IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

RALPH EDMOND GOAD,

Electronically Filed
May 08 2020 10:16 a.m.
No. 7507abeth A. Brown
Clerk of Supreme Court

Appellant,

VS.

THE STATE OF NEVADA.

Respondent.

Appeal from a Judgment of Conviction in Case CR19-0999
The Second Judicial District Court of the State of Nevada
Honorable David Hardy, District Judge

JOINT APPENDIX VOLUME THREE

JOHN L. ARRASCADA Washoe County Public Defender

KATHRYN REYNOLDS Deputy Public Defender 350 South Center Street, 5th Floor Reno, Nevada 89501

Attorneys for Appellant

CHRISTOPHER J. HICKS
Washoe County District Attorney

JENNIFER P. NOBLE Chief Appellate Deputy One South Sierra Street, 7th Floor Reno, Nevada 89501

Attorneys for Respondent

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Court Minutes: Decision on Motion to Admit Evidence of Motive, held on July 30, 2019
Defendant's Offered and Rejected Jury Instructions filed on August 9, 2019
Judgment of Conviction, filed on October 3, 2019
Jury Instructions, filed on August 9, 2019
Indictment, filed on June 12, 2019
Motion in Limine Re: Other Act Evidence, filed on July 8, 2019
Motion to Admit Evidence of Motive, filed on July 3, 2019
Motion to Preclude Or Limit Use of Prejudicial Photographs, filed on July 8, 2019
Notice of Appeal, filed on November 4, 2019
Opposition to Motion in Limine Re: Other Act Evidence, filed on July 18, 2019
Opposition to Motion to Preclude or Limit Use of Prejudicial Photographs, <i>filed on</i> July 18, 2019
Opposition to State's Motion to Admit Evidence of Motive, filed on July 11, 2019
Order, <i>filed</i> on July 30, 2019
Order, <i>filed</i> on August 9, 2019

Reply in Support of Motion to Admit Evidence of Motive,
filed on July 22, 2019
Second Supplement to Exhibit, filed on July 22, 2019
State's Exhibit 15, admitted on August 8, 20198 JA 1114
State's Exhibit 19A, admitted on August 7, 2019
State's Exhibit 20A, admitted on August 8, 20198 JA 1152
State's Exhibit 21A, admitted on August 7, 2019
State's Exhibit 22, admitted on August 22, 2019
Stipulation and Waiver of Jury Penalty Hearing, filed on August 9, 2019
Supplement to Exhibit, filed on July 12, 2019
Transcript of Proceedings: Pretrial Motions, held on July 23, 2019
Transcript of Proceedings: Jury Trial, held on July 31, 2019
Transcript of Proceedings: Jury Trial, held on August 5, 2019
Transcript of Proceedings: Jury Trial, held on August 6, 20194 JA 511
Transcript of Proceedings: Jury Trial, held on August 7, 2019
Transcript of Proceedings: Jury Trial, held on August 8, 2019

Transcript of Proceedings: Jury Trial,	in the control of the property of the property of the property of the control of
held on August 9, 2019	7 JA 1044
Transcript of Proceedings: Sentencing,	
held on October 2, 2019	9 JA 1330
Verdict, filed on August 9, 2019	9 JA 1324

	40 (m m + 114 to 1
1	4185
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA
7	IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF WASHOE
8	THE HONORABLE DAVID A. HARDY, DISTRICT JUDGE
9	000
10	STATE OF NEVADA.) Case No. CR19-0999
11	STATE OF NEVADA,) Case No. CR19-0999) Dept. No. 15
12	Plaintiff,)
13) TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
14	RALPH EDMOND GOAD,)
15	Defendant.))
16	JURY TRIAL - DAY 1 AUGUST 5, 2019, RENO, NEVADA
17	
18	APPEARANCES:
19	For the Plaintiff: AMOS R. STEGE, ESQ. Deputy District Attorney
20	One S. Sierra Street, 4th Floor Reno, Nevada 89520
21	For the Defendant: JENNIFER ARIAS MAYHEW, ESQ.
22	JAY SLOCUM, ESQ. Deputy Public Defenders
23	350 South Center St., 6th Floor Reno, Nevada 89520
24	The Defendant: RALPH EDMOND GOAD Reported by: JULIE ANN KERNAN, CCR #427, CP, RPR Computer-Aided Transcription

RENO, NEVADA, MONDAY AUGUST 5, 2019; 8:55 A.M.

---000---

THE COURT: We'll go on the record in CR19-0999. The State is present through attorney Stege. Mr. Goad is present with attorneys Slocum and Mayhew. I want to talk for just a couple of minutes before we summons the jury but before I do, let me first confirm that you have received a copy of the email regarding the prospective juror who we got this morning that he is a felon and his civil rights have not been restored.

Any suggestions first to the State and then to the Defense how I should handle that. Should I similarly at the outset dismiss him or I should let him sit through the morning?

MR. STEGE: Either one. It's tempting to make him sit here but I think the better course, honestly, is to send him away when he gets in here.

MR. SLOCUM: And are we convinced that he actually has been convicted of a felony or is he coming in to say that so that he doesn't have to serve, that's the question.

MR. STEGE: This gentleman's criminal history,

I think, indicates he does.

THE COURT: I see him for three felony convictions for controlled substances about 20 years ago.

MR. SLOCUM: I'll leave it to the Court's discretion.

THE COURT: I, like trial counsel, inadvertently and regrettably perform in the heat of trial. One thing I attempt to do is present balance in the courtroom between the State and the Defense. I have found that when there are multiple defense attorneys, and a single State's attorney, I occasionally refer to the State's attorney by name, and then not knowing who is going to participate as the next examining attorney, I'll say counsel. And I want to avoid that so the way I'm going to try and avoid it, first of all, I have a note on my bench. I'll strive to just refer to the State's attorney as counsel, but then if I get some indication you half rise out of the chair or, and then turn to look for one of the attorneys so I can get a clue as to who, then I'll refer to you by name.

It's been a long process because as a veteran

I had -- I had the sir and ma'am developed, embedded

deeply in my vocabulary, and as our communities progress

I've learned, heard from time to time that those are not welcome references. So I strive to avoid that. If I just responsively say yes, sir or yes, ma'am, I'll just — I have a note here I'll attempt to avoid, but I hope you'll forgive those indulgences.

2.2

Most importantly is my Pretrial Order. That order was not written in response to one attorney, and it certainly is the outgrowth of both the State and the Defense attorneys that participate in trials in Department 15.

I just realized that we have different roles in jury selection, and I have a responsibility to manage jury selection. I really have three concerns that I have attempted to resolve by Pretrial Order, and then when I'm done talking I'll invite you if you seek leave from its direction.

I've been frustrated with the State year over year, particularly younger attorneys who they develop this overlayic metaphoric if a tree falls in the forest and there's chocolate around the mess, person who doesn't have chocolate on her finger, but there's only one witness and the cookie jar has less — one fewer cookies, and I just want to stop with that.

Second, oh, and also it's part of my first

reason I found over the years that attorneys both State and Defense don't really listen to what I do, but instead when I'm done they just begin what they prepared over the weekend as if we had spent an hour in unnecessary territory. So I really do want you to listen and follow up with what I've attempted to do.

5.

I acknowledge my voir dire's not going to be comprehensive, you'll have additional questions, and you're welcome, but I want you to kind of follow what I've attempted to do.

Second, I've been really concerned with these hypothetical questions, well, if, then that, and these instructions on probable cause and beyond preponderant evidence in civil cases. And I understand you want to deselect, but that's not my role. And so there will be no instructions of law or hypotheticals based upon instructions of law.

I will instruct the jury, after consulting with you on the record, but we just want to try and guess at the outset whether jurors are resistant to a statement of law from the Court that they will follow.

Third, there is a level of advocacy, endearment, indoctrination that begins at the very first moment. And it's inappropriate, I'm not going to allow

it.

Now, having said that, I do believe that your Peremptory Challenges should be informed. And so I do want to grant some latitude so you can kind of get into jurors', prospective jurors' minds. So that will be the balance I attempt to strike.

And the objectionable, you know your objections to my order, I think it's well grounded in Nevada law, if you seek leave or have different opinions let's do it now because I don't want -- I don't want to step on any one of you. I don't know which of the two of you are doing jury selection. I don't want to step on you in front of this jury. But I don't want to have problems in front of this jury either. Counsel?

MR. STEGE: I have no issues with it.

MR. SLOCUM: No issues, your Honor.

THE COURT: Good. Anything from you, to the State, before I summons the jury?

MR. STEGE: No.

THE COURT: To the Defense.

MR. SLOCUM: No, thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Are we ready? Are they

downstairs? We have 54 who are here.

MR. STEGE: Not yet.

MIX. DILGE.

THE COURT: Does anybody need a last-minute 1 We could do it for five minutes, if necessary. 2 break? 3 MR. STEGE: No. MR. SLOCUM: No thanks, your Honor. 4 5 THE COURT: Well, I do. (Short break.) 6 THE COURT: The question was whether Panelist 7 Botteron was going to be under oath. I assumed that had 8 he disclosed his status he would not even have been 9 included in the panel, and so I didn't want to put him 10 under oath in front of everyone else --11 12 MR. STEGE: Right. THE COURT: -- to confirm anything, but I 13 don't think I want him to stay all morning and so I was 14 just going to take him to the jury room with all of you 15 16 present --MR. STEGE: Okay. 17 THE COURT: -- to confirm and excuse. And 18 then if something comes up in that conversation I'd put 19 20 him back in the group. Is that okay? 21 MR. STEGE: Yes. MR. SLOCUM: Thank you, your Honor. 22

(Short break.)

THE COURT: All right.

23

24

THE COURT: Good morning, Ladies and gentlemen.

2.2

Good morning, counsel, Mr. Goad. Please be seated. Welcome to the Second Judicial District Court. This is Department 15 and I am Judge David Hardy. You have responded to the call of service. You are here after summons for potential jury service.

I know that some of you have arrived this morning hoping to quickly express your inability to serve. We will arrive at your ability or inability to serve shortly. If you will just trust me for a few moments that this is a highly orchestrated phase of jury trial, and your concerns, I will invite your concerns at the proper place.

I just begin by acknowledging that you are here, possibly uncertain about what this means. A few of you have served previously, this may be a first, undoubtedly is a first for most of you. And I want to join with the attorneys and Mr. Goad in expressing my gratitude for your willingness, at least, to be here and to participate in this process.

I've learned over the years that there's a subtle change in opinion as trial unfolds. Many of you are here with inconvenience and preference elsewhere.

But as the trial unfolds, those who participate begin to realize how critical, how noble jury service is. And at the end of the experience, regardless of the outcome, whether it be not guilty, guilty, the inability even to reach a verdict, regardless of the outcome, there is this awareness of the sacred trust we place upon members of our community to come together and to be for a moment the voice and values of our community consistent with the legal principles that will govern the trial and your deliberations.

Though we don't know each other, I ask for your confidence, I loan it to you hoping to learn it throughout this week, but please be confident that those of you who serve will have an experience that justifies your time.

Often public service is inconvenient. I think about it April 15th of every year. We're aging now as a community, but I grew at a time when, I, as a very young boy, I heard from courts about casualties in the Vietnam war. I remember sitting with my mother and watching television as prisoners of war exited the airplane and raised across the tarmac. I think of their service. Historically we've had great service that compose the threads that bind us as communities, and you're called

upon to be that great legacy.

Despite inconvenience and your preference is everywhere, we rely upon members of our community randomly selected, diverse in experience and perspectives to be part of something -- something that both preserves public safety and social order and concomitantly and equally the rule of law.

The Constitutional privileges we each enjoy it is through your service that you will palpably touch some of these constitutional consents, maybe in ways that you never had in the past. And you will feel the value, the power of what we do. The jury system is historical. It's rich. It is a mechanism to -- to prevent despotism by those who have authority. It is a chance to -- to emerge from the community anonymously but have such power that creates fairness, objectivity, and I ask you to consider this tradition, to accept the duties of citizenship. Those who are ultimately called to serve will reach fair, neutral, fact-in-law-driven decisions.

This is our historic courtroom. Not every courtroom in the building looks like this. This room, courtroom was one of the only courtroom in the building. It was completed in 1911, 108 years ago. It's been

restored to its original condition.

2.0

There are many ghosts of justice that occupy this room. For more than a hundred years members of our community have done the very thing you are called upon to do this morning. And I'm privileged to sit in this courtroom and I hope that you will fill its — its sacred venue, not in a spiritual sense, but a secular sacred venue.

And with this courtroom comes great complications. We can't hear each other well in this courtroom. The acoustics are horrible. So from time to time I'll amplify my voice, and I'm not yelling at the attorneys or witnesses, I'm attempting to leave what I expect, and that's full sound in the courtroom. I might even interrupt the attorneys from time to time and ask them to speak up.

We don't place -- we don't embed technology in the walls of this room and so it's a little unwieldy to crane your necks to see the television screen. The chairs aren't quite as comfortable as I wish. But in exchange we sit in this wonderful courtroom.

We'll also periodically stand and even exit the courtroom for breaks throughout the trial. My

preference and attempt is to have a formal courtroom that befits the important work we do here.

The attorneys are called to this work, the court staff are deeply involved in our work of justice. And from time to time, we smile. You'll certainly see collegiality between counsel. Intentional humor is never welcome, but from time to time we'll have light moments, never at the expense of the State, never at the expense of the Defense. And never ever at the expense of he or she who is accused of crime. So in advance I hope that you'll indulge those moments never offsetting important work that we all respect.

Ms. Clerk, we need to ensure that everybody who arrived down stairs has also made it upstairs. So if you will call the role, please, Ms. Clerk.

As you hear your name, please audibly respond. Ms. Clerk.

COURT CLERK: Marie Baker?

MS. BAKER: Here.

THE COURT: Darren Barnes?

MR. BARNES: Here.

COURT CLERK: Ashley Bautista?

MS. BAUTISTA: Here.

COURT CLERK: Lawrence Beccard?

MS. BENSON: Here. MS. BENSON: Here. COURT CLERK: Clinton Botteron? MR. BOTTERON: Here. COURT CLERK: Lois Bynum? MS. BYNUM: Here. COURT CLERK: Michael Cherti? MR. CHERTI: Here. COURT CLERK: Amber Choate? MS. CHOATE: Here. COURT CLERK: Jamie Clark? MS. CLARK: Here. COURT CLERK: Megan Coates? MS. COATES: Here. COURT CLERK: Donna Cody? MS. COOY: Here. COURT CLERK: Richard Combs? MR. COMBS: Here. COURT CLERK: Stephanie Cortes? MS. CORTES: Here. COURT CLERK: Christopher Cunningham? MR. COURT CLERK: Christopher Cunningham? MR. CUNNINGHAM: Here. COURT CLERK: Michael Dedomenico?	1	MR. BECCARD: Here.
MR. BOTTERON: Here. COURT CLERK: Lois Bynum? MS. BYNUM: Here. COURT CLERK: Michael Cherti? MR. CHERTI: Here. COURT CLERK: Amber Choate? MS. CHOATE: Here. COURT CLERK: Jamie Clark? MS. CLARK: Here. COURT CLERK: Megan Coates? MS. COATES: Here. COURT CLERK: Donna Cody? MS. CODY: Here. COURT CLERK: Richard Combs? MR. COMBS: Here. COURT CLERK: Stephanie Cortes? MS. CORTES: Here. COURT CLERK: Christopher Cunningham? MR. CUNNINGHAM: Here.	2	COURT CLERK: Cathy Benson?
MR. BOTTERON: Here. COURT CLERK: Lois Bynum? MS. BYNUM: Here. COURT CLERK: Michael Cherti? MR. CHERTI: Here. COURT CLERK: Amber Choate? MS. CHOATE: Here. COURT CLERK: Jamie Clark? MS. CLARK: Here. COURT CLERK: Megan Coates? MS. COATES: Here. COURT CLERK: Donna Cody? MS. CODY: Here. COURT CLERK: Richard Combs? MR. COMBS: Here. COURT CLERK: Stephanie Cortes? MS. CORTES: Here. COURT CLERK: Christopher Cunningham? MR. CUNNINGHAM: Here.	3	MS. BENSON: Here.
6 COURT CLERK: Lois Bynum? 7 MS. BYNUM: Here. 8 COURT CLERK: Michael Cherti? 9 MR. CHERTI: Here. 10 COURT CLERK: Amber Choate? 11 MS. CHOATE: Here. 12 COURT CLERK: Jamie Clark? 13 MS. CLARK: Here. 14 COURT CLERK: Megan Coates? 15 MS. COATES: Here. 16 COURT CLERK: Donna Cody? 17 MS. CODY: Here. 18 COURT CLERK: Richard Combs? 19 MR. COMES: Here. 20 COURT CLERK: Stephanie Cortes? 21 MS. CORTES: Here. 22 COURT CLERK: Christopher Cunningham? 23 MR. CUNNINGHAM: Here.	4	COURT CLERK: Clinton Botteron?
MS. BYNUM: Here. COURT CLERK: Michael Cherti? MR. CHERTI: Here. COURT CLERK: Amber Choate? MS. CHOATE: Here. COURT CLERK: Jamie Clark? MS. CLARK: Here. COURT CLERK: Megan Coates? MS. COATES: Here. COURT CLERK: Donna Cody? MS. CODY: Here. COURT CLERK: Richard Combs? MR. COMBS: Here. COURT CLERK: Stephanie Cortes? MS. CORTES: Here. COURT CLERK: Stephanie Cortes? MS. CORTES: Here. COURT CLERK: Christopher Cunningham? MR. CUNNINGHAM: Here.	5	MR. BOTTERON: Here.
MR. CHERTI: Here. MR. CHERTI: Here. COURT CLERK: Amber Choate? MS. CHOATE: Here. COURT CLERK: Jamie Clark? MS. CLARK: Here. COURT CLERK: Megan Coates? MS. COATES: Here. COURT CLERK: Donna Cody? MS. CODY: Here. COURT CLERK: Richard Combs? MR. COMBS: Here. COURT CLERK: Stephanie Cortes? MS. CORTES: Here. COURT CLERK: Christopher Cunningham? MR. CUNNINGHAM: Here.	6	COURT CLERK: Lois Bynum?
9 MR. CHERTI: Here. 10 COURT CLERK: Amber Choate? 11 MS. CHOATE: Here. 12 COURT CLERK: Jamie Clark? 13 MS. CLARK: Here. 14 COURT CLERK: Megan Coates? 15 MS. COATES: Here. 16 COURT CLERK: Donna Cody? 17 MS. CODY: Here. 18 COURT CLERK: Richard Combs? 19 MR. COMBS: Here. 20 COURT CLERK: Stephanie Cortes? 21 MS. CORTES: Here. 22 COURT CLERK: Christopher Cunningham? 23 MR. CUNNINGHAM: Here.	7	MS. BYNUM: Here.
COURT CLERK: Amber Choate? MS. CHOATE: Here. COURT CLERK: Jamie Clark? MS. CLARK: Here. COURT CLERK: Megan Coates? MS. COATES: Here. COURT CLERK: Donna Cody? MS. CODY: Here. COURT CLERK: Richard Combs? MR. COMBS: Here. COURT CLERK: Stephanie Cortes? MS. CORTES: Here. COURT CLERK: Christopher Cunningham? MR. CUNNINGHAM: Here.	8	COURT CLERK: Michael Cherti?
MS. CHOATE: Here. COURT CLERK: Jamie Clark? MS. CLARK: Here. COURT CLERK: Megan Coates? MS. COATES: Here. COURT CLERK: Donna Cody? MS. CODY: Here. COURT CLERK: Richard Combs? MR. COMBS: Here. COURT CLERK: Stephanie Cortes? MS. CORTES: Here. COURT CLERK: Christopher Cunningham? MR. CUNNINGHAM: Here.	9	MR. CHERTI: Here.
COURT CLERK: Jamie Clark? MS. CLARK: Here. COURT CLERK: Megan Coates? MS. COATES: Here. COURT CLERK: Donna Cody? MS. CODY: Here. COURT CLERK: Richard Combs? MR. COMBS: Here. COURT CLERK: Stephanie Cortes? MS. CORTES: Here. COURT CLERK: Christopher Cunningham? MR. CUNNINGHAM: Here.	10	COURT CLERK: Amber Choate?
MS. CLARK: Here. COURT CLERK: Megan Coates? MS. COATES: Here. COURT CLERK: Donna Cody? MS. CODY: Here. COURT CLERK: Richard Combs? MR. COMBS: Here. COURT CLERK: Stephanie Cortes? MS. CORTES: Here. COURT CLERK: Christopher Cunningham? MR. CUNNINGHAM: Here.	11	MS. CHOATE: Here.
COURT CLERK: Megan Coates? MS. COATES: Here. COURT CLERK: Donna Cody? MS. CODY: Here. COURT CLERK: Richard Combs? MR. COMBS: Here. COURT CLERK: Stephanie Cortes? MS. CORTES: Here. COURT CLERK: Christopher Cunningham? MR. CUNNINGHAM: Here.	12	COURT CLERK: Jamie Clark?
MS. COATES: Here. COURT CLERK: Donna Cody? MS. CODY: Here. COURT CLERK: Richard Combs? MR. COMBS: Here. COURT CLERK: Stephanie Cortes? MS. CORTES: Here. COURT CLERK: Christopher Cunningham? MR. CUNNINGHAM: Here.	13	MS. CLARK: Here.
COURT CLERK: Donna Cody? MS. CODY: Here. COURT CLERK: Richard Combs? MR. COMBS: Here. COURT CLERK: Stephanie Cortes? MS. CORTES: Here. COURT CLERK: Christopher Cunningham? MR. CUNNINGHAM: Here.	14	COURT CLERK: Megan Coates?
MS. CODY: Here. COURT CLERK: Richard Combs? MR. COMBS: Here. COURT CLERK: Stephanie Cortes? MS. CORTES: Here. COURT CLERK: Christopher Cunningham? MR. CUNNINGHAM: Here.	15	MS. COATES: Here.
COURT CLERK: Richard Combs? MR. COMBS: Here. COURT CLERK: Stephanie Cortes? MS. CORTES: Here. COURT CLERK: Christopher Cunningham? MR. CUNNINGHAM: Here.	16	COURT CLERK: Donna Cody?
MR. COMBS: Here. COURT CLERK: Stephanie Cortes? MS. CORTES: Here. COURT CLERK: Christopher Cunningham? MR. CUNNINGHAM: Here.	17	MS. CODY: Here.
COURT CLERK: Stephanie Cortes? MS. CORTES: Here. COURT CLERK: Christopher Cunningham? MR. CUNNINGHAM: Here.	18	COURT CLERK: Richard Combs?
MS. CORTES: Here. COURT CLERK: Christopher Cunningham? MR. CUNNINGHAM: Here.	19	MR. COMBS: Here.
COURT CLERK: Christopher Cunningham? MR. CUNNINGHAM: Here.	20	COURT CLERK: Stephanie Cortes?
MR. CUNNINGHAM: Here.	21	MS. CORTES: Here.
	22	COURT CLERK: Christopher Cunningham?
24 COURT CLERK: Michael Dedomenico?	23	MR. CUNNINGHAM: Here.
	24	COURT CLERK: Michael Dedomenico?

1	MR. DEDOMENICO: Here.
2	COURT CLERK: Michelle Donald?
3	MS. DONALD: Here.
4	COURT CLERK: Della Dunbar?
5	MS. DUNBAR: Here.
6	COURT CLERK: Joyce Farnsworth?
7	MS. FARNSWORTH: Here.
8	COURT CLERK: Clarita Fillipone?
9	MS. FILLIPONE: Here.
10	COURT CLERK: Nelson Garcia?
11	MR. GARCIA: Here.
12	THE COURT: Sierra Genz?
13	MS. GENZ: Here.
14	COURT CLERK: John Giammona Wilber?
15	MR. WILBER: Here.
16	COURT CLERK: Jennifer Gibbs?
17	MS. GIBBS: Here.
18	COURT CLERK: Charles Gray?
19	MR. GRAY: Here.
20	COURT CLERK: Sandra Gualano.
21	MS. GUALANO: Here.
22	COURT CLERK: Carlos Hernandez-Guillen?
23	MR. HERNANDEZ-GUILLEN: Here.
24	COURT CLERK: Deborah Holbrook?

1	MS. HOLBROOK: Here.
2	COURT CLERK: Rick Humphrey?
3	MR. HUMPHREY: Here.
4	COURT CLERK: Jonathon Hunter?
5	MR. HUNTER: Here.
6	COURT CLERK: Nathaniel Kanute?
7	MR. KANUTE: Present.
8	COURT CLERK: Todd Kerfoot?
9	MR. KERFOOT: Here.
10	COURT CLERK: Audra Leroy?
11	MS. LEROY: Here.
12	COURT CLERK: Jenny Lopez?
13	MS. LOPEZ: Here.
14	COURT CLERK: Kristin Mahrt?
15	MS. MAHRT: Here.
16	COURT CLERK: Stephen Morro?
17	MR. MORRO: Here.
18	COURT CLERK: Marlem Nolasco?
19	MR. NOLASCO: Here.
20	COURT CLERK: Carol Nutter?
21	MS. NUTTER: Here.
22	COURT CLERK: Deborah Ramirez?
23	MS. RAMIREZ: Here.
24	COURT CLERK: Steven Rayner?

- 11	
1	MR. RAYNER: Here.
2	COURT CLERK: James Reid?
3	MR. REID: Here.
4	COURT CLERK: Janet Roberts?
5	MS. ROBERTS: Here.
6	COURT CLERK: Sergio Ruiz?
7	MR. RUIZ: Here.
8	COURT CLERK: James Sargent?
9	MR. SARGENT: Here.
10	COURT CLERK: Gregory Scoville?
11	MR. SCOVILLE: Here.
12	COURT CLERK: Katie Smith?
13	MS. SMITH: Here.
14	COURT CLERK: Frederick Steinmann.
15	MR. STEINMANN: Here.
16	COURT CLERK: Rebecca Striggow.
17	MS. STRIGGOW: Here.
18	COURT CLERK: Therese Ure?
19	MS. URE: Here.
20	COURT CLERK: Jesus Valadez?
21	MR. VALADEZ: Here.
22	THE COURT: Douglas Wells?
23	MR. WELLS: Here.
24	COURT CLERK: Jordan Wilcher?

1

MR. WILCHER: Here.

2

COURT CLERK: Mark Witman?

3

MR. WITMAN: Here.

4

COURT CLERK: Ashlee Younie?

5

MS. YOUNIE: Here.

6

COURT CLERK: Thank you.

7

THE COURT: Thank you. Is anybody present

8

whose name was not called?

9

All right. Ladies and Gentlemen, in the law,

10

and you will see vestiges of past, and they're still

11

relevant for me. For example, 7 we always stand for you

12

as judges of the facts when you enter and exit the

13

courtroom. That's a symbolic statement of respect for

14

the work that you do. It's our privilege to show that

15

symbolism.

16

so symbolic. They are finding. And they mean something

We also take oaths frequently, and they're not

17 18

in this department. I am in no way threatening you. I

19

want you to know how important oaths are to the Court.

20

criminal prosecution because of dishonesty. In 15 years

Just last week I referred somebody for a

2122

as a judge only one time I've referred a lawyer to the

23

State Bar for dishonesty. I have on a few occasions

24

found witnesses in contempt of court immediately in my

presence and caused them to be handcuffed and taken to 911 Parr Boulevard. I don't -- and it happens so infrequently I don't want you to think you will see it or experience it, but I want to emphasize the importance of the oaths that we take, because at this time each of you must stand, face the court clerk, raise your right hands, and be sworn. If you will do so, please.

COURT CLERK: Please stand and raise your right hand.

(Jury panel sworn in.)

COURT CLERK: Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you. I, the lawyers, Mr. Goad, court staff, everyone who's involved in this trial are deeply interested in seating a panel of citizens, a jury comprised of 12 open-minded neutral citizens who do not have any prejudices for or against any trial participant. Jury selection allows us to probe the existence of the causes for you not to serve.

So I acknowledge at the outset that there will be public disclosures of private facts, and that for a moment in your lives you have to speak in public and you might have to reveal things that are better reserved for your privacy. I know that. But I must balance your right of privacy, your comfort in silence with the

State's ability to seat a fair jury and the Defense ability to seat a fair jury.

And so we begin with a process referred to as voir dire. It's a Latin phrase meaning to say what is true. You'll each be asked questions. And I'll invite you to answer honestly. My goal, the attorney's goal is to determine who can and will, according to their oath, follow the law, be intellectually honest, and render a verdict according to their conscious as informed by the facts and the law. I need to ensure that none of you bring to this trial any perspective, any influence that would cause it to be unfair to either the State or the Defense. So we ask questions. While it is your duty to serve, it is also your duty to serve in the right case, and through no fault of yours this may not be a case for you. And we'll learn that during jury voir dire.

Please understand the significance of complete and open answers. Now, you're going to have to filter that a little bit because if I emphasize too much, the thoroughness of answers, I start to hear about who was detained on the playground in second grade, and those are not the things that would infect this proceeding. So please balance tilting in favor of disclosure as you answer.

There are great risks to your incomplete or dishonest answers. The risks, first, are to a fair trial. There are risks of unnecessary delays, a contaminated verdict or finding in the jury, whatever it may be, and there could be in an outlier situation being personal risks to you.

2.0

During and at the conclusion of voir dire the attorneys may ask me to excuse one or more of you for cause, meaning they believe they can persuade me legally that you can not serve in this case. If you are the subject of a for-cause request, please do not take it personal. It will be hard not to do so, but please don't take it personal. It just means the attorneys believe that you are fit for another case. You haven't done anything wrong.

The attorneys are charged with zealous advocacy. They're not charged with diplomacy, delicacy. We have this legal system we refer to it as the adversarial system where each side pursues the center ground of truth zealously, and through that tension it's created the truth unfolds.

So the State will zealously represent the State's interests. And the Defense will zealously represent the Defense interests, and occasionally step

on toes.

I know these three attorneys, I know them well. I respect them personally and professionally.

But they will do their jobs this week, and I will take your heat if necessary.

Under no circumstances please do not hold any of this experience against the attorneys or their cause.

At the end of the for-cause process the attorneys will meet out of my presence, out of your presence, and strike additional members of our panel. They do that because of information they have heard along the way. They don't believe they can actually seek your formal exclusion, but they're given under the law the right to quietly and without explanation seek others, so they're going to want to hear from each of you and hear a little bit about your personality and your perspectives. And if you don't speak, they're going to call upon you individually, so they can hear your voice. And I know that's frightening for some of you, but that's the process. And they're authorized by this Court to do so.

Just by show of hands, is there anything who does not have sufficient knowledge of the English language so you have not been able to follow my words?

1	Anybody have a problem with English that would affect
2	this trial?
3	Sir, would you just stand and tell us your
4	name, please?
5	MR. VALADEZ: Jesus Valadez.
6	THE COURT: Jesus.
7	MR. VALADEZ: Valadez.
8	THE COURT: Let's find it. Yes, sir. Is
9	English your first language?
10	MR. VALADEZ: No, that is my second language.
11	THE COURT: What is your first language?
12	MR. VALADEZ: Spanish.
13	THE COURT: How long have you been speaking
14	English?
15	MR. VALADEZ: Ah, I live here in the United
16	States for about 40 years.
17	THE COURT: Four zero? 40?
18	MR. VALADEZ: Yeah.
19	THE COURT: Okay. And you speak Spanish and
20	English in the home.
21	MR. VALADEZ: Yes.
22	THE COURT: Both.
23	MR. VALADEZ: Both.
24	THE COURT: Okay. And are you employed?

MR. VALADEZ: Yes.

THE COURT: And do you speak Spanish and English at work?

MR. VALADEZ: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. Have a seat, please. Anybody else?

The attorneys have told me that this trial will last through the week. There's a possibility it could end Thursday. There's a much smaller possibility it would go to next Monday. I've got a great big target on Friday as our ending day.

When our computer randomly selected you it had no idea what your personal circumstances were. I know that today's the first day of school, and we have a few teachers. We have others who might be scheduled, several of you who might be scheduled to do important work functions. I'm not asking about inconvenience or preference at the moment. I assume that each of you would be somewhere else, if not here. I'm asking for nondiscretionary fixed calendar items that are kind of a one-off exception. For example, it's your 50th Wedding Anniversary Wednesday, and you and your spouse have already purchased tickets to go to Hawaii, and you're had your trip planned for a very long time. Or you're

scheduled for surgery on Thursday, and it took you three 1 months to get into that surgical calendar, something 2 like that; not work related, not inconvenient, and not 3 what you want. Does anybody have a fixed 4 nondiscretionary conflict? Okay. Mostly because of the 5 room, let me just have you stand, tell us your name. 6 7 MS. CHOATE: Amber Choate. THE COURT: And if you'll all speak up, 8 9 please, because --MS. CHOATE: Amber Choate. Sorry. 10 THE COURT: Choate? 11 MS. CHOATE: Yes. 12 THE COURT: Okay. Let's find you here. 13 14 Choate? Yes.

MS. CHOATE: I have to take my mother, we purchased plane tickets for Wednesday night. I have to take her to Minnesota to see our sons.

THE COURT: Thank you. Next.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. STEINMANN: Frederick Steinmann.

THE COURT: Yes, Mr. Steinmann?

MR. STEINMANN: I'm an assistant research professor with the University of Nevada, Reno and I have to be in Battle Mountain, Nevada this Friday for a series of workshops that were scheduled a month ago as

1	part a regional economic development plan we're working
2	on.
3	THE COURT: Thank you.
4	MS. URE: Tracy Ure.
5	THE COURT: Your last name?
6	MS. URE: Ure, U-r-e.
7	THE COURT: U-r-e.
8	MS. URE: Correct.
9	THE COURT: There we are. Yes.
10	MS. URE: I have a funeral to attend on
11	Saturday in Portland and we were scheduled to leave on
12	Friday.
13	THE COURT: What time on Friday?
14	MS. URE: We were leaving at 11 a.m.
15	THE COURT: Driving or flying?
16	THE DEFENDANT: Driving.
17	THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
18	MS. URE: And as a side note, too, I'm
19	supposed to be in federal court on Wednesday for a
20	status conference, but I can get someone to cover for me
21	for that.
22	THE COURT: Thank you. Anybody else?
23	MS. CORTES: Stephanie Cortes.
24	THE COURT: Yes.

MS. CORTES: I have a report for my job on Thursday that was really important for one of my clients.

THE COURT: Thank you. I should have also said that if you are excused for this reason, you'll be summoned back to court for another jury opportunity.

The next trial might be three days. It could also be — we just did a three-week civil trial with a jury, so I have no way of knowing what the subject and the length of your next service would be, so kind of have to balance that as you seek to be excused from this trial.

All right. Very well. I refer now to our statute which identifies the reasons why you could be excused early.

First, sickness or physical disability. So think to yourself, because at the end of the list I'll ask for your responses, sickness or physical disability. Please understand that we will make reasonable accommodations for any disabling condition you have.

Second, serious illness or death of a member of immediate family.

Third, I want you to listen to the modifying words. Undue hardship or extreme convenience. It's not hardship and it's not inconvenience. I must be

satisfied that it is undue hardship and extreme inconvenience.

And then with proof, your primary caregiver for another person who has a documented medical condition that requires your assistance at all times.

I'm about to ask who might fall within that statute. Just a moment. The genius of our jury system is random selection of diverse citizens. If we just had a panel of people who wanted to be here, it would be an incomplete panel. If we only had a panel with people who could be here, we would have an incomplete panel.

Time and again I've had people from certain professions tell me how important their work is elsewhere and they just can not be absent from their work. And time and again I keep them on the jury panel because we need the differences that you bring together. So I am very strict in the excuses I provide. And I know that creates heat from you to me, but it's because of my deep respect for this jury system that I make the decisions I do.

Now, with that, does anybody wish to be heard on any of those statutory reasons for excuse? Yes.

Your name first, please?

MS. LEROY: My name is Audra Leroy.

THE COURT: Laroy?

2

MS. LEROY: L-e-r-o-y.

3

THE COURT: Yes.

4

MS. LEROY: My 24-month old son, my third son,

5

he was hospitalized for a MRSA infection of his foot.

He is out of the hospital. He had surgery. And he has

6

kind of trouble walking right now and I'm his primary

7

caregiver so I kind of help him walk. I also have

8

follow-up appointments, not this week, but next week.

10

And then he recently quit antibiotics for the MRSA so

11

right now I'm just kind of on red alert watching the --

12

the surgery point and making sure that nothing gets

13

reinfected -- it doesn't get reinfected. And,

14

unfortunately, there's a very low threshold, if there's even a slight redness, or the slightest of fevers I have

1516

to take him back to the ER right away.

for money or

17

THE COURT: And do you work out of the home

18

19

MS. LEROY: No, I stay at home.

20

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

21

MS. LEROY: Uh-hum.

22

THE COURT: Anybody else? All right. Deputy.

23

MS. COATES: Megan Coates.

24

THE COURT: Coates. Yes?

1	MS. COATES: I have a 10-month old at home
2	that I'm breast-feeding and I have a pump schedule
3	outside of that that I can be elsewhere, but I have to
4	pump for her.
5	THE COURT: And do you work out of the home
6	for money or
7	MS. COATES: I do.
8	THE COURT: Okay. And so you accommodate that
9	necessity when you're at work?
10	MS. COATES: Yes, I do. I'm I work at
11	nights in the hospital and they accommodate that.
12	THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
13	MS. COATES: Uh-hum.
14	THE COURT: Anybody else? Yes.
15	MS. GIBBS: Jennifer Gibbs.
16	THE COURT: Yes.
17	MS. GIBBS: I don't necessarily want to be
18	excused, but I am only three weeks out of a surgery.
19	THE COURT: How many weeks?
20	MS. GIBBS: Not even three weeks yet. And
21	sometimes I need just make an extra restroom break.
22	THE COURT: Yes, as does the Court. You will
23	find this department to be very flexible about that.

And the drinking fountain and the coffee there, mostly

because of the chair. Let me just take this note here.
Yes.

MS. CHOATE: Amber Choate. I have a 13-month-old that I breast feed full time who is allergic to milk. And I do not pump. She won't -- she won't accept a bottle.

THE COURT: So do you work out of the home from there?

MS. CHOATE: No.

THE COURT: You're a stay-at-home?

MS. CHOATE: I work. I work at home. My husband owns a business and so I can do all my work from my computer.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. Anybody else?

I know I'd come across fairly insensitive to your lives.

Underneath this robe there is some sensitivity, but I

try not to let it show.

All right. You're all going to stand for just a minute and rest while I and counsel meet with Mr. Clinton Botteron. Is Mr. Botteron present? If you'll just follow the deputy, please. Counsel, if you'll join me All of you stand and be at ease.

(Side bar off the record.)

THE COURT: The first phase of jury selection

is to discover your familiarity with any of us, or with trial participants. And so I will have each of the attorneys stand and turn so that you can see them and hear their voices. I want to have you hold your observations until I ask the questions, but if you will begin, please, to the State.

MR. STEGE: Good morning. My name is Amos Stege. I'm the prosecutor on this criminal case. I'm employed by the Washoe County District Attorney as a Deputy District Attorney.

MR. SLOCUM: My name is Jay Slocum and together with Ms. Mayhew, Jennifer Mayhew, we represent Mr. Goad.

THE COURT: Thank you. You've each heard at different times in your lives that we are constitutionally presumed to be innocent. That's not a platitudinal statement, it has real meaning in our justice system.

Those who are accused of crime have the absolute right to have the State's allegations proven against them beyond a reasonable doubt, if at all. And Mr. Goad is charged with the crime Murder With the Use of Deadly Weapon. He has chosen his constitutional imparity, and that is trial by jury, and I honor that

request and will regularly remind you that he is innocent of any charge until proven guilty, if at all. And the only way he can be proven guilty is through the course of trial, the State meets its high burden of proof.

I won't return to that theme with the same emphasis throughout jury selection. I begin with it with emphasis so that we don't lose track of Mr. Goad's presumption.

Mr. Ralph Edmond Goad, if you'll just swivel in your seat, please, sir, so everyone can see you?

Thank you.

I am going to ask the deputy to publish a list of names. These are people who might be called to testify. And I want to know if you have any relationship or experience with any of them.

And Mr. Stege, if you will recite each of these names, please, with, if necessary, a professional connection.

MR. STEGE: Okay. Jasper Acuna, Raymond
Aubin, Ken Barlor, employed at the Cal-Neva. Patrick
Billings, Katelyn Burgoyne, employed by the coroner's
office. Katherine Callahan, employed by the coroner's
office. Deborah France, Cody Idso, Victoria Juarez,

Kristen Marshaw, Becky Korn, Alan Lamont, Brenda Mothershead, Scott Napier, Bernard Robinson, Glen Solberg, Trevor Vaught, employed at Wal-Mart. Elijah Waggoner, Alonna Craig, employed with REMSA. Brandon Casanelli, employed as a patrol officer with Reno Police Department, Michael Gider, Detective, Reno Police Department, Ernie Kazmar, Detective, Reno Police department. David Millsap, RP Detective, David Nevills, RP Detective, Ryan Noel, RPD patrol officer, Nicholas Smith, RPD patrol -- RPD detective, John Torrez, RPD patrol officer, Monique Warnecke, RPD, Marco Madrigal-Pintor, RPD, Shaun Braly, Washoe County Sheriff Forensic Investigative Service, Madison Dahlquist, investigative service with the county, Elvira Koeder, forensic investigative service with the county, Toni Leal-Olsen, also Forensic Investigator Service, Nicole Rapino, as well Washoe County forensic investigative service, Monica Siewertsen, scientist with the Washoe County Forensic Investigative Service, Amanda Arrascada and Ellie Koeder. Ellie Koeder is our final Forensic Investigative Service officer. THE COURT: Thank you, counsel. Okay. this time we're going to move seats a little bit. When

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

I refer to in the box, it means that we're referring to

the jury box. And so we're going to randomly select a number of you to sit in the jury box and in the first two rows of the courtroom, the first three rows of the courtroom to answer specific questions.

2.0

You'll see that the court clerk has a cylinder Keno-type device. In that device are each of your names. And you'll observe just how random your selection is. But I need everybody who's in the first three rows to stand with everything you have and retreat to the back standing against the wall or in the side aisles, please. And as the clerk names you, please follow the deputy's instructions. Ms. Clerk.

COURT CLERK: Frederick Steinmann. Nathaniel Kanute. Michael Cherti.

THE COURT: Ms. Clerk, is that Sherti with an S?

MR. STEGE: C. It's a C, Cherti.

COURT CLERK: Clinton Botteron.

THE COURT: Mr. Botteron has been excused.

COURT CLERK: Michelle Donald. Cathy Benson.

Michael Dedomenico. James Reid. Jenny Lopez. Sandra

Gualano. Carlos Hernandez-Guillen. Gregory Scoville.

Jordan Wilcher. Jonathon Hunter. Stephen Morro. Marie

Baker. Jennifer Gibbs. Kristin Mahrt. Jamie Clark.

Sierra Genz. Lawrence Beccard. Mark Witman. Stephanie Cortes. Ashlee Younie.

THE COURT: Ms. Clerk, will you give that spelling, please.

COURT CLERK: Yes. Y-o-u-n-i-e. James

Sargent. Charles Gray. Donna Cody. Katie Smith.

Carol Nutter. Janet Roberts. Christopher Cunningham.

Audra Leroy. Joyce Farnsworth.

THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Clerk. I'm going to invite the attorneys into the jury deliberation room for what is the second of many side bar conversations you will observe.

A side bar conversation is a conversation out of your presence. And it's a easier to move the four of us than to move all of you. We are a court of record which means that every word that's uttered in this proceeding is reported and transcribed. And the attorneys are invited to memorialize side bar conversations at the appropriate time.

I'd like for all of you to stand and at ease when we leave the courtroom just to kind of shake it out, but those who are in the fourth row and farther back, and those who stand, if you'll just all reconvene somewhere in the left side of the courtroom so that the

Court and counsel have you of just the first three rows on our left. And with that, counsel, we'll adjourn to the jury box.

(Side bar not reported.)

THE COURT: Be seated if you would, please.

Ms. Audra Leroy, you are thanked and excused from

further service. You may leave the courtroom.

MS. LEROY: Thank you.

THE COURT: Ms. Clerk.

COURT CLERK: Your Honor, which number was that?

THE COURT: 31.

COURT CLERK: Deborah Holbrook.

THE COURT: Where you sit is very important so we can track where you sit so please don't change chairs at all unless expressly invited to do so.

All right. For those of you who are not in the box, your chance of jury service just went down dramatically. But you are also required to be present to participate by observation in this experience because if I excuse somebody, as I just did, we'll randomly select a replacement, and then will be asked to answer the same questions.

But from this point forward when I ask

questions the only people who will answer are in our hypothetical box.

All right. Do any of you know me or the trial attorneys or Mr. Goad? All right. Beginning in the left second position, Mr. Kanute?

MR. KANUTE: Yeah.

THE COURT: Thank you. At this point I'll have everyone just remain seated. When they stand, the attorneys stand, but I want you to be comfortable and now I can see all of you. But do speak into the microphone, please. Mr. Kanute.

MR. KANUTE: Thank you, your Honor. It was habit. I'm an attorney. I've been in front of your Honor a number of times. I also help run the red mass here in town, you've been instrumental in helping keep that going. And also in Costco Foundation we've met there a number of times.

THE COURT: Thank you. And would you confirm that while you and I have professional interactions, and from my part at least professional fondness, that we don't know each other personally?

MR. KANUTE: That's correct.

THE COURT: Never been to your home, you've never been to my home?

1	MR. KANUTE: Correct.
2	THE COURT: Don't know any of your
3	circumstances outside of your profession.
4	MR. KANUTE: Correct.
5	THE COURT: Thank you. Next. Anybody? Yes.
6	This is Mr. Wilcher?
7	MR. WILCHER: Correct. I may know Mr. Goad,
8	that sounds strange. I work in health care. He looks
9	very familiar. I don't
10	THE COURT: Tell us a little bit more about
11	where and what you do.
12	MR. WILCHER: I currently work at the VA
13	Sierra Nevada, Reno for the last year and a half. Prior
14	to that I worked for Saint Mary's for the previous five
15	years.
16	THE COURT: So is your familiarity with Mr.
17	Goad such that you're vague in recollection?
18	MR. WILCHER: Correct.
19	THE COURT: It's not as if you have day-to-day
20	impactful experiences in any way with Mr. Goad?
21	MR. WILCHER: No.
22	THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. Anybody else?
23	All the way in the back. Deputy? Where's my deputy?

There you go.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: I know the prosecuting 1 2 attorney. THE COURT: What's your name, please? 3 MR. CUNNINGHAM: Chris Cunningham. 4 THE COURT: In the 30th position. How do you 5 know Mr. Cunningham? Excuse me, Mr. Stege? 6 MR. CUNNINGHAM: Our daughters play softball 7 8 together. THE COURT: Have you been to his home? 9 I have not. MR. CUNNINGHAM: 10 THE COURT: You talked to him about his work? 11 I have not. MR. CUNNINGHAM: 12 THE COURT: How often do you see him? 13 MR. CUNNINGHAM: Two times a week, um, since 14 February. And then on the weekends for tournaments. 15 THE COURT: Thank you. 16 MR. CUNNINGHAM: Yes, sir. 17 THE COURT: Anybody else? Okay. Jury 18 service. Who has served in the past? We've viewed all 19 of your questionnaires and that's typically disclosed, 20 but I just want to travel over it real quickly beginning 21 here in jury service? Just amplify your voice real 22

quickly if we can't get a microphone to you. You are

23

24

Ms?

1	MS. GUALANO: Sandy. Sandra Gualano.
2	THE COURT: Gualano, yes.
3	MS. GUALANO: Yes. I don't remember. A long
4	time ago.
5	THE COURT: More than ten years ago?
6	MS. GUALANO: Oh, yeah.
7	THE COURT: Where?
8	MS. GUALANO: Here in Reno, Washoe County.
9	THE COURT: Was it a criminal or civil case?
10	MS. GUALANO: Um, I think it was civil.
11	THE COURT: Did you deliberate with your
12	fellow jurors?
13	MS. GUALANO: Yes, I did.
14	THE COURT: Were you a spokesperson?
15	MS. GUALANO: No.
16	THE COURT: A foreperson?
17	MS. GUALANO: No.
18	THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. Tell me about
19	your experience if you rate it one to ten, ten being a
20	great experience one, being a horrible experience.
21	MS. GUALANO: It was ten. It was fine.
22	THE COURT: Okay.
23	MS. GUALANO: It was good.
24	THE COURT: All right. Anybody else jury

1	service? Ms. Cody, is it?
2	MS. CODY: Yes. Donna Cody.
3	THE COURT: I'm getting feedback on those
4	microphones. Are they turned up too high?
5	Okay, Ms. Cody, where?
6	MS. CODY: Here, Mills Lane.
7	THE COURT: Mills Lane was the judge?
8	MS. CODY: Yes.
9	THE COURT: Was it a criminal or civil case?
10	MS. CODY: Criminal.
11	THE COURT: Did the jury reach a verdict?
12	MS. CODY: It was a well, we couldn't
13	decide.
14	THE COURT: Okay. All right. And tell me
15	about your experience. As you think about it, was it a
16	positive or negative response?
17	MS. CODY: It was positive.
18	THE COURT: Okay. Were you looking forward to
19	coming back?
20	MS. CODY: Yes.
21	THE COURT: Okay. All right. Anybody else?
22	All right. All the way in the back, Ms. Nutter? Where
23	and when?
24	MS. NUTTER: Washoe County, about

1	THE COURT: Hold on. Now they're not working
2	and I can't hear. Speak loudly, please.
3	MS. NUTTER: It was in Washoe County about ten
4	years ago.
5	THE COURT: Criminal or civil?
6	MS. NUTTER: Criminal.
7	THE COURT: How long was the trial?
8	MS. NUTTER: One day.
9	THE COURT: Okay. Did the jury reach a
10	verdict?
11	MS. NUTTER: Yes.
12	THE COURT: Were you the foreperson?
13	MS. NUTTER: No.
14	THE COURT: How would you describe your
15	experience in just a sentence?
16	MS. NUTTER: It was interesting.
17	THE COURT: Did you dread returning this
18	morning or did you want to return?
19	MS. NUTTER: I did not dread it.
20	THE COURT: You did not dread it. That's a
21	double negative. Let me see if I can turn that around.
22	So are you okay about being here
23	MS. NUTTER: Yes.
24	THE COURT: or did you want to be here?

1 MS. NUTTER: I'm okay about being here. THE COURT: You could take it either way? 2 3 MS. NUTTER: Well, yes. THE COURT: Anybody else. So I ask general 4 questions, eliciting specific responses, and then the 5 attorneys have the right of supplemental inquiries, so 6 7 they might drill down to any of you individually. So part of this it just a happen to take notes about who 8 they want to talk more with. All right? So just by 9 show of hands, it will take a moment leaving your hands 10 up, who absolutely does not want to be here this 11 12 morning? Ms. Smith? 13 MS. SMITH: Yes. 14 THE COURT: All right. Why? MS. SMITH: A few reasons. So number one, my 15 husband has been a deputy for 15 years. And so I want 16 17 to be unbiased, but I struggle to think --THE COURT: Okay. So you have a law 18 enforcement connection. 19 MS. SMITH: Yeah. 20 21 THE COURT: Okay. Anything else?

22

23

24

work.

THE COURT: Is today your first day?

MS. SMITH: I'm a teacher so I go back to

MS. SMITH: Not today. It's later this week.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. You saw that I cut Ms. Smith off. I didn't mean to be disrespectful, but I anticipate sometimes what people say, and we don't want to say too much, and inadvertently create a lasting impression. I'm not picking on her, I'm saying it to all so from time to time I'll just stop you. Okay. Thank you. Any other reason why you don't want to be here?

MS. SMITH: I have a skin issue that I've been waiting to get into the doctor for. I have some — they've done some biopsies that I have to have follow-up on that, and I have an appointment that I've waited two months for on Thursday.

THE COURT: Thursday. Okay. Thank you.

Anybody else? So I'm looking just at this panel. But hold that thought.

MS. SMITH: Sorry.

another gentleman who does not want to be here and he gets to stay and watch for a while. All right. Who really, really wants to serve on a jury. You've been waiting for decades. You've watched the television programs. You read the books, and this is your chance.

I know there are a few of you. It's hard for me to believe an attorney does not want to be here. This is like a lottery pick for an attorney to be able to see the inside of the process, except for Mr. Kanute, nobody else is just really anxious to be here.

Okay. Keep in mind the presumption of innocence, nothing the attorneys say is evidence in the case. And nothing that I say is evidence in the case.

Now, what I say about the law is pretty important. But the attorneys argue about the law, is argument. Right? So I don't ant to keep returning to this constitutional presumption of innocence, it's there, it's ever present. But Mr. Goad is charged with Murder With the Use of a Deadly Weapon. The State has alleged that Mr. Goad murdered another person by stabbing that person with either a knife, scissors, or other sharp-forced instrument.

I have not seen the evidence that will be presented at court. It's not customary for the judge to see evidence before it's presented at court. But I contemplate that some of the evidence could be unsettling. There will be photographic evidence. And I want to know if what I've said so far puts any of you on the edge of your seat that you might begin dreading or

responding negatively in a way that is out of custom.

2.2

I think everybody would respond to different images and fact patterns in different ways, and that's okay. But sometimes there's a trigger and I want to know if that trigger's been.

Would anybody here avert your eyes or begin reciting the alphabet backwards to distract yourselves at images and descriptions of crime scenes and autopsy?

Okay. I'm going to ask about law enforcement.

And I want to confine your answers to some close degree of consequent. So it would be you, your spouse or significant other, parents, siblings, or children, okay? Somebody in your ancestral treaty you can touch.

Does anybody here have experience with law enforcement? All right. Mr. Scoville?

MR. SCOVILLE: Yes.

THE COURT: Tell us about it.

MR. SCOVILLE: My son's a sheriff in San Francisco.

THE COURT: For how long?

MR. SCOVILLE: Fourteen years.

THE COURT: Where did you raise your son?

MR. SCOVILLE: In Sacramento.

THE COURT: Do you talk to him about his job?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

MR. SCOVILLE: Frequently.

THE COURT: Has he ever been honest with you, son to father?

MR. SCOVILLE: Sure.

THE COURT: Has he ever been dishonest with you, son to father?

MR. SCOVILLE: Sure.

THE COURT: Do you accept my suggestion that not every person works within their profession in the exact same way?

MR. SCOVILLE: Absolutely.

THE COURT: All right. So I'm not suggesting any law enforcement is going to be dishonest, but I just want to keep -- I want to preserve the possibility that you observe the witnesses yourselves, and you determine their credibility. That's all I want to convey. Any problems with that, Mr. Scoville?

MR. SCOVILLE: None at all.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. Anybody else law enforcement experience?

All the way back to Ms. Smith? Your spouse is a Washoe County Sheriff Deputy and has been for 15 years?

MS. SMITH: That's correct.

THE COURT: All right. We'll leave it there. 1 2 Anybody else? MS. CORTES: I work for a non-profit 3 organization constantly working together with law 4 5 enforcement. THE COURT: You are Ms. Cortes? 6 7 MS. CORTES: Yes. THE COURT: All right. You are primarily 8 9 social work? MS. CORTES: Yeah. Case management. 10 THE COURT: And you work for Awaken? 11 MS. CORTES: Awaken, yes. 12 THE COURT: Perfect. Give us the two-sentence 13 elevator speech about what Awaken does. 14 MS. CORTES: We are a non-profit organization 15 who works with victims who have been sexually exploited. 16 I work with the youth, with minors under the age of 18. 17 THE COURT: Thank you. Anybody else? I don't 18 want anyone on this jury who automatically believes law 19 enforcement. And I don't want anyone on this jury who 20 automatically disbelieves law enforcement. 21

22

23

24

48

find those members of our community. Does anybody have

a concern about law enforcement professionalism, honesty

And sometimes on either margin we find -- we

where your default position is don't like them and don't believe them? Anybody?

I'll ask the exact opposite question. Does anybody have a heightened sense of reliability because of law enforcement?

Ms. Smith, at this point you have to raise your hand and say yes. I won't ask any further questions.

MS. SMITH: Okay.

THE COURT: Yeah. Your name, please.

MS. CODY: Donna Cody.

THE COURT: Yes. Tell us.

MS. CODY: Well, I just want to respect them. I think they have a hard job to do.

THE COURT: Okay. I just want to make sure they're not ahead of the pack when it comes to witness credibility.

Okay. I'm about to ask whether you have been affected by crime. I don't want to know if someone spit on your sidewalk 20 years ago, but I do want to know about the effect that is deep and personal. And so if there is something that you wish to disclose privately on this question alone, I would allow you to do so in the presence of the Court and counsel. But we would

segregate you. Because some crimes do occur privately. 1 And as I balance the public disclosure and private facts 2 I just want to be sensitive to that. 3 Who has been affected by crime as a victim? 4 MS. ROBERTS: I don't need to be segregated, 5 but I teach at Procter Hug High School. And the issue 6 that happened was in front of my classroom. 7 THE COURT: And you are Ms. Roberts? 8

MS. ROBERTS: Correct.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

THE COURT: Were you present?

MS. ROBERTS: Not at the shooting, but once it happened we were immediately outside showing students in. And I saw the event.

THE COURT: Has that caused any emotional response that still lingers?

MS. ROBERTS: Um, only towards students.

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. ROBERTS: And children.

THE COURT: Thank you. Anybody else been influenced by crime in a way that could adjust your perspectives in this case?

Wow, counsel, this may be -- maybe I should stop talking and start listening more. I think I'm sharing conversation. Nobody else on this panel has

been affected by crime. 1 MS. CORTES: Can I just? 2 3 THE COURT: Again, Ms. Cortes. 4 5 6 7 something. 8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MS. CORTES: Again working with victims, I think the last year I was -- one of my youth passed away by a crime, so I think that probably would trigger

THE COURT: Thank you.

MR. CHERTI: I've had stuff stolen from me, but I don't think it would affect the trial, my perspective in the trial.

THE COURT: You're Mr. Cherti?

MR. CHERTI: Cherti, Yes.

THE COURT: Thank you. Anybody else?

Have any of you had close family members or friends affected by crime? In the front, Ms. Clark?

MS. CLARK: Yes. I have had a friend who was raped by a taxi driver.

THE COURT: How does that work in your mind? How does it affect you?

MS. CLARK: At the time of the incident it was horrible. I don't think it would affect my ability on this jury. I'm able to separate them.

THE COURT: How long ago was it?

51

11	
1	MS. CLARK: Five years ago.
2	THE COURT: Thank you. Anybody else? Mr.
3	Sargent?
4	MR. SARGENT: Yes, sir. My closest friend
5	lives in kind of an abusive household. And I'm
6	consistently worried about her and her safety. I don't
7	think it will have anything to do with the trial, but I
8	just want to acknowledge that.
9	THE COURT: Thank you. Mr. Cunningham.
10	MR. CUNNINGHAM: My grandma. On my own yes.
11	My grandma was murdered, but it was approximately 40
12	years ago so I was five years old at the time. Domestic
13	violence.
14	THE COURT: That must be part of your family
15	story.
16	MR. CUNNINGHAM: Absolutely.
17	THE COURT: Forty years later how often do you
18	discuss it or reflect upon it when you're together with
19	family?
20	MR. CUNNINGHAM: My dad time to time, his
21	mother.
22	THE COURT: And who committed the crime? When
23	you say domestic, was it a spouse?
	II

MR. CUNNINGHAM: It was my grandmother's

sister's, um, live-in boyfriend. 1 THE COURT: Thank you. Nobody else. 2 Who here has been charged with a crime? And 3 I'm not asking you to reveal your driving history. 4 Anything above speeding tickets. 5 All right. Beginning with Mr. Steinmann? 6 MR. STEINMANN: Misdemeanor conspiracy charge. 7 THE COURT: Conspiracy. Was it drug related? 8 9 MR. STEINMANN: No. THE COURT: Conspiracy to do what? 10 Theft. MR. STEINMANN: 11 THE COURT: How long ago? 12 MR. STEINMANN: Approximately 12 years ago. 13 THE COURT: Were you convicted of the crime? 14 MR. STEINMANN: No. 15 16 THE COURT: Why not? There was a plea agreement, MR. STEINMANN: 17 you know, no fault. 18 THE COURT: Okay. Were you treated fairly or 19 unfairly in the process? 20 MR. STEINMANN: Fairly. 21 THE COURT: So here we get to those very 22

hope that your courage inspires others. Who's next?

embarrassing private facts. Thank you, Mr. Steinmann, I

2.3

24

1	MS. DONALD: Charged with a misdemeanor about
2	12 years ago.
3	THE COURT: Hold on. You are Ms. Michelle
4	Donald?
5	MS. DONALD: Yes.
6	THE COURT: Where?
7	MS. DONALD: Here in Washoe County.
8	THE COURT: What was the misdemeanor?
9	MS. DONALD: I don't know the exact wordage of
10	it, but it was conspiracy and drug, um, Vicodin-type
11	stuff. I was just in the wrong place at the wrong time.
12	But I was charged with possessing the misdemeanor.
13	COURT: Were you represented by an attorney?
14	MS. DONALD: Public defender.
15	THE COURT: Okay.
16	MS. DONALD: In my 20's.
17	THE COURT: All right. And as you think about
18	that experience, were you treated fairly or unfairly?
19	MS. DONALD: I think for the circumstance, um,
20	maybe unfairly.
21	THE COURT: Why?
22	MS. DONALD: Well, I was young and didn't have
23	financial or I would have done a lawyer for sure, so. I

don't think that I got to speak fully on the actual

1	situation.
2	THE COURT: Okay.
3	MS. DONALD: But I'm okay with it now, so.
4	THE COURT: Thank you.
5	MS. DONALD: Uh-hum.
6	THE COURT: Anybody else? Mr. Dedomenico. I
7	did not do that right.
8	MR. DEDOMENICO: Fine. Who cares.
9	THE COURT: What did you say?
10	MR. DEDOMENICO: I'm not that picky about it.
11	THE COURT: How do you say your name?
12	MR. DEDOMENICO: Dedomenico.
13	THE COURT: Dedomenico?
14	MR. DEDOMENICO: Right.
15	THE COURT: Talk to us, please.
16	MR. DEDOMENICO: Oh. Actually several trials.
17	I think one of the things that might be important is a
18	misdemeanor. I attacked a prosecuting attorney in the
19	courtroom, jumped off the witness stand, served four
20	months at Parr Boulevard.
21	THE COURT: Hold on, let me impact that for
22	just a moment. You were testifying as a witness.
23	MR. DEDOMENICO: I was the defendant.
	II

THE COURT: Okay. You were charged with a

crime. What was the crime you were charged with?

MR. DEDOMENICO: Oh. Well, let's see. That
was a civil trial about, um, tax evasion in California.

THE COURT: Okay. And during the course of trial you became unhappy with one of the attorneys?

MR. DEDOMENICO: Very much so, yes.

THE COURT: And you left the witness stand and attacked the attorney.

MR. DEDOMENICO: That is true.

THE COURT: And you went to jail for that.

MR. DEDOMENICO: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. DEDOMENICO: Before that it was a criminal trial in Sacramento, tax evasion. Innocent. Well, I say not convicted, same thing.

THE COURT: Tell me how you view government. What is your two-sentence not lengthy introduction to how you view the role of government in your life.

MR. DEDOMENICO: That flag has a gold braid around it. My flag, United States of America flag does not have a gold blade around it — braid around it. I'm concerned that we lost our constitution somewhere back in the 1800s and that's where we got the gold braid. I don't know what government we're running. I don't know

what constitution we're running. That's two sentences.

THE COURT: Thank you. Anything else?

MR. DEDOMENICO: I think that's all of the trials I've been to, you know, we could go down them.

THE COURT: Do you want to serve on this jury?

MR. DEDOMENICO: No, not necessarily. I might be curious about a murder trial, but.

THE COURT: As you think about the State's attorney, the defense attorneys, which of the two of them would want you on this jury more, if any?

MR. DEDOMENICO: Would want me on the jury. I give up. I couldn't come to a conclusion on that, I don't know anything.

THE COURT: All right. Well, Mr. Dedomenico?

MR. DEDOMENICO: Dedomenico.

THE COURT: Dedomenico has illustrated a deep virtue in our work, and that is the privilege of expression without judgment. We may disagree or agree with each other at any time, and he has the right to be heard respectfully, as do all of you, and I'm grateful you took the time to speak to us.

Anybody else charged with a crime?

In the back, Ms. Roberts?

MS. ROBERTS: I wasn't charged, but I had a

1	minor possession that was dropped when I was at UNR.
2	THE COURT: Okay. There's always a minor in
3	possession in our panel somewhere.
4	Okay. In the front here, Ms. Gualano.
5	MS. GUALANO: Yes. In my twenties, I had a
6	misdemeanor for theft.
7	THE COURT: He is handing you the microphone.
8	MS. GUALANO: Sorry.
9	THE COURT: Where?
10	MS. GUALANO: Here in Washoe County.
11	THE COURT: Were you charged?
12	MS. GUALANO: Yes. I did some work crew.
13	THE COURT: You did work crew so you were
14	convicted?
15	MS. GUALANO: Yes.
16	THE COURT: Tell me about the theft. Was it
17	retail, home?
18	MS. GUALANO: Retail. Under ten dollars.
19	THE COURT: Okay.
20	MS. GUALANO: Some Advil.
21	THE COURT: Anybody else charged with a crime?
22	Mr. Lope excuse me, Mr. Morro?
23	MR. MORRO: No. She just gave it to me to
24	hold, I think.

THE COURT: What did you think so far about
what you've observed?

MR. MORRO: It's very interesting. I'm

enjoying it so far.

Cherti.

THE COURT: Nobody else charged with a crime. How about somebody close to you in your orbit, you can reach out and touch this person, somebody very close to you who's been charged with a crime for which you have an opinion. Mr. Sargent?

MR. SARGENT: My old man had a DUI probably maybe 19 years ago. I have no real opinion on it. He understands that it was a stupid mistake and he hasn't had alcohol since he got out of jail, so.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. SARGENT: And that was 19 years ago.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Mr.

MR. CHERTI: Yes. My father was convicted of felony possession of marijuana, and this was after the law was passed for legalization for personal use.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. Ms. Gibbs.

MS. GIBBS: My father's had several DUIs. My brother's had a DUI, and my brother also had possession of methamphetamines, but that was -- it never went

anywhere. They dismissed it before he even went to court.

THE COURT: Did you have any experience where you observed unfair treatment?

MS. GIBBS: No.

THE COURT: Anybody else? Ms. Cody.

MS. CODY: I had a neglect experience. I guess I didn't pursue this right. My son or stepson got a DUI, and he was asleep in the back seat so yes, he had been drinking, but he was asleep when the cop came and knocked on the door and, of course, the keys were in the ignition, said he was cold. So I thought it was stupid on his part, but I also remember the old days where the cop probably would have just taken the keys and let him sleep, not charged him, so to me I thought that was a little harsh.

THE COURT: Thank you. Ms. Clark.

MS. CLARK: My brother's had a DUI.

THE COURT: Was he treated fairly or unfairly?

MS. CLARK: Fairly.

THE COURT: Ms. Cortes.

MS. CORTES: Both of my brothers were charged with DUIs, and then my older brother with a couple of felonies, I think.

THE COURT: Tell me your relationship with 1 2 your brothers. MS. CORTES: I'm very close to them. 3 THE COURT: You speak regularly? 4 MS. CORTES: Yeah. 5 THE COURT: Are you defensive of them or do 6 7 you believe they were fairly treated? MS. CORTES: No, they were fairly treated. 8 9 THE COURT: Okay. Anybody else? Who has legal training? Formal legal training, law firm 10 training where you're support staff. Anybody? Mr. 11 12 Kanute? MR. KANUTE: Three years of law school. 13 14 THE COURT: Will you tell the attorneys about 15 your practice. 16 MR. KANUTE: Yeah, I'm in private practice with Snell Wilmer here in town. I've been an attorney 17 for 12 years. Prior to joining Snell Wilmer I did two 18 years with the Supreme Court. I am currently doing 19 20 bankruptcy and creditor's rights attorney. THE COURT: Thank you. Anybody else? All 21 22 right. Ms. Lopez.

23

24

file clerk.

MS. LOPEZ: Well, I don't have legal, I was a

1	THE COURT: Tell us about it.
2	MS. LOPEZ: Fifteen years ago I worked for a
3	bankruptcy attorney.
4	THE COURT: Okay.
5	MS. LOPEZ: And then his wife did family law,
6	so I worked there for about ten years.
7	THE COURT: Okay.
8	MS. LOPEZ: Just as a file clerk while I was
9	in college.
10	THE COURT: Thank you. Anybody else? Ms.
11	Gibbs.
12	MS. GIBBS: I went to college and did prelaw
13	and criminal justice, but after I graduated I did not
14	use it.
15	THE COURT: Okay. Why did you study criminal
16	justice?
17	MS. GIBBS: I wanted to be a homicide
18	detective. That's what I wanted to do when I was
19	younger.
20	THE COURT: Tell me a little bit more about
21	that. Why, and then why not?
22	MS. GIBBS: It just was incredibly
23	interesting. My mother was a ran an emergency room,
24	and I liked some of the work she did, but decided I

didn't -- I wanted to do it from a different angle, but I had -- was in a car accident when I was young and had back surgery and so I went a different direction with my career because it would be hard to get on a police force when I had surgery, so I changed careers.

THE COURT: Thank you. Anybody else? Ms. Smith.

MS. SMITH: I worked only for about three years as a receptionist and a file clerk at Parsons Behle & Latimer.

THE COURT: And in the back, Ms. Farnsworth.

MS. FARNSWORTH: I was a CASA for nine years so I been in court and had to write things, but I never had criminal training.

THE COURT: Counsel, I risk offending your knowledge, and I don't mean to suggest you're not familiar, but CASA is an acronym for Court Appointed Special Advocates, members of the community get training, then they are assigned by the Court to assist, specifically children hopefully in some longitudinal direction.

All right. Anybody else?

Who thought about going to law school but decided not to?

Okay. I've got Ms. Gibbs who we've heard from, and then Ms. Clark?

MS. CLARK: Uh-hum.

THE COURT: Tell us a little bit about it.

MS. CLARK: I considered going to law school, and it was too much school after college. I was just -- I was not ready to continue to be -- further my education at that point.

THE COURT: But why were you considering law school? What is it about the law that was attractive to you?

MS. CLARK: It's fair. It's a neutral way to assess a crime that's happened and I am fairly logical and analytical, so that was what drew me to potentially going that direction.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. Anybody else?
Mr. Steinmann.

MR. STEINMANN: Yes, sir. I was interested as an undergraduate studying economics at the University of Nevada to go to law school. Ended up pursuing a degree in public policy and public administration.

THE COURT: When you considered law school were you drawn more to the civil law or the criminal law?

MR. STEINMANN: Mostly constitutional law as it relates to public policy and public administration.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. Mr. Morro.

MR. MORRO: Early in my career I took L-S-A-Ts because I thought I wanted to be an attorney, but it ended when the scores came back.

THE COURT: That's a great example of how we occasionally smile. And it's appropriate. But always with a larger context of this is serious work and there are important issues both for the State and the Defense, I'm not in any way responding to what you said. I want to reset — reset the value thing. So you didn't do well on the L-SAT and chose to do what instead?

MR. MORRO: At the time I was a regulator for the casino industry in New Jersey and then that transferred into a career in the slot machine business in Nevada.

THE COURT: And why did you think about law? School?

MR. MORRO: As a regulator in New Jersey I dealt a lot with the attorneys from the casinos and I enjoyed that.

THE COURT: Is it fair to say you were intrigued by regulatory in civil law but not criminal

law?

MR. MORRO: That's correct.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. Anybody else? Oh, yes, go ahead, please. Ms. Farnsworth.

MS. FARNSWORTH: Yeah. My brother always wanted me to be a lawyer with him. He's a lawyer, retired in Illinois and so when I was younger he was pushing me to go to law school, but I can't compete with him, he's too smart.

THE COURT: Thank you. Yes. Ms. Smith.

MS. SMITH: When I finished my M.A. in writing, I was trying to figure out what to do with that and I was always interested in law and at the time my husband was already a deputy and so I thought I would be interesting but I chose to not go that route because we already had our daughters, and the closest one is over in Sacramento and just family wise it wouldn't work.

THE COURT: Thank you. Much of what you do this morning is self-disclosure. No matter how long I talk or how skilled the attorneys are, we can't get to the -- to the center of your thoughts unless you choose to disclose. That's the reality of what we're doing here.

And I wonder if any of you have concerns about

your own service in this case, whether you have concerns or inclinations about your fairness. If we could just strip everything away and be pured into your truth, is there anybody we would not want in this trial?

Does anybody have philosophical or religious guidelines that would prevent you from sitting in judgment of others? Mr. -- I'm going to get this right. Dedomencio.

MR. DEDOMENICO: Close enough. Do we do the death penalty here in Nevada?

THE COURT: Yes. And there is no suggestion of its role in this trial. Again, hearkening back to the constitutional presumption of innocence, and nothing I say is evidence, and I have no opinion about what the jury will decide, I'll just disclose to you that -- that there is not a capital punishment certification in this case.

I've spoken about Mr. Goad's constitutional presumption of innocence. He has another critical constitutional right, which he alone will exercise. He alone will chose whether he exercises. And that is his right to remain silent. The context for that right is that he's presumed innocent, and the State must prove his guilt beyond a reasonable doubt. And I'll define

what reasonable doubt is at the trial.

But under no circumstances is any accused required to assist the State. The State will prove its case or it will not. Yet some jurors want to hear from the accused. If Mr. Goad chooses to remain silent, will that be a problem for any of you? Will you secretly harbor a desire that he speak? I know there are some of you. Mr. -- let's say it Mr. Cherti?

MR. CHERTI: Yeah.

THE COURT: Tell me about it.

MR. CHERTI: Okay. I mean — I mean, I'd like to hear from him but, I mean, I understand that it's their responsibility of the State to prove it and if he doesn't want to speak, that's up to him. But I would — I think I would be able to judge better or, like, gauge better on what I — what I — the evidence and everything if I heard from him.

THE COURT: Thank you. Anybody else? Nobody else? All the way back to Ms. Holbrook.

MS. HOLBROOK: Can I have a side bar and tell you why I feel like I shouldn't be here?

THE COURT: Sure. Just hold that for a moment. Anybody else? Remember, we can only count upon your public spiritedness, your personal virtue to

disclose any disqualifying opinions or even opinions that would influence the fairness of this proceeding.

None of you believe that you should be excused because of private feelings, and none of you would hold it against Mr. Goad if he chooses to remain silent; is that correct?

Except for family court, because a majority of us go through changes in our family, and we're also good members of our community. So excluding that, who has been in court either as a witness, a victim, or a litigant? So you're involved in a lawsuit or you provide assistance as a witness in a lawsuit. Anybody? Anything beyond what we've already talked about, Mr. Dedomenico?

MR. DEDOMENICO: No, just more cases.

THE COURT: Okay. Of the same type.

MR. DEDOMENICO: Oh. Well, when I got indicted for tax evasion, it just seemed like a whole bunch of other people, local people, you know, jumped in to put their ticket on me to get paid first before California.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. DEDOMENICO: California didn't get paid, but it just meant there were a lot of cases. A lot of

cases.

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Kanute.

MR. KANUTE: I currently have a -- I currently have a civil case pending in front of Judge Freeman where I'm --

THE COURT: You disclosed that in your questionnaire. The attorneys may already know that.

MR. KANUTE: Thank you.

THE COURT: Anybody else? Yes. Mr. Steinmann.

MR. STEINMANN: Yes, your Honor. It hasn't occurred yet, but I expect to be an expert witness in the Third Judicial District in a lawsuit between Lyon County, the Lyon County School District and the City of Fernley.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. All right.

We'll to go do this exercise quickly, but not too quick.

A lot of you haven't said a word. And so beginning in the first position in the 32nd position, if your position is microphones, please, deputy, hand it to Ms.

Farnsworth. If you've not spoke — if you have spoken, pass the microphone. If you have not spoken, take a moment, and tell us your observations, so far, or tell us what questions you almost answered, but I went too

fast. Or tell us your opinion about being here or not 1 here, one of those three things. Observations, what 2 question you would have answered, opinion about being 3 here. Okay. We're just going to do this in alternating 4 order. So start passing the microphone until it lands 5 on someone who has not spoken. 6 MS. BENSON: Cathy Benson. 7 THE COURT: Yes. 8 MS. BENSON: I'm fine being here. 9 THE COURT: Tell us a little more. We want to 10 hear your voice. Why are you fine being here? 11 MS. BENSON: I don't know. Just that I'm fine 12 13 serving the county. THE COURT: Tell us what you would be doing 14 today if you were not here. Where would you be right 15 16 now? MS. BENSON: Probably at home. I'm on 17 workman's comp right now. 18 THE COURT: Tell us about your employment. 19 MS. BENSON: I'm a housekeeper. And that's 20 21 it. THE COURT: Is there any question you might 22

have answered if I would have given you more time?

No.

MS. BENSON:

23

24

THE COURT: Okay. Keep passing the microphone. We're going to get to somebody.

MR. WITMAN: Mark. Mark Witman.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. WITMAN: The experience has been good so far other than last week I did come back. I volunteered to come back. And that's really all I.

THE COURT: Thank you.

MR. REID: My name's Jim Reid. I'm here because I think it's our duty to be part of this and I'm also kind of that good karma thing so if ever I am sitting out there someone I want to have a reliable jury up here to make sure that judgment is fair.

THE COURT: Well said. Who agrees with Mr.

Reid? I think it's unanimous. Okay. Thank you. Who's next?

MR. HUNTER: Good morning. Jonathon Hunter.

My observation is this has been a very deliberate

process.

THE COURT: What question did you almost answer?

MR. HUNTER: I didn't have a question that I almost answered.

THE COURT: What question should I have asked

1	that would have revealed whether you're fit for this
2	trial or fit for a different trial?
3	MR. HUNTER: I can't think of a question you
4	could have asked, sir.
5	THE COURT: How do you respond when I say that
6	the evidence in this case could be unsettling?
7	MR. HUNTER: I have I've seen things that
8	are unsettling before.
9	THE COURT: What do you do for work?
10	MR. HUNTER: Currently I am a program manager
11	at Sierra Army Depot.
12	THE COURT: You said currently. How long have
13	you been there?
14	MR. HUNTER: I have been there since January
15	of 2015.
16	THE COURT: What did you do before then?
17	MR. HUNTER: I served in the United States
18	Army, sir.
19	THE COURT: Enlisted or officer?
20	MR. HUNTER: Both.
21	THE COURT: How did you transition from
22	enlisted to officer?
23	MR. HUNTER: I went to the warrant officer
24	candidate course at Fort Rucker, Alabama in 2005.

1	THE COURT: So you flew helicopters?
2	MR. HUNTER: No, sir, I was a technician
3	warrant officer.
4	THE COURT: How many total years in service,
5	active and reserve?
6	MR. HUNTER: Twenty-two years, sir.
7	THE COURT: How many of those years were
8	active duty?
9	MR. HUNTER: All of them.
10	THE COURT: How many years enlisted and how
11	many years as a warrant officer?
12	MR. HUNTER: Ten years, nine months enlisted.
13	The rest was as a warrant officer.
14	THE COURT: Has Mr. Dedomenico said anything
15	that you agree with or disagree with?
16	MR. HUNTER: Neither, sir.
17	THE COURT: I'm not teasing and I'm not being
18	sarcastic. Some people arrive in the courtroom with a
19	goal of saying almost nothing because they don't want to
20	disqualify themselves from service. And there's this
21	perception out there that if I say a lot, I'm going to
22	trip over something that the judge will let me go home.
23	Did you set a goal of not saying much before court?

MR. HUNTER: No, sir.

1	THE COURT: Do you want to serve?
2	MR. HUNTER: If selected, I will serve, sir.
3	THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. Mr I'm
4	going to say that your name is Mr. Wilcher.
5	MR. WILCHER: Correct.
6	THE COURT: You've talked about your health
7	care and the VA. Tell us a little bit more about that.
8	MR. WILCHER: Currently I'm an RN case manager
9	at the VA Reno, and I have a panel of 1200 or so
10	patients that I work with. And prior to that I was an
11	ER nurse at Saint Mary's.
12	THE COURT: Your prior service yourself?
13	MR. WILCHER: No, sir.
14	THE COURT: Okay. By the way, who has served
15	military here? Mr. Witman has?
16	MR. WILCHER: Yes, sir.
17	THE COURT: What branch?
18	MR. WILCHER: USMC.
19	THE COURT: Anybody else? Let's see. Mr.
20	Gray?
21	MR. GRAY: Yes.
22	THE COURT: What branch?
23	MR. GRAY: In the Army.
24	THE COURT: Okay. Anybody else?

All right. Who else hasn't spoken yet? Mr Hernandez-Guillen.

2.4

MR. HERNANDEZ-GUILLEN: Correct. So my observations today is it's very thorough process. When I moved to the United States I was eight years old back in March, 1997, with the belief of better opportunities. And upon becoming a U.S. citizen, October 10th, 2014, I know it's one of my two civic duties to, so when I received my summons in the mail I — I knew it was something that I needed to fulfill.

THE COURT: Thank you. Appreciate that.

MS. YOUNIE: Ashley Younie.

THE COURT: Where are you?

MS. YOUNIE: I'm back here, sorry.

THE COURT: Okay. Let's see. Ms. Younie?

MS. YOUNIE: Younie.

THE COURT: Younie.

MS. YOUNIE: I also was here last week and chose to come back because I believe this is a fair process and it's a privilege to be readily chosen for. It's our civic duty, too, we're in a place I would want a fair and honest jury.

THE COURT: Thank you. I ask questions sometimes hoping that I'll elicit a personal response,

fearing that I won't, but also communicating a little bit. I don't allow the attorneys to advocate during this process, but I could a little bit.

Is there anybody who won't follow the Court's written instructions because you have your own view of the law or you're just counterposed enough where you want to do it your own way? Anybody have a problem not following the Court's instructions? Even if you disagree.

I'll give you an example. I don't know if Mr. Goad is going to exercise his Constitutional right to silence. If he chooses to do so, I will instruct you that you shall not consider his silence against him. And you shall not even discuss it during your deliberations.

Will anybody violate that instruction? Or do you feel that you might or be inclined to violate that instruction?

So Mr. Goad has been charged with a crime. Charged. The State has to prove his guilt. Would anybody have a problem returning a verdict of not guilty?

If the State felt it met its burden, does anybody believe right now here that Mr. Goad is guilty

because he sits in this courtroom?

1.0

Does anybody have a concern that he's guilty because he sits in this courtroom?

Who has the next microphone?

MR. GRAY: That would be me.

THE COURT: Let me see. Who are you? There you are. Besides your Army answer, Mr. Gray, let me hear from you. Well if you want to answer those three questions?

MR. GRAY: The three questions. I guess the one I was going back on forth on is the silence part of it. I run a warehouse and when there's conflicts there should be two sides and we strive to get both sides of it. But I understand it's the part of the right to be silent, just inside I'm always looking for another side of the story.

THE COURT: Thank you. Tell us a little bit more about you.

MR. GRAY: In what regard? In Reno for 30 years. First time possibly serving on a jury. Been called before but not selected.

THE COURT: Do you want to be selected?

MR. GRAY: I would be selected if it's fine.

I don't have a reason not to be selected. I don't have

a desire not to be selected if you want to put it that way. As many have said, it's our duty and I believe it a hundred percent.

THE COURT: All right. Pass the microphone. Let's make sure everyone's voice has been heard.

MR. BECCARD: I'm Lawrence.

THE COURT: Hi, Mr. Beccard. What have you been thinking this morning?

MR. BECCARD: This is interesting. I don't know. I'm just right now observing it, checking it out.

THE COURT: Was there any question you would have answered if I gave you more time?

MR. BECCARD: I wasn't sure. When I was in my late teens, early twenties, I had a marijuana charge and assault and battery charge.

THE COURT: Tell us about that assault and battery charge.

MR. BECCARD: A guy walked into my house, I asked him to leave, he didn't leave. He started swinging so I started swinging. I was exonerated of it so I didn't know if I was actually charged, but I had to go to court and everything.

THE COURT: How long ago?

MR. BECCARD: I think I was 19, so 24 years

1	ago.
2	THE COURT: Okay. Do you want to serve on
3	this jury?
4	MR. BECCARD: Yeah. I'm impartial. I will or
5	I won't.
6	THE COURT: Thank you.
7	MS. GENZ: Hi. I'm Sierra.
8	THE COURT: Ms. Genz.
9	MS. GENZ: I'm just here to listen and observe
10	and give my input when needed. I don't have any answer
11	to your questions that you've previously asked.
12	THE COURT: What would you be doing this
13	morning if you weren't here?
14	MS. GENZ: I would be working.
15	THE COURT: What would you be doing
16	specifically today?
17	MS. GENZ: I'm a graduate nurse, so I'd be at
18	Renown.
19	THE COURT: Tell me what subset of nursing you
20	enjoy the most. Acute care? Oncology?
21	MS. GENZ: I'm a medical/surgical, so I just
22	see patients after surgery usually.
23	THE COURT: And you've never been affected by
	II

crime in any way? In your personal life.

MS. GENZ: No, not in my personal life, or anything.

THE COURT: Do you want to serve on this jury?

MS. GENZ: I don't mind. Either way.

The COURT: Do you watch crime shows on the television?

MS. GENZ: Yes.

THE COURT: What's your favorite one?

 $\qquad \qquad \text{MS. GENZ: Criminal Minds. I watch a lot of } \\ \text{TV on my spare time.}$

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

MS. MAHRT: Hi. I'm Kristin Mahrt. And I am happy to be here. I do love our constitution and our judicial — our judicial system and I'm really happy to serve.

The only other question I probably would have answered that you asked, I was called as a witness. I had — two years ago I had someone who was completely drugged up, messed up, tried to break into my house, and I called the police and he was caught stalking my house. And so they called me in and it did not go to court. The attorney's assistant asked me if the guy that just came in was the guy who was at my house. And I could not see him so I could not give her an answer until I

saw his face, but she actually told me, she said "Well, it must be him because there's nobody else here."

So when I would not agree with that, I told her I can not concur that that is him until I see his face. And then she came to me and apologized. And I did tell her that I did see his face and I did some.

And we never went to court, they settled out, so.

THE COURT: So do you believe you were unfairly treated by the prosecuting attorney, or the District Attorney's Office?

MS. MAHRT: I felt like that was leading a witness for sure. I mean, we weren't in a courtroom, but for her to say well, it must be him, there's nobody else here, I wouldn't agree with that, so I told her I can't tell you that for sure until I see his face.

THE COURT: All right.

MS. MAHRT: So.

THE COURT: Thank you.

MS. MAHRT: You're welcome.

MS. BAKER: Marie Baker. I have my own insurance office. Being here doesn't affect me good or bad. With regards to teaching experience for my kids, because they keep asking me why are you going to court? Because I have to.

THE COURT: Were you here last week?

MS. BAKER: I was not here last week.

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. BAKER: I was told to come on the 5th when I called in, so. But that's, like, my fourth card, so and this is my first time ever being called to jury duty, too. Any other questions?

THE COURT: Has everybody spoken? Ladies and Gentlemen, we're going to take a recess. It's not going to be brief, because I'm going to visit with the attorneys for a moment while Ms. Holbrook just waits on the outside of the doors in the rotunda.

And then when I'm done with the attorneys, I am going to visit with the attorneys with Ms. Holbrook. And so you will be released for 20 minutes.

But during this recess you must not discuss this case amongst yourselves. You will not form or express any opinion about this matter until it's been submitted to you.

You'll hear that admonition every single time you leave the courtroom and the idea is that the jury must be informed at the same time with the same information. Nobody can ever get different information than the entire jury. And so you will find that even

the attorneys, the court staff, nobody will speak to 1 It's not because we're antisocial, it's because 2 there can be no question about the information you 3 receive when you're together in this room. 4 We'll stand for our jury panel. Please return 5 for entry in the courtroom at 11:30. 6 (Jury panel leaves courtroom.) 7 THE COURT: Everyone be seated, please. 8 Ms. Holbrook, you want to speak privately? 9 MS. HOLBROOK: Yes. I feel like I can't 10 I'd love to be able to serve on the jury, but 11 this one is a violent crime and I was raised in a very 12

THE COURT: So I heard most of what you said.

I believe you said you don't believe this is the case

for you because of its allegations of some violence.

MS. HOLBROOK: Correct. Yes.

THE COURT: Okay.

violent situation.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MS. HOLBROOK: I have too much violence as a child, and similar to kind of what is going on here.

THE COURT: I don't want to plant any words in your mouth when I talk to much. Did you feel your past kind of --

84

MS. HOLBROOK: Oh, yes.

THE COURT: -- present today?

MS. HOLBROOK: Very badly.

THE COURT: Counsel, do you have any questions?

MR. STEGE: No.

MR. SLOCUM: No, I don't have any questions, your Honor. We would not object to her being excused.

MR. STEGE: Nor would I.

THE COURT: Thank you for your call to service, and for your courage in your honest disclosure. I am going to let you leave now not returning with the panel, and then we'll replace your empty seat then.

MS. HOLBROOK: Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Holbrook.

THE COURT: Counsel with the deputies can accommodate me privately in one of the jury rooms so that you can avoid the public facilities, I'd be happy to make that request. We'll see you at 11:30.

(Short break.)

THE COURT: Let's go back on the record. So it's always delicate I want to advocate, I want to indoctrinate to planting seeds of defense. But I also think it's fair that you identify people who have some familiarity, so let's hear from Mr. Stege and find out

where he thinks the line should be.

MR. STEGE: Without some -- I would say without an offer or a statement that we are going to go down an area of mental health, right, there will be positive evidence of mental health on one side or the other, planting the idea of you have to be crazy to commit murder or sort of diminished capacity evidence, I think, is -- it's not called for. I don't -- there's been no claim of insanity in this case. So I don't know that we want this idea of mental illness, the defendant's mentally ill out there somewhere without any connection to the trial, the evidence in the trial.

MR. SLOCUM: And your Honor, I'm a little bit unclear about this. I thought the issue was specifically regarding putting that kind of evidence before the Court. I don't think I can make an offer at this point about what that evidence is gonna be more than do I think that would be proper to tell the jury this is what the evidence in this case is gonna be and, in fact, the order specifically precludes me from doing that. So I am forced to do exactly what Mr. Stege is seemingly objecting to.

MR. STEGE: Well, my objection is without a hook in the trial, all right, without a hook somewhere

in the trial that the defendant is mentally ill, how is it appropriate to bring that up on a -- it's not an issue they're going to address.

I'm reminded in my work that I view a world through my own lens, and I want to make sure that I accommodate other lens. And I've had a sense just by observation of Mr. Goad has been itinerant in the past. Yes. And so I probably spoke without thinking because as Mr. Stege speaks, I agree with him I don't want to plant a seed, but I also want to allow you to conduct your appropriate challenges in an informed way, but I can't have you telling the jury by your questions that he's excused from criminal liability because of mental illness. So how do we strike that balance?

MR. SLOCUM: And Mr. Stege is correct if the question were with regard to not guilty by reason of insanity. But — but I'm not sure why it is not appropriate for me to ask the jury if they have some preconceived idea about somebody who is mentally ill and whether or not they should be held at a different level of criminal responsibility than somebody else. That's — that isn't saying what is your verdict going to be, but it is something where people have preconceived

ideas, and it's important for them to be able to express what those ideas may be in order to know -- frankly, I intend to emphasize the degree to which what you've said is true, that these jurors have to decide for themselves whether or not this is the right case for them. And one of the issues is whether or not they have a particular feeling that somebody who is homeless, or somebody who has a mental illness, whether that be okay they must be guilty, or they are guilty at all or whatever the case may be, that's the sort of thing that's going to be very important for us to know in determining who should serve on the jury.

THE COURT: So I ask about all kinds of silly things. I ask about what television program somebody watched, right? And so we're trying to do is just get people to talk. But it also plants a seed of excuse in this case if you focus on — by asking about mental illness you're arguing that your client is somehow.

MR. SLOCUM: I don't think that that necessarily follows, your Honor. I think that, frankly, in an area where people may have preconceived ideas that they'll inform their own judgment in the case, that's important for them to at least reflect upon and tell us about. And to leave that — to leave that as just a

hidden area is, frankly, unfair when we consider how important it may be to some people. And so to leave that uncovered is — it's operating to, frankly, a disadvantage to both sides. And I don't think it's planting a seed, I think it's a fact that some people may have preconceived ideas and it's important for us to ferret those out —

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. SLOCUM: -- with regardless of whether or not there is evidence of the particulars of Mr. -- Mr. Goad's past and his life and so on.

THE COURT: Okay. I get it. I understand the important intention and you're competing views.

What will the evidence be about Mr. Goad's homelessness? How did this event occur in your mind? What was it?

MR. STEGE: Mr. Goad lived in the same apartment complex as the victim. For -- he lived there for a long time. Number of years, not homeless.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. STEGE: He stopped getting his checks from SSI November of '18. Caused him, in the State's mind, to then get served with an eviction notice. In the meantime he murdered the victim and was subsequently

evicted on January 30th.

1.0

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. STEGE: The man's body was found February 13th. The defendant was located a number of weeks later in Sacramento, not homeless but sort of in group homes or he'd been picked back up onto or connected back with his Social Security benefits.

So I don't -- I'm looking at the witness list here. I don't see anyone who's gonna say he's mentally ill. I don't see any issue of mental illness in this case. The homelessness portion may come up in the -- when talking about in the manual's captured in California because he's bouncing around there.

MR. SLOCUM: Well, and your Honor, we had a whole discussion about an interview that — that Mr. Goad gave. As far as I understood, that was not redacted out. And Mr. Stege and I had a conversation about it. It's my understanding that the State intends to use that so —

MR. STEGE: No.

MR. SLOCUM: -- there is going to be evidence.

MR. STEGE: No, I'm not putting his statement in.

THE COURT: Okay. We're going to break. Ten minutes. Thank you, counsel, for your help.

(Short break.)

THE COURT: On the record before you open the door. I am going to disallow the Defense questions as proffered. I'm going to travel over the subject at a higher level. I think that — that if the questions come directly from Defense counsel it begins to advance a theory of the case, and there is no legal relevance. I'm just trying to discover experience and training and mental health subjects and so I'll do a little bit and you will be disallowed.

MR. SLOCUM: The homelessness?

THE COURT: I'm sorry?

MR. SLOCUM: The homelessness?

THE COURT: Again, I don't know the evidence vet.

MR. STEGE: Yeah, I think that's less problematic from the State's perspective. I think it's more likely that may come out.

THE COURT: I'll probably combine the two.

MR. STEGE: But I may be -- I want to come back to the mental health thing because I -- during the break I talked with Mr. Slocum. I don't intend to

introduce the man's statement. But if it were to come to pass that I were to introduce it, the defendant does mention having been in a mental hospital for, I think, depression is what he, himself, names. That's not been redacted out because it's too numerous the number of times. So I don't want to give the Court -- I'm not trying to set a trap for Mr. Slocum or the Court.

THE COURT: Final preservation of thoughts before we bring the jury in.

MR. SLOCUM: Right, your Honor. Again, there's the reasonable expectation that I have that there's is gonna be evidence that comes in. And I've talked to Mr. Stege about what my intent with regard to these questions is. I appreciate the Court's concern that you don't want to turn this into a circus where I'm presenting my whole case during voir dire. That is not at all what I intend to do. What I do intend to do is make sure, or intended to do until the Court made its ruling, that there are folks that have some preconceived idea. I'm not planting any seed buy they have an idea if they heard something like Mr. Goad's statement, that that would cause some kind of reaction in them, whether it be along the lines of well, if he's crazy he must have done this because crazy people are murders or any

kind of preconceived ideas where they're not going to be 1 able to hear the evidence anymore once they hear oh, he 2 was in a mental hospital? And that's important, I 3 think, for the defense to know if, in fact, there are 4 people who are going to have that reaction. 5 THE COURT: Okay. So you've got to slow down 6 in your delivery. Is there institutionalization, mental 7 health hospital that's going to come in in addition to 8 the statement you've just described? 9 10 MR. STEGE: No. 11 THE COURT: Okay. MR. STEGE: No. 12 THE COURT: All right. Unless there's further 13 order of the Court you won't be permitted. 14 The jury, please. 15 (Jury panel enters the courtroom.) 16

THE COURT: Ms. Clerk, to replace the 31st position, please.

COURT CLERK: Della Dunbar.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

THE COURT: Would you hand a microphone to Ms. Dunbar, please. Good morning.

MS. DUNBAR: Good morning.

THE COURT I can't try and recreate the lengthy past. You were paying attention I hope?

1

MS. DUNBAR: I was.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

THE COURT: Do you know what questions you would have answered? I can go over them by summary, but--

MS. DUNBAR: I don't know that I would have answered any of them. Maybe in regards to the sensitive nature of some of the images might be unsettling. But other than that, I -- I do consulting work so I did put a hold on my calendar for this week, but I do have a flight on Monday to visit a client if it goes over.

THE COURT: Do you want to serve on this jury? MS. DUNBAR: I would not be opposed to It's not like the top of my list of things I serving. want to do, but I would be happy to serve.

THE COURT: Have you any experience with law enforcement or crime either as an accused or as a victim that would influence your observations here?

MS. DUNBAR: I have neighbors who are retired P.D., but I don't think that would influence me. I do have great nieces and nephews who have parents, grandparents are charged with child porn.

THE COURT: Hold that mic away from you a little bit away.

MS. DUNBAR: Okay. So my great niece and

nephew that --

THE COURT: Let's just take the microphone away until we can fix it. Just speak up very loudly. I'm getting a whistle the entire time.

MS. DUNBAR: My great niece and great nephew, their dad and grandfather are -- have been charged with child pornography, among other things.

THE COURT: Where did that -- where is the charge?

MS. DUNBAR: Um, currently up in Alturas. I don't know what else you heard or didn't hear.

THE COURT: Legal training. Legal desires.

MS. DUNBAR: No, I work in the health care field.

THE COURT: Law enforcement?

MS. DUNBAR: Other than my neighbors who are retired PD.

THE COURT: Ms. Dunbar mentioned unsettling, the possibility of being unsettled by evidence, and it causes me to ask another question, Ladies and Gentlemen. We each travel through life, sometimes with highs and sometimes with lows, each of us in different ways experience depression and anxiety. We sometimes experience unnecessary euphoria. I'm wondering if any

of any you have any specific training in mental health issues at all?

Ms. Clark?

MS. CLARK: I have an undergraduate degree in psychology, but no professional training.

THE COURT: Okay. Anybody else? Ms. Donald?

MS. DONALD: I have a Bachelor's degree in

Human Services, but did not work in the field since I

got it. Did a few internships, but that's as far as

that one went.

THE COURT: Yes. Mr. Wilcher.

MR. WILCHER: Just part of school, mental health, and then some trainings with work and -- for both of my jobs so far.

THE COURT: Do any of you have opinions that we should know about regarding mental health addictions or depression or insecurity, anything of that nature? Personal experiences, professional training or just opinions. Yes, Mr. Dedomenico.

Mr. DEDOMENCIO: I -- I don't believe that they know what they're talking about. I think that the brain is very complicated instrument and that they come up with a bunch of blanket answers and just not buying it. Sorry.

THE COURT: Okay. Anybody else? All right.

At this time I'm going to invite the State's attorney -yes. Ms. Farnsworth.

MS. FARNSWORTH: Sorry. I have a Masters degree in counseling and educational psychology so I have some background.

THE COURT: Well, tell us a little bit more about that.

MS. FARNSWORTH: Well, when I grew up I wanted to be a school counselor. Never happened. I did the classes, but.

THE COURT: You'll just have to yell, I'm sorry. We do our best with these microphones.

MS. FARNSWORTH: Yeah, that was kinda bad.

THE COURT: So you wanted to be a school counselor?

MS. FARNSWORTH: Yes, I did, when I was young. Yeah, I was a -- yeah, my son wanted to go at the time and I couldn't afford to take a pay cut.

THE COURT: But then you received training or education?

MS. FARNSWORTH: I have training and education. So I've kind of worked with kids with the CASA, and then I worked at the Parenting Peace Center

here with children and their parents. 1 THE COURT: Okay. 2 MS. FARNSWORTH: I do it volunteer. 3 THE COURT: Okay. Anybody else? On mental 4 health? All right. Now I'm going to ask the State's 5 attorney if he wishes to ask supplemental questions. 6 MR. STEGE: Yes, thank you. Speaking with Ms. 7 Farnsworth, I'm reading your questionnaire. Says you're 8 9 a mediator? MS. FARNSWORTH: Yeah, I'm a volunteer 10 mediator with the Neighborhood Mediation Center. 11 MR. STEGE: What sort of disputes do you help? 12 MS. FARNSWORTH: Civil. Civil court, 13 neighbors, you know, with their dogs, you know, rent. 14 MR. STEGE: Okay. 15 MS. FARNSWORTH: Things like that. 16 MR. STEGE: Do you ever interact with the 17 Court in that role? 18 MS. FARNSWORTH: No. We see -- we see the 19 people before they go to court. 20 MR. STEGE: Okay. 21 MS. FARNSWORTH: And if we can get them to 22 come to their own conclusions that's -- that's our job. 23

We don't decide for them. We don't lead them, just to

24

1	get them to talk to each other and come to a conclusion.
2	If they do, then I write up the agreement, and then that
3	goes to the court to be signed by the judge.
4	MR. STEGE: How do you think that background
5	might affect you if you were to sit on this jury?
6	MS. FARNSWORTH: Well, to be honest, I think
7	it would be an asset because I'm my job is to listen
8	and it's you know, to be able to hear both sides. In
9	this case I would have to make decision.
10	MR. STEGE: Right. You understand there's no
11	middle ground. Right?
12	MS. FARNSWORTH: No middle ground. And I
13	understand that and quite a people do.
14	MR. STEGE: I notice there's a number of
15	teachers and school district employees on in this
16	group. Of those people do any of you know each other?
17	I think the back row has a number of okay.
18	REPORTER: Excuse me. Please state your name.
19	MR. STEGE: Yes.
20	MS. LOPEZ: Jenny Lopez.
21	MR. STEGE: Ms. Lopez, do you know Mr.
22	Cunningham?
23	MS. LOPEZ: Correct.

MR. STEGE: How do you know him?

1	MS. LOPEZ: Um, I personally know him because
2	I worked with his son. I am a speech pathologist.
3	MR. STEGE: Okay.
4	MS. LOPEZ: So I did a group therapy.
5	MR. STEGE: Okay. Work at the same school?
6	MS. LOPEZ: No, we do not. So I work for the
7	school district but we do not work for the same school.
8	MR. STEGE: Okay. Same answer, Mr.
9	Cunningham?
10	MR. CUNNINGHAM: Yes, sir
11	MR. STEGE: Outside of the teacher group does
12	anyone here know anyone else who's sitting in this group
13	here?
14	Okay. We heard a bit about being a witness to
15	a violent crime, we had someone who witnessed the Hug
16	High shooting. Anyone else been a witness to a violent
17	crime? No. Okay. Sir.
18	MR. HERNANDEZ-GUILLEN: October 1st, 2017, Las
19	Vegas, I was there.
20	MR. STEGE: You were at the
21	MR. HERNANDEZ-GUILLEN: Yes.
22	REPORTER: Your name, please?
23	MR. HERNANDEZ-GUILLEN: Carlos
24	Hernandez-Guillen.

1

MR. STEGE: You were there when it happened?

2

MR. HERNANDEZ-GUILLEN: Yeah.

3

MR. STEGE: How did that -- how did that affect you to this date?

5

4

MR. HERNANDEZ-GUILLEN: Oh, I believe that --

6

myself, personally? I believe that I've overcome the

7

challenges that presented the first couple weeks

8

after---

overcome.

MR. STEGE: Okay.

9

MR. HERNANDEZ-GUILLEN: -- the incident due

11

to the support of my family and friends. So I feel like

12

today, you know, yes, seen what just happened a couple

13

days ago, 20 -- 40 hours ago.

14

MR. STEGE: Right.

15

MR. HERNANDEZ-GUILLEN: It's interesting to

16

see it. Read more and here about it knowing that I've

17

been through something similar and just knowing the

18

emotions that people are experiencing, but like I said,

19

I feel that due to the family support and support of

20 21 friends that I have, feel like I've been able to

22

MR. STEGE: Do you feel the nature of this

23

case that cause you -- I mean, does that cause you --

24

MR. HERNANDEZ-GUILLEN: Huh-uh.

1	MR. STEGE: to be uneasy
2	MR. HERNANDEZ-GUILLEN: No.
3	MR. STEGE: with your background? Did you
4	
5	MR. HERNANDEZ-GUILLEN: No.
6	MR. STEGE: Were you interviewed by police or
7	investigators or anyone as a witness?
8	MR. HERNANDEZ-GUILLEN: I received a phone
9	call because so I was there with my girlfriend and
10	her family.
11	MR. STEGE: Okay.
12	MR. HERNANDEZ-GUILLEN: And her family reached
13	out to counseling.
14	MR. STEGE: Okay.
15	MR. HERNANDEZ-GUILLEN: And then I received a
16	phone call to ask if I needed or if I wanted to pursue
17	some services.
18	MR. STEGE: Okay.
19	MR. HERNANDEZ-GUILLEN: But beyond that phone
20	call
21	MR. STEGE: Okay.
22	MR. HERNANDEZ-GUILLEN: nothing.
23	MR. STEGE: So never involved with law

1	MR. HERNANDEZ-GUILLEN: No.
2	MR. STEGE: Other than that.
3	MR. HERNANDEZ-GUILLEN: No.
4	MR. STEGE: Anyone else witnessed a violent
5	crime?
6	Mr. Dedomenico, you said there were a number
7	of cases you were involved with.
8	MR. DEDOMENICO: Yes
9	MR. STEGE: The tax evasion.
10	MR. DEDOMENICO: Yes.
11	MR. STEGE: That was one case? And then the
12	battery
13	MR. DEDOMENICO: Right.
14	MR. STEGE: case.
15	MR. DEDOMENICO: Exactly.
16	MR. STEGE: The battery case was against the
17	prosecutor in your own case.
18	MR. DEDOMENICO: Right. The tax prosecutor,
19	yes.
20	MR. STEGE: Okay. What court was that in?
21	MR. DEDOMENICO: It's bankruptcy court here in
22	Nevada.
23	MR. STEGE: And what court was the battery
24	trial in?

1	MR. DEDOMENICO: Oh. Let's see. That was in
2	Washoe County court.
3	MR. STEGE: Okay.
4	MR. DEDOMENICO: Not this building.
5	MR. STEGE: Was it across the street maybe?
6	MR. DEDOMENICO: I'm really sorry. You know,
7	from the inside I suppose they all look the same.
8	MR. STEGE: Okay.
9	MR. DEDOMENICO: But I just can't remember
10	where that trial was. Maybe it was at the Reno.
11	MR. STEGE: What was the result of the second
12	trial?
13	MR. DEDOMENICO: The second one, you mean the
14	battery trial.
15	MR. STEGE: Yes.
16	MR. DEDOMENICO: I served the maximum sentence
17	at Parr. But by good behavior I got off in four months.
18	MR. STEGE: Do you feel like you were treated
19	fairly in those two cases.
20	MR. DEDOMENICO: Those two cases. Actually,
21	I'm going to have to say no.
22	MR. STEGE: Okay.
23	MR. DEDOMENICO: I deserve the battery case, I
24	mean, I did that on purpose.

MR. STEGE: Okay.

MR. DEDOMENICO: But the tax case, that one is way over the line.

MR. STEGE: But you prevailed.

MR. DEDOMENICO: Yes. Both times, civil and criminal.

MR. STEGE: Do you feel you sort of carry around those bad feelings about how you were treated?

MR. DEDOMENICO: Ah. I have a what, a grudge against the country? No. A grudge against lawyers?

Not necessarily.

MR. STEGE: Okay. What about a grudge against a prosecutor.

MR. DEDOMENICO: You're a pretty big guy, I'm probably not going to, you know, jump or harass you. Prosecutors have their job, they do, I mean, we — things happen. We aren't angelic people. Things happen. You go to trial, you go to jail, or you get away. Things happen. And sometimes there are mistakes.

MR. STEGE: I agree with that, but you understand that I'm kid of worried to have you on my jury, given your background.

MR. DEDOMENICO: Well --

MR. STEGE: Should I be?

MR. DEDOMENICO: That's okay if you let me go.

I would say that's a return on an investment in my heart

-- from my heart.

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$ STEGE: And I'm also troubled about your observations about the flag.

MR. DEDOMENICO: The law says we're not supposed to have stuff attached to our flag or covering our flag. Very simple law. The idea that that law, that that flag is not my flag makes me very unhappy, makes me suspicious, and so I do a little research, and I find that in 1807 we became corporate United States. We get to say U.S. now instead of United States of America. And this — I believe this has caused a lot of trouble. We don't necessarily follow the constitution that I was educated on and tested on and couldn't pass high school unless I, you know, had some grip of the constitution.

MR. STEGE: Okay. Let me interrupt you.

MR. DEDOMENICO: No, go ahead, I'm sorry, I -- it's a sensitive issue.

MR. STEGE: And it sounds like -- and this will be a leading question, right, calling for a yes or no. You do have strong feelings about that particular subject.

MR. DEDOMENICO: That, the constitution, that, the flag, that, the government, that the -- how many -- what are we talking about?

MR. STEGE: This issue about the flag.

MR. DEDOMENICO: Well, come on, it's just a piece of cloth.

MR. STEGE: Okay.

MR. DEDOMENICO: But it's symbolic and, like I said, I don't know what constitution we are following.

MR. STEGE: Okay. I'll try a different leading question.

MR. DEDOMENICO: Okay.

MR. STEGE: Is it true that that causes you to question the legitimacy of this proceeding here this morning?

MR. DEDOMENICO: Ah. This is a murder trial. People do -- things happen like that. Our constitution guarantees us certain things. One of those is to remain silent with this and all that.

MR. STEGE: I'm not trying to pick on you, sir, but that question asks for a yes or no.

MR. DEDOMENICO: Well, then you'll have to repeat the question. I got distracted.

MR. STEGE: Your views on this -- on the flag

1	and the other views you've mentioned cause you to
2	question the legitimacy of this proceeding this morning.
3	MR. DEDOMENICO: This this proceeding, the
4	murder trial, not at all.
5	MR. STEGE: Thank you. Anyone else have views
6	like that on the flag or the legitimacy of this
7	proceeding or whether we are a Constitutional democracy.
8	Okay. Going back through some of the notes I
9	took, we had a number of people involving misdemeanor
10	convictions, Mr. Steinmann and Ms. Donald.
11	First to Mr. Steinmann. Was that a
12	misdemeanor or gross misdemeanor?
13	MR. STEINMANN: Gross misdemeanor.
14	MR. STEGE: Okay. Were you treated fairly in
15	that?
16	MR. STEINMANN: Yes.
17	MR. STEGE: Who was the investigating agency?
18	MR. STEINMANN: I believe it was the Reno
19	Police Department.
20	MR. STEGE: You had an attorney?
21	MR. STEINMANN: Yes.
22	MR. STEGE: Who was your attorney?
23	MR. STEINMANN: Public defender.
24	MR. STEGE: Do you know who the judge was?

1	MR. STEINMANN: Can't recall.
2	MR. STEGE: You also had mentioned a
3	conference you had this week.
4	MR. STEINMANN: Yes, work shops, starting on
5	Friday through the week.
6	MR. STEGE: Can you miss those?
7	MR. STEINMANN: No.
8	MR. STEGE: Why not?
9	MR. STEINMANN: They were scheduled
10	approximately a month and a half ago. They involve
11	elected officials, state and local, Northern Nevada,
12	people who have already made the arrangements, being in
13	Battle Mountain people from Carlin, West Wendover the
14	next two weeks.
15	MR. STEGE: How many people are going to be
16	there?
17	MR. STEINMANN: Five different workshops so
18	two-hundred plus.
19	MR. STEGE: What is your role in those
20	workshops?
21	MR. STEINMANN: Facilitator.
22	MR. STEGE: Okay. What time do you need to be
23	there on Friday?

MR. STEINMANN: I'll probably need to leave

about noon in order to set up about four or 5:00 in the 1 2 afternoon on Friday. MR. STEGE: And it will last two weeks? 3 MR. STEINMANN: Approximately. I'll be back 4 Thursday Friday, Saturday, Sunday of next week. 5 MR. STEGE: Okay. 6 MR. STEINMANN: And then back over. 7 MR. STEGE: You heard this trial is scheduled 8 to go to Friday. Right? The hard target, I think the 9 judge said if we were to go to 5:00 on Friday, could you 10 accommodate that? 11 MR. STEINMANN: Possibly. 12 MR. STEGE: Well, if you're ordered to, if 13 you're on this jury, you would. 14 THE COURT: I can think of no more receptive 15 audience than elected officials who respond to jury 16 17 service. MR. STEGE: Okay. Ms. Donald as well, was 18 your case a misdemeanor or gross misdemeanor? 19 MS. DONALD: I think it was a gross 20 21 misdemeanor. MR. STEGE: Okay. Did you feel you were 22

23

24

treated fairly?

MS. DONALD: For the circumstance, I guess.

think if I would have had more knowledge, more time and 2 financially, I think the outcome could have been a 3 little different. 4 MR. STEGE: Should I be worried that your --5 you might be a person who is going to sort of if you 6 have negative feelings take that out on the State's 7 case? 8 MS. DONALD: No, not at all. 9 MR. STEGE: You think you are a fair person. 10 MS. DONALD: I am. MR. STEGE: Ms. Clark. 11 12 MS. CLARK: Yes. 13 MR. STEGE: You mentioned aspirations or ideas 14 of going into the law. You said you did something else 15 instead. 16 MS. CLARK: Yes. 17 MR. STEGE: Your questionnaire isn't real 18 specific about --19 MS. CLARK: No. 20 MR. STEGE: -- what you do so --21 MS. CLARK: Sure. 22 -- can you tell us what you do? MR. STEGE:

MS. CLARK: Sure. I am a customer

satisfaction manager for Custom Ink. We're online

23

24

1	customer to teachers.
2	MR. STEGE: That's pretty far away from the
3	law.
4	MS. CLARK: Yes. Sure it is.
5	MR. STEGE: Okay. Mr. Kanute, do you ever do
6	jury trial work yourself?
7	MR. KANUTE: No.
8	MR. STEGE: Were you involved in mock trial
9	during law school?
10	MR. KANUTE: No.
11	MR. STEGE: Have you seen trials, jury trials?
12	MR. KANUTE: Many.
13	MR. STEGE: As in what capacity?
14	MR. KANUTE: So in high school I did an
15	internship with a with a county judge in Arizona.
16	And I regularly attended jury trials that were going on
17	starting with voir dire and through through the
18	deliberation, and verdict.
19	MR. STEGE: And so you know in law school,
20	right? What would they say about having a lawyer on a
21	jury if you're a practitioner? Would you want that?
22	MR. KANUTE: No.
23	MR. STEGE: Why not?

MR. KANUTE: Because lawyers tend to think

1	they know the law better than other lawyers.
2	MR. STEGE: And do you think I should be
3	worried about that if you were to sit on this panel?
4	MR. KANUTE: I don't think you should be
5	worried about me, no.
6	MR. STEGE: How are we doing so far?
7	MR. KANUTE: I think you're doing fine.
8	MR. STEGE: Thank you. Ms. is it Ms. Gibbs?
9	MS. GIBBS: (Nods head.)
10	MR. STEGE: I also in reading your
11	questionnaire wanted to know, wasn't real specific about
12	your occupation. Can you tell us about your occupation?
13	MS. GIBBS: A state licensed CAM, I am a
14	community manager to homeowners' associations.
15	MR. STEGE: You're going to have to be a
16	little more specific.
17	MS. GIBBS: So homeowners' associations, the
18	boards that govern a homeowner association hire
19	management company or a manager to help them make sure
20	that everything is in line. And that's me.
21	MR. STEGE: And what company do you work for?
22	MS. GIBBS: I have worked for a company Terra
23	West Management Services.

MR. STEGE: Anyone been involved in, besides

Mr. Dedomenico, any civil litigation where they're the 1 2 primary party? Yes, sir. Well, you mentioned HOA. I think 3 you mentioned it in your questionnaire. 4 5 MR. KANUTE: I did, yeah. MR. STEGE: Can you talk about it, please. 6 MR. KANUTE: No. I currently have, my wife 7 and I are the plaintiffs against the party we bought the 8 house from failing to disclose that it was currently in 9 litigation related to the house. 10 MR. STEGE: Any issues with that case 11 affecting your ability to sit on this panel? 12 MR. KANUTE: No. 13 MR. STEGE: Any issue with your prior 14 relationship or workings with the judge in sitting on 15 16 this panel? MR. KANUTE: No. 17 MR. STEGE: You feel like you'd have to 18 justify whatever outcome to the judge at a later date? 19 2.0 MR. KANUTE: Absolutely not. MR. STEGE: Ms. Gualano. 21 22 MS. GUALANO: Yes. MR. STEGE: Your questionnaire indicates you 23

worked for the Recorder?

24

1	MS. GUALANO: Uh-hum.
2	MR. STEGE: Can you tell us about that
3	experience?
4	MS. GUALANO: Yes. I was with the Recorder's
5	Office for 28 years, and I'm retired now. I worked from
6	the bottom up to the chief deputy position.
7	MR. STEGE: Have you ever been involved with
8	any litigation on behalf of the county?
9	MS. GUALANO: Not in a courtroom.
10	MR. STEGE: Anyone know any district attorney
11	employees? Anyone who works for the Washoe County D.A.?
12	Ms. Donald.
13	MS. DONALD: I'm just familiar with who we
14	were assigned our District Attorney over time, they
15	changed and represented us in anything.
16	MR. STEGE: Yes.
17	MS. ROBERTS: I know Chris Frey.
18	REPORTER: Who's talking, please.
19	MS. ROBERTS: Janet Roberts. I know Chris
20	Frey.
21	MR. STEGE: Okay.
22	MS. ROBERTS: But I don't know
23	MR. STEGE: Federal public defender. How do
24	you know him?

 $$\operatorname{MS.}$$ ROBERTS: His wife and I taught school together.

2.1

MR. STEGE: Anyone ever heard anything about this particular case before?

And your Honor, may I give a very few details about this case?

THE COURT: For what purpose?

MR. STEGE: To see if anyone's heard -- it's difficult to say -- ask if they're ever heard anything about it when there's -- they don't know what they're heard about or not heard about.

THE COURT: Right. And so I'm responding conceptually not to the State's attorney, certainly not the Defense attorneys. Jury selection is not a time to argue the case. I am going to allow Mr. Stege to very briefly identify central facts for the sole purpose of determining your familiarity. I'll do so neutrally without any editorializing.

MR. STEGE: Anyone familiar with 33 Park
Street? Which is an apartment complex right near the police station, in fact.

Anyone read about or hear about -- well, one thing we haven't said is the victim's name which is Theodore Gibson, the 74-year-old man. Anyone familiar

nd rd the
the
the
m
m
?
ked
t.
re on
le
me in
1

1 MR. STEGE: Anyone else see a news report? MR. STEGE: Don't speak without saying your 2 3 name, please. MS. BAKER: Marie Baker. 4 5 MR. STEGE: Yes. MS. BAKER: I did see the one where they 6 7 stated who was being charged with a murder. I don't --8 didn't really read the whole article, I just saw the 9 picture and then the name. 10 MR. STEGE: Okay. MS. BAKER: And I don't even remember where. 11 I know it happened somewhere near downtown, I think, but 12 13 that's about it. MR. STEGE: Okay. Anyone else have? 14 15 Yes, ma'am. Ms. MS. NUTTER: Carol Nutter. 16 17 MR. STEGE: Nutter. MS. NUTTER: Yes. I just remember seeing his 18 19 picture on the news. MR. STEGE: Okay. That's all pretty low 20 level, most people have seen. We need to worry that you 21 22 might decide this case on what you heard on the news, as opposed to the evidence as put worth in the case. 23

Okay. This is the speaking hour,

24

forever-hold-your-peace question. Any burning statement people want to make, maybe the thing that you asked your neighbor you had to get out of juror service, say it now. Say your name first.

2.0

MR. SARGENT: James Sargent. I don't -- the question about knowing a D.A., I think. I'm not sure, Mark Sertic --

THE COURT: Can you speak up, please?

MR. SARGENT: Mark Sertic. I know Mark

Sertic, I think he was a D.A., I'm not sure. I know he

worked as a lawyer. He was my mom's ex-husband.

MR. STEGE: Okay. Anything about that relationship or circumstance that would affect your ability to be fair?

MR. SARGENT: I don't think so. I just want to bring it up, to speak.

MR. STEGE: Thank you. Sir? Mr. Kanute.

MR. KANUTE: Again, probably not very important but I just figured I'd mention it. My wife and I were foster parents and we adopted four child through the Washoe County Human Services Department and so through that we got to know some of the DA's the Human Services side, not on the criminal side.

MR. STEGE: And your, I assume, fondness for

them, that's not gonna wear off on me necessarily, you're going to approach this case as if I'm a stranger.

 $$\operatorname{MR}.$$ KANUTE: You assume fondness but for the most part it was fond. No, it would not cross over.

MR. STEGE: Okay. I wish to thank you and pass the panel for cause.

THE COURT: Thank you. To the Defense.

MR. SLOCUM: Thank you very much, your Honor.

So the judge earlier asked who was happy to be here. But who's happy about having to divulge personal details in a public forum like this.

I think that's actually one of the biggest fears that people have is public speaking. But that's what you're going to be asked to do should you be selected to be a juror in the case.

Now, it's a little bit different than our common hey, I just want to listen to the evidence and I'll -- I'll be kind of allowed to just be on my own and make my own decision. One of the obligations you're gonna have is that you're gonna have to be able to speak about the case with your fellow jurors.

Now, to reiterate what the judge said, a lot of this process is an internalization that is you're looking inside to decide is this really the right case

for me. And the questions that are being asked that the judge has asked and Mr. Stege asked was to try to get to something inside of you because we don't always know is this something that's gonna be a trick trigger for you and this is he why we ask the questions that by do because we want to try to figure out is there something inside that's gonna cause you such a reaction that you're not gonna be able to set it to the side. Because we all agree that it's important for both sides in the case that we have the ability to be fair and impartial.

That being said I want to follow up on a few things that were mentioned during the -- during the course of the discussion. Ms. Donald?

MS. DONALD: Uh-hum.

MR. SLOCUM: You have previous experience yourself in the justice system.

MS. DONALD: As far as my degree goes or?

MR. SLOCUM: The criminal justice system --

MS. DONALD: Oh, yes.

 $$\operatorname{MR}.\ \operatorname{SLOCUM}:\ --\ \operatorname{you}\ \operatorname{indicated}\ \operatorname{you}\ \operatorname{had}\ \operatorname{a}\ \operatorname{case}$ where you were the defendant.

MS. DONALD: Yeah.

MR. SLOCUM: And the question was raised whether or not you felt that you were fairly treated.

Right?

MS. DONALD: Yes.

MR. SLOCUM: And if I understood your answer correctly you believe that the result might have been different if you had had money and been able to hire an attorney?

MS. DONALD: And a little more knowledge of the system and the events that occurred, yes.

MR. SLOCUM: Okay. Is it your belief that if somebody can't hire an attorney or doesn't have money to hire an attorney, that there's a different result that happens?

MS. DONALD: No. I just firmly believe mine would have been different, given the circumstance that I was put in.

MR. SLOCUM: Okay. And you had mentioned that if you had a little bit more knowledge did you feel like the person who was representing you didn't inform you correctly?

MS. DONALD: Possibly, yes. It all happened very quickly. It was within just a couple days, so yeah.

MR. SLOCUM: I'm sorry, what was within a couple of days?

2.2

MS. DONALD: The whole trial, the charging and from, like, the actual event it all happened very fast, so.

MR. SLOCUM: And was it your choice that it happened quickly or were you forced into something too quickly?

MS. DONALD: Forced too quickly into something. It was like Option A or Option B, and the one I chose definitely sounded better than the other option, yeah.

MR. SLOCUM: And is there -- is there anything that you came away with from that experience as far as whether or not someone who doesn't have money to hire an attorney would be improperly treated?

MS. DONALD: No, not at all. I don't think -I don't think -- no, I don't know. I'm not sure.

MR. SLOCUM: Do you understand what I'm asking?

MS. DONALD: Maybe not.

MR. SLOCUM: So I want to make sure that we're on the same page, it's very important that we understand one another. And it sounded like what you were saying is because you didn't have money you couldn't hire an attorney, you were put in a position where you had to

act quickly, you were told that there were those two 1 different options. 2 MS. DONALD: Yeah. 3 MR. SLOCUM: One of the options sounded better 4 than the other. 5 MS. DONALD: Yes. 6 MR. SLOCUM: And then perhaps if you had had 7 money to hire an attorney you would have had more time, 8 you wouldn't have felt forced --9 MS. DONALD: Yes. 10 MR. SLOCUM: -- and maybe the result would 11 have been different. 12 13 MS. DONALD: Yes. MR. SLOCUM: And my question is to whether or 14 not that experience informs your view of this case now. 15 MS. DONALD: No, not at all. 16 MR. SLOCUM: So you can set aside whatever --17 MS. DONALD: Oh, yeah. 18 MR. SLOCUM: -- that experience was. 19 MS. DONALD: Yes. Yeah. 2.0 MR. SLOCUM: And you would agree that whether 21 or not someone has money to -- to hire an attorney that 22

shouldn't dictate the justice to which they're entitled

23

24

to.

MS. DONALD: No, not at all.

MR. SLOCUM: We shouldn't say well, you don't have money so your justice should be something, or you do have money so you get a different justice.

MS. DONALD: No.

MR. SLOCUM: Ms. Gualano?

MS. GUALANO: Yes.

MR. SLOCUM: You had mentioned that you saw some sort of newspaper segment where there was a picture of Mr. Goad. Do you recall that?

MS. GUALANO: Uh-hum.

MR. SLOCUM: Yes?

MS. GUALANO: Yes, I'm sorry.

MR. SLOCUM: Yes. And you had said well, there's a certain feeling that I have as a result of seeing that picture. Right?

MS. GUALANO: I just recognized him and then I think I added I do feel like I have a lack -- a little bit of a lack of tolerance for being up to something that's no good or being involved with something that went bad.

MR. SLOCUM: Okay. And I think, actually, you said bad behaviors.

MS. GUALANO: Yes. Yes, I did.

2.3

MR. SLOCUM: And I was wondering in your mind what the connection was when you said well, I saw his picture on the television, and then I see him here, and my feeling is well, I don't have tolerance for bad behavior. Can you help us understand what the connection is for you in your mind?

MS. GUALANO: I guess, yeah. I guess when you see a report like that, and you hear the story, I -- you tend to have an opinion. And mine tends to go with if you were out up to no good, then you were probably up to no good. I don't know if that answered your question.

MR. SLOCUM: Well, I want --

MS. GUALANO: That sits in my head --

MR. SLOCUM: I'm sorry?

 $$\operatorname{MS}.$$ GUALANO: That sits in my head when I watch the news and see reports sometimes.

MR. SLOCUM: Okay. And it's one thing certainly to watch the news and be informed about what's going on in the community --

MS. GUALANO: Yes.

MR. SLOCUM: -- right?

MS. GUALANO: Yes.

MR. SLOCUM: And you'd agree with me that it's a whole other matter to -- to sit on a jury where you

have to just consider what's presented here in court.

MS. GUALANO: Yeah. I struggle with that a little bit, I guess, is what I'm saying.

MR. SLOCUM: Well, and that's important, so that's a natural -- that's a natural feeling if you know something how you unknow it. Right?

MS. GUALANO: Yeah. Yeah.

MR. SLOCUM: And the question is really, honestly, to you whether or not you have the feeling hey, I found something in that news report and I certainly don't want the details of what you heard, but I am interested to know if there were details in that report which, again, may or not be true, may or may not be presented in court, but if there's something about some information you received or some reaction that you had to the report, such that you're not going to be able to place it to the side, and you're just gonna be able to consider the evidence in the case, how do you feel about that?

MS. GUALANO: I mean, I would be open to hearing, but I do tend to -- when I watch the stories I, um, tend to think, you know, even two people in a bad situation, one ends up deceased, they were up to something no good anyway so, I mean -- I don't know.

MR. SLOCUM: Well, you say you don't know, but you understand that it's a very important question.

MS. GUALANO: Not that my mind's not open to hearing the other side of the story that you don't hear on the news or both sides of the story and to accepting new information and changing my mind about who might be quilty and who might not be —

MR. SLOCUM: Okay.

2.4

MS. GUALANO: -- so.

MR. SLOCUM: And thank you very much for that answer. But I want to ask you is it your view that the trial is just going to add new information for you or are you going to just start, basically, with a clean slate saying hey, I don't know anything about this case and I'm only gonna be able to consider what is presented at the trial? This, again, may not be right the piece if you've got information that I think is of such a nature you just can't just put to the side. And again, I don't want to hear what the information is, I want you to just be able to look inside yourself and say hey, this — this is the kind of the information that I can't unknow and it's always gonna be in my mind —

MS. GUALANO: Right.

MR. SLOCUM: -- when I'm trying to render a

verdict at the other end.

MS. GUALANO: There was really nothing specific on the news report other than pictures and who was involved. And I would try really hard to come into this with a clean slate. I just — like I said, my opinion is when someone's out up to no good and something goes bad, they were probably up to no good.

MR. SLOCUM: Okay.

MS. GUALANO: That's just my -- that's how I feel.

MR. SLOCUM: Okay. And again, I really don't want to ask you what information you may have, but I am concerned when you keep talking about that they were up to no good. Do you just mean the charge itself or did you mean is there something that --

MS. GUALANO: No, I don't mean that case at all. I mean watching the news in general. The newspaper in general and something gone wrong, someone's been out, and chances are the situation wasn't ideal to begin with.

MR. SLOCUM: Okay. When you say you have a low tolerance for it, can you tell us know what this means when you say a low tolerance for it?

MS. GUALANO: I have no patience for that kind

of behavior. Be abusive to people, thinking it's okay
to put your hands on someone else, that's not okay in my
world.

MR. SLOCUM: And I think that you're not gonna

MR. SLOCUM: And I think that you're not gonnaget any argument --

MS. GUALANO: Yeah.

MR. SLOCUM: -- from anyone about that.

MS. GUALANO: Yes.

MR. SLOCUM: But again, to come back to whether or not you can set aside what you know or, frankly, I would say don't know about the case --

MS. GUALANO: Yeah.

MR. SLOCUM: -- to be able to say hey, I will -- I will put that to the side, I will just focus on what's happening in this trial, I won't be thinking the whole time about some bad behavior --

MS. GUALANO: No.

MR. SLOCUM: -- or something else that I think that I even know because, again, I don't want the information --

MS. GUALANO: I don't know.

MR. SLOCUM: But you would agree with me that it would be unfair if you were thinking well, the news said this and nobody said anything at the court but I

1	know that that this happened or that this was
2	MS. GUALANO: Yeah.
3	MR. SLOCUM: a part of the case even if it
4	may not be.
5	MS. GUALANO: Yeah.
6	MR. SLOCUM: You'd agree that would be fair.
7	Right?
8	MS. GUALANO: I know. And I would do my best,
9	absolute best to do that. But I am the kind of person
LO	that tends to think someone's guilty until they're
11	proven innocent. Sorry.
12	MR. SLOCUM: Okay. And you'd agree that would
13	be
14	MS. GUALANO: I'm just being honest.
15	MR. SLOCUM: And let me be very, very clear.
16	What we need is honesty.
17	MS. GUALANO: And, I mean, there's situations
18	where I don't feel that way, but this situation for some
19	reason I do, a little bit.
20	MR. SLOCUM: Okay. Well, and that's, again,
21	very, very important
22	MS. GUALANO: Okay.
23	MR. SLOCUM: to know, and if you're

thinking I'm gonna expect something from the Defense,

otherwise Mr. Goad is guilty, you'd agree with me that 1 that wouldn't be fair. MS. GUALANO: Yeah, I do agree with you. 3 MR. SLOCUM: And so then the question becomes 4 if you were sitting where Mr. Goad is sitting right 5 there would you want someone in your frame of mind to be 6 sitting as a juror in the case? 7 MS. GUALANO: No. 8 MR. SLOCUM: And as I'm understanding it you 9 truly would be wanting the Defense to give you something 10 to disprove the allegation; is that right? 11 12 MS. GUALANO: Yes. MR. SLOCUM: Your Honor, I would respectfully 13 thank -- ask to thank and excuse Ms. Gualano. 14 THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Gualano, for your 15 service. You're free to leave the courtroom. 16 MS. GUALANO: Okay. 17 THE COURT: Ms. Clerk? 18 COURT CLERK: Sergio Ruiz. 19 THE COURT: Mr. Ruiz, are you here? 20 MR. RUIZ: Yes. 21 THE COURT: All right. Mr. Slocum, will you 22

please travel from the beginning quickly with Mr. Ruiz?

MR. SLOCUM: Is it the Court's intention I

23

24

will conclude mine and then Mr. Stege will have the opportunity?

THE COURT: Focus on Mr. Ruiz for a moment.

MR. SLOCUM: Okay.

THE COURT: Complete your supplemental examine, ask the panel for cause, and then return to the State on Mr. Ruiz only.

MR. SLOCUM: Good morning, Mr. Ruiz.

Actually, good afternoon. We've traveled now into the afternoon hour. You'll recall earlier this morning that Judge Hardy asked everybody some very general questions about whether or not they knew anybody involved in the case, if they had any prior commitments that would preclude their service, if you had any other reason that we might not be aware of why you could not serve. Do you remember all of that?

MR. RUIZ: Yes.

MR. SLOCUM: Okay. Do you have any reasons or answers in the affirmative to any of those questions?

MR. RUIZ: I mean, I guess my only thing would be is my wife is a police officer, she's been with University Police Department for five years now. That would be probably the only thing that I could think of.

MR. SLOCUM: If I understood correctly, you

had a vacation that was -- that was scheduled? No?

MR. RUIZ: No. It may have been, sorry, beforehand, but I know that we switched it. It was Friday, last Friday that we had called, and then they moved it to today.

MR. SLOCUM: Okay. I just wanted to make sure there's not any issue with a vacation and your ability--

MR. RUIZ: No.

MR. SLOCUM: -- to serve. And with the -- with the idea that your wife is a police officer, would you have difficulty going home at the end of this trial and saying we found the defendant not guilty?

MR. RUIZ: That would be -- no, I don't think I would just because we haven't seen any evidence or don't know anything really about what's going on.

MR. SLOCUM: Okay. You thought -- you thought hard about that, which I appreciate. Can you talk to us about some of the concerns that you might have with regard to that?

MR. RUIZ: I mean, I can't speak on any information. I never seen the gentleman. It would just — and, obviously, he's innocent, there's nothing you can do about that, there's proof that he's innocent or not proof of either way, but that would be — show that

he's innocent, then he's innocent, it would just be kind of weird to say that he's innocent, I guess.

MR. SLOCUM: Okay. So talk to me about when you say it would be weird to say that he's not guilty, we use the word not guilty —

MR. RUIZ: Not guilty, yes.

MR. SLOCUM: -- which is an important distinction, I want to make sure that we're clear about this.

MR. RUIZ: Okay.

MR. SLOCUM: An important distinction. If at the end of the day the conclusion that you have is he probably is guilty, that's not — that's not a guilty verdict. We have — we have a system in place where if the State doesn't prove the charge, he's not guilty. That doesn't mean he's innocent and that's why —

MR. RUIZ: Okay.

 $$\operatorname{MR.\ SLOCUM:}\ --\ I$$ want to make sure with that the judge is going to instruct you on that, but when you said that --

THE COURT: Slow down the cadence.

MR. SLOCUM: -- I want to make sure that we were clear. So with that in mind, coming back to a conversation you might have with your wife at the end of

this trial in which you believe that the state gas not proven the charge. You said that would be a little -- a little uncomfortable for you. Is that true?

MR. RUIZ: I mean, if -- I guess like I said, if he's not guilty, he's not guilty, there's nothing you can say that yes, it was wrong or right, but if it -- not guilty is not guilty, I guess.

MR. SLOCUM: Well, right. And the concern that I'm asking about is specifically with regard to your wife who's a law enforcement officer, and so you might have the feeling well, I don't want to have to go back and tell her that the police didn't do their job right or whatever your reason might be, but — but there's a natural feeling that you might want to say that to your wife and so that's what I'm asking you about.

MR. RUIZ: I guess no, I mean, if I had to say it would be because we've gone through the process of figuring out the information, so no, I think it would be okay to say so.

MR. SLOCUM: Okay. So when you say you had to say you mean if that was a conclusion that you reached.

MR. RUIZ: Yes.

MR. SLOCUM: You would be able to reach that

conclusion independently in the jury room of thinking well, I don't want to have to go home and tell my wife that he was not guilty.

MR. RUIZ: Yeah. No, keeping my wife as I said, yeah.

MR. SLOCUM: I'm sorry?

MR. RUIZ: No, not taking her feelings into concern, I think I would be able to.

MR. SLOCUM: Okay. And you'd agree with me that if your wife were a witness in the case that might be a different thing, but just because her colleague or someone who's also law enforcement testifies that doesn't make them more credible or more believable.

Right?

MR. RUIZ: We'd like to think that they would be more believable but they shouldn't be held to a higher standard because they are police officers, they're -- you know, we all lie sometimes, whether we want to admit it or not. And I'm not saying they're gonna lie, I'm just saying you may not remember everything accurately either.

MR. SLOCUM: Okay. So you said a couple of different things which I think I need to make sure I'm clear about. You're talking about a situation in which

someone might be mistaken or a situation in which someone might lie. Right? Is that -- is that -- is that fair to say?

MR. RUIZ: Yes.

MR. SLOCUM: Well, I want to make sure I'm clear with what you're saying. Because it sounded like you would inherently believe a police officer because of their position as opposed to somebody who is not a police officer?

MR. RUIZ: I want to say yes, but I think that we all -- nobody's 100 percent right and nobody's 100 percent wrong all the time, so there's got to be a middle ground somewhere.

MR. SLOCUM: Okay.

MR. RUIZ: But I guess yes, I would be inclined to believe a police officer more than, I guess, just --

MR. SLOCUM: Would you be able to set that belief aside if you were told no witness is to be judged because of their position any more than another person is to be judged?

MR. RUIZ: Yes.

MR. SLOCUM: So you be able to set that aside.

MR. RUIZ: Separate.

MR. SLOCUM: And you wouldn't inherently think well, they're these two different opinions, but this person's a police officer so, therefore, we have to believe the police officer.

MR. RUIZ: I could set that to a side, yeah.

MR. SLOCUM: And you feel -- you feel confident in your ability to evaluate someone based on just their testimony and the believability of what they're saying as opposed to their position.

MR. RUIZ: Yes.

MR. SLOCUM: Do you have other law enforcement that's in your family or is that the extent of it?

MR. RUIZ: No, that's the extent.

MR. SLOCUM: And how long has she been a police officer?

MR. RUIZ: Five years.

MR. SLOCUM: And while we're on the subject,
Ms. Smith, you had expressed some -- some concern about
the fact that your husband is a police officer; is that
right?

MS. SMITH: Yeah. Do you need my first name? Kate Smith.

MR. SLOCUM: Yeah, it's juror number 27. Just so we're clear, you had expressed some concern about the

fact that your husband's a police officer. Correct?

MS. SMITH: That's correct.

MR. SLOCUM: And so you just heard a long discussion that I had with Mr. Ruiz about concerns about at the end of the trial going back and telling your spouse that, actually, we found the defendant not guilty. Would that be — would that be something that you would have difficulty with at the end of the trial?

MS. SMITH: No. I think unless — part of our relationship, I would say, is that it's important that we uphold the law. But we also recognize that, like the other juror said, sometimes law enforcement officers maybe don't — they're supposed to know the law better than others, but they don't always know the extent of the law, and this is why I think court is important. But if it came to saying we found him innocent, I don't — I wouldn't feel worried about that. I don't — there's a difference in what he does and what they say here in the courtroom.

MR. SLOCUM: Okay. Now, I want to make sure that we're clear about the idea of being innocent. You heard what I talked to Mr. Ruiz about. Right?

MS. SMITH: Yeah.

MR. SLOCUM: And so -- but I want to make sure

that we're good because you're gonna get instructions on the law, but they're these common sense ideas about well, innocent, and so I want to make sure that you're okay with the idea that we're not here to determine innocence, right? Is that something that's okay for you or would you have difficulty with that?

2.2

MS. SMITH: I think that's where I struggle, I think. So we -- I've been with him almost 20 years, he has been a police officer for almost 15 years, and I find it fascinating, but I think the struggle is in my mind, if you're innocent that means you did not commit a crime.

THE COURT: Let me just stop because I don't want to belabor the point. The jury verdict form is going to ask you to check one of two boxes, guilty or not guilty. The word innocent will not appear in the jury verdict form. So as you think about the answers, the question is whether the State has proven guilt beyond a reasonable doubt, or whether the State has not proven guilt beyond a reasonable doubt.

MR. SLOCUM: And Ms. Smith, what are your feelings about that?

MS. SMITH: I mean, I guess -- I guess what's the difference in innocent versus?

THE COURT: We're not gonna get into hypotheticals without jury instructions. So if you'll redirect the question.

MR. SLOCUM: Oh, absolutely, your Honor.

Right. The concern is are you gonna be able to just do what the judge has asked you to do or is there gonna be something else in your mind, in your head that isn't part of the trial but that's gonna impede your ability to make that determination? And whether or not it would be that I have to go home at the end of the week and tell my husband we found him not guilty, is that gonna be something that's gonna be a difficulty for you, if that, in fact, is the case?

MS. SMITH: So telling him —— I guess telling my husband if a person is guilty or not guilty does not affect me. But I do struggle with this idea of —— I feel more influenced by my previous knowledge, no knowledge of this case or this at home, I don't watch the news, so —— I guess I don't know how else to say it.

Like I —— I think we're influenced by people around us, but people we're married to, their jobs, if you would ask me this 16 years ago I would been, like, oh, I would be happy to serve, I'd be happy to have a clear mind and everything. But after many years and many discussions

and many instances, I don't have the same mentality that I did prior to being with somebody in law enforcement.

MR. SLOCUM: Okay. And so that's along the lines of what I was asking Mr. Ruiz. Can you put that to the side? Can you say hey, I'm going to now consider only what's here, not my previous years of experience having talked to my husband about his work and being informed in a way such that — and I would have to direct the question back to the idea if you were sitting where Mr. Goad is, would you want someone with your mental state sitting as a juror?

MS. SMITH: No.

MR. SLOCUM: And why not?

MS. SMITH: Because I would want people who come into it a little -- I guess I feel guilt in saying this, I mean, I heard everybody said that they're excited to be here, they think it's our duty, and I a hundred percent agree it's our foundation, but I just -- I don't know if I can come at it -- with a blank slate.

MR. SLOCUM: That's what we're asking you to do. And it's okay if you look inside yourself and say

MR. STEGE: Your Honor, can we pose an

objection?

or do you object for a side bar?

MR. STEGE: I object for a side bar.

THE COURT: Ladies and Gentlemen, stand and shake it out for just a moment, please, while I approach

THE COURT: Do you have a stipulation to offer

7 counsel.

(Short side bar not reported.)

THE COURT Counsel, you may continue.

MR. SLOCUM: Thank you, your Honor. So before we took the break, Ms. Smith, you were talking about the fact that you have now been with your husband for 20 years you said?

MS. SMITH: Uh-hum.

MR. SLOCUM: And of that, 15 of them he's been a law enforcement officer.

MS. SMITH: Yes, sir.

MR. SLOCUM: And during that time you've had many, many discussions with him about his work and he's informed you about various things relating to his work. Correct?

MS. SMITH: That is correct.

MR. SLOCUM: And before we took the break you said you -- you had some concerns you wouldn't want to

have somebody in your mind set if you were sitting where Mr. Goad is sitting. Right?

MS. SMITH: That's correct.

MR. SLOCUM: And then I was asking you to explore with us what your -- what your thoughts are with regard to that, and whether or not there are things that -- that you know or that -- that you've been informed by such that you can't -- you can't at this point set those to the side because they're too in-depth in your thinking. Is that fair to say?

MS. SMITH: That's fair to say.

MR. SLOCUM: Okay. And you have -- so you have a belief that you're not going to set those to the side, therefore, you wouldn't want to be -- to be sitting where Mr. Goad is sitting and somebody as a juror of your mind set.

MS. SMITH: That's correct.

MR. SLOCUM: Your Honor, I would --

THE COURT:

MR. STEGE: I would.

THE COURT: There was a series of leading questions there, and rather than have you say yes or no, I want you to talk for just a moment about whether you can be fair observing this evidence in this case, or

whether you're going to be unfair because of whatever opinion you bring to this court, just talk for a couple minutes, please.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

MS. SMITH: I mean, I would like to think that I could be fair. Like I said, I teach. I hope in my classroom I'm fair when it comes to upholding classroom rules and stuff like that. I am concerned about the nature of the case. I -- I thought I could state that I don't watch the news. It's not to be aware of ongoings. Don't watch it because it -- I get anxiety from it. Same with discussing with my husband stuff that happens at work, there's certain things, things that I can't -um, I struggle with violence. I've never had any violence against me or anything like that, but in his job he -- but I've gone out when he's been on SWAT, so he's gone out on calls where I don't know if he'll come home. He's a street deputy so he's been on patrol for ten years now. And so I also struggle with that, like, content. That does haven't to do with, like, just and fair in the court system, but I just in all honesty, you know, thinking about my schedule, whatever, I can put that aside I can push out all the stuff that's going on, I just don't know if I can handle a violent murder case, and then putting aside -- I don't know if I can be doing any of that.

So when my husband has to testify for cases that he's on, he -- he's a good person. Not all cops are good people, not all teachers are good people, that's life. And sometimes he'll say, like, their case, you know, they plead out or it was dropped or whatever. And he's not -- he might be a little upset if he feels like he did a good job, but sometimes we discuss the loopholes, I guess, of the court system.

THE COURT: Mr. Stege, what's the State's position on the Defense motion?

MR. STEGE: It should be denied. We want a fair cross-section of this community. The idea that because you're married to a police officer you have to justify anything to them, one, I think it's a false narrative, right, that police just believe everyone's guilty. But nothing in this -- Ms. Smith's statements is saying that she will not be fair to the Defendant. And I think the question of would you want someone like you sitting, it's more -- no defendant wants a police officer's husband or wife judging them --

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. STEGE: -- but that's nothing she says disqualifies her from being on this jury.

THE COURT: Thank you. As a matter of law, counsel, we will all agree there's no automatic disqualification because of any occupation or relationship with a romantic partner's occupation. And I am listening to and distinguishing two spouses of law enforcement, and there is not a motion to excuse one for cause, there's a motion to excuse the other. And grounded in the responses given, I am thanking and excusing Ms. Katie Smith. You're free to leave the courtroom. Thank you.

Ms. Clerk?

COURT CLERK: Steven Rayner.

MR. RAYNER: Here.

THE COURT: Mr. Slocum, if you'll begin -well, I know we just all stood at side bar but, counsel,
I'd like to visit with you again just about the schedule
because we're almost past our lunch hour.

Ladies and Gentlemen, just stand for a moment, please. Let me explain to you what a bench conference is. I don't want to rush counsel. But when counsel's finished I can send half the courtroom home so I keep holding onto you for a little while longer. So counsel, will you see me at side bar, please?

And just be at ease, and stretch.

(Side bar not reported.)

THE COURT: Ladies and Gentlemen, during this lunch recess, please do not discuss this case amongst yourselves. Please do not form or express any opinion about this matter until it's been submitted to you.

Those of you who are not in the jury box will be required to return in the event that your service is necessary.

We will return at exactly 2:00, which is one hour and ten minutes. Please remember for those in the jury box to sit where you currently sit upon your return. There will be more instructions after the jury is seated. I'll just say that counsel are instructed to avoid you, not because they're rude, because we just have to manage the information. No one can even say hello to you so please don't take it personally.

We'll stand as our jury panel exits the courtroom.

(Jury panel leaves courtroom for lunch break.)

THE COURT: There was a prospective juror by the name of Amber Choate. No, no, Amber Choate or Megan Coates. Where's Ms. Law Clerk?

MS. LAW CLERK: Yes, Judge.

THE COURT: What was the name?

Τ

MS. LAW CLERK: Amber Choate.

THE COURT: Choate, Amber Choate. She's taking her mother to Minnesota on Wednesday night. She has a 13-month-old who breast-feeds, and she's a stay-at-home mother. She called -- her mother called and said she will not be returning for the afternoon session. She is not in the box, but her mother reports that she had -- that she has mental health -- was what the word?

MS. LAW CLERK: She was disassociating.

THE COURT: Disassociating. There was a message that she left, and then the clerk called her back. I'm inclined not to send the sheriffs out with handcuffs. I just want you to know.

MR. SLOCUM: I thank you for letting us know, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Do we have everybody here? Let's find out. And please be seated as you arrive.

To the Defense, as you continue your supplemental voir dire examination, please focus on number 27, Mr. Steven Rayner, who is new to the panel.

MR. SLOCUM: Thank you very much, your Honor.
Mr. Rayner?

MR. RAYNER: Yes.

2

MR. SLOCUM: How are you, sir?

3

MR. RAYNER: Doing well. How are you?

4

MR. SLOCUM: Good. Thank you. So this

5

morning the judge had asked a series of questions, and had asked everyone to -- to keep the questions in mind

6 7

for themselves. And I can -- I can ask you directly

ρ

because we have the jury questionnaires you had

9

indicated that you had a reason that you could not

10

serve; is that correct?

11

serve, that I just didn't want to serve. I did this

13

about 12 years ago, and my life's pretty busy, so I

14

really didn't want to serve. But I'll be honest. The

MR. RAYNER: No, not a reason I could not

15

judge did a very good job this morning of kind of changing my opinion because although it would be easier

16 17

for me not to serve and go on with my life, I can see

18

the importance of serving, so I could go either way.

19

And if you want me to go ahead and answer those questions, and give you a quick synopsis of things

2021

and you guys could make your decision I'll be happy to

22

MR. SLOCUM: Thank you very much. We would

2324

appreciate it.

do that.

MR. RAYNER: Um, like I said, I served on a criminal case about 12 years ago, it was a short case, it was heard, the guy was convicted. I was in the United States Marine Corps for four years. I served my time there as an aviation ground support equipment mechanic. Got out, was an mechanic, then I became a preacher for a few years, or for a while.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

And any reasons why I shouldn't serve? Well, I would really like to say yes, there's lot of them, but the only one that I can think of is, realistically, one of the ladies was asked about does money make a difference in the process of law. And I think we work within the system that we've got right now, and so we work with that. But anyone who can say that someone able to hire a crack team of legal defenses can come out better or get more loopholes in the processes than someone who can not, to me they're fooling themselves. I think money -- and it's bad because justice should be won, it really should be won. But when you see as much where people are getting away, and getting off with things because they were able to hire a good team of lawyers and you're going they're guilty, but they get away with it, for a while anyway, I can't say that I don't believe that money has no influence on it.

Do I believe that both teams, irregardless of whether they were hired or they're hired by the public defense or a crack pot team from some big lawyer company? They're both going to do the best job that they can.

So I've got no bias in that, but I will say that I will follow the evidence wherever it goes. And if it's at the end of the day, my kids kind of like me for this, and then they didn't because even though they were kids, my kids, if they were wrong I would say you're wrong. If it was my wife and my mother—in—law, I have to look at it, go wait a minute, you were wrong for that and I don't care if you're my wife or I don't care that you're my mom, this is right and this is wrong. So for me, even though it's disheartening to me that I believe money is involved in the system, for me, I'm a black and white guy.

If the evidence points to innocent or not guilty, I will vote not guilty. If the evidence clearly points to guilty, I will vote guilty. And I believe the State has the burden of proof. He should not have to prove his innocence, they have to prove his guilt.

MR. SLOCUM: Okay. Thank you very much for that answer. I wanted to explore with you what you

meant when you said there are loopholes and a crack attorney would find a loophole, is that kind of what I heard you to say?

MR. RAYNER: Well, I believe that when you can hire a legal team, they go in and they find loopholes to get around to circumvent the legal system. And I -- I mean, okay, O.J. Simpson, first trial, that was bad. I mean, you've got trial after trial after trial that some people get off because they hired a good team of lawyers. So like I said, I believe that that's a flaw in our system I wish we could take money completely out of it.

MR. SLOCUM: Okay. When you're talking about taking money out of it how would that operate in your mind?

MR. RAYNER: Well, since how we are a free enterprise system I don't think we're ever going to be able to do it. But I would believe that all attorneys that were going to represent people in court should be public attorneys, not private attorneys to where you could have the even playing field. That would be the only way I could see it. I mean there may be other ways, but I would think that would be the most fair way to where whenever someone with a big name and a big

reputation could come in to court and have the legal system treat them exactly the same as they would when someone who isn't known that has no name at all, and I just think it's biased as times.

MR. SLOCUM: And I want to make sure I understand your answer. This is an opinion you have about the legal system, but you don't personally hold that view; is that correct?

MR. RAYNER: Personally hold which view?

MR. SLOCUM: This idea that well -- so as I understood what you were talking about, you have the sense that money plays a role because there's certain attorneys who find loopholes. But your idea as well for you, personally, you don't care whether or not the attorney is known to you or -- or somebody that -- that you have never heard of.

MR. RAYNER: Oh, I personally don't care at all. For me I care about what's true and what's not true. I could care less about money or anything like that, but I just think that you'd have a better system if you could figure out a way to make it more fair and balanced irregardless of who the person was.

MR. SLOCUM: Okay.

MR. RAYNER: Whether it was Elvis Presley or

again.

whether it's the gentleman here, it shouldn't make a difference who you are in the eyes of the legal system as to what type of defense that you see.

MR. SLOCUM: But you understand that insofar as if you're selected as a juror you're going to be the eyes of the system.

MR. RAYNER: Correct.

MR. SLOCUM: So it's going to be people like you who are going to have to decide the case. Right?

MR. RAYNER: I've done it before and I'd do it

MR. SLOCUM: And it's not a problem for you that somewhere out in the legal system there are crack attorneys who are finding loopholes, your job in this case is gonna be to decide whether or not Mr. Goad is guilty or not guilty.

MR. RAYNER: Correct.

MR. SLOCUM: And you're comfortable with that.

MR. RAYNER: Yes.

MR. SLOCUM: And you won't be thinking about the legal system as a whole and the influence that money may have in it.

MR. RAYNER: Well, that would have no influence in this case for me.

MR. SLOCUM: Okay. Let me ask you this. You spoke to the fact that you have no problem telling your wife or your mother-in-law you're wrong. Did I understand that correct?

MR. RAYNER: Well, as a son and a husband sometimes you get stuck in the middle.

MR. SLOCUM: Okay. When you've made up your mind hey, you're wrong, will you listen if they give you some other explanation or some other information maybe you didn't know before you made your decision?

MR. RAYNER: Sure. Evidence will always or what they've got to say can sway what my opinion is based upon the facts that they tell me.

MR. SLOCUM: And if the judge instructs you don't make up your mind about the case until you've heard all of the -- all of the evidence, would you be able to follow that?

MR. RAYNER: Yes, because you can't make a final decision on it until you've heard all the evidence, even the Bible says you can't make a --

THE COURT: Hold on, hold on, hold on.

MR. SLOCUM: Sorry.

THE COURT: Were you finished?

MR. RAYNER: I was just gonna say even the

Bible says that one side seems right till the other side is heard. You've got to be able to hear both sides fully before you can make a sound judgment.

2.0

MR. SLOCUM: Thank you very much for that. So if the -- if the judge instructs you that the State has the burden, that the Defense doesn't have any burden at all, will you hold the Defense to a burden of trying to present something or some other side to the story before making your decision?

MR. RAYNER: I'm sorry, I didn't follow you completely.

MR. SLOCUM: I want to make sure that we're very clear on this point. You spoke to the fact that in the Bible it seems like one side is right until you've heard from the other side. And what I wanted to make sure that you were okay with is this idea that the State has a burden in the case. Right? The Defense doesn't have any burden at all. They don't have an obligation to convince you of anything.

MR. RAYNER: Correct.

MR. SLOCUM: Okay. So my concern when you spoke about what the Bible said was that perhaps you would hold the Defense to some type of burden to give you a side of the story.

MR. RAYNER: No. He is -- he is innocent until he is proven guilty. And I would say the -- the burden is not on him at all. It's upon the State to prove that he is guilty. He does not need to prove that he is innocent.

MR. SLOCUM: Okay. Would you have a problem if I rephrased what you said as he's -- he's not guilty unless he is proven guilty? Would you have -- well, it would be better --

MR. RAYNER: Let me rephrase it, maybe it will clear it up for you. As he sits right there right now, he's innocent until or unless he is proven guilty in the jury.

MR. SLOCUM: And the only reason I wanted to make sure we are clear about this is the idea that until presumes that it's gonna happen, would you wait for it to happen?

MR. RAYNER: We don't know that. We --

MR. SLOCUM: What's that?

MR. RAYNER: We don't know whether he's going to be found guilty or found innocent or not guilty until all the evidence has been handed out.

MR. SLOCUM: Okay. Along this vein following up on what the judge talked to you about that -- that

Mr. Goad has no obligation to -- to talk to the jury, 1 would you -- would be able to accept that, or would you 2 be thinking the whole time well, an innocent man -- and 3 again, that's the false word, but a innocent man --4 MR. RAYNER: Not at all. 5 MR. SLOCUM: -- would speak --

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. RAYNER: Not a problem. The legal system gives us the right to remain silent, and choosing that right is your choice. If you want to do that, fine. I would not hold him guilty at all because he remains silent to make the State prove their case.

Now, for me, if I am innocent of something, I have a hard time just sitting back and not saying anything, but that's my choice. But there again, his is different and he doesn't have to prove his innocence.

MR. SLOCUM: Okay. Thank you very much. And with respect to any of the other questions that the judge imposed earlier, you're okay with where we sit. You haven't been affected by a crime in such a way that it would impact you --

MR. RAYNER: No --

MR. SLOCUM: -- in this case?

MR. RAYNER: -- I have not. The only other thing I can think of is I'm not married to a cop. I'm not married to a cop so we can get that one out of the way.

My son-in-law's sister is married to a cop, but I had to actually when I was at lunch thinking that this would come up because it was so predominant, I had to actually set and think of his name. I've never been to his house, he's never been over to mine, we've been to a couple things together, family things, but if we was to bump into each other on the road, there's a good chance we wouldn't even recognize each other.

MR. SLOCUM: Okay. And if I understood what you were saying is that the judge and how he asked his questions changed your whole view of your jury experience.

MR. RAYNER: Well, you know, probably like all of us here, we've got a life outside of here. And I'm pretty busy. I've got stuff I need to do.

But it's also important that this man gets as fair of a trial as he can, and because of that, you know, I've had to go and say okay, even though I'm busy and I've got a life, everybody else here does also, I think if I can help him get as fair a trial as possible by being just honest and everything, then it's worth setting my life a little bit to the side during that

time.

MR. SLOCUM: And during the week that we expect to be here for trial, whatever your other obligations are would not impact your ability to listen to the evidence here?

 $$\operatorname{MR}.$$ RAYNER: Correct. My work is already aware of that.

MR. SLOCUM: So no concerns that you have about being able to serve.

MR. RAYNER: No. No --

MR. SLOCUM: Well, you say that somewhat hesitantly so I'm --

MR. RAYNER: You want to move on with life, you know, we're all busy, but like I said, the only concern is I've got stuff to do, but everybody here does. Outside of that, no. I'm just a straight forward quy, black and white.

MR. SLOCUM: I'm sorry, you're just a straight forward guy what?

MR. RAYNER: I'm just a straight forward guy, black and white type, a simple guy.

MR. SLOCUM: But black and white only at the end; is that right?

MR. RAYNER: Yeah. I mean, you know, I'm --

I'm just a person that tries to live a life in a peaceful life. I'm one of those people that you don't known that is around.

MR. SLOCUM: You don't even what? I'm sorry.

MR. RAYNER: I'm one of those people that you

don't even know is around. I try to just live a quiet

and peaceful life.

MR. SLOCUM: Well, that's — I wanted to make sure, and you remember when I first started asking questions one of the important things is your ability to voice your opinion. And what I'm hearing you say is that you may be quiet, but that when the time comes, you can speak your mind in terms of black and white; is that right?

MR. RAYNER: I was a United States Marine. I know how to speak my mind. I've served on a jury before. I know how to speak my mind.

MR. SLOCUM: Okay. Thank you very much.

Ms. Genz? Hi. You spoke earlier just briefly that you said you're a graduate nurse; is that right?

MS. GENZ: Uh-hum.

MR. SLOCUM: Okay. What does ha mean?

MS. GENZ: I am in a graduate program. I just got out of college three weeks ago.

MR. SLOCUM: Okay. So you're in a graduate nursing program?

MS. GENZ: Uh-hum.

MR. SLOCUM: And as such are you working or are you a student?

MS. GENZ: I am working under -- I'm working, yes.

MR. SLOCUM: Okay. And the reason I'm asking, I want to make sure it was gonna be okay for this — for this week if you need to be at work or if that's no issue for you, you can take that time off.

MS. GENZ: Uh-hum. I can take it off.

MR. SLOCUM: Okay. And when you're serving on the jury if you're selected, you won't be thinking the whole time hey, I'm missing these hours that I'm supposed to have where not working on something or anything like that?

MS. GENZ: No.

MR. SLOCUM: Ms. Clark?

MS. CLARK: Yes.

MR. SLOCUM: If I understood earlier, you made the statement that the system is fair, pertaining to the criminal justice system.

MS. CLARK: Yes.

MR. SLOCUM: In the Army?

24

MR. GRAY: Army, yeah. 1 MR. SLOCUM: What did you do in the Army? 2 MR. GRAY: Mechanic supply room, mechanic area 3 4 supply. MR. SLOCUM: How long were you in the service? 5 MR. GRAY: Four years active duty. 6 MR. SLOCUM: Okay. You made a statement 7 earlier because I know your work now is as a warehouse 8 9 manager? MR. GRAY: (Nods head.) 10 MR. SLOCUM: And you had said that you like to 11 hear both sides before you come to a decision. So along 12 the lines of the discussion that I had with Mr. Rayner I 13 wanted to make sure that it is okay for you if the 14 system is such that you may only here from the State 15 because it's their burden, but the Defense doesn't have 16 a burden. Is that concept okay for you or --17 MR. GRAY: Yes. 18 MR. SLOCUM: -- do you have a problem with 19 20 that?

MR. GRAY: Yes.

21

22

23

24

MR. SLOCUM: And would you at the and think well, I didn't get to hear the Defense's side, so to speak, and so therefore he must be guilty.

MR. GRAY: No. I'd have to see what the evidence says. If the evidence is clear one way or another it would be a clear signal. If it's split, I probably would ask why -- you know, what the motivation was.

MR. SLOCUM: I'm sorry I didn't catch the last part.

MR. GRAY: At least to hear what the other side what happened, why, so on and so forth, if it was very unclear.

MR. SLOCUM: Okay. Well, and you understand, for example, the defense attorney may ask questions of the State's witnesses, right? That may be evidence that you can hear. But I just wanted to make sure that you're okay with this idea that hey, the Defense doesn't have an obligation, they don't have to prove anything.

MR. GRAY: Absolutely.

MR. SLOCUM: And that's the way our system is set up.

MR. GRAY: Uh-hum.

MR. SLOCUM: And that -- that concept for you is okay. You can live with that.

MR. GRAY: Yes.

MR. SLOCUM: And you would not hold it against

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Mr. Goad.

MR. GRAY: No.

MR. SLOCUM: Thank you. Mr. Cunningham. You had -- you had indicated earlier that you know Mr. Stege through your daughter's softball league; is that right?

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Correct.

MR. SLOCUM: And you see him every -- couple times a week, I think you said.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Couple times a week.

MR. SLOCUM: And do you have personal-type conversations with him?

MR. CUNNINGHAM: No, I do not. Hello, how are you doing? Hi, what's going on.

MR. SLOCUM: But you're present, but nothing substantive.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Right.

MR. SLOCUM: Okay. There's not a connection that you have to Mr. Stege such that Mr. Goad should be concerned about your relationship with him?

MR. CUNNINGHAM: No.

MR. SLOCUM: And if you were sitting where Mr. Goad is sitting, your relationship to - to Mr. Stege would not be something that should trouble him?

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Not at all.

MR. SLOCUM: You also spoke, as I understood it, that your grandmother was murdered?

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Yeah.

MR. SLOCUM: But that happened, I think you said when you were five?

MR. CUNNINGHAM: I was five, about five years old.

MR. SLOCUM: But the judge asked whether or not this is kind of a family story, it's always present that --

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Absolutely.

MR. SLOCUM: — this has happened. Do you think that hearing about the facts in this case, and Mr. Stege already gave you kind of a nutshell idea, do you think hearing those facts is going to bring back memories of that or anything like that?

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Has nothing to do with that.

MR. SLOCUM: And you certainly wouldn't hold whatever happened in that case against Mr. Goad.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Two different things. I didn't even know about this, so.

MR. SLOCUM: True. Although you might be surprised that sometimes people have ideas before they've heard anything and that's what we're trying to

figure out that they've already made up their mind even though they haven't heard anything.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Yeah, I would say absolutely not.

MR. SLOCUM: And as far as your feeling -- one thing that was not asked, at least if it was asked I didn't -- I didn't hear the answer. Was there a prosecution in that case?

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Yes.

MR. SLOCUM: And in your estimation were you satisfied with that prosecution?

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Was not.

MR. SLOCUM: Okay. And the fact that you were not satisfied with that prosecution, does that affect your view in any way of this case?

MR. CUNNINGHAM: No.

MR. SLOCUM: Or about the criminal justice system generally?

MR. CUNNINGHAM: No, sir.

MR. SLOCUM: You can set that situation aside and be able to just focus on things here.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Yes, sir.

MR. SLOCUM: And you do not have the feeling that your role as a juror now is to correct some wrong

that happened 40 years ago.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Absolutely not.

MR. SLOCUM: Good. You'd agree that would not be appropriate.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: I agree that would not be appropriate.

MS. SLOCUM: Ms. Roberts? Hello.

MS. ROBERTS: Hi.

MR. SLOCUM: You had -- you had indicated that you were at Hug High School when the shooting occurred?

MS. ROBERTS: Yes, it was outside of my classroom.

MR. SLOCUM: And you said you were not directly involved, it happened outside the classroom but you could hear everything that was going on?

MS. ROBERTS: We heard commotion and kids screaming, and then we heard gunfire. And then we came immediately outside and we saw what happened and then we immediately started ushering kids inside.

MR. SLOCUM: That was obviously a pretty emotional experience. Do you think that hearing about the facts in this case is going to bring back those kind of memories of what happened?

MS. ROBERTS: Most likely not. We were able

2.1

to offer counseling if we wanted. I didn't offer or opt for that. But as I said earlier, as a teacher things that involve children and students tend to be more -- more close to me than things that occur with people outside of high school.

MR. SLOCUM: So for you you could just evaluate the facts that are gonna be offered in this case and not be thinking emotionally about the event that already took place in your high school.

MS. ROBERTS: Correct.

MR. SLOCUM: And you said most likely not, but are you -- are you satisfied that those facts are those facts and that they don't play a role in this case?

MS. ROBERTS: Correct.

MR. SLOCUM: And that you'd be able to decide this case based on the facts that are admitted here at trial.

MS. ROBERTS: Correct.

MR. SLOCUM: Mr. Hernandez-Guillen?

MR. HERNANDEZ-GUILLEN: Yes.

MR. SLOCUM: Am I saying that correct?

MR. HERNANDEZ-GUILLEN: Yep.

MR. SLOCUM: You had indicated that you were present when the shooting in Las Vegas occurred; is that

right?

MR. HERNANDEZ-GUILLEN: Yes, I was.

MR. SLOCUM: And you said that you were contacted by -- by someone afterwards, but it was with regard to whether or not you needed counseling or help of some sort?

MR. HERNANDEZ-GUILLEN: Correct.

MR. SLOCUM: And at that time you elected you didn't need counseling.

MR. HERNANDEZ-GUILLEN: Correct.

MR. SLOCUM: That was obviously a pretty emotional situation as well.

MR. HERNANDEZ-GUILLEN: It was.

MR. SLOCUM: Do you have concerns that hearing the facts in this case are going to bring back the memories and the experience in your mind of what happened in Las Vegas?

MR. HERNANDEZ-GUILLEN: No concerns.

MR. SLOCUM: You'd agree as I was speaking earlier with Ms. Roberts that that wouldn't be appropriate. Right?

MR. HERNANDEZ-GUILLEN: Right.

MR. SLOCUM: And that's that internal dialogue that happened inside. You seem pretty certain, but it's

1	an internal dialogue that no, I know that that's
2	different, because we're human beings
3	MR. HERNANDEZ-GUILLEN: Yeah.
4	MR. SLOCUM: we sometimes have emotional
5	reactions. But this case should be decided based on the
6	facts in this case.
7	MR. HERNANDEZ-GUILLEN: Agreed.
8	MR. SLOCUM: Mr. Hunter?
9	MR. HUNTER: Yes, sir.
10	MR. SLOCUM: You served in the Army.
11	MR. HUNTER: Yes, sir.
12	MR. SLOCUM: Were you a 55 Series?
13	MR. HUNTER: No, sir.
14	MR. SLOCUM: Okay. What was your MOS?
15	MR. HUNTER: I had three. 63 Yankee, 63
16	Bravo, and 915 Alpha.
17	MR. SLOCUM: So you were not involved in the
18	ammunition then during the time that you were serving?
19	Ammunition
20	MR. HUNTER: Right.
21	MR. SLOCUM: activity? Because you're
22	employed now at Sierra Army Depot; is that correct?
23	MR. HUNTER: Correct. It's not a munitions

depot.

MR. SLOCUM: Okay.

MR. HUNTER: And the only time I dealt with ammunition was in a deployed environment or at the range.

MR. SLOCUM: Okay.

MR. HUNTER: I was not a professional ordinance soldier if that's what you're asking. As far as bullets I was in ordinance as my field.

MR. SLOCUM: Okay. But now your work is a little bit different from what you did in the Army or is it along the same lines?

MR. HUNTER: It's fundamentally the same.

MR. SLOCUM: And Mr. Kanute?

MR. KANUTE: Yes.

MR. SLOCUM: You mentioned you do work with bankruptcy but on the creditor side of things; is that right?

MR. KANUTE: Correct.

MR. SLOCUM: Okay. And was the issue as far as bankruptcy petition preparers and so on, had the law already changed when you started doing this work?

MR. KANUTE: It had.

MR. SLOCUM: So you didn't observe that change.

MR. KANUTE: That was -- yeah, a 2005 change I think you're talking about.

MR. SLOCUM: I just wanted to make sure we're on the same page.

MR. KANUTE: Correct.

MR. SLOCUM: But your work, as I understood it, doesn't involve necessarily participating in court although you sometimes go to court.

MR. KANUTE: I am regularly in bankruptcy court. I don't do jury work was the question that was asked.

MR. SLOCUM: Okay.

MR. KANUTE: I rarely have a jury trial.

MR. SLOCUM: That's -- I wanted to make sure we're on the same page. So you do appear in court, however, it's bankruptcy court, you're before a judge, and there's no jury involved.

MR. KANUTE: That's generally the case. I am in state court and federal court periodically, too, for, again, creditor's rights several on behalf of banks.

MR. SLOCUM: Now, you had earlier indicated, I believe, to Mr. Stege that you do work with foster children?

MR. KANUTE: So my wife and I we're foster

parents for roughly four years, we have adopted four girls through the foster care system. I also was on the Washoe CASA Foundation Board for three years. I just finished my third year term in April.

MR. SLOCUM: Okay. And so for those people, you adopt out of a system. And then you can actually adopt them, you don't return them to their families or anything like that.

MR. KANUTE: Correct. Our girls had their

--the parents rights were terminated on all four girls
separately and we were adoptive placement for all four.

MR. SLOCUM: And you -- you were earlier asked about a pending lawsuit that you have, but it's in a different department. Right?

MR. KANUTE: Correct. It's in front of Judge Freeman.

MR. SLOCUM: And you obviously realize there's a big difference between that lawsuit and what you'd be called upon to do here.

MR. KANUTE: I do.

MR. SLOCUM: Mr. Stege asked you about an idea of whether or not an attorney or a lawyer should be on a jury --

MR. KANUTE: Correct.

MR. SLOCUM: -- is that right? And what are your thoughts about that?

2.4

MR. KANUTE: I personally don't -- I mean, I don't think there's anything wrong with an attorney being on a jury. I think in some ways it can be helpful, in particular for other members of the jury if they -- but I also understand the problem with that is lawyers answering legal questions in the jury room separate and outside of the communications with private counsel and directions from the judge. So that's -- that's why a lot of people don't like lawyers on juries.

MR. SLOCUM: Right. So you raised a concern that you are supposed to decide the cases as a juror based on the instructions that are given.

MR. KANUTE: Right.

MR. SLOCUM: And there would be a concern that if a lawyer might think I know of a different rule or this may be a little bit different from what the judge instructed. But you're gonna be told you have to follow the law. And it is not just the law but the law as given by the judge. So, with that in mind would you be able to set aside your — what you may say is what I know about the law to serve as a juror?

MR. KANUTE: I would have taken multiple oaths

both as a lawyer and as a juror to do that.

MR. SLOCUM: And you don't have any concerns that you couldn't do that.

MR. KANUTE: No.

MR. SLOCUM: If I could just have the Court's indulgence, your Honor.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. SLOCUM: Okay. So this is now the end really. What I want to make sure is that if there's anything that any one of you sitting here would think I really want to say something or there is something important that these attorneys should know, but nobody asked me the right question. But if they had asked me this I really think it's important that they would know that. Is there anybody who has that feeling?

Ms. Lopez, please.

MS. LOPEZ: I was going back and forth on this, but I feel now that I'm looking more at his face I may have come across he was working as a patient at Rosewood rehabilitation. It's a skilled nursing facility. I am a speech therapist, but I pick up seasonal work and maybe two, three years ago, I don't — I'm starting to recognize his face, but I'm not sure. If I was just following therapy or what type of therapy

it was.

MR. SLOCUM: Okay. I'm sorry. Do you have any specific recollection of working with him or how that process was?

MR. KANUTE: I just can recognize the face.

I'm a pretty good facial recognition. And his last

name, I don't know why I put the face and the last name
together, so but.

MR. SLOCUM: Okay. Is there anything about that particular interaction that you had that influences you one way or another with respect to this case?

MR. KANUTE: Um, no.

MR. SLOCUM: So you can -- you can set to the side whatever it may be that your experience was, and it may come during the trial if you're called on, that's what happened, but you're gonna be able to set that to the side and decide the case just based on the facts here.

MR. KANUTE: Right.

MR. SLOCUM: Is there anybody else?

Mr. Kanute.

MR. KANUTE: Just one thing that I don't think you've asked was whether or not anybody had any knowledge of anybody else working at the Public

Defender's Office? Ms. Bertschy, who's in the back of the courtroom, was on the Washoe CASA Board with me and I don't know whether she'll be here, but she and I got to know each other fairly well the last year and a half on the board. MR. SLOCUM: Okay. Is there anything about that relationship with Ms. Bertschy that would affect your ability to serve as a juror? MR. KANUTE: No.

MR. SLOCUM: Would you have any particular feeling about hey, if I come to a guilty verdict or a not guilty verdict that I would have to talk to Ms. Bertschy about it?

MR. KANUTE: No.

MR. SLOCUM: So that wouldn't impact any of your decisions in this case.

MR. KANUTE: It wouldn't.

MR. SLOCUM: Okay. Is there anyone else?

MR. RUIZ: Mine was more a concern about timing --

THE COURT: That's Mr. Ruiz?

MR. RUIZ: Apologize. Mine was more a concern about the time, I know you said it would be about a week trial? I know that we get -- we're covered for a

certain amount. My only concern would be that amount.

I work. I guess my question would be if I'm not at work

every day I don't --

THE COURT: I believe that our Washoe County
Board of Commissioners has determined that the daily
amount, 40 dollars, is sufficient for your absence.

MR. RUIZ: I know that everybody's got different incomes, but -- and everybody's situation is different. I guess mine would be I just don't rely on a paycheck really.

MR. SLOCUM: Okay.

2.2

MR. RUIZ: I'm more of a day-to-day income.

MR. SLOCUM: Okay. So let me ask you this.

If you were selected for the jury and you're, obviously, gonna have to listen to the evidence, it's important that you pay attention and that you're focused on what's being presented. Would you be thinking this whole week about the money that you weren't earning because you're were sitting here and not about the evidence that was being presented?

 $$\operatorname{MR}.$$ RUIZ: That would be a very big concern of mine, yes, sir.

MR. SLOCUM: Okay. So let me ask you this. If you were sitting where Mr. Goad is sitting, and

20

21

22

23

24

someone with -- with your mind set was sitting as a jury -- as a juror would you feel comfortable? MR. STEGE: Objection to the question related

THE COURT: Sustained. Please don't answer the question.

MR. SLOCUM: Your focus, as I understood it, would be on the money that you're not earning?

MR. RUIZ: He said not to answer the question.

THE COURT: Well, there's now another question.

MR. RUIZ: Oh, I am sorry. Okay. I apologize.

MR. SLOCUM: Certainly. Your focus would be on the money that you're not earning right now. Correct?

MR. RUIZ: Yes.

MR. SLOCUM: And you would not be able to give your full attention to the evidence that's being presented.

THE COURT: Well, I'd rather hear the witness describe rather than being led the witness -- excuse me, just tell us about what concerns you had. Obviously, you are going to be away from work, and 40 dollars a day will not compensate you for your absence. So what does that mean about your participation in trial?

THE DEFENDANT: Obviously like we were saying -- well, okay, I feel bad saying that, but I would definitely be having that thought in the back of my mind. I would just because the situation that we're in right now, my family, and I know everybody's got their own families, you know, we've got mortgages, power bills, same thing as everybody else, we're normal people, but I rely on that daily income.

THE COURT: So I can accept -- I can accept that members of the jury may be grouchy with me.

MR. RUIZ: Oh, no.

THE COURT: No, that's okay. Because it is inconvenient. The question is whether it affects you in your participation. Are you going to hold it against the State, hold it against the Defense, not listen, how is it going to actually affect your participation?

MR. RUIZ: It definitely is gonna be weighing on me. The uncertainty of whether I can pay a certain bill on a certain time that's due a certain day. So without getting into the, you know, I'm gonna miss this bill because I'm not here today at work, because that would be the money that I would normally use to pay that

bill on that day.

3.

THE COURT: All right. Carry on to a different subject if you would, please.

MR. SLOCUM: Well, just following up on this, and you've had time to reflect now with respect to your wife, that's, we're agreeing, not a concern.

MR. RUIZ: Yeah, not a concern.

'MR. SLOCUM: But you do have this other concern.

MR. RUIZ: Yes.

MR. SLOCUM: Is there anybody else who has a concern, I haven't asked the right question, but there's something you want to disclose?

And your Honor, at this point I am going to ask that Mr. Ruiz be thanked and excused.

THE COURT: On what basis?

MR. SLOCUM: That he can't pay adequate attention to what's happening in the courtroom because he's thinking about the bills that he needs to pay and that he can't pay them because he's sitting here in court.

THE COURT: Well, I think your argument that

-- you heard his response differently than I heard my

response. And neither one of us should put words in his

mouth.

2.2

You're going to be worried about your lost income, no doubt about it, but is that going to physically or intellectually, physically cause your mind to be unable to focus on the evidence and strive to fulfill your duty as a juror. That's what I need to know.

MR. RUIZ: Yes, sir, because there is -- I mean, without having to get into too much more personal information. I mean, I know you said that least a line between that and we speak to you guys privately, if that would be the case, there is a little more to it going on if that would be an option. I know you said there's kind of a little thin line where we --

THE COURT: That is not something we would discuss privately.

MR. RUIZ: Okay.

THE COURT: What we discuss privately is usually --

MR. RUIZ: That's fine.

THE COURT: -- sexual assault type things that --

MR. RUIZ: Okay. So I mean, I could give you more information if need be.

THE COURT: I don't -- and I'm not trying to 1 cut you off. I accept the possibility that it's 2 inconvenient, and that a lot of people struggle, the 3 fact I have to make that decision. So I don't want you 4 to feel that you have to disclose what bills you have to 5 pay for anything like that. 6 MR. RUIZ: Okay. 7 THE COURT: You're just saying it's really 8 9 hard. MR. RUIZ: I'm saying there is a possibility 1.0

MR. RUIZ: I'm saying there is a possibility of not making a bill on time, yes.

THE COURT: So your service with me between now and Friday to going to prevent you paying a bill between now and Friday.

MR. RUIZ: Yes because, like I was saying, I work -- I make income every day. If I'm -- for lack of better words I get tips.

THE COURT: All right.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

MR. RUIZ: So if I'm not making those tips, on certain days by certain days I can't make certain payments because I physically make that payment myself.

THE COURT: State wish to be heard?

MR. STEGE: Well, I haven't gotten to examine Mr. Ruiz yet.

THE COURT: And Mr. Rayner.

MR. STEGE: Right.

2.2

THE COURT: Ladies and Gentlemen, I think it's appropriate that -- because we're only going to be focusing on two more panelists -- except for Mr. Ruiz are you passing the panel for cause?

MR. SLOCUM: Yes, your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: It's good for you to have breaks, so let's all stand while everybody except Mr. Rayner and Mr. Ruiz leave the courtroom.

Please remember that admonition not to discuss this case amongst yourselves. Please do not form or express any opinions about this matter until it's submitted to you.

(Jury panel leaves courtroom except Mr. Ruiz & Mr. Rayner.)

THE COURT: All right. So this is the endless tension when members of the community become very frustrated with the Court.

I've caused cardiologists to stay, pilots, plumbers who -- a plumber who told me he couldn't pay for diapers the next day. It is very, very difficult for me to impose upon a member of the community civic duty for 40 dollar a day.

But if we're to ask the question of every member of this panel who's going to suffer financial hardship, I'm losing a majority of them.

So the question is not whether it's hard for Mr. Ruiz, the question is whether he's gonna dig his heels in, be angry, not participate or participate fraudulently, I don't think that of him as I'm observed his participation, I don't think he's that guy.

The second is that there is something so pervasive about his concern that he's not going to listen to any words, he's gonna go the first time the jury does a straw poll in which case it distracts him, I don't think he's that person either by my observation, and on consideration of his words.

So I wanted to make that record without everyone else here. You can further inquire, and if you wish to say more you can, but I'm not going to grant it based upon the record that's before me right now.

MR. SLOCUM: If I may, your Honor. I understand the Court's concern that all of these folks might be -- might be excused. I have passed for cause. We're in a situation in which I multiple times asked is there anybody whose situation is such that they've got concerns that they wouldn't be able to be fair in this

case, and we didn't get any responses from them.

2.2

However, Mr. Ruiz did express his concern not about hey, and you remember the discussion we had about his wife, and you noticed I didn't challenge for cause because his answer was a good one, I respect that and I made concerns that I had. However, at the point at which he's talking about, and we haven't gone into it and we want to delve into his personal life the consequences of paying these bills might be, as the Court is aware, that has — that has an impact in this particular case that — that — you've asked me not to say anything about the facts of the case so —

THE COURT: Right. I feel what you're saying.

MR. SLOCUM: I do very much want the -- the record made that that is an issue in the case that this idea of what happens if I don't pay a bill. And I don't know what impact that might have for -- for Mr. Ruiz --

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. SLOCUM: -- but I've determined that it would.

THE COURT: I got it.

MR. SLOCUM: Thank you.

THE COURT: Mr. Stege, you wish to examine the panelist?

MR. STEGE: You understand that this man's on 1 trial for murder --2 MR. RUIZ: I understand. 3 MR. STEGE: -- right? And you -- your job 4 will probably go on if you miss a week of it. 5 MR. RUIZ: I understand that aspect, yes. And 6 I mean, my only thing would be to say next, like, we've 7 already talked about everyone said, you know, like you 8 said, if I were to say who's gonna suffer financially 9 everyone's going to lift their hand. And I understand 10 11 that as well. MR. STEGE: And it sounds like my observation 12 is you've fully been wanting to say what the 13 circumstance is. Would you like to say, like, what bill 14 is not gonna be paid? 15 MR. RUIZ: So my biggest concern is, again, 16 like now it's just smaller groups I would be paying. 17 MR. STEGE: What bill's not going to be paid? 18 MR. RUIZ: My wife's pregnant in addition, 19 we're expecting. 20 MR. STEGE: Okay. 21 MR. RUIZ: So we've got things to start 22

23

24

thinking about there.

MR. STEGE: Right.

MR. RUIZ: We've got power bill that's coming up, sewer that's come up.

MR. STEGE: Right.

 $$\operatorname{MR.\ RUIZ}$: Car notes that come up, house payments that come up.

MR. STEGE: Right.

MR. RUIZ: And I have some put away for that, but to take a week off -- and I'm sorry, it may sound petty.

MR. STEGE: Right.

MR. RUIZ: but 40 dollars doesn't quite cover the payment.

THE COURT: yeah. There is no doubt -- you don't have to feel sorry about that. This is not employment, it pretty much pays for lunch and your parking. It's not intended to be employment.

MR. RUIZ: Yeah, it is. And sorry.

MR. STEGE: Okay. And so what would you expect to make this week?

MR. RUIZ: It just sounds -- it sounds petty talking about that when we're talking -- we just said it's a trial for -- it does --

MR. STEGE: Right. Constitution, this man's on trial, he needs a jury of his peers, if believed,

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

someone was murdered.

MR. RUIZ: It does, but it's -- I'm sorry. Like the gentlemen behind me goes to court for banks, right?

MR. STEGE: Right.

MR. RUIZ: So ironically if I don't make a certain house payment --

MR. STEGE: Right.

MR. RUIZ: -- I find myself in that situation.

THE COURT: I'm trying to understand how a week of missed employment is going to affect your mortgage. I'm not --

MR. RUIZ: You're okay.

THE COURT: I'm not silent to the inconvenience, but you and your wife live together and share expenses, and she's a full-time law enforcement officer.

MR. RUIZ: She is on leave, but her -- this sounds horrible but her shift differential is now also not there anymore.

THE COURT: So I asked what bills between now and Friday will you not be able to pay? You talked about routine bills of life.

MR. RUIZ: The routine bills of life, yes.

So--

THE COURT: So Mr. Ruiz, let me just --

MR. RUIZ: Yes.

THE COURT: -- call it out directly. Some people come to court hoping that their get-out-of-jury-service free card is i can't afford to be here. And I'm trying to discern whether you really want to serve, or whether this is a legitimate concern of yours.

MR. RUIZ: So like you said, one week cost me for work, I make about -- it just sounds terrible to say. So I make about 160 dollars a day.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. RUIZ: So what is that 530, almost 800 dollars that I don't get a week. And without the 800 dollars, I mean, I -- again, I serve so now there's less people I serve. I'm a server. My paychecks are nothing. I don't get -- I get maybe 30, 40 dollars a paycheck. I'm not asking for you guys to pity me, oh, pity he doesn't get a paycheck, but it does make it so that I have to make money on a daily basis. I have to. I don't get the reassurance of every two weeks I get a check. If I miss a day of work I don't get paid. And I mean, that's -- that's my facts and my daily life.

MR. STEGE: And we're not trying to be insensitive or embarrassing, but I am struck that it — in the big picture it's — it might seem sort of a small concern, but the real question is is it a small concern or is it such a big concern that you're gonna be hearing the facts of this case, and when asked to deliberate or asked by another juror to talk about the evidence, you'll be so worried about the number of days you've missed and the money that —

MR. RUIZ: It honestly is a split to me. Feel like I could, and then there will be a moment where I can sit here and think but this time x amount of things would have already happened in a normal day and I would have almost already made -- it sounds --

MR. STEGE: Certain amount of money.

MR. RUIZ: Certain amount of money that covered, A, gas, B, my insurance, c, you know, vice -- so on and so forth.

MR. STEGE: But your financial situation doesn't sound so precarious that, say, the sewer bill gets paid late, it's going to send you into bankruptcy or you'll lose your house.

MR. RUIZ: No. You know, it sounds -- bankruptcy won't happen.

MR. STEGE: Right.

MR. RUIZ: But there are, you know, an extra 50 dollars for being late here, an extra amount of money that's gonna be late or due because of not paying on time, \$25 here, \$50 here, sadly and unfortunately it sounds petty again. And I'm sorry, you guys, but it adds up and no --

MR. STEGE: Right. Okay. I don't have anything else of this gentleman.

THE COURT: Mr. Rayner, will you come forward please, and just sit in that corner chair. Do you wish to ask any questions of Mr. Rayner?

MR. STEGE: Yes. Mr. Rayner, I've -- the pastor portion of your history, can you tell us about that.

MR. RAYNER: I was a youth pastor on staff at a church for a year, and then I've done, you know, ministry stuff for several years, but.

MR. STEGE: That's all locally?

MR. RAYNER: No, that was I was living back in Phoenix then. And I was -- for about a year I was a volunteer Chaplain for the Truckee Meadows law enforcement.

MR. STEGE: Okay. Should I be concerned that

you might -- I know you served before, but did -- that your sort of -- your faith, did that interfere with your -- any obligations you had in the jury room?

No. My faith would tell us that you'd have to be honest and integrity is utmost.

MR. STEGE: On the question of you've seen here a couple people sort of get there's moment where they say I have to hear both sides of it and it causes a lot of questioning. Right? Do you think you might have said that because you've been in a trial and you understand that even if there's not a defense case there's defense arguments?

MR. RAYNER: Um, I would just any time you'd like to hear both sides of the situation, I mean, that's just — that's, in my opinion, what law is about is figuring out what the truth is and then letting the chips go where they may.

But now I'm not in control what's heard and what's not heard, that's not my responsibility. My responsibility is to take the evidence that I've been given and make the best decision based upon that evidence, whatever that evidence is.

MR. STEGE: And you told us how you've sort of had to play truth finder within your family.

MR. RAYNER: Ever married person does.

MR. STEGE: Yes. Have you been on the

receiving end of that where you've had to be told you're wrong and --

MR. RAYNER: Oh, yeah.

MR. STEGE: -- you've accepted it based on the evidence?

MR. RAYNER: Oh, yes. I've been married 30 years coming up real soon. I've been told that quite a few times.

MR. STEGE: Very good. Nothing further.

THE COURT: Do you pass Mr. Rayner --

MR. STEGE: Yes.

THE COURT: -- for cause?

THE COURT: Mr. Rayner, if you'll step out, please.

(Mr. Rayner leaves the courtroom.)

THE COURT: Your motion to excuse Mr. Ruiz is still before the Court.

MR. SLOCUM: Yeah, your Honor. I understood that you had denied the motion. But I could renew the motion, but I thought if I renewed the motion you would say I already ruled on this why you ruled on the motion, so.

THE COURT: I think I expressed in a moment my inclination I didn't want to fully foreclose it until everyone has been heard.

What's the State's position on Mr. Ruiz?

MR. STEGE: The Court expressed, I think, it's general opinion about such situations.

THE COURT: I'm going to -- hold on. Mr.

Ruiz, I'm going to invite you out because I think your participation is done and I have responsibility to be patient, dignified and courteous from this bench. I strive to be so. You probably felt like you were under attack a little bit because I just have to figure out what's really motivating people. But I appreciate your willingness to share your concerns and if you'll step out of the courtroom I'm going to make a decision here in a moment.

MR. RUIZ: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Thank you.

MR. RUIZ: Thank you.

(Mr. Ruiz leaves the courtroom.)

MR. STEGE: Mr. Ruiz seems awfully entrenched. He may be the exception to the general rule that everyone here suffers financially and otherwise for their service.

THE COURT: I'm having a hard time reading him. It's not as obvious as it typically is when someone is just trying to get out of service.

MR. STEGE: Right.

THE COURT: And I want to be slow in my analysis because it's been a long time since I've been paycheck to paycheck and I don't remember as well as I used to.

MR. STEGE: And having a child on the way, I think that's also --

THE COURT: Right. But I didn't hear anything that was, like, off-the-cliff-type stuff and he's got an income coming into the home through the spouse and talking about five days of, you know, it's gonna be five or six or seven or 800 dollars is going to be financial devastation to him? No. I don't believe he's the person who's going to hold it against either side. He might be mad at me and express that at some point, that's fine.

But the question is whether he's going to be distracted. I don't really see it but I'm willing to give you another say, but if there is an agreement, which I think is where you're going, Mr. Stege, I would accept that.

1	MR. STEGE: It was more giving the Court
2	permission to rule in Mr. Slocum's favor and not an
3	offer of agreement.
4	THE COURT: So does the State object or ==
5	MR. STEGE: Yes, I do object, yeah.
6	THE COURT: Then I'll make a decision.
7	MR. STEGE: Of course, I mean that, that was
8	·
9	THE COURT: Thank you.
10	MR. STEGE: rather
11	THE COURT: No, no problem.
12	MR. STEGE: common speak.
13	THE COURT: From my total observation of Mr.
14	Ruiz's participation, I do not find that he would affect
15	the fairness of this proceeding. And I don't believe
16	that his hardship and inconvenience are undue or
17	extreme. He will not be excluded from cause.
18	Anything else?
19	MR. STEGE: May I have a restroom break?
20	THE COURT: No.
21	MR. STEGE: Okay.
22	THE COURT: Give me just a minute, then rest.
23	I want to send the rest of the community home and then
24	that's going to take me about three minutes.

Deputy, if you can bring everyone in. Deputy, if you'll just have them filter into the spectator gallery just standing anywhere.

DEPUTY COSS: Just hang out back here for now anywhere in the gallery. Come on in.

(Jury panel returns to the courtroom.)

THE COURT: Ladies and Gentlemen, that completes our voir dire. If you were seated in the box and you answered questions, you must return to the courtroom in 20 minutes. But if you were seated to your left and were not answering questions, this concludes your service.

Oh, boy, it's been a long day and I'm going to tell an anecdote. I was on the phone during the lunch hour on one of commercial calls. And I was on hold.

And this voice kept — this recorded voice kept coming back, thank you for your patience. I was screaming in the phone but I'm not patient, I need just someone to talk to me. And I feel maybe that when I say thank you for being here, because I'm not sure how you really feel. But week over week, month over month, year over year I'm inspired by members of our community who appear and offer their service, if necessary. Thank you for being part of this work.

You are not required to return to the courtroom, instead you're relieved of further service today and you may return to your lives. Thank you so much.

Ladies and Gentlemen who returned, please do not discuss this case amongst yourselves. Please do not form or express any opinion about this matter until it's been submitted to you.

Grab what you've left, if you have, because when you return to the courtroom you'll just populate the general seats behind the bar. And with that we will see you at exactly 3:30.

(Jury panel is excused for Peremptory Challenges.)

(Short break.)

THE COURT: Counsel, are you ready to go with your challenges?

MR. STEGE: Yes. Can we clarify the number of alternates, the number of Peremptory Challenges?

THE COURT: You each get eight Peremptory
Challenges, and you will each have one Peremptory
Challenge to alternates so there will be four possible
alternates. You can each strike one.

MR. STEGE: And we are having one alternate

1	for this week, or two?
2	THE COURT: I thought we were having two.
3	MR. STEGE: Okay. Eight plus one, and the
4	ninth challenge can only be used to who will then
5	sitting?
6	THE COURT: One of the last four.
7	MR. STEGE: Very good.
8	THE COURT: And I'll before we go over the
9	alternates after each of you have exercised eight, I'll
10	recite who the 12 deliberating jurors are and then I'll
11	recite the names of the four potential alternates.
12	To the State, your first.
13	MR. STEGE: Mr. Dedomenico, seat 6.
14	THE COURT: To the Defense.
15	MR. SLOCUM: Mr. Kanute, Juror 2.
16	THE COURT: To the State.
17	MR. STEGE: Mr. Steinmann, position 1.
18	THE COURT: Defense.
19	MR. SLOCUM: 25, Mr. Gray.
20	THE COURT: To the State.
21	MR. STEGE: 24, Sargent.
22	THE COURT: Defense.
23	MR. SLOCUM: 27, Rayner.
24	THE COURT: To the State.

1	MR. STEGE: 20, Beccard.
2	THE COURT: Defense.
3	MR. SLOCUM: Court's indulgence, your Honor.
4	15, Baker.
5	THE COURT: You've each exercised four. You
6	each have four more.
7	MR. STEGE: 18, Clark.
8	THE COURT: Defense.
9	MR. SLOCUM: 16, Gibbs.
10	THE COURT: The State.
11	MR. STEGE: 17, Mahrt.
12	THE COURT: Defense.
13	MR. SLOCUM: Cody. 20 or 26.
14	THE COURT: Donna Cody, number 26. The State.
15	MR. STEGE: 9, Ruiz.
16	THE COURT: To the Defense.
17	MR. SLOCUM: Hunter, 13.
18	THE COURT: To the State your last Peremptory
19	Challenge.
20	MR. STEGE: 5, Benson.
21	THE COURT: To the Defense.
22	MR. SLOCUM: Number 28, Nutter.
23	THE COURT: All right, counsel, there are four
24	potential alternates. You may each strike one. The

names of the 29th through 32nd position are Roberts, Cunningham, Dunbar and Farnsworth. To the State.

MR. STEGE: Farnsworth.

THE COURT: To the Defense.

MR. SLOCUM: Cunningham, 30.

THE COURT: All right. As I read my list, counsel, beginning with the first position we have Cherti, Donald, Reid, Lopez, Hernandez-Guillen, Scoville, Wilcher, Morro, Genz, Witman, Cortes and Younie. These are our 12 deliberating jurors. Our two alternates will be Roberts and Dunbar.

Deputy, 30 seconds. Everyone join me in standing for the jury panel. I'll be right back.

(Short pause while jury panel returns to courtroom.)

THE COURT: If your name is called you will serve on the jury. Please follow the deputy's instructions. Where you sit is important.

In the first position Cherti. Donald. Reid.

Lopez. Hernandez-Guillen. Scoville. Wilcher. Morro.

In the first row Genz. Witman. Cortes. Younie.

Roberts. Dunbar.

Ladies and Gentlemen, if your name has not been called, your service is no longer required. Thank

you for participating in our jury selection.

Counsel, if you'll join me, please.

(Jury panel not picked are released.)

THE COURT: Now, members of our new jury if you'll all stand, raise your right hands, face the clerk and be sworn.

COURT CLERK: Please stand and raise your right hand.

(Jury panel sworn in.)

COURT CLERK: Thank you.

THE COURT: Be seated, please. Before the end of the day we will hear opening statements. And the first witness will be tomorrow morning.

I want to provide a few oral instructions, and then give you an idea of what the week looks like. I begin with introductions. As I said, we are a court of record, so every word uttered will be reported and transcribed.

I might, if necessary, interrupt the trial participants to ask them to speak one at a time, or speak louder. The reporters hate it when I say that we will also break regularly to give them a rest, they're heroic and they say Judge, don't break for me, but the fact is after 90 minutes, their fingers start smoking.

And so we'll always have a break no less frequent than 90 minutes.

The court clerk, you've heard her voice a few times, you've seen her, she is always present when the Court is in session. She swears the witnesses, marks exhibits, keeps the evidence, prepares minutes for descriptions the proceeding.

You've seen several members of the Washoe

County Deputy Sheriff's association, they are here to
assist you and to be the Court's filter for you. The
deputies are responsible for courtroom security.

Deputies are nice, nice professionals, but they are
never part of the jury. They are trained to deflect any
personal conversation. They're not going to talk you
about the election, hunting season, or what you're doing
this weekend. They're with you but not part of you. So
please don't misunderstand their deference. They will
speak to you on my behalf.

Our primary deputy is Deputy Coss, and he'll be assisted, it looks like Deputy Peek, and possibly others throughout the week.

At this time I will invite the court clerk to read the charging document. This is a statement of charges. It is not evidence. Ms. Clerk.

COURT CLERK: In the Second Judicial District Court of the State of Nevada, in and for the County of Washoe.

2.1

The State of Nevada, Plaintiff, versus Ralph Edmond Goad, Defendant, Case Number CR19-0999,

Department Number 15.

Indictment: Filed June 12th, 2019. The

Defendant, Ralph Edmond Goad, is accused by the Grand

Jury of Washoe County, State of Nevada, of the

following:

Murder With the Use of a Deadly Weapon, a violation of NRS 200.010, and 200.030, and NRS 193.165, a Category A felony, in the manner following, to wit, that the said Defendant, Ralph Edmond Goad, on or about January 22, 2019, within the County of Washoe, State of Nevada, did willfully, unlawfully, and with malice aforethought, deliberation and predetermination, kill and murder Theodore Gibson, a human being, by means of stabbing the said victim with a deadly weapon, which was a knife, scissors or other sharp-forced instrument, thereby inflicting mortal injuries upon Theodore Gibson, from which he died on or about January 22, 2019.

Or, that the said Defendant, Ralph Edmond Goad, on or about January 22, 2019, within the County of

Washoe, State of Nevada, did willfully and unlawfully kill Theodore Gibson, in the perpetration, or attempted perpetration of a robbery and/or burglary, in that the killing occurred when the Defendant did enter Theodore Gibson's room or apartment at 33 Park Street, Number 205, Reno, with intent to commit larceny, robbery, assault or battery and, thereafter, did take, or attempt to take personal property from the person of Theodore Gibson, or from his presence, against Theodore Gibson's will, by means of force of violence or fear of injury to the person, and in the course of the crime did stab Theodore Gibson with a deadly weapon, which was a knife, scissors, or other sharp-forced instrument, inflicting mortal injuries upon Theodore Gibson, from which he died on or about January 22, 2019.

And to which the defendant -- and to which a plea of not guilty was entered.

Dated this 12th day of June, 2019, Christopher J. Hicks, District Attorney, by Amos Stege, Deputy District Attorney.

THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Clerk. All the information available for your deliberations will be provided in this room when you are all together. So if at any time you discover you might know something about

the events in question, please let me know through

Deputy Coss. Please do not discuss it with your fellow
jurors.

If you discover during the course of this trial that you might know someone who is participating in trial, again, please do not discuss it amongst yourselves but, instead, let me know in writing through Deputy Coss.

No one is allowed to speak to you except the bailiff. And the attorneys and the court staff are instructed not even to say hello to you in the hallways. Again, this is not because they are antisocial, but because they — and I'm included, because we don't want to have any possible suggestion that there has been an interaction or exchange of information, and so we just put a great big wall around you.

In fact, before you go home tonight you'll be given a badge to wear throughout the week to identify yourselves as jurors, so you'll be the loneliest people in a large building full of people. We'll all leave you alone. If at any time anyone does attempt to speak to you, please let me know in writing through Deputy Coss.

You will hear the same admonition at the end of every session. And that is that you shall not form

or express any opinion until the matter is submitted to you.

2.1

These trials are highly orchestrated. And if you're patient, the information the State believes you need to reach a decision will be presented to you.

You should not at any time perform any independent research. You will hear my admonishment at the end of every day about no internet research, no personal investigation, no field trips to any location that you might hear about. Please just trust the information you need will be presented. What you do with that information belongs to you.

My reference to the State's burden is not to suggest the State will or will not meet its burden, it's just the State has prepared a case and will present it, and then you will evaluate the case. But there's no research, investigation or field trips.

As I indicated, the Indictment is a statement of charges, it is not evidence. The allegations it contains Mr. Goad has pled not guilty. He is constitutionally presumed innocent and the State must prove its case beyond a reasonable doubt.

I will provide instructions to you at the end of trial about what reasonable doubt is.

Again, the Defendant is not obligated to provide any information. The Defense is not obligated to call any witnesses. And Mr. Goad can not be forced to testify.

There are different types of evidence. I'll provide some instructions about that at the end of trial. During trial just know that anything that is presented to you is fair for your consideration in whatever way you choose to treat it. You will be the judges of fact; how you observe witnesses, their motivation, demeanor, gesticulations, tones, everything is available to you to determine what the facts are.

The attorneys are advocates. They will provide arguments. They do not provide evidence.

They'll comment upon the evidence at the conclusion of trial. But the form of questions, the content of questions is not evidence. You must not at any time, and you'll receive greater instructions at the end of trial influenced by personal feelings, sympathy and prejudice.

All we ask is for your fair, impartial examination of the facts, intellectual honesty as you apply the principles of law that I give to you, and participation during your deliberation.

There are rules that determine what evidence is presented to you. And we sometimes disagree about those rules. And there could be some disagreements in your presence about those rules. I indicate I will often simply say overruled or sustained. The attorneys know what that means and they'll act accordingly. The attorneys will not provide speaking objections, counsel, I don't want arguments, unnecessary arguments in front of the jury unless I invite them. If I sustain an objection please don't speculate as to what the evidence would have shown. Just accept the Court's ruling and consider the evidence as presented.

2.3

At the end of the day before you go home in addition to the badge you'll be given a note pad. In fact, we're going to give those note pads to you before opening statements. You may take notes throughout trial. It's important for you to balance note taking with your own active observations of trial. Don't be so encumbered by your note taking that you lose the flow. Watch carefully, listen carefully, consider carefully. At no time may you share your notes with other members of the jury until your deliberation so keep them private until the right time.

In the State of Nevada we allow juror

questions, but I discourage juror questions. At no time will you ask a question. From time to time you might say something in writing to me, in which case I'll first show to the lawyers out of your presence and we'll talk about it. My experience is that if you'll just be patient and await the presentation of evidence, your questions will be answered. So if you have a question that just has not been answered, first wait. Second, make a note of it.

As I work as gatekeeper, I occasionally sustaining, occasionally overruling evidentiary questions, please don't infer from me any opinion about this case.

The case belongs to you as the fact finders.

I might sound stern in a decision I make. I might seem impatient when I similarly stop a line of questioning.

It's not because I have an opinion about the case. It's because I have rules I'm trying to enforce.

I know these three attorneys, I've said that earlier. I expect a fair trial, a spirited zealous trial, but I know the attorneys to be professional, competent, and nothing I say in the moment should be used against any of them during your deliberations.

If you're unhappy with me hold it, write a

letter to me or this newspaper or something after the fact, but don't -- don't hold it against the attorneys or their interests or for the State and Mr. Goad.

Quickly summarizing very lengthy script because I want to have the attorneys' opening statements before the end of the day. An opening statement is a summary of what the attorneys expect the evidence to show. It's a road map for you. It's not argument. It just contextualizes what you're about to hear over the next few days.

Because the State has the burden of proof, the State always begins. There is an opportunity for the defense to participate and then State will sometimes get a rebuttal opportunity. It's not because I favor the State, it's because the State has the burden of proof.

Counsel will have direct, cross, redirect, recross, and then we're done. We don't go past any first redirect or recross.

I described the side bar from time to time I will take the attorneys into the empty room and we'll visit outside of your presence. And I don't want you to make any inferences about that, just understand that it's customary. I expect that it's going to happen.

And we'll attempt to keep them to a minimum so that we

efficiently use your time.

We will start tomorrow morning at nine.

Please be in the jury deliberation room at about 8:45.

We'll break roughly about 10:30. We'll break at noon again for an hour and a half. And then we'll break sometime around 3:15 or 3:30 for midafternoon.

We don't always go to the end of the day, sometimes we do. I don't expect that we're going to go past five and I don't expect that we're going to end before 4:00.

After the attorneys have presented all evidence, we'll meet out of your presence to resolve the instructions so there may be a lengthier recess I might have you come later, get to the courthouse, I might excuse you earlier in the evening, I'm just not sure how it's going to unfold. My experience is that no matter what I say at this point I'm always wrong because though orchestrated each trial has its own personality and I don't know how this trial will unfold.

As I estimate time, there's a 75 percent chance I'm going to be wrong. Again, any concerns you have about this process I invite you to hold them against me personally and not to trial attorneys or their interests.

With that, we will begin with opening statements. And to the State.

COURT CLERK: What about the notebooks?

THE COURT: Oh, yeah. Thank you, Ms. Clerk,
for that reminder.

Deputy, if you could just grab the notebooks and pens really quick. We have them.

Would you all like to stand for a minute as we await those notebooks?

All right. We'll be seated. And to the State, you may begin.

MR. STEGE: This is a case about how Theodore Gibson came to be stabbed to death by the Defendant, Ralph Goad, over 200 times; a case of two men enter, one man leaves.

The evidence will show the following relevant facts. Both gentlemen live at 33 Park Street in Reno, Nevada, on the second floor of a multiunit apartment complex. Each unit is a studio. The victim lived in Apartment 205, the Defendant in Apartment 213, down the hallway.

Both men were getting their rent paid through something called a payee service. And in November of 2018, Mr. Goad stopped paying his rent, in fact, he got

his last check through the payee service of \$253.90.

The murder occurred about January 22nd of 2019. So between November and January the following relevant facts will be shown at this trial. The victim, Theodore Gibson, residing in Apartment 205, had a friend by the name of Scott Napier. And Scott, knowing that the victim was in his 70's and had no transportation would periodically pick him up from the apartment complex and take him shopping.

We know that on January 18th of 2019 was the last time the victim ever went shopping. The evidence will show we have Mr. Napier testify about taking him shopping. We also have surveillance from the Wal-Mart where they went shopping.

What Mr. Gibson did was he went up to the Wal-Mart clerk, you're able to use your debit card to get cash, so he got an amount of cash consisting of at least a 100-dollar bill, five 20s, and the balance in smaller bills. The 100-dollar bill may come into prominence later in the case.

The 18th is the last day Mr. Gibson leaves his apartment, he returns to his apartment. Between the 18 and 22nd of January the Defendant visits the victim on a daily basis, arriving early in the morning each day.

Around five or six in the morning, Defendant goes to the victim's apartment, coming and going from the victim's apartment, ultimately the pattern is between the 18th and the 22nd, leaving around noon, and coming back the next day. Gibson never leaves his apartment after the 18th.

Now, that pattern holds until January 22nd.

The morning's the same. Leaving at noon is the same.

But in the afternoon for the first time the Defendant
goes to Theodore Gibson's apartment. And between 2:30

in the afternoon and 5:30 in the afternoon, the evidence
will show, is when Mr. Goad stabbed Mr. Gibson to death.

He leaves, the evidence will show he then goes to the
Cal-Neva casino just downtown where he stays for a
protracted amount of time. He gets there in the
evening. He leaves in the evening of the next day.

Within that time period he takes a hundred-dollar bill, a man who had not been paid since the beginning part of November, a 100-dollar bill he changes in. He returns the next few days only twice outside of the pattern and for reasons unknown.

Time passes and the residents of 33 Park

Street are unaware there's a body of an elderly man

laying on the floor for three weeks in his apartment.

When Mr. Napier, February 13th, having not heard from his friend, calls, and they do a welfare check. The manager, Victoria Juarez, and the maintenance person, Mr. Billings, go into the apartment and discover — they open the door and discover laying underneath a blanket the body of Theodore Gibson having laid there for three weeks.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Patrol officers respond and ultimately detectives. And in that they learn, or observe -- this is January, right, the air conditioner is on high, blasting. The window is cracked. Underneath the blanket, Mr. Gibson lying on his side, stab wounds all over his body. Within the apartment laying near Mr. Gibson's feet is a pair of scissors, office scissors, just near his feet. Appeared to have blood on the tip. The man's wallet, Mr. Gibson's wallet, empty, the contents strewn about; ID cards, debit card, all sorts of personal ID information. In the sink, it's a studio, right, in the bathroom. To the left a fixed blade, you might call it a hunting-style knife, a knife that doesn't fold but a black-handled knife appearing to have blood on the blade. Within the sink and just to the lap or the flat part, not the bowl, a dried puddle of apparent blood as if someone washed their hands off and

the blood is left there.

2.2

I want to back up a little bit. How do we know this? How do we know about this visitation pattern that Mr. Gibson never left his apartment after the 18th of January. Well, this apartment complex, it's one long hallway on the second floor, with rooms to either side. A number of feet away in the ceiling of that hallway is a surveillance camera, which captures between. The 18th, he goes in between the 18th of January and the 13th of February no man goes in except for a man in this courtroom, Ralph Goad. The entire time no one else goes in that room.

That, the evidence will show, led the detectives to suspect that Mr. Goad was the killer. Continuing the observations in the room, evidence of the struggle and evidence of the violent death of Mr. Gibson. There is blood on the wall where his head lay, blood to the left on the dresser, lamp, the wall near Mr. Gibson. To the right — his body lay at the foot of the bed, it's a very — a humble living situation, blood spattered up on the foot of the bed. The TV on, and you could hear the TV. For 22 days he lay there, the evidence will show.

In the meantime, before he's discovered,

recall that Mr. Goad had not been paid since November. The apartment management made efforts and instituted a proceeding to kick Mr. Goad out of the complex and that occurred on January 30th, Sheriff's deputies, pursuant to lawful process, locked Mr. Goad out of his apartment. That process involved Mr. Billings, the maintenance man, you go in, you take the lock out so no one can go in unless they have — essentially unless you're the maintenance man.

So after detectives reviewed the surveillance, noticed the man's wallet had been strewn about, bloody scissors, apparent bloody knife, and the blood in the sink suspected Mr. Goad. A search of the body found on the 13th. 15th they do a search of Mr. Goad's apartment which had been locked. He'd been locked out since the 30th. Inside the apartment, a sweatshirt, sort of like a hoodie but without the hood. Collected that piece of evidence, observing on the sleeves, right, so the area where a person doing work might get dirty, apparent blood, and the clothing left behind in a hamper, a pair of black jeans, also containing apparent blood.

Now, a number of these pieces of evidence were sent to the Washoe County Forensic Investigative Service or forensic science division, the crime lab, where it

was discovered these scissors laying at the foot of Mr. Gibson, the blood on the tip belongs to Theodore Gibson. A thing called handler DNA or touch DNA on the handle portion contains the DNA of Ralph Goad. The knife is bloody. It is Mr. Gibson's blood. In Mr. Goad's apartment, the blood on the sweatshirt, that's Theodore Gibson's blood. The evidence will show that got there from doing the dirty work it takes to stab a man to death.

Similar to touch DNA, residual DNA within the collar, you wear a collar, skin cells get on your clothes, same with your pants. The sweatshirt, residual DNA of Ralph Goad, his sweatshirt containing the blood of Theodore Gibson. The pants. On the pants is the blood. It's Theodore Gibson's blood. The pants, they're the defendant's pants the evidence will show.

Mr. Goad was arrested by the police in Sacramento, California.

Now, in the meantime they had shown the video surveillance of Mr. Goad walking underneath the camera. Walking underneath the camera. Two among other people Victoria Juarez who has known Ralph Goad, the other occupants of the apartment complex for many years, and she identified him, yeah, that's Ralph Goad.

Mr. Goad was wearing a distinctive -- a baseball cap, a Boston Red Sox logo, a worn, on the verge of being worn out hat cocked to the side. When he's arrested he's wearing that hat.

He's also wearing a distinctive parka, blue and black parka, when he is ultimately captured by the police. Same jacket, same hat he's wearing on the surveillance video of the Cal-Neva downtown when he changes in the bill right when you go to the cage there's cameras right there and we're going to see Mr. Goad on that camera easily identifying him as the only man who ever went in that apartment.

Mr. Gibson's body was subjected to an autopsy, a medical examination. Dr. Callahan is the forensic pathologist who identified five wounds to the left hand which she will characterize as defensive, right? When being attacked with a knife or scissors, or fists, people, we tend to use our hands first to defend, and often in a way like this. First palms out (indicating), and then like this (indicating). So injuries, palm of the hand, and then to the back. There's five of those on the left hand. There's 17 counted stab wounds to the right hand.

Now, Mr. Gibson was found sort of laying

partially on his right hand -- his right side, his face not identifiable. 76 wounds, the evidence will show, to the back, as they're individual stab wounds. And those are sort of to the mid point of the back, but also a large number on the back and base of the skull.

151 is the remaining number counted by Dr. Callahan, for a total of 249. The remainder of those are to the head, the face, eyeballs, to the eyes, ears, side of the face. All evidence, all which bear witness to a number of things.

Now, you — I mentioned the hundred-dollar bill. The hundred-dollar bill comes back to us at the Cal-Neva. There is an apparent, I will use that word apparent motive of robbery as a possibility. The wallet is strewn about, no money in the wallet, but all this, the surveillance video, the forensic evidence from both apartments, surveillance from the Cal-Neva, the forensic results from the crime lab all bear witness as to these 249 stab wounds to the fact that the person who committed this act or these acts is in this room, his name's Ralph Goad. And bear witness to the fact the evidence will show he is guilty of first degree murder. Thank you.

THE COURT: Let's all stand for just a moment,

Ladies and Gentlemen.

(Short pause.)

THE COURT: Ms. Mayhew.

MS. MAYHEW: May I, your Honor?

THE COURT: Yes, please.

MS. MAYHEW: Only through love and friendship can you create the illusion that you're not alone.

Ralph Goad's wife, Sara, died in 2010. They had been married for 27 years. He loved his wife. And after she died, he had no friends. He had no family. He had no kids. He had nobody to talk to. He was all alone.

Until he met Ted Gibson. You see, Ted lived down the hall from Ralph at the Park Manor Apartments. They formed a deep friendship with each other. They were companions. They cared, comforted, and confided in each other for almost nine years.

You see, Ralph and Ted had similar life experiences. They were both retired. They were both in their 70's. They both lived in a small studio apartment. They were both married at some point in their lives. They were both from the east coast. And they had a lot in common.

They were also fond of old war movies. Ted was in the military. Ralph liked to travel. They were

best friends. Ralph, every morning like clock work, he would run down to the corner store, he would grab beer and cigarettes, and he would come back to Ted's apartment, and they would hang out all day. They would hang out all day every day.

They enjoyed each other's company. They would watch TV, including the history channel, sports channel, old black and white movies. They would eat meals together. They would talk, all day every day, and that was their routine. They would talk for hours. They would laugh. They would talk about the good old days. They enjoyed reminiscing about their life experiences, their upbringing. They were friends. And for almost nine years, that was their routine. Ralph would go to the corner store and buy beer and cigarettes, come back to Ted's apartment, and they would hang out, talk, watch TV. Life was good. They had each other.

And through the years they forged a friendship. They did what most friends did. They shared meals. They shared clothes. And for those nine years they were not alone.

There is no reason Ralph would kill his best friend. There is no reason that Ralph would violently stab his best friend over 250 times.

The State wants you to believe that Ralph killed his best friend, that Ralph violently stabbed him, that he did all of that, that he killed the one person that he cared for in his life and that cared for him, for money. That is false. That is simply not true, Ladies and Gentlemen, for three main reasons.

First, Ted was the only person in Ralph's life. Ralph cared for his friend. Ralph confided in his friend. Ralph and Ted comforted each other. There is no reason that Ralph would kill his best friend.

Second, Ralph had money. You see, he collected — he received an inheritance from his mother who died in 2016. In addition to that inheritance he also collected Social Security.

Now, the State wants you to believe that he didn't have money as a motive to kill his best friend, but that's simply not true. He had money. Ralph had a payee that did close in November of last year. But that doesn't mean somebody doesn't have money. For those of you who don't know, the payee is a resource that helps elderly persons who need help in terms of rent or help facilitate those types of expenses. Ralph simply had difficulty setting up a new payee, but that does not mean that he didn't have money. He did have money.

Third, there's no evidence that Ralph took

Ted's money. You see, Ralph received absolutely no

financial gain from Ted's death. Ralph received

nothing. And the evidence will actually show that law

enforcement even found money on Ted, and found a credit

card in his apartment. Surely if somebody was gonna

kill for money, they would have taken the money.

The illusion is gone. Ralph is alone. Ralph did not stab his best friend. Ralph would not hurt Ted. They cared, comforted, and confided in each other for almost nine years. They cared for each other. Ted was the only person in Ralph's life. He would not hurt the only person in his life. And in Ralph's own words with detectives, when Ralph repeatedly said I did not do this, I did not kill my best friend, I would not do this, in his own words, he said —

MR. STEGE: Your Honor, I have to object based on pretrial discussions we've had.

THE COURT: I understand. Opening statement is an opportunity to reveal what the evidence will show. I expect that there will be evidence to support the statements that you're making.

MS. MAYHEW: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you. Overruled.

MS. MAYHEW: Ralph said it in his own words,
Ladies and Gentlemen. "I didn't kill Ted. Ain't no
way. I got too little bit of time to live myself. And
I wouldn't hurt my only friend. No." Thank you.

1.4

2.3

THE COURT: All right. Ladies and Gentlemen, that concludes our trial today. During this overnight recess, you're admonished not to converse amongst yourselves or with anyone else on any subject connected with this trial.

You will not read, watch or listen to any report of or commentary on the trial by any person connected with this case or by any medium of information, including the television, radio, newspaper, and internet.

You're not to form or express any opinion about any subject connected to this trial until the matter is submitted to you for deliberations.

No form of independent research, investigation, or field study is permitted.

Please return to the jury deliberation room for entry into the courtroom at nine a.m. You'll meet with Deputy Coss for a few moments, as you receive further logistical instructions.

And we will stand for our jury.

(Jury is excused for the evening.)

THE COURT: Counsel, you know that this case was assigned to me from Department 4 at the last moment.

MR. STEGE: Right.

THE COURT: I did not conduct the pretrial hearings. I looked this morning for any written orders. I didn't see any. I want to make sure that I understand.

MR. STEGE: Here's my issue. I mentioned earlier today I'm not bringing in his statement.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. STEGE: I think we all know unless I bring it in it's hearsay.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. STEGE: And the -- the argument wasn't, and he will say or sort of detaching it from his statement to the police, there's very limited circumstances absent me bringing it in that the Defense can bring forth his statement to the police, namely, he testifies and then accepts his statements or adopts his statement to the police.

THE COURT: I understand. But as I was making my evidentiary ruling, I reflected on the fact that I don't know everything that was argued in front of Judge

Steinheimer. And I don't have written orders and I won't create bad form --

MR. STEGE: Right.

THE COURT: -- by making an uninformed decision. Ms. Mayhew made a decision before this jury to tell them what the evidence was gonna show. If you don't bring that evidence in, Ms. Mayhew's going to have to explain -- she's not going to have to do anything, I guess, but the jury's going to have to decide whether she overstated the evidence in her opening statements. That's the best I can think of.

MS. MAYHEW: Your Honor, just for clarification, there's no court order that specifically addressed whether or not these statements will or will not be admitted.

THE COURT: I understand that, but if it is

Mr. Goad's own statement, the State may bring it in.

But the State may choose not to. And the State

indicated today that it wasn't inclined to. How is that

evidence gonna come in if the State doesn't introduce

it.

MS. MAYHEW: So first of all, so when cross-examining the officer, the officer asked him questions whether or not he admitted or denied it.

Clearly he denied it throughout the entire interview, so that would come in his denial so that was improbable.

With regards to the actual specific statement, it was just to illustrate to the — to the jury that he denied it and he didn't do it because it was his friend.

THE COURT: I don't want to, you know, fight in the deliberations. You specifically quoted the Defendant. You brought in an out-of-court declaration from your client and you presented it to the jury. It may be consistent with admissible evidence, but I don't know what that admissible evidence is going to be at the end of trial.

MR. STEGE: Right.

THE COURT: And if the State doesn't introduce it there's a great big gap between what you told the jury the evidence is going to be and what the evidence is. But I can't cure that.

MR. STEGE: Right. And I think back on a Supreme Court case involving a similar issue where the Defense tried and tried and tried to bring forth the Defendant's statement which included a denial that resulted in a published decision which I will -- can't remember the name offhand, I've cited it to this Court before, but I want to point out the question of did the

man admit or deny it on cross-examination, it is not proper because it calls for a hearsay answer.

THE COURT: I agree.

MR. STEGE: So I think we need to be -- this will be my placeholder that I'm going to refer to later if that questioning occurs with Detective Nevills.

THE COURT: Right. So I don't want this to grow larger than what it is. You've made your record.

MR. STEGE: Right.

THE COURT: But anything else for you to say before I wish everyone good night. Because I don't think there's any action for me to take.

MR. SLOCUM: And your Honor, just to -- if ·I may with respect to you had asked about an order with regard to a hearing that we had in Department 4. That is a totally separate issue than Mr. Stege started talking about in opening statement. But I want to make sure the record was clear. This issue about statements made by Mr. Goad had nothing to do with the order.

THE COURT: I think I understand that. And my words are not suggesting Ms. Mayhew violated a court order, but Mr. Stege surprised me a little bit in his objection because he said pretrial. And I was just thinking oh, my gosh, what don't I know.

1

MR. STEGE: Right.

2

And so I didn't want to rule THE COURT:

3

against Ms. Mayhew in her opening statement, so I

4

MR. STEGE: Right.

5

THE COURT: So I think I understand the

6

distinction between what was argued today in front of

7

me, and what is uncertain in my mind about what Judge

8 9

Steinheimer ruled.

overruled it.

10

11

on this subject. It was earlier today is what my

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. STEGE: I agree there's no pretrial order reference. MR. SLOCUM: Okay. So in answer to whether or

not there's a pretrial order about some other issues that we did actually hear, there was a minute order that was issued. Judge Steinheimer had a telephone conference with the respective parties, and issued a minute order with regard to evidence that was going to come in potentially as motivation evidence and then res gestae-type evidence. So that was what the pretrial hearing was about, just so we're clear about that.

THE COURT: And is that going to come up in the flow of trial?

MR. STEGE: I just talked about it, how he

1 lost his pay -- stopped getting paid from his payee, was 2 evicted. That's --3 THE COURT: Okay. 4 MR. STEGE: -- a piece. 5 THE COURT: Right. 6 MR. SLOCUM: And the idea was that it could 7 come in under a res gestae theory, but it could not be 8 used as a motivation. 9 THE COURT: All right. Okay. Well, let me 10 end by being very frank because I don't want Ms. Mayhew 11 to go home and think that I've stumped her. I don't 12 think for a moment you would violate a pretrial order. 13 MS. MAYHEW: Understood, your Honor. 14 THE COURT: All right. So --15 MR. STEGE: Not alleging that. 16 THE COURT: All right. We'll see you here 17 tomorrow morning about 8:50. I can't think of anything 18 else. Good night, every one. Good night, Mr. Goad. 19 (Proceedings continued until August 6, 2019, 20 at 9:00 a.m.) 21 ---000---22 23

24

1	STATE OF NEVADA)
2	COUNTY OF WASHOE)
3	I, JULIE ANN KERNAN, official reporter of
4	the Second Judicial District Court of the State of
5	Nevada, in and for the County of Washoe, do hereby
6	certify:
7	That as such reporter I was present in
8	Department No. 15 of the above court on Monday,
9	August 5, 2019, at the hour of 8:55 a.m. of said day,
10	and I then and there took verbatim stenotype notes of
11	the proceedings had and testimony given therein upon the
12	Jury Trial of the case of STATE OF NEVADA, Plaintiff,
13	vs. RALPH EDMOND GOAD, Defendant, Case No. CR19-0999.
14	That the foregoing transcript, consisting of
15	pages numbered 1 through 237, both inclusive, is a full,
16	true and correct transcript of my said stenotype notes,
17	so taken as aforesaid, and is a full, true and correct
18	statement of the proceedings of the above-entitled
19	action to the best of my knowledge, skill and ability.
20	
21	DATED: At Reno, Nevada, this 31st day of March, 2020.
22	
23	/s/ Julie Ann Kernan
24	JULIE ANN KERNAN, CCR #427