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Las Vegas, Nevada, Wednesday, January 29, 2020
(Thereupon, the following proceedings were had out of the presence of the jury.):

THE COURT: There are some matters outside the presence?

MR. P. HYMANSON: Yes, Your Honor.

Very briefly, we have -- $I$ know you want to
do the cause at the end, but there are three came up yesterday that $I$ think really we need to clear the plan and get going, so we can get this done.

THE COURT: Speak with them first.

MR. P. HYMANSON: Yes.

In that case they're actually four, but I
wanted to re-address Mr. Wilder.

I noticed we're giving him headphones today.

As you were sitting there yesterday --
THE COURT: Did he ask for those?

MR. P. HYMANSON: No, the bailiff was supplying them, the head phones.

MR. MC BRIDE: Did he ask for them, or we just suggested he wear them.

THE MARSHAL: I offered them to him,
talking about the headphones we use for the courtroom.

THE COURT: Do we have these other things that dangle?

THE MARSHAL: No, the ones that go over his ears.

THE COURT: So he didn't ask for them?
MR. P. HYMANSON: He did not ask for it, and $I$ don't think it makes a deference.

As you were sitting there yesterday, you had that expression that if he doesn't hear 50 percent of it so far and hasn't asked, what type of appeal is that going to be?

And, Your Honor, if he has headphones, and they go down, if he takes them off, he's missing 50 percent, or if he's only getting 75 percent, you have issues anyway you look at it.

Mr. Wilder we're really trying to get out of here. As much as he wants to serve, he knows that he's was never able to serve before because he can't hear, and you can't do almost good enough for a jury.

So I would -- His badge number is 611, and I just don't think that it's going to be fair to either side if he have a juror that doesn't hear everything that is being said.

THE COURT: Mr. McBride.

MR. MC BRIDE: Yes, Your Honor.

I think that we continue with our plan to keep him on there, until we have absolute information from him that he's been unable to hear any of the questions from counsel. I don't think he's indicated that.

He said he hasn't been able to hear some of the responses from people in the audience, but nothing specific, and again $I$ don't think that is any more reason to dismiss him at this point.

I think Mr. Weaver should be allowed to maybe inquire a little bit and make that assessment when he makes the assessment for the other ones.

THE COURT: Mr. Weaver, do you concur, yes or no?

MR. WEAVER: I do.

And if it makes it easier, I'll lead with him.

THE COURT: This may be an impertinent question to ask, but why do we want to keep him any longer?

Any other person might be a problem with this jury, we let them go. Why is this one an issue?

I'm trying to rack my brain because I
necessarily don't know the answers one way or the other, but --

MR. MC BRIDE: I would agree.
And frankly $I$ don't think there's anything specific about a reason to keep him on.

It's not like we think he's providing all the great answers because either way I think that ultimately's just something that we need to kind of flush out a little bit more if that is true, a reason why he can't serve.

We talked about the other times he was a prospective juror, again a while back, we don't know the circumstances in particular in those instances as to why he was eliminated as a juror, if it was specifically related to that.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. MC BRIDE: So I just think out of an abundance of caution we be allowed to keep him on there, and then --

THE COURT: I understand Mr. Hymanson's position, and I'm inclined to excuse Mr. Wilder, but here's what I'm going to do, not knowing the offer was made for him to have the revisions, $I$ can't assume he wouldn't work with his hearing, I think we need to know what his hearing is, and I think if he
wears them, I don't think you want to tell him we have any of these concerns what we're looking for, but $I^{\prime} m$ going to inquire of him afterwards with that device, was there still anyone he was unable to hear, if there's anybody he's unable to hear with the device on, because again whether or not he can hear those of us who are speaking at him directly in a higher pitch, or certain toned voice, is not the issue.

The issue's, can he hear everyone, but I'm not going to take him off.

MR. ARNTZ: I was just going to say, my father's extremely hard of hearing, and the problem with people who are hard of hearing is, they detach themselves from the conversation, so they don't even know they are doing it, just quit pay paying attention to whatever is being said because they can't hear it all.

I'm not even sure we would be able to know how much.

THE COURT: I understand.

He has however been engaged, has been responsive to the questions as they've been asked, so he doesn't appear to be tuning out.

I think where he helped us understand is,
those of us who are speaking directly at him, he has not had any problem hearing them, there are certain people with certain tones, generally low or soft-spoken apparently, he doesn't hear.

My concern overall is, would he actually say something to interrupt, even though if he was asked if he would to that, and he said he would rather not do it -- or do it, because it hasn't connected for him.

I don't think being able to hear all the people if you're participating in the process -- A side note, what is happening with the screen, and why is it on the $T V$, and now going to some picture?

MR. J. HYMANSON: Your Honor, I was trying it out to see if IPad would work.

I apologize, Your Honor.
THE COURT: You can leave it connected. It's distracting because I'm looking at things I'm not used to seeing.

MR. J. HYMANSON: That's the story, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right.
The next --
MR. P. HYMANSON: My effort was to expedite.

THE COURT: I understand.

We got the record.

We'll move on.

MR. P. HYMANSON: I think this will be the easy one, juror number 8, badge number 606, Mr. Ehle, he's had numerous procedures, misdiagnosis, and would seem to lean toward the Plaintiff.

As much as I would like to have him, he has no place on this jury.

THE COURT: Any objection from the Defense?

MR. MC BRIDE: No objections, Your Honor.

MR. P. HYMANSON: Which would bring me to --

THE COURT: Hold on.

I'm I'm going to make the record now and direct my marshal when we're done, he will go and bring in the jurors, hold those back, and excuse them as we did yesterday with one of the others.

So, Mr. Ehle, juror 606, will be excused based on the other bias towards one side or the other.

MR. P. HYMANSON: He says that the other side he would be favorable to.

THE COURT: He has a clear expression.

He's not suited for trial under the
circumstance.

MR. P. HYMANSON: Juror Number 18, badge number 637, Mr Read, was the same discussion. He's the one had the former wife who was an ER nurse, sued for malpractice, and she would -- or that as we started out the Defense would have a lame duck.

It's the same analysis, you can't take it back, and as such, just like Mr. Ehle, Mr Read would not be qualified to be fair and impartial.

THE COURT: Mr. McBride, the same?
MR. MC BRIDE: No objection, Your Honor.
MR. WEAVER: No objection, Your Honor.
THE COURT: All right.
Mr Read, I'm just going to make the record, I'm going to go ahead, agree with counsel, this appears to be a request for excusal.

I believe Mr Read, he's difficult to follow, the way he articulates compared to some of the others jurors. I think in the end he said, he would attempt to listen to the evidence, and could listen to the evidence, and try to listen to the evidence, but also expressed concern about how as the facts unfold it might affect him, so in the grand scheme of things $I$ don't see a reason to risk continuing him on the panel, even though I don't know
he has reached a level Mr. Ehle has reached of excusing, inability to serve.

I think there's enough concern here to go ahead, allow his excusal as well.

You had one more?
MR. P. HYMANSON: One more, Your Honor, it's not a move for cause, it's Miss Brown, 668. We have several Browns on the panel, this Brown happens to be the one that went to Bible class with the Plaintiff at the same school and --

THE COURT: With the Defendant.
MR. P. HYMANSON: --the Defendant.
THE COURT: By the way, I've been meaning to ask, am I incorrectly referring to her -- I know that she is.

MR. WEAVER: We would prefer nurse practitioner.

THE COURT: Nurse Practictioner Bartmus.
Thank you.
Bartmus.
MR. P. HYMANSON: If we were to ask that question, that is something would probably clear the room because you want to have that discussion outside the presence of the jury.

THE COURT: We did have some discussion
already.

I think you are right, if we wanted to find out anymore involvement, $I$ didn't get the impression -- I think I asked the question if they are still in a social connection other tie.

The answer was, no.

Then $I$ think $I$ asked the question, would it affect your ability to be fair and impartial, and again said, no.

MR. P. HYMANSON: My recollection, I think that given the fact we're crossing religious classes at school, I'd like to know she doesn't have concern that we're starting on an even keel.

I don't know the strength of the classmate's relationship, some places that would be an automatic disqualification, but she didn't say she went to USC, and $I$ would just suggest that out of an abundance of caution we have her individually questioned.

THE COURT: What is the Defense position on this?

MR. WEAVER: You know, I think the only thing we would say to that is, there was that opportunity before passing for cause and questions or concerns about that, and there wasn't anything that
was responded to, other than --
THE COURT: I'll bring her in to have a brief traverse of just her.

MR. ARNTZ: Has there been a pass for cause I heard?

THE COURT: No, I instructed counsel at the bench yesterday that once the Defense is completed we would have a group discussion about cause.

I have no problem with the jury if you want to challenge it, that's fine.

If you wanted to further traverse Mr. Read, I would have allowed it, but that is not what is being asked, so he was excused.

But as far as Miss Brown, I think the line of question we had so far would indicate no reason to remove her, but $I$ think we might as well clear that up, and Mr. Hymanson, I'll give you some opportunity to traverse as well.

Why don't we bring her in and see.
While we are on the subject, up to this point are there any cause concerns the Defense has to be mindful of?

MR. MC BRIDE: No, Your Honor.
MR. WEAVER: No.
THE COURT: So, Joshua, please bring us

Miss Brown, actually juror 668 on the original list, she was in seat number -- moved up to seat number 5 . (Juror Brown brought into the courtroom.) THE COURT: Miss Brown, come forward. Past counsel's table there's a nice chair there in the front.

We just have a couple questions for you. That chair right there.

So we wanted to inquire a little bit more from you about something that you mentioned at the beginning of the trial before we actually got everybody up in the box -- or got you up in the box $I$ should say, about the fact you had a connection to one of the parties.

JUROR M. BROWN: Yes.
THE COURT: And the nurse practitioner was
the party you identified, and $I$ had a very brief inquiry of you at that time, but are you still
acquainted or social friends in some fashion, and I think you answered no to that, but $I$ don't want to answer for you.

So have there been any further
communications since you had Bible studies?
JUROR M. BROWN: No.

THE COURT: How long ago was it you had

Bible studies?
JUROR M. BROWN: I'm thinking about 2001.
THE COURT: I don't mean this to sound unkind to Nurse Practitioner Bartmus, but why would you remember her a long time later?

JUROR M. BROWN: We had a whole year of Bible study.

THE COURT: I guess the Bible study I was involved in was many years ago, $I$ don't remember the people.

How many were in the class?
JUROR M. BROWN: About probably maybe 8 to 10.

THE COURT: But you said, no continuing communications after that?

JUROR M. BROWN: Huh-uh.
THE COURT: One of the concerns -Obviously we always want it to be whoever is on that panel is just sitting there with an open mind receiving the evidence, and not biased, and $I$ don't mean that in a negative way, but just that sort of bias we all might have about people we know and things we're familiar with, and things like us, or whatever it is, that might impact the ability to be impartial here.

So I think I just asked the very general question, do you think that would impact your ability to be fair and impartial, and $I$ think you said, no, but we want to inquire a little further about that.

JUROR M. BROWN: I know we had Bible study, but we didn't have a whole bunch of conversations on the outside, but $I$ do remember her, $I$ guess $I$ have a good memory.

THE COURT: We like that as jurors all day long.

I don't mean to put you on the spot here, so $I$ hope it's not coming across like that, but I guess the next question would be, you know, at least at some point in time you all shared a religion, Bible study class, you indicated you still read the Bible.

Is there any reason why that religious connection you had would impact your ability to be fair and impartial in this trial?

JUROR M. BROWN: I don't think so.

THE COURT: You don't anticipate that would be something you would bring into evaluation of the witnesses or evidence?

JUROR M. BROWN: No.

THE COURT: Of the witnesses?

JUROR M. BROWN: No.
THE COURT: We talk about this any trial like this, $I$ think still in one of the instructions the parties start out even Steven, and maybe my pre-trial instructions about you -- The point is, everybody sitting in there isn't favoring one side or the other as we get started, and as we see that evidence, and brings in common sense what is that evidence, and when the time comes gets instructions, goes with their fellow jurors and deliberates and does that fairly without favoritism or disfavoritism to either side.

Do you think you would be able to do that? JUROR M. BROWN: I do.

I tell you my faith comes with me wherever I go, but looking at evidence and weighing it of course my faith factors into everything, so $I$ would leave that to you guys to determine.

I don't know how it would connect directly with the case, $I$ have no idea what it's --

THE COURT: The only thing $I$ had about how it might connect to the indication is, that you share a religion with one of the parties.

Would you favor that party because of that?
JUROR M. BROWN: I can't say because right
is right, and wrong is wrong.
THE COURT: But $I$ heard you saying that, again not trying to put words in your mouth, what you are really going to do is what is the evidence -JUROR M. BROWN: Yes.

THE COURT: -- and you're going to make your decision, is that true, based on the evidence presented, and really that alone?

JUROR M. BROWN: Yes.
THE COURT: Okay.
I'm going to ask Mr. Hymanson, any
follow-up questions for Miss Brown?
MR. J. HYMANSON: Just briefly, Your Honor. Good afternoon, Miss Brown.

Thanks so much for coming to talk to us.
So you said you remember Nurse Practitioner Bartmus from about 19 years ago?

JUROR M. BROWN: Oh, my gosh yes.
MR. J. HYMANSON: From 19 years ago.
And it was a class size of about 8 to 10
people?
JUROR M. BROWN: Yes.
MR. J. HYMANSON: How often did that class
meet?

JUROR M. BROWN: Once a week.

MR. J. HYMANSON: Did the class involve outside discussions?

How many hours a week do you think you spent with Nurse Practitioner Bartmus during class time, after class?

JUROR M. BROWN: I remember we did have one camping trip with the Bible study.

MR. J. HYMANSON: Besides that one camping trip, would it be a regular week, one week you would see her?

JUROR M. BROWN: I think so.

MR. J. HYMANSON: And where were you going to school at this time?

JUROR M. BROWN: Reno.

MR. J. HYMANSON: So UNR?

JUROR M. BROWN: Yes.

MR. J. HYMANSON: This was your
undergraduate?

JUROR M. BROWN: Yes.

MR. J. HYMANSON: Did you have any other classes with Nurse Practitioner Bartmus, besides the Bible study.

JUROR M. BROWN: No, not that $I$ can remember.

MR. J. HYMANSON: That's all I can ask you,
the best of your memory.
So do you think there's anything about the fact you're going to have to make some tough decisions here, and so you are going to be obviously involved a dispute, we can't get into the dispute, but you will have to make a decision who you're going to side with.

So do you think as you sit there the fact you spent that year with Practitioner Bartmus in the Bible class, you don't think will influence you?

Let's say, if things are really, really close, would you at least give an edge to Nurse Practitioner Bartmus?

JUROR M. BROWN: If it's based on evidence, it's based on evidence and the law.

MR. J. HYMANSON: Absolutely.
So that's what I'm asking you.
JUROR M. BROWN: I can't say at this point I would have a bias toward anybody.

I just remember her face and remember we did have that interaction, but beyond that $I$ couldn't say anything else, like $I$ have a feeling one way or another.

MR. J. HYMANSON: Is there anything about the fact that you spent a year with Nurse

Practitioner Bartmus would make you think instantly she has either more or less credibility upon the witness stand?

JUROR M. BROWN: No.
MR. J. HYMANSON: Thank you very much.
THE COURT: Mr. McBride.

MR. MC BRIDE: No questions.
MR. WEAVER: Just a couple questions.
Miss Brown, you said that you identified the nurse practitioner. Was it her name, or did you recognize her face?

JUROR M. BROWN: Her face.
MR. WEAVER: But you haven't had any contact with her in approximately 20 years, is that right?

JUROR M. BROWN: No.
MR. WEAVER: If it weren't for the fact it was a Bible class, would you have ever even known her, would it have made any difference to you whether it was an algebra class, or political science class?

JUROR M. BROWN: I've known -- I guess I knew the Bible study because it was a smaller group and recognizing if you see somebody on a weekly basis, you know their face.

MR. WEAVER: That was at UNR?

JUROR M. BROWN: Uh-huh.

MR. WEAVER: You didn't have any other interaction, other than basically an hour a week that included other people?

JUROR M. BROWN: The Bible study and the camping trip.

MR. WEAVER: So if there were any
implications, you might be in Miss Bartmus' favor, maybe not a level playing field.

What about was there anything about your interaction with Miss Bartmus we should know whether you might not give her the same fair deal you give Plaintiffs?

JUROR M. BROWN: No.

MR. WEAVER: Thank you, Miss Brown.

MR. ARNTZ: Was it UNR, or through a church while you were at UNR?

JUROR M. BROWN: It was through UNR, called inner-varsity had Bible studies that broke off from the group.

MR. ARNTZ: So a Bible study --
JUROR M. BROWN: On the campus.

MR. ARNTZ: Okay.

THE COURT: Thank you, Miss Brown. We appreciate your time.

Go ahead and step out.
(Juror excused from the courtroom.)
THE COURT: Mr. Hymanson anything further you want to add to your request at this time?

MR. P. HYMANSON: Other than apologize for delaying the Court, $I$ have nothing else.

THE COURT: Unbeknownst to me, until just now apparently Mr . Jones in seat number 13 is not with us yet.

We're trying to locate Mr. Jones.
It's always with an issue with something like that it becomes how long do we wait.

He hasn't made any effort to contact us that we are aware of.

Jurors tend to find a way to get to us if they can.

One of the mistakes we made is just to let my marshal know that generally on the first day of trial we get a sign-in sheet with everybody on it, so if something happens, we have a way to contact them, but this has been a little hectic getting everything moving forward, we neglected to do that, so it doesn't automatically come from jury services, so we will follow-up, but give at least ten more minutes, and then we will be an hour from the start time,
maybe have to consider what to do.
MR. P. HYMANSON: Your Honor, just one moment.

THE COURT: Of course.
MR. P. HYMANSON: I don't know how counsel for the Defense feels, but we'll stipulate to let Mr. Jones go.

MR. MC BRIDE: I still want to have him here.

There's no reason to really excuse him.
We can wait ten minutes.
THE COURT: If we're going to finish jury selection today, on the plus side the concern $I$ have on the record about my own personal time frame has been resolved, so we're fine there.

But let's give at least ten more minutes, see if we can get Mr. Jones here, and come back in collectively decide how to proceed.

MR. MC BRIDE: Before you leave the bench, I want to let you know we did submit our order on the motions that we prepared, and I think --

THE COURT: How did you submit that?
MR. MC BRIDE: We signed it.
She brought it back to your chambers.

I also have an objection we filed, I wanted
to give Your Honor a copy of it, an objection to the Plaintiff's proposed jury instruction regarding loss of chance, just prior to opening statements $I$ wanted to make sure that we kind of address that.

Thank you.
THE COURT: I've not spent any time on jury instructions yet, but $I$ would see if anyone has any objections.

Have you seen the filing?
MR. ARNTZ: Just so you know, I don't intend on addressing that in opening, so that will not be a topic in my opening.

THE COURT: Good to know.
MR. WEAVER: Your Honor, we join the objection on behalf of Bartmus, the objection to Defendant's proposed jury instruction regarding loss of chance.

THE COURT: Let me step in the back, clear up my prior issues, and see if juror Jones gets here. (Thereupon, a recess was had.)
(Thereupon, the following proceedings were had out of the presence of the jury.):

THE COURT: So we're back on the record now with Juror Crayton Jones, III, juror 625.

Apparently he e-mailed the Court this morning, sent the e-mail to the e-juror e-mail, just made it's way to my JEA and Court clerk like at 2:19, so literally as we are talking about him they are sending it over, so it says:

Subject: Sick and unable to return to the gallery for jury selection in Courtroom 15-B.

Then he identifies himself as juror ID.
He says, please be advised I've taken ill and am unable to return to Court as part of the gallery today at 1:30 p.m. in Courtroom 15-B.

I've not been selected for the jury, and I feel awful for not being able to complete the obligation, I'm willing to be re-selected in the future in consideration of others in attendance.

It would be irresponsible to expose others to my illness, and I'm respectfully requesting to eliminate my appearance in 1:30 p.m.

I'm looking forward to serving as a prospective juror in the future.

Mr. Jones will be put in the next available
pool.
I don't have too much sympathy for the circumstances, since he's not really identifying the circumstances, but I'm going to make this a Court's Exhibit 1, so we have it for the record, even though I read it in, we have it, and $I$ think we'll have to proceed with filling Mr. Jones' seat.

So at this moment in time we're going to have three vacant seats in the panel, we're going to ask my marshal to hold back Juror Number 606, Mr. Ehle, who is in seat 8, and hold back jurors, and have Mr. Read, juror 637, in seat 18 , you know which jurors those are, $I$ believe, and is that correct, hold them back, bring everybody else in, we'll seat everybody else who is seated, and proceed with the next three in order to fill those seats.

We still have the panel from the original start of trial.

My latest count was down to 11. This will take us down to 8.

We still have an additional 10 we asked to be brought in, but we're still keeping them in jury services in hopes we won't need to get to them.

## All right.

(Thereupon, the following proceedings were had in open court and in the presence of the jury.): THE COURT: As the rest of the jurors find their seat, I'll ask everyone else to have a seat as well.

Thank you, ladies and gentlemen.
Welcome back.
We are in the home stretch of this jury selection, we'll most certainly finish the jury selection today, absent unforeseen circumstances.

I do want to note in part the delay starting today was because of one of your fellow jurors took ill, was unable to return, so it took a while to make that determination and be able to proceed.

But we're going to proceed without that juror.

We also have had two additional excusals from the panel, so we have three empty seats to fill over here.

And the first seat to be filled is going to be seat number 8 in the back row.

So if you will come through between counsel table, around the podium, through the well, enter through the left side of the jury box, we would
appreciate that.
The next juror in order.
THE CLERK: Badge 683, Katrina Johnson.

THE COURT: Then the next seat to be filled is the one in the second row, but to the left as you're looking at the jury box, that is seat number 13.

And the next juror in order for that seat.
THE CLERK: 688, Teresa Blake.
THE COURT: Last but not least, the remaining seat number 18 will be filled by.

THE CLERK: 691, Joel Woods.
THE COURT: All right.

Thank you, folks.
As we did yesterday when we added
additional folks after a break to the panel, we still need to get a few minutes to get the other folks that just joined us, so I'm going to start with Juror Johnson, badge 683.

If you are able to see the boards.
If not, I'm happy to walk you through it,
but --
JUROR JOHNSON: 683.
I'm a speech therapist at the Southern
Nevada Health Care System and the VA Hospital here in

Vegas.

I'm primarily in the outpatient.

I have my Masters degree.

I moved to Vegas in December of 2018 for this job.

I relocated from Denver, Colorado, where I worked at a facility that gave therapy is services to people with dementia.

Single.

Never married.

No children.

And this is the first time $I$ received a jury summons.

THE COURT: If someone comes from another state, I like to ask that.

Thank you very much, Miss Johnson.

Let me ask you, we just had a couple folks to go through, obviously in your job there's some ties to the medical community, but any job you had, family members, close friends, working in the medical industry?

JUROR JOHNSON: Just me.

THE COURT: Okay.

And because you haven't been in the jurisdiction very long, no knowledge or connection to
-- that you recall the any of the parties or the witnesses in the case?

JUROR JOHNSON: No, ma'am.
THE COURT: Okay.
And like you said, primarily you are at the VA?

JUROR JOHNSON: Yes, primarily see out patients there.

THE COURT: Any connection, again yourself,
close friend, or family member, to any kind of
medical malpractice litigation?
JUROR JOHNSON: No, ma'am.
THE COURT: Thank you so much.
Moving now down to the front row, Miss
Blake.
JUROR BLAKE: Blake, 688.
I'm a librarian for the Clark County School
District.
Masters Degree in education.
Associate Engineer with SOCm which is a contractor with the Army.

Pre-existing real estate agent.
No children.
Las Vegas about 25 years.
Never been on a jury.

THE COURT: Here?

JUROR BLAKE: Never.

THE COURT: Never even made it this far.

JUROR BLAKE: Never even this far.

THE COURT: See how fortunate everybody is.

What about medical profession connections?

JUROR BLAKE: RN, a friend is a case
manager at the UMC.
THE COURT: How long has she had that
position?

JUROR BLAKE: At UMC, a few years.

THE COURT: Just to get a better
understanding, 5 years, 10 years, 15 , more?
JUROR BLAKE: 15 or more.

THE COURT: Okay.
And then what about any connections with
any medical malpractice litigation?

JUROR BLAKE: No.

THE COURT: Thank you.
Last but not least Mr. Woods.

JUROR WOODS: Woods, 691.

My job currently -- Before $I$ go any
further, $I$ have a stuttering problem, you will have to bear with me, if you know what I'm trying to say.

I'll keep going, but that's fine --

THE COURT: On the plus side, once jurors start their service if you are one of the 10 , you don't get to speak until you are in your deliberations, you just get to listen.

I've had some jurors think they should be speaking, but it's not the case.

JUROR WOODS: So I'm buying stock. What I did was job-related jobs.

Prior to that out of college I have a Bachelors degree.

Out of college a case manager for several years.

THE COURT: Where did you do that work? JUROR WOODS: State --

THE COURT: Like a hospital?
JUROR WOODS: Different out-patients and in-patient facilities in Oklahoma several years ago, and later on down the line in software, eventually medical software where $I$ work with a variety of doctors and surgeons in the emergency room who $I$ consider probably the best, so I have a high respect for doctors and nurses who do work in the emergency room because $I$ know the way the hospital usually works, it takes very experienced people in that situation because that's who you want to handle a
emergency, if you;re a doctor dealing with patients.
So I do have a little bit of extra respect for people do that sort of work.

THE COURT: We appreciate you bringing that up, but $I$ want to make sure we don't forget.

JUROR WOODS: I've been with my spouse for 20 years, he's a registered nurse.

We've been together mostly nursing home work, it was in Washington state.

THE COURT: How long?
JUROR WOODS: Sorry.
Eight years.
THE COURT: Any children in the community?
JUROR WOODS: No children.
THE COURT: Eight years.
Moved here from where?
JUROR WOODS: Washington.
THE COURT: How about jury service?
JUROR WOODS: I've never done jury service.
THE COURT: So coming back to your
connection to medical profession, let me take the second question first.

Any connection that you had, your spouse, or another close friends, or family member, to any kind of medical malpractice litigation specifically?

JUROR WOODS: Malpractice was something I used to hear about because $I$ worked so close with the doctors and the nurses, and almost in-patient care going into the exam room, so.

THE COURT: Again, the time frame you engaged in those activities, can you give us a year span for that?

JUROR WOODS: How long, or when was it?
THE COURT: Dates I'm thinking.
JUROR WOODS: Probably like 2000 to 2010, around there, probably ten years back.

THE COURT: And back now to the first part, we talked a little bit about it yesterday, and because $I$ never know with the folks in the gallery if they are paying attention or not, $I$ want to go over this again, we fully understand there will be people on the panel who have life experiences, and who have perhaps understandings of certain things, or feelings a certain way, and the question really becomes, even though you may have some sympathy for a party or a general circumstance that might affect a party, are you going to be able to sort of set that aside to do your duty here, and just listen to the witnesses, take in the evidence as you receive it from the witnesses, and the documents, and when it comes time
for you and your fellow jurors to do so fairly and impartial -- The other way to sort of ask that is, it comes up the most commonly $I$ would say in our criminal cases because we're going to obviously have testimony from police officers, and there may be people who have family members are police officers and people had very good experiences with police officers, oftentimes people had bad experiences with police officers, so their life experience is going to have them have some feelings one way or the other.

What we're trying to ferret out is the kind of bias that might preclude the person from being able to do actually jury service, be fair and impartial with this particular case, with these particular people, and there's no right or wrong answer to that.

JUROR WOODS: Yes, I feel impartial, but I believe there are some odd questions, hypotheticals, have been presented.

One of them was a German Shepherd biting and passers-by. I don't think that has any relation to a person has a very serious condition going into a hospital to have that condition treated, and blaming the person who wasn't able to cure you for that condition you went in for.

If that's that case, I don't see those things related.

THE COURT: Fair enough.

We appreciate that.

So to your sort of analysis of the question, one of the things that is always tricky about jury service in voir dire, which is what we're doing now, and it kind of came up in the last couple of days, but just to bring it home, the hypotheticals have nothing to do with the case in terms of whether or not, as I'm sure you can appreciate, you can't have a voir dire where you sit there actually asking questions related to the case and actually ferreting out how people feel about the facts and circumstances of the case.

What you do, and $I$ think counsel so far have done a very skilled job of that, is you ask questions that sort of ferret out people's thought processes about different things to help you understand how they might handle the types of things that might come up in the case.

So I very much appreciate that insight for you, but again the facts and circumstances of the case will come into play when we actually start the case, which is opening statements are not evidence,
you will not regard them as evidence, but you will hear from counsel when the trial starts if you're on the panel, that these are the facts and circumstances of the case, and then you will hear the witnesses who will actually provide the actual evidence through their testimony and through the documents they discuss.

Then you will know what the case is about.
So what we have to know is, to make sure we don't have anybody predetermining any outcomes because they think based on the voir dire questions so far, or what they think they know about the case, they already think they know what the answer is.

If that's the case, that is fine, we need to know that, but again that is not going to be somebody going to stay with us on the jury panel.

So you indicated you had had a mixed answer there, which was I think you said, I'd like to be impartial, or think I'm impartial, something along that line, but expressed a concern about what if certain facts are, so really what it boils down to is, do you believe that not knowing the facts and circumstances of this case as the case comes in, are you going to allow the parties to start at the same starting line, at the so called race start?

JUROR WOODS: Yes.
THE COURT: Find them even Steven, and as you listen to the evidence, at the end of the day decide whether the Plaintiff has met the burden? JUROR WOODS: Yes.

THE COURT: There will be more questions coming from counsel, but $I$ appreciate that.

Anything else from the three of you that you heard questions being asked over the last two days that you were either chomping at the bit to answer, or really think we should know about anything that you have mindset wise about this trial?

JUROR JOHNSON: Yes, ma'am.
I just wanted to disclose, I'm also
military veteran who receives care at the VA Hospital that I also work at.

So I just wanted to let you know that I've seen it from a patient perspective and from providing services, kind of the good, the bad, and the ugly.

I wanted to disclose that.

THE COURT: Thank you.
There may be some more questions.
Anybody else?
Miss Blake.

JUROR BLAKE: No.

THE COURT: Anything else, Mr. Woods?
JUROR WOODS: No.
THE COURT: Thank you.
I'm going to pick up with Mr. Weaver,
because that's where we left off I believe, and then of course we'll still give the other counsel an opportunity to ask questions of the panel.

Mr. Weaver, you may proceed.
MR. WEAVER: Good afternoon.
I represent Nurse Practitioner Bartmus.
Miss Clinton, I'm going to start with you
because I think we left off with you yesterday afternoon with Mr. McBride, and $I$ just wanted to mention one small detail.

I think you were asked a question about -or the panel was asked a question about if anybody had any familiarity or relationship with St. Rose Hospital, and you mentioned your brother, and then you asked about where this campus is, the San Martin Campus.

This one is Buffalo and Warm Springs.
Does that make any difference to your recollection whether that may have been where your brother was treated?

JUROR CLINTON: Sabrena Clinton, 658.

I don't believe that location you described on Buffalo and Warm Springs was not where my brother was.

MR. WEAVER: Does anyone else have -- So the question is:

Do any of you have any association with any of the three campuses of St. Rose Hospital here in Las Vegas?

Yes, ma'am.
Miss Chavez.
JUROR CHAVEZ: My grandmother had a surgery sometime ten years ago, but everything was good, she came out of it great.

MR. WEAVER: Any reason to believe that anything good or bad happened with your grandmother is in association with Sunrise Hospital would affect your ability to be fair in this case?

JUROR CHAVEZ: The only thing happened, she didn't know she was allergic to a certain antibiotic, and they gave it to her, but fixed her up immediately, everything was fine.

I don't hold any grudges or anything.
MR. WEAVER: Anybody else?
Yes, Miss Bebekyan.
JUROR BEBEKYAN: I do work at a call center
for San Martin, but $I$ don't believe it should be a
problem.

MR. WEAVER: What context do you answer calls --

JUROR BEBEKYAN: Call-ins.
MR. WEAVER: Would you just explain a little more, that is for example do you answer for physicians associated with San Martin.

JUROR BEBEKYAN: No, I'm not familiar with that.

MR. WEAVER: You may have heard the name Dr. Lasry and some of the others.

JUROR BEBEKYAN: I haven't.
I've been working there for four months.
I haven't.
MR. WEAVER: Would it be fair to say, you also don't take any of the calls that have to do with the emergency department?

JUROR BEBEKYAN: I do take calls from the emergency department, we do ICU too.

MR. WEAVER: Based on the context of any of the calls that you take, any of the information you pass along, any reason to believe that would affect your ability to be fair in in this case?

JUROR BEBEKYAN: No.

```
                            MR. WEAVER: Anybody else have any
association with St. Rose Hospital here in Las Vegas?
    Yes, sir, Mr. Wilder.
    JUROR WILDER: 611.
    My daughter was born in one of them.
    My mother's been in one of them.
    My wife had an operation in the other
thing.
    So all three of them, so --
    THE COURT: Mr. Wilder, you had the
headphones, but I see you are not utilizing them
anymore.
    Is there a reason?
    JUROR WILDER: They worked, just everything
is louder, but it doesn't really have the clarity, so
I can't hear as well, so I kind of put them on and
take them off.
    I can hear right now fine.
    THE COURT: We'll let you use your best
judgment.
Go ahead.
MR. WEAVER: Mr. Wilder, on that point, were you able to hear Miss Bebekyan, 109, what her answers were?
JUROR WILDER: Yes.
```

MR. WEAVER: You mentioned sometimes you have difficulty in hearing, has to do with tones more than anything else?

JUROR WILDER: I have problem with tones because $I$ got really good hearing aids and can hear okay.

MR. WEAVER: Are you able to tell us what types of tones you can't hear?

JUROR WILDER: My daughter.

MR. WEAVER: What about your wife?

Let's start with that.

JUROR WILDER: I can hear my wife.

MR. WEAVER: What is it about your daughter's tones make it difficult to hear --

JUROR WILDER: She has a real monotone voice and doesn't move her lips a lot.

I've been reading lips, and that helps me.

So I can't read her lips and can't hear her.

MR. WEAVER: With regard to hearing the answers to other jurors over the last few days, have you been attempting to be reading lips to understand what they are saying, or in your judgment be able to hear?

JUROR WILDER: I think I'm hearing pretty
good.

MR. WEAVER: Going back to the question about your experience with the St. Rose Hospitals, do you think your experience with St. Rose Hospital, including the birth of a child, that is going to cause you to be favorably disposed to any emergency department at St. Rose Hospital?

JUROR WILDER: I don't think so.
MR. WEAVER: With regard to the issue of the birth of one of your children -- ladies and gentlemen, $I$ think everybody has answered to questions from Mr. Hymanson they wouldn't think negatively, wouldn't hold it against Mr. Moore if he were to come and go, or have a leave of absence, or need to excuse.

Is everybody on the same page, that would not be an issue for them?

Is there anybody, including you new folks, Miss Johnson, Mr. Woods, and Miss Blake, have any concern, or hold it against, or look unfavorably, if Mr. Moore were to leave at any point, come and go, or not be present, is that a problem for anybody?

No.
Miss Bartmus is pregnant.
She intends to be here not only throughout
the trial obviously, but every moment of every day of the trial, but what happens with some folks, morning sickness is not always in the morning, sometimes it's in the afternoon.

So would anybody hold it against Miss Bartmus if she wasn't here for a small amount of time, or if she was here and needed to step out, or any circumstances where you looked over and saw she was leaving briefly, or looked over and saw she wasn't here for that reason, would anybody be concerned that it's a lack of interest, or lack of concern, or lack of caring on her part, about this case?

So everybody can feel comfortable, everybody can commit if Miss Bartmus for whatever reason, even if she's here, needs to step out, isn't going to hold it against her, is everybody all right with that?

Going back to the issue of the hospital, and St. Rose Hospital, Dr. Lasry, and Miss Bartmus worked in St. Rose Hospital in the emergency department, but were not employed by St. Rose Hospital, they worked for an emergency medicine group that contracted with St. Rose Hospital.

Does that make any difference to anybody,
does anybody care whether or not they worked for the hospital, as opposed to working in the hospital?

Does it make any difference to anybody whether the nurses that they worked with in the emergency department worked for the hospital itself, but not their emergency group?

Does anybody have any experience with circumstances where they work with somebody in a team approach, where perhaps that person works for a different employer than they do, but they need to work collaboratively?

Mr. Withers, you have that circumstance? JUROR WITHERS: I do.

MR. WEAVER: What type?
JUROR WITHERS: The company I work for is contracted by RTC. Now we manage the bus systems here in Las Vegas.

We're not an entity of that, we're contracted by them.

MR. WEAVER: Thank you.
So in your circumstance you work
collaboratively with folks that you may not have direct control over in terms of what they do, is that a fair way to look at things?

JUROR WITHERS: Yes.

MR. WEAVER: Is it your effort or goal to kind of work closely in doing that?

JUROR WITHERS: Yes.

MR. WEAVER: Mr. Newman, I haven't talked with you yet.

I think you told us that you were associated with overseeing environmental services?

JUROR NEWMAN: Yes.

MR. WEAVER: And in your capacity do you sometimes work with the folks, you oversee work collaboratively with other people that are non-employees with whatever employees you're associated with?

JUROR NEWMAN: Not often, because most all of us are at the school district.

MR. WEAVER: On a little bit of a different point, there was some talk yesterday, but I'll stick with you for this moment, we talked about documentation, and the issue hit on terms of procedures, part of people's jobs.

Do the folks you supervise sometimes have to document the things they do?

JUROR NEWMAN: Yes.

MR. WEAVER: Would it be fair to say in
your job as a supervisor sometimes things may get
documented, but it doesn't mean in your opinion they haven't been done, it just means they were done, but not documented?

JUROR NEWMAN: Correct.
MR. WEAVER: Anybody who has a feeling that just because you did something and didn't document it, it should be you didn't do it in the first place?

Anybody hold that feeling that if you didn't document something, it automatically means it's not done?

Okay. Miss Johnson, welcome. JUROR JOHNSON: Thank you.

MR. WEAVER: I am just trying to clarify some of the answers that my colleagues have given, so I'm not going to be as extensive as some of the questions of my colleagues, we have a tight schedule, and the Court runs a tight ship, and we're going to do our best to stay on schedule, so if $I$ skip over asking some of the questions that have already been asked of others, will you let us know if there's any particular relevance comes to mind?

JUROR JOHNSON: Yes.
MR. WEAVER: So, Miss Johnson, in your capacity as a speech therapist is that including $I$ think you said some outpatient treatment.

JUROR JOHNSON: Yes, sir.
MR. WEAVER: And I should have said your badge number.

JUROR JOHNSON: 683.
MR. WEAVER: Did that also include some evaluations of patients?

JUROR JOHNSON: Yes, sir.
MR. WEAVER: In your experience have there been times where you have evaluated patients with speech therapy on an out-patient or in-patient basis at the VA Hospital where you know they do -- have provided them the care they needed, that it was appropriate care, and didn't necessarily document it?

JUROR JOHNSON: I would like to think we did document it.

It not be a surprise at the time, things are left out.

MR. WEAVER: So you try to document what you think is important, because it isn't documented doesn't mean you didn't do it, is that a fair way to look at it?

JUROR JOHNSON: Yes.
MR. WAVER: Sometimes that documentation isn't there, and you believe you did it, you know you did it because it's your habit to do it, your custom

```
is to do it?
```

JUROR JOHNSON: Would you say that again?

MR. WEAVER: Sure.

In general, in your evaluation and treatment of patients are there certain things that you do as part of your processes, part of your custom?

JUROR JOHNSON: Yes.

MR. WEAVER: So even if you give some treatment, do some evaluation, and you didn't document that you did it, is it fair to say you would know you did it because it's your habit to do it?

JUROR JOHNSON: Sometimes I would say. If it's a patient I've seen routinely, but if it's something really important, and $I$ realize after the fact it wasn't addressed, the next time I see the patient $I$ would emphasize to myself to make sure I did that.

MR. WEAVER: Thank you, ma'am.

Mr. Headd, before $I$ come back to you, we're going go to answer a question -- or tell the Judge something.

James Maltese, 665.

THE COURT: We have had a different reporter each afternoon we've been in selection.

Generally either counsel or myself say the name of the jurors. They've not been saying the names, so at this point because this reporter is not used to that process, say your name and badge number when you speak out.

Thank you.
JUROR MALTESE: I have been on projects,
and no project was completed until the paperwork was done and documentation.

I just wanted to say that.
MR. WEAVER: So with that, Mr. Maltese,
would it be an instance where you needed to document a little later, than something was done immediately, it would be done in order for it to be complete? JUROR MALTESE: Most of the times after hours at dinner, or at a hotel.

MR. WEAVER: Whenever there was time to do it? JUROR MALTESE: Yeah. MR. WEAVER: Mr. Headd, you seem to speak your mind.

Is that a fair thing to say?
JUROR HEADD: I'm fine with that.
Ryan Headd, 643.
MR. WEAVER: All right.

You gave us some perception you have of the emergency department is fast-paced, and the emergency department providers, health care providers, basically need to take all comers, whether it a gunshot trauma, burn, heart attack, or whatever it is, is that an accurate perception of that?

JUROR HEADD: Yeah, I imagine certain times it's a very chaotic environment, depending what is going on.

MR. WEAVER: Does anybody in general have a different perception of the emergency department, other than what Mr. Headd described?

Mr. Headd, would it also be your perception that there are times when people go to the emergency department because they think they have an emergency condition, and it's determined that the condition actually isn't an emergency?

JUROR HEADD: Sure.
MR. WEAVER: Can you think of any of what those scenarios might be, or are you just comfortable with the concept, even if somebody in good faith thinks they need to go to the emergency department to be checked out, that's to see what their condition is, it wouldn't surprise you if the condition isn't an emergency?

JUROR HEADD: Yeah, I'm fine with that.
MR. WEAVER: Is there anybody that would be surprised by that perception, or anybody who would be surprised by the idea even a patient who in good faith thinks they might have an emergency condition and needs to be treated in the emergency department, that it doesn't turn out to be an emergency, anybody subscribe to the view that doesn't make sense or wouldn't hold true?

Does anybody -- or do any of you folks hold the view that the only people, a health care provider in the emergency department, who should be able to treat a patient who believes they need to be evaluated for an emergency condition should be a physician?

Anybody hold that view?
Would anybody think that it would be appropriate for a nurse practitioner, and we'll talk about what that is in a moment, anybody have the view it would be inappropriate for a nurse practitioner to evaluate a patient in the emergency department when that patient believes they might have an emergency condition and needs to be evaluated?

Does that strike anybody as something that shouldn't happen?

Mr. Woods, 691, do you have any concern or perception?

Your husband's a registered nurse.
Any concern or perception that a nurse practitioner in the emergency department wouldn't be appropriate to diagnose the condition of the patient who came?

JUROR WOODS: No, my actual doctor's a nurse practitioner that $I$ go to as my general physician is a nurse practitioner, so when $I$ refer to her, I call her my doctor.

I'm aware of kind of how that works, there are some things she has to get the doctor to sign off on.

I know it's how it works, but for the most part she's my doctor, so that's how I see it.

MR. WEAVER: So is there anybody on the panel who doesn't have an understanding of what a nurse practitioner is?

So if $I$ tell you that a nurse practitioner like Miss Bartmus is a registered nurse who then went on to have additional training, a Masters and a Doctorate degree, and assumes a practice, even though we don't call her Dr. Bartmus, she has a Doctorate degree in nursing practice, but she's not a
physician, in other words, she's what some hospitals -- or some call a mid-level practitioner, does anybody, without even knowing the facts, hold against Miss Bartmus if she diagnoses patients in the emergency department, maybe puts in orders for medication, or testing, the discharge of patient, anybody who would hold that against her if she's licensed to do that, and working with in the scope of what she's allowed to do?

Does that strike anybody, even if it's legal, as not being okay?

All right.
Mr. Fyfe, 614.
How are you today.
JUROR FYFE: Good.
How are you?
MR. WEAVER: Good.
Thank you.
Yesterday in response to one of the questions when Mr. McBride was visiting with you was brutal honesty, and one of the questions had to do with does anybody think a medical malpractice case may not be a great case for them, and we appreciated your response, you're not sure because there might be terms that come up, medical terms that you may not
understand, did I basically summarize what your thought on that was?

JUROR FYFE: Yes.

MR. WEAVER: So if we as the lawyers, I'm sure we intended to do so, if we explain those terms to you in a way that is acceptable, and a way can be explained to ease that, give you any concern about whether or not you would be able to be a fair juror in this case?

JUROR FYFE: No.

MR. WEAVER: Somewhat along those same
lines, does anybody have a type A personality?
JUROR WOODS: That they admit to? Me.

MR. WEAVER: That answer about whether they
would admit to it was Mr. Woods, juror 691.
MR. WEAVER: Do you think having a type A personality is a bad thing?

JUROR WOODS: No, I don't think it's a bad thing.

MR. WEAVER: Does anybody perceive
themselves to have a type A personality?
Here's where I'm going with this:
Does anybody have a concern that if they are instructed they can only look at the evidence in
this case, and not look -- can't Google, anything, can't go outside of the information that is provided or what they are instructed to do, they can't talk to the spouse about the information, they can't talk to their sister about the information about health care terms, health care language, or any of the information in this case, is there anybody who has a concern they are just not going to be able to resist that temptation, anybody?

So, Mr. Fyfe, for example whether it's today or tomorrow, you find me using the term emergency department, and Mr. McBride's using the term emergency room, or if it is something as simple as that probably, it wouldn't be an issue, but if it's a language issue of say what acute arterial occlusion means, if you are not getting in the moment what we're explaining, will you resist the temptation after hours to look it up, to Google it, do your own independent research?

JUROR FYFE: Yes.

MR. WEAVER: Is there anybody based on their personality or anything else that just doesn't think they will be able to resist the temptation to look up stuff, or investigate things on their own, is there anybody who has somebody in their life who's
going to drive them crazy by asking them about what is going on with the case, what is it all about, and then tell them what they should think? Miss Bechtold, juror 624. JUROR BECHTOLD: Yes.

THE COURT: The question concerns me because the jurors will understand they are not allowed to discuss the case with anyone, and even if they're pestered to share, $I$ don't know how we ever get to the point where anybody would tell them what they think, I'm a little concerned about the impression posed by that question.

The admonishment as you know is giving your version of it, each of you, while you can certainly help your friend, family, and co-workers, or employers know you're on a jury, and you can say it's a civil trial, any specific details about the trial may not be discussed by anyone, or with anyone, includes family, friends, anybody.

MR. WEAVER: Thank you, Your Honor.
Anybody have any opinions about health care in Las Vegas in general?

JUROR WOODS: 691.
I think the health care in general in Las
Vegas is a little bit sub-par from other cities I've
lived in, so that is a common complaint I've heard from other people from out of state, and $I$ don't know why that would be anything -- or anything else, but in general it seems like it's a little bit more lacks than it is in other states.

MR. WEAVER: Would that information or that impression you may have give you any cause or concern about whether Nurse Practitioner Bartmus and Dr. Lasry would be starting on anything less than a level playing field for you?

JUROR WOODS: No, because I kind of see emergency room treatment is very different from say a paid clinic, the general practitioner, again you are going to be able to do it, but an emergency room there's an emergency, $I$ don't think anybody comes into the emergency room, can walk in there and not feel like it's an emergency, it's an emergency for everybody who is there, but it's a little different, so $I$ feel like the kind of people tend to migrate to that kind of work are probably going to be a little higher caliber than somebody who works in a pediatrician's office or something slower.

You got certain type of people $I$ noticed working in health care who gravitate to different areas of medicine, but the sort of people who end up
in the emergency room are the sort of people who are -- I can't think of the word -- usually are the best of the class, for lack of a better word.

MR. WEAVER: Thank you, sir.
Does anybody else have any general
impressions about medical care in -- or health care in Las Vegas?

JUROR JOHNSON: Just from my experience.
I was recruited here from out of state, and they said it's sometimes hard to retain people in association, so sometimes -- I can speak for the VA, we are constantly understaffed in multiple departments, and it makes it difficult to bring people here and keep them here for a while.

MR. WEAVER: All right.
Anybody else with any impressions of health care in general in Las Vegas?

Miss Clinton.
JUROR CLINTON: Yes, $I$ don't know in terms of general, but $I$ have personal experience where $I$ was out of state, I wasn't able to get the assistance I needed here, but in terms of the medical, whatever you are here for that particular issue, I had to go out of state for it.

MR. WEAVER: I'm not going to ask you what
type of care was it, but did that needing to go out of state relate to the need to get some type of specialty care, as opposed to a concern about the quality of the care here in Las Vegas?

JUROR CLINTON: It was more related to inability to diagnose here, and so we were referred out of state to get an accurate diagnosis.

MR. WEAVER: Anybody else with any
impressions of health care in Las Vegas, or any perception about the need to go out of Las Vegas for any type of illness?

Yes, Miss price.
JUROR PRICE: Juror 632 .

I had a similar experience where $I$ couldn't find the health care high quality here, I would have to go out of state for it for myself.

I would think the provider $I$ think is okay, and I will go out of state if $I$ don't find the quality.

MR. WEAVER: Miss Price, would that experience that you have give you any concern about whether or not Nurse Practitioner Bartmus and Dr. Lasry would be starting with the impression about the concern of the quality of care they would provide? JUROR PRICE: No.

MR. WEAVER: Does anybody hold the opinion if there's a bad medical outcome, that it means that somebody is at fault no matter what, anybody hold that opinion that if somebody had a bad outcome, somebody is to blame?

Anybody hold that viewpoint?
There was a hypothetical Mr. Hymanson gave, I'm just going to follow-up on it, and I'm so interested in what the answer to that hypothetical was, in my own mind $I$ don't remember what anybody's answers were, so I'm not going to re-ask the hypothetical, but it had to do with there was some perception of whether if something had ultimately happened, it comes down to karma I think was the gist of it.

The different question $I$ want to know is, is there anybody on the panel who doesn't believe that if there's a perceived bad medical outcome, that it couldn't be as just a coincidence?

Anybody think that nothing can happen by a coincidence, if something happens that perceives a bad medical outcome, it must have been predictable?

Let's start with that, does anybody have that perception?

Does anybody have the perception that if
there's a perceived negative or bad medical outcome, and somebody seen a physician or a health care provider, or been in the emergency department, that that bad outcome must have been preventable one way or another?

Does anybody hold that viewpoint, that any bad outcome one way or another should be considered preventable?

Nobody.
Miss Sallee, 604, do you have any concerns about the idea that if there's a bad perceived result after a health care provider, that that must be the health care provider didn't do something, that it was preventable?

JUROR SALLEE: No.
MR. WEAVER: Would anybody have the -- This is a little bit of a housekeeping matter, and I think we know the answer to all pf this, does -- or would anybody have any difficulty in seeing what is up on any of the screens if there's any exhibits or medical evidence up on the screen?

Would anybody have any difficulty reading anything that is up on the screen, or any difficulty along those lines?

Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.

Thank you.

Can $I$ have counsel at the bench just
briefly?
(Thereupon, a discussion was had between
Court and counsel at sidebar.)

THE COURT: Okay.

Let me ask Mr. McBride first, do you have any additional questions that would you like to ask of the new members?

MR. MC BRIDE: Actually I don't.

I'm good.

Thank you.

THE COURT: All right.

Thank you.

Mr. Hymanson, do you have any questions you would like to ask?

MR. J. HYMANSON: Very quickly, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. J. HYMANSON: Good afternoon, everyone, and good afternoon Miss Blake, Miss Johnson, and Mr. Woods.

I want to go -- You guys have all been here for everything, we appreciate your patience and everything, I'm going to do a quick hit list of a
couple things.
We talked about apple pie, for example how many of you disclosed you don't like apple pie?

So, Miss Johnson, correct?
JUROR JOHNSON: 683.
MR. J. HYMANSON: Why do you think it should be disclosed?

JUROR JOHNSON: It sort of would depend upon am $I$ judging on date, or presentation of it. If it's the case specifically, I think you should disclose it, but if it's the presentation, the style of it, and not going to interfere, $I$ can be objective, then no.

MR. J. HYMANSON: So on this case you think she should disclose -- you think you should excuse yourself?

JUROR JOHNSON: No, I think you disclose it, and a decision is made by the judging party.

MR. J. HYMANSON: And then, Miss Blake, you don't think you should, is that correct?

JUROR BLAKE: I think you should like everything, so I don't know about pie.

MR. J. HYMANSON: Hypothetically, if you didn't like pie, do you think you should disclose it? JUROR BLAKE: Yes.

MR. J. HYMANSON: You think you should excuse yourself?

JUROR BLAKE: Personally I probably would want to excuse myself, but $I$ guess that would be up to the Judge.

MR. J. HYMANSON: Absolutely.
Mr. Woods, I think you did not raise your
hand, is that correct, you don't think you should?
JUROR WOODS: I wasn't really following you.

MR. J. HYMANSON: You say to Judge a pie eating competition, there's a apple pie and blueberry pie, you know you really don't like apple pie, should you disclose you don't like apple pie?

JUROR WOODS: Yes, I think you should
disclose it, but $I$ think it's a hard question for me because I like either one.

MR. J. HYMANSON: You think you should
recuse yourself?
JUROR WOODS: Yes.

MR. J. HYMANSON: Thank you very much.
Do all three believe people should take
responsibility for their actions?
Mr. Woods?

JUROR WOODS: Woods.

Yes.

MR. J. HYMANSON: Do you think that you agree with what people said on $I$ think yesterday about full responsibility, everyone agree with that? JUROR WOODS: Yes.

MR. J. HYMANSON: Are all three of you comfortable with the facts of this case is about money?

JUROR WOODS: Yes.

MR. J. HYMANSON: And I gave a hypothetical about if you think based on the facts and the evidence that $\$ 500$ is sufficient to compensate the Plaintiff for their harms and losses, the Plaintiffs are asking for ten million dollars, are all three of you comfortable awarding $\$ 500$ to the Plaintiff?

JUROR JOHNSON: Maybe I'm just not understanding that question correctly, but is it 500 is agreed upon as it matches what --

MR. J. HYMANSON: What you believe.
So you think in your evaluation you think
that what the Plaintiff should be compensated is $\$ 500$, and so the Plaintiffs are asking for ten million dollars, do you think if it's 500, are you comfortable awarding the Plaintiff $\$ 500 ?$

JUROR JOHNSON: I guess that would be my
apologies, $I$ thought it was explained that we would kind of be directed as a jury what the typical compensation is, so $I$ would kind of follow that outline more than say, well, $I$ think it's this amount of money.

MR. J. HYMANSON: Okay.
JUROR JOHNSON: If I was understanding the Judge correctly.

THE COURT: Let me try to clarify.
JUROR WOODS: I agree with her.
JUROR BLAKE: I also agree.
THE COURT: Interesting all of you are sitting over there.

So let me explain.
The instruction talks about pain and suffering damages in the sense of there's no fixed number, there's no specific way to determine it, it gives you instructions how to think about it, but there are no numbers involved.

The determination of that has to come from the evidence and from the jury's deliberation.

We simply have instructions how to go about it to make the determination if any money is to be awarded, what the amount should be, and I apologize for any confusion on that.

I don't happen to have instructions in the room with me, although $I$ could probably find them very quickly if $I$ needed to clarify, but it's not something you are going to get any guidance of any kind what the verdict should be, only how you reach the verdict.

MR. J. HYMANSON: Thank you very much, Your Honor.

I appreciate that.

There's going to be, as you will see, different types of damages we present, some things you will see some calculations for different categories, $I$ can't get into the specifics with that, but just say that you believe that based on what the verdict -- or the instructions the court gave you, you think that $\$ 500$ is appropriate, and the Plaintiff's asking for ten million, are all three of you comfortable awarding \$500?

Okay.

So then we flip to that question is to say that, do you think based on the evaluation of all the facts and evidence before you the Plaintiff's are entitled to ten million dollars to compensate them for their harms and losses, and the Defense wants you to only award $\$ 500$, are you comfortable if you
believe it is justified based on the facts and evidence presented to you that ten million dollars is what it takes for this Defendant, are you comfortable with awarding ten million dollars?

JUROR WOODS: I believe so, yes.
MR. J. HYMANSON: Thank you very much.
Mr. Woods, 691.
JUROR WOODS: Correct.
MR. H. HYMANSON: Thank you so much.
THE COURT: I found the instructions, so why don't we review it.

The instruction being proposed is a standard set of instructions we would give, reads as follows:

No definite standard or method of calculation is prescribed by law by which to fix reasonable compensation for pain and suffering.

Nor is the opinion of any witness required as to the amount of such reasonable compensation.

Furthermore, the argument of counsel as to the amount of damages is not evidence of reasonable compensation.

In making an award for pain and suffering you shall exercise your authority and calm and reasonable judgment, and the damages you shall fix
shall be just and reasonable in the light of the evidence.

That is what we talked about when we say instructions on how to, not giving you the numbers.

MR. J. HYMANSON: Thank you so much, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you.
MR. J. HYMANSON: I'm going as quick as I can, ladies and gentlemen.

Do any of the three of you have any negative feelings about lawsuits, or people who file lawsuits?

JUROR WOODS: Woods.
I don't feel pro or negative about it.
MR. J. HYMANSON: 691, Mr. Woods.
Mr. Woods, I want to ask you a couple follow-up questions.

You talked about your long-term spouse is a registered nurse, correct?

JUROR WOODS: Correct.
MR. J. HYMANSON: Where does he work?
JUROR WOODS: He does the same thing as $I$ do now, but he's been a nurse for over 20 years.

MR. J. HYMANSON: Did he work more in the emergency room, in a certain department?

JUROR WOODS: The only time he worked in an emergency room was prior to us meeting, when he was in rotation or something like that.

Most of the time $I$ knew him he either worked in the nursing home or county general.

MR. J. HYMANSON: We talked about that you used to work, was it software you did in the emergency room?

JUROR WOODS: I did medical stuff, but didn't actually work in the emergency room.

I worked with several different doctors and specialists in the hospital system who also rotated.

I did not actually work in the emergency room myself, no.

MR. J. HYMANSON: When you were asked some questions about what you thought about health care in Las Vegas, and correct me if I'm wrong, but you said you thought it was generally okay, but you -- I gathered you have saw the emergency room kind of a top of the heap for the different departments, is that fair to say.

JUROR WOODS: I would think that would be one of the last places in a hospital that $I$ notice that, yeah.

MR. J. HYMANSON: So you understand this is
a medical malpractice case involves the emergency room, correct, and is there anything about your belief that the emergency room is the top of the heap that you think would give the Defendants in this case a little bit of a leg up in this case?

JUROR WOODS: No, because I've always been living long enough to see bad things happen also, so I'm also aware of those.

MR. J. HYMANSON: The fact you view the emergency room so much differently, at least from your words, of all the other kind of types of medicine practice in Las Vegas --

JUROR WOODS: I don't really know the answer to that question because I don't know the details or any specifics of this case yet, would all depend on the specifics of this case because in the emergency room it could be really wild differences, you can have somebody coming in for a common cold, or somebody having a baby, or somebody coming in from a car wreck, part of their chest removed.

I can go on and on, there's so many variables, and in the emergency room $I$ wouldn't begin to speculate the details of that.

MR. J. HYMANSON: I understand that, and I appreciate that.

But I do need to know how you fell about that because if it ends up being one of those cases, to me what $I$ heard from that is that in a certain situation you don't think emergency room would be ahead, but in another situation depending what the facts are the emergency room may be one step ahead, is that fair?

JUROR WOODS: I don't think the emergency room itself, $I$ think it's the persons around the emergency room is less likely to be sub-par than say a dentist's office, or pain clinic, or something like that around town.

You're probably pretty focused and drawing a reasonable paycheck, and some people are, you know --

MR. J. HYMANSON: Understood. So.
I'm sorry I keep asking you this, I want to focus in, get to the direct issue, and $I$ want to see.

So we're dealing with two individuals that work in an emergency room department, okay, and $I$ want to know if you think there's a scenario you could be presented with that you on the basis of the facts of that are presented here that given the fact that the people in front of you are emergency room employees, that you would give them at least a little
bit of one step ahead of where my clients are?
JUROR WOODS: I don't think so, because it
would all be objective. I would have to hear the details, and $I$ don't know any details of it.

MR. J. HYMANSON: I appreciate that.
I want to flush out, make sure $I$ understand because you said you don't know the details, you would have a step ahead or not, but by saying you don't have details to know if you're a step ahead or not, that leads me to believe that is at least some scenario where you think by virtue of being an emergency room employee they would be a step ahead.

JUROR WOODS: That is not necessarily -Tell me what the scenario would be, tell me.

MR. J. HYMANSON: I can try to come up with a hypothetical, I guess.

I can't get into the specifics of this case.

THE COURT: I think he answered your question.

MR. J. HYMANSON: Thank you very much, Your Honor.

Thank you very much, Mr. Woods.
Do any of you know anyone who uses a
wheelchair?

Miss Johnson.
JUROR JOHNSON: 683.
I work in a hospital, and some of our survivors are wheelchair-bound, and I have many patients that are as well.

MR. J. HYMANSON: What about anyone that has an amputation?

JUROR JOHNSON: Yes, sir.
MR. J. HYMANSON: And what about Miss Blake or Mr. Woods, anyone had an amputation?

JUROR BLAKE: Yes.
JUROR WOODS: I can't remember anything.
MR. J. HYMANSON: Okay.
I want to touch real quickly on something Mr. McBride touched on yesterday.

I think you all have heard him when he was talking about sympathy.

Sympathy is something all the attorneys agree we don't want you to give your sympathy at all.

Mr. McBride asked people about if they are okay with sympathy for the Plaintiff's side, so let me ask you this:

Are you okay putting sympathy for the Plaintiff's side in determining whether or not what is right, compensate them if you find the Defendants
are at fault?
Yes.
Are you also okay putting your sympathy aside regarding the fact Nurse Practitioner Bartmus is training and the defers ability to pay a just compensation to the Defendant, is that something all three of you are willing to put aside also?

Do any of you hold anything against people that are lifelong smokers?

Miss Johnson.
JUROR JOHNSON: I hold against them as in what, a personality, or what are we talking about?

MR. J. HYMANSON: Let's say there were evidence to come out that smoking has nothing to do with what caused a person's injuries, but the simple fact a person was a smoker, do you think you would hold that against them for suffering the injury they suffered?

JUROR JOHNSON: No, sir.
MR. J. HYMANSON: Mr. Woods?
JUROR WOODS: Not if it had nothing to do with the injury.

MR. J. HYMANSON: Miss Blake?
JUROR BLAKE: No.
MR. J. HYMANSON: Anything the three of you
think we should know that we haven't asked, or we haven't talked about yet?

My final question is:
If you were an injured person, injured by someone's medical malpractice, would you feel comfortable with someone with your beliefs sitting on that jury considering your case?

Yes?
Thank you very much.
THE COURT: May $I$ have counsel back at the bench, please.
(Thereupon, a discussion was had between Court and counsel at sidebar.)

THE COURT: Okay.
Thank you.
I did want to check with counsel, see if they had any final questions before we have a brief recess, and Mr. Hymanson indicated one follow-up.

I believe it's going to be to the entire panel, not the three just joined us, based on some questions and answers came up.

MR. J. HYMANSON: I'm sorry, ladies and gentlemen, $I$ promise.

THE COURT: Stop promising.
It's not working.

MR. J. HYMANSON: As I said, Your Honor, I neglected to ask a question about smoking yesterday, so $I$ want to follow-up with the whole panel about that.

So my question was:
If you knew someone was a lifelong smoker, and you saw that something happened to them, there was a medical issue with them, and smoking didn't have anything to do with that, would you hold the fact they were a smoker against them?

Mr. Maltese, I think you sort of raised your hand about that.

JUROR MALTESE: Yeah, my basic belief is on smoking, if you're a smoker, you are on idiot, with all the information out there.

I mean, I have colon cancer, and they always told me don't smoke.

Every one of my doctors, researchers to medical people, so I'm sorry.

MR. J. HYMANSON: Would this change your opinion if someone had been a smoker since their entire life, and during times when it was always on TV, the Marlboro Man, would that change your mind, an older person been smoking their whole life, as opposed to someone started smoking recently?

JUROR MALTESE: No, when I grew up, it was a Marlboro Man, you put the Marlboro box in your pocket.

MR. J. HYMANSON: Anyone else have any
feelings that way, or other?
JUROR EVERETT: I agree with him.

MR. J. HYMANSON: Thank you very much.

Anyone else feels that way?
Anyone else has an opinion about that one way or another?

Thank you very much.

THE COURT: All right.

Thank you, Mr. Hymanson.

Folks, we're going to take a brief recess, ten minutes.

Be back at ten minutes to 4 .
(Jury admonished by the Court.)

THE COURT: We're going to take a ten-minute break.

See is you back shortly.
(Jury excused from the courtroom.)
(Thereupon, the following proceedings were
had out of the presence of the jury.):
THE COURT: All right.
Let's break first and come back in about
five or seven minutes, resume our conversation with Mr. Wilder.
(Thereupon, a recess was had.)
(Thereupon, the following proceedings were had out of the presence of the jury.):

THE COURT: Counsel, we're going to have Mr. Wilder.

THE MARSHAL: No problem.
I'll go grab him.
(Juror Wilder brought into the courtroom individually.)

THE COURT: Mr. Wilder, come through the well here and sit in the black chair right there in the front.

All right. I notice you don't have the headset.

Did you give those back?
JUROR WILDER: He took them away from me, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.
So we wanted to have a few additional questions with you about your ability to fully participate in the trial.

There's been a lot of discussion that you have had, and they have asked you about terms of your ability to hear, and $I$ think over all my impression is that you are hearing quite a bit, and you feel good about how you would sort of police it if you
weren't hearing.
I happened to notice in that last round of questioning that a couple of the jurors in front of you when they were speaking, that you went ahead and picked up the headset and put them on.

I did notice though that some of the answer was going unknowing, as you were making sure it was adjusted and putting it on, so obviously some of that was missed, that was Miss Price, but were there any other jurors speaking, what about Mr. Woods in front of you?

JUROR WILDER: There were two here I couldn't hear, and $I$ put the headset on, still couldn't hear because everything was louder, but the stuff I can't understand is still there.

THE COURT: So when you say it wasn't helping you with the clarity earlier, that's what you meant?

JUROR WILDER: Everything was like right here now, only louder.

THE COURT: To phrase it this way, I want to make sure I'm making it clear, what you can hear you can hear better with the headset, but what you can't hear is not aided by the headset?

JUROR WILDER: Correct.

THE COURT: There are still things you have not been able to hear?

JUROR WILDER: Correct.

THE COURT: Any further questions, counsel?
MR. ARNTZ: Your Honor, do you mind if $I$
ask a couple questions?
THE COURT: No.

Go ahead.
MR. ARNTZ: Hi.
You haven't met me.

My name is Breen Arntz. I am counsel.
My dad is very hard of hearing, and what I've found with him is that generally he becomes detached from the conversation, and so my biggest concern isn't so much you hear every single thing, I would want you involved in the discussion, and do you find yourself taking yourself out of the discussion?

JUROR WILDER: If it's not really relevant to me, yes.

I've had a hearing problem pretty much my whole life, kind of in our genes, so I try to stay focused, I nudge my my wife, what did they say.

MR. ARNTZ: My dad will come over and stand over you and say, what did you say.

JUROR WILDER: Again, it's been a lifelong
thing for me, I can't believe I'm sitting here.
In the past $I$ even had a doctor tell me -I was going to jury duty the next day, and he laughed at me said, no, you're not.

I said, what do you mean?
He said, no, you're not, they don't want you there.

He wrote me a letter, sent the letter out about 20 years ago.

MR. ARNTZ: Otherwise, we all like you.
JUROR WILDER: Make no mistake, I would like to serve, but in all due fairness $I$ do have this problem, and $I$ would do my best to control it and raise my hand.

MR. ARNTZ: Okay.
Thank you.
THE COURT: Anybody else?
MR. MC BRIDE: Just a couple questions.
Mr. Wilder, real quick, you don't have any problem with seeing any of the writing on the screen, do you?

JUROR WILDER: No.
MR. MC BRIDE: Have you had any problem hearing me, or anything of the other attorneys?

JUROR WILDER: No.

MR. MC BRIDE: Again, if I told you -- I'm pretty loud, but do you think in any way that your ability to kind of not hear some of these jurors who have been talking, some of them in lower tones, Mr . Everett $I$ think has difficulties speaking up, but do you think that in any way affected your ability to participate in answering questions as part of this voir dire process?

JUROR WILDER: I don't think so, because I'm watching counsel and interface with them, so I get the gist of what they are talking about, so it's not like I'm totally flying blind eyed, just can't hear a lot of their words.

MR. MC BRIDE: Do you think though still even with your hearing difficulties, that you could still participate in this trial and do your best and be able to raise your hand if you have any difficulties?

JUROR WILDER: If it's okay for me to raise my hand, absolutely.

MR. MC BRIDE: Thank you, sir.
THE COURT: Mr. Weaver.
MR. WEAVER: Mr. Wilder, if you were deliberating, and it were a juror that whose tone was difficult for you to hear, would you have any
hesitation in making sure that you could hear that, or interact with that?

JUROR WILDER: Not if $I$ can read their lips or get close to them.

MR. WEAVER: I think I may have asked you this question before.

Does it matter to you in terms of whether you can hear better with someone who got a difficult tone to hear where you sit?

JUROR WILDER: Not really.
Just certain things with tones.
Like I say, I haven't heard my daughter for several years.

MR. WEAVER: Thank you, sir.
THE COURT: I have two follow-ups.
You indicated you have some proficiency in reading lips.

Just curious, have you made an effort to try to read lips when we have been up here at the bench conferences?

JUROR WILDER: No.
THE COURT: Okay.
And maybe --
JUROR WILDER: I'm not a lip reader, Your Honor, but it happens because $I$ kind of get the gist
of the conversation.

THE COURT: That gets into my more serious second question.

When we are actually in the trial, you are sort of at a side view of the parties participating, the witnesses are here, attorneys are here, talking like this, and you will get a side view.

The voir dire of the conversation with the jury is very different, they are looking at you, not to say some witnesses don't turn and talk to the jury, but the vast majority of the witnesses and the counsel will be facing each other in the courtroom this way, and you would be over there on the side view.

Do you think that would affect your ability to hear them?

JUROR WILDER: I don't know.

Sideways is kind of okay most of the time, but if it's a tone $I$ can't hear, then I'll do -raise my hand or whatever.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Wilder.

Step back out.
(Juror Wilder now excused from the
courtroom.)
(Thereupon, the following proceedings were had out of the presence of the jury.):

THE COURT: Final argument on whether Mr. Wilder stays or goes, Mr. Hymanson.

MR. P. HYMANSON: Very briefly, I think we made a record. You already indicated where you were going to go when he did not wear the headset.

He had the headset on, you asked how he's doing, he said okay.

It's not a Geico commercial.

THE COURT: Actually, that commercial says okay.

MR. P. HYMANSON: But they don't buy that insurance.

So speech and hearing are critical, and you don't want to make that an appellate issue because as long as it's going to take to try this case once, we don't want to try it twice.

THE COURT: Okay.
Mr. McBride, anything you have to say?
MR. MC BRIDE: Nothing further, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Mr. Weaver?
MR. WEAVER: No.
THE COURT: The Court is going to exercise its discretion to excuse Mr. Wilder, juror 611, based
on his hearing difficulties.
I think we do have a very good record on this point, and my biggest concern is even with the assistance of a hearing device, the clarity he's given us now is that if the tone is off, he's not going to hear it, and even though he has indicated that in circumstances he would perhaps ask his wife, I've had jurors nudge the other jurors, but I think it really seems like no matter what the circumstances are he's not going to hear everything, and then we're leaving it to his own devices to let us know that he doesn't hear everything.

Even though $I$ think he would give it his best efforts, $I$ can't be certain he will connect to all of the testimony and all of the information, and again that issue with when the tone was down, he made some effort to try to listen, there was time wasted there, and ultimately it didn't work.

At the end of the day he's not going to be able to -- or we're not going to be able to be certain he will pick up a hundred percent of the circumstances, and while there may be other jurors don't pay attention, fail to pick up a hundred percent, he really does have a difficulty, which I think excludes him from service.

We'll excuse him.

MR. P. HYMANSON: Juror Number 3 and Juror Number 14, Everett and Mr. Maltese in the closing moments of voir dire said they felt anyone that smokes was stupid, I think that was the term, those who smoke we're stupid, and the follow-up question that would have been asked probably would have cleared the courtroom, and I think the question I would like the Court to inquire with these two jurors outside the presence of the others is, if you believe an individual who continues to smoke in this day and age is stupid, does that impact your ability to be fair and impartial?

I think that is a critical question.

I think if young Mr. Hymanson asked that, it would have required the jury to be dismissed and --

THE COURT: Any objection from the Defense for bringing them in and inquire of them?

MR. MC BRIDE: That's fine, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Let's start with Mr. Everett, juror 143 , in seat number 3.

MR. P. HYMANSON: Thank you, Your Honor.
(Juror Everett now brought into the courtroom.)

THE COURT: Hi, Mr. Everett.

Come forward right here to the chair in the front there.

Mr. Everett, we wanted to ask a couple of follow-up questions that we thought were better to ask just directly to you and one of the other panelists, not to the whole group, and that has to do with the last few questions about the smoking.

As I've said multiple times, I'll just remind again everybody's coming in here with life experiences, common sense, who they are as people, what they think and believe, and the real question $I$ think that we have is, if it should come out in the evidence in the trial that any one or more of the parties have been a lifelong smoker, or are smokers, would you be able to overcome that concern you have about generally people being smokers and ultimately receive the evidence, weigh the evidence with your fellow jurors, and deliberate for a fair and impartial verdict.

JUROR EVERETT: It's something embedded in me.

I have a lot of negative experiences with it.

THE COURT: I'm not sure that answered my
question.
I'm not trying to change your thought process, not trying to change how you feel about it.

I'm trying to understand how it might impact you here in this trial.

We understand you have those concerns.
The issue becomes, this is still a hypothetical, but the understanding there could be people in this case who are smokers, is that automatically going to then turn you a against them, or are you able to in this trial with the oath would indicate what you are required to do, and there's a separate oath for the people actually on the panel to listen to the evidence, weigh the evidence, and reach a verdict the jurors believe is appropriate, would you be able to do that?

JUROR EVERETT: Not easily, I don't think.
THE COURT: Okay.
Any follow-up questions from the Plaintiff's side?

MR. ARNTZ: No.
THE COURT: Any follow-up questions from the Defense side?

MR. MC BRIDE: No, Your Honor.
MR. WEAVER: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Everett.

You may step out.
(Juror Everett now excused from the courtroom.)

THE COURT: Then we need juror 665, Mr. Maltese, was the one in the front row.
(Juror Maltese now brought into the courtroom.)

THE COURT: Mr. Maltese, can you just come forward, and we're going to have you sit right in the black chair in the front row of the jury box here just for ease of chatting with you a few more minutes.

Thank you.

Mr. Maltese, we just brought you in briefly to follow-up on that last little bit of questioning we had, and how much we appreciate to know your candor and feelings about smoking, your prior history how you feel about people that smoke, so the follow-up question really not with all the other jurors present, it follows that same arena I've been talking about, you know overall, which is we all have our own life experiences, we all have our own common sense, we all are who we are as people, we come together on this jury, so we're going to have
whatever life experiences and thought processes we have.

The question is:
When it comes to the fact of should it come to light in the trial that one or more of the parties in the case are smokers, is that something that is going to get in the way of your ability to be a fair and impartial juror in this trial?

In other words, if you can set that aside, even though you have those concerns generally, can you seat that aside when it comes to this case, listen to the witnesses, receive their testimony, receive the exhibits, and when it comes time to deliberate, sit down with your fellow jurors and deliberate fairly and impartially, do you think you would be able to do that?

JUROR MALTESE: I want to say, yes, but I don't want to lie to you.

THE COURT: And so maybe help us understand a little bit more about what it is, and how it is you think it would impact your ability to be fair and impartial.

JUROR MALTESE: I had aunts and uncles who smoked at the time, were big, and they both died of cancer, and when she was in the hospital, I couldn't
tell where the sheets ended and they started, that's how much weight they lost.

I tell my friends that smoke they are morons.

THE COURT: I think the question was asked before quite well by counsel, but just again because it's just us here, we do want your candor, obviously the trial is based on whatever evidence is available too about what occurred in the case, and a lot of facts going to come into play, and ultimately the law you are given to apply to those facts.

Am I understanding you correctly that regardless of what the evidence is, regardless of what the law is, if you find out one of the people involved in the case is a smoker, you automatically will be opposed to them, is that what you're indicating to us?

JUROR MALTESE: I believe, yes.
THE COURT: Okay.
Any further questions from the Defendant?
MR. MC BRIDE: No, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Any further questions from the Plaintiff?

MR. ARNTZ: None, Your Honor.
MR. WEAVER: None, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right.
You can step out.
(Juror Maltese excused from the courtroom.)
(Thereupon, the following proceedings were had out of the presence of the jury.):

THE COURT: I don't believe either of them.
I think we gave them an open door, but at
the end of the day they gave their testimony, and it is what it is, so we'll excuse Mr. Everett, and we will excuse Mr. Maltese and replace their seats, and of course we excused Mr. Wilder from our discussion.

So we have three empty seats to fill, and I would like to get to know them.

I will invite Mr. Hymanson to inquire first, and invite Defense counsel to the extent they wish to further inquire.

I appreciate your ability to get through the things to have them sitting here.

So Joshua, hold back Mr. Everett, Mr.
Wilder, and Mr. Maltese as we bring the folks in.
Bring them in.
(Thereupon, the following proceedings were had in open court and in the presence of the jury.): THE COURT: All right.

Make sure your cell phones are off or silent if you used them on the break, please.

As folks can see, we have some additional empty seats.

That means the folks over here in the gallery will need to fill those seats.

We're going to start with seat number 3 in the back row to the left, the next in line.

THE CLERK: 694, Julian Abaca.
THE COURT: Next up is seat number 9 in the back row on the right, but please come through and go around as Mr. Abaca, but if you want to go through the front row, come up on the side in the back, that is fine too.

THE CLERK: 699, Nicolette Albright.
THE COURT: Last but not least replacing seat number 14.

THE CLERK: 714, Terry Brown.
THE COURT: Mr. Abaca, may you give us the information on the board?

JUROR ABACA: Badge 694.
I install granite counter top.

And never graduated high school.
I am single.
I have one child, a son three years old.
This is my -- I lived in Las Vegas for 23
years, my whole life.
And never been a juror.
THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Abaca.
What about anybody -- It sounds like your
profession you already identified, but any close
friends, family members in the medical profession.
JUROR ABACA: My grandmother.
THE COURT: What did she do?
JUROR ABACA: She was an RN.
THE COURT: Here or somewhere else?
JUROR ABACA: Not here in the hospital.
THE COURT: When did she work for that
hospital?
JUROR ABACA: Ten years ago.
THE COURT: Was that when she was
traveling?
JUROR ABACA: Yes.
THE COURT: What about any circumstances
you might have had regarding malpractice, medical
malpractice litigation?
JUROR ABACA: Nothing.

THE COURT: Thank you.
Miss Albright, answer the questions on the board.

JUROR ALBRIGHT: Nicolette Albright, badge 699.

Currently I'm an accounts payable specialist.

THE COURT: Where do you work.
JUROR ALBRIGHT: I work for a company
called G \& G Management.
I have some college.
I'm divorced.
I have two children -- Well, I have two grown people, I have a 25 year old and 27 year old.

THE COURT: Do they work here in Las Vegas?
JUROR ALBRIGHT: One works for -- he's a supervisor at Fed Ex, and works part-time at Big 5.

My other son lives in Portland, Oregon.
THE COURT: How long have you lived here?
JUROR ALBRIGHT: Oh, my God, almost 28
years.
THE COURT: How about jury service here or anywhere you lived?

JUROR ALBRIGHT: Never had jury service.
I never have gotten this far.

THE COURT: Okay.
You probably thought you were still going to get away.

JUROR ALBRIGHT: Yes.
THE COURT: Over than Miss Brown in the front row -- or I'm sorry -- before that, how about anybody in the medical profession in your family, family or friends?

JUROR ALBRIGHT: No.
I did at one point in time when $I$ was out of work went to school to be a medical assistant, but it didn't -- I didn't practice.

THE COURT: How about any knowledge of -would you have any prior knowledge, family member or close friend, of medical malpractice litigation?

JUROR ALBRIGHT: No.
THE COURT: Okay.
JUROR M. BROWN: Terry Brown, 714.
Some college.
I work at Four Queens as a server.

Some college.
My husband Dan works at Planet Hollywood as a supervisor.

Four children.
Pharmacy tech at CVS.

A branch of manager at City Electric.
A school teacher at Lacey School.
And been here about ten years.
And never been a juror.
MR. WEAVER: Your Honor, I'm sorry, I
didn't hear where Miss Brown works.

JUROR M. BROWN: Four Queens.
THE COURT: Miss Brown, what if any prior
profession for yourself, or friend, or family member in the medical profession?

JUROR BROWN: No.
THE COURT: What about any experiences with
anything medical malpractice-related?
JUROR M. BROWN: No.
THE COURT: Okay.
I'll invite Mr. Hymanson to inquire of our panelists first.

MR. J. HYMANSON: Thank you very much, Your
Honor.
THE COURT: I could have asked the Four
Queen question, but we've gone over a lot of ground.
I'll let you ask the questions.
MR. J. HYMANSON: That's fine.
Thank you, Your Honor.
Mr. Abaca, Miss Albright, and Miss Brown,
welcome.
As briefly as $I$ can, do you agree about the comments about personal responsibility, most of you agree with those statements?

JUROR ABACA: Yes.
THE COURT: Any of you have any different feelings or input about that?

JUROR ABACA: No.
THE COURT: Any of you have any specific feelings regarding lawsuits, good feelings, bad feelings, too many, or any specific feelings come up for anything in the community?

JUROR ALBRIGHT: No.

MR. J. HYMANSON: Do any of you have a problem with the fact this is a case about money?

JUROR ALBRIGHT: No.

JUROR ABACA: No.

MR. J. HYMANSON: Thank you very much.
Is there anything else, you heard
everything, been through -- been here for several days now, anything that you heard that you thought I really need to speak up about that, I really have a feeling about that, or something we should know?

I'll go individually.
Mr. Abaca, anything?

JUROR ABACA: No, sir.

MR. J. HYMANSON: Thank you very much.

Miss Albright.

JUROR ALBRIGHT: Badge 699.

No.

MR. J. HYMANSON: Okay.

And Miss Brown?

JUROR M. BROWN: 714.

No.

MR. J. HYMANSON: Miss Albright, just real
briefly, you went to school to be a medical assistant.

Do you have any strong feelings one way or the other about the medical profession?

JUROR ALBRIGHT: Well, not really, no.

MR. J. HYMANSON: The final question is, I'll ask you individually, would you if you were a person seeking compensation for harm caused to you by medical malpractice, would you be comfortable with somebody like you sitting on the jury, Mr. Abaca?

JUROR ABACA: Break that down, please.

MR. J. HYMANSON: If you were injured because of someone's medical malpractice, and trying to recover from your injuries or damages, would you be comfortable with your view points sitting on the
jury to decide that case?

JUROR ABACA: Yes.
MR. J. HYMANSON: Same question for you, Miss Albright.

JUROR ALBRIGHT: 699.
Yes.

MR. J. HYMANSON: And Miss Brown?
JUROR M. BROWN: If I was the Plaintiff,
yes.
If $I$ was the Defendant, no.
MR. J. HYMANSON: Okay.
I have no further questions.
Thank you very much.
THE COURT: Mr. McBride.
MR. MC BRIDE: Thank you.
Good afternoon, everyone, and welcome as well to the new members.

Miss Brown, I'm going to follow-up directly on that last answer you gave there.

Can you tell me why you feel you would not
feel comfortable if you were either Dr. Lasry or
Nurse Practitioner Bartmus if you were on the jury?
JUROR M. BROWN: I feel like doctors make a lot of mistakes, and $I$ think they act like they don't, so --

MR. MC BRIDE: So in this case before hearing any evidence in this case that Dr. Lasry and Nurse Practitioner Bartmus would be basically at a disadvantage in your view, based on your feelings they make mistakes?

JUROR M. BROWN: Absolutely.

MR. MC BRIDE: You heard us talk about the other cases being more appropriate, either a criminal case or other type of case.

Would you agree this is probably not the right case for you to act as a juror?

JUROR M. BROWN: I don't think I would be fair.

Yeah, I agree.

MR. MC BRIDE: Thank you for your honesty, I appreciate it.

Miss Albright, $I$ wanted to follow-up with the question where $I$ think it was asked about your feelings about the medical profession, and if you have strong feelings one way or another, and you somewhat hesitated $I$ think in your response.

Is there something you want me wanted to say about your feelings about -- whether it's positive or negative, and this is tough, but this is where we need to know, and my clients as well as the

Moores need to know, if you are the right type of juror for this case.

JUROR ALBRIGHT: Okay.
Back in July I lost my mom.
She went months with fluid on her lungs, and her oncologist would not see her without an appointment.

Her appointment was so far out, so she was going to her cardiologist, thought he can find where the fluid is coming from.

He sent her for a scan, and it came back, said you have a small mass, we're just going to treat this, but we think that fluid on your lungs might just be allergies, they gave a hundred an one things back and forth to the doctor we went to, until he decided she was staying to Mountain Vista Hospital, and she checked her in, and she was diagnosed within hours, I won't even say hours, I would say an hour, of stage 4 ovarian cancer, where it has just spread.

Not saying that $I$ don't know why or what decisions were made in the office to say we don't need to look further at this, but $I$ took issue with it, $I$ have problems with it, nobody would ever -after they did her surgery to remove the mass, she never woke up.

MR. MC BRIDE: Not to interrupt you, but this is very recently you said?

JUROR ALBRIGHT: In July.
MR. MC BRIDE: In July.
So your mother passed away in July?
JUROR ALBRIGHT: In July.
MR. MC BRIDE: I appreciate your honesty and telling us about that.

That is why it's very important, just like I asked Miss Brown those questions in terms of her ability to sit here and listen to the evidence in this case and be able to be fair and impartial to everyone, including my clients, who are my client Dr. Lasry, as well as Nurse Practitioner Bartmus.

Would you agree given the fact this was just recent in time, and resulted in the loss of your mother, your feelings about this, that again this is probably not the right type of case for you to be sitting on?

JUROR ALBRIGHT: I probably would agree with it.

But I will say that $I$ had another instance, my son, he had an issue and had to be -- he had to have emergency surgery.

Then we ended up at actually the campus
your speaking of, and they did a fabulous job, I mean I couldn't have asked for a better response, better doctors, better -- just better care for my baby.

He's 25, but you know $I$ care for my kid. MR. MC BRIDE: And that's very great to hear, but you agree with me that happened a lot farther away, years ago, right? JUROR ALBRIGHT: No. MR. MC BRIDE: Relatively recently? JUROR ALBRIGHT: His emergency surgery was probably about not even two months ago.

MR. MC BRIDE: You had both experiences, negative experiences, as well as the positive ones? JUROR ALBRIGHT: Right.

MR. MC BRIDE: And that's why it's just important for us to know the loss of your mother, and what you just related to us sounds like that was a pretty emotional event and involved a lot of concerns you had about the providers that were treating her. JUROR ALBRIGHT: You're right, those are those providers.

I can't hold this individual over here accountable for what this one over here didn't do, so everybody is an individual, and what their capabilities are is their capabilities, and not
somebody else's.
They weren't standing next to them when they gave that diagnosis.

MR. MC BRIDE: And let me ask you the question, if you were someone like Dr. Lasry or Nurse Practitioner Bartmus, would you want someone with your same mindset sitting on a jury if you were them?

All given what you just related, those experiences?

JUROR ALBRIGHT: I think $I$ would be fair and impartial.

I don't see those doctors that misdiagnosed my mother, or missed her diagnosis several times over, I don't see those doctors sitting down there, I see them as individuals, and what their capabilities are.

MR. MC BRIDE: Fair enough.
That is all we're asking, and you are willing, and Mr. Abaca, you are also willing, to sit and listen to all the evidence in this case, as is presented before you make a decision?

JUROR ABACA: Yes.
MR. MC BRIDE: Is it something you think you can make -- the Plaintiff's, since they have the burden of proof in this case, prove that case and
every element of their case before you even consider an award of damages is appropriate?

JUROR ABACA: Yes.

MR. MC BRIDE: In this particular case is there any other questions I asked yesterday you happened to be paying attention to any of them, was there any of those questions that raised something in your mind that you feel you need to say today?

JUROR ABACA: No.
MR. MC BRIDE: Anything we should know, all of us collectively, as about you, or something that you in your background you think is important for us to know?

JUROR ABACA: Yes.
I'm very stressed out right now, understanding I'm supposed to be here.

It's my first time, I thought it was going to be a one-day thing.

I have a three year old son, and because I do construction work, $I$ don't get on the job, $I$ don't get paid, so no way to pay rent, and I'm very stressed out, and I'm really sorry.

MR. MC BRIDE: There is nothing to apologize about.

You think given that you're stressed out
about that, obviously it is weighing on you, that that is going to potentially interfere with your ability to listen to the evidence and that this case goes until next Friday?

JUROR ABACA: I'm going to be honest with you, $I$ don't want to be here at all.

I just want to be released.
MR. MC BRIDE: Again, if you were someone -- I apologize for asking this question, but do you think you could set aside these sort of feelings, the stress you're experiencing right now, and be able to listen to the evidence and view it impartially, or be so upset you think by the fact you're sitting here that you might not pay attention?

JUROR ABACA: I'm paying attention, just stressed out.

That's all $I$ can say.
THE COURT: Can I remind Mr. Abaca, are you currently on work job now?

JUROR ABACA: I work.

THE COURT: So --
JUROR ABACA: I actually was supposed to
start a job yesterday.
Like I said, I thought it was going to be a one-day thing, so the fact I'm here still is
stressing me out.
THE COURT: I understand that.
I'm trying to remind you of a couple
things, see if it makes any difference.
So you are not out looking for work, you have the work waiting for you to go do it, correct?

JUROR ABACA: Yeah, whoever comes on the job first.

THE COURT: Tomorrow and Friday we're essentially here full days, but next week we're only here half days, 1:30 to 5.

Can you talk to your relative and work the schedule around that, so you can still work?

JUROR ABACA: It's not going to make a difference. It's the first one on the job, and the next job whoever is on that job.

THE COURT: So I want to make sure I'm understanding you clearly, that even though our schedule is relatively how much time you sit here in the courtroom, you see no possibility of engaging in any work between now and next Friday, is that what you're telling me?

JUROR ABACA: No work at all, that's why I'm stressed.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. MC BRIDE: Thank you.

THE COURT: Mr. Weaver.

MR. WEAVER: Thank you.

Good afternoon.

I'll be super brief.

Miss Albright, and Miss Blake, and Mr.

Abaca, have any of the questions --

THE COURT: Mr. Weaver, I want to make sure there's no confusion.

It's Miss Albright, Miss Brown, and Mr.

Abaca.

MR. WEAVER: Thank you, Your Honor.
The questions that $I$ asked about Nurse Practitioner Bartmus, do any of you have any responses or concerns or anything that contributes to any of the questions that was specific to Nurse Practitioner Bartmus, specifically having to do with whether you have any concerns about a nurse practitioner diagnosing, treating, doing orders in the emergency department, as opposed to a physician, any concerns about that?

JUROR ALBRIGHT: No.

MR. WEAVER: Thank you, Miss Albright.

Mr. Abaca.

JUROR ABACA: No feelings at all.

MR. WEAVER: Miss Brown?

JUROR M. BROWN: No.

MR. WEAVER: And I assume, Miss Brown, that since you said that you are not a fan of doctors, would the same be true with regard to nurse practitioners?

JUROR BROWN: I have a nurse practitioner and as my doctor.

MR. WEAVER: But it sounds like your concerned with the health care providers in general, is that fair?

JUROR M. BROWN: Yes.

MR. WEAVER: Miss Albright, just for clarification, 699, given that you expressed concern about what happened with your mother, and $I$ think you said repeatedly a misdiagnosis, if hypothetically there were issues in this matter that had to do with allegations of misdiagnosis, are you worried, or do you think that that may cause emotions or issues of concern that given how recent it was just in July having to do with your mother?

JUROR ALBRIGHT: You don't know when your emotions is going to flare up from day to day.

I can hear a song on the radio and get in my heart and absolutely boo-hoo, go from one extreme
to the other, and sit there and laugh.
So hearing something, this is not my mom's case, this is not her issue, this is something totally separate, and does not have anything to do with me per se.

So I will hear it, and hopefully $I$ wouldn't have issues, but you never know from day to day.

MR. WEAVER: That is just what I'm asking you about.

It sounds like even though you are trying to be fair and impartial, given this doesn't have to do with your mother, it has to do with someone else, it sounds like it would be fair to say that you would have some concern about whether if any of the issues were the same in terms of concerns that you had about your mother's care, you don't know that you might not have emotional reactions because of what happened with your mother, is that fair?

JUROR ALBRIGHT: Well, it's fair, yeah, that's fair.

I just, like $I$ said, $I$ don't see the doctors that took care of my mom.

I don't see the doctors took great care of my son.

I see the people who are there, and
whatever their abilities are, those are their abilities.

Everybody's not the same.
Just like the lawyers sitting next to -- at the table, so everybody's abilities are different, and whatever they brought to the table that day is what they brought to the table that day, has nothing to do with what happened with my mother in July, has nothing to do with my son and 18 months ago.

MR. WEAVER: Thank you, Miss Albright.
One last clarification, did you say your mother was taken to Mountain View Hospital?

JUROR ALBRIGHT: Yes.

MR. WEAVER: And the diagnosis was made within an hour, give or take?

JUROR ALBRIGHT: Yes.
MR. WEAVER: Was she admitted through the emergency department?

JUROR ALBRIGHT: She was admitted through the emergency department.

THE COURT: Okay.
Thank you.
Any further questions?
I'll see counsel at the bench, please.
(Thereupon, a discussion was had between Court and counsel at sidebar.)

THE COURT: At this time we have two additional excusals from the panel.

We're going to excuse juror number 694, Mr.
Abaca, and Juror Number 714 , Miss Brown.

You are excused.
Please see the marshall on your way out to
turn your badges in.
I'll ask my clerk to call next in line to
fill seat number 3 in the back row.
THE CLERK: 730, Joey Polk.
THE COURT: The front row seat.

THE CLERK: 731, Jose Cordova.
THE COURT: Let's start with you and get to know you a little better.

Answer the questions on the board.
JUROR POLK: 730.
My husband is a manager at the Golden
Nugget.
We have five children together. None of them are old enough to work.

I lived in Las Vegas 28 years.
I've been a juror before on a civil case
and was the foreperson.

And a verdict was reached.

MR. MC BRIDE: How long ago was that.

JUROR POLK: 2008 .

THE COURT: How was that experience for
you?

JUROR POLK: It was a good time.

THE COURT: I appreciate you being back for service this time.

And I would like to know the two questions
coming next, any connection between you, a close
friend, family member to the medical profession?

JUROR POLK: No.

THE COURT: How about any experiences with
the medical profession?

JUROR POLK: No.

THE COURT: Turning to Mr. Cordova.

JUROR CORDOVA: I'm a control supervisor.

THE COURT: Where do you work?

JUROR CORDOVA: For Boyd Corporation,
downtown.

I went to high school, graduated.

I'm divorced.

I have two kids.

One is growing up.

One is in New Mexico.

The other one lives here. He's a chef in a restaurant down on The Strip.

I've been here 34 years.
THE COURT: Jury service?
JUROR CORDOVA: I've been through this, but didn't get this far.

THE COURT: That's the last question there, jury service.

Why are you nervous, sir?
JUROR CORDOVA: I don't know.
THE COURT: You understand once we get to the final qualifications, ultimately only 10 will serve, and again at that point -- I mean, I could say it's a passive role, it's not entirely passive, you have to be engaged, listening, receiving the evidence, and ultimately deliberating, but you won't be participating back and forth like this then. Is that okay with you? JUROR CORDOVA: Yes.

THE COURT: How about you, as far as yourself, family member, close friends in the medical profession?

JUROR CORDOVA: No.
THE COURT: How about any interactions with any kind of medical malpractice experience?

JUROR CORDOVA: I had an experience with a nephew.

THE COURT: Okay.
And was that recent?
JUROR CORDOVA: About 10,12 years ago.
THE COURT: When you say, experience, I've asked the question more specifically about medical malpractice, like litigation. Was he involved in litigation?

JUROR CORDOVA: He died.
They ended up taking him to Kingman in the ER, and they found him nine days later behind the hospital somewhere.

THE COURT: You said this occurred in Kingman?

JUROR CORDOVA: Yes.
THE COURT: Did the family ever pursue any kind of litigation?

JUROR CORDOVA: My sister did.
THE COURT: And that was in Kingman related to like what the hospital did?

JUROR CORDOVA: The hospital and police for negligence.

THE COURT: And how directly involved were you with with that circumstance?

JUROR CORDOVA: I am the one went and
looked for him, and when they told me he was missing, and $I$ didn't find him.

THE COURT: Like Miss Albright back there, she was having your questions, kind of had some experience on both sides, maybe you had some good experiences with doctors and hospitals, or not, I don't know, but $I$ guess the question is, will you be able to look out on the evidence, the witnesses, the parties, the case as its own separate thing?

JUROR CORDOVA: I shouldn't have a problem with that.

THE COURT: You will be able to be fair and impartial, deliberate with your fellow jurors?

JUROR CORDOVA: Concerning myself, I have had my hips replaced, so --

THE COURT: Thank you, sir.
Mr. Hymanson, any questions of those two new panelists?

MR. J. HYMANSON: Thank you, Your Honor.

Good afternoon, Miss Polk and Mr. Cordova.
So you heard all of this.
You have any feelings about personal responsibility, any positive, negative feeling about lawsuits?

JUROR POLK: No.
MR. J. HYMANSON: Any problems that the case is about money?

JUROR POLK: No.
MR. J. HYMANSON: Anything else you really
think we should know that in everything we've been talking about will affect your ability to serve as fair and impartial jurors on this particular case?

Miss Polk?
JUROR POLK: No.

MR. J. HYMANSON: And, Mr. Cordova, the same thing, anything?

JUROR CORDOVA: No.
MR. J. HYMANSON: I'll ask you a couple
follow-ups.
Miss Polk, you said you were a foreperson
on a jury before?
JUROR POLK: It was a good time.
MR. J. HYMANSON: What do you mean by, it
was a good time?
JUROR POLK: I have a Bachelor's Degree in
criminal justice, so $I$ was just out of college.
MR. J. HYMANSON: And you got to apply your
knowledge of that?
JUROR POLK: Yes.

MR. J. HYMANSON: Mr. Cordova, I'm very
sorry to hear about your nephew, and thank you for sharing that, $I$ know it's tough to say that in front of everyone else.

You understand that the facts of this case are different than what happened with your nephew, correct?

JUROR CORDOVA: Yes.

MR. J. HYMANSON: And you think given the facts of this case will be different than what happened to your nephew, you think you will be able to just look at the facts and evidence presented to you in this Court, and make a fair and impartial decision?

JUROR CORDOVA: Yes.

MR. J. HYMANSON: Ladies and gentlemen, I have no further questions.

THE COURT: Mr. McBride.

MR. MC BRIDE: Thank you, Your Honor.

I'll try to be brief.

Miss Polk and Mr. Cordova -- Miss Polk, the experience as a juror, you were able to apply your experience in your background in criminal justice.

You said it was a civil case, right?

JUROR POLK: Yes.

MR. MC BRIDE: What was it that you felt you were able to apply to that civil case?

MR. MC BRIDE: This was ten years ago, so please don't take offense, but they didn't really explain the process as well as possible, so $I$ was one of the few people could help explain it, so a lot of people on the jury didn't understand what it was they were supposed to do.

MR. MC BRIDE: And you understood because you were presented with instructions from the Judge at the conclusion of the case before you actually won't back, that told you what the law is, and what you were supposed to consider, is that right?

JUROR POLK: Yes.

MR. MC BRIDE: So as the foreperson, did you help explain that process to other jurors? JUROR POLK: Yes. MR. MC BRIDE: And a case like -- again, this is a case you know nothing about the facts and circumstances, other than the little tidbits you may have heard.
Anything -- This occurred in an emergency
room.

Anything about any personal experiences you may have may impact your ability to be other than
fair and impartial in this case?
JUROR POLK: No.
MR. MC BRIDE: This is a case of the Plaintiff's are going to be asking for money at the conclusion of, and same question $I$ would ask, but in a different light, if the evidence suggested at the conclusion of it all that Plaintiff's are not entitled to any damages, if the jury finds the Defendants didn't do anything wrong, are you able to turn the Plaintiffs away and award zero dollars to them?

JUROR POLK: Yes.
MR. MC BRIDE: You have any problem with that?

JUROR POLK: No.
MR. MC BRIDE: You understand sympathy is not going to enter into any of the decision making? JUROR POLK: Yes.

MR. MC BRIDE: Okay.
Mr. Cordova, again I'm sorry for your experience, personal experience, and $I$ want to make sure, it sounds like you are able to separate the facts in what happened to your nephew in that case from anything that you haven't even heard the facts of, right?

JUROR CORDOVA: Right.
MR. MC BRIDE: Do you have any strong opinions one way or another about the medical care here in Las Vegas?

JUROR CORDOVA: No.
MR. MC BRIDE: Do you have a doctor who you regularly treat with for any reason?

JUROR CORDOVA: Dr. Manning was one the one did my hips, did both surgeries on both hips within a year, so it was great, everything turned out good.

MR. MC BRIDE: What hospital did that take place?

JUROR CORDOVA: Mountain Vista.
MR. MC BRIDE: And you heard me talk about the fact this is a case that you would decide on the facts and evidence.

Do you think you're able to do that in this particular case?

JUROR CORDOVA: I should be able to.
MR. MC BRIDE: Are you willing to wait until the Plaintiffs have put on their case and before making any certain judgment allow the Defense to put on their case?

JUROR CORDOVA: Yeah.

MR. MC BRIDE: Again, one last thing, if
you were someone like Dr. Lasry, would you want someone with your same mindset, given your prior experience, would you want someone where your same mindset sitting on a jury in judgment of him or his character?

JUROR CORDOVA: I wouldn't judge him because $I$ don't know the whole thing, don't know what went down or whatever, but I'd be fair as much as I could, if the evidence was provided.

MR. MC BRIDE: That's all we can ask.
Again, we're just asking for you to be fair and impartial.

You think you can do that, and you think also that if the facts in this particular case don't support an award of damages to the Plaintiff, would you be okay turning the Moores away, not awarding them any money?

JUROR CORDOVA: If that's what would be the facts and all that comes out, that's fair.

MR. MC BRIDE: Okay.
Anything from either one of you on anything I should know about either one of you, or anything in your background based on any of the questions you heard today might be important for any of us to know?

Thank you very much.

THE COURT: Mr. Weaver.

MR. WEAVER: Thank you, Your Honor.

Good afternoon, Miss Polk.

Is there any answer that you would give me as pertains to Miss Bartmus -- or Nurse Practitioner Bartmus that is different than what you gave Mr.

McBride about Dr. Lasry?

JUROR POLK: No.

MR. WEAVER: Mr. Cordova, any answer would you give me as pertains to Nurse Practitioner Bartmus would be different than the answers that you gave to Mr. McBride as pertains to Dr. Lasry, if I were asking you the same question?

JUROR CORDOVA: No, I wouldn't.

MR. WEAVER: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right.

Thank you.

Counsel, please.
(Thereupon, a discussion was had between

Court and counsel at sidebar.)

THE COURT: All right.

Ladies and gentlemen, at this time $I$ can inform the panel we have qualified 20 jurors to possibly serve at this trial.

Those are the 20 here in the box.

The five of you back there, I saw you were getting ready, $I$ don't know if that was engaging in any specific prayer or hopefulness one way or the other, but at this time the remaining five of you are excused.

Thank you for your service.

Please see the marshal on the way out.

I think we had a voucher for you.

They served three days, do they not
vouchers?

THE MARSHAL: Yes.

I already explained it to them.

THE COURT: Thank you for your service.

THE COURT: What we're going to do now is, complete the final portion of the process, ladies and gentlemen.

I'm going to have some instructions I'm going to read to you that will give you some basic information about this trial.

We will begin with the opening statements tomorrow, and the jurors will return at 9:30.

I originally thought we were going to start
at 9, but $I$ forgot there was one other unrelated

Court matter $I$ need to handle and resolve in the morning at 9, so we'll move that quickly, expect to
start with you at 9:30.
Just like every other day, come here, be out front waiting to go.

Things that will change, the marshal can explain, answer any questions you might have.

So you will now be provided parking, so you won't be on your own for parking, that is one benefit, and because it's a full day tomorrow and Friday you will be on your own for lunch, but we'll give you a lunch break for those remaining with us.

For the 10 don't remain, we're very appreciative of your service.

I want to, like I said, $I$ have some basic information that we provide now, so that you kind of understand the playing field.

To the extent some of the stuff has come up in the time that we have been through this voir dire process, again there's some redundancies, and I apologize for that.

Forgive me again for reading. I just want to make sure we get through it quickly.

I have this script, so the reporter does not have to write this down, $I$ can provide that to the reporter.

> So I'm going to do it as quickly as
possible, so you all have this information, and then of course the final instructions, inclusive of some of these will come at the end of the trial, but I'll do them now, since we have a little bit of time for this final selection process.
(The Judge read the pre-trial information to the jurors.)

THE COURT: I'm just looking at the final list, and when $I$ 'm certain we have a final panel of 10, I'm going to ask my Court clerk to read the names.

I want to review it.
Any motions to be made by either counsel at this time?

MR. MC BRIDE: No, Your Honor.
MR. ARNTZ: No, Your Honor.
THE COURT: At this time $I$ believe we do have the final panel of 10 .

I'll give it to my clerk, she will read your name and the seat you have.

If you hear your name read, you are one of the 10 staying with us.

If you do not hear your name read, please keep seated until all 10 names are read, so people aren't getting up leaving causing a disruption.

Once all 10 are named, $I$ will excuse the rest of the panel, and thank you now on behalf of counsel and myself for your service.

THE CLERK: Seat number, 1 Sabrena Clinton.
Seat number 2, Marcel Brown.
Number 3, Ryan Burk.
Number 4, Lynevieve Sallee.
Number 5, Katrina Johnson.
Number 6, Timothy Fyfe.
Number 7, Theresa Blake.

Number 8, Rebecca Price.
Number 9, Terry brown.
Number 10, Michael Newman.
THE COURT: All right.
If you did not hear your name read at this
time, you are excused.
Thank you for your service.
(Remaining jurors excused from the
courtroom.)
THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, when you come back in tomorrow, we'll have your seats.

You will be seated more central in the jury box.

You will have your note pads and pens.
You will have your new badge.

I do expect to start promptly at 9:30.
If there's any slight delay, please stand by because sometimes things beyond our control need to be addressed with the jurors not present.

We promise you, if you are not in here, we are working in here, not wasting time.

We like to run a tight ship, keep the trial on track.

We do believe we are on track to finish this.

All we ask again is that you return
tomorrow with your open mind and your juror hat on and ready to serve.

If you have any questions at all as you leave here, the marshal will take you outside, and he can answer the questions.

But you will be given parking instructions.
And see you back here tomorrow for a 9:30 start.

Thank you all.
Have a good night.
(Jury excused from the courtroom.)
(Thereupon, the following proceedings were had out of the presence of the jury.):

THE COURT: I think we have a very good panel.

I really do anticipate -- I have one attorney going to be here tomorrow is very long-winded, $I$ won't say which one it is, but I'll do everything in my power to keep it tight, and if you see we're still arguing, I'll try to get you in and set up right at 9:30 to get going.

We'll take the lunch break because we're having the dailies.

Depending when we do take lunch break, we need to resume no earlier than $1: 30$, so I'm trying to take that somewhere between 12 and 1:30, but we'll see you all tomorrow.

Anything we need to address before we leave?

MR. MC BRIDE: We were going to ask to confirm on the record who you anticipate calling as your witnesses tomorrow.

MR. ARNTZ: I anticipate calling Miss
Bartmus first, and Dr. Lasry second, and then
depending on what time is left we may call
Christopher, the son.

THE COURT: How long do you think your opening might be?

MR. MC BRIDE: We talked about that.
We're going to try make it around 45
minutes $I$ think each, it may go 45 minutes to an hour hopefully.

THE COURT: We might break for lunch then, and whenever we break keep in mind I'm not bringing anybody back before 1:30 because of the dailies and time frame, and how the schedule works I need that last reporter to be here for $1: 30$ to 5, so if we can get it up to noonish, if we take a little longer lunch, I don't have a problem, I don't want to lose any time in the trial.

MR. MC BRIDE: Right.
MR. ARNTZ: So we're looking at possibly two-and-a-half hours.

THE COURT: Yes.
So two-and-a-half hours, so a start at 9:30 puts us right at 12.

If we go into the 12:00 hour, we can start a little later than 1:30, it just can't start before.

Have a good night.
(Proceedings concluded.)
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IN THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

DARELLL MOORE, ET AL, )
Plaintiffs, )
Case No. A-17-766426-C
Dept. No. 25
JASON LASRY, M.D., ET AL,)
Defendants.

JURY TRIAL
Before the Honorable Kathleen Delaney
Wednesday, January 29, 2020, 1:30 p.m.
Reporter's Transcript of Proceedings

REPORTED BY:
BILL NELSON, RMR, CCR \#191
CERTIFIED COURT REPORTER

APPEARANCES:

For the Plaintiffs: Breen Arntz, Esq. Philip Hymanson, Esq. Joseph Hymanson, Esq.

For the Defendants: Robert McBride, Esq. Keith Weaver, Esq. Alissa Bestick, Esq.


Las Vegas, Nevada, Wednesday, January 29, 2020
(Thereupon, the following proceedings were had out of the presence of the jury.):

THE COURT: There are some matters outside the presence?

MR. P. HYMANSON: Yes, Your Honor.

Very briefly, we have -- $I$ know you want to
do the cause at the end, but there are three came up yesterday that $I$ think really we need to clear the plan and get going, so we can get this done.

THE COURT: Speak with them first.

MR. P. HYMANSON: Yes.

In that case they're actually four, but I
wanted to re-address Mr. Wilder.

I noticed we're giving him headphones today.

As you were sitting there yesterday --
THE COURT: Did he ask for those?

MR. P. HYMANSON: No, the bailiff was supplying them, the head phones.

MR. MC BRIDE: Did he ask for them, or we just suggested he wear them.

THE MARSHAL: I offered them to him,
talking about the headphones we use for the courtroom.

THE COURT: Do we have these other things that dangle?

THE MARSHAL: No, the ones that go over his ears.

THE COURT: So he didn't ask for them?
MR. P. HYMANSON: He did not ask for it, and $I$ don't think it makes a deference.

As you were sitting there yesterday, you had that expression that if he doesn't hear 50 percent of it so far and hasn't asked, what type of appeal is that going to be?

And, Your Honor, if he has headphones, and they go down, if he takes them off, he's missing 50 percent, or if he's only getting 75 percent, you have issues anyway you look at it.

Mr. Wilder we're really trying to get out of here. As much as he wants to serve, he knows that he's was never able to serve before because he can't hear, and you can't do almost good enough for a jury.

So I would -- His badge number is 611, and I just don't think that it's going to be fair to either side if he have a juror that doesn't hear everything that is being said.

THE COURT: Mr. McBride.

MR. MC BRIDE: Yes, Your Honor.

I think that we continue with our plan to keep him on there, until we have absolute information from him that he's been unable to hear any of the questions from counsel. I don't think he's indicated that.

He said he hasn't been able to hear some of the responses from people in the audience, but nothing specific, and again $I$ don't think that is any more reason to dismiss him at this point.

I think Mr. Weaver should be allowed to maybe inquire a little bit and make that assessment when he makes the assessment for the other ones.

THE COURT: Mr. Weaver, do you concur, yes or no?

MR. WEAVER: I do.

And if it makes it easier, I'll lead with him.

THE COURT: This may be an impertinent question to ask, but why do we want to keep him any longer?

Any other person might be a problem with this jury, we let them go. Why is this one an issue?

I'm trying to rack my brain because I
necessarily don't know the answers one way or the other, but --

MR. MC BRIDE: I would agree.
And frankly $I$ don't think there's anything specific about a reason to keep him on.

It's not like we think he's providing all the great answers because either way I think that ultimately's just something that we need to kind of flush out a little bit more if that is true, a reason why he can't serve.

We talked about the other times he was a prospective juror, again a while back, we don't know the circumstances in particular in those instances as to why he was eliminated as a juror, if it was specifically related to that.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. MC BRIDE: So I just think out of an abundance of caution we be allowed to keep him on there, and then --

THE COURT: I understand Mr. Hymanson's position, and I'm inclined to excuse Mr. Wilder, but here's what I'm going to do, not knowing the offer was made for him to have the revisions, $I$ can't assume he wouldn't work with his hearing, I think we need to know what his hearing is, and I think if he
wears them, I don't think you want to tell him we have any of these concerns what we're looking for, but $I^{\prime} m$ going to inquire of him afterwards with that device, was there still anyone he was unable to hear, if there's anybody he's unable to hear with the device on, because again whether or not he can hear those of us who are speaking at him directly in a higher pitch, or certain toned voice, is not the issue.

The issue's, can he hear everyone, but I'm not going to take him off.

MR. ARNTZ: I was just going to say, my father's extremely hard of hearing, and the problem with people who are hard of hearing is, they detach themselves from the conversation, so they don't even know they are doing it, just quit pay paying attention to whatever is being said because they can't hear it all.

I'm not even sure we would be able to know how much.

THE COURT: I understand.

He has however been engaged, has been responsive to the questions as they've been asked, so he doesn't appear to be tuning out.

I think where he helped us understand is,
those of us who are speaking directly at him, he has not had any problem hearing them, there are certain people with certain tones, generally low or soft-spoken apparently, he doesn't hear.

My concern overall is, would he actually say something to interrupt, even though if he was asked if he would to that, and he said he would rather not do it -- or do it, because it hasn't connected for him.

I don't think being able to hear all the people if you're participating in the process -- A side note, what is happening with the screen, and why is it on the $T V$, and now going to some picture?

MR. J. HYMANSON: Your Honor, I was trying it out to see if IPad would work.

I apologize, Your Honor.
THE COURT: You can leave it connected. It's distracting because I'm looking at things I'm not used to seeing.

MR. J. HYMANSON: That's the story, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right.
The next --
MR. P. HYMANSON: My effort was to expedite.

THE COURT: I understand.

We got the record.

We'll move on.

MR. P. HYMANSON: I think this will be the easy one, juror number 8, badge number 606, Mr. Ehle, he's had numerous procedures, misdiagnosis, and would seem to lean toward the Plaintiff.

As much as I would like to have him, he has no place on this jury.

THE COURT: Any objection from the Defense?

MR. MC BRIDE: No objections, Your Honor.

MR. P. HYMANSON: Which would bring me to --

THE COURT: Hold on.

I'm I'm going to make the record now and direct my marshal when we're done, he will go and bring in the jurors, hold those back, and excuse them as we did yesterday with one of the others.

So, Mr. Ehle, juror 606, will be excused based on the other bias towards one side or the other.

MR. P. HYMANSON: He says that the other side he would be favorable to.

THE COURT: He has a clear expression.

He's not suited for trial under the
circumstance.

MR. P. HYMANSON: Juror Number 18, badge number 637, Mr Read, was the same discussion. He's the one had the former wife who was an ER nurse, sued for malpractice, and she would -- or that as we started out the Defense would have a lame duck.

It's the same analysis, you can't take it back, and as such, just like Mr. Ehle, Mr Read would not be qualified to be fair and impartial.

THE COURT: Mr. McBride, the same?
MR. MC BRIDE: No objection, Your Honor.
MR. WEAVER: No objection, Your Honor.
THE COURT: All right.
Mr Read, I'm just going to make the record, I'm going to go ahead, agree with counsel, this appears to be a request for excusal.

I believe Mr Read, he's difficult to follow, the way he articulates compared to some of the others jurors. I think in the end he said, he would attempt to listen to the evidence, and could listen to the evidence, and try to listen to the evidence, but also expressed concern about how as the facts unfold it might affect him, so in the grand scheme of things $I$ don't see a reason to risk continuing him on the panel, even though I don't know
he has reached a level Mr. Ehle has reached of excusing, inability to serve.

I think there's enough concern here to go ahead, allow his excusal as well.

You had one more?
MR. P. HYMANSON: One more, Your Honor, it's not a move for cause, it's Miss Brown, 668. We have several Browns on the panel, this Brown happens to be the one that went to Bible class with the Plaintiff at the same school and --

THE COURT: With the Defendant.
MR. P. HYMANSON: --the Defendant.
THE COURT: By the way, I've been meaning to ask, am I incorrectly referring to her -- I know that she is.

MR. WEAVER: We would prefer nurse practitioner.

THE COURT: Nurse Practictioner Bartmus.
Thank you.
Bartmus.
MR. P. HYMANSON: If we were to ask that question, that is something would probably clear the room because you want to have that discussion outside the presence of the jury.

THE COURT: We did have some discussion
already.

I think you are right, if we wanted to find out anymore involvement, $I$ didn't get the impression -- I think I asked the question if they are still in a social connection other tie.

The answer was, no.

Then $I$ think $I$ asked the question, would it affect your ability to be fair and impartial, and again said, no.

MR. P. HYMANSON: My recollection, I think that given the fact we're crossing religious classes at school, I'd like to know she doesn't have concern that we're starting on an even keel.

I don't know the strength of the classmate's relationship, some places that would be an automatic disqualification, but she didn't say she went to USC, and $I$ would just suggest that out of an abundance of caution we have her individually questioned.

THE COURT: What is the Defense position on this?

MR. WEAVER: You know, I think the only thing we would say to that is, there was that opportunity before passing for cause and questions or concerns about that, and there wasn't anything that
was responded to, other than --
THE COURT: I'll bring her in to have a brief traverse of just her.

MR. ARNTZ: Has there been a pass for cause I heard?

THE COURT: No, I instructed counsel at the bench yesterday that once the Defense is completed we would have a group discussion about cause.

I have no problem with the jury if you want to challenge it, that's fine.

If you wanted to further traverse Mr. Read, I would have allowed it, but that is not what is being asked, so he was excused.

But as far as Miss Brown, I think the line of question we had so far would indicate no reason to remove her, but $I$ think we might as well clear that up, and Mr. Hymanson, I'll give you some opportunity to traverse as well.

Why don't we bring her in and see.
While we are on the subject, up to this point are there any cause concerns the Defense has to be mindful of?

MR. MC BRIDE: No, Your Honor.
MR. WEAVER: No.
THE COURT: So, Joshua, please bring us

Miss Brown, actually juror 668 on the original list, she was in seat number -- moved up to seat number 5 . (Juror Brown brought into the courtroom.) THE COURT: Miss Brown, come forward. Past counsel's table there's a nice chair there in the front.

We just have a couple questions for you. That chair right there.

So we wanted to inquire a little bit more from you about something that you mentioned at the beginning of the trial before we actually got everybody up in the box -- or got you up in the box $I$ should say, about the fact you had a connection to one of the parties.

JUROR M. BROWN: Yes.
THE COURT: And the nurse practitioner was
the party you identified, and $I$ had a very brief inquiry of you at that time, but are you still
acquainted or social friends in some fashion, and I think you answered no to that, but $I$ don't want to answer for you.

So have there been any further
communications since you had Bible studies?
JUROR M. BROWN: No.

THE COURT: How long ago was it you had

Bible studies?
JUROR M. BROWN: I'm thinking about 2001.
THE COURT: I don't mean this to sound unkind to Nurse Practitioner Bartmus, but why would you remember her a long time later?

JUROR M. BROWN: We had a whole year of Bible study.

THE COURT: I guess the Bible study I was involved in was many years ago, $I$ don't remember the people.

How many were in the class?
JUROR M. BROWN: About probably maybe 8 to 10.

THE COURT: But you said, no continuing communications after that?

JUROR M. BROWN: Huh-uh.
THE COURT: One of the concerns -Obviously we always want it to be whoever is on that panel is just sitting there with an open mind receiving the evidence, and not biased, and $I$ don't mean that in a negative way, but just that sort of bias we all might have about people we know and things we're familiar with, and things like us, or whatever it is, that might impact the ability to be impartial here.

So I think I just asked the very general question, do you think that would impact your ability to be fair and impartial, and $I$ think you said, no, but we want to inquire a little further about that.

JUROR M. BROWN: I know we had Bible study, but we didn't have a whole bunch of conversations on the outside, but $I$ do remember her, $I$ guess $I$ have a good memory.

THE COURT: We like that as jurors all day long.

I don't mean to put you on the spot here, so $I$ hope it's not coming across like that, but I guess the next question would be, you know, at least at some point in time you all shared a religion, Bible study class, you indicated you still read the Bible.

Is there any reason why that religious connection you had would impact your ability to be fair and impartial in this trial?

JUROR M. BROWN: I don't think so.

THE COURT: You don't anticipate that would be something you would bring into evaluation of the witnesses or evidence?

JUROR M. BROWN: No.

THE COURT: Of the witnesses?

JUROR M. BROWN: No.
THE COURT: We talk about this any trial like this, $I$ think still in one of the instructions the parties start out even Steven, and maybe my pre-trial instructions about you -- The point is, everybody sitting in there isn't favoring one side or the other as we get started, and as we see that evidence, and brings in common sense what is that evidence, and when the time comes gets instructions, goes with their fellow jurors and deliberates and does that fairly without favoritism or disfavoritism to either side.

Do you think you would be able to do that? JUROR M. BROWN: I do.

I tell you my faith comes with me wherever I go, but looking at evidence and weighing it of course my faith factors into everything, so $I$ would leave that to you guys to determine.

I don't know how it would connect directly with the case, $I$ have no idea what it's --

THE COURT: The only thing $I$ had about how it might connect to the indication is, that you share a religion with one of the parties.

Would you favor that party because of that?
JUROR M. BROWN: I can't say because right
is right, and wrong is wrong.
THE COURT: But $I$ heard you saying that, again not trying to put words in your mouth, what you are really going to do is what is the evidence -JUROR M. BROWN: Yes.

THE COURT: -- and you're going to make your decision, is that true, based on the evidence presented, and really that alone?

JUROR M. BROWN: Yes.
THE COURT: Okay.
I'm going to ask Mr. Hymanson, any
follow-up questions for Miss Brown?
MR. J. HYMANSON: Just briefly, Your Honor. Good afternoon, Miss Brown.

Thanks so much for coming to talk to us.
So you said you remember Nurse Practitioner Bartmus from about 19 years ago?

JUROR M. BROWN: Oh, my gosh yes.
MR. J. HYMANSON: From 19 years ago.
And it was a class size of about 8 to 10
people?
JUROR M. BROWN: Yes.
MR. J. HYMANSON: How often did that class
meet?

JUROR M. BROWN: Once a week.

MR. J. HYMANSON: Did the class involve outside discussions?

How many hours a week do you think you spent with Nurse Practitioner Bartmus during class time, after class?

JUROR M. BROWN: I remember we did have one camping trip with the Bible study.

MR. J. HYMANSON: Besides that one camping trip, would it be a regular week, one week you would see her?

JUROR M. BROWN: I think so.

MR. J. HYMANSON: And where were you going to school at this time?

JUROR M. BROWN: Reno.

MR. J. HYMANSON: So UNR?

JUROR M. BROWN: Yes.

MR. J. HYMANSON: This was your
undergraduate?

JUROR M. BROWN: Yes.

MR. J. HYMANSON: Did you have any other classes with Nurse Practitioner Bartmus, besides the Bible study.

JUROR M. BROWN: No, not that $I$ can remember.

MR. J. HYMANSON: That's all I can ask you,
the best of your memory.
So do you think there's anything about the fact you're going to have to make some tough decisions here, and so you are going to be obviously involved a dispute, we can't get into the dispute, but you will have to make a decision who you're going to side with.

So do you think as you sit there the fact you spent that year with Practitioner Bartmus in the Bible class, you don't think will influence you?

Let's say, if things are really, really close, would you at least give an edge to Nurse Practitioner Bartmus?

JUROR M. BROWN: If it's based on evidence, it's based on evidence and the law.

MR. J. HYMANSON: Absolutely.
So that's what I'm asking you.
JUROR M. BROWN: I can't say at this point I would have a bias toward anybody.

I just remember her face and remember we did have that interaction, but beyond that $I$ couldn't say anything else, like $I$ have a feeling one way or another.

MR. J. HYMANSON: Is there anything about the fact that you spent a year with Nurse

Practitioner Bartmus would make you think instantly she has either more or less credibility upon the witness stand?

JUROR M. BROWN: No.
MR. J. HYMANSON: Thank you very much.
THE COURT: Mr. McBride.

MR. MC BRIDE: No questions.
MR. WEAVER: Just a couple questions.
Miss Brown, you said that you identified the nurse practitioner. Was it her name, or did you recognize her face?

JUROR M. BROWN: Her face.
MR. WEAVER: But you haven't had any contact with her in approximately 20 years, is that right?

JUROR M. BROWN: No.
MR. WEAVER: If it weren't for the fact it was a Bible class, would you have ever even known her, would it have made any difference to you whether it was an algebra class, or political science class?

JUROR M. BROWN: I've known -- I guess I knew the Bible study because it was a smaller group and recognizing if you see somebody on a weekly basis, you know their face.

MR. WEAVER: That was at UNR?

JUROR M. BROWN: Uh-huh.

MR. WEAVER: You didn't have any other interaction, other than basically an hour a week that included other people?

JUROR M. BROWN: The Bible study and the camping trip.

MR. WEAVER: So if there were any
implications, you might be in Miss Bartmus' favor, maybe not a level playing field.

What about was there anything about your interaction with Miss Bartmus we should know whether you might not give her the same fair deal you give Plaintiffs?

JUROR M. BROWN: No.

MR. WEAVER: Thank you, Miss Brown.

MR. ARNTZ: Was it UNR, or through a church while you were at UNR?

JUROR M. BROWN: It was through UNR, called inner-varsity had Bible studies that broke off from the group.

MR. ARNTZ: So a Bible study --
JUROR M. BROWN: On the campus.

MR. ARNTZ: Okay.

THE COURT: Thank you, Miss Brown. We appreciate your time.

Go ahead and step out.
(Juror excused from the courtroom.)
THE COURT: Mr. Hymanson anything further you want to add to your request at this time?

MR. P. HYMANSON: Other than apologize for delaying the Court, $I$ have nothing else.

THE COURT: Unbeknownst to me, until just now apparently Mr . Jones in seat number 13 is not with us yet.

We're trying to locate Mr. Jones.
It's always with an issue with something like that it becomes how long do we wait.

He hasn't made any effort to contact us that we are aware of.

Jurors tend to find a way to get to us if they can.

One of the mistakes we made is just to let my marshal know that generally on the first day of trial we get a sign-in sheet with everybody on it, so if something happens, we have a way to contact them, but this has been a little hectic getting everything moving forward, we neglected to do that, so it doesn't automatically come from jury services, so we will follow-up, but give at least ten more minutes, and then we will be an hour from the start time,
maybe have to consider what to do.
MR. P. HYMANSON: Your Honor, just one moment.

THE COURT: Of course.
MR. P. HYMANSON: I don't know how counsel for the Defense feels, but we'll stipulate to let Mr. Jones go.

MR. MC BRIDE: I still want to have him here.

There's no reason to really excuse him.
We can wait ten minutes.
THE COURT: If we're going to finish jury selection today, on the plus side the concern $I$ have on the record about my own personal time frame has been resolved, so we're fine there.

But let's give at least ten more minutes, see if we can get Mr. Jones here, and come back in collectively decide how to proceed.

MR. MC BRIDE: Before you leave the bench, I want to let you know we did submit our order on the motions that we prepared, and I think --

THE COURT: How did you submit that?
MR. MC BRIDE: We signed it.
She brought it back to your chambers.

I also have an objection we filed, I wanted
to give Your Honor a copy of it, an objection to the Plaintiff's proposed jury instruction regarding loss of chance, just prior to opening statements $I$ wanted to make sure that we kind of address that.

Thank you.
THE COURT: I've not spent any time on jury instructions yet, but $I$ would see if anyone has any objections.

Have you seen the filing?
MR. ARNTZ: Just so you know, I don't intend on addressing that in opening, so that will not be a topic in my opening.

THE COURT: Good to know.
MR. WEAVER: Your Honor, we join the objection on behalf of Bartmus, the objection to Defendant's proposed jury instruction regarding loss of chance.

THE COURT: Let me step in the back, clear up my prior issues, and see if juror Jones gets here. (Thereupon, a recess was had.)
(Thereupon, the following proceedings were had out of the presence of the jury.):

THE COURT: So we're back on the record now with Juror Crayton Jones, III, juror 625.

Apparently he e-mailed the Court this morning, sent the e-mail to the e-juror e-mail, just made it's way to my JEA and Court clerk like at 2:19, so literally as we are talking about him they are sending it over, so it says:

Subject: Sick and unable to return to the gallery for jury selection in Courtroom 15-B.

Then he identifies himself as juror ID.
He says, please be advised I've taken ill and am unable to return to Court as part of the gallery today at 1:30 p.m. in Courtroom 15-B.

I've not been selected for the jury, and I feel awful for not being able to complete the obligation, I'm willing to be re-selected in the future in consideration of others in attendance.

It would be irresponsible to expose others to my illness, and I'm respectfully requesting to eliminate my appearance in 1:30 p.m.

I'm looking forward to serving as a prospective juror in the future.

Mr. Jones will be put in the next available
pool.
I don't have too much sympathy for the circumstances, since he's not really identifying the circumstances, but I'm going to make this a Court's Exhibit 1, so we have it for the record, even though I read it in, we have it, and $I$ think we'll have to proceed with filling Mr. Jones' seat.

So at this moment in time we're going to have three vacant seats in the panel, we're going to ask my marshal to hold back Juror Number 606, Mr. Ehle, who is in seat 8, and hold back jurors, and have Mr. Read, juror 637, in seat 18 , you know which jurors those are, $I$ believe, and is that correct, hold them back, bring everybody else in, we'll seat everybody else who is seated, and proceed with the next three in order to fill those seats.

We still have the panel from the original start of trial.

My latest count was down to 11. This will take us down to 8.

We still have an additional 10 we asked to be brought in, but we're still keeping them in jury services in hopes we won't need to get to them.

## All right.

(Thereupon, the following proceedings were had in open court and in the presence of the jury.): THE COURT: As the rest of the jurors find their seat, I'll ask everyone else to have a seat as well.

Thank you, ladies and gentlemen.
Welcome back.
We are in the home stretch of this jury selection, we'll most certainly finish the jury selection today, absent unforeseen circumstances.

I do want to note in part the delay starting today was because of one of your fellow jurors took ill, was unable to return, so it took a while to make that determination and be able to proceed.

But we're going to proceed without that juror.

We also have had two additional excusals from the panel, so we have three empty seats to fill over here.

And the first seat to be filled is going to be seat number 8 in the back row.

So if you will come through between counsel table, around the podium, through the well, enter through the left side of the jury box, we would
appreciate that.
The next juror in order.
THE CLERK: Badge 683, Katrina Johnson.

THE COURT: Then the next seat to be filled is the one in the second row, but to the left as you're looking at the jury box, that is seat number 13.

And the next juror in order for that seat.
THE CLERK: 688, Teresa Blake.
THE COURT: Last but not least, the remaining seat number 18 will be filled by.

THE CLERK: 691, Joel Woods.
THE COURT: All right.

Thank you, folks.
As we did yesterday when we added
additional folks after a break to the panel, we still need to get a few minutes to get the other folks that just joined us, so I'm going to start with Juror Johnson, badge 683.

If you are able to see the boards.
If not, I'm happy to walk you through it,
but --
JUROR JOHNSON: 683.
I'm a speech therapist at the Southern
Nevada Health Care System and the VA Hospital here in

Vegas.

I'm primarily in the outpatient.

I have my Masters degree.

I moved to Vegas in December of 2018 for this job.

I relocated from Denver, Colorado, where I worked at a facility that gave therapy is services to people with dementia.

Single.

Never married.

No children.

And this is the first time $I$ received a jury summons.

THE COURT: If someone comes from another state, I like to ask that.

Thank you very much, Miss Johnson.

Let me ask you, we just had a couple folks to go through, obviously in your job there's some ties to the medical community, but any job you had, family members, close friends, working in the medical industry?

JUROR JOHNSON: Just me.

THE COURT: Okay.

And because you haven't been in the jurisdiction very long, no knowledge or connection to
-- that you recall the any of the parties or the witnesses in the case?

JUROR JOHNSON: No, ma'am.
THE COURT: Okay.
And like you said, primarily you are at the VA?

JUROR JOHNSON: Yes, primarily see out patients there.

THE COURT: Any connection, again yourself,
close friend, or family member, to any kind of
medical malpractice litigation?
JUROR JOHNSON: No, ma'am.
THE COURT: Thank you so much.
Moving now down to the front row, Miss
Blake.
JUROR BLAKE: Blake, 688.
I'm a librarian for the Clark County School
District.
Masters Degree in education.
Associate Engineer with SOCm which is a contractor with the Army.

Pre-existing real estate agent.
No children.
Las Vegas about 25 years.
Never been on a jury.

THE COURT: Here?

JUROR BLAKE: Never.

THE COURT: Never even made it this far.

JUROR BLAKE: Never even this far.

THE COURT: See how fortunate everybody is.

What about medical profession connections?

JUROR BLAKE: RN, a friend is a case
manager at the UMC.
THE COURT: How long has she had that
position?

JUROR BLAKE: At UMC, a few years.

THE COURT: Just to get a better
understanding, 5 years, 10 years, 15 , more?
JUROR BLAKE: 15 or more.

THE COURT: Okay.
And then what about any connections with
any medical malpractice litigation?

JUROR BLAKE: No.

THE COURT: Thank you.
Last but not least Mr. Woods.

JUROR WOODS: Woods, 691.

My job currently -- Before $I$ go any
further, $I$ have a stuttering problem, you will have to bear with me, if you know what I'm trying to say.

I'll keep going, but that's fine --

THE COURT: On the plus side, once jurors start their service if you are one of the 10 , you don't get to speak until you are in your deliberations, you just get to listen.

I've had some jurors think they should be speaking, but it's not the case.

JUROR WOODS: So I'm buying stock. What I did was job-related jobs.

Prior to that out of college I have a Bachelors degree.

Out of college a case manager for several years.

THE COURT: Where did you do that work? JUROR WOODS: State --

THE COURT: Like a hospital?
JUROR WOODS: Different out-patients and in-patient facilities in Oklahoma several years ago, and later on down the line in software, eventually medical software where $I$ work with a variety of doctors and surgeons in the emergency room who $I$ consider probably the best, so I have a high respect for doctors and nurses who do work in the emergency room because $I$ know the way the hospital usually works, it takes very experienced people in that situation because that's who you want to handle a
emergency, if you;re a doctor dealing with patients.
So I do have a little bit of extra respect for people do that sort of work.

THE COURT: We appreciate you bringing that up, but $I$ want to make sure we don't forget.

JUROR WOODS: I've been with my spouse for 20 years, he's a registered nurse.

We've been together mostly nursing home work, it was in Washington state.

THE COURT: How long?
JUROR WOODS: Sorry.
Eight years.
THE COURT: Any children in the community?
JUROR WOODS: No children.
THE COURT: Eight years.
Moved here from where?
JUROR WOODS: Washington.
THE COURT: How about jury service?
JUROR WOODS: I've never done jury service.
THE COURT: So coming back to your
connection to medical profession, let me take the second question first.

Any connection that you had, your spouse, or another close friends, or family member, to any kind of medical malpractice litigation specifically?

JUROR WOODS: Malpractice was something I used to hear about because $I$ worked so close with the doctors and the nurses, and almost in-patient care going into the exam room, so.

THE COURT: Again, the time frame you engaged in those activities, can you give us a year span for that?

JUROR WOODS: How long, or when was it?
THE COURT: Dates I'm thinking.
JUROR WOODS: Probably like 2000 to 2010, around there, probably ten years back.

THE COURT: And back now to the first part, we talked a little bit about it yesterday, and because $I$ never know with the folks in the gallery if they are paying attention or not, $I$ want to go over this again, we fully understand there will be people on the panel who have life experiences, and who have perhaps understandings of certain things, or feelings a certain way, and the question really becomes, even though you may have some sympathy for a party or a general circumstance that might affect a party, are you going to be able to sort of set that aside to do your duty here, and just listen to the witnesses, take in the evidence as you receive it from the witnesses, and the documents, and when it comes time
for you and your fellow jurors to do so fairly and impartial -- The other way to sort of ask that is, it comes up the most commonly $I$ would say in our criminal cases because we're going to obviously have testimony from police officers, and there may be people who have family members are police officers and people had very good experiences with police officers, oftentimes people had bad experiences with police officers, so their life experience is going to have them have some feelings one way or the other.

What we're trying to ferret out is the kind of bias that might preclude the person from being able to do actually jury service, be fair and impartial with this particular case, with these particular people, and there's no right or wrong answer to that.

JUROR WOODS: Yes, I feel impartial, but I believe there are some odd questions, hypotheticals, have been presented.

One of them was a German Shepherd biting and passers-by. I don't think that has any relation to a person has a very serious condition going into a hospital to have that condition treated, and blaming the person who wasn't able to cure you for that condition you went in for.

If that's that case, I don't see those things related.

THE COURT: Fair enough.

We appreciate that.

So to your sort of analysis of the question, one of the things that is always tricky about jury service in voir dire, which is what we're doing now, and it kind of came up in the last couple of days, but just to bring it home, the hypotheticals have nothing to do with the case in terms of whether or not, as I'm sure you can appreciate, you can't have a voir dire where you sit there actually asking questions related to the case and actually ferreting out how people feel about the facts and circumstances of the case.

What you do, and $I$ think counsel so far have done a very skilled job of that, is you ask questions that sort of ferret out people's thought processes about different things to help you understand how they might handle the types of things that might come up in the case.

So I very much appreciate that insight for you, but again the facts and circumstances of the case will come into play when we actually start the case, which is opening statements are not evidence,
you will not regard them as evidence, but you will hear from counsel when the trial starts if you're on the panel, that these are the facts and circumstances of the case, and then you will hear the witnesses who will actually provide the actual evidence through their testimony and through the documents they discuss.

Then you will know what the case is about.
So what we have to know is, to make sure we don't have anybody predetermining any outcomes because they think based on the voir dire questions so far, or what they think they know about the case, they already think they know what the answer is.

If that's the case, that is fine, we need to know that, but again that is not going to be somebody going to stay with us on the jury panel.

So you indicated you had had a mixed answer there, which was I think you said, I'd like to be impartial, or think I'm impartial, something along that line, but expressed a concern about what if certain facts are, so really what it boils down to is, do you believe that not knowing the facts and circumstances of this case as the case comes in, are you going to allow the parties to start at the same starting line, at the so called race start?

JUROR WOODS: Yes.
THE COURT: Find them even Steven, and as you listen to the evidence, at the end of the day decide whether the Plaintiff has met the burden? JUROR WOODS: Yes.

THE COURT: There will be more questions coming from counsel, but $I$ appreciate that.

Anything else from the three of you that you heard questions being asked over the last two days that you were either chomping at the bit to answer, or really think we should know about anything that you have mindset wise about this trial?

JUROR JOHNSON: Yes, ma'am.
I just wanted to disclose, I'm also
military veteran who receives care at the VA Hospital that I also work at.

So I just wanted to let you know that I've seen it from a patient perspective and from providing services, kind of the good, the bad, and the ugly.

I wanted to disclose that.

THE COURT: Thank you.
There may be some more questions.
Anybody else?
Miss Blake.

JUROR BLAKE: No.

THE COURT: Anything else, Mr. Woods?
JUROR WOODS: No.
THE COURT: Thank you.
I'm going to pick up with Mr. Weaver,
because that's where we left off I believe, and then of course we'll still give the other counsel an opportunity to ask questions of the panel.

Mr. Weaver, you may proceed.
MR. WEAVER: Good afternoon.
I represent Nurse Practitioner Bartmus.
Miss Clinton, I'm going to start with you
because I think we left off with you yesterday afternoon with Mr. McBride, and $I$ just wanted to mention one small detail.

I think you were asked a question about -or the panel was asked a question about if anybody had any familiarity or relationship with St. Rose Hospital, and you mentioned your brother, and then you asked about where this campus is, the San Martin Campus.

This one is Buffalo and Warm Springs.
Does that make any difference to your recollection whether that may have been where your brother was treated?

JUROR CLINTON: Sabrena Clinton, 658.

I don't believe that location you described on Buffalo and Warm Springs was not where my brother was.

MR. WEAVER: Does anyone else have -- So the question is:

Do any of you have any association with any of the three campuses of St. Rose Hospital here in Las Vegas?

Yes, ma'am.
Miss Chavez.
JUROR CHAVEZ: My grandmother had a surgery sometime ten years ago, but everything was good, she came out of it great.

MR. WEAVER: Any reason to believe that anything good or bad happened with your grandmother is in association with Sunrise Hospital would affect your ability to be fair in this case?

JUROR CHAVEZ: The only thing happened, she didn't know she was allergic to a certain antibiotic, and they gave it to her, but fixed her up immediately, everything was fine.

I don't hold any grudges or anything.
MR. WEAVER: Anybody else?
Yes, Miss Bebekyan.
JUROR BEBEKYAN: I do work at a call center
for San Martin, but $I$ don't believe it should be a
problem.

MR. WEAVER: What context do you answer calls --

JUROR BEBEKYAN: Call-ins.
MR. WEAVER: Would you just explain a little more, that is for example do you answer for physicians associated with San Martin.

JUROR BEBEKYAN: No, I'm not familiar with that.

MR. WEAVER: You may have heard the name Dr. Lasry and some of the others.

JUROR BEBEKYAN: I haven't.
I've been working there for four months.
I haven't.
MR. WEAVER: Would it be fair to say, you also don't take any of the calls that have to do with the emergency department?

JUROR BEBEKYAN: I do take calls from the emergency department, we do ICU too.

MR. WEAVER: Based on the context of any of the calls that you take, any of the information you pass along, any reason to believe that would affect your ability to be fair in in this case?

JUROR BEBEKYAN: No.

```
                            MR. WEAVER: Anybody else have any
association with St. Rose Hospital here in Las Vegas?
    Yes, sir, Mr. Wilder.
    JUROR WILDER: 611.
    My daughter was born in one of them.
    My mother's been in one of them.
    My wife had an operation in the other
thing.
    So all three of them, so --
    THE COURT: Mr. Wilder, you had the
headphones, but I see you are not utilizing them
anymore.
    Is there a reason?
    JUROR WILDER: They worked, just everything
is louder, but it doesn't really have the clarity, so
I can't hear as well, so I kind of put them on and
take them off.
    I can hear right now fine.
    THE COURT: We'll let you use your best
judgment.
Go ahead.
MR. WEAVER: Mr. Wilder, on that point, were you able to hear Miss Bebekyan, 109, what her answers were?
JUROR WILDER: Yes.
```

MR. WEAVER: You mentioned sometimes you have difficulty in hearing, has to do with tones more than anything else?

JUROR WILDER: I have problem with tones because $I$ got really good hearing aids and can hear okay.

MR. WEAVER: Are you able to tell us what types of tones you can't hear?

JUROR WILDER: My daughter.

MR. WEAVER: What about your wife?

Let's start with that.

JUROR WILDER: I can hear my wife.

MR. WEAVER: What is it about your daughter's tones make it difficult to hear --

JUROR WILDER: She has a real monotone voice and doesn't move her lips a lot.

I've been reading lips, and that helps me.

So I can't read her lips and can't hear her.

MR. WEAVER: With regard to hearing the answers to other jurors over the last few days, have you been attempting to be reading lips to understand what they are saying, or in your judgment be able to hear?

JUROR WILDER: I think I'm hearing pretty
good.

MR. WEAVER: Going back to the question about your experience with the St. Rose Hospitals, do you think your experience with St. Rose Hospital, including the birth of a child, that is going to cause you to be favorably disposed to any emergency department at St. Rose Hospital?

JUROR WILDER: I don't think so.
MR. WEAVER: With regard to the issue of the birth of one of your children -- ladies and gentlemen, $I$ think everybody has answered to questions from Mr. Hymanson they wouldn't think negatively, wouldn't hold it against Mr. Moore if he were to come and go, or have a leave of absence, or need to excuse.

Is everybody on the same page, that would not be an issue for them?

Is there anybody, including you new folks, Miss Johnson, Mr. Woods, and Miss Blake, have any concern, or hold it against, or look unfavorably, if Mr. Moore were to leave at any point, come and go, or not be present, is that a problem for anybody?

No.
Miss Bartmus is pregnant.
She intends to be here not only throughout
the trial obviously, but every moment of every day of the trial, but what happens with some folks, morning sickness is not always in the morning, sometimes it's in the afternoon.

So would anybody hold it against Miss Bartmus if she wasn't here for a small amount of time, or if she was here and needed to step out, or any circumstances where you looked over and saw she was leaving briefly, or looked over and saw she wasn't here for that reason, would anybody be concerned that it's a lack of interest, or lack of concern, or lack of caring on her part, about this case?

So everybody can feel comfortable, everybody can commit if Miss Bartmus for whatever reason, even if she's here, needs to step out, isn't going to hold it against her, is everybody all right with that?

Going back to the issue of the hospital, and St. Rose Hospital, Dr. Lasry, and Miss Bartmus worked in St. Rose Hospital in the emergency department, but were not employed by St. Rose Hospital, they worked for an emergency medicine group that contracted with St. Rose Hospital.

Does that make any difference to anybody,
does anybody care whether or not they worked for the hospital, as opposed to working in the hospital?

Does it make any difference to anybody whether the nurses that they worked with in the emergency department worked for the hospital itself, but not their emergency group?

Does anybody have any experience with circumstances where they work with somebody in a team approach, where perhaps that person works for a different employer than they do, but they need to work collaboratively?

Mr. Withers, you have that circumstance? JUROR WITHERS: I do.

MR. WEAVER: What type?
JUROR WITHERS: The company I work for is contracted by RTC. Now we manage the bus systems here in Las Vegas.

We're not an entity of that, we're contracted by them.

MR. WEAVER: Thank you.
So in your circumstance you work
collaboratively with folks that you may not have direct control over in terms of what they do, is that a fair way to look at things?

JUROR WITHERS: Yes.

MR. WEAVER: Is it your effort or goal to kind of work closely in doing that?

JUROR WITHERS: Yes.

MR. WEAVER: Mr. Newman, I haven't talked with you yet.

I think you told us that you were associated with overseeing environmental services?

JUROR NEWMAN: Yes.

MR. WEAVER: And in your capacity do you sometimes work with the folks, you oversee work collaboratively with other people that are non-employees with whatever employees you're associated with?

JUROR NEWMAN: Not often, because most all of us are at the school district.

MR. WEAVER: On a little bit of a different point, there was some talk yesterday, but I'll stick with you for this moment, we talked about documentation, and the issue hit on terms of procedures, part of people's jobs.

Do the folks you supervise sometimes have to document the things they do?

JUROR NEWMAN: Yes.

MR. WEAVER: Would it be fair to say in
your job as a supervisor sometimes things may get
documented, but it doesn't mean in your opinion they haven't been done, it just means they were done, but not documented?

JUROR NEWMAN: Correct.
MR. WEAVER: Anybody who has a feeling that just because you did something and didn't document it, it should be you didn't do it in the first place?

Anybody hold that feeling that if you didn't document something, it automatically means it's not done?

Okay. Miss Johnson, welcome. JUROR JOHNSON: Thank you.

MR. WEAVER: I am just trying to clarify some of the answers that my colleagues have given, so I'm not going to be as extensive as some of the questions of my colleagues, we have a tight schedule, and the Court runs a tight ship, and we're going to do our best to stay on schedule, so if $I$ skip over asking some of the questions that have already been asked of others, will you let us know if there's any particular relevance comes to mind?

JUROR JOHNSON: Yes.
MR. WEAVER: So, Miss Johnson, in your capacity as a speech therapist is that including $I$ think you said some outpatient treatment.

JUROR JOHNSON: Yes, sir.
MR. WEAVER: And I should have said your badge number.

JUROR JOHNSON: 683.
MR. WEAVER: Did that also include some evaluations of patients?

JUROR JOHNSON: Yes, sir.
MR. WEAVER: In your experience have there been times where you have evaluated patients with speech therapy on an out-patient or in-patient basis at the VA Hospital where you know they do -- have provided them the care they needed, that it was appropriate care, and didn't necessarily document it?

JUROR JOHNSON: I would like to think we did document it.

It not be a surprise at the time, things are left out.

MR. WEAVER: So you try to document what you think is important, because it isn't documented doesn't mean you didn't do it, is that a fair way to look at it?

JUROR JOHNSON: Yes.
MR. WAVER: Sometimes that documentation isn't there, and you believe you did it, you know you did it because it's your habit to do it, your custom

```
is to do it?
```

JUROR JOHNSON: Would you say that again?

MR. WEAVER: Sure.

In general, in your evaluation and treatment of patients are there certain things that you do as part of your processes, part of your custom?

JUROR JOHNSON: Yes.

MR. WEAVER: So even if you give some treatment, do some evaluation, and you didn't document that you did it, is it fair to say you would know you did it because it's your habit to do it?

JUROR JOHNSON: Sometimes I would say. If it's a patient I've seen routinely, but if it's something really important, and $I$ realize after the fact it wasn't addressed, the next time I see the patient $I$ would emphasize to myself to make sure I did that.

MR. WEAVER: Thank you, ma'am.

Mr. Headd, before $I$ come back to you, we're going go to answer a question -- or tell the Judge something.

James Maltese, 665.

THE COURT: We have had a different reporter each afternoon we've been in selection.

Generally either counsel or myself say the name of the jurors. They've not been saying the names, so at this point because this reporter is not used to that process, say your name and badge number when you speak out.

Thank you.
JUROR MALTESE: I have been on projects,
and no project was completed until the paperwork was done and documentation.

I just wanted to say that.
MR. WEAVER: So with that, Mr. Maltese,
would it be an instance where you needed to document a little later, than something was done immediately, it would be done in order for it to be complete? JUROR MALTESE: Most of the times after hours at dinner, or at a hotel.

MR. WEAVER: Whenever there was time to do it? JUROR MALTESE: Yeah. MR. WEAVER: Mr. Headd, you seem to speak your mind.

Is that a fair thing to say?
JUROR HEADD: I'm fine with that.
Ryan Headd, 643.
MR. WEAVER: All right.

You gave us some perception you have of the emergency department is fast-paced, and the emergency department providers, health care providers, basically need to take all comers, whether it a gunshot trauma, burn, heart attack, or whatever it is, is that an accurate perception of that?

JUROR HEADD: Yeah, I imagine certain times it's a very chaotic environment, depending what is going on.

MR. WEAVER: Does anybody in general have a different perception of the emergency department, other than what Mr. Headd described?

Mr. Headd, would it also be your perception that there are times when people go to the emergency department because they think they have an emergency condition, and it's determined that the condition actually isn't an emergency?

JUROR HEADD: Sure.
MR. WEAVER: Can you think of any of what those scenarios might be, or are you just comfortable with the concept, even if somebody in good faith thinks they need to go to the emergency department to be checked out, that's to see what their condition is, it wouldn't surprise you if the condition isn't an emergency?

JUROR HEADD: Yeah, I'm fine with that.
MR. WEAVER: Is there anybody that would be surprised by that perception, or anybody who would be surprised by the idea even a patient who in good faith thinks they might have an emergency condition and needs to be treated in the emergency department, that it doesn't turn out to be an emergency, anybody subscribe to the view that doesn't make sense or wouldn't hold true?

Does anybody -- or do any of you folks hold the view that the only people, a health care provider in the emergency department, who should be able to treat a patient who believes they need to be evaluated for an emergency condition should be a physician?

Anybody hold that view?
Would anybody think that it would be appropriate for a nurse practitioner, and we'll talk about what that is in a moment, anybody have the view it would be inappropriate for a nurse practitioner to evaluate a patient in the emergency department when that patient believes they might have an emergency condition and needs to be evaluated?

Does that strike anybody as something that shouldn't happen?

Mr. Woods, 691, do you have any concern or perception?

Your husband's a registered nurse.
Any concern or perception that a nurse practitioner in the emergency department wouldn't be appropriate to diagnose the condition of the patient who came?

JUROR WOODS: No, my actual doctor's a nurse practitioner that $I$ go to as my general physician is a nurse practitioner, so when $I$ refer to her, I call her my doctor.

I'm aware of kind of how that works, there are some things she has to get the doctor to sign off on.

I know it's how it works, but for the most part she's my doctor, so that's how I see it.

MR. WEAVER: So is there anybody on the panel who doesn't have an understanding of what a nurse practitioner is?

So if $I$ tell you that a nurse practitioner like Miss Bartmus is a registered nurse who then went on to have additional training, a Masters and a Doctorate degree, and assumes a practice, even though we don't call her Dr. Bartmus, she has a Doctorate degree in nursing practice, but she's not a
physician, in other words, she's what some hospitals -- or some call a mid-level practitioner, does anybody, without even knowing the facts, hold against Miss Bartmus if she diagnoses patients in the emergency department, maybe puts in orders for medication, or testing, the discharge of patient, anybody who would hold that against her if she's licensed to do that, and working with in the scope of what she's allowed to do?

Does that strike anybody, even if it's legal, as not being okay?

All right.
Mr. Fyfe, 614.
How are you today.
JUROR FYFE: Good.
How are you?
MR. WEAVER: Good.
Thank you.
Yesterday in response to one of the questions when Mr. McBride was visiting with you was brutal honesty, and one of the questions had to do with does anybody think a medical malpractice case may not be a great case for them, and we appreciated your response, you're not sure because there might be terms that come up, medical terms that you may not
understand, did I basically summarize what your thought on that was?

JUROR FYFE: Yes.

MR. WEAVER: So if we as the lawyers, I'm sure we intended to do so, if we explain those terms to you in a way that is acceptable, and a way can be explained to ease that, give you any concern about whether or not you would be able to be a fair juror in this case?

JUROR FYFE: No.

MR. WEAVER: Somewhat along those same
lines, does anybody have a type A personality?
JUROR WOODS: That they admit to? Me.

MR. WEAVER: That answer about whether they
would admit to it was Mr. Woods, juror 691.
MR. WEAVER: Do you think having a type A personality is a bad thing?

JUROR WOODS: No, I don't think it's a bad thing.

MR. WEAVER: Does anybody perceive
themselves to have a type A personality?
Here's where I'm going with this:
Does anybody have a concern that if they are instructed they can only look at the evidence in
this case, and not look -- can't Google, anything, can't go outside of the information that is provided or what they are instructed to do, they can't talk to the spouse about the information, they can't talk to their sister about the information about health care terms, health care language, or any of the information in this case, is there anybody who has a concern they are just not going to be able to resist that temptation, anybody?

So, Mr. Fyfe, for example whether it's today or tomorrow, you find me using the term emergency department, and Mr. McBride's using the term emergency room, or if it is something as simple as that probably, it wouldn't be an issue, but if it's a language issue of say what acute arterial occlusion means, if you are not getting in the moment what we're explaining, will you resist the temptation after hours to look it up, to Google it, do your own independent research?

JUROR FYFE: Yes.

MR. WEAVER: Is there anybody based on their personality or anything else that just doesn't think they will be able to resist the temptation to look up stuff, or investigate things on their own, is there anybody who has somebody in their life who's
going to drive them crazy by asking them about what is going on with the case, what is it all about, and then tell them what they should think? Miss Bechtold, juror 624. JUROR BECHTOLD: Yes.

THE COURT: The question concerns me because the jurors will understand they are not allowed to discuss the case with anyone, and even if they're pestered to share, $I$ don't know how we ever get to the point where anybody would tell them what they think, I'm a little concerned about the impression posed by that question.

The admonishment as you know is giving your version of it, each of you, while you can certainly help your friend, family, and co-workers, or employers know you're on a jury, and you can say it's a civil trial, any specific details about the trial may not be discussed by anyone, or with anyone, includes family, friends, anybody.

MR. WEAVER: Thank you, Your Honor.
Anybody have any opinions about health care in Las Vegas in general?

JUROR WOODS: 691.
I think the health care in general in Las
Vegas is a little bit sub-par from other cities I've
lived in, so that is a common complaint I've heard from other people from out of state, and $I$ don't know why that would be anything -- or anything else, but in general it seems like it's a little bit more lacks than it is in other states.

MR. WEAVER: Would that information or that impression you may have give you any cause or concern about whether Nurse Practitioner Bartmus and Dr. Lasry would be starting on anything less than a level playing field for you?

JUROR WOODS: No, because I kind of see emergency room treatment is very different from say a paid clinic, the general practitioner, again you are going to be able to do it, but an emergency room there's an emergency, $I$ don't think anybody comes into the emergency room, can walk in there and not feel like it's an emergency, it's an emergency for everybody who is there, but it's a little different, so $I$ feel like the kind of people tend to migrate to that kind of work are probably going to be a little higher caliber than somebody who works in a pediatrician's office or something slower.

You got certain type of people $I$ noticed working in health care who gravitate to different areas of medicine, but the sort of people who end up
in the emergency room are the sort of people who are -- I can't think of the word -- usually are the best of the class, for lack of a better word.

MR. WEAVER: Thank you, sir.
Does anybody else have any general
impressions about medical care in -- or health care in Las Vegas?

JUROR JOHNSON: Just from my experience.
I was recruited here from out of state, and they said it's sometimes hard to retain people in association, so sometimes -- I can speak for the VA, we are constantly understaffed in multiple departments, and it makes it difficult to bring people here and keep them here for a while.

MR. WEAVER: All right.
Anybody else with any impressions of health care in general in Las Vegas?

Miss Clinton.
JUROR CLINTON: Yes, $I$ don't know in terms of general, but $I$ have personal experience where $I$ was out of state, I wasn't able to get the assistance I needed here, but in terms of the medical, whatever you are here for that particular issue, I had to go out of state for it.

MR. WEAVER: I'm not going to ask you what
type of care was it, but did that needing to go out of state relate to the need to get some type of specialty care, as opposed to a concern about the quality of the care here in Las Vegas?

JUROR CLINTON: It was more related to inability to diagnose here, and so we were referred out of state to get an accurate diagnosis.

MR. WEAVER: Anybody else with any
impressions of health care in Las Vegas, or any perception about the need to go out of Las Vegas for any type of illness?

Yes, Miss price.
JUROR PRICE: Juror 632 .

I had a similar experience where $I$ couldn't find the health care high quality here, I would have to go out of state for it for myself.

I would think the provider $I$ think is okay, and I will go out of state if $I$ don't find the quality.

MR. WEAVER: Miss Price, would that experience that you have give you any concern about whether or not Nurse Practitioner Bartmus and Dr. Lasry would be starting with the impression about the concern of the quality of care they would provide? JUROR PRICE: No.

MR. WEAVER: Does anybody hold the opinion if there's a bad medical outcome, that it means that somebody is at fault no matter what, anybody hold that opinion that if somebody had a bad outcome, somebody is to blame?

Anybody hold that viewpoint?
There was a hypothetical Mr. Hymanson gave, I'm just going to follow-up on it, and I'm so interested in what the answer to that hypothetical was, in my own mind $I$ don't remember what anybody's answers were, so I'm not going to re-ask the hypothetical, but it had to do with there was some perception of whether if something had ultimately happened, it comes down to karma I think was the gist of it.

The different question $I$ want to know is, is there anybody on the panel who doesn't believe that if there's a perceived bad medical outcome, that it couldn't be as just a coincidence?

Anybody think that nothing can happen by a coincidence, if something happens that perceives a bad medical outcome, it must have been predictable?

Let's start with that, does anybody have that perception?

Does anybody have the perception that if
there's a perceived negative or bad medical outcome, and somebody seen a physician or a health care provider, or been in the emergency department, that that bad outcome must have been preventable one way or another?

Does anybody hold that viewpoint, that any bad outcome one way or another should be considered preventable?

Nobody.
Miss Sallee, 604, do you have any concerns about the idea that if there's a bad perceived result after a health care provider, that that must be the health care provider didn't do something, that it was preventable?

JUROR SALLEE: No.
MR. WEAVER: Would anybody have the -- This is a little bit of a housekeeping matter, and I think we know the answer to all pf this, does -- or would anybody have any difficulty in seeing what is up on any of the screens if there's any exhibits or medical evidence up on the screen?

Would anybody have any difficulty reading anything that is up on the screen, or any difficulty along those lines?

Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.

Thank you.

Can $I$ have counsel at the bench just
briefly?
(Thereupon, a discussion was had between
Court and counsel at sidebar.)

THE COURT: Okay.

Let me ask Mr. McBride first, do you have any additional questions that would you like to ask of the new members?

MR. MC BRIDE: Actually I don't.

I'm good.

Thank you.

THE COURT: All right.

Thank you.

Mr. Hymanson, do you have any questions you would like to ask?

MR. J. HYMANSON: Very quickly, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. J. HYMANSON: Good afternoon, everyone, and good afternoon Miss Blake, Miss Johnson, and Mr. Woods.

I want to go -- You guys have all been here for everything, we appreciate your patience and everything, I'm going to do a quick hit list of a
couple things.
We talked about apple pie, for example how many of you disclosed you don't like apple pie?

So, Miss Johnson, correct?
JUROR JOHNSON: 683.
MR. J. HYMANSON: Why do you think it should be disclosed?

JUROR JOHNSON: It sort of would depend upon am $I$ judging on date, or presentation of it. If it's the case specifically, I think you should disclose it, but if it's the presentation, the style of it, and not going to interfere, $I$ can be objective, then no.

MR. J. HYMANSON: So on this case you think she should disclose -- you think you should excuse yourself?

JUROR JOHNSON: No, I think you disclose it, and a decision is made by the judging party.

MR. J. HYMANSON: And then, Miss Blake, you don't think you should, is that correct?

JUROR BLAKE: I think you should like everything, so I don't know about pie.

MR. J. HYMANSON: Hypothetically, if you didn't like pie, do you think you should disclose it? JUROR BLAKE: Yes.

MR. J. HYMANSON: You think you should excuse yourself?

JUROR BLAKE: Personally I probably would want to excuse myself, but $I$ guess that would be up to the Judge.

MR. J. HYMANSON: Absolutely.
Mr. Woods, I think you did not raise your
hand, is that correct, you don't think you should?
JUROR WOODS: I wasn't really following you.

MR. J. HYMANSON: You say to Judge a pie eating competition, there's a apple pie and blueberry pie, you know you really don't like apple pie, should you disclose you don't like apple pie?

JUROR WOODS: Yes, I think you should
disclose it, but $I$ think it's a hard question for me because I like either one.

MR. J. HYMANSON: You think you should
recuse yourself?
JUROR WOODS: Yes.

MR. J. HYMANSON: Thank you very much.
Do all three believe people should take
responsibility for their actions?
Mr. Woods?

JUROR WOODS: Woods.

Yes.

MR. J. HYMANSON: Do you think that you agree with what people said on $I$ think yesterday about full responsibility, everyone agree with that? JUROR WOODS: Yes.

MR. J. HYMANSON: Are all three of you comfortable with the facts of this case is about money?

JUROR WOODS: Yes.

MR. J. HYMANSON: And I gave a hypothetical about if you think based on the facts and the evidence that $\$ 500$ is sufficient to compensate the Plaintiff for their harms and losses, the Plaintiffs are asking for ten million dollars, are all three of you comfortable awarding $\$ 500$ to the Plaintiff?

JUROR JOHNSON: Maybe I'm just not understanding that question correctly, but is it 500 is agreed upon as it matches what --

MR. J. HYMANSON: What you believe.
So you think in your evaluation you think
that what the Plaintiff should be compensated is $\$ 500$, and so the Plaintiffs are asking for ten million dollars, do you think if it's 500, are you comfortable awarding the Plaintiff $\$ 500 ?$

JUROR JOHNSON: I guess that would be my
apologies, $I$ thought it was explained that we would kind of be directed as a jury what the typical compensation is, so $I$ would kind of follow that outline more than say, well, $I$ think it's this amount of money.

MR. J. HYMANSON: Okay.
JUROR JOHNSON: If I was understanding the Judge correctly.

THE COURT: Let me try to clarify.
JUROR WOODS: I agree with her.
JUROR BLAKE: I also agree.
THE COURT: Interesting all of you are sitting over there.

So let me explain.
The instruction talks about pain and suffering damages in the sense of there's no fixed number, there's no specific way to determine it, it gives you instructions how to think about it, but there are no numbers involved.

The determination of that has to come from the evidence and from the jury's deliberation.

We simply have instructions how to go about it to make the determination if any money is to be awarded, what the amount should be, and I apologize for any confusion on that.

I don't happen to have instructions in the room with me, although $I$ could probably find them very quickly if $I$ needed to clarify, but it's not something you are going to get any guidance of any kind what the verdict should be, only how you reach the verdict.

MR. J. HYMANSON: Thank you very much, Your Honor.

I appreciate that.

There's going to be, as you will see, different types of damages we present, some things you will see some calculations for different categories, $I$ can't get into the specifics with that, but just say that you believe that based on what the verdict -- or the instructions the court gave you, you think that $\$ 500$ is appropriate, and the Plaintiff's asking for ten million, are all three of you comfortable awarding \$500?

Okay.

So then we flip to that question is to say that, do you think based on the evaluation of all the facts and evidence before you the Plaintiff's are entitled to ten million dollars to compensate them for their harms and losses, and the Defense wants you to only award $\$ 500$, are you comfortable if you
believe it is justified based on the facts and evidence presented to you that ten million dollars is what it takes for this Defendant, are you comfortable with awarding ten million dollars?

JUROR WOODS: I believe so, yes.
MR. J. HYMANSON: Thank you very much.
Mr. Woods, 691.
JUROR WOODS: Correct.
MR. H. HYMANSON: Thank you so much.
THE COURT: I found the instructions, so why don't we review it.

The instruction being proposed is a standard set of instructions we would give, reads as follows:

No definite standard or method of calculation is prescribed by law by which to fix reasonable compensation for pain and suffering.

Nor is the opinion of any witness required as to the amount of such reasonable compensation.

Furthermore, the argument of counsel as to the amount of damages is not evidence of reasonable compensation.

In making an award for pain and suffering you shall exercise your authority and calm and reasonable judgment, and the damages you shall fix
shall be just and reasonable in the light of the evidence.

That is what we talked about when we say instructions on how to, not giving you the numbers.

MR. J. HYMANSON: Thank you so much, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you.
MR. J. HYMANSON: I'm going as quick as I can, ladies and gentlemen.

Do any of the three of you have any negative feelings about lawsuits, or people who file lawsuits?

JUROR WOODS: Woods.
I don't feel pro or negative about it.
MR. J. HYMANSON: 691, Mr. Woods.
Mr. Woods, I want to ask you a couple follow-up questions.

You talked about your long-term spouse is a registered nurse, correct?

JUROR WOODS: Correct.
MR. J. HYMANSON: Where does he work?
JUROR WOODS: He does the same thing as $I$ do now, but he's been a nurse for over 20 years.

MR. J. HYMANSON: Did he work more in the emergency room, in a certain department?

JUROR WOODS: The only time he worked in an emergency room was prior to us meeting, when he was in rotation or something like that.

Most of the time $I$ knew him he either worked in the nursing home or county general.

MR. J. HYMANSON: We talked about that you used to work, was it software you did in the emergency room?

JUROR WOODS: I did medical stuff, but didn't actually work in the emergency room.

I worked with several different doctors and specialists in the hospital system who also rotated.

I did not actually work in the emergency room myself, no.

MR. J. HYMANSON: When you were asked some questions about what you thought about health care in Las Vegas, and correct me if I'm wrong, but you said you thought it was generally okay, but you -- I gathered you have saw the emergency room kind of a top of the heap for the different departments, is that fair to say.

JUROR WOODS: I would think that would be one of the last places in a hospital that $I$ notice that, yeah.

MR. J. HYMANSON: So you understand this is
a medical malpractice case involves the emergency room, correct, and is there anything about your belief that the emergency room is the top of the heap that you think would give the Defendants in this case a little bit of a leg up in this case?

JUROR WOODS: No, because I've always been living long enough to see bad things happen also, so I'm also aware of those.

MR. J. HYMANSON: The fact you view the emergency room so much differently, at least from your words, of all the other kind of types of medicine practice in Las Vegas --

JUROR WOODS: I don't really know the answer to that question because I don't know the details or any specifics of this case yet, would all depend on the specifics of this case because in the emergency room it could be really wild differences, you can have somebody coming in for a common cold, or somebody having a baby, or somebody coming in from a car wreck, part of their chest removed.

I can go on and on, there's so many variables, and in the emergency room $I$ wouldn't begin to speculate the details of that.

MR. J. HYMANSON: I understand that, and I appreciate that.

But I do need to know how you fell about that because if it ends up being one of those cases, to me what $I$ heard from that is that in a certain situation you don't think emergency room would be ahead, but in another situation depending what the facts are the emergency room may be one step ahead, is that fair?

JUROR WOODS: I don't think the emergency room itself, $I$ think it's the persons around the emergency room is less likely to be sub-par than say a dentist's office, or pain clinic, or something like that around town.

You're probably pretty focused and drawing a reasonable paycheck, and some people are, you know --

MR. J. HYMANSON: Understood. So.
I'm sorry I keep asking you this, I want to focus in, get to the direct issue, and $I$ want to see.

So we're dealing with two individuals that work in an emergency room department, okay, and $I$ want to know if you think there's a scenario you could be presented with that you on the basis of the facts of that are presented here that given the fact that the people in front of you are emergency room employees, that you would give them at least a little
bit of one step ahead of where my clients are?
JUROR WOODS: I don't think so, because it
would all be objective. I would have to hear the details, and $I$ don't know any details of it.

MR. J. HYMANSON: I appreciate that.
I want to flush out, make sure $I$ understand because you said you don't know the details, you would have a step ahead or not, but by saying you don't have details to know if you're a step ahead or not, that leads me to believe that is at least some scenario where you think by virtue of being an emergency room employee they would be a step ahead.

JUROR WOODS: That is not necessarily -Tell me what the scenario would be, tell me.

MR. J. HYMANSON: I can try to come up with a hypothetical, I guess.

I can't get into the specifics of this case.

THE COURT: I think he answered your question.

MR. J. HYMANSON: Thank you very much, Your Honor.

Thank you very much, Mr. Woods.
Do any of you know anyone who uses a
wheelchair?

Miss Johnson.
JUROR JOHNSON: 683.
I work in a hospital, and some of our survivors are wheelchair-bound, and I have many patients that are as well.

MR. J. HYMANSON: What about anyone that has an amputation?

JUROR JOHNSON: Yes, sir.
MR. J. HYMANSON: And what about Miss Blake or Mr. Woods, anyone had an amputation?

JUROR BLAKE: Yes.
JUROR WOODS: I can't remember anything.
MR. J. HYMANSON: Okay.
I want to touch real quickly on something Mr. McBride touched on yesterday.

I think you all have heard him when he was talking about sympathy.

Sympathy is something all the attorneys agree we don't want you to give your sympathy at all.

Mr. McBride asked people about if they are okay with sympathy for the Plaintiff's side, so let me ask you this:

Are you okay putting sympathy for the Plaintiff's side in determining whether or not what is right, compensate them if you find the Defendants
are at fault?
Yes.
Are you also okay putting your sympathy aside regarding the fact Nurse Practitioner Bartmus is training and the defers ability to pay a just compensation to the Defendant, is that something all three of you are willing to put aside also?

Do any of you hold anything against people that are lifelong smokers?

Miss Johnson.
JUROR JOHNSON: I hold against them as in what, a personality, or what are we talking about?

MR. J. HYMANSON: Let's say there were evidence to come out that smoking has nothing to do with what caused a person's injuries, but the simple fact a person was a smoker, do you think you would hold that against them for suffering the injury they suffered?

JUROR JOHNSON: No, sir.
MR. J. HYMANSON: Mr. Woods?
JUROR WOODS: Not if it had nothing to do with the injury.

MR. J. HYMANSON: Miss Blake?
JUROR BLAKE: No.
MR. J. HYMANSON: Anything the three of you
think we should know that we haven't asked, or we haven't talked about yet?

My final question is:
If you were an injured person, injured by someone's medical malpractice, would you feel comfortable with someone with your beliefs sitting on that jury considering your case?

Yes?
Thank you very much.
THE COURT: May $I$ have counsel back at the bench, please.
(Thereupon, a discussion was had between Court and counsel at sidebar.)

THE COURT: Okay.
Thank you.
I did want to check with counsel, see if they had any final questions before we have a brief recess, and Mr. Hymanson indicated one follow-up.

I believe it's going to be to the entire panel, not the three just joined us, based on some questions and answers came up.

MR. J. HYMANSON: I'm sorry, ladies and gentlemen, $I$ promise.

THE COURT: Stop promising.
It's not working.

MR. J. HYMANSON: As I said, Your Honor, I neglected to ask a question about smoking yesterday, so $I$ want to follow-up with the whole panel about that.

So my question was:
If you knew someone was a lifelong smoker, and you saw that something happened to them, there was a medical issue with them, and smoking didn't have anything to do with that, would you hold the fact they were a smoker against them?

Mr. Maltese, I think you sort of raised your hand about that.

JUROR MALTESE: Yeah, my basic belief is on smoking, if you're a smoker, you are on idiot, with all the information out there.

I mean, I have colon cancer, and they always told me don't smoke.

Every one of my doctors, researchers to medical people, so I'm sorry.

MR. J. HYMANSON: Would this change your opinion if someone had been a smoker since their entire life, and during times when it was always on TV, the Marlboro Man, would that change your mind, an older person been smoking their whole life, as opposed to someone started smoking recently?

JUROR MALTESE: No, when I grew up, it was a Marlboro Man, you put the Marlboro box in your pocket.

MR. J. HYMANSON: Anyone else have any
feelings that way, or other?
JUROR EVERETT: I agree with him.

MR. J. HYMANSON: Thank you very much.

Anyone else feels that way?
Anyone else has an opinion about that one way or another?

Thank you very much.

THE COURT: All right.

Thank you, Mr. Hymanson.

Folks, we're going to take a brief recess, ten minutes.

Be back at ten minutes to 4 .
(Jury admonished by the Court.)

THE COURT: We're going to take a ten-minute break.

See is you back shortly.
(Jury excused from the courtroom.)
(Thereupon, the following proceedings were
had out of the presence of the jury.):
THE COURT: All right.
Let's break first and come back in about
five or seven minutes, resume our conversation with Mr. Wilder.
(Thereupon, a recess was had.)
(Thereupon, the following proceedings were had out of the presence of the jury.):

THE COURT: Counsel, we're going to have Mr. Wilder.

THE MARSHAL: No problem.
I'll go grab him.
(Juror Wilder brought into the courtroom individually.)

THE COURT: Mr. Wilder, come through the well here and sit in the black chair right there in the front.

All right. I notice you don't have the headset.

Did you give those back?
JUROR WILDER: He took them away from me, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.
So we wanted to have a few additional questions with you about your ability to fully participate in the trial.

There's been a lot of discussion that you have had, and they have asked you about terms of your ability to hear, and $I$ think over all my impression is that you are hearing quite a bit, and you feel good about how you would sort of police it if you
weren't hearing.
I happened to notice in that last round of questioning that a couple of the jurors in front of you when they were speaking, that you went ahead and picked up the headset and put them on.

I did notice though that some of the answer was going unknowing, as you were making sure it was adjusted and putting it on, so obviously some of that was missed, that was Miss Price, but were there any other jurors speaking, what about Mr. Woods in front of you?

JUROR WILDER: There were two here I couldn't hear, and $I$ put the headset on, still couldn't hear because everything was louder, but the stuff I can't understand is still there.

THE COURT: So when you say it wasn't helping you with the clarity earlier, that's what you meant?

JUROR WILDER: Everything was like right here now, only louder.

THE COURT: To phrase it this way, I want to make sure I'm making it clear, what you can hear you can hear better with the headset, but what you can't hear is not aided by the headset?

JUROR WILDER: Correct.

THE COURT: There are still things you have not been able to hear?

JUROR WILDER: Correct.

THE COURT: Any further questions, counsel?
MR. ARNTZ: Your Honor, do you mind if $I$
ask a couple questions?
THE COURT: No.

Go ahead.
MR. ARNTZ: Hi.
You haven't met me.

My name is Breen Arntz. I am counsel.
My dad is very hard of hearing, and what I've found with him is that generally he becomes detached from the conversation, and so my biggest concern isn't so much you hear every single thing, I would want you involved in the discussion, and do you find yourself taking yourself out of the discussion?

JUROR WILDER: If it's not really relevant to me, yes.

I've had a hearing problem pretty much my whole life, kind of in our genes, so I try to stay focused, I nudge my my wife, what did they say.

MR. ARNTZ: My dad will come over and stand over you and say, what did you say.

JUROR WILDER: Again, it's been a lifelong
thing for me, I can't believe I'm sitting here.
In the past $I$ even had a doctor tell me -I was going to jury duty the next day, and he laughed at me said, no, you're not.

I said, what do you mean?
He said, no, you're not, they don't want you there.

He wrote me a letter, sent the letter out about 20 years ago.

MR. ARNTZ: Otherwise, we all like you.
JUROR WILDER: Make no mistake, I would like to serve, but in all due fairness $I$ do have this problem, and $I$ would do my best to control it and raise my hand.

MR. ARNTZ: Okay.
Thank you.
THE COURT: Anybody else?
MR. MC BRIDE: Just a couple questions.
Mr. Wilder, real quick, you don't have any problem with seeing any of the writing on the screen, do you?

JUROR WILDER: No.
MR. MC BRIDE: Have you had any problem hearing me, or anything of the other attorneys?

JUROR WILDER: No.

MR. MC BRIDE: Again, if I told you -- I'm pretty loud, but do you think in any way that your ability to kind of not hear some of these jurors who have been talking, some of them in lower tones, Mr . Everett $I$ think has difficulties speaking up, but do you think that in any way affected your ability to participate in answering questions as part of this voir dire process?

JUROR WILDER: I don't think so, because I'm watching counsel and interface with them, so I get the gist of what they are talking about, so it's not like I'm totally flying blind eyed, just can't hear a lot of their words.

MR. MC BRIDE: Do you think though still even with your hearing difficulties, that you could still participate in this trial and do your best and be able to raise your hand if you have any difficulties?

JUROR WILDER: If it's okay for me to raise my hand, absolutely.

MR. MC BRIDE: Thank you, sir.
THE COURT: Mr. Weaver.
MR. WEAVER: Mr. Wilder, if you were deliberating, and it were a juror that whose tone was difficult for you to hear, would you have any
hesitation in making sure that you could hear that, or interact with that?

JUROR WILDER: Not if $I$ can read their lips or get close to them.

MR. WEAVER: I think I may have asked you this question before.

Does it matter to you in terms of whether you can hear better with someone who got a difficult tone to hear where you sit?

JUROR WILDER: Not really.
Just certain things with tones.
Like I say, I haven't heard my daughter for several years.

MR. WEAVER: Thank you, sir.
THE COURT: I have two follow-ups.
You indicated you have some proficiency in reading lips.

Just curious, have you made an effort to try to read lips when we have been up here at the bench conferences?

JUROR WILDER: No.
THE COURT: Okay.
And maybe --
JUROR WILDER: I'm not a lip reader, Your Honor, but it happens because $I$ kind of get the gist
of the conversation.

THE COURT: That gets into my more serious second question.

When we are actually in the trial, you are sort of at a side view of the parties participating, the witnesses are here, attorneys are here, talking like this, and you will get a side view.

The voir dire of the conversation with the jury is very different, they are looking at you, not to say some witnesses don't turn and talk to the jury, but the vast majority of the witnesses and the counsel will be facing each other in the courtroom this way, and you would be over there on the side view.

Do you think that would affect your ability to hear them?

JUROR WILDER: I don't know.

Sideways is kind of okay most of the time, but if it's a tone $I$ can't hear, then I'll do -raise my hand or whatever.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Wilder.

Step back out.
(Juror Wilder now excused from the
courtroom.)
(Thereupon, the following proceedings were had out of the presence of the jury.):

THE COURT: Final argument on whether Mr. Wilder stays or goes, Mr. Hymanson.

MR. P. HYMANSON: Very briefly, I think we made a record. You already indicated where you were going to go when he did not wear the headset.

He had the headset on, you asked how he's doing, he said okay.

It's not a Geico commercial.

THE COURT: Actually, that commercial says okay.

MR. P. HYMANSON: But they don't buy that insurance.

So speech and hearing are critical, and you don't want to make that an appellate issue because as long as it's going to take to try this case once, we don't want to try it twice.

THE COURT: Okay.
Mr. McBride, anything you have to say?
MR. MC BRIDE: Nothing further, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Mr. Weaver?
MR. WEAVER: No.
THE COURT: The Court is going to exercise its discretion to excuse Mr. Wilder, juror 611, based
on his hearing difficulties.
I think we do have a very good record on this point, and my biggest concern is even with the assistance of a hearing device, the clarity he's given us now is that if the tone is off, he's not going to hear it, and even though he has indicated that in circumstances he would perhaps ask his wife, I've had jurors nudge the other jurors, but I think it really seems like no matter what the circumstances are he's not going to hear everything, and then we're leaving it to his own devices to let us know that he doesn't hear everything.

Even though $I$ think he would give it his best efforts, $I$ can't be certain he will connect to all of the testimony and all of the information, and again that issue with when the tone was down, he made some effort to try to listen, there was time wasted there, and ultimately it didn't work.

At the end of the day he's not going to be able to -- or we're not going to be able to be certain he will pick up a hundred percent of the circumstances, and while there may be other jurors don't pay attention, fail to pick up a hundred percent, he really does have a difficulty, which I think excludes him from service.

We'll excuse him.

MR. P. HYMANSON: Juror Number 3 and Juror Number 14, Everett and Mr. Maltese in the closing moments of voir dire said they felt anyone that smokes was stupid, I think that was the term, those who smoke we're stupid, and the follow-up question that would have been asked probably would have cleared the courtroom, and I think the question I would like the Court to inquire with these two jurors outside the presence of the others is, if you believe an individual who continues to smoke in this day and age is stupid, does that impact your ability to be fair and impartial?

I think that is a critical question.

I think if young Mr. Hymanson asked that, it would have required the jury to be dismissed and --

THE COURT: Any objection from the Defense for bringing them in and inquire of them?

MR. MC BRIDE: That's fine, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Let's start with Mr. Everett, juror 143 , in seat number 3.

MR. P. HYMANSON: Thank you, Your Honor.
(Juror Everett now brought into the courtroom.)

THE COURT: Hi, Mr. Everett.

Come forward right here to the chair in the front there.

Mr. Everett, we wanted to ask a couple of follow-up questions that we thought were better to ask just directly to you and one of the other panelists, not to the whole group, and that has to do with the last few questions about the smoking.

As I've said multiple times, I'll just remind again everybody's coming in here with life experiences, common sense, who they are as people, what they think and believe, and the real question $I$ think that we have is, if it should come out in the evidence in the trial that any one or more of the parties have been a lifelong smoker, or are smokers, would you be able to overcome that concern you have about generally people being smokers and ultimately receive the evidence, weigh the evidence with your fellow jurors, and deliberate for a fair and impartial verdict.

JUROR EVERETT: It's something embedded in me.

I have a lot of negative experiences with it.

THE COURT: I'm not sure that answered my
question.
I'm not trying to change your thought process, not trying to change how you feel about it.

I'm trying to understand how it might impact you here in this trial.

We understand you have those concerns.
The issue becomes, this is still a hypothetical, but the understanding there could be people in this case who are smokers, is that automatically going to then turn you a against them, or are you able to in this trial with the oath would indicate what you are required to do, and there's a separate oath for the people actually on the panel to listen to the evidence, weigh the evidence, and reach a verdict the jurors believe is appropriate, would you be able to do that?

JUROR EVERETT: Not easily, I don't think.
THE COURT: Okay.
Any follow-up questions from the Plaintiff's side?

MR. ARNTZ: No.
THE COURT: Any follow-up questions from the Defense side?

MR. MC BRIDE: No, Your Honor.
MR. WEAVER: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Everett.

You may step out.
(Juror Everett now excused from the courtroom.)

THE COURT: Then we need juror 665, Mr. Maltese, was the one in the front row.
(Juror Maltese now brought into the courtroom.)

THE COURT: Mr. Maltese, can you just come forward, and we're going to have you sit right in the black chair in the front row of the jury box here just for ease of chatting with you a few more minutes.

Thank you.

Mr. Maltese, we just brought you in briefly to follow-up on that last little bit of questioning we had, and how much we appreciate to know your candor and feelings about smoking, your prior history how you feel about people that smoke, so the follow-up question really not with all the other jurors present, it follows that same arena I've been talking about, you know overall, which is we all have our own life experiences, we all have our own common sense, we all are who we are as people, we come together on this jury, so we're going to have
whatever life experiences and thought processes we have.

The question is:
When it comes to the fact of should it come to light in the trial that one or more of the parties in the case are smokers, is that something that is going to get in the way of your ability to be a fair and impartial juror in this trial?

In other words, if you can set that aside, even though you have those concerns generally, can you seat that aside when it comes to this case, listen to the witnesses, receive their testimony, receive the exhibits, and when it comes time to deliberate, sit down with your fellow jurors and deliberate fairly and impartially, do you think you would be able to do that?

JUROR MALTESE: I want to say, yes, but I don't want to lie to you.

THE COURT: And so maybe help us understand a little bit more about what it is, and how it is you think it would impact your ability to be fair and impartial.

JUROR MALTESE: I had aunts and uncles who smoked at the time, were big, and they both died of cancer, and when she was in the hospital, I couldn't
tell where the sheets ended and they started, that's how much weight they lost.

I tell my friends that smoke they are morons.

THE COURT: I think the question was asked before quite well by counsel, but just again because it's just us here, we do want your candor, obviously the trial is based on whatever evidence is available too about what occurred in the case, and a lot of facts going to come into play, and ultimately the law you are given to apply to those facts.

Am I understanding you correctly that regardless of what the evidence is, regardless of what the law is, if you find out one of the people involved in the case is a smoker, you automatically will be opposed to them, is that what you're indicating to us?

JUROR MALTESE: I believe, yes.
THE COURT: Okay.
Any further questions from the Defendant?
MR. MC BRIDE: No, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Any further questions from the Plaintiff?

MR. ARNTZ: None, Your Honor.
MR. WEAVER: None, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right.
You can step out.
(Juror Maltese excused from the courtroom.)
(Thereupon, the following proceedings were had out of the presence of the jury.):

THE COURT: I don't believe either of them.
I think we gave them an open door, but at
the end of the day they gave their testimony, and it is what it is, so we'll excuse Mr. Everett, and we will excuse Mr. Maltese and replace their seats, and of course we excused Mr. Wilder from our discussion.

So we have three empty seats to fill, and I would like to get to know them.

I will invite Mr. Hymanson to inquire first, and invite Defense counsel to the extent they wish to further inquire.

I appreciate your ability to get through the things to have them sitting here.

So Joshua, hold back Mr. Everett, Mr.
Wilder, and Mr. Maltese as we bring the folks in.
Bring them in.
(Thereupon, the following proceedings were had in open court and in the presence of the jury.): THE COURT: All right.

Make sure your cell phones are off or silent if you used them on the break, please.

As folks can see, we have some additional empty seats.

That means the folks over here in the gallery will need to fill those seats.

We're going to start with seat number 3 in the back row to the left, the next in line.

THE CLERK: 694, Julian Abaca.
THE COURT: Next up is seat number 9 in the back row on the right, but please come through and go around as Mr. Abaca, but if you want to go through the front row, come up on the side in the back, that is fine too.

THE CLERK: 699, Nicolette Albright.
THE COURT: Last but not least replacing seat number 14.

THE CLERK: 714, Terry Brown.
THE COURT: Mr. Abaca, may you give us the information on the board?

JUROR ABACA: Badge 694.
I install granite counter top.

And never graduated high school.
I am single.
I have one child, a son three years old.
This is my -- I lived in Las Vegas for 23
years, my whole life.
And never been a juror.
THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Abaca.
What about anybody -- It sounds like your
profession you already identified, but any close
friends, family members in the medical profession.
JUROR ABACA: My grandmother.
THE COURT: What did she do?
JUROR ABACA: She was an RN.
THE COURT: Here or somewhere else?
JUROR ABACA: Not here in the hospital.
THE COURT: When did she work for that
hospital?
JUROR ABACA: Ten years ago.
THE COURT: Was that when she was
traveling?
JUROR ABACA: Yes.
THE COURT: What about any circumstances
you might have had regarding malpractice, medical
malpractice litigation?
JUROR ABACA: Nothing.

THE COURT: Thank you.
Miss Albright, answer the questions on the board.

JUROR ALBRIGHT: Nicolette Albright, badge 699.

Currently I'm an accounts payable specialist.

THE COURT: Where do you work.
JUROR ALBRIGHT: I work for a company
called G \& G Management.
I have some college.
I'm divorced.
I have two children -- Well, I have two grown people, I have a 25 year old and 27 year old.

THE COURT: Do they work here in Las Vegas?
JUROR ALBRIGHT: One works for -- he's a supervisor at Fed Ex, and works part-time at Big 5.

My other son lives in Portland, Oregon.
THE COURT: How long have you lived here?
JUROR ALBRIGHT: Oh, my God, almost 28
years.
THE COURT: How about jury service here or anywhere you lived?

JUROR ALBRIGHT: Never had jury service.
I never have gotten this far.

THE COURT: Okay.
You probably thought you were still going to get away.

JUROR ALBRIGHT: Yes.
THE COURT: Over than Miss Brown in the front row -- or I'm sorry -- before that, how about anybody in the medical profession in your family, family or friends?

JUROR ALBRIGHT: No.
I did at one point in time when $I$ was out of work went to school to be a medical assistant, but it didn't -- I didn't practice.

THE COURT: How about any knowledge of -would you have any prior knowledge, family member or close friend, of medical malpractice litigation?

JUROR ALBRIGHT: No.
THE COURT: Okay.
JUROR M. BROWN: Terry Brown, 714.
Some college.
I work at Four Queens as a server.

Some college.
My husband Dan works at Planet Hollywood as a supervisor.

Four children.
Pharmacy tech at CVS.

A branch of manager at City Electric.
A school teacher at Lacey School.
And been here about ten years.
And never been a juror.
MR. WEAVER: Your Honor, I'm sorry, I
didn't hear where Miss Brown works.

JUROR M. BROWN: Four Queens.
THE COURT: Miss Brown, what if any prior
profession for yourself, or friend, or family member in the medical profession?

JUROR BROWN: No.
THE COURT: What about any experiences with
anything medical malpractice-related?
JUROR M. BROWN: No.
THE COURT: Okay.
I'll invite Mr. Hymanson to inquire of our panelists first.

MR. J. HYMANSON: Thank you very much, Your
Honor.
THE COURT: I could have asked the Four
Queen question, but we've gone over a lot of ground.
I'll let you ask the questions.
MR. J. HYMANSON: That's fine.
Thank you, Your Honor.
Mr. Abaca, Miss Albright, and Miss Brown,
welcome.
As briefly as $I$ can, do you agree about the comments about personal responsibility, most of you agree with those statements?

JUROR ABACA: Yes.
THE COURT: Any of you have any different feelings or input about that?

JUROR ABACA: No.
THE COURT: Any of you have any specific feelings regarding lawsuits, good feelings, bad feelings, too many, or any specific feelings come up for anything in the community?

JUROR ALBRIGHT: No.

MR. J. HYMANSON: Do any of you have a problem with the fact this is a case about money?

JUROR ALBRIGHT: No.

JUROR ABACA: No.

MR. J. HYMANSON: Thank you very much.
Is there anything else, you heard
everything, been through -- been here for several days now, anything that you heard that you thought I really need to speak up about that, I really have a feeling about that, or something we should know?

I'll go individually.
Mr. Abaca, anything?

JUROR ABACA: No, sir.

MR. J. HYMANSON: Thank you very much.

Miss Albright.

JUROR ALBRIGHT: Badge 699.

No.

MR. J. HYMANSON: Okay.

And Miss Brown?

JUROR M. BROWN: 714.

No.

MR. J. HYMANSON: Miss Albright, just real
briefly, you went to school to be a medical assistant.

Do you have any strong feelings one way or the other about the medical profession?

JUROR ALBRIGHT: Well, not really, no.

MR. J. HYMANSON: The final question is, I'll ask you individually, would you if you were a person seeking compensation for harm caused to you by medical malpractice, would you be comfortable with somebody like you sitting on the jury, Mr. Abaca?

JUROR ABACA: Break that down, please.

MR. J. HYMANSON: If you were injured because of someone's medical malpractice, and trying to recover from your injuries or damages, would you be comfortable with your view points sitting on the
jury to decide that case?

JUROR ABACA: Yes.
MR. J. HYMANSON: Same question for you, Miss Albright.

JUROR ALBRIGHT: 699.
Yes.

MR. J. HYMANSON: And Miss Brown?
JUROR M. BROWN: If I was the Plaintiff,
yes.
If $I$ was the Defendant, no.
MR. J. HYMANSON: Okay.
I have no further questions.
Thank you very much.
THE COURT: Mr. McBride.
MR. MC BRIDE: Thank you.
Good afternoon, everyone, and welcome as well to the new members.

Miss Brown, I'm going to follow-up directly on that last answer you gave there.

Can you tell me why you feel you would not
feel comfortable if you were either Dr. Lasry or
Nurse Practitioner Bartmus if you were on the jury?
JUROR M. BROWN: I feel like doctors make a lot of mistakes, and $I$ think they act like they don't, so --

MR. MC BRIDE: So in this case before hearing any evidence in this case that Dr. Lasry and Nurse Practitioner Bartmus would be basically at a disadvantage in your view, based on your feelings they make mistakes?

JUROR M. BROWN: Absolutely.

MR. MC BRIDE: You heard us talk about the other cases being more appropriate, either a criminal case or other type of case.

Would you agree this is probably not the right case for you to act as a juror?

JUROR M. BROWN: I don't think I would be fair.

Yeah, I agree.

MR. MC BRIDE: Thank you for your honesty, I appreciate it.

Miss Albright, $I$ wanted to follow-up with the question where $I$ think it was asked about your feelings about the medical profession, and if you have strong feelings one way or another, and you somewhat hesitated $I$ think in your response.

Is there something you want me wanted to say about your feelings about -- whether it's positive or negative, and this is tough, but this is where we need to know, and my clients as well as the

Moores need to know, if you are the right type of juror for this case.

JUROR ALBRIGHT: Okay.
Back in July I lost my mom.
She went months with fluid on her lungs, and her oncologist would not see her without an appointment.

Her appointment was so far out, so she was going to her cardiologist, thought he can find where the fluid is coming from.

He sent her for a scan, and it came back, said you have a small mass, we're just going to treat this, but we think that fluid on your lungs might just be allergies, they gave a hundred an one things back and forth to the doctor we went to, until he decided she was staying to Mountain Vista Hospital, and she checked her in, and she was diagnosed within hours, I won't even say hours, I would say an hour, of stage 4 ovarian cancer, where it has just spread.

Not saying that $I$ don't know why or what decisions were made in the office to say we don't need to look further at this, but $I$ took issue with it, $I$ have problems with it, nobody would ever -after they did her surgery to remove the mass, she never woke up.

MR. MC BRIDE: Not to interrupt you, but this is very recently you said?

JUROR ALBRIGHT: In July.
MR. MC BRIDE: In July.
So your mother passed away in July?
JUROR ALBRIGHT: In July.
MR. MC BRIDE: I appreciate your honesty and telling us about that.

That is why it's very important, just like I asked Miss Brown those questions in terms of her ability to sit here and listen to the evidence in this case and be able to be fair and impartial to everyone, including my clients, who are my client Dr. Lasry, as well as Nurse Practitioner Bartmus.

Would you agree given the fact this was just recent in time, and resulted in the loss of your mother, your feelings about this, that again this is probably not the right type of case for you to be sitting on?

JUROR ALBRIGHT: I probably would agree with it.

But I will say that $I$ had another instance, my son, he had an issue and had to be -- he had to have emergency surgery.

Then we ended up at actually the campus
your speaking of, and they did a fabulous job, I mean I couldn't have asked for a better response, better doctors, better -- just better care for my baby.

He's 25, but you know $I$ care for my kid. MR. MC BRIDE: And that's very great to hear, but you agree with me that happened a lot farther away, years ago, right? JUROR ALBRIGHT: No. MR. MC BRIDE: Relatively recently? JUROR ALBRIGHT: His emergency surgery was probably about not even two months ago.

MR. MC BRIDE: You had both experiences, negative experiences, as well as the positive ones? JUROR ALBRIGHT: Right.

MR. MC BRIDE: And that's why it's just important for us to know the loss of your mother, and what you just related to us sounds like that was a pretty emotional event and involved a lot of concerns you had about the providers that were treating her. JUROR ALBRIGHT: You're right, those are those providers.

I can't hold this individual over here accountable for what this one over here didn't do, so everybody is an individual, and what their capabilities are is their capabilities, and not
somebody else's.
They weren't standing next to them when they gave that diagnosis.

MR. MC BRIDE: And let me ask you the question, if you were someone like Dr. Lasry or Nurse Practitioner Bartmus, would you want someone with your same mindset sitting on a jury if you were them?

All given what you just related, those experiences?

JUROR ALBRIGHT: I think $I$ would be fair and impartial.

I don't see those doctors that misdiagnosed my mother, or missed her diagnosis several times over, I don't see those doctors sitting down there, I see them as individuals, and what their capabilities are.

MR. MC BRIDE: Fair enough.
That is all we're asking, and you are willing, and Mr. Abaca, you are also willing, to sit and listen to all the evidence in this case, as is presented before you make a decision?

JUROR ABACA: Yes.
MR. MC BRIDE: Is it something you think you can make -- the Plaintiff's, since they have the burden of proof in this case, prove that case and
every element of their case before you even consider an award of damages is appropriate?

JUROR ABACA: Yes.

MR. MC BRIDE: In this particular case is there any other questions I asked yesterday you happened to be paying attention to any of them, was there any of those questions that raised something in your mind that you feel you need to say today?

JUROR ABACA: No.
MR. MC BRIDE: Anything we should know, all of us collectively, as about you, or something that you in your background you think is important for us to know?

JUROR ABACA: Yes.
I'm very stressed out right now, understanding I'm supposed to be here.

It's my first time, I thought it was going to be a one-day thing.

I have a three year old son, and because I do construction work, $I$ don't get on the job, $I$ don't get paid, so no way to pay rent, and I'm very stressed out, and I'm really sorry.

MR. MC BRIDE: There is nothing to apologize about.

You think given that you're stressed out
about that, obviously it is weighing on you, that that is going to potentially interfere with your ability to listen to the evidence and that this case goes until next Friday?

JUROR ABACA: I'm going to be honest with you, $I$ don't want to be here at all.

I just want to be released.
MR. MC BRIDE: Again, if you were someone -- I apologize for asking this question, but do you think you could set aside these sort of feelings, the stress you're experiencing right now, and be able to listen to the evidence and view it impartially, or be so upset you think by the fact you're sitting here that you might not pay attention?

JUROR ABACA: I'm paying attention, just stressed out.

That's all $I$ can say.
THE COURT: Can I remind Mr. Abaca, are you currently on work job now?

JUROR ABACA: I work.

THE COURT: So --
JUROR ABACA: I actually was supposed to
start a job yesterday.
Like I said, I thought it was going to be a one-day thing, so the fact I'm here still is
stressing me out.
THE COURT: I understand that.
I'm trying to remind you of a couple
things, see if it makes any difference.
So you are not out looking for work, you have the work waiting for you to go do it, correct?

JUROR ABACA: Yeah, whoever comes on the job first.

THE COURT: Tomorrow and Friday we're essentially here full days, but next week we're only here half days, 1:30 to 5.

Can you talk to your relative and work the schedule around that, so you can still work?

JUROR ABACA: It's not going to make a difference. It's the first one on the job, and the next job whoever is on that job.

THE COURT: So I want to make sure I'm understanding you clearly, that even though our schedule is relatively how much time you sit here in the courtroom, you see no possibility of engaging in any work between now and next Friday, is that what you're telling me?

JUROR ABACA: No work at all, that's why I'm stressed.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. MC BRIDE: Thank you.

THE COURT: Mr. Weaver.

MR. WEAVER: Thank you.

Good afternoon.

I'll be super brief.

Miss Albright, and Miss Blake, and Mr.

Abaca, have any of the questions --

THE COURT: Mr. Weaver, I want to make sure there's no confusion.

It's Miss Albright, Miss Brown, and Mr.

Abaca.

MR. WEAVER: Thank you, Your Honor.
The questions that $I$ asked about Nurse Practitioner Bartmus, do any of you have any responses or concerns or anything that contributes to any of the questions that was specific to Nurse Practitioner Bartmus, specifically having to do with whether you have any concerns about a nurse practitioner diagnosing, treating, doing orders in the emergency department, as opposed to a physician, any concerns about that?

JUROR ALBRIGHT: No.

MR. WEAVER: Thank you, Miss Albright.

Mr. Abaca.

JUROR ABACA: No feelings at all.

MR. WEAVER: Miss Brown?

JUROR M. BROWN: No.

MR. WEAVER: And I assume, Miss Brown, that since you said that you are not a fan of doctors, would the same be true with regard to nurse practitioners?

JUROR BROWN: I have a nurse practitioner and as my doctor.

MR. WEAVER: But it sounds like your concerned with the health care providers in general, is that fair?

JUROR M. BROWN: Yes.

MR. WEAVER: Miss Albright, just for clarification, 699, given that you expressed concern about what happened with your mother, and $I$ think you said repeatedly a misdiagnosis, if hypothetically there were issues in this matter that had to do with allegations of misdiagnosis, are you worried, or do you think that that may cause emotions or issues of concern that given how recent it was just in July having to do with your mother?

JUROR ALBRIGHT: You don't know when your emotions is going to flare up from day to day.

I can hear a song on the radio and get in my heart and absolutely boo-hoo, go from one extreme
to the other, and sit there and laugh.
So hearing something, this is not my mom's case, this is not her issue, this is something totally separate, and does not have anything to do with me per se.

So I will hear it, and hopefully $I$ wouldn't have issues, but you never know from day to day.

MR. WEAVER: That is just what I'm asking you about.

It sounds like even though you are trying to be fair and impartial, given this doesn't have to do with your mother, it has to do with someone else, it sounds like it would be fair to say that you would have some concern about whether if any of the issues were the same in terms of concerns that you had about your mother's care, you don't know that you might not have emotional reactions because of what happened with your mother, is that fair?

JUROR ALBRIGHT: Well, it's fair, yeah, that's fair.

I just, like $I$ said, $I$ don't see the doctors that took care of my mom.

I don't see the doctors took great care of my son.

I see the people who are there, and
whatever their abilities are, those are their abilities.

Everybody's not the same.
Just like the lawyers sitting next to -- at the table, so everybody's abilities are different, and whatever they brought to the table that day is what they brought to the table that day, has nothing to do with what happened with my mother in July, has nothing to do with my son and 18 months ago.

MR. WEAVER: Thank you, Miss Albright.
One last clarification, did you say your mother was taken to Mountain View Hospital?

JUROR ALBRIGHT: Yes.

MR. WEAVER: And the diagnosis was made within an hour, give or take?

JUROR ALBRIGHT: Yes.
MR. WEAVER: Was she admitted through the emergency department?

JUROR ALBRIGHT: She was admitted through the emergency department.

THE COURT: Okay.
Thank you.
Any further questions?
I'll see counsel at the bench, please.
(Thereupon, a discussion was had between Court and counsel at sidebar.)

THE COURT: At this time we have two additional excusals from the panel.

We're going to excuse juror number 694, Mr.
Abaca, and Juror Number 714 , Miss Brown.

You are excused.
Please see the marshall on your way out to
turn your badges in.
I'll ask my clerk to call next in line to
fill seat number 3 in the back row.
THE CLERK: 730, Joey Polk.
THE COURT: The front row seat.

THE CLERK: 731, Jose Cordova.
THE COURT: Let's start with you and get to know you a little better.

Answer the questions on the board.
JUROR POLK: 730.
My husband is a manager at the Golden
Nugget.
We have five children together. None of them are old enough to work.

I lived in Las Vegas 28 years.
I've been a juror before on a civil case
and was the foreperson.

And a verdict was reached.

MR. MC BRIDE: How long ago was that.

JUROR POLK: 2008 .

THE COURT: How was that experience for
you?

JUROR POLK: It was a good time.

THE COURT: I appreciate you being back for service this time.

And I would like to know the two questions
coming next, any connection between you, a close
friend, family member to the medical profession?

JUROR POLK: No.

THE COURT: How about any experiences with
the medical profession?

JUROR POLK: No.

THE COURT: Turning to Mr. Cordova.

JUROR CORDOVA: I'm a control supervisor.

THE COURT: Where do you work?

JUROR CORDOVA: For Boyd Corporation,
downtown.

I went to high school, graduated.

I'm divorced.

I have two kids.

One is growing up.

One is in New Mexico.

The other one lives here. He's a chef in a restaurant down on The Strip.

I've been here 34 years.
THE COURT: Jury service?
JUROR CORDOVA: I've been through this, but didn't get this far.

THE COURT: That's the last question there, jury service.

Why are you nervous, sir?
JUROR CORDOVA: I don't know.
THE COURT: You understand once we get to the final qualifications, ultimately only 10 will serve, and again at that point -- I mean, I could say it's a passive role, it's not entirely passive, you have to be engaged, listening, receiving the evidence, and ultimately deliberating, but you won't be participating back and forth like this then. Is that okay with you? JUROR CORDOVA: Yes.

THE COURT: How about you, as far as yourself, family member, close friends in the medical profession?

JUROR CORDOVA: No.
THE COURT: How about any interactions with any kind of medical malpractice experience?

JUROR CORDOVA: I had an experience with a nephew.

THE COURT: Okay.
And was that recent?
JUROR CORDOVA: About 10,12 years ago.
THE COURT: When you say, experience, I've asked the question more specifically about medical malpractice, like litigation. Was he involved in litigation?

JUROR CORDOVA: He died.
They ended up taking him to Kingman in the ER, and they found him nine days later behind the hospital somewhere.

THE COURT: You said this occurred in Kingman?

JUROR CORDOVA: Yes.
THE COURT: Did the family ever pursue any kind of litigation?

JUROR CORDOVA: My sister did.
THE COURT: And that was in Kingman related to like what the hospital did?

JUROR CORDOVA: The hospital and police for negligence.

THE COURT: And how directly involved were you with with that circumstance?

JUROR CORDOVA: I am the one went and
looked for him, and when they told me he was missing, and $I$ didn't find him.

THE COURT: Like Miss Albright back there, she was having your questions, kind of had some experience on both sides, maybe you had some good experiences with doctors and hospitals, or not, I don't know, but $I$ guess the question is, will you be able to look out on the evidence, the witnesses, the parties, the case as its own separate thing?

JUROR CORDOVA: I shouldn't have a problem with that.

THE COURT: You will be able to be fair and impartial, deliberate with your fellow jurors?

JUROR CORDOVA: Concerning myself, I have had my hips replaced, so --

THE COURT: Thank you, sir.
Mr. Hymanson, any questions of those two new panelists?

MR. J. HYMANSON: Thank you, Your Honor.

Good afternoon, Miss Polk and Mr. Cordova.
So you heard all of this.
You have any feelings about personal responsibility, any positive, negative feeling about lawsuits?

JUROR POLK: No.
MR. J. HYMANSON: Any problems that the case is about money?

JUROR POLK: No.
MR. J. HYMANSON: Anything else you really
think we should know that in everything we've been talking about will affect your ability to serve as fair and impartial jurors on this particular case?

Miss Polk?
JUROR POLK: No.

MR. J. HYMANSON: And, Mr. Cordova, the same thing, anything?

JUROR CORDOVA: No.
MR. J. HYMANSON: I'll ask you a couple
follow-ups.
Miss Polk, you said you were a foreperson
on a jury before?
JUROR POLK: It was a good time.
MR. J. HYMANSON: What do you mean by, it
was a good time?
JUROR POLK: I have a Bachelor's Degree in
criminal justice, so $I$ was just out of college.
MR. J. HYMANSON: And you got to apply your
knowledge of that?
JUROR POLK: Yes.

MR. J. HYMANSON: Mr. Cordova, I'm very
sorry to hear about your nephew, and thank you for sharing that, $I$ know it's tough to say that in front of everyone else.

You understand that the facts of this case are different than what happened with your nephew, correct?

JUROR CORDOVA: Yes.

MR. J. HYMANSON: And you think given the facts of this case will be different than what happened to your nephew, you think you will be able to just look at the facts and evidence presented to you in this Court, and make a fair and impartial decision?

JUROR CORDOVA: Yes.

MR. J. HYMANSON: Ladies and gentlemen, I have no further questions.

THE COURT: Mr. McBride.

MR. MC BRIDE: Thank you, Your Honor.

I'll try to be brief.

Miss Polk and Mr. Cordova -- Miss Polk, the experience as a juror, you were able to apply your experience in your background in criminal justice.

You said it was a civil case, right?

JUROR POLK: Yes.

MR. MC BRIDE: What was it that you felt you were able to apply to that civil case?

MR. MC BRIDE: This was ten years ago, so please don't take offense, but they didn't really explain the process as well as possible, so $I$ was one of the few people could help explain it, so a lot of people on the jury didn't understand what it was they were supposed to do.

MR. MC BRIDE: And you understood because you were presented with instructions from the Judge at the conclusion of the case before you actually won't back, that told you what the law is, and what you were supposed to consider, is that right?

JUROR POLK: Yes.

MR. MC BRIDE: So as the foreperson, did you help explain that process to other jurors? JUROR POLK: Yes. MR. MC BRIDE: And a case like -- again, this is a case you know nothing about the facts and circumstances, other than the little tidbits you may have heard.
Anything -- This occurred in an emergency
room.

Anything about any personal experiences you may have may impact your ability to be other than
fair and impartial in this case?
JUROR POLK: No.
MR. MC BRIDE: This is a case of the Plaintiff's are going to be asking for money at the conclusion of, and same question $I$ would ask, but in a different light, if the evidence suggested at the conclusion of it all that Plaintiff's are not entitled to any damages, if the jury finds the Defendants didn't do anything wrong, are you able to turn the Plaintiffs away and award zero dollars to them?

JUROR POLK: Yes.
MR. MC BRIDE: You have any problem with that?

JUROR POLK: No.
MR. MC BRIDE: You understand sympathy is not going to enter into any of the decision making? JUROR POLK: Yes.

MR. MC BRIDE: Okay.
Mr. Cordova, again I'm sorry for your experience, personal experience, and $I$ want to make sure, it sounds like you are able to separate the facts in what happened to your nephew in that case from anything that you haven't even heard the facts of, right?

JUROR CORDOVA: Right.
MR. MC BRIDE: Do you have any strong opinions one way or another about the medical care here in Las Vegas?

JUROR CORDOVA: No.
MR. MC BRIDE: Do you have a doctor who you regularly treat with for any reason?

JUROR CORDOVA: Dr. Manning was one the one did my hips, did both surgeries on both hips within a year, so it was great, everything turned out good.

MR. MC BRIDE: What hospital did that take place?

JUROR CORDOVA: Mountain Vista.
MR. MC BRIDE: And you heard me talk about the fact this is a case that you would decide on the facts and evidence.

Do you think you're able to do that in this particular case?

JUROR CORDOVA: I should be able to.
MR. MC BRIDE: Are you willing to wait until the Plaintiffs have put on their case and before making any certain judgment allow the Defense to put on their case?

JUROR CORDOVA: Yeah.

MR. MC BRIDE: Again, one last thing, if
you were someone like Dr. Lasry, would you want someone with your same mindset, given your prior experience, would you want someone where your same mindset sitting on a jury in judgment of him or his character?

JUROR CORDOVA: I wouldn't judge him because $I$ don't know the whole thing, don't know what went down or whatever, but I'd be fair as much as I could, if the evidence was provided.

MR. MC BRIDE: That's all we can ask.
Again, we're just asking for you to be fair and impartial.

You think you can do that, and you think also that if the facts in this particular case don't support an award of damages to the Plaintiff, would you be okay turning the Moores away, not awarding them any money?

JUROR CORDOVA: If that's what would be the facts and all that comes out, that's fair.

MR. MC BRIDE: Okay.
Anything from either one of you on anything I should know about either one of you, or anything in your background based on any of the questions you heard today might be important for any of us to know?

Thank you very much.

THE COURT: Mr. Weaver.

MR. WEAVER: Thank you, Your Honor.

Good afternoon, Miss Polk.

Is there any answer that you would give me as pertains to Miss Bartmus -- or Nurse Practitioner Bartmus that is different than what you gave Mr.

McBride about Dr. Lasry?

JUROR POLK: No.

MR. WEAVER: Mr. Cordova, any answer would you give me as pertains to Nurse Practitioner Bartmus would be different than the answers that you gave to Mr. McBride as pertains to Dr. Lasry, if I were asking you the same question?

JUROR CORDOVA: No, I wouldn't.

MR. WEAVER: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right.

Thank you.

Counsel, please.
(Thereupon, a discussion was had between

Court and counsel at sidebar.)

THE COURT: All right.

Ladies and gentlemen, at this time $I$ can inform the panel we have qualified 20 jurors to possibly serve at this trial.

Those are the 20 here in the box.

The five of you back there, I saw you were getting ready, $I$ don't know if that was engaging in any specific prayer or hopefulness one way or the other, but at this time the remaining five of you are excused.

Thank you for your service.

Please see the marshal on the way out.

I think we had a voucher for you.

They served three days, do they not
vouchers?

THE MARSHAL: Yes.

I already explained it to them.

THE COURT: Thank you for your service.

THE COURT: What we're going to do now is, complete the final portion of the process, ladies and gentlemen.

I'm going to have some instructions I'm going to read to you that will give you some basic information about this trial.

We will begin with the opening statements tomorrow, and the jurors will return at 9:30.

I originally thought we were going to start
at 9, but $I$ forgot there was one other unrelated

Court matter $I$ need to handle and resolve in the morning at 9, so we'll move that quickly, expect to
start with you at 9:30.
Just like every other day, come here, be out front waiting to go.

Things that will change, the marshal can explain, answer any questions you might have.

So you will now be provided parking, so you won't be on your own for parking, that is one benefit, and because it's a full day tomorrow and Friday you will be on your own for lunch, but we'll give you a lunch break for those remaining with us.

For the 10 don't remain, we're very appreciative of your service.

I want to, like I said, $I$ have some basic information that we provide now, so that you kind of understand the playing field.

To the extent some of the stuff has come up in the time that we have been through this voir dire process, again there's some redundancies, and I apologize for that.

Forgive me again for reading. I just want to make sure we get through it quickly.

I have this script, so the reporter does not have to write this down, $I$ can provide that to the reporter.

> So I'm going to do it as quickly as
possible, so you all have this information, and then of course the final instructions, inclusive of some of these will come at the end of the trial, but I'll do them now, since we have a little bit of time for this final selection process.
(The Judge read the pre-trial information to the jurors.)

THE COURT: I'm just looking at the final list, and when $I$ 'm certain we have a final panel of 10, I'm going to ask my Court clerk to read the names.

I want to review it.
Any motions to be made by either counsel at this time?

MR. MC BRIDE: No, Your Honor.
MR. ARNTZ: No, Your Honor.
THE COURT: At this time $I$ believe we do have the final panel of 10 .

I'll give it to my clerk, she will read your name and the seat you have.

If you hear your name read, you are one of the 10 staying with us.

If you do not hear your name read, please keep seated until all 10 names are read, so people aren't getting up leaving causing a disruption.

Once all 10 are named, $I$ will excuse the rest of the panel, and thank you now on behalf of counsel and myself for your service.

THE CLERK: Seat number, 1 Sabrena Clinton.
Seat number 2, Marcel Brown.
Number 3, Ryan Burk.
Number 4, Lynevieve Sallee.
Number 5, Katrina Johnson.
Number 6, Timothy Fyfe.
Number 7, Theresa Blake.

Number 8, Rebecca Price.
Number 9, Terry brown.
Number 10, Michael Newman.
THE COURT: All right.
If you did not hear your name read at this
time, you are excused.
Thank you for your service.
(Remaining jurors excused from the
courtroom.)
THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, when you come back in tomorrow, we'll have your seats.

You will be seated more central in the jury box.

You will have your note pads and pens.
You will have your new badge.

I do expect to start promptly at 9:30.
If there's any slight delay, please stand by because sometimes things beyond our control need to be addressed with the jurors not present.

We promise you, if you are not in here, we are working in here, not wasting time.

We like to run a tight ship, keep the trial on track.

We do believe we are on track to finish this.

All we ask again is that you return
tomorrow with your open mind and your juror hat on and ready to serve.

If you have any questions at all as you leave here, the marshal will take you outside, and he can answer the questions.

But you will be given parking instructions.
And see you back here tomorrow for a 9:30 start.

Thank you all.
Have a good night.
(Jury excused from the courtroom.)
(Thereupon, the following proceedings were had out of the presence of the jury.):

THE COURT: I think we have a very good panel.

I really do anticipate -- I have one attorney going to be here tomorrow is very long-winded, $I$ won't say which one it is, but I'll do everything in my power to keep it tight, and if you see we're still arguing, I'll try to get you in and set up right at 9:30 to get going.

We'll take the lunch break because we're having the dailies.

Depending when we do take lunch break, we need to resume no earlier than $1: 30$, so I'm trying to take that somewhere between 12 and 1:30, but we'll see you all tomorrow.

Anything we need to address before we leave?

MR. MC BRIDE: We were going to ask to confirm on the record who you anticipate calling as your witnesses tomorrow.

MR. ARNTZ: I anticipate calling Miss
Bartmus first, and Dr. Lasry second, and then
depending on what time is left we may call
Christopher, the son.

THE COURT: How long do you think your opening might be?

MR. MC BRIDE: We talked about that.
We're going to try make it around 45
minutes $I$ think each, it may go 45 minutes to an hour hopefully.

THE COURT: We might break for lunch then, and whenever we break keep in mind I'm not bringing anybody back before 1:30 because of the dailies and time frame, and how the schedule works I need that last reporter to be here for $1: 30$ to 5, so if we can get it up to noonish, if we take a little longer lunch, I don't have a problem, I don't want to lose any time in the trial.

MR. MC BRIDE: Right.
MR. ARNTZ: So we're looking at possibly two-and-a-half hours.

THE COURT: Yes.
So two-and-a-half hours, so a start at 9:30 puts us right at 12.

If we go into the 12:00 hour, we can start a little later than 1:30, it just can't start before.

Have a good night.
(Proceedings concluded.)
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