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LAS VEGAS, CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA, JULY 2615, 2019, 9:06 A.M.

*     *         *             *                 * 

(Outside the presence of the jury.)
THE COURT: ...go ahead and put the instructions --
or do you want to do that -- let's just do the testimony because we've got the jury, then we'll put them on a short break after everybody's done. And then we'll put the instructions on the record.

MS. MOORS: Yeah, whatever the Court's pleasure.
THE COURT: As I say, we're ready to go. Is your --
is your detective here and everything?
MS. MOORS: I believe so.
THE MARSHAL: Yes, he is.
MS. MOORS: Okay. Then, yes, he is.
THE MARSHAL: He's right outside.
THE COURT: All right. Let's do that then. But we are ready to go.
(Jury reconvened at 9:07 a.m.)
THE COURT: Thank you. Please be seated. And the record will reflect that this is the continuation of State of Nevada versus Devohn Marks, Case Number C-337017.

The record will reflect the presence of Mr. Marks with his counsel, the prosecutors are present, as are all officers of the court. And we have all 12 members of the jury, as well as the three alternates.
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C-18-337017-2 | State v. Marks.D | 2019-07-26 | JT - Day 8

Good morning, ladies and gentlemen.
THE JURY: Good morning.
THE COURT: And the State may call your first witness
for your rebuttal case.
MS. MOORS: Thank you, Your Honor. The State will
call Detective Dave Miller.
DAVID MILTER
[having been called as a witness and being first duly sworn, testified as follows:]

THE CLERK: Can you please state your full name,
spelling your first and last name for the record.
THE WITNESS: My name is David Miller, D-a-v-i-d
M-i-l-l-e-r.
THE COURT: You may proceed.
MS. MOORS: Thank you.
DIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MS. MOORS:
Q Good morning, Detective Miller.
A Good morning.
Q I -- I know we had talked previously, when you testified before about a case involving Devohn Marks; is that correct?

A Yes.
Q Now, ultimately, we have discussed this previously, but the defendant testified yesterday and was talking about a JD Reporting, Inc.
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conversation that he had with you on November 15th of 2018. Do you recall having that conversation?

A Yes.
Q Now, when you have a conversation or you're interviewing a witness or a suspect or anyone like that, is that something that's customarily audio recorded?

A Yes.
Q And in this case, was that statement audio recorded?
A Yes, ma'am.
Q And as a result of that being audio recorded, does that ultimately then give us what we would call a transcript of that interview?

A Yes, ma'am.
Q And is that something that happened in this particular case?

A Yes, ma'am.
Q So to be clear, when you were speaking with the defendant, you -- you read him his Miranda; is that right?

A Yes, ma'am.
Q And he indicated that he understood his Miranda, and he agreed to waive it and that he was going to speak with you; is that correct?

A Yes.
Q Now since -- let me ask you this. As a detective, how many voluntary interviews of defendants would you say that JD Reporting, Inc.
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you've conducted?
A Oh, wow. Again, I don't keep -- I mean, hundreds and hundreds, maybe in the thousands.

Q Okay. So quite a few?
A Yes.
Q All right. So just to give you a frame of reference, I'm looking at this statement on page 11, and it ultimately looks like you indicated you were speaking with Mr. Marks about whether or not there were kids in his home; is that correct?

A Yes.
Q And specifically he indicated that the kids came out on the 26 th or the 27 th, if he was not mistaken; is that right?

A Yeah. Somewhere right in there, yeah.
Q Now, did you have a chance when you were speaking with him to also speak with him about his phone number?

A Yes.
Q Did he indicate to you that on this date, so on this November 15th date, he had a new number?

A Yes. One beginning with area code (702).
Q Okay. And fair to say that his prior number had a different area code?

A Correct.
Q Okay. Now, did he indicate to you why he had gotten this new number?

A He said his phone was lost or stolen around the date JD Reporting, Inc.
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of the crime.
Q Okay. Now, specifically, when you talked to him about this phone number, were you ultimately able to -- I know we had talked about this a couple days ago, but you had learned that a particular number that Antwaine Johnson had been contacting -- you saw the frequency of this contact. You learned that that number was linked to Devohn Marks; is that correct?

A Correct.
Q And so ultimately when he told you his old phone number, did he tell you that same number we were discussing?

A He did in this sense: His number was -- the real number is (323) 427-3092. He said -- he seemed to struggle remembering it exactly. He said something like (323) 427 -and he said all the right numbers, 3092, except I think he reversed them or something, to my --

Q Okay. So towards the end, he might have superimposed some numbers?

A Something like that, yes.
Q All right. Now when you were speaking with him, did you also talk to him about where he lived?

A Yes.
Q And did he tell you where he lived?
A He did.
Q Was this an apartment complex on Gowan, specifically
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the Bloom Apartments?
A Yeah, 7075 West Gowan. And he specifically gave his apartment number that matches his DMV, 2053.

Q Okay. So that was -- establishes where he lived. Did you further ask him specifically if he knows anyone in the complex?

A Yes.
Q And was his answer that, "I don't know anybody in my apartment complex. I just moved in there"?

A Yes, his -- I mean, throughout the interview -depends on what point of the interview we're talking about. His -- his answers changed throughout the interview.

Q Okay. So I'm essentially just going through this interview to ask you some further questions. Did he ultimately -- I guess, did you make him aware that he was potentially a suspect in this robbery that occurred at 5:15 a.m. on the 29th of October?

A Yes.
Q And did he tell you that he has a 10:00 p.m. curfew since he's been out of prison, that he can't leave the house until 6:00 a.m., and that he's been working different jobs since he got out of prison?

A That's my recollection.
Q Was he very adamant about this curfew?
A Yes.

Q Did he, in fact, say, "I never miss this curfew. You know, there's no way I could have committed this robbery because it was during the time of that curfew"?

A In so many words. I -- I remember him saying he would have been home at that time because he's always home at that time.

Q Okay. Now, did you then further question him and -and just so you're aware, I'm literally reading from this voluntary statement. "And you're telling me you don't have any friends there at all?" Does that sound like a question you asked?

A Yes.
Q And his answer was, "I don't have any friends in that apartment. I don't even associate with anyone in that apartment or know anybody in those apartments"?

A Yeah. He was very adamant.
Q Okay. Now, furthermore -- I'm still looking at this exact same interview. You questioned him, "So I can't link you to anybody in that apartment complex?" Is that correct?

A Yes.
Q And then his answer was, "You can't link me to anyone in that apartment complex." Is that correct?

A That sounds right.
Q Furthermore, you stated, "You don't even know anyone's name?" Is that correct?

A Correct.
Q And his answer was, "I don't know anyone's name. I don't know nobody in that apartment complex. I go home to my girlfriend and then I leave." Is that correct?

A That sounds correct.
Q Okay. Now we were talking about this old phone number, right. And so he had an old phone number with one area code, and this new number with a (702) area code.

Did he also indicate, ultimately, that, "I changed my number because people had been contacting my family members"? Is that correct?

A Yes, that is correct.
Q And this was when he was sort of talking about this lost phone incident?

A Right.
Q So he essentially indicated to you the reason why he canceled this phone was that he had lost it, and someone had been contacting his family members?

A Correct.
Q Okay. Now, furthermore, when you were discussing when he lost it, did he ultimately say to you, "I'm not going to say I lost it on the 27th. I lost it around the 27th. I didn't realize. I was going to report my phone stolen, but I didn't know if I lost it. I went to the gym. I go to the gym all the time at my apartments. So when I was working out, I JD Reporting, Inc.
was getting ready to leave. I don't know exactly which date it was. I can't -- that's what I'm telling you. I can't tell you exact dates. I don't keep track of dates and all of that stuff. I lost my cell phone. I went home. I told my girlfriend, 'Well, I'm not going to report it stolen because I don't know if it's going to pop up. Maybe I left it in your car.' Because she doesn't get off work until 6:00. Once I realized it was stolen, I reported it stolen. My phone's been reported stolen and I told my people, 'Don't call that number.' They kept calling that number."

Is that a fair representation of his answer to you during this interview?

A That's -- that sounds accurate.
Q Okay. Now any time -- at any time during this interview, did he indicate that on this -- on or around this date that he lost his phone, that on that particular date he had been smoking weed in Antwaine Johnson's car?

A On that specific day?
Q Yes.
A No.
Q Okay. Now, at any time in this interview, did he say, "You know, I don't remember when I lost my phone, but it was for sure the Friday before Halloween"?

A No.
Q Okay. Now at one point, did you ultimately ask
C-18-337017-2 | State v. Marks.D | 2019-07-26 | JT - Day 8
him -- and I'm quoting -- "Oh, how long did you wait to report your phone stolen"?

A That sounds like something, yes.
Q And, ultimately, did he answer, "Because I waited for one day. I waited for my girlfriend to get home"? Does that sound correct?

A That sounds right.
Q Now, as we get further into this interview, ultimately, did you ask him a question indicating, "I think I can link -- I will tell you this much. We can link you to someone that lives in your apartment complex"?

A Correct.
Q Does that sound correct?
And, ultimately, did he further say, "You cannot because I don't associate with anybody that lives in my apartment"?

A That sounds correct.
Q And did you further question him, stating, "So if I -- let's say I had a picture of you talking with someone in your apartment complex more than once," was that a question you would have asked?

A Yes.
Q And did he indicate, "Well, can I see the picture"?
A Yes.
Q And further on in this discussion about the picture,
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did he ultimately state to you, "You have pictures of me. You probably have pictures of me talking to a lot of people I don't associate with"?

A That sounds right.
Q And did you ask him, "Well, one time would be one thing, but more than once"? Does that sound correct?

A Yes.
Q And did he answer, "No one knows me in that apartment complex"?

A Yes.
Q Now, did he go on to say, "I come out of my apartment. I take my trash out. I go back to my apartment. I come out of my apartment. I go to my office. I pay rent. I go back to my apartment. I come out of my apartment. I go to the gym. I've spoken to people. I go back into my apartment, pointblank, period. I don't associate with nobody. I associate with my girlfriend. I associate with my mother"? Would that have been his answer?

A That sounds right.
Q Now, when you were speaking with him, did he, again, reiterate and state, "And I turned the phone off. I changed the number because people were contacting my family members"? Is that correct?

A That sounds correct.
Q At this point in time when you're speaking with him, JD Reporting, Inc.
did you already have the phone records of Antwaine Johnson?
A I believe -- yes, I did. Yeah.
Q Okay. So, I mean, obvious -- you knew that there had been a -- what was the amount of contact again during the month of October?

A 1,222 times.
Q And that was between Antwaine Johnson's phone and the phone linked to Devohn Marks?

A To -- yes, that's correct.
Q And that started at the beginning of October?
A Yeah, somewhere near the beginning. I don't know -remember the exact date. Maybe October 5th or somewhere in there.

Q Okay. So it continued throughout the entire month of October?

A Yes.
Q It didn't just start on the 26 th or the 27 th?
A No.
Q Okay. Now, ultimately when you're speaking with him, did you show him this photograph of Antwaine Johnson?

A I did.
Q And was his answer to you, "Okay. Well I don't know him. I've seen his face. I don't know him. I say he lives right up the street from me. He lives in the apartments with me"? Is that correct?
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A That is what he said, yes.
Q And did you ultimately confront him about the fact that they had been in contact over a thousand times?

A Yes.
Q And was his answer, quote/unquote, That's a fucking lie?

A That is what he said.
Q And further on, did he specifically state, "I haven't contacted that -- him over 1,000 times"?

A That sounds correct.
Q Now, as you're still talking to him about Antwaine Johnson, did he ultimately -- did you confront him with the fact that he had essentially changed his story about knowing this person?

A Yes.
Q And was his answer, "No. What the fuck am I changing my story for? I told you I don't associate with that cat"?

A That sounds correct.
Q Did you further ask him, "So for the record, you don't associate with Antwaine? You know that that face is Antwaine's; right"? Is that a question you'd have asked?

A That sounds correct.
Q And was his answer, "Absolutely"?
A Yes.
Q And then did you ask him, "So you don't associate JD Reporting, Inc.
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A Yes.
Q Did he answer, "I don't associate with Antwaine"?
A Correct.
Q Did you then ask him, "He's not your friend"?
A Yes.
Q Did he then answer, "He's not my friend"?
A Correct.
Q And then did you say, "He's not someone you regularly contact"?

A Yes.
Q Did he answer, "He -- we smoke weed. I smoke weed with Antwaine. I don't associate with Antwaine"?

A That is what he said.
Q Okay. Now, when you went into this interview, Devohn Marks was a suspect; is that correct?

A Yes.
Q And why was he a suspect?
A Because of the timing -- the frequency of the contact on the night of the crime and, specifically, to include the timing.

Q Okay. In terms of the timing with conversing with Antwaine Johnson?

A Yeah, and the time -- I mean, the timing in comparison to the actual robbery itself.

Q Okay.
A Yes.
Q And now in -- in your discussion with him, did his answers throughout the course of this interview, did they surprise you?

A Well, yes and no. I mean, going into that interview, I kind of had an expectation of what I might -- might be hearing because keep -- keep in mind, I knew going into this interview that Antwaine was well aware of the course of -- of the direction of my investigation. I told him just two weeks earlier, "Look, buddy. I'm going to be looking at all your phone records, your -- I'm going to find out. We're going to get to the bottom of this." I told him that.

So point being, I knew that Antwaine would have plenty opportunity to speak to his coconspirators to give them that same warning. And so going into the interview, I expected him to do a few things.

Q Okay. And what did you expect him to do?
A To distance himself from Antwaine, to distance himself from his own cell phone, and to probably try to distance himself from the crime via some sort of alibi.

Q And in truth and fact, did he provide you with all three of those things that you were expecting?

A Yes.
MS. MOORS: Court's indulgence. I have no further
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questions for this witness.
THE COURT: Cross.
MR. MATSUDA: Thank you, Your Honor.
CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MR. MATSUDA:
Q Good morning, Detective.
A Good morning, sir.
Q So it sounds like you already thought Mr. Marks was guilty of this crime.

A No, I didn't know that for sure or he would have been in custody. I definitely -- he was a focus of the investigation, and that is -- that is certain.

Q Okay. Now, at some point during your interview with Mr. Marks, he did, in fact, tell you that he either lost or his phone was stolen?

A Yes, he did.
Q Okay. But he couldn't remember the exact date?
A Correct.
Q Okay. Now, you've asked him if he knew a guy named Antwaine from his apartment complex?

A Yes.
Q And he consistently said no; is that correct?
A At the beginning of the interview, yes.
Q Okay. And not until you actually showed a picture of this guy --
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A Correct.
Q -- and then he said, "Yeah, I know the face."
A Correct.
Q Okay. So the name Antwaine he didn't know, but he knew the face; is that correct?

A Apparently he did know the face. That's what he told me.

Q Okay. But just by saying his name Antwaine, Antwaine Johnson?

A At the beginning, I'm not even sure if I -- I'm almost positive I didn't say the name Antwaine, actually, until mid-interview. It was really just whether or not he knew anybody or associated with anyone in his complex, and he was adamant that he did not.

Q Okay. And he was adamant throughout that he didn't know or associate with him?

A With anyone, period. It was later in the interview we got to the name Antwaine.

Q Okay. So consistently he said he didn't associate or he didn't know anyone in the apartment complex?

A Yes.
Q And when you brought up Antwaine's name, he said he didn't associate or he wasn't a friend of Antwaine's?

A He stuck to the same story that he was at the beginning, that he didn't associate with anybody, period.
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Q Okay. Now, he mentioned that he lost or his phone was stolen at some point; right?

A Yes.
Q And through your investigation, did you find out that that phone number was ultimately terminated?

A It was terminated shortly after the robbery.
Q But it was terminated?
A Yes.
Q And that was through -- was it Verizon?
A Verizon --
Q Or was it T-Mobile?
A -- T -- Antwaine -- yeah, Verizon, that's correct, yes.

Q And what was the date that he said he either lost or the phone was stolen?

A He said it was approximately -- he changed. I mean, he changed several times throughout. At one point he said he just doesn't know. At one point he said the 27 th. At one point, I gave him an example and said, "What if you lost it on -- what if it was reported stolen on November 2nd?" I gave him lots of dates. He didn't seem to really know.

Q Okay. So he didn't really know when it was lost or stolen; right?

A Correct.
Q Did you -- through your investigation, did you JD Reporting, Inc.
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calculate how many messages were sent from the time he either said it was lost or stolen to the night of the robbery?

A Well, again, I don't -- I don't know exactly when it was stolen. He said, for instance -- I gave him the example of November 2nd, which is after the robbery obviously, and he said if it was -- if he had reported it stolen November 2nd, then he would have noticed that it was stolen the day before, being the 1st. So that being -- if that's his example, then it would be -- the robbery happened on the 29th, then it would be the 28th. I know that he and Antwaine contacted each other a little over 200 times between the 28th and the 29th, I believe. 200 times, somewhere in there.

Q Okay. But he did terminate his phone on the 29th?
A Yes, after the robbery.
Q Okay. So if he did lose -- and you said so he didn't remember if it was the 1st or the 2nd that he terminated his phone?

A He didn't remember the exact date.
Q Okay. But he did, in fact, terminate it on the 29th?
A He did terminate it on the 29th.
Q Okay. So assuming -- we'll go with the 26 th or 27 th. Did you calculate the number of times messages were sent between the 26th to the 29th?

A The only time I calculated, again based on the example I just gave you, is he said that he -- if he reported
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it -- whatever day he reported it stolen on, that it was the day before. So, again, the answer is sort of, yes, it would have been the 28th, based on what he said, and therefore it was around 200 or a little over 200 texts between himself and Antwaine.

MR. MATSUDA: Okay. I think that is it. Nothing further. Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Redirect?
MS. MOORS: Yeah, just briefly.
REDIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MS. MOORS:
Q When you were -- when you were speaking with the defendant, did he ultimately give you the number for his girlfriend, Destiny Dixon?

A Yes.
Q And in looking at those Verizon records, could you see some contact between his number and that number for Destiny Dixon?

A Yes.
Q Now, specifically the day of the robbery, after the robbery occurred, was there an incoming phone number from Destiny Dixon to his phone number?

A I believe it was his phone number. I think -- it was one or the other. Yeah, they -- they had contact with each other around 7:47 that morning, after the robbery but before he JD Reporting, Inc.
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canceled the number.
Q Okay. And so this would have been after, according to him, he told her on Friday that his phone was lost or stolen; correct?

A I don't know the exact day, but, yeah, he -- he had said that he told her it was stolen when he realized it was stolen, is what he said.

Q And, yet, there was some sort of contact between the two of them after that date?

A Correct.
MS. MOORS: No further questions.
MR. MATSUDA: Real briefly.
RECROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MR. MATSUDA:
Q And, Detective, when you say that they contacted each other, you don't know for sure that it was this person contacting this person? You're talking about numbers; correct?

A What I mean, the phone numbers. I could see the phone numbers in contact with one another.

MR. MATSUDA: Thank you. Nothing further.
THE COURT: Any questions from the jury? I see no
hands.
May the witness be excused?
MS. MOORS: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Thank you for your testimony.
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THE WITNESS: Thank you. Have a good day.
THE COURT: You too.
Do you have any further witnesses?
MS. MOORS: Your Honor, the State has no further rebuttal witnesses and would rest our rebuttal case at this time.

THE COURT: And so the State has rested its rebuttal case. The defense does not have surrebuttal?

MR. MATSUDA: We do not, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay. So, ladies and gentlemen, I'm going to give you a brief break here so that you can use the restroom before we go into the next phase which will be instructing you. I have to read the jury instructions to you, and that can be a little lengthy because I have to read them, and then we'll go right into the argument. So we're going to take about a ten-minute recess now.

And so, ladies and gentlemen, during this recess, it is your duty not to converse among yourselves or with anyone else on any subject connected with the trial; or to read, watch, or listen to any report of or commentary on the trial by any person connected with the trial, or by any medium of information, including, without limitation, newspaper, television, radio, or Internet. You're not to form or express an opinion on any subject connected with this case until it's finally submitted to you.

I'll see you in ten minutes.
(Jury recessed at 9:30 a.m.)

THE COURT: And the record will reflect that the jury
has departed the courtroom.
And so are counsel familiar with the Court's proposed
jury instructions which have been numbered 1 through 34?
MS. MOORS: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Defense?
MR. MATSUDA: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay. And does the State object to the
giving of any of these instructions?
MS. MOORS: The State does not, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Does the State --
MR. MATSUDA: Defense does not, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay. And does the State have any
additional instructions proposed?
MS. MOORS: I -- the State does not, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay. And the defense has already indicated that it does not object to the giving of instructions 1 through 34; correct, Mr. Matsuda?

MR. MATSUDA: That is correct, Your Honor.
THE COURT: And do you have any additional
instructions to propose?
MR. MATSUDA: We do not, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay. And do either or both counsel
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request that the jury be instructed before argument?
MS. MOORS: I would request that, yes, Your Honor.
MR. MATSUDA: Defense would, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay. And, also, you're familiar with the verdict form. You have that as well?

MS. MOORS: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay. And it appears to be in order; is that correct?

MS. MOORS: Yes, Your Honor.
MR. MATSUDA: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: All right. So this is your opportunity also to use the restroom before we launch into the final part of the trial.

MS. MOORS: Final stretch.
THE COURT: All right. We'll be in recess.
MS. MOORS: Thank you.
(Proceedings recessed at 9:32 a.m., until 9:46 a.m.)
(Jury reconvened at 9:47 a.m.)
THE COURT: Thank you. Please be seated. And the record will reflect that we are back within the presence of all 12 members of the jury, as well as the three alternates. Mr. Marks is present with his counsel. The prosecutors are present, as are all officers of the court.

And, ladies and gentlemen, I'm about to read you the jury instructions. So obviously maybe it would be more
congenial if I would just kind of informally explain them to you. However, these jury instructions that have been prepared for you are very important. They were prepared by me, together with counsel. And so the wording of them is important, and that's the reason I have to read them to you.

You don't need to take notes because you will have these jury instructions with you when you go to deliberate the case. So just -- please, just listen so you can understand them as they're being read to you.
(Reading of jury instructions not transcribed.)
THE COURT: And, State, you may begin your closing. CLOSING ARGUMENT FOR THE STATE

MS. CANNIZZARO: Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, on Monday, my cocounsel, Ms. Moors, told you that this case was a story about three men, three different stories of their involvement with this particular case. But what this case is really a story about is a story that the evidence is telling, the story that the evidence is bringing to light, and that story is what ultimately leads us to the three stories of the unknown coconspirator, Mr. Johnson, and Mr. Marks.

In this case, the State must prove two things. In every case, we have to prove, one, that a crime was committed. And, two, that the defendant is the person who committed it. Those are the two things that the State has to demonstrate in any criminal case, and that's no different with this case.
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In every case, you are likely to also hear -- and we've heard in this particular case -- two types of evidence: direct evidence and circumstantial evidence.

Direct evidence is evidence of something that someone observed or was involved in. For example, when Shaylene is here in the courtroom talking what happened during the robbery, that's direct evidence. It's eyewitness testimony of something that she saw happen, something that she was a part of.

Circumstantial evidence is evidence that, when summed together, leads you to a particular conclusion. For example, cell phone records may be circumstantial evidence that two people had contact with one another or that they were in the area where a crime was committed.

Earlier this week -- this may have been last week when we were -- or two weeks ago, rather, when we picked a jury, the judge also talked about an example using direct and circumstantial evidence. Perhaps -- and this is sort of -- I'm paraphrasing, but perhaps when you walk out of this courtroom, you go outside and you see that it's raining. You can see raindrops falling from the sky. As you walk and hurry to your car, you feel the wet raindrops on your hand, and you can feel that the ground is a little bit slicker because there's water on the ground. That's direct evidence that it's raining.

If, however, when you leave this courtroom, you walk outside. You see clouds in the sky, and it feels a little bit
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humid. And you get home, it's a little bit dark. You go inside and you take a nap. And when you wake up, you see that there are water droplets on your windows. Water is running through the gutters in the street. The grass is wet. You can reasonably infer from all of those facts and circumstances that while you were asleep, it rained.

The important thing about both direct and circumstantial evidence is that the law makes no difference. You treat them both the same. One is not more reliable or more weighty than the other. That's up to you to determine. But the law makes no difference between direct and circumstantial evidence.

The other thing to keep in mind is that in this particular case, and in every case, we're talking about just the guilt of the defendant. So whether or not the defendant, in your mind, after reviewing all the evidence, is guilty or not guilty, we're just concerned with Mr. Marks. So even though there may be other individuals who may be guilty, your question is just about Mr. Marks.

And there are a few things mentioned in these instructions about what you cannot consider. So statements, arguments, opinions of counsel are not evidence in the case. What I'm saying to you during this argument and what Mr. Matsuda will say during his argument, as brilliant as it may be, is not evidence in the case.
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You can't speculate to be true any insinuations by a question that was asked, and your verdict must not be influenced by sympathy, prejudice, or public opinion. In your deliberations, you also may not consider or discuss the subject of punishment. That's a subject that relies -- that lies solely with the Court.

So let's talk a little bit about the crimes committed. And in this particular case, ladies and gentlemen of the jury, I would submit to you that there is not a lot of doubt that these crimes occurred. But I want to walk through each of the elements of the crimes with you so that we've covered these.

One of the crimes that you've heard mentioned is burglary. So what is burglary? Burglary is any person who, by day or night, enters any room or building with the intent to commit a felony therein. With the crime of burglary, what you're looking for is whether or not there's that intent. And in this particular case, the intent is entry with the intent to commit a felony, and both battery with use of a deadly weapon and robbery with use of a deadly weapon are felonies.

It is not necessary, of course, that a felony actually occur. Although, I would submit to you that in this particular case, there is evidence that these felonies did occur inside of that building. And, of course, going into the business is not a reason why a burglary wouldn't exist. What
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you're focused on with respect to the crime of burglary is the entry being made with that criminal intent. That's where the crime of burglary occurs.

Robbery is another crime that has been charged in this particular case. And so robbery is the unlawful taking of personal property from the person of another or in their presence with use of force or violence against their will. If there's fear of injury, that's also a type of force or violence. So if you think about it, robbery is if you take property from somebody because you hit them in the head with a gun; that would be a robbery. It's taking property from someone else against their will by using force or violence. Similarly, threatening somebody with a firearm would also be a robbery.

Threat of force or fear of injury has to be used to either obtain or retain the possession of the property, prevent or overcome the resistance to the taking of the property, or to escape with that property. So if the force or fear of violence or fear of injury is used for one of these three purposes, then it's a robbery.

The value of the property taken is immaterial. So if it is $\$ 1$ or it is $\$ 100$, that is not an element of the crime of robbery. It's simply the personal property of someone else. And the focus, of course, is using the threat of force or intimidation. You don't need to actually prove fear. It would
be sufficient if a reasonable person would also feel fear or would also feel that threat of force or intimidation.

Battery with use of a deadly weapon is the unlawful use of force or violence. So any sort of force or violence that is used against the person of another and, in this particular case, using a deadly weapon. So hitting someone would be a force, would be violent. Hitting another person would be the person of another, and using a deadly weapon, which is what we're going to talk about next, is really the crux of that particular inquiry.

A deadly weapon is an instrument that is like -- that will or is likely to cause substantial bodily harm or, given its use or threatened use, is readily capable of causing substantial bodily harm or death. And in this particular case, the instructions that the judge just read indicate that a firearm is, in fact, a deadly weapon. So if a firearm was used, a firearm is a deadly weapon, and that's how that element is met.

The important thing about this particular provision is that the State does not need to actually produce the firearm at trial if you find that there is evidence that the weapon was used during the commission of a crime.

Conspiracy. There are two counts that include a conspiracy: conspiracy to commit burglary and conspiracy to commit robbery. So what is a conspiracy? It's an agreement by

JD Reporting, Inc.
two or more people to commit a crime. They must intend to commit or aid in the commission of that crime, and the crime is complete upon agreement. So it's not necessary that the crime actually occur. Where there's that agreement between the parties, that's a conspiracy.

It is not necessary to prove an actual meeting. So they don't have to physically sit down with one another and take minutes and write notes and plan it all out on a piece of paper. You can infer that from the circumstances.

And similarly to that, you've also heard that aiding and abetting is part of your instructions as well. So what is aiding and abetting? Aiding and abetting is knowingly, with intent, someone who aids, promotes, encourage, or instigates the commission -- sorry, by act or advice or by both, the commission of a crime. So when somebody is participating, they're aiding in some form or fashion in the commission of that crime. They're participating in it.

That's aiding and abetting, and the State is not required to prove directly who committed or who aided and abetted. So if individuals are working together to commit a crime, you don't have to prove that each and every person, as part of that particular crime, did each and every element. It is sufficient that they were participating in the crime. That's the crux of aiding and abetting, of course with the intent.

So there are three types of liability, and that's where this comes in. One, you can be directly liable for committing a crime. If I were to punch Ms. Moors, that would be a direct commission of a crime, a battery, use of force or violence against the person of another.

If Ms. Moors and I were to make an agreement that she was going to punch Mr. Matsuda and I was going to be there with her to drive her there, that would be a conspiracy. And if I was there encouraging her and maybe I held Mr. Matsuda down while she punched him, that would be aiding and abetting.

So let's talk about the specific counts. Count 1 is conspiracy to commit burglary. We heard evidence in this particular case that the video surveillance has shown that Antwaine Johnson was sitting at the bar here at the Torrey Pines Pub on October 29th of 2019. And while he's sitting here, he's actually picking up his phone. And you can see him glance at his phone, text on his phone. And Detective Miller testified that he, in fact, saw that when he reviewed the video surveillance as well.

We also know that when Mr. Johnson goes to leave the bar, he actually holds the door open. He walks out of that bar through a locked exit which is not readily available to the public and which no one would be able to just enter into absent his opening up the door. And what's more is that when you watch the video surveillance, which we've watched multiple
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times and which Detective Miller also testified about, he actually holds the door as if someone were coming in behind him and sort of swings it open a little bit, despite the fact that every person who is in the bar is actually sitting at the bar when he leaves. And after he does that, two individuals come running in, covered in masks, gloves, wearing all black clothing, carrying firearms.

In this particular case, there is evidence that there's a conspiracy because these two individuals would never have known to come into that door, to that bar, unless Mr. Johnson was giving them information about how he was going to leave and where he would leave that door open for them to be able to come back in.

Count 2 is burglary while in possession of a firearm -- or, excuse me, a deadly weapon, which is a firearm. And this is for the Torrey Pines Pub on Lake Mead. And it's a building that at the time is occupied -- and you'll see this in the instructions, as well, for this charge, occupied by Shaylene, Gerald or Jerry, Myer, and Kathleen or Kathy.

What we know from the video surveillance is that when these two individuals enter, they don't just sort of walk in the door, right. They don't saunter in and say, "Hey, what's up? We're here to have a drink." They come running into that bar, they are both armed with firearms, and they immediately go to each of the patrons. What that tells us is that when they
entered, they had every intention of committing a felony therein, specifically robbery because they have the guns and are asking for money.

Conspiracy to commit robbery. Similarly, we know, again, that Mr. Johnson was giving information. He allows them into the bar through a locked door. And, of course, with respect to the robbery, how do we know that they conspired to commit a robbery? Well, when they come into the door, they're armed with the guns. They immediately run over to the patrons. One of those patrons is Gerald Ferony, or Jerry, and Mr. Ferony testifies that he is over the age of 60. I believe he said 70 . He was 70 -- just shy of 71 at the time that this particular crime occurs. And we know that when they approach him, they actually hold out their guns. They're demanding money. They ask him where his wallet is, and we know that that wallet is ultimately taken out of his pocket. That is a robbery. It's force or violence used in order to overcome and take that property from Mr. Ferony's pocket.

Similarly, Counts 5 and 6 are robbery with use of a deadly weapon. However, this pertains to the victims Shaylene and Myer. They're not over 60. And we know that when Myer is first approached by these individuals in the bar, he, like everyone else, is sort of putting his hands up. We know that they're pointing firearms at him. They're demanding his property.

We know that when Shaylene is ultimately asked to go behind the bar to both cash registers, the cooler, and the slot -- the slot drawer, that those guns are used to tell her, as well, to give over the money. And that she, in fact, does that by taking the cash out of those drawers and placing it into the plastic bag.

We can also see in the portion of the video where they reach into Myer's pocket and remove his wallet as well, which he testified was in his back pocket, and they sort of went in and took it from him while they had their guns drawn.

Count 7 is battery with use of a deadly weapon, again victim 60 age -- 60 years of age or older. This is, again, relating to Mr. Ferony. And we know that while he's at the bar, he's approached, and he's hit from behind in the back of the head. And he testified that it was definitely metal, and we know that the individual who was with him had a gun in their hand. So when Mr. Ferony gets hit in the head, and he ultimately has to have three staples placed in the back of his head, he identifies this as a metal object. And you can see this in the video as well, where he's actually hit. That's battery with use of a deadly weapon, victim 60 years of age or older.

Count 8 is battery with use of a deadly weapon. And this relates to Myer. He, of course, was also sitting at the bar. And you can see from the angles of the video that he is JD Reporting, Inc.
approached from behind, and he is hit in the back of the head. Now, he didn't have to go to the hospital and get staples like Mr. Ferony, but, again, a battery is a use of force or violence against another. It doesn't require that, you know, he has to go to the hospital and get staples. So when he's hit with that gun as well, that's a battery with use of a deadly weapon.

Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, I would submit to you that the real inquiry in this case is not whether or not those crimes occurred. The video surveillance and the testimony from everyone in that bar demonstrates that a robbery took place and that those batteries took place as well. And, furthermore, that the individuals involved were working together in order to do that.

I would submit to you that the crux of this crime is whether or not the defendant is the person who committed those crimes. And so the story at this point relies upon the evidence, and, like any story, the timeline is important. So let's walk through that.

When the story begins, Officers Ferguson and Tomaino are called out to the Torrey Pines Pub at 6374 West Lake Mead. They're told that a robbery has just occurred, and they immediately get there. They think they're going to find the suspects because they're just down the street. And, surely, if they had run out of the door and gone down the street, they would have been able to find them. But they don't, right, and JD Reporting, Inc.
these officers appear on scene. What that means is that it triggers an investigation. And that investigation is into who it is that could have committed these crimes. Who are these suspects since they were not found on scene?

The investigation begins. And, of course, we heard from Detective Miller that he is called out to the scene as well. But before that, both Officers Ferguson and Tomaino notice that Antwaine Johnson is the only person who was not robbed. Now, Kathy Petcoff was pushed around, but she indicated that she told them she didn't have any property. Mr. Johnson was simply pushed into the building and left on the floor.

That immediately leads them to start asking some additional questions, and it's discovered that Mr. Johnson actually was the person who opened up the door and let them into the bar. This is starting to make Mr. Johnson seem a little suspicious, and those officers testified to that. He escapes from this uninjured. He is the most capable and able individual that is sitting in that bar at that point in time. He is left far away from the other patrons of the bar. He's left with his phone.

Potentially, he could have run out the door to alert someone that a robbery was occurring. He could have stood up. Maybe he even had a gun. They didn't know because they never even checked. And if you walk into a bar and there's this
person here who is the most capable, most able, but you leave him feet, multiple feet away -- and I believe Detective Miller testified at least from the witness stand to the door of the courtroom. He's that far away from the other individuals. He's starting to look suspicious.

And that's important because that's where this investigation starts to really take shape. They pass this information along to Detective Miller. Detective Miller arrives and he watches the video surveillance. And sure enough, he notes those same things. Antwaine was on his phone. He let the suspects in. He holds that door open. He's far away from the actual robbery. And the suspects, more importantly, knew exactly when to come into the bar.

We watched video of the parking lot. Those two individuals come over the wall prior to Antwaine coming and opening up the door. It's not as though they were waiting for someone to open up the door and simply took advantage of the situation. They knew to hop the fence from the apartment complex that's adjacent to the Torrey Pines Pub parking lot, and then they knew to hide behind a car. And if you watch the video again, you'll also notice that they signal to one another just before Antwaine walks out the door.

So what does Detective Miller do? As part of his investigation, he says, this guy, Mr. Johnson, you know, he's got to know something about this. I just don't think we have JD Reporting, Inc.
all these coincidences and he's not involved. In my training and experience, someone was giving those guys, on the outside, inside information, and Mr. Johnson is the most likely person. So he interviews Antwaine, and Antwaine denies being part of the robbery. He denies holding the door open. He is asked multiple times if he's sure there was no texting between him and the suspects, and he told you he denied it. He denies having contact with anyone outside of the bar, and he denies being part of the robbery even after Detective Miller tells him, "Hey, look, we're going to go ahead and get some phone records." He denies that. He says, "No, I'm not involved. There's no way. I'm not involved in the robbery. Look. I'll show you my phone." And when he shows his phone, he has a call from 3:28 a.m., and he says, "That is the last" -- or, excuse me, a text. "That's the last thing that I did on my phone. No one else has contacted me. I haven't contacted anyone else since 3:28 a.m., two hours, approximately, before the robbery."

But Detective Miller doesn't stop the investigation there. He doesn't say, "Well, Mr. Johnson said he's not involved, and despite the fact that there's this evidence that leads me to believe that he is, he said he's not, so let's all go home." Detective Miller continues his investigation.

He requests Antwaine's phone records. The phone number that's associated with Antwaine is (424) 375-1085. And what he's looking for is any contact with any number after
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3:28 a.m. and maybe even some contact before that. He doesn't know what he's going to get from those records, but he thinks these phone records are the key to starting to unlock this investigation. Because at this point, the only thing he has is suspicious activity by Mr. Johnson and a complete denial.

A few days later, another important thing happens as part of this investigation, and that's when Bob Bonner calls Detective Miller and says, "If you're sitting in Antwaine's seat, you can see the video surveillance cameras outside. You can see the feed. He saws those individuals come over the wall and hide by the car. He knew when to go out and open up the door. He knew that the timing would be right. He sat in that seat for that reason."

And what else do we know about that? We know that Antwaine was sitting right in front of that gaming machine. He wasn't playing those games. And you can watch the video surveillance. You'll see he's sort of clicking through the screens. He's not playing. He's not gambling. So when Detective Miller gets these phone records, he, in fact, sees that there is a 3:28 a.m. text from Mr. Johnson to a number who he identified as being his girlfriend or his baby's -- his baby's mom, his girl, the girl he was talking to.

So given Antwaine's story, Detective Miller would expect that the next cell communication to Mr. Johnson's phone is going to be after 6:00 a.m. Because, remember,
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Detective Miller arrives on scene, he said, around or shortly after 6:00 a.m. And he talked to Antwaine and Antwaine showed him his phone, and there were no other communications after 3:28 a.m. So if Antwaine's story checks out, when Detective Miller looks at those phone records, he's not going to see any communications until after 6:00 a.m. The problem with that is -- the problem with that is, that this right here, that's a text at 3:39, 3:39 a.m.

Mr. Johnson had to have done something with some text messages or some kind of communication, and then Detective Miller starts to look into those phone records. And what does he find as he starts to go through those phone records? One number keeps coming up. One number is, in fact, the only number that is in contact with Mr. Johnson from the time of 3:28 a.m. until the time of the robbery. One number. Just one. This one. (323) 427-3092.

You have the cell phone records. They're evidence in this case. I would encourage members of the jury to look at that because you will see the only number that is contact with Mr. Johnson is this number. And, furthermore, what's important about this is, it's not just that this is the only number that's in contact with him during that period of time, but they are texting each other, like 10:58, 10:58, 10:58, 10:59, 10:59, $11: 00,11: 00,11: 00,11: 00,11: 00,11: 00$. These are people who are texting each other constantly.
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What does that tell Detective Miller? That tells him that his suspicions about Antwaine Johnson having text somebody and giving inside information had to be true. They had to be right. He had to have something that was going on with whoever had this number because this kind of consistent text messaging with one number, that was deleted from the phone before he showed his phone to the detective, has to indicate there's something else going on here.

And you'll see that those text messages come in right after that 3:28 a.m. text message. And, remember, with these T-Mobile records, they're in UTC time. And you'll see that, so you have to adjust by seven hours.

So two numbers are, of course, in contact leading up to the robbery -- let me go back to that; just one second -- at 5:09, $5: 10,5: 10,5: 10,5: 11$. And the next thing that happens is, at 5:12 a.m., those suspects climb over that wall.

We can see them come over the wall. We can see them crouch behind, interestingly enough, Mr. Johnson's car, which is also parked conveniently right next to that same door that they end up going into. And what's -- what's more interesting is that as they're sitting here, crouched down, hiding, because, of course, you know, if somebody were to come into that parking lot or walk by, you wouldn't want to be standing out there in gloves and a mask, holding a gun, like, hey, probably going to go commit a robbery, might walk into this
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bar, watch out.
They're hiding. They knew to hide there. But they also knew exactly when to move from there so that they could run towards the door. And when you watch that video, you'll see them kind of tap each other, move over to the other car, and then run into the door. And, again, those two numbers, they're in contact right before that.

So what does Detective Miller know? He knows that Antwaine is involved at this point. The evidence is telling him, despite Antwaine's protestations to the contrary, that he is involved in this crime. He also knows that there had to have been inside information provided to the suspects because there's no way that those two individuals would have known to hide in that parking lot in that way.

What else does the evidence tell Detective Miller? Well, that the only number that's in contact between them, between the time of that last text that was shown to him and the robbery, is this particular number, and that this number stops contacting Antwaine minutes after the robbery. There's some last-minute text messages, and then it's silent.

So that number was involved in the robbery. Because if that number continues to text Antwaine after the robbery has occurred and the police are on scene -- and Antwaine's probably going to get interviewed because at that point, hey, he's a victim of a robbery, and he was there and he watched the whole JD Reporting, Inc.
thing. Probably wouldn't be prudent -- probably wouldn't be a good plan to be texting with your coconspirators, "Hey, sitting here with the detective. They're asking me about you." Right?

So he deletes the texts and that number goes silent. So despite the fact that there's consistent text messages almost every -- every minute while he's in that bar leading up to the robbery, that number stops. Miller then does a check to figure out whose number is this number. And he finds out that this particular number, this (323) 427-3092 number, is the defendant's number, the number that he uses, the phone that's registered to him.

Detective Miller says, "Well, let's take a look and see if that number has ever been in contact with this number before." The first contact is on October 6th of 2018. And you'll see it's a call between the two numbers. It's sort of singular in this particular set of lines. It's an abnormal completion. And they're after -- what the records start to show is that there's that contact, then there's a few more. And then all of a sudden, there's a number of days where the same kind of thing is happening, right. Constant text messaging. Constant phone calls. They're constantly in communication with one another. 1,222 times later, right, Detective Miller is starting to get from this evidence that these two numbers have something in common. They have to know each other. And not just know each other but, like, texting JD Reporting, Inc.
each other 1,222 times in less than a month. He immediately starts to suspect the defendant is involved.

So what does Detective Miller do? He knows that Antwaine was in contact, of course, with those suspects. That's the only contact. Contact ceases. And this robbery triggers something with Detective Miller. He says, "You know what? This is very similar to another crime that I have been involved in, the 2011 robbery," which we've heard a little bit from [sic], right. The thing about this is -- and you have instructions on this -- that this evidence is admitted not to show that because the defendant committed a robbery in 2011, he committed this robbery. It's used to show the fact that this particular robbery is so similar in nature that it helps to identify who was involved in this crime.

You have an instruction on how to use this evidence, and it must be proven by plain, clear, and convincing evidence. I would submit to you that the witnesses and the fact the defendant confessed to that are certainly evidence that's clear and convincing. And it, of course, must only be used for motive, opportunity, intent, preparation, plan, knowledge, identity, or absence of mistake or accident. In this particular case, it helps to identify the suspect, the suspect that Detective Miller is looking for. But that's not what he's relying on, right. The evidence is driving him to this point. The story that the evidence is telling

Detective Miller, as it starts to unfold, is telling him the next thing I should do is talk to the defendant. So he does. On November 15th of 2018, he talks to the defendant. This is prior to his December interview with Antwaine. Why is that important? That's important because at this point, Antwaine is still adamant that he doesn't know the defendant. Not only does he not know the defendant, he wasn't involved in this robbery. Not only that, but he didn't have any other text or calls except after, you know, 3:28 a.m.

But Miller interviews the defendant based on the evidence. And those phone records and that video surveillance tends to link him towards this point where he's, like, you know, I'm going to talk to the defendant. So he does. And what did Detective Miller say today? "Well, I anticipated that he would say he lost his phone or he didn't have it or someone took it or someone else was using it. Somehow he's going to distance himself from that phone." Defendant says, sure enough, "I lost my phone." First he says the 27th. "I'm not going to say I lost it on the 27th. I lost it around the 27th. I don't know exactly. I can't tell you those exact dates. I don't keep track of that kind of stuff. It was maybe the 26 th or the 27 th."

Again, Detective Miller says, if I'm correct in my experience and training, if he's involved, he's probably going to try and distance himself from anyone who also might be
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involved in this crime. Ask him if he knows anyone in his apartment complex because he knows the defendant and Antwaine live at the same apartment complex. And, sure enough, "I don't know anybody in my apartment complex. I just moved here. I don't have any friends in that apartment. I don't even associate with anybody in that apartment or know anybody in those apartments. You can't link me to anybody in that apartment complex. You cannot link me because I don't associate with anybody that lives in that apartment. What I'm trying to explain to you is I don't associate with nobody at those apartment complex. No one knows me in that apartment complex. I don't associate with nobody."

I don't know how many times the defendant could have possibly said he didn't know anybody at that apartment complex. Today Detective Miller told you the defendant told him the only thing he's doing: trash, dog, girlfriend, work, home, the end, pointblank, period. He doesn't know anybody. At this point, Detective Miller is asking a question about whether or not he just knows anybody, like at all. And he says, "Nope, nope, nope, nope, nope, nope, nope, nope, nope, nope, nope, you can't even link me to anybody there."

When he then is asked, "Do you know Antwaine?" Fine, he knows him by Fame. Antwaine knows him by Chill. Understandable. "Who the fuck is Antwaine?" He says that a few times. "I don't even know an Antwaine." He says that a JD Reporting, Inc.
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few times.
Fine. But then Detective Miller shows him a photograph. "Do you know this guy? His name is Antwaine. You might not know him as Antwaine. His name is Antwaine. Do you know this guy? Do you know this guy?"

Well, now the story is a little bit different. "I don't know him. I've seen his face. I don't know him. I'd say he lives up the street from me. He lives in the apartments with me."
"So don't know anybody in the apartment complex?"
"Well, now, like, I don't really know him. I just know he lives there."

He's asked if he's been in contact with him: "I ain't been in contact with that man no damn thousand times. I don't even know him like that. We haven't contacted over a thousand times. I told you I don't associate with him. I don't associate with Antwaine. He's not my friend. I only associate with my girlfriend and my mom. That's it. The end. I don't associate with Antwaine."

When you show him the picture, all of a sudden, "Well, I know he lives in the apartment complex. I don't have anything to do with him. I didn't text him a thousand times. I didn't text him 1,222 times. I don't contact him a lot. No."
Here's what he also doesn't say, that Destiny went to
pick up the kids. They were going to be gone for the weekend. She was going to wait the weekend. Maybe he lost the phone and, you know, it was going to show up in a few days. And she'll be back on Monday with the kids, and that's when they would find it. What he does say: "I lost my cell phone. I went home. I told my girlfriend 'Maybe I lost it in your car.' She doesn't get off work until 6:00. So I waited one day. I waited for her to get home, and that's when I reported it stolen. It was one day. I reported it stolen." Not like this whole weekend thing about how she's going to go pick up the kids, right.

So -- but at this point -- despite the weekend and some of the other things that have been testified to recently, at this point, Detective Miller knows that his explanation of knowing Antwaine is contradictory to the evidence. Even if he lost his phone on the 26th, 26th of October, that number has been in contact with Antwaine the 6th, the 15th, the 19th, the 20th, the 21st, the 22nd, the 23rd. It has been in constant contact with Antwaine. So what Detective Miller knows is that the defendant -- the defendant -- that doesn't match the evidence, what he's telling -- what he's telling Detective Miller. And he knows whoever Antwaine is in contact with, he's one of the suspects.

So, again, that's the number. That's the number that continues to be in contact. On December 10th of 2018, Antwaine JD Reporting, Inc.
is finally arrested at his apartment complex, right. And he speaks for a second time with Detective Miller. But at this point, Detective Miller tells him, "Look, we have phone records. We know you were calling someone. Who were you calling?" Antwaine says, "No, I wasn't involved. I wasn't involved. I don't know the defendant."

He's asked, "Do you know this guy?"
"No, I don't know him."
Antwaine is still adamant that he is not involved. Well, what did he testify to? "Look, at this point, they have the records, and so I get an attorney and we're going to have a conversation," right.

In the meantime, Detective Miller also makes a request for the defendant's phone records. The interesting thing about the defendant's phone records -- again, the evidence in this case is starting to tell a full story here. The raw data shows similar contacts with Antwaine's number, right.

The analysis of the location data also shows three -three important things: Number one, the defendant's phone is primarily and regularly in contact with the tower that would have service to that particular apartment complex. And Detective Basilotta, yesterday, testified that when you start to look at how far that tower is from that apartment complex...about a half mile which would indicate very strong JD Reporting, Inc.
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service. Additionally, with the number of times that that particular sector map is hitting that exact same location, that -- whatever's in that particular area is consistently getting service from that tower in the consistent and same manner, right.

For the 2:18 a.m. call to Antwaine, however, it's not like the phone was still at that place and it just accidentally called up Antwaine, right. The phone is near the pub. The phone moves. And immediately after, the phone doesn't go somewhere else. The phone doesn't go to another house or another place or another -- you know, let's go meet up somewhere. It goes back to the apartment complex in that exact same sector, right. And we -- we saw some of this. And there's some -- there's one time where there's a phone call out here at -- a couple phone calls that are out there. We would expect to see that. People use their phone and make phones calls.

The important parts are this right here, this dark circle, which Detective Basilotta testified is going to indicate a lot of contact, that's primarily where that phone is. And, of course, when you flip through these records, you'll see that. And we saw that when Detective Basilotta testified. This tower, this sector that encompasses the 7075 West Gowan address is consistently hitting that phone in that particular way.

What we also know is that there's also this 2:18 a.m. phone call where that phone is hitting a tower that is within a half a mile of the Torrey Pines Pub which also indicates that that's a really strong signal for that particular location. And when the robbery is complete, that phone immediately goes back up to the 7075 West Gowan address. And the interesting thing about that is there are multiple contacts between the phone and that cell tower that give it that darker red color, right. And Detective Basilotta testified about that. Because of the way the program works, you're seeing multiple overlays of that same red sector. It's going to appear darker. And if you clip through each one of them separately, you'll see that.

And all these numbers -- nine, nine, ten, ten, two -when you click on each one of those, they'll expand and show you the number of things that are happening. That indicates -the evidence indicates that that phone is being used repeatedly within that same tower location, the same tower location that phone is at most of the time.

So Antwaine then asks to speak with Detective Miller, and he does what's called a proffer. We talked a little bit about a proffer. It is not, at the point in time when Antwaine decides to sit down with Detective Miller, a promise of anything, right. It's information gathering. Detective Miller testified, "This is where I'm going to get some information, and then I'm going to keep doing an investigation and determine
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whether or not there would even be anything after that," right. What the interesting thing about this is, that Antwaine then starts to tell him information that matches what he already knows. He deleted the text messages. He gave the heads up to the suspect. He had been in the bar before; same time, right. We know that Shaylene remembers seeing him in that same bar during her graveyard shift, right, a few times before that. He also gives that information. And additionally, he adds a few details.

He was supposed to give a fake number to detectives. He sort of screwed that up. Accidentally gave a real number, told the defendant about it, and, of course, we then later learn that the defendant's number is subsequently disconnected that same day. He was supposed to give a fake number. He accidentally gives the real thing.

He was -- no one was supposed to get hurt. And that's interesting because what Antwaine says is that when he talks to the defendant and confronts him about this and says, "No one was supposed to get hurt. It was supposed to just be, like, come in, get the cash, and we kind of separated and you hit that old guy," he says, "Well, he was mouthing off."

Now, I recall Mr. Ferony's testimony. And he, I would submit to the members of the jury, likes to have conversations and maybe even punch back a little, right. So does that make sense? And he also mentions he gets about \$200 JD Reporting, Inc.
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from the robbery, so he does admit that he gets cash from it, right, uses it to go -- he said two or $\$ 300$. Uses it to go get groceries and take care of his kids.

So you have an instruction on accomplice testimony. There must be some corroboration, right. We can't say, "Well, here's an accomplice and they're just going to tell you the story again, that's it"; right? That's what this instruction says. It has to tend to connect the defendant with the crime. But the corroboration doesn't have to exist for every single element or every single fact. It's enough if the accomplice, when they're testifying, has evidence that tends to corroborate what they're saying. If the circumstances and evidence tend to connect the defendant to the crime, then that constitutes corroboration.

In this particular case, I would submit to you that there is corroboration, right. We've just discussed all of the evidence that Defendant Miller was looking at prior to Antwaine confirming that the defendant was involved. All the evidence is pointing to the defendant. All of the evidence is saying that he's the person who's texting Antwaine, and all of the evidence is indicating he was in the area at the time of the robbery.

So with accomplice testimony, of course, we can't just show opportunity. I would submit to you those cell phone records don't just show that the defendant happened to be in
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the area. They show that they're in communication. They show that they're -- they're actually planning this thing out, right. And we know from the circumstances of how this robbery happens someone was getting inside information to outside.

Mere presence, of course, is not enough. It wouldn't be enough if he was just standing outside of the bar when police arrived. It would have to be something connecting him to the crime, which, in this case, there's quite a bit.

The inducement does not, of course, necessarily destroy or impair the credibility of a witness. So the credibility of witnesses is up to you, the jury.

Defendant committed the crimes, and I think that the evidence is telling the story of how it is that he did. Before he gives the proffer, before Antwaine gives the proffer, defendant is linked to these crimes. The video surveillance says that these people were working together, his phone records, the defendant's phone records, his location data, right. His own statements about not even knowing Antwaine despite the fact that, even if you assume he lost his phone, he's in contact with Antwaine a number of times before the -before he loses his phone. So this is not tending to indicate that the defendant is not involved. And, additionally, we know that this is eerily similar to another crime which tends to identify the defendant. What Antwaine's proffer does, what his testimony does, is it clarifies the exact role that the
defendant played in this crime.
So what about his stolen phone? His phone was missing or stolen, he testified, by potentially maybe Antwaine now, which is not something he shared with the detective, on, let's say, the 26th. He told Destiny when she left. His testimony is she knew, his girlfriend, the girl he lives with, the girl that moved from California to live here with him, the girl whose kids he's going to help take care of, she's the first person, she knows. For sure, he told her face to face; she knows. That phone; stolen, misplaced, whatever. Her number, (951) 489-2610, is interesting because when you look at the call records from the 26 th of October, which is what we have from the defendants, a much limited -- more limited record. The 26th of October through the 29th of October, there are 34 phone calls with Destiny.

Now, if the defendant really lost or misplaced his phone on the 26th, we would not expect to necessarily see that they're calling each other on the 26th a number of times. If it was the 27th, would we expect to see them calling each other a number of times on the 27 th? Those records show that as well, and I would encourage you to take a look at those, or the 28th when they're also calling one another, or the 29th. If she knows that phone is missing, why is she calling him and why is he calling her unless that phone is not stolen or missing, right.

The records -- the evidence in this case is telling a story about what happened. And when you look, you can see these are phone calls. This is the 27th and these are phone calls that are lasting -- it's 845. That's in seconds. So if you divide by 60, it's about 15 minutes. So either Destiny is having a conversation with someone for 15 minutes, knowing the phone is stolen, who she's going to talk to a number of times, or she's talking to the defendant because the phone is not stolen.

So what about his contacts with Antwaine prior to the phone being stolen? Interesting thing about this is that Shaylene remembers seeing Antwaine at the bar, right, and he says, "Part of the plan -- part of our plan together was that we were going to go to the bar a number of times. I was going to let them know what was going on. I was going to feed them information so we could make a determination what's the best day to go to the bar. We were looking for where there weren't that many people in the bar." She works the graveyard shift. She remembers seeing him. He says, "I'm at the bar about the same time," right, "graveyard shift."

When you go through these records that Mr. Basilotta testified to, showing the number of contacts between one another, what you'll also see in these records -- and this is October 19 -- these records have been adjusted. They're all in local time: 1:25 a.m., 1:26 a.m., 1:27 a.m., 1:29 a.m.,

JD Reporting, Inc.

1:30 a.m., 1:30, 1:30, 1:31, 1:31. Going into the 20th, again we see at 23:58, which is 11 -- almost midnight. And then going into midnight, 00:01, right. This is someone who is consistently texting. This is going into the 21st, early morning, or the 21 st even further in the morning, or the 22 nd . That happens on the 22nd also. Texts between these two numbers consistently at the same rate that we're seeing the night of the robbery, back and forth, constant with one another during the time frame in which Antwaine is saying, "The days leading up to the robbery, we were at the bar. I was getting information." These records are telling a story that the defendant is involved in this crime. The 25 th going into the 26th, they're texting at midnight. They're texting well into the morning over and over and over again.

So in this case, you have the evidence to review, and you've also heard from a number of witnesses. And you have an instruction on the credibility and believability of witnesses. And it says, "The credibility or believability of a witness should be determined by his manner upon the stand, his relationship to the parties, his fears, motives, interests or feelings, his opportunity to observe the matter to which he testified, the reasonableness of his statements, and the strength or weakness of his recollections." That is your job as the jury, is to evaluate the credibility of the witnesses who have testified, and that's all the witnesses.
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So let's talk about reasonable doubt. And this is a reasonable doubt instruction. I'm just going to read it. It's typed on here, but it's in your instructions. I'll read it verbatim.
"A reasonable doubt is one based on reason. It is not mere possible doubt but is such a doubt as would govern or control a person in the more weighty affairs of life. If the minds of the jurors, after the entire comparison and consideration of all the evidence, are in such a condition that they can say they feel an abiding conviction of the truth of the charge, there is not a reasonable doubt. Doubt, to be reasonable, must be actual, not mere possibility or speculation."

One of the other things that we did is we took some time to talk with each and every one of you during jury selection. And one of the reasons why is because when you come into this courtroom, when you come into this courtroom as reasonable men and women with your experiences, you don't come in and sit in this box and check your common sense at the door, right. You bring that with you. Your common sense, as reasonable men and women, is with you as you sit here and evaluate the evidence.

So, ladies and gentlemen of the jury, I ask you: Does it make sense that Antwaine was in contact with the defendant 1,222 times, and the defendant just doesn't know him?
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Does it make sense that Antwaine was in contact with him multiple times over during the evening hours of the graveyard shift the night of the robbery before allowing for someone to come into that bar and rob the place? Does it make sense that after Antwaine told the defendant that he had been asked by the police about his phone number and they mentioned records, that, all of a sudden, that phone number gets disconnected? Does it make sense that the only thing that's deleted from Antwaine's cell phone is the defendant's records? Does it make sense that even prior to that, they're having multiple contact with one another? Or does it make sense that the defendant was involved in this robbery because the evidence is saying that he is? Or did his phone get stolen, and this person picked up the phone and just decided to continue to text his number and call his girlfriend and have phone calls with her and continued to maintain that contact with the one person who for sure knew that phone was stolen?

Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, when evaluating the evidence and the witnesses in this particular case, we ask you that you return a verdict of guilty of conspiracy to commit burglary; guilty of burglary while in possession of a deadly weapon; guilty of conspiracy to commit robbery; guilty of robbery with use of a deadly weapon, victim 60 years of age or older; guilty of robbery with use of a deadly weapon; guilty of robbery with use of a deadly weapon; and guilty of battery with
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use of a deadly weapon, victim 60 years of age or older; and guilty of battery with use of a deadly weapon.

Thank you.
THE COURT: Thank you.
Mr. Matsuda.
MR. MATSUDA: Thank you, Your Honor.
CLOSING ARGUMENT FOR THE DEFENSE
MR. MATSUDA: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. So like the State was saying, the reason why we took so much time in the jury selection process is because we wanted to choose all of you that could be impartial and could keep an open mind until all the evidence is presented to you so you can make an informed decision. So we're at this point.

Remember, this is the State's case to prove. They must prove to you beyond a reasonable doubt each and every element. Now, we're not here to contest that a robbery or burglary took place because we saw the video. It's clear that something happened. This is a case of whodunit. The State's alleging that Devohn Marks was part of this conspiracy, part of this robbery, so they must prove to you beyond a reasonable doubt that Mr. Marks was involved, right.

We have fall guy. Now, this is going to be a theme in my closing because Mr. Marks is the fall guy. He has the background. He has the past. He's the perfect guy to blame this on.

We heard from the witnesses involved in the -- or at the bar. We have Ms. Bernier, Mr. Ferony, Ms. Petcoff, Mr. Goldstein, and Antwaine himself. He was, in fact, a witness. Even though he admitted he was part of planning this robbery and he was there when it went down, he witnessed what happened.

Under Mr. Goldstein, I put five-ten, five-eleven. Why is that important? Because Mr. Goldstein is the only witness who could physically describe the two suspects. What's more interesting about that is Mr. Goldstein himself is five-ten. Now, Mr. Marks is six-three. Five-ten to six-three is a huge difference. If you're five-five and someone's five-ten, you're going to notice that difference. Even if you're sitting down, if you're five-three and someone walks by that's five-eight, you're going to know that person's substantially taller than you.

Mr. Goldstein said the two suspects were five-ten, five-eleven. Mr. Marks is six-three. So that's four or five inches' difference. That's a huge difference. And Mr. Goldstein is the only one that could physically describe the two suspects. Everyone else didn't have a description because the suspects were dressed in all black, they had ski masks, and they had gloves. No one else could give any sort of physical description.

And what did Antwaine say? He was pushed in as part JD Reporting, Inc.
of the plan, he said, and his face was on the ground so he didn't see what was going on. He was involved in the planning of this robbery. We saw him on the video. We heard him admit to this. But when he was in the bar, he let two people in that were wearing ski masks and gloves, so he couldn't even describe them. He's a witness to what happened. Even though he was involved in it, he couldn't describe who was in it.

Detective Miller. Now, he testified that Mr. Marks changed his story. But did he really? If you listened to what Mr. Marks said on the stand and what Detective Miller stated that Mr. Marks said in his interview, it's substantially the same thing. He got a few days wrong, but they're asking him for what he did prior to his interview without a calendar in hand. Without his phone, he's trying to ask Mr. Marks to remember what exactly -- what date these things happened.

His definition of "associate" and "friend." Now, that's a very subjective term. It's going to have a different meaning to everyone. I don't associate with that guy. I'm not that guy's friend. If that doesn't match up with Detective Miller's definition, then he's lying. It's a very subjective term. I think, individually, we're all going to have a different definition of who our friend -- who our friends are or who we associate with.

He doesn't know Antwaine because he didn't know Antwaine by "Antwaine." He knew him as Fame. So when the JD Reporting, Inc.

State is up here saying he's lying, he's lying, he's lying he didn't know an Antwaine, he knew Antwaine as Fame. And when he saw his picture, he said, "Yeah, I don't know him as Antwaine." But he still says, "I don't associate or I'm not friends with him." Because what? What do we know about Mr. Marks? He did prison time. He just got out. He was on parole. He doesn't want to know anybody, especially not someone that Detective Miller is asking about. So he says he doesn't know him. He doesn't know him like that. He doesn't hang out with him.

Even Mr. Johnson on the stand said, "Yeah, we didn't hang out. We weren't friends like that. We smoked weed together. We smoked weed in my car." Mr. Johnson didn't know if Mr. Marks had a girlfriend, if he had a kid, if he had a job. They didn't know each other like that. So everyone's definition of "associate" or "friend" is totally different.

Now, he did, in fact, tell the detective that his phone was lost or stolen. And his phone was, in fact, terminated on the 29th. So when Detective Miller is up here saying that he was changing his story, what exactly did he change? Because throughout the interview and throughout his testimony on the stand, it was very similar. He'd gotten a few days wrong, but he was trying to remember, off the top of his head, without a calendar in hand, without a phone in hand to verify what days, times, or dates.
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Today Detective Miller testified that 200 messages were -- were sent from the time -- if it's the 26 th or 27 th until the 29th when the phone was terminated, 200 messages were sent. Mr. Marks' testimony is he lost or his phone was stolen on the 26 th or 27 th. Detective Miller is saying there's 200 messages sent from the time he lost his phone to the time it was actually deactivated. And this is when Mr. Johnson, according to his admissions, was planning this -- planning this robbery.

What do we know about Antwaine Johnson? Well, we've got to look at his credibility; right? He signs an agreement to testify -- and that's Number 9, that's Jury Instruction Number 9. He's getting a benefit from this testimony. He has motive to lie.

Indictment to newfound benevolence. When he got on the stand, he said, "I'm trying to start a new chapter in my life, do the right thing. That's why I'm testifying." Is that true, or is he getting a benefit for his testimony? Because, unequivocally, he's the only guy we can identify as a participant in this robbery. He's on video. He identifies himself on video. He says, "I was part of planning this." So he's the only person that we can unequivocally state was involved in this robbery. But now he's telling a story to get a benefit for his story.

We know he lied to officers after the robbery
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occurred because he posed as a victim. We know he lied to detectives, saying, "I didn't have any part of this. I just got off of work." He wore his vest. Told him he came from a job. "I didn't have nothing to do with this." Only until he's indicted: "Oh, I'm going to be truthful with you now, but let me get a deal first. I'll tell you what really went down as long as I don't get into that much trouble. What's the benefit to me?" He's not a good Samaritan. He's getting a benefit for his testimony.

He blames his ex for his financial struggles. Now, another motive for Mr. Johnson is he was struggling financially, right. Remember, he said his ex dropped off his daughter and that it made him lose his job. So he's blaming his ex for his financial struggles. So what does he do? He plans a robbery. That's the person we're dealing with. He loses his job. He just gets his kid. He decides to rob somebody -- or rob a place. He couldn't provide for his daughter so he wants to make a quick buck.

He didn't know Mr. Marks too well, and he testifies he wasn't friends. So there we have the definition of "associate" or "friend." Everyone has a different definition of this. Even Mr. Johnson is saying, "We weren't friends like that. We smoked together. Doesn't mean we're cool. We weren't associates. I didn't know if he had a girlfriend. I didn't know he had kids or a job. We just smoked in my car."
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Remember the fact that he said they always smoked in his car because that's very important.

Also in the fact that he doesn't identify a third suspect. And why is that important? Again, because Mr. Marks is the fall guy. He has the background. Mr. Johnson knows his background. He says he can't identify the third suspect, five-eight, five-nine, five-ten, five-eleven, black male adult. He named 10 million people as potential suspects. Why doesn't he know this third suspect that he was conspiring with? Because, remember, he's the -- remember, he's the only one that we can positively identify that was involved -- based on his admission and the video, he conspired with this unknown coconspirator, but he can't even give us a name or a description. Why is that? Who is he trying to protect?

Again, he's testifying to help himself. He doesn't come up here and say, "I feel bad about the victims. You know, they shouldn't have to be put through that. Now that I am starting a new chapter in my life, I feel really bad about what happened." He got up there and said, "I'm doing this for myself. I'm trying to help myself." He's doing the right thing to help himself because he's the only one we can actually point at and say, "You were involved in the planning and commission of this robbery."

He knew Mr. Marks did prison time. Now, this is very important. You heard Mr. Johnson on the stand, as well as
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Mr. Marks. He knew he did prison time for a crime similar to this. He knows how to switch out SIM cards, and they all smoke in his car where Mr. Marks said he -- that's the last time he remembers he had his phone. Fall guy. He can't identify a third suspect, but he has some communication with Mr. Marks, and he knows Mr. Marks has a background. He's the perfect fall guy. Because, remember, we're basing who this number he was texting with through Mr. Johnson. And I'll clarify that when we get to the phone data part. But Mr. Johnson's testimony is, "I was contacting Mr. Marks," and that's how they're connecting these numbers together.

All the witnesses, charts, and data we -- literally hours of cell phone information that we went over, probably more information than anyone ever wanted to know about cell phones, but none of those experts, none of those witnesses, can conclusively state who was sending or receiving those text messages. We know numbers that were in communication, but who was actually receiving and who was actually sending those text messages are totally different. It's a very big distinction, and not one of those experts could unequivocally state who was sending those messages, who was receiving those messages.

Location of device; not person. All those red little dots, those pins on the map, that's where the device itself is, not the person associated with the phone. Again, we're using Mr. Johnson's testimony, saying "I was texting Mr. Marks," but
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what do we know about Mr. Johnson and his motives? We know that that number at some point was associated with Mr. Marks because his name was on the account. But who was sending the messages, who was receiving it, if Mr. Marks lost his phone? Name on account does not equal sender. Again, we cannot conclusively state who was sending messages, who was receiving messages. Where the device is compared to where a person is is totally different. And we submit to you that is reasonable doubt.

Devohn Marks, you heard him take the stand. He was working. He wasn't financially struggling like Mr. Johnson. He knew Mr. Johnson from the apartment complex. He knew him as Fame. But, again, there's this definition of "friend" and "associate." Now, the State would want you to believe that when Mr. Marks tells Detective Miller he doesn't know this guy, it's a consciousness of guilt. But we'll submit to you, ladies and gentlemen, it's not consciousness of guilt. He made his mistakes, he paid his price, and he did his time. If you're on parole for doing seven years and a detective is questioning you, he's going to say, "I don't know this guy."

The State wants you to believe, no, he's trying to hide something. Both men said they didn't really know each other. He didn't want anything to do with Mr. Johnson, so he says, "I don't know him like that." We can't confuse his definition with Detective Miller's definition because once he JD Reporting, Inc.
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saw a picture, he did say, "Yeah, I know him. I know him as Fame, not as Antwaine."

Six-three, four to five inches taller than the eyewitness description. Now, that's huge. Again, five-ten to six-three. It's a very, very big discrepancy. Even if you're sitting on a stool and someone's five inches taller than you, you're going to notice that.

Mr. Marks testified he has no pass code on his phone. It was an older iPhone model. He didn't have the fingerprint ID or the facial recognition software. He had the pass code, four or five digits you enter to unlock your phone. He disabled that because his girlfriend didn't like a pass code on his phone, so he disables it. What does that mean? Anyone can access this phone. He lost the phone sometime around 10/26 or 10/27, and Detective Miller says, "Well, he actually terminated it on 10/29." So these dates that he referenced in his interview with Detective Miller, he didn't change his story. He was just a few days off.

The State wants you to believe that through Detective Miller's testimony and Devohn Marks' testimony, they were totally different, and he lied the whole time. But think back to what Detective Miller stated about his interview with Mr. Marks and recall Mr. Marks' testimony. They were the same thing. Just because people have a different definition of a word doesn't mean they're lying. Everyone is going to have a
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different definition of "friend" or "associate." And he got a few dates wrong. It wasn't weeks or months off. It was literally a day or two.

I think the State went over this jury instruction, but it is very important, the credibility of a witness. "The credibility or believability of a witness should be determined by his or her manner on the stand, his or her relationship to the parties, his or her fears, motives, interests or feelings, his or her opportunity to have observed the matter to which he or she is testifying to, the reasonableness of his or her statements, and the strength or weakness of his or her recollections."

Now this is the most important part: "If you believe that a witness has lied about any material fact in the case, you may disregard the entire testimony of that witness or any portion thereof if it's not supported or proved by other evidence."

Now, again, a lot of the State's case is based on Mr. Johnson's testimony, saying he's the guy that I was texting when we know that Mr. Johnson has a motive to lie. He has an agreement to testify to help himself. He was the one that was struggling financially. He was the one that lost his job. And he's the one that can't identify a third suspect, where he was the one that planned this robbery.

Now, remember, his testimony was he cased this joint JD Reporting, Inc.
for about two weeks. He was in there once or twice a week, right, or he went there about eight, nine, ten times. So he had a lot invested in this robbery that he planned, and he was up here saying he didn't know who that third person was. Common sense would dictate he did know who that third person was, and he doesn't want to say who it is.

But you notice he had some contact with Mr. Marks, and he knows Mr. Marks' background. Why not throw him under the bus, and I won't say anything about the third guy that I don't even know his name, I can't describe him.

Reasonable doubt in this case. Motives of Antwaine Johnson. Lost his phone in his car. He's struggling financially. Protecting actual coconspirators. Cell phone data. Location of device, not person sending. Again, we do not -- we can't conclusively state who was sending, receiving these messages. We know that Devohn's name was on an account, but we don't know who was actually sending these messages or receiving them.

Physical description of Devohn Marks. Again, five inches is a big difference in height. Five-eight, six-one, six-two. You're going to notice that difference, especially with Mr. Goldstein being five-ten. Seeing the suspects, he said, "They're about my height."

State's closing. Now, Ms. Cannizzaro came up here and said the story begins, right, and it does. It begins with JD Reporting, Inc.

Mr. Johnson and it ends with Mr. Johnson because we're really basing a lot of this case on what this guy has to say. Again, he has the motives to lie. He was financially struggling. And we're believing his testimony about who he was texting, who he was calling.

The State's going to present their -- or they did present their phone records to back up whose name was on the account at a certain time, but we're relying on Mr. Johnson's testimony, saying, "He was the guy I was texting."

Now, I'm pretty much done with my closing. I'm assuming Ms. Moors is going to get up here next and basically say whatever I said was hogwash, in a nicer way. She's going to say, "Mr. Matsuda says, defense counsel says." Now, when she says this, I want you to keep in mind: Replace that with what has the evidence shown and what has the evidence not shown us? What have we learned throughout this trial? Because they promised you that they would prove this case beyond a reasonable doubt. So remember what evidence they're using and whose statements and testimony they're relying on.

How would the defense counter their arguments?
Because the counter-arguments to their arguments is what we call reasonable doubt. And, remember, the State must prove to you each and every element of the case beyond a reasonable doubt.

> Now, we're not here to say that a robbery or a
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burglary did not happen. We're disputing the fact that Mr. Marks conspired with Mr. Johnson, and we're disputing the fact that it was Mr. Marks at all. It was obvious that a crime occurred on those videos, but this is a case of whodunit, not if a crime was committed. And we submit to you that Mr. Marks had nothing to do with this. The State has not proven their case beyond a reasonable doubt, and we're asking that you return a verdict of not guilty.

Thank you.
THE COURT: Okay. State, final argument. REBUTTAL ARGUMENT FOR THE STATE

MS. MOORS: All right. Admit what you can't deny; deny what you can't admit. This is essentially the story that you heard. But I want to talk more about this and I'm going to be brief, but here's the gist of it, okay.

You heard from the defendant. You heard from Antwaine. What would they have you believe? All right. So we have Antwaine, and then we have the defendant. All right. Along the lines of admit what you can't deny and deny what you can't admit; absolutely. At the beginning, he denied involvement. Denied. Deleted text messages.

Now, I'm going to get really quickly into what the defense would have you believe, that Antwaine is a criminal mastermind. Antwaine equals the brain. If you believe what defense has postulated to you, it's the fact that Antwaine is
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smart enough to have essentially planned this robbery with Devohn throughout the entire course of October. As the phone records were pointed out, their numerous contacts were always when he was in the bar, graveyard.

He was then smart enough to somehow steal the phone from Mr. Marks on the Friday before and then somehow give it to his buddy and then somehow have that buddy help him rob this bar that he'd been casing. But what I think is really interesting about this is he posed as victim. He thought he was never going to have his phone records called into question; right? He's the victim. That was the whole gist of it. So if he's going to pose as a victim, then, quite frankly, why does he care what phone numbers will show as him contacting on that evening? Why would he even need to steal the phone? He's the victim. He should have -- his phone records should have never been subpoenaed, but they were.

Okay. What do we hear more from the defendant? Well, we know that he is a four-time convicted felon. Now, I'm not saying this to say he's a bad guy. You have an instruction to that effect. Why I am saying this is, one, you can use those prior convictions in terms of assessing his credibility. Is he honest? Is he not?

Two, you heard about what we would call a prior bad act. Now, this prior bad act is really interesting because the defendant got up there and said, "Yes, I told Antwaine that I
had been convicted of robbery." Specifically, he was asked, "Did you tell him the details of robbery?"
"No, never got into the details. He knew that I was a convicted felon, but we never got into the details."

Back to this criminal mastermind. He didn't know anything about those prior robberies and yet somehow was able to orchestrate a robbery that involved casing, a robbery that involved -- that was essentially a take-over style, a robbery that had two individual patrons personally robbed, because he's a genius. Ladies and gentlemen, we heard from Antwaine. I would submit to you he is not a genius; no offense intended. But that's what defendant would have you believe.

Okay. Now what can we use this bad act for? It's like what Ms. Cannizzaro said. We're not saying that he's a bad guy or that because he committed robbery, he committed this robbery. What we can use it for -- we had this acronym in law school, and it was MIMIC. You can use it for motive, intent, mistake, identity, or common scheme or plan. In this case, we are submitting that it's proof of identity. It is a very similar-type crime. It's so similar enough that Detective Miller goes back and thinks about this crime and sees that he was actually involved in a similar-type crime that the defendant ultimately confessed to being involved in.

But what's interesting even more about that is in terms of identity. So we heard about the previous crime. We JD Reporting, Inc.
heard that it was a very similar-type crime, but, unfortunately, the armed robbers didn't cover their faces. We also heard that the defendant was identified and confessed to being the caser and getaway driver. Well, what's interesting in terms of identity? Look at this case that we have before us. Defendant's getting smarter. He's now grown up. He's not just the caser. He gets Antwaine to case for him, Fang or Fame or whatever his name was, the dumbass down the road that he smokes pot with. Not his associate, not his friend, even though they contacted each other a thousand times. He gets him to be the one who will have his face shown. He's learned from his prior experience. He's now one of the main actors. He covers his face. He goes in and does the exact same type of robbery that he did seven years prior.

Well, let's talk about a little thing -- a little -a couple of things that Mr. Matsuda was talking about, right, the fall guy. We like, sorry, key phrases. They make us happy as lawyers. But what did he first say? Man, it is really important to think about Myer Goldstein. He's five-ten, five-eleven. For sure when he's sitting down, he's going to absolutely know how tall someone is behind him when they're there for two minutes, and he thinks he's going to get his head blown off. Totally. Right?

Okay. Right now as I stand before you, I am most likely six foot with heels. I am five-eight without them. Not JD Reporting, Inc.
that big of a distinction. We're not talking about André the Giant versus Theon from Game of Thrones, okay. Absolutely that could be expected.

What I would also point out is you have the video and evidence, and you'll get to watch it. But when you see Shaylene Bernier in that, she is terrified. Well, literally, she never gets up above here because she's worried her head's going to get shot off, and that's why we don't commit armed robberies because people can die. No one died in this case, thank God. But in terms of if they said it's five-ten or five-eleven, and he's actually six-one, you know, smoking gun, not the smoking gun Mr. Matsuda would have you believe. He's not a fall guy. He's the guy.

But let's talk a little more about the differences between these two stories. Back to him being the brain, right, that Antwaine is this brilliant individual. Okay. So we heard from Detective Miller and Mr. Matsuda essentially said, "You know, he didn't really change his story. He didn't get a couple dates right." What has the defendant had the benefit of doing -- which he is entitled to be here. He's been here the entire trial. He's on trial; he's entitled to be here. But he's gotten to hear every single person testify. And I think he said, when Ms. Cannizzaro asked him, "You know, you never once mentioned the Friday before Halloween to Detective Miller."
"I get that you can't remember the day, right. I don't even know what today's number is. I think it's a Friday. Totally fine. But never once, literally a month after this, did you say, 'For sure I lost my phone on the Friday before Halloween.' You never said it."

And his response was, "Well, I've dealing with this case. I've been -- I've been remembering." Let me ask you this: If something happened to you on the Friday -- or anyone the Friday before Halloween and it was very substantial and you were questioned about it a month later, common sense would tell us that we would know a little bit better closer in time as opposed to July -- July 26th, right. That's commonsensical.

But what else did we hear from Antwaine? So he had previously been a security guard, right. He does not have any prior felonies. No priors. No, he's not a Good Samaritan. He didn't just come forward and confess it, ultimately. But what I think is really important that Mr. Matsuda just talked about is we explained to you what a proffer was. So before he's even spoken to, right, it's an agreement between the district attorney and the defendant, saying, "Hey, show me what you got, like you don't have to be fearful of me prosecuting you, but I want to see if there's any truth to what you're telling me. And the only way that I can assure that you're being truthful is to promise you I won't punish you." So this is before any agreement has been made that all of this information comes out.
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And what I would also point out is what Mr. Matsuda talked about: What is Antwaine's motive to lie? If you recall on direct, Ms. Cannizzaro asked him, "As a result of your testimony and you -- you've also entered into a negotiation with the State, with the State of Nevada." And he says, "Yes." Now, the agreement was he is, one, pleading to robbery. Two, the State retains the right to argue. What that means is whoever will be sentencing on that date can argue for any lawful punishment, including prison time, whatever we deem appropriate. Three, that part of that agreement is that he testify truthfully.

You heard in one of the instructions -- and I know that there were so many, it's voluminous, but you're going to have copies of them -- that he has not been sentenced. We have not yet made that argument or determined if he testified truthfully. So what's his motive? His motive is to tell the truth. There's not a motive to lie, to hide this third coconspirator that is his friend, I guess. There is not a motive to lie.

What about defendant's motive? Well, I tell you what. We've talked a lot about stories. The defendant would have you believe he is the unluckiest man in the world, essentially. He wants you to believe, one, he had this phone number registered to him, Verizon; two, that he had it the entire month of October up until the Friday, right, the
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26th before Halloween. During that month, he contacted Antwaine 1,222 times, where there was contact between the two. He would have you believe that when it was either stolen or lost, whoever stole or found that phone then continues to text Antwaine, continues to talk to his girlfriend 34 times back and forth; they were calling each other, not to mention she's the only for-sure one that he unequivocally stated "I lost my phone."

He would have you believe that that other person was just contacting his girlfriend, contacting Antwaine, all of these things, and then fortuitously he noticed the day of the robbery, and then he said, "Okay, I'm going to go ahead and I'm going to disconnect it."

But what else did the defendant say about the phone? Back to the commonsense argument. "I once thought I lost my phone and I'd already ordered a new one and it turns out it was under my car seat." You don't wait a weekend to report your phone stolen. You certainly don't wait a weekend to report your phone stolen if there's no pass code because you have a psycho girlfriend who wants to get into your phone. So anyone could get into it, could charge things to it, might have access to the Apple store, all of these variety of things. You don't wait a weekend. You don't. Common sense tells us you don't.

But what else would the defendant have you believe? This whole silly argument about associate versus friend
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versus -- I mean, whatever. Call it what you want. He would have you -- how do I spell that, defendant. Why am I struggling? I apologize for my handwriting.

All right. What would he have you believe? He would have you believe -- and there were a couple definitions of "associate" or "friend." Whatever. I don't care. Honest answer: Ms. Cannizzaro and myself are friends. We have never once texted each other 1,222 times in a month, and we're legit good friends. Think back to who you've texted that many times, texted or called, any one-month period. Doesn't matter what you call him. Call him the bogeyman; call him your friend; call him your sister; don't care. You're talking to that person.

What else would the defendant have you believe? Well, he actually admitted, if you recall -- admit what you can't deny; deny what you can't admit. He stood up here and said, "Yeah, I lied and said I didn't know anyone in that -- in that complex because I was being accused of a robbery I didn't do." You also heard him say he was on parole. He would have you believe that someone that is on parole and innocent would lie if they were accused of a crime. I tell you this right now; he wants to tell the truth and nothing but the truth. He admitted he lied because he was being accused of a crime.

Now, let's see here. Oh, I thought this was also interesting too. He indicated, the defendant, that he was not JD Reporting, Inc.
struggling, not financially struggling. He actually made it sound like it's super easy to get a job with four prior felony convictions. And then Mr. Matsuda pointed that out, you know, Antwaine was struggling. Yeah, he admitted it. He was struggling. And when he was asked what he used $\$ 200$ for, $\$ 200$ and now a robbery conviction: Groceries and gas. I don't remember how to spell it, so I'm just going to say it: Groceries and gas. But, no, he's a criminal mastermind that's going to pose the defendant as the fall guy. That makes a ton of sense.

Okay. And I apologize. I have to be able to get all of this out, and I'm trying to hurry. Let's see here.

What else did we hear about from Antwaine? Well, we heard about this 2:18 phone call, 2:18 a.m. on the day of the robbery. Now, again, if you would believe the defendant's story, that's, again, to this other unknown coconspirator that is part of this criminal mastermind with Antwaine, it lasted for 33 minutes just so he could hear what was going on inside the bar. And you heard from Mr. Basilotta that the location of that call was pinging off a tower that was a half a mile from the pub. Whoever had that phone, which it was the defendant, was talking -- actually, I guess listening to what was going on inside the bar at that point in time.

And this brings me to what Mr. Matsuda was talking about in terms of cell phones, right. You can't conclusively JD Reporting, Inc.
say who was on the phone. Totally get it, right. I understand that statement. But I want to point you back to what Ms. Cannizzaro said about direct versus circumstantial evidence. We talked about rain, blah, blah. Did it rain? Did it not rain? Let's say we are outside and it's the morning after, and there is rain everywhere, right, or there's water everywhere, on the grass, on the floor. It -- for all intent and purposes, it looks like it rained. Could, technically, the fire department have come out in the middle of the night and practiced using their hoses? Could they have? Yeah, of course, they could have. Does that make any sense? I mean, maybe if you lived near a practice spot for fire fighters, sure. But, no, that is not a reasonable interpretation. That is not reasonable, that.

Okay. When we're talking about the circumstantial evidence that you treat the same as direct evidence, that circumstantial evidence, the evidence of the 1,222 different contacts, the continuing contact, even after when defendant claimed his phone was stolen, between Antwaine and the defendant and the 34 calls, again, with the girlfriend, right. She's somehow, I guess, in on this eight-way criminal mastermind plan. That doesn't make sense.

I'm trying to get through everything. Let's see here. But I just want to talk briefly about some of the instructions that Ms. Cannizzaro mentioned. You'll have a copy
of all of them. Very briefly, Instruction 7 and 22 are regarding conspiracy and aiding and abetting. Essentially, in the law, it doesn't -- we didn't have to show you which one of the two masked men the defendant was because the law treats them the same. So the actions of one is the actions of all. So don't let that be a worry, if that was potentially a worry in your mind.

We already talked about the bad acts, and that's Instruction 21, to tell you how to be able to use that information. Ms. Cannizzaro -- and, actually, I thought it was interesting that Mr. Matsuda also talked about the credibility of witnesses. And he said that's an important instruction, and it is, because, ultimately, that is what you are here to do, to decide who is credible. As much as any of us would want to think that what we are saying is testimony or facts, it's not. It's our interpretation of those facts to kind of help you interpret them.

So the credibility of a witness is 100 percent up to you. And I ask you: Who do you trust of these two individuals? And you might not trust either of them. I don't think I'd invite either over for dinner personally. But this individual, Antwaine, never been in trouble, down on his luck. Good people make bad decisions all the time. Taking accountability for it? He's still getting a robbery conviction where we can argue for any lawful punishment. This guy,
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four-time prior felon. Ultimately, he had committed a crime previously so similar that it literally reminded the detective of it. Okay. He's in contact with Antwaine those amounts of times, the 1,222; that even just in that period of the text messages that were deleted by Antwaine from 3:18 to when the robbery occurred, over 200 times.

He's also -- we have all the phone records. This number the defendant would have you believe is stolen is in contact with his girlfriend 34 times, which would have been in the time period he is alleging it was stolen. Does that make any remote sense?

And I would also point you, if you want -- I know visual things are helpful. And I don't know if this is helpful, but one of our exhibits, Exhibit 71, is the phone records, and they're divided in yellow and green. So you can literally see the level of contact and when they were contacting each other, Antwaine and the defendant. So that's super helpful, and we would request that you also look at that as well.

And back to what Detective Miller said. You know, whether you think that Antwaine -- or the defendant changed his story a lot or didn't change it, he did exactly what that detective thought he would do. One, he distanced himself from Antwaine. "I don't know anyone in that apartment complex." I don't care if you knew him as Skooby-Doo, he said "I do not,"
emphatically, "don't know anyone in that apartment complex." So to say that you don't know someone in that apartment complex when you've contacted them that many times, that, I would submit, is a lie.

And you have an instruction that says if you find that a witness has lied, you can disregard their entire testimony. So keep that in mind when you're reviewing the instructions and you're also reviewing the evidence. But just like Detective Miller said, he tried to distance himself from Antwaine, he tried to distance himself from the phone, and he tried to provide an alibi, which brings me to another point.

If you recall, when the defendant was testifying, he said, "I didn't -- I didn't have a curfew. Like, parole, like, waived that for me because I have a job." Whereas, when I was questioning Detective Miller earlier, he said that that was essentially defendant's alibi. He emphatically said, "I have to be home from 10:00 to 6:00 because I always comply with my parole curfew." The alibi didn't pan out.

I think I've maybe covered everything, but if you'd just humor me for one second.

But, essentially, ladies and gentlemen, it goes back to what I said at the beginning and what Ms. Cannizzaro just reiterated and what Mr . Matsuda even joined in on, the theme, right. You're here for the story of what happened. I would say the unidentified coconspirator, his story is the story of
the luckiest man in the world. Unfortunately, we have not caught him yet. Antwaine, the story of a guy who ultimately comes clean -- don't want him as my neighbor. I know I'm probably not going to go, you know, smoke weed with the guy. We're not going to be weed-smoking buddies. We will most likely not be friends. I'm not saying he's a good guy, but you heard from him. You heard all of it. Where's the motive to lie? There is no motive to lie. Where is the motive to lie here? Huge. Huge.

And the story that ultimately was told throughout the entire course of this trial is the story of the evidence. And we are confident that when all of you go back into that jury deliberation room and you're able to review that story, that story that's provided by the evidence, you will come to the only reasonable conclusion, and that is that the defendant is guilty of all eight crimes for which we have alleged. And that, ultimately, that is his story.

Thank you.
THE COURT: Thank you. I'd ask the clerk now to swear the officers; take charge of the jury.
(The clerk swears officers to take charge of the jury.)
THE COURT: Thank you.
So, ladies and gentlemen, the 12 jurors will
accompany my marshal. The remaining three alternates will accompany my judicial executive assistant, and the clerk will
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be getting the exhibits together, as well as the jury instructions to give to you. Those will be brought to you by the marshal into the jury deliberation room.

And you'll also be provided with a computer, laptop computer. If you want to review the videos or the records, any of the evidence that was admitted in the case in digital format, you may do that. And we're going to train the marshal how to instruct you on how to play the video. You'll recall that there was the video that was admitted and it's got the player, so we'll make sure that the marshal can instruct you, if you want look at those, that you'll know how to do that on your own.

Please keep in mind, of course, the marshal is not permitted to talk to you about this case in any way. And you've been instructed about that, so please don't ask him anything about it. He would only show you how to operate the machine. That would be it.

All right. I will see you when you've completed your deliberations.
(Jury recessed to deliberate at 12:07 p.m.)
THE COURT: The record will reflect that the jury and the alternates have departed the courtroom.

I wanted to make a quick record about a couple typos I found while I was reading the instructions. I corrected those as I read them and then corrected them on the documents
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themselves, so -- and initialed those.
So we're talking about Instruction Number 3, the third page of exhibit -- or Instruction Number 3 on line 26. We had intended to eliminate all of the parenthetical "s" on "defendants." And so I read it as "defendant" and have changed it on this page, as well as the following page of that same instruction, and at -- well, it's somewhere between line 13 and line 14. It's kind of not completely lined up identically on the numbers, but it's, again, the same correction, from "defendants," the plural, to "defendant," and that's how I read it.

And, finally, I found just a -- full-on couple of typos on Instruction Number 22 at line 3. It should have said that "each person did every act." That's how I read it. But the actual instruction said "each personal." So I corrected that typo, initialed it, as in at line 11 where it said "with criminal intent aids." It should have said "aids, promotes, encourages," but it just said "aid," singular, so I added the "s." I read it that way, as plural, and initialed it, so the jury will have the corrected instructions as I read them to the jury.

And if you'll please now give your telephone numbers to the clerk so she can reach you.
(Proceedings recessed at 12:10 p.m., until 2:30 p.m.) (Jury reconvened at 2:30 p.m.)

THE COURT: We are back on the record in C-337017, State of Nevada versus Devohn Marks. Mr. Marks is present with his attorney, Mr. Matsuda, deputy district attorneys on behalf of the State.

Do both parties stipulate to the presence of our jury?

MS. MOORS: Yes, Your Honor.
MR. MATSUDA: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, has the jury selected a foreperson?

JURY FOREPERSON: Yes.
THE COURT: And who is that person?
JURY FOREPERSON: Me.
THE COURT: Okay. And, Mr. Foreperson, has the jury reached a verdict?

JURY FOREPERSON: Yes, we have.
THE COURT: If you could please hand the verdict form to the marshal. The clerk will now read the verdict.

THE CLERK: District Court, Clark County, Nevada. State of Nevada, plaintiff, versus Devohn Marks, defendant. Case Number C-18-337017-2. Department 5. Verdict:

We, the jury, in the above-entitled case find the defendant, Devohn Marks, as follows:

Count 1, Conspiracy to commit burglary; guilty of conspiracy to commit burglary.
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Count 2, Burglary while in possession of a deadly weapon; guilty of burglary while in possession of a deadly weapon.

Count 3, Conspiracy to commit robbery; guilty of conspiracy to commit robbery.

Count 4, Robbery with use of a deadly weapon, victim 60 years of age or older; guilty of robbery with the use of a deadly weapon, victim 60 years of age or older.

Count 5, Robbery with use of a deadly weapon; guilty of robbery with use of a deadly weapon.

Count 6, Robbery with use of a deadly weapon; guilty of robbery with the use of a deadly weapon.

Count 7, Battery with use of a deadly weapon, victim 60 years of age or older; guilty of battery with use of a deadly weapon, victim 60 years of age or older.

Count 8, Battery with use of a deadly weapon; guilty of battery with use of a deadly weapon.

Dated this 26th day of July, 2019. Signed, foreperson.

Is this your -- ladies and gentlemen of the jury, is this the verdict as read?

THE JURY: Yes.
THE CLERK: So say you one, so say you all?
THE JURY: Yes.
THE COURT: Does either side desire to have the jury
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polled?
MR. MATSUDA: No, Your Honor.
MS. MOORS: No, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay. You may be seated, Mr. Matsuda, Mr. Marks.

Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, on behalf of Judge Ellsworth and the Eighth Judicial District Court and all of the members of -- these attorneys, we would like to thank you so much for participating in jury service. The right to a jury trial is a right that's provided in the constitution that we can't provide without our citizens like you being willing to come in and serve. So we want to thank you so much for being willing to come in and give us your time, give us your full attention and all the attention that you paid to this matter. We really, really appreciate it, and thank you so much.

And I know the question may arise now as to whether or not you can talk to anybody about your jury service. The admonishment is now lifted. You are free to talk to anyone in regard to your jury service. However, you don't have to talk to anyone if you do not wish to talk to anyone. That is strictly up to you whether or not you talk to anyone about your jury service.

We're now going to excuse you, and you guys will be sent down to jury services on the third floor where you will be paid for your jury service, and you will be released from jury
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duty. Sometimes the attorneys like to come down and get your opinions, your impressions on how -- the things you liked, the things you didn't like. It's completely up to you whether or not you want to talk to them. If you want to talk to them, you can talk to them and answer their questions. If you do not, you are free to leave and excused from your service in this case.

Thank you very much for your service.
(Jury discharged from service at 2:34 p.m.)
THE COURT: Okay. May the record reflect we are outside the presence of our jury. This matter needs to be referred to the Division of Parole and Probation. It's set over for sentencing on...

THE CLERK: September 16th, 9:00 a.m.
MS. MOORS: And, Your Honor, I would at this point request that the defendant be remanded without bail. I think he does have bail at this point, but given the fact that he is violent-and-habitual eligible and given the fact that he has now been found guilty of all eight charges, I would request that he be remanded without bail.

THE COURT: Mr. Matsuda?
/ / /
/ / /
/ / /
MR. MATSUDA: I'll submit, Your Honor.
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THE COURT: Okay. He will be remanded to custody without bail pending sentencing in this case.

Thank you very much.
(Proceedings concluded 2:35 p.m.)
-oOo-
ATTEST: I do hereby certify that I have truly and correctly transcribed the audio/video proceedings in the above-entitled case.
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| A | 77/20 79/24 79/25 84/2 | apologize [2] 84/3 | 91/1 80/19 88/25 90/3 | bag [1] 37/6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 94/7 94/8 |  |  |  | bail [4] 96/16 96/17 |
| 94/14 94/15 |  |  | 92/6 92/16 92/19 92/20 | 96/20 97/2 |
| [2] $7 / 428 / 15$ | amounts [1] | appear [2] 39/1 54/1 | 93/23 94/21 | bar [37] 34/14 34/21 |
| areed [1] 5/21 | analysis [1] 52/19 | APPEARANCES [1] | ask[18] 5/24 8/5 8/1 | 34/21 35/4 35/4 35/10 |
| greement [10] 3 | André [1] 80/1 |  | 11/25 12/9 13/5 15/19 | 35/24 36/6 36/22 3 |
| 33/3 33/4 34/6 67/1 | angles [1] 37/25 | appear | 15/25 16/5 36/15 49/1 | 37/14 37/25 38/10 |
| 73/21 81/19 81/25 82/6 | another [24] 23/ | Apple [1] 83/22 | 61/23 62/19 65/14 81/7 | 39/16 39/19 39/20 |
| 81/19 81/25 82/6 | 28/12 31/4 31/6 32/5 | appreciate [1] 95/15 | 87/19 90/19 91/15 | 39/25 40/13 41/8 45 |
| head [3] | 32/7 32/8 33/7 34/5 | approach [1] 36/13 | asked [15] 9/11 12/21 | 46/6 55/5 55/7 57/6 |
| 83/12 | 38/4 40/21 42/6 46/2 | approached [3] 36/22 | 15/21 18/19 30/2 37/1 | /12 |
| aid [2] 33/2 92/18 | 47/7 53/10 53/11 53/1 | 37/14 38/ | 41/5 49/22 50/13 52/7 | 59/18 59/19 60/10 6 |
| aided [1] 33/19 | 57/23 58/22 59/23 60/ | appropriate [1] 82 | 62/5 78/1 80/23 82/3 | 4/2 65/4 77/4 77/8 |
| aiding [8] 33/10 33/12 | 62 | approximately [2] | 85 | 23 |
| 33/12 33/16 33/18 |  |  | ing | sed [6] 21/24 22/3 |
| 33/24 34/10 87/2 | 9/21 10/2 11/11 12/4 | are [54] 3/17 3/23 3/23 | 46/3 49/18 65/12 66/8 | 48/10 61/5 69/11 73/1 |
| ds [3] 33/13 92/17 | 13/8 13/18 14/22 15/5 | 25/5 26/20 26/22 26/23 | 76/7 | basically [1] 75/11 |
| 92/17 | 15/16 15/23 16/3 16/7 | 27/3 27/24 28/1 29/3 | asks [1] 54/19 | Basilotta [6] 52/23 |
| ain't [1] 50/14 | 16/12 22/2 84/7 96/5 | 29/20 29/22 30/20 | asleep [1] 29/6 | 53/19 53/22 54/9 59/21 |
| alert [1] 39/22 | answers [2] 8/12 17/4 | 32/23 33/20 34/1 35/24 | assessing [1] 77/21 | 85/19 |
| alibi [4] 17/21 89/1 | anticipated [1] | 37/3 38/20 |  | basing [2] 70/7 75/2 |
| 89/16 89/18 | Antwaine [112] | 39/3 42/3 43/23 43/24 | associate [34] 9/14 | batteries [1] 38/11 |
|  | Antwaine's [13] 15/21 | 43/25 44/13 45/23 | 12/15 13/3 13/16 13/17 | battery [14] 30/19 32/3 |
| 6/6 7/15 7/20 9/10 | 19/22 19/23 41/23 42/8 | 47/18 53/15 53/18 54/7 | 13/17 15/17 15/20 | 34/4 37/11 37/21 37/23 |
| 10/25 11/3 17/11 17/22 | 42/23 43/4 45/10 45/23 | 54/15 58/15 59/3 59/3 | 15/25 16/3 16/13 19/16 | 38/3 38/6 62/25 63/2 |
| 26/11 26/15 26/20 | 52/17 57/24 62/8 82/2 | 59/4 60/11 61/9 65/23 | 19/19 19/23 19/25 49/6 | 94/13 94/14 94/16 |
| 26/23 29/5 29/16 33/8 | any [42] 9/9 9/13 11/14 | 70/19 78/19 84/7 86/5 | 49/9 49/10 49/12 50/16 | 94/17 |
| 35/6 41/1 41/21 46/19 | 11/14 11/21 23/21 24/3 | 87/1 87/13 87/15 88/13 | 50/17 50/18 50/19 | be [88] 3/19 5/17 13/5 |
| 49/19 50/20 54/13 | 24/19 24/20 24/21 | 90/12 93/1 95/18 96/6 | 65/16 65/18 65/23 66/4 | 17/7 17/11 21/9 21/9 |
| 56/16 56/18 56/19 | 24/21 24/24 25/11 | 96/10 | 66/16 68/21 71/14 73/1 | 23/23 24/12 24/14 26/1 |
| 56/20 59/24 60/25 61/9 | 25/15 25/22 27/25 30/1 | area [8] 6/19 6/21 10/7 | 79/9 83/25 84/6 | 26/7 26/15 26/19 26/25 |
| 62/7 63/11 63/12 64/22 | 30/14 30/15 32/4 38/17 | 10/8 28/13 53/3 56/21 | associated [4] 19/13 | 28/11 29/18 29/18 |
| 65/21 70/2 70/12 70/22 | 39/10 41/25 41/25 43/6 | 57/1 | 41/24 70/24 71/2 | 29/25 30/1 30/2 31/11 |
| 76/3 76/12 76/17 76/18 | 48/8 49/5 64/23 68/2 | argue [3] 82/7 82/8 | associates [1] 68/24 | $31 / 13$ 31/15 32/1 32/7 |
| 81/25 8 | 73/14 73/15 81/14 | 87/25 | assume [1] 57/19 | 32/7 32/8 34/2 34/4 |
| 85/11 86/7 87/1 87/5 | 81/22 81/24 82/8 84/10 | argument [14] 2/3 2/4 | assuming [2] 21/21 | 34/7 34/8 34/10 34/23 |
| 7/23 88/7 90/7 90/12 | 86/11 87/14 87/25 | 2/5 24/15 26/1 27/12 | 75/11 | 35/12 42/12 42/25 44/3 |
| 90/16 91/18 92/4 94/23 | 88/11 91/5 91/14 | 29/23 29/24 63/7 76/10 | assure [1] 81/23 | 44/3 44/23 46/1 46/1 |
| 95/7 95/14 96/19 | anybody [18] 8/8 9/15 | 76/11 82/15 83/15 | at [98] | 46/2 47/16 47/19 48/25 |
| eged [1] 90/16 | 9/19 12/15 19/13 19/25 | 83/25 | attention [2] 95/14 | 51/1 51/4 51/25 55/1 |
| alleging [2] 63/19 | 49/4 49/6 49/6 49/7 | arguments [4] | 95 | 55/19 56/5 56/25 57/6 |
|  | 49/9 49/14 49/17 49/19 | 75/20 75/21 75/21 | ATTEST [1] 97/6 | 57/7 60/19 61/11 61/12 |
| allowing [1] 62/3 | 49/21 50/10 66/7 95/17 | arise [1] 95/16 | attorney [5] 1/18 1/1 | 63/11 63/22 68/5 69/17 |
|  | anyone [23] 5/5 8/5 | armed [4] 35/24 36 | 52/11 81/20 93/3 | /6 76/15 79/11 80/3 |
|  | 9/14 9/21 19/13 19/17 | 79/2 80/8 | attorneys [3] 93/3 95/8 | 80/20 80/21 81/21 82/8 |
|  | 19/20 24/18 41/8 41/16 | around [9] 6/25 10/22 | 96/1 | 85/11 87/6 87/9 89/17 |
|  | 48/25 49/1 70/14 72/13 | 11/15 22/4 22/25 39/9 | audio [4] 5/6 5/8 5/10 | 0/5 90/6 91/1 91/2 |
| already [6] 14/1 18/8 | 81/8 83/20 84/17 88/24 | 43/1 48/19 72/14 | 97/7 | 91/4 91/17 95/4 95/23 |
| 25/18 55/4 83/16 87/8 | 89/1 95/18 95/20 95/20 | arrested [1] 52/1 | audio/video [1] 97/7 | /11 |
| so [47] 6/15 7/21 | 95/ | arrived [1] 57/7 | available [1] 34/22 | 96/16 96/20 97/1 |
| 10/9 26/4 26/12 28/1 | anyone's [2] 9/25 10 | arrives [2] 40/9 43/1 | aware [3] 8/15 9/8 17/9 | because [72] 3/6 9/3 |
| 28/16 30/4 31/8 31/13 | anything [7] 50/22 | as [85] 3/10 3/23 3/25 | away [4] 39/20 40/2 | 9/5 10/10 11/5 11/7 |
| 32/1 32/2 33/10 34/20 | 54/23 55/1 71/23 74/9 | 3/25 4/8 4/9 5/10 5/24 | 40/4 40/12 | 12/4 12/15 13/22 16/19 |
| 35/1 37/7 37/24 40/21 | 78/6 91/16 | 5/11 26/5 26/21 | B | 28/22 |
| 44/19 45/3 45/11 48/25 | apartment [41] 7/25 | 26/21 26/23 27/9 28/20 |  | 31/10 35/9 36/2 38/23 |
| 50/25 52/13 52/19 54/1 | 8/3 8/9 9/14 9/15 9/19 | 29/24 29/24 33/11 | baby's [2] 42/21 42/22 | 39/24 40/6 42/4 42/25 |
| 54/1 54/3 55/8 55/25 | 9/22 10/3 12/11 12/16 | 33/21 34/19 35/2 35/18 | back [28] 13/12 13/14 | 43/19 44/5 44/22 45/12 |
| 58/22 59/23 60/6 60/16 | 12/20 13/8 13/12 13/12 | 37/4 37/8 37/19 37/20 | 13/15 26/20 35/13 37/9 | 45/21 45/24 47/11 48/5 |
| 69/3 79/3 80/4 82/1 | 13/13 13/14 13/14 | 38/6 38/11 39/6 40/16 | 37/14 37/18 38/1 44/14 | 49/2 49/8 54/9 55/17 |
| 82/4 84/19 84/24 87/11 | 13/15 18/20 19/20 | 40/23 42/6 42/21 43/12 | 51/4 53/12 54/6 55/24 | 58/11 59/8 61/16 62/12 |
| 88/7 88/12 88/18 89/8 | 40/18 49/2 49/3 49/4 | 44/21 48/1 50/4 58/20 | 60/8 72/22 75/7 78/5 | 63/10 63/17 63/23 64/8 |
|  | 49/5 49/6 49/8 49/9 | 60/24 61/6 61/17 61/20 | 78/21 80/15 83/5 83/15 | 64/22 65/24 66/5 66/21 |
|  | 49/11 49/11 49/14 | 61/21 64/25 65/25 66/2 | 84/9 86/2 88/20 89/21 | 67/18 68/1 69/2 69/4 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { alternates [4] 3/25 } \\ & 26 / 2190 / 2491 / 22 \end{aligned}$ | 50/10 50/21 52/1 52/22 | 66/3 67/19 68/1 68/6 | 90/12 93/1 | 69/10 69/21 70/7 71/3 |
|  | 52/24 53/12 71/12 | 68/7 69/8 69/25 69/25 | background [5] 63/24 | 71/25 72/12 72/24 75/1 |
|  | 88/24 89/1 89/2 | 71/12 72/1 72/2 77/2 | 69/5 69/6 70/6 74/8 | /16 75/21 77/24 78/9 |
| $\text { ays [4] } 3 \text { 89/17 }$ | apartments [6] 8/1 | 77/9 77/12 77/13 79/18 | bad [9] 69/16 69/18 | 78/15 80/7 80/9 83/19 |
| am [6] 15/16 69/17 | 9/15 10/25 14/24 49/7 | 79/24 81/11 82/3 85/9 | 77/19 77/23 77/24 | 84/18 84/23 87/4 87/13 |
|  | 50/8 | 86/16 87/14 87/1 | 78/13 78/15 87/8 87/23 | 89/14 89/17 |


| B | $29$ | C | carrying [1] 35/7 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| been [44] 4/8 7/5 8/20 |  | C-18-337017-2 [2] 1/7 |  | clear [4] 5/17 47/16 $47 / 18$ 63/17 |
| (10/5 10/10 10/18 |  | $9$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l\|l\|l\|l\|l\|}  \\ 27 / 24 & 27 / 14 \end{array}$ | clerk [5] 90/19 90/21 |
| $11 / 8$ $11 / 17$ <br> $15 / 3$ $18 / 18$ <br> 18 $14 / 4$ <br> $22 / 3$ $23 / 2$ | blah [2] 86/4 86/4 | C-337017 [1] 93/1 | 27/16 27/21 27/22 | 90/25 92/23 93/1 |
| 25/6 27/2 28/14 | bla |  | 27/25 28/1 |  |
| 38/25 45/12 46/13 47/7 |  | calculated [1] 21 | 4 | clicking [1] 42/ |
| 50/13 50/14 51/ | $\mid \mathbf{b l}$ | calendar [2] 65/13 | 23 | climb [1] 44/16 |
| 51/17 51/18 55/5 59/24 | blown [1] 79 | 66/24 | 35/8 |  |
| 62/5 77/8 77/16 78/1 | Bob [1] 42/7 | California [1] 58/ | 52/16 56/15 57/8 59 | closing [8] |
| 80/20 81/7 81/7 81/14 $81 / 25$ 82/14 87/22 88/9 | bodily [2] 32/12 | call [20] 4/3 4/6 | 60/15 62/19 63/14 | 27/11 27/12 63/7 6 |
| 81/15 96/19 | bogeyman [1] 84/11 | 53/14 54/2 58/12 62/14 | 63/18 73/14 73/18 | 75 |
| before [32] 1/12 4/21 | Bonner [1] 42 | 75/22 77/23 84/1 84/11 | 74/11 75/2 75/17 75/23 | clothing [1] |
| 11/23 21/7 22/2 22/25 |  | 84/11 84/11 84/12 | 76/4 76/7 78/18 79/5 | clouds [1] 28/25 |
| 24/12 26/1 26/12 39/7 | d19 | 85/14 85/20 | 9 81/7 91 | coconspirator [5] |
| 40/22 41/17 42/1 44/6 |  | called [7] 4/8 38/20 | 3/21 93/22 | 27/20 69/13 82/18 |
| $45 / 746 / 1455 / 555$ $57 / 13$ 57/14 57/20 | $\text { box [1] } 61 / 19$ | 39/6 53/8 54/20 77/1 | cased [1] 73 | coconspirators |
| 57/13 57/14 57/20 | $\text { brain [2] } 76 / 2480 /$ | 84/10 | caser [2] 79/4 79/7 | 17/15 46/2 74/13 |
| 57/21 62/3 77/6 79/5 | break [2] 3/7 24/11 | calling [10] 11/10 52/4 | cash [4] 37/2 37/5 | cocounsel [1] 2 |
| $48$ | brief [2] $24 / 1176$ |  | 55/20 56/1 | code [8] 6/19 6/21 |
| begin [1] 27/11 | briefly [4] 22/9 23/12 | calls [10] 42/7 46/2 | [2] 77/8 7 | /8 72/8 72/10 72/12 |
| beginning [8] 6/19 |  | 48/9 53/15 53/17 58/15 59/3 59/4 62/15 86/20 | cat [1] 15/17 caught [1] 90 | coincidences |
| 14/10 14/11 18/23 | $80 / 16$ | 59/3 59/4 62/15 86/20 | $\text { cause [1] } 32 / 1$ | $\text { color [1] } 54 / 8$ |
| 19/10 19/25 76/20 | bring [1] 61/20 | came [3] 6/11 68/3 | causing [1] 32/13 | come [26] 13/11 |
|  | bringing [1] 27/ |  | ceases [1] 47/5 | 13/14 35/5 |
| 74/25 74/25 | brings [2] 85/24 89 |  | cell [13] 11/4 17/20 | 3 36/8 40/1 |
| behalf [2] 93 | brought [2] | 1012/23 24/11 | 28/11 42/24 43/17 51/5 | 42/10 44/9 44/17 44 |
| behind [7] 35/2 37/2 | buck [1] 68/18 | 24/14 27/8 28/19 28 | 54/8 56/24 62/9 70/13 | 5/20 61/16 61 |
| 37/14 38/1 40/20 44/18 | buddies [1] 90/5 |  | 70/14 74/13 85/25 | 1/18 62/4 69/16 81/ |
| 79/21 | buddy [3] 17/11 77 | 37/7 37/19 37/25 42/9 | certain [2] 18/12 75 | 6/9 90/14 95/12 95 |
| being [21] |  | 42/10 42/16 44/17 | ly [2] 47/18 | 96/1 |
| 17/14 21/7 | bu | 17 59/2 61/10 63/12 |  | comes [3] 34/2 8 |
| 31/2 41/4 41/9 42/21 | 30/24 35/17 39/11 | 67/19 67/22 69/11 | c |  |
| 54/16 59/11 74/22 | burglary [18] 30 | 69/21 70/15 72/1 | 1] | $\mathbf{c}$ |
| 78/23 79/4 80/15 81/23 | 30/14 30/14 30/16 | 77/20 78/13 78/16 | change [4] 66/21 72/17 |  |
| 84/18 84/23 95/11 | 30/25 31/1 31/3 32/2 | 78/17 80/9 81/23 82/8 | 80/18 88/22 | co |
| 95 | 34/12 35/14 62/21 | 87/25 88/15 89/6 91/10 | changed [9] 8/12 10/ | co |
| believability [3] 60/17 | 62/21 63/17 76/1 93/24 | 92/23 95/17 96/5 | 13/21 15/13 20/16 | 33/2 33/14 33/15 33/16 |
| 60/18 73/6 | bus [1] 74/9 | can't [27] 8/20 9/ | changing [2] 15/16 | commit [18] 30/1 |
| believe [27] 3/12 14/2 | business [1] 30/25 | 9/21 11/2 11/2 30/1 | changing [2] 15/16 66/20 | $30 / 1932 / 2432 / 253$ |
| 21/11 22/23 36/11 40/2 | but [94] 3/16 4/25 7/4 | 48/20 49/7 49/20 56/ | chapter [2] 67/16 |  |
| 41/21 71/14 71/21 | $10 / 2311 / 22 \quad 13 / 6 \quad 18 / 17$ | 56/23 69/6 69/13 70/4 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { chapter [2] } 67 / 16 \\ & \text { 69/18 } \end{aligned}$ | 36/8 44/25 62/20 62/22 |
| $72 / 1973 / 13 ~ 76 / 17$ $76 / 2376 / 2478 / 12$ | $19 / 4 \text { 19/8 20/7 21/13 }$ | 71/24 73/23 74/10 | charge [5] 35/18 61/11 | 80/8 93/24 93/25 94/ |
| $76 / 23 ~ 76 / 24 ~ 78 / 12$ $80 / 12$ 82/22 82/23 83/3 | $21 / 1922 / 2523 / 527 / 16$ | 76/12 76/13 | 83/21 90/20 90/21 | 94/5 |
| 80/12 82/22 82/23 83/3 83/9 83/24 84/4 84/5 | 28/18 29/10 30/10 38/3 | 76/19 76/20 81/1 84/16 | charged [1] | committed |
| 84/20 85/15 88/8 | 38/25 39/7 39/9 40/1 | canceled [2] 10 | charges [1] 96/19 | 27/22 27/23 28/13 30/8 |
| believing [1] 75/4 | 41/18 42/2 43/22 45/2 |  | harts [1] 70/12 | 33/19 38/15 39/3 47/1 |
| benefit [6] 67/13 67/18 | 46/25 47/23 48/8 48/10 |  | ck [2] 46/7 61/1 | 12 76/5 78/ |
| 67/24 68/7 68/8 80/19 | 50/2 51/12 52/2 56/9 |  | cked [1] 39/25 | /15 88/ |
| benevolence [1] 67/15 | 61/3 61/6 65/4 65/9 | 80/23 82/3 84/7 86/3 | cks [1] 43/4 | mitting [2] |
| Bernier [2] 64/2 80/6 |  | 86/25 87/10 89/22 | [1] 1/18 |  |
| best [1] 59/16 | 70/15 70/17 70/25 71/3 | cannot [4] 12/14 29/21 | choose [1] 63/10 | common [7] 46/24 61/19 61/20 74/5 78/18 |
| better [1] 81/11 | \| 70/15 70/17 70/25 71/3 | 49/8 71/5 | choose [1] 63/10 circle [1] 53/19 | 61/19 61/20 74/5 78/18 |
| between [20] 14/7 | 74/7 74/17 75/8 76/4 | capable [3] 32/13 | circumstances [4] | commonsense [1] |
| 21/11 21/23 22/4 22/17 | $76 / 1476 / 1577 / 877 / 16$ | 39/18 40/1 | /29/5 33/9 56/12 | $83 / 15$ |
| 23/8 29/11 33/4 41/6 $45 / 1645 / 1746 / 1554 / 7$ | 78/4 78/12 78/24 79/1 | car [12] 11/17 28/21 |  |  |
| 45/16 45/17 46/15 54/7 |  | 40/20 42/11 44/18 45/5 | $28 / 928 / 1128 / 17 \text { 29/8 }$ |  |
| 59/22 60/6 80/15 81/19 83/2 86/19 92/7 | 80/21 81/3 81/13 81/ | 66/13 68/25 69/1 70/3 | 6/3 86/15 86/17 |  |
| 33/2 86/19 92/7 ${ }^{\text {beyond [5] 63/15 63/20 }}$ | $81 / 2182 / 1383 / 14$ | 74/12 83/17 | citizens [1] 95 | communication [6] $42 / 2443 / 1046 / 2257 / 1$ |
| beyond [5] 63/15 63/20 | 83/24 84/22 85/8 86/2 | ' [2] 11/7 51 | claimed [1] 86/19 | $70 / 570 / 1$ |
| g [4] 70/19 | 86/13 86/24 87/21 | $\mathbf{c a}$ | clarifies [1] 57/25 | mmunications [2] |
| 74/20 80/1 | 88/14 89/8 89/19 89/21 |  | [1] 70/8 | /3 |
| bit [10] 28/22 28/25 | 90/6 92/9 92/14 92/18 96/17 | CAROLYN [1] 1/12 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CLARK [3] } 1 / 23 / 1 \\ & 93 / 19 \end{aligned}$ | compared [1] 71/7 comparison [2] 16/25 |


| C | co |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| comparison... [1] 61/8 | 15/3 16/10 16/19 22/17 | co | /13 38/9 38/16 |  |
| complete [3] 33/3 42/5 | 22/24 23/8 23/19 28/12 | corroborate [1] 56/ | 39/3 57/12 57/15 90/16 | deem [1] 82/9 |
| /5 [3] 33/3 | 41/8 41/25 42/1 43/14 | corroboration [4] 56/5 | criminal [8] 27/25 31/2 | defendant [75] |
| completed [1] 91 | 43/19 43/22 44/13 45/7 | 56/9 56/14 56/16 | 76/23 78/5 85/8 85/17 | 1/20 4/25 |
| completely [2] 92/8 | 45/16 46/13 46/14 | could [23] 9/2 22/1 | 86/21 92/17 | $7 / 2$ |
| 96/3 | 46/18 47/4 47/5 47/5 | 23/18 39/3 39/22 39/23 | Cross [3] 2/11 18/2 | 38/15 47/2 47/11 47 |
| completion [1] 4 | 50/13 50/14 50/23 | 45/3 49/13 59/16 63/ | 18 | 48/2 48/3 48/6 48/7 |
| complex [30] 7/25 8/6 | 51/17 51/19 51/22 | 63/11 64/9 64/20 64/23 | Cross-Examination [2] | 48/10 48/13 48/17 |
| 8/9 9/19 9/22 10/3 | 51 | 70/20 80/3 83/21 83/21 | 2/11 18/4 |  |
| 12/11 12/20 13/9 18/20 | 57/20 61/24 62/1 62/10 | 85/18 86/8 86/10 86/1 | crouch [1] | 55 |
| 19/13 19/20 40/19 49/2 | 62/16 74/7 83/2 86/18 | 93/17 | crouched [1] 44/2 | 56/8 56/13 56/17 56/18 |
| 49/3 49/4 49/8 49/11 | 88 | couldn't [4] | crux [3] 32/10 33/24 | 56/19 56/25 57/12 |
| 49/12 49/14 50/10 | contacted [9] 15/9 | 65/7 68/17 | 38/ | 57/15 57/22 |
| 0/21 52/1 52/22 53/ | 21/10 23/15 41/16 | counsel [7] 3/23 25/5 | curfew [6] 8/19 8/24 | 58/16 59/8 60/12 61/25 |
| 71/12 84/18 88/24 89/1 | 41/16 50/15 79/10 83 | 25/25 26/22 27/4 29/22 | 9/1 9/3 89/13 89/18 | 2/5 62/11 76/16 |
| 89/2 | 89 | 75/13 | custody [2] 18/11 97 | 18 77/17 77/25 |
| complex...about | $\mathbf{c o}$ | Count [ | customarily [1] 5/6 |  |
| 52/25 | 23/17 45/19 70/10 | 94/4 94/6 94/9 | D | 83/24 84/2 84/14 84/25 |
| computer [2] 91 | 77/13 83/10 83/10 | 94/13 94/16 | $\overline{\mathrm{D}}$ | 5/9 85/21 86/18 86/20 |
| concerned [1] 29/17 | 88/17 | counter [2] 75/20 | damn [1] 50 | 4 88/8 88/17 |
| concluded [1] 97/4 | $\begin{gathered} \text { contacts [6] } 52 \\ 59 / 10-59 / 22 \end{gathered}$ |  | darker [2] | 93/20 93/23 |
| usion [2] | contest [1] |  | data [6] 52/17 52/19 | defendant's [11] 46/10 |
|  | continuation [1] | counts [3] 32/23 34/11 | 57/17 70/9 | 52/15 52/20 |
| 71/6 74/15 85/25 | continue [1] 62/14 | 36/19 | date [13] 6/17 6/18 | /13 57/17 62/9 79/6 |
| condition [1] | continued [2] 14/14 | COUNTY [3] | 6/25 11/1 11/16 11/1 | 20 85/15 89/16 |
| conducted [1] 6/1 |  |  |  | dants [4] 5 |
| confess [1] 81/16 | continue | couple [7] | 21/18 23/9 65/15 82/8 | 13 92/5 92/10 |
| confessed [3] 47/18 |  |  | 8] |  |
| 78/23 7 | continuing [1] 86/ |  | 20/21 48/20 66/25 | $4 \text { 25/1 }$ |
| confident [1] 90/12 |  | $30 / 2130 / 24$ | 72/16 73/2 80/19 | 76/25 |
| confirming [1] 56/18 | contrary [1] 45/10 | 33/24 36/6 37/24 39 | daughter [2] 68/1 | definitely [2] 18/11 |
| confront [2] 15/2 15/12 confronts [1] 55/18 | control [1] 61/7 | 44/13 44/22 47/4 47/19 | 68/18 | 37/15 |
|  | conveniently [1] 44/19 | 53/21 55/12 56/23 57/5 | Dave [1] 4/6 | definition [11] 65/16 |
|  | conversation [5] 5/1 | 57/9 77/2 86/11 90/11 | DAVID [2] 4/7 4/12 | 65/20 65/22 66/16 |
| 2] $56 / 85$ | 5/2 5/4 52/12 59/6 | 91 | day [19] 1/14 11/18 | 68/21 7 |
| connected [3] 24/19 | conversations [1] | court [8] 1/2 1/12 1/24 | 12/5 21/7 22/1 22/2 | 71/25 71/25 72/24 73/ |
| 24/21 24/24 | 55 | 3/24 26/23 30/6 | 22/20 23/5 24/1 30/15 | definitions [1] |
| connecting [2] 57 | converse [1] 24/18 | 95 | 1/9 55/ | deleted [5] 44/6 55/4 |
| $70 / 10$ | conversing [1] 16/22 | Court's [3] 3/9 17/25 | 73/3 81/1 83/11 85/1 | 62/8 76/21 88/5 |
| consciousness | convicted [3] 77/18 |  | 94 | deletes [1] |
| 71/16 71/17 | 78/1 78/4 | courtroom [8] 25/4 | days [9] 7/4 42/6 46/19 | deliberate [2] $27 / 7$ |
| consider [2] 29/2 | conviction [3] 61/10 | 28/6 28/18 28/24 40/4 | 51/3 60/9 65/12 66/23 | 91/20 |
| consider [2] 29 | 6 87/24 | 91/2 | 72/ | deliberation [2] 90/13 |
| consideration [1] 61/9 | convictions [2] 77/2 | cover [1] 79/2 | deactivated [1] 67/7 | 9 |
| consistent [3] 44/5 |  | covered [3] 30/12 35/6 | de | liberations [2] 30 |
| 46/5 53 | convincing [2] 47/16 |  | 32/3 32/6 32 |  |
| consistently [6] 18/22 | 47 | covers [1] 79/13 | 11 32/16 32/17 | demanding [2] 36/14 |
| 19/19 53/3 53/24 60/4 | cool [1] | credibility [11] 57/ | 36/2 | 36/24 |
| 60/7 | cooler [1] 37/2 | 57/11 60/17 60/18 | 37/21 37/23 38/6 62/21 | demonstrate [1] 27/24 |
| conspiracy [18] 32/23 | copies [1] 82/14 | 60/24 67/11 73/5 73/6 | 62/23 62/24 62/25 63/1 | demonstrates [1] |
| 32/24 32/24 32/24 | copy [1] 86/25 | 77/21 87/11 87/18 | /1 94/2 | 38/10 |
| 32/25 33/5 34/8 34/ | correct [45] 4/22 5/22 | credible [1] 87/14 | 94/8 94/9 94/10 94/11 | denial [1] 42/5 |
| 35/9 36/4 62/20 62/22 | 6/9 6/22 7/8 7/9 9/19 | crime [46] 7/1 16/20 | 94/12 94/13 94/15 | denied [3] 41/7 76/20 |
| 63/19 87/2 93/24 93/25 | 9/22 9/25 10/1 10/4 | 17/21 18/9 27/22 28/13 | 94/16 94/17 | 76/21 |
|  | 10/5 10/11 10/12 10/ | 30/16 31/1 31/3 31/4 | deal [1] 68/6 | denies [5] 41/4 41/5 |
| conspired [3] 36/7 | 12/6 12/12 12/13 12/17 | 31/22 32/22 33/1 33/2 | dealing [2] 68/15 81/6 | 41/7 41/8 41/11 |
| 69/12 76/2 | 13/6 13/23 13/24 14/9 | 33/2 33/3 33/15 33/17 | death [1] 32/14 | deny [6] 76/12 76/13 |
| conspiring [1] 69/9 | 14/25 15/10 15/18 | 33/21 33/22 33/23 | December [2] 48/4 | 6/19 76/19 84/16 |
| constant [4] 46/20 | 15/22 16/1 16/4 16/8 | 34/4 36/13 38/14 45/1 | 51 | 4/16 |
| 46/21 51/18 60/8 | 16/16 18/18 18/22 | 47/14 49/1 | December 10th [1] | departed [2] 25/4 |
| constantly [2] 43/25 | 19/3 19/5 20/12 20/24 <br> 23/4 23/10 23/17 25/20 | $76 /$ | decide | 91/22 <br> department [2] |
| 46/21 | 25/21 26/8 48/23 | 78/20 78/21 78/22 | decided [1] 62/14 | 93/21 |
| constitutes [1] 56/13 constitution [1] 95/10 | corrected [4] 91/24 <br> 91/25 92/15 92/20 | $\begin{aligned} & 78 / 2579 / 184 / 2184 / 23 \\ & 88 / 1 \end{aligned}$ | decides [2] 54/22 68/16 | depends [1] 8/11 DEPT [1] 1/7 |


| D |
| :--- |
| deputy [3] $1 / 181 / 19$ |
| $93 / 3$ |

describe [5] 64/9 64/20 65/5 65/7 74/10
description [5] 64/21 64/24 69/14 72/4 74/19 desire [1] 94/25
despite [6] 35/3 41/20 45/10 46/5 51/12 57/19
Destiny [7] 22/14 22/17 22/22 50/25 58/5 58/15 59/5
destroy [1] 57/10 details [4] 55/9 78/2 78/3 78/4
detective [75] 3/11 4/6
4/18 5/24 18/6 23/15 34/17 35/1 39/6 40/2 40/8 40/8 40/23 41/9 41/18 41/22 42/8 42/19 42/23 43/1 43/5 43/11 44/1 44/7 45/8 45/15 46/3 46/12 46/23 47/3 47/6 47/23 48/1 48/14 48/23 49/15 49/18 50/2 51/14 51/19 51/22 52/2 52/3 52/13 52/23 53/19 53/22 54/9 54/19 54/22 54/23 58/4 65/8 65/10 65/20 66/8 66/17 66/19 67/1 67/5 71/15 71/19 71/25 72/15 72/17 72/20 72/22 78/21
80/17 80/25 88/2 88/20 88/23 89/9 89/15
Detective Basilotta [4] 52/23 53/19 53/22 54/9 Detective Dave [1] 4/6 Detective Miller [55] 34/17 35/1 39/6 40/2 40/8 40/8 40/23 41/9 41/18 41/22 42/8 42/19 42/23 43/1 43/5 43/11 44/1 45/8 45/15 46/12 46/23 47/3 47/6 47/23
48/1 48/14 48/23 49/15 49/18 50/2 51/14 51/19 51/22 52/2 52/3 52/13 54/19 54/22 54/23 65/8 65/10 66/8 66/19 67/1 67/5 71/15 72/15 72/17 72/22 78/21 80/17 80/25 88/20 89/9 89/15
Detective Miller's [3] 65/20 71/25 72/20 detectives [2] 55/10 68/2
determination [1] 59/16
determine [2] 29/10 54/25
determined [3] 60/19 73/6 82/15
device [4] 70/22 70/23 71/7 74/14
DEVOHN [14] 1/9 3/21
4/21 7/7 14/8 16/15

63/19 71/10 72/20 74/19 77/2 93/2 93/20 93/23
Devohn's [1] 74/16 dictate [1] $74 / 5$ did [94] 6/14 6/17 6/23 7/11 7/12 7/20 7/23 7/24 8/5 8/14 8/15 8/19 9/1 9/7 10/9 10/21 11/15 11/21 11/25 12/1 12/4 12/9 12/14 12/18 12/23 13/1 13/5 13/8 13/11 13/20 14/1 14/2 14/20 14/21 15/2 15/8 15/12 15/12 15/19 15/25 16/3 16/5 16/7 16/9 16/12 17/3 17/4 17/18 17/22 18/14 18/16 19/6 19/14 20/4 20/25 20/25 21/13 21/15 21/19 21/20 21/22 22/13 30/23 33/22 41/15 48/14 52/10 57/13 61/14 62/13 64/25 65/9 65/13 66/5 66/17 66/20 69/24 70/1 71/18 72/1 74/5 75/6 76/1 78/2 79/14 79/18 81/4 81/13 83/14 85/13 86/4 86/4 88/22 92/14
didn't [54] 10/23 10/24 14/17 18/10 19/4 19/11 19/15 19/19 19/20 19/23 19/25 20/21
20/22 21/15 21/18 38/2 39/10 39/24 48/8 48/15 49/14 50/22 50/23 64/21 65/2 65/24 66/2 66/11 66/13 66/15 68/2 68/4 68/19 68/24 68/25 71/22 71/23 72/9 72/12 72/17 74/4 78/5 79/2 80/18 80/18 81/16 84/17 84/18 87/3 88/22 89/13 89/13 89/18 96/3 die [1] 80/9
died [1] 80/9
difference [8] 29/8
29/11 64/12 64/13 64/19 64/19 74/20 74/21
differences [1] 80/14 different [15] 6/21 8/21 27/15 27/25 50/6 65/17 65/22 66/16 68/21 70/19 71/8 72/21 72/24 73/1 86/17
digital [1] 91/6
digits [1] 72/11
dinner [1] 87/21
direct [13] 2/10 4/16
28/3 28/4 28/7 28/16 28/23 29/7 29/11 34/4 82/3 86/3 86/16
direction [1] 17/10
directly [2] 33/19 34/2
disabled [1] 72/12
disables [1] 72/13
discharged [1] 96/9 disconnect [1] 83/13 disconnected [2] 55/13 62/7
discovered [1] 39/14 discrepancy [1] 72/5
discuss [1] 30/4
discussed [2] 4/24 56/16
discussing [2] 7/11 10/20
discussion [2] 12/25 17/3
disputing [2] 76/1 76/2 disregard [2] 73/15 89/6
distance [7] 17/19
17/19 17/21 48/17
48/25 89/9 89/10
distanced [1] 88/23 distinction [2] 70/19 80/1
district [8] $1 / 21 / 12$ 1/18 1/19 81/19 93/3 93/19 95/7
divide [1] 59/5
divided [1] 88/15
Division [1] 96/12
Dixon [3] 22/14 22/18 22/22
DMV [1] 8/3
do [46] $3 / 53 / 53 / 53 / 16$ 5/1 17/17 17/18 24/3 24/9 25/22 25/24 25/25 36/7 38/13 40/23 42/14 47/3 48/2 49/22 50/3 50/4 50/5 50/22 52/7 66/5 67/10 67/17 68/4 68/14 71/1 71/23 74/14 76/6 77/17 84/2 84/19 87/13 87/19 88/23 88/25 91/7 91/11 93/5 95/20 96/5 97/6
documents [1] 91/25
does [50] 5/10 9/10 12/5 12/13 13/6 24/8 25/10 25/12 25/13 25/14 25/15 25/17
25/19 32/20 35/5 37/4 40/23 43/12 44/1 45/8 45/15 46/7 47/3 48/2
48/7 48/13 51/5 54/20
55/25 56/1 57/9 57/24
57/25 61/24 62/1 62/4 62/7 62/9 62/11 68/14 71/5 72/13 74/25 77/12 79/13 81/14 86/11 88/10 94/25 96/17
doesn't [31] 11/7 20/18 38/4 41/18 41/19 42/1 48/6 49/17 50/25 51/7 51/20 53/9 53/10 56/9 61/25 65/19 65/24 66/6 66/8 66/9 66/9 68/23 69/3 69/8 69/15 71/15
72/25 74/6 84/10 86/22 87/3
dog [1] 49/16
doing [6] 49/16 54/25

69/19 69/20 71/19 80/20
don't [88] 6/2 8/8 9/9 9/13 9/14 9/24 10/2 10/3 11/1 11/3 11/6 11/22 12/15 13/2 13/16 14/11 14/22 14/23 15/17 15/20 15/25 16/3 16/13 21/3 21/3 23/5 23/16 27/6 31/25 33/7 33/21 35/21 35/22 38/25 40/25 48/20 48/21 49/3 49/5 49/5 49/8 49/10 49/12 49/13 49/25 50/7 50/7 50/10 50/11 50/15 50/16 50/17 50/19 50/21 50/23 52/6 52/8 56/25 61/18 65/18 66/3 66/4 68/7 71/20 71/24 74/10 74/17 80/8 81/2 81/21 83/17 83/18 83/22 83/23 83/23 84/6 84/12 85/6 87/6 87/20 88/13 88/24 88/25 89/1 89/2 90/3 91/15 95/19
done [3] 3/7 43/9 75/10 Doo [1] 88/25 door [22] 34/21 34/24 35/2 35/10 35/12 35/22 36/6 36/8 38/24 39/15
39/22 40/3 40/11 40/16 40/17 40/22 41/5 42/12 44/19 45/4 45/6 61/19 dots [1] 70/23
doubt [16] 30/10 61/1 61/2 61/5 61/6 61/6 61/11 61/11 63/15 63/21 71/9 74/11 75/18 75/22 75/24 76/7 down [14] 33/7 34/9 38/23 38/24 44/21 54/22 64/5 64/14 68/6 79/8 79/20 87/22 95/24 96/1
drawer [1] 37/3
drawers [1] 37/5
drawn [1] 37/10
dressed [1] 64/22 drink [1] 35/23 drive [1] 34/8 driver [1] 79/4 driving [1] 47/24 droplets [1] 29/3 dropped [1] 68/12 duly [1] 4/8 dumbass [1] 79/8 during [16] $9 / 3$ 11/12 11/14 14/4 18/13 24/17 28/6 29/23 29/24 32/22 43/22 55/7 60/8 61/15 62/2 83/1
duty [2] 24/18 96/1

## E

each [28] 21/10 22/24
23/15 30/11 33/21
33/22 35/25 43/23
43/25 45/5 46/25 46/25

47/1 54/12 54/14 58/18 58/19 61/15 63/15
66/15 71/22 75/23
79/10 83/6 84/8 88/17 92/14 92/15
earlier [3] 17/11 28/14 89/15
early [1] 60/4
easy [1] 85/2
eerily [1] 57/23
effect [1] 77/20
eight [8] 64/15 69/7 74/2 74/20 79/25 86/21 90/16 96/19 eight-way [1] 86/21
Eighth [1] 95/7
either [10] 18/14 20/14 21/1 25/25 31/16 59/5 83/3 87/20 87/21 94/25
element [6] 31/22 32/17 33/22 56/10 63/16 75/23
elements [1] 30/11 eleven [5] 64/7 64/18 69/7 79/20 80/11 eligible [1] 96/18 eliminate [1] 92/4 ELLSWORTH [2] 1/12 95/7
else [18] 24/19 31/12 31/23 36/23 41/16 41/16 42/14 44/8 45/15 48/16 53/10 64/21 64/23 81/13 83/14 83/24 84/14 85/13 emphatically [2] 89/1 89/16
encompasses [1] 53/23 encourage [3] 33/13 43/18 58/21 encourages [1] 92/18 encouraging [1] 34/9 end [4] 7/17 44/20 49/16 50/18 ends [1] 75/1 enough [10] 40/10 44/18 48/18 49/3 56/10 57/5 57/6 77/1 77/5 78/20
enter [3] 34/23 35/21 72/11
entered [2] 36/1 82/4 enters [1] 30/15 entire [8] 14/14 61/8 73/15 77/2 80/21 82/25 89/6 90/11
entitled [4] 80/20 80/21 93/22 97/7
entry [2] 30/18 31/2
equal [1] $71 / 5$
equals [1] 76/24
escape [1] 31/18
escapes [1] 39/18 especially [2] 66/7 74/22
ESQ [3] $1 / 17$ 1/18 $1 / 20$ essentially [11] 8/13 10/16 15/13 76/13 77/1

| E | 28 | feelings [2] 60/21 73/8 | floor [3] | gentlemen [17] 4/1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| essentially... [6] 78/8 | except [2] 7/15 48/9 | $\text { ] } 2$ |  | 24/10 24/17 26/24 |
| 80/17 82/23 87/2 89/16 | excuse [3] 35/15 41/14 |  |  |  |
| 89/21 |  | fe |  | 89/21 90/23 93/9 94/20 |
| tablishes [1] 8/4 |  | fe | [2] | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 89/21 90/23 93/9 94/20 } \\ & 95 / 6 \end{aligned}$ |
| aluate [2] 60/24 | exhibit [2] 88/14 92/3 | 30/23 81/1 | foot [1] 79/25 | [2] |
|  | Exhibit 71 [1] 88/14 | felony [5] 30/16 | force [13] 31/7 31 | get [39] 11/7 12/5 12/8 |
| en [36] 9/14 9/24 | exhibits [2] 88/14 91/1 | 30/21 36/1 85/2 | 31/12 31/15 31/18 | 17/13 29/1 38/2 38 |
| 19/10 29/17 39/24 | exist [2] 30/25 56/9 |  | 1/24 32/2 32/4 32/4 | 38/22 41/10 42/2 45/24 |
| 39/25 41/9 42/1 49/5 | exit [1] 34/22 | Ferguson [2] 38/ | 32/7 34/4 36/17 | 51/7 51/8 |
| 49/21 49/25 50/15 | expand [1] 54 |  | foreperson [3] 93/10 | /24 55/16 55/ |
| 51/15 55/1 55/24 57/18 | expect [5] 17/18 42/24 | Ferony [6] | 93/14 94/19 | 62/ |
| 57/19 60/5 62/10 64/4 | 53/16 58/17 58/19 | 37/13 37/17 38/3 64/2 | form [4] 24/23 26/5 | 8/6 68/7 70/9 75/ |
| 64/13 65/5 65/6 66/11 | expectation [1] | Ferony's [2] 36 |  | 76/22 79/22 80/5 80/8 |
| 68/22 69/13 72/5 74/10 | expected [2] 17/16 | 55/22 | format [1] | /18 81/1 83/20 83/23 |
| 7/14 78/24 79/9 81/2 | 80/3 | few [14] 6/4 17/17 | forth [2] 60/8 83 | 85/2 85/11 86/1 86/23 |
| 81/18 86/18 88/4 89/23 | expecting [1] | 29/20 42/6 46/18 4 | fortuitously [1] 83 | 96/1 |
| evening [2] 62/2 77/14 | experience [3] 41/2 | 1/3 | forward [1] 81/16 | getaway [1] 79/4 |
| er [2] 46/13 70/14 | 48/24 79/12 | 65/12 66/22 72/18 73/2 | found [5] 39/4 83/ | gets [9] 37/17 42/19 |
| ery[16] 27/22 28/1 | experiences [1] | fighters [1] 86/1 | 92 | /25 56/1 62/7 68/1 |
| 9/14 33/21 33/22 35/4 | experts [2] 70/15 70/20 | figure [1] 46/8 | four [6] 64/18 72/3 | /7 79/10 80/7 |
| 36/1 46/6 46/6 56/9 | explain [2] 27/1 49/10 | final [3] 26/12 26 | 72/11 77/18 85/2 88/1 | getting [10] 11/1 53 |
| 56/10 61/15 63/15 | explained [1] 81/18 | 10 | r-time [2] 77/18 | 57/4 60/10 67/13 67/18 |
| 75/23 80/22 92/14 | 51/14 | finally [3] 24/25 52 | 88 | 87/8 79/6 87/24 |
| everybody's |  |  |  | nt [1] 80/2 |
| everyone [6] 36/23 | eyewitness [2] 28/7 | financial | kly | [5] 42/22 42/22 |
| 38/10 64/21 65/18 |  |  |  |  |
| 68/21 72/25 | F |  |  |  |
| s [1] | fac |  | FRIDAY [10] 1/13 | 2/21 49/16 50/18 51/6 |
| everything [3] 3/11 | 19/2 19/5 19/6 50/7 | find [9] 17/12 20/4 | 11/23 23/3 77/6 80/24 | 58/6 62/15 66/14 68/24 |
|  | 58/9 58/9 65/1 79/1 | 32/21 38/22 38/25 | 81/2 81/4 81/8 81/9 | 2 83/5 83/10 8 |
| everywhere [2] 86/6 | 79/13 | 43/12 51/5 89/5 9 | 82/25 | 86/20 88/9 |
|  | faces [1] 79/2 | finds [1] 46/8 | friend [16] 16/5 | gist [2] 76/15 77 |
| evidence [67] 27/17 | facial [1] 72/10 | fine [3] 49/22 50/2 81/3 | 19/23 50/17 65 | give [16] 5/11 6/6 |
| 27/18 28/2 28/3 28/3 | fact [29] 9/1 15/2 15/13 | fingerprint [1] 72/9 | 65/19 65/22 66/16 | 17/15 22/13 24/1 |
| 28/4 28/4 28/7 28/9 | 17/22 18/14 21/19 | fire[2] 86/9 86/12 | 68/21 71/13 73/1 79/9 | 55/1 |
| 28/9 28/11 28/17 28/23 | 32/16 34/18 35/3 37/4 |  | 82/18 83/25 84/6 84/11 |  |
| 29/8 29/12 29/16 29/22 | $41 / 2042 / 1943 / 1346 / 5$ | firearm [7] 31/13 32/16 $32 / 1632 / 1732 / 20$ | 82/18 83/25 84/6 84/11 friends [11] $9 / 109 / 13$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6 / 1377 / 69 \\ & 95 / 1395 / 13 \end{aligned}$ |
| 29/25 30/23 32/21 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 41/20 42/19 43/13 46/5 } \\ & \text { 17/12 } 17 / 17 \text { 56/10 } \end{aligned}$ | 2/16 32/17 32/20 | friends [11] 9/10 9/13 | 95/13 95/13 <br> given [4] 32 |
| 34/12 35/8 38/17 41/20 | 57/19 64/3 66/17 66/18 |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & n[4] \text { n } 32 / \\ & 796 / 18 \end{aligned}$ |
| 43/17 45/9 45/15 46/23 | 69/1 69/3 73/14 76/1 | firearms [3] 35/7 35/24 | 68/20 68/22 84/7 84/9 | gives [4] 55 |
| 47/10 47/15 47/16 | 76/3 76/25 96/17 96/ |  | [1] |  |
| 47/18 47/24 47/25 |  |  |  |  |
| 48/11 51/15 51/21 | facts [3] | 46/14 48/18 58/9 | fuck [2] 15/16 49/2 | giving [6] 25/11 25/19 |
| 52/16 54/16 56/11 |  | 68 | fucking [1] 15/5 | 5/11 36/5 41/2 44/3 |
| 56/12 56/17 56/18 | fair [2] 6/20 | five [28] 64/7 64/7 | full [4] 4/10 52/16 | ance [1] 34/17 |
| 56/19 56/21 57/13 5 | fake [2] 55/10 55/14 | 64/11 64/11 64/12 | 92/12 95/13 | gloves [4] 35/6 44/24 |
|  | fall [8] 63/22 63/23 | 64/12 64/13 64/14 | full-on [1] 92/1 | 64/23 65/5 |
| 62/19 63/12 73/17 | 69/5 70/4 70/6 79/17 | 64/15 64/17 64/18 | further [16] 8/5 8/14 | go [38] 3/10 3/17 10/3 |
|  | 80/13 85/9 | 64/19 69/7 69/7 69/7 | 9/7 12/8 12/14 12/18 | 10/24 13/11 13/12 |
|  | falling [1] 28/20 | 69/7 72/3 72/4 72/6 | 12/25 15/8 15/19 17/25 | 13/13 13/14 13/14 |
|  | Fame [6] 49/23 65/25 | 72/11 74/20 74/20 | 22/7 23/11 23/20 24/3 | 13/15 21/21 24/12 |
|  | 66/2 71/13 72/2 79/7 | 74/22 79/19 79/20 | 24/4 60/5 | 27/7 28/19 29/1 |
|  | familiar [2] 25/5 26/4 | 79/25 80/10 80/11 | furthermore [5] 9/1 | 35/24 37/1 38/2 38/5 |
|  | family [3] 10/10 10/18 | five inches [3] 72/3 | 9/24 10/20 38/12 43/20 | 10 41/22 42/ |
| exact [11] 9/18 11/3 |  |  | G | 44/14 44 |
| 14/12 18/17 21/18 23/5 | far [4] 39/20 |  |  |  |
| 48/20 53/2 53/12 57/25 | far [4] 39/20 40/4 4 | five-eight [4] 64/15 | gambling [1] 42/18 | 59/1 |
| 53/2 53/12 57/25 |  | 69/7 74/20 79/25 |  | 59/21 83/12 90/4 90/12 |
|  |  | five-eleven [5] | [1] | od [1] 80/10 |
| 21/3 40/13 45/3 48/20 | fear [6] 31/8 31/15 | 18 69/7 79/20 80/1 | gaming [1] 4215 | goes [7] 34/20 46 |
| 65/15 66/20 88/22 | 31/18 31/19 31/25 32/1 | five-five [1] 64/12 | GARCIA [1] 1/24 | 3/12 54/5 78/21 79/13 |
| xamination [8] $2 / 10$ | fearful [1] 8 | five-nine [1] 69/7 | gas [2] 85/6 85/8 | 89/21 |
| 2/11 2/12 2/13 4/16 | fears [2] 60/20 73/8 | five-ten [10] 64/7 64/1 | thering [1] 54/2 | going [86] 5/21 8/13 |
| 18/4 22/10 23/13 | feed [2] 42/10 59/15 | 4/11 64/13 64/17 69/7 | gave [7] 8/2 20/19 | 0/21 10/23 11/5 11/6 |
| example [7] 20/19 21 | feel [7] 28/21 28/21 | 72/4 74/22 79/19 80/10 | 20/20 21/4 21/25 55 | 11 17/12 |
| 1/8 21/25 28/5 28/10 | 32/1 32/2 61/10 69/16 69/18 | five-three [1] 64/14 flip [1] 53/21 | 55/11 <br> genius [2] 78/10 78/11 | $\begin{aligned} & 17 / 12 \text { 17/16 24/11 } \\ & 24 / 15 \text { 30/24 32/9 34/7 } \end{aligned}$ |


| G | $50$ | he'd [2] 66/22 77/8 | 10/3 11/4 12/5 29/1 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| going... [69] 34/7 | 63/23 63/24 65/18 | he's [102] | 41/22 49/16 51/6 51/8 | 20/19 20/20 21 |
| 35/11 38/22 41/10 42/2 | 67/19 69/5 70/4 70/7 | head [7] 31 | 89/17 | 21/8 21/15 21/16 |
| 2/25 43/5 44/4 44/8 | 71/15 71/20 73/19 74/9 | 37/17 37/19 38/1 66/24 | honest [2] 77/22 84/6 | 27/1 28/24 31/7 31/9 |
| 44/20 44/25 45/24 | 75/2 75/9 77/19 78/15 | 79/22 | Honor [25] 4/5 18/3 | 31/9 31/18 31/21 32/1 |
| 48/13 48/16 48/19 | 79/17 80/13 80/13 85/9 | head's [1] 80/7 | 22/7 23/24 24/4 24/9 | 32/16 32/21 33/20 34/3 |
| 48/24 51/1 51/2 51/3 | 87/25 90/2 90/4 90/6 | heads [1] 55/5 | 25/7 25/9 25/12 25/14 | 34/6 34/8 35/2 38/23 |
| 51/10 52/11 53/19 | guy's [1] 65/1 | hear [6] 28/1 77 | 25/17 25/21 25/24 26/2 | 39/25 40/20 41/6 |
| 4/11 54/24 54/25 56/6 | guys [2] 41/2 95/23 | 80/22 81/13 85/13 | 26/3 26/6 26/9 26/10 | 43/4 44/22 45/22 46/13 |
| 58/8 59/7 59/14 59/14 | gym [3] 10/24 10/24 | 85/18 | 63/6 93/7 93/8 95/2 | 48/23 48/24 49/1 50/13 |
| 59/15 59/15 60/1 60/3 |  | heard [26] 28/2 30/13 | 95/3 96/15 96/25 | 51/ |
| 60/4 60/12 61/2 63/22 | H | 33/10 34/12 39/5 47/8 | HONORABLE [1] 1/12 | 56/12 57/6 57/19 |
| 64/13 64/15 65/2 65/17 |  |  |  | 58/18 58/22 59/4 |
| 65/21 68/5 71/20 72/7 | had [57] 4/20 5/1 6/18 | 76/16 77/23 78/10 | hoses [1] 86/10 |  |
| 72/25 74/21 75/6 75/11 | $\begin{gathered} \text { had [57] } 4 / 205 / 16 / 18 \\ 6 / 206 / 237 / 47 / 47 / 5 \end{gathered}$ | 78/25 79/1 79/3 80/16 | hospital [2] 38/2 38 <br> hours [4] 41/17 44/ | 67/2 68/24 71/4 |
| 75/12 76/14 76/22 | $\begin{array}{ll}10 / 7 \\ 10 / 10 & 10 / 17 \\ 10 / 17\end{array}$ | 82/12 84/19 85/14 | $\begin{gathered} \text { hours [4] } 4 \\ 62 / 270 / 13 \end{gathered}$ | $71 / 1872 / 573 / 1373 / 16$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 77 / 1077 / 1279 / 20 \\ & 79 / 2280 / 882 / 1383 / 12 \end{aligned}$ | 11/17 12/19 14/3 15/3 | 85/19 90/7 90/7 | house [2] 8/20 53/10 | 76/5 76/24 77/11 80/10 |
| 83/13 85/7 85/9 85/18 | 15/13 17/7 21/6 22/24 | hearing [1] $17 / 8$ | how [26] 5/25 12/1 | 81/8 81/22 82/2 82/1 |
|  | 23/5 28/12 36/1 37/10 | heels [1] 79/25 | 21/1 32/17 35/11 36 | 83/19 84/15 84/21 |
| 95/23 | 37/16 38/24 39/24 43/9 | height [2] 74/20 74/23 | 47/15 49/13 51/10 | 5/15 86/12 87/6 88/1 |
| Goldst | 44/3 44/3 44/4 44/5 | held [1] 34/9 | 52/24 57/3 57/13 70 | 88/13 88/25 89/5 89/12 |
| 64/8 64/10 64/17 6 | 45/11 55/5 62/5 64/22 | help [7] 58/8 69/15 | 70/10 75/20 79/21 84/2 | 89/19 91/5 91/11 92/22 |
| 74/22 79/19 | 64/23 66/14 66/14 | 69/20 69/21 73/21 77/7 | 85/7 87/9 91/8 91/8 | 93/17 95/20 96/4 96/5 |
| gone [2] 38/2 | 66/14 68/24 68/25 70 | 87/16 | 91/11 91/16 92/10 | immaterial [1] 31 |
| good [14] 4/1 4/2 4/18 | 72/10 74/3 74/7 76/6 | helpful [3] 88/13 88/14 | 92/14 96/2 | immediately [7] 35/24 |
| 4/19 18/6 18/7 24/1 | 1 78/9 78/16 80/ | 88/18 | however [5] 27/2 28/2 | 36/9 38/22 39/13 47 |
| 2 63/8 68/8 81/1 | 81/13 82/23 82/24 | hel | 36/20 53/6 95/ | 53/9 54/5 |
| /9 87/23 90/6 | 85/21 88/1 92/4 | her [19] 23/3 23/6 34/8 | huge [5] 64/12 64/19 | immediately leads [1] |
| got [16] 3/6 8/22 19/18 | half [3] 52/25 | 34/9 37/3 51/8 | 90/9 90/9 | 39/13 |
| 40/25 65/12 66/6 67/11 | 85/ | 55/7 58/9 581 | humid [1] 29/ | pair [1] 57 |
| 67/15 68/3 69/19 73/1 | Halloween [4] 11/23 | 62/15 73/7 73/7 73/8 | humor [1] 89/20 | impartial [1] 63/11 |
| 77/25 78/3 78/4 81/20 | 80/24 81/9 83/1 | 73/9 73/10 73/11 80/7 | hundreds [2] 6/2 | important [21] 27/3 |
|  | Halloween.' [1] 81/5 | here [37] 3/11 24/11 | hurry [2] 28/20 85/12 | 27/4 29/7 32/19 38 |
| gotten [3] 6/23 66/22 | hand [6] 28/21 37/17 | 28/6 34/14 34/16 35/23 | hurt [2] 55/16 55/19 | 0/6 42/6 43/20 48/5 |
|  | 66/24 66 | 40/1 43/7 44/8 |  | 8/5 52/20 53/18 64/8 |
| govern [1] 61/6 |  |  |  | 69/2 69/4 69/25 73/5 |
| Gowan [4] 7/25 8/2 | ha | 53/18 58/7 61/3 61/21 <br> 63/16 66/1 66/19 69/16 | I'd [4] | 73/13 79/19 81/17 |
| 54/6 | hang [2] 66/9 66/12 | $\begin{aligned} & 63 / 1666 / 166 / 1969 / 16 \\ & 74 / 474 / 2475 / 1175 / 25 \end{aligned}$ | I'll [6] 25/1 41/12 |  |
| grass [2] 29/4 | happen [2] 28/8 76/1 | 80/7 80/20 80/20 80/21 | 68/6 70/8 96/25 | pressions [1] 96 |
| graveyard [5] 55/7 | happened [12] 5/14 | 84/16 84/24 85/12 | I'm [45] 6/7 8/13 9/8 | [292] |
| 59/18 59/20 62/2 77/4 | 21/9 28/6 56/25 59/2 | 86/24 87/13 89/24 90/9 | 9/17 10/21 11/2 11/5 | in at [1] 92/16 |
|  | 63/18 64/6 65/6 65/15 | here's [3] 50/25 56/6 | 12/1 17/11 17/12 19/10 | INC [1] 1/25 |
| ries [3] | 69/19 81/8 89/24 |  | 19/10 24/10 26/24 | hes [3] 72/3 |
|  | happening [2] 46/20 | hereby [1] 97/6 | 28/17 29/23 41/11 | 20 |
|  | 54/15 | hey [6] 35/22 41/10 | 41/12 48/13 48/18 | inches' [1] |
|  | happens [4] | 44/24 45/24 46/2 81/20 | 48/23 49/9 54/24 54/25 | incident [1] 10/14 |
|  | 57/4 60/6 | hide [6] 40/20 42/1 | 59/19 61/2 65/18 66/4 | include [2] 16/20 32/2 |
|  | happy [1] 79/17 | 45/2 45/14 71/22 82/17 | 67/16 67/17 68/5 69/19 | including [2] 24/22 |
| $\begin{aligned} & {[4] \text { [ } 8 / 1582} \\ & \substack{ \\ \hline \\ \hline 101} \end{aligned}$ | harm [2] 32/12 32/14 | hiding [2] 44/21 | /20 75/10 75/10 | 82/9 |
| 86/21 | has [46] 8/19 24/4 24/7 | him [125] | 76/14 76/22 77/18 | incoming [1] |
| $\text { [3] } 2$ | 25/4 25/18 27/24 31/4 | himself [15] 17/19 | 83/12 83/12 85/7 85/1 | indicate [10] 6/17 6/23 |
|  | 31/15 34/13 37/18 38/4 | 17/20 17/21 22/4 48/17 | 86/23 90/3 90/6 | 9 11/15 12/23 32/15 |
|  | 38/21 41/13 41/16 42/4 | 48/25 64/3 64/10 67/21 | I've [7] 13/15 14/23 | 44/7 52/25 53/20 57/21 |
| $17 \text { 29/18 } 6$ | 44/7 45/22 46/13 51/16 | 69/15 69/21 73/21 | 50/7 81/6 81/7 81/7 | icated [7] 5/20 6/8 |
|  | 51/18 56/8 56/11 63/23 | 88/23 89/9 89/10 | 89/19 | 11 10/16 25/19 39/10 |
|  | 63/24 67/13 68/21 69/5 | his [186] | ID [1] | 84/25 |
|  | 70/5 70/6 72/8 73/14 | hit [7] 31/10 37/14 | identically [1] 92/8 | indicates [3] 54/3 |
|  | 73/20 73/20 75/2 75/3 | 37/17 37/20 38/1 38/5 | identified [2] 42/21 | 54/15 54/16 |
|  | 75/15 75/15 76/6 76/25 | 5 | 79/3 | dicating [2] 12/9 |
| 6 | 80/19 81/25 82/14 89/6 | hitting [5] 32/6 32/7 | identifies [2] 37/19 | 6/21 |
|  | 93/9 93/14 96/18 | 53/24 54/2 |  | dicted |
|  | have [1 | hogwash [1] 75/12 | identify [9] 47 | Indictment [1] 67/15 |
| $36 / 1437 / 337 / 10$ | haven't [3] 15/8 41/16 | hold [1] 36/14 | 67/19 69/3 69/1 | individual [5] 37/16 |
| gutters [1] 29/4 |  | holding [2] 41/ | 69/11 70/4 73/23 | 39/19 78/9 80/16 87/22 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { guy [33] } 16 / 118 / 19 \\ & 18 / 2540 / 2450 / 350 / 5 \end{aligned}$ | having [6] 4/8 5/2 41/8 44/2 59/6 62/10 he [517] | holds [3] 34/21 35/2 40/11 <br> home [12] 6/9 9/5 9/5 | identity [5] 47/21 78/18 <br> 78/19 78/25 79/5 <br> if [96] 6/12 8/5 10/24 | individually [1] 65/21 individuals [12] 29/18 33/20 35/5 35/9 35/21 |

## I

individuals... [7] 36/22 38/12 40/4 40/15 42/10 45/13 87/20
inducement [1] 57/9 indulgence [1] 17/25 infer [2] 29/5 33/9
influenced [1] 30/3 informally [1] 27/1 information [18] 24/22 35/11 36/5 40/8 41/3 44/3 45/12 54/23 54/24 55/3 55/8 57/4 59/16 60/11 70/13 70/14 81/25 87/10
informed [1] 63/13 initialed [3] 92/1 92/16 92/19
injury [3] 31/8 31/15 31/19
innocent [1] 84/20 inquiry [2] 32/10 38/8 inside [8] 29/2 30/24 41/3 44/3 45/12 57/4 85/18 85/23
insinuations [1] 30/1
instance [1] 21/4
instigates [1] 33/13
instruct [2] 91/8 91/10
instructed [2] 26/1
91/15
instructing [1] 24/13
instruction [17] 47/15
56/4 56/7 60/17 61/2
67/12 73/4 77/19 87/1
87/9 87/12 89/5 92/2
92/3 92/7 92/13 92/15
instructions [24] 3/4
3/8 24/13 25/6 25/11 25/16 25/19 25/23
26/25 27/2 27/7 27/10 29/21 32/15 33/11
35/18 47/10 61/3 82/12
86/25 89/8 91/2 91/24 92/20
instrument [1] 32/11
intend [1] 33/1
intended [2] 78/11
92/4
intent [11] 30/15 30/17
30/18 30/18 31/2 33/13
33/25 47/20 78/17 86/7
92/17
intention [1] 36/1
interesting [14] 44/20 52/14 54/6 55/2 55/17 58/11 59/11 64/10 77/9 77/24 78/24 79/4 84/25 87/11
interestingly [1] 44/18 interests [2] 60/20 73/8
Internet [1] 24/23
interpret [1] 87/17
interpretation [2]
86/13 87/16
interview [25] 5/12
8/10 8/11 8/12 8/14

9/18 11/12 11/15 11/21 12/8 16/15 17/4 17/6 17/9 17/16 18/13 18/23 19/12 19/17 48/4 65/11 65/13 66/21 72/17 72/22
interviewed [1] 45/24 interviewing [1] 5/5 interviews [3] 5/25 41/4 48/10
intimidation [2] 31/25 32/2
into [45] 12/8 13/15 16/15 17/6 17/8 17/16 24/12 24/15 26/12 30/24 34/23 35/10 35/23 36/6 36/8 37/6 37/8 39/2 39/11 39/16 39/25 40/13 43/11
44/20 44/22 44/25 45/6
60/1 60/3 60/4 60/12
60/13 61/17 61/17 62/4
68/7 76/22 77/10 78/3
78/4 82/4 83/20 83/21
90/12 91/3
invested [1] 74/3
investigation [14]
17/10 18/12 20/4 20/25 39/2 39/2 39/5 40/7 40/24 41/18 41/22 42/4 42/7 54/25
invite [1] 87/21 involved [33] 28/5
38/12 41/1 41/11 41/12 41/20 45/9 45/11 45/21 47/2 47/8 47/14 48/7 48/24 49/1 52/5 52/6 52/9 56/18 57/22 60/12 62/11 63/21 64/1 65/2 65/7 67/23 69/11 69/22 78/7 78/8 78/22 78/23 involvement [2] 27/16 76/21
involving [1] 4/21
iPhone [1] 72/9
is [383]
it [196]
it's [57] 11/6 24/24
28/7 28/19 28/23 29/1
31/11 31/20 31/23
32/25 33/3 35/16 36/16 39/14 40/16 43/21
45/20 46/15 46/15 46/16 47/12 53/6 54/11 54/23 56/10 59/4 59/5 61/2 61/3 63/17 65/11 65/17 65/20 67/2 70/19 71/16 71/17 72/5 73/16 76/25 78/13 78/19 78/20 80/10 81/2 81/19 82/13 85/2 86/5 87/15 87/16 91/9 92/7 92/8 92/9 96/3 96/12 its [2] $24 / 732 / 13$ itself [2] 16/25 70/23

## J

Janie [1] 97/11
JD [1] 1/25

Jerry [2] 35/19 36/10 JESS [1] 1/20
job [9] 60/23 66/15 68/4 68/13 68/16 68/25 73/22 85/2 89/14
jobs [1] $8 / 21$
Johnson [42] 7/5 14/1
14/20 15/12 16/23 19/9 27/20 34/14 34/20
35/11 36/5 39/8 39/11
39/14 39/16 40/24 41/3
41/19 42/5 42/20 43/9
43/14 43/20 44/2 66/11 66/13 67/7 67/10 68/11 68/22 69/5 69/25 70/8
71/1 71/11 71/12 71/23 73/20 74/12 75/1 75/1 76/2
Johnson's [8] 11/17
14/7 42/24 44/18 70/9
70/25 73/19 75/8
joined [1] 89/23
joint [1] 73/25
judge [4] 1/12 28/16 32/15 95/7
Judge Ellsworth [1] 95/7
judicial [2] 90/25 95/7
JULY [5] 1/13 3/1
81/12 81/12 94/18
July 26th [1] 81/12
jurors [2] 61/8 90/23
jury [59] $1 / 143 / 33 / 6$
3/18 3/24 23/21 24/13 25/2 25/3 25/6 26/1
26/18 26/21 26/25 27/2
27/7 27/10 27/13 28/16 30/9 38/7 43/18 55/23
57/11 60/24 61/15
61/23 62/18 63/10
67/12 73/4 90/12 90/20 90/21 91/1 91/3 91/20 91/21 92/20 92/21
92/25 93/6 93/9 93/10 93/14 93/22 94/20
94/25 95/6 95/9 95/10 95/17 95/19 95/22 95/24 95/25 95/25 96/9 96/11
just [62] 3/5 6/6 8/9
8/13 9/8 14/17 17/10
19/8 19/12 20/18 21/25
22/9 27/1 27/8 27/8
29/14 29/17 29/19
32/15 34/23 35/21
36/12 38/21 38/23
40/22 40/25 43/16
43/21 44/14 46/25 49/4 49/19 50/11 53/7 55/19 56/6 56/16 56/24 56/25 57/6 61/2 61/25 62/14 66/6 68/2 68/16 68/25 72/18 72/24 79/7 81/16 81/17 83/10 85/7 85/18 86/24 88/4 89/8 89/20
89/22 92/12 92/18
K
K
Kathleen [1] 35/19

Kathy [2] 35/19 39/9 $\quad$ left [5] 11/6 39/11 keep [11] 6/2 11/3 17/8 39/20 39/21 58/5
17/8 29/13 48/21 54/25 legit [1] 84/8 63/11 75/14 89/7 91/13 lengthy [1] 24/14
keeps [1] 43/13 less [1] 47/1
kept [1] 11/10
key [2] 42/3 79/17
kid [2] 66/14 68/16
kids [8] 6/9 6/11 51/1
51/4 51/11 56/3 58/8
68/25
kind [10] 17/7 27/1
43/10 44/5 45/5 46/20
48/21 55/20 87/16 92/8
knew [23] 14/3 17/8
17/14 18/19 19/5 19/12 40/13 40/18 40/20 42/11 42/12 45/2 45/3
58/6 62/16 65/25 66/2
69/24 70/1 71/12 71/12
78/3 88/25
know [143]
knowing [4] 15/13
51/15 57/18 59/6
knowingly [1] 33/12
knowledge [1] 47/20
known [2] 35/10 45/13
knows [22] 8/5 13/8
45/8 45/11 47/3 49/1
49/2 49/11 49/19 49/23
49/23 51/14 51/19
51/22 55/4 58/9 58/10
58/23 69/5 70/2 70/6
74/8
L
ladies [17] 4/1 24/10
24/17 26/24 27/13 30/8
38/7 61/23 62/18 63/8
71/16 78/10 89/21
90/23 93/9 94/20 95/6
Lake [2] 35/16 38/20
laptop [1] 91/4
LAS [1] 2/14
last [7] $4 / 11$ 28/14
41/14 41/15 45/17 45/20 70/3
last-minute [1] 45/20
lasted [1] 85/17
lasting [1] 59/4
later [5] 19/17 42/6
46/22 55/12 81/10
launch [1] 26/12
law [5] 29/8 29/11
78/16 87/3 87/4
lawful [2] 82/9 87/25
lawyers [1] 79/18
leading [3] 44/13 46/6
60/9
leads [4] 27/19 28/10
39/13 41/21
learn [1] 55/13
learned [4] 7/4 7/7
75/16 79/11
least [1] 40/3
leave [9] 8/20 10/4
11/1 28/24 34/20 35/12
35/12 40/1 96/6
leaves [1] 35/5
let [9] 5/24 39/15 40/11
44/14 59/15 65/4 68/5
81/7 87/6
let's [17] $3 / 53 / 16$
12/19 30/7 34/11 38/18
41/21 46/12 53/11 58/5
61/1 79/15 80/14 84/24
85/12 86/5 86/23
level [1] 88/16
liability [1] 34/1
liable [1] $34 / 2$
lie [12] 15/6 67/14
73/20 75/3 82/2 82/17
82/19 84/21 89/4 90/8
90/8 90/8
lied [7] 67/25 68/1
72/21 73/14 84/17
84/23 89/6
lies [1] 30/5
life [3] 61/7 67/17
69/18
lifted [1] 95/18
light [1] 27/18
like [41] $5 / 56 / 87 / 14$
7/19 9/10 12/3 18/8
32/11 36/22 38/2 38/17
43/23 44/24 46/25
48/12 49/19 50/11
50/15 51/9 53/7 55/20
63/9 66/9 66/12 66/15
68/22 71/11 71/24
72/12 78/14 79/17
81/21 85/2 86/8 89/9
89/13 89/13 95/8 95/11
96/1 96/3
liked [1] 96/2
likely [5] 28/1 32/12
41/3 79/25 90/6
likes [1] 55/23
limitation [1] 24/22
limited [2] 58/13 58/13
LINDSEY [1] 1/18
line [5] 92/3 92/7 92/8
92/13 92/16
lined [1] 92/8
lines [2] 46/16 76/19
link [8] 9/18 9/21 12/10
12/10 48/12 49/7 49/8
49/21
linked [3] 7/7 14/8
57/15
listen [2] 24/20 27/8
listened [1] 65/9
listening [1] 85/22
literally [7] 9/8 70/12
73/3 80/6 81/3 88/2
88/16
little [18] 21/11 22/4
24/14 28/22 28/25 29/1
30/7 35/3 39/17 47/8
50/6 54/20 55/24 70/22
79/15 79/15 80/14
81/11
live [2] 49/3 58/7


| M | 68/4 76/6 84/22 | 0 | 22/24 23/19 27/22 | 77/3 80/4 81/25 82/1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| myself [3] 69/20 69/20 | $4 / 21$ | object [3] 25/10 25/1 | 28/12 29/9 30/13 31/19 34/23 36/10 $33 / 7$ 3/23 | 83/16 85/3 $89 / 18$ |
|  | noticed [2] 21/7 83/11 |  | $40 / 2141 / 1643 / 13$ | de |
| N | November [6] 5/1 6/18 |  | 43/13 43/15 43/1 | 28/19 28/25 41/2 4 |
| name [19] $4 / 104 / 11$$4 / 129 / 2510 / 219 / 4$$19 / 8$ 19/11 $19 / 1819 / 22$$50 / 350 / 469 / 1371 / 3$$71 / 574 / 1074 / 1675 / 7$$79 / 8$ | 20/20 21/5 21/6 48/3 |  | 43/16 44/6 44/14 46/22 | 42/9 57/4 57/6 86/5 |
|  | N |  | 49 | 96/11 |
|  | [1] 6/18 |  | 52/20 53/14 54/12 | over [24] 15/3 15 |
|  | November | -b | 54/ | 21/11 22/4 36/9 3 |
|  |  | occupied [2] 35/17 | 58/22 59/22 60/8 6 | 36/21 37/4 40/15 4 |
|  | November 2nd [3] |  | 61/14 61/15 61/16 | 44/16 44/17 45/5 50/ |
| named [2] 18/19 69/8 |  |  | 62/10 62/16 64/20 | /14 60/14 60 |
|  | now [72] 4/24 5/ |  | 64/23 69/10 69/21 | 70/13 73/4 78/8 87/21 |
| nap [1] 29/2 <br> nature [1] 47/13 |  |  | 70/20 73/21 73/22 | 9 |
|  | 9/17 10/6 10/20 11/14 | 22/21 30/10 38/9 38 | 73 | overcome [2] 31/17 |
| 86/12 | 疗 11/25 12/8 13/ | 45/23 68/1 76/4 88/6 | 77/20 79/11 79/12 80 | 36/17 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { necessarily [2] } 57 / 9 \\ & 58 / 17 \end{aligned}$ |  | occurring [1] 39 |  | overlays [1] |
|  | /13 1 | occurs [2] 31/3 36/13 | 83/7 83/16 84/10 87/3 | own [3] 17/20 57/18 |
| necessary [3] 30/21 |  | October [14] 8/17 14/5 |  |  |
| $\begin{array}{\|l} 33 / 333 / 6 \\ \text { need [4] } 27 / 631 / 25 \end{array}$ |  | 14/10 14/12 |  | P |
|  | $1865$ | 46/14 51/16 | ] |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 32 / 2077 / 14 \\ & \text { needs [1] } 96 / 11 \end{aligned}$ | 67/23 68/5 68/10 69/17 | 58/12 58/14 58/14 | 42/4 43/14 43/19 43/21 | 24 92/25 9 |
|  | 69/24 71/14 72/4 73/13 |  | 45/16 47/5 47/ | 97/4 |
| negotiation [1] 82/4 | 73/18 73/25 74/24 |  | 48/8 49/15 50/17 62 | page [4] 6/7 92/3 92/6 |
| NEVADA [8] 1/2 1/6 | 75/10 75/13 75/25 |  | 64/8 64/20 67/19 67/ | 92/6 |
| 3/1 3/21 82/5 93/2 | 76/22 77/18 77 | O | 68/4 69/10 69/21 81/23 | paid [3] 71/18 95/14 |
| 93/19 93/20 | 78/13 79/6 79/12 79/24 | October 6th [1] | /15 91 |  |
| never [13] 9/1 35/9 | 82 |  | -0 | pan [1] 89/18 |
| 39/24 77/10 77/15 78/3 |  | 55/21 | open [8] 34/21 35 |  |
| 78/4 80/7 80/23 81/3 | 8 95/16 95/ | 72/18 73/2 79/23 80/8 | 35/12 40/11 40/17 41/5 | aphrasing [1] |
| 81/5 84/7 87/22 | 95/23 96/19 |  | 42/11 63/11 | etical [1] |
| new [6] 6/18 6/24 10/8 | number [89] |  | opened [1] 39/15 |  |
| 67/16 69/18 83/16 newfound [1] 67/15 | 6/18 6/20 6/24 $7 / 3$ |  | opening [2] 34/2 | 10 44123 |
|  | 7/7 7/11 7/11 7/12 7/13 | officers [9] 3/24 26/23 |  | 0/19 44/23 45 |
| newspaper [1] 24/22 | 8/3 10/7 10/7 10/8 | 38/19 39/1 39/7 39/17 | operate [1] | parole [7] 66/6 71/19 |
| next [7] 24/12 32/9 <br> 42/24 44/15 44/19 48/2 | 10/10 11/10 13/22 20/5 | 67/25 90/20 90/21 | opinion [2] 24/24 30/3 | 9 84/20 89/ |
|  | 21/22 22/13 22/17 | Oh [4] 6/2 12/1 68/ | opinions [2] 29/22 | 89/18 96/12 |
| 42/24 44/15 44/19 48/2 75/11 | 22/17 22/21 22/22 | Oh [4] |  | [20] 26/ |
| nicer [1] 75/12 | 22/23 23/1 41/24 41 |  | opportunity [6] 17 | 11 33/22 40/2 |
| NICOLE [1] 1/17 <br> night [6] 16/20 21/2 <br> 30/15 60/7 62/3 86/9 | 42/20 43/13 43/13 |  | 26/11 47/20 56/24 | /9 42/7 59/13 59 |
|  | 43/14 43/15 43/19 |  | 60/21 73/9 | 6/19 63/19 64/4 64/25 |
|  | 43/20 43/21 44/5 44/6 | $11 / 14 \text { 11/21 11/25 14/3 }$ | opposed [1] 81/12 | 61 68/2 70/9 73/13 |
| 30/15 60/7 62/3 86/9 | 45/16 45/18 45/18 | /14 14/19 14/22 | or [188] | 82/10 85/17 |
| nine [4] 54/13 54/13 | 45/21 45/22 46/4 46/7 | /15 16/22 17/1 | orchestrate [1] 78/7 | ticipant [1 |
| no [46] 1/7 1/7 9/2 | 46/8 46/8 46/9 46/9 |  | order [3] 26/7 36/17 | participating [4] 33/1 |
| 11/20 11/24 13/8 14/18 | 46/10 46/10 46/13 | /24 19/4 19/8 | 38/ | 33/23 |
| 15/16 17/6 17/25 18/10 | 46/13 46/19 51/16 | 19/19 20/1 20/22 21/13 | ordered [1] 83/16 | ular [31] 5/15 7/5 |
| 18/22 23/11 23/21 24/4 | 4 51/24 52/17 |  | other [31] 21/10 22/ | 1/16 27/16 28/2 28/10 |
| 27/25 29/8 29/11 34/23 | 52/20 53/1 54/15 55 |  | 22/25 23/16 29/10 | 14 30/8 30/18 30/23 |
| 41/6 41/11 41/12 41/15 | 55/11 55/13 55/14 | 25/18 25/25 26/4 26 | 29/13 29/18 39/20 40 | /5 32/6 32/10 32/14 |
| 43/3 45/13 49/11 50/14 | 58/11 58 |  | 43/3 43/23 43/25 45/5 | 32/19 33/22 34/13 35 |
| 50/24 52/5 52/8 55/16 | 58/20 59/7 59/14 59/22 | 78/13 79/24 80/2 80/16 | 45/5 46/25 46/25 4 | 12 45/18 4 |
| 55/19 64/23 71/21 72/8 | 60/16 62/6 62/7 | 86/15 | 48/8 51/13 58/18 58/19 | 47/13 47/22 52/22 53/ |
|  | 70/7 71/2 | 93/14 95/4 96/10 97/ | 61/14 66/15 71/23 | 3/3 53/25 54/4 56/15 |
| 81/15 83/19 85/8 86/13 90/8 95/2 95/3 | 81/2 82/24 88/8 92/2 |  | 73/16 79/10 83/6 83/9 | 62/19 |
|  | 9 |  | 84/8 85/16 88/17 | ies [4] 33/5 60/20 |
| nobody [4] 10/3 13/16 49/10 49/12 | Number C-337017 | ol | 9/13 | 3/5 |
|  |  | $62 / 2463$ | 65/22 87/16 | ts [1] 53/1 |
| none [2] 70/15 70/15 | nu |  | 88/14 93/5 95/11 96 | pass [5] 40/7 72/8 |
| nope [11] 49/19 49/19 49/20 49/20 49/20 | numbered [1] 25/6 |  | out [43] 6/11 8/20 8/22 | 10 72/12 83/19 |
|  | numbers [16] 7/15 | 137] | 13/11 | past [1] 63/24 |
| 49/20 49/20 49/20 | 17 23/18 23 | once [9] 1 | 13/13 13/14 17/12 20/4 | patrons [5] 35/25 36/9 |
| 49/20 49/20 49/20 | /6 46/15 46/24 | 13/6 71/25 74/1 80/2 | /18 33/8 34/21 36/14 | 10 39/20 78/9 |
| not [140] | 54/13 60/6 70/11 70/17 |  | 4 | 13/13 |
| notes [3] 27/6 |  |  | 39/6 39/22 40/22 42/11 | ing [ |
| 40/10 | numerous [1] 77/3 | $11 / 2512 / 5$ | $45 / 146$ | [16] 10/ |
| nothing [5] 22/6 23/20 |  |  | /8 53/14 53/15 5 | 13/2 13/15 13/22 |
|  |  |  | 66/6 66/9 66/12 70/2 | 33/1 43/24 53/16 57/16 |



| R | 67/11 67/17 68/1 | 74/9 | sentenced [1] 82/14 | $\text { [3] } 78$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| remaining [1] 90/24 | 69/20 74/2 74/25 76/12 $76 / 17$ 76/18 77/11 | 75 | sentencing [3] 82/8 | 78/22 79/1 similarly [4] $31 / 13$ |
| remanded [3] 96/16 | 79/16 79/23 79/24 | 86/5 89/2 89/25 94/23 | $55$ | /10 36/4 36/19 |
| $96 / 2097 / 1$ | 80/15 80/19 81/1 81/12 | 94/23 | separately [1] 54/12 | simply [3] 31/23 39 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { br [21] 9/4 } \\ & 14 / 1218 / 17 \end{aligned}$ | 81/14 81/19 82/7 82/25 | saying [23] 9/4 19/8 | September [1] 96/14 | 40/17 |
| 21/16 21/18 42/25 | 84/4 84/21 85/25 86/1 | 29/23 56/12 56/19 60/9 | September 16th [1] | since [5] 5/24 8/20 |
| 44/10 63/14 65/15 | 86/6 86/20 89/24 91/18 | 62/12 63/9 66/1 66/20 | 96/ | /22 39/4 41/17 |
| 66/23 68/12 69/1 69/10 | 95/9 95/10 | 67/5 68/2 68/22 70/25 | serve [1] 95/12 | single [3] 56/9 56 |
| 69/10 70/7 73/25 75/18 | road [1] 79/8 | 73/19 74/4 | service [11] 52/22 | 80/22 |
| 75/22 81/1 85/7 | rob [4] 62/4 68/16 | 77/20 78/14 81/20 | 53/4 95/9 95/17 95/19 | singular [2] 46/1 |
| remembering [2] 7/14 | 68/17 77/7 | 87/ | 95/22 95/25 96/6 96/8 | 92/18 |
|  | robberies [2] 78/6 80/9 | 41/14 42/8 46/12 47/6 | services [1] 95/24 | sister [1] 84/12 |
| remembers [4] 55/6 59/12 59/19 70/4 | robbers [1] 79/2 | 48/17 48/18 48/23 | set [2] 46/16 96/12 | sit [4] 33/7 54/22 |
|  | robbery [99] | 49/19 49/24 49/25 52/5 | seven [3] 44/12 71/19 | 61/2 |
| mote [1] 88/11 | role [1] 57/25 | 55/17 55/18 55/21 56/8 | 79/ | tting [12] |
| move [1] 37/8 | room [3] 30/1 | 57/16 59/13 59/19 | several [1] | 37/2 |
| rent [1] 13/13 | 91/ | 60/18 66/4 66/8 67/2 | shape [1] 40 | 5 44/21 46 |
| repeatedly [1] 54/1 | run [5] | 69/6 71/24 72/15 75/ | shared [1] 58/4 | 72/6 79/20 |
| Replace [1] 75/14 | 39/22 45/4 45/6 | 75/13 75/14 82/5 89/5 | Shaylene [7] 28/5 | tuation [1] |
| report [6] 10/23 11/5 | running [3] 29/3 35/6 | scene [5] 39/1 39/4 | 35/19 36/20 37/1 55 | six [9] 64/11 64/11 |
| 12/1 24/20 83/17 83/18 |  | /1 45 | 80/6 | $1872 / 37$ |
| reported [8] 11/8 11/9 | S | scheme [1] 78/18 | she [24] 11/7 28/8 | 74/21 79/25 80/11 |
| 21/6 21/25 22/1 | said [68] | screens [1] 42/18 | /10 39/10 51/2 51/7 | [5] |
|  | 7/14 7/15 15/1 15/7 | screwed [1] 55/11 | 58/5 58/6 58/9 58/1 | 64/11 64/18 72/3 72 |
| ING [1] 1 | 16/14 18/22 19/2 19/19 | seat [3] 42/9 42/13 | 8/23 58/23 59/18 | six-two [1] 74/21 |
|  | 19/22 20/14 20/16 | 83/17 | 59/19 73/10 75/14 80/6 | ski [2] 64/22 65/5 |
|  | 20/17 20/18 20/19 21/2 | seated [3] 3/19 26/19 | 80/7 92/23 | Skooby [1] 88/25 |
| $52 / 1488 / 1896 / 16$ | 21/4 21/5 21/15 21/25 | 95/4 | she told [1] 39/10 | Skooby-Doo [1] 88/25 |
| 96/19 | 22/3 23/6 23/7 36/1 | second [3] 44/14 52/2 | she III [1] | [2] 28/20 28/25 |
| quests [1] 41/23 | 41/19 41/21 43/1 49/14 | 89/20 | she's [8] 51/10 5 | icker [1] 28/22 |
| quire [1] 38/4 | 4/17 | seconds [ | 9/8 75/12 80 | ot [2] 37/3 37/3 |
| quired [1] 33/ | 65/11 66/3 66/11 67/16 | sector [4] 53/2 53/13 | 83/6 86/21 | nart [2] 77/1 77 |
| istance [1] 31/17 | 68/12 69/1 69/19 70/3 | 53/23 54/11 | shift [4] 55/7 59/18 | marter [1] 79/6 |
| spect [2] 31/1 36/7 | 71/22 74/23 74/25 | se | 59/20 62/3 | oke [4] 16/12 16/ |
| sponse [1] 81/6 | 75/12 77/25 78/14 | see [42] 12/23 22 | short [1] 3/6 | 70/2 90/4 |
| rest [1] 24/5 |  | 28/ | [2] | ked [ |
| rested [1] 24/7 | 837 | 28/19 28/25 29/2 34/ | shot [1] 80/8 | 66/13 68/23 68/25 |
| troom [2] 24 | 87/12 88/20 88/25 89/9 | 35/17 37/7 37/19 37/25 | should [7] 48/2 60/19 | smokes [1] 79/9 |
|  | 89/13 89/15 89/16 | 42/9 42/10 42/17 43/6 | 73/6 77/15 77/15 92/13 | smoking [4] 11/17 |
|  | 89/22 92/13 92/15 | 43/19 44/9 44/11 44/17 | 92/17 | 80/11 80/12 90/5 |
| $\text { 2] } 5 /$ | 92/16 92/17 92/18 | 44/17 45/5 46/13 46/15 | shouldn't [1] 69/1 | so [165] |
| ] $31 / 16$ | Samaritan [2] 68/8 | 53/16 53/22 54/12 | show [17] 14/20 41/13 | software [1] 72/10 |
|  | 81/ | 58/17 58/19 59/2 59/23 | 46/18 47/11 47/12 | solely [1] 30/6 |
| [2] $62 / 20$ | same [27] 7/11 9/18 | 60/2 65/2 80/5 81/22 | 50/20 51/3 54/14 56/2 | some [24] 7/18 8/14 |
|  | 17/16 19/24 29/9 40/10 | 84/24 85/12 86/23 | 56/25 57/1 57/1 58/20 | 17/21 18/13 20/2 22/17 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { reviev } \\ 91 / 5 \end{gathered}$ | 44/19 46/20 49/3 53/2 | 88/16 91/18 | 77/13 81/20 87/3 91/16 | 23/8 33/16 39/13 41/1 |
|  | 53/4 53/13 54/11 54/17 | seeing [6] 54/10 55/6 | showed [3] 18/24 43/2 | 42/1 43/9 43/10 45/20 |
|  | 54/17 55/5 55/7 55/14 | 59/12 59/19 60/7 74/22 | 44/7 | 51/13 53/13 53/14 |
| 89/7 89/8 | 59/20 60/7 65/12 72/23 | seem [2] 20/21 39/16 | showing [1] 59/22 | 54/24 56/5 61/14 70 |
| right [92] 3/15 3/16 | 79/13 86/16 87/5 92/6 | seemed [1] 7/13 | shown [5] 34/13 45/17 | 71/2 74/7 86/24 |
| 5/18 6/6 6/12 6/13 7/15 | 92 | seen [2] 14/23 50/7 | 5 75/15 79/11 | somebody [6] 31 |
| 7/20 9/23 10/7 10/15 | sat [1] 42/12 | sees [2] 42/19 78/2 | shows [4] 41/13 50/2 | 31/13 33/15 44/2 44/2 |
| 12/7 13/4 13/19 14/24 | saunter [1] 35/22 | selected [1] 93/10 | 52/17 52/19 | 68/17 |
| 15/21 20/2 20/23 24/15 | saw [9] 7/6 28/8 34/18 | selection [2] 61/16 | shy [1] 36/12 | somehow [6] 48/16 |
| 26/11 26/15 35/22 | 53/13 53/22 63/17 65/3 | 63/10 | sic [1] 47/9 | 77/5 77/6 77/7 78/6 |
| 38/25 42/12 42/15 43/7 | 66/3 72/1 | sender [1] 71/5 | side [1] 94/25 | 86/21 |
| 44/4 44/9 44/19 45/7 | saws [1] 42/10 | sending [8] 70/16 | signal [2] 40/21 54/4 | someone [25] 10/17 |
| 46/9 44/19 45 | say [49] 3/10 5/25 6/20 | 70/18 70/21 71/3 71/6 | Signed [1] 94/18 | 2/11 12/19 16/9 28 |
|  | 9/1 10/21 10/22 11/22 | 74/14 74/15 74/17 | signs [1] 67/11 | 31/12 31/23 32/6 33/13 |
| 52/18 53/5 53/8 53/13 | 12/14 12/19 13/11 | sense [17] 7/12 55/25 | silent [2] 45/20 46/4 | 35/2 39/23 40/17 41/2 |
| 52/18 53/5 53/8 53/13 | 14/23 16/9 19/11 23/15 | 61/19 61/20 61/24 62/1 | silly [1] 83/25 | 8/15 48/16 52/4 57/4 |
| 55/6 55/7 55/24 56/2 | 29/24 35/22 41/19 | 62/4 62/8 62/9 62/11 | SIM [1] 70/2 | 59/6 60/3 62/3 64/14 |
| 56/5 56/7 56/16 57/3 | 48/14 48/15 48/19 50 | 74/5 81/10 83/23 85/10 | similar [11] 47/7 47/13 | 66/7 79/21 84/20 89/2 |
| 57/ | 61/10 64/25 69/16 | 86/11 86/22 88/11 | 52/17 57/23 66/22 70/1 | someone's [2] 64/1 |
| 59/20 60/3 61/20 63/21 | 69/22 71/20 72/1 74/6 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { sent [6] } 21 / 121 / 22 \\ & 67 / 267 / 467 / 695 / 24 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 78/20 78/20 78/22 79/1 } \\ & 88 / 2 \end{aligned}$ | something [20] 5/6 |

something... [19] 5/14 7/14 7/16 7/19 12/3 28/4 28/7 28/8 40/25
43/9 44/4 44/8 46/24
47/6 57/7 58/4 63/18
71/22 81/8
sometime [1] 72/14
Sometimes [1] 96/1
somewhere [7] 6/13
14/11 14/12 21/12
53/10 53/12 92/7
sorry [2] 33/14 79/17
sort [14] 10/13 17/21
22/2 23/8 28/17 32/4
35/3 35/21 36/23 37/9
42/17 46/15 55/11 64/23
sound [5] 9/10 12/6 12/13 13/6 85/2
sounds [13] 9/23 10/5 11/13 12/3 12/7 12/17 13/4 13/19 13/24 15/10 15/18 15/22 18/8
speak [4] 5/21 6/15 17/15 54/19
speaking [8] 5/17 6/8 6/14 7/20 13/20 13/25 14/19 22/12
speaks [1] 52/2 specific [2] 11/18 34/11
specifically [10] $6 / 11$
7/2 7/25 8/2 8/5 15/8
16/20 22/20 36/2 78/1
speculate [1] 30/1
speculation [1] 61/13
spell [2] 84/2 85/7
spelling [1] 4/11
spoken [2] 13/15 81/19
spot [1] 86/12
stand [10] 40/3 60/19 65/10 66/11 66/22 67/16 69/25 71/10 73/7 79/24
standing [2] 44/23 57/6
staples [3] 37/18 38/2 38/5
start [5] 14/17 39/13 46/17 52/23 67/16
started [1] 14/10
starting [6] 39/16 40/5 42/3 46/23 52/16 69/18 starts [6] 40/7 43/11 43/12 47/2 48/1 55/3 state [46] 1/6 1/17 $2 / 3$ 2/5 2/8 3/20 4/3 4/5 4/10 13/1 13/21 15/8 24/4 24/7 25/10 25/12 25/13 25/15 25/17 27/11 27/12 27/21 27/24 32/20 33/18 63/9 66/1 67/22 70/16 70/20 71/6 71/14 71/21 72/19 73/4 74/15 75/22 76/6 76/10 76/11 82/5 82/5 82/7 93/2 93/4 93/20

State's [5] 63/14 63/18 73/18 74/24 75/6 stated [4] 9/24 65/10 72/22 83/7
statement [4] 5/8 6/7 9/9 86/2
statements [5] 29/21 57/18 60/22 73/11 75/19
stating [1] $12 / 18$ steal [2] 77/5 77/14 still [7] 9/17 15/11 48/6 52/9 53/7 66/4 87/24 stipulate [1] 93/5 stole [1] 83/4 stolen [39] 6/25 10/23 11/5 11/8 11/8 11/9 12/2 18/15 20/2 20/15 20/20 20/23 21/2 21/4 21/6 21/7 22/1 23/4 23/6 23/7 51/9 51/9 58/2 58/3 58/10 58/24 59/7 59/9 59/11 62/13 62/17 66/18 67/4 83/3 83/18 83/19 86/19 88/8 88/10
stood [2] 39/23 84/16 stool [1] 72/6
stop [1] 41/18
stops [2] 45/19 46/7 store [1] 83/22
stories [4] 27/15 27/19 80/15 82/21
story [39] 15/13 15/17 19/24 27/15 27/17 27/17 27/18 27/19 38/16 38/17 38/19 42/23 43/4 47/25 50/6 52/16 56/7 57/13 59/2 60/11 65/9 66/20 67/23 67/24 72/17 74/25 76/13 80/18 85/16 88/22 89/24 89/25 89/25 90/2 90/10 90/11 90/13 90/14 90/17 street [5] 14/24 29/4 38/23 38/24 50/8 strength [2] 60/23 73/11
stretch [1] 26/14 strictly [1] 95/21
strong [2] 52/25 54/4 struggle [1] 7/13 struggles [2] 68/10 68/14
struggling [10] 68/11
71/11 73/22 74/12 75/3 84/3 85/1 85/1 85/4 85/5
stuck [1] 19/24
stuff [2] 11/4 48/21 style [1] 78/8 subject [4] 24/19 24/24 30/4 30/5
subjective [2] 65/17 65/21
submit [14] 30/9 30/22 38/7 38/14 47/17 55/23 56/15 56/24 71/8 71/16

76/5 78/11 89/4 96/25 submitted [1] 24/25 submitting [1] 78/19 subpoenaed [1] 77/16 subsequently [1] 55/13
substantial [3] 32/12 32/14 81/9 substantially [2] 64/16 65/11
such [2] 61/6 61/9 sudden [3] 46/19 50/20 62/7
sufficient [2] 32/1 33/23
summed [1] 28/9 super [2] 85/2 88/18 superimposed [1] 7/17 supported [1] 73/16 supposed [5] 55/10 55/14 55/16 55/19 55/19
sure [15] 11/23 18/10 19/10 23/16 40/9 41/6 48/17 49/3 58/9 62/16 79/20 81/4 83/7 86/13 91/10
surely [1] 38/23
surprise [1] 17/5
surrebuttal [1] 24/8
surveillance [10] 34/13
34/19 34/25 35/20 38/9 40/9 42/9 42/17 48/11 57/15
suspect [13] $5 / 58 / 16$
16/16 16/18 47/2 47/22
47/22 55/5 69/4 69/6
69/9 70/5 73/23
suspects [15] 38/23
39/4 40/11 40/12 41/7
44/16 45/12 47/4 51/23
64/9 64/17 64/21 64/22 69/8 74/23
suspicions [1] 44/2
suspicious [3] 39/17 40/5 42/5
swear [1] 90/20
swears [1] 90/21
swings [1] $35 / 3$
switch [1] 70/2
sworn [1] 4/8
sympathy [1] 30/3

## T

T-Mobile [2] 20/11 44/11
take [16] 13/12 24/16
27/6 29/2 31/9 33/8
36/17 40/7 46/12 56/3
58/8 58/21 71/10 78/8 90/20 90/21
take-over [1] 78/8
taken [2] 31/21 36/16
taking [5] 31/5 31/11
31/17 37/5 87/23
talk [23] 7/21 30/7 32/9
34/11 48/2 48/13 59/7
61/1 61/15 76/14 79/15
80/14 83/5 86/24 91/14

95/17 95/18 95/19 95/20 95/21 96/4 96/4 96/5
talked [12] 4/20 7/2 7/4
28/16 43/2 54/20 81/17 82/2 82/21 86/4 87/8 87/11
talking [19] 4/25 8/11
10/6 10/13 12/19 13/2
15/11 23/17 28/6 29/14
42/22 59/8 79/16 80/1 84/12 85/22 85/24 86/15 92/2
talks [2] $48 / 355 / 18$
tall [1] 79/21
taller [3] 64/16 72/3 72/6
tap [1] 45/5
technically [1] 86/8
telephone [1] 92/22
television [1] 24/23
tell [22] 7/11 7/23 8/19 11/2 12/10 18/14 37/3
44/1 45/15 48/20 52/16 55/3 56/6 66/17 68/6 78/2 81/10 82/16 82/20 84/21 84/22 87/9
telling [13] 9/9 11/2
27/17 45/9 47/25 48/1
51/21 51/21 57/13 59/1
60/11 67/23 81/22
tells [6] 35/25 41/9
44/1 52/3 71/15 83/23
ten [15] 24/16 25/1
54/13 54/13 64/7 64/11 64/11 64/13 64/17 69/7 72/4 74/2 74/22 79/19 80/10
ten-minute [1] 24/16
tend [2] 56/8 56/12
tending [1] 57/21
tends [3] 48/12 56/11 57/23
term [2] 65/17 65/21
terminate [3] 21/13
21/19 21/20
terminated [7] 20/5
20/6 20/7 21/16 66/19 67/3 72/15
terms [6] 16/22 77/21
78/25 79/5 80/10 85/25
terrified [1] 80/6
testified [23] 4/9 4/21
4/25 34/18 35/1 37/9
37/15 39/17 40/3 51/13
52/23 53/19 53/23 54/9
54/24 58/3 59/22 60/22
60/25 65/8 67/1 72/8
82/15
testifies [2] 36/11

## 68/19

testify [5] 52/10 67/12 73/21 80/22 82/11 testifying [5] 56/11 67/17 69/15 73/10 89/12
testimony [28] 3/5
23/25 28/7 38/10 55/22
56/4 56/23 57/25 58/6

66/22 67/4 67/13 67/18 68/9 70/9 70/25 72/20
72/20 72/23 73/15
73/19 73/25 75/4 75/9 75/19 82/4 87/15 89/7
text [24] 34/17 41/15 42/20 43/8 43/9 44/2 44/5 44/9 44/10 45/17 45/20 45/22 46/5 46/20 48/8 50/22 50/23 55/4 62/14 70/16 70/18 76/21 83/4 88/4 texted [3] 84/8 84/9 84/10
texting [14] 41/6 43/23 43/25 46/2 46/25 56/20 60/4 60/13 60/13 70/8 70/25 73/19 75/4 75/9 texts [3] 22/4 46/4 60/6 than [8] 12/20 13/6 29/10 47/1 64/16 70/14 72/3 72/6
thank [23] 3/19 4/5
4/15 18/3 22/7 23/20
23/25 24/1 26/16 26/19 63/3 63/4 63/6 76/9 80/10 90/18 90/19 90/22 95/8 95/12 95/15 96/8 97/3
that [690]
that's [76] 5/6 8/23
11/2 11/13 14/9 15/5
19/6 20/12 21/8 27/5 27/25 28/7 28/23 29/10 30/5 31/2 31/8 32/17 33/5 33/18 33/24 34/1 37/20 38/6 40/6 40/6 40/19 41/15 41/24 42/7 43/8 43/22 45/16 46/10 47/5 47/18 47/23 48/5 50/18 51/4 51/8 51/24 51/24 53/20 54/4 55/17 56/7 56/7 59/4 60/25 62/8 64/15 64/18 64/19 65/17 67/12 67/12 67/17 68/15 69/2 70/3 70/10 70/23 72/4 78/12 80/8 81/12 85/8 85/16 87/8 87/12 88/17 90/14 92/10 92/14 95/10 their [18] 27/15 31/6 31/7 31/12 36/14 37/10 37/16 53/16 75/6 75/7 75/20 75/21 76/6 77/3 79/2 86/10 89/6 96/5 them [41] $3 / 67 / 16$ 17/15 23/9 24/14 27/1 27/4 27/5 27/9 29/9 31/10 35/11 35/12 36/5 38/25 39/10 39/13 39/15 44/17 44/17 45/5 45/16 54/12 58/19 59/15 59/15 65/6 74/18 79/25 82/14 87/1 87/5 87/17 87/20 89/3 91/25 91/25 92/20 96/4 96/4 96/5
theme [2] 63/22 89/23
themselves [1] 92/1


## U

used... [9] 32/5 32/17
32/22 36/17 37/3 47/12
47/19 54/16 85/5
uses [3] 46/10 56/2 56/2
using [9] 28/16 31/12 31/24 32/6 32/8 48/16 70/24 75/18 86/10
UTC [1] 44/11

## V

value [1] 31/21
variety [1] 83/22
VEGAS [1] 3/1
verbatim [1] 61/4
verdict [9] 26/5 30/2
62/20 76/8 93/15 93/17
93/18 93/21 94/21
verify [1] 66/25
Verizon [5] 20/9 20/10 20/12 22/16 82/24 versus [7] 3/21 80/2 83/25 84/1 86/3 93/2 93/20
very [20] 8/24 9/16 27/3 47/7 52/25 65/17 65/20 66/22 69/2 69/24 70/19 72/5 72/5 73/5 78/19 79/1 81/9 87/1 96/8 97/3
vest [1] 68/3
via [1] 17/21
victim [14] 37/12 37/21
45/25 62/23 63/1 68/1
77/9 77/11 77/12 77/15 94/6 94/8 94/13 94/15
victims [2] 36/20 69/16
video [25] 34/13 34/18
34/25 35/20 37/7 37/20
37/25 38/9 40/9 40/14
40/21 42/9 42/16 45/4
48/11 57/15 63/17 65/3
67/20 67/21 69/12 80/4
91/8 91/9 97/7
videos [2] 76/4 91/5
violence [9] 31/7 31/9 31/12 31/18 32/4 32/4 34/5 36/17 38/3
violent [2] 32/7 96/18 visual [1] 88/13 voluminous [1] 82/13 voluntary [2] 5/25 9/9

## W

wait [5] 12/1 51/2
83/17 83/18 83/23
waited [4] 12/4 12/5 51/7 51/8
waiting [1] 40/16 waive [1] $5 / 21$ waived [1] 89/14 wake [1] 29/2 walk [9] 28/18 28/20 28/24 30/10 35/21 38/18 39/25 44/23 44/25
walks [3] 34/21 40/22 64/14
wall [4] 40/15 42/10 44/16 44/17
wallet [3] 36/15 36/15 37/8
want [21] $3 / 530 / 10$
44/23 66/7 71/14 71/23
74/6 75/14 76/14 81/22 84/1 86/2 86/24 87/14 88/12 90/3 91/5 91/11 95/12 96/4 96/4
wanted [3] 63/10 70/14 91/23
wants [6] 68/18 71/21 72/19 82/23 83/20 84/22
warning [1] 17/16 was [257]
wasn't [8] 19/23 42/16
48/7 52/5 52/5 68/20 71/11 73/2
watch [7] 24/20 34/25 40/20 42/16 45/1 45/4 80/5
watched [3] 34/25
40/14 45/25
watches [1] 40/9
water [4] 28/22 29/3
29/3 86/6
way [11] 9/2 41/12
45/13 45/14 53/25
54/10 75/12 81/23
86/21 91/14 92/19
we [157]
we'll [7] 3/6 3/7 21/21
24/15 26/15 71/16 91/10
we're [33] $3 / 108 / 11$ 17/12 24/15 29/14 29/17 32/9 35/23 41/10 52/11 60/7 63/13 63/16 65/21 68/15 68/23 70/7 70/24 75/1 75/4 75/8 75/25 76/1 76/2 76/7 78/14 80/1 84/8 86/15 90/5 91/7 92/2 95/23 we've [8] $3 / 6$ 28/2 30/11 34/25 47/8 56/16 67/10 82/21
weakness [2] 60/23 73/11
weapon [33] 30/19
30/20 32/3 32/6 32/8
32/11 32/16 32/17
32/21 35/15 36/20
37/11 37/21 37/23 38/6 62/22 62/23 62/24 62/25 63/1 63/2 94/2 94/3 94/6 94/8 94/9 94/10 94/11 94/12 94/13 94/15 94/16 94/17
wearing [2] 35/6 65/5 weed [7] 11/17 16/12 16/12 66/12 66/13 90/4 90/5
weed-smoking [1] 90/5
week [3] 28/14 28/14 74/1
weekend [7] 51/1 51/2 51/10 51/12 83/17 83/18 83/23
weeks [4] 17/10 28/15 73/2 74/1
weighty [2] 29/10 61/7
well [47] $3 / 2512 / 23$ 13/5 14/22 17/6 17/9 21/3 26/5 26/21 33/11 34/19 35/18 36/8 37/4 37/8 37/20 38/6 38/11 39/7 41/19 45/16 46/12 48/14 50/6 50/11 50/21 52/10 55/21 56/5 58/21 60/13 67/10 68/19
69/25 72/15 77/18 79/4
79/15 80/6 81/6 82/20 84/15 85/13 88/19 91/1 92/6 92/7
went [11] 10/24 11/4 16/15 37/10 50/25 51/6 64/5 68/6 70/13 73/4 74/2
were [56] 5/17 6/8 6/9 6/14 7/3 7/11 7/20 10/6 10/20 13/20 13/22
17/23 21/1 21/22 22/12 22/12 27/3 28/12 28/15 29/6 33/23 34/3 34/6 35/2 38/12 39/4 40/16 43/3 44/22 51/1 52/4 52/4 57/16 59/14 59/17 60/10 64/17 64/22 65/5 67/2 67/2 67/3 69/22
70/17 72/21 72/23 77/3
77/3 77/16 81/10 82/13 83/6 84/5 84/21 88/5 88/16
weren't [4] 59/17 66/12 68/22 68/24
West [4] 8/2 38/20
53/24 54/6
wet [2] 28/21 29/4
what [144]
what's [12] 34/24
35/22 43/20 44/20 44/20 54/20 59/16 64/9 68/7 78/24 79/4 82/16
whatever [8] 3/9 22/1
58/10 75/12 79/8 82/9 84/1 84/6
whatever's [1] 53/3
when [103]
where [29] 7/21 7/23 8/4 28/13 31/2 33/4 34/2 35/12 36/15 37/7 37/20 40/6 46/19 48/12 53/14 53/20 54/2 54/24 59/17 70/3 70/23 71/7 71/7 73/23 83/2 87/25 90/8 92/16 95/24
Where's [1] 90/7
Whereas [1] 89/14
whether [12] 6/9 19/12 29/15 30/17 38/8 38/15 49/18 55/1 88/21 95/16 95/21 96/3
which [30] 11/1 21/5 24/12 25/6 32/9 34/22

34/23 34/25 35/1 35/15 women [2] 61/18 61/21 37/9 44/18 47/8 52/25 won't [2] 74/9 81/24 53/19 54/3 57/8 57/23 word [1] 72/25 58/4 58/12 60/2 60/9 wording [1] 27/4 60/21 73/9 80/20 85/21 words [1] 9/4 87/3 88/9 89/11 90/16 while [11] 29/6 34/10 34/15 35/14 37/10 37/13 46/6 62/21 91/24 94/1 94/2
who [55] 27/23 29/18
30/14 33/13 33/19
33/19 35/4 37/16 38/15 39/2 39/3 39/8 39/15 40/1 42/20 43/24 47/14 48/25 49/24 52/4 59/7 60/3 60/25 62/16 64/9 65/7 65/22 65/22 65/23 69/14 70/7 70/16 70/17 70/18 70/20 70/21 71/3 71/4 71/6 71/6 74/4 74/5 74/6 74/15 74/17 75/4 75/4 79/11 83/20 84/9 86/1 87/14 87/19 90/2 93/12
who's [1] 56/20
whodunit [2] 63/18 76/4
whoever [5] 44/4 51/22 82/8 83/4 85/21
whole [5] 45/25 51/10
72/21 77/11 83/25
whose [4] 46/8 58/8
75/7 75/19
why [20] 6/23 10/16
16/18 30/25 48/4 58/23
58/23 61/16 63/9 64/8
67/17 69/4 69/8 69/14
74/8 77/12 77/14 77/20
80/8 84/2
will [30] 3/20 3/22 4/5
12/10 24/12 25/3 26/20
27/6 29/24 31/7 31/12
32/12 43/19 77/13
79/11 82/8 90/5 90/14
90/23 90/24 90/25 91/2 91/18 91/21 92/20 93/18 95/23 95/24
95/25 97/1
willing [2] 95/11 95/13
windows [1] 29/3
wish [1] 95/20
within [3] 26/20 54/2
54/17
without [10] 24/22
65/13 65/14 66/24
66/24 79/25 95/11
96/16 96/20 97/2
witness [17] 4/3 4/8
5/5 18/1 23/23 40/3 57/10 60/18 64/4 64/9
65/6 73/5 73/6 73/14
73/15 87/18 89/6
witnessed [1] 64/5
witnesses [14] $2 / 8$
24/3 24/5 47/17 57/11 60/16 60/17 60/24 60/25 62/19 64/1 70/12 70/15 87/12
wore [1] 68/3
work [4] 11/7 49/16
51/7 68/3
working [6] 8/21 10/25
33/20 38/12 57/16
71/11
works [2] 54/10 59/18
world [2] 82/22 90/1
worried [1] 80/7
worry [2] 87/6 87/6
would [95] 5/115/25
9/5 12/21 13/5 13/18
17/14 18/10 21/7 21/8
21/9 22/2 23/2 24/5
26/2 26/3 26/25 27/1
30/9 30/22 31/11 31/13 31/25 32/1 32/2 32/7
32/7 32/8 34/3 34/8
34/10 34/23 35/9 35/12
38/7 38/14 38/25 42/12
42/23 43/18 45/13
47/17 48/15 51/5 52/21
52/25 53/15 55/1 55/23
56/15 56/24 57/7 58/17
58/19 58/21 61/6 71/14
74/5 75/17 75/20 76/17
76/23 77/14 77/23
78/11 78/12 80/4 80/12
81/10 81/11 82/1 82/21
83/3 83/9 83/24 84/1
84/4 84/4 84/14 84/19
84/20 85/15 87/14 88/8
88/9 88/12 88/18 88/23
89/3 89/24 91/16 91/17
95/8 96/15 96/19
wouldn't [5] 30/25 44/23 46/1 46/1 57/5
wow [1] 6/2
write [1] 33/8
wrong [3] 65/12 66/23 73/2

## Y

yeah [19] 3/9 6/13 6/13
8/2 9/16 14/2 14/11
16/24 19/2 20/12 22/9 22/24 23/5 66/3 66/11 72/1 84/17 85/4 86/10
years [10] 37/12 37/21
62/23 63/1 71/19 79/14 94/7 94/8 94/14 94/15 yellow [1] 88/15
yes [69] $3 / 133 / 144 / 23$ 5/3 5/7 5/9 5/13 5/16 5/19 5/23 6/5 6/10 6/16 6/19 7/19 7/22 8/7 8/10 8/18 8/25 9/12 9/20
10/12 11/19 12/3 12/22 12/24 13/7 13/10 14/2 14/9 14/16 15/1 15/4 15/15 15/24 16/2 16/6 16/11 16/17 17/2 17/6 17/24 18/16 18/21 18/23 19/21 20/3 20/8


## FILED IN OPEN COUR? STEVEN D. GRIERSON CLERK OF THE COIJRT

## VER



DISTRICT COURT CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

THE STATE OF NEVADA, Plaintiff, -vs-

DEVOHN MARKS,
CASE NO: C-18-337017-2
DEPT NO: V

$\qquad$
VERDICT
We, the jury in the above entitled case, find the Defendant DEVOHN MARKS, as follows:

COUNT 1 - CONSPIRACY TO COMMIT BURGLARY
(please check the appropriate box, select only one)
区 Guilty of Conspiracy to Commit Burglary
$\square \quad$ Not Guilty

COUNT 2 - BURGLARY WHILE IN POSSESSION OF A DEADLY WEAPON
(please check the appropriate box, select only one)
X Guilty of Burglary While in Possession of a Deadly Weapon
$\square \quad$ Guilty of Burglary
$\square \quad$ Not Guilty

## COUNT 3 －CONSPIRACY TO COMMIT ROBBERY

（please check the appropriate box，select only one）
－Guilty of Conspiracy to Commit RobberyNot Guilty

COUNT 4 －ROBBERY WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON，VICTIM 60 YEARS OF AGE OR OLDER
（please check the appropriate box，select only one）
区 Guilty of Robbery with Use of a Deadly Weapon，Victim 60 years of age or older
$\square \quad$ Guilty of Robbery with Use of a Deadly Weapon
$\square \quad$ Guilty of Robbery，Victim 60 years of age or older
$\square \quad$ Guilty of Robbery
$\square \quad$ Not Guilty

COUNT 5－ROBBERY WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON
（please check the appropriate box，select only one）
区 Guilty of Robbery with Use of a Deadly Weapon
$\square \quad$ Guilty of Robbery
$\square \quad$ Not Guilty

## COUNT 6 －ROBBERY WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON <br> （please check the appropriate box，select only one） <br> 区 Guilty of Robbery with Use of a Deadly Weapon <br> $\square \quad$ Guilty of Robbery <br> $\square \quad$ Not Guilty

## COUNT 7 - BATTERY WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON, VICTIM 60 YEARS OF AGE OR OLDER

(please check the appropriate box, select only one)
区 Guilty of Battery with Use of a Deadly Weapon, Victim 60 years of age or older
$\square \quad$ Guilty of Battery with a Deadly Weapon
$\square \quad$ Not Guilty

COUNT 8 - BATTERY WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON (please check the appropriate bor, select only one)

】 Guilty of Battery with Use of a Deadly Weapon $\square$ Not Guilty

DATED this 26 day of July, 2019


RTRAN

## DISTRICT COURT

CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

THE STATE OF NEVADA,
Plaintiff,
vs.
DEVOHN MARKS,
Defendant.

BEFORE THE HONORABLE CAROLYN ELLSWORTH, DISTRICT COURT JUDGE WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 18, 2019

RECORDER'S TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING RE: DEFENDANT'S PRO PER MOTIONS AND SENTENCING

APPEARANCES:
For the State:
LINDSEY MOORS, ESQ.
Deputy District Attorney
For the Defendant:
Pro Per
BEN NADIG, ESQ.
Standby Counsel

RECORDED BY: LARA CORCORAN, COURT RECORDER

Las Vegas, Nevada; Wednesday, December 18, 2019
[Proceedings began at 10:57 a.m.]
THE COURT: C337017, State of Nevada versus Devohn Marks.

MS. MOORS: Good morning, Your Honor, Lindsey Moors for the State.

THE COURT: Good morning. So, Mr. Marks this is your pro per motion for judgment of acquittal as well as your motion for a new trial and do you have anything to add to your papers? I've read them.

MR. NADIG: Did you read his response to the State as well, Your Honor?

THE COURT: Yes.
MR. NADIG: Okay.
THE DEFENDANT: No, ma'am, at this point there's nothing to add. But there is something I would like to present to Your Honor that I had just received. It was actually part of my discovery. I had just received from Matsuda like last week. It was -- now I understand that this is a hearing for me to argue my motion and l'm prepared to argue. But I just felt the need and the severity to present this to you because I don't know if you got a chance to see this. But I remember I had made multiple -- I raised multiple issues regarding a Marcum notice.

And I understand we're past that point, so l'm not going to, you know, go in depth into that issue. But I remember the State had argued that they sealed the notice. And I was arguing that I had never,
you know, received any motion or copy of a motion, order, or anything like that. And when I got my documents from Matsuda's office it was actually two copies of a motion that says the State's motion for determination of adequate cause to withhold notice pursuant to NRS 172.241 subsection 3. And I noticed that there was no file stamp on it.

The case number says A-17-760797-P which would indicate that that case number is from 2017 which is not my case number. There's a co-Defendant, there's a second defendant on this motion named Ruben Green [phonetic] who is not a part of my case. The date of the hearing says that it was January $11^{\text {th }}, 2019$ and the time of the hearing was 11 a.m. However my grand jury indictment hearing occurred on January $10^{\text {th }}$ of 2019 , so the State to have dated this hearing to have been heard the day after the actual Grand Jury occurred, the days aren't adding up.

And then it says that this motion was drafted on July $9^{\text {th }} 2019$ and I actually wanted to send it up there to you so you could actually visually see if yourself. Because, I mean, if there was no seal of the notice and if there wasn't an adequate motion filed in regard to the sealing of a notice but the State argued on record that they sealed the notice, I mean, that's extreme prosecutorial misconduct.

I mean, I've raised multiple issues that I wasn't served a Marcum notice for this specific reason to have a motion filed to dismiss the indictment based on the lack of notice. And the State's response to that was that they sealed the notice. And nowhere in my case summary in the index is there a hearing regarding the withholding of the notice.

But I have it right here where it's actually a motion signed by Giordani with everything that I explained to you and if you would like to take a look at it before we proceed with this hearing and I can argue my motion.

THE COURT: Well it doesn't sound like it's your case. Is your name anywhere on it?

THE DEFENDANT: My name is on it --
MR. NADIG: He's the --
THE DEFENDANT: May name is on it.
MR. NADIG: He's the A defendant on it.
THE CLERK: That A case number is that generic Grand Jury return case number that they --

THE DEFENDANT: That's why I wanted you to take a look at it yourself so you can actually see it up close.

THE COURT: Okay, wait. Five people can't talk to me at one time. Okay so my clerk is saying that the A case number is the generic -

THE CLERK: Grand Jury --
THE COURT: -- Grand Jury --
THE CLERK: -- case number that kind of just tracks the whole history of every indictment case from that Grand Jury.

MS. MOORS: Right. And Your Honor, I -- this has been an issue and it's already been handled and it's not ripe for even argument today. But just for everyone's edification we proceeded to the Grand Jury. We filed motion to have the Marcum notice served under seal because he was on parole for robbery, we had reason to believe he
would flee. This was all done correctly. Mr. Matsuda looked into that. The name be mentioned a Ruben Green, if you recall from the trial there were actually three defendants. We didn't know that third one. We believe that Ruben Green was the third one. Turns out we did not have enough to actually indict him that's why the name was affiliated with it was well as Devohn Marks as well Antwaine Johnson. So and in terms of the date difference that would have been the return date which is actually the day after the Grand Jury presentation.

THE COURT: All right. So the indictment is always returned after the jury considers it. Then there's a separate date when the Foreperson comes to return the true bill.

THE DEFENDANT: Well I understand that, Your Honor, however it says that the date of the hearing for the courts to make determination if there is adequate cause to withhold the notice is January $11^{\text {th }}, 2019$. And this motion says that it was drafted on July $9^{\text {th }}$, 2019, which is six months after the Grand Jury hearing took place. So I don't understand how the State applied to the courts through written application the day after the Grand Jury hearing occurred to withhold the notice.

Yeah, I mean, I wanted you to take a look at it personally so you could actually see what I highlighted so you could see what I'm speaking on. And l've never received this document up until last week.

MS. MOORS: And, Your Honor, I'm looking at a copy of it. It was just dated wrong. If you look at the front of the State's motion for determination of adequate cause to withhold notice, it's dated January
$11^{\text {th }}$ for where the argument would be happening. And then later on the second date, where it autofills, what l'm thinking is, is when this was printed by Mr. Matsuda if that autofill hadn't been filled out sometimes it will adjust to the date -- today's date. Because that was during trial, I -this was not served by Mr. Giordani on the $9^{\text {th }}$, because I was on the case on the $9^{\text {th }}$. Mr. Giordani was not even involved on the case on July $9^{\text {th }}$. So I think that's where the confusion is coming from.

THE DEFENDANT: Nah.
MR. NADIG: And I can approach and show you, Your Honor, if you --

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
MR. NADIG: It's the third page is where the date for Mr. Giordani --

MS. MOORS: And we can obviously double check it by looking when it was filed in Odyssey.

THE CLERK: It was filed Jan $9^{\text {th }}$--
MS. MOORS: January $9{ }^{\text {th }}$.
THE CLERK: -- on that case --
THE DEFENDANT: It doesn't reflect that in my case summary, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right.
THE DEFENDANT: There is no hearing in my case summary regarding withholding of a notice.

THE COURT: There was a hearing. You weren't privy to it because it's -- because that's the whole purpose of such a hearing.

THE DEFENDANT: Well at any point will I be able to receive the copy of that motion of the official document?

THE CLERK: I'm --
THE COURT: You already did. This is basically it. Do you want this back?

THE DEFENDANT: Well yeah I would like back. There's no file stamp on that, so there's no file stamp on it and the dates are incorrect. So if the State did file something properly with the proper date on it I would like a copy of it please.

THE CLERK: Well, Your Honor, that -- these A cases are considered sealed cases, so I'm hesitant to print anything from it. But I can print it for you and show it to you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: No, I don't need it. I can see it. I was --
THE CLERK: I know they're sealed. I mean, I just handled --
THE COURT: It was handled by Judge Bell I believe so -wasn't it? Or another district court judge who have heard the --

THE CLERK: Judge Bell heard it. I have the minutes here from it. They're just generic.

THE COURT: Okay, so -- all right. Thank you.
THE DEFENDANT: All right. Thank you, Your Honor, I'm ready to proceed.

THE COURT: Did the -- and you didn't want to add anything else, right?

THE DEFENDANT: No, Your Honor, I'm ready to proceed.
THE COURT: And did the State wish to either add anything or
address anything, because we continued it last time so you could read his lengthy --

MS. MOORS: We do, Your Honor. I had a chance to read it. I would stand by my opposition. He just reiterates his original motion and doesn't actually counter the arguments that we presented, so I don't have any oral argument.

THE COURT: So many of the arguments that you make, Mr. Marks, are -- or arguments properly made on appeal.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.
THE COURT: Which will be I'm sure addressed on appeal. And so you should speak with your appellate counsel about that.

MR. NADIG: Your Honor, as a point of clarification. I --
THE RECORDER: Mr. Nadig, grab the mic from him.
MR. NADIG: As a point of clarification am I being appointed or have I been appointed as the appellate counsel on this matter?

THE COURT: No.
MR. NADIG: Okay.
THE COURT: No, Mr. Matsuda is still on as appellate counsel. He can't -- so if wants to make some motion before the Supreme Court for a change of appellate counsel I suppose he could do that, but I don't -- I think Mr. Matsuda is capable of filing the appeal. He was trial counsel. And I mean, he's familiar with the case and what occurred and so there's not any reason for me to change that. As --

MR. NADIG: Your Honor, for the record I may discuss that with Mr. Matsuda and --

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. NADIG: -- if I do, with your permission, substitute in if he requests that I do so.

THE COURT: If he feels that he --
MR. NADIG: That's there's such a conflict --
THE COURT: -- can't work with Mr. Marks that that has broken down. But the thing was, and Mr. Marks knows this, that the Supreme Court rules do not allow him to represent himself --

MR. NADIG: Correct.
THE COURT: -- on appeal.
MR. NADIG: Yes.
THE COURT: He has to have appellate counsel.
MR. NADIG: Yes and he is aware of that. We've discussed that. I was under the impression that I had been appointed. But I'll discuss with Mr. Matsuda, because I have a feeling that he's going to want --

THE COURT: I don't think we did that.
THE CLERK: I thought he was just standby on this, Your Honor.

MR. NADIG: Okay, but in any situation l'll speak to Mr. Matsuda. And if so I will put motion on to ask permission from Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay, so -- I suppose until the notice of appeal is filed you could do that.

MR. NADIG: Yes.

THE COURT: All right.
THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, I would like to make that request here in open court to substitute my appellate counsel. So the Defendant would like to have that done. I just wanted to make the courts aware of that.

MS. MOORS: I would just point out that we're not in appeal angst. We haven't been sentenced yet.

MR. NADIG: Correct.
THE DEFENDANT: Absolutely.
THE COURT: Appropriate motion will be filed if that's necessary. All right, so you're -- all of your appellate issues that you've raised in this are not appropriate for this motion. You've also raised ineffective assistance of counsel, which is not appropriate for a motion for judgment of acquittal or new trial. So basically the standard is would a reasonable jury have -- would there have been sufficient evidence for a reasonable jury to convict you under the reasonable doubt standard.

And that -- I heard the trial and I believe that there was.
So many of the arguments that you raise about that the documents, the text messages were not authenticated, they were -- the documents, the evidence that was received was properly authenticated. You seem to confuse or be confused about the fact that there were no -there's no content to the text messages, but that was clearly addressed during trial. You don't get the content, they don't keep the content. And the purpose of the text messages was merely the contact between the phones.

You've also argued well that doesn't prove that you were the person on the other end of that phone. That's what you're -- and your counsel argued that at trial. And so those arguments were made and you argued that again that I should not have allowed the prior bad act. That's an appellate argument to be made on appeal and -- because l've already ruled on that, so the step is to address that on appeal. That can be raised in your direct appeal.

So none of those are grounds and there was sufficient evidence. So your motion for judgment on -- of acquittal is denied as is your motion for a new trial. Are you ready to proceed to sentencing?

THE DEFENDANT: Nah, can we set it out please?
THE COURT: Pardon me?
THE DEFENDANT: Can we set out sentencing so I can properly prepare. I was prepared to argue my motion. I thought we was coming her for me to argue my motion, but I mean, I guess I didn't get a chance to argue any of the grounds.

THE COURT: Have you had -- you've had the presentence investigation report for some time now.

THE DEFENDANT: I have had it. I have had it.
THE COURT: We've continued this many times. And it was on the calendar and set for sentencing as well.

THE DEFENDANT: It was.
THE COURT: So we're going to proceed.
THE DEFENDANT: All right, let's do it.
THE COURT: All right, so by reason of the jury's verdict of
guilty --
THE RECORDER: Mr. Nadig, can you please take the mic. I'm sorry, Judge.

THE COURT: As to Count 1, conspiracy to commit a burglary, a gross misdemeanor, Count 2, burglary while in possession of a deadly weapon, Count 3, conspiracy to commit robbery, Count 4 robbery with use of a deadly weapon, victim over 60 years of age or older, Count 5 and Count 6 , robbery with use of a deadly weapon, Count 7 , battery with use of a deadly weapon, victim 60 years of age or older, and Count 8, battery with use of a deadly weapon, I hereby adjudge you guilty of those offenses. And State.

MS. MOORS: Yes, Your Honor. So I first wanted to make the record that if you recall there was some potential issue with regards to the timeliness of the filing of the notice of intent to seek habitual. At this point in time to avoid any appellate issues, l'm going to strike that notice. I will not be arguing under that. But I wanted to make the Court aware that I was wishing strike that notice.

In terms of sentencing, Your Honor, with this many counts I went through and looked at what Parole and Probation recommended. And I have to say that I agree with them. So with regards to Count 1, obviously that was a gross misdemeanor. They recommended 364 days. That would be concurrent to Count 2 , which -- in which they recommended a 4 to 14. Count 3 they recommended a 2 to 6 . All of these are concurrent. Count 4 would have been our first robbery with deadly weapon. They recommend a 4 to 15 as well as a consecutive 4
to 15 for the weapon enhancement. So now we're sort of getting to the actual final number. If you add those two together that would be an 8 to 30.

Then on Count 5 they recommended a 4 to 15 on the robbery count as well as a 4 to 15 on the enhancement, obviously legally, definitionally consecutive. That gets us to another 8 to 30 for that count. With regards to Count 6 they also recommend a 4 to 15 on the underlying charge as well as a, you know, obviously consecutive 4 to 15 on the enhancement, which would be another 8 to 15.

Then we get to Count 7 where they recommend a 3 to 10 on the underlying charge as well as a 3 to 10 on the enhancement. That was concurrent, so it would sort of be eaten up by the other counts.

With regards to Count 8 they recommend also a 3 to 10 concurrent. The next sum of that, Your Honor, in terms of addition would be a 24 to 90 and that's what the State would be recommending based on what Your Honor heard throughout the course of this trial obviously the prior --

THE COURT: 24 --
MS. MOORS: Correct, Your Honor.
THE COURT: -- aggregate?
MS. MOORS: Yeah, so it's -- because there were three counts with 4 as the bottom but plus each consecutive enhancement, so 8 times 3 is 24 .

MR. NADIG: So 288 months.
MS. MOORS: Oh, yes correct. I'm talking about years, Your Honor, I apologize.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, all right and so do -- you're not putting the enhancement as part of the aggregate are you? Because you can't do that.

MS. MOORS: Okay, so then -- correct.
THE COURT: It doesn't --
MS. MOORS: Correct, so then what I am requesting, what I am requesting Your Honor, would be a 12 to 45 in terms of years as well as a consecutive 12 to 45 for an aggregate. I was trying to just do the math of a 24 to 90 is where that's coming from.

THE COURT: Okay. Well you -- I'm sorry, you may have lost me on the going through it so quickly --

MS. MOORS: Sure, --
THE COURT: But --
MS. MOORS: --and essentially what l'm asking for, Your Honor, and I was just going through what each count that they had recommended.

THE COURT: Right.
MS. MOORS: But I guess the gist of the argument is all of the counts, like Counts 1, 2, and 3 would run concurrent. Then when we get to Count 4 that's the first one where we ultimately have a 48 to I guess 180.

THE COURT: Uh-huh.
MS. MOORS: And a consecutive 48 to 180 for that count.
And then from there the same would be true for Count 5 and Count 6 , so it would be a 48 to 180 consecutive to a 48 to 180 for the enhancement.

And then getting onto Count 7 or to Count 6 , I apologize, would be the same thing, would be a 48 to 180 for the underlying as well as a 48 to 180 for the enhancement.

MR. NADIG: So it would 144 months to 560 months, is what you're asking for?

MS. MOORS: I--
MR. NADIG: 12 to 45 ?
MS. MOORS: Correct, with a consecutive 12 to 45 . Sorry, when it gets that high my brain struggles with the months.

THE COURT: All right. So, Mr. Marks, you're -- you wanted to represent yourself on your sentencing.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.
THE COURT: So l've adjudged you guilty. This is your opportunity to say anything you would like concerning your sentence.

MS. MOORS: Do you want me to come back, because I actually have a reason for what --

THE COURT: Oh, l'm sorry.
MS. MOORS: Oh, it's okay. That was just the numbers which I know is --

THE COURT: Good, I was kind of thinking well you're not really telling me why but --

MS. MOORS: Yeah, yeah, I know I did the numbers at first, Your Honor. And I apologize. I know I went through them fast. I've just been here so many times in anticipation of this argument I had the numbers there. And I virtually have them memorized, so I apologize.

The reason why I agree with Parole and Probation is what I wanted to get into is we're looking at an individual that, as Your Honor heard through the bad acts motion, had committed a very similar type crime. It seems like not close in proximity. The only reason it wasn't close in proximity is because he had been in prison for that crime. And he essentially had graduated from being the casing agent to sort of a primary operator. He was not even out of prison not even a year, he was still on parole and quite frankly that's why this argument has been going on about the Marcum notice is, you know, we didn't want to serve him Marcum when he's on parole for robbery committing another similar type of robbery.

And so while I indicated previously, you know, we are striking the notice of intent to seek habitual this is a repetitive type of thing for this individual. He has two prior robbery with deadly weapon convictions. He's now here accused and convicted of three separate robbery with deadly weapon convictions.

You know, you heard the testimony. You saw what happened with the pistol whipping of the older patron in terms of the amount of blood that was there, the fact that the ultimate -- the bar tender, she had to switch her shift because she was so terrified. We got to see the video of literally -- I don't know, as a female working late night at a bar, how more terrified you could be. I don't think you could be.

And obviously as the State we were super happy that no one got hurt I mean, this was ripe for someone moves wrong, someone get shot, someone gets killed. This was the most terrifying night of all of
those individual's lives.
And the problem is this is all he knows. This is what he has been doing since he has been -- I guess I don't know his age, but it's been going on for a really long time, Your Honor. And in terms of thinking about the safety of the community and the proper punishment, he has earned this amount of time.

We saw through the testimony of his accomplice. We heard how he was approached, how they talked about it, how they'd been planning it for months. We saw the amount of communication to exceed two hundred times in the month of October, two hundred times. This was planned out. This was methodical, meticulous and it had no regard for the safety or the mental wellbeing, the health of anyone within that bar. And they are all super lucky that they didn't get shot.

And I don't know -- like I said I don't know a scarier position that I could imagine as a female then that. And that's why we're asking for what I discussed the aggregate in terms of a 48 to 180 , consecutive to a 48 to 180 on the several counts for the ultimate total of the 12 years to 45 , consecutive to the 12 years to 45 years on the enhancement. For the protection of community and it's commiserate with what the Defendant actually did based on his history and based on ultimately what would be fair and just based out of all of the facts that came out through the course of the trial, Your Honor. So that's why we are asking for that and we are agreeing with the recommendations made by Parole and Probation.

THE COURT: All right. So, Mr. Marks.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.
THE COURT: What would you like to say?
THE DEFENDANT: First and foremost, Your Honor, as the State addressed to this court on the fifth day of trial when questioned if they offered me any plea agreements I have presumed completely innocent this entire time and I stand here before you today maintaining my complete innocence in this case. I understand that a verdict was returned from a jury. I understand that is the process of the court of law.

And first I would like to offer my recommendation of a sentence and then l'll explain, in the same format as the State did, why I feel that the Defendant is -- why this sentence is reasonable for Mr. Marks. So for Count --

THE COURT: And that's you. You don't need to refer -THE DEFENDANT: Me, okay.

THE COURT: -- to yourself in the third person.
THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am. Yes, ma'am. You know, I'm used to doing it in motions so that's how I talk in a court of law. All right, well Count 1, the defense will -- I would like to recommend 364 days. Count 2 , I would like to recommend 24 to 120 months. For Count 3 , I would like to recommend 24 to 72 months. Count 4 , I would like to recommend 32 to 80 months with a consecutive 32 to 80 months with another consecutive 32 to 80 months for the weapons enhancement and the elderly enhancement. For Count 5 , I would like to recommend 36 to 120 month with a consecutive 36 to 120 months for the weapons enhancement. For Count 6, I would like to recommend 36 to 120
months with a consecutive 36 to 120 months for the weapons enhancement. For Count 7, I would also like to recommend 36 to 120 months with a consecutive 36 to 120 months for the weapons enhancement. For Count 8, I would like to represent -- I mean, I would like to recommend 36 to 120 months.

And, Your Honor, l'm recommended that all of these counts be ran concurrent for a total of total 6 to 20 years in the Nevada Department of Corrections.

And the reason why l'm recommending this sentence, Your Honor, is because well the State argued that l'm -- this is all I know. The only reason why it's been so long of a gap is because I served nearly 8 years in prison. Your Honor, first and foremost I committed the crimes in 2011. I was found guilty, but I wasn't -- I plead guilty to those crimes in 2011. I admitted my role in those crimes when I plead guilty to those crimes and I did my time for that. I paid my dues to society for those crimes, Your Honor.

Prior to being arrested for those crimes I actually was in college playing football. I graduated from high school. I went to college. I completed two semesters of college, so I didn't just -- I wasn't just running around. I don't have an extensive juvenile record. I wasn't just running around committing crimes, robbing people, robbing establishments. Like I said, I graduated from high school. I actually attended college immediately after graduating from high school, completed two semesters.

Ultimately, you know, I ran into some financial struggles. I ran
into some personal, you know, some mental issues as far as my upbringing with my parents, you know, the environment that I grew up in. And I fell into a state where, you know, I was pretty much lost. I was 18. I was young, fresh into adulthood, no real assistance from my parents. I was by myself, so you know, it doesn't justify my actions that I committed in 2011 but that is the truth about what occurred back then.

Furthermore, if you read the parole report from when was I released from prison, I actually obtained employment. I maintained employment the entire time I was on parole which was fulltime. I completed 13 groups of substance abuse class. That was 13 weeks. I did -- I don't have a substance abuse problem at all. However, it was a part of my parole stipulation, I mean, a part of my parole -- how would I say it. This is what they wanted me to agree to so I completed it. I did everything that Parole and Probation asked of me to do.

Like I said, I was out there living my life. I had a job. I maintained employment. And any time I left a job it was to go to a job that was paying me more money. I didn't quit. I didn't stop working. I did not start committing crimes. I was actually employed -- on the morning when they arrested me I was on my way to work where I was working maintenance technician in apartment complexes through a temp agency, getting paid $\$ 13$ an hour, getting ready to get promotion to $\$ 15$ an hour.

My then girlfriend that I was living with works for Amazon through human resources; I didn't have any reason to commit any crimes, Your Honor. I was not in a bad position. I had the support that I
did need to maintain, you know, a positive lifestyle and that's what I was doing.

As far as the police report as you can see the only time my name comes into this crime is because my phone was in contact with somebody's phone. There was no evidence placing me, the Defendant, at the scene of any crime. There was no evidence proving that I had entered into --

THE COURT: Well there was --
THE DEFENDANT: -- an agreement.
THE COURT: -- the testimony of the person --
THE DEFENDANT: There was the testimony of the accomplice.

THE COURT: Yes.
THE DEFENDANT: But pursuant NRS 175.291 his testimony has to be corroborated by other independent evidence linking me to a crime.

THE COURT: And it was through the phone records.
THE DEFENDANT: The phone records, Your Honor, showed that I know this person. Without context those phone records can't be -can't even be proven in and of itself to have anything to do with the crime.

THE COURT: Well I don't want to argue that again, but l'm just --

THE DEFENDANT: Yeah, absolutely.
THE COURT: Okay.

THE DEFENDANT: Well my issue is, Your Honor, my argument is that the victims never positively identified me. You can say okay because they wore ski masks. I'm maintaining my innocence. I did not wear a ski mask. I did not commit this crime. The victims identified the suspects as being $5^{\prime} 10^{\prime \prime}$. I'm 6'3' in height. That's a 5 inch difference. That would exclude me from the accusation that I committed this crime.

The accomplice did testify. He testified that he never left apartment complexes with me. He's testified that he's never seen me in position -- in possession of a firearm. And he's testified to multiple different things that pertain to this case that would exclude me from the accusation that I committed this crime. He also admitted that he was only testifying to get himself out of trouble.

I'm also asking that the -- I be sentenced to this time because I mean, Mr. Johnson walked out this courtroom on probation and he admitted that he committed this same crime. Now regardless to what the roles of these crimes are, just like they told me in 2011 when I was just the getaway driver and they gave me 4 to 20 years for just driving the car. I'm equally liable to that crime as any other defendant in the crime. So if Johnson gets probation and he admits that he participated in this crime without him opening that door these suspects don't walk into this bar. He's just as equally liable for this crime as I am at this point in these proceedings. So for him to get probation I feel like it's only reasonable that Mr. -- that I receive the time that I'm recommending which adds up to 6 to 20 years.

I'm 28 years old. In 6 years I'll be 33. I don't have any kids. For me personally I want to start a family. I've been doing everything that I need to do to better myself. And although like I said I'm maintaining my innocence this has been a severe and profound learning experience for me. And, you know, l'm going to continue to fight and I'm going to continue to grow as a person and build by character.

So I mean, at this point there's really not much more for me to say. l've recommended my sentence structure. I've explained that l'm not a menace. This is not what I do. There are other things that I have done in my life. I made a mistake when I was 19 years old. I did the time for it. I came home. I complied with my parole. I did everything they asked me to do. I maintained employment. So it's never issue whether or not l'm willing to work or not, because I worked the entire 10 months I was released from jail, fulltime, the entire time. So that's not at issue.

THE COURT: Let me ask you about something that's in PSI --
THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.
THE COURT: -- on page 6. It's talking about when you were in prison for your other case. It says that while you were incarcerated that you received several major disciplinary referrals for gang activities, assault, and use of intoxicants.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am. When I was in prison, Your Honor, I was involved in racial riot and I was found guilty of that racial riot. I was involved in a number of fist fights with individuals. As you can imagine I'm in prison. I'm young. I'm still learning myself. I'm still
learning life. I did get into some things when I was in prison. I'm not proud of it. I'm not trying to justify it. But I learned from those mistakes and I learned from those decisions. And I was punished for those decisions while I was in prison.

The only reason why I said that I have the gang activity and the assaults and the batteries is because of mainly that race riot that I didn't start it was a whole unit disturbance with multiple people involved. I got caught up in the middle of it. I did what I did protecting myself and made the decision that I made for whatever reason I made it for at that time. As I stated just previously I learned from that mistake.

As far as use of intoxicants I consumed spice one time my entire incarceration and I actually passed out and I had to be taken to a hospital. This was after I had received a 2 year dump, so you know, I was a little depressed. I thought I was going home to see my grandma to my family. I didn't. So yes I did indulge in, you know, consuming some Spice. And I had a bad episode with that. And that was only time. The whole time I never been caught with any use of intoxicants. I did do a number of months in the hole as anybody else would that's incarcerated for nearly 8 years in Nevada Department of Corrections. Like I said, I went from 19 to 26 , so yeah I did make decisions and I'm not justifying it, but that explains what you read on page 6 .

THE COURT: Thank you. All right, anything else?
THE DEFENDANT: No, ma'am, that's pretty much it.
THE COURT: Okay, so I guess sometimes we lose sight when talking about putting some in prison in years. You know, we only
have -- it's like death is optional. It's not. We only have a set amount on this planet. And men, you know, their life expectancy these days is around 83 if they're lucky, you know. And so when you're talking about putting somebody in prison for 45 years that's already 27 --

THE DEFENDANT: 28.
THE COURT: -- 28 years old, that's a long time. And so the purpose of putting someone in prison obviously is to protect the community, to act as a deterrent, and to hopefully rehabilitate someone.

Now when Mr. Marks was in prison before he happened to spend the time that he was in prison during the time when his brain was developing. Which isn't necessarily a good thing, you know. I mean, because men's brains aren't fully formed until they're 26. So all that time that his brain is forming and he's trying to learn how to and his brain is evolving so it can make those executive functioning decisions to make good decisions, he's in a situation probably that doesn't encourage necessarily good decision making.

For all the -- and that's not to fault the prison system necessarily or those who try and make it better. It's just not a good situation. He's in with regular population for most of the time when he wasn't segregated and so you tend to learn bad things and -- which may lead to further bad decision making. So now the choice is okay what would be an appropriate sentence to protect the community and realize those goals that l've talked about. And so that's what l'm trying to do.

And l've tried to in considering the enhancement provision when I consider enhancement provision I'm supposed to consider
several things, you know, the nature of the crime. Which I admit the nature of the crime of course is very serious. I mean, it wasn't -- it was not only an armed robbery that frightened everybody except the one lady who seemed to be focusing on her poker --

MS. MOORS: Right.
THE COURT: -- more than anything else. But, you know, there was pistol whipping going on and I mean, it was a very horrendous scene. So obviously a very serious crime, masked gunmen, you know, weapons, fear, physical violence, all of that. And of course the fact that it's a conspiracy makes it more important. That's why we can punish conspiracy separately. So I consider that.

I also consider that the age of the Defendant, his prior criminal record. He, you know, has four prior felony convictions, although essentially those were -- he served all time for those at same time. And so I take that into consideration, that although he has four prior felony convictions he went to prison one time for those.

I consider his background as well, that he, you know, was -his childhood was less than what we'd all hope for. He's bounced between the homes of his mother, his father, his grandmother, moved around so that he was never at the same school for more than a year and want's able to settle down make those connections that we always going to be positive connections for kids as opposed to negative ones. His -- he was beaten as a child and that he -- it's really frankly he's to be commended that he -- under all of those situations that he completed high school and graduated and that then he was able to attend a
community college. It's too bad that he didn't stay that course and try and get a further -- you know, further education which would have certainly assisted him. And instead found himself in prison because of these other crimes, which is disturbing obviously that they're similar in nature to the current crime.

So all these things I do take into account. Also I just want to note for the record that it's not clear to me whether or not P\&P thinks that there is a dual enhancement when you have a use of deadly weapon and a victim over 60. But obviously --

MS. MOORS: Correct.
THE COURT: -- we cannot have a dual enhancement.
MS. MOORS: Correct.
THE COURT: The law only provides for one but they're recommending enhancements for both of those. So I don't know whether that -- that's what it seems like they're doing and I recognize that that's --

MS. MOORS: Of course.
THE COURT: -- not proper.
MS. MOORS: And I would not ask for that.
THE COURT: Okay. So as to Count 1, conspiracy to commit burglary you're hereby sentenced to 364 days in the Clark County Detention Center. Before I -- I'm going to circle back. I have to impose the $\$ 25$ Administrative Assessment Fee and the \$3 DNA Collection Fee, the DNA Analysis Fee is waived; that was previously taken. It kind of -that seems so inconsequential to the rest of the sentencing that I
overlooked it.
So as I say, Count 1, 364 days in the Clark County Detention Center. Count 2, burglary while in possession of a deadly weapon. You're hereby sentenced to a minimum term of 48 months, a maximum term of 120 months. Okay. As to count --

THE CLERK: How will that run, Your Honor?
THE COURT: That runs concurrently with his 364 days in CCDC. As to Count 3 , the conspiracy to commit robbery, that's a minimum term of 24 months, a maximum term of 72 months. That runs concurrently with Count 2.

Count 3 -- excuse me, Count 4, robbery with use of a deadly weapon, victim 60 years of age or older. That is a minimum term of 48 months, a maximum term of 120 months. That runs consecutively with Count 3. There's an enhancement of -- the enhancement penalty is 24 to 60 months. The enhancements required by law to run consecutively to the underlying sentence of 48 to 120.

MS. MOORS: And, Your Honor, does it -- this is just a point of clarification, do we need to state on the record which enhancement you are --

THE CLERK: I was going to ask that as well --
MS. MOORS: -- are doing it under?
THE COURT: Yes, l'm going -- it doesn't really matter to me. It's -- he was found guilty of both. I can only impose one and so it's for the victim over 60. It's for both actually. I'm only allowed to enhanced it once but --

MS. MOORS: But it's for --
THE COURT: -- the jury found both.
MS. MOORS: Okay.
THE COURT: And so it's one enhancement is all that's
allowed.
MS. MOORS: Okay.
THE COURT: So it doesn't really -- I don't think I need to choose.

MS. MOORS: I just didn't know, Your Honor.
THE COURT: I don't think I do.
Count 5 -- so Count 4 runs consecutively to Count 3. Did I say that already?

MS. MOORS: You did, Your Honor,
THE DEFENDANT: You did, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Count 5 , is a minimum term of 48 month, a maximum term of 120 months. And the enhancement is likewise 24 to 60.

THE CLERK: And the count runs?
THE COURT: The count runs consecutively to Count 4.
THE CLERK: And it's a consecutive enhancement pursuant to statute?

THE COURT: Exactly.
THE COURT: And Count 6 is robbery with use of a deadly weapon. That's a minimum of 48 months, a maximum of 120 months. And the enhancement, which is required to be consecutive to the
underlying sentence, is 24 to 60 . That runs consecutively --
THE CLERK: The count --
THE COURT: Count 6 runs consecutively to Count 5.
THE CLERK: Thank you.
THE COURT: Count 7, battery with use of a deadly weapon, victim 60 years of age or older is a minimum term of 36 months, a maximum term of 120 months. There's an enhancement of 24 to 60 because the victim is over 60. That runs concurrently with Count 6.

Count 8 is battery with use of a deadly weapon. That's a minimum of 36, a maximum of 120 and that runs concurrently with Count 7. So I believe, if I was keeping track correctly, that's -- essentially four consecutive sentences of 48 to 120 , but I have to pronounce the aggregate. Is that --

THE CLERK: I'm looking, Your Honor. So 4 was a consecutive with 3,5 was consecutive with 4,6 was consecutive with 5 , and you did not say on 7.

THE COURT: 7 is concurrent with 6 . I thought I did say it but I didn't

THE CLERK: You did on the enhancement. And then the -that's the --

THE COURT: Do that's right, 4 ?
THE CLERK: That's the -- I only got 4, 5, 6 .
MS. MOORS: So I guess the net sum would be 4,5 , and 6 added up together.

THE CLERK: That's all I got were consecutive, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay, so 190 -- the aggregate is a 192 -- just
doing my math one more time -- to 480 month.
THE CLERK: 190 to 480.
THE COURT: 192.
THE CLERK: Oh, l'm sorry.
THE COURT: to 480.
THE CLERK: I wasn't sure if you were saying too as in also.
Thank you.
THE COURT: And what's his credit now?
MS. MOORS: Court's indulgence. His credit is 179.
THE COURT: Do you think that's correct, Mr. Marks, 179 days? It seems like you've been in --

MR. NADIG: He's been in since January $14^{\text {th }}$.
THE DEFENDANT: January 14.
THE COURT: Yeah. That can't be right -
MS. MOORS: Your Honor, it is correct. Because if you look at the PSI --

THE COURT: He was on -- was he on parole?
MS. MOORS: Correct.
THE DEFENDANT: My parole actually --
THE RECORDER: If you're going to speak you gotta hold that
up.
THE COURT: But his -- let me see because we've got the date I think --

MS. MOORS: Yes, Your Honor, so if you look --

THE COURT: -- when his parole --
MS. MOORS: -- with regards to he was given 85 credit -- 85 days as of the date of the preparation of the PSI, which I believe was in September or August $29^{\text {th }}$. And then I literally just added the days from then until now. So l-- it is 179.

THE COURT: But he gets from the time he expired his parole.
That's what we need to figure out.
MS. MOORS: Right and so what that -- that's what they are talking about in the credit, Your Honor. So the 114 to the 201 he was just in custody on this case. Then he was taken -- that's why there's a break because he was not out of custody. That was for his parole hold indicating that he was released on $7 / 13$. That's when he started then accruing credit again on this case. That's why the number is 85 in the PSI and then l've added the dates from how long we've continued it.

THE COURT: Okay so the -- he expired his parole you're saying on --

MS. MOORS: It would have been the $13^{\text {th }}$ or the $12^{\text {th }}$ of July.
THE COURT: Of July. Okay. Is that right? You expired your parole.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma’am.
THE COURT: Because when you're on parole you don't get you don't get the credit. So as soon as you expire the parole then you get to accrue credit.

THE CLERK: So July $12^{\text {th }}$ through today is a 160 days.
MS. MOORS: Well it's July $13^{\text {th }}$ actually.

THE CLERK: Okay, sorry, you said -- I was giving the 2th because you said either or -- 159.

MS. MOORS: So that's 159 plus his original 19. So I actually gave him an extra day.

THE COURT: And oh, restitution, let's see here. What do we have for restitution recommendation? Let's see the restitution, so there's an order in judgment of restitution to Torrey Pines Pub, let's see, in the amount of $\$ 250$ because that was the deductible.

MS. MOORS: $\$ 250$, Your Honor?
THE COURT: Right, so the insurance paid all but the $\$ 250$ deductible. And so that's what I'm imposing for the -- it's the dugout -it's Torrey Pines Pub doing business as the Dugout Lounge. Or not it's just the reverse of that. It's the Dugout Lounge Inc. doing business as Torrey Pines Pub. And that's $\$ 250$. And that's the only restitution I believe.

MS. MOORS: Yes Your Honor, if I --
THE COURT: Everybody else did not respond.
MS. MOORS: -- if I can just inquire.
THE CLERK: Joint and several?
THE COURT: It's joint and several with the co-Defendant Antwaine Johnson. Yes.

MS. MOORS: And, Your Honor, with regards to the overall aggregate, am I correct in that it's a -- essentially the total is a 144 to 360 with a consecutive 72 to 180 ?

THE COURT: No, it's --

THE CLERK: You said 1 --
THE COURT: --192 to 480 --
THE DEFENDANT: 80
THE COURT: -- months. The -- when you do the aggregate you're not supposed to include in the aggregate those enhancement penalties.

MS. MOORS: Right, no I understand that.
THE COURT: Yeah.
MS. MOORS: I guess I'm -- then I -- I thought that there were 3 counts that were consecutive to each other.

MR. NADIG: There were four.
THE COURT: Four.
MS. MOORS: There were four, okay.
MR. NADIG: It's a 16 to 40 with a consecutive 8 to 20 .
MS. MOORS: Okay. I got it. I'm like --
MR. NADIG: I'm telling Lindsey. I didn't want that on the record. I was just telling Lindsey.

MS. MOORS: Okay, so then I --
MR. NADIG: I turned it off.
MS. MOORS: I guess I must have missed -- was Count 3 consecutive to Count 4 or concurrent?

THE COURT: Go back and see where --
THE CLERK: No, 3 was concurrent to 2,4 was consecutive to
3.

THE COURT: Right, the conspiracy was concurrent.

MS. MOORS: So 4 was consecutive, 5 was consecutive, 6 was consecutive and then where's the other consecutive?

THE CLERK: I think that's where I had 3 as well.
THE COURT: All right.
THE CLERK: Because I think 7 might be --
THE COURT: Well all right, so -- the first count is -- oh Count
2. Maybe I wrote that wrong. That's why I was asking everybody to keep track.

MS. MOORS: I--
THE COURT: It's all right. It's all right. Okay, so Count 3 is the first one -- no Count 3 is concurrent. Count 4, okay that's consecutive to Count 3 , okay. But 48 to 120 is the first count, right, that's the largest before -- because Count 3 has less time and it's running concurrent with Count 2, right.

MS. MOORS: Okay, so then it --
THE COURT: So that's the first count of 48 to 120. Then Count 4 --

MS. MOORS: But that Count 4 is consecutive to Count 3 .
THE COURT: -- is consecutive. Okay, so that's -- then Count 4 is consecutive, Count 5 is consecutive and Count 6 is consecutive.

That means there's --
MS. MOORS: So we would essentially be adding $3,4,5$, and
6.

THE COURT: There's four counts each of -- that run consecutive to each other.

MS. MOORS: And those counts are 3, 4, 5, and 6.
THE COURT: Yes. But because Count 3 is less time than Count 2, everything --

MS. MOORS: Oh, I see. I see.
THE COURT: Okay.
MS. MOORS: I do see. Sorry about that.
THE COURT: That's all right. It's usually Mr. Giordani that confuses me on these.

MS. MOORS: Yeah, it's -- the number --
MR. NADIG: He has a gift, Your Honor.
THE COURT: He does.
MS. MOORS: So I think I understand. I just -- we essentially have four counts of 48 on the base for the base of 192.

THE COURT: Yes.
MS. MOORS: And then they all were -- they were similar in that they all ended in 120 and then with regards to the enhancement there was obviously no enhancement on Count 2, but then all of the enhancements were 24 to 60 on the three other counts.

THE COURT: Yes.
MS. MOORS: Okay, then I do understand. I apologize, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
MS. MOORS: Thank you.
[Proceeding concluded at 11:51 a.m.]
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THE STATE OF NEVADA,
Plaintiff,
-vs-
DEVOHN MARKS
CASE NO: C-18-337017-2
DEPT NO: V

## JUDGMENT OF CONVICTION AND RESTITUTION (JURY TRIAL)

The defendant previously entered a plea of not guilty to the crimes of COUNT 1CONSPIRACY TO COMMIT BURGLARY (a Gross Misdemeanor) in violation of NRS 205.060, 199.480; COUNT 2 - BURGLARY WHILE IN POSSESSION OF A DEADLY WEAPON (a Category B Felony) in violation of NRS 205.060; COUNT 3 CONSPIRACY TO COMMIT ROBBERY (a Category B Felony) in violation of NRS 200.380, 199.480; COUNT 4 - ROBBERY WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON, VICTIM 60 YEARS OF AGE OR OLDER (a Category B Felony) in violation of NRS 200.380, 193.165, 193.167; COUNTS 5 and 6- ROBBERY WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON (a Category B Felony) in violation of NRS 200.380, 193.165; COUNT 7 BATTERY WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON, VICTIM 60 YEARS OF AGE OR OLDER (a Category B Felony) in violation of NRS 200.481, 193.167; COUNT 8 BATTERY WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON (a Category B Felony) in violation of NRS 200.481; and the matter having been tried before a jury and the defendant having been found guilty of the crimes of COUNT 1-CONSPIRACY TO COMMIT BURGLARY (a Gross Misdemeanor) in violation of NRS 205.060, 199.480; COUNT 2 - BURGLARY

WHILE IN POSSESSION OF A DEADLY WEAPON (a Category B Felony) in violation of NRS 205.060; COUNT 3 - CONSPIRACY TO COMMIT ROBBERY (a Category B Felony) in violation of NRS 200.380, 199.480; COUNT 4 - ROBBERY WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON, VICTIM 60 YEARS OF AGE OR OLDER (a Category B Felony) in violation of NRS 200.380, 193.165, 193.167; COUNTS 5 and 6 - ROBBERY WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON (a Category B Felony) in violation of NRS 200.380, 193.165; COUNT 7 - BATTERY WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON, VICTIM 60 YEARS OF AGE OR OLDER (a Category B Felony) in violation of NRS 200.481, 193.167; COUNT 8 BATTERY WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON (a Category B Felony) in violation of NRS 200.481. Thereafter, on the $18^{\text {th }}$ day of December, 2019, the defendant was present in court for sentencing without counsel, IN PROPER PERSON, and good cause appearing,

THE DEFENDANT IS HEREBY ADJUDGED guilty of said offenses and, in addition to the $\$ 25.00$ Administrative Assessment Fee, the $\$ 3.00$ DNA Collection Fee, ${ }^{1}$ and an Order and Judgment of Restitution in the amount of $\$ 250.00$ payable to and in favor of the Dugout Lounge Inc. dba Torrey Pines Pub payable jointly and severally with the codefendant, the defendant is sentenced to the Nevada Department of Corrections as follows: COUNT 1 - THREE HUNDRED SIXTY FOUR (364) DAYS in the Clark County Detention Center (CCDC); COUNT 2 - a MAXIMUM of ONE HUNDRED TWENTY (120) MONTHS and a MINIMUM of FORTY EIGHT (48) MONTHS, CONCURRENT with COUNT 1; COUNT 3 - a MAXIMUM of SEVENTY TWO (72) MONTHS and a MINIMUM of TWENTY FOUR (24) MONTHS, CONCURRENT with COUNT 2; COUNT 4 - a MAXIMUM of ONE HUNDRED TWENTY (120) MONTHS and a MINIMUM of FORTY EIGHT (48) MONTHS plus a CONSECUTIVE term of a MAXIMUM of SIXTY (60) MONTHS and a MINIMUM of TWENTY FOUR (24) MONTHS for both enhancements, CONSECUTIVE to COUNT 3; COUNT 5-a

[^0]MAXIMUM of ONE HUNDRED TWENTY (120) MONTHS and a MINIMUM of FORTY EIGHT (48) MONTHS plus a CONSECUTIVE term of a MAXIMUM of SIXTY (60) MONTHS and a MINIMUM of TWENTY FOUR (24) MONTHS for the deadly weapon enhancement, CONSECUTIVE to COUNT 4; COUNT 6 - a MAXIMUM of ONE HUNDRED TWENTY (120) MONTHS and a MINIMUM of FORTY EIGHT (48) MONTHS plus a CONSECUTIVE term of a MAXIMUM of SIXTY (60) MONTHS and a MINIMUM of TWENTY FOUR (24) MONTHS for the deadly weapon enhancement, CONSECUTIVE to COUNT 5; COUNT 7 - a MAXIMUM of ONE HUNDRED TWENTY (120) MONTHS and a MINIMUM of THIRTY SIX (36) MONTHS plus a CONSECUTIVE term of a MAXIMUM of SIXTY (60) MONTHS and a MINIMUM of TWENTY FOUR (24) MONTHS for the victim 60 years of age or older enhancement, CONCURRENT with COUNT 6; and COUNT 8 - a MAXIMUM of ONE HUNDRED TWENTY (120) MONTHS and a MINIMUM of THIRTY SIX (36) MONTHS, CONCURRENT with COUNT 7; with ONE HUNDRED SEVENTY NINE (179) DAYS credit for time served. The AGGREGATE TOTAL sentence is a MAXIMUM of FOUR HUNDRED EIGHTY (480) MONTHS and a MINIMUM of ONE HUNDRED NINETY TWO (192) MONTHS.

DATED this 20 day of December, 2019.
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Jess Y. Matsuda, Esq.
Nevada Bar No. 10929
Matsuda \& Associates, LTD.
228 South 4th Street, Suite 300
Las Vegas, NV 89101
Tel. (702) 383-0506
Fax. (702) 825-2688
jess@jesslaw.com
Attorney for Devohn Marks
IN THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

The State of Nevada,
Plaintiff,
vs.
Devohn Marks, \#2798254,
Defendant.

Notice is hereby given that Devhon Marks, defendant in the above-entitled action, appeals to the Supreme Court of Nevada from the Judgment of Conviction filed December 23, 2019.

DATED this $17^{\text {th }}$ day of January, 2020.
/s/ Jess Matsuda
Jess Y. Matsuda, EsQ.
Nevada Bar No. 10929
Matsuda \& Assoclates, Lidid.
228 South 4th Street, Suite 300
Las Vegas, NV 89101
Tel. (702) 383-0506
Fax. (702) 825-2688
jess@jesslaw.com
Attorney for Devohn Marks
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## Certificate of Service

I hereby certify that I am a person competent to serve papers, that I am not a party to the above-entitled action, and that on January 17, 2020, I served the foregoing document on:

Steven B. Wolfson, Esq.
200 Lewis Avenue
Steven S. Owens, Esq.
Clark County District Attorney's Office
Las Vegas, NV 89155
Via e-mail: motions@clarkcountyda.com

DATED this 17 of January, 2020.

Alexid Bridges
An Employee of Matsuda \& Associates, Ltd.

## AFFIRMATION

Pursuant to NRS 239B.030, this document contains no social security numbers.
$\qquad$
Jess Y. Matsuda, Eso
$\frac{01-17-20}{\text { Date }}$
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CASE NO: C-18-337017-2
DEVOHN MARKS
DEPT NO: V

## AMENDED JUDGMENT OF CONVICTION AND RESTITUTION- nunc pro tunc (JURY TRIAL)

The defendant previously entered a plea of not guilty to the crimes of COUNT 1 CONSPIRACY TO COMMIT BURGLARY (a Gross Misdemeanor) in violation of NRS 205.060, 199.480; COUNT 2 - BURGLARY WHILE IN POSSESSION OF A DEADLY WEAPON (a Category B Felony) in violation of NRS 205.060; COUNT 3 CONSPIRACY TO COMMIT ROBBERY (a Category B Felony) in violation of NRS 200.380, 199.480; COUNT 4 - ROBBERY WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON, VICTIM 60 YEARS OF AGE OR OLDER (a Category B Felony) in violation of NRS 200.380, 193.165, 193.167; COUNTS 5 and 6- ROBBERY WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON (a Category B Felony) in violation of NRS 200.380, 193.165; COUNT 7 BATTERY WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON, VICTIM 60 YEARS OF AGE OR OLDER (a Category B Felony) in violation of NRS 200.481, 193.167; COUNT 8 BATTERY WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON (a Category B Felony) in violation of NRS 200.481; and the matter having been tried before a jury and the defendant having been found guilty of the crimes of COUNT 1-CONSPIRACY TO COMMIT BURGLARY (a Gross Misdemeanor) in violation of NRS 205.060, 199.480; COUNT 2 - BURGLARY //

WHILE IN POSSESSION OF A DEADLY WEAPON (a Category B Felony) in violation of NRS 205.060; COUNT 3 - CONSPIRACY TO COMMIT ROBBERY (a Category B Felony) in violation of NRS 200.380, 199.480; COUNT 4 - ROBBERY WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON, VICTIM 60 YEARS OF AGE OR OLDER (a Category B Felony) in violation of NRS 200.380, 193.165, 193.167; COUNTS 5 and 6 - ROBBERY WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON (a Category B Felony) in violation of NRS 200.380, 193.165; COUNT 7 - BATTERY WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON, VICTIM 60 YEARS OF AGE OR OLDER (a Category B Felony) in violation of NRS 200.481, 193.167; COUNT 8 BATTERY WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON (a Category B Felony) in violation of NRS 200.481. Thereafter, on the $18^{\text {th }}$ day of December, 2019, the defendant was present in court for sentencing without counsel, IN PROPER PERSON, and good cause appearing,

THE DEFENDANT WAS ADJUDGED guilty of said offenses and, in addition to the \$25.00 Administrative Assessment Fee, the $\$ 3.00$ DN $\Lambda$ Collection Fee, ${ }^{1}$ and an Order and Judgment of Restitution in the amount of $\$ 250.00$ payable to and in favor of the Dugout Lounge Inc. dba Torrey Pines Pub payable jointly and severally with the co-defendant, the defendant was sentenced to the Nevada Department of Corrections as follows: COUNT 1 THREE HUNDRED SIXTY FOUR (364) DAYS in the Clark County Detention Center (CCDC); COUNT 2 - a MAXIMUM of ONE HUNDRED TWENTY (120) MONTHS and a MINIMUM of FORTY EIGHT (48) MONTHS, CONCURRENT with COUNT 1; COUNT 3 - a MAXIMUM of SEVENTY TWO (72) MONTHS and a MINIMUM of TWENTY FOUR (24) MONTHS, CONCURRENT with COUNT 2; COUNT 4 - a MAXIMUM of ONE HUNDRED TWENTY (120) MONTHS and a MINIMUM of FORTY EIGHT (48) MONTHS plus a CONSECUTIVE term of a MAXIMUM of SIXTY (60) MONTHS and a MINIMUM of TWENTY FOUR (24) MONTHS for both enhancements, CONSECUTIVE to COUNT 3; COUNT 5 - a MAXIMUM of ONE HUNDRED TWENTY (120) MONTHS //

[^1]and a MINIMUM of FORTY EIGHT (48) MONTHS plus a CONSECUTIVE term of a MAXIMUM of SIXTY (60) MONTHS and a MINIMUM of TWENTY FOUR (24) MONTHS for the deadly weapon enhancement, CONSECUTIVE to COUNT 4; COUNT 6 - a MAXIMUM of ONE HUNDRED TWENTY (120) MONTHS and a MINIMUM of FORTY EIGHT (48) MONTHS plus a CONSECUTIVE term of a MAXIMUM of SIXTY (60) MONTHS and a MINIMUM of TWENTY FOUR (24) MONTHS for the deadly weapon enhancement, CONSECUTIVE to COUNT 5; COUNT 7 - a MAXIMUM of ONE HUNDRED TWENTY (120) MONTHS and a MINIMUM of THIRTY SIX (36) MONTHS plus a CONSECUTIVE term of a MAXIMUM of SIXTY (60) MONTHS and a MINIMUM of TWENTY FOUR (24) MONTHS for the victim 60 years of age or older enhancement, CONCURRENT with COUNT 6; and COUNT 8 - a MAXIMUM of ONE HUNDRED TWENTY (120) MONTHS and a MINIMUM of THIRTY SIX (36) MONTHS, CONCURRENT with COUNT 7; with ONE HUNDRED SEVENTY NINE (179) DAYS credit for time served. The AGGREGATE TOTAL sentence is a MAXIMUM of SIX HUNDRED SIXTY (660) MONTHS and a MINIMUM of TWO HUNDRED SIXTY FOUR (264) MONTHS.

This is a nunc pro tune order insofar as it identifies the correct aggregate sentence as required by NRS 176.035(7). The Judgment of Conviction incorrectly listed an aggregate sentence of a maximum of four hundred eighty (480) months and a minimum of one hundred ninety two (192) months. The correct aggregate sentence as reflected in this Amended Judgment of Conviction is a MAXIMUM of SIX HUNDRED SIXTY (660) MONTHS and a MINIMUM of TWO HUNDRED SIXTY FOUR (264) MONTHS.

DATED this $13^{\text {th }}$ day of March, 2020.



[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ The $\$ 150.00$ DNA Analysis Fee is WAIVED.

[^1]:    ${ }^{1}$ The $\$ 150.00$ DNA Analysis Fee was WAIVED.

