#### IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

No. 82700

Electronically Filed
Sep 13 2021 03:46 p.m.
Elizabeth A. Brown
Clerk of Supreme Court

SHAWN GLOVER JR.

Appellant,

v.

### THE STATE OF NEVADA

Respondent.

Appeal from Judgment of Conviction Eighth Judicial District Court, Clark County The Honorable Michael P. Villani, District Court Judge District Court Case No. C-16-312448-1 / A-20-821176-W

## APPELLANT'S APPENDIX

#### **VOLUME II**

Lucas J. Gaffney, Esq. Nevada Bar No. 12373 GAFFNEY LAW 1050 Indigo Drive, Suite 120 Las Vegas, Nevada 89145 Telephone: (702) 742-2055 Facsimile: (702) 920-8838 lucas@gaffneylawlv.com Attorney for Appellant

# **INDEX**

<b>Volume</b>	<b>Document</b>	Bates No.
II	Amended Indictment	AA 338
IV	Amended Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus (post-conviction).	AA 886
IV	Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Order	AA 944
III	Instructions to the Jury.	AA 707
I	Indictment	AA 071
IV	Judgment of Conviction	AA 822
IV	Minute Order denying Amended Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus (post-conviction)	AA 941
IV	Notice of Entry of Finding of Facts, Conclusions of Law And Order	AA 943
IV	Notice of Appeal	AA 956
I	Order re: Defendant's Motion to Compel Production of Discovery	AA 120
IV	Order of Affirmance (NVSC case number 77425)	AA 825
IV	Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus (post-conviction)	AA 832
I	Reporter's Transcript of Grand Jury Proceedings	AA 001
I	Recorder's Transcript of Hearing: Initial Arraignment	AA 078
I	Recorder's Transcript of Hearing: Jess R. Marchese, Esq.'s Motion to Withdraw As Counsel	AA 081

<b>Volume</b>	<u>Document</u>	Bates No.
I	Recorder's Transcript of Hearing Re: Grand Jury Indictment	AA 074
I	Recorder's Transcript of Hearing: Status Check: Trial Readiness.	AA 084
Ι	Recorder's Transcript of Jury Trial – Day 1	AA 143
II	Recorder's Transcript of Jury Trial – Day 2	AA 341
II	Recorder's Transcript of Jury Trial – Day 3	AA 459
III	Recorder's Transcript of Jury Trial – Day 4	AA 637
III	Recorder's Transcript of Jury Trial – Day 5	AA 746
I	Recorder's Transcript of Proceedings Defendant's Motion to Compel Production of Discovery and Brady Material; Status Check: Trial Setting.	AA 087
IV	Recorder's Transcript of Proceedings: Sentencing	AA 802
IV	Remittitur (NVSC case number 77425).	AA 831
I	State's Notice of Expert Witnesses [NRS 174.234(2)]	AA 133
I	State's Notice of Witnesses [NRS 174.234(1)(a)].	AA 140
IV	State's Response and Motion to Strike Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus (post-conviction)	AA 872
IV	Stipulation and Order re: Waiver of Penalty Phase	AA 800
IV	Verdict	AA 798

# **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify and affirm that this document was filed electronically with the Nevada Supreme Court on September 13, 2021. Electronic Service of the foregoing document shall be made in accordance with the Master Service List as follows:

> AARON FORD Nevada Attorney General

ALEXANDER CHEN
Chief Deputy District Attorney

By: /s/ Lucas Gaffney
An Employee of Gaffney Law

1	me how long you've lived in Clark County?
2	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 916: About 20 years.
3	THE COURT: Your educational background?
4	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 916: College.
5	THE COURT: And are you working?
6	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 916: Yes.
7	THE COURT: What do you do?
8	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 916: Real estate broker.
9	THE COURT: Okay. How long have you done that?
10	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 916: About 10 years.
11	THE COURT: Can you give me a checklist of any other job titles
12	that you've held?
13	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 916: Every position in a restaurant, and also
14	the Marines.
15	THE COURT: Okay. What did you do in the Marines?
16	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 916: Parachute rigger.
17	THE COURT: And what is that? You just
18	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 916: Pack parachutes and jump out of
19	planes.
20	THE COURT: Sounds hideously awful.
21	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 916: It was actually a lot of fun.
22	THE COURT: Oh, okay. Everybody's, you know, different. Okay.
23	Are you married?
24	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 916: Yes.
25	THE COURT: Does your spouse work?

1	THE COURT: Okay. And do you have any kids?
2	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 923: Yes, four kids.
3	THE COURT: How old?
4	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 923: Sixteen, 13, 11, and 8.
5	THE COURT: Okay. Thank you very much. Ms. Dwinell, can you
6	tell me how long you've lived in Clark County?
7	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 933: Nineteen years.
8	THE COURT: Your educational background?
9	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 933: High school and some college.
10	THE COURT: Okay. And are you in college currently or working?
11	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 933: Part-time college, part-time working.
12	THE COURT: Okay. And what are you studying?
13	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 933: I'm exploring majors.
14	THE COURT: Okay. And what do you do for work?
15	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 933: Law clerk.
16	THE COURT: Okay. And where are you a law clerk?
17	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 933: Jeffrey Burr, Ltd.
18	THE COURT: Okay. And is that a personal injury firm?
19	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 933: No, it's estate planning.
20	THE COURT: Oh, that's right. And they don't do any criminal
21	work; is that right?
22	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 933: Not to my knowledge.
23	THE COURT: Okay. And so how long have you worked there?
24	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 933: Almost a year.
25	THE COURT: Are you married, or do you have a significant other?
I	1

1	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 933: Significant other.
2	THE COURT: And what's your significant other's occupation?
3	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 933: Retail manager.
4	THE COURT: And do you have any kids?
5	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 933: No.
6	THE COURT: Okay. Thank you very much. Ms. Kime, can you tell
7	me how long you've lived in Clark County?
8	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 940: Thirty-five years.
9	THE COURT: Your educational background?
10	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 940: Some college.
11	THE COURT: And are you working?
12	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 940: Unemployed.
13	THE COURT: And what do you do when you're working?
14	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 940: Executive assistant.
15	THE COURT: Okay. And how long have you done that?
16	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 940: Thirty years.
17	THE COURT: Can you give me a checklist of any other job titles
18	that you've held?
19	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 940: Cashier.
20	THE COURT: Okay. Are you married?
21	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 940: Yes.
22	THE COURT: And does your spouse work?
23	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 940: Yes, he does.
24	THE COURT: And what's he doing?
25	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 940: He's a glazer.

1	THE COURT: And how long has he done that?
2	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 940: Thirty years.
3	THE COURT: And do you have any kids?
4	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 940: They're all grown.
5	THE COURT: And so how many and how old?
6	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 940: Oh, geez. That's a hard question. I
7	can't remember. 35 no, one is 37, the other one is 35, and the other two are
8	29 and 26.
9	THE COURT: Okay. And what do they all do?
10	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 940: Three of them are not working right
11	now, and or I don't think they are, and the other one is a medical assistant
12	THE COURT: Okay.
13	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 940: who lives here in town; yeah.
14	THE COURT: Okay. And the other three live here in town or
15	somewhere else?
16	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 940: They're one lives in Utah, and she's
17	unemployed right now.
18	THE COURT: What does she normally do, to your knowledge?
19	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 940: She does a lot of things, Your Honor.
20	THE COURT: Anything in the medical, or legal field, or law
21	enforcement?
22	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 940: No.
23	THE COURT: Okay. What about your other children?
24	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 940: My youngest lives in town, and she is
25	home, a housewife.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 942: I was a bus boy and a cook.

-115-

24

25

job titles that you've held?

1	THE COURT: Okay. Are you married?
2	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 942: Divorced.
3	THE COURT: And what did your spouse do when you were
4	married?
5	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 942: She was a laborer, like
6	THE COURT: Okay.
7	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 942: in the Laborer's Union.
8	THE COURT: Okay. And do you have a significant other currently?
9	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 942: No.
10	THE COURT: And do you have any kids?
11	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 942: No children.
12	THE COURT: Okay. Do you have any legal or law enforcement
13	training, background, education, or experience?
14	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 942: No.
15	THE COURT: And do you have anyone close to you family
16	member or friend that's very close to you that's in law enforcement?
17	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 942: No.
18	THE COURT: All right. Thank you very much. Mr. Stettler, how
19	long have you lived in Clark County?
20	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 944: Born and raised.
21	THE COURT: Excuse me. And your educational background?
22	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 944: High school.
23	THE COURT: And are you working?
24	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 944: Yes.
25	THE COURT: What do you do?

1	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 944: Bus driver.
2	THE COURT: And how long have you done that?
3	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 944: Eighteen years.
4	THE COURT: Can you give me a checklist of any other job titles
5	that you've held?
6	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 944: Well, I'm a trainer there.
7	THE COURT: Okay.
8	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 944: Previous jobs, I worked for parks and
9	rec.
10	THE COURT: Okay. What'd you do for parks and rec?
11	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 944: Ball field. Just handled the ball fields.
12	THE COURT: Okay.
13	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 944: Yeah.
14	THE COURT: And are you married?
15	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 944: No.
16	THE COURT: And have you previously been married?
17	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 944: No.
18	THE COURT: Do you have a significant other currently?
19	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 944: Yes.
20	THE COURT: And your significant other's occupation?
21	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 944: She does the same thing I do.
22	THE COURT: Okay. And do you have any kids?
23	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 944: No.
24	THE COURT: And you so, I didn't hear any law enforcement or
25	legal training in there anywhere for you.
	1

1	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 944: No.
2	THE COURT: And do you or anyone close to you in law
3	enforcement? Do you have someone close to you?
4	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 944: No.
5	THE COURT: All right. Thank you very much. Mr. Harris, how
6	long have you lived in Clark County, sir.
7	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 947: Three years.
8	THE COURT: And before that, where'd you live?
9	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 947: Kaiserslautern, Germany.
10	THE COURT: How long did you live there?
11	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 947: Twenty years.
12	THE COURT: Okay. And what brought you to the United States?
13	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 947: I'm from here.
14	THE COURT: But like a change of employment? I don't know, it's
15	cold there. I don't know.
16	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 947: Ten years as an MP, 10 years as a
17	customs agent overseas. Decided to come home and take care of my dead.
18	THE COURT: Okay.
19	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 947: Now, I'm back.
20	THE COURT: All right. So, your educational background?
21	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 947: High school. Some college.
22	THE COURT: And you were an MP for
23	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 947: Ten years, 11 deployments, it's time to
24	get out.

THE COURT: Okay. And which branch?

25

- excuse me -- you would have to follow the Court's instructions on the law

25

even if you -- even if your opinions about what the law ought to be were different. Would you be able to do that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 947: Yes.

THE COURT: Is there anything about your law enforcement training experience that you have in both of your employments that you think would limit your ability to be fair and impartial here?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 947: No.

THE COURT: Do you understand why I ask?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 947: Yes.

THE COURT: I'm starting earlier. I don't usually get to it that quick, but because you're here, I'm going to. Do you understand that the State has the burden of proof in this case to prove -- well, the State has the burden of proof in every case, in every court in the country -- to prove whether a defendant is guilty -- whether a crime was committed, and the defendant committed it beyond a reasonable doubt. And that a defendant has no obligation to prove anything whatsoever. Do you understand that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 947: I do.

THE COURT: Do you believe in that basic precept of American justice?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 947: Yes.

THE COURT: And so, do you -- when I say that the Defense could sit there during this trial, which they won't, by the way, but they could, do absolutely nothing, stare off into the, you know, ceiling, never ask a question, never do anything, and the jury's job in this case would be to determine whether the State met the burden of proof?

1	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 947: Yes.
2	THE COURT: Do you understand that concept?
3	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 947: I do.
4	THE COURT: And do you have any problem with that?
5	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 947: No.
6	THE COURT: So, if they didn't prove the case beyond a reasonable
7	doubt, based upon your experience, background, education, and training,
8	would you have a difficult time in rendering a verdict
9	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 947: No.
10	THE COURT: in favor of the Defendant
11	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 947: No.
12	THE COURT: Would it bother you at all?
13	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 947: No.
14	THE COURT: Okay. Did I ask you if you had kids?
15	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 947: No. So, right now, I'm a manager for
16	insurance.
17	THE COURT: Okay.
18	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 947: I have two kids. One in Texas with the
19	Air Force, the other one is in Germany doing international nursing.
20	THE COURT: Okay. And did you tell me you're married or not?
21	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 947: Significant other.
22	THE COURT: And what does your significant other
23	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 947: Works on the Air Base.
24	THE COURT: Okay. Doing?
25	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 947: Defense commissary.

1		THE COURT: Okay. Thank you very much. Ms. Stanek, can you
2	tell me hov	v long you have lived in Clark County?
3		PROSPECTIVE JUROR 948: Nineteen years.
4		THE COURT: And your educational background?
5		PROSPECTIVE JUROR 948: High school and some college.
6		THE COURT: Are you working?
7		PROSPECTIVE JUROR 948: Yes.
8		THE COURT: What do you do?
9		PROSPECTIVE JUROR 948: Cashier.
10		THE COURT: And how long have you done that
11		PROSPECTIVE JUROR 948: Two months.
12		THE COURT: So, it's a new job?
13		PROSPECTIVE JUROR 948: Yeah.
14		THE COURT: And what did they say when you said I have to go to
15	jury duty?	
16		PROSPECTIVE JUROR 948: Yeah.
17		THE COURT: They're okay with it?
18		PROSPECTIVE JUROR 948: Yeah.
19		THE COURT: Okay. Is it a big business?
20		PROSPECTIVE JUROR 948: No, not really.
21		THE COURT: So but they have someone that can cover you?
22		PROSPECTIVE JUROR 948: They should, yeah.
23		THE COURT: Okay. Can you give me a checklist of any other job
24	titles?	
25		PROSPECTIVE JUROR 948: That's it.

1	THE COURT: Okay. And are you married?
2	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 948: No.
3	THE COURT: Do you have a significant other?
4	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 948: No.
5	THE COURT: And do you have any kids?
6	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 948: No.
7	THE COURT: All right. Thank you very much. Ms. Cardoza, can
8	you tell me how long you have lived in Clark County?
9	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 952: Twenty-five years.
10	THE COURT: Your educational background?
11	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 952: Bachelor's degree.
12	THE COURT: In.
13	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 952: Accounting and finance.
14	THE COURT: Okay. And you're working currently?
15	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 952: Yes.
16	THE COURT: What do you do?
17	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 952: Auditor.
18	THE COURT: And how long have you done that?
19	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 952: Current position two weeks, but five
20	years' experience.
21	THE COURT: Okay. Another new job person.
22	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 952: Uh-huh.
23	THE COURT: Yes. Is it for a big company?
24	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 952: For the city.
25	THE COURT: Oh, for the city. They'll live.

1	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 952: Yeah.
2	THE COURT: Okay. So, can you give me a checklist of any other
3	job titles that you held?
4	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 952: Drafter.
5	THE COURT: Drafter, okay. And do you have are you married?
6	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 952: No.
7	THE COURT: Have you previously been married?
8	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 952: No.
9	THE COURT: Do you have a significant other currently?
10	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 952: No.
11	THE COURT: And do you have any kids
12	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 952: No.
13	THE COURT: All right. Thank you very much. Mr. Vinluan.
14	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
15	THE COURT: Can you tell me how long you have in Clark County?
16	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 961: Sixteen years.
17	THE COURT: Your educational background?
18	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 961: Some college.
19	THE COURT: And are you working?
20	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 961: Yes.
21	THE COURT: What do you do?
22	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 961: Cabana service at the Mirage.
23	THE COURT: Okay. How long have you done that?
24	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 961: About a year.
25	THE COURT: Can you give me a checklist of any other job titles

1	THE COURT: And have you previously been married?
2	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 978: No.
3	THE COURT: Okay. Thank you very much. Benjamin Perri. Sir,
4	can you tell me how long you've lived in Clark County?
5	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 000: Twenty-three years.
6	THE COURT: And your educational background?
7	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 000: High school.
8	THE COURT: And are you working?
9	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 000: Yes.
10	THE COURT: What do you do?
11	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 000: Valet.
12	THE COURT: And how long have you been a valet?
13	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 000: Three years.
14	THE COURT: Can you give me a checklist of any other job titles
15	that you've held?
16	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 000: Landscaping and sales.
17	THE COURT: Okay. And are you married?
18	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 000: No.
19	THE COURT: Do you have a significant other?
20	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 000: No.
21	THE COURT: Have you previously been married?
22	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 000: No.
23	THE COURT: And do you have any kids?
24	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 000: No.
25	THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. Did I go through a whole row

without asking the law enforcement thing? Let me ask the second row? I got all caught up with you. Is there anybody else in the second row that I left a minute ago that has you or someone very close to you in law enforcement? Okay. Can you hand that back?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 948: My dad's a juvenile probation officer.

THE COURT: Okay. Hold on one second. So, Ms. Stanek, how

•

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 948: He's been doing it for like nine or ten

THE COURT: Okay. And do you live with him, by the way? PROSPECTIVE JUROR 948: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. And so, is there anything about his experience in that -- it's kind of a different part of the justice system. Is there anything about that you think would limit your ability to be fair and impartial if you were to serve as a juror in this case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 948: No.

THE COURT: So, there would be a really important question I need to ask and have to give a lot of thought to it, because I need a honest answer. If you were selected to serve as a juror in this case, you would not be able to talk to your dad about the details of this case, at all, even a little bit, not -- zero, zilch, nada, by court order, for a week. Would you be able to do that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 948: Yes.

THE COURT: And that would be really important because later I'm going to talk to the jury about the level playing field that both sides are entitled to in this case, where they're not having their case decided by jurors who are

1	out chit-chatting about it with other people. Does that make sense to you?
2	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 948: Yeah.
3	THE COURT: And would you have any problem with that?
4	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 948: No.
5	THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
6	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 948: Uh-huh.
7	THE COURT: Anybody else know someone in law enforcement,
8	serious close relationship of any kind? About you two?
9	UNIDENTIFIED PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.
10	THE COURT: Okay. No other jurors indicated in the affirmative.
11	Okay. Moving on to Ms. Mazzei.
12	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 004: Yes.
13	THE COURT: Am I saying it right?
14	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 004: Mazzei.
15	THE COURT: Mazzei, I'm sorry. How long have you lived in Clark
16	County?
17	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 004: Twenty-nine years.
18	THE COURT: And your educational background?
19	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 004: I have a law degree.
20	THE COURT: Okay. And do you practice?
21	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 004: Yes.
22	THE COURT: What do you do?
23	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 004: Civil litigation, insurance defense.
24	THE COURT: And how long have you done that?
25	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 004: Nine years.

evidence, those kinds of things. Would you be able to follow the Court's

25

instructions on the law?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 004: Yes.

THE COURT: If they differ from your personal beliefs of what the law ought to be?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 004: Yes.

THE COURT: And even more importantly is you're sitting in a trial, there's an evidentiary objection, I make a ruling, the witness has already popped out with an answer, normal jurors are told the objection is sustained, you must disregard the witness' answer. And normal jurors who take an oath, and who are chosen because the lawyers believe that they are serious people that will give serious time and attention to all the Court's orders and take this super serious because it is super serious, will disregard the answer.

A lawyer, on the other hand, might disagree with the Court's ruling. If you did disagree with my ruling, hypothetically, would you be able to follow the Court's instruction anyway and disregard the answer of the witness?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 004: I believe I would.

THE COURT: Okay. And do you understand why that would be really important?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 004: I do.

THE COURT: And you would expect it of a juror in any one of your cases that you tried?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 004: I do. I understand.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you very much. Ms. Morgan, can you tell me how long you have been in Clark County?

1	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 025: Thirty-nine years.
2	THE COURT: Your educational background?
3	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 025: High school.
4	THE COURT: And are you working?
5	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 025: Yes.
6	THE COURT: What do you do?
7	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 025: I'm a bartender.
8	THE COURT: How long have you done that?
9	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 025: Forty-one years.
10	THE COURT: Can you give me a checklist of any other job titles
11	that you held?
12	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 025: I was a waitress in high school, and I
13	worked on the farm growing up.
14	THE COURT: Okay. Are you married?
15	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 025: No.
16	THE COURT: Have you previously been married?
17	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 025: Yes.
18	THE COURT: What did your previous spouse do when you were
19	married?
20	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 025: He's a waiter.
21	THE COURT: And a significant other currently?
22	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 025: No.
23	THE COURT: And any kids?
24	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 025: Two.
25	THE COURT: And how old are they?

1	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 025: My daughter is 37 and my son is 31.
2	THE COURT: And what do they do?
3	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 025: My daughter is a biochemist, and my
4	son is an engineer.
5	THE COURT: Okay. So, I didn't hear any law enforcement in there
6	anywhere?
7	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 025: No.
8	THE COURT: Family or close personal friends?
9	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 025: No.
10	THE COURT: All right. Thank you, very much. Mr. Harrell, how
11	long have you lived in Clark County?
12	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 030: Eight years.
13	THE COURT: And before that, where did you live?
14	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 030: Brevard County, Cocoa Beach, Florida.
15	THE COURT: Okay. And how long did you live there?
16	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 030: Ten years.
17	THE COURT: Your educational background?
18	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 030: College, plus trade.
19	THE COURT: All right. And are you working?
20	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 030: Yes.
21	THE COURT: What do you do?
22	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 030: Major airline pilot. I'm also a
23	Homeland Security Agent.
24	THE COURT: Okay. And how long have you done that?
25	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 030: Eight years.

1	THE COURT: Okay.
2	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 030: For the Homeland.
3	THE COURT: Okay.
4	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 30: Thirty plus for the airline.
5	THE COURT: Okay. And can you give me a checklist of any other
6	job titles that you've held?
7	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 030: Retail, mass communications,
8	television production.
9	THE COURT: Okay.
10	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 030: And that's about it.
11	THE COURT: Are you married?
12	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 030: Yes.
13	THE COURT: And does your spouse work?
14	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 030: Yes.
15	THE COURT: What does your spouse do?
16	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 030: She's a paralegal for Ashcraft and Barr.
17	THE COURT: Okay. And does that have anything to do with
18	criminal law?
19	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 030: To the best of my knowledge, no.
20	THE COURT: Okay. And has she ever worked in criminal law
21	criminal law to the best of your knowledge?
22	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 030: She worked for the City of North Las
23	Vegas as a paralegal. And but I believe it was mainly for city rulings, or
24	something like that. I don't believe it was criminal at all.
25	THE COURT: Like City Council?
Į.	

phonetically, in the hopes that I --

1	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 035: It's okay.
2	THE COURT: you know do my best. You can call me Judge T,
3	and I'll call you Susan G.
4	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 035: Okay.
5	THE COURT: All right. How long have you lived in Clark County?
6	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 035: Twenty-nine years.
7	THE COURT: And your educational background?
8	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 035: I have an associate degree.
9	THE COURT: And are you working?
10	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 035: Yes.
11	THE COURT: What do you do?
12	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 035: I work retail.
13	THE COURT: And how long have you done that?
14	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 035: Twenty-eight-and-a-half years.
15	THE COURT: And any other job titles?
16	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 035: Travel agent and restaurant
17	management.
18	THE COURT: Are you married?
19	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 035: I'm a widow.
20	THE COURT: And what did your husband do?
21	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 035: Repaired swimming pools.
22	THE COURT: And do you have any kids?
23	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 035: I have two step children.
24	THE COURT: And what do they do?
25	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 035: 39 and she works for Freeman. I don't

1	she does a lot of different things. And I have a stepson that's 28 that works
2	in Colorado.
3	THE COURT: Okay. And do you have a significant other currently
4	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 035: No, I do not.
5	THE COURT: And are any of those either of those kids or anyon
6	close to you in law enforcement?
7	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 035: No.
8	THE COURT: All right. Thank you, very much. Renforth. Ms.
9	Renforth, can you tell me how long you've lived in Clark County?
10	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 035: Nineteen years.
11	THE COURT: Your educational background?
12	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 035: High school and some college.
13	THE COURT: Are you working?
14	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 035: Yes.
15	THE COURT: What do you do?
16	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 035: I'm a retail manager.
17	THE COURT: Okay. Can you give me a checklist of any other job
18	titles that you've held?
19	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 035: Waitress.
20	THE COURT: Okay. So, how long have you done retail
21	management?
22	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 035: Twenty-two years.
23	THE COURT: Okay. Are you married?
24	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 035: No.
25	THE COURT: Have you previously been married?

1	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 035: No.
2	THE COURT: Do you have a significant other currently?
3	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 035: No.
4	THE COURT: And do you have any kids?
5	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 035: No.
6	THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, very much.
7	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 035: Thank you.
8	THE COURT: There's another name I have trouble with.
9	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 048: Chiesi works.
10	THE COURT: Chiesi. Okay, can you tell me, Mr. Chiesi, how long
11	have you lived in Clark County?
12	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 048: Three years.
13	THE COURT: And before that, where did you live?
14	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 048: St. Paul, Minnesota for seven years.
15	THE COURT: Okay, your educational background?
16	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 048: Bachelor's degree in civil engineering.
17	THE COURT: And are you working?
18	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 048: No, I'm retired.
19	THE COURT: And what did you do before you retired?
20	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 048: Oh, last one was a project engineer,
21	project manager, equipment division manager, field material control manager,
22	and then blackjack dealer.
23	THE COURT: Okay. Are you married?
24	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 048: Yes.
25	THE COURT: And does your spouse work?

1	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 048: No, she's retired.
2	THE COURT: What did she do before she retired?
3	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 048: She as an office manager for 3M.
4	THE COURT: Okay, any kids?
5	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 048: No.
6	THE COURT: And so, I didn't hear any do you have any close
7	personal friends, or family members in law enforcement?
8	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 048: I do not.
9	THE COURT: All right. Thank you, very much. Ms. Cortez, how
10	long have you lived in Clark County?
11	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 058: Fourteen years.
12	THE COURT: Educational background?
13	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 058: High school.
14	THE COURT: Are you working?
15	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 058: Yes.
16	THE COURT: What do you do?
17	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 058: I work as a scheduler for energy
18	inspectors. I actually just started two weeks ago.
19	THE COURT: Of course. So, everyone here has a new job, except
20	for me. So
21	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 058: You need my history of work?
22	THE COURT: Yeah. I was going to ask you how much of a
23	hardship is it for you do they know you're here?
24	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 058: I told them as soon as I started, so they
25	know it's a possibility.

1	THE COURT: Okay.
2	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 058: I don't know. It's going to affect my
3	training, but they'll figure it out, I guess.
4	THE COURT: Okay.
5	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 058: I guess.
6	THE COURT: Good. Can you give me a checklist of all the job titles
7	that you've done?
8	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 058: Yes, retail cashier for retail,
9	pharmacy technician, call center, customer service, and lending, like online
10	lending. Underwriting loans and whatnot.
11	THE COURT: Okay. Are you married?
12	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 058: Yes.
13	THE COURT: And does your spouse work?
14	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 058: Yes, he's a plumber pipefitter union.
15	THE COURT: Okay. Any kids?
16	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 058: Yes, two. Eight and ten.
17	THE COURT: Okay, thank you, very much. Mr. Reyna, how long
18	have you lived in Clark County?
19	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 073: Twenty-three years.
20	THE COURT: Educational background?
21	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 073: High school.
22	THE COURT: Are you working?
23	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 073: Yes.
24	THE COURT: What do you do?
25	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 073: Ticket office supervisor.

1	THE COURT: And how long have you done that?
2	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 073: Five years.
3	THE COURT: Any other job titles that you've held?
4	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 073: Bank teller, usher, cashier.
5	THE COURT: And are you married?
6	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 073: No.
7	THE COURT: Do you have a significant other?
8	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 073: Yes.
9	THE COURT: And your significant other's occupation?
10	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 073: Cage cashier.
11	THE COURT: And have you previously been married?
12	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 073: No.
13	THE COURT: Any kids?
14	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 073: No.
15	THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, very much. Ms. Hillstead.
16	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 083: Yes.
17	THE COURT: Can you tell me how long have you lived in Clark
18	County?
19	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 083 : Thirty-seven years.
20	THE COURT: And your educational background?
21	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 083: High school.
22	THE COURT: And I'm sorry, I forgot to ask Mr. Reyna. Did I ask
23	you about law enforcement? Anyone close to you in law enforcement?
24	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 073: No.
25	THE COURT: And Ms yes, can you go back, Ms. Cortez?

THE COURT: All right. And so, do you have any kids?

25

1	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 083: I do. I have four.
2	THE COURT: And how old are they and what
3	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 083: Thirty-one, 23, 22, and 19.
4	THE COURT: And what do they do?
5	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 083: My oldest son, he does he sets up
6	web development for stores. My son Zach works in the marijuana industry,
7	trimming. Nikki's a she sells vacuum cleaners. And my youngest son is in
8	the Navy.
9	THE COURT: Okay. So, I didn't hear anybody kids that are in
10	law enforcement.
11	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 083: No.
12	THE COURT: All right. What about the rest of your family or
13	personal friends?
14	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 083: No.
15	THE COURT: All right. Thank you, very much. Mr. Blake, how
16	long have you lived in Clark County?
17	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 086: About 25 years.
18	THE COURT: Your educational background.
19	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 086: Graduated with a degree.
20	THE COURT: In?
21	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 086: It's called human computer interaction
22	It's software design.
23	THE COURT: Okay. And are you working, currently?
24	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 086: I am.
25	THE COURT: What do you do?

1	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 086: Software design, web design.
2	THE COURT: Okay, and you've done that how long?
3	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 086: About eight years.
4	THE COURT: Okay, can you give me a checklist of any other job
5	titles that you've held?
6	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 086: Yeah, retail jobs, busboy, server.
7	THE COURT: Okay, are you married?
8	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 086: I am.
9	THE COURT: And your spouse's occupation, if your spouse works?
10	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 086: She's a stay at home.
11	THE COURT: Okay. How many kids do you have?
12	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 086: Two.
13	THE COURT: And how old are they?
14	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 086: One is 7, and the other is 2.
15	THE COURT: Okay, and do you have anyone close to you that's
16	law enforcement?
17	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 086: No.
18	THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, very much. Ms. Fernandez, can
19	you tell me how long you've lived in Clark County?
20	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 087: About 48 years.
21	THE COURT: And your educational background?
22	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 087: High school.
23	THE COURT: And are you working?
24	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 087: No.
25	THE COURT: Have you previously worked?

1		PROSPECTIVE JUROR 087: Yes.
2		THE COURT: And what type of work have you done?
3		PROSPECTIVE JUROR 087: Restaurant management.
4		THE COURT: Okay, and are you married?
5		PROSPECTIVE JUROR 087: Separated.
6		THE COURT: And what did your spouse do when you weren't
7	separated?	
8		PROSPECTIVE JUROR 087: He's a roofer.
9		THE COURT: Okay. And do you have any kids?
10		PROSPECTIVE JUROR 087: Three.
11		THE COURT: How old are they?
12		PROSPECTIVE JUROR 087: Twenty-six, 28, and 30.
13		THE COURT: And what do they do?
14		PROSPECTIVE JUROR 087: Two are roofers and one's a food
15	server.	
16		THE COURT: Okay, and do you have a significant other currently?
17		PROSPECTIVE JUROR 087: No.
18		THE COURT: All right. Thank you, very much. Mr. Tassy.
19		PROSPECTIVE JUROR 093: Yes.
20		THE COURT: How long have you lived in Clark County?
21		PROSPECTIVE JUROR 093: About 18 years.
22		THE COURT: Your educational background.
23		PROSPECTIVE JUROR 093: High school.
24		THE COURT: And are you working?
25		PROSPECTIVE JUROR 093: Yes.

1	THE COURT: What do you do?
2	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 093: Casino floor supervisor.
3	THE COURT: And how long have you done that?
4	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 093: Twenty years oh, the casino industry
5	20 years.
6	THE COURT: Okay, and can you give me a checklist within, you
7	know, that industry, and of any others, that since you've been working?
8	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 093: Before that, microchip factory, fast
9	food.
10	THE COURT: Okay. Are you married?
11	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 093: Yes.
12	THE COURT: Does your spouse work?
13	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 093: No.
14	THE COURT: And has your spouse previously worked?
15	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 093: Not in this country.
16	THE COURT: Okay. And what line of work, what other country?
17	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 093: Airport.
18	THE COURT: Okay. And do you have any kids?
19	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 093: No.
20	THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, very much. Torri Godwin. Ms.
21	Godwin, how long have you lived in Clark County?
22	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 099: Forty-three years.
23	THE COURT: And your educational background.
24	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 099: High school and some college.
25	THE COURT: Besides twirling you're the only twirler I've ever

1	had.	
2		PROSPECTIVE JUROR 099: Oh.
3		THE COURT: Okay. So, are you working?
4		PROSPECTIVE JUROR 099: Recently retired.
5		THE COURT: Okay. What did you used to do?
6		PROSPECTIVE JUROR 099: I was a complex claims adjuster for
7	AAA Insura	nce.
8		THE COURT: Okay. And how long did you do that?
9		PROSPECTIVE JUROR 099: Just under 28 years.
10		THE COURT: Okay. Any other job titles that you've held?
11		PROSPECTIVE JUROR 099: Claims clerical supervisor and office
12	manager.	
13		THE COURT: Okay. Are you married?
14		PROSPECTIVE JUROR 099: Divorced.
15		THE COURT: And what did your spouse do before you were
16	divorced?	
17		PROSPECTIVE JUROR 099: IT.
18		THE COURT: And do you have a significant other currently?
19		PROSPECTIVE JUROR 099: Yes.
20		THE COURT: And what does your significant other do for a living?
21		PROSPECTIVE JUROR 099: He works for the Clark County School
22	District, as t	the head custodian.
23		THE COURT: Okay. And any kids?
24		PROSPECTIVE JUROR 099: Yes, two.
25		THE COURT: And what do what ages?

1	THE COURT: Okay. And how long has he done that?
2	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 121: Thirty-five years.
3	THE COURT: And as a sheriff in Orange County, North Carolina,
4	do is that like a standard police department, or a highway patrol, or what
5	kind of sheriff's office is it?
6	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 121: That's a good question. I think it's just
7	standard, like local it's local
8	THE COURT: Local police department?
9	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 121: Yeah, local. Yeah.
10	THE COURT: And what's his assignment there?
11	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 121: Canine unit.
12	THE COURT: All right. Thank you. What about you, Ms. Godwin?
13	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 099: I have an ex-brother-in-law that works
14	for the Henderson Police Department, an ex-brother-in-law that is retired from
15	the San Bernardino Police Department, and my significant other used to work
16	for Boulder City Police Department.
17	THE COURT: Okay. And how long ago was that?
18	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 099: Years ago.
19	THE COURT: Years ago. Okay. And as far as the Henderson Polic
20	Department, when you say ex-brother-in-law, does that mean your ex-
21	husband's brother?
22	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 099: Yes.
23	THE COURT: And how long have you been divorced?
24	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 099: Since 2013.
25	THE COURT: Okay Thank you very much Matthew Jones

1	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 131: Yes.
2	THE COURT: How long have you lived in Clark County?
3	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 131: Nineteen years.
4	THE COURT: And your educational background?
5	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 131: High school.
6	THE COURT: Are you working?
7	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 131: No.
8	THE COURT: Do you go to school?
9	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 131: No.
10	THE COURT: Okay. What's the plan? I know I sound like your
11	mother, but
12	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 131: I'm currently looking for a job.
13	THE COURT: Okay. That's a good plan. Jury service pays \$40 a
14	day.
15	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 131: My mom would be asking for that 40
16	bucks.
17	THE COURT: All right. And so, where would you like to work?
18	Let's put it that way. What are you interested in doing?
19	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 131: IT.
20	THE COURT: Okay. And are you married?
21	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 131: No.
22	THE COURT: Okay. Thank God. And do you have a significant
23	other currently?
24	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 131: No.
25	THE COURT: Do you have any kids?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 131: No.
THE COURT: Okay. Good to wait.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR 131: I have a very boring life.
THE COURT: Okay. So, is there any question that I've asked
anybody so far, like law enforcement, for example, anyone in law enforcement
that's close to you?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR 131: No.
THE COURT: All right. What do your parents do?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR 131: My dad is the only one that works, and
he is a plumbing supply manager.
THE COURT: Okay. Did your mom work in the past?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR 131: Yes.
THE COURT: What did she used to do?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR 131: Her last job that I know of was a clerk
at a hotel.
THE COURT: Okay. And do you have any siblings that are older
than you?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR 131: Yes.
THE COURT: How old, and what do they do?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR 131: There's two. And my brother, he's a
U-Haul worker, and then my sister works at Starbuck's.
THE COURT: Okay, thank you, very much. Bethany Johnson.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR 151: Yes, ma'am.
THE COURT: How long have you lived in Clark County?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR 151: Twenty-seven years.

1	THE COURT: And your educational background?
2	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 151: Some college.
3	THE COURT: And are you working?
4	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 151: Yes.
5	THE COURT: What do you do?
6	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 151: Claims associate at Wal-Mart.
7	THE COURT: Okay, and how long have you done that?
8	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 151: Three months, but been with the
9	company for six years.
10	THE COURT: Okay. Can you give me a checklist of any other job
11	titles that you've held?
12	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 151: Sales associate and support manager.
13	THE COURT: By the way, are you hiring?
14	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 151: Yes.
15	THE COURT: You can always do IT later. You've got to get a job.
16	Okay. So, you have done that for six year. Can you give me a checklist of any
17	other job titles?
18	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 151: Pretty much customer service my
19	entire.
20	THE COURT: All right. Are you married?
21	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 151: No.
22	THE COURT: Have you previously been married?
23	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 151: No.
24	THE COURT: Do you have a significant other currently?
25	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 151: No.

1	THE COURT: Do you have any kids?
2	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 151: No.
3	THE COURT: All right. Thank you, very much. Mr. Mejia, how
4	long have you lived in Clark County?
5	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 152: A year.
6	THE COURT: And before that, where did you live?
7	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 152: San Francisco.
8	THE COURT: And how long did you live there?
9	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 152: Eighteen years.
10	THE COURT: Your educational background?
11	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 152: High school.
12	THE COURT: And are you working?
13	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 152: No.
14	THE COURT: Okay. What brought you to Las Vegas, Nevada, if
15	you don't mind my asking?
16	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 152: It was getting too expensive living in
17	San Francisco, so I decided to move over here.
18	THE COURT: Okay. Are you looking for work?
19	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 152: Not right now.
20	THE COURT: Okay. So, what's the plan?
21	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 152: Going to college starting August 20th.
22	THE COURT: August 20th. And what are you going to study?
23	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 152: Criminal justice.
24	THE COURT: Okay. And are you going to UNLV, or where?
25	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 152: Right now, I'm going to Northwest

1	Career College.
2	THE COURT: Okay.
3	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 152: Yeah, and then UNLV.
4	THE COURT: Okay. And so, you haven't started yet: is that what
5	you're saying?
6	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 152: No, I haven't.
7	THE COURT: You're going to start?
8	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 152: Yeah.
9	THE COURT: Okay. And are you married?
10	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 152: No.
11	THE COURT: And do you have a significant other currently?
12	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 152: No.
13	THE COURT: Any kids?
14	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 152: No.
15	THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, very much. Ms. Stewart.
16	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 158: Yes, ma'am.
17	THE COURT: How long have you lived in Clark County?
18	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 158: Twelve years this time.
19	THE COURT: All right. And your educational background?
20	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 158: High school and some college.
21	THE COURT: Are you working?
22	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 158: Not at the present moment.
23	THE COURT: Okay. Is that because you're retired or are you
24	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 158: Unemployed.
25	THE COURT: Okay. What do you do when you're working?

for another.

1	THE COURT: Okay. And so what kind of paralegal work did you
2	do? Work on motions, and that kind of thing?
3	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 158: Yes, ma'am.
4	THE COURT: Okay. Sorry. Small world.
5	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 158: Yes.
6	THE COURT: Are you married?
7	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 158: Yes, ma'am.
8	THE COURT: And does your spouse work?
9	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 158: Yes, ma'am.
10	THE COURT: What does he do?
11	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 158: He's in pest control now. In Louisiana,
12	he was a deputy sheriff.
13	THE COURT: Okay. And how long was he a deputy sheriff?
14	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 158: Five years.
15	THE COURT: Okay. And can you give me any other job titles that
16	he's held?
17	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 158: Truck driver, deputy sheriff, pest
18	control.
19	THE COURT: Okay. Any kids?
20	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 158: Yes, ma'am, two.
21	THE COURT: And how old are they?
22	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 158: Twenty-six and 24. My son is a
23	teacher in Clark County and my daughter works for Boyd Denny.
24	THE COURT: Okay. So, if you were selected to serve as a juror in
25	this case, you have two kind of important orders that you would have to
ı	

1	follow.
2	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 158: Yes, ma'am.
3	THE COURT: And that you would promise to follow.
4	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 158: Yes, ma'am.
5	THE COURT: That we would hold you to. And that would be that
6	you couldn't talk about the case with your spouse or anyone else.
7	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 158: That's no problem.
8	THE COURT: And that you would have to follow the Court's
9	instructions on the law, even if those instructions differ from your personal
10	beliefs of what the law ought to be.
11	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 158: Yes, ma'am.
12	THE COURT: Would that be a problem for you?
13	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 158: No, ma'am.
14	THE COURT: What familiarity, if any, do you have with Nevada
15	criminal law?
16	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 158: I have very little familiarity with
17	Nevada criminal law.
18	THE COURT: All right. Thank you, very much.
19	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 158: Uh-huh.
20	THE COURT: All right. I'm going to shift gears now, and ask
21	questions of the group, the 32. Okay. So, if I ask you this question and you
22	need to answer, you'll raise your hand, and I'll go from the front row to the
23	back row. And do me a favor. Just give me the last three digits on your
24	badge, because I'm getting to know you, but I need it in the recording. Okay.

So, first of all, under our system of criminal procedures, certain

21

22

23

24

25

principles of law apply in every criminal trial. They are that an information or indictment filed in a case is a mere accusation and is not evidence of guilt. It's just a piece of paper with a charge on it, or charges. That the Defendant is presumed innocent and that the State must prove the Defendant is guilty beyond a reasonable doubt. Does anyone not believe in these very basic precepts of American justice? Just the 32 here. This group and that short row in front. Anybody? The record should reflect nobody indicated in the affirmative. Does anyone know anything about this case, other than what's been stated in the courtroom today? Or think you do. Okay. Ms. Cortez what's your number again? PROSPECTIVE JUROR 058: 058. THE COURT: 058. PROSPECTIVE JUROR 058: I know I saw it on TV. That's -- that's all that I know. I mean when I walked in, I know I saw the Defendant on the news. THE COURT: And how long ago do you believe that to have been?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 058: I believe it was a year or so ago. THE COURT: Okay. Anybody else believe you may be familiar

with this case through any kind of media or television report? I'm not saying there was or wasn't one, but if you think there was, then you need to tell me about it.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 025: 025.

THE COURT: 025. Ms. Morgan.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 025: Yeah, I just remember reading it from

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

2122

23

2425

the paper, that's all.

THE COURT: Okay. Anybody else? All right. Nobody else indicates in the affirmative. Have any of you ever served as a juror before? And what I'm getting at is not you know, called to jury duty, sit in a room and get excused, but actually been seated on a jury, been sworn, and gone to trial. Anybody been seated on a jury before?

Okay, Starting with Mr. Barnes. How long ago -- well, first of all, how many times were you a juror?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 912: Just one. Just once, Your Honor --

THE COURT: Okay.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 912: -- as a federal grand juror.

THE COURT: Okay. Federal grand juror?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 912: Correct.

THE COURT: Okay. By the way, when I ask questions about prior jury service, I am never, and no attorney is ever asking you what the verdict was. I'll ask did the jury deliberate and reach a verdict, yes or no, but I will not ask you what the verdict was, and I don't want you to say. Although yours is a little different. You understand that the burden of proof for an indictment is slight or marginal evidence, or probable cause?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 912: I do, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And that burden of proof in this trial will be beyond a reasonable doubt, a completely different burden of proof in the eyes of the law?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 912: I do, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. So, if you were selected to serve as a juror in

this case, you would have to disregard the instruction you were given by the federal judge about what the standard is for an indictment and follow this Court's instruction on the beyond a reasonable doubt standard. Could you do that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 912: I could.

THE COURT: Also, state law and federal law are not the same. If you have any recollection of any criminal laws, you have to disregard those and follow the Court's instructions on the law, as they apply in this particular case. That's my job is to give the instructions that apply. And your job as a juror is to follow those instructions. Would that be a problem for you?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 912: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. And how long ago was your federal grand jury service?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 912: About two years ago it ended.

THE COURT: And how long did it last?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 912: I was on the jury for a year and a half, but it was a three year empanelment.

THE COURT: Oh, what happened?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 912: That's just how grand jury service works. You get -- any federal indictment that is filed has to go in front of a grand jury before it can go to trial.

THE COURT: No, what I mean is if you had a three year term, and you were out in a year-and-a-half --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 912: Oh, well, I was an alternate, so I started after the initial empanelment.

1	THE COURT: Oh, I see. Okay. I get it. I meant why did you leave.
2	And you started late?
3	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 912: Correct.
4	THE COURT: Okay. And how often did the grand jury meet?
5	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 912: Once a week.
6	THE COURT: Okay. And was it all day?
7	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 912: It usually was all day.
8	THE COURT: Okay. For a year-and-a-half?
9	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 912: For a year-and-a-half, once a week.
10	THE COURT: All day, once a week?
11	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 912: Correct.
12	THE COURT: Thank you for that. Okay. Anybody else have been a
13	jury before? Okay. I'm going to go down here. Can you give me the last three
14	digits on your badge again?
15	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 952: 952.
16	THE COURT: Ms. Cardoza.
17	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 952: Yes.
18	THE COURT: How many times have you served as a juror?
19	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 952: One, about three years ago.
20	THE COURT: Was it here in Clark County?
21	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 952: Uh-huh.
22	THE COURT: Was that a yes?
23	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 952: Yes.
24	THE COURT: Was it state court or federal court?
25	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 952: I think it was state.

THE COURT: Was it in this building?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR 952: Yes.
THE COURT: Okay. And was it criminal or civil?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR 952: It was a malpractice case.
THE COURT: Okay. So, it was civil.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR 952: Okay.
THE COURT: Did the jury deliberate and reach a verdict, yes or no?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR 952: Yes.
THE COURT: And were you the foreperson of that jury?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR 952: No.
THE COURT: Is there anything about that jury experience that you
think would limit your ability to be fair and impartial in this unrelated criminal
matter?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR 952: No.
THE COURT: Do you understand that the burden of proof in a civil
case is not the same as it is in a criminal case?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR 952: Yes.
THE COURT: The burden of proof in a civil case is more probable
than not. And in a criminal case it's beyond a reasonable doubt. So, if you
were selected to serve as a juror in this case, you'd have to disregard your
instructions from that other case and follow the Court's instructions on the
law, and particularly the burden of proof: do you understand that?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR 952: Yes.
THE COURT: Could you do that?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR 952: Yes.

1	THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, very much. Who else had their
2	hand up in the okay. I'm going I'll get to you.
3	UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Okay.
4	THE COURT: Can I have the last three digits on your badge again?
5	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 035: 035.
6	THE COURT: Okay. Ms. Gevers.
7	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 035: Uh-huh.
8	THE COURT: How many times have you served as a juror?
9	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 035: Once.
10	THE COURT: And was it here in Clark County or somewhere else?
11	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 035: Clark County in about 1992.
12	THE COURT: And was it criminal or civil?
13	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 035: Criminal.
14	THE COURT: And did the jury deliberate and reach a verdict, yes
15	or not?
16	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 035: Yes.
17	THE COURT: And were you the foreperson of that jury?
18	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 035: No.
19	THE COURT: What kind of case was it?
20	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 035: A stolen car battery.
21	THE COURT: Okay. And is there anything about that case that
22	would limit your ability to be fair and impartial in this unrelated matter?
23	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 035: No.
24	THE COURT: Do you recall any law from 1992?
25	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 035: No.

1		THE COURT: Okay. Perfect. Thank you. Who else had their hand
2	up? Okay.	Can you read in the last three digits on your badge, please?+
3		PROSPECTIVE JUROR 043: 043.
4		THE COURT: Ms. Renforth, how many times have you been a juror
5	before?	
6		PROSPECTIVE JUROR 043: I've been selected as a juror one time.
7		THE COURT: Okay. And was that in Clark County?
8		PROSPECTIVE JUROR 043: Yes.
9		THE COURT: And was it in the state system or the federal system?
10		PROSPECTIVE JUROR 043: The state.
11		THE COURT: So, in this building?
12		PROSPECTIVE JUROR 043: Yes.
13		THE COURT: How long ago?
14		PROSPECTIVE JUROR 043: A little over three years.
15		THE COURT: And was it civil or criminal?
16		PROSPECTIVE JUROR 043: Criminal.
17		THE COURT: And without telling me what the verdict was, did the
18	jury delibe	rate and reach a verdict?
19		PROSPECTIVE JUROR 043: Yes.
20		THE COURT: Were you the foreperson of that jury?
21		PROSPECTIVE JUROR 043: No.
22		THE COURT: And what kind of case was it?
23		PROSPECTIVE JUROR 043: Attempted murder.
24		THE COURT: Okay. And three years ago, wasn't so long, do you
25	have an inc	dependent recollection of the law in that case?

1	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 043: Not really.
2	THE COURT: Okay.
3	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 043: I mean
4	THE COURT: If you were selected to serve as a juror in this case,
5	you would have to completely disregard the instructions and the law as given
6	to you in that case and follow the Court's instructions on the law, as they apply
7	in this completely unrelated matter. Would you be able to do that?
8	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 043: Yes.
9	THE COURT: Is there anything about that experience, that you
10	think would limit your ability to be fair and impartial here?
11	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 043: No.
12	THE COURT: All right. Thank you, very much. Who else had their
13	hand up, prior jury service? Going over there. Ms. Godwin.
14	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 099: 099.
15	THE COURT: 099. How many times have you been a juror?
16	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 099: Once.
17	THE COURT: How long ago?
18	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 099: About 14, 15 years ago.
19	THE COURT: Here in Clark County?
20	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 099: Yes.
21	THE COURT: And was it a civil case or a criminal case?
22	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 099: I believe it was criminal.
23	THE COURT: Without telling me what the verdict was, did the jury
24	deliberate and reach a verdict, yes or no?
25	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 099: Yes.

So, the point of that is, you don't decide the case after one witness,

or two witnesses, or when the State rests, or when you haven't heard what the law is, but that you wait in forming an opinion on the final result, until all of the evidence has been heard, you know what the law is, and then you're in the deliberation room. Even if that's hard to do, because it can be hard to do, are there any of you that cannot do that? That cannot reserve judgment and wait until you know everything before you decide this very important case? Anybody? Nobody indicates that they would be unable to do that.

All right. Have you, or anyone very close to you, such as a close family member, or close friend, starting in the back row -- I'm starting in the back row, and I'll work my way forward, and then I'll go to that side -- ever been the victim of a crime? Starting in the back row, raise your hand if you've been a victim of a crime. You or anyone close to you. Second row. Okay, sir, could you --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 942: My ex-wife was in a car accident, hit by a drunk driver.

THE COURT: Okay, hold on. It's 942, yes?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 942: Yeah, 942.

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Pierce. How long ago was that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 942: 2006.

THE COURT: And were you married?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 942: Yeah, I was married at the time.

THE COURT: Okay. And did you say it was a DUI, or?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 942: Yeah, it went to court, and he went --

he served four years.

THE COURT: Okay. Is there anything about that unrelated

1

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 043: I was at work and two suspects came in and came into the office where I was with another person, and had a gun, and we got the safe open and gave them the money.

THE COURT: Okay. And I assume the police were involved.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 043: Yes.

THE COURT: And was there anyone ever arrested for the offense?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 043: No.

THE COURT: And which police department was it?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 043: Metro.

THE COURT: Okay. Is there anything about that experience, being a victim of a crime, that you think would limit your ability to be fair and impartial in this case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 043: No.

THE COURT: To either side?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 043: No.

THE COURT: Do you understand why I ask? You're looking at me quizzically, but --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 043: No. Yeah, I understand.

THE COURT: If you had -- let's say you had a grudge against Metro, because you didn't think they gave the investigation fair attention, you know, you would be required to tell me that or, conversely, if you just decide that for whatever reason people that are facing a trial, you know, must have done something, and you struggle with the burden of proof, you need to tell me that. Do you understand what I'm getting at?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 043: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. So, is there anything about those experiences that you had that cause you concern either way for either side that you can't be fair and impartial?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 043: No.

THE COURT: And you understand that as the Defendant sits there now, he's presumed innocent?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 043: Yes.

THE COURT: And now would be a good time to ask. As far as law enforcement goes, we may or may not have law enforcement. You've heard a list of witnesses. I don't know who exactly will be called to testify, but if a law enforcement officer comes here, takes the witness stand, takes the oath, and testifies, would you automatically, without hearing what they say, have a tendency to give more or less credence to their testimony, simply because they're a police officer? Meaning, you know, you would either automatically believe it or disbelieve it, or would you be able to consider that testimony in conjunction with all the evidence in the case to determine what weight, if any, to give to it?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 043: I'd be able to consider.

THE COURT: Consider it fairly?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 043: Yes.

THE COURT: And you understand why I'm asking?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 043: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. Anybody else ever been a victim of a crime in the front row? Yes, sir.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 048: 048.

1	THE COURT: I'm sorry, say your number again.
2	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 048: 048.
3	THE COURT: Mr. Chiesi.
4	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 048: Yes.
5	THE COURT: Yes.
6	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 048: I wasn't a victim, but I had a cousin
7	that was murdered.
8	THE COURT: Okay. How long ago was that?
9	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 048: It was 1992.
10	THE COURT: And was that here in Clark County, or somewhere
11	else?
12	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 048: Somewhere else.
13	THE COURT: And where was that?
14	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 048: Indiana.
15	THE COURT: And do you know a lot about the case?
16	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 048: Yeah, I went to the trial every day.
17	THE COURT: Okay. And what were the circumstances?
18	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 048: He was having issues with his wife,
19	and she hired someone to have him killed.
20	THE COURT: Okay. And what happened with the trial?
21	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 048: The suspect was found guilty, and then
22	his wife went on trial, and she was found guilty, also.
23	THE COURT: Okay. So, I mean you understand that there's an
24	allegation here. And that's what it remains, an allegation. And the whole

25 purpose of the trial is to determine whether the State will prove and meet the

1	THE COURT: Last three last three digits on your badge again?
2	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 025: 025.
3	THE COURT: Ms. Morgan?
4	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 025: Yes.
5	THE COURT: Okay. who was the victim?
6	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 025: Well, my house was broken into.
7	THE COURT: How long ago was that?
8	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 025: About 20 years ago.
9	THE COURT: And did you report it?
10	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 025: Yes.
11	THE COURT: And did anyone ever get caught?
12	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 025: No.
13	THE COURT: Is there anything about that experience, that you
14	think would limit your ability to be fair and impartial in this case?
15	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 025: No.
16	THE COURT: Okay. And you've heard me explain why I'm asking,
17	right?
18	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 025: Yes.
19	THE COURT: And so, you understand that's really important to tell
20	me?
21	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 025: Absolutely.
22	THE COURT: Okay. But no problem?
23	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 025: No.
24	THE COURT: All right. Thank you, very much. Ms. Stewart.
25	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 158: Yes.

members that have been victims of a crime. Is there anything about that case,

that you think would limit your ability to be fair and impartial to the Defendant

24

25

1	in this case?
2	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 158: No.
3	THE COURT: Or to the state of Nevada?
4	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 158: No.
5	THE COURT: And you understand why I ask, and why it's
6	important?
7	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 158: Yes, ma'am.
8	THE COURT: And you would tell me?
9	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 158: Yes, ma'am.
10	THE COURT: Okay. Thank you very much.
11	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 158: Uh-huh.
12	THE COURT: Anybody else? Okay. Shifting gears. Remember at
13	the beginning, I said I would never ask you personal questions, unless I had to
14	And that's one of these times. Have you, or anyone close to you, ever been
15	arrested for, accused of, charged with, or cited for a crime more serious than a
16	traffic violation? Can I just start in the back row? I'm going by row. It makes i
17	easier.
18	UNIDENTIFIED PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Can you repeat that, please
19	THE COURT: Have you, or anyone close to you, ever been arrested
20	for, even if you weren't charged, charged, even if you weren't arrested,
21	accused of, or cited for, meaning a ticket, like petty larceny, or DUI, or battery,
22	things like that, more serious than a traffic violation. You know, speeding
23	ticket is not what I'm looking at here. So, anyone in the back row?
24	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 940: My father.

THE COURT: Hold on one second.

25

1	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 940: Oh.	
2	THE COURT: I'll let you - we'll have you go first. Give me the last	
3	three digits on your badge.	
4	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 940: 940.	
5	THE COURT: Ms. Kime.	
6	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 940: Yes.	
7	THE COURT: Your father was arrested for can you tell me the	
8	circumstances?	
9	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 940: Molestation.	
10	THE COURT: Okay. And how long ago was that?	
11	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 940: He just came out of jail September of	
12	last year, in Gary, Indiana.	
13	THE COURT: Okay. So that all happened in Indiana?	
14	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 940: Yes. Well, not in Gary, but, yes, in	
15	Indiana.	
16	THE COURT: Okay, and are you familiar with the circumstances of	
17	the allegations?	
18	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 940: Of?	
19	THE COURT: Well, what he was accused of doing and to whom?	
20	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 940: Yes.	
21	THE COURT: Okay. And were you familiar with that from family	
22	members, from him, how did you become aware?	
23	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 940: From him.	
24	THE COURT: Okay. And based upon what you spoke to him, and	
25	what you know independently, if anything, do you feel like he was treated	
	1	

1	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 093: 2003.
2	THE COURT: And was it here in Clark County or somewhere else?
3	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 093: Clark County.
4	THE COURT: And what was it for?
5	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 093: A domestic violence.
6	THE COURT: And what happened with that?
7	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 093: Plead no contest and do the training
8	course and
9	THE COURT: Okay.
10	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 093: first offense, so
11	THE COURT: Okay. And is there anything about that experience
12	that you think would limit your ability to be fair and impartial in this case?
13	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 093: No.
14	THE COURT: And was that with a city entity, or a county entity?
15	Or what was that? What court was that?
16	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 093: It moved into Clark County from a
17	different
18	THE COURT: Okay.
19	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 093: location from Las Vegas.
20	THE COURT: Okay. And where did the where did the arrest
21	occur, or the event that they said was
22	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 093: I believe it was still Clark County.
23	THE COURT: Was it unincorporated Clark County, or Henderson or
24	North Las Vegas, or Las Vegas, or?
25	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 093: Sahara and Decatur.

THE COURT: Sahara and Decatur, okay. And did you go to municipal court or justice court?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 093? It was this building. Justice court.

THE COURT: Okay. And is -- do you feel after that experience, that you were treated unfairly or fairly by the justice system?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 093: Well, the details of the case, you know, that was actually a manipulation, so --

THE COURT: Unfairly?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 093: Yes, unfairly.

THE COURT: Okay.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 093: Of course.

THE COURT: And when you say a manipulation -- is that what said, not extrapolation? Late in the day, and I'm making sure I understand what you're saying. The complainant was manipulating, or who?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 093: My ex-wife was a foreign entity. She used the law to secure an American citizenship.

THE COURT: Okay. And so, if you were selected to serve as a juror in this case, both sides are entitled to the same fair and impartial consideration, regardless of personal circumstances that may have happened to you, that you believe are unfair, and it's just as important for the State, as it is for the Defendant, to have their case judged on the evidence in the courtroom and not from something that happened to somebody else. Is that something that you would be able to do?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 093: Yes, that's very important to be taken serious.

THE COURT: Okay. Ms. Hillstead.

case?

1	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 083: No.
2	THE COURT: And you understand why I ask?
3	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 083: Yes.
4	THE COURT: And do you feel that the police treated you fairly in
5	that circumstance or no?
6	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 083: Yes.
7	THE COURT: Based upon whatever was going on at the time?
8	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 083: Yes.
9	THE COURT: Okay. Thank you very much. Who else had their
10	hand up? Yes, Ms. Cortez. Did you have okay.
11	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 058: 058. My husband was
12	THE COURT: Arrested?
13	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 058: arrested. It was like 28 years ago, or
14	so, for a statutory rape.
15	THE COURT: Okay. And what happened with that case?
16	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 058: He was found guilty.
17	THE COURT: Did you know him then?
18	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 058: No.
19	THE COURT: Okay. And so, you met him after?
20	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 058: Yes.
21	THE COURT: And what happened with the after he was found
22	guilty?
23	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 058: He's still having to register even
24	though it was like he was 18, she was 16.
25	THE COURT: Okay.

say if I would hold it against them.

because, you know, there's only so many elevators and a lot of you. So, I'm

going to call out a few names, you're going to be excused, and I need you to

24

1 | re 2 | re 3 | ye 4 | C | C | F | 6 | H | 7 | G | 8 | S | 9 | tc |

return back to where Ramsey tells you to come. So, if I call your name, you're returning back to where Ramsey tells you to come tomorrow at 10:45. So, you're not coming to the courtroom. He'll tell you where to meet. Okay. Clinton Barnes, Aziyel Madrigal, John Graber, Huntsman, Dwinell, Kime, Pierce, Stettler, Harris, Stanek, Cardoza, Vinluan, Farfan, Perri, Mazzei, Morgan, Harrell, Gevers, Renforth, Chiesi, Reyna, Hillstead, Blake, Fernandez, Tassy, Godwin, Webster, Matthew Jones, Bethany Johnson, Paul Mejia, and Phyllis Stewart. That's the first wave of people that's being excused, to come back tomorrow morning at 10:45. Okay. So, if I called your name, you can go, and you need to come back tomorrow at 10:45.

[Prospective jurors excused.]

THE COURT: Okay. I'm going to call the second wave of people. Okay. I'm going to call the second wave of people that are going to need to return back to court at 10:45 tomorrow morning. I'm just -- there's a lot of people getting instructions from Ramsey, so I'm trying to let that happen, and then this group will then have that chance, okay. Okay. If I call your name, you're excused for the evening, and I need you to come back tomorrow morning at 10:45 and then tomorrow we'll know who's going to be seated on the jury. Nicole Williams, Manuel De Cespedes, Luzmaria Alarcon, Janice Forbes, Bruce Gorham, Deirdre Parker, Michael Stroud, Lisa Villa-Real, Mark Eli, Robert Patynik, Ivan Rodriguez, Ronda Mayfield, Johnathon Gludt, Mylo Jenereaul, Damian Serrano, Lawrence Luna, Erik Thompson, Glenn Adams, Socrisar Guese, Seth Wright. If I called your name, you're going to check in with Ramsey tomorrow where he tells you to meet him at 10:45.

[Prospective jurors excused.]

THE COURT: Can I see counsel at the bench?
[Sidebar begins at 5:14 p.m.]

THE COURT: The Defense has indicated they changed their mind about --

MR. BASHOR: Yeah.

THE COURT: -- the challenge for cause if they're going to make one.

MR. STANTON: Okay. Then I formally make a motion to challenge her for cause based upon her answers to the Court's questions that she cannot be unequivocally fair and impartial, which I think is the standard set by the Nevada Supreme Court.

MR. BASHOR: I have no objection.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

[Sidebar ends at 5:15 p.m.]

THE COURT: Okay. The rest of you I held you for last for a couple of reasons. One, if you are in this group of people, either you have a hardship, financial or personal, or professional, illness, or a language issue that makes it difficult for you to serve in this case. So, you're going to be excused from the trial, and you don't have to come back.

The one thing that I ask, every once in a while, and you don't seem like this group at all, but every once in a while, I have people at the end who are excused that go soaring past the people that are here tomorrow, high-fiving and whatevering. You know, you got out because you would have to suffer, and we let you go because of that. Please show them the courtesy and respect while they do their civil service, and you go home, not to do such a

Thank you.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 058: Okay. Thank you.

THE COURT: And please don't discuss that on the way out, okay.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 058: No, I'm not going to say anything.

[Outside the presence of the prospective jurors.]

THE COURT: Okay. Okay. So, here's what's going to happen tomorrow. You'll come back at 10:45. I'll start as soon as I can, you know, somewhere between 10:45 and 11:00, no later. Sometimes it takes me that long just to get everybody out. I'm going to cover -- I'm almost done. I normally ask is there any other reason you couldn't be completely fair and impartial. I'll ask a general follow-up on the -- follow the Court's instructions on the law for everyone. I mostly asked it for law enforcement and lawyers, but I'll ask it of everyone. Is there anything else -- I've gone through my checklist. I don't see anything I left out. Is there something that I didn't cover that you wanted me to? Are you going to be ready to go pretty quick tomorrow?

I mean I have to catch somebody up to replace this person, which will be. Let's do that now. Assuming that person shows up, I anticipate Nicole Williams will go in the seat of Ms. Cortez, in juror seat number 21. So, it would be, instead of Frances Cortez, you would white her out and you would put, because she was excused, you would put Nicole Williams, Juror Number 163 --

MR. BASHOR: 163.

THE COURT: -- if she shows up. 163, Nicole Williams. And then I would catch her up, meaning, you know, ask all those questions. God willing and the creek don't rise, I've got maybe one more general question or two, and

then I'm handing them over.

MR. BASHOR: If the panel remains the same, Your Honor, we'll finish up with jury selection, open, and then start with witnesses on Wednesday.

THE COURT: Okay. You're going to come up with a -- okay. Okay, anything else?

MR. STANTON: Counsel asked about if we finish up with the jury selection and then we open, can we then start my witnesses on Wednesday, because I'm sure -- at least for us, we'll need to contact everybody tonight. It would, certainly, be more logistical -- logistically easier for the State, especially since we're going to be --

THE COURT: Well, here's the deal. It's going to take -- if I get in here at 11:00, okay, that's aspirational, let's face it. You've all done -- you've been in -- once I get in, I get moving, but until I get in here, which I get, we're going to go until like 1:00, because I have to take a break -- I have to -- you know, I have to give the staff a break, labor laws and all. I'll go to 2:00 and then -- you know, I really don't think we'll have enough time for more than that.

MR. STANTON: Okay.

MR. BASHOR: Great.

MR. STANTON: I just needed confirmation that we're there and we're good.

THE COURT: Even if we finish early, I won't -- I will not pull a Bonaventure on you and scream at you because you don't have a witness.

MR. STANTON: Thank you, Your Honor.

1	THE COURT: Senior.
2	MR. STANTON: I figured you were talking senior.
3	THE COURT: Having been yelled at myself, by that man, for not
4	having a witness, I know these things. Okay. Anything else?
5	MR. STANTON: No.
6	MR. BASHOR: Not from the Defense.
7	THE COURT: All right. I'll see you tomorrow.
8	MR. BASHOR: Thank you, Your Honor.
9	MR. STANTON: Okay.
10	[Proceedings concluded at 5:21 p.m.]
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	ATTEST: I do hereby certify that I have truly and correctly transcribed the
18	audio/visual proceedings in the above-entitled case to the best of my ability.
19	
20	
21	Junia B Cakill
22	Tusta Prances
23	

Maukele Transcribers, LLC

Jessica B. Cahill, Transcriber, CER/CET-708

24

## ORIGINAL

		Service Services	
ì	AIND		
2	STEVEN B. WOLFSON Clark County District Attorney		IN OPEN COURT /EN D. GRIERSON
3	Nevada Bar #001565 DAVID STANTON		K OF THE COURT
4	Chief Deputy District Attorney Nevada Bar #3202		JUL 3 1 2018
5	200 Lewis Avenue Las Vegas, Nevada 89155-2212	m A	Drumolo
6	(702) 671-2500 Attorney for Plaintiff	ATHEN	TRWILLO, DEPUTY
7			
8	N	CT COURT JNTY, NEVADA	
9	THE STATE OF NEVADA,	1	
10	Plaintiff,	CASE NO:	C-16-312448-1
11	-vs-	DEPT NO:	
12	Although the court of the	DEIT NO.	
13	SHAWN GLOVER, aka Shawn Lynn Glover, Jr., #1950305		AMENDED
14	Defendant.	IN	DICTMENT
15	STATE OF NEVADA )		
16	COUNTY OF CLARK ss.		
17	The Defendant above named, SHA	WN GLOVER, aka	Shawn Lynn Glover, Jr.,
18	accused by the Clark County Grand Jury of the crime(s) of MURDER WITH USE OF A		
19	DEADLY WEAPON (Category A Felony -		
20	ASSAULT WITH A DEADLY WEAPON (Category B Felony - NRS 200.471 - NOC 50201)		
21	DISCHARGE OF FIREARM FROM O		
22	(Category B Felony - NRS 202.287 - NOC 51445) and OWNERSHIP OR POSSESSION C		
23	FIREARM BY PROHIBITED PERSON (C		
24	committed at and within the County of Cla		
25	January, 2016, as follows:	and the state of t	the first market was a second to be seen to be
26	COUNT 1 - MURDER WITH USE OF A D	EADLY WEAPON	
27	did willfully, unlawfully, feloniously	y and with malice afo	orethought, kill PATRICK
28	FLEMING, a human being, with use of a d		
_0	C-16-312448-1 AIND Amended Indictment 4767518	error Ar to some year as require	

and into the body of the said PATRICK FLEMING, the said killing having been willful, deliberate and premeditated.

## COUNT 2 - ASSAULT WITH A DEADLY WEAPON

did willfully, unlawfully, feloniously and intentionally place another person in reasonable apprehension of immediate bodily harm and/or did willfully and unlawfully attempt to use physical force against another person, to-wit: MIRANDA SUTTON, with use of a deadly weapon, to-wit: a handgun, by pointing said handgun at the said MIRANDA SUTTON.

## COUNT 3 - DISCHARGE OF FIREARM FROM OR WITHIN A STRUCTURE OR VEHICLE

did willfully, unlawfully, maliciously, and feloniously, while in, on or under a structure, located at 4032 Smokey Fogg, Apartment No. 201, North Las Vegas, discharge a firearm within or from the structure, while being within an area designated by a City or County Ordinance as a populated area for the purpose of prohibiting the discharge of weapons.

## COUNT 4 - OWNERSHIP OR POSSESSION OF FIREARM BY PROHIBITED PERSON

did willfully, unlawfully, and feloniously own, or have in his possession and/or under his custody or control, a firearm, to-wit: a handgun, the defendant being a convicted felon, having in 2012, been convicted of Voluntary Manslaughter With Use of a Deadly Weapon, in Case No. C211880, in the Eighth Judicial District Court, Clark County, a felony under the laws of the State of Nevada.

DATED this day of July, 2018.

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

BY

Chief Deputy District Attorney Nevada Bar #3202

27

Names of wi	nesses testifying before the Grand Jury:
SUTTON, M	RANDA, c/o CCDA/VWAC, 200 LEWIS AVE., LVN
VEASLEY,	RIRKA, 4032 SMOKEY FOG AVE., NLV, NV
WILSON-FA	Y, SAYOKO, NLVPD P#1437
Additional w	nesses known to the District Attorney at time of filing the Indictment:
CUSTODIA	OF RECORDS, CCDC
CUSTODIAN OF RECORDS, NLVPD DISPATCH	
CUSTODIA	OF RECORDS, NLVPD RECORDS
	TX-
	····
	*
	6FN0004X/dd-GJ
NLVPD EV: (TK)	.600031
Mary 201	7

Electronically Filed 12/31/2018 10:22 AM Steven D. Grierson CLERK OF THE COURT

1	RTRAN	Atumb, Atum
2		
3		
4		
5	DISTRIC	T COURT
6	CLARK COUN	NTY, NEVADA
7		
8	STATE OF NEVADA,	) CASE NO. C-16-312448-1
9	Plaintiff,	) DEPT. IX
10	vs.	
11	SHAWN GLOVER, aka SHAWN LYNN	
13	GLOVER, JR.,	
14	Defendant.	) )
15	BEFORE THE HONORABLE JENNIFER F	P. TOGLIATTI, DISTRICT COURT JUDGE
16	TUESDAY, J	ULY 31, 2018
17	RECORDER'S TRANSCRIP	T OF JURY TRIAL - DAY 2
18	APPEARANCES:	
19		DAVID CTANTON FCO
20	For Plaintiff:	DAVID STANTON, ESQ. WILLIAM FLINN, ESQ.
21	For Defendant:	ROBERT E. O'BRIEN, ESQ.
22	1 of Bolondant.	RYAN J. BASHOR, ESQ.
23		
24	DECORDED BY WIETTE C. CICON, COL	IDT DECODDED
25	RECORDED BY YVETTE G. SISON, COU	IN I NECONDEN
	I	

filed?

[ Case called at 11:22 a.m.]

[Outside the presence of the jury.]

THE COURT: All right. This is the time set for the continuation of the trial in State v. Glover. The record should reflect the Defendant is present and dressed for trial. We're outside the presence of the jury. We've changed the schedule slightly, because the parties have arguments to make about a legal issue or evidentiary issues, associated with the case that you want me to -- want me to consider before openings. And so, we'll do that at the end of the day. Is there anything that we need to do before I bring in the jury?

MR. STANTON: Not on behalf of the State, Your Honor.

MR. BASHOR: Judge, did you address that there was an amended

THE COURT: I did not. The District Attorney filed an amended indictment. Is it an indictment?

MR. STANTON: Yes.

MR. BASHOR: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: An amended indictment. And for the record, the changes are what?

MR. STANTON: The prohibitive person count is now Count 4 instead of Count 3. That way your clerk can comply with the Supreme Court's mandate of not reading that count for consideration on Counts 1, 2, and 3.

THE COURT: Okay. And I was thinking last night that before -weren't there two -- are there two people still left on the panel that heard about

23

24

25

this in the media?

MR. O'BRIEN: Yes.

THE COURT: Before you pursue any questions, I thought maybe we should pull those two people in.

MR. O'BRIEN: Your Honor, I believe we're down to one. One of the two was the woman who was excused at the very end of yesterday.

THE COURT: Okay. We pull the one lady in. And my thought was, I just don't know what she's going to say as far as, you know, you never know. And then everybody saw what she saw, once we asked her what she saw. So, I thought we could have her come in real quick. I'll literally have you ask any questions you would ask in front of everybody, so we can find out what she saw. You know, it's like the cat's out of the bag before we know what --

MR. STANTON: The State has no objection.

THE COURT: -- whether it's a lion, leopard or --

MR. BASHOR: Yeah, it didn't sound very accurate, but sure, Your Honor, I understand your concern.

THE COURT: Okay. So, which one was that? That was --

MR. BASHOR: It's Diane Morgan, Your Honor. That's panel number 16 currently, originally panel number 23. Badge number 025.

THE COURT: Okay. So, you want to get Diane Morgan

THE MARSHAL: Diane Morgan.

THE COURT: -- in here for me?

THE MARSHAL: Yes, ma'am.

MR. O'BRIEN: And Your Honor, we did want to ask for one

courtesy from the Court as well. With a crowded elevator this morning, we -Mr. Bashor and I took an elevator up with members of the jury. One juror
asked us what floor we were on. I said tenth floor, and then stared at the
ground to discourage any other conversation, but if you could tell the jurors
we're not permitted to talk to them, we would appreciate it.

THE COURT: Sure. I haven't gotten there yet, but yes.

MR. O'BRIEN: Gotcha.

THE COURT: Hi, Ms. Morgan. How are you?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 025: Good morning, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Go ahead and have a seat. Okay, so we just have some questions to ask you, related to you specifically. And I didn't want to bring everybody in when it's just about you specifically. You understand you're still under oath?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 025: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. So, I was just going to ask you -- well, I'm going to actually let the attorneys ask you first, anything that they want to ask you related to the statement to me that you made regarding believing that you saw -- you read about this in the newspaper, I think was your phrase, correct?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 025: Correct.

THE COURT: Okay. So, State, did you have any questions about that?

MR. STANTON: I'm going to defer to Mr. Bashor, initially, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. BASHOR: Good morning, Ms. Morgan.

1	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 025: Good morning.
2	MR. BASHOR: Do you recall whether or not so is it you read it?
3	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 025: I do I don't recall the details. I only
4	recognized his hair.
5	MR. BASHOR: Okay. And by read it, I mean did you see it in a
6	newspaper or
7	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 025: Yes.
8	MR. BASHOR: Okay. And about how long ago was that?
9	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 025: Over a year.
10	MR. BASHOR: Okay. And do you remember any details?
11	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 025: I do not.
12	MR. BASHOR: Is there anything at all about thinking that you read
13	something about this case, that would be a problem with you?
14	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 025: Not at all.
15	MR. BASHOR: I have no further questions, Your Honor.
16	MR. STANTON: Nothing from the State, Your Honor.
17	THE COURT: Okay. If you could step outside, I'd appreciate it.
18	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 025: Sure.
19	[Outside the presence of the prospective jurors]
20	THE COURT: So, we're outside the presence of the jury, of all
21	outside the presence of all prospective jurors. A couple of questions I have.
22	Number one, was there a picture of your client in the paper?
23	MR. BASHOR: Yes.
24	THE COURT: And number two
25	MR. BASHOR: But it was over two about two-and-a-half years

1	ago and
2	THE COURT: Was there something special about his hair?
3	MR. BASHOR: When it's not tied back, I guess it could be
4	recognizable.
5	THE COURT: And so, was it not tied back in the picture?
6	MR. BASHOR: I don't have an independent recollection, Judge. I
7	just there's the only reason I believe, other than the fact that this was a
8	murder case that the article had any significance it was the 1st of 2016, so it
9	got a little extra press than your average murder would get.
0	THE COURT: Okay. All right. I was just curious about the hair
1	comment. Okay. So, is there anything else related to Ms. Morgan, before we
2	call everybody else in?
3	MR. STANTON: Not on behalf of the State.
4	MR. BASHOR: Not on behalf of the Defense.
5	THE COURT: All right. Then we're going to call everybody else in.
6	THE MARSHAL: All rise. The jury is entering. The jury is all
7	present, ma'am.
8	[In the presence of the jury.]
9	THE COURT: All right. Counsel, will you stipulate to the presence
20	of the prospective jury panel?
21	MR. STANTON: Yes, Your Honor.
22	MR. BASHOR: Yes, Your Honor.
23	THE COURT: Okay. Ladies and gentlemen, before we continue,
24	we're I need you all to acknowledge everybody in the room to

25 acknowledge that you are still under oath. Do you understand that?

THE COURT: And are you working?

1	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 163: Yes.
2	THE COURT: What do you do?
3	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 163: Fulfillment Center.
4	THE COURT: And what's your official title?
5	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 163: Just fulfillment person. I work at
6	Amazon.
7	THE COURT: Okay. And you've done that how long?
8	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 163: Going on a year in August.
9	THE COURT: Okay. Can you give me a checklist of any other job
10	titles that you've held?
11	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 163: Yes. Administration, customer service
12	management, sales, I think that's about it.
13	THE COURT: So, always in retail, those
14	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 163: Mostly in retail. I did work in business
15	administration, dealing with Enterprise, at their corporate office.
16	THE COURT: Okay. Are you married?
17	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 163: No.
18	THE COURT: Have you previously been married?
19	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 163: Yes.
20	THE COURT: And your previous spouse's occupation, when you
21	were married?
22	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 163: He dealt with computers and dealt with
23	computers and the mail room, from what I remember?
24	THE COURT: And the what, mailroom?
25	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 163: Mailroom and started working with

THE COURT: Have you, or anyone close to you, very close to you, ever been a victim of a crime?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 163: No. Not a crime, no.

THE COURT: Okay. Have you, or anyone close to you, ever been arrested or charged with, accused of, or cited for a crime more serious than like a traffic violation?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 163: No.

THE COURT: So, do you have any interaction or experience with, the justice system?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 163: No.

THE COURT: Yesterday, I asked other jurors, there's a basic precept of American justice. And that is, that a Defendant is presumed innocent. And I talked about how the burden is on the State to prove each and every material element of the charge beyond a reasonable doubt. And that the Defendant has no burden at all. None whatsoever. No obligation to say or do a thing. Do you have a problem with that basic precept of American Justice?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 163: No, I do not.

THE COURT: Do you understand it?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 163: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: And do you realize why we have that, and it's very important?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 163: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: Okay. Yesterday we were talking about persons being able to wait in forming an opinion on the appropriate result, until all of the evidence had been heard, and then only once they knew what the law was.

Are you a person that could do that, even if it's hard to do, wait in forming an opinion on the appropriate result, until you hear everything and know, you know, the entire case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 163: Yes.

THE COURT: And you heard me asking questions yesterday of different jurors. You know, sometimes related to responses they gave, sometimes just because I was picking their brain. It all related to an ability to be fair and impartial to both sides. Is there anything in your mind, that you can think of, any reason whatsoever, why you might not be able to be a fair and impartial juror to both sides in this case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 163: No.

THE COURT: Okay. So, ladies and gentlemen as a follow-up to yesterday, and I'm talking about this group and that group over there, in a criminal trial, the members of the jury are the questions of fact, and I am the Judge of the questions of law. It's my job to give instructions on the law, as they apply in a particular case. And it's your job to apply those instructions to the facts, as you find them, from the evidence.

So, that's the job of the jury, to be fact-finders and follow the Court's instructions on the law. I asked several of you individually yesterday, I believe, especially the ones with the law enforcement background or legal background, would any of you have any difficulty in following the Court's instructions on the law, and being a fact-finder in the case. If so, please raise your hand. No one indicates in the affirmative.

Is there -- are there any of you who have any personal or professional hardships related to jury duty, or jury service in this case, that you

1	didn't bring to my attention yesterday? Yes, sir, hold on one second. Okay,
2	well, we'll stick with you then, Ms. Williams. Go ahead. What's the hardship?
3	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 163: I'm not sure that it's actually a
4	hardship. I just wanted to bring it to your attention. My job does allow me to
5	serve ten days. So and I generally start
6	THE COURT: You mean with pay?
7	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 163: With pay, yes.
8	THE COURT: Okay. We're not going to go longer than that.
9	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 163: Okay. I just want to, you
10	know
11	THE COURT: No way.
12	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 163: make sure I covered everything, you
13	know, if it comes up later on.
14	THE COURT: Let me tell you, I have another trial right after this.
15	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 163: Okay.
16	THE COURT: And they've got 55 witnesses, it's going to go three
17	weeks, like I can't start late.
18	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 163: Okay.
19	THE COURT: We're going to be fine.
20	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 163: Okay.
21	THE COURT: Yes, sir, last three digits on your badge, please.
22	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 086: 086.
23	THE COURT: Okay.
24	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 086: We had a water pipe burst at our
25	home, so right now we have a plumber who is fixing the water heater that has

leaked into the house. And we, also, have construction crew at the house right now.

THE COURT: He's running late for the record.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 086: Yes.

THE COURT: Go ahead, I'm sorry to interrupt. Go ahead.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 086: So, we have a crew at the house who are peeling off drywall off the walls and applying water mitigation stuff to our home at the moment.

THE COURT: Okay. And who's at the home?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 086: My wife is at the home currently with the kids.

THE COURT: Okay. And did you -- when did they start their, I don't know, visit, remediation, whatever we're going to call it?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 086: Last evening we had a plumber over late to fix the water heater. This morning we have a construction crew there. And we'll have another plumber back today. The construction crew is working on the water damage in the walls and the plumber has to remove the water heater he installed last night and put it back this morning, because he wasn't supposed to put it in yet.

THE COURT: Okay. So, as we go through this process, I anticipate we're only going to be here for a couple of hours. And then what's going to happen is the jury is going to go home. The lawyers and the Court are going to do some lawyering. And the Court's going to do some ruling. And then tomorrow openings and everything else in the case.

Knowing that, does that help your concerns, because you aren't

1	2015.
2	THE COURT: Okay. And so, how do you think that's going to
3	affect your jury duty?
4	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 131: It gives me a lot of anxiety and issues
5	of focusing and social interactions.
6	THE COURT: Okay. Yesterday you seemed perfectly able to
7	socially interact, and joke around, and be fine. What's
8	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 131: I've gotten good at hiding.
9	THE COURT: Okay. That's not my issue.
10	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 131: All the
11	THE COURT: What I'm asking you is why are you bringing that up
12	today and didn't mention it yesterday?
13	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 131: Because I didn't when you were
14	asking all of the questions, I didn't know when the appropriate time was to
15	THE COURT: Okay.
16	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 131: bring it up.
17	THE COURT: All right. And is that it?
18	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 131: Yes.
19	THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. Who else had their hand up?
20	Anybody else? All right. Nobody else indicates in the affirmative. Can I see
21	counsel at the bench?
22	[Sidebar begins at 11:41 a.m.]
23	THE COURT: I want to discuss this at sidebar or do you want me t
24	get rid of anybody? I'm not inclined to
25	MR. STANTON: I'm not making a motion.

MR. BASHOR: I'm not making a motion.

THE COURT: All right. So, you're up.

MR. STANTON: All right.

[Sidebar ends at 11:41 a.m.]

THE COURT: Okay. At this time, the State is going to ask questions, and they are, again, sticking with this group here, and the first row over there. So, if he asks a question and he says, hey, group, question, that includes you, first row.

MR. STANTON: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you.

MR. STANTON: Ladies and gentlemen outside of that group, if you can follow along as you did yesterday. If for some reason you get sent up here to replace a person on what we refer to as the panel, if you hear those questions, and keep in your mind, hey, that question about employment, I need to follow-up and advise either myself, Defense Counsel, or Court, that would be helpful as well.

Ladies and gentlemen, I want to begin by asking, as I look out into the crowd of what we refer to as the panel, you all seem to be very reasonable folks. One of the things that sitting as a juror, besides what you've learned yesterday and today, is that you cannot do a number of different things.

You've heard Judge Togliatti talk to a couple of jurors individually, about not being able to speak to a father, about any facts of the case, or any aspects of the trial at all. And that can be a difficult thing. My question to you is looking into yourself, as the type of person that you are, can you abide by this?

In every single break that you get, Judge Togliatti, once you're seated as a juror in this case, will read you what we call is an admonition. It's a warning. It's an instruction that you cannot not only discuss the case, but you can't do any investigation in the case.

Now, I've been around for a little bit, where the internet wasn't as prevalent when I started doing jury trials, but it is now. And that includes doing any type of research or investigation on the internet. And let me just give you some examples that might crop up, or you might think would be innocuous and, therefore, doesn't really qualify as investigation. You can't look up terms. Legal terms, specific terms, medical terms, that you will hear during this trial. Everything that you're going to hear for you to render a fair and just verdict, you're going to hear from that witness stand, and from the exhibits admitted at trial.

So, you can't look up that. You can't go to the scene. You can't go on Google maps to review street corners, locations, buildings. Anything that's described by witnesses in this case.

So, my question to all of you, number one, I'm assuming you all understand that. But the more important thing that I'd ask in a yes or no, is do you all believe that you can abide by that?

PROSPECTIVE JURORS: Yes.

MR. STANTON: Is there anybody that says, look, there's just no way I can do that. If I hear that, I got to do my own research for my own state of mind? Okay. Great.

The second phenomena is -- and I used to ask how many people by a show of hands, I've given up on that -- eight of the top 30 shows in the

United States deal with CSI, crime scene, forensic evidence, or the criminal justice system. Law and Order, types of shows like that. And there's probably a reason why they're so popular. People find it interesting.

My question to you, number one is, do you all understand and agree with, that what you see on television is not necessarily what happens in real life? And that seems like a simple concept, and I'm sure you probably all generally agree with it. In some of the shows, some of the facts are dead on. They've nailed the criminal justice system accurately. I'm not sure it's complete, but certainly cases don't begin and end in an hour. They're obviously very truncated.

Crime scene analysists in the CSI shows don't do interviews.

That's what homicide detectives are for. But you can't, at an autopsy, take a laser and slice the cornea of one's eye and put it under a microscope or some sort of Laser 2000, and determine what the last thing the decedent saw before they died.

So, there are a lot of things that are in those shows that mean well, but have no reality in the actual criminal justice system. And so, you all understand that, and it's not a problem for anybody that what you see on TV, you won't bring that into the courtroom? Okay.

The next question I have is -- has to do with kind of the building blocks, the fundamental rights that kind of serve as the foundation of the criminal justice system. Yesterday, Judge Togliatti mentioned two of them. And I'll just briefly go over them. And you all indicated that you agree with them and believe in them. Number one is that the Defendant, Mr. Glover, as he sits in this courtroom right now, is presumed innocent. That is critical and

fundamental to the criminal justice system.

Second is, is that the duty in the criminal justice system, the burden is on the State. Mr. Flinn and myself have the burden of proving beyond a reasonable doubt that Mr. Glover is guilty of the crimes that he's charged with. That's fundamental. And everybody indicated that they agreed with it. The other right that is equally as fundamental as those is the right that sits at the table with Mr. Flinn and myself. And that's the right of the State, in a criminal case, that if it meets its burden of proving Mr. Glover, beyond a reasonable doubt of his guilt, their right is that the verdict be guilty. Does everybody agree with that?

Now, I'm going to take kind of -- because this question has such a varied response, and such a frequent affirmation that they have knowledge, it deals with firearms. So, what I'm going to do is I'm going to start at the very back row. And as the Judge did, I'll start by whoever raises their hands in the very back row. Raise your hands if you have an excellent, good, or marginal familiarities with firearms, long guns or handguns. Okay. The three of you.

Could I get you to pass the microphone all the way down to Mr. Barnes. Mr. Barnes, since you have the unfortunate spin of the wheel to be on the first seat near the end, Mr. Barnes, do you own firearms?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 912: I do not.

MR. STANTON: Have you trained or shot with them in the past?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 912: I have.

MR. STANTON: Hand guns or long guns?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 912: Both.

MR. STANTON: Do you know the difference between a semi-

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 916: Yes, sir.
MR. STANTON: All types of calibers, and did you go beyond
firearms in your training?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR 916: Yes.
MR. STANTON: Some exotics?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR 916: Yeah.
MR. STANTON: Okay. Thank you very much. And Mr. Huntsman.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR 923: Yes.
MR. STANTON: Same thing to you. Number one, do you own
weapons?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR 923: Yes, I do.
MR. STANTON: And are they hand guns, long guns or both?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR 923: All long guns.
MR. STANTON: And do you know the difference in the hand gun
category between a semi-automatic and revolver?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR 923: Yes, I do.
MR. STANTON: Are you familiar with the different calibers of kind
of what I'll refer to as normal calibers, or common calibers, here in the United
States?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR 923: For the most part, yes.
MR. STANTON: Okay. Thank you very much. Now, in the second
row. By a show of hands, once again, the question to you is do you have
outstanding familiarity, kind of a passing knowledge of firearms? Raise your
hand. Okay. Could we pass it down to is it Mr. Harris?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 947: Yes.

25

1	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 000: Yes.
2	MR. STANTON: What kind of guns do you own?
3	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 000: Hand guns and rifles.
4	MR. STANTON: And is that a hobby that you've had for a long
5	time, short time?
6	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 000: Yes.
7	MR. STANTON: Do you know the difference between a semi-
8	automatic and a revolver?
9	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 000: Yes.
10	MR. STANTON: Do you own both?
11	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 000: Yes.
12	MR. STANTON: You know the difference between the general
13	calibers?
14	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 000: Yes.
15	MR. STANTON: Thank you very much, sir. Are you a good shot?
16	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 000: Yes.
17	MR. STANTON: Okay. Next? And that's Ms. Morgan?
18	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 025: Morgan, yes.
19	MR. STANTON: How do you have familiarity with firearms?
20	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 025: My dad's a big hunter, and it was just
21	always growing up.
22	MR. STANTON: Around the family
23	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 025: Yeah.
24	MR. STANTON: and firearms.
25	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 025: Yeah

1	MR. STANTON: Dad did a pretty good job of telling you about to
2	handle them safely?
3	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 025: Oh, absolutely.
4	MR. STANTON: Okay. Did you ever shoot guns?
5	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 025: Yes.
6	MR. STANTON: Hand guns, firearms - long guns?
7	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 025: I got a rifle for my 12th birthday.
8	MR. STANTON: Okay. And did you know the difference between a
9	semi-automatic and a revolver?
10	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 025: Yes.
11	MR. STANTON: Okay. Thank you very much, ma'am. If you could
12	pass it immediately to your right. And that would be, I believe Mr. Harrell.
13	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 030: Yes, sir.
14	MR. STANTON: Am I pronouncing that name, correct?
15	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 030: Yeah, you are.
16	MR. STANTON: I'm assuming because of your employment, at
17	least a portion of it
18	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 030: Yes, sir.
19	MR. STANTON: is that required?
20	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 030: Yes, sir.
21	MR. STANTON: Do you carry?
22	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 030: Yes, sir.
23	MR. STANTON: On occasion or
24	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 030: on occasion, yeah.
25	MR. STANTON: Okay. Did you have any knowledge of firearms,

1	prior to that employment?
2	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 030: I did.
3	MR. STANTON: Hand guns?
4	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 030: Both.
5	MR. STANTON: Long guns?
6	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 030: Yes.
7	MR. STANTON: You know the difference between a semi-
8	automatic and a revolver?
9	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 030: Yes.
10	MR. STANTON: Common calibers?
11	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 030: Yes, sir.
12	MR. STANTON: The mechanics and operations of how a semi-
13	automatic works?
14	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 030: Yes, sir.
15	MR. STANTON: Okay. Thank you. Anybody else? Yes, Ms.
16	Gevers?
17	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 035: Uh-huh.
18	MR. STANTON: Is it Geevers (phonetic pronunciation) or Gevers?
19	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 035: Gevers.
20	MR. STANTON: Gevers. How do you know about firearms?
21	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 035: I have had a CCW, but I have let it
22	lapse since my husband's passed.
23	MR. STANTON: Okay. Was that here in Clark County?
24	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 035: Yes.
25	MR. STANTON: And what you carried was, I'm assuming a

1	firearm?
2	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 035: Yes.
3	MR. STANTON: Was it a revolver or semi-automatic?
4	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 035: Revolver.
5	MR. STANTON: Did you shoot on a regular basis?
6	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 035: Used to.
7	MR. STANTON: Okay. And because you don't, you wisely
8	decided not to still carry if
9	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 035: Correct.
10	MR. STANTON: if you don't actively shoot?
11	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 035: Correct. Correct.
12	MR. STANTON: Thank you very much. Front row, by show of
13	hands, active familiarity with firearms. If you could pass it up, I think this is all
14	the way to
15	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 093: 093. Arian Tassy.
16	MR. STANTON: Is it Tassy?
17	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 093: Tashy (phonetic pronunciation).
18	MR. STANTON: Tassy. Now, I want to pronounce it correct. Is it
19	Tassy?
20	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 093: Tashi (phonetic pronunciation).
21	MR. STANTON: No, I want to pronounce it correctly.
22	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 093: Tassy.
23	MR. STANTON: Tassy.
24	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 093: Tassy.
25	MR. STANTON: Tassy. How do you know about firearms, Mr.

1	Tassy?
2	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 093: My father had a nine millimeter when
3	I was a child, and he showed me gun safety. And then later as a late teen in
4	Hawaii, in a rural area, rifles and handguns were there.
5	MR. STANTON: Okay.
6	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 093: Little target practice there.
7	MR. STANTON: You knew your father was a or he had a semi-
8	automatic, do you know the difference mechanically, how a revolver is
9	different from a semi-automatic handgun?
10	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 093: Yes.
11	MR. STANTON: Okay. Thank you, sir. If you could pass it down to
12	next, that would be Ms. Hillstead.
13	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 083: Yes.
14	MR. STANTON: Ms. Hillstead, how do you know about firearms?
15	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 083: I keep one for my protection in my
16	house.
17	MR. STANTON: And have you done that for a long period of time?
18	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 083: Yes.
19	MR. STANTON: Hand gun?
20	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 083: Yes.
21	MR. STANTON: Is it a revolver or a semi-automatic?
22	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 083: It's a .357.
23	MR. STANTON: Okay. And that's normally a revolver, although
24	there is, oddly enough, 357 semi, but most people don't have them.
25	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 083: Right.

1	MR. STANTON: It's a revolver, I'm assuming.
2	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 083: Yes.
3	MR. STANTON: Did you take a revolver, or choose a revolver by
4	choice?
5	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 083: My ex-husband gave it to me.
6	MR. STANTON: Okay. Have you ever shot a semi-automatic?
7	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 083: No.
8	MR. STANTON: Do you know the difference between the two?
9	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 083? Yes.
10	MR. STANTON: Okay. Anybody else on the front row?
11	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 087: Yes.
12	MR. STANTON: Okay.
13	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 087: Just basic knowledge of, you know,
14	going out shooting with my ex-husband and my boys.
15	MR. STANTON: Okay. And just for
16	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 087: Recreational.
17	MR. STANTON: and that's Ms. Fernandez, and you're 087.
18	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 087: Yes.
19	MR. STANTON: Okay. So, do you know the difference between a
20	semi-automatic and a revolver?
21	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 087: Yes, but I don't know about calibers.
22	MR. STANTON: Okay. That was actually going to be my very next
23	question. Thank you very much. How about in the front row, I think that starts
24	with Ms. Godwin on the far right. Ms. Godwin, is your number 099?
25	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 099: Correct.

1	MR. STANTON: How are you familiar with firearms?
2	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 099: My significant other owns a hand gun.
3	MR. STANTON: And do you shoot weapons, or have you ever shot
4	them?
5	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 099: Once.
6	MR. STANTON: Okay. The weapon that your significant other has,
7	is it a revolver or semi-automatic, if you know?
8	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 099: I don't know.
9	MR. STANTON: Okay. Well, do you know the difference between
10	the two?
11	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 099: Somewhat.
12	MR. STANTON: Okay. So here is the what I refer to as the idiot's
13	guide to knowing the difference between a semi-automatic and a revolver. At
14	least I thought it was interesting how it's described. It was described to a
15	young child who was in a case of mine, and that was a revolver is a cowboy
16	gun. It's got a wheel that goes around. And a semi-automatic has a slide that
17	goes back and forth. And ejects empty cartridge cases. Do you know which
18	one your significant other has?
19	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 099: It slides.
20	MR. STANTON: It slides, okay. Semi-automatic. Fired one. Other
21	than that, no firearms experience beyond that?
22	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 099: No.
23	MR. STANTON: Thank you very much. Anybody next in that row?
24	That would be, Mr. Jones?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 131: Yes.

25

1	MR. STANTON: Mr. Jones, how do you know about firearms?
2	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 131: My uncle took me shooting.
3	MR. STANTON: Okay. So, kind of a family thing.
4	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 131: Yeah.
5	MR. STANTON: Firearms safety.
6	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 131: Yeah.
7	MR. STANTON: What kind of guns did he teach you firearm safety
8	with?
9	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 131: Long arms and handguns
10	MR. STANTON: Do you know the difference between a semi-
11	automatic and a revolver?
12	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 131: Yes.
13	MR. STANTON: Have you fired both?
14	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 131: No, I haven't shot a revolver.
15	MR. STANTON: You've never shot a revolver?
16	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 131: No.
17	MR. STANTON: But you've shot a semi-automatic?
18	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 131: Yes.
19	MR. STANTON: Are you familiar with the general common
20	calibers that exist here in the United States?
21	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 131: Yes.
22	MR. STANTON: Okay. Thank you very much. Anybody else in
23	that first row? All the way down, I think that's Ms. Stewart?
24	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 158: Yes.
25	MR. STANTON: Can you tell me how you know about firearms?
ı	1

1	MR. STANTON: Ms. Kime, how do you know about firearms?
2	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 940: Well, my husband owns a gun, and we
3	used to go shooting, and skeet shooting, that kind of thing.
4	MR. STANTON: Did you ever skeet shooting is obviously a long
5	gun.
6	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 940: Right.
7	MR. STANTON: Did you ever shoot hand guns?
8	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 940: Yes.
9	MR. STANTON: Did you ever shoot a revolver?
10	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 940: No.
11	MR. STANTON: Did you ever shoot a semi-automatic?
12	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 940: Yes.
13	MR. STANTON: Okay.
14	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 940: Do I know the difference of the
15	calibers? No, I don't.
16	MR. STANTON: Okay. Thank you very much. Anybody else I
17	missed? Okay, thank you. Besides, Mr. Graber, has anybody else here served
18	in the military? By a show of hands? Oh, Mr. Harris. From what you
19	described earlier, correct?
20	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 947: Yes.
21	MR. STANTON: The military police?
22	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 947: Correct.
23	MR. STANTON: Did you do any other job inside the military,
24	besides military police?
25	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 947: Yes, military police is multi-purpose. I

trained tactics, I trained infantry, I trained them how to clear houses. At the same time, I would do law enforcement, patrols. But we went anywhere from KP duty to combat medic.

MR. STANTON: Okay. And as, Mr. Harris, were you assigned to an American military base while you were in the army, in Germany?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 947: Yes.

MR. STANTON: What was the name of the base?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 947: Kaiserslautern, Taylor Barracks,

Mannheim. All of Germany, Heidelberg, Mannheim, Kaiserslautern.

MR. STANTON: So, you moved all around?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 947: Ramstein has been gone, and I'm

MR. STANTON: Oh, so you moved all around.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 947: You jump around. Twenty years overseas is a long time.

MR. STANTON: Okay. Anybody else serve in the military? Okay. Ladies and gentlemen, this is once again, a question I'm going to pose to all of you. In this case, I think any reasonable person will say that there will be testimony and documents that would be deemed graphic or gruesome in nature.

And my question to you is there any member of the prospective panel that does not believe that they could perform that function of jury service? Judge Togliatti talked about the jury is determinative of the facts of any criminal case. And in this case, facts from a particular witness, a doctor, and some photographs are going to be evidence in this case.

My question is, can each and every one of you put aside the emotional aspect of what you will hear and see, and focus on the evidentiary value. What it will tell you about how the victim, Mr. Fleming was killed, and by whom. Can you do that?

PROSPECTIVE JURORS: Yes.

MR. STANTON: Everybody? Finally, Judge Togliatti mentioned about she will give the instructions of law to the jury. Those instructions come in a packet. They're fascinating, really entertaining instructions of law. They will tell you all you need to know about what to apply to the facts in this case, but one thing that they won't do is we won't tell you who to select as a foreperson. That's up to the 12 members of the jury, collectively, to pick one person as the foreperson. There is no additional authority that goes along with that role. They are one of 12, but they perform one function that no one else in the jury does. And that is, they sign the verdict form.

So, my question to all of you, when you look into who you are in your character, sitting in this case, the case where Mr. Glover is charged with first degree murder, with the use of a deadly weapon, if you find that the State has proven its case beyond a reasonable doubt, and the verdict should be guilty, and you're selected foreperson, could each and every one of you sign the verdict form to that effect?

PROSPECTIVE JURORS: Yes.

MR. STANTON: Does anybody have any concerns that they could not? Those are all my general questions. I just have a couple brief questions for a few of you that were individually based upon your questions yesterday. So, if you could just bear with me, I think I can cover these in fairly short order.

Mr. Barnes, you indicated that you had prior federal grand jury service.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 912: Correct.

MR. STANTON: What day of the week did you serve?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 912: Tuesdays.

MR. STANTON: Did you know that there's another federal grand jury that sits for a year, that handles smaller cases, or less complex cases? Were you aware of that? So, you were on the what was referred to as the special grand jury?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 912: Correct.

MR. STANTON: Okay. Is there anything about any cases where might have been -- received instructions of law, that you would have any problem putting that aside?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 912: No, sir.

MR. STANTON: For sure, what happens by your service in the federal grand jury, is that you reviewed and indicted cases under federal law, which are unique. Most of them here, are unique from what you will hear in this courthouse. You understand that, right?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 912: I do.

MR. STANTON: Okay. And no problem in keeping them separate if selected on this jury?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 912: No, sir.

MR. STANTON: Great. Thank you very much. If you could pass it down to Ms. Madrigal. Ms. Madrigal, your prior service and occupation as a nurse, you still are, correct?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 913: Yes.

1	MR. STANTON: Med-Surge?
2	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 913: Yes.
3	MR. STANTON: What other assignments, if any, in the nursing
4	field, did you have?
5	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 913: Home health before this job. That's it.
6	MR. STANTON: Did you ever work in an ER?
7	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 913: I precepted there, when I was in
8	nursing school.
9	MR. STANTON: And is that kind of like residency for nurses?
10	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 913: Yes.
11	MR. STANTON: Okay. And how long did you do that, and where
12	did you do it?
13	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 913: I did that for one year at Desert
14	Springs Hospital.
15	MR. STANTON: Did you ever work on any patients with gunshot
16	wounds?
17	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 913: No.
18	MR. STANTON: Thank you. Would you pass it down to Mr.
19	Graber? Mr. Graber. I'm going to ask you a couple of questions about your
20	marine service. How long were you in the marine corps?
21	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 916: Four years.
22	MR. STANTON: And did you receive a dishonorable discharge or
23	an honorable discharge? Sorry.
24	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 916: I was an honorable.
25	MR. STANTON: Okay. And did you ever serve on any juries or any

1	court martial proceedings while you were in the military?
2	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 916: No.
3	MR. STANTON: Okay. Was that a positive experience?
4	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 916: Yes.
5	MR. STANTON: Thank you, sir. If you could pass it down to Juror
6	badge number is 933. I want to pronounce your name correctly. Is it
7	Dwinell?
8	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 933: Yes.
9	MR. STANTON: Ms. Dwinell, you indicated your employment is
10	with Jeffery Burr, Limited.
11	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 933: Yes
12	MR. STANTON: And that is primarily estate, wills, trusts, kind of
13	thing?
14	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 933: Yes.
15	MR. STANTON: If someone comes in, as I'm sure they do, to the
16	office, possibly seeking representation in a criminal case, is there a referral
17	process within that law firm that you're familiar with?
18	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 933: Not that I'm familiar with, no.
19	MR. STANTON: Okay. That's my only question. Thank you. If you
20	could pass it to Ms. Kime?
21	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 940: Yes.
22	MR. STANTON: Ms. Kime, you mentioned about a relative that
23	was involved in criminal prosecution in another state, in Indiana. Do you
24	remember that yesterday?
25	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 940: My dad.

MR. STANTON: The Judge asked you a question about whether or not there was anything as the result of that, that would cause you a problem sitting in this case. Do you recall that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 940: Yes.

MR. STANTON: My recollection and notes indicate that you didn't have any problem from that.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 940: I do not.

MR. STANTON: Is it something that you knew a lot about, either at the time or since the event took place?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 940: I did not know about it at all. He had called me -- actually he came to Vegas to tell us personally. Like I said, he had divorced my mother many years beforehand, and we were not close to him until he decided to come to Vegas to visit, to tell me. And I did not go to the trial. I did not see the accuser. I didn't -- I didn't have any knowledge. I was very upset, of course, because he is my dad. But he was convicted for 27 years. He got out in September, around 13 years -- you know, after 13 years, they let him out on probation. And we have a relationship now, but I can't -- I mean because he's my dad. I don't know the facts. So, I can't say whether or not he had a just trial or not. I can't answer that.

MR. STANTON: But he did go to trial?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 940: Yes, he did.

MR. STANTON: Clearly, it's another state.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 940: Yeah.

MR. STANTON: It's another law enforcement --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 940: Right.

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. STANTON: organization, than what's dealing with here. In
fact, the charges are not even remotely similar to that here. So, it would see
for most people that at least haven't experienced it, that one could easily say I
can put that aside and judge this case fairly to both sides by listening to the
facts in this courtroom. I'm not sure that it's that easy for people that are very
close to those in that situation, but you seem to have indicated that you think
that you can. Is that accurate?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 940: That is very accurate, because I still have doubts. I don't know. The only -- the only reason why I still have doubts because I wasn't there.

MR. STANTON: Right.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 940: And so, I don't know whether or not he was -- the only who can judge him, to me, is -- is God. So, if he did it, then he's going to be judged by God. I can't judge him. I wasn't there. I didn't see. I didn't go to the trial. I don't know anything. All I know is he's my dad, and I still love him.

MR. STANTON: Okay. And I understand that. But as it relates to the question of sitting in this case --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 940: Right.

MR. STANTON: -- it's not going to interfere with your ability to either side the State or --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 940: Absolutely not. One thing -- it has nothing to do with this -- with this case.

MR. STANTON: Okay.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 940: That's separate. That is -- that was a

different case, and I didn't even -- I don't know anything about it, so I don't know how to -- there's -- it's different. It's totally different, so I don't understand how I could judge this case, you know, compared to what my dad has gone through --

MR. STANTON: Okay.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 940: -- when I wasn't even there.

MR. STANTON: You've answered my question. Thank you very

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 940: You're welcome.

MR. STANTON: If you could pass it down one row, over to Mr. Harris, badge number 947. Mr. Harris, you mentioned in your past two employments, I'm not -- based upon your previous answer about the military police in Germany, my follow-up question is to your job after that. You indicated that there were on occasions that, not only did you testify, but you would come back to the United States to testify. Was that predominantly in federal court?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 940: Yes.

MR. STANTON: Did you ever testify in anything that we refer to as state charges such as this?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 940: No.

MR. STANTON: And you worked there for ten years?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 940: Nine.

MR. STANTON: Okay. Thank you, sir. If you could pass it to Ms. Cardoza, badge number 952. Ms. Cardoza, you said your work as -- you have a bachelor's degree in accounting, and you're an auditor.

1	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 940: Yes.
2	MR. STANTON: What type of work do you do specifically for the
3	city? What do you audit?
4	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 940: Operational audits. So, basically, like
5	the Department of, you know, Parks and Rec, or parking. All those
6	departments.
7	MR. STANTON: And is that something that's done of those
8	departments on a regular basis?
9	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 940: It goes on a cycle.
10	MR. STANTON: Okay. So, it cycles back at a certain time period?
11	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 940: Uh-huh.
12	MR. STANTON: Okay. Do you supervise other employees for the
13	city?
14	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 940: No, it's usually just me.
15	MR. STANTON: Okay. Thank you. If you could pass it to Ms.
16	Farfan, badge number 978. Ma'am, could you tell me a little bit more about
17	what type of medical services you're involved in, currently?
18	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 978: So, currently, I'm a nurse's assistant at
19	a nursing home.
20	MR. STANTON: Okay. And have you, in any of your prior
21	employments in the nursing field, worked in a hospital?
22	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 978: No.
23	MR. STANTON: Have you ever cared for anybody that has suffered
24	a gunshot wound?
25	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 978: No.

1	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 000: Yeah.
2	MR. STANTON: You're a in my world, a fairly young person.
3	Does it cause you any concern to sit on a case of such severity as this?
4	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 000: Not really.
5	MR. STANTON: Besides the weirdness that the same people that
6	prosecuted your friends are prosecuting a case here, does it cause you any
7	concern about being fair to the State?
8	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 000: No.
9	MR. STANTON: You paused for a minute.
10	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 000: Yeah, I had to think about it.
11	MR. STANTON: Okay. Is there anything that's causing you some
12	concern that would make you think long and hard about that?
13	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 000: No.
14	MR. STANTON: You mentioned to Judge Togliatti yesterday, that,
15	in the whole, as the dust settles, maybe over the past couple of years, you
16	believe that they were treated fairly?
17	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 000: Yeah.
18	MR. STANTON: That's accurate?
19	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 000: Yeah.
20	MR. STANTON: They did kind of the old adage, they did the
21	crime, they do the time.
22	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 000: Yeah.
23	MR. STANTON: Sounds like they did it, and hopefully moved on in
24	their life?
25	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 000: Yeah.

so I haven't been part of any of it.

1	MR. STANTON: Okay. Judge Togliatti asked you some questions
2	about ruling on an evidentiary thing during a trial. I want to focus more about
3	jury instructions. I'm sure you are well familiar with a lot in your field. They're
4	going to be probably be different to you in our world. But do you have any
5	problem applying them as instructions of law? It's weird asking an attorney
6	can you follow the law.
7	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 004: Yeah, I don't think there will be any
8	problem.
9	MR. STANTON: Okay. Great. Again, there are some people that
10	sit there and say, you know, look if I was king or queen of the state of Nevada,
11	I would change this law, or think that this law is archaic, something like that.
12	But no problems as far as you go?
13	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 004: No.
14	MR. STANTON: Okay. Thank you. If you could pass it to Mr.
15	Harrell.
16	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 030: Harrell.
17	MR. STANTON: Harrell. Badge number 030.
18	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 030: It's Harrell.
19	MR. STANTON: Harrell?
20	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 030: Yes, sir.
21	MR. STANTON: Okay. Sorry. First question, is you kind of have
22	two jobs, as I understand it?
23	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 030: I have one job. It's a primary job. The
24	other is just a it's an add-on.

MR. STANTON: Okay. Okay.

1	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 030: It's not local, it's federal.
2	MR. STANTON: Okay. And was that back in Virginia or
3	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 030: It was in Artesia.
4	MR. STANTON: Okay. As a result of that, you mentioned some
5	aspect of your firearms. That's the current aspect of your use and familiarity
6	with firearms: is that correct?
7	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 030: I still, recreationally.
8	MR. STANTON: Okay. So, both?
9	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 030: Yes, sir.
10	MR. STANTON: Do you carry on a regular basis, both when you fl
11	and when you add-on?
12	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 030: It's selective, and it's also limitations -
13	MR. STANTON: Okay.
14	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 030: to the carry.
15	MR. STANTON: Okay. If you could pass it to Ms. Gevers. Badge
16	number 035. Now, you mentioned that you had, I think two stepchildren?
17	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 035: Yes.
18	MR. STANTON: What the judge asked you the age. What do
19	they do?
20	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 035: Nichole's 39, and she's a I don't
21	know what exactly her title. She works for Freeman. She puts together
22	conventions.
23	MR. STANTON: Okay. And is that is there two children or just
24	one?
25	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 035: Two children.

1	MR. STANTON: Okay.
2	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 035: The second one is 28. My son,
3	Brandon, and he is a grower in the state of Colorado. Licensed grower.
4	MR. STANTON: Okay. Well, it seems to be a burgeoning business
5	because now that's three people here that have had direct involvement in
6	employment. Is there anything besides the nature of it that is a concern of
7	yours?
8	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 035: Concern of mine?
9	MR. STANTON: Yeah.
10	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 035: No, I don't know anything about it.
11	MR. STANTON: Okay. Okay. And that's for medicinal and the
12	lawful purposes
13	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 035: Yes. Uh-huh.
14	MR. STANTON: Okay. Thank you very much. If you could pass
15	the microphone up to one row, if I could go down to Mr is it Chiesi?
16	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 048: Chiesi.
17	MR. STANTON: Chiesi. Mr. Chiesi is badge number 048. Mr.
18	Chiesi, you said you were a civil engineer. Can you tell me what type of
19	projects you worked on as a civil engineer?
20	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 048: My degree was in civil engineering.
21	And then I was project engineer for eight years in West Virginia. We
22	developed underground coal mining tunneling work. And then for the next 20
23	years, I was involved in oil refinery and chemical plant construction.
24	MR. STANTON: And was that in Minnesota?
25	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 048: It was in West Virginia, Pennsylvania,

1	Ohio, Tennessee, Texas, and Minnesota.
2	MR. STANTON: Okay.
3	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 048: My last my last assignment was in
4	Minnesota, is where I
5	MR. STANTON: Oh, I see. So, you kind of bounced around?
6	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 048: Yeah, I lived in Ohio for 20 years, but I
7	traveled the last probably five years, to travel for work. Mainly it was Ohio, the
8	last
9	MR. STANTON: So, in any of those occupations, were you a
10	supervisor?
11	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 048: Yes.
12	MR. STANTON: How many people did you supervise, say most
13	the most people at any given time?
14	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 048: Usually six.
15	MR. STANTON: Was that also in performance evaluation?
16	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 048: Yes.
17	MR. STANTON: Also include hiring and firing?
18	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 048: No.
19	MR. STANTON: Not even
20	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 048: Well, the firing, I I
21	MR. STANTON: Okay. Thank you, sir. Jump to Ms. Williams. Car
22	you explain to me, if you could, what precisely you do at Amazon?
23	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 163: Oh, I'm a picker. So, I drive a pick
24	MR. STANTON: Okay.
25	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 163: and, basically, we get an order on

process seems to go on and on and on. And it's -- you know, it's just the order

25

1	hands?
2	THE COURT: Ms. Kime? Can you hand the mic back to Ms. Kime?
3	MR. BASHOR: Thank you, Your Honor.
4	THE COURT: I don't know if you saw her.
5	MR. BASHOR: I didn't. You had a similar experience?
6	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 940: Yeah, I was shocked.
7	MR. BASHOR: And as I asked Ms. Williams, has that shock kind of
8	waned?
9	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 940: Absolutely, yes. It's more serious it
10	a serious, you know, allegation, so, yes.
11	MR. BASHOR: Okay. As Judge Togliatti has indicated, these are
12	just accusations. And the reason we're here is that because Mr. Glover denies
13	doing anything. And he's done that by pleading not guilty, right? That's why
14	we're having a trial. Has anyone personally heard of a case, whether in the
15	news or on the television, or the media, where someone was accused of a
16	crime they did not commit? And I'm not going to belabor ten of you, but how
17	about Mr. Chiesi?
18	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 048: Chiesi.
19	MR. BASHOR: Yeah, if we could pass the microphone forward.
20	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 048: I I don't remember the details on the
21	case. I just remember that over some years ago, I remember reading or
22	hearing about the case.
23	MR. BASHOR: So, you would agree it happens?
24	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 048: Yes.

MR. BASHOR: And as I'm sure that every -- the people that are

barred in this room, and the Judge, and everyone have a great affinity for the system working, but we -- it's not perfect, right?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 048: Correct.

MR. BASHOR: Anybody else have any specific case they can think of off the top of their heads? You know, because I read the paper like Mr. Chiesi, and I'm not going to be able to memorize the details either, but anybody have any more specific case? Okay.

What about -- forget about crime for a second. Forget about -- anyone here accused of something they didn't do? Something like, I don't know, eating the last cookie. Right? And we can agree that being accused of something you didn't do, even if it's something as simple as taking the last cookie could be fairly uncomfortable, right? Especially if it's false. So, and so ate the last cookie.

I'm not going to belabor this too much because the Judge has talked to you a little bit about it, and so has Mr. Stanton. But we've talked about the presumption of innocence, right? We all understand that if we all got up and went to the deliberation room right now, you've heard no evidence whatsoever and, therefore, if you had to fill out that verdict form right now, you would have to mark the not guilty box, right? Anyone disagree with that? Anybody -- and you got to be honest here, you took that oath, remember. Anybody walk in and say, whooh, he must have done something? Anybody have that reaction? Show no hands. Good. Good.

Mr. Stanton and the Judge also talked about the burden of proof in this case, and it rests with these two gentlemen here because they are the State of Nevada and that the accuser is the prover. Everybody agree with

not understand that? No hands.

We've heard a lot about Constitutional Rights and the State's right to a fair trial, and a guilty verdict if they meet their burden. There's a right that hasn't been discussed yet, and that is that Shawn does not have to testify. He could sit there throughout the entire trial and not testify. Does anyone believe that he should have to testify? No hands. Does anybody believe it sure would be nice if he testified? No hands. Mr. Graber.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 916: Yes.

MR. BASHOR: There's a microphone nearby. Can you think of some reasons why a lawyer might ask his client not to testify?

MR. STANTON: Your Honor, I'm going to object to the form of the question.

THE COURT: Can I see counsel at the bench?

[Sidebar begins at 12:28]

MR. STANTON: Actually, my objection is two-fold. It's both to the form and to the substance. The question counsel asked was can you think of some reasons why an attorney would advise their client not to testify. I think that's a completely irrelevant question in voir dire at any time. The only inquiry is what he's --

THE COURT: Why a defendant might not --

MR. STANTON: Right.

THE COURT: -- do that.

MR. STANTON: The reasons why --

THE COURT: It's not your decision, you're implying it is,

MR. BASHOR: Okay.

<sup>24</sup> ||so --

1	THE COURT: I would ask you to rephrase. But you can certainly
2	ask about him.
3	MR. BASHOR: Okay.
4	THE COURT: Not him, personally.
5	MR. BASHOR: I understand.
6	THE COURT: A defendant.
7	MR. BASHOR: Right. Yeah.
8	THE COURT: Sure.
9	[Sidebar ends at 12:28 p.m.]
10	MR. BASHOR: Allow me to rephrase. Can you think of a reason
11	why a defendant any defendant may not testify?
12	PROSPECTIVE JUROR GRABER: Self-incrimination or failure to
13	include or exclude information. It may paint a picture that's not positive for
14	their case.
15	MR. BASHOR: Okay, what about nervousness? Could that be a
16	reason?
17	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 916: Sure.
18	MR. BASHOR: Public speaking issues?
19	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 916: Yes.
20	MR. BASHOR: That sort of thing? Can we pass the mic to Mr.
21	Jones, please? Mr. Jones, I'm going to be honest, I'm picking you because
22	you're 19. Okay.
23	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 131: Okay.
24	MR. BASHOR: You've indicated that are you would you
25	describe yourself as kind of shy?

1	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 131: Yes.
2	MR. BASHOR: Trouble talking with strangers?
3	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 131: Yes.
4	MR. BASHOR: Trouble talking with strangers that are double,
5	maybe no offense, triple your age?
6	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 131: Yes.
7	MR. BASHOR: So, let's say you're one of the 12, and you're the
8	young guy. Do you think you'd be able, on a case this serious, to go back
9	there and express your opinion?
10	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 131: No.
11	MR. BASHOR: Why not?
12	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 131: Because it's hard for me to talk to
13	people and stuff like that.
14	MR. BASHOR: Okay. Is it the nature of this particular case, or is
15	it
16	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 131: It's just it's just me in general.
17	MR. BASHOR: Okay. Let's see. I'm trying to find more of the
18	young ones.
19	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 131: I wasn't satisfactory.
20	MR. BASHOR: No, no. Oh, no.
21	THE COURT: Very nervous.
22	MR. BASHOR: I don't know maybe you can express your opinion
23	okay. How about Mr. Perri? Will you pass that mic over here? You're a little
24	older.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 000: Yeah.

25

MR. BASHOR: But still one of the younger folks. Would you agree?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 000: Yeah.

MR. BASHOR: Did you hear my questions I asked Mr. Jones?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 000: Yeah.

MR. BASHOR: So, if you're the young guy, and you're back there with people who have had far more life experience than you, would you be able to express your opinion among strangers?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 000: Probably.

MR. BASHOR: Even if those 11 strangers believed one way, and you were the only one that believed the other way?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 000: Yeah.

MR. BASHOR: Anybody here just a follower? That just -- they're not going to be able to speak up? Anybody here just -- they don't care about the opinions of others? No hands.

You're going to hear testimony from police officers and listen to their testimony and assess their credibility. And we've already heard from the Judge about, just by virtue of the fact, a police officer is a police officer, would you find them more or less credible. That's not what this question is about. But you are going to have to assess the credibility of police officers. And to assess the quality of their investigation.

I have a five-year-old son who loves to dress up as a police officer, arrest his little buddies, throw them in jail, with no investigation whatsoever.

That's great on the playground. Kind of hilarious to watch. But everyone agrees that this is a courtroom. Yes?

PROSPECTIVE JURORS: Yes.

MR. BASHOR: And that even though these individuals are police officers, you're going to have to be able to assess their credibility and assess the quality of their investigation. Does everybody agree?

PROSPECTIVE JURORS: Yes.

MR. BASHOR: Does anybody think that they can't do that? No hands. Mr. Harris, you probably can guess why I'm picking on you. We're talking about police officers, and you were a military police officer, right?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 947: Yes.

MR. BASHOR: And is there anything about your experience of being a police officer and having to assess the credibility and quality of an investigation of the officers in this case. Is there going to be anything about your experience where you go back there and say, they over did it, or they didn't do enough? That kind of thing, based on your experience?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 947? No, based off the facts of the case, they either did their job or they didn't.

MR. BASHOR: Right. And they have different protocols and policies than, say military policemen.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 947: Absolutely.

MR. BASHOR: I've, to be 100 percent honest with you, gone back and forth about asking about this, all night, but I think to be fair, I got to ask about it. And the 32 of you, with the exception of one, don't look like him, right. Mr. Glover's African American. Is there anything about the fact that he's an African American that's going to cloud your judgment, or have some kind of assumption or pre- conceived notion about his behavior? Anything like that

 at all? Anyone?

UNIDENTIFIED PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Absolutely not.

MR. BASHOR: Now's the time to say it. I mean you're under oath. I don't relish in asking about this, but, unfortunately, I think in this day and age, it's still relevant. No hands. Thank you.

I don't know this to be a fact, but in murder cases, in my experience, and again, I don't want to speak necessarily for Mr. Stanton, but I'm sure in his experience, sometimes there are quite a few individuals in the gallery during a murder case. People who are relatives, friends, of either side.

Is there anything about their presence that would you find intimidating? Is anybody going to be intimidated by the gallery? Anyone going to say well, the Defense has 20 people in support and the State has 10, therefore, the Defense is right? Anybody going to do that? No, right? And vise-versa? No hands. Will you pass the microphone to Ms. Mazzei? Are all killings the same?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 004: No.

MR. BASHOR: And you might imagine why I'm picking on you.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 004: I've got an idea.

MR. BASHOR: And so -- but you would agree that there's a spectrum of killings, anything from a pure accident all the way to a premeditated deliberate first degree count?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR 004: Yes.

MR. BASHOR: And as Mr. Stanton discussed you're going to get a packet of instructions that come from the Judge that may or may not define different kinds of killings on that spectrum. Does anybody say a killing is a

1	killing is a killing, and they're not going to be able to take a look at those
2	instructions?
3	UNIDENTIFIED PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.
4	MR. BASHOR: Does everybody agree that not all killings are the
5	same?
6	UNIDENTIFIED PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
7	MR. BASHOR: Everyone seems to be shaking their head. Anyone
8	disagree with that?
9	THE COURT: No positive responses.
10	MR. BASHOR: Mr. Stanton asked quite a bit about hand guns and
11	long guns. And I'm not at all going to attempt to get into a Second
12	Amendment debate with anyone, but guns are all over the media. And there
13	are people that hold strong opinions on both ends of ownership, types, to no
14	one should ever touch a gun, have a gun. Is there anything about the fact that
15	we know that a gun was used in this case, that's going to make anybody
16	uncomfortable at all? No responses.
17	Almost done, folks. Can we pass the mic to Mr. Huntsman? To the
18	back. Mr. Huntsman, you indicated and this individual may or may not
19	testify but you were a friend of Scott Hafen?
20	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 923: Correct.
21	MR. BASHOR: Do you talk about work?
22	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 923: No.
23	MR. BASHOR: Okay. So, it's a personal relationship. Work
24	doesn't really come up?
25	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 923: Correct.

haven't said? Anyone? Anything that, for whatever reason, our exhaustive list

25

MR. BASHOR: And did it go to trial or --

1	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 083: No.
2	MR. BASHOR: Okay. And so, you don't hold any animosity
3	towards the State?
4	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 083: No.
5	MR. BASHOR: Anybody else?
6	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 086: I got one thing, I think related
7	MR. BASHOR: Can you say your name, please?
8	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 086: Bryan Blake, 086.
9	MR. BASHOR: Yes.
10	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 086: To your previous question.
11	MR. BASHOR: Sure.
12	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 086: I don't know a juror, any of these
13	jurors, but somebody works for Jeffery Burr & Associates.
14	MR. BASHOR: Uh-huh.
15	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 086: Jeffery Burr is my stepfather-in- law.
16	MR. BASHOR: Okay. Good to know.
17	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 086: I didn't know if I should bring it up or
18	not.
19	MR. BASHOR: Thank you. Anybody else? Mr. Vinluan.
20	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 581: Yes. So, I have a close friends that's in
21	law enforcement, but he's in the state of California.
22	MR. BASHOR: Okay.
23	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 581: FBI agent.
24	MR. BASHOR: Do you talk about his work a lot?
25	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 581: What's that?

1	MR. BASHOR: Do you talk to him about him about work a lot?
2	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 581: No.
3	MR. BASHOR: Okay. Anything about that relationship that is
4	going to affect your ability to
5	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 581: No.
6	MR. BASHOR: assess the credibility of a detective or a police
7	officer?
8	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 581: No.
9	MR. BASHOR: Thank you for bringing it up. Ms. Williams.
10	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 163: I don't know if it matters, but I've
11	known two people personally that have been shot. So, I don't know if that
12	matters. My ex-husband. Didn't know him at the time, but found out about
13	the information later on, when we got together. My ex-brother-in-law was
14	shot and killed. And that was a drive-by. Both situations were drive-by.
15	MR. BASHOR: Okay. Obviously, we have a murder case here
16	where the allegations was that somebody was shot to death. Do those
17	experiences kind of weigh on you?
18	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 163: No.
19	MR. BASHOR: Are those experiences and the emotion, I'm sure
20	you feel behind those experiences?
21	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 163: Yes, there was emotion in regard
22	well, not so much my ex-husband.
23	MR. BASHOR: Right.
24	PROSPECTIVE JUROR 163: But my my brother-in-law, only

because we got the call at 2:00 something in the morning. So, that -- honestly,

1	MR. STANTON: Yes.
2	THE COURT: So, you can collect your thoughts and chit-chat to
3	
	speed up the
4	MR. STANTON: Are you going to bring them in and then we pass
5	the sheet back and forth?
6	THE COURT: If you need me to, I will. I was just thinking we could
7	you know, give them a little break
8	MR. STANTON: Yeah, we can
9	THE COURT: and do some of preliminary thoughts.
10	MR. STANTON: Yeah, yeah.
11	THE COURT: I assume you wanted them in the room, so you can
12	look at them?
13	MR. BASHOR: Yes, I'd prefer yeah.
14	MR. STANTON: Yeah, I don't have a preference.
15	MR. BASHOR: I would prefer, because that's how I
16	THE COURT: Okay.
17	MR. BASHOR: Okay.
18	THE COURT: So, I'll give them a short break.
19	MR. BASHOR: Yes.
20	[Sidebar ends at 12:44 p.m.]
21	THE COURT: Okay. Ladies and gentlemen, we're going to take a
22	short recess. I'm going to ask that you come back at 1:00 and then we're goin
23	to finish the jury selection process. And those of you that will be selected to
24	serve should know probably by 1:30 at the latest.

Okay. So, yesterday I neglected to mention to you that the lawyers

25

and the -- all persons involved in this case, it doesn't matter whether it's court staff, lawyers, witnesses, you know, they cannot speak to the ladies and gentlemen of the jury because to do so might contaminate your verdict.

So, if you're in the hallway, and you see a lawyer and they are scurrying away from you, or avoiding eye contact, it's not because they're being rude or anti-social, they are bound by ethics and the law, not to speak to you. And mostly also because I would rock their world.

So, during this recess you can talk about anything you want, but you can't talk about the case or anyone who has anything to do with this case. If you could meet back up with my Marshal, Ramsey, at 1:00 in the predesignated area, we're going to bring you back in and then finish the selection part of the jury selection. Okay.

THE MARSHAL: All rise. The jury is exiting.

[Outside the presence of the jury.]

THE COURT: The record should reflect we're outside the presence of the prospective jury panel. Is there anything you'd like to address outside the presence of the jury? The plan would be to bring them back in at 1:00. I'll let you collect your notes and thoughts. Do your exercise or waive peremptory challenges on the form, when you get it. Back and forth while they're in the room. And then cross reference the list with your notes before I call out the names of the jurors who will be seated in the case.

Then I was thinking I would read the introduction to the trial of the case and then excuse them, because it has like all the preliminary nuggets of, you know, you have to do parking, you know, this is how the trial is going to work. Blah, blah, blah.

1	MR. STANTON: That's fine with the State.
2	MR. BASHOR: No problem, Your Honor.
3	THE COURT: Okay, and then we can hear and then we can take a
4	lunch break?
5	MR. STANTON: Yeah, because I just I meant to bring one case
6	over and copies for the Court and Defense Counsel
7	THE COURT: Yeah, we're not going to do argument until after.
8	MR. STANTON: Yeah. Okay. I brought the wrong case, so.
9	THE COURT: So, I'm thinking yeah, I've got to give them a break
10	and
11	MR. STANTON: Sure.
12	THE COURT: so that's the plan.
13	MR. BASHOR: Okay.
14	THE COURT: Be back at 1:00.
15	MR. STANTON: Okay.
16	MR. BASHOR: Thank you.
17	[Recess at 12:47 p.m., recommencing at 1:02 p.m.]
18	THE MARSHAL: All rise. The jurors are entering.
19	[In the presence of the prospective jurors.]
20	THE COURT: Counsel, will you stipulate to the presence of the
21	prospective jury panel?
22	MR. STANTON: Yes, Your Honor.
23	MR. BASHOR: Yes, Your Honor.
24	THE COURT: All right. All counsel and parties are present. The
25	record should reflect that this is the time for the State and the Defense to
I.	

1	MR. STANTON: It's the waive, but I don't know where you want to
2	put it.
3	THE COURT: Just remember that one is State waived or whatever.
4	MR. STANTON: Okay.
5	[Sidebar ends at 1:11 p.m.]
6	[Pause]
7	THE COURT: So, State, I believe your eighth?
8	MR. STANTON: Yes.
9	[Pause]
10	THE COURT: The parties' ninth and final preemptory challenge.
11	[Pause]
12	THE COURT: Thank you. Can I see counsel at the bench? Actually,
13	just in the hallway just for this with your list. Be right back.
14	[Off the record at 1:18 p.m.]
15	THE COURT: Okay. Ladies and gentlemen, we're going to call out
16	I'm going to we, being me, call out the names of the jurors who are going
17	to be seated in this case. Before I do so, I want to extend my gratitude on
18	behalf of the attorneys, and the parties, and the Court. It's been a long jury
19	selection, two days long. And so, I appreciate that, you know, this isn't easy to
20	answer all of these personal questions, and I appreciate your professionalism
21	and courtesy.
22	If I call out your name, you have to stay. You're going to be sworn
23	and seated in the case, okay? So, Madrigal, Graber, Dwinell, Stettler, Cardoza,
24	Vinluan, Farfan, Mazzei, Morgan, Gevers, Chiesi, Williams, Rayna, and Jones.
	1

The rest of you are excused, with the thanks of the Court.

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

[Excused jurors exit the courtroom at 1:20 p.m.]

THE COURT: Okay. So, here's how this works now. Now that you're recovering from the surprise, you're going to be rearranged and given different names. So, Ms. Madrigal, you're going to sit in that first seat. Your new name is Juror Number 1 for the entire trial. Graber, you sit in the next seat. You're Juror Number 2. Morgan, just move down, then Morgan -- I mean, Ms. Dwinell, excuse me, you're Juror Number 3.

JUROR NUMBER 9: Okay.

THE COURT: No, Dwinell.

JUROR NUMBER 9: Oh, I thought you said Morgan.

THE COURT: I did.

JUROR NUMBER 9: Oh, okay.

THE COURT: I just called her by her fast name --

JUROR NUMBER 9: Okay.

THE COURT: -- by mistake.

JUROR NUMBER 9: Okay.

THE COURT: I meant Dwinell, but I was looking at Morgan at the time. Stettler. Sir, you are Juror Number 4 in seat number 4.

JUROR NUMBER 4: Okay.

THE COURT: Ms. Cardoza, you are Juror Number 5 in seat number 5. Mr. Vinluan, you are Juror Number 6 in seat number 6. Farfan, you are Juror Number 7 in seat -- in that first seat right behind you. Ms. Mazzei, you are Juror Number 8. Ms. Morgan, you are Juror Number 9. Gevers is Juror Number 10. Chiesi is 11. Williams is 12. Mr. Reyna, you're right here in this first seat, 13. Mr. Jones, come on over.

Okay. So, all the peremptory challenges, having been exercised or waived, I'm going to now have you stand up, raise your right hand, and take the juror's oath.

## [The jury was sworn]

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. Please be seated. Is there any juror that was unable to take the juror's oath for any reason? Okay. I saw you all took the oath. Thank you.

Okay. So, here's how this is going to work. I'm going to read you an introduction to the trial of the case. It basically tells you how this is going to work, give you some practical information, that kind of thing. It'll take me about -- I don't know -- 20 minutes or so, and then I'm going to let you go for the day because we have some matters to attend to outside of your presence.

I'm going to read to you the introduction to the trial of the case. If there's anything you don't understand, or you want an explanation for, when I'm done reading it, just feel free to ask. Okay.

All right. Ladies and gentlemen, you are admonished that no juror may state to a fellow juror any fact related to this case as of his or her own knowledge, and if you discover during the course of this trial or after you retire to go to the deliberation room that any other juror has personal knowledge of the facts of this case, you have to disclose such situation to myself in the absence of the other jurors. This means that if you learn, during the course of the trial, that you were acquainted with any of the facts or witnesses, and you didn't know it at the time or you didn't previously disclose that relationship to me, you have to tell me.

Now, the jurors are always going to communicate to the Court

through the Marshal. During the course of this trial, I told you before, the attorneys, court personnel, and any -- any court personnel or attorneys are not permitted to converse with the ladies and gentlemen of the jury, because to do so might contaminate your verdict. They're not being antisocial, but really the only person that can speak to a juror is the Marshal, and that's why jurors tend to hang together outside as they're in a trial, in a group, because they're not supposed to be talking to anybody but each other. And even when they do talk to each other, they can't talk about the case.

So, you are admonished that you are not to do any independent investigation of the law or the facts on your own. So, what does that mean, practically speaking? That means you can't visit the scene. Okay. You can't go like on Sunday and go to the scene. You can't Google Earth it, okay? You can't use the internet and do independent research of the law or the facts.

Everything that I'm about to read to you, if you think about it in context of what we're trying to do here and why this is so important, these rules exist to provide these people a level playing field, right? The evidence in this case, which is the testimony of the witnesses and the exhibits introduced into evidence are what a jury has to decide the case on. The jury doesn't decide the case based upon one juror on the internet, or somebody out on a smoker's patio, or some witness on a cell phone talking to somebody, you don't even know who it is, that says something, right, because that's outside our level playing field.

And so, these people just spent two days picking the jurors out of the entire group of 75 people, plus 30 I had waiting in the wings today, because they think you are going to follow your oath, you're going to take this

as serious as they need you to take it, right, and do what you promised to do just now when you took the oath.

And so, that's -- you know, while it may not feel like it right now, a very big honor and responsibility, okay. That's a compliment to you. And because I know you're going to follow these rules, I lay them out very carefully and slowly, and then if you have any questions, I'll answer them.

So, the introduction to the trial in the case that I'm giving you right now is not a substitute for the detailed instructions on the law, which I will give you at the close of the case before you retire to consider your verdict.

Now, this is a criminal case commenced by the State of Nevada, which you already hear me refer to them as State versus Shawn Glover, the Defendant. The case is based on an indictment or amended indictment. The Clerk will now read the charges in the indictment to the ladies and gentlemen of the jury and state the plea of the Defendant to the charges in the inditement.

THE CLERK: District Court, Clark County, Nevada, the State of Nevada, Plaintiff versus Shawn Glover, aka Shawn Lynn Glover, Jr., case number C-16-312448-1, Department 9, amended indictment.

State of Nevada, County of Clark. The Defendant above named, Shawn Glover, aka Shawn Lynn Glover, Jr., accused by the Clark County grand jury of the crimes of murder with use of a deadly weapon, felony NRS 200.010, 200.030, 193.165-NOC 50001; assault with a deadly weapon, felony NRS 200.471-NOC 50201; discharge of a firearm from or within a structure or vehicle, felony NRS 202.287-NOC 51445, committed at and within the County of Clark, State of Nevada, on or about the 1st day of January 2016, as follows:

Count 1. Murder with use of a deadly weapon, did willfully,

unlawfully, feloniously, and with malice aforethought, kill Patrick Fleming, a human being, with use of a deadly weapon, to-wit: a handgun, by shooting at and into the body of the said, Patrick Fleming, the said killing having been willful, deliberate, and premediated.

Count 2. Assault with a deadly weapon, did willfully, unlawfully, feloniously, and intentionally place another person in reasonable apprehension of immediate bodily harm, and/or did willfully and unlawfully attempt to use physical force against another person, to-wit: Miranda Sutton with the use of a deadly weapon, to-wit: a handgun, by pointing said handgun at the said, Miranda Sutton.

Count 3. Discharge of firearm from or within a structure or vehicle, did willfully, unlawfully, maliciously, and feloniously, while in or under a structure located at 4032 Smokey Fog, apartment number 201, North Las Vegas, discharge a firearm within or from the structure while being within an area designated by the city or county ordinance as a populated area for the purpose of prohibiting the discharge of weapons.

Dated this 31st day of July 2018, Steven B. Wolfson, Clark County
District Attorney by David Stanton, Chief Deputy District Attorney, to which the
Defendant has entered pleas of not guilty.

THE COURT: All right. This case is based on that charging document, which has been read to you by the Clerk. You should distinctly understand that that charging document is simply a list of charges, and it is not in itself any evidence of the allegations it contains. The Defendant has plead not guilty to the charges. The State, therefore, has the burden of proving each of the essential elements of each charge beyond a reasonable

doubt. As the Defendant sits there now, he is not guilty. The purpose of this trial is to determine whether the State will meet that burden.

Under our system of criminal procedure, you are the sole judge of the facts. You are to determine the facts from the testimony you hear and the other evidence, including exhibits introduced in Court. It is up to you to determine which inferences may be properly drawn from the evidence.

Now, the parties may sometimes present objections to certain testimony or other exhibits. It is the duty of a lawyer to object to evidence that he believes is not being properly offered, and you should not be prejudice in any way against a party who makes objections on behalf of the party he represents.

Now, at times, I may sustain certain objections or instruct you to disregard certain testimony or exhibits. You must not consider any evidence to which an objection has been sustained or which I have instructed you to disregard.

So, how does that work practically speaking? Well, a lawyer asked a question of the witness. Questions are not evidence in the case. Questions are to be considered only as they supply the meaning to the answer of the witness, which is the evidence in the case. The testimony of the witness under oath is the evidence in the case.

So, if there's a question and the witness blurts out an answer because there's an objection going, and the question, and the answer, and the person doesn't, you know, do this for a living or whatever, they just answer the question. If I sustain the objection, that means that you cannot consider the testimony or the question, because I've sustained it. If I overrule it, you

can consider the testimony and, obviously, the question because that gives meaning to the testimony. If I instruct you to disregard certain testimony or exhibits, you cannot consider that in your deliberation.

Additionally, anything you may see or hear outside the courtroom is not evidence in the case and must be disregarded. Additionally, if you see or hear anything about this case outside the courtroom, it's your responsibility, and you took an oath and promised all of us that you would let my Marshal know.

Now, you're not to be influenced in any degree by any personal feeling of sympathy for or prejudice against either the State or the Defendant. Both sides are entitled to the same fair and impartial consideration. In considering the weight and value of the testimony of any witness, you may take into consideration the appearance, attitude, and behavior of the witness; the interest in the witness in the outcome of the case, if any; the inclination of the witness to speak truthfully or not; and the probability or improbability of the witness's statements; and all of the facts and circumstances in evidence. Thus, you may give the testimony of any witness just such weight and value as you believe the testimony is entitled to receive.

Now, there are two kinds of evidence, direct and circumstantial. Direct evidence is testimony by a witness about what that witness personally saw, heard, or did. Circumstantial evidence is testimony or exhibits which are proof of a particular fact from which, if proven, you may infer the existence of a second fact, which sounds all complicated and legal-like but, really, it's simple.

Same example in every case I always give. If it's cold tonight, and

 cloudy, and you go out to lock up, and you're on your porch, and you can see your own breath in the air and there's big, fat, white flakes falling from the sky, and you reach out your hand and a big, fat, white flake falls on your fingertips and it's wet and cold to the touch, that is direct evidence that it is snowing. You can see it, you can feel it, you could probably even smell it.

If, however, it's a balmy 57 when you go out tonight, which we know isn't going to happen, but let's just pretend. It's 57 degrees and everything is fine. You lock up at 6:00 at night. You go to bed. Twelve hours later, you go out to the porch and there is three feet of snow on the ground as far as the eye can see all the way across the valley on your commute to work. That is circumstantial evidence that it snowed overnight. The law permits you to give equal weight to both kinds of evidence, but it is for you to decide how much weight to give to any evidence.

Now, just like questions of the attorneys are not evidence in the case, opening statements and closing arguments of the attorneys are not evidence in the case. The arguments are intended to help you in understanding the evidence and applying the law to the evidence, but the statements themselves are not evidence in the case.

Additionally, any ruling, remark, or comment which I may make during the course of this trial is not intended in any way to indicate my opinion as to the facts of the case or to indicate my opinion as to what weight you should give to the testimony of any witness.

I may even find it necessary to ask a question of a witness, and if I do, it is for the purpose of bringing information to be brought -- that I think should be brought out and not in any way to give my opinion or indicate any

opinion about the weight that you should give to the testimony of any witness. I may also find it necessary to admonish a lawyer. And if I do, you should not so prejudice against a lawyer or their client because I have found it necessary to admonish him.

Additionally, you should understand that you will be given a limited opportunity to ask questions of any witness called to testify in this case. A question may be asked only in the following manner. Once the witness is done testifying and the examination by the parties is done, I will look to you and I will say, do any of the jurors have any questions you wish the Court to ask the witness. If you do, you have to take your juror notebook on a clean sheet of juror notebook paper, which isn't even full size as it is, but it must be a full-size juror notebook paper, you have to write your juror number on it -- 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and so on -- and you write the question as if I'm asking the witness the question.

Once I've determined that anybody has a question, I will step outside into the hallway, and I will discuss the procedural and substantive propriety of the question, which is a fancy way of saying if I think it's properly asked, I'll ask it. And if I don't, I won't. And if I don't, you can't speculate as to what the answer would have been, and you can't discuss the question in the jury deliberation room. Additionally, jurors should not give undue weight to questions -- to answers to questions that they ask, but they should consider that evidence as they do all other evidence in the case.

Also, I've had to kind of draw some lines here. So, here's the lines I've drawn on juror questions.

Number one. If it's not a full sheet of paper, I'm not going to take

it. If I get the equivalent of a Chicklet wrapper with a question on it, then I'm not taking it. Number two. When I cross the threshold of the room, we're done. You're not firing off papers to me in the back while I'm still dealing with the other papers. I just -- it makes me nuts. So, I get to do little things -- little things I can do and that's one of them. I will, however, wait until you're done writing it out. I'll walk out in the hallway ,and then we'll go forward. The attorneys are given the opportunity should they see fit to do any follow-up strictly to juror questions.

Now, until this case is submitted to you, it's of crucial importance that you not discuss it with anyone, even your fellow jurors. That ensures the level playing field that I keep talking about. When you're in the hallway if you want to talk about the weather or talk about your families, talk about whatever you want, but just don't talk about the case or anyone who has anything to do with the case or anything that has anything to do with the case until you're in the jury deliberation room. It's important that you keep an open mind and not decide any issue in the case until you know what the law is, and you've heard the whole case.

Now, we're going to take -- now, that we have the jury selected, tomorrow, for example, I'm going to tell you to come back at 9:00. And we're going to have a regular schedule. We're going to take restroom breaks. We're going to take a lunch break. But if you need a break before we were planning to take one, it's not a problem. Just raise your hand and tell me you need a break, a restroom break or whatever, and I'll take one. If you can't see an exhibit or hear a witness, please raise your hand as an indication.

I don't have any problem with you bringing a beverage with a lid

or a cap or if you want to bring coffee in the morning and whatever. I just can't have you bring in food, okay.

You are welcome during the course of this trial as far as your lunch, we usually -- I try to wait a little bit -- the rush in downtown Las Vegas starts at about 11:30 because lower court -- some of the lower courts start really early. So, I try to push to 12:30 or 1:00 if I can go that far depending on where we're at. If -- and I usually take an hour. You can do a couple of things. My Marshal will give you places that you could go if you don't want to bring something.

If you want to bring something, you hand it to my marshal in the morning, whether it's frozen, and you want to put it in a microwave, there's microwaves in the juror lounge where you could nuke a lunch. Or if you have some, you know, refrigerated lunch bag, he'll put it in the fridge and then at lunch, he'll give it back to you and you can go to the juror lounge. There's a lounge there, I believe you know, with soda machines and, you know, you can just chill out there if you want to. You can go off campus, as I call it, off the RJC and just go sit somewhere else and take a break from this whole thing. That's up to you as long as you don't talk about the case.

So, during this trial, you're going to see people coming in and out handing me things, you're going to see me on the computer, you're going to see me talking to my staff. You're not to draw any inference from that action. I guarantee you 99.99999 percent of the time it has nothing to do with this case. I have thousands of cases, okay, and I can't just disappear from them. So, you're not to draw any inference from that.

It is incredibly important you've been given notebooks, or you will

9

10

11

12

14

13

15 16

17

19

18

20 21

22

23

24

25

be if you haven't yet, to take notes as you see fit of the trial testimony. The reason for that is you're not going to have a transcript to consult at the close of the case, okay. If the jury were to be go back in the jury deliberation room and require to hear testimony again, first of all, in the playback department I record, the jury would have to very carefully describe what's to be played back. The court recorder would have to go in and find the location and cue up her notes. I have to bring everybody in here. Then I have to bring the jury in and do the playback of testimony.

Because those playbacks of testimony are very time-consuming, I encourage you to listen carefully to the testimony the first time around and for that reason, we've given you notebooks. Your notebooks cannot leave the courtroom. So, what happens is you get the notebook in the morning, you have it, you take notes. You leave it in your chair. Nobody sees the juror notebooks even after the verdict is done. After the verdict is done, my Marshall rips out the notes and throws them away. I have never seen the notes from a juror notebook in over 200 trials, okay. They're private to you, but you can't take them out of the room.

You are -- I believe I mentioned yesterday and if you didn't hear it, I don't recall which group or who I mentioned it to, the whole group possibly, your parking just got upgraded. My Marshal is going to give you a map. You are going to park somewhere closer now. We just don't have enough room there for everybody. But once you get seated as a juror, you go to a new parking place that's right across the street much closer. You must -- this is so crucial. Is everyone listening? There is no, I lost my ticket from the parking garage fund, from the county. You've got to save that ticket. You have to

bring it in here so that we can validate it, so you can park for free. Do you understand? Yes. Okay.

So, the trial is going to proceed in the following manner. One of the Deputy District Attorneys will make an opening statement which is an outline that helps you understand what the State expects to prove. Please remember that the opening statements are not evidence in the case. They're simply -- they serve as an introduction to the evidence which the party making the statement intends to prove. Then the Defense may present an opening statement, but they do not have to.

Then the State will present its evidence in its case-in-chief. Any witnesses that are called for the State, the counsel for the Defendant, one of them, may cross-examine the witnesses. Following the State's case, the Defendant may present evidence. And if so, the Deputy District Attorneys, one of them, may cross-examine any Defense witness. However, as I've said, repeatedly, and you've heard during voir dire, the Defendant is not obligated to present any evidence.

After all the evidence has been presented, I will instruct you on the applicable law. After the instructions have been read to you, the lawyers will have the opportunity to present their closing arguments. Closing arguments are not evidence, just as what is said in opening statements by the attorneys are not evidence. The arguments are designed to summarize and interpret the evidence. Since the State has the burden of proving the Defendant guilty beyond a reasonable doubt, they have the right to open and close the final arguments. After the arguments have been completed, then the jury will retire to deliberate on the verdict.

So, do you have any practical questions about how this is going to proceed? We're going to go 9:00 to 5:00 tomorrow. We'll take a morning recess. It's the only day I can start at 9:00 because I don't have any other cases set. Other days I can't, and I'll start a little later. And I apologize to you for that. Yes?

UNIDENTIFIED JUROR: On Monday, do you know what time approximately you're starting if it goes --

THE COURT: We wouldn't start -- 10:30.

UNIDENTIFIED JUROR: Okay. Thank you.

THE COURT: Anybody else have any questions? Okay. So, here's how this works. My Marshal has information on you from Jury Services. He will give you a number for any emergencies. I would just point out that tomorrow morning at 9:00, if you're not here, we're all sitting here staring at your empty seat. So fun. So, please be mindful of that.

I'm about to read to you an admonishment. Nevada law requires that I read this to you at every overnight recess and every restroom break. The first few times I'm going to sit -- I'm going to talk slowly, you know, compared to my usual. And then I'm going to pick up the pace. I'm picking up the pace not because I don't think you're taking it seriously. The opposite, because I know you're taking it seriously, I know you heard it, I know you promise to follow it. And so, I don't need to belabor the whole thing.

One thing I didn't mention is in addition to not doing any independent investigation of the law or the facts, you cannot engage in social media about this case or anything to do with this case. You can't tweet, you can't Snapchat, you can't Twitter, you can't do anything. Not tweeting,

snapping, Instagramming, Facebooking, I don't know. I know there's a million other ones, GroupMeeting, WhatsApping. I could list it forever. You can't do any of it until you're done as a juror. When I discharge you as a juror, you'll be free to say or not say whatever you want, but until then, you made a promise, and we expect you to stick to it.

So, I'm going to read the admonishment which is really me just saying it because I know it by heart. And then I'm going to see you tomorrow at 9:00. You are admonished not to talk or converse among yourselves or with anyone else on any subject connected with this trial. You're not to read, watch, or listen to any report of or commentary on the trial by any person connected with this case or any medium of information, including without limitation, newspapers, television, the internet, or radio. You're not to form or express any opinion on any subject connected with this trial until the case is finally submitted to you.

Mr. Jones, you don't have to stress about this. It's going to be okay. I promise. And if you're worried, you just let me know about anything, and we'll deal with it, okay? So, relax. You're excused.

THE MARSHAL: All rise. The jurors are exiting.

[Outside the presence of the jury.]

THE COURT: The record should reflect we're outside the presence of the jury. Before I let you go for a lunch break and come back to argue whatever you want to argue about, I'm going to take -- first of all, the record should reflect on the peremptory challenge form which will be marked as Court's exhibit first in order number --

THE CLERK: 1.

THE COURT: Yeah. Can you send it to my law clerk?

MR. STANTON: Sure. It's by the California Supreme Court. So, it's one of those really long opinions, but the section that's relevant is only like two pages. So, I didn't want to print out just the relevant sections and everybody goes, well, where's the rest of it. So, it's actually better I'll email it to you, because I think it's like 60 pages long.

THE COURT: Oh, okay. That's fine.

MR. BASHER: Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you. 3:00 then, yes?

MR. BASHER: Yeah.

MR. O'BRIEN: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you.

[Recess at 1:50 p.m., recommencing at 3:04 p.m.]

THE MARSHAL: Remain seated. Come to order. Court is back in session.

[Outside the presence of the jury.]

THE COURT: Okay. This is the time set for -- to continue the hearing outside the presence of the jury on Glover, excuse me, C312448-1. So, same attorneys and the Defendant are present. Do you wish to be heard?

MR. STANTON: Yes, Your Honor. If I could kind of set the table and frame the issue. So, in talking to Mr. Bashor prior to today's proceeding, I inquired of him if he -- if it was his intent to elicit from the two main State's witnesses -- and for the record, that would be Miranda Sutton who is the victim's wife, and Akira Veasley, V-E-A-S-L-E-Y, I believe, who is the stepdaughter of the victim and daughter of Ms. Sutton. They are present at the time of the shooting.

23

24

25

All parties to include Mr. Fleming know the Defendant for some period of time. He was at the home at their -- with their permission. And they had known the Defendant for some period of years. That knowledge includes knowledge of Mr. Glover's past to include, from their perspective, that he was and may still be involved in gang activity, that he's committed more than one murder, and that he has an extensive record and criminal conduct involving acts of violence.

The predicate to all of that is on January 1, where this shooting takes place, initial responding officers and investigating detectives get a statement from both of those witnesses. As I mentioned to the Court earlier, that statement, what I'll call 1.0, gives a generalized, but non-specific description of the events that took place. As I understand --

THE COURT: What do you mean generalized but non-specific? MR. STANTON: For example, they use a nickname by the name of Hatch to describe to detectives who the person that they see inside their home at the time of the shots being fired. Hatch is a nickname of the Defendant. So, they don't use his actual name.

And so, at this juncture, the police aren't told of the actual names as the witnesses have it. And they talk about that one of the reasons the shooting took place had to do with Mr. Fleming selling narcotics and somebody was over there to purchase them, to wit, Hatch, and they heard shots. In both 1.0 and 2.0 -- and I anticipate their trial testimony -- they are not watching Mr. Fleming or the Defendant literally as the shots are being fired. They are feet away. They are very focused to the argument that's escalating that involves everybody in the home, the four principal adult occupants of the

structure, the Defendant, the victim, and these two female witnesses.

The argument begins or at least comes to its crescendo when the Defendant, from Mr. Fleming's perspective, interjects himself to both his wife and to his stepdaughter on what he perceives to be strictly a family issue and family business. That begins a dialogue between Mr. Fleming and the Defendant, ultimately culminating, as the witnesses I believe will testify, in Mr. Fleming saying, well why don't you and me go outside to discuss it.

And as they start walking down the stairs, Ms. Veasley and Ms. Sutton break eye contact from the situation and proceed to walk in a different direction. Almost instantaneously, they hear three gunshots. They both come rushing back to -- all this occurs on a staircase. At the bottom of the staircase is Mr. Fleming with an obvious significant gunshot wound to the head and other parts of his body. He is not moving. And he is deceased there upon officers and other responders first coming to the scene.

Supporting the count of assault with a deadly weapon is their testimony that as they're looking down at the bottom of the stairs, they see Mr. Glover turn the firearm in their direction and tell them in kind of a direct manner not to talk about what just happened with anybody. I'm paraphrasing, obviously.

THE COURT: I doubt they describe something so polite.

MR. STANTON: And so, after that happens and within minutes of first responders primarily because of the nature of the call, North Las Vegas uniformed police officers soon followed up by detectives, these two witnesses give a version of 1.0, which is that a shooting took place, that they're there, but it's -- they're relatively vague on details and they talk about some aspect to

2

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

narcotics activity.

THE COURT: Is there -- so there's a difference between vague and false or, you know, stating one thing and then later stating another. Meaning -- I have no idea what was said, but let's just say like hypothetically, oh, the shots were at the top of the stairs in 1.0 and they were down the bottom of the stairs at 2.0. Like differences, you know, differences as opposed to vague or omission. There's false or mistaken and then there's omitted, two different things.

MR. STANTON: Okay. Well, there's certainly omissions.

THE COURT: Right. That I --

MR. STANTON: There's no questions about that.

THE COURT: That I got.

MR. STANTON: And there are aspects of what they tell the detectives that are directly false to when you compared it to 2.0.

THE COURT: Like? Can you give me some examples of the more material things, arguably?

MR. STANTON: What is going to be clearly different from their trial testimony in 2.0 is the extent of they knew the person inside the home.

THE COURT: The extent that they knew the person?

MR. STANTON: Right.

THE COURT: Oh.

MR. STANTON: They tell the detectives that they don't know who it is, they didn't -- you know, don't know the person very well. And that's clearly false from their what I believe is 2.0 in their trial testimony.

THE COURT: Okay. Anything else?

MR. STANTON: Once again, the aspect of narcotics, I think they're going to tell you that this had nothing to do with narcotics.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. STANTON: Those are two that jump off to -- at the top of my head. So ,the next day, the 2nd of January, they contact detectives. Oh, let me back up. They express to the detectives their concern for their safety.

THE COURT: In 1.0?

MR. STANTON: One -- well, when they interact with the detectives, I don't know that it's in part of the recorded interview, but their testimony is -- is that they had expressly stated on more than one occasions especially to uniformed officers, so this is prior to the recorded statement or at least not to detectives that they were fearful for their lives and they were hopeful that police officers would remain at the scene until -- if and until someone was caught.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. STANTON: So, their level of concern expressed from them, I believe if asked, they would tell you that it was immediate, and it was expressed to law enforcement.

THE COURT: Is that the same day as 1.0?

MR. STANTON: Yes. That's on the 1st of January.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. STANTON: That's within minutes if not hours of the 911 call that they placed to authorities.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. STANTON: So, on the 2nd of January, Ms. Sutton and Ms.

Veasley contact the police and agree to a second interview now for purposes of this discussion 2.0. And in 2.0, they tell what --

THE COURT: They contact the police or the police contact -- the detectives or the detectives contact them?

MR. STANTON: They contact police.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. STANTON: There is -- in that second interview is what I believe from talking to them prior to this trial, their testimony is going to be consistent with 2.0. And in that version of events, they say they know the Defendant, they've known him for a long period of time. They describe the argument about what the argument was about. It starts with Mr. Fleming first and his stepdaughter who is 21 years of age. He is not her biological father. Ms. Sutton kind of intervenes on her daughter's behalf in the argument, and the argument kind of morphs into Mr. Fleming now arguing with both Ms. Veasley and Ms. Sutton.

And through a series of events that are both visually observed and are verbally stated, the Defendant interjects himself by talking to the daughter, talking to the wife one-on-one, and they will describe what their conversation with the Defendant was. In essence, he was offering to insert himself into this issue. Mr. Fleming sees this, and that's when he begins to say, hey, what are you doing? This is none of your business, the invitation to go outside, and then they describe him as they last see him, Mr. Fleming walking first down the stairs, the Defendant following him, and then within seconds, the gunshots, and then they observe the threat.

It is the State's belief -- now kind of coming full circle to frame the

issue -- it's the State's belief that if the defense seeks to introduce inconsistent statements, the State is entitled to address the rationale and the explanation, if one exists, about why those explanations are different. And the explanation coming from this family from the person who's the author of the statement is going to be their fear of the Defendant based upon concrete facts as they understood them to be. And I believe that there's in some areas of their belief, overwhelming evidence to prove what they suspect to be true about the Defendant's background and the basis of their fear and thus an explanation of why the statements would be inconsistent.

THE COURT: So, if you had one of these witnesses on the witness stand, my guess is they're not going to say gang activity, felonies and acts of violence, and more than one murder. They have, I assume, an entire long laundry list of specific things. What is that going to be? How, as an offer of proof?

MR. STANTON: As an offer of proof, they're going to -- they believe that the Defendant has committed multiple acts of murder and that he has committed multiple acts of violent conduct against others. I'll leave it in that frame as opposed to addressing specific crimes. That he is a member of --

THE COURT: Well, what would they say? What have they said?

MR. STANTON: Right. That he is -- that and in addition, that he -they believe him to be a member of a gang, a known gang.

THE COURT: What gang?

UNIDENTIFIED ATTORNEY: Gerson.

MR. STANTON: Gerson Park, GPK.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. STANTON: And, thus, kind of the -- that specific comment address their concern then and even further from the time that the statements were made that whether the Defendant was in custody or not, they had concerns. And that's why they said 1.0.

So, under 50.135, I believe Nevada law (2)(b): A witness is afforded an opportunity to explain or deny -- this is all presuming under (2) that extrinsic evidence of prior contradictory statement is inadmissible unless they're afforded an opportunity to explain to deny the statement and the opposite party is afforded an opportunity to interrogate the witness therein.

It's clearly designed to be argued to this jury that their statements are unreliable. Therefore, the evidence against the Defendant does not satisfy the State's burden. And I think it is contemplated by the statute both here and in the federal system that you cannot be permitted to do that without an ability to completely and fully explain why the inconsistencies exist.

My reading of the statute or the case law is that to the extent that I find cases on point, and there's not many, they leave it to the discretion of the trial judge to the extent of the -- of what the Court feels is appropriate to meet the definition of the ability to explain their inconsistencies and the motivation between statements 1 and 2 in this particular case.

And as such, if it goes to the weight that is going to be argued by Defense counsel to this jury, either in the form of its not credible or that there's an alternative suspect, then it becomes as probative as you could possibly get in a case like this as to why there would be a distinction between a witness' statement 1.0 versus 2.0. And without the ability for them to explain it, I think arrests the jury's ability to attach the weight that they deem to it after hearing

the explanation and the demeanor and the tenure of the witnesses in a threedimensional format.

So, I think that's as best I think I can do to frame it as I see the issues right now.

THE COURT: Did you want to address the case that you gave the defense and the Court?

MR. STANTON: Yes. The case is -- it's kind of a lengthy thing, but what I thought was of note was that even in a case where there's not evidence directly attributable to a defendant making the threats. Their -- the fact of their threats and the details of the threats was admissible to show the nature of their testimony and the inconsistencies that the defense claimed that there were. And I think procedurally the trial judge warned defense counsel on several different occasions relative to this issue and to a warrant that was outstanding as to another -- or one of these testifying witnesses.

THE COURT: Why she left town and didn't handle her warrant --MR. STANTON: Correct.

THE COURT: -- was because she would say I was getting threats versus, you know, she's just a dishonest person running from the justice system.

MR. STANTON: Correct. And so, to me, the issue is, look, if you're going to go down the road of introducing inconsistent statement and you have full knowledge as you do here that there is a history between these witnesses and the Defendant and that they've known each other for a protracted period of time, that they have this perspective of your -- of the Defendant's background, that they're -- you can't have it both ways. You can't seek to elicit

the inconsistencies to try and blow up the State's case and impeach their credibility while handcuffing them and not giving them the ability to explain and to let the jury assess whether or not those are inconstancies that have any weight or meaning.

THE COURT: By the way, before we hear from the defense on that issue, did you and Mr. Bashor talk about the expert issues that you were having?

MR. STANTON: Yes. We're going to address that kind of when it gets a little closer to Detective Wilson's testimony, but the concern that Mr. Bashor has about testimony regarding no evidence at the scene supports self-defense, as I see this case, I mean I haven't heard their opening argument yet, but I don't see that I would be asking that question of Detective Wilson. I think that's just a matter more of argument than a Q&A in this case.

THE COURT: So, I haven't heard an opening statement yet and I haven't heard any argument from them, but if it's a self-defense case and not a whodunnit, then why does it matter? I mean as long as they say I was scared -- you know, since it's self-defense, there's no question as to who did it. We know who did it, and it's just a matter of why it was done -- than thinking that's pretty scary. I'm just curious, if it's self-defense and not a whodunnit.

Because your argument is more compelling if it's a whodunnit and less compelling if it's a self-defense case.

MR. STANTON: Well, and --

THE COURT: Which means you may not get a ruling before your opening statement.

MR. STANTON: Well, I don't know, Your Honor.

self-defense and the evidence that she observed at the scene, but I can't

25

predict that now and that's not the issue that I'm raising to the Court. I agree with the Court that if this is purely a self-defense case, then maybe the scope of the explanation need not be as in-depth or as broad, but if -- I don't see that happening if you're looking at alternative suspects, which is what I think they're going to proffer.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, and part of your response to Mr. Stanton, I would suggest you address that. There's nothing that says I have to rule on this until the time that I've -- until the time comes. And, quite frankly, I'm not going to allow a tactical advantage to either side and then have it taken advantage of.

MR. BASHER: Right.

THE COURT: If it's left to my discretion as to what's admissible, let's face it. If it's a whodunnit, not why it was done, then it's -- it can be probative. It's certainly prejudicial, but it's also probative, and then it becomes a weighing analysis on all of these things, each one and how far it goes if at all versus why it happened, in which case it becomes less of a weighing analysis because it's not as probative, quite frankly, but it sure is prejudicial.

So, I appreciate you might want a ruling in advance, but I don't think I have to do that. And I'll hear from you, and you can certainly comment on that as part of your -- because, quite frankly, if I don't know what your defense is, I'm not going to rule on it.

MR. BASHER: I understand, Judge. Could I have the Court's indulgence?

THE COURT: Because if it's a whodunnit, it's one thing. If it's a self-defense case --

MR. STANTON: Well, Judge, just -- and I understand that, and I think defense counsel does. But when we talked about this yesterday and the reason why we're requesting it to be put in front of Your Honor now is counsel wanted to know the answer before they did their opening, which I think is probably an important thing for them to know. But I understand the Court that, you know, until the issue is ripe in front of you, then you're not compelled to give any evidentiary ruling, but --

THE COURT: Yeah. I don't give an advisory --

MR. STANTON: -- I'm not here to --

THE COURT: -- decision so that, you know -- you know, there's nothing that -- because it depends on what the defense is as to how probative it is. I mean you're sitting here arguing to me how devastating to the State it can be and how it limits -- handcuffs you and blah-blah-blah. It doesn't handcuff you if it's a self-defense case. It just allows a boatload of bad acts in.

MR. STANTON: Well, I wouldn't get --

THE COURT: So --

MR. STANTON: Your Honor, if it's a pure self-defense case, I'm not asking for a boatload of bad acts to come in because then the inconsistency isn't that probative.

THE COURT: Correct. So, that's what I'm saying. So, perhaps they should address that in part of their -- not only do they persuade me that you're wrong, but they also persuade me that the time is right for the ruling in advance.

MR. BASHER: Can I have the Court's indulgence for like a minute? THE COURT: Sure.

[Pause]

MR. O'BRIEN: Thank you, Your Honor. Your Honor, let me start --knowing the Court's inclination, let me start by saying it is likely a whodunnit
case or at least the opening will be on a whodunnit theory. As the evidence
comes out, of course, there's a possibility of pivoting.

THE COURT: One moment. I need to take notes. You know, I wish I could remember all the -- every single thing that everybody says in all my 120 murder cases, but I want to make sure I don't miss anything. So, if you'd just give me one moment.

MR. O'BRIEN: Sure.

[Pause]

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. O'BRIEN: Let me start by saying I do want to express some appreciation to the State for having this conversation ahead of trial. It infuriates the Defense to constantly be surprised. It's obviously a competitive endeavor trial. We're not cooperating in doing it. But on something this big, we do appreciate having this conversation ahead of time.

THE COURT: Me too.

MR. O'BRIEN: So, I agree with most of what the State has laid out in terms of the difference between what's being called Statement 1.0 and 2.0, but it's -- I would say it's not simply vaguery in 1.0. In fact, it's misleading information provided by the two women to the police. First, Ms. Sutton provides information to the police that she saw nothing, didn't hear from anyone, someone knocked at the door and shot her husband. That's the first statement provided. The second statement --

1	THE COURT: Wait one moment. Saw nothing, didn't what?
2	MR. O'BRIEN: Didn't hear anything other than a gunshot.
3	Someone knocked at the door, and her husband's dead.
4	THE COURT: Okay.
5	MR. O'BRIEN: The next when the police arrive and start
6	interviewing, they speak with the two women separately. Akira tells the
7	officers that she doesn't know the man who was there, the drug customer.
8	THE COURT: Akira is Veasley?
9	MR. O'BRIEN: Akira is the stepdaughter. Stepdaughter.
10	THE COURT: Okay. So, using last names so I can keep track of
11	everybody.
12	MR. O'BRIEN: Veasley.
13	THE COURT: Veasley, thank you. Because we have a Sutton and
14	we have a Veasley.
15	MR. O'BRIEN: Sure.
16	THE COURT: All right.
17	MR. O'BRIEN: And, Your Honor, Veasley tells the police
18	specifically they don't know the man.
19	THE COURT: This is in 1.0?
20	MR. O'BRIEN: This is 1.0, Your Honor. Veasley says, I don't know
21	the man. My mother's never met the man. He's a man with an afro. I think
22	his name is Hatch. Police then interview Miranda. Miranda sorry, last
23	names, Sutton. Police then interview
24	THE COURT: Thanks.
25	MR. O'BRIEN: Sutton. Sutton gives a sort of similar version but

residence. No name is provided. She didn't really interact with him. The suspect tried to talk to her. That's all she knows. This was probably a drug deal gone wrong. There was some issues in the past on drug -- on drug dealing and some anger on the deceased's part about drug dealing in the last 24 hours.

So then within 24 hours, the two women then talk to the police again. And --

THE COURT: You disagree it was at their behest?

MR. O'BRIEN: Well, I have not pre-trialed them, but I will say the police -- from the information I have from North Las Vegas Police, the police are not contacted by Ms. Veasley or Ms. Sutton. They're contacted by a relative of the deceased, his brother. The deceased's brother tells the police these women are lying. They know who killed my brother. You need to interview them again.

Now, what happens from there, there is no discussion in the report whether the women subsequently called detectives or whether the detectives called the women. But that is the first intervention is a call from the brother of the deceased.

So, to take a step back into the -- I think that lays out the factual allegations, Your Honor. Towards the statute of 15.135, starting with just a plain reading of the statute, (2)(b) giving the witness an opportunity to explain, the question becomes how broad that opportunity is going to be, how broad the Court will allow that opportunity to be because you're correct in terms of the statements in 1.0 and the statements in 2.0, they're very similar. The man

at the bottom of the stairs says: Don't f'ing rat on me. It's on you and your children. It is a death threat to the women and the small children that are in the house.

In terms of an opportunity to explain, that's also Count 2 in this case, Assault With A Deadly Weapon. The suspect points a firearm at the two women and threatens to kill them if they talk and their children if they talk. Discussions of gang activity, allegations or rumors of prior murders, and a prior conviction veer us into prior bad act territory, which is why I'm saying the question of how much will the Court allow the witness to explain becomes -- I think the Court's correct. It is the balancing test of 403 or 48.0452.

And I don't -- not to lay it out too much, but I think the Court's very aware how much the Supreme Court has warned both prosecutors and judges. And in at least one case *Griffith v. State* has warned the defense as well do not veer into prior bad act territory. It is very discouraged. The default is that it is not admissible. And that's the territory that we are in. And I want to suggest it was possible if the State believed that we were going down this route, it was possible to file a motion to admit prior bad acts or a motion in limine to preserve the issue. Because we are now on day 2 of trial and figuring it out in the afternoon -- and I do appreciate the heads up on the opportunity before the opening, but I also think it's a little late in the game for us to be having the conversation.

So, I think under the balancing test, the question of -- we turn into the question of other relevant non-propensity purpose exception and whether this is fitting underneath that, what the relevance would be. I think the stated relevance, if I understand it correctly, is to explain why the witness lied to the

police the first time around or why the witnesses lied to the police the first time around. But once we get to that balancing test of probative value versus prejudicial nature of the testimony, I think prejudicial nature of saying there is a person that has previously been killed by Shawn Glover tips prejudicial nature. The scales are essentially way out of balance, especially when we realize that this becomes cumulative evidence.

The women according to both of their statements 1.0 and 2.0 see a man above the deceased body of their father -- or their husband and their stepfather, and he makes a verbal threat to kill them and their children if they talk. That is sufficient explanation. Going beyond that tips us into cumulative evidence and prior bad acts. Thank you, Your Honor.

MR. STANTON: First of all, it kind of disheartens me to hear arguments which blend terms, but have no relevance to the argument.

Counsel suggests that this could have been raised pretrial in two forms, one by the State filing a prior bad act motion

THE COURT: You're not offering it for motive, intent, opportunity, lapse, some mistake, or accident, so I get it.

MR. STANTON: Yeah. I mean that's --

THE COURT: I get it.

MR. STANTON: And the analysis they're in is --

THE COURT: But a motion in limine is what he was also referring to, which is you could say, hey, there's two different inconsistent statements, just doing this earlier. What we're doing right now could have been done earlier is the point of what his argument was.

MR. STANTON: Yeah, but the State's belief is the statute speaks

MR. STANTON: Everything I just outlined.

25

THE COURT: So, all this stuff?

MR. STANTON: The gang, the murder. And, in fact, their belief that the Defendant had committed multiple murders.

THE COURT: And they purport their basis of knowledge to be?

MR. STANTON: Their knowledge of the Defendant, his associated.

MR. STANTON: Their knowledge of the Defendant, his associates, the length of time they'd known him, and what they --

THE COURT: And how long did they say they've known him?

[State counsel confer.]

MR. STANTON: I would say a few years, for sure. And Mr. Fleming, the decedent, knows the Defendant very well. And part of what they know came from Mr. Fleming, in part.

THE COURT: Okay. I'm sorry. I interrupted you with your blending of --

MR. STANTON: So, I mean --

THE COURT: I didn't mean to cut you off.

MR. STANTON: -- if the Court is comfortable because it is -- it is not 4804 --

THE COURT: Right.

MR. STANTON: -- subsection 2. The State's not moving to admit it under those grounds. And, thus, the pretrial raising this issue is, look, you're at your peril if you're seeking to admit an inconsistent statement knowing what the law permits that witness to say as an explanation for the inconsistencies. It also goes without, I think any reasonable dispute, that the defense knows what the underlying facts that these witnesses are going to say about the threats and how that impugns their client's credibility and the

9

8

11 12

10

14

13

16

17

15

18

20

21

22

19

23 24 25 potential that that evidence might be admissible.

So, it's the strategy of the defense to admit the inconsistent statements. So, if there's anybody that needs to do a motion in limine, it would seem to me it's the party that's pursuing that defense and that evidentiary strategy of introducing an inconsistent statement. I mean I can't open the door myself. And, thus, I'm not offering 1.0, and then turning around and say, guess what, it's an inconsistent statement. And I think under the statute, I might be able to. But the State has no intention to doing that.

So, while I think it's certainly my argument is more for the record than it is to Your Honor about the timing of this, I think there can be no further explanation of their -- the explanation absolutely is necessary and pursuant to the law.

I agree with the Defense counsel is what's the scope. What I didn't hear is the answer to the Court's primary question: Is this a self-defense case or is this case of whodunnit? And I would agree with the Court that the probative value attached to that threat and the change of it is directly linked to that.

Now, maybe they don't want to disclose it at this point, and we wait until that happens, and then we rule on the evidence and the admissibility of the first statement and the basis and the explanation attended to therein when that card is played or when in real time as it goes. It --

THE COURT: So, because that's basically what I'm being asked to do, is give an anticipatory -- everything that I would rule on this depends on what questions are asked and how the defense is framed because some kind of claim of prejudice to the State and the 51.35, the whole public policy reason

driving 51.35(2)(b) is so that we don't have a complete bastardization of justice, so that we don't pretend like there's just a special world of facts where we just keep out things that are ugly for the Defendant that leave kind of a false impression about someone's motive when they're giving a statement. That's what this is about.

And that's hard to weigh when I don't know what you're going to say.

MR. O'BRIEN: Your Honor, I apologize for interrupting, but didn't I start my argument by saying what we were --

THE COURT: This is a whodunnit. Yes, you did. And you said we reserve the right to, how did you say, inversely lean to something else? You had a very interesting phrase that I liked because I've never heard it before.

MR. O'BRIEN: Pivot.

THE COURT: Pivot. I heard pivot. I never heard pivot before. And so, can you give me an example of pivot before I chisel a ruling into Moses' tablet and you all carry it to the mountain, because I'm subject to revisiting anything if I hear questioning, and I think there's extreme prejudice on either side, quite frankly.

MR. O'BRIEN: Your Honor --

THE COURT: For example --

MR. O'BRIEN: -- here --

THE COURT: -- let me just give you an example so you can address it. Let's say I make a ruling, and I allow some generically coded version of what they want to do in in the event that the witness is significantly pursued on cross-examination about truthfulness and voracity related to the

first statement versus the second. Because let's face it, I guess that's an important part and there'll be some motive I guess to make up something within 24 hours of your husband being shot on a stairway. I guess I'll know it when I see it.

If it's not that significant, then, you know, Count 2 and, yeah, I knew him to be a violent person, would probably be allowed as much as I allow it to go. If the entire trial is, she's a big fat liar because, you know, they were in with the mob, and that's who had to do it, and she has a motive to fabricate for my client because of X, Y, and Z, and I hear this big elaborate version of whatever, then I guess, you know, I would take a different approach in my ruling. And it's hard to do that in advance.

MR. O'BRIEN: Your Honor, I apologize if I said it sloppily. I said that our theory is whodunnit.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. O'BRIEN: It's the first time that I've really ever revealed a theory on the record, but I went out on that ledge.

THE COURT: Right. I know that.

MR. O'BRIEN: And so, I've said that it's whodunnit. However, Your Honor, to give you an example of what a pivot would be, when I told -- when essentially in ex parte communication one time told Judge Herndon what our theory of defense was, and he said, I'm telling you ahead of time I'm not allowing that testimony in, it pushed me into changing the defense based on the Court's ruling.

So, I am saying this is a whodunnit. If the Court rules in a way that leaves that to be a straightforward guilty finding, and we have no other option,

then I think the defense would reserve the right to pivot. However, that said, this case has been prepped as a whodunnit. This opening has been prepped as a whodunnit. It is a whodunnit case.

MR. STANTON: Well, then, Your Honor, I guess the probative value is from the State's perspective could not be higher to explain 1.0 versus 2.0, especially in light of the fact of their knowledge of the Defendant, the failure to give descriptive -- his name, his description, and all the other attended facts that they give in 2.0 is now couldn't be highlighted as more probative.

MR. O'BRIEN: Just the last thing I'll say, Your Honor, and I appreciate the Court's time and letting us talk multiple times. Every other statute that talks about admitting the prior conviction employs a balancing test. Even when the defendant takes the stand and the State is presumptively allowed to impeach, the balancing act exists. And it exists for this reason.

You talked about creating a fair trial for both sides so that the scales aren't tipped on one way or the other so that we're not hiding information from the jury. But in doing that, to create a fair trial, we do hide information from the jury. We make sure that the unfairly prejudicial information is kept out of the jurors' hands. That's what we're asking for here is if your ruling is under a whodunnit that the prior statement of witnesses would be open to these women's discussion of their hearsay or their hearing of rumors about Shawn Glover, Your Honor, we would ask that you keep out any information about any prior conviction and anything we would characterize as a prior bad act. Thank you.

THE COURT: Anything else?

MR. STANTON: Your Honor, the comment, and I wrote it down when counsel said it, he goes: The count of assault with a deadly weapon when a man at the bottom of the stairs is pointing a gun at them and saying, the language that he used from -- quoting from the witness's statement, that's sufficient to explain 1.0 from 2.0. Well, that may be Counsel's view of it, but what he's saying is, look, that's sufficient because that should be sufficient for the trier of fact, the twelve, to make that determination. Well, he can't make that claim.

And, thus, when your case is hinged as it is that these people are describing an alternative suspect and in conjunction with that, I'm going to be presenting photographs and testimony through cross-examination that the State or the detectives did an incomplete investigation, then it begs for that evidence to be introduced so that the jury can put it into proper context.

And we're not seeking to admit a prior conviction as the case law from the Nevada Supreme Court that I believe counsel is citing without quotation to the name, is a reference to a conviction, a felony conviction. The type of conviction has such a prejudicial impact, it was certainly admissible for impeachment purposes, but that there was a weighing between the type of conviction and its relevance for the fact that someone has been a prior convicted felon of which that felony conviction was irrelevant for the testimony, but substantially prejudicial. There is no, in my opinion, analytical framework where that is the same thing as what's being addressed here.

THE COURT: Anything else because I'm not cutting you short?

MR. STANTON: Not on behalf of the State.

THE COURT: Anything else?

MR. O'BRIEN: Your Honor, we'll submit.

THE COURT: By the way, did we ever make a record with the case that you gave to the defense and to the Court to look at to draw a brief analogy to?

MR. STANTON: No, we didn't, Your Honor. It was *People v. Williams*, found at 315 P.2d 1.

MR. O'BRIEN: I apologize, Your Honor. P.3d.

MR. STANTON: P.3d. Sorry.

THE COURT: Okay. A couple of things. Knowing very little about the examination of the witnesses in advance, exactly how cross will go, and how direct will go, I am just making a ruling anticipatorily that the -- that there will be pursuit of these witnesses with 1.0 and 2.0 impeachment because this is an identity case. And, you know, I appreciate that *People v. Williams* -- I mean it's kind of demonstrative of the underlying problem, but it's not exactly on point. But the gist of it is exactly what I already talked about with 50.135, which is like (2)(b), which is the whole public policy behind allowing someone to explain themselves.

The problem I have here, is I'm not going to allow someone to explain themselves with a couple of murders. So, I am going to allow -- and, you know, this is where witness prep is going to be so crucial. So crucial. And I might require a quick evidentiary hearing outside the presence with each witness, because I am going to allow the State to inquire if they have a knowledge of his history of -- that he had a history of violence in his past. And I may allow gang membership, no GPK in Gerson Park this or that. Just gang membership generically once I hear their basis for that understanding. I need

to have some understanding of the context of what they think before I can decide.

I'm on a -- I feel like I'm on a tight rope balancing. But at some point, there's just no you can't say anything about the fact that you know he's a violent person, and your opinion, and that he's a gang member, and that he made a threat to you because the two go hand in hand. And so -- but I'm not going to allow prior murders. It's over the top, and I'll get reversed even though you make a good argument and, you know, it is what it is.

So, I don't know what you want to do with that, but I'm on the cusp on gang membership and leaning towards allowing it in generic terms. And that they're familiar that he has a history of violence against persons. And I would do a little evidentiary hearing, maybe talk to them myself once I hear what they would say outside the jury about their parameters and cross my fingers that -- and I'm going to allow the State to lead.

MR. STANTON: And, Judge, I think we are in agreement, full agreement with that procedure, because I think it's clear then from the record and doesn't need to delve into have any evidentiary hearing about what we did or didn't prep them on. They're both very receptive. They know that there is a danger zone, and we told them be very careful about what you answer and listen to the directions of the Court. So, I think that --

THE COURT: Did you hear about Barker's trial?

MR. STANTON: Pardon me.

THE COURT: Did you hear about Barker's trial?

MR. STANTON: I did.

THE COURT: With the cop that was told that --

MR. STANTON: I did.

THE COURT: -- there's a parameter.

MR. STANTON: Yeah.

THE COURT: And the cop just ignored the parameter. You know, sometimes it's just they get caught up in whatever, and they're not thinking, and it slips out. So --

MR. STANTON: I don't think that person had testified before, so -but in our discussion with these two witnesses -- and I can't say this in all my
cases -- but these two witnesses are cognitive, understand the principles, are -will take advice and directive from the Court. So, I think that is an excellent
thing.

Now, they're our first two witnesses. So, after openings when we open this case, we start with them.

THE COURT: Okay. So, that was the first part of my ruling. The second part of my ruling is that if the Defense requests -- because this is clearly being -- this is not evidence that the Defendant committed a bad act. And the jury has to be -- well, doesn't have to be, but will be instructed at your request. This is evidence of the mindset of the witness to possibly explain in her own words why she might change her story. It's not evidence that the Defendant did anything. It's just what evidence she thinks in her head, and that's it.

And so, a jury gets told those things at the time that it's admitted. You've heard evidence that this witness had certain beliefs about the Defendant's past. That evidence was not offered and may not be considered by you to find that he is a person of bad character or had a propensity to, you

know, commit crimes. That evidence was offered to you for your consideration as to how that understanding might have affected the witness' -- you know, might affect the witness or might affect the witness' recollection or statements, or may or may not affect the witness' statements, or may have or may have not affected the witness' statements, something to that effect.

Now, clearly, that's a strategic thing. You know, *Williams* talks about it in that case that the State -- but that's just generic 101. Every time you're going to let something in, you give an instruction, especially when it's a nuanced purpose of admission under 50.135(2)(b). And so, especially you got a lawyer on the panel, she'll get it right away. That's just what this lady thinks, and because she thinks it, that may have had an impact on her statements. Maybe it did, maybe it didn't. That's for you to determine, but it doesn't mean he did anything.

Come up with an instruction if you want, and I will give it. If you don't want, we'll make a great record about strategically you don't want it. I can't imagine it, though. I think you want it.

MR. O'BRIEN: And, Your Honor, I think our instructions are due tomorrow morning. Is that what we agreed to?

MR. STANTON: Mr. Bashor --

MR. BASHER: Yeah.

MR. STANTON: -- agreed to it.

MR. O'BRIEN: Okay. We'll have that in the packet, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. And then, you know, I'll look at it while your -- I don't know, they're the first witnesses. So, maybe I need to look at it like first thing in the morning.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2021

22

23

24

25

MR. O'BRIEN: Okay.

THE COURT: Because I might make suggestions you like. If you don't, believe me, I have no -- but, you know, if you think about it, I think you can come up with something that specifically tells the jury this is how you're to consider this, blah-blah-blah. It's kind of a -- what's the name of that case that we do the instructions all the time? *Tavares*?

MR. STANTON: Yes, Tavares the --

THE COURT: The hybrid. Because it really is --

MR. STANTON: It's a hybrid of Tavares is what --

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. STANTON: -- I was thinking as you were making that.

THE COURT: It's only because it relates to the witness' state of mine and nothing to do with anything about the Defendant. So, you can even -- you know, just because a witness may have heard things doesn't mean the Defendant committed any crime, and it cannot be considered by you that he committed any crime. The real issue is how it may or may not impact the mindset of the witness. That's what the relevance is, and if you come up with something, you know I'll give it.

MR. O'BRIEN: Understood, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Anything else?

MR. STANTON: Not on behalf of the State, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.

/////

/////

/////

1	MR. BASHER: 9:00 tomorrow, correct, Judge?
2	THE COURT: 9:00 tomorrow.
3	[Proceedings concluded at 3:57 p.m.]
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	ATTEST: I do hereby certify that I have truly and correctly transcribed the
17	audio/visual proceedings in the above-entitled case to the best of my ability.
18	
19	
20	Oximin B Cabill
21	Junia B. Cahill
22	

Maukele Transcribers, LLC

Jessica B. Cahill, Transcriber, CER/CET-708

23

24

25

Electronically Filed 12/31/2018 10:22 AM Steven D. Grierson CLERK OF THE COURT

1 **RTRAN** 2 3 4 5 **DISTRICT COURT** 6 CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA 7 STATE OF NEVADA, 8 CASE NO. C-16-312448-1 9 Plaintiff, DEPT. IX 10 VS. 11 SHAWN GLOVER, aka SHAWN LYNN 12 GLOVER, JR., 13 Defendant. 14 15 BEFORE THE HONORABLE JENNIFER P. TOGLIATTI, DISTRICT COURT JUDGE WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 1, 2018 16 17 **RECORDER'S TRANSCRIPT OF JURY TRIAL - DAY 3** 18 APPEARANCES: 19 For Plaintiff: DAVID STANTON, ESQ. 20 WILLIAM FLINN, ESQ. 21 For Defendant: ROBERT E. O'BRIEN, ESQ. 22 RYAN J. BASHOR, ESQ. 23 24 RECORDED BY YVETTE G. SISON, COURT RECORDER 25

1	INDEX
2	
3	Testimony26
4	
5	WITNESSES FOR THE PLAINTIFF:
6	Miranda Sutton
7	Direct Examination by Mr. Flinn26
9	Akira Veasley Direct Examination by Mr. Flinn31
10 11	Miranda Sutton
12	Direct Examination by Mr. Flinn
14	Akira Veasley
15 16 17	Direct Examination by Mr. Flinn90 Cross-Examination by Mr. Bashor97 Redirect Examination by Mr. Flinn108
'' 18	Melvin A. Givens, III
19	Direct Examination by Mr. Stanton115
20	Dr. Jennifer Corneal
21	Direct Examination by Mr. Stanton118 Cross-Examination by Mr. Bashor131
23	Renee Harder
24 25	Direct Examination by Mr. Stanton

## **INDEX OF EXHIBITS**

4, 5, 6, 7, 10, 11......58

36 to 48 ......121

1 to 35 ......137

A to K .......152

MARKED RECEIVED

MARKED RECEIVED

4 || 5

FOR THE PLAINTIFF:

**FOR THE DEFENDANT:** 

-3-

24

suggested.

-4-

MR. STANTON: Yes.

THE COURT: Oh, yeah. Yeah.

1	MR. O'BRIEN: Okay.
2	THE COURT: Can I have whatever you're looking at?
3	MR. O'BRIEN: Sure. I emailed it to
4	THE COURT: So, I can look at it while you're doing your opening?
5	MR. STANTON: I actually thought it was pretty good.
6	MR. O'BRIEN: Well, thanks.
7	MR. STANTON: The hybrid Tavares [phonetic] I think is what it's
8	now going to be called.
9	THE COURT: We're going to call it the Togliatti.
10	MR. STANTON: The Tog.
11	THE COURT: The Tog.
12	[Pause]
13	THE COURT: Do you have a problem on line 4 with saying instead
14	of these beliefs, either the witnesses' beliefs or any beliefs by the witnesses?
15	MR. O'BRIEN: Not at all. That's fine.
16	THE COURT: You see, I'm just being really specific.
17	MR. O'BRIEN: I appreciate it. I told you it was poorly worded.
18	THE COURT: Can you send this to
19	MR. O'BRIEN: I did. To Diane.
20	THE COURT: Oh. Is she here today?
21	THE CLERK: She'll be in later.
22	MR. O'BRIEN: I can
23	THE COURT: She'll be in later.
24	MR. O'BRIEN: I have it on my phone Dropbox, I believe. I can
25	email it to anybody.
	I control of the cont

1	THE COURT: Can you email it to my
2	THE LAW CLERK: Just email it to me.
3	THE COURT: Nick Lasso, my law clerk, please? All right. So, I'm
4	going to make I don't know. I'll propose some changes. I just
5	MR. O'BRIEN: Great, Your Honor. Thank you.
6	THE COURT: want to sit with it for a minute.
7	MR. O'BRIEN: Sure.
8	THE COURT: Okay. Anything else before you do your opening
9	statements?
10	MR. STANTON: Not on behalf of the State.
11	MR. BASHOR: Not on behalf of the Defense, Your Honor.
12	THE COURT: And you're doing the opening statement?
13	MR. O'BRIEN: Yes, Your Honor.
14	THE COURT: Do you all have the technology that you need?
15	MR. STANTON: I am hooked up and test run it, so I'm good.
16	MR. O'BRIEN: Good over here.
17	THE COURT: Okay. Do you have a hard copy of any PowerPoints
18	you're using?
19	MR. STANTON: I do. And I can deliver that. There are some
20	notes, but I'll bring over a clean copy.
21	THE COURT: Okay. So, if you could do that after the lunch hour,
22	I'd appreciate it.
23	MR. STANTON: Sure.
24	THE COURT: Do you
25	MR. O'BRIEN: And no PowerPoint here. Your Honor.

1	THE COURT: Okay. All right. So, at this time		
2	THE CLERK: (Indiscernible).		
3	THE COURT: Sure. If he could bring them in.		
4	THE MARSHAL: All rise for the jury. The jurors are all present,		
5	ma'am.		
6	[In the presence of the jury]		
7	THE COURT: Counsel, will you stipulate to the presence of the		
8	jury?		
9	MR. STANTON: Yes, Your Honor.		
10	MR. BASHOR: Yes, Your Honor.		
11	THE COURT: Okay. Ladies and gentlemen, unless any of you have		
12	any questions this morning about the process, we're going to begin the trial.		
13	We'll hear the opening statements. Then I'll take a recess a morning recess		
14	for you to take a restroom break, stretch your legs. And then we're kind of		
15	going into, you know, your participation mode and more of an observation		
16	mode except for at the end of each witness I will ask you if you have any		
17	questions you wish the Court to ask the witness as I told you about yesterday.		
18	Okay.		
19	So, does anybody have any questions before we start about the		
20	process? All right. There being no questions, at this time, State, opening		
21	statement.		
22	MR. STANTON: Thank you, Your Honor. Madam Recorder, can I		
23	have thank you.		
24	[OPENING STATEMENT BY THE STATE]		

Ladies and gentlemen, this case begins factually in the time of the

25

 murder itself, which is January 1st, 2016. And this is the location where Patrick Fleming was murdered. In this home during this day are four adults. There are some minor children, but the four adults inside the home are Miranda Sutton. She is Patrick Fleming's, the victim in this case, wife. Also present in the home is Akira Veasley. She is the stepdaughter to Mr. Fleming and the daughter to Ms. Sutton. She's in her early twenties. There is Patrick Fleming, as I just mentioned. And there's the Defendant.

In this case, you will hear that on January 1st, the beginning of a series of dominoes that falls leading up to Mr. Fleming's murder is an argument -- a verbal argument between Mr. Fleming and his stepdaughter. You'll hear briefly about the nature of that argument, that Mr. Fleming was upset about his stepdaughter seeing another young man under circumstances that he and Akira did not agree.

During that verbal argument, you'll hear from Miranda Sutton and from Akira that Ms. Sutton intervenes on her daughter's behalf on the side of the argument -- the verbal argument. You will also hear, and I ask, as I'm sure you will, to pay special attention to the facts as they describe it about the Defendant's behavior as this argument is ongoing in the home.

You will hear that the Defendant gets involved in the argument, and he gets involved in a couple of different ways. And you'll hear that from Ms. Sutton and Ms. Veasley about how that occurs, and when that occurs, and with whom.

Suffice it to say, that just prior to the critical events and the murder itself, there is a time where the Defendant speaks to Ms. Sutton alone. And the victim, Mr. Fleming, sees that, and he's not happy about it. And so, he and the

Defendant are engaged in now a verbal argument about the Defendant's ongoing interjection into a family dispute that he has no standing to. Once again, this is from Mr. Fleming's perspective.

And right at a critical moment, you will see several photographs in this case of a portion of that interior of the home. So, if you go back and recall in the first photograph, there's a garage door open. And at the back of that garage doors, there's a door that leads into the home itself. And immediately upon entering that door is a stairwell up into the general residence where the rooms, the kitchen, and everything else is located.

So, after this final confrontation occurs, you will hear that the Defendant makes some comments to Miranda prior to them being seen coming out of the bedroom or from a room. She will describe to you what the Defendant tells her and the words that she remembers him uttering to her about what he is willing to do and get involved in in this case.

Then, ladies and gentlemen, there is a discussion between the Defendant and Mr. Fleming about going outside of the home to talk this out. And what happens is that Ms. Sutton and Ms. Veasley are at the top of the stairs. They're observing the argument and what's occurring. And then there's the interjection of let's go outside.

And to go outside, Mr. Fleming makes a fatal error. And what he does, ladies and gentlemen, is he walks down the stairs first with the Defendant behind him. Ms. Veasley and Ms. Sutton who -- have known the Defendant for a period of time, he is a friend or an acquaintance of Mr. Fleming, and Ms. Sutton and Ms. Veasley know him and have seen him repeatedly in the past.

So, Mr. Fleming walks down the stairwell. You can see the width and the length of the stairwell in the photos and you're about to see that in a photo that I'm going to show you. Behind him, as I mentioned, Mr. Glover was walking. Unbeknownst to anybody, Mr. Glover is armed. He's armed with a .40 caliber semi-automatic handgun.

Ms. Sutton and Ms. Veasley will tell you that after they see them walking down the stairs after that discussion, they turn their attention to what they're going to do next. And almost immediately, they hear three gunshots ring out. They run to the stairs -- the top of the stairs and they look down the stairs and this is what they see. That is Mr. Fleming. He is dead. He's been murdered.

You're going to hear testimony about his wounds that are critical in this case. And, ladies and gentlemen, the door that you see down there is the door that I mentioned earlier. One is the exit to the garage and to outside. And as I mentioned to you, there's wounds to Mr. Fleming. Mr. Fleming, you will hear from a witness I believe today -- this afternoon, a doctor, -- a specialized doctor. Her name is Jennifer Corneal.

She is a physician, and she deals as a medical examiner at the coroner's office with a medical procedure called an autopsy. And she's dealing with a subspecialization called pathology and forensic pathology. It's, as she will describe to you, the study of injuries, the cause and manner of death and the injuries that cause death. You will hear from her some very specific aspects of the wounds to Mr. Fleming because while Mr. Fleming will not be here to testify, the wounds and evidence on his body is telling, compelling evidence to tell you how he was killed and by whom.

First of all, Dr. Corneal will tell you that he died from multiple gunshot wounds, one in particular. And I'll get to that in just a moment. She will describe the locations of the wounds. And, ladies and gentlemen, you will hear that Mr. Fleming was shot in three areas of his body, generally his leg, his torso, and the fatal gunshot wound, a massive injury, a headshot with a .40 caliber semi-automatic handgun.

She will also talk about the directionality. And by that, in an autopsy, the observations both externally to show, in a gunshot wound, what wound is the entrance and whether or not there is a corresponding exit. In this case, Mr. Fleming suffered three gunshot wounds. Two were what's called penetrating gunshot wounds, meaning that the bullet went in but did not exit. Those bullets or fragments thereof were removed as evidence during the autopsy procedure. And one wound was what's referred to as a perforated gunshot wound with a recognized entrance and a recognized exit. And you will hear Dr. Corneal, and through photographs of those injuries, describe how she can determine what are entrance and what are exit gunshot wounds.

But in addition to that examination, there is an internal examination. And in the internal examination, it is noted and marked about what damage is done internally. And you will hear that. And you will also hear the directionality, the directionality of how that bullet passed through Mr. Fleming. And that is important, ladies and gentlemen, because it absolutely corroborates Ms. Veasley and Ms. Sutton about what they observed just before the gunshots. And that is the Defendant, Mr. Glover, following right behind Mr. Fleming as he's walking down the stairs because you will see, in especially the head wound, the trajectory is downward.

In addition, you will hear the doctor testify about in her medical opinion which of these gunshot wounds are lethal and those that are not, independently of one another. And certainly, when you hear the testimony regarding the head wound, you will hear testimony from Dr. Corneal that that is an instantaneously incapacitating wound and a fatal wound.

In addition, ladies and gentlemen, you're going to see that there is a shot from behind multiple -- that there are two bullets recovered from both Mr. Fleming's head as well as his arm, that there is from the crime scene evidence of one round that strikes ultimately directly under Mr. Fleming's body. And so, let me show you that.

So, what you're looking at here is the close-up at the bottom of the stairs. Mr. Fleming has now been taken from the scene. The carpet in the left-hand photograph has been pulled back. You will see closer photographs of a bullet hole in that carpeting. And in the center is the tile with distinct marks showing a bullet impact at that site. And what that means from a homicide detective's perspective as to how Mr. Fleming is positioned, the number of wounds, and the exiting of wounds, that tells you where Mr. Fleming was when that shot entered and exited his body.

Immediately adjacent to Mr. Fleming's body at the bottom of the stairs are two expended cartridge cases. They're both .40 caliber. They are semi-automatic rounds. And you will hear from the primary homicide detective in this case, Detective Wilson, that as of today or her testimony tomorrow, there's been no weapon recovered by their investigation associated with those two and ultimately three rounds.

You will also hear testimony that when they examined the scene,

once again, which include Mr. Fleming's body, right at his waist band is a gun. Mr. Fleming was carrying a semi-automatic handgun on his person as you see it there, not withdrawn, but literally that's the condition at the scene. And, ladies and gentlemen, you're going to hear evidence in this case about that weapon because as you can imagine, this weapon is part of a crime scene. And you're going to hear from a crime scene analyst and from the detective about the condition of this weapon and how a weapon like this is handled and processed at the scene.

You're going to hear that it is photographed both in its natural condition as you see here, but that after the scene is processed, and you see in that photograph the yellow, what we call, evidence tents, with the numbers on them, have a very specific purpose and design, that they are to mark evidence in a crime scene and that they have a corollary cognition to the crime scene diagram.

So, there's a crime scene diagram that will be introduced as evidence in this case. And certain items of evidence are denoted in the index by a number, and those numbers on the index correspond to the evidence tents that you see actually at the crime scene.

So, what you see here at the scene in the photographs and in all the photographs that will be admitted, you will see numbers. It will tell you, number one, that the scene has been processed, and it's towards the end of the process, but, also, that it will tell you, and you can use as reference when you look at the crime scene diagram where those items are located and a reminder what each one of those items are.

So, in this particular case, that weapon was discovered and as you

will hear from the crime scene analyst, after it is collected physically as evidence, it is examined by crime scene investigators in a methodical patterned way. And one of the things that they do in the methodical manner is that they photograph it, and they note the condition of the weapon as they find it.

So, what you see here are two photographs in that progression of processing the weapon Mr. Fleming had. And there's two very important things about it. Number one, it's in the condition on his body as you see on the left. Number two, ladies and gentlemen, it's a 9 millimeter. It's a 9 millimeter semi-automatic handgun. And on the right, you will see the depiction of it now in a what's referred to as a render-safe condition. The slide is ejected and locked back. And you will hear testimony that it had ammunition in the magazine which is on the far-right upper portion, that's in the handle portion of the semi-automatic handgun.

So, it had ammunition in it, but it had no round in the barrel of the weapon. And, thus, this weapon is -- has ammunition, but it's not ready to fire. So, anybody that pulled the trigger, as you will hear from witnesses, this weapon would not have fired. It physically has to be loaded by sliding back the handle that you see in the condition it is, and the handle has to come forward to then load the weapon.

So, ladies and gentlemen, the facts of this case as I've just outlined is that there is a three-shot close -- or at least relatively close range firing once into the head, into the body, and into the central area of the pelvic region, actually the leg. And those wounds are fatal to Mr. Fleming. And as I mentioned to you in the last part of this story and what the evidence will show

 you, is that Ms. Sutton and Ms. Veasley are staring down the stairs at a scene that they know -- is becoming real to them. That from Ms. Sutton's perspective, her husband is lying dying on the floor. And Ms. Veasley observes her stepdad in the same condition.

But Ms. Sutton will tell you that when she's staring down the stairwell and what leads to Count 2 of this case, the assault with a deadly weapon, because as she's staring down and absorbing what she's seen, after she heard the gunshots, went to the stairwell and looked down, at the bottom of that stairwell is Shawn Glover. And what does Mr. Glover do? He points the gun at Ms. Sutton, and he utters these words: If you and your kids don't want to -- or want to make it, shut the fuck up. And then he flees from the home.

Ladies and gentlemen, at the end of this case, Mr. Flinn and myself are going to ask you to find the Defendant guilty of first-degree murder with the use of a deadly weapon, assault with a deadly weapon, and discharging a firearm in a structure. And that is going to be based upon the evidence in this case. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. At this time does the Defense wish -- does the Defense wish to make an opening statement?

MR. O'BRIEN: Yes, Your Honor. If we can just clear the screen.

[OPENING STATEMENT BY THE DEFENSE]

MR. O'BRIEN: Shawn Glover did not kill Patrick Fleming and yet he was put in handcuffs, arrested, and charged with a crime he -- crimes he did not commit. Now, he sits at a table with Mr. Bashor and is forced to defend himself against a crime he didn't commit. This is exactly why there's a

presumption of innocence in this country.

Now, the question for you in this case is going to be does the prosecution have enough evidence to show that Shawn Glover committed these crimes beyond a reasonable doubt. The judge has already told you, as the jury, you are the people in this trial who find the facts. You'll sit through the evidence, you'll sit through the testimony. And at the end, you'll weigh out who is credible, what to rely on, and to evaluate whether the prosecution has met its burden of proving that Shawn Glover committed these crimes beyond a reasonable doubt.

Now, in order to try to figure out what happened, you might look to physical evidence. But in this trial, you will hear that there are no fingerprints, no DNA, no gunshot residue, no video surveillance, none of those things to tie Shawn Glover to these crimes. What you will be relying on is the testimony of Ms. Veasley and Ms. Sutton. They're the two adults who were at the property at the time, as the prosecution said. The problem is going to be that they gave three versions of what happened that day to police.

On New Year's Day when Ms. Sutton is at the bottom of the stairs, she calls 911. And the version she tells the police is that she doesn't know who shot her husband. Someone knocked on the door, shot her husband. She didn't see anything. She doesn't know anything.

A couple of hours later the police arrive or a couple of hours later into the investigation, police talk to Ms. Veasley. And she says, actually the suspect is a man named Hatch, my father deals marijuana. Patrick Fleming deals marijuana. And Hatch is a customer of my father's. He was sitting on the couch for a while. I was having an argument with my dad down in the

garage. And then Hatch talked to my mom, Miranda, for a minute, and then he ultimately shot Patrick. She'll explain Miranda doesn't know this person. She -- Ms. Sutton has never met this person, and Akira does not know this person either. Ms. Veasley does not know this person.

She'll explain to police at that time that when Ms. Sutton and her hear three gunshots, they run over to the stairwell to look down. And what they see is the body of Patrick Fleming. He is dying, or he is dead due to multiple gunshot wounds. Ms. Veasley tells the police she sees no one else. The suspect must have run out the door, but she does know that Patrick Fleming's Dodge Durango was missing. They keep the keys on the counter. They always keep them on the counter, and the keys aren't there, and the Dodge Durango's gone.

The same day, New Year's Day 2016, the police interview Miranda Sutton. They want to find out what she saw, what she knows. She explains to police at that time, I think there was a guy here. He's a customer of my husband's. He's a customer of Patrick Fleming's. He was sitting on the couch. My daughter, Akira Veasley, and my husband were arguing down in the garage. I went down to check on what happened with them.

I don't really know this guy. I've seen him maybe one time before at a previous house that we had. And she'll explain to police that she does not know information about who this person is. But if they give her until 6:00 p.m. that night, she will come back and give them the name of the person who shot her husband.

The very next day, January 2nd, Akira Veasley and Miranda Sutton will tell police we lied yesterday. It was Shawn Glover who shot Patrick

Fleming. We were scared because he threatened us. With these three versions of what happened on January 1st, 2016, and you trying to sort through what is true and what is not, you would usually want to rely on some type of evidence beyond the statements, but you will not have that here. You will not have the fingerprints of the man who ran out the door of the townhome from the door. You will not see evidence about fingerprints on the door of the Dodge Durango or inside the Dodge Durango that the suspect stole.

You will not hear if there's any DNA evidence tying Mr. Glover to that townhome. You will not hear that there's any DNA evidence tying Mr. Glover to the Dodge Durango. You will not see any video surveillance of the suspect running out of the townhome into a townhome community, a gated townhome community. You will not hear about gunshot residue testing on Mr. Glover or anyone else.

At the end of this trial, you'll be left with the word of these two women to determine is there enough evidence to find a man guilty of murder. And at the conclusion of this trial, we are going to say we are going to ask you to find Shawn Glover not guilty of these crimes because there's simply not enough evidence. Thank you.

THE COURT: Okay. Ladies and gentlemen, we're going to take a brief recess for you to use the restroom and us to address a couple of matters. During this recess, you're admonished not to talk or converse among yourselves or with anyone else on any subject connected with this trial. You're not to read, watch, or listen to any report of or commentary on the trial by any person connected with this case or any medium of information,

MR. STANTON: Yes.

THE COURT: One at a time. I wanted to hear exactly what they were going to say about the gang membership, specifically. If you could like run through that real quick before I go and say -- also, I want it made very clear, and I'll say this on the record, that this was what they heard, not who they heard it from or anything else, but that's what they heard. I mean I'll assume they didn't watch anybody -- they didn't watch him shoot somebody other than allegedly, you know -- didn't see him in a gang or --

MR. STANTON: They heard it from him.

MR. BASHOR: He's told them, and he sat there showing them videos of these are my homies in New York and stuff doing, you know, this and that with their guns.

THE COURT: It's still --

MR. BASHOR: And they know he couldn't have killed somebody because he just got out of prison for --

THE COURT: It's still --

MR. BASHOR: -- manslaughter.

THE COURT: It's still a hearing. Sorry.

MR. STANTON: From a reliable source.

THE COURT: No elaboration, just hearing. I heard.

MR. STANTON: And he's the father of her grandchildren. It's not like they're strangers. That's the scenario.

THE COURT: Well, that would explain why we hang out with people who we think more than other people. Okay. Well, that makes more sense to me. None of that made any sense. I have no pride of ownership or

instruction that's a little less specific, too, that's usually given at the end. It

25

1	references this mort specific instruction.
2	THE COURT: Okay. So, whatever you want to do for the end, let
3	me know.
4	MR. O'BRIEN: Okay.
5	THE COURT: Because right now this doesn't say, you know,
6	instruction blank.
7	MR. O'BRIEN: No, it does not. Absolutely not.
8	THE COURT: This is just what I'll do right now.
9	MR. O'BRIEN: I appreciate that.
10	THE COURT: And then give me in your I'm just going to read it
11	I don't think you need to file it
12	MR. O'BRIEN: That's fine, Judge. And
13	THE COURT: unless you want to.
14	MR. O'BRIEN: No.
15	THE COURT: Okay. So, let's hear from the witnesses first.
16	[Sidebar ends at 9:46 a.m.]
17	[Outside the presence of the jury.]
18	THE COURT: Okay. So, there's a limited instruction or a
19	cautionary instruction that has been proposed by the defense. Oh, I'm sorry.
20	He's not here. One moment. I can wait. He's using the restroom?
21	MR. O'BRIEN: No, he's not.
22	MR. BASHOR: No, he's going to get the witnesses.
23	THE COURT: I meant the Defendant.
24	MR. BASHOR: Okay. Sorry.
25	THE COURT: I can wait if he has to use the restroom.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Oh, no. He's --

THE CLERK: We just had him in there.

THE COURT: Okay. So, we're back on the record. We had a brief bench conference so that I could give the defense a slightly amended version of a cautionary instruction, which I think is, you know, better. Nothing personal to you. I think yours is great. I just think this is better, but I have no pride of authorship, and I told you if you don't want to use it, don't use it.

MR. O'BRIEN: I would like to use it.

THE COURT: And you would like to use it?

MR. O'BRIEN: Yes.

THE COURT: So, I'll read it into the record: Now I'm going to caution the ladies and gentlemen of the jury that the testimony that the witness believed the Defendant was gang-affiliated and/or had a history of violence against persons is being offered and may only be considered by you solely for the purpose of explaining the state of mind of the witness at the time she made her statement to police on January 1st, 2016. The testimony, if believed, was not to be -- excuse me -- is not to be considered as substantive evidence that the Defendant is in fact gang-affiliated, and/or has a history of violence against persons, or that he is a person of bad character.

So, what I think I didn't mention yesterday, but I will when the witnesses come in here, is that I'm allowing -- aware of a history of violence against persons and general, vague gang affiliation potentially depending on what I hear with the understanding that the witness can say she heard it. She can't say she heard it from the Defendant. She can't say anything else. Let's

25

just keep it contained. And I will give you some latitude to lead the witness so that there is no -- while I know the district attorney's position, the State, is that the source of information that she has that would give her this state of mind was, fill in the blank.

MR. STANTON: From the Defendant.

THE COURT: And unless you want me to allow such a thing?

MR. O'BRIEN: No.

THE COURT: I didn't think so. I think it's enough to show her state of mind, and why she might change her story over time to show that he -- that she believed he was -- had been violent against people in the past, that he was a gang member, and that's what she heard and believed, and that's it.

So, if we could bring --

MR. STANTON: Judge, is it proper for us within your ruling to ask the witness that they heard it, and they believed it to be true? That they personally believed it to be true?

THE COURT: Yes. That's kind of the point.

MR. STANTON: I think so, too.

MR. FLINN: And I did, in speaking with them, advise them because I've obviously been talking to them about -- that there's going to be limitations, but that the purpose of this is that the Court would advise them --

MR. STANTON: What those limitations are --

THE COURT: I will advise them.

MR. FLINN: -- so they're prepared for that.

THE COURT: I will advise them.

MR. STANTON: Miranda Sutton, Your Honor.

THE COURT: So, the record should reflect we've been outside the presence of the jury since they've been excused. And we're calling in the first witness.

THE MARSHAL: Follow me, please.

THE COURT: Ma'am, if you could approach the witness stand.

Once you're there and you're ready, if you could face my clerk. Raise your right hand and be sworn.

MIRANDA SUTTON, PLAINTIFF'S WITNESS, SWORN

THE MARSHAL: Please be seated.

THE COURT: Okay. I'm sorry about this. One second. We're outside the presence of the jury right now. The district attorney is going to ask you some questions. The defense counsel may also ask you some questions. And then we're going to talk about your testimony before the jury. Regardless of what is asked of you in front of the jury, we're not going to discuss this little hearing right here in front of the jury. We might say things like, you said before, or you've said in the past, but we're not going -- you know, your answer shouldn't be, yeah, in the little mini hearing five minutes ago, right, because this is off -- outside of their consideration.

THE WITNESS: Okay.

THE COURT: Okay.

## **DIRECT EXAMINATION**

BY MR. FLINN:

Q So, Ms. Sutton, you've testified in this case before, correct? You remember that?

A Yes.

O And you testified about giving statements about what happened on January 1st, 2016 to police, correct?

A Yes.

Q And I know that on the day of the murder of your husband, you told police one version of what happened that day, correct?

A Yes.

Q Yes. And then on the next day, January 2nd, you and your family reached out to police and you told them a different version or a more detailed version of what happened the previous day, and that included who shot your husband?

A Correct.

Q What I'd like for you to tell the Court, because you previously testified that you -- the second statement was truthful and that the first version was not because you were afraid --

A Exactly.

Q -- is that correct?

A Yes.

Q So, what I'd like, if you could tell the Court, please, the reasons, whatever they may be, however many or how few there are, that you were afraid at that particular time that you gave the statement and what about it made you change your mind the following day?

A During the interview, I felt intimidated because once I asked the officers if they could stay there with us, because I was in fear of my life, they told me, no, they could not. There was not enough police officers to stay. All I could see was my husband on the ground. That's all I could see. I was in fear

of my life. I had already been threatened. And I was not okay until my family came in.

- O Did you also previously explain, and I believe in that second statement to police, that there were things that in addition to having just been threatened the day before by the Defendant, that you knew about him that made you believe those threats to be true; is that correct?
  - A Yes.
  - O Could you explain what what those are to the Judge, please?
- A I know that he has a violent past, that my husband is laying on the floor, that he had just been murdered, and that I had been threatened. And I still had my kids and myself inside of the apartment there in the townhouse. And my biggest fear was getting out alive.
- Q You, in that second statement to police also talked to them about the Defendant, his family and friends, and, for example, videos he had shown you, things of that nature, correct?
  - A Yes.
- Q What were you talking about when you explained that to the detectives?
  - A The nature of -- I know who he is.
  - Q What do you mean by that, who he is?
- A That he was an active gang member. That -- you know, that he was sitting there watching the videos that morning of different instances that had happened the night before, New Year's Eve. The simple fact that my husband was laying on the floor was the biggest part of everything.
  - MR. FLINN: No more questions, Your Honor.

MR. BASHOR: Your Honor, I would like to be heard --

1	THE COURT: Yes. Do you want to
2	MR. BASHOR: outside the presence of the witness.
3	THE COURT: Can you step out just for one second in the hallway
4	I mean in the little room there?
5	THE MARSHALL: Follow me, please.
6	[Outside the presence of the witness]
7	MR. BASHOR: I guess, Judge, you know, yesterday it was
8	proffered that
9	THE COURT: Why don't we hear from both of them and then you
10	can argue?
11	MR. BASHOR: Okay.
12	THE COURT: Because otherwise we're going to we're going to
13	have
14	MR. BASHOR: That makes sense, Your Honor.
15	THE COURT: Does that make sense?
16	MR. BASHOR: Yes, it does.
17	THE COURT: Okay. Let's call the other witness in.
18	MR. FLINN: It's Akira Veasley.
19	THE MARSHAL: Akira Veasley. Follow me, please. Watch your
20	step.
21	THE COURT: If you could face my Clerk, raise you right hand and
22	be sworn.
23	AKIRA VEASLEY, STATE'S WITNESS, SWORN
24	THE CLERK: Please be seated.
25	THE COURT: Okay. Before the District Attorney and possibly the

And so, January 1st, was the day your stepdad, Patrick Fleming, of

24

25

Q

course, was killed in the home, right?

A Yes.

Q So, that day you told police that the man that shot your dad was somebody by the name of Hatch, right?

A Yes.

Q The following day you and your mom, Miranda Sutton, went to the police and told them what you explained was the truth and that it was actually Shawn Glover, correct?

A Correct.

O Now, what I want you to tell the Court is the reasons that you have for telling one thing on the 1st, and then telling something else on the 2nd. So, what about the events that day, what you know about Shawn Glover, and anything else that was in your head made you do that course action?

A I was just scared. After the events that happened, I didn't know what to do. I just never been in that predicament before. And just the events that happened that day I was scared. I looked in my mom's eyes, and she just looked at me, and I was scared. I didn't know what else to do.

Q What, in particular, made you scared?

A Shawn, the way -- you know, what happened right there, you know. Just everything that happened that day made me scared, you know. The prior things before made me scared.

Q What prior things?

A As far as like behavior, you know, the way he acted towards people, the things that were happening that day, the event that happened. And, again, I was just scared. I didn't know what else to do. I didn't know what I should do being in this predicament.

Q Did -	you testified	about when	your dad	l was shot
---------	---------------	------------	----------	------------

- A Yes.
- Q -- and that you heard the Defendant make threats to you and your mom, correct?
  - A Correct.
- Q Did you have reasons, based on your knowledge of Shawn, and anything you knew about him, and his relationship with your family, did you have any reason that you thought he was serious about that threat?
- A Yeah, just due to the threats and what happened in the past, what he had stated that day, you know, as far as if -- if you, you know, do this, I'm going to do that. So, that did make me scared. It made me, you know, feel in fear of my life, so I didn't know what else I should do. I -- I didn't know.
- Q Were -- at the -- were you aware at that time about Shawn Glover's past and having been in prison?
  - A Yes.
  - Q How were you -- how did you know about that?
- A Just through people, you know, he say, she say. As far as social media, as far as things I looked up, as far as things, you know, what has been said. Again, with those prior events I was in fear.
  - O Did you know or believe you knew why he had been in prison?
- A Yeah. For -- for I think it was, if I'm not mistaken, a murder. I'm not sure.
  - Q And --
- THE COURT: What prior events are you talking about? Are you talking about that or something else?

21

22

23

24

25

THE WITNESS: No. The events that happened that day.

THE COURT: Okay.

THE WITNESS: As far as him, you know, doing what he did, as far as what was said that day, as far as me being scared, as far as me, you know, knowing that the kids were in the house and, you know, trying to defend them, as well.

## BY MR. FLINN:

- O Now, this house was your sister, Angela's, right?
- A Correct.
- Q And Angela and Shawn Glover had a relationship, right?
- A Correct.
- Q Did Angela talk to you about Shawn Glover and things that went on with them?
  - A No, she did not.
  - Ω She left that out?
- A She didn't really mention like the full extent, but she did mention that, you know, that they did have arguments, that they did have their own problems, as well.
- Q So, when the -- when you said that you knew that the Defendant had been in prison, you believed it was for a murder, are you talking about -- you're not talking about what happened that day, right; you're talking about a murder from before, and he was in prison and then released for that?
  - A That's correct.
  - Q Were you familiar with the Defendant's gang affiliations?
  - A I was not, but I was aware of it, but I -- I didn't know.

A Yeah. That night -- the following night after I was receiving random friend requests, after, you know, certain threats were made, I was in danger and scared for my life, so I did feel that way. I -- I felt like I was in danger, and I was -- I was scared.

THE COURT: I'm sorry, could you repeat, random friend requests and then you said something else, something about threats; is that what you said?

THE WITNESS: Yeah. Yes. I -- I'm not completely sure, but I heard that there was a threat about me and my mom if we told, we were going to be killed next or something to that stipulation.

MR. FLINN: No other questions, Your Honor.

MR. BASHOR: No questions.

THE COURT: Okay. Could you step outside for a second, please?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

THE COURT: I'd appreciate it.

THE BAILIFF: Watch your step, follow me.

[Outside the presence of the witness]

THE COURT: Well, before I hear from you, I would -- do you have your -- can you give me your proposed instructions, please, the ones I just gave you?

MR. BASHOR: Yes.

THE COURT: Could you approach? Okay. Can you approach again? I'm sure Mr. Stanton appreciates you getting his paper for him. This is what you're arguing about?

MR. BASHOR: Yes, Your Honor. I think you read my mind.

THE COURT: Okay. So, based upon the testimony of the witnesses, balancing -- all the balancing in the world, I appreciate that there's some evidence of knowledge of gang affiliation, but the gist of this is that these women both believed he went to prison before for some kind of death of another, at the hands of another, and the mother -- I mean the wife of the decedent testified that she knew he had a violent past. And so, that's where I'm going to leave it. I'm going to allow the District Attorney to talk about the witness' beliefs of the history of violence, but I'm going to exclude gang affiliation because it's not really the impetus of this. It's mostly a deceased relative, a very serious threat, and a history of violence.

MR. BASHOR: And, Your Honor, just in case an appellate tribunal were to think that I've acquiesced, obviously, our objections from yesterday as to any of this I would renew. You've ruled, but I don't want someone to say --

THE COURT: Well, that's fine.

MR. BASHOR: -- well, he was okay with the instruction later on.

THE COURT: No, I know. The record should reflect that you've objected to any history of violence or any testimony about any history of violence. And, honestly, you know, the problem I have is I don't know what those videos -- you know, once I open the door a little bit, I don't know what it's all about, and we could have a collateral trial on how that message of violence was communicated to these witnesses. And I don't want to get -- I don't want to get into it that far. I will tell you, though, depending on what questions you ask, if you open the door to how they knew this information --

MR. BASHOR: Yeah, I'm not --

THE COURT: -- the fact that the Defendant is the one they know it

20

21

22

23

24

25

from is, you know -- I'm not going to thought to exclude it if you ask.

MR. BASHOR: I'm going to put a deadbolt on that door, Judge.

THE COURT: All right. Just checking. Okay. So, what I'm inclined to do now is bring in the witnesses, tell them about the Court's ruling. I would -- on one hand I want to encourage leading. On the other -- you know, just to confine them. On the other hand, which one of you is examining these witnesses in front of the jury? Because if it's you, you're going to have to change your style a little bit. Leading is to keep the deadbolt on what I've allowed, not to spoon feed the witness your words.

MR. FLINN: No, I understand.

THE COURT: So, like I just heard some of those leading questions. So, do you understand what I'm getting at?

MR. FLINN: I do, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. FLINN: I was trying to direct them just to get through the short hearing versus what I would ask in front of a jury.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. FLINN: Based on all of their conversations with us previously.

THE COURT: Okay. I understand. I'm just saying I don't know what you're going to do.

MR. FLINN: No, I understand.

THE COURT: I'm just trying to give you a head's up --

MR. FLINN: No, I understand.

THE COURT: -- that if there's an objection to leading questions like that, I'm going to sustain them. Okay. So, could you bring in the ladies,

please?

 [In the presence of the witnesses]

THE COURT: Okay. If you could just stand right there by the District Attorneys. Okay. So, here's the thing. You're both going to testify in this trial. I know testifying can be very stressful. And I've made a few rulings based upon arguments of the attorneys and some testimony that you gave here today. And the rulings relate to what the District Attorneys can have you say on the witness stand, okay?

And so, what I'm going to do is I'm going to give them some latitude to ask you specific questions when it gets to the area of Mr. Glover's history, meaning they'll ask you questions like then what happened, then what happened; open-ended questions. When we get to things that you know about his history, they're going to be very specific, because I'm not allowing you to testify about his gang membership, okay? What I'm allowing you to testify about is that you have a belief about his violent past. You can't say murder, you can't say prison; violent past. That's what I heard from both of you here today. It's a more general phrase for the prison case, okay?

So please don't reference prison. The District Attorney's not going to ask you about prison. Please don't reference the gang membership. The District Attorney's not going to ask you about the gang membership. And then if, you know, the Defense were to ask you, I'll cross that bridge when I come to it, okay?

And so, when they're getting to the point of what you know about Mr. Glover, they're really just talking about did you understand -- you know, had you heard he had a violent past? We're not going to talk about videos or

1	strike, but.
2	MR. BASHOR: Okay.
3	THE COURT: All right. Perfect. Anything else?
4	MR. FLINN: No, Your Honor.
5	THE COURT: Okay.
6	[Pause]
7	THE MARSHAL: All rise. The jury is entering. The jury is all
8	present, Your Honor.
9	[In the presence of the jury.]
10	THE COURT: Counsel, will you stipulate to the presence of the
11	jury?
12	MR. FLINN: Yes, Your Honor.
13	MR. BASHOR: Yes, Your Honor.
14	THE COURT: All right. At this time, State, call your first witness.
15	MR. FLINN: The State calls Miranda Sutton, Your Honor.
16	THE MARSHAL: Follow me, please.
17	THE COURT: Ma'am, if you could face my Clerk, raise your right
18	hand, and be sworn.
19	MIRANDA SUTTON, STATE'S WITNESS, SWORN
20	THE MARSHAL: Please be seated. State and spell your name for
21	the record.
22	THE WITNESS: Miranda Sutton, M-I-R-A-N-D-A S-U-T-T-O-N.
23	THE COURT: State, when you're ready.
24	MR. FLINN: Thank you, Your Honor. Can I kind of drag this back a
25	little bit

1		THE COURT: Sure.	
2		MR. FLINN: so I'm out of the way?	
3		DIRECT EXAMINATION	
4	BY MR. FL	INN:	
5	Q	Good morning, Ms. Sutton.	
6	Α	Good morning.	
7	Q	Is it all right if I call you Miranda?	
8	Α	Yes.	
9	Q	Miranda, I want to talk to you about January 1st, 2016, specifically,	
10	okay?		
11	A	Okay.	
12	Q	At that time, back then on January 1st, a little over two years ago,	
13	where were you living?		
14	A	With my daughter at 38 it was Foggy Smock Smokey Fog	
15	Avenue. I	remember that.	
16	Q	Okay. You're not sure of the number, but Smokey Fog Avenue?	
17	A	Right.	
18	Q	And when and that's in North Las Vegas?	
19	A	Yes.	
20	Q	City of North Las Vegas, correct?	
21	A	Yes.	
22	Q	Here in the county. You said you lived with your daughter; who is	
23	that?		
24	A	Angela. It was my goddaughter, Angela.	
25	Q	Your goddaughter, Angela. The house itself, what I want you to do	