IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

Electronically Filed Feb 28 2022 02:59 p.m. Elizabeth A. Brown Clerk of Supreme Court

IAN CHRISTOPHER HELD,)
Appellant,) Case No. 83549
vs.	<u> </u>
THE STATE OF NEVADA,)
Respondent.)
)

Appeal from Jury Verdict and Conviction Second Judicial District Court of the State of Nevada The Honorable David Hardy

<u>APPELLANT'S JOINT APPENDIX – VOLUME V</u>

MARC PICKER Washoe County Alternate Public Defender	CHRISTOPHER HICKS Washoe County District Attorney
MELISSA ROSENTHAL	JENNIFER NOBLE
Deputy Alternate Public Defender	Deputy District Attorney
350 S. Center St., 6 th Floor	1 South Sierra St., 4 th Floor
RENO, NEVADA 89501	RENO, NEVADA 89501
ATTORNEYS FOR APPELLANT	ATTORNEYS FOR RESPONDENT

$\frac{\textbf{TABLE OF CONTENTS}}{\textbf{VOLUME I}}$

1.	Information (Filed on 3/18/2021)	
2.	Judgment (Filed on 9/3/2021)	
3.	Notice of Appeal (Filed on 9/3/2021)	
4.	Motion to Bifurcate Count three of the Information	
	(Filed on 6/17/2021)9	
5.	Motion to Suppress (Filed on 6/16/2021)	
6.	Opposition to Defendant's Motion to Suppress	
	(Filed on 6/22/2021)	
7.	Defendant's Motion to Suppress Fruits of Search Warrant Pursuant	
	To Franks v. Delaware (Filed on 5/12/2021)29	
	<u>VOLUME II</u>	
8.	Opposition to Defendant's Motion to Suppress Fruits of Search	
	Warrant Pursuant to Franks v. Delaware (Filed 5/24/21) 40	
9.	Exhibit 1 Telephone Search Warrant (Filed 5/24/2021)54	
10.	Exhibit 2 Application for Search Warrant (Filed 5/24/2021) 59	
,	VOLUME III	
11.	Exhibit 3 Transcript of Preliminary Hearing, Pages 1-68	
	Dated 3/3/2021)70	

VOLUME IV

12.	Continued Exhibit 3 Transcript of Preliminary Hearing, Pages 69-14	
	Dated 3/3/2021)	
	<u>VOLUME V</u>	
13.	Transcript of Proceedings, Motion to Suppress	
	(Dated 6/9/2021)215	
	VOLUME VI	
14.	Transcript of Proceedings, Motion to Suppress, Pages 1-83	
	(Dated 6/29/2021)237	
VOLUME VII		
15.	Continued Transcript of Proceedings, Motion to Suppress,	
	Pages 84-165 (Dated 6/29/2021)320	
	VOLUME VIII	
16.	Transcript of Proceedings, Jury Trial Day 2, Pages 1-99	
	(Dated 6/30/2021)402	
	VOLUME IX	
17.	Continued Transcript of Proceedings, Jury Trial Day 2,	
	Pages 100-199 (Dated 6/30/2021)	
///		
///		
/// · ·		

VOLUME X

18.	. Continued Transcript of Proceedings, Jury Trial Day 2,	
	Pages 200-261 (Dated 6/30/2021)	601
	<u>VOLUME XI</u>	
19.	Transcript of Proceedings, Jury Trial Day 3,	
	Pages 1-129 (Dated 7/1/2021)	663
	VOLUME XII	
20.	Continued Transcript of Proceedings, Jury Trial Day 3,	
	Pages 130-261 (Dated 7/1/2021)	792
	VOLUME XIII	
21.	Notice of Bindover (Filed 3/08/2021)	924
22.	Appearances Hearing (filed 3/22/2021)	925
23.	Verdict, Count I (Filed 7/06/2021)	926
24.	Verdict, Count II (Filed 7/06/2021)	927
25.	Verdict, Count III (Filed 7/06/2021)	928
26.	Order (Filed 4/09/2021)	929
27.	Third Amended Criminal Complaint (Filed 2/24/2021)	930

	•
1 2 3 4	FILED Electronically CR20-3104 CODE: 4185 LORI URMSTON, CCR #51 Litigation Services 151 Country Estates Circle Reno, Nevada 89511 (775) 323-3411 Court Reporter
5	
6	SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA
7	IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF WASHOE
8	HONORABLE DAVID A. HARDY, DISTRICT JUDGE
9	
10	STATE OF NEVADA,
11	Plaintiff, Case No. CR20-3104
12	vs.
13	Dept. No. 15 IAN CHRISTOPHER HELD,
14	Defendant.
15	 /
16	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
17	MOTION TO SUPPRESS
18	Wednesday, June 9, 2021
19	Reno, Nevada
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	Reported by: LORI URMSTON, CCR #51

	11	
1		APPEARANCES:
2	FOR THE PLAINTIFF:	ROBERT W. DELONG Deputy District Attorney
3		1 South Sierra Street South Tower, 4th Floor
4		Reno, Nevada 89520
5 6	FOR THE DEFENDANT:	MELISSA ROSENTHAL Alternate Deputy Public Defenders
7		350 S. Center Street Reno, Nevada 89520
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
Į.		

RENO, NEVADA; WEDNESDAY, JUNE 9, 2021; 9:00 A.M.

--000--

THE COURT: This is CR20-3104, the State versus Ian Christopher Held. I'm Judge David Hardy, Department

15. I conduct this hearing through our Zoom technology in light of our COVID pandemic. There is an objection to this proceeding occurring through Zoom. I have read that objection. I do not have authority to supplant the chief judge's administrative order. I therefore deny the objection.

MS. ROSENTHAL: Your Honor, may I be heard on that issue?

THE COURT: My best guess -- hold on,

Ms. Rosenthal. My best guess is that the courthouse
will open sometime in July. This matter is set for
trial to begin by my best guess the week of June 28th
or 29th, whatever that week is. Because the courthouse
has not yet been opened there is not yet a new
administrative order. The trial will occur in the
plexiglass courtroom with various protocols for jury
selection and spacing.

If you have anything to add beyond the motion, you may make your record, Ms. Rosenthal.

MS. ROSENTHAL: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: For some reason I can't hear. Hold on, 1 2 please. I just was adjusting my volume when you spoke the first time. Would you say something, please. 3 4 MS. ROSENTHAL: Yes. 5 THE COURT: Thank you. 6 MS. ROSENTHAL: You're welcome. Thank you, Your 7 Honor. 8 Melissa Rosenthal appearing on behalf of Mr. Held 9 who is present at the Washoe County Jail. 10 THE COURT: Hold on, Ms. Rosenthal. There may be 11 something with you, because you're going in and out and 12 the last few words you said there was no volume at all. 13 Is there anything covering your microphone? 14 MS. ROSENTHAL: No. One second. Let me try 15 something. 16 I'm going to be using Mr. Silverberg's -- is it 17 echoing now? 18 THE COURT: It sounds much better. 19 MS. ROSENTHAL: Okay. I turned Mr. Silverberg's 20 microphone on and muted myself on my computer. He will 21 be in a minute, but this should get us through. 22 THE COURT: We are now getting an echo.

MS. ROSENTHAL: Okay. Is this better?

THE COURT: Yes.

23

24

MS. ROSENTHAL: Okay. I'm going to use his computer then. Sorry for the confusion, but I think with the court reporter we'll be okay.

My computer is not working, so I'm using yours.

MR. SILVERBERG: Go ahead.

MS. ROSENTHAL: Thank you, Your Honor. I apologize for that. Melissa Rosenthal on behalf of Mr. Held.

In regards to the objection for this hearing to be conducted via Zoom, that was filed pursuant to the suggestion in the chief judge's order regarding the motion to confirm and how to object to a hearing via Zoom. And that's why that objection was filed in that matter -- or manner. I apologize.

The reasons for the objection more substantively are that the -- the crux of the motion or the request for a suppression hearing regarding Franks v. Delaware relates to witness credibility and the importance of that and witnesses perhaps not being totally truthful under oath when sworn previously in front of a judge.

In addition, Your Honor, there is evidence, including audio and video files and photos, that would be difficult to be presented to witnesses via the Zoom platform. The rule of exclusion I believe would be hard to control, whether or not other people are

watching or in the room when somebody else is testifying in the hearing. We're not sure what's in front or around somebody when they are appearing via Zoom, so it's hard to tell if they are looking at something, looking at someone else or that is influencing their testimony in any way.

I would -- if the Court is inclined I would ask that we not have the hearing via Zoom today and that we allow for the courthouse to reopen and not confirm the trial for this afternoon and allow the Court to reset it, because I do feel like it is that important that this hearing be held in person.

I have discussed that with Mr. Held and he is okay with that outcome. I know it's not this Court's decision on when the hearing can be -- or the trial can be reset. Mr. Held does understand that, but I do think that this hearing being conducted in person is necessary because this is a substantive motion and it is pretty dispositive of how the case would move forward.

THE COURT: Mr. DeLong.

2.1

MR. DELONG: I have a couple thoughts, Your Honor. It's my understanding that the defendant has invoked. That's why we are on the schedule that we have right

now. In addition, I do think reliability can be determined over Zoom, especially by the Court since we're not dealing with a jury. The Court has been utilizing this technology for the last year. The audio video files playing, I've done it in hearings before. I know it's been done before the Court before. I know it can be done. It's a little clunky at times, but I don't think it would impair the proceedings in a material way.

And then with respect to the rule of exclusion, I don't think there's any reason to believe that any of the officers would violate that in any way and the Court's directives and admonishments can handle that. However, with those comments being added, Your Honor, the State recognizes that this really isn't our fight with regard to whether or not this is done now. We are ready to proceed and I have my witnesses here, Your Honor.

THE COURT: How many witnesses do you anticipate appearing, counsel?

MR. DELONG: Your Honor, I have three that I anticipate calling with one potential fourth if necessary. And it's my understanding that one more witness may be appearing today for the defense,

1 Annebelle Bush.

THE COURT: Let me be very clear. Three officer witnesses and Ms. Bush?

MR. DELONG: The State has three, potentially four officer witnesses, plus one lay witness that the defense intends to call is my understanding.

THE COURT: Where is Ms. Bush now?

MS. ROSENTHAL: Your Honor, Ms. Bush is currently in treatment at Vitality Center, but she has been subpoensed to appear for the hearing.

THE COURT: How would she appear in person?

MS. ROSENTHAL: She would be picked up by our investigator and transported or brought by Vitality.

If a hearing is set, she's not -- I don't believe -- I believe if this is reset she would be done with that program. She is currently in the Second Judicial District Court drug court program, so where she would be at would be known.

MR. DELONG: Your Honor, may I be heard?

THE COURT: Hold on. Let me just think for a moment.

MR. DELONG: Sure.

THE COURT: I asked where she was only because I just wanted to confirm she wasn't out of the county.

1 2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

1.0

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

There is Vitality elsewhere. And so I want to think for a moment.

Ms. Rosenthal, if I -- I don't have a courtroom that accommodates a hybrid.

MR. DELONG: I did have one important piece of information that I wanted to provide to the Court.

THE COURT: Go ahead.

MR. DELONG: We did file a stipulation to continue the motion deadlines which I think obviously has been denied by the fact that no order was ruled on it, but I would note for the Court that I received information from my office the transcript of one of the interviews that is key to this hearing should be ready by Friday. We are ready to proceed regardless, but I know that's something that's been in discussions with defense counsel and I thought the Court should know that as well.

THE COURT: How long do you anticipate trial to take, Mr. DeLong?

MR. DELONG: I would anticipate a minimum of four days, Your Honor, potentially five.

THE COURT: And is that for your case in chief or are you adding an estimate of any defense case, jury instructions and so forth? From beginning to end you believe five days or fewer?

MR. DELONG: Yes, Your Honor.

MS. ROSENTHAL: Your Honor, on that note, this would have to be a bifurcated trial given one of the charges.

MR. DELONG: Yes. I apologize. A severed trial actually.

THE COURT: I understand.

I'm not ignoring you. I'm awaiting my calendar to load.

By administrative order the courthouse remains closed. Informally I believe I have the discretion to order an in-person proceeding as the circumstance requires. The fact is COVID today is different than COVID of months ago and a year ago and one broad brush for fluctuating pandemic circumstances is inappropriate.

So I'm juggling with one side of my brain, my desire to be compliant with COVID protocols that are established by our current chief judge and court administration. On the other hand, I am personally responsible for the proceedings within Department 15 to ensure that they are not just constitutional but efficacious. I don't know that this proceeding will be

efficacious. I have read the motion. I have read Franks, Chism and Liston which are in my hand. I have read the transcript of the application for warrant. I have read the entire proceedings of the preliminary hearing.

I come to the bench with some reservations about whether misstatements are of a general benign nature or whether they are so intentional and/or reckless that they caused a decision that would not have otherwise been made. I have some reservations about whether this motion is going to succeed. I haven't made a decision because I haven't heard from counsel and I haven't heard witnesses, but as a judge I prepare in advance. And so I'm thinking I can probably do this by Zoom.

I know what the arguments are and I know what the facts proffered are. And if the witness testimony is consistent with the facts proffered, I'll make my decision. That's the one side of me.

The other side is that Mr. Held should be entitled to a vigorous defense so that he's given every opportunity to persuade the Court. The problem I have with moving this suppression hearing is that as of this moment I am unwilling to move trial which means that if I order an in-person suppression hearing, it's going to

occur on June 2nd, immediately before trial, like the day before trial or three days before trial. I'm not exactly sure when we're going to seat the jury.

And often the Court's ruling on dispositive motions tends to change the pretrial dynamics. So I wanted to have a decision of some type in advance of trial. So those are all of my thoughts. And I invite counsel to respond. I am willing to move the motion to suppress in person to June 28th, but I'm unwilling to move the trial date.

MS. ROSENTHAL: I would ask for the June 28th, Your Honor.

MR. DELONG: Your Honor, I apologize. I probably should have been prepared with this. Are we still fifth in the trial flight is what my wondering is right now, but if we are, then we're not likely to start immediately. That would give us some time is what I'm thinking.

THE COURT: I would invite you not to speculate as to where you are in the trial flight or when it may begin only because -- I'm not trying to be guarded. I am aware of conversation internally that may rearrange the start date and we could very well start that week. So by locating the placement of fifth and then trying

to project that we're into July, I am fairly confident that we don't know and you should prepare for that first week.

MR. DELONG: With every intention, Your Honor, it sounds like my calendar is going to get messy real quick here.

THE COURT: Fortunately or unfortunately

Ms. Rosenthal and the Court share that same dilemma.

Mr. DeLong, I can move this to the 28th to in person.

MS. ROSENTHAL: Your Honor, I do have one more question. Sorry.

THE COURT: Let me hear from Mr. DeLong about the State's position.

MR. DELONG: I'm just thinking, Your Honor. I'm trying to think it through.

THE COURT: Mr. DeLong, as the State's attorney you are in some ways the guardian of the record. And I eliminate one important argument by giving to Mr. Held every opportunity to be successful.

MR. DELONG: I 100 percent understand, Your Honor.

I just needed a second to think this through. But I really don't think the State's position is prejudiced in any way if this motion is done before trial, so the

State would defer to the Court.

THE COURT: Really the only concern I would have is witness availability. They're subpoenaed I presume to be ready for trial that week anyway.

MR. DELONG: And, Your Honor, if they're in the queue, which I can't see them personally, but they may be, I can speak with at least the ROPE detectives, which are all of the State's witnesses for the purpose of this motion, to confirm their availability for the further date. We can do that right now.

THE COURT: Yes, Ms. Rosenthal, you said you had a question.

MS. ROSENTHAL: Your Honor, I was curious if a new administrative order comes in prior to that time that allows for these hearings would there be the potential to move it up?

THE COURT: No. There's a balance on the bench because, again, for those who -- for those judges who strive to be prepared, we develop inclinations along the way. I want to be very clear that I have not made a decision in this case. My comments I hope will aid the parties, the attorneys as they prepare for the hearing.

I'm trying to focus on would the outcome have been

U-Haul was in the street and not the driveway, if instead of generalizing the statement the defendants admitted their responsibility there was a specific description of the Whisper Rock, Somersett, I think it's Whisper Rock, the University and the Jeep -- you know, each of the three alleged crimes are supported by some form of knowledge as set forth in the opposition.

I'm trying to decide if all of that will change the outcome, because the defense has an obligation to make a substantial showing, not clear and convincing, which is a civil standard, but two of the three cases are civil standards regarding motions for summary judgment in federal civil actions. That's really my focus is would there have been a different outcome. And it's upon the defense to demonstrate that in some substantial way.

Okay. Ms. Clerk, what time can we begin Monday the 28th?

THE CLERK: Your Honor, whenever you want to. I believe we can begin at 9:00 if that works for you.

THE COURT: Yeah, the problem is there will be jurors in the building at 9 o'clock that morning and so we have to be very, very careful. I'm saying this so

1.8

that you can coordinate with the attorneys and the Washoe County Sheriff. There must be a very coordinated effort so that there is no interaction in the hallways and there is no -- between Mr. Held and any member of the court staff or the public and there must be no interaction with any prospective jurors. And so we're going to have to facilitate counsel, witnesses and Mr. Held's access to the courtroom through some supervised way.

THE CLERK: Yes, your Honor, I'll talk to the sheriff's office. And are we doing it in our courtroom?

THE COURT: Yes. And I'm saying that to emphasize, because when I told the chief judge that I wanted to do some proceedings in person, he cautioned me against having any contacts between any case I have and prospective jurors who are otherwise in the building.

Why don't we start at 9 o'clock. I presume that -I'm presuming we can make that happen some way.

MS. ROSENTHAL: And, Your Honor, I believe that we can definitely coordinate getting Mr. Held up to the second floor and I can walk with him from the elevators. That's kind of what we did when we had that trial in the CLC. We met them upstairs and walked

down, but in this case it would just be coming over. think that that -- he would avoid them on the first floor.

and I appreciate your suggestion and I know you'll assist in this effort to create integrity in our process. I presume you were walking with a defendant who was in civilian clothes and did not appear to be restrained in any way, whereas for this motion to suppress I presume at the moment that because we aren't picking a jury that day that Mr. Held will not be in civilian clothes and he will be under restraint.

MS. ROSENTHAL: I'm happy to put him in civilian clothes to just deter on that day if that helps with the process. As far as the restraints, that would be a sheriff's office question.

THE CLERK: Your Honor, I'll coordinate all this with the sheriff's office.

THE COURT: Let's start at 9 a.m.

Anything else, counsel?

MR. DELONG: Your Honor, we're set for a motion to confirm this afternoon. I was wondering if we could handle that this morning.

THE COURT: Don't those motions to confirm have to

happen in front of the chief judge?

THE CLERK: Yes, Your Honor.

MR. DELONG: I've gotten this to work before. I thought I would try again.

THE COURT: I'm trying so hard to keep my own counsel and not say anything on this record. At the moment you'll have to do your motion to confirm in front of the chief judge.

MR. DELONG: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Held, there's no reason for us to have any conversation with each other. I simply acknowledge your presence and wish you a good day.

MR. DELONG: Your Honor, I apologize. I did have one other -- I think we briefly mentioned it, but the State's position is that based on the case law because the gun issues in this case are not in any way related to the other facts, the gun charge is going to need to be completely severed and not just bifurcated for purposes of the jury. So we would need entirely new evidence to prove the gun charge to either a second jury or a severed trial is what the State thinks.

THE COURT: What is the defense position on bifurcation versus severance?

MS. ROSENTHAL: Your Honor, our preference would be

1 a separate jury.

THE COURT: And that's essentially what I -- I summarize what I think I heard. That was your request, Mr. DeLong?

MR. DELONG: Yes, Your Honor, I think it's required by the law.

THE COURT: So that means that that separate trial will occur at some subsequent date.

MR. DELONG: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I am very, very hopeful that in the near -- I don't know what's going to happen with trial flights and stacks. I don't know. I'm not hiding that information. But I'm hopeful that I can soon begin setting my own cases.

MS. ROSENTHAL: Your Honor, I would ask if the Court could bring in Ms. Bush, Officer Catalano, Fye and Tindell and hold them to their subpoenas for that new date instead of us reissuing them.

THE COURT: Okay. It's Ms. Bush, Officer Tindell.

MR. DELONG: Detective Fye, F-y-e.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. DELONG: And Officer Catalano.

THE COURT: All right. Ms. Clerk, I see that you're promoting people. I am awaiting -- well, it may

be that Tindell is with Fye and Catalano. Is that right? Oh, there's Catalano separately.

Tindell and Catalano and Bush, if you'll please activate your videos.

MS. ROSENTHAL: I believe Detective Fye -- there he is.

THE COURT: Good morning to all four of you. I see that Ms. Bush is present through Zoom, law enforcement officers Fye, Tindell and Catalano. Each of you have been subpoenaed to appear at a hearing on a motion to suppress. You will be called upon to provide witness testimony.

I have convened the evidentiary hearing now and am continuing it until Monday morning on June 28th at 9 a.m. You remain under subpoena to be present at that time. You will be in person at the courthouse.

Counsel, are you satisfied?

MS. ROSENTHAL: Yes, Your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: I'm just going to acknowledge personally to all four and additionally to Mr. Held, this is a crazy time. I'm a little embarrassed that we're not -- I'm not embarrassed personally, but I'm just sorry for the inconvenience. And we'll get through it and I'll see everybody, all four of you, on

```
June 28th. Good day to all of you.
  2
          Court will be in recess.
  3
                   (The proceedings were concluded.)
  4
                                 --000--
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
```

STATE OF NEVADA ss. 2 COUNTY OF WASHOE 3 I, LORI URMSTON, Certified Court Reporter, in and 4 5 for the State of Nevada, do hereby certify: 6 That the foregoing proceedings were taken by me 7 at the time and place therein set forth; that the 8 proceedings were recorded stenographically by me and 9 thereafter transcribed via computer under my 10 supervision; that the foregoing is a full, true and correct transcription of the proceedings to the best 11 of my knowledge, skill and ability. 12 13 I further certify that I am not a relative nor an employee of any attorney or any of the parties, nor am 14 15 I financially or otherwise interested in this action. 16 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of Nevada that the foregoing statements 17 18 are true and correct. 19 DATED: At Reno, Nevada, this 12th day of 20 November, 2021. 21 22 LORI URMSTON, CCR #51 23 24 LORI URMSTON, CCR #51 The document to which this certificate is attached is a full, true and correct copy of the original on file and of record in my office. By: ALICIA L. LERUD, Clerk of the Second Judicial District Court, in and for the County of

Washoe.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I am an employee of the Washoe County Alternate

Public Defender's Office and that on this date I served a copy of the Appellant's

Joint Appendix – Volume V to the following:

IAN CHRISTOPHER HELD, 96555 c/o NNCC PO BOX 7000 CARSON CITY, NV 89702 Via U.S. Mail

CHRIS HICKS
WASHOE COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY
Attn: Appellate Department
Via Electronic Mail

DATED this 28th day of February, 2022.

/s/Randi Jensen Randi Jensen