CASE NO. 82271 IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

ARLEO EARL DAVIS

PETITIONER,

VS.

Electronically Filed Jan 04 2021 02:07 p.m. Elizabeth A. Brown Clerk of Supreme Court

THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA, IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF CLARK, AND THE HONORABLE MICHAEL VILLANI, DISTRICT JUDGE,

RESPONDENT,

AND

STATE OF NEVADA,

REAL PARTY IN INTEREST.

PETITIONER'S APPENDIX

PETITION FROM THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT, CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA DISTRICT COURT CASE NO. C-20-346920-3
THE HONORABLE MICHAEL VILLANI

Joshua Tomsheck, Esq. HOFLAND & TOMSHECK 228 South 4th Street, 1st Floor Las Vegas, Nevada 89101 702-895-6760 Attorney for Petitioner

INDEX

Document	Pages
G 11 E 12 2020	000001 000055
Grand Jury Transcripts, February 13, 2020	000001 - 000055
Superseding Indictment Transcripts,	000056 - 000092
March 19, 2020	
Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus	000093 - 000117
State's Return to Writ of Habeas Corpus	000118 - 000140
Order Denying Defendant's Pre-Trial	000141 - 000144
Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus	

Electronically Filed 2/17/2020 4:39 PM

00:00:59	1	EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRI	CT COURT	Steven D. Grierson CLERK OF THE COURT
	2	CLARK COUNTY, NEV	'ADA	Atumb. Line
	3	·		
	4	BEFORE THE GRAND JURY IMPANELED	BY THE AFORE	SAID
00:00:59	5	DISTRICT COURT	1	
	6			
	7	THE STATE OF NEVADA,)	
	8	Plaintiff,)	
	9	vs.) GJ Case No.	19CGJ007A-B
00:00:59	10	JECORY ELES KEMP, aka Jecory Kemp) DC Case No.	C346920
	11	TYESHIA EVAN JAMES,)	
	12	Defendants.) _)	
	13			
	14	Taken at Las Vegas,	Nevada	
00:00:59	15	Thursday, February 1	3, 2020	
	16	8:25 a.m.		
	17			
	18			
	19			
00:00:59	20	REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF	PROCEEDINGS	
	21			
	22			
	23			
	24			
00:00:59	25	Reported by: Donna J. McCord, C.C.R	R. No. 337	

00:00:59	1	GRAND JURORS PRESENT ON FEBRUARY 13, 2020:
	2	
	3	KENNETH DICKINSON, Foreperson,
	4	JANSSEN REMBERT, Deputy Foreperson
00:00:59	5	DENISE WALLACE, Secretary
	6	WENDY MOORE, Assistant Secretary
	7	GULLIVER FLYNN
	8	BELINDA MILLER
	9	EMMETT MORGAN
00:00:00	10	ANEDA MURRAY
	11	JOHN PLUNKETT
	12	VIRGIL RAYOS
	13	JESSIE SAULSON
	14	SCOTT STEVENSON
00:00:00	15	DEBORAH TILLEMA
	16	VATCHARA VICHAIKUL
	17	GLORIA WYETH
	18	
	19	
00:00:00	20	
	21	Also present at the request of the Grand Jury:
	22	Jory Scarborough Deputy District Attorney
	23	Pamela Weckerly Chief Deputy District Attorney
	24	onici bepacy biodited necotiney
00:00:00	25	

00:00:00	1		INDEX OF WITNESSES	
	2			EXAMINED
	3	ARTURO ALVARADO		8
	4	MITCHELL DOSCH		21
00:00:00	5			
	6			
	7			
	8			
	9			
00:00:00	10			
	11			
	12			
	13			
	14			
00:00:00	15			
	16			
	17			
	18			
	19			
00:00:00	20			
	21			
	22			
	23			
	24			
00:00:01	25			

00:00:01	1	INDEX OF EXHIBITS		
	2			
	3	GRAND JURY EXHIBITS	IDENTIFIED	
	4	EXHIBIT 1 - PROPOSED INDICTMENT	5	
00:00:01	5	EXHIBIT 2 - INSTRUCTIONS EXHIBIT 3 - PHOTOGRAPH	6 31	
	6	EXHIBIT 4 - PHOTOGRAPH EXHIBIT 5 - PHOTOGRAPH	31 24	
	7	EXHIBIT 6 - PHOTOGRAPH EXHIBIT 7 - PHOTOGRAPH	23 23	
	8	EXHIBIT 8 - PHOTOGRAPH EXHIBIT 9 - PHOTOGRAPH	23 23	
	9	EXHIBIT 10 - PHOTOGRAPH EXHIBIT 11 - PHOTOGRAPH	23 23	
00:00:01	10	EXHIBIT 12 - PHOTOGRAPH EXHIBIT 13 - PHOTOGRAPH	23 23	
	11	EXHIBIT 14 - PHOTOGRAPH EXHIBIT 15 - PHOTOGRAPH	23 23	
	12	EXHIBIT 16 - PHOTOGRAPH EXHIBIT 17 - PHOTOGRAPH	28 28	
	13	EXHIBIT 18 - PHOTOGRAPH EXHIBIT 19 - PHOTOGRAPH	28 28	
	14	EXHIBIT 20 - PHOTOGRAPH EXHIBIT 21 - PHOTOGRAPH	10 10	
00:00:01	15	EXHIBIT 21 PHOTOGRAPH EXHIBIT 23 - PHOTOGRAPH	10 10 10	
00:00:01	16	EXHIBIT 24 - PHOTOGRAPH	10	
	17	EXHIBIT 25 - PHOTOGRAPH EXHIBIT 26 - PHOTOGRAPH	10 10	
		EXHIBIT 27 - PHOTOGRAPH EXHIBIT 28 - PHOTOGRAPH	10 10	
	18	EXHIBIT 29 - PHOTOGRAPH EXHIBIT 30 - PHOTOGRAPH	42 42	
00 00 01	19			
00:00:01	20			
	21			
	22			
	23			
	24			
00:00:01	25			

00:00:02	1	LAS VEGAS, NEVADA, FEBRUARY 13, 2020
	2	* * * * * *
	3	
	4	DONNA J. McCORD,
00:00:02	5	having been first duly sworn to faithfully
	6	and accurately transcribe the following
	7	proceedings to the best of her ability.
	8	
	9	THE FOREPERSON: Let the record reflect
00:00:02	10	that I have canvassed the waiting area and no one has
	11	appeared in response to Notice of Intent to Seek
	12	Indictment.
	13	MR. SCARBOROUGH: Good morning, ladies and
	14	gentlemen.
08:25:28	15	A JUROR: Good morning.
	16	A JUROR: Good morning.
	17	MR. SCARBOROUGH: My name is Deputy
	18	District Attorney Jory Scarborough. I'm presenting the
	19	case of 19CGJ007A and B, the State of Nevada versus
08:25:38	20	Jecory Eles Kemp and Tyeshia Evan James. In the
	21	Indictment Jecory Kemp and Tyeshia James are charged
	22	with conspiracy to commit robbery, murder with use of a
	23	deadly weapon under the premeditation theory and the
	24	felony murder theory, first degree kidnapping with use
08:25:55	25	of a deadly weapon resulting in substantial bodily harm

and robbery with use of a deadly weapon. May the record 1 08:25:58 2 reflect that all members of the Grand Jury have a copy 3 of this indictment. Noting all nods in affirmance. For the record I've also marked as I 4 5 believe Exhibit 2 are my instructions to the elements of 08:26:11 6 the offense. Included in the instructions are all of 7 the instructions for conspiracy, what robbery means, 8 murder, what a deadly weapon is, the different theories 9 of murder, what kidnapping is, what robbery with a 10 deadly weapon is and also case law instructions that 08:26:29 11 I'll refer to as the Mendoza instructions. I'm talking 12 about a robbery in relation to a kidnapping. 13 Also, there are case law instructions 14 included in the packet that I will refer to as the 15 Bruton case law. The Bruton case law delineates that 08:26:44 16 when a statement is introduced of one defendant, you can 17 only use the information learned from that statement 18 against that defendant, meaning you can't use 19 information one defendant says against another. 20 would violate constitutional rights of the other 08:27:03 21 defendant and that is subsequent to the Bruton case law. 22 I will remind you of that when we get into the 23 statements of Mr. Kemp and Miss James when we begin. 24 Noting that, are there any preliminary 25 questions as to the elements of the offenses that I have 08:27:19

08:27:22	1	briefly discussed now? No questions at this point.
	2	With that, ladies and gentlemen, I will begin my
	3	presentation.
	4	What you're going to do is stand here,
08:27:55	5	that's the guy that's going to swear you in, raise your
	6	hand and then sit down.
	7	THE FOREPERSON: You do solemnly swear that
	8	the testimony that you're about to give upon the
	9	investigation now pending before this Grand Jury shall
08:28:00	10	be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the
	11	truth, so help you God?
	12	THE WITNESS: I do.
	13	THE FOREPERSON: Thank you. Please be
	14	seated.
08:28:13	15	You're advised that you are here today to
	16	give testimony in the investigation pertaining to the
	17	offenses of conspiracy to commit robbery, murder with
	18	use of a deadly weapon, first degree kidnapping with use
	19	of a deadly weapon resulting in substantial bodily harm
08:28:27	20	and robbery with use of a deadly weapon involving Jecory
	21	Eles Kemp and Tyeshia Evan James.
	22	Do you understand this advisement?
	23	THE WITNESS: I do, sir.
	24	THE FOREPERSON: Thank you. Please state
08:28:38	25	your first and last name and spell both for the record.

08:28:41	1	THE WITNESS: First name Arturo,
	2	A-R-T-U-R-O, last Alvarado, A-L-V, as in Victor,
	3	A-R-A-D-O.
	4	ARTURO ALVARADO,
08:28:48	5	having been first duly sworn by the Foreperson of the
	6	Grand Jury to testify to the truth, the whole truth
	7	and nothing but the truth, testified as follows:
	8	
	9	<u>EXAMINATION</u>
08:28:50	10	BY MR. SCARBOROUGH:
	11	Q Mr. Alvarado, how are you currently
	12	employed?
	13	A I'm currently a detective for the San
	14	Bernardino County Sheriff's Department located in
08:28:58	15	California.
	16	Q Are you a part of any particular division
	17	as a detective in that San Bernardino department?
	18	A I am. I'm part of the specialized
	19	investigation division, specifically the homicide
08:29:07	20	division.
	21	Q In the course of your — how long have you
	22	been employed in that capacity as a homicide detective?
	23	A As a homicide detective three years now.
	24	Q During the course of your tenure as a
08:29:17	25	homicide detective, is it safe to say that you've

08:29:20	Т	responded to many scenes that include a potentially
	2	violent homicide?
	3	A Many.
	4	Q Would some of those scenes, or a vast
08:29:28	5	majority of those scenes include the use of a potential
	6	firearm?
	7	A Yes.
	8	Q And have you had occasion amongst your just
	9	tenure as a police officer in general and as a homicide
08:29:38	10	detective to respond to scenes where there's a fire
	11	component?
	12	A Yes, on both occasions.
	13	Q Okay. And in your training and experience
	14	you seen many scenes where there would be a fire
08:29:50	15	component?
	16	A Yes.
	17	(Miss Weckerly entered the Grand Jury room.)
	18	Q So I want to direct your attention to
	19	December 30th and December 31st of last year. Did you
08:29:58	20	have occasion to be called out to a scene of an alleged
	21	homicide?
	22	A Yes, I was.
	23	Q Okay. And where was that scene?
	24	A It was an area off the 15 freeway between
08:30:10	25	Baker and Barstow.

08:30:12	1	Q Okay. And what was the nature of the call
	2	when you responded?
	3	A It was a death investigation, a vehicle on
	4	fire and a victim that was deceased that had been on
08:30:28	5	fire.
	6	Q Okay. So as a homicide detective are you
	7	on call, like on a rotational basis to where scenes get
	8	called in and then you get called out to respond?
	9	A Yes.
08:30:39	10	Q And is that what happened in this case?
	11	A Yes, I was the on-call team for that week.
	12	Q Okay. So when you responded to the scene,
	13	walk the members of the Grand Jury just through the
	14	basics of the scene as you responded to it.
08:30:53	15	A Okay. So the I-15 freeway, it's a main
	16	U.S. highway. It connects Southern California with Las
	17	Vegas. So for me I was coming from the south side so we
	18	traveled north on the 15 and the exit's Field Road. If
	19	you exit there's nothing there other than just desert.
08:31:15	20	The area of the location was on the west side of the
	21	freeway in a dirt open area.
	22	Q Okay. So as I approach you I'm going to
	23	hand you a stack of photographs. I'm handing you Grand
	24	Jury proposed 20 through 28. If you could briefly flip
08:31:32	25	through all those photographs, please, and look up at me

08:31:35	1	when you're done.	
	2	A Done, sir.	
	3	Q So do you recognize what's depicted in that	
	4	series of photos of Grand Jury Exhibits 20 through 28?	
08:32:05	5	A Yes, I do.	
	6	Q And how do you recognize those photographs?	
	7	A It was the crime scene that our division	
	8	responded to of the incident.	
	9	Q Now, when you responded to the scene did	
08:32:14	10	you walk all areas of the scene and look at all of the	
	11	relevant pieces of evidence at the scene?	
	12	A Yes.	
	13	Q Okay. And do these pictures, Grand Jury	
	14	Exhibits 20 through 28, fairly and accurately represent	
08:32:26	15	the scene as you saw it on that day when you responded?	
	16	A Yes, it does.	
	17	Q Okay. So publishing for the members of the	
	18	Grand Jury Grand Jury Exhibit Number 20, if we look at	
	19	the T.V. what are we looking at here?	
08:32:39	20	A Right here we are looking at the crime	
	21	scene from an aerial photograph taken from our	
	22	helicopter unit. As you look down that's the I-15 on	
	23	the right-hand side oriented at, if you're looking up	
	24	that's oriented north and the west side of the freeway.	
08:32:58	25	Q So at the top of the freeway, that would be	

08:33:00	1	the northern direction?
	2	A Yes, sir.
	3	Q Okay. And the northern direction heads
	4	where?
08:33:04	5	A Toward Las Vegas.
	6	Q Now, as we go towards the left side of the
	7	photograph, is the area of the investigation or the
	8	scene depicted small but in the left area of the
	9	photograph?
08:33:13	10	A Yes, it is, sir.
	11	Q Okay. Showing you Grand Jury Exhibit
	12	Number 21, what are we looking at there?
	13	A Okay. We're looking at again aerial
	14	photographs. Now we're oriented, up is west and that's
08:33:29	15	our scene as well.
	16	Q So off of the freeway westbound of the
	17	freeway is where our scene is?
	18	A Yes.
	19	Q Okay. And again pointing to the top maybe
08:33:38	20	left of the screen a little bit as I circle with my
	21	hand, is that the scene?
	22	A Yes, that's the vehicle.
	23	Q Okay. Now, when you approached the scene
	24	and looked at the vehicle, did you notice any obvious
08:33:50	25	damage to the vehicle?

08:33:51	Τ	А	Yes, the vehicle was fully burned to the
	2	ground essen	tially.
	3	Q	Okay. And in your training and experience
	4	you had seen	property or any different structures and
08:34:04	5	vehicles whe	n or after they are burned?
	6	А	Yes.
	7	Q	What would lead you to conclude that this
	8	was burned i	n this case?
	9	А	Clearly looking at it you knew it had been
08:34:14	10	burned. The	re was no question. Everything was burned
	11	to a crisp.	
	12	Q	Was the coloring like a charring on all the
	13	metal and ev	erything?
	14	А	It was charred, any rubber was already
08:34:22	15	burned away,	any plastic was burned away. Basically it
	16	was just met	al and —
	17	Q	Okay. Showing you Grand Jury Exhibit
	18	Number 22, w	hat are we looking at there?
	19	А	That is a close-up photograph of the
08:34:32	20	vehicle.	
	21	Q	And was that a Lexus vehicle?
	22	А	You know, at the time it was burned to a
	23	crisp we cou	ldn't even figure out what the vehicle was
	24	but it turne	d out to be a Lexus.
08:34:45	25	Q	Okay. And then showing you Grand Jury

08:34:47	Τ	Exhibit Numbe	er 23, what are we looking at there?
	2	А	We're looking at the passenger side of the
	3	same vehicle	•
	4	Q	Indicating all the burn and charring marks
08:34:55	5	that you had	referred to earlier, correct?
	6	А	Yes, sir.
	7	Q	And that's on the exterior of the vehicle?
	8	А	That's the exterior of the vehicle.
	9	Q	Showing you Grand Jury Exhibit Number 24,
08:35:02	10	just another	angle, right?
	11	А	Yes, and that's the driver side. As you
	12	can see it's	fully burned.
	13	Q	Okay. Now looking towards the interior of
	14	the vehicle,	did you notice obvious damage in the
08:35:15	15	interior?	
	16	А	Yes.
	17	Q	What was that?
	18	А	Everything had burned away, all the
	19	material and	plastic had burned away.
08:35:21	20	Q	Okay. Grand Jury Exhibit Number 25, what
	21	are we lookii	ng at there?
	22	А	That's the picture from the driver's side
	23	door open and	d everything on the inside was consumed by
	24	the fire.	
08:35:33	25	Q	Grand Jury Exhibit Number 26, what are we

08:35:36	Τ	looking at there?	
	2	A That's a close-up picture again of the	
	3	interior of the vehicle fully burned out.	
	4	Q Okay. Now, when you arrived on scene near	
08:35:46	5	the vehicle, did you see what appeared to be a deceased	
	6	body?	
	7	A Yes, I did see a deceased body, yes.	
	8	Q And where was that located in relation to	
	9	the vehicle?	
08:35:56	10	A In relation to the vehicle it was to the	
	11	rear of the trunk area.	
	12	Q And when you arrived was the victim	
	13	breathing?	
	14	A No, the victim was obviously deceased.	
08:36:05	15	Q Okay. Showing Grand Exhibit Number 27,	
	16	it's pretty graphic, what are we looking at there?	
	17	A We're looking at the victim's body which	
	18	was face down. It had more burn toward the legs as	
	19	opposed to the upper body.	
08:36:22	20	Q Now, is it typical for you when you respond	
	21	to a scene, are you going to touch the body and	
	22	manipulate the body?	
	23	A No.	
	24	Q Who would?	
08:36:30	25	A By law, California law, only the coroner's	

08:36:32	1	division is allowed to touch the body.
	2	Q So at this scene you did not touch the
	3	body?
	4	A No.
08:36:39	5	Q Did eventually the coroner respond to the
	6	scene and the body was eventually removed?
	7	A Yes, the coroner division responds and at
	8	that point they do what we call is a body roll.
	9	Q And what is a body roll?
08:36:51	10	A The body roll is when we, whatever position
	11	the body is found we roll it, roll the person to the
	12	other side to assess any injuries or address the victim.
	13	Q So after the coroner responded and there
	14	was a body roll, as you referred to, did you ultimately
08:37:08	15	develop information that led you to contact Las Vegas
	16	homicide detectives?
	17	A We did.
	18	Q Okay. And I'm showing you Grand Jury
	19	Exhibit Number 28. Without getting into what people
08:37:22	20	told you or just basic reading information, what's the
	21	relevance in this photograph?
	22	A The relevance of this photograph, this is a
	23	key card which was around a lanyard around the victim's
	24	neck.
08:37:36	25	Q And let me stop you there. So based on

08:37:39	1	information from the lanyard, is that what led you to
	2	contact Las Vegas homicide detectives?
	3	A It's more of the key card itself rather
	4	than the lanyard and the rest of the investigation that
08:37:53	5	we did that led us to Las Vegas.
	6	Q Just generally again in terms of the rest
	7	of the investigation, did information pertaining to the
	8	actual vehicle involved in this event lead you, along
	9	with this information from the key card, to contact
08:38:07	10	detectives in Las Vegas?
	11	A Yes, a combination of both things.
	12	Q Okay. And so then eventually after you
	13	contacted detectives in Las Vegas did you actually take
	14	part and help assist in the investigation later on in
08:38:19	15	Las Vegas?
	16	A Yes, we worked from the night into the
	17	morning.
	18	Q And did you contact a Detective Mitch
	19	Dosch?
08:38:28	20	A I did.
	21	Q All right. Brief indulgence.
	22	I have no other questions for this witness
	23	if any members of the Grand Jury do. We have one
	24	question.
08:38:37	25	///

00:30:37		DI A UURUR.
	2	Q Detective, based on your knowledge of
	3	burned vehicles or whatever you know about burned
	4	vehicles, did this vehicle look like this fire could
08:38:50	5	have been set just by lighting a match or would there
	6	have had to have been some kind of an accelerant poured
	7	in there as far as you know?
	8	MR. SCARBOROUGH: Go ahead, Detective.
	9	THE WITNESS: I'm not an expert but we had
08:39:02	10	our bombs and arson expert show up who later determined
	11	an accelerant but I wasn't part of that investigation.
	12	BY A JUROR:
	13	Q Okay. But they did determine that an
	14	accelerant was used in that fire?
08:39:16	15	A I was told by the bombs and arson, yes.
	16	MR. SCARBOROUGH: And I just want to
	17	admonish the members of the Grand Jury that the
	18	information that he was told, that is in fact hearsay.
	19	A JUROR: Okay.
08:39:25	20	MR. SCARBOROUGH: And also it would require
	21	some form of expert foundation so you can't consider
	22	that for the truth.
	23	A JUROR: Okay.
	24	MR. SCARBOROUGH: And actually that isn't
08:39:33	25	information he can testify to through his personal

08:39:37	1	knowledge, okay?		
	2	A JUROR: Okay.		
	3	MR. SCARBOROUGH: Thank you. Any other		
	4	questions from the members of the Grand Jury? Noting no		
08:39:41	5	hands.		
	6	Thank you, sir.		
	7	THE FOREPERSON: By law these proceedings		
	8	are secret and you are prohibited from disclosing to		
	9	anyone anything that transpired before us including any		
08:39:43	10	evidence presented to the Grand Jury, any event		
	11	occurring or a statement made in the presence of the		
	12	Grand Jury or any information obtained by the Grand		
	13	Jury.		
	14	Failure to comply with this admonition is a		
08:39:43	15	gross misdemeanor punishable up to 364 days in the Clark		
	16	County Detention Center and a \$2,000 fine. In addition		
	17	you may be held in contempt of court punishable by an		
	18	additional \$500 fine and 25 days in the Clark County		
	19	Detention Center.		
08:39:43	20	Do you understand this admonition?		
	21	THE WITNESS: I do, sir.		
	22	THE FOREPERSON: Thank you. You're		
	23	excused.		
	24	THE WITNESS: Thank you and you have a good		
08:40:20	25	day.		

08:40:21	1	A JUROR: Thank you.
	2	A JUROR: Thank you.
	3	MR. SCARBOROUGH: Thank you, sir.
	4	And for the record, ladies and gentlemen,
08:40:37	5	Chief Deputy District Attorney Pam Weckerly walked in.
	6	She's with me and accompanying me through this
	7	presentation for the record. I will now call my next
	8	witness.
	9	THE FOREPERSON: You do solemnly swear that
08:40:55	10	the testimony that you're about to give upon the
	11	investigation now pending before this Grand Jury shall
	12	be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the
	13	truth, so help you God?
	14	THE WITNESS: I do.
08:41:06	15	THE FOREPERSON: Thank you. Please be
	16	seated.
	17	THE WITNESS: Thank you.
	18	THE FOREPERSON: You're advised you're here
	19	today to give testimony in the investigation pertaining
08:41:12	20	to the offenses of conspiracy to commit robbery, murder
	21	with use of a deadly weapon, first degree kidnapping
	22	with use of a deadly weapon resulting in substantial
	23	bodily harm and robbery with use of a deadly weapon
	24	involving Jecory Eles Kemp and Tyeshia Evan James.
08:41:28	25	Do you understand this advisement?

08:41:31	1	THE WITNESS: Yes, I do.
	2	THE FOREPERSON: Please state your first
	3	and last name and spell both for the record.
	4	THE WITNESS: My name is Mitchell,
08:41:35	5	M-I-T-C-H-E-L-L, Dosch, D-O-S-C-H.
	6	MITCHELL DOSCH,
	7	having been first duly sworn by the Foreperson of the
	8	Grand Jury to testify to the truth, the whole truth
	9	and nothing but the truth, testified as follows:
08:41:41	10	
	11	<u>EXAMINATION</u>
	12	BY MR. SCARBOROUGH:
	13	Q Good morning, Mr. Dosch. How are you
	14	currently employed?
08:41:48	15	A As a detective with the Las Vegas
	16	Metropolitan Police Department currently assigned to the
	17	homicide section.
	18	Q And how long have you been in the homicide
	19	section?
08:41:55	20	A Seven years.
	21	Q In your training and experience is it safe
	22	to say that you've responded and investigated many
	23	scenes involving the use of a possible firearm?
	24	A That's correct.
08:42:06	25	Q Have you also responded to many scenes with

08:42:08	1	a fire or arson component?		
	2	A Yes.		
	3	Q Okay. Now, I want to direct your attention		
	4	to December 30th, 2019. Did you have occasion to become		
08:42:19	5	involved in a homicide investigation alleged to have		
	6	occurred around that time?		
	7	A Not on the 30th. We actually became		
	8	involved as members of the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police		
	9	Department on December 31st through contact from the San		
08:42:31	10	Bernardino County Sheriff's Department.		
	11	Q And just walk the members of the Grand Jury		
	12	through how that came to be, how did you become		
	13	involved?		
	14	A I have a partner, his name is Breck,		
08:42:41	15	B-R-E-C-K, Hodson, H-O-D-S-O-N, and we work as a team.		
	16	On that particular day, again that being December 31st,		
	17	2019, Detective Hodson received contact from the San		
	18	Bernardino County Sheriff's Department homicide section		
	19	requesting information on a death investigation they		
08:43:00	20	were actively investigating.		
	21	Q All right. Ultimately based on that		
	22	contact from San Bernardino, did you become affiliated		
	23	or direct your attention specifically to an address		
	24	located at 6555 Boulder Highway?		
08:43:15	25	A Yes.		

08:43:15	1	Q And specifically was that address 11309?
	2	A Yes, 11309 actually is the building, number
	3	11, and the apartment, 309.
	4	Q What is the significance of that address?
08:43:28	5	A That ended up being the primary crime
	6	scene.
	7	Q So when you were directed to that address
	8	did you ultimately respond to that physical scene?
	9	A Yes, I did.
08:43:38	10	Q When you responded to that physical scene,
	11	what became apparently or abundantly relevant to you as
	12	you walked the exterior of the building leading up to
	13	the apartment?
	14	A Just in context, the 309 apartment, again
08:43:52	15	in building 11, is located on the third floor which is
	16	the top floor of that particular building located in the
	17	northwest corner. To get to apartment 309 you must go
	18	up one of two stairwells, the stairwell that's
	19	immediately outside of apartment 309 and then around
08:44:10	20	that building there was an apparent blood trail that
	21	actually looked like it initiated just outside of
	22	apartment 309, went all the way down to the ground
	23	floor, around the building into the parking lot.
	24	Q Okay. So as I approach I am showing you
08:44:26	25	Grand Jury Exhibits 6 through 15. If you could briefly

08:44:29	1	flip through those, please.		
	2	А	I am familiar with these photos.	
	3	Q	And I'm sorry, Detective, I forgot one	
	4	more. Showin	g you Grand Jury Exhibit 5, does that	
08:44:58	5	photograph lo	ook familiar to you as well?	
	6	A	It does.	
	7	Q	So after looking at Grand Jury Exhibits 5	
	8	through 15, d	lo you recognize what's depicted in those	
	9	photographs?		
08:45:07	10	А	I do.	
	11	Q	And how do you recognize what is depicted	
	12	in them?		
	13	А	Because I've been there and I've had	
	14	experience at	that particular location.	
08:45:14	15	Q	Okay. And do these photographs fairly and	
	16	accurately re	present the scene at the apartment building	
	17	11 and apartm	ent 309 as you saw it when you responded	
	18	that day?		
	19	А	Yes, they do.	
08:45:27	20	Q	Including the exterior portion leading up	
	21	and the stair	well?	
	22	А	Correct.	
	23	Q	And is that location here in Clark County,	
	24	Las Vegas, Ne	vada?	
08:45:33	25	А	It is.	

08:45:35	1	Q Okay. Showing you or the members of the
	2	Grand Jury Grand Jury Exhibit Number 5, just walking
	3	through what are we looking at here?
	4	A That is the number 11 which identifies that
08:45:46	5	particular building as being building 11 within this
	6	complex.
	7	Q Okay. Showing you Grand Jury Exhibit
	8	Number 6, what are we looking at there?
	9	A That's an up-close photograph of the front
08:45:57	10	door to apartment 11309.
	11	Q Showing you Grand Jury Exhibit Number 7,
	12	you had alluded to a blood trail earlier. Is that what
	13	we're looking at here?
	14	A Correct, that appears to be the end
08:46:09	15	location. This is the east parking lot and if you'll
	16	notice to the left in the upper left-hand corner that is
	17	the north end of building 11.
	18	Q Thank you. Showing you Grand Jury Exhibit
	19	Number 8, what are we looking at there?
08:46:24	20	A That's an up-close photograph of that last
	21	photo but looking almost 90 degrees down where at the
	22	end of that parking space it's apparent blood on the
	23	asphalt surface.
	24	Q Okay. Showing you Grand Jury Exhibit
08:46:36	25	Number 9 to give you perspective, is that apparent blood

08:46:41	1	splatter or trail located near like the trunk of the
	2	vehicle that would be located in that parking space?
	3	A Generally speaking, yes, with the idea that
	4	most vehicles park front in.
08:46:51	5	Q Showing you Grand Jury Exhibit Number 11,
	6	what are we looking at here?
	7	A Now, this photograph is the person, we're
	8	standing at the north end of building 11 looking toward
	9	the east, that same parking lot. So whereas those other
08:47:04	10	photographs were somebody from the east looking toward
	11	the west, this is the west looking towards the east.
	12	Q And what is significant, I know we've been
	13	going over it, what is significant in terms of the
	14	yellow cones that are placed in
08:47:16	15	A The yellow cones are placed there by crime
	16	scene analysts to document either apparent footwear or
	17	blood or apparent blood.
	18	Q Showing you Grand Jury Exhibit Number 12,
	19	are we continuing along that same path?
08:47:30	20	A Yes. Now we are on the west side of
	21	building 11 and this is at the ground floor to the
	22	stairwell.
	23	Q Okay. Eventually did you make your way up
	24	the stairwell and see apparent blood on the stairs too?
08:47:41	25	A Yes.

08:47:41	1	Q Okay. Showing you Grand Jury Exhibit
	2	Number 13, what are we looking at here?
	3	A More of that same stairwell.
	4	Q Okay. And just to orient the members of
08:47:50	5	the Grand Jury, that looks like it's coming from the
	6	landing going back down towards the ground?
	7	A That is correct.
	8	Q Okay. And another photograph from the same
	9	angle, Grand Jury Exhibit Number 14?
08:48:00	10	A Just more of the same stairwell in that
	11	same prospective looking downward.
	12	Q Okay. And more yellow cones or orange
	13	cones just establishing demarcations of the trail?
	14	A Correct. And this is actually the second
08:48:11	15	floor looking to the ground floor.
	16	Q Perfect. Showing you Grand Jury Exhibit
	17	Number 15, what are we looking at there?
	18	A That's up at the top of the second floor
	19	rounding to the walkway if a person were then to
08:48:27	20	continue up to the third floor.
	21	Q Okay. Now, eventually based on that trail,
	22	do you ultimately draft and obtain a search warrant for
	23	that apartment?
	24	A Yes, my partner actually was the affiant in
08:48:40	25	that search warrant.

08:48:41	1	Q Okay. And then did you eventually execute
	2	the search warrant on the apartment?
	3	A We did.
	4	Q Now, when you made entry into the
08:48:48	5	apartment, did a lot of factors and physical evidence
	6	become abundantly relevant to the investigation?
	7	A Immediately.
	8	Q So now I am showing you 16. I'm sorry,
	9	okay, so this is Grand Jury Exhibit Number 10. Do you
08:49:05	10	recognize that photograph?
	11	A I do.
	12	Q Okay. And how do you recognize that
	13	photograph?
	14	A This is a photograph taken inside the
08:49:11	15	apartment, again that being 11309.
	16	Q Okay. And then just that was a little out
	17	of order. So now I'm going to show you 16, 17, 18 and
	18	19. If you could look through those, please. Okay.
	19	And do you recognize what is depicted in all those
08:49:36	20	photographs?
	21	A I do.
	22	Q Okay. And how do you recognize them?
	23	A Because I have been there.
	24	Q Okay. And do those fairly and accurately
08:49:42	25	represent the scene as the interior of the apartment

08:49:44	1	that you made entry based on the search warrant?
	2	A And a small portion of the exterior of the
	3	apartment, yes.
	4	Q Perfect. Okay. Showing you Grand Jury
08:49:52	5	Exhibit Number 16, what are we looking at there?
	6	A So this is standing on the landing outside
	7	of apartment 11309. 11309 is the door to the left and
	8	that is a downward photo looking at the landing.
	9	Q Okay. Now, just briefly, what would you
08:50:11	10	say the layout just generally of that apartment is?
	11	A It's a very small apartment. It consists
	12	of a living room, a kitchen, a bedroom and a bathroom.
	13	Q Okay. So showing you Grand Jury Exhibit
	14	Number 19, what are we looking at there?
08:50:26	15	A This is an interior shot looking from west
	16	to east because the front door to the apartment is a
	17	west facing door. So when you come in you would be
	18	standing in the living room, which I don't know if the
	19	folks can see it, but on the lower portion of that
08:50:41	20	photograph you see an area that's demarcated with carpet
	21	and then you see the tile which represents the kitchen.
	22	Q Okay. What became very relevant in this
	23	area?
	24	A There's multiple things that are quite
08:50:55	25	relevant to that photograph, although not well depicted,

08:50:58	1	is that floor looks very clean and in fact it was so
	2	clean that you could see some white residue. When I,
	3	along with the other entry team, made entry into this
	4	apartment, I was hit with the overwhelming stench of
08:51:11	5	cleaning material. Then getting toward the kitchen
	6	which has the tile floor, you could see that the tile
	7	floor was very clean again with the white residue that
	8	was on there. And then on the far side where the
	9	appliances are there was apparent blood.
08:51:29	10	Q Okay. So as we're in the kitchen now,
	11	Grand Jury Exhibit Number 18, what are we looking at in
	12	that photograph?
	13	A So obviously the previous photo didn't have
	14	any stickers. Those stickers were placed there by crime
08:51:42	15	scene analysts but those stickers represent apparent
	16	footwear.
	17	Q And Grand Jury Exhibit 17, what are we
	18	looking at here and why are the stickers relevant?
	19	A The stickers are relevant, and again they
08:51:55	20	were placed there by crime scene analysts, they are
	21	documenting the apparent blood that was found on the
	22	cabinets and on the appliances.
	23	Q Okay. In an area of the apartment was
	24	there apparent blood also found on a light fixture?
08:52:09	25	A Yes. If you were to look 90 degrees

08:52:11	1	straight up in that kitchen, there is a dome and there
	2	was apparent blood on the exterior of the light.
	3	Q Okay. And alluding back to the
	4	overwhelming stench of what you said to be cleaning
08:52:23	5	products apparently, showing you Grand Jury Exhibit
	6	Number 10, what are we looking at there?
	7	A They're cleaning materials.
	8	Q So based on the search of the apartment and
	9	all the steps in your investigation, did you ultimately
08:52:33	10	develop two suspects?
	11	A We did.
	12	Q Okay. And who were they?
	13	A They were Jecory Kemp, that's J-E-C-O-R-Y,
	14	and Tyeshia James.
08:52:46	15	Q Showing you Grand Jury Exhibit Numbers 3
	16	and 4, do you recognize the people depicted in those
	17	photographs?
	18	A I do. It's Mr. Kemp and Miss James.
	19	Q And so for the record Grand Jury Exhibit
08:52:57	20	Number 3 would be Mr. Kemp and Grand Jury Exhibit
	21	Number 4 would be Miss James. Ultimately did you become
	22	aware that Mr. Kemp and Miss James were apprehended?
	23	A Yes.
	24	Q Okay. And then eventually did you and
08:53:09	25	another detective subsequently make contact with both of

08:53:12	1	these individuals?
	2	A We did.
	3	Q Okay. And then were they read Miranda?
	4	A They were.
08:53:17	5	Q Okay. And did they acknowledge their
	6	rights and wish to speak with detectives?
	7	A They did.
	8	Q Now, showing you Grand Jury Exhibit
	9	Number 3, is that Mr. Kemp?
08:53:26	10	A It is.
	11	Q Okay. And as stated before in the
	12	instructions, ladies and gentlemen, there is the Bruton
	13	case law where you are only to take the evidence of
	14	someone's statement as evidence against them, not
08:53:38	15	against any other co-defendant or any other
	16	co-conspirator. I'm about to introduce a statement by
	17	which you are only to consider the evidence against
	18	Mr. Kemp, okay?
	19	So when you interviewed Mr. Kemp, walk us
08:53:52	20	through what he told you about his involvement in the
	21	incident and maybe any subsequent plans involving the
	22	incident.
	23	A Mr. Kemp appeared to be forthright in his
	24	statement. He basically laid out what led to the victim
08:54:09	25	getting killed inside the apartment that he was staying

1 at. 08:54:12 2 Okay. Now, did he admit to a general plan Q 3 in order to rob the alleged victim in this incident? 4 Α Yes. 5 Q And what was that? 08:54:23 The plan was developed either a day to two 6 Α days before the actual murder which occurred on 7 8 December 30th, 2019, and the plan was to purchase or 9 request a large amount of marijuana which would then be 10 sold to the occupants of his apartment, that being 08:54:42 11 11309. When the victim arrived with the marijuana it 12 was their intent to rob him of the marijuana and not 13 make payment for the marijuana they had requested. 14 0 How did Mr. Kemp tell you the event unfolded once the victim arrived at the apartment? 15 08:55:02 16 On that particular day the victim, 17 Mr. Anderson, came to the door, was let in, the door was 18 closed behind him. Mr. Anderson moved to the kitchen 19 area after dropping down a backpack. Inside the 20 backpack was purportedly one of the two pounds of 08:55:21 21 marijuana that was sought in the drug deal. Another 22. individual within the residence opened up the backpack, 23 examined and noticed that there was a pound short. was then discussed that the other pound would be made 24 25 available as the money was paid. And shortly thereafter 08:55:40

some individuals who were hidden in the bedroom, again, 1 08:55:44 2 the way that the apartment is set up, you have a living 3 room followed by a kitchen, there was a doorway that 4 separates the southern half of the apartment from the 5 northern half which contains the bathroom and the 08:55:56 6 bedroom, two individuals were laid off on that side and 7 at one point they came out and the robbery is now 8 underway. 9 So as the robbery was underway, can you 10 describe what Mr. Kemp told you about the interaction 08:56:10 11 between the victim and the parties now in the living 12 room? 13 Upon Mr. Anderson seeing these 14 individuals who emerged suddenly from the bedroom, 15 Mr. Anderson purportedly pulled a firearm and kept it by 08:56:23 16 his side, it sounds like it was in his right hand and 17 pointed downward. That caused another individual within 18 the apartment to produce a firearm and pointed it at 19 Mr. Anderson. Then what did Mr. Kemp say in relation to a 20 08:56:39 21 potential shooting? 22. That's when the shooting occurred. At Α 23 least one round was fired which appeared to strike 24 Mr. Anderson. 25 Now, did Mr. Kemp talk to you about what 08:56:50 Q

08:56:52	Τ	the parties did after the gunshot went off?
	2	A Yes. There were multiple people inside the
	3	apartment at that particular time and some of the
	4	individuals had purportedly gone through the victim's
08:57:04	5	pockets and left the apartment. Eventually Mr. Kemp and
	6	Miss James left the apartment and returned to the
	7	apartment where they initiated the process of cleaning
	8	up the apartment and removing his body from the
	9	residence.
08:57:21	10	Q Okay. And based on — I'm sorry for
	11	interrupting, Detective.
	12	A No, that's it.
	13	Q Sorry to interrupt. And now based on the
	14	statements of Mr. Kemp and what we alluded to earlier,
08:57:28	15	was there physical evidence that corroborated statements
	16	made by Mr. Kemp in terms of cleaning up the scene?
	17	A Yes, as stated previously it appears that
	18	they had done a great deal of or put forth a great deal
	19	of effort to clean the tile but unfortunately had missed
08:57:44	20	a lot of the walls and even the ceiling.
	21	Q Now, did eventually Mr. Kemp relay to you
	22	attempts to move and relocate the victim's body?
	23	A Yes.
	24	Q And what did he tell you him and the other
08:57:58	25	people did?

1 Α The first thing that they had to do was 08:57:58 2 prepare the body to be moved, meaning that they had 3 placed it in trash bags. The second thing that had to 4 be done was that Mr. Anderson is a fairly large statured 5 individual and to move him, at one point there was a 08:58:12 6 plan to utilize a table within the apartment where they 7 broke off a couple legs and almost in a gurney-like 8 fashion they would utilize that table to carry the body 9 That plan was scrapped and eventually his body was 10 attached to a small shopping cart which was then used to 08:58:31 11 bring the body down those flights of stairs and into the 12 parking lot and into the awaiting vehicle. 13 So what did Mr. Kemp reveal to you about that specific vehicle where they transported the 14 15 victim's body? 08:58:47 16 So Mr. Kemp had done two things with the 17 victim's vehicle. He had a 1998 Lexus four-door sedan. 18 After the murder Mr. Anderson's vehicle was moved to a 19 different location outside of the apartment complex to, 20 in his mind, to take the victim's vehicle away, to not 08:59:07 21 have it necessarily attached to the apartment complex, 22. but when it was determined that they were going to 23 utilize the victim's vehicle for the purposes of 24 disposing of the body, Mr. Kemp went and retrieved 25 Mr. Anderson's car, brought it back to the parking lot 08:59:21

08:59:24	1	near building 11 and Mr. Anderson's body was loaded into
	2	the trunk of his car.
	3	Q Where did you ultimately learn from
	4	Mr. Kemp where that car and that body ended up?
08:59:36	5	A Mr. Anderson, excuse me, Mr. Kemp talked
	6	about how he drove the victim's car from the apartment
	7	complex all the way out to that area known as Interstate
	8	15 and Field Road which is in San Bernardino County.
	9	Q Okay. And, Detective, you and I spoke
08:59:53	10	before and you had indicated you had actually made a
	11	visit out to that scene in San Bernardino, correct?
	12	A Yes, several weeks later my partner and I
	13	went out there so we could examine the scene obviously
	14	minus a vehicle and body.
09:00:06	15	Q Okay. So showing you Grand Jury Exhibit
	16	Number 21, an aerial view, if I was represent to you
	17	that in the top maybe middle of the photograph would be
	18	the scene, is that the scene that you visited?
	19	A It was.
09:00:19	20	Q And that's in the San Bernardino area?
	21	A Correct.
	22	Q Okay. Now, did Mr. Kemp talk to you about
	23	what happened when they got to that area of the San
	24	Bernardino scene?
09:00:31	25	A Yes. Once the vehicle was in place,

09:00:34	1	probably about a hundred to 200 yards off of the
	2	freeway, obviously it's pitch black, the car was doused
	3	with gasoline and set on fire.
	4	Q Okay. And did he tell you about any other
09:00:48	5	event in terms of making arrangements for another person
	6	to pick him up?
	7	A Yes. When they were driving the car down
	8	to California Mr. Kemp was actually following another
	9	vehicle where another individual involved in this
09:01:05	10	incident was riding.
	11	Q And what happened with that other vehicle?
	12	A He claimed that it had left and that
	13	another vehicle was summoned to pick them up and bring
	14	them all back to Las Vegas.
09:01:19	15	Q Okay. So you had also made reference that
	16	you had come into contact with Tyeshia, correct?
	17	A Correct.
	18	Q Okay. And then we had asked before, was
	19	she read Miranda?
09:01:31	20	A She was.
	21	Q And did she acknowledge those and still
	22	wish to speak with detectives?
	23	A Yes, she did.
	24	Q Okay. Showing you Grand Jury Exhibit
09:01:38	25	Number 4, that's Tyeshia, correct?

09:01:40	1	A Yes, it is.
	2	Q When you spoke with her did she too reveal
	3	information about the event, her involvement and her
	4	role?
09:01:48	5	A Yes.
	6	Q Okay. Just briefly and generally, so what
	7	did she reveal to you in terms of her involvement in the
	8	initial set-up of the victim?
	9	A Initially Miss James lied about having any
09:02:02	10	role and actually lied about even being on the property
	11	grounds on the day that the murder occurred, but
	12	eventually her story changed and she recounted a very
	13	similar story minus the movement of the body to
	14	California as her boyfriend provided to us.
09:02:23	15	Q Okay. And did she indicate that she in
	16	fact was the renter of that 11309 apartment?
	17	A Yes, she had a lease for it.
	18	Q Okay. And when was the lease, according to
	19	her, in effect?
09:02:36	20	A I believe, according to lease paperwork,
	21	she had gotten the apartment in mid to late November and
	22	it was, the lease was set to expire either on the 4th or
	23	5th of January of 2020.
	24	Q And what was her recounting of the actual
09:02:54	25	event where there was the shooting?

09:02:55	1	A She had talked about the robbery being
	2	planned either a day or two before. At the time of the
	3	murder she and another female were asked to leave the
	4	apartment before Mr. Anderson arrived at the apartment
09:03:11	5	and then later on they heard about what had happened and
	6	set forth a plan to clean up the apartment and help move
	7	the body from the apartment downstairs into the awaiting
	8	vehicle.
	9	Q So she admitted to her role in terms of
09:03:24	10	cleaning up the apartment and a possible transportation
	11	of the body?
	12	A She is not part of the transportation of
	13	the body to California, but she did have a role in
	14	taking the body out of the apartment, down the sets of
09:03:38	15	stairs and to the awaiting vehicle in the Sienna Suites
	16	apartments.
	17	Q So after speaking with those two people,
	18	are you familiar just generally kind of the autopsy
	19	procedures maybe in San Bernardino?
09:03:53	20	A Yes.
	21	Q Is that going to happen right away or did
	22	the autopsy in this event take place sometime after?
	23	A Yes, contrasting it to the Clark County
	24	Coroner's office, we typically have our autopsies within
09:04:06	25	24 to 48 hours after the event. San Bernardino appears

09:04:09	1	to be a much busier, much larger county, and the autopsy
	2	for Mr. Anderson did not occur until January 21st of
	3	2020 which we attended.
	4	Q Okay. That's where I was getting to next.
09:04:21	5	So when you attended the autopsy were you able to
	6	determine the identity of the named victim?
	7	A Yes, he had been previously positively
	8	identified as Marion B. Jabbar, J-A-B-B-A-R, Anderson.
	9	Q Did people colloquially refer to him, and
09:04:40	10	by people I mean the parties that you interviewed, as
	11	A.J.?
	12	A Yes.
	13	Q Okay. So any references to A.J. would have
	14	meant the victim in this instance?
09:04:48	15	A That's correct.
	16	Q Okay. You ultimately attended the autopsy
	17	and identified that victim, correct?
	18	A He was identified — the way that they have
	19	it set up is that he had already been positively
09:04:58	20	identified several days, weeks prior to the actual
	21	autopsy itself.
	22	Q Now, when you attended the autopsy did you
	23	see any obvious wounds to the victim?
	24	A Yes.
09:05:10	25	Q Okay. And what did you see?

09:05:12	Τ	A If I could just say very easily there was
	2	an apparent gunshot wound to his upper left chest and
	3	that there was quite a bit of thermal damage to his
	4	body, specifically the lower half.
09:05:24	5	Q Okay. Showing you Grand Jury Exhibits 29
	6	through 30, do you recognize what is depicted in those
	7	two photographs?
	8	A I do.
	9	Q Okay. And how do you recognize what is
09:05:36	10	depicted?
	11	A The first photo is Mr. Anderson at the time
	12	of the autopsy and the second photo is an up-close
	13	photograph of the apparent gunshot wound to his upper
	14	left chest.
09:05:48	15	Q Okay. And just briefly, it is a graphic
	16	image, ladies and gentlemen, showing you Grand Jury
	17	Exhibit Number 29, is that the victim as he lay in the
	18	autopsy?
	19	A It is.
09:05:57	20	Q And just to briefly walk through, you had
	21	indicated there was thermal damage and burning. Do we
	22	see that depicted in this photograph?
	23	A Yes, especially on that left arm and then
	24	his lower half of his body, fire damage.
09:06:09	25	Q And then lastly Grand Jury Exhibit Number

09:06:11	1	30, what are we looking at there?
	2	A That's a 90-degree photograph or
	3	practically a 90-degree photograph of the apparent
	4	gunshot wound to his upper left chest.
09:06:20	5	Q Okay. Brief indulgence.
	6	I have no other questions for this witness
	7	if any members of the jury do.
	8	BY A JUROR:
	9	Q Was Mr. Kemp one of the individuals that
09:06:30	10	was in the bedroom at the apartment hiding?
	11	A No, he was not.
	12	Q Okay.
	13	MR. SCARBOROUGH: Any other questions from
	14	the members of the Grand Jury?
09:06:41	15	A JUROR: Quick question.
	16	MR. SCARBOROUGH: Yes.
	17	BY A JUROR:
	18	Q Was Tyeshia present during the actual
	19	shooting?
09:06:46	20	A No, she indicated to us that she had left
	21	the apartment prior to the murder and Mr. Kemp had
	22	stated the same thing.
	23	Q Thank you.
	24	BY MR. SCARBOROUGH:
09:06:55	25	Q Just to follow up on that, Tyeshia did

admit to you her involvement in the planning and 1 09:06:58 2 bringing that victim over to the apartment, correct? 3 Yes, she talked about the planning again Α 4 which occurred either one to two days prior to the 5 incident. 09:07:07 6 Q Okay. 7 Any other questions from the members of the 8 Grand Jury? Noting no hands. 9 THE FOREPERSON: By law these proceedings 10 are secret and you are prohibited from disclosing to 09:07:13 11 anyone anything that transpired before us including any 12 evidence presented to the Grand Jury, any event 13 occurring or a statement made in the presence of the 14 Grand Jury or any information obtained by the Grand 15 Jury. 09:07:13 16 Failure to comply with this admonition is a 17 gross misdemeanor punishable up to 364 days in the Clark 18 County Detention Center and a \$2,000 fine. In addition 19 you may be held in contempt of court punishable by an 20 additional \$500 fine and 25 days in the Clark County 09:07:13 2.1 Detention Center. 22 Do you understand this admonition? 23 THE WITNESS: I do. 24 THE FOREPERSON: Thank you. You're 25 excused. 09:07:48

09:07:49	1	A JUROR: Thank you.
	2	MR. SCARBOROUGH: Ladies and gentlemen,
	3	that will conclude my presentation. Before I walk out I
	4	just want to briefly remind you of the Bruton case law
09:07:57	5	that I had indicated. At this point I will submit it
	6	for your deliberation.
	7	A JUROR: I have a question.
	8	MR. SCARBOROUGH: Yes, sir.
	9	A JUROR: 15 is very much traveled, I
09:08:07	10	travel it a lot going to California. If there's a fire
	11	there I would call it in. Was the fire department
	12	called to put it out or anything like that?
	13	MR. SCARBOROUGH: So this is a question for
	14	a witness that I can't answer.
09:08:18	15	A JUROR: Okay.
	16	MR. SCARBOROUGH: If you would have had
	17	that for the witness I would have allowed him to answer.
	18	I can't answer that question. It's not my personal
	19	knowledge, sorry about that.
09:08:28	20	Any other questions though preliminarily,
	21	anything else before I submit for deliberation? Thank
	22	you.
	23	(At this time, all persons, except the
	24	members of the Grand Jury, exited the room at 9:08 and
09:08:32	25	returned at 9:21.)

9:21:04	1	THE FOREPERSON: Mr. District Attorney, by
	2	a vote of 12 or more Grand Jurors a true bill has been
	3	returned against the defendants Jecory Eles Kemp and
	4	Tyeshia Evan James charging the crimes of conspiracy to
9:21:14	5	commit robbery, murder with use of a deadly weapon,
	6	first degree kidnapping with use of a deadly weapon
	7	resulting in substantial bodily harm and robbery with
	8	use of a deadly weapon.
	9	We instruct you to prepare an Indictment in
9:21:26	10	conformance with the proposed Indictment previously
	11	submitted to us.
	12	MR. SCARBOROUGH: Thank you, sir.
	13	(Proceedings concluded.)
	14	00000
	15	
	16	
	17	
	18	
	19	
	20	
	21	
	22	
	23	
	24	
	25	

09:21:31	1	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE
	2	
	3	STATE OF NEVADA)
	4	COUNTY OF CLARK)
09:21:31	5	
	6	I, Donna J. McCord, C.C.R. 337, do hereby
	7	certify that I took down in Shorthand (Stenotype) all of
	8	the proceedings had in the before-entitled matter at the
	9	time and place indicated and thereafter said shorthand
09:21:31	10	notes were transcribed at and under my direction and
	11	supervision and that the foregoing transcript
	12	constitutes a full, true, and accurate record of the
	13	proceedings had.
	14	Dated at Las Vegas, Nevada,
09:21:31	15	February 17, 2020.
	16	
	17	/S/DONNA J. MCCORD
	18	Donna J. McCord, CCR 337
	19	
09:21:31	20	
	21	
	22	
	23	
	24	
09:21:31	25	

09:21:31	1	AFFIRMATION
	2	Pursuant to NRS 239B.030
	3	
	4	The undersigned does hereby affirm that the preceding
09:21:31	5	TRANSCRIPT filed in GRAND JURY CASE NUMBER 19CGJ007A-B:
	6	
	7	
	8	X Does not contain the social security number of any
	9	person,
09:21:31	10	-OR-
	11	Contains the social security number of a person as
	12	required by:
	13	A. A specific state or federal law, to-wit: NRS 656.250.
	14	-OR-
09:21:31	15	B. For the administration of a public program or for an application for a federal or
	16	state grant.
	17	
	18	/S/DONNA J. MCCORD February 17, 2020 Signature Date
	19	Signature
09:21:31	20	Donna J. McCord Print Name
	21	TITHE Name
	22	Official Court Reporter Title
	23	TTCT6
	24	
	25	

11/14 11/18 **200 yards [1]** 38/1 A JUROR: [12] 5/14 2019 [3] 22/4 22/17 5/15 18/18 18/22 19/1 33/8 19/25 20/1 43/14 44/25 **2020 [7]** 1/15 2/1 5/1 45/6 45/8 45/14 39/23 41/3 47/15 48/18 BY A JUROR: [4] **21 [4]** 3/4 4/14 12/12 17/25 18/11 43/7 43/16 37/16 BY MR. 21st [1] 41/2 SCARBOROUGH: [3] 22 [2] 4/14 13/18 8/9 21/11 43/23 **23 [12]** 4/6 4/7 4/7 4/8 MR. SCARBOROUGH: 4/8 4/9 4/9 4/10 4/10 [15] 5/12 5/16 18/7 4/11 4/15 14/1 18/15 18/19 18/23 19/2 239B.030 [1] 48/2 20/2 43/12 43/15 45/1 **24 [4]** 4/6 4/15 14/9 45/7 45/12 45/15 46/11 40/25 THE FOREPERSON: **25 [4]** 4/16 14/20 19/18 **[13]** 5/7 7/6 7/12 7/23 44/20 19/6 19/21 20/8 20/14 **26 [2]** 4/16 14/25 20/17 21/1 44/8 44/23 **27 [2]** 4/17 15/15 45/25 **28 [9]** 4/11 4/12 4/12 THE WITNESS: [11] 4/13 4/17 10/24 11/4 7/11 7/22 7/25 18/8 11/14 16/19 19/20 19/23 20/13 **29 [3]** 4/18 42/5 42/17 20/16 20/25 21/3 44/22 **30 [3]** 4/18 42/6 43/1 **\$2,000 [2]** 19/16 44/18 309 [6] 23/3 23/14 **\$500 [2]** 19/18 44/20 23/17 23/19 23/22 24/17 30th [4] 9/19 22/4 22/7 -oo0oo [1] 46/14 33/8 -**OR [2]** 48/10 48/14 **31 [2]** 4/5 4/5 31st [3] 9/19 22/9 22/16 /**S/DONNA [2]** 47/17 **337 [3]** 1/25 47/6 47/18 48/18 **364 [2]** 19/15 44/17 **10 [12]** 4/8 4/13 4/14 **42 [2]** 4/18 4/18 4/14 4/15 4/15 4/16 **48 [1]** 40/25 4/16 4/17 4/17 28/9 4th [1] 39/22 31/6 **11 [11]** 4/9 23/3 23/15 24/17 25/4 25/5 25/17 5th [1] 39/23 26/5 26/8 26/21 37/1 **11309 [8]** 23/1 23/2 25/10 28/15 29/7 29/7 **6555 [1]** 22/24 33/11 39/16 **656.250 [1]** 48/13 **12 [3]** 4/9 26/18 46/2 **13 [5]** 1/15 2/1 4/10 5/1 27/2 8:25 [1] 1/16 **14 [2]** 4/10 27/9 **15 [10]** 4/11 9/24 10/15 10/18 11/22 23/25 24/8 90 [2] 25/21 30/25 27/17 37/8 45/9 **90-degree [2]** 43/2 **16 [4]** 4/11 28/8 28/17 43/3 29/5 9:08 [1] 45/24 17 [5] 4/12 28/17 30/17 9:21 [1] 45/25 47/15 48/18 **18 [3]** 4/12 28/17 30/11 **19 [3]** 4/13 28/18 29/14 **A-L-V [1]** 8/2 **1998 [1]** 36/17 **A-R-A-D-O [1]** 8/3 19CGJ007A [1] 5/19 **A-R-T-U-R-O** [1] 8/2 **19CGJ007A-B [2]** 1/9 **A.J [2]** 41/11 41/13 48/5 a.m [1] 1/16 ability [1] 5/7 able [1] 41/5

20 [5] 4/13 10/24 11/4

about [20] 6/12 7/8

18/3 20/10 32/16 32/20 34/10 34/25 36/13 37/6 37/22 38/1 38/4 39/3 39/9 39/10 40/1 40/5 44/3 45/19 abundantly [2] 23/11 28/6 accelerant [3] 18/6 18/11 18/14 accompanying [1] 20/6 according [2] 39/18 39/20 accurate [1] 47/12 accurately [4] 5/6 11/14 24/16 28/24 acknowledge [2] 32/5 38/21 actively [1] 22/20 actual [5] 17/8 33/7 39/24 41/20 43/18 actually [10] 17/13 18/24 22/7 23/2 23/21 27/14 27/24 37/10 38/8 39/10 addition [2] 19/16 44/18 additional [2] 19/18 44/20 address [5] 16/12 22/23 23/1 23/4 23/7 administration [1] 48/15 admit [2] 33/2 44/1 admitted [1] 40/9 admonish [1] 18/17 admonition [4] 19/14 19/20 44/16 44/22 advised [2] 7/15 20/18 advisement [2] 7/22 20/25 aerial [3] 11/21 12/13 37/16 affiant [1] 27/24 affiliated [1] 22/22 affirm [1] 48/4 affirmance [1] 6/3 AFFIRMATION [1] 48/1 AFORESAID [1] 1/4 after [10] 13/5 16/13 17/12 24/7 33/19 35/1 36/18 40/17 40/22 40/25 again [11] 12/13 12/19 15/2 17/6 22/16 23/14 28/15 30/7 30/19 34/1 44/3 against [6] 6/18 6/19 32/14 32/15 32/17 46/3 ahead [1] 18/8 aka [1] 1/10 all [18] 6/2 6/3 6/6 10/25 11/10 11/10 13/12 14/4 14/18 17/21 22/21 23/22 28/19 31/9 37/7 38/14 45/23 47/7 alleged [3] 9/20 22/5 33/3

allowed [2] 16/1 45/17 appears [3] 25/14 alluded [2] 25/12 35/14 alluding [1] 31/3 almost [2] 25/21 36/7 along [3] 17/8 26/19 30/3 already [2] 13/14 41/19 approach [2] 10/22 also [8] 2/21 6/4 6/10 38/15 although [1] 29/25 **ALVARADO [4]** 3/3 8/2 8/4 8/11 am [4] 8/18 23/24 24/2 28/8 amongst [1] 9/8 amount [1] 33/9 analysts [3] 26/16 30/15 30/20 **Anderson [12]** 33/17 33/18 34/13 34/15 34/19 34/24 36/4 37/5 40/4 41/2 41/8 42/11 Anderson's [3] 36/18 36/25 37/1 **ANEDA [1]** 2/10 angle [2] 14/10 27/9 another [11] 6/19 14/10 27/8 31/25 33/21 34/17 38/5 38/8 38/9 38/13 40/3 answer [3] 45/14 45/17 45/18 any [28] 6/24 8/16 16/12 17/23 19/3 19/9 19/10 19/12 30/14 32/15 32/15 32/21 38/4 39/9 41/13 41/23 43/7 43/13 44/7 44/11 44/12 44/14 45/20 48/8 anyone [2] 19/9 44/11 anything [4] 19/9 44/11 45/12 45/21 apartment [48] 23/3 23/13 23/14 23/17 23/19 23/22 24/16 24/17 25/10 27/23 28/2 28/5 28/15 28/25 29/3 30/4 30/23 31/8 32/25 33/10 33/15 34/2 34/4 34/18 35/3 35/5 35/6 35/7 35/8 36/6 36/19 36/21 37/6 39/16 39/21 40/4 40/4 40/6 40/7 40/10 40/14 43/10 43/21 44/2 apartments [1] 40/16 apparent [14] 23/20 25/22 25/25 26/16 26/17 26/24 30/9 30/15 30/21 30/24 31/2 42/2 42/13 43/3 apparently [2] 23/11 appeared [4] 5/11 15/5 32/23 34/23

35/17 40/25 appliances [2] 30/9 30/22 application [1] 48/15 apprehended [1] 31/22 23/24 6/13 18/20 21/25 30/24 approached [1] 12/23 are [48] 5/21 6/5 6/6 6/13 6/24 7/15 8/11 8/16 10/6 11/19 11/20 12/12 13/5 13/18 14/1 14/21 14/25 15/16 15/21 19/8 19/8 21/13 25/3 25/8 25/19 26/6 26/14 26/15 26/19 26/20 27/2 27/17 29/5 29/14 29/24 30/9 30/11 30/17 30/18 30/19 30/20 31/6 32/13 32/17 40/18 43/1 44/10 44/10 area [14] 5/10 9/24 10/20 10/21 12/7 12/8 15/11 29/20 29/23 30/23 33/19 37/7 37/20 37/23 areas [1] 11/10 arm [1] 42/23 around [5] 16/23 16/23 22/6 23/19 23/23 arrangements [1] 38/5 **arrived [5]** 15/4 15/12 33/11 33/15 40/4 12/24 13/4 13/14 13/15 arson [3] 18/10 18/15 22/1 **ARTURO [3]** 3/3 8/1 asked [2] 38/18 40/3 asphalt [1] 25/23 assess [1] 16/12 assigned [1] 21/16 assist [1] 17/14 **Assistant** [1] 2/6 attached [2] 36/10 36/21 attempts [1] 35/22 attended [4] 41/3 41/5 41/16 41/22 29/7 29/10 29/11 29/16 | attention [3] 9/18 22/3 22/23 **Attorney [5]** 2/22 2/23 5/18 20/5 46/1 autopsies [1] 40/24 autopsy [9] 40/18 40/22 41/1 41/5 41/16 41/21 41/22 42/12 42/18 available [1] 33/25 awaiting [3] 36/12 40/7 40/15 aware [1] 31/22 away [6] 13/15 13/15 14/18 14/19 36/20 40/21 **B-R-E-C-K** [1] 22/15

В back [4] 27/6 31/3 36/25 38/14 backpack [3] 33/19 33/20 33/22 bags [1] 36/3 Baker [1] 9/25 Barstow [1] 9/25 based [8] 16/25 18/2 22/21 27/21 29/1 31/8 35/10 35/13 basic [1] 16/20 basically [2] 13/15 32/24 basics [1] 10/14 **basis** [1] 10/7 bathroom [2] 29/12 34/5 became [3] 22/7 23/11 29/22 become [5] 22/4 22/12 22/22 28/6 31/21 bedroom [5] 29/12 34/1 34/6 34/14 43/10 been [15] 5/5 8/5 8/22 10/4 13/9 18/5 18/6 21/7 21/18 24/13 26/12 28/23 41/7 41/19 46/2 before [14] 1/4 7/9 19/9 20/11 32/11 33/7 37/10 38/18 40/2 40/4 44/11 45/3 45/21 47/8 before-entitled [1] 47/8 begin [2] 6/23 7/2 behind [1] 33/18 being [7] 22/16 23/5 25/5 28/15 33/10 39/10 40/1 believe [2] 6/5 39/20 **BELINDA** [1] 2/8 **Bernardino [11]** 8/14 8/17 22/10 22/18 22/22 37/8 37/11 37/20 37/24 40/19 40/25 best [1] 5/7 between [2] 9/24 34/11 **bill [1]** 46/2 bit [2] 12/20 42/3 black [1] 38/2 blood [11] 23/20 25/12 25/22 25/25 26/17 26/17 26/24 30/9 30/21 30/24 31/2 **bodily [4]** 5/25 7/19 20/23 46/7 body [32] 15/6 15/7 15/17 15/19 15/21 15/22 16/1 16/3 16/6 16/8 16/9 16/10 16/11 16/14 35/8 35/22 36/2 36/8 36/9 36/11 36/15 36/24 37/1 37/4 37/14 39/13 40/7 40/11 40/13 40/14 42/4 42/24 bombs [2] 18/10 18/15 both [5] 7/25 9/12

17/11 21/3 31/25

Boulder [1] 22/24 boyfriend [1] 39/14 breathing [1] 15/13 Breck [1] 22/14 Brief [2] 17/21 43/5 briefly [8] 7/1 10/24 23/25 29/9 39/6 42/15 42/20 45/4 bring [2] 36/11 38/13 bringing [1] 44/2 broke [1] 36/7 brought [1] 36/25 **Bruton [5]** 6/15 6/15 6/21 32/12 45/4 building [13] 23/2 23/12 23/15 23/16 23/20 23/23 24/16 25/5 25/5 25/17 26/8 26/21 37/1 **burn [2]** 14/4 15/18 **burned [14]** 13/1 13/5 13/8 13/10 13/10 13/15 13/15 13/22 14/12 14/18 14/19 15/3 18/3 18/3 burning [1] 42/21 busier [1] 41/1 C.C.R [2] 1/25 47/6 C346920 [1] 1/9 cabinets [1] 30/22 **California** [7] 8/15 10/16 15/25 38/8 39/14 40/13 45/10 call [6] 10/1 10/7 10/11 16/8 20/7 45/11 called [4] 9/20 10/8 10/8 45/12 came [3] 22/12 33/17 34/7 can [5] 6/16 14/12 18/25 29/19 34/9 can't [4] 6/18 18/21 45/14 45/18 canvassed [1] 5/10 capacity [1] 8/22 car [6] 36/25 37/2 37/4 37/6 38/2 38/7 card [3] 16/23 17/3 17/9 carpet [1] 29/20 carry [1] 36/8 cart [1] 36/10 case [13] 1/9 1/9 5/19 6/10 6/13 6/15 6/15 6/21 10/10 13/8 32/13 45/4 48/5 caused [1] 34/17 **CCR [1]** 47/18 ceiling [1] 35/20 Center [4] 19/16 19/19 44/18 44/21 CERTIFICATE [1] 47/1 certify [1] 47/7 changed [1] 39/12 charged [1] 5/21 charging [1] 46/4

charred [1] 13/14 charring [2] 13/12 14/4 chest [3] 42/2 42/14 43/4 Chief [2] 2/23 20/5 circle [1] 12/20 claimed [1] 38/12 **CLARK [8]** 1/2 19/15 19/18 24/23 40/23 44/17 44/20 47/4 clean [5] 30/1 30/2 30/7 35/19 40/6 cleaning [6] 30/5 31/4 31/7 35/7 35/16 40/10 Clearly [1] 13/9 close [5] 13/19 15/2 25/9 25/20 42/12 close-up [2] 13/19 15/2 closed [1] 33/18 co [2] 32/15 32/16 co-conspirator [1] 32/16 co-defendant [1] 32/15 colloquially [1] 41/9 coloring [1] 13/12 combination [1] 17/11 come [2] 29/17 38/16 coming [2] 10/17 27/5 commit [4] 5/22 7/17 20/20 46/5 complex [4] 25/6 36/19 36/21 37/7 comply [2] 19/14 44/16 component [3] 9/11 9/15 22/1 **conclude [2]** 13/7 45/3 **concluded [1]** 46/13 cones [4] 26/14 26/15 27/12 27/13 conformance [1] 46/10 connects [1] 10/16 consider [2] 18/21 32/17 consists [1] 29/11 conspiracy [5] 5/22 6/7 7/17 20/20 46/4 conspirator [1] 32/16 constitutes [1] 47/12 constitutional [1] 6/20 consumed [1] 14/23 contact [9] 16/15 17/2 17/9 17/18 22/9 22/17 22/22 31/25 38/16 **contacted** [1] 17/13 contain [1] 48/8 contains [2] 34/5 48/11 contempt [2] 19/17 44/19 context [1] 23/14 continue [1] 27/20 **continuing [1]** 26/19 contrasting [1] 40/23 copy [1] 6/2 corner [2] 23/17 25/16 **coroner [3]** 16/5 16/7 16/13 coroner's [2] 15/25 40/24

24/22 25/14 27/7 27/14 37/11 37/21 38/16 38/17 38/25 41/15 41/17 44/2 corroborated [1] 35/15 could [8] 10/24 18/4 23/25 28/18 30/2 30/6 37/13 42/1 couldn't [1] 13/23 county [13] 1/2 8/14 19/16 19/18 22/10 22/18 24/23 37/8 40/23 41/1 44/18 44/20 47/4 couple [1] 36/7 course [2] 8/21 8/24 court [5] 1/1 1/5 19/17 44/19 48/22 crime [6] 11/7 11/20 23/5 26/15 30/14 30/20 crimes [1] 46/4 crisp [2] 13/11 13/23 21/14 21/16 **D-O-S-C-H [1]** 21/5 damage [5] 12/25 14/14 42/3 42/21 42/24 **Date [1]** 48/18 **Dated [1]** 47/14 day [8] 11/15 19/25 22/16 24/18 33/6 33/16 39/11 40/2 days [7] 19/15 19/18 33/7 41/20 44/4 44/17 44/20 DC [1] 1/9 deadly [14] 5/23 5/25 6/1 6/8 6/10 7/18 7/19 7/20 20/21 20/22 20/23 46/5 46/6 46/8 deal [3] 33/21 35/18 35/18 death [2] 10/3 22/19 **DEBORAH [1]** 2/15 deceased [4] 10/4 15/5 15/7 15/14 **December [6]** 9/19 9/19 22/4 22/9 22/16 33/8 December 30th [3] 9/19 22/4 33/8 December 31st [3] 9/19 22/9 22/16 **defendant [5]** 6/16 6/18 6/19 6/21 32/15 defendants [2] 1/11 degree [6] 5/24 7/18 20/21 43/2 43/3 46/6 degrees [2] 25/21 30/25 deliberation [2] 45/6 45/21 **delineates** [1] 6/15 demarcated [1] 29/20 demarcations [1]

27/13 correct [14] 14/5 21/24 **DENISE [1]** 2/5 department [7] 8/14 8/17 21/16 22/9 22/10 22/18 45/11 depicted [10] 11/3 12/8 24/8 24/11 28/19 29/25 31/16 42/6 42/10 42/22 **Deputy [5]** 2/4 2/22 2/23 5/17 20/5 describe [1] 34/10 desert [1] 10/19 detective [16] 8/13 8/17 8/22 8/23 8/25 9/10 10/6 17/18 18/2 18/8 21/15 22/17 24/3 31/25 35/11 37/9 **detectives [6]** 16/16 17/2 17/10 17/13 32/6 38/22 **Detention [4]** 19/16 19/19 44/18 44/21 currently [4] 8/11 8/13 | determine [2] 18/13 41/6 **determined** [2] 18/10 36/22 develop [2] 16/15 31/10 developed [1] 33/6 DICKINSON [1] 2/3 did [57] didn't [1] 30/13 different [3] 6/8 13/4 36/19 direct [3] 9/18 22/3 22/23 directed [1] 23/7 direction [3] 12/1 12/3 47/10 dirt [1] 10/21 disclosing [2] 19/8 44/10 discussed [2] 7/1 33/24 disposing [1] 36/24 **DISTRICT [7]** 1/1 1/5 2/22 2/23 5/18 20/5 46/1 division [6] 8/16 8/19 8/20 11/7 16/1 16/7 do [41] 7/4 7/7 7/12 7/22 7/23 11/3 11/5 11/6 11/13 16/8 17/23 19/20 19/21 20/9 20/14 20/25 21/1 24/8 24/10 24/11 24/15 24/19 27/22 28/9 28/11 28/12 28/19 28/21 28/22 28/24 31/16 31/18 36/1 42/6 42/8 42/9 42/21 43/7 44/22 44/23 47/6 document [1] 26/16 documenting [1] 30/21 does [5] 11/16 24/4 24/6 48/4 48/8 dome [1] 31/1 don't [1] 29/18 **done** [5] 11/1 11/2

36/16 **Donna [7]** 1/25 5/4 47/6 47/17 47/18 48/18 door [8] 14/23 25/10 29/7 29/16 29/17 33/17 33/17 36/17 doorway [1] 34/3 **DOSCH [5]** 3/4 17/19 21/5 21/6 21/13 doused [1] 38/2 down [11] 7/6 11/22 15/18 23/22 25/21 27/6 33/19 36/11 38/7 40/14 downstairs [1] 40/7 downward [3] 27/11 29/8 34/17 draft [1] 27/22 driver [1] 14/11 driver's [1] 14/22 driving [1] 38/7 **dropping [1]** 33/19 **drove** [1] 37/6 drug [1] 33/21 duly [3] 5/5 8/5 21/7 during [2] 8/24 43/18 earlier [3] 14/5 25/12 35/14 easily [1] 42/1 east [5] 25/15 26/9 26/10 26/11 29/16 **effect [1]** 39/19 effort [1] 35/19 **EIGHTH [1]** 1/1 either [5] 26/16 33/6 39/22 40/2 44/4 elements [2] 6/5 6/25 ELES [5] 1/10 5/20 7/21 20/24 46/3 else [1] 45/21 emerged [1] 34/14 **EMMETT [1]** 2/9 employed [3] 8/12 8/22 21/14 end [4] 25/14 25/17 25/22 26/8 ended [2] 23/5 37/4 entered [1] 9/17 entitled [1] 47/8 entry [4] 28/4 29/1 30/3 30/3 **especially [1]** 42/23 essentially [1] 13/2 establishing [1] 27/13 **EVAN [5]** 1/10 5/20 7/21 20/24 46/4 even [3] 13/23 35/20 39/10 event [9] 17/8 19/10 33/14 38/5 39/3 39/25 40/22 40/25 44/12 eventually [11] 16/5 16/6 17/12 26/23 27/21

D

done... [3] 35/18 36/4

28/1 31/24 35/5 35/21 21/7 36/1 42/11 46/6 36/9 39/12 fixture [1] 30/24 everything [4] 13/10 flights [1] 36/11 13/13 14/18 14/23 flip [2] 10/24 24/1 evidence [8] 11/11 floor [11] 23/15 23/16 19/10 28/5 32/13 32/14 23/23 26/21 27/15 32/17 35/15 44/12 27/15 27/18 27/20 30/1 EXAMINATION [2] 8/9 30/6 30/7 21/11 **FLYNN [1]** 2/7 examine [1] 37/13 folks [1] 29/19 examined [2] 3/2 33/23 follow [1] 43/25 except [1] 45/23 followed [1] 34/3 **excuse [1]** 37/5 following [2] 5/6 38/8 excused [2] 19/23 follows [2] 8/7 21/9 44/25 footwear [2] 26/16 execute [1] 28/1 30/16 EXHIBIT [65] foregoing [1] 47/11 Exhibit 17 [1] 30/17 Foreperson [4] 2/3 2/4 8/5 21/7 **Exhibit 2 [1]** 6/5 Exhibit 5 [1] 24/4 forgot [1] 24/3 **EXHIBITS** [7] 4/1 4/3 form [1] 18/21 11/4 11/14 23/25 24/7 forth [2] 35/18 40/6 42/5 forthright [1] 32/23 Exhibits 20 [1] 11/4 found [3] 16/11 30/21 exit [1] 10/19 30/24 exit's [1] 10/18 foundation [1] 18/21 exited [1] 45/24 four [1] 36/17 experience [4] 9/13 four-door [1] 36/17 13/3 21/21 24/14 freeway [8] 9/24 10/15 expert [3] 18/9 18/10 10/21 11/24 11/25 12/16 12/17 38/2 18/21 front [3] 25/9 26/4 expire [1] 39/22 exterior [6] 14/7 14/8 29/16 23/12 24/20 29/2 31/2 full [1] 47/12 fully [3] 13/1 14/12 15/3 face [1] 15/18 facing [1] 29/17 fact [3] 18/18 30/1 39/16 factors [1] 28/5 Failure [2] 19/14 44/16 fairly [4] 11/14 24/15 28/24 36/4 faithfully [1] 5/5 familiar [3] 24/2 24/5 40/18 far [2] 18/7 30/8

fashion [1] 36/8

5/1 47/15 48/18

felony [1] 5/24

female [1] 40/3

figure [1] 13/23

filed [1] 48/5

44/18 44/20

34/15 34/18

fired [1] 34/23

45/11

Field [2] 10/18 37/8

fine [4] 19/16 19/18

fire [12] 9/10 9/14 10/4

10/5 14/24 18/4 18/14

22/1 38/3 42/24 45/10

firearm [4] 9/6 21/23

first [12] 5/5 5/24 7/18

7/25 8/1 8/5 20/21 21/2

February [5] 1/15 2/1

federal [2] 48/13 48/15

gasoline [1] 38/3 general [2] 9/9 33/2 generally [5] 17/6 26/3 29/10 39/6 40/18 gentlemen [6] 5/14 7/2 20/4 32/12 42/16 45/2 get [4] 6/22 10/7 10/8 23/17 getting [4] 16/19 30/5 32/25 41/4 give [5] 7/8 7/16 20/10 20/19 25/25 **GJ [1]** 1/9 **GLORIA** [1] 2/17 go [3] 12/6 18/8 23/17 **God [2]** 7/11 20/13 going [10] 7/4 7/5 10/22 15/21 26/13 27/6 28/17 36/22 40/21 45/10 gone [1] 35/4 **good [5]** 5/13 5/15 5/16 19/24 21/13 got [1] 37/23 gotten [1] 39/21 **GRAND** [69]

grant [1] 48/16

42/15

graphic [2] 15/16

great [2] 35/18 35/18

gross [2] 19/15 44/17 ground [5] 13/2 23/22 26/21 27/6 27/15 grounds [1] 39/11 **GULLIVER [1]** 2/7 gunshot [4] 35/1 42/2 42/13 43/4 gurney [1] 36/7 **gurney-like** [1] 36/7 **guy [1]** 7/5

H-O-D-S-O-N [1] 22/15 had [40] 9/8 10/4 13/4 13/9 14/5 14/18 14/19 15/18 18/6 18/9 24/13 25/12 33/13 35/4 35/18 35/19 36/1 36/2 36/3 36/16 36/17 37/10 37/10 38/12 38/15 38/16 38/18 39/17 39/21 40/1 40/5 41/7 41/19 42/20 43/20 43/21 45/5 45/16 47/8 47/13

half [4] 34/4 34/5 42/4 42/24

hand [6] 7/6 10/23 11/23 12/21 25/16 34/16

handing [1] 10/23 hands [2] 19/5 44/8 happen [1] 40/21 happened [4] 10/10 37/23 38/11 40/5 harm [4] 5/25 7/19 20/23 46/7

has [3] 5/10 30/6 46/2 have [29] 5/10 6/2 6/25 identity [1] 41/6 8/21 9/8 9/20 17/22 17/23 18/5 18/6 18/6 19/24 21/18 21/25 22/4 22/5 22/14 28/23 30/13 | IMPANELED [1] 1/4 34/2 36/21 40/13 40/24 41/13 41/18 43/6 45/7 45/16 45/17

having [4] 5/5 8/5 21/7 39/9

he [16] 18/18 18/25 32/20 32/24 32/25 33/2 **INDEX [2]** 3/1 4/1 35/24 36/17 37/6 38/4 38/12 41/7 41/18 41/19 42/17 43/11

heads [1] 12/3 heard [1] 40/5 hearsay [1] 18/18 held [2] 19/17 44/19 helicopter [1] 11/22 help [4] 7/11 17/14 20/13 40/6

her [11] 5/7 39/2 39/3 39/3 39/7 39/12 39/14 39/19 39/24 40/9 44/1 here [11] 7/4 7/15 11/19 11/20 20/18 24/23 25/3 25/13 26/6

27/2 30/18 hereby [2] 47/6 48/4 hidden [1] 34/1 hiding [1] 43/10 highway [2] 10/16 22/24 him [7] 33/12 33/18 35/24 36/5 38/6 41/9 45/17 his [17] 18/25 22/14 32/20 32/23 33/10 34/16 34/16 35/8 36/9 36/20 37/2 42/2 42/3 42/13 42/24 42/24 43/4 hit [1] 30/4 Hodson [2] 22/15 22/17 homicide [14] 8/19 8/22 8/23 8/25 9/2 9/9 9/21 10/6 16/16 17/2 21/17 21/18 22/5 22/18 hours [1] 40/25 how [13] 8/11 8/21 11/6 21/13 21/18 22/12 22/12 24/11 28/12

I'II [1] 6/11 I'm [13] 5/18 6/11 8/13 8/18 10/22 10/23 16/18 18/9 24/3 28/8 28/17 32/16 35/10 I've [3] 6/4 24/13 24/13 **I-15 [2]** 10/15 11/22 idea [1] 26/3 identified [5] 4/3 41/8

28/22 33/14 37/6 42/9

hundred [1] 38/1

41/17 41/18 41/20 identifies [1] 25/4 image [1] 42/16 immediately [2] 23/19 28/7

incident [6] 11/8 32/21 32/22 33/3 38/10 44/5 include [2] 9/1 9/5 included [2] 6/6 6/14 including [3] 19/9 24/20 44/11 indicate [1] 39/15 indicated [5] 37/10 42/21 43/20 45/5 47/9 Indicating [1] 14/4 indictment [6] 4/4 5/12 5/21 6/3 46/9 46/10 individual [4] 33/22 34/17 36/5 38/9

34/1 34/6 34/14 35/4 43/9 indulgence [2] 17/21 43/5

individuals [6] 32/1

information [13] 6/17 6/19 16/15 16/20 17/1 17/7 17/9 18/18 18/25 19/12 22/19 39/3 44/14 initial [1] 39/8 000051

Initially [1] 39/9 initiated [2] 23/21 35/7 injuries [1] 16/12 inside [5] 14/23 28/14 32/25 33/19 35/2 instance [1] 41/14 instruct [1] 46/9 instructions [8] 4/4 6/5 6/6 6/7 6/10 6/11 6/13 32/12 intent [2] 5/11 33/12 interaction [1] 34/10 interior [5] 14/13 14/15 15/3 28/25 29/15 interrupt [1] 35/13 interrupting [1] 35/11 Interstate [1] 37/7 **interviewed [2]** 32/19 41/10 introduce [1] 32/16 introduced [1] 6/16 investigated [1] 21/22 investigating [1] 22/20 investigation [15] 7/9 7/16 8/19 10/3 12/7 17/4 17/7 17/14 18/11 20/11 20/19 22/5 22/19 28/6 31/9 involved [5] 17/8 22/5 22/8 22/13 38/9 involvement [4] 32/20 39/3 39/7 44/1 involving [4] 7/20 ladies [6] 5/13 7/2 20/4 20/24 21/23 32/21 is [81] isn't [1] 18/24 it [55] it's [10] 10/15 14/12 15/16 17/3 25/22 27/5 29/11 31/18 38/2 45/18

J-A-B-B-A-R [1] 41/8 **J-E-C-O-R-Y [1]** 31/13 Jabbar [1] 41/8 **JAMES [13]** 1/10 5/20 5/21 6/23 7/21 20/24 31/14 31/18 31/21 31/22 35/6 39/9 46/4 **JANSSEN** [1] 2/4 January [2] 39/23 41/2 January 21st [1] 41/2 **JECORY [8]** 1/10 1/10 5/20 5/21 7/20 20/24 31/13 46/3 **JESSIE [1]** 2/13 **JOHN [1]** 2/11 Jory [2] 2/22 5/18 JUDICIAL [1] 1/1 **JURORS [2]** 2/1 46/2 jury [67] just [26] 9/8 10/13 10/19 13/16 14/10 16/20 17/6 18/5 18/16 22/11 23/14 23/21 25/2 27/4 27/10 27/13 28/16

itself [2] 17/3 41/21

29/9 29/10 39/6 40/18 42/1 42/15 42/20 43/25 45/4

32/24

36/17

left [14] 12/6 12/8

35/5 35/6 38/12 42/2

left-hand [1] 25/16

legs [2] 15/18 36/7

lied [2] 39/9 39/10

lighting [1] 18/5

36/7 45/12

34/2 34/11

26/2

36/19

loaded [1] 37/1

light [2] 30/24 31/2

23/21 26/1 27/5 34/16

little [2] 12/20 28/16

living [4] 29/12 29/18

located [7] 8/14 15/8

location [5] 10/20

24/14 24/23 25/15

long [2] 8/21 21/18

look [8] 10/25 11/10

looking [36] 11/19

11/20 11/23 12/12

12/13 13/9 13/18 14/1

14/2 14/13 14/21 15/1

15/16 15/17 24/7 25/3

26/6 26/8 26/10 26/11

29/5 29/8 29/14 29/15

30/11 30/18 31/6 43/1

looks [2] 27/5 30/1

lower [3] 29/19 42/4

45/10

42/24

25/8 25/13 25/19 25/21

28/18 30/25

11/18 11/22 18/4 24/5

KEMP [33] 1/10 1/10 5/20 5/21 6/23 7/21 20/24 31/13 31/18 31/20 31/22 32/9 32/18 32/19 32/23 33/14 34/10 34/20 34/25 35/5 35/14 35/16 35/21 36/13 36/16 36/24 37/4 37/5 37/22 38/8 43/9 43/21 46/3 **KENNETH** [1] 2/3 kept [1] 34/15 key [3] 16/23 17/3 17/9 kidnapping [6] 5/24 6/9 6/12 7/18 20/21 46/6

killed [1] 32/25 kind [2] 18/6 40/18 kitchen [7] 29/12 29/21 30/5 30/10 31/1 33/18 34/3

knew [1] 13/9 know [5] 13/22 18/3 18/7 26/12 29/18 knowledge [3] 18/2 19/1 45/19 known [1] 37/7

32/12 42/16 45/2 laid [2] 32/24 34/6 landing [3] 27/6 29/6 29/8 lanyard [3] 16/23 17/1 17/4 large [2] 33/9 36/4 larger [1] 41/1 Las [15] 1/14 5/1 10/16 12/5 16/15 17/2 17/5 17/10 17/13 17/15 21/15 22/8 24/24 38/14 47/14 last [5] 7/25 8/2 9/19 21/3 25/20 lastly [1] 42/25 late [1] 39/21 later [4] 17/14 18/10 37/12 40/5 law [12] 6/10 6/13 6/15 6/15 6/21 15/25 15/25 19/7 32/13 44/9 45/4 48/13 lay [1] 42/17 layout [1] 29/10

lead [2] 13/7 17/8

learn [1] 37/3

39/20 39/22

least [1] 34/23

leave [1] 40/3

learned [1] 6/17

leading [2] 23/12 24/20

lease [4] 39/17 39/18

M-I-T-C-H-E-L-L [1] 21/5 made [9] 19/11 28/4 29/1 30/3 33/24 35/16 37/10 38/15 44/13 main [1] 10/15 majority [1] 9/5 make [3] 26/23 31/25 33/13 making [1] 38/5 manipulate [1] 15/22 many [5] 9/1 9/3 9/14 21/22 21/25 **marijuana [5]** 33/9 33/11 33/12 33/13 33/21 Marion [1] 41/8 marked [1] 6/4

marks [1] 14/4

led [4] 16/15 17/1 17/5 match [1] 18/5 material [2] 14/19 30/5 materials [1] 31/7 12/20 25/16 25/16 29/7 matter [1] 47/8 may [3] 6/1 19/17 42/14 42/23 43/4 43/20 44/19 maybe [4] 12/19 32/21 37/17 40/19 McCord [7] 1/25 5/4 **Lexus [3]** 13/21 13/24 47/6 47/17 47/18 48/18 48/20 me [6] 10/17 10/25 16/25 20/6 20/6 37/5 like [9] 10/7 13/12 18/4 mean [1] 41/10 meaning [2] 6/18 36/2 means [1] 6/7 meant [1] 41/14 members [14] 6/2 10/13 11/17 17/23 18/17 19/4 22/8 22/11 25/1 27/4 43/7 43/14 22/24 23/15 23/16 26/1 44/7 45/24 Mendoza [1] 6/11 metal [2] 13/13 13/16 Metropolitan [2] 21/16 22/8 mid [1] 39/21 middle [1] 37/17 MILLER [1] 2/8 mind [1] 36/20 minus [2] 37/14 39/13 looked [2] 12/24 23/21

Miranda [2] 32/3 38/19 misdemeanor [2] 19/15 44/17 Miss [7] 6/23 9/17 31/18 31/21 31/22 35/6 39/9 missed [1] 35/19 27/2 27/11 27/15 27/17 Mitch [1] 17/18 MITCHELL [3] 3/4 21/4 21/6 money [1] 33/25 lot [8] 23/23 25/15 26/9 MOORE [1] 2/6 28/5 35/20 36/12 36/25 more [7] 15/18 17/3 24/4 27/3 27/10 27/12

46/2

40/6

36/18

MORGAN [1] 2/9

5/16 17/17 21/13

Mr [2] 8/11 41/2

Mr. [40] 6/23 21/13

32/18 32/19 32/23

33/14 33/17 33/18

34/10 34/13 34/15

34/19 34/20 34/24

36/18 36/24 36/25 37/1

37/4 37/5 37/5 37/22

38/8 40/4 42/11 43/9

43/21 46/1

most [1] 26/4

45/9 46/5 44/8 morning [5] 5/13 5/15 move [3] 35/22 36/5 34/5 moved [3] 33/18 36/2 movement [1] 39/13 31/18 31/20 31/22 32/9

Mr. Anderson [10] 33/17 33/18 34/13 34/15 34/19 34/24 36/4 37/5 40/4 42/11 Mr. Anderson's [3] 36/18 36/25 37/1 Mr. District [1] 46/1 Mr. Dosch [1] 21/13 Mr. Kemp [25] 6/23 31/18 31/20 31/22 32/9 32/18 32/19 32/23 33/14 34/10 34/20 34/25 35/5 35/14 35/16 35/21 36/13 36/16 36/24 37/4 37/5 37/22 38/8 43/9 43/21 much [3] 41/1 41/1 multiple [2] 29/24 35/2 murder [12] 5/22 5/24 6/8 6/9 7/17 20/20 33/7 36/18 39/11 40/3 43/21 **MURRAY [1]** 2/10 must [1] 23/17 my [11] 5/17 6/5 7/2 12/20 20/7 21/4 27/24 37/12 45/3 45/18 47/10 named [1] 41/6 nature [1] 10/1 neck [1] 16/24

name [7] 5/17 7/25 8/1 21/3 21/4 22/14 48/20 near [3] 15/4 26/1 37/1 necessarily [1] 36/21 **NEVADA [8]** 1/2 1/7 1/14 5/1 5/19 24/24 47/3 47/14 next [2] 20/7 41/4 night [1] 17/16 **no [16]** 1/9 1/9 1/25 5/10 7/1 13/10 15/14 15/23 16/4 17/22 19/4 35/12 43/6 43/11 43/20 nods [1] 6/3 north [4] 10/18 11/24 25/17 26/8 northern [3] 12/1 12/3 northwest [1] 23/17 not [12] 16/2 18/9 22/7 29/25 32/14 33/12 36/20 40/12 41/2 43/11

45/18 48/8 **notes [1]** 47/10 **nothing [5]** 7/10 8/7 10/19 20/12 21/9 notice [4] 5/11 12/24 14/14 25/16 34/25 35/5 35/14 35/16 | **noticed [1]** 33/23 35/21 36/4 36/13 36/16 Noting [4] 6/3 6/24 19/4 44/8

November [1] 39/21

now [30] 7/1 7/9 8/23

11/9 12/6 12/14 12/23

000052

Ν now... [23] 14/13 15/4 15/20 20/7 20/11 22/3 26/7 26/20 27/21 28/4 28/8 28/17 29/9 30/10 32/8 33/2 34/7 34/11 34/25 35/13 35/21 37/22 41/22 NRS [2] 48/2 48/13 number [36] 11/18 12/12 13/18 14/1 14/9 14/20 14/25 15/15 16/19 23/2 25/2 25/4 25/8 25/11 25/19 25/25 26/5 26/18 27/2 27/9 27/17 28/9 29/5 29/14 30/11 31/6 31/20 31/21 32/9 37/16 38/25 42/17 42/25 48/5 48/8 48/11 Number 10 [2] 28/9 Number 11 [1] 26/5 Number 12 [1] 26/18 Number 13 [1] 27/2 Number 14 [1] 27/9 Number 16 [1] 29/5 Number 19 [1] 29/14 Number 21 [2] 12/12 37/16 Number 22 [1] 13/18 Number 24 [1] 14/9 Number 3 [2] 31/20 32/9 Number 4 [2] 31/21 38/25 Number 5 [1] 25/2 Number 6 [1] 25/8 Number 7 [1] 25/11 Number 8 [1] 25/19 Number 9 [1] 25/25 **Numbers [1]** 31/15 Numbers 3 [1] 31/15 obtain [1] 27/22 obtained [2] 19/12 44/14 obvious [3] 12/24 14/14 41/23 obviously [4] 15/14 30/13 37/13 38/2 occasion [3] 9/8 9/20 occasions [1] 9/12 occupants [1] 33/10 occur [1] 41/2 occurred [5] 22/6 33/7 34/22 39/11 44/4 occurring [2] 19/11 44/13 off [6] 9/24 12/16 34/6

35/1 36/7 38/1

offense [1] 6/6

office [1] 40/24

Official [1] 48/22

officer [1] 9/9

20/20

offenses [3] 6/25 7/17

45/18

okay [83] on-call [1] 10/11 once [2] 33/15 37/25 one [12] 5/10 6/16 6/19 17/23 23/18 24/3 33/20 34/7 34/23 36/5 43/9 44/4 only [4] 6/17 15/25 32/13 32/17 oo0oo [1] 46/14 open [2] 10/21 14/23 opened [1] 33/22 opposed [1] 15/19 orange [1] 27/12 order [2] 28/17 33/3 orient [1] 27/4 oriented [3] 11/23 11/24 12/14 other [17] 6/20 10/19 16/12 17/22 19/3 26/9 30/3 32/15 32/15 33/24 35/24 38/4 38/11 43/6 43/13 44/7 45/20 our [6] 11/7 11/21 12/15 12/17 18/10 40/24 out [15] 9/20 10/8 13/23 13/24 15/3 28/16 32/24 34/7 36/9 37/7 37/11 37/13 40/14 45/3 45/12 outside [4] 23/19 23/21 29/6 36/19 over [2] 26/13 44/2 overwhelming [2] 30/4 31/4 packet [1] 6/14 paid [1] 33/25 Pam [1] 20/5 Pamela [1] 2/23 paperwork [1] 39/20 park [1] 26/4 parking [7] 23/23 25/15 25/22 26/2 26/9 36/12 36/25 part [5] 8/16 8/18 17/14 18/11 40/12 particular [7] 8/16 22/16 23/16 24/14 25/5 33/16 35/3 parties [3] 34/11 35/1 41/10 partner [3] 22/14 27/24 37/12 passenger [1] 14/2 path [1] 26/19 payment [1] 33/13 pending [2] 7/9 20/11 people [7] 16/19 31/16 35/2 35/25 40/17 41/9 41/10 Perfect [2] 27/16 29/4 person [6] 16/11 26/7 27/19 38/5 48/9 48/11 personal [2] 18/25

perspective [1] 25/25 pertaining [3] 7/16 17/7 20/19 **photo [5]** 25/21 29/8 30/13 42/11 42/12 photograph [50] photographs [10] 10/23 10/25 11/6 12/14 24/9 24/15 26/10 28/20 31/17 42/7 photos [2] 11/4 24/2 physical [4] 23/8 23/10 28/5 35/15 pick [2] 38/6 38/13 picture [2] 14/22 15/2 pictures [1] 11/13 pieces [1] 11/11 pitch [1] 38/2 place [3] 37/25 40/22 47/9 placed [5] 26/14 26/15 30/14 30/20 36/3 Plaintiff [1] 1/8 plan [6] 33/2 33/6 33/8 36/6 36/9 40/6 planned [1] 40/2 **planning [2]** 44/1 44/3 plans [1] 32/21 plastic [2] 13/15 14/19 please [7] 7/13 7/24 10/25 20/15 21/2 24/1 28/18 **PLUNKETT [1]** 2/11 pockets [1] 35/5 point [5] 7/1 16/8 34/7 36/5 45/5 pointed [2] 34/17 34/18 pointing [1] 12/19 police [3] 9/9 21/16 22/8 portion [3] 24/20 29/2 29/19 position [1] 16/10 positively [2] 41/7 41/19 possible [2] 21/23 40/10 potential [2] 9/5 34/21 potentially [1] 9/1 pound [2] 33/23 33/24 pounds [1] 33/20 poured [1] 18/6 practically [1] 43/3 preceding [1] 48/4 preliminarily [1] 45/20 preliminary [1] 6/24 premeditation [1] 5/23 prepare [2] 36/2 46/9 **presence** [2] 19/11 44/13 present [3] 2/1 2/21 43/18 presentation [3] 7/3 20/7 45/3 presented [2] 19/10 44/12

persons [1] 45/23 **presenting** [1] 5/18 pretty [1] 15/16 **previous** [1] 30/13 previously [3] 35/17 41/7 46/10 primary [1] 23/5 **Print [1]** 48/20 prior [3] 41/20 43/21 44/4 probably [1] 38/1 procedures [1] 40/19 proceedings [7] 1/20 5/7 19/7 44/9 46/13 47/8 47/13 process [1] 35/7 produce [1] 34/18 **products** [1] 31/5 program [1] 48/15 prohibited [2] 19/8 44/10 **property [2]** 13/4 39/10 24/16 28/25 30/15 proposed [3] 4/4 10/24 46/10 prospective [1] 27/11 **provided** [1] 39/14 **public [1]** 48/15 **publishing** [1] 11/17 **pulled [1]** 34/15 punishable [4] 19/15 19/17 44/17 44/19 purchase [1] 33/8 purportedly [3] 33/20 34/15 35/4 purposes [1] 36/23 **Pursuant [1]** 48/2 put [2] 35/18 45/12 question [6] 13/10 17/24 43/15 45/7 45/13 45/18 questions [8] 6/25 7/1 17/22 19/4 43/6 43/13

44/7 45/20 Quick [1] 43/15 quite [2] 29/24 42/3

raise [1] 7/5 rather [1] 17/3 **RAYOS [1]** 2/12 read [2] 32/3 38/19 reading [1] 16/20 rear [1] 15/11 received [1] 22/17 recognize [11] 11/3 11/6 24/8 24/11 28/10 28/12 28/19 28/22 31/16 42/6 42/9 record [9] 5/9 6/1 6/4 7/25 20/4 20/7 21/3 31/19 47/12 recounted [1] 39/12 recounting [1] 39/24 refer [3] 6/11 6/14 41/9 **reference** [1] 38/15 references [1] 41/13

15/10 34/20 relay [1] 35/21 relevance [2] 16/21 16/22 relevant [7] 11/11 23/11 28/6 29/22 29/25 30/18 30/19 relocate [1] 35/22 **REMBERT [1]** 2/4 remind [2] 6/22 45/4 removed [1] 16/6 removing [1] 35/8 renter [1] 39/16 **Reported [1]** 1/25 **Reporter [1]** 48/22 **REPORTER'S [2]** 1/20 47/1 represent [5] 11/14 37/16 represents [1] 29/21 request [2] 2/21 33/9 **requested [1]** 33/13 requesting [1] 22/19 require [1] 18/20 required [1] 48/12 residence [2] 33/22 35/9 residue [2] 30/2 30/7

reflect [2] 5/9 6/2

relation [4] 6/12 15/8

respond [5] 9/10 10/8 15/20 16/5 23/8 responded [12] 9/1 10/2 10/12 10/14 11/8 11/9 11/15 16/13 21/22 21/25 23/10 24/17 responds [1] 16/7 response [1] 5/11 rest [2] 17/4 17/6 resulting [4] 5/25 7/19 20/22 46/7 retrieved [1] 36/24 returned [3] 35/6 45/25 46/3 reveal [3] 36/13 39/2

39/7 riding [1] 38/10 right [7] 11/20 11/23 14/10 17/21 22/21 34/16 40/21 right-hand [1] 11/23 rights [2] 6/20 32/6 Road [2] 10/18 37/8 rob [2] 33/3 33/12

robbery [14] 5/22 6/1 6/7 6/9 6/12 7/17 7/20 20/20 20/23 34/7 34/9 40/1 46/5 46/7 role [4] 39/4 39/10 40/9 40/13

roll [6] 16/8 16/9 16/10 16/11 16/11 16/14 room [6] 9/17 29/12 29/18 34/3 34/12 45/24 rotational [1] 10/7 round [1] 34/23 referred [2] 14/5 16/14 rounding [1] 27/19

R rubber [1] 13/14 safe [2] 8/25 21/21 same [8] 14/3 26/9 26/19 27/3 27/8 27/10 27/11 43/22 San [11] 8/13 8/17 22/9 22/17 22/22 37/8 37/11 37/20 37/23 40/19 40/25 **SAULSON [1]** 2/13 saw [2] 11/15 24/17 **says [1]** 6/19 Scarborough [2] 2/22 scene [33] 9/20 9/23 10/12 10/14 11/7 11/9 11/10 11/11 11/15 11/21 12/8 12/15 12/17 12/21 12/23 15/4 15/21 16/2 16/6 23/6 23/8 23/10 24/16 26/16 28/25 30/15 30/20 35/16 37/11 37/13 37/18 37/18 37/24 scenes [8] 9/1 9/4 9/5 9/10 9/14 10/7 21/23 21/25 SCOTT [1] 2/14 scrapped [1] 36/9 screen [1] 12/20 search [5] 27/22 27/25 28/2 29/1 31/8 seated [2] 7/14 20/16 second [4] 27/14 27/18 36/3 42/12 secret [2] 19/8 44/10 Secretary [2] 2/5 2/6 section [3] 21/17 21/19 22/18 security [2] 48/8 48/11 sedan [1] 36/17 seeing [1] 34/13 Seek [1] 5/11 seen [2] 9/14 13/4 separates [1] 34/4 series [1] 11/4 set [7] 18/5 34/2 38/3 39/8 39/22 40/6 41/19 set-up [1] 39/8 sets [1] 40/14 Seven [1] 21/20 several [2] 37/12 41/20 shall [2] 7/9 20/11 she [19] 38/19 38/20 38/21 38/23 39/2 39/7 39/12 39/15 39/15 39/17 39/21 40/1 40/3 40/9 40/12 40/13 43/20 43/20 44/3 She's [1] 20/6 Sheriff's [3] 8/14 22/10 22/18 shooting [4] 34/21 22/23 23/1 42/4 34/22 39/25 43/19

shopping [1] 36/10

short [1] 33/23 shorthand [2] 47/7 47/9 shortly [1] 33/25 shot [1] 29/15 show [2] 18/10 28/17 showing [27] 12/11 13/17 13/25 14/9 15/15 16/18 23/24 24/4 25/1 25/7 25/11 25/18 25/24 26/5 26/18 27/1 27/16 28/8 29/4 29/13 31/5 31/15 32/8 37/15 38/24 42/5 42/16 side [13] 10/17 10/20 11/23 11/24 12/6 14/2 14/11 14/22 16/12 26/20 30/8 34/6 34/16 Sienna [1] 40/15 Signature [1] 48/18 significance [1] 23/4 significant [2] 26/12 26/13 similar [1] 39/13 sir [10] 7/23 11/2 12/2 12/10 14/6 19/6 19/21 20/3 45/8 46/12 sit [1] 7/6 small [4] 12/8 29/2 29/11 36/10 **so [46]** 7/11 9/18 10/6 10/12 10/15 10/17 10/17 10/22 11/3 11/17 11/25 12/16 16/2 16/13 16/25 17/12 18/21 20/13 23/7 23/24 24/7 26/9 28/8 28/9 28/17 29/6 29/13 29/17 30/1 30/10 30/13 31/8 31/19 32/19 34/9 36/13 36/16 37/13 37/15 38/15 39/6 40/9 40/17 41/5 41/13 45/13 social [2] 48/8 48/11 sold [1] 33/10 solemnly [2] 7/7 20/9 some [6] 9/4 18/6 18/21 30/2 34/1 35/3 somebody [1] 26/10 someone's [1] 32/14 sometime [1] 40/22 sorry [5] 24/3 28/8 35/10 35/13 45/19 sought [1] 33/21 sounds [1] 34/16 south [1] 10/17 southern [2] 10/16 space [2] 25/22 26/2 speak [2] 32/6 38/22 speaking [2] 26/3 40/17 specialized [1] 8/18 **specific [2]** 36/14 48/13 specifically [4] 8/19

spell [2] 7/25 21/3

splatter [1] 26/1 **spoke [2]** 37/9 39/2 **ss [1]** 47/3 stack [1] 10/23 stairs [3] 26/24 36/11 40/15 stairwell [6] 23/18 24/21 26/22 26/24 27/3 27/10 **stairwells** [1] 23/18 stand [1] 7/4 standing [3] 26/8 29/6 29/18 state [7] 1/7 5/19 7/24 21/2 47/3 48/13 48/16 stated [3] 32/11 35/17 43/22 **statement** [7] 6/16 6/17 19/11 32/14 32/16 32/24 44/13 statements [3] 6/23 35/14 35/15 statured [1] 36/4 staying [1] 32/25 stench [2] 30/4 31/4 **Stenotype** [1] 47/7 steps [1] 31/9 STEVENSON [1] 2/14 stickers [5] 30/14 30/14 30/15 30/18 30/19 still [1] 38/21 **stop [1]** 16/25 **story [2]** 39/12 39/13 straight [1] 31/1 strike [1] 34/23 structures [1] 13/4 submit [2] 45/5 45/21 **submitted [1]** 46/11 subsequent [2] 6/21 32/21 subsequently [1] 31/25 substantial [4] 5/25 7/19 20/22 46/7 suddenly [1] 34/14 **Suites [1]** 40/15 summoned [1] 38/13 supervision [1] 47/11 surface [1] 25/23 suspects [1] 31/10 swear [3] 7/5 7/7 20/9 sworn [3] 5/5 8/5 21/7 T.V [1] 11/19 table [2] 36/6 36/8 take [4] 17/13 32/13 36/20 40/22 taken [3] 1/14 11/21 28/14 taking [1] 40/14 talk [2] 34/25 37/22 talked [3] 37/5 40/1 44/3 talking [1] 6/11 team [3] 10/11 22/15 30/3

tell [3] 33/14 35/24 38/4 tenure [2] 8/24 9/9 terms [6] 17/6 26/13 35/16 38/5 39/7 40/9 testified [2] 8/7 21/9 testify [3] 8/6 18/25 21/8 testimony [4] 7/8 7/16 20/10 20/19 than [2] 10/19 17/4 Thank [17] 7/13 7/24 19/3 19/6 19/22 19/24 20/1 20/2 20/3 20/15 20/17 25/18 43/23 44/24 45/1 45/21 46/12 that's [25] 7/5 7/5 11/22 11/24 12/14 12/22 14/7 14/8 14/11 14/22 15/2 21/24 23/18 took [1] 47/7 31/13 34/22 35/12 43/2 their [2] 32/5 33/12 them [5] 24/12 28/22 32/14 38/13 38/14 then [21] 7/6 10/8 13/25 17/12 23/19 27/19 28/1 28/16 29/21 30/5 30/8 31/24 32/3 33/9 33/24 34/20 36/10 38/18 40/5 42/23 42/25 theories [1] 6/8 theory [2] 5/23 5/24 there [45] 6/13 6/24 13/18 14/1 14/21 15/1 15/16 16/13 16/25 18/5 | transportation [2] 18/7 23/20 24/13 25/8 25/19 26/15 27/17 28/23 29/5 29/14 30/8 30/9 30/14 30/20 30/24 31/1 31/1 31/6 32/12 33/23 34/3 35/2 35/15 36/5 37/13 39/25 42/1 42/3 42/21 43/1 45/11 there's [4] 9/10 10/19 29/24 45/10 thereafter [2] 33/25 47/9 thermal [2] 42/3 42/21 these [7] 11/13 19/7 24/2 24/15 32/1 34/13 44/9 They're [1] 31/7 thing [3] 36/1 36/3 43/22 things [3] 17/11 29/24 36/16 third [2] 23/15 27/20 those [17] 9/4 9/5 10/25 11/6 24/1 24/8 26/9 28/18 28/19 28/24 30/14 30/15 31/16 36/11 38/21 40/17 42/6 though [1] 45/20 three [1] 8/23

54 through [18] 10/13 10/24 10/25 11/4 11/14 18/25 20/6 22/9 22/12 23/25 24/1 24/8 25/3 28/18 32/20 35/4 42/6 42/20 Thursday [1] 1/15 tile [4] 29/21 30/6 30/6 35/19 TILLEMA [1] 2/15 time [7] 13/22 22/6 35/3 40/2 42/11 45/23 47/9 Title [1] 48/22 to-wit [1] 48/13 today [2] 7/15 20/19 **told [5]** 16/20 18/15 18/18 32/20 34/10 too [2] 26/24 39/2 25/9 25/20 27/18 29/20 **top [5]** 11/25 12/19 23/16 27/18 37/17 37/20 38/25 41/4 41/15 touch [3] 15/21 16/1 toward [5] 12/5 15/18 26/8 26/10 30/5 towards [4] 12/6 14/13 26/11 27/6 trail [5] 23/20 25/12 26/1 27/13 27/21 training [3] 9/13 13/3 21/21 transcribe [1] 5/6 transcribed [1] 47/10 transcript [3] 1/20 47/11 48/5 9/14 10/19 12/12 13/10 | transpired [2] 19/9 44/11 40/10 40/12 transported [1] 36/14 trash [1] 36/3 travel [1] 45/10 traveled [2] 10/18 45/9 true [2] 46/2 47/12 trunk [3] 15/11 26/1 37/2 truth [13] 7/10 7/10 7/11 8/6 8/6 8/7 18/22 20/12 20/12 20/13 21/8 21/8 21/9 turned [1] 13/24 two [10] 23/18 31/10 33/6 33/20 34/6 36/16 40/2 40/17 42/7 44/4 two pounds [1] 33/20 **TYESHIA [11]** 1/10 5/20 5/21 7/21 20/24 31/14 38/16 38/25 43/18 43/25 46/4 typical [1] 15/20 typically [1] 40/24

U.S [1] 10/16 **ultimately [8]** 16/14 22/21 23/8 27/22 31/9 31/21 37/3 41/16 000054

U under [2] 5/23 47/10 undersigned [1] 48/4 understand [4] 7/22 19/20 20/25 44/22 underway [2] 34/8 34/9 unfolded [1] 33/15 unfortunately [1] 35/19 unit [1] 11/22 until [1] 41/2

unit [1] 11/22 until [1] 41/2 up [31] 10/25 11/23 12/14 13/19 15/2 18/10 19/15 23/5 23/12 23/18 24/20 25/9 25/20 26/23 27/18 27/20 31/1 33/22 34/2 35/8 35/16 37/4 38/6 38/13 39/8 40/6 40/10 41/19 42/12 43/25 44/17

up-close [3] 25/9 25/20 42/12

upon [3] 7/8 20/10 34/13

upper [5] 15/19 25/16 42/2 42/13 43/4 **us [7]** 17/5 19/9 32/19 39/14 43/20 44/11

use [16] 5/22 5/24 6/1 6/17 6/18 7/18 7/18 7/20 9/5 20/21 20/22 20/23 21/23 46/5 46/6 46/8

used [2] 18/14 36/10 **utilize [3]** 36/6 36/8 36/23

V

46/11

vast [1] 9/4 VATCHARA [1] 2/16 Vegas [15] 1/14 5/1 10/17 12/5 16/15 17/2 17/5 17/10 17/13 17/15 21/15 22/8 24/24 38/14 47/14

vehicle [32] 10/3 12/22 12/24 12/25 13/1 13/20 13/21 13/23 14/3 14/7 14/8 14/14 15/3 15/5 15/9 15/10 17/8 18/4 26/2 36/12 36/14 36/17 36/18 36/20 36/23 37/14 37/25 38/9 38/11 38/13 40/8 40/15

vehicles [4] 13/5 18/3 18/4 26/4

versus [1] 5/19 very [7] 29/11 29/22 30/1 30/7 39/12 42/1 45/9

VICHAIKUL [1] 2/16 victim [17] 10/4 15/12 15/14 16/12 32/24 33/3 33/11 33/15 33/16 34/11 39/8 41/6 41/14 41/17 41/23 42/17 44/2 victim's [9] 15/17 16/23 35/4 35/22 36/15 36/17 36/20 36/23 37/6 Victor [1] 8/2 view [1] 37/16 violate [1] 6/20 violent [1] 9/2 VIRGIL [1] 2/12 visit [1] 37/11 visited [1] 37/18

vote [1] 46/2

W

waiting [1] 5/10
walk [6] 10/13 11/10
22/11 32/19 42/20 45/3
walked [2] 20/5 23/12
walking [1] 25/2
walkway [1] 27/19
WALLACE [1] 2/5
walls [1] 35/20
want [4] 9/18 18/16
22/3 45/4
warrant [4] 27/22

27/25 28/2 29/1 wasn't [1] 18/11 way [5] 23/22 26/23 34/2 37/7 41/18 we're [7] 12/13 12/14 14/2 15/17 25/13 26/7 30/10

we've [1] 26/12 weapon [14] 5/23 5/25 6/1 6/8 6/10 7/18 7/19 7/20 20/21 20/22 20/23 46/5 46/6 46/8

Weckerly [3] 2/23 9/17 20/5

week [1] 10/11 weeks [2] 37/12 41/20 well [3] 12/15 24/5 29/25

WENDY [1] 2/6 went [4] 23/22 35/1 36/24 37/13

were [20] 22/20 23/7 26/10 27/19 30/14 30/20 30/25 31/12 31/13 31/22 32/3 32/4 34/1 34/6 35/2 36/22 38/7 40/3 41/5 47/10 west [8] 10/20 11/24 12/14 26/11 26/20 29/15 29/17 westbound [1] 12/16

westbound [1] 12/16 what's [3] 11/3 16/20 24/8

whatever [2] 16/10 18/3 when [30] 6/16 6/22

6/23 10/2 10/12 11/1 11/9 11/15 12/23 13/5 15/4 15/12 15/20 16/10 23/7 23/10 24/17 28/4 29/17 30/2 32/19 33/11 34/22 36/22 37/23 38/7 39/2 39/18 41/5 41/22 where [18] 9/10 9/14 9/23 10/7 12/4 12/17 15/8 25/21 30/8 32/13 35/7 36/6 36/14 37/3 37/4 38/9 39/25 41/4 whereas [1] 26/9 which [16] 15/17 16/23 23/15 25/4 29/18 29/21 30/6 32/17 33/7 33/9 34/5 34/23 36/10 37/8 41/3 44/4 white [2] 30/2 30/7 who [5] 15/24 18/10 31/12 34/1 34/14 whole [4] 7/10 8/6 20/12 21/8

whole [4] //10 8/6 20/12 21/8 why [1] 30/18 will [6] 6/14 6/22 7/2 20/7 45/3 45/5 wish [2] 32/6 38/22 wit [1] 48/13 within [5] 25/5 33/22

34/17 36/6 40/24 Without [1] 16/19 witness [5] 17/22 20/8 43/6 45/14 45/17

WITNESSES [1] 3/1 work [1] 22/15 worked [1] 17/16 wound [3] 42/2 42/13 43/4

wounds [1] 41/23 WYETH [1] 2/17

v

yards [1] 38/1 year [1] 9/19 years [2] 8/23 21/20 yellow [3] 26/14 26/15 27/12 yes [58] you [196]

you'll [1] 25/15 you're [10] 7/4 7/8 7/15 11/1 11/23 19/22 20/10 20/18 20/18 44/24

you've [2] 8/25 21/22 your [16] 7/5 7/25 8/21 8/24 9/8 9/13 9/18 13/3 18/2 21/2 21/21 22/3 22/23 26/23 31/9 45/6

000055

		Electronically Filed			
12:00	1	3/20/2020 6:38 PM Steven D. Grierson EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT CLERK OF THE COURT			
	2	CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA			
	3				
	4				
12:00	5	THE STATE OF NEVADA,)			
	6) Plaintiff,)			
	7	vs.) GJ No. 19CGJAB&E			
	8	JECORY ELES KEMP, aka Jecory)			
	9	Kemp, TYESHIA EVAN JAMES, ARLEO) EARL DAVIS, aka Arleo Earl Davis,)			
12:00	10	Jr.,)			
	11	Defendants.))			
	12				
	13				
	14	Taken at Las Vegas, Nevada			
12:00	15	Thursday, March 19, 2020			
	16	9:53 a.m.			
	17				
	18				
	19				
12:00	20	REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS			
	21				
	22	SUPERSEDING INDICTMENT			
	23				
	24				
12:00	25	Reported by: Danette L. Antonacci, C.C.R. No. 222			

12:00	1	GRAND JURORS PRESENT ON MARCH 19, 2020
	2	
	3	JANSSEN REMBERT, Deputy Foreperson
	4	DENISE WALLACE, Secretary
12:00	5	WENDY MOORE, Assistant Secretary
	6	GULLIVER FLYNN
	7	BELINDA MILLER
	8	JENNIFER MURRELL
	9	JOHN PLUNKETT
12:00	10	JESSIE SAULSON
	11	SCOTT STEVENSON
	12	DEBORAH TILLEMA
	13	DANIEL WILLIAMS
	14	GLORIA WYETH
12:00	15	Also present at the request of the Grand Jury:
	16	Marc DiGiacomo, Chief Deputy District Attorney
	17	Jory Scarborough, Deputy District Attorney
	18	
	19	
	20	
	21	
	22	
	23	
	24	
	25	

10.00	1	TNDEW OF MITTINGGER
12:00	1	<u>INDEX OF WITNESSES</u>
	2	<u>Examined</u>
	3	
	4	MACKESHIA MURPHY 7
12:00	5	BRECK HODSON 24
	6	
	7	
	8	
	9	
	10	
	11	
	12	
	13	
	14	
	15	
	16	
	17	
	18	
	19	
	20	
	21	
	22	
	23	
	24	
	25	

12:00	1	INDEX OF EXHIBITS	
	3	Grand Jury Exhibits	Identified
	4	1A - PROPOSED SUPERSEDING INDICTMENT	5
12:00	5	31 - TRANSCRIPT	6
	6	32 - PHOTOGRAPH	21
	7	33 - PHOTOGRAPH	22
	8	34 - PHOTOGRAPH	22
	9	35 - PHOTOGRAPH	22
12:00	10	36 - PHOTOGRAPH	22
	11	37 - PHOTOGRAPH	22
	12	38 - CELL SITE MAP WITH TOWER HIT	30
	13	39 - CELL TOWER RECORD	32
	14	40 - CERTIFIED COPY OF PHONE RECORDS	27
12:00	15	41 - CERTIFIED COPY OF PHONE RECORDS	29
	16		
	17		
	18		
	19		
	20		
	21		
	22		
	23		
	24		
	25		

12:00 1 LAS VEGAS, NEVADA, MARCH 19, 2020

* * * * *

3

4

2

DANETTE L. ANTONACCI,

having been first duly sworn to faithfully
and accurately transcribe the following
proceedings to the best of her ability.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

23

24

25

09:53

09:53

09:53

09:54

MR. DIGIACOMO: Good morning ladies and gentlemen. My name is Marc DiGiacomo. I'm here with Jory Scarborough and we are deputy district attorneys here in Clark County. We're here to present a superseding Indictment. You have previously heard testimony related to this case against a Jecory Kemp and a Tyeshia James. At the end of this testimony I'm going to ask you to revote as it relates to those two and now there is an additional person on what's been marked as Grand Jury Exhibit 1A under Grand Jury case number 19CGJ007AB&E. You were previously instructed on the elements of the offenses that are contained in the Indictment and Mr. Davis has been added to all four counts. I also understand that you've been previously instructed on a number of occasions related to both aiding and abetting and conspiracy liability. There is

one grand juror who may not have been here previously

09:54	1	for the presentation, however the transcript has been			
	2	marked as Grand Jury Exhibit Number 31. Has that grand			
	3	juror had the opportunity to review the transcript?			
	4	A JUROR: All but three pages.			
09:54	5	MR. DIGIACOMO: So before we deliberate			
	6	I'll ask that question again			
	7	A JUROR: Okay.			
	8	MR. DIGIACOMO: and ask you to make sure			
	9	that we finish those three pages. But we'll do the			
09:54	10	testimony, then I'll give you a moment to do that.			
	11	Okay?			
	12	If there are no questions I would call my			
	13	next witness.			
	14	THE FOREPERSON: Okay. Officer, please			
09:55	15	state your first and last name and spell both for the			
	16	record.			
	17	OFFICER LOZANO: Officer Armando Lozano.			
	18	A-R-M-A-N-D-O, last name L-O-Z-A-N-O.			
	19	THE FOREPERSON: Thank you.			
09:55	20	DEPUTY MARSHAL WALKER: Deputy Marshal			
	21	Lamons Walker. L-A-M-O-N-S, last name W-A-L-K-E-R, P			
	22	number 257.			
	23	THE FOREPERSON: Thank you.			
	24	Witness, please raise your right hand.			
09:55	25	You do solemnly swear the testimony you are			

09:55	1	about to give upon the investigation now pending before			
	2	this Grand Jury shall be the truth, the whole truth, and			
	3	nothing but the truth, so help you God?			
	4	THE WITNESS: Yes, I do.			
09:56	5	THE FOREPERSON: Okay. You are advised			
	6	that you are here today to give testimony in the			
	7	investigation pertaining to the offenses of conspiracy			
	8	to commit robbery, murder with use of a deadly weapon,			
	9	first degree kidnapping with use of a deadly weapon			
09:56	10	resulting in substantial bodily harm, robbery with use			
	11	of a deadly weapon, involving Jecory Eles Kemp, Tyeshia			
	12	Evan James, Arleo Earl Davis.			
	13	Do you understand this advisement?			
	14	THE WITNESS: Yeah.			
09:56	15	THE FOREPERSON: Please state your first			
	16	and last name, spell both for the record.			
	17	THE WITNESS: Mackeshia Murphy.			
	18	M-A-C-K-E-S-H-I-A, M-U-R-P-H-Y.			
	19	MACKESHIA MURPHY,			
09:56	20	having been first duly sworn by the Foreperson of the			
	21	Grand Jury to testify to the truth, the whole truth,			
	22	and nothing but the truth, testified as follows:			
	23	<u>EXAMINATION</u>			
	24	BY MR. DIGIACOMO:			
09:56	25	Q. Miss Murphy, the acoustics in here are a			

09:57	1	little different than maybe a normal courtroom. Your		
	2	voice sounds pretty good, just make sure you keep it up		
	3	for us. Okay?		
	4	A. Okay.		
09:57	5	Q. You're currently in custody?		
	6	A. Yeah.		
	7	Q. Is that a yes?		
	8	A. Yes.		
	9	Q. And what are you in custody for?		
09:57	10	A. Right now I'm in custody for probation		
	11	violation and open murder, conspiracy to robbery and		
	12	robbery.		
	13	Q. Okay. Let's talk about the probation		
	14	violation. When were you convicted or what crime were		
09:57	15	you convicted of?		
	16	A. Attempt grand larceny.		
	17	Q. Is that a felony or a gross?		
	18	A. It's a felony turned into a gross, I mean		
	19	turned into a misdemeanor.		
09:57	20	Q. If you successfully complete your		
	21	probation?		
	22	A. Yes.		
	23	Q. You were recently arrested, when I say		
	24	recently, sometime in 2020 you were arrested in		
09:57	25	California related to absconding from your probation?		

09:57	1	A. Yes.			
	2	Q. And you're in custody on that probation			
	3	hold right now?			
	4	A. Yes.			
09:57	5	Q. You were also originally charged with			
	6	counts related to what you're here to testify to here			
	7	today; is that correct?			
	8	A. Yes.			
	9	Q. And this morning did you become aware that			
09:58	10	you received immunity for your testimony in order for			
	11	you to come here and testify and you will not be charged			
	12	with any crime associated with the events you're here to			
	13	testify about?			
	14	A. Yes.			
09:58	15	Q. Okay. Do you have a sister?			
	16	A. Yes.			
	17	Q. What's her name?			
	18	A. Tyeshia James.			
	19	Q. Did she have a boyfriend?			
09:58	20	A. Yes.			
	21	Q. What's his name?			
	22	A. Jecory Kemp.			
	23	Q. Did you have a boyfriend?			
	24	A. Yes.			
09:58	25	Q. And what's his name?			

09:58	1	A. Davon Hickman.
	2	A JUROR: What was his name?
	3	THE WITNESS: Davon Hickman.
	4	BY MR. DIGIACOMO:
09:58	5	Q. Davon, did well, first of all, did
	6	Jecory Kemp have a nickname that he went by?
	7	A. Yeah, Smooth Got It.
	8	Q. Smooth Got It?
	9	A. Uh-huh.
09:58	10	Q. And what about Davon Hickman, did he have a
	11	nickname?
	12	A. Yeah, he had a couple nicknames. Little BD
	13	or Pay Still Got It.
	14	Q. Now back in the end of 1019, were you
09:59	15	staying in the Siegel Suites down on Boulder Highway,
	655 South Boulder Highway?	
	17	A. Yeah, the Siena Suites, yes.
	18	Q. Siena Suites. Sorry. On Boulder Highway?
	19	A. Yes.
09:59	20	Q. Who were you staying there with?
	21	A. Davon Hickman, Jecory Kemp and Tyeshia
	22	James.
	23	Q. The four of you stayed in an apartment
	24	there?
09:59	25	A. Yes.

09:59	1	Q. Now a couple days or maybe a day prior to		
	2	November 26th of 2019, or sorry, December 30th of 2019,		
	3	were you present for a conversation that involved a		
	4	discussion about a guy named AJ?		
09:59	5	A. Yes.		
	6	Q. Who is AJ?		
	7	A. He's our maintenance man.		
	8	Q. The maintenance man at the Siena Suites?		
	9	A. Yes.		
09:59	10	Q. When you had this conversation about AJ,		
	11	who else is in the room?		
	12	A. I name all Sayso. I name everybody?		
	13	Q. You name everybody. So you said Sayso?		
	14	A. Yeah.		
10:00	15	Q. So that's S-A-Y-S-O?		
	16	A. Yes.		
	17	Q. That's different than your boyfriend who is		
	18	Payso; correct?		
	19	A. Yeah, different than Payso, yeah.		
10:00	20	Q. So Sayso's in the room?		
	21	A. Yeah. His brother.		
	22	Q. Sayso's brother?		
	23	A. Yeah. Davon Hickman, Jecory Kemp, Tyeshia		
	24	and me.		
10:00	25	Q. At some point the discussion about AJ,		

10:00	1	what's the discussion about AJ?		
	2	A. That	Sayso owed AJ \$2000 for weed I guess	
	3	that AJ gave Sayso	and that Sayso and Davon and them was	
	4	going to rob him.		
10:00	5	Q. So Sa	yso allegedly owed AJ \$2000 for	
	6	marijuana that AJ	had provided him?	
	7	A. Yes.		
	8	Q. And i	nstead of paying him back, Sayso and	
	9	Hickman and Kemp and the brother, Sayso's brother, are		
10:00	10	going to rob AJ of	what?	
	11	A. Like	what do you mean? Like what?	
	12	Q. What	are they taking from him?	
	13	A. Oh, m	narijuana.	
	14	Q. Mari	uana. Is there a plan formed as to	
10:01	15	how it is they're	going to get the marijuana from AJ?	
	16	A. Yeah.	They were going to call him over	
	17	there and have him	bring two pounds and then they was	
	18	going to rob him.		
	19	Q. Call	him over to your apartment?	
10:01	20	A. Yes.		
	21	Q. So th	at plan is formed. How much later	
	22	does the killing o	occur in this case? Do you think it's	
	23	a day, two days, a	in hour?	
	24	A. It wa	s that night. So it was the next day.	
10:01	25	Q. Next	day. Okay. The next day are you	

there when AJ comes over?		
I was walking down the stairs, me and		
Tyeshia James.		
Why do you leave the apartment before AJ		
wify do you leave the apartment before Ao		
Decayed they gold they didn't want up to		
Because they said they didn't want us to		
So they didn't want you and Tyeshia to tell		
g happened?		
Yeah.		
So who tells you that you should leave?		
Davon.		
Davon tells you to leave?		
Yeah.		
So you leave as AJ is going up to the		
Yes.		
When you leave, who is in that apartment?		
Sayso, Davon, Smooth I mean Davon,		
s, Sayso and his brother.		
So now in the room is Sayso, Sayso's		
Yes.		
Your boyfriend Hickman?		
Uh-huh.		
Yeah. So you leave as AJ is going up to the Yes. When you leave, who is in that apartment? Sayso, Davon, Smooth I mean Davon, C, Sayso and his brother. So now in the room is Sayso, Sayso's Yes. Your boyfriend Hickman?		

10:02	1	Q.	Tyeshia's boyfriend Kemp?	
	2	Α.	Uh-huh.	
	3	Q.	And an individual named Star?	
	4	Α.	Uh-huh.	
10:02	5	Q.	Is that a yes?	
	6	Α.	Yes.	
	7	Q.	Okay. Just the uh-huhs and the huh-uhs	
	8	don't come o	ut really good on a transcript. Okay?	
	9	Α.	Okay.	
10:02	10	Q.	And the plan well, let me ask you this.	
	11	Describe wha	t the apartment generally looks like. How	
	12	many rooms i	s it?	
	13	Α.	It's one.	
	14	Q.	One bedroom and then a common area?	
10:02	15	Α.	There's one bedroom, in the bedroom is a	
	16	bathroom and	then you go out the bedroom, the living	
	17	room and the	kitchen.	
	18	Q.	Are there some people that are part of this	
	19	plan who are	going to be back in the bedroom?	
10:03	20	Α.	Yes.	
	21	Q.	Who's going to be back in the bedroom?	
	22	Α.	Sayso and his brother.	
	23	Q.	Sayso and his brother. So in the front	
24		room is going to be Kemp, Hickman and Star?		
10:03	25	Α.	Yeah.	

10:03	1	Q.	So you leave. Where do you go when you're
	2	walking down	the stairs and you see AJ coming up?
	3	Α.	We go to our friend house under us named
	4	Mariah.	
10:03	5	Q.	So you and Tyeshia are in Mariah's house.
	6	Is Mariah the	ere?
	7	Α.	Yeah, Mariah's there.
	8	Q.	How long are you there before something
	9	happens?	
10:03	10	Α.	We were there 20, 15 minutes.
	11	Q.	What happened?
	12	Α.	We was outside smoking a cigarette. When
	13	we come outs:	ide they're running down the stairs and my
	14	fiancé Davon	Hickman says he shot AJ.
10:03	15	Q.	So who is running down the stairs; all five
	16	of them?	
	17	Α.	All five of them, yes.
	18	Q.	And Hickman says to you I shot AJ?
	19	Α.	Yeah.
10:03	20	Q.	What happens at that point?
	21	Α.	What do you mean?
	22	Q.	So these people run down, Hickman says to
23		you I shot A	J.
	24	Α.	Uh-huh.
10:04	25	Q.	Is AJ still at the apartment at this point?

10:04	1	Α.	Yes.
	2	Q.	Was he shot in that apartment?
	3	Α.	Yes. He said that AJ was laying on the
	4	floor shot.	
10:04	5	Q.	Okay. Do Sayso and his brother stick
	6	around?	
	7	Α.	Sayso and his brother, they leave after
	8	that, and the	en they come back.
	9	Q.	Is there a discussion about what needs to
10:04	10	be done now t	that AJ is laying up in the apartment shot?
	11	Α.	Yeah. They all had, Sayso, Kemp and Davon
	12	and Sayso's k	prother, they had a discussion about what
	13	they was goir	ng to do with the body.
	14	Q.	What about Star, does he come back or does
10:04	15	he just run a	and leave?
	16	Α.	Star just gone.
	17	Q.	He's just gone?
	18	Α.	Yeah.
	19	Q.	And you don't see Star again?
10:04	20	Α.	No.
	21	Q.	There's a conversation about what they're
	22	going to do.	What's the plan?
	23	Α.	I guess they was going to take the body to
	24	some Barstow	or somewhere, Barstow or San Bernardino.
10:05	25	Q.	Do you do anything to help like the

10:05	1	situation?
	2	A. No, I never seen, I never seen the body.
	3	Q. Do you do anything to help clean up the
	4	outside of the apartment?
10:05	5	A. Yeah. They told me, they asked me to clean
	6	the blood up from outside and they handed me a broom.
	7	Q. What about your sister, did she help clean
	8	up?
	9	A. Yes, she cleaned up the inside of the
10:05	10	apartment.
	11	Q. So she goes in the apartment to clean up,
	12	you clean up the stairs?
	13	A. Yeah.
	14	Q. Do you ever see them take AJ's body out of
10:05	15	the apartment?
	16	A. No, I never seen the body.
	17	Q. But at some point do you become aware the
	18	body has left?
	19	A. Yeah.
10:05	20	Q. And do you know how it left?
	21	A. No, I don't know how it left because I
	22	never came back outside but Jecory Kemp and Davon, I
	23	guess Jecory Kemp and Ty moved the body.
	24	Q. So who tells you that Jecory Kemp and Ty
10:05	25	moved the body?

10:06	1	A. Jecory.
	2	Q. Jecory told you that he moved the body?
	3	A. Yeah.
	4	Q. Did Jecory tell you how he moved the body?
10:06	5	A. No.
	6	Q. Did you know that AJ or were you aware of
	7	whether or not AJ had a vehicle?
	8	A. No, I really wasn't until they said they
	9	moved some car, I don't know what kind of car it is,
10:06	10	they moved it around to the building.
	11	Q. So you learned that some car got moved?
	12	A. Yeah.
	13	Q. And then eventually you learn that the body
	14	left the Siena Suites?
10:06	15	A. Yeah.
	16	Q. Okay. Do you ever have a conversation with
	17	Hickman about what happened inside the apartment?
	18	A. Yeah. I don't really remember the
	19	conversation but I do, yeah, I do remember having a
10:06	20	conversation with him because he was scared.
	21	Q. Did he tell you generally, basically he
	22	told you that he's the one who shot him?
	23	A. Yeah.
	24	Q. Did he tell you whether or not AJ showed up
10:06	25	with the two pounds of marijuana?

10:06	1	А.	He told me he showed up with a half a
	2	pound.	
	3	Q.	He only showed up with a half a pound of
	4	marijuana?	
10:06	5	Α.	Uh-huh.
	6	Q.	And what happens when, well, once he comes
	7	in the room,	does he tell you about what happens with
	8	Sayso and hi	s brother?
	9	Α.	No, not really. Sayso and his brother was
10:07	10	in the back	room and they came out and that's when I
	11	guess AJ pul	led out a gun or something and then that's
	12	when Davon H	ickman shot him.
	13	Q.	So AJ's there, he only had a half pound of
	14	weed.	
10:07	15	Α.	Yeah.
	16	Q.	That causes a discussion
	17	Α.	Yeah.
	18	Q.	when Sayso and his brother come out?
	19	Α.	Yeah.
10:07	20	Q.	And that's when AJ tries to pull a weapon
	21	according to	Mr. Hickman?
	22	Α.	Yeah.
	23	Q.	And that's when Hickman shoots AJ?
	24	Α.	Yes.
10:07	25	Q.	And that's how the murder occurs?

10 07	1		
10:07	1	Α.	Yes.
	2	Q.	Do you ever see the weed that they took off
	3	of AJ?	
	4	Α.	No.
10:07	5	Q.	After the apartment is cleaned up, the body
	6	is gone, what	t do you do?
	7	Α.	I, me and my sister, we was at Mariah's
	8	house cause :	I was scared to go back up there.
	9	Q.	Do you eventually flee town with
10:07	10	Mr. Hickman?	
	11	Α.	Yes.
	12	Q.	Where do you go?
	13	Α.	We went to LA.
	14	Q.	Do you eventually get arrested in LA?
10:08	15	Α.	Yes.
	16	Q.	Do you recall as you sit here today what
	17	Mr. Hickman'	s cell phone number was back then?
	18	Α.	Yes, I do.
	19	Q.	Can you tell us that?
10:08	20	Α.	(716) 341-8448.
	21	Q.	And you provided that to detectives as
	22	well?	
	23	Α.	Yes, I did.
	24		MR. DIGIACOMO: Thank you, ma'am.
10:08	25		That completes my questions for the witness

10:08	1	if the Grand Jury has any questions.
	2	THE FOREPERSON: Hearing no questions.
	3	By law, these proceedings are secret and
	4	you are prohibited from disclosing to anyone anything
10:08	5	that has transpired before us, including evidence and
	6	statements presented to the Grand Jury, any event
	7	occurring or statement made in the presence of the Grand
	8	Jury, and information obtained by the Grand Jury.
	9	Failure to comply with this admonition is a
10:08	10	gross misdemeanor punishable by up to 364 days in the
	11	Clark County Detention Center and a \$2,000 fine. In
	12	addition, you may be held in contempt of court
	13	punishable by an additional \$500 fine and 25 days in the
	14	Clark County Detention Center.
10:08	15	Do you understand this admonition?
	16	THE WITNESS: Yes.
	17	THE FOREPERSON: Thank you. You're
	18	excused.
	19	MR. DIGIACOMO: Before they take her,
10:09	20	actually I'm going to ask her a few more questions. I
	21	forgot to have her ID some pictures. So let me just
	22	approach for just a second.
	23	Q. Ma'am, do you recognize the person that's
	24	depicted in Grand Jury Exhibit Number 32?
10:09	25	A. Yes, that's me.

10:09	1	Q.	Do you recognize the person that's depicted
	2	in Grand Jury	y Exhibit Number 33?
	3	Α.	Yes, that's Davon.
	4	Q.	Do you recognize the person depicted in
10:09	5	Grand Jury E	xhibit Number 34?
	6	Α.	Yes, that's AJ.
	7	Q.	Do you recognize the person that's depicted
	8	in Grand Jury	y Exhibit Number 35?
	9	Α.	Yes, that's Sayso.
10:09	10	Q.	Do you recognize the person depicted in
	11	Grand Jury E	xhibit Number 36?
	12	Α.	Yes, that's Sayso brother.
	13	Q.	And lastly, I don't think we talked about
	14	this, but the	e person depicted in Grand Jury Exhibit
10:09	15	Number 37, do	you recognize that person?
	16	Α.	Yes, that's Flaco.
	17	Q.	Let me ask you about Flaco for a second.
	18	Flaco wasn't	there during the murder; correct?
	19	Α.	Correct.
10:10	20	Q.	What is Flaco's involvement here?
	21	Α.	Flaco came and got Davon Hickman and Jecory
	22	Kemp and he	followed Jecory Kemp to Barstow and brought
	23	them back.	
	24	Q.	Okay. And how do you know that?
10:10	25	Α.	Because Davon told me and I asked them

10:10	1	where they was at.
	2	Q. So Davon tells you that Flaco is the one
	3	who helped them go to San Diego and then bring them
	4	back?
10:10	5	A. Yes.
	6	MR. DIGIACOMO: Thank you. I apologize.
	7	No more questions. Oh, the grand juror have a question?
	8	BY A JUROR:
	9	Q. One question. I just want to get the names
10:10	10	straight. Stayso is who?
	11	A. It's Sayso, S-A-Y-S-O.
	12	MR. DIGIACOMO: There's another witness who
	13	will be able to tell you his real name.
	14	A JUROR: Okay. Thank you.
10:10	15	MR. DIGIACOMO: Thank you. The admonition
	16	still applies, ma'am.
	17	THE FOREPERSON: Yes, the admonition still
	18	applies.
	19	Please raise your right hand.
10:11	20	You do solemnly swear the testimony you are
	21	about to give upon the investigation now pending before
	22	this Grand Jury shall be the truth, the whole truth, and
	23	nothing but the truth, so help you God?
	24	THE WITNESS: I do.
10:11	25	THE FOREPERSON: Please be seated.

10:11	1	You are advised that you are here today to
	2	give testimony in the investigation pertaining to the
	3	offenses of conspiracy to commit robbery, murder with
	4	use of a deadly weapon, first degree kidnapping with use
10:12	5	of a deadly weapon resulting in substantial bodily harm,
	6	robbery with use of a deadly weapon, involving Jecory
	7	Eles Kemp, Tyeshia Evan James, Arleo Earl Davis.
	8	Do you understand this advisement?
	9	THE WITNESS: I do.
10:12		
10:12	10	THE FOREPERSON: Please state your first
	11	and last name and spell both for the record.
	12	THE WITNESS: My name is Breck Hodson.
	13	It's B-R-E-C-K, H-O-D-S-O-N.
	14	BRECK HODSON,
10:12	15	having been first duly sworn by the Foreperson of the
	16	Grand Jury to testify to the truth, the whole truth,
	17	and nothing but the truth, testified as follows:
	18	
	19	<u>EXAMINATION</u>
10:12	20	
	21	BY MR. DIGIACOMO:
	22	Q. Detective, how are you employed?
	23	A. As a detective with Las Vegas Metropolitan
	24	Police Department's homicide section.
10:12	25	Q. How long have you been with Metro?

10:12	1	A. Over 14 years.
	2	Q. How long have you been in homicide?
	3	A. Eighteen months.
	4	Q. Sometime in early 2020 do you become
10:12	5	involved in the investigation into the death of a person
	6	identified to you as Jabbar Anderson?
	7	A. I do, yes.
	8	Q. And during the course of that investigation
	9	are you working with a partner?
10:13	10	A. Yes, I am.
	11	Q. Who is your partner?
	12	A. Detective Mitchell Dosch.
	13	Q. Detective Dosch has previously testified in
	14	this proceeding so I'm going to sort of just jump for a
10:13	15	second. I'm going to ask you if you recognize some of
	16	the people that are depicted in some Grand Jury
	17	exhibits. Do you recognize the woman that's depicted in
	18	Grand Jury Exhibit Number 32?
	19	A. Yes, that's Miss Mackeshia Murphy.
10:13	20	Q. Do you recognize the person identified in
	21	Grand Jury Exhibit Number 33?
	22	A. That is Mr. Davon Hickman.
	23	Q. Aka Little and/or Payso?
	24	A. That's correct.
10:13	25	Q. Do you recognize the person that's depicted

10:13	1	in 34?	
	2	Α.	That's the victim, Marion Jabbar Anderson.
	3	Q.	Also known as AJ?
	4	Α.	That's correct.
10:13	5	Q.	Do you recognize 35?
	6	Α.	Yes, that's Arleo Earl Davis, Jr.
	7	Q.	Also known as Sayso?
	8	Α.	That's correct.
	9	Q.	Do you recognize the person in Exhibit 36?
10:14	10	Α.	I do. That's Mr. Anthony Woods.
	11	Q.	Also
	12	Α.	Known as Sayso's brother.
	13	Q.	That's how he was known in the
	14	investigation	n?
10:14	15	Α.	Yes.
	16	Q.	And then the person depicted in 37?
	17	Α.	That's Preston Huteson, known as Flaco.
	18	Q.	During the course of your investigation did
	19	you identify	a number for Davon Hickman?
10:14	20	Α.	We did, yes.
	21	Q.	How is it that you originally identified
	22	that phone ni	umber if you recall?
	23	Α.	Originally, I would have to say that came
	24	from our init	tial interviews that were conducted. I
10:14	25	don't exactly	y recall who initially gave up that phone.

10:14	1	Q. But after you got that phone number did you
	2	make a request for phone records associated with the
	3	phone number that was provided to you?
	4	A. Yes, we did.
10:15	5	Q. And that phone number started with a 716
	6	number; is that correct?
	7	A. That's correct.
	8	Q. Did you identify the phone company as
	9	T-Mobile?
10:15	10	A. We did, yes.
	11	Q. Eventually do you send a court order and/or
	12	pen register and/or search warrant to T-Mobile to get a
	13	copy of those records?
	14	A. Yes, we did.
10:15	15	Q. Ladies and gentlemen, I've had marked here
	16	as Grand Jury Exhibit Number 40 a certified copy of the
	17	phone records received by the Las Vegas Metropolitan
	18	Police Department between November 30th of 2019 and
	19	January 7th of 2019 for target number (716)341-8447.
10:15	20	You eventually come into contact with a
	21	Mackeshia Murphy?
	22	A. We do, yes.
	23	Q. During the course of your conversation with
	24	Miss Murphy, does she confirm that phone number is in
10:15	25	fact Mr. Hickman's phone number?

10:16	1	A. She does, yes.
	2	Q. Were you able to locate that device?
	3	A. That device, no, we were not able to locate
	4	that device.
10:16	5	Q. So the device at some point is no longer
	6	around. Do you come in contact with Mr. Hickman?
	7	A. Yes.
	8	Q. Does he have that device on him?
	9	A. He does not.
10:16	10	Q. Eventually were you able to identify Sayso?
	11	A. Yes.
	12	Q. And when you identified Sayso, did he have
	13	a phone on him? Or Sayso, Arleo Davis.
	14	A. He did, yes.
10:16	15	Q. And that particular phone at the time he
	16	had the device that you took off him, did it have a
	17	particular phone number?
	18	A. It did.
	19	Q. But is that the phone number that was
10:16 20 assigned to that device at the time that the		assigned to that device at the time that the events
	21	happened on December 30th?
	22	A. No, that number had been changed.
	23	Q. Were you able to get the records associated
	24	with that device that Verizon had for the time period in
10:16	25	question?

10:16	1	A. Yes.				
	2	Q. And ladies and gentlemen, I have a copy of				
	3	those records marked as Grand Jury Exhibit 41 which is a				
	4	certified copy of the phone records from Verizon related				
10:17	5	to the 28 files provided to you by Verizon related to				
	6	the number associated with the device in Sayso's				
	7 possession at the time of the crime.					
	8	A. That's correct.				
	9	Q. When you talked to Sayso, where is it you				
10:17	come in contact with Arleo Davis?					
	11	A. So Arleo Davis was taken into custody by				
	12	our fugitive apprehension people at the intersection of				
	13	Bonanza and Nellis at the welfare office parking lot.				
	14	Q. And at some point do you talk to him?				
10:17	15	A. We do. We took him, he was transported to				
	16	LVMPD headquarters where he was interviewed by myself				
	17	and Detective Dosch.				
	18	Q. Prior to interviewing him did you give him				
	19	Miranda warning?				
10:17	20	A. We did, yes.				
	21	Q. When you gave him Miranda warnings did he				
	22	additionally agree to speak with you?				
	23	A. He did, yes.				
	24	Q. During the course of your conversation with				
10:17	25	him did you ask him about various individuals associated				

10:17	1	with this case?				
	2	A. Yes, we did.				
	3	Q. And who is it that he indicated that he				
	4	knew?				
10:18	5	A. He indicated that he knew not only the				
	6	victim Mr. Anderson, Mr. Hickman, also Mr. Kemp,				
	7	Miss Murphy and Miss James.				
	8	Q. And when you talked to him did he also				
	indicate to you that he was in possession of that device					
10:18	10:18 10 at the time that the crime occurred?					
	11	A. He did, yes.				
	12	Q. Did he confirm to you the switch of the				
	13	phone numbers?				
	14	A. He did, yes.				
10:18	15	Q. Now did you have an opportunity to then				
	16	find out the location information associated with that				
	17	device during the day and time of December 30th?				
	18	A. I did, yes.				
	19	Q. And I'm going to start with first				
10:18	20	Mr. Hickman's. I'm going to show you Grand Jury Exhibit				
	21	Number 38 which is representative of a tower hit on				
	22	Mr. Hickman's phone. Do you recognize that?				
	23	A. I do recognize it, yes.				
	24	Q. What is it?				
10:19	25	A. So this is described as the H plane of the				

10:19 1 cell site which when it's mapped out in this form it 2 doesn't, it gives you the best area coverage of that 3 phone connection at the time which places our scene 4 right in the middle of that coverage. 10:19 If you can hold it up, we don't have the 5 6 overhead working today. But generally that yellow dot 7 in the middle, and we'll pass the exhibit around, is directly in the middle of the cell site coverage 8 9 associated with Mr. Hickman's phone let's say sometime 10:19 10 between 11:00 a.m. and 2:00 p.m. on December 30th of 11 2019? 12 That's correct. Α. 13 Q. In speaking to Miss Murphy, did 14 Mr. Hickman's phone records confirm to you -- well, you 10:19 15 did speak to Miss Murphy; correct? 16 That's correct. Α. 17 She provided you a version of events that Q. 18 occurred? 19 Α. Yes. 10:20 20 Q. Did looking at Mr. Hickman's records, did 21 that confirm or corroborate her story that Mr. Hickman 22 was the one, was present at the apartment at the time 23 your crime occurred? 24 It did. Α. 10:20 25 Ultimately do you determine that the crime Q.

occurred sometime around afternoon to 2:00 p.m.-ish on 10:20 1 2 December 19th -- or December 30th of 2019? 3 Α. That's correct. Now were the records associated with 4 0. 10:20 5 Mr. Sayso, Arleo Davis, did they have different 6 information than T-Mobile had provided? 7 Α. Yes. And I'm showing you now Grand Jury Exhibit 8 0. 9 Number 39 which is representative of one record at 1:52 10:20 10 in the afternoon on December 30th of 2019; is that 11 correct? 12 That's correct. Α. 13 Q. And what's the difference in the T-Mobile 14 information that you received and the Verizon 10:20 15 information you received? 16 So the main difference is on, when you 17 graph this version, so Verizon provided us what's called 18 a measurement from the actual device that connected to 19 whatever cell site it was. And what that does is that 10:21 20 allows us, it gives us an arc here and we can look at 21 that and it gives us a measurement from the tower, what 22 they figure out mathematically, that that device is 23 communicating with that tower along that arc. 24 And is there a period of time between noon 10:21 25 and 2:00 p.m.-ish that the arc of the device goes

10:21 1 generally right through the apartment itself of the 2 crime scene? 3 Α. That's correct. And that's between noon and 2:00 p.m. 4 0. 10:21 5 generally speaking on December 30th of 2019? That's correct. 6 Α. 7 0. And so does the information from Mr. 8 Davis's cell phone records corroborate what Miss Murphy told you about him being present at the time of the 10:21 10 murder? 11 Yes, it does. Α. 12 MR. DIGIACOMO: That completes my questions 13 for the witness if the Grand Jury has any questions. 14 THE FOREPERSON: No questions. 10:22 15 By law, these proceedings are secret and 16 you are prohibited from disclosing to anyone anything 17 that has transpired before us, including evidence and 18 statements presented to the Grand Jury, any event 19 occurring or statement made in the presence of the Grand 10:22 20 Jury, and information obtained by the Grand Jury. 2.1 Failure to comply with this admonition is a 22 gross misdemeanor punishable by up to 364 days in the 23 Clark County Detention Center and a \$2,000 fine. 24 addition, you may be held in contempt of court 10:22 25 punishable by an additional \$500 fine and 25 days in the

1	Clark County Detention Center.					
2	Do you understand this admonition?					
3	THE WITNESS: I go.					
4	THE FOREPERSON: Thank you. You're					
23 5 excused.						
6	THE WITNESS: Thank you.					
7	MR. DIGIACOMO: Mr. Grand Juror, have you					
8	had the opportunity to finish the last three pages?					
9 A JUROR: No, I haven't.						
10	MR. DIGIACOMO: I'll pass this around while					
11	1 you read the last three pages.					
12	MR. SCARBOROUGH: He's done, Marc.					
13	MR. DIGIACOMO: Ladies and gentlemen, that					
14	completes the presentation of the evidence on this case.					
15	I'd ask you to vote each count as to all three					
16	defendants even though you've done two of the defendants					
17	previously. If there are no other questions I'd ask you					
18	to deliberate.					
19	(At this time, all persons, other than					
10:24 20 members of the Grand Jury, exit the room at 10:2						
21	and return at 10:29 a.m.)					
22	THE FOREPERSON: Mr. District Attorney, by					
23	a vote of 12 or more grand jurors a true bill has been					
24	returned against defendants Jecory Eles Kemp, Tyeshia					
25	Evan James, Arleo Earl Davis, charging the crimes of					
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24					

10:29	1	conspiracy to commit robbery, murder with use of a					
	2	deadly weapon, first degree kidnapping with use of a					
	3	deadly weapon resulting in substantial bodily harm, and					
	4	robbery with use of a deadly weapon, in Grand Jury case					
10:30	5 number 19CGJ007AB&E. We instruct you to prepare an						
	Indictment in conformance with the proposed Indictment						
	7	previously submitted to us.					
	8	MR. DIGIACOMO: Thank you. I will.					
	THE FOREPERSON: Thank you.						
10:30	10:30 10 (Proceedings concluded.)						
	11	00000					
	12						
	13						
	14						
	15						
	16						
	17						
	18						
	19						
	20						
	21						
	22						
	23						
	24						
	25						

10:30	1	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE					
	2						
	3	STATE OF NEVADA)					
	4	COUNTY OF CLARK)					
10:30	5						
	6	I, Danette L. Antonacci, C.C.R. 222, do					
	7	hereby certify that I took down in Shorthand (Stenotype)					
	8	all of the proceedings had in the before-entitled matter					
	9	at the time and place indicated and thereafter said					
10:30	10	shorthand notes were transcribed at and under my					
	11	direction and supervision and that the foregoing					
	12	transcript constitutes a full, true, and accurate record					
	13	of the proceedings had.					
	14	Dated at Las Vegas, Nevada,					
10:30	15						
	16						
	17	/s/ Danette L. Antonacci					
	18	Danette L. Antonacci, C.C.R. 222					
10.00	19						
10:30	20						
	21						
	22						
	23 24						
	25						
	4 J						

10:30	1	AFFIRMATION					
	2	Pursuant to NRS 239B.030					
	3						
	4	The undersigned does hereby affirm that the preceding TRANSCRIPT filed in GRAND JURY CASE NUMBER					
10:30	5	19CGJ007AB&E:					
	6						
	7						
	8	\underline{X} Does not contain the social security number of any person,					
	9						
10:30	10	-OR-					
	11	<pre> Contains the social security number of a person as required by:</pre>					
	12	A. A specific state or federal law, to-					
	13	wit: NRS 656.250.					
	14	-OR-					
10:30	15	B. For the administration of a public program or for an application for a federal or					
	16	state grant.					
	17						
	18	/s/ Danette L. Antonacci 3-20-20					
	19	Signature Date					
10:30	20						
	21	Danette L. Antonacci Print Name					
	22						
	23	Official Court Reporter Title					
	24						
	25						

Electronically Filed 5/5/2020 5:05 PM Steven D. Grierson CLERK OF THE COURT

HOFLAND & TOMSHECK

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Joshua Tomsheck, Esq. Nevada State Bar No. 9210 josht@hoflandlaw.com 228 South Fourth Street, 1st Floor Las Vegas, Nevada 89101 Telephone: (702) 895-6760 Facsimile: (702) 731-6910 Attorney for Petitioner

DISTRICT COURT

CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

THE STATE OF NEVADA)		
)	Case Number:	C-20-346920-3
Plaintiff,)	Department:	XVII
v.)		
)		
ARLEO EARL DAVIS, aka)	****HEARING I	REQUESTED****
ARLEO EARL DAVIS, JR. #7058423)		
)		
Defendant.)		
)		

PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS

TO: The Honorable Judge of the Eighth Judicial District Court of The State of Nevada, in and for the County of Clark

The Petition of Arleo Earl Davis submitted by Joshua Tomsheck, Esq., of the law firm of Hofland & Tomsheck, as attorney for the above-captioned individual, respectfully affirms:

- That he is a duly qualified, practicing and licensed attorney in the City of Las Vegas, County of Clark, State of Nevada.
- 2. That Petitioner makes application for a Writ of Habeas Corpus; that the place where the Petitioner is imprisoned actually or constructively imprisoned and restrained of his liberty is the Clark County Detention Center; that the officer by whom he is imprisoned and restrained is Joe Lombardo, Sheriff.
- 3. That the imprisonment and restraint of said Petitioner is unlawful in that there is insufficient evidence to support Count 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the Indictment against him. Therefore, Counts 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the Indictment must be dismissed.

000093

- 4. That Petitioner waives his right to a Trial within 60 days;
- 5. That Petitioner was arraigned at his first District Court appearance on the instant matter on April 14, 2020.
- 6. That Petitioner consents that if this Petition is not decided within 15 days before the date set for trial, the Court may, without notice of hearing, continue the trial indefinitely to a date designated by the Court.
- 7. That Petitioner personally authorized his aforementioned attorney to commence this

WHEREFORE, Petitioner prays that this Honorable Court make an order directing the County of Clark to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus directed to the said Joe Lombardo, Sheriff, commanding him to bring the Petitioner before your Honor, and return the cause of

DATED this 5th day of May, 2020.

HOFLAND & TOMSHECK

By: /s/ J. Tomsheck_ Joshua Tomsheck, Esq. Nevada Bar No. 9210 228 S. Fourth Street, 1st Floor Las Vegas, Nevada 89101 (702) 895-6760 Attorney for Petitioner

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT OF PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS

COMES NOW Petitioner, ARLEO EARL DAVIS, by and through his counsel, Joshua Tomsheck, Esq., of the law firm of Hofland & Tomsheck, and submits the following Points and Authorities in Support of Defendant's Petition for a pre-trial Writ of Habeas Corpus.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

a. Grand Jury Presentation No. 1: The following facts are taken from the transcripts of the Grand Jury Hearing(s) held on February 13, 2020.

Testimony of Arturo Alvarado (p. 8-18)

8). He is currently assigned to the homicide division and has been for the last three years. (p. 8). A vast majority of the homicide scenes include the use of a potential firearm. (p. 9). He

has also responded to scenes where there is a fire component involved. (p. 9).

Arturo Alvarado is employed as a detective in San Bernardino County, California. (p.

On December 30, and December 31, 2019, he was called out to the scene of an alleged homicide located off the I-15 freeway between Baker and Barstow, California. (p. 9). The nature of the call was for a death investigation, and that a vehicle was on fire, and a deceased victim had been on fire. (p. 10). He was the on-call team for the week and responded to the scene. (p. 10). From the I-15, he exited Field Road, where there is nothing other than desert. (p. 10). The area of the scene was on the west side of the freeway in an open dirt area. (p. 10). The scene was located westbound of the freeway. (p. 12).

The vehicle was fully burned to the ground. (p. 13). Everything was burned to a crisp. (p. 13). The vehicle was charred, and the rubber and plastic were burned away. (p. 13). The

vehicle was a Lexus vehicle. (p. 13). There was damage to the interior and exterior of the vehicle. (p. 14).

When he arrived on scene, a deceased body was found in the trunk area of the car. (p. 15). The victim was not breathing when he arrived and was obviously deceased. (p. 15). The body was burned, more toward the legs as opposed to the upper body. (p. 15). He did not touch or manipulate the body, as in California only the coroner's division is allowed to touch the body. (p. 15-16). When the coroner division responds, a body roll is conducted. (p. 16). The body roll consists of rolling the person to the other side to assess any injuries or address the victim. (p. 16).

After the body roll, information was gathered which led him to contact Las Vegas homicide detectives. (p. 16). The body roll revealed a key card on a lanyard around the victim's neck. (p. 16-17). Information related to the actual vehicle involved, along with the key card information, led him to contact Las Vegas homicide detectives, specifically Detective Mitch Dosch. (p. 17).

The bombs and arson expert arrived later and determined an accelerant was used in the fire. (p. 18). The detective was not part of that investigation. (p. 18).

Testimony of Mitchell Dosch (pages 21-44)

Mitchell Dosch is employed as a homicide detective with the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department and has been for the last seven years. (p. 21). He has responded and investigated many scenes involving the possible use of a firearm, as well as many scenes with a fire or arson component. (p. 21-22). His involvement with the homicide investigation began on December 31, 2019 after being contacted by the San Bernardino County Sheriff's Department. (p. 22). His partner, Breck Hodson, received contact from the San Bernardino

County Sheriff's Department homicide section requesting information on an active death investigation they had. (p. 22).

Based on the contact from San Bernardino, he directed his attention to 6555 Boulder Highway, building 11, apartment 309. (p. 22-23). This address ended up being the primary crime scene. (p. 23). He responded to that physical scene after being directed to that address. (p. 23).

This apartment in building 11 is located on the third floor, which is the top floor. (p. 23). Building 11 is in the northwest corner. (p. 23). To get to apartment 309, a person must go up one of two stairwells. (p. 23). There is a stairwell immediately outside of 309. (p. 23). Around building 11 there was an apparent blood trail that appeared to initiate just outside of apartment 309, went all the way down to the ground floor, around the building, and into the parking lot. (p. 23). The apartment building is located in Las Vegas, Clark County, Nevada. (p. 24).

Apparent blood splatter or a blood trail was located in a parking space, near where the trunk of a vehicle would be if parked. (p. 25-26). Apparent blood was found on the stairs, as well. (p. 26). Based on the blood trail, he drafted and obtained a search warrant for the apartment. (p. 27). Detective Hodson was the affiant in the search warrant. (p. 27). He then executed the search warrant on the apartment. (p. 28).

Immediately upon making entry into the apartment, a lot of factors and physical evidence became relevant to the investigation. (p. 28). The apartment is very small and consists of a living room, a kitchen, a bedroom, and a bathroom. (p. 29). The front door to the apartment faces west. (p. 29). When standing in the living room, there is carpet, and when it switches to tile, that is where the kitchen is. (p. 29).

The floor was very clean, and some white residue could be seen. (p. 30). When he made entry into the apartment, he was hit with the overwhelming stench of cleaning material. (p. 30). The tile floor was also very clean with the same white residue. (p. 30). There was apparent blood on the far side where the appliances are located. (p. 30). Blood was also found on a light fixture in the kitchen. (p. 30-31). Cleaning materials were found inside the apartment. (p. 31).

Two suspects were developed as a result of the apartment search and the investigation. (p. 31). They were Jecory Kemp and Tyeshia James. (p. 31). The two were apprehended, read Miranda, acknowledged their rights, and spoke with detectives. (p. 32). Jecory Kemp told detectives that the victim was killed inside the apartment. (p. 32). The plan was to rob the victim. (p. 33).

The murder occurred on December 30, 2019. (p. 33). A plan was developed a day or two earlier to purchase or request a large amount of marijuana which would then be sold to the occupants of apartment 11-309. (p. 33). When the victim arrived with the marijuana, it was their intent to rob him of the marijuana and not make payment for the marijuana. (p. 33).

On the day of the murder, the victim came to the door and was let in. (p. 33). The door was closed behind the victim. (p. 33). The victim moved to the kitchen area after dropping his backpack, which contained one of the two pounds of marijuana that was sought in the drug deal. (p. 33). Another individual within the apartment opened up the backpack, examined, and noticed a pound of marijuana was missing. (p. 33). They discussed that the other pound would be made available as the money was paid. (p. 33). Some individuals were hidden in the bedroom, and they came out at one point and the robbery was then underway.

(p. 33-34). When the victim saw the individuals suddenly emerge from the bedroom, the victim pulled out a firearm and kept it by his side, pointed downward. (p. 34). Another individual within the apartment produced a firearm and pointed it at the victim, and that is when the shooting occurred. (p. 34). At least one round was fired, which appeared to strike the victim. (p. 34).

There were multiple people inside the apartment at the particular time, and some of the individuals had gone through the victim's pockets and left the apartment. (p. 35). Jecory Kemp and Tyeshia James left the apartment and returned when they initiated the process of cleaning up the apartment and removing the victim's body. (p. 35). A great deal of effort to clean the tile had occurred, but the cleaning had missed a lot of the walls and the ceiling. (p. 35).

Jecory Kemp told the detective about attempts to move and relocate the victim's body. (p. 35). The body was placed in trash bags. (p. 36). The victim was of fairly large stature, and they planned to break off his legs and carry the body out in a gurney-like fashion. (p. 36). They did not end up doing that, and instead attached the body to a small shopping cart which was used to bring the body down the stairs and into the parking lot of a waiting vehicle. (p. 36).

The victim's vehicle was a 1998 Lexus four-door sedan. (p. 36). The car was moved to a different location outside of the apartment complex but was then brought back to utilize disposing the body. (p. 36-37). The victim's body was loaded into the trunk of his car. (p. 37). Kemp then drove the victim's car from the apartment complex to I-15 and Field Road in San Bernardino County. (p. 37). As he was driving the car down, Jecory Kemp was following another vehicle where another individual involved was driving. (p. 38). That vehicle had to

leave, and Kemp summoned another vehicle to pick them up and bring them back to Las Vegas. (p. 38).

Tyeshia James initially lied to detectives about having any role and about being on the property grounds the day of the murder. (p. 39). Her story changed and she recounted a very similar story to Jecory Kemp's. (p. 39). She did not discuss the movement of the body to California that her boyfriend, Jecory Kemp, had told detectives. (p. 39). Tyeshia James was the renter of the 11-309 apartment and had the lease for it. (p. 39). She moved into the apartment in November and the lease was set to expire in early January. (p. 39).

Tyeshia James told detectives about the robbery being planned a day or two before the murder. (p. 40). At the time of the murder, she and another female were asked to leave the apartment before the victim arrived. (p. 40). Later, they heard about what had happened and developed a plan to clean up the apartment and help move the body from the apartment into a vehicle. (p. 40). She did not take part in the transportation of the body to California, but she did have a role in taking the body out of the apartment, down the stairs, and into the waiting vehicle. (p. 40).

The autopsy did not take place until January 21, 2020, and the detective attended. (p. 40-41). The victim was identified as Marion B. Jabbar Anderson. (p. 41). He was colloquially referred to as A.J. (p. 41). The body had an apparent gunshot wound to his upper left chest and there was thermal damage to the lower half of his body. (p. 42).

At the Grand Jury Hearing on February 13, 2020, the Grand Jurors returned a true bill against Mr. Davis's co-defendants.

///

b. **Grand Jury Presentation No. 2:** *The following facts are taken from the transcripts of the Grand Jury Hearing(s) held on March 19, 2020.*

Testimony of Mackeshia Murphy (pages 7-22)

Mackeshia Murphy, at the time of her testimony, was in custody for open murder, conspiracy to commit robbery, robbery, and a probation violation. (p. 8). She was on probation for an attempt grand larceny conviction. (p. 8). If she successfully completes probation, the felony charge will be reduced to a misdemeanor. (p. 8). She was arrested in California in 2020 for absconding from probation. (p. 8-9). She was also originally charged with counts related to what she is testifying about. (p. 9). In exchange for her testimony, she has received immunity and will not be charged with any crime associated with her testimony. (p. 9).

Tyeshia James is Mackeshia's sister. (p. 9). Tyeshia's boyfriend is Jecory Kemp. (p. 9). Mackeshia was dating Davon Hickman. (p. 10). Jecory Kemp's nickname was Smooth Got It. (p. 10). Davon Hickman's nicknames were Little BD, Payso, or Pay Still Got It. (p. 10-11).

In the end of 2019, Mackeshia was staying at the Siena Suites at 6555 South Boulder Highway. (p. 10). She stayed there in an apartment with Davon Hickman, Jecory Kemp, and Tyeshia James. (p. 10).

On December 30, 2019, she was present for a conversation hat involved a discussion about a man named AJ, who was the apartment complex's maintenance man. (p. 11). Mackeshia, Davon Hickman, Jecory Kemp, Tyeshia James, Sayso, and Sayso's brother were all present. (p. 11). Sayso owed A.J. \$2,000.00 for marijuana. (p. 12). Sayso, Davon Hickman, Jecory Kemp, and Sayso's brother were going to rob A.J. instead of paying him back. (p. 12). The plan was to call A.J., have him bring two pounds of marijuana to the apartment, and rob

him. (p. 12).

The murder then happened the next day. (p. 12). She was walking down the stairs with Tyeshia James when A.J. showed up. (p. 12-13). She left the apartment before A.J. showed up because they didn't want her to tell if something happened. (p. 13). Davon told her to leave the apartment. (p. 13). As she was leaving, A.J. was going up to the apartment. (p. 13). Jecory Kemp, Sayso, Star, Davon Hickman, and Sayso's brother, remained in the apartment. (p. 13).

The apartment was a one-bedroom. (p. 14). In the bedroom is a bathroom, and then when you go out of the bedroom, there is a living room and the kitchen. (p. 14). Sayso and Sayso's brother were going to be back in the bedroom. (p. 14). In the front room it was going to be Jecory Kemp, Davon Hickman, and Star. (p. 14).

Mackeshia and Tyeshia went to their friend Mariah's apartment. (p. 15). They were at Mariah's apartment for fifteen or twenty minutes before something happens. (p. 15). They were outside smoking cigarettes when the men came running down the stairs and Davon said he shot A.J. (p. 15). A.J. was still in the apartment. (p. 15-16). Davon said A.J. was laying on the floor, shot. (p. 16). Sayso and his brother leave, but later come back. (p. 16).

There is a discussion between Sayso, Sayso's brother, Davon Hickman, and Jecory Kemp about what to do with the body. (p. 16). Star left and wasn't seen again. (p. 16). The plan was to take the body to Barstow or San Bernardino. (p. 16). She never saw the body. (p. 17).

She helped her sister clean up the outside of the apartment where the blood was. (p. 17). Her sister cleaned up the inside, while Mackeshia cleaned up the stairs. (p. 17). She doesn't know how the body left the apartment but was told by Jecory Kemp that he and Ty

moved the body. (p. 17-18). She didn't know whether or not A.J. had a car until they moved it around the building. (p. 18).

Davon Hickman expressed to her he was scared because he was the one who shot A.J. (p. 18). Davon told Mackeshia that AJ showed up with only half a pound of marijuana. (p. 19). Sayso and his brother were in the bedroom and when they came out, AJ pulled out a gun. (p. 19). After AJ pulled out a gun, Davon Hickman shot him. (p. 19). She never saw the marijuana they took from AJ. (p. 20).

After the murder, she and Davon Hickman go to Los Angeles, California where she was arrested. (p. 20). Davon Hickman's phone number was 716-361-8448. (p. 20).

An individual named Flaco picked up Davon Hickman and Jecory Kemp. (p. 22). He followed Jecory Kemp to Barstow, California and brought them back. (p. 22).

Testimony of Breck Hodson (p. 24-34)

Breck Hodson is employed as a homicide detective with the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department. (p. 24). He has been with Metro for fourteen years and has been in homicide for eighteen months. (p. 25). In early 2020, he became involved in the investigation of Jabbar Anderson's death. (p. 25). His partner is Detective Mitchell Dosch. (p. 25).

Davon Hickman goes by Little and/or Payso. (p. 25). Marion Jabbar Anderson went by AJ. (p. 26). Arleo Earl Davis Junior went by the name Sayso. (p. 26). Anthony Woods was known as Sayso's brother. (p. 26). Preston Huteson is known as Flaco. (p. 26).

The investigation identified a phone number for Davon Hickman. (p. 26). A request was made for the phone records associated with his phone number. (p. 27). Davon Hickman's phone number began with a 716 number and was owned by the T-Mobile phone company. (p. 27). A court order and/or pen register and/or search warrant was sent to T-

Mobile to obtain a copy of Davon Hickman's phone records. (p. 27). He came in contact with Mackeshia Murphy, who confirmed 716-341-8447 was Davon Hickman's phone number. (p.

27-28). They were not able to locate the actual phone. (p. 28).

When he came into contact with Davon Hickman, he did not have the phone on him. (p. 28). Arleo Davis had a phone on him when he made contact with police. (p. 28). The phone number assigned to the phone had changed since the events that happened on December 20. (p. 28). He was able to get the records associated with the phone number for the time period in December. (p. 28-29).

Arleo Davis was taken into custody by the fugitive apprehension team at the welfare office parking lot at the intersection of Bonanza and Nellis. (p. 29). Arleo Davis was transported to LVMPD headquarters where he was interviewed by detectives. (p. 29). He was read his Miranda rights and agreed to speak with detectives. (p. 29). Arleo Davis told detectives he knew Marion Jabbar Anderson, Davon Hickman, Jecory Kemp, Mackeshia Murphy, and Tyeshia James. (p. 30). He told detectives he had his cell phone on him at the time the crime occurred, and that his phone number had changed since. (p. 30).

Davon Hickman's cell phone hit on a cell phone tower. (p. 30-31). Davon Hickman's cell phone records corroborated Mackeshia Murphy's story that Davon Hickman was present at the apartment at the time the crime occurred. (p. 31). The crime occurred sometime around 2:00 p.m. on December 30, 2019. (p. 32).

The T-Mobile information provided was different than the Verizon information. (p. 32). Verizon provided a measurement from the actual device that connected to the cell site. (p. 32). It gives an arc and a measurement from the tower, so it tells that the device is communicating with that tower along the arc. (p. 32). There is a period of time between 12:00

p.m. and 2:00 p.m. on December 30, 2019 where the arc of the cell phone goes generally right through the apartment itself. (p. 32-33). The information provided from Arleo Davis's cell phone records corroborated what Mackeshia Murphy told detectives about him being present at the time of the crime. (p. 33).

At the Grand Jury Hearing on March 19, 2020 the Grand Jurors returned a true bill against Arleo Davis.

LEGAL STANDARD

As this Court is well aware, "[t]he finding of probable cause may be based on slight, even 'marginal,' evidence because it does not involve a determination of the guilt or innocence of an accused." Sheriff v. Hodes, 96 Nev. 184, 186, 606 P.2d 178 (1980); see also Sheriff v. Shade, 109 Nev. 826, 828, 858 P.2d 840 (1993); Sheriff v. Simpson, 109 Nev. 430, 435, 851 P.2d 428 (1993); Sheriff v. Crockett, 102 Nev. 359, 361, 724 P.2d 203 (1986). Moreover, "The grand jury can receive none but legal evidence, and best evidence in degree, to the exclusion of hearsay or secondary evidence." NRS 172.135(2); Sheriff v. Frank, 103 Nev. 160, 165 (1987). A probable cause finding, however, must be based solely on admissible evidence. Only where there is sufficient *legal* evidence to support the charge can an Indictment be sustained. Robertson v. State, 84 Nev. 559, 561-562 (1968).

///

₄ ∥ ///

₅ | ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

ARGUMENT

I. THE STATE INTRODUCED NO SLIGHT OR MARGINAL LEGALLY SUFFICIENT EVIDENCE THAT ARLEO EARL DAVIS COMMITTED THE CRIMES OF CONSPIRACY, MURDER, KIDNAPPING, ROBBERY OR DEADLY WEAPON ENHANCEMENTS AS ALLEGED IN THE SUPERSEDING INDICTMENT.

In this instant case, the transcript of the Grand Jury Proceedings is completely void of evidence connecting the Petitioner to the charge of Conspiracy to Commit Robbery, as alleged in Count 1 of the Indictment.

NRS 200.380(1) states:

Robbery is the unlawful taking of personal property from the person of another, or in the person's presence, against his or her will, by means of force or violence or fear of injury, immediate or future, to his or her person or property, or the person or property of a member of his or her family, or of anyone in his or her company at the time of the robbery. A taking is by means of force or fear if force or fear is used to

- (a) Obtain or retain possession of the property;
- (b) Prevent or overcome resistance to the taking; or
- (c) Facilitate escape.

Count 1, in a blanketed statement, simply alleges that:

Mr. Davis did willfully, unlawfully, and feloniously conspire with each other and/or unknown individuals to commit a robbery, by the Defendants committing the acts as set forth in Counts 2 through 4, said acts incorporated by this reference as though fully set forth herein.

There is a lack of specificity within Count 1. An indictment, standing alone, must contain each and every element of the crime charged and the facts showing how defendant allegedly committed each element of the crime charged. State v. Hancock, 114 Nev. 161, 164 (1998). Count 1 does not provide any details at which Mr. Davis must be prepared to face. An indictment is deficient unless it sufficiently apprises the defendant of what he must be prepared to meet. Id. at 165. The accusation must include a characterization of the crime and

such description of the particular act alleged to have been committed by the accused. <u>Id.</u> The description of the offense must be full and complete to accord to the accused his constitutional right to due process of law. <u>Id.</u> This indictment is fatally flawed due to the lack of details provided within Count 1. As a result, Count 1 of the Indictment must be dismissed.

Moreover, and more importantly to the instant case, the transcript of the Grand Jury Proceedings is completely void of evidence connecting the Petitioner to the charge of Murder with Use of a Deadly Weapon, as alleged in Count 2 of the Indictment.

NRS 200.010 defines Murder as follows:

The unlawful killing of a human being with malice aforethought, either express or implied; Caused by a controlled substance which was sold, given, traded or otherwise made available to a person in violation of Chapter 453 of NRS; or caused by a violation of NRS 172.144.

Count 2 states that Mr. Davis:

Did willfully, unlawfully, feloniously and with malice aforethought, kill Marion B. Jabbar Anderson, a human being, with use of a deadly weapon, to wit: a firearm, by shooting at and into the body of the said Marion B. Jabbar Anderson, the said killing having been 1) willful, deliberate and premediated and/or 2) committed during the perpetration or attempted perpetration of a kidnapping and/or robbery, the Defendant(s) being criminally liable under one or more of the following principles of criminal liability, to wit: (1) by directly committing this crime, and/or (2) by aiding or abetting in the commission of this crime, with the intent that this crime be committed, by counseling, encouraging, hiring, commanding, inducing and/or otherwise procuring the other to commit the crime; and/or (3) pursuant to a conspiracy to commit this crime, with the intent that this crime be committed, Defendants and/or others yet unknown to the conspiracy acting in concert throughout.

The State has failed to prove that Mr. Davis was involved with the willful, deliberate, and premediated murder of Mr. Anderson. The State also failed to prove by a scintilla of evidence that the murder was committed during the perpetration of a robbery that Mr. Davis was involved in. The only testimony elicited that ties Mr. Davis to the crime scene is that of

an un-indicted co-conspirator, who was granted immunity, and who has every motive to lie and point the blame at other individuals. Before an out-of-court statement by an alleged co-conspirator may be admitted into evidence against a defendant, the existence of a conspiracy must be established by independent evidence, and the statement must have been made during the course of and in furtherance of the conspiracy. Wood v. State, 115 Nev. 334, 349 (1999) *quoting* Carr v. State, 95 Nev. 238, 239 (1980). In the instant case, the State's barebones presentation of evidence to the Grand Jury establishes that a deceased, burned body was discovered in California and that a location for the alleged crime(s) is discovered in Las Vegas.

The State has zero independent evidence that Mr. Davis planned or participated in a robbery or committed a murder. Here, the only evidence of a conspiracy involving Mr. Davis is the uncorroborated testimony of an unindicted participant testifying for personal gain. As this Court will quickly recognize when reading the Grand Jury Transcripts, the only evidence that implicated Mr. Davis in a conspiracy and/or robbery and/or murder is the testimony of Mackeshia Murphy. Mr. Davis never lived in the apartment where the crime took place. The Grand Jury heard zero testimony about physical evidence, forensics or ballistics that tie Mr. Davis to the murder. There was no evidence presented to the Grand Jury that Mr. Davis used force, violence, had a weapon or had knowledge that a weapon was present or would be used in any event involving the decedent in this case. No one, other than Ms. Murphy, identifies Mr. Davis as being present at the time of a murder or robbery in any way. Therefore, there is no independent evidence that a conspiracy existed in this case, *other than* the testimony of alleged accomplice Ms. Murphy. This is important because, as this Court well knows, NRS 175.291 provides that the testimony of an accomplice *must* be

11 12

10

14

15

13

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

26 27

28

corroborated and defines the requisite sufficiency of corroboration. It states:

- 1. A conviction shall not be had on the testimony of an accomplice unless the accomplice is corroborated by other evidence which in itself, and without the aid of the testimony of the accomplice, tends to connect the defendant with the commission of the offense; and the corroboration shall not be sufficient if it merely shows the commission of the offense or the circumstances thereof.
- **2.** An accomplice is hereby defined as one who is liable to prosecution, for the identical offense charged against the defendant on trial in the cause in which the testimony of the accomplice is given.

The introduction of the accomplice testimony of Murphy is precisely the type of testimony this statute was designed to address. Clearly Ms. Murphy is seen as an accomplice by the State, given that she was facing charges. An accomplice is one who is liable to prosecution for the identical offense charged against the defendant, or who is culpably implicated in, or unlawfully cooperates, aids or abets in the commission of the crime charged. Potter v. State, 96 Nev. 875, 619 P.2d 1222, (1980). The reasoning behind this requirement is mandated by the Nevada Legislature by reasoning that an individual who has "participated criminally in a given criminal venture shall be deemed to have such character, and such motives, that his testimony alone shall not rise to the dignity of proof beyond a reasonable doubt." Austin v. State, 87 Nev. 578, 491 P.2d 724, (1971). The purpose behind this statutory requirement of corroborative evidence is to prevent false accusations and false convictions. State v. Wyatt, 84 Nev. 731, 448 P.2d 827, (1968), Eckert v. State, 91 Nev. 183, 533 P.2d 468, (1975). The Nevada Supreme Court addressed this issue in Heglemeier v. State, 111 Nev. 1244, 903 P.2d 799, (1995), where the Court made clear the standard for reviewing evidence of corroboration to the testimony of an accomplice. In that case, the Court held that corroborating evidence must independently connect the defendant

28

with the offense; evidence does not suffice as corroborative if it merely supports the accomplice's testimony and that if there is no independent, inculpatory evidence, evidence tending to connect the defendant with the offense, there is no corroboration. <u>Id.</u> When analyzing the facts of <u>Heglemeier</u>, the Nevada Supreme Court held, consistent with the plain language of NRS 175.291, that "[i]n order for a defendant to be convicted on the testimony of an accomplice, the state must present other independent evidence that tends to connect the defendant with the crime." Moreover, the Court held that corroborating evidence *must* independently connect the defendant with the offense; evidence does not suffice as corroborative if it merely supports the accomplice's testimony. Id., emphasis added. The Court clearly mandated that "if there is no independent, inculpatory evidence -- evidence tending to connect the defendant with the offense, there is no corroboration, though the accomplice may be corroborated in regard to any number of facts sworn to him." Id., citing <u>Austin v. State</u>, 87 Nev. 578, 585, 491 P.2d 724, 728-29 (1971) (quoting <u>People v. Shaw</u>, 17 Cal. 2d 778, 112 P.2d 241, 255 (Cal. 1941)). In emphasizing this point, the Court held that "[w]here the connecting evidence shows no more than an opportunity to commit a crime, simply proves suspicion, or is equally consonant with a reasonable explanation pointing toward innocent conduct on the part of the defendant, the evidence is to be deemed insufficient." <u>Id.</u> citing State v. Dannels, 226 Mont. 80, 734 P.2d 188, 194 (Mont. 1987) (quoting State v. Mitchell, 192 Mont. 16, 625 P.2d 1155, 1158 (Mont. 1980)).

In <u>Heglemeier</u>, the Court identified positive, independent corroborative evidence introduced at trial related to 1) cartridge cases recovered from the crime scene; (2) Heglemeier's close relationship with people involved (the owner of the gun used); 3) Heglemeier knew where the Murder weapon was usually kept; 4) Independent witnesses

believed that Heglemeier may have accompanied the owner of the gun to the place of purchase; 5) Heglemeier was acquainted with Becker for several years and was on his list of persons who could visit him in prison; 6) the relative height of the suspects and that of the witness (Becker) and Heglemeier.

The <u>Heglemeier</u> Court found that "[a]lthough the state did introduce some evidence that might be construed as tending to connect Heglemeier with the crime" – the evidence was "insufficient, as a matter of law, to corroborate Becker's testimony." <u>Id.</u> The Court further held that the relationship of Heglemeier with his alleged accomplice Becker was insufficient to establish corroborative evidence. <u>LaPena v. Sheriff</u>, 91 Nev. 692, 695, 541 P.2d 907, 909 (1975). The Court even stated that although an eyewitness to the crime gave a description of the gunmen's heights as approximating the heights of Becker and Heglemeier, this was not sufficient.

In sum, the Court found that the connection of Heglemeier and Elizabeth and her gun, Heglemeier's association with Becker, and the eyewitness testimony regarding the height of the suspects do not, *when considered independently from Becker's testimony*, sufficiently connect Heglemeier to the crime. The Court succinctly stated that "this evidence does not constitute adequate corroboration." <u>Id.</u>

In the end, the Court in <u>Heglemeir</u> concluded that this lack of corroboration fell short of the requirement of NRS 175.291 and **reversed the conviction of Heglemeier**. The Court found particularly instructive the case of <u>Eckert v. State</u>, 91 Nev. 183, 533 P.2d 468 (1975). In that case, the defendant, Eckert, was charged with the murder of a man who had been shot in Las Vegas by three different weapons, including a nine-millimeter handgun and a .38 caliber handgun. An accomplice, Hilt, had previously given Eckert money for both a nine-

millimeter and a .38 handgun, and Eckert had signed the required federal forms for these guns. After purchasing the guns, Eckert, Hilt, and another accomplice, Overton, decided to drive from Kansas to Las Vegas; the car, however, broke down along the way in New Mexico.

At trial, Overton testified against Eckert and stated that after the car broke down, all three of them continued on to Las Vegas and picked up the victim, who had just left the bar. According to Overton, Eckert shot the victim for no apparent reason and then ordered the others to shoot the victim. Eckert, however, testified that he stayed with the broken car while the others went to Las Vegas. Id. at 184-85, 533 P.2d at 469-70. The only evidence connecting Eckert to the murder was that Eckert had signed the federal form for one of the guns identified as a murder weapon and that Eckert was associated with Overton, who admitted that they had shot the victim. This court concluded that the evidence was not sufficient to corroborate the accomplice's testimony. Id. at 186, 533 P.2d at 471. The Nevada Supreme Court in Heglemeier echoed the holding previously issued in the Eckert decision, concluding "the dangers are too great in view of the self-purposes to be served by [Becker] to suggest that the contents of this record supply the needed corroboration to uphold conviction." Id.

In the instant case, the testimony and evidence is no different. While the State may believe that simply placing an accomplice on the witness stand to testify as to their version of events, the law in Nevada requires more, namely corroboration. Here, the testimony of these accomplices cannot be corroborated and therefore, must be excluded. Without the testimony of Ms. Murphy, there is simply no corroborating evidence sufficient to allow this matter to proceed to trial and the Superseding Indictment must be dismissed.

///

///

2

4

5

6 7

8

10

11

12

13

1415

16

17

18

19

2021

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

II. THE STATE INTRODUCED NO SLIGHT OR MARGINALLY LEGALLY SUFFICIENT EVIDENCE THAT ARLEO EARL DAVIS COMMITTED THE CRIME OF FIRST DEGREE KIDNAPPING WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON RESULTING IN SUBSTANTIAL BODILY HARM AS ALLEGED IN COUNT 3 OF THE INDICTMENT

NRS 200.310(1) states, in pertinent part:

A person who willfully seizes, confines, inveigles, entices, decoys, abducts, conceals, kidnaps or carries away a person by any means whatsoever with the intent to hold or detain, or who holds or detains, the person for ransom, or reward, or for the purpose of committing a sexual assault, extortion or robbery upon or from the person, or for the purpose of killing the person or inflicting substantial bodily harm upon the person, or to exact from relatives, friends, or any other person any money or valuable thing for the return or disposition of the kidnapped person ... is guilty of kidnapping in the first degree which is a Category A Felony.

Count 3 of the Indictment alleges that Mr. Davis:

Did willfully, unlawfully, and feloniously, seize, confine, inveigle, entice, decoy, abduct, conceal, kidnap or carry away Marion B. Jabbar Anderson, a human being, with the intent to hold or detain the said Marion B. Jabbar Anderson against his will, and without his consent, for the purpose of committing a robbery, with use of a deadly weapon, to wit: a firearm(s), resulting in substantial bodily harm to Marion B. Jabbar Anderson, the Defendant(s) being criminally liable under one or more of the following principles of criminal liability, to wit: (1) by directly committing this crime; and/or (2) by aiding or abetting in the commission of this crime, with the intent that this crime be committed, by counseling, by encouraging, hiring, commanding, inducing and/or otherwise procuring the other to commit the crime, whereby one of their number lured and/or enticed the said victim to the crime scene under the guise of a drug deal with the intent to rob him, thereafter during the course of the robbery and/or attempted robbery, one of their number shot at and into the body of the said victim; and/or (3) pursuant to a conspiracy to commit this crime, with the intent that this crime be committed Defendants and/or others yet unknown to the conspiracy acting in concert throughout.

The transcript is entirely void of any evidence Mr. Davis committed the crime of

Kidnapping with use of a Deadly Weapon Resulting in Substantial Bodily Harm. *Even if* this

Court were legally permitted to consider the testimony of Ms. Murphy as it relates to any kidnapping, (for reasons outlined herein, this Court should not), the testimony provided to the Grand Jury is not legally sufficient to sustain the dual charges of robbery and kidnapping. The Nevada Supreme Court has repeatedly held that to sustain convictions for both robbery and kidnapping arising from the same course of conduct, any movement or restraint must stand alone with independent significance form the act of robbery itself, create a risk of danger to the victim substantially exceeding that necessarily present in the crime of robbery, or involve movement, seizure or restraint substantially in excess of that necessary to its completion. Mendoza v. State, 122 Nev. 267, 275 (2006). As a general matter, movement or restraint incidental to an underlying offense will not expose the defendant to dual criminal liability under the kidnapping statutes. Id. at 274.

Moving a victim from one room inside a house to another room in search of valuables during the commission of a robbery is insufficient, by itself, to sustain convictions for both kidnapping and robbery. <u>Gonzalez v. State</u>, 131 Nev. 481, 498 (2015) (*citing* <u>Wright v. State</u>, 94 Nev. 415, 417-18 (1978)).

According to the testimony adduced at the Grand Jury, 6555 Boulder Highway, building 11, apartment 309 is a very small apartment and consists of just a living room, a kitchen, a bedroom, and a bathroom. (GJT Vol 1., page 29). The testimony, if believed and legally sufficient, was that Mr. Anderson showed up to the apartment on his own volition, to sell marijuana to the group. The victim brought one pound of marijuana to sell and said the group would receive the other pound of marijuana when he was paid for the first pound. There is simply no evidence that Mr. Anderson was never carried away, confined, seized, enticed, concealed or that any independently significant event above that required for a

robbery occured. Even accepting all of the State's elicited testimony in the light most favorable to the State, there is simply no evidence that there was any restriction of movement or movement which was not incidental to the Robbery, occurring within the confines of this very small apartment. As such, the State has failed to meet their burden and Count 3 of the Indictment must be dismissed.

IV. THE STATE INTRODUCED NO SLIGHT OR MARGINALLY LEGALLY SUFFICIENT EVIDENCE THAT ARLEO EARL DAVIS COMMITTED THE CRIME OF ROBBERY WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON AS ALLEGED IN COUNT 4 OF THE INDICTMENT.

In this instant case, the transcript of the Grand Jury Proceedings is completely void of evidence connecting the Petitioner to the charge of Robbery with Use of a Deadly Weapon, as alleged in Count 4 of the Indictment.

NRS 200.380(1) states:

Robbery is the unlawful taking of personal property from the person of another, or in the person's presence, against his or her will, by means of force or violence or fear of injury, immediate or future, to his or her person or property, or the person or property of a member of his or her family, or of anyone in his or her company at the time of the robbery. A taking is by means of force or fear if force or fear is used to

- (a) Obtain or retain possession of the property;
- (b) Prevent or overcome resistance to the taking; or
- (c) Facilitate escape.

Count 4 of the Indictment alleges that Mr. Davis:

Did willfully, unlawfully, and feloniously take personal property, to wit: Marijuana and/or US Currency and/or vehicle and/or vehicle keys, from the person of Marion B. Jabbar Anderson, or in his presence, without the consent and against the will of Marion B. Jabbar Anderson, by means of force or violence or fear of injury, immediate or future, to his person, the person of a member of his family, or of anyone in his company at the time of the robbery, defendant using force or fear to obtain or retain possession of the property, to prevent or overcome resistance to the taking of the property, and/or to facilitate escape, with use of a deadly weapon, to wit: a firearm; the Defendant(s) being criminally liable under one or more of the following

principles of criminal liability, to wit: (1) by directly committing this crime; and/or (2) by aiding or abetting in the commission of this crime, with the intent that this crime be committed, by counseling, encouraging, hiring, commanding, inducing and/or otherwise procuring the other to commit the crime, and/or (3) pursuant to a conspiracy to commit this crime, with the intent that this crime be committed, Defendants and/or unknown individuals acting in a concert throughout.

There is no scintilla of evidence that connects Mr. Davis to the crime of Robbery with Use of a Deadly Weapon. The State's star only witness connecting Mr. Davis to the crimes in this case, the un-indicted co-conspirator who was granted immunity, testified she never saw any marijuana. There was no testimony that any marijuana or US currency was taken as alleged in the Superseding Indictment. The testimony regarding the victim's car was that Jecory Kemp and Davon Hickman took the victim's car – not Mr. Davis. As it relates to the specific allegations of Count 4, there is an overwhelming lack of evidence implicating Mr. Davis in any criminal activity as alleged in Count 4. As such, Count 4 of the Indictment must be dismissed.

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, the instant Petition should be granted and Indictment as to Arleo Earl Davis should be dismissed in its entirety.

DATED this 5th day of May, 2020.

HOFLAND & TOMSHECK

By: ___/s/ J. Tomsheck____ Joshua Tomsheck, Esq. Nevada Bar No. 9210 228 South Fourth Street, 1st Floor Las Vegas, Nevada 89101 (702) 895-6760 Attorney for Petitioner

1	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE				
2					
3	On this 5th day of May, 2020 of a true and correct copy of the foregoing PETITION				
4	FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS was made via electronic service system to the following				
5	MARC.DIGIACOMO@CLARKCOUNTYDA.COM				
6	JORY.SCARBOROUGH@CLARKCOUNTYDA.COM				
7	DEPT17LC@CLARKCOUNTYCOURTS.US				
8					
9					
10	/s/ Olivia Campbell				
11	An Employee of Hofland & Tomsheck				
12					
13					
14					
15					
16					
17					
18					
19					
20					
21					
22					
23					
24					
25					
26					
27					
28					

Electronically Filed 5/19/2020 2:57 PM Steven D. Grierson CLERK OF THE COURT

1 RET STEVEN B. WOLFSON 2 Clark County District Attorney Nevada Bar #001565 3 MARC DIGIACOMO Chief Deputy District Attorney 4 Nevada Bar #006955 200 Lewis Avenue 5 Las Vegas, Nevada 89155-2212 (702) 671-2500 6 State of Nevada

> DISTRICT COURT CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

8

9

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

7

In the Matter of Application,

10 of

11 ARLEO EARL DAVIS, aka, Arleo Earl Davis, Jr.,

12 | #7054823

13 for a Writ of Habeas Corpus.

CASE NO: C-20-346920-3

DEPT NO: XVII

STATE'S RETURN TO WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS

DATE OF HEARING: 5/29/2020 TIME OF HEARING: 10:15 A.M.

COMES NOW, JOE LOMBARDO, Sheriff of Clark County, Nevada, Respondent, through his counsel, STEVEN B. WOLFSON, Clark County District Attorney, through MARC DIGIACOMO, Chief Deputy District Attorney, in obedience to a writ of habeas corpus issued out of and under the seal of the above-entitled Court on the 5th day of May, 2020, and made returnable on the 29th day of May, 2020, at the hour of 10:15 A.M., before the above-entitled Court, and states as follows:

- 1. Respondent admits the allegations of Paragraph(s) 1, 2 and 7 of the Petitioner's Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus.
- 2. Respondent denies the allegations of Paragraph(s) 3 and 5 (Defendant was arraigned on April 2, 2020) of the Petitioner's Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus.
 - 3. Paragraph(s) 6 and 7 do not require admission or denial.

28

V:\2020\117\86\202011786C-RET-(DAVIS WRIT RETURN)-001.DOCX

4. The Petitioner is in the actual custody of JOE LOMBARDO, Clark County Sheriff, Respondent herein, pursuant to a Criminal Superseding Indictment, a copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit 1 and incorporated by reference herein.

Wherefore, Respondent prays that the Writ of Habeas Corpus be discharged and the Petition be dismissed.

DATED this <u>19th</u> day of May, 2020.

Respectfully submitted,

STEVEN B. WOLFSON Clark County District Attorney Nevada Bar # 001565

BY /s/ Marc DiGiacomo
MARC DIGIACOMO
Chief Deputy District Attorney
Nevada Bar #006955

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On March 19, 2020, Defendant was indicted for the instant charges. The very next day, the transcripts of the grand jury proceedings were filed. The first appearance of Defendant in district court took place on March 27th, 2020. *See* Exhibit 2 attached hereto. At that hearing, the arraignment was continued to April 2, 2020. On April 2, 2020, Defendant was arraigned, pled not guilty and invoked the 60-day rule. *See* Exhibit 3 attached hereto. On April 14, 2020, Attorney Joshua Tomsheck appeared and confirmed as counsel on the case. The minutes show the Defendant was arraigned for a second time, pleading not guilty, and invoking the 60-day rule. The trial date was set for July 6, 2020.

A review of the Court's electronic filing system shows that Defendant never sought any extension of time for the filing of the petition, either *ex parte* or otherwise. Defendant filed a Pre-Trial Writ of Habeas Corpus on May 5, 2020, well past the deadline statutory, jurisdictional time period. This opposition follows.

27 ///

28 ///

///

STATEMENT OF FACTS

I. OVERVIEW

Shortly prior to December 30, 2019, Defendant Arleo Davis owed money to the victim, Marion Jabbar Anderson, over a drug transaction. Defendant enlisted the help of Jacory Kemp and Davon Hickman to help him rob Anderson of Marijuana. Kemp and Hickman were dating Tyesha James and Mackeshia Murphy and sharing an apartment on Boulder Highway. The five (5) people were present when Anderson, Kemp and Hickman discussed robbing Anderson of two (2) pounds of marijuana. Anderson was lured to the apartment and James and Murphy were ordered to leave. When he arrived, the group tried to rob Anderson and during that effort, Anderson was shot and killed. Anderson's body was loaded into Anderson's vehicle and taken to California, where it was burned. During this time, James assisted in the clean-up of the apartment, and Murphy helped clean the outside of the apartment.

GRAND JURY PRESENTMENTS

I. GRAND JURY PRESENTATION 1:

On the evening of December 30, and December 31, 2019, San Bernardino County Sheriff's Department (SBCSD) Homicide Detective Arturo Alvarado was called out to a homicide investigation at Interstate 15 (I-15) between Baker and Barstow California. Grand Jury Presentation 1 ("GJ1"), at p. 9. Once on scene, Detective Alvarado discovered a vehicle with significant fire damage. <u>Id.</u> at 12. The vehicle was charred, the rubber and plastic were already burned away, and the car was basically just metal. <u>Id.</u> at 13. The vehicle was determined to a be a Lexus. <u>Id.</u> at 13.

Once the fire was extinguished, Detective Alvarado discovered a deceased body outside of the vehicle next to the vehicle's trunk. <u>Id</u>. at 15. The victim's body was face down and the body was burned. <u>Id</u>. Under California law the coroner is the only entity allowed to touch or manipulate the body. <u>Id</u>. When the coroner responded to the scene, the coroner conducted what is referred to as a "body roll." <u>Id</u>. at 16.

¹ Defendant's brother, Antonio Woods, was present as well, but has yet to be arrested.

The body roll revealed a key card on a lanyard around the victim's neck. <u>Id</u>. at 16. The information learned from the key card, along with the information about the vehicle involved, lead SBCSD Homicide Detectives to conclude that the victim had potential ties to Las Vegas. <u>Id</u>. at 17. Based on that information, SBCSD Homicide Detectives contacted LVMPD Homicide Detectives Hodson and Dosch for assistance. <u>Id</u>.

Once Hodson and Dosch became involved, they developed the address of 6555 S. Boulder Highway, building 11, apartment 309 as the murder scene. <u>Id</u>. Apartment 309 is located on the top floor of building 11. <u>Id</u>. To get to apartment 309, one has to walk up two flights of stairs. <u>Id</u>.

When detectives responded to the apartment complex, Dosch discovered a blood trail on the ground. <u>Id</u>. at 23. The trail started on the third floor of building 11, right near the front door of apartment 309. <u>Id</u>. The blood trail continued down the stairs to the ground floor and ended in the parking lot. <u>Id</u>. The blood trail ended near a parking space where the trunk of a vehicle would be located if a vehicle parked in the space facing forward. <u>Id</u>. p 25-26.

Based on the blood trail, Detectives obtained a search warrant for the residence. <u>Id.</u> at 27. Upon entry, the apartment was unoccupied. <u>Id.</u> Once inside, Detective Dosch immediately noticed a strong odor of cleaning chemicals. <u>Id.</u> at 30. Dosch also noticed a white residue on the tile kitchen floor. <u>Id.</u> Not only was there apparent blood spatter along the bottom edge of the kitchen cabinets, there was also apparent blood spatter on the overhead kitchen light and the dishwasher. <u>Id.</u> at 30. Cleaning materials were found inside the apartment as well. <u>Id.</u> at 31.

Initially, the first two suspects who were developed as a result of the investigation were Jecory Kemp and Tyeshia James. <u>Id</u>. James and Kemp were apprehended and interviewed in connection with the murder. <u>Id</u>. Those interviews lead to the identification of Davon Hickman and Mackeshia Murphy as well as a suspect named "Sayso," later identified as Defendant Arleo Davis.

///

II. GRAND JURY PRESENTATION 2:

Mackeshia Murphy received immunity for her testimony in this matter. Grand Jury Presentation 2 ("GJP 2") at p. 9.²

Mackeshia is Tyesha James' sister. <u>Id</u>. Mackeshia testified that Jecory Kemp is Tyeshia's boyfriend and that she was dating a man named Davon Hickman. <u>Id</u>. at 10. Mackeshia knows Jecory by the nickname "Smooth Got It", and also knows Davon by the nickname "Payso." <u>Id</u>. Mackeshia was living with Davon Hickman, Jecory Kemp and Tyeshia James at the Sienna Suites at 6555 South Boulder Highway near the end of 2019. Id.

Mackeshia testified to a conversation that she overheard on December 30, 2019 discussing the victim. <u>Id.</u> at 11. Mackeshia, Hickman, Kemp, James, a man who goes by the nickname "Sayso," and Sayso's brother were all present during this conversation. <u>Id.</u> Through that conversation it was learned that "Sayso" owed the victim \$2000 for marijuana. <u>Id.</u> at 12. Instead of paying the victim back, "Sayso," Hickman, Kemp and Sayso's brother were going to rob the victim. Id.

The plan was to call the victim, have him bring two pounds of marijuana, and to rob him once he arrived. <u>Id</u>. The next day, Mackeshia saw the victim show up at the apartment. <u>Id</u>. at 12-13. Mackeshia left the apartment with James before the planned robbery because she was told to leave by the conspirators. <u>Id</u>. As she was leaving, the victim was walking towards the apartment. <u>Id</u>. The last people in the apartment before she left was Kemp, "Sayso", Hickman, "Star", and Sayso's brother. <u>Id</u>.

When Mackeshia and Tyeshia left the apartment, they went to a friend's apartment nearby. <u>Id</u>. at 15. After 15-20 minutes, the two were outside smoking a cigarette when Hickman came running down the stairs saying he shot the victim. <u>Id</u>. The victim was still in the apartment. <u>Id</u>. Hickman, Kemp, "Sayso," and Sayso's brother discussed what to do with the victim's body. <u>Id</u>. at 16. The plan was to take the body to Barstow or San Bernardino. <u>Id</u>. at 17. Mackeshia helped her sister clean up the outside stairs where the blood was. <u>Id</u>. Mackeshia never saw the body. <u>Id</u>. Mackeshia indicated that Kemp told her that he and James

² During her testimony, while she admitted to knowing about the plan to rob before, her only admission to criminal liability was to accessory after the fact for cleaning up the blood from the stairs.

///

moved the body. <u>Id</u>. at 17-18. When transporting the body, a man referred to as "Flaco" followed Kemp and Hickman to Barstow and drove the two back to Las Vegas. <u>Id</u>. at 19.

Mackeshia testified that Hickman expressed to her that he was scared because he was the one who shot the victim. <u>Id</u>. at 18. Hickman told her that the victim showed up with less marijuana than discussed and that he was confronted by "Sayso" and his brother. <u>Id</u>. at 19. Once that happened, the victim pulled out a gun and Hickman shot him. Id.

After the murder, Mackeshia and Hickman fled to Los Angeles where she was ultimately arrested. Detective Hodson learned of a phone number associated with Hickman that was confirmed by Mackeshia Murphy after her arrest. <u>Id.</u> at 27. Murphy confirmed that that Hickman's phone number was (716)-361-8448. After Detectives requested the phone records associated with that 716 number, cell cite coverage details were able to confirm and corroborate Murphy's story that Hickman was present at the apartment during the homicide. <u>Id.</u> at 31.³

Ultimately, all the of the remaining suspects associated were identified by Detectives during the investigation. Sayso's brother was identified as Anthony Woods. The man named "Flaco" was identified as Preston Huteson and the man named "Sayso" was identified as Defendannt Arleo Davis Junior. Id. at 26.

Defendant Davis was taken into custody by a fugitive apprehension team at the intersection of Bonanza and Nellis at the welfare parking lot. <u>Id</u>. at 29. Davis had a phone on his person when he was taken into custody. <u>Id</u>. at 28. However, the phone number associated with the device at the time of his arrest was not the number assigned to that same device during the time of the homicide on December 30th, 2019. Id.

While in custody, Davis was interviewed about the homicide. During his interview, Davis indicated that he knew the victim, Hickman, Kemp, Murphy and James. <u>Id</u>. at 30. Davis also admitted that he was in possession of the phone at the time of the homicide, and also confirmed the subsequent switch of the phone numbers associated with that device. <u>Id</u>.

³ Both Tyesha James and Jacory Kemp provided similar custodial statements as Murphy Grand Jury testimony.

Detectives obtained the records associated with the actual device possessed by Davis and were able to confirm and corroborate Davis's presence at the apartment during the time of the murder. Id. at 33.4 Unlike Davon Hickman's phone records which provided general location information, Defendant's phone records were from Verizon. Those records had a measurement of how far Defendant's device was from the cellular tower during specific times. Id. at 32. That allowed detectives to draw an arc on a map to display the exact location of Defendant at specific times. During the time of the crime, that arc ran directly through the apartment where the murder occurred at the time the murder occurred. Id. at 33. Thus, the electronic evidence not only corroborated Murphy, but established independent of Murphy that Defendant was present at the time of the murder.

POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

I. DEFENDANT'S PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS IS PROCEDURALLY BARRED

Defendant has failed to properly file his petition for writ of habeas corpus. As such, the Court lacks jurisdiction to consider the petition. NRS 34.700 is mandatory and states:

- 1. Except as provided in subsection 3, a pretrial petition for a writ of habeas corpus based on alleged lack of probable cause or otherwise challenging the court's right or jurisdiction to proceed to the trial of a criminal charge may not be considered unless:
- (a) The petition and all supporting documents are filed within 21 days after the first appearance of the accused in the district court; and
- (b) The petition contains a statement that the accused:(1) Waives the 60-day limitation for bringing an accused to trial; or
- (2) If the petition is not decided within 15 days before the date set for trial, consents that the court may, without notice or hearing, continue the trial indefinitely or to a date designated by the court.
- 2. The arraignment and entry of a plea by the accused must not be continued to avoid the requirement that a pretrial petition be filed within the period specified in subsection 1.
- 3. The court may extend, for good cause, the time to file a petition. Good cause shall be deemed to exist if the transcript of the preliminary hearing or of the proceedings before the grand jury is not available within 14 days after the accused's initial appearance

⁴ Defendant's records were admitted as Exhibit 41 at the grand jury presentment.

and the court shall grant an ex parte application to extend the time for filing a petition. All other applications may be made only after appropriate notice has been given to the prosecuting attorney.

(Emphasis Added). Any petition which is not filed in conformance with NRS 34.700 is not cognizable and cannot be considered by the Court. NRS 34,710. *See also* Sheriff of Washoe County v. Chumphol, 95 Nev. 818, 603 P.2d 690, 1979 Nev. LEXIS 668 (Nev. 1979); Gatlin v. State, 96 Nev. 303, 608 P.2d 1100, 1980 Nev. LEXIS 576 (Nev. 1980); Sheriff, Clark County v. Marshall, 96 Nev. 304, 608 P.2d 1101, 1980 Nev. LEXIS 577 (Nev. 1980). As such, the petition must be dismissed. Sheriff, Clark County v. Jensen, 95 Nev. 595, 600 P.2d 222, 1979 Nev. LEXIS 690 (Nev. 1979).

Defendant's claims lack merit and fail under the law should the court decide to adjudicate the motion on its merits. In his Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus, Defendant

The first appearance of Defendant in district court took place on March 27th, 2020. *See* Exhibit 2 attached hereto. At that hearing, the arraignment was continued to April 2, 2020. On April 2, 2020, Defendant was arraigned, pled not guilty and invoked the 60-day rule. *See* Exhibit 3 attached hereto. On April 14, 2020, Attorney Joshua Tomsheck appeared and confirmed as counsel on the case. The minutes show the Defendant was arraigned for a second time, pleading not guilty, and invoking the 60-day rule. The trial date was set for July 6, 2020.

A review of the Court's electronic filing system shows that Defendant never sought any extension of time for the filing of the petition, either ex parte or otherwise. Since Defendant's first appearance was on March 27, 2020, his writ was procedurally barred at of April 17, 2020. The statute specifically notes that the fact that Defendant wasn't arraigned on this date does not affect the time for filing. However, if the Court were to extend the statute to arraignment instead of first appearance, Defendant was arraigned on April 2, 2020 and his time for filing the petition ran on April 23, 2020. Certainly, the fact that he was rearraigned on April 14, 2020, does not start a new clock on his time for filing of a writ. Since no request was filed, and no extension was granted, the writ is procedurally barred.

II. MORE THAN SUFFICIENT EVIDENCE WAS PRESENTED TO HOLD DEFENDANT TO ANSWER TO THE CHARGES

asserts that the State did not present sufficient legal evidence to sustain the charges. Defendant contends that the testimony of Mackeshia Murphy is insufficiently corroborated accomplice testimony under NRS 175.291, and that the State has "zero independent evidence" that Defendant participated in a robbery or committed a murder. Defendant also claims that the first-degree kidnapping charge must be dismissed pursuant to the Mendoza decision because the kidnapping was incidental to the robbery charge. Lastly, Defendant claims the State failed to introduce sufficient evidence of the robbery with deadly weapon charge. Each of these arguments fail and the writ must be denied.

It is well settled that a district court's function in reviewing a pretrial writ of habeas corpus challenging the sufficiency of probable cause is to determine whether enough competent evidence was presented to establish a reasonable inference that the accused committed the offenses. State v. Fuchs, 78 Nev. 63 (1962). The finding of probable cause to support a criminal charge may be based on "slight, even 'marginal' evidence . . . because it does not involve a determination of the guilt or innocence of the accused." Sheriff v. Hodes, 96 Nev. 184, 186, 606 P.2d 178, 180 (1980). "To commit an accused for trial, the State is not required to negate all inferences which might explain his conduct, but only to present enough evidence to support a reasonable inference that the accused committed the offense." Kinsey v. Sheriff, 87 Nev. 361, 363, 487 P.2d 340, 341 (1971). Sheriff v. Miley, 99 Nev. 377 (1983). Thus, the court need not consider whether the evidence presented to a Grand Jury, or presented at a preliminary hearing, may, by itself, sustain a conviction, because the State need not produce the quantum of proof required to establish the guilt of the accused beyond a reasonable doubt. See Hodes, 96 Nev. at 186, 606 P.2d at 180; Miller v. Sheriff, 95 Nev. 255, 592 P.2d 952 (1979); McDonald v. Sheriff, 87 Nev. 361, 487 P.2d 340, (1971).

The Nevada Supreme Court has explicitly held that a probable cause determination is "not a substitute for trial," and that the "full and complete exploration of all facets of the case" should be reserved for trial. Marcum v. Sheriff, 85 Nev. 175, 178, 451 P.2d 845, 847 (1969); Robertson v. Sheriff, 85 Nev. 681, 683, 462 P.2d 528, 529 (1969). If the evidence produced establishes a reasonable inference that the defendant committed the crime, the probable cause

2.7

to order the defendant to answer in the district court has been established. Morgan v. Sheriff, 86 Nev. 23, 467 P.2d 600 (1970). Accordingly, the issue of guilt or innocence is not involved and "the evidence need not be sufficient to support a conviction." Kinsey, 87 Nev. at 363 (citing Masklay v. State, 85 Nev. 111, 450 P.2d 790 (1969)); Hodes, 96 Nev. at 184, 606 P.2d at 180.

A. ACCOMPLICE TESTIMONY AND NRS 175.291.

Accomplice testimony is governed by NRS 175.291. NRS 175.291 states:

- 1. A conviction shall not be had on the testimony of an accomplice unless the accomplice is corroborated by other evidence which in itself, and without the aid of the testimony of the accomplice, tends to connect the defendant with the commission of the offense; and the corroboration shall not be sufficient if it merely shows the commission of the offense or the circumstances thereof.
- 2. An accomplice is hereby defined as one who is liable to prosecution, for the identical offense charged against the defendant on trial in the cause in which the testimony of the accomplice is given.

While a reading of the statute appears to only apply to trial, the Nevada Supreme Court has ruled that the corroboration rule applies to preliminary hearings. *See* Lamb v. Bennett, 87 Nev. 89, 482 P.2d 298 (1971). By extension, the corroboration rule would seem to apply to grand juries. However, by that same extension, the corroboration requirement must be slight, even marginal.

Under 175.291, an accomplice is defined as a person who is liable to prosecution for the <u>identical</u> offense charged against the defendant. If, from the testimony of the witness' alone, there is no doubt the witness is liable for the charged crimes, he is an accomplice as a matter of law. *See* Rowland v. State, 118 Nev. 31, 39 P.3d 114 (2002). However, if the testimony of the witness leaves doubt whether he is liable for the charged crime, then the question of whether or not he is an accomplice is a matter of fact. *See* <u>id</u> (*citing* Austin v. State 87 Nev. 578, 588-89, 491 P.2d 724, 730-31 (1971)). Matters of fact are determinations for a jury. *See* Ford v. State, 99 Nev. 209, 660 P.2d 992 (1983).

With respect to Murphy as an accomplice, simply "facing charges" does not render Murphy an accomplice under the law. See Def. Mot. At 17. In her testimony, Murphy claimed knowledge of the conspiracy to commit robbery, but never agreed to partake in the robbery and wasn't present at the time of the crime. As such, as a matter of law, Murphy is not an accomplice. *See* Bolden v. State, 124 P.3d 191 (Nev. 2005)("[A]bsent an agreement to cooperate in achieving the purpose of a conspiracy, mere knowledge of, acquiescence in, or approval of that purpose does not make one a party to conspiracy." *quoting* Garner v. State, 116 Nev. 770, 780, 6 P.3d 1013, 1020 (2000), *overruled in part by* Sharma v. State, 118 Nev. 648, 56 P.3d 868 (2002)). Murphy's only admission during her testimony was that upon learning of the crime, she tried to clean up blood on the stairs. At most, that would make Murphy an accessory to the crimes after the fact. As Murphy's testimony did not implicate her in the crimes for which Davis is charged, she is not an accomplice as a matter of law. Once it is determined that she is not an accomplice, Murphy did not need to be corroborated and her testimony alone was sufficient evidence to hold Defendant to answer for all the charged.

In the instant case, the facts and circumstances are substantially similar and warrant the same decision previously rendered by the Nevada Supreme Court in Fish v. Sheriff of Clark County, 1973, 510 P.2d 1370, 89 Nev. 250. In that case, the Defendant was charged Murder. A grand jury returned an indictment against Defendant and he sought pretrial habeas relief. In the grand jury presentation, the state introduced testimony from David Boyd Miller ("Miller") and Constance Baker ("Baker"). Id. Miller, an accomplice, testified to the events that took place and received immunity for his testimony in the matter. Id. The State offered Baker's testimony to establish the requisite corroboration under that statute. Id. In his petition, Defendant argued that the grand jury improperly relied on Baker's testimony to corroborate Miller's testimony because she was also an accomplice. Id.

The court found that the "record was totally devoid of any testimony or other evidence that would suggest or support an inference that Baker performed any of the aforementioned activities that would make her amendable to prosecution for the offense charged." Id. at 252. The court found that Baker "at most, may have known that an accomplice and others were

going to perform a "job" for the defendant and that sometime after completion of the "job" Baker may have become aware of its nature and consequences." <u>Id</u>. Based on that reasoning the court held that those circumstances **did not render** the witness an "accomplice" so as to preclude use of her testimony to corroborate grand jury testimony given against petitioner by accomplice. <u>Id</u>.

Here, the evidence coupled with Murphy's testimony only establishes criminal liability as an accessory after the fact for cleaning up the blood from the stairs. No testimony or evidence remotely suggests that Murphy was involved in the actual planning and execution of the robbery and subsequent homicide. All evidence points to the fact that Murphy was not actively involved in the commission of the crime. Murphy took no part in formulating the plan of luring the victim to the apartment, was not even present while the event took place, and only cleaned up blood in an attempt to hide physical evidence. Based on those facts, it would be a very far logical leap to label Murphy as an accomplice to the kidnapping, robbery and felony murder. Because Murphy is only an accessory after the fact, her testimony should not be evaluated under the corroboration requirements listed in the listed in the statute.

It would be misguided for the court to completely throw out the competent, relevant, and probative testimony of this witness in a homicide case by misapplying a statute in this circumstance. Murphy's testimony is proper and must be heavily considered against Defendant to hold him to answer for the charges he faces.

Notwithstanding, even if Murphy had been an accomplice, her testimony is more than corroborated. Corroboration evidence is only evidence which "tends" to connect Defendant to the commission of the offense. *See* NRS 175.291(1).

Corroboration evidence need not be found in a single fact or circumstance and can, instead, be taken from the circumstances and evidence as a whole. <u>LaPena v. State</u>, 92 Nev. 1, 544 P.2d 1187 (1976). Corroboration evidence also need not in itself be sufficient to establish guilt, and it will satisfy the statute if it merely tends to connect the accused to the offense. *See* <u>State v. Hilbish</u>, <u>Et. Al.</u>, 59 Nev. 469, 97 P.2d 435 (1940).

Cheatham v. State, 104 Nev. 500, 761 P.2d 419 (1988).

Just Defendant's cell phone records alone tend to connect Defendant to the commission of the crime. Defendant admits to being in possession of the device and confirmed its number at the time of the crime. The cell phone records from Verizon gave the device's distance to tower and side of the tower it was on. That allowed detectives to draw an arc on that side of the tower to determine it's location. That arc passed directly through apartment 309 (the murder scene) at the time of the murder. Certainly, that evidence alone would have been sufficient to indict Defendant for the crime of murder. The standard for corroboration is way lower and obviously met by this evidence alone.

Defendant's statements to detectives are also independent of Murphy's testimony. In his interview, Defendant confirms his association with all the parties involved in this case, confirms that he was in possession of the cellular device that puts him in the apartment during the homicide, and confirms that he switched the phone number associated with the device after the murder. Moreover, the cell tower records from Defendant's phone at the time of the homicide introduced through Detective Hodson firmly establish Defendant's presence at the apartment during the time of the murder. Since, "Defendant has never lived in the apartment where the crime took place," a reasonable inference can be drawn from the evidence that Defendant did not just happen to be in that area during the time of a murder. See Def. Motion at 16.

Murphy's statements are sufficiently corroborated under the statute. The abundance of independent evidence allows the court to comfortably consider Murphy's testimony to establish probable cause to hold the defendant to answer for the crimes charged.

B. CONSPIRACY AND CO-CONSPIRATOR TESTIMONY.

Defendant challenges the admission of a co-conspirator statement on the grounds that the State failed to sufficiently establish the existence of a conspiracy. Defendant contends that the *only* evidence of his involvement in a conspiracy is Murphy's uncorroborated testimony. This is patently incorrect. However, Defendant is also confusing two separate evidentiary rules. Statements of conspirators are admissible against each other once some evidence of the

conspiracy is admitted. Nothing precludes Murphy's testimony, whether an accomplice or not, from supplying that evidentiary basis.

Before an out of court statement by an alleged co-conspirator may be admitted into evidence against a defendant, the existence of a conspiracy must be established by independent evidence, and the statement must have been made during the course of and in furtherance of the conspiracy. Wood v. State, 115 Nev. 334, 349 (1999). A conspiracy is an agreement between two or more persons for an unlawful purpose. Peterson v. Sheriff, 95 Nev. 522, 598 P.2d 623 (1979). "[C]onspiracy is seldom susceptible of direct proof and is usually established by inference from the conduct of the parties." Gaitor v. State, 106 Nev. 785, 790 n. 1, 801 P.2d 1372, 1376 n. 1 (1990) (quoting State v. Dressel, 85 N.M. 450, 451, 513 P.2d 187, 188 (1973)). In particular, a conspiracy conviction may be supported by "a coordinated series of acts," in furtherance of the underlying offense, "sufficient to infer the existence of an agreement". Id.

The formation and existence of a conspiracy may be inferred from all circumstances tending to show the common intent and may be proved in the same way as any other fact may be proved, either by direct testimony of the fact or by circumstantial evidence, or by both direct and circumstantial evidence. <u>Doyle v. State</u>, 112 Nev. 879, 894 (1996), overruled on other grounds by <u>Kaczmarek v. State</u>, 120 Nev. 314 (2004).

Abundant physical evidence coupled with cell tower records readily demonstrates a series of coordinated acts by multiple individuals in furtherance of the kidnapping robbery and murder. As an initial starting matter, the victim was killed in an apartment, taken to the trunk of his car, and then both the victim and the car were left out in the middle of a desert. Those facts alone suggest more than one person as the perpetrator had to be driven home from the desert because he was not present when the police arrived to the burning car and body. Both Hickman's and Defendant's cell phone records are indicative of a conspiracy.⁵

The statements Murphy testified to are statements of co-conspirators during the course and furtherance of the conspiracy. Some of those statements are literally the formation of the conspiracy. On December 30, 2019, Murphy testified to a conversation that she overheard

⁵ While the statements of Kemp and James were not admitted against Defendant, the fact that they admitted their own involvement in the crime is also suggestive of a conspiracy.

15

16

11

20

21

22

23 24

25 26 27

28

regarding the plan. Murphy was present when the Defendant, along with Hickman, Kemp, and Defendant's brother devised the plan to lure and rob the victim.

Additionally, Murphy was present for conversations after the murder the discussed the plan to cover up the crime. The Defendant, Hickman, Kemp, and Defendant's brother created a plan to take the body to Barstow or San Bernardino. Murphy also indicated that Kemp told her that he and James moved the body.

The State's presentation of evidence to establish a conspiracy is far from bare bones. Murphy's testimony is corroborated by independent evidence and even further supported by physical and electronic evidence. Thus, Murphy's testimony concerning statements of coconspirators must also be considered as they are properly admitted and highly probative of defendant's involvement in the kidnapping, robbery and felony murder.

C. MENDOZA FACTORS ARE QUESTIONS OF FACT TO BE DETERMINED BY THE TRIER OF FACT.

Defendant's assertion that the testimony and evidence is not legally sufficient to sustain both kidnapping and robbery charges is misplaced under the law. The question of whether the movement of a victim is incidental to the associated offense and whether the movement increased the risk of harm to a victim are questions of fact to be determined by a jury in all but the clearest of cases. Wright v. State, 106 Nev. 647, 649, 799 P.2d 548, 549 (1990); Turner v. State, 98 Nev. 243, 245, 645 P.2d 971, 972 (1982); Curtis D. v. State, 98 Nev. 273, 274, 646 P.2d 547, 548 (1982); Sheriff v. Medberry, 96 Nev. 202, 204, 606 P.2d 181, 182 (1980); Langford v. State, 95 Nev. 631, 638-39. 600 P.2d 231, 236-37 (1979). Nevada case is very clear that this question is a question of fact. Essentially, should this go to trial, this issue should be decided by a jury.

In the instant case, the movement of the victim was both independent of the act of the robbery itself and substantially increased the risk of danger to the victim beyond that necessary to perpetrate the crime. Stating that the victim showed up to the apartment on his own volition is absurd. The victim is not a door to door marijuana salesman that just happened to be at the apartment in question. But for that plan to arrange a large purchase of marijuana for two

26 ///

thousand dollars, it is quite hard to believe that the victim would have been at the apartment. This is a precise example of the inveigling theory of Kidnapping.

Any robbery with a deadly weapon has a high chance of success when a person walks up and points a gun in someone's face. The threat of force creates the unfair advantage necessary to force someone to part with their possessions. What takes any situation *beyond a robbery* is the creation of another circumstance that compounds any unfair advantage. Luring a victim to a residence where multiple individuals have the opportunity to hide in adjacent rooms in order to ambush the victim undoubtedly increases that unfair advantage beyond just sticking the gun in the victim's face. This movement was absolutely unnecessary for purposes of completing the robbery.

Under the law, this issue is a question of fact. Since this is not the "clearest of cases," this court should permit this charge to go to the jury for decision.

D. ROBBERY WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON.

Defendant asserts there is "no scintilla of evidence" that connect Mr. Davis to the crime of Robbery with Use of a Deadly Weapon. Again, the thrust of Defendant's argument concerns the testimony of Murphy and that it is improper for the court to consider. Without fully reiterating the arguments mentioned above, the State maintains that it is entirely proper for the court to heavily consider the testimony of Murphy. Moreover, sufficient evidence has been established to hold defendant to answer for the charge of Robbery with a Deadly weapon under the multiple theories of liability as alleged in the indictment. Based on the arguments above, it is clear that Defendant was involved in the planning, execution and coverup of the robbery and felony murder. As such, the Defendant must answer for said charges and the indictment must stand.

///

1	CONCLSUION				
2	Based upon the foregoing, Defendant's Petition should be denied.				
3	DATED this <u>19th</u> day of May, 2020.				
4	Respectfully submitted,				
5	STEVEN B. WOLFSON Clark County District Attorney Nevada Bar # 001565				
6					
7 8	BY /s/ Marc DiGiacomo MARC DIGIACOMO Chief Deputy District Attorney Nevada Bar #006955				
9	Nevada Bar #006955				
10					
11					
12	CERTIFICATE OF ELECTRONIC SERVICE				
13	I hereby certify that service of the above and foregoing, was made this 19th day of May				
14	2020, by email to:				
15 16	Joshua Tomsheck, Esq. josh@hoflandlaw.com				
17					
18	BY: /s/ Stephanie Johnson				
19	BY: /s/ Stephanie Johnson Employee of the District Attorney's Office				
20					
21					
22					
23					
24					
25					
26					
27					
28	20F00659E/MD/saj/MVU				

ORIGINAL

IND 1 FILED IN OPEN COURT STEVEN B. WOLFSON STEVEN D. GRIERSON 2 Clark County District Attorney Nevada Bar #001565 **CLERK OF THE COURT** 3 MARC DIGIACOMO 0202 PK RAM Chief Deputy District Attorney 4 Nevada Bar #006955 200 Lewis Avenue Las Vegas, Nevada 89155-2212 5 KIM ESTALA, DEPUTY (702) 671-2500 6 Attorney for Plaintiff 7 DISTRICT COURT 8 CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA 9 THE STATE OF NEVADA, 10 Plaintiff. CASE NO: 11 DEPT NO: III -vs-12 JECORY ELES KEMP, aka, Jecory Kemp, #7066250 13 TYEŠHIA ĖVAN JAMES. #8351796 ARLEO EARL DAVIS, aka, SUPERSEDING 14 Arleo Earl Davis, Jr., #7054823 INDICTMENT C-20-346920-3 15 Defendant(s). SIND Superseding indictment 16 STATE OF NEVADA SS. 17 COUNTY OF CLARK 18 19

The Defendant(s) above named, JECORY ELES KEMP, aka, Jecory Kemp, TYESHIA EVAN JAMES, ARLEO EARL DAVIS, aka, Arleo Earl Davis, Jr., and/or others yet unknown and/or DAVON WILLIAM HICKMAN, aka, Davon Hickman and PRESTON ALOOKHAI HUTESON to the conspiracy accused by the Clark County Grand Jury of the crime(s) of CONSPIRACY TO COMMIT ROBBERY (Category B Felony - NRS 200.380, 199.480 - NOC 50147); MURDER WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON (Category A Felony - NRS 200.010, 200.030, 193.165 - NOC 50001); FIRST DEGREE KIDNAPPING WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON RESULTING IN SUBSTANTIAL BODILY HARM (Category A Felony - NRS 200.310, 200.320, 193.165 - NOC 50056) and ROBBERY WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON (Category B Felony - NRS 200.380, 193.165 - NOC 50138), committed at and within the County of Clark, State of Nevada, on or about the 30th day of December.

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

2019, as follows:

<u>COUNT 1</u> - CONSPIRACY TO COMMIT ROBBERY

did willfully, unlawfully, and feloniously conspire with each other and/or unknown individuals to commit a robbery, by the Defendants committing the acts as set forth in Counts 2 through 4, said acts being incorporated by this reference as though fully set forth herein.

COUNT 2 - MURDER WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON

did willfully, unlawfully, feloniously and with malice aforethought, kill MARION B. JABBAR ANDERSON, a human being, with use of a deadly weapon, to wit: a firearm, by shooting at and into the body of the said MARION B. JABBAR ANDERSON, the said killing having been 1) willful, deliberate and premeditated and/or 2) committed during the perpetration or attempted perpetration of a kidnapping and/or robbery, the Defendant(s) being criminally liable under one or more of the following principles of criminal liability, to wit: (1) by directly committing this crime; and/or (2) by aiding or abetting in the commission of this crime, with the intent that this crime be committed, by counseling, encouraging, hiring, commanding, inducing ad/or otherwise procuring the other to commit the crime; and/or (3) pursuant to a conspiracy to commit this crime, with the intent that this crime be committed, Defendants and/or others yet unknown to the conspiracy acting in concert throughout.

COUNT 3 - FIRST DEGREE KIDNAPPING WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON RESULTING IN SUBSTANTIAL BODILY HARM

did willfully, unlawfully, and feloniously, seize, confine, inveigle, entice, decoy, abduct, conceal, kidnap, or carry away MARION B. JABBAR ANDERSON, a human being, with the intent to hold or detain the said MARION B. JABBAR ANDERSON against his will, and without his consent, for the purpose of committing a robbery, with use of a deadly weapon, to wit: a firearm(s), resulting in substantial bodily harm to MARION B. JABBAR ANDERSON, the Defendant(s) being criminally liable under one or more of the following principles of criminal liability, to wit: (1) by directly committing this crime; and/or (2) by aiding or abetting in the commission of this crime, with the intent that this crime be committed, by counseling, encouraging, hiring, commanding, inducing ad/or otherwise procuring the other

to commit the crime, whereby one of their number lured and/or enticed the said victim to the crime scene under the guise of a drug deal with the intent to rob him, thereafter during the courtse of the robbery and/or attempted robbery, one of their number shot at and into the body of the said victim; and/or (3) pursuant to a conspiracy to commit this crime, with the intent that this crime be committed Defendants and/or others yet unknown to the conspiracy acting in concert throughout.

COUNT 4 - ROBBERY WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON

did willfully, unlawfully, and feloniously take personal property, to wit: Marijuana and/or US Currency and/or vehicle and/or vehicle keys, from the person of MARION B. JABBAR ANDERSON, or in his presence, without the consent and against the will of MARION B. JABBAR ANDERSON, by means of force or violence or fear of injury, immediate or future, to his person, the person of a member of his family, or of anyone in his company at the time of the robbery, defendant using force or fear to obtain or retain possession of the property, to prevent or overcome resistance to the taking of the property, and/or to facilitate escape, with use of a deadly weapon, to wit: a firearm; the Defendant(s) being criminally liable under one or more of the following principles of criminal liability, to wit: (1) by directly committing this crime; and/or (2) by aiding or abetting in the commission of this crime, with the intent that this crime be committed, by counseling, encouraging, hiring, commanding, inducing and/or otherwise procuring the other to commit the crime; and/or (3) pursuant to a conspiracy to commit this crime, with the intent that this crime be committed, Defendants and/or unknown individuals acting in concert throughout.

DATED this 19 day of March, 2020.

STEVEN B. WOLFSON Clark County District Attorney Nevada Bar #001565

BY

Chief Deputy District Attorney Nevada Bar #006955

ENDORSEMENT: A True Bill

reperson, Clark County Grand Jury

I	Names of Witnesses and testifying before the Grand Jury:		
2	ALVARADO, ART – SAN BERNARDINSO COUNTY SHERRIF		
3	DOSCH, MITCHELL – LVMPD #7907		
4	HODSON, BRECK – LVMPD #9034		
5	MURPHY, MACKESHIA – c/o CCDA, 200 Lewis Avenue, LV, NV 89101		
6			
7	Additional Witnesses known to the District Attorney at time of filing the Indictment:		
8	BOGATAY, MAUREEN – LVMPD #7782		
9	CUSTODIAN OF RECORDS - CCDC		
10	CUSTODIAN OF RECORDS - LVMPD COMMUNICATIONS		
11	CUSTODIAN OF RECORDS - LVMPD RECORDS		
12	HICKAMN, DAVON – c/o CCDA, 200 Lewis Avenue, LV, NV 89101		
13	JAMES, TYSHIA – c/o CCDA, 200 Lewis Avenue, LV, NV 89101		
14	KATOWICH, TODD – LVMPD #6360		
15	MAGNESS JR., GARY – c/o CCDA, 200 Lewis Avenue, LV, NV 89101		
16	OGAZ, ERIC – SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY SHERIFF		
17	TRAYLOR, WAYNE - c/o CCDA, 200 Lewis Avenue, LV, NV 89101		
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26	10001007 A D F/00F007 CO A D F/ 1 O I		
27	19CGJ007A,B,E/20F00659A,B,E/ed-GJ LVMPD EV# 200100003412		
28	(TK11)		

DISTRICT COURT CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

Felony/Gross Misdemeanor COURT MINUTES March 27, 2020

C-20-346920-3 State of Nevada

٧S

Arleo Davis

March 27, 2020 01:45 PM All Pending Motions

HEARD BY: Herndon, Douglas W. **COURTROOM:** RJC Lower Level Arraignment

COURT CLERK: Schlitz, Kory
RECORDER: Ray, Stacey

REPORTER:

PARTIES PRESENT:

Arleo Earl Davis Defendant

Jay Maynard Attorney for Defendant

Marc P. Di Giacomo Attorney for Plaintiff

State of Nevada Plaintiff

JOURNAL ENTRIES

SUPERSEDING INDICTMENT WARRANT RETURN... INITIAL ARRAIGNMENT: SUPERSEDING INDICTMENT...

Mr. Maynard requested the matter be continued for them to review the Indictment and to discuss if the Defendant will retain them. COURT ORDERED, arraignment CONTINUED.

CUSTODY

4/2/2020 3:30 P.M. ARRAIGNMENT CONTINUED: SUPERSEDING INDICTMENT

EXHIBIT "2"

Prepared by: Kory Schlitz

DISTRICT COURT CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

Felony/Gross Misdemeanor COURT MINUTES April 02, 2020

C-20-346920-3 State of Nevada

٧S

Arleo Davis

April 02, 2020 03:30 PM Arraignment Continued: Superseding Indictment

HEARD BY: Herndon, Douglas W. COURTROOM: RJC Lower Level Arraignment

COURT CLERK: Schlitz, Kory
RECORDER: Ray, Stacey

REPORTER:

PARTIES PRESENT:

Arleo Earl Davis Defendant

Craig A Mueller Attorney for Defendant Marc P. Di Giacomo Attorney for Plaintiff

State of Nevada Plaintiff

JOURNAL ENTRIES

Upon Court's inquiry, Mr. Mueller stated he has been in contact with the Defendant's family and can confirm as counsel of record, and requested a status check be set in a moth. COURT STATED the Co-Defendant's have been assigned to Department 17. DEFENDANT DAVIS ARRAIGNED, PLED NOT GUILTY, and INVOKED the 60-DAY RULE. COURT ORDERED, matter set for status check. Upon Court's inquiry, Mr. Di Glacomo indicated he does not know if the matter is going before the Death Review Committee. Pursuant to Administrative Order 17-05 this COURT ORDERS the case REASSIGNED to Department 17. COURT DIRECTED Mr. Mueller to reach out to the other Defense Attorney's to discuss trial dates.

CUSTODY

4/7/2020 10:15 A.M. STATUS CHECK: TRIAL SETTING (DEPT 17)

EXHIBIT "3"

Prepared by: Kory Schlitz

ELECTRONICALLY SERVED 7/30/2020 5:42 PM

Electronically Filed 07/30/2020 5:42 PM CLERK OF THE COURT

			CLERK OF THE COURT
1	ORDR STEVEN B. WOLFSON		
2	Clark County District Attorney Nevada Bar #001565		
3	MARC DIGIACOMO		
4	Chief Deputy District Attorney Nevada Bar #006955 200 Lewis Avenue		
5	Las Vegas, NV 89155-2212 (702) 671-2500		
6	Attorney for Plaintiff		
7			
8	DISTRICT COURT CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA		
9	CLARK COUL	NII, NEVADA	
10	THE STATE OF NEVADA,		
11	Plaintiff,		
12	-VS-	CASE NO:	C-20-346920-3
13	ARLEO DAVIS, aka, Arleo Earl Davis, Jr.,	DEPT NO:	XVII
14	#7054823		
15	Defendant.		
16	ORDER DENYING DEFENDANT'S PRE-TRIAL PETITION FOR WRIT OF		
17	HABEAS	S CORPUS	
18	THIS MATTER was taken under advisement before the above entitled Court on the		
19	21st day of July, 2020, the Defendant not being present, represented by JOSHUA		
20	TOMSHECK, ESQ. also not present, the	Plaintiff being re	epresented by STEVEN B.
21	WOLFSON, District Attorney, through MARC DIGIACOMO, Chief Deputy District		
22	Attorney.		
23	After reviewing all arguments and pleadings, the Court renders its decision as follows:		
24	///		
25	///		
26	///		
27	///		
28	///		

 $\verb|\CLARKCOUNTYDA.NET|| CRMCASE2 | 2020 | 117 | 86 | 202011786C-ORDR-(DAVIS, ARLEO ORD PWHC PT)-001.DOCX | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |$

The crux of Defendant's argument is that insufficient evidence was presented to the Grand Jury because the majority of the testimony presented was from an accomplice. NRS 175.292(1) provides that a conviction cannot be had based upon an accomplice testimony unless sufficient corroboration is presented. The matter before the Court is whether or not sufficient evidence was presented to establish probable cause. An Accomplice is defined in NRS 175.291 (2) as one who is liable to prosecution, for the identical offense charged against the defendant on trial. It is argued that Murphy is an accomplice for the crime charged and, therefore, her testimony standing alone was insufficient. The Court does not find as a matter of law that Murphy is an accomplice to the charges against Davis. Therefore, her testimony is considered standing alone for purposes of establishing probable cause.

Murphy testified that she was present when Davis told the co-defendants that he owed Anderson \$2000 from a prior drug transaction. Defendant discussed with Kemp and Hickman a plan to rob Anderson when he arrived at the apartment with the narcotics. When Anderson arrived Murphy left the apartment. Approximately 15 minutes after leaving the apartment, Murphy saw Hickman leave the apartment and at that time he told her that he had shot Anderson. Subsequently Murphy was asked to help clean up the apartment and blood trail outside of the apartment. Testimony was presented that based on cell tower analysis Davis's telephone was in the area of the scene of the crime. Upon Davis's arrest he told the detective that he knew Anderson, and that he had a different phone in his possession than he had at the time of the killing. Ultimately Anderson's burned body and vehicle were located in California.

To hold a defendant over to answer charges the State must present slight or marginal evidence that a crime was committed and that the defendant committed the crime. Sheriff v. Middleton, 112 Nev. 956, 961 (1996) (citing Sheriff v. Hodes, 96 Nev. 184, 186 (1980)).. Evidence was presented that Davis had a motive, planned, was present and set in motion the events that lead to Anderson's death. Anderson was led to believe by the Defendant that he was delivering the narcotics to the apartment when actually it was Defendant's intent to rob him and take the narcotics without paying for them.

///

1	Therefore, COURT ORDERED, Petition DENIED.			
2				
3	DATED this day of July, 2020.	Dated this 30th day of July, 2020		
4		Mun 1V		
5	DI	STRICT JUDGE		
6	STEVEN B. WOLFSON	C09 9C1 5B73 52DF Michael Villani		
7	Clark County District Attorney Nevada Bar #001565	District Court Judge		
8				
9	BY /s/ Marc DiGiacomo MARC DIGIACOMO			
10	Chief Deputy District Attorney Nevada Bar #006955			
11	TVO VAGA BAR 11000988			
12				
13				
14				
15				
16				
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				
26				
27				
28	20F00659E/saj/MVU			

28