Mr. Sweetin confirmed. Further, Ms. Hojjat advised her concern is the characterization that Defendant was answering drugs and alcohol is why and/or how it started. Court stated she will review the information again; however, she previously ruled that the information is not coming in unless it somehow becomes relevant which it may and she stated she would address the issue should it become relevant.

Court noted outside the presence of the jury panel and in the presence of juror \# 9 Ms . Lutz.

Upon Court's inquiry, Ms. Lutz advised she was at the gym and saw one of the players that looked like the State she moved away.

## JURY PRESENT:

Testimony and Exhibits continued. (See Worksheets).
OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY:
Mr. Feliciano advised Defendant is wearing a very distinct rust colored shirt today and requested that Defendant wear a different shirt next week. Ms. Hojjat advised Defendant has wore the same shirt everyday and today he was taken back with to have his shirt changed. The Correction Officer advised he will make sure that the property department is aware that Defendant needs to be in a different color shirt next week, Court so noted.

## 11:10 a.m. Court Clerk Kory Schlitz present

## JURY PRESENT

Spanish Interpreter Carola Anderson present on behalf of Defendant. Testimony and Exhibits continued. (See Worksheets).

## OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY

Mr. Feliciano informed the Court Detective Pretti and Juror \#7 were speaking once they were released for lunch. Ms. Hojatt stated they heard voices, lips moving and they were interacting with each other.

Mark Pretti present. Upon Court's inquiry, Mr. Pretti stated he did not speak with any Jurors, or speak with anyone at the break, adding there were Jurors having conversations at the elevators however he did not speak with any of them.

Danyel Garrett Juror \#7 present. Upon Court's inquiry, Ms. Garrett stated she did not have a conversation with Mark Pretti, adding he was standing in line waiting to get on the elevators and she stated out loud that she didn't like crowded elevators and she was going to wait for the next one.

## JURY PRESENT

Testimony and Exhibits continued. (See Worksheets).
OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY
Ms. Hojatt moved for a mistrial due to the limitation of the ability of the Defense to cross examine the lead detective in the case, adding numerous times when the Defense was trying to cross examine him regarding statements he received and how he responded to them, the Court kept the Defense from going into the Statements. Ms. Hojatt further argued they were not offering Ms. Alvarez's statements for the truth of the matter. Mr. Rowles stated his objection. COURT STATED ITS FINDINGS and ORDERED Motion for Mistrial DENIED.

## JURY PRESENT

Testimony and Exhibits continued. (See Worksheets). Court recessed for the evening and directed Jurors to return Monday at 9:00 a.m.

OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY
COURT requested Jury Instructions. Mr. Sweetin indicated the State will be resting on Monday Morning, and they can send over their Jury Instructions now. Ms. Hojatt informed the Court the Defense is not required to disclose their Jury Instructions until the State rests, and they will
provide the instructions to Chambers and request they do not be provided to the State. Mr. Rowles inquired what rule the Defense was referencing. Ms. Hojatt argued since the Jury Instructions show theories of the case, they are not technically required to disclose them until after the State has rested. Upon Court's inquiry, Mr. Feliciano stated they have the Doctor, and they think the State might have a rebuttal witness. Colloquy regarding trial scheduling.

## CUSTODY

CONTINUED TO: 10/14/19 9:00 A.M.

## DISTRICT COURT

CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

Felony/Gross Misdemeanor
COURT MINUTES
October 14, 2019
C-16-316382-1 State of Nevada
vs
ARMANDO VASQUEZ-REYES
October 14, 2019 9:00 AM Jury Trial
HEARD BY: Leavitt, Michelle
COURTROOM: RJC Courtroom 14D
COURT CLERK: Denise Husted

RECORDER: Kristine Santi
REPORTER:

## PARTIES

PRESENT: Feliciano, Mike
Hojjat, Nadia
Rowles, William C.
State of Nevada
Sweetin, James R
Vasquez-Reyes, Armando
Attorney for Defendant
Attorney for Defendant
Attorney for Plaintiff
Plaintiff
Attorney for Plaintiff
Defendant
JOURNAL ENTRIES

- Spanish interpreters Bette Brooks, Maria Peters and Maria Peralte de Gomez present.

OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY:

Colloquy regarding scheduling of witnesses and stipulations which the parties have reached and request the Court to read to the jury. Court advised parties to prepare the written stipulations they wish the Court to read to the jury.

Testimony and exhibits presented (see worksheets). Court read stipulations of the parties to the jury.

## OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY:

Defendant advised of his right not to testify. Instructions settled. Mr. Feliciano advised there are witnesses in the court room and the exclusionary rule has been invoked. Upon Court's inquiry, Mr. Sweetin advised they are expert witnesses and have been noticed as rebuttal witnesses. Mr. Feliciano advised the State has been provided everything that he will rely on for the testimony of Dr. Harder which should be sufficient for their rebuttal testimony. Court stated you are permitted to have experts sit in during testimony and the rebuttal experts shall be permitted to remain in the courtroom.

JURY PRESENT:

Testimony and exhibits presented (see worksheets).

OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY:

Mr. Sweetin made a proffer of the testimony of the State's rebuttal experts Dr. Kapel and Dr. Roley. Ms. Hojjat objected to the rebuttal experts. Court Finds, there has not been a proper proffer of proof for Dr. Kapel to testify as a rebuttal expert and Dr. Roley would be limited rebuttal testimony only.

JURY PRESENT:

Testimony and exhibits presented (see worksheets).

OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY:

PRINT DATE: 10/18/2019 Page 2 of 3 Minutes Date: October 14, 2019

Court noted that defense provided a Tavares instruction to the Court and indicated they do not want that instruction given to the jury. Ms. Hojjat agreed with the Court's representations. Ms. Hojjat made a record of the objections made at the bench during the testimony of Dr. Roley and moved for a mistrial State opposed. COURT ORDERED, oral motion for mistrial DENIED as the objection made were overruled and the witness was permitted to answer the questions posed.

| C-16-316382-1 | State of Nevada |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | vs |
|  | ARMANDO VASQUEZ-REYES |

October 15, 2019 10:30 AM Jury Trial
HEARD BY: Leavitt, Michelle COURTROOM: RJC Courtroom 14D
COURT CLERK: Yorke, Dara
RECORDER: Santi, Kristine
REPORTER:
PARTIES PRESENT:

ARMANDO VASQUEZ-REYES
James R Sweetin
Mike Feliciano
Nadia Hojjat
State of Nevada
William C. Rowles

## Defendant

Attorney for Plaintiff
Attorney for Defendant
Attorney for Defendant
Plaintiff
Attorney for Plaintiff

JOURNAL ENTRIES
Also present, Alex Avants, Maria Peralta De Gomez, and Maria Peters, Spanish Court interepreters.

JURY PRESENT: Jury INSTRUCTED by the Court. Closing arguments by the State. CONFERENCE AT BENCH. COURT RECESSED.

OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY: Ms. Hojjat indicated she moved for a mistrial at the bench. Ms. Hojjat explained her reasoning for the mistrial were due to multiple instances where the State characterized the Defense theory of the case as one thing, and then indicated there was lack of evidence, as well as burden shifting and disparaging of the Defense counsel. Further arguments by Ms. Hojjat in support of the Mistrial. Arguments by Mr. Rowles in opposition. COURT ORDERED, Motion for Mistrial was hereby DENIED.

JURY PRESENT: Closing arguments by the Defense. CONFERENCE AT BENCH. Rebuttal by Mr. Sweetin. CONFERENCE AT BENCH. OATH ADMINISTERED to the Matron and Bailiff. The Jury RETIRED to deliberate at the hour of 1:45 PM and the alternates were EXCUSED at that time.

OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY: Mr. Feliciano indicated there was an objection as to Mr. Sweetin indicating Deft. wiped eyes which mistakes the testimony; therefore, Mr. Feliciano moved for a mistrial. Arguments by Mr. Sweetin. Statements by Mr. Feliciano in support of Mistrial. Colloquy between parties. Court noted parties could comment on evidence, video and what it represents.

At the hour of 3:23 PM, the JURY RETURNED with VERDICTS of GUILTY as to COUNTS 1 AND 2- LEWDNESS WITH A CHILD UNDER THE AGE OF 14 (F); and as to COUNTS 3 THROUGH 9 - SEXUAL ASSAULT WITH A MINOR UNDER FOURTEEN YEARS OF AGE
(F). Defense counsel wished to poll the Jury. The Court thanked and EXCUSED the Jury.

OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY: COURT ORDERED, matter referred to the Division of Parole and Probation ( $\mathrm{P} \& \mathrm{P}$ ) and SET for sentencing. Court inquired about bail amount, which was indicated to be $\$ 250,000.00$; therefore, COURT FURTHER ORDERED, bail REVOKED and Deft. to be HELD WITHOUT BAIL.

CUSTODY- HOLD WITHOUT BAIL
12/10/19 8:30 AM SENTENCING

## C-16-316382-1 <br> State of Nevada <br> vs <br> ARMANDO VASQUEZ-REYES

## December 10, 2019 08:30 AM Sentencing

HEARD BY: Leavitt, Michelle COURTROOM: RJC Courtroom 14D
COURT CLERK: Jackson, Carolyn; Pannullo, Haly
RECORDER: Santi, Kristine

## REPORTER:

## PARTIES PRESENT:

## ARMANDO VASQUEZ-REYES

## Mike Feliciano

## State of Nevada

William C. Rowles

## Defendant

Attorney for Defendant
Plaintiff
Attorney for Plaintiff
JOURNAL ENTRIES

Alex Avantes, Spanish Interpreter, also present.
DEFENDANT VASQUEZ-REYES ADJUDGED GUILTY of COUNTS 1 and 2 - LEWDNESS WITH A CHILD UNDER THE AGE OF 14 (F), COUNTS 3-10 SEXUAL ASSAULT WITH A MINOR UNDER FOURTEEN YEAR OF AGE (F). Arguments by counsel. Victim Speaker Guadalepa Alvares SWORN and TESTIFIED. COURT ORDERED, in addition to the $\$ 25.00$ Administrative Assessment fee, \$150.00 DNA Analysis fee including testing to determine genetic markers, and \$3.00 DNA Collection fee, Defendant SENTENCED as follows:

COUNT 1 LIFE with a MINIMUM parole eligibility of TEN (10) YEARS, in the Nevada Department of Corrections (NDC);

COUNT 2 LIFE with a MINIMUM parole eligibility of TEN (10) YEARS, CONCURRENT with COUNT 1, in the NDC;

COUNT 3 LIFE with a MINIMUM parole eligibility of THIRTY-FIVE (35) YEARS, CONSECUTIVE to COUNT 2, in the NDC;

COUNT 4 LIFE with a MINIMUM parole eligibility of THIRTY-FIVE (35) YEARS, CONCURRENT with COUNT 3 , in the NDC;

COUNT 5 LIFE with a MINIMUM parole eligibility of THIRTY-FIVE (35) YEARS, CONCURRENT with COUNT 2 , in the NDC;

COUNT 6 LIFE with a MINIMUM parole eligibility of THIRTY-FIVE (35) YEARS, CONCURRENT with COUNT 2, in the NDC;

COUNT 7 LIFE with a MINIMUM parole eligibility of THIRTY-FIVE (35) YEARS, CONCURRENT with COUNT 3, in the NDC;

COUNT 8 LIFE with a MINIMUM parole eligibility of THIRTY-FIVE (35) YEARS, CONCURRENT with COUNT 3, in the NDC;

COUNT 9 LIFE with a MINIMUM parole eligibility of THIRTY-FIVE (35) YEARS, CONCURRENT with COUNT 3 , in the NDC; and

COUNT 10 LIFE with a MINIMUM parole eligibility of THIRTY-FIVE (35) YEARS, CONCURRENT with COUNT 3, in the NDC, with ONE THOUSAND THREE HUNDRED THIRTY-FOUR $(1,334)$ DAYS credit for time served; AGGREGATE TOTAL of FORTY-FIVE (45) YEARS to LIFE.

COURT FURTHER ORDERED, a special SENTENCE OF LIFETIME SUPERVISION is imposed to commence upon release from any term of probation, parole or imprisonment and Defendant shall register as a sex offender in accordance with NRS 179D. 460 within 48 hours upon release.

BOND, if any EXONERATED.
NDC
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APPEARANCES:
For the State:
VIVIAN LUONG, ESQ.
Deputized Law Clerk

For the Defendant: No Appearance

RECORDED BY: KIARA SCHMIDT, COURT RECORDER

Las Vegas, Nevada; Thursday, July 14, 2016
[Hearing commenced at 12:36 p.m.]
THE COURT CLERK: Okay. So, then page 39, Vasquez-
Reyes.
THE CORRECTIONS OFFICER: He says he needs an interpreter.

[Colloquy]<br>[The Court speaks Spanish to the Defendant]<br>[Proceedings trailed at 12:36 p.m.]<br>[Proceedings resumed at 12:38 p.m.]<br>THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Vasquez-Reyes.<br>[The Court speaks Spanish to the Defendant]<br>THE COURT: And this was at the request of --<br>THE COURT RECORDER: Mr. Buttell.<br>THE COURT: Okay.<br>[The Court speaks Spanish to the Defendant]<br>THE DEFENDANT: Yeah.<br>[The Court speaks Spanish to the Defendant] THE DEFENDANT: Okay.<br>[The Court speaks Spanish to the Defendant] THE DEFENDANT: Okay.<br>THE COURT: Okay?<br>[The Court speaks Spanish to the Defendant] THE DEFENDANT: Okay.

[The Court speaks Spanish to the Defendant]
THE DEFENDANT: Okay.
THE COURT: Okay?
THE DEFENDANT: Yep.
THE COURT: We're going to continue it to two weeks from Tuesday.

THE COURT CLERK: Two weeks from -- okay. So, that will be August $2^{\text {nd }}$ at 10 o'clock.

THE COURT: And, for the record, I told him his attorney wasn't here, had to request a two-week continuance, we were continuing it for two weeks from next Tuesday. And Mr. Vasquez-Reyes had no objection.
[Hearing concluded at 12:39 p.m.]
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BEFORE THE HONORABLE MELISA DE LA GARZA, HEARING MASTER TUESDAY, AUGUST 2, 2016

RECORDER'S TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING: ARRAIGNMENT CONTINUED

APPEARANCES:
For the State:
NICOLE J. CANNIZZARO, ESQ.
Deputy District Attorney

For the Defendant:
MIKE FELICIANO, ESQ.
Deputy Public Defender
Also Present:
JEFF HANKS
Court Interpreter

RECORDED BY: KIARA SCHMIDT, COURT RECORDER

Las Vegas, Nevada; Tuesday, August 2, 2016
[Hearing commenced at 10:09 a.m.]
THE COURT: Page 28, State of Nevada versus Armando Vasquez-Reyes, C316382. Armando Vasquez-Reyes he is present in custody. Mr. Feliciano is here on his behalf, as well as Mr. Hanks from the interpreter's office.

Mr. Feliciano?
MR. FELICIANO: And, Your Honor, this is going to be a not guilty plea. We are -- we are going to invoke our right to a speedy trial. We will waive the reading of the Information.

THE COURT: Sir, you've received a copy of the Information stating the charges against you?
[The Defendant speaks through the use of the Court Interpreter]
THE DEFENDANT: I don't remember.
MR. FELICIANO: Well --
THE COURT: Have you received the charges against you?
THE DEFENDANT: The last time I went to court it wasn't provided to me.

THE COURT: All right.
MR. FELICIANO: Oh.
THE COURT: Let's get him the Information. Mr. Feliciano, have the Spanish interpreter read those charges to him and then l'll call you back.

MR. FELICIANO: I'll go over them with him again. Thanks.
[Proceedings trailed at 10:10 a.m.]
[Proceedings resumed at 10:27 a.m.]
THE COURT: Page 28, State of Nevada versus Armando Vasquez-Reyes, C316382. He is present in custody. Mr. Feliciano is here on his behalf, as well as Mr. Hanks from the interpreter's office.

Sir, have you now received a copy of the Information stating the charges against you?
[The Defendant speaks through the use of the Court Interpreter] THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Were they read to you in Spanish by the interpreter?

THE DEFENDANT: In Spanish.
THE COURT: Did you understand the charges?
THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
THE COURT: Do you want to waive a formal reading of the charges?

THE DEFENDANT: I don't understand what that means.
THE COURT: It means if they've -- the charges have been read to you, do you need them to be read out loud on the record or do you want to waive that?

THE DEFENDANT: No.
THE COURT: All right, sir, how do you plead?
THE DEFENDANT: Not guilty.
THE COURT: You do have a right to a trial within 60 days. It's my understanding you want to invoke that right; is that true, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
THE COURT: Speedy trial.
THE COURT CLERK: Your calendar call is September $20^{\text {th }}$ at 8:30. Your trial date is September $27^{\text {th }}, 1: 30$, Department XII.

THE COURT: Counsel, pursuant to statute you have 21 days from today for the filing of any writs. If the transcript has not been filed as of today you have 21 days from the filing.

MR. FELICIANO: Thank you.
THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Feliciano.
[Hearing concluded at 10:29 a.m.]
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JENNIFER CLEMONS, ESQ.
Chief Deputy District Attorney
MELISSA C. NAVARRO, ESQ.
Deputy Public Defender

LAS VEGAS, NEVADA, TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 20, 2016
[Case called at 8:56 a.m.]
THE COURT: Page 2, State of Nevada versus Armando VasquezReyes, C316382.

MS. CLEMONS: Jennifer Clemons for the State. I think we're waiting on Mr. Feliciano?

MS. NAVARRO: That's correct, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay.
[Case trailed at 8:56 a.m.]
[Case recalled at 9:31 a.m.]
MS. CLEMONS: Your Honor, we may be able to recall page 2, Armando Vasquez-Reyes.

THE COURT: C316382.
MS. CLEMONS: I know that he doesn't speak English, but the PD has spoken to him, so it's up to your -- if you would -- if we would handle that. We're just going to -- I spoke to Mike Feliciano. He's sick today --

THE COURT: Oh.
MS. CLEMONS: -- so he's just asking for a status check in a couple of weeks to reset the trial. We had agreed to call it off.

THE COURT: Okay. And he knows his client invoked?
MS. NAVARRO: And your --
MS. CLEMONS: He knows he invoked but --
MS. NAVARRO: Your Honor, I do speak Spanish.
THE COURT: Yeah, he invoked.

MS. NAVARRO: I'm going to double check with Mr. Armando Vazquez-Reyes, make sure that he understands that the trial is going to be pushed.

THE COURT: Okay.
MS. NAVARRO: If I may have --
THE COURT: Sure.
MS. NAVARRO: -- a second.
[Pause in proceedings]
MS. NAVARRO: And, Your Honor, we are ready with --
THE COURT: Okay, State versus Vasquez-Reyes.
THE DEFENDANT: Yeah.
THE COURT: And it's on for calendar call.
MS. NAVARRO: Your Honor, I did speak to him. Mr. Feliciano did go over the ramifications of waiving your right to have a trial within 60 days. He is going to waive his trial within those 60 days. And I told him that we would reset the trial in two weeks when Mr. Feliciano is here. Unfortunately, he did fall sick and notified the District Attorney.

THE COURT: We're going to set the trial in two weeks?
MS. CLEMONS: He doesn't have his trial schedule with -- I mean, we don't know what Mr. Feliciano's trial schedule is, so that's why I think he's asking for the two-week date.

MS. NAVARRO: That's when we're going to reset it, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay.
MS. CLEMONS: Yeah.
THE COURT: So l'll vacate --

MS. CLEMONS: Oh, yeah. Sorry.
THE COURT: I'll vacate the trial date and set it for two weeks to reset a trial date.

THE CLERK: October 4, 8:30.
MS. NAVARRO: Thank you, Your Honor.
MS. CLEMONS: Thank you.
THE COURT: Thank you.
MS. CLEMONS: And just for the record, it was a Defense continuance but no objection.

THE COURT: Sure.
[Proceedings concluded at 9:33 a.m.]
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Certified Spanish Court Interpreter

RECORDED BY: KRISTINE CORNELIUS, COURT RECORDER

LAS VEGAS, NEVADA, TUESDAY, OCTOBER 4, 2016
[Case called at 8:55 a.m.]
THE COURT: Anyone else ready? Go ahead.
MR. FELICIANO: Sure. Your Honor, I have Vasquez-Reyes on 24.
MS. KOLLINS: Good morning again, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Good morning.
MS. KOLLINS: Stacey Kollins for Jenny Clemons for the State.
THE COURT: C316382. He's present. He's in custody. He's using the services of the interpreter. Will the Interpreter please state her name.

THE COURT INTERPRETER: Alex Andrade.
THE COURT: Thank you.
MR. FELICIANO: Your Honor, I believe this is on to set trial. I think we have some new discovery --

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. FELICIANO: -- and we needed more time to prep for trial. I believe this is the first setting. I don't know what the Court's stacks are looking like for ordinary course.

THE COURT: Probably about March now. I mean, probably -- we're probably into March.

MR. FELICIANO: Okay. Well, I talked to him about it, and he does want to waive his right to speedy trial. That was -- this is an invoked.

THE COURT: He waived at the September $20^{\text {th }}$ hearing.
MR. FELICIANO: So we'll take whatever date the Court has.
THE COURT: Okay.

THE CLERK: Calendar call, March 7, 8:30; Jury trial, March 14, 1:30. MR. FELICIANO: Thank you.

THE COURT INTERPRETER: Thank you.
[Proceedings concluded at 8:56 a.m.]
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LAS VEGAS, NEVADA; TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 2017
[Case called at 8:57 a.m.]
THE COURT: Page one, State versus Armando Vasquez-Reyes, C316382.

MS. BEVERLY: Your Honor, that's Ms. Clemons' case. She texted me this morning. She's on her way.

THE COURT: Okay.
MS. DEVANEY-SAUTER: That's also --
THE COURT: Okay. And I now --
MS. DEVANEY-SAUTER: -- my specialty team.
THE COURT: And I think he wants a continuance, Mr. Feliciano.
MS. DEVANEY-SAUTER: Thank you.
THE COURT: Right, it's his case?
MS. DEVANEY-SAUTER: It is his case. Last I had heard was that he had contacted the department that he was running late. He has not communicated with me though about it.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, the message I got was he was in North Las Vegas and he wanted a two week continuance, so. I'm not even sure who I heard that from.

MS. BEVERLY: I'm not sure.
THE COURT: I heard that from someone on my staff this morning, probably Pam.

MS. BEVERLY: Okay. Mister -- yeah. I don't think Ms. Clemons would have a problem with that.

MS. DEVANEY-SAUTER: I mean Provided that was the representation, I expect --

THE COURT: Okay.
MS. DEVANEY-SAUTER: -- Mike has no problem. I trust Pam.
THE COURT: State versus Vasquez Reyes, C316382. He's present. He's in custody. There is a motion to dismiss counsel on calendar. I've been asked to pass it for two weeks and that that issue might be resolved. So l'll put it on for two weeks.

THE CLERK: Yes, Your Honor. February 21, 8:30.
THE COURT: And the Defendant is using the services of the interpreter. Will the interpreter state her name for the record.

THE COURT INTERPRETER: Maria Peralta De Gomez.
THE COURT: Thank you.
[Proceedings concluded at 8:58 a.m.]
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MIKE FELICIANO, ESQ.
Deputy Public Defender
MARIA PERALTA DE GOMEZ Certified Spanish Court Interpreter

LAS VEGAS, NEVADA; TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 21, 2017
[Case called at 9:02 a.m.]
THE COURT: Page 12, State of Nevada versus Armando VasquezReyes, C316382.

MS. CLEMONS: Your Honor, this is miss -- this is actually Mr.
Feliciano's. I just texted him. He's going to come back up when he's ready, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.
[Case trailed at 9:02]
[Case recalled at 9:41 a.m.]
MR. FELICIANO: Good morning, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Good morning.
MR. FELICIANO: Mike Feliciano for defendant, who's present in custody.

MS. CLEMONS: And Jennifer Clemons for the State.
MR. FELICIANO: So I talked to him. I have no problem giving him his discovery. The only thing that I won't give him is the medical records.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, back up.
MR. FELICIANO: Okay. I'm sorry.
THE COURT: Because it was my understanding we were putting this on so you go talk to him and hopefully things were going to be okay.

MR. FELICIANO: I -- there's just one issue that we're having. It's he wants me to make copies of the medical records and give them to him, and I told him I would gladly show him the medical records, but I won't make a copy of
them.
THE COURT: Okay. He'll show you the medical records, but he won't give a copy to you; nor will anybody else give you a copy of those medical records. Do you understand that?
[The Defendant speaks through the use of the Court Interpreter] THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. Nobody is going to give you a copy of those medical records. You're entitled to see them. You're not entitled to possess them. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
THE COURT: Okay. Was that the only issue that was left?
MR. FELICIANO: It was.
THE COURT: Okay. So at this time l'll take it off calendar.
THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, I need my discovery.
THE COURT: Okay. You can have your discovery. You will not be given copies of medical records; do you understand that -- by anybody. No matter who is your attorney, you will not be given copies of medical records. You're entitled to look at them. Your attorney can bring them to you. You're entitled to look at them, review them. You're not entitled to possess them. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Okay.
THE COURT: Okay.
THE DEFENDANT: But I need my discovery in Spanish, please.
THE COURT: Okay. And we don't -- what can happen is your attorney can come over there with an interpreter and the interpreter can translate
for you because you certainly are entitled to have it interpreted into Spanish for you.

And Mr. Feliciano you've done that, correct?
MR. FELICIANO: Absolutely.
THE COURT: That's what I thought. Okay.
THE DEFENDANT: Thank you.
[Proceedings concluded at 9:43 a.m.]
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Chief Deputy District Attorney
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YUL HAASMANN
Certified Spanish Court Interpreter

LAS VEGAS, NEVADA; TUESDAY, MARCH 7, 2017
[Case called at 8:02 a.m.]
THE COURT: Good morning.
MR. FELICIANO: Good morning, Your Honor. I have a -- if we could call Vasquez-Reyes on page 3. I'd appreciate it.

THE COURT: C316382. Is he present?
THE CORRECTIONS OFFICER: Reyes-Vasquez, stand up, please.
THE CLERK: He needs an interpreter.
THE COURT: Okay. He's present. He's in custody. He's using the services of the interpreter. Will the interpreter please state his name for the record.

THE COURT INTERPRETER: Yul Haasmann, court interpreter.
THE COURT: Good morning. Thank you.
MR. FELICIANO: Good morning, Your Honor. Mike Feliciano for Mr. Vasquez-Reyes. This is a case where -- this is Ms. Clemons' case and she -I've asked her to continue it. She's agreed to a continuance. This is the -- we originally invoked and then we set it out. We got a regular date, but we need a little bit more time. We looked before and I think June -- the end of June is when you have availability, and I think if we do it then we'll definitely have it ready to go.

THE COURT: That's fine.
MS. MENDOZA: That's correct, Your Honor. Ms. Clemons indicated any time after June $7^{\text {th }}$ works for her.

THE COURT: Okay.

THE CLERK: Calendar call June $13^{\text {th }}, 8: 30$; Jury trial June 20, 1:30. MR. FELICIANO: Thank you.
[Proceedings concluded at 8:03 a.m.]
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LAS VEGAS, NEVADA, TUESDAY, JUNE 13, 2017
[Hearing begins at 8:32 a.m.]
THE COURT: Page 6, State of Nevada versus Armando Vasquez-
Reyes.
THE CORRECTIONS OFFICER: Your Honor, he also needs a -THE COURT: Okay.

THE CORRECTIONS OFFICER: Sorry.
THE COURT: Well, for some reason, nobody wants to let me get done this morning.
[Case trailed at 8:33 a.m.]
[Case recalled at 9:54 a.m.]
THE COURT: C316382. Is he present? He's present. He's in custody. It's on for Calendar Call. He's using the services of the interpreter.

Will the interpreter please state her name for the record.
THE INTERPRETER: Alex Andrade.
THE COURT: Thank you.
MR. FELICIANO: May we approach, Your Honor?
THE COURT: Of course.
[Bench conference transcribed as follows:]
THE COURT: Good morning. Good morning.
MR. FELICIANO: So I didn't really want to put this out on the record -THE COURT: Yeah, no problem.

MR. FELICIANO: -- but my wife was just diagnosed with a brain tumor.

THE COURT: Oh, no.
MR. FELICIANO: So --
THE COURT: I was just going to ask you. I saw her this morning. Oh, l'm so sorry. Oh, l'm sorry.

MR. FELICIANO: So thank you. Thank you.
THE COURT: Please tell her l'm thinking about her.
MR. FELICIANO: Okay.
THE COURT: I think she looks good this morning though.
MR. FELICIANO: Yeah.
THE COURT: I was going to tell her how good she looked. Ah, geez.
MR. FELICIANO: So we're kind of dealing with that.
THE COURT: Oh.
MR. FELICIANO: So I was going to ask for a little more time on this case. He's -- my client's very upset and he wants to make a record. I told him to file the motion; that you wouldn't let him --

THE COURT: He didn't invoke, did he?
MR. FELICIANO: He did not. He -- we --
THE COURT: Okay.
MR. FELICIANO: He invoked originally. Then he waived, right --
THE COURT: Okay.
MR. FELICIANO: -- if I remember correctly.
MR. SWEETIN: I thought he had waived.
THE COURT: How long do you want? I mean, I'm going to grant you your continuance.

MR. FELICIANO: Just a couple more months or so --

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. FELICIANO: -- like two months or something and then he --
THE COURT: Are you sure it's going to be enough?
MR. FELICIANO: If it's not I'll be in contact with Mr. Sweetin a little bit later on --

THE COURT: Sure.
MR. FELICIANO: -- but he's fairly anxious to go.
THE COURT: He is. He's yakking up a storm over there to the interpreter.

MR. FELICIANO: I told him that I didn't think you would let him make a record. He needed to put it in writing and file it. So he's going to try to make --

THE COURT: Oh, he wants to fire you now?
MR. FELICIANO: Yeah.
THE COURT: Okay.
MR. FELICIANO: He wants to make a record today too.
MR. SWEETIN: So he did waive.
THE COURT: Okay. You have no objection, right?
MR. SWEETIN: No. I have no objection.
THE COURT: Okay.
MR. SWEETIN: And I -- for the record, I'm going to say the State's ready, but we have no objection.

THE COURT: Okay, obviously. Okay. I'm going to grant you your continuance, and then we'll deal with this.

MR. FELICIANO: Okay.
THE COURT: Okay.

MR. FELICIANO: Thank you, Your Honor.
[Bench conference concluded]
THE COURT: All right, the State has no objection to the continuance.
Mr. Vasquez-Reyes, it's my understanding you do object to the continuance? I'm going to grant the continuance.
[The Defendant speaks through the use of the Court Interpreter]
THE DEFENDANT: Can I speak?
THE COURT: Sure.
THE DEFENDANT: Can I approach the bench?
THE COURT: Absolutely not.
THE DEFENDANT: I've been here for 14 months.
THE COURT: Okay.
THE DEFENDANT: He has told me not to say anything here in court, so l've been quiet this whole time.

THE COURT: You've been quiet this whole time --
THE DEFENDANT: And that's mostly --
THE COURT: -- because I haven't called your case.
THE DEFENDANT: I requested my discovery. I've asked for the medical examination and l've asked for time here in Court, and all of it's been denied.

THE COURT: Okay. You want your discovery? Okay.
And, Counsel, you'll make sure he gets a copy of his discovery,
correct --
MR. FELICIANO: I --
THE COURT: -- of what -

MR. FELICIANO: I'm sorry.
THE COURT: -- would be appropriate to give to your client?
MR. FELICIANO: That's kind of the issue is because --
THE COURT: Right.
MR. FELICIANO: -- he wants a copy of the medical records. We've we addressed this before on the record and I told him that he could not. I couldn't turn those over to him --

THE COURT: Right.
MR. FELICIANO: -- but everything else he should have.
THE COURT: You're not going to get a copy of the medical records.
I'm not going to give you a copy. In fact, I'm going to tell your attorney specifically not to give you a copy. You're not entitled to possess those. Your attorney can bring them to you and you can go over them, but you are not permitted to have a copy.

THE DEFENDANT: Okay. He hasn't -- he hasn't given me anything. And so the last court that we were here --

THE COURT: Okay. I just told him to give you a copy of your discovery. Anything else?

THE DEFENDANT: I told him he was violating my rights, and he said I didn't have any rights.

THE COURT: Okay. Anything else?
THE DEFENDANT: That's all.
THE COURT: Okay.
MR. FELICIANO: I won't even -- I'm not even going to respond to that, Judge.

THE COURT: Okay, the Motion to Continue is granted.
THE CLERK: Thank you, Your Honor.
Calendar call, January 9, 8:30; Jury trial, January 16, 1:30.
MR. FELICIANO: Thank you, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Thank you.
[Proceedings concluded at 9:59 a.m.]
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THE COURT: Good morning.
MR. SWEETIN: Good morning, Judge. We have the Vasquez-Reyes
case.
THE COURT: Page 3, State of Nevada versus Armando VasquezReyes, C316382.

Are you Mr. Vasquez-Reyes?
[The Defendant speaks through the use of the Court Interpreter] THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. He's present. He's in custody, and this is on for your motion. I did have an opportunity to review your motion. Is there anything else you want to say to the Court?

MR. FELICIANO: If I may before he speaks, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Sure.
MR. FELICIANO: Mike Feliciano for Mr. Vasquez-Reyes. The issue the issue that we have is the complaining witness' medical records is something that Mr. Vasquez-Reyes wants to see. I told him --

THE COURT: How many times do I have to tell him he's not going to be able to have possession of them?

MR. FELICIANO: I talked to him yesterday. I told him I could go next week and show him the records, but I can't physically give him a copy of them. And I think that's the only issue that we have.

THE COURT: Okay. And, sir, you remember I told you last time you
were here that you're not going to be able to possess those medical records. Your attorney can come to you. He can show you the medical records. You can look at them, but he's going to be required to take those medical records back. He will not leave them in your possession; do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
THE COURT: And it's the medical records from the day her mom took her to the hospital. Is that all there is?

MR. FELICIANO: There's some follow-up testing as well that was done.

THE COURT: Okay. But it's all --
MR. FELICIANO: It's related.
THE COURT: The day when she reported, her mom took her to the hospital, right?

MR. FELICIANO: Yeah. Yes.
THE COURT: And then some subsequent follow-up?
MR. FELICIANO: Yes.
THE COURT: So it's not voluminous?
MR. FELICIANO: No, no, no. I --
THE COURT: Okay.
MR. FELICIANO: I can go -- like next week I can go show him all the records.

THE COURT: Okay. And, sir, you understand that? Your attorney is going to come show it to you. And you understand your matter has been set for trial. I know you're concerned that the matter is not set for trial. It is set for January 16 of next year.

THE DEFENDANT: I don't want him as my attorney anymore because he hasn't done anything for me.

THE COURT: Okay.
THE DEFENDANT: He's only been lying. He hasn't been going to see me. In 17 months, he's only come to see me twice. He says he's going and he never shows up.

THE COURT: He -- I'm sorry. He said what?
THE DEFENDANT: He's going and he never shows up.
MR. FELICIANO: Well, I --
THE COURT: I mean, you're visiting your client, correct?
MR. FELICIANO: Yeah. And I told him I would see him next week to show him the medical records that there's -- there's several things that need to be done in the case, and there's time to do it before his trial date. And it will get done, but from the beginning --

THE COURT: I just want to make sure you are going to see him.
MR. FELICIANO: From the beginning of our representation, it's been a little difficult, so.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. FELICIANO: But I am willing to work with him to defend him and try his case.

THE COURT: Okay. All right.
THE DEFENDANT: I've never been difficult. He's only been telling me lies. I asked him for my full discovery and he's never taken it.

THE COURT: Okay. So that's one thing. Has -- sorry. Has he been provided with a full set of his discovery, less those medical records?

MR. FELICIANO: He's been provided what the beginning of the case provided with what I had at the time, which were statements and things like that, but no medical records.

THE COURT: All right, so he has everything but the medical records?
MR. FELICIANO: To my - again, to my understanding. I could go visit him and see what he has and we can compare.

THE COURT: Okay. So your attorney is representing to the Court that he has provided you with all of the discovery, less the medical records, and that he's even willing to come over, see what you have and make sure you do have a full copy of your discovery. So he's going to do that by next week. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do, but I don't want him as an attorney anymore.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, you don't get to choose your attorney. Based on your motion, l'm not inclined to dismiss this attorney.

THE DEFENDANT: The only thing that he has handed me is the police report.

THE COURT: Well, he's indicated he's given you more than that. So I'm going to ask him to come see you to make sure you have a full set of your discovery because you are entitled to see the evidence against you.

MR. FELICIANO: I'll bring him a new copy. I'll make a copy of everything and l'll take it to him.

THE COURT: Okay. Will you make sure you provide the Court with a receipt of copy so --

MR. FELICIANO: Sure.

THE COURT: -- because he seems to say the same thing? So then we can have a record that you have provided him with his discovery.

MR. FELICIANO: No problem.
THE DEFENDANT: Perfect.
THE COURT: Okay. Also, in your motion, you seem to think that the trial is being delayed because I need something. I'm ready for trial. I don't need anything, so I just wanted to clear that up. Do you know what that's all about?

MR. FELICIANO: I don't.
THE COURT: Okay.
MR. FELICIANO: But I don't see why this shouldn't go on, I believe, the $16^{\text {th }}$ of January. We should be ready to go. There's other -- of course, there's other matters set around that time, but --

THE COURT: Sure.
MR. FELICIANO: -- it should be ready to go.
THE COURT: And the State's ready to go?
MR. SWEETIN: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay. Also, I just want to make sure you understand that if Mr. Feliciano gets an offer from the State of Nevada he is legally required to convey that offer to you and to give you his honest opinion about that offer. So that's not anything to get him dismissed. If he's conveying an offer to you, he's doing what he's supposed to do.

THE DEFENDANT: That's all I want for him to do his job.
THE COURT: Okay.
THE DEFENDANT: Okay.
THE COURT: All right, so I'm just going to take it off. I'm going to
deny the motion and take it off calendar, and then l'm assuming if there's anything else it will be brought before me before January.

MR. FELICIANO: All right, thank you.
THE COURT: Okay, thank you.
THE DEFENDANT: Thank you.
[Proceedings concluded at 9:04 a.m.]
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THE COURT: State versus Vasquez-Reyes, C316382; he's present.

MR. FELICIANO: Good morning, Mike Feliciano for Mr. Vasquez-Reyes.

THE COURT: Thank you.
MR. STEPHENS: Rob Stephens for the State.
THE COURT: Thank you. He's in custody; he's using the services of the Interpreter. Will the Interpreter please state her name for the record?

THE COURT INTERPRETER: Alicia Herrera.
THE COURT: It's on for calendar call.
MR. FELICIANO: May we approach?
THE COURT: Of course.
MR. FELICIANO: Thank you.
[Bench conference -- begins]
THE COURT: Good morning. Well I hope you're ready.
MR. SCHWARTZER: Well --
THE COURT: I hope you're not approaching to tell me you're not ready.

MR. STEPHENS: Well, we're not sure yet --
THE COURT: Okay.
MR. STEPHENS: -- cause it's Jim Sweeten's case, he's trying it and he has the Sena [phonetic] case next week.

THE COURT: He has the what?
MR. STEPHENS: The Sena case.
THE COURT: Okay.
MR. STEPHENS: In front of Judge Kephart. Do you know that one or --

THE COURT: Not really.
MR. FELICIANO: It's a super old case.
MR. STEPHENS: It's bad video; it was a media case.
THE COURT: Oh gosh, videos?
MR. FELICIANO: Yeah, oh yeah, like a lot. We won't go into it but --

THE COURT: Okay. Yeah, yeah.
MR. FELICIANO: -- but and there's some pending motions on.

THE COURT: Does that have to -- is that going to go forward?

MR. STEPHENS: We're not sure yet.
MR. FELICIANO: Calendar calls Wednesday.
MR. STEPHENS: Mr. Sweetin's in another airport locked in and -- and so he's --

THE COURT: Was he at JFK or something?
MR. STEPHENS: He was at JFK.
MR. FELICIANO: Well, yeah did something happen to him?
MR. STEPHENS: No, the --
THE COURT: Yeah. It flooded, freezing, --

MR. STEPHENS: Yeah.
THE COURT: -- but like yeah, it was flooded.
MR. FELICIANO: Oh.
MR. STEPHENS: My understanding is Jim would potentially be ready on the case, but he -- the Sena case is so old that the calendar call is Wednesday. I'd like to kick it to Thursday.

THE COURT: Do you want to kick it to Thursday to see what Kephart's going to do?

MR. STEPHENS: Yeah, it's a firm -- I know that -- yeah, I know it's a firm set, but I heard there's maybe discovery issues, so, I don't know.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. STEPHENS: And then -- I don't know -- I thought Jim would be back so now I know why he's not. But there's --

THE COURT: Oh my gosh, that's awful. He's not still there is he?

MR. STEPHENS: I don't -- I haven't heard back from him this morning, so --

THE COURT: Oh, my gosh; the poor guy.
MR. STEPHENS: Okay. So, Thursday we'll have a better picture once Jim gets back and we --

THE COURT: You'll be ready to go?
MR. FELICIANO: Well, I have pending motions that are set for next Tuesday --

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. FELICIANO: -- which it's just a discovery motion, a suppression motion. If we need to be we will. I just didn't know -THE COURT: Okay.

MR. FELICIANO: -- we're --
THE COURT: Because I can hear those motions before the --
MR. FELICIANO: Yeah. And I heard -- Jim called and he said there was a bunch of cases on that are older than ours that was his understanding or at least that's what I thought that were -- that might have -- might go, so I guess we'll see Thursday.

THE COURT: You're ready to go; right?
MR. FELICIANO: Um --
THE COURT: I just know your client freaks out every time you ask for a continuance.

MR. FELICIANO: Well, he doesn't cooperate. He still won't cooperate, but l'm going to go for -- I mean, he can just sit there and be ridiculous -- ridiculous, I don't know.

THE COURT: He's still not cooperating?
MR. FELICIANO: I saw him a week ago and he was just -- he doesn't really speak to me. He's angry. He doesn't seem to care. It's just --

THE COURT: Let's see. Did you tell him about the ten life sentences?

MR. FELICIANO: He doesn't care. He doesn't care or at least that's what he tells me.

THE COURT: Okay, because that can't possibly be true.

MR. FELICIANO: Well --
THE COURT: If there's a human being that doesn't care about ten -- well, I don't know.

MR. FELICIANO: Well, alright let's maybe we'll --
THE COURT: I believe you.
MR. FELICIANO: That's what he -- I mean, I was -- and my interpreter was there too. It's -- we're just like -- I don't know how to deal with him. He's just --

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. FELICIANO: He's just -- but you'll see Thursday.
THE COURT: But you're ready to go but if Mr. Sweetin got some airport issues --

MR. FELICIANO: Yeah, the motions I filed --
THE COURT: And I can't wait to hear --
MR. FELICIANO: -- yeah, I don't know if the motions I filed are going work. If there's something we're missing or something, but it's just kind of just to cover up -- keep myself covered.

THE COURT: You've got it.
MR. FELICIANO: So, Thursday?
THE COURT: Okay.
[Bench conference -- concludes]
THE COURT: All right. Mr. Vasquez-Reyes, the District Attorney that's going to try this case isn't here. I'll know better whether the District Attorney's going to be ready to trial on Thursday, so I'm going to continue the calendar call for the $11^{\text {th }}$. But your attorney has
indicated he's ready to go forward.
THE CLERK: January $11^{\text {th }} 8: 30$.
THE COURT: How long will this take?
MR. FELICIANO: At least a week.
THE COURT: Just -- okay. Do you think it'll be done in five judicial days?

MR. FELICIANO: I doubt it.
THE COURT: Well, you said a week.
MR. FELICIANO: At least --
THE COURT: What's a week to you?
MR. FELICIANO: -- at least a week.
THE COURT: Okay.
MR. FELICIANO: Five, well --
THE COURT: So, it will probably spill over into next week?
MR. FELICIANO: Yes, yes.
THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
MR. FELICIANO: Thank you.
MR. STEPHENS: Thank you, Your Honor.
[Hearing concluded at 9:25 a.m.]

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.


Court Recorder/Transcriber

RTRAN

$$
\begin{gathered}
\text { DISTRICT COURT } \\
\text { CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA }
\end{gathered}
$$

THE STATE OF NEVADA,
Plaintiff,

VS.
ARMANDO VASQUEZ-REYES, aka ARMANDO VASQUIEZREYES,

Defendant.

CASE NO. C-16-316382-1
DEPT. NO. XII

BEFORE THE HONORABLE MICHELLE LEAVITT, DISTRICT COURT JUDGE

THURSDAY, JANUARY 11, 2018
RECORDER'S TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING: CALENDAR CALL

APPEARANCES:

For the State:

For the Defendant:
MIKE FELICIANO, ESQ.
Deputy Public Defender
MARIA PERALTA DE GOMEZ
Spanish Interpreter

RECORDED BY: KRISTINE SANTI, COURT RECORDER

Las Vegas, Nevada; Thursday, January 11, 2018
[Hearing commenced at 8:42 a.m.]
THE COURT: Does he need the Interpreter?
MR. FELICIANO: Yes, he does.
THE COURT: Okay. We want to welcome back Mr. Sweetin.
We heard you had quite the odyssey.
MR. SWEETIN: Yes, Idid.
THE COURT: Well, we're glad you're back safe.
MR. SWEETIN: Thank you.
THE COURT: Mr. Vasquez-Reyes is present. He's in custody and it's on for calendar call.

MR. FELICIANO: May we approach?
THE COURT: Of course.
[Bench conference -- begins]
MR. FELICIANO: So, I wasn't sure -- is there space for us if we're ready or --

THE COURT: We have Jeff Banks -- I have Jeff Banks going -- you know, I have somebody --

THE CLERK: Brown.
THE COURT: -- Brown that's trailing.
MR. FELICIANO: We're -- I know Mr. Sweetin's announcing ready.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. FELICIANO: There's a few -- I would be ready if I have everything that I need. There's a few items that -- one of them is --
okay, I filed a suppression motion --
THE COURT: Mm-hmm.
MR. FELICIANO: -- and my client is telling me what is in the transcript, he never said any of it. Probably a long --

THE COURT: In the Court transcript?
MR. FELICIANO: No. In the -- in his voluntary statement to the police.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. FELICIANO: Probably a longshot, but he wants to hear it. He wants proof that he said this stuff, so --

THE COURT: Okay. That's fine. He can have the audio.
MR. FELICIANO: Yeah, so I just -- if I have it in like just relatively soon, but I mean, would we have time. Will we be able to go -to anyway -- to see --

THE COURT: I'm not sure --
MR. FELICIANO: You don't think --
THE COURT: -- I mean, there's a possibility Banks won't go that's why I put somebody behind him and so I don't know if I set a third one. What do we have next week?

THE CLERK: Next week?
THE COURT: Uh-huh. I mean, could I just give them -- yes the following week?

THE CLERK: Yes.
THE COURT: Could I just give them the following week?
THE CLERK: Yes.

MR. FELICIANO: That'll work.
THE COURT: I can give you the following week.

MR. FELICIANO: So, yeah. Let me just check my calendars.
THE COURT: What will that be?
THE CLERK: The week of January 23.
THE COURT: The week of --
THE CLERK: So that's Monday the $22^{\text {nd }}$.
THE COURT: Okay. So, you will get the $22^{\text {nd }}$. How long is this going to take?

MR. SWEETIN: I think it's -- l've got eight witnesses; there's two victims that'll be testifying. So, I'm thinking that in your department I think I get full days on Thursdays and Fridays; right? So, I think we could probably get it done in five days. It might go over, but --

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. FELICIANO: Sounds about right. I don't know if we have anybody else to be here. The -- so we have discovery motion and a suppression motion on Tuesday. As long as we have like --

MR. SWEETIN: Late a little bit.
MR. FELICIANO: Huh?
MR. SWEETIN: Yeah. So, we can do that this Tuesday?
MR. FELICIANO: Yeah. So, for -- we can -- we can see what's going on with all the discovery Tuesday. And as long as I have everything next week, we're good to go.

THE COURT: Okay. See you all on the $22^{\text {nd }}$ at $10: 30$ with
jury selection?
MR. FELICIANO: Uh-huh, assuming I have everything.
THE COURT: That way your client will be happy.
MR. FELICIANO: He's not going to be happy after.
THE COURT: Why won't he be you're happy going to trial? But will you be able to get counsel that audio?

MR. SWEETIN: Yes.
THE COURT: Is this audio of his --
MR. FELICIANO: Of his voluntary statement to the police.
Well, I need like the voluntary -- pretty much it. He doesn't really believe anything I say, so --

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. FELICIANO: -- I need proof of that that I can show him, and that's still might not be enough. I did -- there's an issue where, just so you know, where you asked me to take the discovery and do an ROC. He wouldn't sign it, so I didn't file it. But my Interpreter was there; he refused to sign anything. He's -- l've given him discovery three times now.

THE COURT: Did he take it?
MR. FELICIANO: Yes, but --
THE COURT: Okay.
MR. FELICIANO: I've given it to him three times.
THE COURT: All right. We can make a record that regardless of whether he signed the ROC; he took it.

MR. FELICIANO: Mm-hmm. Yeah, and we'll see Tuesday
where we're at with everything?
THE COURT: Okay.
MR. FELICIANO: That's fine.
MR. FELICIANO: So, we --
THE COURT: But right now we can set it for the $22^{\text {nd }}$ at 10:30?

MR. SWEETIN: That's fine. So, as far as Tuesday is concerned, we can set it for an evidentiary hearing time just so we can do the evidentiary hearing are we doing a calendar? What are your calendars -- I guess today actually you got Tuesday --

THE COURT: And what evidentiary hearing do we need to do?

MR. FELICIANO: Jackson v. Denno.
THE COURT: Oh.
MR. FELICIANO: Well, the thing is, I need the audio first so I can listen to it.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. SWEETIN: No, I can get you the audio by later today.
MR. FELICIANO: Oh, okay.
MR. SWEETIN: The basis that -- the basis of the motion -- I --
THE COURT: All right. So, we then -- okay this is --
MR. SWEETIN: Yeah. I'm going to have the opposition filed today, but the whole basis of the motion is that he didn't understand his Miranda. He's not contesting that the Miranda was properly given or anything like that. He's just saying that he didn't understand it. So, I
mean, I don't know if that evidentiary call could probably be made by looking at the transcript or we can probably on an abundance of caution present the evidence, you know, witnesses or whatnot.

THE COURT: Okay. Do I have the transcript and the audio because it sounds familiar? But have I listened to it before?

MR. SWEETIN: You don't have the audio, you have the transcript.

MR. FELICIANO: The transcript's attached to my motion.
THE COURT: Okay. So, maybe I could have the audio then I can listen to it and then we may not need an evidentiary hearing.

MR. FELICIANO: Do you want to do that Tuesday or do you want to argue the motions, the other motion first to see what -- where that leads us; we'll deal with whatever?

THE COURT: We can do jury selection on Monday. Tuesday morning, the next morning, we can do whatever motions. Maybe we'll have the jury picked by then, if not, then we'll just continue with jury selection.

MR. SWEETIN: So, if there is an evidentiary hearing we'll bump it until the following week you're saying; is that right? So, we wouldn't have that on this Tuesday but the following --

THE COURT: Right.
MR. SWEETIN:-- week during trial?
THE COURT: Right, during trial.
MR. FELICIANO: But this Tuesday we'll be -- address all the discovery issues?

THE COURT: Uh-huh.

MR. FELICIANO: Okay, perfect.
THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
MR. SWEETIN: Thank you.
[Bench conference -- concludes]
THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Vasquez-Reyes, we have tentatively set your trial to start Monday January $22^{\text {nd }}$ at 10:30 for jury selection. And we'll be back on next Tuesday to address some discovery issues and other motions your attorney has filed; okay?

THE DEFENDANT: Okay.
THE COURT: Thank you.
MR. FELICIANO: Thank you.
[Hearing concluded at 8:48 a.m.]
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THE COURT: State of Nevada versus Armando Vasquez-
Reyes. Where's he at? He's present in custody. The Public Defender's motion to compel and suppress, let's go through -- let's do the motion to suppress first.

MR. FELICIANO: We -- we were -- we talked. I talked to Mr. Sweetin last week; we're just going to ask to pass these to Thursday -THE COURT: Oh.

MR. FELICIANO: -- if that's okay.
MR. SWEETIN: We had talked to the Judge about this at sidebar at calendar call when the motion had just been filed and there was some discussion in regards to the recording might be dispositive and wouldn't have to have a Jackson v. Denno hearing.

THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, I -- I --
THE COURT: Okay. Hold --
THE DEFENDANT: -- I cannot hear you; sorry.
THE COURT: Okay. The record shall also reflect the presence of the Court Interpreter on behalf of the Defendant. Okay. There was -- there was some sidebar discussions, but what --

MR. SWEETIN: Yes, and --
THE COURT: -- between you guys and the Judge?
MR. SWEETIN: Yeah. And based upon the sidebar discussions, I think it might be easiest if we just continue this over to Thursday and then the Court can decide whether they want a Jackson v.

Denno hearing or not.
THE COURT: Okay. And I read through -- I read through the whole statement and I read through the motions and I could certainly entertain the argument on the motion, but if you guys have had some discussions with Judge Leavitt, then I really would be much more comfortable letting her hear this.

MR. FELICIANO: Okay.
THE COURT: So, let's move this till Thursday --
THE CLERK: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: -- at 8:30.
THE CLERK: January 18, 8:30.
MR. FELICIANO: Thank you.
THE COURT: Do you understand? Comprende? Okay. All right.
[Hearing concluded at 9:53 a.m.]
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THE COURT: State versus Vasquez-Reyes, C316382. The Defendants present and he's in custody. He's using the services of the Interpreter. Will the Interpreter state her name for the record?

THE COURT INTERPRETER: Yes, Your Honor. Maria Peralta De Gomez.

THE COURT: Thank you. Okay. There's two motions. The motion to suppress, is the Defense submitting it just on what you've -I'm not sure I really understand your motion except that maybe you're just asking for a hearing, and I'm not sure you've even put forth enough.

MR. FELICIANO: Well --
THE COURT: I've read the transcript of the -- I'm not sure what your contention is because I don't know what else -- I think they were explained extraordinarily well in this case.

MR. FELICIANO: There's certain things that are not in the motion that I think --

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. FELICIANO: -- only Mr. Vasquez-Reyes could really explain, which is --

THE COURT: Well, that's why I wondered. Were you just asking for a hearing --

MR. FELICIANO: Yes.
THE COURT: -- because there's things your client wants to testify too?

MR. FELICIANO: Yes.
THE COURT: That are inconsistent with the transcribed -- the transcribed testimony interview?

MR. FELICIANO: Yes.
MR. SWEETIN: Well, we'll submit it to the Court; Judge. If the Court wants to set a Jackson v. Denno hearing I think we could probably do that right before trial.

MR. FELICIANO: I mean, I can -- l'm going to go see him tomorrow and prepare him for the hearing and if -- I'm going to show him the video and all that stuff and that might change his mind. If it does, I can contact the Court and we can take it off calendar if that's what --

THE COURT: But -- has he -- has he gotten a copy of the transcript?

MR. FELICIANO: Yes.
THE COURT: And he's read it?
MR. FELICIANO: I -- presumably; yes.
THE COURT: He thinks the video might be different?
MR. FELICIANO: I'm not -- I don't really feel comfortable saying --

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. FELICIANO: -- what he thinks, but --
THE COURT: All right. I'm just wondering because there's a written transcript of the proceedings, so that's fine. I can set it for a hearing.

MR. SWEETIN: Judge, he indicated last time he might want
to look at the actual video, and I have it here if I could approach?
THE COURT: Sure. Thank you.
MR. SWEETIN: Counsel's been provided one as well.
THE COURT: Thank you. All right. So, you just want to set it for Monday?

MR. FELICIANO: Please.
THE COURT: Okay. We will set it for Monday morning at 10:30. You're for sure starting on Monday because my other one, it resolved.

MR. FELICIANO: Okay. So, after that we'll go straight into jury selection?

THE COURT: Sure.
MR. FELICIANO: Okay.
THE COURT: And then, I think, your motion regarding discovery, did you want to -- does the State want to say anything?

MR. SWEETIN: I think that we've got the discovery issues worked out at this point, I believe. There is one issue and that has to do with CPS records. I determined just this week that there are a limited number of CPS records to the order of about 14 pages. I've represented to Defense counsel that they relate to this particular incident; it's sort of regurgitation of what's in the police reports. It also makes reference to the victim and the evaluation of the victim's mother. This was a situation where the Defendant was the boyfriend of the victim's mother.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. SWEETIN: They all lived in the same household. So,
there was an evaluation determination that the victim's mother was protective and she was able to keep the children.

So, that's essentially what's -- what's in this. I haven't been able to provide a copy to Defense without the order of the Court. I do have a copy here if the Court wants to -- wants to review it.

THE COURT: Sure. Sounds like it's going to be discoverable?

MR. SWEETIN: I believe so.
THE COURT: All right. So, l'll review it today and I'm assuming based on what the DA said that I'm just going to turn it over to the Defense.

MR. FELICIANO: Okay.
THE COURT: And we'll provide a copy to you.
MR. FELICIANO: All right.
THE COURT: Is there anything else regarding discovery?
MR. FELICIANO: There are -- there's therapy -- looks like there's therapy records. I don't know -- we don't -- we don't have them. I --

THE COURT: Just tell me why, I mean, what's the basis for -just because the type of case it is? You believe that you're entitled -- I'm not sure you're entitled to them straight out.

MR. FELICIANO: Well --
THE COURT: You think there are some?
MR. FELICIANO: -- well, we -- we know there are some.
THE COURT: Okay.

MR. FELICIANO: I don't know. I didn't say that we're entitled to them. I would want them to be reviewed by the Court.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. SWEETIN: Well, in all sexual assault cases pursuant to statute, the victim is given the opportunity to have counseling, and that's what happened in this case. There is counseling that occurred after the sexual assault was reported to the police. Now, the State's position has always been that's clearly not in the State's possession; it's not discoverable from the State. And if in fact, the Defense were to subpoena those records, I think that there is a good defense that could be put up that in fact they're privileged records.

THE COURT: Well, that's always my concern. The State's not in possession of them?

MR. SWEETIN: That's correct.
THE COURT: You know they exist?
MR. SWEETIN: Well, I know that she went to counseling. I don't know if there's written records; I'm not sure of that.

THE COURT: Have you subpoenaed them?
MR. FELICIANO: No. I mean, they -- they're not going to give them to us, I mean, and we've tried before, not in this case, but they're not going to respond to our subpoena, so maybe --

THE COURT: Because they're privileged, and again, they're not in the State's possession. You basically put forth, you know, they exist, so give them to us.

MR. FELICIANO: Well, I mean, at least a review. I mean, if
she's recanting at therapy I think we'd be entitled to that, but I don't know. I have no access to them, so there's no way for me to find out.

MR. SWEETIN: Well, I mean, if there was any indication that the victim was recanting I think that that would be evidence I would have -- that is evidence I would have to produce over to the Defense.

THE COURT: Mm-hmm.
MR. SWEETIN: And I would represent that I've talked to the victim as recently as last week, and I don't believe that to be the case.

MR. FELICIANO: Well, but that's not, I mean, that's between him and the victim not between the therapist and the victim. There could be -- it would be a different conversation.

THE COURT: Yeah, but you're asking me to like invade the privilege and order a victim's therapeutic records turned over. I'm not sure you've even put forth an initial showing that I should even review them. I've basically been told that they exist; therefore turn them over. So, I guess if there -- you know, I don't think you'd be entitled to them right out because they're privileged. I just don't understand that just because it's the type of case you'd be entitled to all their -- the victim's therapeutic records.

MR. FELICIANO: And we may not, --
THE COURT: I --
MR. FELICIANO: -- but certain -- but we don't know that because we don't have access to them. So there's no way to really determine without --

THE COURT: But the State's not required to turn them over
because they're not in their possession. They can't have access to them either, they're privileged.

MR. FELICIANO: Well --
THE COURT: If they had them and they reviewed them, that would be different. And they knew that there was Brady that would be different.

MR. FELICIANO: Well, I mean, if --
THE COURT: But they're not in their possession.
MR. FELICIANO: -- that's the position. I mean, if you just denied the request for records, then my record will be made.

THE COURT: Okay. The request for the therapeutic records is denied. Is there anything else that's really in dispute at this point?

MR. FELICIANO: Court's indulgence for one moment.
[Colloquy between Defense and the State]
MR. FELICIANO: Okay. So, I just spoke to Mr. Sweetin, number 33 -- 33 and 34 those are our Summit and Miller requests. We would ask that the State make an inquiry during pretrial to see if any of those materials exist.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. SWEETIN: And that's fine. I have no problem --
THE COURT: All right.
MR. SWEETIN: -- with that, Judge. I have no knowledge of it as of this point --

THE COURT: Of any prior allegations? Okay.
MR. FELICIANO: Prior allegations or sources of knowledge,
other sources of knowledge.
THE COURT: How old is the victim?
MR. SWEETIN: At the time she made the disclosure she was 14 years old.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. So, the State can make the initial disclosure to determine whether there's any of that information, but if they were aware of that, yes, they would be required to turn that over to you. Is there anything else?

MR. FELICIANO: I think that's it.
THE COURT: Okay. I'll see you on Monday.
MR. FELICIANO: Okay. And we'll be contacted to pick up the CPS records at some point?

THE COURT: Sure.
MR. FELICIANO: Thank you.
MR. SWEETIN: Just for the record Judge, I have talked to Defense counsel in regards to Defendant's statement, which we plan on playing in the course of the trial. There have been some redactions made and that's by agreement of the parties, just for the record.

MR. FELICIANO: May we approach briefly?
THE COURT: Sure. Do I have an unredacted version?
MR. SWEETIN: You have your redacted version?
[Bench conference -- begins]
MR. FELICIANO: So, I didn't want to put this on the record --
THE COURT: That's okay.
MR. FELICIANO: -- because it's kind of silly, but l'm going to
go show him his statement tomorrow. Hopefully the jail lets me in there with a laptop. The jails been difficult --

THE COURT: Oh, okay.
MR. FELICIANO: -- been really difficult lately, but l'll do my best.

THE COURT: You've got it.
MR. FELICIANO: If he says -- my position is if he says that's not me or that's not my voice, --

THE COURT: Oh.
MR. FELICIANO: -- I don't need to do anything further. I mean I need a good faith basis to -- I'm not going to hire somebody to see if it's CGI or special effects or -- I don't think I need to do that. I think we're still good to go; fair enough?

THE COURT: Okay. Are you -- that's video [indiscernible] if your client says that's not me?

MR. FELICIANO: Yeah.
THE COURT: Okay, because that would be strange.
MR. FELICIANO: Uh-huh.
THE COURT: Oh, okay. That's why you wanted to approach?

MR. FELICIANO: Yes. Because I don't --
THE COURT: Okay.
MR. FELICIANO: -- I'm just saying, I don't think -- I don't think I need to go out and hire somebody and have it -- I'll make the record if -- when I need to if it gets to that point, but there's stuff that he's told me
that it just didn't happen.
THE COURT: Okay. But kind of was trying to infer from your motion, and I thought that maybe there were some things that were -that your client made were different than the transcript. So, --

MR. FELICIANO: Well, yeah that that --
THE COURT: -- based on my inference was kind of correct?
MR. FELICIANO: Yeah.
THE COURT: But -- now you've looked at the video. Did it like, show the people?

MR. FELICIANO: I couldn't open the video on my computer. I'm still -- I had a problem with it.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. FELICIANO: So, I asked Mr. Sweetin. He told me the video is fine l've got to find another computer, but it's -- l'm sure it's --

THE COURT: Does it show people?
MR. SWEETIN: No. It does show the people. At the beginning of the interview the camera cuts off his face because he's sitting back on the chair.

THE COURT: Uh-huh.
MR. SWEETIN: In the course of the interview he scoots forward; you can see his face.

THE COURT: Okay. I think -- you'll go and show it to him; right?

MR. FELICIANO: Yes, but he -- I can show him the most obvious thing, and he will not listen to me. So --

THE COURT: Oh.
MR. FELICIANO: -- I don't think it's --it's not a competency issue or anything like that, it's I don't like what's happening to me issue.

THE COURT: No, I understand. Okay.
MR. FELICIANO: So, l'm just -- if it becomes an issue he might have to make his record, but I don't see -- this shouldn't postpone -- I don't want this to postpone anything.

THE COURT: Okay. I've got it. I got it.
MR. FELICIANO: Because -- I mean, but --
THE COURT: Because like -- okay, I mean. But would he get on the stand and testify at trial that's not me, it wasn't me? Okay.

MR. FELICIANO: At that point, I hope not, but we'll see, I guess.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. FELICIANO: It's his trial.
THE COURT: Okay. All right. Well, you've got to say what you've got to say, I mean --

MR. FELICIANO: Uh-huh.
THE COURT: Okay.
MR. FELICIANO: Okay, just wanted to give you the heads up.
THE COURT: I appreciate that.
MR. FELICIANO: Thank you.
THE COURT: Thank you.
[Bench conference -- concludes]
THE COURT: So, we'll see you on Monday.
MR. FELICIANO: Thank you.
[Hearing concluded at 9:39 a.m.]
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[Hearing commenced at 10:48 a.m.]
THE COURT: The State of Nevada versus Vasquez-Reyes,
C316382. The Defendant is present; he's in custody; he's using the services of the Interpreter. Will the Interpreter please state her name fo the record?

THE INTERPRETER: Elsa Marisco, M-A-R-I-S-C-O.
THE COURT: Thank you.
THE INTERPRETER: Court Certified Interpreter, Your Honor.
THE COURT: The parties can state their appearance.
MR. SWEETIN: Yeah, James Sweetin and Jennifer Clemons for the State.

MR. FELICIANO: Mr. Feliciano and Nadia Hojjat for Mr. Vasquez-Reyes.

THE COURT: Mr. Feliciano, do you want to go ahead?
MR. FELICIANO: Yes, Your Honor. So, let's put on the record that we had our chamber's meeting on Friday, and upon review of Mr. Vasquez-Reyes' medical records we need an expert now to look at those records and possibly use the expert for the Denno hearing and possibly the trial. So, l've looked at them, I -- some things I understand, some things I don't, but it looks like there's something there that needs to be at least explored --

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. FELICIANO: -- before we go forward. Additionally, we talked about the issue of the STD coming into evidence. I guess as it
stands now, I guess that would be for me to move to admit that. I would imagine I think that's where we are now. So, I know the Sate filed a bench memo so there's no calendar date so I just imagine that just stands.

THE COURT: I agree. I mean -- but if you were seeking to admit that information I think you would probably have to bring that before the Court before you asked a witness that.

MR. FELICIANO: We should. So, based on that, we are asking for a -- to continue the trial for --

THE COURT: Well, you didn't -- you've asked for than that on the STD. You indicated you're going to test your client.

MR. FELICIANO: Yes, well --
THE COURT: That your client has not been tested.
MR. FELICIANO: That's correct.
THE COURT: That you thought he should have been and that you're --

MR. FELICIANO: That's correct.
THE COURT: -- going to privately test him?
MR. FELICIANO: That is correct.
THE COURT: Okay. Wasn't there a third issue?
MR. FELICIANO: I remember those were the two big ones, I think.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. And you want a continuance in light of that?

MR. FELICIANO: We do.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. SWEETIN: And just to make a complete record Judge, in regards to the medical records, the State opposed the -- any sort of continuance on that basis. Defense counsel indicated that some of the medical records that the Defendant had when he was taken into custody at the jail indicated that he had an elevated blood pressure or his heart rate was higher. The State submits that I don't think that that's out of the ordinary for someone who is just arrested for a sexual assault. I don't think that that is a basis to delay this trial to have a medical expert look and see if that's out of the range of normalcy because I think in this particular case it's clear; it's reasonable to assume that it probably is.

The other issue that the Defendant brought up was in regards to the fact that the victim in this case, in the course of the sexual assault exam, tested positive for the sexually transmitted disease chlamydia. The Defendant now wants to have himself tested to see if he has chlamydia. Now, the State's position is at this point that it's not relevant. Defense wants to be able to have that exam done and then briefed to the Court why it's relevant in this matter.

We submitted it to the Court's discretion in regards to whether or not a continuance was appropriate under that circumstance and the Court has determined that a continuance is -- is appropriate. But it's our understanding as well that that's really the purpose of this continuance for the Defense to have the Defendant tested for the sexually transmitted disease chlamydia.

THE COURT: I agree. And I just want to make sure, Mr.

Feliciano, you have discussed with your client the privacy issues that will be raised, and that if he does take this test that this is very, very likely that the State will get those results.

MR. FELICIANO: Yes, we have discussed it. We're going to meet with him again and discuss it further, but I don't -- I don't want to give up like what our conversation is but --

THE COURT: I understand.
MR. FELICIANO: -- that we have discussed it.
THE COURT: But I just told you I wanted to make sure that he understood that if the trial went forward it would go forward with he's never been tested. With the request for a continuance, he could be tested and the results of those -- the result of that test could be admissible at a prior trial. I just wanted to make sure that that was out there.

MR. FELICIANO: Understood.
THE COURT: Okay. And you understand that sir; correct?
THE DEFENDANT: Yes, yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: And you understand your attorney is seeking to continue the trial?
[Defendant speaks through the use of the Spanish Court Interpreter] THE DEFENDANT: For how long?

MR. FELICIANO: We discussed dates with May.
MR. SWEETIN: I believe we both have the ability to do the trial May $29^{\text {th }}$, that week.

THE COURT: So, it looks like it's going to be continued into

May or June. Do you understand that?
THE DEFENDANT: No, no, no.
MR. FELICIANO: We --
THE DEFENDANT: No.
MR. FELICIANO: Can I have the Court's indulgence for a moment?

THE COURT: Okay. I don't think we've released our jury panel.
[Colloquy between the Defense, Defendant and Court Interpreter]
THE COURT: You know, Mr. Feliciano, I don't think I need his consent. You've sought the Court's request to continue it. I've indicated I'm going to grant it. I brought him here today to make sure he understood a couple of things. Test results could now become admissible and that you were seeking a continuance so we weren't going to trial today. Do you understand those two things; sir?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
THE COURT: Okay. Your motion to continue is granted.
Now l'm going to continue trial. It appears though May $29^{\text {th }}$ is for both sides; agreeable?

MR. FELICIANO: Yes.
MR. SWEETIN: Yes.
THE COURT: And your calendar call.
THE CLERK: May 22, 8:30.
MR. FELICIANO: We also have -- well, I -- because Mr.
Sweetin wants to just talk about the offer? You want the offer on the
record today?
MR. SWEETIN: Yeah -- well, we've had discussions as the Court knows. There still has to be a Denno hearing, a determination by the Court whether a Denno hearing is necessary. And so, we were going to ask for a two week status check that will allow Mr. Feliciano to evaluate what he might want to present at the Denno hearing, and then discuss it further with the Court at that time. And on that date, the State would also -- there's been an offer extended in this case of one count of sexual assault, punishable by 10 years to life in prison, and one count of lewdness, victim under 14, punishable by 10 to life -- 10 years to life in prison with the State retaining the right to argue, and the Defense retaining the right to argue as to whether those two counts would run concurrently or consecutively. That's the offer of negotiation, and l've indicated to Mr. Feliciano that that would be left open until the next status check, and then it would be withdrawn.

MR. FELICIANO: And yes. And what we will do in the meantime we will go discuss the offer one more time with Mr. VasquezReyes. Additionally, in the next two weeks before the status check I hope to at least have -- find a doctor and have him review the records and see -- his or her availability and set the hearing.

THE COURT: Within two weeks you're going to do that?
MR. FELICIANO: I'm going to try.
THE COURT: Okay. I think it's great. Okay. So, we'll set it down for two weeks.

THE CLERK: February $8^{\text {th }}$ at $8: 30$.

THE COURT: And the State's leaving that offer open until that date?

MR. SWEETIN: That's correct; Judge.
THE COURT: Okay. And sir, Mr. Vasquez-Reyes, the State of Nevada is leaving their offer open until that date. So, you'll need to inform the Court whether you wish to accept that offer or reject it and proceed and go to trial on that date. Okay. We'll see you on February $8^{\text {th }}$.

MR. SWEETIN: Thank you, Judge.
MR. FELICIANO: Thank you.
[Hearing concluded at 10:58 a.m.]
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[Hearing commenced at 9:12 a.m.]
THE COURT: Vasquez. Oh, we're still -- I think it's Mr.
Sweetin and then Mr. Feliciano.
UNKNOWN SPEAKER: And he was here, Your Honor.
THE COURT: I know it. Oh, there's Mr. Sweetin. Is Mr.
Feliciano going to appear?
MR. SWEETIN: Yeah, he was here then. Said he had to run up to a --

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. SWEETIN: -- another courtroom.
THE COURT: Department 1. Who's that; Cory?
THE CLERK: Cory.
THE COURT: What are they going -- what kind of hearing is it?

THE CLERK: It's a short hearing.
THE COURT: Okay.
[Hearing trailed at 9:12 a.m.]
[Hearing resumed at 9:34 a.m.]
THE COURT: C316382, he's present. He's in custody. He's using the services of the Interpreter. Will the Interpreter please state her name for the record?

THE INTERPRETER: Alex Andrade.
THE COURT: Thank you. Good morning.
MR. FELICIANO: Good morning. So, I guess we're on to set
a Denno hearing.
THE COURT: Uh-huh. What's the status? What --
MR. FELICIANO: Um, I --
THE COURT: Bring me up to speed.
MR. FELICIANO: Okay. So, I have there's an expert that I'm working with and --

THE COURT: Medical?
MR. FELICIANO: A yes.
THE COURT: Okay.
MR. FELICIANO: And I'm -- I have to get him the records and he said his turnaround time is a few days. So, it -- l'll probably have not a report -- at lease a consult with him in the next few weeks. And as far as him -- his availability to testify at a hearing it seems like they're flexible. I think if we set it out maybe a well --

THE COURT: Thirty days?
MR. FELICIANO: I'd ask for maybe a little bit longer because we have trial in May, I believe.

THE COURT: Right. That's why -- 30 days is March.
MR. FELICIANO: Yeah, look, yeah 30 days. If there's new issues l'll put it back on if there's any issues with their availability.

THE COURT: Okay. Is that okay?
MR. SWEETIN: That's fine. We're setting it then for the hearing or we setting it for status check?

THE COURT: Oh, no for the hearing.
MR. SWEETIN: Okay.

THE COURT: I mean, if it's -- we've got to keep it moving. MR. FELICIANO: No, no absolutely.

THE COURT: So, that means, you know, help you put pressure on your expert to get it done --

MR. FELICIANO: Okay.
THE COURT: -- in a timely manner.
MR. FELICIANO: There is a -- there was an issue of an offer that Mr. Sweetin extended that was expiring today. I just wanted to make that record.

THE COURT: Oh, that's right.
MR. FELICIANO: That is something -- I went to see Mr.
Vasquez-Reyes last week, we did not discuss it. And we had a relatively short meeting so we did not discuss the offer.

MR. SWEETIN: The offers going -- what we --
THE COURT: It hasn't been conveyed to him?
MR. SWEETIN: -- is going away. Yeah, so I mean, we have to make a record that he has at least received the offer and is rejecting it.

MR. FELICIANO: Well, I don't --
THE COURT: What's the offer?
MR. SWEETIN: The offer is --
THE COURT: Put it on the record.
MR. SWEETIN: The offer is -- the offer is that he would plead guilty to one count of sexual assault, one count of lewdness, victim under 14. Both punishable by 10 years to life, the State retained the
right to argue. That's the offer.
THE COURT: Okay. Do you understand that's the offer being made by the State of Nevada?
[Defendant speaks through the use of the Spanish Court Interpreter] THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. And I guess you think it's funny, because you're laughing?

THE DEFENDANT: It's funny, yes. I think it's funny.
THE COURT: Okay. I'll accept that as a rejection because I'm not sure there's anything funny about it. So, that's a bizarre reaction --

## MR. FELICIANO: Well --

THE COURT: -- especially when you're facing 10 life sentences.

MR. SWEETIN: Yeah, and just to be clear the offenses that he's currently charged with, just so he's completely aware of this. The sexual assault with a minor under the age of 14 , which is punishable by 35 years to life in prison as well as lewdness with a child under the age of 14 , which is punishable by 10 years to life in prison. He's facing multiple counts of that. In this negotiation he'd be able to argue for a minimum sentence of 10 to life. Just so he's aware of all the parameters of the offer.

THE COURT: Okay. Because based on my -- it looks like he's facing 10 life sentences with two of them being 35 to life's.

MR. SWEETIN: That's correct.

THE COURT: Thirty-five minimum. And the State has offered him two counts where he could argue for a minimum of 10 --

MR. SWEETIN: That's correct.
THE COURT: -- years. Okay. You understand that sir?
THE DEFENDANT: Yes, yes.
THE COURT: And you're rejecting that offer?
THE DEFENDANT: Of course I am.
THE COURT: Okay. All right. The records clear the offer was made. It is rejected and so I just want to make sure is the State going to make that offer again?

MR. SWEETIN: No. The offer -- the offer's withdrawn at this point.

THE COURT: Okay. The offer is withdrawn and make it 10:30 Tuesday or Thursday. Is Tuesday or Thursday better?

MR. FELICIANO: Um --
THE COURT: Does it matter?
MR. FELICIANO: It doesn't matter --
THE COURT: Okay.
MR. FELICIANO: -- to me. I don't know --
THE COURT: Does it matter Mr. Sweetin?
MR. FELICIANO: -- if Mr. Sweetin has a preference.
MR. SWEETIN: Well, what date are we looking at?
MR. FELICIANO: Well, I could check my [indiscernible] -we're looking at 10:30 for start; okay.

THE COURT: Mm-hmm.

MR. FELICIANO: What dates were you thinking?
THE CLERK: March 15.
THE DEFENDANT: Why so long?
THE COURT: Because your attorney asked for 30 days trying to accommodate your attorney.

MR. SWEETIN: Yeah, that would work for me.
THE COURT: Mr. Feliciano?
THE DEFENDANT: Running around in circles.
THE COURT: I'm sorry, what did you say?
THE DEFENDANT: Just going around in circles, he doesn't do anything.

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Feliciano, just so the records clear, I mean, l've met with both sides in chambers and it's very clear to me that Mr. Feliciano has done a substantial amount of work in getting this case ready for trial, a substantial amount.

MR. FELICIANO: And I don't want to go into what we've spoken about.

THE COURT: I just didn't want that to be on the record --
MR. FELICIANO: Okay.
THE COURT: -- without my opinion being --
MR. FELICIANO: Thank you.
THE COURT: -- that it's very clear to the Court that you've done a substantial amount work in preparing this case for trial. And that you have some very important things that need to be developed prior to going to trial in this matter.

MR. FELICIANO: The only thing I wanted state as far as the Denno hearing goes I'm going to do everything I can on my end to get it ready.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. FELICIANO: As far as prepping him for testifying or preparing him for any type of participation, it's almost impossible. I just wanted the Court to be aware of that. His last visit was ended very quick.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. FELICIANO: But, I'm doing my best.
THE COURT: Okay. That's fine just so long as he knows we're going to go forward.

MR. FELICIANO: March $15^{\text {th }}$ should a well -- it should work, but next week would absolutely work.

THE COURT: Okay. The $22^{\text {nd }}$.
MR. FELICIANO: Yes.
THE COURT: That's fine. Mr. Sweetin?
MR. SWEETIN: Ms. Clemons is out of the jurisdiction that week and I also have some prelims that week.

THE COURT: How about the next week?
THE CLERK: March $29^{\text {th }}$.
THE COURT: March $29^{\text {th }}$.
MR. FELICIANO: Ah --
THE COURT: If not, I'm just going to go back to the $15^{\text {th }}$.
MR. SWEETIN: Yeah, the $29^{\text {th }}$ will work for me.

MR. FELICIANO: Yes, the $29^{\text {th }}$ works.
THE COURT: March $29^{\text {th }}$ at 10:30.
MR. SWEETIN: That's fine, Judge. I think the Court's already made a record, but just to make a complete record as we've been discussing the case here. The Defendant has been involved in discussion has asked some impromptu questions so that he has a clear understanding of what's going on. And in the course of this he's been sneering at the Court and actually sort of chuckling under his breath through the full conversation. He hasn't been very receptive to this Court. I think what Mr. Feliciano is feeling towards just the general desire of the Defendant to kind of walk through this with a sort of nonchalant attitude.

THE COURT: Probably an accurate statement of what's happened this morning.

MR. SWEETIN: Thank you, Judge.
THE COURT: Thank you.
MS. CLEMONS: Thank you.
MR. FELICIANO: Thank you.
[Hearing concluded at 9:41 a.m.]
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THE COURT: State of Nevada versus Vasquez-Reyes. C316382.
He's present. He's in custody. He's using the services of the interpreter.
Will the interpreter please state her name for the record?
THE INTERPRETER: Maria Peralta De Gomez, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Thank you.
THE INTERPRETER: You're welcome, Your Honor.
THE COURT: This is on for calendar call. And then there's a couple of motions pending.

MR. FELICIANO: There is. May we approach, Your Honor?
THE COURT: Of course.
MR. FELICIANO: Thank you.
[Bench conference -- begins]
MR. FELICIANO: So, it's our understanding that you're dark next week.

THE COURT: Well -- and it's not -- I mean, l'm dark because they're doing stuff --

MR. FELICIANO: Yeah, yeah.
THE COURT: -- in the courtroom.
MR. FELICIANO: Okay.
THE COURT: So -- and I know -- I'm not sure how I set this date here because they've asked me to do this for -- I mean they've asked me for this date like months ago.

MR. FELICIANO: Okay.
THE COURT: So, my apologies.
MS. CLEMONS: Oh, no. That's fine.
THE COURT: Okay. I'm not sure how because I think it was implicit when I reset it that you guys were going to go so I apologize.

MR. FELICIANO: No problem. So when -- when would the Court be available? Would it be the next week or later with a different staff?

THE COURT: We'll be available to do it the next week.
MR. FELICIANO: Well, they can't so --
MR. SWEETIN: The problem is --
THE COURT: Oh, you're kidding -- see this is how I get so -- because I know you were ready to go that week.

MR. SWEETIN: Well, actually I got -- I got --
THE COURT: I mean if I could find another courtroom --
MR. SWEETIN: Actually, I'm -- I'm actually in another trial. It's a multi-week trial.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. SWEETIN: And it's going to be going through the next two weeks, so, you know, I'm not sure what the Court's -- I mean, I think the case has been continued four times.

THE COURT: I know.
MR. SWEETIN: I think they're all at Defendant's request. I think the last time --

THE COURT: But you're ready?
MR. FELICIANO: Yeah.

MR. SWEETIN: -- it was on the chlamydia. It was on the chlamydia, and I don't think the defense has done a test on chlamydia --

MR. FELICIANO: He won't do it. He doesn't want to do it now.
MR. SWEETIN: -- ultimately.
THE COURT: Sorry.
MR. SWEETIN: So, I'm not sure what the Court wants to do, but, you know, I mean, I would -- I would rather just have a short continuance so but --

THE COURT: I would rather just do a short one. When can I try it? MR. FELICIANO: Would it be --

THE COURT: How long is it going to take? Remind me.
MR. SWEETIN: Week and a half probably, at least a week.
THE COURT: Okay. So, two weeks?
MR. FELICIANO: Yeah.
MR. SWEETIN: Yeah, probably.
THE COURT: Out to June $12^{\text {th }}$. Okay.
MR. FELICIANO: My second chair who -- Ms. Hojjat, who did the hearing --

THE COURT: Uh-huh, yeah.
MR. FELICIANO: -- she's out. She's leaving that week so she's unavailable.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. FELICIANO: And I prefer that -- I usually don't care about second chairs, but in this case I do prefer that she stay on.

THE COURT: Yeah, of course. That's fine. I usually don't care about second chairs. He is so funny.

How about the $19^{\text {th }}$ ?
MR. FELICIANO: The $19^{\text {th }}$ if I could check.
THE COURT: And the State --
MS. CLEMONS: June $19^{\text {th }}$ ?
THE COURT: Will you be done though --
MR. SWEETIN: Yeah, I should.
THE COURT: -- because I know we're at the end of May.
MR. SWEETIN: Yeah, I should done by June $8^{\text {th }}$.
THE COURT: Okay. June $19^{\text {th }}$ ?
[Colloquy between the Court and the Court Clerk.]
MR. SWEETIN: Is it okay for you?
MS. CLEMONS: Yeah, I have one on the $25^{\text {th }}$, but l'm pretty sure that guy is getting deported so I don't think he's going to be present.

MR. SWEETIN: Yeah, it works for me.
MS. CLEMONS: So, okay, l'll have someone else do it I think after that case.

MR. FELICIANO: Okay. Ms. Hojjat is in a hearing in North Las Vegas. Could we maybe --

THE COURT: Okay. But what -- I mean, June $19^{\text {th }}$ is just a start date.
She just has one hearing in North Las Vegas?
MR. FELICIANO: No, no. Right now.
MS. CLEMONS: No, I think currently.
MR. FELICIANO: That's why I'm trying to communicate with her -THE COURT: Oh, okay. I'm sorry.

MR. FELICIANO: So, maybe -- we have some motions pending. Maybe we can put it on in a week or --

THE COURT: Well one is going to become moot; right?
MS. CLEMONS: Right. Yeah, that's moot.
THE COURT: Because the State filed a noticed -- they filed a motion to strike based on notice. That's going to become moot.

MR. FELICIANO: True. The other one might require a hearing if, if we were granted a hearing --

MS. CLEMONS: And Mr. -- technically the opposition was due today, I was actually supposed to start a trial yesterday so Mr. Feliciano said he's fine with giving me a couple more days, like a week --

MR. FELICIANO: That's no problem.
MS. CLEMONS: -- to file something. So, if we could set that -- that I guess argument on the week of the $4^{\text {th }}$.

MR. FELICIANO: If we could do that, maybe set it on the week of the $4^{\text {th }}$ with the trial date on the $19^{\text {th }}$--

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. FELICIANO: -- but with the understanding that l'm not sure if we're going to be able to go forward. I just -- I can't get ahold of Ms. Hojjat right now. I think she's leaving -- I think the $14^{\text {th }}$ or $15^{\text {th }}$. She's gone for like a week.

THE COURT: Okay. How about I just put it over for the -- is it the $4^{\text {th }}$ ?

THE CLERK: Tuesday -- l'm sorry -- It's Monday.
THE COURT: No, the $5^{\text {th }}$--
THE CLERK: So it'll be --

THE COURT: -- Tuesday, the $5^{\text {th }}$, and then I'll keep that date for you. If everyone's good with it, we'll set it for the $19^{\text {th }}$.

MR. FELICIANO: Okay. Perfect.
THE COURT: If not, we'll try to find a date where everbody is available --

MR. FELICIANO: Okay.
THE COURT: -- and we'll set it.
MR. FELICIANO: Perfect.
THE COURT: Okay.
MS. CLEMONS: And so the -- just so l'm clear that's just to argue the motion --

THE COURT: Right. The only --
MS. CLEMONS: -- to suppress not the actual hearing.
THE COURT: Right --
MS. CLEMONS: Okay.
THE COURT: The only thing left would be the motion to suppress.
MS. CLEMONS: Okay.
THE COURT: And I think we've -- I mean you weren't here at that hearing, but I think this appeared to me to be almost duplicative. Am I missing something?

MS. CLEMONS: I wasn't at the hearing either so --
MR. FELICIANO: Something overlapsed --
THE COURT: Okay. All right.
MR. FELICIANO: Some of the facts they were basing it overlapped, but the legal theory is different so I don't know --

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. FELICIANO: -- I wasn't at the hearing either so I ordered a transcript which the order was signed about a week ago. So, I imagine l'll get it soon so we may not require it. It may just -- I may be able to get what I need from the transcript.

THE COURT: Okay. I think probably from the transcript and the testimony -- I think he probably -- because it sounded awful familiar. I thought that those issues had been resolved but --

MR. FELICIANO: Okay.
MS. CLEMONS: Okay.
THE COURT: -- we'll set it over for the $5{ }^{\text {th }}$.
MR. FELICIANO: Okay. Thank you.
MS. CLEMONS: Sounds good. Thank you.
THE COURT: All right. We'll set it over for June $5^{\text {th }}$ at $8: 30$, and the State will file their opposition to the motion to suppress, and the State's motion to strike the expert due to untimely notice will be moot. And then we'll set your trial date on that date.

MR. SWEETIN: Thank you. Just to be clear, Judge, the current trial date is vacated then?

THE COURT: That's correct. Thank you.

May trial date is vacated.
[Hearing concluded at 8:56 a.m.]
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THE COURT: State versus Armando Vasquez-Reyes, C316382. He's present, he is in custody, and he's using the services of the interpreter. Will the interpreter please state her name for the record?

THE COURT INTERPRETER: Michelle Roth.
THE COURT: Okay. So, we're here to discuss resetting the trial date.

MR. FELICIANO: Yes. May we approach, please?
THE COURT: Of course.
MR. FELICIANO: Thank you.
[Bench conference -- begins]
THE COURT: Today's the $5{ }^{\text {th }}$.
MR. FELICIANO: So, we have the $18^{\text {th }}$.
THE COURT: Eighteenth of what?
MR. FELICIANO: Of this month was possibly available. I want to see if the $25^{\text {th }}$ is available.

MS. CLEMONS: But I'm not available on the $25^{\text {th }}$.
THE COURT: Well, then why ask for the $25^{\text {th }}$ ?
MS. CLEMONS: Because he keeps trying to kick me out.
MR. FELICIANO: She -- I mean, she doesn't have to it.
THE COURT: Come on. There's [indiscernible] making concessions for your second chair.

MS. CLEMONS: Thank you, Your Honor.
MR. FELICIANO: Well, no, that's the issue. My second chair
is not available on the $18^{\text {th }}$.
MS. CLEMONS: Right.
MR. FELICIANO: She's back on the $25^{\text {th }}$.
THE COURT: Okay. So, what else do you have?
MR. FELICIANO: So, do you have like the week after that maybe?

THE COURT: After the $25^{\text {th. }}$
MR. FELICIANO: Uh-huh.
THE COURT CLERK: July $2^{\text {nd }}$.
THE COURT: July $2^{\text {nd }}$.
MR. FELICIANO: We'll take it.
THE COURT: Okay. So, is that a Tuesday?
MR. FELICIANO: July $2^{\text {nd }}$.
MS. CLEMONS: How long is this going to go?
THE COURT: It's a Monday so July $2^{\text {nd }}$.
MR. FELICIANO: This?
MS. CLEMONS: Yeah.
MR. FELICIANO: A week.
THE COURT: Okay. So, I just want to warn you Wednesday is the holiday. We start on the $2^{\text {nd }}$. So, we have Monday, Tuesday. Just Wednesday is the holiday; right? Wednesday is a holiday and then we'll be back on Thursday. Are you okay with that?

MR. FELICIANO: Sure.
MS. CLEMONS: I'm leaving town on July $11^{\text {th }}$--
THE COURT: Okay.

MS. CLEMONS: -- and I don't know if we're going to be done by then.

MR. FELICIANO: I don't know.
THE COURT: When is July $11^{\text {th }}$ ? What day does that --
MS. CLEMONS: It's a Wednesday.
THE COURT: So, it's the following Wednesday.
MS. CLEMONS: l'll be gone Wednesday through Tuesday.
THE COURT: So, Monday, Tuesday --
MS. CLEMONS: I'm sorry. I think if we're done on the $10^{\text {th }}$ it's all right. I fly out on the $10^{\text {th }}$, yeah, $10^{\text {th }}$ through $14^{\text {th }}$. So, no, I can't do it, I can't.

MR. FELICIANO: Okay. What about the week after that?
MS. CLEMONS: The $16^{\text {th }}$, I think Jim and I -- I'm fine. Jim's

THE COURT: Okay. Can't do the $16^{\text {th }}$.
MS. CLEMONS: Okay.
MR. FELICIANO: So, it's the $18^{\text {th }}$. So, is the $18^{\text {th }}$ still there?
THE COURT: June $18^{\text {th }}$ ? I'm here.
MR. FELICIANO: Okay. Well --
THE COURT: I will wait for your second chair.
MR. FELICIANO: The thing is he -- he -- we met with him yesterday and he'd rather have her off the case then go on the $18^{\text {th }}$ as opposed to continuing but --

THE COURT: Well, I mean, that's not necessarily his decision.

MR. FELICIANO: Now, it's --
THE COURT: I mean, if you need that second chair.
MR. FELICIANO: When would we be looking at?
THE COURT: Well, I've given you multiple --
MS. CLEMONS: I know it's hard because --
THE COURT: Okay. So, tell me what --
MS. CLEMONS: -- everybody's got stuff going on.
THE COURT: -- tell me when you're available after the last date that we just mentioned. July $16^{\text {th }}$, what about after that? July $23^{\text {rd }}$.

MR. FELICIANO: I'll take it.
MS. CLEMONS: I can -- I can figure that out.
THE COURT: And that's a Monday; right? And how long -do you think you'll need a couple weeks?

MS. CLEMONS: I think we can for sure get it done in two weeks.

MR. FELICIANO: Yeah.
MS. CLEMONS: I think it's just a matter of how many days go into that second week.

MR. FELICIANO: Yeah.
MS. CLEMONS: Is that fair?
MR. FELICIANO: Yeah. I'd probably say Tuesday, maybe Wednesday of the following week.

THE COURT: So, July 23rd that's a Monday; right? Can you start at 10:30 with jury selection?

MS. CLEMONS: Yeah, yeah.

THE COURT: We'll actually start July $23^{\text {rd }}$. I can start at 8:30. MR. FELICIANO: Sure.

THE COURT: That's up to you.
MS. CLEMONS: That's fine.
MR. FELICIANO: This is my oldest case. It needs to go.
THE COURT: So, July $23^{\text {rd }}$ at $8: 30$ for jury selection. Do you want a calendar call?

MS. CLEMONS: Yes.
MR. FELICIANO: Sure, just in case something comes up.
THE COURT: And I'm scared to give you a calendar call.
Then you're going to tell me there's a problem.
MR. FELICIANO: No --
MS. CLEMONS: I think --
MR. FELICIANO: Everybody has us to go.
MS. CLEMONS: Yeah.
THE COURT: So, everybody's good and all the lawyers will be here. Sweetin better be available.

MS. CLEMONS: I have his schedule and he doesn't have anything for July $23^{\text {rd }}$. So, I think we're good.

MR. FELICIANO: And so we also have a motion on today. THE COURT: Mm- hmm.

MR. FELICIANO: But the -- there's only the transcripts done from the last hearing yet. I got the order signed a couple weeks ago.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. FELICIANO: I think maybe we might want to get that
transcript first.
THE COURT: Okay.
MS. CLEMONS: Yeah.
MR. FELICIANO: There's another motion that they filed on -it's on calendar soon. It's like the $19^{\text {th }}$ maybe.

THE COURT: What's the motion called?
MS. CLEMONS: It's a motion in limine.
MR. FELICIANO: To the gonorrhea.
THE COURT: Let's see. State's motion -- is it --
MR. FELICIANO: Maybe we move this motion to that date.
MS. CLEMONS: Was that on today?
MR. FELICIANO: No.
MS. CLEMONS: Motion in limine was on --
THE COURT: It's on for the $19^{\text {th }}$.
MS. CLEMONS: Oh, okay.
THE COURT: Is that okay?
MS. CLEMONS: Yeah.
MR. FELICIANO: And l'll call and see what's going on with the transcript.

THE COURT: Okay. I can check too and see whether -okay. So, June $19^{\text {th }}$ for the hearing and then July $23^{\text {rd }}$ for your trial date.

MR. FELICIANO: Perfect.
MS. CLEMONS: Okay.
THE COURT: Okay.
[Bench conference -- ends]

THE COURT: Okay. All right.
So, June $19^{\text {th }}$ I'll hear the two motions pending, and then your trial date is July $23^{\text {rd }}$ with jury selection at 8:30, and your calendar call is July $17^{\text {th }}$ at 8:30 for your calendar call.

MR. FELICIANO: I mean, just so Mr. Vasquez-Reyes is aware, I just want to make the record that we are absolutely starting trial on the $23^{\text {rd }}$--

THE COURT: That's correct.
MR. FELICIANO: -- with jury selection. And we are the first or the only case on calendar for that week. So, we have what --

THE COURT: Yes. We'll be going on July $23^{\text {rd }}$. Okay. Thank you.

MR. FELICIANO: I think he has a question.
THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
[The Defendant speaks with the use of the Court Interpreter]
THE DEFENDANT: May I say something?
MR. FELICIANO: Sure.
THE DEFENDANT: Why do you keep delaying the trial for so long? I've been here for two years and two months. And they don't even have any evidence against me.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. I'll see you back on June $19^{\text {th }}$.

MR. FELICIANO: Thank you.
THE COURT: Thank you.
[Proceedings concluded at 9:50 a.m.]
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THE COURT: State versus Vasquez-Reyes, C316382. He's present. He's in custody. There's some motions on. He's using the services of the interpreter. Will the interpreter state her name for the record?

THE COURT INTERPRETER: Alicia Herrera.
THE COURT: Okay. The State's motion in limine. You didn't file in opposition?

MR. FELICIANO: I did.
THE COURT: Okay.
MR. FELICIANO: I filed -- I filed it yesterday.
THE COURT: Okay. Do you have a copy?
MR. FELICIANO: Yes. May I approach?
THE COURT: Absolutely. Sorry about that. Okay. Anything either side would like to add? I mean I'm familiar with this issue. I know we've discussed it outside of Court as well, and we had conferences together --

MR. SWEETIN: Right.
THE COURT: -- so is there anything the State would like to add?

MR. SWEETIN: No, Judge. I would just say it's a clear violation of rape shield.

MR. FELICIANO: Other than what -- I think it's pretty simple. I got to standby what I wrote.

THE COURT: Thank you very much. At this time l'm going to grant the motion in limine, and the State can prepare the order.

MR. SWEETIN: Thank you, Judge.
THE COURT: On your motion to suppress, do you believe that you need -- because you asked for an evidentiary hearing.

MR. FELICIANO: Yes. Well, I looked at the transcript of the other hearing on the Denno -- the Denno hearing.

THE COURT: Uh-huh.
MR. FELICIANO: And it -- there's references to whether Mr. Vasquez-Reyes voluntarily went with the police --

THE COURT: Right.
MR. FELICIANO: -- at page 11. It's not very clear though. I think that needs to be developed further.

THE COURT: So, just that one witness?
MR. FELICIANO: Well, it probably be with Pretti and the -- I guess, the interpreter, I would think, and Mr. Vasquez-Reyes, if necessary. I think those two.

THE COURT: Okay. So, the detective and the interpreter that was called in?

MR. FELICIANO: The very least the detective and possibly the interpreter. It shouldn't be very long. It's just a few points that we need to make unless -- unless they agree with the facts the way l've -my interpretation of the facts, but I guess we don't move into the hearing, but otherwise we do.

MS. CLEMONS: Well --

THE COURT: Well, since their pleadings indicate that they think the facts were different --

MS. CLEMONS: -- and Your Honor --
THE COURT: -- they believe he -- they believe he voluntarily went.

MR. FELICIANO: Yeah --
MS. CLEMONS: Additionally, I mean, I mention this in -- on page 6 real briefly. It doesn't necessarily even matter whether or not he was detained because there was probable cause to arrest him once the victim made the disclosure. So, there is no violation here, there's no statutory violation, and if there was what is his -- what's the prejudice to him? I mean, he -- they already had PC to arrest him so they could take him to the station and hold him for as long as they wanted to because he -- there was a probable cause. So, I mean I don't think there's a need for a hearing because of that element alone. There's no prejudice to him. He was getting arrested regardless.

MR. FELICIANO: Yeah, and I don't think it's necessarily they did actually have probable cause to arrest him. They had uncorroborated testimony from a teenager when the police were there on a totally unrelated issue where the child pulled the police aside and asked -- told them some information. So, that in it of itself I don't think would be enough to arrest him.

MS. CLEMONS: But, I mean, I did cite the case.
THE COURT: So, that wasn't probable cause but after talking to your client they had probable cause?

MR. FELICIANO: Well, after -- after the several hours or whatever it was that he gave the statement, I mean, the -- the handcuffing him, putting him in the back of the police car, taking him to the police -- or to the headquarters or whatever they took him, letting him sit for an hour or so in a room then interrogating him, he makes some damaging statements then I guess they arrested him. It's not really clear.

They're saying they -- they're saying they arrested him at the conclusion of the interview based -- I mean, I would imagine based on what he said. If there was enough to arrest him before that why wouldn't they? That doesn't make any sense.

MS. CLEMONS: Well, it's because -- I mean you can have probable cause to -- for purposes of --

THE COURT: And continue to investigate.
MS. CLEMONS: Yeah, they chose to investigate it. So, they asked him do you want to come to the station and he voluntarily went to the station. Her statement saying that he abused her alone is enough to convict in a jury trial. So, obviously it's enough for a probable cause.

THE COURT: So, why wouldn't it be enough for probable cause?

MS. CLEMONS: Correct.
THE COURT: I mean --
MR. FELICIANO: Well --
THE COURT: I'll allow you to develop this issue because I think that it would probably be a short hearing.

MR. FELICIANO: Yeah, very short.
THE COURT: And I don't know if your client wants to testify.
Sounds like maybe he would want to testify as to this specific issue --
MR. FELICIANO: Most likely.
THE COURT: -- based on the pleadings. So -- when can we do -- do you want to do it the first day? I just know you have -- your trial date is -- is very close.

MR. FELICIANO: Yeah, that should be fine. That's fine with us.

THE COURT: You want to do it the first day of trial?
MR. SWEETIN: I think that's fine, Judge.
MS. CLEMONS: Yeah.
THE COURT: Okay. So, July $23^{\text {rd }}$. Thank you.
MR. FELICIANO: Thank you.
MS. CLEMONS: Thank you.
[Proceedings concluded at 10:21 a.m.]
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THE COURT: Vasquez-Reyes. C316382. Good morning. MR. FELICIANO: Good morning.

THE COURT: He's present. He's in custody. He's using the services of the interpreter.

Will the interpreter please state her name for the record?
THE INTERPRETER: Alex Avants, A-V-A-N-T-S.
THE COURT: Okay.
MR. FELICIANO: Competency form for Mr. Vasquez-Reyes.
THE COURT: Okay. Dated today?
MR. FELICIANO: Yes.
THE COURT: Okay. So based on this --
MR. FELICIANO: I have no choice. Based on our meeting last week I -- he -- I think he has to go through competency.

THE COURT: Okay. I'll refer the matter to competency court.

THE CLERK: August 10 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ 9:00 a.m., Department IX.
THE COURT: And then I'll vacate the trial date.
MR. SWEETIN: Just for the record, Judge. The State would have been ready to proceed.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. FELICIANO: Thank you.
THE COURT: And you would have been ready too?
MR. FELICIANO: Yes.

THE COURT: I'm confident.
MR. FELICIANO: Yes.
THE COURT: But for this. Okay.
MR. FELICIANO: Correct.
THE COURT: Thank you.
MR. FELICIANO: Thank you. [Proceedings concluded at 8:54 a.m.]
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[Hearing began at 9:07 a.m.]
THE COURT: Armando Vasquez-Reyes. Mr. Vasquez-Reyes is present in custody. He has the services of the Court Certified Interpreter. Ms. Interpreter could you state your appearance.

COURT CERTIFIED INTERPRETER: Ximena Fiene.
THE COURT: Thank you. Drs. Colosimo and Harder find the Defendant incompetent to proceed with adjudication. What is the Public Defender's position?

MS. MURPHY: Your Honor, Ms. Hojjat texted me this morning and asked me to trail this for her.

THE COURT: She doesn't want to do a 425 ?
MS. MURPHY: I -- I can text her back --
THE COURT: Yes.
MS. MURPHY: -- if you'd like. I mean I just told her okay, I'd trail it -- without getting into it but.

THE COURT: Yes. Say Judge wants to know why we're not just going to do a 425 and why do you have to be here.

MS. MURPHY: I will certainly do that.
THE COURT: All right; text her back. Ms. Interpreter can you wait just a minute?

COURT CERTIFIED INTERPRETER: Of course.
THE COURT: Okay. I'll recall it as soon as we get an answer.
[Case trailed at 9:08 a.m.]
[Case recalled at 9:24 a.m.]
THE COURT: For the interpreter, Armando Vasquez-Reyes. MS. MURPHY: And Your Honor, she's asking to continue this 30 days. They have been working to schedule actually an MRI that they want to have done to send up with him to Lakes, and they just finally got the final approval for that.

THE COURT: Okay, the matter is continued, status check MRI, 30 days.

MS. MURPHY: Thank you.
THE COURT CLERK: September $14^{\text {th }}$ at 9 a.m.
THE COURT: Yeah, we don't have to wait for her to come for that.

MS. MURPHY: I didn't know until just now.
THE COURT: No, but you know what I mean --
MS. MURPHY: Sure.
THE COURT: -- why? Why run all the way here? Your lawyer just needs to get a medical test for you, and then in 30 days, you know, the jail has to bring you and that gets done, and then we'll see you again.

THE DEFENDANT: Okay. [Hearing concluded at 9:25 a.m.]
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THE COURT: Armando Vasquez-Reyes, C316382-1. He's present in custody. From the Interpreter's Office, Ms. Interpreter, could you state your appearance for the record.

COURT CERTIFIED INTERPRETER: Ximena Fiene, Spanish Interpreter.

THE COURT: Thank you. The Defendant is here on return from Stein. Drs. Abu-Kamil [phonetics], DeVillez, and Roley find the Defendant meets the criteria to be considered competent to proceed. What's the Public Defender's position.

MS. ROMNEY: No challenge.
THE COURT: There being no challenge at this time, I find -pursuant to NRS 178.420, sir you are competent to proceed to adjudication, and you are being returned back to District Court 12 on --

THE COURT CLERK: November $27^{\text {th }}$ at 8:30 a.m.
THE COURT: If you have any questions, you'll have an attorney with you on that day. Any questions?

THE DEFENDANT: It's all right.
THE COURT: Okay, thank you.
[Hearing concluded at 9:21 a.m.]
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THE COURT: State versus Armando Vasquez-Reyes, C316382. He's present, he's in custody. He's using the services of the interpreter.

Will the interpreter state his name for the record?
THE COURT INTERPRETER: Jeff Hanks.
THE COURT: Okay. So, I'm assuming we're ready to reset it for trial.

MR. FELICIANO: We are. It's a return from -- he went to Stein for a few months. He's back, so we're ready to reset it.

THE COURT: Okay. Would it -- what's your calendar like?
MR. FELICIANO: Is there any March available?
THE COURT CLERK: Yes.
THE COURT: We can do March.
MR. FELICIANO: Okay.
THE COURT CLERK: Calendar call March 12, 8:30, jury trial March 19, 1:30.

MR. FELICIANO: Thank you.
THE COURT: Thank you.
MR. SWEETIN: Thank you, Judge. And there is a Denno hearing, but the Court had indicated that we were going to do that the first day of trial.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. SWEETIN: Thank you, Judge.

THE COURT: Thank you. MR. FELICIANO: Thanks.
[Proceedings concluded at 9:14 a.m.]
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THE COURT: State versus Vasquez-Reyes, C316382. He's present and he's in custody. He's using the services of the interpreter.

Will the interpreter state his name for the record?
THE COURT INTERPRETER: Jeff Hanks.
THE COURT: Thank you.
All right. The State has a motion on. I got the Defense opposition late last night. I just wanted to make sure the State had an opportunity to review it.

MR. SWEETIN: I have, Judge.
THE COURT: Okay. And you're ready to go?
MR. SWEETIN: Yes, Judge.
THE COURT: Okay. Go ahead.
MR. SWEETIN: Judge, in this case Defense has noticed a witness in regards to -- the witness noticed was -- I'm sorry, I don't have it.

MR. FELICIANO: Harder.
THE COURT: Harder?
MR. FELICIANO: Dr. Harder.
MR. SWEETIN: Yeah, Dr. Harder, and that was noticed in regards to cognitive functioning. The notice itself only says that. He says that he will testify at trial regarding the Defendant's cognitive functioning. The statute is clear on this point that any notice requires a brief statement regarding the subject matter in which the expert witness
is expected to testify and the substance of his testimony.
In this case, based upon what Defense counsel's provided me, l'm still not sure what Dr. Harder's actually going to testify to at the trial. I'm not sure if it's going to be relevant to the proceeding. I'm not sure whether I need to get another expert to testify in rebuttal to him. I'm not sure if -- whether the State needs to challenge the witness's ability to testify on whatever he -- he's going to testify on.

Subsequent to the initial notice of the expert there was a -basically a report that was provided. This report is actually dated quite some time ago and actually predates the -- one of the competency evaluations of the Defendant. In looking in the report I'm even more confused as to what Defense counsel intends Dr. Harder to testify to. It appears that the report gets to competency issues and whether he's able to actually stand trial; it would appear anyway from my brief reading of it.

So, at this point the State submits that the notice itself is inadequate. We're making a motion to strike it. If in fact the witness is allowed or the motion's not stricken, the State would submit that if the Defense is going to use an expert who has examined the Defendant, that the State should also have an opportunity to have a neuropsychological examination done on the Defendant by its expert if I'm able to find out exactly what this expert is testifying to so that I can make that determination whether or not an expert for the State is appropriate.

So, it's the State's first motion to strike that expert. And,
certainly, if the Defense gives a more precise indication of what the expert would testify to and the Court does not strike, then the State would ask to have its own neuropsychological examination of the Defendant done.

THE COURT: Okay. I think that that Notice of Expert Witness is very vague. I don't know what cognitive function -- and I don't feel much better after reading your opposition either.

MR. FELICIANO: Well, I have provided the report to Mr. Sweetin. I didn't file the report that Dr. Harder completed.

THE COURT: Right. But a report before he went to Lakes Crossing?

MR. FELICIANO: Yes.
THE COURT: That was a year ago.
MR. FELICIANO: That is correct.
THE COURT: Okay.
MR. FELICIANO: But nothing has changed in this case from day one. From -- as you know, the history of this case, we've been here a lot.

THE COURT: Sure.
MR. FELICIANO: And we've had these kind of issues for three years now. So, nothing has changed. I put every --

THE COURT: Well, I have no idea. I don't know what cognitive function means. I want your expert to be able to testify, but I have to be able to rule on this motion and I don't think that your notice is sufficient.

MR. FELICIANO: Well, at the time of the interrogation -THE COURT: I don't know what that means. MR. FELICIANO: I'm sorry? Well, that would be his -- okay, so, when he was interrogated --

THE COURT: Sure.
MR. FELICIANO: -- we filed a Jackson -- we filed a motion for a Jackson v. Denno hearing.

THE COURT: Right.
MR. FELICIANO: We did the hearing and that motion was denied; however, our expert has spoken to Mr. Vasquez-Reyes and he has opinions as to whether Mr. Vasquez-Reyes understands certain things as far as conversations and information exchanges. So, we think that would be certainly relevant to have in front of a jury to testify whether he understood what was going on at the time of the interrogations. Now, as far as --

THE COURT: Okay. So, the expert would come in and say he didn't understand? I don't know.

MR. FELICIANO: Nobody can say that.
THE COURT: I don't know what --
MR. FELICIANO: Well, no, I wouldn't have him say that in absolute -- that's -- that would be a --

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. FELICIANO: -- question of fact for the jury, but he could say his observations as to -- into dealing with Mr. Vasquez-Reyes what he believes his cognitive abilities are.

Now, I don't believe the State has -- is entitled to have somebody speak to him independently. He has a right to remain silent, and then if he's not going to waive that for their doctor, the cases they cite deal with NGRI. This is not an NGRI case, and those cases are absolutely NGRI cases. So, that's a different issue.

THE COURT: Well, then what relevance does the report have? I'm just wondering why you provided that report.

MR. FELICIANO: The Harder report.
THE COURT: Right, the one from before he went to Lakes Crossing.

MR. FELICIANO: They talked about -- the report talked about his basically borderline, low intellectual functioning, and that -- how that would impair possibly his understanding of what's going on around him.

THE COURT: Okay. So, that would be the extent of the testimony.

MR. FELICIANO: That would be it. I mean, no, he's not going to be called to say he's -- this happened or this didn't happen or he's telling the truth or he's not telling the truth, that -- nobody can do that, but it's just to talk about his reactions with Mr. Vasquez-Reyes and what he perceives are his issues.

THE COURT: Okay.
Anything else?
MR. SWEETIN: I still don't understand what this expert's going to testify to. I mean, l've heard a couple things Defense counsel has --

THE COURT: His --
MR. SWEETIN: -- laid out.
THE COURT: I mean, he's diagnosed him? Is that a diagnosis, borderline -- I don't --

MR. FELICIANO: Yeah, he's -- I mean, he's -- said he's very low functioning as far as intellectual abilities.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. SWEETIN: So, l'm not sure how that's necessarily relevant to the case. I mean, if he's going to be testifying that he could not understand and communicate with individuals in order to make a statement -- is that what we'd get? And that's why I would ask for an expert notice that laid out exactly what they're going to testify -- what the expert's going to testify to as the statute requires so then I can make a motion to strike the expert because it's -- he's -- it's not relevant to the proceeding or I can challenge the expert's confidence to testify. I don't have that now and Defense counsel has danced around a couple different issues that he might testify to at this point.

THE COURT: Well, I think that you do -- I mean, cognitive functioning, I really -- I'm not convinced that that's enough. I think that you have maybe laid out better today. I think that you need to supplement your expert witness notice so that the State's put on notice of what he's going to testify to.

MR. FELICIANO: Well, I mean, I think --
THE COURT: I mean, I think cognitive functioning, that is just not enough.

MR. FELICIANO: Well, I mean, looking at the report and when it was done and looking at the entire case -- and I think it's pretty clear what we're doing here. We're not trying to hide anything.

THE COURT: Well, then just say it in your expert. That's what I don't understand. Just say, say what you've said today and put it in your notice.

MR. FELICIANO: I can -- I guess I can type that out and put it in the -- into the notice. I thought it was sufficient, but I can supplement it.

THE COURT: Okay. So, l'm going to deny and give you an opportunity to supplement.

MR. FELICIANO: Okay.
THE COURT: Now, we're here for calendar call as well.
MR. FELICIANO: So, we were -- we anticipated announcing ready today.

THE COURT: Mm-hmm.
MR. FELICIANO: I don't know, do we even have a courtroom?

THE COURT: We may not because l've started one already.
MR. FELICIANO: Okay. I met with Mr. Vasquez-Reyes yesterday and he told me he absolutely wants to go to trial. Whatever issue's outstanding, he wants to go to trial, so --

Right?
MR. SWEETIN: Well, I mean, the issue --
THE COURT: What does that mean whatever issue's
outstanding? What does that --
MR. FELICIANO: Well, even if this -- well, even if we have this expert issue that's still outstanding, I think he would want to still go to trial even if this is out there, but --

THE COURT: Okay. Well, you've got to have a judge and a courtroom too.

MR. FELICIANO: I understand. I understand. I'm just doing this so he doesn't have to, but he's going to make the same --

THE COURT: Oh.
MR. FELICIANO: -- record.
THE COURT: Okay. Okay. But you're ready to go?
MR. FELICIANO: Yeah, we are.
THE COURT: Okay.
MR. SWEETIN: And, Judge, I would note that, you know, from what the expert -- what the expert will testify to, there's other -- I -and I put in my opposition that there are other learned individuals that directly, you know, controvert what that -- their expert says or is saying in this sort of report in regards to low functioning.

THE COURT: Oh, so you think you might want to --
MR. SWEETIN: So, the State -- I think I probably would want --

THE COURT: Oh.
MR. SWEETIN: -- an expert, and I would want to broach the issue upon receiving a notice from the Defense that meets the statute of whether or not the State was entitled to also have an examination, but

I'd wait until I received that notice to bring that before the Court again.
THE COURT: Okay.
But, I mean, I can tell you I'm in a -- I started one already. I don't think we're going to have a courtroom next week. So, do you know when -- I mean, if both sides are ready l'd like to continue it and give you a date that's convenient for both sides.

I mean, I understand that it's been continued a lot. I understand your client doesn't want a continuance, but I can't do two at the same time.

MR. FELICIANO: I understand. Yesterday he told me that if this was happening that he wanted to address the Court.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. FELICIANO: I told him that it'd be better if he took -talked to me and I spoke to the Court for him, but I think he wants --

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. FELICIANO: -- to address the Court directly.
[The Defendant speaks through the use of the Court Interpreter]
THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do. I have a motion here.
THE COURT: Okay.
THE DEFENDANT: About the trial. I've been ready for three years. That's all.

THE COURT: Okay. But you understand it has nothing to do with the attorneys, it's the Court's schedule. Your attorney has indicated he's ready to go. The State could probably be ready to go. But it's the Court's schedule.

THE DEFENDANT: Okay. THE COURT: So --

MR. FELICIANO: So, how far out are we looking?
THE COURT: I mean, I could -- I --
Can we put it on my next stack?
Do you want me to put it on the next stack?
MR. FELICIANO: What are the dates?
THE COURT CLERK: The next stack right away is May $20^{\text {th }}$.
THE COURT: In May; May $20^{\text {th }}$ ?
THE COURT CLERK: So, this is May. Yeah, May --
THE COURT: Do I have any weeks that look better than others?

Is May $20^{\text {th }}$ an actual open date?
MR. SWEETIN: Yeah, so, actually, Ms. Clemons who's doing the trial with me is out of the country, coming back on the $20^{\text {th }}$.

THE COURT: Okay.
THE COURT CLERK: May $20^{\text {th' }}$ s the next one.
THE COURT: Okay. Can't do May $20^{\text {th }}$.
MS. CLEMONS: I can do the week after.
MR. FELICIANO: But Mr. Sweetin and I have a different case in a different department on that week.

THE COURT CLERK: It shows you have three.
MR. FELICIANO: This case is older though.
THE COURT: The week after?
MR. FELICIANO: The week of the $28^{\text {th }}$.

THE COURT: Do I have the week of the $28^{\text {th }}$ ?
THE COURT CLERK: I --
THE COURT: Okay.
THE COURT CLERK: It can be set on the -- on Tuesday the $28^{\text {th }}$ because the $27^{\text {th }}$ is Memorial Day.

THE COURT: Okay.
THE COURT CLERK: Yeah.
THE COURT: I can set it for the $28^{\text {th }}$.
MS. CLEMONS: That's fine.
MR. FELICIANO: That's fine. I mean --
MR. SWEETIN: That's fine.
THE COURT: Is that okay?
MR. FELICIANO: -- this case is much older than the other case, so --

THE COURT: Right.
THE COURT CLERK: So, do you want to aim for the $28^{\text {th }}$ ?
THE COURT: May $28^{\text {th }}$.
THE COURT CLERK: All right. May $28^{\text {th }}, 1: 30$.
And then are we setting calendar call?
THE COURT: And calendar call.
THE COURT CLERK: Okay. You're dark the week previous, so we can just set it for the $14^{\text {th }}$ ?

THE COURT: Okay.
THE COURT CLERK: May $14^{\text {th }}$, calendar call, 8:30.
MR. FELICIANO: And I'll supplement that --

THE COURT: And --
MR. FELICIANO: -- notice so we can litigate that before trial.
THE COURT: Okay. And so if there's --
MR. SWEETIN: And I would just ask that that be done timely.
I know that the notice was filed, I think -- or inside the 21days.
THE COURT: I can put it on for 30 days to make sure that issue's resolved and address whether the State's going to hire their own expert so we could keep it on --

MR. FELICIANO: Ill file it within a week.
THE COURT: -- schedule. Okay.
MR. SWEETIN: Thank you, Judge.
THE COURT: And we'll put it on for 30 days.
THE COURT CLERK: April $9^{\text {th }}, 8: 30$.
MR. FELICIANO: Thank you.
THE COURT: Thank you.
THE COURT INTERPRETER: Thank you.
[Proceedings concluded at 9:26 a.m.]
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THE COURT: State of Nevada versus Vasquez-Reyes, C316382. He's present and he's in custody. He's using the services of the interpreter.

Will the interpreter state his name for the record?
THE COURT INTERPRETER: Yes, Your Honor. Carlos Calvo, C-A-L -- V as in Victor -- O.

THE COURT: Okay.
THE COURT INTERPRETER: Thank you.
THE COURT: This is on -- I -- the -- I know the State had a motion pending. I gave the Defense an opportunity to amend.

MR. SWEETIN: Yeah.
THE COURT: Anything further?
MR. SWEETIN: They did file the motion to amend. I had mentioned to defense counsel and I think I mentioned to the Court that the State would be seeking an examination of the Defendant ourselves. I'd like to supplement our pleadings in that regard.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. SWEETIN: So, I don't know if you want to set a briefing schedule or you want me to e-file a supplement.

MR. FELICIANO: I'm good with whatever.
THE COURT: Why don't you just go ahead and file a supplement and then the Defense can have an opportunity to respond. I mean, because we have a trial date set May $28^{\text {th }}$.

MR. FELICIANO: And as far as the trial date, are we -- as far as on the stack, are we first or are we -- l'm just kind of curious to see if we're going.

THE COURT: I don't know if -- I don't -- I haven't stacked them up yet in --

MR. FELICIANO: Okay. All right.
THE COURT: -- one, two or three.
MR. FELICIANO: All right. Thanks.
THE COURT: But I understand you all have been waiting to go to trial for a while.

MR. FELICIANO: Yeah, yeah, I just -- he just had some questions about, you know, where he stood, so I was just --

THE COURT: Sure.
MR. FELICIANO: -- going to clarify. But thank you.
THE COURT: Okay.
MR. SWEETIN: And just to be clear then, Judge, the State will file a motion to supplement and then we'll have a hearing date set on that motion.

THE COURT: Sure.
MR. SWEETIN: Thank you, Judge.
THE COURT: Sure. You know, maybe l'll give you a hearing now because we're so close to trial l'm afraid --

MR. SWEETIN: Sure.
THE COURT: -- you might --
Let's see, first of May?

THE COURT CLERK: Do you want a 10:30 hearing, Judge?
THE COURT: No, it can be on a regular calendar.
THE COURT CLERK: Oh, okay.
THE COURT: Like May $7^{\text {th }}$ ?
THE COURT CLERK: Yes.
THE COURT: If we did May $7^{\text {th }}$ would that be enough time?
MR. SWEETIN: Yes, should be. I should be --
THE COURT: For both sides?
MR. SWEETIN: -- able to get my motion filed in about a week.
THE COURT: Okay.
May $7^{\text {th }}$ at $8: 30$.
MR. FELICIANO: Okay. Ill file something a week from
receiving his; is that good?
THE COURT: Sure.
MR. FELICIANO: Okay.
THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
MR. FELICIANO: Thank you.
[Proceedings concluded at 9:17 a.m.]
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THE COURT: State versus Vasquez-Reyes, C316382. He's present and in custody and using the services of the interpreter.

Would the interpreter state his name for the record?
THE COURT INTERPRETER: Ricardo Pico, Spanish interpreter.

THE COURT: Okay. Go ahead.
MR. FELICIANO: So, this was on for the State to possibly file another motion.

THE COURT: Right, but they didn't file anything.
MR. FELICIANO: Yeah, and I talked -- I met with Mr. Sweetin in his office last week. Based on our new notice, they're not -- my understanding, they're not proceeding on their motion, so it should be off calendar.

MS. DIGIACOMO: That is correct with the understanding -it's my understanding that Mr. Feliciano or the Defense has agreed not to have their expert, Dr. Harder, do any further exams on the Defendant, that they will be just referring to the ones that were done June $8^{\text {th }}, 2018$ and August $10^{\text {th }}, 2018$.

MR. FELICIANO: I don't know specifically on the dates offhand, but I -- we're not going to have any more further out evaluations, so --

THE COURT: Okay. No problem. So, it will be off calendar till May $14^{\text {th }}$. That's your calendar call.

MR. FELICIANO: Yes. Now, today I spoke to -- in speaking with Mr. Vasquez-Reyes this morning, he has some issues that I can't resolve that he wants to address with the Court. I -- so, l've told him, but we've been here doing this now for about three years, so he wants to address the Court.

THE COURT: Okay.
[The Defendant speaks through the use of the Court Interpreter]
THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, with all due respect, this is what I need; I need all those documents from the doctor that shows all the medications l've ever received because they're giving me medications that are not for my well-being, for my health. I should only be getting medications for blood pressure, but l've been getting up to six pills. I've been getting aspirin for my heart issues and two other pills that I don't know what they're for. The doctor wrote down the medication that I should be getting and the nurse gave me the names of the medication that l'm getting and they don't coincide with what l'm supposed to be getting. And right now on my way to court they put something in my food that I'm not -- just don't feel well.

THE COURT: Who put something in your food?
THE DEFENDANT: I need to -- that -- you know, have that checked, whatever they put into my food.

THE COURT: Who put something in your food?
THE DEFENDANT: I do not know. I just want to know what was put in it.

THE COURT: Well, how do you know they -- somebody put
something in your food?
THE DEFENDANT: Because I always wash what I eat and then feel well, and this time I didn't wash it and now I don't feel well. All of us who are on a special diet, it's the same case.

MR. FELICIANO: Well, we have looked at the NaphCare records, not recently, and there's no -- at least the records don't show anything where they're putting -- tainting his food, and I know of no medicines that they would add to food, but, you know --

THE DEFENDANT: I want to ask, please, I need all those names of the medications that l've been given for the past three years that l've been here.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, your attorney has your medical records; he can provide that to you.

THE DEFENDANT: But I need the names of all the pills that I've been given.

THE COURT: Okay. And that --
MR. FELICIANO: I'Il --
THE COURT: -- should be in the medical records.
MR. FELICIANO: I'll order updated records --
THE COURT: Okay.
MR. FELICIANO: -- and get those to him. It's probably going to take a week or so to get them, but I can --

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. FELICIANO: -- get those pretty quick.
THE COURT: All right.

THE DEFENDANT: And, please, Your Honor, please don't delay my trial anymore because l've been here for three years and l've been just getting more and more time and it's just not fair.

THE COURT: Okay. I know you're ready to go to trial, and we're -- l'm going to do everything in my power to make sure it goes forward on the date that it's scheduled to go forward.

THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, ever since I got arrested the DA should have been ready. It's been three years and they're not ready.

THE COURT: Well, the DA's been ready. That's not necessarily true. The DA has been ready.

THE DEFENDANT: Well, l've been ready for three years.
THE COURT: Okay. All right.
MR. FELICIANO: So, calendar call next week.
THE COURT: That's right. We'll see you then.
MR. FELICIANO: So, do you know if -- are -- does it look good for trial; can you tell? Or we won't know till next week as far as, like, are we -- because I think I -- my secretary said that you're dark the -- like in a week or so for a week. I don't know if that's true though.

THE COURT: The $19^{\text {th }}$ through -- yeah, it's before your trial date.

MR. FELICIANO: Oh, okay. All right.
THE COURT: Yeah, it's before.
MR. FELICIANO: All right. We'll see what happens next week.

THE COURT: Yeah, okay.
MR. FELICIANO: Thank you.
THE COURT: Thank you.
MS. DIGIACOMO: Thank you.
THE DEFENDANT: I have another question. They sent me to the psychiatric -- to do a psychiatric evaluation and I came out fine. And Mr. Feliciano, he said to me that I have to undergo psychiatric treatment. And that's what I told the doctor, that I need -- all I need is my medication for my high blood pressure, cholesterol, and diabetic, and that's it.

THE COURT: Okay.
THE DEFENDANT: So, they did the test, I came out fine, and this is why I'm here. Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
MR. FELICIANO: Thank you, Judge.
THE COURT: Thank you.
[Proceedings concluded at 9:45 a.m.]
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THE COURT: State of Nevada versus Vasquez-Reyes, C316382. He's present, he's in custody. He's using the services of the interpreter.

Will the interpreter please state her name for the record?
THE COURT INTERPRETER: Norma Caucas, C-A-U-C-A-S.
THE COURT: Thank you.
MR. FELICIANO: May we approach?
THE COURT: You may.
MR. FELICIANO: Thank you.
[Bench conference -- begins]
THE COURT: You're, like, killing me, Mr. Feliciano.
MS. CLEMONS: Good morning.
MR. FELICIANO: I'm sorry?
THE COURT: Are you really going to send him to
Competency again? What am I going to do?
MR. FELICIANO: Do you remember what he said last time we were here?

THE COURT: Yeah, but --
MR. FELICIANO: That Sweetin's poisoning his food.
THE COURT: Oh, yeah, yeah.
MR. FELICIANO: I mean --
MS. CLEMONS: I mean -- yeah.
MR. FELICIANO: Here's the thing, the thing I have --

THE COURT: Yeah, that was a little -- that was strange.
MR. FELICIANO: And there's -- I mean, I have a lot of other stuff that he said. It was just bizarre. I don't really know what to do with this guy. It's been three years.

THE COURT: Well, if you tell me to send him back I don't think I have a choice.

MS. CLEMONS: I agree.
MR. FELICIANO: Will the State object and make us go over objection?

MS. CLEMONS: I mean, I just -- I don't know if I'm -- I don't know him, so l'm not in a position --

THE COURT: Well, I mean, if they object I'm going to send him.

MS. CLEMONS: Yeah.
MR. FELICIANO: Okay.
THE COURT: I mean --
MS. CLEMONS: The thing with him is that he really wants to go to trial.

THE COURT: Because I'm going to be sure.
MR. FELICIANO: He --
THE COURT: If you're telling me, you as his attorney -- you're the one that has the most interaction with him. You're the one that has the most contact. If you're concerned about his competency, with all due respect to the State, they can --

MS. CLEMONS: Right, yeah.

THE COURT: -- object, but l'm going to send him there because I need to be sure.

MR. FELICIANO: I understand. I mean, just certain other departments -- it just depends on the department, depends on who we're -- the State, the DA we're dealing with that -- I've had objections to that before.

MS. CLEMONS: I've --
MR. FELICIANO: Not with this --
MS. CLEMONS: I've -- yeah, I --
MR. FELICIANO: Not in this department.
THE COURT: And the person doesn't get referred? Oh my God.

MS. CLEMONS: I know.
MR. FELICIANO: It's -- we've dealt, you know --
THE COURT: That's a bad record.
MS. CLEMONS: Yeah, yeah.
MR. FELICIANO: Oh -- yeah, I agree. It's just I don't know -do you want me to make a record as to the things l'm seeing or just send him? I --

THE COURT: Did you fill out the --
MR. FELICIANO: I didn't fill it out yet because I called yesterday to --

THE COURT: Yeah, usually what I do is I, like, just read it -MR. FELICIANO: Yeah.

THE COURT: -- and then I sign it because l'm not sure you
want to put all -- I mean, are you going to --
MR. FELICIANO: Okay.
THE COURT: -- want to -- I think you can make your record by putting it in there.

MR. FELICIANO: Okay. I will. I think he is --
THE COURT: He's going to freak out.
MS. CLEMONS: He's going to freak out, yeah.
MR. FELICIANO: I know.
MS. CLEMONS: That's why I feel like -- you know, there's some defendants who make this up because they don't want to go to trial. Like, he's not one of them, so for him to start saying weird stuff like this it's very concerning.

THE COURT: Yeah, that was weird, you know?
MR. FELICIANO: And that's just a few of the things that are bizarre. So, I will -- he's going to make a statement, so l'll tell him -THE COURT: Again?

MR. FELICIANO: -- what's happening and then we'll go from there.

THE COURT: How do you know? He told you?
MR. FELICIANO: Well, he usually wants to make statements --

THE COURT: Yeah.
MR. FELICIANO: -- and I stop him, but when I explain to him I think he's going to have a few words for us. But l'll fill out --

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. FELICIANO: -- the form.
THE COURT: But did you tell him you're concerned about his --

MR. FELICIANO: I told him and that just met with more agitation.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. FELICIANO: When I met with him last week.
THE COURT: Well, when -- and that's -- I -- and I don't think we have any choice then.

MR. FELICIANO: I don't think so, and that would be our position because I don't see -- there's no way I could try a case with him next to me in that condition. So, l'll fill out the form. Okay.

THE COURT: Okay. Yeah.
MR. FELICIANO: All right.
THE COURT: And then we'll refer him over. I mean, I think l've got to be sure. Everybody has to be sure.

MS. CLEMONS: Yeah, it's too big of a sentence to not; in my personal feeling. It's too big of a sentence not to be sure.

THE COURT: I -- yeah, way -- it's too big of a case -MS. CLEMONS: Yeah.

THE COURT: -- to not be sure.
MR. FELICIANO: And what I will do, I will reach out to the doctors and tell them exactly what l'm seeing to see if -- because sometimes they reach out to us. Sometimes they -- they usually don't though.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. FELICIANO: So, l'll do that.
THE COURT: Okay.
MR. FELICIANO: Do you want to call the case now or give me a couple of seconds?

THE COURT: Yeah, you can fill it out and then we'll recall it.
MR. FELICIANO: [Indiscernible].
THE COURT: Okay.
[Bench conference -- concludes]
THE COURT: So we're just going to trail the case for a minute for the -- for his attorney to prepare some paperwork.
[Proceedings trailed at 9:45 a.m.]
[Proceedings recalled at 9:55 a.m.]
THE COURT: State of Nevada versus Vasquez-Reyes, C316382. He's present and in custody using the services of the same interpreter.

THE COURT INTERPRETER: Norma Caucas.
THE COURT: Okay. I mean, based on what I've reviewed I'm inclined to refer this to Department 7; right?

MS. CLEMONS: Mm-hmm.
MR. FELICIANO: Thank you.
THE COURT CLERK: That will be June $7^{\text {th }}, 10$ a.m., Department 7.

MR. FELICIANO: So, Mr. Vasquez I believe wants to address the Court. I told him he should not, but, I mean, I can't keep him from
doing it.
THE COURT: Okay. And -- but based on that, you understand l'll be vacating the trial date.

MS. CLEMONS: Yes.
MR. FELICIANO: Yes.
THE COURT: Okay.
MS. CLEMONS: And then we'll just take the motions off calendar until we -- we're back?

THE COURT: That's correct.
Go ahead, sir.
[The Defendant speaks through the use of the Court Interpreter]
THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, I have been incarcerated for three years. I would like to know why it's taking so long. I have been ready for the last three years and I'm still here. I am sick. I -- last Tuesday I was very sick. I don't know what's going on with the food. Today I haven't eaten. Look it, I'm wasting away.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Thank you.
MR. FELICIANO: Thank you.
THE COURT: Thank you.
[Proceedings concluded at 9:57 a.m.]
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THE COURT: State of Nevada versus Armando Vasquez-Reyes, C316382. He is present in custody. He was found competent to proceed with adjudication --

MS. ROMNEY: This is an interpreter case.
[Matter trailed at 10:16 a.m.]
[Matter recalled at 10:33 a.m.]
THE COURT: State of Nevada versus Armando Vasquez-Reyes, C316382. He is present in custody. He is being assisted by the Court Interpreter. And, Madam Interpreter, could we please get your name for the record.

THE INTERPRETER: Yes. My name is Simena, S-I-M-E-N-A, Chita, C-H-I-T-A.

THE COURT: Thank you, ma'am. So Mr. Vasquez-Reyes was found competent. Is there any challenge to that finding?

MR. FELICIANO: There is.
THE COURT: All right. So when would you like to do a challenge hearing?
MR. FELICIANO: Can we set a hearing today in three weeks?
MR. O'BRIEN: Well, are you going to get --
MR. FELICIANO: We have records already from the last time.
MR. O'BRIEN: There is no independent eval in there.
MR. FELICIANO: There is one that we -- actually, we had a doctor evaluate him before we sent him to competency, and Judge-- before he went to Judge -- Judge Leavitt's courtroom. So can we just set it out a couple weeks and --
for scheduling maybe?
MS. ROMNEY: Hold on.
[Defense counsel confer]
MR. FELICIANO: Okay. So I'm going to get my evil to Mr. O'Brien and then go from there. Maybe we can have a week or so?

MR. O'BRIEN: Two weeks.
MR. FELICIANO: Two weeks?
THE COURT: All right. Weill pass it two weeks to set a challenge hearing?
MR. FELICIANO: Yes. Thank you.
THE CLERK: June 21st, 10:00 am.
[Proceeding concluded at 10:34 a.m.]
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THE COURT: State of Nevada versus Armando Vasquez-Reyes, C316382. He's present in custody. This is a status check to set a challenge hearing.

MS. ROMNEY: Your Honor, this is Mr. Feliciano's case. He indicated that he had the independent evaluations done. He just needs the report. He's asking for two weeks.

THE COURT: All right. We'll pass it two weeks, and Ill just note that Mr.
Vasquez-Reyes is being assisted by the Court Interpreter.
THE CLERK: We're dark in two. Can I go three?
THE COURT: Were going to go three.
THE CLERK: July 12th, 10 am.
[Proceeding concluded at 10:19 a.m.]
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Friday - July 12, 2019 - Las Vegas, Nevada
[Proceedings begin at 10:16 a.m.]

THE COURT: State of Nevada versus Armando Vasquez-Reyes, Case Number C316382.

MR. FELICIANO: This is a status check for us to see if were going to challenge competency. Based on what we've done, we cannot -- we're not going to challenge competency at this point.

THE COURT: All right. So then based on the -- pursuant to NRS 178.420, based on the reports of Dr. Sussman and Dr. Collins finding Mr. Vasquez-Reyes competent, this case will return to District Court Department 12 --

THE INTERPRETER: Your Honor, the interpreter did not -- did not hear.
THE COURT: Oh, I'm sorry. So pursuant to NRS 178.420, based on the reports of Dr. Sussman and Collins finding Mr. Vasquez-Reyes competent to proceed with adjudication, this case will return to District Court Department 12.

THE CLERK: July 16, 8:30, Department 12.
MR. FELICIANO: Thank you.
THE COURT: Thank you.
[Proceeding concluded at 10:19 a.m.]
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THE COURT: State of Nevada versus Vasquez-Reyes, C316382. He's present, he's in custody. He's using the services of the interpreter.

Will the interpreter state his name for the record?
THE COURT INTERPRETER: Ricardo Pico, Spanish interpreter.

THE COURT: Okay. This is -- he's returned, we have a finding now, so l'm assuming I can reset it for trial.

MR. FELICIANO: Yes.
THE COURT: Okay. What do your trial calendars look like?
MR. FELICIANO: Other than December, I can probably get this to go pretty much at any point.

THE COURT: This year?
MR. FELICIANO: Yes.
THE COURT: Okay.
MS. CLEMONS: Yes, October and November I have -- Jim and I have some dates available, so is there anything the Court has available October, November?

THE COURT CLERK: We have an October stack from October $8^{\text {th }}$ to the - November $5^{\text {th }}$, so --

MR. FELICIANO: I do have other cases, but this one is, like, three years old, so --

THE COURT: Sure.

MR. FELICIANO: -- I imagine --
MS. CLEMONS: Yeah.
MR. FELICIANO: -- this is priority, so -- okay.
MS. CLEMONS: Do you want to do October $8^{\text {th }}$ ?
MR. FELICIANO: Sure.
MS. CLEMONS: October $8^{\text {th }}$ would work.
THE COURT CLERK: Okay. Calendar call's going to be October $1^{\text {st }}, 8: 30$ a.m., jury trial October $8^{\text {th }}, 1: 30$ p.m.

MS. CLEMONS: Thank you.
MR. FELICIANO: Thank you.
THE COURT: Thank you. [Colloquy regarding an unrelated matter] MR. FELICIANO: Oh.

THE COURT: Oh, go ahead.
[The Defendant speaks through the use of the Court Interpreter]
THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, this is just giving me the runaround. I mean, I wanted 60 days. It's -- I think it should be sooner then. I've been detained for over three years; three years and three months.

THE COURT: I think that's --
THE DEFENDANT: Please, Your Honor.
THE COURT CLERK: August stack.
THE COURT: I mean, I have an August stack.
MS. CLEMONS: I have multiple invokes --
THE COURT: Okay.

MS. CLEMONS: -- in August, I think one in here as well, so that's my, kind of, dilemma on that. I mean, he's waived, so in theory the invokes --

THE COURT: Right, but --
MS. CLEMONS: -- are going to take precedence.
THE COURT: Right.
MS. CLEMONS: Mm-hmm.
THE COURT: And I understand he --
MS. CLEMONS: Yeah.
THE COURT: -- wants to go to trial as soon as --
MS. CLEMONS: Right.
THE COURT: -- possible. I mean, he has been in custody for quite some time.

MS. CLEMONS: Correct.
THE COURT: But, Mr. Vasquez-Reyes, that -- it looks like that's as soon as I'm going to be able to set your trial to start.

THE DEFENDANT: So, what's going on?
THE COURT: It's not necessarily your attorney's fault, it's the Court's calendar; okay?

THE DEFENDANT: Okay. Thank you.
THE COURT: Thank you.

MS. CLEMONS: Thank you.
MR. FELICIANO: Thank you.
[Proceedings concluded at 9:34 a.m.]
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THE COURT: State of Nevada versus Armando VasquezReyes, case C316382.

MR. FELICIANO: Good morning. I think we need Mr.
Sweetin.
MS. HOJJAT: Oh, he was here.
THE COURT: Okay.
MR. FELICIANO: I'll wait.
THE COURT: Sure, no problem.
[Proceedings trailed at 8:43 a.m.]
[Proceedings recalled at 9:07 a.m.]
THE COURT: Good morning, Page 1.
MR. FELICIANO: Yes, please.
THE COURT: State versus Vasquez-Reyes, C316382.
He's present, he's in custody. This is on for calendar call. The Defendant is using the services of the interpreter. Will the interpreter state her name for the record.

THE COURT INTERPRETER: Soledad Garcia.
THE COURT: Thank you. So, this is on for calendar call. Are the parties ready to go?

MR. SWEETIN: State expects ready, Judge.
MR. FELICIANO: We are.
THE COURT: How long is this going to take?
MR. FELICIANO: A week and a half maybe.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. FELICIANO: At least a week.
MR. SWEETIN: Yeah. I think -- we have at least ten witnesses. I know the Defense has some witnesses. So, I would expect it's going to be six to seven days, somewhere in that territory.

THE COURT: Okay. Will you be able to start jury selection -[Colloquy between the Court and the Court Clerk]

THE COURT: I'm going to ask if you could start on Monday but I -- I will still be in another trial. So, probably the earliest you'll start is Tuesday morning. But l'm going to finish up my calendar calls and then l'll let you know when we're going to start. But it will probably be Tuesday morning at 10:30. I mean, obviously if my trial in front of you isn't done it will just move.

MR. FELICIANO: Okay.
MR. SWEETIN: That's fine, Judge. I did file a motion in limine --

THE COURT: Yes.
MR. SWEETIN: -- and I submitted that. That was an issue that we've discussed, Defense and myself, and it was a choice in regards to how they're going to proceed or what they're going to do, and they're not -- they weren't exactly sure what they were going to do.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. SWEETIN: And so I presented it in the motion in limine to make sure that we had a ruling.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. FELICIANO: So, I received it. I would ask for -- maybe I could respond to it and maybe put it on in a couple days if possible. I noticed -- when this went to Competency Court there was some other things that were taken off calendar. So, I wanted to see if we could address those maybe Thursday.

THE COURT: Okay. What else was taken off calendar so I can make sure everything gets [indiscernible].

MR. FELICIANO: Our motion to dismiss to preserve exculpatory evidence, our motion to exclude improper expert opinion, and our motion to reconsider.

MR. SWEETIN: And --
THE COURT: And so there's three motions by the Defense.
MR. FELICIANO: Yeah. And there's one --
THE COURT: And there's a motion in limine?
MR. SWEETIN: Yeah. And l'm not aware of those motions, to tell you the truth. I thought everything had been resolved up to this point. But I can get with Defense counsel and see. I know that there -there have been motions going back and forth. There still is a second motion to suppress that -- I mean, that's all I thought was outstanding, and that's -- has to do with -- Defense filed a second motion to suppress. I think the Court ruled that there would be a Denno hearing on first day of trial. And I thought that that was all that we had outstanding besides mine. But I can talk to Defense counsel. I know that we have resolved and there's been some motions withdrawn in the process.

THE COURT: Were they responded to? Did the State
respond to them?
MR. FELICIANO: I don't think so. I'm looking at the minutes from May $14^{\text {th }}$ of this year and it looks like that was all taken off calendar. I don't think -- I don't know if there were responses filed. I don't think so.

THE COURT: Okay. So, it probably is not going to do any good to put it on Thursday. Why don't we continue them all for the first day of trial next Tuesday --

MR. FELICIANO: Okay.
THE COURT: -- so both sides can respond to the outstanding motions.

MR. FELICIANO: Okay. Do you want us to re-file them or just --

THE COURT: No, no, l'll just set them. Thank you.
MR. FELICIANO: Thank you.
[Proceedings concluded at 9:11 a.m.]
[Proceedings recalled at 10:56 a.m.]
MS. HOLIDAY: Your Honor, as to page one --
THE COURT: Right.
MS. HOLIDAY: -- the attorneys asked me to let them know when --

THE COURT: Mr. Sweetin, we're going to call page one again, Vasquez-Reyes. We can just start Tuesday morning. What time is that? I mean, what day is that?

THE COURT CLERK: Next Tuesday; correct?
THE COURT: Right.

THE COURT CLERK: October $8^{\text {th }}$ at 10:30 a.m.
THE COURT: I'm going to set it for October $8^{\text {th }}$ at 10:30.
I believe I'll be done, but I just want to make sure you understand if for any reason -- we'll stay in contact with you and let you know -- but tentatively Tuesday, if not we'll start Wednesday morning.

MS. HOLIDAY: Thank you, Your Honor.
MR. SWEETIN: That's fine, Judge. Just to let the Court know remember that we have a Denno hearing --

THE COURT: Right.
MR. SWEETIN: -- where we're going to have to call at least two witnesses and I know the Defendant will want to testify again. And I remember the last time we had a Denno hearing it took like a couple hours, I think.

THE COURT: Okay, okay. Thank you.
MR. SWEETIN: So, l'm not sure.
THE COURT: We can do that first.
MR. SWEETIN: If you want me to have my witnesses available for Tuesday for that hearing or -- for the Denno hearing.

THE COURT: Yeah. I really think we'll be done.
MR. SWEETIN: Okay.
THE COURT: And so I'm estimating that we'll start Tuesday morning so we can start with your hearing Tuesday morning.

MR. SWEETIN: Okay. So, l'll have them -- l'll let them know that we might be delayed but --

THE COURT: Okay.

THE COURT CLERK: If we do a Wednesday start, just in case, there would be a 10:30 start as well.

THE COURT: All right. So, if it's Wednesday it will be 10:30.
MR. SWEETIN: Okay. Thank you.
THE COURT: All right. Thanks.
[Proceedings concluded at 10:57 a.m.]
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LAS VEGAS, NEVADA, MONDAY, OCTOBER 7, 2019, 10:42 A.M. (Court was called to order) (Prospective jurors not present)

THE COURT: State of Nevada versus Vasquez-Reyes. C316382. The defendant is present. He is in custody. He's using the services of the interpreter.

Would the interpreter please state her name for the record.

THE INTERPRETER: Maria Peralta De Gomez.
THE COURT: Thank you. Thank you very much for being here.

Will the parties make their appearances, please. MR. SWEETIN: James Sweetin an William Rowles for the State.

MR. FELICIANO: Mike Feliciano and Nadia Hojjat for Mr. Vasquez-Reyes.

THE COURT: Good morning.
Okay. So it's my understanding your witnesses are here for the motion to suppress.

MR. SWEETIN: They are.
THE COURT: So are you going to call the witnesses?
I don't know how --
MR. SWEETIN: I was going to call the witnesses, Judge. And it's basically -- you know, it's a little strange, because $I$ know we've got a prior motion to suppress in this
case.

THE COURT: Right.
MR. SWEETIN: And I think I have to present
basically all of the evidence even though the issue in this case is very -- kind of unique just to get into defendant's, you know, essentially what probable cause was at any point in time and that in fact the defendant gave a statement. He was arrested at the end. So I do intend to introduce all that.

THE COURT: And I guess it's your burden if you want to bring in the statement, so --

Mr. Feliciano?

MR. FELICIANO: I know we have a number of motions. All I'm going to do is ask how do you want to do these, after, Or --

THE COURT: Well, there's a couple of them that I got oppositions to this morning.

MR. FELICIANO: Yes.
THE COURT: And so I have to have an opportunity to read those.

MR. FELICIANO: Okay.
THE COURT: But I'd like -- if you have witnesses here, I'd like to get the witnesses called, and then we can move on.

MR. FELICIANO: Okay. Sure. Thank you.
MR. SWEETIN: So the State would call as its first
witness Maria Corral.
THE COURT: And $I$ know the State filed a motion last Friday, too, that you opposed this morning. I didn't mean to infer that, you know, anybody wasn't getting their stuff on time, but $I$ just got a couple of them this morning.

MARIA CORRAL, STATE'S WITNESS, SWORN
THE CLERK: You may be seated. Please state and spell your first and last name for the record.

THE WITNESS: My name is Maria Corral, M-A-R-I-A Corral is $C-O-R-R-A-L$.

DIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MR. SWEETIN:
Q Ms. Corral, how are you currently employed?
A I'm currently employed as a part-time Spanish interpreter for Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department.

Q And how long have you been so employed?
A Fifteen years.
Q And what are your duties in that position?
A To interpret for the detectives, the officers, and the Spanish speakers.

Q So it'd be fair to say that you translate English to Spanish, Spanish to English for other individuals?

A Yes, I do.
Q What qualifies you to perform that job?
A I have -- I was -- I passed all the appropriate
exams that are required by Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department, and I also took a short course through UNLV to become certified, to obtain certification.

Q How long have you been speaking Spanish?
A That's my native language.
Q So since birth you've been speaking Spanish.
A Right.

Q And you indicated that you are certified by the Las
Vegas Metropolitan Police Department to interpret; is that correct?

A That's correct.
Q Are there different forms of certification as to forms of your ability to interpret, by writing, by talking?

A Writing, sight translation, consecutive, simultaneous.

Q And are you certified in all of those?
A Through Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department.
Q Okay. Have you previously testified as an expert regards to English/Spanish translation in the courts here in Clark County?

A I was through the courts.
Q So you have testified as an expert before?
A Have I testified as an expert before? Once before.will

Q Thank you. Now I want to turn your attention to

April 16th of 2016 in the afternoon. Were you so employed and on duty on that day?

A Yes, I was.
Q Did you have occasion to respond to the residence located at 2213 Berkley Avenue here in Las Vegas, Clark County, Nevada, on that day?

A Yes, I did.
Q Do you remember about what time you arrived?
A I arrived there around 4:30 p.m.
Q I'm sorry. It was 4:30 p.m.?
A Around 4:30 p.m.
Q And what was the purpose of your arrival there?
A I went there -- originally it was a disturbance, but there were some other allegations made.

Q Okay. So you went there because there was a call made to the Police Department; is that correct?

A That's correct.
Q And you as a translator went there for what purpose?
A To assist the officers that responded to that event.
Q And do you recall what you did upon arrival at that location?

A When I arrived I approached the officers, and they told me to -- they told me to wait, there were some other allegations, a sexual assault detective was on his way. MS. HOJJAT: Objection. Hearsay.

THE COURT: I mean, we're having a Jackson v. Denno hearing, so I'm going to allow it. Go ahead. BY MR. SWEETIN:

Q After you received information that in fact there was an ongoing investigation were you ever asked to assist in translation with anyone in particular?

A With the suspect and the detective.

Q Do you see the suspect in the courtroom today?
A I don't see him. I believe that's him sitting right in front of me in the white shirt.

MS. HOJJAT: And I'd like the record to reflect that she first said, "I don't see him," and then most of the parties in the room turned and looked to the defendant, and then she identified the defendant.

MR. FELICIANO: And he's the only one who's not wearing a suit of the males in the courtroom. BY MR. SWEETIN:

Q Do you see a person that you believe is the person that you translated for on that day?

A I believe so. I believe it's him sitting in front of me.

Q Okay. So is a person sitting at the table next to him?

A At the table across from me.
Q And could you describe something that person's
wearing today.
A A white shirt.

Q Does the person have a coat on?

A No.

MR. SWEETIN: May the record reflect the witness has
identified the defendant?

THE COURT: So reflected.

MS. HOJJAT: I'd object to the identification, Your
Honor, based on the previous interaction that occurred.
THE COURT: Overruled. And you can proceed.
BY MR. SWEETIN:
Q At that time did you become aware of the individual's name as being that of Armando Vasquez-Reyes?

A Yes.

Q Okay. And upon being asked to assist did you translate for an officer?

A I don't recall actually translating for the officer.
Q Who did you translate for?
A For the detective.
Q Who was the detective?
A Detective Pretti.

Q Okay. And in the course of that translation did you in fact translate everything that was being said between the defendant and Detective Pretti?

A Yes.

MS. HOJJAT: I'm going to object to leading at this point, Your Honor. I understand some foundational stuff, but we're in the substance of what her testimony is at this point. I think there need to be open-ended questions.

THE COURT: I mean, if it's foundational, I'll allow
you to lead. But otherwise --
MR. SWEETIN: That's fine, Judge.
BY MR. SWEETIN:

Q You indicated that you subsequently had a conversation; is that correct?

A That's correct.
Q Okay. And what did you do in that conversation?
A In the conversation what $I$ remember, it was mentioned that --

Q What did you do?
A I interpreted.
Q Okay. Now, do you remember the substance of that conversation?

A The substance. I remember there was a discussion about continuing going over to headquarters.

Q Okay. Do you remember specifically what was said?

A I don't remember specifically what was said.
Q But you remember that was sort of the subject matter?

A That was the subject.

Q Okay. Now, at the time that you were translating as you've described did the defendant appear to understand what you were saying?

A Yes.

Q Did he answer appropriately?
A Yes.

MS. HOJJAT: Objection. Speculation as to what the defendant understood or didn't understand.

THE COURT: Overruled.

BY MR. SWEETIN:
Q What was his demeanor?
A He appeared very calm and very cooperative.
Q What happens next?
A Next we all head out to headquarters.

Q And when you said we all would that be Detective Pretti?

A Detective Pretti -- I left in my -- in the Department vehicle, and then we all met at headquarters.

Q Okay. So sometime later you met Detective Pretti again at headquarters. Would that be fair to say?

A Yes.
Q Okay. Were you able to see the defendant once you went to headquarters?

A Yes.
Q Okay. At some point in time did you assist again in
translating for the defendant?

A Yes.

Q And approximately what time was that?
A That was around 18:00, 6:00 o'clock or a little after 6:00 p.m.

Q And could you describe was it on one occasion, or more than one occasion while you were at headquarters that you assisted in translating for the defendant?

A I remember one occasion.

Q There was an interview that was performed; is that correct?

A That's correct.
Q Was there a prior occasion before that?
A I don't recall.

Q Was there a time when you assisted in translating in
regard to some money?
A Yes.

MS. HOJJAT: Objection. Asked and answered.
THE COURT: Just a minute. What's the objection? MS. HOJJAT: I mean, she had said that she doesn't remember, and now the State is just testifying.

MR. SWEETIN: I'm just clarifying.

THE COURT: Overruled. You may proceed.
BY MR. SWEETIN:

Q And approximately when was that that you assisted
with an issue with money?
A Prior to the interview.

Q And that would have been about how long before the interview?

A A few minutes.

Q And at the time that you assisted on that occasion where were you at the police station?

A I was in headquarters in the interview room.
Q And who else was in the room?
A The defendant and Detective Pretti.
Q Okay. And yourself?
A And myself.
Q And what was the discussion that was had at that time?

A At that time there was a discussion about some rent money.

Q Do you remember the specifics of the conversation?
A He said he needed to pay the rent and asked -Detective Pretti asked if he could go get his wallet to get the money, and he agreed.

Q When you say he you're referring to the defendant?
A The defendant.
Q Okay. And did you later observe the defendant hand the money over to Detective Pretti?

A Yes.

Q Was there any other discussion at that time?
A Well, the defendant did mention to me that he was feeling light-headed, which I notified Detective Pretti. And he said he needed his medication. Detective Pretti asked, where's your modification; he said, it's in my lunch box. Where; at home. He says, $I$ can't get your medication, but do you want me to call Medical for you.

Q Did the defendant ever request that Medical be called?

A $\quad$ No.
Q Okay. Now, you had subsequent contact with him that day in another interview; is that correct?

A Pardon?

Q You said that there was another interview that was done a few minutes later.

A Right after that.
Q Okay. Was there ever any request by the defendant for Medical?

A No.

Q Now, going to the interview that was done a few minutes later, who was present in the room during that interview?

A It was myself, Detective Pretti, and I believe there was another detective.

Q Okay. And in that interview did you likewise
translate for Detective Pretti as he talked to the defendant?

A Yes.
Q Now, showing you what's marked as State's Exhibits -- Proposed Exhibits 1 and 2 and ask you, first looking at State's Proposed Exhibit 1, what is that?

A This is the video-audio tape.
Q And would that be the video-audio of the defendant in the interview room once he arrived at headquarters?

A Yes.
Q Okay. And have you had an opportunity to review that?

A Yes.
Q What's the basis of your recognition of this particular disk as representing that audio or video?

A The interview that was made between Detective Pretti and the defendant.

Q Okay. Is there something written on that disk that allows you to recognize that particularly?

A The defendant's name and my initials and $P$ number.
Q And you reviewed this on a prior occasion?
A Yes.
Q And is it a true and accurate depiction of what you observed in that room?

A Yes.
Q And I'm showing you what's marked as State's
Proposed Exhibit Number 2. Do you recognize that?
A Yes.
Q And what is that?
A That's a transcription of the interview.
Q So would that be fair to say that it's a
transcription of the interview that's contained on State's
Proposed Exhibit 1?
A Yes.
Q Now, have you had a chance to review that
transcription in its entirety?
A Yes, I have.
Q Did you prepare that transcription?
A No, I did not.
Q So does this transcription merely transcribe what
you in fact said?
A Right. What was said back and forth.
Q So everything in this transcription is in English;
is that right?
A That's correct.
Q And there's some transcriptions, but that wasn't
done by you?
A Correct.
Q That was done by somebody else?
A That's correct.
Q Have you had an opportunity to review this entire
document and the entire tape to verify the accuracy of the translations?

A Yes.
Q Okay. And in your review of this have you noticed any discrepancies?

A Yes.
Q Okay. What discrepancies have you noted?
A On page 4 I noticed that --
Q Moving to page 4.
A I noticed that the word -- he said his wife was mad.
Q When you say he --
A The defendant said the wife was mad. The
transcriber wrote "upset" versus "mad."
Q Okay. And so when you were transcribing [sic] what the defendant said to Detective Pretti you said the word "mad"; is that right?

A Right.
Q But when the transcriptionist wrote down, she said "upset"; is that correct?

A "Upset." That's correct.
Q Okay. So that's one discrepancy?
A Right.
Q And you believe that you translated that correctly?
A Correct.
MS. HOJJAT: I'm sorry. Could we get an indication

```
of where on page 4 we're talking about?
```

THE COURT: Sure. I don't know if there's line numbers.

MR. SWEETIN: There isn't line numbers, but we can count down.

THE COURT: Sure.
MR. SWEETIN: It would be -- on line 5 would be the word "upset."

THE COURT: And it should be "mad" instead of "upset"?

MR. SWEETIN: That's correct. That should be "mad." And then we see just two more lines down HIS is the translator, and she uses the word "mad" as she translates for Detective Pretti.

BY MR. SWEETIN:

Q So that's a discrepancy; is that correct?

A Yes.

Q Have you noticed any other discrepancies?
A Yes. There's a discrepancy on page 17.
Q Okay. Let's turn to page 17. Okay. And what's the discrepancy on that page, if you could? If you could, count down the page for the line number so we can all --

A Okay. Let me see where it's at. Line 12 the word "rape" --

THE COURT: I'm sorry. The word?

THE WITNESS: "Rape."

THE COURT: Okay.

THE WITNESS: Instead of "rape" I used the word
"abused."
BY MR. SWEETIN:

Q Okay. So just to be clear, on that line there is a designation there "Answer"; is that correct?

A Correct.

Q And that's when the defendant answered the -- hold on a second. That's when the defendant answered the question in Spanish; is that correct?

A That's correct.
Q And the transcriptionist who prepared this transcript translated that; is that correct?

A That's correct.

Q Is her translation accurate?
A Her translation is accurate.

Q Now, the next line is what you actually said to
Detective Pretti --

A Correct.
Q -- in translating; is that correct?
A Correct.

Q Was your translation accurate?

A No. I used "abuse" instead of "rape."
Q Okay. So that's the distinction. The word that was
used was the defendant said that he raped, you used the word "abuse."

A Abuse.

Q Okay. Besides those two discrepancies are there any other -- anything -- any other inaccuracies in this transcription?

A Not that I found.
MR. SWEETIN: Okay. State would move for the admission of what's been marked State's Proposed Exhibits 1 and 2 .

MS. HOJJAT: For the purpose of this hearing and getting a legal ruling on this issue we have no objection.

THE COURT: Okay. They're admitted. Thank you. (State's Exhibits 1 and 2 admitted)

BY MR. SWEETIN:
Q Now, when you began the interview with Detective Pretti do you recall whether or not there was a document that was provided to the defendant and signed?

A Yes.
Q And I'm showing you what's marked as State's Proposed Exhibit 3. Do you recognize this?

A Yes.
Q And what is that?
A The advisement of rights.
Q And was that provided to the defendant at the
beginning of the interview?

A Yes, it was.

Q Did you observe whether or not the defendant affixed his signature to that?

A Yes.

Q Now, just for the record, if I could have you just read into the record what is documented on that particular form.

A May I get my glasses?
Q Certainly.
A $\quad$ You have the right to remain silent. Anything you say will be used against you in a court of law. You have the right to consult an attorney before the questioning. You have the right to the presence of attorney during questioning. If you cannot afford an attorney, one will be appointed to you before questioning. Do you understand your rights?"

Q Thank you. I have no further --

MR. SWEETIN: And State would move the admission of what's been marked as State's Proposed Exhibit 3.

THE COURT: Thank you. Any objection?

MR. FELICIANO: For the purpose of this hearing, no. THE COURT: Thank you. It's admitted.
(State's Exhibit 3 admitted)
THE COURT: And you're done?
MR. SWEETIN: I'm done, Judge.

THE COURT: Okay. Any cross-examination? MS. HOJJAT: Yes, Your Honor. Thank you. THE COURT: You bet.

CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MS. HOJJAT:
Q Good morning, ma'am.
A Good morning.

Q How are you today?
A Very good, thank you.
Q All right. I want to start by talking to you about page 17 about "raped" versus "abused." So what word did the defendant use?

A He used "rape."
Q I mean in Spanish. What's the word?

A Oh. Violacion. Violata. Uh-huh.
Q So which one did he use, "violacion," or "violata"?

A Violata.
Q Now I want to talk to you about the initial encounter you had with my client at the residence.

A At the residence?
Q Yes. Actually, let's back up very quickly. I want to talk to you about what just happened in court this morning when Mr. Sweetin asked you if you saw Armando Vasquez-Reyes in court here today; okay?

A Uh-huh.

THE COURT: You need to answer audibly, please. THE WITNESS: Okay.

THE COURT: Thanks.

THE WITNESS: I'm sorry.
THE COURT: That's okay. You're fine.
BY MS. HOJJAT:

Q So you understand what we're talking about; right?
A Yes. Yes.

Q Okay. So you were sitting on the witness stand; correct?

A Correct.
Q And the setup of this courtroom is actually that defense table is almost directly across from the witness stand; correct?

A Correct.

Q And Mr. Vasquez-Reyes is on the left side of the defense table right now?

A Correct.

Q He is not blocked from your view by any sort of monitor or anything like that; correct?

A Correct.

Q Okay. So you're almost looking directly at him when you're sitting there.

A Correct.

Q Okay. And so Mr. Sweetin asked you if you saw the
individual in court today; correct?
A Correct.
Q And you looked right at defense table?
A Uh-huh.
Q Yes. And then you said you didn't see the individual.

A Right.
Q Right. And then multiple members of the courtroom all turned and looked at Mr. Vasquez-Reyes?

A Correct.
Q And then you said, oh, I think that might be.
A I recognized him then.
Q So now I want to talk to you -- now I want to go back and talk to you about your encounter at the Berkley Street address.

A Okay.
Q Okay. So this encounter happened in 2016?
A Correct.
Q April of 2016?
A Right.
Q So over three years ago?
A Yes.
Q Nearly three and a half years ago at this point?
A Correct.
Q Fair to say that you interpret frequently for Metro
officers and detectives?

A Correct.

Q This is in fact your full-time job?

A Part time.

Q Part time. Okay. So it's a part-time job. But you do it often?

A Correct.

Q You've been called out to many scenes?
A Correct;

Q You've interpreted for many individuals?

A Correct.

Q Do you have a $P$ number?
A Yes. It's 12133.
Q Okay. So you work with them so frequently you have a $P$ number; correct?

A Correct.

Q And, like we said, this was three and a half years ago.

A Correct.

Q Now the conversation about the -- your testimony about the conversation that happened at the police station, you had the chance to review video of that; correct?

A Yes.

Q In fact, the video that was just entered as an exhibit.

A Correct.

Q So you had the chance to view that and refresh your recollection as to what happened at the police station.

A Correct.

Q But there is no video or audio of what happened at the Berkley Street address.

A Correct.

Q Right. So you were going off of memory from three and a half years ago.

A That's correct.

Q And, like we've established, Mr. Vasquez-Reyes is not the only person that you have interviewed for.

A Right.
Q Translated for, rather. Correct?
A Correct.

Q Okay. And so you don't remember exactly what the conversation was at the Berkley Street address?

A No, I don't.
Q Okay. You remember vague generalities.
A Correct.

Q The general gist of what happened?

A Correct.

Q Which is that Mr. Vasquez-Reyes was informed that
there was some sort of allegation?
A Correct.

Q And then he was told that he needed to go to the police station?

A Yes.
Q And then he was placed in handcuffs?
A I did not see that. I don't remember seeing that.
Q Okay. So you don't even recall whether he was placed in handcuffs or not.

A No.
Q Okay. Were you present when he was placed in the back of the police car in this case?

A From what I remember I was already walking towards my Department vehicle.

Q Okay. Do you remember him being placed in the back of the police car at all?

A No.
Q Okay. So you just weren't present for that?
A Right.
Q Okay. So basically that's the gist of what you remember?

A Right.
Q Okay. And this all happened -- do you recall what time this all happened?

A This -- well, I arrived there around 4:30 in the afternoon.

Q At the Berkley Street address?

A At the Berkley Street address. MS. HOJJAT: Court's indulgence.
(Pause in the proceedings)
BY MS. HOJJAT:

Q Okay. So around 4:30 arrived there. And it was a short conversation that was had with Mr. Armando -- or Mr. Vasquez-Reyes?

A Yes.

Q Okay. And then the conclusion of that conversation being that they were going to take him to the police station?

A That we were all going to meet at the headquarters.
Q Okay. And so then you got in your car and drove to headquarters?

A Right. That's correct.
Q And then the interrogation in this case did not begin until 6:30 p.m. you said?

A Around that time.

Q Okay. In fact, if I said 6:27 p.m., , would that sound correct to you?

A That would -- that sounds correct. MS. HOJJAT: Okay. Court's indulgence.
(Pause in the proceedings)
MS. HOJJAT: Is this still recording when I press down? How do $I$ turn it off to have a conversation with my client?

THE COURT: I think you can turn it off.

MR. FELICIANO: Yeah. You just hold it. You have to hold it.

MS. HOJJAT: I am holding it, but it's still on.
MR. FELICIANO: Usually the light goes off when
it's --

THE COURT: Oh. Okay.
MS. HOJJAT: Yeah. Usually the light turns off when
you push the button.
MR. FELICIANO: So I'm still on the mike?
THE COURT RECORDER: If you just don't talk near it
we're not going to [inaudible].
MS. HOJJAT: Okay.
(Pause in the proceedings)
BY MS. HOJJAT:

Q And, ma'am, do you recall during the interrogation at the police station my client was handcuffed to the table?

A $\quad$ No.
Q You don't recall that?

A No.

MS. HOJJAT: Okay. Thank you.
Pass the witness, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Any redirect?
MR. SWEETIN: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you very much for your testimony here today. You may step down. MR. SWEETIN: The State would call Mark Pretti. THE COURT: You're excused for now. But I'm assuming she's still under subpoena. MR. SWEETIN: She is.

THE COURT: Okay. Do you mind if she leaves? MR. SWEETIN: No. THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. Who are you calling next? MR. SWEETIN: Mark Pretti. THE COURT: Okay.

MARK PRETTI, STATE'S WITNESS, SWORN THE CLERK: You may be seated. Please state and spell your first and last name for the record.

THE WITNESS: It's Mark Pretti, M-A-R-K
P-R-E-T-T-I. DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. SWEETIN:

Q Detective -- or Officer Pretti, how are you currently employed?

A I am a patrol sergeant with Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department.

Q How long have you been employed with the police department?

A Almost 13 years.

Q You mentioned that you're a patrol sergeant currently. How long have you held that position?

A Two months.

Q And previous to that where did you work?
A I was a detective in the Homicide and Sex Crimes

Bureau.
Q While in that Bureau were investigating predominantly sexual crimes?

A For most of my tenure there, yes.
Q I want to turn your attention back to April 16th of 2016 in the afternoon. Did you become -- do you recall being employed and on duty on that particular day?

A I do.

Q Do you recall being dispatched to the residence located at 2013 Berkley Avenue in Las Vegas, Clark County, Nevada, on that particular date?

A I do.

Q Do you remember approximately when you were dispatched?

A Just before 4:00 o'clock in the afternoon.
Q And what was the purpose of your dispatch?
A I was requested to assist in a sex crimes investigation.

Q Okay. Did you become aware of at that particular
time whether or not some of the witnesses might be Spanish speakers or English speakers?

A Yes. I was aware they were -- or made aware they were Spanish speaking.

Q Did you have occasion to come in contact with Maria Corral that afternoon?

A I did.

Q And how did you come in contact with her?
A She was on scene as a Spanish interpreter for the Metropolitan Police Department.

Q So upon arrival at that particular location what did you do?

A I made contact with the patrol officers that were already on scene, got a quick briefing overall as to what was going on, and then made my determination on what to do from there.

Q Okay. Based upon that information was your attention directed to any particular person?

A Yes.

Q Who would that be?
A That would have been a suspect, a victim, and a victim's mother.

Q Okay. Did you have conversations with each of those individuals?

A I did.

Q And were you able to ascertain the veracity of the officer's initial report that there had been a crime that occurred at that location?

A Yes.

Q What were you able to -- what specific probable cause were you able to develop at that particular time?

A The juvenile victim had told the patrol officers that she --

MS. HOJJAT: Objection. Hearsay.
MR. SWEETIN: And this goes --
THE COURT: Yeah. This is for purposes of a
hearing, so I'm going to allow it. Go ahead.
MR. SWEETIN: Thank you.
BY MR. SWEETIN:
Q And, if you could, describe the probable cause that you developed at that particular time as you talked to these witnesses and the police as you arrived?

A The juvenile victim had told patrol officers that she had been sexually abused by her stepfather for several years. I believe initially she told them the last incident was approximately a week prior.

Q Now, did they describe any particular sexual acts in regards to that abuse that you were aware of at that time?

A I don't recall specifically what she told patrol officers, but I -- that's it. I don't recall specifically.

Q Okay. But you recall there was specific information as to sexual crimes that were committed against her?

A Yes.

Q Now, at that particular time did you have sufficient probable cause to make an arrest?

A I believe so.

Q Okay. Did you choose to make an arrest at that time?

A At that time $I$ did not.

Q What did you do instead?
A I spoke with the suspect in the issue, requested that he consent to coming to Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department for -- or headquarters for interview. And I also had to conduct a formal interview with the victim.

Q Okay. Now, let me stop you there for a minute. You indicated that you had a conversation with the suspect; is that correct?

A Yes.

Q Do you see that person in the courtroom today?
A I do.

Q Could you point that person out, identify something he's wearing today.

A He's seated at the table to my right. He's wearing a white button-up shirt.

Q With no tie?

A No tie.

MR. SWEETIN: May the record reflect the witness
identified the defendant?

THE COURT: So reflected.
BY MR. SWEETIN:

Q Now at the time that you made contact with the defendant you'd mentioned earlier that Maria Corral was there to assist you; is that correct?

A Yes.

Q Was she there with you at that time?

A Yes.

Q And the reason for her being there was what?
A Spanish interpretation.

Q Okay. So it'd be fair to say you don't speak
Spanish.

A That's correct.

Q And the defendant did speak Spanish.
A My understanding, yes.
Q At the time that you made contact with the defendant you indicated that there was discussions about -MS. HOJJAT: Objection. Leading.

MR. SWEETIN: I'm just --

THE COURT: I mean, if this is foundational -MR. SWEETIN: Yes.

THE COURT: -- I'll allow it.

BY MR. SWEETIN:

Q You mentioned that there was some discussions in regards to going to the police station; is that correct?

A That's correct.
Q Could you describe those discussions in a little more detail?

A My discussion with the suspect?

Q Yes.

A Okay. I explained that there had been an allegation made against him and $I$ would like to speak with him regards to that allegation and requested that he come with us down to headquarters.

Q Okay. Now, why did you think it was better to go to headquarters at that particular time than to stay there?

A At that time we were out on the street in a residential neighborhood. There's no way to really have a sterile, private environment. We have audio and video recording capabilities at headquarters. Whereas, if we were out on the street in a patrol car or my unmarked vehicle, there's really no good way to do an interview and document it. We had the time to move a little bit more slow. We didn't have to get an interview right that second where he was standing. So I felt it was better to move everybody over to headquarters.

Q How did the defendant respond to your request to go
to headquarters to talk about this?

A He agreed to go to headquarters with us.

Q Was there any discussion in regards to how he would get to headquarters?

A I explained that he would be taken to headquarters in a marked patrol vehicle. I also explained that it was our policy to transport people in a marked patrol vehicle while in handcuffs. And he agreed to that, as well.

Q And was the defendant ultimately transported to headquarters?

A Yes.
Q In your initial contact with the defendant could you describe his demeanor as you made contact with him and had this conversation?

A He seemed calm. Nothing that $I$ would say is out of the ordinary.

MS. HOJJAT: Objection. Speculation. How would this witness know what's out of the ordinary for this defendant?

THE COURT: Overruled. It's just based on his perspective, obviously. BY MR. SWEETIN:

Q Was there anything to cause you to believe that the defendant did not understand what you were saying to him through the translator?

MS. HOJJAT: Objection. Speculation. THE COURT: Overruled. You can answer. THE WITNESS: No.

BY MR. SWEETIN:
Q Did you have any concerns that the defendant did not respond reasonably through the translator to your questions?

A I did not.

Q What happens upon arriving at -- and let me be clear. How far is headquarters from this particular location?

A It was not far. Maybe 10 -minute drive max.
Q Okay. And what happens upon the defendant and you arriving at headquarters?

A He was escorted into the interview room. I removed his handcuffs, asked him to take a seat at the table, and left the room.

Q Okay. So he remained in that interview room; is that correct?

A That's correct.
Q He wasn't in handcuffs?
A Correct.
Q He was just sitting, essentially, waiting?
A Correct.
Q And during that time you left the room; is that correct?

A Yes.

Q And where did you go?
A I went and conducted an interview with the victim and spoke with the victim's mother.

Q Okay. And at that time you obtained additional information. Would that be fair to say?

A Yes.

Q Okay. And after obtaining that information what happens next?

A I went back in essentially to start the interview with the suspect.

Q Was there just one time that you went back into the room, or multiple times you went back into the room?

A Multiple times.

Q Okay. How many times?
A At least three.
Q Okay. And prior to the interview how many times did you go back into the room?

A I believe two.
Q Okay. And for what purpose did you go back into the room?

A Initially there was a question over rent money from the victim's mother. The suspect had the rent money. Went in, kind of explained the situation to him, asked if it was okay to give the victim's mother the rent money. He agreed. I left the room to get the wallet -- excuse me, to get his
wallet, came back in, counted out the rent money with him there, took the rent money back to the suspect's mother, and then went back -- or, I'm sorry, the victim's mother and then went back in the room to start the interview.

Q Besides the discussion of the rent money as you were in the interview room, returning there, was there any other discussion that was had?

A Yes, there was.
Q And what would that be?
A Ms. Corral informed me that the suspect had told her he was light-headed, I believe because he was diabetic, and he needed his medication.

Q Okay. And did you have a discussion with the defendant about that through Ms. Corral?

A I did.
Q Okay. Could you describe that.
A I asked him where his medication was. I believe he said it was in his lunch box at his house. I told him I cannot give him medication, he's at the police department, I'm not trained or qualified to give medication. I told him if he needed medical attention to let me know and I would get medical attention for him.

Q Did he agree to that at that time?
A Yes.
Q Did he ever at any point in your contact with him
that evening request medical attention?
A No.
Q Now, you mentioned that a short time -- or at some time later there was an interview; is that correct?

A Yes.
Q About how long was that interview -- how long after that initial time that you were in the interview room with him discussing the money and his light-headedness did the second interview happen?

A Fifteen to twenty minutes maybe.
Q Okay. And in that second interview did you discuss matters relating to your investigation?

A I did.
Q I'm going to show you what's marked as State's Exhibits 1 and 2 for identification and ask if you recognize those.

A I do.
Q Okay. First referring to State's Exhibit 1, what's that?

A This is a DVD, the video recording of the interview.
Q Okay. And does that actually include a video of the entire time that the defendant was in the interview room?

A It does.
Q Have you had an opportunity to review that?
A Yes.
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