### IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

KODY HARLAN

Appellant,

vs.

THE STATE OF NEVADA,

Respondent.

Electronically Filed Mar 10 2021 02:54 p.m. Supreme Court CENTZABeth A. Brown Clerk of Supreme Court

#### APPELLANT'S APPENDIX Volume XV

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

	THE COURT: How long it will last. How long will the
effects I	ast?
	MR. PESCI: I'm not sure.
	THE COURT: Well I'm sure he's going to say it's going to
vary.	
	Do you guys want me to ask the first question again?
	MR. HELMICK: Sure.
	THE COURT: Okay.
	MR. YAMPOLSKY: Why not, we've got time.
	THE COURT: Thank you.
	[Mumbling between Counsel]
	THE COURT: That's good.
	MR. PESCI: No objection.
	THE COURT: Okay.
	[End of bench conference.]
	THE COURT: Okay. Dr. Donelson, I have a couple of
questio	ns for you if I could.
	EXAMINATION BY THE COURT [JURY QUESTIONS]
BY THE	COURT:
Q	Could you just describe specifically what effects do
Xanax,	marijuana, and alcohol have on human beings?
A	In 25 words or less.
Q	Yeah, 25 words or less. Thank you.
A	Ethanol is a general CNS depressant. Therefore, the
effects of	of alcohol on the human body, particularly the brain is that
	vary. question BY THE Q Xanax, A Q A

1	of reducing function to the point of dysfunction and possibly death.
2	Xanax is a CNS depressant but it's very selective and will
3	not take you to general anesthesia and will not kill you, at least in
4	terms of your heart failing, your breathing failing.
5	Marijuana is a completely different drug in the sense that
6	it's not a depressant, it's not a stimulant. There's a whole system of
7	nerves in the brain called the endocannabinoid system. That
8	endocannabinoid system seems much more dedicated to
9	integrating functions in the brain. In other words, it's not functional
10	per se, it helps coordinate functions.
11	One of the obvious effects of marijuana on the brain is
12	that people lose their short-term memory. They start talking about
13	something and the thought is gone. So it's an example of how
14	marijuana interrupts the integration in the brain.
15	Now if you had that interruption in the brain from the
16	integration to the depressant effects, you're going to get a whole lot
17	worse.
18	Q Okay. How long would the effects last on someone
19	abusing the drug, as in and there's a separate part of this says in
20	a 24-hour period. So why don't you speak to that, if you would,
21	please as to each of those individually and then how they're taken
22	in combination if that would affect them.
23	A Uh-huh. Let's start with the familiar one, alcohol. The
24	duration and the intensity of effects is strictly a function of how
25	much you drink. And you could knock yourself out for 24 hours if

you have a near poisonous amount of alcohol in you. So the dose is the key.

1

2

For marijuana, generally speaking, the drug will last about four to six hours, measurably. In other words, if you give people marijuana in a laboratory and you have a bunch of sensitive tests, you could pick up the effects of marijuana for maybe four to six hours. After 24, the general consensus is you're not going to find effects of marijuana. You may find THC in the blood and in the urine but there's no effects of that drug then.

For Xanax, Xanax is one of the most powerful
benzodiazepines on the market. So in measuring certain of the old
benzodiazepines you may know as Valium or Librium, diazepam.
They were taken in tens of milligrams. Xanax is taken maximumly
without impairment, maybe one milligram dose, so it's more
powerful.

16 It is also a shorter-acting benzodiazepine, so it's useful
17 when people taking it at night, they don't wake up with hangovers.
18 So its effects will dissipate say in six to eight hours, depending on
19 dose. Now if you overdose on any drug you could have the effects
20 go for some time. But not necessarily obvious effects.

Q All right. The next question has two parts and the first
part of it I think you already answered in terms of where we classify
weed as either a stimulant or a depressant. But the question is
what is the weed in the mix of three drugs, a stimulant or
depressant, and how does it affect the outcome of symptoms?

A It's still neither a depressant or a stimulant. It is a drug
unto itself. The endocannabinoid nerves in the brain do not
increase or augment function like a methamphetamine would. And
it doesn't depress function like alcohol would or Xanax would.
When you add all three brain disruptors together, you're
going to get a very complex mix of dysfunction and it's not
necessarily predictable. It's not predictable because scientists and
investigators do not give people all three of those drugs and watch
what happens. It's just simply not done.
THE COURT: Thank you. Mr. Margolis, any further
questions?
MR. MARGOLIS: No, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Mr. Pesci?
MR. PESCI: No. Thank you.
THE COURT: Mr. Helmick?
MR. HELMICK: No, Your Honor. Thank you.
THE COURT: Dr. Donelson, thank you very much for your
time, sir, I appreciate it. You are excused.
Any further witnesses on behalf of Defendant Caruso?
MR. YAMPOLSKY: No, Your Honor. The Defense rests.
THE COURT: Thank you. Any rebuttal witnesses from the
State?
MR. HELMICK: No, Your Honor.
THE COURT: All right. Ladies and Gentlemen, that
completes the presentation of witnesses and evidence. We're

going to take a break before we get started with closing arguments
 so I can finish up a couple things getting the jury instruction
 packets for you.

4	So during the recess you're admonished not to talk or
5	converse among yourselves or with anyone else on any subject
6	connected with the trial. Or read or watch or listen to any report of
7	or commentary on the trial by any medium of information
8	including, without limitation, newspapers, television, the internet,
9	and radio. Or form or express any opinion on any subject
10	connected with the case until it's finally submitted to you. No legal
11	or factual research, investigation, or social media communication
12	on your own.
13	You're getting real close to never hearing me say that
14	again. So we'll be in break. Hopefully we'll get started in about 15
15	minutes with our arguments, okay?
16	THE MARSHAL: All rise for the jury.
17	[Outside the presence of the jury]
18	THE COURT: All right. You all can be seated.
19	So yes, I did get the information that you wanted to seek
20	larceny from the person as a lesser included.
21	MR. HELMICK: Yes, Your Honor.
22	THE COURT: The problem is I don't think it's a lesser
23	included.
24	MR. HELMICK: Well, you know, in reading that case that
25	Mr. Pesci provided us, an unpublished opinion I might say, but

1	THE COURT: Correct.
2	MR. HELMICK: it seems that the Court in that case is
3	making a distinction in regard to talking about the penalties. That's
4	kind of what I they really focus a lot on the penalties.
5	THE COURT: Right.
6	MR. HELMICK: But when I look at robbery and I look at
7	larceny from a person, it seems as though that robbery consumes
8	larceny from a person, taking the property of another. The only
9	difference is by force or fear, or the threat of force or fear.
10	THE COURT: Right.
11	MR. HELMICK: And so I feel like I mean, it is kind of
12	consumed in there, but it seems like a lesser included offense to
13	me.
14	THE COURT: I think you have a logical approach to that.
15	Mr. Pesci? I think the case speaks to what I have to do,
16	but is there anything you want to add?
17	MR. PESCI: Yes, Judge, so I pointed out this case because
18	it's the very most recent
19	THE COURT: Right.
20	MR. PESCI: addressing this by the Nevada Supreme
21	Court. Now it's unpublished but post-January of 2016, we're
22	allowed to utilize unpublished opinions
23	THE COURT: Correct.
24	MR. PESCI: and it's the State Supreme Court. And they
25	go so far as to literally interpret the legislative import of the statutes

and to say that they're mutually exclusive.

THE COURT: Right.

1

2

MR. PESCI: The actual instruction or the statutes on it
says that it is not robbery so clearly it cannot be subsumed in it
because it's saying it's not robbery. That's why at first blush we
might think that it is but it's in actuality not and the State Supreme
Court just three months ago was -- told us directly on point.

THE COURT: Yeah, here's the reality. I think in the past I
may have very well given that as a lesser included, prior to the case
that Mr. Pesci's referring to and I remember when Hodges came out
because I think it was Hardesty, Stiglich, and Silver. And I was a
little surprised by some of the language to be honest.

I never read that statute where it says in circumstances
not amounting to robbery as excluding those two from each other,
but rather saying if it's force, right, then it's robbery. If there's no
force then it's larceny from the person but they're not exclusive
other than that. But I agree that that case stands for the proposition
that they are completely exclusive of each other.

That being the case, at best it's a lesser related and we
don't give instructions on lesser related offenses. You know, a lot
of times we get requests for that, maybe to instruct the jury about
trespass or petty larceny in a burglary case, things like that. You're
certainly free -- and I would also say this. The instructions are
pretty specific that we've settled in talking about when the intent to
commit a robbery has to occur. It can't be an afterthought kind of

Day 6 - Page 32

1 robbery situation.

2	So I think that it's completely covered in that regard and
3	you're certainly free to argue that at best, folks maybe stole
4	something from the gentleman after he was deceased but that it
5	doesn't amount legally to robbery under the instructions they're
6	given. But I don't think it's appropriate to give any kind of
7	instructions on larceny from the person.
8	MR. HELMICK: Okay. In that regard then in closing
9	argument, if I'm saying that it doesn't amount to robbery because it
10	was taken after he was deceased, am I able to even mention
11	because the jury mention because the jury might be thinking well
12	what does it equal because it's
13	THE COURT: Right.
14	MR. HELMICK: some type of crime, right? Am I able to
15	mention the words that it's a different type of theft or
16	THE COURT: Well, no I mean, you yeah, if you're
17	mentioning the words theft or
18	MR. HELMICK: Larceny from
19	THE COURT: larceny that somebody stole something
20	from an individual after they were deceased even though I mean,
21	it's not simply they took his property after he was deceased. That
22	can still be robbery if you form the intent for robbery prior to
23	MR. HELMICK: Right.
24	THE COURT: the force or violence being used.
25	MR. HELMICK: Right.

1	THE COURT: But if it's just for instance the I've had
2	more than one case sadly where a homicide occurs and then
3	people are all going back to the residence to steal from the person
4	after
5	MR. HELMICK: Right.
6	THE COURT: a homicide occurs because they found out
7	there was a homicide there. So that's grand larceny or petty
8	larceny, whatever it may be.
9	So if you're talking about theft in that kind of a concept
10	that this is all that occurred here because the facts of this case don't
11	show that a robbery occurred then your yes, you can
12	MR. HELMICK: Okay.
13	THE COURT: make that argument.
14	MR. HELMICK: Okay.
15	THE COURT: It's just that we don't instruct them on those
16	lesser related offenses in terms of how they're defined because
17	they're not asked to render a verdict on them.
18	MR. HELMICK: Okay, good.
19	THE COURT: Okay.
20	MR. HELMICK: And I do have one more thing.
21	THE COURT: Sure.
22	MR. HELMICK: I brought a chart.
23	THE COURT: Okay.
24	MR. HELMICK: And I've used this in the case last
25	year
	Day 6 - Page 34 AA1409

1	THE COURT: Okay.
2	MR. HELMICK: [indiscernible] case. Your Honor let me
3	use it. And I used it also in Judge Adair's case in a murder trial last
4	year as well.
5	THE COURT: Okay.
6	MR. HELMICK: And it's this one right here. Do you
7	remember this one last year?
8	THE COURT: I believe so, yeah.
9	MR. HELMICK: Yeah. And so I want to use this in my
10	closing argument not to it's not to excl give a different
11	reasoning for guilt beyond a reasonable doubt. I'm not trying to do
12	that. The way that we analyzed it before was that we're reminding
13	the jury of what it isn't. It's not you can't say well he's possibly
14	guilty.
15	THE COURT: Understood.
16	MR. HELMICK: So that's what I'm using. It's a visual aid
17	as well.
18	THE COURT: Okay.
19	MR. HELMICK: So.
20	THE COURT: Mr. Pesci?
21	MR. PESCI: The State objects as quantifying reasonable
22	doubt. Reasonable doubt's the third rail, we're not supposed to
23	touch it, Your Honor. We're not supposed to go near it, other than
24	what's in the statute.
25	THE COURT: I agree. But there's a difference between
	Day 6 - Page 35 AA1410

1	quantifying the definition of reasonable doubt and telling a juror
2	that this isn't a preponderance of the evidence, it's not clear and
3	convincing evidence, it's not hey I think somebody's guilty, et
4	cetera. It is beyond a reasonable doubt. That has to be the
5	standard of proof.
6	MR. PESCI: Correct. But this is quantifying it. It's
7	possibly guilty, probably guilty, guilty likely, guilty highly likely,
8	that's quantifying
9	THE COURT: But you would agree that all of those things
10	are not reasonable beyond a reasonable doubt, right? That
11	you're just pointing out in writing as opposed to like
12	MR. PESCI: I wouldn't agree with Your Honor,
13	respectfully
14	THE COURT: Okay.
15	MR. PESCI: because that's where the slippery slope is.
16	That's if I get up and I start saying look, you feel it in your gut, right.
17	We've been told we can't do that, Judge. This is doing that. It's
18	akin to that. That's giving some sort of concept that it equals they
19	get to decide what's reasonable doubt. Not us.
20	THE COURT: Well look, sometimes we have to agree to
21	disagree.
22	MR. PESCI: Okay.
23	THE COURT: I don't think quantifying reasonable doubt is
24	the same a telling people that it isn't these certain things. The
25	definition of reasonable doubt, what constitutes reasonable doubt

1	can't be quantified in any fashion by people talking. But it is not
2	inappropriate for people to talk to a jury and say you can't find
3	somebody guilty just because you think they may be guilty or
4	because you suspect they may be guilty. You have to find it to the
5	standard that's defined in reasonable doubt.
6	And so I don't think and I get it. I think there was an
7	objection to it probably when we had it last summer in the case as
8	well, which
9	MR. PESCI: The State
10	THE COURT: look, resulted in a guy being convicted of
11	first-degree murder. So I know that jurors are capable of
12	understanding this.
13	MR. PESCI: I potentially I would ask that this be made a
14	court's exhibit because I'd like to utilize that potentially on appeal.
15	THE COURT: Yeah, I don't want to take your poster from
16	you
17	MR. HELMICK: Sure.
18	THE COURT: but do you have it as a pdf like before it
19	was printed out?
20	MR. HELMICK: I think I do at the office.
21	THE COURT: Okay. Well I don't want
22	MR. HELMICK: If not I mean, if I
23	THE COURT: If not I need to make that as an exhibit
24	because I don't
25	MR. HELMICK: That's fine.

THE COURT: think that's inappropriate.
MR. HELMICK: Yeah, that's fine.
THE COURT: But we have a pdf we can use it and I'll just
say for the record that it's approximately a three by four-foot poster
and we'll get a pdf of what's actually depicted
MR. HELMICK: Sure.
THE COURT: upon there so there can be a court exhibit
for any
MR. PESCI: Thank you.
THE COURT: For the purposes of
MR. YAMPOLSKY: Take a picture and text it to him.
THE COURT: any record on appeal.
MR. HELMICK: Okay. Thank you.
MR. PESCI: We just need it
THE COURT: No, no, I don't want to text it.
MR. PESCI: We need it in a format that it can go with the
file.
MR. YAMPOLSKY: Yeah. Got it, Your Honor.
THE COURT: My phone doesn't go in the file, Mace.
Thank you, though.
MR. YAMPOLSKY: You can e-mail it.
THE COURT: All right. Anything further before we get
started?
MR. PESCI: No, not from the State. Thank you.
MR. HELMICK: No, Your Honor.

1	THE COURT: Okay.
2	MR. YAMPOLSKY: No, Your Honor.
3	THE COURT: Then did you guys each get a copy of the
4	instructions? Did Sarah give you them this morning? We printed
5	out copies for everybody.
6	MR. PESCI: No.
7	MR. YAMPOLSKY: I did not get one.
8	THE CLERK: Greg has them.
9	MR. YAMPOLSKY: Ah-hah.
10	THE COURT: So after I finished correcting everything and
11	numbering them all and organizing them last night, I did e-mail
12	them out to everybody by Word and
13	MR. YAMPOLSKY: We got that.
14	THE COURT: made sure that I pointed out the two that
15	had a couple of corrections and invited you all to respond if there
16	was anything. I didn't hear any response or concern about any of
17	those.
18	MR. PESCI: Not from the State.
19	THE COURT: Right?
20	MR. HELMICK: What was that? I'm sorry I was
21	THE COURT: No, I was just saying the e-mail that I sent
22	last night with all the instructions, I didn't get any response, so I
23	didn't think there
24	MR. HELMICK: Everything's good.
25	THE COURT: was any issue.

1	Okay. Mace, and you all had no issue as well?
2	MR. YAMPOLSKY: No, I got them.
3	THE COURT: Okay.
4	MR. MARGOLIS: No, we're good.
5	THE COURT: But there was no issue with the e-mail that I
6	sent out? Everything looked good?
7	MR. YAMPOLSKY: No, everything looked fine.
8	THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. All right.
9	MR. YAMPOLSKY: I actually got it. I for whatever
10	reason
11	THE COURT: I'm very happy that you got it.
12	MR. YAMPOLSKY: I did not get Mr. Pesci's e-mails,
13	even though I know he sent it.
14	THE COURT: Thank you.
15	All right. You guys want to take a minute and make sure
16	your stuff's all hooked up you're working with the equipment? And
17	then we'll get started. Like five minutes.
18	[Court recessed at 12:56 p.m., until 1:08 p.m.]
19	[In the presence of the jury]
20	THE MARSHAL: All rise for the jury.
21	THE COURT: You all can be seated. Thank you.
22	Okay. We will be back on the record. Mr. Harlan, Mr.
23	Caruso are present with their attorneys, States' attorney, all of our
24	jurors are present.
25	Ladies and Gentlemen, did each of you have in chairs a
	Day 6 - Page 40 AA1415

packet of the jury instructions, yes? Okay.

1

So as we talked about many moons ago when we started
jury selection, I told you there'd come a point in time in the case
where I was going to read you or give to you the law that applies in
the case. I have to by law read the instructions to you, kind of to
make sure that you've actually gone through them.

But I gave you your own packet so that you can read
along while I'm reading them to you. I think it's a lot more
comfortable to go through it that way for you and I think it makes it
easier for you to kind of start digesting what the law is and be able
to think about it a little bit.

12 I will tell you that you will get to take that packet with you 13 when you go back to deliberate, your individual packet. So if you 14 want to write any notes while I'm reading them to you, feel free to 15 do so. Write any notes on them while the attorneys are arguing, 16 feel free to do so. You might write your name or initials on the 17 front of your packet just -- as you know back in the deliberation 18 room you just have that one big table; so your packet doesn't get 19 mixed up with anybody else's.

But I will try and read through these as quick as I can so
that we can get you on to the arguments.

[The Court read the Instructions to the Jury]
 THE COURT: Each of you should have attached to your
 jury packet a copy of the verdict form as well that lists the three
 charges. I'm sure the attorneys may talk about that with you during

their closing arguments, but I will simply point out to you it's pretty
self-explanatory and you only check one box under each of the
three charged offenses for each of the Defendants. There's a
verdict form for each of the Defendants.

All right. Thank you very much for your patience. Before 5 we get started with argument, as to our audience, everybody has 6 7 been incredibly appropriate during the course of our trial and 8 respectful and I greatly appreciate that. Closing arguments are a 9 really critical time and I would like the attorneys and the jurors to 10 be able to focus on what's being stated and shown so please, try 11 and limit yourselves form leaving the courtroom. And if you do 12 leave the courtroom, I don't want people coming and going during 13 the argument.

So if you need to leave for any reason you need to wait
outside until we take a recess and then we'll let people back in.

You got that, Greg?

THE MARSHAL: Say that again, Judge.

THE COURT: I'm saying if anybody needs to leave, I don't
want people coming and going back and forth. So if they need to
leave, they need to wait outside until we get to the next recess,
okay?
THE MARSHAL: Okay, Judge.
THE COURT: All right. On behalf of the State, Ms.

24 Overly?

. . .

25

16

17

CLOSING ARGUMENT BY THE STATE BY MS. OVERLY: Ladies and Gentlemen, approximately a week ago I stood before you and I explained why we're here. And I explained that it is because on June 8th of 2018, Matthew Minkler was murdered. And the people responsible for that are the Defendants Jaiden Caruso and Kody Harlan. So now I stand before you to explain what that really means. And that means that the State must do two things; that -- to prove that a crime was committed and that the Defendants are the individuals responsible for committing that crime.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

We already know that the Defendants are responsible.
This isn't a whodunnit. We already know that Jaiden Caruso
possessed the firearm that shot and killed Matt Minkler on June 8th.
We know that Kody Harlan was with him in that house and
proceeded to clean up the scene and go with him about town after
that murder.

So what we're really here to establish is what crimes were
committed. The Defendants in this case are both charged with
murder with use of a deadly weapon and robbery with use of a
deadly weapon. Additionally, Defendant Kody Harlan is charged
with accessory to murder with use of a deadly weapon.

And you're instructed on what accessory to murder with
 use of a deadly weapon is; essentially that every person who after
 the commission of a felony destroys or conceals or aids in the

destruction or concealment of material evidence, or harbors or
 conceals such offender with the intent that the offender may avoid
 or escape from arrest, trial, conviction or punishment, having
 knowledge that such offender has committed a felony or who is
 liable to arrest is an accessory to that felony.

6 And we already know that Kody Harlan is an accessory to 7 murder with use of a deadly weapon. We know that by his own 8 admission. He tells police, he tells Detective Nichols that he in fact helped assist in cleaning of the scene. In fact, he even indicated 9 10 that it was his idea where to move Matt Minkler in the house. We know that this information is corroborated by Traceo Meadows, 11 12 who testified and indicated that he saw Kody Harlan participate in 13 cleaning up the house.

So the next thing to establish is whether or not a deadly
weapon was used. You'll notice that in all of the charges here,
deadly weapon is added to the charge. So what is a deadly
weapon? You'll be instructed on the actual jury instruction on what
a deadly weapon is, but you're also instructed that a firearm is in
fact a deadly weapon. And what do we know here? That a firearm
was used.

We know that there were actually two firearms that keep coming up throughout this trial but specifically in regards to the one that killed Matt Minkler was this .357 revolver possessed by Jaiden Caruso. We know that that occurred because we've seen photos of it, we've seen videos of it, we've heard from the coroner

Day 6 - Page 44

in this case that Matt Minkler suffered a gunshot wound to the head. We've heard from a firearms examiner that this gun was operational and working. So we already know that a deadly weapon was used.

1

2

3

4

So let's go to Count 1, Murder with Use of a Deadly
Weapon. As the Judge previously instructed you, the charge may
include various degrees of murder; murder of the first-degree,
murder of the second-degree, and that of manslaughter. So in
order to establish what this is, let's first talk about what it isn't.

Manslaughter, the unlawful killing of a human being
 without malice, express or implied, and without any mixture of
 deliberation. It can include voluntary and involuntary.

Specifically, involuntary is the killing of a human being
without any intent to do so. In the commission of an unlawful act
or a lawful act which probably might produce such a consequence
in a unlawful manner where the involuntary killing occurs in the
commission of an unlawful act, which in its consequences naturally
tends to destroy the life of a human being or is committed in the
prosecution of felonious intent, the offense is murder.

So with regards to involuntary manslaughter, you'll also
be instructed that this does not include the conscious use of a
deadly weapon. You cannot commit involuntary manslaughter and
simultaneously consciously use a deadly weapon. And what do we
know about the evidence here? That Jaiden Caruso pointed the
firearm at Matt Minkler's head and pulled the trigger. That's a

conscious use of a deadly weapon. So involuntary manslaughter 2 does not apply in this case.

1

3 That's evidenced by the coroner photos that we saw in 4 this case. Again, let's talk about what this isn't. Voluntary 5 manslaughter, which is defined as a killing upon a sudden heat of 6 passion, caused by a provocation apparently sufficient to make the 7 passion irresistible. The provocation must either consist of a 8 serious and highly provoking injury inflicted upon the person 9 killing, sufficient to excite an irresistible passion in a reasonable 10 person.

And what do we know about the facts of this case? We've 11 12 heard testimony from the various witnesses that came in here, from 13 Charles, Alaric, we've heard from Ghunnar, Kymani. We heard that prior to the Defendant, Jaiden Caruso, standing up, walking over to 14 15 that kitchen, he was sitting on this very loveseat. We've seen him 16 in videos sitting there.

17 We also hear from witnesses that there was no guarrel 18 beforehand, there was no argument, there was no fist fight, there 19 was no yelling. But the Defendant calmly stood up, walked over to 20 where Matt Minkler was standing in the kitchen, picked up that 21 firearm, pointed at Matt Minkler, and fired. There was no heat of 22 passion, there was no provocation here.

23 So when you get your verdict form in the jury room, it's 24 clear that any option that lacks a deadly weapon and that involves 25 any form of manslaughter does not apply in this case. And why is

#### Day 6 - Page 46

that? Because let's talk about what this actually is. And this is firstdegree murder, Ladies and Gentlemen. There's no ifs, ands, or buts about it.

1

2

3

Murder's the unlawful killing of a human with malice
aforethought, either express or implied. Malice aforethought is the
intentional doing of a wrongful act, which would be the killing,
without legal cause or excuse or what the law calls adequate
provocation, which is what we just talked about involuntary
manslaughter.

Malice aforethought can arise in various ways. It can arise
from anger, hatred, revenge, ill will, spite, grudge, any unjustifiable
or unlawful motive or purpose to injure another. It denotes an
unlawful purpose or design, as opposed to an accident or a
mischance.

Now there are two ways that you can reach the conclusion
of first-degree murder. The first is willful, deliberate, and
premeditated killing. The second is otherwise known as felony
murder, which is a murder committed in the perpetration or the
attempted perpetration of a robbery.

So let's first talk about the willful and deliberate and
premeditated killing, which is also a specific intent crime. It's a
specific intent crime because there needs to be an establishment of
intent behind the killing. So let's talk about what willful is. Willful
is pretty straightforward. It's an intent to kill. How do we know that
there was an intent to kill in this case? Again, we heard evidence.

Jaiden Caruso walked over to Matt Minkler, pointed a loaded firearm at his face and pulled the trigger.

1

2

3 Deliberation is the process of determining upon a course 4 of action to kill as a result of thought, including weighing the 5 reasons for and against the action and considering the 6 consequences of the action. A deliberate determination may be 7 arrived in a short period of time. This isn't a situation where 8 somebody needs to think about it for days, for hours, or even minutes. We know that Jaiden Caruso on June 8th, 2018, knew that 9 10 this firearm was operational, that it was loaded. In fact, he was the one that would load it. 11

And we know that that was actually the case because
when he fired that shot at Matt Minkler, it went off.

And what do we know about premeditation? It's a design,
a determination to kill distinctly formed in the mind by the time of
the killing. It need not be for a day, an hour, or even a minute. It
can be as instantaneous as successive thoughts of the mind.

18 Oftentimes an example of that would be you're driving 19 down the road and the light turns yellow and it's about to turn red. 20 And in the moment that you decide whether or not you're going to 21 rush through that yellow light or you're going to stop for that red 22 one, that can be as instantaneous as successive thoughts of the mind. So if the formulation to kill and an intent to kill was derived 23 24 within that instantaneous successive thoughts of mind, it's 25 premeditated.

1	[Video playing]
2	BY MS. OVERLY:
3	And we know, like I said before, that Jaiden Caruso was
4	operating that gun all day. Taking the bullets in, putting the bullets
5	out, firing it. At one point he even shot it into the ceiling. And we
6	heard evidence from other witnesses that Matt Minkler in fact was
7	somewhat stunned by this and he even said to him at some point
8	man, you almost shot me. You're lucky you're my friend.
9	And how do we know that that actually happened?
10	Because Matt Minkler then posted simultaneously of that video, this
11	photo: Lucky I fw with him.
12	And I'd submit to you that Matt Minkler in this post is
13	referring to Jaiden Caruso. And the State's not required to
14	establish motive in this case, but I would submit to you that if there
15	was going to be one, it was right here.
16	And you've you're going to be instructed and you've
17	heard a lot of evidence on this idea of voluntary intoxication. But
18	it's important to note that when you're discussing voluntary
19	intoxication, it may be a defense to a specific intent crime, which in
20	this case would be willful, premeditated and deliberate murder.
21	The person's intoxication can be taken into consideration
22	when you're thinking about the person's motive and intent. It
23	doesn't negate the crime, but you can consider it.
24	So with regards to the state of mind and the intent, the
25	State is not required to present direct evidence of a Defendant's

state of mind as it existed during the commission of the crime. 2 Meaning the State does not have to prove that Jaiden Caruso stood 3 up and said I'm going to kill you Matt Minkler; that we can 4 determine that based off of the circumstances.

You can infer the existence of a state of mind of a party or 5 6 a witness from the circumstances disclosed by the evidence. And 7 as I indicated, the State's not required to establish that Jaiden 8 Caruso stood up and said he's going to shoot Matt Minkler and kill him, but we did in fact hear from Ghunnar when he testified that 9 10 Jaiden Caruso was talking before Matt Minkler even got there that 11 day saying he wanted to kill somebody.

12 And we know with this regard to voluntary intoxication, 13 that despite consuming alcohol, marijuana, and Xanax, which 14 you've heard a lot about, that Jaiden Caruso that day was capable 15 of rising from that loveseat, he was capable of grabbing that gun, 16 he was capable of pointing a loaded gun at Matt Minkler's face, he 17 was capable of shooting Matt Minkler.

18 He was then capable of filming and uploading videos of a 19 deceased Matt Minkler on the ground. He was then capable of 20 cleaning up that scene consciously. And then he was also capable 21 of texting and calling his friends hours later, bragging about 22 catching a body. We know that he was capable of going to the mall 23 and shopping. And we know that he was even capable of going to 24 a party afterwards.

25

1

So this concept of consuming alcohol, weed, and Xanax

didn't prevent him from doing all of these things after shooting Matt Minkler in the face.

1

2

3 So Ladies and Gentlemen, this is straightforward. This is 4 murder of the first degree. But there's also another means by 5 which you can find the Defendant is guilty of first-degree murder. If 6 you don't find that it's willful, premeditate, and deliberate, he can 7 be found guilty of first-degree murder by means of the felony murder rule. And that is that a killing is committed in the 8 9 perpetration or attempted perpetration of a robbery. And that is 10 first-degree murder, whether that killing was intentional or unintentional or accidental. 11

The intent to commit the robbery has to have arisen
before during the conduct resulting in the death. However, in
determining whether the Defendant had the requisite intent to
commit that robbery before or during the killing, you can infer that
intent from the Defendant's actions during and immediately
thereafter of the killing.

You're also instructed on these various theories of
liability; the first being that the individual directly committed the
crime. Directly committed a robbery. Directly shot Matt Minkler.
Or that they aided and abetted in the commission of that crime. Or
that it was done pursuant to a conspiracy to commit the crime.

Aiding and abetting is when a person commits -- if he
 knowingly and with a criminal intent aids, promotes, encourages, or
 instigates by act or advice. Or by act and advice the commission of

such crime with the intention that the crime be committed.

1

Conspiracy is simply an agreement or mutual
understanding between two or more persons to commit a crime. A
Defendant must intend to commit or aid in the commission of the
specific crime agreed to and the formation and existence of that
conspiracy can be inferred from all the circumstances tending to
show the common intent and can be proved by direct or
circumstantial evidence.

And what's important to note about this is that there may
not be an agreement on the theory. So what does that mean? That
means that your verdict must be unanimous as to the charge,
meaning it must be unanimous as to first-degree murder. It must
be unanimous as to robbery with use of a deadly weapon.

But what that does not mean is that you need to come to an agreement on the theory of it. Meaning that if some of you because that Jaiden Caruso committed the crime of first-degree murder by means of willful, deliberate, premeditated murder and another portion agree that he committed first-degree murder but pursuant to the felony murder rule, then it's first-degree murder.

If half of you believe that a robbery was committed
because he directly did it or half of you believe that he merely aided
and abetted in it, regardless the crime is robbery.

And you'll get the robbery instruction for you and it's the
 unlawful taking of personal property of another in the person 's
 presence, by means of force or violence or fear of injury. And that

Day 6 - Page 52

it must be used to obtain or retain possession of the property to 2 prevent or overcome the resistance and to facilitate escape with the 3 property.

1

4 And again, in determining whether the Defendants have 5 the requisite intent to commit robbery before or during the killing, 6 that can be inferred from the intent by the Defendant's actions 7 during and after the killing.

8 Now with regards to voluntary intoxication, we talked 9 about how voluntary intoxication can be considered when you're 10 looking at a specific intent crime. Meaning you're looking at a crime of willful, deliberate, and premeditated murder because there 11 12 needs to exist an intent to kill.

13 But it's important to note that when we're talking about 14 voluntary intoxication, it does not apply to general intent crimes. 15 And general intent crimes consist of robbery and first-degree felony 16 murder committed through the perpetration or attempted 17 perpetration of robbery.

18 So what that means is if you believe the Defendants 19 intended to rob Matt Minkler and his death resulted in furtherance 20 of that robbery, no level of intoxication is a defense to that. It's 21 first-degree murder.

22 So we know that Jaiden Caruso is responsible and liable 23 for first-degree murder, either through the premediated, deliberate, 24 and willful or by means of felony murder. Meaning that he had an 25 intent to rob Matt Minkler that day and his death resulted in

1 || furtherance of that.

2

3

4

So how is Kody Harlan liable for murder? Same way. Under the theory of felony murder.

[Video playing]

5 BY MS. OVERLY:

And how do we know about the evidence of the robbery
here? We know that Matt Minkler posted that video to his Snapchat
on June 7th. That would have been a day before his murder.

We know that we've heard a lot about Snapchat in this
case. That's the way of life. That's the way they're communicating,
that's the way they're keeping tabs on each other. And that's
exactly what was posted to Matt Minkler's Snapchat the day before.
A whole lot of cash that looked very similar to the cash that we see
Kody Harlan in a video later.

What else do we know about evidence of this idea and conspiracy to commit robbery by both Jaiden and Kody? We know that from the witnesses' testimony that on June 8th, the Defendants are the only two people in that house with guns. You don't hear evidence about Alaric having a gun, you don't hear evidence that Charles has a gun, you don't hear evidence that Kymani does, that Ghunnar, that Traceo does.

We hear from Kymani that both Jaiden and Kody
mentioned wanting to rob someone and wanting to do a lick. We
hear from Kymani that they kept talking about it. That Matt's name
was brought up in this idea of committing a robbery or getting

more weed.

1

We also know that Ghunnar testified that he didn't hear
Kody talking about it, but he heard Jaiden talking about it; that
Jaiden wanted to commit a robbery, do a lick, and he wanted to kill
someone. And we know that Ghunnar indicated that Kody was
sitting right there on the couch as this conversation is happening.

We also know that Ghunnar told us that within 20 minutes
of that conversation is happening, the Defendants leave, Kody
driving and they go and they pick up Matt Minkler and they bring
him back to the house. You didn't hear any other evidence about
the Defendants picking up anybody else. There were several
people that came and went from that house that day. They all
found their own ride. Matt Minkler didn't.

We also know that Ghunnar and Kymani that their
testimony's corroborated by the phone logs that we see. Kymani
indicated and Ghunnar indicated that after they fled the house that
day, after that shot to the ceiling that the Defendant was calling
them, come back, come back, come back and smoke weed with us.
And this I corroborated when you look at the phone records.

We also heard from Charles that he fled after the killing.
That's corroborated because you see here that the Defendant
attempted to call Charles after.

We know that the Defendants went, picked up Matt
 Minkler, drove back. And we know that at 6/8 of 2018, at 12:32 there
 is a text message -- SMS message from Matt Minkler to Jaiden

Day 6 - Page 55

1	Caruso where he says I got you on some when you get here.
2	And we know that Jaiden Caruso had all these contacts in
3	his phone. He had Ghunnar in his phone, he had Nate in his phone,
4	he had all these people, but he certainly didn't have Matt as a
5	contact in his phone. And we see here that like the Detective
6	Spangler indicated when he testified that Jaiden Caruso had to be
7	the one to text Matt because Matt had a Samsung and Kody was
8	only equipped with doing iMessages.
9	So this contact was between Jaiden Caruso and Matt
10	Minkler. And we know that at 12:32, Matt Minkler was waiting to
11	get picked up.
12	[Video playing]
13	BY MS. OVERLY:
14	We know that this video was created at 12:59. Matt sent
15	that text to Jaiden Caruso at 12:32 and waited to be picked up. This
16	video is created at 12:59, approximately 30 minutes after that. We
17	know that Matt's not in this video, which makes sense because
18	
10	Matt's waiting at home, waiting to get picked up.
19	Matt's waiting at home, waiting to get picked up. We know that there's clearly bullets in the gun, we see
19	We know that there's clearly bullets in the gun, we see
19 20	We know that there's clearly bullets in the gun, we see that in the video. We see Jaiden Caruso's beginning of what
19 20 21	We know that there's clearly bullets in the gun, we see that in the video. We see Jaiden Caruso's beginning of what appears to be this obsession with carrying this gun and pointing it
19 20 21 22	We know that there's clearly bullets in the gun, we see that in the video. We see Jaiden Caruso's beginning of what appears to be this obsession with carrying this gun and pointing it at people.
19 20 21 22 23	We know that there's clearly bullets in the gun, we see that in the video. We see Jaiden Caruso's beginning of what appears to be this obsession with carrying this gun and pointing it at people. We know that Kymani testified that he had a bad vibe
19 20 21 22 23 24	We know that there's clearly bullets in the gun, we see that in the video. We see Jaiden Caruso's beginning of what appears to be this obsession with carrying this gun and pointing it at people. We know that Kymani testified that he had a bad vibe from the second he showed up at that house. And we know that

Day 6 - Page 56

1	about the situation that made him uneasy. Like he felt like he was
2	invited there to be killed.
3	[Video playing]
4	BY MS. OVERLY:
5	We know that that video, now Matt's at the house. We
6	know that both Defendants still have guns. We know Kody's awake
7	on the couch. In fact, he's waving around that gun and pointing it
8	at Matt Minkler.
9	We know that at this point Jaiden shot into the ceiling.
10	And we know that the only two people to have fled the house that
11	day after the shot to the ceiling were the same two people that had
12	an uneasy feeling and the same two people that heard a
13	conversation about a lick.
14	We also know that Kymani even came back he testified
15	that he came back and he retrieved that lighter. When asked why
16	he did that, he said he didn't even want to leave a trace of him
17	being at that house.
18	He anticipated something was going to go down. This
19	wasn't just a vibe anymore, it was corroborated because shortly
20	thereafter, Matt Minkler was killed.
21	And what do we know at the time that this happened? We
22	heard some evidence that Kody Harlan was asleep on the couch or
23	falling asleep on the couch, that he had taken some Xanax and, you
24	know, was, you know, kind of out of it. But Ladies and Gentlemen,
25	that doesn't matter because if you believe that Jaiden Caruso and

Kody Harlan had agreed to rob Matt Minkler, then anything done by
 Jaiden Caruso in furtherance of that is felony murder. And Kody
 Harlan is liable for felony murder.

You'll be instructed on the concept of a conspiracy which
means each member of a criminal conspiracy is liable for each act
of every member of the conspiracy, even though the acts may have
occurred in the absence and without the knowledge of that
Defendant, provided they were knowingly made and done during
the continuance of such conspiracy and in furtherance of some
object or purpose of the conspiracy.

And I'd submit to you that when Jaiden Caruso and Kody 11 12 Harlan went to go pick up Matt Minkler in that car that day and 13 bring him back to the house that this agreement was already 14 established, they were moving forward with it, that they were both 15 well aware that they had firearms on them that were loaded, and that any act done by either or after that in furtherance of that 16 17 conspiracy makes the other liable for it. And that's the concept behind felony murder. 18

So what acts in furtherance? So like I said even if Kody
was asleep when Matt Minkler was shot by Jaiden Caruso, even if
he was unaware, if it's in furtherance of the robbery, he's liable for
first-degree murder.

And how do we know the killing of Matt was in
furtherance of that robbery? Well like we said, we can infer the
intent to commit the robbery from the actions during and after the

killing? And what do we know about the killing of Matt Minkler and
what the Defendants did immediately thereafter? We know that the
video Jaiden Caruso filmed of I caught a body was filmed at 2:44.
We know that Matt Minkler was still waiting to get picked up around
12:30 or so. So by 2:44 Matt Minkler's dead.

We know that at this point in time, after Jaiden Caruso 6 7 shot Matt Minkler, Charles fled, Alaric fled, Kymani and Ghunnar were already gone. Who doesn't flee? He just woke up off the 8 couch, he's out of it, he's just taken, you know, all this Xanax and 9 he wakes up and his buddy's dead on the ground. He doesn't flee. 10 He doesn't follow suit like Charles, like Alaric. Doesn't call police. 11 12 Doesn't render aid. Doesn't drive back to Matt Minkler's house, 13 same place he had just picked him up from.

And we see in this video that Matt is on his side and his
pant pockets are tucked in. And who's standing by him?
[Video playing]

17 BY MS. OVERLY:

And if you slow down that video, you'll see that that was
Kody Harlan standing right there. Not bent down trying to render
aid to his friend, not rushing to call anyone, not fleeing out of panic.
Standing there while Jaiden Caruso films and documents this.

We know that this second video, which was sent as attachment was at 2:50 p.m. We know that now in this video Matt's body's been moved. We know that at this point in time Traceo Meadows has arrived at the house, he's come upon this, we hear

from Traceo that Matt, again, doesn't render aid to his friend,
 doesn't call police. His next step is to remove his shoes, check his
 pockets, pull out his wallet, pull out his phone.

[Video playing]

5 BY MS. OVERLY:

4

6

7

8

No effort to wipe any blood off Matt Minkler because it was more important for Jaiden Caruso to wipe the blood off of his shoes.

We also know that Kody Harlan and Jaiden Caruso
cleaned up the scene. We know that based off of Kody Harlan's
own statements and we know that based off of Traceo Meadows
testifying. We also know that because it's corroborated by the
photographic evidence in this case. And again, we see that Matt
Minkler's pockets have been turned out.

We heard from Detective Spangler that Matt Minkler's phone, which was recovered from on top of that tarp that Kody Harlan tossed over his dead body that that phone wasn't just spray painted. That phone, the charger was irreparable. We heard that he had to replace the digitizer. It had been burned. It had been water damaged. It had been cracked. There were several attempts to destroy that phone.

We know that efforts were made to clean up the blood.
Traceo Meadows testified that Jaiden Caruso took this nozzle here
from the kitchen and sprayed the floor with water. We know that
there were Clorox wipes that were out and open. We know that

Matt Minkler originally was shot in that kitchen and that it was Kody Harlan's idea to then move him, his buddy, to this hallway closet here.

1

2

3

We know that he was then tossed into this hallway closet,
a tarp was thrown over him, his phone had been damaged, was
tossed on top. And we can see here, again, that his pockets had
been turned out.

And what do we know about Kody Harlan's statement to
police. He said Matt was friend, this was his homie. He wouldn't
want to just leave him there. He tried to help him. He didn't know
he was dead. He never had a gun. Repeatedly said he never had a
gun. And he doesn't really know how Matt got there, he must have
just popped up. And he also said that he was never driving that
Mercedes.

And what do we know is in direct contrast of all of this? That this is exactly how Kody Harlan left his homie, his friend, the one he tried to help, the one he didn't know was dead. And this is how he left his homie, his friend for dead inside of a closet while he proceeded with Jaiden Caruso to drive around town and shop, and socialize, and hang out.

Because we know that shortly after this, they drive to the
Galleria Mall. Not to a police station, not to Matt's house, not to a
hospital; nowhere but the Galleria Mall. We see them with Traceo
Meadows walking throughout the food court. And you'll see that
this timestamp of this video is at 3:30.

We know that that video attachment where Matt's body
had been moved and his pockets had been turned out was at
2:50 p.m. So by 3:30 that crime scene has been cleaned up, he's
been tossed in a hallway closet, and it's time to get shopping
because now they've got money.

So what do we know about intent? Like I said within 45
minutes of tossing him in a closet, throwing a tarp over him, they're
now shopping. It's time to get some food, it's time to shop for
shoes.

We see them walk into Shoe Palace. We see that Jaiden
Caruso originally walks in with black sneakers, but we know those
have got to go because now they've got Matt Minkler's blood on
them. So it's time to get new shoes, which is exactly what he does.
He buys new shoes at Shoe Palace which he then changes into.

Then we see Kody Harlan at Foot Locker, again, buying
some new shoes. I mean, he wouldn't just leave his homie and his
friends in a hallway closet.

And he conveniently has a ton of cash on him. Cash that
 has been used to purchase shoes, cash that seems to be in several
 denominations, similar to that very Snapchat that we saw from
 Matt Minkler the day before.

We know that when they leave, they've now gotten
themselves a drink, they've done a little shopping, and it's time to
leave. And the only person who didn't shop for anything was
Traceo Meadows. There's been some insinuation that Traceo

Meadows is the one that might have stolen the money from Matt
 Minkler but if he had money, why wouldn't he just shop with it.
 Why feel the need to steal something. The people who had money
 were the Defendants because they were the ones who took the
 money from Matt Minkler.

And we know that after this, they decided to go to an
apartment complex pool party because now, in addition to
shopping, they needed to socialize.

So when they do, we hear from Angie Knox who testified
that she was there with her friend Patrick and her other friend Jacy
and that she overheard Kody Harlan bragging about catching a
body. Not Jaiden Caruso; Kody Harlan.

We also know that Jaiden Caruso then sent that video of
Matt dead on the floor to his buddy Nate at 4:32, well after going to
the mall. Now they're at a party. So this convenient accident is
something that he's continued to now brag about to other
individuals. Having posted these videos on Snapchat, sending
them to friends. All the while Matt Minkler lie in this house in a
closet.

You'll also be instructed on flight and the flight of a
person after the commission of a crime isn't itself sufficient to
establish their guilt, but you can use it as circumstantial evidence of
that guilt. And what do we know about the flight in this case? We
know that had Officer Cochran not stopped the Defendants in that
car, who's to say what they would have done next.

They stopped because they crashed. And after crashing,
 they fled. You head Jaiden Caruso fled towards the Chevron,
 Officer Cochran had to chase after him and that finally upon
 apprehending him, his response to her was well this will all just
 wash away.

We also heard that Kody Harlan fled in the other direction,
conveniently towards Jaiden Caruso's house at the Villas
Apartments. And we heard from Detective Condratovich that
pursuant to some investigation, they discovered they wanted to do
a search warrant at Jaiden Caruso's Villas Apartments.

And why? Because Jaiden Caruso had received a text
shortly after this crash and there had been some other
conversations indicating that Kody Harlan might have stopped by
that Villa Apartment. It might have been the place where that gun
was ditched. So they executed a warrant approximately a week
later and they didn't find anything.

We know that inside that very vehicle were the shoes that
were purchased by Kody Harlan, that those shoes were purchased
with cash. We see the Shoe Palace shoe bag that Jaiden Caruso
purchased. We see the shoes that originally had blood on them,
and he switched out of. We see the shirt that he was wearing at the
scene of the crime and at the mall has now been thrown in the back
and taken off.

We know that the firearm that was used was now in the
 passenger side seat compartment where Jaiden Caruso fled from.

And we know that Matt Minkler's wallet was found in the very back
 seat. And a day before Matt Minkler was posting a Snapchat about
 all the money he had. And conveniently, a day later this wallet is
 now in the backseat and the only thing left in it is his Silverado high
 School ID card.

Now Ladies and Gentlemen, you were instructed a lot on
the law and you're given an enormous amount of it. However, one
of the most important things you will be instructed on is to provide
and allow for your common sense. You are reasonable men and
women and you're allowed to make reasonable inferences from the
evidence.

Mr. Helmick stood before you during opening statements
and indicated that injustice anywhere is a threat to justice
everywhere. And I'd submit to you that that is very true. And I
would submit to you that the only justice in this case is to find the
Defendants guilty of first-degree murder with use of a deadly
weapon, robbery with use of a deadly weapon, and accessory to
murder with use of a deadly weapon.

Thank you.
 THE COURT: Mr. Yampolsky, on behalf of Mr. Caruso.
 MR. YAMPOLSKY: Thank you, Your Honor.
 CLOSING ARGUMENT FOR THE DEFENDANT CARUSO

BY MR. YAMPOLSKY:
There is no justice, just us. No matter what happens, is

25

there justice for Matt? Should that have happened? Absolutely not.

I told you in the beginning, my client who shot and killed Matt Minkler. Didn't mean to. Didn't murder him. Shot and killed him.

1

2

3

4

5

6

As I said in opening several times, I'm going to say it again. Stupid kids, doing drugs, playing with guns resulted in a tragedy. If anyone could go back and turn back the hands of time, they would but they can't. Just can't do it.

Who is Jaiden? My client, Jaiden, you've heard all these
awful things about him. And I'll admit, he shot and he killed Matt
Minkler. He didn't plan to kill him, didn't murder him. Why? Who
is he? He was a stupid 16-year old kid doing drugs, doing lots of
drugs, playing with guns. Playing Russian Roulette.

You've seen him this whole trial, how he's behaving. He
would have loved to come and talk to you, I wouldn't let him. My
call. I don't like my clients testifying, so he didn't.

What do we know that happened? You've heard a lot of witnesses, the players. And, you know, once again stupid kids doing drugs. I don't want to brand myself an old fogey, I have a daughter who's 20-years old and kids do stupid stuff, but when you do drugs, you play with guns, people get hurt and unfortunately that's what happened.

Now you heard from a lot of these kids and one of them
that Ms. Overly mentioned was Ghunnar Methvin. Now it was
really interesting because he had given a statement to the police, he
gave a statement on the 12th of June, four days after this
happened. And he wanted to be helpful. He ran, he got of Dodge,

he was there, he talked to the police, and he wanted to be truthful 2 and accurate and complete as possible and he wanted to tell them 3 what happened. And they asked him all these questions.

1

4 And then he said well he spoke to law enforcement a 5 couple of weeks before this trial. And then he said he spoke to Mr. 6 Pesci about a week before this trial. And that was the only time that 7 he said oh by the way, Matt -- Matt said he wanted to kill -- excuse 8 me, Jaiden said he wanted to kill someone, and Jaiden said he wanted to do a lick. 9

And Mr. Pesci asked him he said oh, you never said that 10 11 before and he said oh no, because no one ever asked me about 12 that. Well he's right because no one ever asked him hey Ghunnar, 13 did you ever hear Matt say he want to do a lick. Did you ever hear 14 Matt say he wanted to kill someone? No, he wouldn't ask him that.

15 So why wouldn't he say that? If that were the truth, you 16 know, why would he just come up with that? Because no one asked 17 him. But as I pointed out in his statement, you said -- and he answered: I felt like it was you all guys need to leave before I kill 18 someone shot, like it was not an accident, like I really felt like 19 20 planning on doing something to somebody in that house that day.

21 So I asked him well that's your perception, right? That's 22 what you think? He said yeah, yeah, that's what I think. And 23 nobody asked him. But right before that, right before that very 24 answer, the detective said so when he fires a warning shot, we did 25 see it in the roof. Did you get the impression that this was an

accident or it's a deliberate?

1

2

3

4

5

Well, don't you think at that time if he had heard Jaiden say that, oh no I know it's deliberate because he said he wanted to kill someone. He didn't say that. You know why? Because it didn't happen. There is no way he said that.

And another thing that was testified that didn't happen.
Matt Minkler, according to Charles Osurman, I believe, said oh
yeah, you know, after Jaiden shot that bullet into the ceiling, Matt
picked up the gun, pointed it at Jaiden and said something like oh,
you're lucky you're my friend or something like or I'd kill you.

I forget -- I don't know the exact words but use your own
memory but he said something like that. Now does that make any
sense? It's not Matt's house, he's not pointing at Matt. He shoots
at the ceiling, this other house, this party house and Matt Minkler is
so incensed that he's going to kill them over that? Really? No, that
didn't happen.

I mean, if that were the case, I could come before you with
a self-defense theory because self-defense is a defense for killing
someone. I'm not going to insult your intelligence. This isn't a selfdefense case, this is an accidental killing. And that didn't happen.

Now I told you what Jaiden is, now I'm going to tell you
what Jaiden isn't. Not a gangbanger, not out there selling drugs,
wearing his colors, looking for people to kill. That's not him. Nope.
Not a mass murderer. He didn't get an assault rifle, didn't go to a
crowded place like in El Paso or on the Strip and kill a lot of people.

Day 6 - Page 68

No, didn't do that.

1

15

And he's not some evil criminal mastermind. I think I'm going to sell drugs. I'm going to get all these people hooked. I'm going to give them a loss leader and then later I'm going to be able to sell them more drugs and line my pockets. No. I mean, you saw the pictures, he's 16-years old.

I mean, look at him now, he's not very big, he was 30
pounds lighter. He was doing Xanax, lots of Xanax. He was
smoking weed. He was drinking. Do you really think he had this
ability, this criminal mastermind to think of all this stuff to do?

I mean, you heard from Mr. Donelson, what happens
when you smoke marijuana or ingest marijuana; I guess you can
eat it with edibles these days. Smoke marijuana, drink, take Xanax.
How does that affect your cognitive ability?

And he said: It is a complex mix of dysfunction.

The trifecta of dysfunction. Do you really think he knew
what he was doing? Do you really think that he got up there and
said hmm, ah, Minkler, my buddy, I get drugs from him, we get
high together, I think I'm going to kill him? Is that what you think
he was saying?

And let me ask you this if, as Ghunnar said, oh yeah, I'm
going to kill -- I want to kill someone, I -- I'm going to kill Minkler,
going to rob Minkler. Now don't you think the time to do that
would have been when Jaiden and Kody went and picked him up to
bring him to the party? No one else is there, if they want to rob

1	him, why didn't they rob him there? Why didn't they rob him
2	before? Oh yeah, he was providing the dope.
3	Why should they rob him? They didn't need to rob him,
4	he wanted to smoke with them. He was their smoking buddy, their
5	drinking buddy. There is no animus, there's no need for them to
6	rob him, he was willingly providing it. There's no robbery. There
7	was no robbery here.
8	And you'll hear from the instructions and I hope, Ladies
9	and Gentlemen, that I'm able to do this right because I have my
10	technological issues, but I do want to go over some of the
11	instructions. You'll have them, you'll take them back to you, but I
12	do want to highlight a couple.
13	Is this right?
14	THE COURT: Yep, that's right.
15	MR. YAMPOLSKY: All right.
16	BY MR. YAMPOLSKY:
17	So you'll get them all take back to you. I'll try and refer to
18	the right ones and everything but when we talk about the
19	instructions, this is the law and once again we talked about it in the
20	beginning you don't have to agree with it, you know, but it's not
21	your job to agree or disagree, it's your job to follow the law. The
22	instructions as given that is the law and whether you like them or
23	not and I know I don't like some of them, but you got to follow
24	them.
25	So what should we talk about? Ms. Overly said hey this is

Day 6 - Page 70

all or nothing. It's first-degree murder or it's not guilty. Well I
respectfully disagree. It could be first-degree, or it could be not
guilty, it could be second-degree, it could be voluntary.

4 I'll give you this, I don't think it's involuntary
5 manslaughter. I know there's an instruction on that and our
6 position it's an accidental killing, there should be no crime.
7 However, if you believe that a crime has been committed,
8 involuntary manslaughter is not the crime. It doesn't fit the facts.

But this is Number 22 and it says: Willfulness is the intent
to kill. Deliberation is the process of determining upon a course of
action -- this is for first-degree murder -- to kill as a result of
thought, including weighing the reasons for and against the action
in considering the consequences of the actions.

You see him deliberating? You've seen him on the
videos. You've heard about how much -- how many drugs that he's
ingested. Do you see him really deliberating after you go get his
buddy bring him back? Was he deliberating when he picked him
up, oh, I'm going to bring him back and kill him?

Premeditation is a design, a determination to kill distinctly
formed in the mind at the time of the killing. So when was it? Was
it when hey come on in here, let's play Russian Roulette when he
took the bullets out or all -- some of the bullets when he was
clicking it at everyone else, when he clicked it at his own head; is
that when the premeditation occurred?

25

1

2

3

Or was it when he picked up the gun playing Russian

Roulette and when he picked it up and he pointed it, is that when 2 premeditation happened? No, there was no premeditation.

1

3

4

It says: It may not be for a day, an hour, or a minute, it may be a instantaneously as successive thoughts of the mind.

5 Or the jury believes from the evidence that the act 6 constituting killing has been preceded by has been the result of 7 premeditation no matter how rapidly the act follows the 8 premeditation, it is premeditated.

9 Do you think anything in this case really was premeditated when it came to the shooting? Do you think he thought playing 10 11 Russian Roulette, screwed up on drugs, boom. I mean, it's a tragic 12 accident. But it's not first-degree murder.

13 Now, the State has talked about well, in addition to the 14 premeditation and everything -- in addition to all that you can do 15 the felony murder rule. And they talk about felony murder which is 16 if a killing is committed in the course of a felony, then it becomes 17 first-degree murder.

18 So if this killing was -- had occurred -- was done in the 19 course of a robbery, you could consider it first-degree murder. Not 20 have to worry about anything else. No premeditation, no 21 deliberation, none of that. But there was no robbery. There are no 22 evidence that Jaiden Caruso participated in a robbery. No evidence 23 he had a spray paint can, no evidence of a robbery.

24 Well -- but what happened -- you know, you saw that his 25 wallet didn't have any money, well wouldn't that be a robbery?

Day 6 - Page 72

Well the instructions go into that saying that robbery can't be an
 afterthought. So it can't be an afterthought. So if you're going to
 talk about felony murder, it has to be in the commission of that
 particular crime.

So this is -- and I've highlighted some of this, it's
Instruction 25. Okay. It says: Therefore, a killing which is
committed in the perpetration or attempted perpetration of a
robbery is deemed to be murder of the first degree, whether the
killing was intentional, unintentional, or accidental. This is the
felony murder rule.

But for the purposes of felony murder rule, the intent to commit the robbery must have arisen before or during the conduct resulting in death. There is no felony murder rules where the robbery occurs as an afterthought following the killing. There was no intent to rob, there was no threat to rob.

They were in there, playing Russian Roulette, he took the gun, he pointed it, he fired it. He never said hey, give me your weed or else; give me your money or else. None of that. That's not what happened. He picked up the gun, he shot him. Nothing to do with any robbery. There was no robbery. This is not a felony murder case because there's no felony murder when the robbery occurs as an afterthought of the killing.

So we talked about Instagram, Snapchat, social media
 that's what kids do these days. I know Facebook is antiquated and

Now, we talked about -- oh excuse me.

23

everything because it's not quick enough, it's not instantaneous.
Snapchat, that's what they do. The problem is these kids -- lots of
kids, they have no social skills. What do they do? Oh something
happens, they go on their phones, they text it, they go back and
forth, they post it, that's what they do. There's no back and forth,
that's just the way it is, unfortunately.

Now, one thing we talked about was the texts and the
texts back and forth between -- it was Nate S -- Detective Spangler
talked about it and it was this conversation where it said -- and this
came out on -- excuse me -- Detective Spangler's testimony and this
would be from Nate: Quit being a mark.

And then this comes from Jaiden: I just caught a body.
Nate: You lying.

Jaiden sends him the video.

15 And then he says that's tg, whatever that means.

And then Jaiden says popped him on accident.

He's saying this to his friends. He's not talking to police;
he's not talking to anyone else. Yeah, this is what happened, I killed

<sup>19</sup> him. Popped him on accident.

14

16

Well, you know, that's what he said, how is that an
accident? Really? Well according to -- and I forget which witness
because -- one of the kids said -- maybe it was Traceo? One of
them said yeah, they were playing Russian Roulette. They were
playing Russian Roulette; they were playing a game. So where's
this willful premeditation, where's this animus, where's this malice?

You talk about malice. In order to be first-degree murder, if it's not felony murder, there has to be malice aforethought.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

And what is malice. Malice aforethought means: The intentional doing of a wrongful act without legal cause or excuse or what the law considers adequate provocation. Condition of mind as described as malice aforethought may arise from anger hatred, revenge, from particular ill will, spite or grudge toward the person killed.

So let's stop right there. You've heard from several 9 10 witnesses, there's no anger. These guys were drinking buddies, smoking buddies. There's no hatred, there's no revenge. Almost 11 12 all the witnesses said that. There is none of this between Matt 13 Minkler and Jaiden Caruso. None of that. Or a grudge -- it may 14 also arise from an unjustifiable or unlawful motive of a person to 15 injure another proceeding from a heart fatally bent on mischief or 16 with reckless disregard of consequences and social duty.

Do you really think he has, and the term of art is an
abandoned malignant heart? Did you see any evidence of that in
this case? Lapse in judgment, absolutely, but abandoned malignant
heart?

Malice does not imply deliberation but denotes an
unlawful purpose and design, as well as by accident and
mischance. There wasn't any actual malice. There wasn't any
implied malice. There wasn't any malice. Stupid kids, doing drugs,
playing with guns that resulted in an awful tragedy. I can say it a

hundred times, it's not going to change things.

1

2

3

4

5

6

And you'll go through each and every of the jury instructions and I don't want to go through all of it but one of things is that Ms. Overly said well look, it's all or nothing. It's either going to be first-degree murder or not guilty. Nothing in between. And I disagree.

7 And while involuntary manslaughter is the killing of a 8 human being without any intent to do so in the commission of an 9 unlawful act or lawful act which probably might produce such a 10 consequences in an unlawful manner, the involuntary killing occurs in the commission of an unlawful act which in its consequence it 11 12 naturally tends to destroy the life of a human being or is committed 13 in the prosecution of a felonious intent, the offense is murder. 14 Involuntary manslaughter does not involve the conscious use of a 15 deadly weapon. I already said it's not involuntary.

But when it comes to voluntary, usually voluntary
manslaughter is thought of oh, in the heat of blood. You come
home, your spouse is in bed with someone else, you're overtaken,
you shoot and kill your spouse. That's not first-degree murder
because it was premeditated, it wasn't deliberate. That wasn't your
intention it was called in the heat of blood.

Did that happen here? No. Well if that didn't happen
here, there's no heat of passion like that, how do we get to
voluntary. Well this is how. First of all, in the instructions -- and I'll
use the expression, I'm a baseball fan, tie goes to the runner. So in

Day 6 - Page 76

the instructions it says if you're not sure if it's first-degree or
second-degree then the Defendant is entitled to the benefit of the
doubt. So it should be second-degree.

Similarly, how do you get to voluntary? You get to
voluntary manslaughter if first of all, you decide that a crime has
been committed. Our position is a crime has not been committed.
However, if you disagree, you are the jury, you are the finder of
fact, that's your prerogative.

But let's say you disagree, and you say oh, something 9 10 happened here, absolutely a crime has been committed. But what is it? Is it first-degree? I know he was killed, but I don't think it was 11 12 first-degree. Was it second-degree? I don't know, I just don't think 13 it's second-degree. But if you think there's going to be criminal 14 responsibility and you think it's not first-degree and you think it's 15 not second-degree, then based on that, you can come back with 16 voluntary manslaughter.

17 And Ladies and Gentlemen of the Jury, if you think there 18 is criminal responsibility, it's not first-degree. There's no 19 premeditation, there's no felony murder. If there's criminal 20 responsibility for Jaiden Caruso, for this killing, it is voluntary 21 manslaughter. Voluntary manslaughter with use of a deadly 22 weapon. A deadly weapon was used, there is no question. So that's what it should be if you decide that he's criminally 23 24 responsible.

25

So we talked about the robbery and you'll see it and

robbery's basically taking and carrying away personal property
either by force or fear. In the specific felony murder instruction it
talks about it can't be done as an afterthought. So I mean, you can't
be in force or fear if you're already deceased. So there was no
robbery. There was no robbery committed here by anyone. The
killing was committed by Mr. Caruso. It wasn't murder, but he did
kill him.

So tough job what you folks have to do. I just got my first
Jury Summons by the way, I'm not happy. But you have to sit here
and decide what happened. You're the finder of fact. It's not what I
think, what they think, even what he thinks doesn't matter. It
matters what you think. So what happened?

Remember when Mr. Helmick was talking to you in jury
selection are you a palm tree or are you a redwood? You know, do
you kind of go with the flow or do you stand strong? That's a good
question because with your oath as jurors, everyone is entitled to
your personal opinion. So everyone is entitled to your opinion.

18 Ah-hah. So this is a picture of Tiananmen square. 19 Remember when Hong Kong was ceded -- the city of Hong Kong 20 was seized back to mainland China after British rule for 99 years? 21 Remember this guy? They brought the tanks into Tiananmen 22 Square. There's this guy by himself standing in front of those 23 tanks. He was a redwood. We need you all to be redwoods. And if 24 it's your decision, yes; if someone convinces you, that's right. But if 25 they don't convince you, be a redwood.

So I'm about to wrap up. I'm always worried I forgot 2 some things and I don't have the burden of proof beyond a 3 reasonable doubt. And you know, we talked about other jurors, it's 4 not, you know, preponderance of the evidence, more than likely 5 than not. It's beyond a reasonable doubt. The instruction talks 6 about beyond a reasonable doubt. Mr. Helmick will go into detail 7 as to what things that reasonable doubt is not. I won't.

1

8 But I'll say this, our justice system is constantly maligned, 9 sometimes justifiably, sometimes unjustifiably and it's flawed. I'll 10 be the first one to admit it, I don't think many people are going to argue you with me. Still the best in the world. And our justice 11 12 system comes from English common law because that's where 13 justice was given its voice.

14 In London, Old Bailey, the majestic courtroom where 15 English common law, that we all know, that came into the United 16 States on how people should judge other people, what the laws are. 17 Old Bailey. In Old Bailey there's this huge rock in front of Old 18 Bailey. And in that rock emblazoned it says: The Crown never 19 loses.

20 And what's that mean? That means that as long as a 21 Defendant is found -- is tried fairly, whether he's found guilty or 22 negligence, the Crown never loses.

23 Stupid kids, playing with guns, doing drugs, a tragedy 24 occurred on June 8th, 2018. By our verdict please don't let there be 25 another tragedy. Do justice. Thank you.

1	THE COURT: All right. Ladies and Gentlemen, we're
2	going to take a short break before we continue on.
3	During the recess, you're admonished not to talk or
4	converse among yourselves or with anyone else on any subject
5	connected with the trial or read, watch, or listen to any report of or
6	commentary on the trial by any medium of information, including,
7	without limitation, newspapers, television, the internet, and radio.
8	Or form or express any opinion on any subject connected with the
9	case until it's finally submitted to you. No legal or factual research,
10	investigation, or recreation of testimony, or social media
11	communication.
12	We'll be in break for about 10 or 15 minutes and then we'll
13	continue on, okay?
14	THE MARSHAL: All rise for the jury.
15	[Outside the presence of the jury]
16	THE COURT: Do you all have anything outside the
17	presence?
18	MR. PESCI: Not from the State, Your Honor.
19	THE COURT: Anything outside the presence, gentlemen?
20	MR. YAMPOLSKY: No.
21	MR. HELMICK: No, Your Honor.
22	THE COURT: No? Okay. We're in recess. Thank you,
23	guys.
24	[Court recessed at 2:57 p.m., until 3:12 p.m.]
25	[Outside the presence of the jury]

1	THE COURT: All right. We will be on the record, outside
2	the presence.
3	Mr. Pesci.
4	MR. PESCI: Thank you, Your Honor. I just wanted to
5	make the record referencing the exhibit now instead of interrupting
6	the flow of the argument because I know your ruling, but I need to
7	for a contemporaneous objection.
8	THE COURT: Sure.
9	MR. PESCI: It's the State's objection, I'd ask that it be
10	considered to be contemporaneous that I object to the use of that
11	exhibit and to the argument therefrom. But knowing your ruling, I
12	just wanted to do it now instead of in the middle.
13	THE COURT: No, you're perfectly fine.
14	MR. HELMICK: I appreciate that.
15	THE COURT: I appreciate the respect in doing it that way.
16	So we will note for the record the objection to the poster that we
17	discussed earlier with Mr. Helmick. He's getting ready to start his
18	argument so I will consider the objection to be contemporaneous
19	and you don't
20	MR. PESCI: Thank you very much
21	THE COURT: need to make it
22	MR. PESCI: Your Honor.
23	THE COURT: in the middle of his argument.
24	Anything else from either side?
25	MR. PESCI: Not from the State.

1	MR. HELMICK: No, Your Honor.
2	MR. YAMPOLSKY: No, Your Honor.
3	THE COURT: Okay. You can go get them. Thank you.
4	[In the presence of the jury]
5	THE MARSHAL: All rise for the jury.
6	THE COURT: You all can be seated. Thank you.
7	We will be back on the record. Mr. Harlan, Mr. Caruso are
8	present, all the attorneys and our jurors are present.
9	Ladies and Gentlemen, we'll continue on with our closing
10	arguments. Mr. Harlan, on behalf of Mr. Harlan.
11	MR. HELMICK: Thank you very much.
12	<b>CLOSING ARGUMENT FOR THE DEFENDANT HARLAN</b>
13	BY MR. HELMICK:
14	Good afternoon, everybody.
15	You know I was sitting in my office last night, going over
16	what I was going to say here today and I'm sitting there and I'm
17	thinking to myself, have I done everything I could for this young kid.
18	And the fear begins to kind of sit in, I'm driving home, still thinking
19	that stuff. And even now I'm standing here and my heart's
20	pounding through my chest, everything's going on in here; that fear
21	is still there. And I'm glad it is because it motivates me to talk to
22	you about this case.
23	The Prosecution has asked the question why are we here.
24	They've asked that over and over. It's a great question. We're here
25	because some drugged-up reckless kid wanted to play a deadly

game with his gun. We're here because he bragged about it 2 afterwards. We're here to -- and I'm flattered that they used the 3 quote by we're here to provide justice to prevent injustice. We're 4 not here because of some alleged robbery. We're not here because of some lick. 5

1

6 And we're certainly not here because of Kody Harlan's 7 actions in anyway, other than being an accessory after the fact. 8 Every single kid that got up here and testified in this case said that Kody was asleep at the time that Jaiden fired into the ceiling and 9 10 that Kody was asleep at the time that Jaiden killed Matt.

11 They said it doesn't matter but that's wrong. It does 12 matter. We heard that he was laying down on the couch the 13 majority of the time, that he was out of it, that he wasn't saying 14 much, that he wasn't -- he didn't indicate his thoughts on getting 15 more drugs. All those things. There's not a single piece of 16 evidence that has been provided in this case by them that can test 17 those facts. Not one.

18 But let's talk about this robbery allegation for a minute. 19 Let's talk about the robbery allegations. And let's look at -- let's 20 look closely at the Prosecution's story here. Let's look at the facts. 21 Matt calls Jaiden three times. They say that well he's the only one 22 who got picked up, well because he asked to get picked up. He calls 23 Jaiden three times so that he can get picked up from his house.

24 They -- nobody called him first in an effort to lure him 25 over to that house to get robbed. He said I got you on some when

you get here, right? I got you on some marijuana. All the kids said 1 2 when he showed up, he had marijuana on him. If there was plan --3 and Mr. Yampolsky talked about this. If there was some plan to rob 4 him, why didn't they do it then when they picked him after they got him from his house when he was all alone, when he had the brand-5 new bag of marijuana on him? Wouldn't that have been the time to 6 7 do it? It doesn't make sense. And then when he gets there, he's 8 sharing it with everybody. It also doesn't make sense to rob 9 somebody of something that they are giving away.

But let's look though -- let's look at what all the kids in this 10 case said. I want to go over each one of these. Let's start with 11 12 Kymani. So when Mr. Pesci was questioning Kymani at first, he 13 said he didn't remember anything about the lick. Mr. Pesci went 14 through every single person and he said he didn't remember and 15 then what does he do, he grabs his police statement, he refreshes 16 his memory. Okay, now he remembers that it came from Kody and 17 Jaiden, okay?

18 When I get up to question him on the stand, what does he 19 say? Now he vaguely remembers the mentioning of the word lick. 20 At the preliminary hearing, I talked to him about his testimony 21 there. He said he didn't remember any conversation about the lick 22 and that wasn't my question at the preliminary hearing, that was 23 Mr. Pesci's questioning. And again, same thing that happens, what does he do? He refreshes his memory; okay, now he remembers 24 25 again.

You know what hasn't been mentioned and one of the 1 2 jurors actually asked about this in one of their questions. What 3 about this unknown African American kid that was there with the 4 spray paint can when Kymani showed up? Nobody's ever said anything about him, where'd he go? Why haven't they talked about 5 6 him at all? So we have another person who's there that they 7 haven't taken away from the scene at all; who had the spray paint in 8 his hand.

More of my questioning to Kymani Thompson. Never
heard any talk about wanting to rob Matt while he was there.
Directly contradicts what Mr. Pesci was saying to him on direct
examination or what they were talking about. Nothing about
wanting to do a lick on Matt. Never heard -- well, who was the
target of this lick? What was to be taken? When was it to be taken?
Why? All of those important facts. None of that stuff.

16 And here's the most important thing, he only came up 17 with this robbery opinion based off of what he read on the news 18 articles and comments. And you remember him saying that. Can 19 you imagine if I were to make an argument to the Judge and he 20 says to me, well, Mr. Helmick, where'd you get that argument from? How'd you come up from that? If I say, Judge, I read it off the 21 News -- read about the comment, can you imagine what would 22 happen to me if I said that? 23

Then what about a juror? What if a juror based their
decision to convict somebody -- or their verdict off of what they

read on the News or some comment? They would be disqualified.
 Shouldn't the same be for Kymani Thompson? Shouldn't his
 testimony in regard to any talk about a robbery or a lick, shouldn't
 that be disqualified by you?

More of my questioning to Kymani Thompson. It's
important he wasn't there when Matt was shot. We know that he
left -- him and Ghunnar left right after that shot into the ceiling. So
he didn't know for sure what happened. He was just guessing. And
you saw me asking that. He was just guessing.

Okay. Let's talk about another kid. Let's talk about
Ghunnar. And he was a -- he said some interesting stuff. You know
what has really frustrated me this case is when kids get up here,
when they talk to the police, when they've had lengthy formal
interviews and all the sudden they get up here and they say
something totally different.

16 He was Kymani's friend. Kymani and him shared opinions 17 as to what happened after this case. He said he heard talk about a 18 lick but like I mentioned to you he didn't tell the police one year ago 19 when he had that formal interview with the detective. Didn't tell the 20 police two weeks ago when he had another interview with the 21 detective. And even so, even what he said when he testified, he 22 said any conversation that he heard about a lick or a robbery was only in regard to Jaiden only. That's what he said. 23

Now this was actually an answer to one of your guy's
 questions, which I thank you because listen I make mistakes and

stuff. I can't get it all right and sometimes you guys point that out 2 by your questions, and I appreciate that. And this is one of the 3 answers that was given by one of your questions to Ghunnar.

4 Kody was asleep on the couch. Didn't say anything about a robbery or a lick. 5

That was his answer.

1

6

7 Okay. Let's talk about Charles for a second. Consistent 8 theme here, Kody was asleep on the couch at the time Jaiden shot 9 to the ceiling. He was asleep on the couch when Jaiden killed Matt. No testimony from Charles who was there the whole time, we saw 10 him in the videos -- no testimony about hearing anything about a 11 12 robbery or a lick.

13 Okay. Let's talk about Trae for a minute here. When he 14 walked up to the house that day after Matt had already been shot, 15 Charles told him, Jaiden shot Matt. It was an act -- and then Jaiden 16 walks in, it was accident, he was playing Russian Roulette and 17 accidentally shot him.

18 If these things are being said, why are they lying to their 19 own friends? This is right after this event happened. It's fresh in 20 his mind. Never heard any talk about killing Matt so that he could 21 be robbed. Nothing like that from Traceo.

22 And then we get to Trae's new stuff, another kid who got 23 up here and said some stuff that I was totally taken back by because 24 he didn't say anything like that before. In fact, he said guite the 25 opposite. And so I hope I did a good job by showing you guys that

he said a bunch of other stuff. And how many times did I have to
get up here and grab the documents and say Trae, does this refresh
your memory? How many times did I have to impeach him on all
those things that he said?

5 He said now, when Mr. Pesci was questioning him, Kody 6 spray painted Fuck Matt. Kody went through Matt's pockets. Well, 7 what was his incentive? He walked in here with shackles on his 8 ankles and on his hands. These charges -- he was an accessory to murder, malicious destruction of property, everything's on 9 10 probation, it's all stayed. He's up on the mountain, I'm sure he wants to get off. He said that himself. Of course he's going to do 11 12 anything he can to get out of this jam. And he's definitely not going 13 to admit to what he did.

14 And then we get to his statement to the police. Well, the 15 statement to the police, Kody wasn't spray painting. Didn't even 16 know at first what was spray painted but then tells the police later 17 int eh interview that he actually did know what was spray painted. 18 Why? I mean, why lie? Either you do or you don't now. Why are 19 you lying about that? Kody never touched Matt's pockets. That's 20 what he told the police, but in here he said something totally different. 21

Then here's interesting -- here's an interesting thing. How is Kody doing all these things that he said that he was doing now but when he talks to the police, he says that Kody was out of it. Wasn't really even talking. Awful to the point to where he couldn't

even comprehend what was going on. He was just standing there. Jaiden doing all the talking.

1

2

3 Does that sound like someone who's going to be able to 4 go through pockets and spray paint and all kinds of stuff like that? 5 Here's some stuff that I want you to think about when 6 you're deliberating. Trae lies about sending the photos of the 7 bloody towels and his feet being wet to Kristin Prentiss. When she 8 testified, I asked her about that, and she said that Trae sent her the 9 bloody towels in the photo. So he was there, he was sending photos too. Trae was standing next to Matt after the body was 10 11 moved. They showed you the first video of Kody standing there 12 and then after the body was moved, who was standing right next to 13 him? That was Trae.

Trae admits to spray painting both on Thursday and that
day. After Matt was already killed, he was spray painting, but he
didn't -- he wasn't the one who wrote Fuck Matt.

17 And then here's an interesting thing, he says that he just waits outside after he helps move the body into the closet, middle 18 19 of the summer; you guys do your thing, I'm just going to sit outside 20 and sit in the hot sun, where there's no chairs, nothing but rocks. 21 That doesn't make any sense for five minutes. Why wouldn't he 22 just watch out with the kids that he was with, Jaiden and Kody 23 already in the house? Why wouldn't he just walk out together? 24 Trae steals. Yeah, he didn't buy stuff at the mall because 25 he didn't feel the need to buy stuff, he'd just rather steal it. And so

we already know that he's a thief. We know that somebody took
 Matt's wallet, okay, and so we know that Trae was a thief. We
 talked about what he was on probation for and so forth. Malicious
 destruction of property, consistent with spray paint.

Now here's a very important witness, Alaric Oliver,
because he was the only kid that was actually there the whole time,
okay? He was in the house the whole time until Matt was shot.
Never heard any talk about wanting to rob Matt. Never heard any
talk about doing a lick. Nobody was angry or mean towards Matt,
didn't think there was a plan to rob Matt at all.

What else does Alaric say? Let's see. Kody was asleep on the couch off and on. Called Kymani, told him that -- this is somebody who was there. Told him that Jaiden was clicking the gun, dry firing the bullets, but one of the times it didn't click no more and Matt fell to the ground. On that same phone call he says that Kody was asleep that after the loud bang he popped up. That's what Alaric said.

Okay. So I mean, here's the thing. Alaric was the only kid
there who was awake at the time that Jaiden shot Matt, remember?
Because Charles said he was asleep, and Kody was asleep on the
couch as well. Therefore his story is direct evidence of exactly what
really happened. He saw it, he felt it, he heard it. Just like His
Honor said in his example about the rain at the beginning of this
trial.

25

And, you know, what's interesting is that he was the only

kid that became emotional when he was up here testifying. This
poor kid was the only -- because this poor kid was the only kid who
had to see this horrific incident unfold right before his very eyes.
The only kid. I ask that you give his testimony the most credit here
because he really was the only kid who knew what happened -- who
saw it all happen.

I want to talk to you about accountability because we had
talked about that way back in jury selection -- sorry, I got to take a
sip here. We had talked about that way back in jury selection and I
had asked every one of you the question and every one of you
raised your hand when I asked them about accountability, and you
made a promise. You said that you would hold each person in this
case accountable only for what they did.

14 Accountability is so important in this case for Kody Harlan 15 because only one kid pulled the trigger. Only one kid was taking 16 the bullets out of the gun, leaving one in and pointing it at the other 17 kids. Only one kid was bragging about what he did. Taking a video 18 of Matt laying in his own blood deceased. Awful videos. Only one 19 kid tried to post that on social media. Therefore only one kid in this 20 case is responsible for the death of Matthew Minkler. And we know 21 what his name is. It's not Kody Harlan. But since we're talking 22 about accountability, we got to talk about Kody's.

And I told you at the beginning of this case that he was no
angel here. Kody did some bad stuff. He did some wrong and
illegal stuff. Let's talk about what he was accountable for. I can't

stand up here and look at you in the eyes and try to pretend that 2 Kody didn't do anything wrong. He helped move the body. He lied 3 to the police about a gun. He ditched the gun, okay? He ran from 4 the police. He didn't call the police when he saw Matt on the floor, dead after he woke. 5

1

What does he do? Yeah, he goes shopping, he goes to a 6 7 pool party, all those things. He pointed the laser of the gun at 8 people. He did all these wrong and illegal things in this case. And 9 this is the real reason that he's sitting here in this trial with Jaiden. He made some bad and stupid mistakes. Mistakes that have severe 10 11 consequences and he's willing to accept that. He's willing to be 12 held accountable by you for that.

13 But, you know, all these things here that he did, all of 14 these things that Kody did wrong and illegal, they don't equal 15 murder. The law doesn't say that if you do all these things and you 16 just so happen to be friends with the kid that pulled the trigger, that 17 you too are guilty of murder. That's not what the law says. Nor do 18 all these things equal robbery.

19 Let's talk about that for a second. Let's talk about Matt's 20 wallet. Matt's wallet we know was taken in this case and we know 21 that Trae was sitting in the right rear passenger seat of the car on 22 the way to the mall; the exact spot where the police searched the car and found Matt's wallet. We know that. 23

24 We also know that there was an error in this case because 25 the police did not test the wallet. It would have been nice if they

would have tested the wallet because then we would have our
answer, right? We'd have the fingerprints, we'd hopefully have the
DNA of the wallet, then we'd know who would have taken the
wallet. But that was an unnecessary error in this case.
Unnecessary error.

6 The Prosecution tries to make it seem as though the 7 robbery could have been done -- I mean, the taking of the wallet 8 could have been done by Kody. Could have, right? And they base that off of Trae's testimony. Trae's inconsistent testimony. But 9 10 could have is not the standard in a criminal case. You can't convict somebody for something you could have done. And I'll go over this 11 12 in a second. It has to be done beyond a reasonable doubt. We'll 13 talk about that in a second though.

The other thing is that -- I don't know if you all noticed this
but when you watched the video of Kody at the cash register,
buying the shoes, and maybe one of you guys caught this, I don't
know, but the person to his left was Jaiden and what does he do?
He walks up here, grabs a shoe cleaning kit, puts it in his bag, walks
right out.

Another person that we know stole something. So Trae
and Jaiden and the two people that we know who stole something
in this case.

But let's talk about the most important thing here is this
 could not legally be considered a robbery -- and Mr. Yampolsky
 talked a lot about it. It cannot legally be considered a robbery

because -- and listen, sadly and respectfully Matt was deceased at
the time that somebody took his wallet, therefore no force or fear
could have been -- could have even been used.

Let me give you an example. Somebody's asleep, they have a hundred bill hanging out of their pocket. Another person walks up, they take the hundred dollar bill out of their pocket, they put it in theirs. That's not robbery. The person was asleep. That's a different type of crime. Larceny from a person, theft from a person. But there's no force or fear needed in this case, as I mentioned, because he was already deceased.

Now, there's one caveat. There could be a robbery and
only by Jaiden if at the time that he pulled the trigger that killed
Matt, he was doing so for the purpose of taking Matt's stuff. He
was using the gun, the force, for the purpose of killing Matt to take
his stuff. That's the only way there could be a robbery and that's to
Jaiden only.

17 As we come to a close here, I want to just go back to 18 Jaiden's words -- I want to just go back to Jaiden's words one more 19 time. Because when we look at the words here -- when we look at 20 the words, it tells us what happened, who did it. The crime is 21 solved by just looking at the words that Jaiden wrote. Bro, I just 22 caught a body. I killed Matt. I shot him. I shot him on accident. I 23 just caught a body. Those are his words. Kody was asleep on the 24 couch at the time that Jaiden killed Matt.

25

1

2

3

By your verdict and your verdict only, injustice can be

Day 6 - Page 94

prevented here. And it would undoubtedly be an extreme injustice 2 to convict someone of murder and robbery, the biggest crime there 3 is, while they were sleeping. What an awful nightmare that would 4 be to wake up to.

1

5 But by your verdict and your verdict only, you can also 6 provide justice by holding Kody accountable for what he did. In 7 regard to Kody Harlan's role, he was an accessory to this murder. 8 For all the things that he did after Matt was killed, he was an 9 accessory to this murder and he's willing to be held accountable for 10 that by each one of you.

Let's talk about this poster board here for a second 11 12 because I think this lays it out quite well. It's not -- if you think well, 13 you know what, maybe he's -- maybe Kody's probably guilty. 14 Maybe his guilt is highly likely. Maybe it's possible. All the way up 15 here, maybe it's highly likely. But still not guilty. They have to 16 show it beyond a reasonable doubt in your mind that there was this 17 robbery.

18 And guess what, they want the robbery so bad because 19 that's the only way that they pull Kody into this first-degree murder 20 is by putting him into this robbery theory of theirs. That's the only 21 way they get him. But that's not what he did. He was an accessory. 22 Yes, he was. But there was no robbery and they have to prove that beyond a reasonable doubt in this case. 23

24 We talked about redwoods and palm trees and Mr. 25 Yampolsky used that when he was talking to you guys and

everybody here -- almost everybody -- almost everybody here
raised their hand and the said that they felt like they were a
redwood. And -- an open-minded redwood but a redwood. And
because of this they would not be peer pressured into doing
something that they felt deep down that they did not want to do.

And we had talked about this again, during jury selection.
I'll just go back to this. Every person's voice on this jury, no matter
what the age, occupation, everything, it's just as important as the
person sitting next to them. But that's the beauty of it that we
talked about.

I want to show you one more quote actually before I tell
you just the last couple sentences I wanted to tell you. Here's one I
found last night when I was working on this. This is from a famous
lawyer from the early 1900s. He says: You can only protect your
liberties in their world by protecting the other man's freedom.

That's powerful. You can only protect your liberties in this
world by protecting the other man's freedom. Myself, as well as
my client Kody Harlan only ask that you take your time, that you
think it all over, that you ponder the evidence.

And after all that is done, we ask that you hold Kody
accountable for what he did, for being an accessory to this murder.
But not for committing the murder, not for committing some
alleged robbery, in any way, shape, or fashion that the Prosecution
is trying squeeze Kody into; through all their theories, they're trying
to squeeze him into. That's not what happened here. It's certainly

1	not what happened here beyond a reasonable doubt.
2	We ask that you find Kody Harlan not guilty of the murder
3	and robbery in this case. Hold him accountable for what he did,
4	being an accessory after the fact. Thank you.
5	THE COURT: Thank you.
6	Mr. Pesci, on behalf of the State.
7	MR. PESCI: Thank you, Your Honor.
8	[Colloquy between the Court and Counsel]
9	THE COURT: We're going to take a quick break, Ladies
10	and Gentlemen. If you go ahead and step outside with the marshal
11	and we'll see if we can get this figured out.
12	[Court recessed at 3:42 p.m., until 4:00 p.m.]
13	[In the presence of the jury]
14	THE MARSHAL: All rise for the jury.
15	THE COURT: You all could be seated. Thank you.
16	We will be back on the record. Mr. Caruso, Mr. Harlan, all
17	of our attorneys and all of our jurors are present.
18	We're going to continue on with closing arguments. I
19	patrol officer for the inconvenience. I think we have a workaround
20	in place, so keep your fingers crossed.
21	Mr. Pesci.
22	MR. PESCI: Thank you.
23	CLOSING ARGUMENT FOR THE STATE
24	BY MR. PESCI:
25	Ladies and Gentlemen, we just had a technological snafu.
	Day 6 - Page 97 AA1472

Don't hold that against anybody, please. Thank you for your 2 patience, we're almost there. When I'm done, you will get the case 3 and you will start to argue.

1

4 There are some things I need to go over because you 5 heard a lot in this case, and we need to apply the law to the facts to come to the conclusion. The conclusion in this case is that the 6 7 Defendants are guilty as we told you at the beginning. We're not 8 trying to force something through some hole. We're trying to hold 9 the people accountable who did what they did to Matthew.

10 We're here because Matthew's dead. That's why we're 11 here. We're here because someone put a gun to Matthew' face, 12 pulled the trigger, and then left him on the ground. And then 13 videoed. That's why we're here. We're not here about some quote 14 from somebody somewhere else, we're here because he's dead. 15 And when you're asked to say that this is not a conviction because 16 there is reasonable doubt, there is not reasonable doubt.

17 The instruction, Number 5, you have it in your packet, it's even numbered for you. Instruction Number 5 specifically says: 18 19 Doubt to be reasonable must be actual, not mere possibility or 20 speculation. Possibility and speculation do not equate to 21 reasonable doubt. The evidence in this case shows you what 22 happened. You were just told a moment ago that somehow some way you can't rob a dead person. That's dead wrong. The robbery 23 24 instruction has this language. This is in the packet. I'm not making 25 this up.

1	Such taking constitutes robbery whenever it appears that
2	although the taking was fully completed without the knowledge of
3	the person from whom taken.
4	That would be a dead person.
5	Such knowledge was prevented their inability to know
6	what's happening was prevented by the use of force or fear.
7	Under the law, you can rob a dead person. When
8	Matthew's shot in the face and killed and his money is taken, that's
9	robbery.
10	Now, what's really important to know and to apply and is
11	the law, in order for it to be a felony murder, in order for it to
12	become murder of the first degree because of felony murder, the
13	intent to commit the robbery has to predate the shooting.
14	So if there is intent to rob Matt before he is shot and killed
15	then taking of the from him, the money after he's dead is robbery
16	and is felony murder robbery. Keep that in mind when you're back
17	there and you're going through this.
18	You were just told who is Jaiden Caruso and you were
19	talked about how he's not a person who did some terrible shooting
20	in some other area of the country or even here on the Strip, you
21	know, eliciting this idea of these mass shootings. We're not saying
22	he's a mass murderer. And he doesn't get out of his responsibility
23	because the body count's not three, four, five, or fifteen. He's
24	responsible. And this is the guy who he is.
25	You know, there's a lot about impugning the witnesses in

this case, the teenagers -- and we'll get into that in a minute. But
there was an impugning of the witnesses in this case about what
they said. Officer Cochran has no ax to grind. She isn't working off
a case. She's not a teenager. What does she say the Defendant
said? When I turn 18 this will all wash away.

So in answer to the question posed by Defense Counsel,
who is Jaiden Caruso, there it is. He's someone who thinks this is
going to wash away. It's not going to wash away. Matt's not
coming home. And responsibility for what they did to him, it needs
to be imposed. Under the law. Not emotion, the law.

Malice. You were talked about malice. You know, the 11 12 instructions are really important. There's a Number 19 there for 13 you so you can go back into it, right? You were talked about how it 14 wasn't this and it wasn't that, so therefore it wasn't malice. What 15 does the instruction actually say? Malice aforethought means the 16 intentional doing, picking up a gun, walking up to a person, and 17 pulling the trigger, to the face. A wrongful act without legal cause 18 or excuse. It's not justified. It's not self-defense. It's not even 19 voluntary manslaughter, what they're saying. We'll get into that in 20 a minute.

Without the law considers adequate provocation. That's
what malice is. It's intentional doing of a wrongful act that you
don't have an excuse for. The instruction goes on to say it's really
important in the law, may and shall. Those are really important
concepts. And the concept of malice: The condition of mind

described as malice aforethought may arise from any hatred,
 revenge, or roommate percent ill will, spite, or grudge towards the
 person killed. It may also arise from an unjustifiable or unlawful
 motive or purpose to injure another.

It is not required. You don't have to have those things in
order for it to be malice. Those are examples of how it could be.
And my co-counsel explained how that fit in the context of when
Matthew walked up and said hey, you almost hit me. And then
time passed and then Jaiden picked up the gun and walked over.

That could be that he was angry about that. That's a
possible way of showing that malice. You don't need that because
malice is the intentional doing of a wrongful act without legal cause
or excuse. He killed Matthew without a legal cause or excuse. That
was a wrongful act. That's malice.

You were just told earlier about how it was error for the
police to not have tested the wallet, right? Ask yourself this, what
did the test of the spray can -- spray paint can yield? An
inconclusive determination.

Do we know for a fact that DNA is going to be conclusive?
It might have been, but we don't know, right? So it's not
reasonable doubt just because something may have turned out one
way or the other. Remember going back to what I read, Instruction
Number 5, speculation's not reasonable doubt.

Voluntary manslaughter. It's the voluntary killing upon a
 sudden heat of passion caused by a provocation, apparently

sufficient to make the passion irresistible. That's what you have to 2 have for voluntary manslaughter. Jaiden Caruso doesn't get 3 voluntary manslaughter without that.

1

4 Does that fit in our case? The killing upon a sudden heat 5 of passion. What was the sudden heat of passion? The evidence 6 from the witnesses was that time had passed between the shot to 7 the ceiling and the shot to the face. And we know that because 8 Ghunnar left, Kymani, left and we have actual video evidence from Matt showing the shot to the ceiling and then panning out across 9 10 the room. Time has passed. There's no ill will, anger, screaming, provocation. There's none of that. And even if there was, that 11 12 provocation apparently sufficient to make the passion irresistible.

13 Do you know what voluntary manslaughter is? I go home 14 and find my wife in bed with another man, I get my gun and I shoot 15 them both. That's voluntary manslaughter. That's -- the idea on 16 the law is like look that's still criminal, we're not going to condone 17 killing somebody, it's just less serious -- that's not the right word. 18 It's less criminally responsible than a premeditated killing because 19 the idea is the heat of passion. I lost my mind when I saw them in 20 bed. And it's the kind that's going to make it irresistible; that I just 21 knee jerk react to it. There is absolutely, positively none of that in 22 this case. That's why you cannot come back with voluntary manslaughter. It does not apply. 23

24 Involuntary manslaughter. So I -- I mean, we got the 25 instruction, being told it's not involuntary. I'm a little confused why

we got the instruction if it wasn't. But let's go through it 2 nonetheless. It's a very long instruction, right, about what it could be; what it's not? Look at that comma where it says but and pick it 3 4 up from there.

1

5 But where at the involuntary killing occurs in the 6 commission of an unlawful act which in its consequence it naturally 7 tends to destroy the life of a human being or is committed in the 8 prosecution of a felonious intent, the offense is murder.

9 Translation, you don't get involuntary manslaughter when 10 you take a gun and you point it at a person's face and then you pull the trigger. There's nothing involuntary about that. 11

12 The fact is but where the involuntary killing occurs in the 13 commission of an unlawful act which in its consequences naturally 14 tends to destroy the life of a human being, pointing the gun at a 15 person's face and pulling the trigger, that naturally tends to destroy 16 the life. You've seen that. You've seen the video.

17 And then the added instruction, the added paragraph to this instruction, Number 31: Involuntary manslaughter does not 18 19 involve the conscious use of a deadly weapon in the commission of 20 a crime.

If it is the conscious use of a deadly weapon, it cannot be 21 involuntary. We know it's a conscious use because he picked it up, 22 23 he walked over there, and he pulled the trigger. But even if you 24 somehow think oh well, you know, he's not really sure how a gun 25 works. Really? There's the shot to the ceiling that predates in time

the shot to the face. He knows that gun works. He knows what happens when you pull the trigger. You've literally seen the evidence of that, the hole in the wall.

1

2

3

You've heard about them being so high or drunk that
somehow this is not going to be a premeditated murder and you
have to assess that. You know, the interesting thing, where does
the evidence come in that they were so high or drunk? Who
provides that evidence? Who are some of the witnesses that
provide that?

Could it be, no, you're kidding Ghunnar? Could it be
Kymani? So let me get this straight, they want you to believe
Ghunnar and Kymani when it's good for them because they relied
on Ghunnar and Kymani's testimony about how everyone's
smoking weed, taking Xanax, and drinking. They are credible
witnesses there but somehow not later on. Keep that in mind when
you're assessing their credibility.

What is it that they did that shows you their capacity to
deliberate? They're able to drive. I mean, get in a car, work the
transmission, drive to a location. Now this is to go get Matt. This is
at the beginning of the drinking, the taking of the drugs. So maybe
they're not just that high yet.

What about the trip to the Galleria mall? You have an
exhibit. It's 10.7 miles. There are multiple ways to get from Cool
Lilac, you'll see it in the exhibit, to the Galleria Mall. There's a
capacity take the highway responsible surface street to go one way

Day 6 - Page 104

or the other. Or better yet, when we get inside and we see the 2 actual purchasing of items.

3 Able to pull a trigger. Capable of doing that. By the way 4 there is evidence of premeditation; shot to the face after the shot to 5 the ceiling. Again, this showing what he knows a gun can do. 6 Knowing that it can do this and then walking up and pull the trigger 7 is evidence of the premeditation. Knowing the design, a 8 determination to kill, that's the instruction. You know that gun does that because it's been shot into the ceiling. 9

[Video playing]

BY MR. PESCI: 11

1

10

12 Is he falling down? Is he stuttering? Is he stammering? 13 And do not confuse premeditation with a good decision. You can 14 premeditate and make a horrific decision to kill somebody and then 15 to post about it afterwards. You got to get out the phone, you've 16 got to pull up Snapchat. And if that's on the phone, which we know 17 it is, then you've got to utilize the application to upload that and 18 send it on its way.

19 And you can do all that but somehow you're so high or so 20 drunk you can't premeditate? What about that? How is it possible 21 to have the capacity to move that body and not just move that 22 body, to cover it. To cover it with a tarp and then take that phone 23 and burn it, put it in water, smash it, and spray paint it. But 24 somehow there's an inability of capacity to premeditate or 25 deliberate?

How about spelling? How's your spelling when you're high and drunk? It seems to work. There's the phone. Just talked about all that damage. Why do that to the phone? Ask yourself that. Why do that to the phone? If this is an accident, if this is not a robbery, why on earth burn it, put it in water, smash it, and spray paint it?

1

2

3

4

5

6

We talked about able to drive. There's the map. Look at
the different routes. I mean, this is Google search, right?
Everybody's got that in their phones. You can go one way, you can
go another way, make a determination, I'm going to get to the
Galleria Mall, I'm going to utilize the car to get there. This is being
shown to you for a reason. It's to show you how they're acting,
walking, moving at this very time shortly thereafter.

And remember what Ms. Overly said, what's the purpose
of going to Shoe Palace? Who gets some shoes? Jaiden. And we
know from the video he's got blood on his black shoes. Got to
change those out.

And they were successful in all those purchases. Look at
the bags that Jaiden and Kody are carrying. And Traceo doesn't
have anything. No bags. And there's been this argument about
Traceo being the person who really stole, so maybe there is a
robbery? Wait a minute, am I confused? If he took it, could that be
a robbery?

Well if there is a robbery, Traceo didn't take it and these
guys did, that's a problem for them, right? So let's blame Traceo.

Let's partner Traceo on the hook. You saw that video, there's not
 anything on him. He admitted he stole because he had no cash. If
 he stole Matt's money, he uses his cash to buy those things. He
 had no cash. You have literal video evidence to confirm that.

## [Video playing]

You have to be able to select your item, bring it to the
counter, and wow, look at that cash. Look at how much cash. But
somehow it can't be premeditated or deliberate.

5

Remember something, when it comes to the context of
voluntary intoxication, when it comes to robbery -- because for
Kody he's a first-degree murder via felony murder. Voluntary
intoxication is not a defense to a general intent crime. The Court
has specifically told you that robbery is not a general -- that robbery
is a general intent crime. So voluntary intoxication does not negate
or get you out of robbery because you're so high or drunk.

But there's still more evidence of their ability to do things because the car crash, he's able to run. You remember the very beginning of this case, Officer Cochran chases him. He's able to figure out to run down this back alley, go along this other wall, jump over it, go past the side of the building, head south, and then go inside and try to hide inside. That's what Jaiden's able to do.

What about Kody? And then Kody takes off beats feet right way, goes in the opposite direction. He's able to leave that area, head south and go to the Villas Apartment, where he's taken into custody by the police. He's capable of doing that all the while

so high apparently he can't figure anything out.

1

2

3

And -- oh by the way, got rid of the gun. The gun. We'll come back to that in a minute.

Corroboration. Ghunnar and Kymani. You remember the
Defense says that they're okay as witnesses when it comes to
establishing their clients having used alcohol, marijuana, or Xanax.
But somehow they're not good when it comes to talking about the
lick. They're being called into question. And they rely on them to
get in that voluntary intoxication. And you heard that. That's what
they told you. But they're not believable in the context of a lick.

Now remember, Ghunnar was 16 years old when he's
interviewed by police. He's not a homicide detective, I asked him
that. He doesn't know all the facts of the case. He's just a 16-year
old kid answering the questions he's being asked by the detective.

And this is important, I asked Detective Nichols this and it
might have seemed like it was out at left field. Ghunnar was
interviewed on June the 12th, 2018. Kymani was not interviewed
until June the 13th. Kymani mentions the lick. The first time the
police hear the word lick is on the 13th.

That's why it doesn't come up in Ghunnar's on the 12th because they don't even know anything about it yet. Ghunnar's just answering the questions. Ghunnar doesn't know what the police are looking for other than the questions being asked. And the police don't know yet to ask Ghunnar about a lick because they haven't heard that yet. That doesn't happen until the next day.

Day 6 - Page 108

You know, Ghunnar -- think about it, I mean, you can assess the credibility from a person's demeanor on the stand. Ghunnar's not working off any charges. Ghunnar has no ax to grind. Ghunnar was scared. He was answering the questions.

1

2

3

4

And I asked him specifically after he'd been crossexamined, after they were trying to say that he was making this up
about the lick and hearing that before they went to pick up Matthew
and I asked him are you saying this because you're making it up or
someone else told you? And his response was no, because that's
what he saw and he heard.

Speaking of working off charges, right? Traceo was 11 12 charged with accessory to murder. You have an instruction that 13 specifically says you're only an accessor to the charge that the 14 other person is charged with, right? So he -- this only needs to be 15 corroborated as to the charge of accessory to murder. That's the 16 only application of that instruction and it talks about how you have 17 to have independent corroboration. Well they just told you he didn't. So it's established. Don't confuse what Traceo says about 18 19 the robbery and the murder as having to be corroborated, it's as to 20 the accessory charge.

We talked about Traceo didn't take anything from them.
Traceo -- you were told that this was crazy how he said he went and
sat outside. He didn't testify that he sat outside, he testified that he
went outside. He said it was only a few minutes, why is he going to
sit down if it's just a few minutes. He didn't say he say out there, he

said he went out there and waited. Because he's not calling the 2 shots at this place, Ladies and Gentlemen. He's just being utilized 3 to put a body in a closet. And then apparently being utilized as the 4 scapegoat as to who really committed a robbery event.

1

5 Kymani -- switching from Ghunnar to Kymani -- heard a 6 conversation between the Defendants about doing a lick. 7 Defendants wanted to rob someone for weed, they kept talking 8 about it, that's how Matt's name was brought into it. And there's back and forth about what he said in his statement to police. 9

10 By the way, in the statement to the police he's with police, as opposed to when he's in court. And then they're cross-11 12 examining him about how in court he says this, then he says that. 13 He never backs off from the fact that he said that to the police, back 14 on June 13th, right? There's back and forth but he acknowledges 15 yep, that's my statement. And even at the preliminary hearing, 16 again, not with detectives, but in a courtroom, he acknowledges 17 that he said that. He was shown his statement.

18 Again, Ghunnar and Kymani talking about before Matt's 19 picked up, right? What's the corroboration? Why should you 20 believe Ghunnar and Kymani?

21 Ms. Overly went through some of this. They told you he 22 shot in the ceiling. Well there's actual video evidence to support that. 23

24 They told you that they left after the shot to the ceiling. 25 There's actual video evidence to support that. Matt's video shows

1	the shot to the ceiling corroborating, confirming what Ghunnar and
2	Kymani said. Additionally, Matt's video shows Ghunnar and
3	Kymani are gone. There's the hole to the ceiling and they ran.
4	That's what they told you. And other evidence is showing that
5	that's true. That video evidence corroborates them.
6	[Video playing]
7	BY MR. PESCI:
8	You don't see those two kids.
9	You even have Charles coming into this, Charles talking
10	about phone calls happening. Ghunnar and Kymani told you
11	Jaiden called the after they left the house, after he shot into the
12	ceiling. Charles testified that Jaiden called him after he left the
13	house. The phone evidence corroborates that. You have video
14	evidence; you have phone evidence corroborating these two young
15	men and including Charles. Because there's the call to Ghunnar.
16	You can literally see his name. That's to Ghunnar.
17	If he's making it up and he's a liar because he's making up
18	something about a lick that didn't happen, then why on earth is the
19	phone evidence actually proving him truthful? And it's not just
20	Ghunnar, it's also Charles. Charles said that he called.
21	Now listen, Ladies and Gentlemen, we don't pick our
22	witnesses. The witnesses that are in the case, those are the
23	witnesses I the people that they chose to do this crime in the
24	presence of, those are the witnesses. Would it be better if they
25	weren't teenagers? Absolutely. Would it be better if they weren't

also doing drugs? Absolutely. But those are the witnesses. That's 2 why they call -- we call them in because they're the ones that see it, hear it, and know what happened. 3

4 Traceo said Kody Harlan when into Matt's pockets and 5 took Matt's wallet. Big to do about how Traceo said that. Traceo 6 said he didn't take Matt's wallet, right? And video evidence 7 corroborates Traceo. There it is. He's got nothing. Whatever he stole has got to be in his pocket somewhere. He's not walking out 8 with bags of merchandise. If Traceo stole the money in the wallet 9 of Matt, Traceo would have stuff in his bags. He wouldn't have 10 stolen it if he'd had money to be able to purchase it. There's 11 12 nothing.

13

1

## [Video playing]

BY MR. PESCI: 14

15 That's shown to you because that was posted on 16 Snapchat on June the 7th. That's out there. Because kids today 17 they just think oh, you know, I just post it and nothing happens. It's 18 out there for anybody to see. Who subscribes or sees or is a part of 19 his Snapchat. And ask yourself, it's amazing that flush cash that 20 Matt had on June 7th, look at the flush cash in Kody's hands.

21 We're not saying Kody shot Matt, we're saying that Kody 22 was a part of the robbery and he took steps in furtherance of that by literally taking a wallet. And the evidence of that is what you just 23 24 watched.

25

Remember that gun? Remember how adamant he was

1		that he didn't do it?	Detective Nichols talked about that.
---	--	-----------------------	--------------------------------------

Repeatedly, I didn't have a gun, I didn't have a gun, I didn't have a
gun. Well, who's got a gun? The picture on the left is to help you
realize who it is that's on the couch. I mean, pay attention to this.
We've got these torn jeans right there. The shirt, the red yellow up
at the top left. That's Kody with a gun. But he's adamant he didn't
have a gun. He didn't have a gun. Why be untruthful about that?
Ask yourself that.

I mean, Defense Counsel said, put it up there on the board
that his client lied about that, right? So why lie about that? Ask
yourself that. If he didn't commit a crime, if he wasn't a part of a
robbery, and this was just an accident, why on earth lie about it?
Especially when there's evidence to prove that it's not true.

We was just trying to help him out, trying to tell him to get
up and stuff. Or like -- we didn't know he was dead.

You've seen the video. It's clear as day he's dead.

Me and Jaiden were there trying to like clean it up like -not like clean it up to hide it type shit.

16

Whoa. I said clean it up, whoa, I got to like explain that
away so it's not like I'm trying to hide it. Because what does hiding
it show? You hide something that you did wrong, you don't hide an
accident. You don't hide a mistake.

I just put a tarp over him and left him there. I cleaned up
the blood around his face and made sure like -- you know, like I
don't know -- I tried to help him out the best I -- because that was a

o me.
o me.

,

2	Really? That was a homie?
3	I want to help you all find it because that's my friend, you
4	know, like I just don't want to leave him sitting there.
5	When he says that to the detective, the shooting has
6	already occurred, shopping has already occurred, a pool party has
7	already occurred and then a chase with Officer Cochran has already
8	occurred, and then running from the scene has already occurred.
9	But, you know, I don't want to leave him sitting there? That's
10	exactly what they did, left him sitting there.
11	Like everything I've been telling you has been 100 percent
12	truth? No, no it hasn't. And knowing that you have to assess the
13	evidence, put it into context, and make a determination as to the
14	guilt of these Defendants.
15	The felony murder rule here: A killing which is committed
16	in the perpetration or attempted perpetration of a robbery is
17	deemed to murder of the first degree.
18	That's how Kody gets there. We've already talked about it
19	as far as Jaiden and shooting, right?
20	Whether the killing was intentional or unintentional or
21	accidental.
22	If you believe that Kody was on the couch sleeping, if you
23	believe that, that does not save him from the felony murder rule.
24	Because the evidence establishes that the idea of robbing them
25	predates the shooting. It happened earlier, it happened when the

conversation about the lick occurred, when they went and got him and brought him back; Matt that is.

3 So when the force, the shooting occurred, he could be 4 asleep. As long as he was a part of the idea and a part of the acts in 5 furtherance of the conspiracy to commit the robbery by going and 6 getting him and then the acts -- as Ms. Overly explained, the acts 7 after -- you take into consideration taking his cash, taking his wallet 8 is evidence of that earlier intent. That's felony murder. So even 9 though he was asleep from the time the shot occurred, it still 10 applies.

We've already gone through this afterthought. You can
rob someone who's dead, but you have to intend to rob them
before they're killed in order for felony murder to apply.

Now you're being told repeatedly it's not a robbery. Okay.
Let's snapshot. I showed you some torn jeans and some black
shoes just a moment ago of Kody on purpose, to show he was the
person with the gun and also to show you look who's right next to
the body. Those -- that pocket, it's not turned out. That didn't
magically happen on its own.

That's the person next to him. That is Kody Harlan.
There's the ripped jeans, the black shirt. That's the person next to
that body before all that money comes out, right? Those are the
facts. They're unbending. You can't get away from that right there.
His pants have the pockets pulled out.

25

1

2

And to add insult to injury, I mean, you really have to be

AA1490

motivated to go get someone's wallet when you're digging in all
that blood. You just saw the video. He, Matthew did not have his
pockets turned out after he was shot.

4 But now when he's being taken from the scene and you 5 heard from Crime Scene Analyst Proietto, he said I stay with that 6 body from when I get there until the coroner's investigator takes it 7 away in that body bag. That blue around the body's the body bag. 8 He didn't touch those pockets and nobody else touched those 9 pockets. Those pockets were turned out before police got there and after he was shot. Because his money's taken and it's used to buy 10 some clothes. 11

12 The police asked Kody how Matthew got to the house and 13 Kody said -- I'm almost done. Here's what I want you to keep in 14 mind, when you're back there and you're going to make your 15 determination as to the guilt of these Defendants and if for some 16 reason you're thinking that okay, Kody didn't actually play a part in 17 this robbery so therefore he's not a part of the murder, ask yourself 18 this, the police asked him how Matthew got to the house and Kody 19 said: He walked -- I guess, he -- I'm honestly -- I don't know how he 20 got there. He just popped up.

Why be untruthful about that? The evidence from all the
witnesses, all the witnesses whether they're allegedly credible or
not credible is that the Defendants left and got Matt. He didn't just
pop up. Think about that. Why did he tell the police he just popped
up? Because you want to know something, Ladies and Gentlemen,

Day 6 - Page 116

1 || you can tell a lot about the truth by what people lie about.

2

3

4

5

6

I asked at the beginning of this case during jury selection if some of you maybe as parents or teachers ever have to figure out what happened between two people, usually kids we're talking about. You know, who stole the cookie from the cookie jar? Whatever. Fill the blank as to the thing that happened.

And I talked about in the face of people giving you
different stories, could you come to a conclusion as to what really
happened and people said yes. And think about it, when you're
making that analysis, when you're trying to figure out who are the
people that are talking to you and telling the truth, sometimes it's
the lies that lets you know the truth.

You know, if my son stole those cookies and he's adamant
he never came downstairs, never came downstairs, and he throws
his sister completely under the bus. But when I go to my son's
room there's all kinds of cookies on the floor. How'd that happen,
son? If you're so adamant about never being downstairs, that's a
big key. You now know he's been downstairs. And the fact that
he's lying so much about it, brings into question whether he did it.

So keep that in mind. Why say he just popped up? Why
distance himself from giving Matt a ride? Because the ride is the
beginning of the robbery. The ride is the plan to rob put in action.
That's where it starts. There's a conversation about a lick, but then
there's action. And the action is these two going to pick up
Matthew.

Lying about that also helps you know that Ghunnar and
Kymani heard about it. Why should he distance himself from just
getting a ride if there wasn't a conversation about a lick? Why do
that? You lie about the things that hold you responsible.
Truth and justice, you've heard about those things.
You've heard quotes, I'm not going to mess with those things.
Truth and justice leads to first-degree murder convictions with use
of a deadly weapon for both Defendants. Truth and justice leads to
a robbery with use of a deadly weapon charge for both Defendants.
And additionally, the accessory murder with use of a deadly
weapon for Kody.
Thank you very much.
THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Pesci.
All right. We're going to swore our jury or our officers
to take charge of our jurors, please.
[The Clerk swore in the officers to take charge of
jury during deliberations]
THE COURT: All right. Gather all your belongings, take
your notepads with you. You can leave your clipboards here in
court and we'll get you back to the deliberation room, except Ms.
Sepulveda, Seat Number 5, was randomly chosen to be our
alternate seat before we seated.
So you're not going to go back to the deliberation room
right now, you're going to kind of peel off with Jackie once you get
back there and she's going to get some information from you and

then you're going to be release. You're under the same admonition
that you still can't talk to anybody about the case or anything until
we let you know that the jury has finished their duties, okay?

Everybody else we'll get you back to the deliberation
room. I know we're approaching 5:00. I don't have any
expectations for what you're going to do this evening, other than I
would like you to at least get a foreperson elected.

The foreperson is simply going to be the person that's
kind of in charge of leading your discussions and communicating to
the Court with any notes or communicating with the marshal about
if and when you want to go home this evening, what time you'd
want to come back tomorrow, things like that, okay?

13 But go ahead and get back there and we'll get all the 14 exhibits back there for you as well to assist your with your 15 deliberations and a clean computer so that you can watch any of the videos or any of the other evidence that's in evidence, okav? 16 17 With that you guys can go ahead and head on out. [The jury retired to deliberate at 4:39 p.m.] 18 19 THE COURT: You guys have anything outside the 20 presence? MR. PESCI: Not from the State. 21

MR. HELMICK: No.
 MR. YAMPOLSKY: No, Your Honor.
 THE COURT: Okay. Do you guys - MR. HELMICK: You need my cell phone?

1	THE COURT: have a pardon?	
2	MR. HELMICK: Cellphone, that's all.	
3	THE COURT: Oh, okay. You guys have a clean you	
4	guys can be seated. Thank you.	
5	THE CLERK: They already gave that.	
6	THE COURT: Got it. Okay. All right.	
7	Then yes, just make sure we have phone numbers and	
8	everything for Kory to contact you at. I don't anticipate that they're	
9	going to go long this evening and I don't ever think it's a great idea	
10	to keep jurors late in the evening, so I'll just kind of take direction	
11	from them and have them let me know when they want to leave	
12	and then I'll communicate to you all, okay?	
13	MR. PESCI: Thank you.	
14	[Evening recess at 4:40 p.m.]	
15	* * * * * *	
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21	ATTEST: I do hereby certify that I have truly and correctly	
22	transcribed the audio/video proceedings in the above-entitled case to the best of my ability.	
23		
24	Battonang	
25	Brittany Mangelson Independent Transcriber	
	Day 6 - Page 120 AA1495	

		Electronically Filed 1/22/2020 8:55 AM Steven D. Grierson CLERK OF THE COURT
1	TRAN	Alena A. atrum
2	DISTRICT	COURT
3	CLARK COUN	TY, NEVADA
4 5	STATE OF NEVADA,	) ) CASE NO. C-18-333318-1
6 7	Plaintiff, vs.	) C-18-333318-2 ) DEPT. III
8 9	JAIDEN CARUSO & KODY HARLAN,	) ) )
10	Defendants.	
11 12	BEFORE THE HONORABLE DISTRICT COU	
13	WEDNESDAY, AU	JGUST 07, 2019
14	<i>TRANSCRIPT OF</i> JURY TRIA	PROCEEDINGS
16	APPEARANCES:	
17 18	For the State:	GIANCARLO PESCI, ESQ. SARAH E. OVERLY, ESQ. Chief Deputy District Attorneys
19	For the Defendant	
20 21	Jaiden Caruso:	MACE J. YAMPOLSKY, ESQ. JASON R. MARGOLIS, ESQ.
22	Kody Harlan:	RYAN K. HELMICK, ESQ.
23 24	RECORDED BY: JILL JACOBY, COU	JRT RECORDER
25	TRANSCRIBED BY: MANGELSON	TRANSCRIBING
	Day 7 Case Number: C-18-33	- Page 1 AA1496

1	Las Vegas, Nevada, Wednesday, August 07, 2019
2	
3	[Trial began at 2:44 p.m.]
4	[Outside the presence of the jury]
5	THE COURT: So before we get our jurors in, we will be on
6	the record outside the presence of the jury.
7	I just wanted to make a record of the one question that
8	came out. This morning the jurors had sent out a question and it
9	was I guess a three-part question you could say and the question
10	was, quote: Vince, just the name Vince, with a question mark, is
11	he the light-skinned curly hair guy? And why hasn't he been
12	questioned? End quote.
13	So I contacted the attorneys. Mr. Pesci was in court
14	because I had my homicide calendar this morning. I got Mr. Harlan
15	and Mr. Yampolsky on the phone. I told everybody what my
16	inclination was, and I believe everybody agreed with it.
17	And the answer that I responded to them was: As you will
18	recall from Instruction Number 43, the Court is not at liberty to
19	supplement the evidence. The Court also cannot speak to why any
20	particular persons were or were not questioned.
21	And I believe everybody was in agreement with that,
22	correct?
23	MR. PESCI: That's correct
24	MR. HELMICK: Correct, Your Honor.
25	MR. PESCI: from the State.

1	THE COURT: Mace?
2	MR. YAMPOLSKY: Yes.
3	THE COURT: Yes. Okay. Thank you.
4	We'll have that marked as a Court Exhibit. And that's the
5	only note that came out that we had any response to.
6	[Pause in proceedings]
7	[In the presence of the jury]
8	THE MARSHAL: All rise for the jury.
9	THE COURT: All right. You all can be seated. Thank you.
10	We will be back on the record. Mr. Harlan and Mr. Caruso
11	are present. All of our attorneys and our jurors are present.
12	So Ms. Rice, my understanding is you're the foreperson of
13	the jury, correct?
14	THE FOREPERSON: Yes, Your Honor.
15	THE COURT: All right. And you all have reached a
16	verdict?
17	THE FOREPERSON: Yes, Your Honor.
18	THE COURT: Could you go ahead and hand those forms
19	to the marshal for me, please?
20	All right. And you all can remain seated.
21	In the matters of Kody Harlan and Jaiden Caruso, Case
22	Number 333318, Defendants Number 1 and 2, the verdict is: We,
23	the jury, in the above entitled case find the Defendants as to Count
24	1, murder with use of a deadly weapon; each Defendant guilty of
25	first-degree murder with use of a deadly weapon.

1	As to Count 2, robbery with use of a deadly weapon; each
2	Defendant guilty of robbery with use of a deadly weapon.
3	And as to Mr. Harlan, Count 3, accessory to murder with
4	use of a deadly weapon; guilty of accessory to murder with use of a
5	deadly weapon.
6	Ladies and Gentlemen of the Jury, are those your verdict?
7	So say you one, so say you all?
8	THE JURY: Yes.
9	THE COURT: Either side wish to have the jury polled?
10	MR. PESCI: Not from the State.
11	MR. HELMICK: No, Your Honor.
12	MR. YAMPOLSKY: No, Your Honor.
13	THE COURT: Ladies and Gentlemen with that, that
14	concludes your jury service with the great thanks of the Court, and I
15	will tell you on behalf of our community, I give you their thanks as
16	well.
17	First off, I'm not going to give you that admonition now,
18	so that just means you're free to talk to anybody that you want to
19	talk to about the case. You certainly don't have to talk to anybody if
20	you don't want to and I'll explain that to you a little further in a
21	moment. I'm going to come back there and chat with you for a
22	couple of minutes.
23	But thereafter the attorneys may want to talk to you and if
24	they do, I'll bring you back into the courtroom just with the
25	attorneys and myself. It's always very valuable for the attorneys to

learn from the people that sit in judgment of issues in our
 community about what you thought about the process; everything
 from getting a Jury Summons, to coming into Jury Services, to the
 jury selection process. How they present a case as attorneys. Just
 kind of get some feedback from you.

We don't talk about your deliberative process. There's a
reason that you go back there, and we close the door, and nobody
gets to communicate with you. That's a very private thing amongst
the collective members of the jury, okay? But nonetheless, to be
able to give some feedback to the attorneys and the people
involved in the case so that they can learn from it because we learn
every day, is a good thing.

So if some of you have some time and you're willing to
stick around and chat, I know on behalf of them, they would
appreciate it. Ono the other hand, if you want to get on your way, I
understand that as well. So don't feel like you have any obligation
to stick around. After I get a chance to chat with you, any of you
that want to leave, you're certainly free to do so.

As you'll recall from the jury selection process, there's a
lot of folks that come in for jury selection and try really hard to get
out of jury duty, right? Every question I ask they want to kind of
come up with an answer that's going to alleviate that inconvenience
on their life. So to the extent you all didn't do that, you were willing
to honor what it means to be on a jury and serve, on behalf of this
community I really, really do thank you because I know it takes a lot