## APPENDICES TABLE OF CONTENTS

Volume 1
Criminal Complaint
Second Amended Criminal Complaint1AA000003-7
Third Amended Criminal Complaint1AA000008-12
Fourth Amended Criminal Complaint1AA000013 -18
Minutes 9/23/15 Arraignment
Indictment1AA000020-26
Superseding Indictment1AA000027 -33
Second Superseding Indictment1AA000034 -40
Transcript – Calendar Call1AA000041-1AA000059
Transcript Jury Trial Day (tr. p. 1-143) .1AA000060- 1AA000202
Transcript Jury Trial Day (tr. p. 1-48 of 175)1AA000203-250
Volume 2
Transcript Jury Trial Day 2 (tr. cont. p. 49-175) 2AA000251-AA000251-377
Transcript Jury Trial Day 3 9/14/16 (tr. p. 1-123)
Volume 3
Transcript Jury Trial Day 3 (tr. cont. p. 124-228)3AA000501-605
Transcript Jury Trial Day 4 (tr. p. 1-145)3AA000606- 750
Volume 4
Transcript Trial Day 4 (tr. cont. p. 146-197)4AA000751-802
Transcript Jury Trial Day 5 (tr. p. 1-198)4AA000803 -4AA001000
Volume 5
Transcript Jury Trial Day 5 (tr. cont. p. 199-215).5AA001001-5AA001017
Transcript Jury Trial Day 6 9/19/16 (tr. p. 1-121)5AA001018-1138
Transcript Jury Trial Day 7 9/20/16 (tr. p. 1-112 of 176)5AA001139-1250
Volume 6
Transcript Jury Trial Day 7 (tr. cont. p. 113-176)6AA001251-6AA001314
Transcript Jury Trial Day 8 9/21/16 (tr. p. 1-133)6AA001314-1447
Transcript Jury Trial Day 9 9/22/16 (tr. p. 1-53 of 150)6AA001448-1500
Volume 7
Transcript Jury Trial Day 9 (tr. cont. p. 54-150)7AA001448-1597
Transcript Jury Trial Day 10 9/23/16 (tr. p. 1-153 of 251).7AA001598-1750
Volume 8
Transcript Jury Trial Day 10 (tr. cont. p. 154-251)8AA001751-1848
Transcript Jury Trial Day 11 9/27/16 (tr. p. 1-145).8AA001849-8AA001993
Transcript Jury Trial Day 12 (tr. p. 1-7 of 150)8AA001994-8AA002000
Volume 9
Transcript Jury Trial Day 12 (tr. cont. p. 8-150)9AA002001-9AA002143

Transcript Jury Trial Day 13 (tr. p. 1-107 of 165).9-AA002144- 9AA002250
Volume 10
Transcript Jury Trial Day 13 (tr. cont. p. 108-65)10AA002251-10AA002308
Transcript Trial Day 14 (tr. p. 1-192 of 258)10AA002309-10AA002500
Volume 11
Transcript Jury Trial Day 14 (tr. cont. p. 193-258)11AA002501-2566
Transcript Jury Trial Day 15 10/3/16 (tr. p. 1-68)11AA002567-2634
Transcript Jury Trial Day 16 10/4/16 (tr. p. 1-116 of 140)11AA002635-2760
Volume 12
Transcript Jury Trial Day 16 (tr. cont. p. 117-140)12AA002761 -2774
Transcript Jury Trial Day 17 10/5/16 (tr. p. 1-32)12AA002775-3806
Transcript Jury Trial Day 18 10/6/162 (tr. p. 1-127)12AA002809-2933
Transcript Jury Trial Day 19 10/7/16 (p. 1-67 of 79)12AA002934-3000
Volume 13
Transcript Jury Trial Day 19 (tr. cont. p. 68-79)13AA3001-3012
Judgment of Conviction 12/2/16
Notice of Appeal 12/22/16
Appendix Volume 14
Disbarment of Trial Attorney William Wolfbrandt14 AA 3018-3029
Grand Jury Transcript Volume I January 8, 201514 AA 3030-3086
Grand Jury Transcript Volume II January 29, 201514 AA 3087-3226
Defendant Mendoza's Proposed Jury Instructions14 AA 3227-3236
(Not used at Jury Trial)
Appendix Volume 15
Jury Instructions Used and Blank Verdict Forms15 AA 3237-3299
Verdict Form
Appellant's Opening Brief in Prior Appeal 7205615 AA 3309-3341
Respondent's Answering Brief
Court of Appeals Order of Affirmance for Appeal 7205615 AA 3374-3378
Inmate filed Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus 10/18/1915AA 3379-3387
Inmate filed handwritten Request for Hearing on Motion
To Amend and Appoint Counsel 11/14/1915 AA 3388-3395
State's Response to Petition for Writ of Habeas
Corpus (Post-Conviction) Motion for Appointment of
Counsel, Request for Evidentiary Hearing and Motion
To Amend 12/10/19
9/20/20 Supplemental Brief in Support of Postconviction
Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus
Exhibit 1 Affidavit of Jorge Mendoza15 AA 3454-3457
Appendix Volume 16

State's Response to Petitioner's Supplemental Brief in Support of Petitioner's Postconviction Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus	16 AA 3487-3539
Postconviction Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus And Supplement 12/14/2020	.16AA 3557-3587
1/23/2021 Motion for Leave to Submit Hospital	16.1.2.700.2627
Records for Consideration	.16AA 3588-3625
Exhibit 1 Mendoza Medical Records Directly After Being Shot September 21, 2014	16 A A 3502 3626
Appendix Volume 17	10 AA 3392-3020
Court Minutes from Evidentiary Hearing on	
Post-Conviction Writ of Habeas Corpus & Motion for	
Leave to Add to Record	17 AA 3627
2/23/2021 Transcript of Evidentiary Hearing re Petition	
For Writ of Habeas Corpus and Motion for Leave to Add	
Hospital Records1	7AA 3628-3682
3/14/2021 Objection to Proposed Findings of Fact,	
Conclusions of Law & Order1	
4/2/2021 Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law & Order	
4/5/2021 Notice of Appeal	17 AA 3741-3743
4/8/2021 Minute Order Admitting Hospital Record and	
Photos as Hearing Court's Exhibits 1 & 2	17 AA 3744
Appendix Volume 18	NAME 2545 2552
Jury Trial Summary	
11/28/16 Minutes of Sentencing Hearing	
11/28/16 Sentencing Transcript	XVIII:3/56-3/82
ALPHABETICAL ORDER OF APPENDICES 1-18	
Affidavit of Jorge Mendoza	
Arraignment Minutes 9/23/15	
Criminal Complaint	1AA00001-2
Criminal Complaint Second Amended	1AA000003-7
Criminal Complaint Third Amended	
Criminal Complaint Fourth Amended	
Disbarment of Trial Attorney William Wolfbrandt1	
Evidentiary Hearing 2/23/21 Transcript	17AA 3628-3682
Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law & Order Objection	

to Proposed 3/14/2021
Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law & Order 4/2/202117 AA 3692-3740
Hospital Police Statement of Jorge Mendoza Part 116 AA 3487-3539
Hospital Police Statement of Jorge Mendoza Part 216 AA 3540-3556
Hospital Records of Mendoza 9/21/1416 AA 3592-3626
Hospital Records Ordered Admitted 4/8/202117 AA 3744
Indictment
Indictment Superseding
Indictment Second Superseding 1AA000034 -40
Inmate filed Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus 10/18/1915AA 3379-3387
Inmate filed Handwritten Request 11/14/1915 AA 3388-3395
Judgment of Conviction 12/2/1613AA003013-3016
Jury Instructions (Mendoza's Proposed Not Used) 14 AA 3227-3236
Jury Instructions Used and Blank Verdict Forms15 AA 3237-3299
Jury Trial SummaryXVIII:3745-3753
Notice of Appeal (First Notice Direct Appeal) 12/22/16 .13AA003017- 3018
Notice of Appeal (Writ of Habeas Corpus) 4/5/202117 AA 3741-3743
Prior Appeal Appellant's Opening Brief Appeal 7205615 AA 3309-3341
Prior Appeal Respondent's Answering Brief
Prior Appeal Order of Affirmance
Reply to State's Response on Supplement 12/14/202016AA 3557-3587
State's Initial Response to Petition 12/10/1915 AA 3396-3422
State's Response to Petitioner's Supplemental
Supplement to Petition for Writ 9/20/2020
Transcript Grand Jury Transcript Volume I 1/8/1514 AA 3030-3086
Transcript Grand Jury Transcript Volume II 1/29/1514 AA 3087-3226
Transcript Calendar Call 9/7/171AA000041-1AA000059
Transcript Jury Trial Day 1 (tr. p. 1-143)1AA000060- 1AA000202
Transcript Jury Trial Day 2 (tr. p. 1-48 of 175)1AA000203-250
Transcript Jury Trial Day 2 (tr. cont. p. 49-175)2AA000251-AA00251-377
Transcript Jury Trial Day 3 9/14/16 (tr. p. 1-123 of 228)2AA00378-500
Transcript Jury Trial Day 3 (tr. cont. p. 124-228)
Transcript Jury Trial Day 4 (tr. p. 1-145 of 197)3AA000606- 750
Transcript Jury Trial Day 4 (tr. cont. p. 146-197)4AA000751-802
Transcript Jury Trial Day 5 (tr. p. 1-198)4AA000803-1000
Transcript Jury Trial Day 5 (tr. cont. p. 199-215)5AA001001-1017
Transcript Jury Trial Day 6 9/19/16 (tr. p. 1-121) 5AA001018-1138
Transcript Jury Trial Day 7 (tr p. 1-112 of 176)2016 5AA001139-1250
Transcript Jury Trial Day 7 (tr. cont. p. 113-176)6AA001251-6AA001314
Transcript Jury Trial Day 8 9/21/16 (tr. p. 1-133) 6AA001314-1447

Transcript Jury Trial Day 9 (tr. p. 1-53 of 150)	6AA001448-1500
Transcript Jury Trial Day 9 (tr. cont. p. 54-150)	7AA001448-1597
Transcript Jury Trial Day 10 (tr. p.1-153 of 251)	7AA001598-1750
Transcript Jury Trial Day 10 (tr. cont. p. 154-251)	8AA001751-1848
Transcript Jury Trial Day 11 9/27/16 (tr. p. 1-145) .8AA	A001849-8AA001993
Transcript Jury Trial Day 12 (tr. p. 1-7 of 150)8AA0	01994-8AA002000
Transcript Jury Trial Day 12 (tr. cont. p. 8-150)9AA(	002001-9AA002143
Transcript Jury Trial Day 13 (tr. p. 1-107 of 165).9AA0	02144- 9AA002250
Transcript Jury Trial Day 13 (tr. cont. p. 108-165).10A	
Transcript Jury Trial Day 14 (tr. p. 1-192 of 258) 10AA	02309-10AA002500
Transcript Jury Trial Day 14 (tr. cont. p. 193-258)	11AA002501-2566
Transcript Jury Trial Day 15 10/3/26 (tr. p. 1-68)	11AA002567-2634
Transcript Jury Trial Day 16 (tr. p. 1-116 of 140)	11AA002635-2760
Transcript Jury Trial Day 16 (tr. cont. p. 117-140)	.12AA002761 -2774
Transcript Jury Trial Day 17 10/5/16 (tr. p. 1-32)	. 12AA002775-3806
Transcript Jury Trial Day 18 10/6/16 (tr. p. 1-127)	12AA002809-2933
Transcript Jury Trial Day 19 10/7/16 (tr. p. 1-67 of 79).	12AA002934-3000
Transcript Jury Trial Day 19 (tr. cont. p. 68-79)	13AA3001-3012
Verdict Form	15 AA 3300-3308
11/28/16 Minutes of Sentencing Hearing	XVIII:3754-3755
11/28/16 Sentencing Transcript	XVIII:3756-3782

Dated September 2, 2021
BY /s/ DIANE C. LOWE
DIANE C. LOWE, ESQ
Nevada Bar #14573

# JURY TRIAL SUMMARY

Writ Case Number	Prior Criminal Case Number	Appeal Case Number	Date of Birth	DOC Number	NEW Judge	Facility of Inmate	Length of Sentence	Review of Jury Trial
A-19- 804157-W	C-15- 303991-1	Current appeal number	9/3/ 1982 (37)	1169537	Bita Yeager Dept 1	High Desert State	Life with Parole after 23	19-day Jury Trial 9/12/16- 10/7/16
Jorge Mendoza v.	State of Nevada v.	82740				Prison HDSP	Years	and Appeal
Warden	Jorge Mendoza	Jorge Mendoza v. State of Nevada			Previously: Carolyn Ellsworth Dept V			Sentencing Date 12/12/2016
		<u>eFiling</u>			2 Spt 1			Judgment of Conviction 12/2/16
		Sup Ct 72056 Denied 10-						
		20-18 10-17-18						
		Oral argument						

Count	Crime	N.R.S.	Classification	Date of Occurrence	File Date	Jury Trial	Date of Conviction
1	Conspiracy to Commit Robbery	200.380	Felony B	9/21/2014	1/30/15	9/12/16- 10/7/16	Sentencing 11/28/16 JOC: 12/02/2016
2	Burglary while in Possess of	205.060.4	Felony B	9/21/2014	1/30/15		12/02/2016
3	Home Invasion, While in Poss	205.067.4	Felony B	9/21/2014	1/30/15		12/02/2016
4	Attempt Robbery with a Deadly W	200.380	Felony B	9/21/2014	1/30/15		12/02/2016
5	Attempt Robbery with a Deadly W	200.380	Felony B	9/21/2014	1/30/15		12/02/2016
6	Murder with Use of a Deadly W	200.030.1	Felony A	9/21/2014	1/30/15		12/02/2016
7	Attempt Murder with a Deadly W	200.010	Felony B	9/21/2014	1/30/15		12/02/2016

	Mendoza C-15-303991-1	Laguna C-15-303991-5	Murphy C-15-303991-4
Ct 1 Conspiracy to commit robbery	same	28-72 months	same
Ct 2 Burglary while In possession of dangerous weapon	48 to 180 months concurrent to count 1	48-150 months Concurrent to count 1	48 to 180 months concurrent to ct 1
Ct 3 Home invasion while in poss of a deadly	48 to 180 months concurrent to count 2	66 to 180 months Concurrent to count 2	same

Count 4 Attempt Robbery 36 to 120 months with 48 to 120 months with with use of a deadly consecutive weapon consecutive weapon consecutive weapon	ns
	apons
weapon enhancement 36 to 120 enhancement 48 to 120 enhancement 3	6 to 120
months concurrent to months concurrent to months concurr	ent to
count 3 count 3 count 3	
Count 5 Attempt Robbery 36 to 120 months with 48 to 120 months 48 to 120 months	:hs
with use of a deadly consecutive weapons consecutive weapon consecutive weapon	apons
weapon enhancement 36 to 120 enhancement 48 to 120 enhancement 3	6 to 120
months concurrent to months concurrent to months concurr	ent to
count 4 count 4 count 4	
Count 6 Murder with use   1st Life with possibility of   2nd degree Life with poss   2nd degree same	е
of a deadly weapon parole after 20 years of parole after 20 years	
consecutive weapons Consecutive weapons	
enhancement 48 to 240 enhancement 36 to 240	
months concurrent to months	
count 5 Concurrent to count 5	
Count 7 attempt murder 48 to 240 months 84 to 240 months 84 to 240 months	:hs
with use of a deadly consecutive weapons Consecutive weapon consecutive weapon	apon
weapon enhancement 36 to 240 enhancement 84 to 240 enhancement 3	
months concurrent to months consecutive to months consecu	utive to
charge 6 800 days credit   count 6   count 6	-
Credit for 655 days 719 days credit	:
served	

Jorge Mendoza was convicted of First-Degree Murder with use of a deadly weapon and 6 Felony B crimes after a 19-day jury trial which resulted, for him, in an aggregate sentence of 23 years to Life imprisonment on December 12, 2016, the Honorable Judge Carolyn Ellsworth presiding throughout. XIII:3013-6. The three co-defendants - Jorge Mendoza, Joseph Larson and David Murphy were tried together, despite efforts to sever the cases. XI:2569-86. Joseph Laguna was convicted of Second-Degree Murder and 6 Felony B Counts. His aggregate sentence was 27 years to life. XIII:3007-8. He appealed his conviction and Order denying the Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus Pro Per and judgment was reversed and remanded May 11, 2020, in Nevada Supreme Court case 78866. Case A-18-785267-

W shows the next hearing on this case is April 18, 2022, per a July 6, 2021, Stipulation and Order to Continue Briefing Schedule.

David Murphy was convicted of Second-Degree Murder and 6 Felony B Counts. His aggregate sentence was 23 years to life. XIII:3008-9. He appealed his conviction, and his judgment was affirmed November 12, 2019, in Nevada Supreme Court case 77828.

The 19-day jury trial commenced September 12, 2016. I:60. Throughout the entirety the lawyers and Judge were:

Judge Carolyn Ellsworth

For the State Marc DiGiacomo, Agnes M. Lexis

For Defendant Mendoza: William L Wolfbrandt

For Defendant Murphy Casey A. Landis

For Defendant Laguna Monique A McNeill I:60.

Voir dire lasted 4 days. Jury Trial Day 1: I:60-202. Jury Trial Day 2 I:203-50, II:251-377. Jury Trial Day 3: II:378-500, III:501-605. Jury Trial Day 4 III:606-750, IV:751-802. The State presented 22 witnesses and rested their case on September 30, 2016, the fourteenth day of a nineteen-day jury trial. (tr. p. 74) X:2382. State's witnesses in front of and or outside the presence of the jury:

**Brown** - David Brown Esq testimony outside the presence of the jury Jury Trial Day 14 (tr. p. 109-128) X:2417-36.

**Brown**-Jennifer Brown forensic scientist in DNA section of Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department forensic laboratory Jury Trial Day 9 (tr. p. 2, 88-113) VI:1449, VII:1535-60.

Cattoir – Aaron Cattoir pawn shop record verification of pawn witness Jury Trial Day 6 (tr. p. 74-82) V:1091-99.

Day- Roger Day on September 21st, 2014, he was living near the murder site 10025 Long Cattle in Las Vegas called 911 Jury Trial Day 8 (tr. p. 86-114) VI:1316, VI:1400-28.

**Dutra-**Dr. Timothy Dutra Medical Examiner at Clark County Office of the Coroner Jury Trial Day 8 (tr. p. 4-21) VI:1316-35.

Estavillo – Michelle Estavillo- Jorge Mendoza's mother-in-law Jury Trial Day 7 (tr. p. 2, 95-140) V:1140, V:1233-50, VI:1251-78.

Felabom – Adam Felabom, Crime Scene Analyst CSA Jury Trial Day 5 (tr. p. 2, 129-213) IV:804, IV:930-1000, V:1001-15.

Figueroa – Robert Figueroa, Defendant who took plea deal in exchange for testimony Jury Trial Day 10, 11, 12 - Jury Trial Day 10 (tr. p. 2, 207-249) VII:1599, VII1804-46; Jury Trial Day 11 (tr. p. 2, 5-143) VII:1850, VIII:1853-1991; Jury Trial Day 12 (tr. p. 2, 30-58) VIII:1995, IX:2023-51.

Gandy-Officer Christopher Gandy Police Officer with Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department Jury Trial Day 10 (tr. p.2, 63-203) VII:1660-1750, VII:1751-1800.

Gutierrez – Xavier Gutierrez Employed by AT&T assistant store manager at retail location – he was asked by AT&T to come to jury trial and authenticate some records from AT&T as well as Cricket Jury Trial Day 8 (tr. p.2, 76-86) VI:1316, VI:1390-1400.

Jensen-Detective Barry Jensen Las Vegas Police Detective Jury Trial Day 12, 13, 14 Jury Trial Day 12 (tr. p. 91-147) VIII:1995, IX:2084-140; Jury Trial Day 13 (tr.

p. 2, p. 9-155) IX:2145, IX:2152-250, X:2251-98; Jury Trial Day 14 (tr. p. 2, 51) X:2310, X:2359-81.

**Kovacich** – Officer Matthew Kovacich Patrol Officer called to scene Jury Trial Day 5 (tr. p. 2, 94) IV:804, IV:896-930.

**Larsen-**Steven Larsen Father of Joey Larsen name on lease of scene of crime and called house to give heads up and also came to scene after learning of shooting Jury Trial Day 9 (tr. p. 2, 6-86) VI:1449, VI:1453-1500, VII:1501-33.

**Larsen-** Summer Larsen estranged wife of Joey Larsen, roommate of murder victim Jury Trial Day 6 (tr. p. 92-119), Jury Trial Day 6: V:1109, V:1099-V:1136, Jury Trial Day 7 (tr. p. 92-139) V:1140-1250, VI:1251-77.

Lester-Anya Lester employed as a forensic scientist with the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department forensic laboratory in the firearms and tool marks analyst unit Jury Trial Day 7 (tr. p. 142-172) V:1140, VI:1278-310.

**McPhail**-Randy McPhail State's Rebuttal Witnesses Jury Trial Day 16 (tr. p. 87-124) XI:2721-58.

**Selgado**-Renee Salgado lived near the murder site and also called 911 when she looked out the window and saw what was going on - Jury Trial Day 8 (tr. p. 114 - 132) VI:1316, VI:1400-46.

Sierra-Joseph Sierra employed with T-Mobile US custodian of records provided extensive testimony on cell phone towers and information gathering and potential scenarios Jury Trial Day 8 (tr. p. 21-74) VI:1316, VI:1335-88.

Szukiewicz – Joseph Szukiewicz Crime Scene Analyst Jury Trial Day 6 (tr. p. 2, 20-33) V:1019-50.

Theobald – Officer Ronald Theobald Jury Trial Day 6 (tr. p. 2, 34-74) V:1051-90.

**Walker** - Gene Walker neighbor of house where murder was Jury Trial Day 5 (tr. p. 2, 66-94) IV:804, IV:868-96.

Williams – Tod Williams Detective with the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department Interviewed Mr. Mendoza at the Hospital – Recording played to the Jury

he authenticates them, and they are played to the jury on Jury Trial Day 16. Additional Testimony: Jury Trial Day 9 (tr. p. 113-149) VII:1560-97; Jury Trial Day 10 (tr. p. 5), VII:1599, VII:1603-45; Jury Trial Day 16 (tr. p. 126) XI:2636, XI:2760, XII2761-63. Jury Trial Day 17 (tr. p. 2, 3-23) XII:2776, XII:2777-97.

Exhibit 334 Transcript of 2 hospital Mendoza interviews admitted XII:2762; Exhibit 334A Recordings admitted and First Hospital Interview Played to Jury XII:2763. Jury Trial Day 17 State's rebuttal Witness Tod Williams XII:2776 2<sup>nd</sup> Hospital Interview of Mendoza played to Jury XII:2778-97.

Jorge Mendoza testified directly after the State rested, thinking based on his attorney's advice he had legal grounds for asserting self-defense including jury instructions on self-defense but after he testified his attorney presented the request to the court and the request was denied. Jury Trial Day 18. (tr. p. 4-18) XII:2809-24. XV:3454-7.

**Mendoza-**Jorge Mendoza -Defendant and Petitioner for this Action Jury Trial Day 14 (tr. p. 2, 78-205, 206-231) X:2310, X:2386-500, XI:2501-13, XI:2514-39.

Other Defense Witnesses:

Michalsky-Dan Michalsky defense witness of Joseph Laguna – lived near crime scene called 911 Jury Trial Day 15 (tr. p. 2, 21-41) XI:2568, XI:2587-2607.

Hall-Ashley Hall- friend of Summer Larsen XI:2568 Defense Witness of David Murphy Jury Trial Day 15 (tr. p.2, 45-66) XI:2568, XI:2611-32.

**Sotelo**-Gabriel Sotelo testifies re with North Las Vegas Police detective and gave information he had heard regarding this crime Defense Witness of David Murph Jury Trial Day 16 (tr. p. 2,16-58, 5883) XI:2636, Outside Presence of Jury: XI:2650-92; In presence of jury: XI:2692-717.

# **Jury Trial Outline:**

Appendices	Trans	Trial Day	
	cript		
IV:825	23-52	5	State's Opening Statement
IV:854	52-54	5	Mendoza's Opening Statement
IV:856	54-57	5	Laguna's Opening Statement
IV:859	57-65	5	Murphy's Opening Statement
IV:869	67	5	State Witness Gene Walker Neighbor of Crime Site
IV:896-930	94	5	Officer Matthew Kovacich Patrol called to scene
IV:931-1000	129	5	Adam Felabom, CSA Crime Scene analyst
V:1037-1050	20	6	Joseph Szukiewicz, CSA Crime Scene Analyst
V:1051-90	34	6	Officer Ronald Theobald
V:1091-9	74	6	Aaron Cattoir pawn shop record verification of pawn ticket witness
V:1109-36	92	6	Summer Larsen estranged wife of roommate of murder victim
V:1140-232	3	7	Summer Larsen – estranged wife of Joey Larsen continues testimony
V:1233-50 VI:1251-78	95	7	Michelle Estavillo – Jorge Mendoza's mother-in- law
VI:1278-310	142	7	Employed as a forensic scientist with the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department forensic laboratory in the firearms and tool marks analyst unit
VI:1316-335	4	8	Medical Examiner at Clark County Office of the Coroner
VI:1335-88	21	8	Joseph Sierra Employed with T-Mobile US custodian of records provided extensive testimony on cell phone towers and information gathering and potential scenarios
VI:1390-400	76	8	Xavier Gutierrez Employed by AT&T assistant store manager at a retail location – he was asked by AT&T to come to jury trial and authenticate some records from AT&T as well as Cricket
VI:1400-28	86	8	Roger Day page 86 On September 21 <sup>ST</sup> 2014 he was living near the murder site 10025 Long Cattle in Las Vegas in a house called 911

VI:1428-46	114	8	Renee Salgado lived near the murder site and also called 911 when she saw out the window what was going on
VI1:453-500		9	Steven Larsen page 6 Father of Joey Larsen and
VII:1501-33			name on lease for house he lived in
VII:1535-60	88	9	Jennifer Brown forensic scientist in DNA section of Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department forensic laboratory
VII:1560-97	113	9	Detective Tod Williams Detective with the Las
			Vegas Metropolitan Police Department
			Interviewed Mr. Mendoza at the Hospital
VII:1602-45	5	10	Detective Tod Williams
VII:1660-750	63	10	Officer Christopher Gandy
VIII:1751-			•
1800	1		
VIII1804-46	207	10	Robert Figueroa testifying as part of plea bargain
VIII:1853-991	5	11	Robert Figueroa
IX:2023-51	30	12	Robert Figueroa
IX:2084-140	91	12	Detective Barry Jensen
IX:2152-250	9	13	Detective Barry Jensen
X:2251-298			
X:2359-381	51	14	Detective Barry Jensen
X:2382		14	State Rests
X:2386-414	78-	14	Jorge Mendoza
	106		
X:2417-36	109-	14	David Brown Esq former attorney for Robert
	128		Figueroa testimony outside the presence of the
			jury
X:2445-2500	137	14	Jorge Mendoza
XI:2501-2539		15	Jorge Mendoza
XI:2569-86	3-20	15	Argument on Motion to Sever
XI:2587-607	21-41	15	Defense McNeill / Laguna Witness: Dan
			Michalsky lived near crime site called 911
XI:2607	41 line 20	15	Laguna Defense team rests
XI:2611-32		15	Defense Atty Landis/ Murphy Witness: Ashley
			Hall page 45-66 friend of Summer Larsen
XI:2650-78	16-44	16	Defendant Murphy's Witness Gabriel Sotelo
XI:2690-1	56-57		Outside the presence of the jury

XI:2692-717			
XI:2721-58	87- 124	16	Randy McPhail State's Rebuttal Witness
XI:2760 XII:2761-3	126-9	16	Detective Tod Williams-Interviewed Mr. Mendoza at the Hospital – Recording played to the Jury he authenticates them, and they are played to the jury.
XII:2777-97	3-23	17	Detective Tod Williams
XII:2810-22	4-16	18	Self-Defense Jury Instructions requested by Attorney Wolfbrandt for Mr. Mendoza. Argument and Request denied.
XII:2833-71	27-65	18	State's Closing Argument
XII:2873-87	72-73	18	Mendoza's Closing Argument
XII:2887-906	81- 100	18	Laguna's Closing Argument
XII:2906-28	100- 22	18	Murphy's Closing Argument
XII:2940-91	7-58	19	State's Rebuttal Closing Argument -DiGiacomo
XII:3005-6	72-73	19	Verdict re Jorge Mendoza
XII:3006-8	73-75	19	Verdict re Joseph Laguna
XII:3008-9	75-76	19	Verdict re David Murphy

C-15-303991-1

### **DISTRICT COURT CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

Felony/Gross Misdemeanor

**COURT MINUTES** 

November 28, 2016

C-15-303991-1

State of Nevada

Jorge Mendoza

November 28, 2016

09:00 AM Sentencina

**HEARD BY:** 

Ellsworth, Carolyn

COURTROOM: RJC Courtroom 16D

COURT CLERK: Truiillo, Denise RECORDER:

Corcoran, Lara

REPORTER:

**PARTIES PRESENT:** 

**Agnes Lexis** 

**Attorney for Plaintiff** 

Jorge Mendoza

Defendant

Marc P. Di Giacomo

**Attorney for Plaintiff** 

State of Nevada

**Plaintiff** 

William L. Wolfbrandt, ESQ

**Attorney for Defendant** 

#### **JOURNAL ENTRIES**

#### **SENTENCING**

Deft. present in custody. DEFT. MENDOZA ADJUDGED GUILTY OF CT 1 - CONSPIRACY TO COMMIT ROBBERY (F); CT 2 - BURGLARY WHILE IN POSSESSION OF A DEADLY WEAPON (F); CT 3 -HOME INVASION WHILE IN POSSESSION OF A DEADLY WEAPON (F); CT 4 & CT 5 - ATTEMPT ROBBERY WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON (F); CT 6 - FIRST DEGREE MURDER WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON (F); and CT 7 - ATTEMPT MURDER WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON (F). Statements by counsel, COURT ORDERED, in addition to the \$25.00 Administrative Assessment fee, \$150.00 DNA Analysis fee including testing to determine genetic markers, \$3.00 DNA Collection fee, and JUDGMENT of RESTITUTION of \$5,500.00 PAYABLE to State of Nevada, Victim of Crimes, jointly and severally with co-Deft.'s, Deft. SENTENCED to:

CT 1 - a MAXIMUM of SEVENTY TWO (72) MONTHS and MINIMUM of TWENTY FOUR (24) MONTHS in the Nevada Department of Corrections (NDC):

CT 2 - a MAXIMUM of ONE HUNDRED EIGHTY (180) MONTHS and MINIMUM of FORTY EIGHT (48) MONTHS in the NDC to run CONCURRENT with CT 1;

CT 3 - a MAXIMUM of ONE HUNDRED EIGHTY (180) MONTHS and MINIMUM of FORTY EIGHT (48) MONTHS in the NDC to run CONCURRENT with CT 2;

CT 4 - a MAXIMUM of ONE HUNDRED TWENTY (120) MONTHS and MINIMUM of THIRTY SIX (36) MONTHS in the NDC with a CONSECUTIVE MAXIMUM of ONE HUNDRED TWENTY (120) MONTHS and MINIMUM of THIRTY SIX (36) MONTHS for weapons enhancement, to run CONCURRENT with CT 3;

CT 5 - a MAXIMUM of ONE HUNDRED TWENTY (120) MONTHS and MINIMUM of THIRTY SIX (36) MONTHS in the NDC with a CONSECUTIVE MAXIMUM of ONE HUNDRED TWENTY (120) MONTHS and MINIMUM of THIRTY SIX (36) MONTHS for weapons enhancement, to run CONCURRENT with CT 4:

CT 6 - a MAXIMUM of LIFE and a MINIMUM of TWENTY (20) YEARS in the NDC with a CONSECUTIVE MAXIMUM of TWO HUNDRED FORTY (240) MONTHS and MINIMUM of FORTY EIGHT (48) MONTHS for weapons enhancement, in the NDC, to run CONCURRENT with CT 5;

Printed Date: 2/27/2019

Page 1 of 2

Minutes Date:

November 28, 2016

Prepared by: Andrea Natali

#### C-15-303991-1

CT 7 - a MAXIMUM of TWO HUNDRED FORTY (240) MONTHS and MINIMUM of FORTY EIGHT (48) and a CONSECUTIVE MAXIMUM of TWO HUNDRED FORTY (240) MONTHS and MINIMUM of THIRTY SIX (36) MONTHS for weapons enhancement, to run CONCURRENT with CT 6, for an AGGREGATE TOTAL of a MAXIMUM of LIFE, and MINIMUM of TWENTY THREE (23) YEARS with 800 DAYS CREDIT for time served. Mr. Wolfbrandt moved to withdraw and have Ms. Amanda Gregory appointed as appellant counsel. Ms. Gregory advised she was contacted by Mr. Christensen's office. COURT ORDERED, Motion GRANTED.

## NDC

CLERK'S NOTE: COURT ORDERED, the foregoing minutes updated to add "FIRST DEGREE" to the adjudication of CT 6, by virtue of the verdict reached by the Jury (2/26/19 amn).

Printed Date: 2/27/2019

Page 2 of 2

Minutes Date:

November 28, 2016

Prepared by: Andrea Natali

Electronically Filed 9/2/2021 12:20 PM Steven D. Grierson CLERK OF THE COURT

ĺ		CLERK OF THE COURT
1	RTRAN	Steves, Sum
2		
3		
4	DISTRICT COURT	
5	CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA	
6		
7	THE STATE OF NEVADA, )	
8	Plaintiff,	CASE NO. C-15-303991-1
9	vs.	C-15-303991-3 C-15-303991-4
10	JORGE MENDOZA,	C-15-303991-5
11	SUMMER LARSEN, ) DAVID MURPHY, )	DEPT. V
12	JOSEPH LAGUNA,	) }
13	Defendant.	
14	BEFORE THE HONORABLE CAROLYN ELLSWORTH, DISTRICT COURT JUDGE	
15	BEFORE THE HOROTABLE GARGETTA LELEGATORTH, BIOTRIOT GOORT SODGE	
16	MONDAY, NOVEMBER 28, 2016	
17	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS RE:	
18	SENTENCING	
19		
20	A DDE A DANCEC.	
21	APPEARANCES: (See next page)	
22		
23		
24		
25	RECORDED BY: LARA CORCORAN, COURT RECORDER	
		1
	. I	

For the State: MARC DiGIACOMO, ESQ.,

AGNES M. LEXIS, ESQ.,

**Chief Deputy District Attorneys** 

For the Defendant, Mendoza: WILLIAM L. WOLFBRANDT, ESQ.,

AMANDA S. GREGORY, ESQ.,

For the Defendant, Larsen: GREGORY E. COYER, ESQ.,

For the Defendant, Murphy: DANIEL R. GILLIAM, ESQ.,

For the Defendant, Laguna: MONIQUE A. McNEILL, ESQ.,

## LAS VEGAS, NEVADA; MON7DAY, NOVEMBER 28, 2016

[Proceeding commenced at 10:43 a.m.]

THE COURT: All right. Case number C303991, State of Nevada versus Jorge Mendoza, David Murphy, Joseph and Summer Larsen. Unless you have a preference, I was going to just take these in the order that they appear on the calendar. Do you have a preference?

MR. GILLIAM: I don't, Judge.

MR. DiGIACOMO: No. I think my argument except for Ms. Larsen would be the same as it relates to the three that went to trial.

THE COURT: Okay. And so we'll begin with Mr. Mendoza. And this is the time set for sentencing; are you ready to proceed?

MR. WOLFBRANDT: Yes.

THE COURT: State?

MR. DiGIACOMO: Yes, Judge. As it relates to Mr. Mendoza, and just so you're aware of many of -- or several of the family members are present. Some were noticed as speakers. They all just want to be present and they want you to know that their present, but they don't actually want to speak here today.

As it relates to -- to Mr. Mendoza, I'll be honest with you, his criminal history, the reason he's present at this house and everything else that occurred as it relates to this homicide, I recognize that he is the person who pulled the trigger. But other than that, that does not distinguish him.

That the verdict in and of itself, and I've talked to the family about this, that he's not eligible for life without. The verdict itself was going to give him at the very least 21 years from the verdict. And so you know the facts of this case and I'm

21

22

23

24

25

going to leave it up to your discretion as what you believe is -- is an appropriate sentence for Mr. Mendoza. I will have more argument as it relates to the -- Mr. Murphy and Mr. Laguna.

THE COURT: Mr. Mendoza, would you like to address the Court?

DEFENDANT, MENDOZA: No, I don't.

THE COURT: Counsel?

MR. WOLFBRANDT: Judge, obviously you're very familiar with the circumstances of this case. I've got to know Jorge and his family for a bit. I mean this is something that was just -- it was tragic on many different levels. For the Gibson family as well as the Mendoza family.

I thought the recommendation by Parole and Probation was pretty accurate. The only thing that I would request is when it comes to the weapon enhancement, rather than the 36 to whatever months it recommended, I was going to ask you to do 12 to 30 months. It's all still going to be -- those are going to be consecutive, but ask you to run all the other counts concurrent to the life sentence that's come with the murder case.

THE COURT: All right. So by virtue of the jury's verdict in this case of -- on Count 1, conspiracy to commit robbery, Count 2, burglary while in possession of a deadly, Count 3, home invasion while in possession of a deadly weapon, attempt robbery with a deadly weapon on Count 4, Count 5, attempt robbery with a deadly weapon, Count 6, murder with use of a deadly weapon and Count 7, attempt murder with use of a deadly weapon, I hereby adjudge you guilty of those offenses.

And as to Count 1, conspiracy to commit robbery, I hereby sentence you to a minimum term of 24 months, the maximum term of 72 months in the Nevada Department of Corrections.

As to Count 2, burglary while in possession of a deadly weapon, a minimum term of 48 months, a maximum term of 180 months in Nevada Department of Corrections. That will run concurrently with Count 1.

Count 3, home invasion while in possession of a deadly weapon, a minimum term of 48 months, a maximum term of 180 months. That will run concurrently with Count 2.

Count 4, attempt robbery with use of a deadly weapon, a minimum term of 36 months, a maximum term of 120 months which will run concurrently with Count 3.

Count 5, attempt robbery with use of a deadly weapon, a minimum term of 36 months, a maximum term of 120 months. There is a consecutive minimum enhancement for use of the deadly weapon, a minimum of 36 months, a maximum of 120 months. That count, Count 5, will run concurrently with Count 4.

As to --

THE CLERK: I'm sorry. Does Count 4 have that same enhancement? You didn't say that.

THE COURT: Oh yes. I'm sorry. I did my -- thank you for pointing that out,

Madam Clerk. So there's a minimum term of 36, maximum term of 120 as the

enhancement for Count 4 which was robbery with use of a deadly weapon. And still
that runs concurrently to Count 3.

Count 5 runs concurrent to Count 4.

Count 6, murder with use of a deadly weapon, the term is life imprisonment with the possibility of parole after 21 -- 20 years has been served. And a consecutive minimum term of 36 months, maximum of 240 months for the deadly weapon enhancement. And that runs concurrent with Count 5.

And Count 7, attempt murder with use of a deadly weapon is a minimum term of 48 months, a maximum term of 240 months with an enhancement for use of a deadly weapon of -- which is consecutive to the underlying sentence of 36 to 240. But Count 7 also runs concurrently with Count 6.

So, how do I do the aggregate? Let's see. So there's an aggregate I guess sentence of a minimum of 23 and a maximum of life.

MR. DiGIACOMO: Correct.

THE CLERK: Twenty-three years?

THE COURT: Yes, 23 years, a maximum of life. And credit for time served which is through today is 800 days credit for time served. Do you believe that to be inaccurate?

MR. WOLFBRANDT: No.

THE COURT: Okay. Eight hundred days.

And the next is David Murphy.

MR. GILLIAM: Good morning, Judge, Dan Gilliam standing in for Mr. Landis. I think the Court's aware of his situation which is why I'm here. Mr. Murphy's been made aware of it.

THE COURT: And that is he's moved from the jurisdiction?

MR. GILLIAM: Correct.

THE COURT: Well, I'm sad to see him go.

MR. GILLIAM: We all were, Judge. But, Judge, if I may, did Mr. Landis -- he told me that he filed a sentencing memorandum; is that accurate?

THE COURT: I do have that and I read it.

MR. GILLIAM: Thank you, judge.

THE COURT: And State.

MR. DiGIACOMO: Thank you, Judge. As it relates to Mr. Murphy and Mr. Laguna, when I read the recommendation of P and P it looks like from the formula that they had that they somehow wound up two years less than Mr. Mendoza. So it looks like that the aggregate is 21 to life as opposed to 23 to life which is what they recommend on Mr. Mendoza.

And I believe that formula came out that way because of the verdict for second degree murder instead of first degree murder which you know from the facts of this case is sort of a legal fiction in the sense that the jury found that they both had the intent to kill as well as it had conspired. But more importantly is why this crime occurred. And there's no question in anybody's mind that but for Mr. Murphy this crime doesn't occur ever.

And I know we can talk about what Summer Larsen said on the stand and, you know, whether the Court believes it or doesn't believe it. I know there's no evidence that directly contradicts it. And so that maybe 100 percent the truth of what came out of Ms. Larsen's mouth. But certainly Mr. Murphy armed his cousin with a weapon, went over to do an act that was completely foreign to Mr. Mendoza, and was breaking into a home that he had to believe was occupied 'cause it made no sense otherwise. Otherwise, the marijuana wouldn't have been there.

He brought along with him Mr. Laguna who you can see from his record is a very hardcore violent felon and the result of that was the death of an innocent roommate who was actually in the process of moving out of that particular residence.

I recognize that they recommended that the attempt robbery run consecutive, or the murder run consecutive, to the attempt robbery. I'm going to suggest to the Court that you follow the recommendation, but you run the attempt

murder from the murder count to consecutive and that would run the sentence ultimately to something significantly higher I believe than Mr. Mendoza. And I also think it'd be more commensurate of their responsibility combined with their criminal history.

And so I would request the Court to run the final two counts consecutive as opposed to the first two counts or as opposed to the attempt robbery and the murder counts consecutive. And I will submit it to the -- on that.

THE COURT: All right. And Mr. Murphy, would you like to address the Court?

DEFENDANT, MURPHY: No, I would not.

MR. GILLIAM: Judge, I'd just like to submit on Mr. Landis' sentencing memorandum please.

THE COURT: All right. And the Court has read that. I guess I disagree in that basically he says that he's -- his culpability is less than the shooter and he never intended for a murder to occur. I think it's pretty clear that maybe no one intended for a murder to occur. Certainly -- maybe they weren't expecting the people to be armed when they arrived at the house and that they're -- one of the victims to be waiting with a loaded gun into -- you know, so when they reached the door that there would a fire fight. But when you go, especially in Nevada where people are very fond of their guns to a house armed with weapons, you ought to maybe expect a fire fight to happen.

So yes I see that Mr. Murphy's prior convictions have to do with stealing cars which, you know, he likes to do. But I have to agree with the State here that really without him deciding that they were going to go to this second house -- I mean, they went to the first house and I think the evidence of that was very

convincing. Not only did we have witness -- a witness who testified about that and -- actually two witnesses who testified about going to the first house, but we have the cellphone records that show that.

And it's only after they decide to abort that robbery attempt as being too risky that the decision is made solely through Mr. Murphy to go and commit the robbery at the second location. And then all these bad things happen which is what one might expect.

And so in addition to the administrative assessment of \$25, the \$150 DNA testing fee, the \$3 DNA collection fee, there's also an order and judgment of restitution in the amount of \$5,500. And who is -- do we know who that's to be payable to? I think it's Nevada Victims of Crimes. Let me just double check.

MR. DiGIACOMO: I'm not positive. I'm looking right now in this.

THE COURT: Yeah.

MR. DiGIACOMO: I would assume --

MS. LEXIS: Victims of Crimes.

THE COURT: It's the --

MR. DiGIACOMO: -- it's the Victims of Crime.

THE COURT: -- the State of Nevada, the count being the Nevada Victims of Crime account, so the restitution is ordered payable to the State for reimbursement to the victims -- Nevada Victims of Crime account.

THE CLERK: Is that joint and several?

THE COURT: Yes. Joint and several liability with Jorge Mendoza and Joseph Laguna.

And by the way that's also going -- that restitution order as well as the same administrative assessment fees need to also be ordered for Mr. Mendoza as

well.

 As to Count 1, conspiracy to commit robbery, there will be a minimum term of 28 months, a maximum term of 72 months in the Nevada Department of Corrections.

Count 2, burglary while in possession of a deadly weapon, a minimum term of 48 months, a maximum term of 180 months.

Count 3, home invasion while in possession, a minimum term -- oh -Count 2 runs concurrently with Count 1. Count 3, home invasion is 66 months
minimum, maximum 180 months in Nevada Department of Corrections concurrent
with Count 2.

Count 4, attempt robbery with use of a deadly weapon, a minimum term of 48 months, a maximum term of 120 months with a consecutive enhancement for use of the deadly weapon, a minimum of 36 months and a maximum of 120 months.

As to --

THE CLERK: Is that concurrent or consecutive?

THE COURT: Concurrent with Count 3.

Count 5, attempt robbery with a deadly weapon, a minimum term of 48 months, a maximum term of 120 months with a consecutive enhancement penalty of 36 months minimum, maximum 120 months. That runs concurrent to Count 4.

Count 6, second degree murder with use of a deadly weapon is life with possibility of parole after 10 years has been served and there is an enhancement for use of the deadly weapon of 36 -- minimum 36, maximum of 240.

And then as to Count 7, attempt murder with use of a deadly weapon, a minimum -- oh -- Count 6 is concurrent to Count 4. Count 7, attempt murder with use of a deadly weapon, a minimum term of 84 months, a maximum term of 240

months with a consecutive minimum term for use of the deadly weapon of 84 months and a maximum of 240 months. Actually no. I'm changing that. A minimum is 36 months and a maximum of 240 months for the -- that runs consecutively with the life or, excuse me, with -- that runs consecutively to Count 6 -- that to Count, yes, 6.

So the enhancement then is -- let's see -- or aggregate is maximum of life and a minimum of --

MR. DiGIACOMO: I believe it comes out to 23 as well.

THE COURT: -- 23.

And let's see. I will also want to indicate that the Court in deciding the - the enhancement penalties took into consideration the underlying facts of the case,
the prior history of the Defendant in this case as well as the arguments of counsel,
everything indicated in the presentence investigation report as well. And that is the
same for Mr. Mendoza. The Court took that into account as well. All right.

THE CLERK: So the credit for time served?

THE COURT: Credit for time served I think is --

MS. LEXIS: Seven hundred nineteen.

MR. GILLIAM: My understanding as well, Judge.

THE COURT: Seven hundred nineteen?

MR. GILLIAM: Yes, ma'am.

THE COURT: Seven hundred nineteen days credit for time served.

[Colloquy between the Court and the Clerk]

THE CLERK: Okay. What was the credit? I'm sorry.

MR. GILLIAM: Seven, nineteen.

THE COURT: Seven hundred ten.

MR. GILLIAM: One, nine. Seven, one, nine.

THE COURT: One, nine. Seven, nineteen.

All right. Joseph Laguna. Oh and before we get off of Mr. Murphy, I make sure I adjudged him guilty of all those offenses. He's adjudged guilty.

And as for Mr. Laguna, you're as well adjudged guilty by reason of the verdict of the jury to Count 1, conspiracy to commit robbery, Count 2, burglary while in possession of a deadly weapon, Count 3, home invasion while in possession of a deadly weapon, Counts 4 and 5, attempt robbery with use of a deadly weapon and Count 6, second degree murder with use of a deadly weapon, and Count 7, attempt murder with use of a deadly weapon. State?

MR. DiGIACOMO: Thank you, Judge. As it relates to well practically I guess Mr. Murphy, but more likely as it relates to -- to Mr. Laguna, he was dangerously close to being a mandatory habitual criminal. And if nobody had died, he could get a sentence of that you gave the other Co-defendants in this case based upon that criminal history. He has acts of violence. He's on either probation or parole at the time of the offense for an act of violence against the Federal officer. And he is a continuing danger to our society.

I would once again urge the Court, at the very least, to give him the 23 to life, but I believe that he -- that he has earned the 27 to life if you would have run the attempt murder counts consecutive in full as recommended by P and P and I would submit it.

THE COURT: Counsel.

MS. McNEILL: And, Your Honor, just for the record, I don't believe Mr. Laguna --

THE COURT: Mr. Laguna, do you want to say anything?

 DEFENDANT, LAGUNA: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right.

MS. McNEILL: Thank you, Your Honor. I advised Mr. Laguna that because of the pending appeal, it is best for him just to remain silent. I think he's going to do that. I'm not going to talk about the facts. Your Honor sat here for four weeks. It's a jury verdict. There's nothing I could do about that.

I would like Your Honor to consider the fact that I think clearly the jury felt that Mr. Laguna was not as culpable as Mr. Mendoza by their verdict. I think that's the only explanation for their verdict is that I think that they didn't feel that he should be standing in the same position as Mr. Mendoza.

I understand Mr. Laguna's record. He understands his record. It does not look favorable for Your Honor on a case where he's charged with crimes of violence. But I would like Your Honor to consider is -- is the following things about Mr. Laguna.

Mr. Laguna, he lost a parent to the prison system because that parent committed a murder; that was his father. He grew up with a lot of CPS involvement in his life. He was in special education classes. He hasn't had the easiest road ahead of him. It's certainly no excuse, but I think it does explain a lot of how Your Honor sees a lot of people come into the criminal justice system.

And what I would like you to know about Joey is that before he was arrested in this case, he had met his wife who is here in the courtroom in support of him. And he was doing everything that he could to stop the life that he was living so that he could be the husband that she needed to be. Unfortunately, when you grow up a product of the system, and you enter into the prison system, you tend to be surrounded by people who are not productive outstanding members of the

community themselves. And I think we found certainly by the facts that were presented to the Court the result of having those types of relationships in your life.

His wife indicates that he is a loving, hard-working man who has been trying his best to extricate himself from the life in which he's found himself. And I can say the same as his lawyer. He is a very passionate person, but he is also very kind, very generous.

And I would ask Your Honor to consider not giving him the sentence that P and P recommends. I understand that Your Honor had sentenced Mr. Murphy. I assume that sentences between Mr. Laguna and Mr. Murphy it was probably your intent that they be similar.

Mr. Laguna is -- is almost 40 years old and while that's certainly not old, he's not going to make any type of first parole based on his record, based on the ties that the allegations of gang affiliations. And he knew that going into this which is one of the reasons why he was very frank with me about not taking a deal from the State was that he knew he would not make his first parole and he knew that he would be ending up serving a fairly lengthy sentence that would have him in the Nevada Department of Corrections until he was in his 60's. Which again is not old, but when you consider the fact that you're in a system where you're not getting preventative care. You're not getting healthcare. He is going blind. He has had corneal transplants that are failing him. That is a very rough living in the Nevada Department of Corrections that he faces.

I think the term of years on the second degree murder ends up punishing him just as much as a life tail would do based on the life that he has ahead of him in the prison system. And I would submit it on that, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

So in addition to the \$25 administrative assessment fee, I'm waiving the DNA analysis fee as that was previously taken in 2009, there's a \$3 DNA collection fee.

And on Count 1, there is a minimum term — that's conspiracy to commit robbery — minimum of 28 years — 28 years — 28 months, excuse me, a maximum of 72 months in the Nevada Department of Corrections. There's also an order and judgment of restitution in the amount of \$5,500 and that's payable to in favor of the State of Nevada Victim — Nevada Victims of Crimes fund.

Count 2 -- and that's joint and several liability with the Co-offenders, Mr. Mendoza and Mr. Murphy -- Count 2, a minimum term of 48 months, a maximum term of 150 months in the Nevada Department of Corrections, but runs concurrent to Count 1.

Count 3, home invasion is a minimum term of 66 months, maximum term of 180 months that runs concurrently with Count 2.

Count 4 is a minimum term of 48 months, a maximum term of 120 months with a consecutive minimum enhancement of 48 months on the minimum, and 120 months as the maximum. That runs concurrent with Count 3.

Count 5, attempt robbery with use of a deadly weapon is a minimum term of 48 months, a maximum of 120 months and a consecutive for use of the deadly weapon enhancement of a minimum of 48 months, maximum of 120 months. That runs concurrent with Count 4.

Count 6, second degree murder, the sentence is life with the possibility of parole after 10 years has been served, and a consecutive minimum term as in the enhancement for use of a deadly weapon of a minimum of 36 months, the maximum of 240 months. That runs consecutive -- that is the consecutive enhancement.

Count 6 -- yeah, consecutive to -- I'm sorry -- that's concurrent with Count 5.

Count 6 [sic], attempt murder is a minimum term of 84 months, the maximum term of 240 months with a consecutive minimum enhancement term of 84 months, the maximum of 240 months for the deadly weapon enhancement. And that runs consecutive to Count 6. Okay.

And so the aggregate is -- who's been keeping track?

MR. DiGIACOMO: That's 27 I believe.

THE COURT: Twenty-seven and the --

MR. DiGIACOMO: Life.

THE COURT: -- to life.

THE CLERK: Credit time served?

MS. McNEILL: Six hundred sixty -- I'm sorry -- six hundred fifty five days.

THE COURT: Six hundred fifty five days credit for time served.

And as well as in considering the enhancements, the State -- the Court did in fact consider his extensive criminal record which is largely violent crimes and as well the facts of this case. But I also -- I did take into account in the entire sentence, of course, his -- the -- his background that counsel referred to in this case. Thank you.

And lastly we have Summer Larsen. And, Ms. Larsen, by virtue of your plea of guilty to Count 1, conspiracy to commit robbery, a felony, and Count 2, attempt robbery, a felony, I hereby adjudge you guilty of those offenses. And State's retained the right to argue.

MR. DiGIACOMO: That's correct, Judge. I can say that this is probably one of the more unique situations that I've been involved in my career in the sense that I've charged a lot of people with murder and I've heard a lot of stories in my time

about why it is they are not guilty.

This story that was told was I'm not guilty of the crime you are charged me with because I'm guilty of something else. Now that happens and that happens after they've had a chance to review discovery and I hear that story. But this maybe the first time that when I go down into the minute details of this case, I can't find anything that disputes the version of events.

Ashley Hall's connection to Mr. Murphy is indicative of why it is the story came out the way the story came out. Ms. Larsen's version of events as it applies to the phone numbers we had associated with her in connections with Mr. Murphy and from connections we had with Ashley hall or the other woman who reports, none of them dispute her version of events.

And I'm a Prosecutor and I have to rely upon reasonable doubt and I certainly said that to the jury. We give a Defendant the benefit of the doubt. And thus from perspective, I'm here arguing a conspiracy to commit robbery that as far as it's not attenuated is an attempt robbery that occurs at that first location. And that from as a matter of law, she is probably not liable for the crimes that occurred later that day if they're sufficiently attenuated.

And that was the reason for the negotiation and essentially she pled straight up. And this is her first criminal offense, so I am going to submit to your discretion what you believe the appropriate sentence should be. You know as much as I know from sitting through this trial and you can make a decision that's appropriate in this case.

THE COURT: All right. And, Ms. Larsen, would you like to address the Court?

DEFENDANT, LARSEN: I wrote you a letter, but I do want to say something.

My intentions in this was not for this to happen. My intentions were to rob the first house. I had a conversation with my Co-defendant and we had an argument. He went without my acknowledgment out of our agreement. Do you know what I mean? I didn't even know that he had done it. And then they went to my husband's house. If I was guilty, I'd be right along with them.

Ms. Ellsworth, I had nothing to do with that second house. And I'm asking you for a chance -- like I don't have a horrible background, but I am asking you for a chance like of drug rehabilitation, anything. I'm asking the mercy of you to please help me. Do you know what I mean? I had a drug problem and I relapsed. And it spiraled out of control and this happened.

I was put here for a reason. You know what I mean? To stop what I was doing because I was a Good Samaritan. I just really want a chance. I have two years in. If could give me a chance probation or consecutive — can I address the family?

THE COURT: Yes. And -- and this letter --

DEFENDANT, LARSEN: Yes, ma'am.

THE COURT: -- I did not get this until just before I took the bench.

DEFENDANT, LARSEN: I know because --

THE COURT: So I haven't been able to -- if you want to read it to me, you can.

DEFENDANT, LARSEN: Okay. I wrote it 'cause last time I rambled.

Your Honor, I'm writing this letter to you and this Court today to formally take responsibility for my actions. I'm humbly pleading for the mercy of the Court as well as requesting a chance to prove myself by granting the opportunity to be on probation. I will like to eliminate any fear that the Court may have of me potentially

being a repeat offender.

To accomplish this, I'm going to explain how my offenses are regrettable once in a lifetime mistake. Never again to be repeated and how I've everything to gain by being open and cooperative with in all assistance and quidance to this Court offers towards my rehabilitation and reentrance in society.

I was an addict who's life spiraled out of control after a shock and traumatic separation from my husband, a battle with methamphetamine addiction in the past. And when me and my husband got together I started recovery. I was able to maintain a sobriety for seven years. I was working as a store manager. I was doing good. My husband and I had a house. I thought my life was great. Then I came home one day and found my husband had packed up and left, and I was devastated. We hadn't even had an argument. I never even saw it coming.

A few weeks later I discovered that he had left me for another woman.

A woman who ended up pregnant and as a result my husband then wanted the house back. He offered me the apartment that he and his new girlfriend shared. I accepted it at first, but then I couldn't -- I couldn't keep -- it was unbearable for me -- unbearable for me to be there knowing that they lived there as a couple, so I moved in with a friend.

However, at this point in my depression was about to reach a peak.

Within a couple of weeks I lost my job with the combination of losing my husband, my house, my dog, my job. I began to fully embark on the path of self-destruction.

After seven years of hard earned sobriety, I relapsed. I was so distraught over the tragedy that had become my life. I stopped thinking clearly and I started to lash out.

I started casually spending time with my Co-defendant, Mr. Murphy.

This was my revenge on my husband for his affair. I also had another man I would

sleep with occasionally too. My time with these men was spent getting high and having sex, attempting to fill the void that of all that I had lost.

After a few months of this routine, I discussed an idea with Mr. Murphy of robbing a friend of my husband's. Mr. Murphy and I had an agreed plan before we even took place in this action. Later we had a fight. Later I discovered that Mr. Murphy, as a result of being mad at me, had decided to act out without me.

Instead he enlisted the help of three of his friends that I didn't even know. Except somehow his -- except somehow his plan changed from robbing my husband's friends to robbing my husband, which resulted in the death of a mutual friend, and my husband -- was robbed -- my husband -- and resulted in a mutual friend. I was horrified and shocked. None of that was supposed to happen. This was not the plan of Mr. Murphy and I had discussed. He didn't even tell me that this had happened. I had to hear about it from somebody else.

Now, it's been two years later and the story that I thought was going to be happily ever after has warped into a grizzly nightmare coming to a close. The experience has been depressing, terrifying and enlightening. I can't even begin to express how glad I will be when this is all behind me. I never want to look back. I never want to repeat the same mistakes. I want to start to build -- I want to start to build a new life.

So now the ending is in your hands. I begin -- I beg for the Court's mercy. I seek the Court's guidance and assistance and ask for an opportunity to have probation. I'm more than willing to cooperate with any additional restrictions in counts that the Court deems necessary. Thank you for listening.

THE COURT: Mr. Coyer.

MR. COYER: Good morning, Your Honor. Thank you. I apologize that the

letters did come to me this morning. I provided them to the Court.

THE COURT: I read the letter from grandmother, step grandfather and I assume the mother. It's not signed, but it says she's pleading for leniency on her daughter's behalf. So I assume it's mom.

MR. COYER: It is morn and she's here today, Your Honor.

DEFENDANT: Yeah. I'm sorry.

MR. COYER: So thank you for reviewing those. Sorry they came in late, Your Honor.

We talked a little bit about some of the things that Ms. Larsen's done since she's been incarcerated at the motion hearing a couple of weeks ago. I'll just touch on them briefly.

She did provide me today her high school equivalency certificate that she did get that while she's been in jail. Not an easy feat, but certainly she has applied herself and done that. And that's here if the Court would like to see it.

She has, of course, maintained her sobriety while she's in jail, but she also still continues to work the program of -- the anonymous program. She goes to those classes and does daily deal with this and consider what it's going to be like when she's out 'cause it's probably going to be tougher when she's out. And she knows that. And she's prepared for that, Your Honor.

She's managed to become a worker in jail which is someone as Your Honor well knows that the jail trusts with a large degree of privileges, much greater freedoms. And she has responsibilities including, you know, food service, cleaning, linens. And it is a significant achievement to accomplish in the jail.

It's difficult for me, Your Honor, to think really what more we could expect from someone during their incarceration. I do think that in the two year she's

been in, she has really shown that she wants to apply herself and do positive good things. And it's difficult to demonstrate that from inside, but I think to the extent that one can, I think she's done that.

The facts of this case Your Honor knows very well. I won't belabor them, but I do think it's important to reemphasize as the Court already knows that Ms. Larsen's involvement in this is so tangential that she was in a conspiracy with related -- with regard to that first house. There's no doubt about that.

Her engagement in that conspiracy was not just to get Mr. Murphy off of her back. It truly was to redirect his attention away from 1661 Broadmere in the hopes that there wouldn't be any more problems at that address. And it's in this unfortunate twist that that's where Mr. Murphy and his crew end up going back after not being able to achieve their goal at the first house. But that was in many ways exactly one of the results that Ms. Larsen had hoped to achieve is to avoid any violence coming to that address. And it's so that that's exactly what happened after they changed the plan.

And I agree a hundred percent with Mr. DiGiacomo, it is a very strange set of facts, a very strange and unique set of circumstances. But in a very real way Ms. Larsen really did plea straight up to the full extent of her involvement in this case. And we could have gone to trial and tried to explain that to the jury and make these very particular precise legal arguments while facing extremely serious charges. The risks of that were not desirable for obvious reasons.

But she certainly didn't have to go to the next step which is to actually stand up and have the courage to take part in and assist in the administration of justice with respect to Mr. Murphy and his Co-defendants, Your Honor. And I do think that some consideration should be given to her for that. I think justice has

been served with respect to Summer for the time she's been in. And I think the Court should consider that she has also assisted in the administration of justice with the other Defendants, Judge.

I do know that you heard a lot of bad things about Ms. Larsen throughout the course of these proceedings and certainly at trial. I would submit to you that the defense lawyers in this case had a difficult position when she finally decided to testify. When a skilled trial lawyer makes it their mission to paint someone in a negative light to try to damage their credibility, to try to help their client, you're going to hear bad things. Those are to be expected.

And even though Ms. Larsen was the target of these attacks during trial, it really wasn't all that bad. You heard bad things about her relationships and about her people she keeps company with, but you didn't hear that she was a multi - multiple time violent felon or any of these horrible things you've heard about some of the other people. She really doesn't have much criminal history at all and the PSI bears that out.

For what she has done, she has been incarcerated for two years, Your Honor. I think she's demonstrated to this Court that she has the potential to be a good a probationer and to be a productive citizen. And we are asking this Court to suspend her sentence, whatever that may be, Your Honor, and grant her probation today.

THE COURT: All right. So I agree with you that there is a lot of bad things that came about out with Mr. -- Ms. Larsen at trial. Most of those things came from her own mouth. I mean, she didn't try and paint a better picture of herself. It seemed to me after I've heard all of the facts that her testimony was truthful. You know, Mr. Figueroa also testified at the trial and his testimony seemed to be

 consistent with what she was saying as far as what he knew about what had occurred 'cause he was sort of recruited into the whole thing.

Her step grandfather in the letter to me said she's got nowhere to go, but up. And that's probably true. You know you've certainly bottomed out here.

I guess the thing -- the recommendation of the Division, of course, is a total in aggregate sentence that would be a 28 month sentence on the bottom.

She's already done actually ten days more than two years in prison. And so frankly I think it would be better to place her on probation to further supervise her and give her the chance to have continued follow up for what was a raging methamphetamine addiction that pretty much led to, you know, all of this bad behavior and associations.

Obviously, you have to reach back further to determine what caused her to use these things and to say -- to blame it on any single one thing is probably naïve. You will need to do a lot of work on your part to -- to make sure you don't go back to that.

DEFENDANT, LARSEN: Yes, ma'am.

THE COURT: Because otherwise what you're going to find yourself is, you know --

DEFENDANT, LARSEN: Yeah.

THE COURT: -- if you go back to using meth is, you know, a middle aged woman who looks like a senior citizen with no teeth, no prospects and a very bad life. And so it's going to be up to you. As I say, you've already done what's 730 days I think it is -- 740 days, excuse me in prison.

So in addition to the \$25 administrative assessment fee, the \$150 DNA testing fee, and the \$3 DNA collection fee, as to Count 1, conspiracy to commit

.

robbery, I hereby sentence you to a minimum term of 12 months, a maximum term of 48 months. I'm not going to order the restitution in -- in this case because I don't think that was related to the crimes that she --

MR. DiGIACOMO: It's not.

THE COURT: And so I don't think it's appropriate.

As to Count 2, attempt robbery, a minimum term of 16 months, a maximum term of 72 months. That will run consecutive to Count 1. So the aggregate is one -- 28 to 120. I'm going to suspect those sentences and place you on probation for an indeterminate period not to exceed five years.

Special conditions of probation will be in addition to the standard conditions of probation which I'm going to hand you today. I want you to read those before -- right now -- before you leave the courtroom. And you'll notice on number 3, intoxicants, that I've lined through the words in parenthesis to excess, as well as the last sentence, that's because while you're on probation you're not to consume alcoholic beverages whatsoever. You have a sobriety issue and any substance is going to impact that and if you want to stay sober and off meth, you need to not drink too because those things are all tied in with each other.

Special conditions of probation are that you're not to have any use, possession or control of alcohol or marijuana while you're on probation. You are within the first 30 days after your meeting, your initial intake with Parole and Probation, you are to undergo a substance abuse evaluation and follow through with any recommendation for treatment or counseling on the recommended schedule.

You are to provide the Division of Parole and with a complete financial disclosure at any time they request it and that's for the purpose of determining legitimate source of income.

You are to -- to complete 16 hours of community service each month unless you are employed at least 40 hours per week of each and every week of the month that you are on probation.

And if you have a cellphone, you, of course, may have a cellphone when you get out. You can get a cellphone, but you're not to let anyone else use your cellphone, and you are to submit to a search of your cellphone at any time the Division of Parole and Probation asks for it. And if its password protected, you are to give the Officer requesting to search your phone with that password. And you're not to let anyone else use your personal cellphone. Anything that's on your cellphone is yours and so don't be telling me that somebody else used your phone because that would be a violation of your probation.

Okay. And credit for time served is 740 days through today's date.

MR. COYER: Thank you very much, Your Honor.

MR. DiGIACOMO: Thank you, Judge.

MR. GILLIAM: Thank you.

MR. WOLFBRANDT: Judge, one last thing for Mr. Mendoza.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. WOLFBRANDT: I just want to ask you to be allowed to withdraw at this point since the sentencing is over. I've got Amanda Gregory here willing to pursue the appeal. She would be willing to confirm today --

MS. GREGORY: Mr. Christensen's office did contact me to be appointed to do the appeal on this case.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. I'll appoint you and allow Mr. Wolfbrandt to withdraw.

MS. GREGORY: Okay. Thank you, Your Honor.

MR. WOLFBRANDT: Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you.

[Proceeding concluded at 11:32 a.m.]

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

Christine Erickson,

Court Recorder/Transcriber