1	YAMPOLSKY & MARGOLIS	
2	MACE J. YAMPOLSKY, ESQ. Nevada Bar No. 001945	
3	JASON R. MARGOLIS, ESQ. Nevada Bar No. 012439	
	1625 South Sixth Street	Electronically Filed Jul 06 2020 10:32 a.m.
5	Las Vegas, Nevada 89101 (702) 385-9777; Fax: (702) 385-3001 Attorney for Defendant	Elizabeth A. Brown Clerk of Supreme Cour
6		
7	IN THE SUPREME COU	JRT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA
8	JAIDEN CARUSO,	}
9	Appellant,	Case No. 80361
10	vs.	}
11	THE STATE OF NEVADA,	\
12	Respondent.	\
13		<i>)</i>
14	APPELLANT'S	S APPENDIX VOLUME V
15		
16		
17 18	MACE J. YAMPOLSKY, ESQ. 625 South Sixth Street Las Vegas. Nevada	ALEXANDER CHEN District Attorney
19	Las vegas. Ivevada	
20		AARON FORD Attorney General for the State of Nevada
21		Attorney General for the State of Nevada
22		
23	ATTORNEY FOR APPELLANT	ATTORNEYS FOR RESPONDENT
24	JAIDEN CARUSO	THE STATE OF NEVADA
25		
26		
27		
28		· ·

ALPHABETIC APPENDIX FOR APPELLANT'S APPENDIX

2	DOCUMENT	VOLUME	PAGE NOS.
3	BOCOMENT	VORUME	INGE WOO
4 5	Defendant Harlan's Motion to Sever or in the Alternative Motion to Deem Statements of the Co-Defendant Inadmissable filed April 8, 2019	I	0001-0013
6	Defendant Jaiden Caruso's Joinder to Defendant Kody Harlan's Motion to Set Aside Guilty		
7 8	Verdict as to Counts One and Two; In the Alternative Motion for a New Trial filed August 28, 2019	I	0014-0015
9	Defendant Jaiden Caruso's Joinder to Defendant		
10 11	Kody Harlan's Motion to Sever or in the Alternative Motion to Deem Statements of the Co-Defendant Inadmissable filed April 22, 2019	I	0016-0017
	Defendant Jaiden Caruso's Supplemental Points and Authorities in Support of His Joinder to Defendant		
	Kody Harlan's Motion to Set Aside Guilty Verdict as to Counts One and Two; In the Alternative		
13	Motion for a New Trial filed September 12, 2019	I	0018-0033
15	Information filed July 17, 2018	I	0034-0037
	•		
16	Judgment of Conviction filed December 12, 2019	I	0038-0039
17	Notice of Appeal filed January 2, 2020	I	0040-0041
18	Notice of Motion to Place on Calendar to Set Aside Guilty Verdict as to Counts One and Two; In the		
19	Alternative Motion for a New Trial and to Request		
20	Additional Time for Supplemental Briefing filed August 13, 2019	I	0042-0046
21	Notice of Non-Filed Plea Agreements of Jaiden	•	00464 004677
22	Caruso and Kody Harlan filed May 27, 2020	I	0046A-0046W
23	Order Denying Defendant's Motion to Sever, or in the Alternative, Motion to Deem Statements of the		
24	Co-Defendant Inadmissable filed May 15, 2019	I	0047-0048
25	Order Denying Defendant's Pretrial Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus (as to Defendant Caruso) filed October 23, 2018	I	0049-0050
26		•	0017 0000
27	Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus (as to Defendant Caruso) filed August 29, 2018	I	0051-0062
28			

1	DOCUMENT	VOLUME	PAGE NOS.
2	Recorder's Transcript of Hearing: Hearing Re:		
3	Motion to Set Aside Guilty Verdict as to Counts One and Two, in the Alternative Motion for a New Trial filed January 22, 2020	I	0063-0087
4	Recorder's Transcript of Hearing Re: Status	1	0003-0007
5	Check; Negotiations filed June 4, 2020	I	0087A-0087G
6	Reporter's Transcript of Preliminary Hearing		
7	before the Honorable Samuel G. Bateman	II	0088-0303
8	filed July 30, 2018 Recorder's Transcript of Proceedings: All	11	0088-0303
9	Pending Motions filed January 22, 2020	III	0304-0375
10	December's Transprint of Drassadings		
11	Recorder's Transcript of Proceedings: Sentencing filed January 22, 2020	III	0376-0418
12	Degrange to State's Opposition to Haylon's		
13	Response to State's Opposition to Harlan's Supplemental Briefing for Motion for a New Trial	III	0419-0429
14	filed October 3, 2019 State's Opposition to Defendant Harlan's Motion to	111	0417-0427
15	State's Opposition to Defendant Harlan's Motion to Sever or in the Alternative Motion to Deem		
16	Statements of the Co-Defendant Inadmissable filed April 11, 2019	III	0430-0442
17	State's Onne sition to Defendant's Motion to Set		
18	State's Opposition to Defendant's Motion to Set Aside Jury Verdict as to Counts One and Two;		
19	or in the Alternative, Motion for New Trial and Supplemental Briefing filed August 20, 2019	III	0443-0460
20	Ctatala Datamata Wait af Habaaa Camana filad		
21	State's Return to Writ of Habeas Corpus filed September 11, 2018	III	0461-0472
22	Guida Defendante		
23	State's Supplemental Opposition to Defendant's Motion for New Trial filed September 26, 2019	III	0473-0500
24	G 1 AD C CoNACCO CONSTRUCT		
25	Supplemental Briefing for Motion for New Trial of Defendant Kody Harlan filed September 12, 2019	III	0501-0521
26	T ' CD		
27	Transcript of Proceedings Jury Trial Day 1 filed January 22, 2020	IV	0522-0682 &
28		V	0683-0843

1	DOCUMENT	VOLUME	PAGE NOS.
2	Transcript of Proceedings Jury Trial Day 2 filed January 22, 2020	VI	0844-1039
3	Transcript of Proceedings Jury Trial Day 3		
4	filed January 22, 2020	VII VIII	1040-1168 & 1169-1294
5			
6	Transcript of Proceedings Jury Trial Day 4 filed January 22, 2020	IX	1295-1486
7			
8	Transcript of Proceedings Jury Trial Day 5 filed January 22, 2020	X	1487-1715
9			
10	Transcript of Proceedings Jury Trial Day 6 filed January 22, 2020	XI	1716-1835
11			
12	Transcript of Proceedings Jury Trial Day 7 filed January 22, 2020	XI	1836-1843
13			
14	Verdict filed August 7, 2019	XI	1844-1845
15			
16			
17			
18			
19	·		
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			

INDEX FOR APPELLANT'S APPENDIX

- 1			
2	DOCUMENT	VOLUME	PAGE NOS.
3	Information filed July 17, 2018	I	0034-0037
4 5	Reporter's Transcript of Preliminary Hearing before the Honorable Samuel G. Bateman filed July 30, 2018	II	0088-0303
6 7	Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus (as to Defendant Caruso) filed August 29, 2018	I	0051-0062
8 9	State's Return to Writ of Habeas Corpus filed September 11, 2018	III	0461-0472
10 11	Order Denying Defendant's Pretrial Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus (as to Defendant Caruso) filed October 23, 2018	I	0049-0050
12 13	Defendant Harlan's Motion to Sever or in the Alternative Motion to Deem Statements of the Co-Defendant Inadmissable filed April 8, 2019	I	0001-0013
14 15	State's Opposition to Defendant Harlan's Motion to Sever or in the Alternative Motion to Deem Statements of the Co-Defendant Inadmissable filed April 11, 2019	III	0430-0442
161718	Defendant Jaiden Caruso's Joinder to Defendant Kody Harlan's Motion to Sever or in the Alternative Motion to Deem Statements of the Co-Defendant Inadmissable filed April 22, 2019	I	0016-0017
19 20 21	Order Denying Defendant's Motion to Sever, or in the Alternative, Motion to Deem Statements of the Co-Defendant Inadmissable filed May 15, 2019	I	0047-0048
22	Verdict filed August 7, 2019	XI	1844-1845
23 24	Notice of Motion to Place on Calendar to Set Aside Guilty Verdict as to Counts One and Two; In the Alternative Motion for a New Trial and to Request Additional Time for Supplemental Briefing		
2526	filed August 13, 2019 State's Opposition to Defendant's Motion to Set	I	0042-0046
27 28	Aside Jury Verdict as to Counts One and Two; or in the Alternative, Motion for New Trial and Supplemental Briefing filed August 20, 2019	III	0443-0460

1	DOCUMENT	VOLUME	PAGE NOS.
2	Defendant Jaiden Caruso's Joinder to Defendant		
3	Kody Harlan's Motion to Set Aside Guilty Verdict as to Counts One and Two; In the		
4	Alternative Motion for a New Trial filed August 28, 2019	I	0014-0015
5	Defendant Jaiden Caruso's Supplemental Points and		
6	Authorities in Support of His Joinder to Defendant Kody Harlan's Motion to Set Aside Guilty Verdict		
7	as to Counts One and Two; In the Alternative Motion for a New Trial filed September 12, 2019	I	0018-0033
8	Supplemental Briefing for Motion for New Trial of Defendant Kody Harlan filed September 12, 2019	III	0501-0521
9	of Defendant Rody Harian fried September 12, 2019	111	0301-0321
10	State's Supplemental Opposition to Defendant's Motion for New Trial filed September 26, 2019	III	0473-0500
11	Response to State's Opposition to Harlan's	111	0173 0300
12	Supplemental Briefing for Motion for a New Trial filed October 3, 2019	III	0419-0429
13	Judgment of Conviction filed December 12, 2019	I	0038-0039
14	Notice of Appeal filed January 2, 2020	I	0040-0041
15	Trottee of Appear fried standary 2, 2020	•	
16	Transcript of Proceedings Jury Trial Day 1 filed January 22, 2020	IV	0522-0682 &
17	ined January 22, 2020	V	0683-0843
18	Transcript of Proceedings Jury Trial Day 2		
19	filed January 22, 2020	VI	0844-1039
20	Transcript of Proceedings Jury Trial Day 3		
21	filed January 22, 2020	VII VIII	1040-1168 & 1169-1294
22			
23	Transcript of Proceedings Jury Trial Day 4 filed January 22, 2020	IX	1295-1486
24			
25	Transcript of Proceedings Jury Trial Day 5 filed January 22, 2020	X	1487-1715
26			
27	Transcript of Proceedings Jury Trial Day 6 filed January 22, 2020	XI	1716-1835
28			

1	DOCUMENT	VOLUME	PAGE NOS.
2	Transcript of Proceedings Jury Trial Day 7 filed January 22, 2020	XI	1836-1843
3	Recorder's Transcript of Hearing: Hearing Re:		
5	Motion to Set Aside Guilty Verdict as to Counts One and Two, in the Alternative Motion for a New Trial filed January 22, 2020	I	0063-0087
6	Recorder's Transcript of Proceedings: All		
7	Pending Motions filed January 22, 2020	III	0304-0375
8	Recorder's Transcript of Proceedings:		
9	Sentencing filed January 22, 2020	III	0376-0418
10	Notice of Non-Filed Plea Agreements of Jaiden Caruso and Kody Harlan filed May 27, 2020	I	0046A-0046W
11	Recorder's Transcript of Hearing Re: Status		
12	Check; Negotiations filed June 4, 2020	I	0087A-0087G
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
1920			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			

MR. PESCI: All right. I think the gentleman to your left also had raised your hand, correct?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 523: Correct.

MR. PESCI: All right. And then tell us about your experience or the lack thereof with social media.

And I apologize, this is Mr. Sulstrom, Badge 523? PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 523: Correct.

MR. PESCI: Did I pronounce that correctly?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 523: Yes.

MR. PESCI: Thank you.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 523: I just don't choose to participate. My wife is very active. I know about social media, I just choose not to be involved.

MR. PESCI: All right. And the fact that there could be evidence from that, would that prevent you from being fair and impartial?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 523: Not at all.

MR. PESCI: Okay. Thank you very much.

Speaking of phones, you know, we always think of that type of social media, there are times in court when we will utilize a phone because we can't always get internet access here and we're trying to set up witnesses. We're trying to get witnesses lined up for court and things of that nature and you might see us on the phone. Is anybody going to hold that against us, that we utilize that tool to try to keep the case moving along? Anybody have any

 problems with that?

Okay. Well it's kind of hard because the Court tells you don't touch your phone. But we're going to be under the desk, you might see us because we're just trying to get things moving along.

Does anybody have any personal, religious, moral reasons why you cannot sit in judgment of another human being?

No answers. I'll try to follow that up. What I mean by that is we, the prosecution, are going to present our witnesses and at the end of the day we're going to ask you to pass judgment on the facts. As the Court explained earlier, you are the judge of the facts. We're going to ask you to make a decision that will affect the parties. Some people think that they can't or shouldn't do that and that's totally fine, we just need to know if that's you.

All right. Mr. Gutierrez-Sosa, 505. If you could hold on just one second so we can get the microphone.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 505: First time I served as a juror I felt very uneasy with the final verdict. There was a lot of he said, she said, there wasn't concrete evidence. And so I left that case feeling very uneasy about it for a few weeks afterwards just thinking a lot about it. And this case is several degrees more severe than that. And so I feel that it could -- I could potentially feel very uncomfortable assessing a guilty or not guilty verdict.

MR. PESCI: Okay. And I apologize, I'm looking at my notes because I knew that you served on a jury before and I was trying to remember if it was civil or criminal and I think it was civil,

3

5

6

7

8

9

11

12 13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21 22

23

2425

correct?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 505: Yes.

MR. PESCI: All right. So and it was two years ago?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 505: Roughly.

MR. PESCI: Okay. And here in Vegas.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 505: Yes.

MR. PESCI: All right. So there was a judge in that case that provided the law to you at the end and said look, here's the standard of proof. Do you remember -- not the specifics, but do you remember being told that? Just being given the law.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 505: What I remember being told was that there weren't -- there wasn't any factual evidence to be presented in the case that it was mostly he said, she said type of argument.

MR. PESCI: Uh-huh.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 505: And it was the jury's responsibility to assess which party was more responsible.

MR. PESCI: Okay. And then I believe the Court would have given you at some point saying okay, here are the facts that you've listened to, now here's the law. Apply the facts to the law to make your determination.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 505: There -- like I said, there were not -- there weren't many -- very many facts.

MR. PESCI: Okay.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 505: Just storytelling

from each side.

MR. PESCI: Okay. And then the big thing is at the end of the day for all of you that have served on juries before, whether it's civil or there are many of you that was criminal that the decision as to what the law is, is Judge Herndon's and that everything you've heard before you don't take into this courtroom, as far as what the law is.

Judge Herndon at the end of the case is going to give you the law and tell you it and in particular the standard of proof, right, the proof beyond a reasonable doubt, that's the standard in a criminal case and it's different from civil, right? We don't get into what that standard is. The Judge gives an explanation at the very end. We can't quantify it and we can't talk about that. He's going to give a very explicit instruction on that.

The question is, is can you listen to that instruction and apply that instruction alone and forget about, for those of you that served as jurors before, what you may have been told in the past. Would anybody have difficulty with that?

Nobody is shaking their head in the affirmative, indicating that they can in fact follow the Court's instructions.

THE COURT: Giancarlo, right --

MR. PESCI: Yes?

THE COURT: -- before you started talking to Mr. Gutierrez-Sosa, Ms. Lambert had her hand up on that question that you --

MR. PESCI: I'm sorry.

THE COURT: -- asked as well.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 466: Just --

MR. PESCI: Can we have the microphone. One second, ma'am, I apologize.

Thank you, Your Honor.

So and I apologize, Ms. Lambert, your Badge Number? PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 466: 466.

MR. PESCI: Thank you very much.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 466: Okay. First of all, I just want to say that being a medication assistant, I work with hospice and the more I'm listening about the case and hearing it, I have a problem -- I give comfort meds, you understand what that is?

MR. PESCI: Yes.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 466: Correct. I have a hard time when I go home after giving these meds, returning and finding the person deceased. Listening right now, it's going to be really hard for me to make a decision because I feel guilty. It's my job, but I still feel guilty with what I do because of the end result. I don't know if that has -- will make a difference to you or anyone else in it but it does every day.

MR. PESCI: Okay. So could you feel guilty whichever way you came back?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 466: Yes.

MR. PESCI: Okay. So for the Prosecution or for the

1	
1	Defense, either way you could be affected by that?
2	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 466: Yes.
3	MR. PESCI: All right. Would that impede or impair your
4	ability to be able to make a decision?
5	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 466: It would.
6	MR. PESCI: Okay.
7	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 466: Because I feel so
8	bad and so strong about what I'm doing at for my job. And like I
9	said I know it's my job and a part of my job but as far as, you know,
10	having a say in someone else's life, either way, I don't feel like I
11	have that right.
12	MR. PESCI: Okay. So you don't
13	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 466: Nor do I want that
14	right.
15	MR. PESCI: Okay. And I guess and very, very important
16	within that is that would affect your ability to be able to be fair to
17	both sides.
18	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 466: [No audible
19	response - nods head yes].
20	MR. PESCI: And I'm sorry, ma'am, you shook your head.
21	I understand it's a yes but for her
22	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 466: Yes.
23	MR. PESCI: recording thank you.
24	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 466: Yes.
25	MR. PESCI: For the recording. Thank you very much.

Judge, could we approach?
THE COURT: Yeah.
[Bench conference transcribed as follows.]
THE COURT: You done already?
MR. PESCI: I'm sorry?
THE COURT: You done already?
MR. PESCI: No.
MR. YAMPOLSKY: No, you kidding me?
MR. PESCI: I'm making a challenge as to that juror.
THE COURT: Oh, as to her.
MR. PESCI: Yes.
THE COURT: Just go ahead and finish questioning the
panel as a whole
MR. YAMPOLSKY: Yeah, we don't object to her being
relieved.
THE COURT: Okay. Generally I let you guys go through
all 32
MR. PESCI: Okay.
THE COURT: and then you'll let me know who you're
going to challenge. I'll let them do their thing and then they'll tell
let us know who they're challenging, and we'll get them all figured
out.
MR. PESCI: All right.
THE COURT: So you know, obviously, since he's
challenging her, you don't have to do anything rehabilitate. If you

21

22

23

24

25

want to, obviously you can.

MR. YAMPOLSKY: Okay.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. PESCI: Okay. Thank you, Judge.

THE COURT: Either way, just keep going.

MR. PESCI: All right.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

[End of bench conference.]

MR. PESCI: Thank you very much, ma'am.

I wanted to follow up on a few of you. If you could raise your hands if you have children? There's quite a few, right?

Okay. Have you ever had a time where they said something different about the same event?

THE COURT: Raise your hand if that never happened.

MR. PESCI: No hands, Judge.

THE COURT: No hands.

MR. PESCI: All right. So it's a joke but it's not, right? And I'm going to -- Mr. Gutierrez-Sosa just talked about the experience that he had in the civil case where there was things being said on both sides, right?

So there will be evidence presented, the State has the burden, the Defense does not have burden whatsoever. But you might hear different versions of the same events. The question is, is in your own experience, those of you that have children, have you been able to assess all of the evidence and make a decision or

is just the fact that there are two versions enough that you can't come to a conclusion? Does that make sense?

So even with maybe some conflict, are you as a parent, able to make a determination as to what happened? And make a decision as to what you're going to do, maybe potentially as to who gets to watch the TV now or who ate the cookies or fill in the blank, right? Can you apply that to the courtroom?

Could I have -- where's the microphone? Could we pass it back -- thank you so much, ma'am.

Could we go back to, I think it's Ms. Fox?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 381: Uh-huh.

MR. PESCI: Badge 381. You were kind of smiling and shaking your head. I get the sense that with those two kids, 20 and 18-year old, you've had some experience with this.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 381: Sure, yes.

MR. PESCI: Tell us about how you as a parent went through that process.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 381: I mean, usually it was about homework, right? Or grades. So the facts kind of bear themselves out, so --

MR. PESCI: Okay.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 381: -- yeah. That's the best example I can come up with.

MR. PESCI: And are there times when you're just not sure and you're not able to make a determination?

1	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 381: No, I don't think so
2	No.
3	MR. PESCI: So you're saying you were able to determine
4	pretty much every time.
5	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 381: Yes.
6	MR. PESCI: All right. Even in the conflict of evidence?
7	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 381: Yes. I mean, there
8	was always you know, talk to them, talk to the teacher type of
9	scenario.
10	MR. PESCI: Right.
11	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 381: You can usually
12	come up with the facts based you know, base your decision on
13	that.
14	MR. PESCI: Okay. Anybody have any difficulty applying
15	that kind of an approach to a courtroom and to a case when it
16	involves murder?
17	Okay. Speaking of that murder itself, does that charge
18	make it such that you cannot be fair? Some people hear that
19	charge and they just are affected by it. Is there anybody who
20	cannot be fair because of the charge in particular, murder, in this
21	case?
22	And I we have in the front, if we could get the
23	microphone one more time.
24	And I assume Ms. Lambert, 466, this is kind of building
25	on

shaking your head as well?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 468: Yes.

MR. PESCI: Okay. Tell us what you're shaking you're head about.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 468: Well based on the charges, I think I have a problem with sympathizing with others.

MR. PESCI: Okay.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 468: So it'd be hard for me to make a decision.

MR. PESCI: So the sympathy would affect your ability you think?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 468: I think so.

MR. PESCI: All right. And is it affecting you based on the fact that someone's been murdered or that someone's been accused of murder?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 468: Someone's been murdered.

MR. PESCI: Okay. And this brings up an important concept. I mean, I don't think anyone's going to say that anyone likes murder, right? No one's trying to condone it or anything like that. And emotions are tied to that and that's understandable. The question really is, is are those emotions so strong that it would prevent you or anybody else, because you've got the mic right now, to be fair and impartial? Would it make it so that you couldn't hold me, the State of Nevada, to my burden and Ms. Overly to our burden?

1	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 468: I don't think I'm
2	understanding what you're saying.
3	MR. PESCI: It's because I'm just talking too much, I
4	apologize.
5	Would your sympathy make it such that you would
6	automatically go for guilty?
7	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 468: Yes.
8	MR. PESCI: Even if we don't prove it to you? We bring in
9	witnesses and you think you know, that stunk.
10	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 468: I think it'd be hard
11	to make a decision.
12	MR. PESCI: Okay. So that would affect your ability to be
13	fair?
14	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 468: Yes.
15	MR. PESCI: All right. Thank you, Ms. Williams.
16	And then I think we had someone shaking their head.
17	So if you could pass the microphone over your shoulder,
18	someone hopefully can grab it and we'll send it back to Mr.
19	Contreras, right, 378.
20	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 378: I think it will affect
21	my answer. I will definitely lean more towards guilty.
22	MR. PESCI: Okay.
23	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 378: Just for the fact that
24	my cousin got killed almost in the same way, here in Vegas.
25	MR. PESCI: Okay.

charged?

1	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 378: Yes.
2	MR. PESCI: And was there a case that was generated?
3	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 378: Yeah.
4	MR. PESCI: And did that person get prosecuted?
5	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 378: There were actually
6	four people.
7	MR. PESCI: [Indiscernible].
8	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 378: Four guys.
9	MR. PESCI: Okay.
10	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 378: And they were all
11	underage. House party, things got out of control.
12	MR. PESCI: Okay. Do you did you follow it? Did you
13	keep tabs on it?
14	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 378: Nah.
15	MR. PESCI: Okay. And I ask that in the sense of do you
16	know who prosecuted, like was it my office?
17	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 378: I don't know.
18	MR. PESCI: You don't you have no idea. Okay.
19	Did you ever come to court for any of the proceedings?
20	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 378: I would try not to
21	get involved.
22	MR. PESCI: Okay. And do you know if they were like
23	did they negotiate the case? Did they go to trial?
24	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 378: I don't know.
25	MR. PESCI: Don't know, okay. All right. But that

particular experience brings up some emotions to you?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 378: Oh yes.

MR. PESCI: Okay. And do you think all those things that you said you checked off in your mind, right, about being young, having a gun, are they going to make it such that you're going to automatically find guilty or automatically find not guilty?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 378: It all depends on the background. Like for instance in my background, where I was raised, I wasn't raised in the United States. I'm an American citizen but wasn't raised here. Killing is pretty much almost a normal thing. So when I get here and I see these things like you just make me think okay, well there was no way this guy being able to defend himself. So even if you guys prove -- whatever you guys -- you know, whatever you guys prove, I think I will already have an answer in my mind.

MR. PESCI: You have an idea in your mind already? PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 378: Oh yeah.

MR. PESCI: Okay. And you're saying based on the charge itself?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 378: Yes.

MR. PESCI: Okay. All right. And you said the way you were raised, that's affecting your viewpoints on this?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 378: Yes.

MR. PESCI: Okay. And how so? Just because of your experience where you said that there are people -- there were

people that were killed before?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 378: Well back home it's very easy, it's very common to see people getting killed every day, so it's not something that affects us, it just affects the way that you see things like when it comes to defending yourself like you know --

MR. PESCI: Uh-huh.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 378: Like for instance, by you just saying the matter of the case, it just makes me think one answer.

MR. PESCI: Okay.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 378: By default.

MR. PESCI: All right. So then if you're on the other side of this, not the Prosecution, but if you're on the Defense, would they be worried to have you as a juror?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 378: They should.

MR. PESCI: Okay. And that's because of this experience that you've had?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 378: Probably, probably not. It just -- that's just my feelings right now. That's -- you know, those are the emotions that I'm finding at this moment.

MR. PESCI: Okay. And one of the things that the Court will explain to everybody, not just Mr. Contreras is that your decision has to be made on the facts that come into this. And so your emotions or your experiences, although you can take them into consideration, it's not what you can base a decision on; in the

sense that it only depends on what we present by way of witnesses up here on the stand. And if we prove it, in your opinion, you make that decision; if we haven't, you make that decision as well. Do you think you could do that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 378: Yes. But your question was if it will affect my answers, so that's why I answered that question.

MR. PESCI: Right. No, and I get that.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 378: now on this one -- yeah. Now on this one, it's a -- you know, it's a total different thing but I don't know.

MR. PESCI: Okay.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 378: I mean, honestly, I don't know.

MR. PESCI: And that's a fair response, right? Because we don't until we're in it. But it -- in the absence of all the facts, we have to know if you can make a determination based on facts alone. We don't know them yet --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 378: Uh-huh.

MR. PESCI: But on facts alone and not emotion. Are you able to make a decision based on facts?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 378: I will find out if I get picked.

MR. PESCI: Okay. All right. Thank you very much.

I wanted to follow up -- could we pass the microphone to

23

24

25

Badge 418. And then is Gelbert?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 418: Gebhart.

MR. PESCI: Gebhart. Sorry, thank you.

So, ma'am, if I understood correctly, you said that there's an uncle that's a detective and was at the Henderson Police Department?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 418: Yes.

MR. PESCI: Okay. And do you know his or her name?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 418: Kyle --

MR. PESCI: I mean, uncle, I'm sorry.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 418: Kyle Massenberg [phonetic].

MR. PESCI: All right. So the other names Ms. Overly stood up and she read a bunch of names from employees from the Henderson Police Department, did any of them ring a bell?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 418: No, they did not.

MR. PESCI: Okay. Now, during trial you and everybody else cannot talk to your uncle or anybody else about the case.

Would you be able to do that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 418: Yes, I would be able to.

MR. PESCI: All right. When the case is over, you can talk all you want, you can talk nothing at all, it's totally your decision.

But until the case is over, jurors cannot speak about the case during a trial. Some time, and I want to kind of follow up with you,

sometimes if people who have law enforcement relatives -- PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 418: Uh-huh.

MR. PESCI: Sometimes people feel like well I'm going to have to explain my verdict to my uncle who's a cop. Would you feel pressured in making a determination because of a relative or a friend that's in law enforcement?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 418: Can you repeat the question?

MR. PESCI: Yes. Would you feel a need to have to explain your verdict to anybody when this was done?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 418: No, I wouldn't.

MR. PESCI: And to include specifically your uncle, being that he's a detective at the Henderson Police Department.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 418: No, we don't hang out with him too much --

MR. PESCI: Okay.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 418: -- so I wouldn't -- I maybe see him at my birthday in a month but that's it so I wouldn't --

MR. PESCI: So --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 418: -- feel the need to like -- if I was picked in the jury and everything, I wouldn't feel the need to talk to him or speak to him at all.

MR. PESCI: Okay. Or anybody else for that matter. Can you make your decision not worrying about what anybody else may

1	or may not say about it?
2	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 418: Yes.
3	MR. PESCI: Okay. Thank you very much.
4	Could we pass the microphone to Badge Number 460,
5	Tagahashi?
6	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 460: Takahashi.
7	MR. PESCI: Sorry.
8	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 460: That's all right.
9	MR. PESCI: You have, I believe a brother-in-law in the
10	Honolulu
11	THE COURT: Mr. Takahashi, right behind you there.
12	Thank you, Ms. Gebhart.
13	MR. PESCI: Thank you.
14	A brother-in-law in the Honolulu Police Department?
15	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 460: Correct.
16	MR. PESCI: Kind of similar questions. Would you feel any
17	duty or responsibility to explain your verdict one way or the other
18	to that individual?
19	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 460: No, I would not.
20	MR. PESCI: Could you make your determination based on
21	the evidence in this case and only the evidence?
22	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 460: Yes.
23	MR. PESCI: Okay. Anybody else that has a friend or a
24	relative that's in law enforcement that would feel that they had to
25	explain it? Or it would affect their ability to make a determination?

Okay. Could I steal this from you?

All right. We're going to go to the gentleman who was in law enforcement.

MR. PESCI: All right. So Badge 523, Mr. Sulstrom.

You mentioned earlier that you felt that you would kind of lean towards a police officer witness. Did I mischaracterize that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 523: No, that's correct.

MR. PESCI: Okay. Would you automatically think that an officer -- that he or she is telling the truth just because they're an officer?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 523: I would lean heavily that way, yes.

MR. PESCI: Okay. The question then becomes -- and that instinct is there, right? And I -- thank you for sharing that.

Do you think that you would automatically find guilt just because we had law enforcement witnesses?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 523: Not necessarily.

MR. PESCI: All right. If we don't prove to you beyond a reasonable doubt, even when we call some police officers, could you return a not guilty verdict?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 523: If you haven't proven your case.

MR. PESCI: So it doesn't matter what the witness is, as far as a job, if we haven't proven the case, you could come back with a not guilty?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 523: I could.

MR. PESCI: All right. And you're not going to automatically come back with a guilty just because of a law enforcement officer testifying?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 523: Not necessarily, no.

MR. PESCI: Not necessarily. Okay. All right. Thank you very much, sir.

Court's indulgence.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. PESCI: Judge, we'll pass for cause with that one caveat.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Yampolsky, on behalf of Mr. Caruso.

MR. YAMPOLSKY: Afternoon. As I said, my name's Mace Yampolsky. I represent Mr. Caruso. And just like the DAs would want to be fair to their side, I want you to be fair to our side. And we're asking these questions, we don't -- nobody wants you to think we're picking on you but when you make some -- take -- say some things that hmm, maybe this could affect their judgment, we have to ask.

And if I ask any questions or anything and you have an answer, but you feel embarrassed, you can ask and we can do it at sidebar, so you don't have to say it in front of everyone.

Now Mr. Pesci talked a little bit about burden of proof.

You'll get an instruction. Prosecution has the burden to prove guilt

beyond a reasonable doubt. Defense doesn't have a burden so if I so choose, I can sit there, twiddling my thumbs, not ask a question of any witness would anyone, if that happened, feel that oh, we have to find him guilty, his lawyer didn't do anything. He doesn't believe him or something like that? Anyone feel that way?

I see no hands.

Another thing, and you'll be instructed also, is the right against self-incrimination. So I may have Mr. Caruso not testify. Maybe he won't get up on the stand. Does anyone feel like well, he should have said something in his defense, it's --

Okay. Mr. Gutierrez-Sosa. Now you said you were in a civil case, you didn't agree with the verdict, is that accurate?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 505: Correct.

MR. YAMPOLSKY: And you said that you didn't believe -- and I'm -- if I get this wrong, I'm paraphrasing that you didn't believe there was enough evidence because it was basically a he said, she said?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 505: As we were told from the begin -- from the initial beginning of the case.

THE COURT: Hey Mace, can I interrupt you for a second?

So can I just clarify something because in a civil case you don't have to have a unanimous verdict. So did you vote for the verdict and then later you felt like you regretted that vote or were you voting not for the verdict, but it got returned anyway?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 505: We had a jury of --

THE COURT: Eight.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 505: -- four or eight, I believe.

THE COURT: Eight.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 505: And everyone came to a consensus and I still had my doubts --

THE COURT: Okay.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 505: -- and I agreed to the consensus, but I had strong doubts and there was nothing I could do at that point.

THE COURT: Okay. I'm sorry.

MR. YAMPOLSKY: Well I --

THE COURT: And I didn't mean to interrupt you, Mace, but I just wanted to figure that out.

MR. YAMPOLSKY: And I'm glad you brought it up because one thing is that the Defendant is entitled to everyone's individual consideration on their guilt or innocence. So the question is, and I'm going to ask you Mr. Gutierrez-Sosa because you volunteered. If you were on this jury and all the 11 other jurors would vote one way, whether it's guilty or not guilty, but one way and you disagreed, would you have the intestinal fortitude to stand up and say no, not my verdict, you haven't convinced me. Would you be able to do that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 505: Yes. However, I understand the Defendant doesn't have a burden of proof of

innocence. But personally, I don't think I can judge fairly without an argument from both sides and strong evidence from both sides.

MR. YAMPOLSKY: Okay. And that's good. And I'm glad you brought that up because everyone has strong feelings and that's fine because this is the place we want to hear about them. So what you're saying is you understand that Defendant has no burden of proof, correct?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 505: [No audible response - nods head yes].

MR. YAMPOLSKY: Is that a yes?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 505: Yes, correct.

MR. YAMPOLSKY: Okay. And you understand, if I want to, I can sit there just twiddling my thumbs, correct?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 505: Yes.

MR. YAMPOLSKY: But you wouldn't feel comfortable if I did that -- if we didn't produce any evidence [indiscernible] on behalf of the Defendant, would that be accurate?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 505: Absolutely not -- would not feel comfortable.

MR. YAMPOLSKY: Okay. And thank you. And I really appreciate your answer.

Now, give the mic to Mr. Meng, please.

Now I want to make this point is that what we want is a fair juror for this case. Now some jurors could be fair for all kinds of cases. Let's say a sexual assault. They have a relative and they

automatically would vote guilty or something like that. I was a victim of armed robbery, so I would not be a good juror for an armed robbery.

Now Mr. Meng, you've been a victim of robbery a couple of times, correct?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 390: Four.

MR. YAMPOLSKY: Four times. And you know -- well you don't know, I don't believe, but in this particular case one of the counts is that both of these Defendants participated in an armed robbery. So do you think you could be fair and it's okay if you can't, but with -- I just would like to know and -- because I know I couldn't be fair in a robbery trial.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 390: I would have a hard time answering that. I probably -- you know, again, I do hold hard feelings against hearing anything about an armed robbery when I know I was a victim of one.

MR. YAMPOLSKY: So you're saying that there's a possibility that, you know, you might not be able to be fair.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 390: Again, it would -- unless I was presented with all the evidence and was really, really convinced, yeah, that'd be right.

MR. YAMPOLSKY: So -- and I'm just trying to follow up like on Mr. Gutierrez-Sosa. So if the State presents all this evidence on all the charges and both Mr. Caruso and his Co-Defendant, Mr. Harlan didn't produce any evidence whatsoever, would you feel like

1	you probably would vote guilty?
2	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 390: Knowing me, yes, 1
3	probably would be, yeah.
4	MR. YAMPOLSKY: Okay. And that's good and I really
5	appreciate everyone's candor because we don't know. That's why
6	we ask these questions.
7	Now does and I know there are some. How many on
8	the jury have teenage children?
9	Okay. A bunch of you. All right. Could you please give
10	the mic to Ms. Fox?
11	Now you said that you have two children, 20 and 18, is
12	that accurate?
13	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 381: Correct.
14	MR. YAMPOLSKY: Okay. And you said that many times
15	as a parent you would have to for lack of a better word, mediate
16	disputes between them.
17	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 381: Correct.
18	MR. YAMPOLSKY: And then you would have to make a
19	determination as to what happens
20	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 381: Correct.
21	MR. YAMPOLSKY: right?
22	And you said in order to make your decision, you would
23	talk to are they boys? Girls? What?
24	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 381: Boys.
25	MR VAMPOLSKY: Okay You talk to both hove and then

you said you talked to the teacher.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 381: Correct.

MR. YAMPOLSKY: Correct. Okay.

Now let's say there was no teacher involved. Let me give you this hypothetical. You made this blueberry pie, you're going to have a dinner party, you are the world's best baker of blueberry pies and you have all the people that were on the cooking shows, the chefs, and they're going to eat your blueberry pie. And you come home and there is a slice of the blueberry pie that's gone and you ask your kids and you say who took this and they go like this. What would you do to make that determination?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 381: Figure out which one likes blueberry. The answer would be obvious in that case.

MR. YAMPOLSKY: Okay. Now in this particular case there's -- like Mr. Gutierrez-Sosa -- there's going to be a lot of he said, she said. And how are you going to decide whether or not what he said is what happened or is what she said did happen if they're different.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 381: I mean you have to look at the facts that are available.

MR. YAMPOLSKY: Okay. And in addition to the facts, are there any factors that you might use?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 381: In this case or --

MR. YAMPOLSKY: Yes.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 381: I mean, no, it's

1	going to be the facts of this case.
2	MR. YAMPOLSKY: Okay. And what about in some other
3	situation?
4	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 381: With my kids?
5	MR. YAMPOLSKY: Yeah.
6	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 381: It would be what
7	they've previously done because I know them.
8	MR. YAMPOLSKY: Okay. So if one of your kids
9	previously kept stealing slices of your pie, you would think it's him.
10	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 381: Because I know
11	them, yes.
12	MR. YAMPOLSKY: Okay. Thank you.
13	Now, Mister, is it Sulstrom, is that how you pronounce it?
14	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 523: Yes.
15	MR. YAMPOLSKY: Okay. Could you please pass the mic
16	to Mr. Sulstrom?
17	Now if I remember correctly you are a you retired from
18	the LA County Sheriff's Department.
19	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 523: Correct.
20	MR. YAMPOLSKY: And your wife actually worked for the
21	LA County Sheriff's Department.
22	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 42: That's true.
23	MR. YAMPOLSKY: And earlier and once again,
24	everyone has their opinion, your opinion's not wrong, we just want
25	to find out. You said that based on your work experience that you

probably would believe a police officer as opposed to a lay witness; would that be accurate?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 523: Yes.

MR. YAMPOLSKY: Okay. So for instance -- and I'm simplifying, I'm making a hypothetical which has nothing to do with this case. If a police officer said hey, this car was black and somebody else gets up there who's not a police officer said hey, this car is white, you would tend to believe the police officer.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 523: Unless there was other evidence to prove.

MR. YAMPOLSKY: Right. But I'm saying that's it. It's a he said, she said. There's no other evidence.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 523: Correct.

MR. YAMPOLSKY: So you would believe the police officer.

And you would try to be fair though, correct?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 523: Yes.

MR. YAMPOLSKY: But there is a possibility that you would lean towards what law enforcement is saying.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 523: Correct.

MR. YAMPOLSKY: Okay. I appreciate your candor.

And one thing I want to bring up and this goes to the right to remain silent and I -- you know, some people just don't want to testify and everyone -- I mean, some people like Mr. Gutierrez-Sosa well, you know, if he's innocent he should say that, why -- you

know, why not? And can anyone think of a reason why an innocent person may not want to take the stand?

Could you please the mic to Mr. Jaska?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 474: Do you just want me to give a reason?

MR. YAMPOLSKY: Yes.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 474: Or -- because let's say their Miranda Rights were violated under intense questioning and if they took the stand, the false confession can be used against them.

MR. YAMPOLSKY: Okay. So what you're saying is that maybe because what they said before might be different to what they would say on the stand.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 474: Correct.

MR. YAMPOLSKY: Okay. Can you think of any other reasons why an innocent person might not want to take the stand?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 474: No, I'm saying an innocent person could do that under -- if there's enough stress in the questioning, an innocent person will say anything. So if -- that would be a reason.

MR. YAMPOLSKY: So you're saying there's a possibility there might be a false --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 474: It happens all the time, no?

MR. YAMPOLSKY: -- confession.

question is inappropriate --

MR. YAMPOLSKY: All right. I'll move on.

1	
1	THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
2	[End of bench conference.]
3	THE COURT: All right. You can continue, Mace.
4	MR. YAMPOLSKY: And could you pass the mic over here
5	to Ms. Williams?
6	And if I'm wrong, please let me know. It happens all the
7	time; if you don't believe me ask my ex-wife, but be that as it may,
8	how I believe what you said was that because of sympathy for the
9	victim, you were afraid that you might not be fair. Is that accurate?
10	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 468: True.
11	MR. YAMPOLSKY: Okay. And when you say might not be
12	fair, you'd be more prone to vote guilty as opposed to not guilty.
13	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 468: I believe so, yes.
14	MR. YAMPOLSKY: Okay. Could you pass the mic to Mr.
15	Contreras, please?
16	Mr. Contreras, as I understand it, your cousin was
17	murdered like three/four years ago. Is that accurate?
18	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 378: Yes.
19	MR. YAMPOLSKY: And that happened in Las Vegas.
20	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 378: Yes.
21	MR. YAMPOLSKY: And the people that were I believe
22	you said four people were involved
23	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 378: Yes.
24	MR. YAMPOLSKY: is that right?
25	And they were accused.

1	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 378: Yes.
2	MR. YAMPOLSKY: And do you know if they were
3	convicted or not?
4	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 378: Don't know.
5	MR. YAMPOLSKY: No you don't know or no, they're
6	weren't convicted?
7	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 378: I don't know.
8	MR. YAMPOLSKY: Okay. And
9	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 378: I was in the
10	Bahamas at that time, so.
11	MR. YAMPOLSKY: Excuse me?
12	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 378: I was living in
13	Bahamas at that time so I just
14	MR. YAMPOLSKY: Oh, okay.
15	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 378: Yeah.
16	MR. YAMPOLSKY: And I believe you said once again, if
17	I'm wrong, you let me know that because there's a murder charge
18	here and because these Defendants are being accused of murder,
19	you may have a tough time being fair. Would that be an accurate
20	statement?
21	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 378: Yes.
22	MR. YAMPOLSKY: Okay.
23	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 378: Those are the
24	feelings that I'm finding out right now.

MR. YAMPOLSKY: Okay. And you haven't heard any

evidence right now.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 378: Yes, sir.

MR. YAMPOLSKY: Okay. Now the other thing I believe you said that because there were firearms involved, correct?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 378: Yes.

MR. YAMPOLSKY: And how would that affect your determination?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 378: Not that it'll affect it in the future because I will have to see the facts but again, I answer to the question of the feelings at that moment -- of this moment and the fact that I think they were underage --

MR. YAMPOLSKY: Right.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 378: -- the fact that there's an arm on underage guys, hence -- I mean, that just lead me towards one answer.

MR. YAMPOLSKY: Okay. And you're saying because if the evidence shows that there were underage people --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 378: Yes.

MR. YAMPOLSKY: And when you say underage, you mean under 18, under 20 --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 378: Under 18.

MR. YAMPOLSKY: Under 18 that were using a firearm that they may -- and if my words are wrong -- but that may like bias you against them, would that be accurate?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 378: Not really against

them because I mean, again, no one is guilty until proven, you know? So that's -- those are just my feelings. I answered to the question that was asked earlier.

MR. YAMPOLSKY: Right. But just like because it's a murder case, you may -- you have some strong feelings about underage people that would be using firearms?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 378: No, not necessarily underage people because like I said, I mean, where I come from that's pretty normal. I'm just saying those things are adding up in my head and because of that, that's -- if the case had to be solved today, right now, I had a -- I already have an answer in my head. Make sense?

MR. YAMPOLSKY: Okay. So -- and tell me if I'm wrong. So what you're saying because the charge is murder and because -- and I'm just -- that there are underage people as the DA said and firearms are involved, you may have a hard time being fair. Would that be accurate?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 378: Yes.

MR. YAMPOLSKY: Okay.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 378: Without seeing no evidence at this time, yes.

MR. YAMPOLSKY: Right. Okay. And right now you haven't heard any evidence but just --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 378: Yes, sir.

MR. YAMPOLSKY: -- without hearing any evidence, you

1	believe that you maybe would lean towards the Prosecution?
2	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 378: Towards one
3	answer; yes, sir.
4	MR. YAMPOLSKY: Okay.
5	I have nothing further right now. Thank you.
6	THE COURT: Thank you.
7	All right. Will you guys approach real quick?
8	[Bench conference transcribed as follows.]
9	THE COURT: I'll probably give them a quick bathroom
10	break before we move over to Ryan, but are you challenging
11	anybody?
12	MR. YAMPOLSKY: Of course I am.
13	THE COURT: Okay. So last name.
14	MR. YAMPOLSKY: Okay. So Mr. Contreras said without
15	any evidence
16	THE COURT: No, just tell me who they are real quick. Mr.
17	Contreras.
18	MR. YAMPOLSKY: Okay. Mr. Contreras, Mr. Gutierrez-
19	Sosa, Mister
20	MR. HELMICK: Sulstrom.
21	MR. YAMPOLSKY: Mr. Sulstrom.
22	THE COURT: Okay.
23	MR. YAMPOLSKY: Did I miss anyone? Ms. Williams.
24	THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Contreras, Gutierrez-Sosa, and
25	Ms. Williams, okay.

MR. YAMPOLSKY: Yes.

THE COURT: All right. Okay. So just be thinking about those and then when we're done with Ryan, we'll all come back and talk about all of them --

MR. PESCI: Okay.

THE COURT: -- including Ms. Lambert.

MR. YAMPOLSKY: Okay.

THE COURT: Okay. So we'll take a break real quick.

[End of bench conference.]

THE COURT: All right. Folks, before we continue on with Mr. Helmick, we're going to go ahead and take a short break, let you use the restroom, stretch.

I don't think I told you earlier and I apologize, but if you want to bring a drink back into courtroom, please feel free to do so. Even if you grab like a small pack of candy or something like that. I eat obscene amounts of jellybeans when I sit in court so please feel free to do that as well. With the drinks, just make sure you keep the top on them if you would though.

So we're going to take about a 10 or 15-minute break and then we'll continue on.

During the recess you're admonished not to talk or converse among yourselves or with anyone else on any subject connected with the trial. Or read or watch or listen to any report of or commentary on the trial by any medium of information including, without limitation, newspapers, television, the Internet,

1	and radio. Or form or express any opinion on any subject
2	connected with the case until it's finally submitted to you. No lega
3	or factual research, or investigation on your own.
4	Thank you. I need everybody to go ahead and step out.
5	Again, leave whatever you want in your chairs for now, okay?
6	[Outside the presence of the prospective jury]
7	THE COURT: Do you guys have anything outside the
8	presence?
9	MR. PESCI: Yeah, real quick, Judge.
10	THE COURT: Okay.
11	MR. PESCI: You hopefully have some records?
12	THE COURT: Yes.
13	MR. PESCI: Okay.
14	THE COURT: I just started to kind of try and glance at
15	them.
16	MR. PESCI: So just to make a record, we asked for our
17	Juvenile Division to get the records. Judge Voy signed the release
18	they forwarded it to me.
19	THE COURT: Okay.
20	MR. PESCI: I opened the document. Once I saw there
21	were reports, I stopped
22	THE COURT: Okay.
23	MR. PESCI: and I just forwarded it to you.
24	THE COURT: Okay.
25	MR. PESCI: So I haven't seen them. But the first page

was the order so I was trying to see -- once I saw that there were some, I just sent it right to you and I haven't seen it.

THE COURT: Yeah, it was 105 pages, so I've printed it out.

Just as I was flipping through it, it looks like a lot of it is arrest report, incident report, stuff like that.

MR. PESCI: Right.

THE COURT: On top of it was the Order to Testify. So I haven't got into the meat to see what else is there yet.

MR. PESCI: And I just wanted to make the record, the State doesn't have it under the advantage of in the sense of looking at it. We're not going to look at it --

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. PESCI: -- until you tell us if we can.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. PESCI: Secondarily, Mr. Helmick was very kind and pointed out a couple of things that he's intending on using during his voir dire.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. PESCI: One of them was the Shawshank Redemption picture. I mean, I really don't know what's going to happen with that so I'm not necessarily going to object at this point.

But there was also one that was a picture it was called the game of telephone. And so the State is objecting in advance that, you know, getting into the facts of the case again, under Eighth Judicial District Court 7.70, you can't really argue the case. And the

1	idea of telephone is that one person says, then another person
2	says, which, you know, could be argued is the facts of this case. So
3	I'd rather not do that in front of the jury, so
4	THE COURT: Okay.
5	MR. PESCI: I'm making my objection now.
6	THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Helmick.
7	MR. HELMICK: That wasn't the purpose of telephone. It
8	was really going to be into if this jury had heard about this case on
9	the news. And we haven't had many people talk about that yet, so I
10	don't think I'm really even going to use those telephone exhibits
11	that I have.
12	THE COURT: Okay. All right.
13	MR. PESCI: Thank you.
14	THE COURT: If that changes, just kind of give me a hi sign
15	or
16	MR. HELMICK: Sure, I'll give you
17	THE COURT: whatever
18	MR. HELMICK: a heads up
19	THE COURT: and we'll talk about it.
20	MR. HELMICK: We'll approach if I try to use it.
21	THE COURT: Okay. All right. Then we will be on break.
22	[Court recessed at 3:05 p.m., until 3:22 p.m.]
23	[Outside the presence of the prospective jury]
24	THE COURT: Okay. We're on, Ryan, you can go ahead.
25	MR. HELMICK: Okay. So I wanted to make sure because I

don't want to do something that's wrong. Can we talk about whether they have heard about the case last year that involved Russian roulette and an abandoned house. The goal is I'm trying to figure out who heard about this case. They're not going to remember the names of the people but --

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. HELMICK: -- those things might ring a bell as to what they heard about it.

THE COURT: Mr. Pesci.

MR. PESCI: Judge, I object as to talking specifically about Russian Roulette. I don't think that anybody's indicated at all they have heard anything in the media. I specifically avoided specific facts of this case and so I don't think we need to plant in their heads the concept of Russian Roulette. I think it'd be better to --

THE COURT: The -- and I'm sorry to interrupt. The problem with that is, is like well, okay -- then the State says well maybe we want to bring up that, you know -- did you hear about the case in Henderson that allegedly involved Russian Roulette and dah, dah. So that --

MR. PESCI: Right.

THE COURT: -- kind of gets back and forth. So I mean, really it's just kind of -- I mean, you can bring up to them and say there was some media attention when this case first arose. Does anybody remember seeing anything about it on the news or reading anything about it in the newspaper.

MR. HELMICK: Yeah.

THE COURT: You heard from Ms. Gideon that these guys were in high school at the time. Anything about that ring any bells with any of you all.

MR. HELMICK: That's how I'll do it. That was my goal.

THE COURT: I don't want to go into planting a fact to ask them about because there's so many facts in any given situation.

MR. YAMPOLSKY: But just -- and obviously I don't -- well maybe I do --

THE COURT: Go ahead.

MR. YAMPOLSKY: But let's say he has that question, and someone says oh yeah, I remember. Could he go into it then or no?

THE COURT: No, no, no. If somebody says I remember about the case, we'll bring them in by themselves.

MR. PESCI: Oh, okay.

THE COURT: Okay. So what I would probably say is go ahead and finish all your questions of the panel and then we'll pull those people back and ask them what it is --

MR. HELMICK: Okay.

THE COURT: -- they think they remember. Okay.

MR. PESCI: And that was going to be the State's request. If someone says they remember something from media, that we do it individually so that we're not telling the other people what the facts are.

THE COURT: Yeah. I mean, that was just the same way --

2

4 5

6

7 8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23 24

25

name is Ryan Helmick. I represent Kody Harlan.

I want to talk with you about a comment that the lady that's sitting in Mr. Young's seat made earlier. She said that she had heard about this case, that she went to high school with these kids. This case had some media coverage last year. Does anybody remember hearing anything about this case and the facts that the Prosecutors stated at the beginning of this case? Does anybody remember hearing anything in the news, on social media, anything? I just want to make sure.

Nobody? Okay. Go ahead, Jessica.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 468: Oh I just -- I remember hearing it in the news.

MR. HELMICK: Oh, you do?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 468: Yeah.

MR. HELMICK: Okay. That's okay. That's all I wanted to know.

THE COURT: So just to clar -- I don't want you to go into anything, Ms. Williams, right now that you may or may not have heard but was it newspaper, Internet, television?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 468: Social media.

THE COURT: Pardon?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 468: On social media.

THE COURT: Social media. Social media news sites --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 468: Yeah.

THE COURT: -- or amongst people you knew.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 468: News.

THE COURT: Okay. So like a Channel 3 social media site or a Channel 8 site or something like that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 468: Channel 8.

THE COURT: Okay. Great. Thank you.

MR. HELMICK: Okay. Thank you. Okay. So this is my new whiteboard here. I'm going to write stuff on here, maybe write some of your answers on here as well.

You didn't think we were going to be talking about sushi, did you?

So I want to talk with you about sushi for a minute. I want you to pretend that I am the judge of -- we're talking about honesty here. I want to pretend that I'm the judge of a sushi contest and I have to tell you that I absolutely hate sushi. I can't do it. I can't do the fish taste. It's not for me. Some people do it.

But I'm selected as the judge for this sushi contest and you got all the famous chefs in the world coming from Japan and they're coming to make this sushi and I'm picked as the judge for this sushi contest. Do you think that I have a duty to the contestants who work so hard to let them know that I just -- I don't like sushi? You think I have a duty? Can I see your hands, please?

Okay. Thank you. So I'm going to try to visualize all that and talk to everybody who raised their hands.

Shayra, right? Did I say that right?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 452: Shayra.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 463: Yep.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 463: Yeah.

1	MR. HELMICK: Does anybody disagree with that?
2	Anybody disagree with that?
3	Thank you, Ms. Robinson.
4	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 463: Uh-huh.
5	MR. HELMICK: Can each one of you promise to be as
6	honest as you can with me and my client Mr. Harlan, and the
7	Prosecutor and everybody in this courtroom? Can you promise to
8	be as honest as you can with us in this case? You think that's fair?
9	Okay. Thank you.
10	Okay. So let's talk about I want to talk about guns for a
11	moment. I'm just going to erase this.
12	Who here is a gun owner? May I see your hand, please?
13	Okay. I'll come over to a few of you here.
14	Okay. Let's start with Laura Leon, right?
15	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 512: Yes.
16	MR. HELMICK: Okay.
17	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 512: 512.
18	MR. HELMICK: 512. Thank you, Ms. Leon.
19	Well first of all, what type of gun do you own?
20	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 512: I have a Smith &
21	Wesson M&P Shield .9 millimeter.
22	MR. HELMICK: Why? Why do you own a gun?
23	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 512: For home security,
24	for personal security. Because it's my constitutional right to do so.
25	MR. HELMICK: Sure.

1	MR. HELMICK: So more for as a hobby too at the same
2	time, right?
3	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 378: Yes. I was raised
4	with guns.
5	MR. HELMICK: That's what you were saying, right?
6	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 378: Yes.
7	MR. HELMICK: Where are you from?
8	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 378: Guatemala.
9	MR. HELMICK: Guatemala, okay. And guns are kind of
10	prevalent in Guatemala, in the streets and
11	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 378: Yeah, anyone can
12	own guns over there.
13	MR. HELMICK: What's that?
14	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 378: Anyone can own
15	guns over there.
16	MR. HELMICK: So they're kind of all over the streets and
17	stuff?
18	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 378: Yeah.
19	MR. HELMICK: Yeah, okay.
20	Anybody here have some negative feelings about guns? I
21	hate them, I don't want to be around them. We know Mr. Meng
22	talked about that, right? Does anybody share the same feelings as
23	Mr. Meng in regard to the guns?
24	Okay. We got may I call you Jessica?
25	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 468: Sure.

1	MR. HELMICK: Thank you.
2	Can you pass the microphone to Jessica?
3	Thanks, Luis.
4	What are you what's your concern?
5	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 468: I just don't like
6	guns.
7	MR. HELMICK: You just don't like them, right?
8	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 468: Yeah.
9	MR. HELMICK: You don't
10	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 468: I don't want to be
11	around them, don't want to look at them.
12	MR. HELMICK: Would you have any negative feelings
13	because there's guns involved in this case? Would you have any
14	negative feelings about that?
15	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 468: Possibly. I'm not
16	sure.
17	MR. HELMICK: But it is possible.
18	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 468: Yeah.
19	MR. HELMICK: Who else has some negative feelings
20	about guns?
21	I don't know how to say your last name, but Sydney,
22	right
23	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 418: Yeah, Gebhart.
24	MR. HELMICK: is your first name. Gebhart, okay.
25	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 418: I'm the same. I

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

that?

to have a gun or to use guns in general? Do you disagree with

illegal. People -- regular people cannot own a gun. So as far as

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

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

MR. HELMICK: Irrespons --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 432: You know, if [indiscernible], if it's used to commit a crime, if you don't have the license, whatever condition whether it is illegal or irresponsible, I would feel -- I would take that as a [indiscernible], you know, something that will make me feel very uncomfortable.

MR. HELMICK: Yeah. But will that --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 432: I believe in guns.

MR. HELMICK: Sure.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 432: I like guns, I like going shooting [indiscernible] you know, guns. I like shotguns and -- it's not that I don't like them or disapprove them --

MR. HELMICK: Yeah.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 432: -- or whatever. But use them irresponsible --

MR. HELMICK: Well --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 432: -- commit a crime while owning or carrying a gun that is -- was stolen or something like that, you know, that would make me feel very, very --

MR. HELMICK: Right.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 432: -- bad.

MR. HELMICK: I think that'd make everybody in here feel bad, right? Anybody -- everybody agree with Juan, if somebody is using a gun irresponsibly, right?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 432: And that's all I have.

On the other hand, I'm okay with guns. I don't own one because

my wife, we're divorced, wouldn't buy a gun.

MR. HELMICK: Yeah, you don't want to do that.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 432: No. But I feel that I -- you know, irresponsible in general. What is irresponsible with guns or, you know, [indiscernible] or whatever --

MR. HELMICK: Yeah.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 432: It makes me feel a little uncomfortable.

MR. HELMICK: Well, you know, Judith talked about her not being able to be fair on this jury possibly because there was a gun involved. Do you agree with Judith or do you disagree with her?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 432: I will be fair, but I can be influenced badly if the gun had been used irresponsibly or, you know.

MR. HELMICK: That's going to negatively affect you.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 432: That would be a negative, you know? It will -- I don't know how I'm going to react to that. I know how I'm going to react.

MR. HELMICK: Sure.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 432: I know I -- I know me, you know?

MR. HELMICK: Are you still going to listen to all the evidence or do you still going to require the Prosecution to prove the case beyond a reasonable doubt? Or when you hear those

facts, are you going to say you know what, I just don't know. I mean, I'm already kind of -- I've already kind of answered it, like kind of like Luis said earlier.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 432: Exactly.

MR. HELMICK: You have already kind of answered it if you see some facts like that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 432: Yes, I -- I'm not sure but I will feel inclined to that. I -- knowing me [indiscernible], I think that will tip the balance, you know, on the [indiscernible] --

MR. HELMICK: Okay.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 432: -- [indiscernible]

I'm just being honest --

MR. HELMICK: Please, that's what -- I mean, listen, isn't that the duty of this, right? Everybody has their different opinion --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 432: [Indiscernible].

MR. HELMICK: -- and everybody's walked this earth in different shoes, right?

All right. Okay. Thank you, Juan.

All right. I want to talk about something that I know probably all of you guys have heard about.

Okay. Anybody here ever heard about or read about or watched a movie or anything in regard to somebody being wrongfully charged or wrongfully convicted? Can I see your hands, please?

Looks like we got a lot of people. All right. Hold those up

for me again real quickly just so I can see if I can visualize it. Okay.

All right. Let me talk to a few people here. Mr. Barrett, right? Can I call you Brett?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 398: Sure.

MR. HELMICK: Okay, Brett. Have you heard of a scenario like that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 398: I've heard of a few.

MR. HELMICK: Okay. Do you know the facts that you could share about one in particular?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 398: I can't think of one in particular, but I do know that kind of the recurring facts are that oftentimes witnesses memories -- they can come up with phantom memories and belief based on emotion more than what they actually remember about particular crimes and get things wrong -- honestly wrong.

MR. HELMICK: So okay -- so one thing you said was maybe a bad memory, right, could be a factor?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 398: Bad memory or influenced memory in some way by the biases and the trauma of the situation. Or by being coerced.

MR. HELMICK: Coerced, yeah. Thank you. Nick said something about that, right?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 398: Yeah.

MR. HELMICK: Okay. When you hear about those things, I mean, how does that make you feel?

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

accounts of that happening; yes, sir.

MR. HELMICK: How does that make you feel?

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

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

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

MR. PESCI: Judge, can we approach?

THE COURT: Yeah.

[Bench conference transcribed as follows.]

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

MR. HELMICK: It's not going to the facts of the case at all.

I'm talking about -- this is normal voir dire done at countless trials

that we have a duty to exercise our peremptive challenges appropriately. We have a ethical duty to do that in any case like this and cause -- or talking --

THE COURT: I don't know that I've ever had anybody question the jury from the standpoint of wrongful convictions as the basis for questioning them about, you know, evidence in a case. You need to be talking about --

MR. HELMICK: Well --

THE COURT: -- what constitutes evidence and talking about witness testimony and what affects witness's --

MR. HELMICK: Sure.

THE COURT: -- credibility and all that. But --

MR. HELMICK: [Indiscernible] before if I'm going to say --

THE COURT: Wrongful convictions?

MR. HELMICK: No, I said so what are some of the reasons why and then I want to say again, can we promise to hold everybody accountable in this case, so it doesn't -- so something like that doesn't happen.

MR. PESCI: So we're going to give them scenarios --

THE COURT: He's kind of started with this kind of telling them this idea that there's a wrongful conviction and, you know --

MR. HELMICK: We can't talk about those -- all those incidents before the -- whether they're --

THE COURT: But the problem is that starts talking about other cases, right? And you're starting to say, okay, you've heard

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

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

MR. HELMICK: Yeah.

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

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

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

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

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

MR. HELMICK: Sure.

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

Let me change this for a second here.

So you're going to have a lot of witnesses come in here and testify about an event that happened a year ago. What are some things that you think can affect the witness's ability to, you know, recall events? Does anybody here that -- has anybody heard a witness testimony? Anybody read about that, witness testimony, and things like that?

Can I see your hands if you have?

Okay. I haven't talked to you yet. I don't know how to say your last name, but I know your first name's Gordon, right?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 460: Correct.

MR. YAMPOLSKY: Gordon, okay.

Can we get the microphone to Gordon, please?

What do you think, what can -- could affect he witness's ability to testify as to what really took place?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 460: It could have been a distraction, it could have been something where something else --MR. HELMICK: Okay.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 460: A vague memory, something --

MR. HELMICK: Distraction is one, okay. And you said -- you actually said two, you said memory; that can affect it, right?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 460: Uh-huh.

MR. HELMICK: Okay. Gordon, Thank you very much.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 460: You're welcome.

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

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

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

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

1	1 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUME	ER 452: Uh-huh.
2	2 MR. HELMICK: You know, wi	nat are some reasons that
3	3 kids do stupid stuff?	
4	4 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUME	ER 452: I think fear to cover
5	5 up certain stuff.	
6	6 MR. HELMICK: Fear.	
7	7 All right. Oh, I'm sorry. Wha	t's your badge number
8	8 again?	
9	9 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUME	ER 452: 452.
10	0 MR. HELMICK: Ms. Estrada, i	ight?
11	1 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMB	ER 452: Esparza.
12	2 MR. HELMICK: Esparza.	
13	Okay. Fear. And then you els	se had raised their hand?
14	4 Yeah, Gordon, what do you tl	nink?
15	5 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMB	ER 460: A lot of them will do
16	6 it because they don't know what the co	nsequences are.
17	7 MR. HELMICK: And why is th	at?
18	8 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMB	ER 460: They're young.
19	9 MR. HELMICK: Yeah. Okay.	So they're just not mature.
20	O Anybody else have anything	to add to this?
21	Yeah, Juan? Let's get you the	e microphone.
22	Okay. Go ahead. Pass that, J	essica, thank you.
23	3 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMB	ER 432: Just influence from
24	4 others.	
25	5 MR. HELMICK: Right, like the	peer pressure. Is that what

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

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

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 378: I mean, same thing

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

MR. HELMICK: Okay.

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

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

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

MR. HELMICK: Yeah.

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

MR. HELMICK: So it's not fair.

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

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

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

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

MR. HELMICK: Okay.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 425: So.

MR. HELMICK: Yeah, thank you very much.

Okay. Leonard, go ahead.

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

MR. HELMICK: Yeah.

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

MR. HELMICK: Yeah.

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

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

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

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

everyone's responsible for their actions, but I --

MR. HELMICK: Okay.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 468: -- also heard the saying guilty by association.

MR. HELMICK: Anybody else heard that saying? Do you agree with that?

Sorry, go ahead, Jessica.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 468: No, that's it.

MR. HELMICK: Yeah, that -- okay. All right. So I mean, I think that's kind of what Leonard was saying, right? I mean, isn't that you were saying, the kids should have told the brother hey, put that pie down man --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 426: Right.

MR. HELMICK: -- right? Or mom's going to get us, right? PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 426: Right.

MR. HELMICK: Yeah. Okay. Thank you very much.

Who else? Anybody disagree though with that guilt by association? I saw -- Shayra, you were shaking your head and Ms. Powell.

Yeah, let's go ahead and pass it down here.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 518: I disagree with guilt by association because in the instance with the pie, it could be two toddlers, one is older, one is younger. The younger one may not even know what they're doing is wrong.

And this case is completely different because these two

are old enough to know right.

MR. HELMICK: Okay. Now you said a couple things there. And I'll come back to Leonard in regard to one of them. But do you feel that there's guilt by association simply based off of age? Is that what you mean?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 518: No, because it's still individual.

MR. HELMICK: So kind of what Luis was saying? PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 518: Uh-huh.

MR. HELMICK: You would hold each person in this trial, each person, accountable for the actions that they did.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 518: Yes.

MR. HELMICK: Okay. Anybody agree with the guilt by association or anybody agree with Terry's -- I guess -- I mean, everybody has their own opinion on this stuff. Leonard, you had a little bit different of an opinion. She had mentioned something about the toddlers. Is your position still the same if it was toddlers and they didn't -- they weren't really able to think about it?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 518: These were twins -- MR. HELMICK: Yeah.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 518: -- and they were all over ten years old so --

MR. HELMICK: Okay.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 518: -- you can build all kinds of stuff --

8

10 11

12 13

15

14

16 17

18 19

20

2122

23

2425

MR. HELMICK: Well it could go forever, right?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 518: Exactly.

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

All right. Thank you.

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

Can I see your hands, please?

Okay, good. Thank you very much.

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

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

What do you think, Henrry?

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

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

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

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

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

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

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 505: Yes.

MR. HELMICK: Do you understand that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 505: Yes.

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

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 505: Yes.

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

here, right? Do you understand that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 505: Yes.

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

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

MR. HELMICK: Yeah. Okay.

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

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

MR. HELMICK: Sure.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 505: -- a particular charge?

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

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 505: Uh-huh.

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

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

MR. HELMICK: Uh-huh.

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

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

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

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

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

MR. HELMICK: Okay.

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

MR. HELMICK: I've never seen it.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 505: It was rough.

MR. HELMICK: Okay.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 505: But I think times have somewhat changed and science now is able to provide, you know, concrete evidence and evidence that didn't exist. So it's not impossible but it's tougher now to get a wrongful conviction.

MR. HELMICK: Okay. I hear you. I mean, you laid that out pretty well. Thank you, Henrry for that.

Gordon --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 460: Uh-huh.

MR. HELMICK: -- because I saw you shaking your head.

Can we get it down to Gordon here, please?

Gordon, what do you think about what Henrry was saying?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 460: Well I agree. You know, they're here for a reason. So whatever that is, these two were the ones that were actually -- you know, I guess you could say the evidence proved that they -- we have enough evidence to go to court. Something that probably happened.

MR. HELMICK: Something that probably happened.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 460: Right.

MR. HELMICK: Did you feel that they -- I guess what you're saying then, when you walked in here you felt they had done something wrong in order to even be here. Is that what went

through your head?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 460: Yes.

MR. HELMICK: Okay. When we talked about the presumption of innocence just now, are you able to give them that --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 460: Yes.

MR. HELMICK: -- presumption of innocence, even though you had said that earlier?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 460: Yes.

MR. HELMICK: Okay. So I guess there's a bit of a conflict in what you had said just a moment ago in a presumption of innocence. Do you understand that that may look like a conflict?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 460: It does. You know, it's just like --

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Can you come over to the -PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 460: -- prejudging is
what you're saying.

MR. HELMICK: Yeah.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 460: But they're here for a reason. That's why you just said so looking at it, I think weighing out the evidence and hearing how everything comes through, I think yeah, I can sit there and make a very good judgment.

MR. HELMICK: Okay. Good. Yeah. I mean, it's hard for us to sit here because we haven't seen a piece of evidence, heard from one witness, nothing, right? We're just talking hypothetical

stuff, right? Yeah.

All right. Thank you, Gordon.

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

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

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

Thank you, Gordon.

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

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

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

MR. HELMICK: Okay.

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

see all the evidence and then, you know, talk with the other jurors to make a conclusion.

MR. HELMICK: Okay. So let me just hone in on something you said there. You would talk with the other jurors. Would the other jurors -- can they influence you in any way or would -- if you had made up your mind, would you be kind of stuck in your shoes there?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 504: I wouldn't have my mind made up -- if I did have my mind made up, I would still have to validate what I was thinking by going through the evidence with the other jurors --

MR. HELMICK: Yeah.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 504: -- in case I missed something. So I would still be open, you know, to other people's opinions.

MR. HELMICK: Sure. Right. Maybe they saw something differently, right?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 504: Yeah.

MR. HELMICK: Yeah. Okay. All right. Thank you very much, Ronald.

And we had -- Mindy, let me come over to you and then Nick, I'll get you in a second. Thank you very much.

What was your badge number again?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 504: Hmm?

MR. HELMICK: Badge number real quick.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 504: 504.

MR. HELMICK: 504, okay.

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

MR. HELMICK: Blank slate, okay.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 429: Okay.

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

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

Okay. What do you think?

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

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

MR. HELMICK: Oh, that's right.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 468: -- a year ago.

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

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 468: So it kind of just -- MR. HELMICK: Yeah.

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

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

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

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

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

MR. HELMICK: Sure.

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

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

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

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

MR. HELMICK: Sure.

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

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

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

MR. HELMICK: Yeah.

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

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

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

MR. HELMICK: Yeah.

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

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

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

MR. HELMICK: Impossible for you.

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

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

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 474: Certainly.

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

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

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

wants to hear him testify?

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

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

You want to, right?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 505: Yes, I want to.

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

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

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

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

MR. HELMICK: Okay. You would prefer it.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 505: Yes.

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

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 505: No, the evidence

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

MR. HELMICK: Shayra. Shayra. Okay. Accountability.
Okay. And what did you say again, Ms. Huston, I'm I
couldn't remember.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 506: The risk of not
testifying?
MR. HELMICK: Yeah.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 506: That they don't
have the chance to tell their side of the story; that leaves some
doubt as to why they didn't testify.
MR. HELMICK: Tell
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 506: What their motives
were.
MR. HELMICK: their story, okay?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 506: What do they have
to hide by
MR. HELMICK: Oh, that's a good one, right?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 506: not telling it.
MR. HELMICK: If they're innocent then why the heck
why won't they get up here, right? You know?
Okay. So I mean we talked about two different sides of
this. Can anybody here see the dilemma that there's two sides to
this. Is there a dilemma?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 506: Yes, there's always
two sides.

MR. HELMICK: Yeah. Fred, I see you nodding your head.

Let's get over to Fred.

Ms. Huston, thank you.

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

There's that influence.

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

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

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

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 398: Possibly.

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

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 398: Of course.

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

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

minute. Big decisions. Big decisions in life, right? What are some

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

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

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

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

Brett, right here. Thank you.

What are some things you do?

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

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

Okay. Yeah? What else? Anybody else?

Markletter, thank you.

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

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

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

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

Thank you very much.

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

Gabriel, come on.

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

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

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

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

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

MR. HELMICK: You let them eat the other candy, right?

22

23

24

25

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 466: Yeah.

MR. HELMICK: Okay. I mean, what's another word here? because they have a what? A doubt as to the what, safety, of the Snickers bars, right? Everybody understand that?

Okay. Would you consider that doubt to be reasonable?

THE COURT: Ah, we're not going to go there.

MR. HELMICK: Okay.

THE COURT: There is a very specific definition of reasonable doubt that you'll get at the conclusion of the case. So we don't discuss that or quantify it in any fashion.

MR. HELMICK: I wasn't trying to go further on that.

THE COURT: I know.

MR. HELMICK: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I always jump in anyway. It's not a you thing. Don't worry.

MR. HELMICK: All right.

Okay. Let's see what else we have here, hold on.

All right. So anybody here, let me see your hands, please, ever been blamed for something and think back when you were kids if you had siblings or anything like that -- blamed for something they didn't do?

Okay. All right. Let's go to Sydney here and then we'll go over to some other people.

Can you give us an example of that, Sydney? What's your badge number please?

friends and I were arguing about something that -- about like an

argument, debate that was happening between us and they'd think that like in that particular case -- I forgot what it was about really but they think I was the one who did it but like clearly I was just -- you know, just trying to be in a debate with them.

MR. HELMICK: Uh-huh.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 424: But for some reason they all pointed towards me being like the culprit of this thing that I know I didn't do, and nobody would listen to me and it -- that kind of feeling just sucked overall.

MR. HELMICK: Okay. So it made you -- it sucked.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 424: Yeah.

MR. HELMICK: Yeah. And Sydney said she -- what was the word that you used, I'm sorry? How did that make you feel? Sydney? Bad?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 418: Yeah, bad.

MR. HELMICK: Okay. Sucked, it was bad.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 424: Yeah.

MR. HELMICK: Yeah. Thank you for sharing.

Anybody else, right? I mean, I think -- Henrry, did you raise your hand on that one too?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 505: Yes. But I'd rather not comment on that.

MR. HELMICK: That's all right. That's okay.

Okay. Let me ask you this then. Hold on. This is kind of going back to what I guess Mr. Yampolsky was talking about with

24

25

Sarah in regards to the cookies. So you have two people that say that they felt bad, that they felt it sucked being blamed for something they didn't do. I mean, what are some things that -- let me ask you this, Gilbert, what are some things that those people should have done who were accusing you of this?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 424: They should have listened to my side of the story because they just write it off.

MR. HELMICK: Yeah. So I mean, listen to both sides of the story, right?

Okay. What else? What else, Sydney.

Thank you, Gilbert.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 418: My siblings could have owned up to their own actions.

MR. HELMICK: Okay.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 418: Does that make sense?

MR. HELMICK: So the other people that did it should have owned up to their own actions?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 418: Yeah.

MR. HELMICK: That kind of goes back to what we were saying in regard to taking responsibility, right?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 418: Uh-huh.

MR. HELMICK: Yeah. Okay. Sarah, I forgot what you -- thank you, Sydney.

What did you say in regard to the cookies? I mean, you

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

MR. HELMICK: Now you understand that based off of what we have talked about here today that everybody has their own opinion, right?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 505: Yes.

MR. HELMICK: And sometimes I think that -- somebody over here said that they may feel that they could be swayed but they'll still have their own opinion, right?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 505: Correct.

MR. HELMICK: Okay. So what's -- I mean, what's one of the reasons that that may happen and a jury of 12 -- or eight people in your case. What are some of the reasons that people might be swayed or convinced otherwise of their opinion?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 505: Sometimes you can misinterpret facts as they're presented to you. You can come up with your own story as to what happened, rather than sticking to the facts. So go off on a tangent based on your imagination.

MR. HELMICK: Uh-huh. Yeah. And when you're in a room with other people, maybe there's peer pressure? Is that possible, you think?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 505: Yeah, that's possible. Also --

MR. HELMICK: That happen --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 505: -- being in a room with those other people for a very long time --

MR. HELMICK: Yeah.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 505: -- it will start to wear you down as well.

MR. HELMICK: Okay. And can you imagine that that can happen in a scenario like that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 505: Yes.

MR. HELMICK: Yeah. Okay. So you have had a firsthand experience with that then.

Is anybody here -- I mean, does anybody here, please honest with yourselves, especially for a case like this. Does anybody here feel if they are back there in that deliberation room -- [beeping]. Am I out of time, Gordon?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 460: [Indiscernible].

MR. HELMICK: All right. Just making sure.

Does anybody here feel if they're back there in that deliberation room that they have the personality that you know what, enough people are saying this and I'm just going to go with the crowd. I'm just going to be a palm tree. If enough wind blows on me, then I'm going to sway with the others. Does anybody here feel that you know what, I'm a palm tree? And it's okay if you are. Anybody feel that way? Let me see your hands if you do. If enough wind is blown on you that you may sway.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 505: Can I comment on that?

MR. HELMICK: Yeah, go ahead.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 505: When people

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

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

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 505: Yes.

MR. HELMICK: Okay.

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

MR. HELMICK: Uh-huh.

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

MR. HELMICK: Okay. So --

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

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

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 505: Yes.

MR. HELMICK: Okay. Okay, good.

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

Henrry, if you could just pass it down there.

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

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

MR. HELMICK: Yeah, thanks for sharing that.

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

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

23

24

25

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

All right. Thank you, Nick.

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

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 460: Individuality.

MR. HELMICK: Yeah, there it is.

Gordon said -- can we give Gordon the microphone?

We just got to get that recorded, Gordon.

What did you say again?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 460: Individuality.

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

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

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 460: Yes.

MR. HELMICK: Right.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 460: Yeah.

MR. HELMICK: Okay. Well let's see a show of hands then. I mean, who here feels that they can be a Redwood in this case, no matter how hard the winds may blow in the back of that jury room? Let me see your hands if you feel that you can be a Redwood.

Uh-oh, we don't have all the hands up. Sydney, what do you think?

Let's give Sydney the microphone. Thank you, Gordon.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 418: I feel like I would be -- I would lean towards more of a palm tree just because I don't want to have a different opinion than everybody else. I don't want to stand out from everybody else. I want to kind of blend in, if that makes sense.

MR. HELMICK: Sure. No, I appreciate you sharing that. That's what I'm looking for. And there's nothing wrong with that, right? There's wrong with being a palm tree or a redwood. This is just a figure of speech that I'm talking about --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 418: Yeah.

MR. HELMICK: -- right?

Okay. Thank you very much.

Sylvia?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 463: So with being like a palm tree, it's not more like oh, I want to go with the crowd.

MR. HELMICK: Yeah.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 463: It's kind of like if you can sway me with the evidence --

MR. HELMICK: Oh, okay.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 463: -- then I would possibly become a palm tree, but I'm going to be a redwood when it comes to being fair.

MR. HELMICK: Yeah, so that's -- I mean, that's a good analogy but what I'm going for is swayed with the crowd --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 463: Yeah.

MR. HELMICK: -- right? So you would be a redwood -- PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 463: Yeah.

MR. HELMICK: -- in that scenario.

Okay. All right. So there were some people that didn't raise their hand though.

Gilbert, did you raise your hand?

Okay. Let's give it to Gilbert. Thank you, Sylvia.

What do you think, are you kind of like in Sydney's shoes?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 424: I'm more of being palm tree out of the fact that it's -- I think it's best to keep an open mind and say yeah, you could be a redwood in the sense that you could have your opinion of staying strong but in the -- but you could also be like a palm tree in the fact that you can consider what other people think about the same thing because what someone else said before, you know, points could be, you know, there are points that could be brought up about the --

MR. HELMICK: Henrry.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 424: Yeah, Henrry.

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

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

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 424: Yes.

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

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 424: Yeah.

MR. HELMICK: Yeah. Okay.

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

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 468: No, I did not.

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

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

Thank you very much.

What do you think?

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

MR. HELMICK: Okay.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 507: Yes, because I have friends and family who are in a -- the police and I know they have good character and also it's their job and their civil duty to do the right thing. And murder is not a small charge, it's some -- it's a very serious charge and I think most or all police officer will take that murder charge very seriously and not just throw a charge out there or make things up.

MR. HELMICK: So are you saying -- are you saying -- and maybe I'm taking this the wrong way but are you saying that every murder charge that comes about is legit?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 507: I feel like there is evidence to it, yes.

MR. HELMICK: Okay. And you feel that -- do you feel that the cops are immune to making mistakes?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 507: No, obviously not. They are human.

MR. HELMICK: Okay. That's all I'm asking.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 507: And my name is Marklester, by the way.

MR. HELMICK: Marklester.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 507: Yeah.

MR. HELMICK: I've been saying wrong, huh?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 507: Yep.

MR. HELMICK: I apologize. Thank you.

Who else -- I mean, who disagrees with Marklester?

Nobody disagrees with Marklester?

Okay. Yeah, Ms. Leon. Thank you.

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

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

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

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

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 512: Yes.

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

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

25

just want to ask you, based off of what you said, sir, do you feel that you're going to give more weight to the Prosecution because of that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 507: Yes.

MR. HELMICK: Okay. Thank you very much.

Let's go ahead and give it over to Mr. Donald Meng, please.

Now, you had talked about some scenarios in your life that sounded absolutely horrifying and I understand your position on guns and all that -- and all those things. So you had said that this is going to affect your ability to fair. Do you still feel that --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 390: I said it could.

MR. HELMICK: Could. Could affect your ability to be fair?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 390: It could, yeah.

MR. HELMICK: Yeah.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 390: That's honest -- yeah.

MR. HELMICK: No, I mean, that's what we're looking for, right? Yeah.

Are you going to start off looking at this scenario on the Prosecution's side or are you going to be kind of neutral?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUMBER 390: You're going to have to repeat that.

MR. HELMICK: Yeah. I mean, are you going to start off looking at the Defendants in this case negatively? Are you going to

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

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

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

24

25

to Lambert.

And then you all both are challenging Williams. What's your position as to Williams?

MR. YAMPOLSKY: Yes.

MR. PESCI: Judge, I oppose the challenge for cause. I think that's she indicated that she can lean one way. We've talked about the palm trees and redwood, but I don't think that she says that she can't be fair.

MR. YAMPOLSKY: She --

MR. HELMICK: Hold on, hold --

MR. YAMPOLSKY: She --

MR. HELMICK: -- on, let him --

THE COURT: Calm down.

MR. YAMPOLSKY: All right. Sorry. Sorry.

THE COURT: Okay. And they both have challenged Sulstrom. What's your position on Sulstrom?

MR. PESCI: I object again, to him being released.

THE COURT: Okay. I think that he's even a stronger position to stay. He's talked about how he would listen to police officers -- he was leaning towards police officers, but I asked him specifically if we did not prove the case could you come back not guilty and he said yes, he could.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. YAMPOLSKY: And I asked him black and white --

THE COURT: Hold on, hold on.

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

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

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

 THE COURT: Thank you.

THE MARSHAL: Thank you.

[End of bench conference.]

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

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

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

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

THE MARSHAL: 16B.

THE COURT: 16B?

THE MARSHAL: In front of 16B.

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

All right, guys, thank you very much.

[Outside the presence of the prospective jury]

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

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

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

24

25

Honor.

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

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

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

MR. YAMPOLSKY: And I agree with those challenges.

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

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

MR. HELMICK: Correct.

THE COURT: Okay. All right.

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

THE COURT: You join in on Meng and Pedronan?

MR. YAMPOLSKY: Yes.

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

Sosa challenge or no?

MR. HELMICK: No, not at this time.

THE COURT: Okay. So essentially the Defense has challenged six people. And the State doesn't agree with any of them, correct?

MR. PESCI: The State agrees with Gutierrez-Sosa.

THE COURT: With Gutierrez-Sosa. Okay. And I'm sorry, Ryan, you disagreed with that one or agreed?

MR. HELMICK: I disagreed.

MR. YAMPOLSKY: No, he --

THE COURT: Disagreed with that one. So what's your disagreement on Mr. Gutierrez-Sosa?

MR. HELMICK: I'm trying to look at my notes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. HELMICK: You want to maybe come back to this one.

THE COURT: Okay. So what's the -- and I know you started to talk about it, but I'll give you more of an opportunity, Giancarlo. As to the three in common, Williams, Contreras, Sulstrom?

MR. PESCI: Williams, Contreras, and Sulstrom. Judge, I think that they've indicated, you know, building on this redwood versus palm trees concept and I think that one juror, in particular said it really, really well. She talked about how, you know, you could be a redwood on being fair but be a palm tree based on the evidence. That you're willing to listen and be swayed by the

evidence but you're not going to be unfair.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

MR. YAMPOLSKY: Well I'm speculating.

THE COURT: Okay.

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

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

21

22

23

24

25

for cause.

And Mr. Contreras, he did go back and forth, but I mean, his cousin was killed four years ago, and he said in the beginning -- and I forget exactly what because I questioned him this morning that he would --

THE COURT: You questioned him this afternoon. It was an hour and a half ago.

MR. YAMPOLSKY: It was right after him and before him, that was like yesterday.

THE COURT: No.

MR. YAMPOLSKY: Anyway, I'm remembering --

THE COURT: You are correct in your chronology --

MR. YAMPOLSKY: All right.

THE COURT: -- but it was an hour and --

MR. YAMPOLSKY: All right.

THE COURT: -- a half ago. Hold on. The young lady --

MR. YAMPOLSKY: Look --

THE COURT: -- Ms. Alvarez would like to tell you something.

MR. YAMPOLSKY: Excuse me.

[Colloquy between Counsel]

MR. YAMPOLSKY: I believe -- and I don't know who -- maybe Mr. Helmick because he has better questions than me, unfortunately. But I think he said to him -- and if it's not him, I apologize. Should the Defense be scared about you being on the

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

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

Do I have anyone else I can rail against?

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

MR. PESCI: I'm sure you do.

THE COURT: -- three for this moment.

MR. YAMPOLSKY: Okay.

THE COURT: Mr. Helmick?

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

THE COURT: Yeah, Williams, Contreras, Sulstrom.

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

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

THE COURT: I know.

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

THE COURT: Okay.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

MR. HELMICK: Yes, I did.

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

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

talking to him, but I mean --

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

MR. HELMICK: Oh the construction guy.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

MR. PESCI: Adamant.

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

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

THE COURT: Right.

MR. PESCI: Because he --

THE COURT: I know.

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

THE COURT: Right.

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

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

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

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

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

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

MR. PESCI: Then it's inappropriate --

THE COURT: Right?

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

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

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

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

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

THE COURT: For Mr. Pedronan?

MR. PESCI: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. All right.

MR. PESCI: And so that's my concern.

THE COURT: Okay. What about Mr. Meng?

MR. PESCI: Mr. Meng, it's a different analysis because he's the victim of armed robberies when he's working at Albertsons four times.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. PESCI: I asked him specifically if he could set that aside, if he could make the determination as to his own experience and he said yes. Of course he has emotional experiences or feelings based on that but he said he would make his determination based on the facts of this case and so I don't think it's appropriate for him to be released because he said he could be fair.

In fact I wrote down -- he said, I'm a very fair person and he said that he didn't believe that that was going to affect his ability to be fair.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Mr. Helmick.

MR. HELMICK: Thank you. Are we talking about Mr.

Meng?

THE COURT: Yeah. Sure.

MR. HELMICK: Okay. So in regards to Mr. Meng I mean, I think that -- I recognize what Mr. Pesci said in regards to can he be fair but there were a lot of things that he said prior to that after he was so to speak, rehabilitated, even though some of those

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

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

THE COURT: And then Mr. Pedronan?

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

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

MR. HELMICK: Yeah.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

22

23

24

25

the board. One thing he did say which troubled me and should really trouble you is that either they're both innocent or they're both guilty. So what that says, he's not going to consider all the evidence fairly and he's going to decide one way or another. So I think based on that --

THE COURT: So you're in agreement.

MR. YAMPOLSKY: What?

THE COURT: You're in agreement.

MR. YAMPOLSKY: Yeah, I'm in agreement.

THE COURT: Okay. All right.

MR. YAMPOLSKY: I hate to say it.

THE COURT: Mr. Helmick.

MR. HELMICK: I'm in agreement with Jaska too.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. PESCI: Thank you.

THE COURT: So we will excuse Jaska as well then. Thank you. So that's --

MR. PESCI: Sorry, I forget that earlier.

THE COURT: -- seven total.

So when we get back tomorrow morning, we'll let those folks go. We have six right now. So before we start with those six, I'm going to have Jury Services send us more people and then I'll run through my stuff with them first and then we'll fill the seven empty seats and then we'll move forward.

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

to do for witnesses, timing wise?
THE COURT: I mean, if you want we can just plan on
getting through openings tomorrow
MR. PESCI: Okay.
THE COURT: and then start with witnesses Wednesday
morning.
MR. PESCI: That's fine.
THE COURT: I'm
MR. YAMPOLSKY: That's fine.
THE COURT: Because I'm thinking we probably will spend
maybe a couple hours finishing up jury selection in the morning,
take a later lunch break and then it may be that we're starting at
2:00 after lunch instead of earlier. So that may mean we get done a
little early but I'm fine with that.
MR. PESCI: And Wednesday's an early day, 9:00 day.
THE COURT: Wednesday is 9:00 a.m.
MR. PESCI: So we'll anticipate getting witnesses lined up
for Wednesday, 9:00 a.m.
THE COURT: Yeah.
MR. PESCI: Okay. Thank you, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay. Good? Okay.
MR. HELMICK: Okay.
THE COURT: And just so you know hold on one second.
Sorry.
My brief ability to review all this has nothing about any

1	juvenile record. It's everything related to this case.
2	MR. PESCI: Okay.
3	THE COURT: It's just incident reports, arrest reports, and
4	a couple of handwritten voluntary statements from some people. I
5	don't know
6	MR. PESCI: I don't know, I haven't seen it.
7	THE COURT: I don't know what all's in discovery but
8	there are a variety of incident reports and you know, the main
9	arrest report, the incident reports, and then as I said a couple of
10	voluntary statements. Patrick Stauffenberg.
11	MR. PESCI: He's in this case.
12	THE COURT: Jacy Freshour.
13	MR. PESCI: Yep, she's in this case.
14	MS. OVERLY: Yes.
15	THE COURT: Angie Knox.
16	MS. OVERLY: Yes.
17	MR. PESCI: In this case.
18	THE COURT: And that's pretty much it.
19	MR. PESCI: Okay.
20	THE COURT: So there isn't any juvenile record
21	information in here. So I don't know if they misunderstood
22	MR. PESCI: Could be and
23	THE COURT: because
24	MR. PESCI: I apologize.

THE COURT: It's okay.

25

1	MR. PESCI: I'll try to follow up.
2	THE COURT: But I'm going to go ahead and copy and
3	disseminate this to both sides just so you have all of it.
4	MR. PESCI: And they should have it anyway from
5	discovery.
6	THE COURT: Okay.
7	MR. PESCI: So your so I can try to make it more clear
8	then. You're saying that the juvenile charges referenced in this,
9	separate and distinct from our case, those records should be
10	reviewed.
11	THE COURT: Yeah, I don't I didn't see anything in here
12	that references Traceo Meadows' juvenile record at all.
13	MR. PESCI: Okay.
14	THE COURT: It's yeah, I mean, you normally you'd
15	get a printout from the Juvenile Court that shows
16	MR. PESCI: All the times they've been charged.
17	THE COURT: Yeah.
18	MR. PESCI: Yeah. I'll follow up. Thank you, Your Honor.
19	[Evening recess at 5:30 p.m.]
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	n Hon
24	Battjiang
25	Brittany Mangelson Independent Transcriber