IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

RALPH EDMOND GOAD,

Electronically Filed
May 08 2020 10:22 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 SIX

JOHN L. ARRASCADA Washoe County Public Defender CHRISTOPHER J. HICKS Washoe County District Attorney

KATHRYN REYNOLDS Deputy Public Defender 350 South Center Street, 5th Floor Reno, Nevada 89501 JENNIFER P. NOBLE Chief Appellate Deputy One South Sierra Street, 7th Floor Reno, Nevada 89501

Attorneys for Appellant

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, filed on July 30, 20192 JA 266
Order, filed 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, 20198 JA 1140
State's Exhibit 20A, admitted on August 8, 20198 JA 1152
State's Exhibit 21A, admitted on August 7, 20198 JA 1162
State's Exhibit 22, admitted on August 22, 20198 JA 1170
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, 20195 JA 720
Transcript of Proceedings: Jury Trial, held on August 8, 20196 JA 813

2	
Transcript of Proceedings: Jury Trial, held on August 9, 2019	
Transcript of Proceedings: Sentencing, held on October 2, 2019	JA 1330
Verdict, filed on August 9, 2019	A 1324

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) Dept. No. 15
12	Plaintiff,) vs.
13) TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS RALPH EDMOND GOAD,
14	Defendant.
15)
16	JURY TRIAL - DAY 4 AUGUST 8, 2019, RENO, NEVADA
17	APPEARANCES:
18	For the Plaintiff: AMOS R. STEGE, ESQ.
19	Deputy District Attorney One S. Sierra Street, 4th Floor
20	Reno, Nevada 89520
21	For the Defendant: JENNIFER ARIAS MAYHEW, ESQ. JAY SLOCUM, ESQ.
22	Deputy Public Defenders 350 South Center St., 6th Floor
23	Reno, Nevada 89520 The Defendant: RALPH EDMOND GOAD
24	Reported by: JULIE ANN KERNAN, CCR #427, CP, RPR Computer-Aided Transcription

INDEX 1 2 EXAMINATION DIRECT CROSS REDIRECT RECROSS 3 For the State: THE WITNESS: AMANDA ARRASCADA 4 By Mr. Stege 10 5 By Mr. Slocum 20 6 7 TREVOR VAUGHT THE WITNESS: By Mr. Stege 26 8 THE WITNESS: DAVID L. NEVILLS 9 By Mr. Stege 30 55 10 11 THE WITNESS: ELVIRA KOEDER 12 By Mr. Stege 64 95 13 By Mr. Slocum 85 99 14 THE WITNESS: MADISON DAHLQUIST 15 By Mr. Stege 100 123, 128 16 By Mr. Slocum 119 125 17 THE WITNESS: MONICA SIEWERTSEN 18 By Mr. Stege 137 177 19 By Mr. Slocum 169 178 20 THE WITNESS: KATHERINE CALLAHAN, M.D. 21 By Mr. Stege 194 222 22

By Mr. Slocum 217

23

CONTINUATION OF INDEX

2	EXHIBITS MARKED AI	OMITTED
3	Exhibit 51 - Thumbdrive	28
4	Exhibit 16 - Photos from surveillance camera	34
5	Exhibit 38 - Ball Cap	41
6	Exhibit 11 - Photograph series	44
7	Exhibit 36 - Evidence box	82
8	Exhibit 37 = Knife	85
9	Exhibit 34 - Pants	105
10	Exhibit 6 - Black Wrangler pants	105
11	Exhibit 35 — Gray hooded sweatshirt	110
12	Exhibit 7 - Photo series of sweatshirt	111
13	Exhibit 15 - Photo series of Autopsy	202
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21	w.	
22		
23		
24		

RENO, NEVADA; WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 8, 2019; 9:00 A.M.

---000---

THE COURT: We'll go on the record. As Mr. Goad is in the well of the court to say good morning, Mr. Goad is present.

To State's attorney, be seated, if you would, please.

To the defense, is there anything you wish to say?

MR. SLOCUM: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. SLOCUM: I've got some concerns this morning with regard to Mr. Goad. But what I'm going to ask the Court to do is somewhat unorthodox, but I think that it's appropriate in this circumstance because I've spent a lot of time with Mr. Goad, and I truly believe that his desire is to have a trial, he has been adamant about this.

THE COURT: Do you know who this gentleman is?

MR. STEGE: That is my father, your Honor.

THE COURT: Oh, Mr. Stege. Welcome to the Second Judicial District Court.

Second Judicial District Court

MR. SENIOR STEGE: Thank you.

+ 9

THE COURT: All right. Carry on.

MR. SLOCUM: Thank you, your Honor. So that's a -- that's a firm belief that I have that he wants to have a trial and that he wants to go forward.

Throughout the entire course of my representation that has been the case.

This morning he's -- he's not been responsive to the attorneys. However --

THE COURT: What does that mean exactly?

MR. SLOCUM: He -- he doesn't actually

acknowledge us at all.

THE COURT: So his responses are not meandering and not responsive. There is no audible.

MR. SLOCUM: No, there is no response. In fact, there's not even looking at us. However, that being said, I've spoken with the deputies and they indicated that he has been responsive, we were able to get him down to the courtroom. However, it's basically when we try to talk with him he doesn't even address us.

When I say address I mean even look at us, even when we request that of him. So with that being said I don't know if it's an authority sort of thing because of the deputies he's willing to respond to them.

So what I would be interested in this morning is just the Court to ask Mr. Goad if he understands why we're here and what we're doing. And if he could acknowledge that to the Court I would feel comfortable going forward. But I don't feel comfortable right now because I can't get any sort of response from him. So if the Court would be willing to do that.

THE COURT: Well, I'm not going to -- do you wish to be heard?

MR. STEGE: No.

THE COURT: I'm not going to conduct some form of informal mini mental examination from the bench.

This trial is going to proceed with or without Mr.

Goad's presence or participation. I want Mr. Goad to be present. But if Mr. Goad, for example, chose not to accept the transport I'd quickly do some legal research but I -- I have a sense that without any competent jury this trial proceeds.

So I'm going to ask Mr. Goad about being here, I'm going to acknowledge him, express my gratitude that he's here, my hope that he remains, but I'm not going to make any findings about his cog nature.

MR. SLOCUM: And your Honor, I'm okay with that. I did want to make it clear that I do believe

that I have an obligation if Mr. Goad is not able to aid and assist counsel, to make a record with respect to that.

As I said, I have now spent quite a bit of time with Mr. Goad. I do believe that he wants to go forward, and he's been consistent about that, however --

THE COURT: And Mr. Goad just nodded affirmatively --

MR. SLOCUM: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: -- and raised his hand when he heard you say Mr. Goad wants to go forward.

MR. SLOCUM: So that's been the first that we've gotten any acknowledge of anything he said.

THE COURT: Mr. Goad, good morning. And you've just raised your hand to say hello to me in gesture. Are you having a hard time speaking?

THE DEFENDANT: (Nods head.)

THE COURT: Yes, you're nodding your head yes. The record will reflect that I'm looking directly at Mr. Goad and he is looking at me as I speak to him. Our eyes are communicating with each other, and he's nodding his head yes. But you're not able to speak this morning; is that correct?

THE DEFENDANT: (No audible response.)

THE COURT: So Mr. Goad has attempted to make noise with his throat and he's held his hand up to his throat indicating there may be some problem with his ability to use words this morning.

Mr. Goad, do you know who I am? Not my name, but do you know what I do? Yeah, you're nodding your head yes. And these are your two attorneys. And you're nodding your head and saying yes and waving to them.

Are you able to write at all? Yes? So what I'll do is at defense counsel's request, if at any time you want to communicate with your attorneys, just let Ms. Mayhew know, she'll stand and let me know, and we'll take a recess out of the jury's presence and we'll let you write a note to them. I'm not sure what's going on.

Has Mr. Goad been medically cleared from the infirmary? The deputies are answering yes, he has, and he is nodding his head yes.

Mr. Goad, is it -- will you just raise your hand if you want this trial to proceed? Yes. He's raising his hand immediately.

All right. That's enough of a canvass for me.

Good morning. Thank you for being here.

We'll all stand for our jury. Hold on. Do we have all

of our jury?

DEPUTY: Yes, your Honor.

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: okay. We had one late arrival. Make sure Mr. Goad has at least a paper and a pen

available so he can make some note to Ms. Mayhew.

(Jury returns to courtroom.)

THE COURT: Good morning. The entire jury If you'll be seated, please. present.

To the attorneys and Mr. Goad, if you ever want water, I think there are cups and water.

As we begin our fourth day, Ladies and Gentlemen, I think we have coffee for you, at least we should. Do we have coffee this morning? Deputy Coss has answered with a nod. I see one or two water bottles. I'll be certainly responsive to your needs to refreshment breaks or to stand.

Mr. Stege, on behalf of the State call your next witness.

MR. STEGE: Amanda Arrascada, please.

COURT CLERK: Please raise your right hand.

AMANDA ARRASCADA,

called as a witness herein, being first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

1	COURT CLERK: Thank you.
2	THE COURT: To the State, you may begin.
3	MR. STEGE: Thank you. Ma'am, get seated,
4	yes, take a seat.
5	DIRECT EXAMINATION
6	BY MR. STEGE:
7	Q Would you please state and spell your name.
8	A Amanda Arrascada. A-m-a-n-d-a. Arrascada's
9	A-r-r-a-s-c-a-d-a.
10	Q And how are you currently employed?
11	A I'm the owner and director of Nevada
12	Fiduciary Solutions.
13	Q What is Nevada Fiduciary Solutions?
14	A We are a representative payee provider.
15	Q And we've heard from another payee provider.
16	How long have you been in business?
17	A It will be five years in October.
18	Q We heard from Becky Korn that towards the end
19	of 2018 she transferred some clients to you.
20	A Correct.
21	Q And can you tell us about how that process
22	worked once you had the referrals from Ms. Korn.
23	A So she closed her office, she gave notice to
24	Social Security, I think, sometime around September or

October of 2018, um, and we had to treat each new client as if it were a new case. Social Security didn't just transfer everybody over to our office, we had to meet with each person individually as if it were a brand new client, do a new intake, a new application with the Social Security office.

Q And the clients, they go to your office to work with Social Security to get their service or their funds transferred to your business.

A They typically. Do in this case with the transfer because we had so many people transferring over to our office, we were meeting with everybody at Social Security and doing both our intake that we would normally do at our office, and then Social Security appointment, we were doing them all at Social Security to kind of save time.

Q And How long does that process take? So suppose you meet at Social Security with the client, yourself to transfer over, how long does that process take to get from the old payee to you?

A Social Security has cutoffs each month so usually it's around the middle of the month so we were to meet with them before the 15th usually. We would get their funds for the following month.

- O And what if it was after the 15th?
- A Then it would be the month, the following month,
- Q Were there clients who were referred to you who did not end up signing up with you?
- A No, none of the clients were really formally referred to our office. My understanding was is that Becky was just handing out a flyer saying we're closing, here's another payee that you can go to.
- Q Theodore Gibson, is that a person who transferred his payee service to you?
 - A He was.
 - Q And was able to get set up.
 - A Correct
- Q And how do -- at your business how do people get their remainder funds, the funds that aren't used towards their bills that you pay, how do they get the remainder of those funds?
- A Their personal spending funds are disbursed one of two ways. We either cut paper text, and they come in and pick them up or we mail them to them, or we have a debit card that most of our clients choose to utilize. And we load the debit card either once a week or once every two weeks, it's just based off of their

preference.

- Q And as it relates to Mr. Gibson, do you remember as you sit here today which option he chose?
 - A He had a debit card with our office.
- Q And as part of that, having the debit card, do you have a record of when that debit card is used?
 - A Yes.
- Q And is that information go into your file at your office?

A It's an online database through the debit card company so we can log in at any time regardless if the card is active or inactive, and view the transactions on the card.

Q And in this case were you -- did you, in fact, look to see what the transactions were as it relates to Mr. Gibson's debit card --

A I have not, no. There was no reason for us to look at his transaction record or his transaction history until notice of his passing.

Q At which point you did and provided that document to the police.

A Correct.

Q So you were able to log on and see the transaction history.

4

5

6

7

8 9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21 22

23

24

Correct. Α

Separately is there a computer log of the client's statement for all the transactions that include getting the money deposited from Social Security, your fees, and then the disbursements?

There is, yeah, we have a system that's called Representative Payee Manager, RPM for short, we use and it's an accounting software that logs every ingoing and outgoing transaction for each individual client.

And was that statement also provided in this case after Mr. Gibson's passing?

It was. Α

MR. STEGE: I'd like to approach the witness with proposed Exhibit Number 20.

THE COURT: Yes.

BY MR. STEGE:

Ask you first to review -- well, the front sheet of that proposed exhibit, do you recognize that?

Α I do.

And what -- that appears to be a custodian of records affidavit completed by someone in your office.

It was. It was completed by me. Α

Indicating that the attached file or

paperwork from the file is a true and accurate copy of the original held at your office.

A Correct.

Q And that file contains, among other things, the two things we talked about, history of the debit card transactions, and the second was the log of all the payments.

A Correct.

Q And do you see -- there's a post-it note, on the first post-it note do you recognize that document?

A I do. It's a-print out from our system RPM, that's a client statement from start to finish with Mr. Gibson's account with us.

Q And the second one?

A Is his debit card transactions from the time his card was opened until it was closed.

MR. STEGE: I'd move to introduce these two portions of Exhibit 21 related to the two logs.

THE COURT: So I anticipate the defense objection. Mr. Slocum is about to stand. Let me see if I can fix it and then I'll hear from Mr. Slocum.

I haven't seen the exhibit, it's not in my hand, I presume it's similar to yesterday. If there are specific pages —— I am satisfied by the foundation and

evidentiary authenticity. You may argue the weight.

I'm not vouching for the contents, I'm just determining that it may be admitted. And with that, I think it's important that we admit only those pages that are referenced to the testimony, subject to any clean up you wish to pursue after the fact.

And so Ms. Clerk, if you'll pay attention, the Bates stamp references of the documents that are broadcast on the screen, those will be admitted.

Mr. Slocum?

MR. SLOCUM: Thank you. That is what we would ask.

THE COURT: Thank you.

BY MR. STEGE:

Q Make this easier. I'll remove the stapled, client's stapled record, which is a two-page document. It should be on the monitor in front of you, ma'am, to the -- this first document.

This appears to begin November 6th with a deposit of \$2,012. Where did that come from?

A That came from his former payee with the counseling services.

Q And so when was the first payment that he got to you?

A The first one was on November 14th from Social Security, the 607-dollar deposit.

Q And then from there I also see on November 30th a V.A. entry of \$495.

A Correct. He was a veteran so he received a small V.A. benefit.

Q So he received two benefits, the V.A. plus the Social Security.

A Correct.

Q And then you would pay the rent in the amount of \$490?

A Uh-hum. Correct.

 ${\tt Q}$ And the remainder goes to personal needs, for example, at December 17th you have \$250 personal needs.

A Correct. So Mr. Gibson had elected to have his personal spending allotments once -- excuse me, every two weeks, he got a deposit onto his debit card.

Q Onto the debit card. And this continues, apparently, after his death, right? We have into March, April and on to page 2.

THE COURT: So are you going to hand to the clerk every document that you've broadcast on this screen so that she can separately mark it?

MR. STEGE: Yes.

THE COURT: If not, then refer to the Bates stamp, please, so she --

MR. STEGE: This is not a Bates-stamped document.

THE COURT: So then just compile all of the documents that you've broadcast to the jury, we'll cause that to be separated.

BY MR. STEGE:

Q Which continues into page 2 of this document. Right?

A Correct. Yes. His benefits continued on because his death hadn't been reported to Social Security until it was reported to us. It takes Social Security and the V.A. some time to stop benefit.

Q And is that -- would you agree the Social Security as a general principal moves slow?

A Yes.

Now, there are a number of -- in fact, we have the history of all the transactions related to the debit card, but let's focus here on one from January 18th, which will be on the monitor. It's a two-page document stapled together. What does this indicate?

A So on the 17th here we deposited 250 -- \$250, and then there was a transaction on January the 4th for

- \$253.74 at Wal-Mart. And then subsequently all of the transactions on the 18th -- let's see here.
 - Q Right.

- A They were attempted transactions using the card that were declined.
- Q And then ultimately it was -- it went through.
- A It did go through, that \$253 transaction went through.
- Q And before that you have a deposit on January 3rd and another one on the 17th --
 - A Right.
 - Q -- each of 250.
 - A Correct.
 - Q That being the remainder of his benefit.
 - A Right.
- Q On the second page of this document lists the balance history, indicating that on January 17th, was that the ending balance of 3430?
 - A Repeat that. I'm sorry.
- Q Can you explain this -- these dates down here we have?
- A So this is just the balance of the card, what the dollar amount that was on the card as of that date.

Okay. Was Ralph Goad ever a client of yours? 1 He was not. 2 Do you know the process if you -- if your 3 payee goes out of business and you do not get a new 4 5 payee? So typically the individual has two options. 6 They can either go down to Social Security and apply to 7 become their own payee. Social Security ultimately 8 makes that decision if they think the person is capable 9 of managing benefits. If they're -- Social Security 10 felt they're not capable and says that still need a 11 payee, they would refer them to another payee 12 organization. And then our normal intake process would 13 then occur, the individual would come in, we'd do an 14 intake with them, and then go down to the Social 15 Security office and apply to be the payee. 16 MR. STEGE: Thank you. I'll pass the witness. 17 THE COURT: Thank you. To the defense. 18 CROSS-EXAMINATION 19 BY MR. SLOCUM: 20 Good morning. 21 0 Good morning. 22 I just wanted to talk with you first about 23

what you understood the process was when Becky Korn shut

down her business.

A Okay.

Q So your understanding was that she had just posted a flier or she had given out fliers to people — there were multiple different payees that her clients could then use once she was shut down?

A So while Becky's office was still in -- was still open and operational there were three payees including our office, her office, and then there's one other. When Becky and I had met prior to her getting her notice to Social Security Administration she shutting her business, she had indicated to me I'm just going to tell everybody to go see you. I'm going to hand out your information and have all of our clients go and talk to you.

I don't know — the other payee provider here in town, I don't know what the infrastructure is, and their ability to absorb a large amount of clients was, they provide other services aside from just payee services. We strictly do payee services so I think we had the capability of on boarding more clients at one time.

Q Okay.

A But she had -- people were coming into our

office with a piece of paper that she was handing out saying my payee told me to come here.

Q Okay. So no actual information was forwarded to you. If somebody was with Becky Corn, would come to you, you would take all of their information yourself. You didn't have any information beforehand that, for example, Joe Smith, we've got his information here, we just need him to come in and verify that information in order to start receiving benefits.

A Right. So they come in and we would do our normal intake process. If we had questions regarding other bills or their housing situation, whatever it may be related to that specific client, we would contact Becky's office and request any type of supporting documentation that might help us move their case along a little bit quicker, but that didn't happen in every case.

Q Okay. But you didn't have any information beforehand.

A No.

Q At all.

A No.

Q Okay. Now, I want to talk to you about Ted Gibson's setup with you. Is it accurate that he

received two different forms of income, income stream?

- A Correct. He got V.A. and Social Security.
- Q And is it -- is it correct that you set both of those up for him with your payee service?
 - A Correct.

2.2

- Q Now, was it your understanding that before Mr. Gibson had come to you that he actually received a paper check and a direct deposit to a payee?
 - A I -- clarify that.
- Q Okay. So we talked about two different forms, income stream, you talked about the V.A. and Social Security?
 - A Correct.
- Q Was it your understanding that before he had come to you that he used to receive a paper check and also a direct deposit for the Social Security?
- A I would have to look at my initial note. I

 -- for some reason I think he may have been getting one
 source of his income directly to him and then one source
 of income may have been going to payee counseling
 services which is not uncommon.
 - Q Okay.
- A But I couldn't be a hundred percent sure without looking at my case notes.

Q Okay. Did you provide those kind of notes to the District Attorney?

A I don't believe so. They're -- they're interoffice office, really, that just type up saying note to document our encounter with individuals. I don't know that those were provided.

Q So as you sit here today and even with the documents that you have you are not in a position to be able to answer that particular question.

A No.

2.3

Q Okay. Now, with respect to the process with the payee, there's an automatic deposit, you said, to the debit card as the -- as the client sets up with you.

A Correct.

Q So money can be then withdrawn once it's deposited.

A Correct.

Q And that provides the ability for -- for necessary other expenses that someone might have so that they have money to afford those.

A Right. That money that goes onto the debit card is their personal spending money to spend however they choose.

MR. SLOCUM: I don't have any further

1	questions. Thank you.
2	THE COURT: Any redirect?
3	MR. STEGE: Court's indulgence, please.
4	May I see the no further questions.
5	THE COURT: Thank you. You're free to step
6	down and leave the courtroom.
7	To the State, your next witness, please.
8	MR. STEGE: Trevor Vaught, please.
9	DEPUTY: Stand on this platform, face the
10	clerk
11	COURT CLERK: Please raise your right hand.
12	
(1)	
13	TREVOR VAUGHT,
13	TREVOR VAUGHT, called as a witness herein, being first
14	called as a witness herein, being first
14 15	called as a witness herein, being first duly sworn, was examined and testified
14 15 16	called as a witness herein, being first duly sworn, was examined and testified
14 15 16 17	called as a witness herein, being first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:
14 15 16 17	called as a witness herein, being first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows: COURT CLERK: Thank you.
14 15 16 17 18	called as a witness herein, being first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows: COURT CLERK: Thank you. THE COURT: Be seated and remember to speak
14 15 16 17 18 19 20	called as a witness herein, being first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows: COURT CLERK: Thank you. THE COURT: Be seated and remember to speak into the microphone.
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	called as a witness herein, being first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows: COURT CLERK: Thank you. THE COURT: Be seated and remember to speak into the microphone. THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.

1	BY MR. STE	GE:
2	Q	Sir, please state and spell your name.
3	A	Trevor Vaught. T-r-e-v-o-r V-a-u-g-h-t.
4	Q	How are you currently employed?
5	A	Wal-Mart.
6	Q	How long have you worked at Wal-Mart?
7	A	Eleven years.
8	Q	Is there a specific Wal-Mart that you work
9	at?	
10	A	Second Street Wal-Mart.
11	Q	And what is your role there, what's your
12	A	I'm an asset protection manager.
13	Q	What does that mean?
14	A	Basically secure assets, merchandise, I
15	other	
16	Q	Other duties?
17	A	Fraud-type incidents, whatever.
18	Q	Maybe try to catch shoplifters?
19	A	Shoplifters, yes.
20	Q	Internal fraud?
21	A	Internal fraud.
22	Q	All sorts of stuff.
23	A	Yes, sir.
24	Q	Do you have access to the surveillance of

Wal-Mart?	
A	I do.
Q	And you're familiar with how the system
works.	
A	I am.
Q	And have you been using surveillance in your
duties in	the time you've worked there?
A	Yes, sir.
Q	Were you asked in this case to specifically
look for s	some surveillance by the detectives?
A	I was.
Q	And were you able to locate that
surveillar	nce?
A	I was.
Q	And prior to testifying today were you able
to review	a thumbdrive with some surveillance on it?
A	Yes.
Q	And did you recognize the surveillance on the
thumbdrive	≘?
A	I did.
Q	You recognize it to be an authentic copy of
that yo	ou had provided?
A	Yes, sir.
Q	Which is a copy of the original at Wal-Mart.
	A Q works. A Q duties in A Q look for s A Q surveillar A Q to review A Q thumbdrive A Q that yo

1	A Yes.
2	Q And after recognizing it as authentic, did
3	you initial the tag on the said thumbdrive?
4	A I did.
5	MR. STEGE: Can I approach the witness?
6	THE COURT: Yes.
7	BY MR. STEGE:
8	Q Handing you proposed 51. Do you recognize
9	that thumbdrive?
10	A Yes, I do.
11	Q Do you recognize the initials on that
12	thumbdrive?
13	A Yes. Those are mine.
14	Q Is this the thumbdrive you reviewed?
15	A Yes.
16	MR. STEGE: Move to introduce 51.
17	MR. SLOCUM: No objection, your Honor.
18	THE COURT: 51 is admitted, Ms. Clerk.
19	COURT CLERK: Thank you.
20	(Exhibit 51 is admitted into evidence.)
21	BY MR. STEGE:
22	Q I'm going to ask you about you did mention
23	doing fraud investigations. Are you familiar with the
24	cash drawers

1	A Yes.
2	Q at Wal-Mart? In the farthest left oh,
3	where are the hundred dollar bills?
4	A The hundreds are on the left. Twenties,
5	tens, fives and ones.
6	Q And that is standard throughout Wal-Mart.
7	A Yes. Every drawer is exactly the same.
8	Q Including at the service desk.
9	A Yes, sir.
10	MR. STEGE: I'll pass the witness.
11	THE COURT: To the defense.
12	MR. SLOCUM: I don't have any questions.
13	Thank you.
14	THE COURT: All right. Thank you. You're
15	free to step down and leave the courtroom.
16	THE WITNESS: Thank you.
17	THE COURT: Mr. Stege, your next witness,
18	please.
19	MR. STEGE: Dave Nevills, please.
20	DEPUTY: Please stand on the platform, face
21	the clerk.
22	THE COURT: So this witness has previously
23	been sworn. He will not be resworn, but I admonish you

that you remain under oath.

1	THE WITNESS: Yes.
2	THE COURT: Thank you. Please be seated.
3	CONTINUATION OF DIRECT EXAMINATION
4	BY MR. STEGE:
5	Q Welcome back, Detective. We had briefly
6	mentioned before the Wal-Mart surveillance that was
7	recovered by Mr. Vaught.
8	A Yes.
9	Q Did you, yourself, have an opportunity to
10	review that surveillance?
11	A Yes.
12	Q And did you were you able to review the
13	transaction that occurred during that surveillance?
14	A Yes.
15	Q And who conducted the transaction?
16	A Mr. Napier and Mr. Gibson.
17	Q And did you you were aware that Mr. Gibson
18	had withdrawn \$253.74.
19	A Yes.
20	Q And with that knowledge did you watch the
21	transaction as it related to the cash drawer?
22	A Yes.
23	Q And what did you notice?
24	A It appeared to me that he got two one hundred

dollar bills in regards to the exchange, as well as some additional monies, and then he returned one 100 dollar bill back in and received five bills for that.

MR. STEGE: I would like to publish from Exhibit 51.

(Publishing Exhibit 51.)

BY MR. STEGE:

- Q So this surveillance begins?
- A It's on January 18th, 2019, and the time, it looks like around 7:20. It's kind of cut off there.
- Q So show us what -- tell us what you just saw there.
- A The exchange two the bills from the far left, which I believe are two 100-dollar bills. He returns one of those back in, and then she pulls out five bills from that location which I believe to be 20s.
- Q At which point -- well, in your review of the surveillance what happens next?
- A They ultimately -- well, I didn't watch them throughout the store. A short time later they left. I didn't follow them through the store to do shopping or anything like that.
- Q Let's talk about we have now had introduced the -- surveillance from the Cal-Neva.

A Yes

Q I'd like to publish some from there, but if you give us a -- did you, yourself, watch the Cal-Neva surveillance?

A Yes, I did.

Q And in relation to -- well, when does it start?

A About 17:47 hours on the 22nd.

Q And how does that relate to the video review of Camera 10 from Park Manor Apartments?

A It's approximately ten minutes after Mr. Goad leaves Mr. Gibson's apartment, apartment complex.

Q And how does it relate to on Camera 10 his return to Park Manor?

A He returns to the apartment complex around 14:47, just 2:47 p.m., and he leaves the Cal=Neva on the 23rd and he leaves the Cal-Neva, around 2:30 p.m. on the 23rd.

Q So you used 14 something on the --

A 2:47 p.m

Q Okay. So from a short amount of time from leaving the Cal-Neva to Park Manor?

A Yes.

Q And a short amount of time, ten minutes or so

I think you said, from leaving Park Manor on the 22nd to get to the Cal-Neva?

- A Correct.
- O And what does he do in the Cal-Neva?
- A He visits the cage several -- on several occasions, and then he gambles.
- Q But he stays there essentially overnight and into the afternoon of the next day.
 - A Approximately 21 hours, yeah.
- Q And in your review of the surveillance what, in particular, were you looking for in terms of Mr. Goad?
- A What clothing he was wearing, if it was consistent with what he was wearing at the Park Manor Apartments.
 - Q And did you spot such clothing?
- A Yes. He had the same ball cap on with the letter B. The jacket was consistent with what he was wearing. Also, there's a couple views where you can see, like, a crew neck sweatshirt gray color, it's consistent with what --
- $$\operatorname{MR.}$ STEGE: Can I approach the witness with proposed 16?
 - THE COURT: Yes. Did you say 16, 1-6?

1	MR. STEGE: 1-6, your Honor.
2	THE COURT: Yes.
3	BY MR. STEGE:
4	Q Detective, will you please review the
5	contents of proposed 16? Do you recognize Exhibit 16?
6	A Yes.
7	Q And how is it that you recognize it?
8	A Those are still photographs from the
9	surveillance video at the Cal-Neva.
10	MR. STEGE: Move to introduce Exhibit 16 which
11	is a 24-page document.
12	MR. SLOCUM: No objection, your Honor.
13	THE COURT: 16 is admitted, Ms. Clerk.
14	COURT CLERK: Thank you.
15	(Exhibit 16 is admitted into evidence.)
16	MR. STEGE: And I move to publish.
17	THE COURT: Yes, you may.
18	BY MR. STEGE:
19	Q Can you walk us through, please, page 1 of
20	Exhibit 16.
21	A This is January 22nd, it says 5:37 p.m.
22	Q You're reading that from the upper left-hand
23	portion of this exhibit.
24	A Correct.

So this is at sort of ten-minute time frame 1 you mentioned before. 2 Correct. 3 Who do we see here? Mr. Goad entering the casino. 5 Page 2 of Exhibit 16. 6 Mr. Goad at the cage window making a 7 transaction. 8 And what, I guess, stuck out to you in this 9 cage shot? 10 Specifically -- specifically the ball cap and A 11 12 the jacket. The ball cap was --13 The same as what he's seen wearing on Camera 14 10 at the apartment complex. 15 And so he had this initial transaction here 16 0 at the cage that looks like 5:38 p.m. on January 22nd. 17 Α Yes. 18 Page 5 of Exhibit 16 we then have Mr. Goad 19 20 gambling. Yes. Α 21 In a separate part of the casino. 22 Q Yes. This is the west building. 23 Α

24

He gets up and leaves. Let's talk about this

cage shot at 3:38 a.m. on the 23rd. What, if anything, stuck out to you in this shot?

A The same ball cap, the jacket's consistent, and then this specific one you can actually see the gray sweatshirt and the neck line.

Q In terms of the transaction that he completes here at 3:30 in the morning, did you take note of that?

A Yes. He turns in one bill and gets five in the re -- five in return.

Q And do you recall which drawer the cashier took the bill from Mr. Goad and -- to make change?

A The bill he changes this with come from -- if it's left to right it's ones, fives, tens and -- be the 20 slot, which is the slot farthest -- not farthest to the right, second one farthest to the right.

Q But then -- but the bill he gives over, does that go to the far --

A Yes.

Q -- right-hand slot? Observing it did you have a theory or an idea of what this bill might be?

A A hundred dollar bill.

Q So here we have that, the one bill for the five bills.

A Correct.

And this is still part of that 3:30 a.m. transaction. Α Yes. And from there what? He takes his bills and then he goes to another part of the casino and gambles. Which is depicted at Page 11. Yes. And he's now in the east building which Α

is -- and basically right across from the cage where he just did the transaction. He came in this upper left-hand corner in here.

Q So here we have him until 5:00 in the morning. Let's talk specifically about the 5:01 a.m. transaction. What, if anything, caught your attention about this transaction or this?

- A He has no injuries to his face or hands.
- Q And are you able to tell in a bit more detail on what he's wearing?

A Yes. He's got a jacket on, consistent with before. You can still see the gray sweatshirt, and he still has a baseball cap on even though you can't see the letter B on it.

Q Right. And doesn't this compare -- another shot we had was sort of from the left, doesn't this one

give you a better view of that gray sweatshirt? 1 Yes. 2 Α And at this point in your — when you're 3 reviewing this had you yet recovered or -- the 4 sweatshirt from the apartment of Mr. Goad? 5 6 Α No. Is that -- have you seen the sweatshirt from 7 Mr. Goad's room? 8 9 Α Yes. Is this consistent with that sweatshirt? 10 Yes. 11 Α Is this consistent with on Camera 10, the 12 22nd, you see him walk outside with a bowl and he's 13 wearing a sweatshirt. 14 Yes, it is. 15 Is this consistent? 16 Yes. 17 Α 15 is the further still shot from this 5:01 18 19 transaction? Yes. And you can see sweatshirt there, a 20 little bit more. 21 From there continues to gamble into the 22 0 morning. Continuing. Here we have him at six in the

morning back at the cage, perhaps his jacket's

23

24

- unbuttoned or zipped down a little bit more.
- A Yes.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

19

21

- Q This transaction, do you recall what it was?
- A Appears to be a voucher, which is something that the machine spits out when you win and you can turn that in and cash it out.
- Q And ultimately we have him leaving on 2:28 p.m.
 - A Yes.
 - O On the 23rd, the next day.
 - A Correct.
- Q Ultimately Mr. Goad was taken into custody in Sacramento, California; is that right?
- A Yes.
- O And when was that?
- 16 A March 7th.
- 17 Q And did you, yourself, travel to Sacramento?
- 18 A I did.
 - Q And did you recover the clothing worn by Mr.
- 20 Goad when he was booked?
 - A I recovered a ball cap at that time.
- 22 Was there also a jacket?
- 23 A Yes, but I did not recover those clothings at that particular time.

1	Q That's right. Okay. The ball cap that he
2	was wearing at booking, you recovered that?
3	A Correct.
4	Q And what kind of ball cap was it?
5	A Matched the description you saw there, blue
6	ball cap with a red letter B on it.
7	THE COURT: Ladies and Gentlemen, let's all
8	stand for just a minute, and stretch.
9	(Short pause.)
10	THE COURT: All right, Mr. Stege.
11	BY MR. STEGE:
12	Q What'd you do with the ball cap?
13	A I collected it and later booked it into
14	evidence.
15	MR. STEGE: May I approach the witness with
16	Exhibit proposed 38?
17	THE COURT: Yes.
18	BY MR. STEGE:
19	Q Do you recognize proposed 38?
20	A Yes.
21	Q How do you recognize it?
22	A Says right on it. Yeah, a ball cap with the
23	letter B.
24	Q Is that your handwriting?

- 1		
1	A	Yes.
2	Q	Is that indicate you're the person who booked
3	that piece	of evidence into the evidence vault?
4	A	Yes, sir.
5	Q	If we were to open that you'd expect to find
6	the blue b	all cap
7	A	Yeah.
8	Q	we were just talking about.
9		MR. STEGE: We'll move Exhibit 38.
10		MR. SLOCUM: No objection, your Honor.
11		THE COURT: 38 is admitted.
12		(Exhibit 38 is admitted into evidence.)
13		COURT CLERK: Thank you.
14	BY MR. STE	GE:
15	Q	There appears to be some staining here on
16	this bag.	Would you advise opening this bag?
17	A	Not really, no.
18	Q	What condition is the ball cap in?
19	A	It's disheveled.
20	Q	Is it dirty
21	A	Yes.
22	Q	is this staining from the ball cap?
23	A	Yes.
24	Q	But you did document it by photographing it.

1	A	Yes.
2	Q	It appeared consistent with both the Camera
3	10 surveill	ance as well as the Cal-Neva surveillance we
4	just saw st	tills.
5	A	Yes.
6	Q	A jacket, did you recover a jacket worn by
7	Mr. Goad?	
8	A	Yes.
9	Q	Was that also in Sacramento?
10	A	No.
11	Q	Where was that?
12	A	Washoe County.
13	Q	And where I'm talking about a blue and
14	black park	a.
15	A	Yes.
16	Q	Where was that recovered?
17	A	Washoe County.
18	Q	Where in Washoe County?
19	A	Oh, I'm sorry. Washoe County Jail.
20	Q	Okay. Is that also part of the booking
21	property?	
22	A	Yes.
23	Q	That had come with him from Sacramento.
24	A	Correct.

And did you also recover a pair of sneakers? 1 0 2 Yes. Α Where did you recover those? 3 0 Washoe County. Parr Boulevard, jail. 4 Α Similar to the jacket. 5 Yes. 6 Α Those came with him from Sacramento. 7 0 8 Yes. Α Did you recognize anything about the jacket? 9 Q It was consistent with what was seen on the 10 video, the Cal-Neva video, the blue and black. It was 11 also consistent with what he's wearing at the apartment 12 13 complex. And as to the shoes, do you recognize them? 14 Yes, the soles had, like, a neon green sole 15 which is consistent with the video in the Cal-Neva, as 16 well as the video at the apartment complex. 17 You mentioned the disheveled nature of the 18 hat. What was the condition of both the shoes and the 19 20 jacket? The same, they were both disheveled. 21 Α Were they all dirty? 22 0 23 Yes. Α

24

Q

But you did photograph all three of those

1	items; is that correct?
2	A Yes.
3	MR. STEGE: Approach the witness with proposed
4	11?
5	THE COURT: Yes.
6	BY MR. STEGE:
7	Q Recognize proposed whoops. Let's have it
8	a page got stuck here.
9	A Yes. Yes, I recognize them.
10	Q How do you recognize them?
11	A They're the photographs I took of the
12	property at the station. And I recognize the carpet in
13	the station as well.
14	MR. STEGE: Move to introduce the 11 series,
15	which is a four-page document.
16	MR. SLOCUM: Your Honor, we've already
17	stipulated to those.
18	THE COURT: There's a stipulation for
19	admission. If not already admitted, it is now admitted,
20	Ms. Clerk.
21	COURT CLERK: Thank you.
22	(Exhibit 11 is admitted into evidence.)
23	MR. STEGE: I may publish it?
24	THE COURT: Yes.

- 1	1	
1		(Publishing Exhibit 11 to the jury.)
2	BY MR. S	STEGE:
3	Q	Here we have the ball cap?
4	A	Yes.
5	Q	The inside of it?
6	A	Yes.
7	Q	Jacket?
8	A	Yes.
9	Q	And the shoes.
10	A	Yes.
11	Q	Did you also when Mr. Goad was in Sacramento
12	obtain	a buccal swab from him?
13	A	Yes.
14	Q	What is a buccal swab?
15	A	It's a it's a like a large Q-tip only
16	it has	a swab only at one end. It has a wooden handle.
17	Q	And what did you collect with this wooden
18	handle	Q-tip?
19	A	Samples of saliva and skin cells.
20	Q	All right. A person's DNA.
21	A	Correct.
22	Q	And you collected that from what part of Mr.
23	Goad?	
24	A	Between his cheek and gum.

1	MR. STEGE: Court's indulgence.
2	THE COURT: Yes.
3	(Short pause.)
4	MR. STEGE: I'll pass the witness. Thank you.
5	THE COURT: To the defense.
6	MR. SLOCUM: Thank you, your Honor.
7	CROSS-EXAMINATION
8	BY MR. SLOCUM:
9	Q Good morning.
10	A Good morning. How are you?
11	Q Fine. So the District Attorneys showed you
12	some surveillance of Wal-Mart. Correct?
13	A Yes.
14	Q And you had an opportunity previously to
15	review that surveillance; is that right?
16	A Yes.
17	Q And how was it that you that you
18	recognized the two individuals that were depicted in the
19	surveillance that you reviewed from Wal-Mart?
20	A Well, there's not just that view, there's
21	additional views that I was able to identify Mr. Gibson.
22	I'd already seen Mr. Scott Napier before so I was able
23	to recognize Mr. Napier as well.
24	Q Okay. So Mr. Napier you had met with before

- 1 because you did an interview with him?
 - A I did not interview him, but I saw him that day.
 - Q So you had physically seen him.
 - A Right.

- Q And as far as identifying Mr. Gibson in the video, how did you do that?
- A He had -- when I initially responded to the scene there was Nevada identification cards, and I had seen his face. He was recognizable to me in the Wal-Mart video.
- Q Okay. So the identification card that you had seen in his room.
 - A Uh-hum.
 - Q Which was on the 13th of February?
- A Correct.
 - Q And then when did you review the surveillance video from the Wal-Mart?
 - A A day later or two, I believe. I don't recall. No. I'm sorry, I don't recall. I believe I obtained that video on the 14th.
 - Q So you believe on the 14th is when you went to Wal-Mart?
 - A I believe that's when I obtained the Wal-Mart

So the next day after having looked at the --2 at the ID card you recognized Mr. Gibson in the video. 3 Yes. It looked like the same person to me, 4 5 sir. Okay. And then at that time you reviewed the 6 surveillance and you indicated that a purchase was made; 7 8 is that right? There's a transaction made, yes. 9 Well, it's a purchase; isn't that correct? 10 I don't know if it's a purchase or just cash. 11 So if I were to show you a copy of your 12 report would that assist you --13 Sure. 14 Α -- in remembering? So I'm going to show you 15 page 6 of Supplement 9, that's Bates stamp page 70. 16 If I may approach, your Honor? 17 THE COURT: Yes. 18 19 MR. SLOCUM: Thank you. BY MR. SLOCUM: 20 I'm going to have you take a look at that. 21 Yeah. Indicated here that I received 22 Α information from Detective Smith that that was the last 23

video, yes, on the 14th.

1

24

purchase that Mr. Gibson had made for 253.74.

Okay. So you received information that a 1 purchase had been made --2 Yes. 3 Α -- correct? 4 Yes, sir. 5 But then you went ahead and reviewed the 6 surveillance. Right? 7 Correct. 8 Α And at that time you indicate that the video 9 depicted a purchase that occurred on January 18th at 10 11 7:22. Correct? Yes. 12 Α And then you indicated that you were able to 13 location Mr. Gibson on video making the purchase. 14 15 Correct? Right. 16 Α And then you received video depicting Gibson 17 arriving at the store, making his purchase, and leaving 18 the store. 19 Yes, sir. 20 Α Now, you indicated that you recognized Mr. 21 Gibson as having partially gray hair, wearing a brown 22 jacket and tan pants and brown shoes. Correct? 23

24

Α

Yes.

And that's just in your report to 1 differentiate him from Mr. Napier. 2 Yes. 3 Α Now, you indicated that on the video you saw 4 that Mr. Napier assisted Mr. Gibson in using his debit 5 card. Now, we saw that depicted on the video. Do you 6 7 remember that? Yes. 8 Α Mr. -- Mr. Napier's actually holding the 9 10 phone? 11 Α Yes. In his hand? 12 0 Yes. 13 Α And would you agree that it appears that he's 14 got Mr. Gibson's pin number on his phone and he's 15 attempting to enter it on that key pad? 16 It appears that way, yes. 17 But they're having some kind of difficulty 18 actually getting the transaction to go through. 19 20 Correct? Correct. 21 Α And, in fact, it's -- it is Mr. Napier who is 22 standing at the -- at the station inputting the numbers;

23

24

is that right?

A Yes.

3

ass tim

5

4

6

7

8

9

11

12

13 14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

24

Q But then you indicate that Mr. Napier assisted Mr. Gibson in using the debit card at which time Mr. Gibson made a purchase in the amount of 253.74; is that correct?

A Correct.

Q The purchase was processed at 07:22 hours.

Α

Correct?

Q This transaction is always described as a purchase in your report; isn't that correct?

A Correct.

Yes.

Q You testified about the surveillance that you were able to view at the Cal-Neva; is that right?

A Yes.

Q And there was some discussion about the surveillance that you had observed previously at the Park Manor Apartments. Correct?

A Yes.

Q And as I understood your testimony, the last -- the last thing that -- or the last room from which Mr. Goad leaves is from Mr. Gibson's room; is that correct?

A Before he gets to the Cal-Neva?

1 Q Correct. 2 Yes. Α 3 So before he leaves he doesn't go back to his room, he actually leaves from Mr. Gibson's room, 4 5 Yes. Α That's 2:05. Correct? 6 7 Correct. Α So he leaves from 2:05 and he proceeds 8 directly to the Cal-Neva as you understand it? 9 10 Α Yes, sir. And do you know how long that takes to walk 11 from the Park Manor Apartments to Cal-Neva? 12 13 Α No. You didn't check on that? 14 0 15 No. Α So you don't know, for example, if Mr. Goad 16 went somewhere else before he went to the Cal-Neva? 17 True. Yes, I do not know that. 18 But you know that he does arrive at the 19 20 Cal-Neva, and you said you made some observations the fact that he did not appear to have any injuries on him; 21 22 is that right? That's correct.

And he didn't seem to have any blood on him;

23

24

Α

1 is that right? Correct. 2 Α And it did not -- it did not appear to you 3 that there was anything that stood out to you with 4 respect to any -- any injuries. Is that fair to say? 5 Correct. 6 And then you said he spent about 21 hours in 7 the casino? 8 9 A Yes. And then he leaves the casino presumably. 10 Correct? 11 12 Α Yes. And then were you able to view the 13 surveillance from the Park Manor Apartments when he goes 14 15 back? Yes, sir. 16 Α Do you know how long it takes him to get from 17 the Cal-Neva to the Park Manor? 18 Um, time stamp on the Cal-Neva is 2:28 p.m. 19 And he arrives back at the Park Manor Apartments on that 20 time stamp at about 2:47 p.m. 21 Now, when you say that are we assuming that 22 the time stamps are correct? 23

24

We know that time stamps at Cal-Neva is

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

- correct. The time stamp at the Park Manor Apartments is about ten minutes fast. So that would mean that Mr. Goad should have arrived around 2:37 p.m. at the Park Manor Apartments.
- Q Okay. So do you -- when you say we know that the Cal-Neva is correct, how do we know that?
 - A We checked it. I checked it. I verified it.
 - Q And how do you do that?
- A With my work iPhone. So I watch the active surveillance and then compare it to my work iPhone. And it's the same.
- Q Okay. So when you mean you veri -- you verified on the day that you go the surveillance is correct today.
 - A Yes.
- Q But you don't think the surveillance is correct on the day that the recording was made.

 Correct?
 - A True. Yes.
- Q But it was brought to your attention that there is a discrepancy in the time stamp with respect to the Park Manor Apartments.
 - A Yes, sir.
 - MR. SLOCUM: No further questions, your Honor.

1	Thank you.
2	THE COURT: Redirect.
3	REDIRECT EXAMINATION
4	BY MR. STEGE:
5	Q Is there a way to know how fast Mr. Goad
6	could make the trip from Park Manor to the Cal-Neva?
7	A No, sir.
8	Q Is that roughly 10, 15 minutes consistent
9	with your understanding of the location of the Cal-Neva
10	which is about right here (indicating) and Park Manor
11	which is by your police station?
12	A Yes, sir.
13	Q It's about consistent.
14	A Sure.
15	Q Would if it took ten minutes longer or 20
16	minutes longer would that cause you suddenly to not
17	suspect or believe that Mr. Goad was the killer of Mr.
18	Gibson?
19	MR. SLOCUM: Objection, your Honor.
20	THE COURT: As to the word killer?
21	MR. SLOCUM: Yes.
22	THE COURT: It is overruled.
23	BY MR. STEGE:
24	Q Would it change?

Α

Yes.

-- surveillance? The issue of -- well, did 1 you see anything nefarious in Mr. Napier's actions on 2 the Wal-Mart surveillance? 3 No. 4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Who walks away with the money on this transaction?

Mr. Gibson. Α

Now, we've talked about he gets a Q hundred-dollar bill up front. He's -- stays in the -doesn't leave the apartment after the 18th. Then we see him in the Cal-Neva. Is there a way to be certain that that hundred-dollar bill is the same hundred-dollar bill?

No. Α

Mr. Slocum referred to the leaving on camera 10 and arriving on Cal-Neva, then returning. The clothing being warn upon exit, is that consistent with the clothing he's worn -- wearing on Cal-Neva?

Α Yes.

And by the same token when he returns is the clothing he's wearing when he leaves Cal-Neva consistent with what you see him on camera 10?

Yes. Α

On the question of injuries or blood observed

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

on the Cal-Neva surveillance, what was the significance of, I guess, the lack of injuries to Mr. Goad?

A Well, he had no injuries, then — if he's in an altercation it doesn't mean — if he has no injuries, even if he is in an altercation doesn't necessarily mean he wasn't in an altercation. He could still have injuries, or he could not have injuries, but it's something to note.

 \mathbb{Q} And in the surveillance would you have seen blood on the sleeves or arms of the sweatshirt of Mr. Goad?

A No, it was covered by the jacket.

MR. STEGE: No further questions.

THE COURT: Recross.

MR. SLOCUM: Thank you, your Honor.

RECROSS EXAMINATION

BY MR. SLOCUM:

Q So as you recall from the surveillance did Mr. Goad have the jacket on when he went in to 205 on the 22nd of January?

- A Initially he had the jacket on, I believe so.
- Q But you can't state for certain right now.
- A This case encompassed such a large amount of video, no. I would have -- I would have to review it.

5

6

4

7 8

10

12 13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

Now, with respect to the purchase, again, your word, that — that Mr. Gibson made, there's no indication in your report about withdrawing any money; isn't that correct?

A Correct.

Q And there's no discussion about a hundred-dollar bill and turning a hundred-dollar bill in and getting five 20s back, that's not in your report, is it?

A No.

Q Now, with respect to the time that it took to get from the Park Manor Apartments to the Cal-Neva, you indicated to me you were not sure how long that took; isn't that right?

A Correct.

Q And then Mr. Stege asked you well, isn't there a way to know how long it takes? That was his question. Right?

A Yes. It would depend on a lot of things.

 ${\tt Q}$ So your answer to me now is it would depend on a lot of things.

A Yeah, that's what I said. I don't know — I don't know how long it would take to get to the Cal-Neva.

Q That's not the sort of thing you could, for example, look up on Google Maps?

A Well, you could, but I've actually done that in the past. However, there-again, there's so many other different things that allow me to how fast does he walk and so on.

Q So the short answer is you could have some information about it but you just don't have the information today.

A It would be all speculation.

Q Well, then Mr. Stege said well, we know how long it takes, right, because you know where Park Manor Apartments is and you know where the Cal-Neva is so you know long how long it takes. Right

A We could guesstimate how long it takes. You know, the distance between Park Manor Apartments and the Cal-Neva and myself, I could probably walk that within 10, 15 minutes I would guess.

O What's the distance?

A I know in my mind the distance where Park

Manor are is compared to the Cal-Neva. I don't know the distance. When I say that I say I know in my mind how far it is I can picture in my mind where Park Manor is and where the Cal-Neva is.

Okay. So what's the distance, then, in your 1 2 mind? Ten to 15-minute walk. 3 Α For you? 4 Q 5 Yes. Α MR. SLOCUM: No further questions. 6 Thank you, your Honor. 7 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. You're 8 free to step down and leave the courtroom. 9 Is this witness subject to recall? 10 MR. STEGE: Yes. 11 THE COURT: All right. Ladies and Gentlemen, 12 during this recess please do not discuss this case 13 amongst yourselves. Please do not form or express any 14 opinion about this matter until it has been submitted to 15 16 you. We will stand for our jury. I intend to 17 return to the courtroom in 15 minutes. 18 (Jury leaves courtroom.) 19 THE COURT: I'll just note for the record that 20 I have observed during this first session of trial that 21 Mr. Goad is drinking water, there have been nominal 22 interactions with counsel. He stands with us as

appropriate, just waved at me, and appears to be

23

24

participating in some measure in this proceeding. See you in 15 minutes.

testify.

(Short break.)

THE COURT: Let's begin writing. We just had an off-the-record quick conversation about the schedule of witnesses and how long lunch should be and when lunch should begin.

And then to the defense you mentioned something about the Court's canvass of Mr. Goad, and I do want to capture this on the record. My practice is after the State rests, I excuse the jury, and I canvass the accused out of the jury's presence, of course.

Are you suggesting something different?

MR. SLOCUM: Your Honor, my concern is only to give Mr. Goad the opportunity, should he wish to have it after your canvass, about whether or not he should

THE COURT: Oh, 100 percent. After I canvass Mr. Goad I will give you time to consult with him privately and I will give him time to reflect.

MR. SLOCUM: Thank you very much.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. STEGE: And the schedule thereafter, whenever both sides rest, are we going to close tomorrow

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

morning?

THE COURT: Depends on what happens this afternoon with the defense case and what time -- let me just think for a moment, because I want to -- I want to think about why you've asked the question which is I presume time to prepare the closing?

MR. STEGE: Prepare the closing, argue, if necessary, instructions.

THE COURT: Is your preference that regardless of what time we finish this afternoon we instruct and arque tomorrow morning?

MR. STEGE: Yes.

MR. SLOCUM: That's fine, your Honor.

MR. STEGE: It's a better product on all sides.

THE COURT: All right. I'll certainly consider that as the afternoon unfolds.

The jury, please.

(Jury returns to the courtroom.)

THE COURT: The jury is present. And to the State, you may continue.

MR. STEGE: Elvira Koeder.

DEPUTY: Stand up there, face the clerk.

COURT CLERK: Please raise your right hand.

ELVIRA KOEDER,

called as a witness herein, being first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

COURT CLERK: Thank you.

THE COURT: Counsel.

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. STEGE:

- O Hello. Please state and spell your name.
- A Elvira Koeder. E-l-v-i-r-a K-o-e-d-e-r.
- Q How are you currently employed?
- A I'm employed at the Forensic Science Division in the Washoe County Sheriff's Office.
- Q And what do you do within the Forensic Science Division?
- A I'm a criminalist who performs duties such as processing crime scenes and latent print processing, I do examinations as well as I'm also cross-referencing in the DNA section. And there I process anything that has to do with biological material for the presence of certain biological material.
 - Q And how would you -- what training and

experience do you have in this field?

A I have a Bachelor's and a Master's in Biotechnology from the University of Nevada, Reno. In my training in the crime lab included the DNA training portion, and there was training in the primary examination specifically where I had to perform successfully oral and written examination and a competency testing in the disciplines, and also in the forensic investigation section where I had to complete the same written, oral and — written, oral and competency testing.

Q And is that -- is your training since you've been in the division ongoing? Do you have periodic trainings within the field?

A Yes. Since I've been employed since 2009 in the crime lab anyway we had a proficiency test that all the analysts had to compete in their qualified discipline.

- Q You said since 2009 --
- A Yes.
- Q you've been. Did you respond to 33 Park
 Street on February 13th of 2019?
- A Yes, I did.
 - O We've heard from Detective Kazmar about his

observations and the collection of evidence within Apartment 205. Did you have a role in that?

A Yes, I was requested at the scene of 33 Park Street Apartment 205 to process the hallway and the interior of the Apartment 205.

 $\ensuremath{\mathbb{Q}}$ $\ensuremath{\,}$ And part of the processing is the taking the photographs of the scene.

A Yes. That includes the photography of the scene and preservation, evidence collection at the scene, as well as diagramming and -- and certain testing like latent processing or presumptive testing.

Q And so we've seen in this trial a number of exhibits that have yellow placard numbers within them. Are you the person who marks all the placards?

A Yes. And I use the placards to identify certain items and it will be easier than later in the diagram, or also in the photographs to identify certain items.

Q And so the photographs we saw with Detective Kazmar, they were likely yours.

A Yes.

Q Right. Because Detective Kazmar's not taking photographs at the same time you are, your — one of your primary duties is photographing the scene.

A Yes. The process for me as I take overalls of the initial crime scene, and then I place the placards as identified -- as identification markers next to items that I'm interested in in collecting or processing, and then I'll take those orders again with the placards on them.

Q And so you — in this case Detective Kazmar and you were working together on the scene or sort of have concurrent roles.

A Yes.

Q Let's move beyond photographs. Was there evidence that you collected in this scene? And let's talk in broad materials as, like, tangible items from within the apartment that you took and bagged up and booked into evidence.

A Yes. There were red stains that I collected.

There were a pair of scissors that I collected,

actually, a few pair of scissors because they were in

different locations, a pair of knife, a towel, cigarette

butts, ashtray, beer cans.

Q Were there some, like, cards or ID-type cards, business cards?

A Yes. There were business cards or ID, identification cards, yes.

3 4

2

5

6

7

8 9

10

11

12

14

13

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

And tell us about the process of -- once you collect those, what happens to them?

So once they're photographed and collected, you mean at the scene?

At the scene, right. So you photograph it in place.

Α Uh-hum.

Then you collect it. And how does it get into evidence, into the evidence vault?

I place the item into a clean packaging material, and it depends what the item is, for example, the business cards I would place them in clean envelope, mark the envelope with identification marker or the placard number, my initials, the agency, the date I collected it, and then I would transport all those evidence items collected in clean packaging into the crime lab where I would seal them and enter them into our database system, and then transfer them into a secured storage area either within the forensic investigation section garage or our evidence section in the lab.

And so, for example, you mentioned a towel. Was that a -- there is a towel hanging in the bathroom or a towel, sorry, underneath the sink that appeared to have red/brown staining, that item you collected?

A Yes, I did.

- O Booked it into evidence?
- A Yes, I did.
- Q A number of pairs scissors collected and booked into evidence?
 - A Yes.
 - Q Including the ones by the body?
 - A Yes.
- Q And cigarette butts and these remaining items you talked about were all physically taken and booked into evidence.
 - A Yes.
- Q You mention staining. It's true there was -- you've seen photographs of some red/brown staining or blood red staining within the apartment.
- A Yes. There was significant staining around the decedent, on the wall, on the dresser, and throughout the apartment, in the bathroom, and also in the hallway across the Apartment Number 205.
- Q And so within the photographs of the scene we see little tape flags or colored flags with numbers or letters written on them. Are you the person who places those there?

A I did. I call them markers. And I numbered certain red staining on the walls and the dresser that I observed. And the reason why I mark them differently or with different numbers was because they were — because of their directionality, they were going in different directions, and they were of different sizes, so I would select or mark them and first photograph them in place, and then select a certain area or representative area and swab those stains.

O And what does it mean to swab the stains?

A So in this case the red staining was dry, so I applied a wet -- one wet and one dry sterile swab to the area of interest, and I swabbed them simultaneously, the stain, and then I collected it and I used a clean sterile swab box.

- O And that swab then --
- A To preserve the swabs.
- Q And the swab then goes into evidence in case or in the event that it's used for further testing.
 - A Yes.
- Q So these areas you've testified about were the red -- blood red staining was observed, those were collected, swabbed and collected for evidence?
 - A That's correct.

Q Were you also looking for the question of residual swab? What's a residual swab?

A So residual swabs are the term that we use to collect touch DNA. And when a person touches an object, a residual or a residue is left behind, and this is what we refer to as residue swabs.

When I go in and swab that area, for example, in this case, I swabbed the exterior and interior of front door handles, the exterior and interior bathroom handles, as well as the dial knob off the AC unit, and the handle off the bathroom faucet.

Q And you -- in touching, you don't always know if someone touches something if their DNA is going to be left behind?

A No, I -- you can't see DNA visibly on a door handle but, yes, I did swab it because I didn't know if somebody -- if that door knob was touched or not.

Q And this is the similar process as the blood red staining, you swab it, collect the swabs, preserve them and book them into evidence for --

A Yes.

- Q -- potential future testing.
- A Yes, a method system.
- O Also collected at the scene was a cigarette

packet; is that right?

2.2

- A That's correct.
- Q And why was that collected or?
- A That cigarette packet was collected because it had also red staining, and not only red staining but it also had a visible patent print. And a patent print is a fingerprint left in a material, either a liquid, paint, or something oily. And in this case I collected it because I noticed the patent print on the exterior of the cigarette pack.
- Q And just because you observe one doesn't necessarily mean that that patent print is of suitable quality to be tested against other fingerprints. Right?
 - A Yeah, that is a possibility.
 - Q Did you also use a Hemastix?
- A Yes. A Hemastix is a presumptive test that we use to test possible, the possible presence of blood.
- Q Is it conclusive as to whether the substance is blood?
- A No, it's not conclusive. There is a confirmation test done at the lab. But at the scene this is the easiest and quickest test for me to guide me in the right direction to say okay, I am this is a positive for possible blood, and I will collect this

item, and then further analysis will be done at the lab.

Q And so, for example, in this case at marker 7 you use a red stain on the southeast corner of wall under the bedroom dining area you've performed a Hemastix on that.

A Yeah. And the reason why I performed the Hemastix that the special red stain is because it didn't look similar to the other ones it, was a little bit out of place as well because most the stains were observed on the dresser and this was in the corner of the southeast wall of the bedroom and the living room area. And I photographed it, I tested with a Hemastix test, and I collected it.

Q And it was — the result was what, positive or negative?

A It was positive for Hemastix for the possible presence of blood.

Q You also performed Hemastix on the red staining of the bathroom sink countertop.

A Yes, I did.

O And what was the result of that?

A The result was positive for the possible presence of blood.

Q And so all the evidence collected ultimately

went up to the vault at the crime lab.

A To the evidence section of the crime lab, yes.

Q Evidence section, okay. You also -- once you got to the lab was there additional work you did on some of the evidence?

A Yes. Once it is packaged, properly sealed and entered into our database system and submitted to the evidence section, I also do further analysis, for example, latent fingerprint processing, and this was done in some — for some items.

Q Right. So you mentioned the primary examination in DNA. Can you tell us what that is?

A The primary examination in our crime lab includes the processing of any biological fluids that are present on an object of evidentiary item.

Q Did you process a pair of black-handled scissors with red staining located at Placard 5 near the body of the deceased?

A I did.

Q And what processing did you conduct?

A I started with a visual examination and I observed red staining on the tip of the scissors, of the blade of the scissors, and I processed — or I swabbed

that area.

I also processed the scissors for latent processing on the blade of the scissors and the handle of the scissors. And also I collected residual swabs from the blade of the scissors and the handle of the scissors.

Q Okay. Let's talk about those separately. Which occurs first, fingerprint processing or residual DNA or the DNA portion?

A So in this case I actually collected the red staining on the tip of the scissors first because the red — the red staining was flaky and I didn't want to lose any evidence so I only swabbed the red staining before — for any latent print processing so — and then I have to perform latent print processing first because once I swab — swab an area I can eliminate some possible fingerprints on the item. So in this case I process the latent print — the scissors for latent prints first, and then swabbed it for residual DNA.

Q And the latent print processing, does that disturb in any way the DNA portion of the item of evidence?

A No, it does not. It does not take anything away.

Q What is the process for the DNA or, I'm sorry, the fingerprint development? Was it done?

A So after visual examination I processed it with a method called cyanoacrylate glue, and which is also commonly known as the super glue method. And it's a method that combines the fuming or the vapor of the super glue and humidity, and the reaction causes it to adhere to the amino acids, fatty acids or proteins in the fingerprint possibly located on the item.

Q So you did that process on the scissors with red staining?

A I did.

2.1

Q And did you also do that with respect to the knife located on the bathroom counter?

A Yes, I did.

Q So after the fingerprint processing, you then do the DNA section portion.

A Yes.

Q Let's talk first -- let's go back to the scissors. What areas -- you had already swabbed the red blood -- blood red tip.

A Uh-hum.

Q What do you do to process the rest?

A So after that I processed it via the

cyanoacrylate esters fume method. And then I took photograph of what I observed, if something was observed. In this case I did not observe any ridge detail.

Q And what does that mean to observe no ridge detail?

A So I didn't -- I didn't find any -- so ridge detail or fingerprint is the finger skin ridge detail that you see on your fingertips or the palm of your hand. And I did not see any of the ridge detail on the -- on the blades or the handle of the scissors.

Q But then you process it for DNA.

A So yes. This part I process for residual swabs and in this case I take, once again, a sterile wet and dry swab and apply to the area of interest, in this case it was the scissors blades that I swabbed separately avoiding the red staining, and then I did the same thing with the ham of the scissors also avoiding the red staining, and then just trying to collect possible residual DNA.

Q What about the knife, what were the results of the super glue fuming with respect to the knife?

A So I did not observe any fingerprints of value for comparison on the knife as well.

- Q And so then you move to the DNA portion of the knife. What areas did you swab on the knife?
 - A I swabbed the red staining separate on the knife which was between the blade and the handle of the knife. And then also I swabbed the blade of the knife separately for residual DNA, as well as the handle of the knife for residual DNA.
 - Q And so one portion you're looking at the apparent blood and swabbing that. The next portion you're doing the part without blood that's the blade.
 - A Yes.
 - Q And the third being the handle.
 - A Yes.

- Q And the handle being for residual.
- A Yes.
 - Q And those swabs and samples were all further booked into evidence and by you.
 - A Yes.
 - Q And is there a -- I use a term primary DNA.

 Is that a secondary DNA section?
- A Yes. This is where the -- the DNA profile will be established, so I'm not qualified to speak to that.
 - Q Right. But you do the first process, then

the samples are preserved and go to the second process.

- A Yes.
- Q In this case, Ms. Siewertsen.
- ${\tt A} {\tt Yes.}$

- Q The business there were three business cards and two ID cards in the name of Mr. Gibson with red staining. Were those similarly swabbed?
 - A Yes. May I refer to my report?
 - Q Would it refresh your recollection?
 - A Yes, it will.

THE COURT: So the witness may refer to it privately but not testify directly from it or be examined upon it until further order of the Court.

THE WITNESS: Thank you.

BY MR. STEGE:

- Q If you'll review that. Does that refresh your recollection?
 - A Yes.
 - Q Did you do a swabbing of those cards?
- A I swabbed to the Veterans ID card because it was a laminated card so I did swab that one. The other business cards were the paper product so I had to use a different method. I did not swab those, I chemically processed them with a hydrogen which is a similar method

like I described before where the chemical adheres to the amino acids in the fingerprint.

Q Okay. So you were looking in both of those cases for fingerprints and collecting DNA swabs.

A Yes.

Q Did any of the items -- well, similar to the DNA having a two-step process does the fingerprint process have the same two-step process or a similar one?

A Yes. There is a latent print processing method which I did in this case and there's also latent fingerprint examination or confirmation.

Q And on the majority of the items were, were there latent impressions that were of value for comparison?

A On the -- on the porous business cards, I mean the porous paper of the business cards they were possible fingerprints of value for comparison, but they were forwarded to the comparison section.

Q And are you aware of the results of whether, in fact, they were able to be compared?

A I can not speak to the latent print examiner's report on this.

Q But you have seen it.

A I have seen it, yes.

1	Q And you're aware that
2	MR. SLOCUM: I'm going to object, your Honor.
3	She just said
4	THE COURT: Sustained.
5	BY MR. STEGE:
6	Q The cigarette packet, was that also swabbed
7	for potential DNA, residual DNA?
8	A May I refer to my report for this?
9	Q If it refreshes your recollection.
10	A Yes, it will. Thank you.
11	Q Does that refresh your recollection?
12	A Yes. So the cigarette pack was swabbed for
13	red staining.
14	MR. STEGE: May I approach the witness?
15	THE COURT: Yes.
16	BY MR. STEGE:
17	Q Ma'am, I'm handing you proposed Exhibit 36.
18	A Okay.
19	Q Do you recognize that item?
20	A Yes, I do. Sorry.
21	Q How is it that you recognize it?
22	A I initialed the packaging with my initials,
23	and this was collected by me on February 13th at 33 Park
24	Street, Apartment 205.

1	Q And the handwriting being yours?	
2	A Yes, that's my handwriting.	
3	Q Indicating that you are the person who	
4	collected it	
5	A Yes.	
6	Q and booked it. There's some red tape on	
7	that box. Tell us about what kind of red tape is.	
8	A So this is red evidence seal tape and I seal	
9	the box to prevent anything from either escaping or	
10	entering the box. And then I initial the label or the	
11	sorry, the seal.	
12	Q If anyone else had opened that it would have	
13	a broken seal and that would be visible.	
14	A That's correct.	
15	MR. STEGE: And move to introduce this	
16	exhibit.	
17	MR. SLOCUM: No objection.	
18	THE COURT: It is admitted, Ms. Clerk.	
19	COURT CLERK: Thank you.	
20	(Exhibit 36 is admitted into evidence.)	
21	BY MR. STEGE:	
22	Q Within this box what would you expect to	
23	what's in the box?	
24	A So in this box there is one pair of Office	

Depot scissors of black handle with red staining, and it was collected from the bedroom dining area. 2 From the placard near the body. Yes. Placard Number 5. 4 You put on gloves before handling that box. 5 Why did you do that? 6 7 Because I labeled it with a biohazardous label when I packaged it and I know that there is red 8 staining, so possible blood on the scissors. 9 10 You don't want to touch the blood. And I don't want to add my fingerprints to 11 Α 12 the scissors, either. Okay. Is there -- the chemical process you 13 used, is there a residual super glue on that as well? 14 15 Yes. There is a label saying "Caution Α evidence chemically treated, handle with gloves." And 16 this is because I did treat it with chemicals during the 17 latent print processing examination. 18 And so in its state if you were to touch it 19 with your bare hand would it -- what would happen? 20 You could just get chemicals transferred onto 21 Α 22 your skin. Okay. Maybe best not to open it --23

1

24

A

Yes.

1	Q unless you're wearing gloves.
2	Do you recognize Exhibit 37?
3	A Yes, I do.
4	Q You recognize it?
5	A Yes. It is the one knife with a black handle
6	with red staining, and was collected from top of the
7	bathroom countertop. And it has my initials on it, the
8	date I collected it, February 13th of 2019, and the
9	address is 33 Park Street, Apartment Number 205, and the
10	Reno PD agency case number 19-3098.
11	Q Okay. It bears the evidence seals as well.
12	A Yes. It has I sealed it and I initialed
13	it. I also added the biohazardous label and the
14	chemical treated label on the packaging.
15	Q For the same reasons?
16	A For the same reasons.
17	Q And this is the fixed blade knife that we
18	that was recovered from the from that counter.
19	A That's correct.
20	MR. STEGE: I move to introduce this exhibit.
21	THE COURT: Would you tell me the number,
22	please.
23	MR. STEGE: 37, your Honor.

MR. SLOCUM: No objection.

1	THE COURT: 37 is admitted, Ms. Clerk.	
2	COURT CLERK: Thank you.	
3	(Exhibit 37 is admitted into evidence.)	
4	MR. STEGE: I'll pass the witness.	
5	THE COURT: To the defense.	
6	CROSS-EXAMINATION	
7	BY MR. SLOCUM:	
8	Q Good morning.	
9	A Good morning.	
10	Q So you actually went out to the scene to	
11	to perform your duties; is that right?	
12	A That's correct, yes.	
13	Q And it's fair to say when you entered the	
14	apartment that there's a fair bit of blood that you're	
15	able to see strewn on the wall?	
16	A Yes.	
17	Q Did you make note of the carpeting that was	
18	upon which the body was laying?	
19	A I documented it in my photographs, yes.	
20	Q But I'm not talking about the photographs,	
21	now, I'm interested to find out your observations	
22	personally.	
23	A Okay.	
24	Q Okay? Did you observe the carpeting to	

actually be saturated and wet?

A Yes, it was because once the decedent was moved, I collected red staining from underneath the decedent as well.

Q Okay. Now I'm asking a slightly different question. So I'm talking about with the body laying on the carpet --

A Uh-hum.

Q — did you observe the area around the body to be wet?

A I did not test it for wetness or dryness. I can go by the documentation through my photographs.

Q Okay. But I'm asking here about your observation that it was so saturated that you would have been concerned about spreading the blood even further.

A I wasn't concerned about spreading the blood because I tried to avoid the -- you know, stepping into evidence, so no, I wasn't concerned about that.

Q Okay. So -- and this is what you do, right?

I mean --

A Yes.

Q -- your job is to preserve the evidence and the scene as it is. Correct?

A Yes.

Q So you would want to, of course, know if the -- if the carpet is saturated because if you -- if you note that the carpet's saturated you're not going to want to step there. Right?

A That's correct.

Q But in this case you didn't have any concern about that, is that fair to say, because the carpet really wasn't saturated?

A I don't know if the carpet was not saturated or not because I didn't remove the carpet to see what's underneath the carpet.

Q Right. And I'm not -- I'm not asking for -for you to tell us today about if this was saturated.

I'm actually interested in your testimony regarding
whether or not you made note of it. And that's the sort
of thing that you would have made note of.

 $$\operatorname{MR}.$ STEGE: Objection to the form of the question.

THE COURT: Question's pretty complex. I'm going to overrule and determine if the witness is under — the witnesses understands enough to answer. If not, I'm going to refuse it.

MR. SLOCUM: All right.

THE COURT: Ma'am, do you understand the

question?

THE WITNESS: I understand. I believe I answered it.

THE COURT: All right. But I'm going to have you answer it again to the defense satisfaction. Go ahead, please.

THE WITNESS: Okay. So when I enter a crime scene, I -- of course I observe everything, but I also document everything through my photographs, so it should be documented in my photographs.

BY MR. SLOCUM:

Q Okay. So -- so if someone were, for example, to say oh, you can't see this really in the photograph but it was really saturated there, you would have issue with that?

A Well, the saturation also is -- if it seeped through the carpet, that's what you're talking about, right?

Q Well, I'm talking specifically about — your job is to document the evidence and you've been very clear about that.

A Yes.

Q And so to the extent that your job is to document evidence, it would not be a fair statement to

saw you can't really see this, however, this carpet was really -- was really saturated.

A So I observed red staining around the decedent on the carpet, yes, but I can not speak to the saturation because I did not remove the carpet and look to see how -- how saturated it was.

- Q Okay. Was the blood dry on the carpet?
- A I don't recall.
- Q Is that the sort of thing that you would have made note of?

A No, not necessarily because it depends -- I don't know how long the body or the red stain was there, so not necessarily.

- Q So you didn't know how long it was there.
- A No.

Q Would whether or not the blood was dry or not assist you in making that determination?

A The blood stains that I observed throughout the apartment were dry. When the body was removed by the medical examiner, yes, the blood staining, or the red staining, sorry, red staining underneath the body was wet.

Q And I'm speaking now about the before you removed the body. So we're not talking about where the

- body was found, but around the body on the carpet, and the question is --
 - A Okay.

2.3

- Q -- whether or not that was dry or not.
- A That area was dry, yes.
- Q Now, I also want to ask you about some -- some red staining that was actually out in the hallway.
 - A Okay.
- Q You also made some -- some observations about some red staining in the hallway; is that right?
- A Yes. There were some red staining on the wall across from Apartment Number 201, across from Apartment 203, and across from Apartment 205. And there was along the north wall of the hallway.
- Q And are these the sorts of stains where you would have used a Hemastix?
- A No, not necessarily because they looked consistent with the red staining that is consistent with dried -- the color of dried blood so I did not necessarily have to test it with -- with the Hemastix presumptive test.
- Q Okay. So with the naked eye you can see whether or not that's blood or not?
 - A No. I can see if it's red staining that is

consistent with possible blood, the color of possible blood.

Q And you can see that with the naked eye.

A Yes, because I've been doing this for quite sometime.

Q Okay. I just want to make sure we're clear about this. So when you looked at those stains, although you marked them, you looked at them and said that's — that can't be blood because it doesn't have the right color.

A Yes. If it's like orange in color or pink in color, then I would not even collect that, or test it.

O You would --

A Because it's not consistent with the color of possible blood.

Q Okay. So you would mark it on the wall, you would photograph it.

A Uh-hum.

Q But then you wouldn't do any type of further testing.

A Yeah, I would take -- I would probably take a picture, a photograph, yes.

Q Do you recall if you did that in this case?

A In this case in the hallway specifically?

Yes.

2

I saw that the red staining and I marked it, photographed it, and also collected it.

3 4

Okay. So those stains you did -- you did Q collect.

5

I did. A

7

6

Okay. But the question I was asking was whether or not you would have used Hemastix to determine whether or not that was blood.

9

10

11

8

No because I did not -- I only used Hemastix on something is not consistent with what I'm seeing, and I try to, you know, collect it or test it, and it's presumptive test. If it's -- if the result would be negative, then I would not collect it, but in this case it looked consistent with, which in my experience I believed to be possible bloodstains in the hallway so I

12 13

14

15

16

did collect them.

17

18

19

Okay. So if I'm understanding what you said correctly, if -- if the naked eye, to you with the naked eye you look at it and it appears to be blood, you've been doing this a long time so you're gonna collect it.

21

20

Yes, that's correct.

22 23

24

But you're gonna use Hemastix when what -what you're seeing is not consistent with what?

A With the color. So sometimes it's more blood can appear in color more brownish, or — or more on the red side. And the areas that I tested in the apartment, inside the apartment I wasn't sure so I went ahead and tested this with the presumptive test.

Q Okay. So -- and just to make sure that I'm understanding your testimony correctly, there's a range of colors. There's some at the far, the far end, and you can identify them with your naked eye and say that's not blood.

MR. STEGE: Objection, form of the question.

THE COURT: I'm going to overrule it. Your questions do become complex and multidivergent.

MR. SLOCUM: This witness has been doing this a long time, though.

THE COURT: So just remember to always tighten your questions and wait, let the witness answer. But it is overruled.

BY MR. SLOCUM:

Q So if I'm understanding your testimony correctly there's a range, correct? Of colors.

A Yes.

Q Okay. At one end with the naked eye you can look at this and say this is not consistent with blood,

every single little stain that I see.

Q Okay. Why do you say that would be a waste of time?

A Because there were so many stains, and I know some stains were definitely consistent with -- with red staining that look, in my experience, from my work experience, similar to the color of red staining of blood.

MR. SLOCUM: Okay. If I could just have the Court's indulgence.

No further questions. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you. You may redirect.

REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. STEGE:

Q Well, and part of the reason it's a waste of time is because all the swabs you collect can be examined at the lab.

A Exactly.

Q In what way?

A So we do a presumptive testing which is also called the Kastle-Meyer or phenolphthalein test that is more specific than the Hemastix test. The Hemastix test, like I said before, is just a quick and easy test, a presumptive test to do in the field. And then when we bring back the evidence into the lab, we do another

presumptive test which is a Kastle-Meyer or a phenolphthalein test. And also then we can do a confirmatory test which is the Hemastix test, and that specifically tests for human blood, for the presence of human blood.

Q So you have a, sounds like a wide range of tests available to determine if a stain is, in fact, human blood.

A Yes.

Q And the Hemastix, is that of the ones you mention, on the lower end of a reliability or lower end of use?

A Yes. But it's — in the field it's the most convenient because it's portable, it's easy and quick to test in the field, whereas, all the other chemicals or presumptive tests are confirmatory tests, they need — there's a process involved with those tests and they take longer. To do those kind of tests in the field would take a lot of time.

And if I may add, in the testing in the laboratory it's a controlled environment, sterile environment. In the field I can not perform these tests necessary with possibly contaminating something.

Q Within the layers of questioning I missed if

there were any stains that you observed or suspected were blood that were not collected. Like were there any of these close-in-color ones that weren't tested or weren't collected?

A I don't recall if I saw anything that was pink or orange that I did not collect, but I collect — I decided to collect these stains that I collected at the scene and then bring them back rather than not collecting them at all and then not having the evidence available, the possible evidence available.

Q Right. Rather err on the side of caution, collect it, and then do further testing if necessary.

A That's correct.

Q The -- as to the stains in the hallway that -- those were collected.

A Those were collected, yes.

Q Saturation, on cross-examination that term saturation was used quite a bit.

A Uh-hum.

Q Is that a term you use within your field?

A Not necessarily, but I would use it to describe the condition of something if I had removed it and examined it or if the carpet was not -- not examined by me in detail. I did not cut out a piece of carpet

and looked under the carpet to see what's.

- Q You've been doing this a while. Have you ever been on any other murder scenes or scenes with a corpse?
 - A Yes, I have.
 - Q Is it more than you can count?
 - A Yes.

- Q Would you expect underneath a body with apparent stab wounds there to be fluid or blood?
 - A Yes.
- Q Given the amount of blood that you saw on this scene would you have expected there to be blood under the body?
 - A Yes.
- $\ensuremath{\mathtt{Q}}$ $\ensuremath{\mathtt{A}}\ensuremath{\mathtt{A}}\ensuremath{\mathtt{N}}\ensuremath{\mathtt{A}}\ensuremath{\mathtt{N}}\ensuremath{\mathtt{A}}\ensuremath{\mathtt{N}}\ensuremath{\mathtt{A}}\ensuremath{\mathtt{N}}\ensuremath{\mathtt{A}}\ensuremath{\mathtt{N}}\ensuremath{\mathtt{A}}\ensuremath{\mathtt{N}}\ensuremath{\mathtt{A}}\ensuremath{\mathtt{N}}\ensuremath{\mathtt{A}}\ensuremath{\mathtt{N}}\ensuremath{\mathtt{A}}\$
- A Yes. When the medical examiner removed the body I photographed the area of the body, and that area was, was wet.
- Q On the -- back to the saturation issue. As a matter of course do you make it -- when you're on a scene do you prefer to step in blood or step around blood?

A I prefer to step around blood.

1	Q And that's what you try to do.	
2	A Yes.	
3	MR. STEGE: Okay. Nothing further. Thank	
4	you.	
5	THE COURT: Recross.	
6	RECROSS EXAMINATION	
7	BY MR. SLOCUM:	
8	Q So if I understood your testimony correctly,	
9	you had the option to cut out a piece of the carpet and	
10	you chose not to do that. Is that fair to say?	
11	A That's fair to say, yes.	
12	MR. SLOCUM: No further questions, your Honor.	
13	THE COURT: All right. Thank you. You're	
14	free to step down and leave the courtroom.	
15	THE WITNESS: Thank you.	
16	THE COURT: Ladies and Gentlemen, will you	
17	stand for a moment and relax while I have a side bar	
18	with counsel?	
19	(Side bar not reported.)	
20	THE COURT: Your next witness.	
21	MR. STEGE: Madison Dahlquist.	
22	COURT CLERK: Please raise your right hand.	
23	MADISON DAHLQUIST,	
24	called as a witness herein, being first	

duly sworn, was examined and testified 1 as follows: 2 3 COURT CLERK: Thank you. 4 THE COURT: Be seated, please, and remember to 5 speak into the microphone. 6 THE WITNESS: Yes. 7 DIRECT EXAMINATION 8 BY MR. STEGE: 9 Good morning. Please state and spell your 10 11 name. A It's Madison Dahlquist. M-a-d-i-s-o-n 12 D-a-h-l-q-u-i-s-t. 13 How are you employed? 14 The Washoe County Sheriff's Office, Forensic 15 Science Division. 16 THE COURT: So let me return to this 17 microphone. Either amplify your voice, we won't think 18 you're yelling at us, or speak into the microphone, 19 please. You have a soft voice and everyone in this room 20 needs to be able to hear you. 21 BY MR. STEGE: 22 Q We've heard testimony from Ms. Koeder. Is 23

she a colleague of yours?

- A Yes, she is.
- Q How long have you worked at the Forensic Science Division?
- A I've been with the Forensic Science Division just over two years. I started in June of 2017 and I've been with FIS, which is the Forensic Investigation Section, since April of 2018.
- Q Were you involved in the -- did you do some work in -- at Apartment 213 of 33 Park Street?
 - A Yes, I did.
 - O Along with Detective Kazmar.
 - A Yes, I did.
 - Q Did you collect evidence from that location?
 - A Yes, I did.
- Q Now, we have seen in this trial the photographs taken during that process, but -- and we've heard testimony about the process of booking evidence or collecting evidence. Could you tell us about what specific evidence was taken and booked into evidence by you from 213?
- A There were numerous items of evidence. There were some residual swabs. There was a towel with brown staining. There --
 - Q Let's start with -- well, let's put to the

side swabs for now. Let's talk about tangible items like things you might put in a bag.

A There was a pair of black Wrangler pants that had brown and red staining. There was a gray sweatshirt that had red staining. I did some singular track samples. There was a baseball style hat, and another jacket as well.

Q I'm going to ask you to speak up a little bit.

A Okay.

Q Have you ever testified in district court before?

A No, I have not.

Q Well, welcome. It's a please raise your voice. A brown towel, where was -- I'm sorry, green towel with brown stain. Where was that?

A That was collected in the back room in the towel rack.

Q A gray in color weather-proof jacket, size medium. Where was that collected?

A That was collected from atop a chair in the living area.

Q A brown cigarette butt.

A That was from inside. That was on the

	H
1	1
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	

21

22

23

24

nightstand.

- Q Gillette razor?
- A That was in the bathroom on top of the counter.
 - Q Why the razor?
 - A It could have possible DNA on it.
 - O From the shaver?
 - A That's correct.
- Q A pair of -- I want to draw your attention specifically to a pair of black Wrangler pants, size 34/32. Where were those found?
- A Those were found -- they were inside on the top of a blue laundry-style bag, and that bag was next to the dresser in the living area.
- Q What did you do with the pants when you collected them?
- A I collected them with clean gloves and handled the item as little as possible. I placed them into a paper bag and took it back to the lab.
- Q What did you do with it when you got back to the lab?
- A Once at the lab inside the FIS secure garage there are cabinets which I only have the key to. I finished the package, sealed the item up, and entered

into our lab management system. This process gives it a 1 unique item number that is specific to each item in that 2 case. And at this point the item was then released to 3 the agency. 4 MR. STEGE: Can I approach the witness? 5 THE COURT: Yes. 6 7 BY MR. STEGE: I'm holding here for you proposed Exhibit 34. 8 Do you recognize this proposed exhibit? 9 Yes, I do. 10 A How? 11 That's my handwriting. It's my item 12 description. 13 Item description being the pants. 14 Q That's correct, black Wrangler pants. 15 Α What is the condition or, I guess, 16 cleanliness of these particular pants? 17 They have red and brown staining. Α 18 Do you advise opening it in court? 19 0 I mean, it could be a potential biohazard. 20 Α And where is the brown staining? 21 Q Brown staining is at the top of the pants 22 more on the inside kind of like where you would find a 23

24

tag.

1	MR. STEGE: Move to introduce Exhibit 34.
2	MR. SLOCUM: No objection.
3	THE COURT: 34 is admitted, Ms. Clerk.
4	COURT CLERK: Thank you.
5	(Exhibit 34 is admitted into evidence.)
6	BY MR. STEGE:
7	Q At the crime lab did you further document the
8	condition of those pants?
9	A Yes, I did.
10	Q How?
11	A On February 26, 2019, inside the secure FIS
12	garage I took photographs of the pants, showing the
13	general condition and staining of the item.
14	MR. STEGE: I move to introduce Exhibit 6
15	which has been admitted by stipulation, which it is a
16	THE COURT: It has not been previously been
17	admitted, Ms. Clerk; is that correct?
18	COURT CLERK: Negative.
19	THE COURT: It is now admitted by stipulation
20	Exhibit Number 6.
21	COURT CLERK: Thank you.
22	(Exhibit Number 6 is admitted into evidence.)
23	MR. STEGE: May I publish
24	THE COURT: Yes.

1	MR. STEGE: the exhibit?
2	BY MR. STEGE:
3	Q What do we see at page 1 of Exhibit 6?
4	A This is the pair of black Wrangler pants with
5	the brown and red staining.
6	Q Where do you see are you able to see the
7	red staining from this particular view?
8	A It's quite hard to see in this particular
9	view.
10	Q Oh, the brown staining.
11	A You can. It's at the top kind of underneath
12	where the scale is.
13	Q Can you circle it?
14	A (Witness circling Exhibit y.)
15	Q Let's go to page 2. What are we seeing here?
16	A That is the pants opened up so that you can
17	see the tag as well as that brown staining.
18	Q Do you know how to clear?
19	A I do not.
20	Q Bottom left corner. I can do it.
21	A My screen is now black.
22	Q Okay. Why did you document this particular
23	area of the pants?
24	A Just so that you could see that it is a pair

of Wrangler pants in the size, as well as that brown 1 2 stain. Page 3, looks like we're moving down here. 3 That is correct. Α 4 Showing the right pant leg. 5 Yes. 6 Α Are you able to see in this photograph the 7 red staining? 8 Yes, you are. 9 Α Could you indicate that, please, for the 10 11 jury? (Witness circling Exhibit 6.) 12 Was this -- going back to the scene was this 13 Q blood red staining visible at the scene? 14 Yes, the red staining was visible at the 15 Α 16 scene. And I guess a better way to ask that is that 17 visible to the naked eye? 18 Yes, it was. 19 Α Moving down to page 4. What is this? 20 It's just further down a close-up view of 21 that same pant leg. 22 So a detail indicating the blood red stain? 23

Yes, it is.

A

Is that -- that's in the middle of the 1 photograph here. Right? 2 It's almost as full -- here. 3 Let's move to 5. It appears as though we're 4 transitioning to the left leg, front of the left leg. 5 That is correct. 6 Page 6. We're now at a detail of the left, 7 front of the left leg. 8 That is correct. 9 , A Was blood red staining visible to the naked 10 Q 11 eye? Yes, it was. 12 Α Do you see it here? 1.3 0 I do. 14 Α Would you indicate it, please. 15 0 (Witness circling Exhibit 6.) 16 Α Now, we have -- I'm going to pause here for 17 sort of procedural question. We've heard about primary 18 DNA and secondary DNA. We've heard a presumptive 19 testing for suspected blood. Did you do any of that 20 process with respect to these pants? 21 No, I did not. 22 But was that process ordered or was that --23

was this item of evidence forwarded for that process?

Yes, it was. 1 Α Page 7. What are we seeing here? 2 That's the back view pants and overall view. 3 Α And are we, again, see detail both of the 4 5 left and right leg? 6 Yes, you will. 7 Let's then go ahead to 9. The back of the 8 right leg. 9 That's correct. Α 10 Was there blood red staining visible to the naked eye? 11 12 Yes, there was. Α Do you see it here? 13 Q 14 A Yes, I do. Can you indicate it, please? 15 Q (Witness circling Exhibit 6.) 16 Α Okay. Was there -- maybe an omission here 17 Q but was there -- do you recall there being blood red 18 staining on the back of the right leg? 19 This is the back of the right leg. 20 A I'm sorry. The back of the left leg. 21 I do not recall. I'd have to see my 22

Okay. Did you do a similar process with a

23

24

photographs

1	sweatshirt	?
2	A	Yes, I did.
3	Q	Where did you find the sweatshirt?
4	А	The sweatshirt was on top of a chair in the
5	living are	ea of the residence.
6	Q	Was that item also booked into evidence?
7	A	Yes, it was.
8	Q	Was it later photographed at the lab?
9	A	Yes, it was.
10	Q	Do you recognize what is Exhibit 35, which
11	I'm holdi:	ng in front of you?
12	A	Yes, I do.
13	Q	How do you recognize it?
14	A	It's the gray hooded sweatshirt.
15	Q	And it's sealed with evidence tape?
16	A	That is correct.
17		MR. STEGE: Move to introduce 35.
18		MR. SLOCUM: No objection.
19		THE COURT: 35 is admitted, Ms. Clerk.
20		COURT CLERK: Thank you.
21		(Exhibit 35 is admitted into evidence.)
22	BY MR. ST	TEGE:
23	Q	This also a biohazard?
24	A	Yes, it is.

1	Q	Why?
2	А	There was red staining on the item.
3	Q	You commented on the condition or cleanliness
4	of the pan	ts. What about the sweatshirt?
5	А	The sweatshirt had red staining on it so it
6	was furthe	r photographed at the lab just like the pants
7	were.	
8		MR. STEGE: Move to introduce, your Honor,
9	Exhibit 7	which is we have a stipulation.
10		THE COURT: 7 is admitted, Ms. Clerk, by
11	stipulatio	on.
12		COURT CLERK: Thank you.
13		(Exhibit 7 is admitted by stipulation.)
14		MR. STEGE: May I publish it?
15		THE COURT: Yes.
16	BY MR. STI	EGE:
17	Q	Can you walk us through page 1 of this
18	exhibit?	
19	A	This is an overall photograph of the gray
20	hooded sw	eatshirt with red staining.
21	Q	You used the term overall photo. What is an
22	overall p	hoto?
23	A	It just shows the entirety of the item.
24	Q	Page 2.

Zoomed in of the collar area to show that 1 it's a Hanesbrand. 2 Page 3? 3 0 That is the right arm of the sweatshirt and 4 part of the body. 5 Was there -- you mentioned blood red staining 6 visible on this. Do you see that in this picture or do 7 we need to look at the close-ups? 8 I can see it in this picture. 9 Α Will you indicate, please. 10 (Witness circling spot in picture.) 11 Let's move to the next page, page 4. This is 12 a close-up, is that the term used? 13 Yes, it is. 14 Α Of the right sleeve. 15 0 That's correct. 16 Α With the visible blood red staining. 17 0 Yes. 18 Α At 5. Where are we -- from the previous 19 Q picture, where are we? 20 It's the same size just a little bit zoomed 21 out from the previous picture to include the upper arm 22

Was there blood red staining on the upper arm

23

24

area.

- 1		
1	area?	
2	A	Yes.
3	Q	Can you indicate, please?
4	А	(Witness circling spot on picture.)
5	Q	Let's move to 6. Are we now at a detail of
6	that upper	arm area?
7	A	Yes, we are.
8	Q	7 it appears we're transitioning to the left
9	arm?	
10	A	That is correct.
11	Q	Was there on left arm blood red staining
12	visible?	•
13	A	Yes, there is.
14	Q	8, is 8 a detail of that blood red staining?
15	A	Yes, it's a detail of the red staining.
16	Q	9, orient us here as to 9.
17	A	This is a flipped-over overall photograph of
18	the back	of the sweatshirt.
19	Q	Was there on the back of the sweatshirt
20	was there	visible red staining?
21	A	Yes, there was.
22	Q	Now it looks like we're to now the back of
23	the left	arm?
24	A	That is correct.

And is 11 a detail of that? 1 Q Yes, it is. 2 Α Do you see the blood red staining? 3 0 Yes, I do. 4 Α And can you indicate it, please. 5 (Witness circling spot on picture.) 6 Α I want you to try to clear again. 7 Okay. With the reset button? 8 Α No, bottom left of the screen. 9 0 Got it. 10 Α Thank you. Let's go to 12. 11 Q That is the right side of the back of the 12 Α 13 sweatshirt. Well, where is there blood red staining on 14 15 this? There is red staining on this area. (Witness 16 circling spot in picture.) 17 Is that further indicated at page 13? 18 Yes, it does. 19 Α After photographing this what did you do with 20 21 it? I packaged the item up, sealed it, entered it 22 into the lab management system, like I said, assigns it 23

a unique item number within a case, and then the item is

returned to the agency.

- Q But did this item, in fact, go to further DNA testing?
 - A Yes, it was submitted for testing.
- ${\tt Q}$ You also the other items you collected at the scene, they were all stored at the lab and available for testing.
 - A That's correct.
 - Q As well as the swabbing?
 - A That is correct.
- Q I think we had sort of moved past that. Can you tell us briefly about the swabbing done or less tangible evidence collection?
- A At the scene I swabbed possible areas for residual DNA so that would be touch DNA left on a surface or an object. So I did the exterior and the interior front door handles and locks, and then the back room, exterior and interior door handles as to the water control spot as well.
- Q You also had -- let's transition to other duties. Did you have any duties during the autopsy that was performed on Mr. Gibson?
 - A Yes, I did.
 - O And what were those?

fingerprints from the corpse.

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

Yes, that is correct. Α

But you observe the technicians and the staff of the coroner or medical examiner's office collect it, take evidence from the body.

Yes, that's correct.

That you then take from them and impound at the sheriff's office.

Yes. I receive those items from the tech and take it into my custody.

Do you recall which items you received from the tech and took into your custody?

That would be the left and right hand bags at Α the scene. There was a pair of pants with a belt attached with a defect in it and red staining. There was a pair of boxers with red staining. There's a tan Hanes T-shirt with multiple defects and red staining. There is a black Mountain Club jacket with multiple defects and red staining. There was a pen, and their autopsy samples that I received from them as well.

And those are all removed from the body of Mr. Gibson.

Α That's correct.

You used the term defects. We talked about a T-shirt that has defects. What sort of defect are you

talking about?

A So a defect is a general term that I use.

It's to do -- or explain any void in an object so in this case there were quite a few voids that could be a cut, a tear, something that I am not determining because I'm not comparing it to anything else, but they were linear voids throughout the object.

- Q The shirt.
- A Yes.
- O And how do you document those defects?
- A They are documented via photography.
- Q Did you do anything to enhance the visibility of the defects?

A At the discretion of the medical examiner or the technician they can put cold Whypall, which is basically thick paper towel in between the clothing so if you've got a piece of, like, a T-shirt on top of each other you might not be able to see all the way through, so it's just basically paper towel that's put in between the layers so that you can see the void in the shirt.

- Q As well a blood spot card was that collected?
- A Yes, it was.
- Q What's a blood spot card?
- A It's basically just a piece of paper that a

1	blood sample goes onto.
2	Q In this case the blood sample from Mr.
3	Gibson.
4	A Yes, that's correct.
5	Q You went also into 205 as well. Right?
6	A Yes, that's correct.
7	Q So we've heard testimony that Detective
8	Kazmar after being in 213 went back to 205.
9	A Yes, that's correct.
10	Q And the items of evidence found in there were
11	collected by you and booked into evidence.
12	A Yes.
13	MR. STEGE: Thank you. Pass the witness.
14	THE COURT: To the defense.
15	CROSS-EXAMINATION
16	BY MR. SLOCUM:
17	Q Good morning, what's left of it.
18	A Good morning.
19	Q So I want to talk to you a little about the
20	staining. Are you able to come to any conclusion of how
21	long a stain has been on a particular piece of clothing?
22	A No, I am not. I document it upon my arrival.
23	Q What do you document upon your arrival?
24	A The stain.

1 Q Okay. So the question I'm asking you, ma'am, 2 is are you able to determine how long a stain has been 3 on this clothing? No, I am not. 5 The extent of what you can do, as I 6 understand it, is to document that there is a stain. 7 Α That is correct. 8 You're not able to say, for example, this 9 stain is fresh? 10 Α That is correct. 11 Or this stain has been there for a long time. 12 Yes, that's correct. 13 Now, with respect to the items that you did 14 collect you had said that the sweatshirt was found where 15 exactly? 16 A The gray sweatshirt was found atop a chair in 17 the living area. 18 And when you say atop a chair what do you Q 19 mean? 20 It was on top of the seat bottom of the 21 chair, so it would be -- if you can see my chair it 22 would be, like, right here (indicating).

Unfortunately I can't see that, so.

So if you've got a seat, here's the back,

23

24

here's the bottom. It was on top of that. 1 Okay. On the seat portion of where the -- of 2 where the seat is. Where you would sit. 3 That's correct. Α 4 Was it folded? 5 It was just placed. I'm not sure. 6 Α Well, what do you mean by you're not sure? 7 0 I don't -- I don't know if it was actually Α 8 It was upon my arrival on top of the chair. 9 folded. Well, was it bunched up or was it set neatly? 10 Q It was lying in place. 11 Α Well, would you say it was set there or it 12 was thrown there? 13 MR. STEGE: Objection, speculation. 14 THE COURT: Overruled. 15 THE WITNESS: I would say that it wasn't in a 16 ball, it was laying. 17 BY MR. SLOCUM: 18 Okay. But the question, ma'am, was whether 19 or not it looked at if it was set there or if it was 20 thrown there. 21 MR. STEGE: Asked and answered. 22 THE COURT: Overruled. 23

24

THE WITNESS: I would say that it was set

1	there.
2	BY MR. SLOCUM:
3	Q Now, you also spoke to the pants that were
4	located, the Wrangler jeans?
5	A Yes, that's correct.
6	Q And you said that those were actually in a
7	laundry bag?
8	A It's a laundry-style bag.
9	Q What else was found in that laundry-style
10	bag?
11	A There were multiple items of clothing.
12	Q Such as?
13	A I would have to refer to my photographs.
14	Q To your photographs or your report?
15	A My photographs.
16	Q Okay. Why would they not be documented in
17	your report?
18	A Because I did not feel that they had
19	evidential value, there was no staining on those items.
20	Q Okay. So you made a determination that they
21	didn't have evidentiary value?
22	A That's correct, between my training and
23	experience.
2.4	O And the decision that you made was because

1	you did not observe any staining on these other items?
2	A That's correct, I did not see any staining.
3	Q And you can't tell us what those item even
4	were today based on your report.
5	A That's correct. They were multiple items of
6	clothing.
7	Q How many do you mean by multiple?
8	A I would say under ten.
9	Q So of these items of clothing are you able to
10	be more specific about what they were?
11	A Unfortunately, no. I would have to refer to
12	my photographs.
13	MR. SLOCUM: I don't have any further
14	questions. Thank you.
15	THE COURT: Thank you. Any redirect?
16	REDIRECT EXAMINATION
17	BY MR. STEGE:
18	Q You said a number of times that you have to
19	refer to the photographs, not your report, to refresh
20	your recollection about the clothes.
21	A That is correct.
22	Q So you agree that the photographs do depict
23	the condition of the clothes in the laundry bag, for
24	example.

- A That is correct. The photos do depict the items in the laundry bag.
- Q Was it just you who is looking at the clothing in the bag?
- A No. So I work with in conjunction with detectives so there were three other detectives on scene as well as another criminalist.
- Q And so three detectives, is that other criminalists senior or junior to you?
 - A More senior.
- Q So all of you look at the clothing in the laundry bag.
 - A That is correct.
 - Q And no staining observed on those.
- A That is correct. We're also using a flashlight at the time with opening glide so that's kind of using a flashlight at an angle, so you can see maybe something that you might not catch in normal light.
- Q Okay. So eight items or so. Is that the same case for the rest of the apartment?
 - A Yes, it is.
- Q So everyone's sort of making observations and looking for potential evidence.
 - A That's correct.

1	MR. STEGE: Thank you. No further questions.
2	THE COURT: Recross.
3	RECROSS EXAMINATION
4	BY MR. SLOCUM:
5	Q Ma'am, you mentioned you're working with
6	another criminalist?
7	A That is correct.
8	Q And who was that?
9	A That was criminalist S. Braly.
10	Q I'm sorry, what's the name?
11	A S., Shaun Braly.
12	Q Can you spell that so the court reporter can
13	take that down?
14	A It's S-h-a-u-n. And Braly is B-r-a-l-y.
15	Q Now, as part of your report you indicate who
16	was present at the scene. Correct?
17	A That is correct.
18	Q Okay. Would there be a reason why that
19	individual's name is not here?
20	A It is in my report, it's in a case summary.
21	It should say that Criminalist S. Braly and I arrived.
22	Q Do you note on your report an area that says
23	"present at scene"?
24	A Yes, I do.

1	Q is there a reason why Ms. Brary's hame is not
2	present at scene?
3	A It could have been redundant. He's already
4	mentioned in the case summary.
5	Q Okay. So although it specifically indicates
6	who's present at the scene, you don't put that
7	information in there?
8	A No, because in the case summary it states
9	that S. Braly and I arrived at that location.
10	Q You'd agree with me, though, that it's
11	possible that you could arrive and criminalist could go
12	somewhere else, that's why it's important to document
13	who's actually at the scene when you're doing your
14	investigation. Isn't that true?
15	A Yes, that's why I put him in my case summary
16	to show that he was at the scene with me.
17	Q Okay, ma'am, you need to answer the question
18	I'm asking you.
19	MR. STEGE: Objection. It's asked and
20	answered.
21	THE COURT: Overruled.
22	BY MR. SLOCUM:
23	Q The question I'm asking you is isn't it
24	important to know, because you're gonna arrive at the

scene and perhaps go to two different places, who is actually present at the scene where you're doing your processing?

A Yes, it is.

Q Okay. So would you agree with me then that it would be important to differentiate between those people that simply arrived with you and those people that were present at the scene doing the evaluation and trying to determine what is of evidentiary value.

A Yes, I do. It does also say that you were requested to further process the scene. It's in the case summary as well.

Q Is it your training, experience which leads you to only put a name in the case summary but not in the area of the -- that talks about who was present at the scene?

A Yes, it is.

Q Okay. And that's done did you say because of redundancy reasons?

A That is correct.

Q So it should be -- it should be clear that -- that when someone arrives that they're present even if they go and do something else at the scene?

A That is correct.

24

So you'd agree with me, then, that you don't

THE COURT: Recross.

2

MR. SLOCUM: No, thank you.

3

THE COURT: All right. Thank you. You're free to step down and leave the courtroom.

4 5

THE WITNESS: Thank you.

6

THE COURT: Ladies and Gentlemen, during this noon recess please do not discuss this case amongst yourselves. Please do not form or express any opinion

8

7

about this matter until it's submitted to you.

10

I'll see you in the courtroom at 1:40, which

11

We'll stand for our jury.

is one hour and 35 minutes from now.

12 13

(Jury leaves courtroom for lunch recess.)

14

THE COURT: On the record we discussed the

15

Court's canvass of Mr. Goad at the conclusion of the

16

State's case-in-chief. And by agreement we discussed

17

whether it might occur simply before the State rested.

18

counsel indicated preference for canvassing Mr. Goad

19 20

before the noon hour to reflect his circumstances as set

Then at side bar off the record, defense

21

forth in the record over the past few days. Do you

22

MR. SLOCUM: Yes, your Honor.

agree with that, defense counsel?

2324

THE COURT: Everyone be seated. Mr. Goad, I'm

going to have you be seated, too. Typically the defendant would stand while the Court addresses him or her, but I want you to be comfortable. Okay?

When I use the word canvass, I'm referring to a series of questions that I ask. Those questions are based upon information that I give.

I'll note in our record that Mr. Goad is looking at me and appears engaged in my words. Do you agree with that? He's shaking his head yes and raising his hand indicating so.

We are out of the jury's presence. The State will soon rest its case-in-chief which means that it will complete all of the evidence it intends to present to the jury.

After the State rests its case, the defense may present a case. The defense has no burden to present the case because it is the State's burden to prove guilt beyond a reasonable doubt.

Under the Constitution of the United States and the Constitution of the State of Nevada you have the right to present defensive evidence if you wish. Your attorneys will provide defensive arguments. However, under no circumstance, Mr. Goad, can you be compelled to testify. You can not be called as a witness by the

State.

2.2

You may at your own request give up that

Constitutional right to remain silent, and your

attorneys may call you as a witness, but you alone will

make that decision. Do you understand so far?

THE DEFENDANT: (Nods head.)

THE COURT: And you are shaking your head yes.

If you choose to testify, I will make reasonable accommodations for your communication with the jury.

And I'm not sure what those accommodations will look like. You're shaking your head yes that you understand. You're shrugging your shoulders and even looking up at the ceiling a little bit in a form of eye communication, now you're smiling at me. I don't know what those reasonable accommodations will look like, but I will strive to make them so that you can communicate effectively with the jury, if you choose.

You should know, Mr. Goad, that if you choose to testify, you will be subject to cross-examination by the State's attorney.

Mr. Goad looked at the State's attorney when I referenced him and even raised his hand in acknowledgment to the State's attorney.

I'm adding these comments just so our record

will create a full story of our exchange with each other, Mr. Goad.

Now, if the State cross-examines you, he will do so with his own attempt to prove his case. So he's not -- he won't always be coming, all the attorneys will be coming and dignified. But his purpose is not to help you in any way, but to use your testimony against you before this jury.

Any testimony you provide will be subject to fair comment during closing arguments. And the State will attempt to impeach you through cross-examination, I presume, at least he is authorized to do so. Do you understand what I'm saying so far?

THE DEFENDANT: (Nods head.)

THE COURT: You are emphatically shaking your head yes.

If you choose not to testify, you will be exercising your Constitutional Right. I will not allow the State to comment upon your silence.

And, at your attorney's request, I will instruct the jury that they shall not consider your choice to remain silent, and they shall not discuss your choice to remain silent. Do you understand?

THE DEFENDANT: (Nods head.)

THE COURT: To the State, do you have impeachment material through prior histories?

MR. STEGE: No.

THE COURT: Okay. What that means is that if you have a series of prior felonies, I would allow the State to introduce their existence, and it appears that there is no such criminal history.

MR. STEGE: Within the statutory frame.

THE COURT: Within the statutory frame. So they would inadmissible --

MR. STEGE: I agree.

THE COURT: -- if Mr. Goad chooses to testify. So if you choose to testify the State will not be permitted to ask you about or discuss any prior criminal history that you have. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: (Nods head.)

THE COURT: Okay. To the State, are you satisfied with the Court's canvass of Mr. Goad?

MR. STEGE: The canvass, yes. The circumstances are quite unique.

THE COURT: And I prefer that the defense attorneys introduce those circumstances after they've had time to consult with Mr. Goad privately. After the lunch hour.

MR. STEGE: Okay.

THE COURT: I think that the comments they make will be subject to your comments about the proceeding and the record that's created.

MR. STEGE: Okay.

THE COURT: Did I cut you off, Mr. Stege?

MR. STEGE: No.

THE COURT: Because I've attempted to recite what the Court observes.

MR. STEGE: Well, right. The question is how is a man gonna -- who is not today speaking going to testify?

THE COURT: I don't know. I mentioned reasonable accommodations. And if Mr. Goad chooses to testify, again out of the jury's presence we will formulate those mechanism.

MR. STEGE: I'm less concerned about the question — of course, I'm not concerned about the question whether he does or not. I see in the future the question of could the man effectively waive that right and exercise the opposite right in the State he's been in this morning. It may be a bridge that we're not to yet, but that would be a concern if we go towards the route of testimony.

THE COURT: Counsel, the State's being guarded as it contemporaneously puts a point on the record. You understand that what Mr. Stege has said, I don't invite you to respond, I just want to make sure that through your deliberations in the lunch hour you're prepared to respond to Mr. Stege with something.

MR. SLOCUM: And your Honor, I have the same concerns as well, that it may well be that -- that Mr. Goad is precluded due to his current circumstances from testifying if he were to choose to do so.

And I'm understanding Mr. Stege's concern to be that the down the line, should he be convicted, that it could be raised that he — he did not have the ability to testify that he's foreclosed from testifying because of his current situation.

I understand that the Court has indicated it would make all reasonable accommodations for him, although we're all in agreement that it's unclear exactly what that would mean. And certainly Mr. Stege is right to be concerned that someone could raise that issue down the line.

THE COURT: So I understand. But the predicate question to the answer is yes, I want to testify, or no, I do not. If the answer is no, then we

move forward. If the answer is yes, I think a second question is can there be an effective form of communication with this jury. But I prefer to answer that after Mr. Goad makes his decision.

MR. SLOCUM: Right. And I think for the record, to be clear we just have to ask a question that we normally don't ask which is is the reason that you're not testifying because of some concern you have about the man or in which you would do it.

THE COURT: That's a good suggestion.

MR. SLOCUM: Thank you.

THE COURT: See you at one -- what time did I say?

COURT CLERK: 1:40.

THE COURT: See you at 1:40. Court will be in recess.

(Lunch break.)

THE COURT: I do not intend to -- we're back off the lunch hour. Out of the jury's presence counsel, Mr. Goad, I do not intend to elicit any further comments from Mr. Goad or his attorneys until after the State has rested. I think that they have the right to review the rest of the evidence.

All right. Anything before I bring the jury?

11	
1	MR. STEGE: No.
2	THE COURT: All right. Join me in standing
3	for our jury at this point.
4	(Jury returns to the courtroom.)
5	THE COURT: Please be seated. For the State,
6	call your next witness.
7	MR. STEGE: Ms. Monica Siewertsen.
8	DEPUTY: Stay standing. Face the clerk.
9	COURT CLERK: Please raise your right hand.
10	
11	MONICA SIEWERTSEN,
12	called as a witness herein, being first
13	duly sworn, was examined and testified
14	as follows:
15	
	COURT CLERK: Thank you.
16	THE COURT: Counsel, you may begin.
17	
18	MR. STEGE: Thank you.
19	DIRECT EXAMINATION
20	BY MR. STEGE:
21	Q Please state and spell your name.
22	A Monica Siewertsen. M-o-n-i-c-a
23	S-i-e-w-e-r-t-s-e-n.
24	Q And how are you employed?

A I'm currently employed as a criminalist with the Washoe County Sheriff's Office, in the Forensic Biology Unit.

Q Within the Forensic Biology Unit, what specifically are your duties or tasks that you perform?

A The Forensic Biology Unit is made up of two sections; the primary examination section and the DNA analysis section. The primary examination section is responsible for receiving items of evidence and documenting the condition, color, brand, size, and then attempting to locate biological stains, and performing presumptive tests on those biological stains, determining which ones might be useful for DNA typing analysis, and then taking a sample of those potentially useful stains for DNA typing analysis.

And then the DNA typing analysis area actually performs DNA typing analysis, which is a comparison of the DNA profiles obtained from questioned or unknown items, and comparing it to the DNA profiles obtained from reference samples. And I perform and do all of those duties within the section.

- Q And how long have you been doing this work?
- A This type of work overall? Over 20 years.
- Q And can you tell us about your training and

experience and education.

2.2

from the University of Waterloo in Waterloo, Canada. I have approximately six years of research experience in the area of molecular biology, which is using DNA analysis techniques in order to attempt to answer research questions. Three of those years with the hospital for sick children in Toronto, Canada, and three with the King Faisal Specialist Hospital & Research Centre in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia. And as mentioned, I have over 20 years of experience in the area of forensic biology.

I worked for the Royal Canadian Mounted Police in Edmonton, Alberta, for the Mesa Police Department in Mesa, Arizona, for the San Bernardino County Sheriff's Office Forensic Science Division, and most recently with the Washoe County Sheriff's Office.

Q Can you tell us about the general types of, I guess, sources of DNA that the lab looks for?

A Yes. I mentioned biological materials. So biological materials are things that originate from the body; blood, semen, saliva, and potentially DNA from skin cells that may be left behind from the individual who touches an object, or an individual who wears an

item, and we often refer to that as residual DNA.

2.2

Q Can you tell us more about residual DNAs for, what surfaces you'll examine for that in your experience working with residual DNA?

A So residual DNA is sort of a catch-all phrase for a nonimmediately obvious staining, so blood or semen are often things that we'll look at in the course of an investigation. But different investigations may be interested in who might have handled an item, or who, perhaps, may have worn that item. So as a result of that, both of those are often referred to as residual DNA. So if you were to handle a pen, the longer you handle a pen, the more potential there is to leave behind skin cells, and those skin cells contain DNA.

If an individual wears an item, then the areas that rub against their skin, inside of the collar, the inside of the cuffs, perhaps underneath the underarm, you'll be rubbing against that material and potentially leave skin cells behind. So we may be able to take a sample of that area and perform DNA typing analysis to attempt to determine the source of the cells that are present.

Q Is it understood with respect to skin cells residual DNA field, the degree to which skin cells

contain DNA may or may not be present as it varied between people?

A Yeah. So an individual -- one individual may handle an item for a period of time and leave behind a small number of skin cells. Another individual may handle an item for a long period of time and not leave behind very many. An individual may handle an item for a short period of time and leave behind a large number, so there's no real automatic way to determine how many skin cells are left behind.

Some of the factors that determine how many are how the smoothness or roughness of the surface that an individual handles, or an item that an individual wears, perhaps the last time that an individual has washed their hands. If you've just washed your hands, then there may not be very many cells left to be able to deposit on a surface.

A good visual example of this is if I were to hand a glass to a number of individuals who come to my residence for a party, and I ask them to handle that glass for the duration of the evening, and then collect that glass at the end of the evening, some individuals their glass may appear clean like they hardly held it all night. And other individuals the glass is almost

cloudy because they've left so much oil behind. So that's sort of the same type of skin cells. Some individuals leave a large number and some don't leave very many at all. The only way to perform the analysis is to swab the item or take out a cutting if it's a garment, and then just determine how much DNA is present and perform the DNA typing analysis.

Q Going back to your -- the party example, if multiple people were to handle that glass would you necessarily expect DNA to be left by every person?

A I'm not sure that I would say I would expect to. So every time an individual touches something, they do transfer cells, and they may take some cells with them when they let go of that item. The factor that comes into play is, is the cells that they left at the limit of detection for our particular technology.

So residual — our technology right now is quite sensitive, so a small number of cells are required in order for us to determine that an individual may be present. But a larger amount of DNA needs to be present in order to actually determine the individual's DNA profile.

So your example of a number of individuals handling an item, if one person handled the item for a

long period of time or shed a large number of cells, and five or six other people held it and left a small number, what may happen during my analysis is that I end up with what we call a dominant contributor. That's a person that left the most cells and the most amount of DNA. And quite often, although I can say it's a mixture of a large number of individuals, I can pull out the dominant component and determine their DNA typing profile.

Or if all the individuals shed approximately the same number of cells, then I may only be able to say that it's a mixture, and I can't make any conclusions because there's just not enough information for me to pull out a dominant component.

Q Is the -- you mentioned sensitivity of the technology used. Is the sensitivity such that in passing around that glass, say, the second or third person may, if tested, get the DNA of the first person transferred onto their skin if you were to test their finger?

A It's possible but, again, the only way to answer the question is to actually perform the testing and see what the DNA typing analysis results are.

Q Did you do any such testing in this case?

1	A Handling items, I did do some residual DNA
2	testing, yes.
3	Q And did you do other types of DNA testing?
4	A Yes.
5	Q And have you prepared a slide show to
6	summarize and aid you in explaining the results to the
7	Court and Jury?
8	A Yes. The presentation is a summary of the
9	report that I authored for the analysis.
10	MR. STEGE: May I publish the slide show, your
11	Honor.
12	THE COURT: Right. Are you going to invite
13	this witness to give a free-flowing narrative as the
14	slides progress?
15	MR. STEGE: I will intersperse ==
16	THE COURT: Not necessary.
17	MR. STEGE: Okay.
18	THE COURT: If so, I want your cadence to
19	slow
20	THE WITNESS: Yes.
21	THE COURT: as if there were natural
22	breaks between you and counsel, and just think about the
23	reporter, please.

THE WITNESS: Yes.

THE COURT: Go slow.

BY MR. STEGE:

Q Please begin.

A Okay. As mentioned, this is a -- these slides are a summary of the analysis that I performed and the report that I authored. The slide -- each of the slides follows the same format so I'll explain that format initially so that it makes it a little bit easier for you to follow.

On the left-hand side is the item number that the laboratory has so in this instance item 43. In parenthesis is the item number of the submitting agency. Then there is a description of the actual item that I examined.

Initially I will give the presumptive testing results so in this instance I'm testing for possible blood, so I would be locating biological or red/brown staining, and then performing this presumptive test in order to give me an idea of whether that red/brown staining may be blood. And then I will follow it with the DNA typing analysis results.

So in this instance item 43 is a pair of black Wrangler pants that were removed from a blue bag near the dresser in Apartment 213. I obtained positive

results for the presumptive presence of blood from the following red/brown stains. Five of seven tested small to medium sized stains that I observed on the exterior lower front left and right legs, a medium-sized stain on the exterior right thigh, a large stain on the exterior lower back of the right leg, a very large stain on the exterior low back left leg, and a very large stain on the interior right leg extending from the top to the bottom, and then a large stain on the interior front crotch area.

Of a portion of one of the five smaller stains that I obtained a positive presumptive presence of blood, I removed a portion of that and designated as 43.1. I removed a portion of the large stain on the exterior lower back of the right leg as 43.2. And then I swabbed the front button hole area and the interior of both front pockets together for possible residual DNA as 43.3, the interior of the left thigh area, again, for possible residual DNA as 43.4. And then I removed a portion of the interior Wrangler tab, again, for possible residual DNA.

Q If I might interrupt you. As to the removing the Wrangler tab on the interior of the pants, the button hole, which of these are you focused more on

residual DNA as opposed to your testimony about a red/brown staining presence of blood?

A Okay. So the top two, 43.1 and 43.2, were both red/brown stains that tested presumptively positive for blood. And the last three, 43.3, 43.4 and 43.5, were all collected or removed for possible residual DNA.

Q And why choose, for example, the button hole, the thigh, and the Wrangler tag on the interior?

A The button hole and the inside of the interior front pockets are areas that an individual would touch potentially when they're wearing so in order to put on your pants you would button up the pants.

Often individuals stand with their hands in their front pockets. On the interior tag area, that is — that was located on the interior of the fly so that also may be an area that might — may have rubbed against the skin of the individual that wore it. And the interior of the left thigh, that's an area if you're walking, the front of your pants may rub against your thigh, or if you're sitting it may rub against so the potential for obtaining skin cells from an individual that wore the item is there.

Q As opposed to the exterior where the potential may be for -- it might capture or gather DNA

not only that the person —— from the wearing person but maybe a person who had touched or otherwise got DNA on the exterior of the clothing.

A Yes. So if I were — if I were looking to obtain the cells and the DNA profile of an individual that wore an item, I would want to sample from the interior as opposed to the exterior.

O Please continue.

A The one of the five presumptively positive stains that I removed as 43.1, the DNA results indicate a mixture. I was able to pull out a male dominant DNA profile from that mixture so, again, I talked about sometimes in a mixture I'm able to pull out a dominant component. That is an individual that has contributed more DNA than the other contributors for the mixture. And this is the sample, a sample that was red/brown in color and presumptively positive for the presence of blood. Theodore Gibson is the source of the male dominant DNA profile. And this is going to be the same in all the slides. So underneath in parenthesis there is an estimated frequency of occurrence number.

So in DNA typing analysis, a full profile is a large number of areas, and we would not expect that DNA, full DNA profile would be present or would be possessed

by any other individual in the population except for an identical twin.

2.0

2.1

But not all DNA profiles are full DNA profiles. Sometimes we only obtain results from a portion of the areas, or a number of the areas that we look at on the DNA molecule. So if an individual, a reference sample matches a question sample need to give some idea of how common or rare that match is or that profile is in order to give an idea of whether it's something that everybody in the population would have or whether it's something that's unique.

So the number that the Washoe County Sheriff's Office utilizes is the number one in eight trillion individuals. So if the profile is more rare than one in eight trillion, then my statement will be that the individual is the source of that particular stain or sample.

If the resulting match has less areas and is more common than one in eight trillion, then the statement would be that that individual can not be excluded, and then the number would reflect would also be present. So for brevity sake, the number is there, but if the number is more rare than one in eight trillion the statement is is that individual is the

source of that sample. Okay.

And for the end of this particular mixture, due to the low level of DNA, no conclusions can be offered for the trace results that I obtained from this mixture.

Q Can you speak about low level DNA? Is it an appropriate metaphor, say, if you're able to get the DNA to the size that would fit in a vial, that low level would mean the dominant profile would nearly fill the vial, yet the low level would be a very small portion of that.

- A That's one example. Sometime --
- O Okay. Can you think of a better one?

A No, no, that is a — that's a great example. But it doesn't always have to be 90 percent dominant and ten percent minor or trace, it can be 60 or 70 percent dominant and 30 percent trace. It depends on the profiles of the individuals present and the overall level of the amount of DNA.

The laboratory has set up thresholds that must match in order to be confident that the results we've obtained are interpretable and that they can be reproducibly interpreted. And so the more dominant a profile is, the more obvious it is. The less dominant a

profile is, that either it's not as obvious and requires more interpretation, or it may be that the individuals the mixture may be of almost equal components from all individuals, and the mixture can't be interpreted.

2.0

Q Let's continue to slide 5 if you're ready.

A This is discussing 43.2, which was a portion of the large stain on the exterior lower back of the right leg. The DNA results that I obtained indicate a mixture of at least three individuals, assuming three contributors, a mixed dominant DNA profile was determined from this mixture. So to carry on from the example we just talked about, one individual contributing 90 percent and another individual contributing ten percent.

When we have a mixed dominant component, we have two individuals that have contributed approximately equal quantities of DNA. But they contributed enough DNA that I can actually -- I'm confident that the results that I've obtained are true results, but I can't determine which individual or which of the two profiles how they come together, okay?

But I can determine that there are two individuals and that they are dominant components. So I'm going to try to explain that a little better. If I

give numerical results at one location of one, two, three and four, if I have a dominant component that is 90 percent of mixture, and that individual is one and two, I'm easily able to see that. And then I'm easily able to see that the component three and four is the minor or trace. Okay?

2.1

But if I have the mixture of one, two, three, and four, and they're all approximately equal, then I don't know if the individual contributing to the mixture is one and two, or one and three, or one and four, or two and three, or two and four, or three and four.

So all of those possibilities could have contributed to that mixture and been a part of it, okay? So -- but I'm able to determine that the one, two, three, four are part of the dominant component, okay?

So in this instance I have a dominant component, it's made up of into individuals, and it contains the fragments that are represented in the DNA profiles that I obtained from the reference samples of Theodore Gibson and Ralph Goad.

Based on these results, Gibson and Goad can not be excluded as the sources of the mixed dominant DNA profile. And the approximate estimated frequency of occurrence of the individuals that could have

contributed to that mixture are approximately one in 2.786 trillion individuals, okay? Due to the low level of DNA, no conclusions can be offered for the trace contributor.

Q Are you ready to proceed to slide 6?

A The front button hole area and the interior of both pockets, that was the two areas that I swabbed together for possible residual DNA, and a portion of the interior Wrangler tag, that was another area that I had for possible residual DNA, the DNA results from both of these indicate mixtures. A male dominant partial DNA profile was determined from each mixture, so previously I talked about we attempt to obtain results from all of the areas on the DNA molecule that we look at, but sometimes we don't get results from all of the areas, so a partial profile means that I did not obtain interpretable results from each of the areas.

In this instance Ralph Goad is the source of the male dominant partial DNA profiles. And again, the estimated frequencies of occurrence are over one in eight trillion so that's why the statement is the source.

I can not make any conclusions on the trace results from this mixture, or both mixture. The

interior of the left thigh area that was swabbed as 43.4 for possible residual DNA also indicated a mixture, a male dominant DNA profile was determined from that mixture. Ralph Goad is the source of that male dominant DNA profile. And due to a low level of DNA, no conclusions can be offered for the trace results.

 ${\tt Q}$ So is another wearer sample or result looking for wearer DNA.

A So I swabbed the interior of the pants for residual DNA, yes.

O Residual. Please continue.

2.2

A This is a new item, item 5.1, these were swabs that were collected from the scissors that were located at Placard Number 5. 5.1.1 is red staining from the tip of the scissors, and that gave me a positive result for the presumptive presence of blood. 5.1.2 were the blades of the scissors swabs which were for possible residual DNA so unstained area, and black handle of scissors also for possible residual DNA profile. Gesundheit.

THE COURT: Thank you.

THE WITNESS: The DNA results that I obtained from the 5.1.2 which were the blades of the scissors for possible residual DNA indicate a mixture. A male

dominant DNA profile was determined from that mixture. Theodore Gibson is the source of that male dominant DNA profile that I determined from the blades of the scissors swabs, and the source of the DNA profile that I obtained from the scissors stained swab which was the 5.1.1, which had tested presumptively positive for blood.

 ${\tt Q}$ So both on the red staining Mr. Gibson as well as the unstained portion of the scissors blade also was of Mr. Gibson.

A Yes.

Q Please continue.

A Due to the low level of DNA, I could not make any conclusions on the trace results that were present in this mixture. The same item, the third set of swabs were the swabs collected from the black handle the scissors for possible residual DNA. The DNA results that I obtained indicate a mixture of at least three individuals, so assuming three individuals, a male dominant DNA profile was determined from that mixture. Ralph Goad is the source of the male dominant DNA profile. Due to the low level of DNA no conclusions can be offered for the trace results for that mixture.

This is a new item, item 9.1, which were swabs

Placard Number 10. 9.1.1 was the red staining collected from the area between the blade and the knife handle, and that staining tested presumptively positive for the presence of blood. 9.1.2 was red staining that was collected from the handle of the knife. That also tested presumptively positive for the presence of blood. 9.1.3 were swabs that were collected from the blade of the knife for possible residual DNA. And 9.1.4 were swabs that were collected from the handle of the knife for possible residual DNA. The red staining collected from the -- let me stop and start again.

2.2

The DNA results obtained from the red staining collected from the handle, the blade of the knife possible residual DNA swabs, and the handle of the knife possible residual DNA swabs each indicate a mixture.

The same male dominant DNA profile was obtained from each of those mixtures. Theodore Gibson is the source of the male dominant DNA profile determined from those three swabs, as well as the DNA profile obtained from the red staining collected from the area between the blade and the knife handle.

Okay. And then due to a low level of DNA, I could not make any conclusions on the trace results that

were present in the three mixed samples.

This is a new item, item 47, which was one blue Hanes sweatshirt size extra large with red/brown staining collected from atop a chair in Apartment 213. Red/brown staining was observed on the exterior lower back portion of both sleeves and the interior of the right cuff. Positive presumptive presence of blood was obtained from each of the six stains that I tested. A portion of one of the positive presumptive stains was collected as 47.1. The interior of the entire collar of that sweatshirt was swabbed for possible residual DNA as 47.2.

Q On the swabbing of the interior of the collar do you go all the way around the collar or how do you do that?

A Yes, the entire interior. If there's no staining, then the entire interior of the collar.

Sorry. What's going on here? Sorry. I'm technically challenged.

The DNA results that I obtained from the portion of one of the presumptively positive stains indicates a mixture. A male dominant partial DNA profile was determined from that mixture. Theodore Gibson is the source of the male dominant partial DNA

profile obtained from the portion of the presumptively positive red/brown stain on the sweatshirt. Due to the low level of DNA no conclusions can be offered for the trace results in that sample.

2.2

The interior of the entire collar swabbed for possible residual DNA, the DNA results indicate a mixture. Assuming a total of three contributors, a male dominant partial DNA profile was determined from the mixture. Ralph Goad is the source of the male dominant partial DNA profile. And due to a low level of DNA, no conclusions can be offered for the trace results.

Q So even these trace results given the sensitivity of the equipment, you can not analyze them or not interpret the results.

A In this particular instance there was not enough information to give additional conclusions. And I think that's been pretty apparent throughout the whole of the slides that I have presented. Most of the samples are mixtures, and a dominant or partial dominant is able to be determined, but the trace results are generally so low that there's just no conclusions. There's not enough information.

- O Please continue.
- A This is a new item, item 2. These were swabs

with red staining collected from inside Apartment Number 205, and in the envelope that I obtained there were a number of sets of swabs, and I examined three of them. A marker 5, which was the middle drawer of the dresser, marker number 10, which was the southeast wall edge, marker 14, which was inside the bathroom sink, and the remaining 11 sets of swabs in that item were not examined at this time.

Each of those was positive for the presumptive presence of blood, and I performed a DNA analysis on those three swabs. The DNA results I obtained from marker 10 and marker 14 swabs each indicate a mixture. The same male dominant DNA profile was determined from those mixtures. Theodore Gibson is the source of the male dominant DNA profile, and the source of the DNA profile obtained from marker 5, which was not a mixture, that was a single source sample. Due to the low level of DNA, I could not make any conclusions on the trace results for marker 10 and marker 14.

Item 3, which were swabs collected from inside Apartment 205, the ones that I did not examine in this particular item were the exterior front door handle, the interior front door handle, the exterior/interior bathroom door handles, and the bathroom sink faucet.

The dial or blue button on the cooling/heating unit, those sets — or that set of swabs I did analyze. The DNA results indicate a mixture. Theodore Gibson is the source of the male dominant DNA profile determined from that mixture from the dial or blue button swabs. And due to the low level of DNA, no conclusions can be offered for the trace results from this mixture.

Q On this question -- the left-hand portion indicates items not examined. Can you tell us about that process? You have a large number of samples and how is it determined to test particular ones?

A Generally ones that may be able to answer the -- a specific question asked at that point or in an investigation usually in consultation with the investigating officers, with potential DA assigned to the case. Also we're -- we want to look at items that are most likely to provide a useful piece of information.

So in this instance, door handles, large individuals don't necessarily have contact with them for that length for a very long period of time so they may not provide useful information. I believe in this instance that the dial on the cooling/heating unit was potentially a source of information because the

temperature was adjusted in the apartment, so that was the reason for looking at this particular item.

Q And -- okay. Please continue.

A Item 8 was one dirty blue towel, an unknown brand, collected from the bathroom of Apartment 205. A negative result for the presumptive presence of blood was obtained from each of the numerous tested large brown stains that were observed on the towel. A large unstained area of the towel was swabbed for possible residual DNA. Theodore Gibson is the source of the DNA profile obtained from the residual DNA swabs.

Q And so the staining did not test positive for blood.

A Correct.

Q Visually did it have an appearance -- are you able to say what it was if it wasn't blood?

A Not in any expert capacity, no.

Q Okay.

A Item 13.2 were swabs of red staining from the exterior of a cigarette pack, a positive result for the presumptive presence of blood was obtained from these swabs. The DNA results that I obtained from this mixture indicate at least two individuals, assuming two contributors, a male dominant DNA profile and a male

minor partial DNA profile were determined from this mixture. Theodore Gibson is the source of the male dominant DNA profile determined from the cigarette pack stains.

Q Are you able to say anything or interpret any further the male minor partial DNA profile?

 $_{\mbox{\sc A}}$ $_{\mbox{\sc By}}$ pulling out the male minor partial profile I'm able to compare it to the reference samples that I have, yes.

O Please continue.

A An unknown male is the source of the male minor partial DNA profile determined from the cigarette pack swabs. Ralph Goad is excluded as the source of that unknown male profile, so I have partial results but enough information, and the amount of DNA was enough that I could actually interpret the profile as opposed to most of the other ones where it was just too low or not enough information. And in this instance I was able to exclude Ralph Goad as the possible source.

Q Might you expect on a cigarette packet that, say, a clerk or other worker who handles the cigarettes, the packet, to potentially leave DNA?

A I wouldn't say necessarily expect it, but it is absolutely a possibility. Obviously every time you

handle something, as we talked about earlier, you may leave cells behind. You may leave enough behind in order to be detected and interpreted so that is a possible explanation, yes.

- Q So going back to your glass of water example, there could be a person who handles it leaving no DNA on it.
 - A Correct.

O Let's continue.

Theodore Gibson at autopsy. And we have interior neck swabs, left fingernail swabs, right fingernail swabs, left fingernail clippings, package that was labeled as fingernail clippings right, but found to contain hairs from the right hand, a package that was labeled hairs from the right hand, but was found to contain fingernail clippings, possible tissue from the clippings, and nasal swabs. The nasal swabs were the sample that I used as my reference sample from Theodore Gibson.

Additional items that were present in this — additional samples were present in this item that I did not examine were scalp, pubic, and axillary hair samples, hair from the left hand, penile, oral and rectal swabs, left and right palmer swabs, left and

right posterior hand swabs, fingernail clippers, and a seal.

2.0

A positive result for the presumptive presence of blood were obtained from anterior neck swabs, the left fingernail swabs, the right fingernail swabs, one of the clippings tested from the left fingernail clips sample, and one clipping tested from the item labeled as hairs from right hand, but was found to contain the fingernail clippings.

Q Can you tell us about the idea behind fingernail clippings in your field?

A Yes. If there is direct contact between two individuals in a struggle or something, then that individual may attempt to scratch or fight off an individual, so there is the potential for possible skin cells or tissue underneath fingernails during that.

The DNA results that I obtained from the left fingernail swabs indicate contributions from at least one individual foreign to Theodore Gibson. Due to the low level of DNA I could not make any conclusions on those results. And no DNA foreign to Theodore Gibson was obtained from the anterior neck swabs, the right fingernail swabs, or the possible tissue that was removed from the right hand fingernail clippings. So

remember, each of these items originated from Theodore Gibson so I am looking for potential DNA that is not his.

Item 39 was a dirty green towel, the brand was Cannon, collected from the bathroom of Apartment 213. A negative result for the presumptive presence of blood was obtained from each of the numerous tested large brown stains that were observed on the towel. A large unstained area of the towel was swabbed for possible residual DNA.

The DNA results that I obtained from those swabs were a mixture. A male dominant DNA profile was determined from that mixture, and Ralph Goad is the source of the male dominant DNA profile. And due to a low level of DNA, no conclusions can be offered for the trace results obtained from that mixture.

Item 40 was one gray weather-proof jacket, size medium, that was collected from atop a chair. In item 213 no apparent bloodstains were observed to be associated with the jacket, there was no further analysis. Item 50 were items collected from the ground of Apartment 205. There was a Department of Veterans' Affair card with the name Gibson, red stain swabs that were collected from the front side of that card, and

front and back of the card for possible residual DNA, so nonstained areas.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

There were also three business cards. One of these cards was selected, and the front and back of that card was swabbed for possible residual DNA. There was also a Medicare card with the name Theodore Gibson.

That was not examined.

A positive result for the presumptive presence of blood was obtained from the red staining that I collected that was collected from the Department of Veterans' Affairs card. The DNA results that I obtained from the red/brown staining swabs and from the residual swabs from the front and back of that card each indicate a mixture. A male dominant DNA profile was determined from the red stain swabs, and a male dominant partial DNA profile was obtained from the possible residual DNA swabs. Theodore Gibson is the source of the male dominant and the male dominant partial DNA profile obtained from the red stain swabs collected from the Department of Veterans' Affair card and from the possible residual DNA swabs collected from the front and back of that card. And due to a low level of DNA no conclusions could be offered for the trace results in each of those mixtures.

The one business card that had the front and back swabbed for possible residual DNA, I obtained a mixture from that — that set of swabs, and due to the low level of DNA I could make no conclusions as to the possible source of that DNA.

And the item 53 was a reference select sample, and that was what was used as the reference sample from Ralph Goad.

Item 42 was an additional item submitted which was a black Gillette razor. This item was not examined.

And that's it.

Q There was -- in your report I think it was number 7, report number 7, and then you issued an amended report.

A Yes.

Q Can you talk to us about that?

A Yes. The over -- the general -- so the amended report is something that after the -- so once a case package analysis is completed by myself, then that completed packet goes to a second qualified individual that reviews the analysis that was performed and the conclusions that are drawn in order to ensure that the technical part is correct and that they agree with the conclusions that are put in a summary table.

The file is then administratively reviewed, and then the report leaves the building. If an error in the report is discovered after the report leaves the building, then an amended report is issued. And that can be anything from a grammatical error to an actual error in conclusion to in this instance a name, a name change, so there's two individuals that I had reference samples for in this particular case and I inadvertently used the wrong name in one of my conclusions. The actual DNA results were the amended individual's name. The results in the table were the amended individual's name, however, the actual report used the incorrect name. I would have to refer to my report for the exact conclusion.

Q Right. But -- and to help us understand the process, your results, you get your results, then you issue a narrative report that also contains a chart or description of the evidence examined.

- A A narrative, yes.
- Q Right.
- A Generally any DNA results that are obtained in the file are they are summarized in a table that is included in the packet of my analysis.
 - Q So that people who aren't proficient in

reading DNA tables may understand the results. 1 Partially, but also to summarize the actual 2 conclusions for each of the analysis for each sample. 3 MR. STEGE: Thank you. I'll pass the witness. 4 THE COURT: To the defense. 5 MR. SLOCUM: If I could just have the Court's 6 indulgence for a moment. 7 (Colloquy between defense attorneys.) 8 THE COURT: Ladies and Gentlemen, why don't we 9 stand for a moment. 10 (Short pause.) 11 THE COURT: And to the defense. 12 MR. SLOCUM: Thank you, your Honor. 13 CROSS-EXAMINATION 14 BY MR. SLOCUM: 15 Good afternoon. 16 Good afternoon. 17 Α So to start out with the last point that we 18 were talking about, there's a subsequent report that's 19 issued, and it's an amendment to the report but the 20 report itself just changes a name. 21 Correct. So that is -- that was the 22 correction. One name was inserted in a paragraph and it 23

should have been the opposite name.

24

1	Q Okay. 1 just want to make sure we were clear
2	on the use of the word amendment. So I think an
3	amendment as something that comes afterwards that you're
4	adding to the report
5	A Okay.
6	Q but
7	A I believe the term is amended.
8	MR. SLOCUM: If I may approach, your Honor.
9	THE COURT: Yes.
10	BY MR. SLOCUM:
11	Q So would it be helpful to you if you could
12	look at
13	A Sure.
14	Q the paperwork? I'll approach. This is
15	Bates stamp number 2361.
16	A It does say amendment, this particular one.
17	I use the term amended. So yes, it does not have
18	additional information, it has a correction to
19	information that was present.
20	Q Okay. I just wanted to make sure we were
21	A Sorry.
22	Q No problem. Now, you would agree with me
23	that in your presentation you presented a lot of

24 information to the jury.

4 5

A I did present a lot of information.

Q So what I wanted to go over with you are some of those to make sure that I'm clear and that the jury's clear on what your results were. But first I'd like to ask you we didn't hear anything about any -- any items that were collected outside of either of the apartments. Is that accurate that you didn't do any examination of anything that's collected outside of the apartment?

A I'm thinking. I don't believe that any items that I examined were collected outside of those two apartments.

Q And do you know who made the decision not to analyze the -- the items that were collected outside of the apartment?

A No.

Q Now, I want to talk you about item number 3. So item number 3 consisted of various swabs. And the only item -- the only swab that you conducted analysis on was the button of the cooling heating unit?

A Yes.

Q And that came back to Ted Gibson; is that right?

A The dominant component, yes. It was a mixture, and the dominant component of that mixture was

Mr. Gibson, and I could make no conclusions for the minor component.

- Q But part of item number 3 was also a swab of the exterior front door handle. Correct?
 - A I believe so, yes.
- Q But we heard that there was no analysis conducted on the exterior front door handle swab.
 - A Correct.
- Q Do you know why that particular item was not analyzed?

mentioned that that is an area where a number of individuals may have touched that item and different individuals over a period of time. Also the individual that uses the apartment on a regular basis would have to open and close it every time they entered or left the apartment, so a possibility of obtaining a minor amount of DNA result was relatively limited. The heating cooling unit button, although the possible obtaining a profile was also potentially slim, the temperature of the room was altered, and it seemed a good set of swabs to look at.

Q I very much appreciate the answer you gave, but the question was who made the decision not to

analyze that particular swab?

A I'm sorry, I did not hear that, but I heard it this time. I do not know.

- O It wasn't you?
- A No. The --
- Q So somebody tells you which items to analyze.
- A So as I mentioned earlier, often the decision of which items to analyze is in conjunction with the investigating officers for a particular situation, as well as a District Attorney if they are assigned, and individuals from the Forensic Science Division who can offer information as to the items that may or may not give potentially good results. So I'm not sure I know who made the final decision for which swabs in this particular instance, but it was not me.
- Q Okay. Because you're not in a position to make a determination about what might be valuable or not. Is that fair to say, you rely upon others to give you that information?
- A I -- in conjunction with other individuals, I give my -- my input is based on my experience as to what may or may not give potentially good DNA typing result, but it's in conjunction with other individuals.
 - Q Okay. Who in your estimation, though, makes

that final decision? Who is the one who finally decides
this gets analyzed or this doesn't get analyzed?

A That just depends on a particular situation. Sometimes it may be the supervisor of the biology unit. Sometimes it may be the analyst. Sometimes it may be the investigating officer. And sometimes it may be the District Attorney.

Q And in this case you just don't recall which of those it was.

A I don't.

2.0

Q Okay. I want to talk to you now about item 5.1. These are swabs that were collected from some scissors that were found at placard number 5?

A Yes.

Q So in this case as I understand, the black handle of the scissors you were able to identify three separate profiles; is that right?

A So I would -- I don't recall off the top of my head. I would have to refer to the summary slide or the report.

Q Okay.

A Can I -- is the slide okay?

 $\,$ Q $\,$ We can put the slide back up, or if you have a copy of the $-\!-\!$

The slide is probably the -- be easier. So the handle, the DNA results were from three individuals, so I can explain sometimes a mixture it is easy to determine how many individuals are contributing, and sometimes it's not easy depending. On the level of DNA, if you're able to pull out a dominant component, then that individual is -- there is clearly one, but if the additional contributions are very low, then sometimes it's not clear whether there is another one additional individual, two additional individuals, three, four, on this particular instance the indications were that there were at least three individuals, so I made my conclusions and interpretations assuming that the results were from three individuals.

Q Thank you. And then I want to talk to you about item 9.1. So these are the swabs with regard to the knife?

A Yes.

Q So with respect to the knife, you were only able to get results that come back to Ted Gibson; is that correct?

A So from the red stain on the handle, the possible residual DNA from the blade, and the possible residual DNA from the handle, I obtained mixtures from

each of those. I was only able to pull out a dominant component and make interpretations on those dominant components. Each of those, as well as the single source profile from the red/brown staining on the blade did come back to Theodore Gibson. I was unable to make conclusions regarding the minor components of those three mixtures.

Q Okay. Now I want to talk to you about item 13.2.1. This is a cigarette pack that there were some swabs done on?

A Yes.

Q And in this case you were able to determine that there was DNA present that was an individual — that was certainly not Mr. Goad; is that correct?

A Correct.

Q You were able to say definitively there's another set of DNA here, however, we know that it is not Mr. Goad.

A Correct. The mixture was two individuals, a dominant component, and a minor component. The dominant component matched Mr. Gibson, the minor component did not match Mr. Goad. He was excluded.

MR. SLOCUM: I don't have any further questions of this witness.

THE COURT: Thank you. Any redirect? REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. STEGE:

Q Starting at the end there, the cigarette packet where you are able to exclude Mr. Goad, the blood is source Mr. Gibson?

presumptively positive for the presence of blood. Blood is an excellent source of DNA. It has large amount of DNA per amount that you see. The dominant component in this instance of the mixture was or matched Mr. Gibson, but I can't say for sure that that profile came from the blood — from the possible red/brown staining, but it is the thing that has the most DNA as opposed to residual DNA, but I — there's no way for me to look at the profile and say this profile definitely came from the red/brown staining. But red/brown staining that is presumptively positive for blood generally gives more DNA than residual DNA.

Q And I did notice that was the -- of all these minor or trace contributors that is the, I think, the sole time you're able to exclude Ralph Goad from these minor or trace portions of the samples.

A It was the only one where I was able to make

1	a conclusion about the minor component, yes.
2	Q Okay. So some of these other the minor
3	contribution or the trace that's not identified could be
4	anyone.
5	A I can make no conclusion so yes, it could be
6	anybody.
7	Q Okay.
8	A I can't make a conclusion.
9	Q It could be anyone. Could also that anyone
10	include Mr. Goad himself?
11	A I can't make any conclusions so it could be
12	anybody.
13	Q I don't in the entire world.
14	A Yes. Because I can't make any conclusions.
15	MR. STEGE: I have no further questions.
16	THE COURT: Any recross?
17	MR. SLOCUM: Yes, please, your Honor.
18	RECROSS EXAMINATION
19	BY MR. SLOCUM:
20	Q So on this question about it could be anybody
21	in the entire world, that's really not entirely
22	accurate, is it?
23	A So the minor component that's present does
24	not contain enough information for me to make any
	â

conclusions about. So I could have a reference sample from every individual in the world and I could not make any conclusions as to whether they are included or excluded. That's what I meant by that statement.

Q Okay. But the significance of that is not that we should think that there's no information at all there just because you wouldn't make a conclusion as a — as a scientist that there's — that there's a possibility that it could be anyone, that in and of itself doesn't mean that there's not information there to have. Correct? You're just as a scientist saying I can't — I can't make a determination on this with any degree of scientific certainty.

the question. As I mentioned during the initial part of my talking, the laboratory has through validation determine specific thresholds and criteria that DNA typing results is needed to meet before we consider them reliable. So if those results don't meet that point where we deem them reliable, then we make no interpretation on them. So based on the thresholds and criteria that the laboratory has, there is something there because I can say that it's a mixture of individuals, but I can't make any conclusions about it.

2

3

4

So I hope that answers your question.

Well, it does. I've seen this presentation

given that was a little more technical and you've

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23 24 addressed some things, but I think we need to be on the

same page about you have some -- a threshold where you

say hey, we're not gonna analyze things below that threshold. Correct?

Correct. But they're not just arbitrary values, they are determined --

THE COURT: So hold on, you're in cross-examination. You were given a full opportunity to say whatever you wanted. I just want you to focus on the question and answer and we'll see what proceeds from there.

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

THE WITNESS: Sorry.

THE COURT: That's okay.

BY MR. SLOCUM:

So there's threshold but there's information that exists below that threshold; is that correct?

There is information, yes. Α

All right. As a scientist, you've got a threshold, you've made a determination you're not gonna look below that threshold.

A Based on -- that threshold is not an arbitrary value. It's based on a large number of -- a large amount of testing within the actual laboratory to determine at what point is the information above this level interpretable and reliable. And at a point below this threshold, based on the way the testing is performed in this particular laboratory, that value, anything below that is not reliable.

THE COURT: Ms. Reporter, could you read back the last question, please.

(Record read.)

(Q As a scientist, you've got a threshold, you've made a determination you're not gonna look below that threshold.)

THE COURT: So when we —— careful how I do

this because I don't want to ever affirm or disaffirm

any witness, my opinion is not relevant, but I am

required to manage this proceeding. I think the State's

witness, scientific witnesses from time to time

misunderstand the role of testimony because they've

given such carte blanch unrestricted direct testimony,

they can just editorialize whatever information they

believe is appropriate. On cross-examination this

witness is not allowed to travel into areas that she

wants, she must answer the questions directly. Mr. 1 2 Stege. MR. STEGE: So long as the question can be 3 asked yes or no, you know, pursuant to a leading 4 5 question. THE COURT: Right. 6 MR. STEGE: It's not so much editorializing as 7 attempting to answer the question in the State's view. 8 THE COURT: Right. So I never confine counsel 9 to yes or no questions. Thematically you are correct. 10 It needs to be tight in its form so the witness can 11 answer it or not answer it, a full understanding of what 12 13 you're seeking. MR. SLOCUM: Thank you, your Honor. 14 THE COURT: Go ahead. 15 MR. SLOCUM: Thank you. 16 BY MR. SLOCUM: 17 So to come back, there's a threshold that is 18 determined where you're going to start your measurement. 19 Is that fair to say? 20 Yes. 21 Α There's information that exists below that 22

threshold. Correct?

Α

There is data.

23

24

Q Okay. There's data that exists below that threshold. Correct?

A Correct.

Q Now, if I were to take a low level of DNA, and I were to go below that threshold, I could actually include people, couldn't I?

A Not if you are wishing to make conclusions based on reliable data.

Q Okay. So let me come back. Below the threshold there's data. Right? That data could operate to exclude someone if you chose to do that.

A Not -- me personally? No, because it is below the threshold of being reliable.

Q Okay. But the question has to do with whether or not there is data there that exists that could exclude someone. I understand that there's a threshold that you use. But the question is isn't there information that exists, or data, to use your word, that exists under that threshold which could actually be used to exclude someone because it doesn't match up to the data that you have information on; isn't that correct?

A So the reason for the threshold is that I can't distinguish between what is data and what is background. So there may be information below that

threshold, but if it is not data, if it is background, then I can't use it to -- it shouldn't be used to include or exclude an individual.

Q Okay. So — so your concern is with regard to what would be described as background. But isn't it accurate that there are times where that data can be identified as actual data, and we don't have to be concerned about it being background even if it is below that threshold.

A I do not make interpretations below the threshold.

Q And the question has to do with whether or not you can identify data that's below that threshold. And that's true you can do that, correct?

A No, I can not distinguish between data and background, potential.

Q I want to make sure we're on the same page. Your testimony today is anything below that threshold can not be identified always as data or background. Is that fair to say?

A It can not always be, no, that is correct.

Q Right. Can it ever be?

 ${\tt A}$ I can't answer the question of whether it can ever be.

Q Why not?

A Because I don't know what may happen down the road. I can only answer the question that I do not make interpretations on data below the thresholds that are in

place.

Q Okay. And so regardless of what -- of what information or data, to use your word, exists below that threshold, you will never be willing to use that data to exclude someone.

A Again, I can't -- I don't like to use the word never or always. I follow the protocols of interpretation that are currently present at the Washoe County Sheriff's Office.

Q Well, and this comes back around to the fundamental question of the idea that if the DNA level falls below this threshold, that you can never exclude someone and it could truly be anyone in the world.

That's a concern I have. Do you really believe that idea that it could be anyone in the world?

A I believe that it is below the threshold and I can make no interpretations, that's --

Q Okay. So the question you were asked is whether or not it could be anyone in the world you would not phrase it that way. Is that fair to say?

1	A That's correct.
2	MR. SLOCUM: Okay. I don't have any further
3	questions.
4	THE COURT: Thank you for your testimony. You
5	can step down
6	MR. STEGE: Whoa, whoa.
7	THE COURT: I thought have you already had
8	redirect?
9	MR. STEGE: Yes, but this whole thresholds and
10	accuracy and that the Court
11	THE COURT: I understand.
12	MR. STEGE: the form of the question
13	issue.
14	THE COURT: I understand. Ladies and
15	Gentlemen, during this recess please do not form
16	anything about this matter. Please do not discuss it
17	with each other, express any opinions. We'll be in
18	recess for 15 minutes until 3:15.
19	The witness is excused. You may leave the
20	podium. There will be no further redirect.
21	MR. STEGE: No, that was my no, I wish to
22	have further examination of the witness
23	THE COURT: I know.
	II

MR. STEGE: -- on those two issues.

Will the Court give it to me?

THE COURT: We'll certainly talk out of the jury's presence.

Ladies and Gentlemen, you're free to step out.

(Jury leaves courtroom.)

THE COURT: I have to be very careful what I say in front of the jury because they watch judges and I don't ever want to suggest credibility, lack of credibility. I didn't mean by my comments to personally respond to this particular witness when I said about scientific witnesses who on direct examination —

MR. STEGE: Right.

THE COURT: -- they get a very broad

latitude. On cross-examination you need to bring them

back into the normal colloquy of attorney and witness.

I didn't mean it personally against you, it's just the

style that I've observed.

MR. STEGE: Right.

THE COURT: You do want a third redirect.

MR. STEGE: I do want a third redirect.

THE COURT: You may be heard, bearing in mind that at the beginning of this trial I looked at both you in the eyes and I said there will be nothing past second cross.

MR. STEGE: I know you did, but Mr. Slocum respectfully went way — went quite beyond what the State's redirect was and left this rather, I'll use the term fuzzy question out there about the standards such that the witness was unable to answer that where the standards come from and how they're comprised.

And adding to that, I appreciate what the Court was doing, but I was rather taken aback by it by the Court sort of $-\!$

THE COURT: I was taken aback by the serial attempts by defense counsel to elicit a simple answer. She would turn to the jury and carry on a lengthy response that was nonresponsive and I could think of no way to correct that except subtly doing it.

MR. STEGE: I'm not -- I'm not pushing back here on your Honor, but we have technology that was the first time that happened and in this case -- this trial and it is unusual in my experience for the Court to do that. So that's the fullness of my request for additional questions.

MR.. SLOCUM: And your Honor, if I may respond to that. In fact, it was Mr. Stege's question which was the entirety my recross-examination. And that's this idea that it could be anybody in the world. And that

was -- that was the substance of it. That was Mr.

Stege's question. He didn't far exceed anything. It
was really to get to the bottom of if this -- is this
accurate to say it could be anyone in the world.

And beyond that the Court did attempt with this particular witness to say please answer the question as directed, and it was only after this was repeatedly done that the Court did have to intervene to say you really do have to focus on — on the question on cross-examination, this isn't the opportunity to get an editorial.

THE COURT: Criminal justice attorneys are the most experienced trial attorneys in our county. But not all of what they do is reflective of the Court's entire experience. I regularly am asked to instruct a witness who's being nonresponsive. I don't think I do it on my own, as you just saw, but I agree with Mr. Slocum that the first time I didn't, and only after the second time did I choose to do so.

I don't want to burden the entire break on the record. We have a question, counsel, that I'll need you to look at and we'll respond. There will not be a third redirect on the record. This witness is able to leave.

If you'll approach, please. First of all,

_

that question is marked and made part of Court's record.

The attorneys have seen it. I intend to answer it

generally as the afternoon unfolds. I'm not responding

right now. Ten minutes for all of us.

(Short break.)

MR. SLOCUM: If we could have a moment out of the presence?

THE COURT: Yes, go ahead.

MR. SLOCUM: My understanding, your Honor, is that he's preparing to call the ME. There were some photos that we had talked about at a pretrial hearing. It is not entirely clear that at least one of those pictures, that is, one depicting the shirt, not the actual autopsy itself, but the body itself, what the issue or the reason why that was going to be necessary for the ME. We dealt with this somewhat at the pretrial hearing in front of Judge Steinheimer, but we have a continuing objection to these photos. I just want to make sure that the record was clear on that piece.

THE COURT: So I typically hear objections as to the cumulative effect of prejudicial images. When you're talking about a T-shirt, is that still the basis for your concern is that it's cumulative in its --

MR. SLOCUM: So here's what happened at the

pretrial hearing. It's been my experience that we will file a motion for excessively gruesome photos. We will have a hearing at which the ME will testify I need this photo for this reason, I need this photo for this reason, I need this photo for this reason, and also give 5 reasons why this will help inform the jury. And I think 6 that's important if there are two photos that are gonna 7 be admitted they should have separate explanatory value 8 for the examining. 9

THE COURT: Understood.

1

2

3

4

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. SLOCUM: Which was okay. What ended up happen, the ME didn't testify at that hearing but these were photographs which had been used at grand jury and so Mr. Stege was able to look to the testimony of the grand jury to say why these particular photos were necessary to help the jury understand her testimony.

But there was this issue of the T-shirt and how the T-shirt is in that way necessary to explain --

THE COURT: So is your objection limited to the T-shirt photo?

MR. SLOCUM: Correct. I believe that we are satisfied with regard to the explanatory value of the other photo.

MR. STEGE: I would disagree, I'd say,

strongly with Mr. Slocum's assessment that we dealt with this somewhat at pretrial hearing. I would say we dealt with it, and the ruling was these 13 photographs are admissible on the grounds of gruesomeness. I also —

THE COURT: Admissible on the grounds of gruesomeness.

MR. STEGE: The Court, Judge Steinheimer

MR. STEGE: The Court, Judge Steinheimer rejected the claim that these photographs were gruesome as a matter of law, right? She denied their motion. I

THE COURT: Is Mr. Slocum renewing an objection --

MR. STEGE: Yes.

THE COURT: -- previously made to which there was a response and he's just preserving it? Or --

MR. STEGE: That's what I believe and that's what I -- I'm loathe to tell the Court about what counsel talk about because --

THE COURT: Yeah, please don't.

MR. STEGE: -- it's often in confidence and--

THE COURT: Yeah, please.

MR. STEGE: -- it helps things go along. But my impression was we're going to have that preserved here today. I would -- I don't like the idea they get a

second chance at this photograph.

I also push back on the idea that as a matter of course the coroner or ME should have to testify before trial absent a specific objection. So what I did was if the Court cares about what happened in that hearing.

THE COURT: I really don't because I'm not going to make a decision, I'm just giving the defense the opportunity to lodge its objection for future review, if necessary.

MR. STEGE: Very good.

MR. SLOCUM: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: The photographs are coming in as presented to Judge Steinheimer.

MR. SLOCUM: Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. The jury, please.

(Jury returns to courtroom.)

THE COURT: All right. Please be seated.

Ladies and Gentlemen, we're approaching the end of our

Thursday. Some of you are undoubtedly thinking about

what the schedule looks like. We are still set to

tender the case to you for deliberations tomorrow, and I

will have more information about that probably by the

end of the day. Our trial day today will end at 4:40.

1	To the State, you may call your next witness.
2	MR. STEGE: Katherine Callahan.
3	COURT CLERK: Please raise your right hand.
4	
5	KATHERINE CALLAHAN, M.D.
6	called as a witness herein, being first
7	duly sworn, was examined and testified
8	as follows:
9	
10	COURT CLERK: Thank you.
11	THE COURT: Remember speak in the microphone,
12	please. Counsel, you may begin.
13	MR. STEGE: Thank you.
14	DIRECT EXAMINATION
15	BY MR. STEGE:
16	Q Please state and spell your name.
17	A Katherine Callahan. K-a-t-h-e-r-i-n-e, last
18	name is C-a-l-l-a-h-a-n
19	Q How are you currently employed?
20	A I'm an Assistant Medical Examiner at the
21	Washoe County Regional Medical Examiner's Office here in
22	Reno, Nevada.
23	Q You hold any special degrees or training to
24	hold that position?

A Yes. I'm a forensic pathologist. So to become a forensic pathologist I got my Bachelor of Science at University of New Mexico. I then completed four years of medical school at the University of New Mexico.

After that I completed four years of residency in anatomic and clinical pathology at Stanford University. After residency I completed a one-year fellowship in forensic pathology at New Mexico Office of Medical Investigator.

After that I started working as a Deputy

Medical Examiner at the Travis County Medical Examiner's

Office in Austin, Texas, where I worked for about three

and a half years. And then I started working here,

where I've been for about two and a half years now.

- Q And so you've been working full time as a forensic pathologist for sometime.
 - A Yes, since August, 2013.
 - Q And what does a forensic pathologist do?
- A So a forensic pathologist is a physician who investigates deaths, which may include performing autopsies, to determine cause of death and manner of death.
 - O There are different causes and manners of

1 death.

- A Yes, there are.
- Q Did you perform an autopsy upon the body of Theodore Gibson?
 - A Yes, I did.
 - Q Can you tell us about that process?
- A Yes. So Theodore Gibson came to our office in a sealed body bag. I removed the seal and found that he was clothed in a black jacket, a tan shirt, brown pants with a black belt and plaid boxer-style underpants.

The jacket and the shirt were blood soiled. There was also some dried blood on the pants.

He had multiple injuries of his body including his face and his torso. And he also had what we call mild decomposition, so he had been dead for a period of time.

- Q Is it understood with -- in the field decomposition?
- A Decomposition is understood but, unfortunately, it doesn't happen at the same rate for everybody. There are a lot of variables that have to be taken into account. It would be really nice if everyone decomposed at the same rate. The biggest factor is

- 5

environmental so what's the temperature. If it's hot outside you're going to decompose a lot faster than if you're in the snow frozen.

Your body habitus also plays a factor, so if you're obese, fat serves as an insulator so you're gonna to decompose faster than maybe a thin person would.

There are also certain medications that can accelerate decomposition. So it's really difficult for us to say based on decompositional pattern exactly how long someone has been deceased.

- Q So in the pop culture you might see a detective or someone observe a body be able to state with pretty ease of level decomposition. Is that simply not the case in the field?
 - A It's not the case.
 - Q You did observe some decompositional changes.
 - A Yes, I did.
 - Q And can you summarize those, please.
- A Yes. So he had green discoloration of his abdomen. And the green discoloration comes about from bacteria. So we normally have bacteria in our guts, and after anyone dies they just go crazy and they start proliferating. And so they produce several gasses including hydrogen sulfide which makes the skin turn

green.

The other things he had were a drying of hands or desiccation, it's like a mummification. So he had drying of his hands and he had some skin slippage so the surface of his skin was starting to slip off from the underlying dermis layer.

Q And so let's walk us through the first portion of the autopsy. How does the examination begin?

A So an autopsy consists of both an external examination and an internal examination. During the external examination, we collect evidence if it's needed for the case. Evidence includes things like fingernail clippings, swabs of the body. We also look for any trace evidence so if there's some hairs there where there shouldn't be hairs like on hands or on the body, we'll collect those. We measure the length of the body and we weigh the body.

We document what clothing is on the body and remove it. We also document any medical intervention that might be on the body. Sometimes people have had emergency medical personnel perform resuscitation efforts on them so they'll have different medical intervention on them, so we'll remove that.

We document and photograph any injuries that

would be on the external surface of the body. We document characteristics including hair color, eye color, any tattoos or scars that are on the body. And if you need it we'll perform radiographs or x-rays, particularly in cases where there's penetrating injuries including gunshot wounds, we're looking for bullets, stab wound, we're looking for any retained knife tips.

Then we start the internal examination which is done by making a Y-shaped incision from shoulder to shoulder midline chest down to pubic bone. We reflect the skin and subcutaneous tissue in the muscle. We cut the ribs to remove the chest plate so now we have exposure of the abdominal cavity and the chest cavity.

We collect blood, vitreous fluid from the eye, and urine from the urinary bladder if there is any that's present. We do further studies including toxicology testing. We then remove all organs from the chest in the abdominal cavity and we assemble them for any injuries, any actual disease, any congenital abnormalities and tumors.

We then examine the head by making an incision from ear to ear over the top of the head, we reflect the front of the scalp forward, back of the scalp backward

that expose the top of the skull.

Q I don't know if the court reporter can keep up with your --

A Okay.

- Q -- rather enthusiastic pace.
- A Sorry. Sorry.
- O The head.

A The head. Sorry, I will slow down. So now we have the skull exposed. We use a bone saw, and we cut open the top of the head, and that allows us to see the brain. We remove the brain and we assess for any injuries, natural disease, tumors, congenital abnormalities.

After the brain is examined we then turn our efforts to the neck. We look at all the muscles in the front of the neck. We look at structures including the hyoid bone, is a bone right under you jaw, the thyroid gland, the thyroid cartilage and gain assess —

- Q The pace.
- A Sorry.
- Q Thyroid.

THE COURT: The reporter's fingers are smoking steadily fast.

THE WITNESS: Sure.

THE COURT: When there is the normal question and answer colloquy it gives pause and we can kind of take cues.

THE WITNESS: Right.

THE COURT: It's appropriate that you provide this -- I do not -- I'm not concerned about the testimony you're providing but I'm very concerned about the pace.

THE WITNESS: Okay. Sorry.

THE COURT: And so because Mr. Stege can see the witness and I can't, you just stand in front and wave your hands.

MR. STEGE: I'm trying to.

THE WITNESS: Yeah. Yeah.

BY MR. STEGE:

Q You're doing great. I think you were --

A Yeah, structures of the neck. So we look for any injuries. Sometimes you can have hemorrhage in the muscles. You can have fractures of the hyoid bone, fractures of the thyroid cartilage, and we assess the thyroid gland for any tumors.

After we've examined all of these organs we place them back in the body cavity and the body is then released to the funeral home.

1	Q And in this case did you select a number of
2	photographs to help you explain your testimony in the
3	case?
4	A Yes, I did.
5	Q I'm going to hand you what's been marked as
6	proposed 15. Would you review those briefly?
7	Do you recognize those photographs?
8	A Yes, I do.
9	Q Are these a true and accurate depiction of
10	the body of Mr. Gibson at autopsy?
11	A Yes, they are.
12	MR. STEGE: Move to introduce 15.
13	MR. SLOCUM: Subject to my objection, your
14	Honor.
15	THE COURT: Thank you. 15 is admitted, Ms.
16	Clerk, without contemporaneous objection noted.
17	COURT CLERK: Thank you.
18	(Exhibit 15 is admitted into evidence.)
19	MR. STEGE: May I publish the exhibit, your
20	Honor.
21	THE COURT: Yes.
22	BY MR. STEGE:
23	Q Doctor, did the previous witness leave a
24	clicker at your okay. would you like to use it?

Okay. Thank you. This is a photograph of

screen will clear it.

Α

23

24

the right side of Mr. Gibson's face. And what I've done here is provided some labels, just arbitrary labels, labeling injuries. So anywhere you see a number there's at least one injury. Some of the numbers represent more than one injury.

Q And they're arbitrary in the sense that the earliest ones don't necessarily indicate the first injury to have occurred.

A Correct. So the way I do my numbering is from top of the head to the foot. So the injury that's closest to the top of the head usually starts with one, then I'll choose different sides of the face, I'll do the front of the body, and then I'll do the back of the body.

Q Now, you have used the term injuries to the side of the face. Did you investigate what type of injuries they are?

A Yes. So these are all sharp force injuries, meaning stab wounds or incised wounds. The majority of these are stab wounds. And the difference between the two are they're both sharp force injuries. Stab wounds, the injury on the skin surface is shorter than the injury, the depth of the wounds. Opposite is true for incised wounds so incised wound the injury on the skin

surface is longer than the injury depth.

Q Okay. And you've labeled either individual stab wounds or stab wounds with these numbers. Right?

A Yes.

Q As you're doing this are you counting the number of stab wounds to Mr. Gibson?

A Yes. So Mr. Gibson had a total of 250 stab wounds, which included 151 stab wounds of the face, head and neck, 76 stab wounds of the back in the right and left sides of the torso, one stab wound of the left thigh, 17 stab wounds of the right upper extremity, including the hand, the wrist, and the forearm, and five stab wounds of the left hand.

Q So a number of those here are depicted in the right-hand view of Mr. Gibson's face.

A Yes.

Q You may continue to narrate.

A So this is a photograph of the opposite side of his face so the left side. You can see the number 2, and then just a lot of dark discoloration here, (marking Exhibit 15.)

So because of his decomposition and darkening and drying of the skin, it's kind of hard to make out exactly where -- how many wounds there are and where

they start and where they begin. And this decomposition also makes it kind of difficult to do certain characteristics of the stab wounds, but I was able to count how many were there and where they went.

These stab wounds, three of them injured the left eyeball, one of them actually fractured the orbital plate which is a thin bone, it's on the surface of the eyeball, and one of them penetrated the middle cranial fossa which is the base of the skull. But it did not injure the brain.

- O That last, cranial fossa?
- A Fossa, yes.
- Q Is that depicted -- where is that on the body?
- A It's -- whoops. It's in one of these (indicating).
 - Q Okay.
 - A Yeah.

2.0

- Q What was the result of the injury to the eye?
- A So the eye is collapsed because of the stab wounds, and hemorrhagic or bloody.

This is a photograph of what I call the palmar surface of the hand, so everywhere you see numbers those are areas where there are sharp force injuries.

- 1 Q And those appear to go up the hand and into 2 the -- I'll use the term the forearm?
 - A Yes.

- O The inside of his wrist?
- A Yes. So there's -- they're on the hand, the wrist, and the forearm.
- Q Okay. And is -- talk to us about the location of these sharp force injuries as it relates to defensive wounds.
- A So defensive wounds is not an anatomical diagnosis. But any time we have injuries to the extremities, so hands, arms, feet, legs, they could represent defensive injuries. As people are defending themselves from a perpetrator who's far away they tend to have their hands out, and as they get closer they'll shield themselves so we can see injuries on the arms and the hands, and if the person is laying down and kicking we can see them on the feet or the legs, too.
- $\,$ Q $\,$ And in this case did you see those wounds both to the palm and to the --
 - A Yes.
 - O -- back of the hand?
- A On the right, the right hand they were both on the palm and the back of the hand.

Q Would you continue.

A Yes. So this is the back of the right hand.

Again, anywhere you see a number is an area of sharp

force injury.

Q And again, not necessarily one -- like, for example, 51 could indicate one injury or could it indicate a number of them?

A Yes. And then this is the back of the left hand that had five sharp force injuries.

Q Continue, please.

A This is a photograph of the left side of his body. Here are some stab wounds and what I call puncture wounds. And here is a stab wound. (Witness marking Exhibit 15.)

Q The back of that left hand, is that also a wound?

A Yes. So that is another angle of the photograph that we just saw. So we looked at this injury in the previous photograph that I — we went over.

Q Did you -- as you're looking at these injuries what is it that you're looking for?

A So with stab wounds we look at characteristics that might help us identify maybe what

kind of weapon was used so the ends of the stab wound we would look to see if they're what we call sharp or tapered or blunted, meaning they have a squared-off edge. Typically single-edged knives will give you a sharp end and a blunt end. That being said, they can also give you two sharp ends. That can happen if when the knife is inserted the knife moves towards the sharp end so that the blunt end never comes in contact with the skin. It would make a stab wound look like it has two sharp — it would make it look like a double-edged knife instead of a single-edged.

Q And are you also investigating or looking at the depth of the stab wound or injury?

A Yes. So we look at the depth, which is an approximation, how far the stab goes into the body, and what organs it injures.

Q Please continue if you're ready.

A So number 16 is a stab wound on the right side of the chest, which is fairly superficial, doesn't go into the chest cavity. Sorry. You can see here this green discoloration (indicating), that's decomposition.

Q Continue when you're ready.

A This is a photograph of the jacket that he was wearing. This is the back panel of the jacket. You

/

can see all the blood towards the top and, then these split-like defects here, here (indicating), and these all correspond to the stab wounds, which we will see shortly.

This is a shirt that he was wearing. Again, on this side we see a lot of these defects. These split-like defects correspond to stab wounds.

Q Okay.

A And this is a photograph taken of Mr.

Gibson's body. He's now laying on his stomach so,

again, you can see all of these injuries of his head and

his back that are represented by number labels. And

again, the number labels may represent one wound or

multiple wounds.

Q And can you speak to us about the degree of injury to the back.

A Yes. So as I said before the back and the sides of the torso had 76 stab wounds. On the right side of this back six of the stab wounds entered into the right chest cavity and injured the right lung. On the left side of the back, one of the stab wounds entered into the left chest cavity and injured the left lung.

Q Injured to what extent as to both of those?

- A Just penetrated the lung tissue.
- Q And what happens when you penetrate the lung tissue?
- A Yeah. So any time you have a penetrating injury to the chest cavity, you can bleed, again, we call it hemothorax, or you can also develop what we call pneumothorax, so it's really important for there to be no air between the chest wall and the lung, we need it that way so that we can breathe. So any time you have a penetrating injury and you're able to introduce air into that space, it can lead to a collapsed lung which puts strain on the heart and can cause you to die.
 - O Is that what caused Mr. Gibson to die?
- A It could have, but in this case there's so many stab wounds the most likely mechanism is exsanguination, which means losing blood.
 - Q Blood loss?
 - A Blood loss.
- Q I'm sorry but this -- back to the head. Talk to us about the existence of those injuries.
- A So these are all stab wounds on the back of the head. None of the ones on the back of the head injured the skull or entered into the skull and injured the brain. They were all limited to the skin,

subcutaneous tissue and the muscle.

Q Okay.

A On the right side of the head one of the stab wounds, or two of the stab wounds injured the outer surface of the skull, but it didn't injure the brain and didn't go all the way through the skull.

Q Page 12 of this, please.

A Yeah. So this is just a close-up photo of, excuse me, some of the stab wounds. You can see here what we're talking about kind of the tapered or sharp end and the squared off or blunt ends.

Q Are you talking about (indicating)?

A Yeah. This one and these ones. (Witness circling spots on Exhibit 15.)

So this side is a squared-off end. This side, whoops, is a sharp or tapered end. Same here. (Witness circling spots on Exhibit 15.)

On the right-hand side are the blunt or squared-off ends, and the opposite side are the sharp or tapered ends.

Q And what does the blunt or -- and tapered end, what does that tell you?

A That tells me that this instrument is -- has a single sharp end, and the other end is not sharp,

which we can see with some knives. We can also see with scissors if the stab is made with the blades open, stab wounds made by a closed pair of scissors will look different than this, but stab wounds made just a single layer of the scissors could have this appearance.

Q Did you see any pared wounds or wounds that seemed to have any other sort of patterning besides the blunt and sharp end?

A Yeah. There were some pared wounds on the right upper extremity and on the back, and here's a good example of one. And any time I see pared wounds with a blunt end and a sharp end, I think of scissors. But usually if it's scissors and it's made with a scissors blades open, they'll kind of be an oblique angle and the sharp ends will be facing each other and the blunt ends will be opposite.

And so you can see here the blunt ends are on the same side and the sharp ends are on the same side so that is not consistent with scissors — one pair of scissors, one stab with the blades open, this would have to be the same blade twice.

And then here's some examples of two sharp ——
two sharp ends, or two tapered ends. So here you can
see a sharp end on both sides, neither one of those

looks like they squared off or tapered. Same with this one. Same with this one. (Witness circling spots on Exhibit 15.)

Q And a double-tapered wound can be either from a single end or a double end?

A A double -- a double-tapered wound could be from a single edged if it's pushed all the way to what we call the Ricasso, so the end of the blade will have two blunt ends. Double blunted can also be from a screwdriver.

Q But double -- double taper could be --

A Oh, sorry. Yeah, double tapered — that's double one. Double taper could be from — you can see it with the double-edge knife or a single-edge knife from what I described before. But it if there's movement kind of forward towards the sharp end and blunt end it never comes in contact with the skin.

Q Of the injuries observed to Mr. Gibson, what would be incapacitating?

A You mean unconscious or?

Q Well, like for the lung -- the injuries to the lungs, would that incapacitate a person?

A Okay. Yes, they -- when you develop pneumothorax you actually get shortness of breath. Ar

if you don't have surgery right away, you could die from that.

Q And the injury to the eye, and bone, I can't remember the name.

A Right. Yeah, the orbital bone. Yeah, those — I mean, those two, I mean, he's not gonna be able to see. Depending on how much force, which I can't say, I wouldn't be able to say with certainty how much force would be needed to fracture that bone, but if there was enough force to knock him unconscious that's a possibility.

Q Can you describe death by exsanguination what happens to the body?

A So the body loses blood, at usually the terminal mechanism is a cardiac arrhythmia. So it's losing enough blood to where your heart isn't being — isn't receiving enough blood to profuse itself in the brain, and you usually have a cardiac arrhythmia.

Q And in the meantime is your -- as a body loses blood is the heart trying to keep up?

A Yes. So with any type of blood loss your sympathetic nervous system is gonna kick in and you're gonna try to pump harder and faster to profuse these organs.

1	Q Did you determine the cause and manner of
2	death?
3	A Yes. So the cause of death is multiple stab
4	wounds. The manner of death is homicide.
5	Q Did you determine in the investigation the
6	age of Mr. Gibson?
7	A So Mr. Gibson was 76 years old.
8	Q The cause and manner, can you tell us about
9	what what those terms mean in your field?
10	A Yes. So cause of death is the injury or
11	disease process that initiates the chain of events that
12	leads to death. Manner of death is the circumstance
13	circumstances surrounding the death. So we have five
14	manners. We have homicide, suicide, natural, accident,
15	and undetermined is a Category if we can't fit into
16	those four.
17	Q Here homicide.
18	A Homicide.
19	MR. STEGE: Thank you. Pass the witness.
20	THE COURT: All right. To the defense.
21	MR. SLOCUM: Thank you.
22	CROSS-EXAMINATION
23	BY MR. SLOCUM:
24	Q Good afternoon.

1	A Good afternoon.		
2	Q So you mentioned that Mr. Gibson was 76. Do		
3	you know when he was born?		
4	A I do not know when he was born.		
5	Q Okay. Would that be part of the information		
6	that would be in your file?		
7	A Yes, it would be on our face sheet.		
8	Q When you say face sheet?		
9	A Yeah, our investigator face sorry, face		
10	sheet.		
11	Q Okay. I would like to direct you to what I		
12	think is the face sheet, but if it's		
13	A Okay.		
14	Q not then		
15	A Sure.		
16	Q then please let me know and we can get		
17	you a different. I'm looking at 2264 Bates stamp		
18	number.		
19	MR. STEGE: Thank you.		
20	MR. SLOCUM: If I could approach?		
21	THE COURT: Yes.		
22	BY MR. SLOCUM:		
23	Q Is that what you mean by the?		

A

Yes.

1 Okay. So when was he born? 2 He was born July 3rd, 1942. 3 And you also have the Social Security number 4 reflected on there. I don't want you to read the whole 5 thing, but do you see his last four? 6 Α Yes, I do. 7 And what is that? 8 2846. Α 9 Okay. Thank you. Again, I just want to make Q 10 sure that we were clear. As far as the decomposition 11 process you said it's very variables; is that right? 12 Yes, sir. 13 And there are a number of different things 14 that contribute to how fast bodies decompose. 15 Α Yes, sir. 16 And, in fact, even if you took two bodies and 17 put them in exactly the same environment, one is going 18 to decompose at a different rate than the other. 19 Yes, sir. Α 20 So we can't really make a conclusion on how 21 long Mr. Gibson was dead before he was discovered. 22 that fair to say?

You on your direct testimony said he had been

Fair to say.

Α

23

dead for a period of time.

- A Correct.
- Q And so I wanted -- I wanted to make sure that we could maybe nail that down a little bit better. When you say a period of time what does that mean to you?
- A Can I explain decomposition and kind of -- do you want, like, a time frame or can I explain why it's difficult?
- Q So what I'm asking is when you say a period of time I just wanted to make sure that I was clear on what those words mean to you.
 - A Sure. It means days to me, not hours.
 - Q Okay.
- A Whether that's five days versus ten days, I wouldn't be able to say.
- Q Okay. So that's exactly the answer that I wanted. In your mind that is days --
 - A Yes.
 - Q -- that's not months. Right?
- A I would have to know all the variables of how he was found, like what environment he was found in.
- Q Well, you don't know what environment Mr. Gibson was found in?
 - A I believe he was in his apartment. But I

don't know the temperature of the apartment.

Q Okay. So I just want to make sure we're clear. You believe that the temperature of the apartment could be so cold that a period of time could be months?

A Oh, not months, I'm sorry, I'm thinking like

-- to me more than one month, like more than four weeks.

Could it be five weeks? Maybe. But months, not like

two, three, four, five. But more than one month, sorry,

is what months means to me.

Q Right. So I get -- I just want to make sure we're on the same page so --

A Yes.

 $\ensuremath{\mathtt{Q}}$ So we said to you a period of time in this case means days.

A Days.

O Not hours, we're good on that. Right?

A Right.

Q And not months, so days.

A Yes.

Q Okay. Thank you. And you had said actually that fat acts as an insulator which increases the speed at which a body decomposes; isn't that right?

A Yes.

- Q Now, Mr. Stege asked you about a type of injury that would incapacitate someone. Do you remember that question?

 A Yes, I do.
 - Q But that's not a term that you use in your in your area of specialization. Is that true?
 - A Not necessarily, no.
 - Q So it's difficult for you to say what particular injury would cause someone not to be conscious. That was one of the options that you gave, right?
 - A Right.

2.2

- Q And it's difficult to know exactly the order in which these injuries occurred. Is that true?
 - A True.
- Q So we don't know which injury occurred in which order.
 - A Correct.
- Q So if I understood your testimony, you can identify the injuries but it's difficult for you to establish how much force is necessary to create these injuries; is that right?
- A Correct. There have -- there have been some studies done on cadavers where they looked at how much

force it took to injure skin, subcutaneous fat and
muscle, and the average was 11 pounds, but in that study
there's no documentation of how big the person was so in
forensics unfortunately we can't do a lot of
evidence-based medicine because of what we do. So these
questions are yes, difficult to answer.

Q Which is exactly why it's difficult for us when we use the word incapacitate because clearly the person's already dead by the time you're evaluating them.

A Correct.

MR. SLOCUM: No further questions. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. Any redirect?

REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. STEGE:

Q This question of the time, right, that the body may have sat there, how would a -- in February, a cold apartment that was -- let's talk about this -- let me start over. A studio apartment --

A Uh-huh.

Q -- as a hypothetical. With the window cracked, say, an inch. In February of 2019 that was, in fact, between snow and rain, kind of little drizzle, the air conditioning similar to the one in a -- might find

in a hotel, the wall unit?

A Uh-hum.

2.2

2.3

Q It has heat, high/low, heat and cold, and a dial to go high/low. In this instance the air conditioner was turned to high for a period of three weeks. How would that affect your -- and how would that affect the decay? Or decomposition.

A So decomposition, I can speak to kind of in a temperate environment how it proceeds. Usually around 24 hours, and this is just on average, like an average person you get green discoloration of the abdomen. And then 48 hours you start to get bloating of the tissues and that is from gas produced by bacteria. Around 72 hours the body turns green, again, that's from the hydrogen sulfide that's made by the bacteria in the gut. And then a couple days later you lose all those gases and the body's not really bloated anymore, and the tissues start to dry.

The type of decomposition for Mr. Gibson doesn't follow that pattern. His is more consistent with a cool, dry environment. Another thing to note on him is he didn't have extensive insect activity, which can also change the way decomposition happens. For him, you know, he had the green discoloration of the abdomen

and the drying of the hands, so it is consistent with a cool, dry environment.

2.0

I mean, we keep our coolers at 39 degrees

Fahrenheit in the office, and that is to prevent
decomposition at an accelerated rate. Bodies will
decompose unless they're frozen, but even if they're
refrigerated, but it's to slow it down. So that's why
its difficult. This could be days, and like I said, it
could be five days, ten days, 14 days. You put it into
14 days I'm gonna say weeks, so it's two weeks. So it's
-- there's so much -- it's possible that it could be two
weeks. It's possible it could be, you know, 17 days,
ten days. All I know is his -- his pattern of
decomposition did not follow what we see with a person
in a -- like a setting of 80 degree or ambient
temperature environment.

Q And I'm sensing in fairness reluctance really to nail down a time frame.

A Yeah, I just -- I can't do that with certainty, there's just no way I could say.

Q And it's not just you that can't say, it's within the field itself.

A Right. We've tried. We have body farms in Texas and in Tennessee where we try to look at

1 decomposition and, you know, I think maybe back in the 2 day we used to be more dogmatic about it, but we've learned that there's so much variation that we can not 3 say with certainty how long. And the longer the period 4 5 of interval, so the longer between when they die and 6 when they're discovered, the more imprecise it gets. 7

MR. STEGE: Thank you.

THE COURT: Recross.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

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

THE COURT: All right. Thank you. You're free to step down and leave the courtroom.

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

I'm not sure how long you'll be in the jury deliberation room, but you will return into the courtroom before the end of the day. We'll stand for our jury.

(Jury leaves courtroom.)

THE COURT: Do you wish to rest in the presence of the jury?

MR. STEGE: I do. I want to reexamine the 24 A that I hadn't marked. It was a certified copy issue

as it relates to -- Court's indulgence. 1 2 Your Honor, I'm prepared to rest. THE COURT: Do you want to do that in the 3 4 presence of the jury? MR. STEGE: I'm indifferent. 5 THE COURT: Okay. To the defense. Do you 6 have any witnesses to call this afternoon? 7 8 MR. SLOCUM: The only possible witness would be Mr. Goad. We would ask for a moment to speak with 9 10 him. THE COURT: I think it's appropriate that you 11 finally confirm his intentions. I'm going to ask that 12 13 all of the court staff, the District Attorney staff leave the courtroom, only the security staff will 14 remain. We'll be subject to your call. 15 16 Deputies, if you'll just give sight supervision but give them as much space as possible, 17 please. But not long. 18 MR. SLOCUM: I understand, your Honor. 19 20 (Short break.) THE COURT: Mr. Slocum or Ms. Mayhew, I would 21 like you to comment about your interactions with Mr. 22

Goad relating to his choice to remain silent. I do not

want you to disclose any content of what was said but,

23

instead, the mechanics of that conversation.

MR. SLOCUM: Absolutely, your Honor. What I want to let the Court know is it's as if the medication that he was given yesterday has a -- has a time frame in which it actually has its effect. Because I have noticed a marked difference now with respect to Mr. Goad and his ability to communicate with me.

THE COURT: Difference of improvement?

MR. SLOCUM: Of improvement. That — that it's as if the medication took a while to have its effect, that this morning it hadn't fully activated, but by this afternoon when I've spoken with him, he's communicating with us, we can have meaningful discussions about the evidence and his decision, the questions that he asked were relevant and helpful in terms of establishing whether or not he wanted to testify, so I feel very confident in his decision and that he understands both the pros and the cons of testifying.

THE COURT: I was just concerned with my observation Mr. Goad appears to be interactive, and interactive with counsel and observant of the proceedings in ways that do not concern me.

The jury, please.

(Jury returns to courtroom.)

THE COURT: All right. If everyone will be seated, please.

To the State.

MR. STEGE: The State rests.

THE COURT: Thank you. To the defense.

MR. SLOCUM: The defense rests. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you. Ladies and Gentlemen, that concludes our trial day. During this overnight recess you are admonished not to converse amongst yourselves, or with anyone else on any subject connected with this trial.

You will not read, watch, listen to, or listen to any report of or commentary upon the trial by any medium of information including without limitation newspaper, television, radio or internet.

You are not to conduct any form of personal investigation or research. No field studies are allowed.

We are close to the time when you will deliberate. You are still not allowed to discuss this case amongst yourselves. I also ask that you not form any final opinion about this matter. I know that you've participated as passive observers throughout the trial.

You may start to have opinions about what is presented, but it is fair to the State and to Mr. Goad that you await the full presentation of arguments before reaching a final decisions.

Tomorrow when you arrive, I will begin by providing instructions of law that will govern your deliberations.

The attorneys will then argue the case by summarizing the evidence that's been presented, possibly focusing on the principles of law they wish you to consider.

Because the State has the burden of proof it is -- it begins in argument. The defense will argue in opposition, and then the State will have limited rebuttal argument time.

After that you will be free to deliberate.

There are no rules about the length of deliberations. I have no opinion about how long you will deliberate. But I find it highly unlikely that you will still be in deliberations on Monday. So if you have work commitments on Monday, you should plan on not being at the courthouse. We need to talk about this, counsel.

Just think for a moment about -- Ms. Clerk?

Ladies and Gentlemen, please return to the

courthouse for entry into the courtroom at 9:30 tomorrow morning. We have work to do outside of your presence in settling the jury instructions and then there's just some mechanical work of making copies and so forth, so 9:30 tomorrow morning.

We'll all stand for our jury.

(Proceedings continued until August 9, 2019, at 9:30 a.m.)

---000---

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	

STATE OF NEVADA) COUNTY OF WASHOE)

I, JULIE ANN KERNAN, official reporter of the Second Judicial District Court of the State of Nevada, in and for the County of Washoe, do hereby certify:

That as such reporter I was present in Department No. 15 of the above court on Wednesday, August 8, 2019, at the hour of 9:00 a.m. of said day, and I then and there took verbatim stenotype notes of the proceedings had and testimony given therein upon the Jury Trial of the case of STATE OF NEVADA, Plaintiff, vs. RALPH EDMOND GOAD, Defendant, Case No. CR19-0999.

That the foregoing transcript, consisting of pages numbered 1 through 230, both inclusive, is a full, true and correct transcript of my said stenotype notes, so taken as aforesaid, and is a full, true and correct statement of the proceedings of the above-entitled action to the best of my knowledge, skill and ability.

At Reno, Nevada, this 25th day of March, 2020. DATED:

22

23 /s/ Julie Ann Kernan

JULIE ANN KERNAN, CCR #427