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APPEAL INDEX
SUPREME COURT NO: 83885
DISTRICT CASE NO: CR18-1654
LUIGY RICHARD LOPEZ-DELGADO vs STATE OF NEVADA
DATE: FEBRUARY 3, 2022

| PLEADING | DATE FILED | VOL. | PAGE NO. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ACKNOWLEDGMENT BY DEFENDANT OF NRS 179D. 460 AND NRS 176.0926 | 03-14-19 | 3 | 387-388 |
| AMENDED INFORMATION | 11-01-18 | 3 | 241-244 |
| AMENDED ORDER APPROVING ATTORNEY'S FEES (POST CONVICTION) | 12-15-21 | 5 | 866 |
| APPLICATION FOR ORDER TO PRODUCE PRISONER | 10-12-21 | 5 | 776-777 |
| APPLICATION FOR SETTING | 09-25-18 | 2 | 37 |
| APPLICATION FOR SETTING | 11-13-18 | 3 | 250 |
| APPLICATION FOR SETTING | 10-12-21 | 5 | 775 |
| CASE APPEAL STATEMENT | 03-29-19 | 3 | 409-412 |
| CASE APPEAL STATEMENT | 12-03-21 | 5 | 828-829 |
| CASE ASSIGNMENT NOTIFICATION | 05-27-20 | 4 | 524-525 |
| CERTIFICATE OF CLERK AND TRANSMITTAL | 07-30-19 | 4 | 477 |
| CERTIFICATE OF CLERK AND TRANSMITTAL - NOTICE OF APPEAL | 03-29-19 | 3 | 422 |
| CERTIFICATE OF CLERK AND TRANSMITTAL - NOTICE OF APPEAL | 12-03-21 | 5 | 827 |
| CONFIDENTIAL PSYCHOLOGICAL EVALUATION TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL | 03-04-19 | 6 | 92-97 |
| CORRECTED JUDGMENT OF CONVICTION | 03-18-19 | 3 | 395-396 |
| COURT NOTE - HEARING | 12-18-18 | 3 | 302-303 |
| COURT NOTE - HEARING | 03-12-19 | 3 | 377-378 |
| DOCUMENTS TO BE CONSIDERED AT SENTENCING | 03-13-19 | 3 | 381-384 |
| EX PARTE BILLING INVOICE FOR LEGAL FEES | 03-02-21 | 6 | 98-100 |
| EX PARTE BILLING INVOICE FOR LEGAL FEES | 04-02-21 | 6 | 104-107 |
| EX PARTE BILLING INVOICE FOR LEGAL FEES | 05-04-21 | 6 | 111-114 |
| EX PARTE BILLING INVOICE FOR LEGAL FEES | 07-30-21 | 6 | 118-121 |
| EX PARTE BILLING INVOICE FOR LEGAL FEES | 11-02-21 | 6 | 125-128 |
| EX PARTE BILLING INVOICE FOR LEGAL FEES | 12-08-21 | 6 | 129-132 |
| EX PARTE BILLING INVOICE FOR LEGAL FEES | 01-04-22 | 6 | 136-139 |

APPEAL INDEX
SUPREME COURT NO: 83885
DISTRICT CASE NO: CR18-1654
LUIGY RICHARD LOPEZ-DELGADO vs STATE OF NEVADA
DATE: FEBRUARY 3, 2022

| PLEADING | DATE FILED | VOL. | PAGE NO. |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| EX PARTE MOTION FOR APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL AND <br> REQUEST FOR EVIDENTIARY HEARING | $06-11-20$ | 4 | $540-543$ |
| GUILTY PLEA MEMORANDUM | $12-13-18$ | 3 | $267-274$ |
| INFORMATION | $09-26-18$ | 2 | $46-52$ |
| JUDGMENT OF CONVICTION | $03-15-19$ | 3 | $391-392$ |
| MINUTES - ARRAIGNMENT - 10-11-18 | $10-24-18$ | 3 | 238 |
| MINUTES - ARRAIGNMENT - 11-01-18 | $11-08-18$ | 3 | 247 |
| MINUTES - HEARING ON MOTION FOR NEW COUNSEL <br> (YOUNG HEARING) - 11-29-18 | $12-05-18$ | 6 | 22 |
| MINUTES - MOTION - BAIL REDUCTION - 12-20-18 | $02-11-19$ | 3 | 370 |
| MINUTES - MOTION TO DISMISS - 11-02-21 | $11-05-21$ | 5 | $815-816$ |
| MINUTES - MOTION TO SET TRIAL / ARRAIGNMENT ON SECOND <br> AMENDED INFORMATION | $12-17-18$ | 3 | 288 |
| MOTION FOR A STATUS CHECK | $10-13-20$ | 4 | $551-554$ |
| MOTION FOR APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL | $07-01-20$ | 4 | $547-548$ |
| MOTION FOR BAIL REDUCTION | $12-13-18$ | 3 | $277-285$ |
| MOTION FOR WITHDRAWAL OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD AND <br> DELIVERY OF RECORDS | $05-12-20$ | 4 | $501-504$ |
| MOTION FOR WITHDRAWAL OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD AND <br> DELIVERY OF RECORDS | $12-02-21$ | 5 | $822-826$ |
| MOTION TO DISMISS COUNTS I, III, V, VII AND VIII | $03-28-19$ | 3 | $399-401$ |
| MOTION TO DISMISS IN PART | $06-07-21$ | 5 | $712-733$ |
| MOTION TO VACATE A. J.O.C. (0203), AND WITHDRAW A GUILT <br> PLEA | $05-13-20$ | 4 | $507-514$ |
| NOTICE AND ORDER OF AUDIO / VISUAL HEARING | $10-27-21$ | 5 | $786-789$ |
| NOTICE OF APPEAL | $03-29-19$ | 3 | $407-408$ |
| NOTICE OF APPEAL | $09-25-18$ | 2 | 5 |
| NOTICE OF BINDOVER | $820-821$ |  |  |
| NOTICE OF CHANGE OF RESPONSIBLE ATTORNEY | 4 | $520-521$ |  |

APPEAL INDEX
SUPREME COURT NO: 83885
DISTRICT CASE NO: CR18-1654
LUIGY RICHARD LOPEZ-DELGADO vs STATE OF NEVADA
DATE: FEBRUARY 3, 2022

| PLEADING | DATE FILED | VOL. | PAGE NO. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NOTICE OF DOCUMENT RECEIVED BUT NOT CONSIDERED BY THE COURT | 04-01-19 | 3 | 425-426 |
| NOTICE OF ENTRY OF ORDER | 12-10-21 | 5 | 842-851 |
| NOTICE OF PROPOSED EXHIBITS SUBMITTED BY RESPONDENT FOR THE NOVEMBER 2, 2021, EVIDENTIARY HEARING | 11-01-21 | 5 | 793-797 |
| OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANT'S MOTION FOR BAIL REDUCTION | 12-17-18 | 3 | 291-299 |
| OPPOSITION TO MOTION TO DISMISS | 07-06-21 | 5 | 746-750 |
| OPPOSITION TO MOTION TO VACATE A J.O.C. AND WITHDRAW A GUILT PLEA | 05-22-20 | 4 | 517-519 |
| ORDER | 03-28-19 | 3 | 404 |
| ORDER | 03-30-21 | 4 | 585-587 |
| ORDER (1) DIRECTING THE STATE TO RESPOND (2) GRANTING MOTION FOR APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL | 01-04-21 | 4 | 561-563 |
| ORDER APPROVING ATTORNEY'S FEES (POST CONVICTION) | 03-24-21 | 4 | 581 |
| ORDER APPROVING ATTORNEY'S FEES (POST CONVICTION) | 04-28-21 | 4 | 698 |
| ORDER APPROVING ATTORNEY'S FEES (POST CONVICTION) | 05-19-21 | 5 | 708 |
| ORDER APPROVING ATTORNEY'S FEES (POST CONVICTION) | 08-17-21 | 5 | 765 |
| ORDER APPROVING ATTORNEY'S FEES (POST CONVICTION) | 12-15-21 | 5 | 862 |
| ORDER APPROVING ATTORNEY'S FEES (POST CONVICTION) | 01-18-22 | 5 | 876 |
| ORDER ENLARGING TIME | 06-15-21 | 5 | 742 |
| ORDER FOR ROUGH DRAFT TRANSCRIPTS | 04-04-19 | 3 | 432 |
| ORDER FOR ROUGH DRAFT TRANSCRIPTS | 04-11-19 | 3 | 444 |
| ORDER FOR TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS | 04-18-19 | 3 | 447 |
| ORDER GRANTING DISCHARGE OF ATTORNEY | 11-30-18 | 3 | 253 |
| ORDER GRANTING MOTION TO DISMISS IN PART | 11-04-21 | 5 | 804-811 |
| ORDER TO PRODUCE PRISONER VIA SIMULTANEOUS AUDIO / VISUAL TRANSMISSION | 10-14-21 | 5 | 781-782 |
| ORDER TO SET HEARING | 09-07-21 | 5 | 769-771 |
| PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS (POST CONVICTION) | 06-10-20 | 4 | 528-537 |

APPEAL INDEX
SUPREME COURT NO: 83885
DISTRICT CASE NO: CR18-1654
LUIGY RICHARD LOPEZ-DELGADO vs STATE OF NEVADA
DATE: FEBRUARY 3, 2022

| PLEADING | DATE FILED | VOL. | PAGE NO. |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| PRESENTENCE INVESTIGATION REPORT | $02-28-19$ | 6 | $70-91$ |
| PRETRIAL SERVICES ASSESSMENT REPORT | $09-25-18$ | 6 | $12-16$ |
| PRETRIAL SERVICES ASSESSMENT REPORT | $09-28-18$ | 6 | $17-21$ |
| PROCEEDINGS | $09-25-18$ | 2 | $2-36$ |
| RECOMMENDATION AND ORDER APPOINTING COUNSEL <br> (POST CONVICTION) | $02-24-21$ | 4 | $570-571$ |
| RECOMMENDATION FOR PAYMENT OF INTERIM ATTORNEY'S FEES <br> - POST CONVICTION | $04-13-21$ | 6 | $108-110$ |
| RECOMMENDATION FOR PAYMENT OF INTERIM ATTORNEY'S FEES <br> - POST CONVICTION | $05-08-21$ | 6 | $115-117$ |
| RECOMMENDATION FOR PAYMENT OF INTERIM ATTORNEY'S FEES <br> - POST CONVICTION | $08-14-21$ | 6 | $122-124$ |
| RECOMMENDATION FOR PAYMENT OF INTERIM ATTORNEY'S FEES <br> -POST CONVICTION | $12-13-21$ | 6 | $133-135$ |
| RECOMMENDATION FOR PAYMENT OF INTERIM ATTORNEY'S FEES <br> - POST CONVICTION | $01-11-22$ | 6 | $140-142$ |
| RECOMMENDATION OF ADMINISTRATOR FOR PAYMENT <br> OF ATTORNEY FEES - POST CONVICTION | $03-10-21$ | 6 | $101-103$ |
| REQUEST FOR DISCOVERY PURSUANT TON RS 174.245 | $09-26-18$ | 2 | $53-55$ |
| REQUEST FOR ROUGH DRAFT TRANSCRIPTS | $03-29-19$ | 3 | $413-415$ |
| REQUEST FOR SUBMISSION | $12-19-18$ | 3 | $306-307$ |
| REQUEST FOR SUBMISSION | $02-01-21$ | 4 | $566-567$ |
| REQUEST FOR SUBMISSION | $07-08-21$ | 5 | $754-755$ |
| REQUEST FOR SUBMISSION OF MOTION | $10-26-20$ | 4 | $557-558$ |
| REQUEST FOR TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS | $04-05-19$ | 3 | $435-437$ |
| RESPONSE TO MOTION FOR WITHDRAWAL OF ATTORNEY OF <br> RECORD AND DELIVERY OF RECORDS | 5 | $833-835$ |  |
| RETURN OF NEF | $09-25-18$ | 2 | $38-39$ |
| RETURN OF NEF | $09-25-18$ | 2 | $44-18$ |
| RETURN OF NEF | 2 | $56-67$ |  |
| RETURN OF NEF | 2 | $42-43$ |  |

APPEAL INDEX
SUPREME COURT NO: 83885
DISTRICT CASE NO: CR18-1654
LUIGY RICHARD LOPEZ-DELGADO vs STATE OF NEVADA
DATE: FEBRUARY 3, 2022

| PLEADING | DATE FILED | VOL. | PAGE NO. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RETURN OF NEF | 09-28-18 | 2 | 58-59 |
| RETURN OF NEF | 10-09-18 | 3 | 236-237 |
| RETURN OF NEF | 10-24-18 | 3 | 239-240 |
| RETURN OF NEF | 11-01-18 | 3 | 245-246 |
| RETURN OF NEF | 11-08-18 | 3 | 248-249 |
| RETURN OF NEF | 11-13-18 | 3 | 251-252 |
| RETURN OF NEF | 11-30-18 | 3 | 254-255 |
| RETURN OF NEF | 12-05-18 | 3 | 256-257 |
| RETURN OF NEF | 12-11-18 | 3 | 265-266 |
| RETURN OF NEF | D12-13-18 | 3 | 275-276 |
| RETURN OF NEF | 12-14-18 | 3 | 286-287 |
| RETURN OF NEF | 12-17-18 | 3 | 289-290 |
| RETURN OF NEF | 12-17-18 | 3 | 300-301 |
| RETURN OF NEF | 12-18-18 | 3 | 304-305 |
| RETURN OF NEF | 12-19-18 | 3 | 308-309 |
| RETURN OF NEF | 12-23-18 | 3 | 327-328 |
| RETURN OF NEF | 12-25-18 | 3 | 337-338 |
| RETURN OF NEF | 12-26-18 | 3 | 339-340 |
| RETURN OF NEF | 01-02-19 | 3 | 358-359 |
| RETURN OF NEF | 01-07-19 | 3 | 368-369 |
| RETURN OF NEF | 02-11-19 | 3 | 371-372 |
| RETURN OF NEF | 02-28-19 | 3 | 373-374 |
| RETURN OF NEF | 03-04-19 | 3 | 375-376 |
| RETURN OF NEF | 03-12-19 | 3 | 379-380 |
| RETURN OF NEF | 03-13-19 | 3 | 385-386 |
| RETURN OF NEF | 03-14-19 | 3 | 389-390 |

APPEAL INDEX
SUPREME COURT NO: 83885
DISTRICT CASE NO: CR18-1654
LUIGY RICHARD LOPEZ-DELGADO vs STATE OF NEVADA
DATE: FEBRUARY 3, 2022

|  | PLEADING | DATE FILED | VOL. |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| RETURN OF NEF | $03-15-19$ | 3 | $393-394$ |
| RETURN OF NEF | $03-18-19$ | 3 | $397-398$ |
| RETURN OF NEF | $03-28-19$ | 3 | $402-403$ |
| RETURN OF NEF | $03-28-19$ | 3 | $405-406$ |
| RETURN OF NEF | $03-29-19$ | 3 | $416-417$ |
| RETURN OF NEF | $03-29-19$ | 3 | $418-419$ |
| RETURN OF NEF | $03-29-19$ | 3 | $420-421$ |
| RETURN OF NEF | $03-29-19$ | 3 | $423-424$ |
| RETURN OF NEF | $04-01-19$ | 3 | $427-428$ |
| RETURN OF NEF | $04-04-19$ | 3 | $430-431$ |
| RETURN OF NEF | $04-04-19$ | 3 | $433-434$ |
| RETURN OF NEF | $04-05-19$ | 3 | $438-439$ |
| RETURN OF NEF | $04-08-19$ | 3 | $442-443$ |
| RETURN OF NEF | $04-11-19$ | 3 | $445-446$ |
| RETURN OF NEF | $04-18-19$ | 3 | $448-449$ |
| RETURN OF NEF | $04-25-19$ | 4 | $472-473$ |
| RETURN OF NEF | $07-30-19$ | 4 | $475-476$ |
| RETURN OF NEF | $05-30-19$ | 4 | $478-479$ |
| RETURN OF NEF | $01-07-20$ | 4 | $481-482$ |
| RETURN OF NEF | $02-11-20$ | 4 | $485-486$ |
| RETURN OF NEF | $02-19-20$ | 4 | $490-491$ |
| RETURN OF NEF | $05-20-20$ | 4 | $498-500$ |
| RETURN OF NEF | 4 | $505-506$ |  |
| RETURN OF NEF | 4 | 4 | $515-516$ |
| RETURN OF NEF | 4 | $522-523$ |  |
| RETURN OF NEF | 05 | $526-527$ |  |

APPEAL INDEX
SUPREME COURT NO: 83885
DISTRICT CASE NO: CR18-1654
LUIGY RICHARD LOPEZ-DELGADO vs STATE OF NEVADA
DATE: FEBRUARY 3, 2022

| PLEADING | DATE FILED | VOL. | PAGE NO. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RETURN OF NEF | 06-10-20 | 4 | 538-539 |
| RETURN OF NEF | 06-11-20 | 4 | 544-545 |
| RETURN OF NEF | 07-01-20 | 4 | 549-550 |
| RETURN OF NEF | 10-26-20 | 4 | 559-560 |
| RETURN OF NEF | 01-04-21 | 4 | 564-565 |
| RETURN OF NEF | 02-01-21 | 4 | 568-569 |
| RETURN OF NEF | 02-24-21 | 4 | 572-574 |
| RETURN OF NEF | 03-02-21 | 4 | 575-577 |
| RETURN OF NEF | 03-11-21 | 4 | 578-580 |
| RETURN OF NEF | 03-24-21 | 4 | 582-584 |
| RETURN OF NEF | 03-30-21 | 4 | 588-590 |
| RETURN OF NEF | 04-02-21 | 4 | 591-593 |
| RETURN OF NEF | 04-08-21 | 4 | 692-694 |
| RETURN OF NEF | 04-14-21 | 4 | 695-697 |
| RETURN OF NEF | 04-28-21 | 4 | 699-701 |
| RETURN OF NEF | 04-14-21 | 5 | 702-704 |
| RETURN OF NEF | 05-10-21 | 5 | 705-707 |
| RETURN OF NEF | 05-19-21 | 5 | 709-711 |
| RETURN OF NEF | 06-07-21 | 5 | 734-736 |
| RETURN OF NEF | 06-07-21 | 6 | 739-741 |
| RETURN OF NEF | 06-15-21 | 5 | 743-745 |
| RETURN OF NEF | 07-06-21 | 5 | 751-753 |
| RETURN OF NEF | 07-08-21 | 5 | 756-758 |
| RETURN OF NEF | 07-30-21 | 5 | 759-761 |
| RETURN OF NEF | 08-16-21 | 5 | 762-764 |
| RETURN OF NEF | 08-17-21 | 5 | 766-768 |

APPEAL INDEX
SUPREME COURT NO: 83885
DISTRICT CASE NO: CR18-1654
LUIGY RICHARD LOPEZ-DELGADO vs STATE OF NEVADA
DATE: FEBRUARY 3, 2022

| PLEADING | DATE FILED | VOL. | PAGE NO. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RETURN OF NEF | 09-07-21 | 5 | 772-774 |
| RETURN OF NEF | 10-12-21 | 5 | 778-780 |
| RETURN OF NEF | 10-14-21 | 5 | 783-785 |
| RETURN OF NEF | 10-27-21 | 5 | 790-792 |
| RETURN OF NEF | 11-01-21 | 5 | 798-800 |
| RETURN OF NEF | 11-02-21 | 5 | 801-803 |
| RETURN OF NEF | 11-04-21 | 5 | 812-814 |
| RETURN OF NEF | 11-05-21 | 5 | 817-819 |
| RETURN OF NEF | 12-03-21 | 5 | 830-832 |
| RETURN OF NEF | 12-03-21 | 5 | 836-838 |
| RETURN OF NEF | 12-08-21 | 5 | 839-841 |
| RETURN OF NEF | 12-10-21 | 5 | 852-854 |
| RETURN OF NEF | 12-14-21 | 5 | 855-857 |
| RETURN OF NEF | 12-14-21 | 5 | 859-861 |
| RETURN OF NEF | 12-15-21 | 5 | 863-865 |
| RETURN OF NEF | 12-15-21 | 5 | 867-869 |
| RETURN OF NEF | 01-04-22 | 5 | 870-872 |
| RETURN OF NEF | 01-12-22 | 5 | 873-875 |
| RETURN OF NEF | 01-18-22 | 5 | 877-879 |
| RETURN OF NEF | 01-25-22 | 5 | 882-884 |
| SEALED SUPPLEMENTAL PROCEEDINGS | 09-25-18 | 6 | 1-11 |
| SECOND AMENDED INFORMATION | 12-11-18 | 3 | 258-264 |
| SECOND CORRECTED JUDGMENT OF CONVICTION | 04-08-19 | 3 | 440-441 |
| STIPULATION FOR ENLARGEMENT OF TIME | 06-07-21 | 5 | 737-738 |
| SUBSTITUTION OF COUNSEL WITHIN PUBLIC DEFENDER'S OFFICE | 09-25-18 | 2 | 40-41 |
| SUPPLEMENT BRIEF | 10-26-20 | 4 | 555-556 |
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SUPREME COURT NO: 83885
DISTRICT CASE NO: CR18-1654
LUIGY RICHARD LOPEZ-DELGADO vs STATE OF NEVADA
DATE: FEBRUARY 3, 2022

| PLEADING | DATE FILED | VOL. | PAGE NO. |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| SUPPLEMENTAL PETITION IN SUPPORT OF A WRIT OF HABEAS <br> CORPUS (POST-CONVICTION) | $04-08-21$ | 4 | $594-691$ |
| SUPPLEMENTAL POINTS AND AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT | $06-22-20$ | 4 | 546 |
| SUPPLEMENTAL PROCEEDINGS | $10-09-18$ | 2 | $60-235$ |
| SUPREME COURT CLERK'S CERTIFICATE \& JUDGMENT | $03-17-20$ | 4 | 493 |
| SUPREME COURT NOTICE OF TRANSFER TO COURT OF APPEALS | $01-07-20$ | 4 | 480 |
| SUPREME COURT ORDER DIRECTING TRANSMISSION OF <br> PRESENTENCE INVESTIGATION REPORT | $07-30-19$ | 4 | 474 |
| SUPREME COURT ORDER DIRECTING TRANSMISSION OF RECORD <br> AND REGARDING BRIEFING | $01-25-22$ | 5 | $880-881$ |
| SUPREME COURT ORDER OF AFFIRMANCE | $02-19-20$ | 4 | $487-489$ |
| SUPREME COURT ORDER OF AFFIRMANCE | $03-17-20$ | 4 | $494-497$ |
| SUPREME COURT RECEIPT FOR DOCUMENTS | $04-04-19$ | 3 | 429 |
| SUPREME COURT RECEIPT FOR DOCUMENTS | $12-14-21$ | 5 | 858 |
| SUPREME COURT REMITTITUR | $03-17-20$ | 4 | 492 |
| THIRD CORRECTED JUDGMENT OF CONVICTION | $02-11-20$ | 4 | $483-484$ |
| TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS - ARRAIGNMENT - NOV 1, 2018 | $12-23-18$ | 3 | $310-326$ |
| TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS - HEARING ON MOTION FOR NEW <br> COUNSEL - NOV 29, 2018 | $12-25-18$ | 3 | $329-336$ |
| TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS - HEARING ON MOTION FOR NEW <br> COUNSEL - NOV 29, 2018 | $12-25-18$ | 6 | $23-69$ |
| TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS - MOTION FOR BAIL REDUCTION - <br> DEC 20, 2018 | $01-07-19$ | 3 | $360-367$ |
| TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS - MOTION TO SET TRIAL - <br> DEC 13, 2018 | $01-02-19$ | 3 | $341-357$ |
| TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS - SENTENCING - MARCH 14, 2019 | $04-25-19$ | 3 | $450-471$ |

STATE OF NEVADA,
Plaintiff,
vs.
Case No. BIND-2018
LUIGY RICHARD LOPEZ,
Defendant.
$\qquad$

## NOTICE OF BINDOVER

DEFENDANT'S NAME: Luigy Richard Lopez
AKA's: Luigi Lopez, Luigi Lopez-Delgado, Luigi Richard Lopez-Delgado, Luigi
Richard Lopez-Delgado

DATE OF BIRTH:
02/03/1993
DATE OF BINDOVER: 9/24/2018
JUSTICE COURT: Sparks Justice Court
J/C Case Number: 17-SCR-02095
DA Case Number: 17-14504
Co-Defendant(s):
No

DAS Supervision: No
PROSECUTING ATTORNEY: Nickolas J Graham
DEFENSE COUNSEL: Public Defender
3

1

## The State of Nevada vS. Luigi Richard Lopez-Delgado

| $\S$ | Location: | Sparks Criminal <br> Wilson, Chris |
| :--- | ---: | :--- |
| $\S$ | Judicial Officer: | Filed on: | 12/19/2017


| Case Information |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Offense | Statute | Deg | Date | Case Type: | Felony |
| 1. Statutory sexual seduction by person age 21 or older | NRS 200.368.1 | B | 10/01/2017 | Case | 12/19/2017 Active |
| 2. Statutory sexual seduction by person age 21 or older | NRS 200.368.1 | B | 10/01/2017 | Case Flags: | In Custody |
| 3. Use or permit minor, under age 14 , to produce pornography | NRS 200.710.1 | A | 10/01/2017 |  |  |
| 4. Possess visual pornography of person under age 16 , 1 st | NRS 200.730.1 | B | 10/01/2017 |  |  |
| 5. Lewdness with child older than 14 | NRS 201.230.3 | B | 10/01/2017 |  |  |
| 6. Lewdness with child older than 14 | NRS 201.230.3 | B | 10/01/2017 |  |  |
| 7. Lure/att to lure child/mentally ill pers w/use of computer technology to engage in sexual conduct | NRS 201.560.4a | B | 10/01/2017 |  |  |
| 8. Prevent, dissuade, or att to prevent or dissuade person from testifying or producing evidence | NRS 199.230.2 | G | 12/26/2017 |  |  |
| Statistical Closures |  |  |  |  |  |
| 09/24/2018 Preliminary Hearing - Bindover |  |  |  |  |  |


| Date | Case Assignment |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Current Case Assignment  <br> Case Number 17-SCR-02095 <br> Court Sparks Criminal <br> Date Assigned 12/19/2017 <br> Judicial Officer Wilson, Chris |  |
| PARTY InFormation |  |  |
| Plaintiff | The State of Nevada | Lead Attorneys Graham, Nickolas J 775-328-3200(H) |
| Defendant | Lopez-Delgado, Luigi Richard Also Known As Lopez, Luigy Richard Also Known As Lopez, Luigi | Slocum, Jay <br> Retained |
| Date | Events \& Orders of the Court | Index |

12/15/2017 $\mid$ Probable Cause Findings/Hearings (4:00 PM) (Judicial Officer: Judge, Probable Cause)

12/15/2017 Court Found Probable Cause SEALED

## CASE NO. 17-SCR-02095

| 12/15/2017 | Bail Set (Judicial Officer: Longley, Jessica ) \$200,000 F/\$1,000 M bondable with supervision |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 12/15/2017 | Public Defender Denied |  |
| 12/15/2017 | [国] Nevada Pre-trial Risk Assessment Medium | Instrument\# $2$ |
| 12/18/2017 | 72 Hour (8:30 AM) (Judicial Officer: Longley, Jessica) Parties Present: Defendant Lopez-Delgado, Luigi Richard |  |
| 12/18/2017 | Public Defender Appointed On the record |  |
| 12/19/2017 | 家 Case Filed |  |
| 12/20/2017 | Arraignment (8:30 AM) (Judicial Officer: Longley, Jessica) Parties Present: Defendant Lopez-Delgado, Luigi Richard |  |
| 12/20/2017 | Bail Set (Judicial Officer: Longley, Jessica ) $\$ 200,000$ Bondable with supervision |  |
| 12/20/2017 | Amended Criminal Complaint Filed Amended wrong name on Count III |  |
| 12/21/2017 | Arraignment (8:30 AM) (Judicial Officer: Wilson, Chris) Parties Present: Defendant Lopez-Delgado, Luigi Richard |  |
| 12/28/2017 | CANCELED Mandatory Status Conference (1:30 PM) (Judicial Officer: Wilson, Chris) Vacated |  |
| 01/03/2018 | CANCELED Preliminary Hearing (10:00 AM) (Judicial Officer: Wilson, Chris) Vacated |  |
| 01/18/2018 | CANCELED Mandatory Status Conference (1:30 PM) (Judicial Officer: Wilson, Chris) Vacated |  |
| 01/31/2018 | Amended Criminal Complaint Filed Second - Added Count VIII and new PC. |  |
| 02/01/2018 | Arraignment (8:30 AM) (Judicial Officer: Higgins, Kevin) Parties Present: Defendant Lopez-Delgado, Luigi Richard |  |
| 02/01/2018 | Hearing Result: <br> Defendant arraigned on amended criminal complaint. |  |
| 02/01/2018 | Bail Reduction <br> $\$ 200,000$ bondable with supervision |  |
| 02/05/2018 | CANCELED Mandatory Status Conference (1:30 PM) (Judicial Officer: Wilson, Chris) Vacated |  |
| 02/05/2018 | Custody Change Request Filed |  |
| 02/05/2018 | Bail Reduction |  |

## CASE NO. 17-SCR-02095

|  | \$80,000 bondable with enhanced supervision |
| :---: | :---: |
| 04/18/2018 | CANCELED Preliminary Hearing (2:00 PM) (Judicial Officer: Wilson, Chris) Vacated |
| 07/05/2018 | CANCELED Mandatory Status Conference (1:30 PM) (Judicial Officer: Wilson, Chris) Vacated |
| 07/12/2018 | CANCELED Mandatory Status Conference (1:30 PM) (Judicial Officer: Wilson, Chris) Vacated |
| 09/24/2018 | Preliminary Hearing (10:00 AM) (Judicial Officer: Wilson, Chris) <br> Parties Present: Plaintiff The State of Nevada Defendant Lopez-Delgado, Luigi Richard Public Defender Slocum, Jay Deputy District Attorney Graham, Nickolas J |
| 09/24/2018 | Hearing Result: <br> Defendant motions for new Public defender. Motion denied. Defendant arraigned on amended criminal complaint. |
| 09/24/2018 | Amended Criminal Complaint Filed $3 r d$ |
| 09/24/2018 | Disposition (Judicial Officer: Wilson, Chris) <br> 1. Statutory sexual seduction by person age 21 or older <br> Bound Over <br> 2. Statutory sexual seduction by person age 21 or older <br> Bound Over <br> 3. Use or permit minor, under age 14 , to produce pornography <br> Bound Over <br> 4. Possess visual pornography of person under age 16,1 st <br> Bound Over <br> 5. Lewdness with child older than 14 <br> Bound Over <br> 6. Lewdness with child older than 14 <br> Bound Over <br> 7. Lure/att to lure child/mentally ill pers w/use of computer technology to engage in sexual conduct <br> Bound Over <br> 8. Prevent, dissuade, or att to prevent or dissuade person from testifying or producing evidence <br> Bound Over |
| 09/24/2018 | Notice of Bindover |
| 09/25/2018 | Request for Transcript |

IN THE JUSTICE COURT OF WASHOE COUNTY, STATE OF NEVADA

EN EL TRIBUNAL DE JUSTICIA DEL
CONDADO DE WASHOE, ESTADO DE NEVADA


I hereby apply for appointment of the Washoe County Public Defender and declare under penalty of perjury: (1) I am indigent and I am without financial means to hire an attorney. Mediante la presente solicito la asignación del Defensor Público del Condado de Washoe y declaro bajo pena de perjurio: (1) que soy indigente y (2) que no tengo los medios económicos para contratar a un abogado.

I receive government assistance __yes __no, specifically $\qquad$ .
Recibo ayuda del gobierno $\qquad$ sí no, especificamente $\qquad$ .

My weekly household income is 81000 the total number of people in my household is 2 and my total assets are $\$ / 500$
Los ingresos semanales de mi familia son de $\qquad$ el número de personas que viven en mi hogar es $\qquad$ y mi capital total es de $\qquad$

WITNESSED:
 TESTIGO


## ORDER

The Court has reviewed this Application executed under penalty of perjury. Good cause appearing it is hereby ordered that:
the Application is DENIED. The Court finds the Defendant is not indigent.
Comment:
the Application is GRANTED. The Court finds that the Defendant is without means to employ an attorney or otherwise determines that representation by the Washoe County Public Defender is required. Reimbursement may be ordered by the Justice Court or District Court at a later time. The Washoe County Public Defender is appointed to represent the Defendant on the following condition(s):

(\$464/1, \$625/2, \$785/3, \$946/4, \$1,107/5)




 hereby ordered that:
$\qquad$ The Application is DENIED. The Court fins the Defendant is not indigent.
$\qquad$ The Application is GRANTED. The Court finds that the Defendant is without means to employ an attorney or otherwise determines that representation by the Washoe County Public Defender is required. Reimbursement may be ordered by the Justice Court.

Fee Assessed: $\qquad$ No $\qquad$ Yes \$
Defendant.

## AFFIDAVIT FOR APPOINTMENT OF PUBLIC DEFENDER

I hereby apply for appointment of the Washoe County Public Defender and declare under penalty of perjury:

1. That affiant is indigent.
2. That affiant is without the financial means to employ an attorney for the reasons that:
(a) Affiant has no personal funds; (b) Affiant has no family or friends with the ability to provide funds to assist him; (c) Affiant has no assets of any kind in this State or elsewhere to assisting the employment of counsel; (d) Affiant is without financial resources of any kind which, if existent, would be used to assist in the employment of Counsel.

I receive government assistance My weekly household income is

$\qquad$ The total number of people in my household is
My total assets are


Defendants Signature
Phone
ORDER
The Court has reviewed this Application executed under penalty of perjury. Good cause appearing it is

Dated: December 18, 2017



IN THE JUSTICE COURT OF SPARKS TOWNSHIP
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF WASHOE, STATE OF NEVADA
the state of nevada,
Plaintiff,
v.

LUIGI RICHARD LOPEZ-DELGADO, also known as LUIGI LOPEZ, also known as
LUIGY RICHARD LOPEZ,
Defendant.
$\qquad$ 1

## CRIMINAL COMPLAINT

ERICA L. JACKSON of the County of Washoe, State of Nevada, verifies and declares upon information and belief and under penalty of perjury, that LUIGI RICHARD IOPEZ-DELGADO also known as LUIGI LOPEZ also known as LUIGY RICHARD LOPEZ, the defendant above-named, has committed the crime(s) of:

COUNT I. STATUTORY SEXUAL SEDUCTION BY PERSON AGE 21 OR OLDER, a violation of NRS 200.368.1, a category B felony, (60323) in the manner following, to wit:

That the said defendant LUIGI RICHARD LOPEZ-DELGADO, on or between October 1, 2017 and December 13, 2017, within the County of Washoe, State of Nevada, did willfully and unlawfully, being over 21 years of age, commit an act of statutory sexual seduction with the person of H.T., who was then and there under the age of 16 years, in that the said defendant engaged in an act of oral intercourse with
the said H.E. at or near 3094 Diamond Dust Court, Washoe County, Nevada.

COUNT II. STATUTORY SEXUAL SEDUCTION BY PERSON AGE 21 OR OLDER, a violation of NRS 200.368.1, a category B felony, (60323) in the manner following, to wit:

That the said defendant LUIGI RICHARD LOPEZ-DELGADO, on or between October 1, 2017 and December 13, 2017, within the County of Washoe, State of Nevada, did willfully and unlawfully, being over 21 years of age, commit an act of statutory sexual seduction with the person of H.T., who was then and there under the age of 16 years, in that the said defendant engaged in an act of vaginal intercourse with the said H.E. at or near 3094 Diamond Dust Court, washoe County, Nevada.

COUNT III. USE OR PERMIT MINOR, UNDER AGE 18, TO PRODUCE PORNOGRAPHY, a violation of NRS 200.710.1, a category A felony, (50368) in the manner following, to wit:

That the said defendant JEFFERY LYNN FLUCKIGER, on or between October 1, 2017 and December 13, 2017, at the Reno Township, within the County of Washoe, State of Nevada, did willfully and unlawfully, use or permit a minor child of approximately 14 years of age to engage in sexual conduct to produce a performance and/or pornography, in that the defendant did have H.T. produce nude photographs of herself, at his suggestion and had her send them to him.
16, FIRST OFFENSE, a violation of NRS 200.730.1, a category B felony,
(50374) in the manner following, to wit:

That the said defendant LUIGI RICHARD LOPEZ-DELGADO, between October 1, 2017 and December 13, 2017, within the County of Washoe, State of Nevada, did knowingly, willfully and unlawfully have in his possession for any purpose film, photograph or other visual presentation depicting a person under 16 year as the subject of a sexual portrayal or engaging in or simulating, or assisting others to engage in or simulate, sexual conduct, in that the defendant possessed nude photographs of H.T., who was under the age of 18 at the time the photograph was taken, 3094 Diamond Dust Court, Washoe County, Nevada.

COUNT V. LEWDNESS WITH CHILD OLDER THAN 14, a violation of NRS 201.230.3, a category $B$ felony, (58747) in the manner following, to wit:

That the said defendant LUIGI RICHARD LOPEZ-DELGADO, between October 1, 2017 and December 13, 2017, within the County of Washoe, State of Nevada, did willfully, unlawfully and lewdly commit any lewd or lascivious act upon or with the body or any body part of H.T., a female child between the ages of fourteen and sixteen years at the time the act was committed, in that the defendant penetrated H.T.'s mouth with his penis, with the intent of arousing, appealing to, or gratifying the lust, passions, or sexual desires of himself or the child, at or near 3094 Diamond Dust Court, Washoe County, Nevada. NRS 201.230.3, a category B felony, (58747) in the manner following, to wit:

That the said defendant LUIGI RICHARD LOPEZ-DELGADO, between October 1, 2017 and December 13, 2017, within the County of Washoe, State of Nevada, did willfully, unlawfully and lewdly commit any lewd or lascivious act upon or with the body or any body part of H.T., a female child between the ages of fourteen and sixteen years at the time the act was committed, in that the defendant penetrated H.T.'s vagina with his penis, with the intent of arousing, appealing to, or gratifying the lust, passions, or sexual desires of himself or the child, at or near 3094 Diamond Dust Court, Washoe County, Nevada.

COUNT VII. LURE OR ATTEMPT TO LURE A CHILD WITH THE USE OF COMPUTER TECHNOLOGY TO ENGAGE IN SEXUAL CONDUCT, a violation of NRS 201.560.4a, a category $B$ felony, (51078) in the manner following, to wit:

That the said defendant LUIGI RICHARD LOPEZ-DELGADO, between October 1, 2017 and December 13, 2017, within the County of Washoe, State of Nevada, did willfully and unlawfully contact and/or communicate with a child, H.T., who was less than 16 years of age and who was at least 5 years younger than the defendant, with the intent to persuade, lure or transport the child away from the child's home or place where the child is located, without the express consent of the parent or guardian or other person legally responsible for the child; and with the intent to avoid the consent of the parent or
guardian or other person legally responsible for the child; with the intent to solicit, persuade or lure the person to engage in sexual conduct, to wit: the defendant contacted H.T., who was 14 at the time he was 24, through Facebook and lured her away from her legal guardian (s) in order to engage in sexual conduct at or near 3094 Diamond Dust Court, Sparks, Washoe County, Nevada.

AFFIRMATION PURSUANT TO NR 239B. 030
The undersigned does hereby affirm that the preceding
document does not contain the social security number of any person.

DATED this 19 th day of December, 2017.


CA: WASOOO70047C-LOPEZ-DELGADO
Custody: X
District Court Dept:
Bailed:
District Attorney: JACKSON
Defense Attorney:
Bail
Restitution:

WCSO WC17－006416
IN THE JUSTICE COURT OF SPARKS TOWNSHIP
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF WASHOE，STATE OE NEVADA

THE STATE OF NEVADA，

Plaintiff，

V．

Case No：：M－SCR－O2C195 Dept．No．：$/$

LUIGI RICHARD LOPEZ－DELGADO， also known as
LUIGI LOPEZ，
also known as
LUIGY RICHARD LOPEZ，
Defendant．

## AMENDED CRIMINAL COMPLAINT

ERICA L．JACKSON of the County of Washoe，state of Nevada， verifies and declares upon information and belief and under penalty of perjury，that LUIGI RICHARD LOPEZ－DELGADO also known as LUIGI LOPEZ also known as LUIGY RICHARD LOPEZ，the defendant above－named， has committed the crime（s）of：

COUNT I．STATUTORY SEXUAL SEDUCTION BY PERSON AGE 21 OR OLDER，a violation of NRS 200．368．1，a category B felony，（60323）in the manner following，to wit：

That the said defendant LUIGI RICHARD LOPEZ－DELGADO，on or between October 1， 2017 and December 13,2017 ，within the County of Washoe，State of Nevada，did willfully and unlawfully，being over 21 years of age，commit an act of statutory sexual seduction with the person of $H . T .$, who was then and there under the age of 16 years，in that the said defendant engaged in an act of oral intercourse with
the said H.E. at or near 3094 Diamond Dust Court, Washoe County, Nevada.

COUNT II. STATUTORY SEXUAL SEDUCTION BY PERSON AGE 21 OR OLDER, a violation of NRS 200.368.1, a category B felony, (60323) in the manner following, to wit:

That the said defendant LUIGI RICHARD LOPEZ-DELGADO, on or between October 1, 2017 and December 13, 2017, within the County of Washoe, State of Nevada, did willfully and unlawfully, being over 21 years of age, commit an act of statutory sexual seduction with the person of H.T., who was then and there under the age of 16 years, in that the said defendant engaged in an act of vaginal intercourse with the said H.E. at or near 3094 Diamond Dust Court, Washoe County, Nevada.

COUNT III. USE OR PERMIT MINOR, UNDER AGE 18, TO PRODUCE PORNOGRAPHY, a violation of NRS 200.710.1, a category A felony, (50368) in the manner following, to wit:

That the said defendant LUIGI RICHARD LOPEZ-DELGADO, on or between October 1, 2017 and December 13, 2017, at the Reno Township, within the County of Washoe, State of Nevada, did willfully and unlawfully, use or permit a minor child of approximately 14 years of age to engage in sexual conduct to produce a performance and/or pornography, in that the defendant did have H.T. produce nude photographs of herself, at his suggestion and had her send them to him.
// /
// / 16, FIRST OEFENSE, a violation of NRS 200.730.1, a category B felony, (50374) in the manner following, to wit:

That the said defendant LUIGI RICHARD LOPEZ-DELGADO, between October 1, 2017 and December 13, 2017, within the County of Washoe, State of Nevada, did knowingly, willfully and unlawfully have in his possession for any purpose film, photograph or other visual presentation depicting a person under 16 year as the subject of a sexual portrayal or engaging in or simulating, or assisting others to engage in or simulate, sexual conduct, in that the defendant possessed nude photographs of H.T., who was under the age of 18 at the time the photograph was taken, 3094 Diamond Dust Court, washoe County, Nevada.

COUNT V. LEWDNESS WITH CHILD OLDER THAN 14, a violation of NRS 201.230.3, a category B felony, (58747) in the manner following, to wit:

That the said defendant LUIGI RICHARD LOPEZ-DELGADO, between October 1, 2017 and December 13, 2017, within the County of Washoe, State of Nevada, did willfully, unlawfully and lewdy commit any lewd or lascivious act upon or with the body or any body part of H.T., a female child between the ages of fourteen and sixteen years at the time the act was committed, in that the defendant penetrated H.T.'s mouth with his penis, with the intent of arousing, appealing to, or gratifying the lust, passions, or sexual desires of himself or the child, at or near 3094 Diamond Dust Court, Washoe County, Nevada.

COUNT VI. LEWDNESS WITH CHILD OLDER THAN 14, a violation of NRS 201.230.3, a category B felony, (58747) in the manner following, to wit:

That the said defendant LUIGI RICHARD LOPEZ-DELGADO, between October 1, 2017 and December 13, 2017, within the County of Washoe, State of Nevada, did willfully, unlawfully and lewdly commit any lewd or lascivious act upon or with the body or any body part of H.T., a female child between the ages of fourteen and sixteen years at the time the act was committed, in that the defendant penetrated H.T.'s vagina with his penis, with the intent of arousing, appealing to, or gratifying the lust, passions, or sexual desires of himself or the child, at or near 3094 Diamond Dust Court, Washoe County, Nevada.

COUNT VII. LURE OR ATTEMPT TO LURE A CHILD WITH THE USE OF COMPUTER TECHNOLOGY TO ENGAGE IN SEXUAL CONDUCT, a violation of NRS 201.560.4a, a category B felony, (51078) in the manner following, to wit:

That the said defendant LUIGI RICHARD LOPEZ-DELGADO, between October 1, 2017 and December 13, 2017, within the County of Washoe, State of Nevada, did willfully and unlawfully contact and/or communicate with a child, H.T., who was less than 16 years of age and who was at least 5 years younger than the defendant, with the intent to persuade, lure or transport the child away from the child's home or place where the child is located, without the express consent of the parent or guardian or other person legally responsible for the child; and with the intent to avoid the consent of the parent or
guardian or other person legally responsible for the child; with the intent to solicit, persuade or lure the person to engage in sexual conduct, to wit: the defendant contacted H.T., who was 14 at the time he was 24, through Facebook and lured her away from her legal guardian (s) in order to engage in sexual conduct at or near 3094 Diamond Dust Court, Sparks, Washoe County, Nevada.

AFFIRMATION PURSUANT TO NR 239B. 030
The undersigned does hereby affirm that the preceding document does not contain the social security number of any person. DATED this $20^{\text {th }}$ day of December, 2017.


CA: WASO0070047C-LOPEZ-DELGADO
District Court Dept:
Custody: X
Bailed:
Warrant:

# Electronically SPARKS JUSTICE COURT <br> 01/31/2018 <br> M. Wright 

DA \#17-14504
WCSO WC17-006416
IN THE JUSTICE COURT OF SPARKS TOWNSHIP
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF WASHOE, STATE OF NEVADA

THE STATE OF NEVADA,

Plaintiff,
v.

LUIGI RICHARD LOPEZ-DELGADO, also known as LUIGI LOPEZ, also known as LUIGY RICHARD LOPEZ,

Defendant.

## SECOND AMENDED CRIMINAL COMPLAINT

ERICA L. JACKSON of the County of Washoe, State of Nevada, verifies and declares upon information and belief and under penalty of perjury, that LUIGI RICHARD LOPEZ-DELGADO also known as LUIGI LOPEZ also known as LUIGY RICHARD LOPEZ, the defendant above-named, has committed the crime(s) of:

COUNT I. STATUTORY SEXUAL SEDUCTION BY PERSON AGE 21 OR OLDER, a violation of NRS 200.368.1, a category B felony, (60323) in the manner following, to wit:

That the said defendant LUIGI RICHARD LOPEZ-DELGADO, on or between October 1, 2017 and December 13, 2017, within the County of Washoe, State of Nevada, did willfully and unlawfully, being over 21 years of age, commit an act of statutory sexual seduction with the person of H.T., who was then and there under the age of 16 years, in that the said defendant engaged in an act of oral intercourse with
the said H.E. at or near 3094 Diamond Dust Court, Washoe County, Nevada.

COUNT II. STATUTORY SEXUAL SEDUCTION BY PERSON AGE 21 OR OLDER, a violation of NRS 200.368.1, a category B felony, (60323) in the manner following, to wit:

That the said defendant LUIGI RICHARD LOPEZ-DELGADO, on or between October 1, 2017 and December 13, 2017, within the County of Washoe, State of Nevada, did willfully and unlawfully, being over 21 years of age, commit an act of statutory sexual seduction with the person of H.T., who was then and there under the age of 16 years, in that the said defendant engaged in an act of vaginal intercourse with the said H.E. at or near 3094 Diamond Dust Court, Washoe County, Nevada.

COUNT III. USE OR PERMIT MINOR, UNDER AGE 18, TO PRODUCE PORNOGRAPHY, a violation of NRS 200.710.1, a category A felony, (50368) in the manner following, to wit:

That the said defendant LUIGI RICHARD LOPEZ-DELGADO, on or between October 1, 2017 and December 13, 2017, at the Reno Township, within the County of Washoe, State of Nevada, did willfully and unlawfully, use or permit a minor child of approximately 14 years of age to engage in sexual conduct to produce a performance and/or pornography, in that the defendant did have H.T. produce nude photographs of herself, at his suggestion and had her send them to him.

COUNT IV. POSSESS VISUAL PORNOGRAPHY OE PERSON UNDER AGE 16, FIRST OFFENSE, a violation of NRS 200.730.1, a category B felony, (50374) in the manner following, to wit:

That the said defendant LUIGI RICHARD LOPEZ-DELGADO, between October 1, 2017 and December 13, 2017, within the County of Washoe, State of Nevada, did knowingly, willfully and unlawfully have in his possession for any purpose film, photograph or other visual presentation depicting a person under 16 year as the subject of a sexual portrayal or engaging in or simulating, or assisting others to engage in or simulate, sexual conduct, in that the defendant possessed nude photographs of H.T., who was under the age of 18 at the time the photograph was taken, 3094 Diamond Dust Court, Washoe County, Nevada.

COUNT V. LEWDNESS WITH CHILD OLDER THAN 14, a violation of NRS 201.230.3, a category B felony, (58747) in the manner following, to wit:

That the said defendant LUIGI RICHARD LOPEZ-DELGADO, between October 1, 2017 and December 13, 2017, within the County of Washoe, State of Nevada, did willfully, unlawfully and lewdly commit any lewd or lascivious act upon or with the body or any body part of H.T., a female child between the ages of fourteen and sixteen years at the time the act was committed, in that the defendant penetrated H.T.'s mouth with his penis, with the intent of arousing, appealing to, or gratifying the lust, passions, or sexual desires of himself or the child, at or near 3094 Diamond Dust Court, Washoe County, Nevada.

COUNT VI. LEWDNESS WITH CHILD OLDER THAN 14, a violation of NRS 201.230.3, a category B felony, (58747) in the manner following, to wit:

That the said defendant LUIGI RICHARD LOPEZ-DELGADO, between October 1, 2017 and December 13, 2017, within the County of Washoe, State of Nevada, did willfully, unlawfully and lewdly commit any lewd or lascivious act upon or with the body or any body part of H.T., a female child between the ages of fourteen and sixteen years at the time the act was committed, in that the defendant penetrated H.T.'s vagina with his penis, with the intent of arousing, appealing to, or gratifying the lust, passions, or sexual desires of himself or the child, at or near 3094 Diamond Dust Court, Washoe County, Nevada.

COUNT VII. LURE OR ATTEMPT TO LURE A CHILD WITH THE USE OF COMPUTER TECHNOLOGY TO ENGAGE IN SEXUAL CONDUCT, a violation of NRS 201.560.4a, a category B felony, (51078) in the manner following, to wit:

That the said defendant LUIGI RICHARD LOPEZ-DELGADO, between October 1, 2017 and December 13, 2017, within the County of Washoe, State of Nevada, did willfully and unlawfully contact and/or communicate with a child, H.T., who was less than 16 years of age and who was at least 5 years younger than the defendant, with the intent to persuade, lure or transport the child away from the child's home or place where the child is located, without the express consent of the parent or guardian or other person legally responsible for the child; and with the intent to avoid the consent of the parent or guardian or other person legally responsible for the child; with the
intent to solicit, persuade or lure the person to engage in sexual conduct, to wit: the defendant contacted H.T., who was 14 at the time he was 24, through Facebook and lured her away from her legal guardian(s) in order to engage in sexual conduct at or near 3094 Diamond Dust Court, Sparks, Washoe County, Nevada.

COUNT VIII. ATTEMPTING TO PREVENT OR DISSUADE A WITNESS
EROM TESTIFYING, a violation of NRS 199.230, a gross misdemeanor,
(52983), in the manner following, to wit:

That the said defendant on or about the 26 th day of December, 2017, within the County of Washoe, State of Nevada, did willfully and unlawfully, by persuasion, force, threat, intimidation, deception or otherwise, and with the intent to obstruct the course of justice, attempt to prevent or dissuade another person from appearing before any court or evade the process which requires the person to appear as a witness to testify, to wit: the defendant wrote a postcard to H.T./Accuser that stated "I am asking for you guys to help me get these charges dismissed, my whole life and future is on the line. I have a daughter and was in the process of enrolling in the military but with these charges I wont be able to. This can ruin my life and future I am trying to set for my daughter and I. Can you please not show to court and not make up accusations anymore.

Anything to help get this dismissed. Thank $u^{\prime \prime}$ from 911 Parr Boulevard, Washoe County, Nevada.
The undersigned does hereby affirm that the preceding
document does not contain the social security number of any person.
DATED this $31^{\text {St }}$ day of January, 2017.

```


CN: WASO0070047C; WASO0074509C-LOPEZ-DELGADO
District Court Dept:
Custody: X District Attorney: JACKSON
Bailed:
Warrant:

Defense Attorney:
Bail
Restitution:
J
\(\qquad\) SOCSICWJCIVJC \(\qquad\) DC Dept. \(\qquad\)
DEFENDANT'S NAME: \(\frac{\text { Lopez, Luigy Richard }}{\text { (Last) }}\)

DOB: 02/03/1993


CASE \#: 17-SCR-02095
NEXT COURT DATE / TIME: \(4117 / 18\) (r 2 pm
Waived/Bound Over Today? \(\square\) YES \(\mathbb{O}\) NO
CHARGES: Statutory sexual seduction by person age 21 or older; Statutory sexual seduction by person age 21 or older; Use or permit minor, under age 14, to produce pornography; Possess visual pornography of person under age 16, st; Lewdness with child older than 14; Lewdness with child older than 14; Lure/att to lure child/mentally ill pers w/use of computer technology to engage in sexual conduct; Prevent, dissuade, or att to prevent or dissuade person from testifying or producing evidence

Requested by:

\(\begin{array}{ll}\text { Title: } & \text { DDA } \\ \text { Title: } & \underline{\text { DPD }}\end{array}\)
REQUESTED ACTION:
\(\triangle\) Bail Modification
Increase to: \$ \(\qquad\) YoD
Decrease to: s
 000 (B)Supervised Bail
\(\square\) PR
\(\square\) Basic
\(\square\) DAB
\(\square \mathbf{A S U}\)
supervision 'l DE T゙ bails cat.O.R. Release with Supervision

\(\square\) DIS
\(\square\) Medium
\(\square\) ASS
Enhanced
\(\square\) O.R. Release into In-Patient Treatment ProgramDefendant to be transported by:
Inmate Assistance Program (IAP)Other \(\qquad\)Supervision after release from treatment:
\begin{tabular}{lll}
\(\square\) RT & \(\square\) PAS & \(\square\) AS \\
\(\square\) Basic & \(\square\) Medium & \(\square\) Enhanced
\end{tabular}
Self-surrender with prearranged O.R.O.R./Supervised Bail Revocation Request

Warrant Requested? \(\square\) Yes \(\square\) No
* If re-arrested/revoked and released, is supervision ordered again? \(\square\) Yes \(\square\) No


BAIL\$ \(\qquad\) cash? \(\qquad\)

Additional notes for the Judge's consideration or special conditions of release:
 Date: \(\qquad\)

DA \#17-14504


IN THE JUSTICE COURT OE SPARKS TOWNSHIP
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF WASHOE, STATE OE NEVADA

THE STATE OF NEVADA,

Plaintiff,
V.

Case No.: 17-SCR-02095
Dept. No.: SO1

LUIGI RICHARD LOPEZ-DELGADO, also known as
LUIGI LOPEZ,
also known as
LUIGY RICHARD LOPEZ,
Defendant.

\section*{THIRD}

OSGOND AMENDED CRIMINAL COMPLAINT

\section*{Nickous J. Grathm}

ERICA I. JACKSON of the County of Washoe, State of Nevada, verifies and declares upon information and belief and under penalty of perjury, that LUIGI RICHARD LOPEZ-DELGADO also known as LUIGI LOPEZ also known as LUIGY RICHARD LOPEZ, the defendant above-named, has committed the crime (s) of:

COUNT I. STATUTORY SEXUAL SEDUCTION BY PERSON AGE 21 OR OLDER, a violation of NRS 200.368.1, a category B felony, (60323) in the manner following, to wit:

That the said defendant, LUIGI RICHARD LOPEZ-DELGADO, on or between October 1, 2017 and December 13, 2017, within the County of Washoe, State of Nevada, did willfully and unlawfully, being over 21 years of age, commit an act of statutory sexual seduction with the person of H.T., who was then and there under the age of 16 years, in SEXUAL that the said defendant engaged in an act of oral^intercourse with

\title{
H.T. \\ 228 East \(8^{\text {th }}\) Ave. Sun Valley,
} the said H.E. at or near 3094 Diamend Dust Court, washoe County, Nevada.

COUNT II. STATUTORY SEXUAL SEDUCTION BY PERSON AGE 21 OR OLDER, a violation of NRS 200.368.1, a category B felony, (60323) in the manner following, to wit:

That the said defendant, LUIGI RICHARD LOPEZ-DELGADO, on or between October 1, 2017 and December 13, 2017, within the county of Washoe, State of Nevada, did willfully and unlawfully, being over 21 years of age, commit an act of statutory sexual seduction with the person of H.T., who was then and there under the age of 16 years, in that the said defendant engaged in an act of vaginal sexual \(\Lambda^{\text {intercourse with }}\)
H.T.

228 East 8th Ave. Soin Valley.
the said H.T. at or near 3094 . Nevada.

COUNT III. USE OR PERMIT MINOR, UNDER AGE 18, TO PRODUCE PORNOGRAPHY, a violation of NRS 200.710.1, a category A felony, (50368) in the manner following, to wit:

That the said defendant, LUIGI RICHARD LOPEZ-DELGADO, on or between October 1, 2017 and December 13, 2017, at Sparks Township, within the County of Washoe, State of Nevada, did willfully and unlawfully, use or permit a minor child of approximately 14 years of age to engage in sexual conduct to produce a performance and/or pornography, in that the defendant did have H.T. produce nude photographs of herself, at his suggestion and had her send them to him.
```

///

```
/1/

COUNT IV. POSSESS VISUAL PORNOGRAPHY OF PERSON UNDER AGE
16, FIRST OFFENSE, a violation of NRS 200.730.1, a category B felony, (50374) in the manner following, to wit:

That the said defendant, LUIGI RICHARD LOPEZ-DELGADO, between October 1, 2017 and December 13, 2017, within the County of Washoe, State of Nevada, did knowingly, willfully and unlawfully have in his possession for any purpose film, photograph or other visual presentation depicting a person under 16 year as the subject of \(a\) sexual portrayal or engaging in or simulating, or assisting others to engage in or simulate, sexual conduct, in that the defendant possessed nude photographs of H.T., who was under the age of 18 at atorard 228 fast gin Ave., SUN VAlley, the time the photograph was taken, Diamond Dust Court, Washoe County, Nevada.

COUNT V. LEWDNESS WITH CHILD OLDER THAN 14, a violation of NRS 201.230.3, a category B felony, (58747) in the manner following, to wit:

That the said defendant, LUIGI RICHARD LOPEZ-DELGADO, between October 1, 2017 and December 13, 2017, within the County of Washoe, State of Nevada, did willfully, unlawfully and lewdly commit any lewd or lascivious act upon or with the body or any body part of H.T., a female child between the ages of fourteen and sixteen years at the time the act was committed, in that the defendant penetrated H.T.'s mouth with his penis, with the intent of arousing, appealing to, or gratifying the lust, passions, or sexual desires of himself or 228 East \(8^{\text {th }}\) Ave. Sun Valley, the child, at or near 3094 Court, Washoe County, Nevada.

COUNT VI. LEWDNESS WITH CHILD OLDER THAN 14, a violation of NRS 201.230.3, a category B felony, (58747) in the manner following, to wit:

That the said defendant, LUIGI RICHARD LOPEZ-DELGADO, between October 1, 2017 and December 13, 2017, within the County of Washoe, State of Nevada, did willfully, unlawfully and lewdly commit any lewd or lascivious act upon or with the body or any body part of H.T., a female child between the ages of fourteen and sixteen years at the time the act was committed, in that the defendant penetrated H.T.'s vagina with his penis, with the intent of arousing, appealing to, or gratifying the lust, passions, or sexual desires of himself or 228 East \(8^{\text {th }}\) Are. Sun Valley, the child, at or near 3094 Dust Coutt, Washoe County, Nevada.

COUNT VII. LURE OR ATTEMPT TO LURE A CHILD WITH THE USE OE COMPUTER TECHNOLOGY TO ENGAGE IN SEXUAL CONDUCT, a violation of NRS 201.560.4a, a category B felony, (51078) in the manner following, to wit:

That the said defendant LUIGI RICHARD LOPEZ-DELGADO, between October 1, 2017 and December 13, 2017, within the County of Washoe, State of Nevada, did willfully and unlawfully contact and/or communicate with a child, H.T., who was less than 16 years of age and who was at least 5 years younger than the defendant, with the intent to persuade, lure or transport the child away from the child's home or place where the child is located, without the express consent of the parent or guardian or other person legally responsible for the child; and with the intent to avoid the consent of the parent or guardian or other person legally responsible for the child; with the
intent to solicit, persuade or lure the person to engage in sexual conduct, to wit: the defendant contacted H.T., who was 14 at the time he was 24, through Facebook and lured her away from her legal guardian (s) in order to engage in sexual conduct at or near 3094 Eth Avenue, Sun Valley, Spark, Washoe County, Nevada.

COUNT VIII. ATTEMPTING TO PREVENT OR DISSUADE A WITNESS EROM TESTIFYING, a violation of NRS 199.230, a gross misdemeanor, (52983), in the manner following, to wit:

That the said defendant on or about the 26 th day of December, 2017, within the County of Washoe, State of Nevada, did willfully and unlawfully, by persuasion, force, threat, intimidation, deception or otherwise, and with the intent to obstruct the course of justice, attempt to prevent or dissuade another person from appearing before any court or evade the process which requires the person to appear as a witness to testify, to wit: the defendant wrote a postcard to H.T./Accuser that stated "I am asking for you guys to help me get these charges dismissed, my whole life and future is on the line. I have a daughter and was in the process of enrolling in the military but with these charges I wont be able to. This can ruin my life and future I am trying to set for my daughter and I. Can you please not show to court and not make up accusations anymore. Anything to help get this dismissed. Thank u" from 911 Parr Boulevard, Washoe County, Nevada.
///
/1/

\section*{AFFIRMATION PURSUANT TO NR 239B. 030}

The undersigned does hereby affirm that the preceding
document does not contain the social security number of any person.
```

DATED this 3/St day of January, 2017.

```


Dated this \(24^{\text {th }}\) day of September, 2018


CN: WASO0070047C; WASO0074509C-LOPEZ-DELGADO
District Court Dept:
Custody: X
District Attorney: JACKSON
Defense Attorney:
Bail
Restitution:

\title{
SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT COUNTY OF WASHOE, STATE OF NEVADA
}

\section*{AFFIRMATION \\ Pursuant to NRS 239B. 030}

The undersigned does hereby affirm that the preceding document, All pertinent information being sent to Second Judicial District Court for bindover proceedings
(Title of Document)
filed in case number: 17-SCR-02095
\(\boxed{\square}\) Document does not contain the social security number of any person -OR-

\(\square\)Document contains the social security number of a person as required by:
\(\square\) A specific state or federal law, to wit:
(State specific state or federal law)
-or-
\(\square\) For the administration of a public program
-or-
\(\square\) For an application for a federal or state grant
-or-

(Attorney for)

STATE OF NEVADA, \\ \title{
SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT \\ \title{
SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT STATE OF NEVADA STATE OF NEVADA IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF WASHOE
} IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF WASHOE
}

Plaintiff,
Case No. CR18-1654
Dept No. D3
LUIGY RICHARD LOPEZ-DELGADO
Defendant.

\section*{APPLICATION FOR SETTING}

TYPE OF ACTION:
MATTER TO BE HEARD:
DATE OF APPLICATION:
COUNSEL FOR DEFENDANT(S):
Criminal
Arraignment
9/25/2018
Jennifer Arias Mayhew, Esq.
Emilie Meyer, Esq.

Setting at 09:00:00 on 10/11/2018

\section*{Recipients}

JENNIFER - Notification received on 2018-09-25 09:05:52.16.
MAYHEW, ESQ.
EMILIE MEYER, - Notification received on 2018-09-25 09:05:52.113. ESQ.
DIV. OF PAROLE \& - Notification received on 2018-09-25 09:05:52.191.

PROBATION
NICKOLAS - Notification received on 2018-09-25 09:05:51.77.
GRAHAM, ESQ.

\title{
****** IMPORTANT NOTICE - READ THIS INFORMATION ***** PROOF OF SERVICE OF ELECTRONIC FILING
}

A filing has been submitted to the court RE: CR18-1654

\begin{abstract}
Judge:
\end{abstract}

HONORABLE JEROME M. POLAHA

\section*{Official File Stamp:}

Clerk Accepted:
Court:

Case Title:
Document(s) Submitted:
Filed By:

09-25-2018:09:04:22
09-25-2018:09:05:16
Second Judicial District Court - State of Nevada Criminal

STATE VS LUIGY RICHARD LOPEZ (D3)
Application for Setting - eFile
Deputy Clerk RRodriguez

You may review this filing by clicking on the following link to take you to your cases.
This notice was automatically generated by the courts auto-notification system.

If service is not required for this document (e.g., Minutes), please disregard the below language.
The following people were served electronically:
JENNIFER ARIAS MAYHEW, ESQ. for LUIGY
RICHARD LOPEZ-DELGADO
NICKOLAS J. GRAHAM, ESQ. for STATE OF NEVADA

EMILIE MEYER, ESQ. for LUIGY RICHARD LOPEZ-DELGADO
DIV. OF PAROLE \& PROBATION

The following people have not been served electronically and must be served by traditional means (see Nevada Electronic Filing Rules.):

WASHOE COUNTY PUBLIC DEFENDER JAY SLOCUM, \#9909
P.O. BOX 11130

RENO, NV 89520-0027
(775) 337-4823

ATTORNEY FOR: DEFENDANT

IN THE SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF WASHOE

THE STATE OF NEVADA, Plaintiff,
vs.
LUIGI RICHARD LOPEZ-DELGADO, Defendant.

Case No. CR18-1654
Dept. No. 3
/

\section*{SUBSTITUTION OF COUNSEL WITHIN PUBLIC DEFENDER'S OFFICE}

JAY SLOCUM and LYNN BRANZELL, Deputy Public Defenders, hereby substitutes in as the Deputy Public Defender handling the above-entitled matter on behalf of the Defendant in place of EMILIE MEYER and JENNIFER MAYHEW, Deputy Public Defenders. This Substitution of Counsel is being made to comply with the requirements of District Court Rule 23 and to assure that we will receive proper e-filing notifications in this case.

\section*{AFFIRMATION PURSUANT TO NRS 239B. 030}

The undersigned does hereby affirm that the preceding document does not contain the social security number of any person.

Dated this 25th day of September, 2018.
JOHN L. ARRASCADA
Washoe County Public Defender
By__/s/JAY SLOCUM
JAY SLOCUM
Deputy Public Defender

\section*{CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE}

I hereby certify that I am an employee of the Washoe County Public Defender's Office, Reno, Washoe County, Nevada; that on this 25th day of September, 2018, I electronically filed the foregoing documents with the Clerk of the Court by using the ECF system which will send a notice of electronic filing to the following:

DEPUTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY
/s/ Wendy Lucero
WENDY LUCERO
```
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ESQ.
DIV. OF PAROLE \& - Notification received on 2018-09-25 11:42:21.314.
PROBATION
NICKOLAS - Notification received on 2018-09-25 11:42:21.22.
GRAHAM, ESQ.

```
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EMILIE MEYER, ESQ. for LUIGY RICHARD LOPEZ-DELGADO
DIV. OF PAROLE \& PROBATION

The following people have not been served electronically and must be served by traditional means (see Nevada Electronic Filing Rules.):

\section*{Recipients}

JAY SLOCUM, ESQ. - Notification received on 2018-09-25 11:51:02.981.
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A filing has been submitted to the court RE: CR18-1654
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Judge:
\end{abstract}

HONORABLE JEROME M. POLAHA

\section*{Official File Stamp: \\ 09-25-2018:09:39:00}
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CODE 1800
Christopher J. Hicks
\#7747
P.O. Box 11130

Reno, NV 89520
(775) 328-3200

IN THE SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA, IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF WASHOE

THE STATE OF NEVADA,

> Plaintiff,
V.

Case No.: CR18-1654
Dept. No.: DO3
LUIGI RICHARD LOPEZ-DELGADO, also known as
LUIGY RICHARD LOPEZ,
also known as
LUIGI LOPEZ,
Defendant.

\section*{INFORMATION}

CHRISTOPHER J. HICKS, District Attorney within and for the County of Washoe, State of Nevada, in the name and by the authority of the state of Nevada, informs the above entitled Court that LUIGI RICHARD LOPEZ-DELGADO, also known as LUIGY RICHARD LOPEZ, also known as LUIGI LOPEZ, the defendant above-named, has committed the crimes of:
/ / /
/ / /
/ / /

COUNT I. STATUTORY SEXUAL SEDUCTION BY PERSON AGE 21 OR OLDER, a violation of NRS 200.368.1, a category B felony, (60323) in the manner following:

That the said defendant LUIGI RICHARD LOPEZ-DELGADO, on or between October 1, 2017 and December 13, 2017, within the County of Washoe, State of Nevada, did willfully and unlawfully, being over 21 years of age, commit an act of statutory sexual seduction with the person of H.T., who was then and there under the age of 16 years, in that the said defendant engaged in an act of oral sexual intercourse with the said H.T. at or near 228 East 8th Ave., Sun Valley, Washoe County, Nevada.

COUNT II. STATUTORY SEXUAL SEDUCTION BY PERSON AGE 21 OR OLDER, a violation of NRS 200.368.1, a category B felony, (60323) in the manner following:

That the said defendant LUIGI RICHARD LOPEZ-DELGADO, on or between October 1, 2017 and December 13, 2017, within the County of Washoe, State of Nevada, did willfully and unlawfully, being over 21 years of age, commit an act of statutory sexual seduction with the person of \(H . T .\), who was then and there under the age of 16 years, in that the said defendant engaged in an act of vaginal sexual intercourse with the said H.T. at or near 228 East \(8^{\text {th }}\) Ave., Sun Valley, Washoe County, Nevada.

COUNT III. USE OR PERMIT MINOR, UNDER AGE 18, TO PRODUCE PORNOGRAPHY, a violation of NRS 200.710.1, a category A felony, (50368) in the manner following:

That the said defendant LUIGI RICHARD LOPEZ-DELGADO, on or between October 1, 2017 and December 13, 2017, within the County of Washoe, State of Nevada, did willfully and unlawfully, use or permit a minor child of approximately 14 years of age to engage in sexual conduct to produce a performance and/or pornography, in that the defendant did have H.T. produce nude photographs of herself, at his suggestion and had her send them to him.

COUNT IV. POSSESS VISUAL PORNOGRAPHY OF PERSON UNDER AGE 16, FIRST OFFENSE, a violation of NRS 200.730.1, a category B felony, (50374) in the manner following:

That the said defendant LUIGI RICHARD LOPEZ-DELGADO, between October 1, 2017 and December 13, 2017, within the County of Washoe, State of Nevada, did knowingly, willfully and unlawfully have in his possession for any purpose film, photograph or other visual presentation depicting a person under 16 year as the subject of a sexual portrayal or engaging in or simulating, or assisting others to engage in or simulate, sexual conduct, in that the defendant possessed nude photographs of \(H . T .\), who was under the age of 18 at the time the photograph was taken, 228 East \(8^{\text {th }}\) Ave., Sun Valley, Washoe County, Nevada.

COUNT V. LEWDNESS WITH CHILD OLDER THAN 14, a violation of NRS 201.230.3, a category B felony, (58747) in the manner following:

That the said defendant LUIGI RICHARD LOPEZ-DELGADO, between October 1, 2017 and December 13, 2017, within the County of Washoe, State of Nevada, did willfully, unlawfully and lewdly commit any lewd or lascivious act upon or with the body or any body part of H.T., a female child between the ages of fourteen and sixteen years at the time the act was committed, in that the defendant penetrated H.T.'s mouth with his penis, with the intent of arousing, appealing to, or gratifying the lust, passions, or sexual desires of himself or the child, at or near 228 East \(8^{\text {th }}\) Ave., Sun Valley, Washoe County, Nevada.

COUNT VI. LEWDNESS WITH CHILD OLDER THAN 14, a violation of NRS 201.230.3, a category B felony, (58747) in the manner following:

That the said defendant LUIGI RICHARD LOPEZ-DELGADO, between October 1, 2017 and December 13, 2017, within the County of Washoe, State of Nevada, did willfully, unlawfully and lewdly commit any lewd or lascivious act upon or with the body or any body part of H.T., a female child between the ages of fourteen and sixteen years at the time the act was committed, in that the defendant penetrated H.T.'s vagina with his penis, with the intent of arousing, appealing to, or gratifying the lust, passions, or sexual desires of himself or the child, at or near 228 East 8th Ave., Sun Valley, Washoe County, Nevada. COMPUTER TECHNOLOGY TO ENGAGE IN SEXUAL CONDUCT, a violation of NRS 201.560.4a, a category \(B\) felony, (51078) in the manner following:

That the said defendant LUIGI RICHARD LOPEZ-DELGADO, between October 1, 2017 and December 13, 2017, within the County of Washoe, State of Nevada, did willfully and unlawfully contact and/or communicate with a child, H.T., who was less than 16 years of age and who was at least 5 years younger than the defendant, with the intent to persuade, lure or transport the child away from the child's home or place where the child is located, without the express consent of the parent or guardian or other person legally responsible for the child; and with the intent to avoid the consent of the parent or guardian or other person legally responsible for the child; with the intent to solicit, persuade or lure the person to engage in sexual conduct, to wit: the defendant contacted H.T., who was 14 at the time he was 24, through Facebook and lured her away from her legal guardian(s) in order to engage in sexual conduct at or near 228 East 8th Ave., Sun Valley, Sparks, Washoe County, Nevada.

COUNT VIII. ATTEMPTING TO PREVENT OR DISSUADE A WITNESS
FROM TESTIFYING, a violation of NRS 199.230, a gross misdemeanor,
(52983), in the manner following:

That the said defendant on or about the 26 th day of December, 2017, within the County of Washoe, State of Nevada, did willfully and unlawfully, by persuasion, force, threat, intimidation, deception or otherwise, and with the intent to obstruct the course of justice, attempt to prevent or dissuade another person from appearing
before any court or evade the process which requires the person to appear as a witness to testify, to wit: the defendant wrote a postcard to H.T./Accuser that stated "I am asking for you guys to help me get these charges dismissed, my whole life and future is on the line. I have a daughter and was in the process of enrolling in the military but with these charges \(I\) wont be able to. This can ruin my life and future I am trying to set for my daughter and I. Can you please not show to court and not make up accusations anymore. Anything to help get this dismissed. Thank u" from 911 Parr Boulevard, Washoe County, Nevada.

All of which is contrary to the form of the Statute in such case made and provided, and against the peace and dignity of the State of Nevada.

CHRISTOPHER J. HICKS
District Attorney Washoe County, Nevada

By: \(\frac{/ \text { s } / \text { Nickolas J. Graham }}{\text { NICKOLAS J. GRAHAM }}\) 10885 DEPUTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY

The following are the names and addresses of such witnesses as are known to me at the time of the filing of the within Information:

WILLIAM BRIAN ATKINSON, WASHOE COUNTY SHERIFFS OFFICE, WCSO SPECIAL OPS 911 PARR BLVD RENO, NV 89512
DENNIS CARRY, WASHOE COUNTY SHERIFFS OFFICE, WCSO DETECTIVES 911 PARR BLVD Reno, NV 89512
ARICK DICKSON, WASHOE COUNTY SHERIFFS OFFICE, WCSO SPECIAL OPS 911 PARR BLVD RENO, NV 89512
MICHAEL IVERS, WASHOE COUNTY SHERIFFS OFFICE, WCCL 911 PARR BLVD Reno, NV 89512
EMMETT FLOREZ,
BRITTNEY ANN CHILTON, WCCL 911 PARR BLVD Reno, NV 89512 JANENE TRUJILLO, 7562 Ulysses Drive Sparks, NV 89436

AFFIRMATION PURSUANT TO NRS 239B. 030
The party executing this document hereby affirms that this document submitted for recording does not contain the social security number of any person or persons pursuant to NRS 239B.030.

CHRISTOPHER J. HICKS
District Attorney Washoe County, Nevada

By:_/s/ Nickolas J. Graham
NICKOLAS J. GRAHAM 10885
DEPUTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY

PCN: WASOOO70047C, WASO0074509C-LOPEZ-DELGADO

CODE 3870
Christopher J. Hicks
\#7747
P.O. Box 11130

Reno, NV 89520
(775) 328-3200

IN THE SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA, IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF WASHOE

THE STATE OF NEVADA,

Plaintiff,
v.

LUIGI RICHARD LOPEZ-DELGADO, also known as LUIGY RICHARD LOPEZ, also known as LUIGI LOPEZ,

Defendant
\(\qquad\)

Case No: CR18-1654
Dept: D03
\(\qquad\)
REQUEST FOR DISCOVERY PURSUANT TO NRS 174.245
The State hereby requests notice and disclosure of evidence relating to the defense in the above-entitled case pursuant to NRS 174.245, including any:
(a) Written or recorded statements made by a witness the defendant intends to call during the case in chief of the defendant, or copies thereof, within the possession, custody or control of the defendant, the existence of which is known, or by the exercise of due diligence may become known, to the defendant;
(b) Results or reports of physical or mental examinations, scientific tests or scientific experiments that the defendant intends to introduce in evidence during the case in chief of the defendant, or copies thereof, within the possession, custody or control of the defendant, the existence of which is known, or by the exercise of due diligence may become known, to the defendant; and
(c) Books, papers, documents or tangible objects that the defendant intends to introduce in evidence during the case in chief of the defendant, or copies thereof, within the possession, custody or control of the defendant, the existence of which is known, or by the exercise of due diligence may become known, to the defendant.

AFFIRMATION PURSUANT TO NRS 239B. 030
The undersigned does hereby affirm that the preceding document does not contain the social security number of any person. Dated this 26th day of September, 2018.

\author{
CHRISTOPHER J. HICKS \\ District Attorney Washoe County, Nevada
}

\author{
By_/s/ Nickolas J. Graham___ \\ NICKOLAS J. GRAHAM \\ 10885 \\ DEPUTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY
}

Pursuant to NRCP 5(b), I certify that I am an employee of the Washoe County District Attorney's Office and that, on this date, I electronically filed the foregoing with the Clerk of the Court. A notice will be sent electronically to the following:

PUBLIC DEFENDER
JAMES "JAY" G SLOCUM, ESQ.
LYNN BRANZELL, ESQ.

Dated this 26th day of September, 2018
\[
\frac{\text { /s/CELINA GONZALEZ-VALENZUELA }}{\text { CELINA GONZALEZ-VALENZUELA }}
\]

\section*{Recipients}

JAY SLOCUM, ESQ. - Notification received on 2018-09-26 09:55:33.092.
LYNN BRANZELL, - Notification received on 2018-09-26 09:55:33.123. ESQ.
DIV. OF PAROLE \& - Notification received on 2018-09-26 09:55:33.154. PROBATION

NICKOLAS - Notification received on 2018-09-26 09:55:33.076. GRAHAM, ESQ.
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THE COURT: All right, are you Luigi Richard
Lopez-Delgado?
THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.
THE COURT: All right. We're here on
17-SCR-02095, the State of Nevada versus Luigi Richard Lopez-Delgado. Mr. Slocum is here for the --

Mr. Delgado, who's present in the courtroom today.
Mr. Graham is here for the state.
And are we ready to proceed?
MR. GRAHAM: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: How many witnesses?
MR. GRAHAM: Your Honor, I have five witnesses today.

THE COURT: Okay. And my plan is we'll go until lunch. We'll break for lunch and come back, and we'll continue on until the prelim is concluded.

MR. GRAHAM: Sounds good, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay.
MR. GRAHAM: One thing I did want to put on the record is there was a --

THE COURT: I was going to ask, was there an offer made in this case?

MR. GRAHAM: There was, Your Honor.
Mr. Slocum and I have gone back and forth numerous times regarding this case.

THE COURT: Uh-huh.
MR. GRAHAM: The offer today that's going to expire as soon as we start this preliminary hearing is the Defendant was offered to plead guilty to one count of stat sex by person age 21 or older. That is a category \(B\) felony punishable by 1 to 10 in prison. And also plead guilty to Count 5 , which is lewdness with a child older than 14. It's also a cat \(B, 1\) to \(10 . \quad\) If you'll notice, I'll be dismissing several of the charges, and most importantly, I'll be dismissing the charge of use or permit minor under age 18 to produce pornography. That's a category A felony, and that's 5 to life. That's the prison sentence on that case.

The negotiations would be that \(I\) would be free to argue, but \(I\) would have no objection to concurrent treatment. The life --

THE COURT: So the sentences running concurrent, you mean?

MR. GRAHAM: The sentences would -- I have no objection to them running concurrent. That reduces his liability significantly down to approximately 4 to 10 years if he were to be maxed out. It's my understanding that that offer has been conveyed and rejected by Mr. Delgado. I just wanted to put that on the record so he can't come back and say he wants that deal that -- my
understanding it's been fully explained to him, and he understands what he's missing out on.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, Mr. Slocum.
MR. SLOCUM: Your Honor, that is correct. I will note for the record it is now ten minutes before 11:00. Mr. Graham and I, again, repeatedly spoke about the offer in this case. We spoke early this morning. I arrived about 9:30, began speaking with Mr. Delgado about the possibility of taking the offer. We talked about a number of different things, to include the fact that if he decided to waive the preliminary hearing, to take the offer today and then he changed his mind, that he would be able to plead not guilty at the District Court and set the matter for trial if he decided later that that was what he wanted to do.

And, of course, the original charges would come back, but he would have some opportunity to talk about and think about the offer should he want to do that, and then \(I\) would be more than happy to go up and spend even more time with him than what \(I\) already have with him. My understanding is he desires not to even waive the preliminary hearing today. He would like to have the preliminary hearing. We discussed what that's going to involve.

THE COURT: Uh-huh.

MR. SLOCUM: Additionally, Your Honor, I received an inquiry that Mr. Lopez-Delgado had submitted, it looks like, to the Court. It was sent to me. I talked Mr. Graham, and he said he didn't receive that, but \(I\) want to make sure we're on the same page about that because there are -- there are some things that were concerning to me in that letter, but \(I\) don't know how the Court wants to approach that.

THE COURT: Let me see, I have an inmate request that was submitted on \(8 / 16 / 2018\). Is that what you're referring to?

MR. SLOCUM: I have one that was on August 14th, 2018.

THE COURT: I'll print this out. I don't have a 14th one.

MR. SLOCUM: Okay.
THE COURT: Do you have a 14 th one in your notes?

THE CLERK: I don't, Judge.
THE COURT: Like I said, I have this one. I'm going to hand it to you. Hand that to Mr. Slocum.

MR. SLOCUM: Okay, and you will note, Your Honor, that at the top here, it's August 14 th, 2018.

THE COURT: Oh, I see that. I was looking at the last assigned to line.

MR. SLOCUM: Right.
THE COURT: So it's the same.
MR. SLOCUM: Right, and then it was forwarded
to us, but this is part of the Court's record, correct?
THE COURT: It is, yes.
MR. SLOCUM: So, in that case, Your Honor, I
believe we need to address these issues with
Mr. Lopez-Delgado.
THE COURT: Okay. Do we want to do that outside the presence of --

MR. SLOCUM: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: All right. Ladies and gentlemen, I'm going to ask everybody to step outside. I'm going to close the hearing for a portion of it. I'm going to ask the Prosecutor to, as well --

MR. GRAHAM: Yes.
THE COURT: -- to step outside. And then once we've addressed this, we'll bring everybody back in.

THE CLERK: Pause this?
THE COURT: Not yet.
All right, Mr. Slocum, I'm going to seal the portion coming up here.

MR. SLOCUM: Thank you.
THE COURT: It will still -- there will still
be a record of it, but it will be sealed that nobody can have access to it --

MR. SLOCUM: Thank you.
THE COURT: -- unless you have a court order.
Then you can always come back and look at what was stated here. So we're going to seal it from this part forward, but keep the tape going, okay. So it's sealed.
(Whereupon, closed hearing held with The Court, Mr. Slocum, and the Defendant, transcript sealed)

THE COURT: We're back on the record in
17-SCR-02095, and this portion of the record forward is not sealed. All right, let's get everybody back in.

Okay. Are they coming?
THE BAILIFF: Yes.
THE COURT: Okay. All right, are we ready to proceed?

MR. GRAHAM: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Mr. Slocum.
MR. SLOCUM: If I can just have a moment, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Oh, certainly.
(Whereupon, Mr. Slocum and the Defendant
confer)
THE COURT: Was there an amended filed in this case?

> MR. GRAHAM: I think there's a second amended.

THE COURT: Could you print that out for me, please.
(Whereupon, The Court and the Clerk confer) THE COURT: It's time.

Mr. Slocum, the rule of exclusion? You've got to make up your mind.

THE DEFENDANT: I don't know how sure --
THE COURT: Well, then we're going to move forward.

Rule of exclusion, Mr. Slocum?
MR. SLOCUM: Rule of exclusion, Your Honor.
THE COURT: All right. Ladies and gentlemen, if you're a witness in this case, the rule of exclusion has been invoked. What that means is you may not speak to anybody about this case, nor may you speak to any witness who's testified about what they testified to or what they're going to testify to until this proceeding is concluded. You may, of course, speak to either attorney about your testimony or proposed testimony but no one else.

And who is your first witness? And I ask all your witnesses to remain outside.

MR. GRAHAM: It's -- I'm sorry.

MR. SLOCUM: Your Honor, if I may --
THE COURT: Uh-huh.
MR. SLOCUM: -- part of our discussion when it was just the Court and the Defense was regarding the possibility that Mr. Lopez-Delgado could waive the prelim and that would preserve the offer.

THE COURT: Yeah, he can keep the offer. He can always do that.

MR. SLOCUM: Right, but the offer itself was going to expire if we do the --

THE COURT: Yeah, once we call one of those folks in there, then it's over.

MR. SLOCUM: Correct. And so --
THE COURT: My understanding from what -well, you told me.

MR. GRAHAM: Yeah. No, that's correct.
MR. SLOCUM: That's correct. And so Mr. Graham and \(I\) were just talking about that as a possibility, and if he can put that on the record that we were all very clear about that being an option in the case. Again, Mr. Lopez-Delgado is not sure what he wants to do, but that would allow him to --

THE COURT: He's had plenty of time since January to figure it out.

MR. SLOCUM: Correct, although in all
fairness, Your Honor, this latest iteration of what the offer is --

THE COURT: Oh, okay, I don't know the machinations going on behind the scenes.

MR. SLOCUM: Right. So -- right. So we have talked about a number of different possibilities, but that particular offer came this morning, not for, frankly, any lack of diligence. Both of us have been working on it. I was in trial last week, and for whatever reason, we were only able to get that morning. With that being said, I've presented that to Mr. Lopez-Delgado to try to give him a little bit more time because the Court's, obviously, got a time --

THE COURT: Yes, we've got to move.
MR. SLOCUM: -- set for this prelim.
And, again, Mr. Lopez-Delgado is a little unsure what he wants to do, but...

THE COURT: Well, if he wants to preserve it, then he waive it and then decide in District court. If you don't want to preserve it, the option, then we go. The folks have been waiting long enough, so. It's your decision to make.

THE DEFENDANT: I'll go.
THE COURT: All right. Let's have the prelim.

MR. SLOCUM: Okay.
THE COURT: All right, who's your first witness?

MR. GRAHAM: It's going to be Alexis Auckenthaler. And, Your Honor, her testimony and the evidence is going to be about an hour. So with the Court's permission, I was going to let my other witnesses go and then come back after lunch.

THE COURT: Yeah, if you think she's going to take an hour because we're going to break at noon -MR. GRAHAM: Right.

THE COURT: -- and then come back at 1:30 and continue on.

MR. GRAHAM: Okay.
THE COURT: All right. I'd ask the other witnesses to remain outside and come back at 1:30. How's that? Be back at 1:30 to continue the preliminary hearing. We need this Alexis.

MS. AUCKENTHALER: (Indiscernible)
THE COURT: Yes, up here if you would.
MR. GRAHAM: For the record, that offer is now expired for Mr. Lopez-Delgado.

THE COURT: I think we figured that out.
Ma'am, if you'd come up and face me, raise your right hand. Do you swear to tell the truth, the
whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God? MS. AUCKENTHALER: Yes.

THE COURT: Have a seat right there if you would.

THE WITNESS: Thank you.
THE COURT: Now, in front of you is a
microphone. It records everything you say, and I need you to -- as soon as you've made yourself comfortable and sit back, if you would, and pull that chair all the way up. All right, I need you to state your name and spell your last name for the record.

THE WITNESS: Alexis Auckenthaler. My last name is spelled A-U-C-K-E-N-T-H-A-L-E-R.

MR. GRAHAM: Thank you.
Alexis Auckenthaler
(Sworn as a witness, testified as follows)
DIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MR. GRAHAM:
Q. Ms. Auckenthaler, how are you employed?
A. I'm employed as a forensic interviewer through the Child Advocacy Center.
Q. And how long have you been with the Child Advocacy Center?
A. Since October of 2016.
Q. As a forensic interviewer, what are your job duties?
A. I interview children who have been alleged victims of abuse.
Q. Do you have to have any education or training, which enables you to do that job?
A. Yes.
Q. And what is that?
A. I have a bachelor's and a master's degree in social work, and \(I\) have attended specific trainings through CornerHouse, which is the nationally-recognized forensic interview protocol.
Q. Approximately, how many forensic interviews have you conducted?
A. About 730 .
Q. When you conduct a forensic interview, what's the first thing that you do?
A. The very first thing is \(I\) meet with the multidisciplinary team in a pre-interview staffing. Q. And who's part of that multidisciplinary team? A. It's whoever's involved in the case. So that would be law enforcement, potentially Child Protective Services, if they were involved. We will have a prosecutor, potentially, if they're available, a victim advocate is usually present during that meeting, and medical staff if that's necessary, and, of course, myself.
Q. What's the purpose of that -- that pre-interview team meeting?
A. It's really for the team to meet together and discuss the allegations. It's really helpful for me before \(I\) go into an interview with the child to understand what the dynamics of the case are so far and really what the allegations are and what the child has already talked about.
Q. And where does that pre-interview team meeting take place?
A. That occurs at the Child Advocacy Center. We have an observation room where the multidisciplinary team meets, and that's where the pre-staffing also occurs. Q. After that meeting, what's the next step of the forensic interview?
A. So after that meeting, I go to the lobby, and I introduce myself to the child, and then \(I\) bring the child back to the interview room.
Q. And I think you already discussed it a little bit, but where is the person interviewed?
A. At the Child Advocacy Center in a child-friendly environment in one of our three interview rooms that we have there.
Q. And is there a way that these conversations or these interviews can be recorded?
A. Yes, we have video and audio recording. So there's two cameras that are in the room that capture different angles of the child in the interview.
Q. Is there anybody else in the room while you're conducting the interview?
A. The only people in the room is myself and the child.
Q. Is anyone able to watch the interview while it's going on?
A. Yes. So the multidisciplinary team, who \(I\) mentioned, they are in the observation room, and they're able to observe the interview from a monitor in that observation room.
Q. Is it a live stream?
A. Yes.
Q. So they can hear the questions as you ask them and see the responses, as well as hear the responses?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. And what are the first things you do once the forensic interview is started?
A. The first thing that \(I\) do is develop rapport with the child. Through developing rapport, that's the first stage of the Cornerhouse protocol. And within that stage, I'm orienting the child to the interview room, helping them understand what the conversation would look like as the conversation continues, and I'm also just
kind of getting an understanding how the child is going to respond to questions \(I\) ask and how -- and \(I\) also provide that opportunity for the child to understand how I'm going to ask questions throughout the rest of the interview.
Q. During that initial stage, is part of your responsibility to determine the child's verbal skills? A. Yes.
Q. And kind of -- are you at that same time assessing maybe their mental age or trying to determine how they communicate and whether they can communicate?
A. Yes, absolutely.
Q. During the interview, what type of -- are the questions you ask leading in any way?
A. No.
Q. What kind of questions do you ask?
A. I ask -- I start with the most open-ended questions possible and then -- basically, I use a funnel technique. And so if the open-ended questions -- if there are still details that may be really important for an investigation, then \(I\) can narrow my questions down to more specific and just -- yeah.
Q. I'd like to draw your attention to Monday, December 11 th, 2017, in the - \(1: 30\) in the afternoon.

Were you working that day?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you have the opportunity to interview a person for the purposes of this hearing that we're going to refer to as Haley (phonetic)?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. Do you recall when Haley was born? Do you recall her birthday?
A. January 6th, 2003.
Q. Okay. And so that would have made her 14 years old at the date of the interview?
A. Yes.
Q. And during your interview of Haley, did you follow the same protocol that you've outlined for the court?
A. Yes.
Q. All right.

MR. GRAHAM: If I may approach?
THE COURT: Go ahead.
BY MR. GRAHAM:
Q. Showing you what's -- well, actually -- showing you what's been marked as State's proposed Exhibit 1, do you recognize this disc?
A. Yes.
Q. Is that the recording of the interview that you conducted with Haley?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. And you watched it afterwards and verified that it's actually the recording you conducted? A. Yes.

MR. GRAHAM: All right, Your Honor --
THE COURT: what exhibit number?
MR. GRAHAM: 1 .
THE COURT: Okay, go ahead.
MR. GRAHAM: Your Honor, at this time, I'd move for admission and publication of State's Exhibit 1.

MR. SLOCUM: No objection for the purposes of this hearing.

THE COURT: Exhibit 1 is admitted.
(Whereupon, Plaintiff's Exhibit 1 admitted)
MR. GRAHAM: Thank you.
THE COURT: Are you requesting permission to
publish?
MR. GRAHAM: Admit and publish, yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay, permission granted.
MR. GRAHAM: Thank you.
(Whereupon, Plaintiff's Exhibit 1 played)
MR. GRAHAM: Before we go into this, I'm pausing it at about 12 seconds there.

BY MR. GRAHAM:
Q. Do you recognize yourself in this video?
A. Yes.
Q. Can you identify yourself?
A. Looking at the screen, I'm the person on the left-hand side.
Q. And do you see Haley in this screen?
A. Yes, she's sitting in the chair on the right-hand side of the screen.
Q. Can you articulate an article of clothing that she's wearing?
A. I apologize, I have really bad vision, but it looks like she's wearing a red shirt.
Q. All right, thank you.

MR. GRAHAM: Then just -- Your Honor, I
wanted to let the Court know, usually I jump around, and I'll play certain portions, but for this interview, I'm going to be playing the majority of it. For the record, starting it at 12 seconds.

THE COURT: All right, go ahead.
(Whereupon, Plaintiff's Exhibit 1 continued to play)

THE COURT: Well, let's take a break now for lunch. So we can pause it. What time do you have on there?

MR. GRAHAM: 43 minutes, 13 seconds.
THE COURT: And we'll come back at 1:30 and
pick up where we left off. All right.
MR. GRAHAM: Thank you, Your Honor.
THE COURT: And I'll remind you the admonition. So you can't talk to anybody, okay.

THE WITNESS: Uh-huh.
THE COURT: Other than the two attorneys.
THE WITNESS: Okay.
THE COURT: All right. We'll see everybody back at 1:30.

MR. GRAHAM: Thank you.
(Whereupon, court recessed)
THE COURT: We're back on the record in 17-SCR-02095, State of Nevada versus Luigi Richard Lopez-Delgado. The State's presented the Court with a Third Amended Criminal Complaint. I'm having the Prosecutor sign the copy, sign and date it, and then he'll submit it to my clerk. We'll scan it in one more time. We'll get some copies, arraign, Mr. Delgado on it, and then we can proceed.

As soon as she scans that in, we'll hand you this one. How's that?

MR. SLOCUM: That's fine, Your Honor, thank you.

THE COURT: All right. Have you received a copy of the Third Amended Criminal Complaint,

Mr. Slocum?
MR. SLOCUM: Thank you, Your Honor. We have received it. Mr. Lopez-Delgado indicates to me his true and correct name is set forth at line 7. We're going to waive a formal reading of the amended criminal complaint.

THE COURT: All right.
THE CLERK: It didn't scan -- oh, now --
THE COURT: Did it?
THE CLERK: Yes, we're good.
THE COURT: Good. Let me make sure we have one copy for each counsel, and then we'll proceed. All right, and while she's doing that, any objection to proceeding at the prelim?

MR. SLOCUM: Not at all, Your Honor, thank you.

THE COURT: Okay. We've already arraigned him on it, so. All right, all parties are present. And do we have Alexis Auckenthaler? Did \(I\) butcher that name?

THE WITNESS: No, that was perfect.
THE COURT: All right, come on up, ma'am, to continue with the proceeding. And as soon as we get these printed up, I'll have my Bailiff hand them to you gentlemen.

MR. GRAHAM: Thank you.
THE COURT: All right. Ma'am, I'll remind you you're still under oath.

THE WITNESS: Okay.
THE COURT: And just have a seat and make yourself comfortable and --

THE WITNESS: Thank you.
THE COURT: All right, counsel continue.
MR. GRAHAM: Thank you. For the record, we stopped at 43 minutes, 13 seconds in the forensic interview. I'm going to just click play to continue at that same time.
(Whereupon, Plaintiff's Exhibit 1 continued to play)

MR. GRAHAM: For the record, I had to rewind it just a little bit to about 43 minutes, 10 seconds.

THE COURT: Okay.
(Whereupon, Plaintiff's Exhibit 1 continued to play)

THE COURT: Okay, I didn't hear her answer.
MR. GRAHAM: I'll rewind it. Rewinding to about 45 minutes, 30 seconds.
(Whereupon, Plaintiff's Exhibit 1 continued to play)

MR. GRAHAM: Your Honor, at this point, I'm
stopping the video at 47 minutes, 51 seconds, and \(I^{\prime} m\) going to fast-forward it to 53 minutes and 34 seconds. THE COURT: Go ahead.

MR. GRAHAM: Thank you. So starting -- I couldn't get 34 , but 53 minutes, 32 seconds.
(Whereupon, Plaintiff's Exhibit 1 continued to play)

THE COURT: I couldn't hear that, say -sorry.

MR. GRAHAM: Why don't I just rewind it about ten seconds, starting it at 54 minutes, 5 seconds.
(Whereupon, Plaintiff's Exhibit 1 continued to play)

MR. GRAHAM: I'm sorry, back it up again, 53 minutes, 44 seconds.
(Whereupon, Plaintiff's Exhibit 1 continued to play)

MR. GRAHAM: Your Honor, if \(I\) could, it's kind of --

THE COURT: It's coming in broken, yeah --
MR. GRAHAM: I'm going to back it up a little bit.

THE COURT: -- and garbled.
MR. GRAHAM: I'm backing it up to one hour

53 seconds.
(Whereupon, Plaintiff's Exhibit 1 continued to play)

MR. GRAHAM: Your Honor, I'm stopping the video at one hour, one minute, and 38 seconds. I have no further questions for Ms. Auckenthaler.

MR. SLOCUM: No questions, Your Honor.
THE COURT: No questions from the Defense?
MR. SLOCUM: No.
THE COURT: Okay. May this witness be excused, gentlemen?

MR. SLOCUM: Yes.
THE COURT: Ma'am, you may go about your day.
MS. AUCKENTHALER: Thank you.
THE COURT: Your next witness.
MR. GRAHAM: The next witness is -- the State calls Mike Ivers.

THE COURT: Sir, if you'd please face me and raise your right hand. Do you swear to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

MR. IVERS: Yes, I do, sir.
THE COURT: Please have a seat right there. Once you've made yourself comfortable, if you would, pull that chair all the way up. And in front of you is a microphone. It's recording everything you say. Would
you please state your name and spell your last name for the record.

MR. IVERS: It's Michael Ivers, I-V-E-R-S.
THE COURT: Counsel.
MR. GRAHAM: Thank you.
MICHAEL IVERS
(Sworn as a witness, testified as follows)
DIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MR. GRAHAM:
Q. Is it detective or deputy?
A. Deputy.
Q. Deputy. Deputy Ivers, how are you employed?
A. I'm a forensic investigator with the Washoe County Sheriff's Office Crime Lab.
Q. How long have you been with the washoe County Sheriff's Office?
A. I was hired in 1996.
Q. And how long have you been with the Forensic Division?
A. I've worked crime scene investigation since 1999 and then as a full-time assignment from 2009 to current.
Q. To present, all right. As a crime scene investigator, are you routinely tasked to take forensic photos?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. Are you aware of a case involving a defendant by the name of Lopez Luigi Delgado [sic]?
A. Yes.
Q. Excuse me, Luigi Richard Lopez-Delgado?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. I'd like to draw your attention to January \(23 r d\), 2018 .

Were you on duty that day?
A. I was.
Q. During that time, were you asked to take some pictures of a beige Ford 1986 Econoline Windjammer motorhome?
A. Yes, I was.
Q. All right. And where did you take those photos?
A. The Washoe County Sheriff's Office impound lot.
Q. All right. Are you aware of how that -- that RV got
to the Washoe County impound lot?
A. I don't have direct knowledge of that.
Q. All right. Who tasked you with taking photos?
A. Detective Arick Dickson.
Q. All right. And is he the case agent on this case?
A. He is.
Q. All right. And what did he ask you to do?
A. He asked for overall photographs, inside and outside of the motorhome, photographs of the general layout, the
features inside the motorhome, the kitchen, dining area, bedroom area, and the bathroom, and collect specific items of evidence inside the motorhome.
Q. During your examination and taking the photographs of the RV, did there come a time when you used something called an ALS or alternative light source?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. And what is that?
A. An alternate light source is a light source that emits light in different bandwidths of light. So specifically, \(I\) was using a light source with 420 to 470 nanometers. We use that as a screening tool to find biological material.
Q. What kind of biological material were you looking for in this case?
A. Specifically semen, saliva, or vaginal secretions. Q. Okay.

MR. GRAHAM: May I approach?
THE COURT: Yes.
BY MR. GRAHAM:
Q. I'm showing you what's been marked as State's Exhibits -- proposed Exhibits 10 [sic] through 12. If you can take a look at those and let me know if you recognize those.
A. Yes, \(I\) recognize -- these photographs are of the
motorhome that \(I\) photographed for Detective Dickson. Q. All right. And do they truly and accurately depict the motorhome as depicted in those photos?
A. Yes, they do.
Q. All right.

MR. GRAHAM: Your Honor, at this time, I'd
move for admission of State's proposed Exhibits 2 through, \(I\) believe, 12 and publication.

THE COURT: Any objection?

MR. SLOCUM: No objection for the purpose of this hearing.

THE COURT: And that's Exhibits 2 through 12?
MR. GRAHAM: That's correct, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. And no objection 2
through 12?

MR. SLOCUM: Not for this hearing, thank you.

THE COURT: All right. Exhibits 2 through 12 are admitted. Permission to publish.
(Whereupon, Plaintiff's Exhibits 2, 3, 4, 5, \(6,7,8,9,10,11\), and 12 admitted)

MR. GRAHAM: Thank you, Your Honor.

BY MR. GRAHAM:
Q. Showing you what's been marked as State's Exhibit 2, what do we see in this photo?
A. It's an overall photograph of the front end of the

Ford Windjammer motorhome.
Q. All right. Showing you what's been marked as State's Exhibit 3, what are we looking at in this photo? A. Number 3 is a photograph of the rear exterior of the motorhome.

MR. GRAHAM: Can the Court see these?
THE COURT: Yes, I can see them.
MR. GRAHAM: Thank you.
BY MR. GRAHAM:
Q. Directing your attention to State's Exhibit 4, what are we looking at in this photo?
A. It's the interior of the motorhome, the dining table and kitchen area.
Q. Where is this photo taken from?
A. That photograph is taken almost immediately after you enter the motorhome looking towards the rear of the motorhome. So it's more towards the front.
Q. All right. And was there a door on the side of this motorhome that you entered into this living area?
A. Yes, there was.
Q. And that's the door you were looking through?
A. Yes.
Q. Not like the passenger doors up front?
A. No.
Q. Okay. State's Exhibit 6 [sic].
A. Is an overall photograph of the dining table.
Q. Or excuse me, this is 5, State's Exhibit 5, apologize. Dining table?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Now State's Exhibit 6 .
A. It's a photograph of me standing in the kitchen area looking to the rear of the motorhome. There is an accordion door, and it's looking into the bedroom area. Q. State's Exhibit 7.
A. It's a photograph with the accordion door open looking into the bedroom area of the motorhome.
Q. Drawing your attention specifically to the left-hand corner of this photo, what is this area right here?
A. That is the bed. It's a couch that folds out into a bed.
Q. All right. And in the right-hand corner with this chair, was that chair there? I mean, you guys didn't move anything, right, taking these photos?
A. Those photographs were taken before we've touched anything in the motorhome.
Q. Thank you. And in the back, what do we see right there?
A. There's a restroom towards the rear of the motorhome.
Q. State's Exhibit 8.
A. It's an overall photograph of the bed.
Q. All right. And are there pillows on this bed?
A. Yeah, there were three pillows on the bed and a couple cushions as well.
Q. State's Exhibit 9.
A. It's a photograph of a fan that was just near the recliner that you could see in the previous photograph.
Q. All right. And is it also a heater?
A. I don't recall, sir.
Q. Okay. And State's Exhibit 10.
A. The box similar to the fan that was on the counter.
Q. And now we get into State's Exhibit 11. What are we looking at here?
A. This is a photograph of the bed. All the pillows and cushions have already been collected as evidence, and I've removed -- I've began to remove the fabric that was on the bed. So you can tell by the front end, that piece of the fabric has already been removed.
Q. Okay. And State's Exhibit 12.
A. And then the next step is to remove the other piece of fabric that was on the bed.
Q. Okay. What was the purpose of removing that fabric?
A. To collect as evidence. It had given a positive result with the alternative light source.
Q. And once you removed that fabric, what did you do
with it?
A. Placed it inside of a paper bag.
Q. And after that?
A. It gets booked into evidence, submitted to our evidence section.
Q. Okay. And were you able to tell, based on that ALS, if there was some body fluids on that mattress?
A. It gave a presumptive positive result, which is not
a confirmatory result. It's a screening tool that we can use to determine what items need to be collected.
Q. All right. So it gave you reason to take it and test it further?
A. That's correct.
Q. All right. But you don't do that testing, do you?
A. I do not.

MR. GRAHAM: Court's indulgence.

BY MR. GRAHAM:
Q. Is there a specific lab number that is assigned to these cases?
A. Yes.
Q. And what was -- do you remember the specific lab number that was assigned to this case?
A. 17-001024.
Q. Thank you.

MR. GRAHAM: No further questions.

THE COURT: Cross.
MR. SLOCUM: I don't have any questions, thank you.

THE COURT: I didn't hear, Mr. Slocum.
MR. SLOCUM: I don't have any questions.
THE COURT: Oh, all right. May this witness be excused?

MR. SLOCUM: Yes.
THE COURT: Sir, you may go about your day.
MR. IVERS: Thank you.
THE COURT: Your next witness.
MR. GRAHAM: The State calls Brittany
Chilton.
THE COURT: Do you have Exhibit 1? I need that for up here.

MR. GRAHAM: Oh, I'm sorry.
THE COURT: Okay, thanks.
All right, ma'am, if you'd please face me and raise your right hand. Do you swear to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

MS. CHILTON: I do.
THE COURT: All right, please have a seat right there if you would. And once you've made yourself comfortable -- yes, pull your chair all the way up. In
front of you is a microphone. It's recording everything you say. And if you'd please state your name and spell your last name for the record.

THE WITNESS: My name is Brittany Chilton.
The last name is spelled C-H-I-L-T-O-N.
THE COURT: Counsel.
MR. GRAHAM: Thank you.
BRITTANY CHILTON
(Sworn as a witness, testified as follows)
DIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MR. GRAHAM:
Q. Ms. Chilton, how are you employed?
A. I work at the Washoe County Sheriff's Office in the Forensic Science Division.
Q. How long have you been employed there?
A. January will be seven years.
Q. What is your specific job?
A. I'm a criminalist, and as a criminalist, I examine items of evidence that are associated with criminal cases. Specifically, \(I\) am employed in the biology unit, and \(I\) am cross-trained in primary exam, DNA, and CODIS. Q. What kind of training and/or education do you have in order to do your job?
A. I have a degree from the University of Nevada, Reno. I graduated with a combined Bachelor of Science and

Master of Science in 2011 in biotechnology. At the Crime Lab, we're required to go -- undergo extensive training. I underwent two training programs in primary exam and in DNA. That training program consisted of an in-depth review of past and current literature in the field.

I was required to observe qualified analysts performing casework. I was required to perform DNA analysis on mock samples that mimicked the type of samples that \(I\) would see in actual cases. I was then required to compile cases that had been completed by previously-qualified analysts and come to the same conclusions and opinions as the original analyst.

I then underwent mock cases and pre-mock cases. Those included being watched by my trainer the entire step of -- every step that \(I\) did, in which case they verified that \(I\) followed all the procedures and protocols.
Q. Have you been qualified as an expert in the analysis of DNA in Washoe County?
A. I've been qualified as a primary examiner in Washoe County, but \(I\) have been qualified in DNA in other Nevada counties.
Q. Okay. And have you testified in Washoe County as an expert?
A. In DNA or primary?
Q. Either?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. How often do you perform DNA testing?
A. I wouldn't say daily. In between the lab and at my desk daily, but that's where I'm assigned currently as performing DNA analysis.
Q. Are you aware of an investigation of -- under lab number 17-001024?
A. I am.
Q. What was your role in that case?
A. I performed the DNA analysis in this case.
Q. Okay. And did you receive something to test -- tell us how that happened? Did you receive --
A. Yes. Evidence is brought into the laboratory with a submission, and the submission says what type of testing they would like to have done. The items that I received first went to a primary examiner, which were screened for the presence of bodily fluids. And then from there, those items were sampled, and those samples were sent to DNA, and I received those samples and processed them through the DNA process.
Q. What samples did you receive?
A. I received a reference sample from an individual named Haley, a reference sample from -- may \(I\) look at my
report for the exact names?
Q. Would that refresh your recollection?
A. Yeah.
Q. All right. Do you have your report up there?
A. I do.
Q. Oh, okay.
A. So a reference sample from an individual named Haley, a portion of a reference sample from Luigi Lopez-Delgado, a portion of vaginal swabs that had been collected in a sexual assault kit under RN02951, a portion of a small stain from a large cushion that was collected in a motorhome, and a portion of a large stain from a large cushion that was collected in a motorhome. Q. Okay. And when you received those -- those samples, what did you do?
A. I performed the DNA process, and what that is is I apply a series of chemicals to the samples that will break open or lyse the cells that will release the DNA housed within those cells. From there, I perform a quantitation that tells me how much DNA is in those samples, and then depending on how much DNA there is, I have thresholds that tell me I can proceed with the process called polymerase chain reaction, or PCR, or I have to stop the analysis. I stopped the analysis in some of the samples and proceeded with analysis in other
samples in this case.
Q. All right. And so what samples did you end up testing?
A. I ended up testing the small stain from the large cushion, the large stain from the cushion, and the reference samples. I stopped the vaginal samples at quantitation.
Q. And what were your results with this testing that you did?
A. Comparison of DNA profiles show that the profile from Haley -- Haley's reference sample was the same as the female DNA profile obtained from the epithelial fraction of the smaller stain. The estimated frequency of this matching DNA profile is approximately 1 in 21.66 octillion individuals, and based upon those results, it is reasonable to conclude that Haley is the source of this DNA profile.
Q. Just to be clear, so the results from the -- from the smaller stain came back with the DNA profile from Haley?
A. The epithelial fraction, correct.
Q. What does that mean?
A. During that extraction process where \(I\) lyse the cells open to obtain the DNA, we have another type of extraction process called a differential. What this
differential does is it allows me to separate skin cells or epithelial cells from sperm cells.
Q. Okay. And so what is an epithelial cell?
A. An epithelial cell is a skin cell.
Q. Okay. And so basically, you were able to determine that a skin cell was in that small stain on the cushion?
A. Correct.
Q. And it matched Haley's DNA profile?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. What was your next result?
A. Additionally, comparison of DNA profile showed the DNA profile obtained from the Luigi Lopez-Delgado reference sample was the same as the DNA profile obtained from each of the sperm fractions of the small stain and the large stain. The estimated frequency of this matching DNA profile is approximately 1 in 1.218 octillion individuals. Based upon these results, it's reasonable to conclude that Luigi Lopez-Delgado is the source of these DNA profiles.
Q. Okay. Now this is -- now this result is different in that it's not an epithelial fraction?
A. Correct, it's a sperm fraction.
Q. Okay. And so meaning that Mr. Delgado's sperm was what was analyzed and found to match his DNA that you have -- that you had?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. You're not familiar with Mr. Delgado at all; is that correct?
A. No, I am not.
Q. And you're not familiar with Haley at all as well, are you?
A. No.
Q. Have your DNA test results ever excluded a suspect?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. And if someone disagrees with your results, is there a scientific way to check if you got the right answer?
A. Yes.
Q. All right.
A. First and foremost, I should say that my work goes through a second process called technical review. So my entire case packet that \(I\) compile of my findings goes to a second qualified individual at the laboratory who then has to agree and sign off on my results as well.

If somebody else outside of our laboratory disagreed, these results could always be sent to another expert witness to review as well. And these are portions of these stains. There are still other portions remaining that could be tested by another laboratory if that needed to happen.
Q. You had indicated that there was some that -- let me back up. Were there some testing that you had to stop?
A. That is correct.
Q. And why was that?
A. There was no male DNA detected in the non-concentrated extracts from the vaginal swabs, and this item could not be processed beyond the quantification step at that time. I would need a stipulation to consume the other half of the vaginal swabs to combine those to see if there is any male DNA present.
Q. Okay.

MR. GRAHAM: No further questions. Pass the witness.

THE COURT: Cross.
MR. SLOCUM: Thank you, Your Honor. CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. SLOCUM:
Q. If I may approach, can \(I\) see what it is that you're looking at that you referred to?
A. This is the report.

MR. GRAHAM: May I approach as well?
THE COURT: Certainly.
BY MR. SLOCUM:
Q. So if I understood your testimony correctly, you're
provided some samples; is that right?
A. That is correct.
Q. Okay. So you don't -- you don't have necessarily a knowledge of where specific items come from. You're given a small piece that goes through the primary section to you and just told test these items?
A. So I'm given the tube that contains the cutting, and I'm also given the report from the primary examiner. So I never saw the item itself, but that report and those case findings went through technical review first, and then another analyst agreed with those. And then at that time, I'm allowed to take the samples.
Q. And when you say "take the samples," you mean you're able to test the samples?
A. Correct. I receive them from the biology unit and then proceed with my testing.
Q. Okay. So as an example, when it says a portion of Haley's [full name stated, first name inserted] reference sample?

THE COURT: We're going to strike the last name that was just mentioned.

MR. SLOCUM: Thank you, Your Honor.
THE COURT: But we'll stick with Haley from now on.

Go ahead.

BY MR. SLOCUM:
Q. When you talk about Haley reference sample, you don't -- you don't have any knowledge of that reference sample other than finding out that that's a -- an item that's marked with this name.

Is that fair to say?
A. Correct. I did not actually receive the box that contained it. I received a tube with a portion of the sample.
Q. That is marked in some way to connect it up --
A. Correct.
Q. -- to Haley?
A. Yes, it's marked with the case number and identifying mark. So in this instance, it was marked with the name.
Q. And just so that we're clear about this, your results, as far as a matching DNA profile, is only as good as your knowledge about whether or not this came from Haley or this came from Luigi Lopez-Delgado.

Is that fair to say?
A. Maybe you should restate the question.
Q. Certainly.
A. Okay.
Q. If, for example, you're making a comparison and you're saying hey, this matches a reference sample of
this person, that information's only as good as how good the reference sample itself is.

Is that fair to say?
A. Correct.
Q. So you could -- you could call that a different name, and you would say, okay, it matches that. That's all that you can really say, it matches one thing to another thing.
A. Yes.
Q. But as far as connecting the name, that's not part of what you do.

Is that fair to say?
A. Not exactly because the name does come with the sample, and that name stays associated with that sample through my entire process. And so as far as the name going on the tube, you are correct, I had no connection with putting that name on that tube, but that name stayed with that tube through the entire process. And the profile that was generated from that sample was marked with a name, and that name then matched the sample that was marked with the piece of evidence. Q. Okay. But you don't have any firsthand knowledge of the name itself --
A. Correct.
Q. -- that's my point.
A. Uh-huh.
Q. So all you're doing is making a comparison to something that we could call \(X\) and making sure that, yeah, X matches over here, and we have another sample that we could call \(Y\), and that \(Y\) matches over here.

That's your role. It isn't to assign individual names to things.

Is that fair to say?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay.

MR. SLOCUM: I don't have any further questions.

THE COURT: Redirect.

MR. GRAHAM: Just briefly.
REDIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MR. GRAHAM:
Q. You know, normally, I don't get to ask this question in trial, but you don't stop once you -- if it comes back to, as it did in this case, to Mr. Luigi Lopez-Delgado, you don't just stop right there. Is there any other tests that you run against that reference sample?
A. I'm not sure what you're asking.
Q. Okay. In the second paragraph of your report --
A. Uh-huh.
Q. -- it indicated that the profile obtained was searched against a Combined DNA Index System.
A. Correct.
Q. All right. And did it come back -- there is specific language that is always written in these reports. It's kind of like a double negative -A. Uh-huh.
Q. -- that there's no unknown person. That means -what does that mean?
A. So what this is saying in the report -- can \(I\) read it first, and then I'll explain it?
Q. I have no objection to that.

THE COURT: Any objection, Mr. Slocum?
MR. SLOCUM: TO, I'm sorry, reading it and
then explaining it?
THE COURT: It's for reference to some statement in a report that I'm not aware of. She's going to explain what the statement means. MR. GRAHAM: Right. THE COURT: Because he didn't read the statement. I don't know what the statement says. MR. SLOCUM: Yes, I'm not sure. Can we just explain what she means rather than reading the statement.

BY MR. GRAHAM:
Q. Without reading the statement --
A. I can do that. I can do that.
Q. -- can you just explain it.

Thank you.
A. So what ends up happening in a case -- the next step after the DNA process would be what's called CODIS, so the Combined DNA Index System. This index system houses known profiles from convicted offenders, from qualifying arrestees. It houses unknown profiles from crime scenes, such as sexual assault cases. In this case, the sperm fraction from the small stain qualified for CODIS. It was entered into CODIS, and it came back to a match matching to the Defendant.
Q. Okay. And so that would have not been a reference sample that you were given. That would have been a different sample that was put into CODIS?
A. That is correct.
Q. All right.

MR. GRAHAM: Nothing further, pass the
witness.
THE COURT: Recross.
RECROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MR. SLOCUM:
Q. And as \(I\) understood your testimony, that's a standard procedure that you do?
A. That is a very standard procedure, yes.
Q. And why is that?
A. That is what CODIS is for is to link crimes and link criminals back to crimes. And so at the end of our processing, if profiles qualify for CODIS, we enter them into the database, and they stay in the database to be continually crossed against other cases to see if matches occur, which can lead to investigative leads for officers.
Q. Okay. Now, as I understood what you're saying, you entered the DNA profile from this case and put it in CODIS?

Is that what \(I\) understood?
A. Yes. I entered the profile obtained from the sperm fraction of the small stain.
Q. Okay. But that's different than doing a search against CODIS; is that right?
A. It does it at the same time. So when \(I\) enter a profile, it will search at that time, and it's searched at the State level. And when \(I\) put this profile in, it did have a hit in this case, and it hit to the individual named Luigi Lopez-Delgado.
Q. Okay. When you say "a hit," what does that mean?
A. What it does is it runs the profile against all the known profiles in the database, and it will come back
and tell us if there's been a match. The match can match to other unknown profiles for other cases, it can match to convicted offenders, it can match to arrestees, and in this case, it matched to -- I'm sorry, I'd have to review my notes to tell you if it was an arrestee sample or a convicted offender, but it matched to that, and that sample was from the Defendant.
Q. Okay. And you're going to have to help me with this, because as the D.A. said, normally, you don't ask this question at trial, so. But when - - the statement, as I understood it, was the profile obtained from the sperm fraction of the small stain was searched against the CODIS with no unknown matching profile found, right?
A. That terminology at our laboratory, for no unknown matching profile found means that the profile that we put it as a known, say \(I\) put it in already knowing that it matched to a suspect or someone in the case matched to the same individual in CODIS, and it would have matched to either a convicted offender or an arrestee sample. We don't re-list the individual's name because I've already made a source statement in the text of my report. So we use the terminology no unknown matching profile found.
Q. And your point with that is that that's a reenforcement somehow of the accuracy? Is that what it
is?
A. Yeah, so you had been asking how can \(I\) verify that the reference samples -- you were saying you could call it \(X\) or \(Y\) or whatever --
Q. Yeah.
A. -- and I believe the line of questioning from the prosecution was, was there any additional tests that would show that it matched to the individual named on the tube, and the answer would be yes, and that \(I\) put it into the CODIS database, and it matched to an individual from a completely separate sample collected at a completely separate time and it matched the same individual.
Q. Okay. Because you notice the final statement in the -- in that paragraph is if a matching profile is located, you or a representative of your agency will be contacted.
A. We're required to leave that in there because these profiles stay in CODIS, and they will continue to be searched against the database and additional matches could be found if, in fact, the individual named had committed other crimes at a later date, and those profiles went in, they would match to one another and those could be investigative leads for agencies. So once a profile goes in, I'm required to say that it will
stay in, and should an additional match be found, \(I\) will let you know at that time.
Q. And you're required to do that for CODIS, you mean? A. It's a requirement, yes.

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

THE COURT: All right, may this witness be excused, gentlemen?

MR. GRAHAM: Yes, Your Honor, thank you.
MR. SLOCUM: Yes.

THE COURT: Ma'am, you may go about your day, thank you.

MS. CHILTON: Thank you.

THE COURT: Your next witness.

MR. GRAHAM: The State calls Ms. Trujillo.

THE COURT: Up here, ma'am. And if you'd please face me and raise your right hand, if you would. Do you swear to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God, ma'am?

MS. TRUJILLO: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: Please have a seat right there. And once you've made yourself comfortable, there you go, pull that chair all the way up to the table. Now, that's a microphone that's in front of you, and if you could pull that towards you, ma'am. It's recording
everything you say. And I need you to state your name and spell your last name for the record, if you would, ma'am.

THE WITNESS: Jeanine Trujillo, T-R-U-J-I-L-L-O.

THE COURT: Counsel, go ahead. JEANINE TRUJILLO
(Sworn as a witness, testified as follows)
DIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MR. GRAHAM:
Q. Ms. Trujillo, do you know a person -- and for this proceedings, we're going to refer to her as Haley. Do you know a person by the name of Haley?
A. Yes.
Q. Who is Haley to you?
A. She's my granddaughter.
Q. All right. Are you her legal guardian?
A. Yes, I am.
Q. Okay. How long have you been Haley's legal guardian?
A. Since she was 18 months old.
Q. All right. And where does Haley live -- what -- I want to -- let's go back to last year between October and January, where did Haley live? What was the address?
A. 3094 Diamond Dust Court.
Q. And that's here in Sparks --
A. Sparks.
Q. -- Washoe County, Nevada?
A. Uh-huh.
Q. All right. Are you or did you become aware of Haley being involved in a relationship with a person by the name of Luigi Delgado?
A. Eventually, yes.
Q. How is it that you became aware of that?
A. Through the Police Department, I guess, through -through my daughter, through my daughter who looked at her phone.
Q. Okay. Now, your daughter who -- without telling what your daughter said, did there come a time when you reached out to have your daughter look through Haley's phone?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Now, that daughter is not Haley's mother?
A. No.
Q. Okay. Before that happened, did there -- was there an incident which caused your suspicions to kind of -did something happen with your car?
A. Yes.
Q. And what was that?
A. She tried to take my car out.
Q. And who's she?
A. My granddaughter, Haley.
Q. Okay. And do you remember when that was?
A. I don't exactly.
Q. Was it before Thanksgiving?
A. I believe so.
Q. In 2017?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. And what caused you to notice that your car had been taken out?
A. She was ramming it into the house.
Q. All right.
A. She couldn't get it out of the garage.
Q. Before that incident, was there something about a spare tire?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay.
A. Yes. The -- I looked in the garage and the spare was on the car, and I didn't think I'd ever had a spare put on the car. I thought all my tires were fine. So I asked, and she acted like she didn't know what had happened, and \(I\) began to question my mental status.
Q. Eventually, did she admit to taking out the car?
A. Eventually.
Q. All right. Now, \(I\) want to go -- fast-forward a little bit to November 23rd, 2017. That would have been Thanksgiving --
A. Uh-huh.
Q. -- in 2017. Did there come a point in that evening where you found Haley was missing?
A. Yes, she was running away.
Q. What did you do when you saw that Haley had ran away?
A. I had to call the police.
Q. All right. And did Sparks Police come to your house?
A. Yes.
Q. While Sparks Police were at your house, did Haley eventually come home?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. At some point -- as part of punishment, did you do anything to Haley after she had run away?
A. Well, we took her phone away.
Q. Okay. And when you took the phone away, is that when you called your daughter to take a look at it?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Based on what your daughter told you, without telling what your daughter said, did you do anything or question Haley as to the contents of her phone messages?
A. \(O h\), yes.
Q. All right. Did you question her about a person by the name of Luigi Delgado?
A. Yes.
Q. And what did Haley say that person was to her?
A. Her boyfriend.
Q. All right. Did she indicate her feelings for --
A. Yes.
Q. What did she say?

MR. SLOCUM: And I'm going to object to
hearsay, Your Honor.
MR. GRAHAM: Your Honor, pursuant to
NRS 171.196, subsection 5, hearsay evidence consisting of a statement made by the alleged victim of the offense is admissible at a preliminary examination conducted pursuant to this section only if the Defendant is charged with one of the following crimes, and this talks about sexual offenses.

THE COURT: Uh-huh.
MR. GRAHAM: That's how \(I\) was able to admit

THE COURT: Is one of these enumerated crimes one of those offenses listed in the statute?

MR. GRAHAM: All of them except for the gross misdemeanor.

THE COURT: Okay. Then it's admissible, is it not?

MR. SLOCUM: No, Your Honor, the issue is her feelings for him are not part of the -- part of the crime.

THE COURT: It's still a statement made by her.

MR. SLOCUM: But the -- if we take a look, Your Honor -- okay, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Withdrawn?
MR. SLOCUM: Thank you.
THE COURT: All right. Objection overruled.
Re-ask the question.
BY MR. GRAHAM:
Q. Did she say anything about her feelings towards Luigi Delgado?
A. Yes.
Q. What did she say?
A. She loved him.
Q. All right. Did you ask her or tell her what you thought of the situation?
A. Well, yes.
Q. What did you say?
A. It's ridiculous.
Q. Did you indicate at any time that you thought he was
taking advantage of her?
A. Yes.
Q. Was that because of the age difference?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you know the age difference?
A. I knew that it was an adult.
Q. Did you ask or did Haley tell you how old Mr. Delgado was?
A. No, I don't believe so. I think that came later, but I'm not sure.
Q. Do you remember having a conversation with a Detective Arick Dickson?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you remember telling him that Haley told you he was 23?
A. Oh, okay.
Q. Do you remember that?
A. Yes, yes.
Q. Okay. Do you recall whether or not Haley told you if they'd been involved sexually, if they had had sex?
A. Eventually she did, but not initially.
Q. But eventually she told you that?
A. Uh-huh.
Q. Do you recall her making a statement about tacos? A. Yes.
Q. What was that?
A. That he took her to have tacos. He took her out, and they had tacos.
Q. All right. Do you recall having a conversation with Haley -- and I apologize for the graphic nature of this but something regarding the Defendant wanting to use her poo-poo hole?
A. I know that she said that he begged her for sex and so she let him.
Q. All right. Do you recall Haley telling you that the Defendant knew she was 14 before they had sex?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. After learning all these things, what did you do?
A. I was horrified.
Q. Were you worried she was pregnant?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you make her do something as a result of that? A. Yes.
Q. What was that?
A. I took her to the Children's Advocacy, and they examined her to make sure that she didn't have any diseases and was not pregnant.
Q. All right. Do you recall having a conversation with her about the Internet and photos?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. What did Haley tell you about that?
A. Just that she was trying to please someone.
Q. All right. Did she indicate to you that she had taken nude photos of herself?
A. Yes.
Q. And that she had sent them to Mr. Delgado?
A. Yes.
Q. And that was at his request?
A. Yes.
Q. All right.

MR. GRAHAM: Pass the witness, thank you. CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. SLOCUM:
Q. As I understand it --

THE COURT: Go ahead, counsel. Go ahead, I was making notes. MR. SLOCUM: Thank you, Your Honor. BY MR. SLOCUM:
Q. Good afternoon. As I understood your testimony, you never met Mr. Lopez-Delgado; is that right?
A. That's right.
Q. So the extent of your knowledge was what Haley had told you that she had done; is that right?
A. Correct.
Q. And then some other things that you brought up on your conversation with the District Attorney with regard to her taking the car --
A. Uh-huh.
Q. -- and attempting to take the car; is that right?
A. Uh-huh.
Q. Is that a yes?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Because you have to answer out loud because this is being recorded.

THE COURT: Yes, I was about to remind her of the same thing. You need to speak out loud. So when you say uh-huh, it doesn't pick up.

THE WITNESS: Oh, I see.
THE COURT: I don't know what the answer is. You have to say yes or no.
the witness: Okay.
THE COURT: Okay, go ahead, counsel.
MR. SLOCUM: Thank you, Your Honor.
BY MR. SLOCUM:
Q. So with respect to those events, did you believe that Mr. Lopez-Delgado had anything to do with those?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And is that because Haley told you that he had something to do with it?
A. Because \(I\) believed that he had a lot to do with it. Q. Okay. So at one point she had taken the car, and she had apparently gotten a flat tire and replaced the tire with a spare tire; is that right?
A. Yes, that's right.
Q. Okay. And you had said that Haley eventually admitted to taking the car; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. But she didn't tell you that Mr. Lopez-Delgado had anything to do with that, did she?
A. No.
Q. Okay. And with respect to the time that she was trying to take the car was apparently running into the house?
A. Yes.
Q. Haley didn't tell you that he had anything to do with that, correct?
A. No.

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

THE COURT: All right. Redirect.
MR. GRAHAM: Just briefly.

REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. GRAHAM:
Q. As part of this investigation, did you release

Haley's phone to Detective Arick Dickson?
A. Yes.
Q. And were you the one who paid the phone bill on that?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. And you let him examine it?
A. Yes --
Q. All right.
A. -- I did.

MR. GRAHAM: Nothing further.
MR. SLOCUM: I don't have any further
questions for her.
THE COURT: All right. May this witness be
excused?
MR. GRAHAM: Yes, Your Honor, thank you.
MR. SLOCUM: Yes.
THE COURT: Ma'am, you may go about your day, thank you.

MR. GRAHAM: The State calls Detective Arick
Dickson.
THE COURT: Sir, if you'd raise your right hand. Do you swear to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

MR. DICKSON: I do.
THE COURT: Please have a seat right there.

And once you've made yourself comfortable, pull that chair all the way up to the table. In front of you is a microphone. It's recording everything you say. Please state your name and spell your last name for the record.

THE WITNESS: Arick Dickson, D-I-C-K-S-O-N.
THE COURT: Go ahead, counsel.
MR. GRAHAM: Thank you.
ARICK DICKSON
(Sworn as a witness, testified as follows)
DIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MR. GRAHAM:
Q. Detective Dickson, how are you employed?
A. I am a detective at the washoe County Sheriff's Office.
Q. And how long have you been with the washoe county Sheriff's Office?
A. For 16 and a half years.
Q. How long have you been a detective with the Sheriff's Office?
A. For about six and a half years.
Q. Are you assigned to a specific division inside the detectives' office?
A. Yes.
Q. What is that?
A. I am assigned to crimes against children.
Q. I'd like to direct your attention to a case -- your case number 17-6416. That's State versus Luigi Richard Lopez-Delgado. Are you familiar with the facts and circumstances of that case?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you see a person in court today by the name of Luigi Lopez-Delgado?
A. Yes.
Q. Can you point to him and identify an article of clothing that he's wearing?
A. He's wearing a light blue shirt.

MR. GRAHAM: I'd ask that the record reflect
that the witness has identified the Defendant.

THE COURT: The record will reflect an
identification.

MR. GRAHAM: Thank you.
BY MR. GRAHAM:
Q. How is it that you became involved in this case?
A. I was assigned this case on either December 4th or December 5th of 2017 by my supervisor.
Q. Okay. And at that time, what kind of information did you have at the very beginning of your case?
A. That the victim had reported to a probation officer that she had been in a sexual relationship with a 23 or 24-year-old man, and then he ended up making a report
with the Sheriff's Office.
Q. And was that report -- was the Defendant in that report Mr. Delgado?
A. Yes.
Q. Are you aware of Mr. Delgado's birthday?
A. Yes.
Q. Is it February 3rd, 1993?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. And how old would that have made him at the time of your investigation?
A. Twenty-four.
Q. Okay. What is the first thing that you did after receiving the case?
A. I made contact with the -- with the victim's guardian, grandmother, and set up a child forensic interview.
Q. All right: And we've --
A. Actually, oh, sorry, I made a mistake. Prior to that, I learned that there was evidence on a possible phone, and so I did that before \(I\) scheduled the forensic interview.
Q. So whose phone was there potential evidence on?
A. On the victim's.
Q. All right. And for the purposes of today's hearing, we're referring to the victim as Haley. So would that
phone have been Haley's phone?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. In speaking with the grandma of Haley, did you get consent to retrieve that phone?
A. Yes.
Q. And download that phone to look at the contents of the phone?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. While that was occurring, I think you had mentioned that you set up a child forensic interview?
A. Yes.
Q. Was that on December 11th, 2017?
A. Yes.
Q. Were you present for that interview?
A. Yes.
Q. We've already heard testimony from forensic interviewer Alexis Auckenthaler. She indicated that there was a multidisciplinary team meeting before the actual interview.

Were you present for that?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. What, if anything, did you provide to Ms. Auckenthaler regarding the interview?
A. That -- the initial probation officer's statement about the original report and what generated this and
then just provided information that they had reportedly gone to an RV that the suspect owned. So \(I\) wanted to make sure we got a description of like the interior of the motorhome during the forensic interview.

I also knew that -- she said that she was in a relationship with him and that, according to the grandmother, she relayed to the grandmother that she cared for him because he bought her tacos so \(I\) wanted to see if those would -- that would come up in the forensic interview.
Q. After witnessing the forensic interview, what did you do next?
A. After the forensic interview, then our victim advocate scheduled a SART examination that occurred the following day. And then on the -- on December 13th, I found out information that the family was concerned that Haley was going to be running away again, and after that SART examination, \(I\) found out that the last known contact they had had was a lot sooner than \(I\) previously had thought.
Q. Regarding that SART examination, there was a question \(I\) wanted to ask you about that. In the SART examination, is there a DNA sample that is taken from Haley and booked into evidence?
A. Yes.
Q. And what's the purpose of that?
A. For later, if there is biological evidence discovered, they can use that for comparison purposes to determine who the individual -- or who it belongs to.
Q. All right. So later you can actually send up

Haley's sample to be tested against any biological samples, other biological samples discovered?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And that was done in this case?
A. Yes.
Q. So you had indicated that after the SART exam, you discovered there was more recent contact than you thought, and what did that cause you to do?
A. I wanted to -- or I expedited my contact with the suspect, Luigi.
Q. So what did you do?
A. I went to his house, and then we also made contact with his brother that was leaving, and \(I\) had contact with the mom. He wasn't home. I got his phone number, called him, and left him a message, and where he called me back explain -- he explained that he was on a graveyard shift and wouldn't be off until about 3:00, 3:30 in the morning, and \(I\) made arrangements to meet him at that time.
Q. Now, you said you went to his house. Was that
located at 228 East 8 th Avenue, Sun Valley?
A. Yes.
Q. Is that here in Washoe County, Nevada?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. When you went to his house, did you see anything that corroborated Haley's forensic interview?
A. Yes.
Q. What was that?
A. There was a 1986 Ford motorhome parked out in front of the house, and that was -- it was described as her going to an \(R V\) after he had picked her up. Previous to that too, she had also described him having a four-door white car, and \(I\) had seen that he had a Subaru that matched the description with four doors.
Q. So it was four doors, and it was white?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Now, you made contact with him. He indicated to you that he doesn't get off until 3:30. Did you set up a time to interview him?
A. Yeah, it was going to be at 3:00 or 3:30. Then approximately like an hour later, he called back and said that he was -- he wanted to take care of this and find out what was going on so we made arrangements to meet sooner at the Sheriff's Office.
Q. Ultimately, did he come to the Washoe County

Sheriff's Office for an interview?
A. Yes.
Q. What time was that?
A. I don't know exactly, but \(I\) know it was in the later evening on December 13 th .
Q. Okay. When he got there, was he under arrest?
A. No.
Q. Was he detained in any way?
A. No.
Q. Was the door open?
A. Yes.
Q. Or, I mean, at least not locked?
A. Yeah, it was unlocked.
Q. It was unlocked for privacy?
A. Yes.
Q. Was he in handcuffs?
A. No.
Q. All right. When you started the conversation, what's the first thing you did?
A. I asked him how he had come to the Sheriff's Office.

I wanted to shoe that he had driven up by himself, that he wasn't brought up by police officers or made to come here, that he had volunteered to come here. Then went over the phone conversation that we had had previously and talked about how \(I\) wanted to talk to him about
involvement and any knowledge he had with a girl named Haley. And then \(I\) read him his Miranda rights.
Q. And did he indicate he understood his Miranda rights?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you ask him to do anything -- did he have a phone with him?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you ask him to do anything with the phone?
A. Yeah, prior -- before going into the interview room, I asked him to put it on airplane mode so we wouldn't be disturbed with phone calls, messages, or anything like that, and he said he would.
Q. All right. Now, after Miranda and he indicates he understands, did you ask him about being in a dating relationship with anyone?
A. Yes.
Q. And what was his response?
A. That he hadn't been in a dating or a sexual relationship in over a year.
Q. Did he indicate whether he knew a person by the name of Haley?
A. He said he did not - oh, he said he knew a Haley but described her as a 22-year-old female that lived in Eernley and worked at the Wendy's, which did not match
the description of Haley, the victim in this case. Q. Based on the forensic interview, did you have information that Mr. Delgado had met Haley through social media applications and or dating applications?
A. Yes.
Q. And what were those?
A. It started off with MeetMe, and then it transitioned to Facebook Messenger.
Q. Did you ask Mr. Delgado about that?
A. Yes.
Q. What was his response?
A. I can't remember if he acknowledged MeetMe, but I know he said that he wasn't on Facebook and never had been on Facebook and didn't use it.
Q. Did he indicate whether or not he ever downloaded those applications to his phone?
A. I don't think he ever said he had downloaded any of those.
Q. Did he at any time indicate what his e-mail address was?
A. Yes, it was something close to like blazin218@gmail.com.
Q. All right. And if you had wrote in -- or excuse me, put in your report that it was, in fact, blazin, spelled B-L-A-Z-I-N, 218@gmail.com, would that be correct?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. Did you ask him about any other electronics that he might have, like computers or tablets?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. Did he say he had any other electronic devices?
A. No, just his cellular phone.
Q. All right. Do you remember explaining to him the allegations and how could these allegations just kind of come out of thin air?
A. I might need a little bit more direction with that. I don't understand.
Q. Do you recall a time the Defendant responding to you that possibly he just had a stalker?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. And do you recall the question that prompted that response?
A. Yeah, I asked him how anyone would have such personal knowledge about him involving like his family and his vehicles, and then he responded by saying that maybe he had a stalker.
Q. All right. Did you ask him about whether his DNA or Haley's DNA would be in the motorhome or the car?
A. Yes.
Q. And what was his response?
A. I don't remember if he said no, but \(I\) was asking him for consent to search things. And that was the reason why I gave of why \(I\) wanted to, but I can't remember right now if he said no or how he responded.
Q. If you put in your report that he indicated that Haley's DNA would not be in his motorhome -- or when asked about whether it would be in there, and he stated no, would that be correct?
A. Yeah, if it's in my report.
Q. Did you ask him about using a name or an e-mail -- I don't know how to say it, but maybe a moniker of Richeez spelled \(\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{I}-\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{E}-\mathrm{E}-\mathrm{Z}\) ?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. Now, specifically to Facebook, is there another application where you can kind of send text messages?
A. Yes.
Q. What's that application called?
A. Facebook Messenger.
Q. All right. Did you ask him if he ever used Facebook Messenger?
A. Yes.
Q. And what was his response?
A. No, that he didn't have Facebook.
Q. Okay. At some point, did the conversation end -- or the interview ended at that point?
A. Yes.
Q. What did you do?
A. At that timè, I placed him under arrest for several charges.
Q. All right. And did you collect his phone at that point or seize his phone?
A. Yes.
Q. Was there anything that you discovered when you seized his phone?
A. Yes, I checked the phone to make sure it was in airplane mode so it couldn't be manipulated or wiped from on outside source, and I noticed that it wasn't in airplane mode.
Q. Did you question him about that?
A. Yes.
Q. And what was his response?
A. He said he didn't think it was necessary to put it in airplane mode.
Q. Okay. Now, at this point and at this time during the interview, have you received a full download of Haley's phone?
A. No.
Q. Okay. Did you author any search warrant after
arresting Mr. Delgado?
A. Yes.
Q. What were those search warrants for?
A. One was for MeetMe.com, one was for Facebook, one was for the motorhome, one was for the subaru, one was
for his phone, and then \(I\) completed a seizure order for his DNA.
Q. All right. I want to fast-forward now to after you authored those search warrants and seizure orders.

MR. GRAHAM: If I could approach?

THE COURT: Go ahead.

MR. GRAHAM: Thank you.

THE COURT: They're right here. What do you
need --

BY MR. GRAHAM:
Q. Directing your attention --

MR. GRAHAM: Thank you.

BY MR. GRAHAM:
Q. Directing your attention to what's been already marked and admitted as State's Exhibits 2 through 12, would you take a look at those.
A. (Witness complies)
Q. Do you recognize those State's exhibits?
A. Yes.
Q. And are those the photographs of Mr. Delgado's
motorhome?
A. Yes.
Q. And those are a result of the search warrant that you obtained?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. I'd like to draw your attention specifically
to State's Exhibit 7. And this is -- Deputy Ivers had already testified that this is a -- a photograph of a bed area, a chair with a toilet in the background. Did anything regarding this area of the motorhome corroborate Haley's forensic interview?
A. Yes. First, she described the bed as being a bench style foldout bed, and then she also described that there was a chair directly across from it. In the forensic interview, she said it was very similar to the chair that she was doing the interview in, which was an armchair. She described that there was a small bathroom in the back and also described there being accordion style doors. And just off from here too is there was a little space heater. And she described that it was -it was very cold in the \(R V\) and that Luigi had gone into the house and retrieved the heater.
Q. Showing you what's been marked as State's Exhibit 9, is that a photo of the heater?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. And that's a space heater; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Now, on that bed, directing you to State's Exhibit 11 and 12 , it looks like some fabric has been removed. What was the reason for removing that fabric? A. To have it tested for biological fluids. We couldn't remove it through any like zippers or buttons, so it had to be cut to be removed.
Q. Is there a reason that this specific area was important to the investigation?
A. Yes. First it was examined with an ulterior light source. It lit so we knew that it could be a potential source of evidence, and then \(I\) submitted for the lab to test that and test those two stains to see what the fluids came back as.
Q. Is that the area that Haley had described where they would -- where all the sexual encounters had occurred?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. During this time, did you receive the download of Haley's phone?
A. Yes.
Q. And during the download of that phone, did you find anything of value as it pertained to this case?
A. Yes, there was chats recovered from MeetMe.com. In
one of those, he was speaking with a user name with
Richeez. The user asks -- asks Haley if she wants to
have sex, and then -- \(I\) can't remember how she
responded, but that user of Richeez says, hey, it's me,
Louie, let's communicate on Facebook Messenger,
something to that sort.

MR. GRAHAM: May I approach the clerk?
THE COURT: You may.

MR. GRAHAM: I'd like to do this as a packet
if \(I\) could.

THE CLERK: Okay.
MR. GRAHAM: I need this one separate.

THE COURT: Is that the one that's going to be sealed?

MR. GRAHAM: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: We haven't done anything yet? We haven't -- you're fine.

MR. GRAHAM: No, \(I\) just forget something in my own case-in-chief.

THE COURT: I thought you were worried about them not being sealed. They'll be sealed.

MR. GRAHAM: Thank you, Your Honor. I do ask that these be sealed.

THE COURT: All right. What are they marked for -- what numbers?

MR. GRAHAM: It's going to be 14.
THE COURT: 14 and what?
MR. GRAHAM: It's just --
THE COURT: Okay, 14, and how many -- could you count them?

MR. GRAHAM: Oh, there are 24.
THE COURT: So Exhibit 14 has 24 parts?
MR. GRAHAM: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: And has Mr. Slocum seen these exhibits?

MR. GRAHAM: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Any objection to the way he's doing this with 14 subparts or 24 subparts?

MR. SLOCUM: I don't have any problem with what he's --

THE COURT: Just for preservation purposes is all.

MR. SLOCUM: Right, I don't have any problem with subparts, no.

THE COURT: Okay. I don't want to have to label every one, but if you want to, we can label every single one of them, 14A, B, C, through 24.

MR. SLOCUM: I don't think that there's any necessity to do that, no.

THE COURT: Thank you, all right.

MR. SLOCUM: Thank you.
(Whereupon, Plaintiff's Exhibit 14 marked)
THE COURT: All right. Go ahead, counsel.
MR. GRAHAM: Thank you.
THE COURT: So there is no 13. I just
have 14.
MR. GRAHAM: Well, that's the thing I just realized I messed up on.

THE COURT: Okay.
BY MR. GRAHAM:
Q. Showing you what's been marked as State's proposed Exhibit 14, and it does have 24 subparts, do you recognize this packet?
A. Yes.
Q. And what do you recognize that as?
A. These were CSI photographs taken by patrol Deputy stoess, while \(I\) was present, of the victim's phone and going through different things on the screen with Facebook Messenger with Haley's phone.
Q. Okay. And now, this -- and you were present when Deputy Stoess did this?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. And do they fairly and accurately depict Haley's phone and certain screen shots on Haley's phone? A. Yes.
Q. And that was after Haley's grandmother gave you consent to look through her phone?
A. Yes.
Q. All right.

MR. GRAHAM: Your Honor, at this time, I'd move for admission and publication of State's Exhibit 14 and all subparts?

THE COURT: Any objection?
MR. SLOCUM: Not for the purposes of this hearing.

THE COURT: All right, 14 will be admitted with its 24 subparts. It is sealed, though.
(Whereupon, Plaintiff's Exhibit 14 admitted)
THE COURT: All right, go ahead.

BY MR. GRAHAM:
Q. Well, before \(I\) get into that, you were already aware -- at the time that you examined this, you were already aware who Luigi Delgado is?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. Part of the investigation, did it entail linking Mr. Delgado to messages that he sent?
A. Yes.
Q. Were you able to ever look into Mr. Delgado's phone to see whether he sent those actual messages?
A. No.
Q. And why was that?
A. Because he -- with the search warrant -- or after I had retrieved the search warrant, I asked him for the pass code, and he said he didn't remember what it was.
Q. Okay. So part of your investigation then entailed having to prove that he was the one who was actually sending these message to Haley?
A. Yes.
Q. How were you able to do that?
A. By examining the Facebook Messenger and comparing some of the items that \(I\) found on the Messenger application on the victim's phone to his Facebook account.
Q. Okay. And are you aware of what his Facebook account is?
A. Yes.
Q. What was that?
A. It was Louie Delgado. The name under the Facebook Messenger was Luigi Delgado.
Q. So his actual Facebook name was Louie Delgado, but his Facebook Messenger name was Luigi Delgado?
A. Yes.
Q. Was there a photo that was associated with the Facebook Messenger name?
A. Yes, there was a small circle, and it showed a white
phone with a hand and a Band-Aid holding the white phone.
Q. Did that photo correlate to any other photos?
A. Yes.
Q. What was that?
A. Some images that were on Louie Delgado's Facebook. I found the same image, but it was much larger, and it showed Luigi Delgado.
Q. In addition to that, you had indicated that you had also subpoenaed Facebook.com?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you receive any information from Facebook.com that linked up Mr. Delgado with that Facebook account? A. Yeah, the photograph in itself and then there was also other Facebook Messenger that was relayed back and forth. I called someone that knew Luigi. I asked him what Facebook he used. They identified it as Louie Delgado. The content within some of the Facebook messages matched up with things that \(I\) knew were consistent with Luigi to include him mentioning an RV and it being cold when he was talking to Haley.

MR. GRAHAM: If I may approach with State's proposed Exhibit 15.

BY MR. GRAHAM:
Q. What are we looking at here?
A. This is one of the images that \(I\) found in Louie Delgado's Eacebook.
Q. All right. And did it match -- does it match the Defendant?
A. Yes.
Q. Are you able to identify Mr. Delgado here, the Defendant, with that photo?
A. Yes.
Q. And does this photo --

MR. GRAHAM: Your Honor, at this time, I'd move for admission and publication of State's Exhibit 15.

THE COURT: Any objection? Do you have a copy of 15?

MR. SLOCUM: I do, thank you, Your Honor. Not for the purposes of this hearing.

THE COURT: All right, 15 will be admitted.
(Whereupon, Plaintiff's Exhibit 15 admitted)
MR. GRAHAM: Thank you.

BY MR. GRAHAM:
Q. Before \(I\) asked the next question, I should have asked that. Were you able to match that photo with any photos from the Messenger application in Facebook?
A. Yes.
Q. And what was that?
A. That was the circular icon in front of -- in front of his name, and it was of a white phone with a hand holding it, and he's got a Band-Aid on his index finger. Q. All right. Can you flip to that in the 14 packet and just show the Court which one that would be. It should have a number on the back.
A. Number 3.
Q. And then if you would just place it up here and show the Court.
A. (Witness complies)
Q. So this photo right here is the one that is associated with the Messenger application photo here?
A. Yes.
Q. And it's the same phone and the same Band-Aid?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. At this time, let's -- you're aware, obviously, of the allegations that you're investigating. Did you find anything of evidentiary value going through these messages?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. Let's start with the beginning. So I guess that's 14, so 2 . What is that that we're looking at?
A. This is Haley's phone, the one that \(I\) got permission from the grandmother to search.
Q. And that has a cracked screen?
A. Yes.
Q. And it's a ZTE phone?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. Can you flip to 14-3. What are we looking at at 14-3?
A. Starting at the very top and looking over to the right, you can see there's a small circular icon.

That's a photograph of Haley with some filters that gave her like a mouth or a nose. When you click on that, it goes to a Cat Lorvan (phonetic), or a Catherine Lorvan. And then down farther are people that she's communicating with with Facebook Messenger.
Q. Okay. Now, Cat Lorvan or Catherine Lorvan, are you aware of what that meaning -- the meaning of that name as it pertains to Haley?
A. Yes, it was the Facebook name she was using.
Q. Okay. Now, is -- now, going down, we see a contact by the name of Luigi Delgado. What is the date on that?
A. November 25th, 2017.
Q. Okay. And what does the message say?
A. Thought \(I\) was going to see you.
Q. Now, can you tell from this context, is he -- is Luigi Delgado sending that message or receiving that message?
A. I'm not sure about that.
Q. Okay.
A. Not on this one. I don't know.
Q. Not on this one?
A. No.
Q. Okay. Can you switch to the next page. What are we looking at here.
A. This is a photograph that was taken within Haley's room. It's of -- from the neck down where she's wearing a bra and a skirt, and she comments, I didn't cut my skirt right.
Q. All right. And can you tell who she's sending that to?
A. Not on -- oh, yes, to Luigi Delgado.
Q. All right. Can you go to number 5. What is the message here?
A. It continues. It says, cute. It's longer in front and shorter in back.
Q. I'm sorry, who says cute?
A. Luigi.
Q. And what is Haley's response?
A. It's longer in front and shorter in back.
Q. What is Luigi's response?
A. Ha, take a pic bending over with it.
Q. All right. And then can you see the -- what happens
right after that?
A. A photograph is sent.
Q. And what's the date and time of that photograph?
A. November 9, 2017, at 12:11 a.m.
Q. Going -- can you flip to the next one, number -- it would be number 6 .

What do we see here?
A. It's a picture reflected from a mirror of a buttocks with the skirt hiked up a little bit.
Q. All right. And now this mirror, were you able to investigate whether you could locate this mirror? A. Yes.
Q. What did you do to investigate that?
A. I went to Haley's grandmother's house, went inside of her room, and compared the photograph with the -with the border of the mirror, and it was the same. Q. Now, in this photo, are you able to see any genitalia?
A. Not really.
Q. Okay. And are you able to tell that Haley sent that to Luigi?
A. Yes, it's labeled at the top, Luigi Delgado.
Q. And was that in response to his question, take a pic bending over with it?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. Can you go to the next one, which would be number 7 .

What do we see here?
A. It's another photograph that's taken with a reflection of the mirror. It's bent over. In this case, you can see her buttocks and her vagina.
Q. Is there another photograph immediately below it?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. Can you go to number 8. And is that the photograph that's partially cut off in 14-7?
A. Yes.
Q. And in this photograph, can you describe it for the Court.
A. It's -- you can see a skirt pulled up. You can see
a buttocks, and you can see a vagina.
Q. And does Luigi give a response?
A. Four letter M's, like mmmm.
Q. And then how does Haley respond?
A. With a smiley wink emoji.
Q. And then does Luigi respond after that?
A. Yes.
Q. What does he say?
A. Fuck, another like the last one but spread open more.
Q. And does Haley respond?
A. Yes, she sends back to two \(K^{\prime} s\), to letter \(K^{\prime} s\), and then a photograph on November 9th at 12:30 a.m.
Q. And can you describe for the court that photograph?
A. It's a blurrier photograph of a buttocks, and this time you can see a hand on her buttocks.
Q. All right. And is it spread open more?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. Can you go to number 9 -- or excuse me, we're on 9. Can you go to number 10.

Does Haley send a message?
A. Yes, she puts LOL, sorry, I fell over. You want me to take another one?
Q. And what is Luigi's response?
A. Yeah.
Q. And what does Haley respond?
A. KK, and again, it's of the buttocks with -- you can see the hand on one part of the buttocks that's more spread open. You can see her vagina.
Q. All right. Can you go to number 11. Does Haley say anything?
A. Yes, she puts the letter \(G\) and several A's, like gaaa, give me a second, and then sends another photograph.
Q. And please describe this photo for the Court?
A. It's of a bare buttocks again. This one I can't see
the vagina.
Q. All right. Continuing on to number 12. And does Haley say anything?
A. Yeah, she says damn, I'm sorry. My hands are shaky, and I'm horny, and I feel like I could throw up and run a marathon.
Q. And what is Luigi's response?
A. Three letter M's, like mmm.
Q. And Haley's response to that?
A. You like them, with a question mark.
Q. And how does Luigi respond?
A. Yes, turned me on. Would you be wearing that if \(I\) picked you up?
Q. And what is her response?
A. Yeah.
Q. And how does Luigi respond?
A. With four letter M's, like mmmm.
Q. Moving to number 12 -- or 13. And what is the date
on this next series of messages?
A. November 9th, 2017, at 1:11 a.m.
Q. Does Haley send a message?
A. Yes.
Q. And what does she say?
A. She says hee-hee, I'm wet.
Q. And what does the -- how does Luigi respond?
A. Let me see, and then Haley sends a photograph.
Q. And can you please describe that photograph for the Court.
A. It's of a vagina with fingers at the very top of the vagina.
Q. And how does Luigi respond?
A. I want it.
Q. Moving on to Exhibit 14 -- or excuse me, page 14 of Exhibit 14 , does Luigi give another statement -- or a text rather after he says \(I\) want it?
A. He may have, but then it does move on to a different date in the next series.
Q. Okay. Now moving to the next series, what date are we now?
A. November 10th, 2017, at 12:16 a.m.
Q. And what does the Defendant's text say?
A. Now, with a question mark.
Q. And what does Haley respond?
A. Now is good for me.
Q. And how does Luigi respond?
A. He says, okay, come out, walk the way you were walking last time.
Q. And how does Haley respond?
A. Okay.
Q. And then does Luigi respond to that?
A. Yes, he writes, what are you wearing? I'll tell you when to leave.
Q. And then what does he say?
A. He says, hello, and then Haley responds with a KK, and then Luigi responds, go now.
Q. Moving to November 10th, 2017, at 2:56 p.m., does Haley send Luigi a message?
A. Yes. It says, hey.
Q. And does Luigi respond?
A. It looks like the next response is November loth at 8:37 p.m., but I can't see what the message was because I think it moves on to another series after this.
Q. Another series, all right. So going to page 16 in Exhibit 14, what does Haley indicate -- or what does she say -- or excuse me, what does Luigi say?
A. It says, IDK LOL. It's hot if you just send him a pic of your pussy spread. He probably wants you.
Q. And what does Haley respond?
A. No, with several O's, I don't want to.
Q. And how does Luigi respond?
A. Don't ask, just spread it and send him one LOL.
Q. And how does Haley respond?
A. Actually, Luigi responds first with an LOLO, and then Haley responds with an LOL.
Q. And then does he say something after that?
A. Yes, it says, do it.
Q. Okay. And moving to the -- can you go to the next one, which is going to be 17. Is this the same series?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. And what does Luigi say?
A. Show me screenshots of it. Did you? LOL.
Q. And how does Haley respond?
A. Yeah.
Q. And then Luigi?
A. Let me see what he'd say.
Q. And then how does Haley respond?
A. Oh, shit, is that really yours.
Q. And then Luigi?
A. Show me the screenshot, baby, with a question mark.
Q. And then does Haley do that, or does it --
A. Yeah, first Luigi responds show me the screenshot of the messages and pic you sent. And that was on November 12th, 2017, at 12:27 a.m. And then she sends a screenshot.
Q. And does that screenshot include a picture?
A. Yes.
Q. And what is that picture of?
A. It's a picture of a vagina with some fingers above it.
Q. All right. And is there any words that go with that
picture?
A. Yeah, it says, you want a surprise? The other person responds, sure, I guess. Then it's the photograph. And then it says, oh, shot, is that really yours? So you want a surprise?
Q. All right. And does this indicate -- the context of this conversation back and forth, is that indicative of Luigi telling Haley to send a screenshot of her vagina to another person?
A. Yes.
Q. And from this message, it looks like she complied? A. Yes.
Q. All right. Moving to page 19 , does Haley reach out to Luigi at all?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. And what does she say?
A. She says, please fuck my ass and pussy until \(I\) can't walk.
Q. And how does Luigi respond?
A. With three letter M's, like mmm, and then it says, show me or \(S-H-O-W-M\), and then it's finished with me. Q. All right. And how does Haley respond?
A. November 16th at 1:20 a.m., there's a picture of her bare buttocks with her hands separating her buttocks. He can see her anus and her vagina.
Q. Moving to number 20 , does Luigi send a message, and what date and time are we now?
A. November 16 th at, \(I\) think it's 1:33 a.m.
Q. What does Luigi say?
A. They're with me now. Show us your pussy.
Q. And how does Haley respond?
A. Mmm, you where, serious? And he responds with yes.
Q. And how does Haley respond?
A. Okay, and then several thumbs-up emojis.
Q. And after the thumbs up emojis, what do we see?
A. A picture of a vagina with some fingers above it.
Q. And that's what Haley sent to Luigi?
A. Yes.
Q. And what is Luigi's response?
A. Mmmm, like four letter M's. So you want to?
Q. And that's a question?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. Moving to page 22, and how does Haley respond?
A. Okay, I will. Are we just fuck buddies, or are we dating?
Q. And how does Luigi respond?
A. Both kinda. IDK about dating because you're really young, but we can wait until you're older to date, but I still want you.
Q. And how does Haley respond to that?
A. I still want you too, okay.
Q. And moving to number 23?
A. Haley asked how long do we have to wait until we date?
Q. And then what does Luigi say?
A. He puts the numeral 16.
Q. And how does Haley respond to that?
A. Oh, okay, not that long. I'll be 15 in two months, just a year.
Q. And does Luigi reply?
A. Yes.
Q. What's he say?
A. You had sex on Tuesday, question mark.
Q. And what does Haley say?
A. What, question mark.
Q. And then Luigi's response?
A. You had sex on Tuesday, and Haley responds with yeah.
Q. Going to 24 , and what does Luigi ask?
A. With who?
Q. And what does Haley -- or how does Haley respond?
A. Maybe it was last week, with you.
Q. And Luigi's response?
A. With who, another guy?
Q. And then Haley?
A. How did you know that?
Q. And Luigi?
A. Did you? Just tell the truth.
Q. Okay. Now --

THE COURT: All right, at this time we're going to take a five-minute recess, and then we'll come back. These are sealed. It's going to take us time to scan those in and seal them.

MR. GRAHAM: All right.
(Whereupon, court recessed)
THE COURT: Are you ready to proceed?
MR. GRAHAM: I am, Your Honor, thank you.
THE COURT: Okay. Back on the record in
17-SCR-02095. All parties are present.
And go ahead, counsel.
MR. GRAHAM: Thank you.
BY MR. GRAHAM:
Q. Detective Dickson, before the break, we had been speaking regarding the text -- well, Messenger messages back and forth between Mr. Delgado and Haley. Were you able to -- and there's a series of photos that are encompassed in those messages. Were you able to identify the female in those messages as Haley? A. Yes.
Q. And that was based on the context as well as the visual appearance of Haley?
A. Yeah, and the visual appearance of her room too.
Q. Okay. Did the examination of her phone help you develop probable cause to get a seizure order?
A. Yes.
Q. And also to look into Mr. Delgado's phone?
A. Yes.
Q. Based on that, did you have to serve those on the Defendant?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. I want to draw your attention to January 23rd, 2018. At that time, did you have contact with Mr. Delgado?
A. Yes.
Q. Where did that contact occur?
A. In interview room number 2 at the washoe county Sheriff's Office.
Q. To be clear, was Mr. Delgado in custody at that time?
A. Yes.
Q. And he had already been arraigned on this case?
A. I don't know for sure, but \(I\) assume so.
Q. Okay. And at that time, what was the purpose of bringing him up to the interview room?
A. To conduct the seizure order to get his DNA and then also to serve him with the other search warrants.
Q. All right. And how is it that you obtained his DNA? A. With two buccal swabs.
Q. And for the Court, how, and for the record, how are those buccal swabs obtained and what is a buccal swab?
A. A buccal swab is basically like a Q-tip. It's
rubbed on the inside of his cheek and then put into a box.
Q. And what is the purpose of that?
A. To identify him and his DNA --
Q. Okay.
A. -- for comparison purposes at a later time if there was any biological evidence.
Q. All right. And at this time, had you already searched the motorhome?
A. No, I would do later that evening.
Q. Okay. And so you -- and is it -- that buccal swab, is that oftentimes called a reference sample?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And during the service of that seizure order, did you obtain a buccal swab?
A. Yes.
Q. And during that time while Mr. Delgado was in the interview room, did he initiate contact with you in some
way?
A. Yes.
Q. And how is that?
A. He stated that \(I\) never identified the victim -- or \(I\) had only called the victim Haley and that he knew her as Kathleen or Catherine.
Q. Okay. And was that important to the investigation?
A. Yes.
Q. And why is that?
A. Because during the first interview, he said that he had never known who Haley was even in -- even though during that interview, I had showed him a picture of Haley from her phone. So now it had changed dramatically from the first interview when he said he didn't know that Haley, and now he was saying he knew her, just as a different -- under a different name. Q. Okay. And that mean that he knew her as, you had previously testified as Catherine or Cat, that was the name on her Facebook account?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Did he indicate that he wanted to give a statement regarding that?
A. Yes.
Q. What did you do when he told you that?
A. I told him that \(I\) wanted to go start the video and
the audio recording equipment in the room. I needed to get someone that could watch the interview, and then \(I\) wanted to go over his rights before we spoke again.
Q. Okay. And did you do that?
A. Yes.
Q. And did he say he understood his rights?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. And when you started speaking with him, what were the questions that you asked?
A. It started with him describing, again, that he only knew Haley as Catherine before, and I had never mentioned that name during the first interview. And then also, he went into another explanation of how she could have got the SART findings.
Q. So he had received some discovery at that point?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Did he indicate what he and Catherine would do together?
A. Yes, he said that they had communicated first on MeetMe, then moved to Facebook Messenger, that he had gone out to her grandmother's house and picked her up, and that there was times that they had just driven around, and then there was other incidents where he had driven her, and they had gone inside of his RV.
Q. All right. And did he indicate what they would do
inside the RV?
A. He said that they would just talk and hang out. He said that Haley talked a lot about having problems with her dad and that also she had talked about suicidal thoughts, and he said that he would just try to put her at ease and talk to her and tell her to calm down.
Q. Did you ask Mr. Delgado how he and Catherine first started communicating?
A. Yes.
Q. And what did he say?
A. He said that it started on MeetMe.com and then
transitioned to Messenger.
Q. Oh, I'm sorry, how long ago that it had started?
A. Oh, he -- he indicated October or November.
Q. All right. And did he confirm with you that -- his Facebook account?
A. Yes, he was adamant that his Facebook account was Luigi Delgado.
Q. Okay. And then did he at some point change to a different Facebook name?
A. Yes.
Q. And what was that?
A. Rah Blazin.
Q. Spelled \(R-A-H\) space \(B-L-A-Z-I-N\) ?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. Did you ask him again about his phone? A. Yes.
Q. And what did he say?
A. Well, I asked him about the appearance of the phone because it looked very new, and he had said that it had gotten stolen in October, his previous phone had gotten stolen in October. So he had a new phone. Later in the interview, he'd say that he it for approximately two weeks. I asked him specifically what had happened to his white phone, and he said that he hadn't had that white phone for approximately two years.
Q. Okay. Did you ask Luigi how he met, physically met, Haley the first time?
A. Yes, and he described driving out to the grandmother's house and then Haley meeting him in his vehicle.
Q. All right. Did he accurately -- did you ask him to physically describe Haley?
A. Yes.
Q. And how did he describe her?
A. He described her as tall with shorter dark hair with glasses. He described her as being thick, which all matched Haley's description.
Q. All right. Did you ask him to describe -- or did he describe the first time meeting Catherine, who we know
is Haley?
A. Yes.
Q. What car did he pick her up in?
A. At first he said it was a blue Thunderbird, and then later in the interview, he would say that it was possible that he had picked him [sic] up in his white Subaru.
Q. All right. Did he indicate what they would do while talking in the RV?
A. He described them -- one of them sitting in the chair and one of them sitting on the bed and just talking.
Q. All right. Did he indicate anything that he would put into his body?
A. Oh, he said that he would drink alcohol and take Oxycodone.
Q. Okay. At any time did he indicate whether he would pick her up in the white Subaru?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Did he indicate whether he knew about Haley crashing her mother's vehicle?
A. Yes. He talked about also trying to counsel her and not taking the vehicle and being kind to her grandmother.
Q. All right. How did Luigi describe Haley's actions
toward him?
A. That she was the aggressor, that she wanted a relationship with him. He described himself as not being a kissing type, but he described times where Haley would pull him onto her and then also described her as touching his penis over and underneath his clothing.
Q. All right. Did he indicate that Haley would try to get him to take off his clothes?
A. Yes.
Q. And he refused to do that?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Do you recall how many times Luigi admitted that Haley and him were in the RV?
A. At least twice.
Q. Okay. In total how many times did he admit to meeting?
A. Three or four. I was confused by it because I didn't know if there was two incidents where he just drove around, but he said that there was two different times that they had gone into the RV.
Q. At some point did he ever tell you that he explained to Haley that she wasn't old enough for him?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. At some point, did you ask Luigi how old she told him she was?
A. I don't remember that.
Q. Would it refresh your recollection if you saw your report --
A. Yeah.
Q. -- supplement 14, paragraph one, two, three, four, five?

Would that refresh your recollection?
A. Yes.

MR. GRAHAM: May I approach?

THE COURT: You may.
BY MR. GRAHAM:
Q. Did that sufficiently refresh your recollection?
A. Yes.
Q. And do you know the answer?
A. Yes, she described -- she said she was 14.
Q. And Luigi told you that?
A. Yes, and that was prior to their last meeting.
Q. Did at any time he admit to you about taking Haley to get tacos?
A. Yes.
Q. And where did he take her?
A. To Jack in the Box.
Q. All right. Did you ask Luigi directly if he had sex with Haley?
A. Yes.
Q. And what was his response?
A. No.
Q. Did you ask him if he had kissed her?
A. Yes.
Q. And what was his response?
A. No.
Q. Did you ask him whether or not there were any photographs that she had sent him?
A. Yes.
Q. And what was his response?
A. I think his response was possibly or probably.
Q. Okay. And if you wrote in your report that he stated possibly --
A. Yes.
Q. -- would that be accurate?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you come -- at this point, you'd already seen the Facebook Messenger messages back and forth between the two?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. And did you confront him with that.
A. Yes.
Q. And what was his response?
A. He was -- he started talking about how this was his whole life, and he started talking more about
consequences than denying any of the allegations. Q. All right. If you had indicated in your report that -- it indicates here, \(I\) also informed him \(I\) knew he received a photograph of her vagina on November 18 th , 2017, and he acknowledged it by stating, mmm. And that's referring to the Messenger back and forth. And Luigi stated, quote, I mean, fuck.
A. Yes.
Q. Is that what he said?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Are you aware of a postcard that the Defendant sent?
A. Yes.
Q. What was that about?
A. It was sent -- or it was sent to Jeanine's address, Haley's grandmother, and it was sent to -- it says HT or HI accuser, who it was addressed. It talked about -and was trying to encourage the accuser not to show up to court, that he planned on going into the military. It could ruin his life. He had a daughter. That daughter needed services.
Q. Are you aware -- without telling us what Haley's grandma said, are you aware whether that postcard was delivered?
A. Yes, it was.
Q. All right. And did you have the opportunity to review that postcard?
A. Yes.

MR. GRAHAM: May I approach?
THE COURT: You may.
BY MR. GRAHAM:
Q. Showing you what's been marked as State's proposed Exhibit 13, do you recognize that?
A. Yes.
Q. And what do you recognize that to be?
A. The postcard that Luigi sent to Jeanine's address -THE COURT: What exhibit?

MR. GRAHAM: 13.
THE WITNESS: 13.
THE COURT: Thank you.
THE WITNESS: -- where it's labeled HI HT
accuser.
BY MR. GRAHAM:
Q. How is it -- and then there's two pages to Exhibit 13. What's on the second page?
A. The second page is the description talking about how he is wrongfully accused --
Q. I'm going to stop you there. But do you recognize that?
A. Yes.
Q. And how is it that you recognize it?
A. Because \(I\) collected it and booked it into evidence.
Q. And who did you collect it from?
A. I collected it from Jennifer Rich (phonetic), Jeanine's daughter. They had collected it a couple weeks prior from Jeanine.
Q. And provided it to you?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. And is that a true and accurate copy of what Haley's aunt, I guess, gave to you?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And before \(I\) ask you the next question, did you have an opportunity to ask Mr. Delgado about that? A. Yes.
Q. And did he indicate that he did send that postcard?
A. Yes.
Q. All right.

MR. GRAHAM: Your Honor, at this time, I'd move for admission and publication of State's proposed Exhibit 13.

MR. SLOCUM: No objection for this hearing, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Exhibit 13 is admitted.
(Whereupon, Plaintiff's Exhibit 13 admitted)
MR. GRAHAM: Thank you.

BY MR. GRAHAM:
Q. For the record -- actually, I'm going to have you read it, if you could, and it's page 2 of Exhibit 13. Can you read that into the record.
A. Hi, I am in jail being wrongfully accused. I don't know who \(H T\) or \(H I\) is in the charges description -- and above it it's in parentheses, and it says criminal complaint. I'm asking for you guys to help me get these charges dismissed. My whole life and future is on the line. I have a daughter and was in the process of enlisting in the military, but with these charges, I won't be able to. This can ruin my life and future. I am trying set for my daughter and I. I -- can you please not show to court and not make up accusations anymore. Anything to help get this dismissed. And it looks like thank you in the very corner.
Q. All right, thank you. And so at that time, when you asked him about that, you had indicated that he said, yeah, he did send that?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you ask him why he sent that?
A. I don't remember.
Q. Did you ask him what it said?
A. Yeah, he gave a description where he talked about that he was wrongfully accused, and I can't remember
everything of what his description was.
Q. Was it consistent with the postcard that you'd seen?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. At some point, did you take a break of that -- during that interview?
A. Yes.
Q. And when you came back, did you ask him about a text message chain that you had seen regarding Haley being on her period?
A. Yes.
Q. And what specifically did he say about that regarding cleaning out?
A. He described he didn't know what that meant. I told
him what \(I\) believed \(I\) thought it meant because she had described being -- where she was having cramps, and it was painful, and it wasn't a period. I told him that I believed it was him asking her if she had cleaned the semen out from her vagina.
Q. All right. And he claimed he didn't know what that meant?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Did you confront Mr. Delgado about encouraging Haley to send naked photographs of herself and meeting him after he knew she was 14?
A. Yes.
Q. And what was his response?
A. I don't remember exactly what it was --
Q. Would it --
A. -- but the theme of the denials was a lot of, you know, this is my life we're talking about, no really strong denial to the accusation.
Q. Okay. Based on -- soon after, did the interview end?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And based on his statements to you, the evidence in the case, did you add a charge for dissuading a witness?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. And that was for the postcard that was sent?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Now, the time frame that we're talking about and -- from your investigation, to the best of knowledge, the time frame that the conversations started to when they end is approximately October 1st, 2017, to December 13th, 2017?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. And based on the context of the conversations, did it appear to you that Mr. Delgado was encouraging Haley to send those photos to him?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. And based on the nature of the contact being over electronic communication or the Internet, but for that, would they have ever made contact?
A. I'm sorry, can you ask that again?
Q. I guess my question is, did it appear to you that but for these electronic communications, Haley would have ever made contact with the Defendant?
A. No.
Q. All right. And based on the covert messages that we read about and your interview -- or at least watching the interview with Haley and in your interviews with Mr. Delgado, did it appear that -- or did the evidence suggest that they were trying to get away from his -her grandma in order to continue this sexual relationship?
A. Yes.
Q. And all this occurred in Washoe County, Nevada?
A. Yes.

MR. GRAHAM: Pass the witness. THE COURT: Cross.

CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MR. SLOCUM:
Q. Good afternoon.
A. Good afternoon.
Q. How are you today?
A. Good.
Q. Good. Okay, so you mentioned that there were two different interviews that you did with Mr. Lopez-Delgado; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And the first one that you did was because he had been identified by Haley; is that right?
A. He had been identified through the probation officer and the aunt and uncle. Haley, in her forensic interview, would not say him by name, but she had given that name to the probation officer.
Q. Okay. So your understanding was the name had originally come from Haley, but then it was routed through a probation officer, and then you said an uncle, and that's how you came to know that perhaps Mr. Lopez-Delgado would be a person of interest? A. Yes.
Q. And, yeah, we listened to the forensic interview this afternoon. So you're aware that at no point does the name Luigi Lopez-Delgado get mentioned?
A. Correct.
Q. And you said that initially when you talked to Mr. Lopez-Delgado, you were mentioning a Haley. He said he only knew one Haley; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. And that was not the Haley that you were interested in -- in knowing about.

Is that fair to say?
A. Correct.
Q. All right. And then through the course of that interview, at no point did Mr. Lopez-Delgado disclose to you that he knew who you were talking about; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And you said there was some concern on your part because you had asked him to turn his phone to airplane mode.

Do you remember that?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Now that happens before we go into the interview room; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. So that's not actually recorded?
A. I don't think \(I\) had my audio recorder on so I don't think that was recorded.
Q. Okay. But you have a distinct recollection of telling him why don't you put your phone in airplane mode so that we won't get disturbed?
A. Yes.
Q. And it was your understanding that he had done that? A. Yes.
Q. Did you ask him specifically, hey, did you do that, or how was that understanding from you?
A. Yeah, when I asked him to do it, he started manipulating the phone, and he said that he had done it. Q. Okay. And you have a distinct memory that he told you, yeah, I did that?
A. Yes.
Q. But as you go into the interview room throughout the parts of your interview, he's denying that he knows -he knows the Haley that you're interested in. And that -- how is it that hi's phone comes into question? A. I asked for consent to search his phone, to search his vehicle that he had driven in the Sheriff's Office, and the motorhome.
Q. And he denies all those consents; is that correct? A. Initially, he gives me consent for the phone, and then he denies -- I can't remember what it was at first, if it was the car or the motorhome, but then he denies for that, and then he changes his mind about the phone. Q. Okay. So as far as the phone was concerned, even though he said that he would grant you consent, he didn't know how to get into the phone. Is that what \(I\) understood? He didn't remember the pass code. Isn't
that what you said?
A. That was later when \(I\) had the search warrant for the phone. I asked him for the pass code so we could search it because it had been locked, and that's when he said he didn't know what the pass code was.
Q. Okay. So--
A. He didn't say it at the time.
Q. Okay. So when you're having that first interview and he gives you consent, were you able to get into the phone?
A. Just to put it in airplane mode, and that was after he had already -- he had taken back his consent so \(I\) put it in airplane mode so it couldn't be tampered with and I was going to apply for a search warrant.
Q. Okay. So you did or did not get into the phone at that time? When \(I\) say "get in," I mean could you open it up and see what was on the phone?
A. Opened it and just went to airplane mode, and \(I\) think it was just already previously opened from his contact to it, contact with it.
Q. And what do you mean by it was open with his contact with it?
A. He started manipulating the phone when \(I\) asked to -for the phone. So \(I\) think it was in an open screen. It hadn't locked up yet.
Q. Okay. So then when you put it in airplane mode, does that immediately lock the phone then?
A. No, I think it's just probably over a period of time or if maybe the power goes out on it. It had locked up at some point. I don't know exactly when.
Q. Or was it your testimony that you put it in airplane mode, and he says, actually, I'm going to revoke my consent?
A. I don't remember which one came first.
Q. Is it fair to say you didn't make any attempt to look at the phone beyond putting it in airplane mode at least at that time?
A. Yes.
Q. And then you advise Mr. Lopez-Delgado that that's fine that you don't give consent, and then you went ahead and applied for some search warrants?
A. Yes.
Q. But as that interview ended, at that point, Mr. Lopez-Delgado was saying I don't know the Haley you're talking about.

Is that how it ended?
A. Yeah, he said that throughout the interview.
Q. But \(I\) mean, as things ended, you went from him saying I don't know who you're talking about, and at the end, he was still saying \(I\) don't know who you're talking
about.
Is that fair to say?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And then you placed him under arrest, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And then you did your applications for the search warrants and the seizure order?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And then if \(I\) understood your testimony, you actually went to -- to him to do the seizure order and advise him of the search warrants. Were you already in the interview room at that time, or did the interview room come to fruition because you then, when you go to serve them, Mr. Lopez-Delgado tells you okay, now \(I\) want to talk to you?
A. I had placed him in the interview room because it's a convenient place where we could get a buccal swab. It's out of the, you know, out of like the general public area. He was brought up by jail staff. I told him I got some paperwork I need to serve you. I had gone into the secretary's office where all of the search warrants were, activated my audio recorder, went in and told him about the search warrants and the seizure order, and \(I\) obtained it then.
Q. Okay. So there's an audio portion for that, and then when he tells you that actually, I want to talk to you, it was at that point that you activated the video as well?
A. Yes, after taking a short break to go out and actually start it. You can't just flip a switch or anything on our systems. You have to go to an observation room and type in the case number, who you're interviewing.
Q. Okay. And then did you say you had to go get somebody else also to monitor the interview?
A. Yes.
Q. And what was the reason for that?
A. It's policy and procedure where when we're conducting an interview with a suspect, that we have someone else observing it, not only to notice content, but also for safety concerns.
Q. Okay. So there was no concern as far as issuing the -- or advising him of the search warrant and then executing the seizure order?
A. There was because the jail staff was still present with me or just outside the door when \(I\) was doing that. So they were still present in the area, the jail staff was.
Q. In the area, is that what you said?
A. Yeah, if they were -- if they weren't outside right at the door, they would have been in the observation room while \(I\) was doing that.
Q. Okay. And so the person that you get to observe that, does that end up being a jail person, or who is that, if you recall?
A. I think \(I\) went and got a detective, but \(I\) don't remember who \(I\) went and got. Normally, you know, we can't always take jail staff for long periods of time, and if it's going to be an interview, it can be very long. So in this case, \(I\) don't remember if jail staff stayed, but \(I\) think it's more likely that \(I\) got another detective to observe the interview.
Q. Okay. And you mentioned as part of that second interview, now -- now Mr. Lopez-Delgado informed you that, oh, now that I've had a chance to think about it, I know who you're talking about --
A. Yes.
Q. -- is that right?

Okay. But somebody that he never knew as Haley?
A. Yes.
Q. And you'd agree with me that throughout the first interview, the only name that you talked about was Haley. You didn't have any other names.

Is that fair to say?
A. Yes.
Q. And not only does he say, okay, I know who you're talking about, but also knows about some other incident that had occurred at Jan Evans.

Do you remember that?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Did you ever conduct any more investigation about that particular disclosure?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. So did you go and talk to folks at Jan Evans about that?
A. Yes.
Q. Did that investigation go anywhere?
A. No.
Q. So after -- and what was the extent of the investigation just so that we're --
A. I talked to the probation officer. Her last name was Falconer (phonetic). I asked if there was any way we could review video footage from, I guess, the closest area to the showers as they could. At that point, they had -- they didn't retain the video long enough. Too much time had expired.

I also spoke to Sam and Jennifer Rich again. They said that they had spoken to her about the allegations, and she said it wasn't true. And then I talked to the
grandmother, and she told me that she spoke to her granddaughter, Haley. She said it wasn't -- it wasn't true. And grandma asked, well, why would you say something like that, and Haley's response to her grandmother was is he liked to hear things like that. Q. Okay. So just so we're clear about this, your understanding was that she had actually said that, but it just wasn't true.

Is that fair to say?
A. Yes.
Q. And then additionally, you talked with him about what his -- was it at that point you talked to him about what his Facebook name was or his Facebook profile was, or how was that that --
A. Yeah, I started from the very beginning to -because at that point for the first interview, he said he didn't know her so I wanted to establish how they had met and walk through that, and sometime in the beginning I do ask about his Facebook name or what he is called on Facebook Messenger.
Q. Okay. And had you already done the subpoena to Facebook, or did that come later?
A. That was already done on the 22nd, but I hadn't received any of the information yet.
Q. Okay. So the subpoena had been issued, but you
didn't have a return on the subpoena, is that --
A. Yeah, correct. I just got a real brief electronic response saying we've received the warrant, and we're going to be processing it.
Q. And then throughout the course of the interview, you're, of course, interested to know whether it's Luigi Delgado or Louie Delgado that's on Facebook; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. And all you're doing at that point is determining whether or not there's -- there is some sort of contact between Haley and Mr. Lopez-Delgado; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. And then we saw the packet that was created. And in terms of messages that are exchanged, do you know what mechanism is used to exchange the messages on this phone?
A. It was using Facebook Messenger.
Q. And so I'm going to show you what's the third page here.

MR. SLOCUM: If I may approach, Your Honor? THE COURT: Certainly.

BY MR. SLOCUM:
Q. So this is the third page. So it's your testimony today that that's a screenshot from an app?
A. Yeah, you turn on the phone, and there's a Messenger app that you click on, and this is the very first screen that shows up on the home screen after getting into that on the Messenger app.
Q. Is the home screen for the app or the home screen for the phone?
A. For the app.
Q. Okay. So you have to turn on or open up the phone, as the case may be, and then you would click on a Facebook Messenger app?
A. Yes.
Q. And then this is the screen that comes up?
A. Yes.
Q. And then from there, you said that you located a picture -- because clearly, we're in agreement as far as the Facebook Messenger app, all we see is a hand, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And it does say Luigi Delgado, but is it your understanding that this name -- where does this name come from?
A. It's the user name for Messenger, Facebook Messenger.
Q. Okay. But is that something that you have to show any verification of to have that name?
A. No, I think you just complete it yourself.
Q. So you could put John Smith or you could put Joe Blow with that or what name you put in there.

Is that fair to say?
A. Yes.
Q. And then you showed us in Exhibit 15 what you had done with respect to Facebook to get this picture?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And what is this picture, or where did this picture come from?
A. It came from images that were on Louie Delgado's Facebook.
Q. Okay. So when you say "Facebook," are we going back to where the subpoena was, or did you just go to the Facebook website?
A. No, going to the actual what was returned with the warrant service.
Q. Okay. So you get a packet back from the search warrant, and this is a picture that's among the still shots on the page?
A. Yeah, it's grouped. You can go to a specific file where it says images, and then all the images that were associated to his Facebook account are there. And that was one of the -- one of the images there.
Q. Okay. But you'd agree with me that there are a variety of different images there, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And they're different people that are associated with the different images.

Is that fair to say?
A. No, I'd say the one that was most consistent was Luigi himself. There was plenty of other photographs in there of him, and then there appeared to be a lot of other photographs of other girls that he was in relationships with. There was also -- like for some reason, it pulls up like emojis and things like that are all associated in all the files in the images.
Q. Okay. When you got the return on that -- on that warrant from Facebook, what did you do with those material?
A. I don't understand.
Q. Where are those materials right now?
A. I've had them, and I turned over to the District Attorney's Office all the records with her Facebook, Rah Blazin, and Louie Delgado.
Q. Okay. So when you did the return, this was among the pictures for that?
A. Yeah, it was one of the images that was in that electronic file. I think when \(I\) turned it over, it would have been thousands and thousands -- probably over a thousand pages of information. So \(I\) put it on a DVD
and gave it to the District Attorney's Office.
Q. Okay. And how many pictures are associated with this particular account; do you recall?
A. I don't know, probably hundreds, maybe even getting close to a thousand.
Q. Okay, and of various different people. You said mostly the person you recognize as Mr. Lopez-Delgado is the one depicted, but there are a variety of people depicted --
A. Yes.
Q. -- is that fair to say?
A. Yes.
Q. And is it also fair to say there are no pictures of Haley associated with this Facebook images?
A. No, not on that Facebook return.
Q. Now, you mentioned during the course of the, as I understood it, the first interview, that

Mr. Lopez-Delgado had indicated his phone had been stolen, is that right --
A. Yes.
Q. -- or he had lost it?

I think he actually said stolen, right?
A. Yeah, I think he said it got stolen.
Q. And that he had to get a new phone?
A. Yes.
Q. And do you recall when it was that he said it had been stolen?
A. I'm sorry, what?
Q. Do you recall when it was that he said it was stolen?
A. I --
Q. Would it be fair to say that he says that the phone was stolen before any of the photographs that we've talked about here today in that packet occurred?
A. Yeah, he said it got stolen in October.
Q. Okay. And is it fair to say that once somebody has an account set up, unless they do something to change it, the account is going to be what it is.

Is that fair to say?
A. I don't understand that question.
Q. Okay. So for example, if somebody's got images that are associated with a particular name that are associated, for example, with a particular app, unless somebody were to change that, it's going to remain what it is.

Is that fair to say? Do you not understand the question? I can try to rephrase it.
A. I think \(I\) know, but maybe if you can make it a little more --
Q. Certainly. So if \(I\) have a phone that has an app and
identifies me as being Luigi Delgado, let's say, as an example, and \(I\) lose my phone and somebody else can get into the phone, then unless \(I\) change something or the new person changes something, it's going to remain with the same image.

Is that not so?
A. Yeah, I'd say it would stay the same unless it was either manipulated by the company or manipulated by the person or an outside source.
Q. Right. So my point being is that the person that Haley was communicating with has this name of Luigi Delgado in the contact list, I guess, is that how he described it on that home page?
A. I think it -- yeah, it could be described as that or maybe like more -- like more recent messages. I don't know exactly how --
Q. Are you that familiar with it? I am not so that's why I'm asking the question.
A. I am not that either.
Q. Okay. So I'm trying to get a sense of whether or not that is -- the person that she's communicating with has this name associated with Luigi Delgado, but we don't know, necessarily, at this particular moment whether that's an exchange between Luigi Lopez-Delgado or not, right, because he's already told you his phone
got stolen in October, right?
A. Yes, but that's where \(I\) would go to the context of some of the conversations where it's still consistent with Luigi. Like there was a time where he said that it's still freezing, it's still cold, it's in the RV, and that was in November of 2017, and that's exchanges between --
Q. Was that in the exchanges that we just saw?
A. No, but it was in the original ones that \(I\) showed him on the first interview. So I don't -- they're not in that series, but \(I\) did photograph that and bring it in and show him during that first interview, so. And that was provided in -- to the District Attorney's Office.
Q. And so is that a similar Facebook app?
A. It's the exact same. I jut didn't take another picture of it for this series because I thought it was -- already existed.
Q. Okay. And as I understand, what happened was you got a list of all of these -- all of this data, basically, but these photos are something different. These are still shots that were taken from Haley's phone?
A. Yes.
Q. So that's different than the data that we talked
about that came back as a result of the subpoena.
Is that fair to say?
A. Yes.
Q. So the only photograph or picture that we've seen today that's connected to the subpoena that you did is the -- is the -- Exhibit 15; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. And is it fair to say you don't know what all of this at the top is above the picture?
A. No.
Q. Or why this has a timestamp of 5:43 a.m. or anything. Is that fair to say?
A. Yes, I don't know.
Q. And then you did talk to Mr. Lopez-Delgado about whether or not he sent these messages?
A. Yes.
Q. And he denied that he had -- had these exchanges?
A. In the first interview but not in the second interview.
Q. I meant specifically these that we've seen today that you took the still shots of.
A. I did not show them -- show him those particular ones. I talked about him knowing the age, which was consistent with one of those in the second interview. So he did provide some information that was consistent
with something from that first set.
Q. But as far as asking, hey, were you encouraging her to send pictures and so on, did you ask that question? A. I don't know if \(I\) used the word encourage or did you ask her or did she send. I might have said that.
Q. Okay. So what we heard on direct that you asked could he have -- could she have sent a picture, and his response was possibly. Is that the extent of the conversation about whether or not she had sent pictures? A. Yes.
Q. And then as \(I\) understood it, there's a -- there's a part in which it's deemed that someone was asking her to send a picture to somebody else?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Were you able to identify who that other person was?
A. I believe \(I\) did find that in her Facebook data -actually, no. No, I wouldn't have because that was -it wasn't there because the date range on the data \(I\) received from Facebook was very limited starting from like the beginning of December, like December 4 th, and only going to about December 9 th or 10 th for almost -for all three accounts that \(I\) applied for search warrants for.
Q. Okay. So even though it's in the -- it's in the
still shots that we saw today, it's not in the data that you received?
A. Yeah, correct, and \(I\) believe that would be the case because it took me a while to identify these Facebook accounts for everyone, including the victim. So it took me a while to be able to send something to Facebook to preserve that information before it was deleted. And there was text communication where Luigi was requesting Haley to delete this -- delete this conversation, delete it. That was referenced in the messages that were exchanged between them. So I believe that's why the Facebook information \(I\) did receive back from the company was only limited to those dates.
Q. So you were not able to identify the other person that the photograph was sent to; is that correct?
A. I can't remember if \(I\) did or not just through like the little circle icon. She was communicating with other people, but \(I\) have a strong suspicions who I think it was sent to with one of the one person she was communicating, but \(I\) can't say for certain right now. Q. Okay. So when you say "one of the other people she was communicating with," do you think that that's somebody that Mr. Lopez-Delgado also knew?
A. No.
Q. Okay. So if \(I\) understand your testimony, you
believe that he was encouraging her to send a picture to somebody that he didn't know?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And from there, he denies -- or would you not say he -- he's not really directly asked were there pictures of some questionable content, or were there naked photos, for example, that were exchanged?
A. I don't know if \(I\) specified it as being naked photos or anything. I asked if he had received or she had sent photographs.
Q. And then you said you were never able to confirm that he received the photographs.

Is that fair to say?
A. No, I think the content and his responses acknowledge that he did receive them.
Q. Okay. Which responses do you mean?
A. Like the mmm, and then he would receive one picture and give direction to spread more, and the next photograph would be that. So I think he was -Q. Somebody had received them. You can agree with that, right? I mean, we could say somebody received them and somebody responded, but my point is, you were not able to, for example, find where it was that Mr. Lopez-Delgado had received any photos.

Is that fair to say?
A. Can you repeat the question?
Q. Certainly. My understanding was that you did a request from Facebook for the account s. I don't know whether you can do that with the Messenger or not, can you?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. So were you able to from that account establish that the man who is sitting here at Defendant's table is the man who received those images? A. Based on the totality of the circumstances, yes. Q. And when you say "totality of the circumstances," you mean what exactly?
A. Linking up the Facebook Messenger to his actual Facebook account where there's several photographs of him talking to someone that he knew that identified that was the Facebook page that he was using, the content of their conversations, to him consistently being -responding with mmm after getting receipt. And then even to go with Haley's statements about he liked to hear things like that where the content was asking her if she'd be interested in having sex with multiple partners or hearing about any other sexual escapades she was having. And then also just to include the -- him stating about the RV, the RV's cold, and that was communication with Haley.

And then as a series of this -- between MeetMe with Richeez, the Louie Delgado, and the Facebook Messenger IP addresses that were being used, it matched up with also another account he admitted to using was Rah Blazin. The IP -- there was certain IP addresses that were all the same between all three. And in the very first one with MeetMe, it states, hey, this is Louie, let's talk on Facebook Messenger. So that would be another thing for content to show that was him. Q. Okay. And when was that done?
A. What do you mean?
Q. Do you recall when -- because it started with MeetMe, right?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you recall when that began?
A. That was -- the earliest information \(I\) think was the beginning of November. I don't remember the exact date. Q. And as \(I\) understood, everything that you're linking it to is that Mr. Delgado acknowledged to you that he was using Rah Blazin? Is that what it is?
A. Yes, that was one of the names he was using.
Q. And where was he using the Rah Blazin?
A. Also on Facebook, at a different separate account. Q. Okay. And that the IP address was the same between Rah Blazin and the Facebook --
A. Yeah, there was consistent IP addresses with Rah Blazin, Louie Delgado on Facebook, which what he was using Luigi Delgado in Facebook Messenger, and also MeetMe. And then also going back to Rah Blazin, it only had one listed friend, and that was the Catherine Lorvan, the Facebook that Haley was using.
Q. Okay. And you said that when you clicked on Haley's picture, then it comes up with identifying information that says Catherine Lorvan?
A. Yes.
Q. And then did you go back and talk to Haley about this or not really?
A. No.
Q. But you know that she was communicating with other people as well?
A. Yes.

MR. SLOCUM: I don't have any further questions at this time.

THE COURT: Redirect.
REDIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MR. GRAHAM:
Q. Do you recall in Defendant's very first interview he stated to you that he had no Facebook accounts?
A. Yes.
Q. That he never even used Facebook?
A. Yes.
Q. Never even used Facebook Messenger?
A. Yes.
Q. Never even used dating applications --
A. Yes.
Q. -- like MeetMe?

And hadn't been in a relationship in over a year?
A. Yes.
Q. Physical or otherwise?
A. Yes.
Q. And that's because he was focusing on his work?
A. Yes.
Q. And his daughter. Do you remember how old she was?
A. I think she was seven.
Q. So seven at the time. And Haley's how old?
A. Fourteen.
Q. At the time?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And then later when you're able to go into Haley's phone, you find that -- I mean, you already suspected it, but you found that that's completely not true?
A. Yes.
Q. And during the second interview, all of a sudden now, Defendant says, okay, okay, I do have Facebook
accounts, not one, not two, possibly three, but two for sure, Rah Blazin, Louie Delgado, with a Messenger of Luigi Delgado?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. So kind of where Defense was going is it could have been somebody else if you believe him that his phone was stolen?
A. Correct.
Q. So you'd have to trust him that he's telling the truth?
A. Yes.

MR. GRAHAM: Nothing further.
THE COURT: Recross.
MR. SLOCUM: I don't have anything further, Your Honor.

THE COURT: May this witness be excused?
MR. SLOCUM: Yes.
MR. GRAHAM: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: All right. You may go about your day. Thank you, sir.

MR. DICKSON: Thank you.
THE COURT: Your next witness.
MR. GRAHAM: I have no more witnesses, Your Honor, with the admission of State's evidence.

THE COURT: I have Exhibits 1 through 15 that
have been admitted.
MR. GRAHAM: Thank you. That's all that I have testimony, evidence. That's all I have.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. SLOCUM: If I could just have a moment, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Take your time.
(Whereupon, Mr. Slocum and the Defendant confer)

MR. SLOCUM: And, Your Honor, thank you very much for the indulgence. I've spoken with

Mr. Lopez-Delgado. It's my understanding that based upon my advice, he's not going to be testifying at the preliminary hearing.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. SLOCUM: We are not going to be offering any additional evidence today, and we --

THE COURT: So he was informed of his right to call witnesses and there are none?

MR. SLOCUM: That is correct, Your Honor.
THE COURT: All right. He's not testifying, all right. So Defense case?

MR. SLOCUM: That is correct, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Thank you. I just want to make it clear, so.

MR. SLOCUM: Yes, thank you.
THE COURT: Argument, State.
MR. GRAHAM: I'll waive and reserve for rebuttal.

THE COURT: Defense.
MR. SLOCUM: Your Honor, we will submit it, however, before the Court makes a determination on the bindover --

THE COURT: Uh-huh.
MR. SLOCUM: -- we would ask that
Mr. Lopez-Delgado have the opportunity to speak with Court Services again for --

THE COURT: I can't do that. I have to make a decision now. I can't take a break and then have him talk to Court Services and come back tomorrow or the next day to make a decision on whether I'm going to bind it over.

MR. SLOCUM: No, no, no, no --
THE COURT: Oh, you want me to order another -- yeah, I'm --

MR. SLOCUM: That's correct, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay.
MR. SLOCUM: I'm just asking that you order that Court Services speak with Mr. Lopez-Delgado again, and I just know that once you --

THE COURT: So you're requesting some sort of
a bail reduction in this case?
MR. SLOCUM: I'm sorry, Your Honor?
THE COURT: Are you requesting some sort of bail reduction in this case?

MR. SLOCUM: Well, so the Court rightly --
THE COURT: It was reduced from 200,000 to 80,000 once.

MR. SLOCUM: That's correct. The Court rightly concluded or rightly assessed that the bail had already been reduced from 200 to 80 --

THE COURT: Yeah.
MR. SLOCUM: -- which I believe is what the Court is inclined to set the bail at, which is why it was set in the way that it was. I don't have additional information today to offer to you. That's why we're making the request that Court Services evaluate him. They may be able to give the court more information. But \(I\) just know that if you make the decision to bind over and he is bound over, then it's going to be too late for you to order that Court Services speak with him.

THE COURT: Well, I mean, when you look at these -- right now -- I mean, I haven't made the decision yet. I'm going to hear from the parties, and
then I'll consider the evidence, but two of these are category A felonies; are they not?

MR. SLOCUM: One is a category A felony. THE COURT: Yes. Yes, what's the penalty for that if he's convicted?

MR. SLOCUM: Five to life, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Five to life so it's looking at a
life sentence on that, and then we have multiple
category \(B\) felonies.
MR. SLOCUM: That's correct.
THE COURT: So how many total years were he to be convicted of these?

MR. SLOCUM: Well, so, Your Honor --
THE COURT: I'll hear from the State when you're done, so go ahead.

MR. SLOCUM: Okay. As far as that goes, Your Honor, it's six times four to ten, plus a five to life, and a gross misdemeanor. So that's 30 years by my calculation, one day short of 30 years.

THE COURT: That's where he'd parole, at the 40 -year mark, yeah. That's 24, 29, okay. It's 29 on the bottom and life on the top.

MR. SLOCUM: Plus the gross misdemeanor, Your
Honor.
THE COURT: I wasn't even looking at that.

MR. SLOCUM: Right, that's what I'm saying, it's one day short of 30 years.

THE COURT: Yes, it's a lot. Okay, so go ahead, State.

MR. GRAHAM: Your Honor, you know what's funny about that gross misdemeanor, it's a little bit indicative --

MR. SLOCUM: Your Honor, I'm going to object at this time. I submitted the case for your consideration. Mr. Graham doesn't have the opportunity now to argue.

THE COURT: Yes, but you're arguing bail. So I'm going to allow him to respond to bail.

MR. GRAHAM: I'm just going to argue bail.
MR. SLOCUM: Oh, bail. Okay, I misunderstood what --

THE COURT: Yes, he can respond to bail.
MR. SLOCUM: Oh, absolutely, No, I
misunderstood.
THE COURT: Yes, he's not -- hopefully, he's not getting into the facts --

MR. GRAHAM: No, no, no.
THE COURT: -- other than the bail.
MR. GRAHAM: That's what \(I\) was going to argue, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Yes, so go ahead.
MR. GRAHAM: I was just going to say
nothing's really changed. I think the bail was reduced because if you notice on the -- what he was booked in on, the charging document doesn't list all those. They kind of lump them into only eight counts, rather than everything that he was booked in on.

So bail was reduced to \(\$ 80,000\), but after that, the Defendant made contact with the victim's grandma asking them not to show up. So nothing's changed except he reached out to the victims when there's already a no-contact order in place. You know, the Defendant was working at a temp job, living at his mom's house, but having -- you know, the evidence suggests that having --

THE COURT: And that occurred after the bail was reduced?

MR. GRAHAM: I don't -- I wasn't on this originally so \(I^{\prime} m\) not sure when that --

THE COURT: It was reduced on the 5 th.
What's the date of that card? I have it right here.
MR. GRAHAM: December 26 th.
THE COURT: Okay. So it was before the bail reduction, okay.

MR. GRAHAM: Oh, it was. Okay, well, then I
take that back. I will retract that. But I think 80,000 based on the severity of the charges is more than reasonable.

THE COURT: Actually, it's awfully low, but okay. All right, he's facing a life sentence. Thirty years on the bottom, and then a life sentence on the top. A letter was sent to the victims so we'll get to that in a minute.

Regarding the charges, the reason we're here today, the preliminary hearing, it appears to me from the complaint on file herein and from the testimony adduced at the preliminary examination, that the crimes of Count 1 , statutory sexual seduction by a person age 21 or older, a felony; Count 2, statutory sexual seduction by a person age 21 or older, a felony; Count 3, use or permit minor under the age of 18 to produce pornography, a felony, that's count 3; Count 4, possess visual pornography of person under age 16 , a felony; Count 5, lewdness with a child older than 14, a felony; Count 6, lewdness with a child under 14, a felony, that's count 6; Count 7, lure or attempt to lure a child with the use of computer technology to engage in sexual conduct, a felony, that's count 7; Count 8, attempting to prevent or dissuade a witness from testifying, a gross misdemeanor, that's Count 8, have
been committed, and there's sufficient evidence to believe that the Defendant, Luigi Richard Lopez-Delgado, committed said crimes. I hereby order Defendant be bound over to the Second Judicial District Court to answer to the charges.

I'm denying the request for a re-interview.
I think he's a flight risk so that will be my decision in this case.

MR. SLOCUM: Thank you very much, Your Honor.
THE COURT: You bet.
MR. GRAHAM: Thank you, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Oh, we're not done.
(Whereupon, the recording stopped)
THE COURT: Keep the recording going.
THE CLERK: Okay, it's going.
THE COURT: All right. All parties are
present. I need to seal the photographs of the young lady in stages of undress. Those are sealed.

Any objection from --
MR. SLOCUM: No, Your Honor.
THE COURT: All right. Now, next, any objection to returning the exhibits to the State? They've all been scanned in, is that correct, Ms. Clerk?

THE CLERK: That's correct.
THE COURT: So we all have them scanned in
digitally. Any objection to returning these to the State so I don't have physical copies of these? MR. SLOCUM: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you. And I'm giving these to the Bailiff to deliver to the State.

MR. GRAHAM: Thank you.
THE COURT: And so evidence returned to the
State. Have we forgotten anything, counsel?
MR. GRAHAM: No.
MR. SLOCUM: I don't believe so, Your Honor. THE COURT: That will be the order, thank you.

MR. GRAHAM: Thank you.
(Whereupon, proceeding concluded)
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\title{
SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT COUNTY OF WASHOE, STATE OF NEVADA
}

\section*{AFFIRMATION \\ Pursuant to NRS 239B. 030}

The undersigned does hereby affirm that the preceding document, \(\qquad\) All pertinent information being sent to Second Judicial District Court for bindover proceedings (Title of Document)
filed in case number:
CR18-1654
\(\checkmark\) Document does not contain the social security number of any person -OR-
\(\square\) Document contains the social security number of a person as required by:A specific state or federal law, to wit:
(State specific state or federal law)
-or-
For the administration of a public program
-or-
For an application for a federal or state grant
-or-
\(\square\) Confidential Family Court Information Sheet (NRS 125.130, NRS 125.230 and NRS 125B.055)
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