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THE COURT: Let's get on the record and we'11 answer that question.

Thank you. Back on the record in trial, Moore vs. Lasry, et al.

You all may have a seat. I don't think we need to restate appearances. Just keep in mind our reporter that's with us today is different than our reporter yesterday, and we'11 follow all the same rules. We'll speak up. Try to remember to give juror numbers and names as we're doing it -- you're doing a great job with that, by the way.

We had a little bit of delay. There's been one juror that was a little late, but it looks like everybody is here and ready to go. We do have an additional group of jurors. I did not bring them into the room. I'm having them sit down in jury services. I don't think we're going to need them. By my count, we have 1 ike 16 extra people in the room. And, you know, so far, things seem to be going fairly well here.

You were going to ask a question, Mr. Arntz, about folks observing in the courtroom.

| from my firm. Are they okay there, or -- |
| :---: |
| back over here. |
| THE COURT: well, it really depends on, you |
| know, what their advantage point would be best |
| served. There's still seats up here behind counsel |
| table, which we're not bringing the jurors in that |
| way, so that's not an issue, if they want to be |
| there; or they can be back there. We just have |
| jurors, you know, that -- they can probably be over |
| here behind this table, closer, because are you going to bring the rest of the jurors and line them |
|  |  |
|  |
|  |
| in the courtroom like yesterday. I told them the |
| rest of the gallery people would just line up so |
| you'11 feed them in. So it really depends on where |
| you're best -- |
| UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We'11 just sit back |
| here. |
| THE COURT: Al1 right. You can be in the |
| middle row. You don't have to be in the back row. That gives you a little bit better viewpoint. |
|  |  |
|  |

okay. Anything else before we bring the
jurors in and get started?
MR. ARNTZ: That's it, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay. I'm very hopeful. I don't know what you're all thinking in your agenda, but I really would like to complete jury selection today. Is that a possibility?

MR. MCBRIDE: I would love to, but I don't think it's going to be possible. I think each of our clients have to have an opportunity to be able to question and be able to ask the panel questions.
the court: well, I don't disagree, but we have -- you know, it's $1: 15,2: 15,3: 15,4: 15$-- we have 3 hours and 45 minutes. We can't finish his questioning and your questioning and your questioning in that amount of time?

MR. MCBRIDE: I will do my best,
Your Honor. But I think it's important and depends on how much information they're providing us when we ask these general questions. But I really do think it's important for us to get an idea of who these jurors are and which ones are going to be appropriate jurors for this case.

THE COURT: All right. Counsel, I don't disagree with you. I know it's important. You don't have to share with the Court what's important.
what's also important is we keep this trial on track.

MR. MCBRIDE: Understood.
THE COURT: And if we can finish jury selection today, we're fine. If not and we have to trail it over to Wednesday, then what are we looking at? Are we looking at trying to do openings with people who just got seated? Are we trying to then postpone openings until Thursday? And then where are we?

So this is why we, $I$ think, have to have an aspirational goal here. I know you have prepared your voir dire, but $I$ 'm asking you to be creative in that, if you can still do your inquiry, depending on the information -- counsel here is getting quite a bit of information. Lots of people are talking. You're getting to know these people. But, you know, we're not engineering this jury within an inch of its life. We're picking fair and impartial jurors, and I don't why we need to spend hours upon hours separately inquiring if you're getting information and you're doing the followup. I'm just asking you to be thoughtful to whatever your script is, that we try to work within the time frames.

MR. ARNTZ: Your Honor, if it helps, if it
helps at all, I really believe we're still going to be on track, even if we start with openings on Thursday.

THE COURT: Well, that helps a lot. I'm not inclined to start with openings on Thursday if we don't have to, like you know.

MR. ARNTZ: I understand.
THE COURT: But let's see where we go. But, you know, like I said, all I'm asking -- I know how important this is to both sides, and we've got two folks over here, and I get it -- all I'm asking is each of you have planned the trial you want to conduct. But $I$ have to oversee a whole trial, and I have to get a whole trial done.

So you can't just stay on your scripts.
You have to start to think along the lines of what gets us done and where we need to go. If we're still on track to finish by next week and we can take until Wednesday, fine. The giant group of people that we're going to keep bringing back here aren't going to be thrilled to be still in jury selection on Wednesday, but that's life.

MR. ARNTZ: Well, let me put it this way, $I$ was always planning on finishing my case in chief on Monday, and I will still finish my case in chief on

Monday.
THE COURT: Let's see how we do. All right.
MR. MCBRIDE: Thank you, Your Honor. And just so the Court is clear, $I$ don't intend on taking hours and hours of jury selection, but $I$ honestly don't know how much more that they're going to ask.

THE COURT: I don't either, and we'11 get started, you know, but we're talking 3 hours and 45 minutes. I thought we could finish. But if you tell me we can't --

MR. Mcbride: And I'11 do my best.
THE COURT: -- then so be it.
MR. MCBRIDE: I'11 certainly do my best.
THE COURT: Okay. That's all I'm asking. I'm not asking for anything special. I'm just asking -- this is the two days that we blocked for jury selection. I know we got a little bit behind, but plaintiff got rolling and he's in his mix, and let's, you know, try to get this done. You know, we're going to start later in the day. Now we've lost a little time $I$ get it with the juror being late and me committed. But we're going to start earlier than we anticipated and, you know, that was what we were looking at. So I'm just trying to keep to the schedule we actually already talked about.

MR. MCBRIDE: Understood, Your Honor.
the court: All right.
MR. ARNTZ: Understood, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Let's get the jurors.
THE MARSHAL: All rise for the jury.
THE COURT: All right. As the last few jurors are taking their seats, 1 '11 invite everyone else to have a seat. Thank you and welcome back, everyone, to day 2 of or voir dire, discussions with our potential jurors and those who might serve on this panel.

I will acknowledge that we have one missing seat or one juror who's no longer with us in the box of 20. We had, with counsel's discussion, gone ahead and excused, for the record, Juror ms. Ashley, Juror 627. She had expressed some language concerns and disability to be able to fully understand and be able to participate in this trial. So she has been excused.

We do need to call the next juror in line to fill that vacancy which is, if you'11 again remember as we were coming through between counsel table through what we call the "well" here and then around on the side to take your spot.
the CLERK: Badge 665, James Maltese.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Maltese.
Before $I$ have counsel for the plaintiffs
resume the questioning of the entire panel, now that you have joined the group of 20 , we'd like to get to know you a little bit better. I don't know if you can see the board well enough or if you can just --

MR. MALTESE: My name is James Maltese. My former job, I was assistant vice president and telecommunications manager for a financial firm in Manhattan. I have a BBA, business computer information systems and quantitative methods.

THE COURT: okay.
MR. MALTESE: I don't have a spouse or a domestic partner. I have no children. I've lived in Las vegas like two and a half years. Moved here from New York. I've been on two, one jury trial that ended after two days of trial they settled.

THE COURT: All right. when you say "settled," we use that term typically when we're talking about a civil trial. Do you recall it to have been a civil trial?

MR. MALTESE: No. It was a burglary and a stabbing.

THE COURT: All right. So it was a criminal trial, but so there was a plea entered?

MR. MALTESE: Plea entered.
the court: is that how you understand it?
okay. And you said "second day of trial," so were you actually in the position of listening to witnesses and participating?

MR. MALTESE: Yes.
THE COURT: And just, again, for the record, even though we had called you right before you began speaking, you're Juror No. 665. Just remember if you're going to be responsive to any questions of counsel, that you give name and your Juror No. And your badge number, last three digits, and I'11 remind all of the jurors of that.

I think, at this time, you're ready to resume, Mr. Hymanson, with your questions?

MR. H. HYMANSON: No questions. Thank you.
the court: oh, no questions of this witness. No, but I meant you're going to resume with the panel.

MR. H. HYMANSON: I apologize. Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. H. HYMANSON: Thank you so much. Apologize for the confusion.

Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. Good
to see you all again.
Mr. Maltese, welcome to the panel.
THE COURT: And before you start, Mr. Hymanson, stay there. But $I$ did ask the general pane1 before Mr. Hymanson started yesterday, do you have anybody in your, you know, close circle, family member, close friend, you, yourself, in a prior job ever working in the medical field.

MR. MALTESE: I have a sister who is an R.N., and now she's an administrator in a hospital.

THE COURT: Okay. Have there been any occasions that you, a family member, a close friend have been involved in any medical malpractice 1itigation?

MR. MALTESE: My brother-in-1aw's family sued a doctor because of a heart problem or something, but they lost.

THE COURT: Okay. And how long ago was that?

MR. MALTESE: Maybe 10,15 years ago.
THE COURT: was that something that you were sort of directly involved in or just aware of?

MR. MALTESE: Not at all.
THE COURT: okay. Is that anything that would impact your ability to be fair and impartial
here?
MR. MALTESE: No.
THE COURT: Mr. Hymanson, whenever you're ready.

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

Ladies and gentlemen, we're going to start of with group questions like we're doing again -- or like we did yesterday.

What does it mean to take full responsibility for your actions?

Yes. Ms., is it "Bechtold"?
MR. BECHTOLD: Yes. Juror 624. To be accountable for your actions.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. And so what does being accountable for your actions mean to you?

MS. BECHTOLD: Doing what is expected of you under the rules or the practice or whatever your career is.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Does that involve -1et's say a hypothetical. There's two kids playing catch with a baseball, and one of them throws the ball over other kid's head, and it breaks a window. What is full accountability in that situation?

MS. BECHTOLD: He should have gone to the
owner and told his story that it was an accident and that he would come take responsibility for the breakage.

MR. H. HYMANSON: And when you say "take responsibility," would you say that paying to fix the window, is that what you consider part of the responsibility or not?

MS. BECHTOLD: Yes. Part of it. Yes.
MR. H. HYMANSON: okay. So saying that I did something wrong, but then doing what you can to compensate for the wrong that you caused. I don't want to put words in your mouth, but is that what you're saying?

MS. BECHTOLD: Yes.
THE COURT: Mr. Hymanson, can I ask a favor. You're kind of dancing around in front of the court reporter, and it's much easier if she can actually see the person speaking. So if you could either just be over there or be over here, it would be great. I don't mind if you move around. Just try not to stand in the line of sight of the court reporter.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Understood, Your Honor. Thank you very much, and I apologize.

THE COURT: Thank you.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Ladies and gentlemen, does anyone agree? Some people shaking their heads. okay. Does anybody disagree?

Yes, sir. Mr. Withers; correct?
MR. WITHERS: Bruce Withers, 618. So prior to before the window was broken, there was two people involved in the apartment, and they could have said, "Hey, we're getting kind of close to this house, maybe should move to a different location." So I think ownership is on both boys.

MR. H. HYMANSON: okay. And so you think that the two boys playing catch are both responsibile for the window being broken?

MR. WITHERS: Yes.
MR. H. HYMANSON: Do you still agree that taking full responsibility is to compensate the owner of the house for the damage that's been done? MR. WITHERS: Yes.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Do you think that it's important for people to take responsibility for their actions? Is that an important thing for people to do?

MR. WITHERS: Yes.
MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. Let's talk to Mr. Headd, Juror 633; correct?

MR. HEAD: Correct.
MR. H. HYMANSON: why is it important for people to take responsibility for their actions?

MR. HEAD: Well, if people didn't, it would be pandemonium. People could do whatever they want and get away with it and, you know, and it would make society really tough.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. Does anyone disagree with what Mr. Headd said?
okay. So everyone agrees that if people -people need to take responsibility for their actions; otherwise, it would make everything chaotic?

Does anyone have an opinion about, if it's important to compensate -- why it's important to compensate people for their harms and their losses?

Mr. "Eh7e"?
MR. EHLE: "Eh7e."
MR. H. HYMANSON: "Ehle." I apologize. Mr. Ehle, Badge No. 022 ; correct?

MR. EHLE: Uh-huh.
MR. H. HYMANSON: why is it important to compensate people for their harms and their losses?

MR. EHLE: Otherwise, there would be no consequences, $I$ guess.
 situation where like -- like, you know, like kids
have broken stuff at my house, and I'm like, "Don't worry. You guys were just playing." And it's like "I'll take care of it. Don't worry about it." It's just it kind of comes out to that. But for the most part, they could at least offer to clean up the glass. You know, just try to do your best, yeah. MR. H. HYMANSON: And I'm going to switch gears a little bit. I just want to talk -- does anybody have any strong feelings, one way or the another, about lawsuits? Yes, sir.

MR. HEADD: About 17 years ago --
THE COURT: Your name and your badge number, please.

MR. HEADD: Oh, Ryan Headd, 633. Back in, I think it was probably 2002, 2003, I was sued for \$10 million in a fender-bender. And so I, after a two-year process, it kind of came out to be a big waste of everybody's time, and it was basically people looking for a payday. And so ever since then, $I$ haven't really had a high opinion of civil suits.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. Did that case go to trial?

MR. HEADD: Yes.
MR. H. HYMANSON: And did it result in a
verdict, or did it settle before the trial was over? MR. HEADD: No. It resulted in a verdict. They were trying to get $\$ 10 \mathrm{million}$. They ended up getting a few thousand for medical expenses.

MR. H. HYMANSON: And is it fair to say that soured your opinion about people that file 1awsuits?

MR. HEADD: If it's a similar case. If it comes out to it's pretty obvious people are trying to get a payday, then yes. If it's something actually was done wrongly or, you know, something that's pretty obvious that somebody was gross negligence or something like that, then, yeah, it makes sense to me. But I think society has kind of gotten sue happy.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. what do you use as a basis to determine what you think is -- because I think you're saying -- and, again, I'm not trying to put words in anyone's mouth.

But what I think I understand you saying is that you think if it's a suit that you think has merit, you don't have a problem with that; but if you think it's a frivolous suit, you have an issue with that; is that fair?

MR. HEADD: Correct.

MR. H. HYMANSON: And what kind of criteria do you use to try to determine if it's what you think is a meritorious suit or a frivolous suit?

MR. HEADD: I think it depends on the situation. But if it's one of those accidents happen -- accidents happen every day. Does that mean somebody purposely hurt somebody on purpose? If it's something that's purely an accident, I don't think somebody else should really try to make millions of dollars off it.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Thank you very much.
THE COURT: And before you move on, I just want to clarify something. You used a term of art here, "gross negligence." I don't know if you meant that in any particular way or if that was just a term you were using.

But at the end of the day, $I$ just want to remind the jurors that whatever the causes of action are in this case and whatever those standard or law to be applied to them is, the Court will give it to you, and it will be your duty, as jurors, to follow that.

So I don't want there to be any misunderstanding that you won't have the instructions on that but that, you know, any kind of
idea that you might have in your mind about what the law to be, that's not your province. The Court will give you the law to apply. I just want to make sure everybody is clear on that.

Does anybody have any questions about that? All right. You may proceed, Mr. Hymanson.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Thank you very much
Your Honor. So following-up on what Mr. Headd said, just by a show of hands, does anybody have the opinion that there are too many lawsuits that are being filed today?

Okay. All right. Does anybody -- well, let's see. So, Ms. Price, you raised your hand. Why is it that you think there are too many lawsuits being filed today?

MS. PRICE: I had a similar situation. I was in a car accident about five or six years ago, and the other person was in the fault. However, they decided to sue me. It didn't wind up going through with anything. There was no -- there were no witnesses. There was no evidence on either side.
so nothing wound up happening. But it definitely stayed in the back of my mind that somebody would sue.

MR. H. HYMANSON: okay. Thank you very
much. And Badge No. 632; correct?
MS. PRICE: 632.
MR. H. HYMANSON: Thank you very much. Mr. Taylor, I believe you had your hand raised.

MR. TAYLOR: Yes.
MR. H. HYMANSON: And then why do you think that there are too many lawsuits?

MR. TAYLOR: 644. Yeah, I mean, there's circumstances where some lawsuits are justified. Some things happen, and compensation is necessary. However, it does seem like it's, as referenced earlier, people are sue happy. They just want a big payday, just for -- just because they can.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Mr., I think it was -- is it Burke?

MR. BURKE: Yes.
MR. H. HYMANSON: Badge No. 510; correct?
mR. bURKE: Yes.
MR. H. HYMANSON: Did you have your hand up a1so?

MR. BURKE: Yeah.
MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. And why do you think that there are too many lawsuits?

MR. BURKE: Just kind of a group's opinion,
just people looking for things that are going out of their way to put themselves in situations they don't need to be just so they can, you know, have it happen for them. Almost put yourself in harm's way to have something happen to you.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Can anyone think of a specific example that they can point to why they have this feeling there are too many lawsuits?

Yes, sir. Mr. -- I'm sorry. Mr. Wilder; correct?

MR. WILDER: 611. As a businessman, I've had a few of those lawsuits thrown at us too. As an example, we had a kid that was doing delivery for us, and believe it or not -- don't laugh -- he drove into a rehab bus. Out of ten -- there were ten people on this bus, and every one of them sued us. And every one of them, it was either dismissed or they got caught on film with investigators doing certain things.

It was really a nuisance suit, but it was extremely time consuming and it was pretty evident what was happening, and we had to settle all the little ones like that that were just kind of actually senseless and led now where in the end.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Does anybody think that
sometimes people have to sue to be compensated for the harm that's been done to them?

Does anybody disagree with that statement?
okay. Let's say -- Ms., is it "Sallee"?
MS. SALLEE: It's "Sallee."
MR. H. HYMANSON: "Sallee." I apologize, ma'am. Do you think that someone needs to sue sometimes to be justly compensated for the harm that's been done to them?

MS. SALLEE: They do sometimes. You know, whether it's medical or property or, you know. It depends on what it is obviously.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Does anyone have any example of how they would determine if they think a case is meritorious or if it's frivolous?

Yes, sir. Mr. Taylor. 644.
MR. TAYLOR: Yeah. Taylor, 644. If it comes down a he-said, she-said basically. If it's just somebody saying something just because and there's no way to quantify it to prove it, then it's hard to justify.

MR. H. HYMANSON: okay. I want to make sure that I understand what you're saying. So you think that if it comes down to a he-said, she-said, that that makes it meritorious?

MR. TAYLOR: No, no, no. It becomes, as mentioned before, frivolous basically. So without lack of evidence, facts, it becomes basically his word versus my word, her word, whoever's word.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. And so, again, I'm not trying to put words in your mouth. I'm just trying to see if $I$ understand you correctly.

Are you basically saying that you want to look to see if there's some other facts that back up what happened.

MR. TAYLOR: Precisely.
MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. Does everyone agree with Mr. Taylor by a show of hands?

Does anybody disagree with Mr. Taylor? Yes, sir. Mr. Read; correct?

MR. READ: I kind of do to -- I don't know. Like, we're just kind of like -- like that almost like kind of needs a lawsuit, kind of, to kind of settle it. It's just when things kind of don't -you can't come to agreement. I don't know. I've never been to a point where $I$ feel like I need to go to court or even get close, like over an issue. Like either trying to concede an issue or like kind of come to some kind of agreement.

But like, kind of like $I$ think lawsuits are
kind of you just can't come to an agreement like at all. Like, you know, $I$ think that's in -- that's kind of what's this process is about. It's kind of finally settling your argument that it's not like you guys can keep going around in circles.

MR. H. HYMANSON: And so it's fair to say that kind of goes back to what we were talking about before that sometimes you think it's necessary for a party to file a lawsuit to get resolution for something?

MR. READ: Yeah, yeah.
MR. H. HYMANSON: That they feel like, you know what, we're not being properly compensated for the harm that's been done to us. So we have to file this lawsuit?

MR. READ: Yeah. So even like -- yeah, he-said, she-said or whether it's. I just realized I probably should give my badge number. It's 637.

MR. H. HYMANSON: No problem.
MR. READ: I don't know why it just crossed my mind just now. But, yeah, so just kind of like where that is, so it's just kind of that situation where like, you know, I think that like you have -it's like, you know, like even if somebody is lying or not being totally honest or being straightforward,
like it's maybe where you're going to have to come up with the facts and at least make some kind of judgment on those facts.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Great. Thank you.
Ms. Clinton, $I$ haven't talked to you yet today. I know that you are a practicing attorney. what kind of law do you practice?

MS. CLINTON: I haven't practiced actively for awhile. I'll be starting a job in a few weeks. when $I$ was practicing, $I$ did civil litigation. MR. H. HYMANSON: Civil litigation. Okay. And your badge number is 658; correct?

MS. CLINTON: Yeah, 658.
MR. H. HYMANSON: What kind of civil
litigation did you do?
MS. CLINTON: Mostly business matters, contract disputes, and real estate issues.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. May I ask you where you're starting your new job.

MS. CLINTON: The Attorney General's office.

MR. H. HYMANSON: okay. Congratulations. Very exciting. How do you feel about lawsuits? Do you think there's too many? There's not enough?

MS. CLINTON: I don't have a feeling, one way or the other. I don't know how many lawsuits are filed. So it's all relative, how you look at it.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Nothing about your civil practice from before turned you off to thinking there's too many lawsuits or there's not enough 1awsuits?

MS. CLINTON: No.
MR. H. HYMANSON: Thank you very much.
So we've talked about lawsuits. Let's talk about jury verdicts. How many of you think that jury verdicts are too high? Anyone think that jury verdicts are too high?

No. No concerns about the size of jury verdicts? okay.

How do you feel about attorney advertising? Does anyone have an opinion about, you know, especially in this town, of advertising all over the place? Yes. Mr. Jones.

MR. JONES: Badge 625. Being retired now, having a chance to watch daytime television, there are attorneys everywhere, and I think that they do an injustice to the lawsuit system by basically making it seem as though it's very, very easy to get in a wreck, need a check; or, you know, $I$ mean, it's
just like $I^{\prime \prime m}$ in dire straits, but $I$ invent something, and all of a sudden, wow, I'm rich.

And I think they're really creating a real false sense of what the legal system is for and how it should be utilized. There's just -- especially if there are no down sides to bringing an issue. I think that it just makes it way too easy, and it's portrayed as something that should be a lot more careful. I think they should treat it like they do liquor on television. Be very, very careful who you advertise it to and how you put it out there because, you know, it involves some very, very serious situations, and I don't think those things get played up enough.

MR. H. HYMANSON: And I think you said a lot there. I want to ask you about one particular line in that. I think that if $I$ hear you correctly, you're saying that you think that they almost lessen the effect of the -- we talked about frivolous and meritorious cases, the fact that there's so many ads for everything. People say "hey, in a wreck, need a check," it kind of takes away from how people potentially view the meritorious lawsuits because the system just gets filled with a lot of frivolous lawsuits also. Is that kind of what you're saying?

MR. JONES: Yeah, that's correct. Yeah, there's so much garbage, you can't tell what's real. MR. H. HYMANSON: Understood. Does anyone agree with Mr. Jones?

Does anyone disagree with Mr. Jones?
Yes, sir. Mr. Grant; correct?
MR. GRANT: Yes. 634. While I agree that there are a lot of frivolous lawsuits, I think attorneys have every right to advertise their services because they're in business to make money. Just like I'm in business to make money, just like doctors are in business to make money. And I think all of them are -- it's fair game. Go out there, brand yourself in a certain way and have a catchy jingle with your phone number on it. Everyone knows that number, by the way, he just said.

But, to me, it's not the fault of someone watching daytime television and being confused with the process. It's up to their own merits to decide whether to reach out to an attorney or not. It's just that, you know, they're putting their sign on the door, so to speak, to get people out there to get them business so they can provide for their families. So I don't have anything against advertising.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Thank you very much.
By a show of hands, if you were injured, seriously injured by someone else's conduct, would you file a lawsuit?

I'm sorry. So Ms. Bechtold; correct?
MS. BECHTOLD: 624.
MR. H. HYMANSON: 624. You started saying something.

MS. BECHTOLD: It's not as clearcut as that for me.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. So what would it come down to for you?

MS. BECHTOLD: If I was seriously injured?
MR. H. HYMANSON: Correct.
ms. bechtold: okay. well, there are first a lot of facts to be known and medical treatment, and there's just a lot to go through before you just go sue somebody. And that's why there's a Statute of Limitations to kind of see, yes, you're really hurt in the beginning; but then, you know, who knows what's going to happen. So there's just a lot of different unknowns.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Absolutely.
MS. BECHTOLD: So just to go out and file one right off the cuff, out of the ambulance, I'm
not for that.
MR. H. HYMANSON: Understood. And it was really, as you put it, that was an incomplete hypothetical that I had, but just for the purposes of talking to people, that's what that was.

But that brings out something. So you worked as a paralegal for several years; correct?

MS. BECHTOLD: Yes.
MR. H. HYMANSON: And what type of law did the firm that you work for practice?

MS. BECHTOLD: We did insurance -- I did insurance defense for 15 years.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. And I'm sorry. I didn't mean to cut you off, ma'am.

MS. BECHTOLD: That's okay. I worked for some really special attorneys that we collected all the evidence, and they were very fair. If they felt that the plaintiff was injured, their recommendations, I always felt were fair.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. Is there anything about your experience working for so many years as an insurance defense paralegal that gives you any hesitation about serving as a juror on a medical malpractice case?

MS. BECHTOLD: No. I worked both sides.

Yeah.
MR. H. HYMANSON: And so you don't think there's anything about your experience that would make you give, lean more towards the defense or towards the plaintiff in this?

MS. BECHTOLD: No. I've actually worked for a plaintiff firm for like five years. So I've worked both sides, and I think I'm fair to look at all the information.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Thank you very much.
So I was also asking -- so the way you started on that was if you were injured by someone else's actions, if you were to file a lawsuit. So let's put a little bit more context to that.

Not right out of the gate, but if you tried to be -- what you tried to seek what you thought was just compensation and it wasn't offered you and you felt as though you had no choice, given that situation -- so you were severely injured and you're not offered enough to properly compensate you -given that factual scenario, does that change anyone's answer that didn't raise their hand about whether they'd file a lawsuit or not?

Yes, sir. Mr. Burke; correct?
MR. BURKE: Yes. 510.

MR. H. HYMANSON: And why does that change your answer?

MR. BURKE: Just because $I$ think, you know, some people take responsibility for their actions and if they hurt someone, they'11 -- you know, you can settle before you have to come to those terms or you file a lawsuit. But as you said, that's not happening and you have serious expenses or things to replace or anything like that, then that's when it comes into play to file a lawsuit.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. And I know that Mr. Jones said he wouldn't file a lawsuit.

Is there anyone else that said that they wouldn't file a lawsuit? No one else?

MR. MALTESE: "would" or "wouldn't"?
MR. H. HYMANSON: Would not.
MR. JONES: You didn't ask under what conditions, why they would file.

THE REPORTER: I'm sorry. The two gentlemen, please.

MR. H. HYMANSON: So that was Mr. Maltese, 665, to the right; and then Mr. Jones, 625.

THE REPORTER: Thank you.
MR. H. HYMANSON: And so, Mr. Jones, 625. You're saying "what conditions."

What conditions would it take for you to file a lawsuit?

MR. JONES: Is that something happened where I did not contribute to any of the law. I think that's -- if you know that it's solely someone else's fault. You know, you can have someone do something to you that hurt you, and you may have been involved in something that, by your own actions, that caused the situation to be worse than maybe it should have been.

So, yeah, I think that, you know, you have to look at what are all the facts, okay, before you run out and hire somebody and try to get everything done. There's -- just do your due diligence and make sure that it's right before you run out and make a legal issue.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Understood. Let me ask you this, you said if you were completely not at fault. But let's say if we're talking about fault, 100 percent. If you think you were 20 percent out of fault, would you file a lawsuit do you think, or do you think you wouldn't file a lawsuit?

MR. JONES: Depends on what the injury is.
MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. I apologize.
Mr. Maltese, 665.

MR. MALTESE: I was in the hospital over 20 times, and this one time, the nurse, the R.N. gave me an IV for a diabetic person. Now, I guess I could have sued, but I didn't because there was no real harm done really. So I don't know if that makes a difference.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. No. The basis of the scenario we've gotten away from a little bit was if you were severely injured or harmed by someone actions. That was what it was premised on. But thank you very much for volunteering that.

If there's something that you really need to remember, what do you do to remember, to try to remember that thing? So it's a very abstract question. It's switching gears a little bit.

But, yes, Mr. Headd; correct?
MR. HEADD: Yes. 633. Just go over it again and again and again, just so that it's, you know, engrained in your memory.

MR. H. HYMANSON: okay. So you just in your head, you try to remember it by repeating it in your head.

Okay. Does anybody write something down if they really want to remember something?

Anybody that -- any other tricks that
anyone has besides repeating it in their head, writing it down? Anything else?

Yes, sir. Mr. Taylor.
MR. TAYLOR: 644. Yeah, visualization. Basically imagining what the concept or idea or image, person, or whatever, putting it a word associating with a visual.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. Anybody else?
Let's talk about the effects of lawsuits. How many of you feel that lawsuits are hurting business? I see some hesitant hands in there.

So we'll start Mr. Withers.
MR. WITHERS: Withers, 618. In the industry $I$ work in, transportation, lawsuits are a norm. And it's, you know, whether it's at-fault negligence or it happened, it just happened, it's something that we actually hand off to our legal department. So it's up to us to collect all the information, document, pictures, so on, and then pass it on to the legal department.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Is there anything -- so this came up with saying that you think it hurts business. So is there anything that, of that opinion, that you think it hurts business that makes you feel that, you know, you might have a different
opinion coming in as a juror on a medical malpractice case like this?

MR. WITHERS: Well, I think with what we've talked about earlier today, there's a lot of frivolous lawsuits, and in my industry, there's a lot of frivolous lawsuits. When it comes to malpractice or just cause, rather, 1 think there's a place for it. Once again, if it's frivolous, it's just wasting people's time.

MR. H. HYMANSON: But there's nothing about -- it sounds like you're saying there's nothing about your background that just makes you automatically want to favor one side or the other.

MR. WIthers: No.
MR. H. HYMANSON: okay. And then I saw Mr. Grant, you had raised your hand; correct? MR. GRANT: Yes.

MR. H. HYMANSON: 634; correct?
MR. GRANT: 634. Sorry. I forgot again. MR. H. HYMANSON: That's all right. It's tricky.

MR. GRANT: No, I don't have any data to back it up whether it hurts business or not. It's strictly just opinion. I just know that if I am -let's say if $I$ am hired to photograph someone's
wedding, $I$ stress out a lot about potential mistakes because I don't want to be sued because I've read too many horror stories about it.

So as far as that, $I$ kind of just try to minimize mistakes as much as $I$ can to make sure that I don't have any lawsuits handed to me at some point.

MR. H. HYMANSON: And so it's something of your kind of personal anxiety about things. But has it affected your business at all?

MR. GRANT: It's kept me from doing more weddings, yeah. That's usually the field that they're more suing at.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Is there anything about that experience that makes you question your ability to serve on a medical malpractice case?

MR. GRANT: No.
MR. H. HYMANSON: And, Mr. Headd, you had your hand up also; correct?

MR. HEADD: Yeah.
MR. H. HYMANSON: 633?
MR. HEADD: Correct.
MR. H. HYMANSON: And why did you have your hand up?

MR. HEADD: Mainly just it seems like it
pulls away resources from everybody, time from the jurors, time from the courtrooms, time from everybody. And that being said, there is cases that absolutely should be in court and should be tried. But the frivolous ones, it's just hurting everybody else. It's eating our time, their time, everybody's time.

MR. H. HYMANSON: And we may have talked about this directly. If we did, I apologize. But I just want to get more revealed. So we talked about this definition of essentially two designations: A frivolous lawsuit or a meritorious lawsuit.
what do you do to determine what the difference of those is?

MR. HEADD: Oh, I think it depends on the situation. But it's -- like $I$ said, if it's just a pure accident, you know, some -- nobody is really trying to do harm to anybody else; or, you know, sometimes stuff just happens and if one party tries to sue the other over that, I think it's leaning towards potentially frivolous.

Then, again, if there's something that you have somebody hurt somebody else and it's completely their fault, then those people, you know, deserve to be able to go to court and be heard, and so it just
depends on the situation.
MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. Mr. Wilder, I saw that you had your hand up.

MR. WILDER: Yeah, 611. This might be a one off. But being in the construction business, our little company, we were delivering about 6,000 houses a year --

THE REPORTER: I'm sorry.
(The record was read.)
MR. WILDER: Oh, I'm sorry. And I'm the one that can't hear.

Anyway, we were in the kitchen cabinet business, and our little company was doing about 6,000 houses a year in kitchen and bath cabinetry for the major builders in Las vegas. But when the construction defect lawsuits came in, it was just brutal. Talk about hurting a business, almost destroyed ours.

MR. H. HYMANSON: okay. And so that's, you said kind of a one off because that's a bigger kind of --

MR. WILDER: Purely, purely one off for us because we had nothing to do with anything structural. But we got drug in and sued in every single one, thousands and thousands and thousands.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Is there anything about that experience that has affected how you think about lawsuits in general?

MR. WILDER: Not really. Not really. MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. You say "not really." So let's explore that a little bit more. Why do you say "not really"?

MR. WILDER: It was pretty traumatic. I mean, $I$ literally had to hire my own attorney to just work for me full time, just to handle it, and with no recourse. He would just coordinate with the insurance companies. But it left a pretty bad taste in my mouth, for sure. But, again, it's a one off. But I mean, that's how these things can get out of control when you say, when you talk about frivolous. MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. I appreciate that. So but it's fair to say that there is still some negative taste in your mouth for lawsuits?

MR. WILDER: Yeah, yeah. Probably right. Probably right.

MR. H. HYMANSON: okay. If you're just being completely honest, that's something that's happened for awhile.

MR. WILDER: Yeah.
MR. H. HYMANSON: And there's nothing that

I'm going to say today that's going to change how you feel about lawsuits?

MR. WILDER: Not that regard for that specific time, no.

MR. H. HYMANSON: This is a bit of a strange question: But if you hear that something bad has happened to someone, do you ever think that that's maybe because of something bad that they did in the past or that, you know, they had that coming for them, that they deserved that?

Has anyone ever had that feeling before?
MR. JONES: Talking about karma?
MR. H. HYMANSON: Sure. Talking about karma. So, Ms. Price, you had your hand up first. MS. PRICE: Yes.

MR. H. HYMANSON: So what do you think about that? So 632; correct?

MS. PRICE: 632. Yeah, and I guess I was in the same word, "karma," which is sometimes we put ourselves in situations that we shouldn't be putting ourselves into.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay, okay. what would be an example of that?

MS. PRICE: You leave your car open, unlocked. Somebody steals something out of your
car. Obviously, it's more out of some -- more on the person who's burglarizing you. But you did just make it a lot easier for them by leaving your car open.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Thank you very much.
Mr. Jones, you were talking about karma. So do you feel that sometimes karma is a real thing?

MR. JONES: I don't know if it's
necessarily a real thing. I think if people continue to think of bad things on them, that at some point, just the odds are that something bad is going to happen to you.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. And 625; correct?
MR. JONES: Yes.
MR. H. HYMANSON: I apologize. Okay. So if you're going to keep doing something bad, basically it's -- maybe playing with fire would be an example. People would say, "Oh, you're playing with fire" or something?

MR. JONES: Yeah.
MR. H. HYMANSON: That's what you're talking about with that?
okay. I believe -- well, let's see. We haven't heard from Mr. Fife; correct?

MR. FIFE: Yes.

MR. H. HYMANSON: what do you think about that? Do you think that just because -- so do you think that sometimes bad things happen because someone did something bad in the past?

MR. FIFE: 614. I guess not necessarily. But $I$ mean, $1 i k e$ he said, if you keep doing bad things, bad things are probably going to happen to you.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Thank you very much.
Does anyone have a problem with awarding damages for someone's pain and suffering?

Money damages for someone's pain and suffering, does that give anyone?

Yes, sir. Mr. Back; correct?
MR. BACK: Yes. 385. Were you saying if I had anything wrong with it?

MR. H. HYMANSON: Yeah. Do you have something that you think it would be hard for you to award money for someone for their pain and suffering?

MR. BACK: I actually have the inverse feeling.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. Let's talk about that.

MR. BACK: I may get a little emotional
talking about it. My little sister was born January 2006. She was born ten weeks premature.

THE COURT: Can I interrupt you for just one second, and may $I$ have counsel at the bench. Something just occurred, and I want to...
(Bench conference.)
THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
we are going to take a brief recess at this time. I know we've only been back at it about 45 minutes. But coming off of lunch is oftentimes a time when more breaks are better than less breaks. But, regardless, we're going to take a slightly over ten minute break. we'11 be returning at 2:15.

During this recess, of course, I'm just going to remind you again that you're not to talk or converse among yourselves or with anyone else about the case, try to speculate about the case, try to do any research about the case. No social media communications of any kind. No Internet searches. Anything like that. All those same admonishments that I gave you last night. But don't go too far, and we're going to see you back in here at 2:15.

All right.
(Jury panel exits courtroom.)
the COURT: Let's go ahead and use the
restrooms. We'11 come back in about five minutes, at 3:10 and we'11 have a brief discussion about that matter before we bring the gentleman back in.

And there's one other matter that $I$ need to bring to the parties' attention as well about the jurors, but we'11 come back in about five minutes.

MR. ARNTZ: Thank you, Your Honor.
(Pause in the proceedings.)
THE COURT: We're going to need some help, Joshua, bringing in a couple of the jurors to talk to, but let me just do a couple of things first.

So just to make record of the bench conference, $I$ called the counsel forward because it appeared quite obvious that the juror -- what's his number again? Is it 510? Sorry. It's 385, Mr. Back. "Back" and "Burke," I'm struggling with. Mr. Back, Juror 385 , was about to go into some detail about something he had expressed earlier about having a family member who had gone through a medical malpractice case. So we're going to bring him in and have a separate inquiry with him.

I also noted for counsel at the bench that it's been my observation that -- and I didn't know if they could see it because of the line of sight -but Juror No. 20 has been appearing to be asleep or
at least not engaged almost the entirety of the discussion so far. I don't recall what she said, you know.

I know she's young, and I want to say I thought she was a student, but I don't recall what she said as far as if she's working crazy hours or whatever. But I guess we'11 figure out some more information.

MR. ARNTZ: $I$ think we're in agreement to --

MR. MCBRIDE: We'll stipulate too.
THE COURT: Yeah, I mean I guess I just -I need to talk to her first anyway, even if I excuse her, just to find out what's going on. I've had occasion where we've had a couple people -- I don't perceive this to be -- where that's how people listen and they really are engaged, but that's how they're listening. That's not been my view so far.

And the other issues with the jurors, and I really don't think it's an issue, but if we want to inquiry of them, I suppose we can. I'm not sure which juror brought it to the marshal's attention, but jurors in seats No. 8 and 11 , Ehle and withers apparently know or somehow recognized each other. I didn't get the impression that they're social
friends or anything like that.
Was that the impression that you got,
Joshua?
THE MARSHAL: I didn't inquire once they told me.

THE COURT: who told you about the friendship?

THE MARSHAL: It was Ehle.
the court: Ehle indicated that he knew withers?

THE MARSHAL: Yes. And Withers acknowledges it, "Yeah, I know him."

THE COURT: All right. So they know each other. I don't know the specifics of that. obviously, they'11 get the same admonishments, and I can specifically, you know, admonish them separately. But does anybody want to bring them in separately, at this point, to inquire about that, how they know each other; or do you just want to make it part of the voir dire?

MR. P. HYMANSON: We can make that part of the record to help expedite it, Your Honor.

THE COURT: At this point, you know, it's 12:15. I know Mr. Hymanson is going to probably be a little past 3:00 before he finishes. Obviously
we're not going to finish today. I just needed some time to come to terms with that understanding.

MR. MCBRIDE: Understood, understood,
Your Honor.
THE COURT: And so I've already let jury services know that the extra folks, we don't need them, just to have a little extra panel intentionally for tomorrow just in case. But I don't really perceive we're going to need them then either. But my understanding is we'11 go -- so we're not going to try to crush it, rush it, anything like that. And we'll conclude today at 5:00 or before, and then we'11 come back tomorrow at 1:30 and pick up then and finish tomorrow.

MR. MCBRIDE: okay. So I was going to ask you, 1:30 or 1:00?

THE COURT: I can't start earlier than 1:30. There was a little miscommunication $I$ had with my court reporters about that circumstance. I didn't realize dailies were being done for jury selection. But in order for dailies to work and to not, you know, completely overburden my court reporters, $I$ really do need to start the afternoon sessions at 1:30.

MR. MCBRIDE: No problem. It's not a
prob1em.
THE COURT: If that's okay. But whatever we get through today, we're finishing jury selection tomorrow.

MR. MCBRIDE: And that's the thing, I told Breen too, I thought that Hank was doing a very good job. I don't think there's going to be much overlap in the questions $I$ have. So $I$ think that will streamline it.

THE COURT: But just to give everybody an opportunity. We'11 see where we are today, but I'm not anticipating we finish today, just, you know, the time.

MR. MCBRIDE: Understood.
THE COURT: We'11 figure it out.
All right. So we won't inquire of Ehle and Withers now. We will make that part of the voir dire, however, whoever wants to bring it up and whenever. At the end, we can always address it, if we haven't.

But I do want to see -- let's get Juror No. 20 first. You have the name as Jimenez, 664. You all can have your seats, if you wish. I know you normally stand when they come in, but it's just one. I don't want to freak her out that we're all
standing. She's so young.
MR. ARNTZ: And, Your Honor, I think I'm going to have my clients go home. They're getting a 1ittle tired.

THE COURT: Certainly. You made that inquiry earlier if anybody would have any concerns with that. I don't think that would be an issue. There's not really any way to go that's not -- you know, do you want to wait until the venire comes back in and then go? Because that won't be much longer and then they're not all outside.

MR. MCBRIDE: We can finish --
THE MARSHAL: All rise for the juror.
THE COURT: Actually, we're not all rising. I told them to sit. But that's okay.

Ms. Jimenez, come on in. Just have a seat. See that nice cushy chair that's right there in the front. So it's been my observation, Ms. Jimenez, that you've been, at best, disengaged if not somewhat sleep much of this voir dire process.

MS. JIMENEZ: I'm not asleep.
the court: You're not asleep. why are your eyes closed?

MS. JIMENEZ: My eyes? My eyes are just normally small.

THE COURT: I looked over many times, and it appears that your eyes have been fully closed. I'm not trying to challenge you.

MS. JIMENEZ: I was probably looking down.
THE COURT: You just may not be aware, but it --

MS. JIMENEZ: I'm paying attention though. I just don't think there's anything for me to put out into the conversation yet.

THE COURT: okay. So it's your belief that you are fully engaged in this process, that you are not --

MS. JIMENEZ: Not sleeping.
the court: well, I mean, I didn't think you had fully fallen asleep. I mean we can tell what that looks like when someone's head completely goes because they're asleep. But there's a big difference between "not asleep" and "not engaged," and it really does appear that you're not engaged.

There's been lots of questions, lots of ways in which people could respond. Very generalized types of things. Lots of people are sharing information. You're not engaged at all, and every time I looked over, almost every time, your eyes appear again to me to have been closed.

It's not a criticism. And it's, you know, if you're doing something, you know, otherwise outside of this courtroom that makes it very difficult for you to stay, engage, or pay attention here, we would understand that. We just need to know because I can't have somebody that's ultimately going to be on this panel who's not going to be engaged and who we lose during the process of the trial.

So is there something -- are you working an extra job? Is there something else going on?

MS. JIMENEZ: No. I literally have nothing going on. I just don't think it's my time to put anything into the conversation yet.

THE COURT: So if I understand you correctly, and like Mr. Hymanson said, nobody is trying to put any words in anybody's mouth. You've heard and listened to all the questions, and you've made a deliberate decision that those questions did not apply to you or you didn't have a response to give? Is that --

MS. JIMENEZ: Every question that they've asked, I've either agreed with somebody. Pretty much, $I^{\prime}$ ve agreed with one person or the other.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Have you raised your hand or nodded your head or indicated
those things in any way?
MS. JIMENEZ: Yes.
the court: All right. Go ahead. we'll
have you step back out.
Counsel didn't have any questions, did they, for Ms. Jimenez?

MR. ARNTZ: No, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Go ahead and step back out.
Thank you.
(Juror No. 664 exits courtroom.)
THE COURT: It was like the perfect opening to get out, but she didn't bite. I don't understand. I kind of have to take her at her word.

MR. ARNTZ: We're willing to let her go anyway.
the court: I can't. I mean, I've got a juror who's over here telling me that she's engaged and she's listening and she wants to participate. Unless I have -- you know, I'll keep observing her. But I'm not willing to let her go, at this point, with what her responses to the questions were.

MR. MCBRIDE: Well, I personally have not seen her raise her hand a single time, and so I wouldn't --

THE COURT: I haven't either. But, you
know, you guys are directly --
MR. MCBRIDE: Sure.
THE COURT: -- south of her, and I'm looking at her, and I've seen her eyes open, and I've seen her looking up. I just have also seen times when, you know, she hasn't been -- I don't know why she wouldn't want to admit it. I told her it was okay. I told her there's no harm, no foul. I'm just not ready to cut her loose just yet. So let me keep observing it. we'11 probably have another break before the end of the day. If I continue to see this sort of engagement, I'11 have to say something.

MR. ARNTZ: My problem with her answer was that she doesn't seem willing to engage, that she just isn't willing to enter the conversation.

THE COURT: Wel1, I mean, we'11 have to see how that goes. The other thing too is, and $I$ think you all know this, but this opens the door for this conversation. You know that the alternates will be the last two seated, regardless of whomever. So, you know --

MR. MCBRIDE: Should the Moores use this opportunity at this point to leave or if they wanted to?

THE COURT: Well, this is what I was thinking, I'd rather finish the other and then --

MR. MCBRIDE: oh, sure. okay.
THE COURT: Rather than them going out with everybody out there waiting, we could, if you're okay, just a few more minutes. Let's get the other juror in, and let's have that conversation. You might want to see that conversation anyway. And then once all the panel is back in, in place, you're welcome to go. okay? Does that work, or do you need to go now?

MR. MOORE: No, that's fine. Thank you for that.

MR. P. HYMANSON: And, Your Honor, when the panel is seated, do you want us to ask leave of court for them to get going, or do you just want them to --

THE COURT: It depends on how much of a thing you want to make about it. At this point, they're welcome to come and go as they please. It's already been asked of the jurors if they want --

MR. P. HYMANSON: Make it as innocuous as possible.

THE COURT: Right. That's what I'm thinking too, and it's already been offered that
they may not stay the whole time. So think it's fine. I don't think anybody will notice. You know, I have no problem if Mr. Hymanson wants to say, you know, just noting again, reminding you all yesterday that, you know, our clients may come and go. I don't think that's a problem.

Let's have Juror No. 385, Mr. Jeffrey Back back.
(Juror No. 385 enters courtroom.)
the COURT: hi, Mr. Back. Come on through. We're going to have you sit in the front here, not your usual seat. Just that one right there, if that's okay. It's about the same comfort level, I hope, and it brings you a little bit closer.
we just felt we have an understanding of obviously where this conversation is going to go, and we just felt that maybe it was better that it be had not in front of all the other jurors.

MR. BACK: I figured, yeah.
THE COURT: So that's why we -- and it was good time to take a break for other reasons anyway.

So at this point, Mr. Hymanson, do you want to pick up where you left off and finish the inquiry, and then we can go from there, and I can give other counsel an opportunity.

MR. H. HYMANSON: I'm happy to do that, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And wherever it's more
comfortable for you to be. I just thought we needed to have this conversation separately.

MR. BACK: I had a feeling, yeah.
MR. H. HYMANSON: I think I'll just go back to where I was, if that's all right for you.

THE COURT: Whatever is easier. I know I've got him here. I mean, I can put him back in his other seat if it's easier.

MR. H. HYMANSON: I feel like I got a good
space going her now.
THE COURT: It's better for the court reporter too.

MR. H. HYMANSON: So, Mr. Back, thank you so much for coming back to talk with us. I understand that this is going to be a difficult thing to say and that this is, unfortunately, about as private as we can make it.

But so you were talking about -- I had asked about if you think there should be a limit on pain and suffering damages. You said you think it should be exactly the opposite, and then you were going to tell us about your experience with your
sister. And so can you just tell us what you were going to say about your sister.

MR. BACK: Yes. 385. I do apologize. I'm losing my voice as well. So $I$ was probably about ten years old. So January 2006, my little sister, Chloe, she was born ten weeks premie and with Down Syndrome. She spent 75 days in NICU. About halfway through, a nurse accidentally swapped her breast milk in her IV. So breast milk went through her brain. Had a series of seizures. Sorry.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Take your time. I know this is very difficult, and if you'd like, there's tissues right behind you, and there's also some water if you'd like that also.

MR. BACK: She is happy. She's healthy now. But, yeah, she did nearly die. we had a six-years suit with valley view Hospital and the manufacturer.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Please take your time. MR. BACK: Lucky enough for her, she was able to -- she's set for life for now. And my mom, she's now a care advocate for a pediatrician. She's an ambassador for Community Patient Care Advocates. But, yeah, luckily she's happy and healthy today and going to school.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Very happy to hear that. MR. BACK: Do you have any questions for me, I guess?

MR. H. HYMANSON: I don't think I have any further questions.

THE COURT: Mr. McBride, would you like to inquire? You can keep your seat too, if you wish.

MR. MCBRIDE: I'11 just step here.
THE COURT: okay.
MR. MCBRIDE: Mr. Back -- and, again, on behalf of all the counsel here, we do appreciate your honesty. I know this is a very difficult thing to have to relive. But as you can understand, from my client's standpoint, $I$ represent Dr. Lasry and obviously Mr. Weaver represents APRN Bartmus.

It sounds like this event was a very emotional event for you and for your family and it continues to be. It brings up a lot of emotions for you.

MR. BACK: Yep.
MR. MCBRIDE: Do you believe that your experience that you had with your sister is going to make you more favorable to whatever plaintiffs might have in this case?

MR. BACK: Yeah, I thought about this a lot

1ast night because $I$ figured that this is where it was going to come to. I would like to think that I would be impartial, but I'm not sure if I could be impartial.

MR. MCBRIDE: Sure. And that's fine. And that's what we're looking for. All counsel here is looking for brutal honesty. You heard Mr. Hymanson say that. That's what we're looking for.

So I guess the other question is would you, if you were Dr. Lasry, would you want someone with your same mindset sitting on the jury in judgment of his care and treatment?

MR. BACK: I would guess no.
MR. MCBRIDE: Okay. Thank you very much. I appreciate it.

MR. WEAVER: I don't have any questions, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
MR. H. HYMANSON: No further questions, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Any --
MR. ARNTZ: We'll stipulate, Your Honor.
THE COURT: I believe there's a stipulation forthcoming, and I was trying to think of the artful way to ask it.

We're all very appreciative of your service, but $I$ think we all agree that, as $I$ mentioned on the first day, not every trial is a perfect fit for every person. We're sorry that this trial has invoked these emotions for you, and we thank you for your service, but we are going to go ahead and excuse you at this time. If you have your badge with you, give it to the marshal on your way out, but you are excused.

MR. BACK: Thank you.
THE COURT: A11 right. Thank you.
And, you know, $I$ 'm reconsidering my thought process about Ms. Jimenez. If the counsel are in agreement to stipulate to excuse, $I$ think we might as wel1 fill both seats and move forward before we go too much further.

MR. WEAVER: Yes, Your Honor.
MR. ARNTZ: Sounds good to me.
THE COURT: Bear with me. I get there. It was a really long calendar this morning. MR. MCBRIDE: I don't know how you could do it.

THE COURT: It was exhausting. That's what my court clerk just said, and it was.

Joshua, we're going to also excuse

Ms. Jimenez. Thank her for her service. Tell her, you know, no issue. Just, you know -- why don't we bring everybody back in, hold her back. And then once everybody's back in the room, keep her in the alcove. You can let her go and take her badge. okay?

THE MARSHAL: Okay. No problem, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
(Jury panel enters the courtroom.)
THE COURT: All right. As everyone finishes coming into the courtroom, I'11 invite everyone to have a seat.

MR. ARNTZ: I think they're going to take this opportunity to leave, if that's okay.

THE COURT: That's fine. we're going to excuse the Moores at this time and proceed with our inquiry of the panel.

You will note that we have excused two additional members from the pane1, and we are going to need to fill those two vacant seats. So the first vacant seat is seat No. 5. It's in the back row. And, again, for the folks who are coming forward, come through the center, around, and enter from the left of the jury box.

Next juror in line is:
THE CLERK: Badge 668, Marce1 Brown.
THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Brown.
And the other seat is seat No. 20. We have a little path of travel here behind counsel table. So it might be quicker to go that direction.

Filling seat No. 20 is:
the CLERK: Badge 677, Jessica Chavez.
THE COURT: All right. Thank you, both.
I'm going to start with Ms. Brown. If you're able to see the board or 1 can just ask you the questions. Either way. Whatever is easier.

MR. BROWN: Yes. Question No. 1 is gone. Is that my name?
the court: Did it somehow fall off the 1ist? Yeah, we're moving the projector a little bit. It's okay. I'11 go through it. Yes, we have your name and your --

MR. H. HYMANSON: Are you all right with me standing here? I'm sorry to interrupt you.

THE COURT: No, you're fine. Perfectly fine.

So, Ms. Brown, your badge number is 668. Yes, the name. And then, of course, it kind of jumps right to former job or current job. Either
way.
MS. BROWN: My current job, I'm a social worker with Nevada Medicaid. Education, I have a Master's degree in rehab counseling. Not married, no children. I have -- my family's lived in Las vegas for about 20 years, and I've just been back the last 11.

THE COURT: Okay.
MS. BROWN: I've never been a juror.
THE COURT: Here or anywhere?
MS. BROWN: No.
THE COURT: Okay. How about any connections -- other than, you know, yourself obviously perhaps in the way that you do the work you do for Medicaid -- but how about, again, yourself in a former position to also discuss or a family member or a close friend in the medical field?

MS. BROWN: No. Besides working for insurance. No connections.

THE COURT: And meaning yourself and what you do with Medicaid?

MS. BROWN: uh-huh.
THE COURT: And what about any involvement in or knowledge of any malpractice, medical
malpractice lawsuit?
MS. BROWN: No.
THE COURT: Okay. Coming now down to
Ms. Chavez. Are you able to see?
MS. CHAVEZ: Yes.
THE COURT: okay.
MS. CHAVEZ: I'm Jessica Chavez, 677. I'm a food server at olive Garden. I have a high school education.

THE REPORTER: I'm sorry.
THE COURT: She's a food server at Olive Garden. She has a high school education. Maybe just speak up just a touch.

MS. CHAVEZ: From Granada Hills,
California. High school. I'm married to Tony Chavez. He's a Sunrun installer, solar installer. We have no children. I've lived in vegas for 11 years, and I've never been a juror.

THE COURT: okay. Thank you. And what about you, yourself, again, family member, close friend with any kind of medical field connections?

MS. CHAVEZ: No.
THE COURT: Here or California? Nobody does any of that kind of work?
mS. CHAVEZ: No.

THE COURT: what about anything related to any kind of lawsuits involving medical malpractice? MS. CHAVEZ: No.

THE COURT: All right. So we have our two new jurors. We know it's difficult when you add to the panel kind of late.

And, you know, I suppose a fair question now because counsel for the Moores have been at it for, total, maybe about an hour, a little over that of questioning, is there anything that you heard that's come up so far that, if you had been in the box and would have answered or could have answered, you might want to say?

Anything that you've listened to so far? Any answers you think you might want to give?
ms. Chavez: No.
the court: All right. well, there's going to be more questions, and we'll get more time with you. So Mr. Hymanson, whenever you're ready to proceed.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Thank you so much, Your honor.

Hello again, ladies and gentlemen. So we were just talking about -- before we took a break, we were talking about if anyone had any negative
feelings about pain and suffering damages. Mr. Grant, do you have any particular feelings about pain and suffering damages?

MR. GRANT: 634. No strong feelings either way. No. I don't think it's a -- no. Again, no strong feelings. I'11 just leave it there.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Well, let me ask you. So I'm just picking up a little bit of hesitation when you say you "don't think it's" and then you kind of cut off. What's the -- just the hesitation there?

MR. GRANT: Everything is circumstantial. So it depends on what's going on. We've been talking a lot about if things are frivolous or not. You know, if it's -- you know, if it ends up being justified. If say something goes to trial, and then that's fine, $I$ suppose. But without knowing the circumstances, $I$ don't really want to say "yes" or "no" on it.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Do you think that if evidence were presented to you, in either via testimony or documents or something, that substantiated an individual's pain and suffering, if you saw that, would you be comfortable awarding pain and suffering damages?

MR. GRANT: Yeah, I think so probably.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. We11, and I'm sorry that $I$ keep hammering on you.

MR. GRANT: Yes.
MR. H. HYMANSON: But just to be exact with you, when you say, you know, "I think so, probably," I need to dig in on that a little bit more. So why the, you know, you think so probably?

So if there's, you know, documented proof of it, you know, you were saying you needed to see something; and then $I$ changed the scenario if you see something, and it still seems like there's some hesitation.

MR. GRANT: Pardon me. with proof, yes. I'd say yes.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. So that actually kind of dovetails to something we talked about a 1ittle bit earlier, but we can go back to it for a second. So we were talking about the distinction between a frivolous case and a meritorious case. And different people had different opinions about that.

Some people talked about this notion of he-said, she-said. And then you started talking about "circumstantial"; right?

MR. GRANT: Uh-huh.
MR. H. HYMANSON: And so what do you mean
by "circumstantial"? what does that mean to you?
MR. GRANT: I suppose it would be whether
it's determined or not that whatever the complaints
are valid or not.
For example, there was a wedding
photographer I read about that, right after the
wedding, let's several years ago and let's say five
years later, the couple divorced. They were happy
with the photos beforehand. But then after they got
divorced, one of them sued the photographer for the
full amount of the services given several years
before, as well as the amount for the entire wedding
itself as for pain and damages, or something along
those lines, if I can remember.
think.
the divorce; right? It wasn't the pictures that
were the basis of the divorce?
cash grab, in my opinion. think.

MR. H. HYMANSON: And is this kind of going back to what you kind of talked about before, that when you're taking your pictures or you do a job for a wedding, you always have it in the back of your mind that: Hey, you know what, I could be sued for this. I've got to cover myself for everything? MR. GRANT: I agree.

MR. H. HYMANSON: okay. And but is there anything about that that you think makes you more hesitant about lawsuits in general?

Do you kind of question them? I'm just kind of picking up a kind of consistent theme of, you know, that you have some hesitation about lawsuits. Is that fair to say?

MR. GRANT: I think they're overdone. A little too abundant. That's my opinion.

MR. H. HYMANSON: And you also questioned, potentially, the validity of pain and suffering damages; correct?

MR. GRANT: I'11 say yes.
MR. H. HYMANSON: okay. What would you need to see? Because we talked about circumstantial evidence, and we changed, and you still had the hesitation with that. So I just want to figure out where it is. What do you need to feel comfortable
awarding pain and suffering damages?
MR. GRANT: I'm not really sure.
MR. H. HYMANSON: And I don't mean to put you on the spot. I'm sorry if I'm going at you. MR. GRANT: Oh, no, no. You're fine. You're fine.

MR. H. HYMANSON: I just need to figure these things out.

MR. GRANT: No. No problem. I think, again, just proof that there was actual suffering involved. Proof that financial compensation would actually help the situation as opposed to it just not being about taking advantage of someone else's real pain, $I$ suppose. You know, it's like, for example, if someone wants to try and sue McDonald's because they spill coffee on themselves, for instance. That whole famous story. So maybe more people would try that.

A restaurant in town had some food poisoning, $I$ remember, and $I$ knew the owners, and they were -- people were trying to take advantage of them saying, "Yeah, I got sick off of this kind of food that day too." So they were starting to try and sue them. But what happened was is the food that they ate wasn't the contaminated food. They
were trying to, you know, see if they could get some money out of it, out of someone else's problem.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. With your new examples, is it fair to say that you have a distrust of lawsuits?

MR. GRANT: Yeah.
MR. H. HYMANSON: And is it fair to say that if starting out judging this case, that you would give the defense a little bit of a -- that let's say the plaintiff would be starting one step behind than the defense?

MR. GRANT: No. I don't know the circumstances. SO I reserve all judgment.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. Well, you talked about you think that things are frivolous.

So, for example, you talked about the McDonald's hot coffee lawsuit; correct?

MR. GRANT: uh-huh.
MR. H. HYMANSON: Do you know the facts of that lawsuit?

MR. GRANT: No. It's just something I read in the paper like 20plus years ago. It was just an example or two.

MR. H. HYMANSON: If you found out that the lady from the McDonald's case was --
well, what's your understanding of the facts of what happened with that?

MR. GRANT: what I remember is someone spilled hot coffee on themselves in the drivethrough.

MR. H. HYMANSON: And has anyone else heard about this case before?

MR. GRANT: They sued McDonald's and got some sort of settlement out of it even though everyone knows coffee is hot.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. And does everyone agree that they think this is a perfect example of a frivolous lawsuit?

I see some people raising their hand.
Does anyone think that that was not a frivolous lawsuit? Yes, sir. Mr. Maltese; correct?

MR. MALTESE: 665. It depends. was it coffee at boiling, and was it -- did she get scarred on her lap or whatever the situation was? It depends on the facts.

MR. H. HYMANSON: And so if the facts were that she had third-degree burns, would that change your assessment of that case?

MR. GRANT: Yeah.
MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. And so that's

Mr. --
MR. GRANT: 634.
MR. H. HYMANSON: Mr. Grant, 634, just for the record, for everything.

And if it was documented there was over 700 occasions where people had been burned before, would that change your impression of that case?

MR. GRANT: Of course. The more facts that get presented, then that could sway my opinion, yeah.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. I'm not going to go really into this, but this brought it up a little bit. So we talked about, you know, your impression of frivolous lawsuits. And because of the McDonald's case, does anybody ever think the media exaggerates certain things when they're reporting about lawsuits?

Couple people with their hands up.
Mr. Burke; correct?
MR. BURKE: Yep. 510.
MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. Can you elaborate on that a iftte bit.

MR. BURKE: I mean, I guess I'd say sometimes they might even oversimplify it, as you just listed some possible facts that could have been
from the McDonald's case that even swayed his opinion. You know, if you put it in its simplest terms, people watching TV could be easily swayed to see things a certain way. Just kind of how the media works.

MR. H. HYMANSON: And, Ms. Chavez, do you ever think that sometimes -- do you think that there's reports on cases where people file meritorious lawsuits but they don't get what they deserve? Do you think that there's many articles or news stories about that?

MS. CHAVEZ: Yeah. 677. Sorry. I think that does happen sometimes. I can't think of anything right now, but I 'm sure it does.

MR. H. HYMANSON: You think it gets reported when people don't get what they deserve?

MS. CHAVEZ: Like I said sometimes. Maybe. I don't know. I'11 say I don't know.

MR. H. HYMANSON: No, that's totally fine. And I don't mean to make you nervous. I just -- and there's no wrong answers to this. we just want to hear what you think of things, and so you're doing just fine.

So let's talk about the specifics, this type of case. So we've talked about, you know,
different types of damages. Is there anyone that is uncomfortable with the fact that this is a medical malpractice case?

Does anyone have a problem with medical malpractice cases?

Yes, sir. Mr. Jones, 625; correct?
MR. JONES: Yeah. I don't have a problem with it, in general. I have one specifically.

MR. H. HYMANSON: okay.
MR. JONES: That, in 2017, I was diagnosed as having prostate cancer. And so, you know, you start the whole series of different things, different tests; and they all lead to certain different procedures going down the line in order to ascertain whether or not you do have prostate cancer. Well, the physician that had me in the process, it wasn't until I got to the point where they were going to do a biopsy. And you think, well, it's 12 minutes, you'11 be out. And the nurse goes, "Oh, no. It's 48."

And so you do these 48 , and then they find out that only four have any type of abnormality. But you have the statistics that say that African-American men, particularly within my age group, have a higher rate of dying from this. Now,

I'm not a physician. So, you know, I don't have all of the information. But you go through all of the tests, and had it not been for me having access to another physician that looked at the report, the physicians that were leading me down the path to, more or less, make the situation right, forgot to tell me a number of things.

So, yeah, I have some concerns because like when I took a look at it, $I$ began to recount all the facts and asked questions, nothing from an operational standpoint or from a procedural standpoint was wrong. What was wrong is that you have this very large organization of managed care, all these physicians with different ownership positions, and the thing was is to get him in the system and keep him in.

So, yeah, I have some problem with it. You know, everywhere you turn, every question you ask, they have an answer for it. So, you know, even through it didn't result in permanent damage; it did result in damage that you could find significant -you could live with it, but it's something I probably never would have entered into without more information.

So when I looked at it, I says, you know,
it's not worth a lawsuit. But somebody needs to give people more information, and this whole thing needs to be clearer on both sides. I don't want to just run and jump and say, "We11, you know, this shouldn't happen or I should sue you" because I can't really say because I'm not debilitated as a result of the treatment. Are they something I would have never entered into? Absolutely.

But I didn't think it was worth going through a lawsuit on it. That's just where I'm at right now. I do have some problems with how they come out and some of the things that the people file malpractice lawsuits on and what gets compensated.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Well, thank you very much for sharing that. I know that sometimes that's difficult to talk about in a room with a lot of other people.

Is there anything about that that would -you think that -- you can't get into the facts of the case -- but that you think that because you didn't file a medical malpractice case but my client did file, my clients did file a medical malpractice case, that you would hold against my clients?

MR. JONES: No. I wouldn't say I'd hold it against your client, but what $I$ would like to find
out and we don't know because we're not into the case, as to what this case is all about, what exactly happened; what is the structure of the organization that supposedly committed the offense and all of those things. There's so much information that not there.

And just like I said before, when we asked a question about advertising and those things, I think that some of the advertising cheapens the seriousness of something like this. Just because someone has the ability to pay doesn't mean that they should necessarily be sued, unless it is absolutely necessary and that they earned whatever punishment they're going to receive.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Understood. Thank you very much.

Does anyone else have any problems with the fact that it's a medical malpractice case?

So I'11 go from the front row first. So I apologize. Mr. Read; correct?

MR. READ: Read, 637. I kind of like had mentioned yesterday, like, my wife's a nurse, and we -- again, she was kind of part of a situation. I kind of still remember when she called me up from work. Like, she worked graveyard at the time, and
she called me from work, and I was home for our kids, and $I$ still kind of remember like when she told me that -- first she's like, "I got in trouble."

And, like, this happened like it actually was the day after my daughter's first birthday, and it was like -- and this was like over the weekend. So like this happened the week before, and she's like this: "Something came up," and she kind of like told me, she was whispering, and she goes, "They're going to let me work today, but I'm probably going to be put on leave, and like we're probably going to have to hire a lawyer," and just like and "There might be jail time and lose my license" type thing.

I'm just like thinking, I'm like I wasn't married too long ago, and my daughter just turned one. And I thought, "Am I ready to take care of my kids by myself?" It's like eventually we got divorced, and we both very good parents, I think. And I was like, at that time, just being, I think it was like 26,27 at the time, it was like -- it was like scary.

And it's still like, even like when $I$ kind of heard about some kind of case like this, it
just -- it definitely struck a nerve. Like, you know, it's like just certain things about this like reminded me of the situation. Like the defendants having two sets of attorneys. Like we didn't have the same attorneys, the doctor. And I don't know much about their case -- or I obviously know nothing about their case. But like, you know, just like certain things $I$ 've noticed in kind of the room which just kind of reminded me of that situation.

And it's just it's more of like nothing prejudging of medical malpractice, like heard things either way. Like I've heard other things just being friends and, you know, everything of medical professionals because of my wife and my mom and other family members, like from a family member of medical professionals. But just like just different things. But and sometimes like trivial, sometimes not.

But just like -- just kind of like, and it's just like. I don't know, I got a feeling. You go to work and you kind of try to do your best, and something maybe -- maybe you made a wrong judgment. And not to go much into her case. It's just like -it was like, you know, you got wrong information like from a wrong family member, and it wasn't a
family member. It was like a girlfriend, and he was still married --

MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. Yeah, and we don't have to get into all the specifics of that.

MR. READ: Just anxiety. And it just -MR. H. HYMANSON: Understood. So let me ask you, does that experience with your ex-wife, does that change how you feel about walking into being a juror for a medical malpractice case?

MR. READ: It does in the sense that it definitely like makes me kind of nervous, definitely. But, yeah, but $I$ don't know if it makes me feel like you know, like one way or the other. Like, okay, where I necessarily would feel like I'd side with the nurse or side with the plaintiff. I don't know.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Yeah. Let's talk about that a little bit more because you don't know if it would necessarily make you feel that way. But your ex-wife is a nurse, as we've been through; right? And you know that one of the defendants here is a nurse practitioner; correct?

MR. READ: Correct.
MR. H. HYMANSON: And you tell me, but is it fair to say that you think you would be, just
inherently, given your relationship with your ex-wife, what you've been through with her, that you would be more sympathetic to the defendants in this case?

MR. READ: Well, I definitely would be in the sense that -- in the sense that they like -- and not knowing any facts of the case, but yeah, in the sense that sometimes you go to work; like, you know, you do try to do a good job, and it's like and something just didn't go right. It's like, you know, it's like not always necessarily your fault. And it's just like that would like in -- yeah, it's like that would make me sympathetic.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. And so, again, Mr. Read, just as I've said today, I'm not trying to put words in anyone's mouth. I'm just trying to attempt to distill what we're saying with things. But it sounds, and obviously I can't get into the facts of this case. But it sounds, like you say, that you think that you would be sympathetic to the defendants in this case?

MR. READ: I guess if you would say that, yeah.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. And so just fleshing that out a little bit, do you think that --
is it safe to say that going into this case, you think that my clients would be one step behind the defendants in this case, instead of starting out at an equal starting point?

MR. READ: I don't like ever think $I$ 'm that person. Like, and I put -- and like -- yeah, so I would want to say no, but like maybe.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Well, and this kind of goes back to what we started with yesterday, when we were talking about the apple pie competition. And it's not saying that -- it's not a bad thing. when you say that you're "that person," there's no such thing with "that person" with things. But there's such thing as it's not the right case for everyone to judge to from everything.

And what I'm hearing from you is that you think that you would be more sympathetic, despite your best efforts. You want to be as objective as you can. And, again, I'm not trying to put words in your mouth. But you'd like to be as objective as you can. But you feel as though, ultimately, when it came down to it, that the defendants would be one step ahead of my clients before this case started? MR. READ: If you put it that way, yes. MR. H. HYMANSON: Thank you very much.

to your pain and suffering?
THE COURT: I just want to add because it begs the followup that $I$ had before. There will be a jury instruction for those who are on the panel that discusses how to determine pain and suffering damages, if it's determined that any should be awarded. Okay? So the instructions cover a lot of the ground that maybe some uncertainty that the jurors have in their mind. okay.

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

And thank you very much also, Mr. Burke. Anybody else that thinks they have some hesitations about the fact that this is a medical malpractice case? Yes, sir. Mr. Taylor.

MR. TAYLOR: Taylor, 644. We11, yeah. If it basically comes down to just the case of pain and suffering, that's a very subjective view. we all have to determine whether we believe that or not. And just to come and say, "okay. I'm going to give you $\$ 10$ miliion because $I$ believe," I mean, what's the foundation for that?

I mean, is it loss of work time? Is it just because $I$ say I'm hurting? I mean, it comes down to what you believe. If there's actual factual
evidence that supports that, that okay maybe I cut off the wrong arm instead of this arm, which has happened in medical history. We've seen that. We've seen lawsuits justified. Those are very justified. But if it comes down to basically, you know, as I mentioned earlier, he-said, she-said, then I don't know. I don't know if I can buy that.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. Understood. Let's talk about that a little bit more. So we talked about he-said, she-said. We touched on this a little bit yesterday, but let's go into it a little bit more.

If it's he-said, she-said, do you think that you could come to a decision based on just two different people, their stories, and what they said; or would you need to see more evidence than just what he said or she said?

MR. TAYLOR: Basically, I would need more because you could tell me something. I could tell you something. Maybe we're both correct, you know, or maybe we're both wrong. It's, you know, for all of us to decide obviously.

But it's -- without some kind of evidence, you know, a third person or perhaps a procedure or some instance, say like if somebody gave a needle to
somebody that had been used by somebody e1se, something resulted as that, obviously there's evidence. But if it's basically: I'm hurting because somebody forgot to check my heart or, you know, take my blood pressure or whatever, you know, that's minute.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Understood. Are you comfortable being in a position to judge someone's credibility?

I mean you're all going to be hearing from -- if you're picked for this jury, you're going to be hearing from witnesses that come up and take the stand. And as the judge will tell you, it's your job to judge their credibility and if you believe them or not.

Is that something that you're comfortable with? Are you comfortable judging whether the individuals that take this stand are telling the truth?

MR. TAYLOR: Yeah, I've been on a jury before. I am comfortable to listen to facts and to hear what's happening. But, ultimately, if it really comes down to just basically one person saying this and the other person saying this and there's no evidence to support really either way, I
have questions about that.
THE COURT: Can you get the juror some water, please.

MR. H. HYMANSON: And so just so -- again, I'm trying to clarify that $I$ 'm hearing you correctly, that being if a juror is up there -- if a witness is up testifying and even if you believe that they're credible, that's not sufficient for you as a basis to make your decision? If you don't have anything else in a vacuum, that basis alone is not enough?

MR. TAYLOR: Not particularly, no.
MR. H. HYMANSON: So you're in agreement with my statement; correct?

MR. TAYLOR: Yeah. Basically, if somebody is just saying something, $I$ can't -- I can't back it up with any evidence that's been presented to me, then it's just, why are they here? what's the point of this whole thing?

MR. H. HYMANSON: Understood. Thank you very much.

Anyone else that have any particular reservations about the fact that this is a medical malpractice case?
okay. So we've already kind of touched on
the next topic $I$ want to talk about. But at the end of the day, what this case is about, unfortunately, the only way that we can compensate -- that the Moores can receive compensation for what's happened to them is money, and so ultimately this is a case about money, where we're going to be asking you to award money to the Moores.

Does anyone have a problem with the fact that this is a case about money?

Does that bother anyone?
MR. TAYLOR: Taylor, 644. Only if it's excessive.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay, okay. Anybody else? Yes, sir. Mr. Burke; correct?

MR. BURKE: Yeah, 510. Just same as I was saying earlier.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Yes, ma'am. Ms. Price; correct?

MS. PRICE: I was going to say what he says. If it's too excessive, I think that would put a point in my mind that already that this person is just trying to get money.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. And so it depends on the amount of money that's being asked for. And, again, not trying to put words in your mouth. But

I'm just trying to interpret what I'm hearing. You think that if someone is asking for too much -- if it's a number that you think is too much money, that that fact alone, you think, takes away from their credibility with something, and you think that it makes it into at least the territory of a frivolous lawsuit or a money grab or something like that?

MS. PRICE: Yes.
MR. H. HYMANSON: okay. And how would that affect your overall opinion? would that make you inclined to award no money or exactly what you think they're entitled to?

How do you think that would affect you?
MS. PRICE: I somewhat dealt with that in the last case that I was a jury on, and we tried to come up with an amount that we felt was appropriate. It wound up coming up we gave nothing.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. And so it's at least fair to say that you think that that would influence that fact alone of asking for what you determine to be too much money would influence how you looked at the rest of the facts of the case -MS. PRICE: Yes.

MR. H. HYMANSON: -- and whether you thought that it was proper to award X -amount to
properly compensate the plaintiff for the damages? MS. PRICE: uh-huh.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. Does anybody else have a problem this case is about money?

Yes, sir. Mr. Headd; correct?
MR. HEADD: I pretty much agree with her -633 -- that, you know, that if it's to an astronomical level, that it takes away from the credibility of, you know, what they're trying to prove.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. Thank you.
Does anybody else have any thoughts about that?
okay. So we're going to move to -- the judge, as the Court has told you several times, she's going to be the one that instructs you about the law. But the standard of proof here is going to be lower than the standard of proof in a criminal trial. So everyone has heard in criminal trial "beyond a reasonable doubt."

Here it's going to be "preponderance of the evidence," and the Court will explain what that means. But does anyone have a problem with the fact that we're going to be asking for money based on a lower standard than beyond a reasonable doubt?

Is there anyone that that gives someone issue? Yes, sir, Mr. Jones.

MR. JONES: 625. It gives me issue because if you're asking for what I consider to be a huge amount of money, then you need to be able to prove -- you know, there should be a high level of proof. I mean, it shouldn't be a low bar for something like that. I mean, if you genuinely and sincerely believe that you have been wronged and the evidence is there, then you should present it. I mean, if anything, it should -- I feel it should be higher.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. And so, as I said, the Court is going to instruct you of the law. And your job is going to be to follow the law as instructed by the Court. And so if the Court instructs you that the law is this lower standard, preponderance of the evidence, do you think that you personally would have a hard time following the law?

MR. JONES: I wouldn't have a problem following it. I necessarily may not like it. But I wouldn't have a problem following it because those are the instructions. That's what you've agreed to do by being here.

MR. H. HYMANSON: okay. Thank you very
much.
Does anyone else have an issue with the fact that we're going to be asking for money and that the standard is preponderance of the evidence?

Yes, sir. Mr. withers.
MR. WITHERS: 618. I think there's a quality of 1 ife to be considered when talking about money. And, you know, did it change the person's outcome because of the mistake? Is there an ownership involved in whatever took place? And we don't know the details, and I'm sure we'11 find out. But $I$ think that plays a big role in this.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. And how does that play role to you? Just a little more.

MR. WITHERS: So there's responsibility, and we talked about ownership earlier. Did the mistake or what would be presumed was the mistake change the person's quality of life? And because of that, now they're going to be awarded this exponential amount of money. You know, and are we going to have any evidence, or is it somebody saying, well, "Yeah, now 1 can't do this."

MR. H. HYMANSON: Thank you very much.
Is there anyone else that has an issue or thinks that they have a question about that, that
that would be difficult for them?
All right. So let's go through just two quick hypotheticals. So if the plaintiff was seeking $\$ 10,000$ in damages, would you be comfortable awarding $\$ 10,000$ of damages based on the preponderance of the evidence standard?

And so the preponderance of the evidence that the defendants harmed the plaintiff in the amount of $\$ 10,000$, would anyone have a problem with that?

MS. PRICE: Can you say it again.
MR. H. HYMANSON: Yeah. Does anyone have a problem with the standard being that the plaintiff has to prove, by a preponderance of the evidence, that the defendant caused them harm and is asking for $\$ 10,000$ ?
would you have a hard time awarding $\$ 10,000$ if you determined that the defendant was at fault for the plaintiff's harm?

Is there anyone that would have a problem with that?

MR. MALTESE: No. 665. No.
MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. Thank you very much. Let's change the hypothetical -- and this kind of goes off what you were saying, Mr. Jones.

If it was proven that the defendant's harm caused $\$ 10$ miliion in damages, would everyone be comfortable awarding $\$ 10$ million in damages with still using that preponderance of the evidence standard to determine if the defendant was at fault?

Does that change anyone's perception? we've kind of talked about it, but $I$ just wanted a direct example of that.

Does that change anyone's perception? Thank you very much. And so I've got two more hypotheticals that kind of go with that. But I want you all to think about this:

If you thought it would only take five -based on the facts and the evidence that you saw, if you determined that the defendant was at fault for the plaintiff's arm and you thought that all it would take to compensate the plaintiff was $\$ 500$ and the plaintiff was asking for $\$ 10 \mathrm{million}$, would everyone be comfortable awarding the plaintiff $\$ 500$ ?

Is there anyone that would have a problem doing that?
okay. So let's flip the scenario. If the facts of that incident that you saw, you thought warranted compensation for the harm of $\$ 10 \mathrm{million}$ and if the defense was just asking for $\$ 500$, is
there any of you that would have a hard time returning a verdict of $\$ 10 \mathrm{million}$ ?

Yes. Ms. Price.
MS. PRICE: You said that if it was shown that it was only worth 500, would I --

MR. H. HYMANSON: I'm sorry. No. This hypothetical was different in the sense that the defense is asking for 500 , but the facts and the evidence, in your determination, warrant a \$10 million award and that's what the plaintiff is asking.

MS. PRICE: And would I have a problem if they award the $\$ 10$ miliion, if it was proved that it really was done?

MR. H. HYMANSON: Exactly. If you believe that, based on the facts and the evidence, it warrants a $\$ 10$ million award, but the defense is asking for a $\$ 500$ award, would that change -- would that affect your ability to give that award?

MS. PRICE: No.
MR. H. HYMANSON: It's the same answer for everyone?
the court: There's a hand, mr. hymanson.
MR. TAYLOR: Taylor, 644. Slightly, just based on the fact that, in a criminal trial, I've
experienced you have to have unanimous; whereas, in this case, not quite the case. So there could be the majority decision; yet $I$ could have a dissenting view on this and, unfortunately, almost stuck to it.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. Well that brings up a good point. So is there anyone that thinks that they would have a problem deciding the way that they think about this case?

So you're talking about, in the jury room, that you think, if you had one opinion and the other people had a different opinion, is there anyone that feels like that they would let other people opinions influence the way that they would vote?

So you think that no money should be awarded; they think that money should be awarded. Do you think that you would let that influence you, even though you didn't think money should be awarded, that you would vote to award money?

Does anyone think that they would be influenced like that?

Now, let's talk about something that was brought up by several of you, and as the court stated, she's going to give you the instructions, the jury instructions of how you determine everything. But let's talk about, you know, 1this
term of "pain and suffering" damages and emotional distress. It's an amorphous term, and there's no scale or metric or a thing that you can put up, you know, what does it mean if you've lost an arm? If you've lost a leg. But does anyone have any thoughts about how you would try to determine what factors you would look at to determine how to compensate someone for pain and suffering or emotional distress?

Yes, sir. Mr. Headd.
MR. HEADD: 633. Yeah, I guess it depends on how it changes their life, you know, what they were doing before the accident or whatever happened and to what happens after and what they now can't do. So I think that would be important for me.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. Thank you. Mr. Ehle, do you have any thoughts on this? MR. EHLE: Yeah, I think about -- 606. MR. H. HYMANSON: Thank you. MR. EHLE: I think, yeah, about the same. I think it would depend on how their life changes. MR. H. HYMANSON: okay. Thank you.
Ms. Chavez, what do you think? what kind of factors would you look at?

MS. CHAVEZ: 677. Same thing that they're
saying, whether or not they can still work, if they are able to take care of their children. Anything like that.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Thank you.
Does anybody think that there's something that has been -- that they think that they would use that hasn't been brought up yet?

Yes, ma'am. Ms. Clinton.
MS. CLINTON: 658. Medical records, medical testimony describing the type of injury and the potential impact on life in terms of physicality. That type of thing.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Thank you. Anybody else?
How many of you go to see a doctor on a regular basis? okay. I think there's, in general, kind of two different types of people. There's a type of people that something first shows up and they want to go to the doctor right away and get it checked out; and there's other people, like me, that want to put it off and wait to go see a doctor.

Does anyone think that they're the type of person that, when something first comes up, they're going to go get it checked out right away?

Ms. Price. Okay.
Does anybody think that they would kind of
wait awhile to go see a doctor?
okay. Why do you go -- when you go to see a doctor, why do you go to the doctor? Kind of a generic question. But why do you go see the doctor? Yes, ma'am. Ms. Bechtold.

MS. BECHTOLD: 624. It depends on how it's impacting my life, you know, and what is the -- is it an injury, or is it some kind of chronic illness? I mean, it depends on how it's affecting me or will affect me as to when my decision is whether to run to the doctor with a cold. Everyone's got a cold this season.

So do we wait a few days or run -- is it going to your lungs and your bronchitis so you better go so it's not pneumonia. I mean, there's a lot of different aspects when $I$ go to the doctor.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Absolutely. And when you go to the doctor, do you have an expectation that they're going to diagnose what's wrong with you?
mS. bechtold: yes.
MR. H. HYMANSON: And that they're going to properly treat you for what's wrong?

MS. BECHTOLD: Yes. Doesn't mean I always agree with them though.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Understood.

Does everyone have that expectation when they go to the doctor, that they're going to be properly diagnosed? They're going to be properly treated for what is wrong with them?

How many people trust hospitals?
I see a couple of hands up. I see a couple basically saying "not so much."

How many people don't trust hospitals?
okay. I see a lot of hands up.
Ms. Bebekyan, $I$ keep butchering that. I apologize.

MS. BEBEKYAN: No, it's correct.
MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. Ms. Bebekyan, why don't you trust hospitals?
ms. Bebekyan: 109. That's just my opinion. I mean, I don't trust them in many ways because you can get treated by not going to the hospital or by not going to the doctors.

I mean, my situation, they said I might be diabetic because $I$ just started gaining a lot of weight and not getting enough insulin, but $I$ went to the doctors, and he said, "Oh, I'll give you Metformin. Go ahead and drink this once a day. You'11 be fine, and then you've just got to stick to it."

And I'm like, "okay. No, I'm not going to take that. I'm not taking Metformin. I'm only 26 years old. I'm young. I'll just lose weight, and I'll just exercise and keep myself healthy. And I mean, knock on wood. I'm not diabetic. So why trust a doctor to give you medicines when you can cure yourself alone?

MR. H. HYMANSON: Understood.
Mr. Eh7e, I think you had your hand up. MR. EHLE: Yeah. Recently, I had a couple of people $I$ know die in hospitals from bad decisions. One went in for something relatively, you know, that he had before, a stint -- a "stent" rather, and he ended up getting a staff infection and dying.

MR. H. HYMANSON: I'm very sorry to hear that.

MR. EHLE: I had another friend, she was in a car accident, and she was in surgery for her back. And in the middle of the surgery, they said everything was going fine; everything was going great; they were only going to do part of the surgery. "We'll push on through, we'll do the rest of it," she ended up her kidneys failing and, again, the staff infection.

MR. H. HYMANSON: I'm sorry to hear that. Does anybody have any different feelings about nurses or nurse practitioner? we've been talking about kind of doctors and hospitals. what about nurses and nurse practitioners? The same general thoughts?

Anyone have any specific thoughts about nurses or nurse practitioners? No.

How many people think that just because someone is a medical professional, that they have more credibility? Okay. So Ms. Price and Mr. Headd.

Mr. Headd, why do you think that?
MR. HEADD: Well, they go to school. They do residency. They go through a lot to learn their trade. So I think they have more credibility than someone who doesn't.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. And Ms. Price?
MS. PRICE: 632. I just want to clarify, you're saying "credibility" as a person in general; or "credibility" in the medical field?

MR. H. HYMANSON: I think as a person in general.

MS. PRICE: Then no.
MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. Does that change
your answer at all, Mr. Headd?
MR. HEADD: I'm talking about in the medical field, $I$ trust their information more than somebody who's not in the medical field.

MR. ARNTZ: Ms. Chavez was going to say something.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Thank you very much.
Ms. Chavez.
MS. CHAVEZ: 677. I was just going to say the same thing as him. They went to school for it, you know, more than me.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. Thank you.
Is there anyone that thinks that just by having a doctor or a nurse practitioner take the stand, that you think that they're going to be automatically more credible in what they're going to say than anyone else?

MR. MALTESE: No. 665.
MR. H. HYMANSON: Does anybody think that?
okay. Mr. Headd.
MR. HEADD: Well, they do take oaths to -you know, the Hippocratic Oath, and so hopefully they're not going to purposely lie up there. So, you know, a lot of other witnesses maybe don't have the same or are held to that same standard. I think
they might have a little more credibility than Joe Schmoe off the street.

MR. H. HYMANSON: okay. So you think the fact -- and so what's your understanding of what the Hippocratic Oath is?

MR. HEADD: Do no harm.
MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. And so you think the fact that a doctor or nurse practitioner took an oath to do no harm, that you think that would give them more credibility when they came and sat up on the stand?

MR. HEADD: when it comes to a medical case. I mean, I think they're doctors and nurses; by default, they're trying to help people. You know, they -- people come to them with a problem. They try to help and fix it. So $I$ think in this -in that type of situation, they're called on the stand to talk about medical things that, you know, they're going to be more credible than somebody who's not in the field.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. So we've talked about how people go to the doctor with the expectation that they're going to be properly diagnosed and properly treated. We talked about responsibility earlier.

Earlier, Mr. Headd, you were just talking about giving them potentially more credit because they have taken this Hippocratic Oath.

Is there anyone that thinks that doctors or nurse practitioners should be held to a higher standard if they give improper care?

Meaning people put their trust in them to be treated correctly, but if they aren't treated correctly -- first of all, do you think that those providers should take responsibility for those actions? Ms. Price.

MS. PRICE: Yes. I think they should take responsibility for that.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. Thank you very much. And 632; correct?

MS. PRICE: 632.
MR. H. HYMANSON: Sorry.
And, Mr. Ehle, you raised your hand also. MR. EHLE: Yeah. 606. I think they should be held to a higher standard because they're dealing with a human life.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Does anybody else have any thoughts about that?

Is anybody familiar with the phrase "If it's not recorded, it didn't happen?"

Yes. I see some people nodding their heads. Let's talk to Ms. Brown. You said you're familiar with that phrase. And what does that phrase mean to you?

MS. BROWN: If it's not documented, it didn't take place.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. And is that important in your line of work?

MS. bROWN: Yes.
MR. H. HYMANSON: why is it --
MS. BROWN: 668.
MR. H. HYMANSON: Thank you. I apologize. why is it important in your line of work?

MS. BROWN: Individual recipients could come back and say that you didn't provide them a service or they could tell you that you didn't call them on $X, Y$, and $Z$. But if you can go back to your documentation, you can prove all the different aspects, all the different times that you made contact or the resources that you gave them.

MR. H. HYMANSON: And is there ever a time that you're worried that there may be an issue with something and you decide to make a little more detailed documentation?

MS. BROWN: More detailed documentation?

MR. H. HYMANSON: Yeah. Well, just in terms of for a specific note. Maybe something, I don't know. You're worried about a specific issue coming up, and so you may have a basic way to do notes; but you may, in certain cases, make even more detailed notes.

MS. BROWN: Oh. Yes.
MR. H. HYMANSON: Has that ever happened to you?

MS. BROWN: Yes.
MR. H. HYMANSON: And why do you make more detailed notes?

MS. BROWN: If we know that individuals -usually you document everything that individuals are saying; but if someone has a questioning component, they question you on everything, to cover yourself, you make every detail, put every detail in there.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Has anyone ever had any issues with blood flow issues in their body? vascular issues or anything like that?

Mr. Ehle.
MR. EHLE: Yeah, a number of times.
MR. H. HYMANSON: And we don't have to get into the medical history or anything. I can just leave it at that. We don't need to --
 apologize. I have it written down wrong. Thank you so much. Anybody else? Oh, okay. Mr. Maltese.
mR. MALTESE: Yep.
MR. H. HYMANSON: what about does anyone have any people from their family, family, friends that have blood flow issues?
the court: Mr. wilder had raised his hand previous7y.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Thank you so much, Your Honor. Mr. Wilder.

MR. WILDER: 611. Well, I had a heart attack four years ago.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Sorry to hear that.
MR. WILDER: And I was the one that --
THE REPORTER: I'm sorry. Could you repeat, sir. I apologize.
the court: she can't see you, Mr. wilder, so if you could please speak up.

MR. WILDER: I trust hospitals because they saved my life.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Thank you very much, Mr. Wilder. Let me ask you a couple of other questions. So we talked about your hearing before; correct? And you've been on jury panels before but haven't been selected; correct?

MR. WILDER: Never made it that far.
MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. And was the basis
for that sometimes your hearing?
MR. WILDER: Always my hearing.
MR. H. HYMANSON: Always your hearing.
Okay. Has your hearing improved since that time?
MR. WILDER: No.
MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. We talked yesterday, you were talking about different tones. Certain tones you could hear, and certain tones you couldn't hear; correct?

MR. WILDER: Correct.
MR. H. HYMANSON: And if I remember correctly, you said that there were -- even when the counsel were introducing themselves, you could hear some people and you couldn't hear other people; correct?

MR. WILDER: Correct.
MR. H. HYMANSON: I assume you've been able to hear me while I've been talking today.

MR. WILDER: I can't hear you. I can hear the judge, but $I$ can't hear her (to reporter). MR. H. HYMANSON: what about the other jurors that have been talking? Have you been able to hear all them, or do you have certain issues with that?

MR. WILDER: About half of them.
MR. H. HYMANSON: About half you've heard. okay. Do you have any concerns -- and I don't mean to call you out with everything. I'm sorry. But we just need to know. Do you have any concerns about, you know, given that you've heard about half of what's going on, that you're not going to hear certain testimony or certain evidence that is presented during this trial?

MR. WILDER: Absolutely.
MR. H. HYMANSON: okay. And do you think that that will affect your ability to properly serve as a juror in this case?

MR. WILDER: Well, unless I, you know, like the judge suggested, I raise my hand and have everybody repeat when I can't hear.

MR. H. HYMANSON: And do you have any -and I don't know because $I$ haven't seen you do that yet, and I understand that is a dynamic process with
everything -- but do you have any concerns about raising your hand during the trial when you can't hear something?

MR. WILDER: No, not really.
MR. H. HYMANSON: But you are concerned that you haven't been able to hear -- at least half of what's been happening you haven't heard?

MR. WILDER: Correct.
MR. H. HYMANSON: okay. Thank you very much. I'm sorry to go through that but --

MR. WILDER: No problem. I can't hear my own daughter.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. Fair enough. Has anyone here -- well, does anyone know anyone here that has had a limb amputated? A limb amputated, like an arm or a leg?

Yes, sir mr. Jones.
MR. JONES: My grandfather had a limb amputated after he had a knee surgery that went bad. They eventually amputated the entire leg.

MR. H. HYMANSON: I'm sorry to hear that.
MR. JONES: Because it wouldn't properly heal. He's been deceased now for about 15 years.

MR. H. HYMANSON: okay. How did that affect him?

MR. JONES: Well, it was pretty
debilitating. He was in a lot of pain and really couldn't move around, you know, on that leg. So at that point, he was an elderly man when that happened, and he had some other physical issues. But still the fact is it never healed properly, and after a couple of operations, they realized there was nothing that could be done, particularly with the infection that set in, and they amputated his 1 eg .

MR. H. HYMANSON: I'm sorry to hear that. You said you recall it was very painful for him?

MR. JONES: Before they decided to make the decision. You know, $I$ had a knee surgery myself. So I knew what knee surgeries looked like, and his looked bad. I mean, I don't know who his orthopedic person was, but it just didn't look like a quality surgery.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Understood. Do you know, did you hear anything about him talking about phantom limb pain?

MR. JONES: He felt like it was still there once it was removed. He had mentioned that a number of times, that he could feel his toes.

MR. H. HYMANSON: And did he ever talk
about being -- that he felt his leg that wasn't there had pain? Do you remember having any discussions with him about that?

MR. JONES: No pain.
MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. No pain, but he could feel it.

MR. JONES: Right.
MR. H. HYMANSON: Understood.
Has anyone here ever had a femoral popliteal graft or bypass surgery called a "fem-pop"? If you don't know what it is, that's fine. I'm just curious if anyone has had an experience or has a family member that's had that experience?

THE COURT: How are we doing, Mr. Hymanson, on time?

MR. H. HYMANSON: We're getting very close.
Court's indulgence, Your Honor.
MR. ARNTZ: Can we take a break?
the court: Can I have counsel at the bench.
(Bench conference.)
THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, we've been at it about an hour, $I$ think since we resumed, and I think we want to take another brief recess.

Do about ten minutes, just to give everybody time to stretch your legs, use the restrooms, and make sure they're back and ready to start promptly at 3:40.

Reminding you again, please do not talk or converse among yourselves or with anyone else about this case. No Internet searches, no trying to investigate anything. You've heard a lot of medical terms here. Again, none of it -- your whole case and your service as jurors is based on the evidence that comes into this case through the witnesses and through the exhibits. So make sure you avoid any of those kinds of communications. But we'11 see you back here in a little over ten minutes. 3:40.

THE MARSHAL: All rise for the jury.
(Jury panel exits the courtroom.)
THE COURT: All right. I definitely want to resume at 3:40. So whatever discussion you have to streamline, let's do it. okay.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Thank you so much,
Your Honor.
(Pause in the proceedings.)
THE COURT: I'11 have everybody take their seat and resume. I didn't mention this before. We've had no problems with this. But please do make sure your cellphones are off or silenced if you've
had them on during the break.
Mr. Hymanson, whenever you're ready.
MR. H. HYMANSON: Thank you very much, Your Honor.

Mr. Everett, I'm sorry I haven't spoken to you all day. I'm going to direct this question to you. Do you think that it's important for a treating medical physician to physically examine patients?

MR. EVERETT: Physically examine?
MR. H. HYMANSON: Yes.
mR. EVERETT: Yes, I do.
MR. H. HYMANSON: what about, Mr. Newman, I haven't spoken to you either. I apologize.

MR. NEWMAN: Could you repeat.
MR. H. HYMANSON: Yes. No problem. Do you think it's important for a treating medical professional to physically examine a patient?

MR. NEWMAN: Yes.
MR. H. HYMANSON: Does everyone agree with
that? Does anybody disagree with that?
Yes, sir. Mr. Headd.
MR. HEADD: Yes. 633. I think in certain situations, if their assistants are taking good notes or, you know, doing their job properly, that
maybe he doesn't have to actually see the person -in certain situations, not all.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Understood. And so you say "doing their job properly," what is doing job properly?

MR. HEADD: Just, you know, following the correct operating procedures that are, you know, standard operating procedures, doing everything they're, you know, they're trained to do.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. And is part of that -- so you're talking about if basically someone like working under someone is doing -- looking at the patient and then communicating that information to the supervising person; is that correct?

MR. HEADD: Yeah, either verbally or through notes.

MR. H. HYMANSON: okay. But you think does that require proper communication?

MR. HEADD: Yes.
MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. Does anybody agree with that, with what Mr. Headd just said? Ms. Price, okay, 632.

Anyone else? Yes, sir. Mr. Taylor?
MR. TAYLOR: No. I just agree.
MR. H. HYMANSON: You agree. Okay.

Is anyone here or either themselves or their close, you know, friends or family suffering from any kidney problems?

Ms. Price. Okay. Thank you.
Anyone else?
Does anyone here know anyone that is confined to a wheelchair? Mr. Newman.

MR. NEWMAN: 640 badge. My sister is.
She's had some illness that started in her head, and basically she had surgery. She had a light stroke. So she's basically unable to maybe move one side of her body, particularly it's the left side.

MR. H. HYMANSON: I'm sorry to hear that. Have you noticed that have an effect on her 1ife?

MR. NEWMAN: Yes. Considerably. She was really outgoing doing everything, working her job. And it basically, you know, took her quality of life away.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Did she have to make any modifications to her house?
mR. NEWMAN: Yes, yes.
MR. H. HYMANSON: And what kind of modifications did she make?

MR. NEWMAN: Bathrooms, no stairs. Lifts
to come through in and out. It's a major life change, no matter how you look at it.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. Well, thank you for sharing that. Does anyone else know someone that is confined to wheelchair?

Yes, Mr. Ehle, 022 -- I keep getting that's the one I have wrong. I apologize.

MR. EHLE: Yeah, a good friend of mine is confined. I missed the part about the kidney disease, but he has third-stage kidney disease.

MR. H. HYMANSON: I'm sorry to hear that.
MR. EHLE: Just kind of happened recently. So he's been in a wheelchair now for probably three months.

MR. H. HYMANSON: I'm sorry to hear that.
All right. Ladies and gentlemen, I 'm getting very close today, and I'll finally sit down and you won't have to hear from me anymore.

Is there anyone here that thinks that they will have an issue following the law as given to them by the Court? No hands.

This is an important question: Is there anything that $I$ didn't ask or that $I$ asked and didn't follow-up with you about that you think that we should know before we decide who should sit on
this jury? Anything anybody can think of?
Yes, ma'am. Ms. Brown.
MS. BROWN: Yes. 668. I do work on a daily basis with a lot of individuals with disability. So when you're talking about wheelchairs and different handicaps, I do come across a lot of people with Medicaid, and our population is primarily disabled.

MR. H. HYMANSON: okay. Thank you for sharing that, and you have a Master's in, is it rehab counseling?

MS. BROWN: Yeah.
MR. H. HYMANSON: And what is a Master's in rehab counseling?

MS. BROWN: It's where you help individuals who have disabilities find employment, but that's what my Master's is in. That's not currently what I'm working.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. And so what's the day-to-day description? I know you kind of said it, but just is there anything else in the description you said that describes what your job description is?

MS. BROWN: What the rehab counseling is or what my current job?

MR. H. HYMANSON: Your current job description.

MS. BROWN: Well, I'm a supervisor, and I supervise individuals who go out to nursing facilities and hospitals, and we help them transition individuals with Medicaid, transition back home.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. Thank you very much. Is there anyone else that has something that they think that I should really ask you about or that you should te11 me about.

Yes, sir. Mr. Ehle.
MR. EHLE: 606. I've had extensive medical history, lots of dealings with doctors. You're talking about giving an edge to somebody. I'd be more inclined, right off the bat, to give an edge to you.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay, okay. Thank you very much. Is there anyone else that has any statements? Oh, yes. Ms. Price.

MS. PRICE: I just don't know how much the kidney thing is going to be. I just have a lot of family history with kidney disease.

MR. H. HYMANSON: okay, okay.
MS. PRICE: I don't know if that's
important or not.
MR. H. HYMANSON: Understood. I'll ask you a couple of questions about that. Thank you. So 632 ; correct?

MS. PRICE: Yes.
MR. H. HYMANSON: Thank you so much.
Ms. Price, so you say you have a lot of family history with kidney disease. I don't want to go into a lot with that, but can you expand on that a little bit.

MS. PRICE: My family has a genetic disorder with polycystic kidney disease. My brother was actually just diagnosed on Saturday with it.

MR. H. HYMANSON: I'm sorry to hear that.
MS. PRICE: That's really it.
MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. All right. well, thank you very much for sharing that. I appreciate that.

Is there anything that any of you have heard so far that makes you think that it would be difficult for you to sit and serve as a juror on this case?

Al1 right. Ladies and gentlemen -MR. ARNTZ: wait.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Court's indulgence.

Apologies. Thank you very much, Your Honor. (Pause in the proceedings.)

MR. H. HYMANSON: I'm not quite done. I have a couple more.

So, Mr. Ehle, I want to just follow-up on what you said. You said that you think that given your issues with medical treatment before, you think that you would be potentially having -- well, to ask the question, would one side be more ahead than the other? You think that my side would be more ahead, the plaintiffs; correct?

MR. EHLE: Correct.
MR. H. HYMANSON: And so do you think that -- you understand that the facts of this case that are going to be presented are different from any of the facts of what's happened to either yourself or your friends; correct?

MR. EHLE: Yes, I think so.
MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. And that's a different scenario. Even if it's something similar, it's not the same person, not the same set of facts; correct?

MR. EHLE: Correct.
MR. H. HYMANSON: Do you think that there is a way that you can still be fair and impartial
and sit and judge this case?
MR. EHLE: I'll try. I think, like I said, I have a very extensive medical history, starting when I was eight years old. I'm 69 now. A lot of different doctors, a lot of different misdiagnoses. A lot of -- I had a botched operation. I could go on and on and on. I mean, I can try to be fair. It would be, you know, just I'm afraid of whatever the other side brings up, it's going to reference something that I've already been through.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Understood. Thank you very much for that.

Ladies and gentlemen, if you were a plaintiff who was injured as a result of someone's medical malpractice, would you feel comfortable with someone with your viewpoint or disposition sitting on the jury?

Is there anybody that feels that they wouldn't be comfortable? If you were injured and you were severely harmed by someone's medical malpractice, would you be comfortable with someone with your viewpoints sitting on the jury?

Is there anyone that wouldn't be comfortable?

Seeing that, I have no further questions.

Thank you very much, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Thank you. We'11 let Mr. -are you going to use the podium?

MR. MCBRIDE: Sure. I might as well, Your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. And are you okay with that location? we don't have the same line of much sight issues from you.

MR. MCBRIDE: My voice is very loud too.
Good afternoon, everyone. Can everyone hear me?

You can hear me all right, Mr. Wilder?
And one thing, so that we know -- and, Mr. Wilder, in case you're concerned about being able to hear anything, see these little microphones in front of the jury box and over in front of the witness stage, and the judge has one up there? That's going to help, I think, project so you can hear.

But you understand you can also use that device that the judge told you about as well; right? okay. You feel comfortable given that information the fact that there's microphones here to be able to hear the witnesses testifying and the judge and counsel, what they might say?

You feel comfortable with being able to raise your hand if you can't hear anything?

MR. WILDER: I think so.
MR. MCBRIDE: All right. One question $I$
wanted to ask everyone in general -- and I think we've covered this earlier -- is just, in general, do the people here in this panel, do you feel or have one opinion of physicians negatively or positively? Either negatively or positively?

Mr. Ehle, we already know, $I$ think, where you're coming from.

MR. EHLE: Yeah.
MR. MCBRIDE: All right. I'11 get to you in a second. Anyone else here who has a very favorable about physicians, Mr. Maltese?
mR. MALTESE: Yeah.
MR. MCBRIDE: And that's Mr. Maltese, you are at 665.

MR. MALTESE: Correct. I have a favorable -- I was in a hospital and had almost 20 surgeries in a hospital stay; and they, you know, I was about to die. They just took me up and got me better.

MR. MCBRIDE: So was that here locally in Las vegas, or was that back in New York?

MR. MALTESE: No. It was in New York, yeah.

MR. Mcbride: And how long ago was that?
MR. MALTESE: Colon cancer survivor about 20 years ago.

MR. MCBRIDE: Congratulations. Do you
think that that positive experience that you had as a result of the physicians and the healthcare providers that took care of you, do you think that's going to impact, one way or another on your ability to be fair and impartial juror in this case?

MR. MALTESE: I could be fair and impartial.

MR. MCBRIDE: Okay. Does everyone here understand like, up to this point, no one has heard a single thing about the facts of this case? You'd agree with that; right? So everyone, you're coming into this case with a clean slate; right?

Mr. Ehle, let's go to your concerns, and I appreciate, $I$ think counsel mentioned the term "brutal honesty," and that's all we're asking for, everyone's brutal honesty here, because it's very important to both sides, to our clients as well as to the plaintiffs.

And so, Mr. Ehle, I wanted to touch really
quickly on your feelings about physicians given your extensive medical history. If you were in Dr. Lasry's position or APRN Bartmus's position, would you want someone with your same mindset, as you sit here right now, judging against them in this case?

MR. EHLE: I wouldn't want me judging against them.

MR. MCBRIDE: Right. And is that because you have had such bad experiences? MR. EHLE: Yeah, yeah.

MR. MCBRIDE: And not just personally. I think you told us about other individuals who you believe have been victims of malpractice; is that right? Maybe I -- I took that down in my notes. Was there anyone else that you've encountered that you felt to have had malpractice against them?

MR. EHLE: I don't think $I$ know anybody that had malpractice against them. I have a good friend that's in a wheelchair because of third-stage kidney disease. I've thought about doing malpractice suits myself. I never have.

MR. MCBRIDE: And I guess what I'm trying to get at and counsel even mentioned, there's other cases that are in this courtroom, and some are not
medical malpractice. Some are criminal cases. There's construction defect cases, as we've heard about. Do you think, given your past experience, that this is maybe not the right case for you to be a juror on because of that?

MR. EHLE: Yeah, medical malpractice suits aren't the right case for me. I've served before on a criminal case.

MR. MCBRIDE: Right, right.
MR. EHLE: This is not -- I don't think you want me.

MR. MCBRIDE: Okay. Well, and, again, and I appreciate your brutal honesty, and that's all we're asking for from everyone here. We want everyone to disclose if there is some feeling, as much as each of us want to believe we can be fair and impartial, it's really important if there's something maybe deep down or some past experience that might affect our ability to be fair and impartial. And I appreciate -- Mr. Ehle, I appreciate that.

How about anyone else, given what Mr. Ehle has talked about, anyone else kind of have that same feeling, one way or the other? Mr. Read.

MR. READ: 637. Yeah, if you asked the
question like he asked and I probably should have raised my hand when he kind of mentioned it like at the end it was like "Is this the right case for you?" And this is probably like -- like there's probably like tons of cases on your dockets that would be probably a better case for me to have walked in and like where I would have. But, yeah, if you're asking me the question, "Is this probably the right case for me?" No.

MR. MCBRIDE: okay. And, again, that's for the opposite reason? That's because -- and I think in response to questioning, you felt that you might be more favorable, given your experience with your ex-wife towards the defendants in this case.

MR. READ: Well, yeah, just also just kind of being able to not think of like myself in that situation and like, you know, just kind of like we're like just being that family observer-type person that, you know, like it's affecting their lives. Yeah, it's more of that person and --

MR. MCBRIDE: And is that even the case, Mr. Read, even though everyone agrees here we haven't heard anything about the facts of the case? MR. READ: Yeah, and that's where $I$ kind of like were kind of hesitant to even mention it when
he asked it before because I haven't heard anything. so it's like, you know, it might be totally something where it's just -- or it disappears or it doesn't -- so I wouldn't know. But like if you're asking me the question like right now, like just even listening to like just his comments, it's like if you're asking me that particular question, "Is this the right case for you," you know, like move me next-door, and then I'd love to serve, and I think it might be a better fit than where this wouldn't be a good fit for me.

MR. MCBRIDE: Understood. Anyone else have any similar strong feelings, one way or another about their ability to be fair and impartial in this case? Mr. Headd.

MR. HEADD: Mr. Headd, 633. I don't know if it will be an issue, but $I$ heard it's an E.R. case. Is that -- it's going to deal with the E.R.?

MR. MCBRIDE: It pertains to the care and treatment rendered was in the emergency room; right?

MR. HEADD: Yeah, my just personal opinion is it's a very -- you know, they don't know what's coming in the door a lot of times, and they're going to just -- they have to kind of take it as it comes and do the best they can because, you know, they
don't have any prior knowledge of what's going on. So $I$ think, in that case, $I$ potentially might be skewed towards the E.R. doctor because they're just trying to do the best they can with what they know right that second. So like, you know, their chances of making a mistake might be higher because they don't have this long-term history with the patient, and I think I would feel more forgiving towards them in that situation versus like a family practitioner.

MR. MCBRIDE: Understood. But you would agree with me, you know absolutely no facts about this case?

MR. HEADD: Yeah. I'm saying the facts might come out and might not affect me at all.

MR. MCBRIDE: Right, right. And I appreciate you being honest and telling me about that and telling us about that. However, do you think, again, in this case, that --

And I would ask this of everyone: Do you think all of you can sit and wait until you hear all of the evidence that comes in before you make up your mind in this case?

Can everyone agree to do that?
Mr. Withers, can you agree with that too?

MR. WITHERS: Yes.
MR. MCBRIDE: A11 right. Mr. Newman.
MR. NEWMAN: Yes.
MR. MCBRIDE: And, Mr. Newman, you are 640.
MR. NEWMAN: Yes.
MR. MCBRIDE: And, Mr. Headd, I wanted to just touch that based on that, in terms of your, you know, feelings already that you've expressed about this if this is an E.R. case, are you willing to wait and until all the evidence has been in, until plaintiff has put their evidence and submitted their evidence and defendants have had an opportunity to respond before you make any decision in this case?

MR. HEADD: Like I said, it's going to depend on how the facts come out.

MR. MCBRIDE: Right.
MR. HEADD: But for me, in my mind, I'm trying to look at it in a different scenario. If I look at it as, you know, somebody is in a burning house and the fireman pulls them out trying to save their 1 ife and dislocates their shoulder, should that fireman then be sued for dislocating their shoulder while he was trying to save their life? I feel no. But $I$ mean, depending how the facts come out, you know, if it's not a situation like that at
al1, I'11 be fine.
MR. MCBRIDE: Right. And, again, those are not the facts of this case.

MR. HEADD: Yeah, okay. Just I don't want to -- you know, if a certain scenario like that comes on, 1 might shut down a little bit and, you know what I'm --

MR. MCBRIDE: Understood, understood.
And, again, everyone has to wait until the evidence comes in. How about this general question in terms of we talked about the burden of proof.

Does everyone here understand that the plaintiff is the one that has the burden of proof of their case by a preponderance of the evidence?

Does everyone -- Mr. Headd, you understand that?

MR. HEADD: Uh-huh.
MR. McBRIDE: And that means that the plaintiff will go first. That's why they ask questions first of the jurors here, and then the defense goes.

Do you think that everyone here can make a promise to all of us that you'll wait until all of the evidence has been presented before you make up your mind in this case? Everyone can do that?

Mr. Headd, again, coming back to you, you think, again, understanding what you told us, do you believe that you could still be fair and impartial and wait until all the evidence has been submitted? MR. HEADD: Yeah, yeah.

MR. MCBRIDE: Okay. Thank you.
THE COURT: And I'm just going to interject briefly, Mr. McBride. Don't lose your place on your questions.

MR. MCBRIDE: Sure.
THE COURT: I think that's a good place to just interrupt briefly and say we even have an instruction that talks about how you are, you know, nobody lives in a vacuum; right? we all have common 1ife experiences, and we're all entitled to bring to our jury service our common life experiences; and even if we have some empathy or sympathy or whatever it is, one way or the other, what we need to know is if you could not set that aside and if you could not overcome whatever those feelings are and, at the end of the day, deliberate with your fellow jurors to render, you know, a verdict according to the evidence. That's the concern.

We know people are going to have their life experiences. We know people are going to have
their, again, empathies and sympathies, and there are instructions that talk about this. But at the end of the day, your duty, your oath is going to be that you will listen to the evidence and you will receive the instructions, and you will render a verdict based on what you find the evidence to be.

Is there anyone here, as you sit here right now, who does not believe that they can do that? And there's no right or wrong answer?

MR. MCBRIDE: Mr. Ehle.
MR. EHLE: And I think, again, as I said -MR. MCBRIDE: Mr. Ehle, you're 606?

MR. EHLE: 606. I think I'd be predisposed for against your side.

MR. MCBRIDE: Against the doctor and the healthcare provider.

MR. EHLE: Yeah, I wish it wasn't the case, but I've had too many past experiences. MR. MCBRIDE: Sure.

THE COURT: And you've explained. It was just -- it was really a yes-or-no answer at that point. I was just trying to clarify. So we appreciate your additional information.

Go ahead, Mr. McBride. MR. MCBRIDE: And that actually brings --
that was a perfect segue into my next line of question. The judge just told you there's going to be instructions on what the law is, and in terms of one of those instructions is going to talk to you about how you can't judge this case on the basis of sympathy.

Does anyone, by the mere fact that Mr. Moore, who you saw here earlier today and yesterday, and Mrs. Moore sitting here, but Mr. Moore is here in a wheelchair, is that going to -- do you think you're going to be more sympathetic towards him because of that he's in a wheelchair? Anyone?

Okay. How many of you feel that simply because we're here in court, that that means that necessarily either my client, Dr. Lasry or APRN Bartmus must have done something wrong?

Any of you come to that conclusion before we started talking to you? Okay. Everyone --

Mr. Withers.
MR. WITHERS: Yeah. 618. I guess it's kind of presumed. That's why, you know, there's $i 11$ feelings or there's reasons to be here. obviously if there wasn't, there wouldn't be a lawsuit; right?

MR. MCBRIDE: Well, and you've managed a
car -- what's the general gist of the company that you work for right now?

MR. WITHERS: A bus company.
MR. MCBRIDE: I'm sorry?
MR. WITHERS: A bus company.
MR. MCBRIDE: A bus company. And have you said, in the past, that you've actually been involved in lawsuits that have been filed against your company?

MR. WITHERS: Many of them.
MR. MCBRIDE: And do you believe, on that basis, that every one of those cases -- have any of them ever ended up in the courtroom?

MR. WITHERS: I've been in deposition a lot. Most of them got settled outside of court.

MR. MCBRIDE: Okay. Have you ever had occasions, in your personal experience, where there's -- a lawsuit is filed, but it's your belief and after all the evidence that you've gathered as part of your job that you feel that there was absolutely nothing that was done inappropriately or wrong?

MR. WITHERS: Yes.
MR. MCBRIDE: Given that information, do you necessarily feel that -- would you agree with me
that a defendant -- if a plaintiff files a lawsuit, a defendant or defendants is entitled to defend themselves if they feel that they don't do anything wrong?

MR. WITHERS: Absolutely.
MR. MCBRIDE: So with that in mind, do you think that have you made any sort of decision in your mind that, before you've even heard any of the facts of this case, that either Dr. Lasry or Nurse APRN Bartmus had done anything wrong in this case?

MR. WITHERS: I haven't heard any facts. I can't come to that conclusion. Like I said earlier, if you're here, somebody believes they did something wrong.

MR. MCBRIDE: Fair enough.
MR. WITHERS: It's what evidence comes into play. Once we see the evidence, I'd like to think $I$ could draw a conclusion.

MR. MCBRIDE: Fair enough. In other words, I think you said this earlier in response to counsel's questions about you need to see some sort of evidence to be able to make your decision; is that right?

MR. WITHERS: Absolutely.
MR. MCBRIDE: And does everyone pretty much
agree with that's your job as a juror by its very essence, that you're here to judge the evidence and the testimony that you're going to hear before you make any sort of judgment against either in favor of the plaintiff or against my clients? You understand that? You're all good with that?
okay. Thank you, Mr. Withers. I appreciate it.

In terms of the medical care, $I$ think there was some of you -- I think, Ms. Bechtold, I think it was you and actually Mr. Withers, and I want to talk about you, Ms. Bechtold, you talked about you may not go to a doctor necessarily on a regular basis; is that right?

MS. BECHTOLD: I go for well checkups, yes.
MR. Mcbride: well checkups.
MS. Bechtold: yes.
MR. MCBRIDE: okay. And but you might wait a little while to see if there's really something more wrong if you think you have the symptoms of a cold; is that right?

MS. BECHTOLD: That's correct.
MR. MCBRIDE: Do you think a patient, such as yourself, are you responsible, do you think you're responsible for certain aspects of your own
health?
MS. BECHTOLD: Yes. My own self-care. I think we know our own bodies better sometimes and know our healing responses at this age especially, so.

MR. MCBRIDE: And in terms of that, does everyone kind of feel that same way that if you go see a doctor, if you have other prior health conditions, that each of us or each of you are responsible, to a certain degree, with your own health? You would agree with that?

That, and in terms of following a physician's advice, do you think that if a doctor tells you to go see another doctor, do you think that that's something that's important for you to follow? Everyone agree with that?

Anyone disagree with that? okay.
MR. WEAVER: Ms. Brown, I think.
MS. BROWN: Brown, 668.
MR. Mcbride: Oh, I'm sorry. Yeah, Ms. Brown. I'm sorry.

MS. BROWN: You said if anybody disagrees like if a referral is made to a different doctor, $I$ would think that would be on their own personal preference. It would depend on if you take the
> doctor's information and then you process that information. If you want to follow-up with a referral, you can. It's free will.

MR. MCBRIDE: Fair enough. And that's something that would you also agree that everyone is entitled to a second opinion if they disagree with another doctor?

MS. BROWN: Yes.
MR. MCBRIDE: Everyone agree with that concept? okay.

Thank you, Ms. Brown. I appreciate that. I'm sorry I didn't see your hand raised.

Has anyone here either have you personally experienced it where you've been disabled for a period of time, or do you know people who, in your family, immediate family, who have been disabled for a period of time? I think we talked about some people. Ms. Brown, you mentioned an individual you knew about in -- excuse me.

Mr. Jones, you knew someone about who was in a wheelchair.

MR. JONES: Yeah, wel1, I said I had a grandfather who had a leg amputated. But $I$ have a nephew who was in a wheelchair as a result of a surgery and caught some kind of a -- what do you
call it? He caught something in the hospital that debilitated him and he couldn't recover from it. It wasn't a staff infection. It was something else, and he was never able to recover from it. He's still in a wheelchair. He's only 41 years old. MR. McBRIDE: How long ago did that happen? I'm sorry to hear that.

MR. JONES: About eight years ago.
MR. MCBRIDE: would anything about that particular instance and understanding that Mr. Moore is in a wheelchair -- again, we don't know, you don't know the circumstances behind that -- anything which might cause you to be less than fair and impartial in this case?

MR. JONES: No.
MR. MCBRIDE: Okay. Thank you. I appreciate it.

Anyone else? Anyone else have anyone who had a long-term disability that kept them out of work or in a wheelchair for a long period of time?

All right. Mr. -- I'm going to get your 606, and it's Mr. Ehle.

MR. EHLE: I just have a question.
MR. MCBRIDE: Sure.
MR. EHLE: Personally or if we know
somebody?
MR. MCBRIDE: Either one.
MR. EHLE: Yeah. I been disabled several times. I was on crutches for three years. After that, $I$ had a broken leg one time. I was on crutches for about six weeks, $I$ think, for that one. Let me think. There might be another time. I can't remember.

THE COURT: okay.
MR. MCBRIDE: But fair to say a few times?
MR. EHLE: A few times, yeah.
MR. MCBRIDE: And in terms of there was some questions about anyone who knew anyone who had vascular insufficiency or any of those questions, do you remember those questions? How about the term DVT, deep vein thrombosis? Anyone know about that?

MR. JONES: I actually had a DVT.
MR. MCBRIDE: Oh, you did. Okay. And without getting too personal, how long was that?

MR. JONES: Actually, $I$ had two over a 12 -year period. The 1 ast one was about six years ago. And so they put me on $a \operatorname{blood}$ thinner as $a$ result of it. I played a lot of basketball, and a leg injury and migrated blood clot. So not any fault of -- just one those lumps, it was a P.E.,
pulmonary embolus.
MR. MCBRIDE: Pulmonary embolus. And in terms of the medication you were on, is that going to be something, without getting too invasive, is that something you were on medication for a period of time?

MR. JONES: I'm still on it. After you have the second one, they usually kind of -- they feel that you may have a predisposition for clotting, and they put you on a thinner on a permanent basis.

MR. MCBRIDE: Okay. And in terms of your understanding of your condition, the reasons why you're taking that medication, do you take that medication on a daily basis?

MR. JONES: As instructed, right.
MR. MCBRIDE: And is that because you know what could happen if you don't take that medication?

MR. JONES: Yeah.
MR. MCBRIDE: Okay. How did you feel about the treatment you received as a result of the DVT that you had?

MR. JONES: I had excellent treatment.
MR. MCBRIDE: All right. And in terms of anyone else, anyone else heard that term "DVT" or
had experience? Ms. Price, 632.
MS. PRICE: I've just heard of it. My father had coronary artery disease, had to have surgery, was on blood thinners. So I know that he had one in the past.

MR. MCBRIDE: Right, right. And there's a medication known as Xarelto. Is that --

MR. JONES: Actually, I take Eliquis.
MR. MCBRIDE: Eliquis.
MR. JONES: It's the same family of thinners but just a different brand name.

MR. MCBRIDE: Have all of you seen those commercials on TV about Xarelto and Eliquis and all those sorts of things? So people generally have an understanding of blood thinners and what they're used for? okay. You're going to hear physicians, experts get up here to talk and explain all of the medical terminology to you that might come up in this case, and that's a general question.

Does anyone here have any sort of hesitation, without hearing any sort of evidence, that they're not going to understand what this case is about? Anyone at this point?

Mr. Fife, 614.
MR. FIFE: Yes.

MR. MCBRIDE: what's your concern, sir?
MR. FIFE: Well, just like you said, just not understanding the terms or exactly what's going on with it.

MR. MCBRIDE: And I think, you know, with the exception of a couple of people that have relatives -- Mr. Read, your ex-wife, who was a nurse -- for the most part, I don't believe -- and Ms. Jones (sic), I believe you're Medicaid, but there's no other individuals here on this panel who actually have medical background; is that right?

Did I miss that? Oh. Ms. Bebekyan.
ms. bebekyan: yes.
MR. MCBRIDE: Did I say that right?
mS. bebekyan: yes, 109. I work in a medical call center. So I'm paging out to doctors and nurses, and you hear all these words that are familiar, and I didn't go to medical school. So I learned it based off of two weeks. So and every day, you just learn something new and catch up.

MR. MCBRIDE: And that's something I could assure you that those of us who do this sort of work, as attorneys I'm not a doctor, but we learn things all the time, including in every trial.

So I could assure you we're going to have
witnesses who are going to testify, who are going to be medical experts, as well as the defendants who are going to testify, and they'll explain that information to you, and hopefully you'll be able to get a gist of what's happened.

That brings up another point. Does anyone here have a problem with the fact that some of the physicians who might be called in to testify, either as experts or as treating physicians, that they may be compensated for their time away from patients and here on the stand? Anyone have a problem with that?

Ms. Price, what's your concern? 632.
MS. PRICE: It's not necessarily $I$ have a problem with it. It just puts -- I know that they're getting paid for it. So it's not as -- I don't know if I take the testimony with as much weight as somebody who $I$ know is doing it of their own volition. They know that they're doing it because they truly believe the stuff, what they're saying.

MR. MCBRIDE: Sure. And if it's the case that, on both sides, experts have been retained and are going to testify, are you saying basically it would be kind of a wash to you in terms of given the fact that they're being paid to --

MS. PRICE: No, it wouldn't be a wash. I'd just maybe take it with a grain of salt.

MR. MCBRIDE: okay. Fair enough, fair enough. I appreciate that.

THE COURT: Just to interject, there is also an instruction on how to determine credibility and believability of witnesses, and it kind of goes into some detail. The counsel may inquire of any person who's testifying and whether or not they're being compensated. It's very hard in these trials to predict timing and when to call and things like that, and people have to rearrange their schedules and circumstances.

So, you know, it really does boil down to an understanding by all the parties and all the counsel that certain folks with certain expertise in certain areas of certain knowledge would be compensated. So, and, again, it's all instructions. The instructions talk about all factors to be considered about credibility, believability of witnesses, how you weigh them, whether you believe them, all of those things.

So you'11 get instructions on that. But, again, it's not uncommon at all for witnesses to be compensated.

MR. MCBRIDE: Thank you, Your Honor.
There was some questions -- I just wanted to go briefly over it. There was some questions by counsel about people taking responsibility for their actions. Do you remember that line of questioning?

How many here believe that patients -again, this kind of goes to a question I asked earlier -- how many believe that patients have a certain responsibility of their own when it comes to their healthcare? Pretty much everyone?

Mr. Grant, you believe that as well?
MR. GRANT: Yes. 634.
MR. MCBRIDE: Okay. Anything about any experience that you've had where you feel that if a physician were to come in and defend his care and treatment of this, that in a particular case -- and in this case, Dr. Lasry -- would you have any problem listening to his point of view before making any sort of decision on the case relative to the plaintiff?

MR. GRANT: I have no problem, no.
MR. MCBRIDE: How many of you have ever been either judged by someone else on the benefit of hindsight or you judged something on the benefit of hindsight? Do you understand that?

MR. WITHERS: No.
MR. MCBRIDE: okay. How about the term "Monday morning quarterback," let's put it in a term 1ike that. Has everyone heard that term "Monday morning quarterback"?

Ms. Price, you've not heard that term before. MS. PRICE: No.

MR. MCBRIDE: 632.
Mr. Withers, why don't you explain what your understanding is of a Monday morning quarterback.

MR. WITHERS: 618. This is something I deal with constantly, working for $24 / 7$ business. Things are going to happen when $I$ 'm not there. Things are going to happen over the weekend, overnight. It happened in a different department, and I manly get a portion or a part of the truth, and the first thing I would say to myself or to others is "I wouldn't have done it that way" or "why did they do it like that?"

That's the Monday morning quarterback is: I would have done it different than you, even though I wasn't in that situation.

MR. MCBRIDE: Right. And in those certain circumstances, when someone comes back to you and
they have a good response to the reason why they did it, do you accept that explanation for it?

MR. WITHERS: I expect it.
MR. MCBRIDE: okay. And, again, in terms of does everyone kind of feel that same way that if you kind of look at something, you might have a difference of opinion as to whether or not a certain employee underneath you should have done certain things a certain way, that you want to listen to them and see what their explanation is for it? And if the explanation is a reasonable explanation, are you inclined to at least allow them the benefit of that doubt?

Anyone so adamant that they cannot accept that and it's only your decision, your hindsight that should be the determinative factor? Anyone? Mr. Everett, anything about that? We haven't heard much from you today, and you're probably thankful for that. But I wanted to ask you some stuff about your work as a -- was it content creator.

MR. EVERETT: Videographer.
MR. MCBRIDE: Videographer. And in terms of the work that you do, do you have other people who work for you?

THE COURT: Mr. Everett, I could barely hear you. So I can only imagine certainly Mr . wilder is not hearing you.

MR. EVERETT: Just maybe like one other person.

THE COURT: We need your court reporter to hear you.

MR. WEAVER: I still can't. I'm sorry.
THE COURT: You're really going to have to speak up, sir.

MR. EVERETT: One other person.
MR. MCBRIDE: One other person. All right. Thank you. And then you do you collaborate together with that other person?

MR. EVERETT: Yeah. We do it together.
THE COURT: So I'm going to interrupt. Mr. Everett, I've got to be honest. You're talking to Mr. McBride. But nobody else can hear you. So I know it's going to sound awkward, but you're going to have to shout or you're going to have to stand because you're just having a very soft conversation, and even though we're telling you we can't hear you, you haven't raised the decibels of your voice at a11.

MR. EVERETT: Okay.

THE COURT: So either stand up or project.
okay? Thank you.
MR. EVERETT: Yes. We work together, one other person.

MR. MCBRIDE: All right. And certainly don't mean to call you out, sir. I just want to -and in your line of work, is it important, do you believe to collaborate with that other person and take that other person's opinions and decisions as well?

MR. EVERETT: Yes. All of it. Everything, yeah.

MR. MCBRIDE: Do you think you're ultimately the one in charge and the only one who can make that decision?

MR. EVERETT: No.
MR. MCBRIDE: Thank you, sir. Appreciate it.
There was also some talk about award of millions of dollars and whether you could feel comfortable awarding $\$ 10$ million or $\$ 5$ million if the found that the particular case and the facts presented itself. How about the reverse of that?

If you felt that after you heard all of the evidence in this case and you listened to all of the witnesses, if at the end of the day, you feel that
the plaintiff did not prove their case or they did not prove that they are entitled to damages, would you be okay turning the plaintiff away, Mr. and Mrs. Moore away, without awarding anything?

Could everyone do that?
Anyone who would have a problem or difficulty doing that, besides maybe Mr. Ehle? And I don't mean to call you out.

Anyone else who would have a problem doing that? No.

Ms. Brown, are you okay with if the facts and evidence did not support the fact that plaintiff was entitled to an award of damages, would you have any problem turning Mr. and Mrs. Moore away?

MS. BROWN: No.
MR. MCBRIDE: How about in terms of medical care in the practice of medicine, how many of you believe that medicine is an exact science; in other words, there's only one answer that can be for any particular condition? Anyone?

All right. No hands.
All right. So in this particular case, you've heard the term the "practice of medicine"; right? Ms. Price, what's your understanding of what that means?

MS. PRICE: "Practice of medicine"?
MR. MCBRIDE: 632.
MS. PRICE: 632. A patient healthcare. So basically people going in, getting a diagnosis, getting prescription, surgery, mental care, psychology, therapy. Anything that falls under the umbrella of taking care of your body and mind.

MR. MCBRIDE: Okay. And I think there was some discussion, Mr. Headd, you talked about it, I think you did as well, Ms. Price, about physicians, the fact that they go to medical school for years of training and practice of medicine in a particular area; right?

Do you feel that that makes them necessarily the only experts to listen to? In other words, do you --

MS. PRICE: Are you asking me?
MR. McBRIDE: Yeah, I'm talking to you, Ms. Price. I'm sorry. In other words, do you believe that there's other ways to treat certain conditions? And different physicians might have different opinions as to how to treat those conditions.

MS. PRICE: 632. And yes. Definitely, there's multiple ways for something to have been
handled.
MR. MCBRIDE: Okay. And, again, Mr. Jones, would you feel that same way?

MR. JONES: Yes.
MR. MCBRIDE: Ms. Sallee, you are 604. I have not heard you today. But I wanted to just kind of inquire of you, is there anything that you've heard from either side here that raises a question in your mind as to whether or not you could be fair and impartial in this case?
ms. SALLEE: Not at all.
MR. MCBRIDE: Have you heard of the term "standard of care"?

MS. SALLEE: Yes.
MR. MCBRIDE: Okay. what's your
understanding of that term as it relates to the practice of medicine?

MS. SALLEE: I'd say it's the basics. Without it being a special -- just the basic normal standard of care.

MR. MCBRIDE: And has anyone else heard that term?
the court: we didn't get Ms. Sallee's number. It's 604. MR. MCBRIDE: Oh, I'm sorry. 604.4.

Anyone else, have you heard that term, what the "standard of care" is generally?

I guess let me just kind of finish it up with this, and $I$ think I'm actually done. Let me just check my notes real quick. oh, a couple of things. Sorry. Sorry to give you false hope, everyone. But has anyone here been treated at St. Rose, San Martin, in the emergency room?

Has anyone here been treated or had any close family members treated in the emergency room at any hospital here in Las vegas?

Show of hands. There's several of you. okay. Mr. Withers.

And how about, of those who raised their hands, have any of you any bad experiences of the emergency room departments that you've been treated at here in Las vegas? No one.
okay. Any good experiences? I know that's hard to even imagine, but any good experiences?

Mr. Newman, did you raise your hand there, 640?

MR. NEWMAN: 640. Yes.
MR. MCBRIDE: Okay. What was good experience in the emergency room?

MR. NEWMAN: My sister, they did very well
with her. You know, she was really messed up for quite awhile, but they stayed with it, and everything they did, it helped her. Even now, she's lost a lot of movement in one side, but the movement is back. I mean, she's in a wheelchair. She can't do what she normally was able to do, but she could function; and, you know, and she could get around.

MR. MCBRIDE: Right. And were you there when your sister was in the emergency room?

MR. NEWMAN: I came in later. She was already inside.

MR. MCBRIDE: Did you have occasion to personally interact with any of the healthcare providers?

MR. NEWMAN: Sometimes, but not all the time because my other sister, which is a nurse also. I mean, she's retired. It's many years ago. So she kind of controlled everything.

MR. MCBRIDE: okay. And but were you and your sister, were you happy with the answers that you got from the physicians and the nurses who took care --

MR. NEWMAN: Yes, I was. Yeah.
MR. MCBRIDE: Do you remember if you saw if your sister was treated specifically by a physician,
or was the APRN or a P.A., a Physician's Assistant. MR. NEWMAN: I think they had a team, a team of them. You know, after she was recovered and went home, she was back with a therapist and everyone else, and that's what really helped her.

MR. MCBRIDE: Great. That's good to hear. And then let's just talk real quick about any other hospitalizations here in Las Vegas. Besides those that you've already mentioned, anyone who have had any hospitalizations of close family members or yourselves at St. Rose, San Martin.

No one? Ms. Clinton. I'm sorry. And you are 658.

MS. CLINTON: 658, yes. And where is St. Rose, San Martin?

MR. MCBRIDE: San Martin campus is up off of St. Rose Parkway.

MS. CLINTON: Okay. I believe I had a brother who was in the hospital there.

MR. MCBRIDE: Okay. Anything -- did you go visit that brother?

MS. CLINTON: Yes.
MR. MCBRIDE: okay. And anything about that experience that caused you any concern, one way or another?

MS. CLINTON: No.
MR. MCBRIDE: Ms. Clinton, while I have you there and you raised your hand, I want to ask you another couple questions about your work in civil litigation. I think you said you did mostly business litigation and real estate.
ms. CLINTON: Yes.
MR. MCBRIDE: The fact that that's an entirely different area of law compared to a medical malpractice case or personal injury case, do you feel that you're able to view this case impartially and fairly as a juror in this case?
ms. CLINTON: Yes.
MR. MCBRIDE: All right. Anything about that experience as a civil litigator you think you're going to judge the attorneys harsher or less harsh.

MS. CLINTON: No.
MR. MCBRIDE: Okay. Again, I'm going to ask the final question, $I$ think for me, similar to what counsel had already asked, is there any question that you think that $I$ need to ask of you that would help me decide whether or not, and whether Dr. Lasry would need to know, about you personally that would help us decide whether you
could be fair and impartial in this case?
Anything? No.
And all of you, I think, have promised us if you were chosen to be jurors in this case, you could view this evidence fair and impartially and wait until all the evidence has been submitted?
would you agree that you will make every effort to make sure that the plaintiff proves every element of their case before you make a decision as to whether or not damages are appropriate in the case? Everyone agree with that?

That's all the questions $I$ have. Thank you very much.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
I'm going to have counsel at the bench for a brief scheduling conference.
(Bench conference.)
THE COURT: All right. Ladies and gentlemen, I wanted to have a conversation. I think you probably have figured out that, based on the classic and we're only 20 minutes or so before 5:00 o'clock and we really don't have the luxury to go past 5:00 unless it's going to be circumstances where it's just going to be just past 5:00 and we know we can complete, we still have a party and
their counsel who have to finish inquiring of the jurors.

We are not going to finish today. I'm sorry for that. We had hoped to do that, but that did not work, and this is not an exact science. We do our very best. I can assure you that we will finish tomorrow. We are going to return here tomorrow at 1:30. We will take however long it takes to qualify the final group of 20 ; and then from there, the final selection of ten will be complete. So I appreciate very much your indulgence to have the ability to return at least one more day for this process.

I will remind you again, and $I$ will go over the, you know, admonishment a little bit more in detail again that you are to be reminded that you're not to talk or converse among yourselves or with anyone else about the trial, not to do any independent researching, not to try to recreate any aspect of the case, not to visit any of the locations we talked about in the case and, you know, really most importantly, not to form or express any opinion on the case.
of course, you have zero evidence in the case, and the reason you know that is you can't
infer anything from the questions that are being asked is this is just to sort of get to people's mindsets on how certain things might work so final selections can be made. But until you actually hear the witnesses and until you actually see the documents, you don't have any evidence in the case. But please do not try to form or express any opinion on the case.

I will check with the jury services. I think if you're here on the third day, there might be some compensation that comes. I don't want to make any false promises, but that's my recollection. And but, again, we will absolutely complete tomorrow. There's no doubt about that. We have one remaining set of inquiries and whatever slight followup there might be. But thank you again for patience while we complete this process.
we are still on track, by the way. I've spoken with counsel, and the way we've looked at things, that we still expect to finish on the 7 th. That does not delay us on the end of the trial. It just is taking us a little bit longer to complete this part of the process than we anticipate.

Thank you again for your patience. Have a good night. Any questions, you can pose them to the
marsha1.
THE MARSHAL: Al1 rise for the jury.
(Jury panel exits the courtroom.)
THE COURT: Let me get the marshal back in so we can have that conversation about storing stuff, where we might put it.

MR. ARNTZ: Your Honor, $I$ think we're all in agreement that regardless -- we probably won't get done until 3:00 or 3:30 tomorrow at the earliest. If we all prefer just to plan on starting our openings on Thursday.

THE COURT: That's fine. I figured that's where you want to. We actually have some things we have to work out. We can go off the record on this. I don't think we have anything further on the record.

THE REPORTER: Thank you.
(Pause in the proceedings.)
THE COURT: I'm sorry. I should have thought of this. I just want to make one final record before we adjourn for the day that $I$ did inform counsel at this last bench conference that we had a concern about Mr. Wilder in seat No. 9, Juror 611, and his ability to truly hear the proceedings and whether or not he would, in fact,
engage in interruptions, so to speak, if he wasn't hearing people speaking.

His indication that he can hear about half the people, that it's based on tone, there's really no way for us to know who he's hearing and who he is not hearing, and we would have to be reliant on him to inter rupt the proceedings, I'm not really sure since he certainly hasn't done that, not once here, but he has indicated he could hear the counsel. So maybe that's why.

But, of course, some of the questions feed off of answers from other people's, you know, other answers that people have given, and he's shown no indication to want to know what that was or have you missed anybody. There's no way he heard Mr. Everett. There's no way he's heard lots of the people. So I am concerned. But we're going to wait, and by agreement of counsel, to deal with that concern tomorrow. We still have obviously --

Mr. Weaver, are you doing any voir dire?
mR. WEAVER: Yes.
THE COURT: We have Mr. Weaver's voir dire and then, of course, any final requests to traverse anybody that might be in question. So we'11 deal with them.

There also obviously has been identified, informally up to this, two potential cause excusals. Perhaps there are more in counsels' mind. But we talked about the two at the bench, Mr. Ehle, Juror 606; and Mr. Read, Juror 637, and we agreed also to wait until all of the questions have been asked to deal with those. So that was the nature of the final bench conference, besides the scheduling of when we might break today and resume tomorrow.

I hope I did tell all the jurors to come back at 1:30.

MR. MCBRIDE: You did.
THE COURT: But that's when we're going to start, and then we'll complete. And if we complete early tomorrow, that's fine, and we will wait and begin with opening statements on Thursday morning.

It's never my preference to hit the ten who are in shock that they just got selected with trying to pay attention to opening statements. It just is not conducive, I don't think, to anybody's efforts. So we will do and plan on doing opening statements at 9:00 on Thursday.

MR. MCBRIDE: Thank you, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Last housekeeping. I've gotten from Mr. Weaver the order on his motions of limine,
but $I$ haven't seen anyone else's. Again, I'm not
trying to push you. I know you're trying to prepare for trial. But $I$ obviously, in case any issues come up, having the order in place would be ideal. If not, $I$ certainly have notes and things.

But do we have any potential for those orders.

MR. MCBRIDE: I will have ours submitted by tomorrow.
the court: And mr. Arntz, any eTA on yours?

MR. ARNTZ: I'11 contact the others.
THE COURT: Yeah, tomorrow or the next day. Just somewhere in the process so that we have them when things might become an issue. okay? Everybody, goodnight.

MR. WEAVER: And, Your Honor, on that housekeeping point, we may also have a stipulation that we can submit jointly on some of the ones that weren't contested.

THE COURT: Okay. Fantastic.
MR. WEAVER: We'11 get that to you.
THE COURT: That's great. Yeah, we did talk about that too.

Thank you so much. Have a good night.
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|  | 1:17 <br> appeared [1] - 46:14 <br> appearing [1] - 46:25 <br> apple ${ }_{[1]}-85: 10$ <br> applied $[1]$ - 19:20 <br> apply [2] - 20:3, 53:19 <br> appreciate [16] - <br> 41:16, 60:11, 61:15, <br> 124:17, 129:20, <br> 131:13, 131:20, <br> 131:21, 134:17, <br> 138:23, 142:8, <br> 144:11, 145:17, <br> 151:4, 156:17, <br> 165:11 <br> appreciative [1]-62:1 <br> appropriate $[3]-4: 22$, <br> 92:16, 164:10 <br> APRN $[6]-1: 9,60: 15$, 130:3, 139:16, 141:10, 162:1 <br> area [2]-158:13, 163:9 <br> areas [1] - 151:17 <br> argument [1] - 25:4 <br> $\operatorname{arm}[5]-88: 2,97: 16$, <br> 100:4, 114:16 <br> ARNTZ ${ }_{[21]}-1: 19$, <br> 3:1, 4:2, 5:25, 6:7, <br> 6:23, 8:3, 46:7, 47:9, <br> 51:2, 54:7, 54:14, <br> 55:14, 61:22, 62:18, <br> 63:14, 106:5, <br> 116:19, 124:24, <br> 167:7, 170:12 <br> arntz [1] - 170:10 <br> Arntz [1] - 2:25 <br> art [1] - 19:13 <br> artery [1] - 148:3 <br> artful [1]-61:24 <br> articles [1] - 76:10 <br> ascertain [1] - 77:15 <br> Ashley [1] - 8:15 <br> aside [1] - 137:19 <br> asleep [6] - 46:25, <br> 51:21, 51:22, 52:15, <br> 52:17, 52:18 <br> aspect $[1]-165: 19$ <br> aspects [3]-102:16, 109:19, 142:25 <br> aspirational [1]-5:12 <br> assessment ${ }_{[1]}$ - <br> 74:23 <br> assistant [1] -9:8 <br> Assistant [1] - 162:1 <br> assistants [1] - 118:24 <br> associating [1] - 36:7 <br> assume [1] - 112:24 <br> assure [3] - 149:22, <br> 149:25, 165:6 | ```astronomical [1] - 93:8 at-fault [1] - 36:15 ate [1]-72:25 attack [1] - 111:17 attempt [1] - 84:17 attention [5] - 46:5, 47:22, 52:7, 53:4, 169:19 attorney [4]-26:6, 27:16, 29:20, 41:9 Attorney \({ }^{1}\) ] - 26:20 attorneys [7]-27:22, 29:9, 31:16, 82:4, 82:5, 149:23, 163:16 automatically \({ }_{[2]}\) - 37:13, 106:16 avoid [1] - 117:11 award [12] - 44:19, 91:7, 92:11, 92:25, 98:10, 98:13, 98:17, 98:18, 98:19, 99:18, 156:18, 157:13 awarded [6] - 86:18, 87:7, 95:19, 99:15, 99:18 awarding [9]-44:10, 68:23, 72:1, 96:5, 96:17, 97:3, 97:19, 156:20, 157:4 aware [2]-11:22, 52:5 awhile [4]-26:9, 41:23, 102:1, 161:2 awkward [1] - 155:19 \\ B``` ```BACK [13] - 44:15, 44:21, 44:25, 57:19, 58:6, 59:3, 59:15, 59:20, 60:2, 60:20, 60:25, 61:13, 62:10 background [2] - 37:12, 149:11 bad [16] - 41:12, 42:7, 42:8, 43:10, 43:11, 43:16, 44:3, 44:4, 44:6, 44:7, 85:11, 104:11, 114:19, 115:16, 130:10, 160:15 badge [15]-8:25, 10:12, 16:14, 16:15, 17:12, 21:18, 25:18, 26:12, 27:20, 62:8, 63:5, 64:2, 64:8, 64:23, 120:8 Badge [2] - 15:20, 21:1 ball \({ }_{[1]}-12: 23\)``` ```BACK [13] - 44:15, 44:21, 44:25, 57:19, 58:6, 59:3, 59:15, 59:20, 60:2, 60:20, 60:25, 61:13, 62:10 background [2] - 37:12, 149:11 bad [16] - 41:12, 42:7, 42:8, 43:10, 43:11, 43:16, 44:3, 44:4, 44:6, 44:7, 85:11, 104:11, 114:19, 115:16, 130:10, 160:15 badge [15]-8:25, 10:12, 16:14, 16:15, 17:12, 21:18, 25:18, 26:12, 27:20, 62:8, 63:5, 64:2, 64:8, 64:23, 120:8 Badge [2] - 15:20, 21:1 ball \({ }_{[1]}-12: 23\)``` |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |






| F | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 82:15, 82:25, 83:1, } \\ & \text { 111:10, 116:13, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { file }[20]-18: 6,25: 9, \\ 25: 14,30: 4,30: 24, \end{gathered}$ | flip ${ }_{[1]}-97: 22$ <br> flow [2] - 110:1 | $\begin{gathered} 80: 19,127: 16 \\ \text { full }[5]-12: 10,12: 24, \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| facilities $[1]-123: 5$ fact 22$]-28: 20,77.2,2$ | $120: 2,123: 23$ | $32: 13,32: 23,33: 7,$ |  | $14: 16,41: 10,70: 12$ |
| $\begin{array}{r} \text { fact }[22]-28: 20,77: 2, \\ 80: 18,87: 14,90: 23, \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 124:8, 124:11, } \\ & \text { 132:18, 134:10 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 33: 10,33: 12,33: 14, \\ & 33: 18,34: 2,34: 21, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { folks [5] - } 2: 25,6: 11, \\ 49: 6,63: 23,151: 16 \end{array}$ | fully [4] - 8:17, 52:2, |
| 91:8, 92:4, 92:20, | 144:16, 148:10 | 6:8, 79:12, | follow [7]-2:11, | function [1]-161:7 |
| 93:23, 95:3, 98:25, | 160:10, 162:10 | 79:21, 79:22 | 19:21, 94:15, | future [1] - 86:14 |
| 107:4, 107:8, 115:6, | family's [1] - 65:5 | filed [5] - 20:11, 20:15, | 121:24, 125:5, |  |
| 150:7, 150:25 | fantastic [1]-170:21 | files [1] - 141 | follow-up [3] - 121:24, |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 157:12, 158:11, } \\ & \text { 163:8, 167:25 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \operatorname{far}_{[11]}-2: 22,38: 4, \\ 45: 21,47: 2,47: 6, \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { fill }[3]-8: 21,62: 15 \\ & 63: 21 \end{aligned}$ | $125: 5,144: 2$ <br> following [7]-20: | gaining ${ }_{[1]}-103: 20$ <br> gallery [1] - $3: 17$ |
| factor [1] - 154:1 | , 67 | 28:2 | 94:21, 94:22 | game [1] - 29: |
| factors [3] - 100:7 | 86:18, 112:6, 124:20 | filling [1] - 64 | \%:6, 121:20, | garbage [1] - 29 |
| 100:24, 151:19 | father $[1]-148: 3$ | film [1] - 22:1 | 143:1 | Garden [2] - 66:8, |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { facts [36] - 24:3, 24:9, } \\ 26: 2,26: 3,30: 16, \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { fault }[13]-20: 18 \\ 29: 17,34: 6,34 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { final }[7]-163: 20 \\ 165: 9,165: 10 \end{gathered}$ | following-up [1] - 20:8 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 66:12 } \\ & \text { gate }[1]-32: 15 \end{aligned}$ |
| 34:12, 73:19, 74: | :21, 36:15, 39:24 | 67:20, | followup [3] - | gathered [1] - 140:19 |
| 74:20, 74:21, 75:8, | 11, 96:18, 97:5, | 168:23, 169:8 | 87:3, 166:16 | gears [2] - 17:8, 35:15 |
| $75: 25,78: 10,79: 19,$ | $97: 15,146: 25$ | finally [2] - 25:4, | food [6] - 66:8, 66:11, | general [14]-4:19, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 84:7, 84:19, 89:21, } \\ & 92: 22, ~ 97: 14, ~ 97: 23, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { favor }[3]-13: 16, \\ 37: 13,142: 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 121:17 } \\ & \text { financial }[2]-9: \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 72: 19,72: 23,72: 24, \\ & 72: 25 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 11:4, 41:3, 71:10, } \\ & 77: 8,101: 15,105: 6, \end{aligned}$ |
| 98:8, 98:16, 125:14, | favorable [4]-60:23 | 72:11 | foregoing [1] - 172:7 | 5:20, 105:23, |
| 125:16, 125:21, | 128:15, 128:20 | fine [19]-5:5, 6:19, | forgiving [1] - 134:9 | 128:5, 128:6, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 129:16, 132:23, } \\ & \text { 134:12, 134:14, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 132:13 } \\ & \text { feed }[2]-3: 18,168: \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 56: 12,57: 2,61: 5, \\ & 63: 16,64: 21,64: \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { forgot }[3]-37: 19, \\ 78: 6,89: 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 136:10, 140:1, } \\ & 148: 19 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 135:15, 135:24, } \\ & 136: 3,141: 9, \end{aligned}$ | feelings [12]-17:9, 68:1, 68:3, 68:4 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 68:16, 72:5, 72:6 } \\ & 76: 19,76: 23, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { form [2] - 165:22 } \\ & 166: 7 \end{aligned}$ | General's [1] - 26:20 generalized [1] - |
| 141:11, 156:21, | 05:2 | 76.19, $103.24,104: 2$ | former [3] - 9:8, 64 | 52: |
| 157:11 | :1, 133:13 | 136 | 65:1 | generally [2] - 148:14, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { factual }[2]-32: 21, \\ & 87: 25 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 135: 8,137: 20 \\ & 139: 23 \end{aligned}$ | $167: 12,169: 1$ | forthcoming [1] | $160: 2$ |
| failing [1] - 104:24 | fellow [1] - 137:2 | $6: 18,6: 25,7: 9,49: 1,$ | forward [3] - 46:13, | genetic [1] - 124:11 |
| fair [35]-5:19, 11:25, | felt ${ }_{[11]}-31: 17,31: 19$, | 49:14, 50:12, 51:12, | 62:15, 63:2 | gentleman [1] - 46:3 |
| 18:5, 18:24, 25:6, | 32:18, 57:15, 57:17 | 56:2, 57:23, 160:3, | foul ${ }_{[1]}-55:$ | gentlemen [10] - |
| 29:13, 31:17, 31:19, | 92:16, 115:22, | 65:1, 165:3, 165:7, | foundation [1] - 87:22 | $\text { 10:25, 12:7, } 14:$ |
| 32:8, 41:17, 67:7, | 6:1, 130:17 | 166:20 | four [2] - 77:22, | 33:20, 67:23, |
| 71:14, 73:4, 73:7, | 132:12, 156:2 | finishes [2]-48:25, | 111:1 | 116:23, 121:16 |
| 83:25, 92:19, | fem [1]-116:11 | 63:12 | frames [1]-5:24 | 124:23, 126:13, |
| 114:13, 125:25, | fem-pop [1] - 116:11 | finishing [2]-6:24, | $\text { freak }{ }_{[1]}-50: 2$ | 164:19 |
| 126:7, 129:11, | femoral ${ }_{[1]}$ - 116:9 | 50:3 | free [1] - 144:3 | genuinely [1] - 94:8 |
| 129:12, 131:16, | fender ${ }_{[1]}$ - 17:16 | fire [2]-43:17, 43:19 | FREMONT $[1]$ | giant ${ }_{[1]}-6: 19$ |
| 131:19, 133:14, | fender-bender [1] | fireman [2]-135:20, | friend $[7]$ - 11:7 | girlfriend [1]-83:1 |
| 137:3, 141:15, | 17:16 | 135:2 | 11:12, 65:17, 66:21, | gist [2] - 140:1, 150:5 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 141:19, 144:4, } \\ & \text { 145:13, 146:10, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { few }[8]-8: 6,18: 4, \\ 22: 12,26: 9,56: 6 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { firm }[4]-3: 2,9: 4 \\ 31: 10,32: 7 \end{gathered}$ | 104:18, 121:8, | given [15] - 32:18, |
| 151:3, 159:9, 164:1, | $\text { 12, 26:9, } 56$ | $\text { first }[16]-30: 1$ | 130: | $21,70: 12,84: 1$ |
| 164:5 | $46: 1$ | 42:14, 46:11, 47:13, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { frienas }[5]-48 \\ & 82: 13,111: 1 \end{aligned}$ | $25: 6,127: 22$ |
| fairly $[2]-2: 23,163: 12$ | field [8] - 11:8, 38:12 | :22, 62:3, 63:22, | $20: 2,125: 1$ | $30: 1,131: 3$ |
| fall ${ }_{[1]}-64: 15$ | 65:18, 66:21, | 0:19, 81:3, 81:6, | $\text { ndship }{ }_{[1]}-48: 7$ | $31: 22,132: 1$ |
| fallen [1]-52:15 | 105:21, 106:3 | 1:17, 101:22 | frivolous [22]-18:23, | 40:24, 150:24, |
| falls [1]-158:6 | 106:4, 107:20 | 08:9, 136:19 | $19: 3,23: 15,24: 2 \text {, }$ | 168:13 |
| false [3]-28:4, 160:6, | fife [1] - 148:24 | 136:20, 153:18 | $3: 19,28: 24,29: 8,$ | $\text { glass }[1]-17: 6$ |
| 166:12 | Fife [1] - 43:24 | fit [3]-62:4, 133:10, | $7: 5,37: 6,37: 8,$ | goal [1] - 5:12 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { familiar }[3]-108: 24, \\ 109: 3,149: 18 \end{gathered}$ | FIFE [4] - 43:25, 44:5, 148:25. 149:2 | $\begin{aligned} & 133: 11 \\ & \text { five }[6]-20: 17,32: 7, \end{aligned}$ | $39: 5,39: 12,39: 21,$ | goodnight [1] - 170:16 |
| families [1]-29:24 | figure [4] - 47:7 | $46: 1,46: 6,70: 8,$ | 4:13, 74:16, | grab [2] - 70:18, 92:7 |
| family [25] - 11:6, | $50: 15,71: 24,72: 7$ |  | 75:14, 86:19, 92:6 | graft [1] - 116:10 |
| 11:12, 11:15, 46:19, | figured [4] - 57:19, | fix [2] - 13:5, 107:16 | $\text { front }[7] \text { - 13:16, }$ | grain [1] - 151:2 |
| 60:17, 65:17, 66:20, | 61:1, 164:20, 167:12 | fleshing [1] - 84:25 | $51: 18,57: 11,57: 18$ | Granada [1] - 66:14 |




| 25, | judged [2] - 152:23 |  | knock [1] - 104:5 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| JANUARY ${ }_{[2]}$ - 1:16, | 152:2 | $\begin{array}{r} \text { keep }[16]-2: 9,5: \\ 6: 20,7: 24,25: 5 \end{array}$ | knowing [2] - 68:16, | $\begin{aligned} & 22: 8,22: 12,24: 25, \\ & \text { 26:23, 27:2, 27:6, } \end{aligned}$ |
| January [3]-45:2 | 89:17, 130:5, 1 | 6, 44:6, 54 | knowledge | 27:10, 28:23 |
| :5, 172 | judgment [5] - 26:3 | 10, 60:7, 63:4 | 5, 134:1, 151:1 | 25, 29:8, 36:9, |
| ASON | 1:11, 73:13, 82:22, | 2, 78:16, 103:10 | known [2] - 30: | 36:14, 37 |
| Jeffrey [1] - 57:7 | 142:4 | 12 | 148:7 | 8.6, 40.16 |
| Jessica [2] - 64:8, 66:7 | JUDICIAL ${ }_{[1]}-1 / 1$ jump ${ }^{[1]}-79: 4$ | KEITH $_{[1]}-1: 2$ kept [2] - 38:11, | knows [3] - 29:15 | $\begin{aligned} & 41: 3,41: 18,42: 2, \\ & 67: 2,71: 10,71: 1 \end{aligned}$ |
| Jimenez [6] - 50:22, 51:16, 51:18, 54:6, 62:13, 63:1 |  | 145:19 <br> kid ${ }_{[1]}-22: 13$ <br> kid's [1] - 12:23 |  | $\begin{aligned} & 73: 5,75: 14,75: 17 \\ & 76: 9,79: 13,86: 20 \\ & 88: 4,140: 8 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { jumps }[1]-64: 25 \\ & \text { Juror }[14]-8: 15,8: 16, \\ & 10: 9,10: 12,14: 25, \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { JIMENEZ [8] - 51:21, } \\ & \text { 51:24, 52:4, 52:7, } \\ & \text { 52:13, 53:11, 53:21, } \\ & \text { 54:2 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 46: 17,46: 25,50: 21, \\ & \text { 54:10, 57:7, 57:9, } \\ & \text { 167:24, 169:5 } \\ & \text { juror }[25]-2: 13,2: 16, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { kidney [8] - 120:3, } \\ & \text { 121:9, 121:10, } \\ & \text { 123:22, 123:23, } \\ & \text { 124:8, 124:12, } \\ & \text { 130:21 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { lack }[1]-24: 3 \\ & \text { Ladies }[1]-124: 23 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { lawyer }_{[1]}-81: 13 \\ & \text { lead }[1]-77: 13 \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Iadies [8] - 10:25, } \\ 12: 7,14: 1,67: 23 \end{gathered}$ | leading [1] - 78:5 <br> lean [1] - 32:4 |
| jingle ${ }_{[1]}-29$ : | 7:21, 8:13, 8:20, |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 116:23, 121:16, } \\ & \text { 126:13, 164:18 } \end{aligned}$ | leaning [1] - 39:20 <br> learn [3] - 105:15, |
| job [23] - 2:14, 9:8, | :13, 31:23 | 130:21 <br> kidneys [1] - 104:24 |  |  |
| 11:7, 26:9, 26:19, | $46: 14,47: 22,51: 13$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { kids [4] - 12:21, 16:25, } \\ 81: 2,81: 19 \end{gathered}$ | lady ${ }_{[1]}$ - 73:25 <br> language ${ }_{[1]}-8: 16$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 149:20, 149:23 } \\ \text { learned }[1]-149: 19 \end{gathered}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 50: 7,53: 10,64: 25, \\ & 65: 2,71: 3,84: 9, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 54: 17,56: 7,64: 1, \\ & 65: 9,66: 18,83: 9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { kind }[98]-13: 16,14: 8, \\ 16: 6,16: 24,17: 4, \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { least }[10]-16: 11, \\ & 16: 24,17: 5,26: 2, \end{aligned}$ |
| 89:14, 94:15 | :2, 90:6, 113:1 |  |  |  |
| 118:25, 119:4 | 4:21, 129:11 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 17:17, 18:14, 19:1, } \\ & \text { 19:25, 21:25, 22:23, } \end{aligned}$ | large $[1]$ - 78:13 <br> Las [9]-9:15, 40:15, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 47:1, 92:6, 92:19, } \\ & \text { 114:6, 154:12, } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 120:17, 122:22 } \\ & 122: 25,123: 1, \end{aligned}$ | $131: 5,142: 1,163: 12$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 19:25, 21:25, 22:23, } \\ & \text { 24:16, 24:17, 24:18, } \end{aligned}$ | 65:6, 128:25, | $\begin{aligned} & 114: 6,154: 12, \\ & 165: 12 \end{aligned}$ |
| 140:20, 142:1 | 3, 4:1, | $\begin{aligned} & 24: 16,24: 17,24: 18 \\ & 24: 19,24: 23,24: 24 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 162:8, 172:13, } \\ & 172: 18 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| Joe [1] - 107:2 | 4:22, 5:19, 8:4, 8:7, | 25, 25:1, 25:3, |  | $\begin{aligned} & 55: 24,56: 15,63: 15, \\ & 68: 6,81: 12,110: 25 \end{aligned}$ |
| joined [1] - 9:4 | 10, 10:13, 19:18 | 5:21, | LAS ${ }_{[1]}-2: 1$ |  |
| jointly [1] - 170:19 | 19:21, 39:2, 46:6 | 2, 26:7, 26:14 | LASRY ${ }_{[1]}-1: 7$ | leaving [1] - 43:3 |
| Jones [14]-27:19, | ::10, 47:19, 47:23, | :22, 28:25, 30:19, | $\begin{gathered} \text { Lasry }[7]-2: 7,60: 14, \\ 61: 10,139: 16, \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { led }[1]-22: 24 \\ & \text { left }[4]-41: 12,57: 23, \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 29: 4,29: 5,33: 12, \\ & 33: 22,33: 24,43: 6 \end{aligned}$ | $: 9,113: 4,117$ | 19, 54:13, 64:2 | 141:9, 152:17, | $\begin{gathered} \text { left [4] - 41:12, 57:23, } \\ 63: 25,120: 12 \end{gathered}$ |
| 77:6, 94:2, 96:25, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 136:20, 137:21, } \\ & \text { 164:4, 165:2, 169:10 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6: 21,66: 24,67: 2 \\ & 7: 6,68: 9,69: 16, \end{aligned}$ | 163:24 | leg [9] - 100:5, 114:16, |
| 149:9, 159:2 | JURY [1] - 1:1 | 1, 71:2, 71 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Lasry's }[1]-130: 3 \\ & \text { last }[11]-8: 6,10: 12, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 114:20, 115:3, } \\ & 115: 10,116: 1, \end{aligned}$ |
| JONES [33]-27: | $\begin{gathered} \text { Jury }[4]-45: 24,63: 10, \\ 117: 15,167: 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & : 12,72: 22,76: 4, \\ & : 21,80: 23,80: 24 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 16:14, 45:21, 55:21, } \\ & 61: 1,65: 7,92: 15, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 144:23, 146:5, } \\ & 146: 24 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 29: 1,33: 17,34: 3, \\ & 34: 23,42: 12,43: 8 \end{aligned}$ | $\text { jury [34] - 2:19, } 4:$ | 81:9, 81:24 | 61:1, 65:7, 92:15, 146:21, 167:22, | 146:24 |
| 43:14, 43:20, 77:7, | 4, 5:18, 6:21, 7:5 | 25, 82:8, 82:9 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 146:21, 167:22, } \\ & 169: 24 \end{aligned}$ | legal [4]-28:4, 34:16, 36:17, 36:20 |
| 77:10, 79:24, 94:3, | 17, 8:5, 9:16, | 8:19, 82:21, 83:11, |  | legs ${ }_{[1]}-117: 2$ less $[4]-45: 11,78: 6$, |
| 94:20, 114:18, 114:22, 115:1, | $\begin{aligned} & 7: 11,27: 12,27: 14 \\ & 9: 5,49: 20,50: 3, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 85: 8,88: 23,90: 25 \\ & 96: 25,97: 7,97: 11 \end{aligned}$ | 67:6 | $\begin{gathered} \text { less [4] - 45:11, } 78 \\ 145: 13,163: 16 \end{gathered}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 114:22, 115:1, } \\ & \text { 115:13, 115:22 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9: 5,49: 20,50: 3, \\ & 1: 11,63: 25,87: 4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 36: 25,97: 7,97: 1 \\ & 100: 23,101: 16, \end{aligned}$ | laugh ${ }_{[1]}-22: 14$ |  |
| 116:4, 116:7, | :11, 89:20, 92:15, | 01:25, 102:3 | $\begin{gathered} \text { law [14]-19:19, 20:2, } \\ 20: 3,26: 7,31: 9, \end{gathered}$ | lessen [1] - 28:18 <br> level [3] - 57:13, 93:8, |
| 144:22, 145:8, | 9:9, 99:24, 111:5 | 2:8, 105:4, | 20:3, 26:7, 31:9, 34:4, 93:17, 94:14, | 94:6 |
| 145:15, 146:17 $146: 20,147: 7$ | 112:4, 117:14 | $0: 23,121: 12$ | 94:15, 94:17, 94:19, 121:20, 139:3, 163:9 | license [1] - 81:15 <br> lie ${ }_{[1]}-106: 23$ |
| 146:20, 147:7, 147:16, 147:19, |  | 20, 131:23 |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 147:16, 147:19 } \\ & \text { 147:23, 148:8, } \end{aligned}$ | $166: 9,1$ | $\begin{aligned} & 132: 1 \\ & , 132 \end{aligned}$ | law's [1] - 11:15 | $\begin{gathered} \text { life [19] - 5:19, 6:22, } \\ 59: 21,95: 7,95: 18, \\ 100: 12,100: 21, \end{gathered}$ |
| 148:10, 159:4 | justified [4] - 21: | 22:25, 133:24 | lawsuit [27]-24:18, 25:9, 25:15, 27:23, |  |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { Joshua [3] - 46:10, } \\ 48: 3,62: 25 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 68: 15,88: 4,88: 5 \\ & \text { justify }[1]-23: 21 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 139: 22,143: 7 \\ & 144: 25,147: 8 \end{aligned}$ | $30: 4,32: 13,32: 23,$ <br> 33:7, 33:10, 33:12 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 00:12, 100:21, } \\ & \text { 01:11, 102:7, } \end{aligned}$ |
| judge [15]-85 | justly [1]-23:8 | 24, 151:7 |  |  |
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THE COURT: Let's get on the record and we'11 answer that question.

Thank you. Back on the record in trial, Moore vs. Lasry, et al.

You all may have a seat. I don't think we need to restate appearances. Just keep in mind our reporter that's with us today is different than our reporter yesterday, and we'11 follow all the same rules. We'll speak up. Try to remember to give juror numbers and names as we're doing it -- you're doing a great job with that, by the way.

We had a little bit of delay. There's been one juror that was a little late, but it looks like everybody is here and ready to go. We do have an additional group of jurors. I did not bring them into the room. I'm having them sit down in jury services. I don't think we're going to need them. By my count, we have 1 ike 16 extra people in the room. And, you know, so far, things seem to be going fairly well here.

You were going to ask a question, Mr. Arntz, about folks observing in the courtroom.

| from my firm. Are they okay there, or -- |
| :---: |
| back over here. |
| THE COURT: well, it really depends on, you |
| know, what their advantage point would be best |
| served. There's still seats up here behind counsel |
| table, which we're not bringing the jurors in that |
| way, so that's not an issue, if they want to be |
| there; or they can be back there. We just have |
| jurors, you know, that -- they can probably be over |
| here behind this table, closer, because are you going to bring the rest of the jurors and line them |
|  |  |
|  |
|  |
| in the courtroom like yesterday. I told them the |
| rest of the gallery people would just line up so |
| you'11 feed them in. So it really depends on where |
| you're best -- |
| UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We'11 just sit back |
| here. |
| THE COURT: Al1 right. You can be in the |
| middle row. You don't have to be in the back row. That gives you a little bit better viewpoint. |
|  |  |
|  |

okay. Anything else before we bring the
jurors in and get started?
MR. ARNTZ: That's it, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay. I'm very hopeful. I don't know what you're all thinking in your agenda, but I really would like to complete jury selection today. Is that a possibility?

MR. MCBRIDE: I would love to, but I don't think it's going to be possible. I think each of our clients have to have an opportunity to be able to question and be able to ask the panel questions.
the court: well, I don't disagree, but we have -- you know, it's $1: 15,2: 15,3: 15,4: 15$-- we have 3 hours and 45 minutes. We can't finish his questioning and your questioning and your questioning in that amount of time?

MR. MCBRIDE: I will do my best,
Your Honor. But I think it's important and depends on how much information they're providing us when we ask these general questions. But I really do think it's important for us to get an idea of who these jurors are and which ones are going to be appropriate jurors for this case.

THE COURT: All right. Counsel, I don't disagree with you. I know it's important. You don't have to share with the Court what's important.
what's also important is we keep this trial on track.

MR. MCBRIDE: Understood.
THE COURT: And if we can finish jury selection today, we're fine. If not and we have to trail it over to Wednesday, then what are we looking at? Are we looking at trying to do openings with people who just got seated? Are we trying to then postpone openings until Thursday? And then where are we?

So this is why we, $I$ think, have to have an aspirational goal here. I know you have prepared your voir dire, but $I$ 'm asking you to be creative in that, if you can still do your inquiry, depending on the information -- counsel here is getting quite a bit of information. Lots of people are talking. You're getting to know these people. But, you know, we're not engineering this jury within an inch of its life. We're picking fair and impartial jurors, and I don't why we need to spend hours upon hours separately inquiring if you're getting information and you're doing the followup. I'm just asking you to be thoughtful to whatever your script is, that we try to work within the time frames.

MR. ARNTZ: Your Honor, if it helps, if it
helps at all, I really believe we're still going to be on track, even if we start with openings on Thursday.

THE COURT: Well, that helps a lot. I'm not inclined to start with openings on Thursday if we don't have to, like you know.

MR. ARNTZ: I understand.
THE COURT: But let's see where we go. But, you know, like I said, all I'm asking -- I know how important this is to both sides, and we've got two folks over here, and I get it -- all I'm asking is each of you have planned the trial you want to conduct. But $I$ have to oversee a whole trial, and I have to get a whole trial done.

So you can't just stay on your scripts.
You have to start to think along the lines of what gets us done and where we need to go. If we're still on track to finish by next week and we can take until Wednesday, fine. The giant group of people that we're going to keep bringing back here aren't going to be thrilled to be still in jury selection on Wednesday, but that's life.

MR. ARNTZ: Well, let me put it this way, $I$ was always planning on finishing my case in chief on Monday, and I will still finish my case in chief on

Monday.
THE COURT: Let's see how we do. All right.
MR. MCBRIDE: Thank you, Your Honor. And just so the Court is clear, $I$ don't intend on taking hours and hours of jury selection, but $I$ honestly don't know how much more that they're going to ask.

THE COURT: I don't either, and we'11 get started, you know, but we're talking 3 hours and 45 minutes. I thought we could finish. But if you tell me we can't --

MR. Mcbride: And I'11 do my best.
THE COURT: -- then so be it.
MR. MCBRIDE: I'11 certainly do my best.
THE COURT: Okay. That's all I'm asking. I'm not asking for anything special. I'm just asking -- this is the two days that we blocked for jury selection. I know we got a little bit behind, but plaintiff got rolling and he's in his mix, and let's, you know, try to get this done. You know, we're going to start later in the day. Now we've lost a little time $I$ get it with the juror being late and me committed. But we're going to start earlier than we anticipated and, you know, that was what we were looking at. So I'm just trying to keep to the schedule we actually already talked about.

MR. MCBRIDE: Understood, Your Honor.
the court: All right.
MR. ARNTZ: Understood, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Let's get the jurors.
THE MARSHAL: All rise for the jury.
THE COURT: All right. As the last few jurors are taking their seats, 1 '11 invite everyone else to have a seat. Thank you and welcome back, everyone, to day 2 of or voir dire, discussions with our potential jurors and those who might serve on this panel.

I will acknowledge that we have one missing seat or one juror who's no longer with us in the box of 20. We had, with counsel's discussion, gone ahead and excused, for the record, Juror ms. Ashley, Juror 627. She had expressed some language concerns and disability to be able to fully understand and be able to participate in this trial. So she has been excused.

We do need to call the next juror in line to fill that vacancy which is, if you'11 again remember as we were coming through between counsel table through what we call the "well" here and then around on the side to take your spot.
the CLERK: Badge 665, James Maltese.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Maltese.
Before $I$ have counsel for the plaintiffs
resume the questioning of the entire panel, now that you have joined the group of 20 , we'd like to get to know you a little bit better. I don't know if you can see the board well enough or if you can just --

MR. MALTESE: My name is James Maltese. My former job, I was assistant vice president and telecommunications manager for a financial firm in Manhattan. I have a BBA, business computer information systems and quantitative methods.

THE COURT: okay.
MR. MALTESE: I don't have a spouse or a domestic partner. I have no children. I've lived in Las vegas like two and a half years. Moved here from New York. I've been on two, one jury trial that ended after two days of trial they settled.

THE COURT: All right. when you say "settled," we use that term typically when we're talking about a civil trial. Do you recall it to have been a civil trial?

MR. MALTESE: No. It was a burglary and a stabbing.

THE COURT: All right. So it was a criminal trial, but so there was a plea entered?

MR. MALTESE: Plea entered.
the court: is that how you understand it?
okay. And you said "second day of trial," so were you actually in the position of listening to witnesses and participating?

MR. MALTESE: Yes.
THE COURT: And just, again, for the record, even though we had called you right before you began speaking, you're Juror No. 665. Just remember if you're going to be responsive to any questions of counsel, that you give name and your Juror No. And your badge number, last three digits, and I'11 remind all of the jurors of that.

I think, at this time, you're ready to resume, Mr. Hymanson, with your questions?

MR. H. HYMANSON: No questions. Thank you.
the court: oh, no questions of this witness. No, but I meant you're going to resume with the panel.

MR. H. HYMANSON: I apologize. Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. H. HYMANSON: Thank you so much. Apologize for the confusion.

Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. Good
to see you all again.
Mr. Maltese, welcome to the panel.
THE COURT: And before you start, Mr. Hymanson, stay there. But $I$ did ask the general pane1 before Mr. Hymanson started yesterday, do you have anybody in your, you know, close circle, family member, close friend, you, yourself, in a prior job ever working in the medical field.

MR. MALTESE: I have a sister who is an R.N., and now she's an administrator in a hospital.

THE COURT: Okay. Have there been any occasions that you, a family member, a close friend have been involved in any medical malpractice 1itigation?

MR. MALTESE: My brother-in-1aw's family sued a doctor because of a heart problem or something, but they lost.

THE COURT: Okay. And how long ago was that?

MR. MALTESE: Maybe 10,15 years ago.
THE COURT: was that something that you were sort of directly involved in or just aware of?

MR. MALTESE: Not at all.
THE COURT: okay. Is that anything that would impact your ability to be fair and impartial
here?
MR. MALTESE: No.
THE COURT: Mr. Hymanson, whenever you're ready.

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

Ladies and gentlemen, we're going to start of with group questions like we're doing again -- or like we did yesterday.

What does it mean to take full responsibility for your actions?

Yes. Ms., is it "Bechtold"?
MR. BECHTOLD: Yes. Juror 624. To be accountable for your actions.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. And so what does being accountable for your actions mean to you?

MS. BECHTOLD: Doing what is expected of you under the rules or the practice or whatever your career is.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Does that involve -1et's say a hypothetical. There's two kids playing catch with a baseball, and one of them throws the ball over other kid's head, and it breaks a window. What is full accountability in that situation?

MS. BECHTOLD: He should have gone to the
owner and told his story that it was an accident and that he would come take responsibility for the breakage.

MR. H. HYMANSON: And when you say "take responsibility," would you say that paying to fix the window, is that what you consider part of the responsibility or not?

MS. BECHTOLD: Yes. Part of it. Yes.
MR. H. HYMANSON: okay. So saying that I did something wrong, but then doing what you can to compensate for the wrong that you caused. I don't want to put words in your mouth, but is that what you're saying?

MS. BECHTOLD: Yes.
THE COURT: Mr. Hymanson, can I ask a favor. You're kind of dancing around in front of the court reporter, and it's much easier if she can actually see the person speaking. So if you could either just be over there or be over here, it would be great. I don't mind if you move around. Just try not to stand in the line of sight of the court reporter.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Understood, Your Honor. Thank you very much, and I apologize.

THE COURT: Thank you.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Ladies and gentlemen, does anyone agree? Some people shaking their heads. okay. Does anybody disagree?

Yes, sir. Mr. Withers; correct?
MR. WITHERS: Bruce Withers, 618. So prior to before the window was broken, there was two people involved in the apartment, and they could have said, "Hey, we're getting kind of close to this house, maybe should move to a different location." So I think ownership is on both boys.

MR. H. HYMANSON: okay. And so you think that the two boys playing catch are both responsibile for the window being broken?

MR. WITHERS: Yes.
MR. H. HYMANSON: Do you still agree that taking full responsibility is to compensate the owner of the house for the damage that's been done? MR. WITHERS: Yes.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Do you think that it's important for people to take responsibility for their actions? Is that an important thing for people to do?

MR. WITHERS: Yes.
MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. Let's talk to Mr. Headd, Juror 633; correct?

MR. HEAD: Correct.
MR. H. HYMANSON: why is it important for people to take responsibility for their actions?

MR. HEAD: Well, if people didn't, it would be pandemonium. People could do whatever they want and get away with it and, you know, and it would make society really tough.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. Does anyone disagree with what Mr. Headd said?
okay. So everyone agrees that if people -people need to take responsibility for their actions; otherwise, it would make everything chaotic?

Does anyone have an opinion about, if it's important to compensate -- why it's important to compensate people for their harms and their losses?

Mr. "Eh7e"?
MR. EHLE: "Eh7e."
MR. H. HYMANSON: "Ehle." I apologize. Mr. Ehle, Badge No. 022 ; correct?

MR. EHLE: Uh-huh.
MR. H. HYMANSON: why is it important to compensate people for their harms and their losses?

MR. EHLE: Otherwise, there would be no consequences, $I$ guess.
 situation where like -- like, you know, like kids
have broken stuff at my house, and I'm like, "Don't worry. You guys were just playing." And it's like "I'll take care of it. Don't worry about it." It's just it kind of comes out to that. But for the most part, they could at least offer to clean up the glass. You know, just try to do your best, yeah. MR. H. HYMANSON: And I'm going to switch gears a little bit. I just want to talk -- does anybody have any strong feelings, one way or the another, about lawsuits? Yes, sir.

MR. HEADD: About 17 years ago --
THE COURT: Your name and your badge number, please.

MR. HEADD: Oh, Ryan Headd, 633. Back in, I think it was probably 2002, 2003, I was sued for \$10 million in a fender-bender. And so I, after a two-year process, it kind of came out to be a big waste of everybody's time, and it was basically people looking for a payday. And so ever since then, $I$ haven't really had a high opinion of civil suits.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. Did that case go to trial?

MR. HEADD: Yes.
MR. H. HYMANSON: And did it result in a
verdict, or did it settle before the trial was over? MR. HEADD: No. It resulted in a verdict. They were trying to get $\$ 10 \mathrm{million}$. They ended up getting a few thousand for medical expenses.

MR. H. HYMANSON: And is it fair to say that soured your opinion about people that file 1awsuits?

MR. HEADD: If it's a similar case. If it comes out to it's pretty obvious people are trying to get a payday, then yes. If it's something actually was done wrongly or, you know, something that's pretty obvious that somebody was gross negligence or something like that, then, yeah, it makes sense to me. But I think society has kind of gotten sue happy.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. what do you use as a basis to determine what you think is -- because I think you're saying -- and, again, I'm not trying to put words in anyone's mouth.

But what I think I understand you saying is that you think if it's a suit that you think has merit, you don't have a problem with that; but if you think it's a frivolous suit, you have an issue with that; is that fair?

MR. HEADD: Correct.

MR. H. HYMANSON: And what kind of criteria do you use to try to determine if it's what you think is a meritorious suit or a frivolous suit?

MR. HEADD: I think it depends on the situation. But if it's one of those accidents happen -- accidents happen every day. Does that mean somebody purposely hurt somebody on purpose? If it's something that's purely an accident, I don't think somebody else should really try to make millions of dollars off it.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Thank you very much.
THE COURT: And before you move on, I just want to clarify something. You used a term of art here, "gross negligence." I don't know if you meant that in any particular way or if that was just a term you were using.

But at the end of the day, $I$ just want to remind the jurors that whatever the causes of action are in this case and whatever those standard or law to be applied to them is, the Court will give it to you, and it will be your duty, as jurors, to follow that.

So I don't want there to be any misunderstanding that you won't have the instructions on that but that, you know, any kind of
idea that you might have in your mind about what the law to be, that's not your province. The Court will give you the law to apply. I just want to make sure everybody is clear on that.

Does anybody have any questions about that? All right. You may proceed, Mr. Hymanson.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Thank you very much
Your Honor. So following-up on what Mr. Headd said, just by a show of hands, does anybody have the opinion that there are too many lawsuits that are being filed today?

Okay. All right. Does anybody -- well, let's see. So, Ms. Price, you raised your hand. Why is it that you think there are too many lawsuits being filed today?

MS. PRICE: I had a similar situation. I was in a car accident about five or six years ago, and the other person was in the fault. However, they decided to sue me. It didn't wind up going through with anything. There was no -- there were no witnesses. There was no evidence on either side.
so nothing wound up happening. But it definitely stayed in the back of my mind that somebody would sue.

MR. H. HYMANSON: okay. Thank you very
much. And Badge No. 632; correct?
MS. PRICE: 632.
MR. H. HYMANSON: Thank you very much. Mr. Taylor, I believe you had your hand raised.

MR. TAYLOR: Yes.
MR. H. HYMANSON: And then why do you think that there are too many lawsuits?

MR. TAYLOR: 644. Yeah, I mean, there's circumstances where some lawsuits are justified. Some things happen, and compensation is necessary. However, it does seem like it's, as referenced earlier, people are sue happy. They just want a big payday, just for -- just because they can.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Mr., I think it was -- is it Burke?

MR. BURKE: Yes.
MR. H. HYMANSON: Badge No. 510; correct?
mR. bURKE: Yes.
MR. H. HYMANSON: Did you have your hand up a1so?

MR. BURKE: Yeah.
MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. And why do you think that there are too many lawsuits?

MR. BURKE: Just kind of a group's opinion,
just people looking for things that are going out of their way to put themselves in situations they don't need to be just so they can, you know, have it happen for them. Almost put yourself in harm's way to have something happen to you.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Can anyone think of a specific example that they can point to why they have this feeling there are too many lawsuits?

Yes, sir. Mr. -- I'm sorry. Mr. Wilder; correct?

MR. WILDER: 611. As a businessman, I've had a few of those lawsuits thrown at us too. As an example, we had a kid that was doing delivery for us, and believe it or not -- don't laugh -- he drove into a rehab bus. Out of ten -- there were ten people on this bus, and every one of them sued us. And every one of them, it was either dismissed or they got caught on film with investigators doing certain things.

It was really a nuisance suit, but it was extremely time consuming and it was pretty evident what was happening, and we had to settle all the little ones like that that were just kind of actually senseless and led now where in the end.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Does anybody think that
sometimes people have to sue to be compensated for the harm that's been done to them?

Does anybody disagree with that statement?
okay. Let's say -- Ms., is it "Sallee"?
MS. SALLEE: It's "Sallee."
MR. H. HYMANSON: "Sallee." I apologize, ma'am. Do you think that someone needs to sue sometimes to be justly compensated for the harm that's been done to them?

MS. SALLEE: They do sometimes. You know, whether it's medical or property or, you know. It depends on what it is obviously.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Does anyone have any example of how they would determine if they think a case is meritorious or if it's frivolous?

Yes, sir. Mr. Taylor. 644.
MR. TAYLOR: Yeah. Taylor, 644. If it comes down a he-said, she-said basically. If it's just somebody saying something just because and there's no way to quantify it to prove it, then it's hard to justify.

MR. H. HYMANSON: okay. I want to make sure that I understand what you're saying. So you think that if it comes down to a he-said, she-said, that that makes it meritorious?

MR. TAYLOR: No, no, no. It becomes, as mentioned before, frivolous basically. So without lack of evidence, facts, it becomes basically his word versus my word, her word, whoever's word.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. And so, again, I'm not trying to put words in your mouth. I'm just trying to see if $I$ understand you correctly.

Are you basically saying that you want to look to see if there's some other facts that back up what happened.

MR. TAYLOR: Precisely.
MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. Does everyone agree with Mr. Taylor by a show of hands?

Does anybody disagree with Mr. Taylor? Yes, sir. Mr. Read; correct?

MR. READ: I kind of do to -- I don't know. Like, we're just kind of like -- like that almost like kind of needs a lawsuit, kind of, to kind of settle it. It's just when things kind of don't -you can't come to agreement. I don't know. I've never been to a point where $I$ feel like I need to go to court or even get close, like over an issue. Like either trying to concede an issue or like kind of come to some kind of agreement.

But like, kind of like $I$ think lawsuits are
kind of you just can't come to an agreement like at all. Like, you know, $I$ think that's in -- that's kind of what's this process is about. It's kind of finally settling your argument that it's not like you guys can keep going around in circles.

MR. H. HYMANSON: And so it's fair to say that kind of goes back to what we were talking about before that sometimes you think it's necessary for a party to file a lawsuit to get resolution for something?

MR. READ: Yeah, yeah.
MR. H. HYMANSON: That they feel like, you know what, we're not being properly compensated for the harm that's been done to us. So we have to file this lawsuit?

MR. READ: Yeah. So even like -- yeah, he-said, she-said or whether it's. I just realized I probably should give my badge number. It's 637.

MR. H. HYMANSON: No problem.
MR. READ: I don't know why it just crossed my mind just now. But, yeah, so just kind of like where that is, so it's just kind of that situation where like, you know, I think that like you have -it's like, you know, like even if somebody is lying or not being totally honest or being straightforward,
like it's maybe where you're going to have to come up with the facts and at least make some kind of judgment on those facts.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Great. Thank you.
Ms. Clinton, $I$ haven't talked to you yet today. I know that you are a practicing attorney. what kind of law do you practice?

MS. CLINTON: I haven't practiced actively for awhile. I'll be starting a job in a few weeks. when $I$ was practicing, $I$ did civil litigation. MR. H. HYMANSON: Civil litigation. Okay. And your badge number is 658; correct?

MS. CLINTON: Yeah, 658.
MR. H. HYMANSON: What kind of civil
litigation did you do?
MS. CLINTON: Mostly business matters, contract disputes, and real estate issues.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. May I ask you where you're starting your new job.

MS. CLINTON: The Attorney General's office.

MR. H. HYMANSON: okay. Congratulations. Very exciting. How do you feel about lawsuits? Do you think there's too many? There's not enough?

MS. CLINTON: I don't have a feeling, one way or the other. I don't know how many lawsuits are filed. So it's all relative, how you look at it.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Nothing about your civil practice from before turned you off to thinking there's too many lawsuits or there's not enough 1awsuits?

MS. CLINTON: No.
MR. H. HYMANSON: Thank you very much.
So we've talked about lawsuits. Let's talk about jury verdicts. How many of you think that jury verdicts are too high? Anyone think that jury verdicts are too high?

No. No concerns about the size of jury verdicts? okay.

How do you feel about attorney advertising? Does anyone have an opinion about, you know, especially in this town, of advertising all over the place? Yes. Mr. Jones.

MR. JONES: Badge 625. Being retired now, having a chance to watch daytime television, there are attorneys everywhere, and I think that they do an injustice to the lawsuit system by basically making it seem as though it's very, very easy to get in a wreck, need a check; or, you know, $I$ mean, it's
just like $I^{\prime \prime m}$ in dire straits, but $I$ invent something, and all of a sudden, wow, I'm rich.

And I think they're really creating a real false sense of what the legal system is for and how it should be utilized. There's just -- especially if there are no down sides to bringing an issue. I think that it just makes it way too easy, and it's portrayed as something that should be a lot more careful. I think they should treat it like they do liquor on television. Be very, very careful who you advertise it to and how you put it out there because, you know, it involves some very, very serious situations, and I don't think those things get played up enough.

MR. H. HYMANSON: And I think you said a lot there. I want to ask you about one particular line in that. I think that if $I$ hear you correctly, you're saying that you think that they almost lessen the effect of the -- we talked about frivolous and meritorious cases, the fact that there's so many ads for everything. People say "hey, in a wreck, need a check," it kind of takes away from how people potentially view the meritorious lawsuits because the system just gets filled with a lot of frivolous lawsuits also. Is that kind of what you're saying?

MR. JONES: Yeah, that's correct. Yeah, there's so much garbage, you can't tell what's real. MR. H. HYMANSON: Understood. Does anyone agree with Mr. Jones?

Does anyone disagree with Mr. Jones?
Yes, sir. Mr. Grant; correct?
MR. GRANT: Yes. 634. While I agree that there are a lot of frivolous lawsuits, I think attorneys have every right to advertise their services because they're in business to make money. Just like I'm in business to make money, just like doctors are in business to make money. And I think all of them are -- it's fair game. Go out there, brand yourself in a certain way and have a catchy jingle with your phone number on it. Everyone knows that number, by the way, he just said.

But, to me, it's not the fault of someone watching daytime television and being confused with the process. It's up to their own merits to decide whether to reach out to an attorney or not. It's just that, you know, they're putting their sign on the door, so to speak, to get people out there to get them business so they can provide for their families. So I don't have anything against advertising.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Thank you very much.
By a show of hands, if you were injured, seriously injured by someone else's conduct, would you file a lawsuit?

I'm sorry. So Ms. Bechtold; correct?
MS. BECHTOLD: 624.
MR. H. HYMANSON: 624. You started saying something.

MS. BECHTOLD: It's not as clearcut as that for me.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. So what would it come down to for you?

MS. BECHTOLD: If I was seriously injured?
MR. H. HYMANSON: Correct.
ms. bechtold: okay. well, there are first a lot of facts to be known and medical treatment, and there's just a lot to go through before you just go sue somebody. And that's why there's a Statute of Limitations to kind of see, yes, you're really hurt in the beginning; but then, you know, who knows what's going to happen. So there's just a lot of different unknowns.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Absolutely.
MS. BECHTOLD: So just to go out and file one right off the cuff, out of the ambulance, I'm
not for that.
MR. H. HYMANSON: Understood. And it was really, as you put it, that was an incomplete hypothetical that I had, but just for the purposes of talking to people, that's what that was.

But that brings out something. So you worked as a paralegal for several years; correct?

MS. BECHTOLD: Yes.
MR. H. HYMANSON: And what type of law did the firm that you work for practice?

MS. BECHTOLD: We did insurance -- I did insurance defense for 15 years.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. And I'm sorry. I didn't mean to cut you off, ma'am.

MS. BECHTOLD: That's okay. I worked for some really special attorneys that we collected all the evidence, and they were very fair. If they felt that the plaintiff was injured, their recommendations, I always felt were fair.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. Is there anything about your experience working for so many years as an insurance defense paralegal that gives you any hesitation about serving as a juror on a medical malpractice case?

MS. BECHTOLD: No. I worked both sides.

Yeah.
MR. H. HYMANSON: And so you don't think there's anything about your experience that would make you give, lean more towards the defense or towards the plaintiff in this?

MS. BECHTOLD: No. I've actually worked for a plaintiff firm for like five years. So I've worked both sides, and I think I'm fair to look at all the information.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Thank you very much.
So I was also asking -- so the way you started on that was if you were injured by someone else's actions, if you were to file a lawsuit. So let's put a little bit more context to that.

Not right out of the gate, but if you tried to be -- what you tried to seek what you thought was just compensation and it wasn't offered you and you felt as though you had no choice, given that situation -- so you were severely injured and you're not offered enough to properly compensate you -given that factual scenario, does that change anyone's answer that didn't raise their hand about whether they'd file a lawsuit or not?

Yes, sir. Mr. Burke; correct?
MR. BURKE: Yes. 510.

MR. H. HYMANSON: And why does that change your answer?

MR. BURKE: Just because $I$ think, you know, some people take responsibility for their actions and if they hurt someone, they'11 -- you know, you can settle before you have to come to those terms or you file a lawsuit. But as you said, that's not happening and you have serious expenses or things to replace or anything like that, then that's when it comes into play to file a lawsuit.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. And I know that Mr. Jones said he wouldn't file a lawsuit.

Is there anyone else that said that they wouldn't file a lawsuit? No one else?

MR. MALTESE: "would" or "wouldn't"?
MR. H. HYMANSON: Would not.
MR. JONES: You didn't ask under what conditions, why they would file.

THE REPORTER: I'm sorry. The two gentlemen, please.

MR. H. HYMANSON: So that was Mr. Maltese, 665, to the right; and then Mr. Jones, 625.

THE REPORTER: Thank you.
MR. H. HYMANSON: And so, Mr. Jones, 625. You're saying "what conditions."

What conditions would it take for you to file a lawsuit?

MR. JONES: Is that something happened where I did not contribute to any of the law. I think that's -- if you know that it's solely someone else's fault. You know, you can have someone do something to you that hurt you, and you may have been involved in something that, by your own actions, that caused the situation to be worse than maybe it should have been.

So, yeah, I think that, you know, you have to look at what are all the facts, okay, before you run out and hire somebody and try to get everything done. There's -- just do your due diligence and make sure that it's right before you run out and make a legal issue.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Understood. Let me ask you this, you said if you were completely not at fault. But let's say if we're talking about fault, 100 percent. If you think you were 20 percent out of fault, would you file a lawsuit do you think, or do you think you wouldn't file a lawsuit?

MR. JONES: Depends on what the injury is.
MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. I apologize.
Mr. Maltese, 665.

MR. MALTESE: I was in the hospital over 20 times, and this one time, the nurse, the R.N. gave me an IV for a diabetic person. Now, I guess I could have sued, but I didn't because there was no real harm done really. So I don't know if that makes a difference.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. No. The basis of the scenario we've gotten away from a little bit was if you were severely injured or harmed by someone actions. That was what it was premised on. But thank you very much for volunteering that.

If there's something that you really need to remember, what do you do to remember, to try to remember that thing? So it's a very abstract question. It's switching gears a little bit.

But, yes, Mr. Headd; correct?
MR. HEADD: Yes. 633. Just go over it again and again and again, just so that it's, you know, engrained in your memory.

MR. H. HYMANSON: okay. So you just in your head, you try to remember it by repeating it in your head.

Okay. Does anybody write something down if they really want to remember something?

Anybody that -- any other tricks that
anyone has besides repeating it in their head, writing it down? Anything else?

Yes, sir. Mr. Taylor.
MR. TAYLOR: 644. Yeah, visualization. Basically imagining what the concept or idea or image, person, or whatever, putting it a word associating with a visual.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. Anybody else?
Let's talk about the effects of lawsuits. How many of you feel that lawsuits are hurting business? I see some hesitant hands in there.

So we'll start Mr. Withers.
MR. WITHERS: Withers, 618. In the industry $I$ work in, transportation, lawsuits are a norm. And it's, you know, whether it's at-fault negligence or it happened, it just happened, it's something that we actually hand off to our legal department. So it's up to us to collect all the information, document, pictures, so on, and then pass it on to the legal department.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Is there anything -- so this came up with saying that you think it hurts business. So is there anything that, of that opinion, that you think it hurts business that makes you feel that, you know, you might have a different
opinion coming in as a juror on a medical malpractice case like this?

MR. WITHERS: Well, I think with what we've talked about earlier today, there's a lot of frivolous lawsuits, and in my industry, there's a lot of frivolous lawsuits. When it comes to malpractice or just cause, rather, 1 think there's a place for it. Once again, if it's frivolous, it's just wasting people's time.

MR. H. HYMANSON: But there's nothing about -- it sounds like you're saying there's nothing about your background that just makes you automatically want to favor one side or the other.

MR. WIthers: No.
MR. H. HYMANSON: okay. And then I saw Mr. Grant, you had raised your hand; correct? MR. GRANT: Yes.

MR. H. HYMANSON: 634; correct?
MR. GRANT: 634. Sorry. I forgot again. MR. H. HYMANSON: That's all right. It's tricky.

MR. GRANT: No, I don't have any data to back it up whether it hurts business or not. It's strictly just opinion. I just know that if I am -let's say if $I$ am hired to photograph someone's
wedding, $I$ stress out a lot about potential mistakes because I don't want to be sued because I've read too many horror stories about it.

So as far as that, $I$ kind of just try to minimize mistakes as much as $I$ can to make sure that I don't have any lawsuits handed to me at some point.

MR. H. HYMANSON: And so it's something of your kind of personal anxiety about things. But has it affected your business at all?

MR. GRANT: It's kept me from doing more weddings, yeah. That's usually the field that they're more suing at.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Is there anything about that experience that makes you question your ability to serve on a medical malpractice case?

MR. GRANT: No.
MR. H. HYMANSON: And, Mr. Headd, you had your hand up also; correct?

MR. HEADD: Yeah.
MR. H. HYMANSON: 633?
MR. HEADD: Correct.
MR. H. HYMANSON: And why did you have your hand up?

MR. HEADD: Mainly just it seems like it
pulls away resources from everybody, time from the jurors, time from the courtrooms, time from everybody. And that being said, there is cases that absolutely should be in court and should be tried. But the frivolous ones, it's just hurting everybody else. It's eating our time, their time, everybody's time.

MR. H. HYMANSON: And we may have talked about this directly. If we did, I apologize. But I just want to get more revealed. So we talked about this definition of essentially two designations: A frivolous lawsuit or a meritorious lawsuit.
what do you do to determine what the difference of those is?

MR. HEADD: Oh, I think it depends on the situation. But it's -- like $I$ said, if it's just a pure accident, you know, some -- nobody is really trying to do harm to anybody else; or, you know, sometimes stuff just happens and if one party tries to sue the other over that, I think it's leaning towards potentially frivolous.

Then, again, if there's something that you have somebody hurt somebody else and it's completely their fault, then those people, you know, deserve to be able to go to court and be heard, and so it just
depends on the situation.
MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. Mr. Wilder, I saw that you had your hand up.

MR. WILDER: Yeah, 611. This might be a one off. But being in the construction business, our little company, we were delivering about 6,000 houses a year --

THE REPORTER: I'm sorry.
(The record was read.)
MR. WILDER: Oh, I'm sorry. And I'm the one that can't hear.

Anyway, we were in the kitchen cabinet business, and our little company was doing about 6,000 houses a year in kitchen and bath cabinetry for the major builders in Las vegas. But when the construction defect lawsuits came in, it was just brutal. Talk about hurting a business, almost destroyed ours.

MR. H. HYMANSON: okay. And so that's, you said kind of a one off because that's a bigger kind of --

MR. WILDER: Purely, purely one off for us because we had nothing to do with anything structural. But we got drug in and sued in every single one, thousands and thousands and thousands.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Is there anything about that experience that has affected how you think about lawsuits in general?

MR. WILDER: Not really. Not really. MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. You say "not really." So let's explore that a little bit more. Why do you say "not really"?

MR. WILDER: It was pretty traumatic. I mean, $I$ literally had to hire my own attorney to just work for me full time, just to handle it, and with no recourse. He would just coordinate with the insurance companies. But it left a pretty bad taste in my mouth, for sure. But, again, it's a one off. But I mean, that's how these things can get out of control when you say, when you talk about frivolous. MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. I appreciate that. So but it's fair to say that there is still some negative taste in your mouth for lawsuits?

MR. WILDER: Yeah, yeah. Probably right. Probably right.

MR. H. HYMANSON: okay. If you're just being completely honest, that's something that's happened for awhile.

MR. WILDER: Yeah.
MR. H. HYMANSON: And there's nothing that

I'm going to say today that's going to change how you feel about lawsuits?

MR. WILDER: Not that regard for that specific time, no.

MR. H. HYMANSON: This is a bit of a strange question: But if you hear that something bad has happened to someone, do you ever think that that's maybe because of something bad that they did in the past or that, you know, they had that coming for them, that they deserved that?

Has anyone ever had that feeling before?
MR. JONES: Talking about karma?
MR. H. HYMANSON: Sure. Talking about karma. So, Ms. Price, you had your hand up first. MS. PRICE: Yes.

MR. H. HYMANSON: So what do you think about that? So 632; correct?

MS. PRICE: 632. Yeah, and I guess I was in the same word, "karma," which is sometimes we put ourselves in situations that we shouldn't be putting ourselves into.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay, okay. what would be an example of that?

MS. PRICE: You leave your car open, unlocked. Somebody steals something out of your
car. Obviously, it's more out of some -- more on the person who's burglarizing you. But you did just make it a lot easier for them by leaving your car open.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Thank you very much.
Mr. Jones, you were talking about karma. So do you feel that sometimes karma is a real thing?

MR. JONES: I don't know if it's
necessarily a real thing. I think if people continue to think of bad things on them, that at some point, just the odds are that something bad is going to happen to you.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. And 625; correct?
MR. JONES: Yes.
MR. H. HYMANSON: I apologize. Okay. So if you're going to keep doing something bad, basically it's -- maybe playing with fire would be an example. People would say, "Oh, you're playing with fire" or something?

MR. JONES: Yeah.
MR. H. HYMANSON: That's what you're talking about with that?
okay. I believe -- well, let's see. We haven't heard from Mr. Fife; correct?

MR. FIFE: Yes.

MR. H. HYMANSON: what do you think about that? Do you think that just because -- so do you think that sometimes bad things happen because someone did something bad in the past?

MR. FIFE: 614. I guess not necessarily. But $I$ mean, $1 i k e$ he said, if you keep doing bad things, bad things are probably going to happen to you.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Thank you very much.
Does anyone have a problem with awarding damages for someone's pain and suffering?

Money damages for someone's pain and suffering, does that give anyone?

Yes, sir. Mr. Back; correct?
MR. BACK: Yes. 385. Were you saying if I had anything wrong with it?

MR. H. HYMANSON: Yeah. Do you have something that you think it would be hard for you to award money for someone for their pain and suffering?

MR. BACK: I actually have the inverse feeling.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. Let's talk about that.

MR. BACK: I may get a little emotional
talking about it. My little sister was born January 2006. She was born ten weeks premature.

THE COURT: Can I interrupt you for just one second, and may $I$ have counsel at the bench. Something just occurred, and I want to...
(Bench conference.)
THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
we are going to take a brief recess at this time. I know we've only been back at it about 45 minutes. But coming off of lunch is oftentimes a time when more breaks are better than less breaks. But, regardless, we're going to take a slightly over ten minute break. we'11 be returning at 2:15.

During this recess, of course, I'm just going to remind you again that you're not to talk or converse among yourselves or with anyone else about the case, try to speculate about the case, try to do any research about the case. No social media communications of any kind. No Internet searches. Anything like that. All those same admonishments that I gave you last night. But don't go too far, and we're going to see you back in here at 2:15.

All right.
(Jury panel exits courtroom.)
the COURT: Let's go ahead and use the
restrooms. We'11 come back in about five minutes, at 3:10 and we'11 have a brief discussion about that matter before we bring the gentleman back in.

And there's one other matter that $I$ need to bring to the parties' attention as well about the jurors, but we'11 come back in about five minutes.

MR. ARNTZ: Thank you, Your Honor.
(Pause in the proceedings.)
THE COURT: We're going to need some help, Joshua, bringing in a couple of the jurors to talk to, but let me just do a couple of things first.

So just to make record of the bench conference, $I$ called the counsel forward because it appeared quite obvious that the juror -- what's his number again? Is it 510? Sorry. It's 385, Mr. Back. "Back" and "Burke," I'm struggling with. Mr. Back, Juror 385 , was about to go into some detail about something he had expressed earlier about having a family member who had gone through a medical malpractice case. So we're going to bring him in and have a separate inquiry with him.

I also noted for counsel at the bench that it's been my observation that -- and I didn't know if they could see it because of the line of sight -but Juror No. 20 has been appearing to be asleep or
at least not engaged almost the entirety of the discussion so far. I don't recall what she said, you know.

I know she's young, and I want to say I thought she was a student, but I don't recall what she said as far as if she's working crazy hours or whatever. But I guess we'11 figure out some more information.

MR. ARNTZ: $I$ think we're in agreement to --

MR. MCBRIDE: We'll stipulate too.
THE COURT: Yeah, I mean I guess I just -I need to talk to her first anyway, even if I excuse her, just to find out what's going on. I've had occasion where we've had a couple people -- I don't perceive this to be -- where that's how people listen and they really are engaged, but that's how they're listening. That's not been my view so far.

And the other issues with the jurors, and I really don't think it's an issue, but if we want to inquiry of them, I suppose we can. I'm not sure which juror brought it to the marshal's attention, but jurors in seats No. 8 and 11 , Ehle and withers apparently know or somehow recognized each other. I didn't get the impression that they're social
friends or anything like that.
Was that the impression that you got,
Joshua?
THE MARSHAL: I didn't inquire once they told me.

THE COURT: who told you about the friendship?

THE MARSHAL: It was Ehle.
the court: Ehle indicated that he knew withers?

THE MARSHAL: Yes. And Withers acknowledges it, "Yeah, I know him."

THE COURT: All right. So they know each other. I don't know the specifics of that. obviously, they'11 get the same admonishments, and I can specifically, you know, admonish them separately. But does anybody want to bring them in separately, at this point, to inquire about that, how they know each other; or do you just want to make it part of the voir dire?

MR. P. HYMANSON: We can make that part of the record to help expedite it, Your Honor.

THE COURT: At this point, you know, it's 12:15. I know Mr. Hymanson is going to probably be a little past 3:00 before he finishes. Obviously
we're not going to finish today. I just needed some time to come to terms with that understanding.

MR. MCBRIDE: Understood, understood,
Your Honor.
THE COURT: And so I've already let jury services know that the extra folks, we don't need them, just to have a little extra panel intentionally for tomorrow just in case. But I don't really perceive we're going to need them then either. But my understanding is we'11 go -- so we're not going to try to crush it, rush it, anything like that. And we'll conclude today at 5:00 or before, and then we'11 come back tomorrow at 1:30 and pick up then and finish tomorrow.

MR. MCBRIDE: okay. So I was going to ask you, 1:30 or 1:00?

THE COURT: I can't start earlier than 1:30. There was a little miscommunication $I$ had with my court reporters about that circumstance. I didn't realize dailies were being done for jury selection. But in order for dailies to work and to not, you know, completely overburden my court reporters, $I$ really do need to start the afternoon sessions at 1:30.

MR. MCBRIDE: No problem. It's not a
prob1em.
THE COURT: If that's okay. But whatever we get through today, we're finishing jury selection tomorrow.

MR. MCBRIDE: And that's the thing, I told Breen too, I thought that Hank was doing a very good job. I don't think there's going to be much overlap in the questions $I$ have. So $I$ think that will streamline it.

THE COURT: But just to give everybody an opportunity. We'11 see where we are today, but I'm not anticipating we finish today, just, you know, the time.

MR. MCBRIDE: Understood.
THE COURT: We'11 figure it out.
All right. So we won't inquire of Ehle and Withers now. We will make that part of the voir dire, however, whoever wants to bring it up and whenever. At the end, we can always address it, if we haven't.

But I do want to see -- let's get Juror No. 20 first. You have the name as Jimenez, 664. You all can have your seats, if you wish. I know you normally stand when they come in, but it's just one. I don't want to freak her out that we're all
standing. She's so young.
MR. ARNTZ: And, Your Honor, I think I'm going to have my clients go home. They're getting a 1ittle tired.

THE COURT: Certainly. You made that inquiry earlier if anybody would have any concerns with that. I don't think that would be an issue. There's not really any way to go that's not -- you know, do you want to wait until the venire comes back in and then go? Because that won't be much longer and then they're not all outside.

MR. MCBRIDE: We can finish --
THE MARSHAL: All rise for the juror.
THE COURT: Actually, we're not all rising. I told them to sit. But that's okay.

Ms. Jimenez, come on in. Just have a seat. See that nice cushy chair that's right there in the front. So it's been my observation, Ms. Jimenez, that you've been, at best, disengaged if not somewhat sleep much of this voir dire process.

MS. JIMENEZ: I'm not asleep.
the court: You're not asleep. why are your eyes closed?

MS. JIMENEZ: My eyes? My eyes are just normally small.

THE COURT: I looked over many times, and it appears that your eyes have been fully closed. I'm not trying to challenge you.

MS. JIMENEZ: I was probably looking down.
THE COURT: You just may not be aware, but it --

MS. JIMENEZ: I'm paying attention though. I just don't think there's anything for me to put out into the conversation yet.

THE COURT: okay. So it's your belief that you are fully engaged in this process, that you are not --

MS. JIMENEZ: Not sleeping.
the court: well, I mean, I didn't think you had fully fallen asleep. I mean we can tell what that looks like when someone's head completely goes because they're asleep. But there's a big difference between "not asleep" and "not engaged," and it really does appear that you're not engaged.

There's been lots of questions, lots of ways in which people could respond. Very generalized types of things. Lots of people are sharing information. You're not engaged at all, and every time I looked over, almost every time, your eyes appear again to me to have been closed.

It's not a criticism. And it's, you know, if you're doing something, you know, otherwise outside of this courtroom that makes it very difficult for you to stay, engage, or pay attention here, we would understand that. We just need to know because I can't have somebody that's ultimately going to be on this panel who's not going to be engaged and who we lose during the process of the trial.

So is there something -- are you working an extra job? Is there something else going on?

MS. JIMENEZ: No. I literally have nothing going on. I just don't think it's my time to put anything into the conversation yet.

THE COURT: So if I understand you correctly, and like Mr. Hymanson said, nobody is trying to put any words in anybody's mouth. You've heard and listened to all the questions, and you've made a deliberate decision that those questions did not apply to you or you didn't have a response to give? Is that --

MS. JIMENEZ: Every question that they've asked, I've either agreed with somebody. Pretty much, $I^{\prime}$ ve agreed with one person or the other.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Have you raised your hand or nodded your head or indicated
those things in any way?
MS. JIMENEZ: Yes.
the court: All right. Go ahead. we'll
have you step back out.
Counsel didn't have any questions, did they, for Ms. Jimenez?

MR. ARNTZ: No, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Go ahead and step back out.
Thank you.
(Juror No. 664 exits courtroom.)
THE COURT: It was like the perfect opening to get out, but she didn't bite. I don't understand. I kind of have to take her at her word.

MR. ARNTZ: We're willing to let her go anyway.
the court: I can't. I mean, I've got a juror who's over here telling me that she's engaged and she's listening and she wants to participate. Unless I have -- you know, I'll keep observing her. But I'm not willing to let her go, at this point, with what her responses to the questions were.

MR. MCBRIDE: Well, I personally have not seen her raise her hand a single time, and so I wouldn't --

THE COURT: I haven't either. But, you
know, you guys are directly --
MR. MCBRIDE: Sure.
THE COURT: -- south of her, and I'm looking at her, and I've seen her eyes open, and I've seen her looking up. I just have also seen times when, you know, she hasn't been -- I don't know why she wouldn't want to admit it. I told her it was okay. I told her there's no harm, no foul. I'm just not ready to cut her loose just yet. So let me keep observing it. we'11 probably have another break before the end of the day. If I continue to see this sort of engagement, I'11 have to say something.

MR. ARNTZ: My problem with her answer was that she doesn't seem willing to engage, that she just isn't willing to enter the conversation.

THE COURT: Wel1, I mean, we'11 have to see how that goes. The other thing too is, and $I$ think you all know this, but this opens the door for this conversation. You know that the alternates will be the last two seated, regardless of whomever. So, you know --

MR. MCBRIDE: Should the Moores use this opportunity at this point to leave or if they wanted to?

THE COURT: Well, this is what I was thinking, I'd rather finish the other and then --

MR. MCBRIDE: oh, sure. okay.
THE COURT: Rather than them going out with everybody out there waiting, we could, if you're okay, just a few more minutes. Let's get the other juror in, and let's have that conversation. You might want to see that conversation anyway. And then once all the panel is back in, in place, you're welcome to go. okay? Does that work, or do you need to go now?

MR. MOORE: No, that's fine. Thank you for that.

MR. P. HYMANSON: And, Your Honor, when the panel is seated, do you want us to ask leave of court for them to get going, or do you just want them to --

THE COURT: It depends on how much of a thing you want to make about it. At this point, they're welcome to come and go as they please. It's already been asked of the jurors if they want --

MR. P. HYMANSON: Make it as innocuous as possible.

THE COURT: Right. That's what I'm thinking too, and it's already been offered that
they may not stay the whole time. So think it's fine. I don't think anybody will notice. You know, I have no problem if Mr. Hymanson wants to say, you know, just noting again, reminding you all yesterday that, you know, our clients may come and go. I don't think that's a problem.

Let's have Juror No. 385, Mr. Jeffrey Back back.
(Juror No. 385 enters courtroom.)
the COURT: hi, Mr. Back. Come on through. We're going to have you sit in the front here, not your usual seat. Just that one right there, if that's okay. It's about the same comfort level, I hope, and it brings you a little bit closer.
we just felt we have an understanding of obviously where this conversation is going to go, and we just felt that maybe it was better that it be had not in front of all the other jurors.

MR. BACK: I figured, yeah.
THE COURT: So that's why we -- and it was good time to take a break for other reasons anyway.

So at this point, Mr. Hymanson, do you want to pick up where you left off and finish the inquiry, and then we can go from there, and I can give other counsel an opportunity.

MR. H. HYMANSON: I'm happy to do that, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And wherever it's more
comfortable for you to be. I just thought we needed to have this conversation separately.

MR. BACK: I had a feeling, yeah.
MR. H. HYMANSON: I think I'll just go back to where I was, if that's all right for you.

THE COURT: Whatever is easier. I know I've got him here. I mean, I can put him back in his other seat if it's easier.

MR. H. HYMANSON: I feel like I got a good
space going her now.
THE COURT: It's better for the court reporter too.

MR. H. HYMANSON: So, Mr. Back, thank you so much for coming back to talk with us. I understand that this is going to be a difficult thing to say and that this is, unfortunately, about as private as we can make it.

But so you were talking about -- I had asked about if you think there should be a limit on pain and suffering damages. You said you think it should be exactly the opposite, and then you were going to tell us about your experience with your
sister. And so can you just tell us what you were going to say about your sister.

MR. BACK: Yes. 385. I do apologize. I'm losing my voice as well. So $I$ was probably about ten years old. So January 2006, my little sister, Chloe, she was born ten weeks premie and with Down Syndrome. She spent 75 days in NICU. About halfway through, a nurse accidentally swapped her breast milk in her IV. So breast milk went through her brain. Had a series of seizures. Sorry.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Take your time. I know this is very difficult, and if you'd like, there's tissues right behind you, and there's also some water if you'd like that also.

MR. BACK: She is happy. She's healthy now. But, yeah, she did nearly die. we had a six-years suit with valley view Hospital and the manufacturer.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Please take your time. MR. BACK: Lucky enough for her, she was able to -- she's set for life for now. And my mom, she's now a care advocate for a pediatrician. She's an ambassador for Community Patient Care Advocates. But, yeah, luckily she's happy and healthy today and going to school.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Very happy to hear that. MR. BACK: Do you have any questions for me, I guess?

MR. H. HYMANSON: I don't think I have any further questions.

THE COURT: Mr. McBride, would you like to inquire? You can keep your seat too, if you wish.

MR. MCBRIDE: I'11 just step here.
THE COURT: okay.
MR. MCBRIDE: Mr. Back -- and, again, on behalf of all the counsel here, we do appreciate your honesty. I know this is a very difficult thing to have to relive. But as you can understand, from my client's standpoint, $I$ represent Dr. Lasry and obviously Mr. Weaver represents APRN Bartmus.

It sounds like this event was a very emotional event for you and for your family and it continues to be. It brings up a lot of emotions for you.

MR. BACK: Yep.
MR. MCBRIDE: Do you believe that your experience that you had with your sister is going to make you more favorable to whatever plaintiffs might have in this case?

MR. BACK: Yeah, I thought about this a lot

1ast night because $I$ figured that this is where it was going to come to. I would like to think that I would be impartial, but I'm not sure if I could be impartial.

MR. MCBRIDE: Sure. And that's fine. And that's what we're looking for. All counsel here is looking for brutal honesty. You heard Mr. Hymanson say that. That's what we're looking for.

So I guess the other question is would you, if you were Dr. Lasry, would you want someone with your same mindset sitting on the jury in judgment of his care and treatment?

MR. BACK: I would guess no.
MR. MCBRIDE: Okay. Thank you very much. I appreciate it.

MR. WEAVER: I don't have any questions, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
MR. H. HYMANSON: No further questions, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Any --
MR. ARNTZ: We'll stipulate, Your Honor.
THE COURT: I believe there's a stipulation forthcoming, and I was trying to think of the artful way to ask it.

We're all very appreciative of your service, but $I$ think we all agree that, as $I$ mentioned on the first day, not every trial is a perfect fit for every person. We're sorry that this trial has invoked these emotions for you, and we thank you for your service, but we are going to go ahead and excuse you at this time. If you have your badge with you, give it to the marshal on your way out, but you are excused.

MR. BACK: Thank you.
THE COURT: A11 right. Thank you.
And, you know, $I$ 'm reconsidering my thought process about Ms. Jimenez. If the counsel are in agreement to stipulate to excuse, $I$ think we might as wel1 fill both seats and move forward before we go too much further.

MR. WEAVER: Yes, Your Honor.
MR. ARNTZ: Sounds good to me.
THE COURT: Bear with me. I get there. It was a really long calendar this morning. MR. MCBRIDE: I don't know how you could do it.

THE COURT: It was exhausting. That's what my court clerk just said, and it was.

Joshua, we're going to also excuse

Ms. Jimenez. Thank her for her service. Tell her, you know, no issue. Just, you know -- why don't we bring everybody back in, hold her back. And then once everybody's back in the room, keep her in the alcove. You can let her go and take her badge. okay?

THE MARSHAL: Okay. No problem, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
(Jury panel enters the courtroom.)
THE COURT: All right. As everyone finishes coming into the courtroom, I'11 invite everyone to have a seat.

MR. ARNTZ: I think they're going to take this opportunity to leave, if that's okay.

THE COURT: That's fine. we're going to excuse the Moores at this time and proceed with our inquiry of the panel.

You will note that we have excused two additional members from the pane1, and we are going to need to fill those two vacant seats. So the first vacant seat is seat No. 5. It's in the back row. And, again, for the folks who are coming forward, come through the center, around, and enter from the left of the jury box.

Next juror in line is:
THE CLERK: Badge 668, Marce1 Brown.
THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Brown.
And the other seat is seat No. 20. We have a little path of travel here behind counsel table. So it might be quicker to go that direction.

Filling seat No. 20 is:
the CLERK: Badge 677, Jessica Chavez.
THE COURT: All right. Thank you, both.
I'm going to start with Ms. Brown. If you're able to see the board or 1 can just ask you the questions. Either way. Whatever is easier.

MR. BROWN: Yes. Question No. 1 is gone. Is that my name?
the court: Did it somehow fall off the 1ist? Yeah, we're moving the projector a little bit. It's okay. I'11 go through it. Yes, we have your name and your --

MR. H. HYMANSON: Are you all right with me standing here? I'm sorry to interrupt you.

THE COURT: No, you're fine. Perfectly fine.

So, Ms. Brown, your badge number is 668. Yes, the name. And then, of course, it kind of jumps right to former job or current job. Either
way.
MS. BROWN: My current job, I'm a social worker with Nevada Medicaid. Education, I have a Master's degree in rehab counseling. Not married, no children. I have -- my family's lived in Las vegas for about 20 years, and I've just been back the last 11.

THE COURT: Okay.
MS. BROWN: I've never been a juror.
THE COURT: Here or anywhere?
MS. BROWN: No.
THE COURT: Okay. How about any connections -- other than, you know, yourself obviously perhaps in the way that you do the work you do for Medicaid -- but how about, again, yourself in a former position to also discuss or a family member or a close friend in the medical field?

MS. BROWN: No. Besides working for insurance. No connections.

THE COURT: And meaning yourself and what you do with Medicaid?

MS. BROWN: uh-huh.
THE COURT: And what about any involvement in or knowledge of any malpractice, medical
malpractice lawsuit?
MS. BROWN: No.
THE COURT: Okay. Coming now down to
Ms. Chavez. Are you able to see?
MS. CHAVEZ: Yes.
THE COURT: okay.
MS. CHAVEZ: I'm Jessica Chavez, 677. I'm a food server at olive Garden. I have a high school education.

THE REPORTER: I'm sorry.
THE COURT: She's a food server at Olive Garden. She has a high school education. Maybe just speak up just a touch.

MS. CHAVEZ: From Granada Hills,
California. High school. I'm married to Tony Chavez. He's a Sunrun installer, solar installer. We have no children. I've lived in vegas for 11 years, and I've never been a juror.

THE COURT: okay. Thank you. And what about you, yourself, again, family member, close friend with any kind of medical field connections?

MS. CHAVEZ: No.
THE COURT: Here or California? Nobody does any of that kind of work?
mS. CHAVEZ: No.

THE COURT: what about anything related to any kind of lawsuits involving medical malpractice? MS. CHAVEZ: No.

THE COURT: All right. So we have our two new jurors. We know it's difficult when you add to the panel kind of late.

And, you know, I suppose a fair question now because counsel for the Moores have been at it for, total, maybe about an hour, a little over that of questioning, is there anything that you heard that's come up so far that, if you had been in the box and would have answered or could have answered, you might want to say?

Anything that you've listened to so far? Any answers you think you might want to give?
ms. Chavez: No.
the court: All right. well, there's going to be more questions, and we'll get more time with you. So Mr. Hymanson, whenever you're ready to proceed.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Thank you so much, Your honor.

Hello again, ladies and gentlemen. So we were just talking about -- before we took a break, we were talking about if anyone had any negative
feelings about pain and suffering damages. Mr. Grant, do you have any particular feelings about pain and suffering damages?

MR. GRANT: 634. No strong feelings either way. No. I don't think it's a -- no. Again, no strong feelings. I'11 just leave it there.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Well, let me ask you. So I'm just picking up a little bit of hesitation when you say you "don't think it's" and then you kind of cut off. What's the -- just the hesitation there?

MR. GRANT: Everything is circumstantial. So it depends on what's going on. We've been talking a lot about if things are frivolous or not. You know, if it's -- you know, if it ends up being justified. If say something goes to trial, and then that's fine, $I$ suppose. But without knowing the circumstances, $I$ don't really want to say "yes" or "no" on it.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Do you think that if evidence were presented to you, in either via testimony or documents or something, that substantiated an individual's pain and suffering, if you saw that, would you be comfortable awarding pain and suffering damages?

MR. GRANT: Yeah, I think so probably.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. We11, and I'm sorry that $I$ keep hammering on you.

MR. GRANT: Yes.
MR. H. HYMANSON: But just to be exact with you, when you say, you know, "I think so, probably," I need to dig in on that a little bit more. So why the, you know, you think so probably?

So if there's, you know, documented proof of it, you know, you were saying you needed to see something; and then $I$ changed the scenario if you see something, and it still seems like there's some hesitation.

MR. GRANT: Pardon me. with proof, yes. I'd say yes.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. So that actually kind of dovetails to something we talked about a 1ittle bit earlier, but we can go back to it for a second. So we were talking about the distinction between a frivolous case and a meritorious case. And different people had different opinions about that.

Some people talked about this notion of he-said, she-said. And then you started talking about "circumstantial"; right?

MR. GRANT: Uh-huh.
MR. H. HYMANSON: And so what do you mean
by "circumstantial"? what does that mean to you?
MR. GRANT: I suppose it would be whether
it's determined or not that whatever the complaints
are valid or not.
For example, there was a wedding
photographer I read about that, right after the
wedding, let's several years ago and let's say five
years later, the couple divorced. They were happy
with the photos beforehand. But then after they got
divorced, one of them sued the photographer for the
full amount of the services given several years
before, as well as the amount for the entire wedding
itself as for pain and damages, or something along
those lines, if I can remember.
think.
the divorce; right? It wasn't the pictures that
were the basis of the divorce?
cash grab, in my opinion. think.

MR. H. HYMANSON: And is this kind of going back to what you kind of talked about before, that when you're taking your pictures or you do a job for a wedding, you always have it in the back of your mind that: Hey, you know what, I could be sued for this. I've got to cover myself for everything? MR. GRANT: I agree.

MR. H. HYMANSON: okay. And but is there anything about that that you think makes you more hesitant about lawsuits in general?

Do you kind of question them? I'm just kind of picking up a kind of consistent theme of, you know, that you have some hesitation about lawsuits. Is that fair to say?

MR. GRANT: I think they're overdone. A little too abundant. That's my opinion.

MR. H. HYMANSON: And you also questioned, potentially, the validity of pain and suffering damages; correct?

MR. GRANT: I'11 say yes.
MR. H. HYMANSON: okay. What would you need to see? Because we talked about circumstantial evidence, and we changed, and you still had the hesitation with that. So I just want to figure out where it is. What do you need to feel comfortable
awarding pain and suffering damages?
MR. GRANT: I'm not really sure.
MR. H. HYMANSON: And I don't mean to put you on the spot. I'm sorry if I'm going at you. MR. GRANT: Oh, no, no. You're fine. You're fine.

MR. H. HYMANSON: I just need to figure these things out.

MR. GRANT: No. No problem. I think, again, just proof that there was actual suffering involved. Proof that financial compensation would actually help the situation as opposed to it just not being about taking advantage of someone else's real pain, $I$ suppose. You know, it's like, for example, if someone wants to try and sue McDonald's because they spill coffee on themselves, for instance. That whole famous story. So maybe more people would try that.

A restaurant in town had some food poisoning, $I$ remember, and $I$ knew the owners, and they were -- people were trying to take advantage of them saying, "Yeah, I got sick off of this kind of food that day too." So they were starting to try and sue them. But what happened was is the food that they ate wasn't the contaminated food. They
were trying to, you know, see if they could get some money out of it, out of someone else's problem.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. With your new examples, is it fair to say that you have a distrust of lawsuits?

MR. GRANT: Yeah.
MR. H. HYMANSON: And is it fair to say that if starting out judging this case, that you would give the defense a little bit of a -- that let's say the plaintiff would be starting one step behind than the defense?

MR. GRANT: No. I don't know the circumstances. SO I reserve all judgment.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. Well, you talked about you think that things are frivolous.

So, for example, you talked about the McDonald's hot coffee lawsuit; correct?

MR. GRANT: uh-huh.
MR. H. HYMANSON: Do you know the facts of that lawsuit?

MR. GRANT: No. It's just something I read in the paper like 20plus years ago. It was just an example or two.

MR. H. HYMANSON: If you found out that the lady from the McDonald's case was --
well, what's your understanding of the facts of what happened with that?

MR. GRANT: what I remember is someone spilled hot coffee on themselves in the drivethrough.

MR. H. HYMANSON: And has anyone else heard about this case before?

MR. GRANT: They sued McDonald's and got some sort of settlement out of it even though everyone knows coffee is hot.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. And does everyone agree that they think this is a perfect example of a frivolous lawsuit?

I see some people raising their hand.
Does anyone think that that was not a frivolous lawsuit? Yes, sir. Mr. Maltese; correct?

MR. MALTESE: 665. It depends. was it coffee at boiling, and was it -- did she get scarred on her lap or whatever the situation was? It depends on the facts.

MR. H. HYMANSON: And so if the facts were that she had third-degree burns, would that change your assessment of that case?

MR. GRANT: Yeah.
MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. And so that's

Mr. --
MR. GRANT: 634.
MR. H. HYMANSON: Mr. Grant, 634, just for the record, for everything.

And if it was documented there was over 700 occasions where people had been burned before, would that change your impression of that case?

MR. GRANT: Of course. The more facts that get presented, then that could sway my opinion, yeah.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. I'm not going to go really into this, but this brought it up a little bit. So we talked about, you know, your impression of frivolous lawsuits. And because of the McDonald's case, does anybody ever think the media exaggerates certain things when they're reporting about lawsuits?

Couple people with their hands up.
Mr. Burke; correct?
MR. BURKE: Yep. 510.
MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. Can you elaborate on that a iftte bit.

MR. BURKE: I mean, I guess I'd say sometimes they might even oversimplify it, as you just listed some possible facts that could have been
from the McDonald's case that even swayed his opinion. You know, if you put it in its simplest terms, people watching TV could be easily swayed to see things a certain way. Just kind of how the media works.

MR. H. HYMANSON: And, Ms. Chavez, do you ever think that sometimes -- do you think that there's reports on cases where people file meritorious lawsuits but they don't get what they deserve? Do you think that there's many articles or news stories about that?

MS. CHAVEZ: Yeah. 677. Sorry. I think that does happen sometimes. I can't think of anything right now, but I 'm sure it does.

MR. H. HYMANSON: You think it gets reported when people don't get what they deserve?

MS. CHAVEZ: Like I said sometimes. Maybe. I don't know. I'11 say I don't know.

MR. H. HYMANSON: No, that's totally fine. And I don't mean to make you nervous. I just -- and there's no wrong answers to this. we just want to hear what you think of things, and so you're doing just fine.

So let's talk about the specifics, this type of case. So we've talked about, you know,
different types of damages. Is there anyone that is uncomfortable with the fact that this is a medical malpractice case?

Does anyone have a problem with medical malpractice cases?

Yes, sir. Mr. Jones, 625; correct?
MR. JONES: Yeah. I don't have a problem with it, in general. I have one specifically.

MR. H. HYMANSON: okay.
MR. JONES: That, in 2017, I was diagnosed as having prostate cancer. And so, you know, you start the whole series of different things, different tests; and they all lead to certain different procedures going down the line in order to ascertain whether or not you do have prostate cancer. Well, the physician that had me in the process, it wasn't until I got to the point where they were going to do a biopsy. And you think, well, it's 12 minutes, you'11 be out. And the nurse goes, "Oh, no. It's 48."

And so you do these 48 , and then they find out that only four have any type of abnormality. But you have the statistics that say that African-American men, particularly within my age group, have a higher rate of dying from this. Now,

I'm not a physician. So, you know, I don't have all of the information. But you go through all of the tests, and had it not been for me having access to another physician that looked at the report, the physicians that were leading me down the path to, more or less, make the situation right, forgot to tell me a number of things.

So, yeah, I have some concerns because like when I took a look at it, $I$ began to recount all the facts and asked questions, nothing from an operational standpoint or from a procedural standpoint was wrong. What was wrong is that you have this very large organization of managed care, all these physicians with different ownership positions, and the thing was is to get him in the system and keep him in.

So, yeah, I have some problem with it. You know, everywhere you turn, every question you ask, they have an answer for it. So, you know, even through it didn't result in permanent damage; it did result in damage that you could find significant -you could live with it, but it's something I probably never would have entered into without more information.

So when I looked at it, I says, you know,
it's not worth a lawsuit. But somebody needs to give people more information, and this whole thing needs to be clearer on both sides. I don't want to just run and jump and say, "We11, you know, this shouldn't happen or I should sue you" because I can't really say because I'm not debilitated as a result of the treatment. Are they something I would have never entered into? Absolutely.

But I didn't think it was worth going through a lawsuit on it. That's just where I'm at right now. I do have some problems with how they come out and some of the things that the people file malpractice lawsuits on and what gets compensated.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Well, thank you very much for sharing that. I know that sometimes that's difficult to talk about in a room with a lot of other people.

Is there anything about that that would -you think that -- you can't get into the facts of the case -- but that you think that because you didn't file a medical malpractice case but my client did file, my clients did file a medical malpractice case, that you would hold against my clients?

MR. JONES: No. I wouldn't say I'd hold it against your client, but what $I$ would like to find
out and we don't know because we're not into the case, as to what this case is all about, what exactly happened; what is the structure of the organization that supposedly committed the offense and all of those things. There's so much information that not there.

And just like I said before, when we asked a question about advertising and those things, I think that some of the advertising cheapens the seriousness of something like this. Just because someone has the ability to pay doesn't mean that they should necessarily be sued, unless it is absolutely necessary and that they earned whatever punishment they're going to receive.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Understood. Thank you very much.

Does anyone else have any problems with the fact that it's a medical malpractice case?

So I'11 go from the front row first. So I apologize. Mr. Read; correct?

MR. READ: Read, 637. I kind of like had mentioned yesterday, like, my wife's a nurse, and we -- again, she was kind of part of a situation. I kind of still remember when she called me up from work. Like, she worked graveyard at the time, and
she called me from work, and I was home for our kids, and $I$ still kind of remember like when she told me that -- first she's like, "I got in trouble."

And, like, this happened like it actually was the day after my daughter's first birthday, and it was like -- and this was like over the weekend. So like this happened the week before, and she's like this: "Something came up," and she kind of like told me, she was whispering, and she goes, "They're going to let me work today, but I'm probably going to be put on leave, and like we're probably going to have to hire a lawyer," and just like and "There might be jail time and lose my license" type thing.

I'm just like thinking, I'm like I wasn't married too long ago, and my daughter just turned one. And I thought, "Am I ready to take care of my kids by myself?" It's like eventually we got divorced, and we both very good parents, I think. And I was like, at that time, just being, I think it was like 26,27 at the time, it was like -- it was like scary.

And it's still like, even like when $I$ kind of heard about some kind of case like this, it
just -- it definitely struck a nerve. Like, you know, it's like just certain things about this like reminded me of the situation. Like the defendants having two sets of attorneys. Like we didn't have the same attorneys, the doctor. And I don't know much about their case -- or I obviously know nothing about their case. But like, you know, just like certain things $I$ 've noticed in kind of the room which just kind of reminded me of that situation.

And it's just it's more of like nothing prejudging of medical malpractice, like heard things either way. Like I've heard other things just being friends and, you know, everything of medical professionals because of my wife and my mom and other family members, like from a family member of medical professionals. But just like just different things. But and sometimes like trivial, sometimes not.

But just like -- just kind of like, and it's just like. I don't know, I got a feeling. You go to work and you kind of try to do your best, and something maybe -- maybe you made a wrong judgment. And not to go much into her case. It's just like -it was like, you know, you got wrong information like from a wrong family member, and it wasn't a
family member. It was like a girlfriend, and he was still married --

MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. Yeah, and we don't have to get into all the specifics of that.

MR. READ: Just anxiety. And it just -MR. H. HYMANSON: Understood. So let me ask you, does that experience with your ex-wife, does that change how you feel about walking into being a juror for a medical malpractice case?

MR. READ: It does in the sense that it definitely like makes me kind of nervous, definitely. But, yeah, but $I$ don't know if it makes me feel like you know, like one way or the other. Like, okay, where I necessarily would feel like I'd side with the nurse or side with the plaintiff. I don't know.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Yeah. Let's talk about that a little bit more because you don't know if it would necessarily make you feel that way. But your ex-wife is a nurse, as we've been through; right? And you know that one of the defendants here is a nurse practitioner; correct?

MR. READ: Correct.
MR. H. HYMANSON: And you tell me, but is it fair to say that you think you would be, just
inherently, given your relationship with your ex-wife, what you've been through with her, that you would be more sympathetic to the defendants in this case?

MR. READ: Well, I definitely would be in the sense that -- in the sense that they like -- and not knowing any facts of the case, but yeah, in the sense that sometimes you go to work; like, you know, you do try to do a good job, and it's like and something just didn't go right. It's like, you know, it's like not always necessarily your fault. And it's just like that would like in -- yeah, it's like that would make me sympathetic.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. And so, again, Mr. Read, just as I've said today, I'm not trying to put words in anyone's mouth. I'm just trying to attempt to distill what we're saying with things. But it sounds, and obviously I can't get into the facts of this case. But it sounds, like you say, that you think that you would be sympathetic to the defendants in this case?

MR. READ: I guess if you would say that, yeah.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. And so just fleshing that out a little bit, do you think that --
is it safe to say that going into this case, you think that my clients would be one step behind the defendants in this case, instead of starting out at an equal starting point?

MR. READ: I don't like ever think $I$ 'm that person. Like, and I put -- and like -- yeah, so I would want to say no, but like maybe.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Well, and this kind of goes back to what we started with yesterday, when we were talking about the apple pie competition. And it's not saying that -- it's not a bad thing. when you say that you're "that person," there's no such thing with "that person" with things. But there's such thing as it's not the right case for everyone to judge to from everything.

And what I'm hearing from you is that you think that you would be more sympathetic, despite your best efforts. You want to be as objective as you can. And, again, I'm not trying to put words in your mouth. But you'd like to be as objective as you can. But you feel as though, ultimately, when it came down to it, that the defendants would be one step ahead of my clients before this case started? MR. READ: If you put it that way, yes. MR. H. HYMANSON: Thank you very much.

to your pain and suffering?
THE COURT: I just want to add because it begs the followup that $I$ had before. There will be a jury instruction for those who are on the panel that discusses how to determine pain and suffering damages, if it's determined that any should be awarded. Okay? So the instructions cover a lot of the ground that maybe some uncertainty that the jurors have in their mind. okay.

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

And thank you very much also, Mr. Burke. Anybody else that thinks they have some hesitations about the fact that this is a medical malpractice case? Yes, sir. Mr. Taylor.

MR. TAYLOR: Taylor, 644. We11, yeah. If it basically comes down to just the case of pain and suffering, that's a very subjective view. we all have to determine whether we believe that or not. And just to come and say, "okay. I'm going to give you $\$ 10$ miliion because $I$ believe," I mean, what's the foundation for that?

I mean, is it loss of work time? Is it just because $I$ say I'm hurting? I mean, it comes down to what you believe. If there's actual factual
evidence that supports that, that okay maybe I cut off the wrong arm instead of this arm, which has happened in medical history. We've seen that. We've seen lawsuits justified. Those are very justified. But if it comes down to basically, you know, as I mentioned earlier, he-said, she-said, then I don't know. I don't know if I can buy that.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. Understood. Let's talk about that a little bit more. So we talked about he-said, she-said. We touched on this a little bit yesterday, but let's go into it a little bit more.

If it's he-said, she-said, do you think that you could come to a decision based on just two different people, their stories, and what they said; or would you need to see more evidence than just what he said or she said?

MR. TAYLOR: Basically, I would need more because you could tell me something. I could tell you something. Maybe we're both correct, you know, or maybe we're both wrong. It's, you know, for all of us to decide obviously.

But it's -- without some kind of evidence, you know, a third person or perhaps a procedure or some instance, say like if somebody gave a needle to
somebody that had been used by somebody e1se, something resulted as that, obviously there's evidence. But if it's basically: I'm hurting because somebody forgot to check my heart or, you know, take my blood pressure or whatever, you know, that's minute.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Understood. Are you comfortable being in a position to judge someone's credibility?

I mean you're all going to be hearing from -- if you're picked for this jury, you're going to be hearing from witnesses that come up and take the stand. And as the judge will tell you, it's your job to judge their credibility and if you believe them or not.

Is that something that you're comfortable with? Are you comfortable judging whether the individuals that take this stand are telling the truth?

MR. TAYLOR: Yeah, I've been on a jury before. I am comfortable to listen to facts and to hear what's happening. But, ultimately, if it really comes down to just basically one person saying this and the other person saying this and there's no evidence to support really either way, I
have questions about that.
THE COURT: Can you get the juror some water, please.

MR. H. HYMANSON: And so just so -- again, I'm trying to clarify that $I$ 'm hearing you correctly, that being if a juror is up there -- if a witness is up testifying and even if you believe that they're credible, that's not sufficient for you as a basis to make your decision? If you don't have anything else in a vacuum, that basis alone is not enough?

MR. TAYLOR: Not particularly, no.
MR. H. HYMANSON: So you're in agreement with my statement; correct?

MR. TAYLOR: Yeah. Basically, if somebody is just saying something, $I$ can't -- I can't back it up with any evidence that's been presented to me, then it's just, why are they here? what's the point of this whole thing?

MR. H. HYMANSON: Understood. Thank you very much.

Anyone else that have any particular reservations about the fact that this is a medical malpractice case?
okay. So we've already kind of touched on
the next topic $I$ want to talk about. But at the end of the day, what this case is about, unfortunately, the only way that we can compensate -- that the Moores can receive compensation for what's happened to them is money, and so ultimately this is a case about money, where we're going to be asking you to award money to the Moores.

Does anyone have a problem with the fact that this is a case about money?

Does that bother anyone?
MR. TAYLOR: Taylor, 644. Only if it's excessive.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay, okay. Anybody else? Yes, sir. Mr. Burke; correct?

MR. BURKE: Yeah, 510. Just same as I was saying earlier.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Yes, ma'am. Ms. Price; correct?

MS. PRICE: I was going to say what he says. If it's too excessive, I think that would put a point in my mind that already that this person is just trying to get money.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. And so it depends on the amount of money that's being asked for. And, again, not trying to put words in your mouth. But

I'm just trying to interpret what I'm hearing. You think that if someone is asking for too much -- if it's a number that you think is too much money, that that fact alone, you think, takes away from their credibility with something, and you think that it makes it into at least the territory of a frivolous lawsuit or a money grab or something like that?

MS. PRICE: Yes.
MR. H. HYMANSON: okay. And how would that affect your overall opinion? would that make you inclined to award no money or exactly what you think they're entitled to?

How do you think that would affect you?
MS. PRICE: I somewhat dealt with that in the last case that I was a jury on, and we tried to come up with an amount that we felt was appropriate. It wound up coming up we gave nothing.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. And so it's at least fair to say that you think that that would influence that fact alone of asking for what you determine to be too much money would influence how you looked at the rest of the facts of the case -MS. PRICE: Yes.

MR. H. HYMANSON: -- and whether you thought that it was proper to award X -amount to
properly compensate the plaintiff for the damages? MS. PRICE: uh-huh.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. Does anybody else have a problem this case is about money?

Yes, sir. Mr. Headd; correct?
MR. HEADD: I pretty much agree with her -633 -- that, you know, that if it's to an astronomical level, that it takes away from the credibility of, you know, what they're trying to prove.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. Thank you.
Does anybody else have any thoughts about that?
okay. So we're going to move to -- the judge, as the Court has told you several times, she's going to be the one that instructs you about the law. But the standard of proof here is going to be lower than the standard of proof in a criminal trial. So everyone has heard in criminal trial "beyond a reasonable doubt."

Here it's going to be "preponderance of the evidence," and the Court will explain what that means. But does anyone have a problem with the fact that we're going to be asking for money based on a lower standard than beyond a reasonable doubt?

Is there anyone that that gives someone issue? Yes, sir, Mr. Jones.

MR. JONES: 625. It gives me issue because if you're asking for what I consider to be a huge amount of money, then you need to be able to prove -- you know, there should be a high level of proof. I mean, it shouldn't be a low bar for something like that. I mean, if you genuinely and sincerely believe that you have been wronged and the evidence is there, then you should present it. I mean, if anything, it should -- I feel it should be higher.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. And so, as I said, the Court is going to instruct you of the law. And your job is going to be to follow the law as instructed by the Court. And so if the Court instructs you that the law is this lower standard, preponderance of the evidence, do you think that you personally would have a hard time following the law?

MR. JONES: I wouldn't have a problem following it. I necessarily may not like it. But I wouldn't have a problem following it because those are the instructions. That's what you've agreed to do by being here.

MR. H. HYMANSON: okay. Thank you very
much.
Does anyone else have an issue with the fact that we're going to be asking for money and that the standard is preponderance of the evidence?

Yes, sir. Mr. withers.
MR. WITHERS: 618. I think there's a quality of 1 ife to be considered when talking about money. And, you know, did it change the person's outcome because of the mistake? Is there an ownership involved in whatever took place? And we don't know the details, and I'm sure we'11 find out. But $I$ think that plays a big role in this.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. And how does that play role to you? Just a little more.

MR. WITHERS: So there's responsibility, and we talked about ownership earlier. Did the mistake or what would be presumed was the mistake change the person's quality of life? And because of that, now they're going to be awarded this exponential amount of money. You know, and are we going to have any evidence, or is it somebody saying, well, "Yeah, now 1 can't do this."

MR. H. HYMANSON: Thank you very much.
Is there anyone else that has an issue or thinks that they have a question about that, that
that would be difficult for them?
All right. So let's go through just two quick hypotheticals. So if the plaintiff was seeking $\$ 10,000$ in damages, would you be comfortable awarding $\$ 10,000$ of damages based on the preponderance of the evidence standard?

And so the preponderance of the evidence that the defendants harmed the plaintiff in the amount of $\$ 10,000$, would anyone have a problem with that?

MS. PRICE: Can you say it again.
MR. H. HYMANSON: Yeah. Does anyone have a problem with the standard being that the plaintiff has to prove, by a preponderance of the evidence, that the defendant caused them harm and is asking for $\$ 10,000$ ?
would you have a hard time awarding $\$ 10,000$ if you determined that the defendant was at fault for the plaintiff's harm?

Is there anyone that would have a problem with that?

MR. MALTESE: No. 665. No.
MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. Thank you very much. Let's change the hypothetical -- and this kind of goes off what you were saying, Mr. Jones.

If it was proven that the defendant's harm caused $\$ 10$ miliion in damages, would everyone be comfortable awarding $\$ 10$ million in damages with still using that preponderance of the evidence standard to determine if the defendant was at fault?

Does that change anyone's perception? we've kind of talked about it, but $I$ just wanted a direct example of that.

Does that change anyone's perception? Thank you very much. And so I've got two more hypotheticals that kind of go with that. But I want you all to think about this:

If you thought it would only take five -based on the facts and the evidence that you saw, if you determined that the defendant was at fault for the plaintiff's arm and you thought that all it would take to compensate the plaintiff was $\$ 500$ and the plaintiff was asking for $\$ 10 \mathrm{million}$, would everyone be comfortable awarding the plaintiff $\$ 500$ ?

Is there anyone that would have a problem doing that?
okay. So let's flip the scenario. If the facts of that incident that you saw, you thought warranted compensation for the harm of $\$ 10 \mathrm{million}$ and if the defense was just asking for $\$ 500$, is
there any of you that would have a hard time returning a verdict of $\$ 10 \mathrm{million}$ ?

Yes. Ms. Price.
MS. PRICE: You said that if it was shown that it was only worth 500, would I --

MR. H. HYMANSON: I'm sorry. No. This hypothetical was different in the sense that the defense is asking for 500 , but the facts and the evidence, in your determination, warrant a \$10 million award and that's what the plaintiff is asking.

MS. PRICE: And would I have a problem if they award the $\$ 10$ miliion, if it was proved that it really was done?

MR. H. HYMANSON: Exactly. If you believe that, based on the facts and the evidence, it warrants a $\$ 10$ million award, but the defense is asking for a $\$ 500$ award, would that change -- would that affect your ability to give that award?

MS. PRICE: No.
MR. H. HYMANSON: It's the same answer for everyone?
the court: There's a hand, mr. hymanson.
MR. TAYLOR: Taylor, 644. Slightly, just based on the fact that, in a criminal trial, I've
experienced you have to have unanimous; whereas, in this case, not quite the case. So there could be the majority decision; yet $I$ could have a dissenting view on this and, unfortunately, almost stuck to it.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. Well that brings up a good point. So is there anyone that thinks that they would have a problem deciding the way that they think about this case?

So you're talking about, in the jury room, that you think, if you had one opinion and the other people had a different opinion, is there anyone that feels like that they would let other people opinions influence the way that they would vote?

So you think that no money should be awarded; they think that money should be awarded. Do you think that you would let that influence you, even though you didn't think money should be awarded, that you would vote to award money?

Does anyone think that they would be influenced like that?

Now, let's talk about something that was brought up by several of you, and as the court stated, she's going to give you the instructions, the jury instructions of how you determine everything. But let's talk about, you know, 1this
term of "pain and suffering" damages and emotional distress. It's an amorphous term, and there's no scale or metric or a thing that you can put up, you know, what does it mean if you've lost an arm? If you've lost a leg. But does anyone have any thoughts about how you would try to determine what factors you would look at to determine how to compensate someone for pain and suffering or emotional distress?

Yes, sir. Mr. Headd.
MR. HEADD: 633. Yeah, I guess it depends on how it changes their life, you know, what they were doing before the accident or whatever happened and to what happens after and what they now can't do. So I think that would be important for me.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. Thank you. Mr. Ehle, do you have any thoughts on this? MR. EHLE: Yeah, I think about -- 606. MR. H. HYMANSON: Thank you. MR. EHLE: I think, yeah, about the same. I think it would depend on how their life changes. MR. H. HYMANSON: okay. Thank you.
Ms. Chavez, what do you think? what kind of factors would you look at?

MS. CHAVEZ: 677. Same thing that they're
saying, whether or not they can still work, if they are able to take care of their children. Anything like that.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Thank you.
Does anybody think that there's something that has been -- that they think that they would use that hasn't been brought up yet?

Yes, ma'am. Ms. Clinton.
MS. CLINTON: 658. Medical records, medical testimony describing the type of injury and the potential impact on life in terms of physicality. That type of thing.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Thank you. Anybody else?
How many of you go to see a doctor on a regular basis? okay. I think there's, in general, kind of two different types of people. There's a type of people that something first shows up and they want to go to the doctor right away and get it checked out; and there's other people, like me, that want to put it off and wait to go see a doctor.

Does anyone think that they're the type of person that, when something first comes up, they're going to go get it checked out right away?

Ms. Price. Okay.
Does anybody think that they would kind of
wait awhile to go see a doctor?
okay. Why do you go -- when you go to see a doctor, why do you go to the doctor? Kind of a generic question. But why do you go see the doctor? Yes, ma'am. Ms. Bechtold.

MS. BECHTOLD: 624. It depends on how it's impacting my life, you know, and what is the -- is it an injury, or is it some kind of chronic illness? I mean, it depends on how it's affecting me or will affect me as to when my decision is whether to run to the doctor with a cold. Everyone's got a cold this season.

So do we wait a few days or run -- is it going to your lungs and your bronchitis so you better go so it's not pneumonia. I mean, there's a lot of different aspects when $I$ go to the doctor.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Absolutely. And when you go to the doctor, do you have an expectation that they're going to diagnose what's wrong with you?
mS. bechtold: yes.
MR. H. HYMANSON: And that they're going to properly treat you for what's wrong?

MS. BECHTOLD: Yes. Doesn't mean I always agree with them though.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Understood.

Does everyone have that expectation when they go to the doctor, that they're going to be properly diagnosed? They're going to be properly treated for what is wrong with them?

How many people trust hospitals?
I see a couple of hands up. I see a couple basically saying "not so much."

How many people don't trust hospitals?
okay. I see a lot of hands up.
Ms. Bebekyan, $I$ keep butchering that. I apologize.

MS. BEBEKYAN: No, it's correct.
MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. Ms. Bebekyan, why don't you trust hospitals?
ms. Bebekyan: 109. That's just my opinion. I mean, I don't trust them in many ways because you can get treated by not going to the hospital or by not going to the doctors.

I mean, my situation, they said I might be diabetic because $I$ just started gaining a lot of weight and not getting enough insulin, but $I$ went to the doctors, and he said, "Oh, I'll give you Metformin. Go ahead and drink this once a day. You'11 be fine, and then you've just got to stick to it."

And I'm like, "okay. No, I'm not going to take that. I'm not taking Metformin. I'm only 26 years old. I'm young. I'll just lose weight, and I'll just exercise and keep myself healthy. And I mean, knock on wood. I'm not diabetic. So why trust a doctor to give you medicines when you can cure yourself alone?

MR. H. HYMANSON: Understood.
Mr. Eh7e, I think you had your hand up. MR. EHLE: Yeah. Recently, I had a couple of people $I$ know die in hospitals from bad decisions. One went in for something relatively, you know, that he had before, a stint -- a "stent" rather, and he ended up getting a staff infection and dying.

MR. H. HYMANSON: I'm very sorry to hear that.

MR. EHLE: I had another friend, she was in a car accident, and she was in surgery for her back. And in the middle of the surgery, they said everything was going fine; everything was going great; they were only going to do part of the surgery. "We'll push on through, we'll do the rest of it," she ended up her kidneys failing and, again, the staff infection.

MR. H. HYMANSON: I'm sorry to hear that. Does anybody have any different feelings about nurses or nurse practitioner? we've been talking about kind of doctors and hospitals. what about nurses and nurse practitioners? The same general thoughts?

Anyone have any specific thoughts about nurses or nurse practitioners? No.

How many people think that just because someone is a medical professional, that they have more credibility? Okay. So Ms. Price and Mr. Headd.

Mr. Headd, why do you think that?
MR. HEADD: Well, they go to school. They do residency. They go through a lot to learn their trade. So I think they have more credibility than someone who doesn't.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. And Ms. Price?
MS. PRICE: 632. I just want to clarify, you're saying "credibility" as a person in general; or "credibility" in the medical field?

MR. H. HYMANSON: I think as a person in general.

MS. PRICE: Then no.
MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. Does that change
your answer at all, Mr. Headd?
MR. HEADD: I'm talking about in the medical field, $I$ trust their information more than somebody who's not in the medical field.

MR. ARNTZ: Ms. Chavez was going to say something.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Thank you very much.
Ms. Chavez.
MS. CHAVEZ: 677. I was just going to say the same thing as him. They went to school for it, you know, more than me.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. Thank you.
Is there anyone that thinks that just by having a doctor or a nurse practitioner take the stand, that you think that they're going to be automatically more credible in what they're going to say than anyone else?

MR. MALTESE: No. 665.
MR. H. HYMANSON: Does anybody think that?
okay. Mr. Headd.
MR. HEADD: Well, they do take oaths to -you know, the Hippocratic Oath, and so hopefully they're not going to purposely lie up there. So, you know, a lot of other witnesses maybe don't have the same or are held to that same standard. I think
they might have a little more credibility than Joe Schmoe off the street.

MR. H. HYMANSON: okay. So you think the fact -- and so what's your understanding of what the Hippocratic Oath is?

MR. HEADD: Do no harm.
MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. And so you think the fact that a doctor or nurse practitioner took an oath to do no harm, that you think that would give them more credibility when they came and sat up on the stand?

MR. HEADD: when it comes to a medical case. I mean, I think they're doctors and nurses; by default, they're trying to help people. You know, they -- people come to them with a problem. They try to help and fix it. So $I$ think in this -in that type of situation, they're called on the stand to talk about medical things that, you know, they're going to be more credible than somebody who's not in the field.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. So we've talked about how people go to the doctor with the expectation that they're going to be properly diagnosed and properly treated. We talked about responsibility earlier.

Earlier, Mr. Headd, you were just talking about giving them potentially more credit because they have taken this Hippocratic Oath.

Is there anyone that thinks that doctors or nurse practitioners should be held to a higher standard if they give improper care?

Meaning people put their trust in them to be treated correctly, but if they aren't treated correctly -- first of all, do you think that those providers should take responsibility for those actions? Ms. Price.

MS. PRICE: Yes. I think they should take responsibility for that.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. Thank you very much. And 632; correct?

MS. PRICE: 632.
MR. H. HYMANSON: Sorry.
And, Mr. Ehle, you raised your hand also. MR. EHLE: Yeah. 606. I think they should be held to a higher standard because they're dealing with a human life.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Does anybody else have any thoughts about that?

Is anybody familiar with the phrase "If it's not recorded, it didn't happen?"

Yes. I see some people nodding their heads. Let's talk to Ms. Brown. You said you're familiar with that phrase. And what does that phrase mean to you?

MS. BROWN: If it's not documented, it didn't take place.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. And is that important in your line of work?

MS. bROWN: Yes.
MR. H. HYMANSON: why is it --
MS. BROWN: 668.
MR. H. HYMANSON: Thank you. I apologize. why is it important in your line of work?

MS. BROWN: Individual recipients could come back and say that you didn't provide them a service or they could tell you that you didn't call them on $X, Y$, and $Z$. But if you can go back to your documentation, you can prove all the different aspects, all the different times that you made contact or the resources that you gave them.

MR. H. HYMANSON: And is there ever a time that you're worried that there may be an issue with something and you decide to make a little more detailed documentation?

MS. BROWN: More detailed documentation?

MR. H. HYMANSON: Yeah. Well, just in terms of for a specific note. Maybe something, I don't know. You're worried about a specific issue coming up, and so you may have a basic way to do notes; but you may, in certain cases, make even more detailed notes.

MS. BROWN: Oh. Yes.
MR. H. HYMANSON: Has that ever happened to you?

MS. BROWN: Yes.
MR. H. HYMANSON: And why do you make more detailed notes?

MS. BROWN: If we know that individuals -usually you document everything that individuals are saying; but if someone has a questioning component, they question you on everything, to cover yourself, you make every detail, put every detail in there.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Has anyone ever had any issues with blood flow issues in their body? vascular issues or anything like that?

Mr. Ehle.
MR. EHLE: Yeah, a number of times.
MR. H. HYMANSON: And we don't have to get into the medical history or anything. I can just leave it at that. We don't need to --
 apologize. I have it written down wrong. Thank you so much. Anybody else? Oh, okay. Mr. Maltese.
mR. MALTESE: Yep.
MR. H. HYMANSON: what about does anyone have any people from their family, family, friends that have blood flow issues?
the court: Mr. wilder had raised his hand previous7y.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Thank you so much, Your Honor. Mr. Wilder.

MR. WILDER: 611. Well, I had a heart attack four years ago.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Sorry to hear that.
MR. WILDER: And I was the one that --
THE REPORTER: I'm sorry. Could you repeat, sir. I apologize.
the court: she can't see you, Mr. wilder, so if you could please speak up.

MR. WILDER: I trust hospitals because they saved my life.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Thank you very much, Mr. Wilder. Let me ask you a couple of other questions. So we talked about your hearing before; correct? And you've been on jury panels before but haven't been selected; correct?

MR. WILDER: Never made it that far.
MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. And was the basis
for that sometimes your hearing?
MR. WILDER: Always my hearing.
MR. H. HYMANSON: Always your hearing.
Okay. Has your hearing improved since that time?
MR. WILDER: No.
MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. We talked yesterday, you were talking about different tones. Certain tones you could hear, and certain tones you couldn't hear; correct?

MR. WILDER: Correct.
MR. H. HYMANSON: And if I remember correctly, you said that there were -- even when the counsel were introducing themselves, you could hear some people and you couldn't hear other people; correct?

MR. WILDER: Correct.
MR. H. HYMANSON: I assume you've been able to hear me while I've been talking today.

MR. WILDER: I can't hear you. I can hear the judge, but $I$ can't hear her (to reporter). MR. H. HYMANSON: what about the other jurors that have been talking? Have you been able to hear all them, or do you have certain issues with that?

MR. WILDER: About half of them.
MR. H. HYMANSON: About half you've heard. okay. Do you have any concerns -- and I don't mean to call you out with everything. I'm sorry. But we just need to know. Do you have any concerns about, you know, given that you've heard about half of what's going on, that you're not going to hear certain testimony or certain evidence that is presented during this trial?

MR. WILDER: Absolutely.
MR. H. HYMANSON: okay. And do you think that that will affect your ability to properly serve as a juror in this case?

MR. WILDER: Well, unless I, you know, like the judge suggested, I raise my hand and have everybody repeat when I can't hear.

MR. H. HYMANSON: And do you have any -and I don't know because $I$ haven't seen you do that yet, and I understand that is a dynamic process with
everything -- but do you have any concerns about raising your hand during the trial when you can't hear something?

MR. WILDER: No, not really.
MR. H. HYMANSON: But you are concerned that you haven't been able to hear -- at least half of what's been happening you haven't heard?

MR. WILDER: Correct.
MR. H. HYMANSON: okay. Thank you very much. I'm sorry to go through that but --

MR. WILDER: No problem. I can't hear my own daughter.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. Fair enough. Has anyone here -- well, does anyone know anyone here that has had a limb amputated? A limb amputated, like an arm or a leg?

Yes, sir mr. Jones.
MR. JONES: My grandfather had a limb amputated after he had a knee surgery that went bad. They eventually amputated the entire leg.

MR. H. HYMANSON: I'm sorry to hear that.
MR. JONES: Because it wouldn't properly heal. He's been deceased now for about 15 years.

MR. H. HYMANSON: okay. How did that affect him?

MR. JONES: Well, it was pretty
debilitating. He was in a lot of pain and really couldn't move around, you know, on that leg. So at that point, he was an elderly man when that happened, and he had some other physical issues. But still the fact is it never healed properly, and after a couple of operations, they realized there was nothing that could be done, particularly with the infection that set in, and they amputated his 1 eg .

MR. H. HYMANSON: I'm sorry to hear that. You said you recall it was very painful for him?

MR. JONES: Before they decided to make the decision. You know, $I$ had a knee surgery myself. So I knew what knee surgeries looked like, and his looked bad. I mean, I don't know who his orthopedic person was, but it just didn't look like a quality surgery.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Understood. Do you know, did you hear anything about him talking about phantom limb pain?

MR. JONES: He felt like it was still there once it was removed. He had mentioned that a number of times, that he could feel his toes.

MR. H. HYMANSON: And did he ever talk
about being -- that he felt his leg that wasn't there had pain? Do you remember having any discussions with him about that?

MR. JONES: No pain.
MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. No pain, but he could feel it.

MR. JONES: Right.
MR. H. HYMANSON: Understood.
Has anyone here ever had a femoral popliteal graft or bypass surgery called a "fem-pop"? If you don't know what it is, that's fine. I'm just curious if anyone has had an experience or has a family member that's had that experience?

THE COURT: How are we doing, Mr. Hymanson, on time?

MR. H. HYMANSON: We're getting very close.
Court's indulgence, Your Honor.
MR. ARNTZ: Can we take a break?
the court: Can I have counsel at the bench.
(Bench conference.)
THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, we've been at it about an hour, $I$ think since we resumed, and I think we want to take another brief recess.

Do about ten minutes, just to give everybody time to stretch your legs, use the restrooms, and make sure they're back and ready to start promptly at 3:40.

Reminding you again, please do not talk or converse among yourselves or with anyone else about this case. No Internet searches, no trying to investigate anything. You've heard a lot of medical terms here. Again, none of it -- your whole case and your service as jurors is based on the evidence that comes into this case through the witnesses and through the exhibits. So make sure you avoid any of those kinds of communications. But we'11 see you back here in a little over ten minutes. 3:40.

THE MARSHAL: All rise for the jury.
(Jury panel exits the courtroom.)
THE COURT: All right. I definitely want to resume at 3:40. So whatever discussion you have to streamline, let's do it. okay.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Thank you so much,
Your Honor.
(Pause in the proceedings.)
THE COURT: I'11 have everybody take their seat and resume. I didn't mention this before. We've had no problems with this. But please do make sure your cellphones are off or silenced if you've
had them on during the break.
Mr. Hymanson, whenever you're ready.
MR. H. HYMANSON: Thank you very much, Your Honor.

Mr. Everett, I'm sorry I haven't spoken to you all day. I'm going to direct this question to you. Do you think that it's important for a treating medical physician to physically examine patients?

MR. EVERETT: Physically examine?
MR. H. HYMANSON: Yes.
mR. EVERETT: Yes, I do.
MR. H. HYMANSON: what about, Mr. Newman, I haven't spoken to you either. I apologize.

MR. NEWMAN: Could you repeat.
MR. H. HYMANSON: Yes. No problem. Do you think it's important for a treating medical professional to physically examine a patient?

MR. NEWMAN: Yes.
MR. H. HYMANSON: Does everyone agree with
that? Does anybody disagree with that?
Yes, sir. Mr. Headd.
MR. HEADD: Yes. 633. I think in certain situations, if their assistants are taking good notes or, you know, doing their job properly, that
maybe he doesn't have to actually see the person -in certain situations, not all.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Understood. And so you say "doing their job properly," what is doing job properly?

MR. HEADD: Just, you know, following the correct operating procedures that are, you know, standard operating procedures, doing everything they're, you know, they're trained to do.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. And is part of that -- so you're talking about if basically someone like working under someone is doing -- looking at the patient and then communicating that information to the supervising person; is that correct?

MR. HEADD: Yeah, either verbally or through notes.

MR. H. HYMANSON: okay. But you think does that require proper communication?

MR. HEADD: Yes.
MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. Does anybody agree with that, with what Mr. Headd just said? Ms. Price, okay, 632.

Anyone else? Yes, sir. Mr. Taylor?
MR. TAYLOR: No. I just agree.
MR. H. HYMANSON: You agree. Okay.

Is anyone here or either themselves or their close, you know, friends or family suffering from any kidney problems?

Ms. Price. Okay. Thank you.
Anyone else?
Does anyone here know anyone that is confined to a wheelchair? Mr. Newman.

MR. NEWMAN: 640 badge. My sister is.
She's had some illness that started in her head, and basically she had surgery. She had a light stroke. So she's basically unable to maybe move one side of her body, particularly it's the left side.

MR. H. HYMANSON: I'm sorry to hear that. Have you noticed that have an effect on her 1ife?

MR. NEWMAN: Yes. Considerably. She was really outgoing doing everything, working her job. And it basically, you know, took her quality of life away.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Did she have to make any modifications to her house?
mR. NEWMAN: Yes, yes.
MR. H. HYMANSON: And what kind of modifications did she make?

MR. NEWMAN: Bathrooms, no stairs. Lifts
to come through in and out. It's a major life change, no matter how you look at it.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. Well, thank you for sharing that. Does anyone else know someone that is confined to wheelchair?

Yes, Mr. Ehle, 022 -- I keep getting that's the one I have wrong. I apologize.

MR. EHLE: Yeah, a good friend of mine is confined. I missed the part about the kidney disease, but he has third-stage kidney disease.

MR. H. HYMANSON: I'm sorry to hear that.
MR. EHLE: Just kind of happened recently. So he's been in a wheelchair now for probably three months.

MR. H. HYMANSON: I'm sorry to hear that.
All right. Ladies and gentlemen, I 'm getting very close today, and I'll finally sit down and you won't have to hear from me anymore.

Is there anyone here that thinks that they will have an issue following the law as given to them by the Court? No hands.

This is an important question: Is there anything that $I$ didn't ask or that $I$ asked and didn't follow-up with you about that you think that we should know before we decide who should sit on
this jury? Anything anybody can think of?
Yes, ma'am. Ms. Brown.
MS. BROWN: Yes. 668. I do work on a daily basis with a lot of individuals with disability. So when you're talking about wheelchairs and different handicaps, I do come across a lot of people with Medicaid, and our population is primarily disabled.

MR. H. HYMANSON: okay. Thank you for sharing that, and you have a Master's in, is it rehab counseling?

MS. BROWN: Yeah.
MR. H. HYMANSON: And what is a Master's in rehab counseling?

MS. BROWN: It's where you help individuals who have disabilities find employment, but that's what my Master's is in. That's not currently what I'm working.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. And so what's the day-to-day description? I know you kind of said it, but just is there anything else in the description you said that describes what your job description is?

MS. BROWN: What the rehab counseling is or what my current job?

MR. H. HYMANSON: Your current job description.

MS. BROWN: Well, I'm a supervisor, and I supervise individuals who go out to nursing facilities and hospitals, and we help them transition individuals with Medicaid, transition back home.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. Thank you very much. Is there anyone else that has something that they think that I should really ask you about or that you should te11 me about.

Yes, sir. Mr. Ehle.
MR. EHLE: 606. I've had extensive medical history, lots of dealings with doctors. You're talking about giving an edge to somebody. I'd be more inclined, right off the bat, to give an edge to you.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay, okay. Thank you very much. Is there anyone else that has any statements? Oh, yes. Ms. Price.

MS. PRICE: I just don't know how much the kidney thing is going to be. I just have a lot of family history with kidney disease.

MR. H. HYMANSON: okay, okay.
MS. PRICE: I don't know if that's
important or not.
MR. H. HYMANSON: Understood. I'll ask you a couple of questions about that. Thank you. So 632 ; correct?

MS. PRICE: Yes.
MR. H. HYMANSON: Thank you so much.
Ms. Price, so you say you have a lot of family history with kidney disease. I don't want to go into a lot with that, but can you expand on that a little bit.

MS. PRICE: My family has a genetic disorder with polycystic kidney disease. My brother was actually just diagnosed on Saturday with it.

MR. H. HYMANSON: I'm sorry to hear that.
MS. PRICE: That's really it.
MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. All right. well, thank you very much for sharing that. I appreciate that.

Is there anything that any of you have heard so far that makes you think that it would be difficult for you to sit and serve as a juror on this case?

Al1 right. Ladies and gentlemen -MR. ARNTZ: wait.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Court's indulgence.

Apologies. Thank you very much, Your Honor. (Pause in the proceedings.)

MR. H. HYMANSON: I'm not quite done. I have a couple more.

So, Mr. Ehle, I want to just follow-up on what you said. You said that you think that given your issues with medical treatment before, you think that you would be potentially having -- well, to ask the question, would one side be more ahead than the other? You think that my side would be more ahead, the plaintiffs; correct?

MR. EHLE: Correct.
MR. H. HYMANSON: And so do you think that -- you understand that the facts of this case that are going to be presented are different from any of the facts of what's happened to either yourself or your friends; correct?

MR. EHLE: Yes, I think so.
MR. H. HYMANSON: Okay. And that's a different scenario. Even if it's something similar, it's not the same person, not the same set of facts; correct?

MR. EHLE: Correct.
MR. H. HYMANSON: Do you think that there is a way that you can still be fair and impartial
and sit and judge this case?
MR. EHLE: I'll try. I think, like I said, I have a very extensive medical history, starting when I was eight years old. I'm 69 now. A lot of different doctors, a lot of different misdiagnoses. A lot of -- I had a botched operation. I could go on and on and on. I mean, I can try to be fair. It would be, you know, just I'm afraid of whatever the other side brings up, it's going to reference something that I've already been through.

MR. H. HYMANSON: Understood. Thank you very much for that.

Ladies and gentlemen, if you were a plaintiff who was injured as a result of someone's medical malpractice, would you feel comfortable with someone with your viewpoint or disposition sitting on the jury?

Is there anybody that feels that they wouldn't be comfortable? If you were injured and you were severely harmed by someone's medical malpractice, would you be comfortable with someone with your viewpoints sitting on the jury?

Is there anyone that wouldn't be comfortable?

Seeing that, I have no further questions.

Thank you very much, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Thank you. We'11 let Mr. -are you going to use the podium?

MR. MCBRIDE: Sure. I might as well, Your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. And are you okay with that location? we don't have the same line of much sight issues from you.

MR. MCBRIDE: My voice is very loud too.
Good afternoon, everyone. Can everyone hear me?

You can hear me all right, Mr. Wilder?
And one thing, so that we know -- and, Mr. Wilder, in case you're concerned about being able to hear anything, see these little microphones in front of the jury box and over in front of the witness stage, and the judge has one up there? That's going to help, I think, project so you can hear.

But you understand you can also use that device that the judge told you about as well; right? okay. You feel comfortable given that information the fact that there's microphones here to be able to hear the witnesses testifying and the judge and counsel, what they might say?

You feel comfortable with being able to raise your hand if you can't hear anything?

MR. WILDER: I think so.
MR. MCBRIDE: All right. One question $I$
wanted to ask everyone in general -- and I think we've covered this earlier -- is just, in general, do the people here in this panel, do you feel or have one opinion of physicians negatively or positively? Either negatively or positively?

Mr. Ehle, we already know, $I$ think, where you're coming from.

MR. EHLE: Yeah.
MR. MCBRIDE: All right. I'11 get to you in a second. Anyone else here who has a very favorable about physicians, Mr. Maltese?
mR. MALTESE: Yeah.
MR. MCBRIDE: And that's Mr. Maltese, you are at 665.

MR. MALTESE: Correct. I have a favorable -- I was in a hospital and had almost 20 surgeries in a hospital stay; and they, you know, I was about to die. They just took me up and got me better.

MR. MCBRIDE: So was that here locally in Las vegas, or was that back in New York?

MR. MALTESE: No. It was in New York, yeah.

MR. Mcbride: And how long ago was that?
MR. MALTESE: Colon cancer survivor about 20 years ago.

MR. MCBRIDE: Congratulations. Do you
think that that positive experience that you had as a result of the physicians and the healthcare providers that took care of you, do you think that's going to impact, one way or another on your ability to be fair and impartial juror in this case?

MR. MALTESE: I could be fair and impartial.

MR. MCBRIDE: Okay. Does everyone here understand like, up to this point, no one has heard a single thing about the facts of this case? You'd agree with that; right? So everyone, you're coming into this case with a clean slate; right?

Mr. Ehle, let's go to your concerns, and I appreciate, $I$ think counsel mentioned the term "brutal honesty," and that's all we're asking for, everyone's brutal honesty here, because it's very important to both sides, to our clients as well as to the plaintiffs.

And so, Mr. Ehle, I wanted to touch really
quickly on your feelings about physicians given your extensive medical history. If you were in Dr. Lasry's position or APRN Bartmus's position, would you want someone with your same mindset, as you sit here right now, judging against them in this case?

MR. EHLE: I wouldn't want me judging against them.

MR. MCBRIDE: Right. And is that because you have had such bad experiences? MR. EHLE: Yeah, yeah.

MR. MCBRIDE: And not just personally. I think you told us about other individuals who you believe have been victims of malpractice; is that right? Maybe I -- I took that down in my notes. Was there anyone else that you've encountered that you felt to have had malpractice against them?

MR. EHLE: I don't think $I$ know anybody that had malpractice against them. I have a good friend that's in a wheelchair because of third-stage kidney disease. I've thought about doing malpractice suits myself. I never have.

MR. MCBRIDE: And I guess what I'm trying to get at and counsel even mentioned, there's other cases that are in this courtroom, and some are not
medical malpractice. Some are criminal cases. There's construction defect cases, as we've heard about. Do you think, given your past experience, that this is maybe not the right case for you to be a juror on because of that?

MR. EHLE: Yeah, medical malpractice suits aren't the right case for me. I've served before on a criminal case.

MR. MCBRIDE: Right, right.
MR. EHLE: This is not -- I don't think you want me.

MR. MCBRIDE: Okay. Well, and, again, and I appreciate your brutal honesty, and that's all we're asking for from everyone here. We want everyone to disclose if there is some feeling, as much as each of us want to believe we can be fair and impartial, it's really important if there's something maybe deep down or some past experience that might affect our ability to be fair and impartial. And I appreciate -- Mr. Ehle, I appreciate that.

How about anyone else, given what Mr. Ehle has talked about, anyone else kind of have that same feeling, one way or the other? Mr. Read.

MR. READ: 637. Yeah, if you asked the
question like he asked and I probably should have raised my hand when he kind of mentioned it like at the end it was like "Is this the right case for you?" And this is probably like -- like there's probably like tons of cases on your dockets that would be probably a better case for me to have walked in and like where I would have. But, yeah, if you're asking me the question, "Is this probably the right case for me?" No.

MR. MCBRIDE: okay. And, again, that's for the opposite reason? That's because -- and I think in response to questioning, you felt that you might be more favorable, given your experience with your ex-wife towards the defendants in this case.

MR. READ: Well, yeah, just also just kind of being able to not think of like myself in that situation and like, you know, just kind of like we're like just being that family observer-type person that, you know, like it's affecting their lives. Yeah, it's more of that person and --

MR. MCBRIDE: And is that even the case, Mr. Read, even though everyone agrees here we haven't heard anything about the facts of the case? MR. READ: Yeah, and that's where $I$ kind of like were kind of hesitant to even mention it when
he asked it before because I haven't heard anything. so it's like, you know, it might be totally something where it's just -- or it disappears or it doesn't -- so I wouldn't know. But like if you're asking me the question like right now, like just even listening to like just his comments, it's like if you're asking me that particular question, "Is this the right case for you," you know, like move me next-door, and then I'd love to serve, and I think it might be a better fit than where this wouldn't be a good fit for me.

MR. MCBRIDE: Understood. Anyone else have any similar strong feelings, one way or another about their ability to be fair and impartial in this case? Mr. Headd.

MR. HEADD: Mr. Headd, 633. I don't know if it will be an issue, but $I$ heard it's an E.R. case. Is that -- it's going to deal with the E.R.?

MR. MCBRIDE: It pertains to the care and treatment rendered was in the emergency room; right?

MR. HEADD: Yeah, my just personal opinion is it's a very -- you know, they don't know what's coming in the door a lot of times, and they're going to just -- they have to kind of take it as it comes and do the best they can because, you know, they
don't have any prior knowledge of what's going on. So $I$ think, in that case, $I$ potentially might be skewed towards the E.R. doctor because they're just trying to do the best they can with what they know right that second. So like, you know, their chances of making a mistake might be higher because they don't have this long-term history with the patient, and I think I would feel more forgiving towards them in that situation versus like a family practitioner.

MR. MCBRIDE: Understood. But you would agree with me, you know absolutely no facts about this case?

MR. HEADD: Yeah. I'm saying the facts might come out and might not affect me at all.

MR. MCBRIDE: Right, right. And I appreciate you being honest and telling me about that and telling us about that. However, do you think, again, in this case, that --

And I would ask this of everyone: Do you think all of you can sit and wait until you hear all of the evidence that comes in before you make up your mind in this case?

Can everyone agree to do that?
Mr. Withers, can you agree with that too?

MR. WITHERS: Yes.
MR. MCBRIDE: A11 right. Mr. Newman.
MR. NEWMAN: Yes.
MR. MCBRIDE: And, Mr. Newman, you are 640.
MR. NEWMAN: Yes.
MR. MCBRIDE: And, Mr. Headd, I wanted to just touch that based on that, in terms of your, you know, feelings already that you've expressed about this if this is an E.R. case, are you willing to wait and until all the evidence has been in, until plaintiff has put their evidence and submitted their evidence and defendants have had an opportunity to respond before you make any decision in this case?

MR. HEADD: Like I said, it's going to depend on how the facts come out.

MR. MCBRIDE: Right.
MR. HEADD: But for me, in my mind, I'm trying to look at it in a different scenario. If I look at it as, you know, somebody is in a burning house and the fireman pulls them out trying to save their 1 ife and dislocates their shoulder, should that fireman then be sued for dislocating their shoulder while he was trying to save their life? I feel no. But $I$ mean, depending how the facts come out, you know, if it's not a situation like that at
al1, I'11 be fine.
MR. MCBRIDE: Right. And, again, those are not the facts of this case.

MR. HEADD: Yeah, okay. Just I don't want to -- you know, if a certain scenario like that comes on, 1 might shut down a little bit and, you know what I'm --

MR. MCBRIDE: Understood, understood.
And, again, everyone has to wait until the evidence comes in. How about this general question in terms of we talked about the burden of proof.

Does everyone here understand that the plaintiff is the one that has the burden of proof of their case by a preponderance of the evidence?

Does everyone -- Mr. Headd, you understand that?

MR. HEADD: Uh-huh.
MR. McBRIDE: And that means that the plaintiff will go first. That's why they ask questions first of the jurors here, and then the defense goes.

Do you think that everyone here can make a promise to all of us that you'll wait until all of the evidence has been presented before you make up your mind in this case? Everyone can do that?

Mr. Headd, again, coming back to you, you think, again, understanding what you told us, do you believe that you could still be fair and impartial and wait until all the evidence has been submitted? MR. HEADD: Yeah, yeah.

MR. MCBRIDE: Okay. Thank you.
THE COURT: And I'm just going to interject briefly, Mr. McBride. Don't lose your place on your questions.

MR. MCBRIDE: Sure.
THE COURT: I think that's a good place to just interrupt briefly and say we even have an instruction that talks about how you are, you know, nobody lives in a vacuum; right? we all have common 1ife experiences, and we're all entitled to bring to our jury service our common life experiences; and even if we have some empathy or sympathy or whatever it is, one way or the other, what we need to know is if you could not set that aside and if you could not overcome whatever those feelings are and, at the end of the day, deliberate with your fellow jurors to render, you know, a verdict according to the evidence. That's the concern.

We know people are going to have their life experiences. We know people are going to have
their, again, empathies and sympathies, and there are instructions that talk about this. But at the end of the day, your duty, your oath is going to be that you will listen to the evidence and you will receive the instructions, and you will render a verdict based on what you find the evidence to be.

Is there anyone here, as you sit here right now, who does not believe that they can do that? And there's no right or wrong answer?

MR. MCBRIDE: Mr. Ehle.
MR. EHLE: And I think, again, as I said -MR. MCBRIDE: Mr. Ehle, you're 606?

MR. EHLE: 606. I think I'd be predisposed for against your side.

MR. MCBRIDE: Against the doctor and the healthcare provider.

MR. EHLE: Yeah, I wish it wasn't the case, but I've had too many past experiences. MR. MCBRIDE: Sure.

THE COURT: And you've explained. It was just -- it was really a yes-or-no answer at that point. I was just trying to clarify. So we appreciate your additional information.

Go ahead, Mr. McBride. MR. MCBRIDE: And that actually brings --
that was a perfect segue into my next line of question. The judge just told you there's going to be instructions on what the law is, and in terms of one of those instructions is going to talk to you about how you can't judge this case on the basis of sympathy.

Does anyone, by the mere fact that Mr. Moore, who you saw here earlier today and yesterday, and Mrs. Moore sitting here, but Mr. Moore is here in a wheelchair, is that going to -- do you think you're going to be more sympathetic towards him because of that he's in a wheelchair? Anyone?

Okay. How many of you feel that simply because we're here in court, that that means that necessarily either my client, Dr. Lasry or APRN Bartmus must have done something wrong?

Any of you come to that conclusion before we started talking to you? Okay. Everyone --

Mr. Withers.
MR. WITHERS: Yeah. 618. I guess it's kind of presumed. That's why, you know, there's $i 11$ feelings or there's reasons to be here. obviously if there wasn't, there wouldn't be a lawsuit; right?

MR. MCBRIDE: Well, and you've managed a
car -- what's the general gist of the company that you work for right now?

MR. WITHERS: A bus company.
MR. MCBRIDE: I'm sorry?
MR. WITHERS: A bus company.
MR. MCBRIDE: A bus company. And have you said, in the past, that you've actually been involved in lawsuits that have been filed against your company?

MR. WITHERS: Many of them.
MR. MCBRIDE: And do you believe, on that basis, that every one of those cases -- have any of them ever ended up in the courtroom?

MR. WITHERS: I've been in deposition a lot. Most of them got settled outside of court.

MR. MCBRIDE: Okay. Have you ever had occasions, in your personal experience, where there's -- a lawsuit is filed, but it's your belief and after all the evidence that you've gathered as part of your job that you feel that there was absolutely nothing that was done inappropriately or wrong?

MR. WITHERS: Yes.
MR. MCBRIDE: Given that information, do you necessarily feel that -- would you agree with me
that a defendant -- if a plaintiff files a lawsuit, a defendant or defendants is entitled to defend themselves if they feel that they don't do anything wrong?

MR. WITHERS: Absolutely.
MR. MCBRIDE: So with that in mind, do you think that have you made any sort of decision in your mind that, before you've even heard any of the facts of this case, that either Dr. Lasry or Nurse APRN Bartmus had done anything wrong in this case?

MR. WITHERS: I haven't heard any facts. I can't come to that conclusion. Like I said earlier, if you're here, somebody believes they did something wrong.

MR. MCBRIDE: Fair enough.
MR. WITHERS: It's what evidence comes into play. Once we see the evidence, I'd like to think $I$ could draw a conclusion.

MR. MCBRIDE: Fair enough. In other words, I think you said this earlier in response to counsel's questions about you need to see some sort of evidence to be able to make your decision; is that right?

MR. WITHERS: Absolutely.
MR. MCBRIDE: And does everyone pretty much
agree with that's your job as a juror by its very essence, that you're here to judge the evidence and the testimony that you're going to hear before you make any sort of judgment against either in favor of the plaintiff or against my clients? You understand that? You're all good with that?
okay. Thank you, Mr. Withers. I appreciate it.

In terms of the medical care, $I$ think there was some of you -- I think, Ms. Bechtold, I think it was you and actually Mr. Withers, and I want to talk about you, Ms. Bechtold, you talked about you may not go to a doctor necessarily on a regular basis; is that right?

MS. BECHTOLD: I go for well checkups, yes.
MR. Mcbride: well checkups.
MS. Bechtold: yes.
MR. MCBRIDE: okay. And but you might wait a little while to see if there's really something more wrong if you think you have the symptoms of a cold; is that right?

MS. BECHTOLD: That's correct.
MR. MCBRIDE: Do you think a patient, such as yourself, are you responsible, do you think you're responsible for certain aspects of your own
health?
MS. BECHTOLD: Yes. My own self-care. I think we know our own bodies better sometimes and know our healing responses at this age especially, so.

MR. MCBRIDE: And in terms of that, does everyone kind of feel that same way that if you go see a doctor, if you have other prior health conditions, that each of us or each of you are responsible, to a certain degree, with your own health? You would agree with that?

That, and in terms of following a physician's advice, do you think that if a doctor tells you to go see another doctor, do you think that that's something that's important for you to follow? Everyone agree with that?

Anyone disagree with that? okay.
MR. WEAVER: Ms. Brown, I think.
MS. BROWN: Brown, 668.
MR. Mcbride: Oh, I'm sorry. Yeah, Ms. Brown. I'm sorry.

MS. BROWN: You said if anybody disagrees like if a referral is made to a different doctor, $I$ would think that would be on their own personal preference. It would depend on if you take the
> doctor's information and then you process that information. If you want to follow-up with a referral, you can. It's free will.

MR. MCBRIDE: Fair enough. And that's something that would you also agree that everyone is entitled to a second opinion if they disagree with another doctor?

MS. BROWN: Yes.
MR. MCBRIDE: Everyone agree with that concept? okay.

Thank you, Ms. Brown. I appreciate that. I'm sorry I didn't see your hand raised.

Has anyone here either have you personally experienced it where you've been disabled for a period of time, or do you know people who, in your family, immediate family, who have been disabled for a period of time? I think we talked about some people. Ms. Brown, you mentioned an individual you knew about in -- excuse me.

Mr. Jones, you knew someone about who was in a wheelchair.

MR. JONES: Yeah, wel1, I said I had a grandfather who had a leg amputated. But $I$ have a nephew who was in a wheelchair as a result of a surgery and caught some kind of a -- what do you
call it? He caught something in the hospital that debilitated him and he couldn't recover from it. It wasn't a staff infection. It was something else, and he was never able to recover from it. He's still in a wheelchair. He's only 41 years old. MR. McBRIDE: How long ago did that happen? I'm sorry to hear that.

MR. JONES: About eight years ago.
MR. MCBRIDE: would anything about that particular instance and understanding that Mr. Moore is in a wheelchair -- again, we don't know, you don't know the circumstances behind that -- anything which might cause you to be less than fair and impartial in this case?

MR. JONES: No.
MR. MCBRIDE: Okay. Thank you. I appreciate it.

Anyone else? Anyone else have anyone who had a long-term disability that kept them out of work or in a wheelchair for a long period of time?

All right. Mr. -- I'm going to get your 606, and it's Mr. Ehle.

MR. EHLE: I just have a question.
MR. MCBRIDE: Sure.
MR. EHLE: Personally or if we know
somebody?
MR. MCBRIDE: Either one.
MR. EHLE: Yeah. I been disabled several times. I was on crutches for three years. After that, $I$ had a broken leg one time. I was on crutches for about six weeks, $I$ think, for that one. Let me think. There might be another time. I can't remember.

THE COURT: okay.
MR. MCBRIDE: But fair to say a few times?
MR. EHLE: A few times, yeah.
MR. MCBRIDE: And in terms of there was some questions about anyone who knew anyone who had vascular insufficiency or any of those questions, do you remember those questions? How about the term DVT, deep vein thrombosis? Anyone know about that?

MR. JONES: I actually had a DVT.
MR. MCBRIDE: Oh, you did. Okay. And without getting too personal, how long was that?

MR. JONES: Actually, $I$ had two over a 12 -year period. The 1 ast one was about six years ago. And so they put me on $a \operatorname{blood}$ thinner as $a$ result of it. I played a lot of basketball, and a leg injury and migrated blood clot. So not any fault of -- just one those lumps, it was a P.E.,
pulmonary embolus.
MR. MCBRIDE: Pulmonary embolus. And in terms of the medication you were on, is that going to be something, without getting too invasive, is that something you were on medication for a period of time?

MR. JONES: I'm still on it. After you have the second one, they usually kind of -- they feel that you may have a predisposition for clotting, and they put you on a thinner on a permanent basis.

MR. MCBRIDE: Okay. And in terms of your understanding of your condition, the reasons why you're taking that medication, do you take that medication on a daily basis?

MR. JONES: As instructed, right.
MR. MCBRIDE: And is that because you know what could happen if you don't take that medication?

MR. JONES: Yeah.
MR. MCBRIDE: Okay. How did you feel about the treatment you received as a result of the DVT that you had?

MR. JONES: I had excellent treatment.
MR. MCBRIDE: All right. And in terms of anyone else, anyone else heard that term "DVT" or
had experience? Ms. Price, 632.
MS. PRICE: I've just heard of it. My father had coronary artery disease, had to have surgery, was on blood thinners. So I know that he had one in the past.

MR. MCBRIDE: Right, right. And there's a medication known as Xarelto. Is that --

MR. JONES: Actually, I take Eliquis.
MR. MCBRIDE: Eliquis.
MR. JONES: It's the same family of thinners but just a different brand name.

MR. MCBRIDE: Have all of you seen those commercials on TV about Xarelto and Eliquis and all those sorts of things? So people generally have an understanding of blood thinners and what they're used for? okay. You're going to hear physicians, experts get up here to talk and explain all of the medical terminology to you that might come up in this case, and that's a general question.

Does anyone here have any sort of hesitation, without hearing any sort of evidence, that they're not going to understand what this case is about? Anyone at this point?

Mr. Fife, 614.
MR. FIFE: Yes.

MR. MCBRIDE: what's your concern, sir?
MR. FIFE: Well, just like you said, just not understanding the terms or exactly what's going on with it.

MR. MCBRIDE: And I think, you know, with the exception of a couple of people that have relatives -- Mr. Read, your ex-wife, who was a nurse -- for the most part, I don't believe -- and Ms. Jones (sic), I believe you're Medicaid, but there's no other individuals here on this panel who actually have medical background; is that right?

Did I miss that? Oh. Ms. Bebekyan.
ms. bebekyan: yes.
MR. MCBRIDE: Did I say that right?
mS. bebekyan: yes, 109. I work in a medical call center. So I'm paging out to doctors and nurses, and you hear all these words that are familiar, and I didn't go to medical school. So I learned it based off of two weeks. So and every day, you just learn something new and catch up.

MR. MCBRIDE: And that's something I could assure you that those of us who do this sort of work, as attorneys I'm not a doctor, but we learn things all the time, including in every trial.

So I could assure you we're going to have
witnesses who are going to testify, who are going to be medical experts, as well as the defendants who are going to testify, and they'll explain that information to you, and hopefully you'll be able to get a gist of what's happened.

That brings up another point. Does anyone here have a problem with the fact that some of the physicians who might be called in to testify, either as experts or as treating physicians, that they may be compensated for their time away from patients and here on the stand? Anyone have a problem with that?

Ms. Price, what's your concern? 632.
MS. PRICE: It's not necessarily $I$ have a problem with it. It just puts -- I know that they're getting paid for it. So it's not as -- I don't know if I take the testimony with as much weight as somebody who $I$ know is doing it of their own volition. They know that they're doing it because they truly believe the stuff, what they're saying.

MR. MCBRIDE: Sure. And if it's the case that, on both sides, experts have been retained and are going to testify, are you saying basically it would be kind of a wash to you in terms of given the fact that they're being paid to --

MS. PRICE: No, it wouldn't be a wash. I'd just maybe take it with a grain of salt.

MR. MCBRIDE: okay. Fair enough, fair enough. I appreciate that.

THE COURT: Just to interject, there is also an instruction on how to determine credibility and believability of witnesses, and it kind of goes into some detail. The counsel may inquire of any person who's testifying and whether or not they're being compensated. It's very hard in these trials to predict timing and when to call and things like that, and people have to rearrange their schedules and circumstances.

So, you know, it really does boil down to an understanding by all the parties and all the counsel that certain folks with certain expertise in certain areas of certain knowledge would be compensated. So, and, again, it's all instructions. The instructions talk about all factors to be considered about credibility, believability of witnesses, how you weigh them, whether you believe them, all of those things.

So you'11 get instructions on that. But, again, it's not uncommon at all for witnesses to be compensated.

MR. MCBRIDE: Thank you, Your Honor.
There was some questions -- I just wanted to go briefly over it. There was some questions by counsel about people taking responsibility for their actions. Do you remember that line of questioning?

How many here believe that patients -again, this kind of goes to a question I asked earlier -- how many believe that patients have a certain responsibility of their own when it comes to their healthcare? Pretty much everyone?

Mr. Grant, you believe that as well?
MR. GRANT: Yes. 634.
MR. MCBRIDE: Okay. Anything about any experience that you've had where you feel that if a physician were to come in and defend his care and treatment of this, that in a particular case -- and in this case, Dr. Lasry -- would you have any problem listening to his point of view before making any sort of decision on the case relative to the plaintiff?

MR. GRANT: I have no problem, no.
MR. MCBRIDE: How many of you have ever been either judged by someone else on the benefit of hindsight or you judged something on the benefit of hindsight? Do you understand that?

MR. WITHERS: No.
MR. MCBRIDE: okay. How about the term "Monday morning quarterback," let's put it in a term 1ike that. Has everyone heard that term "Monday morning quarterback"?

Ms. Price, you've not heard that term before. MS. PRICE: No.

MR. MCBRIDE: 632.
Mr. Withers, why don't you explain what your understanding is of a Monday morning quarterback.

MR. WITHERS: 618. This is something I deal with constantly, working for $24 / 7$ business. Things are going to happen when $I$ 'm not there. Things are going to happen over the weekend, overnight. It happened in a different department, and I manly get a portion or a part of the truth, and the first thing I would say to myself or to others is "I wouldn't have done it that way" or "why did they do it like that?"

That's the Monday morning quarterback is: I would have done it different than you, even though I wasn't in that situation.

MR. MCBRIDE: Right. And in those certain circumstances, when someone comes back to you and
they have a good response to the reason why they did it, do you accept that explanation for it?

MR. WITHERS: I expect it.
MR. MCBRIDE: okay. And, again, in terms of does everyone kind of feel that same way that if you kind of look at something, you might have a difference of opinion as to whether or not a certain employee underneath you should have done certain things a certain way, that you want to listen to them and see what their explanation is for it? And if the explanation is a reasonable explanation, are you inclined to at least allow them the benefit of that doubt?

Anyone so adamant that they cannot accept that and it's only your decision, your hindsight that should be the determinative factor? Anyone? Mr. Everett, anything about that? We haven't heard much from you today, and you're probably thankful for that. But I wanted to ask you some stuff about your work as a -- was it content creator.

MR. EVERETT: Videographer.
MR. MCBRIDE: Videographer. And in terms of the work that you do, do you have other people who work for you?

THE COURT: Mr. Everett, I could barely hear you. So I can only imagine certainly Mr . wilder is not hearing you.

MR. EVERETT: Just maybe like one other person.

THE COURT: We need your court reporter to hear you.

MR. WEAVER: I still can't. I'm sorry.
THE COURT: You're really going to have to speak up, sir.

MR. EVERETT: One other person.
MR. MCBRIDE: One other person. All right. Thank you. And then you do you collaborate together with that other person?

MR. EVERETT: Yeah. We do it together.
THE COURT: So I'm going to interrupt. Mr. Everett, I've got to be honest. You're talking to Mr. McBride. But nobody else can hear you. So I know it's going to sound awkward, but you're going to have to shout or you're going to have to stand because you're just having a very soft conversation, and even though we're telling you we can't hear you, you haven't raised the decibels of your voice at a11.

MR. EVERETT: Okay.

THE COURT: So either stand up or project.
okay? Thank you.
MR. EVERETT: Yes. We work together, one other person.

MR. MCBRIDE: All right. And certainly don't mean to call you out, sir. I just want to -and in your line of work, is it important, do you believe to collaborate with that other person and take that other person's opinions and decisions as well?

MR. EVERETT: Yes. All of it. Everything, yeah.

MR. MCBRIDE: Do you think you're ultimately the one in charge and the only one who can make that decision?

MR. EVERETT: No.
MR. MCBRIDE: Thank you, sir. Appreciate it.
There was also some talk about award of millions of dollars and whether you could feel comfortable awarding $\$ 10$ million or $\$ 5$ million if the found that the particular case and the facts presented itself. How about the reverse of that?

If you felt that after you heard all of the evidence in this case and you listened to all of the witnesses, if at the end of the day, you feel that
the plaintiff did not prove their case or they did not prove that they are entitled to damages, would you be okay turning the plaintiff away, Mr. and Mrs. Moore away, without awarding anything?

Could everyone do that?
Anyone who would have a problem or difficulty doing that, besides maybe Mr. Ehle? And I don't mean to call you out.

Anyone else who would have a problem doing that? No.

Ms. Brown, are you okay with if the facts and evidence did not support the fact that plaintiff was entitled to an award of damages, would you have any problem turning Mr. and Mrs. Moore away?

MS. BROWN: No.
MR. MCBRIDE: How about in terms of medical care in the practice of medicine, how many of you believe that medicine is an exact science; in other words, there's only one answer that can be for any particular condition? Anyone?

All right. No hands.
All right. So in this particular case, you've heard the term the "practice of medicine"; right? Ms. Price, what's your understanding of what that means?

MS. PRICE: "Practice of medicine"?
MR. MCBRIDE: 632.
MS. PRICE: 632. A patient healthcare. So basically people going in, getting a diagnosis, getting prescription, surgery, mental care, psychology, therapy. Anything that falls under the umbrella of taking care of your body and mind.

MR. MCBRIDE: Okay. And I think there was some discussion, Mr. Headd, you talked about it, I think you did as well, Ms. Price, about physicians, the fact that they go to medical school for years of training and practice of medicine in a particular area; right?

Do you feel that that makes them necessarily the only experts to listen to? In other words, do you --

MS. PRICE: Are you asking me?
MR. McBRIDE: Yeah, I'm talking to you, Ms. Price. I'm sorry. In other words, do you believe that there's other ways to treat certain conditions? And different physicians might have different opinions as to how to treat those conditions.

MS. PRICE: 632. And yes. Definitely, there's multiple ways for something to have been
handled.
MR. MCBRIDE: Okay. And, again, Mr. Jones, would you feel that same way?

MR. JONES: Yes.
MR. MCBRIDE: Ms. Sallee, you are 604. I have not heard you today. But I wanted to just kind of inquire of you, is there anything that you've heard from either side here that raises a question in your mind as to whether or not you could be fair and impartial in this case?
ms. SALLEE: Not at all.
MR. MCBRIDE: Have you heard of the term "standard of care"?

MS. SALLEE: Yes.
MR. MCBRIDE: Okay. what's your
understanding of that term as it relates to the practice of medicine?

MS. SALLEE: I'd say it's the basics. Without it being a special -- just the basic normal standard of care.

MR. MCBRIDE: And has anyone else heard that term?
the court: we didn't get Ms. Sallee's number. It's 604. MR. MCBRIDE: Oh, I'm sorry. 604.4.

Anyone else, have you heard that term, what the "standard of care" is generally?

I guess let me just kind of finish it up with this, and $I$ think I'm actually done. Let me just check my notes real quick. oh, a couple of things. Sorry. Sorry to give you false hope, everyone. But has anyone here been treated at St. Rose, San Martin, in the emergency room?

Has anyone here been treated or had any close family members treated in the emergency room at any hospital here in Las vegas?

Show of hands. There's several of you. okay. Mr. Withers.

And how about, of those who raised their hands, have any of you any bad experiences of the emergency room departments that you've been treated at here in Las vegas? No one.
okay. Any good experiences? I know that's hard to even imagine, but any good experiences?

Mr. Newman, did you raise your hand there, 640?

MR. NEWMAN: 640. Yes.
MR. MCBRIDE: Okay. What was good experience in the emergency room?

MR. NEWMAN: My sister, they did very well
with her. You know, she was really messed up for quite awhile, but they stayed with it, and everything they did, it helped her. Even now, she's lost a lot of movement in one side, but the movement is back. I mean, she's in a wheelchair. She can't do what she normally was able to do, but she could function; and, you know, and she could get around.

MR. MCBRIDE: Right. And were you there when your sister was in the emergency room?

MR. NEWMAN: I came in later. She was already inside.

MR. MCBRIDE: Did you have occasion to personally interact with any of the healthcare providers?

MR. NEWMAN: Sometimes, but not all the time because my other sister, which is a nurse also. I mean, she's retired. It's many years ago. So she kind of controlled everything.

MR. MCBRIDE: okay. And but were you and your sister, were you happy with the answers that you got from the physicians and the nurses who took care --

MR. NEWMAN: Yes, I was. Yeah.
MR. MCBRIDE: Do you remember if you saw if your sister was treated specifically by a physician,
or was the APRN or a P.A., a Physician's Assistant. MR. NEWMAN: I think they had a team, a team of them. You know, after she was recovered and went home, she was back with a therapist and everyone else, and that's what really helped her.

MR. MCBRIDE: Great. That's good to hear. And then let's just talk real quick about any other hospitalizations here in Las Vegas. Besides those that you've already mentioned, anyone who have had any hospitalizations of close family members or yourselves at St. Rose, San Martin.

No one? Ms. Clinton. I'm sorry. And you are 658.

MS. CLINTON: 658, yes. And where is St. Rose, San Martin?

MR. MCBRIDE: San Martin campus is up off of St. Rose Parkway.

MS. CLINTON: Okay. I believe I had a brother who was in the hospital there.

MR. MCBRIDE: Okay. Anything -- did you go visit that brother?

MS. CLINTON: Yes.
MR. MCBRIDE: okay. And anything about that experience that caused you any concern, one way or another?

MS. CLINTON: No.
MR. MCBRIDE: Ms. Clinton, while I have you there and you raised your hand, I want to ask you another couple questions about your work in civil litigation. I think you said you did mostly business litigation and real estate.
ms. CLINTON: Yes.
MR. MCBRIDE: The fact that that's an entirely different area of law compared to a medical malpractice case or personal injury case, do you feel that you're able to view this case impartially and fairly as a juror in this case?
ms. CLINTON: Yes.
MR. MCBRIDE: All right. Anything about that experience as a civil litigator you think you're going to judge the attorneys harsher or less harsh.

MS. CLINTON: No.
MR. MCBRIDE: Okay. Again, I'm going to ask the final question, $I$ think for me, similar to what counsel had already asked, is there any question that you think that $I$ need to ask of you that would help me decide whether or not, and whether Dr. Lasry would need to know, about you personally that would help us decide whether you
could be fair and impartial in this case?
Anything? No.
And all of you, I think, have promised us if you were chosen to be jurors in this case, you could view this evidence fair and impartially and wait until all the evidence has been submitted?
would you agree that you will make every effort to make sure that the plaintiff proves every element of their case before you make a decision as to whether or not damages are appropriate in the case? Everyone agree with that?

That's all the questions $I$ have. Thank you very much.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
I'm going to have counsel at the bench for a brief scheduling conference.
(Bench conference.)
THE COURT: All right. Ladies and gentlemen, I wanted to have a conversation. I think you probably have figured out that, based on the classic and we're only 20 minutes or so before 5:00 o'clock and we really don't have the luxury to go past 5:00 unless it's going to be circumstances where it's just going to be just past 5:00 and we know we can complete, we still have a party and
their counsel who have to finish inquiring of the jurors.

We are not going to finish today. I'm sorry for that. We had hoped to do that, but that did not work, and this is not an exact science. We do our very best. I can assure you that we will finish tomorrow. We are going to return here tomorrow at 1:30. We will take however long it takes to qualify the final group of 20 ; and then from there, the final selection of ten will be complete. So I appreciate very much your indulgence to have the ability to return at least one more day for this process.

I will remind you again, and $I$ will go over the, you know, admonishment a little bit more in detail again that you are to be reminded that you're not to talk or converse among yourselves or with anyone else about the trial, not to do any independent researching, not to try to recreate any aspect of the case, not to visit any of the locations we talked about in the case and, you know, really most importantly, not to form or express any opinion on the case.
of course, you have zero evidence in the case, and the reason you know that is you can't
infer anything from the questions that are being asked is this is just to sort of get to people's mindsets on how certain things might work so final selections can be made. But until you actually hear the witnesses and until you actually see the documents, you don't have any evidence in the case. But please do not try to form or express any opinion on the case.

I will check with the jury services. I think if you're here on the third day, there might be some compensation that comes. I don't want to make any false promises, but that's my recollection. And but, again, we will absolutely complete tomorrow. There's no doubt about that. We have one remaining set of inquiries and whatever slight followup there might be. But thank you again for patience while we complete this process.
we are still on track, by the way. I've spoken with counsel, and the way we've looked at things, that we still expect to finish on the 7 th. That does not delay us on the end of the trial. It just is taking us a little bit longer to complete this part of the process than we anticipate.

Thank you again for your patience. Have a good night. Any questions, you can pose them to the
marsha1.
THE MARSHAL: Al1 rise for the jury.
(Jury panel exits the courtroom.)
THE COURT: Let me get the marshal back in so we can have that conversation about storing stuff, where we might put it.

MR. ARNTZ: Your Honor, $I$ think we're all in agreement that regardless -- we probably won't get done until 3:00 or 3:30 tomorrow at the earliest. If we all prefer just to plan on starting our openings on Thursday.

THE COURT: That's fine. I figured that's where you want to. We actually have some things we have to work out. We can go off the record on this. I don't think we have anything further on the record.

THE REPORTER: Thank you.
(Pause in the proceedings.)
THE COURT: I'm sorry. I should have thought of this. I just want to make one final record before we adjourn for the day that $I$ did inform counsel at this last bench conference that we had a concern about Mr. Wilder in seat No. 9, Juror 611, and his ability to truly hear the proceedings and whether or not he would, in fact,
engage in interruptions, so to speak, if he wasn't hearing people speaking.

His indication that he can hear about half the people, that it's based on tone, there's really no way for us to know who he's hearing and who he is not hearing, and we would have to be reliant on him to inter rupt the proceedings, I'm not really sure since he certainly hasn't done that, not once here, but he has indicated he could hear the counsel. So maybe that's why.

But, of course, some of the questions feed off of answers from other people's, you know, other answers that people have given, and he's shown no indication to want to know what that was or have you missed anybody. There's no way he heard Mr. Everett. There's no way he's heard lots of the people. So I am concerned. But we're going to wait, and by agreement of counsel, to deal with that concern tomorrow. We still have obviously --

Mr. Weaver, are you doing any voir dire?
mR. WEAVER: Yes.
THE COURT: We have Mr. Weaver's voir dire and then, of course, any final requests to traverse anybody that might be in question. So we'11 deal with them.

There also obviously has been identified, informally up to this, two potential cause excusals. Perhaps there are more in counsels' mind. But we talked about the two at the bench, Mr. Ehle, Juror 606; and Mr. Read, Juror 637, and we agreed also to wait until all of the questions have been asked to deal with those. So that was the nature of the final bench conference, besides the scheduling of when we might break today and resume tomorrow.

I hope I did tell all the jurors to come back at 1:30.

MR. MCBRIDE: You did.
THE COURT: But that's when we're going to start, and then we'll complete. And if we complete early tomorrow, that's fine, and we will wait and begin with opening statements on Thursday morning.

It's never my preference to hit the ten who are in shock that they just got selected with trying to pay attention to opening statements. It just is not conducive, I don't think, to anybody's efforts. So we will do and plan on doing opening statements at 9:00 on Thursday.

MR. MCBRIDE: Thank you, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Last housekeeping. I've gotten from Mr. Weaver the order on his motions of limine,
but $I$ haven't seen anyone else's. Again, I'm not
trying to push you. I know you're trying to prepare for trial. But $I$ obviously, in case any issues come up, having the order in place would be ideal. If not, $I$ certainly have notes and things.

But do we have any potential for those orders.

MR. MCBRIDE: I will have ours submitted by tomorrow.
the court: And mr. Arntz, any eTA on yours?

MR. ARNTZ: I'11 contact the others.
THE COURT: Yeah, tomorrow or the next day. Just somewhere in the process so that we have them when things might become an issue. okay? Everybody, goodnight.

MR. WEAVER: And, Your Honor, on that housekeeping point, we may also have a stipulation that we can submit jointly on some of the ones that weren't contested.

THE COURT: Okay. Fantastic.
MR. WEAVER: We'11 get that to you.
THE COURT: That's great. Yeah, we did talk about that too.

Thank you so much. Have a good night.
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| ```start \([15]-6: 2,6: 5\), 6:16, 7:20, 7:22, 11:3, 12:7, 36:12, 49:17, 49:23, 64:10, 70:23, 77:12, 117:3, 169:14 started [12] - 4:1, 7:8, 11:5, 16:7, 30:7, 32:12, 69:23, 85:9, 85:23, 103:20, 120:9, 139:19 starting [9] - 26:9, 26:19, 72:23, 73:8, 73:10, 85:3, 85:4, 126:3, 167:10 STATE [1] - 172:3 statement [2]-23:3, 90:14 statements [4] - 123:20, 169:16, 169:19, 169:21 statistics [1] - 77:23 Statute [1] - 30:18 stay \([5]-6: 15,11: 4\), 53:4, 57:1, 128:21 stayed [2] - 20:23, 161:2 steals [1] - 42:25 stent [1] - 104:13 step [6] - 54:4, 54:8, 60:8, 73:10, 85:2, 85:23 stick [1] - 103:24 still [27] - 3:7, 5:14, 6:1, 6:18, 6:21, 6:25, 14:15, 41:17, 69:11, 71:23, 80:24, 81:2, 81:24, 83:2, 97:4, 101:1, 115:6, 115:22, 125:25, 137:3, 145:5, 147:7, 155:8, 164:25, 166:18, 166:20, 168:19 stint \({ }_{[1]}\) - 104:13 stipulate [3] - 47:11, 61:22, 62:14 stipulation [2] - 61:23, 170:18 stories [3] - 38:3, 76:11, 88:15 storing [1] - 167:5 story [2] - 13:1, 72:17 straightforward [1] - 25:25 straits [1] - 28:1 strange \([1]\) - 42:6 streamline [2] - 50:9, 117:18 street [1] - 107:2``` | $\begin{aligned} & \text { stress }[1]-38: 1 \\ & \text { stretch }[1]-117: 2 \\ & \text { strictly }[1]-37: 24 \\ & \text { stroke }[1]-120: 10 \\ & \text { strong }[4]-17: 9,68: 4, \\ & 68: 6,133: 13 \\ & \text { struck }[1]-82: 1 \\ & \text { structural }[1]-40: 24 \\ & \text { structure }[1]-80: 3 \\ & \text { struggling }[1]-46: 16 \\ & \text { stuck }[1]-99: 4 \\ & \text { student }[1]-47: 5 \\ & \text { stuff }[6]-17: 1,39: 19, \\ & 86: 23,150: 19, \\ & 154: 20,167: 6 \\ & \text { subjective }[1]-87: 18 \\ & \text { submit }[1]-170: 19 \\ & \text { submitted }[4]- \\ & 135: 11,137: 4, \\ & 164: 6,170: 8 \\ & \text { substantiated }[1]- \\ & 68: 22 \\ & \text { sudden }[1]-28: 2 \\ & \text { sue }[11]-18: 15, \\ & 20: 19,20: 24,21: 13, \\ & 23: 1,23: 7,30: 18, \\ & 39: 20,72: 15,72: 24, \\ & 79: 5 \\ & \text { sued }[11]-11: 16, \\ & 17: 15,22: 16,35: 4, \\ & 38: 2,40: 24,70: 11, \\ & 71: 5,74: 8,80: 12, \\ & 135: 22 \\ & \text { suffer }[1]-86: 11 \\ & \text { suffering }[19]-44: 11, \\ & 44: 13,44: 20,58: 23, \\ & 68: 1,68: 3,68: 22, \\ & 68: 24,71: 18,72: 1, \\ & 72: 10,86: 9,86: 14, \\ & 87: 1,87: 5,87: 18, \\ & 100: 1,100: 8,120: 2 \\ & \text { sufficient }[1]-90: 8 \\ & \text { suggested }[1]- \\ & 113: 21 \\ & \text { suing }[1]-38: 13 \\ & \text { suit }[6]-18: 21,18: 23, \\ & 19: 3,22: 20,59: 17 \\ & \text { suits }[3]-17: 21, \\ & 130: 22,131: 6 \\ & \text { Sunrun }[1]-66: 16 \\ & \text { supervise }[1]-123: 4 \\ & \text { supervising }[1]- \\ & 119: 14 \\ & \text { supervisor }[1]-123: 3 \\ & \text { support }[2]-89: 25, \\ & 157: 12 \\ & \text { supports }[1]-88: 1 \\ & \text { suppose }[5]-47: 21, \\ & 67: 7,68: 16,70: 3, \\ & 72: 14 \end{aligned}$ | ```supposedly \({ }_{[1]}-80: 4\) surgeries [2] - 115:15, 128:21 surgery [11]-104:19, 104:20, 104:23, 114:19, 115:14, 115:18, 116:10, 120:10, 144:25, 148:4, 158:5 survivor [1] - 129:4 swapped [1] - 59:8 sway [1] - 75:9 swayed [2] - 76:1, 76:3 switch [1] - 17:7 switching [1]-35:15 sympathetic [5] - 84:3, 84:13, 84:20, 85:17, 139:12 sympathies [1] - 138:1 sympathy [2] - 137:17, 139:6 symptoms [1] - 142:20 Syndrome [1] - 59:7 system [4]-27:23, 28:4, 28:24, 78:16 systems \({ }_{[1]}\) - 9:11 T table [4]-3:8, 3:12, 8:23, 64:5 talks [1] - 137:13 taste [2]-41:12, 41:18 TAVAGLIONE \({ }_{[1]}\) - 1:25 Tavaglione [3] - 172:6, 172:16, 172:17 Taylor [11]-21:4, 23:16, 23:17, 24:13, 24:14, 36:3, 87:15, 87:16, 91:11, 98:24, 119:23 TAYLOR \({ }_{[14]}-21: 6\), 21:9, 23:17, 24:1, 24:11, 36:4, 87:16, 88:18, 89:20, 90:12, 90:15, 91:11, 98:24, 119:24 team [2]-162:2, 162:3 telecommunications [1] - 9:9 television [3]-27:21, 28:10, 29:18 ten [10]-22:15, 45:2, 45:13, 59:5, 59:6, 117:1, 117:13,``` | $\begin{gathered} \text { 165:10, 169:17 } \\ \text { term }[19]-9: 19,19: 13, \\ 19: 16,100: 1,100: 2, \\ 129: 20,134: 7, \\ 145: 19,146: 15, \\ \text { 147:25, 153:2, } \\ \text { 153:3, 153:4, 153:6, } \\ 157: 23,159: 12, \\ 159: 16,159: 22, \\ \text { 160:1, } \\ \text { terminology }[1]- \\ 148: 18 \\ \text { terms }[21]-33: 6,49: 2, \\ 76: 3,101: 11,110: 2, \\ 117: 8,135: 7, \\ 136: 11,139: 3, \\ 142: 9,143: 6, \\ 143: 12,146: 12, \\ 147: 3,147: 12, \\ 147: 24,149: 3, \\ 150: 24,154: 4, \\ 154: 23,157: 16 \\ \text { territory }[1]-92: 6 \\ \text { TERRY }[1]-1: 9 \\ \text { testify }[4]-150: 1, \\ 150: 3,150: 8,150: 23 \\ \text { testifying }[3]-90: 7, \\ 127: 24,151: 9 \\ \text { testimony }[5]-68: 21, \\ 101: 10,113: 14, \\ 142: 3,150: 16 \\ \text { tests }[2]-77: 13,78: 3 \\ \text { thankful }[1]]-154: 19 \\ \text { THE }[155]-1: 1,1: 15, \\ 2: 4,3: 5,3: 22,4: 3, \\ 4: 11,4: 23,5: 4,6: 4, \\ 6: 8,7: 2,7: 7,7: 12, \\ 7: 14,8: 2,8: 4,8: 5, \\ 8: 6,8: 25,9: 1,9: 12, \\ 9: 18,9: 24,10: 2, \\ 10: 7,10: 17,10: 22, \\ 11: 3,11: 11,11: 18, \\ 11: 21,11: 24,12: 3, \\ 13: 15,13: 25,17: 12, \\ 19: 12,33: 19,33: 23, \\ 40: 8,45: 3,45: 7, \\ 45: 25,46: 9,47: 12, \\ 48: 4,48: 6,48: 8, \\ 48: 9,48: 11,48: 13, \\ 48: 23,49: 5,49: 17, \\ 50: 2,50: 10,50: 15, \\ 51: 5,51: 13,51: 14, \\ 51: 22,52: 1,52: 5, \\ 52: 10,52: 14,53: 14, \\ 53: 24,54: 3,54: 8, \\ 54: 11,54: 16,54: 25, \\ 55: 3,55: 17,56: 1, \\ 56: 4,56: 18,56: 24, \\ 57: 10,57: 20,58: 3, \\ 58: 9,58: 14,60: 6, \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 60:9, 61:18, 61:21, } \\ 61: 23,62: 11,62: 19, \\ 62: 23,63: 7,63: 9, \\ 63: 11,63: 16,64: 2, \\ 64: 3,64: 8,64: 9, \\ 64: 15,64: 21,65: 8, \\ 65: 10,65: 12,65: 21, \\ 65: 24,66: 3,66: 6, \\ 66: 10,66: 11,66: 19, \\ 66: 23,67: 1,67: 4, \\ 67: 17,87: 2,90: 2, \\ 98: 23,111: 12, \\ 111: 20,111: 22, \\ 116: 15,116: 20, \\ 116: 23,117: 14, \\ 117: 16,117: 22, \\ 127: 2,127: 6,137: 7, \\ 137: 11,138: 20, \\ 146: 9,151: 5,155: 1, \\ 155: 6,155: 9, \\ 155: 16,156: 1, \\ 159: 23,164: 14, \\ 164: 18,167: 2, \\ 167: 4,167: 12, \\ 167: 17,167: 19, \\ 168: 22,169: 13, \\ 169: 24,170: 10, \\ 170: 13,170: 21, \\ 170: 23 \\ \text { theme }[1]-71: 12 \\ \text { themselves }[6]-22: 2, \\ 72: 16,74: 4,112: 20, \\ 120: 1,141: 3 \\ \text { therapist }[1]-162: 4 \\ \text { therapy }[1]-158: 6 \\ \text { they've }[1]-53: 21 \\ \text { thinking }[5]-4: 4, \\ 27: 5,56: 2,56: 25, \\ 8: 16 \\ \text { thinks [6] - 87:13, } \\ 95: 25,99: 6,106: 13, \\ 108: 4,121: 19 \\ \text { thinner }[2]-146: 22, \\ 147: 10 \\ \text { thinners }[3]-148: 4, \\ 148: 11,148: 15 \\ \text { third }[5]-74: 22, \\ 88: 24,121: 10, \\ 130: 20,166: 10 \\ \text { third-degree }[1]- \\ 74: 22 \\ \text { third-stage } \\ \text { 121:10, } 130: 20 \\ \text { thoughtful }[1]-5: 23 \\ \text { thoughts }[7]-86: 1, \\ 93: 12,100: 6, \\ 100: 17,105: 6, \\ 105: 7,108: 23 \\ \text { thousand }[1]-18: 4 \\ \text { thousands }[3]-40: 25 \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


| three [3]-10:12, | trail ${ }_{[1]}-5: 6$ | 126:2, 126:7, | understood [25] - 8:1, | $\text { valid }_{[1]}-70: 5$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 21:13, 146:4 | trained [1] - 119:9 | 165:19, 166 | :3, 13:23, 29:3, | validity $[1]-71: 18$ |
| thrilled [1] - 6:21 | training [1] - 158:12 | trying [35] - 5:7, 5:8, | 31:2, 34:17, 49:3, | Valley [1] - 59:17 |
| thrombosis [1] - 146:16 | TRANSCRIPT ${ }_{[1]}{ }^{1: 13}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 7: 24,18: 3,18: 9 \\ & 18: 18,24: 6,24: 7, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 50:14, 80:15, 83:6, } \\ & 88: 8,89: 7,90: 20, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { vascular }_{[2]}-110: 20, \\ & 146: 14 \end{aligned}$ |
| thrown [1] - 22:12 | transition [2]-123:6 | 24:23, 39:18, 52: | 02:25, 104:8, | Vegas [10]-9:15, |
| throws [1] - 12:22 | transportation [1] | 53:16, 61:24, 70:24 | 5:19, 116:8 | 40:15, 65:6, 66:17, |
| Thursday [6] - 5:9, | 36:14 | 72:21, 73:1, 84:15, | 119:3, 124:2, | 128:25, 160:11, |
| 6:3, 6:5, 167:11, | traumatic [1]-41:8 | 84:16, 85:19, 90:5, | 126:11, 133:12, | 160:17, 162:8, |
| 169:16, 169:22 <br> timing [1] - 151:1 | travel ${ }_{[1]}-64: 5$ traverse ${ }_{[1]}-168$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 91:22, 91:25, 92:1, } \\ & 93: 9,107: 14,117: 6, \end{aligned}$ | 134:11, 136:8 unfortunately $[3]$ - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 172:13, 172:18 } \\ & \text { /EGAS }[1]-2: 1 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\text { tired }[1]-51: 4$ | treat [4]-28:9, | 130:23, 134:4, | 58:19, 91:2, 99:4 | vein [1] - 146:16 |
| tissues [1] - 59:13 | 102:22, 158:20 | 135:18, 135:20, | UNIDENTIFIED ${ }^{2}$ 2] | venire [1]-51:9 |
| to.. [1]-45:5 | 158:22 | 135:23, 138:22, | 3:3, 3:20 | verbally [1]-119:15 |
| today [23]-2:10, 4:6, $5: 5,20: 11,20: 15$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { treated }[10]-103: 4, \\ \text { 103:17, 107:24, } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 169:18, 170:2 } \\ & \text { TUESDAY [2] - 1:16, } \end{aligned}$ | unknowns [1] - 30:22 <br> unless [4]-54:19, | $\begin{gathered} \text { verdict }[5]-18: 1, \\ 18: 2,98: 2,137: 2 \end{gathered}$ |
| 26:6, 37:4, 42:1, | 108:8, 160:7, 160:9, | , | 80:12, 113:20, | 2, $8.2,1$ |
| 49:1, 49:12, 50:3, | 160:10, 160:16, | turn [1] - 78:1 | 164:23 | verdicts [4]-27:11, |
| 50:11, 50:12, 59:24, | 161:25 | turned [2]-27:5, | unlocked [1] - 42:25 | 27:12, 27:13, $27: 15$ |
| 81:11, 84:15, | treating [3] - 118:8 | 81:17 | up [78] - 2:12, 3:7, | versus [2]-24:4, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 112:25, 121:17, } \\ & \text { 139:8, 154:18, } \end{aligned}$ | $118: 17,150: 9$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { turning [2] - 157:3, } \\ & \text { 157:14 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3: 14,3: 17,17: 5 \\ & \text { 18:3, 20:8, 20:19, } \end{aligned}$ | 134:9 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 139:8, 154:18, } \\ & \text { 159:6, 165:3, 169:9 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { treatment }[8]-30: 16, \\ 61: 12,79: 7,125: 7, \end{gathered}$ | $\mathrm{TV}_{[2]}-76: 3,148: 13$ | $20: 22,21: 20,24: 9,$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { via }_{[1]}-68: 20 \\ & \text { vice }_{[1]}-9: 8 \end{aligned}$ |
| toes [1] - 115:24 | 133:20, 147:21, | two [25] - 6:11, 7:16, | 26:2, 28:14, 29:19, | victims [1] - 130:14 |
| together [3]-155:13, 155:15, 156:3 | 147:23, 152:16 | $\begin{aligned} & 9: 15,9: 16,9: 17 \\ & \text { 12:21, 14:6, 14:1 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 36: 18,36: 22,37: 23, \\ & 38: 19,38: 24,40: 3, \end{aligned}$ | videographer ${ }_{[2]}$ - |
| tolerances [1] - 86:11 | 12, 6:13, 6:14 | 17:17, 33:19, 39:11, | 42:14, 49:14, 50:18, | View [1]-59:17 |
| tomorrow [13] - 49:8, | $8: 18,9: 16,9: 17,$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 55:21, 63:19, 63:21, } \\ & \text { 67:4, 73:23, 82:4, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 55: 5,57: 23,60: 18, \\ & 66: 13,67: 11,68: 8, \end{aligned}$ | view [7]-28:23, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 49:13, 49:14, 50:4, } \\ & 165: 7,165: 8, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9: 20,9: 21,9: 25, \\ & 10: 3,17: 23,18: 1, \end{aligned}$ | 88:14, 96:2, 97:10, | 68:14, 71:12, 75:12, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 47:18, 87:18, 99:4, } \\ & \text { 152:18, 163:11, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 166:14, 167:9, | 6:8, 62:3, 62:5, | 1:16, 146:20, | 75:18, 80:24, 81:9, | 4:5 |
| 168:19, 169:9, | 68:15, 93:19, 98:25, | 149:19, 169:2, 169:4 | 89:12, 90:6, 90:7, | viewpoint [2]-3:24 |
| 169:15, 170:9, | 113:15, 114:2, | two-year [1] - 17:17 | 90:17, 92:16, 92:17, | 126:16 |
| 170:13 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 149:24, 165:18, } \\ & \text { 166:21, 170:3 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { type }[10]-31: 9,76: 25, \\ & 77: 22,81: 15, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 99:6, 99:22, 100:3, } \\ & \text { 101:7, 101:17, } \end{aligned}$ | viewpoints [1] - |
| tone [1] - 168:4 <br> tones [3] - 112:14 | $\begin{gathered} \text { 166:21, 170:3 } \\ \text { trials }[1]-151: 10 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 77:22, 81:15, } \\ & \text { 101:10, 101:12 } \end{aligned}$ | 101:22, 103:6, | 126:22 |
| $\begin{array}{r} \text { tones }[1] \\ \text { 112:15 } \end{array}$ | tricks [1] - 35:25 | 101:17, 101:21 | 103:9, 104:9, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { visit [2] - 162:2 } \\ & 165: 20 \end{aligned}$ |
| tons [1]-132:5 | tricky [1] - $37: 21$ | 107:17, 132:18 | 14, 104:24, | visual [1] - 36:7 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Tony }[1]-66: 15 \\ & \text { took }[9]-67: 24,78: 9, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { tried }[4]-32: 15, \\ & 32: 16,39: 4,92: 15 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { types [3]-52:22, 77:1, } \\ & \text { 101:16 } \end{aligned}$ | 110:4, 111:23, | visualization [1] - $36: 4$ |
| 95:10, 107:8, | tries [1]-39:19 | typically ${ }_{[1]}$ - 9:19 | 121:24, 125:5, | voice [3] - 59:4, 127:9, |
| 120:18, 128:22, | trivial [1]-82:17 |  | 129:15 | 155:23 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 129:9, 130:15, } \\ & \text { 161:21 } \end{aligned}$ | trouble [1] - 81: <br> true [1] - 172:8 |  | $34: 22,136: 24,$ | VOIR ${ }_{[1]}-1: 14$ |
| topic [1]-91:1 | $\text { truly }[3]-16: 12,$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ultimately }[5]-53: \\ & 85: 21,89: 22,91 \text { : } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 140: 13,144: 2, \\ & 148: 17,148: 18 \end{aligned}$ | 48:20, 50:18, 51:20, |
|  |  | 56:1 | 49:20, 150:6, | 168:20, 168:22 |
| $76: 19,133: 2$ | 103:8, 103:14, | umbrella [1] - 158:7 | $55: 10,156: 1,$ | volunteering ${ }_{[1]}$ - |
| touch [3]-66:13, | 103:16, 104:6 | unable [1] - 120:1 unanimous [1]-99:1 | 0:3, 161:1, 62:16, 169:2, 170:4 | $35: 11$ |
| $129: 25,135: 7$ touched | 106:3, 108:7, 111:24 truth | uncertainty [1] - 87:8 | $\text { usual }_{[1]}-57: 12$ | vote [2] - 99:13, 99:18 |
| touched [2]-88:10, 90:25 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { truth [2] - 89:19, } \\ & 153: 17 \end{aligned}$ | uncomfortable [1] | utilized [1] - 28:5 | vs [2] - 1:6, 2:7 |
| tough [1] - 15:7 | try ${ }_{[27]}-2: 12,5: 24$ |  | V | W |
| towards [7] - 32:4, | , 13:21, 16: | 151:24 |  |  |
| 134:3, 134:9, 139:12 | 19:9, 34:13, 35:13, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { under }[4]-12: 18, \\ & 33: 17.119: 12.158: 6 \end{aligned}$ | vacancy [1]-8:21 <br> vacant $[2]-63: 21$, | 101:20, 102:1, |
| town [2]-27:18, 72:19 | 35:21, 38:4, 45:17, | 33:17, 119:12, 158:6 | 63:22 | 102:13, 124:24, |
| track [4] - 5:2, 6:2, | 49:11, 72:15, 72:18, | underneath [1] | vacuum [2]-90:10, | 134:21, 135:10, |
| $\begin{gathered} 6: 18,166: 18 \\ \text { trade }[1]-105: 16 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 72:23, 82:21, 84:9, } \\ & \text { 100:6, 107:16, } \end{aligned}$ | Understood [1] - 5:3 | 137:14 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 136:9, 136:23, } \\ & \text { 137:4, 142:18, } \end{aligned}$ |



