## IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

**KODY HARLAN** 

Appellant,

VS.

THE STATE OF NEVADA,

Respondent.

Electronically Filed
Mar 10 2021 02:39 p.m.
Supreme Court Cara Beth A. Brown
Clerk of Supreme Court

## APPELLANT'S APPENDIX Volume V

JEAN J. SCHWARTZER. ESQ Nevada Bar No. 11223 Law Office of Jean J. Schwartzer 170 S. Green Valley Parkway #300 Henderson, Nevada 89012 (702) 979-9941 Attorney for Appellant STEVEN B. WOLFSON, ESQ.
Nevada Bar No. 1565
Clark County District Attorney
Clark County District Attorney's Office
200 Lewis Avenue
Las Vegas, Nevada 89155
(702) 671-2500
Attorney for Respondent

## Harlan v. State Case No. 80318

## **INDEX TO APPELLANT'S APPENDIX**

Document	Page
Information (7.17.2018)	1-4
Instructions to the Jury (8.7.2019)	50-94
Judgment of Conviction (12.12.2019)	178-179
Motion in Limine re Bad Acts (4.18.2019)	37-37
Motion for New Trial (8.13.2019)	95-99
Motion to Sever (4.8.2019)	5-17
Notice of Appeal filed (12.23.2019)	180-181
Response to State's OPP to MTN for New Trial (10.3.2019)	167-177
State's OPP to MTN in Limine re bad Acts (4.25.2019)	38-47
State's OPP to MTN to Set Aside Verdict (8.20.2019)	100-117
State's OPP to MTN to Sever(4.11.2019)	18-30
State's Supplemental Opposition to MTN for New Trial (9.26.2019)	139-166
Supplemental Briefing for MTN for New Trial (9.12.2019)	118-138
Verdict Form (8.7.2019)	48-49
Transcript/Minutes	Page
Transcript of Evidentiary Hearing (1.22.2020)	1529-1600
Transcript of Hearing on MTN for New Trial (1.22.2020)	1504-1528
Transcript of Hearing on MTN to Sever (5.1.2020)	1644-1653
Transcript of Jury Trial Day 1 (1.22.2020)	182-503

Transcript of Jury Trial Day 2 (1.22.2020)	504-699
Transcript of Jury Trial Day 3 (1.22.2020)	700-954
Transcript of Jury Trial Day 4 (1.22.2020)	955-1146
Transcript of Jury Trial Day 5 (1.22.2020)	1147-1375
Transcript of Jury Trial Day 6 (1.22.2020)	1346-1495
Transcript of Jury Trial Day 7 (1.22.2020)	1496-1503
Transcript of Sentencing (1.22.2020)	1601-1643

1	gun, I associate with killing and death.
2	MR. HELMICK: That's what you associate it with?
3	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 471: Yes. And I'm still
4	very afraid. And I am up until today, I never really hold a gun.
5	And I only see the guns in like the law enforcement's pockets
6	MR. HELMICK: Uh-huh.
7	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 471: or in the movie. I
8	never really seen a real gun.
9	MR. HELMICK: Okay. Does that bother you when you see
10	it in the movies and when you walk by an officer who has a gun?
11	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 471: No.
12	MR. HELMICK: Okay.
13	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 471: No. Uh-uh.
14	MR. HELMICK: Do you understand or can you see Ms.
15	Leon's opinion and Mr. Contreras opinion in regards to carrying
16	guns? Do you understand other people's reason for it?
17	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 471: I do.
18	MR. HELMICK: All right.
19	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 471: But it still I still
20	have the fear.
21	MR. HELMICK: Okay.
22	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 471: Yeah.
23	MR. HELMICK: Yeah. So you just have a fear. Do you
24	have anything against somebody who carries a gun?
25	PROSPECTIVE ILIBOR NUMBER 471: Should Leav my

1	opinion?
2	MR. HELMICK: Sure.
3	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 471: Yes, I do. Nobody
4	should carry a gun except the law enforcement people.
5	MR. HELMICK: And if you were to find out there was guns
6	involved in this case, is that going to negatively affect your ability
7	to
8	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 471: Yeah.
9	MR. HELMICK: Yeah?
10	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 471: I think I will.
11	MR. HELMICK: And that's because you have a fear of
12	them?
13	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 471: That's right.
14	MR. HELMICK: Okay. All right. Thank you.
15	Anybody agree with Ms. Kord? I've had a few people
16	already. Anybody else though?
17	Yeah. Mr. Pereda, let's get you the microphone.
18	May I call you Juan?
19	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 432: Yes.
20	THE COURT: Okay. Juan, go ahead.
21	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 432: How based on
22	your last question I would I think that it would make me feel
23	uncomfortable and against the person in general that uses a gun
24	irresponsibly.
25	MR. HELMICK: Irrespons

1	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 432: You know, if
2	[indiscernible], if it's used to commit a crime, if you don't have the
3	license, whatever condition whether it is illegal or irresponsible, I
4	would feel I would take that as a [indiscernible], you know,
5	something that will make me feel very uncomfortable.
6	MR. HELMICK: Yeah. But will that
7	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 432: I believe in guns.
8	MR. HELMICK: Sure.
9	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 432: I like guns, I like
10	going shooting [indiscernible] you know, guns. I like shotguns
11	and it's not that I don't like them or disapprove them
12	MR. HELMICK: Yeah.
13	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 432: or whatever. But
14	use them irresponsible
15	MR. HELMICK: Well
16	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 432: commit a crime
17	while owning or carrying a gun that is was stolen or something
18	like that, you know, that would make me feel very, very
19	MR. HELMICK: Right.
20	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 432: bad.
21	MR. HELMICK: I think that'd make everybody in here feel
22	bad, right? Anybody everybody agree with Juan, if somebody is
23	using a gun irresponsibly, right?
24	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 432: And that's all I have
25	On the other hand, I'm okay with guns. I don't own one because

1	my wife, we're divorced, wouldn't buy a gun.
2	MR. HELMICK: Yeah, you don't want to do that.
3	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 432: No. But I feel that
4	I you know, irresponsible in general. What is irresponsible with
5	guns or, you know, [indiscernible] or whatever
6	MR. HELMICK: Yeah.
7	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 432: It makes me feel a
8	little uncomfortable.
9	MR. HELMICK: Well, you know, Judith talked about her
10	not being able to be fair on this jury possibly because there was a
11	gun involved. Do you agree with Judith or do you disagree with
12	her?
13	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 432: I will be fair, but I
14	can be influenced badly if the gun had been used irresponsibly or,
15	you know.
16	MR. HELMICK: That's going to negatively affect you.
17	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 432: That would be a
18	negative, you know? It will I don't know how I'm going to react to
19	that. I know how I'm going to react.
20	MR. HELMICK: Sure.
21	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 432: I know I I know
22	me, you know?
23	MR. HELMICK: Are you still going to listen to all the
24	evidence or do you still going to require the Prosecution to prove
25	the case beyond a reasonable doubt? Or when you hear those

1	facts, are you going to say you know what, I just don't know. I
2	mean, I'm already kind of I've already kind of answered it, like
3	kind of like Luis said earlier.
4	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 432: Exactly.
5	MR. HELMICK: You have already kind of answered it if
6	you see some facts like that?
7	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 432: Yes, I I'm not sure
8	but I will feel inclined to that. I knowing me [indiscernible], I think
9	that will tip the balance, you know, on the [indiscernible]
10	MR. HELMICK: Okay.
11	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 432: [indiscernible]
12	I'm just being honest
13	MR. HELMICK: Please, that's what I mean, listen, isn't
14	that the duty of this, right? Everybody has their different opinion
15	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 432: [Indiscernible].
16	MR. HELMICK: and everybody's walked this earth in
17	different shoes, right?
18	All right. Okay. Thank you, Juan.
19	All right. I want to talk about something that I know
20	probably all of you guys have heard about.
21	Okay. Anybody here ever heard about or read about or
22	watched a movie or anything in regard to somebody being
23	wrongfully charged or wrongfully convicted? Can I see your hands,
24	please?
25	Looks like we got a lot of people. All right. Hold those up

1	for me again real quickly just so I can see if I can visualize it. Okay.
2	All right. Let me talk to a few people here. Mr. Barrett,
3	right? Can I call you Brett?
4	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 398: Sure.
5	MR. HELMICK: Okay, Brett. Have you heard of a scenario
6	like that?
7	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 398: I've heard of a few.
8	MR. HELMICK: Okay. Do you know the facts that you
9	could share about one in particular?
10	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 398: I can't think of one
11	in particular, but I do know that kind of the recurring facts are that
12	oftentimes witnesses memories they can come up with phantom
13	memories and belief based on emotion more than what they
14	actually remember about particular crimes and get things wrong
15	honestly wrong.
16	MR. HELMICK: So okay so one thing you said was
17	maybe a bad memory, right, could be a factor?
18	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 398: Bad memory or
19	influenced memory in some way by the biases and the trauma of
20	the situation. Or by being coerced.
21	MR. HELMICK: Coerced, yeah. Thank you. Nick said
22	something about that, right?
23	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 398: Yeah.
24	MR. HELMICK: Okay. When you hear about those things,
25	I mean, how does that make you feel?

1	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 398: More informed.
2	MR. HELMICK: More informed? When you hear about a
3	story like that, more informed is
4	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 398: About the human
5	psyche, I guess, yeah.
6	MR. HELMICK: Sure.
7	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 398: I mean, it's a good
8	thing to know.
9	MR. HELMICK: Okay.
10	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 398: You know, the more
11	people know that or to be aware of that condition that it actually
12	happens more often than you might think.
13	MR. HELMICK: Yeah. Okay. Thanks, Brett.
14	You want to pass it over to Mr. Young.
15	Can I call you Chris?
16	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 540: Yes, sir.
17	MR. HELMICK: Okay, Chris. What do you think? Have
18	you ever heard a scenario like that?
19	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 540: Absolutely. A
20	couple.
21	MR. HELMICK: Okay.
22	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 540: I mean, I don't have
23	any definitive details
24	MR. HELMICK: Sure.
25	PROSPECTIVE ILIBOR NI IMBER 5/10: but there's lote of

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24 25 accounts of that happening; yes, sir.

MR. HELMICK: How does that make you feel?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 540: Bad for the wrongfully convicted. I mean, I don't know. It's just part of the process. It does happen, absolutely. But I don't know if there's anything --

MR. HELMICK: I'm going to add something else here to -just to charge -- wrongfully convicted or wrongfully charged. Let's go that end there.

So I mean, let me ask everybody this. How do you think that that happens when we know, right that they have had a jury of 12 people. They all went through the same process as you guys are going through, what are some reasons -- and let's put these on the board. What are some reasons --

MR. PESCI: Judge, can we approach?

THE COURT: Yeah.

[Bench conference transcribed as follows.]

MR. PESCI: Your Honor, The State objects and I don't understand how this is getting into the qualifications for jurors. I think this is arguing the case. That's, again, violation of Eighth Judicial District Court Rule 7.70. So I don't know how this goes to the qualifications, asking them to opine about reasons for wrongful convictions.

MR. HELMICK: It's not going to the facts of the case at all. I'm talking about -- this is normal voir dire done at countless trials

1	that we have a duty to exercise our peremptive challenges
2	appropriately. We have a ethical duty to do that in any case like
3	this and cause or talking
4	THE COURT: I don't know that I've ever had anybody
5	question the jury from the standpoint of wrongful convictions as
6	the basis for questioning them about, you know, evidence in a case.
7	You need to be talking about
8	MR. HELMICK: Well
9	THE COURT: what constitutes evidence and talking
10	about witness testimony and what affects witness's
11	MR. HELMICK: Sure.
12	THE COURT: credibility and all that. But
13	MR. HELMICK: [Indiscernible] before if I'm going to say
14	THE COURT: Wrongful convictions?
15	MR. HELMICK: No, I said so what are some of the reasons
16	why and then I want to say again, can we promise to hold
17	everybody accountable in this case, so it doesn't so something
18	like that doesn't happen.
19	MR. PESCI: So we're going to give them scenarios
20	THE COURT: He's kind of started with this kind of telling
21	them this idea that there's a wrongful conviction and, you know
22	MR. HELMICK: We can't talk about those all those
23	incidents before the whether they're
24	THE COURT: But the problem is that starts talking about
25	other cases, right? And you're starting to say, okay, you've heard

about wrongful convictions or why do those occur in those other cases. But the focus is this case. And so you're asking him questions about how witnesses perceive things and what would affect their credibility and their perception and their recall and if they have any thoughts on those things is okay.

But just kind of saying hey has anybody ever read about ---

MR. HELMICK: Yeah.

THE COURT: -- wrongful convictions and what did you read about those, that's not part of this case.

MR. HELMICK: I don't mind the facts, I just want to know why they think that can happen on a jury of 12 people. Bad memory, bad witnesses, bad defense lawyers, what are the reasons. I don't think that that's crossing the line.

THE COURT: But I think that talking to them -- this is what I'm saying about talking to them about have you seen other cases where wrongful convictions occurred. That's like the State --

MR. HELMICK: What if I'm talking about Shawshank Redemption.

THE COURT: Hold on, hold on, hold on. Have you seen -that's a movie. Have you seen cases where people get convicted
and why do people get convicted? You know, it doesn't matter
whether you're talking about somebody's conviction or
somebody's acquittal in another case --

MR. HELMICK: Sure.

1	THE COURT: these people don't know anything about
2	the other cases.
3	MR. HELMICK: Sure.
4	THE COURT: They don't know anything about all the facts
5	there, so you just got to ask them questions about let's just talk
6	about witnesses in general. Not making reference to other
7	scenarios and other cases and what they've seen on TV or what
8	have you. That's what I'm trying that's what I think their
9	objection is and what I'm trying to focus you on.
10	It's not about writing things on the board, it's just
11	MR. HELMICK: Sure.
12	THE COURT: about trying to get them to think about
13	other cases where things have gone wrong
14	MR. HELMICK: Right.
15	THE COURT: Right. They could not know everything in
16	that case. So then
17	MR. HELMICK: No, I know.
18	THE COURT: you're talking in front of the whole jurors
19	about a case that everybody doesn't know everything about. So we
20	don't know what really went wrong there or not wrong.
21	MR. HELMICK: Well what if I reference a movie then, like
22	the
23	THE COURT: Shawshank Redemption.
24	MR. HELMICK: Yeah.
25	THE COURT: So what are you going to ask

1	MR. HELMICK: How that
2	THE COURT: What are you going to ask them about
3	Shawshank?
4	MR. HELMICK: You know, it's kind of the same
5	THE COURT: Have you seen it?
6	MR. HELMICK: Have you seen it?
7	THE COURT: Okay.
8	MR. HELMICK: How did that make you feel? What are
9	some of the reasons why the that guy ended up in you know, if
10	they remember the movie.
11	THE COURT: What is that relevant to this case though?
12	MR. HELMICK: Well it's putting in their head
13	THE COURT: It's in a movie or in another case.
14	MR. HELMICK: some things that they have to look at in
15	this trial, so it doesn't so that potentially doesn't happen here.
16	THE COURT: I think that's getting into, you know, kind of
17	arguing the case. And you can argue your case with Shawshank
18	Redemption, but that's not
19	MR. HELMICK: Sure.
20	THE COURT: can somebody be fair and impartial.
21	MR. HELMICK: Okay. I'll figure out so tell me how I can
22	tailor this then. You said I can ask about a witness, how a witness
23	can
24	THE COURT: Yeah, you just say I'm making these
25	references have you seen these other situations where we don't

1	really know what happened in those other situations and then
2	trying to educate the jury to a situation that other people don't
3	know anything about is kind of very risky in my mind.
4	So if you're just saying you know, when you're talking
5	about the sufficiency of evidence in a case and you're talking about
6	okay, witnesses. Witnesses have testify. What do you think
7	affects a witness's ability to recall and relay things that have
8	happened or is going to affect their ability to, you know,
9	misinterpret
10	MR. HELMICK: Okay. I can do that. I can do witnesses
11	what do you think affects a witness's ability? Time?
12	THE COURT: Yeah.
13	MR. HELMICK: Memory?
14	THE COURT: Yeah.
15	MR. HELMICK: Things like that.
16	THE COURT: Do you have any opinions about those
17	things
18	MR. HELMICK: Yeah.
19	THE COURT: about how you're evaluating witnesses,
20	okay?
21	MR. HELMICK: Okay.
22	THE COURT: All right.
23	[End of bench conference.]
24	THE COURT: All right. Mr. Helmick.
25	MR. HELMICK: All right. Thank you, Judge.

1	Let me change this for a second here.
2	So you're going to have a lot of witnesses come in here
3	and testify about an event that happened a year ago. What are
4	some things that you think can affect the witness's ability to, you
5	know, recall events? Does anybody here that has anybody heard
6	a witness testimony? Anybody read about that, witness testimony,
7	and things like that?
8	Can I see your hands if you have?
9	Okay. I haven't talked to you yet. I don't know how to say
10	your last name, but I know your first name's Gordon, right?
11	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 460: Correct.
12	MR. YAMPOLSKY: Gordon, okay.
13	Can we get the microphone to Gordon, please?
14	What do you think, what can could affect he witness's
15	ability to testify as to what really took place?
16	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 460: It could have been a
17	distraction, it could have been something where something else
18	MR. HELMICK: Okay.
19	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 460: A vague memory,
20	something
21	MR. HELMICK: Distraction is one, okay. And you said
22	you actually said two, you said memory; that can affect it, right?
23	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 460: Uh-huh.
24	MR. HELMICK: Okay. Gordon, Thank you very much.
25	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 460: You're welcome.

1	MR. HELMICK: And Sylvia, I think you raised your hand,
2	right? What's your badge number?
3	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 463: Ummm
4	MR. HELMICK: Sorry, it's take that microphone and
5	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 463: No, that's okay.
6	463.
7	MR. HELMICK: All right. 463. What do you think?
8	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 463: Again, probably just
9	bad memory like Gordon said.
10	MR. HELMICK: Yeah.
11	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 463: Especially since it's
12	so long ago
13	MR. HELMICK: Yeah, so time, right?
14	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 463: Yeah. It can just
15	kind of become distorted in a way.
16	MR. HELMICK: Yeah. What are some things that the
17	jurors can do to kind of cipher through that stuff?
18	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 463: Well do they they
19	initially speak to them when the crime first happens, correct?
20	MR. HELMICK: Who, the police?
21	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 463: Or
22	MR. HELMICK: People in general?
23	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 463: Yeah. There's
24	MR. HELMICK: Yeah.
25	PROSPECTIVE ILIBOR NUMBER 463: some sort of

1	statement
2	MR. HELMICK: Yeah.
3	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 463: So you can look
4	MR. HELMICK: Okay.
5	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 463: back at the
6	statement and see if it changed in any way.
7	MR. HELMICK: Oh, okay. Okay. Yeah.
8	So maybe focus on the statement when it was fresh in
9	their mind, right?
10	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 463: Yeah.
11	MR. HELMICK: Statement, okay.
12	Okay. Thanks, Sylvia.
13	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 463: Uh-huh.
14	MR. HELMICK: Who else raised their hand? I know
15	Shayra?
16	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 452: Yeah.
17	MR. HELMICK: Shayra, am I saying that right?
18	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 452: Shayra.
19	MR. HELMICK: Shayra, okay. Shayra.
20	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 452: Well I
21	MR. HELMICK: What do you think?
22	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 452: agree with Sylvia,
23	I was going to say time.
24	MR. HELMICK: Time.
25	PROSPECTIVE HIROR NUMBER 452: Voah

1	MR. HELMICK: That's a big one, right?
2	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 452: Yeah. The more I
3	mean, I don't remember what I did two weeks ago, you see, so I
4	think that's a huge one.
5	MR. HELMICK: And then she had mentioned maybe you
6	go back, and you look at the statement, right?
7	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 452: Right.
8	MR. HELMICK: What else do you think though? Vantage
9	point, maybe?
10	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 452: Explain that.
11	Vantage point?
12	MR. HELMICK: Were they was something blocking their
13	view or
14	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 452: Would that fall with
15	like distraction?
16	MR. HELMICK: Yeah, I guess it could fall under that, right
17	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 452: Okay.
18	MR. HELMICK: I'll put it like this.
19	Anybody else?
20	Markletter [sic], anything from you?
21	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 507: Oh, no, I'm good.
22	THE COURT: Okay. All right. Just checking. All right.
23	Thank you.
24	Okay. So Mr. Yampolsky had talked about kids and he
25	was talking to Ms. Fox because it seems like you got the kid thing

1	down pretty well. Who else here has kids besides Ms. Fox? We got
2	a lot of people, I know. Okay. All right, good. Who have I not
3	talked to yet?
4	Okay. So can you raise your hands for me, who has kids?
5	All right. I'm going to come over to you, Ms. Huston.
6	How many kids do you have again?
7	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 506: I have five of my
8	own and two stepkids.
9	MR. HELMICK: Okay. So I mean, maybe this is a
10	rhetorical question but do kids do stupid stuff?
11	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 506: All the time.
12	MR. HELMICK: Okay. What are some reasons then with
13	being a mom, what are some reasons that kids do stupid stuff?
14	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 506: Peer pressure,
15	fitting in, just because they're not thinking.
16	MR. HELMICK: Okay. Peer pressure, yeah. Yeah, maybe
17	they're not thinking right.
18	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 506: Fitting in.
19	MR. HELMICK: Fitting in, okay.
20	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 506: Not thinking clearly
21	Tired.
22	MR. HELMICK: So there's a lot of things, right?
23	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 506: Oh yeah.
24	MR. HELMICK: Yeah. Have you experienced that yourself
25	with kids?

1	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 506: Yeah, sure.
	·
2	MR. HELMICK: Okay. Anybody else? Who else raised
3	their hand? Did you raise your hand, ma'am?
4	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 425: Yes.
5	MR. HELMICK: Ms. Alvarez, yeah?
6	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 425: Yes.
7	MR. HELMICK: All right. Thank you.
8	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 425: In my experience,
9	my kids when they were bored, they would do things that they were
10	not supposed to do.
11	MR. HELMICK: Yeah, right. Too much time on their
12	hands, right? That's a big one, huh?
13	THE COURT: That's Ms. Alvarez.
14	MR. HELMICK: Ms. Alvarez, yes.
15	THE COURT: Okay.
16	MR. HELMICK: Okay. Ms. Alvarez, Thank you very much.
17	What else? There's a couple more that I'm trying to think of that I
18	want to get up there.
19	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 452: What was the
20	question?
21	MR. HELMICK: Do you have kids, Shayra?
22	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 452: Uh-huh. Too many.
23	MR. HELMICK: So we're talking about what was that?
24	
	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 452: Too many.
25	MR HEI MICK: Too many?

1	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 452: Uh-huh.
2	MR. HELMICK: You know, what are some reasons that
3	kids do stupid stuff?
4	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 452: I think fear to cover
5	up certain stuff.
6	MR. HELMICK: Fear.
7	All right. Oh, I'm sorry. What's your badge number
8	again?
9	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 452: 452.
10	MR. HELMICK: Ms. Estrada, right?
11	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 452: Esparza.
12	MR. HELMICK: Esparza.
13	Okay. Fear. And then you else had raised their hand?
14	Yeah, Gordon, what do you think?
15	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 460: A lot of them will do
16	it because they don't know what the consequences are.
17	MR. HELMICK: And why is that?
18	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 460: They're young.
19	MR. HELMICK: Yeah. Okay. So they're just not mature.
20	Anybody else have anything to add to this?
21	Yeah, Juan? Let's get you the microphone.
22	Okay. Go ahead. Pass that, Jessica, thank you.
23	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 432: Just influence from
24	others.
25	MR_HELMICK: Right like the neer pressure. Is that what

1	it was?
2	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 432: Yeah.
3	MR. HELMICK: Yeah. Influence huh? Do you think
4	they're easier to influence kids or than adults or what do you
5	think?
6	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 432: What was
7	MR. HELMICK: Do you think kids are easier to be
8	influenced than adults?
9	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 432: Yes.
10	MR. HELMICK: Yeah. You were hesitant there.
11	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 432: Because there are
12	smart kids too.
13	MR. HELMICK: That's true, right?
14	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 432: I was
15	[indiscernible].
16	MR. HELMICK: Well we right. We all can
17	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 432: I wasn't I don't
18	remember being easily influenced when I was young, so that's why
19	I was thinking to myself.
20	MR. HELMICK: Sure.
21	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 432: But in general, I
22	think so, yeah. They're not mature, they don't know
23	MR. HELMICK: Okay.
24	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 432: the
25	consequences.

1	MR. HELMICK: Yeah, thank you, Juan. Thank you. Yeah.
2	Anybody else have anything to add?
3	We got to keep Luis awake. What do you think, Luis?
4	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 505: I just want to say
5	MR. HELMICK: Yeah, let's get you the microphone.
6	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 505: I just want to say
7	ego just ego-driven is what I remember seeing a lot, you know,
8	from my younger days. Just a lot of just ego
9	MR. HELMICK: Yeah. Hot head, right?
10	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 505: short-term
11	thinking.
12	MR. HELMICK: Yeah.
13	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 505: Selfish thinking and
14	lack of maturity but yeah, driven by ego.
15	MR. HELMICK: Okay. Yeah, I mean, is that kind of the gist
16	of it for everybody? Like kind of the gist of it. Okay.
17	THE COURT: Mr. Gutierrez-Sosa, thank you.
18	MR. HELMICK: Thank you.
19	All right. Thanks, Henrry. Let me see what else we can
20	talk about here.
21	All right. Let's talk about something else here.
22	Okay. So I mean, you guys see right that there's two
23	people being charged here. Do you think that because they're both
24	sitting at the same table that they must be that you're going to
25	keep them tied together? That you're going to think that they

1	busted them together? Anybody think that because they're sitting
2	at the same table?
3	Luis, I see you shaking your head. Can we get Luis the
4	microphone, please?
5	Do you think that they're tied together in some way
6	because they're sitting at the same table?
7	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 378: Everyone's
8	responsible for their own actions.
9	MR. HELMICK: Yeah. Does anybody disagree with Luis?
10	Anybody disagree? Everybody agrees, right, they're responsible for
11	their actions, right?
12	Yeah, thank you, Luis.
13	But Luis, let me take it a step further. If there are bad
14	facts, even evil facts against one person in this case, are you going
15	to hold it against the other person just because they were friends?
16	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 378: Well the facts will
17	speak for themselves.
18	MR. HELMICK: Yeah.
19	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 378: You have to look at
20	the facts.
21	MR. HELMICK: Sure. Well I'm just saying
22	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 378: It's like the answer
23	to the question earlier about the blueberry pie whatever, you know?
24	MR. HELMICK: Right.
25	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 378: I mean, same thing

here. I got three kids of my own and just because one kid did one thing, I can't blame the other. I can't treat them the same.

MR. HELMICK: Okay.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 378: You know, it's every -- like I said everyone's responsible for their own actions.

MR. HELMICK: What if I give you this hypothetical and maybe this happened to some people in this room when they were in school and if it did, I'll have you raise your hand. But have you ever been in a situation where you were in school, so think back a little bit, and you were taking a test, right, and you're done with the test and the teacher finds out that one kid has cheated and they make everybody take the test all over again. Do you think that that's fair?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 378: No, it's not but I'm pretty sure it happens to all of us in this room in different scenarios. I mean, you know, you could just be at the wrong place at the wrong time. You could be -- I mean, it's just part of life. You can't really change those things. It just happens because it happens, that's it.

MR. HELMICK: Yeah.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 378: You know? But as far as like attaching things to, you know, actions from one person to the other person, that's just not fair.

MR. HELMICK: So it's not fair.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 378: No, it's not.

1	MR. HELMICK: Right, right.
2	Okay. Anybody agree with Luis?
3	Yeah? I see a lot of heads shaking here.
4	Let's go over to thank you, Luis.
5	Let's go over to Gabriel, right?
6	Yeah, please, Gabriel. If you could ahead and just let us
7	know your badge number.
8	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 424: 424.
9	MR. HELMICK: Okay. What'd you think about what Luis
10	was saying?
11	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 424: I think I agree with
12	Luis what he was saying because, you know, you can't look at these
13	two and say, you know, that one of their actions, you know, you
14	could apply that to the other and say, you know, that because he
15	did this, you know, it's also his fault, you know, that he let that
16	happen or
17	MR. HELMICK: Okay.
18	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 424: something like
19	that.
20	MR. HELMICK: So you would hold in this trial, you
21	would hold each one accountable for their own actions?
22	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 424: Yes.
23	MR. HELMICK: Is that the fair thing to do?
24	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 424: Yes.
25	MR. HELMICK: Sanjuana, I see you nodding your head.

Thank you, Gabriel. If you can give it Sanjuana.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 425: Yes because it's not like one of them grabbed the other one's hand and did the same action. One of them did it and one of them didn't, probably.

MR. HELMICK: Okay.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 425: So.

MR. HELMICK: Yeah, thank you very much.

Okay. Leonard, go ahead.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 426: Hi. Badge Number 426. Can we not focus on these gentlemen over here? Let's go back to the blueberry pie.

MR. HELMICK: Yeah.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 426: There were two children involved but both of them knew that they were in the young to even eat, even to cut into the pie, even though only one of them did it, right?

MR. HELMICK: Yeah.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 426: I think the mother has a responsibility to chasten both of them, maybe not equally but they both need to be held accountable and responsible for the action to -- I feel to society because the act was against society.

MR. HELMICK: Hmm. But what if only one -- one of -- you said only one of --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 426: I don't know those facts.

1	MR. HELMICK: No, no. No, I'm asking about the pie.
2	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 426: Pie.
3	MR. HELMICK: Yeah.
4	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 426: I'm not the mother.
5	I'm just saying
6	MR. HELMICK: Okay.
7	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 426: if I were the
8	mother, I would hold both children accountable for my pie, which
9	was going to a judging contest, right
10	MR. HELMICK: Okay.
11	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 426: they probably
12	wouldn't get TV for several weeks.
13	MR. HELMICK: Now if they if you knew which one ate
14	the pie though, would you still hold them accountable is what I'm
15	asking.
16	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 426: Because the other
17	one knew that he wasn't supposed to, he should have talked to his
18	brother and say no, no, don't do that.
19	MR. HELMICK: I mean, I thank you for that opinion,
20	Leonard.
21	What do you think, anybody disagree with that? Please
22	tell us if you do.
23	Yeah, I mean, Jessica, I saw her foot Jessica. What do
24	you think? Do you agree with what he was saying?
25	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 468: I mean, I agree that

1	everyone's responsible for their actions, but I
2	MR. HELMICK: Okay.
3	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 468: also heard the
4	saying guilty by association.
5	MR. HELMICK: Anybody else heard that saying? Do you
6	agree with that?
7	Sorry, go ahead, Jessica.
8	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 468: No, that's it.
9	MR. HELMICK: Yeah, that okay. All right. So I mean, I
10	think that's kind of what Leonard was saying, right? I mean, isn't
11	that you were saying, the kids should have told the brother hey, put
12	that pie down man
13	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 426: Right.
14	MR. HELMICK: right? Or mom's going to get us, right?
15	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 426: Right.
16	MR. HELMICK: Yeah. Okay. Thank you very much.
17	Who else? Anybody disagree though with that guilt by
18	association? I saw Shayra, you were shaking your head and Ms.
19	Powell.
20	Yeah, let's go ahead and pass it down here.
21	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 518: I disagree with guilt
22	by association because in the instance with the pie, it could be two
23	toddlers, one is older, one is younger. The younger one may not
24	even know what they're doing is wrong.
25	And this case is completely different because these two

1	are old enough to know right.
2	MR. HELMICK: Okay. Now you said a couple things there.
3	And I'll come back to Leonard in regard to one of them. But do you
4	feel that there's guilt by association simply based off of age? Is that
5	what you mean?
6	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 518: No, because it's still
7	individual.
8	MR. HELMICK: So kind of what Luis was saying?
9	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 518: Uh-huh.
10	MR. HELMICK: You would hold each person in this trial,
1	each person, accountable for the actions that they did.
12	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 518: Yes.
13	MR. HELMICK: Okay. Anybody agree with the guilt by
14	association or anybody agree with Terry's I guess I mean,
15	everybody has their own opinion on this stuff. Leonard, you had a
16	little bit different of an opinion. She had mentioned something
17	about the toddlers. Is your position still the same if it was toddlers
18	and they didn't they weren't really able to think about it?
19	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 518: These were twins
20	MR. HELMICK: Yeah.
21	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 518: and they were all
22	over ten years old so
23	MR. HELMICK: Okay.
24	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 518: you can build all
25	kinds of stuff

MR. HELMICK: Well it could go forever, right? PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 518: Exactly.

MR. HELMICK: All right. So anybody disagree with Terry at all?

All right. Thank you.

Well let me get a show of hands though. Can everybody here promise, as many of you already have, to hold each person accountable for their own actions?

Can I see your hands, please?

Okay, good. Thank you very much.

Let's tie that into something else here. Kind of what Luis was saying earlier. When you walked into this courtroom and you saw these individuals sitting over here and you heard what the charges are, did you automatically think that because he's sitting in this courtroom that he must have done something wrong or why would he be here? Did anybody think that?

Please. Okay. May I see your hands if you thought that? I got a couple hands up already. Yeah. Okay. So let's start with Henrry and then we'll come -- we'll work our way down. Let's get Henrry the microphone, please, Ms. Powell.

What do you think, Henrry?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 505: Well to the question you asked earlier in regards to wrongful convictions or charges, before DNA testing, I -- you know, I could give -- I could give more of a pass as to why someone would find themselves in court. Now

I think with the progress of investigation and police work, I wouldn't -- I don't see a case why someone would end up in court if they were not -- you know, if they were not somehow associated with the case they were being charged for.

It doesn't mean they're guilty but somehow associated with it.

MR. HELMICK: Associated, okay. All right. So that -- so you didn't have the opinion that hey, he must have done something wrong was my question? Did you have that opinion that -- did you feel that hey, they must have done something wrong? That's different than being associated, right?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 505: My initial thought was they must have something to do with this, simply put.

MR. HELMICK: Okay. And you heard Mr. Pesci talk about the presumption of innocence and so forth?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 505: Yes.

MR. HELMICK: Do you understand that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 505: Yes.

MR. HELMICK: Okay. So you understand that it's a beyond a reasonable doubt standard, right?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 505: Yes.

MR. HELMICK: Okay. So you understand that -- well let me ask you this. I'm standing right here in the middle of the courtroom, here's the Prosecutor's table over here and you understand that he starts at the presumption of innocence back

here, right? Do you understand that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 505: Yes.

MR. HELMICK: Okay. And are you saying then that based off of your opinion when he walked into this courtroom, you felt that he kind of already stood over here?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 505: Closer to that edge, yes.

MR. HELMICK: Yeah. Okay.

But when we talked about the presumption of innocence, do you feel that you can be fair -- as we have all discussed this throughout today, do you feel that you could be fair though now and listen to all the evidence and make a decision knowing that they're presumed innocent?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 505: Having reviewed all the evidence and facts presented, absolutely, I'd feel like I'd be fair. But that was my initial thought coming in, just simply saying why would someone end up here if they had nothing to do with --

MR. HELMICK: Sure.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 505: -- a particular charge?

MR. HELMICK: Yeah. And you know what, I'm ashamed to admit it because I have watched stuff on TV and I say to myself oh God, those guys look guilty, right? And I say hold on, and you take a step back, right? I think that's a human reaction, right?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 505: Uh-huh.

MR. HELMICK: Okay. Thank you for sharing. Well, let me ask you this. As you sit here now though, do you still feel that way?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 505: I feel that I can be fair is what I can say. I feel I can review the evidence, the facts presented, and form a fair -- a more fair opinion. You know, I -- there has to be reasons as to why they were charged --

MR. HELMICK: Uh-huh.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 505: -- and those are the reasons I would carefully consider.

MR. HELMICK: Okay. But let me just clarify. Do you feel that just because he's sitting here, he did something wrong? Is that your personal opinion right now?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 505: Not necessarily that they did something wrong, but they had some association with the case likely to be not good; likely to be wrong.

MR. HELMICK: Well do you feel the police ever get it wrong? What's your feeling on that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 505: Yes. I feel they used to get it wrong a lot more back before the advancement of DNA testing or -- you know, the advancement of police work and evidence collection.

MR. HELMICK: Okay.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 505: I saw this show on Netflix, When They See Us, and that made me lose faith in, you know, the justice system, quite a lot.

1	MR. HELMICK: I've never seen it.
2	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 505: It was rough.
3	MR. HELMICK: Okay.
4	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 505: But I think times
5	have somewhat changed and science now is able to provide, you
6	know, concrete evidence and evidence that didn't exist. So it's not
7	impossible but it's tougher now to get a wrongful conviction.
8	MR. HELMICK: Okay. I hear you. I mean, you laid that
9	out pretty well. Thank you, Henrry for that.
10	Gordon
11	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 460: Uh-huh.
12	MR. HELMICK: because I saw you shaking your head.
13	Can we get it down to Gordon here, please?
14	Gordon, what do you think about what Henrry was
15	saying?
16	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 460: Well I agree. You
17	know, they're here for a reason. So whatever that is, these two
18	were the ones that were actually you know, I guess you could say
19	the evidence proved that they we have enough evidence to go to
20	court. Something that probably happened.
21	MR. HELMICK: Something that probably happened.
22	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 460: Right.
23	MR. HELMICK: Did you feel that they I guess what
24	you're saying then, when you walked in here you felt they had done
25	something wrong in order to even be here. Is that what went

1	through your head?
2	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 460: Yes.
3	MR. HELMICK: Okay. When we talked about the
4	presumption of innocence just now, are you able to give them
5	that
6	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 460: Yes.
7	MR. HELMICK: presumption of innocence, even though
8	you had said that earlier?
9	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 460: Yes.
10	MR. HELMICK: Okay. So I guess there's a bit of a conflic
11	in what you had said just a moment ago in a presumption of
12	innocence. Do you understand that that may look like a conflict?
13	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 460: It does. You know,
14	it's just like
15	UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Can you come over to the
16	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 460: prejudging is
17	what you're saying.
18	MR. HELMICK: Yeah.
19	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 460: But they're here for
20	a reason. That's why you just said so looking at it, I think weighing
21	out the evidence and hearing how everything comes through, I
22	think yeah, I can sit there and make a very good judgment.
23	MR. HELMICK: Okay. Good. Yeah. I mean, it's hard for
24	us to sit here because we haven't seen a piece of evidence, heard
25	from one witness nothing right? We're just talking hypothetical

stuff, right? Yeah.

All right. Thank you, Gordon.

Anybody disagree with Gordon that hey, when I walked in here, I mean, I didn't offer any opinion, I didn't think that they were -- did anything wrong. Did anybody kind of -- was anybody kind of just neutral?

Can I see your hands that you were just -- kind of just neutral about this whole thing?

All right. Let's go over to Ronald and then we'll go to Mindy. Let's go ahead and get it back here to Ronald.

Thank you, Gordon.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 504: Yeah, I just -- I don't have any information on the case so I can't make any decisions on it so -- and, you know, the way it's set up, you're innocent until proven guilty.

MR. HELMICK: Yeah. So what are your thoughts on then what Gordon was saying? I mean, do you saw -- I assume you disagree with that position?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 504: Yeah, I do. I didn't have any assumptions when I come in. It doesn't matter who was sitting at any of the tables or anything. I mean, in my mind -- I mean, I just come. I was just neutral.

MR. HELMICK: Okay.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 504: So -- and that's how I'm supposed to be and if I'm picked as a juror -- and then I would

1	see all the evidence and then, you know, talk with the other jurors
2	to make a conclusion.
3	MR. HELMICK: Okay. So let me just hone in on
4	something you said there. You would talk with the other jurors.
5	Would the other jurors can they influence you in any way or
6	would if you had made up your mind, would you be kind of stuck
7	in your shoes there?
8	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 504: I wouldn't have my
9	mind made up if I did have my mind made up, I would still have
10	to validate what I was thinking by going through the evidence with
11	the other jurors
12	MR. HELMICK: Yeah.
13	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 504: in case I missed
14	something. So I would still be open, you know, to other people's
15	opinions.
16	MR. HELMICK: Sure. Right. Maybe they saw something
17	differently, right?
18	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 504: Yeah.
19	MR. HELMICK: Yeah. Okay. All right. Thank you very
20	much, Ronald.
21	And we had Mindy, let me come over to you and then
22	Nick, I'll get you in a second. Thank you very much.
23	What was your badge number again?
24	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 504: Hmm?
25	MR. HELMICK: Badge number real quick.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 504: 504.

MR. HELMICK: 504, okay.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 429: Badge 429. And I'm pretty much the same. I came in here not even knowing who was who on the panel. It's not my place to judge and that's pretty much how I try to live it. And obviously we're here to listen to the statements, to listen to the evidence, and from there make a decision, but I definitely came in here as a blank slate.

MR. HELMICK: Blank slate, okay.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 429: Okay.

MR. HELMICK: Now we did have a couple people raise their hand when I had asked who here thought they did something wrong. It was Gordon, I think, Jessica raised their hand. Who elements raised their hand? Who was it because I want to talk to those people?

Let's get over to Jessica and then I'll come back over to you. I'll try to get everybody. I'm sorry. I got about an inch [indiscernible].

Okay. What do you think?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 468: So walking into the courtroom, I do have an idea that someone did something wrong.

And then after hearing the short story of what actually happened, it kind of jogged my memory of the article I read --

MR. HELMICK: Oh, that's right.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 468: -- a year ago.

MR. HELMICK: And we don't have to get into the facts of that.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 468: So it kind of just --

MR. HELMICK: Yeah.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 468: -- made me feel like something happened.

MR. HELMICK: Okay. Yeah, so maybe a little bit different for your scenario, which I -- we'll talk about later. But thank you for sharing that.

Okay. Let's get it over to Nick because I almost forgot about him.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 474: Hi. Yes, thank you. Perhaps you can clear it up. I'm hearing this discussion, I'm really like in my head just almost going crazy because I don't understand, if you're -- if somebody's innocent, as you're saying, you know, not guilt by association, then why weren't they listed on the witnesses that the assistant DA gave? Wouldn't they have every incentive to -- the prisoner's dilemma to turn State evidence.

And so going by guilt by association, they're really together. Like either one's innocent or the other one's innocent or one's guilty, the other one's guilty. So I don't know if I could find -- I think that's -- tell me if I'm wrong, the question you're asking --

MR. HELMICK: Sure.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 474: -- one guilty and one innocent. I really think that they're just -- they're connected in

that sense. So whatever you make -- determination on one of them, the other one would be in the same boat so to speak.

MR. HELMICK: Okay. That's an interesting perspective.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 474: Because I think that -- I remember Sociology 101, you know, if you're going to -- you know, I don't see how you could say that you're completely innocent but at the same time give every piece of information that you possibly know -- you know, I'm not -- I don't know if that's going to be --

MR. HELMICK: Sure.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 474: -- the case or not in the trial but again, you would -- whatever we find you to be innocent, the other person would be innocent. We find you guilty -- that -- I don't know that I could find a separate verdict so to speak.

MR. HELMICK: Well I mean, I think that some people had said that maybe they had different roles and so forth. What are your thoughts on that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 474: I haven't really formed an opinion on that, so to speak.

MR. HELMICK: Yeah.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 474: I don't know the facts of the case again, so.

MR. HELMICK: Right, right, right. No, I mean -PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 474: Maybe that'll
change but just like from the initial tidbits of information you're

giving, it really -- it would be hard for me right now --

MR. HELMICK: Yeah.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 474: It may be a bias, I -- we're supposed to tell that I suppose to you. I don't know that if I find one guilty, I could find the other one innocent. Or if I find one innocent that I -- I think it's going to be the same.

MR. HELMICK: That might be difficult for you is what you're saying.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 474: It may be impossible for me.

MR. HELMICK: Impossible for you.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 474: Potentially. If there's not something that resolves that dilemma that I just laid out for you.

MR. HELMICK: Okay. Now if -- you said a good word there resolve. Now if you hear facts and evidence and so forth, are you going to be open to listen to things that could resolve it or could not resolve that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 474: Certainly.

MR. HELMICK: Yeah. And then you'll be able to make a fair decision.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 474: Like I said, from the initial facts, that's the first assumption I'm getting is if you're completely innocent, why haven't you given -- you know, what is it the speaking to the queen or whatever they call it; where you come

1	in and you tell everyone everything. Why hasn't that happened?
2	MR. HELMICK: Sure.
3	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 474: That's
4	MR. HELMICK: I got ya. All right. Thank you very much,
5	Nick.
6	Marklester. Let's get it over to Marklester.
7	Pedronan, right? Is that how you say your last name?
8	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 507: Yes.
9	MR. HELMICK: What do you think?
10	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 507: Yeah. I mean, I feel
11	like murder is a very serious charge and that there's different
12	checks and balances for the police and the prosecutors have looked
13	at enough evidence at least charge the people here. So I just feel
14	like I have that bias that yeah, if you're here, you have some
15	evidence against them. That's all.
16	MR. HELMICK: Okay. Do you feel that they're guilty
17	based on them being here or they must have done something
18	wrong?
19	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 507: They must have
20	done something wrong.
21	MR. HELMICK: Okay. But not guilty.
22	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 507: Not guilty.
23	MR. HELMICK: Okay. You want to hear everything, right?
24	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 507: Yes, sir.
25	MR. HELMICK: Can you give them the presumption of

1	innocence that we talked about? Are you able to do that?
2	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 507: Somewhat, but with
3	a heavy bias that they're here for a reason.
4	MR. HELMICK: Okay. So you said somewhat in regard to
5	the presumption of innocence. What do you mean by that?
6	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 507: Well I could see I
7	could look at evidence and if you could sway me, yes for sure.
8	MR. HELMICK: So you just kind of need to see everything
9	is what you're saying?
10	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 507: Yes, sir.
11	MR. HELMICK: [Indiscernible].
12	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 507: But like I said,
13	they're here for a reason.
14	MR. HELMICK: They're here for a reason. Okay. Thank
15	you very much, Markletter.
16	All right. Court's indulgence.
17	THE COURT: Okay.
18	MR. HELMICK: Now I want to talk about this big topic that
19	Mr. Yampolsky talked about. And I think that Henrry had said
20	something about Defendant's right to testify. We talked about that.
21	That's always a big one. And since you got the microphone,
22	Markletter, I'll talk to you about it first.
23	Let's see what I wrote down here.
24	Okay. All right. So I mean, let's go back for a second
25	there Who here wants to hear my client's Mr. Harlan. Who here

wants to hear him testify?

Henrry, yeah. Mr. Meng. Okay. Go ahead. Let's get them the microphone, Markletter.

All right. Go ahead. Henrry first and then we'll go over to Mr. Meng.

You want to, right?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 505: Yes, I want to.

MR. HELMICK: Do you need to in order for you to be fair in this case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 505: Not necessarily. It doesn't outweigh the evidence.

MR. HELMICK: Okay. So you can still be fair, even if that doesn't happen?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 505: Yes, I would think you can tell a lot about a person, maybe a person's motives or who they are just from hearing them speak -- just from hearing them say -- whether they're genuine or not if they feel that they are innocent. So I would prefer to hear an innocent testify and say so in their own words.

MR. HELMICK: Okay. You would prefer it.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 505: Yes.

MR. HELMICK: But I guess what I'm trying to pin you down is, do you absolutely need to be -- to keep an open mind, to be fair in this case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 505: No, the evidence

1	outweighs everything.
2	MR. HELMICK: Okay. All right. Mr. Meng.
3	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 390: Actually I really
4	agree with exactly what he said.
5	MR. HELMICK: Yeah.
6	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 390: I would like to hear
7	him but if the evidence was, you know, such then that would be
8	what it would be.
9	MR. HELMICK: Okay. So you don't it's not a need for
10	you. I got to do it, or I can't even be fair to the State
11	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 390: No, just kind of it
12	would just be a deal about why didn't he get up there and, you
13	know, say hey, I didn't do that. I didn't do it. That's all.
14	MR. HELMICK: Okay. Yeah, yeah. That's fair.
15	Anybody else? Anybody else feel the same way Mr. Meng
16	and Henrry does?
17	Okay. While I got you while you got the mic there. I
18	mean, what are some of the risks of testifying? What are some of
19	the risks that you can see?
20	Leonard let's get you over to Leonard. Thank you, Mr.
21	Meng.
22	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 426: Leonard, Badge
23	Number 426.
24	First of all, at the beginning of this in the Judge's
25	instructions, the necessity to testify or to do anything on behalf of

1	the Defense is not required because of the presumption of
2	innocence.
3	MR. HELMICK: Sure.
4	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 426: The risk involved is
5	that some people maybe don't present very well
6	MR. HELMICK: Yeah.
7	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 426: and we had a case
8	of that with Robert Mueller.
9	MR. HELMICK: Was that just on the TV a few days ago?
10	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 426: Yeah.
11	MR. HELMICK: Yeah, okay.
12	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 426: So talk you can
13	shoot yourself in the foot, literally.
14	MR. HELMICK: So maybe just I guess how would you
15	word that then? They don't present themselves well?
16	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 426: They don't present
17	their case well.
18	MR. HELMICK: Okay. Presentation.
19	What's another risk?
20	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 432: [Inaudible].
21	MR. HELMICK: Sorry, Juan, we got to get you the
22	microphone.
23	Thank you, Leonard.
24	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 432: 432, that's my juror
25	badge number.

1	MR. HELMICK: Okay. Yeah.
2	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 432: You might
3	contradict yourself with something you said on the you know,
4	when you were being investigated or something.
5	MR. HELMICK: Yeah, you might contradict yourself, right?
6	Be caught in a lie, right?
7	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 432: Yep.
8	MR. HELMICK: Okay. What about being questioned by
9	the Prosecution? Is that another one?
10	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 432: Yeah, that's a big
11	one.
12	MR. HELMICK: Okay. Go ahead and give it over to Ms.
13	Huston there. Thank you, Juan.
14	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 506: I'm 506.
15	MR. HELMICK: 3-0 yeah, go ahead.
16	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 506: 506.
17	MR. HELMICK: 506, okay.
18	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 506: I I mean, if I can
19	put myself in their shoes, I would just be scared out of my mind. I'd
20	be nervous.
21	MR. HELMICK: Okay. So nervous, right? Maybe people
22	don't speak well in front of other people, right?
23	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 506: Yeah. And I
24	wouldn't want to be questioned by somebody that wasn't on my
25	side, I guess. They could twist things around. Whatever I'm trying

1	to say or whatever.
2	MR. HELMICK: Could be twisted up, huh? That's a good
3	one.
4	All right. Well let's do the inverse though, right, because
5	there's two sides to this. I mean, what are the risks of not
6	testifying?
7	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 506: You don't get to tell
8	your side of the story and you don't get to see somebody else
9	was saying like your intent or your motives or your personality
10	and
11	MR. HELMICK: Yeah. I mean, Henrry was
12	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 506: how it happened.
13	MR. HELMICK: saying that, Donald was saying that,
14	right? They want them to get up there and say, you know, what the
15	heck happened, right? Okay. So what's a word that we can choose
16	for that?
17	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 452: Accountability
18	MR. HELMICK: Risk of not testifying. Who said that?
19	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 452: Me.
20	MR. HELMICK: Shayra?
21	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 452: Uh-huh.
22	MR. HELMICK: What's your badge number?
23	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 452: 452.
24	MR. HELMICK: 452.
25	THE COURT: Shavra

1	MR. HELMICK: Shayra. Shayra. Okay. Accountability.
2	Okay. And what did you say again, Ms. Huston, I'm I
3	couldn't remember.
4	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 506: The risk of not
5	testifying?
6	MR. HELMICK: Yeah.
7	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 506: That they don't
8	have the chance to tell their side of the story; that leaves some
9	doubt as to why they didn't testify.
10	MR. HELMICK: Tell
11	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 506: What their motives
12	were.
13	MR. HELMICK: their story, okay?
14	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 506: What do they have
15	to hide by
16	MR. HELMICK: Oh, that's a good one, right?
17	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 506: not telling it.
18	MR. HELMICK: If they're innocent then why the heck
19	why won't they get up here, right? You know?
20	Okay. So I mean we talked about two different sides of
21	this. Can anybody here see the dilemma that there's two sides to
22	this. Is there a dilemma?
23	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 506: Yes, there's always
24	two sides.
25	MR. HELMICK: Yeah. Fred, I see you nodding your head.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Let's get over to Fred.

Ms. Huston, thank you.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 398: Well when there's two people involved such as this then it's pretty classic behavior for one to quote, unquote plea bargain. So there's always that. There's that influence.

MR. HELMICK: Okay. Thank you very much for sharing that.

Anybody else? Anybody see the dilemma in the risk of testifying, the risk of not testifying?

Let me ask you this, Brett, I mean, do you think that that's why the founding fathers came up with that rule because they saw the dilemma?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 398: Possibly.

MR. HELMICK: Would it be fair for me to advise my client -- are you okay with me advising my client as to what I think he should do --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 398: Of course.

MR. HELMICK: -- ultimately for him making this decision?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 398: Yeah, you're his attorneys. Yeah, of course. And then again, there's so much nuance that we don't know about yet. You know, there might be a viable reason why not. But of course, like a lot of people have said here, the decision not to testify does, you know, on the face look pretty badly.

	MAD LIEUNION, OL A L. L. C. L. C.
1	MR. HELMICK: Okay. And nobody talked about you
2	said the decision not to testify, right? But nobody talked about the
3	reasons
4	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 398: Yeah.
5	MR. HELMICK: for testifying, right?
6	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 398: Yeah. Again, I
7	MR. HELMICK: But for you
8	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 398: I can I'm trying
9	not be emotionally biased
10	MR. HELMICK: Sure.
11	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 398: either way.
12	MR. HELMICK: Sure.
13	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 398: You know, I want to
14	just base it on the facts an evidence and I don't have any of that yet
15	MR. HELMICK: Of course. Right. And that's I mean,
16	that's all we're talking about right now anyways.
17	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 398: Yeah.
18	MR. HELMICK: Would it be fair I mean, I asked Brett
19	about that. Can everybody agree with that that it would be fair to
20	allow myself to advise my client with his permission as to what I
21	think he should do? Is that fair?
22	Anybody think that's not fair?
23	Okay. Thank you.
24	Okay. So let's talk about something else here for a
25	minute. Big decisions. Big decisions in life, right? What are some

23

24

25

things that we do -- people do in their lives before making big decisions? Moving, getting a new job, having a kid, right? what are some things that people do? Everybody does something differently. I write it plus and minus. You know, what's the pluses, what's the minuses. That's what I do.

Does anybody do something like that when they're trying to make big decisions in their life? Can I see your hands, please?

All right. Who have I not talked to? Go ahead and hold those up for me for a second, please?

All right. Let's go over to Markletter [sic] and then we'll come down to Ms. Leon.

Brett, right here. Thank you.

What are some things you do?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 507: I do a pros and cons sheet.

MR. HELMICK: Pros and cons, right? Yeah.

Okay. Yeah? What else? Anybody else?

Markletter, thank you.

Who else raised their hand? I saw some -- yeah, that's right, Ms. Leon.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 512: Well so for personal decisions for pros and cons obviously you outweigh the risk versus the benefit. But when I have to make big decisions as it relates to the workplace, it comes into doing your research on what's going on, what's the evidence that you have, what are your options,

1	what's the best fit for all parties involved. There's quite a few
2	things that go into it. It's an investigation in itself.
3	MR. HELMICK: Yeah. Yeah, that's a lot of good stuff.
4	Thank you for sharing that. Right.
5	Steven, we haven't talked to you yet. What do you think?
6	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 514: All of those things
7	are fantastic that you said and also consult with your spouse.
8	MR. HELMICK: Oh that's a good one, right?
9	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 512: Oh. No.
10	UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [Indiscernible] now.
11	MR. HELMICK: We're going to tell him that, right? You
12	know that.
13	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 512: He knows.
14	MR. HELMICK: Okay. So we got spouse, we got notes.
15	What else?
16	Anybody over here? I'm sorry you guys. Anything to add
17	over here?
18	Yeah, yeah. Ms. Huston. Let's give Ms. Huston
19	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 506: I'm 506.
20	MR. HELMICK: Here you go.
21	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 506: The biggest thing I
22	do when I'm making a big decision is, I pray.
23	MR. HELMICK: Yeah. A lot of people do that too, right?
24	Of course.
25	Well I mean, you heard the charges in this case, right? I

mean, can anybody here agree that they will do -- that they will take the time in making a decision in this case? Anybody agree that they will do that with a case like of this magnitude? Could I see your hands if you agree that you're going to do that?

Thank you very much.

And Ms. Leon had talked about note -- research. Now you can't do research, you heard the Judge say that, right? But you can take notes. Can any -- can everybody agree that they'll do their best to take good notes in this case as to what they hear from the witnesses? And we rely upon you to do that. Can you raise your hand, please, if you're going to do that?

Gabriel, come on.

Here we go. All right. Okay. Thank you.

Okay. So today's July 29th. Halloween is October 31st. I want to give you a hypothetical, especially for the parents. I want you to pretend that you heard on the news that there are a handful of Snickers bars in the valley that contain poison, right? And you are -- you send your kids out the door to go trick-or-treating, they come home, they take out the Snickers -- they take the candy, they dump it on the floor and you see just a few Snickers bars. Maybe one out of ten on the News said that there's some poison in it.

I want to see your hands if you're going to let your kid have one of the Snickers bars.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 551: If you don't like your kid.

1	MR. HELMICK: Okay. And why is that? I mean, what is
2	the reason for that?
3	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 506: You're not going to
4	take the chance.
5	MR. HELMICK: Take the chance, okay.
6	What else?
7	And who was that, I'm sorry, Ms. Huston?
8	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 506: Yeah, 506.
9	MR. HELMICK: Sorry, we just have to
10	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 506: I still have the
11	microphone.
12	MR. HELMICK: Okay.
13	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 506: Yeah, 506.
14	MR. HELMICK: Good. 506, all right.
15	What else? And nobody
16	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 506: You love your kids.
17	MR. HELMICK: raised their hand. Thank God, right?
18	I'll talk to you, Roxanne. Let's get the microphone up
19	here.
20	Why? What's another reason? She's not going to let
21	them take the chance. We had Gordon say protection. What do
22	you think?
23	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 466: I'd only not take the
24	chance, but they have more candy, so let them eat the other.
25	MR. HELMICK: You let them eat the other candy, right?

1	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 466: Yeah.
2	MR. HELMICK: Okay. I mean, what's another word here?
3	because they have a what? A doubt as to the what, safety, of the
4	Snickers bars, right? Everybody understand that?
5	Okay. Would you consider that doubt to be reasonable?
6	THE COURT: Ah, we're not going to go there.
7	MR. HELMICK: Okay.
8	THE COURT: There is a very specific definition of
9	reasonable doubt that you'll get at the conclusion of the case. So
10	we don't discuss that or quantify it in any fashion.
11	MR. HELMICK: I wasn't trying to go further on that.
12	THE COURT: I know.
13	MR. HELMICK: Thank you, Your Honor.
14	THE COURT: I always jump in anyway. It's not a you
15	thing. Don't worry.
16	MR. HELMICK: All right.
17	Okay. Let's see what else we have here, hold on.
18	All right. So anybody here, let me see your hands, please
19	ever been blamed for something and think back when you were
20	kids if you had siblings or anything like that blamed for
21	something they didn't do?
22	Okay. All right. Let's go to Sydney here and then we'll go
23	over to some other people.
24	Can you give us an example of that, Sydney? What's you
25	badge number please?

1	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 418: 418.
2	MR. HELMICK: 418.
3	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 418: I have four younger
4	siblings, so I was always blamed when I was a kid or when we
5	were kids, I was always blamed. Like who snuck out at night? Who
6	left the doors unlocked? Just something just stupid. It was always
7	my fault.
8	MR. HELMICK: And how did that make you feel?
9	THE COURT: Well
10	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 418: Well
11	THE COURT: were you sneaking out at night?
12	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 418: No, my brother was
13	and I got blamed for it.
14	MR. HELMICK: You got blamed for it, okay.
15	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 418: Yeah, actually. But
16	my parents didn't trust me, they trusted the younger kids which
17	sucked.
18	MR. HELMICK: So it bothered you, right?
19	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 418: Yeah.
20	MR. HELMICK: Yeah. Okay, good. That's a very good
21	example. Thank you for sharing that, Sydney.
22	Gilbert [sic], I saw you raise your hand too. Let's get you
23	the microphone.
24	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 424: Yeah, I think my
25	friends and I were arguing about something that about like an

1	argument, debate that was happening between us and they'd think
2	that like in that particular case I forgot what it was about really
3	but they think I was the one who did it but like clearly I was just
4	you know, just trying to be in a debate with them.
5	MR. HELMICK: Uh-huh.
6	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 424: But for some reason
7	they all pointed towards me being like the culprit of this thing that I
8	know I didn't do, and nobody would listen to me and it that kind
9	of feeling just sucked overall.
10	MR. HELMICK: Okay. So it made you it sucked.
11	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 424: Yeah.
12	MR. HELMICK: Yeah. And Sydney said she what was
13	the word that you used, I'm sorry? How did that make you feel?
14	Sydney? Bad?
15	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 418: Yeah, bad.
16	MR. HELMICK: Okay. Sucked, it was bad.
17	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 424: Yeah.
18	MR. HELMICK: Yeah. Thank you for sharing.
19	Anybody else, right? I mean, I think Henrry, did you
20	raise your hand on that one too?
21	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 505: Yes. But I'd rather
22	not comment on that.
23	MR. HELMICK: That's all right. That's okay.
24	Okay. Let me ask you this then. Hold on. This is kind of
25	going back to what I guess Mr. Yampolsky was talking about with
1	

1	Sarah in regards to the cookies. So you have two people that say
2	that they felt bad, that they felt it sucked being blamed for
3	something they didn't do. I mean, what are some things that let
4	me ask you this, Gilbert, what are some things that those people
5	should have done who were accusing you of this?
6	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 424: They should have
7	listened to my side of the story because they just write it off.
8	MR. HELMICK: Yeah. So I mean, listen to both sides of
9	the story, right?
10	Okay. What else? What else, Sydney.
11	Thank you, Gilbert.
12	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 418: My siblings could
13	have owned up to their own actions.
14	MR. HELMICK: Okay.
15	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 418: Does that make
16	sense?
17	MR. HELMICK: So the other people that did it should have
18	owned up to their own actions?
19	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 418: Yeah.
20	MR. HELMICK: That kind of goes back to what we were
21	saying in regard to taking responsibility, right?
22	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 418: Uh-huh.
23	MR. HELMICK: Yeah. Okay. Sarah, I forgot what you
24	thank you, Sydney.
25	What did you say in regard to the cookies? I mean, you

1	had one of the kids was being blamed for something, right? And
2	what did you do to solve the dilemma?
3	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 381: I knew who liked the
4	blueberries. The pie.
5	MR. HELMICK: I would have done cookies, that's why. I
6	don't know why. Okay, so what would you do you had it easy
7	then, I guess.
8	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 381: Yeah.
9	MR. HELMICK: Can you think of anything else? You
10	raised your hand when I asked that question
11	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 381: Yes.
12	MR. HELMICK: have you ever been blamed for
13	something.
14	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 381: I have.
15	MR. HELMICK: Okay. Tell us about that.
16	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 381: Sixth grade, there
17	was it was guilt by association. I was friends with a bunch of girls
18	that were stealing candy bars.
19	MR. HELMICK: Uh-huh.
20	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 381: So I got blamed for
21	one of the school fundraisers. I was not stealing candy bars.
22	MR. HELMICK: But how did that make you feel?
23	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 381: Angry.
24	MR. HELMICK: Angry. So there's another adjective, right?
25	Angry, okay.

1	What should those people have done?
2	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 381: They should have
3	told the truth.
4	MR. HELMICK: Yeah. Okay. So kind of like take
5	responsibility
6	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 381: Correct.
7	MR. HELMICK: right?
8	Okay. Thank you very much, Sarah.
9	Okay. I got one more topic and then I just want to talk to
10	just a few jurors that I made some notes on earlier. This is a very
11	important topic though.
12	Okay. Redwoods. Anybody know what a Redwood tree
13	is? Everybody know what that is, right? A sequoia, right, versus
14	palm trees? Okay.
15	You know, there's some people on this jury that have
16	served on juries before, right? Who was that, again, can you raise
17	your hand? Henrry, I think you did, right? Okay.
18	Let me talk to you just for a second, Henrry. And you
19	went you were in that deliberation room, right? Okay.
20	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 505: Yes.
21	MR. HELMICK: Yes.
22	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 505: Yes.
23	MR. HELMICK: Okay. And you said that you had some
24	reservations about what happened in that case, right?
25	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 505: Yes.

1	MR. HELMICK: Now you understand that based off of
2	what we have talked about here today that everybody has their owr
3	opinion, right?
4	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 505: Yes.
5	MR. HELMICK: And sometimes I think that somebody
6	over here said that they may feel that they could be swayed but
7	they'll still have their own opinion, right?
8	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 505: Correct.
9	MR. HELMICK: Okay. So what's I mean, what's one of
10	the reasons that that may happen and a jury of 12 or eight people
11	in your case. What are some of the reasons that people might be
12	swayed or convinced otherwise of their opinion?
13	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 505: Sometimes you can
14	misinterpret facts as they're presented to you. You can come up
15	with your own story as to what happened, rather than sticking to
16	the facts. So go off on a tangent based on your imagination.
17	MR. HELMICK: Uh-huh. Yeah. And when you're in a
18	room with other people, maybe there's peer pressure? Is that
19	possible, you think?
20	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 505: Yeah, that's
21	possible. Also
22	MR. HELMICK: That happen
23	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 505: being in a room
24	with those other people for a very long time
25	MR. HELMICK: Yeah.

1	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 505: it will start to
2	wear you down as well.
3	MR. HELMICK: Okay. And can you imagine that that can
4	happen in a scenario like that?
5	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 505: Yes.
6	MR. HELMICK: Yeah. Okay. So you have had a firsthand
7	experience with that then.
8	Is anybody here I mean, does anybody here, please
9	honest with yourselves, especially for a case like this. Does
10	anybody here feel if they are back there in that deliberation room
11	[beeping]. Am I out of time, Gordon?
12	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 460: [Indiscernible].
13	MR. HELMICK: All right. Just making sure.
14	Does anybody here feel if they're back there in that
15	deliberation room that they have the personality that you know
16	what, enough people are saying this and I'm just going to go with
17	the crowd. I'm just going to be a palm tree. If enough wind blows
18	on me, then I'm going to sway with the others. Does anybody here
19	feel that you know what, I'm a palm tree? And it's okay if you are.
20	Anybody feel that way? Let me see your hands if you do. If enough
21	wind is blown on you that you may sway.
22	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 505: Can I comment on
23	that?
24	MR. HELMICK: Yeah, go ahead.
25	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 505: When people

present an argument, they don't do it without basis. People can present a very logical argument, very logical way of interpreting their facts and seeing things that maybe you didn't consider. And if you're a nonbiased person, if you're attempting to judge a case fairly, then you're considering their points of views as well. And if they're logical enough and they go along with the evidence and it's something that you haven't considered before, that can sway a person's opinion. That can change your opinion.

MR. HELMICK: Yeah. Do you feel that if -- that that could happen to you?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 505: Yes.

MR. HELMICK: Okay.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 505: Sometimes. I'll tell you something happens in my life candidly.

MR. HELMICK: Uh-huh.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 505: My girlfriend and I are arguing about something we see on TV, you know, a topic relating to politics or culture, and she brings up points that I may not have considered before and vice versa. So we change each other's opinions all the time --

MR. HELMICK: Okay. So --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 505: -- and we grow each other's perspectives. We expand them.

MR. HELMICK: So you have an open mind is what you're saying basically, right?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 505: Yes.

MR. HELMICK: Okay. Okay, good.

Anybody disagree with Henrry? Or feel the same as Henrry? Let me get -- okay, let's go over to Nick.

Henrry, if you could just pass it down there.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 474: Yeah, in terms of the palm tree argument, I just -- I was -- when you said that I just thought about the Challenger disaster where everyone knew the Orings were faulty in that weather. And all those PhDs from NASA, 50 of them, when there wasn't the stakes of someone on a murder trial and you're -- you know, your ethical bounds, et cetera, they all went for it, even though most of them knew that it was wrong.

And so if those people succumb to that kind of pressure, I don't know if there's anyone here who legitimately can say I'm a Redwood, 100 percent of the time. So for me, being truthful, I probably have a bias that I don't even know about, you know, kind of hidden with regards to whether or not I can be swayed. And so that's where I come down on this.

MR. HELMICK: Yeah, thanks for sharing that.

Well we got two different perspectives here. Does anybody understand the point that Nick was trying to make; that that could happen? Does anybody feel that you know what -- and you made a good point, maybe that could happen to me? Anybody?

Anybody feel that if they are in the minority and the wind

is blowing very hard and the rest are in the majority, do you feel that you're just -- you're going to stick -- you're going to stand strong. That you are a Redwood, that you're not going to be swayed by the winds. Anybody feel that way?

All right. Thank you, Nick.

I mean, what is the most important -- what is the most important function of the jury that you think I'm trying to point out here? What's the most important pieces of this whole thing? What do you think?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 460: Individuality.

MR. HELMICK: Yeah, there it is.

Gordon said -- can we give Gordon the microphone?

We just got to get that recorded, Gordon.

What did you say again?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 460: Individuality.

MR. HELMICK: Right. So unique personal power, right?

Gilbert -- I think that Gilbert is -- and correct me if I'm wrong, I mean, there's some younger people on this jury, right? So Gordon, you're saying that no matter what age you are, what occupation you have, what your color of your skin is, everybody is as powerful as the person next to them, is that -- that's the beauty of it all?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 460: Yes.

MR. HELMICK: Right.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 460: Yeah.

I mean, who here feels that they can be a Redwood in this case, no matter how hard the winds may blow in the back of that jury room?  Let me see your hands if you feel that you can be a Redwood.  Uh-oh, we don't have all the hands up. Sydney, what do you think?  Let's give Sydney the microphone. Thank you, Gordon.  PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 418: I feel like I would be I would lean towards more of a palm tree just because I don't want to have a different opinion than everybody else. I don't want
Let me see your hands if you feel that you can be a Redwood.  Uh-oh, we don't have all the hands up. Sydney, what do you think?  Let's give Sydney the microphone. Thank you, Gordon.  PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 418: I feel like I would be I would lean towards more of a palm tree just because I don't
Uh-oh, we don't have all the hands up. Sydney, what do you think?  Let's give Sydney the microphone. Thank you, Gordon.  PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 418: I feel like I would be I would lean towards more of a palm tree just because I don't
you think?  Let's give Sydney the microphone. Thank you, Gordon.  PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 418: I feel like I would be I would lean towards more of a palm tree just because I don't
Let's give Sydney the microphone. Thank you, Gordon.  PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 418: I feel like I would be I would lean towards more of a palm tree just because I don't
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 418: I feel like I would be I would lean towards more of a palm tree just because I don't
be I would lean towards more of a palm tree just because I don't
want to have a different opinion than everybody else. I don't want
to stand out from everybody else. I want to kind of blend in, if that
makes sense.
MR. HELMICK: Sure. No, I appreciate you sharing that.
That's what I'm looking for. And there's nothing wrong with that,
right? There's wrong with being a palm tree or a redwood. This is
just a figure of speech that I'm talking about
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 418: Yeah.
MR. HELMICK: right?
Okay. Thank you very much.
Sylvia?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 463: So with being like a
palm tree, it's not more like oh, I want to go with the crowd.
MR. HELMICK: Yeah.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 463: It's kind of like if
you can sway me with the evidence

1	MR. HELMICK: Oh, okay.
2	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 463: then I would
3	possibly become a palm tree, but I'm going to be a redwood when
4	it comes to being fair.
5	MR. HELMICK: Yeah, so that's I mean, that's a good
6	analogy but what I'm going for is swayed with the crowd
7	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 463: Yeah.
8	MR. HELMICK: right? So you would be a redwood
9	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 463: Yeah.
10	MR. HELMICK: in that scenario.
11	Okay. All right. So there were some people that didn't
12	raise their hand though.
13	Gilbert, did you raise your hand?
4	Okay. Let's give it to Gilbert. Thank you, Sylvia.
15	What do you think, are you kind of like in Sydney's shoes?
16	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 424: I'm more of being
17	palm tree out of the fact that it's I think it's best to keep an open
18	mind and say yeah, you could be a redwood in the sense that you
19	could have your opinion of staying strong but in the but you
20	could also be like a palm tree in the fact that you can consider what
21	other people think about the same thing because what someone
22	else said before, you know, points could be, you know, there are
23	points that could be brought up about the
24	MR. HELMICK: Henrry.
25	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 424: Yeah, Henrry.

About the case that you haven't considered before and maybe you might put those points that you haven't considered for into your own conclusion about what had happened in considering all the facts that -- you know, that can be interpreted.

MR. HELMICK: Okay. So in regards to what Sylvia was saying, do you agree with her that you're not going to be swayed by the crowd, but you're going to be open-minded to what's presented in this case.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 424: Yes.

MR. HELMICK: Yeah. That's different, right?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 424: Yeah.

MR. HELMICK: Yeah. Okay.

Who else didn't raise their -- Jessica, did you raise your hand?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 468: No, I did not.

MR. HELMICK: She did not. That's what I thought.

All right. Go ahead, Gilbert, if you could get to Jessica.

Thank you very much.

What do you think?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 468: I mean, I get the concept that redwoods are sturdy and strong, but the base of the palm trees are as well. It's more along the top of the palm tree that makes it sway back and forth. So regardless, you're still a strong tree.

MR. HELMICK: Okay.

1	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 468: So I still think I'm a
2	palm tree; I still lean towards things, depending on the
3	circumstances. Like based on the evidence, I might be swaying one
4	way or the other.
5	MR. HELMICK: Sure.
6	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 468: And I might be
7	leaning towards the crowd.
8	MR. HELMICK: So it's possible for both?
9	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 468: Yeah.
10	MR. HELMICK: Okay. Anybody else? Who else did I
11	miss? Anybody over here?
12	Okay. I just want to follow up with a few jurors here and
13	then I'll be done. I know everybody wants to get out of here.
14	All right. Let's go ahead and pass the microphone to
15	Markletter, please.
16	Thank you, Jessica.
17	All right. So you had mentioned earlier that you feel that
18	you would be a little biased towards the police. You would tend to
19	believe the police more kind of like gentleman over here, Mister
20	what's your last name, sir, Sultan?
21	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 523: Sulstrom.
22	MR. HELMICK: Sulstrom
23	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 523: 523.
24	MR. HELMICK: Thank you.
25	Yeah, I mean so tell me about that. Why?

1	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 507: Yes, because I have
2	friends and family who are in a the police and I know they have
3	good character and also it's their job and their civil duty to do the
4	right thing. And murder is not a small charge, it's some it's a very
5	serious charge and I think most or all police officer will take that
6	murder charge very seriously and not just throw a charge out there
7	or make things up.
8	MR. HELMICK: So are you saying are you saying and
9	maybe I'm taking this the wrong way but are you saying that every
10	murder charge that comes about is legit?
11	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 507: I feel like there is
12	evidence to it, yes.
13	MR. HELMICK: Okay. And you feel that do you feel that
14	the cops are immune to making mistakes?
15	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 507: No, obviously not.
16	They are human.
17	MR. HELMICK: Okay. That's all I'm asking.
18	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 507: And my name is
19	Marklester, by the way.
20	MR. HELMICK: Marklester.
21	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 507: Yeah.
22	MR. HELMICK: I've been saying wrong, huh?
23	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 507: Yep.
24	MR. HELMICK: I apologize. Thank you.
25	Who else I mean, who disagrees with Marklester?

Nobody disagrees with Marklester?

Okay. Yeah, Ms. Leon. Thank you.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 512: I think what we are raised to believe is that those in law enforcement and our firefighters and our first responders that they are above reproach and that's mainly because they're held to higher standard. But we also have you're innocent until proven guilty, that's part of it.

So yes, we give our respect to our law enforcement officers, but we also have to be realistic and understanding that not everyone behind the badge is of sound mind and not everyone who's behind the badge has the best intentions in their heart. I mean, we have to be honest in saying that sometimes there are people that will lie, no matter what profession they're in.

So I think we have to take that into account and not, you know, have that confirmation bias that simply because that's what you are then everything you say is golden. We have to be openminded in the evaluation of that.

MR. HELMICK: Yeah, confirmation bias, I've heard about that lately. I mean, right, any profession, does anybody -- does everybody agree that any profession that there are good lawyers, bad lawyers; good doctors, bad doctors, right? I mean, they're human beings, right?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 512: Yes.

MR. HELMICK: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Leon.

So, I mean, let's pass it back to Mr. Marklester, because I

1	just want to ask you, based off of what you said, sir, do you feel that
2	you're going to give more weight to the Prosecution because of
3	that?
4	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 507: Yes.
5	MR. HELMICK: Okay. Thank you very much.
6	Let's go ahead and give it over to Mr. Donald Meng,
7	please.
8	Now, you had talked about some scenarios in your life
9	that sounded absolutely horrifying and I understand your position
10	on guns and all that and all those things. So you had said that
11	this is going to affect your ability to fair. Do you still feel that
12	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 390: I said it could.
13	MR. HELMICK: Could. Could affect your ability to be fair?
14	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 390: It could, yeah.
15	MR. HELMICK: Yeah.
16	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 390: That's honest
17	yeah.
18	MR. HELMICK: No, I mean, that's what we're looking for,
19	right? Yeah.
20	Are you going to start off looking at this scenario on the
21	Prosecution's side or are you going to be kind of neutral?
22	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 390: You're going to
23	have to repeat that.
24	MR. HELMICK: Yeah. I mean, are you going to start off
25	looking at the Defendants in this case negatively? Are you going to

1	think that they are they must have done something wrong or are
2	you going to believe the Prosecution
3	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 390: I don't think I'd be
4	sitting if they something somebody did something wrong.
5	MR. HELMICK: Sure.
6	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 390: I don't think they'd
7	be sitting at the Defendant table
8	MR. HELMICK: Yeah.
9	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 390: if something,
10	yeah.
11	MR. HELMICK: Okay. So I mean, can you be fair though
12	in regards to
13	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 390: Yeah, absolutely.
14	I'm a very fair person.
15	MR. HELMICK: Even based off of your are your persona
16	experiences with criminals going to affect your ability to judge this
17	case?
18	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 390: I don't believe so.
19	MR. HELMICK: You don't believe so. All right. Thank
20	you, Donald.
21	Let's go ahead and get it over to Ms. Williams, please.
22	Okay. Thank you very much.
23	Okay. What's your badge number, again, ma'am?
24	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 468: 468.
25	MR. HELMICK: Now you had mentioned that you're going

1	to have more sympathy to the victim in this case, right, because
2	somebody was killed, right?
3	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 468: Yes.
4	MR. HELMICK: Is that what you said?
5	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 468: Yes.
6	MR. HELMICK: Okay. Now is that going to affect your
7	ability to be fair to the people that have that were charged in this
8	case?
9	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 468: I believe so, yes.
10	MR. HELMICK: Yeah. Are you going to believe them to
11	be are you going to be more prone to looking at them as being
12	guilty because of that?
13	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 468: I believe so, yes.
14	MR. HELMICK: Okay. Thank you, Jessica.
15	Okay. Thank you very much, everybody. I don't have any
16	other questions.
17	THE COURT: Thank you. Will you guys approach?
18	[Bench conference transcribed as follows.]
19	THE COURT: All right. Who all are you going to
20	challenge for cause?
21	MR. HELMICK: Contreras, Sulstrom, cop guy, Jessica
22	Williams, Donald Meng.
23	MR. YAMPOLSKY: Pedronan.
24	MR. HELMICK: Huh?
25	MR. YAMPOLSKY: Pedronan or whatever it was.

1	MR. HELMICK: Oh, yeah, Pedronan. Yeah, Pedronan.
2	MR. PESCI: That's five.
3	How many is that, five?
4	THE COURT: That's five.
5	MR. YAMPOLSKY: Five or six.
6	MR. HELMICK: Yeah.
7	THE COURT: Is that it?
8	MR. HELMICK: Yeah.
9	So what is your you all's position on Lambert now?
10	MR. YAMPOLSKY: I agree with everything on them, but I
11	also
12	MR. HELMICK: On who?
13	MR. YAMPOLSKY: On all of yours
14	MR. HELMICK: Oh.
15	THE COURT: No, no, we're starting with they had
16	challenged Lambert. You disagreed earlier.
17	MR. PESCI: Earlier I made one on Lambert. You at that
18	point disagreed. You disagreed.
19	MR. YAMPOLSKY: No, I agree
20	THE COURT: What's your position on Lambert?
21	MR. PESCI: Right. [Indiscernible].
22	MR. HELMICK: I still object to
23	MR. YAMPOLSKY: I'm submitting
24	MR. HELMICK: for cause, I still object to that one.
25	THE COURT: All right. I'm going to grant the challenge as

_	
1	to Lambert.
2	And then you all both are challenging Williams. What's
3	your position as to Williams?
4	MR. YAMPOLSKY: Yes.
5	MR. PESCI: Judge, I oppose the challenge for cause. I
6	think that's she indicated that she can lean one way. We've talked
7	about the palm trees and redwood, but I don't think that she says
8	that she can't be fair.
9	MR. YAMPOLSKY: She
10	MR. HELMICK: Hold on, hold
11	MR. YAMPOLSKY: She
12	MR. HELMICK: on, let him
13	THE COURT: Calm down.
14	MR. YAMPOLSKY: All right. Sorry. Sorry.
15	THE COURT: Okay. And they both have challenged
16	Sulstrom. What's your position on Sulstrom?
17	MR. PESCI: I object again, to him being released.
18	THE COURT: Okay. I think that he's even a stronger
19	position to stay. He's talked about how he would listen to police
20	officers he was leaning towards police officers, but I asked him
21	specifically if we did not prove the case could you come back not
22	guilty and he said yes, he could.
23	THE COURT: Okay.
24	MR. YAMPOLSKY: And I asked him black and white
25	THE COURT: Hold on, hold on.

1	They also challenged Contreras. Are you in agreement
2	with any of their challenges?
3	MR. PESCI: No.
4	MR. HELMICK: Oh come on, Giancarlo.
5	MR. PESCI: You didn't agree with
6	MR. HELMICK: Oh, one.
7	MR. PESCI: Lambert.
8	THE COURT: Hold on, hold on. I'm going to send them
9	home then and we'll argue on the record, so that we cannot have to
10	be crammed over the microphone. I was just trying to see if there
11	was an agreement, then I was going to let those people go right
12	now.
13	MR. YAMPOLSKY: I agree that he's wrong.
14	THE COURT: Okay. All right. So hold on, hold on, come
15	back. When we get them back, I'm going to start at 10:30
16	tomorrow.
17	MR. YAMPOLSKY: Okay.
18	THE COURT: And we'll bring back those extra six, I guess,
19	that we have and I'll probably have them send down some more as
20	well.
21	MR. YAMPOLSKY: Okay.
22	THE COURT: All right.
23	MR. PESCI: Judge, sorry, can you
24	You know, we haven't quite gotten there yet, but I'm
25	having a really hard time with 466, Ms. Lambert.

1	MR. YAMPOLSKY: The marijuana smoker?
2	MR. PESCI: She can't stop talking
3	THE COURT: I know.
4	MR. HELMICK: Yeah, I know.
5	MR. PESCI: when it's not her time.
6	THE COURT: I know.
7	MR. PESCI: I'm afraid that someone who has already
8	manifestly expressed inability
9	THE COURT: Do you guys have
10	MR. PESCI: to follow instructions
11	THE COURT: any objection?
12	MR. HELMICK: No, I don't have
13	MR. YAMPOLSKY: I like her, but
14	MR. HELMICK: an objection to her.
15	MR. YAMPOLSKY: yeah
16	MR. HELMICK: If Giancarlo doesn't have any objection to
17	all the other ones.
18	THE COURT: You good?
19	MR. YAMPOLSKY: Yeah.
20	THE COURT: All right. I'll tell the marshal.
21	MR. YAMPOLSKY: I don't have an objection.
22	MR. HELMICK: She's a loose cannon.
23	MR. YAMPOLSKY: Yeah, I like her.
24	MR. HELMICK: She's a loose cannon.
25	THE COURT: Okay. All right.

1	MR. YAMPOLSKY: Thank you.
2	THE COURT: Thank you.
3	[End of bench conference.]
4	THE COURT: Hey, will you come here for a sec?
5	THE MARSHAL: Yes, sir.
6	THE COURT: No, not you guys.
7	[Bench conference transcribed as follows.]
8	THE COURT: Jill, my noise back.
9	So I'm going to send them home for the evening
10	obviously.
11	THE MARSHAL: Uh-huh.
12	THE COURT: But there are one or two
13	THE MARSHAL: Can I use your stickies here?
14	THE COURT: Yeah. They've agreed to let Ms. Phillips go,
15	the lady on the end of that row that keeps talking all the time.
16	THE MARSHAL: Oh.
17	THE COURT: She's Badge Number
18	THE MARSHAL: 551.
19	THE COURT: 551.
20	THE MARSHAL: Okay.
21	THE COURT: So once you get them outside you can just
22	tell her she's off.
23	THE MARSHAL: Okay.
24	THE COURT: Okay.
25	THE MARSHAL: Yes sir

THE COURT: Thank you.

THE MARSHAL: Thank you.

[End of bench conference.]

THE COURT: Okay. So here's what we're going to do, folks. I think we go it worked out. We're going to go ahead and break for the evening. We're going to start at 10:30 tomorrow morning. I am anticipating that we should by -- before we break for lunch, get everything whittled down to the 14 of you. That's my hope. Might need to go through the lunch hour a little bit but get it whittled down to the 14 of you and then the rest of you will be on your way, okay?

So during the recess you're admonished not to talk or converse among yourselves or with anyone else on any subject connected with the trial. Or read or watch or listen to any report of or commentary on the trial by any medium of information including, without limitation, newspapers, television, the internet, and radio. Or form or express any opinion on any subject connected with the case until it's finally submitted to you. No legal or factual research, or investigation or social media communication on your own.

Thank you very much for your time today and I will see you tomorrow morning.

Do you want them on the third floor and then you'll get them? Hallway?

THE MARSHAL: 16B.

THE COURT: 16B?

THE MARSHAL: In front of 16B.

THE COURT: So just collect down this hallway down the way there and when we get you all here, we'll get started, okay?

All right, guys, thank you very much.

[Outside the presence of the prospective jury]

THE COURT: Okay. So outside the presence of the jurors, I did tell the marshal, pursuant to your agreement at the bench that he can excuse Ms. Phillips, Badge Number 551. And I agree that she was constantly wanting to answer questions when I told her we weren't talking to her at those moments and she was -- just kept answering things out loud when people were -- other people were talking. So I agree with you all's assessment.

So on the challenges for cause, the defend -- or excuse me, the State challenged Ms. Lambert and there was some discussion at the bench but what I had said over Mr. Helmick's objection -- I think Mr. Yampolsky agreed with the challenge for Lambert, but I was going to grant the challenge as to Ms. Lambert.

She -- I think overall what she was saying about the difficulties she faces is that she works in an industry where she is involved in essentially euthanizing people by giving them drugs in a hospice-type setting and helping them to -- kind of give them -- I think she referred to it as comfort meds. And that it's a -- it's something that she struggles greatly with, helping people with their death and feeling guilt over that and she did not think -- and it was

obvious through her body language as well that she did not think that this was a case that she could be involved in and fairly assess everything because of those aspects of her work.

And I recognize Defendant Harlan was objecting, but I think the totality of things, which is the way I always view it, was appropriate to grant the challenge on her, as to her ability to be a fair juror.

Then in regard to both Defendants, they've challenged Contreras, Sulstrom, and Williams. And then Mr. Yampolsky also challenged Gutierrez-Sosa. And then Mister -- or Mr. Helmick did not challenge Gutierrez-Sosa but challenged Meng and Pedronan. So I think we have --

MR. YAMPOLSKY: And I agree with those challenges.

MR. HELMICK: I'm sorry, I didn't hear what you said, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. So Mr. Yampolsky challenged Williams, Contreras, Sulstrom, and then Gutierrez-Sosa. And you, Mr. Helmick, challenged Williams, Contreras, Sulstrom, and then also Meng, and Pedronan.

MR. HELMICK: Correct.

THE COURT: Okay. All right.

MR. YAMPOLSKY: And I also join in those challenges.

THE COURT: You join in on Meng and Pedronan?

MR. YAMPOLSKY: Yes.

THE COURT: All right. Are you joining in his Gutierrez-

1	Sosa challenge or no?
2	MR. HELMICK: No, not at this time.
3	THE COURT: Okay. So essentially the Defense has
4	challenged six people. And the State doesn't agree with any of
5	them, correct?
6	MR. PESCI: The State agrees with Gutierrez-Sosa.
7	THE COURT: With Gutierrez-Sosa. Okay. And I'm sorry,
8	Ryan, you disagreed with that one or agreed?
9	MR. HELMICK: I disagreed.
10	MR. YAMPOLSKY: No, he
11	THE COURT: Disagreed with that one. So what's your
12	disagreement on Mr. Gutierrez-Sosa?
13	MR. HELMICK: I'm trying to look at my notes, Your Honor
14	THE COURT: Okay.
15	MR. HELMICK: You want to maybe come back to this one
16	THE COURT: Okay. So what's the and I know you
17	started to talk about it, but I'll give you more of an opportunity,
18	Giancarlo. As to the three in common, Williams, Contreras,
19	Sulstrom?
20	MR. PESCI: Williams, Contreras, and Sulstrom. Judge, I
21	think that they've indicated, you know, building on this redwood
22	versus palm trees concept and I think that one juror, in particular
23	said it really, really well. She talked about how, you know, you
24	could be a redwood on being fair but be a palm tree based on the
25	evidence. That you're willing to listen and be swayed by the

evidence but you're not going to be unfair.

I think that those three individuals were asked questions and I think that they were very honest with saying that they may lean one way, for example, Mr. Contreras, towards police; or Ms. Williams, towards the victims; Mr. Sulstrom, the police. but they didn't say that they couldn't be fair.

And I specifically asked Mr. Sulstrom who was retired out of the LA County Sheriff's Department, I believe, if he's going to have any problem coming back with a not guilty if the State proves -- doesn't prove it, including calling police officers. And he said he would not have a problem returning a not guilty verdict in that scenario.

I think with Ms. Williams, she also talked about how, you know, she would be feeling sympathy towards the victims -- the victim or the victim's family, but that she also said that she could listen to the evidence and make her decision on the evidence.

I think that applies to Mr. Contreras. I'm trying to look really fast. He specifically -- I wrote it in quotes: No one is guilty until proven. Without seeing the evidence, you can't answer the question.

So he's been given all these hypotheticals and he said unequivocally no one's guilty until it's proven guilty. So he's not starting off as guilty. So under those three, I object.

THE COURT: Okay. So Mr. Yampolsky, as to those three?
MR. YAMPOLSKY: Well, on Ms. Williams, I mean, she

said lots of things and I wish I wrote down all of them but the last question -- the last question he asked, so you think -- and you can tell me it's -- so you think you prob -- and I'll probably find him guilty. Would you lean this way? She said yes. After everything. After the pound her in the head, you got to be fair; she couldn't be fair. So there's no question in my mind, she's got to go.

Now on Mr. Sulstrom, he's not an idiot. She was a county sheriff for 30 years, his wife was a county sheriff, they probably have kids that are county sheriffs. And when I asked him --

THE COURT: I don't think he said anything about having kids that are the county sheriff.

MR. YAMPOLSKY: Well I'm speculating.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. YAMPOLSKY: Well in any event, when I said hey, if this one says black, this one says white, well without anything more, he'd believe the cop. Now yeah, he's going to say well I'm swayed by the evidence, this and that, but when you're going in like that, you don't believe in the presumption of innocence and I think that's where we go back to.

I don't think he believes in the presumption of innocence. I believe he believes in the presumption that cops tell the truth and other people don't. Or maybe cops tell more of the truth or cops are more believable. But because of that you're skewing the balance. It's not presumption of innocence, it's presumption of maybe innocence, unless the cops say so. So I think he's got to go

1 for cause. 2 And Mr. Contreras, he did go back and forth, but I mean, 3 his cousin was killed four years ago, and he said in the beginning -and I forget exactly what because I questioned him this morning that he would --5 THE COURT: You questioned him this afternoon. It was 6 7 an hour and a half ago. 8 MR. YAMPOLSKY: It was right after him and before him, that was like yesterday. 9 THE COURT: No. 10 MR. YAMPOLSKY: Anyway, I'm remembering --11 12 THE COURT: You are correct in your chronology --13 MR. YAMPOLSKY: All right. 14 THE COURT: -- but it was an hour and --15 MR. YAMPOLSKY: All right. THE COURT: -- a half ago. Hold on. The young lady --16 17 MR. YAMPOLSKY: Look --THE COURT: -- Ms. Alvarez would like to tell you 18 19 something. 20 MR. YAMPOLSKY: Excuse me. 21 [Colloquy between Counsel] MR. YAMPOLSKY: I believe -- and I don't know who --22 maybe Mr. Helmick because he has better questions than me, 23 24 unfortunately. But I think he said to him -- and if it's not him, I 25 apologize. Should the Defense be scared about you being on the

jury and I think he said yes. Someone said yes, I believe it was him. So if he's saying that, what does that mean?

He also said he had a problem with people having guns illegally and he also said if someone's underage they shouldn't have guns. Well what's going to happen in this case? There's going to be evidence that people who were underage had guns. So when you add that to the murder and add that to the fact that he said the Defense should be scared, I don't know how he could fair, even if he said it later, he couldn't. So that's him.

Do I have anyone else I can rail against?

THE COURT: Well not yet, I'm just dealing with those --

MR. PESCI: I'm sure you do.

THE COURT: -- three for this moment.

MR. YAMPOLSKY: Okay.

THE COURT: Mr. Helmick?

MR. HELMICK: All right. Thank you. Okay, so are we talking about Williams?

THE COURT: Yeah, Williams, Contreras, Sulstrom.

MR. HELMICK: Okay. The last two questions that I asked her, I said will this affect your ability to be fair? Yes. Or more inclined to prove him guilt -- to rule him guilty, something like that. Yes.

Also, she's the one who said she knew about the case and we forgot to bring her up to talk about that aspect.

THE COURT: I know.

MR. HELMICK: So I mean, she's already admitted that she can't be fair in this case. I mean, Mace already said all those things, but that's what she just said to us.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. HELMICK: I don't think you can rehab her.

And then in regards to Contreras, I wrote down, because he said it so many times, he said, I've already came up with an answer in my head. This always leads me to -- I've already been led to the answer in this case. The Defense should be worried. If I get picked, I guess we'll find out.

I mean, come on? I mean, he's clearly at a huge bias towards the Defendants in this case already. He said it multiple times, he's already made up his mind. He doesn't need to hear a single piece of evidence.

THE COURT: All right. So here's the thing, I'm going to grant the challenges as to all three of those. And look, when you're evaluating things from the totality, you do have individual topics that people can talk about and express a problem with, but they can still be overall --pass the smell test, so to speak, for their ability to be fair and impartial and move forward in the process, even though you may later challenge them with a peremptory challenge.

And that works both ways. There are times when people, you know, tell the Prosecution that they have a lot of problem with police officers, right? That they've had bad encounters, et cetera and they read the news about horrible things the police officers do.

But they say look, I'm going to listen to this case for whatever it is and I'll evaluate evidence and give you a fair decision. It may not make the State have a warm feeling about them, but they still can be passed for cause.

Likewise, the Defense may have people that say look, I think a Defendant should testify. I don't know why somebody wouldn't testify if they're innocent and why they wouldn't want to get up there. But look, I get it, you guys might advise your clients some way, I'm still going to listen to whatever the Judge tells me the law is and I'll give you a fair opinion, based on the evidence.

Again, it may not make the Defense feel real good about what they think about your client not testifying but they've still, you know, been able to be fair. So what I look for through all of your questions are consistent themes or issues where maybe I feel somebody that's inconsistent was confused about something and sincerely understands it now and have answered in a certain way.

So Ms. Williams I thought was pretty consistent in saying she would -- was struggling with the idea of whether she could be completely fair. And if a juror is anything other than unequivocal in that, then I think case law says they are to be challenged.

And you're right, we didn't go into what it was she read in the news. I didn't have a sense that she really read anything prejudicial, she just remembered seeing it. But I do think that she consistently was struggling with this idea and telling us that it would be hard for her to be fair. Regardless of how she viewed

herself on the redwood/palm tree analogy, she was still saying it would be hard to be fair.

Similar on Mr. Sulstrom, the thing that I think was -- what kind of tipped the balance with him was yes, he was saying he could return a verdict of not guilty if he felt the State didn't prove their case but he was saying, and his word was heavily, he would lean very heavily in favor of believing the cops over anybody else just believe they're cops.

And that kind of a viewpoint on that, kind of informs the rest of how you view evidence in a case if it's coming from police officers and I think that is an inappropriate person to have on the jury.

Mr. Contreras, I do think he was fairly consistent in the problem areas that had been elucidated here during our discussion. I'm not going to go into all those but obviously it kind of came up in the beginning when he was talking about his cousin having been murdered and the difficulty sitting on a trial with individuals that are charged with that.

All right. That leaves us with first off, Ryan, Gutierrez-Sosa. Have you had a chance to look at that?

MR. HELMICK: Yes, I did.

THE COURT: Mace challenges, State agrees, your position is?

MR. HELMICK: Let's see here. I mean, I can't remember exactly what was -- what notes I had written down in regard to

talking to him, but I mean --

THE COURT: And let me just add this into it. He is the gentleman that said he's self-employed and has a number of --

MR. HELMICK: Oh the construction guy.

THE COURT: -- projects due in the next two weeks and then he's going to be gone and so it's going to be really difficult for him financially as well. If that informs you at all about what position you want to take.

MR. HELMICK: Right, right. I mean, I thought he was pretty -- I think I asked him multiple times if he could be fair and impartial and all those basic questions. From what I understood he seemed like he could have that position. I will go ahead and just submit that to Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. I think he's a gentleman that was kind of hard because I felt like he was not consistent in any one thing. Not because he was trying to get out of jury duty, but I couldn't really figure out exactly what his position overall was in terms of his ability to be fair, separate and apart from his prior jury experience that he seemed to be troubled by. And it sounded like he was saying he signed off on a verdict that he then regretted and didn't disagree with and -- so.

He was somebody that I think was challenge -- or could have been excused for cause based on his work issues but we left him on. You guys didn't really explore that anymore with him, which is fine, you don't have to. But that's one of the reasons I left

him there in the beginning was to let you all follow up if you wanted to. But I think under the totality, I will go ahead and grant Defendant Caruso's challenge as to that gentleman as well.

All right. And then we have Meng and Pedronan that are being challenged and joined in -- so Mr. Harlan challenges, Mr. Yampolsky joins in for Mr. Caruso. So State, what's your position as to Mr. Meng and Mr. Pedronan?

MR. PESCI: So, Judge, I think it's a different approach in the sense that Pedronan would fall under kind of the Sulstrom because Pedronan's got the family members that are with the police department in Hawaii, so it's that bias -- or the perception of bias towards that. I mean, if it's -- if the analysis is the same as it was for Mr. Sulstrom, I'm assuming that's what's going to happen but not --

THE COURT: I don't think he was as --

MR. PESCI: Adamant.

THE COURT: -- adamant or used the same kind of terminology in what he thought about cops.

MR. PESCI: Right. And, you know, Judge, it brings up something -- and I want to bring it up now because we're going to bring in other jurors tomorrow, so it's impossible to rebut or prepare for they must have done something to get here.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. PESCI: Because he --

THE COURT: I know.

MR. PESCI: -- kept going back to that, right? And it's really crazy to ask a jury they must have done something. Well of course they must have done something, they're been charged, right? For me to really respond to that I got to talk about well you see there was a determination of probable cause, then a sergeant reviewed what that person decided, then it was submitted to the DA's office.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. PESCI: Then the screening department decided to look at it, then it was decided by our office to send it. There are so many layers of things that are done. Someone doesn't just show up here willy nilly. And I'm going to do that tomorrow if this same thing happens. In fact, I'm going to do it unless you're making a ruling that they can't do that because I go first, they go last.

There's no way for me to respond to that where there's smoke, there's fire analysis. There is something that got you here but he, specifically, and that's why I'm bringing this up, kept saying they're innocent until proven guilty. They're here for a reason, he would say that, I admit that, I could see that, but that's factually accurate. Whether we believe there's sufficient evidence is a whole nother issue. You've already made a determination in a Writ context that there was sufficient evidence.

Do you want me to tell him guess what, that guy thinks that there's enough evidence?

THE COURT: No. Look, I get what you're getting at. I

don't think it's inappropriate to ask the question that's being asked about, you know, do you think they're guilty just because they're here and somebody says no, look, I figure they're here because there's a reason they're here. And a lot of people have that kind of belief that gee, if a case is going to trial there must be some evidence against these people. It doesn't mean they can't appreciate the presumption of innocence and still evaluate the case fairly.

So I don't think -- no, you don't get to go back in and say to them well the reason you're here, you understand, is people have found evidence against them. It's just like they're here because they were charged, right? That's the -- the reason they're here is because they were charged with crimes and the trial is to decide what evidence is there that they either did or didn't commit the crimes.

MR. PESCI: Then it's inappropriate --

THE COURT: Right?

MR. PESCI: -- to have a basis of trying to remove them by saying they're here for a reason.

THE COURT: I -- well that hasn't --

MR. PESCI: There's some reason that they're here.

THE COURT: Well first off that hasn't happened yet, right?

MR. PESCI: Well I think that's the underpinnings of the arguments for these individuals.

THE COURT: For Mr. Pedronan?

1	MR. PESCI: Yes.
2	THE COURT: Okay. All right.
3	MR. PESCI: And so that's my concern.
4	THE COURT: Okay. What about Mr. Meng?
5	MR. PESCI: Mr. Meng, it's a different analysis because
6	he's the victim of armed robberies when he's working at Albertsons
7	four times.
8	THE COURT: Right.
9	MR. PESCI: I asked him specifically if he could set that
10	aside, if he could make the determination as to his own experience
11	and he said yes. Of course he has emotional experiences or
12	feelings based on that but he said he would make his determination
13	based on the facts of this case and so I don't think it's appropriate
14	for him to be released because he said he could be fair.
15	In fact I wrote down he said, I'm a very fair person and
16	he said that he didn't believe that that was going to affect his ability
17	to be fair.
18	THE COURT: Okay. All right. Mr. Helmick.
19	MR. HELMICK: Thank you. Are we talking about Mr.
20	Meng?
21	THE COURT: Yeah. Sure.
22	MR. HELMICK: Okay. So in regards to Mr. Meng I mean, I
23	think that I recognize what Mr. Pesci said in regards to can he be
24	fair but there were a lot of things that he said prior to that after he
25	was so to speak, rehabilitated, even though some of those

questions were by me that he said that he would look at individuals with guns with bias because he had been on the other end of the gun.

And so, I mean, I don't think it's to the level of Sulstrom, for sure, but I think that it's something the Court should consider. I think it's a chal -- it's a basis for a challenge for cause. It doesn't seem like he can be fair given his scenario, his personal experiences being robbed four times and being held at gunpoint, I just don't it's possible for him to be fair.

THE COURT: And then Mr. Pedronan?

MR. HELMICK: Now Mr. Pedronan at the end there I think I really kind of pinned him down on whether he could be fair to the Defense and I forgot what the question was I asked him, but it seemed like he could not. He said he feels like every murder charge is legit. He is biased in believing in police authority because he has friends and family in the force. He didn't seem at all like he could be fair towards the Defense based off of the last questions that I just asked him.

MR. YAMPOLSKY: And I believe the last was, you know, would you lean towards the Prosecution and he didn't even hesitate, he -- yes.

MR. HELMICK: Yeah.

MR. YAMPOLSKY: So I think it was abundantly -- I think he's worse than Sulstrom and I think Sulstrom's bad.

THE COURT: So let Ryan finish, please. Thank you.

MR. HELMICK: Well thank you. So he refreshed my memory and that's what I asked him. And you could tell he's pretty clear cut on that.

THE COURT: All right. So I'm going to grant the challenge as to Pedronan. I'm going to deny the challenge as to Meng. And I agree that Meng made comments early on about what I believe are more in terms of I don't really relish the idea of sitting on a case investigation robbery considering I was the victim of armed robberies. But it wasn't that he ever said he couldn't be fair.

And you got to remember, you know -- let's take the sexual assault of a child case for instance. Pretty much every juror will say I have a bias against people that sexually abuse kids. Well that's fine, you can still be a fair juror. I mean, the issue isn't if you think badly of people that sexually abuse kids, it's can you be fair in evaluating a trial and then listening to the evidence, which you don't have any of right now and then deciding whether somebody's guilty of that crime.

So whether people think minors should or shouldn't have guns, think badly of people that, you know, commit crimes, things like that, that's not the issue for them as jurors. The totality of what that gentleman said I believe was that he could be fair. And a lot of that quite honestly kind of came out at the Defense questioning. It wasn't the State doing that. And he said I agree that he said he could -- he was a very fair gentleman, that he could be fair regardless of the other aspects. So I think he -- that gentleman

1	passes for cause.
2	So we will be excusing Lambert, Williams, Contreras,
3	Sulstrom, Gutierrez-Sosa, and Pedronan.
4	MR. PESCI: Judge, I apologize, I forgot one.
5	THE COURT: Oh, okay.
6	MR. PESCI: 474, Jaska. I wrote down specifically he said
7	he would give less weight to police officers. That was just one of
8	and then he put into context about the Reid method he actually
9	utilized
10	THE COURT: Yeah, I look, that guy was a little odd. I
11	don't think the singular comment about, you know, I would give
12	less weight or credence to police officers is something that's
13	automatically going to make you challengeable. Well first off, I
14	mean, like I said the guy was just kind of seemed a little odd. I
15	don't know. Mace, what's your position?
16	MR. YAMPOLSKY: He was all over the board.
17	THE COURT: Okay.
18	MR. YAMPOLSKY: I
19	MR. PESCI: Right. He says things that are bad for you.
20	MR. YAMPOLSKY: Well
21	THE COURT: Well that's why you know, [indiscernible]
22	argument that nobody
23	MR. YAMPOLSKY: Well all I'm saying
24	THE COURT: wants that kind of a person.
25	MR. YAMPOLSKY: is my recollection, he was all over

1	the board. One thing he did say which troubled me and should
2	really trouble you is that either they're both innocent or they're both
3	guilty. So what that says, he's not going to consider all the
4	evidence fairly and he's going to decide one way or another. So I
5	think based on that
6	THE COURT: So you're in agreement.
7	MR. YAMPOLSKY: What?
8	THE COURT: You're in agreement.
9	MR. YAMPOLSKY: Yeah, I'm in agreement.
10	THE COURT: Okay. All right.
11	MR. YAMPOLSKY: I hate to say it.
12	THE COURT: Mr. Helmick.
13	MR. HELMICK: I'm in agreement with Jaska too.
14	THE COURT: Okay.
15	MR. PESCI: Thank you.
16	THE COURT: So we will excuse Jaska as well then. Thank
17	you. So that's
18	MR. PESCI: Sorry, I forget that earlier.
19	THE COURT: seven total.
20	So when we get back tomorrow morning, we'll let those
21	folks go. We have six right now. So before we start with those six,
22	I'm going to have Jury Services send us more people and then I'll
23	run through my stuff with them first and then we'll fill the seven
24	empty seats and then we'll move forward.

MR. PESCI: What do you want me to do -- or I'm sorry, us

25