

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

Case No. 83796

Electronically Filed
May 27 2022 03:57 p.m.
Elizabeth A. Brown
Clerk of Supreme Court

DONTE JOHNSON,
Petitioner,

v.

STATE OF NEVADA, *et al.*,
Respondent.

Appeal From Clark County District Court
Eighth Judicial District, Clark County
The Honorable Jacqueline M. Bluth, District Judge
(Dist. Ct. No. A-19-789336-W)

APPELLANT'S APPENDIX

Volume 7 of 50

RENE L. VALLADARES
Federal Public Defender
Nevada State Bar No. 11479
RANDOLPH M. FIEDLER
Assistant Federal Public Defender
Nevada State Bar No. 12577
Assistant Federal Public Defender
ELLESE HENDERSON
Assistant Federal Public Defender
Nevada State Bar No. 14674

411 E. Bonneville, Suite 250
Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
Telephone: (702) 388-6577
Fax: (702) 388-6419
Randolph_Fiedler@fd.org
Ellesse_Henderson@fd.org

Counsel for Petitioner
Donte Johnson

DOCUMENT	DATE	VOLUME	PAGE(S)
Amended Verification, <i>Johnson v. Gittere, et al.</i> , Case No. A-19-789336-W, Clark County District Court, Nevada	05/17/2019	47	11613-11615
Amended Verification – Index of Exhibit and Exhibit in Support, <i>Johnson v. Gittere, et al.</i> , Case No. A-19-789336-W, Clark County District Court, Nevada	05/17/2019	47	11616-11620
Court Minutes, <i>Johnson v. Gittere, et al.</i> , Case No. A-19-789336-W, Clark County District Court, Nevada	02/13/2019	49	12248
Court Minutes, <i>Johnson v. Gittere, et al.</i> , Case No. A-19-789336-W, Clark County District Court, Nevada	10/28/2021	50	12365
Defendant's (Pro Se) Request for Petition to be Stricken as it is Not Properly Before the Court, <i>Johnson v. Gittere, et al.</i> , Case No. A-19-789336-W, Clark County District Court, Nevada	04/11/2019	46	11606-11608
Defendant's (Pro Se) Request to Strike Petition, <i>Johnson v. Gittere, et al.</i> , Case No. A-19-789336-W, Clark County District Court, Nevada	04/04/2019	46	11603-11605

DOCUMENT	DATE	VOLUME	PAGE(S)
Exhibits and Exhibit List in Support of Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus	02/13/2019	25	6130–6146
6. Judgment of Conviction, <i>State v. Johnson</i> , Case No. 153154, District Court, Clark County (Oct. 3, 2000)	02/13/2019	25	6147–6152
7. Judgment of Conviction (Amended), <i>State v. Johnson</i> , Case No. 153154, District Court, Clark County (Oct. 9, 2000)	02/13/2019	25	6153–6158
8. Appellant’s Opening Brief, <i>Johnson v. State</i> , Case No. 36991, In the Supreme Court of the State of Nevada (July 18, 2001)	02/13/2019	25	6159–6247
10. Appellant’s Reply Brief, <i>Johnson v. State</i> , Case No. 36991, In the Supreme Court of the State of Nevada (Jan. 15, 2002)	02/13/2019	25–26	6248–6283
15. Motion to Amend Judgment of Conviction, <i>State v. Johnson</i> , Case No. 153154, District Court, Clark County (Apr. 8, 2004)	02/13/2019	26	6284–6295
16. Amended Judgment of Conviction, <i>State v. Johnson</i> , Case No. 153154, District Court, Clark County (Apr. 20, 2004)	02/13/2019	26	6296–6298
17. Judgment of Conviction, <i>State v. Johnson</i> , Case No. 153154, District Court,	02/13/2019	26	6299–6303

	DOCUMENT	DATE	VOLUME	PAGE(S)
	Clark County (June 6, 2005)			
21.	Judgment Affirming Death Sentence (45456), <i>Johnson v. State</i> , Case No. 45456, In Supreme Court of the State of Nevada (Dec. 28, 2006)	02/13/2019	26	6304–6330
22.	Notice of filing of writ of certiorari, <i>Johnson v. State</i> , Case No. 45456, In Supreme Court of the State of Nevada (Apr. 5, 2007)	02/13/2019	26	6331–6332
24.	Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus, <i>State v. Johnson</i> , Case No. 153154, District Court, Clark County (Feb. 11, 2008)	02/13/2019	26	6333–6343
25.	Pro Per Petition, <i>Johnson v. State</i> , Case No. 51306, In the Supreme Court of the State of Nevada (Mar. 24, 2008)	02/13/2019	26	6344–6364
26.	Response to Petition Writ of Habeas Corpus, <i>State v. Johnson</i> , Case No. 153154, District Court, Clark County (Apr. 29, 2008)	02/13/2019	26	6365–6369
27.	Order denying Pro Per Petition, <i>Johnson v. State</i> , Case No. 51306, In the Supreme Court of the State of Nevada (May 6, 2008)	02/13/2019	26	6370–6372
28.	Supplemental Brief in Support of Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus, <i>State v. Johnson</i> , Case No.	02/13/2019	26	6373–6441

	DOCUMENT	DATE	VOLUME	PAGE(S)
	153154, District Court, Clark County (Oct. 12, 2009)			
29.	Second Supplemental Brief in Support of Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus, <i>State v. Johnson</i> , Case No. 153154, District Court, Clark County (July 14, 2010)	02/13/2019	26	6442–6495
30.	Response to Petition Writ of Habeas Corpus, <i>State v. Johnson</i> , Case No. 153154, District Court, Clark County (Jan. 28, 2011)	02/13/2019	26–27	6496–6591
31.	Reply to Response to Petition Writ of Habeas Corpus, <i>State v. Johnson</i> , Case No. 153154, District Court, Clark County (June 1, 2011)	02/13/2019	27	6592–6627
32.	Reply Brief on Initial Trial Issues, <i>State v. Johnson</i> , Case No. 153154, District Court, Clark County (Aug. 22, 2011)	02/13/2019	27–28	6628–6785
33.	Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, <i>State v. Johnson</i> , Case No. 153154, District Court, Clark County (Mar. 17, 2014)	02/13/2019	28	6786–6793
34.	Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus, <i>State v. Johnson</i> , Case No. 153154, District Court, Clark County (Oct. 8, 2014)	02/13/2019	28	6794–6808

DOCUMENT	DATE	VOLUME	PAGE(S)
35. Response to Second Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus (Post-Conviction), <i>State v. Johnson</i> , Case No. 153154, District Court, Clark County (Dec. 15, 2014)	02/13/2019	28	6809–6814
36. Reply to Response to Second Petition for Habeas Corpus (Post-Conviction), <i>State v. Johnson</i> , Case No. 153154, District Court, Clark County (Jan. 2, 2015)	02/13/2019	28	6815–6821
37. Appellant’s Opening Brief, No. 65168, Nev. Sup. Ct., Jan. 9, 2015	02/13/2019	28	6822–6973
38. Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law), <i>State v. Johnson</i> , Case No. 153154, District Court, Clark County (Feb. 4, 2015)	02/13/2019	28	6974–6979
40. Appellant’s Reply Brief, No. 65168, Nev. Sup. Ct., Nov. 18, 2015	02/13/2019	28–29	6980–7078
45. Autopsy Report for Peter Talamantez (Aug. 15, 1998)	02/13/2019	29	7079–7091
46. Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Dept. Voluntary Statement of Ace Rayburn Hart_Redacted (Aug. 17, 1998)	02/13/2019	29	7092–7121
47. Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Dept., Voluntary Statement of Brian	02/13/2019	29	7122–7138

	DOCUMENT	DATE	VOLUME	PAGE(S)
	Johnson_Redacted (Aug. 17, 1998)			
48.	Indictment, <i>State v. Johnson</i> , District Court, Clark County, Nevada Case No. C153154 (Sep. 2, 1998)	02/13/2019	29	7139–7149
49.	Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Dept., Voluntary Statement of Terrell Young_Redacted (Sep. 2, 1998)	02/13/2019	29	7150–7205
50.	Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Dept., Voluntary Statement of Charla Severs_Redacted (Sep. 3, 1998)	02/13/2019	29	7206–7239
51.	Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Dept., Voluntary Statement of Sikia Smith_Redacted (Sep. 8, 1998)	02/13/2019	29–30	7240–7269
52.	Superseding Indictment, <i>State v. Johnson</i> , District Court, Clark County, Nevada Case No. C153154 (Sep. 15, 1998)	02/13/2019	30	7270–7284
53.	Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Dept., Voluntary Statement of Todd Armstrong_Redacted (Sep. 17, 1998)	02/13/2019	30	7285–7338
54.	Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Dept., Voluntary Statement of Ace Hart_Redacted (Sep. 22, 1998)	02/13/2019	30	7339–7358

DOCUMENT	DATE	VOLUME	PAGE(S)
55. Testimony of Todd Armstrong, <i>State of Nevada v. Celis</i> , Justice Court, Clark County, Nevada Case No. 1699-98FM (Jan. 21, 1999)	02/13/2019	30–31	7359–7544
56. Trial Transcript (Volume VIII), <i>State v. Smith</i> , District Court, Clark County, Nevada Case No. C153624 (June 17, 1999)	02/13/2019	31	7545–7675
57. Trial Transcript (Volume XVI-AM), <i>State v. Smith</i> , District Court, Clark County, Nevada Case No. 153624 (June 24, 1999)	02/13/2019	31–32	7676–7824
58. Motion to Permit DNA Testing of Cigarette Butt (Aug. 17, 1998)	02/13/2019	32	7825–7835
59. Trial Transcript (Volume VI), <i>State v. Young</i> , District Court, Clark County, Nevada, Case No. C153154 (Sep. 7, 1999)	02/13/2019	32	7836–7958
60. Interview of Charla Severs (Sep. 27, 1999)	02/13/2019	32	7959–7980
61. Motion to Videotape Deposition of Charla Severs, <i>State v. Johnson</i> , District Court, Clark County, Nevada Case No. C153154 (Sep. 29, 1999)	02/13/2019	32–33	7981–8004
62. Opposition to Videotape Deposition of Charla Severs, <i>State v. Johnson</i> , District Court, Clark	02/13/2019	33	8005–8050

	DOCUMENT	DATE	VOLUME	PAGE(S)
	County, Nevada Case No. C153154 (Oct. 6, 1999)			
63.	Transcript of Video Deposition of Charla Severs (Filed Under Seal), <i>State v. Johnson</i> , District Court, Clark County, Nevada Case No. C153154 (Oct. 6, 1999)	02/13/2019 SEALED	33	8051–8160
64.	Cellmark Report of Laboratory Examination (Nov. 17, 1999)	02/13/2019	33	8161–8165
65.	Motion for Change of Venue, <i>State v. Johnson</i> , District Court, Clark County, Nevada Case No. C153154 (Nov. 29, 1999)	02/13/2019	33	8166–8291
66.	Records from the California Youth Authority_Redacted	02/13/2019	33–34	8292–8429
67.	Jury Instructions (Guilt Phase), <i>State v. Johnson</i> , District Court, Clark County, Nevada Case No. C153154 (June 8, 2000)	02/13/2019	34	8430–8496
68.	Verdict Forms (Guilt Phase), <i>State v. Johnson</i> , District Court, Clark County, Nevada Case No. C153154 (June 9, 2000)	02/13/2019	34	8497–8503
69.	Special Verdict, <i>State v. Johnson</i> , District Court, Clark County, Nevada Case No. C153154 (June 15, 2000)	02/13/2019	34	8504–8506
70.	Affidavit of Kristina Wildeveld (June 23, 2000)	02/13/2019	34	8507–8509

DOCUMENT	DATE	VOLUME	PAGE(S)
71. Amended Notice of Evidence Supporting Aggravating Circumstances, <i>State v. Johnson</i> , District Court, Clark County, Nevada Case No. C153154 (Mar. 17, 2004)	02/13/2019	34	8510–8518
72. Second Amended Notice of Evidence Supporting Aggravating Circumstances, <i>State v. Johnson</i> , District Court, Clark County, Nevada Case No. C153154 (Apr. 6, 2004)	02/13/2019	34	8519–8527
73. Opposition to Second Amended Notice of Evidence Supporting Aggravating Circumstances, <i>State v. Johnson</i> , District Court, Clark County, Nevada Case No. C153154 (Apr. 20, 2004)	02/13/2019	34	8528–8592
74. Reply to Opposition to Notice of Evidence Supporting Aggravating Circumstances, <i>State v. Johnson</i> , District Court, Clark County, Nevada Case No. C153154 (Apr. 26, 2004)	02/13/2019	34–35	8593–8621
75. Jury Instructions (Penalty Phase 3), <i>State v. Johnson</i> , District Court, Clark	02/13/2019	35	8622–8639

	DOCUMENT	DATE	VOLUME	PAGE(S)
	County, Nevada Case No. C153154 (Apr. 28, 2005)			
76.	Petition for rehearing, Johnson <i>v. State</i> , Nevada Supreme Court, Case No. 45456 (Mar. 27, 2007)	02/13/2019	35	8640–8652
77.	John L. Smith, <i>Mabey takes heat for attending his patients instead of the inauguration</i> , Las Vegas Review-Journal (Jan. 5, 2007)	02/13/2019	35	8653–8656
78.	Sam Skolnik, <i>Judge out of order, ethics claims say</i> , Las Vegas Sun (Apr. 27, 2007)	02/13/2019	35	8657–8660
79.	EM 110 - Execution Procedure_Redacted (Nov. 7, 2017)	02/13/2019	35	8661–8667
80.	<i>Nevada v. Baldonado</i> , Justice Court, Clark County, Nevada Case No. 04FH2573X (Mar. 30, 2004)	02/13/2019	35	8668–8698
81.	Birth Certificate John White Jr_Redacted	02/13/2019	35	8699–8700
82.	Declaration of Eloise Kline (Nov. 19, 2016)	02/13/2019	35	8701–8704
83.	Jury Questionnaire 2000_Barbara Fuller_Redacted (May 24, 2000)	02/13/2019	35	8705–8727
84.	Media Jury Questionnaire 2000	02/13/2019	35–36	8728–8900
85.	Media Jury Questionnaire 2005	02/13/2019	36	8901–9025
86.	News Articles	02/13/2019	36–37	9026–9296

DOCUMENT	DATE	VOLUME	PAGE(S)
87. State's Exhibit 63 – Photo	02/13/2019	37	9297–9299
88. State's Exhibit 64 – Photo	02/13/2019	37	9300–9302
89. State's Exhibit 65 – Photo	02/13/2019	37	9303–9305
90. State's Exhibit 66 – Photo	02/13/2019	37	9306–9308
91. State's Exhibit 67 – Photo	02/13/2019	37	9309–9311
92. State's Exhibit 69 – Photo	02/13/2019	37	9312–9314
93. State's Exhibit 70 – Photo	02/13/2019	37	9315–9317
94. State's Exhibit 74 – Photo	02/13/2019	37	9318–9320
95. State's Exhibit 75 – Photo	02/13/2019	37	9321–9323
96. State's Exhibit 76 – Photo	02/13/2019	37	9324–9326
97. State's Exhibit 79 – Photo	02/13/2019	37	9327–9329
98. State's Exhibit 80 – Photo	02/13/2019	37	9330–9332
99. State's Exhibit 81 – Photo	02/13/2019	37	9333–9335
100. State's Exhibit 82 – Photo	02/13/2019	37	9336–9338
101. State's Exhibit 86 – Photo	02/13/2019	37	9339–9341
102. State's Exhibit 89 – Photo	02/13/2019	37	9342–9344
103. State's Exhibit 92 – Photo	02/13/2019	37	9345–9347
104. State's Exhibit 113 – Photo	02/13/2019	37	9348–9350
105. State's Exhibit 116 – Photo	02/13/2019	37	9351–9353
106. State's Exhibit 120 – Photo	02/13/2019	37	9354–9356
107. State's Exhibit 125 – Photo	02/13/2019	37	9357–9359
108. State's Exhibit 130 – Photo	02/13/2019	38	9360–9362
109. State's Exhibit 134 – Photo	02/13/2019	38	9363–9365
110. State's Exhibit 137 – Photo	02/13/2019	38	9366–9368
111. State's Exhibit 145 – Photo	02/13/2019	38	9369–9371
112. State's Exhibit 146 – Photo	02/13/2019	38	9372–9374
113. State's Exhibit 148 – Photo	02/13/2019	38	9375–9377
114. State's Exhibit 151 – Photo	02/13/2019	38	9378–9380
115. State's Exhibit 180 – Photo	02/13/2019	38	9381–9384
116. State's Exhibit 181 – Photo	02/13/2019	38	9385–9388
117. State's Exhibit 216 - Probation Officer's Report - Juvenile_Redacted	02/13/2019	38	9389–9403
118. State's Exhibit 217 - Probation Officer's Report_Redacted	02/13/2019	38	9404–9420

DOCUMENT	DATE	VOLUME	PAGE(S)
119. State's Exhibit 221 – Photo	02/13/2019	38	9421–9423
120. State's Exhibit 222 – Photo	02/13/2019	38	9424–9426
121. State's Exhibit 256	02/13/2019	38	9427–9490
122. Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Dept. Crime Scene Report (Aug. 14, 1998)	02/13/2019	38	9491–9499
123. VCR at Terra Linda	02/13/2019	38	9500–9501
124. VCR Remote Control Buying Guide	02/13/2019	38	9502–9505
125. Jury Instructions (Penalty Phase 3), <i>State v. Johnson</i> , District Court, Clark County, Nevada Case No. C153154 (May 4, 2005)	02/13/2019	38	9506–9519
126. Motion to Bifurcate Penalty Phase, <i>State v. Johnson</i> , District Court, Clark County, Nevada Case No. C153154 (Apr. 27, 2004)	02/13/2019	38	9520–9525
127. Motion to Reconsider Request to Bifurcate Penalty Phase, <i>State v. Johnson</i> , District Court, Clark County, Nevada Case No. C153154 (Apr. 11, 2005)	02/13/2019	38	9526–9532
128. Special Verdicts (Penalty Phase 3), <i>State v. Johnson</i> , District Court, Clark County, Nevada Case No. C153154 (Apr. 28, 2005)	02/13/2019	38	9533–9544
129. Verdict (Penalty Phase 3), <i>State v. Johnson</i> , District Court, Clark County, Nevada Case No. C153154 (May 5, 2005)	02/13/2019	38	9545–9549

DOCUMENT	DATE	VOLUME	PAGE(S)
130. Declaration of Arthur Cain (Oct. 29, 2018)	02/13/2019	38	9550–9552
131. Declaration of Deborah White (Oct. 27, 2018)	02/13/2019	38	9553–9555
132. Declaration of Douglas McGhee (Oct. 28, 2018)	02/13/2019	38	9556–9558
133. Declaration of Elizabeth Blanding (Oct. 29, 2018)	02/13/2019	38	9559–9560
134. Declaration of Jesse Drumgole (Oct. 27, 2018)	02/13/2019	38	9561–9562
135. Declaration of Johnnisha Zamora (Oct. 28, 2018)	02/13/2019	38	9563–9566
136. Declaration of Johnny White (Oct. 26, 2018)	02/13/2019	38	9567–9570
137. Declaration of Keonna Bryant (Oct. 30, 2018)	02/13/2019	38	9571–9573
138. Declaration of Lolita Edwards (Oct. 30, 2018)	02/13/2019	38	9574–9576
139. Declaration of Loma White (Oct. 31, 2018)	02/13/2019	38	9577–9579
140. Declaration of Moises Zamora (Oct. 28, 2018)	02/13/2019	38	9580–9582
141. Declaration of Vonjelique Johnson (Oct. 28, 2018)	02/13/2019	38	9583–9585
142. Los Angeles Dept. of Child & Family Services_Redacted	02/13/2019	38–39	9586–9831
143. Psychological Evaluation of Donte Johnson by Myla H. Young, Ph.D. (June 6, 2000)	02/13/2019	39	9832–9841
144. Psychological Evaluation of Eunice Cain (Apr. 25, 1988)	02/13/2019	39	9842–9845

DOCUMENT	DATE	VOLUME	PAGE(S)
145. Psychological Evaluation of John White by Harold Kates (Dec. 28, 1993)	02/13/2019	39–40	9846–9862
146. Student Report for John White	02/13/2019	40	9863–9867
147. School Records for Eunnisha White_Redated	02/13/2019	40	9868–9872
148. High School Transcript for John White_Redacted	02/13/2019	40	9873–9874
149. School Record for John White_Redacted	02/13/2019	40	9875–9878
150. Certified Copy SSA Records_Eunice Cain_Redacted	02/13/2019	40	9879–9957
151. Declaration of Robin Pierce (Dec. 16, 2018)	02/13/2019	40	9958–9961
152. California Department of Corrections Records_Redacted (Apr. 25, 2000)	02/13/2019	40	9962–10060
153. Letter from Maxine Miller to Lisa Calandro re forensic lab report (Apr. 13, 1999)	02/13/2019	40	10061–10077
154. Letter from Lisa Calandro Forensic Analytical to Maxine Miller (Apr. 20, 1994)	02/13/2019	40	10078–10080
155. Memorandum re call with Richard Good (Apr. 29, 1999)	02/13/2019	40	10081–10082
156. Letter from Maxine Miller to Berch Henry at Metro DNA Lab (May 7, 1999)	02/13/2019	40	10083–10086
157. Letter from Maxine Miller to Richard Good (May 10, 1999)	02/13/2019	40	10087–10092

DOCUMENT	DATE	VOLUME	PAGE(S)
158. Letter from Maxine Miller to Tom Wahl (May 26, 1999)	02/13/2019	40	10093–10098
159. Stipulation and Order, <i>State v. Johnson</i> , District Court, Clark County, Nevada Case No. C153154 (June 8, 1999)	02/13/2019	40	10099–10101
160. Stipulation and Order, <i>State v. Johnson</i> , District Court, Clark County, Nevada Case No. C153154, (June 14, 1999)	02/13/2019	40	10102–10105
161. Letter from Maxine Miller to Larry Simms (July 12, 1999)	02/13/2019	40–41	10106–10110
162. Stipulation and Order, <i>State v. Johnson</i> , District Court, Clark County, Nevada Case No. C153154 (Dec. 22, 1999)	02/13/2019	41	10111–10113
163. Letter from Maxine Miller to Nadine LNU re bullet fragments (Mar. 20, 2000)	02/13/2019	41	10114–10118
164. Memorandum (Dec. 10, 1999)	02/13/2019	41	10119–10121
165. Forensic Analytical Bloodstain Pattern Interpretation (June 1, 2000)	02/13/2019	41	10122–10136
166. Trial Transcript (Volume III), <i>State v. Young</i> , District Court, Clark County, Nevada, Case No. C153461 (Sep. 7, 1999)	02/13/2019	41	10137–10215
167. Trial Transcript (Volume VII), <i>State v. Young</i> ,	02/13/2019	41	10216–10332

DOCUMENT	DATE	VOLUME	PAGE(S)
District Court, Clark County, Nevada, Case No. C153461 (Sep. 13, 1999)			
168. National Research Council, <i>Strengthening Forensic Science in the United States: A Path Forward</i> , Washington, D.C.: The National Academies Press (2009)	02/13/2019	41	10333–10340
169. Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Dept. Forensic Lab Report of Examination (Sep. 26, 1998)	02/13/2019	41	10341–10343
170. Todd Armstrong juvenile records_Redacted	02/13/2019	41–42	10344–10366
171. Handwritten notes on Pants	02/13/2019	42	10367–10368
172. Declaration of Cassondrus Ragsdale (Dec. 16, 2018)	02/13/2019	42	10369–10371
173. Report of Dr. Kate Glywasky (Dec. 19, 2018)	02/13/2019	42	10372–10375
174. Curriculum Vitae of Dr. Kate Glywasky	02/13/2019	42	10376–10384
175. Report of Deborah Davis, Ph.D. (Dec. 18, 2018)	02/13/2019	42	10385–10435
176. Curriculum Vitae of Deborah Davis, Ph.D.	02/13/2019	42	10436–10462
177. Report of T. Paulette Sutton, Associate Professor, Clinical Laboratory Sciences (Dec. 18, 2018)	02/13/2019	42	10463–10472
178. Curriculum Vitae of T. Paulette Sutton	02/13/2019	42	10473–10486

DOCUMENT	DATE	VOLUME	PAGE(S)
179. Report of Matthew Marvin, Certified Latent Print Examiner (Dec. 18, 2018)	02/13/2019	42	10487–10494
180. Curriculum Vitae of Matthew Marvin	02/13/2019	42	10495–10501
181. Trial Transcript (Volume V), <i>State v. Smith</i> , District Court, Clark County, Nevada Case No. C153624 (June 16, 1999)	02/13/2019	42–43	10502–10614
182. Trial Transcript (Volume VI), <i>State v. Smith</i> , District Court, Clark County, Nevada Case No. C153624 (June 16, 1999)	02/13/2019	43	10615–10785
183. Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Dept. Interview of Tod Armstrong_Redacted (Aug. 17, 1998)	02/13/2019	43	10786–10820
184. Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Dept. Interview of Tod Armstrong_Redacted (Aug. 18, 1998)	02/13/2019	43	10821–10839
185. Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Dept. Interview of Charla Severs_Redacted (Aug. 18, 1998)	02/13/2019	43–44	10840–10863
186. Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Dept. Interview of Sikia Smith_Redacted (Aug. 17, 1998)	02/13/2019	44	10864–10882
187. Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Dept. Interview of Terrell Young_Redacted (Sep. 2, 1998)	02/13/2019	44	10883–10911
188. Declaration of Ashley Warren (Dec. 17, 2018)	02/13/2019	44	10912–10915

DOCUMENT	DATE	VOLUME	PAGE(S)
189. Declaration of John Young (Dec. 10, 2018)	02/13/2019	44	10916–10918
190. Brief of Plaintiffs-Appellants, <i>Abdur'rahman v. Parker</i> , Tennessee Supreme Court, Nashville Division, Case No. M2018-10385-SC-RDO-CV	02/13/2019	44–45	10919–11321
191. Sandoz' Inc.'s Motion for Leave Pursuant to NRAP 29 to Participate as Amicus Curiae in Support of Real Parties in Interest, <i>Nevada v. The Eighth Judicial District Court of the State of Nevada</i> , Nevada Supreme Court, Case No. 76485	02/13/2019	45	11322–11329
192. Notice of Entry of Order, <i>Dozier v. State of Nevada</i> , District Court, Clark County, Nevada, Case No. 05C215039	02/13/2019	45	11330–11350
193. Declaration of Cassondrus Ragsdale (2018.12.18)	02/13/2019	45	11351–11353
194. Affidavit of David B. Waisel, <i>State of Nevada</i> , District Court, Clark County, Case No. 05C215039 (Oct. 4, 2018)	02/13/2019	45–46	11354–11371
195. Declaration of Hans Weding (Dec. 18, 2018)	02/13/2019	46	11372–11375
196. Trial Transcript (Volume IX), <i>State v. Smith</i> , District Court, Clark County, Nevada Case No. C153624 (June 18, 1999)	02/13/2019	46	11376–11505

DOCUMENT	DATE	VOLUME	PAGE(S)
197. Voluntary Statement of Luis Cabrera (August 14, 1998)	02/13/2019	46	11506–11507
198. Voluntary Statement of Jeff Bates (handwritten)_Redacted (Aug. 14, 1998)	02/13/2019	46	11508–11510
199. Voluntary Statement of Jeff Bates_Redacted (Aug. 14, 1998)	02/13/2019	46	11511–11517
200. Presentence Investigation Report, State’s Exhibit 236, <i>State v. Young</i> , District Court, Clark County, Nevada Case No. C153461_Redacted (Sep. 15, 1999)	02/13/2019	46	11518–11531
201. Presentence Investigation Report, State’s Exhibit 184, <i>State v. Smith</i> , District Court, Clark County, Nevada Case No. C153624_Redacted (Sep. 18, 1998)	02/13/2019	46	11532–11540
202. School Record of Sikia Smith, Defendant’s Exhibit J, <i>State v. Smith</i> , District Court, Clark County, Nevada (Case No. C153624)	02/13/2019	46	11541–11542
203. School Record of Sikia Smith, Defendant’s Exhibit K, <i>State v. Smith</i> , District Court, Clark County, Nevada (Case No. C153624)	02/13/2019	46	11543–11544

DOCUMENT	DATE	VOLUME	PAGE(S)
204. School Record of Sikia Smith, Defendant's Exhibit L, <i>State v. Smith</i> , District Court, Clark County, Nevada (Case No. C153624)	02/13/2019	46	11545–11546
205. Competency Evaluation of Terrell Young by Greg Harder, Psy.D., Court's Exhibit 2, <i>State v. Young</i> , District Court, Clark County, Nevada Case No. C153461 (May 3, 2006)	02/13/2019	46	11547–11550
206. Competency Evaluation of Terrell Young by C. Philip Colosimo, Ph.D., Court's Exhibit 3, <i>State v. Young</i> , District Court, Clark County, Nevada Case No. C153461 (May 3, 2006)	02/13/2019	46	11551–11555
207. Motion and Notice of Motion in Limine to Preclude Evidence of Other Guns Weapons and Ammunition Not Used in the Crime, <i>State v. Johnson</i> , District Court, Clark County, Nevada Case No. C153154 (Oct. 19, 1999)	02/13/2019	46	11556–11570
208. Declaration of Cassondrus Ragsdale (Dec. 19, 2018)	02/13/2019	46	11571–11575
209. Post –Evidentiary Hearing Supplemental Points and Authorities, Exhibit A: Affidavit of Theresa Knight, <i>State v. Johnson</i> ,	02/13/2019	46	11576–11577

DOCUMENT	DATE	VOLUME	PAGE(S)
District Court, Clark County, Nevada Case No. C153154, June 5, 2005			
210. Post –Evidentiary Hearing Supplemental Points and Authorities, Exhibit B: Affidavit of Wilfredo Mercado, <i>State v. Johnson</i> , District Court, Clark County, Nevada Case No. C153154, June 22, 2005	02/13/2019	46	11578–11579
211. Genogram of Johnson Family Tree	02/13/2019	46	11580–11581
212. Motion in Limine Regarding Referring to Victims as “Boys”, <i>State v. Johnson</i> , District Court, Clark County, Nevada Case No. C153154	02/13/2019	46	11582–11585
213. Declaration of Schaumetta Minor, (Dec. 18, 2018)	02/13/2019	46	11586–11589
214. Declaration of Alzora Jackson (Feb. 11, 2019)	02/13/2019	46	11590–11593
Exhibits in Support of Petitioner’s Motion for Leave to Conduct Discovery	12/13/2019	49	12197–12199
1. <i>Holloway v. Baldonado</i> , No. A498609, Plaintiff’s Opposition to Motion for Summary Judgment, District Court of Clark County, Nevada, filed Aug. 1, 2007	12/13/2019	49	12200–12227
2. Handwritten letter from Charla Severs, dated Sep. 27, 1998	12/13/2019	49	12228–12229

DOCUMENT	DATE	VOLUME	PAGE(S)
Exhibits in Support of Reply to State's Response to Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus	12/13/2019	47	11837–11839
215. <i>Holloway v. Baldonado</i> , No. A498609, Plaintiff's Opposition to Motion for Summary Judgment, District Court of Clark County, Aug. 1, 2007	12/13/2019	47–48	11840–11867
216. <i>Holloway v. Baldonado</i> , No. A498609, Opposition to Motion for Summary Judgment Filed by Defendants Stewart Bell, David Roger, and Clark County, District Court of Clark County, filed Jan. 16, 2008	12/13/2019	48–49	11868–12111
217. Letter from Charla Severs, dated Sep. 27, 1998	12/13/2019	49	12112–12113
218. Decision and Order, <i>State of Nevada v. Johnson</i> , Case No. C153154, District Court of Clark County, filed Apr. 18, 2000	12/13/2019	49	12114–12120
219. State's Motion to Disqualify the Honorable Lee Gates, <i>State of Nevada v. Johnson</i> , Case No. C153154, District Court of Clark County, filed Apr. 4, 2005	12/13/2019	49	12121–12135
220. Affidavit of the Honorable Lee A. Gates, <i>State of Nevada v. Johnson</i> , Case No. C153154, District	12/13/2019	49	12136–12138

DOCUMENT	DATE	VOLUME	PAGE(S)
Court of Clark County, filed Apr. 5, 2005			
221. Motion for a New Trial (Request for Evidentiary Hearing), <i>State of Nevada v. Johnson</i> , Case No. C153154, District Court of Clark County, filed June 23, 2000	12/13/2019	49	12139–12163
222. Juror Questionnaire of John Young, <i>State of Nevada v. Johnson</i> , Case No. C153154, District Court of Clark County, dated May 24, 2000	12/13/2019	49	16124–12186
Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Order, <i>Johnson v. Gittere, et al.</i> , Case No. A–19– 789336–W, Clark County District Court, Nevada	10/08/2021	49	12352–12357
Minute Order (denying Petitioner’s Post–Conviction Writ of Habeas Corpus, Motion for Discovery and Evidentiary Hearing), <i>Johnson v. Gittere, et al.</i> , Case No. A–19–789336–W, Clark County District Court, Nevada	05/15/2019	49	12264–12266
Minutes of Motion to Vacate Briefing Schedule and Strike Habeas Petition	07/09/2019	47	11710
Motion and Notice of Motion for Evidentiary Hearing, <i>Johnson v.</i>	12/13/2019	49	12231–12241

DOCUMENT	DATE	VOLUME	PAGE(S)
<i>Gittere, et al.</i> , Case No. A-19-789336-W, Clark County District Court, Nevada			
Motion and Notice to Conduct Discovery, <i>Johnson v. Gittere, et al.</i> , Case No. A-19-789336-W, Clark County District Court, Nevada	12/13/2019	49	12187-12196
Motion for Leave to File Under Seal and Notice of Motion	02/15/2019		11600-11602
Motion in Limine to Prohibit Any References to the First Phase as the “Guilt Phase”	11/29/1999	2	302-304
Motion to Vacate Briefing Schedule and Strike Habeas Petition, <i>Johnson v. Gittere, et al.</i> , Case No. A-19-789336-W, Clark County District Court, Nevada	05/16/2019	46-47	11609-11612
Motion to Vacate Briefing Schedule and Strike Habeas Petition, <i>Johnson v. Gittere, et al.</i> , Case No. A-19-789336-W, Clark County District Court, Nevada	05/23/2019	47	11621-11624
Motion to Withdraw Request to Strike Petition and to Withdraw Request for Petition to be Stricken as Not Properly Before the Court), <i>Johnson v. Gittere, et al.</i> , Case No. A-19-789336-	06/26/2019	47	11708-11709

DOCUMENT	DATE	VOLUME	PAGE(S)
W, Clark County District Court, Nevada			
Notice of Appeal, <i>Johnson v. Gittere, et al.</i> , Case No. A-19-789336-W, Clark County District Court, Nevada	11/10/2021	50	12366-12368
Notice of Entry of Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Order, <i>Johnson v. Gittere, et al.</i> , Case No. A-19-789336-W, Clark County District Court, Nevada	10/11/2021	49-50	12358-12364
Notice of Hearing (on Discovery Motion), <i>Johnson v. Gittere, et al.</i> , Case No. A-19-789336-W, Clark County District Court, Nevada	12/13/2019	49	12330
Notice of Objections to Proposed Order, <i>Johnson v. Gittere, et al.</i> , Case No. A-19-789336-W, Clark County District Court, Nevada	02/02/2021	49	12267-12351
Notice of Supplemental Exhibit 223, <i>Johnson v. Gittere, et al.</i> , Case No. A-19-789336-W, Clark County District Court, Nevada	02/11/2019	49	11242-12244
223. Declaration of Dayvid J. Figler, dated Feb. 10, 2020	02/11/2019	49	12245-12247
Opposition to Defendants' Motion in Limine to Prohibit	12/02/1999	2	305-306

DOCUMENT	DATE	VOLUME	PAGE(S)
Any References to the First Phase as the “Guilt Phase”			
Opposition to Motion in Limine to Preclude Evidence of Other Guns, Weapons and Ammunition Not Used in the Crime	11/04/1999	2	283–292
Opposition to Motion to Vacate Briefing Schedule and Strike Habeas Petition, <i>Johnson v. Gittere, et al.</i> , Case No. A–19–789336–W, Clark County District Court, Nevada	05/28/2019	47	11625–11628
Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus, <i>Johnson v. Gittere, et al.</i> , Case No. A–19–789336–W, Clark County District Court, Nevada	02/13/2019	24–25	5752–6129
Post–Evidentiary Hearing Supplemental Points and Authorities	06/22/2005	22	5472–5491
Reply to Opposition to Motion to Vacate Briefing Schedule and Strike Habeas Petition	06/20/2019	47	11705–11707
Reply to State’s Response to Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus	12/13/2019	47	11718–11836
State’s Response to Defendant’s Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus (Post–Conviction),	05/29/2019	47	11629–11704

DOCUMENT	DATE	VOLUME	PAGE(S)
<i>Johnson v. Gittere, et al.</i> , Case No. A–19–789336–W, Clark County District Court, Nevada			
Stipulation and Order to Modify Briefing Schedule, <i>Johnson v. Gittere, et al.</i> , Case No. A–19–789336–W, Clark County District Court, Nevada	09/30/2019	47	11711–11714
Stipulation and Order to Modify Briefing Schedule, <i>Johnson v. Gittere, et al.</i> , Case No. A–19–789336–W, Clark County District Court, Nevada	11/22/2019	47	11715–11717
Transcript of All Defendant’s Pending Motions	03/02/2000	2	416–430
Transcript of Argument to Admit Evidence of Aggravating Circumstances	05/03/2004	12	2904–2958
Transcript of Argument: Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus (All Issues Raised in the Petition and Supplement)	12/01/2011	22–23	5498–5569
Transcript of Arguments	04/28/2004	12	2870–2903
Transcript of Decision: Procedural Bar and Argument: Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus	07/20/2011	22	5492–5497
Transcript of Defendant’s Motion for Leave to File Under	02/25/2019	46	11594–11599

DOCUMENT	DATE	VOLUME	PAGE(S)
Seal, <i>Johnson v. Gittere, et al.</i> , Case No. A-19-789336-W, Clark County District Court, Nevada			
Transcript of Defendant's Motion to Reveal the Identity of Informants and Reveal Any Benefits, Deals, Promises or Inducements; Defendant's Motion to Compel Disclosure of Existence and Substance of Expectations, or Actual Receipt of Benefits or Preferential Treatment for Cooperation with Prosecution; Defendant's Motion to Compel the Production of Any and All Statements of Defendant; Defendant's Reply to Opposition to Motion in Limine to Preclude Evidence of Other Guns, Weapons, Ammunition; Defendant's Motion in Limine to Preclude Evidence of Witness Intimidation	11/18/1999	2	293-301
Transcript of Evidentiary Hearing	05/17/2004	12	2959-2989
Transcript of Evidentiary Hearing	06/14/2005	22	5396-5471
Transcript of Evidentiary Hearing	04/04/2013	23	5570-5673
Transcript of Evidentiary Hearing	04/11/2013	23	5674-5677

DOCUMENT	DATE	VOLUME	PAGE(S)
Transcript of Evidentiary Hearing	06/21/2013	23	5678–5748
Transcript of Evidentiary Hearing	09/18/2013	23–24	5749–5751
Transcript of Excerpted Testimony of Termaine Anthony Lytle	05/17/2004	12	2990–2992
Transcript of Jury Trial – Day 1 (Volume I)	06/05/2000	2–4	431–809
Transcript of Jury Trial – Day 2 (Volume II)	06/06/2000	4–5	810–1116
Transcript of Jury Trial – Day 3 (Volume III)	06/07/2000	5–7	1117–1513
Transcript of Jury Trial – Day 4 (Volume IV)	06/08/2000	7–8	1514–1770
Transcript of Jury Trial – Day 5 (Volume V)	06/09/2000	8	1771–1179
Transcript of Jury Trial – Penalty – Day 1 (Volume I) AM	04/19/2005	12–13	2993–3018
Transcript of Jury Trial – Penalty – Day 1 (Volume I) PM	4/19/2005 ¹	13	3019–3176
Transcript of Jury Trial – Penalty – Day 10 (Volume X)	05/02/2005	20–21	4791–5065

¹ This transcript was not filed with the District Court nor is it under seal.

DOCUMENT	DATE	VOLUME	PAGE(S)
Transcript of Jury Trial – Penalty – Day 10 (Volume X) – Exhibits	05/02/2005	21	5066–5069
Transcript of Jury Trial – Penalty – Day 11 (Volume XI)	05/03/2005	21–22	5070–5266
Transcript of Jury Trial – Penalty – Day 12 (Volume XII)	05/04/2005	22	5267–5379
Transcript of Jury Trial – Penalty – Day 12 (Volume XII) – Deliberations	05/04/2005	22	5380–5383
Transcript of Jury Trial – Penalty – Day 13 (Volume XIII)	05/05/2005	22	5384–5395
Transcript of Jury Trial – Penalty – Day 2 (Volume I) AM	04/20/2005	13	3177–3201
Transcript of Jury Trial – Penalty – Day 2 (Volume II) PM	04/20/2005	13–14	3202–3281
Transcript of Jury Trial – Penalty – Day 3 (Volume III) PM	04/21/2005	14–15	3349–3673
Transcript of Jury Trial – Penalty – Day 3 (Volume III–A) AM	04/21/2005	14	3282–3348
Transcript of Jury Trial – Penalty – Day 4 (Volume IV) AM – Amended Cover Page	04/22/2005	16	3790–3791
Transcript of Jury Trial – Penalty – Day 4 (Volume IV) PM	04/22/2005	15–16	3674–3789

DOCUMENT	DATE	VOLUME	PAGE(S)
Transcript of Jury Trial – Penalty – Day 4 (Volume IV–B)	04/22/2005	16	3792–3818
Transcript of Jury Trial – Penalty – Day 5 (Volume V) PM	04/25/2005	16	3859–3981
Transcript of Jury Trial – Penalty – Day 5 (Volume V–A)	04/25/2005	16	3819–3858
Transcript of Jury Trial – Penalty – Day 6 (Volume VI) PM	04/26/2005	17–18	4103–4304
Transcript of Jury Trial – Penalty – Day 6 (Volume VI–A) PM	04/26/2005	16–17	3982–4102
Transcript of Jury Trial – Penalty – Day 7 (Volume VII– PM)	04/27/2005	18	4382–4477
Transcript of Jury Trial – Penalty – Day 7 (Volume VII–A)	04/27/2005	18	4305–4381
Transcript of Jury Trial – Penalty – Day 8 (Volume VIII– C)	04/28/2005	18–19	4478–4543
Transcript of Jury Trial – Penalty – Day 9 (Volume IX)	04/29/2005	19–20	4544–4790
Transcript of Jury Trial – Penalty Phase – Day 1 (Volume I) AM	06/13/2000	8	1780–1908
Transcript of Jury Trial – Penalty Phase – Day 1 (Volume II) PM	06/13/2000	8–9	1909–2068

DOCUMENT	DATE	VOLUME	PAGE(S)
Transcript of Jury Trial – Penalty Phase – Day 2 (Volume III)	06/14/2000	9–10	2069-2379
Transcript of Jury Trial – Penalty Phase – Day 3 (Volume IV)	06/16/2000	10	2380–2470
Transcript of Material Witness Charla Severs’ Motion for Own Recognizance Release	01/18/2000	2	414–415
Transcript of Motion for a New Trial	07/13/2000	10	2471–2475
Transcript of Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus and Setting of 1. Motion for Leave and 2. Motion for Evidentiary Hearing, <i>Johnson v. Gittere, et al.</i> , Case No. A–19–789336–W, Clark County District Court, Nevada	02/13/2020	49	12249–12263
Transcript of Preliminary Hearing	10/12/1999	2	260–273
Transcript of State’s Motion to Permit DNA Testing	09/02/1999	2	252 – 254
Transcript of State’s Motion to Videotape the Deposition of Charla Severs	10/11/1999	2	255–259
Transcript of Status Check: Filing of All Motions (Defendant’s Motion to Reveal	10/21/1999	2	274–282

DOCUMENT	DATE	VOLUME	PAGE(S)
the Identity of Informants and Reveal Any Benefits, Deals, Promises or Inducements; Defendant's Motion to Compel Disclosure of Existence and Substance of Expectations, or Actual Receipt of Benefits or Preferential Treatment for Cooperation with Prosecution; Defendant's Motion to Compel the Production of Any and All Statements of Defendant; State's Motion to Videotape the Deposition of Charla Severs; Defendant's Motion in Limine to Preclude Evidence of Other Crimes; Defendant's Motion to Reveal the Identity of Informants and Reveal any Benefits, Deals' Defendant's Motion to Compel the Production of any and all Statements of the Defendant			
Transcript of the Grand Jury, <i>State v. Johnson</i> , Case No. 98C153154, Clark County District Court, Nevada	09/01/1998	1–2	001–251
Transcript of Three Judge Panel – Penalty Phase – Day 1 (Volume I)	07/24/2000	10–11	2476–2713
Transcript of Three Judge Panel – Penalty Phase – Day 2 and Verdict (Volume II)	07/26/2000	11–12	2714–2853

DOCUMENT	DATE	VOLUME	PAGE(S)
Transcript Re: Defendant's Motions	01/06/2000	2	307–413
Verdict Forms – Three Judge Panel	7/26/2000	12	2854–2869

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on May 27, 2022, I electronically filed the foregoing Appendix with the Nevada Supreme Court by using the appellate electronic filing system. The following participants in the case will be served by the electronic filing system:

Alexander G. Chen
Chief Deputy District Attorney
Clark County District Attorney's Office

/s/ Celina Moore

Celina Moore

An employee of the Federal
Public Defender's Office

THOWSEN - DIRECT

1 BY MR. GUYMON:

2 Q Now then, at the Detention Center, did you collect
3 some evidence from Donte Johnson?

4 A Yes, I did.

5 Q And when you did that, who was present?

6 A Myself and Donte Johnson.

7 Q And what evidence were you collecting at that time?

8 A It's called a buccal swab, which is a -- it's like a
9 small toothbrush made out of like a cardboard material.

10 Q And where do you get that small toothbrush made out
11 of cardboard material, to use your expression?

12 A It's located, already in a package like this, in the
13 nurse's station at the jail.

14 Q Okay. Now, is the package that you receive from the
15 nurse's station, is it sealed up?

16 A The package that you get before you seal is not
17 sealed up.

18 Q Okay. Is it sterile, to your knowledge?

19 A Yes, it is.

20 Q And how is it that you know that, or why do you say
21 that?

22 A The outer package like this is opened up by just
23 unwinding it and opening it up. Inside the portion that you
24 actually do the test with, is in a sterile sealed plastic
25 container, and there's instructions that tell you step by step

THOWSEN - DIRECT

1 how to do it, which include installing rubber gloves, removing
2 the testing material from the hermetically sealed package, and
3 having the individual that's going to give the sample take it
4 and rub it inside their cheek several times. Then they place
5 it inside a small cardboard box that's provided, and it's
6 allowed to air dry for I believe fifteen minutes. They do
7 another one on the other side, that's placed in there, and
8 after it has had time to dry the whole thing is sealed up,
9 placed in this bag here, and then evidence seal is placed on
10 it so that you know it is secure. It's then placed in the
11 refrigerator there at the jail.

12 Q All right. Now, is that the procedure you followed
13 in collecting the swab, two swabs from Donte Johnson that very
14 day of August 18th, 1998?

15 A Yes, it is.

16 Q Did the kit you actually received from the nurse's
17 station, did it -- was it sealed?

18 A Yes, it was.

19 Q Did you wear the gloves?

20 A Yes, I did.

21 Q Did you follow the procedure step by step as
22 outlined?

23 A Yes, I did.

24 Q Is that a procedure you're familiar with?

25 A I've done it many times.

III-385

THOWSEN - DIRECT

1 Q Approximately how many times?

2 A I would guess more than fifty.

3 Q Now did you actually watch Donte Johnson take the
4 first "toothbrush," if you will, and rub the side -- the
5 inside of his mouth with the toothbrush?

6 A Yes.

7 Q Did you give him direction as to how to do that and
8 what he was to do?

9 A Yes, I did.

10 Q Did he follow those directions?

11 A Yes, he did.

12 Q Did you take that toothbrush and place it there for
13 it to dry, as you indicated to the jury?

14 A Yes. What I actually do is, once I put the rubber
15 gloves on, the latex gloves on, remove it, hand it to them,
16 have them rub it in their cheek, I have them insert it into
17 the box; so I don't even touch it again after they've taken
18 the sample.

19 Q All right. So once Donte Johnson received the
20 toothbrush, did you touch the sample again at all?

21 A No.

22 Q All right. Did Donte Johnson then do it a second
23 time as requested by yourself?

24 A Yes.

25 Q And I guess that's consistent with the procedure?

III-386

THOWSEN - DIRECT

1 A Yes, it is.

2 Q Now, once Donte Johnson rubbed his, I guess the
3 inside of his cheek, the other side --

4 A That's correct.

5 Q -- with the toothbrush, the second toothbrush, what
6 did Donte Johnson do with that toothbrush?

7 A He placed it inside the cardboard container that I
8 was holding for him to insert it into.

9 Q And then what do you do with now both of these
10 containers that have the toothbrushes in them?

11 A It's actually one container with two toothbrushes,
12 and you just allow it to dry for fifteen minutes. Once it's
13 dried, you seal the entire package up in here.

14 Q All right. For those fifteen minutes that it was
15 drying, did you keep those toothbrushes in your sole care and
16 custody?

17 A Yes, I did.

18 Q Once they had dried and the fifteen minutes had
19 expired, what did you then do with that particular exhibit?

20 A I placed an evidence seal on the -- on the flap,
21 which is designed to rip if someone were to reopen the flap,
22 and then I put my initials and personnel number, as well as
23 the date.

24 Q And is your evidence seal still intact?

25 A Yes, it is.

III-387

THOWSEN - DIRECT

1 Q All right. Has this piece of evidence changed at
2 all since the last time you saw it, that is to say, since you
3 sealed it up, put it in the refrigerator, has it changed at
4 all?

5 A Yes, it has.

6 Q And how has it changed?

7 A It has an additional seal placed on the bottom,
8 indicating that it has been opened and examined. And there's
9 a place on the bottom of the form itself here, for the chain
10 of custody, and that's signed by Thomas Wahl on 9/4 of '98.

11 Q And is Thomas Wahl someone you know and are familiar
12 with?

13 A Yes.

14 Q Who is Thomas Wahl?

15 A Thomas Wahl is a criminalist that works for the Las
16 Vegas Metropolitan Police Department assigned to the DNA
17 laboratory.

18 Q Is it common, using standard operating police
19 procedures, if another person opens that particular piece of
20 evidence that they do not disturb your seal, but rather open
21 it somewhere else and put their own seal on it?

22 A That is correct.

23 Q And why is that?

24 A So that you can keep track of exactly how many times
25 the package has been opened, and by whom.

III-388

THOWSEN - DIRECT

1 Q Now once it's sealed up by yourself, you've
2 collected the evidence, dried it, sealed it, what do you do
3 with it?

4 A I retrieve a key for the refrigerator, the evidence
5 refrigerator in the nurse's station at the jail, I remove a
6 lock from that refrigerator allowing me to have access to the
7 inside, and I place the evidence inside, relock it, and return
8 the key to the desk at the nurse's station.

9 Q After locking that refrigerator and returning the
10 key, do you have any contact whatsoever with that particular
11 exhibit, in other words, those two toothbrushes and that
12 envelope?

13 A No.

14 Q All right. And what is the -- I guess the last time
15 you would've seen that -- those toothbrushes and envelope
16 would have been on August 18th then?

17 A That's correct?

18 A 1998?

19 A That is correct.

20 Q And when is the next time that you saw that
21 particular evidence envelope?

22 A When I picked it up at approximately 3:55 this
23 afternoon at the evidence vault.

24 Q And the evidence vault, I take it, is maintained by
25 the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department?

III-389

THOWSEN - CROSS

1 A Yes, it is.

2 Q Is it a secure facility, the evidence vault?

3 A Yes, it is.

4 MR. GUYMON: I'd move for the admission of State's
5 Proposed Exhibit --

6 MR. FIGLER: No objection, Your Honor.

7 THE COURT: Received.

8 MR. GUYMON: -- 194.

9 (Plaintiff's Exhibit No. 194 admitted)

10 MR. GUYMON: No other questions of this witness,
11 pass the witness.

12 MR. FIGLER: Briefly.

13 THE COURT: Any cross of this witness?

14 MR. FIGLER: Thank you, Judge.

15 CROSS-EXAMINATION

16 BY MR. FIGLER:

17 Q Good afternoon. Just a couple real quick questions.
18 The name of your partner on this particular case was?

19 A Detective James Buczek, B-U-C-Z-E-K.

20 Q Okay. And your supervisor in this case was?

21 A Sergeant Ken Hefner.

22 Q Okay. Now, Detective, during the course of your
23 investigation I think that you indicated that you share
24 information always between the three of you with regard to
25 proceeding with your investigation?

III-390

THOWSEN - CROSS

1 A We certainly make an attempt to share information,
2 yes.

3 Q And oftentimes rely on each other's information, is
4 that correct?

5 A That would be correct.

6 Q Okay. Now I notice you have two very large
7 notebooks with you. Is that related to this case?

8 A Yes. That is the case file for this particular
9 case.

10 Q And it's important for you to bring these case files
11 to court with you in case there's any questions, correct?

12 A Yes.

13 Q Gives you a frame of reference, something to look
14 at?

15 A Yes, it does.

16 Q Okay. Finally, when you went to do the swabbing, or
17 request the swabbing of this gentleman, you identified
18 yourself as a police officer, correct?

19 A Yes, that is correct.

20 Q Okay. And you described his conduct as cooperative,
21 he was cooperative and did what you told him to do?

22 A Yes, he did what I asked.

23 Q In other words, he respected your authority?

24 A In completing this test, he did.

25 Q Okay. He didn't give you any hassle, just did what

THOWSEN - CROSS

1 he was supposed to do, correct?

2 A Yes, he did.

3 Q Okay, thank you.

4 MR. FIGLER: No further questions.

5 THE COURT: Anything further?

6 MR. GUYMON: Nothing else, Your Honor.

7 THE COURT: Thank you, you're excused, Detective.

8 THE WITNESS: Thanks, Your Honor.

9 THE COURT: All right, folks, we're gonna take our
10 evening recess now. During this recess you're admonished not
11 to talk or converse among yourselves or with anyone else on
12 any subject connected with this trial; read, watch or listen
13 to any report of or commentary on the trial, or any person
14 connected with it by any medium of information, including,
15 without limitation, newspaper, television and radio; or form
16 or express any opinion on any subject connected with the trial
17 until it's finally submitted to you.

18 Tomorrow morning is one of the mornings where I have
19 a calendar of arraignments and sentencings and things like
20 that before we get to the trial, so we're going to go back to
21 the Tuesday schedule, which means if you report to Stony by no
22 later than 9:20, unless something unforeseen happens we will
23 start this trial at exactly 9:30.

24 If you're the sort of folks who likes to know what's
25 going on and what the future will bring, I expect that we will

1 have all the witnesses done at some point tomorrow morning.
2 And really the only thing that's sort of up in the air is
3 whether you're going to go and have brunch around 11:00 or
4 you're gonna go and have lunch around 12:00. And after one of
5 those two events there's going to be the instructions of the
6 Court and argument sometime around mid-day tomorrow. So
7 that's where we're at, and we'll see you tomorrow morning.
8 We're in recess. We'll make the record on that one
9 issue tomorrow.
10 MR. FIGLER: Thanks, Judge.
11 (Court recessed at 5:25 p.m. until the following day,
12 Thursday, June 8, 2000 at 9:30 a.m.)
13 * * * * *
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

INDEX

NAME	DIRECT	CROSS	REDIRECT	RECROSS	VOIR DIRE
------	--------	-------	----------	---------	--------------

PLAINTIFF'S WITNESSES

Charla Severs	2	89	118/132	127	
Bryan C. Johnson	133	151	168/175	173/175	
Shawn Fletcher	176	227	232/235	234/236	
Bradley Grover	238	252	256	--	
Dr. Robert Bucklin	256	295	312	314	
Robert Honea	316	326	328	--	
Ken Hefner	329	353	358/360	359	
Marc Washington	363	376	--	--	
Thomas Thowsen	379	390	--	--	

DEFENDANT'S WITNESSES

None

EXHIBITS

DESCRIPTION	ADMITTED
-------------	----------

PLAINTIFF'S EXHIBITS

20	Crime Scene Photograph	189
74-76	Crime Scene Photograph	209
79-82	Crime Scene Photograph	211
86	Crime Scene Photograph	211
89-95	Crime Scene Photograph	211
96-97	Cigar Box Photograph	208
105	Photograph of Everman home	342
106	Photograph of Everman home	342
113	Autopsy photos of Talamantez	287
114	Autopsy photos of Talamantez	287
116	Autopsy photos of Talamantez	287
120	Autopsy photos of Talamantez	287
125	Autopsy photos of Talamantez	287
127	Autopsy photos of Mowen	280
130	Autopsy photos of Mowen	280
134	Autopsy photos of Mowen	280
135-137	Autopsy photos of Biddle	265
145-146	Autopsy photos of Biddle	265

(Continued)

III-394

EXHIBITS

<u>DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>ADMITTED</u>
--------------------	-----------------

PLAINTIFF'S EXHIBITS

147-148	Autopsy photos of Gorringe	274
151	Autopsy photos of Gorringe	274
153-153A	VCR taken from crime scene	366
154-154A-D	Hotel keys and pager	371
155-155A	Duct tape	369
156	Cartridge cases, fragments	224
157-157A	Duffel bag	367
162	Crime Scene Diagram	219
168C	.22 Rifle	375
180	Photograph	10
182	Photographs of cigarette butts	196
183	Cigarette Butts	200
185	Letter from Charla Severs to District Attorney's Office	80
186	Letter from Charla Severs to Channel 8 News	84
187	Beaudette's stipulation	237
188	Latent fingerprint card	250
189	Sawed off rifle	325
190	Consent to search card signed by Tod Armstrong	338
191	Black Calvin Klein jeans	372
194	Toothbrush swab of Donte Johnson's	390

DEFENDANT'S EXHIBITS

None

CERTIFICATION

I (WE) CERTIFY THAT THE FOREGOING IS A CORRECT TRANSCRIPT FROM
THE ELECTRONIC SOUND RECORDING OF THE PROCEEDINGS IN THE
ABOVE-ENTITLED MATTER.

NORTHWEST TRANSCRIPTS, INC.
LAS VEGAS DIVISION
P.O. BOX 35257
LAS VEGAS, NEVADA 89133-5257
(702) 658-9626

GAYLE MARTIN-LUTZ
FEDERALLY CERTIFIED OWNER

Beverly Siquenik
MANAGER

Beverly Siquenik
SIGNATURE OF TRANSCRIBER

6/8/00
DATE

ORIGINAL

293

ORIGINAL

FILED IN OPEN COURT
JUN 12 2000 20

DISTRICT COURT
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA
* * * * *
SHIRLEY B. PARRAGUIRRE, CLERK
BY *Carole D'Aloia*
CAROLE D'ALOIA DEPUTY

STATE OF NEVADA

Plaintiff

vs.

DONTE JOHNSON,
aka John Lee White

Defendant

CASE NO. C153154

DEPT. V
DOCKET "H"

Transcript of
Proceedings

BEFORE THE HONORABLE JEFFREY D. SOBEL, DISTRICT COURT JUDGE

JURY TRIAL - DAY 4
THURSDAY, JUNE 8, 2000
VOLUME IV

APPEARANCES:

FOR THE PLAINTIFF:

GARY L. GUYMON
Chief Deputy District Attorney
ROBERT J. DASKAS
Deputy District Attorney

FOR THE DEFENDANT:

DAYVID J. FIGLER
Deputy Special Public Defender
JOSEPH S. SCISCENTO

COURT REPORTER:

SHIRLEE PRAWALSKY
District Court

TRANSCRIPTION BY:

NORTHWEST TRANSCRIPTS, INC.
Las Vegas Division
P.O. Box 35257
Las Vegas, Nevada 89133-5257
(702) 658-9626

Proceedings recorded by electronic sound recording, transcript
produced by transcription service.

CE

CE45

AA01514

1 LAS VEGAS, NEVADA, THURSDAY, JUNE 10, 2000, 8:40 A.M.

2 (Jury is present)

3 THE COURT: All right, call your first witness,
4 Robert.

5 MR. DASKAS: Ed Guenther.

6 THE CLERK: Please remain standing and raise your
7 right hand.

8 EDWARD GUENTHER, PLAINTIFF'S WITNESS, IS SWORN

9 THE CLERK: Please state your full name and spell
10 your last name for the record.

11 THE WITNESS: My name is Edward Guenther. It's
12 spelled G-U-E-N-T-H-E-R.

13 DIRECT EXAMINATION

14 BY MR. DASKAS:

15 Q Mr. Guenther, can you tell me where it is that
16 you're employed?

17 A Yes, I'm employed with the Las Vegas Metropolitan
18 Police Department. I'm assigned to the Crime Laboratory and I
19 work in the Latent Print Detail.

20 Q What's your actual job title?

21 A I'm a latent print examiner.

22 Q Okay. And how long have you been a latent print
23 examiner with Metro?

24 A With Metro I have been a latent print examiner for a
25 little over two years now.

GUENTHER - DIRECT

1 Q Prior to your employment with Metro, did you also
2 work in the field of latent fingerprint examination?

3 A Yes, I did.

4 Q For whom and for how long?

5 A Well, my training in fingerprinting began back in
6 1975. I was employed by the Federal Bureau of Investigation
7 in Washington, D.C. That is where I underwent my basic
8 training in classifying, searching and identifying of
9 fingerprints.

10 In 1977 I entered into a training program with the
11 State of Ohio for a latent fingerprint examiner. I completed
12 that training program and I did case work in Ohio for three
13 years and then, in 1980, took a job with the Florida
14 Department of Law Enforcement in Tampa, Florida and I worked
15 there for the next 18 years on the bench as a latent
16 fingerprint analyst until taking my job with Metro in 1998.

17 Q In total, then, how long have you been employed in
18 the area of fingerprint examination?

19 A 25 years in fingerprint examination, 23 as a latent
20 fingerprint examiner.

21 Q What exactly are your duties and responsibilities
22 now with Metro as a latent print examiner?

23 A My duties are to process evidence that comes into
24 the laboratory for the presence of latent fingerprints and
25 also to make examinations of latent lift cards that are

GUENTHER - DIRECT

1 submitted to our laboratory through our Crime Scene Detail and
2 to make comparisons with those items with the known finger,
3 palm and sole prints of individuals that are submitted into
4 the laboratory for the purposes of comparison and trying to
5 make identifications.

6 Q Can you tell me just a little bit about your
7 training that qualifies you to perform the work that you do
8 with Metro as a fingerprint examiner?

9 A Well, what I reviewed there is the -- Well, mostly
10 my experience, my 23 years of experience, and I periodically
11 keep up with going to classes. I'm a member of the
12 International Association for Identification. I'm a certified
13 latent fingerprint examiner through that organization.

14 And so those are some of the other qualifications I
15 have, plus I've probably examined hundreds of thousands of
16 fingerprints over the last 23 years in the latent fingerprint
17 area.

18 Q You mentioned that prior to your employment with
19 Metro you actually worked for the FBI at some point?

20 A Yes, I did.

21 Q Have you previously testified as an expert in courts
22 of law regarding fingerprint comparison and examination?

23 A Yes, I have.

24 Q How many times?

25 A Well over a hundred times.

IV-4

AA01517

GUENTHER - DIRECT

1 Q Have you ever qualified as an expert in the Eighth
2 Judicial District Court here in Las Vegas, Nevada?

3 A Yes, I have.

4 Q As a fingerprint expert?

5 A Yes, I have.

6 MR. DASKAS: Judge, I would proffer Mr. Guenther's
7 testimony as an expert in the area of fingerprint examination.

8 THE COURT: Any --

9 MR. FIGLER: Submitted, Your Honor.

10 THE COURT: He'll be found to be an expert.

11 As I indicated with reference to Dr. Bucklin, all
12 that means is that he can give his testimony, as most lay
13 witnesses cannot, in the form of opinions. And as you'll be
14 instructed later on today, what weight you give his opinion is
15 up to you.

16 Go ahead, Mr. Daskas.

17 MR. DASKAS: Thank you, Judge.

18 BY MR. DASKAS:

19 Q Mr. Guenther, let me have you define some terms and
20 explain the processes that you employ in your examinations.
21 First of all, what is a fingerprint?

22 A Well, in a fingerprint -- Well, we have two types
23 of, when we talk about fingerprints, we have what we call an
24 inked fingerprint and we have a latent fingerprint. An inked
25 fingerprint is the standard that is taken from an individual.

GUENTHER - DIRECT

1 And I guess the easiest way to explain it is that the finger -
2 - the skin on your hands and your feet is obviously different
3 than any other skin on your body. It's not smooth. It's
4 raised into rows, which we call ridges, and when a thin film
5 of ink is applied over those ridges and they are rolled onto a
6 receiving medium, which is normally a fingerprint card, an
7 exact replica of those -- of that detail is left upon that
8 card. This is what we call an inked fingerprint.

9 Q Is that, and I apologize for interrupting, is that
10 also known sometimes as an exemplar?

11 A Yes, sir.

12 Q All right.

13 A Yes, it is.

14 A latent fingerprint -- The ridges I just described
15 to you are at the tips of -- or at the tops of every ridge are
16 pores and, obviously, we all know that our body is constantly
17 excreting perspiration and other chemicals and, when the hand
18 or foot comes into contact with a surface, a deposit of that
19 material is going to be left on the surface and then it's our
20 job, as either crime scene analysts or fingerprint examiners,
21 to employ various methods and techniques to try to develop and
22 enhance those latent fingerprints so that we can use them to
23 make comparisons with those exemplars that come into the
24 laboratory setting.

25 Q What factors or variables would determine whether

GUENTHER - DIRECT

1 somebody actually leaves a print on any particular object?

2 A Well, there are numerous factors that have -- play
3 into whether a fingerprint will actually be left on a surface.
4 The primary one, in my opinion, is pressure. If there's too
5 much pressure put down on a surface, instead of getting nice
6 ridge detail what you end up with is a big blob, a smear.

7 The other would be environmental factors, whether --
8 how long a latent print, once it's placed down, is exposed to
9 wind, moisture, rain, you know, rain or any kind of
10 environmental factor that you can think of.

11 The substrate that's touched, generally speaking,
12 the smoother a surface is the better it is for leaving a
13 latent print behind that can be identified.

14 The skin condition of the individual who's touching
15 it, some people just simply perspire more than others or they
16 have skin conditions that maybe they don't -- do or don't
17 leave latents behind.

18 And time is also a factor. From the moment a latent
19 is put down on a surface, eventually it will reach the point
20 where it's not able to be developed and utilized for
21 comparison purposes.

22 Q Do any two individuals have the same fingerprints?

23 A No.

24 Q What about identical twins?

25 A No.

GUENTHER - DIRECT

1 Q Can you explain how is it that you actually compare
2 fingerprints and then make identifications?

3 A Yes. Well, the first process of making a comparison
4 is the analytical portion where a latent -- we have a lift or
5 we have a photograph, whatever means we have that that latent
6 was recorded, and the analyst has to first make a
7 determination of whether that latent is actually of what we
8 call comparison value. That means does it have enough of what
9 we call characteristics to make it unique and to individualize
10 it to a particular individual.

11 And not all latent prints make the cut. A lot of
12 times latent lifts are made at crime scenes and the ridge
13 detail that's left is of insufficient quality or quantity to
14 make a comparison with any individual.

15 So once we've gone through that process and
16 determined that particular latent lifts do, in fact, have
17 value for comparison, we then introduce the exemplar into the
18 -- or the standard into the process and from there we look for
19 a grouping of these individual characteristics on the latent
20 fingerprint and try to locate the same grouping of individual
21 characteristics on the inked fingerprint.

22 And this is the process that we go through. And
23 when, in the examiner's mind, they have found a sufficient
24 number of corresponding points between this latent fingerprint
25 and the inked fingerprint, they're able to make an

GUENTHER - DIRECT

1 identification and make a positive statement about that latent
2 print as it relates to that particular standard.

3 Q What value then would a fingerprint comparison or
4 identification have in a criminal case?

5 A Well, it will establish, if you are able to make an
6 identification, it will establish a positive identity, that a
7 particular latent print was left at a crime scene or on a
8 particular item, whatever the situation surrounding that
9 particular latent print may be.

10 Q With what percent of accuracy does a fingerprint
11 ascertain somebody's identification?

12 A 100 percent.

13 Q All right. You were called upon in this particular
14 case to make some comparisons, is that correct?

15 A Yes, sir.

16 Q All right. And do you know who in this
17 investigation called upon you to begin your work in the area
18 of fingerprint examination?

19 A Detective Jim Buczek was the detective in charge of
20 this case. He made a submittal into the laboratory for we in
21 the Latent Print Detail to make a processing of exhibits that
22 were collected at the crime scene and also to make a
23 comparison of latent lifts that were made by the crime scene
24 analysts at the crime scene.

25 Q Detective Buczek is a homicide detective, is that

GUENTHER - DIRECT

1 true?

2 A Yes, sir.

3 Q All right. And is that standard protocol, for the
4 detective assigned to the case to request fingerprint
5 examiners to perform comparisons?

6 A Yes, it is.

7 Q Once you receive a request to perform a comparison,
8 what steps do you take?

9 A Well, once we receive a request, by this time
10 normally we have gathered up the latent lifts from the Crime
11 Scene Detail and have them secured and stored in the Latent
12 Print Detail. The next step then is to contact our evidence
13 vault and to have the evidence brought up into the laboratory
14 from the vault.

15 From there an inventorying of all of the evidence is
16 done so that we correspond, that we do exactly have what the
17 detective has asked us to look at, and from there we enter
18 into the examination process of actually processing the
19 evidence or, as I explained earlier, evaluating the latent
20 lifts.

21 Q Once you received a request from Detective Buczek in
22 this case, did you also then subsequently receive latent
23 fingerprint cards?

24 A Latent fingerprint cards?

25 Q Yes.

GUENTHER - DIRECT

1 A Yes. Those were the -- Those would have been
2 gathered together in the latent -- in the Crime Scene Detail
3 and then we have a policy and procedure in place where we, as
4 the latent print examiners, go over to their area and remove
5 them from a locked box and bring them over to our area in the
6 Latent Print Detail.

7 Q There's been some testimony thus far from crime
8 scene analysts who testified that they lifted prints from
9 items and placed those prints onto latent fingerprint cards.
10 Is that what you retrieved from the evidence vault in this
11 case?

12 A Yes.

13 Q I don't think we've defined the term latent print.
14 Can you define the term latent print?

15 A Yes. I explained that it's a deposit left on a
16 surface.

17 Q You mentioned the term exemplars or standards of
18 individuals. Did you receive exemplars or known fingerprints
19 of individuals in this investigation?

20 A Yes, I did.

21 Q Can you tell me the names of the individuals you
22 received known prints from?

23 A Yes, I can. In this case I was asked to examine the
24 latent prints from the case with these following individuals;
25 John L. White, also known as Donte Johnson, Terrell Young,

GUENTHER - DIRECT

1 Sikia Smith, Jeffrey Biddle, Tracey Gorringe, Matthew Mowen,
2 Peter Talamantez, Nicholas Gorringe, Joseph Haphes [phonetic]
3 and Tod Alan Armstrong.

4 Q All right. Now those individuals you just
5 mentioned, you received their known fingerprints, is that
6 true?

7 A Yes, finger and palm -- and in some instances their
8 known palm prints also.

9 Q So, for example, these individuals may have applied
10 for a work card at some point and rolled their prints onto a
11 card, much like, I'm sure, many of us have done?

12 A Yes.

13 Q All right, let me show you, -- and I've shown
14 defense counsel, Judge, what's been marked as State's Proposed
15 Exhibits 197 and 198 and I'll ask you if you recognize those
16 two documents.

17 A Yes, I do. It has my identifying initials and our
18 laboratory number at the bottom and I recognize them as
19 certified copies of fingerprint standards that I made in our
20 laboratory from the original cards.

21 Q Is there a name associated with those known
22 fingerprints and palm prints?

23 A Yes.

24 Q What name is associated with those known
25 fingerprints and palm prints?

GUENTHER - DIRECT

1 A The name on the top of each card, 197 and 198, says
2 John L. White or John Lee White.

3 Q You mentioned those are certified copies?

4 A Yes.

5 Q All right, does that mean that these are true and
6 correct copies of the actual fingerprints that were rolled
7 onto those forms?

8 A Yes.

9 Q Are those in the same condition as when you
10 retrieved them -- On what did you retrieve those?

11 A Well, I made the actual certified copy back in 1998,
12 September 11th, and from that time they have been in my case
13 file, which is secured in the laboratory setting.

14 MR. DASKAS: I'd move for the admission of 197 and
15 198, Judge.

16 MR. FIGLER: Submitted, Your Honor.

17 THE COURT: Admitted.

18 (Plaintiff's Exhibit Nos. 197, 198 admitted)

19 MR. DASKAS: Thank you, Judge.

20 BY MR. DASKAS:

21 Q Now did you also receive the known fingerprints and
22 palm prints of somebody named Sikia Smith?

23 A Yes, I did.

24 Q Let me hand you, and I've shown defense counsel,
25 what's been marked as State's Proposed Exhibit 172 and I'll

GUENTHER - DIRECT

1 ask if you recognize that.

2 A Yes, I do recognize State's Exhibit 172. Once
3 again, my initials and our laboratory case number is located
4 in the corner of the exhibit.

5 Q Is that also a certified copy and was that in your
6 sole care, custody and control from the time you retrieved it
7 until today?

8 A Yes, it would have been handled exactly the same as
9 State's Exhibits 197 and 198 would have been.

10 MR. DASKAS: Judge, I'd move for the admission of
11 172.

12 MR. FIGLER: Submitted.

13 THE COURT: Admitted.

14 (Plaintiff's Exhibit No. 172 admitted)

15 BY MR. DASKAS:

16 Q Now are you also familiar with the process of
17 lifting or developing latent prints?

18 A Yes, sir.

19 Q All right. In addition to your training to compare
20 fingerprints, have you received training to lift or develop
21 fingerprints?

22 A Yes. Training in the processing of evidence is
23 standard training for all latent fingerprint -- well, I
24 shouldn't -- almost all latent fingerprint examiners, is to
25 learn the techniques and the processes to develop latent

GUENTHER - DIRECT

1 fingerprints within the laboratory setting, much the same as
2 what happened at a crime scene. We employ the same techniques
3 in the laboratory and sometimes we employ some additional
4 techniques that are better utilized in a laboratory setting
5 than they are in a field situation.

6 Q In this particular case did you also develop or
7 recover some latent prints?

8 A Yes, I did.

9 Q And can you describe the item from which you
10 developed those prints?

11 A Yes. One of the items that I was asked to examine
12 was a VCR, an RCA VCR cassette deck, and I did, in fact, call
13 that particular item up from the vault, as I described
14 earlier, and I did process that item in the laboratory and I
15 did develop a particular latent palm print on that -- on that
16 VCR.

17 Q You mentioned that you developed a palm print from
18 the VCR?

19 A Yes.

20 Q And do any two individuals have the same palm
21 prints?

22 A No. All of the ridge detail on your hands and feet
23 is unique to you and you alone, so it's not just your
24 fingerprints. It's your palms, the joint areas of your
25 fingers and the ridge detail on your feet.

GUENTHER - DIRECT

1 Q Mr. Guenther, let me hand you what's previously been
2 admitted as State's Exhibit 153A and I will ask if you
3 recognize that particular item.

4 A Yes, I do. I recognize it as the VCR that I did, in
5 fact, process back in 1998. It has my initials and our
6 laboratory case number on the front.

7 Q In fact, is there something on that VCR that is
8 State's 153A that indicates to you you did develop --

9 A Oh.

10 Q -- latents from that item?

11 A Yes. On the back underneath side of the VCR there's
12 an area that has a piece of tape over it and this indicates
13 the area where I actually processed -- where I processed and
14 then did notice a latent palm print. And so my normal
15 procedure is once I recognize that area I make a lift of it, I
16 place a piece of tape over that area to cover it so that I
17 can, well, show later on where, in fact, I did make a
18 particular latent lift from.

19 Q Now if you can hold up for the jury --

20 A Yes, sir.

21 Q -- the bottom of the VCR, I see what appears to be a
22 piece of tape with the numbers or letters E5891G, is that
23 correct?

24 A Yes.

25 Q And there's a date of August 22nd, 1998?

GUENTHER - DIRECT

1 A Yes.

2 Q Does that suggest to you that's the date you lifted
3 the print from this VCR?

4 A Yes.

5 Q The E and the G, does that stand for Ed Guenther?

6 A Yes.

7 Q All right. And perhaps you mentioned it, but can
8 you tell me briefly how it was -- the process you used to
9 actually develop that print?

10 A Okay. Well, in this particular instance, as in all
11 instances, we first do what we call a visual examination,
12 'cause sometimes you can actually see a latent fingerprint on
13 an item just with a visual, with a strong light passing across
14 it. In this particular instance I was not able to do that
15 with a visual exam, so I introduced what we call the super
16 glue technique to this surface. And what happens in that
17 technique is the item is actually placed into a sealed chamber
18 and --

19 THE COURT: Sir, we heard that from another witness.
20 Will you move on to a new area?

21 MR. DASKAS: Yes, Judge. I apologize.

22 THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.

23 BY MR. DASKAS:

24 Q After applying the super glue and developing the
25 print through that process, did you then memorialize the print

GUENTHER - DIRECT

1 that you lifted in some particular fashion?

2 A Yes, I powdered -- I then powdered the area once I
3 noticed -- saw the ridge detail and then I made a lift of that
4 area to preserve the image that was on the VCR.

5 Q Was the lift then placed onto a fingerprint card?

6 A Yes.

7 Q And let me hand you what's been marked and shown to
8 defense counsel as State's Proposed Exhibit 171 and ask you if
9 you recognize 171.

10 A Yes, I recognize State's Exhibit 171. Once again I
11 have -- my initials are on this particular lift, the date I
12 made the lift and our laboratory event number.

13 Q Now is 171 the actual palm print that you lifted
14 from the VCR, 153A, and then placed onto the fingerprint card?

15 A Yes, onto the latent print -- onto the latent lift
16 card, yes, it is.

17 Q And is it in the same condition today as when you
18 lifted it and placed the print onto the card?

19 A Yes.

20 MR. DASKAS: I'd move for the admission of 171,
21 Judge.

22 MR. FIGLER: Submitted.

23 THE COURT: Admitted.

24 (Plaintiff's Exhibit No. 171 admitted)

25 (Pause in the proceedings)

GUENTHER - DIRECT

1 BY MR. DASKAS:

2 Q Now, Mr. Guenther, did you then take the print that
3 you lifted from the VCR and compare that print to the known
4 prints of a particular individual?

5 A Yes, I did.

6 Q And to whom did you compare the print from the VCR?

7 A Well, I began comparing it with all of the
8 individuals, but when I reached one particular individual I
9 stopped, because at that point I made an identification with
10 this individual.

11 Q And who is the individual that you identified as
12 having left the palm print on the VCR?

13 A I identified the palm print from the VCR as the
14 right palm print of Sikia Smith.

15 Q And with what percent of accuracy did you identify
16 Sikia Smith as having left the palm print on the VCR?

17 A 100 percent.

18 Q Can you just briefly or quickly hold the VCR in the
19 fashion that Sikia would have held the VCR to leave the palm
20 print that he left, so the jury can understand it.

21 A Well, on the card I normally -- When you receive the
22 card you'll see that there's a line on the bottom of it and I
23 mark on the bottom of it what I think is the direction of the
24 print on a particular item and that helps me in orienting the
25 latent print when I make a comparison.

GUENTHER - DIRECT

1 And also, when you get this, you'll see that there's
2 a large circle right here in the latent lift card and you'll
3 be able to locate and place that on the actual bottom of the
4 VCR, which will show that the palm print would have been in
5 this fashion, like this, on the back side of the VCR.

6 Q So it's possible that Sikia Smith would have held
7 that VCR upright with his right hand on the bottom of the VCR?

8 A Yes, or in any number of other combinations.

9 Q All right.

10 A But this would certainly be one possibility.

11 Q After you identified Sikia Smith as having made that
12 palm print, did somebody else in the Metro Crime Lab confirm
13 or verify your results?

14 A Yes.

15 Q And is it common practice, in the Crime Lab at
16 Metro, to have somebody else confirm or verify another
17 fingerprint examiner's results?

18 A Yes.

19 Q And who --

20 A All --

21 Q I apologize.

22 A Yeah, all identifications in our laboratory system
23 are verified by a second person.

24 Q And who in this case, that is involving Sikia
25 Smith's palm print, verified your results?

GUENTHER - DIRECT

1 A They were verified by Joe Geller.

2 Q And Joe Geller, I assume, is also a fingerprint
3 examiner with Metro?

4 A Yes.

5 Q Do you know how many years of experience Joe Geller
6 has?

7 A Over 20.

8 Q All right, combined some 45 years of experience
9 between you and Mr. Geller?

10 A Yes.

11 Q And did he reach the same results as you?

12 A Yes.

13 Q You made other comparisons in this case, is that
14 correct?

15 A Yes, I did.

16 Q All right. Now in this particular print involving
17 Sikia Smith, you developed the latent print yourself?

18 A Yes, I did.

19 Q Did you ever also make comparisons with latent
20 prints that other crime scene analysts developed?

21 A Yes, I did.

22 Q All right, let me hand you what's been marked as
23 State's -- marked and admitted as State's Exhibit 188 and its
24 content and ask you if you recognize this item.

25 A Yes, I do. I recognize it as a latent -- one of the

GUENTHER - DIRECT

1 latent lift cards that came into the Latent Print Detail's
2 possession. My initials and the latent lift number are on the
3 card, as is our Metro event number.

4 Q All right. Can you tell me who it was that lifted
5 or developed that print?

6 A Yes. It would have been lifted by CSA Grover.

7 Q All right. And that's associated with this
8 quadruple homicide case, correct?

9 A Yes.

10 Q Let me also hand you what's been marked and admitted
11 as State's Exhibit 96 and 97 and ask you if you recognize
12 these photographs.

13 A Well, not directly, sir. No, I do not, because I
14 never actually saw the cigar pack in the laboratory setting.

15 Q Right, but, at the very least, do you recognize that
16 there's something in the photos to indicate to you that a
17 latent print was lifted from that cigar box?

18 A Oh, yes, sir. There is a piece of tape, which
19 appears to me to be fingerprint tape, that is placed on this
20 Middleton cigar box.

21 Q In fact, is there also something on the latent print
22 card itself to suggest that that print was developed from a
23 Black and Mild Middleton cigar box?

24 A Well, I'm just assuming that the individual who took
25 the photograph or who placed the tape on there is the same and

GUENTHER - DIRECT

1 then lifted the latent from this cigar box and placed it onto
2 the latent lift card.

3 Q Is there anything unusual about a fingerprint
4 examiner, such as yourself, comparing latent prints developed
5 by some other person?

6 A No. That's probably the norm more than the
7 exception.

8 Q Okay. Now did you compare the latent fingerprint
9 card lifted from the Black and Mild cigar box with a known
10 individual's prints?

11 A Yes, I did.

12 Q And who did you compare those prints with?

13 A Once again, I compared the latent from the cigar box
14 with the individuals that were submitted to me and I stopped
15 once again at a particular individual because I had made an
16 identification with that particular individual.

17 Q What's the name of the individual that you
18 identified as having left the fingerprint on the Black and
19 Mild Middleton cigar box?

20 A I identified the latent from the Black and Mild
21 cigar box as the right thumb of Donte Johnson.

22 Q And is Donte Johnson also known as John Lee White?

23 A Yes.

24 Q In fact, on the exemplars or known prints of John
25 Lee White that you have up at the witness stand, does a

GUENTHER - DIRECT

1 signature appear on there and specifically the signature of
2 John White?

3 A Yes, sir, on both cards -- or on both certified
4 copies, 197 and 198, they both have the signature of John
5 White or John Lee White.

6 Q With what percent of accuracy can you tell us that
7 John Lee White, also known as Donte Johnson, left a
8 fingerprint on that Black and Mild cigar box?

9 A 100 percent.

10 Q What instrumentality did you use to make the visual
11 comparison in this case involving the latent print card from
12 the Black and Mild cigar box?

13 A Well, normally we just utilize a simple magnifying
14 glass and it's just a simple five-power magnification
15 apparatus that we place over -- Usually we employ two, one
16 that we place over the latent fingerprint and one that we use
17 and place over the inked fingerprint or the known standard.

18 Q Is that common practice in your profession among
19 your peers?

20 A Yes.

21 Q Now you mentioned previously that you had somebody
22 verify or confirm your results involving Sikia Smith. Did you
23 do that involving the cigar box as well?

24 A Yes, I did.

25 Q And who confirmed or verified your results?

GUENTHER - DIRECT

1 A Once again Mr. Joe Geller.

2 Q So again, between the two of you, some 45 years of
3 experience?

4 A Yes.

5 Q And you both identified John Lee White as having
6 left the print on the cigar box?

7 A Yes, we did.

8 Q If you could, if it would assist the jury, can you
9 take the photograph of the cigar box, along with the latent
10 print that was lifted from it, and describe to the jury how
11 that print could have been placed on the cigar box, if you
12 can.

13 A Well, once again, as I did on the palm print, I
14 always orient my latent prints and in this case, with a
15 fingerprint, I make this little half circle over the top of
16 the latent print to once again orient me to -- for the
17 positioning and in this instance the print would be in this
18 fashion, oriented as the right thumb. And judging by the
19 photographs that are in my possession here, the thumb would
20 either have to have been placed --

21 MR. DASKAS: And with the Court's permission, could
22 he --

23 THE WITNESS: May I step down, Your Honor?

24 It would either have to have been placed in this
25 fashion on the cigar box or, of course, the other possibility

GUENTHER - CROSS

1 is that the hand came across the cigar box in the other
2 direction and then the thumb would be across the box in this
3 direction.

4 MR. DASKAS: Okay. Judge, may I publish?

5 THE COURT: Yes.

6 MR. DASKAS: Thank you.

7 BY MR. DASKAS:

8 Q Mr. Guenther, is there any way for an expert such as
9 yourself to determine when a particular print was left on an
10 object?

11 A No.

12 MR. DASKAS: I'll pass the witness, Judge.

13 THE COURT: Thank you.

14 MR. FIGLER: The Court's indulgence.

15 (Pause in the proceedings)

16 MR. FIGLER: Your Honor, actually, I think I need
17 the photographs that are being published to the jury, so would
18 you like me to gather those now or wait until this jury has
19 had a chance to see all of them?

20 THE COURT: I'd wait a minute or two.

21 MR. FIGLER: That's fine.

22 (Pause in the proceedings)

23 CROSS-EXAMINATION

24 BY MR. FIGLER:

25 Q Good morning, Mr. Guenther.

GUENTHER - CROSS

1 A Good morning.

2 Q Now I want to ask you some general questions first
3 and then will specifically ask about this case.

4 The process in fingerprint analysis is to, well,
5 essentially gather as many latent prints as possible for later
6 comparison, is that correct?

7 A Yes.

8 Q And when we use that expression, "latent prints,"
9 that can cover -- that covers all three things that you talked
10 about. The fingerprint, right?

11 A Well, it --

12 Q Well, a fingerprint is a latent print or can be a
13 latent print?

14 A Well, in the jargon of the -- A latent print is not
15 an inked -- There's a distinction between an inked fingerprint
16 and a latent fingerprint.

17 Q Okay.

18 A A latent fingerprint coming from something from a
19 crime scene and an inked fingerprint being the exemplar.

20 Q Okay, let's just use the expression then, just to
21 clear it up, and I'm glad I'm doing this, latent print. If a
22 latent print has been recovered, that could be a fingerprint,
23 correct?

24 A Yes.

25 Q And that could be a palm print?

GUENTHER - CROSS

1 A Yes.

2 Q And it could even be a sole print from the bottom of
3 someone's foot, correct?

4 A Yes.

5 Q Okay, so all those are captured when you're talking
6 about -- or those type of things are captured when you're
7 talking about latent prints, correct?

8 A Yes.

9 Q Okay. And you additionally stated, and I think the
10 prosecutor asked you, that there's no way to tell the length
11 of time that a print existed, correct?

12 A No, there's not.

13 Q Now there's also a distinction between permanent
14 structured prints and transitory item prints, isn't that
15 correct?

16 A I'm not familiar with that term. Maybe I understand
17 it as a --

18 Q Well, maybe if I give you an example.

19 A Yes, sir.

20 Q If I walk up to the bench here by the Judge and I
21 put my hands on this item, --

22 A Yes.

23 Q -- there is a possibility that my fingerprints may
24 be left, correct?

25 A Yes, sir.

GUENTHER - CROSS

1 Q Okay. No, if you were to recover those fingerprints
2 off the Judge's bench, there's a pretty good inference there
3 that I was actually the one standing at this bench putting my
4 prints on it, correct?

5 A Yes.

6 Q Okay. Now I used an example before with someone
7 else about a cup. If I put my hand on a cup, it may or may
8 not leave prints on the cup, correct?

9 A Correct.

10 Q And then if somebody were to then take that cup and
11 go into any number of places, then that doesn't necessarily
12 mean that I'm where the cup was found, correct?

13 A No.

14 Q Okay. Now do you still have the VCR up there with
15 you?

16 A Yes, sir, I do.

17 Q Now the VCR had a print on it, right, that you
18 found, a palm print?

19 A Yes, sir.

20 Q Okay. Now it doesn't surprise you that there was
21 testimony that that VCR was in three or four different
22 locations, isn't that correct? It doesn't surprise you, that
23 type of testimony?

24 A Well, I'm not -- I don't know.

25 Q It's possible?

GUENTHER - CROSS

1 A It certainly is, sir.

2 Q It's possible that that was in a hundred different
3 places, correct?

4 A It may well have been, sir.

5 Q Changed hands, that sort of thing?

6 A It certainly could have.

7 Q Now let me ask you about this particular case. When
8 you received information to test, you received about a hundred
9 latent lifts?

10 A Yes, I did.

11 Q And those came from a number of different examiners,
12 correct?

13 A Yes, they came from numerous crime scene analysts.

14 Q Grover, Horn, Fletcher, O'Donnell, Perkins, does
15 that seem right to you?

16 A Yes. Just let me check my report here just to make
17 sure.

18 Q Sure.

19 A Yes, those are some of the names that I have listed
20 on my report.

21 Q And, in fact, you then also received items that were
22 recovered from different locations and you did your own
23 fingerprint analysis on those things, correct?

24 A Yes.

25 Q And retrieved and recovered latent prints off of

GUENTHER - CROSS

1 those items as well?

2 A Yes, on this VCR, yes.

3 Q Okay, now you also received exemplars. Is that the
4 word that we used?

5 A Yes.

6 Q So those are the known finger or palm prints of
7 individuals, correct?

8 A Yes.

9 Q And you went down the list, and I won't make you do
10 it again, of all the people that you received known
11 fingerprints to compare, correct?

12 A Yes.

13 Q Now is the list that you told us when the prosecutor
14 asked you, is that the complete list? In other words, was
15 there anyone else that you received besides the people who you
16 just listed?

17 A I do not think -- No.

18 Q Okay. So you never received the fingerprint of an
19 individual named Ace Hart to compare?

20 A No.

21 Q And you never received the fingerprint of an
22 individual named Bryan Johnson to compare?

23 A No.

24 Q And you never received the fingerprints of an
25 individual named Charla Severs to compare?

GUENTHER - CROSS

1 A No.

2 Q And out of those hundred or so prints that were
3 presented to you, you were only able to -- well, there were
4 some that -- or, in fact, there were numerous that you weren't
5 able to match up, isn't that correct?

6 A Yes.

7 Q And these were from items taken from the Terra Linda
8 residence?

9 A Yes, sir.

10 Q Now there was a time when you actually did this
11 examination?

12 A Yes.

13 Q And that date was?

14 A Well, it would have been approximately between
15 August 15th and the 22nd. I'd have to see the card again to
16 see the exact date that I made the identification.

17 Q This card here?

18 A Yes, 'cause it will have the date that the
19 identification was actually made on it.

20 August 22nd, 1998.

21 Q Okay. And you have prepared a report in this
22 particular case, is that correct, sir?

23 A Yes.

24 Q And do you remember the date of your report?

25 A Yes. It says October 15th, 1998.

GUENTHER - CROSS

1 Q October 15th, 1998?

2 A Yes, sir.

3 Q Now at the time that you had prepared that report on
4 October 15th, 1998, certain individuals were identified to you
5 as suspects, is that correct?

6 A Yes.

7 Q And you even notated that on your -- on your report,
8 isn't that correct?

9 A Yes. We often place either S or V next to the
10 individual or an E just to indicate who in the detective's
11 point of view or their submission, based on their submission,
12 who a suspect, victims or prints submitted for elimination
13 purposes could have originated from.

14 Q So E stands for elimination?

15 A Yes.

16 Q So an S, if someone has an S by their name, they're
17 considered a suspect?

18 A Yes.

19 Q And an E, someone's trying to eliminate that person,
20 correct?

21 A Yes. There could be a person who had legitimate
22 access to the scene and what we try to do is -- we always try
23 to eliminate all of the latent prints that we can. Oftentimes
24 we ask for victim prints from crime scenes so that we can
25 compare the latents from the crime scene, obviously, with the

GUENTHER - CROSS

1 victims, or people who have had legitimate access to a scene,
2 to -- well, to eliminate those so we don't have to keep
3 comparing them and comparing them and comparing them with
4 suspects in the case.

5 Q Okay. Now in your investigation you were given the
6 name John White, correct?

7 A Yes.

8 Q And you had a card that said John White on it,
9 right?

10 A Yes.

11 Q And you were informed that John White was a suspect,
12 correct?

13 A Yes.

14 Q And so you put an S next to his name on your report,
15 correct?

16 A Yes.

17 Q Now you were also given the name Tod Armstrong,
18 isn't that correct?

19 A Yes.

20 Q And you put an S next to his name as well?

21 A No.

22 Q So you were not presented that Tod Armstrong may be
23 a possible suspect in this case?

24 A No. His name was introduced to me as a -- for
25 elimination purposes.

GUENTHER - CROSS

1 Q In fact, you were given other information about --
2 or direction about Tod Armstrong? Yes or no?

3 A Yes, I believe I was.

4 Q And that came directly from Detective Buczek, isn't
5 that correct?

6 A Yes.

7 Q And what did Detective Buczek tell you with regard
8 to comparing the fingerprints of Tod Armstrong in this
9 particular case?

10 A Well, at the -- at this particular time in the
11 investigation I was asked only to compare Tod Armstrong's
12 prints with latent prints that would have been developed on
13 Item 13, which would be an ATM card, I believe.

14 Yes, I'm sorry, EG6. Excuse me.

15 Q Right.

16 Q Which would have been, excuse me, EG6, Item 13,
17 which would have been the RCA VCR tape player here that we've
18 been talking about this morning.

19 Q So pursuant to a directive from Detective Buczek,
20 even though you had all of these other fingerprints to
21 compare, as late as October 15th, 1998 Detective Buczek said
22 only check Tod Armstrong with regard to that VCR that you
23 have, correct?

24 A At that date, yes.

25 Q He didn't tell you to -- He said don't check 'em

GUENTHER - CROSS

1 with anyone else, just that VCR?

2 A Correct.

3 Q Don't compare Tod Armstrong with any of the other
4 prints that were found at Terra Linda, correct?

5 A Yes.

6 Q Now, Mr. Guenther, I want to talk to you about this
7 photograph, the Black and Mild photograph.

8 A Yes, sir. Excuse me.

9 Q You don't have that box with you, do you, the actual
10 box? You haven't actually seen that box?

11 A No, I have not.

12 Q So really all that remains of the box is the
13 photograph that you have in your hand, is that correct?

14 A Yes, sir, that's what I'm assuming.

15 Q Okay. And that's Exhibit 96 and 97?

16 A Yes.

17 Q Okay, you can't tell me, from looking at those
18 pictures, whether or not there might have been a smeared print
19 on there, can you?

20 A No, not really.

21 Q And you can't tell me what was on the underside of
22 that Black and Mild box, can you?

23 A No.

24 Q And typically, as an expert, someone who lifts
25 latents, you're not gonna lift a smeared print because there's

GUENTHER - REDIRECT

1 no reason for that, isn't that correct?

2 A Yes. You usually would do a -- Once powder is
3 applied to a surface, the person, either the crime scene
4 person or a latent print person, is going to make an
5 evaluation of that area to determine if there is, in fact,
6 some ridge detail to in fact actually be lifted.

7 Q So if there's something of no value, in other words,
8 if someone put too much pressure or if it got smeared or
9 something like that, no one's gonna bring that back to you to
10 look at 'cause that's a waste of time, right?

11 A Yes, sir.

12 MR. FIGLER: Pass the witness, Your Honor.

13 THE COURT: Redirect.

14 MR. DASKAS: Thank you, Judge.

15 REDIRECT EXAMINATION

16 BY MR. DASKAS:

17 Q Mr. Guenther, you were asked if you had received the
18 known prints, that is the exemplars, of either Ace Hart, Bryan
19 Johnson or Charla Severs and I believe your answer was no.

20 A Yes, sir, it was.

21 Q All right. You were also asked whether Detective
22 Buczek asked you to only compare Tod Armstrong's known prints
23 with one particular object and the answer was yes.

24 A Yes, sir, at that -- at that date, yes.

25 Q And as of what date was that?

GUENTHER - REDIRECT

1 A That would have -- Well, I'll have to just double
2 check, but it would have been some time between the issuance
3 of the report and the date that the investigation was started.
4 I can tell you the exact date here.

5 On the 2nd of September of '98.

6 Q Some time subsequent to September 2nd, 1998, did you
7 receive another request to compare Tod Armstrong's known
8 prints to every single latent print lifted from the Terra
9 Linda home?

10 A Yes, I did.

11 Q And did you make those comparisons?

12 A Yes, I did.

13 Q In other words, you took Tod Armstrong's known
14 fingerprints and compared those to every latent print
15 developed at Terra Linda?

16 A Yes, I did.

17 Q And what were the results?

18 A I was not able to make any identifications between
19 the inked fingerprints of Tod Armstrong with any of the lifts
20 from the Terra Linda address.

21 Q Of the some 100 prints developed from the Terra
22 Linda home, none of those were Tod Armstrong's?

23 A No, sir.

24 Q All right. You were asked some questions about
25 either an E next to a person's name for elimination or an S

GUENTHER - REDIRECT

1 for suspect. When you received the second request to make the
2 comparison with Tod Armstrong, was there a letter next to
3 Tod's name?

4 A Yes.

5 Q What letter?

6 A It had an S next to it at that time.

7 Q And what did that suggest to you?

8 A It suggested at that point Detective Buczek had
9 wanted the comparison with Mr. Armstrong as a -- he was asking
10 it as a suspect in his mind.

11 Q You identified the defendant's fingerprints on a
12 cigar box at the crime scene, but Tod Armstrong's prints were
13 nowhere?

14 A Correct.

15 Q You were shown the photograph of the cigar box and
16 you were asked whether a smeared print either was found
17 anywhere on the box or whether you received a smeared print,
18 is that correct?

19 A Yes.

20 Q And the answer was no?

21 A Correct.

22 Q Would the existence of a smeared print on the cigar
23 box affect your identification of Donte Johnson as having left
24 a print on that box?

25 A No.

GUENTHER - RECROSS

1 Q All right, you were asked about the underside of the
2 cigar box. Do you recall that question?

3 A Yes, sir.

4 Q Would the existence of anything on the underside of
5 the cigar box affect your identification of Donte Johnson as
6 having left the print on the Black and Mild cigar box?

7 A No.

8 MR. DASKAS: I'll pass the witness, Judge.

9 THE COURT: Any recross?

10 RECROSS EXAMINATION

11 BY MR. FIGLER:

12 Q However, Mr. Guenther, had there been evidence that
13 some smeared -- or prints of no value were on the underside,
14 it might suggest that someone else could have handled that
15 Black and Mild box and you just don't know?

16 A I'm not able to make a determination to that, sir.

17 Q It might show activity, but, again, because it would
18 be of no value, all it would show is perhaps activity, but not
19 identity, correct?

20 A Correct.

21 Q Now the prosecutor just asked you about some
22 supplemental request that was made of you, correct?

23 A Yes, sir.

24 Q And you talked about your first investigation being
25 done in September of -- I'm sorry, August, September, October,

GUENTHER - RECROSS

1 1998, correct?

2 A Yes.

3 Q Now this supplemental request was made in December
4 of 1999, isn't that correct?

5 A Yes, that's when the report was issued, December
6 1st, 1999.

7 Q Okay. And Tod Armstrong was then compared, correct?

8 A Yes.

9 Q Okay. Now if Tod Armstrong had been wearing gloves,
10 per se, at the Terra Linda residence, that would diminish the
11 ability for his fingerprints to actually show up on surfaces,
12 isn't that correct?

13 A Yes.

14 Q Okay. Now you were given Tod Armstrong's name, but
15 you still weren't given Ace Hart's, right?

16 A No.

17 Q And you still weren't given Bryan Johnson's, right?

18 A No.

19 Q And you still weren't given Charla Severs, correct?

20 A No.

21 Q Now there was something else about Tod Armstrong's
22 prints that you lacked to do a complete investigation, isn't
23 that correct?

24 A Yes.

25 Q Okay. In fact, that's how you phrased it, you

GUENTHER - FURTHER REDIRECT

1 needed something necessary for a complete examination that you
2 didn't have, correct?

3 A Yes, sir.

4 Q Okay. And what was that, sir?

5 A Well, there were -- no palm prints were on file for
6 Tod Armstrong, so the only exemplars that I had to make a
7 comparison were with his fingerprints.

8 Q So you didn't even have the palm prints of Tod
9 Armstrong, did you?

10 A No, I did not.

11 Q Now how hard is it, if I'm here present and you want
12 to compare my palm print, how hard is it for me to give you my
13 palm print?

14 A Oh, it would take about ten minutes.

15 Q About ten minutes.

16 (Pause in the proceedings)

17 MR. FIGLER: Nothing further, Your Honor.

18 MR. DASKAS: Two questions, Judge.

19 FURTHER REDIRECT EXAMINATION

20 BY MR. DASKAS:

21 Q Mr. Guenther, from the time you made your initial
22 comparisons in this case until you received a second request
23 in December of 1999, when you compared Tod's prints to the
24 latents, --

25 A Yes, sir.

GUENTHER - FURTHER REDIRECT

1 Q -- did the latents change in any fashion?
2 A No.
3 Q They're preserved for all time?
4 A Yes, sir.
5 Q And from the time you received your initial request
6 to make the comparisons until the subsequent request in
7 December of '99 to compare Tod Armstrong, did the known prints
8 of Tod Armstrong change in any fashion?
9 A No, they did not.
10 MR. DASKAS: I have nothing else, Judge.
11 MR. FIGLER: Nothing, Judge.
12 THE COURT: Thank you. You're excused, sir.
13 Call your next witness, please.
14 THE WITNESS: Thank you, Your Honor.
15 MR. DASKAS: Richard Good.
16 (Pause in the proceedings)
17 THE COURT: While Richard's coming in, would you
18 guys approach the bench, please?
19 (Off-record bench conference)
20 THE COURT: You gonna to be good today?
21 THE WITNESS: Yes, sir, I will.
22 THE COURT: Okay.
23 RICHARD GOOD, PLAINTIFF'S WITNESS, IS SWORN
24 THE CLERK: Please state your full name and spell
25 your last name for the record.

GOOD - DIRECT

1 THE WITNESS: Richard George Good, Sr., G-O-O-D.

2 DIRECT EXAMINATION

3 BY MR. DASKAS:

4 Q Mr. Good, by whom are you employed?

5 A By the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department.

6 Q Okay. And how long have you been employed with
7 Metro?

8 A Just about 28 years.

9 Q And what's your job title?

10 A I'm a lab manager in the forensic laboratory of the
11 Criminalistics Bureau.

12 Q Do your duties and responsibilities include work in
13 the area of firearms examination?

14 A Yes, they do.

15 Q And tell us a little bit about what's encompassed or
16 involved in the area of firearms and ballistics examination
17 and comparison.

18 A Well, the discipline of firearms examination or
19 firearms identification is one that entails the examination of
20 firearms that have been submitted to the laboratory and have
21 been suspected of being involved in criminal matters. The
22 examination itself of a standard firearm is fairly
23 straightforward. The examiner examines the firearm to
24 determine the make, the model, serial number and location,
25 caliber, finish, barrel length, trigger pull and the type of

IV-44

AA01557

GOOD - DIRECT

1 function that firearm has.

2 He then would test fire the firearm to see if it's
3 functional and would compare the test fires of that firearm
4 with other ammunition components, that is to say fire bullets
5 or fire cartridge cases from minor crime scenes or from
6 autopsies.

7 THE COURT: Excuse me, Mr. Daskas, I understand
8 that's what Mr. Good usually does, but in this case he did
9 something else, right?

10 MR. DASKAS: Right.

11 BY MR. DASKAS:

12 Q Tell me specifically what your involvement was with
13 respect to this quadruple homicide investigation. What
14 comparisons were you asked to make in this case?

15 A I was asked to examine and compare fire cartridge
16 cases and bullet fragments involving this event.

17 Q Now you've previously qualified and testified as an
18 expert in courts here -- in the Eighth Judicial District Court
19 of Las Vegas, Nevada in that area, is that true?

20 A Yes, sir, that is true.

21 MR. DASKAS: Judge, I believe there would be a
22 stipulation of his qualifications as an expert in that area.

23 THE COURT: Is that stipulated?

24 MR. FIGLER: That's correct, Your Honor.

25 THE COURT: All right, thank you

GOOD - DIRECT

1 Again, this just means that rather than go through
2 all of Mr. Good's various qualifications and then find he's an
3 expert, he's been around for years and the defense does not
4 contest that he is a qualified expert, which, as I've told you
5 twice before, just means he can state his testimony in the
6 form of opinions and what weight you give the opinions are up
7 to you.

8 Go ahead, Mr. Daskas.

9 MR. DASKAS: Thank you, Judge.

10 BY MR. DASKAS:

11 Q Mr. Good, if it would assist the jury, what I'd like
12 you to do is step down from the stand and, with the assistance
13 of a diagram, explain the terms to the jury that you utilize
14 in your area of expertise and how it is that you go about
15 making such a determination or comparison of cartridge cases.

16 And let me show you, first of all, what purports to
17 be a diagram of a semi-automatic handgun and then the interior
18 portion of the barrel of the gun. And just explain,
19 generally, the functions of the gun and how the mechanism and
20 function of the gun would assist in the determination you made
21 in this case.

22 A Well, this depiction is of the old standard Colt
23 Model 1911-A-1 service pistol, which is a single-action, semi-
24 automatic, .45 caliber pistol. More importantly, in respect
25 to the case, a portion of that firearm is depicted here, which

GOOD - DIRECT

1 would be the barrel of the firearm. The barrel is that
2 portion of the firearm in which the bullet travels and what
3 you see here is a cartridge and the cartridge is seated in a
4 chamber of that barrel.

5 When the firearm is discharged, variously a firing
6 pin or a striker or a hammer nose would strike the primer,
7 which is an area right back here, the base of the cartridge,
8 which would cause a flash, burning the powder inside the
9 cartridge case, and causing the bullet to travel down the
10 barrel of the firearm.

11 What is marked here as "rifling" refers to these
12 helical grooves that are cut inside the barrel of the gun, the
13 purpose of which is to impart a rotational spin to the bullet
14 as it exits through -- or exits the muzzle of the pistol.

15 Q And what's depicted at the top of the diagram is a
16 semi-automatic handgun, is that correct?

17 A Yes, sir, that is correct.

18 Q And what's the difference between a semi-automatic
19 handgun or an automatic versus a revolver?

20 A A semi-automatic handgun and an automatic handgun,
21 which is very rare, is the fact that in a semi-automatic
22 firearm a single pull of the trigger is needed to discharge
23 each shot. In a fully automatic firearm, the shooter would
24 simply need to pull the trigger one time and not release it
25 and the firearm would discharge until the contents of the

IV-47

AA01560

GOOD - DIRECT

1 magazine were expended.

2 And I believe your question was a revolver?

3 Q Yes.

4 A Is that correct?

5 A comparison of a pistol with a revolver is such
6 that rather than have a slide mechanism that you see here, a
7 revolver employs a revolving cylinder, which typically would
8 hold between five and nine cartridges which are held
9 separately in holes known as charge holes. The cylinder -- I
10 guess the best depiction I can think of, of a revolver as
11 opposed to a pistol, would be the old-fashion western
12 firearms, western six-guns, this little thing, where in those
13 usually the hammer would be cocked, but, in any event, the
14 cylinder would rotate one-sixth of a turn for the six shots
15 that would be held in the cylinder.

16 Another very important difference, from the
17 standpoint of criminalistics, is that in a firearm of this
18 nature, when the bullet is discharged, another component -- we
19 see the bullet here and the cartridge here, labeled as
20 cartridge, but the remaining component of the cartridge would
21 be the cartridge case and with a pistol that case is ejected
22 from the firearm and very oftentimes is found at the crime
23 scene. That differs from a revolver inasmuch as with a
24 revolver, once fired, that cartridge case remains inside the
25 firearm cylinder and most generally is only ejected at one

IV-48

AA01561

GOOD - DIRECT

1 time, generally when the shooter is completely out of
2 cartridges. He would then manually open up the cylinder and
3 eject the cartridge cases. And they, of course, are much more
4 rarely found at the scenes of crime.

5 Q Okay, you mentioned some terms, including cartridge
6 and cartridge case. Let me now turn around this diagram and,
7 if it would assist the jury, explain what's depicted on the
8 other side of the diagram and what the various terms mean.

9 A Well, here we have the entire unit of ammunition,
10 which is known as a cartridge. A cartridge consists of a
11 bullet, the holder for the cartridge -- I beg your pardon, the
12 holder for the bullet, the gunpowder, which is the propellant
13 that makes everything happen and this area here at the base of
14 the cartridge is known as the primer. The primer is the
15 initiator and once struck a very intense flame shoots through
16 a hole in the primer, actually in the cartridge case, from
17 there, and ignites the gunpowder. And, once again, as I
18 mentioned earlier, this conversion of gunpowder to a gaseous
19 form is the impetus to propel the bullet down the barrel of
20 the firearm.

21 This would be the base of the cartridge, if this
22 cartridge was turned in this fashion, in other words,
23 sideways, and you would see an unfired primer. If this were
24 fired, there would be some form of a shape, most commonly a
25 circular or semi-circular shape here, to show that it had been

GOOD - DIRECT

1 fired.

2 Q And I assume the center-fire cartridge most people,
3 other than experts, such as yourself, might refer to that as a
4 bullet.

5 A Yes, unfortunately, very oftentimes we hear this
6 constantly where someone says, "I need more bullets," or "I'm
7 out of bullets." It's a misnomer. The bullet is only a
8 portion of the cartridge, in the same way a tire is only a
9 portion of a car. The bullet is the portion of the cartridge,
10 once again, that goes down range and hopefully strikes the
11 intended target, but the unit of ammunition is not a bullet.
12 Once again, the bullet is only, basically, one-fourth of the
13 cartridge.

14 Q On the -- well, what I would call the right side of
15 the diagram, as I'm facing it, we have three other depictions,
16 is that correct?

17 A Yes, that's correct.

18 Q Now does that actually depict the various components
19 of a center-fire cartridge after it's fired?

20 A Yes, it does.

21 Q And describe each one of those, if you would,
22 please.

23 A Well, this figure here would represent a fired
24 cartridge case, once again most commonly found at crime scenes
25 in a pistol much more so than in a revolver. This depiction

IV-50

AA01563

GOOD - DIRECT

1 is that of a fired bullet and although we don't have -- well,
2 we do, we have a bullet here that does not have any of these
3 markings that you see referred to as rifling impressions.
4 That's because this bullet has not been fired, has not been
5 squeezed down the barrel of a firearm and been made to take on
6 these impressions that you see here, known as rifling
7 impressions.

8 Here, in this depiction, this would be
9 representative of the cartridge case, only in this instance
10 it's fired. We see there is a firing pin impression and then
11 various marks are found on the cartridge case. This refers to
12 ejector marks. An ejector is a device inside the firearm that
13 may or may not leave identifiable marks on the softer metal of
14 the cartridge case. Chamber marks very commonly are found on
15 a fired cartridge case.

16 Here we have an ejector. This, as I mentioned
17 earlier, is an extractor mark on this portion of the cartridge
18 case. On the head of the cartridge case, commonly ejector
19 marks are found, which can also, in many instances, be
20 identified to the proper firearm.

21 A firing pin impression, you can see that here, and
22 then breech base marks, which take various physical forms, but
23 which are probably the most pronounced marking that's found on
24 a fired cartridge case and is most commonly used to identify a
25 cartridge case with the responsible firearm.

IV-51

GOOD - DIRECT

1 Q Mr. Good, based on your testimony thus far, I assume
2 that if cartridge cases are found at a particular crime scene
3 we can assume that a revolver was not used?

4 A It would be unusual, not to say it couldn't happen,
5 but it would be unusual. The shooter wouldn't have a need to
6 reload and dump the cartridge cases at that time.

7 Q Now also the diagram depicts what you've described
8 as chamber marks on a cartridge case, is that true?

9 A Yes, sir, that's correct.

10 Q Now is that one of the indications or markings that
11 enables an expert, such as yourself, to compare cartridge
12 cases to determine if they were fired from the same weapon?

13 A It is.

14 Q And do you make that observation or comparison with
15 the naked eye or do you use some instrument to assist you?

16 A No, sir. Some of these marks actually can be seen
17 with the naked eye, depending, of course, on the size of the
18 cartridge case. The larger the case, in the instance of a .45
19 auto, which we saw on the reverse of the diagram, very
20 oftentimes with the naked eye these marks can be seen. The
21 same is true of the ejector mark, but they can only be seen,
22 in other words, just a rough outline of the geometry of the
23 mark can be noted, but the comparisons themselves are
24 conducted microscopically.

25 Q And is that what was done in this case?

IV-52

AA01565

GOOD - DIRECT

1 A Yes, sir, it was.

2 Q Are chamber marks that are left on a cartridge case
3 unique to individual firearms?

4 A In fact, sir, all of the markings we have here, in
5 respect to the cartridge case, be they chambering marks,
6 extractor marks, ejector marks or breech base marks, are
7 unique to a specific firearm.

8 Q If I might speak in crude terms, would it be similar
9 to say a fingerprint?

10 A Yes, it would be, in terms of identification. The
11 identification of a cartridge case with a firearm is as
12 positive as a fingerprint would be to an individual.

13 Q If I could ask you to please return to your seat.

14 A Sure.

15 Q Now you mentioned that you made a comparison in this
16 case of, I believe, four cartridge cases recovered from the
17 crime scene. Let me hand you what's been marked as State's
18 Proposed Exhibit 156 and ask you if you recognize at least the
19 description that's contained on 156.

20 A Yes, sir, I do.

21 Q And what do you recognize 156 to be, or at least its
22 contents, the description?

23 A The contents should be a sealed evidence envelope
24 containing a bullet fragment and four fired Winchester 380
25 automatic cartridge cases.

IV-53

AA01566

GOOD - DIRECT

1 Q Okay, I'm assuming, based on your answer, that those
2 cartridge cases, after you performed an examination, were sent
3 somewhere else, is that true?

4 A Yes, sir, that is true.

5 Q All right. If you would remove the contents,
6 though, you would expect to find the cartridge cases that you
7 analyzed and compared in this case?

8 A That's correct.

9 Q Did you go about making your comparison
10 microscopically as we've discussed this morning?

11 A Yes, sir, I did.

12 Q And tell me what conclusions did you reach after
13 examining the four cartridge cases recovered from the Terra
14 Linda crime scene in this case?

15 A I concluded that all four of the cartridge cases
16 were manufactured by the firm of Winchester, all four of them
17 were of caliber 380 automatic and were all fired from a common
18 firearm, a single firearm.

19 Q And you based that conclusion on the microscopic
20 examination you performed in this case?

21 A Yes, sir, that's correct.

22 Q How certain are you that those four cartridge cases
23 were fired from the same weapon?

24 A I'm positive.

25 Q Let me ask you just a little bit about various forms

IV-54

AA01567

GOOD - DIRECT

1 of ammunition. I assume you're familiar with the various
2 calibers and sizes of ammunition?

3 A Yes, sir.

4 Q What's the difference say between a 9-millimeter and
5 a .38?

6 A In terms of the bullet or the cartridge or both?

7 Q Well, both actually, the size of wound that would be
8 left by such a piece of ammunition and the size of the
9 cartridge or center-fire cartridges themselves.

10 A Well, in terms of the physical characteristics --
11 I'm sorry, it was a 380 and a .38? Is that what you --

12 Q A 9-millimeter versus a .38.

13 A A 9-millimeter and a .38.

14 In general, when we're speaking of a .38, we're
15 speaking of a .38 Smith & Wesson Special. The difference in
16 the bullet are sometimes extremely minimal. The base diameter
17 of a 9-millimeter Luger is most generally about .355 of an
18 inch, whereas with a .38 it's generally .357 of an inch. So
19 in terms of size, at least in terms of diameter, there is
20 very, very little difference whatsoever.

21 Most commonly, --

22 Q Let me, and I apologize, let me stop you. What
23 about the difference in size between a 9-millimeter and a .38
24 versus a 380 cartridge case -- or cartridge rather? And we're
25 talking about the size now of the ammunition.

IV-55

GOOD - DIRECT

1 A Well, the size -- The size of the unit of
2 ammunition?

3 Q Yes.

4 A The overall cartridge in a 380 is the smallest of
5 any. A 9-millimeter, if we were to measure from the base of
6 the cartridge case to the very tip of the bullet nose, you'd
7 find that in sequence of small to large there would be the
8 380, the 9-millimeter Luger and the .38 Special, exclusive of
9 a wad-cutter type, but a standard round-nose would be the
10 largest of the .38 ammunition.

11 Q Now let me see if we've covered this. What about
12 the difference in diameter between a 9-millimeter, a .38.
13 versus 380 ammunition, what the diameters are?

14 A Well, once again, in fact, there almost is none. I
15 mentioned that the 9-millimeter generally mics out at about
16 .355 of an inch and a .38 Special, most generally, is about
17 .357 of an inch. Now in speaking of the .38 -- I beg your
18 pardon, a 380 auto, we're back down to the 9-millimeter. The
19 380 auto is a smaller 9-millimeter in terms of overall length,
20 but not in terms of diameter.

21 The diameter of a 380 auto again, most generally, is
22 about 3 -- I beg your pardon, .355 of an inch, the same as the
23 9-millimeter, but the overall length is quite a bit smaller
24 and, as a result, the bullet weight of the 380 is, most
25 generally, substantially less than that of a 9-millimeter.

IV-56

AA01569

GOOD - CROSS

1 Q In terms of diameter though there is either little
2 or no difference between, again, the diameter size of a 9-
3 millimeter, .38 and 380 ammunition?

4 A For practical purposes there really isn't.

5 Q All right.

6 MR. DASKAS: Nothing else, Judge. I'll pass the
7 witness.

8 THE COURT: Any cross?

9 MR. FIGLER: Real quick, Judge.

10 CROSS-EXAMINATION

11 BY MR. FIGLER:

12 Q So your conclusion in this particular matter was
13 that the four cartridges that you examined all came from the
14 same unknown firearm, isn't that correct?

15 A The four fired cartridge cases, yes, sir.

16 Q Came from the same unknown firearm, correct?

17 A That is correct.

18 Q Okay. Now in this particular case you were informed
19 that guns were taken into evidence, correct?

20 A I was informed?

21 Q Were you?

22 A No, sir.

23 Q Now there was some guns that were retrieved in this
24 particular case.

25 MR. DASKAS: Judge, I apologize. If I might, in the

GOOD - CROSS

1 interest of time, I would certainly stipulate that the
2 cartridge cases he examined were not fired from the guns
3 recovered in this case, if it would save us some time.

4 MR. FIGLER: It sure would. That's fine.

5 So the stipulation is that these guns here had
6 nothing to do with any of those cartridge cases that you did
7 your investigation on.

8 THE COURT: So stipulated?

9 MR. DASKAS: That's the stipulation, Judge.

10 THE COURT: All right.

11 BY MR. FIGLER:

12 Q In fact, you have no information of the
13 investigation that those guns had anything to do with this,
14 isn't that correct, from your investigation and your
15 examination?

16 A I am unaware of any firearms in this case.

17 MR. FIGLER: No further questions, Judge.

18 MR. DASKAS: No redirect, Judge.

19 THE COURT: Thank you, sir. You're excused.

20 Call your next witness, please.

21 MR. DASKAS: Detective James Buczek.

22 THE WITNESS: Good morning, Your Honor.

23 THE CLERK: Please raise your right hand.

24 JAMES BUCZEK, PLAINTIFF'S WITNESS, IS SWORN

25 THE CLERK: Please be seated.

IV-58

AA01571

BUCZEK - DIRECT

1 State and spell your name for the record, please.

2 THE WITNESS: My name is James Buczek. It's

3 B-U-C-Z-E-K.

4 DIRECT EXAMINATION

5 BY MR. DASKAS:

6 Q Detective Buczek, you are employed by the Las Vegas
7 Metropolitan Police Department as a detective in the Homicide
8 Bureau, is that correct?

9 A Yes, sir.

10 Q For how many years?

11 A I've been with the homicide detail for approximately
12 three and a half years.

13 Q How many years in total have you been employed with
14 law enforcement?

15 A Approximately 18.

16 Q Let me direct your attention specifically to the
17 month of August 1998. Were you working in the Homicide
18 Division at that time?

19 A Yes, I was.

20 Q Did you have a partner?

21 A Yes, I did.

22 Q And who was your partner?

23 A My partner was Detective Tom Thowsen.

24 Q Who was your sergeant back in 1998, August?

25 A My sergeant is Sergeant Ken Hefner.

IV-59

AA01572

BUCZEK - DIRECT

1 Q And, generally speaking, when you and your partner,
2 Detective Thowsen, are called out to homicide investigations,
3 do you divide the responsibilities of your investigation?

4 A Yes, we do.

5 THE COURT: I think we know that from earlier
6 witnesses. Would you get to the one area that you were gonna
7 pursue with this detective today?

8 MR. DASKAS: Certainly, Judge.

9 BY MR. DASKAS:

10 Q You were assigned to a particular homicide that
11 occurred at 4825 Terra Linda here in Las Vegas?

12 A That's correct.

13 Q And your responsibility included interviewing
14 witnesses?

15 A That's right.

16 Q Do you make an effort, as a homicide detective, once
17 you learn information about a crime, not to release certain
18 information to the media or to the general public?

19 A Yes.

20 Q And what's the reason for that?

21 A Certain information we don't want to go out to the
22 media -- out to the media so it's disbursed to the general
23 public because we want to see if people that we are talking to
24 can corroborate what we saw there.

25 Q And in this case did you make an effort not to

BUCZEK - DIRECT

1 release details of the quadruple homicide either to the media
2 or the public in general?

3 A That's correct, yes.

4 Q And were you satisfied that that was done?

5 A Yes.

6 Q You mentioned that one of your responsibilities
7 included interviewing witnesses. When you interview witnesses
8 in any investigation, do you share with them details of a
9 crime scene?

10 A No, I do not.

11 Q Why not?

12 A 'Cause I want to learn what they have to offer me
13 and I don't want to try to put words into their mouth. I need
14 to go in and find out what type of information they have.

15 Q And did you avoid, in this particular investigation,
16 the quadruple homicide, did you avoid sharing details of the
17 crimes with witnesses?

18 A Yes, I did.

19 Q When you interview witnesses do you interview
20 witnesses together or do you separate witnesses?

21 A We separate witnesses and interview them by
22 themselves.

23 Q And what's the reason --

24 A Normally.

25 Q And what's the reason for that?

BUCZEK - DIRECT

1 A Because I don't want other people that are sitting
2 there listening to what a witness is saying learn something
3 else and use it in their testimony.

4 Q Did you make an effort in this case to ensure that
5 you didn't influence witness statements by letting them listen
6 to other witnesses?

7 A That's right, I did.

8 Q You received information in this case that a VCR was
9 recovered from a home at an Everman address, is that true?

10 A Yes, that is correct. I believe it was 4815.

11 Q After learning that information, did you attempt to
12 determine who owned that VCR?

13 A Yes, I did.

14 Q And what efforts did you make and what were your
15 findings?

16 A I spoke to Dave Mowen, the father of Matt Mowen, and
17 asked if he had provided his child with the VCR and he -- I
18 described the VCR to him and he said, yes, that he believed
19 that he did give it to his son, Matt. And he then remembered
20 that he had a remote control somewhere in his home that went
21 with the VCR. It was an RCA VCR. Mr. Mowen, I believe it was
22 on October 23rd of 1998, was able to provide me with a remote
23 control and, on a later date, I believe it was April 20th of
24 1999, we took the remote control, went over to the evidence
25 vault, met with the prosecuting attorneys there and we put

BUCZEK - DIRECT

1 batteries in the remote control and tried it with the RCA VCR
2 and it actually activated the VCR, so it worked with it.

3 Q In other words, the remote control that David Mowen,
4 the victim's father, provided to you operated the VCR that was
5 recovered from the Everman home where the defendant was
6 arrested?

7 A That's right.

8 Q All right. Let me hand you what's been marked as
9 State's Proposed Exhibit 169 and ask you if you recognize 169
10 and its contents?

11 A Yes. Exhibit 169 is the packaging that I put the
12 remote control in. It has my name and P-number, 3702, on it
13 and it describes an RCA black remote. And inside is the
14 remote that I tested on the RCA VCR and it worked.

15 Q Is the remote itself also labeled with an evidence
16 sticker?

17 A Yes, it is.

18 Q And what number's on there?

19 A It would be 169A.

20 Q Is 169A and 169 in the same or substantially the
21 same condition as when you impounded the remote and placed it
22 in the envelope on the date that you just mentioned?

23 A Other than the court's evidence sticker -- exhibit
24 stickers on there and being opened, yes.

25 MR. DASKAS: Judge, I'd move for the admission of

IV-63

AA01576

BUCZEK - CROSS

1 169 and 169A.

2 MR. FIGLER: Submitted.

3 THE COURT: Admitted.

4 (Plaintiff's Exhibit Nos. 169, 169A admitted)

5 MR. DASKAS: Thank you, Judge.

6 I'll pass the witness, Judge.

7 THE COURT: Thank you.

8 Cross?

9 MR. FIGLER: Thank you, Judge.

10 CROSS-EXAMINATION

11 BY MR. FIGLER:

12 Q Good morning, detective.

13 A Good morning.

14 Q The prosecutor asked you a question and I just want
15 to do some follow-up on that, okay?

16 A Yes, sir.

17 Q Your primary task in this particular investigation
18 was to interview witnesses, correct?

19 A That is correct.

20 Q And you also indicate that sometimes, when you
21 interview witnesses, you separate them out, correct?

22 A That's correct.

23 Q And one of the reasons for that, I think you just
24 told us, is that you don't want them hearing what each other
25 has to say, correct?

BUCZEK - CROSS

1 A That's right.

2 Q That's because, and correct me if I'm wrong, one of
3 them may not know something and they might say something that
4 the other person said? In other words, you might get people
5 giving you information that they don't have personal knowledge
6 of, correct?

7 A That's right.

8 Q And another reason, would you agree, is that if
9 witnesses give you conflicting information that that's
10 somewhat suspicious to you, isn't that correct?

11 A That's correct, yes.

12 Q And that helps you, in your investigation, in
13 figuring out perhaps what happened in a particular case,
14 correct?

15 A Correct.

16 Q Now you also talked on direct about the media, that
17 there's certain information that you don't release to the
18 media, correct?

19 A That's right.

20 Q Although there was a lot of media coverage in this
21 particular case, wasn't there?

22 A Yes, there was.

23 Q More than normal, but still a lot?

24 A Yes.

25 Q Okay. Nonetheless, there were very specific facts

BUCZEK - CROSS

1 in this case that you felt you had concealed from the media,
2 right?

3 A That's correct.

4 Q Now if individuals are presented to you and they
5 happen to know those facts that haven't been released to the
6 media, that also might be something suspicious to you, isn't
7 that correct?

8 A Suspicious and also maybe interesting.

9 Q Interesting, something you might want to follow up
10 on, correct?

11 A That's right.

12 Q Now you personally interviewed witnesses in this
13 case, correct?

14 A Yes, I have.

15 Q So you were able to interview an individual named
16 Tod Armstrong, correct?

17 A Yes, I have.

18 Q And an individual named Bryan Johnson?

19 A Yes.

20 Q And an individual named Ace Hart?

21 A That's correct.

22 Q In fact, you did multiple interviews with these
23 boys, correct?

24 A Yes, that's right.

25 Q And pretty much in this case everyone that you were

BUCZEK - CROSS

1 looking at, the people who were killed, these witnesses I just
2 talked about and people you later developed as suspects,
3 they're all around the same age, isn't that correct?

4 A Yes, they are.

5 Q All in that sort of 17 to 19 range?

6 A I think that's fair to say, yes.

7 Q Young men, one and all?

8 A Yes.

9 Q Now the information that you get from the people
10 that you interview, you state that's important and interesting
11 for your investigation, right?

12 A That's right.

13 Q Okay, now I want to focus on Tod Armstrong for a
14 second. When you were interviewing this gentleman you had
15 learned that Tod Armstrong was in a -- or at least he
16 indicated to you that he was in a vehicle that drove by that
17 Terra Linda residence that we've all been talking about
18 shortly before this killing occurred?

19 MR. DASKAS: Judge, I apologize. My objection is,
20 before we get into any specific statements, it's hearsay and
21 it's not admissible.

22 THE COURT: Overruled.

23 Let's hear an additional question.

24 BY MR. FIGLER:

25 Q Have you learned that from Tod Armstrong?

BUCZEK - CROSS

1 A I'm sorry, could you repeat?

2 Q Have you learned from Tod Armstrong that prior to
3 this killing occurring at Terra Linda that he was in a car
4 that drove by the Terra Linda residence?

5 A Yes, that's correct.

6 Q Okay. And you were informed that Ace Hart was the
7 driver of that vehicle, correct?

8 A Incorrect.

9 Q Who was the driver of the vehicle?

10 A I believe the driver of the vehicle was Deco.

11 Q Okay. Do you want to look at Tod Armstrong's -- Did
12 he indicate to you that Ace Hart was in the vehicle?

13 A Yes, he did.

14 Q Oh, okay, maybe that's where I'm mistaken.

15 And that Ace Hart was the one who knew where this
16 location was, correct?

17 A That's right.

18 Q And so Ace Hart was the one who was able to point
19 out, according to Tod Armstrong, the Terra Linda residence,
20 right?

21 A That's right.

22 Q Okay. Now on August 17th, 1998 you had Tod
23 Armstrong, Ace Hart and Bryan Johnson down at your detective
24 bureau, correct?

25 A Yes.

BUCZEK - CROSS

1 Q And you separated them out pursuant to your policy,
2 correct?

3 A That's correct.

4 Q Okay. Now when you talked to Ace Hart about that on
5 August 17th, 1998, Ace Hart never told you that he was in a
6 car that went by the Terra Linda residence, isn't that true?

7 MR. DASKAS: Judge, the same objection here. If
8 we're getting into statements by witnesses, it's only offered
9 for the truth of the matter and that's clearly hearsay.

10 MR. FIGLER: No, that's --

11 THE COURT: No, I don't think that's why it's
12 offered. And, of course, it's also beyond the scope of the
13 direct, but that would just mean we'd hear from Detective
14 Buczek later in the day.

15 MR. DASKAS: I understand that.

16 THE COURT: So I'll overrule the objection.

17 BY MR. FIGLER:

18 Q Do you want me to re-ask it or do you remember what
19 I asked?

20 A No, I remember what you asked.

21 Q And so what did Ace Hart say about driving by the
22 Terra Linda residence?

23 A That I don't recall.

24 Q Okay. In fact, in the first statement he gave you,
25 he didn't say anything about it. And you might remember if he

BUCZEK - CROSS

1 did, right?

2 A I just don't recall.

3 Q Okay, there did come a time, however, though --

4 MR. FIGLER: The Court's indulgence.

5 (Pause in the proceedings)

6 BY MR. FIGLER:

7 Q -- when you specifically had asked Ace Hart if he
8 was involved in driving by the Terra Linda residence, isn't
9 that true?

10 A Again, I don't -- I don't recall. I did not review
11 Ace Hart's statements, the three of 'em, and it is a bit
12 confusing having the three individuals telling various similar
13 stories. If you could point it out to me and assist me.

14 Q Sure.

15 THE COURT: Would counsel approach the bench,
16 please?

17 MR. FIGLER: Sure.

18 (Off-record bench conference)

19 BY MR. FIGLER:

20 Q I'll say that in the first statements on August 17th
21 of 1998 this subject didn't come up, Ace Hart didn't give you
22 this information, but let me approach another statement you
23 took from Ace Hart.

24 Let me show you this and see if you recognize this
25 document.

BUCZEK - CROSS

1 A This would have been a statement taken on September
2 22nd of 1998 with myself and Detective Thowsen and also Ace
3 Hart.

4 Q Okay. Now I marked a page there for you in the
5 middle. Why don't you read that and see if that refreshes
6 your memory of whether you asked Ace Hart if he drove by the
7 Terra Linda residence.

8 A "Had you gone over prior to the" --

9 Q Oh, no, I don't want you to read it out loud. I'm
10 sorry, Detective. Read it to yourself and then I'll ask you a
11 question about it.

12 A Okay.

13 Q The rules of evidence and all that.

14 (Pause in the proceedings)

15 A Okay.

16 Q Okay, now do you remember specifically -- excuse me,
17 specifically asking Ace Hart whether he had driven by the
18 Terra Linda residence before the murder?

19 A Yes.

20 Q And he denied it, didn't he?

21 A Yes, he did.

22 Q Now when Tod Armstrong was separated, Ace Hart had
23 no way of knowing whether or not Tod had told you that Ace was
24 in that car, isn't that correct?

25 MR. GUYMON: Objection, calls for speculation,

BUCZEK - CROSS

1 Judge.

2 THE COURT: Sustained.

3 BY MR. FIGLER:

4 Q Now eventually Ace Hart gave you information
5 regarding hearing a conversation where individuals known to
6 him as Red and Deco were allegedly discussing the murder,
7 correct?

8 A Yes.

9 Q That came from Ace Hart?

10 MR. DASKAS: Judge, can we -- can we approach on
11 this?

12 THE COURT: Sure.

13 MR. DASKAS: I think he's gonna get into an area he
14 doesn't want to open.

15 (Off-record bench conference)

16 BY MR. FIGLER:

17 Q Now you had asked Ace Hart if he had heard any
18 conversations when you first saw him concerning this murder,
19 hadn't you?

20 A Yes.

21 Q Okay. And initially Ace Hart told you --

22 MR. GUYMON: Objection to what Ace Hart tells him,
23 Judge. It's hearsay. Ace Hart's not been here to testify.

24 MR. SCISCENTO: No, it's not --

25 THE COURT: Well, to the extent --

BUCZEK - CROSS

1 MR. FIGLER: I got it, Joe.

2 THE COURT: We're doing tag teams again?

3 MR. SCISCENTO: Well, I mean, Mr. Guymon got into
4 it, so I figured I could do it.

5 MR. GUYMON: I'm sorry, Judge.

6 THE COURT: That's true, but you might as well just
7 go to tag teams for the rest of the trial.

8 MR. FIGLER: I'll take care of myself, Judge.

9 THE COURT: You will?

10 MR. FIGLER: Yeah.

11 THE COURT: Okay, thank you.

12 I don't know, as we discussed at the bench, that it
13 is being used for the truth of the matter asserted. We've
14 also discussed relevance.

15 You want to ask generally, as we discussed at the
16 bench?

17 MR. FIGLER: It's all generally, Judge, and I'll do
18 it that way.

19 THE COURT: Well, it's getting very specific with
20 the problems that we discussed at the bench.

21 MR. FIGLER: Okay.

22 THE COURT: If you want to address a general
23 question about conflicting statements to this witness and ask
24 some follow-up on that, do that.

25 MR. FIGLER: Thank you, Judge.

BUCZEK - CROSS

1 THE COURT: Otherwise it's sustained.

2 BY MR. FIGLER:

3 Q All right, we're talking about Ace Hart. We had
4 just gone over that he had denied driving by Terra Linda. Now
5 isn't it true that he denied hearing, initially, any
6 conversation regarding this murder, isn't that correct?

7 A Again, I don't recall. There's multiple statements
8 and multiple similar stories. If you could --

9 THE COURT: He's already asked something like that
10 and you've answered it.

11 Move on to another area, please, Mr. Figler.

12 MR. FIGLER: He didn't remember, Judge, so I'm just
13 gonna refresh his memory.

14 BY MR. FIGLER:

15 Q Again, if you could identify that that is a
16 statement that you took and see if that refreshes your memory.

17 MR. GUYMON: Counsel, can you tell me the statement
18 and the page?

19 MR. FIGLER: Statement number 1, page number 9,
20 question number 1.

21 (Pause in the proceedings)

22 BY MR. FIGLER:

23 Q So now does that refresh your memory that in the
24 first statement that Ace Hart gave you he denied hearing any
25 type of conversation at all regarding this murder?

BUCZEK - CROSS

1 A Yes, that's correct.

2 Q And, in fact, same page, same document, he said --
3 or you had general information that he knew stuff about this
4 murder and he identified the source of that information, isn't
5 that correct?

6 A Yes, he did.

7 Q And who did he tell you was the source?

8 MR. GUYMON: Objection.

9 THE COURT: Sustained.

10 Move on to another area.

11 BY MR. FIGLER:

12 Q It came from another individual though, isn't that
13 correct?

14 MR. GUYMON: Same objection, Judge.

15 THE COURT: Sustained.

16 Move on to another area.

17 MR. FIGLER: Can we approach on that one, Judge?

18 THE COURT: Sure.

19 MR. FIGLER: Thanks.

20 (Off-record bench conference)

21 THE COURT: Sustained.

22 BY MR. FIGLER:

23 Q Was Ace Hart an important witness for you to rely
24 upon in your investigation?

25 A There were a lot of important witnesses in --

BUCZEK - CROSS

1 Q I understand that, Detective. I'm asking you if Ace
2 Hart was important in your investigation.

3 A Somewhat.

4 Q He had lots of information to provide to you, isn't
5 that correct?

6 A Initially.

7 Q And you would agree that Ace Hart gave you
8 information that didn't match with what other witnesses, Tod
9 Armstrong and Bryan Johnson, were giving you, isn't that
10 correct?

11 A Yes, that's correct.

12 Q Okay. And Ace Hart was also a source of information
13 for you, was he not, about the kids in the Terra Linda
14 residence?

15 A Such as?

16 Q Well, now that you ask, such as the mass quantities
17 of drugs --

18 MR. GUYMON: Judge, I'm gonna object to that.

19 BY MR. FIGLER:

20 Q -- that were being sold out of their house.

21 MR. GUYMON: Judge, I'm gonna object.

22 THE COURT: Sustained.

23 BY MR. FIGLER:

24 Q Did you do an investigation with regard to the drugs
25 that were being sold out of the Terra Linda residence?

BUCZEK - CROSS

1 A No, I did not.

2 MR. DASKAS: Objection, assumes facts not in
3 evidence.

4 MR. FIGLER: I'm asking if he did an investigation.

5 THE COURT: Overruled.

6 BY MR. FIGLER:

7 Q You did not.

8 Do you recall if you had any information available
9 to you regarding the sale of acid, ecstasy, coke, weed and
10 mushrooms?

11 A I had that information available to me, however, I
12 wasn't conducting a drug investigation. I was conducting a
13 murder investigation.

14 Q Okay. Sometimes drugs and murders kind of come
15 together, isn't that correct?

16 A That is correct.

17 Q And, in fact, in this investigation you had lots of
18 information about lots of people with drugs, isn't that
19 correct?

20 A That is correct.

21 Q Selling drugs, buying drugs, using drugs, that sort
22 of thing, correct?

23 A That's right.

24 Q And, in fact, at the investigation of the Terra
25 Linda house, drugs were found, isn't that correct?

BUCZEK - CROSS

1 A Yes, I believe there were mushrooms found there.

2 Q Okay, and some methamphetamine too? Would you
3 accept that, if there was already a stipulation between
4 counsel, that methamphetamine was found?

5 A I don't recall seeing that report.

6 Q Okay. You know that there were a lot of materials
7 that were found at the Terra Linda residence that have
8 previously been described as materials which could be utilized
9 for methamphetamine manufacturing, correct?

10 A I'm sorry, I'm not familiar with methamphetamine
11 manufacturing and I couldn't testify to that.

12 Q So if some other witness, a crime scene analyst,
13 someone like that, came in and said that they saw meth lab
14 materials there, they would be perhaps better versed in that
15 than yourself?

16 A Much better versed. I'm not familiar with the
17 manufacturing of drugs at all.

18 Q Okay. So then, I take it, you didn't follow up on
19 that aspect?

20 A No, I did not.

21 Q Okay.

22 A I was investigating the murder.

23 Q But you weren't investigating any of the background
24 information in that particular house about illegal activity?

25 A I had learned about drugs in that household being

BUCZEK - CROSS

1 sold and being used, however, I wasn't investigating that and,
2 if it came up in obtaining a statement, then it did, but,
3 however, I wasn't going out and actively conducting a drug
4 investigation on the four boys who were murdered.

5 Q Okay. Now how long have you been a detective doing
6 murder cases?

7 A Three and a half years now.

8 Q And before that you were with Metro doing
9 investigation on cases?

10 A Yes, that's correct.

11 Q Now it's not uncommon for a house where drugs are
12 being sold to be ripped off, isn't that correct, in your
13 experience and training?

14 A It happens.

15 Q Okay. In fact, it results in murder sometimes,
16 doesn't it?

17 A Yes, it does.

18 Q Okay. And the reason why those two factors are
19 important to each other, and correct me if I'm wrong, is
20 because the people who are engaging in the illegal activity
21 draw other illegal activity, isn't that correct? In other
22 words, if you're mixed up in illegal stuff, bad stuff can
23 happen. Isn't that a good general statement?

24 A That's true.

25 Q You're not dealing with upstanding citizens

BUCZEK - CROSS

1 normally. You're dealing with basically other people who are
2 engaged in illegal activity if you're selling drugs, correct?

3 A I'm sorry, I'm not understanding that question.

4 Q Okay. People who buy illegal drugs can be dangerous
5 people, people who carry guns and act irrationally, that sort
6 of thing?

7 MR. DASKAS: Judge, I'm gonna object to the
8 relevance of this.

9 THE COURT: Argument will be later today, Mr.
10 Figler. Sustained.

11 MR. FIGLER: Okay.

12 BY MR. FIGLER:

13 Q Now you also received information, during the course
14 of your investigation, that these individuals at the Terra
15 Linda house allegedly had a lot of money, isn't that correct,
16 or at least it was thought that they had a lot of money?

17 A It was believed that they had a lot of money, yes.

18 Q And through your investigation of people like Ace
19 Hart, you were told specifically that it was believed that
20 they had about ten thousand dollars (\$10,000)? That number's
21 come around quite a bit. Do you recall that?

22 A Yes, it has. That's correct.

23 Q And you say you don't have familiarity with the drug
24 trade, so you don't know how much money can be gained selling
25 a hundred sheets of acid a day?

BUCZEK - CROSS

1 A None at all. I'm sorry.

2 Q Or any of these other drugs that I mentioned?

3 A No.

4 Q Okay. Now you never found ten thousand dollars
5 (\$10,000) in cash in this particular case, did you?

6 A I didn't conduct the crime scene investigation, so,
7 no, I did not.

8 Q You share information with Detective Thowsen, isn't
9 that correct?

10 A Yes, we do.

11 Q And Sergeant Hefner as well?

12 A That's correct.

13 Q Do you know if ten thousand dollars (\$10,000) was
14 ever recovered in this particular case?

15 A No.

16 Q Okay. Do you know if Bryan Johnson's house was ever
17 searched?

18 A No, it was not.

19 Q Okay, how about Ace Hart's house?

20 A No, not at all.

21 Q Was not?

22 A No.

23 Q Now you are aware that shortly after all this
24 occurred Tod Armstrong fled to Hawaii, isn't that correct?

25 A I don't believe he fled. He went to Hawaii.

BUCZEK - CROSS

1 Q So he definitely went to Hawaii?

2 A Yes.

3 Q Okay. And, Ace Hart, you know that he went
4 somewhere in the midwest, isn't that correct?

5 A I believe so, yes.

6 Q Okay. Now how did they pay for their trips?

7 A I'm not quite sure.

8 Q Okay.

9 MR. DASKAS: Judge, can we approach on that?

10 (Off-record bench conference)

11 BY MR. FIGLER:

12 Q Now these boys, Tod Armstrong, Bryan Johnson, Ace
13 Hart, on the night of August 18th, 1998 they were the ones who
14 led police to the Everman residence, isn't that correct?

15 A I believe it was August 17th, if I'm correct.

16 Q The 17th into the 18th?

17 A Correct.

18 Q Okay, I want to make sure I get that right.

19 And, in fact, these are the same boys who
20 specifically led police to a pager in the backyard, isn't that
21 correct?

22 A I don't know how the pager was found. I wasn't
23 present.

24 Q You do share information with Sergeant Hefner
25 though, correct?

BUCZEK - CROSS

1 A That's correct. And I just don't know how the ---
2 how the pager was found. I don't know if they searched -- I
3 believe they searched for it in the backyard.

4 Q Okay.

5 A And found it.

6 Q Now generally there was also information about black
7 jeans and blood on black jeans and that was provided by those
8 three boys as well to the police, isn't that correct?

9 A That's correct.

10 Q Okay. Now there was also some testimony that Tod
11 Armstrong gave consent to search that house on Everman. Do
12 you recall that?

13 A Yes.

14 Q Okay. And he, in fact, did that?

15 A Yes.

16 Q Okay, there's a consent card that's in evidence?

17 A Yes.

18 Q Okay. Now he signed that card voluntarily, right?

19 A That's correct.

20 Q Cooperated fully with you at that time, is that
21 right?

22 A That's correct.

23 Q But isn't it true that he had a full day between
24 when he initially gave you statements and when he signed that
25 card to go and remove any information that might have

BUCZEK - CROSS

1 implicated him from that Everman house?

2 A No, that's incorrect.

3 Q Okay. Well, how about the 16th and the 15th, do you
4 know where Tod Armstrong's whereabouts were that day?

5 A No, I do not.

6 Q Okay, so he certainly could have rid the house of
7 anything during that time, isn't that correct?

8 A If he wanted to.

9 MR. DASKAS: Judge, I'll object. I think we're
10 getting into an area of speculation at this point.

11 THE COURT: Sustained.

12 BY MR. FIGLER:

13 Q You don't have the -- You don't know the whereabouts
14 of Tod Armstrong from the 14th, when this event occurred, 'til
15 the 17th, when he was in the Detective Bureau, isn't that
16 correct?

17 A That is correct.

18 Q By the way, where was Ace Hart the night of these
19 murders?

20 A I do not know.

21 Q Now you know that Ace Hart was friends with a lot of
22 people whose names keep coming up in this particular case,
23 isn't that correct?

24 A Yes.

25 Q And you also know that Ace Hart was friends with the

BUCZEK - CROSS

1 people who lived in the Terra Linda residence, isn't that
2 correct?

3 A Yes.

4 Q And the same thing goes with Tod Armstrong, correct?

5 A Yes.

6 Q Okay, friends, acquaintances anyway?

7 A That is correct.

8 Q People who bought drugs back and forth? Isn't that
9 information that you had?

10 A Yes.

11 Q Now there has been testimony in this particular case
12 that there was no forced entry into the house, isn't that
13 correct?

14 A That's correct.

15 Q All right, so that would be consistent with someone
16 opening the door to someone that they were acquainted with?

17 A My understanding is that the door was --

18 MR. FIGLER: Object, Your Honor, non-responsive. I
19 asked if it was consistent. It's a yes or no. It calls for a
20 yes or no.

21 THE COURT: Ask your next question.

22 BY MR. FIGLER:

23 Q Was there any sign of forced entry into that house?

24 A No, there was not.

25 THE COURT: That's been asked and answered.

BUCZEK - CROSS

1 Do you have a new area to wrap this up, Mr. Figler?

2 MR. FIGLER: Sure, Judge.

3 BY MR. FIGLER:

4 Q Now Tod Armstrong was developed as a suspect in this
5 particular case, is that correct?

6 A Yes.

7 Q Okay. And had there been information or more
8 information that Tod Armstrong was involved in this particular
9 case, you would have arrested him for it, isn't that correct?

10 A Without a doubt.

11 Q Okay, would that be information like Tod Armstrong
12 planned this entire affair? It's yes or no again.

13 A Yes.

14 Q And how about that Tod Armstrong expected proceeds
15 from a drug rip-off, is that the type of information?

16 A Yes.

17 Q Now didn't you have that information from Charla
18 Severs? Didn't she tell you that information?

19 A She didn't tell me that, no.

20 Q So you don't have that information from Charla
21 Severs?

22 MR. DASKAS: And again, Judge, --

23 THE WITNESS: I did not --

24 MR. DASKAS: -- the objection is hearsay and, if
25 it's not offered for the truth, it's not relevant.

BUCZEK - REDIRECT

1 THE COURT: Overruled.

2 THE WITNESS: I never interviewed her.

3 MR. FIGLER: Okay.

4 BY MR. FIGLER:

5 Q Now you wouldn't do anything at all to be protecting
6 Ace Hart, Bryan Johnson or Tod Armstrong, would you?

7 A No, not at all.

8 Q Nothing during this investigation that would
9 insulate them from being developed as suspects?

10 A No.

11 Q You had interaction with an individual named Ed
12 Guenther, who's a fingerprint examiner, isn't that correct?

13 A Yes.

14 Q Okay, certain requests were made of him to run
15 fingerprint comparisons?

16 A My partner provided the requests, yes.

17 Q Okay. Ace Hart, Bryan Johnson, those were never
18 submitted, were they?

19 A I don't recall.

20 MR. FIGLER: Nothing further, Your Honor.

21 THE COURT: Any redirect?

22 MR. DASKAS: Just one question.

23 REDIRECT EXAMINATION

24 BY MR. DASKAS:

25 Q The question about forced entry into the house, you

BUCZEK - REDIRECT

1 were asked if that's consistent with I guess the victim
2 knowing the perpetrator. Is it also consistent with the
3 victim being led into the house at gunpoint?

4 A Yes, it is.

5 MR. SCISCENTO: Your Honor, I'm gonna object to
6 that. This Court specifically requested that that answer --
7 not be specifically answered.

8 MR. DASKAS: Yeah, I was allowed to ask it.

9 MR. SCISCENTO: And so, therefore, if he's trying to
10 use this in redirect, --

11 THE COURT: I don't understand. I thought he did
12 ask that question.

13 MR. SCISCENTO: You didn't allow that question and
14 you asked him to move on to a different question.

15 THE COURT: Oh, I thought he had given the answer
16 yes or no.

17 MR. DASKAS: He did answer it.

18 MR. FIGLER: So it's just --

19 MR. SCISCENTO: It's gonna exceed the scope of
20 redirect.

21 THE COURT: And it also calls for speculation. And
22 we can have argument in about two hours or so.

23 Any other questions?

24 MR. DASKAS: Just a couple of follow-up, Judge.

25 THE COURT: But you promised just one.

BUCZEK - RECROSS

1 MR. DASKAS: I promise less than five.

2 BY MR. DASKAS:

3 Q Detective, you were asked a lot of questions about
4 information you learned that resulted in Tod Armstrong
5 becoming a suspect. Do you recall those questions?

6 A Yes, I do.

7 Q Did you ever develop enough information about Tod
8 Armstrong's involvement in this case to arrest him?

9 A No, I did not.

10 Q Had you developed that information, what would you
11 have done?

12 A If we had more information, I would -- definitely
13 would have arrested Tod.

14 Q If you learn information after today that leads you
15 to believe that Tod is more involved than you know at this
16 point, what will you do?

17 A I'll be the first one at his door to arrest him.

18 MR. DASKAS: Nothing else, Judge.

19 THE COURT: Any recross?

20 RECROSS EXAMINATION

21 BY MR. FIGLER:

22 Q So if you are -- If you're told that Charla Severs
23 said that Tod Armstrong planned this and received it
24 afterward, is that enough?

25 A I don't believe so, because it's already been

BUCZEK - RECROSS

1 discussed with the District Attorney's Office and we've been
2 advised that we do not have enough to make an arrest at this
3 point.

4 Q Okay, so Charla's evidence is not enough, correct?

5 A That's my understanding. That's correct.

6 MR. DASKAS: Nothing else, Judge.

7 THE COURT: Thank you, sir. You're excused.

8 THE WITNESS: Thank you, Your Honor.

9 THE COURT: Okay, folks, we're gonna take a recess.
10 The State has indicated they have one more witness, who you've
11 heard the name of before, which is Mr. Wahl, and the defense,
12 as I've indicated, doesn't have to call witnesses, but has
13 indicated they might. And so the schedule, what we're gonna
14 follow, is we're gonna take about a ten-minute break, hear
15 from Mr. Wahl, hear from any witnesses that the defense might
16 have, if they choose to call them, there might be a rebuttal
17 witness, depending on whether or not any witnesses are called
18 for the defense, then the lunch break's gonna occur and we're
19 going to get together, meaning us folks, and get some
20 instructions and other things ready for you. So we'll be
21 eating lunch a little late today and right after lunch you're
22 going to be receiving this case.

23 During this recess you're admonished not to talk or
24 converse among yourselves or with anyone else on any subject
25 connected with this trial or read, watch or listen to any

WAHL - DIRECT

1 report of or commentary on the trial, or any person connected
2 with it, by any medium of information, including, without
3 limitation, newspaper, television and radio, or to form or
4 express any opinion on any subject connected with the trial
5 until it's finally submitted to you.

6 We'll be in recess 'til 25 minutes of 12:00.

7 And could I see counsel briefly in chambers?

8 (Court recessed)

9 (Jury is present)

10 THE CLERK: Please raise your right hand.

11 THOMAS WAHL, PLAINTIFF'S WITNESS, IS SWORN

12 THE CLERK: Please state your full name and spell
13 your last name for the record.

14 THE WITNESS: First name Thomas, middle initial A,
15 last name is Wahl, spelled W-A-H-L.

16 DIRECT EXAMINATION

17 BY MR. GUYMON:

18 Q And, Mr. Thomas Wahl, what is your occupation or
19 profession?

20 A I am currently employed as a criminalist and DNA
21 analyst with the Las Vegas Metro Police Department, Forensic
22 Laboratory.

23 Q And have you had some special training in order to
24 hold that position?

25 A I hold a Bachelor of Science Degree in Medical

IV-91

WAHL - DIRECT

1 Technology with a minor in Chemistry. I have 20 years of
2 experience doing forensic biological analysis, 10 years of
3 which is in the DNA analysis field.

4 I have participated in a fair amount of workshops
5 and training to keep abreast with the new technological
6 advancements and also, in some of my previous jobs, I have
7 been an instructor and actually have provided training to
8 people in the DNA identification field. And I'm certified by
9 the American Board of Criminalists in DNA analysis methods and
10 am also a diplomate with the American Board of Criminalistics.

11 Q And, tell me. how long have you been with the Las
12 Vegas Metropolitan Police Department as a DNA analyst?

13 A It will be five years come this September.

14 Q And briefly outline your other job responsibilities
15 before you got to the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department
16 in the field of DNA analysis.

17 A I had approximately five years of experience working
18 in the forensic biology section in the Wisconsin State
19 Department of Justice Regional Crime Laboratory in Milwaukee,
20 Wisconsin. I had two years of experience working with the
21 Florida Department of Law Enforcement Regional Crime Lab in
22 Tampa performing basically the same job duties.

23 I was hired in 1989 to help set up a DNA lab in a
24 private forensic DNA testing laboratory called Analytical
25 Genetic Testing Center located in Denver, Colorado and some of

WAHL - DIRECT

1 my job duties in that capacity were, as I said earlier,
2 training of other personnel from other laboratories in DNA
3 identification training.

4 And then I have two years experience working in a
5 private DNA testing laboratory in Seattle, Washington called
6 Genelex Corporation. I was a forensic supervisor there. I
7 was hired to set up a DNA laboratory with that company. And
8 then I was offered a job with the Las Vegas Metro Police
9 Department to set up a DNA laboratory here in 1995. We have
10 the laboratory set up and now we are doing DNA analysis there.

11 Q It sounds as though you've set up at least three DNA
12 laboratories then, is that correct?

13 A That's correct.

14 Q Or had jobs that you had that very responsibility?

15 A I was hired specifically for that reason, yes.

16 Q Tell me this, have you testified in courts of law as
17 a DNA expert? And let's start first with the Eighth Judicial
18 District Courts right here in the State of Nevada.

19 A Yes, I have.

20 Q And qualified as an expert?

21 A That's correct.

22 Q How about other states, have you qualified as an
23 expert in the field of DNA analysis in other states?

24 A Yes.

25 Q And so testified as an expert?

WAHL - DIRECT

1 A Yes, approximately 13 other state jurisdictions and
2 I also am -- have testified in the country of Canada as a DNA
3 expert.

4 MR. GUYMON: Judge, at this time I would offer
5 Thomas Wahl as an expert in the field of DNA analysis.

6 MR. SCISCENTO: You may.

7 THE COURT: He'll be recognized as an expert.

8 Again, that just means he can give his testimony in
9 the form of opinions. What weight you give those opinions is
10 up to you.

11 Go ahead, Mr. Guymon.

12 BY MR. GUYMON:

13 Q Very briefly, Mr. Wahl, have you written
14 publications and published in the field of DNA analysis?

15 A I have co-authored some publications, yes.

16 Q Okay. Now then, tell me, just what is DNA?

17 A DNA is an acronym for a very long word called
18 deoxyribonucleic acid. DNA is found in all living organisms.
19 This would include viruses, bacteria, plants, animals and
20 humans. It's considered the basic building block or genetic
21 blueprint of all organisms.

22 It's comprised of four building blocks and the
23 sequence of these building blocks in a DNA molecule is what
24 determines the genetic code. The genetic code is responsible
25 for the development, organization and the function of

WAHL - DIRECT

1 organisms from the time they are born 'til the time they die.

2 With respect to human DNA, DNA is found on cellular
3 structures known as chromosomes. These are found in cells in
4 the human body that contain a cell nucleus, so therefore
5 nucleoid cells contain DNA. The types of biological samples
6 that contain DNA that we deal with most often in the forensic
7 laboratory setting are biological substances, such as blood,
8 sperm, epithelial cells, skin, muscle, bone, teeth, hair
9 roots. So a lot of biological material of the human body
10 possesses nucleoid cells and, therefore, possesses DNA.

11 A vast majority of the DNA is the same in all human
12 individuals. In other words, the genetic code codes for the
13 making of one nose, two eyes, things of this type. A very
14 small percentage of the DNA in the human cell is genetically
15 variable. In other words, the structure arrangement of the
16 DNA building blocks is different in different individuals.
17 It's these regions of the DNA that scientists look at in order
18 to determine the genetic differences amongst individuals and
19 to be used for DNA identification purposes.

20 There's several things you need to know about DNA.
21 There is a -- or different regions of the DNA that we look at
22 that have genetic variability and we can refer to those as
23 regions where we can obtain DNA types. A combination of DNA
24 types is referred to as a DNA profile. The DNA profile, your
25 DNA profile, is determined from inheritance, the chromosomes

WAHL - DIRECT

1 you inherit from your biological mother via the female egg
2 cell and the chromosomes you inherit via the sperm cell from
3 your biological father. The combination of those chromosomes
4 is what determines your DNA type and the combination of DNA
5 types is known as a DNA profile.

6 Secondly, the DNA profile does not change from birth
7 until death. When you are born you have a DNA profile and it
8 remains the same. It doesn't change. Secondly, the DNA
9 profile that you could obtain from, let's say, your blood is
10 the same as from a sperm cell in a male individual or from
11 your skin or from muscle tissue. It's the same.

12 And, thirdly, there's enough genetic variation in
13 these regions that we look at such that every individual has a
14 unique DNA profile, with one exception, and that is if you had
15 an identical sibling, such as an identical twin. Identical
16 twins have the same DNA profile. And there is enough
17 variations, as I said before, that everyone has a unique DNA
18 profile.

19 Scientists utilize technology to detect these
20 genetic differences to try to determine DNA profiles. In the
21 forensic lab setting we basically deal with two types of
22 evidence, known evidence and questioned evidence. Known
23 evidence is biological samples that are collected from
24 individuals. We refer to these as reference standards. These
25 could be liquid blood samples or cells that are scraped from

WAHL - DIRECT

1 the inside of the mouth that contain nucleoid epithelial cells
2 called bucca cells and we can extract DNA from that as well.
3 So these are the two types of main biological samples that are
4 collected from individuals. They are known as reference
5 standards. We can obtain DNA profiles from those standards to
6 absolutely, positively determine the DNA profile of an
7 individual.

8 The second type of evidence is known as questioned
9 evidence and this is evidence that is submitted to the
10 laboratory that may be biological substances that are
11 deposited at crime scenes, may be blood stains or semen stains
12 on clothing in which the investigators are submitting it to
13 the laboratory to try to determine the DNA profile from the
14 evidence and whose is it. And this is called questioned
15 evidence. So we're dealing with comparative analysis.

16 The type of technology we use in our laboratory is
17 called PCR technology.

18 Q Let me, before we get to PCR technology, let me ask
19 you this. Can this process of typing DNA identify war dead?

20 A Pardon?

21 Q Through the typing of DNA can we identify war dead,
22 like soldiers that die that aren't identified?

23 A Yes. That's one of the applications of DNA
24 identification technology, yes.

25 Q Can this area of typing DNA exclude suspects in any

1 given case?

2 A Yes, the power of exclusion is extremely strong with
3 DNA analysis.

4 Q And what do you mean by that?

5 A That if a sample, biological sample, truly did not
6 originate from somebody, the DNA analysis system will prove
7 that.

8 Q And you say prove it. With what degree of certainty
9 can it prove that a person's excluded?

10 A Absolutely, 100 percent, absolutely.

11 Q And can it identify suspects?

12 A Yes, it can.

13 Q And with what degree of certainty can it identify a
14 suspect?

15 A In my opinion with absolute certainty if -- and the
16 caveat being there's sufficient genetic information obtained
17 from the evidence.

18 Q Let's talk a little bit about if there's sufficient
19 genetic information then. You put an if there and why?

20 A An example is that in the early days of PCR
21 technology the DNA profiling systems, in most laboratories,
22 consisted of about six or seven DNA types. It was very
23 powerful exclusionary profiling systems, but the rarity of
24 their estimate of the DNA profile frequencies from that
25 battery of tests was not sufficient enough to positively

1 identify somebody.

2 Over the course of time there's been a lot of
3 research and development of new DNA typing methods and there
4 are now DNA typing methods available where the amount of
5 genetic information is so powerful and so discriminatory that
6 the rarity of DNA profiles that can be established are
7 extremely, extremely rare such that to a reasonable degree of
8 scientific certainty positive identification can be made with
9 this type of DNA profiling system.

10 Q Let me ask you, is the process of excluding a
11 suspect through DNA typing, is it commonly accepted within
12 those that practice in your field?

13 A Yes. And, in fact, I look at DNA typing analysis
14 from the exclusionary standpoint.

15 Q And, tell me, persons in your field, do they
16 commonly also use it, however, to positively identify
17 suspects?

18 A Yes.

19 Q And is this used across the country?

20 A In most laboratories, yes.

21 Q And even outside the United States is there DNA
22 testing? You mentioned Canada.

23 A From my understanding, I do believe Canada is now
24 making identity statements.

25 Q All right. Now, then, you mentioned PCR techniques.

WAHL - DIRECT

1 Just what is PCR techniques?

2 A Scientists like to use a lot of acronyms. PCR
3 stands for Polymerase Chain Reaction and this is a relatively
4 new DNA typing technology. It was developed in the late '80s,
5 but it has been recently used in forensic applications since
6 the early '90s and is basically the method -- method of DNA
7 technology of choice in most forensic laboratories across the
8 world.

9 PCR is a method that can enzymatically copy, sort of
10 like a Xerox copy, specific target regions of DNA such that we
11 can take very small amounts of evidentiary material DNA and
12 copy the DNA a million times fold so we have enough DNA to
13 type and then we can -- we have enough DNA to look at the
14 genetic differences we need to.

15 Q If I mention the phrase STR, does that mean anything
16 to you?

17 A STR is another acronym that stands for Short Tandem
18 Repeats. STRs are genetic types -- the STR genetic types are
19 determined by PCR technology, but they are a certain class of
20 genetic types that fall into a class called Short Tandem
21 Repeats. This is currently the DNA profiling/genetic typing
22 system that's used in most government laboratories and most
23 forensic laboratories across the world and it's also used for
24 the FBI's DNA databasing system.

25 So STRs are becoming -- or are the method of choice

WAHL - DIRECT

1 for DNA profiling in forensic labs.

2 Q And is this process, of STR testing, is it reliable?

3 A Yes, it is.

4 Q Can it, in fact, with certainty, exclude suspects?

5 A Absolutely.

6 Q And with the same certainty can it identify suspects
7 through STR testing?

8 A If enough genetic information's obtained from the
9 evidence, yes.

10 Q Now then let's talk about contamination just for a
11 little bit. As a scientist or an analyst in DNA, is
12 contamination important to you?

13 A It's a concern because PCR is a very sensitive
14 method. Because we are actually copying or photocopying DNA
15 samples to perform genetic typing, it's absolutely imperative
16 for the laboratory to set up the laboratory and follow very
17 strict lab protocols to reduce or minimize introducing DNA
18 into the sample during the course of the analysis. And this
19 would be DNA that has nothing to do with the case. It could
20 be contamination from myself. It could be contamination from
21 some other source. So it's very, very important to set up the
22 laboratory and follow strict protocol.

23 And the contamination we're concerned with with PCR,
24 as I stated before, is the introduction of biological material
25 into the sample, so precautions are taken from the crime scene

WAHL - DIRECT

1 people from the time they collect the evidence, package it,
2 store it, to the time it comes to our laboratory, our handling
3 and processing and returning the evidence to the evidence
4 vault. During that whole course of time there are protocols
5 that we need to follow to reduce that possibility from
6 happening.

7 Q Now in the lab that you're currently employed at,
8 the Las Vegas Metropolitan Forensic Lab, does that forensic
9 lab have protocols so as to satisfy your concerns regarding
10 contamination?

11 A Yes. Those are outlined in our PCR manuals, our
12 protocol manuals, and also these are guidelines that are
13 followed by many laboratories according to certain guidelines
14 set up by groups who oversee DNA analysis testing, one known
15 as the Technical Working Group of DNA Analysis Methods and the
16 other one, which is a federally set-up board, called the DNA
17 Advisory Board. They do set guidelines and we follow those
18 guidelines.

19 Q Are there controls or indicators, as an expert in
20 this field, that you can see that tell you that something's
21 been contaminated or hasn't been contaminated once you do the
22 testing?

23 A In our protocol we always set up controls. There
24 are several types of controls that we set up and each have a
25 specific purpose. One control is called a positive control

WAHL - DIRECT

1 and this is a DNA sample of known DNA types. In other words,
2 we know what the DNA types are and this sample is carried
3 through the PCR typing process and then, at the end of the
4 process, the results of the positive control are interpreted
5 and the types of the positive control must reflect the known
6 DNA type. This ensures that the typing process worked as it
7 should.

8 Then there are several types of negative controls
9 that are implemented and each has a certain purpose. One is
10 known as -- what we call in our laboratory the DNA extraction
11 reagent control. When we are in the process of extracting DNA
12 from our evidence, and I'll use a bloodstain as an example,
13 let's say of a bloodstain on a shirt or a pair of pants, we
14 actually cut a small portion of that bloodstain out, put it in
15 a test tube and then we add some DNA extraction reagents to
16 that to try to extract the DNA out of the bloodstain. These
17 reagents, we set up a separate test tube with just those
18 reagents in it and carry it through the DNA extraction process
19 and all the way through the typing procedure.

20 At the end of the typing procedure we look at these
21 controls and we do not want to see any DNA types in that
22 sample. The purpose is that we want to demonstrate that no
23 DNA contamination has occurred in our extraction reagents.
24 That demonstrates that we haven't introduced contamination to
25 our samples with the extraction reagents.

WAHL - DIRECT

1 The second type of negative control is referred to
2 as a negative amplification control. This control is a test
3 tube that uses the PCR reagents we use to enzymatically copy
4 the DNA. These reagents are part of a commercially available
5 kit that we purchase from a company that makes these reagents.
6 And this is carried through the typing procedure. At the end
7 of the typing procedure, we look at the typing results of this
8 sample and we do not want to see any DNA types in this sample.
9 This is a check to ensure that our PCR commercially available
10 reagents were not contaminated with DNA.

11 And then there is a third control that may or may
12 not be run, it's up to the discretion of the analyst, and this
13 is referred to as the substrate control. By substrate I mean
14 the material or the surface that a biological sample's
15 deposited on. We sometimes test an area adjacent to the stain
16 to ensure that there's nothing in the material that could be
17 contributing to the sample typing, because when we extract DNA
18 from let's say a bloodstain out of a piece of cloth, there
19 could be something on the cloth, as well as the bloodstain on
20 the cloth. So you may -- an analyst may run a substrate
21 control and in that control you may or may not see DNA types,
22 but if you do not see DNA types in the substrate control, this
23 is also a very good check that there is nothing on the
24 material itself that could be causing a DNA typing result.

25 Q Mr. Wahl, in this particular case, that being event

WAHL - DIRECT

1 number 9808141600, did you actually obtain pieces of evidence
2 from the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department evidence
3 vault or have them sent to you so you could, in fact, analyze
4 them through PCR testing?

5 A Yes.

6 Q I'm gonna show you a series of pieces of evidence
7 and ask you if you recognize them. We'll start with Item
8 Number 183. Do you recognize it?

9 A Yes. State's Exhibit 183 is an envelope. It's the
10 original package containing a cigarette butt reportedly
11 recovered from the scene.

12 Q And did you have some involvement with the testing
13 of items within that particular piece of evidence or
14 associated with that piece of evidence?

15 A Yes, I did perform DNA analysis on a portion of that
16 cigarette butt shortly after the homicides.

17 Q Okay. And likewise Exhibit Number 194, 193 and 192,
18 in reverse order, are you familiar with each one of these
19 particular items of evidence and did you, in fact, perform
20 testing on each of those?

21 A Yes, I did. My identifying marks are on here, on
22 the evidence packages.

23 Q And you have another bag in your hands, 191. Are
24 you familiar with that particular bag?

25 A Yes. This is the original container containing a

IV-105

AA01618

WAHL - DIRECT

1 pair of black Calvin Klein jeans.

2 Q Okay. And did you do some work on the black Calvin
3 Klein jeans?

4 A Yes.

5 Q And we'll get to those.

6 And lastly 183 -- or 182 is a series of cigarette
7 butts. This one here from Cellmark, 183, is associated with
8 those. In total there are 12 cigarette butts. Are you
9 familiar with those 12 cigarette butts?

10 A Yes. This is the original package container
11 containing all 12 cigarette butts and then one of the
12 cigarette butts was removed from this container, placed in
13 this container and then sent to another DNA testing laboratory
14 later on in the investigation for further DNA testing.

15 Q And, Mr. Wahl, as you began the analysis you also
16 obtained, did you not, the known samples of Jeffrey Biddle,
17 Tracey Gorringe, Matthew Mowen and Peter Talamantez, is that
18 correct?

19 A Yes.

20 Q And they were obtained during the autopsy of each
21 one of those four boys?

22 A Yes.

23 Q And impounded by Sheree Norman?

24 A Yes.

25 Q Okay. Now were each and every one of the items that

WAHL - DIRECT

1 you began to analyze, were they in a sealed condition when you
2 received them?

3 A Yes, they were.

4 Q And was that important to you?

5 A Yes. It's very important that the evidence have
6 intact evidence tape seals that indicates that the samples had
7 not been opened prior to my examining them.

8 Q And once you obtained all of those particular
9 samples, those that you have now and the known samples of the
10 four decedents, what type of testing did you begin to do
11 first?

12 A Back in August of 1998 we were performing PCR
13 technology to do DNA profiling with what I would consider the
14 first set of DNA battery tests. This is the -- a series of
15 profiling, that I indicated earlier in my testimony, in which
16 the testing is very discriminatory, but we couldn't achieve
17 positive identity with that particular set of typing systems.
18 The STR systems were currently in in-house validation. In
19 other words, we were at that time performing internal
20 validation studies on the STR systems to ensure that we could
21 reliably type our DNA samples with STRs, but we were not doing
22 casework typing yet because our validations had not been
23 completed.

24 So we were still doing the older phase DNA typing
25 and that's the type of technology I initially did on the

WAHL - DIRECT

1 evidence back in 1998.

2 Q And were you able to form some conclusions
3 associated with that analysis?

4 A With respect to which items of evidence?

5 Q Well, which items did you first analyze?

6 A The very first --

7 Q You typed -- You typed the boys, correct?

8 A Well, the first thing I did was I examined the pair
9 of black Calvin Klein jeans.

10 Q Let's talk about that examination then.

11 A The request from the homicide division was to
12 determine if there was any blood on the black jeans, if it was
13 human blood and to determine a DNA profile of any blood that
14 may have been found on the jeans.

15 Q Mr. Wahl, was there, in fact, human blood on the
16 back of those Calvin Klein jeans?

17 A Yes. I identified eight human bloodstains on the
18 back right pant leg of the jeans. Six of the stains were
19 somewhat clustered close together on the lower portion of the
20 pant leg and then there were two additional stains that were
21 located in the area -- on the back of the knee area.

22 Q And did you photograph those pants once you had them
23 in the lab yourself?

24 A I did not photograph them at the time I did the
25 analysis. I did photograph them after I had done some

1 analysis.

2 Q Okay. And are the pants actually in State's Exhibit
3 191?

4 A They should be. They were -- The last seal on here
5 is from a private laboratory that received the jeans for
6 analysis purposes.

7 Q It says "Biohazard" on it. As a result, we have not
8 opened it, but can you safely accept the fact that there are,
9 in fact, the very black jeans that you worked on in this case
10 in that bag?

11 A My evidence seals are present on here, they appear
12 to be intact and there are some evidence seals on here from a
13 private DNA testing laboratory and they appear to be intact as
14 well. So, to the best of my knowledge, the jeans are inside.

15 (Pause in the proceedings)

16 Q With the biohazard sticker on there, is there
17 safety concerns or issues?

18 A Our policy is that when we deal with biological
19 evidence it's always considered a potential biohazard and this
20 is because of the reality of hepatitis or AIDS that could be
21 present in a bloodstain. We don't know where the bloodstain
22 came from and we don't know the health condition of the person
23 who deposited the stain, so it's always treated as a
24 biohazard.

25 Q I show you what has previously been marked as

WAHL - DIRECT

1 State's Exhibits 105 and 107. It is reported by Marc
2 Washington that he in fact impounded some black Calvin Klein
3 jeans being of a 34 waist and 30 length.

4 Are those, in fact, photographs of the black jeans
5 that you analyzed and found eight human bloodstains on the
6 back?

7 A It appears that one of these pairs of jeans is.

8 Q Okay, there's two pair of jeans in 107, the lower
9 leg in 105.

10 A Yeah. The jeans in this photograph on the left with
11 a leather patch up here appear to be similar to the ones I
12 examined.

13 Q Okay. Now, then, what type of test did you do in
14 order to determine whether or not this was human blood?

15 A The first test we do is a visual examination to see
16 if anything looks consistent with the appearance of a
17 bloodstain, a dried bloodstain. The pants are black, so blood
18 is a little more difficult to detect on a black background
19 versus a white background.

20 Upon careful examination I did observe the stains I
21 had mentioned on the lower back pant leg and the first step I
22 did was a test known as a presumptive test for blood. A
23 presumptive test is exactly what it sounds. It's a test that
24 if it is positive, based on the appearance and the positive
25 presumptive test result, we presume that the stains we're

WAHL - DIRECT

1 examining are indeed blood, but it is not confirmatory for the
2 presence of blood. We need to go to a next phase of analysis
3 to then confirm that the sample is indeed blood and to confirm
4 that it's human, human in origin.

5 So I did perform presumptive tests on all eight of
6 those stains and I did get positive presumptive tests for
7 blood using this test.

8 Q Did you do subsequent tests, without describing in
9 too much detail what the subsequent tests are, that assured
10 you that in fact it was positively human blood?

11 A I removed a portion of each stain, performed a DNA
12 extraction and evaluation test on it and it was determined to
13 be of human origin, so that test result confirmed that these
14 stains indeed were human blood.

15 Q Did you, through a series of tests, also identify
16 whose human blood it was?

17 A I did extract DNA from all eight stains. I
18 extracted DNA from each of the blood samples collected from
19 each of the four victims at autopsy. I was able to get
20 conclusive DNA typing results with all four reference
21 standards of the victim and all eight bloodstains on the
22 pants. And I excluded three of the victims as a source of the
23 blood and one victim was included as a source of the blood.

24 Q And what three victims were excluded as the source
25 of blood on those Calvin Klein jeans?

WAHL - DIRECT

1 A Matthew Mowen, Peter Talamantez and Jeffrey Biddle.

2 Q And you say that Tracey Gorringer, however, was
3 included as possibly being his blood?

4 A Yes.

5 Q In other words, he was the person --

6 A I could not exclude him with the DNA typing test.

7 Q Through yet further tests did you, in fact, do more
8 than not be able to exclude him, but rather identify him?

9 A Yes.

10 Q And tell me with what degree of certainty are you
11 that he cannot be excluded from being the person -- the owner
12 of that blood?

13 A I did STR testing once we went online with STR
14 testing in June of 1999 and I went back and performed STR
15 analysis on retention DNA extracts from each of those eight
16 stains and from the four victims, as well as the suspects, and
17 I was able to positively identify Tracey Gorringer as the
18 source of all eight bloodstains.

19 Q And with what degree of certainty are you that that,
20 in fact, is Tracey Gorringer's blood at the bottom of those
21 pants?

22 A In my opinion I'm absolutely certain that there's
23 sufficient genetic information obtained from the bloodstains
24 to render an opinion that that blood came from Tracey Gorringer
25 and nobody else.

WAHL - DIRECT

1 Q Now, Mr. Wahl, did you also analyze the front of
2 those pants and, if so, why?

3 A I did a visual examination of the front of the pants
4 and I could not see any visible appearance of blood. And when
5 I found the blood on the back of the pants, I focused my
6 attention on the stains that I visibly could see on the back
7 of the pants.

8 Q And was your attention at a later date now focused
9 on the front of those pants?

10 A Upon my initial examination of the pants, I did
11 notice some whitish discolorations on the front zipper flap of
12 the jeans. It did not appear to --

13 Q You say the flap of the jeans. Where on the flap of
14 the jeans? Are we talking about the outside flap or the
15 inside flap zipper?

16 A There was some on the outside flap, but the majority
17 of the stains were on the inside zipper flap.

18 Q Can you, and I don't mean to embarrass anyone, can
19 you stand up and show the jury where that stain would be on
20 the jeans?

21 A It was actually a flap like this, although in the
22 jeans it's a little wider than the pants I'm wearing, but on
23 the inside flap area. And there was some overlap on the
24 outside, but the majority of it was here.

25 MR. SCISCENTO: Your Honor, can we have the record

WAHL - DIRECT

1 reflect what he's showing to the -- He's pulling --

2 MR. GUYMON: He's pulled back the flap of his zipper
3 exposing now the zipper line and ran his finger down the
4 zipper line from about the middle of the zipper --

5 BY MR. GUYMON:

6 Q Down to the bottom of the zipper?

7 A Yes. I also have photos of this area.

8 Q Did you, in fact, photograph the very area and bring
9 the photo with you?

10 A I photographed them at a later date, yes.

11 Q Okay, can I grab a photograph that would show the
12 very area we're talking about?

13 MR. SCISCENTO: If I may, Your Honor.

14 BY MR. GUYMON:

15 Q And I take it you're the one that photographed this?

16 A Yes.

17 Q And why is it that you would photograph this
18 particular area?

19 A Because there had been a request by the defense to
20 have the pants photographed before they got sent off to
21 another laboratory. And I photographed these and provided a
22 copy to the defense and I kept a copy.

23 Q All right. If I could have those and have them
24 marked.

25 A Here's an overall view, here's the flap area, here's

IV-114

AA01627

WAHL - DIRECT

1 the flap area in front and these are close-ups of that. And
2 we cut -- Some of the stains have been removed, so --

3 (Pause in the proceedings)

4 Q Now, then, once you saw some -- you described it as
5 a white crusty substance on the inside zipper area?

6 A Yes.

7 Q Is that correct?

8 Could you tell with the naked eye what that white
9 crusty substance was?

10 A It could be any material that upon drying looked
11 whitish and crusty.

12 Q Okay. And so what did you do to analyze it?

13 A Given the location and the appearance of the stain,
14 I tested it with a presumptive test for the presence of semen
15 and this presumptive test is known as an acid phosphatase
16 test.

17 Q And when you did that test did you get a result?

18 A I got no result. I got a negative result, a
19 negative result meaning that there was no acid phosphatase
20 enzyme activity detectable in the cuttings or the areas I
21 tested on that stain, indicating that it may not possess semen
22 at that point in time. It's a presumptive test.

23 Q Is it a proof positive test, a presumptive test?

24 Does that mean that there's just no semen there?

25 A No, not necessarily.

WAHL - DIRECT

1 Q And explain.

2 A Presumptive tests, if positive, don't necessarily
3 mean a test of semen and, if it's negative, it indicates it's
4 probably not semen, but it doesn't preclude the possibility it
5 could be.

6 Q Did you test this a second time?

7 A I did test it a second time, yes.

8 Q And what did you find?

9 A I tested it a second time at the request of Sergeant
10 Hefner. Sergeant Hefner, upon receipt of my DNA report
11 regarding the bloodstains on the jeans, he contacted me at the
12 lab and requested that I reexamine the jeans to see if I could
13 find any biological -- other biological stains on there that
14 may contain DNA which I could type and then attribute to the
15 possible wearer of the jeans.

16 When I talked to Sergeant Hefner, I did tell him
17 that I recalled that there was a white crusty stain that I had
18 tested for semen that was negative, however, I would reexamine
19 it and do some confirmatory tests to determine whether it was
20 semen or any other biological fluid. And I did, indeed, do
21 that several days -- within a week after he received my
22 report.

23 Q And did you, in fact, -- Did the confirmatory tests
24 confirm to you what this substance was?

25 A Yes. I removed a portion of the stain, I extracted

WAHL - DIRECT

1 it in a buffer solution and then performed a cellular
2 microscopic evaluation of the stain to determine what types of
3 cells may be in there and I identified sperm cells and
4 nucleoid epithelial cells present in that stain.

5 And the microscopic examination of sperm is a
6 confirmatory test for semen, so semen was proven to be present
7 in the stain.

8 Q And how certain are you that there was, in fact,
9 semen in that stain?

10 A Oh, absolutely positive.

11 Q Now let me ask you, as an expert, have you, on
12 occasion, done a presumptive test on something that you think
13 is semen and learned that in fact it's not?

14 A Yes, I have. It's rare, but I have, on a handful of
15 occasions, I have run across stains that do do that.

16 Q Subsequently, through confirmatory testing, the same
17 presumptive test that said negative may be positive after all?

18 A Yes.

19 Q All right. I want to show you what's been marked as
20 State's Proposed Exhibits 202 through 199, actually, in
21 backwards order, if that's all right.

22 A Starting from the top you said?

23 Q Well, do you recognize all four of those
24 photographs, 199, 200, 201 and 202?

25 A Yes, I do. I took these photographs and my

WAHL - DIRECT

1 identifying marks are on the back.

2 Q And do those photographs fairly and accurately
3 depict the pants after you had begun some work on them?

4 A Yes, they accurately reflect the pants after I had
5 removed some stains and prior to submitting this evidence to a
6 private lab for their testing.

7 Q There is areas on the pants that had been cut out.
8 Who was the one that cut those areas out?

9 A I did.

10 Q And why?

11 A It's our policy, in our laboratory, that
12 particularly if the stains are small that we cut the stains
13 out, remove portions that we need for our testing and any
14 unused portions of the stain are stapled to a three by five
15 index card, placed in a coin envelope and placed in a freezer.
16 The reason is we want to retain biological samples in a frozen
17 state to preserve them for possible reanalysis, either by our
18 laboratory or by an independent laboratory or a laboratory the
19 defense may want to select for reanalysis.

20 MR. GUYMON: And at this time I'd move to admit
21 State's Proposed Exhibit 199 through 202, Your Honor.

22 MR. SCISCENTO: No objection, Your Honor.

23 THE COURT: Received.

24 (Plaintiff's Exhibit Nos. 199 thru 202 admitted)

25 MR. GUYMON: And ask to publish the same.

IV-118

1 THE COURT: Yes.

2 BY MR. GUYMON:

3 Q Once you had confirmed that in fact this white
4 crusty substance on the inside zipper of the pants was sperm
5 did you, in fact, attempt to DNA type it or test it?

6 A Yes, right away.

7 Q Okay. And tell me what your conclusions were and
8 what you did.

9 A Because the microscopic exam indicated that there
10 may be a semen -- a mixture with another biological fluid, by
11 virtue of the fact that I saw nucleoid epithelial cells in
12 there along with sperm, I performed a DNA extraction procedure
13 known as a differential DNA extraction. Differential DNA
14 extraction, the purpose of this extraction procedure, is to
15 separate the sperm cell DNA from the nucleoid epithelial cell
16 DNA, in that the observation of both cells indicated there may
17 be body fluids from two different individuals there as a
18 result of a possible sex act. That's always -- This is very
19 common, particularly in sexual assault cases. We deal with
20 this type of stain quite often.

21 I was able to get a very nice differential
22 extraction from one of the stains and I was able to obtain a
23 DNA profile from the sperm cell donor and I also was able to
24 obtain a DNA profile from the nucleoid epithelial cells that
25 originated from a female individual.

WAHL - DIRECT

1 Q So this stain, part of it was a male stain and part
2 of it was a female stain?

3 A That's correct.

4 Q Would that be consistent with, for instance, sexual
5 intercourse and a male putting his penis back in his pants
6 having some of the female fluid on him now?

7 A It's possible, yes.

8 Q And what would it also be consistent with or
9 possible?

10 A It could be consistent with vaginal drainage. The
11 female could be on top of the male individual when ejaculation
12 occurred and there was drainage onto the jeans. It also could
13 possibly be -- a semen saliva mixture is also a possibility,
14 where an act of fellatio occurred and there could have been a
15 mixture of saliva and semen present in that the nucleoid
16 epithelial cells also could be from the oral cavity.

17 Q Tell me, through DNA analysis were you able to
18 exclude Terrell Young as the possible donor of the semen on
19 those pants?

20 A Yes.

21 Q Were you -- Did you also do a comparison to any of
22 the other names we've mentioned, the victims and otherwise?

23 A I did a comparison to all four victims and all three
24 suspects in the case.

25 Q And, tell me, were you able to exclude all of the

IV-120

AA01633

WAHL - DIRECT

1 persons you've spoken about so far?

2 A Everybody but one individual.

3 Q And who were you able to not exclude?

4 A Donte Johnson.

5 Q And with what degree of certainty are you or were
6 you that Donte Johnson could not be excluded as the donor of
7 the semen?

8 A In my opinion, absolutely. There is sufficient
9 genetic information obtained from the sperm DNA to, with a
10 reasonable degree of scientific certainty, to positively
11 identify the sperm as originating from Donte Johnson.

12 Q You say that you could actually not only exclude
13 him, but you could positively identify him?

14 A Yes, in my opinion.

15 Q Okay. Now, then, did you also analyze the 12
16 cigarette butts in order to find out who smoked the cigarette
17 butts?

18 A A majority of them, yes, I did. With a couple of
19 butts -- I think I did have some with no typing results and
20 some where the typing results were inconclusive, the typing
21 data was not interpretable to any reliability, but I do
22 believe on nine or ten of the cigarette butts, and I'd have to
23 check my notes, but I did obtain genetic information and could
24 render some conclusions as to the source of the DNA on the
25 cigarette butts.

WAHL - DIRECT

1 Q And would you give us your conclusions on the
2 cigarette butts --

3 A Okay.

4 Q -- through your DNA analysis?

5 A Can I refer to my notes, because there were many,
6 many butts?

7 Q Will that assist you?

8 A Yes, it will.

9 Q All right.

10 A I have a quick synopsis here that I can refer to.
11 Give me a second here.

12 (Pause in the proceedings)

13 There were 12 cigarette butts. Ten were a Marlboro
14 brand, two were no brand. There were -- There were four
15 Marlboro cigarette butts in which I positively identified
16 Jeffrey Biddle as the source of the DNA on the cigarette
17 butts.

18 Q So four of the cigarette butts at the scene -- And
19 are you able to tell us, and I don't want to have to go
20 through too many other charts or papers, are you able to tell
21 me where those four cigarette butts came from?

22 A The ones I just talked about?

23 Q Yeah, what area?

24 A The DNA -- The cigarette butts were recovered from
25 the scene, reportedly recovered from the scene, and the DNA on

WAHL - DIRECT

1 there has positively been identified as coming from Jeffrey
2 Biddle.

3 There were three other cigarette butts where there
4 was -- appeared to be an indication of some DNA mixture, a DNA
5 mixture on the cigarette butts, but the major DNA component of
6 the mixture was identified as coming from Jeffrey Biddle. All
7 other people were excluded.

8 There was a cigarette butt with no brand name where
9 there was DNA from a male individual on there that did not
10 originate from either of the four victims or the three
11 suspects. And then I had three cigarette -- two cigarette
12 butts with no -- that were inconclusive and one cigarette butt
13 that no human DNA was recovered from.

14 And then I had one cigarette butt where there was a
15 DNA mixture indicated on the butt. The major DNA component
16 was consistent with Donte Johnson's DNA profile and there was
17 enough genetic information there to positively identify Donte
18 Johnson as the major DNA component of that cigarette butt.

19 Q That cigarette butt was previously labeled, was it
20 not, by Crime Scene Analyst Fletcher, as 22-1. Is that
21 consistent with your notes?

22 A Yes.

23 Q Okay. She had testified that 22-1 came from the
24 floor there in the living room. Is that also consistent with
25 your notes?

WAHL - DIRECT

1 A I don't know where in the crime scene it was
2 actually recovered from.

3 Q Okay. That cigarette butt, 22-1, that was impounded
4 by Fletcher, Crime Scene Analyst Fletcher, you said -- could
5 Donte Johnson be excluded from it?

6 A No, he could not.

7 Q Could he, in fact, be identified?

8 A Yes, he could, with the combination of the DNA
9 typing I did and the STR typing an independent lab performed
10 on the cigarette butt.

11 Q Okay. Tell me, could Terrell Young and Sikia Smith
12 be excluded from any of the other cigarette butts or all the
13 other cigarette butts?

14 A They were excluded as a source of the DNA on all the
15 other cigarette butts.

16 Q Okay. Now, then, did you chart some of your
17 findings for the jury to see actually what DNA typing is and
18 what types of DNA each individual we've talked about has in
19 this case?

20 A Yes, I did.

21 (Pause in the proceedings)

22 Q And will the charts assist you in describing to the
23 jury what the DNA typing really is for each one of these
24 people or persons?

25 A I think it would be an important aid, yes.

WAHL - DIRECT

1 Q Okay. Now let me ask you, we talked a little bit
2 about Cellmark, are you familiar with Cellmark and what
3 Cellmark is?

4 A Yes, I'm familiar with the company and I know quite
5 a few people who work there.

6 Q Okay, what is Cellmark Diagnostics?

7 A Cellmark Diagnostics is a private laboratory that
8 does DNA identification testing both from a forensic
9 standpoint and a paternity standpoint.

10 Q And did Cellmark Diagnostic do any work in this
11 particular case as it relates to any of the samples that we've
12 talked about thus far?

13 A Yes. They did work on one item.

14 Q And what item did they do work on?

15 A It's the cigarette butt that we just recently
16 discussed in which Donte Johnson was identified as a DNA
17 component of the cigarette butt.

18 Q And tell me, if you know, why Cellmark would have
19 done that work instead of yourself?

20 A Back in 1998, as I indicated earlier, we were -- had
21 not implemented STR typing in casework as of yet 'cause we
22 were in the process of validating the procedure. I removed
23 approximately one half of the filter paper that surrounds the
24 cigarette butt to do DNA testing and left the remaining half
25 for possible referee analysis, independent analysis. In the

WAHL - DIRECT

1 process of doing my initial DNA typing, I had to consume --
2 First off, there was not much DNA recovered from that filter
3 paper during my process.

4 Q Is that common?

5 A It can be common, 'cause the amount of DNA that can
6 be recovered from a cigarette butt can vary quite a bit and it
7 has to do with how a person smokes a cigarette, how much
8 saliva's deposited on the cigarette.

9 And I ended up consuming all of the extracted DNA
10 from my half of the cigarette butt, so when it came time to do
11 STR analysis on the other retention DNA extracts from the
12 bloodstains and the reference standards, the situation
13 occurred where I felt there was certainly enough DNA to do STR
14 testings, but I may have to consume all of the rest of the
15 cigarette butt to do that.

16 And part of our policy in our laboratory is that we
17 try or attempt, if at all possible, to save half the sample
18 for other independent analysis, particularly by the defense
19 lab, if they so desire, so I voiced my concerns to Mr. Guymon
20 regarding doing the STR analysis in-house and my concern was
21 that if I tried to separate half of the cigarette butt that
22 was remaining, and leave half for the defense, that may
23 compromise both labs -- one or both labs' ability to get STR
24 typing.

25 So I posed that to Mr. Guymon and then it was my

WAHL - DIRECT

1 understanding he approached defense counsel to discuss some
2 options available to both parties in order to get STR typing
3 results from the cigarette butt.

4 Q In short, you assisted, did you not, both parties in
5 sending items to Cellmark Diagnostic, which was an independent
6 lab agreed to by both parties, by way of stipulation, for
7 further testing of that cigarette butt, correct?

8 A That's correct.

9 Q Now, then, I'm showing you --

10 THE COURT: Before I get to the charts -- Before you
11 get to the charts, can I see you at the bench, please?

12 (Off-record bench conference)

13 BY MR. GUYMON:

14 Q I'm showing you what has been marked as State's
15 Exhibit 203. Do you recognize this particular exhibit?

16 A Yes, I do.

17 Q All right, can you come --

18 MR. GUYMON: I'd move for its admission, Your Honor.

19 MR. SCISCENTO: No objection.

20 THE COURT: Received.

21 (Plaintiff's Exhibit No. 203 admitted)

22 BY MR. GUYMON:

23 Q Let me have you come on down, if you would, and
24 position yourself on this side of the table so that all of the
25 jurors could see and tell me just what it is we're looking at.

WAHL - DIRECT

1 And I want to do it as briefly as possible, yet with some
2 understanding.

3 A I'll just go down by the columns. This is a chart
4 that represents the DNA profile typing results obtained from
5 all the known reference standards. There are no questioned
6 samples on the chart. This is of all the individuals who were
7 victims, Gorringe, Mowen, Biddle, Talamantez, and the three
8 suspects, Johnson, Young and Smith.

9 Locus is a Latin word for location. This could be
10 referred to as the DNA regions that I alluded to earlier that
11 we look at to determine DNA types, there's a space here, all
12 these loci, plural for locus, all these different DNA types,
13 13 DNA types here, plus sex. We can actually determine the
14 sex of the DNA from something called amylagener [phonetic],
15 these are the STR DNA profiling system. From the space down
16 are seven DNA types that were used in our lab way back in 1998
17 before we implemented STR typing.

18 So the DNA profiles we're looking at here are 13 STR
19 DNA types, plus the sexing, and seven more DNA types, so for a
20 total of 20 DNA types. So we have a very extensive profile
21 here.

22 The purpose of this chart is just to show you the
23 numbers or just the scientific nomenclature to determine the
24 DNA type, but the important thing I want to just point out
25 with this chart is that the DNA profiles are different. All

WAHL - DIRECT

1 these individuals can be differentiated from each other if you
2 look at the charts.

3 Q I'm showing you Exhibit 204. Do you recognize it?

4 A Yes, I do.

5 Q And did you, in fact, prepare it?

6 A Yes, I did. I also prepared it.

7 MR. GUYMON: I'd move for the admission of 204 as
8 well, Judge.

9 MR. SCISCENTO: No objection.

10 THE COURT: Admitted.

11 (Plaintiff's Exhibit No. 204 admitted)

12 BY MR. GUYMON:

13 Q I'm gonna show you 204 and tell the jury just what
14 204 is. What are we looking at now?

15 A This is a chart that has Donte Johnson's DNA profile
16 on it, the DNA profile obtained by me on the first phase of
17 the DNA typing test and then the STR typing results that
18 Cellmark Diagnostics performed. And then this is a sperm DNA
19 profile from one of the stains on the black jeans, the one on
20 the zipper flap. All other individuals were excluded as a
21 source of the DNA on the cigarette butt and as a sperm donor.
22 And this chart just demonstrates that there are genetic --
23 cords of genetic similarities across all loci.

24 I do want to point out that on the cigarette butt
25 there are some indications of some other DNA from another

IV-129

AA01642

WAHL - DIRECT

1 individual there, but for the most part everything matches up.

2 Q All right, now let me talk about that. Are you
3 surprised -- You said this was the known DNA of Donte Johnson
4 from the earlier chart and this is Cellmark's findings. This
5 is yours on the bottom. Are you surprised by the additional
6 numbers?

7 For instance, his known is coded 1313, yet you have
8 some additional numbers and, likewise, here in this region
9 that are just downward.

10 A That was, yeah, observed in three of the STR loci
11 and one of the loci down here. No, I'm not surprised. It is
12 not that unusual to find DNA mixtures on cigarette butts.
13 People do share cigarette butts smoking and it's actually
14 quite common to see that on a marijuana cigarette.

15 Q Are your findings, using your testing and Cellmark's
16 findings, inconsistent or consistent with one another? You
17 said here you have an additional in your own testing as well.

18 A Yes. In my report I indicated that there is a
19 predominant major component DNA source in the mixture and what
20 I mean by that is that the typing data demonstrated that there
21 was a -- a large percentage of the DNA in that cigarette butt
22 came from one individual and that there's a very small
23 percentage of DNA present on the butt that may be from some
24 other type individual, such that when you typed the cigarette
25 butt there is a very -- that there was typing results here

IV-130

AA01643

WAHL - DIRECT

1 that were consistent with a predominant or major component
2 DNA.

3 My typing results are very consistent with Donte
4 Johnson's DNA profile. There is some indication of some other
5 DNA types in the GC DNA type. And with Cellmark's the DNA
6 typing profiles are generally consistent across all loci, but
7 there are some indications in the DWA that there's DNA from
8 another individual, a minor component, as is in the D8, S1179
9 and the D5.

10 I did have -- I had the raw data from Cellmark to
11 look at and the typing data was very consistent with what I
12 saw here in that there was a major component DNA and minor
13 component DNA. Both laboratories indicated there was a
14 mixture. Both laboratories indicated that there was a major
15 DNA component that could be interpreted.

16 Q And who was the major DNA component that could be
17 interpreted, whose DNA?

18 A The major component in the cigarette butt is
19 consistent with Donte Johnson across all 20 loci.

20 Q With the minor contributor that you found through
21 your testing and the independent testing of Cellmark, is that
22 -- would that be consistent with one of the other boys at the
23 house or one of the other individuals, period, also taking a
24 drag on that cigarette?

25 A It's possible. Some of the alleles detected here

WAHL - DIRECT

1 can be attributed to one or more of the victims in the house.

2 Q Okay, could they also be attributed to one or more
3 of the suspects in the house?

4 A On some of the alleles, yes, on some of the alleles,
5 no.

6 Q Okay. Now then, lastly, the next column is the
7 black -- sperm on the black jeans. Who typed this through STR
8 and PCR?

9 A I did the sperm. I did both.

10 Q All right. And in the sperm, in the known sample of
11 Donte Johnson, I take it that being the buccal swab?

12 A Yes, that's correct.

13 Q And this being the sperm?

14 A Yes. If you could look across each DNA type, you
15 see consistency across each DNA type all the way down. There
16 were a couple of DNA types from the sperm that were
17 inconclusive, I couldn't get an interpretive result, but we
18 have an 18 DNA type match.

19 Q And an 18 DNA type match, is that enough for
20 identification?

21 A Oh, most definitely.

22 Q With certainty?

23 A Yes.

24 Q Lastly, take a look at that board right behind you,
25 if you would, 205. Do you recognize it?

WAHL - DIRECT

1 A Yes, I do. I prepared this chart.

2 Q All right.

3 MR. GUYMON: I'd move for the admission of State's
4 Proposed Exhibit 205.

5 MR. SCISCENTO: Submitted, Your Honor.

6 THE COURT: Admitted.

7 (Plaintiff's Exhibit No. 205 admitted)

8 BY MR. GUYMON:

9 Q And what does 205, lastly, show?

10 A This chart represents the DNA profile of one of the
11 victims, Tracey Gorringer, in this column. Seven of the eight
12 bloodstains identified on the back pant legs of the black
13 Calvin Klein jeans are in this column and then one -- the last
14 or the remaining eighth stain is in this column. The reason
15 why this stain is in this column is that with one of the DNA
16 types here I got an inconclusive result, but the point I want
17 to show is that there is a DNA consistency across each DNA
18 type, all 20 loci, and 19 out of the 20.

19 Q The first column would be the known blood, in other
20 words, the blood that was taken out of Tracey's body at the
21 autopsy?

22 A That is correct.

23 Q And this would be seven of the bloodstains on those
24 black pants that Donte Johnson's sperm was on?

25 A That is correct.

IV-133

WAHL - DIRECT

1 Q And the last would be the last of the black -- the
2 eighth stain --

3 A Yes.

4 Q -- with Donte's sperm on the front?

5 A That is correct. The only reason this wasn't
6 grouped here is I did have one inconclusive result.

7 Q Okay. Now you had an inconclusive on the chart
8 there and an inconclusive on 204. Does the inconclusive tell
9 you that somehow the charts aren't right or the testing was
10 done wrong?

11 A No. It just indicates that the typing data obtained
12 was not -- didn't meet our interpretational criteria to report
13 a conclusive result.

14 Q And, Mr. Wahl, tell me, in the procedures that have
15 generated these results did you use controls in order to
16 assure you that each substance was handled properly and not
17 contaminated?

18 A Yes.

19 Q Did you use the proper protocol in order to assure
20 that the procedures that are in place and that can give
21 reliable results were, in fact, used for each one of these
22 samples?

23 A Yes.

24 Q Was there a second examiner that analyzed or
25 reviewed your work in this case?

WAHL - DIRECT

1 A It's our lab policy. We always have a second
2 independent, qualified examiner to review the technical data
3 and the report, the conclusions, and they do sign off on it.
4 And following a satisfactory technical review, it's turned
5 over to the DNA lab manager for administrative review before
6 the report goes out the door.

7 This is just a checks and balances system to ensure
8 that a quality work product is sent out to the criminal
9 justice system and ensure that no mistakes -- any mistakes
10 made could be detected.

11 Q And that's reviewed in-house?

12 A That's reviewed in-house.

13 Q And Cellmark's work you said also was looked at and
14 you reviewed it?

15 A Yes, I reviewed Cellmark's work.

16 Q And the two labs are completely independent of one
17 another?

18 A Yes.

19 Q Do the findings, however, of Cellmark and your
20 findings, are they consistent with one another and support --

21 A The conclusions are consistent with one another,
22 yes.

23 MR. GUYMON: I pass the witness, Your Honor.

24 THE COURT: Cross.

25 MR. SCISCENTO: Your Honor, may I have five minutes

WAHL - CROSS

1 to prepare for this?

2 (Pause in the proceedings)

3 MR. SCISCENTO: Is that a yes?

4 THE COURT: Well, I mean, I'm just deciding whether
5 we're gonna leave the room. If it's only gonna be five
6 minutes, I think we'll just stay at ease. And if you want to
7 stand up and move around, go ahead, walk around.

8 (Off the record)

9 THE COURT: Go ahead.

10 CROSS-EXAMINATION

11 BY MR. SCISCENTO:

12 Q Mr. Wahl, can I have the photographs that you took
13 of the pants?

14 (Pause in the proceedings)

15 Mr. Wahl, let's start first with the stains on the
16 pants, on the jeans, that being the semen epithelial stains.
17 They were located on the, as we understood it, the outside --
18 on the inside part of the flap?

19 A The vast majority of the stain was, yes.

20 Q Okay. So that means that it appeared, if I'm
21 correct, on this area which -- and I'm pointing to the flap,
22 the inside of the flap?

23 A Yes. And then I think there maybe was a little bit
24 of stain on the opposite side as well.

25 Q On the outside here?

IV-136

WAHL - CROSS

1 A There, on the inside and then on the opposite side
2 of the zipper as well there's a little bit extra.

3 Q Okay, which could have been transferred from the
4 stain on the outside?

5 A If it was wet, yes.

6 Q Okay. And so, as I understand it, and I wish I had
7 a better prop, that area that we're talking about is pretty
8 much protected when the zipper's closed?

9 A Yes, I think that flap is designed to cover the
10 zipper.

11 Q Okay. And all it is is mostly it just covers up the
12 zipper. You have a zipper and then you have the flap that
13 goes on top of it, am I right?

14 A Yes.

15 Q And then in between that, so we understand, and I'm
16 making a movement with my hand showing that one layer's on the
17 bottom and one's on top, in between there is where you find
18 the majority of the stain, am I right?

19 A Well, it's on the surface of the inside flap.

20 Q Okay, so here's the zipper, here's the flap and on
21 the inside of the flap itself?

22 A Yes, that's correct.

23 Q And easy access to that would be to flip it
24 backwards?

25 A Yes.

WAHL - CROSS

1 Q That way.

2 And other than that, you probably wouldn't have
3 access to it any other way, am I right?

4 A Either that or the pants could be unzipped and then
5 the flap could --

6 Q When they're unzipped, though, the flap goes down
7 and the zipper is pretty much on top of it, follows it?

8 A I would guess so, yeah.

9 Q Would you agree with that?

10 A Yes.

11 Q So again, really, the easy access to it is to flip
12 back the flap?

13 A That would probably be the easiest access, yes.

14 Q Okay. Now you ran a test called an acetate
15 phosphate, am I right?

16 A Acid phosphatase test.

17 Q Acid phosphatase.

18 And you came AP negative 3 in your test?

19 A I tested three different areas and came up negative
20 all three times.

21 Q Acetate phosphate [sic] is basically a detection of
22 semen?

23 A It's a presumptive test for the presence of semen.
24 It does not confirm the presence of semen.

25 Q You use it as a precursor to see if there is semen

WAHL - CROSS

1 and it's not an exclusion.

2 A I use it as a screening tool when screening stains.

3 Q And if it's there, then you know for sure that
4 there's semen there?

5 A No, I don't know for sure there's semen there. If I
6 get a positive acid phosphatase, it's highly probable the
7 stain contains semen and then I definitely will go into
8 confirmatory testing.

9 Q And if it's not there, that doesn't mean there's not
10 semen there?

11 A It does not mean there's not semen there, but there
12 most likely isn't.

13 Q Now acetate phosphate is -- that test is exclusive -
14 - Well, you use it specifically to find the semen?

15 A I use it to screen for the presence of semen.

16 Q The lack of phosphate in the semen can be attributed
17 to what?

18 A There are several possibilities. I could --

19 Q One is time?

20 A Time, yes.

21 Q The time that it is -- Well, do you know if there's
22 been any studies done on diminishing phosphate in semen while
23 it is in a vaginal area?

24 A Yes, I have a copy I can give you right now.

25 Q If I may see that.

WAHL - CROSS

1 (Pause in the proceedings)

2 A Source Pick of Forensic Serology and there is a
3 section here where there's been some studies.

4 (Pause in the proceedings)

5 Q In this one, if I'm correct, the epithelial -- the
6 semen found inside the vagina has some diminishing, is that
7 right?

8 A If I understand your question correctly, semen
9 ejaculated inside the vagina can undergo some degraded
10 processes --

11 Q Yes.

12 A -- because of the vaginal cavity. Yeah, yes, that's
13 a known fact.

14 Q And over time it may decrease even more?

15 A Yes, the longer semen remains in the vaginal cavity,
16 the more likely it's gonna be subjected to degraded
17 processes.

18 Q Okay. And if it's subject to the air drying, you
19 can lose 50 percent?

20 A It's possible. Some of the studies have indicated
21 that's possible.

22 Q Now the longer it's inside the vaginal area, the
23 greater the phosphate would decrease?

24 A It may, yes.

25 Q Okay, it's a given -- I mean, nothing's certain.

WAHL - CROSS

1 A Nothing's certain, but that would be an accurate
2 assessment, yes.

3 Q But it's a theorem that we can follow?

4 A Yes.

5 Q Okay. So we don't know how long that semen was in
6 the vaginal area, do we?

7 A No, I don't.

8 Q Focusing on the epithelium stain -- And I am saying
9 it wrong. Could you pronounce it for me once and maybe I can
10 figure it out.

11 A Epithelial cell.

12 Q Epithelial. I'm not gonna get it.

13 That stain -- They're found in two locations on the
14 pants, correct?

15 A No, the sperm was mixed in with the epithelial cell.

16 Q Okay, but there were two stains in H and K?

17 A I selected two areas that were located a bit apart
18 from each other and tested two separate areas.

19 Q And you designated them as I and K, I think it was.

20 A That's correct.

21 Q Okay. And that's what you designated as two
22 separate areas of stains?

23 A Those are the areas I tested for the -- to do a
24 cellular evaluation and also to do DNA typing.

25 Q And I'm not saying that they're two separate stains.

WAHL - CROSS

1 It's just you divided --

2 A They were adjacent to each other, so I tested two
3 different areas.

4 Q And you went in there and you determined that there
5 was semen found in the I and the J, that you designated I and
6 J stains?

7 A That's correct, yes.

8 Q The two stains, okay, two separates.

9 Now on those you found a reading of semen at a 1 in
10 one of those?

11 A I think you're alluding to my notes in which when I
12 perform my cellular evaluation I write down in my notes
13 whether I detect or identify sperm and I also try to give some
14 type of grading to the concentration of sperm I see on the
15 microscope slide. It gives me a rough estimate of the sperm
16 cell concentration or density in the stain relative to the
17 nucleoid epithelial cells.

18 Q And you designated that as a 1?

19 A 1 plus or 1 and a half, my recollection was.

20 Q One was a 1 and one was 1 plus, would you agree with
21 me on that?

22 A Yes, I think that's accurate. I can check my notes
23 to be sure, but that sounds right.

24 Q We could check your notes, but I'll give you that
25 it's a 1 and a 1 and a half, if you agree with that.

WAHL - CROSS

1 A Okay. That sounds right.

2 Q But the epithelial stain you gave a 4?

3 A 3 plus or a 4, which indicates that there was a
4 three or fourfold higher concentration of nucleoid epithelial
5 cells relative to the sperm in the stain.

6 Q Okay.

7 A At least the area I tested.

8 Q Okay, which means that the epithelial cells had a
9 higher concentration?

10 A Relative to the sperm cells, yes.

11 Q Yes.

12 Okay, did you ever identify where the epithelial
13 cells came from?

14 A I did obtain a complete DNA profile, but I was never
15 given a female reference standard for comparison purposes.

16 Q We know it was a female?

17 A Yes, it's definitely from a female.

18 Q We know it was vaginal?

19 A I didn't say it was vaginal. I said it could be
20 vaginal.

21 Q Okay, what are the chances of that being vaginal?
22 Did you do any tests to determine that?

23 A There are no known tests I'm aware of that could
24 positively identify vaginal fluid to the exclusion of all
25 other body fluids.

WAHL - CROSS

1 Q Okay, but we know the epithelial cells were female
2 in nature?

3 A That's correct.

4 Q Excluding any male?

5 A Yes, they're from a female.

6 (Pause in the proceedings)

7 Q Now when you check -- When you do your process in
8 your lab for determining the DNA -- where you're extracting
9 it, the DNA from semen and epithelial cells, there's a
10 different process you must follow, is that correct?

11 A Yes. It's called a differential extraction.

12 Q As a matter of fact, in your notes -- I'm sorry, in
13 your handbook in the lab that you work at they specifically
14 say, "If epithelial and sperm cells are detected, proceed with
15 different lysis procedure beginning with Step 7," am I right?

16 A That sounds familiar, yes.

17 MR. SCISCENTO: If I may approach.

18 THE WITNESS: Sure.

19 BY MR. SCISCENTO:

20 Q And the reason I'm asking, you agree with me that --
21 First, what I'm handing you is the STR manuals for the Las
22 Vegas Metropolitan Lab Department -- Metropolitan Evidence
23 Lab.

24 A Okay. And which step are you referring to?

25 Q Well, where it says "Note."

WAHL - CROSS

1 A Uh-huh.

2 Q Okay. And it does, in fact, say what, 'cause I
3 don't want to say that word?

4 A Do you want me to read this out?

5 Q Well, it does say what I had said, the epithelial
6 and sperms cells --

7 A "If epithelial and sperm cells are detected, proceed
8 with differential lysis procedure beginning with Step 7,"
9 okay.

10 Q All right.

11 A Yes.

12 Q And that being because you need to separate the two?

13 A Yes, you want to -- The purpose is to try to get a
14 DNA profile from the sperm cell and separate it from the DNA
15 profile from the epithelial cell, because they very well may
16 be from two different individuals. If you did not do that,
17 you'd get a DNA mixture and it would be very difficult to
18 interpret the results.

19 Q Okay. And later on it says, when it talks about the
20 washing, it says, "Additional wash steps are recommended when
21 the ratio of sperm to epithelial cells is low," am I right?

22 A Yes, it's recommended.

23 Q So how many washings did you have to do in this case
24 in order to get the DNA profile or DNA --

25 A I did three -- I did three washes.

WAHL - CROSS

1 Q Normally, you do one to two washes, correct?

2 A No, I always do three.

3 Q You always do three? Regardless if it's semen
4 epithelia?

5 A I always do three and then following the washes I do
6 another microscopic exam, and the purpose is to determine
7 whether my cell extract is -- the sperm cells are still
8 present and I've lysed the epithelial cells. If the
9 microscopic evaluation indicates that that's the case, I see
10 no reason to do any additional washes.

11 Q So based on your knowledge of this and your
12 interpretation and review of the work you figured that you had
13 extracted the DNA separately and you had made it into separate
14 DNAs?

15 A Yes.

16 Q And you had no problem with that?

17 A No.

18 Q There is a major concern when you interpret DNA in
19 the contamination?

20 A Yes, there's a concern.

21 Q You want to keep it free of contamination?

22 A Definitely.

23 Q And when there is a mixture of DNA that is when the
24 greatest contamination can happen?

25 A A mixed sample by definition is contaminated. The

WAHL - CROSS

1 definition of contamination in the dictionary is the act of
2 making a substance impure by mixture or contact. It's a
3 forensic reality that we deal with mixed stains. Vaginal
4 fluid mixed with semen is a very common type of evidence in
5 our laboratory.

6 Q And when you have a mixed stain you can get false
7 readings, correct?

8 A No.

9 Q Not always?

10 A You can get false stains but you get -- you
11 could get false readings in any analysis. It's always a
12 possibility --

13 Q Or --

14 A -- performed improperly.

15 Q Would you agree that contamination can give you a
16 false reading?

17 A Sure.

18 Q How do you extract the DNA? There's three methods,
19 I believe, chloro -- there's staining jelly and --

20 A There's a procedure known as -- an organic procedure
21 called phenyl-chloroform.

22 Q Thank you.

23 A There's another procedure known as celex [phonetic].
24 There are modifications of procedures where both organic and
25 celex are combined. There are commercial companies that have

WAHL - CROSS

1 made available on the market DNA extraction methods that use
2 latex beads. There are -- the company I used to work for uses
3 a different type of DNA extraction method. There are -- there
4 are several out there.

5 Q Let me stop you. Where -- what procedure do you --
6 do you follow? Did you use?

7 A I use -- right now currently I use a combination of
8 organic extraction followed by celex.

9 Q Is it staining -- a staining method that they talk
10 about?

11 A I'm not sure I under -- the only staining I really
12 do is I stain microscope slides in order to aid in the
13 detection of sperm cells and nucleate epithelial cells.

14 Q All right. Let me get back real quick. You had
15 checked first the semen to see if there was the acetate
16 phosphate. It wasn't there. You then moved on, you sent the
17 results to Sergeant Hefner?

18 A I -- well, when I tested the stain I didn't know it
19 was semen. I got a negative AP result so there was no
20 indications that it was semen so I didn't do any confirmatory
21 testing. It was then after I -- shortly after I issued my
22 first DNA typing report that Sergeant Hefner contacted me.

23 Q Okay. Let me stop you there. Sergeant Hefner
24 contacted you and asked you to run the test again?

25 A Sergeant Hefner called me and asked me to reexamine

WAHL - CROSS

1 the pants to see if I could find any other type of biological
2 fluid on the pants which could be attributed to the wearer of
3 the pants.

4 Q Okay. And that being -- biological fluid also means
5 semen?

6 A Could be saliva, it could be semen, it could be
7 sweat, it could be fecal matter, it could be any biological
8 fluid. Urine.

9 Q Now, let me focus. You had done a test or you had
10 Cellmark do a test on the cigarette butts?

11 A Well, I do believe prosecution and defense agreed to
12 have it done. I just had some in --

13 Q There was a test done at Cellmark on the cigarette
14 butts, correct?

15 A That's correct.

16 Q The cigarette butt is kind of like a pen here, this
17 cap I'm showing you. It's a small little cylinder --

18 A It was a cigarette butt that had been partially
19 smoked and all that was remaining was a small portion of
20 tobacco in the butt -- the filter.

21 Q Mr. Guymon asked you if DNA testing can work on dead
22 soldiers, meaning you can identify people who have been dead
23 or who --

24 A The purpose of that is that body remains either from
25 war or a plane crash or -- in which all that's remaining is

WAHL - CROSS

1 maybe a small piece of tissue, you can't -- there's no way to
2 identify who the tissue came from, they do use DNA testing and
3 do genetic reconstruction and compare it to family members to
4 determine if they can identify the --

5 Q Now, how long would DNA stain samples or how long,
6 if I was -- let me rephrase this. If I was to smoke a
7 cigarette, put the cigarette down, without any other
8 interference, how long would the DNA be there for you to test?

9 A It could be in -- it could be there indefinitely if
10 the cigarette butt was stored under conditions that reduced
11 environmental degradation.

12 Q Which is as long as it wasn't wet?

13 A Freezing, keeping -- the rule of thumb is the drier
14 the biological sample and the colder you store it the longer
15 the -- the more preserved the biological sample will be and
16 the better chance you have of getting a DNA result over time.

17 Q The drier though, but if heat doesn't have a direct
18 -- heat would have an effect on it?

19 A Heat may have an effect on it, yes.

20 Q May have an effect but not a direct effect?

21 A It could have a direct effect if a -- I mean, if you
22 threw a cigarette butt in a burning fire that'd probably
23 destroy the DNA.

24 Q Talking about Las Vegas in August, it's hot.

25 A Las Vegas in August is pretty hot so heat could have

1 an effect on it, sure.

2 Q But if it's inside, it wouldn't have much of an
3 effect?

4 A It'd have less of an effect; it'd be in a cooler
5 environment.

6 Q So, if it's kept inside of a home that has an air
7 conditioning running in the middle of August, it's -- the
8 ability for you to extract that DNA would be longer?

9 A Most likely; not necessarily, but most likely.

10 Q So the shelf -- if I can use the word the shelf
11 life, the shelf life with DNA on a cigarette butt could be a
12 few weeks?

13 A I've obtained DNA on a eight-year-old cigarette butt
14 in a private laboratory, so.

15 Q So we can go almost in -- up to eight years -- I'm
16 sorry you said eight weeks?

17 A I said eight years --

18 Q Eight years.

19 A -- but there are documented cases of analysts being
20 able to get DNA types from evidence ten, twenty years old
21 depending on how this -- how the sample's been stored.

22 Q Now, let me ask you on some of these -- I think it's
23 State's Exhibit 204, the loci DS -- D5S818, we have a 13 in
24 parentheses on the cigarette butt, correct?

25 A Yes.

WAHL - CROSS

1 Q Okay. And that usually indicates that as the
2 examiner is reading it or reviewing it he notices the loci is
3 there but it's a weak loci?

4 A Yes, the -- I contacted the analyst who did -- from
5 Cellmark who did the analysis and they --

6 MR. GUYMON: Your Honor --

7 THE WITNESS: You're asking me?

8 BY MR. SCISCENTO:

9 Q Well, I'm just asking you --

10 MR. GUYMON: Can we approach?

11 (Off-record bench conference)

12 THE COURT: Go ahead.

13 BY MR. SCISCENTO:

14 Q Mr. Wahl, let me ask you when a number is in
15 parentheses like this, of different locis, it usually means
16 that it was identified but it's a weak identification, is that
17 correct?

18 A Again, you're asking me about that 13 with the
19 parentheses and that's Cellmark's interpretational annotation
20 and I -- what I was trying to tell you earlier is what
21 Cellmark indicated to me what their parentheses around that
22 number means.

23 Q Which is what?

24 A That there's a very low, very small DNA typing
25 result obtained with that 13 that may be attributed to a true

WAHL - CROSS

1 DNA type or could be an artifact.

2 Q Okay. So in other words, they did see something
3 there and they marked it down but they noted that it was a
4 weak loci?

5 A Yes. If you -- if what you're asking me is that 13
6 parentheses mean it's a very weak result, the answer is yes.

7 Q Same thing on loci D8S1179, we have a 9 which is a
8 low -- a low identification?

9 A It's known as an allele or -- it's called an allele
10 in that locus.

11 Q Well, we have a 14 and an 8 --

12 A That's correct.

13 Q -- that 9 is in parentheses and may be stronger?

14 A No, I actually looked at the data and it was --
15 those 8 and 14 was also very weak. Wasn't much more intense
16 than the 9.

17 Q The cigarette butt on here for loci of D18S51,
18 Cellmark comes up with a 10.2 on the 17, but it's inconclusive
19 on the other ones?

20 A It was inconclusive on Donte Johnson. I had run
21 Donte's DNA twice. I got a result one time and I got a
22 different result the other time, and I didn't -- I didn't test
23 it the third time.

24 Q All right. We know that the sperm on the black
25 jeans was mixed with epithelial cells, correct?

WAHL - CROSS

1 A Yes.

2 Q We know that the cigarette butt was also mixed --
3 the DNA there was mixed with another DNA?

4 A There's indications of that, yes.

5 Q Did you extract that second DNA from the cigarette
6 butt?

7 A I'm not --

8 Q Did you -- were you able to extract --

9 A -- I'm not sure I understand your -- I'm not sure I
10 understand your question.

11 Q Well, you realized that there were two different
12 sources of DNA?

13 A No, not at the time I did the extraction, I didn't.

14 Q Okay. But eventually you found out that there are
15 two separate sources on the cigarette butts?

16 A There's indications of a major/minor component
17 mixture on the --

18 Q Okay.

19 A -- on the cigarette butt, but I did not know that
20 until after I interpreted the data.

21 Q Meaning somebody may have taken a drag and had dry
22 lips or didn't leave a lot of fluid?

23 A That would -- that would be the most probable
24 explanation for that, yes.

25 Q Okay. Now, what I'm talking about, so we know that

WAHL - CROSS

1 there's two separate DNAs -- profiles on that cigarette butt?

2 A Well, there's -- indicates it's two different DNA
3 sources.

4 Q Sources, you mean two separate people?

5 A Yes.

6 Q Okay. You extracted the DNA from that other source?

7 A I think what you're -- if I understand your question
8 is that we do not do differential extractions on cigarette
9 butts, differential extractions are only done on sperm and
10 other cell mixtures. The DNA found on cigarette butts is from
11 nucleate epithelial cells that line the inside lining of your
12 mouth and the cells slough off into the saliva and the saliva
13 is deposited on the cigarette butt when someone smokes a
14 cigarette. There is no way to differentially extract buccal
15 cells from two different individuals. They're gonna co-
16 extract.

17 Q So the problem is we have two known source -- well,
18 they're not known. We have two sources of DNA found on the --
19 on the cigarette butts, correct?

20 A In my opinion, yes, there's two sources.

21 Q And there is no --

22 A At least two sources.

23 Q -- there is no extraction to divide the two of 'em
24 up?

25 A No. The extraction procedure for epithelial cells

WAHL - CROSS

1 is the same, so if you have epithelial cells from two
2 different individuals there you're going to co-extract the
3 DNA. There's no way to separate 'em.

4 Q You said there was at least two?

5 A There's always a possibility there could be a third
6 one but the typing data doesn't -- isn't -- doesn't suggest
7 that there is more than a third person.

8 Q When you do examination of the DNA and you have a
9 second examiner look at your results, what you're having is --
10 you have the results placed up in one point, you have the
11 photograph, is it the butts that you look at?

12 A No, the data -- well, there's two different parts to
13 here.

14 Q Now, let's talk about STR.

15 A Okay. STRs, we're just talking about STRs. The
16 data is actually computerized, it's data that's present in a
17 computer program. We save a file and the analyst brings up
18 the file on the computer and then analyzes the raw data.

19 Q When you look at the alleles -- am I'm saying that
20 right, allies -- the alleles?

21 A The alleles, yes.

22 Q Alleles. You look at the alleles and you notice if
23 there is any colorate -- correlation in the alleles?

24 A Well, you look at the peaks, the alleles appear as
25 peaks in a -- in a --

WAHL - CROSS

1 Q I guess I'm talking PCR, go back to STRs. You look
2 for the peaks in the alleles and if you notice a high peak you
3 indicate that's an allele?

4 A We do -- well, the computer program will call a peak
5 an allele if it's high -- if the peak is high enough, exceeds
6 a threshold level that we set in the -- in the computer
7 program, and also if the peak occurs in a what's called a bin
8 that we know that the allele size is there. So, if it meets
9 those two criteria the computer will call it an allele but the
10 examiner still has to look at the raw data and make some
11 determinations whether this is a true allele or it might be an
12 artifact.

13 Q All right. Let me get to the raw data. When you
14 look at the raw data you have a note with all the different
15 locis and you mark down the numbers that you see on the
16 alleles?

17 A There is a work sheet that the primary analyst, in
18 this case, myself, would record the results down on -- based
19 on what he sees in the computer program file. The secondary
20 reader would come in with the case file and write -- and
21 look --

22 Q Write --

23 A -- at the data and determine whether they concur
24 with my interpretation of that.

25 Q And basically what he does is you write down, you

WAHL - CROSS

1 check the alleles. I think we probably have one here. You
2 look at the alleles and then you mark 'em on the locis and the
3 locis are located on here?

4 A That's correct.

5 Q And then the second reader comes in and he marks
6 down here?

7 A He doesn't write anything down but if he -- if he
8 sees something that -- he or she sees something which they do
9 not agree with or might want to talk to the analyst, then they
10 make a notation on the right side and then confer with the
11 analyst.

12 Q So, it's not really a blind reading that the second
13 person is doing? In other words, he's reviewing, he sees that
14 you mark down as a loci a 19 or 18, and then he looks at the
15 -- these and if he sees an 18 or a 19 -- when he sees an 18 or
16 19 he checks it off?

17 A Yeah. It would not be blind. They have my results
18 in front of them.

19 Q So, if they wanted to do it quickly they could just
20 look over quickly and not really take the time to investigate
21 it?

22 A They do take the time to investigate it --

23 Q But I'm saying it could happen --

24 A -- but they have my results in hand.

25 Q -- it could happen?

WAHL - CROSS

1 A What could happen?

2 Q They don't do a blind reading, do you agree with
3 that?

4 A They don't do a blind reading, no.

5 Q We'll just leave it at that.

6 MR. SCISCENTO: May I have the Court's indulgence
7 for one moment, Your Honor?

8 BY MR. SCISCENTO:

9 Q You had mentioned earlier when you first -- when Mr.
10 Guymon first asked you, you said that DNA is mostly used for
11 human identification? I'm sorry. Let's see if I can get this
12 right. You say you can do the DNA testing to determine human
13 sources of DNA?

14 A That's one application of DNA technology, yes.

15 Q There is some crossover between other origins --
16 other species, would you agree?

17 A Crossover? I'm not sure I understand your question.

18 Q Well, could you get DNA reading of a human being on
19 a primate?

20 A You can get -- you can get DNA results testing high
21 primates, yes. I've done it.

22 Q And that has --

23 A I've done it.

24 Q -- that has been done, the --

25 A I -- we did it in our validation.

WAHL - REDIRECT

1 Q At the Fifth International Symposium on Human
2 Identification?

3 A I believe some people have done it and we actually
4 did it in-house in our laboratory.

5 Q It was done in --

6 MR. SCISCENTO: I have no further questions, Your
7 Honor.

8 THE COURT: Any redirect?

9 MR. GUYMON: Yes, very briefly.

10 REDIRECT EXAMINATION

11 BY MR. GUYMON:

12 Q You talked about your notes and how a second
13 analyst, a second expert, such as yourself, reviews your
14 findings?

15 A That's correct.

16 Q Were all of your findings in this case charted,
17 documented, and kept for review?

18 A Yes. And I might want to point out that when the
19 secondary analyst reviews my data they actually pull up the
20 raw data and create their own file from the data and look at
21 that file, and then look at their interpretation of the type
22 of results and what I had, and they -- it's just simply a
23 matter of recording a result. So, in essence, part of their
24 second reads is, in effect, blind, in that they take the raw
25 data and create their own file and look at their raw data and

WAHL - REDIRECT

1 compare it to mine.

2 Q Did you also -- and I take it the raw data is kept
3 and preserved? In other words, it's documented?

4 A Yes, the second reader creates their file and it's
5 stored in my case file. It's a documentation that they also
6 look at.

7 Q You also document your bunch notes, do you not?

8 A Yes.

9 Q In other words you make notes as you go along?

10 A Yeah, I have a pretty big file.

11 Q And you provided those notes both to the State and
12 to the defense?

13 A Yes, I did.

14 Q Okay. Now, let me ask you one area and that is
15 about this semen and how it degraded. Semen that stays in a
16 vaginal vault for a short period of time, does it change from
17 the semen it is?

18 A No, if you're -- I mean if I understand your
19 question, does degradative process of the vaginal cavity alter
20 the DNA type? No, it just -- semen can stay in a vaginal
21 cavity for a very -- various amounts of time. It depends upon
22 whether the female douched, whether she bathed. There's a lot
23 of variables that account for how long semen may or may not
24 persist in the vaginal cavity.

25 Q If this -- Donte Johnson's semen, that you've

WAHL - RECROSS

1 identified, came from a woman's vagina, it wouldn't matter how
2 long it was in her vagina, but that it wouldn't, in other
3 words change, whose semen that was, it would still be Donte
4 Johnson's?

5 A That's correct.

6 Q And likewise if this is, say, from oral sex, does it
7 change some of the semen as to how long the semen's been in a
8 woman's mouth?

9 A Doesn't alter the DNA types, no.

10 Q So no matter the time frame, this would be Donte
11 Johnson's semen, his own?

12 A It's only his sperm.

13 MR. GUYMON: No other questions.

14 THE COURT: Any redirect -- recross?

15 MR. SCISCENTO: Yes, Your Honor.

16 RECROSS EXAMINATION

17 BY MR. SCISCENTO:

18 Q I want to make sure I understand it, though, the
19 acetate phosphate is reduced the longer it is in the vaginal
20 vault, so to speak? There's a -- we agreed with that earlier,
21 right?

22 A Yes, that's possible.

23 Q Okay. So the longer it's in there, the greater the
24 acetate phosphate may be reduced?

25 A That's correct.

WAHL - RECROSS

1 Q And that may be an indication of the amount of time
2 that it spent in the vaginal vault?

3 A It may be but there's no way to know with any
4 certainty.

5 MR. SCISCENTO: May we -- can we approach for a
6 moment?

7 (Off-record bench conference)

8 BY MR. SCISCENTO:

9 Q Mr. Wahl, you said that you did some examination on
10 the blood of the pants?

11 A Yes.

12 Q You noted blood on the back of the pants?

13 A Yes.

14 Q Did you do a cursory inspection of the front of the
15 pants?

16 A I did a visual, a very close visual inspection, yes.

17 Q How did you do a close visual inspection?

18 A Under visible light, up real close.

19 Q Micro -- magnified?

20 A I did do some stereoscopic exam in some areas, but I
21 didn't cover the entire front of the pants, no.

22 Q On the front of the pants?

23 A No.

24 Q I'm sorry, did you do --

25 A I didn't do an entire stereoscopic exam on the front

WAHL - RECROSS

1 of the pants.

2 Q But you did do some exam on the front of the pants?

3 A Oh, definitely, yes.

4 Q Cursory?

5 A Visual examination.

6 Q Okay. With a -- with a --

7 A Close visual examination --

8 Q Okay.

9 A -- with the naked eye.

10 Q All right. Did you detect any blood there?

11 A Not that I could see with the naked eye, no.

12 Q Okay.

13 MR. SCISCENTO: No further -- no further questions,

14 Your Honor.

15 THE COURT: Anything further?

16 MR. GUYMON: Nothing else, Judge.

17 THE COURT: Thank you, sir.

18 Does the State rest?

19 MR. GUYMON: Judge, I'd like to go check it -- take

20 a look at the exhibit list. I'm -- we're not going to call

21 any other witnesses, I just want to make sure all of the

22 exhibits have been admitted.

23 THE COURT: Okay. Well, let's -- we'll check that

24 over the lunch recess.

25 MR. GUYMON: There's one --

1 THE COURT: Would counsel approach the bench,
2 please?

3 MR. GUYMON: There's one other stipulation also, but
4 no other witnesses.

5 (Off-record bench conference)

6 THE COURT: All right, folks, we're going to take
7 the -- yeah.

8 During this recess you're admonished not to talk or
9 converse among yourselves or with anyone else on any subject
10 connected with this trial, read, watch or listen to any report
11 of or commentary on the trial or any person connected with it,
12 by any medium of information, including, without limitation,
13 newspaper, television or radio, or to form or express any
14 opinion on any subject connected with the trial until it's
15 finally submitted to you.

16 You'll report back to Stony at ten minutes after
17 2:00. We will intend to start at 2:15.

18 Terms of the end of the day, by the way, let me tell
19 you this. You're going to get the argument this afternoon,
20 whether we finish at 4:00 or 5:00, you're going to get the
21 argument. There are judges who tell you exactly when you can
22 deliberate. I don't think that's my business. I set certain
23 limits. If you want to deliberate tonight, that's up to you.
24 So whether you're -- of course, we're not going to sequester
25 you, it's just whether you go home at 5:30 and start again

1 tomorrow at 8:00 or if you deliberate tonight. So, if you've
2 got people that you got to contact, that'll be a decision
3 you'll be making later in the day whether you want to
4 deliberate tonight or whether you've had a full day and you
5 want start tomorrow morning or how you want to divide it up.
6 So, I can't tell you exactly what time you're going to be
7 leaving today.

8 We'll see you at 2:15.

9 Could I see counsel in chambers, please?

10 (Court recessed at 1:00 p.m., until 2:10 p.m.)

11 (Jury is not present)

12 THE COURT: All right. We're back on the record
13 outside the presence of the jury.

14 There were contemporaneous objections to several of
15 the exhibits that came in in terms of pictures yesterday.
16 Among Exhibit 74 through 76, 135 to 148, 151, and Exhibits 113
17 and 14, 116, 120, and 125, 127, 130 and 134, various pictures
18 of the decedents. The objection was made contemporaneously
19 that they were cumulative and prejudicial, which I overruled.

20 Off the record.

21 (Off record)

22 THE COURT: Secondly, there was a request at the
23 appropriate time for a change of venue, which the Court
24 overruled or did not grant, seeing as there was absolutely no
25 basis whatsoever for a change of venue, but the defense has

1 moved for that.

2 I hold in my hand instructions numbered 1 through 52
3 with the appropriate A or B. You object to the giving of any
4 of these instructions, Mr. Figler?

5 MR. FIGLER: Yes, Your Honor. There's numerous
6 instructions in here that we find to be objectionable.

7 THE COURT: You had indicated 11 through 13, one of
8 them did give the negative definition of conspiracy. What
9 else do you specifically object to?

10 MR. FIGLER: Your Honor, with regard to the
11 reasonable doubt instruction, there are two aspects of it.
12 One we have introduced, and if the Court will mark it --

13 THE COURT: I'm asking you which ones you do object
14 to.

15 MR. FIGLER: Well, I object to the reasonable doubt
16 instruction, which I believe is Instruction Number 5.

17 THE COURT: Okay. That is the statutory
18 instruction. I understand you have a supplement or one that
19 would replace it. Other than that, do you have any other that
20 you object to the giving of that I've indicated I'm going to
21 give?

22 MR. FIGLER: Well, I have to -- I have to articulate
23 for the record. Part of the --

24 THE COURT: We'll get to that in a minute, David.

25 MR. FIGLER: Okay. Yes, there is part of

1 Instruction Number 7 dealing with direct and circumstantial
2 evidence which we have an objection to.

3 THE COURT: And what is the objection?

4 MR. FIGLER: Line 9 and 10, we believe, places an
5 overemphasis on circumstantial evidence and is superfluous and
6 must be stricken.

7 THE COURT: Okay. Any other that you object to
8 giving?

9 MR. FIGLER: Your Honor, even though the new
10 statutes has come out with regard to the Byford instructions,
11 we don't believe that they still adequately frame the law as
12 well as the felony murder as being unconstitutional the way
13 that it is designed and implemented. So, we object to those
14 as well --

15 THE COURT: Okay.

16 MR. FIGLER: -- and we'd just submit it.

17 THE COURT: And do you have any objection to any of
18 the instructions we've indicated we've going to give, Mr.
19 Daskas or Mr. Guymon?

20 MR. DASKAS: No, Judge.

21 (Off-record colloquy)

22 THE COURT: Now did I give Elana that instruction
23 that I said I wanted you to show Joe?

24 MR. FIGLER: No, not yet.

25 THE COURT: Do you still have it?

1 MR. FIGLER: It should be amongst my materials.
2 Here's the one with the stuff on the bottom.

3 THE COURT: Do the parties stipulate we can give the
4 instructions, read the instructions to the jury before rather
5 than after argument?

6 MR. GUYMON: Yes, Your Honor.

7 MR. FIGLER: That's fine, Judge.

8 THE COURT: There are lesser included offenses
9 included in the instructions. Defense has called on that,
10 voluntary manslaughter, things such as that. Take them out if
11 the defense doesn't want them? What's your position? You
12 want the lessers?

13 MR. FIGLER: We'll leave 'em in, Judge.

14 THE COURT: Okay. Okay. The only instruction --
15 what instruction do you proffer that I've indicated I will not
16 give?

17 Have that marked by Carol, please.

18 MR. FIGLER: Approaching, Judge, with that right
19 now.

20 THE COURT: That's A -- that's an additional
21 instruction to me on reasonable doubt. Don't believe it's
22 proper under established law. That leaves only one more
23 instruction, which we'll discuss at the bench, conduct subject
24 to motives, at some later point. Now, if we use Sciscento's
25 here.

1 MR. SCISCENTO: Right here.

2 THE CLERK: I'm sorry, this is in court.

3 THE COURT: Yes, that does not go to the jury. I'm
4 going to give this if you want it.

5 Off the record.

6 (Off-record)

7 THE CLERK: The other one though we have -- we have
8 29 and 29B.

9 MR. FIGLER: Oh, then this should be B. Be
10 consistent.

11 THE COURT: Okay. The last thing on the record is
12 the defense has proffered -- the defense has proffered and are
13 you --

14 MR. SCISCENTO: I'm going to argue that, Your Honor,
15 then, on the record. I'm going to argue.

16 THE COURT: We're on the record, Joe. The defense
17 has proffered a adjudication in juvenile court approximately
18 three years prior to the incidents in this case which shows,
19 we will assume for the record, an adjudication of Tod
20 Armstrong of several offenses.

21 MR. FIGLER: And just to correct it, it's five years
22 from today's date.

23 THE COURT: I said several years from before the
24 incident. I didn't say how many years and you can mark that
25 as an exhibit. Do you have that, Joe?

IV-170

1 MR. FIGLER: Do you have the adjudication? The
2 general adjudication?

3 MR. SCISCENTO: Yes, we have it, Your Honor.

4 THE COURT: Okay. That'll go into the record as a
5 defense exhibit. The State has objected to it on several
6 bases. Number one, the statute specifically forbids it. I
7 don't think that's particularly important because the cases
8 such as Davis and Azbill would say there are things that
9 supersede statutes such as that. I do agree with the State's
10 arguments as to relevance. I agree with the State's argument
11 as to the fact that this is not legitimate impeachment of the
12 defendant -- of the witness, Armstrong, on issues that were
13 raised during the cross-examination. Finally, I think that
14 under -- it's also violative of 50.085, sub 3, that is that it
15 might be able to be inquired into as something that affects his
16 truthfulness, but it can't be proved by extrinsic evidence.
17 For any of those reasons or a combination of them all, I'm not
18 going to let it in.

19 MR. SCISCENTO: Your Honor, for the record, I
20 received this after Mr. -- I received these records after Mr.
21 Armstrong took the stand and testified. Specifically, while
22 he was on the stand I asked him specifically, so was any -- so
23 was -- is that the only time that you ever planned to do any
24 kind of robbery? I'm referring to page 224 of the record.

25 THE COURT: Was this a robbery, Mr. Sciscento?

1 MR. FIGLER: Any kind.

2 THE COURT: Was the adjudication you proffered a
3 robbery? I thought it was an auto burglary.

4 MR. FIGLER: They all called it autos.

5 MR. SCISCENTO: Okay.

6 MR. FIGLER: They're all about cars.

7 MR. SCISCENTO: And I go on further. Okay. "Any
8 other time that you asked anybody to commit any robberies?"
9 Answer: "No." It was a burglary, grand larceny, possession
10 of burglary tools, which is similar in nature to -- in nature
11 to robbery, Your Honor. Just because nobody's present --

12 THE COURT: That's similar enough to me and we have
13 somebody -- we've already got Armstrong, of course, admitting
14 that more recently he committed a crime very similar to the
15 one he was adjudicated for several years ago.

16 MR. SCISCENTO: No, no, no, no, Your Honor. He
17 said, well, I talked about it, I wasn't serious about it, I
18 just was -- at that time nothing happened. I was upset with
19 this guy, Chris, and I wanted to do it. But then he says, we
20 didn't do it, it never happened, and I'm a nice clean white
21 guy. That's the problem I have.

22 THE COURT: I see the problem and I've made my
23 ruling and that is the way it's going to be.

24 Now, off the record.

25 (Off record)

1 THE COURT: Now, are we on the record, Shirlee?

2 THE CLERK: We are.

3 THE COURT: I don't even see where you are.

4 THE CLERK: I am here.

5 THE COURT: What would like to discuss about the
6 high tech stuff, Mr. Figler?

7 MR. FIGLER: First of all, Your Honor, I think it's
8 a grand inequity that the prosecutors with their unlimited
9 resources can bring in all this high tech gadgetry to try to
10 fool and with smoke and mirrors present a case, more so than
11 what they have, to the jury where the defendant doesn't have
12 those particular resources to use and we certainly can't use
13 theirs. Secondly, I don't know what they intend to magnify to
14 such a large extent.

15 THE COURT: I don't know why you make that
16 assumption by the way. I -- have you -- representing on the
17 record that you have --

18 MR. FIGLER: No money, yes.

19 THE COURT: -- entered into negotiations with the
20 district attorneys that proved fruitless to try to share some
21 of this --

22 MR. FIGLER: I could tell you this, Judge, that in
23 every case where they've used this high tech machine, if we go
24 anywhere near it they freak out.

25 THE COURT: I see. So that's your basis for saying

1 that if your boss, Philip Kohn, entered into negotiations with
2 them, they wouldn't even let you touch it. Well, if that's
3 the basis of it, that's just --

4 MR. FIGLER: I would believe that to be true, Your
5 Honor.

6 THE COURT: I believe, Mr. Figler, that your office
7 is very well equipped to do it. I'll also give you my
8 personal feeling, which is this doesn't enhance the
9 presentation at all, but I'm old fashioned. But, to me, it's
10 a individual choice by counsel on both sides how they wish to
11 present their cases, and I believe it's a discretionary thing
12 always with the Court and I'm going to exercise my discretion
13 in favor of letting them use the bells and whistles if they
14 would like to use the bells and whistles. Anything else?

15 MR. FIGLER: Yeah, Your Honor, I just want to note
16 that it says County of Clark tag on it, that this would be
17 county property so if we wanted to use it we would have the
18 ability to just go in and use it. Secondly, I'd like to know
19 what the size on the record is because when there's a
20 reviewing authority they're going to want to know exactly how
21 big these screens are. And I'd also like an offer of proof of
22 what they're going to use it for.

23 THE COURT: Well, we'll put that in the record, Mr.
24 Figler, but I disagree based on thirty-two years in this
25 profession that it's going to be of much concern to a higher

1 court, the size of the screen.

2 MR. FIGLER: Well, if nobody every raises it, Your
3 Honor, I guess we'll never find out.

4 THE COURT: Well, I'm just telling you, Mr. Figler,
5 that my opinion is that when you assert that as fact, you're
6 incorrect factually. No one's going to care whether it's
7 twenty-four inches. Is that about what it is?

8 MR. GUYMON: Actually, I think the -- forty-two-inch
9 monitors? Forty-two-inch monitors, Judge.

10 MR. FIGLER: Forty-two inch monitor, Okay.

11 THE COURT: Fine. For the record, forty-two inch
12 monitor.

13 MR. FIGLER: And what do they intend on showing and
14 using that for?

15 THE COURT: Off the record.

16 (Off record)

17 MR. DASKAS: -- make --

18 THE COURT: Yes. Back on the record.

19 MR. DASKAS: -- one point and that is before we ever
20 started trial, at the beginning of this week, I informed both
21 you and defense counsel it was my intention to use this
22 equipment. I did not hear an objection by defense counsel at
23 that point.

24 THE COURT: Oh. So they're objecting now. I see no
25 legitimate basis for objection.

1 MR. FIGLER: Can I ask what's going to be projected
2 on there so I don't have to stop 'em during their closing and
3 make an objection if they want to show some sort of
4 photographs on that? I don't know what they're using it for.

5 THE COURT: You make a contemporaneous objection
6 then.

7 MR. FIGLER: I really don't want to interrupt him
8 during his thing if I could take care of it now. Can they
9 just tell us what they're using this thing for?

10 THE COURT: They don't have to preview their final
11 argument for you and if you have some specific objection,
12 you --

13 MR. FIGLER: I'm not asking for substance, I'm
14 asking for form, Judge.

15 THE COURT: You can ask and I'm telling you listen
16 to final argument and if you have an objection then it's your
17 duty to make it. I understand the tactical reasons for not
18 wanting to do so, but we're not going to make them preview it.

19 THE BAILIFF: Can I go ahead and unlock the door?

20 MR. FIGLER: Let me just make a record then if
21 they're going to use any photographs, any enhancements,
22 anything that is different from what is actually evidence in
23 the record that we will be objecting to that.

24 THE COURT: You have put them on notice. Anything
25 else to come on the record before we take a little break, get

1 the jury back in here?

2 MR. SCISCENTO: I don't know, Your Honor, if we've
3 put on the record that defense's feel -- feeling about the way
4 that this trial has run, that we have to do it by Wednesday,
5 although today is Thursday. My belief and my understanding at
6 the time of voir dire and during some of the questioning, this
7 Court has attempted to rush us along. We have delayed ruling
8 on a matter regarding Tod Armstrong's prior criminal
9 convictions up until minutes before I would be doing --
10 opening my evidence. I disagree with that.

11 THE COURT: Now, we did -- we -- here's --

12 MR. SCISCENTO: I understand, Your Honor --

13 THE COURT: No, let's make a record as you're doing
14 it, Joe, because let me give you my views on that. Ten days
15 to two weeks ago for the very first time in a case where there
16 was, oh, somewhere around a year or more that your office
17 represented Donte, there was some issue about juvenile
18 records. Finally, for the first time, about a day or so ago,
19 if you want to make a record of this, there was some
20 development of this record that I've now said is irrelevant
21 and other -- for other reasons isn't going to come in. I
22 asked at the time that you had it to proffer appropriate
23 authority that I might make an intelligent decision about it.
24 I did not receive then and never did receive from the defense
25 things in terms of case law that would allow me to see the

1 defense's side on that. About, oh, thirty minutes or so ago,
2 because I understand all four of you are in trial, it's hard
3 to do the research during trial, I was finally proffered what
4 I considered was appropriate authority to dispose of the issue
5 and I did it then.

6 Now, in terms of rushing the case, what are you
7 talking about specifically?

8 MR. SCISCENTO: Well, Your Honor, my client has
9 indicated to me, too, he feels that we've been rushed along
10 and that this is a hurry-up trial and leaves it --

11 MR. FIGLER: Long hours, no chance to do any --

12 THE COURT: Oh, I think the record will reflect
13 exactly what we've been doing, Joe, and I'll tell you --

14 MR. SCISCENTO: I don't -- I don't --

15 THE COURT: -- that it might be on the record in
16 case this case results in a conviction. I think that in terms
17 of justice it makes no difference whether we do it in four
18 days or fourteen days. You have always been allowed any time
19 that you need to get ready for this case and there have been
20 prior continuances.

21 I know there are courts in this courthouse where a
22 trial day means you spend maybe the four hours in the
23 afternoon; after the courts go slowly through their morning
24 calendar, they have a trial. In order to get this thing done
25 in such a way that the jurors don't disrupt their lives .

1 unnecessarily, I've started my calendar early. I think that
2 makes the day better so that we can have about an equal amount
3 of testimony in the morning and the afternoon. A generalized
4 feeling that we're rushing without an articulation of any
5 specific prejudice doesn't impress me at all.

6 MR. SCISCENTO: I'm not saying the hours.

7 THE COURT: And I would just -- I would say for the
8 record that I've indicated to you if we haven't scheduled a
9 penalty hearing because it's premature, there might be some
10 specific problems in adhering to the schedule that I had
11 initially suggested, which is Monday and Tuesday. But, if you
12 could, for the record, so that you don't get up there on
13 appeal and start making allegations that were never made to
14 this Court, indicate to me what you have been unable to do
15 because of this rush that you would specifically point to as
16 prejudice?

17 MR. SCISCENTO: Your Honor, for one is when we were
18 voir diring the jury members, we first were informed that we
19 would pass for cause all of them. Then, when we passed them
20 for cause that was denied, then we had to -- each one that we
21 were going to do then we had to -- we had to exclude for
22 cause. It was -- it seemed to us that it was a waste of -- it
23 didn't waste our time, but we had to rush through the
24 selection of the jury. We weren't allowed to ask questions
25 and you kept -- at some point you had said to move on or

1 continue asking questions and move on to another section. Our
2 client has noted this and remarked it on the record, and I
3 feel that that --

4 THE COURT: Okay. Well, let's make a record on
5 that.

6 MR. SCISCENTO: Your Honor, I'm --

7 THE COURT: Yeah.

8 MR. FIGLER: Let me finish. I have no problem going
9 from 8:00 to 6:00, that's okay and I applaud that because we
10 can get on there and do the case. What I disagree with is the
11 fact that we were told then to move on, move on, that's enough
12 questioning, then it's "can we just stip to this," "can we
13 move to this." We feel that we were placed under the gun to
14 move along quickly on this.

15 THE COURT: And you are under the gun to move along
16 quickly because I perceive that that's the best way to try a
17 case. Now, whether that helps the prosecution or it helps the
18 defense, I don't know. I guess there are people who would say
19 if you go really quick it's an open and shut case, and I guess
20 there are people who say if you go quick it shows there isn't
21 much to the case, so it can go either way.

22 In terms of the voir dire, we spent a full day in
23 voir dire, the questionnaires which were given were strictly a
24 matter of discretion. You were able to gain through the
25 questionnaires more information than you could possibly get

1 through supplemental voir dire. The law on voir dire in this
2 state permits reasonable supplemental voir dire, and I think
3 you had it. I think you not only had reasonable supplemental
4 voir dire, but you had engaged in voir dire, and especially
5 Mr. Figler, that was in violation of our local district court
6 rules that argued the case to the jury, that got into
7 hypotheticals touching on their verdict, and I think, if
8 anything, I was very lenient in the amount.

9 Anything else you want to make a record of, Mr.
10 Sciscento?

11 MR. SCISCENTO: No, Your Honor.

12 MR. FIGLER: Yes, I do, Judge. In addition to that,
13 while 8:00 to 6:00 is fine, Judge, with regard to a normal
14 case --

15 THE COURT: We were never in here at 8:00, were we,
16 Mr. Figler?

17 MR. FIGLER: That is correct, we were yesterday,
18 Your Honor.

19 THE COURT: Oh, one day out of four. Okay.

20 MR. FIGLER: Right. When going, the entire length
21 of the day in a normal case, sure, maybe that would work out
22 great. But, in fact, this case is a lot more complicated,
23 involves a lot more witness preparation time, involves -- in
24 fact, these legal issues that do come up and we've had
25 absolutely no time to do adequate preparation and presentation

1 of those issues, especially since we're getting ruled against
2 on areas that we inherently think we have the right side of.

3 Now, as Your Honor is aware, not only are we having
4 to on such a hurried and rushed schedule with regard to this
5 case, but Your Honor knows that I did cases Kevin Camp
6 [phonetic] and Daris Taylor [phonetic] and Johnny Walker
7 [phonetic], which were three- and four-week-long murder trials
8 directly leading up into this with no time off between Daris
9 Taylor, which ended on Wednesday, and Donte Johnson which
10 started on Monday.

11 With regard to the voir dire, we were not allowed to
12 inquire into questions that talked about these individual's
13 beliefs.

14 THE COURT: We're not going to re-litigate voir
15 dire. We've gone over this again and again. Now --

16 MR. FIGLER: You indicated that what you thought
17 were --

18 THE COURT: -- in terms of the schedule of the
19 trial, you were told the schedule for the trial a good ten
20 days in advance of the trial. They had sixteen or seventeen
21 witnesses. The penalty may be death that is being sought by
22 the State, but this is not a complicated case. When you folks
23 needed a continuance, and maybe it was more than one occasion,
24 you got a continuance. I see absolutely nothing that could
25 have been done relative to the guilt of Mr. Johnson in these

1 four days that you could have done any better if you'd a had
2 forty days.

3 MR. FIGLER: Okay, Your Honor.

4 THE COURT: Anything else you'd like to make a
5 record of?

6 MR. FIGLER: Yes, your ending our ability to
7 thoroughly do cross-examination on witnesses, most
8 specifically Detective Buczek, felt that it was more in line
9 with the Court's desire to rush this through than to allow us
10 to do as complete and thorough examination as we are allowed
11 to do under the Sixth Amendment.

12 THE COURT: Right. What I wanted to do is follow
13 the rules of evidence and the concepts of due process, not
14 allow you, Mr. Figler, to do all these things that you wanted
15 to do that I think violates the rules of evidence.

16 Anything else on the record before we take a little
17 break?

18 MR. DASKAS: Judge, one point. Mr. Figler mentioned
19 his involvement in the Daris Taylor trial. I can represent to
20 the Court that I appeared at the calendar call for Daris
21 Taylor and Mr. Figler was there. He and I had a conversation
22 outside the courtroom where I told him I was concerned that he
23 would make a record in this court of ineffective assistance if
24 he went to trial on both Daris Taylor and Donte Johnson.
25 Outside of court he assured me that Mr. Sciscento was lead

1 counsel on this case and that he would not make such a record.

2 MR. FIGLER: That's not in -- absolutely correct,
3 Your Honor. Mr. Sciscento is lead counsel and I tried to get
4 Daris Taylor removed and Mr. Daskas actually tried to help us
5 do that so that I wouldn't have to be in this position.
6 Unfortunately, I am, because Judge Gibbons wouldn't move Daris
7 Taylor.

8 THE COURT: All right.

9 MR. FIGLER: And additionally, Your Honor, I --

10 THE COURT: And let me point out when I turn to the
11 defense, who I've granted prior continuances to, at the
12 beginning of this trial, and it was in full possession of the
13 schedule that I had outlined for this trial and had not one
14 word of objection to. The very first three or four sentences
15 I turned to the defense, knowing what the schedule was, said
16 are you ready? I don't hear a motion to continue orally, I
17 don't see a motion to continue in writing. You knew what the
18 schedule was going to be and all we did was adhere to it. Now
19 your specific rulings you've already got a record of.

20 MR. SCISCENTO: We -- and I have never at this
21 juncture, and I -- you know when I came on this case. I -- we
22 asked for a continuance one time. We were prepared to go
23 forward on this one, I understand there's changes that
24 happened. What I'm saying, is my client feels that this Court
25 is rushing him along and I, Your Honor --

1 THE COURT: And can't I be more -- anymore clear
2 about that?

3 MR. SCISCENTO: I understand but I just --

4 THE COURT: How your client feels is totally,
5 completely, a hundred percent irrelevant to me.

6 MR. SCISCENTO: And, Your Honor, I --

7 THE COURT: I'm not here to satisfy the prosecutors,
8 I'm not here to satisfy Donte, I'm not here to satisfy the
9 defense. What I'm here to satisfy, as the Judge in this
10 court, is what the law is, and what's what I'm doing. And if
11 there's a conviction and you don't agree, you'll take it up
12 with a higher court.

13 We'll be in recess for five minutes then we'll do
14 final arguments.

15 MR. SCISCENTO: I'm sorry, Judge, are you going to
16 -- I don't know if you've admonished the defendant as to
17 whether or not he has a right to testify. We've talked --
18 we've talked about --

19 THE COURT: I don't do that if he's not going to
20 testify.

21 MR. SCISCENTO: Okay. Well, there's an instruction
22 still that they've been talking about whether or not they're
23 going to use --

24 THE COURT: They have not proffered the Carter
25 instruction. Do they want it?

1 MR. FIGLER: Well, we're looking at it.

2 MR. SCISCENTO: I don't know but they -- there was
3 some talk about it, I just wanted to mention it, Judge. And
4 if I could approach, Judge, with the playback or read back
5 here. It's actually play back of testimony instructions.

6 THE COURT: Before I go back there, do you wish to
7 proffer the Carter instruction, Mr. Sciscento?

8 MR. SCISCENTO: Can we have one moment, Your Honor?

9 THE COURT: Sure.

10 (Colloquy between the Court and Clerk)

11 MR. SCISCENTO: Your Honor, we are going to
12 proffer --

13 THE COURT: A-Z-B-I-L-L.

14 MR. FIGLER: Proffer the Carter instruction.

15 THE COURT: What?

16 MR. SCISCENTO: And we'll proffer the Carter
17 instruction.

18 THE COURT: Okay. Could I have the Carter
19 instruction, please?

20 MR. DASKAS: I think that's the only copy --

21 THE COURT: All right. We're going to label this as
22 5 -- let's see. We'll make it 5A. Now a Carter instruction
23 is something that I care what you feel about, Mr. Johnson or
24 Mr. White, because the law makes that a concern of mine. The
25 Carter instruction is it's a constitutional right of a

1 defendant in a criminal trial that he --

2 MR. FIGLER: Your Honor, can we hold on a second?

3 THE COURT: This is something that I do need to
4 concern myself with your feelings about, Mr. Johnson, Mr.
5 White. It's a constitutional right of a defendant in a
6 criminal trial that he may not be compelled to testify. This
7 is the instruction that you and your counsel are asking for.
8 But I only give this if the two of you agree that you'd like
9 this instruction read to the jury. It goes like this:

10 "It is a constitutional right of a defendant in a
11 criminal trial that he may not be compelled to
12 testify. Thus the decision as to whether he should
13 testify is left to the defendant on the advice and
14 counsel of his attorney. You must not draw any
15 inference of guilt from the fact that he does not
16 testify, nor should this fact be discussed by you or
17 enter into your deliberations in any way."

18 You don't want that instruction, I don't read it. You want
19 this instruction?

20 THE DEFENDANT: No.

21 THE COURT: What?

22 THE DEFENDANT: It don't matter, I ain't testifying
23 so it don't matter.

24 THE COURT: No, but I'm saying this is something --

25 MR. SCISCENTO: Your Honor, may I?

1 THE COURT: Yeah.

2 (Colloquy between Mr. Sciscento and Defendant)

3 THE COURT: Yes, the record should reflect you and
4 Joe Sciscento, your lead counsel, have discussed this. Is it
5 clear to you now what I'm asking you is --

6 THE DEFENDANT: Yeah.

7 THE COURT: -- do you want this instruction read to
8 the jury?

9 THE DEFENDANT: Yeah.

10 THE COURT: Okay. So -- and you understand if you
11 don't want it read to the jury, I won't read them anything
12 that even talks about you not testifying. Do you understand
13 that?

14 THE DEFENDANT: Yeah.

15 THE COURT: Okay. And you do want it?

16 THE DEFENDANT: Yeah.

17 THE COURT: Okay. All right. Let's take a recess
18 'til 2:45.

19 (Court recessed until 2:50 p.m.)

20 (Jury is present)

21 THE COURT: Well, hello there.

22 Does the defense intend to call witnesses?

23 MR. SCISCENTO: No, Your Honor, we don't.

24 THE COURT: Defense rests then?

25 MR. SCISCENTO: Defense rests, Your Honor.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

DEFENDANT RESTS

THE COURT: All right. Folks, that means --

MR. GUYMON: There was -- there was one housekeeping matter that --

THE COURT: Oh, a stipulation that we didn't get in?

MR. GUYMON: That's correct.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. GUYMON: You had asked us, Judge, at the -- right before break if we rest and I indicated yes with the exception of a stipulation and to check the evidence chart.

MR. SCISCENTO: Yeah, I reviewed the evidence and the stipulation, Your Honor, and agree to that. If this Court wants --

THE COURT: You want that read to the jury before we instruct them? Want it read?

MR. GUYMON: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: This is a stipulation that's been labeled Exhibit 206, which you'll be getting along with those other stipulations I've read you in the past.

"Sheree Norman is a crime scene analyst employed with the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department. On August the 15th, 1998, Sheree Norman attended the autopsy of the four decedents in this case, identified as Jeffrey Biddle, Tracey Gorringer, Matthew Mowen, and Peter Talamantez. Sheree

1 Norman's responsibilities, while attending the
2 autopsies, were to collect and preserve any evidence
3 associated with the autopsies. Sheree Norman
4 impounded the clothing and personal items associated
5 with each of the decedent's bodies. Sheree Norman
6 did not find any U.S. currency, paper currency or
7 any foreign currency on any of the decedent's
8 persons."

9 (Colloquy between Court and Bailiff)

10 THE COURT: "Sheree Norman was present when Dr.
11 Bucklin recovered bullet fragments from each of the
12 deceased's bodies. Sheree Norman impounded all of
13 the other bullet fragments she" -- excuse me -- "all
14 of the bullet fragments she received from Dr.
15 Bucklin."

16 Anything else before instructions, folks?

17 MR. GUYMON: No, Your Honor.

18 THE COURT: Okay. The thing I'm going to need is,
19 because this is blocking some of them, can we just move it
20 over until I'm through reading the instructions? Thanks.
21 I'll be right back.

22 (Pause in the proceedings)

23 THE COURT: Okay, folks, I'm going to read you the
24 instructions. There's a lot of them and these are, of course,
25 what the law tells -- they tell you what the law is in the

1 state of Nevada. I could read them to you very, very slowly
2 and it could take, my best guess is, somewhere around an hour
3 just to read you the instructions, somewhere around forty-five
4 minutes or so.

5 If I read these instructions at the very slowest to
6 a group of lawyers, if the lawyers didn't engage in criminal
7 prosecution or criminal defense work, they wouldn't understand
8 it the first time through. In most federal courts, maybe this
9 is changing, I don't know that it is, but they read the
10 instructions to you once and you don't even get a copy of
11 them. You're going to get a copy of all of these, one copy,
12 which will be in jury deliberations with you and you can read
13 them over as much as you need to or want to so that you
14 understand them.

15 So, rather than drone on and have you listen to the
16 sound of my voice for quite a period of time, I'm not going to
17 read them as fast as I read the admonition that I read every
18 time you leave the room, but I'm going to read them pretty
19 quick. And if you don't catch them the first time around, you
20 think they're important, you'll get another chance at them
21 later today.

22 You'll notice there's As and Bs and that there're
23 different typewriters and things. Neither -- none of that
24 makes any difference. As a group, these are the instructions
25 of law that you're bound to follow.

1 (Court reads the jury instructions, not transcribed)

2 * * * * *

3 THE COURT: Mr. Daskas, it's my understanding you're
4 going to give the first of the closings?

5 MR. DASKAS: Yes, Judge, if I might have the monitor
6 moved back to the position, please?

7 THE COURT: Certainly.

8 David, do you have the verdicts?

9 MR. FIGLER: I handed that to you, Judge. I have
10 another one here. You could have mine.

11 MR. DASKAS: May I proceed, Judge?

12 THE COURT: Sure.

13 MR. DASKAS: It was Andrew Young who said "it's a
14 blessing to die for a cause, because you can so easily die for
15 nothing." On August 14th, 1998, Matt, Peter, Tracey and Jeff
16 died for nothing.

17 These four boys, none of whom were more than twenty-
18 one years of age, were killed because Donte Johnson, this
19 defendant, concluded that a pager was more valuable than Peter
20 Talamantez's life, a VCR was more valuable to Donte Johnson
21 than Matt Mowen's life, two hundred dollars was more valuable
22 than Jeff Biddle's life, and a Sony Play Station was more
23 valuable to Donte Johnson than the life of Tracey Gorringer.

24 Over the last three days you've heard a lot of
25 testimony from twenty-some witnesses, crime scene analysts,

1 coroners, fingerprint experts and DNA experts, but this case,
2 like every criminal case before it and after it, comes down to
3 two simple questions, what crimes have been committed and who
4 committed those times. When you retire to deliberate it'll be
5 your duty to answer those two questions. I would like to
6 discuss the answers to those two questions with you this
7 afternoon.

8 Let me start with the first question, that is, what
9 crimes have been committed. And you've heard the indictment
10 read and you now know that the defendant's charged with
11 fourteen counts, including burglary, conspiracy, robbery,
12 kidnapping, and murder, everything except Count II, including
13 an enhancement because deadly weapons were used in this case.
14 At this point there should be no doubt in anybody's mind that
15 all of these crimes were committed, that serious, violent
16 crimes were perpetrated on Peter, Matt, Tracey and Jeff. In
17 fact, I'm sure defense counsel would concede that crimes were
18 committed.

19 Nevertheless, the instructions that pertain to these
20 crimes, as you can tell by the instructions that were read to
21 you, can be somewhat technical, so I'd like to discuss some of
22 those instructions with you this afternoon. And let me begin
23 actually out of order with Count II of the indictment, which
24 is the conspiracy count. The reason I began out of order will
25 become apparent in a few moments.

1 You probably all have a preconceived notion, at
2 least before you came into court, about the crime of
3 conspiracy. Perhaps it brings to mind visions of the JFK
4 assassination and a complex government plot to conceal the
5 true killer of JFK, or maybe you think about Area 51 and the
6 government's actions to conceal what's going on in Area 51.
7 But the legal definition is something entirely different and
8 certainly much less complex. In its simplest form a
9 conspiracy is simply an agreement to commit a crime between
10 two or more persons.

11 Was there an agreement in this case to commit a
12 crime and was Donte Johnson part of that agreement? You'll
13 recall the testimony of Charla Severs and LaShawnya Wright.
14 They clearly established that Donte Johnson met with Sikia
15 Smith and Terrell Young and the three of them agreed to rob
16 the occupants of the Terra Linda home.

17 How do we know that? Well, we know they gathered up
18 their tote bag packed with duct tape, packed with rifles,
19 packed with a .380 handgun, and the three of them went to the
20 Terra Linda residence. That agreement that three of these
21 people had is a conspiracy and it's a crime. It's that
22 simple. For you to conclude that there is no conspiracy
23 there, you would have to conclude, essentially, that Donte,
24 Terrell and Sikia just happened to show up at the Terra Linda
25 household at the same time with guns, with gloves and with

1 duct tape. It's unreasonable to conclude that. Certainly
2 there's an agreement in this case.

3 There's an important consequence, though, of finding
4 a conspiracy, and that's why I started out of order in the
5 indictment, actually with Count II. That consequence is
6 actually delineated in instruction number 12, and it reads as
7 follows:

8 "When two or more individuals join together in a
9 common design to commit any unlawful act," which is
10 what the defendant did with Terrell and Sikia, "each
11 is responsible for the acts of his confederates
12 committed in furtherance of the design. In
13 contemplation of law, the act of one is the act of
14 all."

15 Let me give you a --

16 MR. FIGLER: Your Honor, we would object at this
17 time. That is not the complete instruction 12. In fact,
18 there's limiting language that comes after that that is
19 provided in the actual instruction. It's improper to be
20 showing just part of an instruction.

21 THE COURT: Overruled.

22 MR. DASKAS: You will have the instructions when you
23 deliberate. It's certainly not my intention to withhold a
24 portion of the instruction. I'll let you read the instruction
25 and interpret it yourselves.

1 But there's an important consequence, as I said,
2 once you find a conspiracy. The act of one is the act of all.
3 Let me give you an example of this, and actually it was
4 alluded to during the voir dire examination. Let's assume
5 that you and I agree to commit a robbery. We agree that we'll
6 go to a 7-Eleven, that we'll drive my car, that I'll be the
7 getaway driver. I'll transport us to the 7-Eleven and you'll
8 go inside the gun and rob the clerk while I wait outside so
9 that we can flee once the robbery is complete. I never
10 entered the 7-Eleven, I never touched the gun, I never robbed
11 the clerk. Because we had this agreement, this conspiracy to
12 commit this crime and because I participated in that
13 conspiracy, your actions are now imputed or attributed to me.
14 In the eyes of the law, in other words, I did hold the gun, I
15 did enter 7-Eleven, and I did rob the clerk. In the eyes of
16 the law, the act of one is the act of all.

17 Let's talk about that instruction and how it applies
18 to this particular case. Once Donte Johnson agreed with
19 Terrell and Sikia to rob the occupants of the Terra Linda
20 home, they each became responsible for the other person's
21 actions. In other words, it doesn't matter who taped up the
22 victims. In the eyes of the law they all taped the victims.
23 And it doesn't matter who stole the VCR, or the Play Station
24 or the pager, in the eyes of the law, in a conspiracy, each of
25 them stole the VCR and the Play Station and the pager. And it

1 doesn't matter who pulled the trigger that killed those four
2 boys, in the eyes of the law they all pulled the trigger.

3 And if you think about it there's wisdom in this
4 room. The legislature recognizes that dangerous things happen
5 when the Donte Johnsons of this world get together with the
6 Terrell Youngs and the Sikia Smiths, innocent people get
7 killed. Tragic consequences happen and so the law recognizes
8 that they should all be held responsible for each other's
9 actions. The act of one is the act of all. And actually the
10 consequences are even more significant.

11 Instruction Number 13 tells us that when the purpose
12 of the conspiracy is to a commit a dangerous felony, each
13 member of that conspiracy runs the risk that that criminal
14 venture will end in homicide. Accordingly each conspirator is
15 guilty of murder if any one of them commits homicide.

16 What do we know in this case? The purpose of this
17 conspiracy was to commit a robbery, and robbery is a dangerous
18 felony. They all ran the risk that somebody would get killed,
19 and so each became responsible, that is, Donte Johnson,
20 Terrell Young and Sikia Smith became responsible for murder if
21 somebody got killed. And so before we even get to the murder
22 instructions in this case, and we'll get there shortly, you
23 already know that Donte Johnson is responsible, is guilty of
24 four counts of first degree murder with use of a deadly
25 weapon.

1 Let me move on to Count I actually, of the
2 indictment, going backwards, burglary while in possession of a
3 firearm -- and I should say at this point with respect to the
4 enhancement, the deadly weapon enhancement for some of these
5 crimes, I won't mention it as we discuss each crime, I'm
6 certain that you all would understand at this point guns were
7 used, you saw a couple of the weapons in this case, and you
8 saw the injury, the fatal wounds inflicted by the .380 handgun
9 that Donte and his partners took in to the terror in the
10 household. So certainly the deadly weapon enhancements have
11 been established.

12 Burglary is simply entering a home with the intent
13 to steal or to commit a felony. What do we know in this case?
14 We know that Donte and his partners went into the Terra Linda
15 household with a duffel bag loaded with duct tape and guns.
16 We see the Black and Mild cigar box inside the Terra Linda
17 home that held Donte Johnson's fingerprints. Evidence proved
18 that he actually went into that home on August 14th.

19 Now, how can we be satisfied at the time Donte
20 entered the Terra Linda household he intended to steal or
21 commit a felony? And I'll ask you this, what other intentions
22 did Donte Johnson have when he entered the household carrying
23 these two weapons?

24 MR. FIGLER: Your Honor, I object to (A) the photo
25 off the media, and also that there is no conclusion evidence

1 regarding these being in anyone's hand, it goes beyond
2 argument, Your Honor, there's no evidence in the record.

3 THE COURT: Overruled.

4 MR. DASKAS: And Let me mention this again, there's
5 no evidence, it's true, that Donte Johnson held any one of
6 these guns when he walked into the Terra Linda household, but
7 let me remind you, in the eyes of the law the act of one is
8 the act of all. It doesn't matter if Terrell held those guns
9 or Sikia held those guns, their actions are imputed to Donte
10 Johnson, and his actions to them. It is of no significance
11 that Donte Johnson, if he didn't hold those weapons, truly
12 didn't hold them when he entered the household. He is
13 responsible for Terrell's actions and for Sikia's actions.

14 Counts III through VI, robbery with use of a deadly
15 weapon. And you'll realize that there is one count for each
16 victim in this case.

17 Instruction Number 26 tells us that robbery in its
18 simplest form is taking the personal property of somebody else
19 by means of force, by means of fear, or by means of violence.
20 And we see in the photographs the property that Donte and his
21 partners took from the Terra Linda household from the four
22 victims in this case.

23 The entertainment center from the Terra Linda home
24 which once housed the VCR that was found in Donte Johnson's
25 residence. We see the picture to the left, the actual VCR and

1 the Sony Play Station that once were located in the victims'
2 household. And we see the pager. Peter Talamantez's pager
3 that's buried in the backyard where Donte Johnson stays.
4 Certainly personal property was taken in this case.

5 The only remaining question is whether force or fear
6 or violence was used? It's not my intention to insult
7 anybody's intelligence here today, but let me ask you if fear
8 was used in this case? Imagine the fear in the minds of these
9 three boys as they laid face down, duct taped at their ankles
10 and wrists, completely defenseless as they hear the first shot
11 that kills their friend Peter Talamantez. Imagine the fear in
12 their minds. And imagine the fear as they all lay waiting for
13 their turn.

14 MR. FIGLER: Your Honor, golden rule objection.

15 MR. DASKAS: I'm arguing an element of the offense.

16 THE COURT: What is the objection, Mr. Figler?

17 MR. FIGLER: Can we approach on this then?

18 THE COURT: Is it to the imagine?

19 MR. FIGLER: That's correct, Your Honor.

20 THE COURT: If you could rephrase that. Sustained.

21 MR. DASKAS: I will, Judge.

22 There should be no doubt in anybody's mind that
23 these three boys had fear in their minds as they laid face
24 down, duct taped and defenseless, waiting for the bullet that
25 would send each of them into eternity. I'm certain that they

1 were in fear as Donte placed the barrel of the gun two inches
2 from the skull of each boy. And as they were defenseless to
3 even crawl away because he was so thorough in how he taped
4 their ankles. It's not my intention to insult you
5 intelligence when I tell you that there was fear in this case,
6 and that's a robbery.

7 Count VII through X, kidnapping with a deadly
8 weapon. Instruction Number 26 tells us that kidnapping is
9 simply confining or concealing somebody for the purpose of
10 committing robbery or the purpose of committing murder. And
11 you'll gather -- you'll glean from the instructions that you
12 must find the victims were physically restrained. Were these
13 four boys confined in the Terra Linda household so that Donte
14 and his partners could rob and murder them? And is there
15 physical restraint when you see the duct tape at their wrists
16 and at their ankles? The overwhelming evidence in this case
17 is that Donte and his partners entered that home to rob these
18 boys, and they were taped, they were physically restrained for
19 that purpose. Certainly Donte is guilty of Counts VII through
20 X.

21 And that brings us finally to the murder counts,
22 Counts XI through XIV, again, one count for each victim. Now,
23 we already know he's guilty under a conspiracy theory of
24 murder, we discussed that fact. It was a dangerous felony,
25 the felony resulted in homicide, he is responsible. The

1 reason we discuss some other theories though is because .
2 there's an instruction that tells you that you do not have to
3 agree on the theory under which you find Donte Johnson guilty
4 of murder. In other words, some of you might conclude that
5 he's guilty under the conspiracy theory, others might conclude
6 that he guilty under the felony murder rule, and still others
7 might find that he's guilty under the premeditative theory.
8 So long as each of you agrees that he's guilty under one or
9 all of those theories, you still must find him guilty.

10 So let me discuss the remaining two theories. The
11 first being premeditated murder and the second being felony
12 murder. In order to convict Donte Johnson of premeditated
13 murder you must find the existence of three elements,
14 willfulness, deliberation and premeditation. And willfulness
15 is simply an intent to kill. Did Donte Johnson form an intent
16 to kill in this case? You recall the evidence, what the
17 physical evidence suggests, that the gun placed two inches, no
18 more than two inches from the skull of each one of these boys
19 as he fired a fatal shot. Certainly that evidence is an
20 intent to kill on Donte Johnson's part. Is there a
21 deliberation? Don't be fooled by the deliberation
22 instruction, it is simply the process of determining that he
23 desires to kill somebody. And that there's some evidence that
24 he considered the consequences, considered the reasons for and
25 against killing these victims. Most importantly though the

1 instruction tells you that -- that determination can be
2 arrived at in a very short period of time.

3 What do we know about Donte Johnson's determination
4 in this case? Charla Severs told us that Donte told her he
5 decided to kill Peter Talamantez because he was Mexican and
6 because he was talking mess, to use Charla Severs words.
7 Based on those words, the fact that he doesn't like Mexicans
8 anyway, according to Charla, and because Peter was talking
9 mess, Donte Johnson was determined to kill Peter Talamantez.

10 What do we know about the other three boys he
11 killed? The testimony was that he had to get rid of the
12 witnesses. He was determined to kill the three remaining boys
13 because they would have been witnesses to the murder of Peter
14 Talamantez. That's deliberation. In fact there was some
15 testimony that he didn't want to kill one of the victims
16 because he cooperating. In other words, he's considering the
17 reasons against his actions, yet he did it anyway.
18 Deliberation.

19 MR. FIGLER: Your Honor, we'll object at this time,
20 that's not the full law of 683] deliberation, especially after
21 Byford, it's not the instructions that are given. I gave them
22 the opportunity to give the entire law and that's when I made
23 my objection.

24 THE COURT: Overruled.

25 MR. DASKAS: Finally, you must find premeditation to

1 convict him of first degree premeditated murder. Three
2 elements. Before I went to law school I had a preconceived
3 notion of premeditation, that it meant that somebody had to
4 decide they wanted to kill a particular victim, come up with a
5 plan, determine the best way to execute the plan without
6 getting caught, and then actually committing the act. Well,
7 the legal definition is something entirely different. In fact
8 it is simply a design or a determination to kill which can be
9 formed in the mind anytime up until the time of the killing.
10 There need not be the planning of the killing, so long as the
11 killer decides, at some point, at the time he pulled the
12 trigger that's he is going to kill, that's premeditation. In
13 fact the instruction goes on, premeditation need not be for a
14 day, an hour or even a minute, it may be as instantaneous as
15 successive thoughts of the mind.

16 We know that Donte Johnson decided to kill Peter
17 after he was talking mess, that's premeditation. Donte
18 Johnson decided to kill the other three boys because they were
19 witnesses, that's premeditation. As quickly as he placed the
20 gun to the back of each of their heads, is as quickly as he
21 could form premeditation. Don't be fooled by the instruction.

22 Those three elements, willfulness, deliberation and
23 premeditation make this first degree premeditated murder. But
24 I told you that's just one theory, one of three.

25 The felony murder rule, perhaps you've heard of it,

1 it's also an instruction you'll receive in this case. There's
2 a kind of murder which carries with it conclusive evidence of
3 premeditation and malice of forethought, in other words, you
4 don't have to find the existence of the three elements we just
5 talked about if you find felony murder. This class of murder
6 is murder committed in the perpetration of robbery and/or
7 kidnapping. A killing committed in the perpetration of
8 robbery is deemed to be murder of the first degree. All you
9 have to conclude is that these four individuals were killed
10 during the commission of a robbery. And if you conclude that,
11 and the evidence has established that, then you must convict
12 Donte Johnson of first degree murder with use of a deadly
13 weapon, times four.

14 And that answers the first question, that is, what
15 crimes have been committed in this case. A conspiracy, a
16 burglary, four robberies, four kidnappings and four murders,
17 all with use of a deadly weapon. And so the only remaining
18 question is who committed these crimes? It's certainly not my
19 intention to recount for you every piece of evidence and
20 testimony in this case, but what I would like to do is discuss
21 some of the points that were established throughout the course
22 of this trial. And ask yourself this question, to whom does
23 all this evidence point?

24 Point number one, Deco confessed to Charla. You
25 recall Charla Severs the defendant's ex-girlfriend, the story

1 she conveyed. Donte's confession as he returned home that
2 night from Terra Linda, kissed her on the cheek and told her
3 that he's got to go to sleep after he kills somebody. If you
4 believe Charla Severs testimony you must convict Donte
5 Johnson. In fact, if you believe Charla Severs that in itself
6 is proof beyond a reasonable doubt that he's guilty.

7 And so the only question is, can you believe Charla
8 Severs? Is there other evidence, other testimony that
9 corroborates Charla Severs?

10 She told us that Donte mentioned the first victim
11 was Mexican, he didn't like Mexicans. And what do we see from
12 the picture, from the last name of Peter Talamantez that
13 indeed he's Hispanic. Her testimony is corroborated by the
14 fact that Peter Talamantez is, in fact, Hispanic.

15 Corroborated by the print on the cigar box. Charla
16 Severs told us that Donte smokes Black and Mild, there's a
17 Black and Mild box at the crime scene, and lo and behold Donte
18 Johnson's print is on the cigar box.

19 She's corroborated by the blood on Donte's pants.
20 She told you from the stand that he wears black jeans, that he
21 was dressed in black the night of the murders. And in fact
22 scientific proof that the victims' blood are on Donte
23 Johnson's pants. Corroboration of Charla Severs.

24 Matching cartridge cases. It was Charla's testimony
25 that Donte Johnson shot each and every one of the victims in

1 this case. And what do we know from Richard Good, the
2 firearms expert, all four cartridge cases came from the same
3 gun, at least a suggestion that the same person shot all four
4 victims.

5 And finally corroborated by Tod Armstrong, Bryan
6 Johnson and LaShawnya Wright. You've all taken copious notes
7 throughout the trial, you can compare the stories.
8 Inconsistencies yes, but that's human nature. They
9 corroborate the testimony of Charla Severs. You can believe
10 Charla Severs.

11 Point number two, Deco confessed to Tod Armstrong.
12 If you believed Tod Armstrong that, in itself, is enough to
13 convict Donte Johnson, it's proof beyond a reasonable doubt.
14 And so the question is, can you believe Tod Armstrong? Was
15 there corroboration to his testimony?

16 Tod told us that Donte told him he took the first
17 victim into the back room and shot him. And what do we know
18 based on the photos of the crime scene analyst that Peter
19 Talamantez is the only one in the back dining room, kitchen
20 area. Corroboration of Tod Armstrong's testimony.

21 We heard, again, testimony that Donte's print was on
22 a cigar box, doesn't that corroborate Tod when Tod says Donte
23 told him he went inside that household, and we find a
24 fingerprint?

25 Tod told us that Donte told Tod he shot all the

1 victims in the head. And what do we know from the crime scene
2 photos? One gunshot wound to the head of each victim.

3 Corroboration.

4 Matching cartridge cases, suggesting that one person
5 shot all four victims.

6 And finally the other eye -- I'm sorry, the other
7 witnesses in this case, Charla, Bryan and LaShawnya, similar
8 confessions by Donte to all those witnesses. Corroboration.

9 Point number three, Deco confessed to Bryan Johnson.
10 You recall Bryan's testimony, he shows up at the Everman home
11 the 15th for an interview. Deco is there. Deco begins to
12 tell the story. Confesses to Bryan. Brags to Bryan. Can you
13 believe Bryan Johnson? Because if you believe Bryan Johnson,
14 you must convict Donte.

15 Corroborated by Pete's location in the house, again
16 Bryan's testimony was that Donte confessed that he took the
17 first victim into the back room and shot him. Peter
18 Talamantez was found in the back room. Corroborated by Pete's
19 nationality. Bryan too told us that Deco's words were the
20 first kid he shot was Mexican.

21 Blood on Deco's pants, Bryan Johnson testified that
22 Donte told him on August 15th he got blood on the back of his
23 pants. You've heard from Tom Wahl, one of the crime scene
24 analyst. You saw the photos of blood on Donte Johnson's
25 pants. Corroboration of Bryan Johnson. Corroborated by again

1 Charla, Tod and LaShawnya.

2 And finally by Dr. Bucklin. If you remember Bryan
3 Johnson told us that Deco confessed to Bryan that when Peter
4 Talamantez thought it was a joke, Peter Talamantez was kicked,
5 was hit, was beat up as he was brought into a back room. And
6 Dr. Bucklin, the coroner, told us there was trauma, fresh
7 trauma to Peter Talamantez's head, as though he was hit by the
8 butt of a gun. Corroboration of Bryan Johnson.

9 Point number four, Deco confessed to LaShawnya. Can
10 there be anybody -- any doubt in anybody's mind that LaShawnya
11 Wright was telling the truth. You saw her emotions from the
12 witness stand. You heard about the feelings she has for Donte
13 Johnson, how she doesn't want to get him in trouble. And you
14 watched as she struggled to tell you the confession that Donte
15 gave to her. Can you believe LaShawnya Wright?

16 LaShawnya told us that Saturday, the 15th of August,
17 she walked by a newspaper stand with Donte Johnson and Tiny
18 Bug, Sikia Smith, that they saw an article about the quadruple
19 slaying. And you recall Donte's words, "look, we" -- "we made
20 the front page", referring to himself and others. "We made
21 the front page." Well, that's important because if you look
22 at that newspaper article, there are no suspects named, there
23 had been no defendants arrested, nobody knew who committed
24 this crime as of August 15th, 1998, yet Donte Johnson says to
25 LaShawnya, "look, we made the front page". Corroboration of

1 LaShawnya.

2 Corroborated by the enforcer rifle, the duffel bag
3 and the tape. LaShawnya Wright saw the bag that contained the
4 weapons, before Donte left with Tiny Bug and Terrell. And
5 you'll see the photos, and you can handle those items, they're
6 in evidence.

7 Corroborated by the VCR that holds Sikia Smith's,
8 Tiny Bug's palm print. LaShawnya told you that when Tiny Bug
9 came home the next day, some fourteen hours after leaving with
10 Donte and Terrell, he carried a VCR into the apartment. And
11 you heard from Ed Guenther that the VCR contained Sikia
12 Smith's palm print. Corroboration of LaShawnya Wright. And
13 finally corroboration by the other witnesses who testified in
14 this case.

15 Point number five, Tracey's blood on Donte Johnson's
16 pants. We know those pants were found in a room where Donte
17 Johnson kept his personal belongings. The witnesses told us
18 that they've seen Donte Johnson wear black jeans. And you
19 heard from Thomas Wahl, there was a semen stain on the zipper
20 area of those pants. Absolute identification of Donte Johnson
21 being the donor of the semen on those black jeans.

22 Mr. Sciscento said something interesting in his
23 opening statement, he said somebody else deposited Donte
24 Johnson's semen on Donte's black jeans. You've heard no
25 evidence to suggest that. In fact, I would encourage you to

1 read the instruction on reasonable doubt, because it says that
2 doubt to be reasonable must be actual, not mere speculation.
3 It is sheer speculation to suggest that somebody --

4 MR. FIGLER: Your Honor, I'm going to object at this
5 point, neither side can ask the jury to speculate as to
6 anything, and this entire process is then asking to draw
7 inferences, any kind of inference can be drawn, and there's no
8 burden of proof on the defense.

9 THE COURT: Of course there's no burden of proof on
10 the defense, but I don't understand quite what you're saying
11 in terms of the objection. Overruled.

12 MR. DASKAS: It is speculation to suggest that some
13 other unknown person deposited Donte Johnson's semen on his
14 black jeans. Scientific evidence now corroborates Charla,
15 Tod, Bryan and LaShawnya. When those witnesses told you that
16 Donte wears black pants, when Bryan Johnson told you that
17 Donte told him he got blood on the back of his pants, there's
18 corroboration. Scientific proof that those witnesses are
19 telling the truth. You can believe the witnesses in this
20 case.

21 Point number six, Deco's DNA at the murder scene.
22 Do you recall the evidence about the cigarette butts that were
23 impounded from the crime scene, twelve cigarette butts, sent
24 to be analyzed. Saliva on a cigarette butt, Donte Johnson's
25 saliva, scientific proof that Donte Johnson was at the crime

1 scene. More importantly scientific evidence that corroborates
2 the witnesses in this case, all of whom said Donte Johnson
3 confessed that he was at that household, and now we have
4 scientific proof.

5 Mr. Sciscento asked some questions of Tom Wahl. Tom
6 Wahl testified that there was major component and a minor
7 component on the cigarette butt, that the major component, the
8 source of the major component was Donte Johnson. And Tom Wahl
9 couldn't exclude some of the victims as the source of the
10 minor component. And Mr. Sciscento asked him how is that
11 possible? It is one possibility that somebody might have had
12 dried lips when he took a drag on that cigarette.

13 What happens when people get nervous and scared?
14 Do they get cottonmouth? Did Donte Johnson allow the victim
15 to take one last drag before he put a bullet in the back of
16 his --

17 MR. FIGLER: Your Honor, this is my objection with
18 speculation. They can't do it, we can't do it, no one can do
19 it.

20 THE COURT: Overruled.

21 MR. DASKAS: Did Donte Johnson allow the victim to
22 take one last drag of that cigarette before he put a bullet in
23 the back of his head? Is that why there's two sources of DNA
24 on that cigarette? We know Donte Johnson smoked the
25 cigarette, we know Donte Johnson was at that crime scene.

1 Point number seven, Donte's fingerprint at the crime
2 scene. We've alluded to this, the Black and Mild cigar box.
3 Charla told us, Bryan told us that Donte smokes Black and
4 Milds. 100 percent positive that is Donte Johnson's
5 fingerprint. Corroboration, scientific evidence that the
6 witnesses who testified are telling the truth.

7 Point number eight, Matt's VCR at Donte's house.
8 The VCR was found at the Everman home shortly after Donte was
9 arrested. The VCR didn't appear there until August 14th,
10 1998, the morning following the murders. And what do we know
11 about that VCR? The remote control that is kept by Matt's
12 father turned on that VCR, proof that that is Matt's VCR in
13 the defendant's home. And we know that Donte's co-
14 conspirator, Sikia Smith, held that VCR, you recall the
15 testimony again of Ed Guenther. And we also have
16 corroboration of LaShawnya's testimony, she told us that Sikia
17 bought -- I'm sorry, Sikia sold the VCR to Donte for twenty
18 dollars (\$20). We know Sikia's palm print is on there, we
19 know the VCR turned up at Donte's home. Scientific evidence
20 that corroborates LaShawnya Wright.

21 Point number nine, Pete's pager at Donte's house.
22 Pager found buried in the backyard of the Everman home where
23 Donte Johnson stayed. You heard the stipulation that that
24 Peter [sic], in fact, belonged to Peter Talamantez.
25 Corroboration of all the witnesses in this case when they told

1 you Donte confessed to committing these crimes, to killing
2 Peter Talamantez because he doesn't like Mexicans. Scientific
3 corroboration. Physical corroboration when the pager is
4 buried in the defendant's backyard.

5 Point number nine, gun in Deco's car. You saw the
6 enforcer rifle that Sergeant Honea impounded after he stopped
7 Donte and Terrell just three days after the quadruple murders.
8 Charla, Tod and LaShawnya all identified that gun as a gun
9 that was commonly kept in the tote bag, and we know that the
10 tote bag left the Everman home shortly before Donte committed
11 the crimes. Corroboration.

12 Point number nine, gun in Deco's room. When
13 Sergeant Hefner searched the Everman home after arresting
14 Donte Johnson he found the collapsible Ruger rifle that
15 everybody described in this case. Just three days after the
16 murder it's recovered. And Charla and Tod described that gun
17 as the gun that was commonly kept in the tote bag, and the
18 tote bag left the Everman home the night that Donte Johnson
19 killed these boys.

20 Point number twelve, duct tape in Deco's room. All
21 four victims in this case restrained with duct tape. You saw
22 the photographs. And isn't it interesting that there's a
23 partial roll of duct tape recovered from the room where Donte
24 Johnson's stays, sitting in the duffel bag that everybody
25 testified about in this case. And doesn't that evidence

1 corroborate the testimony you heard from the witness stand,
2 the witnesses who said Donte told them about the victims being
3 taped up with duct tape.

4 Twelve points, if you will, that establish Donte
5 Johnson's guilt.

6 Now, I suppose it's possible we can take each one of
7 these points and explain it away. I guess Charla Severs is
8 lying, perhaps Tod Armstrong is lying, Bryan Johnson he must
9 be lying too.

10 MR. FIGLER: Your Honor, they objected during the
11 course as to that terminology, we would have to object at this
12 time for that as well.

13 THE COURT: I think he's saying in terms of argument
14 what might be anticipated, as such it's overruled.

15 MR. DASKAS: And if Donte Johnson is not guilty then
16 LaShawnya Wright must be lying too. So Charla is lying, Tod
17 is lying, Bryan is lying and LaShawnya Wright is lying. And
18 apparently somehow the victims' blood just turned up on Donte
19 Johnson's pants. Somebody -- the true killer apparently wore
20 Donte Johnson's pants to the crime scene and then returned
21 those pants to Donte Johnson's bedroom before the police
22 showed up. And let's not forget that somebody must have
23 deposited Donte Johnson's semen on his own pants.

24 Deco's DNA at the murder scene. Apparently
25 somebody, for Donte Johnson to be found not guilty, took a

1 cigarette butt that Donte Johnson had smoked and placed it at
2 the crime scene. Unlucky for Donte Johnson.

3 Deco's fingerprint at the murder scene. For Donte
4 Johnson to be found not guilty you must conclude that somebody
5 took the cigar box holding his fingerprint, and they planted
6 it at the crime scene. Unlucky Donte Johnson.

7 Matt's VCR at Deco's house. For Donte Johnson to be
8 found not guilty, apparently somebody took Matt's VCR from the
9 Everman home -- from the Terra Linda and placed it in the home
10 where Donte Johnson stayed. Is that reasonable to believe?

11 Peter's pager at Deco's house. For Donte Johnson to
12 be found not guilty you must conclude, speculate that somebody
13 else buried the pager in Donte's backyard, along with all
14 these other speculations you must conclude.

15 The Ruger in Deco's room. Isn't it interesting that
16 all these witnesses described the guns that Donte had
17 possession of, and sure enough we find the Ruger rifle in his
18 -- in his room. I guess somebody planted that. The Enforcer
19 rifle in Donte's car, you heard the testimony about the fact
20 that that gun was kept in the duffel bag, the duffel bag left
21 the night of the murders, and it just happened to be found in
22 his room -- in his car rather, three nights after the
23 homicides.

24 And the duct tape in Deco's room. Apparently the
25 true killer, for you to find Donte Johnson not guilty, placed

1 a partial roll of duct tape in Donte Johnson's room before the
2 police showed up.

3 I suppose it's possible to explain away each of
4 these points, but the thing about reasonable doubt is, it must
5 be reasonable. And is it reasonable to conclude that all
6 these witnesses are lying, that the evidence was planted, that
7 the guns were planted in his car. Is it reasonable to
8 conclude that Donte Johnson is not guilty?

9 This evidence does not point to Ace Hart, and the
10 evidence does not point to Bryan Johnson as having committed
11 these crimes, and no, the evidence does not even point to Tod
12 Armstrong in this case. The evidence points to one person and
13 only one person, Donte Johnson. And you must find him guilty
14 of all the crimes with which he's charged, including four
15 counts of first degree murder with use of a deadly weapon.

16 Thank you.

17 THE COURT: Thank you.

18 Would counsel approach the bench please.

19 MR. FIGLER: Can we pull the screen down?

20 THE COURT: Why don't we do it in the order -- this
21 order that I'm going to suggest.

22 MR. FIGLER: Note for the record, it's still up.

23 (Off-record bench conference)

24 THE COURT: Okay. Take the screens out and turn
25 them off please.

1 By the way, because you're going to be here about
2 another hour before we take the break, Mr. Figler did object
3 at some point to excerpts from instructions, just so that it's
4 clear to you, of course Mr. Daskas was taking parts of these
5 instructions in making his argument and focusing on certain
6 parts of them, they were not the entire instructions in many
7 cases, and the entire instructions are in this package and
8 will be given to you.

9 We're just going to wait a few minutes while they
10 take these out, because neither Mr. Sciscento nor Mr. Guymon
11 are going to be using them. And they've estimated that it's
12 going to take about, between the two of them somewhere around
13 an hour. Are there any of you, and it really only takes one
14 or two votes, who would like to take a little break before
15 hearing another hour? Okay. Let's do that.

16 During this recess your admonished not to talk or
17 converse among yourselves or anyone else on any subject
18 connected with this trial; read, watch or listen to any report
19 of or commentary on the trial, or any person connected with it
20 by any medium of information including, without limitation,
21 newspaper, television or radio; or to form or express any
22 opinion on any subject connected with the trial until it's
23 finally submitted to you.

24 We'll be in recess until 4:15. Thank you.

25 Let's remain in session briefly outside their

1 presence.

2 (Jury recessed)

3 THE COURT: Okay. Two matters, Mr. Figler
4 approached in the presence of the District Attorney just
5 before argument and asked that there be a general objection to
6 aspects of the bells and whistles, the use of the screens and
7 the laser devices, in terms specifically of what, Dayvid?

8 MR. FIGLER: Your Honor, with regard to this new
9 technological component that probably wasn't contemplated by
10 the Legislature in providing their rules of evidence. With
11 regard to the size of the screen, noted that the prosecutor
12 had previously said that each screen was 42 inches, should
13 note for the record that there were two screens positioned so
14 that jury, even if they wanted to, pretty much couldn't avoid
15 the sight of the images that were being projected by the
16 prosecutors from the two 42 inch screens that were
17 approximately one -- one and a half, two feet away from the --
18 where the jury was sitting. A very large monolithic objects.
19 On those objects various pictures were shown.

20 THE COURT: You compare these to like 2001 is that
21 the reference?

22 MR. FIGLER: That would be correct, Your Honor.

23 THE COURT: You realize of course that these
24 screens, and I'm not kidding about it, presents the circle of
25 guilt about half the size that the District Attorney used to

1 present the circle of guilt when they just drew it the old
2 fashioned way.

3 MR. FIGLER: Certainly. Well, with the colors and
4 the way that the visuals work, and the way that the technology
5 operates, I think it's even more impactful that way. But
6 what's more concerning to us, and I made some notes, were
7 regard to the pictures. The pictures of the decedents in this
8 case repeatedly being shown four times, blown up to the 42
9 inch size. The pictures in comparison with the pictures of
10 the defendant and the co-defendants in this case, it was the
11 same objection that we made during the opening, regard to the
12 certain type of picture with the decedents, and then the
13 mugshots of the three black individuals in this particular
14 case. And the absence of any photograph of Tod Armstrong or
15 anything like that being in there.

16 Donte's picture was also made larger than the other
17 ones, framed in a heavy red border. And so basically the
18 argument is that by making these pictures in such a fashion,
19 what it does is it inflames the passions of the jury, which
20 certainly is in contravention of the rules, no matter what
21 time it comes in, whether it be during the opening, the
22 presentation of evidence or the closing. But the enlarged
23 pictures of the -- of the young men, who -- of the unfortunate
24 victims in this case, with the words printed above it on both
25 screens. And then the juxtaposition with that of the fade in

1 to the pictures of these young men dead. And then the
2 pictures of these very harsh looking black individuals, all is
3 appealing to the passions and prejudices of the jury.

4 To that end, Your Honor, I would ask that whatever
5 the program that was utilized by the prosecutors in this
6 particular case be saved onto a floppy disk, or whatever kind
7 of CD rom technology they have, so that it may be made part of
8 this record, so that if any reviewing authority allows, in the
9 event of a conviction in this particular case, the ability to
10 fully review exactly what it is that I'm referring to, because
11 I think it can be saved.

12 The second --

13 THE COURT: If it can be saved, by the way, I think
14 that's a perfectly legitimate request. Anything else briefly,
15 Dayvid, on this point?

16 MR. FIGLER: Not on this point, other than the fact
17 that during the course of the closing argument, to our
18 surprise the State, approximately fifteen to twenty times
19 called this Deco's room, Deco's house, Deco's yard, in fact it
20 even shows up in the text on the various exhibits, so what we
21 would do at this time is make motion for mistrial, or in the
22 alternative, a motion for a new trial, based on our previous
23 motion to suppress the evidence. It was presented by the
24 State at that time that this was not Donte's house, that this
25 was not Donte's room, that this was not anything that Donte

1 had a legitimate interest in.

2 THE COURT: Just for the sake of the record would
3 you like to address that specific point, Mr. Daskas?

4 MR. DASKAS: Judge, when we allude to this as either
5 Donte's home or Donte's room it's for simplicity sake. It's
6 not our suggestion that he own the house, that's clear, we
7 elicited testimony that it's Tod Armstrong's mother home --
8 mother's home. That Donte simply had his personal belongings
9 in the master room, that when he stayed in the home that's
10 where he stayed, and he had belongings in that room and the
11 living room, and that also was borne out through testimony in
12 this case.

13 It's difficult to argue to a jury each time that the
14 room where Donte stayed, or the room where Donte kept his
15 belongings, and so we referred to it on occasion as Donte's
16 room. It's not an inconsistent position, in fact I think this
17 Court's ruling was that Donte wasn't a co-tenant of that home,
18 and that's not inconsistent with our position.

19 THE COURT: And that was my ruling, and the record
20 is whatever it is on that, and the motion is denied.

21 MR. DASKAS: Judge, can I make one other point --

22 THE COURT: Yeah.

23 MR. DASKAS: -- with respect to the display in
24 closing argument. Nothing was displayed that was not an
25 exhibit admitted in this trial.

1 THE COURT: Yeah, I'll --

2 MR. FIGLER: It's the manner, which is our
3 objection, Your Honor, that is correct. We'll concede that.

4 THE COURT: Yeah, and I'll note as I said --

5 MR. FIGLER: With the exception to the text that was
6 added.

7 THE COURT: Yeah. And my -- my own personal
8 observation for the record is, I mean, maybe I'm just an old
9 fashion guy, I think that these things are less effective than
10 the old fashion way. I don't see anything inflaming about
11 them, even at these size, they're not the size of the formerly
12 living four young men there. I don't see anything in these,
13 whatsoever, that is any worse than the old fashion way of just
14 standing in front of the jury and arguing with the exhibits
15 that are admitted. And I tell you that honestly, Dayvid, I
16 really don't.

17 The only other housekeeping thing is, Instruction 5B
18 I don't think we made a record of, Mr. Figler, which is if the
19 evidence in this case is subject to two constructions of
20 interpretation, I think we discussed it off the record. In
21 terms of the appellate record, this was specifically requested
22 by you, and it was at that point that I added it to the
23 package, right? It's Instruction 5B.

24 MR. FIGLER: Well, if you like to single me out, it
25 was by the defense, Your Honor.

1 THE COURT: Okay. You and Mr. Sciscento, in
2 conjunction, suggested that, and that's why I agreed to give
3 it, right?

4 MR. SCISCENTO: Yes, Your Honor.

5 THE COURT: Thank you.

6 What time did I tell them, 3:15 -- 4:15?

7 THE CLERK: Yes, sir, 4:15.

8 MR. FIGLER: There was a typo on there, Your Honor,
9 I noted, I don't know if you want to just fix that.

10 THE COURT: In the second line?

11 MR. FIGLER: Yeah, on 5B.

12 THE COURT: Where that little --

13 MR. FIGLER: Two instead of T, or T instead of two.

14 THE COURT: You mean where that little round zero
15 now is, or O now is? Right there?

16 MR. FIGLER: That's fine, Your Honor, thank you.

17 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you so much.

18 (Court recessed at 4:10 p.m., until 4:20 p.m.)

19 (Jury is present)

20 THE COURT: Mr. Sciscento, whenever you're ready.
21 Whenever I guess Gary is through too.

22 DEFENDANT'S CLOSING ARGUMENT

23 MR. SCISCENTO: May it please this Court, opposing
24 counsel.

25 You know I'm never sure what evidence is going to

1 come out during a trial. And I'm still not sure what evidence
2 came out in this trial. There was a lot of conflicting
3 stories. There was a lot of statements by some people about
4 the time, who was there, who was not there. There was a lot
5 of arguments that the District Attorney made, there's a lot of
6 arguments made by everybody. But there's one thing that I
7 want you to remember is this, the one thing I'm going to tell
8 you, the most important thing I think, is if you believe
9 Charla Severs and the story that she said, if you believe her,
10 then Tod Armstrong should be sitting in that chair.

11 Remember the -- in the very beginning when did the
12 picking of the jury, where we kept describing on the 7-Eleven
13 incident, and it was mentioned again in closing, saying if you
14 wanted somebody to go in and rob a 7-Eleven and you drove them
15 there and you waited, and then they came back out and somebody
16 was killed inside, well you're responsible. Charla Severs
17 said specifically that Tod Armstrong expected cocaine and
18 mentioned money, and talked about the ten thousand dollars
19 (\$10,000).

20 Now, the problem that I have with that is Charla
21 Severs wants -- the State wants you to believe what she said
22 on that stand, but when we asked Detective Buczek, what about
23 somebody else who says they were there expecting some benefit
24 from that, would you charge him with robbery? Oh, yes. With
25 the murder? Oh, yes. I'd charge him with that. I'd be the

1 first through his door in Hawaii to charge him with it. They
2 themselves cannot believe Charla Severs because her testimony
3 alone would have put Tod Armstrong away, that was the other
4 evidence that Buczek needed. So they're telling you that
5 Charla Severs is not believable, because if she was Tod
6 Armstrong would be up there. I'm not throwing guilt anywhere
7 else, I'm asking you to follow the conclusions here.

8 If she's up there saying he, Tod Armstrong, expected
9 drugs, and if the scenario is correct that you expect
10 something and a murder happens you're reliable -- you're
11 liable for that murder, it's got to flow. So who do we
12 believe? Do we believe Charla and therefore Tod's a suspect,
13 so therefore there's his motivation?

14 Charla Severs I told you was gonna be weird. The
15 weirdest thing I ever heard is the fact that Jacquinia
16 [phonetic], some baby that she sent a picture of to John White
17 saying this is your child. She took a picture of a baby she
18 was -- she was baby sitting. I mean and then sent it over
19 there, gave it a birthday, May 9th, 1999 -- or 1998. She gave
20 a birthday to a baby she wasn't -- it wasn't even hers. Said
21 it was mine, and it's yours and we have a kid. And then she
22 gets on there, oh, no, that's -- that's not true. I just made
23 that up. How sick is that? But we've got to believe her.
24 That's wild.

25 She's the one that said Tod wanted the drugs. She

1 gave how many different stories? Five different stories. We
2 got it out of her, five different stories she told.

3 Very important, each story didn't quite fit, when
4 she finally made up her mind to work with the D.A., each story
5 didn't fit. She forgot about the pants, and so they had to
6 tweak it a little more. Who told you about the black pants?
7 Remember I asked her that. The District Attorney. Who told
8 you about the blood on the pants? Remember I asked her that.
9 It's in the transcripts, the District Attorney. They tweaked
10 it and tweaked it until they finally got the story out that
11 they wanted. And when did she finally give that story, after
12 she was placed in handcuffs. After she was returned from New
13 York she finally gave the story that they wanted to hear.
14 After they placed her in custody, promised her freedom to let
15 her go see her child, after all that, then she gives the
16 complete story.

17 Tod Armstrong, he's probably back in Hawaii right
18 now. Incidentally, what did Charla Severs do after the murders?
19 She went to New York. What did Tod Armstrong do after the
20 murders? He went to Hawaii. Ace Hart left town too.
21 Armstrong, I'm testifying here today because it's the right
22 thing to do. It's a morally right thing to do two years
23 later. Four days he waited. Four days he waited before he
24 did the morally right thing. He did the morally right thing
25 because his best friend Bryan Johnson was getting ready to go

1 to jail. Four days later, after three of them talked about
2 this, then he says let's tell the police while they're getting
3 close to Bryan Johnson, while the police were there on a
4 domestic violence cause -- call.

5 Charla Severs, if you believe her again then we got
6 to believe Tod, that he said -- she said he wanted to do a
7 lick with Ace. Well, a lick we've understood means robberies.
8 Robbing for drugs. Tod says, ah, I didn't do any drugs. I
9 stopped doing drugs. Charla said he did them almost every
10 day. Four or five times a day from morning to night, crack
11 cocaine. He stayed up all night long. Well, that's
12 contradiction. Charla says he doesn't do it, he says she does
13 it. He says he doesn't do it. It's a total contradiction of
14 what's happened. The stories up there are not meshing,
15 they're not coming together.

16 Tod Armstrong is the best friend of Ace Hart, we
17 talked about that, and B.J. The three of them together, after
18 the murders, got on their nice clothes and drove out to
19 Stallion Mountain Golf Course, ah, but we never talked about
20 the murders. Four people were just murdered, you're saying
21 the people that did it are living with you and you're not
22 gonna talk about this. And four days later you're gonna
23 finally make a decision.

24 Who told Sergeant Hefner where that beeper was? Tod
25 Armstrong, B.J. and Ace Hart. They told Sergeant Hefner that

1 information. And when he showed it to him he said, yeah,
2 that's one of Matt -- that's Matt Mowen's. He was wrong about
3 that, but he was right about where it was at.

4 And the keys to the Thunderbird Motel that were
5 found in Tod Armstrong's, at his house, in his backyard,
6 buried. The Thunderbird Motel keys. Who are the keys rented
7 to? They fit -- they fit a hotel room with Ace Hart who
8 rented that room. Ace Hart who knows everybody, where is he?
9 He knows everybody.

10 LaShawnya Wright who said that she was closer to Ace
11 than she was to Deco, as she called him. I love Deco. I
12 didn't quite understand half of what she said. She said I
13 love Deco, I don't want to be up here. But you're closer to
14 Ace Hart than you are to Deco? Yes. And you don't want to be
15 here today? No.

16 When's the first time, out of curiosity, that you
17 spoke to the District Attorney regarding this case? That
18 would be when I was in custody like the rest of the people.
19 When I was in custody. So you want to be released? Oh, yes.
20 You have a probation violation. She has a felony. And I
21 asked her about the probation violation. She said, yes, I can
22 go back to prison. They're continuing that. Mr. Guymon
23 called so that she could testify here. I'm not casting any
24 dispersions on Mr. Guymon, but I'm saying the motivation to
25 lie is freedom.

1 If I put somebody up here, if I put a witness up
2 here and I handed them a couple bucks, one hundred, two
3 hundred, three hundred dollars, and I said now tell your story
4 but tell the truth, you'd question that wouldn't you? I'm
5 giving the guy money to testify. Well, compensation comes in
6 many forms. Be it drugs, sex or freedom. Doesn't have to be
7 just money. And the freedom to be out of prison would be
8 enough to say anything, and it wouldn't be the first time that
9 it happened, it won't be the last.

10 Ace Hart was doing crack every day. Was supposed to
11 do a lick with Armstrong.

12 LaShawnya Wright sat up here quivering, crying,
13 yeah, she was upset. It's up to you to decide why she was
14 upset. I mean was she upset because she was telling on her
15 best friend? I don't know. Maybe she didn't want to be here
16 because she didn't want to do what she had to do. I don't
17 know. To get her freedom to take care of her three kids. The
18 three kids who she wasn't sure if Sikia was the father of --
19 my daddy is watching them -- my baby's daddy is watching the
20 kids. Well, who could that be? Well Sikia may be the baby's
21 daddy, but Sikia is not there watching them. It's a different
22 lifestyle there.

23 She was the girlfriend of Sikia Smith. She says
24 that VCR, that damaging evidence that was found at Tod
25 Armstrong's house was purchased for twenty dollars (\$20)

1 through John White. Well, if he stole it why would he have to
2 buy it from somebody. That doesn't make any sense.

3 Who had that .38 she talked about, it's a .380 or
4 .38 that somebody sold? Sikia Smith. It's all around him,
5 but not on him. Sikia got rid of the .38, sold it the next
6 day, did something else. I don't quite understand the time
7 frame, because the times don't mix. Charla says they come
8 back and they leave at a different time, she says that they
9 are at Fremont Street, but they're not. None of the times mix
10 together to place John White at that house on that day.

11 Bryan Johnson smoked crack every day. He testified
12 to that. That came out. Charla Severs said he was the worst.
13 He's best friends with Tod and Ace. Again, he waited four
14 days. Police came on a domestic violence call. They came out
15 there because he was in a heated argument of such magnitude
16 with his mother that the police had to come out there. And
17 after four days of this moral dilemma of what do we do, he
18 then says the police are here for me, maybe I should talk to
19 them and tell them. Four days he waited. Four days.

20 The other weird thing he says, and this is the part
21 that, again, when all the evidence doesn't match. He says,
22 oh, Deco says there's blood on the back of the pants, I did
23 this lick and there's blood on the back of the pants, I left
24 it there. Well, then Severs says, well, he forgot about the
25 blood on the back of the pants otherwise I would have washed

1 it. For four days, five days, they were supposedly sitting
2 there, and he forgot about it. But then he tells Bryan
3 Johnson, oh, he talked about it. Well it doesn't make any
4 sense. He either forgot about it, or he talked about it. But
5 does he do both? Charla says, oh, I woulda washed the jeans
6 for him, I loved him that much. Nothing's meshing here.
7 There's problems with the whole case.

8 The fingerprints. I talked about the Black and
9 Milds, and I told you before Charla Severs is going to say
10 that the Black and Milds were used by Donte sometimes when he
11 sold drugs. He's no angel. John White over there is no angel
12 and I'm not going to put halos on him, and wings. He's a
13 crack dealer, I'll give you that. He sold crack. Probably
14 why it's easy to do everything and look at him and say he's a
15 bad guy. But he sold drugs, and Charla Severs said this, 30
16 percent of the times in the Black and Milds. She saw him give
17 the Black and Milds away to somebody, the box itself, with
18 crack cocaine in there.

19 How long do fingerprints last? Indefinitely.
20 There's no set time. It could be there for hours, it could be
21 there for days, it could be there for years. Their expert,
22 Mr. Guenther, specifically said that. It's transitory, we've
23 seen it numerous times. Mr. Figler picked up the cup and said
24 if it was transitory, if I touch it here, and somebody else
25 grabbed it and moved it somewhere else, doesn't mean I was in

1 that room does it? No. No. And that's what they've got to
2 place him there is this Black and Mild which we know was used
3 to deliver drugs. It's been done before. And one
4 fingerprint, we know he sold drugs to Matt Mowen. Is that it?

5 Black jeans. Now I am going to say, we maybe
6 listened to two separate trials, but I specifically asked Mr.
7 Wahl, could that have been deposited by somebody else? Yes,
8 it looked like the main deposit with DNA was from a female.
9 We went through this whole thing, I asked him about the
10 acetone phosphate, and if it's in the vaginal vault if it
11 loses the acetate phosphate, which means it diminishes it so
12 you won't detect it right away? Yes. And if it gets out on
13 the air it's 50 percent drier, you lose it. And I said there
14 was significant amount of epithelium? Yes. And we determined
15 that was female? Yes. And that could have deposited it
16 there. Now I did not say that somebody walked over and
17 grabbed his semen and put it in her and then deposited that on
18 there. I'm not saying that. What I'm saying is, and Mr. Wahl
19 agreed, that that was transitory. It could have been placed
20 there by another person who was carrying the semen at the
21 time, which fits nicely in the fact that it could have been
22 Charla Severs. She admitted fooling around with him on those
23 jeans.

24 Those black jeans -- we know -- then I asked Mr.
25 Wahl, did you do an examination of the front to look at that

1 blood. There was no blood on the front.

2 Now, Dr. Bucklin, you get him -- he finally says one
3 to two inches away. One to two inches away was that bullet,
4 was that barrel of that gun. One to two inches away. So he
5 leaned down here, yeah, I -- maybe he was standing up, maybe
6 he was sitting down, but one to two inches away. There's got
7 to be some reaction, because there's no other hole, anything
8 to come out of, but to shoot back out. If any blood is coming
9 out, any tissue, anything, any matter, it's coming out back at
10 him. Two inches away -- one to two inches away, puts him
11 close enough there should be something on the front. But
12 there's not, and it doesn't match. Everything they find is on
13 the back. Doesn't say it spatter or splatter. If he gets
14 blood on the back he wasn't the shooter, but that doesn't fit
15 the theory of what they're saying. There's nothing on the
16 front to show that he actually did the shooting, so therefore
17 it doesn't -- it doesn't fit their theory.

18 You know, they can sit here and they can wave these
19 guns at you with the pointer and they will. They'll stand up
20 here and they'll show you these guns, and they'll say look how
21 bad these people are because of the guns that they have. Look
22 how bad they are. They're going to show you those guns. Is
23 there anybody who ever got there and said on the night of the
24 murders we saw John White in possession of those guns?

25 An officer, Trooper Honea, got up and said I pulled

1 'em over, John White came back, which he called Donte Fletch,
2 came back to the car, was very cooperative, didn't have a gun,
3 his passenger Red got out, and Red had the gun. Red pulled
4 the gun out. The officer said drop it, that's when Donte ran.
5 It was Red with the gun.

6 Now everybody talks about Red having these guns.
7 Was there any information that these were ever used in
8 anything? Was there anybody who got up there and said -- they
9 got to allude to it, it's a duffel bag, it's very important we
10 keep talking about that duffel bag, but we didn't see what was
11 inside of it that night.

12 The duct tape, I almost forgot about that. Charla
13 Severs, if you believe her, she says I got there, I moved into
14 the Everman house, a couple days later I saw the duct tape.
15 Where? In the living room on the coffee table, or under the
16 coffee table. Remember she said that. Under the coffee table
17 was the duct tape. But they've got to put it into that box,
18 in that bag. And they got to put the guns in the bag, and
19 they got to make it heavy that night, but they cannot say that
20 these guns, which they're going to hold up and show you that
21 these guns, which I can't play with anymore, were there that
22 night.

23 Thunderbird Motel key found buried at Tod
24 Armstrong's house. Whose was it? Ace Hart. The pager.
25 Armstrong knew everything about it.

IV-235

1 Now, we have been here for four days now, and we've
2 talked about this case, and you've heard evidence and cross-
3 examination. And at this point, closing arguments, this is
4 where I end it, I have nothing more. I will sit over there
5 while Mr. Guymon, who is a seasoned prosecutor will get up
6 there and testify -- or I'm sorry, will get up here and give
7 the closing argument. He knows a lot about this, he's done a
8 lot of trials. He knows one thing too, emotions are very
9 powerful. He's going to want to grip you with that emotion.
10 He's going to want to close your eyes to reality, and he's
11 going to want you to be angry. He may show you the autopsy
12 pictures, and that should upset you. Because he'll want you
13 to stare at them and get angry and close the reality, and
14 close your mind to nothing but anger. He may do that, I don't
15 know. He may sit there and tell you about these kids and how
16 wonderful they are, and I'm not taking that away from them. I
17 do not know them, and I do not cast any dispersions on them.
18 What I'm saying is, this is not the forum for emotions.

19 There are instructions that you're going to be
20 getting, and one of them is number 50:

21 "Although you are to consider only the evidence in
22 the case in reaching a verdict, you must bring to
23 the consideration of your evidence -- of the
24 evidence of everyday common sense and judgment as
25 reasonable men and women. Thus you are not solely

-- limited solely to what you see and hear as the witnesses testify, you may draw reasonable inferences from the evidence which you feel are justified in light of common experience, keep it in mind that such inferences should not be based on speculation or guess.

"A verdict may never be influenced by sympathy, prejudice or public opinion. Your decision should be the product of sincere judgment and sound discretion in accordance with the rules of law."

Don't fall into the hype, the anger. Whichever way your decision is made, whatever you base on the evidence.

Instruction Number 48:

"The credibility or believability of a witness should be determined by his manner upon the stand, his relationship to the parties, his fears, motives, interests or feelings, his opportunity to have observed the matter to which he testified, the reasonableness of his statements and the strength or weakness of his recollections.

"If you believe that a witness had lied about any material fact in the case, you may disregard the entire testimony of that witness or any portion of his testimony which is not proved by other evidence. We've got a lot of problems here. They have a lot