IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

No. 82700

Electronically Filed
Sep 13 2021 03:47 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 III

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

Volume	Document	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
Ι	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

Volume	<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

25

Q

If you could, I know you said this is Angela's house, your

goddaughter. Would you please tell the jury who all was living in this

Could you please tell the Court where that person is sitting and just

25

Q

- Q So, he drove Angela. Approximately at the time how old was Angela? If you know.
 - A Thirty something.
- Q Thirty something. Fair enough. So, he took her to work. And did he use his own vehicle or was there some other vehicle there?
- A Yes, he used his own vehicle. He had just taken both of them to work the day before.
 - O So, he took her to work on the morning of the 1st?
 - A Uh-huh.
 - Q And you thought maybe he stopped by his job to pick up a check?
 - A Right.
- O Did there come a point that morning where he arrived back at the house?
 - A Yes.
 - Q What happened when Patrick came back to the house?
- A When Patrick came back to the house, he came in and he was discussing something about the night before when my daughter was -- had went out. And he said that he was going to look at something on his phone and went to go check out his phone, or what the video was, or whatever. And he said that he wanted to talk to Akira, my 21-year-old. And they went downstairs to talk, and I went with them. And it was a lot of arguing and a lot of discussion down there about her being -- of her age and her being a responsible 21-year-old at the time. And --
- Q Let me stop you for just a second. So, you said Patrick came back and you said with your daughter, and you, obviously, just mentioned Akira,

no, it was a typical argument that we were having.

25

21

22

23

24

25

Q So, while this is going on, does anyone else come down to the garage while you're having this argument?

A Yes. Shawn came down to the garage, and he had the house phone in his hand. It was a phone. I don't know if it was the house phone or cell phone. I knew he had a phone. And he said that Angela's on the phone. And I said yes? And she -- I was talking to Angela on the phone, and she said mommy, are you okay?

MR. BASHOR: Objection, Your Honor, hearsay.

THE COURT: Okay. Counsel --

MR. FLINN: It's not offered for the truth, Your Honor. She's --

THE COURT: Okay. Then it's not relevant, so it's sustained.

BY MR. FLINN:

Q So, he -- the Defendant, told you someone's on the phone and handed you the phone?

A Yes. And I told Angela I was okay, everything was fine. And he left back out.

- O So, at that point the Defendant leaves the garage?
- A Right.
- O Did he go outside or through the door to the stairway?
- A He went back up into the townhouse.
- O So, what did you, Patrick, and Akira do at that point?

A Nothing. We were still standing there discussing everything and actually calming down. It wasn't a big discussion after all - after, you know, so long. It was like everything had gotten out, everybody had said what they had to say. And Shawn came back downstairs.

10

12

11

13

14

16

15

17

18 19

20

21

22 23

24

25

everything is okay.

When they get up there, what happens next? O

It's like a whole different vibe. Patrick asked Shawn what does he Α want to talk to his wife about. And Shawn said well, you're down there tripping with them and fighting them. And Patrick said, no, I'm not. And Patrick went to touch Shawn on his shoulders to say man, no, I'm not. And Shawn did some move like this, like man, get off me, you're too close to me.

MR. FLINN: And, for the record, Your Honor, she kind of put her hands out, palms up, away from her body.

THE COURT: The record shall so reflect.

THE WITNESS: And that's when Patrick looked at Shawn and said, do we have a problem, do we need to talk? He said well let's -- let's go down here, let's go -- we talk.

BY MR. FLINN:

- You said he said let's go down there. Who's he? Q
- Α Patrick looked at Shawn and said, let's go downstairs so we can talk.
- Q So, now when he says that, you and Akira are still standing up there toward the top of the stairs, correct?
 - Α Yes.
 - Q What happens after Patrick says let's go downstairs?
- Patrick looked right at me, and I said no, you don't need to talk to Α him. And Patrick pushed me to the side and went right on downstairs first.
 - Q So, you see Patrick start walking down the stairs?
 - Α Yes.

22

23

24

25

Q Where is the Defendant at that point? Α Coming right behind him. Q So, when you say coming behind him, is he also going downstairs? Yes, he's going downstairs also. Q As they start walking down the stairs, what do you do? Α I'm going back up toward Angela's room to get the stuff for the baby, and I hear the shots. \mathbf{O} You say you hear the shots. Can you just -- just back up. You're -Three loud shots.

going toward Angela's room. What do you hear?

Q When you heard those three shots, can you say how long had it been since you saw the Defendant and Patrick start walking down the stairs?

Α It couldn't have been a couple seconds. Patrick is tall. He went downstairs first. Shawn came right after him. I had already turned around to go to the bedroom and I heard -- before I even got in the bedroom, I heard the shots.

O When you heard the shots, what did you do next?

Α Looked straight at Akira to make sure, because I know I don't have hearing problems that bad, I said did you hear that? And we ran to the stairs.

Q So, you and Akira ran toward the stairs?

Α Yes. The stairs, the way the stairs are, there's -- when you come off of the -- from upstairs there's a little landing. There's a little stairwell, a little staircase, and then there's a landing. And then there's another set of staircases down below that that goes all the way to the front door.

Q So, you came over to the stairs?

A Yes. And we were like on the top -- on the top of the -- of the landing. I was looking straight down at him and Akira was right behind me.

- Q So, just so I have this clear, you're on that couple steps down, then a landing?
 - A Yes.
 - Q And you're looking down the rest of the stairs?
 - A Yes.
 - Q What do you see as you look down those stairs?
- A I see Patrick laying on the floor, and I see Shawn standing over him.
- Q How did -- how did Patrick look to you at that point laying there? Was he moving, was he saying anything?
- A No, not at all. Not at all. He looked like he was slumped over on his side. And I could see Shawn standing down there with the gun, and I could see him standing over Patrick, and he's standing there looking at me with the gun in his hand. When I looked down, I could see he looks up at me with the gun in his hand.
- Q So, as you're looking down the Defendant lifts the gun and points it in your direction?
 - A Yes.
 - Q Did you or the Defendant say anything at that point?
- A I raised my hands, and he said don't tell on me. He said something like don't tell on me, don't say anything. And all I could do was raise my hands and say okay. I really thought that I was going to be shot next.

Q When he said that and that's what you're thinking, what did you do next?

A I panicked. All I could do was stand there. He was trying to get out of the garage door trying to move Patrick's body with the door to get out of the garage door. That's the only way you could get out of the door because Patrick's body was in front of the garage door and the front door.

Q Did you see whether the Defendant made it out one of those doors at that point?

A You could hear the garage door going up. You could -- you knew that he was - all I know is that I was trying to get to Patrick. By then Akira had called 911 and I was on the -- the phone, and she asked me to try and do CPR.

Q So, as you were coming down the stairs, and saw all of this, and the Defendant pointed the gun at you, where was Akira; if you know?

A I -- I knew she was behind me and then when I raised my arms, I don't know what -- you know, all I could say was okay to her.

Q You said that Akira called 911, but you talked to them?

A Yeah. She had to call 911. I know that I had the phone somehow because I had to do -- try to do CPR.

Q So, at some point you're listening to the phone and being told to try to do CPR?

A Yes.

Q So, did you go down the stairs to where Patrick was laying and try to do that?

A Yes. Shawn had already went down to Patrick. I don't know where the phone came from, but I knew that I was doing the CPR on him. I had to

THE COURT: Yes. Can I see you in the hallway for a minute? I'm going to step outside in the hallway. If you can remain seated and not talk to anyone, I'm going to be right back.

[Court and counsel exit courtroom at 10:43 a.m., not recorded]

[Court and counsel return to courtroom at 10:44 a.m.]

THE COURT: Okay. So, State you had a motion?

MR. FLINN: Yes, Your Honor. The State moves to admit State's proposed Exhibits 4, 5, 6, 7, 10, and 11 by stipulation of the parties.

THE COURT: Okay. So, any time the lawyers enter a stipulation, whether it's to admit something or they admit -- they stipulate to the existence of a particular fact, that means they've agreed, and you have to regard that fact as proved. And the stipulation to admit these means that the Defense and the State have agreed to their admission. 4, 5, 6, 7,10, and 11 are admitted.

[STATE'S EXHIBITS 4, 5, 6, 7, 10, AND 11 RECEIVED]

MR. FLINN: Thank you, Your Honor.

BY MR. FLINN:

O So, Miranda, I'm going to show you some photographs of the house on Smokey Fog and ask you to explain to the jury what they're looking at, okay?

A Okay.

Q I'm going to show you State's Exhibit 4, and I'm going to put that up on the screen. Can you see that picture on the screen in front of you, Miranda?

A Yes.

Okay. So, as we're looking at that building there, what is the jury

25

where Patrick was laying at. The steps that go up -- and then up where you

see the plant at, there's a landing right there. So, it's like a little -- you could

peek around the corner to see down into the stairwell.

Q So that landing, if you walk up the stairs to where you described that plant, the rest of the stairs, the couple more stairs you talked about, that's to the right?

A Yes. And it goes straight up into the townhouse.

Q So, when you came down and saw Patrick's body and the Defendant pointed the gun at you, where were you standing in the picture?

A I was standing right up here at the top where you see there's another little banister that's hanging out, right there. All you had to do is look around the corner to just look down. That's as far as I went. When I looked down, I look around that corner.

Q So, you looked around the corner toward the bottom of the stairs?

A Yes.

Q I'm going to show you exhibit -- State's Exhibit 11.

A Yes. That's the top of the stairs. That leads into the townhouse. This is the landing that I was telling you about, the second -- the first landing right here that leads down.

Q In the lower right corner? I'm sorry. In the lower right corner of the screen is the landing?

A Yes. That's the landing right there. There's a set of stairs about three or four steps that goes down. And then that's the landing, the first landing. And then it goes down into the stairwell and there's a second landing at the bottom of the steps.

Q So, when -- as you described Patrick started to walk down the

1	stairs
2	A Yes.
3	Q and then the Defendant started to walk behind him, are you
4	standing near this area?
5	
6	A No.
	Q So, where are you in relation to this part?
7	A I'm all the way over here by Angela's room when they start to go
8	downstairs.
9	Q So, you saw them start to go down and that's when you're
10	walking away from this spot?
11	A Yes. I was over here near the stairs. I was blocking Patrick's
12	way. That's why he pushed me to the side.
13	Q Okay.
14	A And as soon as he walked downstairs, I started walking toward
15	the bedroom because I figured he had it. You know, he's just going to go
16	down there and talk to him like he talked to us.
17	Q So, as we're looking at this picture, you they start going down
18	the stairs, and you turn just as we're looking at it to the left?
19	A Uh-huh.
20	Q Okay.
21	THE COURT: Is that a yes?
22	THE WITNESS: Yes.
23	THE COURT: Thank you.
24	BY MR. FLINN:
25	O When you testified that the Defendant pointed a gun at you and

1	spoke to y	ou
2		A Yes.
3		Q do you recall, at the moment, the precise words that the
4	Defendant	said to you?
5		A All I know is he said something like don't snitch on me, don't tel
6	I seen his ı	mouth moving. All I could do was put my hands up and say okay. I
7	knew that	I I could see my husband laying right there on the ground. I just
8	felt like all	he all he had to do was just I don't even know why I'm sitting
9	here right	now.
10		Q The day after this happened you talked to the police. And do
11	you recall	telling them the precise words that the Defendant said to you at tha
12	point?	
13		A It was fresher then, yes.
14		Q Would reviewing a transcript just of that statement refresh your
15	memory a	bout what the Defendant said to you?
16		A Yes, it could.
17		MR. FLINN: May I approach, Your Honor?
18		THE COURT: Yes.
19	BY MR. FL	INN:
20	Q	I'm going to show you a page of that and if you could just read this
21	paragraph	to yourself and then tell me when you're done.
22		[Witness reviews document]
23		A Yes.
24	Q	Does that refresh your memory?
25	Α	Yes.

1	Q	Would you please tell the jury
2	А	To the
3	Q	specifically what he said?
4	А	He said, if you and your kids want to live, you'll shut the fuck up.
5		MR. FLINN: No further questions, Your Honor.
6		THE COURT: Cross-examination.
7		MR. BASHOR: Thank you, Your Honor.
8		CROSS-EXAMINATION
9	BY MR. B	ASHOR:
10	Q	Good morning.
11	A	Good morning.
12	Q	I'd like to talk to you a little bit about some events leading up to
13	this day.	It's my understanding that you, and your husband, and your
14	daughter,	Akira, were living at a different location, and then moved in with
15	Angela; is	that correct?
16	А	Yes.
17	Q	And that was about two weeks before this occurred?
18	А	Yes, about two weeks.
19	Q	So, it would be fair to say you were kind of transitioning from one
20	residence	
21	А	To another.
22	Q	to another?
23	А	Yes.
24	Q	Okay. And by happenstance it was the holiday season, so you got
25	to spend it together?	

1	A	Yes.
2	Q	Now, Mr. Glover wasn't there and I don't know why I'm making
3	that noise,	, so I'm going to stand back. But Mr. Glover wasn't there when you
4	moved in,	right?
5	A	Right.
6	Q	Mr. Glover moved in on Christmas Eve?
7	A	Right. About that, yes.
8	Q	And between Christmas Eve and New Year's Day, roughly seven t
9	eight days	, he had been in and out of the townhouse, right?
10	A	Yes.
11	Q	Staying away from Angela?
12	A	He had been yes. At first, it was like he was in and out and then
13	he came a	nd stayed.
14	Q	And then he stayed?
15	A	Yeah.
16	Q	Okay. And obviously we've heard about this townhome, and I
17	don't think it's you would agree it's not designed for I don't know how mar	
18	people in	that apartment, 11 or 12 of you, right?
19	A	Actually, him and Angela had her bedroom.
20	Q	Right.
21	A	Me and my husband, we had blowup beds. So, we had a blowup
22	bed that was very comfortable. And all the kids were on the video games all	
23	night, so they were	
24	Q	I don't mean to criticize the mode of living. I'm just saying it's
25	close quar	ters for 11 people?

1	Q	to call 911?
2	А	No.
3	Q	You wanted to get your husband some help?
4	А	Right.
5	Q	As soon as possible?
6	А	Exactly.
7	Q	And I would think it would be safe to assume Akira would want the
8	same thing	g?
9	А	Yes.
10	Q	When you're on the 911 call would it be fair to say that call
11	occurred a	round 12:05?
12	А	It could, yes, about that time.
13	Q	Okay. And you're in shock?
14	А	Yes.
15	Q	And you're hysterical?
16	А	Yes.
17	a	You're crying?
18	А	Yes.
19	Q	You want to do whatever you can to help your husband?
20	А	Yes.
21	Q	And the 911 operator wants to know what kind of services are
22	needed, right?	
23	А	Yes.
24	Q	And you indicate that someone had shot your husband?
25	Α	Yes.

1	Q	And you had stated that your husband had answered the door and
2	he had be	en shot, correct?
3	Α	Yes, I think I did state that.
4	Q	And when asked if you knew who shot your husband, you stated I
5	don't knov	v, I don't know?
6	A	I did say that.
7	Q	When asked if you saw anything at all, you indicated that no,
8	correct?	
9	A	That I had just been threatened, and I see my husband laying there
10	Yes, I did s	say that.
11	Q	Okay. And that you stated all you knew he was on the phone, and
12	someone v	was supposed to come over, I don't know who it was?
13	A	Yes, I did say that. Now
14		MR. BASHOR: I have no idea why my cell phone is in the bag.
15		[Court recorder and counsel confer]
16	MR. BASH	OR:
17	Q	Let's talk about obviously, the first responders come in, right?
18	А	Yes.
19	Q	They secure the scene, right?
20	A	Yes.
21	Q	You are because of where Patrick's located, you're upstairs?
22	A	Yes.
23	Q	And eventually detectives come?
24	А	Yes.
25	Q	And the first responders and the detectives the first responders

	1		
1	are in their uniforms, right?		
2	А	Yes.	
3	Q	And they have their guns, and their tasers, and that sort of thing,	
4	right?		
5	А	Yes, they do.	
6	Q	And the detectives are there. They're armed with different things,	
7	right? Th	ey're usually in civilian clothes, correct?	
8	A	Right. Right.	
9	Q	And they're armed with like a recording device?	
10	A	Yes.	
11	Q	That's kind of like their weapon, right?	
12	A	Yes.	
13	Q	And at this point you have a discussion with the detectives,	
14	correct?		
15	A	Yes.	
16	Q	And at some point, a recorder is put in front of you, right?	
17	А	I believe so. I know that they asked me to write a statement out or	
18	they wanted to record what was going on, yes.		
19	Q	Okay. And so as far as you knew, the conversation was going to	
20	be recorded?		
21	А	I I really don't - don't even remember that part.	
22		Q Okay. Now, you had stated that you were obviously in fear for	
23	your life, right?		
24	A	Yeah.	
25	Q	The suspect had pointed a weapon at you, right?	

Okay. And we'll get to that, okay?

25

O

1	Q	The answer is yes?
2	Α	And I did not I'm sorry.
3	Q	The answer is yes, correct?
4	Α	Say it again. What was the question?
5	Q	Do you you don't recall?
6	Α	I don't recall.
7	Q	You don't recall
8	Α	I don't.
9	Q	saying to the police that the deal didn't go through
10	Α	I could have said that, yes.
11	Q	Ma'am, I'm not done with my question.
12	Α	I'm sorry.
13	Q	That the deal didn't go through, and I know this morning he kept
14	saying tha	t he had to recop or get some weed; you don't recall saying that?
15	A	I could have said that to the police officers. I'm not sure what I said
16	after that.	I was still distraught, I was still shaking, and I was still asking for
17	services th	at they could not provide. So, I'm not exactly sure. I didn't even
18	want to give out his name because I was so scared.	
19	Q	Okay. Maybe because it's a lie, right?
20	A	No, it couldn't have been a lie.
21		MR. FLINN: Objection. Argumentative.
22		THE COURT: Sustained.
23	BY MR. BA	ASHOR:
24	Q	Now
25	А	I stayed there, Shawn did not. I'm sorry, sir.

arguing with Akira, right?

and she did that. So, he had her followed to say that no, she wasn't with a boy

25

thought I was looking at the time because of the situation that we were in

25

going to get started with our day.

- O In your statement to police on January 1st, you indicated to them that you didn't get a good look at the suspect; is that correct?
 - A I'm not exactly sure.
 - Q All right.
- A Like I told you previously, we just -- and I just stated that, that when the officers told me that there was no one that could stay there with me and my kids, that I feared -- I was in fear. All I could see was the gun pointed up at me. And I'm not sure why he didn't shoot me that day myself.
 - Q And, again, there'd be no point to show you the transcript?
 - A No.
- Q All right. Now, do you remember telling the police that your memory was off since your last surgery?
- A No. I told them that I had a lot of things going on since my last surgery, but my memory wasn't off that -- not to know what had happened to my husband. Me and my husband had been together for all these years. I would know exactly what happened to him.
- Q And that's why you told the police you didn't know who shot your husband on January 1st?
- A No. I told the police that when they told me that they could not stay there with me and my kids in the house that my husband was laying on the floor of that had just been shot and murdered.
 - Q Okay.
- THE COURT: Ms. Sutton, because the recording equipment can't get two people talking at once, I need you to let him finish his question before

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE WITNESS: Okay.

THE COURT: Thank you.

BY MR. BASHOR:

So when asked if you could describe the individual on that day, O you don't recall telling the police no, my memory is kind of off since my last surgery?

I can tell you this right here. I could describe him pointing that gun Α up at me. That's the only thing I could see. When the officers was talking to me, that's the only thing I could see. That since they could not stay with me, that he was going to run back up, and he'll shoot us all up.

- Q Okay. So, it's fair you're really adamant today, right?
- I'm sorry? Α
- You're really adamant about what happened today, right? Q
- Yes. Α
- Q Yeah. You can't answer a yes or no question. So when -- you want the killer of your husband brought to justice, right?
 - Α Yes.
 - Q And so then you decide on January 1st, to lie to the police?
- No. What I did was on January 1st, not tell the exact same story that they wanted to know and hear, because I was in fear of my -- my life and then my kids were still there, and my husband's body had not even gotten up off the floor yet. But he had been killed and murdered. That's the only thing I was thinking of that day. Now, when my family got to me that night and took me out of that, like the surrounding that it had happened in, I calmed down,

-- but when they told me that they could not stay with us, there

25

Α

Q

While that was happening, the argument between Akira and Patrick

ends?

A No. They were finishing up. It was -- it wasn't -- the argument in the ending was not between Patrick and Akira. He looked at her and said something -- it was directed to me and him. Me and him was arguing, because I was telling him of her age and as I was doing it, I was like this and as you see, I have had surgeries on my ears, so I'm louder than what I really think I am. I think I'm loud -- not loud now, but I'm louder than what I really think I am. So, downstairs in the garage it was amplified and we're down there screaming, and my voice is getting loud, and I'm clapping, this is nothing unusual. This is a conversation I'm having with my husband.

Q Okay.

A This is an argument conversation that we all -- that, you know, that I'm having with my husband concerning my daughter just standing right there.

Q You testified on direct examination that when Akira and Patrick came out from the garage and started heading upstairs, the argument between the two of them seemed to be over; is that fair?

A Yes.

Q And that they were smiling?

A Yes.

Q And talking?

A I think that Patrick's whole thing that day was to scare Akira and -- and that was it. Her being her age, just turning 21 almost, you know, and being with a new boyfriend and everything, it was a scare tactic for her. It wasn't for anyone else. And I was trying to tell him to calm down. And that's all it was. It wasn't anything serious that, you know --

1	Q	So the argument wasn't all that serious?
2	A	No, not to
3	Q	It was normal?
4	A	It wasn't it was not normal, but it wasn't anything to, you know,
5	get your fe	eathers ruffled about.
6	Q	Uh-huh. Nothing to kill over, right?
7	A	I'm sorry?
8	Q	Nothing to kill over?
9	A	Not that my no, not that I could see.
10		MR. BASHOR: The Court's indulgence.
11		[Defense counsel confer]
12	BY MR. BASHOR:	
13	Q	Towards the end of the interview you don't remember do you
14	recall telli	ng the police that they should go and check the facility for cameras?
15	A	The facility for cameras, yes.
16	Q	You remember that part?
17	A	That they should have cameras outside of the townhouses.
18	Q	And that you give them an approximate time, 11:45, for them to go
19	and look a	t the cameras?
20	A	It had not happened that long before that. An approximate time,
21	yes.	
22	Q	Okay. An approximate time, you recall that part?
23	A	No. I recall me telling them that he did I know of him having a 50
24	round dru	m, that my husband was there on the ground, and that he could not

have gotten out of the townhouses not by foot, and he did not have a vehicle.

25

 So, where is he? He has to still be here in the vicinity.

Q Okay.

MR. BASHOR: Your Honor, may I approach? First of all, I have no further questions, and can I approach?

THE COURT: Sure. Can I see counsel in the hallway? Can you remain seated and not talk to anyone again?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

THE COURT: Thank you.

[Court and Counsel exit the courtroom at 11:17 a.m., not recorded]

[Court and Counsel return to courtroom at 11:21 a.m.]

THE COURT: Okay. Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, we're going to take a short restroom break. During this recess you are -- and you're going to follow my Marshal. During this recess you are admonished not to talk or converse among yourselves or with anyone else on any subject connected with the trial, 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, newspaper, television, the internet, or radio. Do not to form or express any opinion on any subject connected with this trial until the case is finally submitted to you. No social media, no tweeting, no Facebooking, no twitting, no snapchatting, none of that. See you in a few.

THE MARSHAL: All rise. Jury exiting.

[Outside the presence of the jury.]

THE COURT: The record should reflect we're outside the presence of the jury. In the back hallway there I discussed with you a scheduling problem that the Court has that has nothing to do with this case, but that

Justice Hardesty would like my attendance tomorrow at the meeting that we talked about at the calendar call. I told you about the email I sent to him. I think I can get out of the meeting early, but I can't take a pass on the whole meeting. I mean he wants me to attend, it's his commission, I committed to it, so we're going to rediscuss the schedule for tomorrow. And so, I just want to put you on notice to the extent you have to make plans or whatever, you can do that.

Okay. You wished -- the witness needed to use the restroom, so it seemed like a good time to give the jury a break, and we can make a record of whatever you want to make. You can sit down. Thank you. Whatever you want to make a record of. I would note that no one asked me to give any admonishment and --

MR. BASHOR: Well, I don't think it would have been appropriate at that time anyway because the logical -- excuse me -- the logical progression would be yes, I lied. And then on redirect examination it would be let's explore those reasons.

THE COURT: Right. Which they haven't done.

MR. BASHOR: Right. And my point is, since she won't admit or doesn't recall lying, then there's no need to explain under the statute.

THE COURT: Well, here's the thing. There's two witnesses, right? MR. BASHOR: Right.

THE COURT: And so, so far there's this witness who's very clear about everything, and I don't know that it needs to be redirected. I don't quite frankly -- well, I think she's very clear on her feelings. And so, for this witness I don't necessarily disagree, but I'll hear from the State.

 MR. STANTON: Well, first of all, she doesn't -- first of all, the way counsel phrased her testimony the State will disagree. Number one, that she -- her statement is that she doesn't remember lying. No. She remembers the statement, she remembers that she gave it, she remembers that she didn't give complete accurate details. Whether or not you want to say it's a lie, I don't think she's going to concede it is or at least to the extent that it's a conditional lie. She just doesn't remember -- because counsel's asking the question, do you remember telling the detectives this?

THE COURT: Right.

MR. STANTON: So, she's not denying that the statement was made and that the statement has things that are different from her current testimony or version the next day. So, is it --

THE COURT: Yeah, but she already testified why didn't you tell -- why didn't you tell. I mean that's already been covered, and she answered the question with all kinds of things that didn't have anything to do with past violent history. And so, I don't know that there's something to go back on in redirect. I don't -- I mean I get from the Defense perspective you want to call it a lie. She's explained her statement. And so, I guess I don't know what we're pre-arguing about.

MR. BASHOR: Okay. That's fair.

THE COURT: She couldn't be any more clearer like, you know.

MR. STANTON: But that answer is not -- is in response to, do you remember saying this to the detectives. It's, I believe, a substantively and qualitative different concept to ask her what -- and as we planned to do, in a leading fashion, were you also concerned about information that you knew

that the Defendant had committed other acts of violence. In a leading question specifically within the framework of the instruction and that would be the sole question to her to explain what occurred.

And just so the record is abundantly clear, that the strategy of the State as it relates to this issue is, as I stated before, we were not going to touch the inconsistent statements. So, that it is abundantly clear that that is a strategic choice by the Defense to do that under the law in the State of Nevada at the cost to the State's case of not eliciting obviously an inconsistent statement, which I think there is a cost for us to bear in that regard, but pursuant to the Court's directive, and I believe consistent with what the law permits, she is entitled to explain the differences in her inconsistent statements, and I believe within the parameters of the Court's ruling she's entitled to fully explain.

THE COURT: Which I just listened to for 20 minutes, but. So, I understand the nature of your objection. I heard her testimony prior to the hearing. I'm relying on that testimony, I'm standing by my previous ruling, but I'm not allowing gang membership, I'm not allowing any specifics, and that's it. Anything else?

MR. BASHOR: No, Your Honor.

MR. STANTON: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. So, is she out there? Can we -- can we --

[Plaintiff and Defense counsel confer]

MR. BASHOR: Your Honor, how do I go about ordering a JAVS of her testimony?

THE COURT: Ask her, and she'll give it to you. You don't have to

1	order it.
2	MR. BASHOR: Okay.
3	THE COURT: She'll burn a copy of it.
4	MR. BASHOR: Thank you.
5	THE COURT: By lunch or like right before you leave, can you,
6	please?
7	MR. BASHOR: Thank you.
8	[Court and Marshal confer]
9	THE COURT: Okay. Are they ready?
10	THE MARSHAL: In about one minute they'll be ready.
11	THE COURT: Okay. I don't know hey, State, can you go look for
12	your witness? She just went to the bathroom and
13	MR. STANTON: Yeah, she came back and went back in the side
14	room, I believe.
15	THE COURT: Okay.
16	MR. STANTON: She came back.
17	THE COURT: Okay. Will you bring them in when they're ready?
18	THE MARSHAL: Yes.
19	MR. STANTON: And just a reminder to the Court and counsel, I
20	have Dr. Corneal coming here as the first witness in the afternoon session.
21	THE COURT: Okay.
22	MR. STANTON: I told her to be here at 1.
23	THE COURT: Okay.
24	MR. STANTON: I could use a couple minutes for her to review the
25	specific autopsy photographs.

1	THE COURT: I'm going to have the jury come at 1:15.
2	MR. STANTON: Okay.
3	THE COURT: Because I might not be able to take a break until
4	12:15, depending on how you guys go.
5	MR. STANTON: And then my guess is, is that once we're done
6	with this witness, it might be better because the next witness is Ms. Veasley,
7	and we wouldn't be able to complete her testimony, so we'd have to either
8	stop hers or just break and then come back to a witness out of order.
9	THE COURT: Okay.
10	[Court and Clerk confer]
11	THE COURT: Do you want to get the witness, so we can bring the
12	jury in when she's already sitting in the seat?
13	THE BAILIFF: Sure.
14	THE COURT: Thank you.
15	THE MARSHAL: Watch your step. All rise. The jury is entering.
16	The jury's all present, ma'am.
17	[In the presence of the jury.]
18	THE COURT: Counsel, will you stipulate to the presence of the
19	jury?
20	COUNSEL: Yes, Your Honor.
21	THE COURT: Okay. Ma'am, before we continue with your
22	examination, do you understand you're still under oath?
23	THE WITNESS: Yes, ma'am.
24	THE COURT: All right. Redirect.
25	MR. FLINN: Thank you, Your Honor.

25

only other lay witness we are calling at this point is Akira, who's already been

MR. FLINN: I can tell you none of these people are witnesses. The

1	in the courtroom, so the Court knows.
2	THE COURT: Okay. I can accept that.
3	MR. FLINN: And anybody else
4	THE COURT: Will you accept that? I'll make a record that you
5	invoked it up here at the bench.
6	MR. BASHOR: And I've already been in the courtroom. She was in
7	the courtroom earlier. She's not in the courtroom.
8	MR. FLINN: Correct. For the evidentiary.
9	MR. BASHOR: Right.
10	THE COURT: Okay.
11	MR. BASHOR: Thank you.
12	THE COURT: Okay.
13	[Sidebar ending at 11:35 a.m.]
14	THE COURT: Okay. Now that we can hear you, State, go ahead.
15	MR. FLINN: Thank you, Your Honor.
16	BY MR. FLINN:
17	Q Okay. I'm just going to repeat that. Miranda, when you, on
18	January 1st, after right after Patrick had been shot, and you told police what
19	was going on and left out that it was the Defendant who shot Patrick, did you
20	believe did you believe that the Defendant had committed other acts of
21	violence against other people in the past?
22	A I know he had, yes.
23	MR FLINN: Nothing further Your Honor

caution you now, ladies and gentlemen of the jury, that the testimony that the

THE COURT: Anything else? Ladies and gentlemen, I'm going to

24

25

While you were arguing about that did anyone else come to the

25

O

THE COURT: Thank you.

20

21

22

23

24

25

BY MR. FLINN:

- O At some point, do you and Patrick stop arguing?
- A Yeah. So, shortly after Shawn and my mom go upstairs, we stop arguing. He was like I'm sorry, you know, you're grown, blah, blah, blah. And we exited out the garage and started going upstairs.
 - O So, you said he said he was sorry --
 - A Yeah.
- O -- you're grown. So, would it be fair to describe the argument at that point as it's now calm?
- A Yeah. So, everything -- it was okay. Everything was done. Everything is fine at this point.
- Q So, you two started to walk up the stairs. Where did you go when you got up the stairs?
- A I went and sat on the couch. And Shawn and Patrick they were standing up arguing. And then my mom, she was like kind of close to the -- to Angela's door -- to Angela's bedroom door.
 - Q So, when you're sitting on the couch --
 - A Uh-huh.
 - O -- can you hear this argument between Patrick and the Defendant?
 - A Yes. They're right there in front of me.
 - Q What did you hear them arguing about?
- A Basically, Shawn was saying something like Patrick was trying to beat on me and my mom. He heard us crying. And this is his house. And Patrick was like I'm not beating on them, you know, I'm just having a conversation. And I think that's when it was like Shawn got even more mad,

and then Patrick like grabbed him by his elbows, and he was like, you know, it's not like that, I'm just trying to have a conversation, you know. And then Shawn's like no, get off me. So, at that point, I'm not sure -- I don't recall who said, you know, let's go downstairs, but someone said let's go downstairs and let's talk. So, at that point, Patrick starts going down the stairs, and then Shawn, and then that's when I heard the -- the gunshots.

- O So, from -- just sort of backing up. From where you're sitting on the couch you heard all this happen. And then did you personally see Patrick start going toward the stairs?
 - A Yes.
 - Q And you saw him walking down the stairs?
 - A Yeah. I seen him going down the stairs first.
 - Q You say first, meaning ahead of the Defendant?
 - A Correct.
- Q So, the Defendant is behind Patrick. And does he also go down the stairs?
 - A Yes.
- Q Based on where you're sitting at some point they now are out of your line of sight?
- A Yeah. So, where I'm sitting, as soon as they start going down the stairs, they are out of sight.
- Q Approximately how -- you said you heard -- well, after they started going down the stairs, what exactly did you hear?
- A So, I heard the footsteps at first because there's stairs right here and then there's some more stairs going this way. So, you can hear them

22

23

24

25

going down these stairs, but once they're turning, you hear about like one or two more steps, and then you hear the three gunshots.

- Q So, you heard three gunshots?
- A Yes.
- Q Could you describe hearing those three gunshots? You know, were they -- was it, you know, one right after the other, was there any timing lapse? Can you just describe that?
- A So, the first one went, and then there was a pause, and then the other two let off. So, it was like the first one, pause, boom, boom.
- Q When you heard those gunshots, approximately how much time had gone by since you -- since you had -- since you watched the Defendant follow Patrick down the stairs; if you could estimate?
 - A About like ten to 15 seconds. It was real -- it was really quick.
 - Q When you heard those gunshots, what did you do?
 - A I looked up at my mom, and then we ran to the stairs.
 - Q When you got to the stairs, did you start going down the stairs?
- A No. So, my mom started to go down the stairs first, and then I was right behind her.
 - Q So, you stayed behind your mom?
 - A Uh-huh.
 - Q What did you hear or see as the two of you went down the stairs?
- A So, I seen Patrick laying on the floor, and I seen Shawn there. And he was just yelling out threats. And my mom's just like why did you do this, why did you do this? And I was just behind her, you know, just scared. And then at that point I started to run back up the stairs.

1	А	Exactly.
2	Q	And then Shawn moves in approximately two days before
3	Christmas	s, right?
4	A	Yes.
5	Q	And so during that seven or eight days between Christmas
6	Eve-ish ar	nd New Year's Day, Shawn's around a lot?
7	A	Yes, that's correct. Yeah.
8	Q	Okay. All right. And so, you, during that period of time, obviously,
9	given it's	a two bedroom townhouse and there are 11 or 12 of you, you're
10	going to i	nteract with one another, right?
11	A	Yeah. Yeah.
12	Q	And in your observations of Patrick and Shawn, they seemed to be
13	getting along?	
14	А	Exactly.
15	Q	Okay. And, you know, during that time it happened to be the
16	family got	to be together around the holidays, right?
17	А	Yes.
18	Q	Is that fair? Yes?
19	A	Yes.
20	Q	Because in addition to Angela, one of the children in the home was
21	the daugh	ter of Shawn and Angela?
22	А	Correct.
23	Q	Now, I'm going to draw your attention to the argument in the
24	garage, ol	kay?
25	Α	Uh-huh.

1	Q	Is that a yes?
2	A	Yes.
3	Q	Okay. You were arguing with Patrick about what he perceived that
4	you lied to	him, right?
5	Α	Yes.
6	Q	And that you were instructed not to have a boy in his car, right?
7	Α	Yes.
8	Q	And in fact, at least at some point, there was a boy in his car?
9	Α	Yes.
10	Q	And he knew this because he had you followed?
11	Α	Yes.
12	Q	And so he this was upsetting to him?
13	Α	Uh-huh.
14	Q	Yes?
15	Α	Yes.
16	Q	And he wanted to confront you with that, right?
17	Α	Yes.
18	Q	So, you're in the garage, and it would be fair to describe the
19	argument	as pretty loud, right?
20	Α	Yes.
21	Q	You're you're yelling and shouting, right?
22	А	Yes.
23	Q	He's yelling and shouting, right?
24	Α	Yes.
25	Q	You're 21 years old, right?

1	А	Yes.
2	Q	You're an adult?
3	А	Yes.
4	Q	You don't want to be followed?
5	А	Yes.
6	Q	Right. You want to be able to interact with your friend your
7	boyfriend,	however you wish?
8	А	Yes.
9	Q	It's not like you're 14, right?
10	А	Yes.
11	Q	Okay. And because the argument is so loud, Miranda comes down
12	and enters	into the argument, as well, right?
13	Α	Yes.
14	Q	And she kind of comes to your defense, right?
15	Α	Yes.
16	Q	For that very reason we just discussed, that that you're a woman,
17	right?	
18	Α	Yes.
19	Q	And at age 21 you should be able to do whatever you want without
20	being follo	wed?
21	А	Yes.
22	Q	But at the end of the the time at some point Miranda goes
23	upstairs, ri	ght?
24	А	Correct.
25	Q	And you and Patrick are left alone in the garage?

1	А	Uh-huh. Yes.
2	Q	Yes? And you wrap up the argument, right?
3	А	Yes.
4	Q	And as you exit the garage and enter the residence, again, as
5	you're hea	ding up the stairs, the argument is over?
6	А	Yes, that's correct.
7	Q	Okay. You had I think you stated on direct examination that
8	Patrick had	l apologized where he kind of came to your senses like you're right
9	you're 21 y	rears old?
10	А	Yes.
11	Q	Now, I'm going to ask you questions specifically about the
12	statement	you gave to police on January 1st, 2016, okay?
13	А	Okay.
14	Q	And you would agree that that's the day of the incident, correct?
15	А	Yes.
16	Q	And that your statement to police occurred a couple hours after
17	this had ha	ppened?
18	Α	Yes.
19	Q	Just to set the scene, obviously, you had called 911, right?
20	А	No.
21	Q	You didn't call and then hand the phone to your mother?
22	Α	Yes, I dialed. Sorry. Yes.
23	Q	Yeah, sorry. If I'm confusing, please correct me if it's confusing,
24	okay? All ı	right. So, you actually physically dialed 911, yes?
25	Α	Yes.

1	Q	And you hand the phone to your mom, right?
2	А	Yes.
3	Q	And you do that right away?
4	A	Yes.
5	Q	As soon as it's as soon as the suspect has left the residence, you
6	called?	
7	A	Yeah. So, he left, we locked the garage door, and we ran back
8	upstairs.	And that's when we I'm sorry. My mom ran back upstairs and
9	that's wh	en we had called 911.
10	Q	So, about a matter of seconds after the suspect had fled?
11	A	Yeah. About like ten, 30 seconds.
12	Q	Right. Because you want to get medical attention to your dad as
13	soon as p	possible?
14	А	Yes.
15	Q	All right. Now, just talking about your statement to police on
16	January	1st, 2016, they ask you what happened that day, right?
17	А	Yes.
18	Q	And you tell them that there was a man named Hatch in the house?
19	А	Yes.
20	Q	And that Hatch was a customer of your father, Patrick?
21	A	Yes.
22	Q	And that Patrick would average two to three customers a day
23	selling m	arijuana?
24	A	Yes.
25	Q	That Hatch was one of those customers?

1	A	Yes.
2	Q	You weren't sure how Hatch had arrived?
3	А	Yes.
4	Q	You knew that during the argument Hatch was waiting upstairs?
5	А	Yes.
6	Q	At some point during the argument Hatch comes down the stairs,
7	interrupts,	and asks to speak with your mom?
8	Α	Yes.
9	Q	And so, your mom follows?
10	Α	Uh-huh.
11	Q	Is that a yes?
12	Α	Yes.
13	Q	And then that's Patrick and you leave the garage a few moments
14	later?	
15	А	Yes.
16	Q	And Patrick is upset with Hatch for talking to Miranda?
17	Α	Yes.
18	Q	Okay. And that Hatch shouldn't be being nosey into what was a
19	family argument?	
20	Α	Exactly.
21	Q	Now, in that statement you told the police you'd never seen Hatch
22	before, rig	ht?
23	Α	Yes.
24	Q	And that you told the police as far as you knew, your mom didn't
25	know Hato	h?

1	A	Yes.
2	Q	You were asked if Hatch went by any other names. You said you
3	didn't thin	k so?
4	Α	Right. Correct.
5	Q	That you didn't know whether or not Hatch had any tattoos?
6	A	No.
7	Q	And towards the end of the statement with police on January 1st,
8	2016, the s	subject of your dad's car comes up, right?
9	A	Yes.
10	Q	The Dodge Durango?
11	A	Yes.
12	Q	And the people that are allowed to drive the Dodge Durango, are
13	you?	
14	A	Yes.
15	Q	Miranda?
16	A	Yes.
17	Q	Patrick?
18	A	Yes.
19	Q	And probably Angela, right?
20	A	Yeah.
21	Q	Okay. And Patrick had a habit of leaving the keys to that car on the
22	countertop)?
23	A	Correct.
24	Q	And you had noticed sometime between after 911 was called and
25	when you	spoke to the police that the keys were missing?

1	A	Yes.
2	Q	And because you noticed this, you told the police?
3	А	Yes.
4	Q	Okay. Now, I'm going to ask you questions about your second
5	statement,	okay, the next day; do you understand?
6	A	Yes.
7	Q	All right. At that point you tell the police Hatch
8	A	Yes.
9	a	is Shawn Glover?
10	A	Yes.
11	a	Now, on the day in question this was very shocking, right?
12	A	Yes.
13	Q	It was very emotional I would assume?
14	А	Yes.
15	Q	That you were scared?
16	А	Yes.
17	Q	Based on what you said on direct examination you were afraid?
18	A	Yes.
19	Q	Okay. And for those reasons you told the police that the individual
20	was Hatch	?
21	A	Yes.
22	Q	And it was your statement the next day and your testimony today
23	that Hatch	is Shawn Glover?
24	Α	Yes, that's correct.
25	Q	So, before on January 1, when you told the police you had never

1	А	Yeah, exactly.
2	Q	You've got it all wrong?
3	А	Exactly.
4	Q	All right. Now, when you called 911, would it be fair to say that the
5	police arrived fairly quickly?	
6	А	Yes.
7	Q	It probably felt like an eternity, right?
8	A	Yeah.
9	Q	But upon reflection you would agree it was only a matter of a
10	couple of minutes?	
11	A	Yeah.
12		MR. BASHOR: The Court's indulgence.
13		[Defense counsel confer]
14	BY MR. BASHOR:	
15	Q	My co-counsel reminded me about the Dodge Durango. In
16	addition to noticing the keys weren't there	
17	A	Uh-huh.
18	Q	where Patrick had routinely parked the vehicle, the vehicle wasn't
19	there, right?	
20	A	Correct.
21	Q	We'll hear later that the vehicle was recovered, but as far as you
22	knew, the regular spot where Patrick, you, and Miranda would park, the Dodge	
23	Durango was missing?	
24	А	Exactly.
25	Q	Along with the keys?

A Yes.

MR. BASHOR: Nothing further.

THE COURT: Redirect?

REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. FLINN:

Q Akira, when you told the police that it was -- that it was Hatch and didn't use the Defendant's real name at that time, did you personally believe that the Defendant had been violent toward other people in the past?

A Yes.

MR. FLINN: Nothing further, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Again, Ladies and Gentlemen of the jury, the testimony that the witness believed the Defendant has 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, is not to be considered as substantive evidence that the Defendant has a history of violence against persons or that he is a person of bad character. With that, thank you very much.

I'm sorry, do any of the ladies and gentlemen of the jury have any questions you wish the Court to ask the witness? There being no questions, thank you very much for your testimony. You're excused. Can I see counsel about scheduling?

[Sidebar begins at 12:02 a.m.]

THE COURT: So, we break now, and I tell them 1:15?

MR. FLINN: Yeah.

THE COURT: Okay. Ramsey?	
THE MARSHAL: Yes, Your Honor?	
THE COURT: When you're done can you come up here?	
THE MARSHAL: Okay.	
THE COURT: Okay.	
MR. STANTON: If I could just have Ramsey or someone here at 1.	
THE COURT: Yeah.	
MR. STANTON: So, I can get the doctor in here, and then we	
could	
THE COURT: How about 1:05, so I can give them at least an hour?	
MR. STANTON: Yeah, sure.	
THE COURT: You know we had an entire lawsuit with the	
Marshals.	
MR. STANTON: Really?	
THE COURT: Yes. So, I wanted to take them out the back, and	
then take them either down the back door just to the ground floor in the back	
elevator.	
THE MARSHAL: Okay.	
THE COURT: Okay. Cool.	
MR. STANTON: Thanks.	
[Sidebar ends at 12:03 p.m.]	
THE COURT: Okay. Ladies and gentlemen, we are going to recess.	
It's 12:03. We're going to recess until 1:15 for lunch. My Marshal is going to	
give you a meeting location to meet with him where he'll bring you back	

²⁵ upstairs after lunch.

So, during this recess you're admonished not to talk or converse among yourselves or with anyone else on any subject connected with the trial. Do not to read, watch, or listen to an report of, or commentary on, the trial by any person connected with this case or any medium of information, including without limitation, newspaper, 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. You've got about an hour and 12 minutes.

THE MARSHAL: All rise. The jury is exiting.

[Outside the presence of the jury.]

THE COURT: Is that door shut? I can't see. Is that door shut? UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. The record -- thank you. The record should reflect we're outside the presence of the jury. So, I just wanted to make a record that there was one time when the Defense asked to approach. In the record it was at 11:35 a.m. And we had a bench conference where the Defense brought to the Court's attention that while the exclusionary rule had not been previously invoked that the Defense wished to invoke it at that time. The State made it clear that other than the two female witnesses who just testified today, there have been no witnesses present in the courtroom for today's proceedings whatsoever and that besides these two ladies, everyone else is a non-related witness, correct?

MR. STANTON: Correct, Your Honor. Yes.

THE COURT: So even though it hadn't been invoked before, it was of no import because no one was here.

MR. STANTON: I assumed that they -- it had been invoked. I don't

24

25

of concern. So ,the first area is at autopsy, a projectile was removed from Mr.

Fleming that was unrelated to this case. It was from an obvious and apparent

older injury. It was noted both in photograph form and in Dr. Dutra's autopsy

report. Both Dr. Dutra and Dr. Corneal would, I believe, testify that that implement, and the injury, and artifact had nothing to do with the cause and manner of death. And as such I believe the inquiry in that is wholly irrelevant.

THE COURT: Okay. Is that it?

MR. STANTON: Yes.

THE COURT: What's the relevance?

MR. BASHOR: Judge, I would just submit that the old projectile could go to prior enemies, alternate suspects. I don't plan to harp too terribly into it, it's just that the fact that it exists. And I think that that's --

THE COURT: Prior enemies and alternate suspects.

MR. BASHOR: Correct.

THE COURT: Okay. So, what, if any, additional information do you have about the time or evidence would you be able to -- because if this becomes an issue, even though you might not have noticed witnesses, I might allow you to get into it if I allow it. I'm not saying I'm allowing it, I'm just curious. Do you have a witness that says that was 30 years ago, two years ago, six minutes ago; how -- what do you know?

MR. STANTON: For me?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. STANTON: I have -- other than it is a completely healed injury with no evidence of its tracking and no signs of that it be of recent vintage. As far as --

THE COURT: So, have you asked his family, hey -- I mean usually when someone gets shot, someone besides that person knows or has an idea of when that happened.

THE WITNESS: Melvin A. Givens, III. G-I-V-E-N-S.

25

25

and he was over in the project area off of Washington. And he was walking

with another guy and some guy came around the corner and asked him a

24

25

question. It was like a drive-by shooting. And they asked him a question, do he know such and such and such, and he said, no. So, he turned to walk away, and they shot him in the back three times.

- Q Okay.
- A And they shot his friend, also.
- O Thank you very much. I have no further questions.

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

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you very much, sir, for your testimony.

THE WITNESS: All right.

THE COURT: Okay. Is there anything else?

MR. BASHOR: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Anything else?

MR. STANTON: Not any other evidence or argument from me on this issue.

THE COURT: All right. Based upon the only reliable evidence, which is testimony under oath of the named victim's father that this projectile was at or around 25 years ago, I won't allow the inquiry. It is significantly more prejudicial than probative to somehow paint him as I don't know what and the idea that somehow retribution is happening 25 hour -- 25 years later is a stretch, at best. Anything else?

MR. STANTON: And, Your Honor, the other -- just for the record, the other matter was the toxicology report of Mr. Fleming, as well.

THE COURT: One second, one second.

[Court and Marshal confer]

THE COURT: Okay.

23

24

25

MR. STANTON: Mr. Bashor indicated to me that they are not going to go into that area of inquiry. I would have had the same objection for the same reasons, but since he's not going into it, I appreciate that, so that's not an issue, but I just wanted to put it on the record that that issue was discussed between me and Defense counsel prior to this.

MR. BASHOR: And, Judge, if we were pursuing a different line of defense, obviously, I would have a different position, but I don't think that a small amount of marijuana in Mr. Fleming's system has anything to do with this case.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

MR. STANTON: That's it. Nothing further on behalf of the State.

THE COURT: Okay. Bring in the jury. Doctor? By the way, do you have any objection to the named victim's father remaining in the courtroom?

MR. BASHOR: No.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. BASHOR: He's not on our witness list.

THE COURT: No. Okay.

MR. BASHOR: That's fine.

THE COURT: But technically he testified.

MR. BASHOR: Oh, I understand, but, no, that's fine, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.

[State counsel and Court Recorder confer]

THE MARSHAL: All rise. The jury is entering. The jury is all present, ma'am.

[In the presence of the jury.]

1	THE COURT: Counsel, will you stipulate to the presence of the	
2	jury?	
3	MR. STANTON: Yes, Your Honor.	
4	MR. BASHOR: Yes, Your Honor.	
5	THE COURT: Doctor, if you could please face my Clerk, raise your	
6	right hand, and be sworn.	
7	DR. JENNIFER CORNEAL, PLAINTIFF'S WITNESS, SWORN	
8	THE CLERK: Please be seated. Would you state and spell your	
9	name for the record?	
10	THE WITNESS: Jennifer Corneal, J-E-N-N-I-F-E-R C-O-R-N-E-A-L.	
11	MR. STANTON: May I proceed, Your Honor?	
12	THE COURT: Yes. Thank you.	
13	DIRECT EXAMINATION	
14	BY MR. STANTON:	
15	Q Ma'am, how are you employed?	
16	A I'm a medical examiner at the Clark County Office of the Coroner	
17	Medical Examiner.	
18	Q And I'd like to talk to you about, in kind of general terms, your	
19	background both from an educational perspective, as well as your professional	
20	experience. Do you have an educational background that allows you and	
21	assists you in performing your functions at the Coroner's office?	
22	A I do.	
23	Q And what is your educational background?	
24	A I'm a doctor. I completed medical school. I then completed four	
25	years of a pathology residency. I'm a board certified anatomic pathologist. I	

then completed a year of subspecialty training in forensic pathology, and I'm a board certified forensic pathologist.

- Q And the -- I'll get into the area of pathology and the subcategories that you just mentioned, but you are a licensed physician here in the State of Nevada?
 - A lam.
- Q And you perform functions to include a medical procedure as part of your duties called an autopsy?
 - A Correct.
- Q How many autopsies have you been involved in as -- either as the primary physician or an assisting capacity in your career?
 - A Over 1,000.
 - Q And does that also include injuries involving gunshot wounds?
 - A Yes.
- Q Is there a significant number of those thousands that gunshot wounds are part of your examination?
 - A Yes.
- O Doctor, let me ask you some questions about the area of pathology. And once again in general terms can you explain what pathology means?
- A Pathology is a study of disease processes. They consider the pathologist the doctor's doctor. So, if you have a biopsy or specimens taken from you, the pathologist looks at that and gives a diagnosis.
- Q So, that could be say skin tissue involving some sort of suspected disease, and they're looking for a specialized assessment from a physician

focused in that field?

A Yes.

Q And then you mentioned there's something called anatomical pathology; what is that?

A Pathology is divided into anatomical pathology and clinical pathology. Anatomical pathology includes forensic pathology, which is what I do. Surgical pathology, which is what I was talking about when you get a biopsy, or an organ taken out, and they look at it and give a diagnosis to the doctor. Clinical pathology, on the other hand, has to do with microbiology, chemistry. Pathologists are the ones who run the labs in the hospitals, so clinical pathologists tend to do that.

Q And the final field is forensic pathology. Can you explain what that sub-specialization is in?

A Forensic pathology is the subspecialty of anatomic pathology that looks at medical legal death. And my job, as part of that, is to perform autopsies and determine cause and manner of death.

- Q And could you describe what cause of death means to you in the medical legal context?
 - A Cause of death is the immediate reason somebody has died.
- Q And how many categorizations are used in your field as coroners both here and across the country?
 - A For manner of death?
 - Q Well, cause of death can be a wide range. Manner of death.
- A For manner of death, there are five categories; there's natural, accident, suicide, homicide, and then when the death doesn't fit into either of

THE COURT: 36 through 48 are admitted by stipulation.

[STATE'S EXHIBITS 36 THROUGH 48 RECEIVED]

BY MR. STANTON:

- Q In addition, Dr. Corneal, I asked you prior to your testimony to select via file numbers out of a large number of photographs, photographs that you believe might assist the jury in understanding your testimony and the findings in this case; is that accurate?
 - A Yes.
 - Q And they are depicted in the photographs that I just mentioned?
 - A Yes.
- O Doctor, let me first ask some background questions about the autopsy proceeding and that medical procedure. Could you explain kind of what the examination entails, in particular, the external and internal exam?
- A Yes. The autopsy, as he stated, consists of an external examination, which is just looking at the outside of the body, documenting hair color, eye color, tattoos, scars, and any injuries that might be seen. And then we open the body, we examine the organs, we examine the inside tissues to look for again more injuries and also any natural disease processes which might contribute or cause death.
- Q And during that process there are a number of items of evidence that are memorialized, both by the physician, as well as a photographer?
 - A Yes.
- Q So, let me begin now in addressing your assessment of the injuries that were noted on Mr. Fleming. And if -- I plan on going through the order that they're listed in the autopsy report. Are you comfortable with that order?
 - A Yes.

Q And could you kind of contrast what an exit wound would look like versus what we see here?

A Sure. So, an exit wound on the other hand is more of a tearing of the skin. It actually can be pushed back together. We call it a laceration. And there can be abrasion, but usually there's not abrasion and there's no soot or stippling around the wound.

Q So, now what I'd like to do, Doctor, is go back to the previous photograph and ask you some questions about the internal assessment of the injuries of that wound. Is it -- what do you do or what is normal about determining, from an internal examination, where --

MR. STANTON: -- that's still frozen on the previous photograph.

Oh, I think you have to --

THE WITNESS: What did I do?

THE COURT: Wait. Just go ahead and say it.

THE CLERK: You click the other arrow down.

MR. STANTON: I think if she -- oh, no, there you go. You got it.

Sorry.

BY MR. STANTON:

Q So, let me go back to Exhibit 39. Doctor, what is done to determine the path or trajectory of that bullet?

A The scalp is reflected, and a portion of the skull was removed. The brain is also removed and dissected. And as we radiograph everyone, we knew the projectile was in his right jaw area, so that was dissected out from below.

Q And could you tell me what path, anatomically, to your frame of

21

22

23

24

25

reference that you use in all wounds that this bullet -- gunshot injury, took inside his head?

A Sure. First, just to explain anatomic paths, when we're talking about the body, front is the front of your body with your hands, with your palms, facing forward. The tops of your feet would be forward. The soles would be back. Top, bottom, just like you would think. So, this went back to front, left to right, and downward.

- O So, the trajectory as we see it is left to right and downward?
- A Yes.
- Q You indicated that through x-rays you determined that there was a bullet still in Mr. Fleming associated with this entrance gunshot wound?
 - A Yes.
- Q Before we get to where the bullet came to rest, where did it go through anatomically before it came to rest?
- A It went through his brain. It transected his brain stem. And then it went down into his oral cavity fracturing his jaw.
 - Q So, the skull is fractured?
 - A Yes.
- Q And then you said it dissected the brain stem. Is that an important organ when you're examining injuries in that region of the body to note?
 - A Yes.
- Q We'll get back to that in just a second, but let me go to the mandible; what was the condition of the mandible?
 - A The mandible was fractured.
 - O As a result of the bullet striking that bone?

1	A	Yes.	
2	Q	And so for those not familiar, the mandible is part of the jaw area	
3	of our bodies?		
4	A	Yes. It's your jaw on the bottom here.	
5	Q	The lower jaw?	
6	A	The lower jaw.	
7	Q	So, let me talk to you about your assessment from a medical	
8	perspectiv	e, Dr. Corneal, as to whether or not this wound, number one, was	
9	instantaneously incapacitating in your opinion?		
10	A	Yes.	
11	Q	Does that have something to do with the transection of the brain	
12	stem?		
13	A	Yes.	
14	Q	Can you explain that?	
15	A	Within your brain stem and the mid-brain is an area that controls	
16	respiration. So, if you transect the brain stem, you no longer can cause your		
17	lungs and diaphragm to work, and you instantaneously die.		
18	Q	Now, there is another part of gunshot wounds that you look at	
19	from a forensic pathology perspective and that is whether or not you can tell		
20	or see signs of evidence of the range that the weapon was from the person o		
21	the injury at the time it was inflicted?		
22	A	Yes.	
23	Q	Are you familiar with that process?	
24	A	Yes.	
25	Q	And that process leaves physical evidence that you see on a	

O

Now, Doctor, let me ask you a couple questions about that wound.

1	Was it, in your opinion, from a medical degree of certainty, an incapacitating		
2	one?		
3	А	No.	
4	Q	Was it a fatal one?	
5	А	No.	
6	Q	And the final wound gunshot wound number three,	
7	anatomically, where was that wound observed?		
8	А	That was in the right groin area.	
9	Q	I'm going to show you Exhibit Number 45. Is this the upper right	
10	thigh area?		
11	А	Yes.	
12	Q	And is that rod there for a reason?	
13	А	It's yes.	
14	Q	And what is that reason?	
15	А	It's showing trajectory.	
16	a	So, the same thing about a location or the trajectory path that you	
17	previously	described from an internal, this wound can be shown by an	
18	external demonstration which is depicted in this photograph?		
19	Α	Yes.	
20	Q	Doctor, was this wound incapacitating?	
21	А	No.	
22	Q	Was this wound in and of itself fatal?	
23	А	No.	
24	Q	There was no bullet or projectile associated with this wound?	
25	Ι	Correct	

	1		
1	Q	And the track pattern was what, anatomically, to the description of	
2	Mr. Flemir	ng's body as you describe wounds?	
3	A	Right to left, front to back, and downward.	
4	Q	Doctor, what was the cause of Mr. Fleming's death?	
5	А	Gunshot wound to the head.	
6	Q	And what is the manner of death?	
7	A	Homicide.	
8	Q	At the hands of another?	
9	A	Yes.	
10		MR. STANTON: Pass the witness.	
11		THE COURT: Cross-examination.	
12		MR. BASHOR: Thank you, Your Honor.	
13		CROSS-EXAMINATION	
14	BY MR. BA	ASHOR:	
15	Q	Good afternoon, Doctor.	
16	A	Good afternoon.	
17	Q	I'm going to start where Mr. Stanton left off. We heard that you	
18	have classifications for the manner of death, correct?		
19	A	Yes.	
20	Q	And part of your responsibility as a forensic pathologist,	
21	particularl	y when you are working for the county, is that you report your data	
22	to the Bureau of Vital Statistics?		
23	A	Yes.	
24	Q	And we do that because we want to know how our populations are	
25	passing away, right?		

There's usually charring, soot, sometime an abrasion ring, sometimes you can

which I successfully completed. Since then, over the last 14 years, I have

25

 completed hundreds of hours of different forensic discipline classes.

- Q And I know this might be for you a difficult figure to come up with some degree of precision, but I'm looking to an area of what you are comfortable in approximating. How many crime scenes have you been involved in in a professional capacity either as the principal crime scene analyst assigned to that scene or in an assistant capacity?
 - A All kinds of crimes?
 - Q Yes.
 - A Thousands.
- Q And there is a crime scene analyst in your department, as well as the Metropolitan Police Department, kind of a seniority aspect when you have a more serious scene; is that true?
 - A Yes.
- O And could you describe kind of how that works if you're brand new versus someone with your experience about what type of scenes you would go to?
- A Entry level crime scene investigators will not be primary on things like homicides or officer involved shootings. The senior or level two CSI's would take primary on those kinds of calls.
- Q Okay. There are a group of crime scene analysts that respond to some scenes?
 - A Yes.
- Q Can you describe how -- and my first part of my question is, within crime scene analysts themselves and then I'll get to detectives as a byproduct of your answer, but could you describe to the jury how in a scene such as this,

a serious scene, crime scene analysts work together and how those responsibilities are broken down?

A In a scene such as this, usually at least two crime scene analysts would arrive -- would go to the scene. We would then discuss the scene and we would split up the duties so that one person isn't in charge of the entire investigation.

- Q And is there kind of a communication process that exists between the analysts about their jobs and functions as you go through scenes?
 - A Yes.
- Q Can you kind of once again, in a general fashion, kind of explain how that works?
- A Usually one CSI will be in charge of photographs and collecting evidence. Another CSI might handle the diagram portion. If there are other scenes associated, like search warrants or vehicles, someone -- we would split those up, so that one person doesn't have to handle all aspects of the scene.
- Q And now I'd ask you about how that works in the interaction with law enforcement and, in this particular case, at a homicide scene how you interact and what that interaction is with homicide detectives.
- A When the detectives arrive on scene, they let us know what they need from us above and beyond what we might already have decided to complete. And like I said, that would have to do with search warrants and what they might be looking for on warrants and situations like that.
- Q And then prior to your testimony today I had you review Exhibits 1 through 35 marked for this trial. Are you familiar with those photographs and crime scene diagram that are marked accordingly?

1	А	Yes.
2	Q	And do they accurately depict the crime scene document diagram
3	prepared i	n this case, as well as photographs at various different stages at this
4	primary sc	ene as the scene was processed?
5	А	Yes.
6		MR. STANTON: Your Honor, I move for 1 through 35 into
7	evidence.	
8		THE COURT: Stipulated?
9		MR. BASHOR: We stipulate.
0		THE COURT: 1 through 35 are admitted by stipulation.
1		[STATE'S EXHIBIT 1-35 RECEIVED]
2		MR. STANTON: Thank you, counsel.
3	BY MR. ST	ANTON:
4	Q	So, let me talk to you about kind of when you arrive at a scene
5	after you'v	e been briefed some kind of in this case involving a structure;
6	what is kin	d of the first step in photographing or documenting the location tha
7	you're at?	
8	А	We would first document the exterior of the residence showing the
9	address, sł	nowing the basic condition of the exterior.
20	Q	I'm showing you State's Exhibit 4. Is this the exterior photograph
21	of the scen	e that you responded to on January 1st, 2016?
22	А	Yes.
23	Q	Let me go to Exhibit Number 5. Is that kind of a reference with a
24	number th	at's important to you; why is that photograph
25	A	Correct. This shows the front door of the specific unit involved in

7

9

10

11

19

21

24

25

Α

Yes. The numbers that you see here all are associated with pieces

you tell me what those are designed to depict?

25

of evidence that were -- that were collected at the scene.

- O And then is there an index that's associated with that?
- Q And let me show you Exhibit Number 3. Is that the index for the numbers that are depicted on the crime scene?
- Q So, the description is by the crime scene analyst of the item that we see here, and those numbers reference the diagram itself?
- Q I gotcha. So, now let me go to Exhibit Number 8. Can you tell us where inside the home that is and what we're looking at?
- A This is at the top of the first set of stairs looking down into the entryway. The doorway straight in front of you is that front door. And then the doorway to your left is the garage.
- Q Now, Ms. Harder, in this photograph we do not see any yellow evidence tents. Does that tell you something about when this photograph was taken in comparison to some others?
- A This would be taken prior to any investigation, any locating of evidence. This was our initial photographs.
- Q Okay. Now, let me go with Exhibit 9. Can you tell us what that is and how it compares and contrasts with the previous photo?
- A Right. This is the same view, except in this photo you can see evidence tents in the middle under his arm showing where some evidence had been located.
 - Q And so if I could, going back to Exhibit Number 1, this is the raw

diagram without any evidence depicted on it, and this Exhibit 2 is the same diagram, but with it processed and memorialized as to specific evidentiary items?

A Correct.

Q I want to now ask you about Grand Jury Exhibit Number 12. And can you tell us where we are in this photograph?

A This is at the bottom of that same stairway, a closer photo of the deceased in that entryway.

Q And the doors that are around his person, is one of those the garage door?

A Correct. The door near his right hand would be the door to the garage. The door near his head is the door to -- that's the front door.

Q Now, I want to draw your attention to a couple of items here.

Number one is this area under Mr. Fleming's head, this carpeting I'm pointing to. Do you recall that in some subsequent photos we have closer up photographs of that area?

A Yes.

O Can you describe kind of how the processing works from the overall photographs here to when evidence tents are applied and then when Mr. Fleming is removed from the scene? Can you explain how that process works?

A When we arrive on the scene, we take overall photos before anything is disturbed, or touched, or moved. It's just to show the condition when we first arrived. We will then locate any evidence, photograph it. We will then place those evidence markers down and re-photograph the scene

again showing all those evidence markers. Once the victim was removed, we then continue to look for evidence under where his body was. And in this case, we did locate additional evidence on and under that carpet.

- Q And there is a particular agency within Clark County that has a very prominent role when it comes to a deceased person at the scene; is that correct?
 - A Yes.
 - Q Who is that?
 - A The Clark County Coroner's Office.
- Q And is there a kind of a mandated procedure about how the processing of the body and areas around the body work in conjunction with the Coroner's office?
- A Yes. The Coroner's office has jurisdiction over the body. We are not to touch it or move it until they are on scene, and they are able to do their concurrent investigation.
- Q And there's actually an investigator from the Coroner's office that comes to the scene working with you and the detectives?
 - A Correct.
- Q So, I want to go to Exhibit 13. Do you recognize that as you got a closer picture of Mr. Fleming?
 - A Yes.
- Q I want to point in kind of an orientation fashion in this broader photograph to a couple items that aren't as well seen in it. For the record, above Mr. Fleming's left arm against the wall, do you see the item that I'm pointing to there?

1	А	Yes, sir.
2	Q	Is that item something that is photographed, tagged, and
3	impounded	d in the closer set of photographs in this case?
4	А	Yes, it is.
5	Q	And what was that item?
6	А	That's a .40 caliber cartridge case.
7	Q	And let me direct your attention to Mr. Fleming's right elbow here
8	almost in t	ne middle bottom third of the photograph; are there a number of
9	evidentiary	items located against, near, and underneath his body in that area?
0	А	Yes.
1	Q	And, finally, in the waistband area that I'm pointing to now on Mr.
2	Fleming's front stomach area, do you recognize that item?	
3	А	Yes.
4	Q	And what was it?
5	А	Later to be determined a nine millimeter Glock, Model 19 handgur
6	Q	Going to Exhibit 16, is that something we've seen before in the
7	photograpi	ns that I presented to you?
8	А	Yes. That's the .40 caliber cartridge case.
9	a	And that's now a closer picture?
20	A	Correct.
21	a	And this is prior to the processing from tagging and identifying
22	evidentiary	items by number?
23	A	Correct.
24	Q	Okay. Now, let me go to Exhibit 17. What has happened from a
25	crime scen	e analyst's processing perspective that you now clearly see in this

This shows item number two and three closer, item number two

25

Α

22

23

24

25

shown depicted by tag number ten and that matte type carpeting adjacent to the garage door that it's processed further. Can you explain what you do and how it was done in this case?

A In this case, these fragments were collected after being photographed. The carpet is then removed and we're photographing the underside of the carpet, as well as the tile floor underneath.

- O I'm showing you Exhibit Number 28. Is that kind of the process that you just described in the photograph as we're going through them.
 - A Yes.
 - Q And Exhibit 29, what are we looking at there?
- A That's the underside of that mat, showing the defect on the underside of the mat.
- Q And on the top side of that would have been the bullet fragment that was impounded?
 - A Correct.
- Q And let me go to Exhibit 30 and tag 11. What are we looking at there?
- A This is additional bullet fragments and the broken tile underneath that defect in the carpet.
 - Q Exhibit 32, what is that?
- A That's a photograph, stepped back just a little bit so you can see the entire defect in the tile.
- Q And once again, 31, is that a sequential photograph now up close of the previous?
 - A Correct.

has been dropped and the slide has been locked back. The ammunition is still

25

1	А	No.
2	Q	What would be required in order to make this Glock operational so
3	that if I pul	led the trigger the gun would fire?
4	A	The slide would have had to have been racked back to put a round
5	into the ch	amber.
6	Q	Thank you.
7		MR. STANTON: Your Honor, I don't believe I have any further
8	questions.	I pass the witness.
9		CROSS-EXAMINATION
10	BY MR. O'	BRIEN:
11	Q	Good afternoon, Ms. Harder.
12	A	Good afternoon.
13	Q	I want to start with a few general questions. I know you talked a
14	little bit ab	out your background and your training to become a CSA.
15	A	Uh-huh.
16	Q	Let's talk a little bit about the responsibilities of a CSA. You just
17	basically re	espond to crime scenes to document the crime?
18	A	Document and collect evidence, yes.
19	Q	And by collecting evidence, recovering physical evidence and
20	fingerprints?	
21	A	Correct.
22	Q	And also performing a variety of investigative tasks, potentially?
23	A	Yes.
24	Q	Okay. And to accomplish that, you carry test kits and evidence
25	collection materials with you?	

1	А	Yes.
2	Q	Okay. Obviously, you're in North Las Vegas official uniform right
3	now?	
4	А	Yes.
5	Q	You're not driving around in your personal vehicle?
6	A	No.
7	Q	Okay. When you're on the job, you're on the job?
8	A	Correct.
9	a	Okay. So, you're using a North Las Vegas police vehicle?
10	A	Yes.
11	a	And I assume the vehicle is stocked with those kits?
12	A	Yes.
13	Q	Okay. Do you personally stock the vehicle when you begin your
14	shift?	
15	Α	Yes.
16	Q	Okay. And the test kits, just some of the materials that you could
17	collect incl	ude DNA?
18	Α	Yes.
19	Q	Fingerprints?
20	Α	Yes.
21	Q	Gunshot residue?
22	Α	Yes.
23	Q	Blood?
24	Α	Yes.
25	Q	And there's a kit to actually test if something is blood?

O

Okay. And I think you also said you would ask the detective what

1	Q	And by the residence, we're referring to the townhome at 4032
2	Smokey F	og?
3	А	Yes.
4	Q	Okay. Smokey Fog Avenue in North Las Vegas?
5	А	Yes.
6	Q	Okay. Just to give a sense to the jury of what we're talking about
7	you're fan	niliar with this area of North Las Vegas?
8	А	Yes.
9	Q	Okay. I'm showing you what's been marked as Defendant's
10	Proposed	Exhibit I. And
11		MR. STANTON: Well, Judge, just for the record, counsel showed
12	me Defens	se A through K. I have no objection to them being admitted. I think
13	that needs	s to be on the record before they publish it.
14		THE COURT: Okay.
15		MR. STANTON: Thank you.
16		THE COURT: I didn't pay attention to that part. Sorry about that.
17		MR. O'BRIEN: My apologies. Thank you, counsel.
18		THE COURT: So, do you move to admit by stipulation?
19		MR. STANTON: Yes.
20		THE COURT: A through K?
21		MR. STANTON: Those are the ones I've reviewed, Your Honor.
22		MR. O'BRIEN: I believe that's all I have.
23		THE COURT: Okay. A through K are admitted by stipulation.
24		[DEFENDANT'S EXHIBIT A-K RECEIVED]
25		MR. O'BRIEN: Thank you again, counsel.

1	A	Uh-huh.
2	Q	and the tape then is removed to collect the fingerprint?
3	А	Correct.
4	Q	So that it can later be tested?
5	А	It can later be compared, yes.
6	Q	Okay. And in this case, there were some fingerprints taken from
7	4032 Smok	ey Fog; is that correct?
8	A	By CSI Fischer, yes.
9	Q	Yes. In fact, there were two lifts that CSI Fischer did?
10	A	Yes.
11	Q	The first one
12		MR. O'BRIEN: The Court's indulgence.
13	BY MR. O'I	BRIEN:
14	Q	The first lift CSI Fischer took for was from the front door of the
15	property?	
16	A	I believe both of them were from the exterior of the front door.
17	Q	Okay. Exterior, essentially outside, the outside section?
18	A	Yes.
19	Q	Okay. And Lift 1, CSI Fischer refers to as good comparable quality
20	A	Yes.
21	Q	And to explain that a little bit to the jury, there's a comparison
22	phase once	e a fingerprint's collected?
23	A	Yes.
24	Q	And if it's of comparison quality, essentially the fingerprint can be
25	compared	to an elimination print?

1	А	Yes, it can be compared to other fingerprints. No known prints of
2	either susp	pects, or victims, or whomever.
3	Q	Thank you. Much more eloquently worded. And that comparison
4	is, in part,	to determine the existence of any similarities between the two
5	prints?	
6	А	Yes.
7	Q	And, of course, dissimilarities between the two prints?
8	А	Correct.
9	Q	But it's worth noting that CSI Fischer noted that this is not AFIS
10	quality pri	nt?
11	А	Correct.
12	Q	Can you explain AFIS quality to the jury?
13	A	Correct. If a fingerprint is of AFIS quality that means that it's clear
14	enough to	put into the computer, where the computer can then run it against
15	the Wester	n Identification Network first to see if it matches anyone who's ever
16	been put ir	n the system before, but it has to be of a sufficient quality to do so.
17	a	And from your knowledge of the investigation, was Lift Number 1
18	ever comp	ared with the Defendant, Shawn Glover?
19	A	I don't believe so.
20	a	Okay. There was a second lift we talked about from the front door
21	correct?	
22	A	Yes.
23	Q	And this one, in particular, was a poor candidate for comparison?
24	A	Correct.
25	Ω	Which also means automatically it's also not of AFIS quality?

1	Q	3:30 p.m.?
2	А	Yes.
3	Q	Okay. I'm showing you Defense Exhibit D. This is a photo that yo
4	took?	
5	A	Yes.
6	a	And it's essentially just the interior, front interior of the Durango?
7	А	Correct.
8	a	Okay. Going back to Defense Exhibit C. When you arrived at the
9	scene, doe	s the detective does the detective tell you the importance of the
0	vehicle?	
1	A	I usually get a small briefing, yes.
2	a	Okay. And in this case, there was concern that the suspect had
3	stolen this	vehicle?
4		MR. STANTON: Object to any answer that deals with Detective
5	Wilson or a	any other person's opinion. That's hearsay.
6		THE COURT: Counsel, you want to rephrase?
7		MR. O'BRIEN: Yes, Your Honor.
8	BY MR. O'	BRIEN:
9	Q	In this instance, you were asked to investigate this vehicle well,
20	let's just le	ave it there. You were asked to investigate the vehicle, correct?
21	Α	Yes.
22	Q	Okay. The detective did not ask you to take fingerprints of the
23	vehicle?	
24	А	No.
25		Okay And you ultimately did not take fingerprints of the vehicle?

1	А	No.
2	Q	Okay. Did not take fingerprints of the door exterior?
3	А	No.
4	Q	Okay. And obviously going along with that, there were no
5	fingerprints	s in the interior of the vehicle, as well?
6	А	No, sir.
7	Q	Okay. I would like to take a step back from fingerprints for a
8	second and	d talk to you a little bit about gunshot residue.
9	А	Okay.
10	Q	One of the kits that your that you carry with you when you're
11	working is	a gunshot residue test?
12	А	Yes.
13	Q	Essentially, it's a kit?
14	А	Yes.
15	Q	Okay. And the testing involves, in this particular gunshot residue
16	testing is to	esting for lead, barium, and antimony, always difficult to say?
17	А	Yes.
18	Q	And the reason, the reason those particles in particular are being
19	tested is th	at those are in the residue produced from the firing of a weapon?
20	A	Correct.
21	Q	A handgun, essentially. Once a handgun is fired, that those
22	particles ar	e in the residue produced?
23	А	Yes.
24	Q	And part of the reason for that is that they are present in the prime
25	of a cartrid	ge?

1	A	Yes.
2	Q	So, the primer of essentially the bullet or the cartridge inside the
3	gun contai	ns these particles?
4	A	Yes.
5	Q	And then when fired, that's why they are present?
6	A	Yes.
7	Q	All right. To and this part of the science behind it is that these
8	particles ar	e ejected from the barrel of the gun when fired?
9	A	Yes.
10	Q	And it leaves a residue in the area around the gun at the time of
11	the firing?	
12	A	Correct.
13	Q	And that residue can be tested?
14	A	Yes.
15	Q	If requested, a person's hands can be swabbed?
16	A	Yes.
17	Q	And a gun residue test run off of that swab?
18	A	Correct.
19	Q	And part of the reason we might test hands, or we might be
20	requested	to test hands is the residue if a gun was in someone's hand and
21	that gun w	as fired, the residue would fall onto that hand?
22	A	Correct.
23	Q	All right. You could also swab clothing, correct?
24	A	Yes.
25	0	And in this case, while you did not go to the property, are you

1	A	Yes.
2	Q	Okay. I want to talk to you a little bit about DNA and why you
3	would swa	ab an area.
4	Α	Okay.
5	Q	Touch DNA, in particular, it's a forensic method for analyzing DNA
6	that might	be left at the scene of a crime?
7	A	Correct.
8	Q	And it's called, specifically, touch DNA because the testing requires
9	very small	samples in order to be tested?
10	A	Yes, it's an area where someone has touched and left epithelial
11	DNA.	
12	Q	Okay. And when you're swabbing these areas, you're looking for
13	touch DNA	A?
14	A	Yes.
15	Q	Okay. In this instance, the detectives did not ask you to test this
16	DNA?	
17	A	I don't test DNA.
18	Q	Okay. I thought that. As far as you know, the detective did not
19	send the D	NA to be tested?
20	A	I wouldn't know.
21	Q	Okay. All right. So, as we said earlier, you did your job of
22	collecting?	
23	A	Correct.
24	Q	At that point, it's the lead investigator's job to decide what to do?
25	Δ	Yes, sir.

1	Q	Thank you.
2		MR. O'BRIEN: The Court's indulgence.
3	BY MR. O'	BRIEN:
4	Q	And Ms. Harder, just you mentioned epithelial DNA, just so the
5	jury knows	s, epithelial DNA is essentially skin cells?
6	A	Skin cells, yes.
7	Q	Okay. And that was part of when we were discussing touch DNA
8	and what r	night be collected and ultimately tested?
9	A	Correct.
10	a	Okay. A few more questions about the investigation inside of the
11	inside of th	ne property at 4032 Smokey Fog. We talked a little bit about
12	fingerprint	s, and to the best of your knowledge, there was no DNA taken insid
13	of 4032 Sm	nokey Fog?
14	A	Not to my knowledge.
15	a	Okay. And by taken, essentially collected with the swab method as
16	we saw in	the photos?
17	A	Right.
18	a	All right. But actually, let me be more particular. There was a
19	swab taker	n of Mr. Fleming's mouth, a buccal swab?
20	A	That was probably done at the autopsy.
21	Q	Okay. Okay. So not done inside the house, as far as you know?
22	A	I wouldn't assume so.
23	Q	Okay. So, in that vein, there was no DNA taken from the any
24	counter in	the property?
25	Δ	Not to my knowledge, no

1	Q	Okay. And no DNA taken from the couch?
2		MR. STANTON: Objection, asked and answered. The bannister
3	going dow	n the stairs, the couch, the counter, all have been asked and
4	answered.	
5		THE COURT: Is this the last area?
6		MR. O'BRIEN: This is the last area and, Your Honor, I did ask abou
7	fingerprint	s, but not about DNA. This is the very last area.
8		THE COURT: Okay.
9	BY MR. O'	BRIEN:
10	Q	So, no DNA was collected from the couch, as far as you know?
11	А	Not to my knowledge.
12	Q	And no DNA was collected from the railing on the way down the
13	stairs?	
14	A	Not to my knowledge.
15	Q	Or from the wall along the way down the stairs?
16	A	Not to my knowledge.
17	Q	And no DNA was collected from the .40 caliber shells that were
18	found?	
19	A	Not to my knowledge, no.
20	Q	Okay. Thank you very much.
21		THE COURT: Redirect?
22		MR. STANTON: Thank you, Your Honor.
23		REDIRECT EXAMINATION
24	BY MR. ST	ANTON:
25	Ω	And counsel just asked you about three areas of forensic items tha

DNA as opposed to blood or some other DNA rich fluid?

- A No.
- Q Let me talk about gunshot residue. You, on several questions asked by Defense counsel, asked about the collection of gunshot residue. Are you familiar with the limitations on gunshot residue as far as what it will tell you?
- A It will basically tell you whether someone was around a gun being fired.
- Q Okay. Will it tell you whether or not I held a gun in my hand and fired it?
 - A No.
- O So, if we had four people in a room and let's assume this is a normal size bedroom, 10 by 13, or thereabouts, and a gun is fired. Would you expect, if you were to take a gunshot residue test soon in time without anybody putting their hands in clothing, washing their hands, or an appreciable lapse of time, would you expect all four people to test positive?
 - A It's very possible, yes.
- Q And there's no gradiation of the testing of gunshot reside. In other words, you can't tell by the results of it that you're the shooter, you're three feet, you're closer than person number two or three, or anybody else in the room. Is that accurate?
- A I don't know exactly how it measures. From what I understand, it's just it's either present or it's not.
 - Q Okay. Are you --

THE COURT: And you said -- I'm sorry to interrupt. You said

1	gradiation.	
2		MR. STANTON: I did.
3		THE COURT: Spell that for the record.
4		MR. STANTON: Okay. Thank you, Your Honor.
5		THE COURT: G-R-A
6	BY MR. ST.	ANTON:
7	Q	Do you know where
8		THE COURT: It's the first time I ever heard it, so I wanted to make
9	sure I got it	t right.
10	BY MR. ST.	ANTON:
11	Q	Are you familiar where gunshot residue testing is performed?
12	A	It's sent off to a lab somewhere back east, I believe.
13	Q	How about Bear County, Texas? Does that sound familiar?
14	A	East of here.
15	Q	Okay, but it's not by the way right, it's not by the crime lab?
16	A	No, sir.
17	Q	And, in fact, North Las Vegas, getting back to DNA and
18	fingerprints	s, doesn't have their own crime lab, you ship it to Metro. Is that
19	A	We do our own fingerprints.
20	Q	But the DNA
21	A	But we DNA, we do not, it gets sent to Metro, the County Lab.
22	Q	Okay. Thank you, ma'am.
23		MR. STANTON: Nothing further.
24		THE COURT: Re-cross?
25		MR. O'BRIEN: No, thank you.

1	THE COURT: Do any of the ladies and gentlemen of the jury have		
2	any questions you wish the Court to ask the witness? There being no		
3	questions, thank you very much for your testimony. You are excused. We're		
4	going to take a restroom break after		
5	MR. O'BRIEN: Your Honor, may we approach?		
6	THE COURT: Sure.		
7	[Sidebar at 2:36 p.m.)		
8	MR. STANTON: We're done for the day.		
9	THE COURT: Really?		
10	MR. STANTON: Yeah.		
11	THE COURT: All right.		
12	MR. STANTON: I only have one more witness.		
13	THE COURT: Who is it?		
14	MR. STANTON: Detective Wilson, who's unavailable today. She's		
15	out of State on another case, and then we have the		
16	THE COURT: I could do the claims admonishment.		
17	MR. O'BRIEN: Uh-huh.		
18	THE COURT: Right.		
19	MR. O'BRIEN: Sure.		
20	MR. STANTON: And we have to settle the jury instructions. That		
21	won't be too long according to our brief discussion outside your presence.		
22	THE COURT: Okay. So, you're going to close this Friday, is that		
23	what you're thinking?		
24	MR. O'BRIEN: That's be plan, because Thursday being tomorrow,		

would expect the detective to be a couple hours, and my person would be five

minutes, from my perspective.

1

2

25

THE COURT: Okay. So, if I went ahead (indiscernible) it would be 2:20, I was asking to be excused.

MR. O'BRIEN: Okay.

THE COURT: We had a full discussion of whether he's the boss, but I feel like he's possibly self-fulfilling.

MR. STANTON: So, whenever you want to, to tomorrow, and then we'll argue your thing Friday morning.

MR. O'BRIEN: That seems to be the plan.

THE COURT: I have a hearing on an in capita without probability, blah, blah. I might just move it so that we can finish this on time.

MR. O'BRIEN: That would be great, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. I have to move it. I have to move it. Thanks. So, I'm going to give them this thrill about being done a little early today.

MR. STANTON: Right. And then I'll send -- I have two specials on the other murder counts that I'll send over.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. STANTON: Okay?

[Sidebar ends at 2:38 p.m.]

THE COURT: Well, ladies and gentlemen, the testimony that we had anticipated would take the rest of the day is done, and so we're done a little early. And so, we do our best to plan and schedule. We have some witnesses that are out of State that are not available until tomorrow. So, you are done for today.

So, we're going to break now. I have a Nevada Supreme Court

Commission that I am appointed to, with a particular Justice who would like my attendance tomorrow. I'm being excused early from the Commission, but we're not -- and the lawyers knew this in advance and there's at least one of you that understands that when the Supreme Court speaks, those of us in the business listen, including me. So, I have to do that, and we're not going to start this trial until 2:30. So, we're just going to compress, 2:30 to 5. Okay? And so, we'll take a break in there and we're going to -- the way things are going along, we are still on time, no problem.

So, during this overnight recess until 2:30, you can work tomorrow, you can go about your business as long as you're at the meeting place that my Marshall designates to you at 2:30 tomorrow afternoon, okay? As long as you don't talk about the case and you follow my admonishment. Okay. Just put it out of your mind and come back at 2:30 tomorrow.

So, during this recess, you're admonished not to talk or converse among yourselves or anyone else on any subject connected with the trial. You are not to read, watch or listen to any report of or commentary on the trial by any person connected with this case, or any media of information, including, without limitation, newspaper, television, the internet or radio. You're not to form or express any opinion on any subject connected with the trial until the case is finally submitted to you. Tomorrow at 2:30.

THE MARSHAL: All rise. The jury is exiting.

[Outside the presence of the jury.]

THE COURT: The record shall reflect we're outside the presence of the jury. I would like to take a short restroom break, come back and admonish your client, because I have to do that when the State rests, and I hear that

then I'll admonish your client, and you can all be about your day. Okay? Two

25

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24 25 minutes.

MR. O'BRIEN: Very good.

[Recess at 2:42 p.m., recommencing at 2:45 p.m.]

THE COURT: Are you ready?

MR. O'BRIEN: We're ready, Your Honor. I believe Mr. Stanton has left responsibility to Mr. Flinn.

[Outside the presence of the jury.]

THE COURT: Okay. We're back on the record in State v. Shawn Glover outside the presence of the jury. Both Defense counsel are present, Mr. Flinn for the State.

Mr. Glover, in every criminal trial, the Judge has to read an admonishment that is important, and I read it verbatim to make sure I don't, you know, screw it up. So, I'm going to read it to you verbatim here. If you have any -- I usually read it at or around when the District Attorney is going to rest, but since you're going to, at some point, start a case tomorrow, I'll read it to you tonight so that you have been admonished, and you can certainly discuss it to the extent you need to with your attorneys.

THE DEFENDANT: Okay.

THE COURT: So, under the Constitution of the United States and under the Constitution of the State of Nevada, you cannot be compelled to testify in this case. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.

THE COURT: You may, at your own request, give up this right and take the witness stand and testify. If you do, you will be the subject to crossexamination by one of the Deputy District Attorneys, and anything that you

may say, be it on direct or cross-examination, will be the subject of fair comment when the Deputy District Attorneys speak to the jury in their final arguments. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.

THE COURT: If you choose not to testify, the Court will not permit the Deputy District Attorneys, either of them, to make any comments to the jury because you have not testified. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.

THE COURT: If you elect not to testify, the Court will instruct the jury, but only if your attorney requests, specifically as follows:

The law does not compel a Defendant in a criminal case to take the stand and testify, and no presumption may be raised, and no inference of any kind may be drawn from the failure of a Defendant to testify. Do you have any questions about these rights?

THE DEFENDANT: No, ma'am.

THE COURT: You are further advised if you have a felony conviction more than ten years that has not elapsed from the date that you have been convicted or discharged from prison, parole, or probation, whichever is later, and the Defense has not sought to preclude that coming before the jury, and you take the stand and testify, the Deputy District Attorneys, one of them, in the presence of the jury, would be permitted to ask you the following: One, have you been convicted of a felony; two, what was the felony; and, three, when did it happen? However, no other details could be gone into. You discussed these rights with your client?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.

1	MR. O'BRIEN: Yes, ma'am.		
2	THE COURT: And did you answer any questions he had, if he had		
3	any?		
4	MR. O'BRIEN: Absolutely.		
5	THE COURT: Okay. And so, if there's nothing else, I'll see you		
6	tomorrow at, what time did we say? I'm going to say 2:20, and then, you		
7	know, sit in the back.		
8	MR. O'BRIEN: If I have those instructions to you, say 9 or 9:30 in		
9	the morning, that's plenty of time?		
10	THE COURT: Yeah.		
11	MR. O'BRIEN: Okay.		
12	THE COURT: Well, I'm going to be sitting at that meeting with		
13	time.		
14	MR. O'BRIEN: Okay. So, I'll make sure you have them to fill your		
15	time.		
16	THE COURT: Thank you. You may understand that I'm my it's		
17	not formal, but my ADHD requires me to do more than one thing. I can't do		
18	one thing.		
19	MR. O'BRIEN: I'm not very good at idle either, Your Honor.		
20	THE COURT: So, I would be happy to be looking at the		
21	instructions.		
22	MR. O'BRIEN: I'll make sure you have them.		
23			
24	/////		
25			

1	THE COURT: Thanks.
2	MR. O'BRIEN: Yep.
3	[Proceedings concluded at 2:49 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	best of fifty ability.
19	
20	Ox B Cabill
21	Jimia 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 THURSDAY, AUGUST 2, 2018 16 17 **RECORDER'S TRANSCRIPT OF JURY TRIAL - DAY 4** 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		<u>INDEX</u>	
2			
3	Testimony		5
4			
5	WITNESSES FOR THE PLAINTIFF:		
6	Michael Reyes		
7	Direct Examination by Mr. O'Br	ien	5
8	Ben Owens		
9	Direct Examination by Mr. Stan Cross-Examination by Mr. O'Br		
11			
12	INDEX	<u>COFEXHIBITS</u>	
13			
14	FOR THE PLAINTIFF:	MARKED	RECEIVED
15	None	WANKLD	MECLIVED
16			
17 18			
19	FOR THE DEFENDANT:	<u>MARKED</u>	RECEIVED
20	None		
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

THE COURT: Okay. We're back on the record in State of Nevada v. Glover. The record shall reflect the Defendant is present and dressed for trial

with all attorneys present. State, you were saying that at the Court's request you submitted to the Court Clerk a copy of your opening PowerPoint.

[Case called at 2:38 p.m.]

MR. STANTON: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: That will be marked Court's exhibit next in order number

THE CLERK: 2.

THE COURT: And, obviously, does not go back with the ladies and gentlemen of the jury. I believe we're waiting on one juror. So, it was -- I will say this, and you may or may not know this, but it was pelting rain as I am sprinting back from the Commission meeting, so maybe that held the person up. I mean like big, fat not fast enough windshield wiper type rain. So, hopefully, that's all it is and nothing serious. Are we calling -- we're calling your person, right?

MR. O'BRIEN: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And remind me your witness' name, I'm sorry?

MR. O'BRIEN: Michael Reyes.

THE MARSHAL: All rise. The jury is entering. The jurors are all present, ma'am.

THE COURT: Thank you. Counsel, will you stipulate to the presence of the jury?

1	MR. STANTON: Yes, Your Honor.
2	MR. O'BRIEN: Yes, Your Honor.
3	[In the presence of the jury.]
4	THE COURT: Okay. Please be seated. At this time, ladies and
5	gentlemen, due to witness availability issues, the State has agreed, and the
6	Defense have agreed, that the State take a break from its case in chief to allow
7	the Defense to call a witness out of order that's here from out of State. So, at
8	this time, we're going to take a break from the State's case and we're going to
9	hear from a Defense witness.
10	MR. O'BRIEN: Your Honor, the Defense will call Michael Reyes to
11	the stand.
12	THE MARSHAL: Follow me, sir.
13	THE COURT: Sir, if you could while you're still standing, face my
14	Clerk, raise your right hand and be sworn.
15	MICHAEL REYES, DEFENDANT'S WITNESS, SWORN
16	THE CLERK: Thank you. Please be seated and state and spell you
17	first and last name for the record.
18	THE WITNESS: Michael Angelo Padua Reyes.
19	THE COURT: Definitely spell that.
20	THE WITNESS: M-I-C-H-A-E-L, Angelo, A-N-G-E-L-O, middle name
21	P-A-D-U-A, last name R-E-Y-E-S.
22	THE COURT: Thank you.
23	DIRECT EXAMINATION
24	BY MR. O'BRIEN:
25	Q Good afternoon, Mr. Reyes. Thank you for being here.

- 1 Α Good afternoon. 2 Q Mr. Reyes, where do you live? 3 Α I live in Los Angeles, California. 4 Q Okay. And I'll ask you a couple of questions about an event a couple 5 years ago; is that okay? 6 Yes. 7 Q Where -- do you recall where you were January 1st -- we'll start with 8 December 31st, 2015? 9 Α December 31st, 2015, my family, together with my brother's and sister's 10 family, we were here for New Year. We stayed at my sister's house --11 townhouse and, you know, to celebrate New Year. 12 \mathbf{O} Okay. So, the family got together for New Year's? 13 Α Correct. 14 Q All right. And you said your sister's townhouse, is that in North Las 15 Vegas? 16 Α That's in North Las Vegas. 17 Q At specifically 4032 Smokey Fog? 18 Α That is correct. 19 Q Okay. And so, you're here to celebrate New Year's Eve. What did you 20 do for New Year's Eve, what did you and the family do? 21 Α Well, we waited until 12:00. We watched firework out at the back, and 22 then we ate, we drank a little bit, and, you know, have a family gathering and
- ²⁴ || Q Do you recall what time you want to bed?
 - A Around 2 or 3:00 in the morning.

25

went to sleep.

- ¹ Q Okay. Big celebration?
- ² | A Big celebration.
- $3 \parallel Q$ Okay. And so, the next day is New Year's Day?
- ⁴ A Yes.
- ⁵ Q January 1st, 2016?
- 6 A Yes.
- ⁷ || Q | And what are your plans for that day?
- A That day, we were just going to go around. Before -- usually, when we go to Las Vegas, we stop by at their outlet store and shop, and then go back to California.
- 11 Q Okay. So, you went to bed around 2 to 3 in the morning --
- 12 A Correct.
- 13 || Q -- the night before. Around what time did you get up?
- 14 | A Between 10:30 -- before 11 a.m.
- Okay. And how do you recall what time you woke up?
- A Well, they were, my wife and my sister were preparing brunch downstairs, so we were getting ready for breakfast and lunch.
 - Okay. While you were getting ready for brunch, did anything happen?
- A Yes. We heard somebody is arguing from the other side of the place where we're living in.
- $21 \parallel Q$ Okay. Let me slow you down just a little bit.
- ²² | A Sure.

- You said you were at 4032 Smokey Fog, it's a townhome; is that correct?
- ²⁴ A It's a townhome.
 - Q And are there other townhomes in the same building?

- ¹ A Correct.
- Okay. And is your townhome -- you sister's townhome, one floor or two floors?
- ⁴ A Two floors.
- $5 \parallel Q$ Okay. What's on the ground floor?
- 6 A The ground floor is the living room, kitchen, and garage, and a bathroom 7 there.
- 8 | Q Okay. And then what's on the second floor?
- 9 A All the bedrooms.
- ¹⁰ | Q All right. And you were saying you were preparing brunch.
- 11 A Well, my sister and -- the girls were preparing brunch downstairs.
- Okay. And so, you said you heard something from the other side?
- 13 A Correct.
- 14 | Q What do you mean by the other side?
- ¹⁵ A The neighbor.
- ¹⁶ \square So, through the wall?
- ¹⁷ A Through the wall, correct.
- 18 Q Okay. What do you -- what did you hear?
- A Just an argument. You know, there was an argument, and somebody said I don't give a -- F word, you know, and there's some other arguments that we really couldn't understand.
- 22 | Q Okay. And then what happened after that?
- And then we heard two loud noises. You know, we didn't know what it
- was. You know, just two loud noises and then that was about it.
- $25 \parallel Q$ Okay. Do you recall around what time this was?

- ¹ A I would say anywhere from 11:15 to 11:30.
- Okay. And eventually did the -- did you -- the police come and contact you?
- 4 A Yes. After a few minutes, police came, knocked on our door, and they
 5 started asking us questions, if we heard anything.
- ⁶ Q Okay. And you talked to the police?
- $7 \parallel A$ We did.
 - || Q And you eventually gave them a statement; is that right?
- 9 A I did.

- Okay. Let's talk a little bit about -- you said after a few minutes the police knocked on your door; is that right?
- 12 A They did.
- 13 | Q Okay. It wasn't right after the loud noise?
- ¹⁴ A No.
- O When you say a few minutes, was it more like five minutes or more like some six and some six a
- 17 | A I would say anywhere from 20 to 30, 35 minutes.
- $18 \mid \Omega$ Okay.

22

- 19 A In that neighborhood.
- ²⁰ O So, somewhere between 20 and 35 minutes, you remember? And you said you heard the noise around 11:35?
 - A 11:15, 11:30.
- Okay. So, the police are arriving. Let's say we go to 11:30, I just want to get the math right.
 - A Correct.

1	Q Twenty minutes later, would be 11:50. And you said 20 to 35 minutes
2	later?
3	A Yes.
4	O Okay. So, 35 minutes later, doing the math in my head, it would be
5	around 12:05?
6	A Close.
7	Q Okay. Somewhere in that range the police arrived?
8	A Correct.
9	Q Okay. All right. Thank you very much, sir.
10	MR. STANTON: I have no questions of Mr. Reyes. And thank him
11	for appearing.
12	THE COURT: Do any of the ladies and gentlemen of the jury, have
13	any questions you wish the Court to ask the witness? There being no
14	questions, thank you very much, sir, for your testimony. You're excused.
15	THE WITNESS: Thank you.
16	THE MARSHAL: Follow me, please.
17	THE COURT: So, we're going to go back to the State's case. Yes?
18	MR. O'BRIEN: Yes, Your Honor.
19	THE COURT: Okay. So, we're going back to the State's case, and
20	they're going to call their next witness.
21	MR. STANTON: Thank you, Your Honor. The State would call
22	Detective Ben Owens.
23	THE MARSHAL: Watch your step.
24	BENJAMIN OWENS, PLAINTIFF'S WITNESS, SWORN
25	THE CLERK: Thank your Please he seated State and shell your

1	first and last name for the record.
2	THE WITNESS: My name is Benjamin Owens, B-E-N-J-A-M-I-N O-
3	W-E-N-S.
4	MR. STANTON: May I proceed, Your Honor?
5	THE COURT: Yes. Thank you.
6	DIRECT EXAMINATION
7	BY MR. STANTON:
8	Q Sir, how are you employed?
9	A I'm a detective with the North Las Vegas Police Department.
10	Q How long have you been a police officer?
11	A Twenty-one years.
12	Q And can you describe what your current assignment is?
13	A I'm a detective assigned to the robbery/homicide detail.
14	Q And how long have you been in that particular detective assignment?
15	A Twelve years.
16	Q In those 12 years, and including your years in other detective
17	assignments and patrol, how many violent either death scenes or violent crime
18	scenes have you ever been the primary investigating detective or in an
19	assistant capacity?
20	A Close to a hundred.
21	Q And does a number of those involve wounds that are inflicted by
22	gunshots?
23	A Yes.
24	Q Now, Detective Owens, I would like to go back to January of 2016.
25	Clearly by your previous answers, you are assigned to the Homicide/Robbery

Division of the North Las Vegas Police Department. How is it that detectives are assigned to a particular case when a homicide takes place?

- A If a homicide occurs during normal business hours, which for me would be day shift, we would respond to the scene to assist the first responders, which would be patrol. If it occurs during after hours, we would be called out to the scene.
- Q And is there a rotational basis among detectives who are kind of up for the next homicide?
- A Yes. We're usually on call for a period of time, which we would handle basically any homicides that occur, or any crimes that we would investigate during that time we were on call.
- O Directing your attention now specifically to January 1st, 2016, did you and other members of your unit, or the on call detectives for homicide investigations that responded to a case ultimately involving the homicide of Patrick Fleming?
- A Yes.
- Q Can you describe kind of what your role is and how those roles within the Detective Unit, or the Detective Division, are split up when you respond to a scene?
- A Yes. We always work with a partner. Each team will be assigned -- one detective will be assigned as the lead investigator, the other detective will be assigned as the co-lead. Generally, you switch it off and determine -- based on whoever the lead is, will determine whether or not -- how the duties are going to get delegated out.
- Q And so, at this time in this case involving Patrick Fleming, were you one

 \mathbf{O}

And that's the front door?

Q What is the limitation, what's kind of the protocol about you, as a homicide detective investigating this aspect of the scene?

22

23

24

25

A Basically, we want to protect the integrity of the crime scene once it's determined that he is deceased and that, you know, there's -- medical aid is not going to be -- wouldn't -- you know, once it's determined that he is

here, feel free to address any part of your investigation, either that day or the

next day, when you, along with your partner, attended the autopsy of Mr.

24

Fleming, okay?

2

Yes.

3 4

Q Now, once that weapon is fully examined, both at the scene, at the crime lab, or back at the North Las Vegas Police Department, were you able to determine the condition of that weapon in the holster about how it was

6

5

oriented for a shooter?

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Yes. The weapon is tucked into his waistband, in what's referred to as an inside the waistband holster. So, what that is, there's a metal clip that hooks over the belt. The holster and the firearm, itself, are tucked into the pants waistband, and the way that that pistol is oriented just to the right of the center line, is what's referred to as an appendix carry inside the waistband, and it's oriented for what would be a right-handed shooter.

- Q And you, to state the obvious, as a detective, as a police officer, carry a firearm?
- Α I do.
- Q What kind of firearm do you carry?
- Α I carry a Glock 19, 9 by 19 millimeter handgun.
- Q And do you have to qualify with that weapon?
- Α Yes.
- How often?
- Α I have to qualify with it at least twice a year, but I usually qualify four times a year.
- Q And you have done with that weapon that you just mentioned, or a weapon similar to that, every year since you've been a police officer?
- Α Correct.

A Yes. So that's a semi-automatic pistol. We determined later that it was a Glock 19, 9 by 19 millimeter caliber, and there was a magazine loaded with light cartridges, however, the chamber was empty, meaning it was not -- it did not have a round in the chamber ready to fire.

- Q So, if I pulled that trigger, based upon your knowledge of this firearm, would it have gone off?
- A No.
- Q It would have required what for it to have been ready to actually fire when pulled the trigger?
- A You would have to cycle the slide to the rear to the first chamber round in order to make it ready to fire.
- O The next series of questions I want to transition to, Detective, are how you kind of coordinate your activities with crime scene analysts. There's been testimony in this trial about this particular case. You are aware that crime scene analysts from the North Las Vegas Police Department can conduct certain forensic sampling at scenes?
- A Yes.

- Q DNA, fingerprints, gunshot residue, several others, but just to name some relevant ones here; is that correct?
- A That is correct.
 - Q Now, when that decision is made about where to take samples and what type of samples to make, what information do you go from to make those decisions?
 - A We look at the totality of the circumstances, and that information can change as the investigation progresses.

Q And that information changing as it progresses, does that also include the progression of time, and in some cases, the progression of significant amounts of time?

A Yes. If it's not contemporaneous with the time -- with the crime, itself, then that may alter our decision whether or not to do certain types of testing, like if we recover evidence later on, days or even weeks after the crime, itself.

O Now what is the difference between -- or what is the process, if you could describe once again in a general fashion, your role and submitting forensic samples that are taken for further testing in a crime laboratory setting?

A So, in general, if we believe something has evidentiary value that would require further forensic testing at the lab, for example, to compare a sample of potential DNA to a known person, then we would send it off and make that request.

Q And that -- those requests can be made days, weeks, sometimes even months later in the cases you investigate?

A Oh, yes.

Q At the end of your day and in processing this scene on January 1st, 2016, would it be fair to say that you had one suspect described, that is, an African American male adult with the name of Hatch?

A Yes.

Q Were you aware of requests made by Ms. Sutton and Ms. Veasley about concerns for their safety?

A Yes. They were interviewed by detectives where they directly made those concerns about this.

1	MR. O'BRIEN: I'm going to object as to hearsay.
2	THE COURT: Counsel?
3	MR. STANTON: Wait. Your Honor, it's not being offered for truth
4	of the matter through this witness, but simply that those requests were made
5	through law enforcement, and that he was aware of it.
6	THE COURT: Just the request?
7	MR. STANTON: Yes.
8	THE COURT: And that's it?
9	MR. STANTON: Yes.
10	MR. O'BRIEN: Your Honor, can we approach briefly?
11	THE COURT: Sure. I'll see you in the hallway, how about that,
12	because it's hard to talk up here. Sir, if you could remain seated and not talk
13	to anyone, I'll be right back.
14	THE WITNESS: Yes, Your Honor.
15	[Court and counsel exit courtroom at 3:12 p.m., not recorded]
16	THE COURT: Okay. So, based upon conversations at sidebar, it's
17	my understanding you're withdrawing the question at this time, for now?
18	MR. STANTON: At this time, Your Honor, yes.
19	THE COURT: All right. And ladies and gentlemen, you're
20	instructed to disregard the last testimony in response to the last question
21	because it's been withdrawn. And please continue.
22	MR. STANTON: Thank you, Your Honor.
23	BY MR. STANTON:
24	O Detective, at some point, were you advised that there was a Dodge
25	Durango affiliated with the Sutton/Veasley/Fleming side of the family, or

Α

Yes.

1	MR. O'BRIEN: Your Honor, if I can approach?
2	THE COURT: Yes.
3	MR. O'BRIEN: The Court's indulgence to find the report.
4	BY MR. O'BRIEN:
5	Q Detective, did you bring a copy of your report with you, by any chance?
6	A I did.
7	Q You did?
8	A Yes.
9	Q If I could ask you to take a look at it?
10	MR. O'BRIEN: Your Honor, if I can approach, please?
11	THE COURT: Yes.
12	THE WITNESS: So, I was mistaken. It was actually just in the
13	afternoon, about 12:06 is when the patrol officers were first dispatched.
14	BY MR. O'BRIEN:
15	Q At 12:06 p.m.?
16	A 12:06, yes, p.m.
17	Q All right. Thank you, Detective.
18	MR. O'BRIEN: No further questions.
19	MR. STANTON: Nothing further.
20	THE COURT: Do any of the ladies and gentlemen of the jury have
21	any questions you wish the Court to ask the witness? There being no
22	questions, thank you very much for your testimony. You're excused.
23	THE WITNESS: Thank you.
24	MR. STANTON: Your Honor, the State rests.
25	[STATE RESTS]

1	THE COURT: All right. Can I see counsel at the bench?
2	[Sidebar begins at 3:19 p.m.]
3	THE COURT: What's next? Do you need a recess for anything?
4	MR. STANTON: No.
5	THE COURT: Are you done?
6	MR. STANTON: We're done.
7	MR. BASHOR: We've the admonition to the Defendant about
8	testifying and his answer to the Court?
9	MR. STANTON: He actually never answered the question whether
10	or not you asked him
11	THE COURT: We'll take a quick break.
12	MR. STANTON: Right.
13	THE COURT: Okay.
14	MR. STANTON: Okay.
15	[Sidebar ends at 3:19 p.m.]
16	THE COURT: Okay. Well, we were going to take the afternoon
17	recess after the two witnesses were done, and it's time for the afternoon
18	recess. So, we're just talking like a quick restroom break.
19	During this recess, you are admonished not to talk or converse
20	among yourselves or with anyone else on any subject connected with this trial.
21	You are not to read, watch or listen to any report of, or commentary on the
22	trial by any person connected with this case or any medium of information,
23	including, without limitation, newspaper, television, the internet or radio. You
24	are not to form or express any opinion on any subject connected with this trial

until the case is finally submitted to you. Ten minutes.

THE MARSHAL: All rise. The jury is exiting.

THE COURT: By the way, that's real time. I know I have court time, which means it's, you know, ish.

[Outside the presence of the jury]

THE COURT: Okay. It's closed, right? I can't see.

MR. STANTON: It is, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. The record shall reflect we're outside the presence of the jury. I wanted to make a record about a bench -- a sidebar conference right now and then let you fill in the blanks if I leave anything out.

Basically, there was an objection to a question related to what other detectives did or didn't request as far as the investigation goes. In the hallway, the Defense counsel objected as to calls for hearsay, et cetera. The District Attorney decided to withdraw the question and decide whether they wish to pursue that line of questioning on redirect, and as a result, I ordered the jury to disregard the answer to the question and documented that the District Attorney withdrew the question at that time. Is there anything else on that sidebar?

MR. STANTON: Not from the State.

MR. BASHOR: And the question was referencing what the detective had heard from other detectives about requests for protection and safety, and that was the grounds for the objection. So, the question and the answer were struck pending cross-examination, which would make it more relevant.

MR. STANTON: I just want to modify something slightly. It's not what -- it is, in part, what he heard from other detectives, but a secondary, and

25

the more primary source is the transcript of the recorded interviews on both the 1st and the 2nd of both Ms. Veasley and Ms. Sutton, where those concerns are expressed in the recording and this detective's review of the transcript as part of his investigation back in the time and not in preparation of trial.

THE COURT: Well, you could have gotten into all of that had I made a ruling on redirect and gone through all of that, but you withdrew the question. It seems moot at this point.

MR. BASHOR: It is.

THE COURT: You got the relief you requested, I granted the Defense motion. I ordered them to disregard it. Anything else?

MR. BASHOR: No.

MR. STANTON: No.

THE COURT: Okay. So, quick question then. We -- State, you brought to my attention at the bench, and I wasn't paying attention to that exact issue. So, at this time, I'm going to -- you spoke to the Defendant about his right to take the stand and testify?

MR. BASHOR: On several occasions, including today.

THE COURT: And I gave you your rights yesterday, and I told you that the State and the Court can't consider comment, and the jury can't if you choose not to testify, and you went through all of that with your lawyers?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.

THE COURT: And they answered your questions?

THE DEFENDANT: I don't want to testify.

THE COURT: Okay, but did they answer your questions?

THE DEFENDANT: Yeah.

THE COURT: Okay. And no questions for your attorneys or for the Court before your lawyers rest?

THE DEFENDANT: No.

THE COURT: Okay. And it's my understanding you are going to rest, yes?

MR. BASHOR: That's correct.

THE COURT: Okay. So, as far as scheduling and what to tell the jury when they come back in, I believe we can settle jury instructions this afternoon, giving you the overnight period to be able to incorporate, you know, actually numbered instructions into your arguments. I'm looking right now at the competency calendar, which is only a mild 41 pages. I can usually move through that -- that's 40 people. Give me -- I'll do it in an hour or an hour and five minutes.

So, there's no challenge hearings, it's just you're either competent or you're not. There might be some allegations of NSA and some other -- I'm the queen of the Samarians. Once I get through those things, I'll finish. From the competency folks, perhaps a physical or verbal outburst, which might delay me another three to four minutes, but otherwise, I'm going to get this done in an hour and five minutes. So, I moved my challenge hearing, we're not having a challenge hearing. I can start your trial at 10:15.

MR. BASHOR: Sounds great.

MR. STANTON: Sounds great.

THE COURT: How long do you need for closings?

MR. STANTON: Thirty to 40 minutes on behalf of the State.

MR. BASHOR: Same.

THE COURT: All right. Ladies and gentlemen, that concludes the evidence portion of the trial. The way the settling of the jury instructions work, the Court has to settle jury instructions after the conclusion of the evidence. So, the lawyers and I are going to stay and work on our settling of the jury instructions, and when you come back tomorrow morning at 10:15, as soon thereafter as I can start, I will read to you the jury instructions, and you will hear final closing arguments in this case. And then you will retire to deliberate on your verdict.

During this overnight -- and I'm sorry I gave you the recess, but I have to discuss scheduling with the attorneys and whatnot. So, during this overnight recess, you are admonished not to talk or converse among yourselves or with anyone else on any subject connected with this trial. You are 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, newspaper, television, the internet or radio. You are not to form or express any opinion on any subject connected with this trial until the case is finally submitted to you. 10:15 tomorrow morning.

THE MARSHAL: All rise. The jury is exiting.

[Outside the presence of the jury.]

THE COURT: Is it closed?

MR. STANTON: Yes, Your Honor.

MR. BASHOR: Yes, Your Honor.

MR. O'BRIEN: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Let's give them a minute. Let's start -- first of all, we're outside the presence of the jury. Before we take a short break

ourselves to dig into the jury instructions, I thought I could just cover the verdict form while they are clearing out of the hallway.

So, I've reviewed a verdict form that appears to have been attached to an email. I just want Mr. Bashor to come up here and tell me this is the one -- a hard copy of the one that everybody's agreed to.

MR. BASHOR: Yes, Judge. If I could just run it by Mr. Stanton really quickly.

[State and Defense confer]

MR. BASHOR: We're okay, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. Okay. So, this is the verdict form the parties have stipulated -- you can have a seat. Thank you.

The parties have stipulated to the use of that verdict form. Let me just poke my head into the back hallway and make sure the jurors have cleared out, and then I will give you all a short break, and then we can get into the packet.

MR. STANTON: Thank you.

THE COURT: And if the Defendant needs a break now.

[Recess at 3:33, recommencing at 3:42 p.m.]

THE COURT: Okay. We're back on the record in State v. Shawn Glover outside the presence of the jury to settle jury instructions.

Unfortunately, during that meeting, I told you I was planted front and center in the Legislative Council Bureau, testimony, Grant Sawyer Building. I'm thinking they could see my pores in Reno, and I couldn't really study the jury instructions, even though I thought if I was in my usual seat in the back, I could have done it. So, you will have to bear with me as we go

instruct you orally without having to read to you, but I probably could.

MR. BASHOR: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Premeditation need not be for a day, an hour, or even a minute. It may be as --

MR. BASHOR: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. The law does not undertake to measure in units the length of time -- or the length of the period during which, and it goes on. Any objection?

MR. BASHOR: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All murder which is not murder of the first degree is murder of the second degree, and it goes on. Any objection?

MR. BASHOR: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: A deadly weapon is any instrument -- okay. I have -- I don't know if your -- apparently, your office hasn't caught this because I've brought it up before. On the next instruction, the deadly weapon instruction, I have an unpublished opinion in a case of mine where the last sentence was included because it was a firearm case, and the Supreme Court commented on it with disfavor because it was a question of fact. So, I'm inclined to take out the last sentence.

MR. STANTON: That's fine.

THE COURT: I haven't -- I can --

MR. FLINN: The firearm is a deadly weapon?

THE COURT: Yes. I have an unpublished opinion in --

MR. STANTON: I read it.

THE COURT: Okay. So, you know, I don't -- it's never been a subject of discussion in your office, I don't think, because --

MR. STANTON: Well, yeah, and look, my office is like a cargo ship

in the ocean, it takes quite a bit to change it one degree, but I agree with you both by statutory definition, but I guess from the Supreme Court in your opinion, the unpublished one, their comment is that it's a factual finding in each case, and there's probably extreme hypotheticals where you wouldn't have, as a mandatory presumption, so I don't have any problem with it.

MR. BASHOR: That's fine with me, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Isn't it refreshing to hear the cargo ship to move a degree to take -- I mean I know that, and you know that, but they rarely admit that.

MR. STANTON: Well, we had 20 years that we charged an ex-felon in possession of a firearm. There is no crime of ex-felon in -- in fact, the element is the exact opposite, but you think somebody might catch that or do something about it. So, I bring it up when I come down to this office and say why do you do it that way, and I think it took five years before they changed it, so.

THE COURT: Because we always have. Okay. So, you don't have a problem with me taking out the sentence that a firearm is a deadly weapon?

MR. BASHOR: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: A deadly weapon is any instrument which, if used in the ordinary manner, contemplated by its -- oh, I'm sorry, that's the same one. Excuse me. The State is not required to have recovered the deadly weapon, and it goes on. Any objection?

MR. BASHOR: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: An assault means intentionally placing another person in reasonable apprehension of immediate bodily harm, and it goes on.

Any objection?

MR. BASHOR: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. You're not going to like this, but Line 6 and 7 goes right with the firearm is a deadly weapon, in my opinion, to draw an analogy.

MR. BASHOR: And then here's the problem. The statute reads that the area must be designated by a city or county ordinance as a populated area, and we haven't had any evidence of that. It's not like, oh, it's a populated area, and you can use your common sense to fulfill that element. The statute requires that it be an element, that it's pursuant to an ordinance or county code.

MR. STANTON: Well, is there a reasonable dispute that this area is not within the definition of the North Las Vegas area of congested -- for purposes of destruction?

THE COURT: Well, the question is, is that a question of law or a question of fact, because if it's pursuant to a county code, they don't have to go -- you don't have to -- I mean -- right?

MR. FLINN: It is the county code defines all of the areas that are -- and it's basically all of Clark County, unless you're out in a -- where we all would say this is an empty place.

THE COURT: If he asks a witness did that happen here in Clark County, State of Nevada, and the witness says yes, then I'm legally determining that, you know, the area -- I mean there are certain, certain legal determinations. So, the question is, is this something that he would have to present a statute or a code for?

MR. BASHOR: In my opinion.

THE COURT: Well, let me look at the statute. Do you have it

handy?

MR. BASHOR: Yes, Your Honor. Can I approach?

MR. STANTON: What's the -- oh, the statute.

MR. BASHOR: It's 202.287.

THE COURT: State, are you looking at this? I assume you're familiar with it.

MR. FLINN: The NRS yes, absolutely.

THE COURT: Okay. So --

MR. FLINN: I do know what -- I mean it says exactly what's in the instruction, correct?

MR. BASHOR: With the exception of -- the first paragraph to the instruction --

MR. FLYNN: Right.

MR. BASHOR: -- isn't the problem, it's the finding of the element, similar to the deadly weapon. Your Honor, in all due candor, I've never tried a case with this count. For -- if I can give you a for instance, like in New Jersey, where I used to practice? It was thousand foot map. If you were dealing drugs within a thousand feet of a school, you would actually have to bring in a map and have this circle go around the school a thousand feet in all directions in order to prove up that element. So, I guess in my -- what I'm saying is that's kind of analogous to here. Like because the code or the ordinance defines what is and what is not a populated area, while I agree that common says it's, in all likelihood, a populated area, and here's the houses, and cars, and stuff

bring it because Mr. Bashor said he didn't have an objection to my email, so.

MR. BASHOR: Right, because -- I didn't mean to interrupt. Yeah, I

24

20

21

22

23

24

25

didn't have an objection because, again, I thought that, like the deadly -- I wasn't aware of the unpublished case you're talking about with the deadly weapon. I thought that is was something that -- and my other concern, just to make the record clear, Judge, is that this element dramatically changes the penalty. If it's an unpopulated area, it's a misdemeanor. If it's a populated area, it's two to 15 years. And so, I would think that something of that significance, and the fact that is it an element of the crime, would have to be something that the jury would determine as a matter of fact, not law.

THE COURT: Could you find the ordinance for me? Like not right this second, but you can be working on it while we're doing this?

MR. FLINN: Absolutely, Your Honor, yes.

THE COURT: Sure. Okay.

MR. STANTON: So, can we mark that one and then move on or --

THE COURT: Yeah. Put a question mark on it. To constitute the crime charged, there must exist a union or joint operation of an act forbidden by law and an attempt to do the act. Any objection?

MR. BASHOR: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: The Defendant is presumed innocent. I assume you have no objection to the only beyond a reasonable doubt standard instruction that the Supreme Court has approved?

MR. BASHOR: No objection.

THE COURT: The evidence which you are to consider in this case consists of the testimony of the witnesses, the exhibits, and any fact admitted and agreed to by counsel, and it goes on. Any objection?

MR. BASHOR: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: The flight of a person after the commission of a crime is not sufficient in itself to establish his guilt. However, if flight is proved, blah, blah, blah.

MR. BASHOR: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: No objection. Credibility or believebility of a wir

THE COURT: No objection. Credibility or believability of a witness.

This is a stock instruction.

MR. BASHOR: No objection.

THE COURT: All right. The witness -- the commonly known as the expert witness instruction, a witness who has special knowledge, skill, experience, training or education, and it goes on. Any objection?

MR. BASHOR: No, Your Honor. We withdraw the next one, before you may rely on circumstantial evidence, Judge.

THE COURT: Withdrawn?

MR. BASHOR: Withdrawn.

THE COURT: Okay. The next is in arriving at a verdict in this case as to whether Defendant's guilty or not guilty, the subject of penalty or punishment is not to be discussed or considered and in no way influence your verdict.

MR. BASHOR: No objection.

THE COURT: It is the constitutional right of a Defendant in a criminal trial that he may not be compelled to testify, and it goes on. I assume you requested this?

MR. BASHOR: We do.

THE COURT: All right. And so, that will be given. Although you are to consider only the evidence in the case in reaching a verdict, you must

MR. BASHOR: No, I don't remember if this was an instruction I

25

stole from *Coleman Vaoga*, which we tried in here about a year ago, or from Judge Herndon's, but I don't know if this is -- I just added it in there. I don't have a position either way.

MR. STANTON: I think I had a case within the past year or two, I think within the past year, where somehow this was considered by District Court Judges, or at least the Court, for -- that this was something that was encouraged to include. Do you know anything about that, Judge, because --

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. STANTON: -- I don't have this as a predicate --

THE COURT: Yeah, I want to say it's Herndon.

MR. STANTON: Yeah, because I think it's probably --

MR. BASHOR: Uh-huh.

THE COURT: I have an email from Herndon.

MR. STANTON: -- a pretty good thing to do, and I want to incorporate it in all mine, if that's what the Court's feeling is as well, that it's going to be a stock.

THE COURT: The only thing is, you know, once they go to the jury deliberation room, I think, you know, this instruction, where it says during the course of the trial, I tell them that in the introduction. So, I don't have any problem that they shouldn't be communicating with anyone by text, phone or internet, or other means, and I think it's wise to give it. And if you don't care, I'll put it before now you will listen to the arguments of counsel. It's just kind of my second to last instruction before I get -- obviously weave the manslaughter in there somewhere.

MR. BASHOR: Very good, Your Honor.

1	THE COURT: Okay. So, if nobody objects to it, I like it, so let's give
2	it.
3	MR. BASHOR: Great.
4	THE COURT: Now, you will listen to the arguments of counsel,
5	who will endeavor to aid you. I assume you have no objection since that's
6	stock?
7	MR. BASHOR: No objection.
8	THE COURT: Okay. Now, these are the let me just look real
9	quick here. Okay. So, I have two instructions from the State. One is funky to
10	me. It starts, it is a killing. Is that the second page of something or it just
11	starts oddly.
12	MR. STANTON: Yeah, that's just a typographical error of a
13	combination of two instructions, so.
14	THE COURT: So, can you redact it and give it back to me in the
15	way you would like it to look, so I could look compare that to what the
16	Defense is proposing?
17	MR. STANTON: Sure.
18	THE COURT: Because the Defense I don't know, let's see.
19	MR. STANTON: It should read manslaughter is a killing upon, or
20	probably more precisely
21	THE COURT: Voluntary manslaughter?
22	MR. STANTON: Yeah. The Lines 8 and 9 should be at the
23	beginning of the instruction, and then it contextually reads, I think, the way it i
24	written. So, the first line would be
25	THE COURT: So, it would say voluntary manslaughter is the

unlawful killing of a human being without malice, forethought, or without deliberation, or premeditation. It is a killing upon a sudden quarrel or heat of passion, and so on?

MR. STANTON: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. And then you have a heat of passion instruction. So, there's only two total instructions, as opposed to kind of a broken down -- so let me ask you this, is there a reason why the Defense has manslaughter is the unlawful killing of a human being without malice, expressed or implied, and without any mixture of deliberation, and then the next -- very next page says voluntary manslaughter is the unlawful killing of a human being without malice, forethought, and without deliberation or premeditation. It's the same thing, except for the expressed or implied. Why are we --

MR. BASHOR: Judge, I pulled these four instructions right from *Vaoga*. I didn't -- because it was the most recent trial, I had that we actually have the jury charged with the law on manslaughter was *Vaoga*.

THE COURT: So, what's your difference between your heat of passion and the State's heat of passion? Okay, because yours says the basic injury is whether or not at Line 8, and that's not right. So, I'm just curious. I mean I'm not picking on you; a typo is not a big deal. I'm just saying --

MR. BASHOR: You know, Judge, this is not of --

THE COURT: All right. Well, let's go back to the State's first.

MR. BASHOR: Right, let's use theirs.

THE COURT: Okay. What's the beef with the first one, when the State asks to move lines 8 and 9 to lines 1 and 2, and then it goes on. You

THE COURT: -- and I'll be right back.

[Judge exits the courtroom at 4:02 p.m. and re-enters at 4:03 p.m.]

THE COURT: Okay. As we speak, my law clerk is doing your work for you. Excellent. Next. So, the State has no more manslaughter instructions, correct?

MR. STANTON: Correct.

THE COURT: Okay. So, moving to the -- I was going to go to the Defense and see if there's anything they're withdrawing in light of that or want to add on top of it.

MR. STANTON: Okay. The only comment that I would like to make, Your Honor, I think it's important when the settling instructions record is developed is, I'm aware of the law about when lesser includeds in an open murder are permitted. It's important, I think, for the record, that I submitted these instructions under the -- better to submit them than to have them in the same font and paginated, as opposed to the State's belief that they can or should be given.

So, number one, it is, in my opinion, the lesser includeds being inconsistent with the theory of the Defense. I'm also aware that the Nevada Supreme Court, in addressing this issue, says that it's not to be determined based upon the theory of the Defense, but whether or not there's the slightest whiff of evidence that could be argued about these.

So, with that, I just want the record to state the State's perspective of the lesser includeds while they're in here and that -- I'm assuming that the Defense, from a strategic perspective, is requesting that the lesser includeds be given.

MR. BASHOR: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. So, I was waiting when you were -- waiting to see when you were going to bring that up. That's not my --

MR. BASHOR: Did you want to go to the Defense unsettled?

THE COURT: Yes. Just give me one second. So, starting with your manslaughter, the unlawful killing of a human being without malice, expressed or implied, and without any mixture of deliberation, and then your --

MR. BASHOR: I withdraw all four, Judge.

THE COURT: Okay. So, you believe they're covered here?

MR. BASHOR: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Can you approach and get a copy of the, you know, corrected version?

MR. FLINN: I do have that municipal code, as well, Your Honor, whenever the Court's ready to listen to that.

THE COURT: Okay. Right now, we have the Prosecution is not required to present direct evidence of a Defendant's state of mind as it existed during the commission of a crime, and the jury may infer the existence of a particular state of mind from the circumstances disclosed by the evidence. The State has offered that instruction with authority cited as *Miranda v. State*, 101 Nevada 562, a 1985 case, and it's in a pile marked objected to by the Defense.

MR. BASHOR: That's correct, Judge.

THE COURT: So, at this time if you would like to make a record about what your objection is so the District Attorney can respond, and then I'll

make a decision.

MR. BASHOR: Sure. I mean, Judge, in its plain reading, first of all I think it's cumulative to the other explanations of how circumstantial evidence can be used. It is, as Your Honor explains in the opening instructions, and it's repeated here, circumstantial evidence can be just as powerful, if not more powerful, as direct evidence of the state of mind.

And so, my opinion, when we go out of our way to say -- and remind them that the circumstantial evidence is state of mind, it's something that can be considered. It kind of lowers, in my mind, their burden, especially since the cumulative nature exists. I also read *Miranda*. It's kind of a *McConnell* issue in *Miranda* because the argument by the, I guess the Appellant and *Miranda* was that there was kind of a double counting, that the felony murder got them to the penalty phase, and then the only aggravated they had was the felony.

And so, they went into great length to explain that there was circumstantial evidence of a robbery separate and apart from the murder. And so, I think in that context, I could understand it's applicable -- excuse me, applicability, but I would ask that it not be given, given the other instructions.

MR. STANTON: Well, I think I agree that that's the context is what it is, but the Supreme Court in the *McConnell* analysis, I think delves precisely to why this is a correct statement of the law and speaks directly to that issue. Once again, I don't think it highlights anything because they're instructed that none of the instructions have more importance than one another, and the well-worn phrase that they're dutybound to follow their instructions, and we assume that they will.

THE COURT: This is not an inaccurate statement of the law, in the Court's opinion. I've given this instruction probably 50 times, and I'm going to give it in this case over the Defense's objection. So, I appreciate the argument, understand it, and it's overruled. I'll give that instruction and --

[Judge and Clerk confer.]

THE COURT: So other than that instruction, which you made a very good record on, were there any other State proffered instructions that I haven't covered that were objected to by the Defense, because that's the only one that was presented to me.

MR. BASHOR: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Let me get a copy of that, because I took off the cite from the bottom, and I'll give that to you. If we go to the Defense proffered instructions now, please.

Starting with you are instructed, and if you find the State has established the Defendant has committed first degree murder, you shall select first degree as your verdict. The crime of first degree murder includes the crime of second degree murder. You may find the Defendant guilty of second degree murder if -- thank you. I'm sure Mr. Stanton needs that.

MR. BASHOR: That's no problem. I need to burn the calories.

THE COURT: So, I'm sorry. You may find the Defendant guilty of second degree murder if you have not found beyond a reasonable doubt that the Defendant is guilty of murder in the first degree, and all 12 of you are convinced beyond a reasonable doubt the Defendant is guilty of the crime of second degree murder. If you are convinced beyond a reasonable doubt that the crime of murder has been committed by the Defendant, but you have

reasonable doubt as to whether the murder is in first or second degree, you must give the Defendant the benefit of that doubt and return the verdict of murder in the second degree. I'm just going to read all the second degree related because that's -- then we can have one discussion.

The next says, when it is impossible to commit a particular crime without committing it, at the same time and by the same conduct, another offense of less or greater degree, the latter is with respect to the former or lesser included offense. If you're not satisfied beyond a reasonable doubt the Defendant is guilty of the offense charged, he may, however, be found guilty of any lesser included offense if the evidence is sufficient to establish his guilt of such lesser offense beyond a reasonable doubt.

The offense of murder, which actually charges the Defendant with first degree murder, necessarily includes the lesser offense of second degree murder. Voluntary manslaughter is a lesser included offense of both first and second degree murder. Thus, you may return a verdict of voluntary manslaughter if you first rule out both first and second degree murder.

You're instructed if you find the State has established the Defendant's committed second degree murder, you shall select second degree murder as your verdict. The crime of second degree murder can include the crime of voluntary manslaughter. You may find the Defendant guilty of voluntary manslaughter if you have not found beyond a reasonable doubt the Defendant is guilty of murder in the first degree or second degree; and, two, all 12 of you are convinced beyond a reasonable doubt that the Defendant is guilty of the crime of voluntary manslaughter.

If you are convinced beyond a reasonable doubt that the crime of

murder has been committed by the Defendant, but you have reasonable doubt as to whether such murder was a second degree or voluntary manslaughter, you must give the Defendant the benefit of that doubt and return a verdict of voluntary manslaughter.

Next, if you do not find beyond a reasonable doubt the Defendant committed first degree murder or second degree murder, and after consideration of all the evidence you have reasonable doubt as to whether Defendant enacted in the heat of passion caused by adequate legal provocation, you must return a verdict of either voluntary manslaughter or not guilty. This is because the State has the burden of proving beyond a reasonable doubt the Defendant did not act in a heat of passion caused by adequate legal provocation.

Next, the term passion, as used in the definition of -- well, I guess we can talk about that one separately. That's more -- let's talk about the first one, two, three, four instructions that I just read into the record. You don't have to talk about them first because you're offering them, and the State has an objection. So, I'll hear the objection, then I can --

MR. STANTON: Your Honor, as to the first instruction, you are instructed that you find. I believe, and for purposes of my argument, that's a transition instruction. I have no objection to the Lines 1 through 10 of the instructions. The portions I object to are the last paragraph of that instruction.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. STANTON: And I can lay my foundation about the basis of why I object to that portion of the instruction.

THE COURT: Sure.

MR. STANTON: Number one, I'm aware that there is case law where courts have said that it's not error to give this instruction, but it's a circuitous argument because no one has ever, in my experience, been able to cite to the authority of that portion of the instruction.

Number one, I believe it's absolutely nonsensical.

THE COURT: Murder.

MR. STANTON: Number two, it violates what I think the other instructions are about the jury's duty and method in which they deliberate in a case.

THE COURT: Specifically meaning?

MR. STANTON: That there is no way, without doing violence to their obligation to apply the elements and instructions of law to the facts, where someone gives the benefit of the doubt if there's a tie. Number one, I can't envision a tie. I don't know how that comes about, but to -- what I read this to be is a very subtle request for compromise, and there is absolutely no authority in any state or federal jurisdiction that I've found remotely that supports this proposition.

MR. BASHOR: First, Your Honor, you have given this instruction. It came from *Coleman Vaoga*. Second, I would assert to the authority, it probably rests in *Crawford*, in which it's just an inverse statement that if they haven't reached -- or they have a reasonable doubt, that they should, as to premeditation, deliberation, et cetera, that they should return a verdict of second degree.

THE COURT: Well, you're the first DA to ever make this argument.

I don't know that I necessarily disagree with it, but I'm going to give this

instruction. One, because based upon the facts of this case and the evidence that I heard, I can't even wrap my mind around this being really prejudicial to you. So, we might make law, but it won't be in this, it won't be on that instruction in this case. Next.

MR. STANTON: The next one, Judge, is when it's impossible. I think --

THE COURT: A lot of its repetitive of what I just read, except for that last part --

MR. STANTON: Right.

THE COURT: -- voluntary manslaughter.

MR. STANTON: And I think to the next one is this second to manslaughter, which I presume, based upon your previous ruling, you're going to give. I have my same objections for the record to that. And with that, I think it's not only cumulative, but --

THE COURT: Yeah. I mean if I give, you -- if I give the instruction you were instructed if you find that the State has established the Defendant has committed second degree murder, you shall select second degree murder as your verdict. The crime of second degree murder can include the crime of voluntary manslaughter. And I include Lines 12 through 15, because I've already done that in your other transition instruction, how is --

MR. STANTON: Then I agree.

THE COURT: -- the middle one not cumulative?

MR. BASHOR: Then I agree. When it is impossible to --

THE COURT: So, it's withdrawn?

MR. BASHOR: Yes.

1	MR. BASHOR: Yeah.
2	THE COURT: There was a theft of chicken.
3	MR. BASHOR: Yes, there was.
4	THE COURT: Hot fresh chicken.
5	MR. BASHOR: Yes.
6	THE COURT: Okay, I'm just I'm just putting it out there that the
7	facts are he didn't do it
8	MR. BASHOR: Well
9	THE COURT: and I haven't heard any other arguments other
10	than there was yelling, yelling by three different other people. Okay. So, you
11	want this?
12	MR. BASHOR: Yes.
13	THE COURT: And the State, I
14	MR. STANTON: Well, first of all, starting with the first paragraph, I
15	have an objection because I don't think it's
16	THE COURT: Is there more than one paragraph? What are you
17	looking at?
18	MR. STANTON: No, just one paragraph.
19	THE COURT: Oh, okay.
20	MR. STANTON: In the first paragraph, first sentence of the
21	instruction
22	THE COURT: Okay.
23	MR. STANTON: is a complete misstatement, I think, of the law.
24	The term passion, as used in the Defense definition of deliberation I'm
25	unaware that passion is an operative element within deliberations of the

instructions in this case or any --

THE COURT: Well, did I -- is there a passion and first degree murder in these instructions and I -- that like needs to be clarified for them?

Did I miss --

MR. BASHOR: It's just that it, that deliberate must be found in the absence of passion. It's a delivered determination may be arrived in a short period of time, but in all cases, the determination must not be formed in passion, or if formed in passion, it must be carried out after there has been time for the passion to subside and deliberation to occur. A mere unconsidered and rash impulse is not deliberate even though it includes the intent to kill.

I don't necessarily disagree with what Mr. Stanton is saying as to, like, how it's phrased.

THE COURT: Yeah, that first sentence.

MR. BASHOR: Right.

THE COURT: If I gave that to you that's because nobody objected to it.

MR. BASHOR: Right.

MR. STANTON: Who was the DA on this case, the rock and chicken case?

MR. FLYNN: Pam Weckerly and Nick Ports [Phonetic].

THE COURT: Can I tell you something?

MR. STANTON: Yeah.

THE COURT: Sometimes you can be a DA and agree to everything the Defense wants in an instruction and still win your case. Do you

be marked as a Court's exhibit --

1	MR. BASHOR: Okay.
2	THE COURT: next in order number
3	THE CLERK: 3.
4	THE COURT: 3, proffered by the Defense, and the Court declines
5	to give it for two reasons. Number one, the first sentence is confusing,
6	whether I gave it in <i>Vaoga Coleman Vaoga</i> or not; and, number two, the
7	remainder of the instruction is covered in the other instructions.
8	MR. BASHOR: Fair enough, Your Honor.
9	THE COURT: Okay. So, do you have any other proposed
10	instructions that you would proffer, you know, to me to give?
11	MR. BASHOR: Yes, Judge. It's the modified I sent this as a
12	separate email around noon today. It's one instruction. It's a limine it's a
13	version of the limine instruction that Your Honor had given.
14	MR. STANTON: It's a Tog instruction, Your Honor.
15	THE COURT: Oh, yeah, yeah. Where is it? Yes, yes, yes. I
16	like this. So, we're going to put it do you care where it goes?
17	MR. STANTON: No.
18	MR. BASHOR: No.
19	THE COURT: Okay. This is a good instruction, and I'm going to
20	give that.
21	MR. STANTON: You created it.
22	THE COURT: Yeah.
23	MR. BASHOR: Well, that one I slightly modified.
24	MR. STANTON: It's the tog instruction.
25	THE COURT: That's right.
	i

23

24

25

MR. BASHOR: It is slightly modified, Your Honor, because of the concerns you gave the, ladies and gentlemen, now I'm going to caution you. I took --

THE COURT: Yeah.

MR. BASHOR: -- that part out.

THE COURT: Right. Well, that would explain why I like it, because I helped write it.

MR. BASHOR: Right.

THE COURT: I was a contributing author.

MR. BASHOR: Very good. So, that just leaves us with the discharging.

THE COURT: Right. But first, I just need to get -- if you don't mind, what I was going to do was get a little order together here.

MR. BASHOR: Great.

THE COURT: Then listen to the argument, decide if I'm going to give it, then copy them and give them to you in the same order, and then number them.

MR. BASHOR: That's perfect.

MR. STANTON: That's perfect.

THE COURT: So, just give me a minute. Okay. Okay. I've made a proposed order, which I will give you a copy of, and then if you -- I won't number it, obviously, and we'll go through it, and if there's something you prefer moved around, we can do it.

So, the final issue then is related to the instructions proposed by the State, that reads any person who willfully, unlawfully, maliciously

discharges a firearm within an occupied structure is guilty of discharging a firearm within a structure. That structure must be within an area designated by the city or county in a populated area for purpose of prohibiting the discharge of weapons. The city of North Las Vegas is designated as a populated area for the purpose of prohibiting the discharge of weapons.

It's that last sentence that the Defense takes issue with, and I asked you to give me what you were relying on to say that as a matter of law, the Court could take judicial notice and instruct the jury accordingly.

MR. FLINN: Yes, Your Honor, and I just emailed -- I did a screenshot of my phone, but to Defense counsel and to the Court's law Clerk. The Municipal Code for the city of North Las Vegas, 9.32.110, entitled Firing of Weapon, states: It is unlawful for any person to explode or fire any pistol, revolver, rifle, shotgun, or any other firearm within the limits of the city of North Las Vegas.

So, as a matter of law, you cannot shoot a gun. It's a designated place that you cannot discharge a firearm under its own code, which the statute, the NRS, says the county or city designates it accordingly. Any other issue about whether, there's a question for the jury, whether the gun was fired, whether it was fired in a building, of course, all of those things are, but this is a matter of law. It's a municipal code that it's a prohibited place.

MR. STANTON: And, Judge, could I just add one thing? In the Defense exhibits, the aerials, at the bottom in their Google maps index, it says City of North Las Vegas, 4032 Smokey Fog Avenue. So, I think that -- well, that's it.

MR. BASHOR: Judge, I would just rest on the previous objection. I

think that since it is an element of the offense, it's not something that should be taken judicial notice of. I don't think there's a dispute that this occurred in North Las Vegas. And I know that this might be considered splitting hairs, but since it is an element, I would submit that they would have had to present some evidence which would support the element that it was pursuant to a county ordinance, that this was designated a populated area.

THE COURT: Well, I'm going to -- interesting argument, like it, overrule your objection to this instruction. Honestly, I don't want to start having them question -- I guess I could give them an instruction that says Municipal Code 932.110. Why can't that be an instruction then if that's the issue? Why does it have to be in evidence? I mean they're instructed on what the law is. I guess what you're saying is -- that's different than saying a firearm is a deadly weapon, which is a question of fact. So, I'm going to ask you to prepare -- because you understand what I'm saying?

MR. STANTON: Yes.

THE COURT: What we would be doing in response to that objection is taking out Line 6 and 7, and telling them Municipal Code of North Las Vegas, 932.110 permits the firearm -- firing of a firearm in the city of Las Vegas.

MR. FLINN: And quote the -- yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Because it's almost the same as a firearm in that unpublished opinion --

MR. FLINN: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: -- type scenario. See what I'm saying?

MR. BASHOR: I understand what you're saying.

MR. FLINN: I'm working on it.

1	MR. BASHOR: doesn't matter, we could just stand over him
2	and
3	THE COURT: He's used to that. Go lord over him and get this
4	done.
5	MR. BASHOR: Okay.
6	THE COURT: Can you just get it done, because I need to get we
7	need to get a he lives to be lorded over.
8	UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Oh, that's my life.
9	THE COURT: That is your life, only usually it's me.
10	MR. STANTON: So, tomorrow 10:15 is when the
11	THE COURT: Oh, wait, gentlemen. You also have to redact the city
12	of North Las Vegas as designated. So, take this instruction and take that last
13	sentence out, in addition to typing up North Las Vegas, blah, blah, blah.
14	MR. FLINN: Very good.
15	THE COURT: Okay? You see what I'm saying?
16	MR. FLINN: Yes, I do.
17	THE COURT: Okay. I don't need to give it, do you, because then I'I
18	forget.
19	MR. STANTON: Ryan, I'm going to address the Count 4.
20	MR. BASHOR: Okay. I believe I can trust Mr. O'Brien.
21	MR. STANTON: Okay. Your Honor
22	THE COURT: Okay, so wait a minute. Hold on.
23	MR. STANTON: Okay.
24	THE COURT: The record shall reflect that two of the attorneys have

gone to work on the instructions, Mr. Bashor and Mr. Flinn, and that you two,

in the presence of the Defendant, outside the presence of the jury, have something else you want to address. Go ahead.

MR. STANTON: Yes, Your Honor. Mr. Bashor and myself have been in discussions over the past couple days about Count IV, the one of the prohibited person count. And so, to be honest, this is the first time I've ever had to formally do the bifurcation of this particular count. It's Dave Stanton's belief that if the Defendant is convicted, then we have no intent of, even the brief time that I hear it takes to present it, deliberate it, to go forward on that.

So -- but there's a condition too, that Mr. Bashor, I believe, is in agreement, and that is this, if the Defendant is convicted of first degree murder, or even something else, there's a high degree of likelihood that the State is not going to seek to go to that second issue, and, therefore, we would conditionally dismiss it on this ground, that we can agree to dismiss it at this time, but if for whatever reason this matter were to come back for a retrial, the State would then have the opportunity to reinvigorate that count.

THE COURT: So, the State would -- if your client's convicted -- here's what I'm hearing in greater Togliatti detail: First degree murder with use of a deadly weapon, first degree murder, second degree murder with use of a deadly weapon, second degree murder, voluntary manslaughter with use of a deadly weapon, voluntary manslaughter with use of a deadly weapon, voluntary manslaughter. Is that it? Meaning and/or, and/or, and/or, or are you throwing in the if it's just assault with a deadly weapon, which I can't even wrap my mind around, or discharging a firearm because --

MR. STANTON: Right.

THE COURT: -- the facts are --

MR. STANTON: If it's --

THE COURT: -- it's either all or nothing, right?

MR. STANTON: Right. If it's first or second degree murder, I don't have any intention of what I --

THE COURT: What about voluntary manslaughter?

MR. STANTON: Maybe.

THE COURT: So, what I'm hearing is, if your client is convicted of first or second degree murder with use of a deadly weapon or without, the State will dismiss that count conditionally, meaning if you're -- and the condition being if the Defendant is ever in a position, whether it's as the result of an appeal or a result of a successful writ of habeas, post-conviction, to be able to have another trial, that the State reserves the right to charge him with that offense and have it go forward?

MR. O'BRIEN: Understood.

THE COURT: And as to whether he's convicted of voluntary manslaughter with the use of a deadly weapon, which would surprise everyone, but nothing surprises me anymore, the State -- is that undecided, and we'll make that determination presumably at the time, yes?

MR. STANTON: Yes.

MR. O'BRIEN: Understood.

THE COURT: Okay. So, win, win for your client. I mean, you know, on a minor scale.

MR. O'BRIEN: Understood. Once we put into the perspective of chicken and a rock, everything kind of -- it seems fine.

THE COURT: Yep. So, let's wait just a -- we'll get these last two --

Malice or forethought means the intentional doing of a wrongful

25

act is five. No objection.

Express malice is six, and it goes on. No objection.

Murder in the first degree, which is murder -- excuse me, is murder which is perpetrated by means of any kind of, and that is seven. No objection.

Willfulness is the intent to kill is eight. No objection.

Deliberation is a process of determining is nine. No objection.

Deliberate determination may be arrived at is ten. No objection.

Premeditation is a design, 11. No objection.

Premeditation need not be for a day, an hour, or even a minute is 12. No objection.

The law does not undertake the measure in units of time is 13. No objection.

All murder which is not murder in the first degree, murder in the second degree, 14. No objection.

You are instructed that if you find the State has established is 15.

The record should reflect, that as to instruction number 15 proposed by the

Defense, that Lines 12, 13, 14 and 15 were objected to by the State of Nevada.

You are instructed that if the State has established that the Defendant has committed second degree murder, you shall select second degree murder as your verdict was Instruction Number 16. The record shall reflect this was proposed by the Defense and the State of Nevada objects to Lines 12, 13, 14 and 15.

Voluntary manslaughter is the unlawful killing of a human being without malice or forethought and without deliberation or premeditation is 17, and there was no objection.

The heat of passion will reduce a homicide to voluntary manslaughter -- excuse me, which will reduce is 18.

There was no objection. The Prosecution is not required to present direct evidence is 19. The Defense made an objection, which I incorporate here and by reference that I overruled, and I'm giving the instruction.

Assault means an intentional placing of another person in reasonable apprehension is 20. There was no objection.

A deadly weapon is any instrument which, is 21. No objection.

The State is not required to have recovered is 22. No objection.

Any person who willfully, unlawfully, and maliciously discharges a firearm is 23. There was no objection.

The city of North Las Vegas Municipal Code 9.32.110 is 24. The record shall reflect that the Defense's position is that rather than this instruction being given to the jury, the State should have had to present evidence of the city of North Las Vegas Municipal Code or evidence that it was a populated area pursuant to Nevada law, and giving the jury the law and the evidence in the State's case in chief. Does that --

MR. BASHOR: Yes.

THE COURT: -- accurately state your position?

MR. BASHOR: It does.

THE COURT: So, while Instruction Number 24, from your point of view, is not an inaccurate statement of the law, it's simply your view that procedurally, the Court should have handled this in a different manner and required the State to prove it in their case in chief?

MR. BASHOR: Correct.

THE COURT: Okay. Instruction Number 25, to constitute the crime charged. There was no objection.

The Defendant is presumed innocent is 26. No objection.

The evidence which you are to consider is 27. No objection.

The flight of a person after the commission of a crime is 28. No objection.

The credibility or believability is 29. No objection.

Any testimony that a witness believed that the Defendant had a history of violence is being requested by the Defense based upon a previous court ruling that is already in the record, and there was no objection to this instruction.

Any witness who has special knowledge, skill, experience, training, or education is 31. No objection.

In arriving at a verdict in this case as to whether Defendant is guilty or not guilty, the subject of penalty or punishment is 32. No objection.

It is the constitutional right of a Defendant in a criminal trial that he may not be compelled to testify is 33. And requested by the Defense, therefore, no objection.

Although you are to consider only the evidence in the case is 34, and there was no objection.

When you retire to consider your verdict is 35. No objection.

If, during your deliberations, commonly known as the playback instruction, is 36. No objection.

During the course of this trial, you are not to communicate with anyone in any way regarding blah, blah, blah, commonly known as the social

1	media instruction, is 37.
2	Over to the left, is anyone bothered by that because I am not?
3	MR. BASHOR: No.
4	MR. FLYNN: No.
5	THE COURT: All right. Now you will listen to the arguments.
6	Counsel, will endeavor to aid to reach a proper verdict is 38. Any objection?
7	MR. BASHOR: No, Your Honor.
8	THE COURT: Okay. Is there anything else regarding the jury
9	instructions that you would like to address? I've marked as a Court's Exhibit 1
10	that you proposed that I didn't give. I made a record and incorporate all
11	arguments into the objections that you've made. Is there anything else?
12	MR. STANTON: Just that all parties agree that the verdict forms
13	are in proper order.
14	MR. BASHOR: That's correct.
15	THE COURT: Okay. Then I will see you tomorrow at 10:15. Thank
16	you very much.
17	MR. STANTON: Thank you, Your Honor.
18	MR. BASHOR: Thank you, Your Honor.
19	[Proceedings concluded at 4:58 p.m.]
20	ATTEST: I do hereby certify that I have truly and correctly transcribed the
21	audio/visual proceedings in the above-entitled case to the best of my ability.
22	Finia B Cahill
23	Tyura p
24	
25	Maukele Transcribers, LLC

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

FILED IN OPEN COURT STEVEN D. GRIERSON CLERK OF THE COURT

INST

2

3

1

4

5

6

7.8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23 24

25

26

27

28

DISTRICT COURT

CLARK COUNTY, NEVA

ATHENA TRUJULO DESTITY

3.53pm

THE STATE OF NEVADA,

SHAWN GLOVER,

Plaintiff,

V.

{

CASE NO. C-16-312448-1

DEPT. NO. IX

Defendant.

(INSTRUCTIONS TO THE JURY (INSTRUCTION NO. 1)

MEMBERS OF THE JURY:

It is now my duty as judge to instruct you in the law that applies in this case. It is your duty as jurors to follow these instructions and to apply the rules of the law to the facts as you find them from the evidence.

You must not be concerned with the wisdom of any rule of law stated in these instructions. Regardless of any opinion you may have as to what the law ought to be, it would be a violation of your oath to base a verdict upon any other view of the law than that given in the instructions of the Court.

C - 18 - 312448 - 1 Jl Jury Instructions



If, in these instructions, any rule, direction or idea is repeated or stated in different ways, no emphasis thereon is intended by me and none may be inferred by you. For that reason, you are not to single out any certain sentence or any individual point or instruction and ignore the others, but you are to consider all the instructions as a whole and regard each in light of all the others.

The order in which the instructions are given has no significance as to their relative importance.

An Amended Indictment is but a formal method of accusing a person of a crime and is not of itself any evidence of his guilt.

In this case, it is charged in an Indictment that on or about the 1st day of January, 2016 the Defendant committed the offenses of MURDER WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON (Category A Felony - NRS 200.010, 200.030, 193.165 - NOC 50001); ASSAULT WITH A DEADLY WEAPON (Category B Felony - NRS 200.471 - NOC 50201); and DISCHARGE OF FIREARM FROM OR WITHIN A STRUCTURE OR VEHICLE (Category B Felony - NRS 202.287 - NOC 51445). It is the duty of the jury to apply the rules of law contained in these instructions to the facts of the case and determine whether or not the Defendant is guilty of the offense charged.

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 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.

In this case the defendant is accused in an Indictment alleging an open charge of murder. This charge includes and encompasses murder of the first degree, murder of the second degree, and voluntary manslaughter.

The jury must decide if the defendant is guilty of any offense and, if so, of which offense.

Murder is the unlawful killing of a human being, with malice aforethought, whether express or implied. The unlawful killing may be effected by any of the various means by which death may be occasioned.

2 3 4

Malice aforethought means the intentional doing of a wrongful act without legal cause or excuse or what the law considers adequate provocation. The condition of mind described as malice aforethought may arise, not alone from anger, hatred, revenge or from particular ill will, spite or grudge toward the person killed, but may result from any unjustifiable or unlawful motive or purpose to injure another, which proceeds from a heart fatally bent on mischief or with reckless disregard of consequences and social duty. Malice aforethought does not imply deliberation or the lapse of any considerable time between the malicious intention to injure another and the actual execution of the intent but denotes rather an unlawful purpose and design in contradistinction to accident and mischance.

Express malice is that deliberate intention unlawfully to take away the life of a fellow creature, which is manifested by external circumstances capable of proof.

Malice may be implied when no considerable provocation appears, or when all the circumstances of the killing show an abandoned and malignant heart.

Murder of the first degree is murder which is perpetrated by means of any kind of wilful, deliberate, and premeditated killing. All three (3) elements -- willfulness, deliberation, and premeditation -- must be proven beyond a reasonable doubt before an accused can be convicted of first-degree murder.

Willfulness is the intent to kill. There need be no appreciable space of time between formation of the intent to kill and the act of killing.

Deliberation is the process of determining upon a course of action to kill as a

result of thought, including weighing the reasons for and against the action and

considering the consequences of the actions.

7 8

A deliberate determination may be arrived at in a short period of time. But in all cases the determination must not be formed in passion, or if formed in passion, it must be carried out after there has been time for the passion to subside and deliberation to occur. A mere unconsidered and rash impulse is not deliberate, even though it includes the intent to kill.

Premeditation is a design, a determination to kill, distinctly formed in the mind

by the time of the killing.

7 8

Premeditation need not be for a day, an hour, or even a minute. It may be as instantaneous as successive thoughts of the mind. For if the jury believes from the evidence that the act constituting the killing has been preceded by and has been the result of premeditation, no matter how rapidly the act follows the premeditation, it is premeditated.

3 4

The law does not undertake to measure in units of time the length of the period during which the thought must be pondered before it can ripen into an intent to kill which is truly deliberate and premeditated. The time will vary with different individuals and under varying circumstances.

The true test is not the duration of time, but rather the extent of reflection. A cold, calculated judgment and decision may be arrived at in a short period of time, but a mere unconsidered and rash impulse, even though it includes the intent to kill, is not the deliberation and premeditation as will fix an unlawful killing as murder in the first degree.

All murder which is not Murder of the First Degree is Murder of the Second Degree.

Murder of the Second Degree is murder with malice aforethought, but without the

admixture of premeditation and deliberation.

AA 721

You are instructed that if you find that the State has established that the defendant has committed First Degree Murder, you shall select First Degree Murder as your verdict. The crime of First Degree Murder includes the crime of Second Degree Murder. You may find the defendant guilty of Second Degree Murder if:

- You have not found beyond a reasonable doubt, that the defendant is guilty of murder of the first degree, and
- 2. All twelve of you are convinced beyond a reasonable doubt the defendant is guilty of the crime of second degree murder.

If you are convinced beyond a reasonable doubt that the crime of murder has been committed by the defendant, but you have a reasonable doubt whether such murder was of the first or second degree, you must give the defendant the benefit of that doubt and return a verdict of murder of the second degree.

7 8

defendant has committed Second Degree Murder you shall select Second Degree Murder as your verdict. The crime of Second Degree Murder can include the crime of Voluntary Manslaughter. You may find the defendant guilty of Voluntary Manslaughter if:

1. You have not found, beyond a reasonable doubt, that the defendant is guilty

You have not found, beyond a reasonable doubt, that the defendant is guilty
of murder of the first degree or second degree, and

You are instructed that if you find that the State has established that the

2. All twelve of you are convinced beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant is guilty of the crime of Voluntary Manslaughter.

If you convinced beyond a reasonable doubt that the crime of murder has been committed by the defendant, but you have a reasonable doubt whether such murder was of the second degree or Voluntary Manslaughter, you must give the defendant the benefit of that doubt and return a verdict of Voluntary Manslaughter.

Voluntary Manslaughter is the unlawful killing of a human being, without malice aforethought and without deliberation or premeditation. It is a killing upon a sudden quarrel or heat of passion, caused by a provocation sufficient to make the passion irresistible.

The provocation required for Voluntary Manslaughter must either consist of a serious and highly provoking injury inflicted upon the person killing, sufficient to excite an irresistible passion in a reasonable person, or an attempt by the person killed to commit a serious personal injury on the person killing.

For the sudden, violent impulse of passion to be irresistible resulting in a killing, which is Voluntary Manslaughter, there must not have been an interval between the assault or provocation and the killing sufficient for the voice of reason and humanity to be heard; for, if there should appear to have been sufficient time for a cool head to prevail and the voice of reason to be heard, the killing shall be attributed to deliberate revenge and determined by you to be murder. The law assigns no fixed period of time for such an interval but leaves its determination to the jury under the facts and circumstances of the case.

INSTRUCTION NO. 18

2 be read own arc we made 9 read 10 can be read to be r

The heat of passion which will reduce a homicide to Voluntary Manslaughter must be such an irresistible passion as naturally would be aroused in the mind of an ordinarily reasonable person in the same circumstances. A defendant is not permitted to set up his own standard of conduct and to justify or excuse himself because his passions were aroused unless the circumstances in which he was placed and the facts that confronted him were such as also would have aroused the irresistible passion of the ordinarily reasonable man if likewise situated. The basic inquiry is whether or not, at the time of the killing, the reason of the accused was obscured or disturbed by passion to such an extent as would cause the ordinarily reasonable person of average disposition to act rashly and without deliberation and reflection and from such passion rather than from judgment.

The prosecution is not required to present direct evidence of a defendant's state of

mind as it existed during the commission of a crime, and the jury may infer the existence of

a particular state of mind from the circumstances disclosed by the evidence.

Assault means intentionally placing another person in reasonable apprehension of

immediate bodily harm. As used in this instruction, "reasonable apprehension" is defined

1 2

by the objective standard.

A deadly weapon is any instrument which, if used in the ordinary manner contemplated by its design and construction, will or is likely to cause substantial bodily harm or death; or any weapon or device, instrument, material or substance which, under the circumstances in which it is used, attempted to be used or threatened to be used, is readily capable of causing substantial bodily harm or death.

The State is not required to have recovered the deadly weapon used in an alleged

crime, or to produce the deadly weapon in court at trial, to establish that a deadly weapon

1 2

was used in the commission of the crime.

AA 729

Any person who willfully, unlawfully and maliciously discharges a firearm within

an occupied structure is guilty of Discharging Firearm within a Structure. Said structure

must be within an area designated by a City or County as a populated area for purposes of

prohibiting the discharge of weapons.

AA 730

INSTRUCTION NO. O

City of North Las Vegas Municipal Code 9.32.110 states that it is unlawful for any person to explode or fire any pistol, revolver, rifle, shotgun, or any other firearm within the limits of the city of North Las Vegas.

To constitute the crime charged, there must exist a union or joint operation of an act forbidden by law and an intent to do the act.

The intent with which an act is done is shown by the facts and circumstances surrounding the case.

Do not confuse intent with motive. Motive is what prompts a person to act. Intent refers only to the state of mind with which the act is done.

Motive is not an element of the crime charged and the State is not required to prove a motive on the part of the Defendant in order to convict. However, you may consider evidence of motive or lack of motive as a circumstance in the case.

The Defendant is presumed innocent until the contrary is proved. This presumption places upon the State the burden of proving beyond a reasonable doubt every element of the crime charged and that the Defendant is the person who committed the offense.

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

If you have a reasonable doubt as to the guilt of the Defendant, he is entitled to a verdict of not guilty.

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

There are two (2) types of evidence; direct and circumstantial. Direct evidence is the testimony of a person who claims to have personal knowledge of the commission of the crime which has been charged, such as an eyewitness. Circumstantial evidence is the proof of a chain of facts and circumstances which tend to show whether the Defendant is guilty or not guilty. The law makes no distinction between the weight to be given either direct or circumstantial evidence. Therefore, all of the evidence in the case, including the circumstantial evidence, should be considered by you in arriving at your verdict.

Statements, arguments and opinions of counsel are not evidence in the case. However, if the attorneys stipulate to the existence of a fact, you must accept the stipulation as evidence and regard that fact as proved.

You must not speculate to be true any insinuations suggested by a question asked a witness. A question is not evidence and may be considered only as it supplies meaning to the answer.

You must disregard any evidence to which an objection was sustained by the court and any evidence ordered stricken by the court.

Anything you may have seen or heard outside the courtroom is not evidence and must also be disregarded.

The flight of a person after the commission of a crime is not sufficient in itself to establish guilt; however, if flight is proved, it is circumstantial evidence in determining guilt or innocence.

The essence of flight embodies the idea of deliberately going away with consciousness of guilt and for the purpose of avoiding apprehension or prosecution. The weight to which such circumstance is entitled is a matter for the jury to determine.

The credibility or believability of a witness should be determined by his manner upon the stand, his relationship to the parties, his fears, motives, interests or feelings, his opportunity to have observed the matter to which he testified, the reasonableness of his statements and the strength or weakness of his recollections.

If you believe that a witness has lied about any material fact in the case, you may disregard the entire testimony of that witness or any portion of his testimony which is not proved by other evidence.

Any testimony that a witness believed that the defendant has a history of violence against persons is offered solely for the purpose of explaining the state of mind of the witness at the time she made her statement to police on January 1, 2016. This testimony, if believed, is not to be considered as substantive evidence that the defendant has a history of violence against persons, or that he is a person of bad character.

A witness who has special knowledge, skill, experience, training or education in a particular science, profession or occupation is an expert witness. An expert witness may give his opinion as to any matter in which he is skilled.

You should consider such expert opinion and weigh the reasons, if any, given for it. You are not bound, however, by such an opinion. Give it the weight to which you deem it entitled, whether that be great or slight, and you may reject it, if, in your judgment, the reasons given for it are unsound.

In arriving at a verdict in this case as to whether the defendant is guilty or not guilty,

the subject of penalty or punishment is not to be discussed or considered by you and should

1 2

in no way influence your verdict.

7.

It is a constitutional right of a defendant in a criminal trial that he may not be

compelled to testify. Thus, a decision as to whether he should testify is left to the

defendant on the advice eff counsel of his attorney. You must not draw any inference of

guilt from the fact that he does not testify, nor should this fact be discussed by you or ether

1 2

into your deliberations in any way.

Although you are to consider only the evidence in the case in reaching a verdict, you must bring to the consideration of the evidence your everyday common sense and judgment as reasonable men and women. Thus, you are not limited solely to what you see and hear as the witnesses testify. You may draw reasonable inferences from the evidence which you feel are justified in the light of common experience, keeping in mind that such inferences should not be based on speculation or guess.

A verdict may never be influenced by sympathy, prejudice or public opinion. Your decision should be the product of sincere judgment and sound discretion in accordance with these rules of law.

When you retire to consider your verdict, you must select one of your number to act as foreperson who will preside over your deliberation and will be your spokesman here in court.

During your deliberation, you will have all the exhibits which were admitted into evidence, these written instructions and forms of verdict which have been prepared for your convenience.

Your verdict must be unanimous. As soon as you have agreed upon a verdict, have it signed and dated by your foreperson and then return with it to this room.

If, during your deliberation, you should desire to be further informed on any point of law or hear again portions of the testimony, you must reduce your request to writing signed by the foreperson. The officer will then return you to court where the information sought will be given to you in the presence of, and after notice to, the district attorney and the Defendant and his counsel.

Playbacks of testimony are time-consuming and are not encouraged unless you deem it necessary. Should you require a playback, you must carefully describe the testimony to be played back so that the court recorder can arrange her notes. Remember, the court is not at liberty to supplement the evidence.

During the course of this trial, and your deliberations, you are not to:

- communicate with anyone in any way regarding this case or its merits either by phone, text, internet, or other means;
- 2. read, watch, listen to any news or media accounts or commentary about the case;
- 3. do any research, such as consulting dictionaries, using the internet, or using reference materials;
- 4. make any investigation, test a theory of the case, re-create any aspect of the case, or in any other way investigate or learn about the case on your own.

Now you will listen to the arguments of counsel who will endeavor to aid you to reach a proper verdict by refreshing in your minds the evidence and by showing the application thereof to the law; but, whatever counsel may say, you will bear in mind that it is your duty to be governed in your deliberation by the evidence as you understand it and remember it to be and by the law as given to you in these instructions, with the sole, fixed and steadfast purpose of doing equal and exact justice between the Defendant and the State of Nevada.

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

1	RTRAN	Atumb, Dun
2		
3		
4		
5	DISTRICT COURT	
6	CLARK COUNTY, 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 P. TOGLIATTI, DISTRICT COURT JUDG	
16	FRIDAY, AUGUST 3, 2018	
17	RECORDER'S TRANSCRIPT OF JURY TRIAL - DAY 5	
18	APPEARANCES:	
19		DAVID CTANTON FCO
20	For Plaintiff:	DAVID STANTON, ESQ. WILLIAM FLINN, ESQ.
21	For Defendant:	ROBERT E. O'BRIEN, ESQ.
22	Tor Defendant.	RYAN J. BASHOR, ESQ.
23		
24	RECORDED BY YVETTE G. SISON, COURT RECORDER	
25	THE CONDED BY TVELLE G. SISON, COU	IN I NECONDEN
	I	

7

jury?

8

9 10

11

12 13

14 15

16

17 18

19

20 21

22

24

23 25 THE MARSHAL: Okay. Judge, are we ready for the jury?

THE COURT: Oh, I'm sorry. Yes.

THE MARSHAL: All rise. The jury is entering. The jury is all present, ma'am.

[In the presence of the jury.]

THE COURT: Counsel, will you stipulate to the presence of the

MR. STANTON: Yes, Your Honor.

MR. BASHOR: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, I'm now about to instruct you on the laws as it applies in this case. I would like to instruct you orally without having to read to you these instructions, but they're of such importance that I have to read them to you verbatim.

The instructions are long, and some might seem complicated. If they're not especially clear to you when I first read them, please keep in mind that you're going to have a copy of the jury instructions with you in the deliberation room where you can there read and consider them carefully. Instructions to the jury.

Instruction number 1. It is now my duty as judge to instruct you in the law that applies to this case. It is your duty as jurors to follow these instructions and to apply the rules of law to the facts as you find them from the evidence. You must not be concerned with the wisdom of any rule of law stated in these instructions regardless of any opinion you may have as to what the law ought to be. It would be a violation of your oath to base a verdict on any other view of the law than that given in the instructions of the Court.

Instruction number 2. If in these instructions any rule, direction, or idea is repeated or stated in different ways, no emphasis thereon is intended by me and none may be inferred by you. For that reason, you are not to single out any certain sentence or any individual point or instruction and ignore the others, but you are to consider all the instructions as a whole and regard each in the light of all the others. The order in which the instructions are given has no significance as to their relative importance.

Instruction number 3. An amended indictment is but a formal method of accusing a person of a crime and is not of itself any evidence of his guilt. In this case, it is charged, in an indictment, that on or about the 1st day of January 2016, the Defendant committed the offenses of murder with use of a deadly weapon, a category A Felony, NRS 200.010, 200.030, 193.165 assault with a deadly weapon, a category B Felony, NRS 200.471, and discharge of a firearm from or within a structure or vehicle, a category B felony, NRS 202.287. It is the duty of the jury to apply the rules of law contained in these instructions to the facts of the case and determine whether or not the Defendant is guilty of the offense charged.

Count 1. Murder with use of a deadly weapon, did willfully, unlawfully, feloniously, and with malice aforethought kill Patrick Fleming, a human being with the use of a deadly weapon, to wit: a handgun, by shooting at and into the body of 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 Fog, apartment number 201, North Las Vegas, discharge a firearm within or from the structure, while being within an area -- excuse me -- an area designated by a City or County Ordinance as a populated area for the purpose of prohibiting the discharge of weapons.

In this case, the Defendant is accused in the indictment alleging an open charge of murder. This charge includes and encompasses murder of the first degree, murder of the second degree, and voluntary manslaughter. The jury must decide if the Defendant is guilty of any offense and if so, of which offense.

Instruction number 4. Murder is the unlawful killing of a human being with malice aforethought whether express or implied. The unlawful killing may be affected by any of the various means by which death may be occasioned.

Instruction number 5. Malice aforethought means the intentional doing of a wrongful act without legal cause, or excuse, or what the law considers adequate provocation. The condition of mind described as malice aforethought may arise not alone from anger, hatred, revenge or some particular ill will, spite, or a grudge toward the person killed, but may result from any unjustifiable or unlawful motive or purpose to injure another, which proceeds from a heart fatally bent on mischief or with reckless disregard of