1 IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA 2 VANESHIA OLIVER, 3 Electronically Filed Appellant, 4 75eb 11 2022 08:15 p.m. Elizabeth A. Brown 5 VS. Clerk of Supreme Court 6 STATE OF NEVADA 7 Respondent. 8 **APPELLANT'S APPENDIX VOLUME SIX** 9 10 MARTIN HART STEVEN WOLFSON 11 Law Offices of Martin Hart, LLC. Clark County District Attorney Nevada Bar # 5984 Nevada Bar # 1565 12 526 S. 7th St. 200 Lewis Ave. 13 Las Vegas, NV 89101 Las Vegas, NV 89155-2212 (702) 380-4278 (702) 671-2500 14 Attorney for Appellant State of Nevada 15 16 **AARON FORD** Nevada Attorney General 17 Nevada Bar# 7704 18 100 North Carson St. Carson City, NV 89701-4717 19 (775) 684-1265 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27

1	AA 1 – AA 18	Indictment
2	AA 19 – AA 36	Amended Indictment
3	AA 37 – AA 57	Superseding Indictment
4	AA 58 – AA 62	Amended Superseding Indictment
5	AA 63 – AA 78	Second Amended Superseding Indictment
6	AA 79 – AA 136	Jury Instructions
7	AA 137 – AA 143	Verdict Form
8	AA 144 – AA 151	Judgment of Conviction
9	AA 152 – AA 153	Notice of Appeal
10	AA 154 – AA 184	Minutes
11	AA 185 – AA 325	Transcript October 21, 2020
12	AA 326 – AA 331	Transcript October 22, 2020
13	AA 332 – AA 418	Transcript October 28, 2020
14	AA 419 – AA 423	Transcript October 29, 2020
15	AA 424 - AA 435	Transcript November 5, 2020
16	AA 436 – AA 445	Transcript November 25, 2020
17	AA 446 – AA 459	Transcript January 7, 2021
18	AA 460 – AA 464	Transcript February 2, 2021
19	AA 465 – AA 650	Transcript April 12, 2021
20	AA 651 – AA 857	Transcript April 13, 2021
21	AA 858 – AA 1111	Transcript April 14, 2021
22	AA 1112-AA 1293	Transcript April 15, 2021
23	AA 1294-AA 1457	Transcript April 16, 2021
24	AA 1458-AA 1469	Transcript April 19, 2021
2526	AA 1470-AA 1500	Transcript April 20, 2021
27	AA 1501-AA 1518	Transcript June 15, 2021
28	AA 1519-AA1525	Transcript June 17, 2021
۷۵ ا		

1	AA 1526-AA1534	Transcript June 24, 2021
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
1415		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

- O Or retired?
- 2 A Yes.

3

8

- Q Okay.
- 4 A Yeah, somebody else would take my place.
- Q Okay. And if you were to break your leg, somebody would follow up and cover stuff?
- 7 A Correct.
 - Q Okay. And just want to be clear, do you take your job seriously?
- 10 A Of course.
- 11 Q Do you try to put -- you were trained at the 12 academy, if it's not in a report, it didn't happen?
- 13 A Yeah, I'm sorry, say that again.
- Q One of the things you were probably trained at the academy, if it's not in a report, it didn't happen?
- A That's a saying. It's not that -- we necessarily didn't get trained that, but it's a saying.
- 18 Q How long ago did you go through the academy?
- 19 A Oh, 13 years ago.
- 20 What year?
- 21 A 2008.
- Q That was known by then. Okay, but it is a saying?
- 23 A It is a saying, yes.
- 24 MR. HART: Okay. Nothing further.
- 25 THE COURT: All right. Was there something

do have a question. I'll meet with counsel in the back.

THE COURT: Okay. Any questions by our jurors?

24

(Bench conference begins.) 1 THE COURT: All right, Judge Villani here. 2 3 from Juror -- he gave his number, 197, if anyone's interested. It's -- the question is, "Is there a specific officer charged 4 with collecting video?" Any objection, State? 5 MR. LEXIS: No, Judge. 6 7 THE COURT: Mr. Arnold? MR. HART: No objection. 8 MR. ARNOLD: No objection. 9 10 THE COURT: Mr. Hart? No objection. All right. 11 (End of bench conference.) THE COURT: Detective, we have a question from one 12 13 of our jurors. Is there a specific officer charged with 14 collecting video? 15 THE WITNESS: No, there isn't. Generally speaking, the collection of video, the way it would normally work is 16 17 when a patrol officer goes out, each one of these hotels have 18 their own security team and their own investigative team. 19 we respond, their security team responds and also generates a 20 report. Their surveillance, generally speaking, the police 21 department has no control over it. But generally speaking, 22 they will record over video -- or they will -- they will burn the video for us, and then I, as the detective, will get 23 24 assigned the case or request the video from them and then go

25

pick it up.

```
THE COURT: All right. Any follow-up by the State
 1
 2
    to that question?
 3
              MR. LEXIS:
                         No, Judge. No, Your Honor.
              THE COURT: Mr. Arnold?
 4
              MR. ARNOLD: No, Your Honor.
 5
              THE COURT: Mr. Hart?
 6
 7
                        FOLLOW-UP EXAMINATION
 8
   BY MR. HART:
 9
              Just to be clear, so sometimes you'll call out, and
         0
10
    they'll say, we already have that saved, is what you're
11
    saying?
              Yes. Generally speaking, that's -- that's how it
12
13
    works.
              MR. HART: Okay.
14
15
              THE COURT: All right. Any additional questions by
    our jurors? No additional questions. Detective, thank you
16
17
    for your testimony. You are excused.
18
              THE WITNESS:
                            Thank you, Your Honor.
              THE COURT: Next witness for the State?
19
20
              MR. LEXIS: Detective Lopez.
21
              THE MARSHAL: Watch your step. Raise your right
22
   hand. Face the Clerk. Once she swears you in, slide your
23
   chair forward to that red light and make sure you speak loud.
24
    //
25
    //
```

1	CHRISTIAN LOPEZ, STATE'S WITNESS, RESWORN		
2	THE CLERK: Thank you. Please have a seat, and		
3	state and spell your first and last name for the record.		
4	THE WITNESS: Christian Lopez. C-h-r-i-s-t-i-a-n.		
5	Lopez, L-o-p-e-z.		
6	THE COURT: Go ahead, counsel.		
7	DIRECT EXAMINATION (CONTINUED)		
8	BY MR. LEXIS:		
9	Q Detective, did you previously testify today?		
10	A Yes, I did, sir.		
11	Q Okay. Did you were telling the State that you		
12	misspoke after you left about a particular exhibit?		
13	A Yes, I did.		
14	Q And what was that?		
15	A The photograph depicting Social Security cards.		
16	Q Okay. And what did the State tell you to do?		
17	A I reviewed my I reviewed my report.		
18	Q Okay. And since you last testified, have you now		
19	double-checked the report and everything you've done?		
20	A Yes, I did.		
21	Q Okay. And did you all the pictures that were		
22	shown to you previously, did you double-check to see where		
23	those pictures came from, which particular phone?		
24	A Yes, I did, sir.		
25	O Okay Two of these two of the five phones you		

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Α

Yes, sir.

And is that the one phone you're referring to with

Q And that's just a report, though, right?

Yes, I did, sir.

24

25

Α

- A No, that -- the report that I did, the typed report --
 - Q Right.

- A -- is the report that details all the -- the information about the phone. The report that has the pictures, text messages, things like that, are generated by the Cellebrite program.
- Q Okay, I understand that. What did you review to determine that you totally messed up in your testimony previously to this jury in regards to where that picture came from?
 - A From the Cellebrite report.
- Q So, again, you still have the report -- I mean, the phones, though, right?
 - A Yes, sir, at the vault, the LVMPD vault.
 - Q And so did you double-check the phones before coming in here again and realizing where that picture came from?
- A That's not possible. The pictures of the Social Security cards were taken from the SD card. The phone is locked. I can't access any pictures on the phone. The SD card, the memory card from the --
- O Gotcha.
 - A -- black LG phone was taken out, and the information was extracted by Cellebrite. So I can't view those pictures on the cell phone itself.

- So how do you know that the SD card was related to 1 2 the black phone? 3 Because I took it out of the black phone myself. But you came in here earlier and made a mistake 4 5 thinking that that was related to the pink phone? 6 Yes, because most of the pictures that were taken --7 most of the data taken was off the phone, and that was my 8 mistake. And do you have a copy of that report? 10 I provided one to the district attorney. Are you 11 talking about the Cellebrite report? Now, that --The Cellebrite report that you got this information 12 13 from. 14 That's on a thumb drive. That's on a thumb drive 15 that I've provided to the district attorney. 16 So what did you review to -- that made you notice 0 17 that you had made a mistake when you testified? 18 The information that was generated by the Cellebrite 19 report, when they took the -- the information, the data, the pictures off of the SD card. 20
 - A I was asked to review my report.
- Q Who asked you to review your report?
- 25 A This district attorney.

testified wrongly?

21

22

23

What triggered your thought process that you had

And when did he ask you to review your report? 1 After I left here, I was -- I reviewed; I 2 3 remembered. So as you were walking out the door, he said, please 4 5 review that report? 6 I was informed that I may -- I needed a report to 7 review it because I was incorrect. 8 So he told you that you messed up even though you 0 9 didn't think you messed up when you gave the testimony, then 10 you're coming back in here now and saying that you did mess 11 up? I was incorrect when I initially stated that that 12 13 picture came off the phone. 14 But you didn't think you were incorrect until the 0 15 district attorney told you you were incorrect as you were walking through this door; is that correct? 16 17 At the time, yes. Α 18 MR. ARNOLD: No further questions. 19 THE COURT: Any questions, Mr. Hart? CROSS-EXAMINATION 20 21 BY MR. HART: 22 Just to be clear, you didn't come back here on your own volition -- on your own volition, or wasn't -- wasn't 23 24 because it popped into your mind independently? 25 Α No.

```
MR. HART: Nothing further.
 1
              THE COURT: Any redirect?
 2
 3
              MR. LEXIS: Sure. Going to introduce this --
 4
              MR. ARNOLD: The Cellebrite?
 5
              MR. LEXIS: -- as the next exhibit. This is the
    Cellebrex, the next exhibit. Can I get this marked, ma'am?
 6
 7
    What's the next exhibit?
 8
              THE CLERK: Next will be 189.
              MR. LEXIS: 189?
 9
              THE CLERK: Um-hum.
10
              MR. LEXIS: May I approach, Judge?
11
              THE COURT: Yes.
12
13
                         REDIRECT EXAMINATION
   BY MR. LEXIS:
14
15
         0
              Do you recognize this, sir?
16
         Α
              Yes.
17
              What is it?
         0
18
              It's a USB thumb drive, 64 gigabytes of memory
   provided with the -- with the data.
19
20
              Okay. Is that the data you extracted from the
21
   phones at issue?
22
         Α
              Yes.
23
              Let me know when it loads. Password is "user,"
   u-s-e-r. Did it load, sir?
24
25
         Α
              It's opening up right now.
```

```
Okay. Go ahead and load that exhibit.
 1
         Q
              MR. LEXIS: Mr. Arnold and Mr. Hart, if you would
 2
    like to see what he's pulling up, feel free.
 3
 4
              MR. HART: Thank you.
 5
              MR. LEXIS: Thank you.
   BY MR. LEXIS:
 6
 7
         0
              And, sir, if you could go to the phone ending in
 8
    3090. I know it takes some time to load that Cellebrex. Is
    that what it's doing?
10
         Α
              Yes.
11
                      (Pause in the proceedings.)
              THE WITNESS: Yeah, it's loaded for you.
12
13
              MR. LEXIS: Okay.
14
   BY MR. LEXIS:
15
         Q
              Sir, I'm showing you 139. Do you see that
16
   photograph?
17
              I do.
         Α
18
              Okay. Can you blow it up on the screen so it's just
19
    this photo?
20
         Α
              It's loaded up for you.
21
              MR. LEXIS: Can I approach, Judge?
22
              THE COURT: Yes.
23
   BY MR. LEXIS:
24
         0
              Here you go. Can you hold that up for the jury to
25
    observe?
```

1 Α I'm sorry? Just hold it up pointing toward the jury for them to 2 3 observe. 4 THE COURT: And, Detective, what is it depicting? 5 If you could explain that to us. 6 THE WITNESS: It's depicting a picture of the Social 7 Security card that --8 MR. LEXIS: You can sit down. 9 THE WITNESS: -- that was taken from the memory card from the cell phone. 10 BY MR. LEXIS: 11 And, again, the same as Exhibit 139? 12 13 Α Yes, sir. From the Cellebrex software downloaded from the 14 0 15 black phone, once again, ending in phone number 3090? 16 Α Yes. Nothing further. 17 MR. LEXIS: 18 THE COURT: Anything further, Mr. Arnold? MR. ARNOLD: No further questions, Your Honor. 19 20 THE COURT: Anything further, Mr. Hart? 21 MR. HART: No, Your Honor. 22 THE COURT: Any questions by our jurors? We do have a question. I'll meet with counsel in 23 the back. 24 25 Please hand the question to the Marshal.

```
(Bench conference begins.)
 1
 2
              THE COURT: All right.
 3
              MR. LEXIS: Judge, before you read that, can I just
 4
    ask -- say one thing on this?
 5
              THE COURT: State who you are.
              MR. LEXIS: Chad Lexis for the State. Judge, that
 6
 7
    exhibit that I brought up, the reason I didn't move to admit
 8
    it and did what I did as far as just having them show that is
   because it includes a lot of the text messages that you've
10
    already -- we already agreed to that would not come into
11
    evidence and made mentions of other acts. So I just want to
    let you know I'm not going to admit it. I went with -- just
12
13
    with him going to it and showing the jury because of that.
14
              THE COURT: Okay, thank you. This is from Juror --
15
   he used his old number, 051, 051.
16
              MR. ARNOLD: (Indiscernible).
17
              MR. HART:
                        Okay.
18
              THE COURT: So, if anyone's interested.
                                                       "Were these
19
   burner cell phones? If not, are the suspects the registered
20
    owners?"
21
              MR. ARNOLD: (Indiscernible).
22
              THE COURT: Any objection, Mr. Arnold?
              MR. ARNOLD: No objection. Mr. Arnold.
23
24
              THE COURT: Mr. Lexis?
                         No, Judge.
25
              MR. LEXIS:
```

C-20-351676-1/2 | State v. V. Oliver & D. Clark | JT - DAY 4 | 4-15-2021 THE COURT: Any objection, Mr. Hart? 1 2 MR. LEXIS: Are they burner or what -- what --3 THE COURT: Hang on, hang on, hang on. 4 MR. LEXIS: One more time, Judge. Are they --5 MR. HART: No. 6 THE COURT: Were there -- "Were these burner cell 7 phones?" 8 MR. HART: No. 9 THE COURT: "If not, are the suspects the registered 10 owners?" 11 MR. ARNOLD: He can't answer that. That's the --MR. LEXIS: Yeah, I mean, I don't -- okay. 12 13 MR. HART: He kind of knows. 14 MS. COLE: He can answer whether they're burner 15 phones. 16 MR. ARNOLD: He can answer the -- yeah, the burner 17 phone part, but --18 MS. COLE: Right. 19 MR. ARNOLD: -- not the subscriber part. THE COURT: Okay. 20 21 MR. ARNOLD: That's what he'll say. 22 MS. COLE: Right. THE COURT: Then he'll say, I don't know. 23 24 (End of bench conference.) 25 //

1	THE COURT: Sir, we have some questions from one of		
2	our jurors.		
3	THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.		
4	THE COURT: First one, were these burner cell		
5	phones?		
6	THE WITNESS: The two cell phones, the LG cell		
7	phones, I personally would not consider burner cell phones.		
8	They're they were a little on the higher end.		
9	The other phones that I wasn't able to get to, those		
10	are typically what you would someone would consider		
11	burner-type cell phones. A burner-type cell phone, a low-cost		
12	cell phone, something you can use and get rid of at a later		
13	time. There's typically no contracts or anything like that.		
14	THE COURT: If not, are the suspects the registered		
15	owners?		
16	THE WITNESS: That information I don't have. I		
17	don't have any information to figure out who the registered		
18	owners of those cell phones are.		
19	THE COURT: Any follow-up by the State?		
20	FOLLOW-UP EXAMINATION		
21	BY MR. LEXIS:		
22	Q You mentioned burner phone. Just since that was a		
23	question, can you just educate the jury on what is a burner		
24	phone?		
25	A Burner phones are typically more affordable phones.		

- You can typically buy them without a contract. Typically, they don't require a commitment, as far as I know, long-term contracts or anything like that. In my experience as a police officer, typically used for criminal activity, things like that, or just having another cell phone for whatever purposes they need them for.
 - Q Harder to track, harder to get information out of?
- A Yes.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

- Q Okay. And you stated, a couple of these, you were unable to get much information out of?
- 11 A Correct.
- Q Okay. And one of them, you even stated earlier, probably wiped?
 - A Yes. The iPhone, in my opinion, looked to be wiped.
- Q Okay, explain that.
 - A When I got -- we were able to get into that phone through one of our other unlocking tools, and there was no data on there, no personal data. It was a iPhone -- an older -- an older iPhone; I believe maybe an iPhone 7. If you've had an iPhone for that long, just logic would say that you would have more personal information, maybe contact information, photos, things like that. None of that
- Q Is it easy to do that?

information was on there.

25 A Yes.

- Q Okay. Could you do it quick?

 A Relatively quick, yes.

 MR. LEXIS: Nothing further.
 - THE COURT: Any follow-up, Mr. Arnold?
- 5 MR. ARNOLD: No, Your Honor.
- 6 THE COURT: Follow-up, Mr. Hart?
- 7 FOLLOW-UP EXAMINATION

BY MR. HART:

4

8

9

10

- Q Just to be clear, if you get a phone number, you can send out administrative warrants to the carriers about the numbers, correct?
- 12 A I'm sorry, sir?
- Q You can send out warrants, administrative warrants to the different carriers to determine who owns a phone or a number, correct?
- 16 A Yes. Typically, we -- my section doesn't do that,
 17 but yes, you can.
- Q Okay. And one of the features on iPhones and other phones is sometimes people will set them up so if somebody tries to enter the wrong password, you know, a number of times, it cleans the information so that people can't have stuff taken, correct?
- A That is an available feature. How it works on each individual phone, I'm not too familiar with.
- 25 Q Okay. And did you have the password for the iPhone?

No, I did not. 1 Α 2 Do you need a password to get in an iPhone quite 3 often? Sometimes. This iPhone was unlocked by one of our 4 5 unlocking tools. 6 MR. HART: Okay. Nothing further. 7 THE COURT: All right. Any further questions by our 8 jurors? No further questions. All right. Thank you, sir, 9 for your testimony. 10 THE WITNESS: Thank you. 11 THE COURT: You are excused. Do you have another witness for this afternoon? 12 13 MR. LEXIS: Yes, Judge. 14 MS. COLE: Your Honor, at this time, the State calls 15 Officer Montalbano. 16 THE MARSHAL: Watch your step. Raise your right 17 hand. Face the Clerk. Once she swears you in, slide your 18 chair forward to that red light right there and make sure you 19 speak loud. 20 THE WITNESS: Yes, sir. 21 ANTONIO MONTALBANO, STATE'S WITNESS, SWORN 22 THE CLERK: Thank you. Please have a seat, and state and spell your first and last name for the record. 23 24 THE WITNESS: First name is Antonio, A-n-t-o-n-i-o.

Last name is going to be Montalbano. It's going to be

Α

Yes, ma'am.

- Q How did you discover that Letgo account?
- A For the Letgo account, we were told by detectives through a briefing before shift that we had two names, which was going to be the Darrell Clark and Veneshia Oliver.
- Q Okay, and I'm going to stop you right there. Do you see those two individuals in court today?
 - A May I stand up, ma'am?
 - Q Yes.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

- A Yes, ma'am. I see Mr. Clark right there, second from the left. I --
- 11 Q You can step off the stand, sir.
- 12 A I see Ms. Oliver on the right.
- 13 Q Okay.
- MS. COLE: Your Honor, may the record reflect
- 15 identification of the defendants?
- 16 THE COURT: Yes, it will.
- 17 BY MS. COLE:
- Q Okay, sir, and I guess before we get into the Letgo,
 was there a specific Facebook you were aware of?
- 20 A Yes, ma'am.
- Q Okay, and what was the username on that Facebook?
- 22 A Same as one of the defendants, Darrell Clark
- Q Okay. And on that specific Facebook, were there essentially postings?
- 25 A Yes, ma'am. There was shared links to Letgo.

Q Okay. What exactly is Letgo?

- A Letgo is basically a application similar to Craigslist or OfferUp, where a person can sell individual belongings on there, creating postings, and then setting prices and everything.
- Q Okay. And on this specific Facebook, there was essentially a Letgo link?
- A Yes. It shows a link to an item in which -- that the person is selling.
- Q Okay. And was it associated with the Facebook account that it was located on?
- A Yes. So for Darrell Clark, there was a link to

 Letgo. When you open that up, that has another account to

 Letgo, which also said Darrell Clark with a -- with a picture.
- Q Okay. And why did this specific account stand out to you?
- A At that time, when we had the name, we already had a picture for the male. We were able to say that this is more than likely going to be him because the picture resembled the male that was -- or we are looking for.
- Q Okay. And what about the specific items that were being posted? Was there anything significant about those?
- A Yes. We had a spree of burglaries which were happening on the Strip under multiple event numbers, and there was multiple items on that particular Letgo which coexisted

- and co-aligned to those burglaries.
- Q And, sir, I'm showing you what's been marked State's

 121 through 132 with the exception of 130, which I cannot

 locate at this time. Can you take a look at those photos and

 let me know when you're done?
 - A I finished viewing them, ma'am.
- 7 Q I'm sorry?

6

8

15

- A I finished viewing them.
- 9 Q Okay, thank you. Thank you, sir. Do you recognize 10 those photos?
- 11 A Yes, ma'am.
- 12 Q How do you recognize those?
- A Those are pictures that were on the Letgo app under that account name.
 - Q Okay, I found Exhibit No. 130. Okay, and let me just show you this as well. Do you recognize that?
- 17 A Yes, ma'am.
- 18 Q Okay, thank you.
- 19 MS. COLE: And, Your Honor, permission to publish?
- THE COURT: Have these already been admitted in the
- 21 evidence?
- MS. COLE: Yes, Your Honor.
- THE COURT: Okay. Yes, go ahead and publish.
- 24 BY MS. COLE:
- 25 Q State's 121. What are we looking at here?

C-20-351676-1/2 | State v. V. Oliver & D. Clark | JT - DAY 4 | 4-15-2021

- A For this item, it appears to be a handbag in which
 -- that was a picture of on the app.
- Q Okay. And you identified these photos that I showed you, these exhibits, as being consistent with the photos on the app that you saw or on the Letgo page that you saw?
- A Yes, ma'am.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

- Q Showing you State's 130. Same with that one?
- A Yes, ma'am.
 - Q Showing you State's 122. Same as that one?
- 10 A Yes, ma'am.
- 11 0 State's 123?
- 12 A Yes, ma'am.
- 13 Q State's 125?
- 14 A Yes, ma'am.
- 15 Q State's 126?
- 16 A Yes, ma'am.
- 17 Q 127?
- 18 A Yes, ma'am.
- 19 O State's 132?
- 20 A Yes, ma'am.
- 21 Q State's 128?
- 22 A Yes, ma'am.
- Q Sir, on Letgo, is there an application wherein you can chat with a user?
- 25 A Yes, there is a -- basically, a messenger app.

- Q A messaging app?
- A Yes.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

22

23

- Q And is that essentially how you would contact the seller?
- A Yes.
- Q Okay. And showing you what's been marked as State's 177, and I know this is very tiny, so let me approach you with it first so you can take a look at it.
- MS. COLE: Your Honor, may I approach?
- 10 THE COURT: Yes.
- 11 BY MS. COLE:
- Q Can you go ahead and look at that and let me know when you're done? And, sir, do you recognize these messages?
- 14 A Yes, ma'am.
- 15 Q And what are these messages?
- 16 A Those messages are between myself and Darrell Clark
 17 on the messaging app for Letgo.
- Q Okay. And, sir, I'm just going to zoom in because this is very small font, and I'm just going to start in the left-hand corner. Can you indicate what is the username and email address that you are using?
 - A For myself, we used a fictitious name. So Jason would be me, and then the email address BigMoneyMusic23@Gmail was going to be the one that we used.
- Q Okay, so that's you?

C-20-351676-1/2 | State v. V. Oliver & D. Clark | JT - DAY 4 | 4-15-2021

A Yes.

1

9

- Q And your name's not Jason, correct?
- A No, ma'am.
- Q Okay, and you're not purporting to be a police officer?
- A No, ma'am.
- Q You're essentially doing an undercover investigation?
 - A Yes, ma'am.
- Q Okay. And you're purporting yourself to be Jason, looking to buy some products; is that correct?
- 12 A Yes, ma'am.
- Q Okay. And looking at some of these messages, these are, in fact, the messages between you and the user, Darrell
- 15 | Clark?

21

- 16 A Yes, ma'am.
- Q Okay. And what -- can you let us -- can you read
 the email that is associated with the user Darrell Clark?
- 19 A Yes. It says D-c-m-y-g-r-e-a-t at Gmail, so 20 Dcmygreat@Gmail.com.
 - Q Okay. And this is who you were communicating with about potentially buying some items?
- 23 A Yes, ma'am.
- Q Okay. And do you recall what specific items you were attempting to buy?

Α Yes, ma'am. 1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

17

- And what were those? 0
- Α Two Apple Watches.
 - Two Apple Watches. Did you essentially talk about meeting in person?
 - Yes, ma'am. We negotiated on price and then spoke about where to meet up in person.
 - Q Okay. And just for -- just for the record, we're looking at some dates and some timestamps. Are you aware of what time these records are depicted in?
- 11 Yes. It appears that it's going to be a slight 12 shift in time, so it's about seven hours off for --
- 13 Q Okay.
- 14 -- whatever recordkeeping that they had. Α
- 15 Okay, and are you referring to UTC time?
- 16 Α Yes, ma'am.
- So for UTC time to be converted into Pacific 0 Okay. 18 Standard Time, which is essentially the time in Las Vegas, what sort of math do we have to do?
- 20 It should be a minus of seven hours.
- 21 Q Okay. So, in looking at this record, will you just 22 look at number one and tell us what time would that be Pacific Standard Time? 23
- From that time, it should be around ten o'clock, 24 Α 25 10:20.

- Q Okay, on what day?
 - A It should be on the 26th.
- Q Okay. So, in looking at these records, although they depict the 27th, that's because it's indicated in UTC time?
 - A Yes, ma'am.

2

6

7

8

- Q Okay. Do you recall what time you started communicating with Mr. Clark?
 - A Yes, at approximately 10:20, ma'am.
- 10 Q Okay. And, sir, where did you decide to meet?
- 11 A We decided to meet at the Casino Royale on the Las 12 Vegas Boulevard.
- Q Okay. And did you talk about an approximate time?
- 14 A We did discuss a time on there.
- Q Okay. And did you, in fact, go to the Casino Royale
 Hotel?
- 17 A Yes, ma'am.
- Q Okay. And were there other officers that were involved in this investigation as well?
- 20 A Yes, ma'am.
- Q Was there a specific task force, in fact, assigned to be on the premise for this operation?
- A You could say, yes, ma'am. It was the FLEX squad that I was on at the time.
- Q Okay, so you weren't the only officer. There was

- multiple other offers that were set up -- multiple other officers that were set up, waiting at the Casino Royale?

 A Yes, ma'am.
 - Q Okay. And did the defendant arrive?
- 5 A Yes, ma'am.

2

3

4

6

7

8

16

- Q Okay. And where did you meet him?
- A We met him over by the Buffalo slot machine, ma'am.
 - Q Okay. And what happened when you approached him?
- 9 A We came -- we came up to Clark. We were in uniform
 10 at that time. We grabbed -- we detained him at that time,
 11 and --
- Q Okay, and I'm going to stop you right there. You're saying "we." Who are you referring to?
- 14 A It's going to be myself and Officer Perez, and then 15 the other officers approached after.
 - Q Okay. And when you approached him, did he say anything to you?
- 18 A Yes.
- 19 Q What did he say?
- 20 A He said he has a .40.
- 21 Q And what did you understand that to mean?
- A Meaning that he had a firearm that was a .40 caliber.
- Q Okay. And when you were looking at him, when you were approaching him, walking to him, did you ever see a

firearm?

1

2

3

5

- A No, ma'am.
- Q Where exactly was the -- was the firearm positioned?
- 4 A The firearm was going to be in his front waistband.
 - He had loose-fit clothing that was covering over it.
 - Q Okay, so how did you see the firearm?
- 7 A I could not see the firearm until we did a feel, 8 when we did the pat-down, ma'am.
- 9 Q Okay. And then, at that point, you still couldn't 10 see it, correct?
- A No, ma'am.
- 12 Q Okay. When could you finally see the firearm?
- 13 A I had to lift up his shirt physically, altering his 14 clothing.
- Okay. And where was the firearm?
- 16 A It was going to be in his front waistband.
- Q Okay. And his shirt was completely covering that
- 18 | firearm?
- 19 A Yes, ma'am.
- Q It was not readily discernible as a firearm when you saw him or approached him?
- A No, ma'am.
- 23 Q Would you categorize it as concealed?
- 24 A Yes, ma'am.
- 25 Q Sir, I'm showing you State's 97. Was this, in fact,

- the firearm that you saw on Clark's person and the firearm that was impounded under this specific event number of 200800114539?
- 4 A Yes, ma'am.

6

7

8

9

- Q And this fairly and accurately depicts the firearm that you saw on that day at that time?
 - A Yes, ma'am.
- Q And, again, this is the firearm that you're describing as being not readily discernible?
- 10 A Yes, ma'am.
- 11 Q Now, sir, did you ultimately conduct a search on the 12 defendant?
- 13 A Yes, ma'am.
 - Q Okay, and what did you locate?
- 15 A The two Apple Watches in which we agreed upon.
- Q Okay. Was there a specific Apple Watch that was of important evidentiary value?
- 18 A Yes, ma'am.
- 19 Q Is this that watch?
- 20 A Yes, ma'am.
- Q And for the record, I'm showing what's marked as 22 State's 99. Why was this significant?
- A That one was tied to another case that -- which was part of our investigation.
- 25 Q And, sir, showing you State's 104, is this what the

- defendant was wearing when you saw him at the Casino Royale on that date and time?
- A Yes, ma'am.

2

3

4

5

6

7

- Q And for the record, can you just describe the clothing?
 - A He's wearing jean pants with a loose Tupac orange t-shirt. He also had a black face mask on. The shirt has a good amount of ruffles and wrinkles in it, showing how loose it is on him.
- Q Okay. And, sir, showing you State's 103, is that the female that you saw on that day?
- 12 A Yes, ma'am.
- Q Okay. And you didn't actually apprehend this person?
- 15 A No, additional --
- 16 0 That was other officers?
- 17 A Yes, other officers on the squad.
- Q Okay, but you saw this individual, and who do you know that to be?
- 20 A Veneshia Oliver.
- 21 THE COURT: Counsel, I believe you may have 22 referenced Exhibit 177. I don't know that that's been 23 admitted yet. Are you offering that into evidence?
- MS. COLE: Your Honor, I believe all these exhibits that I have referenced have been stipulated to.

C-20-351676-1/2 | State v. V. Oliver & D. Clark | JT - DAY 4 | 4-15-2021 1 THE COURT: Is that correct, Mr. Arnold? 177? 2 MS. COLE: That's my understanding, Your Honor. MR. ARNOLD: Yes. 3 THE COURT: Mr. Hart? 4 MR. HART: Yes, Your Honor. 5 6 THE COURT: All right, thank you. 7 (State's Exhibit 177 is admitted.) 8 (State's Exhibits 184-189 stipulated admitted.) 9 BY MS. COLE: 10 Q And, sir, you also impounded some property from this 11 event? 12 Α Yes, ma'am. Okay. You were what we call the impounding officer? 13 Q 14 Yes, ma'am. Α 15 So it was -- you were tasked with taking all of the 16 items, documenting them, and creating a report? 17 Α Yes, ma'am. Okay. Was there items of evidentiary value 18 19 regarding any cell phones that you, in fact, impounded? 20 Yes, ma'am. Α 21 Q Okay. Was there a cell phone that was impounded 22 from Ms. Oliver's person? 23 Α Yes. 24 Q Okay. And what -- do you recall what cell phone 25 that was?

- Α There was two phones that were -- in particular. 1 2 There was one that was an LG phone, and there was one that was 3 a Motorola phone. There was one -- I'm sorry, can you repeat that? 4 There was an LG phone and a Motorola phone, ma'am. 5 Α 6 Q Okay. And those were both on Ms. Oliver's person? 7 Α They were in her bag, yes. 8 Q Okay. 9 MS. COLE: And for the record, Your Honor, can I 10 approach with the property report? 11 THE COURT: Yes. 12 MS. COLE: I just want to confirm that we're talking 13 about the same one. THE WITNESS: 14 Yeah. BY MS. COLE: 15 16 Q Can you take a look at that? 17 Α Yes, ma'am. 18 And specifically to the LG phone, that had a pink 19 case, correct? 20 Α Yes, ma'am. 21 Q Okay. And you also said there was another phone --22 Α Yes. 23 0 -- on Ms. Oliver? And can you say what that is one
 - A It was a black Motorola phone.

24

25

more time?

- 1 Q Thank you, sir. What about on Mr. Clark? 2 Α Mr. Clark had a iPhone and a similar LG phone with a 3 black case. Okay, so he also had two different phones? 4 5 Yes, ma'am. Α 6 0 Okay, and you indicated this in your property 7 report? 8 Yes, ma'am. The other one should be on the second Α 9 page, ma'am. And, sir, was there any other property that you 10 Q 11 found on Defendant Clark regarding any Apple products? 12 Yes, the two Apple Watches. 13 Okay. And for the record, one of those watches was 14 what we've been looking at and referring to as State's 99; is 15 that accurate? 16 Yes, ma'am. 17 Okay. And where were the Apple Watches recovered? 0 18 Α They were located in his right pocket. 19 Okay, in Mr. Clark's right pocket? Q 20 Α Yes. 21 MS. COLE: Your Honor, I'll pass the witness. 22 THE COURT: Any cross-examination, Mr. Arnold?
 - CROSS-EXAMINATION

MR. ARNOLD: Yes.

25 BY MR. ARNOLD:

23

- Q Sir, you said you recovered two iPhone watches from 2 Mr. Clark?
 - A Yes. Those are going to be Apple Watches, sir, yes.
- Q Apples Watches, I'm sorry. And one of them was stolen, right?
 - A Yes, sir.

3

6

- Q And the other one wasn't stolen, right?
- 8 A Not to our knowledge.
- 9 Q On that Letgo account, I believe it was your
 10 testimony you can go on there and purchase items, too; is that
 11 correct?
- 12 A Yes, sir.
- Q So you can offer them up for sale, but there's also communication where you can purchase it from whoever's offering it up?
- 16 A Yes, sir.
- 17 Q Okay. And you said that you also went on Mr.
- 18 Clark's Facebook, and you saw the Letgo account on there and 19 the Letgo link?
- 20 A Yes, sir.
- Q And then, also, there were other items on his Facebook account that were up for sale; isn't that correct?
- 23 A Yes, sir.
- MR. ARNOLD: I have no further questions.
- THE COURT: Any questions, Mr. Hart?

MR. HART: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Any redirect by the State?

MS. COLE: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Any questions by our jurors? No questions. Thank you, sir, for your testimony. You are excused. About five minutes before 5:00. We're going to -- thank you, Officer.

THE WITNESS: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, hopefully, it will run smooth tomorrow, we won't have any technical issues. So we'll come back at 9:00 A.M. tomorrow morning.

So during this evening recess, it is your duty not to discuss or communicate with anyone, including fellow jurors, in any way regarding the case or its merits either by voice, phone, email, text, internet, or other means of communication or social media. You're not to read, watch, or listen to any news, or media accounts, or commentary about the case. You're not to do any research such as consulting dictionaries, using the internet, or using reference materials. You're not to make any investigation, test a theory of the case, recreate any aspect of the case, or in any other way investigate or learn about the case on your own. You're not to form or express any opinions regarding this case until this matter is submitted to you.

Have a safe drive home. We'll see you tomorrow at

9:00. 1 2 THE MARSHAL: All rise for the exit of the jury. (Outside the presence of the jury.) 3 THE COURT: Okay. All right, we're outside the 4 presence of the jury panel. I had previously given counsel a 5 6 copy of the proposed jury instructions. We had noticed that 7 the numbering line for the instruction number was missing on 8 some pages, and other pages, it was at the bottom of the page. 9 So what you've just been handed is a corrected set of the jury 10 instructions. I don't know if the parties are ready to go 11 over those. Mr. Arnold, have you had an opportunity to review 12 those instructions? 13 MR. ARNOLD: Yes, I have, Your Honor. 14 15 THE COURT: All right. And Mr. Hart, have you had 16 an opportunity to review those? MR. HART: As long as they're not different than 17 18 what we had earlier other than formatting questions. 19 THE COURT: Only formatting. So, State, are you 20 familiar with Instructions 1 through 41? 21 MR. LEXIS: State has no objection, Judge. 22 THE COURT: Okay. Are you requesting any additional instructions? 23 24 MR. LEXIS: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And you're familiar with the Verdict

C-20-351676-1/2 | State v. V. Oliver & D. Clark | JT - DAY 4 | 4-15-2021

	C-20-351676-1/2 State v. V. Oliver & D. Clark JT - DAY 4 4-15-2021
1	Form?
2	MR. LEXIS: Yes, Judge.
3	THE COURT: Any objection to the Verdict Form?
4	MR. LEXIS: No, Your Honor.
5	THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Arnold, are you familiar with
6	Instructions 1 through 41?
7	MR. ARNOLD: Yes, Your Honor.
8	THE COURT: Any objection?
9	MR. ARNOLD: No, Your Honor.
10	THE COURT: Any requests for additional?
11	MR. ARNOLD: No, Your Honor.
12	THE COURT: And any objection to the Verdict Form?
13	MR. ARNOLD: No, Your Honor.
14	THE COURT: All right. Mr. Hart, familiar with 1
15	through 41?
16	MR. HART: Yes, Your Honor.
17	THE COURT: Any objection?
18	MR. HART: No, Your Honor.
19	THE COURT: Requests for additional?
20	MR. HART: No, Your Honor.
21	THE COURT: And any objection to the Verdict Form?
22	MR. HART: None that will be sustained, so, no, Your
23	Honor.
24	THE COURT: I'll hear any objection you want.
25	MR. HART: I always like to put not guilty ahead of

```
1
    the guilty's.
 2
              THE COURT: Actually, State, that's my policy if
 3
    it's requested by defense counsel. If you can just change it,
   not guilty first, because there is a presumption of innocence.
 4
 5
              MR. HART: Oh, wow.
                                   Thank you, Your Honor.
 6
              THE COURT: I know some -- there's just a couple
 7
    judges that do that, but if it's requested, I -- if you can
 8
    just change it around to not guilty first.
 9
              MR. LEXIS: Oh, you want the State to change it?
              THE COURT:
10
                         Yes.
11
              MR. LEXIS:
                         Okay.
12
              THE COURT: All right. Anything else, Mr. Lexis,
13
   before we leave for today?
14
              MR. LEXIS: No, other than I -- we plan on getting
15
    done tomorrow and being -- and closing tomorrow.
16
              THE COURT: Okay, we'll see how fast it goes.
    Anything, Mr. Arnold, before I leave?
17
18
              MR. ARNOLD: No, Your Honor.
19
              THE COURT: Mr. Hart?
20
              MR. HART: No, Your Honor.
21
              THE COURT: So how many witnesses do you expect to
22
   have, State, in the morning?
23
              MR. LEXIS: We expect to have four lined up, ready
24
    to go.
25
              THE COURT: As you know, the Indictment is quite
```

```
1
    lengthy, and it took my Clerk about 30 minutes, 35 minutes to
 2
    read all of it, so that might be a factor. I mean, I'll read
    it, but we'll see if we have the time, all right?
 3
                          Oh, for what, Judge?
              MR. LEXIS:
 4
              THE COURT:
                          No, to --
 5
 6
              MR. ARNOLD: Instructions.
 7
              THE COURT: To have closing tomorrow.
 8
              MR. LEXIS:
                          Oh, yeah, we'll be closing.
 9
              THE COURT:
                          Okay. All right, and in the morning,
    I'll give both defendants the Carter instruction as far as
10
11
    testifying.
12
              MR. LEXIS:
                          Thank you.
13
              THE COURT: Counsel, if you have time, if you
14
   haven't already done so, Mr. Arnold and Mr. Hart, if you would
15
    speak with your clients either now or in the morning about
16
    their rights to testify, but obviously, I will advise them on
17
    the record, but --
18
              MR. ARNOLD: Yes, Your Honor, already have.
19
              THE COURT:
                          Thank you.
20
              (Court recessed at 4:58 p.m., until Friday,
21
                     April 16, 2021, at 9:01 a.m.)
22
23
24
25
```

INDEX

STATE'S WITNESSES:	
	PAGE
DETECTIVE CHRISTIAN LOPEZ Direct Examination by Mr. Lexis	. 15
REBECCA FINGER Direct Examination by Ms. Cole	
DETECTIVE DAVID MANN Direct Examination by Ms. Cole	. 77 104 119 128 131 138 140 141 142
DETECTIVE CHRISTIAN LOPEZ (Witness recalled) Direct Examination by Mr. Lexis	146 149 150 155 155
OFFICER ANTONIO MONTALBANO Direct Examination by Ms. Cole	
EXHIBITS STATE'S EXHIBITS:	
Exhibit 177	. 6

* * * * *

ATTEST: I hereby certify that I have truly and correctly transcribed the audio/visual proceedings in the above-entitled case.

Julie Hord

VERBATIM DIGITAL REPORTING, LLC

Electronically Filed 9/14/2021 2:58 PM Steven D. Grierson CLERK OF THE COURT

TRAN

DISTRICT COURT
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA
* * * * *

THE STATE OF NEVADA,

Plaintiff,

vs.

DEPT. NO. XVII

VENESHIA LANETTE OLIVER, and DARRELL CLARK,

Defendants.

Defendants.

BEFORE THE HONORABLE MICHAEL P. VILLANI, DISTRICT COURT JUDGE

FRIDAY, APRIL 16, 2021

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS: JURY TRIAL - DAY 5

APPEARANCES:

FOR THE STATE: CHAD N. LEXIS, ESQ.

Chief Deputy District Attorney

MADILYN M. COLE, ESQ.
Deputy District Attorney

FOR DEFENDANT OLIVER: MARTIN W. HART, ESQ.

FOR DEFENDANT CLARK: CARL E. ARNOLD, ESQ.

RECORDED BY: CYNTHIA GEORGILAS, COURT RECORDER TRANSCRIBED BY: VERBATIM DIGITAL REPORTING, LLC

Page 1

LAS VEGAS, CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA, FRIDAY, APRIL 16, 2021

2 (Case called at 9:01 a.m.)

(Outside the presence of the jury.)

THE COURT: All right. Counsel, we're on the record. I understand that the State may be resting soon. I want to advise both Ms. Oliver and Mr. Clark on their rights to testify. So Ms. Oliver and Mr. Clark, please listen carefully. I'm going to ask you a series of questions.

I must advise you that you have the right under the Constitution of the United States of America and under the Constitution of the State of Nevada not to be compelled to testify in this case.

Do you understand that, Ms. Oliver?

DEFENDANT OLIVER: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: Do you understand that, Mr. Clark?

DEFENDANT CLARK: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: You may, if you wish, give up this right and take the witness stand and testify. If you do, you will be subject to cross-examination by one of the Deputy District Attorneys. Anything that you may say, be it on direct or cross-examination, would be the -- would be the subject of fair comment when the District Attorneys speak to the jury in their closing argument.

Do you understand that, Ms. Oliver?

DEFENDANT OLIVER: Yes, I do.

1 THE COURT: Do you understand that, Mr. Clark? DEFENDANT CLARK: Yes, I do. 2 3 THE COURT: If you choose not to testify, the Court 4 will not permit the District Attorneys to make any comments to the jury concerning the fact that you have not testified. 5 Do you understand that, Ms. Oliver? 6 7 DEFENDANT OLIVER: Yes, I do. 8 THE COURT: Do you understand that, Mr. Clark? 9 DEFENDANT CLARK: Yes, I do. 10 THE COURT: If you elect not to testify, I will 11 instruct the jury, but only if your attorney specifically requests, the following, and I will give the following 12 instruction if requested. And here is the instruction. 13 14 It is a Constitutional right of a Defendant in a 15 criminal trial that he may -- he or she may not be compelled to testify. Thus, the decision as to whether he or she could 16 testify is left to the defendant on the advice and counsel of 17 18 their attorneys. You must not draw any inference of guilt 19 from the fact that he or she does not testify, nor should this 20 fact be discussed by you, or enter into your deliberations in 21 any way. 22 Ms. Oliver, do you understand I will give that 23 instruction if requested by your attorney? 24 DEFENDANT OLIVER: Yes.

THE COURT: Mr. Clark, do you understand, I will

give that instruction if requested by your attorney?

DEFENDANT OLIVER: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Do you -- Ms. Oliver, do you have any questions regarding these rights?

DEFENDANT OLIVER: No, I do not.

THE COURT: Did you have an opportunity to speak to your attorney regarding your decision to testify in this case?

I'm not asking for --

DEFENDANT OLIVER: Yes.

THE COURT: -- decision right now.

DEFENDANT OLIVER: Yeah.

THE COURT: I'm just saying did you have an opportunity to speak with Mr. Hart regarding you taking the witness stand in this case?

DEFENDANT OLIVER: Yes.

THE COURT: Mr. Clark, did you have an opportunity to discuss with your attorney you testifying in this case?

DEFENDANT CLARK: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Okay. If either defendant has a felony conviction within the last ten years, and the defense has not sought to preclude that from coming in before the jury, I must advise both of you, that if you do take the stand and testify the District Attorney in the presence of the jury will be permitted to ask you if you have ever been convicted of a felony, what was the felony, when did it occur, however, they

1 DEFENDANT CLARK: No, sir. THE COURT: All right. Thank you. 2 3 Anything else before we start, counsel? 4 MR. HART: No, Your Honor. MR. LEXIS: Yes, Judge. Madilyn brought down the --5 the new jury instructions pertaining to those two burglaries. 6 7 I would just ask that maybe you could have your law clerk put on your recommendations on there, on the -- the burg and home 8 invasion that at the top, that this just applies to Esther 9 Chae's events, or however you want to do it. And then on the 10 11 other one, put on there that this is the law that pertains to all the other burgs and this is the law that pertains to all 12 of the home invasions? 13 14 MR. HART: Or just put on it the date for event for 15 July [inaudible]. 16 THE COURT: Just tell me if someone can -- because it's two separate instructions; okay? 17 18 MR. LEXIS: There's two burgs now --19 THE COURT: Okay. 20 -- and two home invasions. MR. LEXIS: 21 THE COURT: I don't know. My law clerk is doing --22 but he is with Judge Barker who's handling my homicide 23 calendar. He'll probably be done maybe 10:00 or 10:15 or so. 24 MR. LEXIS: Well, Judge, we're going to have plenty 25 of time today, I believe, to -- if you give us some time

THE COURT: All right. If you can do that while

specify which charges they belong to.

24

C-20-351676-1/2 | State v. V. Oliver and D. Clark | JT - DAY 5 | 4-16-2021 1 we're examining some of the witnesses, I'd appreciate it. 2 then hand them to my law clerk. 3 All right. Let's get the jury in, 4 THE MARSHAL: All right. All rise for the entry of the jury. 5 6 (Inside the presence of the jury.) THE COURT: All right. Everyone have a seat. Thank 7 8 And welcome back, ladies and gentlemen. you. 9 State, who is your next witness? MS. COLE: And, Your Honor, the State calls Officer 10 Ellis. 11 OFFICER PRESTON ELLIS, STATE'S WITNESS, SWORN 12 13 THE CLERK: And state and spell your first and last 14 name for the record. 15 THE WITNESS: Preston Ellis, P-r-e-s-t-o-n, 16 E-1-1-i-s. THE COURT: Go ahead, counsel. 17 18 DIRECT EXAMINATION 19 BY MS. COLE: 20 Good morning, Officer. Where do you work? 21 Α I work for Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department. 22 And how long have you worked there? 0 23 Just a little over four years. Α 24 Q Did you become involved in a burglary investigation 25 on August 26th, 2020, through August 27th, 2020?

C-20-351676-1/2 | State v. V. Oliver and D. Clark | JT - DAY 5 | 4-16-2021 1 Α Yes. 2 Okay. And were you working in your capacity as a Q Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department officer at the Casino 3 4 Royale? 5 Yes. Α Were you staged there with other officers? 6 Q 7 Α Yes. 8 Was it your knowledge that this was essentially an Q 9 undercover operation? 10 Α Yes. 11 And where were you particularly staged? 12 I was staged near the back door to Casino Royale, 13 leading out to the parking lot. 14 Okay. And who were you with? 15 I was with the -- our Sergeant, Officer -- or 16 Sergeant (indiscernible), and then one other officer, but I do 17 not remember exactly who it was. 18 Q Okay. And were there two suspects that you were 19 looking for? 20 Α Yes. 21 Were they males, females? Q Okay. 22 One was a male, and the other was a female. Α 23 Okay. And did they arrive at the Casino Royale? Q 24 Α Yes, they did. What happened when they arrived? 25 Q

- A They arrived on the casino floor. And --
- Q Were they together at first?
 - A I do not know.
- Q Okay.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

- A And they arrived on the casino floor. Our officers noticed them and went over and talked to at least the gentleman. And then from there, once we detained the gentleman, one of the other officers kind of looked up, noticed that the female was over by the -- walking towards the machine. She looked at him, and then she tried to scurry out
- 12 MR. HART: Objection, hearsay.

of the casino in a hurry.

- 13 THE COURT: Is this something you personally
- 14 observed, sir, or did someone tell you?
- THE WITNESS: I saw it, sir.
- 16 THE COURT: Okay. I'm going to overrule the
- 17 objection.
- 18 BY MS COLE:
- Q Okay. And sir, do you see that female here in court today?
- You can step off the witness stand, sir. And you can come down and take a look if you need to.
- 23 A Yes, I do.
- Q Okay. And can you please point to and describe her?
- 25 A She's sitting over there in the back corner.

C-20-351676-1/2 | State v. V. Oliver and D. Clark | JT - DAY 5 | 4-16-2021 1 Q Okay. And did you subsequently come into contact 2 with her? Yes, I did. 3 Α 4 Q And did you complete a search? 5 Yes, I did. Α And was that a consensual search? 6 Q 7 Α Yes, it was. 8 Okay. And what did you recover? Q 9 Inside, I found a couple screwdrivers, a window Α punch, and a Victoria's Secret credit card. 10 11 Sir, showing you what's been marked as State's 98. Q 12 THE COURT RECORDER: One second. Okay. BY MS COLE: 13 14 Q Is this, in fact, the screwdrivers that you located? 15 Α Yes, it is. 16 Okay. And what are we looking at right there? Q 17 It's a window punch with a seatbelt cutter. Α Okay. And where were these items located? 18 Q 19 Α Inside the purse. 20 And that was of the female suspect? Q 21 Α Yes, ma'am. 22 Q Who you've identified as Ms. Oliver? 23 Correct. Α 24 Q Okay. Sir, showing you State's 100. What are we 25 looking at here?

C-20-351676-1/2 | State v. V. Oliver and D. Clark | JT - DAY 5 | 4-16-2021 1 Α I do believe so, sir. MR. HART: Nothing further. 2 3 THE COURT: Any redirect by the State? 4 MR. LEXIS: Nothing further. MS. COLE: No, Your Honor. 5 THE COURT: Any questions by our jurors? 6 7 No -- no questions? 8 Thank you, officer. You are excused. Thank you. 9 THE WITNESS: Thank you, Your Honor. THE COURT: Who is our next witness this morning? 10 MS. COLE: Your Honor, the State calls Detective 11 12 James Downing. DETECTIVE JAMES DOWNING, STATE'S WITNESS, SWORN 13 14 THE CLERK: Thank you. Please have a seat. 15 And state and spell your first and last name for the 16 record. 17 THE WITNESS: It's James Downing, J-a-m-e-s, 18 D-o-w-n-i-n-g. 19 THE COURT: Go ahead, counsel. 20 MS. COLE: Thank you, Your Honor. 21 (Pause in the proceedings - Ms. Cole/Clerk confer.) 22 DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. COLE: 23 24 Q Good morning, Detective. Where do you work? 25 I work with the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police

Department.

1

2

3

4

5

8

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

- Q And how long have you worked there?
- A I've worked there going on 12-and-a-half years.
- Q And what is your current position right now with Metro?
- 6 A I'm a Detective in the Technical and Surveillance 7 Section.
 - Q Okay. The Technical and Surveillance Section?
- 9 A Yes.
- 10 Q Does that have an acronym?
- 11 A Yeah. We refer to it as TASS, T-A-S-S.
- 12 Q So what exactly does TASS do?
 - A We are essentially the electronic surveillance unit for the Department, which means that we -- we maintain and deploy all covert over cameras, covert listening devices, GPS trackers, as well as phone -- any kind of phone surveillance, whether it's Title 3 wire taps or pen registers.
 - Q Okay. So, Detective, are you responsible for knowing the United States Code and statutory regulations regarding electronic surveillance?
- 21 A Yes.
 - Q Okay. And you also have to be fairly proficient in interpreting IP addresses, dealing with other networking issues, and just generally with phones and computers?
- 25 A Yes. We're like -- we break ourselves into

specialties and I specialize in phone surveillance, so pen registers and wiretap.

- Q Okay, Detective, and from an investigation standpoint, you're essentially receiving these records after they've been subpoenaed or after a search warrant has been given by a different Detective?
 - A Yes.

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

- Q Okay. So when you got these specific records, that are pertinent to today's testimony, you did not actually serve the search warrant and get the records back?
- 11 A In this case, no.
 - Q Okay. And in this specific case that brings you into court today, you received specifically records regarding two numbers. Is that fair to say?
 - A Yes.
 - Q And do you recall the approximate time period for these two numbers?
- A We were researching August 20th, 2020, through I believe it was August 28th, 2020.
- Q Okay. And do you recall if the actual search warrant range was wider?
 - A It was broader, yes.
- 23 Q Okay. Was it June 14th, 2020 through August 28, 24 2020?
- 25 A That sounds correct, yes.

- Q Okay. And when you received these records, were they in various formats, including Excel?
 - A Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

19

20

21

- Q Okay. And when you see -- when you received these records did you also receive the sworn affidavit from the Custodian of Records from T-Mobile that accompanies these records?
 - A I did.
 - Q Okay. And what does that certificate mean?
- A It's -- it's from a representative from the company saying it's their records that they keep in the normal course of business, that they certify they're true and correct, and they're duplicates of their original records.
- Q Okay. And in most records that you receive, do you receive that certificate of authenticity?
- 16 A Yes.
 - Q Okay. And you received that in this case?
- 18 A I did.
 - Q Okay. And you also have access to subscriber information and activation date regarding the two phone numbers?
- 22 A Yes.
- Q Okay. And do you recall what date both of these phone numbers were activated?
 - A They were both activated for these phone records was

C-20-351676-1/2 | State v. V. Oliver and D. Clark | JT - DAY 5 | 4-16-2021 1 Α It is Darrell Clark. Okay. And the address? 2 3 Α It is 455 East Twain Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada 4 89169. 5 Okay. And I believe you testified to the activation Q date, that's also reflected in the statement? 6 7 Α Yes. 8 And there was also another phone number that Q Okay. 9 you were dealing with, and again, pulling up the record that's 10 entitled Sub and Docs on phone number ending in 5174. 11 And can you tell us the subscriber name related to this specific number? 12 13 Darrell Clark, as well. 14 Q Okay. And what is this specific phone number? That's for 702-559-5174. 15 Α 16 Okay. Okay. And Detective, did you learn that Q these two specific numbers were associated with two different 17 18 people? 19 Α Yes, I did. 20 And you conducted some mapping? 0 21 Α Yes. 22 And did you learn that the number ending in 0 5174 was associated with Veneshia Oliver? 23 I did. Yes. 24 Α Okay. And the phone number ending in 3090 is 25 Q

A Yeah. So this is a record that keeps track of all the -- the data sessions that are -- all the activity -- the data activity on a particular phone. And in this case, for T-Mobile they log the -- the cell site that the phone accesses when it accesses that Internet session, or data session. And it provides the IP address that's assigned to the device at the time by the carrier.

- Q Okay. Detective, can you describe what a data session is?
- A So anytime you're using your device on -- on the cellular network, it -- it logs -- it -- the data session is the -- the log of the activity and it reaches out to the Internet through the cellular network.
- Q Okay. So this specific Excel spreadsheet, we're not dealing with calls, incoming and outgoing calls, or text messages. This is specifically data?
 - A Specifically, data, yes.

- Q Okay. And then if you could just kind of explain these columns and the significance of them, specifically when we're seeing this address over here.
- A Yep. So starting in the left, I mean, the IP address is -- that's assigned to the phone for a particular amount of time. You get into identifiers of the phone.

 That's your MSI -- ISD and the IMEI and the Mz (phonetic) is referring to the SIM card. The start date and end time is the

time of that data session.

Then you get into the -- the actual cell site information that's being logged by T-Mobile. That's your node and cell sector ID that's numbers that are assigned to towers by the carrier. And that goes into the LTEID (phonetic), the cell ID and the LAC.

What's nice about T-Mobile is they actually provide you the address of the cell site, aside from the number they assign to it internally. So that's where all those addresses are. That's the address of the cell site.

- Q Okay, Detective. So this column that has addresses, this is essentially the address of a specific cell tower or cell site?
- A Yes.
 - Q Okay. And what -- what is a cell tower?
- A So a cell tower or we call them more likely now cell sites. Traditionally, they were on towers. Now, they're -- they can be on buildings, and light poles, on billboards. But it's the traditionally three sided cell -- cell tower that you guys see all around town. And it's -- it contains multiple antennas that provide service in the cell network for mobile devices.
- Q Okay. And then specifically in regard to this record, was there another individual associated with it before August 20th?

A Yes, there was.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

- Q Okay. And so the records that you looked at in this case, obviously, I've had it at the top to show the columns.

 But none of these records are actually the correct date span of records that you reviewed and mapped?
 - A Correct. Not until -- not until August 20th.
 - Q Okay. So we'd have to --
 - A Anything before that.
 - Q -- scroll down quite a bit.
- 10 A Yes. Yes.
 - Q Okay. Okay. And I'm going to pull up what is labeled as CDR mediations. And again, I'm still on phone number -- phone number ending in 3090.
 - Okay. And Detective, can you explain these records and what we're looking at here?
 - A Sure. If you want to scroll all the way to the left. These records always start scrolled to the right for some reason.
 - Q The computer's thinking. Hang on. Okay.
 - A Okay. So these are -- they're T-Mobile call detail records. The easy way -- easiest way to think of these is it would be similar to your phone bill. It keeps track of your incoming, outgoing calls, and text messages, at what time, for how long, what numbers called you.
- 25 But in this case, they -- they have added

information that we get through the search warrant that provides us, again, the tower that was accessed at the time of the call being received or -- or made.

Q Okay. And so Detective, this is essentially, if you call somebody or send a text, it's going to hit or be placed on a specific cell site?

A Correct. And then T-Mobile will also, as far as text messages, do not provide us locations historically on -- on the CDRs. So you're only seeing locations as far as incoming and outgoing calls. And the call needs to be received by the handset. So if the call is not answered, we're not going to get locations on that either.

Q Okay. And then just scrolling more to the right, is this information that's related to the specific cell site?

A Yeah. So like the data session, they give us the number that's assigned to the tower by the carrier, but also they break it down into GPS coordinates of the cell site as well as the actual physical locations, address of the cell site.

- Q Okay. So for example, in Las Vegas, where there's high density population, a lot of people in a small amount of space, is there a lot of cell towers?
 - A Yes. There's lots of cell towers.
- Q Okay. And is your phone normally going to connect with a cell tower that you're closest to?

A Most likely, yes, the one it's closest to. The exceptions that rule would be environmental factors that may get in the way of seeing the one that is closest to you, your device may get better service from a tower that's further away, or that it sees better.

But most of the time, due to the high density of -of cell sites in Las Vegas, you're going to connect to the one
closest to you, yeah.

- Q Okay. And now, Detective, I also want to draw your attention. So we are looking at Excel. This is an Excel document?
- A Yes.

- Q Okay. And again, these records at the top are not starting at August 20th, so I'll scroll down a little bit.

 But essentially, what I'm going to point out is these numbers all the way to the left. What's significant about these, I guess you could call them line item numbers?
- A In an Excel -- and in these records, it just identifies each individual piece of activity in the CDR record.
- Q And there's those same specific line items in the data sessions that we just looked at as well?
 - A Yes, there is.
- Q Okay. Detective, when you take these records and do what we call mapping, is there a certain program you use to do

that?

A Yeah. We use an Internet based software called ZETX (phonetic) to map our records. We've used it for several years now, I think -- believe going on four to five years.

We picked this software, in particular, because of their research and the way that they portray the cell sites in their approximate coverage area. But also, that when we ingest the records to them, they do not change them in any way when they're depicted on the map, except to convert time zones for us, because a lot of these records are provided in different time zones. That reduces the error when they're being mapped and looked at. But they don't change anything. And everything is depicted based on the line item that's listed in the Excel format of the records.

- Q Okay. So Detective, just to make sure I'm understanding, when you get these records, what is depicted in the line items there is essentially the data that you're dealing with, you're not manipulating anything?
 - A No. Not at all.
- Q The numbers are going to line up precisely to what the numbers are in this specific Excel document?
 - A Yes.
- Q Okay. And you said the only thing that changes is the time conversion?
 - A That's right. And even though they're converting

- it, they tell us what it was provided in originally, and that they converted it. And that's based on what we tell it, to which time zone to convert it to.
- Q Okay. So, Detective, let's -- you did, in fact, do some mapping in this case?
 - A Yes. I did.
- Q And it was with these specific records that we have been discussing; is that correct?
 - A Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

- Q Okay. And with ZETX, the program that you've been referring to, is it associated with Google Earth?
- A It's associated with Google Earth in the fact that it -- it overlays its mapping on top of Google Earth, because that program is known for its extreme accuracy and -- and updating and making it much more advantageous to look at a real world satellite shot with these records.
- Q Okay. And Detective, showing you what's been marked, and this exhibit, for the record, is four pages, showing you what's been marked as State's 180, page 1.
- 20 MS. COLE: Can we switch over?
- THE COURT RECORDER: Oh, yes.
- MS. COLE: Yeah. We're going to be using the projector for a bit.
- 24 BY MS. COLE:
 - Q Okay. Okay, Detective. So can you tell us what is

stated in the top left-hand corner?

- A August 21st, 2020, from 07:00 hours to 07:30, and that's local time.
- Q Okay. And now this is kind of -- we've got some weird shapes and weird colors going on.
 - A Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q Can you describe the significance of what we're seeing on here?
- A Sure. So we'll start with the shapes. The -- the pin drop in the middle of the shape is the location of your cell site that's being referred to in the records.
 - Q Okay. And I'm just going to --
- 13 A And where it's mapped.
- 14 Q I'm going to point right there. Is that the pin?
- 15 A Correct.
 - Q Okay. And it's -- it's kind of hard to see, because the outlining color is kind of the same color as the pin.
 - A Right. And the reason for that being when we mapped the records we -- especially when we're doing multiple different phone numbers, we assign them different colors, so that when they're mapped we can see them being mapped, if they're different, or the same, as other records.
 - But the pin -- the pins will -- will change depending on which records we're looking at here. But the numbers that are around that pin drop refers to some of the

records that are being mapped there in the line items that we were speaking about earlier in this -- in the records.

- Q Okay. So, Detective, like if I'm looking at Number 705, is that essentially corresponding with this line 705?
 - A Yes.

- Q Okay. And this line 705, is directly referenced in what?
- A That would be in the -- in the data records of one of the phone numbers.
- Q Okay. And that's the -- that's the numbers all the way on the left hand side?
 - A Yes.
 - Q Okay. So did you have a different color for each phone number that you mapped?
 - A Correct. So 3090 is actually mapped in blue, 5174 is mapped in red. However, when you map these -- these together in ZETX and they map them out on Google Earth, all the colors will be layered on top of each other. So when you start to get devices that are utilizing similar or the same cell sites during the same timeframe you're going to get layered colors which may be -- that are going to be different than the colors you assign.
 - So in this case, with red and blue, we're going to see some purples or darker reds, or darker, you know, darker blues or -- in that effect, because of the layering of the

cell carriers, to use a sector type antenna because that's really the most cost effective way traditionally to do it.

But so to get -- try not to get too deep into radiofrequency theory and propagation of sector antennas, that is the depiction of a horizontal lane of a sector antenna. So that is what's used to depict the possible coverage area of that same type of antenna on a cell site.

- Q Okay. So if I'm understanding you correctly, when I'm looking at this specific tower, what's being represented in this dark shaded color is the coverage area of that specific tower.
 - A Of that type of antenna that's on the tower, yes.
- 13 Q Okay.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

15

16

17

18

21

22

23

24

- 14 A Of that sector of the tower.
 - Q And Detective, can you point -- and you can actually circle on that screen that you have in front of you, where is the Paris Hotel Casino?
 - A The Paris Hotel is right here.
- Q Okay. And is part of the Paris Hotel even covered under the kind of purple blob that we see?
 - A Yes. It's -- it's under the -- like the far east side of that hotel casino would still be under the approximately coverage area of that sector.
 - Q Okay. And it looks like we have two different towers depicted here.

A Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

- Q Okay. And is it fair to say that both of these towers service the area of the Paris Hotel?
 - A Yes.
 - Q Okay. So essentially, what does that mean?
- A You're going to have to --
 - Q If -- if it's servicing that area --
- A Correct.
 - Q -- is that meaning that if you're calling or texting that your phone is going to hit off that cell tower?
- 11 A Yes. If you're using your phone for a data session 12 to receive or make texts or calls, if you're in the area of 13 the -- those cell sites, then it will be utilizing those to 14 make -- to make your calls.
- Q Okay. Moving on to State's page 2 of 180, are we looking at a map of just one number or two numbers?
- 17 A If you'd be able to scoot it up for me, I will.
- 18 Q Oh, I'm sorry.
- 19 A That -- that's going to be of two -- two different 20 numbers.
- Q Okay. Two different numbers. And can you tell us, 22 I believe this is -- can you read that date and time?
- 23 A Yeah. It's August 21st, 2020, from 07:45 hours to 08:30 hours.
- 25 Q Okay. And can you again indicate on the screen

where the Paris Hotel and Casino is?

- A So the Paris is going to be kind of in this area, okay, it's --
- Q Okay. And again, we're looking at kind of a reddish -- not bright, bright red, but kind of a mixed reddish color?
- A Yes. So I -- I think the -- the projector is having a hard time with the colors exactly, but it is a darker red. And the reason it's favoring the red in -- in the mapping is because there's more activity on the red mapped phone as opposed to the blue mapped phone.
- Q Okay. And when you -- when you're referring to activity, are you talking about these numbers, we have more numbers here than we do here?
- A Correct.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

23

24

- Q So target 5174 had four lines of -- of data sessions being mapped here as opposed to the one line data session being mapped on the other -- on the blue color, on line 3090.
- Q Okay. And so that's why we see that it's a little bit more read?
- 20 A Yes.
 - Q Even though there is some blue in there?
- 22 A Yeah.
 - Q Okay. And showing you page 3 of State's 180. Can you tell us what date and time we're looking at right here?
 - A It's August 21st, 2020, from 09:00 to 09:30 hours.

- Q Okay. And can you indicated on the map where are Target and Walgreens?
- A Target and Walgreens are over here. It's not really lining up with my finger, but off to the east.
- Q Okay. And it's fair to say that this specific tower that's being depicted services this entire area?
- A So there they -- the cell companies have -- have powered the different sectors that hear differently for reasons that they determine, probably environmental and some of the density. So but it's depicting two of the sectors of that -- of the three in that -- on that cell site there.
 - Q Okay. And again, this we're seeing a red color?
- 13 A Yes.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

17

18

19

21

22

- Q Okay. And that's representative of the number ending in 5174?
- 16 A Yes.
 - Q Okay. And this is the area that's being depicted of where that tower services, essentially?
 - A Right. The approximate coverage area that --
- 20 Q The approximate coverage area.
 - Okay. And then looking at this blue circle area, this is depicting phone -- the phone tower that 3090 is hitting during this time period?
- 24 A Correct.
- O Okay. And what address is this?

- A That's 455 East Twain Avenue.
- Q Okay. Showing you page 4.
- Okay. What date and time are we looking at right

4 here?

1

2

5

6

7

8

9

10

- A August 21st, 2020, from 09:30 to 10:00 hours.
- Q Okay. And again, we're seeing two kind of different colors. So starting with this, again, can you indicate some of the landmarks like Target, Walgreens?
- A So Target is still in this area here and the Walgreens.
- 0 Okay. And this timeframe is 30 minutes?
- 12 A Yes.
- Q Okay. And then looking at this, why is this one red and this one is more purple?
- A Because solely, target 5174 is using the cell site down by Target and Walgreens, whereas both of the targets are utilizing the cell site later on that's servicing the -- the 455 Twain address.
- Q Okay. So this cell site is being used earlier, and this cell site is being used later.
 - A Correct. By both -- by both of us.
- Q Okay. Showing you what's been marked as State's 181. And for the record, this exhibit is 4 pages.
- MR. HART: (Inaudible).
- 25 MS. COLE: Oh. Can we [inaudible] going to work?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Α

separate maps?

Correct.

Okay. And that's why you chose to represent them on

A Yes.

Q And again, through this entire time period, is this the only cell tower that's being hit?

A There's multiple cell sites within there, but due to the density of the strip, there's many cell towers very close together and it's not uncommon for cell sites to actually be in casinos to increase connectivity for people. So it's not the only one there, but it's the only in a very small area there.

Q Okay. And Detective, that reminds me, we see a lot of line items on here. And there's only a few depicted up on here. Why is that? How come not every line item is depicted up here?

A So again, that's -- that goes into trying to declutter the mapping that you're seeing. That shows some. If we were in the actual program, I could click on each individual cell site and it would expand out on all the line items where you could click on them individually.

But in an effort for the -- to declutter and make the map more readable, the program automatically reduces what's actually shown on the map.

Q Okay. So for example, if you were actually running ZETX right now with your computer, you could click on those specific line items?

A Yes.

- And they would essentially pop up?
- Α Yes.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- But because we don't have very good Internet, we're 0 -- we're doing this on paper?
- So Google Earth runs -- I mean, it's all Internet based and with a poor Internet service it's -- it's impossible to use.
- Okay. And then, Detective, briefly --Q MR. HART: Your Honor, could we approach very quickly?
- 11 THE COURT: All right.
- (Bench Conference re: scheduling not recorded.) 12
- THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, we're just going 14 to take a ten minute break at this time.

During this recess, you are not to discuss or communicate with anyone, including your fellow jurors, in any way regarding the case or its merits, either by voice, phone, e-mail, text, Internet, or other means of communication or social media. You're not to read, watch, or listen to any news or media accounts or commentary about the case. You're not to do any research such as consulting dictionaries, using the Internet or using reference materials. You're not to make any investigation, test the theory of the case, recreate any aspect of the case, or any other way to investigate or learn about the case on your own. And you're not to form or express

C-20-351676-1/2 | State v. V. Oliver and D. Clark | JT - DAY 5 | 4-16-2021 1 (Court recessed at 10:00 a.m., until 10:15 a.m.) THE MARSHAL: All rise for the entry of the jury. 2 (Inside the presence of the jury.) 3 4 THE COURT: All right. Welcome back, everyone. Detective, do you understand you're still under 5 oath? 6 7 I do, yes. THE WITNESS: THE COURT: All right. Go ahead, counsel. 8 9 MS. COLE: Thank you, Your Honor. And for the record, I'm pulling out State's 181 10 11 again. Court's brief indulgence. 12 BY MS. COLE: Okay. And for the record, I'm showing, again, 13 what's been marked as State's 181. 14 15 MR. HART: Can we have a page number? MS. COLE: Yes. This is the -- the first page of 16 State's 181. 17 BY MS. COLE: 18 19 Now, Detective, you indicated that essentially some 20 of these numbers are going to be down here, some are not going 21 to be down here. But specifically, in relation to 536, is 22 this indicated below? 23 Line 536 would be indicated below, yes. Α 24 Okay. And again, we're talking about line 536. 25 That's specifically corresponding with the call detail records

C-20-351676-1/2 | State v. V. Oliver and D. Clark | JT - DAY 5 | 4-16-2021 1 mapped? 2 Α Yes. Okay. And if you could tell us, what does the red 3 Q 4 represent? 5 The red represents target 5174. Α Okay. And what about the blue? 6 0 7 Blue is target 3090. Α 8 Okay. And then showing you page 2 of 176, what is Q 9 the time range for this particular map? 10 Α This is August 27th, 2020, from 01:47 a.m. to 02:30 11 a.m. 12 And what's being mapped here? Is this just Okay. 13 one number? 14 This is target 3090. 15 Q Okay. And showing you page 3 of State's 176. That 16 is the same time period of 1:47 and 2:30 a.m.? 17 Yes. Α 18 Q Okay. And what is being mapped here? 19 Α And that's target 5174 20 Okay. And again, I know you didn't do these on the 21 same -- because there's -- there's too much data. 22 Α Yeah. These -- they are so similar that again, they 23 -- they cover each other and make it difficult to see. 24 Q Okay. So, again, I'm going to just try to put them 25 side by side so we can see.

A Yes.

1

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

Q Okay. And again, I'm publishing State's 175, specifically, the call detail records from the target phone number ending in 3090.

Is this line 536?

- A Yes.
- Q Okay. What does this information tell us on this 8 line?
 - A That's telling us the time that the call was -- was incoming. You have to keep in mind that these records were provided in UTC time which is similar to -- it's the same as Greenwich Mean Time, so it's seven hours ahead of our local time here.
- Q Okay. So with the conversion, would you be able to tell us what time that would be in pacific standard time?
- 16 A Yes. So that's -- it would be the 23rd, at 21:37:57.
- 18 Q Okay.
- 19 A So 9:37, 9:38'ish, approximately, p.m.
- Q Okay. So this would be -- this call would take place on August 23rd, 2020, at 9:37?
- 22 A Yes.
- 23 Q P.M.?
- 24 A Yes.
- 25 Q Okay. And what is the number that is calling the

of the three types of technologies that are on that cell site

that service that. It's very common for the cell sites out here to -- to have different technologies meaning a data technology, a voice technology, and in this case, an older technology which is 3G. So we actually have a 4G LTE data service, a 4G LTE voice services, and a 3G service on this same cell site for the same carrier.

- Q Okay. And that's --
- A So that's what's being depicted here is the coverage of all three of those technologies on that cell site.
- Q Okay. And again, we're talking about that would service 455 East Twain?
 - A Yes.

- Q Okay. And Detective, when you looked at those records dated from August 20th to August 28th, what did you notice about the relationship between the amount of activity with these numbers and the specific tower or towers, cell sites, plural?
- A Yeah. It's the same cell site, just different technologies on the same cell site. But I noticed that a majority, so over 50 percent of the activity on each device was utilizing a sector off this cell site and one of the many sectors off the cell site.
- Q Okay. And is that -- does that usually tend to correspond to where someone spends a lot of time?
 - A Yes. We usually correspond, you know, a -- wherever

- the largest amount is spent is the person's residence or where they -- where they spend a majority of their time.
- Q Okay. So the area where you spend a majority of time would look similar to this?
 - A Yes.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

- Q Okay. And then Detective, going back briefly.
- Okay. Showing you what's been marked State's Exhibit 180, page 4. Again, can you tell us the date and timestamp in the top left hand corner?
- 10 A August 21st, 2020, from 9:30 a.m. to 10:00 a.m.
- Q Okay. And drawing your attention, particularly to line item 176, if we can see that here, right there.
- Does that correspond to one of the line items below?
- 14 A Yes, it does.
- 15 Q Okay. And what does that indicate?
- A That was an outgoing voice call to 702-283-4833, at 9:54 a.m.
- Q Okay. And Detective, were you able to access who that phone number was associated with?
- A In a way, yes. We -- our ZETX program has a search function that utilizes open source, so information readily available --
- MR. HART: Your Honor, I'm going to object as to foundation on this.
- THE COURT: I'm sorry? I'm sorry, I couldn't hear.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

It's depicting an outgoing voice call from target 5174, to a 702-283-4833, starting at 09:54, 21 seconds.

Okay. And again, looking at this shaded area, this is another diagram that's not blue or red, and why is that?

Α The layering effect of the mapping of -- of both of the target numbers. So the blue and the red mixing off the

C-20-351676-1/2 | State v. V. Oliver and D. Clark | JT - DAY 5 | 4-16-2021 1 same cell site. 2 Okay. And again, this is depicting this specific 3 time frame? 4 Α Yes. 5 MS. COLE: All right. Court's brief indulgence. I'll pass the witness, Your Honor. 6 7 THE COURT: Any cross-examination, Mr. Arnold? 8 MR. ARNOLD: No questions for this witness, Your 9 Honor. THE COURT: All right. Thank you. 10 11 Any cross-examination, Mr. Hart? 12 MR. HART: Yes. 13 You can just -- if you want to leave the exhibits up there, I'll -- I may or may not use them (inaudible). 14 15 CROSS-EXAMINATION 16 BY MR. HART: 17 Detective, let's just give a quick tutorial to Q everybody. 18 19 Α Sure. 20 You talked about sectors --0 21 Α Yeah. 22 -- on a cell tower. What do you mean? 0 Uh --23 Α Well, here, let me -- I can lead. I'm allowed to. 24 Q 25 Α Okay.

- A That's -- that's depending on how it's tuned by the phone carrier. And that's done by many factors. And mostly environmental and density factors.
 - Q So a cell tower could reach ten miles?
- 5 A Yes.

2

3

4

6

8

- O Or further --
- 7 A Yes.
 - Q -- in certain cases? And you were asked if you ordered the records in this case; correct?
- 10 A Correct.
- 11 Q And you were asked by her, when you said, you didn't do it in this case, somebody else did; correct?
- 13 A Yes.
- Q But you can order records from the phone companies and the cell towers themselves; correct?
- 16 A Through a search warrant, yes.
- Q Okay. What is a -- if I'm using the wrong term -- do you guys ever do cell tower dumps?
- 19 A Yes.
- Q For a specific tower to find out what numbers are using that tower?
- 22 A Yes.
- Q Okay. Is that usually to find out who's in the area, like if you have a series of crimes you can do a dump for this day and a dump for this day --

C-20-351676-1/2 | State v. V. Oliver and D. Clark | JT - DAY 5 | 4-16-2021 1 Α Yes. 2 -- and a dump for this day --Q 3 Α Yeah. 4 Q -- and see if you get the same phone numbers popping 5 up? 6 Α Yes. 7 Okay. Do you know if that was done in this case? Q 8 I -- I'm not aware. Α 9 Okay. But that is one technique to find out, hey, Q we've got a bunch of overlapping people; correct? 10 11 Α Yes. 12 Okay. And you said you're using ZETX? 13 Α Yes. 14 Q How do you spell that? 15 Α It's Z-E-T-X. 16 Okay. And that is a software owned by an outside Q company, not Metro; correct? 17 18 Α Correct. 19 Q So you don't maintain it? 20 Α No. 21 And it uses algorithms as well. Do you -- how does Q 22 it work, to the best of your knowledge? 23 To the best of my knowledge, they take cell phone Α 24 lists that are made available by each carrier, cell site lists 25 of the location of all their cell sites, and direction of the

- sectors. And they maintain a database of those and then compare the records that we provide for each case to those records and create a mapping file.
- Q Okay. And you get the information back. Do you individually then verify based on the CDRs and other data you get?
- 7 A Yes. I do.
 - Q Okay.

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

17

18

19

20

21

- A Not every call, but I -- I spot check to make sure that they are lining up.
- 11 Q Spot. Okay.
- 12 A Correct.
- 13 Q You don't do every one?
- 14 A No.
- 15 Q You rely on the software to do it?
- 16 A Yes.
 - Q Now, you said that whether or not a particular tower picks up anything or is used, depends on a number -- well, what factors does it depend on?
 - A Proximity, a line of sites sometimes, but mostly environmental factors, if you have buildings or trees or things in the way, it might favor a cell site over another.
- Q What about the amount of traffic load?
- 24 A Yes.
- Q Okay. So if you're in a dense area, say the game

1 just comes out.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

13

14

15

16

17

19

20

21

22

23

24

- A Yeah.
- Q From a -- the Golden Knights.
- A Okay.
 - Q One where you're allowed to have people in the building. Let's clarify. It might go to -- you might be using a tower quite a ways away; correct?
 - A It depends. If it's able to see the signal, it's possible. But it's also a possibility it would just deny your service all together.
- Q Okay. So you could try to find a tower that works, or you could be (inaudible) too many people on the line?
 - A If -- if the device can see a tower, then it'll -- would try and place the call or receive a call through it. It would use it.
 - Q Okay. And when you are looking at data information on these, it could be apps you have running in the background?
- 18 A Yes.
 - Q So if somebody has their location on their phone, you're there; correct? I mean, it's going to be --
 - A If -- if it's anything that's going to be reaching out through the Internet, through the cell service, then yes.
 - Q And as far as location data, if you download the phone itself, it's usually a lot more precise; correct?
 - A Yes. If they have that service turned on in the

C-20-351676-1/2 | State v. V. Oliver and D. Clark | JT - DAY 5 | 4-16-2021 1 sites? 2 Α Yes. MS. COLE: No further questions, Your Honor. 3 4 THE COURT: Any -- any questions, Mr. Arnold? 5 MR. ARNOLD: No, Your Honor. THE COURT: Any questions, Mr. Hart? 6 7 MR. HART: No, Your Honor. 8 THE COURT: Any questions by our jurors? 9 No questions. 10 Sir, thank you for your testimony. THE WITNESS: Thank you, Your Honor. 11 THE COURT: You are excused. 12 13 Next witness for the State? 14 MR. LEXIS: Judge, can we approach? 15 THE COURT: Yes. 16 (Bench conference re: scheduling - not recorded.) 17 THE COURT: All right. State, will you be calling any other witnesses today? 18 19 MR. LEXIS: The State rests, Judge. 20 THE COURT: The State rests. 21 All right. Thank you. 22 Mr. Hart, will you be calling any witnesses on behalf of your client? 23 24 MR. HART: No, Your Honor. 25 THE COURT: Mr. Arnold, will you be calling any

witnesses on behalf of your client?

MR. ARNOLD: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right.

All right. Ladies and gentlemen, the evidentiary portion of this trial has been concluded. We are going to, as we had mentioned before, at the end of the trial, I will read to you the laws that apply to this particular case. And thereafter, you will hear closing argument by the parties, and then after that, you will commence your deliberation.

We're still putting together all the jury instructions, and I want to give the attorneys an opportunity to get their notes together for their closing arguments.

So we're going to take an early lunch. So if we can just come back -- so take your lunch break now, and we'll come back at noon for the jury instructions and closing argument, and then deliberation; okay?

So, ladies and gentlemen, during this lunch recess, you must not discuss or communicate with anyone, including your fellow jurors, in any way regarding the case or its merits, either by voice, phone, e-mail, text, Internet, or other means of communication or social media. You're not to read, watch, or listen to any news or media accounts or commentary about the case. You're not to do any research such as consulting dictionaries, using the Internet or using reference materials. You're not to make any investigation,

test the theory of the case, recreate any aspect of the case, or any other way to investigate or learn about the case on your own. You're not to form or express an opinion regarding the case until it's submitted to you.

We'll see you back at noon for closing argument.

THE MARSHAL: All rise for the exit of the jury.

(Outside the presence of the jury.)

THE COURT: All right. Counsel, I think Mr. Lexis and -- is going to up and work with the law clerk to finalize the jury instructions. So if we can just come back like five minutes before noon, just to put the final, you know, stack together and have those put on the record that there's no objections or request for additional instructions, and then we'll start at noon.

MR. ARNOLD: All right. Thank you, Your Honor.

MS. COLE: And, Your Honor?

THE COURT: Yes?

MS. COLE: If we could just make a brief record that at this time, the State is striking Exhibit 119. And can we just confirm for the record that all of our exhibits have bee admitted into evidence?

THE COURT: First off, Mr. Arnold, any objection to the Court striking Exhibit 119?

MR. ARNOLD: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Hart, any objection to the Court --

C-20-351676-1/2 | State v. V. Oliver and D. Clark | JT - DAY 5 | 4-16-2021 1 MR. HART: No, Your Honor. 2 THE COURT: -- striking 119? 3 Okay. So when we come back, I'll advise the jurors 4 that that exhibit has been withdrawn. 5 MS. COLE: Yes. And that wasn't published or shown to them. 6 7 THE COURT: All right. 8 THE CLERK: And everything else has been admitted, 9 so. 10 MS. COLE: Okay. What is our last number? 11 THE CLERK: 188. MS. COLE: Perfect. 12 13 THE COURT: All right. I'll see everybody five, ten 14 minutes before noon. 15 Have a good lunch. 16 (Court recessed at 10:52 a.m., until 12:06 p.m.) (Outside the presence of the jury.) 17 THE COURT: Okay. We've added a couple new 18 19 instructions, so now we have 1 through 43 jury instructions. 20 Mr. Lexis, do you have any objection to 1 through 21 43? 22 No, Your Honor. MR. LEXIS: 23 THE COURT: Do you request any additional? 24 MR. LEXIS: No, Your Honor. 25 Mr. Arnold, are you familiar with 1 THE COURT:

1 through 43? 2 MR. ARNOLD: Yes, Your Honor. 3 THE COURT: Do you request any additional? 4 MR. ARNOLD: No, Your Honor. THE COURT: Any objection? 5 6 MR. ARNOLD: None, Your Honor. 7 THE COURT: Mr. Hart, are you familiar with 1 8 through 43? 9 MR. HART: Yes, Your Honor. THE COURT: Any objection? 10 MR. HART: No, Your Honor. 11 12 THE COURT: Do you request any additional? 13 MR. HART: No, Your Honor. 14 THE COURT: And any objection, Mr. Hart, to the 15 verdict forms, one for Oliver, and one for Clark? 16 MR. HART: As long as they're what we discussed. When your law clerk gave us a copy a minute ago, the verdict 17 18 forms were not there. I'm sure they're fine. You said they 19 were good, the first (inaudible). THE COURT: Any objection to the verdict forms, Mr. 20 21 Arnold? 22 MR. ARNOLD: No, Your Honor. 23 THE COURT: And the State has an objection putting 24 not guilty first, but overruled, okay? 25 MR. LEXIS: Hey, Judge, could -- if we could get one

C-20-351676-1/2 | State v. V. Oliver and D. Clark | JT - DAY 5 | 4-16-2021 1 more copy from Adam. He gave -- I have a copy, but --THE COURT: Sure. They're -- he's copying them 2 3 right now --4 MR. LEXIS: Oh, okay. THE COURT: -- down the hallway. 5 (Pause in the proceedings - waiting for Jury Instructions.) 6 7 THE COURT: Are they good, Marshal? THE MARSHAL: Yeah. They're good. All here except 8 9 for one, and one's in the restroom. 10 THE COURT: Pardon? THE MARSHAL: One went to the restroom. 11 THE COURT: Okay. 12 (Pause in the proceedings.) 13 14 (Off the record at 12:18 p.m., until 12:27 p.m.) 15 (Outside the presence of the jury.) 16 THE COURT: Counsel, I will ask each of you, if you stipulate that -- that I don't have -- that I'm not going to 17 read number 3. 18 19 THE MARSHAL: Please rise for the entry of the jury. 20 (Inside the presence of the jury.) 21 THE COURT: All right. Thank you everybody. 22 Have a seat. 23 Okay. Ladies and gentlemen, on your chair or in 24 your desk in front of you will be a packet of jury instructions and also a packet of verdict forms. There are 25

Okay. We will go to Instruction 4,

23

24

25

MR. HART:

ladies and gentlemen.

Yes.

1	listen to any news or media accounts or commentary about the
2	case, or do any research such as consulting dictionaries,
3	using the Internet or using reference materials. You're not
4	to make any investigation, test the theory of the case,
5	recreate any aspect of the case, or in any other way to
6	investigate or learn about the case on your own. And you're
7	not to form or express an opinion any opinion regarding
8	this case until it's submitted to you.
9	Just stay close by. It should just be five
LO	minutes. We're going to call IT right now.
L1	THE MARSHAL: All rise for the exiting of the jury.
L2	(Outside the presence of the jury.)
L3	THE COURT: Mr. Arnold
L4	We can be off the record, Cynthia.
L5	(Court recessed at 1:03 p.m., until 1:23 p.m.)
L6	THE MARSHAL: All rise for the entry of the jury.
L7	(Inside the presence of the jury.)
L8	THE COURT: All right. Welcome back, ladies and
L9	gentlemen. Apologize for the IT problems. It's no one's
20	fault. Things just happen.
21	State, are you ready now for your closing?
22	MS. COLE: Yes, Your Honor.
23	THE COURT: And also, ladies and gentlemen, per
24	stipulation of the parties, State's Exhibit 119 is withdrawn.
25	Is that correct; State?

MS. COLE: That's correct, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Any objection, Mr. Arnold?

MR. ARNOLD: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Any objection, Mr. Hart?

MR. HART: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

So that's 119 is withdrawn.

STATE'S CLOSING ARGUMENT

MS. COLE: So the past few days, we've sat through a lot of evidence. There's been a lot of testimony. We've had several different experts get up here, officers, victims. And so my job here today is to help you tie everything together.

We're going to go by events by events, and I'm going to explain the law that corresponds with the counts that Mr.

Lexis and I are going to be asking you to find both defendants guilty on.

So, the Paris events. We're going to start with the Paris events, and I'm going to go in the same order, at least somewhat of the same order of what we -- what testimony and what evidence we started getting into.

So the Paris event was August 16th, with Mr.

Krusinski. And we know that he left his room at approximately
7:00 p.m. We know his credit card was used at Bally's, and
that was the Sbarro's inside the Bally's. And we know his
credit card was used at 7-Eleven. We saw a video of both

those things. You listened to custodian of records from different banks. You heard the victims say that no one had permission to use their cards.

Rebecca Finger and Brooke Bargholtz. This was also at the Paris. And if you recall, there was several other girls that were staying with Rebecca and Brooke, but you actually heard testimony from both Rebecca and Brooke.

Marissa Metro, Inga Williams, those other girls were also there.

And both Rebecca and Brooke told you that they left their room, they were there in Las Vegas for a birthday weekend. And they had left at 7:45 to go downstairs to have breakfast. And when they returned their room had been obviously damaged. They noticed their property was stolen.

And again, Brooke's card was attempted at Target, and Rebecca's card was attempted three times at Target with two different cards.

Now, the rest of the invents are involving Harrah's.

And you heard from Esther Chae, you got to hear from Bertha

Gerdeau, and you got to hear testimony from both Jewell Love

and Patricia Williams.

Now, speaking of Esther Chae, you heard her tell you that she came back to her room. She heard voices. She identified Darrell Clark not only in a photo lineup but she did it in person in front of all of you.

And then we have Bertha Gerdeau and Latoya Gustus who were sisters. Again, visiting in Las Vegas. All of our victims were out of state. None of them lived here.

And you'll recall that there's a surveillance still of two individuals that matched the general suspect description of all of our events.

Bertha identified numerous very high value designer property from Defendant Clark's Facebook photo. And you'll recall Jewell Love and Patricia Williams, their event was August 23rd.

And they -- the defendants are depicted on video throughout the Harrah's. We're able to tell that Defendant Clark does not have a backpack when he enters the elevators. Then all of a sudden he has one when he comes off the elevators. And that, in fact, was identified by Jewell Love as her Louis Vuitton backpack.

Then when officers do the undercover operation through the LetGo messages and they are able to essentially lure Defendant Clark there under the guise that they want to buy some Apple watches, he's wearing Jewell Love's shirt.

So Mr. Krusinski. Mr. Krusinski was in hotel room 2198. And he had his particular headphones stolen. And if you remember, he was able to identify them, because of their unique color. He was able to identify the knobs on the them. And he was specifically able to tell you that those, in fact,

were there when he left, and they were gone when he came back. He had his credit cards taken, his American Express was used at Sbarro's inside the Bally's and at 7-Eleven.

So, residential burglary. What is a residential burglary. Now, you might be thinking, well, how is this a residential burglary if it's at a hotel. Well, the law says that it doesn't matter. It doesn't necessarily have to be at your home.

Any person, who by day or night, enters any dwelling with the intent to commit a larceny, and/or obtain money under false pretenses, is guilty of residential burglary.

So the crime occurs when you enter with felonious intent.

So what is a dwelling? So a dwelling is defined as something that somebody lives or which is customarily used by a person for overnight accommodations, regardless of whether the person is inside at the time of the events.

So it doesn't matter that none of our victims were actually inside their rooms when this occurred. It doesn't matter that these were at hotel rooms. As soon as the defendants entered with the intent to steal their property, a residential burglary had occurred.

Now, obviously, how do we know someone's intent? We aren't like cartoons that have little thought bubbles walking up beside us. We can't see people's thoughts. So how else

can we tell what someone's intent is? And that's by the conduct and all other circumstances disclosed by the evidence.

Why would they be going in there? Well, we know why they were going in there. Multiple stolen property was recovered. In fact, Esther Chae came back a little too soon. They weren't able to get out fast enough. And she was trying to get in. And a robbery ensued.

Now, we're going to talk a lot about different theories of liability. But in the context of burglary, when two or more people participate in the commission of a burglary, and one or more of them enters, it is not necessary to prove the other individual actually entered, because one who aids and abets another in the commission of a burglary is equally guilty.

You're going to hear Mr. Lexis and I tell you a lot throughout my closing and his rebuttal that the act of one is the act of all. You do not get a benefit because you don't want to get your hands dirty. And that is the same reasoning in every case. That's the same law that's applied, even in murders.

If you want to set up somebody, you want to hire somebody to kill somebody, you're not even in the State, in fact, you're across the country, you don't do anything but tell the person, hey, I want you to do this. You are equally as liable under the law. And when you think about it, when

you think about it, it makes sense. The policy behind it makes sense.

When you're working together in a group of people it makes it easier to point the finger at somebody else. It makes it easier to get away. So you can understand why that's why the law is what it is. You don't get a discount. You don't get any sort of benefit because you don't want to be the one to get your hands as dirty.

Now, home invasion. So again, we talked about the damage and the unique nature of the marks that were found on all these hotel room doors. And a home invasion under the law is when somebody forcibly enters a dwelling, and we know what the dwelling definition is. It's the same as what we discussed with burglary.

And they enter without permission. And again, it doesn't matter if the person is present or not. And this time there has to be force.

So what is force? These pictures are force. There is damage done to the structure of that residence, in an attempt to gain entry.

So again, we heard a lot of testimony about, these are types of marks that some sort of blunt force object has to be used. We know that when Defendant Oliver was apprehended, that she did, in fact, have burglary tools, that she had two screwdrivers. That there was another tool that Officer Ellis

identified as being, you know, this type of tool that could do damage like this.

So again, with a home invasion there has to be a forcible entrance. Force has to be used. And we have that in every single event. Every single event we saw that there are these -- we saw and we heard testimony that there are these distinct marks, and that that is how access was gained, was by breaking in using those tools.

Now, we watched a lot of video. And so I'm going to try to break it down and explain the pertinent parts.

So on August 16th at the Paris, we watched video where we're able to see throughout the different video surveillance that there's a certain pattern, there's a certain MO that we see over and over and over again. And that's that, you know, the defendants pretend like they don't know each other. You know, they keep their distance.

At some point, they'll reconnect. But then again, they don't want anybody to notice that they're working together. And again, this goes back to the policy of why we have aiding and abetting, conspiracy liability. It's easier when you're a team. It's easier to get away. And so the law recognizes that.

So here we have at 8:46, different stills of video surveillance at the Paris, of the defendants entering the elevator wells. And again, two hours later, they're back

here. So what happened during those two hours? We see them on the elevator two hours later. They're back. And Mr. Krusinski's room has been broken into.

So we see them walking out together at 10:17. They're depicted in the left hand corner. We then see them continue to make their way from Paris to the Bally's. And we talked about that a lot. The Paris and Bally's are essentially connected. You can be in one and not even realize you've moved on to the next. They just flow seamlessly.

And so we see them take this path. They're there at 10:18, 10:19, 10:20, 10:21, 10:30. And this video is a little blurry. We don't have the best surveillance video when it comes to the food court, and specifically where Sbarro's is.

And if you'll notice, and you guys are going to have access to all of the exhibits, all of the video, go back and pull this video, because stills just don't do it justice. And you will be able to see Clark and Oliver. Clark sits down in that right hand corner. And Oliver comes over. It's the same exact time as Mr. Krusinski's American Express card is used at Sbarro. And they walk out together.

And you'll know, you know, just to refresh your memory. And again, you'll have all these exhibits. You can view all this evidence as much as you want. You can play the video. You can pause the video. Don't take my word for it. Watch it for yourself. And you will see they're depicted in

the right hand corner, right around the time that Mr. Krusinski's card is being used.

And again, when we talk about the time frames. Is it likely, is it probable, is it rational that somehow they ended up with Mr. Krusinski's property and they weren't the ones that did, in fact, break in? Maybe if it was days later, hours later. But it's not.

And where they go is extremely close, and the time frames all line up to Mr. Krusinski's room, to the surrounding areas. Again, stills don't do this justice. Watch the video. At 10:31, you see them walking out together. You can clearly see their -- the description of their clothing. This is when Defendant Oliver is in a black and white jumpsuit, and Mr. -- or Defendant Clark is in the light shorts, the white top, the hat. Watch it for yourself.

So what is conspiracy? Conspiracy is an agreement to -- or an understanding between two or more persons to commit a crime. It's the actual agreement itself that is the crime.

Now, again, this isn't like the movies. We don't have video surveillance of people, you know, meeting in back rooms, talking about all their criminal plans. That's not realistic. But again, how do we know? How do we know if someone has made an agreement to commit a crime, to commit multiple crimes?

Well, we know by the circumstances surrounding their conduct. And again, it doesn't matter if the ultimate crime that they're conspiring and planning to commit is successful, because the crime itself, when we're talking about conspiracy, is the actual agreement.

And again, this is kind of what I'm discussing.

It's not necessary to have actual proof, video surveillance of individuals talking about an unlawful purpose. It may be inferred from all the circumstances. When we're talking about people's intent, actions, we can tell from all the circumstances surrounding them.

Now, larceny is taking away property with the intent to permanently deprive. When these defendants broke into rooms, stole people's property, what was their intent? Were they planning on giving this stuff back? Were they planning on, you know, just doing whatever? No, they went in with the purpose that they were going to take that property, sell it, use it for their own gain.

So you'll notice, we have conspiracy larceny, and conspiracy burglary charged several times throughout the Indictment. And that is the crime itself of the agreement. It has nothing to do with whether or not the actual crimes occur, although, in this case they did.

It's the fact that they conspired to steal property and break into hotel rooms, and they did it over, and over,

and over.

Again, how do we know that? The same MO, carrying out their plan the same way every time. What did they do? They enter at different times. They come in the same cab, but one will go in, and then one will wait five minutes before they go. Then they meet up again.

Even if they divide and conquer, they are working together for an unlawful purpose. What each one does, the other one's on the hook for. Because remember, two is better than one. Two is easier to remain undetected for.

It's easier if you're going to rob a bank if you have a getaway driver who's ready to take off. It doesn't mean that the getaway drive is any less liable. They're both on the hook for everything that happens.

Now, there's also some charges of burglary of a business. And that's when we're dealing with 7-Eleven, Sbarro, any business structure is defined as a burglary of a business.

And essentially, it's the same concept, entering with the intent for an unlawful purpose. So if you are entering, if you are going into a 7-Eleven, or a Sbarro's pizza, and you know that you're going to use a card that's not yours, that is burglary of a business. You don't even have to use the card. If you enter with the intent.

Now, in this case, we don't have to speculate about

what happened, because it's on video. We can match up the timestamps. And again, how close in proximity did this happen to Mr. Krusinski's room getting broken into? And again, we know his cards were in his room. We see the defendants in the elevator wells. We see them go straight over to Bally's and Sbarros. We see them then go to 7-Eleven, the ARCO, wearing the same clothing.

Again, this is explaining the intent. That's what matters for a burglary. What was the intent when you cross that threshold of that room, of that business, whatever it was.

So if you're in the commission of a burglary, and you and your co-conspirators have decided, hey, we're going to commit a burglary and another foreseeable crime happens.

For example, you enter -- you decide you're going to break into a hotel room and you're going to steal a bunch of property. And ultimately, the suspect -- or the -- not the suspect -- the victim comes back early.

Is that foreseeable that when you're breaking into someone's room that they could actually come back? Is that foreseeable that violence could ensue if you're in someone's essentially home? When you're out of town staying in a hotel, your hotel room's your home.

You are on the hook for that. The foreseeable possibilities based upon the conspiracy for the unlawful

1 purpose.

Now, again, the fraudulent use of credit card, we've talked about this. We know that Mr. Krusinski's card was used fraudulently. Now, was Defendant Clark the one that stuck it in the machine? No. But that does not matter.

Did he benefit from it? Yes. Was he with Defendant Oliver? Yes. And we've established that this is an ongoing conspiracy. So everything that happens during this unlawful plan, that they're working together to break into these rooms to steal property, it doesn't matter that she's the one that inserts the card. He's just as liable. The act of one is the act of all.

Now, again, 7-Eleven, you can see the clothing. And you can also see that Defendant Clark has a Sbarro Pizza bag. So again, don't take my word for it. Go back. Watch the video surveillance. Watch it over and over again. We're able to track from the time Mr. Krusinski's room gets broken into, where they go. They walk to the Bally's. They go use his card at Sbarro's. Then they go to 7-Eleven.

We also have video surveillance of then at ARCO.

And now in this still I tried to highlight to direct you to where they are in this, you know, exact surveillance video.

And in the right hand corner you can actually see Defendant Oliver hand Defendant Clark a bag. What's Defendant Clark carrying around the next time we see him? Again, look at the

bag in that left photo, red and white. It says, Sbarro clear as day wearing the same clothing, again, same time line, all very close in proximity. All these businesses and establishments are very close the Paris Hotel.

It would be extraordinarily difficult to believe that these people weren't, in fact, the ones that broke in, and instead, they just happened to meet somebody else who's broken into these rooms, who has all these -- who has all this property, and then they just take the property. It's not very reasonable.

So we've talked about entering with the intent to commit, you know, fraudulent use of credit card. There's also obtaining money under false pretenses. And that essentially means if you enter with any unlawful purpose to gain something under false pretenses, same thing. That is felonious intent, the crime of burglary has been committed.

And again, here's some more still surveillance photos from the relevant video at the Paris on 8/16. And this is all related to Mr. Krusinski's room burglary. All of these, using the credit card, surveillance video helps us tie them back to the burglary that occurred in Mr. Krusinski's room. And again, at this point, they've met up and they're walking out together. Here is that surveillance again. I've highlighted it for you.

So, you also heard from Rebecca Finger and Brooke

Bargholtz. They were here for a girls' weekend. It was someone's birthday. And they were also staying at the Paris when they came back from breakfast and noticed the damage to their door.

And if you'll recall, Brooke said they were so upset that two of them were crying. They're in Las Vegas for a fun weekend and this is what happens. They realize that their property is taken, their credit cards, they're traveling, they don't have their wallets, they don't have identification.

And this is the Paris, Oliver and Clark, 7:30 and 7:45. And remember, this room burglary happens early in the morning. They were gone for breakfast when they realize and come back that their room has been broken into.

And both girls established the timeline of around 7:45 to 8:30, not even really an hour. And within that short amount of time, their room was broken into by the defendants.

You can see Defendant Clark in the red shirt, red hat.

Defendant Oliver is in the black shorts, the black and white striped tank top. And you'll also note that that item -- that outfit that she has looks oddly familiar, because when Detective Lopez testified, who had done the examination of the phones that were recovered when Oliver and Clark were apprehended by police, she has selfies of herself on her phone, wearing that exact outfit.

So aiding, abetting conspiracy, you're on the hook

for the probably and natural consequences of the object of the conspiracy.

Also, it's important to note that the State is not required to prove precisely who did what, because again, they're acting in concert. They're acting under this criminal conspiracy, as co-conspirators, as aiders and abetters. They're on the hook for everything.

And this is important to note, is that although you must be unanimous in your deliberations to the charges, you don't all have to agree on the same theory of liability. And that's explained as the principal, the direct perpetrator, you know, this would be like in a bank robbery, the shooter.

You know, if me, Mr. Lexis, and one of our colleagues decided that, you know, we were going to rob a bank and I was the one that offered the firearm, I decided to stay at home, but Mr. Lexis drives one of our other colleagues.

Our colleagues goes in, commits the armed robbery --

MR. HART: Your Honor, I would object based on this is, (a) a hypothetical, and (b) it's not necessarily clearly the law.

MS. COLE: Your Honor, do you want me to respond, or do you want to go outside.

THE COURT: No, just go ahead and your response.

MS. COLE: Your Honor, I think it's absolutely appropriate. I'm demonstrating conspiracy liability. I think

it's appropriate to use examples and the examples that I'm using are absolutely proper examples of the law.

THE COURT: All right.

MS. COLE: And it is closing arguments.

THE COURT: All right. I'm going to allow you to go into your argument.

The jury is instructed that they -- that the law on all these issues is contained in the jury instructions and you are to follow those instructions.

Go ahead, counsel.

MS. COLE: That's correct.

So with that example, again, I'm not even there.

Doesn't matter. All three of us are equally liable under the law.

And again, four of you could think, hey, it was Oliver. She did all of it. Four of you could think, no, I think it was him. He -- he was the aider and abetter. She was the principal. You don't have to all be unanimous on the theories of liability. Four of you could think they were coconspirators, four of you could think aider and abetter, four of you think principal. Doesn't matter. You just have to be unanimous on the charge.

Again, it's not necessary to prove that everybody entered. That's important to remember. And again, that demonstrates and illustrates the purpose and the law on the

different theories of liability. It's not necessary to prove the other individual actually entered, because one who aids and abets another in the commission of a burglary is equally guilty.

So don't get hung up on that. Don't get confused about that. Well, what if one of them didn't actually go into the room? Doesn't matter.

So attempt fraudulent use of a credit card. This is different in that if you remember Brooke and Rebecca, actually had cancelled their cards. And so when you see the video surveillance at Target, you'll notice, and when you saw the receipt transaction, those cards weren't actually able to be used. But they were attempted to be used.

And the three elements of the attempt to commit a crime are the intent to commit the crime, performance of some act towards its commission, and failure to consummate its commission. So the performance of some act, that's sticking the card in the card reader. And it doesn't matter if she actually got the goods. That was the performance of the act.

And again, just to refresh your memories, there's been a lot of surveillance video and a lot of different moving parts. But these were -- and I think the timestamps are cut off in some of them at the top. But again, you'll have the video surveillance back. You can corroborate that these occur approximately 9:28, 9:30, 9:32, lining up almost identically

with the credit card statements, or authorizations, should I say.

And then we also know that when Rebecca Finger's room was broken into, her Apple watch was taken. And she was able to identify this as her Apple watch, because she still had the box of the serial ID number and she was able to provide that to officers, and detectives. And ultimately, when they recovered it, they were able to link it back to her, and her room burglary.

Now, when Brooke and Rebecca came back into the room, they were scared, their other friends were freaking out, and they noticed a phone. Brooke, I think, even mentioned that she picked it up, because they didn't realize it wasn't theirs at first.

And you heard the DNA expert talk about DNA and -or excuse me, not DNA -- you heard the latent print examiner
talk about fingerprints and ridge detail, and all of that.
And you'll note that her fingerprint was, in fact, found on
the phone. The phone that was left in their room that wasn't
there when they left, that was back in there when they came
back from breakfast.

We had Detective Downing testify this morning. And I know a lot of the stuff he says is a little complicated and convoluted. But these maps really help get a depiction of where the defendants are at certain times. Or if their phones

happen to just be hitting off the same tower that's servicing the Paris. And they're using their phone. What does that tell us?

And Detective Downing testified that the red represents Oliver, the blue represents Clark, and in that left map he talks about, you know, when it's both shaded, that kind of tells us that both phones are hitting off the same tower.

Again, sometimes he couldn't map them right on top of one another because it was just too dense. So we have the same exact graph with the same time so we can how similar those little bubbles look, which essentially he described as the range of that specific tower.

And how do we know that this, in fact, is Veneshia Oliver's phone number? Well, there's a lot of reasons. We know that this is her phone number.

First off, James Methe testified to the phone number she gave him. And we saw on video surveillance him typing her name into his phone. He was asking how to spell her name. And we know that she had a pink LG phone on her person when she was arrested.

All these photos on the bottom, her in the black and white tank top, the photo all the way to the left of the hat, the photo of her and the defendant, these were all found on that pink LG phone that's associated with the number ending in 5174.

Again, we heard some testimony today from Detective Downing talking about how those two numbers talked to each other, how there was an incoming call when Defendant Clark is on video. And we'll get into that, because that's more related to the August 23rd events.

But we know that the call detail records en masse, corroborate what we see on video surveillance. When Oliver's phone is hitting off the tower that services the Paris, or the Harrah's, we saw that bubble. We saw that range. If you're using your phone and it's hitting off a specific tower, that little range gives us an idea.

And again, this T-Mobile receipt, which has the two phone numbers circled depicting which is the black phone, which is the pink phone. And again, 5174 is the pink phone. That screen shot of that receipt from T-Mobile was found in her phone.

And in the top right photo, you heard Detective Lopez testify, he was able to forensically examine these phones, he was able to do some extractions. And it was the pink phone that he was able to establish was the number ending in 5174. Based off the SIM card and all of that, he was able to establish that that physical phone does, in fact, correspond with 5174.

How do we know that this number belongs to Darrell Clark? Well, there is a lot of reasons how we know. There's

a cab receipt. We had the custodian of record from Desert Cab come. There was some video that you watched. There was a call detail receipt record wherein he identifies himself as Rico, and this is the number he gives.

And then we learned that Rico becomes relevant later when we see on his Facebook the he also identifies himself as Rico. He uses that name before. So he gives the name Rico, gives that phone number, and we see them in the cab.

Again, Detective Lopez testified to the LG phone that was on his -- that he forensically examined, as linking up to the phone number ending in 3090. And we also learned and heard that that number calls -- 3090 calls 5174, and vice versa.

The last map Detective Downing demonstrated today was the cell sites for the cell phone, essentially, the cell phone towers or cell sites that are in the area of 45 East Twain [sic] -- 45 -- 455 East Twain where the defendant are getting picked up from, where they're coming and going from, where they're residing.

He testified that over 50 percent of the usage or how much that phone is operating is hitting off of those towers. Again, that -- all those things help us to confirm that those are, in fact, their numbers. They're hitting off the towers where they live. When we see video surveillance of them depicted, at the Harrah's, at the Paris. Their cell

phones are hitting off the same towers that service those areas. That helps you establish that the person that you're viewing in the video is, in fact, Darrell Clark and Veneshia Oliver.

So now we're going into the Harrah's. Esther Chae testified in front of everybody and she told everybody what happened, how that made her feel, how she was just going up to her room and she thought that her card key didn't work. And again, the significant damage to the door, to the area that she was able to notice. The room key wouldn't work. She heard voices.

She testified that the Defendant Clark came out, he pushed her up against the wall, and grabbed her neck. She couldn't breathe. Even though Detective Mann did not do a photo lineup with Ms. Chae in regards to Veneshia Oliver, when Ms. Chae was giving a description, she was able to identify a bag, which we know Veneshia Oliver carries a large tote that's black and white, that's got a "C" on the side of it. That bag is everywhere she goes. She was able to describe her as a female suspect, thin frame, 5-5.

And we also learned that in the room across the hall from Esther Chae's door there was some wrappers that were placed in that keyhole. And that's odd. I mean, why would there be wrappers placed --

MR. HART: Objection.

- 1 MS. COLE: Again, Your Honor --MR. HART: That's not in evidence. 2 3 MS. COLE: -- this is closing arguments. 4 THE COURT: Hang on. What's your objection? MR. HART: Stating facts not in evidence. 5 MS. COLE: It's absolutely --6 7 MR. HART: The wrappers were on the ground. MS. COLE: -- in evidence. 8 9 THE COURT: Okay. What was your last statement? Please restate it. 10 11 MS. COLE: I'm talking about the wrappers that were 12 tested for DNA that the CSA testified were in -- or from -she was directed when she got on scene that they had been 13 14 placed in the -- the keyhole of the room across from Esther 15 Chae's room. The facts are in evidence, Your Honor. The CSA 16 testified to that. THE COURT: I don't have a specific recollection. 17 The jury will base their decision on how -- on their 18 19 recollection of the testimony in this case. 20 Go ahead, Ms. Cole. 21 MS. COLE: And again, those wrappers are tested and 22 they come back with Veneshia Oliver's DNA. We know she was on that floor when Esther Chae was robbed. 23 24
 - And again, if the conspiracy was for Veneshia Oliver and Darrell Clark to break into hotel rooms to steal property

25

are they both on the hook for the robbery? And absolutely.

Again it's a natural, foreseeable probable consequence of that conspiracy.

Those are the wrappers. That's the keyhole. And Esther was staying in room 44001. 44002 is right across the way. It has a direct line of shot to 44001.

Again, for this incident, because of the date this crime occurred, this is still a burglary. But a burglary in June of '15 -- 2020 [sic] was any person who by day or night enters any house, room, apartment, tenant (phonetic), shop, warehouse, all of those other options, with the intent to commit larceny and/or obtain money or property by false pretenses, is guilty of burglary.

So same thing. They entered the room with unlawful intent. That's a burglary. As soon as they crossed that threshold. It doesn't matter if they don't even steal anything. It doesn't matter if they decide not to go through with it.

In regards to robbery, robbery is the unlawful taking of personal property, but it's doing so by means of force or violence or fear of injury.

So in this case, Defendant Clark was violent. He didn't just threaten Ms. Chae, but he slammed her against the wall, he grabbed her by the neck, he grabbed her phone out of her hand. That's a robbery. He didn't even have to go that

far. If he threatened violence, if he came up to her, and threatened her, do this or I'm going to do that. Give me your money, or I'm going to hurt you, that would be just a threat. That would be a robbery.

But obviously, in this case, there was force used, there was violence used. He made physical contact with Ms.

Chae. He threw here against the wall, grabbed her neck, took her phone out of her hand.

And subsequently, Defendant Oliver was walking out.

And Clark has a backpack, Oliver has a tote bag. And again,
the robbery, they're using force or violence. It can be also
for the defendants to obtain or retain possession of the
property.

They've got all the stolen goods. She's back. What do they do if she tries to get her stuff back? That force or fear can also be used to prevent or overcome resistence or to facilitate escape. And in this case, it's all three.

And again, Esther told you that she was scared, terrified, all of that. But even if she wouldn't -- even if she hadn't done that, again, the law will presume it, in such circumstances. And again, the value of the money or property taken is not an element of the crime.

But we know, not only did he grab her phone and throw it, but they were also leaving with her computer, other personal property. She had a credit card that was taken.

And I touched on this a little bit earlier. But again, that last part, even if it was not intended as part of the original plan, and even if the co-conspirator was not present at the commission of such act, it still counts, because it's foreseeable consequence of that conspiracy, of the conspiracy of burglarizing rooms, of stealing victims' properties, committing home invasions to break into those rooms.

Now, in regards to coercion. Coercion is the doing something with the specific intent to compel or abstain from doing an act which a person is entitled to do. So, when Esther was on her phone trying to call security, trying to get her room situation figured out, and Defendant Clark grabbed her phone, ran off and then threw it, that was preventing her from doing something she was lawfully allowed to do.

Under the law, she was allowed, she was permitted to be able to be making a call and him preventing her from doing that makes it a coercion.

And we know, again, this is focused on the viewpoint of a reasonable person. She told us how scared she was. She told us how it affected her. So in this case, you don't have to worry about that. But under the law, it's the viewpoint of a reasonable person.

Theft. We know that Mr. Chae's MacBook was taken. She talked about the alerts that she got after it was taken.

Again, with this specific event, based off the date the crime was committed, home invasion in relation to this event is this definition, same thing, it's still a home invasion, even though it says "inhabited dwelling" instead of "dwelling".

This is still the same elements.

You enter. You use force. There's some sort of destruction to the property to the door. That's a home invasion. And we know that in Ms. Chae's case, her room did have those pry marks.

So again, theft is charged throughout the Indictment, whether it's \$1200 or more. All of the victims testified about the value of the property that they had taken. Specifically, Esther was able to tell us that after her laptop was taken, she had some sort of a way, some sort of a tracking that she got a notification that a sound was played. Some individual had been using or had opened her lap book -- or her laptop. And then her credit card that was taken is found when Oliver and Clark are arrested in Oliver's purse.

Bertha Gerdeau was staying at the Harrah's. This was her room. Again, the photo is consistent with the same type of damage that we had seem repeatedly over and over again. And we have a still surveillance photo of the defendants in the Harrah's on August 6th.

Detective Mann was able to go on Darrell Clark's Facebook. That again is in evidence. You can review that.

And had made some sort of posting about all this stolen high end property. When Detective Mann gave that to Bertha, she was able to identify all of her property. And she was able to tell you how much those items cost, what specifically she had, how she recognized it was hers.

And again, look at the date stamp on Mr. Clark's Facebook in relation to this event that occurs on 8/6. How soon is that stolen property posted on Facebook? Take a look at that. Again, we know that these were all very expensive designer high end items that were taken from Bertha.

And then we have the Harrah's room number 15058.

Jewell Love and Patricia Williams testified, and they as well had other individuals that were staying with them. They were in Las Vegas vacationing. And they left their room around 9:15, and arrived back at 12:15 a.m.

And if you'll recall, Patricia testified that her and Devonica (phonetic), her wife, had actually not come right back to the room. They were down the hall. And Jewell and Raven had got in the room, and had assumed that Patricia and Devonica had just left it a mess.

And as soon as Patricia and Devonica got there, they were shocked at the state that they saw. They were leaving the next morning. Their suitcases were open. There was food all over the floor. The door, again, had that same damage.

The scratches from the blunt objects. And Patricia Williams

described a little pouch pocket that she had that she kept very important documents, including her social security card, and the social security cards of her children.

Well, we know that there was a photo of Patricia Williams' social security cards, and her children's social security cards in Darrell Clark's phone, that was forensically examined. And if you'll recall, Detective Lopez actually pulled up the program and did it right here in front of you.

Those photos of those social security cards were on his phone. Jewell Love talked about her Louis Vuitton backpack that was taken, as well as a Tupac shirt out of her room. And we know from Detective Downing's testimony and the maps that he analyzed and explained, the cell site or the cell tower that services Harrah's, both of their phones were hitting off that tower during the entire duration of 9:15 and 12:15 a.m.

And Harrah's as a lot of video. Clear video, clear dates, clear timestamps. We know, this is their MO. They arrive together, but get out of the car separately. They try to split up, avoid detection. We can see the black and white bag that Defendant Oliver carries with her routinely with the Gold "C". We can see the different still photos of them in the Harrah's.

And if you'll notice, that t-shirt that Defendant Clark is wearing, is also found on his Facebook photos. He's

seen on Facebook wearing that shirt. That light green and white striped shirt.

Now, there was testimony regarding this from both Detective Mann and Detective Downing today who had access to the call detail records, who was able to plot and analyze those call detail records using ZETX. And you can see on August 23rd, 2020, 21:38, Darrell Clark's on the phone.

And I asked Detective Downing, was there a call placed at that time, and there was an incoming call from 5174. And if you'll notice on that last line on the mapping page, you can see, and that line item matches up with one of those numbers in the blue circle. And again, that blue circle is indicating the range of that particular cell site or cell tower.

And so when Darrell Clark answers that phone call, he's on the phone with Veneshia Oliver. We have it on a video, we have it on their call detail records. And that's also depicted in the cell site tower mapping.

The photo to your right, that's another selfie that was taken from the LG pink phone that is Veneshia Oliver's phone. Again, the clothing she's wearing in that selfie look exactly like the clothing that she's wearing in that surveillance video, down to the tank top, down to the hat, down to the hair.

And you'll know and recognize that in all these

photos on Facebook, on Oliver's phone, she changes her hair color a lot. Her appearance changes a lot. And that's the Facebook photo of Defendant Clark wearing that same t-shirt that he's seen wearing in the Harrah's on the 23rd, the same date and time.

And again, you can look. Harrah's has great video surveillance. There's lots of angles. You can look. You can compare it to that shirt. Again, we've got more mapping of this specific time frame. That 9:15 to 12:15, that's the time frame that Patricia Williams and Jewell Love were able to give us in regards to when they left their room and when they came back.

This map indicates blue. Blue corresponds with Defendant Clark's phone of 684-3090. And in that blue tower, in the left hand corner, we can see the Harrah's Casino. And I'll point to it, because I got this wrong with the Detective. But this little red dot, that depicts the Harrah's Casino. And that's the exact time frame that is given by the victims when they say when they were out of their room. And we know that Defendant Clark's phone is hitting off that tower that services the Harrah's.

Now, Oliver's phone. And again, this was one of the maps that Detective Downing said it would have been great to illustrate as one with the color so you could see the blue and the red mixing. But because it was so dense, because there

was just too much data, it was easier to display them separately.

So again, we have identical time frames. This is, again, from 9:15 to 12:15, the same time frame that the victims gave And this is Defendant Oliver's phone number hitting off the same cell site tower that services the Harrah's Casino.

So not only do we have both of their phones utilizing that cell tower, but we have the video surveillance of them in that hotel. We have the property that was taken.

Jewell talked about this Tupac shirt. Everybody thought it was weird that it was a size large because she said she wanted to wear it as a dress. She identified that shirt as, in fact, her unique Tupac shirt that she had, that was taken from her when her room was burglarized.

We also know, and in that still photo on the right, that's more of a clear depiction of the coloring and what that shirt looks like compared to the shirt that's on Darrell Clark's Facebook, more than once, there's more than one photo of that specific shirt.

And again, you'll have these Facebook photos. Take a look at those. See what you think. See if it's the same shirt. And he's wearing the backpack. We know that when he enters the hotel -- or when he enters the elevator while up, he does not have a backpack on. When he comes down, all the

sudden he has a backpack.

Possession of a credit card without cardholder's consent. This is related to Esther Chae. But even if you don't use someone's credit, with Mr. Krusinski, with Rebecca Finger, with Brooke Bargholtz, their cards were actually used, or attempted to be used. But it is still a crime just to possess someone's credit card without the cardholder's consent. And Defendant Oliver was in possession of this card when she was arrested.

Burglary tools. Burglary tools are sharp metal objects, something under circumstances invincing (phonetic) an intent to use or employ.

Is that a coincidence? We have all these home invasions, all these residential burglaries, that have very distinct marks that we've heard testimony and evidence, some sort of tool. That's what she's found with.

Carrying concealed firearm or other deadly weapon.

Officer Montalbano talked about when they did this setup

operation, and he was acting in a covert capacity. And it was

at that time that he was acting as if he wanted to buy two

Apple watches, one of which turned out to be Rebecca Finger's.

And when they approached the defendant, he notified them that he had a firearm. Now, Officer Montalbano was clear to state that he did not see him with a firearm before that.

It was concealed. It was underneath his clothing. It was

tucked under his waistband. He had a baggy shirt on. It wasn't until he lifted up on the shirt that he was able to discern that, in fact, it was a firearm.

And you heard from expert Bodily who testified that this, in fact, you know, was operable, it functioned, it expelled through the barrel by force of any explosion or other form of combustion. We know that it was, in fact, a firearm.

Ladies and gentlemen, when you go back into deliberations, take the time to put the evidence together.

There's a lot of moving parts and there's a lot of things, but at the end of this trial, Mr. Lexis and I are going to ask you to return verdicts of guilty on all counts to both defendants.

Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you, counsel.

Mr. Hart, are you ready for your closing?

MR. HART: Can we take a brief recess?

THE COURT: All right. Ladies and gentlemen, let's just take a quick -- quick break this afternoon.

During this recess, you are not to discuss or communicate with anyone, including your fellow jurors, in any way regarding the case or its merits, either by voice, phone, e-mail, text, Internet, or other means of communication or social media. You're not to read, watch, or listen to any news or media accounts or commentary about the case. You're not to do any research such as consulting dictionaries, using

the Internet or using reference materials. You're not to make any investigation, test the theory of the case, recreate any aspect of the case, or in any other way to investigate or learn about the case on your own. And you're not to form or express an opinion regarding this matter until it's finally submitted to you.

We'll see you back in about ten minutes.

THE MARSHAL: All rise for the exit of the jury.

(Outside the presence of the jury.)

THE COURT: Counsel, I provided the jurors -- we're outside the presence of the jury panel. I provided the jurors with their own individual set of -- for the verdict form.

Obviously, we have the -- the official set, which is -- will be in with the blue back -- blue backing on it.

On the verdict form for Mr. Clark, the caption says, Mr. Clark, but the first paragraph says, "We the jury in the above-entitled case find the Defendant Veneshia Oliver." So we went ahead and made that change. So the verdict form that will go back with the jury, the official one, has been changed already.

I just wanted to advise you that the jurors did have a verdict form with the two names on one form, and I'll explain to them that we have a corrected form.

MR. LEXIS: Okay.

THE COURT: All right?

We'll see you back in ten minutes or less. 1 (Court recessed at 2:28 p.m., until 2:40 p.m.) 2 THE COURT: All rise for the entry of the jury. 3 (Inside the presence of the jury.) 4 THE COURT: All right. Welcome back, ladies and 5 6 gentlemen. 7 Mr. Hart, are you ready for your closing? MR. HART: Yes, Your Honor. 8 All right. Go ahead. 9 DEFENDANT VENESHIA OLIVER'S CLOSING ARGUMENT 10 11 MR. HART: Hello. I'm Marty Hart and I'd like to thank you all for your patience during this process. 12 13 understand the Judge has given you a set of instructions, and 14 at the beginning it says, all the instructions are equal. 15 I would like you to consider a couple specific instructions as we go through this. 16 17 Instruction No. 34, okay. It says that the 18 defendant is presumed innocent until the contrary is proved. 19 It follows up with the presumption placed upon the State, the 20 burden of proving beyond a reasonable doubt every element of 21 the crime charged, and the defendant is the person that committed it. 22 These crimes, as you've -- we kind of went 23 24 through, you know, the instructions, there's different 25 elements to the crimes. Kind of talk about burglary, entering with the intent to commit a crime; okay?

Now, the important part of this is it talks about who bears the burden. The defense is not required to present any evidence. It's up to the State to prove their case.

It's also up to the State to charge their case properly. So in that vein, you can consider all the evidence presented, but if you look at Instruction No. 32, you're here to determine whether the defendant is guilty or not guilty of the evidence.

You're not required to go -- you're not supposed to look at whether anybody is guilty or innocent. The only people you're considering are the people charged in this Indictment, this 38 pages of 38 counts of charges. You're not to consider if Mr. Hart, or Mr. Arnold is guilty of anything. It's not, Mr. Arnold did this, Mr. Arnold did this, or said this or said that.

Or -- and there are no unnamed co-conspirators in this. So it's not whether or not it's somebody else did stuff that's not included in this -- in this case.

Because you heard a lot of one -- one for all, all for one, or something to that; okay? If one of them did it, well, not if somebody did it. But if one did it.

And number 39, I love this; okay? This (indiscernible) really applied to you guys. I kind of commented on it when we were picking the jury panel, that was

probably one of the most educated panels I've ever, you know, dealt with. I don't know how many masters there were, running though there, or Ph.D.'s, etcetera.

You know, but it says, as a jury, you don't leave your common sense and knowledge at the door; okay? Although you're only to consider the evidence in the case reaching a verdict, you must bring into consideration your everyday common sense and judgment as reasonable men and women.

And you are not limited solely to what you see in here, what the witness testified, you may draw reasonable inferences from the evidence, which you are justified in light of your common experience; okay?

So you get to use the knowledge that you have and put it in the frame work of everything.

Also, it says you're not allowed to come to a -your verdict due to sympathy, prejudice or public opinion;
okay? Sympathy. Whether or not somebody cried because when
they came back to their room, that's not a basis for a
verdict; okay?

You're allowed to have empathy. You're not allowed to base your verdict on that. This is -- this is -- this is not supposed to be an emotional process. This is supposed to be a logical process; okay?

So with that, like I said, you don't get to include just what you were presented, because there is no burden of

proof on the defense. You also get to look at the lack of evidence that was presented. The information that was not presented. And as I stated before you get to only go through what is charged.

Do you remember we talked of -- they were talking about Mr. Krusinski's room being burglarized at one point in here, and how there was a short time frame between it being burglarized and a credit card being used.

Well, what do you know, or don't you know? You do know that there are phone -- or I'm sorry -- lock interrogation locks, which tells you when a door was opened, when a door was closed, would have told you when a door was opened, when a door was closed. If it was opened with a card, if it was left open, etcetera.

There were also no cell dumps done as to other people that were there during the time. There's a large difference between, well, there's not -- there's a difference between theft and possession of stolen property. We don't have possession of stolen property here. We have one possession of a credit card with intent to use. They are very -- they are different crimes, different elements.

What else do we not have? Okay. We have DNA on a gum wrapper outside a door, which tells you that someone -- that person who touched that gum wrapper at some time. And when it was touched, except now I think you get to use your

logical inference. It couldn't have been sitting there for two days. Even at Harrah's, the maid staff would have come through and cleaned it up within a couple days.

But what don't you have? And we asked repeatedly, did you fingerprint and where? Out of all these rooms, we had, oh the CSA decided to fingerprint a door handle. They're trained. You get to use your common sense. They are supposed to use their common sense where you're likely to get evidence.

If you're going in and out of a door, a door handle's pretty damn good place to start. Now, I understand that, hey, if we powder it, it might be a problem for DNA. There's a front and a back side to a door handle. There was not DNA gathered, unless I missed something, from one door handle in here.

There was not DNA gathered -- from -- we talked about how there's difference surfaces. Oh, I could touch this, and I wouldn't -- you know, maybe I'd leave a print, maybe I'd not leave a print. Okay. Maybe I'll leave DNA, or maybe I'll not leave DNA.

We asked, it's possible, is it probable? The answer was no. It's not probable. Probably should have asked, is it highly unlikely. But you saw a bunch of crime scene photos. Surface -- we're not worried about the texture when we're doing DNA. Hell, use your common sense and knowledge. I'm sure somebody's -- somebody has spent a little -- thinking

about this sometime, just but I -- it seems like you're a pretty curious group. The rougher the surface, generally better for DNA, period.

Also, all the items that were taken in here. Okay? We know a bunch of stuff was taken. Large amounts. Now, you're pointing fingers at my client. You've got the videos. She's carrying the same bag, it looks like, you know, the same bag a lot. Does it get bigger? Does it get thicker? Does it get wider because three computers have been put in there?

You're not here to decide if anybody else is guilty. You're here to decide the charges against our clients here.

And that's part of where Instructions No. 30 and 6 come in. Number 30 is mere presence at the scene of a crime or knowledge a crime is being committed is not sufficient to establish guilt beyond a reasonable doubt; okay?

You know, they're merely a spectator. And also the same with the conspiracies here. Mere knowledge (indiscernible) prove (indiscernible) acquiescence a conspiracy without a agreement to cooperate does not one make -- make one a party to a conspiracy. You get to ask common sense questions.

As I've stated, you don't -- going to -- going to purchase stolen property is not the same as stealing the property. You can -- there is possession. You also get to use common sense.

Counts 34. Sorry. I lost my -- sorry. 15. The credit card. Okay. It was used at the Target. I'm not going to tell you nothing happened. Okay. The credit card got used. Credit cards got used, or attempted to be used, or should put attempt to be used. There (inaudible) at the Target store.

But the fact that the credit cards were attempted to be used does not show that my client broke into the room to take the cards. Throughout these events, what was (inaudible) something that was, you know, commented by co-counsel in a second was how long is it going up and down the elevator and coming out.

You don't have the video logs from the initial stuff at Harrah's. You don't have the lock interrogations going through there. We're not here looking at whether or not my client had stolen property. (Inaudible) for it. We're here for whether or not she took it. We're not here on coconspirators.

Remember as you're going through this and the information we had, people who work at the hotel know when people are going in and out. They can check the locks. It goes on as people are checking out of there because it goes through a central system.

We don't carry the burden of presenting the evidence. The State does. To call the proper witnesses, and

present it to you. I don't know, maybe a glaring lack of testimony from what many would consider the most important witness in this case, the lead Detective. And all the Paris stuff. We didn't hear a word about how that was done and gathered.

We did hear from the lead Detective on Harrah's. He couldn't remember when he was assigned the case. We don't have video because in the ordinary course of business, he didn't request it in time. We also heard the testimony, he is not required to request it. The arriving officers can also request it. Or shocker, Harrah's can (indiscernible) and save it on their own, as the Detective testified, happens. Calls up, oh yeah, we've already got it saved. We're ready to go. Come down and get it because they've got people that work there that know also.

So please, consider your obligations to consider each and every count separate; okay? Please use your natural curiosity and desire that I think you all have to read and actually your -- read the charges. Read the elements. See how they relate.

Ultimately, it's for you to decide if something was proved beyond a reasonable doubt. You've got the jury instruction we just read to you. Well, we didn't read the whole thing. But talks about the weightier affairs in life, I think it's Number 39, 38. No, 34. Sorry. And that tells you

what beyond a reasonable doubt is.

Just as an example, Count 36; okay? That is possession of a credit card -- there was a possession of a credit card without cardholder's consent, belonging to Esther Chae, the Victoria's Secret credit card. And one of the elements is, did somebody possess it with the intent to defraud or use; okay?

And that credit card disappeared in June, and August 27th it was found. You didn't hear any testimony about anybody trying to use it, or using it whatsoever.

Now, when it's all said and done, as we've just talked about before, the burden's on the State. The prosecutor gets to stand up here and lambaste everything I said. And I don't get to say anything back. I assume it will be Mr. Lexis, but who knows.

Evidence is not what we said, but you can use it, because as you've got the instructions. We are here to help guide you to look at the evidence. And that's what we're here to do. We ask certain questions for certain reasons. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Hart.

Mr. Arnold, are you ready for your closing?

MR. ARNOLD: Yes, Your Honor.

DEFENDANT DARRELL CLARK'S CLOSING ARGUMENT

MR. ARNOLD: Ladies and gentlemen of the jury,

possession of stolen property is not theft, possession of property is not robbery, possession of stolen property is not burglary. Those are completely entire different charges. And I told you from the very beginning when I did my opening, possession doesn't mean that these crimes were committed by my client; okay?

Is before going into all the charges and everything like that, it hasn't been narrow focused in regards to this crime, the dates, everything like that. And it's like everyone's been saying, you've got to use your common sense. I want you to take some steps back. Not all the way back, but a couple of steps back.

This happened in the months of June through August, 2020. It was the COVID summer. It happened at Harrah's and at Paris. There is several room burglaries that occurred during this time. My clients are charged with several of those burglaries. Take your step back. Harrah's, huge hotel, at least 20 floors. How did my clients -- and remember, this is the COVID summer, still were not up to full occupancy; okay?

We have 20 floors. How did my client know which floor to go to? Which floors were being occupied by guests? Each and every one of these room burglaries occurred when the guests were out. How did my client guess the right floor, and the right room each and every time. Does that make sense to

you? It shouldn't.

How did he know that these people were not going to be in the room? How did he know that these people might have valuable possessions? How did he come to all of this knowledge? Or did he just run up and down each and every floor, each and every room, and keep knocking on doors, oh, nobody answered this door. I'm going to open the doors. And through all that, to not have been discovered by any hotel guests or reported by any hotel guests, that doesn't make sense; okay?

Am I suggesting somebody else was involved? Yes, I am. Why do the lock interrogations never make it into that big pile of evidence? The reason why it's key, it's key, we know when that door opens and closes. However, we don't have that information in front of us. That's important information, because like I said, you can look at when that door open and closes, and then you can trace it back to that floor, you can trace it back to that elevator opening and closing on that floor and then you can see the video of who popped out of that elevator at that time, a few seconds before, a few minutes before, and broke into that room. It's simple.

I mean, I don't watch CSI and I can figure that one out. Okay. How come this Detective, how come -- what was his name from Harrah's, Mr. Lemon, how come they didn't provide

that? It's not that they didn't want to provide it. It's because it's as simple as that. It didn't show my client. It didn't. For sure, if it did, you know we would have had a still photograph sitting up there on this computer screen, T.V. screen, whatever you call it, showing my client getting out of this elevator at that specific time and boom, there's the case.

It's not brain science. It's not a whole bunch of DNA fingerprints and everything. That's simple detective work which wasn't completed in this case.

I've got a I've got a lot to say, because we've got to go through -- we've got work to do. I've got to go through all 30 something charges, whatever. Please feel free to stand up, walk around. I don't want anyone passing out, falling asleep, because what I'm saying is very important, and it needs to be discussed and taken back during these deliberations.

So I'm not worried if you going to fall asleep.

I've a couple times during this trial have almost fell asleep.

I just want you to, you know, get back up and stay engaged with me; okay?

The other thing is, like I said, I'm saying a lot of stuff, but I'm just trying to like point you into a direction; okay? A direction that's in favor of my client. But regardless of anything coming out of my mouth, regardless of

anything that's come out of the State's counsel's mouth, or even Mr. Hart's mouth, those are just statements.

THE COURT RECORDER: (Inaudible)?

MR. ARNOLD: Can we switch to this, ma'am?

I'm going to zoom down.

Just because I make a statement does not mean that it's evidence. Just because the State has made a statement, doesn't mean that it's evidence. Just because I look up at a picture on that video on this screen that you've all been looking at and I say, that's Darrell Clark, that's just their opinion. What identifying features can you show me that that's Darrell Clark? What identifying features in those, you know, fuzzy videos, was that Ms. Oliver? Just because it's being said, doesn't mean that it's true.

So this is what I'm asking you to do. Go back and look at the evidence. Everything that I'm saying is guiding you to look with scrutiny at the evidence. Don't take anybody's word for it. Make your own opinions about all of this. And then sit there and have a discussion in regards to, is that evidence, in your opinion, beyond a reasonable doubt. That's how these deliberations should work.

The act of one is the act of all. That is not the law. Look at your jury instructions. I can tell you what the law is, because I know the law. The jury instructions are the law. And in nowhere does it say the act of one is the act of

all. Me and my buddies are walking down the street. My buddy turns, pulls something out of his pocket, sells some marijuana to a guy. An I liable for conspiracy? Heck, no, I'm not liable for conspiracy. Guess what? I'm there. My presence is there. I'm standing right next to him.

I have knowledge that he did a crime. I just saw him with my own eyes. But am I guilty of that crime? Hell, no, I'm not guilty of that crime. Here's the thing is, I have to do something -- read them all, don't take my word for it -- in furtherance of the conspiracy.

Meaning, I have to say, hey, that guy, go ahead and hit him up because I think he'll buy this marijuana. That's something in further of the conspiracy. But all these charges, that's what we're going to go through. What act was done in furtherance of the conspiracy.

Let's say you believe Ms. Oliver broke into all of these rooms. Okay. Let's say you believe that. What act did my client do in further of the conspiracy? Well, he was with her. His name is tattooed on her -- on his arm. Their phones, their phones are together in the same spot. They have Facebook pictures together. They got out of the cab together. They were in the hotel together. That is a mountain, a mountain of evidence, but not to the specific thing.

And what's the specific thing that we need to see? What act did he do in furtherance of the conspiracy? Did he

have a text message in his phone that said, hey, they just left out of that room on 24, the number is 2486. We got to meet there. I'll break into the room, put the stuff inside your bag and we'll run out of there. There no text message saying that. There's no conversations saying that.

There's no plan or anything that they were going to do that. So right now what's happening is the prosecutor, he's jotting down notes of what I'm saying. And so he's going to come back up here and say, well, no, no, no, on August 23rd, they had a plan. Are you bringing the tools? Are you doing -- are you doing this?

Listen, go ahead, don't take my word for it. Look at that text. August 23rd, the crimes that were committed on August 23rd were in the morning. Whatever they're talking about, is what they're talking about. We don't have to sit here and figure it out. But what I do know is the times on those text messages are later on that evening; okay?

So I say that example to say this. In your gut, man, these people must have done something wrong, in my gut, I feel that. This is not a gut feeling kind of thing. This an evidence kind of thing; okay? And so you have to look at every little piece of evidence with the thought process, does that equate to this -- how many counts, 41 page Indictment, and does it match up to my client being guilty.

THE COURT: Excuse me, Mr. Arnold. Make sure we

provide six feet social distancing.

MR. ARNOLD: Your Honor, I forgot about that. Sorry, Your Honor.

The other thing is, it doesn't matter who entered into the room. Lord Jesus, it does matter who entered into that room. That's the whole basis of the home invasion charge, the whole basis of the burglary charge. You have to first have an entering, and if you don't have the entering, you can't even get to those charges.

So who was the person that made the entrance? Was it Mr. Clark, was Ms. Oliver, or was it both? Remember, in regards to my client, Mr. Clark, not one single thing, not one. In regards to my client, there is no DNA. None. In regards to my client, there's no photograph, not one single one showing him getting off on any of the floors where this happened.

All they've got is possession. Possession. That's all they have, ladies and gentlemen.

All right. Let's start doing the work.

Count No. 1, Conspiracy to commit larceny. What's larceny? Larceny is the theft of property with the intent to take it away permanently. There's no proof of a larceny, because again, you have to have proof of somebody going into the room and taking that property out of the room. They do not have proof of that.

They do have proof that there were certain items, an orange shirt, and iPhone watch, and maybe I'll get to that backpack that's seen on my client. Well, I'll get to that. But those are three items. Not the rest of all those entire items.

So then in regards to this Count 1, it relate to Gary, Gary Krusinski. So, we go to the AMEX card. Who was in possession of the AMEX card? You don't have evidence as to who's in possession of the AMEX card.

You have evidence of the AMEX card being used. But nobody found the AMEX card on my client's possession, or Ms. Oliver's possession.

What they're saying is, well, they were sitting right outside of the place where the AMEX card was being used. Look at the receipt. The receipt says that they used it at --well, it was -- I believe it was 10:30. Again, that's a receipt that they pulled up with the AMEX card number on it.

However, you have conflicting evidence. You also have evidence -- again, don't take my word for it. You've got to review it, and go back and look at what the AMEX person provided us.

What the AMEX person provided us was a detailed list of when the card was being used. In that, we also see that the card was used at 20 -- it 22:30 mountain time. Why is there a difference? I don't know why there is a difference.

I don't know if -- I would imagine AMEX wouldn't be able to doctor a receipt. I don't think Sbarro's would doctor a receipt. What I do know, there's a doubt in regards to when that AMEX card was being used.

Why is there such a conflict in evidence? I don't know. Don't need to sit here and explain it. It's not my burden of proof. It's the State's burden of proof to show why there's a difference between the card being used in mountain time, and the card being used in pacific time.

Not only that, is well, they're going to say my client's walking around with a Sbarro's bag. Use your common sense. Well, use common sense. What is in the Sbarro's bag? We don't know if the specific food items on that list were in my client's bag. What we do know is, whoever had that bag, in the next videos, I believe it's the 7-Eleven videos, they take a phone out of that bag. How do we know there were any food items in that bag? We don't.

We would have to guess, and we would have to speculate that those food items that were on the receipt were the same food items that were in the bag, and we just don't have that information in front of us.

Not only that, go ahead and look at the videos. Still, it's my basis that in those videos you cannot clearly see that it's my client. He has a mask on, he has -- that person has his hat pulled down, the same identifying clothes

that we have in the videos that are clear, are not present in this video of 8/16. So again, look at the evidence to determine if there's sufficient basis to find that that was even my client at the Sbarro -- at the Sbarro's.

So again, that's conspiracy to commit larceny.

It's the same thing -- same arguments with conspiracy to commit burglary. Again, that requires my client to have entered the room. Again, conspiracy to commit residential burglary, invasion of the home. Again, that requires my client to have entered into the home, or at least aided and abetted into the entry of the home.

Remember, if you need to stand up, please stand up.

Don't fall asleep on me here; okay?

So bottom line is, they don't have evidence of my client entering into this place. What evidence do they have that he aided and abetted into the entry of the place? They don't have any.

So that's Count 1, 2, 3, 4, all not guilty.

Count 5 is the burglary of the business. That's using the credit card at Sbarro's. Absolutely, no footage of my client using the card at Sbarro's.

More so, if you believe that it was Ms. Oliver in the videos that used the cards at other times, guess what? It was always Ms. Oliver. Look at the video immediately after the 7-Eleven video. Whoever that individual is, is -- was

sitting -- was moving around in the front of the store. He came up to the register. Whoever the female was in that video is rummaging through stuff. Something dropped out of her purse.

In the beginning of that video, she was going to the front of her purse.

MR. HART: And, Your Honor, I will reserve our right for a motion.

THE COURT: Okay. Go ahead, Mr. Arnold.

MR. ARNOLD: Again, I don't know who is in that video. But I do know that that person was in the front of their purse, something dropped. My client bends down, picks it up, hands it to that person. Steps back, walks away. Then whoever that person is in using the purse, goes to the back of her purse, pulls out a card, and uses that card.

Okay. How did my client aid and abet in that, if that is my client in the video? He didn't know what card she was going to use. Cards dropped on the floor. Multiple cards are in that person's purse. Again, if you believe that's my client, what knowledge does he have? That's the first thing that the card was being used. That's the first element.

The second element is, how does he aid and abet in the use of that card? He didn't say, hey, use that AMEX card that we just got out of the room. Of course he didn't. It's not on video. So again, not guilty.

That's the burglary of the business.

Same argument, you could use at Sbarro's, it's the same argument for the 7-Eleven.

Count 7, fraudulent use of the credit card or debit card, same argument. The only person that was using the credit card was whoever that female was in the video. My client did not use the credit card, nor did he suggest what credit card to use. That's completely wrong what the State said about, well, he benefitted from it.

Again, he did not know what card she was going to use. If he gave her a counterfeit bill and said, go ahead and use this and make payment, that's aiding and abetting. Of course, he's going to be liable for that crime, because she actually used it, but he's getting the benefits from that.

There is nothing in that video that suggests that he knew what form of payment that she was going to use. In fact, look at the video. He wasn't even standing there when that form of payment was being used.

Not quilty, count 7.

Same argument, not guilty, count 8.

Count 9, conspiracy to commit larceny.

Count 10, conspiracy to commit burglary.

Count 11, residential burglary.

And now we're at the Paris Hotel room with Marissa
-- Marissa Metro, Brooke Bargholtz that came and testified and

Rebecca Finger that came and testified.

Again, the only connection my client has to this case is Rebecca Finger's stolen watch which he was attempting to sell. If you recall though, obviously, my client is in the business of selling watches, because not only did he bring one stolen watch, he brought another watch which was not stolen. Trust me. If it was stolen, they would have told us that it was stolen.

But the same serial number that they looked at on the second watch that he brought to this transaction at Casino Royale, that one wasn't stolen, and nor is he being charged with it; okay?

Again, possession of stolen property as opposed to, he stole the property, which I say he didn't. And again, the thing with this one is what's very important in the room. In the room, again, we have this cell phone on the bed. The CSAs picked up the cell phone, and what did they find? Not my client's fingerprint on it, but they did find another male's fingerprint on it.

Why is that relevant? It's very relevant. Agin, these were four women, two of them were repeatedly asked, did anybody else come into the room? No. There were no other males in that room. They were all four females.

That report, and you can go back and look at it, it says, the fingerprint lady specifically excluded my client as

having any fingerprints in that room. And more specifically, on that phone. So whoever that idiot was that left that phone on the bed, that's the person that we should have been investigating and charge, and tried to figure out how did he get into that room. But it wasn't my client.

MR. HART: Your Honor, I'm going to object as to stating facts not in evidence. I believe there was male DNA in the room.

THE COURT: I believe Mr. Arnold has stated it wasn't his client's DNA. Is that correct, Mr. Arnold?

MR. ARNOLD: Correct, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. ARNOLD: And whether it be a DNA or it be a fingerprint, neither of them were my client's. Whether it be DNA of a male, whether it be the male's fingerprint, they were not my client's. They were excluded. Excluded means there's no way that he was in there. Okay? This stuff about touch DNA, well, my fingerprints could be in there, but they couldn't be in there.

Listen, there's where you use your common sense. You did one, two, three, four different room burglaries, and there is no DNA? There's no fingerprint stuff in you, and four of them, that just doesn't make sense. Somebody's going to make a mistake and their stuff is going to be in those rooms.

Count 10, conspiracy to commit burglary, residential burglary of the four girls' room at the Paris Hotel. Invasion of the home, of that same room, all not guilty for my client.

Same with count 13, theft. No proof that my client entered that room to take anything out and to keep it. The evidence, again, suggests my client was in possession. How he came into possession, don't sit up in here and wrack your brain. That was for the DA to prove how he came into possession of that.

And just because it's stolen doesn't mean that he entered into the room and got it.

14, my client is not charged in that. That's burglary of a business. That's Ms. Oliver going into a Target and using the credit cards.

The only thing I want to mention about this is, my client wasn't around. This was Ms. Oliver, or whoever it was, going into the business and doing this all on her own. This is a person with free independent will, committing a crime, that only is she committing a crime, it's like I told you, the DA can't even sit here and charge her, charge my client with that crime, because he was nowhere around.

In no form and no fashion did he aid or abet in the commission of her using that card.

MR. HART: Your Honor, I'm going to object. This does not relate to his client.

THE COURT: Well, overruled. Go ahead, Mr. Arnold.

MR. ARNOLD: Thank you. Again, I'm just using this

for an example, to show that the DA can't even charge my

client for that, because there was no conspiracy. They

couldn't figure out how they conspired to agree for her to use

the card, if it's her. Or that he benefitted in some way from

her use.

So Count 14, not guilty.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Count 15, attempted fraudulent use. That would be a not guilty for my client. He's not charged in there.

Same with Count 16, it'd be a not guilty. He's not even charged in it.

Same as 17. Same as 18.

Now, we're down to 19. Esther Chae. Let's start here with Esther Chae. That photo lineup that Esther Chae did was 2 months and 15 days after this whole entire thing happened. How she fortuitously picked out my client is beyond me to this day.

However, she did. She picked number four; okay?

But what did she tell you? And this is the only thing you need to know, to find my client not guilty. She, herself, is only 50 percent knowingly that it's him. Fifty percent.

She's not 100 percent sure. She's not 80 percent sure. She's

She's not 100 percent sure. She's not 80 percent sure. She's 50 percent sure; okay?

She has doubt. With her having doubt, you should

have doubt. And why should you have doubt? Because, again, no DNA, no fingerprints, no video, nothing. And you had an officer, what do you call him, a TACK (sic) officer, you had an officer come into here today, and I don't know if you caught it, it's like, you know, I do this for a living, and so I heard it. But I was like, I wonder if the jury heard it.

And what he said was, he had a warrant from 6/14/2020 to August 27, 2020, for these phones and then the locations and everything like that. Not once through all their exhibits do we see where my client's alleged phone was at on 6/15. You know why? There ain't no evidence. Just like we don't have any evidence of any video of my client at 6/15. Just like we have no evidence of DNA, or fingerprints. My client wasn't there; okay?

And think about this. I'm sitting here choking you choking you, hands around your neck, and I'm looking at your nose and your mouth. That just doesn't make any sense. I'm looking at the eyes. The eyes. And I don't know if you guys can see it from there, but that's clear as day, my client doesn't have any eyebrows. That alone would have been shocking to me.

She came into this courtroom from this door, walked up here, got all the way up there, and then you know, the DA waits until the very last couple of questions, do you see that person in the courtroom today? She looks at you guys first.

Like, what was that? And then she looks at their table. This guy choked her.

Supposedly, she was in fear of her life. That's easy. I know where that person was sitting. I don't have to look all over the courtroom. It was for you. That wasn't for me. That was for you. That was dramatics. Okay?

Remember, each and every one of these witnesses, before they get up on the stand, are prepped by the DA.

That's their job. Remember that one witness who came in here, he told us that the social security photo, well, that came from what we associated with her phone, the lady's phone in this case. He leaves, walks out of here. And then what was it, an hour later, and he hustles back in here and tells us, oh, I made a mistake. Do you see how this is working?

These people are being fed the answers. These people are being reminded of what their testimony is. This is what's happening. That's why I'm asking you, just don't swallow it, review it. Look at the evidence for what it is; okay?

Esther Chae, 50 percent. That alone. You know, and here's the thing. Like you hear these charges, you know, fraudulent use of a credit card, commit larceny, commit burglary, you know. If it was a murder case, and this -- they said, well, the person that shot me, I'm only 50 percent sure that he shot and caused the murder, the jury would be like,

no, I can't put this person away for life.

Here's the thing, the standard that's in a murder case is the same standard here; okay? It's beyond a reasonable doubt. She has doubt. She told you she had doubt. She wrote it down that she had doubt. She's only 50 percent sure that it could be him. And there's no other evidence on the face of the planet that is going to corroborate that it's him. There isn't. Just isn't.

He didn't have possession of any of her items. Not one. You know why? It wasn't my client. Not guilty.

Where are we at, 17, 18, 19, not guilty. 20, not guilty. 21, 22, 23, not guilty. 24, I have a little note to myself, look at the piece of evidence with the laptop. It shows that on that date, June 15th, that the laptop, you know, I guess she had some other Apple device. And you can figure out where your laptop is by hitting it, and its signal where, the signal at the flamingo.

Is my client's phone coming from the flamingo? No. Is my client's video at the flamingo? No. Is there any evidence that my client was at the flamingo? No. The person that choked her, was at the flamingo with her laptop, a few hours later. Don't take my word for it. Look at it.

Coercion, not guilty.

26, this is the Harrah's Hotel with Bertha Gerdeau.

Again, I'm not going to repeat all the arguments that I made.

But I do want to use a common day life experience. Okay.

Let's say your house was burglarized. Your house is

burglarized. The insurance adjuster comes in. You give him a

list. He's going to ask you for an inventory of what was

stolen out of your house; right?

In this list, you can sit there and you can say, well, I had a 72 inch T.V. You're going to sit there and say, well, I had that leather couch, you know that one that leans back and it has two cup holders in it. You're going to sit there and say, I have this expensive crystal clock that was up on the wall. You can put whatever you want on that list; okay?

But the insurance adjuster is going to say, well, thank you for that list. Now, can you provide us with receipts? Can you provide us with proofs of purchase? Can you provide us with serial numbers? Because the insurance company is not stupid. They're just not going to give you full replacement of all those items that you just put on the list, just because it came out of your mouth; okay?

And you, as jurors, should not just accept Ms.

Gerdeau's testimony, or anybody else's testimony in regards to what was exactly stolen out of their room, unless there is some type of photograph to show that it was in their possession. Unless they show there was some type of receipt that it was in their possession. Unless they show some type

of serial number that it was in their possession. You have nothing. You have someone saying, well, I had these two Gucci, you know, pairs of shoes, and they cost \$300, \$400.

And the DA is going to come up here and say, well, Ms. Gerdeau, well, she didn't have any reason to lie. Well, yeah, she does. She made a police report and now she can claim that stuff. Is it going to be verified? It has to be verified.

And the other reason that it has to be verified is they're asking you to accept the values of those various items. I don't know if Ms. Gerdeau got a knockoff. I don't know if Ms. Gerdeau really went to the Gucci store, or the Louie Vuitton store, or whatever store she went to, to buy her fancy glasses and everything.

All I needed was a receipt. All I needed was a credit card transaction to show that she actually purchased those things. You need proof beyond a reasonable doubt. And again, he didn't even enter into the room.

- 28, not quilty.
- 29, not guilty.
- 30, not guilty.

31, this is Jewell Love. Jewell Love that came up here and said, no, I don't think my cousin was involved, but had the Detective, Detective Mann still check to see if that cousin was involved. But she told us something different.

Jewell Love, she's the one with the Louie Vuitton bag. She's looking at a blurry photo, the photo that they keep putting up there every single time. And for the life of me, I mean, you review the evidence, but I can't see LXV on that. The initials for Louie Vuitton. I can't see it. Maybe you guys can see it. Okay.

But again, what does it go back to? That's possession. That's just possession, how he came into possession of that is not before you and does not need to be decided by you. Because there is not one single shred of evidence that my client was in the room.

And in this room, guess what? The person that broke into the room, that guy or woman was a dummy, too, because they left the beanie right there. The beanie on the bed. And I'm still wondering how we didn't pull DNA out of the beanie and figure out who was involved in that. All kind of hair should have been in that beanie.

But regardless of the point, they did tests on it, and what did it do? Excluded my client. No fingerprints in the room. Again, not my client. No video of him getting off that floor. Not my client.

The video that we do see, is some bag hanging off of him in the -- in front of a machine. Again, we don't know that's the bag.

Here's the thing which how we know that it was my

client in that video. The cab video. The cab video was as clear as day. Look at it. You can zoom in on that one, and you can look at that one, remember what my client's face looked like, and you can see clear as day, that's my client.

But the next videos, the ones in the Harrah's are not that clear. But they can match the clothing. And the clothing is consistent. Not only can they match the clothing, what do you know? One of the pieces of clothing that was upstairs was on my client's back when the police took a photo, that orange shirt. Again, how he came into possession of it, I don't know. Did he go upstairs? No, he didn't, because there is no vide of him going upstairs to that room.

There's no entry of him going into that room. And no DNA, no fingerprints, not guilty.

Do I see possession of stolen property on this Indictment? No, I do not

- 32, not guilty.
- 18 33, not guilty.

- 19 34, not quilty.
- 20 35, theft. Here's the issue that we come to.

Again, Tupac shirt, that's maybe \$20. I'll give them \$50. Let's go on the high end. Louie Vuitton backpack. I do not know if that's a Louie Vuitton backpack. She came in here and said it was. Then I asked her some very specific questions about, was that the only backpack like that, she

said yes. Do -- was that the certificate of authentication with that backpack? She said yes.

I go, is that the only backpack like that made in the whole world? She said yes. The prosecutor, she knew, oh boy, she knew Ms. Jewell Love messed up. So she had to come up here and what we call rehabilitate her, and you know, go through what I just asked her, and then she went back on all of her previous answers.

Oddly, and the evidence is not clear, as you can see, she have a Louie Vuitton backpack on his back. There's no proof of it. So how do we know that it equated to the value of \$1,200 or more?

They threw in jewelry. What jewelry? My client wasn't in possession of any jewelry. And where's the proof that that jewelry cost "X" amount? Again, is that a diamond ring in your house? It was stolen. You can't sit here and say that's a \$50,000 diamond ring without some kind of proof and expect the adjuster to replace that ring. It's not possible.

Not guilty, Count 35.

Count 36, not guilty, because that's not my client and he wasn't in possession of a Victoria's Secret card.

Count 37, possession of burglary tools. Never, because my client, he didn't burglarize any establishment, and he didn't have any tools, nor is his fingerprints or DNA

anywhere on those doors, around the doors, on that same floor, nothing,

Count 38, guilty, carrying a concealed weapon. I have no reason to dispute the officers picked him up, he had a weapon at the time.

Did I get all the counts?

MR. HART: 38. (Inaudible).

MR. ARNOLD: Yeah, I did 38. Was that the last one,

MR. HART: Yes.

Marty?

MR. ARNOLD: So, my closing remarks.

Instruction 39, you may draw reasonable inferences from the evidence which you feel are justified in the light of common experience, keeping in mind that such inferences should not be based on speculation or guess.

Here are my notes. You will have to guess that my client and Ms. Oliver had any agreement to go into rooms and steal items out of rooms. You would have to guess on that. You would have to guess that he had knowledge. If you contend that she went into the rooms, you would have to guess that he had knowledge that she went into those rooms, as opposed to maybe receiving stolen property and giving it to him to put on sale at LetGo like he did.

And lastly, you will have to guess, because there is not one scintilla of evidence, which I told you from the

beginning, that he ever entered into those rooms.

So I went through the charges. I gave you reasons why it should be not guilty on every single charge.

And the last thing, you know, I like that word that Mr. Hart used, the prosecutor's going to come up here and lambaste everything that I said. Well, I don't know if he's going to lambaste everything I said. He is going to dispute everything I said. But again, it's just all statements. All I'm asking you to do is, there is evidence, look at it. Review it. But just don't accept it and don't accept my statements, or don't accept his statement for it.

Make reasonable inference as to what is the logical conclusion of that. And what I'm going to tell you for each and every piece of evidence that they offered, the logical conclusion is not that they entered into the rooms. Just because they have phone evidence doesn't mean they were in the rooms.

Between Harrah's and Paris, you all know if you've been down on the Strip, there must be at least a hundred businesses, there must be at least, you know, 50, 60 floors in between these places. Use reasonable inferences. Just because the phones were there doesn't mean my clients were there. Or where they're saying they were.

So scrutinize that evidence, and the logical conclusion is, not guilty. Thank you for your time.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Mr. Arnold. 1 Ladies and gentlemen, let's just take a five minute 2 3 recess before State's rebuttal argument. During this recess, you are not to discuss or 4 communicate with anyone, including your fellow jurors, in any 5 way regarding the case or its merits, either by voice, phone, 6 7 e-mail, text, Internet, or other means of communication or 8 social media. You're not to read, watch, or listen to any news or media accounts or commentary about the case. You're 10 not to do any research such as consulting dictionaries, using 11 the Internet or using reference materials. You're not to make any investigation, test the theory of the case, recreate any 12 13 aspect of the case, or in any other way to investigate or 14 learn about the case on your own. And you're not to form or 15 express an opinion regarding this matter is -- this matter is submitted to you. 16 17 We'll see you back in just a few minutes. 18 THE MARSHAL: All rise for the exit of the jury. 19 (Outside the presence of the jury.) THE COURT: All right. We're outside the presence 20 21 of the jury panel. Mr. Hart, did you have a motion to make,

MR. HART: Yeah. I'm going --

22

23

24

25

or something --

THE COURT: -- you want to put on the record?

MR. HART: -- to ask for a mistrial or severance. I

mean, I guess, I got -- my client just got lambasted, I guess, would be the term to use, during Mr. Arnold's closing argument. And, you know, the rule is, there's not supposed to be an extra prosecutor in the room. I'm pretty sure my client's not getting a fair trial at this point based on having a co-defendant point the finger at her as to what happened, not knowing what happened here, and Mr. Clark not having any knowledge or information.

There's my motion.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

State?

MR. LEXIS: Judge, I -- the State's position is they can't create their own mistrial among --

THE COURT: I'm sorry, you know, I just can't hear.

MR. LEXIS: The State can't -- the defense can't create their own mistrial between the two. In addition, Mr. Arnold was like interpreting the evidence as he saw it, for his client, and I believe he was commenting on the evidence.

THE COURT: Do you have anything further, Mr. Hart?

MR. HART: He was interpreting the evidence and pointing a -- pointing a finger at my client, Your Honor. I mean, we had the discussion earlier where we can't open a door against my client by cross-examination by Mr. Arnold. And it's one thing for me to cause a problem for my client. It's another for co-counsel to do it. Or I guess, not co-counsel,

counsel for the co-defendant. 1 2 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. MR. LEXIS: And Judge, can I just add, Mr. Arnold 3 did not bring up any bad acts that were previously ruled upon 4 that were not allowed into evidence. 5 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. 6 7 Any comments that Mr. Arnold may have made regarding the co-defendant does not rise to the level of antagonistic 8 defenses that warrant a severance of this case or a mistrial. 9 10 So I am going to deny the motion. 11 If anyone needs to take a personal break, please do so. And I'm going to bring the jury back in as soon as 12 13 possible. 14 (Court recessed at 4:00 p.m., until 4:06 p.m.) 15 (Inside the presence of the jury.) THE MARSHAL: All rise for the entry of the jury. 16 17 THE COURT: All right. Welcome back, ladies and 18 gentlemen. Before Mr. Lexis presents his rebuttal argument, 19 on your chairs or on your desk area we've given you a verdict form for each defendant. 20 21 The verdict forms that you have for Mr. Clark, in 22 the body of it, it said -- it references Ms. Oliver. That's a typographical error. The -- going back with you when you 23

deliberate this case will be the official verdict form

attached to the blue piece of paper.

24

25

This will be signed by your foreperson. And so you will have one for Ms. Clark -- I mean, excuse me -- Clark and Oliver separate. And so like I said, just disregard the typographical error in Mr. Clark's verdict form that was given to you as a worksheet. The one in blue is the official verdict form for both defendants.

Mr. Lexis, are you ready?

MR. LEXIS: Yes, Your Honor.

STATE'S REBUTTAL CLOSING ARGUMENT

MR. LEXIS: Ladies and gentlemen, there's a mountain of evidence in this case, so it's no surprise what you heard from the defense. Not at all.

Before I give you my PowerPoint, I wrote down everything they just talked about. And I'll try to be brief folks, because I know you guys have heard a lot.

I first want to bring up the fact that both defense counsels come up here and had a hard time understanding why Ms. Cole would say the act of one is the act of all.

As you know, she was talking about aiding and abetting and conspiracy when she said that. And right from your jury instructions it states, "The act of one co-conspirator pursuant to in furtherance of a common design or conspiracy is the act of all conspirators."

In addition, defense counsel just came up here and kept referring several times to, well, my client benefit, a

benefit, a benefit. Well, straight from your jury instruction, "The crime is the agreement to do something unlawful. It does not matter whether it was successful or not."

Folks, when defense counsel opened -- did their opening statement, I took down everything he was telling all of us. He came out right out of the gate several times with, all the evidence the State is going to present is to show that the defendant entered the room.

Actually, no, not at all. That's part of the reason. The evidence shows that both of these individuals went in that room. So they would both be liable with the crimes they're both charged with under theory one, directly committed the crime. But you will note, he did not mention about theories two and three, which the evidence shows as clear as day they're guilty of both.

In your Indictment, if you go to any charge that they're both charged with, you will see, as Ms. Cole tried to explain, I just picked one at random, Count 5, since it's in the middle of the page. You will see at the bottom of each one of these charges, they both charged with, that there's three forms of liability, folks.

Where it says, the defendant is being criminally liable under one of the following principals of criminal liability, one, directly committed the crime and/or by aiding

and abetting in the commission of the crime, and/or pursuant to a conspiracy.

Once again, four of you could believe theory one happened, four of you could believe theory two happened, four of you could believe theory three happened. All that you need is to find one of the three, and they're guilty.

He goes to great length to try to focus on the first theory, even though once again, the State believes all 12 of you should find him guilty by way of all three theories. And Ms. Oliver, as well. But he goes to great lengths not to mention aiding and abetting or conspiracy, during his opening statements, and his closing. He's trying to get you to focus on, oh, the enter -- just -- he's got to enter, he's got to enter.

Well, the evidence showed he did enter, but it even -- the evidence is overwhelming as far as aiding and abetting and a conspiracy.

He tells you in opening statement, you will hear of no fingerprints and no DNA evidence. Fails to mention though that his co-conspirator, an aider and abetter, just so happened to leave a print behind in one of the rooms. And that DNA evidence couldn't have been in a more damning place, the same room Esther Chae identifies this man as 50 percent, right out in the hallway is DNA evidence of his co-conspirator and aider and abetter. No mention of that.

Then he closes with this. The only piece of stolen property that was in my client's possession was a watch. Well what about the shirt on his back, when caught? Went to great length to cross-examine that woman. What'd she say? Yeah, I use it as a nightshirt, as well. It's a large. The Detective told you the same thing.

No mention of the stolen cards on his phone. No mention of the backpack, and surely no mention of the LetGo and Facebook account with stolen property all over it. Why? Because all that is evidence of aiding and abetting and conspiracy liability.

Another thing. Mr. Hart came up here and talked about a lot of things regarding possibilities and speculation. You will see possibilities and speculation -- that's not my word for it, but we'll get to it when we get to the law -- is not reasonable doubt. We could do that and go round and round and round in every case about what it could've, should've, would've, this person could've done that, we would've, this would've happened.

He brings up lock interrogation. Well, you heard the Detective say, you know, sometimes when you breach the room it doesn't -- it doesn't register. You heard as far as this isn't an abandoned room. The victims give time frames. But we want to engage in possibility. Well, what if this, speculate as to if we had that. That's not reasonable doubt.

Same with the blanket comment. What we -- what do we not have? That couldn't be more of possibilities and speculation. Attack the CSA for not doing door handles and -- these CSAs told you their trained in this. They take into account mixtures, textures, frequency it's been touched.

And they also told you when it comes to DNA of latent prints, there's no guarantee you've going to leave one behind. And that's just the first thing. You have one of these rooms with just one latent print lifted. Do you think that person in that room, and the person before them, only have one person touch something with one finger? No.

Went around with Clorox everywhere and the -- and she came in there with gloved up the entire time? Come on. These people know, and they told you, it's no guarantee you're leaving DNA behind. There's no guarantee you're leaving latent print behind, so they do the best they can.

But once again, we're going back to speculating this
-- what's it -- what were the -- you don't speculate as to
maybe there is more prints, or maybe it's possible they could
have dusted more things, even though they didn't see anything
on the surface to texture.

And then by the way, again, the next step which is, is it a good enough quality for the analyst to even analyze?

Defense counsel also wanted to make -- says, well, we should have heard from more Detectives, as well. Well, folks, the

Detectives that interpreted the warrants in this case, after Mann, you heard from. The TASS Detective, who told you that he was getting the phone data, the mapping, and talking about those warrants, as well as the takedown officers.

(Indiscernible) came in here and talked about the Facebook and the Letgo. More warrants. More warrants. Those, as far as the State's concerned, are your important Detectives this jury needs to hear from. Once again, possibilities and speculation. Well, what if we would have heard from this guy, speculate as to this. No. That's not reasonable doubt, folks.

Mr. Arnold comes up, once again, possibilities and speculation. He tells you, does it make sense that he's going to just -- they're going to go up there and keep knocking on doors? When you're engaged in this type of behavior, yes. You see on the video them just wandering around, not to mention all the other records you've got.

Then, of course, speculate as to the video from

Lemons and what if they got more, speculate as to that. Maybe

it's possible they could have done this.

He comes to you and then says, trust me, it was not stolen. Well, first of all, what he has to say is not evidence. DNA and fingerprints, again, these don't come with timestamps and they don't come with expiration dates. And you heard the CSA analyst tell you, sometimes you leave them,

sometimes you don't, as you heard from the experts as well.

I made that clear to get that out, because I know there's a lot of times a notion is, just because my hands are here, sure enough, DNA and fingerprints. That's not how it works. Again, folks, you see how many latent prints were lifted. Not just analyzed, but lifted in total. One of the rooms just had one.

Then he keeps saying it's excluded. Excluded. Which once again, you heard me go back to it several times. And even though I'm sure you got sick of hearing it, I wanted to make sure I brought it up with every expert. Excluded does not mean they didn't touch it.

Then they talk -- the cousin, once again, is it surprising that these women tried to first point the finger at somebody they've (indiscernible) in an argument with? Use your common sense. Right off the bat, what are they telling them concerning their wrapper. Soon thereafter, they (indiscernible) up and they're together and they don't even want the person to confront them. And once again, that's speculation of possibilities, of evidence that doesn't point to any of that direction, that came from that stand.

Then he goes on to say, don't consider items that are stolen. Really? Would you burglarize your house, or anybody's house, and the person's caught soon thereafter with it, do you think the law says don't take that into

consideration? No, folks.

As the Judge told you, we'll get to it, direct and circumstantial evidence. Often these cases are proved by circumstantial evidence, even though you didn't see it raining, and you get out in the morning, and you see the street's wet, etcetera, often these cases are proved by a string of circumstances and conduct before, during and after, for you to draw that conclusion.

Esther, he then goes on to attack Esther. Folks, it's shocking that that woman was able to identify anybody, given the situation of the interaction, catching her by surprise, the immediacy of it, and them talking off. The Detective told you in his professional opinion he didn't even bother with the female given the interaction with that, even though he saw her.

But yet sure enough, he identifies her. Identifies him, excuse me, at 50 percent. And then goes on to insinuate that there's some type of coercion going on with Metro and the DA's office.

Ask yourself, first of all, you heard from her and the Detective when I had her up there, I asked the same thing, and then the Detectives asked the same thing. She moved on. And then when asked, do you have anything else to add? That's when she went back. She says, you know what, I think number 4, and then gave the 50 percent.

If this -- if -- did she appear to be giving you an academy award winning performance up there, to take down these two individuals? If she was so coached by the District Attorney's Office, do you think we would have told her when asked to identify the defendant if you see them in court, that they're -- she's going to look off to all of you in the jury?

Then attacks TASS. And help their -- TASS come up here and only tell you about events after August 20th. What did he tell you, folks? That's when those phones were first subscribed. That was when the phones were subscribed. So obviously, that's the only data he has, from their -- that point on.

Oh, then the last part too, that I noted of significance was more coercion by the phone (indiscernible). Yeah, you better believe the State has an obligation if somebody misrepresents something on the stand because they forget something, that yes, what did he tell you? Go back, review your file. The double-check and come back. That's exactly what he did.

And when he was crossed again, what did I have him do? There's the document, there's the data came -- that came from Metro. Do it in front of the jury.

Could we switch it over, please?

And once again, when you have this type of evidence you do this; right? And then when that doesn't work, do this.

Blame the cops, blame the witnesses. Could've, should've, would've, possible this, speculate as to that. And when that doesn't work, as you just saw, blame each other. And then if all else fails say, hey, man, as Mr. Arnold came up here and told you, is this a case where they're walking and he engages in a -- some marijuana transaction without her knowing? And they just keep on going?

Is this a case where me and Madilyn are walking to Subway and I recognize someone I don't like, and so I go over there and start punching them? Well, mere presence at the scene of a crime or knowledge that a crime is being committed is not sufficient to establish that a defendant is guilty of an offense unless you find beyond a reasonable doubt the defendant was a participant and not merely a knowing spectator.

Of course, Madilyn's not quilty of that.

However, "The presence of a person at the scene of a crime and companionship with another person engaged in the commission of the crime and a course of conduct before and after the offense are circumstances which may be considered to determine whether the person directly committed or aided and abetted in the commission of the crime.

What's that telling you? And we'll get to it, this before and after stuff, and -- and what's happening, going on at the time, is direct and circumstantial evidence.

You look at the direct and circumstantial evidence to see if this person is just merely an only spectator. Is that what they are?

We will -- Madilyn went over these, but I just want to highlight some as they were up here doing their closing, I was typing and including some that they -- that are relevant.

Where two or more persons are accused of committing a crime together, their guilt may be established without proof that each personally did every act constituting the offense charged.

Once again, five people in the room, one decides to -- they decide to do a bank robbery, one provides the gun, another one provides the car. One person is just the -- the brain master that concocted all this up. The other person goes in the bank and does it, and the other person is the aftermath guy that just launders the money.

Guess what? You don't need to prove which one did what. Of course, and you understand why the law says that. A lot of times people commit crimes. They can't come in here and say, oh, well, you got the right guys, but can't prove who was the getaway drive and who actually went in. You can't prove, you know, who actually went in and who actually benefitted or if no one even benefitted, who got the property, or who -- so we split up the property. You get what I'm saying.

All persons concerned in the commission of a crime who either directly and actively committed the act constitute the offense, or who knowingly and with the criminal intent, aided and abet in the commission of, whether present or not, just goes to show you folks, you don't even have to be present.

Who advise and encourage its commission with the intent that the crime be committed are regarded by the law as principals in the crime that's committed and are equally guilty.

Look how broad these words are and they're orals.

Okay, when you see them all lined up like this to say, at a minimum, these two were encouraging each other, or aiding each other, is an understatement.

A person aids and bets the commission of a crime if he knowingly and with criminal intent aids, promotes, encourage, or instigates, by act or advice, or by act or advice the commission of such crime with the intention that the crime be committed.

To say these two are aiding one another or encouraging one another is an understatement. The State is not required to prove precisely which defendant actually committed the crime and which defendant aided and abetted.

This isn't me just repeating the law to you. You're probably up here saying, well, why do you keep repeating the

same thing? These are straight from your jury instructions. These are not from me. And it keeps saying the same thing over and over.

Now, the reason why I want to put this up here is because some of you might think, well, you know, Esther said that with regards to the robbery, that Clark is the one that came out and did this to her, but the female isn't the one that put her -- her hands on her. She didn't use force.

Well, folks, you want to engage in criminal activity, it's risky business. And you have to take on that risk which comes from natural and probable consequences from getting in that activity.

The act of on co-conspirator pursuant to or in furtherance of a common design of the conspiracy is the act of all conspirators. Every conspirator is legally responsible for an act of a co-conspirator that follows as one of the probable and natural consequences of the object of the conspiracy, even if it was not intended as part of the original plan, and even if he or she was not present at the time of the commission of the act.

If you want to tell somebody, hey, man, why don't you, or encourage somebody, or either aide and abet, or pursuant to a conspiracy, have somebody go and burglarize something, and guess what? It's a pretty probable or natural consequence that when you're going into the hotel room, they

might come back. And they might have to use some force to get away, which is exactly what he did.

And it is -- this -- these next ones, the reason why

I put them in here, is because as you'll see, they keep

telling you in different ways to take in the direct and

circumstantial evidence of the case, from start to finish.

Conspiracy is seldom susceptible of direct proof.

And is usually established by inference from the conduct of the parties.

What's that telling you? The law recognizes that you're -- a lot of times not going to have video surveillance or somebody telling you, or DNA, or fingerprint evidence, seeing somebody go in and out of that room. Oftentimes, you're not going to have forensic evidence in that room.

(Indiscernible) the conspiracy, well, I told you. Conspiracy is seldom susceptible to direct proof and is usually established on an inference of the conduct of the parties. In particular, a conspiracy may be supported by a coordinated series of acts in furtherance of the underlying offense sufficient to infer the existence of an agreement.

It is not necessary in proving a conspiracy to show a meeting of the alleged co-conspirators or making of an express or former agreement. The formation and existence of the 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.

You are instructed, presence, companionship, conduct before, during, and after an offense or offenses are circumstances from which one participation in the criminal intent may be inferred.

From start to finish.

Now, what is direct and circumstantial evidence?
What is the instruction the Judge went over before this trial started and read to you at the end?

Direct evidence is testimony of a person who claims to have personal knowledge of the crime such as an eye witness.

Forensic evidence, DNA evidence, fingerprint evidence. Circumstantial evidence is proof from a chain of facts and circumstances which tend to show whether the defendant is guilty or not. The law makes no distinction between the weight to be given to either direct or circumstantial evidence, therefore, all the evidence in the case, including circumstantial evidence, should be considered by you in arriving at their verdict

Arrogance and greed is what usually catches up to defendants. If we just had one of these defendants, you better believe, we'd still be right here, telling you that

those are your people, right there. But a mountain of evidence comes to be when it has a snowball effect when they can't help themselves and do the same thing over, and over and over again. And it's a luxury for a jury, because guess what? When you're determining each and every charge, charged by, charge whatever, you consider every act and take all that evidence into account when determining whether or not they're guilty or not.

Let's just go over some of the circumstantial evidence, folks. And I'm not going to break it down as -- as hard as Madilyn did. Just to refresh your memory, all of the circumstantial evidence in the case, the same MO. They break in using a hard tool type object around the key lock, which by the way, they objected when I asked specifically what it was. It was defense counsel himself who impressed with one of the CSA's, and what did she say? Oh, yeah, a screwdriver. Shrugging when they're caught with that, with two screwdrivers in the bag.

Hotel res burgs, the commercial burgs are in the same general area on the Strip. The Hotel video, seen together multiple times. The Paris and these women are out. The cab video. You saw. That's how we got definitive proof linking their phone numbers to them.

And then in addition, the Walgreens, and where they reside. The credit cards. Oliver uses the stolen cards for

the remaining events are present with some of those transactions. The arrest, sure enough, they're caught together, and Clark's phone links them, not only the phone, the -- Clark's phone that links them with the phone number, it verifies it and links him to it. He has a gun. He's wearing a stolen shirt and watch from two different events.

And then Oliver, of course, links her to the phone and the phone number, has the burglary tools in her possession, screwdrivers, and stolen cards.

The phone mapping expert places both defendants in the same area on the Strip at each event that occurred after they obtained the phones. That's why it was that date.

That's when they were subscribed to those phones.

Those two events, obviously, 8/21 and 8/23, as well as the takedown, the sting operation.

The phone expert, continuous communications, the text messages relating to suspicious behavior, this is from all there in green, Whats up, ready to work or what? Clark, I got tools, etcetera. Also shows photo of them, as with regards to Oliver, photos of them all together, photos of clothes depicted on the video surveillance, with regards to him, more photos of stolen items taken from an event, and the social security cards. And we could go on and on with the Facebook and LetGo accounts, which are under his account, Clark. They gave no mention of that in their opening

statements or just now. Multiple photos of both of them together. Multiple pictures of stolen property remained and the multiple items, and clothing that he's wearing that matches video surveillance.

Folks, you better believe, is it all we had is circumstantial evidence, which is the law, that flat out tells you, a lot of times that's all we have to rely on. It allows you to infer their intent. If that's all we had, we'd be right here, guaranteed, telling you, those are your two people that are guilty of the -- all crimes charged.

But it gets better. Rarely do we have hard direct evidence. What do we got? Esther Chae. Attack her all you want. The woman picked him out of a six pack line up, 50 percent, identified in court, saw both of them come out of a room. She gave an accurate description of the female with a tote bag, describe her (indiscernible) bag, and the male, the person she identified in the six pack photo lineup with a backpack.

And folks, once again, the DNA evidence that came in this case, couldn't have been at a better location for the prosecution, and for the jury to tie these two up. Sure enough -- and by the way, defense counsel objected. You're entitled to a playback if you want one or need one. You heard from that CSA that took the stand, why she took those. It was believed to be in the peephole.

And even if it wasn't even if it was just on the ground, can you imagine the DNA evidence showing up, comes back to Oliver? 16.4 octillion times more likely to have originated from her than an unknown.

And just for an extra bonus, we -- she left back an extra print on that Motorola of a right index finger on another event.

Folks, the law makes no distinction between the weight to be given to either direct or circumstantial evidence. Therefore, all the evidence in the case, including circumstantial evidence, should be considered at you when you're arriving at your verdict, from the very first piece of evidence to the very last.

The evidence in this case, what you are to consider, consists of testimony of the witnesses, the exhibits and any facts admitted to or agreed to by counsel.

Sitting back in the jury deliberations, someone say, you know what, speculate as to, you know, what if we had this evidence, speculate and say, what if he said that, you know, it's possible that this could have happened, you know, it's possible if this -- if this would have played out. Maybe -- maybe they could have done this. All that stuff is not reasonable doubt.

And folks, once again, it's not my spin on it. It's the law. This is your reasonable doubt instruction. A

reasonable doubt is one based on reason. It is not mere possible doubt but is such a doubt as would govern or control a person in the more weighty affairs of life. If in the minds of the jurors, after the entire comparison and consideration of all the evidence, are in such a condition that they can say they feel an abiding conviction of the truth of the charge, there is not a reasonable doubt.

It goes on to say, doubt to be reasonable must be something actual you could grasp onto, not mere possibility or speculation.

The State of Nevada asks that you hold these two defendants accountable for their actions and find them guilty of all counts. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Mr. Lexis.

Ladies and gentlemen, we're just -- we're approaching the 5:00 o'clock hour and we had told you that we expect the trial to take six or seven days. We have completed everything now. So we're going to have you come back on Monday morning at 9:00 a.m. for deliberations. You won't wait for us. As soon as you arrive, you can deliberate -- deliberate on this case.

You're to come back on Monday, wait outside this courtroom like you've been doing all along, and the Marshal will escort you in at that time.

So, ladies and gentlemen, during this weekend

recess, you must not discuss or communicate with anyone, 1 2 including your fellow jurors, in any way regarding the case or its merits, either by voice, phone, e-mail, text, Internet, or 3 other means of communication or social media. You're not to 4 read, watch, or listen to any news or media accounts or 5 commentary about the case. You're not to do any research such 6 7 as consulting dictionaries, using the Internet or using 8 reference materials. You're not to make any investigation, test the theory of the case, recreate any aspect of the case, 9 10 or any other way to investigate or learn about the case on 11 your own. And you're not to form or express an opinion regarding this case until this matter is submitted to you. 12 13 Have a safe drive home. We'll see you back Monday, 14 9:00 a.m. 15 THE MARSHAL: Leave your instructions and your 16 notepad on your desk. Leave everything here. Leave 17 everything that -- yep. 18 All rise for the exit of the jury. 19 No, leave everything. Leave your -- well, take all 20 your personal items with you, but your notepads and your jury 21 instructions, leave right on your desk or on your chair. 22 (Outside the presence of the jury.) THE COURT: All right. Can all counsel provide my 23

Court Clerk with your contact information for Monday?

MR. HART: We already did.

24

25

C-20-351676-1/2 | State v. V. Oliver and D. Clark | JT - DAY 5 | 4-16-2021

<u>INDEX</u>					
					PAGE
STATE'S CLOSING ARGUMENT BY MS. COLE					. 67
DEFENDANT OLIVER'S CLOSING ARGUMENT BY MR. HART	•			•	103
DEFENDANT CLARK'S CLOSING ARGUMENT BY MR. ARNOLD.		•		•	111
STATE'S REBUTTAL CLOSING ARGUMENT BY MR. LEXIS				•	141
WITNESSES					
STATE'S WITNESSES:					PAGE
OFFICER PRESTON ELLIS					
Direct Examination by Ms. Cole				•	. 8
Cross-Examination by Mr. Hart		•			. 12
DETECTIVE JAMES DOWNING					
Direct examination by Ms. Cole					. 13
Cross-examination by Mr. Hart				•	. 51
Redirect examination Ms. Cole					. 57

* * * * *

ATTEST: I hereby certify that I have truly and correctly transcribed the audio/visual proceedings in the above-entitled case.

Julie Hord

VERBATIM DIGITAL REPORTING, LLC

Electronically Filed 9/14/2021 2:58 PM Steven D. Grierson CLERK OF THE COURT

TRAN

DISTRICT COURT
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA
* * * * *

THE STATE OF NEVADA,

Plaintiff,

vs.

DEPT. NO. XVII

VENESHIA LANETTE OLIVER, and DARRELL CLARK,

Defendants.

Defendants.

BEFORE THE HONORABLE MICHAEL P. VILLANI, DISTRICT COURT JUDGE

MONDAY, APRIL 19, 2021

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS: JURY TRIAL - DAY 6

APPEARANCES:

FOR THE STATE: CHAD N. LEXIS, ESQ.

Chief Deputy District Attorney

MADILYN M. COLE, ESQ.
Deputy District Attorney

FOR DEFENDANT OLIVER: MARTIN W. HART, ESQ.

FOR DEFENDANT CLARK: CARL E. ARNOLD, ESQ.

RECORDED BY: CYNTHIA GEORGILAS, COURT RECORDER TRANSCRIBED BY: VERBATIM DIGITAL REPORTING, LLC

Page 1

```
LAS VEGAS, CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA, MONDAY, APRIL 19, 2021
 1
               (Court, counsel, defendants not present.)
 2
           (Jury reconvened at 9:07 a.m. for deliberations.)
 3
 4
                   THE MARSHAL: All rise for the entering jury.
              Jury, be seated.
 5
          (CLERK SWEARS MARSHAL TO TAKE CHARGE OF THE JURY.)
 6
              THE CLERK: Thank you.
 7
              THE MARSHAL: All rise for the exit of the jury.
 8
 9
            (Jury retires to begin deliberations 9:09 a.m.)
                   (Court in recess until 3:12 p.m.)
10
11
                  (Outside the presence of the jury.)
              THE COURT: On the desk there, next to Mr. Hart.
12
13
    And Mr. Hart has a copy of the Jury Instructions if you want
14
    to refer to those.
15
     (Pause in proceedings - attorneys review juror's question.)
16
              THE COURT: All right. Is there an agreement?
              MR. LEXIS: Your Honor, the State would request that
17
    the word "indeed", the Court refers you back to Count 25 of
18
    the Indictment.
19
20
              THE COURT: Mr. Arnold?
21
              MR. ARNOLD: I agree with that.
22
              THE COURT: Mr. Hart?
23
              MR. HART: And if you want to add supplemental,
24
    where it is referring to the count of coercion. Count 25 is
    the count of coercion.
25
```

1 MR. LEXIS: It's just without supplementing the jury 2 instructions, Judge, I mean, I think referring them back to Count 25 is as clear as it could be. 3 4 THE COURT: Mr. Hart, I wasn't quite clear what 5 you're requesting. MR. HART: We could put on there that each Count, or 6 7 you could -- that each count is included in each instruction, 8 to lead them back to this crime, being the coercion, not the 9 burglary, not the robbery, because I think that's their 10 confusion. THE COURT: Well, they identify Count 25 and 3 in 11 12 their note. It says, "What is the term for 13 MR. HART: Yeah. 14 crime related to coercion or the others." And the crime it's 15 related to is coercion. 16 THE COURT: I think everyone's in agreement on -- in agreement on that specifically referring to Jury Instruction 17 -- is that 3? 18 19 MR. HART: They're asking about Section 3, the 20 conspiracy to commit a crime. 21 MR. LEXIS: And I think it may refer to the crime --22 MR. HART: This crime. 23 MR. LEXIS: -- in Count 25, coercion, (indiscernible). 24 25 THE COURT: Well, it says, "Does the term apply to

MR. HART: I was just saying it with a little

24

25

specificity.

C-20-351676-1/2 | State v. V. Oliver & D. Clark | JT - DAY 6 | 4-16-2021 1 THE COURT: Why don't you start typing. Repeat that, Mr. Lexis or Ms. Cole, whoever. She's 2 3 going to type as you speak. 4 THE COURT RECORDER: And speak loudly, Mr. Lexis, 5 please. Do you want my (indiscernible)? 6 MR. LEXIS: 7 Yeah. Just -- just repeat it again for THE COURT: 8 the Clerk who is going to type up --9 MR. LEXIS: The State requests that the Court say, The Court refers the jury back to Count --10 11 MS. COLE: 25. MR. LEXIS: -- 25 of the Indictment. 12 13 THE COURT: Isn't that what you were asking for, Mr. 14 Hart? 15 MR. HART: And I would say, which is the coercion 16 count. THE COURT: Well, it says it right there. 17 MR. HART: The crime of coercion. 18 19 THE COURT: We'll say, Count 25 of the Indictment, 20 see Jury Instruction No. 3. 21 THE CLERK: Okay. 22 THE COURT: Because that's what it is. 23 MR. HART: Well, Jury Instruction 3 is the Indictment. 24 25 THE COURT: Correct. I'm saying, look to Count 25

C-20-351676-1/2 | State v. V. Oliver & D. Clark | JT - DAY 6 | 4-16-2021 1 says. 2 MR. ARNOLD: Right. 3 MS. COLE: So there's no need for us to supplement. 4 I mean, that's what it says. 5 MR. ARNOLD: Yeah. But they're not saying -they're not referring to Number 3 Jury Instruction. 6 They're 7 referring to Number 3 --8 MS. COLE: Number 3 is the --9 MR. ARNOLD: -- subsection --10 MS. COLE: -- Indictment. Yes. 11 MR. HART: Yeah. MR. ARNOLD: It's subsection 25. 12 13 MS. COLE: Yes. 14 THE COURT: Or is this -- or is it --15 MS. COLE: Yes. 16 THE COURT: -- alternative -- or is it theory number three of Count 25? 17 18 MR. HART: Yeah. 19 MS. COLE: Yes. That's what they're --20 MR. HART: 21 MS. COLE: Yes. Theory No. 3 --22 MR. HART: -- asking about. 23 MS. COLE: -- of Count 25. MR. ARNOLD: So refer them back to --24 25 THE COURT: Should we send a note in just to say,

C-20-351676-1/2 | State v. V. Oliver & D. Clark | JT - DAY 6 | 4-16-2021 1 are you referring to --2 MR. HART: Theory Number --3 MR. LEXIS: Judge, that's the only place where it 4 has (indiscernible) --MS. COLE: The -- yeah -- yeah, that's pretty clear. 5 MR. LEXIS: (indiscernible). 6 7 MS. COLE: That's what they're referring to. MR. LEXIS: Yeah. They put -- they put number 3 8 9 here. Unless -- if you want --10 THE COURT: Okay. 11 MR. LEXIS: -- to go even more specific, I guess we could say --12 MR. HART: This crime is conspiracy. 13 14 MR. LEXIS: -- the -- the term crime in Count 25 refers to --15 16 MR. HART: Coercion. MR. LEXIS: -- coercion. That's fine. Are you good 17 with that? 18 19 MR. ARNOLD: Yeah. 20 THE COURT: Okay. 21 MR. HART: Yeah. 22 THE COURT: Type that up, Samantha. Did you hear 23 what they said? THE CLERK: Yeah. The term in Count 25 refers to 24 25 coercion.

C-20-351676-1/2 | State v. V. Oliver & D. Clark | JT - DAY 6 | 4-16-2021 1 MR. LEXIS: The term crime --THE COURT: The --2 3 THE CLERK: The term crime. Okay. 4 MS. COLE: But say specifically --5 MR. ARNOLD: Say 25, subsection (3). 6 MR. LEXIS: In Count -- yeah, in Count 25, 7 subsection (3). 8 MS. COLE: Line 17. 9 MR. ARNOLD: Refers to the coercion count. THE COURT: Can you print it here now? 10 THE CLERK: 11 No. THE COURT: Just send it up --12 THE CLERK: 13 I'll send it to Cory. 14 THE COURT: Does it go to the printer next to Cory? 15 THE CLERK: Yeah. It --THE COURT: And then have it bring it down. 16 THE CLERK: -- I can send it to him, yeah. 17 18 MR. LEXIS: Could you repeat it one more time now? 19 THE CLERK: Sure. The Court refers the jury back to 20 Count 25 of the Indictment. See Jury Instruction No. 3. 21 term crime in Count 25, subsection (3), line 17, refers to 22 coercion. 23 MR. ARNOLD: You've got to strike out that whole 24 first part. 25 MR. LEXIS: Yeah. The first part, forget it.

C-20-351676-1/2 | State v. V. Oliver & D. Clark | JT - DAY 6 | 4-16-2021 1 MR. ARNOLD: Because that's going to confuse them. 2 MR. LEXIS: Yeah. 3 THE CLERK: So, the Court refers the jury back to 4 Count 25 of the Indictment? 5 THE COURT: Slower. Read it slower. Go ahead. THE CLERK: Oh. The Court refers the jury back to 6 7 Count 25 of the Indictment. See Jury Instruction No. 3. 8 term crime in Count 25, subsection (3), line 17, refers to 9 coercion. 10 MR. LEXIS: Okay. It's going to start with "the 11 crime". We're going to start with -- the sentence, "The 12 crime." Correct, Arnold? 13 MR. ARNOLD: Right. 14 THE CLERK: Okay. 15 MR. ARNOLD: So, say it --THE CLERK: So get rid of it. 16 MR. ARNOLD: -- one more time, that sentence that 17 18 you said. 19 MR. LEXIS: And start with "The crime". 20 THE COURT: Read it slower. 21 THE CLERK: Okay. "The term crime in Count 25, 22 subsection (3), line 27, refers to coercion." 23 MR. LEXIS: Correct. 24 THE CLERK: Is that --25 MS. COLE: Perfect.

C-20-351676-1/2 | State v. V. Oliver & D. Clark | JT - DAY 6 | 4-16-2021 1 THE COURT: There you go. Okay. THE CLERK: All right. Let me send this to Cory 2 real quick. 3 4 THE COURT: Is there a phone here? Let's call Cory 5 to make sure he's there so we aren't -- we're not waiting. (Pause in the proceedings.) 6 7 THE COURT: In the event that we have a bifurcated 8 trial that goes forward, are the parties ready? 9 MR. LEXIS: Yes, Judge. Whether -- whether it's --MR. ARNOLD: Yes. 10 11 MR. LEXIS: -- not guilty or guilty, the -- the 12 State's ready to proceed. THE COURT: Mr. Arnold? 13 14 MR. ARNOLD: Yes, Your Honor. 15 THE COURT: Because that would only apply to your client, not to Mr. Hart's; correct? 16 17 MR. ARNOLD: Right. 18 MR. HART: That means I get to leave; right? 19 THE COURT: Correct. 20 MR. HART: Okay. 21 THE COURT: I'm not assuming anything. 22 (Clerk/Marshal conferring.) 23 THE COURT: Counsel, is this -- everyone agrees to 24 -- Mr. Arnold, if you can hand that out to your colleagues. 25 (Pause in the proceedings.)

1 MR. ARNOLD: Yeah. It's perfect. 2 MR. HART: Yeah. THE COURT: And State? 3 MS. COLE: Yep. 4 5 MR. LEXIS: Yes, Judge. THE COURT: Okay. Then we'll give this to the 6 7 Marshal to give to the jurors. 8 Is everyone going to be within ten minutes of the Courthouse? 9 10 MR. LEXIS: Yes, sir. MR. ARNOLD: Yes, Your Honor. 11 THE COURT: All right. 12 MR. HART: Yeah. 13 14 (Court recessed at 3:28 p.m., until Tuesday, 15 April 20, 2021, at 10:19 a.m.)

C-20-351676-1/2 | State v. V. Oliver & D. Clark | JT - DAY 6 | 4-16-2021

ATTEST: I hereby certify that I have truly and correctly transcribed the audio/visual proceedings in the above-entitled case.

16

Julie Hord

VERBATIM DIGITAL REPORTING, LLC

Electronically Filed 9/14/2021 3:02 PM Steven D. Grierson CLERK OF THE COURT

TRAN

DISTRICT COURT
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA
* * * * *

THE STATE OF NEVADA,

Plaintiff,

vs.

DEPT. NO. XVII

VENESHIA LANETTE OLIVER,
and DARRELL CLARK,

Defendants.

Defendants.

BEFORE THE HONORABLE MICHAEL P. VILLANI, DISTRICT COURT JUDGE

TUESDAY, APRIL 20, 2021

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS: JURY TRIAL - DAY 7

APPEARANCES:

FOR THE STATE: CHAD N. LEXIS, ESQ.

Chief Deputy District Attorney

MADILYN M. COLE, ESQ.
Deputy District Attorney

FOR DEFENDANT OLIVER: MARTIN W. HART, ESQ.

FOR DEFENDANT CLARK: CARL E. ARNOLD, ESQ.

RECORDED BY: CYNTHIA GEORGILAS, COURT RECORDER TRANSCRIBED BY: VERBATIM DIGITAL REPORTING, LLC

Page 1

LAS VEGAS, CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA, TUESDAY, APRIL 20, 2021

(Case called at 10:19 a.m.)

(Outside the presence of the jury.)

THE COURT: All right. Counsel, we're on the record right now. I've been advised --

THE MARSHAL: Sorry.

THE COURT: It's okay. I've been advised that we do have a verdict for the defendants. I've been advised by the Marshal that after the jurors told the Marshal that they had a verdict, they were about to leave the courtroom and maybe take their personal break. While on their personal break, I guess some maintenance workers came into the courtroom. There was three or four of them, and were standing here, I guess discussing what work they have to do in the courtroom.

The Marshal came in and advised them, or asked them, what are you doing here? We're in the middle of a trial. And they said, we were told to do some work in the courtroom.

The Marshal advised them to leave the courtroom because we were in the middle of a trial.

And so I just wanted to advise all the parties that there was someone in this courtroom, obviously, not when the jury was here, it's just when the jurors were on the their break they came in, to like I said, look at something they had to fix. And thereafter, the Marshal told them to leave the courtroom, which they did.

stand.

VERDICT RE: DEFENDANT VENESHIA OLIVER

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE CLERK: District Court, Clark County, Nevada, State of Nevada, plaintiff, versus Veneshia Oliver, Defendant. Case No. C-20-351676-1, Department 17.

Verdict. We the jury in the above entitled case find the defendant, Veneshia Oliver, as follows:

1 Count 1. Conspiracy to Commit Larceny, Gary 2 Krusinski; guilty of Conspiracy to Commit Larceny. 3 Count 2. Conspiracy to Commit Burglary, Gary 4 Krusinski; guilty of Conspiracy to Commit Burglary. Count 3. Residential Burglary, Gary Krusinski; 5 6 guilty of Residential Burglary. 7 Count 4. Invasion of a Home, Gary Krusinski; guilty 8 of invasion of a home. 9 Count 5. Burglary of a Business, Sbarro; quilty of burglary of a business. 10 11 Count 6. Burglary of a Business, 7-Eleven; guilty 12 of Burglary of a Business. Count 7. Fraudulent use of a debt or credit card, 13 14 Gary Krusinski at Sbarro; quilty of fraudulent use of debt or credit card. 15 16 Count 8. Fraudulent use of a debt or credit card, Gary Krusinski, 7-Eleven; quilty of fraudulent use of debt or 17 credit card. 18 19 Count 9. Conspiracy to commit larceny, Inga 20 Williams and/or Kate Berry, and/or Marissa Metro, and/or 21 Brooke Bargholtz, and/or Rebecca Finger; guilty of conspiracy 22 to commit larceny. 23 Count 10. Conspiracy to commit burglary, Inga 24 Williams and/or Kate Berry, and/or Marissa Metro, and/or

Brooke Bargholtz, and/or Rebecca Finger; guilty of conspiracy

25

1 burglary.

Count 11. Residential burglary, Inga Williams and/or Kate Berry, and/or Marissa Metro, and/or Brooke Bargholtz, and/or Rebecca Finger; guilty of residential burglary.

Count 12. Invasion of a home, Inga Williams and/or Kate Berry, and/or Marissa Metro, and/or Brooke Bargholtz, and/or Rebecca Finger; guilty of invasion of a home.

Count 13. Theft, Inga Williams and/or Kate Berry, and/or Marissa Metro, and/or Brooke Bargholtz, and/or Rebecca Finger; guilty of theft, \$1200 or more.

Count 14. Burglary of a Business, Target; guilty of burglary of a business.

Count 15. Attempt fraudulent use of a credit or debit card, Rebecca Finger, Target; guilty of attempt fraudulent use of a credit or debt card.

Count 16. Attempt fraudulent use of a credit or debit card, Rebecca Finger, Target; guilty of attempt fraudulent use of a credit or debt card.

Count 17. Attempt fraudulent use of a credit or debit card, Rebecca Finger, at Target; guilty of attempt fraudulent use of credit or debt card.

Count 18. Attempt fraudulent use of credit or debit card, Brooke Bargholtz, Target; guilty of attempt fraudulent use of credit or debt card.

1	Count 19. Conspiracy to commit larceny, Esther
2	Chae; guilty of conspiracy to commit larceny.
3	Count 20. Conspiracy to commit larceny, Esther
4	Chae; guilty of conspiracy to commit burglary.
5	Count 21. Residential burglary, Esther Chae; guilt
6	of residential burglary.
7	Count 22. Invasion of home, Esther Chae; guilty of
8	invasion of home.
9	Count 23. Theft, Esther Chae; guilty of theft,
10	\$1200 or more.
11	Count 24. Robbery, Esther Chae; guilty of robbery.
12	Count 25. Coercion, Esther Chae; guilty of
13	coercion.
14	Count 26. Conspiracy to commit larceny, Bertha
15	Geradeau and/or Latoya Gustus; guilty of conspiracy to commit
16	larceny.
17	Count 27. Conspiracy to commit burglary, Bertha
18	Gerdeau and/or Latoya Gustus; guilty of conspiracy to commit
19	burglary.
20	Count 28. Residential burglary, Bertha Gerdeau
21	and/or Latoya Gustus; guilty of residential burglary.
22	Count 29. Invasion of the home, Bertha Gerdeau
23	and/or Latoya Gustus; guilty of invasion of the home.
24	Count 30. Theft, Bertha Gerdeau and/or Latoya
25	Gustus; guilty of theft, \$1200 or more.

1	Count 31. Conspiracy to commit larceny, Jewell Love
2	and/or Raven Hough, and/or Devonica (phonetic) Jones, and/or
3	Patricia Williams; guilty of conspiracy to commit larceny.
4	Count 32. Conspiracy to commit burglary, Jewell
5	Love, and/or Raven Hough, and/or Devonica Jones, and/or
6	Patricia Williams; guilty of conspiracy to commit burglary.
7	Count 33. Residential burglary, Jewell Love and/or
8	Raven Hough, and/or Devonica Jones (phonetic), and/or Patricia
9	Williams; guilty of residential burglary.
10	Count 34. Invasion of the home, Jewell Love and/or
11	Raven Hough, and/or Devonica Jones, and/or Patricia Williams;
12	guilty of invasion of the home.
13	Count 35. Theft, Jewell Love, and/or Raven Hough,
14	and/or Devonica Jones, and/or Patricia Williams; guilty of
15	theft, \$1200 or more.
16	Count 36. Possession of debit or credit card
17	without cardholder's consent, Victoria's Secret card; guilty
18	of possession of document or personal identifying information.
19	Count 37. Possession of burglary tools; guilty of
20	possession of burglary tools.
21	Dated this 20th day of April, 2021, by Renae
22	Decesare.
23	Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, are these your
24	verdicts as read, so say you one, so say you all?
25	MEMBERS OF THE JURY: Yes.

C-20-351676-1/2 | State v. V. Oliver & D. Clark | JT - DAY 7 | 4-20-2021 1 THE COURT: Does either party, the State or Mr. 2 Hart, do you wish to have the jury polled? 3 MR. LEXIS: No, Your Honor. 4 MR. HART: Please, Your Honor. 5 THE COURT: All right. THE CLERK: 6 Did he say yes? 7 THE COURT: Pardon? 8 THE CLERK: Did he say yes? 9 THE COURT: He said yes. THE CLERK: Juror No. 1, is this your verdict as 10 read? 11 12 JUROR NO. 1: Yes. 13 THE CLERK: Juror No. 2, is this your verdict as 14 read? 15 JUROR NO. 2: Yes. 16 THE CLERK: Juror No. 3, is this your verdict as read? 17 JUROR NO. 3: Yes. 18 19 THE CLERK: Juror No. 4, is this your verdict as 20 read?

JUROR NO. 4: Yes.

THE CLERK: Juror No. 5, is this your verdict as

23 read?

22

JUROR NO. 5: Yes.

25 THE CLERK: Juror No. 6, is this your verdict as

C-20-351676-1/2 | State v. V. Oliver & D. Clark | JT - DAY 7 | 4-20-2021 1 read? 2 JUROR NO. 6: Yes. THE CLERK: Juror No. 7, is this your verdict as 3 4 read? 5 JUROR NO. 7: Yes. THE CLERK: Juror No. 8, is this your verdict as 6 7 read? 8 JUROR NO. 8: Yes. 9 THE CLERK: Juror No. 9, is this your verdict as read? 10 JUROR NO. 9: Yes. 11 THE CLERK: Juror No. 10, is this your verdict as 12 13 read? 14 JUROR NO. 10: Yes. 15 THE CLERK: Juror No. 11, is this your verdict as 16 read? JUROR NO. 11: Yes. 17 THE CLERK: Juror No. 12, is this your verdict as 18 19 read? 20 JUROR NO. 12: Yes. 21 THE COURT: All right. The Clerk will record the 22 jury verdict. And we'll set a sentencing date as follows. THE CLERK: It will be June 3rd at 8:30 a.m. 23 24 THE COURT: Defendant is remanded with -- held 25 without bail. She may be removed from the courtroom.

1	Now, we have a verdict form for Darrell Clark, which
2	the Clerk will now read.
3	VERDICT RE: DEFENDANT DARRELL CLARK
4	THE CLERK: District Court, Clark County, Nevada,
5	State of Nevada, plaintiff, versus Darrell Clark, Defendant.
6	Case No. C-20-351676-2, Department 17.
7	Verdict. We the jury in the above entitled case
8	find the defendant, Darrell Clark, as follows:
9	Count 1. Conspiracy to Commit Larceny, Gary
10	Krusinski; guilty of Conspiracy to Commit Larceny.
11	Count 2. Conspiracy to Commit Burglary, Gary
12	Krusinski; guilty of Conspiracy to Commit Burglary.
13	Count 3. Residential Burglary, Gary Krusinski;
14	guilty of Residential Burglary.
15	Count 4. Invasion of a home, Gary Krusinski; guilty
16	of invasion of a home.
17	Count 5. Burglary of a Business, Sbarro; guilty of
18	burglary of a business.
19	Count 6. Burglary of a Business, 7-Eleven; guilty
20	of Burglary of a Business.
21	Count 7. Fraudulent use of a debt or credit card,
22	Gary Krusinski, Sbarro; guilty of fraudulent use of debt or
23	credit card.
24	Count 8. Fraudulent use of a debt or credit card,
25	Gary Krusinski, 7-Eleven; guilty of fraudulent use of a debt

or credit card.

Count 9. Conspiracy to commit larceny, Inga
Williams and/or Kate Berry, and/or Marissa Metro, and/or
Brooke Bargholtz, and/or Rebecca Finger; guilty of conspiracy
to commit larceny.

Count 10. Conspiracy to commit burglary, Inga
Williams and/or Kate Berry, and/or Marissa Metro, and/or
Brooke Bargholtz, and/or Rebecca Finger; guilty of conspiracy
burglary.

Count 11. Residential burglary, Inga Williams and/or Kate Berry, and/or Marissa Metro, and/or Brooke Bargholtz, and/or Rebecca Finger; guilty of residential burglary.

Count 12. Invasion of a home, Inga Williams and/or Kate Berry, and/or Marissa Metro, and/or Brooke Bargholtz, and/or Rebecca Finger; guilty of invasion of a home.

Count 13. Theft, Inga Williams and/or Kate Berry, and/or Marissa Metro, and/or Brooke Bargholtz, and/or Rebecca Finger; guilty of theft, \$1200 or more.

Count 19. Conspiracy to commit larceny, Esther Chae; guilty of conspiracy to commit larceny.

Count 20. Conspiracy to commit burglary, Esther Chae; guilty of conspiracy to commit burglary.

Count 21. Residential burglary, Esther Chae; guilty of residential burglary.

1 Count 22. Invasion of a home, Esther Chae; guilty 2 of invasion of a home. 3 Count 23. Theft, Esther Chae; guilty of theft, 4 \$1200 or more. Count 24. Robbery, Esther Chae; guilty of robbery. 5 Count 25. Coercion, Esther Chae; guilty of 6 7 coercion. Count 26. Conspiracy to commit larceny, Bertha 8 9 Geradeau and/or Latoya Gustus; guilty of conspiracy to commit 10 larceny. Count 27. Conspiracy to commit burglary, Bertha 11 12 Gerdeau and/or Latoya Gustus; guilty of conspiracy to commit 13 burglary. 14 Count 28. Residential burglary, Bertha Gerdeau 15 and/or Latoya Gustus; guilty of residential burglary. 16 Count 29. Invasion of the home, Bertha Gerdeau and/or Latoya Gustus; quilty of invasion of the home. 17 18 Count 30. Theft, Bertha Gerdeau and/or Latoya 19 Gustus; guilty of theft, \$1200 or more. 20 Count 31. Conspiracy to commit larceny, Jewell Love 21 and/or Raven Hough, and/or Devonica Jones, and/or Patricia 22 Williams; guilty of conspiracy to commit larceny. 23 Count 32. Conspiracy to commit burglary, Jewell 24 Love, and/or Raven Hough, and/or Devonica Jones, and/or

Patricia Williams; guilty of conspiracy to commit burglary.

25

1	Count 33. Residential burglary, Jewell Love and/or
2	Raven Hough, and/or Devonica Jones, and/or Patricia Williams;
3	guilty of residential burglary.
4	Count 34. Invasion of the home, Jewell Love and/or
5	Raven Hough, and/or Devonica Jones, and/or Patricia Williams;
6	guilty of invasion of the home.
7	Count 35. Theft, Jewell Love, and/or Raven Hough,
8	and/or Devonica Jones, and/or Patricia Williams; guilty of
9	theft, \$1200 or more.
10	Count 38. Carrying is that right carrying
11	concealed firearm or other deadly weapon; guilty of carrying
12	concealed firearm or other deadly weapon.
13	Dated this 19th day of April, 2021, by Renae
14	Decesare.
15	Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, are these your
16	verdicts as read, so say you one, so say you all?
17	MEMBERS OF THE JURY: Yes.
18	THE COURT: Does either side wish to have the jury
19	polled; State?
20	MR. LEXIS: No, Your Honor.
21	THE COURT: Mr. Arnold?
22	MR. ARNOLD: No, Your Honor.
23	THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
24	The Clerk will record the verdict.
25	Ladies and gentlemen, I need to meet with the

attorneys for one brief moment on a procedural matter, so I'm going to meet with the attorneys in the back hallway. So if you can please just keep your seat.

Mr. Arnold, State?

(Bench conference - not recorded.)

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, we just have to resolve a procedural matter and we just need to put it on the record, and we have to put it on the record outside the presence of the jury panel.

So what we're going to do is, we're going to take just a five-minute recess, and we'll call you back in, and then we'll -- we'll finalize the case; okay?

So ladies and gentlemen, during this morning recess, you are not to discuss or communicate with anyone, including your fellow jurors, in any way regarding the case or its merits, either by voice, phone, e-mail, text, internet, or other means of communication or social media.

You're not to read, watch or listen to any news or media accounts or commentary about the case. You're not to do any research such as consulting dictionaries, using the Internet, or using reference materials. You're not to make any investigation, test the theory of the case, or recreate any aspect of the case, or in any other way investigate or learn about the case on your own. You're not to form or express an opinion regarding this matter until it's finally

1 submitted to you.

Again, just stay close by. It will be just five minutes.

THE MARSHAL: All rise for the exit of the jury.

(Outside the presence of the jury.)

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Arnold, we do have a bifurcated count, the ownership or possession of firearm by prohibited person. I've been handed a Guilty Plea Agreement. Would you please put on the record the negotiations?

MR. ARNOLD: Your Honor, I don't have a copy.

THE COURT: Oh.

MR. ARNOLD: Unless you put them on the --

THE COURT: Okay. And Mr. Clark, the Guilty Plea Agreement that's been handed to me says that you're agreeing to plead guilty to the charge of ownership or possession of firearm by a prohibited person.

That both parties, you, your attorney and the State stipulate to a 19 to 48 month term in the Nevada Department of Corrections. That this case, this ownership of possession of firearm by prohibited person, would run concurrent with all of the other counts in this case, and that you agree to forfeit the items listed in the Stipulation for Compromise of Seized Property.

Is that correct, Mr. Clark?

DEFENDANT CLARK: Yes, sir.

1	THE COURT: And do you wish and do you want to go
2	forward with the negotiations contained in the Guilty Plea
3	Agreement?
4	DEFENDANT CLARK: Yes, sir.
5	THE COURT: All right. Sir, for the record, what is
6	your what is your legal name?
7	DEFENDANT CLARK: Darrell Adam Clark, Jr.
8	THE COURT: How old are you?
9	DEFENDANT CLARK: 41.
10	THE COURT: How far did you go in school?
11	DEFENDANT CLARK: High school diploma.
12	THE COURT: Do you read, write and understand the
13	English language?
14	DEFENDANT CLARK: Yes, sir.
15	THE COURT: And sir, are you pleading guilty to the
16	charge of ownership or possession of firearm by a prohibited
17	person?
18	DEFENDANT CLARK: Yes, sir.
19	THE COURT: Before I can accept your plea of guilty,
20	I want to make sure it is freely and voluntarily entered. Has
21	anyone forced you to plead guilty?
22	DEFENDANT CLARK: No, sir.
23	THE COURT: Has anyone threatened you or anyone
24	closely associated with you in order to get you to plead
25	guilty?

1 DEFENDANT CLARK: No, sir. THE COURT: Sir, do you understand the sentencing 2 3 range of this particular charge that the Court can sentence 4 you to no more than six years, no less than one year in prison, and you can also be fined up \$5,000; do you understand 5 that; sir? 6 7 DEFENDANT CLARK: Yes, sir. 8 THE COURT: Do you understand that sentencing is 9 strictly up to the Court? No one can promise you probation, 10 leniency, or any special treatment? 11 DEFENDANT CLARK: Yes, sir. 12 THE COURT: And sir, is one of the reasons you're 13 pleading guilty to the charge of ownership or possession of 14 firearm by prohibited person is that you are guilty of that 15 offense? 16 DEFENDANT CLARK: Yes, sir. 17 THE COURT: All right. Sir, I have a copy of the 18 Guilty Plea Agreement in front of me. Is this your signature 19 on page five of the agreement? 20 DEFENDANT CLARK: Yes, sir. 21 THE COURT: Sir, did you read the Agreement or was 22 it read to you? 23 DEFENDANT CLARK: Both. 24 THE COURT: Both? Okay. Did you understand 25 everything that you read, and everything that was read to you?

1 DEFENDANT CLARK: Yes, sir. THE COURT: If you had any questions regarding the 2 3 agreement, were they answered by your attorney? 4 DEFENDANT CLARK: Yes, sir. THE COURT: Sir, based upon all the facts and 5 6 circumstances of your case, are you satisfied with the services of your attorney for this charge? 7 DEFENDANT CLARK: Yes, sir. 8 9 THE COURT: And sir, are you a U.S. Citizen? 10 DEFENDANT CLARK: Yes, sir. 11 THE COURT: All right. Sir, I'm going to read the 12 allegation contained in the Second Amended Superceding Indictment and ask you if you committed this criminal offense. 13 14 It says that on or between August 16, 2020, and 15 August 21, 2020, here in Clark County, Nevada, that you 16 wilfully, unlawfully, and feloniously own or have in your possession and/or your custody or control a firearm --17 18 DEFENDANT CLARK: Yes, sir. 19 THE COURT: -- to wit: a Sig Sauer P229 Elite 20 bearing serial number AM168509, that you have been a convicted 21 felon, having in 2019, been convicted of attempt burglary in 22 Case No. C-19-338605, in the Eighth Judicial District Court, 23 Clark County, which is a felony, under the laws of the State of Nevada. 24

Did you do these things, sir, I just read to you?

25

25

voluntarily?

1 DEFENDANT CLARK: Yes, sir. THE COURT: All right. The Court so finds. 2 3 Sir, do you have any questions for me whatsoever 4 before I officially accept your plea of guilty to this charge? DEFENDANT CLARK: No, sir. 5 6 THE COURT: And you wish to go forward with these 7 negotiations, sir? DEFENDANT CLARK: 8 Yes, sir. 9 THE COURT: All right. The Court finds that the plea is freely and voluntarily entered, as well as the 10 11 Stipulation for Compromise of Seized Property. We will file this with the Court. 12 And you have a sentencing date as follows. 13 14 THE CLERK: June 3rd at 8:30 a.m. 15 THE COURT: All right. Thank you, sir. Thank you, counsel. And the defendant's remanded 16 without bail. 17 18 And counsel, as I mentioned, I'm going to call the 19 jury back in. I'm going to have the attorneys excuse 20 themselves. I'm just going to personally thank them for their 21 jury service like I would in the jury room, and then if the --22 if the attorneys wish to speak with the jurors after, they can 23 do so in the hallways, so there's more of an opportunity for 24 social distancing.

MR. ARNOLD: Your Honor, I have to go back upstairs

25

C-20-351676-1/2 | State v. V. Oliver & D. Clark | JT - DAY 7 | 4-20-2021 1 to finish a misdemeanor trial in front of Judge 2 (indiscernible). 3 THE COURT: Okay. 4 MR. ARNOLD: So can I excuse myself? THE COURT: Yes. Yes, please. 5 MR. ARNOLD: Thank you, Your Honor. 6 7 MR. LEXIS: And Madilyn --8 MR. ARNOLD: (Indiscernible). 9 MR. LEXIS: Madilyn wants to talk to them, Judge, so we'll be --10 11 THE COURT: Sure. MR. LEXIS: -- in the hallway. 12 THE COURT: 13 All right. And the Marshal will bring 14 the jury back in. 15 THE CLERK: (Indiscernible). 16 THE COURT: Or Ms. Cole or Mr. -- we need to have the Amended Indictment filed with the Court. 17 MS. COLE: Oh, for the filing? 18 19 THE COURT: Yeah. THE CLERK: The Third Amended is not in Odyssey. 20 21 you want (indiscernible) file it. 22 MS. COLE: Oh, okay. 23 THE COURT: Just file it today, please. 24 MS. COLE: Yes. We'll file it today. 25 THE COURT: Okay.

THE CLERK: (Indiscernible).

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

(Pause in the proceedings.)

THE MARSHAL: All rise for the entry of the jury.

(Inside the presence of the jury.)

THE COURT: All right. Ladies and gentlemen, the reason why I had you come in and I excused the attorneys, the case is over. On behalf of the Court system and my particular Department, I appreciate your service.

Clearly, you've taken your time, yesterday, you were very methodical and considered each of the counts. So that's exactly what we want you to do, and so we appreciate that.

Oftentimes after a jury trial, the attorneys want to speak with the jurors, not to question the wisdom of your decision, but just to -- for you to critique their case, critique their presentation, give them any suggestions you may have. Maybe you've got some questions, why did you do this, why did you ask a particular question.

I believe one of the District Attorneys is going to be in the hallway. If you have any questions for them, they'll be more than happy to answer those for you. If you have any critique for the case, or their presentation, I'm sure that would be very helpful for them, so they can always learn, you know, to do a better job; okay?

Mr. Arnold has another hearing, so he won't be

outside, because he's -- he has to run to another courtroom.

But I just wanted to personally thank you for your service. I know it's -- it's easy to try to get out of jury duty, but all of you took your job seriously. And it is important that we have people such as yourselves willing to serve on juries and perform your civic duty.

I just have one question for you. Is there anything that the Court system could have done to make your service anymore pleasurable? Hopefully, it's pleasurably. But is there anything we could have done, or the system, or any suggestions, critiques?

Yes, sir?

JUROR NO. 11: Could you explain if -- it would have been nice to know who the alternate jurors were. We were assuming it would've --

THE COURT: Right.

JUROR NO. 11: -- been 13 and 14.

THE COURT: Right.

JUROR NO. 11: A lot of rumors were going around. I don't know if you could have told us that or not. I don't know.

THE COURT: We -- we don't typically tell you that because if you know you're an alternate you might think, I don't have to pay attention, because I'm an alternate.

Sometimes we randomly picked maybe Juror 4 or

something. But this time, the parties just agreed they'd have Jurors 13 and 14. And that's the way we did it.

Now, the reason why we sent you out of the room for a few minutes, there was another charge that you were not advised of. We can't advise you of that during the first portion of the trial.

The charge was possession of a firearm by a prohibited person, basically, meaning possession of firearm by an ex-felon. And during the trial, we can't tell you either one of the defendants are ex-felons. Okay. So that could prejudice your (indiscernible), you know, he's an ex-felon so he must have done this case.

So what happens is if you find someone guilty of any charge with a firearm, so now you can determine he had a firearm. So we have a little mini trial, which we were planning to do, but the State just has to prove he's an exfelon. And the way they would prove it is, have a certified copy of a Judgment of Conviction that he was an ex-felon. You deliberate for about 30 seconds, because you've already found that he had a gun. And now we have proof that he's an exfelon. You return your jury verdict, and then we just do -- do the same thing that we just did here, as far as make sure that's your verdict.

But he decided to go ahead and plead to that charge since you -- since the jury found him quilty of possessing a

firearm relating to the other counts. And obviously, there's documentation that he was an ex-felon. So that's why we had to do that. And we don't tell you up-front, because again, that could prejudice you to that.

JUROR NO. 3: Makes sense.

THE COURT: Any other questions? Yes?

UNIDENTIFIED JUROR: Just one thing. The statement I've made a couple times. The Summons, can you put report to the third floor? Because I don't know to go like, read the directories and all that stuff. So I was like,

(indiscernible) carry this (indiscernible) third floor.

12 THE COURT: Okay.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

UNIDENTIFIED JUROR: But they've -- they've -- seen it a lot of times.

THE COURT: All right. I'll -- I'll pass that along.

Anything else, or any -- again, thank you very much. Your -- your check for your services will be in the mail. The check's in the mail. And so, I assure you, it will be in the mail. And so, again, thank you.

Yes, ma'am?

JUROR NO. 2: I just have one question. Is our name on any kind of public records out there, you know, our full names?

THE COURT: The jury list is a public record. We

don't have -- we don't release your phone numbers, your address, or anything like that. We've been doing juries in -- you know, in this -- in our State for hundreds of -- you know, a hundred years or so or more. Obviously, we've never had an issue on that.

I know some people, I mean, particularly when we have gang cases, gang murder cases, we might have issue with that, where people are more concerned. This is -- you know, I can't -- I mean, there's no guarantees in the world. But just never had -- I have never had an issue. I've done about 215 jury trials. We've never had that issue.

Yes, ma'am?

JUROR NO. 2: I just want to thank you, because I've been to a lot of court hearings for my mom's situation that I mentioned in that following Monday, in the Summons, and I just want to say, you make it very easy. You're so easy to talk to, and just make me feel comfortable.

THE COURT: No, I appreciate that.

JUROR NO. 2: Yeah.

THE COURT: And one good -- I don't know if it's good or bad, maybe you're going to be happy or sad. Since you've served on a jury, we take your name out of the computer for the next 18 months.

JUROR NO. 2: Oh, good.

THE COURT: Okay?

1 JUROR NO. 2: I thought it was ten years. THE COURT: So you should not be getting a jury 2 3 summons for the next 18 months. But no, again, we do 4 appreciate your service. And if there's ever anything we can do, please don't hesitate to contact us. 5 6 So, yes, ma'am? JUROR NO. 8: I just have a quick question. 7 Even though our names and things are not going to be 8 9 out there, if -- because obviously if they ever get paroled or released, and this is a small town, are we going to be 10 informed of their release? 11 12 THE COURT: I believe -- no, you -- you won't. 13 JUROR NO. 8: Okay. Because I'm just concerned --14 THE COURT: You can contact the District Attorney's 15 Office --16 JUROR NO. 8: Um-h'm. 17 THE COURT: -- and they can put you on the list to be advised of that. 18 19 JUROR NO. 8: Um-h'm. 20 THE COURT: There again, we've -- we've -- as long 21 -- I've been an attorney since 1982. I was in the DA's office 22 in '84, for a couple years --23 JUROR NO. 8: Right. 24 THE COURT: -- and I did defense work. Never had a 25 situation.

1	JUROR NO. 8: Well, the reason I'm concerned is
2	because when I was a victim, as I said last week, they
3	released this person and he lived in this area
4	THE COURT: Okay.
5	JUROR NO. 8: for more than three years, before I
6	went I went to a second trial and testified. And I was never
7	informed.
8	THE COURT: So you can follow up with the District
9	Attorney's Office, they're more than happy to do it, because I
10	mean, I'm sure they will
11	JUROR NO. 8: Okay.
12	THE COURT: be more than happy to keep you
13	advised of what's going on with it.
14	JUROR NO. 8: Okay.
15	THE COURT: And we've just never had a typically,
16	they're mad at their attorney.
17	JUROR NO. 8: Yeah.
18	THE COURT: Then the DA. Then the Judge.
19	JUROR NO. 8: Right.
20	THE COURT: Okay? And so, but again, thank you very
21	much for your service. I appreciate it. And now you can talk
22	to anyone you want. Okay?
23	JUROR NO. 8: And I just want to say thank you for
24	understanding, too.
25	THE COURT: Well, thank you. And as I said, we I

C-20-351676-1/2 | State v. V. Oliver & D. Clark | JT - DAY 7 | 4-20-2021 think we might have the Deputy DA out there. If you want to talk with them, fine. If you don't, fine. MEMBERS OF THE JURY PANEL: Thank you. THE COURT: Thank you very much. Have a great day. (Court adjourned at 10:53 a.m.)

C-20-351676-1/2 | State v. V. Oliver & D. Clark | JT - DAY 7 | 4-20-2021 INDEX VERDICT RE: DEFENDANT VENESHIA OLIVER...... VERDICT RE: DEFENDANT DARRELL CLARK...... Page 30

C-20-351676-1/2 | State v. V. Oliver & D. Clark | JT - DAY 7 | 4-20-2021

ATTEST: I hereby certify that I have truly and correctly transcribed the audio/visual proceedings in the above-entitled case.

VERBATIM DIGITAL REPORTING, LLC

Julie Hord

Page 31